中国物理学会高能物理分会第十三届全国粒子物理学术会议

Stabilizers of Finite Modular Groups and Leptonic CP Violation



Xin Wang (王 鑫) IHEP, CAS 2021.8.17

Based on XW and S. Zhou, JHEP 07 (2021) 093 [arXiv:2102.04358]

- Background and Motivation
- $\square Modular A'_5 Model$
- Analytical Perturbations
- Radiative Corrections

Summary

Neutrino oscillation experiments have confirmed that



Orbifold compactification



Modular transformation $a, b, c, d \in Z, ad - bc = 1$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c}\omega_1\\\omega_2\end{array}\right)\rightarrow\left(\begin{array}{c}\omega_1'\\\omega_2'\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}a&b\\c&d\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}\omega_1\\\omega_2\end{array}\right)$$

Modular group $\Gamma \simeq SL(2, Z)$ (homogeneous) $\overline{\Gamma} = \Gamma/Z_2$ (inhomogeneous)

Principal congruence subgroups

$$\Gamma(N) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{N} \right\} \stackrel{\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}):}{\text{unitary respective}}$$
$$\Gamma_N \equiv \overline{\Gamma}/\overline{\Gamma}(N) \quad \text{Finite modular group}$$
$$\Gamma'_N \equiv \Gamma/\Gamma(N) \quad \text{Double covering of } \Gamma_N$$
$$\textbf{e.g., } \Gamma_2^{(\prime)} \simeq \mathbf{S}_3^{(\prime)}, \Gamma_3^{(\prime)} \simeq \mathbf{A}_4^{(\prime)}, \Gamma_4^{(\prime)} \simeq \mathbf{S}_4^{(\prime)}, \Gamma_5^{(\prime)} \simeq \mathbf{A}_5^{(\prime)} \quad \chi^{(I)} \to (\mathbf{A}_5^{(I)})$$

 $\frac{\omega_1}{\omega_2} = \boldsymbol{\tau}, \operatorname{Im} \boldsymbol{\tau} > 0$



$$S: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad T: \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

 $ρ^{(I)}(γ)$:
unitary representation of $\Gamma_N^{(\prime)}$

$$\tau \to \gamma \tau = \frac{\omega_1'}{\omega_2'} = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}$$
$$\chi^{(I)} \to (c\tau + d)^{-k_I} \rho^{(I)}(\gamma) \chi^{(I)}$$

Xin Wang (IHEP)

Modular forms $f(\gamma \tau) = (c\tau + d)^k f(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}(N)$ $f(\tau + N) = f(\tau)$ Holomorphic functions of τ with weight k and level N. $f(\tau + N) = f(\tau)$

$$Y^{(k)}_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) Y^{(k)}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) \;, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_N$$

Superpotential $W = \sum_{n \in I_1,...} \sum_{I_1,...}$ remains unchanged

$$Y_{I_1...I_n}(\tau) \rightarrow (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_Y(\gamma) Y_{I_1...I_n}(\tau)$$

A $\Gamma_3 \simeq A_4$ example

$$\sum_{n} \sum_{\{I_1,\dots,I_n\}} Y_{I_1\dots I_n}(\tau) \chi^{(I_1)} \cdots \chi^{(I_n)}$$
 representations of Γ_N .

Yukawa couplings are modular forms!

 $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)} \equiv (f_1(\tau), f_2(\tau), \cdots)^{\mathrm{T}}$

transform as the irreducible

No flavon!

$$k = 2, Y_3^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \\ Y_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Modular forms with higher weights can be constructed using decomposition rules.

Generalized CP (gCP) symmetry

$$\chi^{(I)}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{CP}} X_{\mathrm{r}} \bar{\chi}^{(I)}(x_{\mathrm{P}})$$
$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathrm{CP}} -\tau^{*}$$
$$Y_{\mathrm{r}}^{(k)}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{CP}} Y_{\mathrm{r}}^{(k)}(-\tau^{*}) = \left[Y_{\mathrm{r}}^{(k)}(\tau)\right]^{*}$$

Stabilizer and residual symmetry

 $\tau_L = -1/2 + \sqrt{3}/2i \quad Z_3^{ST} = \{I, ST, (ST)^2\}$ $\tau_R = +1/2 + \sqrt{3}/2i \quad Z_3^{TS} = \{I, TS, (TS)^2\}$ $\tau_C = i \quad Z_2^S = \{I, S\}$ $\tau_T = i\infty \quad Z_3^T = \{I, T, T^2\}$

Novichkov et al., PLB, 2019Novichkov et al., JHEP, 2021Ding et al., JHEP, 2019Feruglio et al., JHEP, 2021Okada et al., JHEP, 2021Feruglio et al., JHEP, 2021

A small deviation of the modulus from its stabilizers Fundamental domain may result in large CP violation. Novichkov *et al.*, JHEP, 2019; Okada *et al.*, JHEP, 2021

Novichkov *et al.,* JHEP, 2019 Baul *et al.,* PLB, 2019

- All the coupling constants should be real.
- Modulus τ is the only source of CP violation!



Xin Wang (IHEP)

 $\Gamma_2 \simeq S_3$: Kobayashi *et al.*, PRD, 2018 Kobayashi *et al.*, PLB, 2019 Okada and Orikasa, PRD, 2019

 $\Gamma_3 \simeq A_4$: Criado *et al.*, SciPost Phys., 2018 Kobayashi *et al.*, JHEP, 2018 Okada and Tanimoto, PLB, 2019 Nomura *et al.*, PLB, 2020 Okada and Tanimoto, EPJC, 2021 Zhang, NPB, 2020 Ding, King and Liu, JHEP, 2019 Wang, NPB, 2020

> S.J. King and S.F. King, JHEP, 2020 Yao, Lu and Ding, JHEP, 2021 Asaka *et al.*, JHEP, 2020

- $\Gamma_4 \simeq S_4$: Penedo and Petcov, NPB, 2019 Novichkov *et al.*, JHEP, 2019 **Wang and Zhou**, JHEP, 2020 Zhang and Zhou, arXiv: 2106.03433
- $$\label{eq:Gamma} \begin{split} \Gamma_5 &\simeq A_5: \mbox{ Novichkov et al., JHEP, 2019} \\ & \mbox{ Ding, King and Liu, PRD, 2019} \\ & \mbox{ Criado, Feruglio and King, JHEP, 2020} \end{split}$$
 - Γ_7 : Ding, King, Li and Zhou, JHEP, 2020
- $\Gamma_3' \simeq A_4'$: Liu and Ding, JHEP, 2019
- $\Gamma'_4 \simeq S'_4$: Novichkov *et al.*, NPB, 2021 Liu, Yao and Ding, PRD, 2021
- $\Gamma'_5 \simeq A'_5$: Wang, Yu and Zhou, PRD, 2021 Yao, Liu and Ding, PRD, 2021
- Attempt to understand modular-symmetry models in an analytical way.
- Combine the modular symmetry with gCP symmetry, and analysis the behavior of CP violation near the stabilizers.

Modular A'_5 Model

Superpotential

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{W}_{l} &= \xi_{1} \left[\widehat{L}_{e} \widehat{E}_{1}^{C} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{d} + \xi_{2} \left[\left(\widehat{L}_{\mu\tau} \widehat{E}_{23}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{d} + \xi_{3} \left[\left(\widehat{L}_{\mu\tau} \widehat{E}_{23}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{1}} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{d} \\ \mathcal{W}_{D} &= g_{1} \left[\left(\widehat{L}_{e} \widehat{N}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{3}'} Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{u} + g_{2} \left[\left(\widehat{L}_{\mu\tau} \widehat{N}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{\widehat{6}}} Y_{\mathbf{\widehat{6}},1}^{(3)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{u} + g_{3} \left[\left(\widehat{L}_{\mu\tau} \widehat{N}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{\widehat{6}}} Y_{\mathbf{\widehat{6}},2}^{(3)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \widehat{H}_{u} \\ \mathcal{W}_{R} &= \frac{1}{2} \Lambda \left[\left(\widehat{N}^{C} \widehat{N}^{C} \right)_{\mathbf{5}} Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)} \right]_{\mathbf{1}} \end{split}$$

Mass matrices

Charged-lepton mass matrix

$$\boldsymbol{M}_{l} = \frac{v_{\rm d}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\xi_2 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}\right)_2 & \xi_2 \left[\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}\right)_1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\tilde{\xi}Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} \right] \\ 0 & \xi_2 \left[\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}\right)_1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\tilde{\xi}Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} \right] & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\xi_2 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}\right)_3 \end{pmatrix}^*$$

SU(2)
$$A'_5$$
 $-k_I$ \hat{L}_e 211 $\hat{L}_{\mu\tau}$ 2 $\hat{2}$ 2 \hat{E}_{1}^{C} 11-1 \hat{E}_{23}^{C} 1 $\hat{2}$ 2 \hat{N}^{C} 1 $3'$ 1 $\hat{H}_{u,d}$ 210

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{M_{\mathrm{D}}} = & \frac{\sqrt{6}g_{1}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathrm{u}}}{12} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 2\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)}\right)_{1} & 2\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)}\right)_{3} & 2\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)}\right)_{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \tilde{g}_{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{4} & -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{2} & \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{1} - \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{6} \\ -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{3} & \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{1} + \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{6} & -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},1}^{(3)}\right)_{5} \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \tilde{g}_{3} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{4} & -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{2} & \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{1} - \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{6} \\ -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{3} & \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{1} + \left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{6} & -\sqrt{2}\left(Y_{\mathbf{6},2}^{(3)}\right)_{5} \end{pmatrix} \right]^{*} \qquad \boldsymbol{M_{\mathrm{R}}} = \frac{\Lambda}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 2\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{1} & -\sqrt{3}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{4} & -\sqrt{3}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{3} \\ -\sqrt{3}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{4} & \sqrt{6}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{2} & -\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{1} \\ -\sqrt{3}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{3} & -\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{1} & \sqrt{6}\left(Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)}\right)_{5} \end{pmatrix}^{*} \end{split}$$

Dirac neutrino mass matrix

Majorana neutrino mass matrix

Modular A'_5 Model

Numerical results



Xin Wang (IHEP)

Analytical Perturbations

$\Box \tau = i \text{ exactly holds}$ $A_0 = \sqrt{\sqrt{5\phi}} - \phi$ $\frac{\widehat{e}_2(i)}{\widehat{e}_1(i)} = \frac{\widehat{e}_3(i)}{\widehat{e}_2(i)} = \frac{\widehat{e}_4(i)}{\widehat{e}_3(i)} = \frac{\widehat{e}_5(i)}{\widehat{e}_4(i)} = \frac{\widehat{e}_6(i)}{\widehat{e}_5(i)} = A_0 \qquad \phi = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}$

$$\begin{split} Y_1(\mathbf{i}) &= \widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})(1 - 3\,A_0^5) \;, \quad Y_2(\mathbf{i}) = 5\sqrt{2}\,\widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})A_0 \;, \quad Y_3(\mathbf{i}) = 10\,\widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})A_0^2 \;, \\ Y_4(\mathbf{i}) &= 10\,\widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})A_0^3 \;, \quad Y_5(\mathbf{i}) = 5\sqrt{2}\,\widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})A_0^4 \;, \quad Y_6(\mathbf{i}) = -\widehat{e}_1(\mathbf{i})(3 + A_0^5) \end{split}$$

Charged-lepton sector

$$U_{l} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \theta_{l} & -\sin \theta_{l} \\ 0 & \sin \theta_{l} & \cos \theta_{l} \end{pmatrix} \quad \frac{\tan 2\theta_{l}}{\operatorname{Approximately diagonal}}$$

Weight-one basis vectors

$$\begin{split} \widehat{e}_1 &= 1 + 3q + 4q^2 + 2q^3 + \cdots, \\ \widehat{e}_2 &= q^{1/5} \left(1 + 2q + 2q^2 + q^3 + \cdots \right) , \\ \widehat{e}_3 &= q^{2/5} \left(1 + q + q^2 + q^3 \cdots \right) , \\ \widehat{e}_4 &= q^{3/5} \left(1 + q^2 + q^3 \cdots \right) , \\ \widehat{e}_5 &= q^{4/5} \left(1 - q + 2q^2 + \cdots \right) , \\ \widehat{e}_6 &= q \left(1 - 2q + 4q^2 - 3q^3 + \cdots \right) \end{split}$$

Wang, Yu and Zhou, PRD, 2021

Neutrino sector (In the M_l -diagonal basis)

$$\widetilde{M}_{\nu} = \frac{\widehat{g}_{1}^{2} v_{u}^{2}}{\text{Det}(M_{\text{R}})} \begin{pmatrix} 50.67 & 0 & -17.19(\widehat{g}_{2} + 4\widehat{g}_{3}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -17.19(\widehat{g}_{2} + 4\widehat{g}_{3}) & 0 & 5.834(\widehat{g}_{2} + 4\widehat{g}_{3})^{2} \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{\widehat{g}_{1} = g_{1}|\widehat{e}_{1}(\tau)|^{2}}{= 0 \text{ if } \widehat{g}_{2} = -4\widehat{g}_{3}}$$

Two-step perturbation

> Assume $\hat{g}_2 = -4\hat{g}_3$ holds and introduce perturbation $\tau = \mathbf{i} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$

> Break the above identity by requiring $\hat{g}_3 = -\hat{g}_2/4 + \kappa$

 $\Box \tau = i + \epsilon$

中国物理学会高能物理分会第十三届全国粒子物理学术会议

Lic

Analytical Perturbations

Comparison between analytical and numerical results



Leptonic CP violation

CP-violating phases

$$\delta = 2\pi - \varphi \approx 2\pi - \arctan\left(\frac{0.0705 - \hat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\rm R}}{\hat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\rm I}}\right)$$
$$\rho \approx \frac{\pi}{2} + \arctan\left(\frac{\epsilon_{\rm I}}{\epsilon_{\rm R}}\right)$$
$$\sigma \approx \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\left(\frac{\epsilon_{\rm I}}{\epsilon_{\rm R}}\right)$$

 $\epsilon_{\rm I} \ll \epsilon_{\rm R}$, nearly-maximal CP violation even if τ is close to i.



中国物理学会高能物理分会第十三届全国粒子物理学术会议

2021/8/17

One-loop RG equations

$$16\pi^{2} \frac{d\tilde{Y}_{l}}{dt} = \left[\alpha_{l} + 3\left(\tilde{Y}_{l}\tilde{Y}_{l}^{\dagger}\right)\right] \tilde{Y}_{l} \quad \mathcal{M} \equiv -U_{l}^{\dagger}Y_{\nu}M_{\mathrm{R}}^{-1}Y_{\nu}^{\mathrm{T}}U_{l}^{*} \qquad \text{Arason } et al., \text{ PRD, 1992} \\ Castano et al., \text{ PRD, 1994} \\ 16\pi^{2} \frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} = \alpha_{\nu}\mathcal{M} + \left[\left(\tilde{Y}_{l}\tilde{Y}_{l}^{\dagger}\right)\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{M}\left(\tilde{Y}_{l}\tilde{Y}_{l}^{\dagger}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right] \qquad \text{Chankowski and Pluciennik, PLB, 1993} \\ \mathbf{M}(m_{Z}) = I_{\nu} \begin{pmatrix} I_{e} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{\tau} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{SS}}) \begin{pmatrix} I_{e} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{\tau} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{Artusch } et al., \text{ PLB, 1993} \\ \mathbf{M}(m_{Z}) = I_{\nu} \begin{pmatrix} I_{e} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{\tau} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{SS}}) \begin{pmatrix} I_{e} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{\tau} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{Mei and Xing, PRD, 2004} \\ I_{\nu} = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{16\pi^{2}} \int_{0}^{\ln(\Lambda_{\mathrm{SS}}/m_{Z})} \alpha_{\nu}(t) dt \right] I_{\nu} \text{ affects the absolute scale of neutrino masses.} \\ I_{\alpha} = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{16\pi^{2}} \int_{0}^{\ln(\Lambda_{\mathrm{SS}}/m_{Z})} y_{\alpha}^{2}(t) dt \right] I_{\alpha} \text{ modify both neutrino masses and flavor mixing parameters.} I_{e} \approx I_{\mu} \approx 1, I_{\tau} \text{ is dominant.} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{split} m_1^2(m_Z) &\approx m_{1,0}^2 - 0.108 \, I_\tau \mu_0^2 \widehat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\mathrm{I}} |\kappa| \\ m_2^2(m_Z) &\approx I_\tau^2 m_{2,0}^2 + 0.108 \, I_\tau \mu_0^2 \widehat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\mathrm{I}} |\kappa| \\ m_3^2(m_Z) &\approx I_\tau^2 m_{3,0}^2 \\ \sin^2 \theta_{12}(m_Z) &\approx \frac{0.108 \, I_\tau \mu_0^2 \widehat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\mathrm{I}} |\kappa|}{I_\tau^2 m_{2,0}^2 - m_{1,0}^2 + 0.216 \, I_\tau \mu_0^2 \widehat{g}_2^2 \epsilon_{\mathrm{I}} |\kappa| \end{split}$$

 $m_{2,0}^2 \approx m_{1,0}^2$, $I_{\tau}^2 m_{2,0}^2 - m_{1,0}^2$ can lead to large corrections to $\sin^2 \theta_{12}$ even if $I_{\tau} - 1$ is small.

Machacek and Vaughn NPR 1984

Radiative Corrections



- It is interesting to explore the basic properties of modularsymmetry models with a modulus τ in the vicinity of the stabilizers.
- we construct a feasible lepton flavor model based on the modular A'_5 group combined with the gCP symmetry, and explain why it predicts a nearly-maximal CP-violating phase within the neighbourhood of $\tau = i$ in an analytical way.
- □ The RG running effect turns out to be significant in our model due to the mass degeneracy between m_1 and m_2 .
- It does shed some light on the common features of the modular-symmetry models that seem to be "unstable" around the stabilizers.

Thank you!