

# Renormalization group effects in astrophobic axion models

Luca Di Luzio<sup>a,b</sup>, Federico Meschia<sup>c</sup>, Enrico Nardi<sup>d</sup>, Shohei Okawa<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia ‘G. Galilei’, Università di Padova, Italy*

<sup>b</sup>*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy*

<sup>c</sup>*Departament de Física Quàntica i Astrofísica, Institut de Ciències del Cosmos (ICCUB),*

*Universitat de Barcelona, Martí i Franquès 1, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>d</sup>*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, C.P. 13, 00044 Frascati, Italy*

---

## Abstract

It has been recently pointed out that in certain axion models it is possible to suppress simultaneously both the axion couplings to nucleons and electrons, realising the so-called *astrophobic axion* scenarios, wherein the tight bounds from SN1987A and from stellar evolution of red giants and white dwarfs are greatly relaxed. So far, however, the conditions for realising astrophobia have only been set out in tree-level analyses. Here we study whether these conditions can still be consistently implemented once renormalization group effects are included in the running of axion couplings. We find that axion astrophobia keeps holding, albeit within fairly different parameter space regions, and we provide analytical insights into this result. Given that astrophobic axion models generally feature flavour violating axion couplings, we also assess the impact of renormalization group effects on axion-mediated flavour violating observables.

## 1. Introduction

Non-universal axion model, in which the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) symmetry  $U(1)_{PQ}$  [1–4] acts on the different Standard Model (SM) fermions in a generation-dependent way, have been often considered in frameworks addressing the SM flavour puzzle (see e.g. Refs. [5–7]), as well as in more phenomenological contexts. For instance, it was recently pointed out in Ref. [8] that in variants of Dine-Fischler-Srednicki-Zhitnitsky (DFSZ) [9, 10] models with two Higgs doublets (2HDM) the non-universality of the SM quarks PQ charges is a necessary ingredient to allow a simultaneous suppression of the axion coupling both to protons and neutrons. Nucleophobia can then be obtained in parameter space regions in which the ratio of the two Higgs vacuum expectation values (VEVs) satisfies certain conditions. This allows to relax the tight astrophysical bounds on the decay constant  $f_a$  (or on the axion mass  $m_a$ ) from Supernova (SN) 1987A. Still, the bounds are only marginally loosened because in DFSZ-like models axion couplings to electrons are generically of  $\mathcal{O}(1/f_a)$ , and then limits from white dwarfs and red giants stars evolution, which are only moderately weaker than the SN1987A bound (see e.g. Ref. [11] for a recent review) still apply. Axion-electron decoupling can be either obtained at the price of an extra tuning with the flavour structure of the lepton rotation matrices [8] or, more elegantly, it can be implemented together with nucleophobia, and without extra tuning, in a three Higgs doublets model (3HDM), as detailed in Ref. [12]. In Refs. [8, 12] the conditions for nucleo/electrophobia were formulated in terms of tree-level relations (up to small QCD running effects [13]) and it is then mandatory to question whether the resulting suppression of the axion couplings to nucleons and electron can survive after including the effects of radiative corrections.

The full one-loop anomalous dimensions for the  $d = 5$  axion effective Lagrangian have been recently computed in Refs. [14, 15], while running effects have been systematically investigated, within canonical axion models, in Ref. [16]. For related efforts to include loop effects on flavour-violating axion couplings, with a non-trivial dependence from the UV completion, see Ref. [17]. The purpose of this work is to extend the analysis of the running axion couplings to non-universal axion models, and to assess, in particular, the radiative stability under the renormalization group (RG) evolution of the nucleo/electrophobic conditions set out in Refs. [8, 12]. A remarkable consequence of non-universal axion models is the generic occurrence of flavour-violating axion couplings, which can be tested in low-energy flavour-changing process, such as e.g.  $K \rightarrow \pi a$ , that will be probed at current and future experimental facilities [18–20]. We hence complement our study by assessing the relevance of running effects for flavour off-diagonal axion couplings.

## 2. Astrophobic axions

We focus first on a specific non-universal axion model introduced in Ref. [12], wherein the nucleo and electrophobic conditions can be elegantly realised within certain regions of the parameter space spanned by the ratios between the VEVs of the Higgs doublets that couple to SM fermions.

The model features three Higgs doublets  $H_{1,2,3}$  (hence we will label it as 3HDM) and a SM singlet complex scalar  $\Phi$ . Under the SM gauge group  $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  the quantum numbers of the scalars are  $H_{1,2,3} \sim (1, 2, -1/2)$  and  $\Phi \sim (1, 1, 0)$ . The SM quarks couple to the first two doublets  $H_{1,2}$  and their PQ charges are characterized by a 2+1 structure, namely the first two generations replicate the same set of

charges, while the PQ charges of the third generation differ. The  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  charges are chosen in such a way that all the entries in the up- and down-type quark Yukawa matrices are allowed, so that there are no texture zeros. In contrast, all the leptons couple to the third doublet  $H_3$  and feature universal PQ charges.<sup>1</sup> The Yukawa sector of the model contains the following operators:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{q}_1 u_1 H_1, \quad \bar{q}_3 u_3 H_2, \quad \bar{q}_1 u_3 H_1, \quad \bar{q}_3 u_1 H_2, \\ & \bar{q}_1 d_1 \tilde{H}_2, \quad \bar{q}_3 d_3 \tilde{H}_1, \quad \bar{q}_1 d_3 \tilde{H}_2, \quad \bar{q}_3 d_1 \tilde{H}_1, \\ & \bar{\ell}_i e_j \tilde{H}_3, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\tilde{H}_{1,2,3} = i\sigma_2 H_{1,2,3}^*$ . Note that the generation label “1” for quarks denotes both the first and second generation, which by assumption have the same PQ charges.

We are interested in the axion couplings to the proton, neutron and electron, which are defined via the effective interaction

$$\frac{C_\psi}{2f_a} \partial_\mu a \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi, \quad (2)$$

with  $\psi = p, n, e$ ,  $f_a = f/(2N)$  where  $f_a$  is the axion decay constant,  $f$  is the scale at which the PQ symmetry is broken, and  $2N$  is the coefficient of the PQ-QCD anomaly.<sup>2</sup> The fundamental couplings  $C_q$  of the axion to the quarks  $q = u, d, \dots$  are also defined by Eq. (2) with the replacement  $\psi \rightarrow q$ .  $C_{p,n}$  can be expressed in terms of  $C_q$  using non-perturbative inputs from nucleon matrix elements (see e.g. [13]). For later purposes it is more convenient to consider the two linear combinations:

$$C_p + C_n = 0.52(C_u + C_d - 1) - 2\delta_s, \quad (3)$$

$$C_p - C_n = 1.28(C_u - C_d - f_{ud}), \quad (4)$$

where the right hand sides are obtained by using the expressions for  $C_{p,n}$  given in Eqs. (A.16)-(A.17). In Eq. (4)  $f_{ud} = f_u - f_d$ , where  $f_{u,d} = m_{d,u}/(m_d + m_u)$  are the model-independent contributions induced by the axion coupling to gluons in the physical basis in which the axion is not mixed with  $\pi^0$ . In Eq. (3) is a small  $\mathcal{O}(5\%)$  correction dominated by the  $s$ -quark contribution (see Appendix A). Neglecting  $\delta_s$ , the approximate conditions for astrophobia are:

$$C_u + C_d \approx 1, \quad (5)$$

$$C_u - C_d \approx f_{ud} \approx \frac{1}{3}, \quad (6)$$

$$C_e \approx 0. \quad (7)$$

At the tree level, the relevant couplings  $C_{u,d}^0 = (\mathcal{X}_{u_1, d_1} - \mathcal{X}_{q_1})/(2N)$  and  $C_e^0 = (\mathcal{X}_e - \mathcal{X}_\ell)/(2N)$  can be read off from the Yukawa operators in Eq. (1). In terms of the PQ charges  $\mathcal{X}_{1,2,3}$  of the three Higgs doublets they read [22]

$$C_u^0 = -\frac{\mathcal{X}_1}{2N}, \quad C_d^0 = \frac{\mathcal{X}_2}{2N}, \quad C_t^0 = -\frac{\mathcal{X}_2}{2N}, \quad C_e^0 = \frac{\mathcal{X}_3}{2N}, \quad (8)$$

<sup>1</sup>An alternative Higgs configuration in the lepton sector, leading to a moderately photophobic axion, is discussed in Ref. [21].

<sup>2</sup>For uniformity of notation with studies of running axion couplings [14–16] in Appendix A we will denote the anomaly coefficient as  $c_G = 2N$ .

where for later convenience we have listed also the top-quark coupling  $C_t^0$ .<sup>3</sup> Due to the particular 2+1 structure of the quarks PQ charges, the contribution to the PQ anomaly of the third generation cancels against the contribution of one of the two light generations, and it is then straightforward to obtain  $2N = \sum_i (\mathcal{X}_{u_i} + \mathcal{X}_{d_i} - 2\mathcal{X}_{q_i}) = \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1$ . This implies that, at tree level, the first condition for nucleophobia Eq. (5) is always satisfied.

Consider now the following terms in the scalar potential, which are needed to break the  $U(1)^4$  rephasing symmetry of the kinetic terms of the four scalars down to  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}} \times U(1)_Y$ .<sup>4</sup>

$$H_3^\dagger H_1 \Phi^2 + H_3^\dagger H_2 \Phi^\dagger. \quad (9)$$

Normalizing the charges to  $\mathcal{X}_\Phi = 1$  we derive the conditions:

$$\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_3 - 2, \quad \mathcal{X}_2 = \mathcal{X}_3 + 1, \quad (10)$$

which yield  $2N = \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1 = 3$ . Substituting the values of  $\mathcal{X}_{1,2}$  in Eqs. (6)-(7) we obtain that, in terms of tree-level couplings, astrophobia can be realised if the following conditions on  $\mathcal{X}_3$  can be simultaneously satisfied:

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = \frac{1}{2}(1 - 3f_{ud}), \quad \mathcal{X}_3 = 0. \quad (11)$$

It is a fortunate numerical accident that the actual value of  $f_{ud}$  is indeed very close to  $1/3$  (corresponding to  $m_d/m_u \approx 2$ ) so that nucleophobia and electrophobia are mutually compatible.

As a final step let us consider the PQ-hypercharge orthogonality condition. Let us parametrise the VEVs as  $v_1 = v c_1 c_2$ ,  $v_2 = v s_1 c_2$ ,  $v_3 = v s_2$  with  $v^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2 \simeq (246 \text{ GeV})^2$ ,  $c_1 \equiv \cos \beta_1$ ,  $c_2 \equiv \cos \beta_2$ , etc. By using Eq. (10) we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1,2,3} \mathcal{X}_i v_i^2 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{X}_3 = (3c_1^2 - 1)c_2^2. \quad (12)$$

The condition  $\mathcal{X}_3 \approx 0$  then selects a certain region in the  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  plane where the tree level axion couplings to nucleons and electrons can be conveniently suppressed (see Fig. 1 in Ref. [12]).

A simpler astrophobic model with only two Higgs doublets  $H_{1,2}$  in which the 2+1 structure is extended also to the leptons was originally presented in Ref. [8] (see also Ref. [11]) and it was labeled “model M1”. The Yukawa terms for the quarks are as in Eq. (1), while the lepton Yukawas, the operators involving the two scalar doublets and the singlet  $\Phi$ , and the PQ-hypercharge orthogonality condition now involving only two Higgs doublets (i.e.  $\beta_2 = 0$ ) read, respectively:

$$\bar{\ell}_1 e_1 \tilde{H}_1, \quad \bar{\ell}_3 e_3 \tilde{H}_2, \quad \bar{\ell}_1 e_3 \tilde{H}_1, \quad \bar{\ell}_3 e_1 \tilde{H}_2, \quad (13)$$

$$H_2^\dagger H_1 \Phi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{X}_2 = \mathcal{X}_1 + 1, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_1 v_1^2 + \mathcal{X}_2 v_2^2 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{X}_1 = -s_{\beta_1}^2. \quad (15)$$

<sup>3</sup>In Eq. (8) we have neglected possible corrections to the diagonal quark couplings arising from fermion mixing. Throughout this paper we will assume that these mixing corrections are negligible.

<sup>4</sup>Different choices for the scalar operators are possible, but they do not allow to satisfy simultaneously the nucleophobia and electrophobia conditions (see Ref. [12]).




Figure 1: Contour lines for  $C_e$  (orange) and  $C_N^{\text{SN}}$  (black, see text) in the  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  plane for the astrophobic 3HDM. Solid lines include RG corrections for  $m_{\text{BSM}} = 10^{10}$  GeV, dashed orange lines correspond to the tree-level results.

Since the quarks Yukawa operators are the same as in the previous model, the expression for the quark couplings in Eq. (8) is the same, however now with  $2N = \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1 = 1$ . It is now easy to see that, with  $f_{ud} \approx 1/3$ , the nucleophobic conditions Eqs. (3)-(4) are satisfied at tree level in the parameter space region where  $\tan^2 \beta_1 \approx 2$ . Instead, the electrophobic condition is not satisfied since the charge assignments give  $C_e^0 = \mathcal{X}_1 \neq 0$ . However, given that in this model the lepton charges are generation dependent, there are corrections to the mass eigenstate couplings due to lepton flavour mixing. Since in the lepton sector mixing effects can be particularly large, as it was pointed out in Ref. [8] electrophobia can still be enforced at the cost of a fine-tuned cancellation yielding  $C_e^0 + \delta_e^{\text{mix}} \approx 0$ .

### 3. Astrophobic axions beyond tree level

The leading RG effects on the nucleo and electrophobic conditions Eqs. (5)-(7) can be understood from the formulae for the axion running couplings given in Eqs. (A.6). The top Yukawa coupling  $Y_t$  gives the dominant contribution to the RH side of these equations. For the first generation fermions, in the approximation in which all Yukawa couplings except  $Y_t$  are neglected, this contribution appears only through the last term  $\beta_\psi \gamma_H$  ( $\psi = q_L, u_R, d_R, \ell_L, e_R$ ). In this approximation the expression for  $\gamma_H$  given in Eq. (A.7) reduces to  $\gamma_H \approx 6Y_t^2(c'_{t_R} - c'_{t_L}) = 6Y_t^2 c_t^0$ , where  $c_t^0$  denotes the axial-vector coupling of the top. We can now combine Eqs. (A.6) to obtain RG equations (RGEs) for the  $u, d, e$  axial-vector couplings  $c_{u,d,e}$ . Recalling the definition of the hypercharge ratio  $\beta_\psi = Y_\psi / Y_H$ , it is easy to see that the  $\gamma_H$  term will appear in these equations respectively with co-




Figure 2: The values of axion-nucleon couplings,  $|C_p + C_n|$  (red) and  $|C_p - C_n|$  (blue) in the nucleophobic 2HDM as a function of  $\tan \beta_1$ . Solid lines include RG corrections for  $m_{\text{BSM}} = 10^{10}$  GeV, dashed lines depict the tree-level results.

efficients  $\beta_u - \beta_q = +1$  and  $\beta_d - \beta_q = \beta_e - \beta_\ell = -1$ .<sup>5</sup> Hence, in this approximation we can write

$$C_u \approx C_u^0 - \kappa_t C_t^0, \quad (16)$$

$$C_{d,e} \approx C_{d,e}^0 + \kappa_t C_t^0, \quad (17)$$

where  $C_{u,d,e} = c_{u,d,e}/(2N)$  are the couplings at the low scale  $\mu$ ,  $C_{u,d,e,t}^0 = c_{u,d,e,t}^0/(2N)$  are the couplings at the high scale  $f$  defined in terms of the PQ charges in Eq. (8), and the coefficient  $\kappa_t \sim 6(Y_t/4\pi)^2 \log(m_{\text{BSM}}/\mu)$  accounts for the running of the couplings from the high scale  $m_{\text{BSM}}$  where the heavy Higgs components are integrated out, down to the low scale  $\mu$ .

The first condition for nucleophobia is still satisfied by the running couplings due to the fact that the correction proportional to  $\kappa_t$  cancels in the sum

$$C_u + C_d \approx C_u^0 + C_d^0 = 1. \quad (18)$$

RG effects modify instead the other two conditions Eqs. (6)-(7). It is straightforward to see that now they are respectively satisfied for the following values of  $\mathcal{X}_3$ :

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(1 - 3f_{ud}) + \kappa_t}{1 - \kappa_t}, \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = \frac{\kappa_t}{1 - \kappa_t}. \quad (20)$$

We see that the same numerical accident that allows to enforce astrophobia with the tree-level relations in Eq. (11) (corresponding to  $\kappa_t \rightarrow 0$ ) ensures that the same result still holds

<sup>5</sup>The difference between the RH and LH hypercharge ratios is proportional to the weak-isospin of the LH component. This explains the opposite sign between the  $u$  and the  $d, e$  coefficients.

after including in the axion couplings the leading RG effects. Let us note that this result is independent of the particular value of  $\kappa_t$ , that is, it does not depend on any specific value of the high scale  $m_{\text{BSM}}$ . Only the value of the PQ charges that realise the two conditions is affected by RG corrections, and while at tree level one has  $\mathcal{X}_3 \approx 0$ , for  $\kappa_t \approx 0.30$  one has instead  $\mathcal{X}_3 \approx 0.43$ . Of course, since the PQ-hypercharge orthogonality condition in Eq. (12) is now satisfied for a non-vanishing value of  $\mathcal{X}_3$ , the region in the  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  plane where the axion can exhibit a remarkable degree of astrophobia gets shifted accordingly, see Fig. 1. However, except for this modification in the viable parameter space region, it is a remarkable result that the astrophobic axion model introduced in Ref. [12] still maintains its properties after including RG corrections, without the need of any modification in the theoretical setup. Finally, it goes without saying that the nucleophobic property of the 2HDM model in Ref. [8] are also preserved, but for a different VEVs ratio  $\tan^2 \beta_1 \approx 1.2$  (see Fig. 2). Also the suppression of the axion-electron coupling can still be engineered, but with a corresponding shift in the value of the mixing correction  $\delta_e^{\text{mix}}$ .

The results of this analysis, based on the approximate expressions Eqs. (16)-(17), are confirmed in Figs. 1 and 2 that are obtained by numerically solving the full RGEs for the axion couplings given in Appendix A. In Fig. 1 we show the contour lines for different values of  $C_e$  and  $C_N^{\text{SN}} = (C_n^2 + 0.61C_p^2 + 0.53C_n C_p)^{1/2}$  in the  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  plane. The latter combination of nucleon couplings corresponds to the quadratic form which is bounded by the SN1987A neutrino burst duration [23]. The lowest value corresponds to  $C_N^{\text{SN}} \approx 0.02$  which is determined by the correction  $\delta_s$  in Eq. (3) (for comparison in the Kim-Shifman-Vainshtein-Zakharov (KSVZ) [24, 25] axion model  $C_N^{\text{SN}} = 0.36$ ). The hatched region in Fig. 1 denotes the perturbative unitarity bounds on the Yukawa couplings of the 3HDM (see e.g. [26, 27]) translated in the  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  plane. It is evident from Fig. 1 that, also in the case of running axion couplings, electrophobia and nucleophobia occur in overlapping regions, so that a single choice of the values of the relevant parameters can simultaneously enforce all the astrophobic conditions. Fig. 2 instead displays the values of  $C_p \pm C_n$  as a function of  $\tan \beta_1$  in the 2HDM case. As expected from the approximate expressions in Eqs. (16)-(17), running effects largely cancel out in the combination  $C_p + C_n$ , while they sizeably change the value of  $\tan \beta_1$  for which the couplings combination  $C_p - C_n$  is maximally suppressed from  $\tan \beta_1 \approx \sqrt{2}$  to  $\tan \beta_1 \approx 1.1$ . Nevertheless the same level of nucleophobia than in the tree level analysis can still be obtained regardless of the running effects.<sup>6</sup>

#### 4. Running effects on flavour-violating axion couplings

Flavour-violating axion couplings are generically expected in axion model with generation dependent PQ charge assignments, and it is therefore important to study the impact of RG

<sup>6</sup>We note in passing that also the exponential enhancement of axion-nucleon couplings in the *nucleophilic* axion models of Ref. [28] is not spoiled by running effects. The reason being that the required cancellation between the QCD anomaly factors of first and second generation quarks holds at all orders.




Figure 3: Flavour off-diagonal axion couplings  $|(C_u^{A,V})_{ij}|$  and  $|(C_d^{A,V})_{ij}|$  with  $m_{\text{BSM}} = 10^{10}$  GeV in the 2HDM for the CKM- $Y_u$ . At tree level  $(C_d^{A,V})_{ij} = 0$  but non-zero values arise radiatively, while  $C_{uc}^{A,V} \neq 0$  but it does not receive RG corrections.

corrections on these couplings. We focus for definiteness on the flavour off-diagonal couplings between the axion and the quarks in the 2HDM. Since only the charges of the left-handed (LH) quarks are generation dependent (see Eq. (A.4)) and recalling that  $c_G = 2N = 1$ , using Eqs. (A.9)-(A.10) we can write<sup>7</sup>

$$(C_{d/u}^V)_{i \neq j} \approx -(C_{d/u}^A)_{i \neq j} \approx (U_{d_L/u_L} c'_{q_L} U_{d_L/u_L}^\dagger)_{ij}, \quad (21)$$

where the LH rotation matrices  $U_{d_L/u_L}$  are defined via

$$Y_u = U_{u_L}^\dagger \hat{Y}_u U_{u_R}, \quad Y_d = U_{d_L}^\dagger \hat{Y}_d U_{d_R}, \quad (22)$$

with  $\hat{Y}_{u,d}$  the diagonal Yukawa matrices, and let us recall that  $U_{d_L/u_L}$  are related to the CKM matrix via  $V_{\text{CKM}} = U_{u_L} U_{d_L}^\dagger$ . Here we will consider the following two flavour ansätze:

$$\text{CKM-}Y_u: Y_u = V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger \hat{Y}_u, \quad Y_d = \hat{Y}_d, \quad (U_{u_L} = V_{\text{CKM}}), \quad (23)$$

$$\text{CKM-}Y_d: Y_u = \hat{Y}_u, \quad Y_d = V_{\text{CKM}} \hat{Y}_d, \quad (U_{d_L} = V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger). \quad (24)$$

In the CKM- $Y_u$  case,  $(C_d^{V,A})_{i \neq j} = 0$  at the tree level and the non-zero  $(C_d^{V,A})_{i \neq j}$  couplings are radiatively generated. We remark that the alignment of the flavour structure in the down sector is not radiatively stable under the RG evolution, and hence processes like  $K \rightarrow \pi a$  can still occur with a rate sufficiently large to be observable. In the CKM- $Y_d$  case,  $(C_u^{V,A})_{i \neq j} = 0$  at the tree level, and it remains negligible, i.e. at most  $O(10^{-9})$

<sup>7</sup>Eq. (21) is defined at low energy, and thus it holds up to small corrections from right-handed (RH) mixings induced by running (see Eq. (A.6)), which lift the universality of the RH couplings. These effects are taken into account in the numerical analysis.

even after including RG effects. For  $f_a \gtrsim 10^8$  GeV all the off-diagonal couplings remain well below the experimental limits reported in Table 1, where the strongest constraint is  $|C_{ds}^V| \leq 3.3 \times 10^{-2} \times (f_a/10^{10} \text{ GeV})$  from Ref. [29].

Coupling	Bound [ $\times (f_a/10^{10} \text{ GeV})$ ]
$ C_{uc}^V $	$\leq 2.1 \times 10^2$
$ C_{ds}^V $	$\leq 3.3 \times 10^{-2}$
$ C_{db}^V $	$\leq 1.8 \times 10^2$
$ C_{sb}^V $	$\leq 61$
$ C_{uc}^A $	$\leq 4.2 \times 10^2$
$ C_{ds}^A $	$\leq 4.5 \times 10^2$
$ C_{db}^A $	$\leq 1.5 \times 10^3$
$ C_{sb}^A $	$\leq 8.7 \times 10^3$

Table 1: Current experimental bounds on axion flavour-violating couplings. See Ref. [29] for details.

In the CKM- $Y_u$  case an interesting feature emerges (see Fig. 3). The  $C_{qb}^{A,V}$  ( $q = s, d$ ) couplings are strongly suppressed for  $\tan\beta_1 \approx 0.65$ . This cancellation can be understood analytically by keeping only leading top-loop effects. Employing the CKM- $Y_u$  structure and neglecting all Yukawa couplings except the top one, the RG evolution of the off-diagonal couplings can be cast in the form

$$\frac{d(c'_{ql})_{i\neq j}}{d\log\mu} \propto \left[ \frac{(c'_{ql})_{ii}}{2} + \frac{(c'_{ql})_{jj}}{2} - (c'_{tr}) \right] Y_t^2 (V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger)_{i3} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{3j}, \quad (25)$$

where only the diagonal couplings of  $(c'_{ql})_{ii}$  have been kept. Since both  $(c'_{ql})_{ii}$  and  $(c'_{tr})$  are positive, it is possible to cancel the quantity in the square brackets for  $i = 3$  or  $j = 3$  at a specific value  $\tan\beta_1$ . The RG corrections to  $(c'_{ql})_{i\neq j}$  are proportional to  $(V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger)_{i3} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{3j}$ , which indicates that the off-diagonal axion couplings to the up-quarks do not receive the corrections, given that the CKM factors cancel out due to unitarity.

In the CKM- $Y_d$  case, on the other hand, flavour mixing occurs only through the down-quarks Yukawa couplings, and keeping only the top-loop contribution, the RG correction to the off-diagonal couplings vanishes, namely  $d(c'_{ql})_{i\neq j}/d\log\mu \approx 0$ . RG effects are thus captured solely by the running of the diagonal LH quark couplings  $(c'_{ql})_{ii}$  and matching corrections at the electroweak scale [15], which remain at the level of 1–4 %.

## 5. Conclusions

In this work we assessed the impact of RG effects on the axion couplings, focussing on the case of non-universal axion models. An important application of the RG analysis arises in the context of the so-called astrophobic axions of Refs. [8, 12], in which the axion couplings to nucleons and electrons can be simultaneously suppressed, thus allowing to relax the most stringent astrophysical constraints. In the original works the nucleo and electrophobic conditions were only set out at tree level, and it remained an important open question whether the conditions for astrophobia would still hold after including RG

effects. In this paper we have shown that, perhaps unexpectedly, the astrophobic features are not spoiled by RG running of the axion couplings. The only effect is a sizeable shift in the parameter space regions in which these conditions are realised.

Since non-universal axion models necessarily imply certain flavour-violating axion couplings, we have also assessed the impact of running on these latter couplings. For instance, a tree level flavour structure aligned in such a way that off-diagonal couplings in the down sector are absent, is not stable under RG evolution, and we have estimated the irreducible contributions to flavour violating processes arising from this type of effects.

The tools developed in this work could be applied to other problems of phenomenological relevance. For instance, it could be interesting to see whether RG corrections can sizeably modify the fit to the so-called ‘‘stellar cooling anomalies’’, improving on the tree-level analysis in Refs. [11, 30].

## Acknowledgments

The work of L.D.L. was partially supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 860881-HIDDEN. E.N. acknowledges support from a María de Maeztu grant for a visit to the Institute of Cosmos Sciences, Barcelona University, where this work was completed. E.N. is supported in part by the INFN ‘‘Iniziativa Specifica’’ Theoretical Astroparticle Physics (TAsP-LNF). S.O. and F.M. acknowledges financial support from the State Agency for Research of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through the ‘‘Unit of Excellence María de Maeztu 2020-2023’’ award to the Institute of Cosmos Sciences (CEX2019-000918-M), and from PID2019-105614GB-C21 and 2017-SGR-929 grants.

## Appendix A. RGEs for axion EFTs

In order to take into account running effects it is convenient to adopt the Georgi-Kaplan-Randall (GKR) field basis [31], where the PQ symmetry is realised non-linearly, so that under a  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  symmetry transformation all fields are invariant except the axion field, which changes by an additive constant  $a \rightarrow a + \alpha f$ , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a^{\text{GKR-2HDM}} = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \sum_{A=G,W,B} c_A \frac{g_A^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{a}{f} F^A \tilde{F}^A \quad (\text{A.1}) \\ & + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{f} \left[ c_{H_1} H_1^\dagger i \overleftrightarrow{D}^\mu H_1 + c_{H_2} H_2^\dagger i \overleftrightarrow{D}^\mu H_2 + \bar{q}_L c_{q_L} \gamma^\mu q_L \right. \\ & \left. + \bar{u}_R c_{u_R} \gamma^\mu u_R + \bar{d}_R c_{d_R} \gamma^\mu d_R + \bar{\ell}_L c_{\ell_L} \gamma^\mu \ell_L + \bar{e}_R c_{e_R} \gamma^\mu e_R \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $H_{1,2}^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}^\mu H_{1,2} \equiv H_{1,2}^\dagger (D^\mu H_{1,2}) - (D^\mu H_{1,2})^\dagger H_{1,2}$  and  $c_{q_L}, \dots$  are diagonal matrices in generation space. Note that in the EFT we have neglected the heavy  $\mathcal{O}(f)$  radial mode of  $\Phi$  and we focused for simplicity on the 2HDM (the generalization to an arbitrary number of Higgs doublets is straightforward). In order to match an explicit axion model to the effective Lagrangian in Eq. (A.1) at the high scale  $\mu \sim \mathcal{O}(f)$ , we perform an axion dependent field redefinition:  $\psi \rightarrow e^{-iX_\psi a/f} \psi$ , where  $\psi$  spans over

all the fields, and  $\mathcal{X}_\psi$  is the corresponding PQ charge. Due to  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  symmetry, the non-derivative part of the renormalizable Lagrangian is invariant upon this field redefinition, while the  $d = 5$  operators in Eq. (A.1) are generated from the variation of the kinetic terms and from the chiral anomaly. The couplings are then identified as

$$c_\psi = \mathcal{X}_\psi, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$c_A = \sum_{\psi_R} 2\mathcal{X}_{\psi_R} \text{Tr} T_A^2(\psi_R) - \sum_{\psi_L} 2\mathcal{X}_{\psi_L} \text{Tr} T_A^2(\psi_L), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where in the second equation  $c_{\psi_{R,L}}$  refer to the charges of the chiral fermion fields.<sup>8</sup> For the 2HDM introduced in Sect. 2, the charges  $\mathcal{X}_\psi$ , that can be read off from the Yukawa couplings in Eq. (13) can be set to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_{q_i} &= (0, 0, \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1), \quad \mathcal{X}_{u_i} = -(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_1), \quad \mathcal{X}_{d_i} = (\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_2), \\ \mathcal{X}_{\ell_i} &= -\mathcal{X}_{q_i}, \quad \mathcal{X}_{e_i} = -\mathcal{X}_{u_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_1 = -s_{\beta_1}^2$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2 = c_{\beta_1}^2$ , see Eq. (15), and we have shifted the charges proportionally to  $B$  and  $L$  to set  $\mathcal{X}_{q_{1,2}} = \mathcal{X}_{\ell_{1,2}} = 0$ . For the anomaly coefficients in Eq. (A.3) one has  $(c_G, c_W, c_B) = (1, -2, 8/3)$  and, in particular, the electromagnetic to QCD anomaly ratio is  $E/N \equiv (c_W + c_B)/c_G = 2/3$ . For the 3HDM instead the lepton charges are  $\mathcal{X}_\ell = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_e = \mathcal{X}_3$ , the corresponding anomaly coefficients read  $(c_G, c_W, c_B) = (3, -9, 17)$  and  $E/N = 8/3$ .

Running effects induced by Yukawa couplings (and in particular by the Yukawa of the top which are the most relevant ones) only occur below the scale of the heavy radial modes of the 2HDM, that will be denoted as  $m_{\text{BSM}} \simeq m_{H,A,H^\pm}$ , with the heavy scalars assumed to be degenerate in the decoupling limit (see e.g. [32]). This is due to the fact that as long as the complete set of Higgs doublets appear in the EFT, the PQ current is conserved (up to anomalous effects) and thus the couplings, which correspond to PQ charges, do not renormalize. Once the heavy scalar components are integrated out, the sum rule of PQ charges set by  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  invariance breaks down, and non-vanishing contributions to the running of the couplings arise (see e.g. [16]). We can now directly match Eq. (A.1) at the scale  $\mu = O(m_{\text{BSM}})$  with a GKR basis featuring only one SM-like Higgs doublet

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a^{\text{GKR-SM}} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \sum_{A=G,W,B} c_A \frac{g_A^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{a}{f} F^A \tilde{F}^A \\ &+ \frac{\partial_\mu a}{f} \left[ c_H H^\dagger i \overleftrightarrow{D}^\mu H + \bar{q}_L c_{q_L} \gamma^\mu q_L \right. \\ &\left. + \bar{u}_R c_{u_R} \gamma^\mu u_R + \bar{d}_R c_{d_R} \gamma^\mu d_R + \bar{\ell}_L c_{\ell_L} \gamma^\mu \ell_L + \bar{e}_R c_{e_R} \gamma^\mu e_R \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where  $c_H = c_{H_1} c_\beta^2 + c_{H_2} s_\beta^2$ , which follows from the projections on the SM Higgs doublet:  $H_1 \rightarrow c_\beta H$  and  $H_2 \rightarrow s_\beta H$ , consistently with the definition of  $\tan\beta \equiv \tan\beta_1 = v_2/v_1$ . In particular, by employing global  $U(1)_Y$  invariance, it is convenient to

<sup>8</sup>Note that our anomaly coefficients  $c_A$  have opposite sign with respect to those in Refs. [14–16]. This is due to the fact that we are using a different convention for the Levi-Civita tensor, namely  $\epsilon^{0123} = -1$ .

cast the RGEs in a form that does not depend explicitly on  $c_H$ . This can be achieved via the axion-dependent field redefinition:  $\psi \rightarrow \psi' = e^{-i c_H \beta_\psi a/f} \psi$ , with  $\beta_\psi = Y_\psi/Y_H$  the ratio of the corresponding hypercharges, which redefines the effective couplings as  $c'_\psi = c_\psi - c_H \beta_\psi$  (so in particular  $c'_H = 0$ ). In this basis the RGEs read:

$$\begin{aligned} (4\pi)^2 \frac{dc'_{q_L}}{d \log \mu} &= \frac{1}{2} \{c'_{q_L}, Y_u Y_u^\dagger + Y_d Y_d^\dagger\} - Y_u c'_{u_R} Y_u^\dagger - Y_d c'_{d_R} Y_d^\dagger \\ &+ \left( 8\alpha_s^2 \bar{c}_G + \frac{9}{2} \alpha_2^2 \bar{c}_W + \frac{1}{6} \alpha_1^2 \bar{c}_B \right) \mathbf{1} - \beta_q \gamma_H \mathbf{1}, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{dc'_{u_R}}{d \log \mu} &= \{c'_{u_R}, Y_u^\dagger Y_u\} - 2Y_u^\dagger c'_{q_L} Y_u - \left( 8\alpha_s^2 \bar{c}_G + \frac{8}{3} \alpha_1^2 \bar{c}_B \right) \mathbf{1} \\ &- \beta_u \gamma_H \mathbf{1}, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{dc'_{d_R}}{d \log \mu} &= \{c'_{d_R}, Y_d^\dagger Y_d\} - 2Y_d^\dagger c'_{q_L} Y_d - \left( 8\alpha_s^2 \bar{c}_G + \frac{2}{3} \alpha_1^2 \bar{c}_B \right) \mathbf{1} \\ &- \beta_d \gamma_H \mathbf{1}, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{dc'_{\ell_L}}{d \log \mu} &= \frac{1}{2} \{c'_{\ell_L}, Y_e Y_e^\dagger\} - Y_e c'_{e_R} Y_e^\dagger + \left( \frac{9}{2} \alpha_2^2 \bar{c}_W + \frac{3}{2} \alpha_1^2 \bar{c}_B \right) \mathbf{1} \\ &- \beta_\ell \gamma_H \mathbf{1}, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{dc'_{e_R}}{d \log \mu} &= \{c'_{e_R}, Y_e^\dagger Y_e\} - 2Y_e^\dagger c'_{\ell_L} Y_e - 6\alpha_1^2 \bar{c}_B \mathbf{1} - \beta_e \gamma_H \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_H &= -2 \text{Tr} \left( 3Y_u^\dagger c'_{q_L} Y_u - 3Y_d^\dagger c'_{q_L} Y_d - Y_e^\dagger c'_{\ell_L} Y_e \right) \\ &+ 2 \text{Tr} \left( 3Y_u c'_{u_R} Y_u^\dagger - 3Y_d c'_{d_R} Y_d^\dagger - Y_e c'_{e_R} Y_e^\dagger \right), \\ \bar{c}_G &= c_G - \text{Tr} \left( c'_{u_R} + c'_{d_R} - 2c'_{q_L} \right), \\ \bar{c}_W &= c_W + \text{Tr} \left( 3c'_{q_L} + c'_{\ell_L} \right), \\ \bar{c}_B &= c_B - \text{Tr} \left( \frac{1}{3} (8c'_{u_R} + 2c'_{d_R} - c'_{q_L}) + 2c'_{e_R} - c'_{\ell_L} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note that the  $c_A$  ( $A = G, W, B$ ) Wilson coefficients in Eq. (A.7) do not run, since in the normalization of Eq. (A.1) the scale dependence of the operator  $aF^A \tilde{F}^A$  is accounted for by the running of the gauge couplings [15, 33].

Eq. (A.5) is matched at the scale  $\mu = O(m_Z)$  with the  $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ -invariant axion effective Lagrangian below the electroweak scale

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a \supset & \frac{g_s^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{a}{f_a} G\tilde{G} + \frac{c_\gamma}{c_G} \frac{e^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{a}{f_a} F\tilde{F} \\ &+ \sum_{f=u,d,e} \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2f_a} \bar{f}_i \gamma^\mu \left( (C_f^V)_{ij} + (C_f^A)_{ij} \gamma_5 \right) f_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where we have introduced the standard QCD normalization factor for the  $aG\tilde{G}$  term and defined the axion decay constant  $f_a = f/c_G$ , while  $c_\gamma = c_W + c_B$ . We further have

$$C_f^V = \frac{1}{c_G} (U_{f_R} c'_{f_R} U_{f_R}^\dagger + U_{f_L} c'_{f_L} U_{f_L}^\dagger), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$C_f^A = \frac{1}{c_G} (U_{f_R} c'_{f_R} U_{f_R}^\dagger - U_{f_L} c'_{f_L} U_{f_L}^\dagger), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where  $U_{f_{L,R}}$  are the unitary matrices that diagonalize the SM fermion mass matrices, and  $c'_{uL} = c'_{dL} = c'_{qL}$ . After including matching corrections at the weak scale [15], the running for  $\mu < m_Z$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (4\pi)^2 \frac{d(C_u^A)_{ii}}{d \log \mu} &= -16\alpha_s^2 \tilde{c}_G - \frac{8}{3} \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 \tilde{c}_\gamma, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{d(C_d^A)_{ii}}{d \log \mu} &= -16\alpha_s^2 \tilde{c}_G - \frac{2}{3} \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 \tilde{c}_\gamma, \\ (4\pi)^2 \frac{d(C_e^A)_{ii}}{d \log \mu} &= -6\alpha_{\text{em}}^2 \tilde{c}_\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

with

$$\tilde{c}_G(\mu) = 1 - \sum_q C_q^A(\mu) \Theta(\mu - m_q), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\tilde{c}_\gamma(\mu) = \frac{c_\gamma}{c_G} - 2 \sum_f N_c^f Q_f^2 C_f^A(\mu) \Theta(\mu - m_f), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where  $\Theta(x)$  is the Heaviside theta function, while  $N_c^f$  and  $Q_f$  denote respectively the colour number and EM charge of the fermion  $f$ . Note that the off-diagonal couplings  $(C_f^{A,V})_{i \neq j}$  do not run below the electroweak scale, while the diagonal vector couplings  $(C_f^V)_{ii}$  can be set to zero thanks to the conservation of the vector current.

The axion-nucleon couplings, neglecting the tiny contributions of the matrix elements  $\Delta_{n,b,c}$  of the heavy flavours, can be calculated by using

$$C_p = C_u \Delta_u + C_d \Delta_d + C_s \Delta_s - \left( \frac{m_d \Delta_u}{m_u + m_d} + \frac{m_u \Delta_d}{m_u + m_d} \right), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$C_n = C_d \Delta_u + C_u \Delta_d + C_s \Delta_s - \left( \frac{m_u \Delta_u}{m_u + m_d} + \frac{m_d \Delta_d}{m_u + m_d} \right), \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where  $C_{u,d,s} = C_{u,d,s}^A(2 \text{ GeV})$  (we neglect here for simplicity model-dependent tree-level flavour mixing effects – see Eq. (A.10)) are evaluated by numerically solving the RGEs, Eqs. (A.6) and (A.11), starting from the boundary conditions set at the scale  $f$  (cf. below Eq. (A.3)). In Eqs. (A.14)-(A.15)  $\Delta_{u,d,s}$  represent the nucleon matrix elements of the light quarks axial-vector current, whose numerical values are  $\Delta_u = 0.897(27)$ ,  $\Delta_d = -0.376(27)$ ,  $\Delta_s = -0.026(4)$ , while  $m_u(2 \text{ GeV})/m_d(2 \text{ GeV}) = 0.48(3)$  [13]. With these inputs, we arrive at

$$C_p = 0.90C_u - 0.38C_d - 0.03C_s - 0.48, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$C_n = 0.90C_d - 0.38C_u - 0.03C_s - 0.04. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

In the calculation, we have employed the two-loop running for gauge and Yukawa couplings, and the input values for the SM Yukawa and CKM mixings are extracted from Ref. [34].

## References

- [1] R. D. Peccei, H. R. Quinn, CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977) 1440–1443. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.1440.

- [2] R. D. Peccei, H. R. Quinn, Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, Phys. Rev. D16 (1977) 1791–1797. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1791.
- [3] S. Weinberg, A New Light Boson?, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 223–226. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.223.
- [4] F. Wilczek, Problem of Strong p and t Invariance in the Presence of Instantons, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 279–282. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.279.
- [5] Y. Ema, K. Hamaguchi, T. Moroi, K. Nakayama, Flaxion: a minimal extension to solve puzzles in the standard model, JHEP 01 (2017) 096. arXiv:1612.05492, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2017)096.
- [6] L. Calibbi, F. Goertz, D. Redigolo, R. Ziegler, J. Zupan, Minimal axion model from flavor, Phys. Rev. D 95 (9) (2017) 095009. arXiv:1612.08040, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.095009.
- [7] F. Bjorkerth, L. Di Luzio, F. Mescia, E. Nardi,  $U(1)$  flavour symmetries as Peccei-Quinn symmetries, JHEP 02 (2019) 133. arXiv:1811.09637, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2019)133.
- [8] L. Di Luzio, F. Mescia, E. Nardi, P. Panci, R. Ziegler, Astrophobic Axions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (26) (2018) 261803. arXiv:1712.04940, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.261803.
- [9] M. Dine, W. Fischler, M. Srednicki, A Simple Solution to the Strong CP Problem with a Harmless Axion, Phys. Lett. B104 (1981) 199–202. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(81)90590-6.
- [10] A. R. Zhitnitsky, On Possible Suppression of the Axion Hadron Interactions. (In Russian), Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 31 (1980) 260, [Yad. Fiz.31,497(1980)].
- [11] L. Di Luzio, M. Fedele, M. Giannotti, F. Mescia, E. Nardi, Stellar evolution confronts axion models, JCAP 02 (2022) 035. arXiv:2109.10368, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2022/02/035.
- [12] F. Bjorkerth, L. Di Luzio, F. Mescia, E. Nardi, P. Panci, R. Ziegler, Axion-electron decoupling in nucleophobic axion models, Phys. Rev. D 101 (3) (2020) 035027. arXiv:1907.06575, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.035027.
- [13] G. Grilli di Cortona, E. Hardy, J. Pardo Vega, G. Villadoro, The QCD axion, precisely, JHEP 01 (2016) 034. arXiv:1511.02867, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2016)034.
- [14] K. Choi, S. H. Im, C. B. Park, S. Yun, Minimal Flavor Violation with Axion-like Particles, JHEP 11 (2017) 070. arXiv:1708.00021, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2017)070.
- [15] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel, A. Thamm, The Low-Energy Effective Theory of Axions and ALPs, JHEP 04 (2021) 063. arXiv:2012.12272, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2021)063.
- [16] K. Choi, S. H. Im, H. J. Kim, H. Seong, Precision axion physics with running axion couplings, JHEP 08 (2021) 058. arXiv:2106.05816, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2021)058.
- [17] G. Alonso-Álvarez, F. Ertas, J. Jaeckel, F. Kahlhoefer, L. J. Thormaehlen, Leading logs in QCD axion effective field theory, JHEP 07 (2021) 059. arXiv:2101.03173, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2021)059.
- [18] E. Cortina Gil, et al., The Beam and detector of the NA62 experiment at CERN, JINST 12 (05) (2017) P05025. arXiv:1703.08501, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/05/P05025.
- [19] J. K. Ahn, et al., Search for the  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 X^0$  decays at the J-PARC KOTO experiment, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122 (2) (2019) 021802. arXiv:1810.09655, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.021802.
- [20] F. Ambrosino, et al., KLEVER: An experiment to measure  $\text{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$  at the CERN SPS arXiv:1901.03099.
- [21] G. Lucente, L. Mastrototaro, P. Carena, L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, A. Mirizzi, Axion signatures from supernova explosions through the nucleon electric-dipole portal, Phys. Rev. D 105 (12) (2022) 123020. arXiv:2203.15812, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.123020.
- [22] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, L. Visinelli, The landscape of QCD axion models, Phys. Rept. 870 (2020) 1–117. arXiv:2003.01100, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2020.06.002.
- [23] P. Carena, T. Fischer, M. Giannotti, G. Guo, G. Martínez-Pinedo, A. Mirizzi, Improved axion emissivity from a supernova via nucleon-nucleon bremsstrahlung, JCAP 10 (10) (2019) 016, [Erratum: JCAP 05, E01 (2020)]. arXiv:1906.11844, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/10/016.
- [24] J. E. Kim, Weak Interaction Singlet and Strong CP Invariance, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43 (1979) 103. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.43.103.
- [25] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov, Can Confinement Ensure

- Natural CP Invariance of Strong Interactions?, Nucl. Phys. B166 (1980) 493. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(80)90209-6.
- [26] L. Di Luzio, J. F. Kamenik, M. Nardecchia, Implications of perturbative unitarity for scalar di-boson resonance searches at LHC, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (1) (2017) 30. arXiv:1604.05746, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4594-2.
- [27] L. Di Luzio, M. Nardecchia, What is the scale of new physics behind the  $B$ -flavour anomalies?, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (8) (2017) 536. arXiv:1706.01868, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5118-9.
- [28] L. Darmé, L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, Selective enhancement of the QCD axion couplings, Phys. Rev. D 103 (1) (2021) 015034. arXiv:2010.15846, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.015034.
- [29] J. Martin Camalich, M. Pospelov, P. N. H. Vuong, R. Ziegler, J. Zupan, Quark Flavor Phenomenology of the QCD Axion, Phys. Rev. D 102 (1) (2020) 015023. arXiv:2002.04623, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.015023.
- [30] M. Giannotti, I. G. Irastorza, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald, K. Saikawa, Stellar Recipes for Axion Hunters, JCAP 1710 (10) (2017) 010. arXiv:1708.02111, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2017/10/010.
- [31] H. Georgi, D. B. Kaplan, L. Randall, Manifesting the Invisible Axion at Low-energies, Phys. Lett. B 169 (1986) 73–78. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(86)90688-X.
- [32] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, The CP conserving two Higgs doublet model: The Approach to the decoupling limit, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 075019. arXiv:hep-ph/0207010, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.67.075019.
- [33] K. G. Chetyrkin, B. A. Kniehl, M. Steinhauser, W. A. Bardeen, Effective QCD interactions of CP odd Higgs bosons at three loops, Nucl. Phys. B 535 (1998) 3–18. arXiv:hep-ph/9807241, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00594-X.
- [34] S. Antusch, V. Maurer, Running quark and lepton parameters at various scales, JHEP 11 (2013) 115. arXiv:1306.6879, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2013)115.