

Systematic analysis of 3HDM symmetries

A. Kunčinas,^{a,1} P. Osland^{b,2} and M. N. Rebelo^{a,3}

^aCentro de Física Teórica de Partículas, CFTP, Departamento de Física,
Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,
Avenida Rovisco Pais nr. 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal,

^bDepartment of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen,
Postboks 7803, N-5020 Bergen, Norway

Abstract

Symmetries play a crucial role in shaping the structure and predictions of multi-Higgs-doublet models. In three-Higgs-doublet models considerable effort has been put into classifying possible symmetry groups and the conditions for their realisation, yet the completeness of existing classifications remains an open question. In this work, we revisit the problem of identifying realisable symmetries by re-examining conventional Higgs family and general CP transformations from an alternative perspective. Our analysis identifies certain limitations in previous approaches and introduces a clearer, more systematic framework for model builders. We expand our classification by investigating more generalised symmetry structures—the recently identified GOOFy transformations, which act non-trivially on the Higgs doublets and their conjugates. Our analysis consolidates known results, uncovers previously overlooked structures, and expands the set of symmetries in three-Higgs-doublet models, offering both a clearer theoretical foundation and a practical reference for symmetry-based model building.

¹E-mail: Anton.Kuncinas@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

²E-mail: Per.Osland@uib.no

³E-mail: rebelo@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Terminology and framework	2
3	HF transformations	8
4	GCP transformations	9
4.1	$O(2) \times U(1)$	10
4.2	The S_3 -based cases	11
4.3	CP_4	13
4.4	The D_4 -based cases	14
4.5	$[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$	16
4.6	$O(2)$	18
4.7	$\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$	18
5	Summary of HF and GCP transformations	19
5.1	Some useful identities and definitions	21
6	GOOFy-like transformations of 3HDMs	22
6.1	The GOOFy framework	22
6.2	Transformations of the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets	24
6.3	GOOFy HF-like transformations	26
6.4	GOOFy GCP-like transformations	28
7	T-GOOFy transformations	30
7.1	T-GOOFy HF-like transformations	31
7.2	T-GOOFy GCP-like transformations	35
8	Summary	36
A	Reasserting $U(1) \times D_4$	37
B	Two different choices of the S_3 representations	39
C	List of generators	40
D	Different T-GOOFy-symmetric potentials	43
D.1	HF-like invariant potentials	44
D.2	GCP-like invariant potentials	50

1 Introduction

Symmetries are central to our understanding of the physical laws—shaping everything from fundamental interactions to conservation rules. Guidelines to choose a particular symmetry can only come from experiment. At this stage a lot of freedom remains due to the lack of definite experimental constraints.

This limitation is particularly noticeable because we depend heavily on the symmetry groups to predict physical properties. It raises an open question: are symmetries truly fundamental or might they be a reflection of deeper structures?

In quantum field theory, a symmetry plays a dual role: it constrains the form of the Lagrangian and governs the possible patterns of spontaneous breaking. Multi-Higgs-doublet models (NHDMs) provide a fertile ground for exploring this interplay, as their scalar sectors admit a rich variety of symmetry groups. In practice, however, such symmetries are typically imposed by hand, rather than derived from underlying principles.

In recent years, substantial progress has been made in identifying realisable symmetries within the framework of 3HDMs [1–15]. Nevertheless, the set of possible symmetries remains largely unexplored, *e.g.*, the recent identification of the so-called GOOFy (abbreviated from the initials of the authors) symmetries [16]; yet, another approach, entirely different, inspired by the information-theoretic properties of scalar models, can be found in Refs. [17–19], but it is not tackled here. In this work, we revisit the question of realisable symmetries in 3HDMs from a slightly different perspective, as some previously adopted approaches may not always capture the full picture [10, 12, 14]. We note that the compact/unitary symplectic group, $USp(n)$, will not be addressed in this study.

The paper is organised as follows. Our analysis begins in Section 2 by establishing a consistent set of definitions and transformation rules, providing a clear foundation for discussing relevant symmetry transformations in the NHDM context and setting the stage for the classification work presented in subsequent sections. In Sections 3 and 4 we discuss two different transformations: Higgs family (sometimes referred to as Higgs flavour transformations) and general CP transformations, which are then summarised in Section 5. We next turn to the discussion of the GOOFy transformations in Sections 6 and 7, examining their implications. We present a summary in Section 8. In Appendix A we consider one of the previously missed models, $U(1) \times D_4$, rigorously, followed by the discussion of the irreducible S_3 representations in Appendix B. In Appendix C we list generators used to identify “conventional” GOOFy symmetries. Finally, in Appendix D we present GOOFy-stabilised potentials.

2 Terminology and framework

In this section we outline the framework and conventions used throughout our analysis. Our aim is to provide a consistent set of definitions, transformation rules, and conventions that will be employed throughout the rest of the paper. We begin by introducing an extended representation for the scalar fields, followed by a discussion of the relevant symmetry transformations in the NHDM context, with a focus on $N = 3$, 3HDM. This sets the stage for the explicit examples and classification work presented in later sections.

Scalar space

We define an extended reducible space for a set of N scalar $SU(2)$ doublets and a corresponding set of their conjugates via

$$H \equiv h_i \oplus h_i^* = (h_1, \dots, h_N, h_1^*, \dots, h_N^*)^T \in \mathbb{C}^{2N}. \quad (2.1)$$

This representation allows us to treat the fields and their conjugates on an equal footing.

Symmetry transformations

The reparametrisation space of an NHDMD is given by an arbitrary basis change

$$h_i \longrightarrow U_{ij} h_j, \quad U \in U(N). \quad (2.2)$$

Any field redefinition acting on the doublets induces a transformation on the set of monomials $h_i^\dagger h_j$, and thus on the coefficients of the scalar potential. These transformations are in general *not* symmetry transformations: they relate equivalent basis choices for the same physical model. However, if a scalar potential is left invariant under a particular transformation, such transformation is promoted to a symmetry transformation.

Demanding that scalar bilinears remain Hermitian and positive-definite restricts the admissible global symmetry transformations of the scalar fields h_i . Two basic types arise:

- Higgs family (HF) transformations amount to basis rotations among the doublets,

$$H \mapsto U^{\text{HF}} H \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{U}^* \end{pmatrix} H. \quad (2.3)$$

- General CP (GCP) transformations [20–23] mix doublets with conjugate doublets,

$$H \mapsto U^{\text{GCP}} H \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{U} \\ \mathcal{U}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} H. \quad (2.4)$$

Here, \mathcal{U} is an $N \times N$ unitary matrix acting in the space of scalar doublets, with N the number of doublets in the model (we focus on $N = 3$). In practice we specify generators in terms of \mathcal{U} , while the *true* group in the H space is generated by $2N \times 2N$ matrices.

It is important to note that \mathcal{U} never acts on the fields independently: the block structures in eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) define the actual action on H . In the HF case, a given \mathcal{U} extends trivially to the H space. In the GCP case, however, the extension involves an antiunitary embedding, and if $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}$, the resulting group structure may be enlarged.

To avoid clutter with redundant $2N \times 2N$ matrices, we will henceforth specify only the \mathcal{U} blocks. To make clear how they are embedded, we shall use the notation

$$\langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\text{HF}} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_*,$$

denoting the subgroups generated by \mathcal{U} when applied as HF or GCP transformations, respectively. We use the “*” symbol to indicate the presence of GCP elements in a symmetry group, see Section 4 for further clarification.

The $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets

For convenience we define an $SU(2)$ bilinear singlet built out of the scalar doublets,

$$h_{ij} \equiv h_i^\dagger h_j. \quad (2.5)$$

The scalar potential is then given by

$$V = \mu_{ij}^2 h_{ij} + \lambda_{ijkl} h_{ij} h_{kl}, \quad \mu_{ji}^2 = (\mu_{ij}^2)^*, \quad \lambda_{jilk} = \lambda_{ijkl}^*, \quad \lambda_{klij} = \lambda_{ijkl}. \quad (2.6)$$

For the studied case of 3HDM there are 9 bilinear, μ_{ij}^2 , and 45 quartic, λ_{ijkl} , terms.

The $SU(2)$ bilinear singlet transforms under the HF and GCP transformations as

$$\text{HF} : \quad h_{ij} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_{ik}^* \mathcal{U}_{jl} h_{kl}, \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\text{GCP} : \quad h_{ij} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_{ik}^* \mathcal{U}_{jl} h_{lk}. \quad (2.7b)$$

The GCP transformation can be understood as a \mathbb{Z}_2 (or S_2) symmetry that acts by swapping the indices of the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets, $\text{GCP}_{\text{trivial}} : h_{ij} \mapsto h_{ji}$.

Having identified how h_{ij} transform, the next step would be to argue which form the transformation matrices \mathcal{U} could take. Although there are various methods for addressing symmetries in NHDMS, we will take a more straightforward, less elegant route—opting for a brute-force approach to identify realisable symmetries; this amounts to systematically reducing the general scalar potential by successively imposing symmetry transformations.

Realisable and accidental symmetries

In NHDMS, a *realisable symmetry* is defined as a symmetry group \mathcal{G}_r that can be imposed on the scalar potential without automatically leading to a larger group. In other words, there exists a valid region of parameter space where \mathcal{G}_r represents the maximal symmetry of the potential.

However, if the parameter constraints required to impose invariance under a group are insufficient to distinguish it from a larger one, the true invariance of the potential becomes an *accidentally enhanced* group. This enhancement occurs because the renormalisable potential lacks the complexity to support the smaller group without automatically satisfying the symmetries of a larger one.

Consequently, a group \mathcal{G}_{nr} is *non-realisable* if the constraints required to satisfy \mathcal{G}_{nr} -invariance accidentally render the potential invariant under a larger group \mathcal{G}_r , such that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{nr}} < \mathcal{G}_r$. In this scenario, \mathcal{G}_{nr} acts merely as a proper subgroup of the true symmetry group. Therefore, non-realisable groups cannot characterise the exact symmetries of an NHDMS potential.

In Ref. [2], it is proved that any finite Abelian group \mathcal{G} realisable in NHDMS satisfies $|\mathcal{G}| \leq 2^{N-1}$. In particular, any cyclic group \mathbb{Z}_p that can be realised must satisfy $p \leq 2^{N-1}$. Groups violating this bound are necessarily non-realisable: imposing them forces the potential to acquire a larger symmetry.

For example, in 2HDMs [24–36], imposing a \mathbb{Z}_n symmetry with $n \geq 3$ automatically leads to invariance under the $U(1)$ Peccei–Quinn group [37]. Hence, \mathbb{Z}_n for $n \geq 3$ are non-realisable in the scalar sector. It is important to note, however, that when extending the framework to the fermionic sector, a symmetry that is non-realisable for the scalar potential alone may become realisable in the full Lagrangian (see, *e.g.*, the \mathbb{Z}_3 -symmetric 2HDM in Refs. [38, 39]).

Identification of symmetry groups

The classification of finite subgroups of $SU(3)$ began several decades ago [40–44] and has more recently continued in Refs. [45–51]. A comprehensive list of non-isomorphic finite subgroups of $U(3)$ with orders up to 2000 (with some special exceptions) is given in Ref. [52], where the **SmallGrp** library [53] of **GAP** [54] was used to classify groups based on generators and irreducible representations. The classification is given in terms of explicit generator matrices. These generators often depend on discrete parameters (for instance, integers $\{m, n\}$ that appear in phases such as $e^{2i\pi m/n}$). Such a parameter-dependent generator should be viewed as a family: fixing the parameters produces a generator of a particular discrete subgroup, while promoting those parameters to continuous variables yields a continuous family of transformations and hence a continuous subgroup of $U(3)$. Because of this, the generator-based description in Ref. [52] is useful both for discrete classifications and for identifying candidate continuous subgroups of $U(3)$. We will predominantly rely on these generator families throughout the paper.

A few clarifications are in order. Real orthogonal matrices $O(n, \mathbb{R})$ are embedded naturally into $U(n)$, $O(n, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow U(n, \mathbb{C})$, since in this case $O^T O = \mathcal{I}$ implies $O^\dagger O = \mathcal{I}$. In contrast, the complex orthogonal group $O(n, \mathbb{C})$ is not a subgroup of $U(n)$.

The scalar potential depends only on the $SU(2)$ singlets h_{ij} , which form a positive-definite Hermitian matrix. The Hermiticity condition is preserved by requiring that field transformations must be unitary. Therefore, the non-unitary groups like $O(n, \mathbb{C})$ would not be physically allowed.

In the 3HDM, the field content is initially invariant under $U(3)$. However, since the hypercharge symmetry, $U(1)_Y$, is gauged, the global symmetries are restricted to the $SU(3)$ sector; the $U(1)_Y$ transformation $h_i \mapsto e^{i\alpha} h_i$ leaves all h_{ij} invariant, hence $U(1)_Y$ acts trivially and must be factored out. Furthermore, because the scalar potential depends solely on the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets h_{ij} , the physical symmetry group acting on the potential is the projective group $PSU(3) \cong SU(3)/\mathbb{Z}_3$.

Invariant potentials

We construct specific scalar potentials by iteratively reducing the parameter space of the most general 3HDM potential through the imposition of symmetry requirements. We start with the most general potential $V_0(H)$ and sequentially impose invariance under groups $\{\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_j\}$, resulting in the following steps:

$$V_0(H) \xrightarrow{\text{impose } \mathcal{H}_1} V_{\mathcal{H}_1}(H) \xrightarrow{\text{impose } \mathcal{H}_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\text{impose } \mathcal{H}_j} V_{\mathcal{G}}(H). \quad (2.8)$$

The constraints imposed by the generators of \mathcal{H}_i reduce the number of independent parameters step-by-step, leaving the potential unchanged if the symmetry was already present.

The resulting potential cannot generate new monomials (beyond h_{ij} and $h_{ij}h_{kl}$), it is just the couplings that can be constrained. By comparing the coefficients of the monomials on both sides of each step in eq. (2.8), we obtain a set of linear constraints on the couplings.

For a chosen symmetry subgroup $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{G}$, generated by $\mathcal{H}_i = \langle g_{(i)} \rangle$, we thus demand that the corresponding potential remains invariant under the action of \mathcal{H}_i :

$$V_{\mathcal{H}_i}(H) = V_{\mathcal{H}_i}(gH), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_i. \quad (2.9)$$

In general, the full symmetry group may consist of several components,

$$\mathcal{G} \cong \mathcal{H}_1 * \mathcal{H}_2 * \dots * \mathcal{H}_j = \langle g_{(1)}, g_{(2)}, \dots, g_{(j)} \rangle, \quad (2.10)$$

where “ $*$ ” denotes an unspecified product type (direct or semidirect, “ \times ” or “ \rtimes ”) determined by the action of the generators on one another. It is important to note that the imposed constraints may lead to an accidental enhancement of the symmetry; thus, the final symmetry of the potential can exceed the initially specified symmetry \mathcal{G} .

Different representations

By examining the finite subgroups of $U(3)$, we not only construct various symmetry-invariant scalar potentials, but also obtain different representations. For example, let us consider the dihedral group, with the group presentation:

$$D_n = \langle g_1, g_2 \mid g_1^n = g_2^2 = (g_2 g_1)^2 = e \rangle. \quad (2.11)$$

Consider the following representations of D_4 , implemented as an HF transformation:

- For

$$D_4 = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \quad (2.12)$$

the invariant scalar potential is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{D_4} = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + \{\lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

- For

$$D'_4 = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \quad (2.14)$$

the invariant scalar potential is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{D'_4} = & \mu_{11}^2(h'_{11} + h'_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h'_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h'_{11}{}^2 + h'_{22}{}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h'_{33}{}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h'_{12} h'_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h'_{13} h'_{31} + h'_{23} h'_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h'_{11} h'_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h'_{11} + h'_{22}) h'_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h'_{12}{}^2 + h'_{21}{}^2) \\ & + \{\lambda_{1323} h'_{13} h'_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

These two are connected via a unitary transformation,

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\pi/4} & e^{i\pi/4} & 0 \\ -e^{-i\pi/4} & e^{-i\pi/4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h'_1 \\ h'_2 \\ h'_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.16)$$

For simplicity we shall define an $SU(2)$ transformation matrix,

$$\mathcal{R}_{(\alpha, \beta, \theta, \phi)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\phi/2)} \cos \theta & e^{i(\alpha-\beta+\phi/2)} \sin \theta & 0 \\ -e^{-i(\alpha-\beta-\phi/2)} \sin \theta & e^{-i(\alpha+\beta-\phi/2)} \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.17)$$

In this notation the basis transformation matrix is given by $h_i = (\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, 0, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)})_{ij} h'_j$.

Basis transformations and redundancies

Although different representations of the same symmetry group can yield distinct forms of the scalar potential, care must be taken to avoid redundant degrees of freedom in the couplings. Eliminating such redundancies, often possible via basis transformations, can reveal an enhanced underlying symmetry, in the sense that the scalar potential becomes explicitly invariant (in a particular basis) under additional symmetry generators.

This raises an interesting question: how can one identify the number of independent variables? However, we do not attempt to answer this question here.

Bilinear formalism

The final ingredient we wish to discuss, before proceeding to our analysis, is the bilinear formalism in the context of NHDMs. Initially developed to study vacuum structures [55], it was subsequently extended in Refs. [24, 25, 27, 56–60]. While we do not present a formal derivation here, the bilinear formalism is a convenient framework that offers significant insight into the underlying symmetries of the scalar potential and its properties. For those unfamiliar with the method, we refer to Ref. [9] for a detailed discussion, including its application in identifying symmetries in a basis-invariant manner for 3HDMs. We found it useful to classify scalar potentials based on the multiplicities of the eigenvalues of the Λ_{ij} matrix, as discussed in Ref. [9].

Degeneracy in the eigenvalues of Λ_{ij} corresponds to rotational freedom in the bilinear space, and hence to symmetry enhancement. We represent the eigenvalue multiplicity patterns compactly: the notation v_m denotes that there are v distinct eigenvalues, each appearing with multiplicity m . For example, the pattern 1_8 indicates that there is a single eigenvalue with multiplicity 8, while 8_1 indicates eight eigenvalues with multiplicity one. Similarly, $3_2 2_1$ corresponds to three eigenvalues with multiplicity two and two eigenvalues with multiplicity one.

Workflow summary

For completeness, we briefly summarise our procedure for obtaining all realisable symmetry patterns. Starting from the family classes of generators given in Ref. [52], we impose them iteratively on the most general 3HDM potential, discarding cases that reproduce previously obtained potentials. We do not restrict the search to finite groups but treat the continuous generators on par with the discrete ones. Surviving potentials are then split into sets based on the eigenvalue structure in the bilinear space, the number of couplings (some of which may be redundant), and the basis-invariant criteria such as those derived in Ref. [9]. Distinct representations of the same group are identified using explicit $SU(3)$ basis transformations. The underlying symmetry of each remaining potential is determined from the full set of generators leaving it invariant, with accidental enhancements identified straightforwardly using the classification of Ref. [52]. This systematic approach will yield the complete catalogue of realisable symmetry groups and their associated scalar potentials.

3 HF transformations

While several claims have been made about having identified *all* possible realisable symmetries of 3HDMs, the reality appears more nuanced. For example, the $O(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry was identified in the context of the minimisation conditions for different S_3 implementations [10, 12]. Another group, $[U(1) \times U(1)] \rtimes S_3$, was partially identified (more precisely, a non-realisable discrete version) in Refs. [3, 4] as part of a larger group, but was subsequently overlooked in the classification literature. Recently, all continuous groups were systematically checked in Ref. [14], and in addition to including these additional symmetries, a completely new group, denoted $U(1) \times D_4$, was identified.

In Ref. [14], we proposed the $U(1) \times D_4$ group as a previously missed realisable symmetry group. The starting point in Ref. [14] was the semi-direct product structure $[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes S_2$. However, through a private communication with I. Ivanov, we were informed that due to a non-trivial intersection between the $U(1)$ and D_4 subgroups, the resulting group structure might more appropriately be expressed as a quotient group. According to the discussion in Appendix A, the symmetry group relevant for our construction $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is the central product (denoted by “ \circ ”) obtained by identifying a finite central subgroup of $U(1)$ with the center $Z(\mathcal{G})$ of a finite group \mathcal{G} such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \cong U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G} : \quad Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n, \quad \mathcal{G}/Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong V_4. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The identification of $Z(\mathcal{G})$ with the corresponding subgroup of $U(1)$ ensures that the common \mathbb{Z}_n group is not double-counted. Explicit realisations mentioned in Ref. [14] include $\mathcal{G} = D_4$ or Q_8 for $n = 2$, and the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_1 for $n = 4$. For $n = 2m$ or $4m$ with odd m one obtains a trivial splitting into direct product extensions $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathcal{G}_{2^k}$, where $n = 2^k m$. Crucially, all such central products induce the same 3HDM scalar potential; hence in the phenomenological analysis we can treat them as a single potential-equivalence class, using the compact label $U(1) \circ V_4$ to denote this family of central products.

We started our scan for possible realisations of HF transformations, which are subgroups of $U(3)$, from the families of generators given in Ref. [52]. First, we applied continuous generators and then particularised to discrete cases. Although mathematical completeness cannot be claimed in a strict sense, our scan for discrete subgroups of $U(3)$ up to order 2000 exhibits a clear saturation behaviour: once all distinct scalar potentials invariant under finite realisable symmetries were obtained, further enlargement in the order of the symmetry groups no longer produced new potentials.

Some of the potentials obtained following this procedure lead to continuous enhancements of the symmetry, including all those obtained previously, by applying continuous generators. Both continuous and discrete realisations thus obtained converge to the $SU(3)$ -invariant limit of the 3HDM. This suggests that nothing new would come after order 2000, taking into account that we are considering a renormalisable, truncated potential. In fact, no new potentials were obtained beyond order 36. Our procedure confirms that the maximal Abelian case is \mathbb{Z}_4 , see Ref. [2], and that the largest realisable discrete symmetry group is $\Sigma(36) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4$ (see eq. (5.9)) as identified in Ref. [3]. This consistency together with the null emergence of new potentials and agreement with existing classifications strongly indicates that all relevant 3HDM symmetries have been identified.

This conclusion refers strictly to realisable symmetries of the scalar potential. Note that when the Yukawa Lagrangian is included, the initial HF symmetry may admit distinct fermion embeddings, *e.g.*, $\mathbb{Z}_{n \geq 5} \leq U(1)$, yielding different textures and phenomenology.

4 GCP transformations

For simplicity, let us introduce two abbreviations for the most general scalar potentials:

- $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ —the most general potential with complex parameters, as long as Hermiticity is preserved;
- $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ —the potential restricted to real parameters, obtained by imposing the trivial CP transformation, which corresponds to $h_{ij} \mapsto h_{ji}$. In the literature, this potential is referred to as CP1, CP2, or CPa in the 3HDM context, despite describing identical physics. However, a real scalar potential might not necessarily indicate that it is generated by the trivial CP transformation; it could instead be viewed as accidental.

These two possibilities behave differently under symmetry constraints. Applying different generators to $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ may result in distinct scalar potentials, certain symmetries cannot be realised if one starts from $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. A simple illustration is provided by the A_4 and S_4 groups. These potentials share the same form, but the distinction is that the A_4 -symmetric potential allows complex couplings. When these couplings are restricted to be real, the symmetry is automatically enhanced to S_4 , since $S_n \cong A_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, for $n \geq 2$. Explicitly,

$$V_{A_4} = \mu_{11}^2 h_{ii} + \lambda_{1111} h_{ii}^2 + \lambda_{1122} h_{ii} h_{jj} + \lambda_{1221} h_{ij} h_{ji} + \{ \lambda_{1212} h_{ij}^2 + \text{h.c.} \}, \quad (4.1a)$$

$$V_{S_4} = \mu_{11}^2 h_{ii} + \lambda_{1111} h_{ii}^2 + \lambda_{1122} h_{ii} h_{jj} + \lambda_{1221} h_{ij} h_{ji} + \lambda_{1212} (h_{ij}^2 + h_{ji}^2), \quad (4.1b)$$

where implicit summation over repeated indices is assumed.

Following the notation of Ref. [2], we reserve the symbol “*” to indicate the presence of GCP (anti-unitary) elements in a symmetry group; \mathcal{G}^* is not a new group, but a label on a specific representation of the same \mathcal{G} . The off-diagonal block structure encodes the \mathcal{U} sub-block of the GCP transformation, *cf.*, eq. (2.4), while the full action also involves complex conjugation. Thus, writing \mathcal{G}^* means the group acting on the H space, $U^{\text{GCP}} = \mathcal{G}^*$.

As an example, consider \mathbb{Z}_2^* , corresponding to the trivial CP transformation: $h_i \mapsto h_i^*$. It is important to stress that \mathbb{Z}_2^* denotes the *full* anti-unitary action in the H space (U^{GCP}), not merely the insertion of $\mathcal{U} = \langle \mathbb{Z}_2 \rangle$ into eq. (2.4). A convenient choice is to consider \mathcal{U} given by an identity matrix, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{I}_n$. Moreover, any real \mathcal{U} with $\mathcal{U}^2 = \mathcal{I}_n$ yields an equivalent representation of \mathbb{Z}_2^* . For cyclic groups, the \mathbb{Z}_n^* notation is unambiguous; for non-cyclic groups, the meaning of “*” should be understood in this full sense.

Let us consider a composite GCP symmetry group. Any CP transformation can be presented as $U^{\text{GCP}} = \mathcal{U} \mathcal{J}$, where the action of U^{GCP} on H was defined in eq. (2.4), and \mathcal{J} denotes a CP operator, which in our discussion maps the scalar fields to their conjugates. The multiplication rule is then given by:

$$U_i^{\text{GCP}} U_j^{\text{GCP}} = (\mathcal{U}_i \mathcal{J}) (\mathcal{U}_j \mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{U}_i \mathcal{U}_j^*, \quad (4.2)$$

since $(\mathcal{J} \mathcal{U}) \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{U}^*$. As a result, the product of two anti-unitary elements generates a unitary subgroup.

The $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ potentials add no fundamentally new structures: they can always be obtained from $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ by imposing HF invariance and enforcing real couplings through a trivial CP. What is genuinely interesting arises when HF and GCP transformations do not commute (in composite cases), leading to new symmetry-defined structures in the potential.

4.1 $O(2) \times U(1)$

Consider the $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ acted upon by

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{-\frac{5i\pi}{8}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{-\frac{3i\pi}{8}} & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}. \quad (4.3)$$

The scalar potential invariant under this transformation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22})h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{22} - h_{11}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

with couplings related by

$$\lambda_{1221} = 2\lambda_{1111} + \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}\lambda_{1112} - \lambda_{1122}, \quad (4.5a)$$

$$\lambda_{1212} = -\lambda_{1112} \sin(\pi/8). \quad (4.5b)$$

The scalar potential is also invariant under

$$g_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}. \quad (4.6)$$

The group $\mathcal{G} = \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ satisfies: (i) $g_1^4 = g_2^4 = e$, (ii) $g_1^2 = g_2^2$ and (iii) $g_2^{-1}g_1^2g_2 = g_1^2$. From the second relation we identify $\langle g_1 \rangle \cap \langle g_2 \rangle = \langle e, g_1^2 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and the third relation shows that this \mathbb{Z}_2 is central. Moreover, there exists no integer n such that $(g_1g_2)^n = e$. This indicates that \mathcal{G} is an example of a finitely generated infinite group.

In the basis of $\mathcal{G} = \langle g_1g_2, g_1 \rangle$, the group under consideration is of the form $\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. Actually, we are considering a non-trivial central extension of the infinite dihedral group by \mathbb{Z}_2 , *i.e.*, a double-cover of D_∞ , an infinite dicyclic Dic_∞ group. Modding out the common central subgroup we get $Dic_\infty/\mathbb{Z}_2 \cong D_\infty$.

Actually, the scalar potential associated with this symmetry is also invariant under the $U(1)_{h_3}$ group. Consequently, D_∞ is effectively extended by this continuous symmetry, resulting in an enlarged group structure— $O(2) \times U(1)$.

After performing a basis transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{3i\pi}{4}} \cos \theta & e^{\frac{i\pi}{4}} \sin \theta & 0 \\ e^{\frac{3i\pi}{4}} \sin \theta & -e^{\frac{i\pi}{4}} \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h'_1 \\ h'_2 \\ h'_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{1}{4} \left[\arctan \left(2\sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} \right) - \pi \right], \quad (4.8)$$

we arrive at the $O(2) \times U(1)$ invariant potential:

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\
& + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\
& + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Equivalently, we can define $O(2) \times U(1)$ in terms of the generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta_1} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle. \tag{4.10}$$

To be precise we have :

$$[U(1) \times U(1)] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong U(1)_{\text{center}} \times [SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2] \cong U(1) \times O(2), \tag{4.11}$$

where $U(1)_{\text{center}}$ is invariant under the swap generated by \mathbb{Z}_2 .

4.2 The S_3 -based cases

Consider a generator representing even permutations (in terms of \mathcal{U}),

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_*, \tag{4.12}$$

applied as a GCP transformation. We get $g_1^3 = e$, but the full group is of dimension six, since we need to consider $(U^{\text{GCP}})^{2n} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}^*, (\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}^*)^*)^n = \mathcal{I}$, for $n = 3$. Applying $\mathcal{U} = g_1$ as a GCP transformation yields a potential with real couplings. In contrast, requiring invariance under the action of $\langle g_1 \rangle_{\text{HF}}$ results in the \mathbb{Z}_3 -symmetric 3HDM.

The S_3 -symmetric (we recall that $S_3 \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) scalar potential in the reducible-triplet framework [61, 62] can be presented as

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & -\lambda \sum_i \phi_{ii} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma \sum_{i < j} (\phi_{ij} + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + A \sum_i \phi_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i < j} \left[C \phi_{ii} \phi_{jj} + \bar{C} \phi_{ij} \phi_{ji} + \frac{1}{2} D (\phi_{ij}^2 + \text{h.c.}) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} (E_1 \phi_{ii} \phi_{ij} + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k \neq i, j < k} (E_2 \phi_{ij} \phi_{ki} + E_3 \phi_{ii} \phi_{kj} + E_4 \phi_{ij} \phi_{ik} + \text{h.c.}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Due to the underlying S_3 symmetry not all of the coefficients can be complex. The two complex couplings are E_1 and E_4 ; one degree of freedom is redundant [63], for example, either E_1 or E_4 can be made real.

Since we are only interested in the even permutations applied as a GCP transformation, and not the full S_3 (in the current context we are considering $\langle g_1 \rangle_{\text{HF}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$), it is to be expected that some additional terms may be allowed. Namely, the

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} (E_1 \phi_{ii} \phi_{ij} + \text{h.c.})$$

term gets split into two parts (before we had $E_1 = E'_1 = E''_1$),

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_i (E'_1 \phi_{ii} \phi_{ii'} + E''_1 \phi_{ii'} \phi_{ii'} + \text{h.c.}), \quad (4.14)$$

where $i' = (i \bmod 3) + 1$. There are no other modifications with respect to the scalar potential of eq. (4.13).

By going into the basis of the irreducible representation of S_3 and further on performing an additional basis transformation,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \\ \phi_3 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\pi/6} & e^{-i\pi/6} & 1 \\ -e^{-i\pi/6} & -e^{i\pi/6} & 1 \\ -i & i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

the scalar potential gets modified,

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \mu_{11}^2 (h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{1111} (h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331} (h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ &\quad + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133} (h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{1323} (h_{13} h_{23} + h_{31} h_{32}) + \{\lambda_{1213} h_{12} (h_{13} + h_{32}) + \text{h.c.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Next, one can rotate the h_1 and h_2 doublets by opposite phases (chosen to leave the λ_{1323} term invariant), with the rotation angle proportional to the argument of λ_{1213} . In this way, the λ_{1213} term becomes real.

Apart from the λ_{1213} term, the scalar potential coincides with the one of the S_3 -symmetric 3HDM. In the S_3 -symmetric potential the last line of eq. (4.16) would read:

$$\lambda_{1323} h_{13} h_{23} + \lambda_{1213} (h_{12} h_{13} \pm h_{21} h_{23}) + \text{h.c.} \quad (4.17)$$

As a result, the group generated by eq. (4.12) differs from the “usual” S_3 group. The origin of the “ \pm ” sign between the two terms in λ_{1213} is discussed in Appendix B.

A more straightforward path to deriving the scalar potential in eq. (4.16) would be to require invariance under the symmetry transformation

$$g_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}} & 0 \\ e^{\frac{2i\pi}{3}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_*, \quad (4.18)$$

which spans symmetry of dimension six, as indicated by “ $*$ ”.

We can identify two cyclic subgroups spanned by $\langle g_2 \rangle_*$: (i) S_2 acting on $\{h_1, h_2\}$ as a GCP transformation and (ii) \mathbb{Z}_3 expressed in terms of a diagonal generator acting as an HF transformation. Therefore, the full symmetry group can be expressed as $\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$, which is algebraically isomorphic to S_3 . However, the scalar potential is different from the S_3 -symmetric one generated by the HF transformation.

A different choice of action would result in a non-isomorphic group of order twelve, $S_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*$.

These symmetry groups were identified and discussed earlier in Refs. [4, 6], to be more precise, both $\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ and $S_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*$, the first being a non-realisable CP6 [64]. In Ref. [13] the scalar potential in question was referred to as CPc ($S_3 \times \text{GCP}_{\theta=\pi}$). However, it was presented with redundant couplings. A basis change from the scalar potential of eq. (35) of Ref. [13] to the one of eq. (4.16) in this work can be performed via a basis transformation $\Phi = \mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, 0, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})} h$.

4.3 CP4

Let us consider two different symmetry transformations, corresponding to CP4:

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_*, \quad (4.19a)$$

$$g_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_*. \quad (4.19b)$$

While $g_1^2 = g_2^4 = e$, one should keep in mind that we are dealing with the GCP transformations. When the generator is represented by a complex matrix, the presence of complex conjugation effectively doubles the action of the generator. In this sense, a complex generator of order n in the unitary subgroup corresponds to a GCP generator of order $2n$. Consequently, the generators g_1 and g_2 represent distinct realisations of \mathbb{Z}_4^* .

The same potential in different bases is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{g_1} = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13} h_{23} + h_{31} h_{32}) \\ & + \{ \lambda_{1212} h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{32}^2) + \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{11} - h_{22}) + \text{h.c.} \}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{g_2} = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + i \lambda_{1323}(h_{13} h_{23} - h_{31} h_{32}) \\ & + \{ \lambda_{1212} h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{32}^2) - \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{11} - h_{22}) + \text{h.c.} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20b)$$

This structure was identified in Refs. [2, 6] and later dubbed CP4, since $(g_n g_n^*)^2 = e$, in Ref. [7]. The defining characteristic of the CP4 3HDM is that, despite the model being explicitly CP-conserving, there is no basis in which all the potential coefficients are real.

One might notice that all possible 2HDM terms (for h_1 and h_2) are included in the above scalar potentials V_{g_1} and V_{g_2} , which, in turn, indicates the existence of redundant couplings; in the 2HDM one can utilise the $SU(2)$ freedom to re-define 14 parameters to 11 physical ones. Different approaches to simplifying the CP4 scalar potentials were followed in Refs. [32, 65]. There is actually also a \mathbb{Z}_2 HF transformation, which can be expressed as $h_3 \mapsto -h_3$ in the above bases.

In Ref. [64], see eq. (A1), the CP4-invariant 3HDM was described by a one-parameter family of generators—different bases of the same scalar potential being related by conjugation of a single matrix,

$$g_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\beta} \end{pmatrix}_* , \quad (4.21)$$

for any fixed value of the β phase. Then, some phases of the quartic couplings will be fixed in terms of the β value. We suggest an alternative parameterisation given by a family of generators:

$$g_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{2i\pi/N} \end{pmatrix}_* , \text{ for } N \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (4.22)$$

which one arrives at naturally, considering an N^{th} root of unity.

Finally, we want to state that we did not succeed in finding a basis, following our approach, in which there would be no redundant couplings present.

4.4 The D_4 -based cases

Now, suppose we extended \mathbb{Z}_4^* by an additional \mathbb{Z}_2^* . Let us consider invariance under

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_* . \quad (4.23)$$

In this case the scalar potential is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{22} - h_{11}) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}) + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13} h_{23} + \text{h.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

It can be viewed as applying two consecutive GCP transformations: CP2 and CP4; see Refs. [32, 64] for a discussion.

After performing a basis rotation of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, \pi, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})}$ the scalar potential becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} \\ & + \{ \lambda_{1212} h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{32}^2) + \text{h.c.} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

In this form four real quartic couplings were exchanged to two complex couplings. Without loss of generality one of these complex phases can be rotated away. Equivalently, we could have performed the $\mathcal{R}_{(\alpha, 0, \theta, 0)}$ basis transformation starting with the scalar potential of eq. (4.24). Another aspect to note is that the scalar potential resembles the D_4 -symmetric one of eq. (2.13), apart from the fact that the terms multiplied by λ_{1313} are grouped in another way, as $(h_{13}^2 + h_{32}^2)$ rather than $(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2)$ in the D_4 -symmetric potential.

Structure-wise, in the basis of eq. (4.25), we are considering

$$V_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^* = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_* \right\rangle, \quad (4.26)$$

but from the group theory perspective of view we are considering D_4 . One can apply

$$D_4 = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_*, \quad (4.27)$$

as a GCP transformation to arrive at the potential of eq. (4.25). As a consequence, the case of the CP4-like scalar potential with real couplings reduces to the one of D_4 applied as a GCP transformation [64].

Let us further comment on several aspects of this realisation. For D_4 there exists a special isomorphism $V_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong D_4$, while in general we have $D_n \cong \mathbb{Z}_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. The two descriptions of D_4 are connected to different choices of normal subgroups: V_4 or \mathbb{Z}_4 , corresponding to different representations.

In eq. (4.2) we demonstrated that a product of two anti-unitary elements generates a unitary subgroup. Consequently, we can present the underlying symmetry as:

$$\mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^* \cong \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{J} \right\rangle \rtimes \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{J} \right\rangle, \quad (4.28)$$

where both generators are anti-unitary. Here we used a consistent notation with eq. (4.2) for an easier comparison.

Our initial assumption was to consider invariance under the symmetry transformations of eq. (4.23), applied as GCP transformations, as a starting point. One may wonder what is the structure behind the GCP transformations

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_*. \quad (4.29)$$

Equivalently it can be presented as $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. In this case the scalar potential is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{22} - h_{11}) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

After performing a basis change $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, 0, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})}$ we end up with a different representation of D_4 , where the potential in a new basis looks like the potential of eq. (2.15), where now $\lambda'_{1212} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda'_{1323} \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, an additional basis transformation given by a phase transformation in terms of the argument of λ'_{1212} in the new basis is needed.

While this section may initially seem somewhat redundant or like an unnecessary exercise, what we have actually learned is that requiring the invariance of the scalar potential

under different representations of the same symmetry group can lead to redundant couplings in one basis, while not in another. Furthermore, in some cases, by considering the same set of elements applied as HF or GCP transformations, we can relatively easily conclude whether there is explicit CP violation, provided we can recognise symmetries in a basis-independent way [9].

4.5 $[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$

Now, suppose that we promote the parameterised generator of eq. (4.21), which led us to the CP4 model, to a continuous one,

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.31)$$

From the HF transformation, $\langle g_1 \rangle_{\text{HF}}$, point of view we are looking at the $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric scalar potential in a representation where it turns out that some of the couplings must be purely imaginary, $\{\lambda_{1112}, \lambda_{1323}, \lambda_{1233}\} \in i\mathbb{R}$. A basis transformation into the “usual” basis is given by $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, 0, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$.

Invariance under the GCP transformation $\langle g_1 \rangle_*$ yields the following scalar potential:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22})h_{33} \\ & + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1112}h_{12}(h_{22} - h_{11}) + \text{h.c.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

In the bilinear formalism the patterns of eigenvalues are given by $1_4 4_1$. The pattern is shared with the $U(1) \circ V_4$ scalar potential, see Appendix A.

While the scalar potential is not $U(2)$ invariant, the $U(2)$ transformations acting on the $\{h_1, h_2\}$ space do not introduce any additional terms. An obvious question follows: are there redundant couplings present? This observation lets us utilise a basis change of $\mathcal{R}_{(\alpha, 0, \theta, 0)}$ to remove either λ_{1212} or λ_{1112} .

Choosing λ_{1112} as a redundant coupling results in a scalar potential which resembles the $U(1) \circ V_4$ -symmetric one, see Appendix A. At this stage the λ_{1212} coupling is complex, however, by re-phasing the fields it can be made real,

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22})h_{33} + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

In this case we have invariance under:

$$[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4^* = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_* \right\rangle. \quad (4.34)$$

We observe that the scalar potential is also invariant under a GCP transformation corresponding to the combined action of the $U(1)$ and S_2 symmetries, implemented jointly.

Actually, there are several different bases. Consider

$$[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_4] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^* = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{HF}}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_* \right\rangle. \quad (4.35)$$

Requiring invariance under these generators results in the following scalar potential:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{12} + h_{21})(h_{22} - h_{11}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

After performing a basis transformation of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$ we arrive at the scalar potential of eq. (4.33).

Next, after discussing possible generators and scalar potentials, we want to identify the underlying symmetry. It should be of no surprise that we are once again looking at the central product, see Appendix A. There is a non-trivial intersection, $U(1) \cap \mathbb{Z}_4 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, while $\mathbb{Z}_4/\mathbb{Z}_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. This relation equivalently holds for the GCP transformation \mathbb{Z}_4^* . As a result, we have $([U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4^*)/\mathbb{Z}_2 \cong ([U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_4] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*)/\mathbb{Z}_2$, where both are factored by a common central $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \langle \text{diag}(-1, -1, 1) \rangle_{\text{HF}}$.

Under a closer inspection one might notice that the HF transformation actually spans D_4 , while the GCP part would then correspond to a trivial \mathbb{Z}_2^* . This can be easily identified by comparing the scalar potential of eq. (4.30) and the one of eq. (4.36), where $\lambda_{1313} = 0$.

For the HF transformation we considered $U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G}$, see eq. (A.7) for specific realisable \mathcal{G} , however in the (current) context of the GCP transformation we have a specific $\mathcal{G} = D_4$ realisation. On the other hand, it is not entirely correct to consider $\mathcal{G} = D_4$, since we have transformations of the type $\text{HF} \rtimes \text{GCP}$. The rendered scalar potentials differ by the fact that $\lambda_{1212} \in \mathbb{C}$ for the GCP transformation, see the scalar potential of eq. (4.33).

We shall refer to the underlying symmetry as $([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^* \cong [U(1) \times V_4] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. Apart from this, one could also present the potential as $U(1) \times \text{CP4-symmetric}$, which would be consistent with the scalar potential of eq. (4.32). In this case, however, a redundant coupling is present. Although various representations of a given symmetry group may produce different forms of the scalar potential, it is important to account for possible redundancies in the couplings. By performing suitable field redefinitions to remove these redundancies, one often uncovers a higher degree of symmetry, manifested as invariance under additional symmetry transformations.

To sum up, in Section 3 (see also Appendix A) we identified $U(1) \circ V_4$. The GCP transformation analogue is limited to a single $\mathcal{G} = D_4$, and not the cohomology group. Factoring out the central \mathbb{Z}_2 we arrive at the $([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ group. The most intriguing observation about these two cases is that $U(1) \circ V_4$ requires $\lambda_{1212} \in \mathbb{R}$, while for the quotient $[U(1) \times V_4] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ we get $\lambda_{1212} \in \mathbb{C}$ —a GCP transformation allows for more freedom than an identical HF transformation, which may sound counter-intuitive.

By solving the minimisation conditions we must require $\hat{v}_2 = \pm \hat{v}_1$ as otherwise the overall symmetry gets increased to the one of $O(2) \times U(1)$, see eq. (A.11). There is a relative phase between the vevs of h_1 and h_2 which cannot be rotated away while leaving the potential invariant. Therefore, CP can only be spontaneously violated.

4.6 $O(2)$

In Ref. [13] a GCP symmetry generated by

$$g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}_* . \quad (4.37)$$

was discussed and named CPd or $O(2) \times \text{CP}$. Requiring invariance under g_1 results in:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} \\ & + \Lambda(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{2}(2\lambda_{1111} - \lambda_{1221} - \lambda_{1122}). \quad (4.39)$$

The scalar potential is consistent with what is presented in Ref. [13].

If a rotation is implemented as multiplication by a complex phase on each complex field (the usual $U(1)$ re-phasing), we get another representation of $O(2)$, given by $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. In this case the scalar potential is

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} + \lambda_{1133}(h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} \\ & + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13} h_{23} + h_{31} h_{32}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

The two representations of $O(2)$ are connected via a basis change of $\mathcal{R}_{(0, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})}$.

In the above cases we considered the $SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ group. From the group theoretical point of view we get $SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^* \cong O(2)$. In this case, however, we end up with the $U(1)_1$ -symmetric 3HDM. A similar observation holds if we apply an improper orthogonal transformation as a GCP transformation. Therefore, the above scalar potentials have an additional symmetry.

Indeed, there is an additional freedom, which leaves the scalar potential invariant under both the rotation subgroup $SO(2)$ and the reflection-like elements. As a result, we are considering the action of $O(2)$ on $V_{\mathbb{R}}$, *i.e.*, the group $O(2) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. Therefore, this case is of no particular interest for our purposes, as it simply corresponds to requiring invariance in the $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ space.

4.7 $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$

The final case we want to discuss is $\Delta(54) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes S_3$; strictly speaking, in the context of 3HDMs it is more appropriate to refer to it as $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$ due to its non-trivial intersection with $U(1)_Y$. Our aim is to discuss the constraints of $\Delta(54)$ on the $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ space. While this might at first appear to be of little relevance from our point of view, the structure of the eigenvalues in the bilinear space actually differs from that of the $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$ -symmetric potential when applied to $V_{\mathbb{C}}$. We assume that the phases of the complex couplings are free parameters.

The scalar potential

$$V = \lambda_{1111} h_{ii}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{ij} h_{ji} + \lambda_{1122} h_{ii} h_{jj} + \{ \lambda_{1323} (h_{13} h_{23} + h_{21} h_{31} + h_{32} h_{12}) + \text{h.c.} \}, \quad (4.41)$$

can be generated by an (minimal) HF transformation

$$\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3 = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \quad (4.42)$$

where $\omega = e^{2i\pi/3}$.

Requiring invariance under $\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3$, the pattern of eigenvalues in the bilinear formalism is 4_2 . By promoting the latter generator to the GCP transformation we are led to $\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_6^*$, where \mathbb{Z}_6^* can be presented as $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*$, but the form is consistent with eq. (4.42). This case amounts to setting $\lambda_{1323} \in \mathbb{R}$, and the pattern of eigenvalues becomes $1_4 2_2$, see Ref. [9].

In both cases there is an additional \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry realised as $h_i \leftrightarrow h_j$. Therefore, the structure is automatically extended to the dihedral-like group $\Delta(6n^2) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n) \rtimes S_3$ for $n = 3$; see Ref. [41]. There is a non-trivial intersection of the center given by $Z(\Delta(54)) = \langle \omega \mathcal{I} \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_3 \leq U(1)_Y$. Consequently, in the language of NHDMs, we are dealing with $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$. For explicit formulations in the context of 3HDMs, see Refs. [4, 6].

We note that $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$ corresponds to the **SmallGrp** identifier $[54, 13]/\mathbb{Z}_3 \cong [18, 4]$. There are several ways of presenting this group: $\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes S_3$ or the generalised dihedral group formed from $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, $D(E_9) \cong E_9 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Next, we arrive at the real scalar potential of eq. (4.41) by requiring invariance under:

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_*. \quad (4.43)$$

The first two generators yield the S_3 -symmetric scalar potential, while imposing all three transformations leads to the $\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$ applied to $V_{\mathbb{R}}$; see Refs. [15, 63] for the path from S_3 to $\Delta(54)$. The underlying structure can be presented as $(\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$, and it corresponds to the **SmallGrp** identifier [36, 13]. From the group-theoretical point of view the quotient group can be presented as $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes S_3$.

5 Summary of HF and GCP transformations

It is useful to summarise the cases discussed so far. Table 1 lists the realisable symmetry groups and their numbers of independent couplings, while Table 2 shows the associated bilinear eigenvalue patterns. We restrict attention to non-trivial realisations, *i.e.*, excluding cases obtained by applying HF transformations to $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. Our focus is on symmetry realisations that reduce the number of independent couplings and leave a characteristic bilinear fingerprint in the scalar potential.

To our knowledge, the symmetries in Tables 1 and 2 provide the most comprehensive overview of realisable HF and GCP transformations in 3HDMs. These tables can also guide the identification of possible group classes in specific 3HDM scenarios. If a potential is free from redundant couplings, Table 1 can help determine possible symmetries. Caution is warranted: in different bases, a single complex coupling may appear as two independent

real couplings, which can obscure identification. A more robust approach is to examine the number of bilinear terms and compare with the table entries.

Table 1: Realisable symmetries and number of independent couplings in 3HDMs. Numbers in the first column denote the count of independent bilinear and quartic couplings, without double-counting complex phases. The $U(1) \circ V_4$ entry is given as a quotient group, while a more appropriate description would be $U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G}$, see Appendix A.

Independent couplings	HF discrete	HF continuous	GCP
1 + 2		$SU(3)$	
1 + 3	$\Sigma(36)$	$SO(3), [U(1) \times U(1)] \rtimes S_3$	
1 + 4	$S_4, A_4, \Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$		$(\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
2 + 5		$U(2)$	
2 + 6		$O(2) \times U(1)$	
2 + 7		$U(1) \circ V_4, O(2)$	$([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
2 + 8	S_3, D_4		$\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*, \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
2 + 9			$\mathbb{Z}_4^* (\text{CP4})$
3 + 9		$U(1) \times U(1)$	
3 + 10		$U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)_1$	
3 + 11	\mathbb{Z}_4		
3 + 12	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_3$		
4 + 14		$U(1)_2$	
4 + 17	\mathbb{Z}_2		
6 + 27			$\mathbb{Z}_2^* (\text{CP2})$

Table 2: Same symmetries as in Table 1, shown with corresponding eigenvalue patterns (v_m indicates v eigenvalues, each with multiplicity m) in the bilinear formalism.

Patterns of eigenvalues	HF discrete	HF continuous	GCP
1_8		$SU(3)$	
$1_6 1_2$		$[U(1) \times U(1)] \rtimes S_3$	
$1_5 1_3$		$SO(3)$	
2_4	$\Sigma(36)$		
$1_4 1_3 1_1$		$U(2)$	
$1_4 2_2$			$(\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
$1_4 1_2 2_1$		$O(2) \times U(1)$	
$1_4 4_1$	$U(1) \circ V_4$		$([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
$2_3 1_2$	S_4, A_4		
4_2	$\Delta(54)/\mathbb{Z}_3$		
$3_2 2_1$	S_3, \mathbb{Z}_3	$O(2), U(1) \times U(1), U(1)_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
$2_2 4_1$	D_4, \mathbb{Z}_4	$U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)_2$	$\mathbb{Z}_4^* (\text{CP4}), \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$
8_1	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2$		$\mathbb{Z}_2^* (\text{CP2})$

Apart from that, Table 2 also provides a basis-independent diagnostic via characteristic eigenvalue patterns. While such information can be extremely useful for classifying the symmetry category of a given potential, it does not by itself provide a complete identification. Additional checks and analysis are often required, as discussed in Refs. [9, 64].

Regarding Table 2, it is noteworthy that several eigenvalue patterns do not occur in the bilinear space. These include: $1_7 1_1$, $1_6 2_1$, $1_5 1_2 1_1$, $1_5 3_1$, $2_3 2_1$, $1_3 2_2 1_1$, $1_3 1_2 3_1$, $1_3 5_1$, and $1_2 6_1$. At first sight, one might suspect that such patterns can never arise. However, this is not the case; some of these are presented in Appendix D. In Ref. [14], we showed that the minimisation conditions of the $O(2)$ -symmetric model for a vacuum of the form $(\hat{v}_1 e^{i\sigma}, \hat{v}_2, 0)$ require $2\lambda_{1111} - \lambda_{1221} - \lambda_{1122} = 0$. Although we were unable to associate this condition with an enhancement of the symmetry, it is nevertheless intriguing that, for this specific implementation, the resulting eigenvalue pattern is $1_3 2_2 1_1$. This observation raises the question of whether there may exist alternative or non-standard ways of implementing symmetries, beyond the conventional HF and GCP transformations considered so far.

At this stage we find it useful to collect some group theory concepts, which are summarised in the following subsection.

5.1 Some useful identities and definitions

Abelian groups

- \mathbb{Z}_n —cyclic group of order n ;
- $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong V_4$ —Klein four-group;
- $U(1) \times U(1) \cong T^2$ —the two-torus.

Many of the symmetry groups relevant to our discussion admit a representation as semidirect products. In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{N} \rtimes_{\phi} \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{N} \triangleleft \mathcal{G}, \quad \phi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{N}), \quad (5.1)$$

with \mathcal{H} acting non-trivially on the normal subgroup \mathcal{N} . Note that the definition of the semidirect group depends on the homomorphism ϕ . Below we list the observed structures that are relevant for 3HDMs.

Dihedral groups

In general, we have:

$$D_n \cong \mathbb{Z}_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad (5.2)$$

Special cases that occur in 3HDMs include:

$$S_3 \cong D_3 \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad D_4 \cong \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong V_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad (5.3)$$

Symmetric and alternating groups

The symmetric group is a semidirect product of the alternating group A_n (the kernel of the sign homomorphism) and \mathbb{Z}_2 , generated by any odd permutation:

$$S_n \cong A_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \quad (5.4)$$

Relevant specific decompositions for 3HDMs are:

$$S_3 \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad A_4 \cong V_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3, \quad S_4 \cong V_4 \rtimes S_3. \quad (5.5)$$

Continuous groups

For these groups we have the following isomorphisms and extensions:

- $SO(2) \cong U(1)$;
- $O(2) \cong SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, where \mathbb{Z}_2 acts on $U(1)$ via complex conjugation;
- $SO(3) \cong SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$;
- $U(n) \cong (SU(n) \times U(1))/\mathbb{Z}_n$ (in particular for $n = 2, 3$).

Special non-Abelian discrete groups

There are two distinct Δ -series given by

$$\Delta(3n^2) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3, \quad (5.6a)$$

$$\Delta(6n^2) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n) \rtimes S_3, \quad (5.6b)$$

with particular cases

$$\Delta(12) = \Delta(3 \times 2^2) \cong A_4, \quad (5.7a)$$

$$\Delta(6) = \Delta(6 \times 1^2) \cong S_3, \quad \Delta(24) = \Delta(6 \times 2^2) \cong S_4, \quad \Delta(54) = \Delta(6 \times 3^2). \quad (5.7b)$$

A further special symmetry in the classification of finite subgroups of $PSU(3)$ belongs to the so-called exceptional series, with the smallest member

$$\Sigma(36) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4. \quad (5.8)$$

In $SU(3)$ this group appears with an additional central \mathbb{Z}_3 factor, denoted $\Sigma(36 \times 3)$,

$$\Sigma(36)_{PSU(3)} \cong \Sigma(36 \times 3)_{SU(3)} / \mathbb{Z}_3. \quad (5.9)$$

6 GOOFy-like transformations of 3HDMs

Having discussed the conventional HF and GCP transformations, we now turn to a distinct class of field-space operations known as GOOFy transformations. These act on scalar doublets and their conjugates through non-standard transformations that can flip relative signs between fields and invert the sign of kinetic-like terms. Unlike ordinary HF or GCP symmetries, GOOFy transformations do not preserve the canonical kinetic structure, yet they can enforce renormalisation-group-stable relations among parameters of the potential and motivate auxiliary-field limits when promoted to exact symmetries. In what follows we summarise their main features and examine how such transformations can be represented within the general symmetry structure of the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets.

6.1 The GOOFy framework

A new kind of global symmetry transformation, not corresponding to any regular symmetry, was recently proposed by Ferreira, Grzadkowski, OGREID and OSLAND [16] for the scalar sector of 2HDMs. It accounts for a region of scalar parameters that is renormalisation-group (RG) invariant to all orders when only scalar and gauge interactions are considered;

this might be also expanded to the Yukawa sector. These transformations differ from those previously known by allowing the scalar doublets to transform independently of their Hermitian conjugates. Such transformations have the paradoxical property of leading to RG-invariant fixed points without keeping the kinetic term $(\partial_\mu h_i)^\dagger (\partial^\mu h_i)$ invariant.

In the example of Ref. [16], the RG-invariant conditions are

$$m_{11}^2 + m_{22}^2 = 0, \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2, \quad \lambda_6 = -\lambda_7, \quad (6.1)$$

written in terms of the most common notation for 2HDMs (and not in our notation), and is reminiscent of the CP2-invariant 2HDM. The transformation of scalar fields leading to this property was found to be:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &\mapsto -h_2^*, & h_1^\dagger &\mapsto h_2^T, \\ h_2 &\mapsto h_1^*, & h_2^\dagger &\mapsto h_1^T. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

This transformation inverts the sign of the kinetic Lagrangian terms, since the fields h_i and their conjugates transform non-trivially under these operations. The scalar covariant derivatives are defined as

$$D^\mu = \partial^\mu + i\frac{g}{2}\sigma_i W_i^\mu + i\frac{g'}{2}B^\mu, \quad (6.3)$$

and invariance of the gauge-interaction terms requires that the gauge fields transform as

$$W_{1\mu} \rightarrow iW_{1\mu}, \quad W_{2\mu} \rightarrow -iW_{2\mu}, \quad W_{3\mu} \rightarrow iW_{3\mu}, \quad B_\mu \rightarrow iB_\mu. \quad (6.4)$$

Clearly, the term $(\partial_\mu h_i)^\dagger (\partial^\mu h_i)$ changes sign and the covariant kinetic terms are therefore not invariant under these transformations. If the transformation of eq. (6.2) is promoted to an exact symmetry of the theory, the “inverted” (scalar) terms must be excluded from the Lagrangian, causing the associated scalar field to lose its kinetic term and become auxiliary.

These kinds of transformations have by now attracted considerable attention (see Refs. [66–68] and Refs. [69, 70] for the implications in the Yukawa sector) and are referred to as *GOOFy symmetries*. One important implication of these transformations is that they can render certain bilinear terms of the scalar potential odd under the symmetry. Initially, GOOFy symmetries were applied as GCP-type transformations, but they were later generalised by Trautner in Ref. [66] to include HF transformations. The defining criterion for a transformation to be GOOFy became the non-trivial transformation of the kinetic terms.

With the generalisation proposed in Ref. [66] (we shall refer to these transformations as T-GOOFy, after Trautner, in Section 7, where more details shall be outlined) situations may arise in which some kinetic terms of the form $(\partial_\mu h_i)^\dagger (\partial^\mu h_i)$ remain invariant, while others change sign. This implies that invariance cannot, in general, be imposed simultaneously for all quartic couplings of the fields appearing in the kinetic term, since the transformations given by eq. (6.4) only work for doublets that transform in a GOOFy way. In such cases, some of the kinetic terms provide a hard breaking of the GOOFy symmetry.

It was argued in Ref. [66] that for NHDMs one should expect non-vanishing RG corrections to fixed points at higher orders whenever there is a relative-sign-flipping behaviour of the gauge kinetic terms. In contrast, for cases with global-sign-flipping GOOFy transformations, one should expect all-order stability of the parameter relations resulting from

imposing the symmetry. This occurs even though, in the latter case, the kinetic terms are not fully invariant under the GOOFy symmetry. A full proof is expected to appear in a future publication. If one chooses to remove the kinetic terms of the doublets that break the GOOFy symmetry, the corresponding scalars will behave as auxiliary fields.

6.2 Transformations of the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets

In Ref. [14] symmetry-breaking patterns for 3HDMs with continuous symmetries were discussed. There, 2HDMs embedded within 3HDMs were mentioned; one may envisage the following construction: a 2HDM accompanied by a separate SM-like scalar sector, with mixing between the two suppressed. A necessary condition for such patterns to emerge is that the underlying symmetry groups act differently on the bilinear and quartic terms of the potential. Although we do not reproduce the exact scenario of Ref. [14] (unless soft symmetry breaking is considered), we may envision a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry acting on the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets, rather than, conventionally, on the scalar doublets, serving as an HF-like transformation:

$$h_{ii} \mapsto -h_{ii}, \quad (6.5a)$$

$$h_{ij} \mapsto -h_{ij}, \quad i \neq j, \quad (6.5b)$$

which will be denoted as $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2$ in the sequel.

This symmetry renders all bilinear terms, μ_{ii}^2 and μ_{ij}^2 , odd under $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2$ while keeping the quartic terms, λ_{ijkl} , even. Consequently, imposing the $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2$ symmetry produces the most general NHDm scalar potential with the bilinear part completely eliminated, $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. Since symmetries in NHDms are typically imposed via the scalar doublets, it is natural to ask whether the transformation in question can, or should, also be meaningfully applied to the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets.

Alternatively, we could also think of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2$ acting as a GCP-like transformation, $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2^*$, under which the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform as

$$h_{ii} \mapsto -h_{ii}, \quad (6.6a)$$

$$h_{ij} \mapsto -h_{ji}, \quad i \neq j, \quad (6.6b)$$

which corresponds, except for the sign, to a CP transformation given by $h_{ij} \mapsto h_{ji}$.

In this case, the bilinear part of the potential is given by:

$$V = i\mu_{ij}^2(h_{ij} - h_{ji}), \quad (6.7)$$

with purely imaginary $i\mu_{ij}^2$ couplings. In contrast, since we can imagine that we are looking at the identity generator acting as a GCP transformation and the quartic potential is even under $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2^*$, we get real couplings, $\lambda_{ijkl} \in \mathbb{R}$.

What about different $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ symmetries? For example, we may consider a $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3$ transformation acting as

$$h_{ij} \mapsto e^{i2\pi/3} h_{ij}. \quad (6.8)$$

Since the renormalisable scalar potential contains $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets of multiplicities one and two, all terms vanish under $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3$. However, cubic $SU(2)$ bilinear singlet structures, $h_{ij}h_{kl}h_{mn}$, remain invariant under both $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3$ and $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3^*$. This observation can be easily extended to any $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ or $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_n^*$ transformation.

Up to this point, we have assumed that all h_{ij} singlets transform identically. As an example of a non-uniform transformation, consider the following:

$$h_{ii} \mapsto h_{ii}, \quad (6.9a)$$

$$h_{ij} \mapsto -h_{ij}, \quad i \neq j. \quad (6.9b)$$

Invariance results in the bilinear part

$$V = \mu_{ii}^2 h_{ii}, \quad (6.10)$$

whereas in the quartic potential the λ_{ijk} couplings are prohibited. In another basis the quartic potential can be associated with the \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric model. On the other hand, if we switch the signs of the above transformation, *i.e.*, $h_{ii} \mapsto -h_{ii}$, $h_{ij} \mapsto h_{ij}$, the bilinear part will be different, while the quartic part remains \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric.

A comprehensive analysis of all possible transformations of this type would be a computationally demanding task since we would be looking at the transformations of the 3^2 $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets for the 3HDM. In general, we do not need to assume that h_{ij} and h_{ji} transform as conjugates; for instance, if $h_{13} \rightarrow ih_{21}$, it is possible to have $h_{31} \rightarrow ih_{12}$, with both transformations involving a common factor of “ i ”. Moreover, it is possible to have transformation given by $h_{13} \rightarrow h_{23} \rightarrow -h_{13}$. These do not violate hermiticity of the scalar potential.

This naturally raises the question: can these identifications be simplified in line with the methodology developed in the previous sections?

For a scalar doublet h_i transforming under \mathcal{U} as $h_i \mapsto \mathcal{U}_{ij} h_j$, the transformation of h_{ij} will not generally match the standard HF or GCP transformation of eqs. (2.7a) and (2.7b) if both h_i and h_i^* transform under the same \mathcal{U} . In such cases, two different unitary transformations, $\mathcal{U}^{(2)} \neq (\mathcal{U}^{(1)})^*$, may be considered, as briefly noted but not elaborated upon in Ref. [15]:

- HF-like transformations,

$$H \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}^{(1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{U}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} H. \quad (6.11)$$

- GCP-like transformations,

$$H \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{U}^{(1)} \\ \mathcal{U}^{(2)} & 0 \end{pmatrix} H. \quad (6.12)$$

Importantly, not every h_{ij} -transformation can be recast into one of these two forms for an arbitrary NHDM; *e.g.*, eqs. (6.9) serve as a counterexample. The earlier outlined preliminary checks suggest that only the structure of the bilinear terms differs, and only in cases where each $SU(2)$ bilinear singlet maps directly to another bilinear singlet (one-to-one) rather than to a linear combination.

It should be noted that the transformations in question are closely related to eq. (5.1) of Ref. [66], identified independently via a different approach. Since a general prescription for mapping eqs. (6.11) and (6.12) to the h_{ij} -space is lacking, we restrict our attention to the GOOFy symmetry transformations explicitly discussed in Ref. [66].

Our approach is to analyse each symmetry transformation type (HF, GCP, GOOFy) within its own fixed framework. In many cases, this full symmetry group can be decomposed into a product of a simple GOOFy-like generator and a HF or GCP symmetry. This distinction is crucial, as it highlights that the full symmetry structure cannot always be reduced to a simple GOOFy action combined with a pure HF transformation.

6.3 GOOFy HF-like transformations

First, consider symmetry transformations of the form

$$H \mapsto U_{\pm}^{\text{HF}} H \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{U}^* \end{pmatrix} H, \quad (6.13)$$

cf. eq. (5.3) of Ref [66]. In this case the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform as

$$h_{ij} \mapsto -\mathcal{U}_{ik}^* \mathcal{U}_{jl} h_{kl}. \quad (6.14)$$

These transformations correspond to the “original” GOOFy transformations introduced in Ref. [16]. When presented in terms of the h_{ij} singlet transformations, it becomes evident that such transformations can at most introduce additional relations among the bilinear terms, while leaving the quartic part unaffected.

If we choose the identity matrix, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{I}_3$, the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform simply as $h_{ij} \mapsto -h_{ij}$, *i.e.*, according to $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_2$. As noted earlier, this case renders a scalar potential with the most general quartic couplings, but with all bilinear terms vanishing. This observation identifies a whole family of scalar potentials with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. One may regard this as an alternative to the CP2 model, which also yields the most general NHDM potential, but with all couplings real. This behaviour has been verified explicitly for all HF transformations.

Beyond the $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$ family of scalar potentials, there exist other configurations where bilinear terms need not vanish. We now turn to discussing these cases, by categorising potentials based on the patterns of eigenvalues in the bilinear formalism. Here, $V_{\mathcal{G}}$ will denote the quartic part of the scalar potential together with the corresponding allowed bilinear terms listed separately:

- **1₄1₂2₁:**
 $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ with $i\mu_{12}^2$;
 $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$.
- **1₄4₁:**
 $V_{U(1) \circ V_4}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$.
- **3₂2₁:**
 $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $i\mu_{12}^2$;
 $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$;
 V_{S_3} with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$.
- **2₂4₁:**
 $V_{U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with μ_{12}^2 ;
 $V_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$;
 V_{D_4} with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$.
- **8₁:**
 $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with μ_{12}^2 ;
 $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ with $\{\mu_{12}^2, \mu_{13}^2\}$.

Table 3: Symmetry transformations after eq. (6.13) for cases where the bilinear terms are presented. In the second column the HF transformation is factored out and provided in the last sub-column, while the first sub-column corresponds to the GOOFy transformation.

\mathcal{G} as HF-like GOOFy	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{HF-GOOFy}} * \mathcal{G}_{\text{HF}}$	
$O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta_2} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$U(1) \times V_4$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
S_3	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{2i\pi/3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\pi/3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
D_4	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{4,\pm}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	—
$U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{2,\pm}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	—

Since most of the considered symmetry groups are composite, *i.e.*, they can be expressed as products of simpler factors such as $\mathcal{G}_1 * \mathcal{G}_2$, it is not surprising that they can be decomposed into a product of GOOFy and HF transformations, yielding the same scalar potential.

These cases are summarised in Table 3, and an explicit list of generators is provided in

Appendix C. In summary, the models considered here can be characterised by two GOOFy HF-like transformations, \mathbb{Z}_2 and \mathbb{Z}_4 . One could then label these two representations as $\mathbb{Z}_{n,\pm}$, where the “ \pm ” subscript corresponds to $\mathcal{U}^{(2)} = -(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})^*$, as a mnemonic for the opposite signs of the two blocks of the transformation of H .

6.4 GOOFy GCP-like transformations

Under a GCP-like transformation of the form

$$H \mapsto U_{\pm}^{\text{GCP}} H \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{U} \\ -\mathcal{U}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} H, \quad (6.15)$$

cf. eq. (5.3) of Ref [66], the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform as

$$h_{ij} \mapsto -\mathcal{U}_{ik}^* \mathcal{U}_{jl} h_{lk}. \quad (6.16)$$

Before proceeding to the discussion of different transformations, let us consider the canonical antisymmetric form

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{I}_3 \\ -\mathcal{I}_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.17)$$

Linear maps $\mathcal{M} : H \mapsto \mathcal{M}H$ (\mathcal{M} is assumed to be unitary) that preserve the canonical bilinear form \mathcal{K} belong to the complex symplectic group

$$Sp(6, \mathbb{C}) = \{ \mathcal{M} \in GL(6, \mathbb{C}) \mid \mathcal{M}^T \mathcal{K} \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{K} \}. \quad (6.18)$$

Two families of transformations appear naturally as subgroups of $Sp(6, \mathbb{C})$:

- The usual HF transformations of eq. (2.3):

$$(U^{\text{HF}})^T \mathcal{K} U^{\text{HF}} = \mathcal{K}; \quad (6.19)$$

- The GCP-like transformations of eq. (6.15):

$$(U_{\pm}^{\text{GCP}})^T \mathcal{K} U_{\pm}^{\text{GCP}} = \mathcal{K}. \quad (6.20)$$

These transformations therefore generate the subgroups of $U(3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \leq Sp(6, \mathbb{C})$, where the non-trivial element of \mathbb{Z}_2 acts on $U(3)$ by the group automorphism. For U^{GCP} and U_{\pm}^{HF} the above \mathcal{K} does not satisfy symplecticity.

Note that for a complex scalar multiplet one finds

$$H^T \mathcal{K} H = h^T h^* - h^\dagger h = (h^\dagger h)^* - h^\dagger h = 0, \quad (6.21)$$

since $h^\dagger h = \sum_i |h_i|^2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This bilinear does not appear in the Lagrangian because it vanishes identically for commuting scalar fields.

After discussing symplecticity, we proceed to the identification of the transformations given by eq. (6.15). Since the HF, GCP, and HF-like GOOFy transformations have already been classified, identifying genuinely new GCP-like GOOFy transformations reduces to finding cases presented by unique generators. Otherwise, the transformation simply falls into one of the previously discussed categories. For example, if we apply the CP2 transformation as the GCP-like GOOFy transformation, we recover exactly the CP2 quartic

potential, while, as expected, the bilinear terms vanish. Consequently, we want to check for potentials when at least a single bilinear term remains.

An interesting observation is that the D_4 group can act as a GCP-like GOOFy transformation, *i.e.*, a non-vanishing bilinear part is allowed. Depending on the choice of D_4 representation, the quartic sector can acquire an additional complex coupling.

The unique configurations categorised in terms of the eigenvalue patterns are:

- **144₁:**

By requiring invariance under the

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_*,$$

generators we arrive at $V_{([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ along with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$. In another representation,

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_*,$$

we get $V_{([U(1) \times D_4]/\mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$, see eq. (4.32) for the quartic part, and $\{\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2, \mu_{12}^2\}$. While there is a redundant coupling present in the quartic part, an extra bilinear term is also allowed, μ_{12}^2 .

- **322₁:**

For $V_{\mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*} : h_1 \mapsto e^{-2i\pi/3}h_2, h_2 \mapsto e^{2i\pi/3}h_1$ we get $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$;

$V_{SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ with $i(\mu_{12}^2 - \mu_{21}^2)$;

$V_{U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$;

- **224₁:**

$V_{U(1)_2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ with $i\mu_{12}^2$;

$V_{\mathbb{Z}_4^*}$ with $\{\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2, \mu_{12}^2\}$. There are no cases with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$, since otherwise CP4 would reduce to the D_4 -symmetric model;

- **8₁:**

$V_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ with μ_{12}^2 ;

$V_{\mathbb{Z}_2^*}$ with $\{i\mu_{12}^2, i\mu_{13}^2, i\mu_{23}^2\}$, assuming $\langle \mathcal{I} \rangle_*$;

As in the HF-like GOOFy case discussed previously, our strategy is to identify symmetries by expressing them as a product of an HF transformation and a GCP-like GOOFy transformation. This decomposition makes it straightforward to distinguish genuinely new structures from those that simply reproduce the earlier listed cases. The explicit examples obtained through this approach are collected in Table 4.

In summary, the GCP-like GOOFy transformations admit only two unique symmetry groups: \mathbb{Z}_2 and \mathbb{Z}_4 . We can label these as $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{n,\pm}^*$. Notice that in the HF-like GOOFy case we had also identified two unique symmetry groups: $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{2,\pm}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{4,\pm}$.

Table 4: Symmetry transformations after eq. (6.15) for cases when the bilinear terms are presented. In the second column the HF transformation is factored out.

\mathcal{G} as GCP-like GOOFy	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{GCP-GOOFy}} * \mathcal{G}_{\text{HF}}$	
$U(1) \times V_4$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
S_3	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{2i\pi/3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\pi/3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$U(1)_2$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{4,\pm}^*$ (CP4-like)	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	—
\mathbb{Z}_2	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$
$\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{2,\pm}^*$ (CP2-like)	$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$	—

7 T-GOOFy transformations

In the previous section, we considered transformations of h_i and h_i^* that differ by an overall minus sign (and complex conjugation). There, the GOOFy symmetries of Ref. [16] were discussed, but for 3HDM, in terms of their action on the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets, without addressing RGE stability. We now turn to a broader class of transformations, which we shall refer to as T-GOOFy transformations, following the transformations identified by Trautner in Ref. [66] and also presented by eqs. (6.11) and (6.12), when additional constraints are applied.

To specify the action of these transformations, we employ the notation

$$\mathcal{G} = \langle [\mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathcal{U}^{(2)}] \rangle, \quad (7.1)$$

which indicates the subspace of H on which the transformations act. For instance, such a transformation can be represented as a HF-type operation, $H \mapsto \text{diag}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathcal{U}^{(2)}) H$. However, this notation alone does not distinguish between HF and GCP transformations. We therefore employ a subscript notation consistent with earlier sections, and the first entry, $\mathcal{U}^{(1)}$, corresponds to the upper index of the full transformation acting on the H fields.

Hermiticity of the Lagrangian imposes a consistency condition on the individual transformations that generate \mathcal{G} . Each transformation, constructed from the unitary blocks $\mathcal{U}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{(2)}$, must preserve the Hermitian form of the kinetic term, which effectively requires that the product of a transformation and its Hermitian conjugate yields a diagonal operator with eigenvalues “ ± 1 ”. These discrete eigenvalues determine whether the transformation leaves the fields invariant or introduces an overall sign flip, ensuring that all elements of \mathcal{G} act as genuine symmetries of the theory.

As noted previously, identifying all possible symmetries in this framework is considerably more involved, since one must also account for permutations of the generators, which determine the form of the bilinear terms. For both methodological and computational reasons, we restrict our analysis to the classification of distinct quartic terms in the scalar potential. Cases differing only by the restriction $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ are omitted, as these correspond to the imposition of a CP2 symmetry, $\text{CP2} : \lambda(\mathbb{C}) \mapsto \lambda(\mathbb{R})$.

As before, distinct symmetry classes are identified via the eigenvalue patterns of the bilinear space. Although no additional refinement step is introduced, it is worth noting that under GOOFy transformations certain eigenvalues may be equal in magnitude or vanish entirely. Such features can provide an initial diagnostic for the underlying symmetry and motivate a further subdivision into finer classes.

Many of the cases discussed below can be expressed as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{GOOFy}} * \mathcal{G}_{\text{HF and/or GCP}}$. In general, multiple decompositions of a given T-GOOFy transformation are possible: different generator sets can lead to identical quartic potentials while differing in the bilinear sector. Since we focus only on the quartic part, the discussion of free parameters remains limited. In particular, when the scalar potential in the $\{h_1, h_2\}$ sector coincides with that of the full 2HDM, an $SU(2)$ transformation can be used to remove redundant degrees of freedom, and we prioritise such two-dimensional group actions in our classification.

7.1 T-GOOFy HF-like transformations

We start by covering the HF transformations, which were given by eq. (6.11). For the HF-like transformations we have:

$$h_{ij} \mapsto U_{ik}^{(2)*} U_{jl}^{(1)} h_{kl}. \quad (7.2)$$

Earlier, we noted that different representations can lead to distinct scalar potentials. For example, consider two different \mathbb{Z}_2 representations (these can be viewed as \mathbb{Z}_2 acting on the whole H space):

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \left\langle \left[\mathcal{I}_3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \quad (7.3a)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \left\langle \left[\mathcal{I}_3, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}. \quad (7.3b)$$

In both cases we get an identical quartic part:

$$\begin{aligned}
V^4 = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \left\{ \lambda_{1112}h_{11}h_{12} + \lambda_{1222}h_{12}h_{22} + \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} \right. \\
& \left. + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

As for the bilinear parts we have:

$$V_{\mathcal{G}_1}^2 = \mu_{11}^2 h_{11} + \mu_{22}^2 h_{22} + \{\mu_{12}^2 h_{12} + \text{h.c.}\}, \tag{7.5}$$

or

$$V_{\mathcal{G}_2}^2 = \mu_{33}^2 h_{33}, \tag{7.6}$$

respectively.

It should be noted that with the help of the $SU(2)$ transformation acting on the $\{h_1, h_2\}$ space, like in the 2HDM, it is possible to rotate away one of the couplings. A convenient choice could be to rotate away either λ_{1112} or λ_{1222} .

Now, suppose that on top of either \mathcal{G}_1 or \mathcal{G}_2 we apply $\mathbb{Z}_2 : h_1 \mapsto -h_1$. Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V^4 = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

Different choices of bases and of the forms of generators lead to several different possibilities for the bilinear terms, either $\mu_{11}^2 h_{11} + \mu_{22}^2 h_{22}$, or $\mu_{12}^2 h_{12}$, or $\mu_{33}^2 h_{33}$, or no terms. As a result, the identification of the underlying symmetries becomes a complicated task following our methodology. Hence, as stated earlier, we shall omit discussion of the bilinear terms.

Both of the discussed cases in the bilinear formalism share the 8_1 pattern of eigenvalues. We can consider yet another \mathbb{Z}_2 representation given by

$$\mathcal{G}_3 = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \tag{7.8}$$

for which,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\mathcal{G}_3}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \{\lambda_{1332}h_{13}h_{32} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

Another representation of \mathbb{Z}_2 , given by

$$\mathcal{G}_4 = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -e^{3i\pi/4} & 0 \\ e^{i\pi/4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\pi/4} & 0 \\ -e^{3i\pi/4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \tag{7.10}$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\mathcal{G}_4}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\
& + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

There is no unitary transformation between $V_{\mathcal{G}_1}^4$, $V_{\mathcal{G}_3}^4$, and $V_{\mathcal{G}_4}^4$. While the generators resemble different \mathbb{Z}_2 representations, it should be noted that h_i and their conjugated fields transform differently, and transformations are not connected by a simple function. In contrast, if we consider how the h_{ij} bilinear singlets transform, we can notice that while for both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_3 the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform into themselves after two operations, for \mathcal{G}_4 we are looking at six operations. On the other hand, while both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_3 seem to correspond to the “same” \mathbb{Z}_2 , \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_3 act on different spaces. To be more precise:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{G}_1 : & \mathcal{G}_3 : \\
\begin{array}{lll} h_{11} \mapsto h_{11}, & h_{12} \mapsto h_{12}, & h_{13} \mapsto h_{13}, \\ h_{21} \mapsto h_{21}, & h_{22} \mapsto h_{22}, & h_{23} \mapsto h_{23}, \\ h_{31} \mapsto -h_{31}, & h_{32} \mapsto -h_{32}, & h_{33} \mapsto -h_{33}. \end{array} & \begin{array}{lll} h_{11} \mapsto -h_{11}, & h_{12} \mapsto h_{12}, & h_{13} \mapsto -h_{13}, \\ h_{21} \mapsto h_{21}, & h_{22} \mapsto -h_{22}, & h_{23} \mapsto h_{23}, \\ h_{31} \mapsto h_{31}, & h_{32} \mapsto -h_{32}, & h_{33} \mapsto h_{33}. \end{array}
\end{array} \tag{7.12}$$

We can also define the following \mathbb{Z}_4 generator

$$\mathcal{G}_5 = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \tag{7.13}$$

for which we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\mathcal{G}_5}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \{ \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \lambda_{1332}h_{13}h_{32} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

These scalar potentials share the same pattern of eigenvalues, 8_1 . However a new feature emerges: while the above patterns fall into the 8_1 class, if we take the absolute values of the eigenvalues we get another pattern, $|2_24_1|$ —six different values. Here, we introduced a new notation inspired by the absolute value.

Potentials other than the ones presented above, sharing the 8_1 eigenvalues pattern, are subject to an underlying symmetry which can be written as products of T-GOOFy and HF transformations. These are presented in Appendix D.1.

The only other unique case is given by the representation of \mathbb{Z}_6 ,

$$\mathcal{G}_6 = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}. \tag{7.15}$$

Note that in the conventional HF transformations \mathbb{Z}_n , with $n \geq 5$, results in either $U(1)_1$ or $U(1)_2$, based on how the symmetry charges are implemented.

Invariance under this group results in the following scalar potential:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\mathcal{G}_6}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{1122}(-h_{11}h_{22} + h_{11}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{33}) \\
& + \lambda_{1221}(-h_{12}h_{21} + h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) + \{ \lambda_{1212}(-h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.} \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

For this case the patterns of eigenvalues are 2_24_1 and $|2_32_1|$.

For the above discussed models it does not make much sense to discuss CP violation since the bilinear part of the scalar potential remains largely unexplored.

One may wonder whether GOOFy transformations could provide a natural mechanism for constructing a 2HDM-like potential enlarged by an additional, non-interacting doublet. Consider $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ applied as a GOOFy transformation (\mathbb{Z}_2 will be identified as \mathcal{G}_1 of eq. (7.3a)):

$$H \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}^{(1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{U}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} H, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.17)$$

or equivalently

$$H \mapsto \text{diag}\{1, 1, e^{i\theta}, 1, 1, -e^{-i\theta}\} H. \quad (7.18)$$

This transformation can be split into two combined transformations: (HF-like GOOFy) \mathcal{G}_1 and the HF $U(1)_{h_3}$, which can be presented as $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1)]_{h_3}$:

$$\mathcal{G}_1 : \quad H \mapsto \text{diag}\{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1\} H, \quad (7.19a)$$

$$U(1)_{h_3} : \quad H \mapsto \text{diag}\{1, 1, e^{i\theta}, 1, 1, e^{-i\theta}\} H. \quad (7.19b)$$

The scalar potential invariant under $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1)]_{h_3}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \mu_{11}^2 h_{11} + \mu_{22}^2 h_{22} + \{\mu_{12}^2 h_{12} + \text{h.c.}\} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{1111} h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222} h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{1221} h_{12} h_{21} + \lambda_{1122} h_{11} h_{22} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \lambda_{1112} h_{11} h_{12} + \lambda_{1222} h_{12} h_{22} + \lambda_{1212} h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2 \\ &= V_{2\text{HDM}} + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

This potential successfully decouples h_3 , replicating the structure of $V_{2\text{HDM}} + V(h_3)$ at tree level. However, a crucial limitation emerges in the bilinear sector: while allowing all bilinear 2HDM terms, the symmetry forbids the μ_{33}^2 term. Since we are working with $SU(2)$ bilinear singlet combinations, one can check that to forbid quartic mixing among $\{h_1, h_2\}$ and h_3 while retaining all bilinear terms, the symmetry would need to assign charges that inevitably render the mixed quartics invariant. The only option is the \mathbb{Z}_2 case, which achieves quartic decoupling but also forbids the μ_{33}^2 term. A fully decoupled $V_{2\text{HDM}} + V(h_3)$ potential in the GOOFy framework is therefore impossible without introducing μ_{33}^2 as a soft symmetry-breaking term.

The $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1)]_{h_3}$ transformation provides a compelling, albeit imperfect, example: one should note that when GOOFy transformations are promoted to exact symmetries, the decoupling of a scalar field from the covariant derivative forces its kinetic term to vanish, rendering the field auxiliary.

This example, nevertheless, provides a basis for identifying other 2HDM-like potentials, presented in Appendix D. In the bilinear formalism the off-diagonal/mixed bilinear terms ($i \neq j$), which encode the relative orientation and phase between doublets, are:

$$\frac{1}{2} (h_{ij} + h_{ji}), \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{1}{2} (ih_{ij} - ih_{ji}).$$

The key, basis-independent signature of such a decoupled structure is the pattern of eigenvalues in the bilinear formalism: since $\{h_1, h_2\}$ and h_3 do not mix, at least four eigenvalues must vanish. This provides a simple diagnostic tool—any 3HDM potential exhibiting a null space of this dimension falls into the 2HDM-like category.

7.2 T-GOOFy GCP-like transformations

Now, we move to the GCP transformations, which were given by eq. (6.12). For this case, the $SU(2)$ bilinear singlets transform as

$$h_{ij} \mapsto U_{ik}^{(2)*} U_{jl}^{(1)} h_{lk}. \quad (7.21)$$

In total, we managed to identify two unique (not a product of other groups) symmetries. First, consider a \mathbb{Z}_4 representation

$$\mathcal{G}_7^* = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_*. \quad (7.22)$$

The \mathcal{G}_7 structure is connected to \mathcal{G}_3 of eq. (7.8) via a basis change of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$. However, utilising the \mathcal{G}_3^* group (we recall that we are considering GCP transformations) would result in a scalar potential with three purely imaginary couplings, $\{\lambda_{1112}, \lambda_{1222}, \lambda_{1323}\}$. On the other hand, \mathcal{G}_7^* results in some redundant couplings. While the two cases are connected via a unitary basis transformation, it should be noted that we consider *only* the quartic part of the potential. As in the previous subsection, while the choice of \mathcal{G}_3^* or \mathcal{G}_7^* would render an identical quartic part of the scalar potential, the bilinear terms will be different. For \mathcal{G}_3^* we get $V = \mu_{12}^2(h_{12} + h_{21}) + \mu_{33}^2$, while for \mathcal{G}_7^* it is $V = \mu_{11}^2(h_{11} + h_{22})$. Moreover, \mathcal{G}_3 and \mathcal{G}_7 are not the only two generators that result in a different bilinear part of the potential.

For \mathcal{G}_7^* we get the following scalar potential:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathcal{G}_7^*}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) \\ & + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{2331}h_{23}h_{31} + \lambda_{1112}(h_{11} - h_{22})h_{21} \right. \\ & \left. + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{32}^2) + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

In terms of the eigenvalues pattern we are considering the $8_1, |2_24_1|$, class of the potentials.

The presence of phase-sensitive couplings in the scalar potential might seem at odds with a GCP-like symmetry. However, taking into consideration that the underlying symmetry is \mathbb{Z}_4^* , it should be of no surprise that these couplings are allowed.

Another unique group is given by another \mathbb{Z}_4 representation:

$$\mathcal{G}_8 = \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\rangle_*. \quad (7.24)$$

In this case the scalar potential is:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathcal{G}_8}^4 = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 - h_{12}^2 - h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1122}(h_{11}h_{22} + h_{12}h_{21}) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{22} - h_{11})(h_{12} + h_{21}) + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

In the bilinear formalism it corresponds to the 2_24_1 and $|1_41_22_1|$ pattern.

All other T-GOOFy GCP-like scalar potentials can be derived starting from these two. The complete set of scalar potentials is presented in Appendix D.2.

8 Summary

The set of realisable symmetries in NHDMs is substantially richer and more intricate than often assumed. The “brute-force” approach, although less elegant than purely group-theoretical methods, has been instrumental in systematically classifying symmetries: by explicitly constructing and comparing scalar potentials.

Our analysis began with a detailed re-examination of conventional HF and GCP transformations in 3HDMs. By systematically constructing the corresponding scalar potentials, we have compiled what we believe to be the most complete picture to date, summarised in Tables 1 and 2. These tables serve as a practical diagnostic reference for model builders, providing the number of independent couplings and basis-invariant eigenvalue patterns associated with each symmetry. Although we have not exhaustively scanned all subgroups of $U(3)$, our results remain broadly consistent with previous classifications and reveal no evidence for additional symmetries beyond those identified here.

Another direction of our paper was to consider GOOFy transformations, which act asymmetrically on scalar doublets and their conjugates. Such transformations challenge the conventional paradigm of symmetry imposition and naturally give rise to new families of scalar potentials. Due to the complexity of the analysis, we restricted our attention to the quartic sector, providing the first systematic study of 3HDM scalar potentials invariant under the GOOFy-type transformations. We found that certain representations in the combined space of doublets and their conjugates can selectively eliminate bilinear terms while leaving the quartic sector invariant. This feature cannot be attributed merely to a basis choice alone and suggests new directions for model building, possibly offering novel approaches to hierarchy [69, 70] and flavour problems. We have not attempted to propose a formal naming convention for such symmetries; instead, GOOFy transformations have been denoted generically as \mathcal{G}_n .

One of the central lessons from our analysis is the observation of the critical roles played by the choice of basis and of representation in the identification of the symmetries. Furthermore, invariance under a given set of generators does not necessarily capture the full underlying symmetry.

While a complete classification of 3HDMs, invariant under all possible transformations, remains an ambitious goal, *e.g.*, we have not considered custodial symmetries, our work provides a transparent framework and lays the ground for several research directions. The new scalar potentials identified here warrant detailed phenomenological study. Extending the GOOFy transformations to the fermion and gauge sectors is an important next step, with the potential for distinctive collider signatures and cosmological implications. Furthermore, extending the work of Ref. [9] in order to recognise potentials invariant under GOOFy transformations, when written in a particular basis would be useful to gain a deeper understanding of these theories.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Darius Jurčiukonis for discussions on group theory and for help with the implementation of the **GAP** software. We are also very grateful to Andreas Trautner for enlightening discussions on properties of generalisations of GOOFy transformations.

The work of AK and MNR was partially supported by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), Portugal through the projects UIDB/00777/2020, UIDP/00777/2020, UID/00777/2025 (<https://doi.org/10.54499/UID/00777/2025>), CERN/FIS-PAR/0002/2021 and 2024.02004.CERN, which are partially funded through POCTI (FEDER), COMPETE, QREN and the EU. Furthermore, the work of AK has been supported by the research studentships for doctoral students BL186/2024 IST-ID within the framework of the project UIDB/00777/2020 as well as BL325/2024 IST-ID within the framework of the project 2024.02004.CERN. PO is supported in part by the Research Council of Norway. We thank the University of Bergen and CFTP/IST/University of Lisbon as well as the CERN Theory Department, where collaboration visits took place.

A Reasserting $U(1) \times D_4$

In Ref. [14] we considered the group spanned by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle_{\text{HF}} = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The subset of generators $\{g_2, g_3\}$ span a group of order eight, $D_4 \cong \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. Its center is $Z(D_4) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and it overlaps non-trivially with $U(1)$: $U(1) \cap D_4 = Z(D_4)$, namely the common subgroup \mathbb{Z}_2 acting on the $\{h_1, h_2\}$ doublets. To avoid double-counting, one quotients out this common subgroup, yielding:

$$D_4/Z(D_4) \cong V_4 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It is worth noting that although $\{g_2, g_3\}$ resemble two \mathbb{Z}_2 -type generators, within D_4 they generate a non-Abelian subgroup, while the quotient group $D_4/Z(D_4)$ is Abelian. Concretely, the quotient identifies rotations and reflections that differ only by the central “ $-\mathcal{I}_2$ ” (acting on $\{h_1, h_2\}$), so the resulting cosets commute.

We emphasise that the quotient group $D_4/Z(D_4) \cong V_4$ represents an abstract group isomorphism: the quotient structure does not correspond to the same matrix action on the H space. In practice, we continue to denote the relevant coset representatives by $\{g_2, g_3\}$, while keeping in mind that they generate V_4 only at the group-theoretic level. Realising the quotient group explicitly would require a new, inequivalent matrix representation. More generally, when a symmetry group is defined as a quotient, the resulting isomorphism refers solely to the abstract group structure; in a specific field representation, the correspondence between coset elements and actual transformation matrices need not be one-to-one, since elements of the factored subgroup may act as overall phases or otherwise trivially on the fields.

In Ref. [14] we also noted that Q_8 (order 8) and the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_1 (order 16) fit into the scalar potential of the $U(1) \times D_4$ model. The latter can be presented as:

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\text{HF}}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with center

$$Z(\mathcal{P}_1) = \{\pm \mathcal{I}_2, \pm i \mathcal{I}_2\} \cong \mathbb{Z}_4 \leq U(1). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Again the intersection with $U(1)$ is non-trivial, and factoring it out results in:

$$\mathcal{P}_1/Z(\mathcal{P}_1) \cong V_4. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In both cases we are considering a quotient of the direct product along the common center

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = [U(1) \times \mathcal{G}] / Z(\mathcal{G}), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $Z(\mathcal{G})$ is a central subgroup, *i.e.*, it lies in the centers of both $U(1)$ and \mathcal{G} . We mentioned several cases so far, $\mathcal{G} = \{D_4, Q_8, \mathcal{P}_1\}$. As a matter of fact, we are considering a central product $U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G}$, *e.g.*, $U(1) \circ_{\mathbb{Z}_2} D_4$, formed by identifying the subgroup of the N^{th} root of unity in $U(1)$ with the central subgroup $Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$. In general, we are considering the following structure:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \cong U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G} : \quad Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n, \quad \mathcal{G}/Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong V_4, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which ensures that the redundant \mathbb{Z}_n is not double-counted.

An obvious question follows: what are the realisable \mathcal{G} ? We have an exact sequence:

$$1 \longrightarrow Z(\mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow V_4 \longrightarrow 1. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

These extensions are classified (up to equivalence) by the second cohomology group $H^2(V_4, \mathbb{Z}_n)$, see Refs. [71–73]. One finds:

$$H^2(V_4, \mathbb{Z}_n) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_n) \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{\text{gcd}(2,n)}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Note that the cohomology classification may also produce extensions in which the normal subgroup is not exactly the center of \mathcal{G} . In such cases one must check explicitly that the subgroup is central and of the desired form \mathbb{Z}_n .

The $H^2(V_4, \mathbb{Z}_n)$ group is non-trivial if and only if n is even, which aligns with the earlier discussed groups $\mathcal{G} = \{D_4, Q_8, \mathcal{P}_1\}$. For odd n one finds $H^2(V_4, \mathbb{Z}_n) = 0$, which corresponds to a trivial split extension $\mathbb{Z}_n \times V_4$ and results in a $U(1) \times U(1)$ -symmetric 3HDM.

Having identified that n should be even, we can further refine the structure. Let $n = 2^k m$, where m is odd. Then, the m part contributes trivially to cohomology, yielding $\mathcal{G} \cong \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathcal{G}_{2^k}$. Thus, for $n = 2$ one finds $\{D_4, Q_8\}$, for $n = 4$ the \mathcal{P}_1 group, and for $n = \{2m, 4m\}$ with odd m one obtains direct products such as $\mathbb{Z}_m \times D_4$ or $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathcal{P}_1$.

Considering the continuous part of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, we have an exact sequence:

$$1 \longrightarrow U(1) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \longrightarrow V_4 \longrightarrow 1. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ group is seen as a central extension of V_4 by the $U(1)$ group. Just as in the discrete case, the extension is determined by the parity of the embedded finite subgroup $Z(\mathcal{G}) \leq U(1)$. When the intersection is trivial (n odd), the extension splits and one obtains $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \cong U(1) \times V_4$, which reduces to $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ due to the overall $U(1)_Y$ symmetry.

For the non-trivial intersection (n even) one arrives at $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \cong U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G}$ of eq. (A.7). In group-cohomological terms, the obstruction to splitting is measured by the non-trivial class in $H^2(V_4, U(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, which is the continuous analogue of the discrete cohomology $H^2(V_4, \mathbb{Z}_n)$. Concretely, this means that the lifts of the three non-trivial elements of

V_4 inside $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ do not commute strictly, but rather commute up to the central element $-\mathcal{I}_2 \in U(1)$. This is precisely the situation realised by the examples $\mathcal{G} = D_4, Q_8, \mathcal{P}_1$, where the continuous phase and the discrete subgroup are identified along their common center.

Finally, we remark that the structure of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ suggests a heuristic connection to continuous symmetries higher than $U(1)$ —a sequence of increasingly fine discrete symmetry subgroups \mathbb{Z}_n with $n \rightarrow \infty$ can approximate a $U(1)$ at the level of symmetry action. While we are not taking a literal group-theoretic limit, this analogy provides a useful perspective: the more finely graded the discrete symmetry, the closer its action may resemble that of a continuous group. This motivates considering whether a continuous symmetry such as $U(1) \times U(1)$, or a related extension, may be relevant.

According to Goldstone’s theorem, the number of Goldstone bosons corresponds to the number of broken generators: $\dim(\mathcal{G}) - \dim(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{G}$ is the symmetry group preserved by the vacuum.

The physical spectrum of the $U(1) \times D_4$ -symmetric 3HDM was analysed in Ref. [14]. For a vacuum of the form (v_1, v_2, v_3) one must solve the minimisation condition:

$$(2\lambda_{1111} - \lambda_{1122} - 2\lambda_{1212} - \lambda_{1221})v_2(v_1^2 - v_2^2) = 0. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Requiring the vanishing of the first parenthesised term corresponds to enhancing the symmetry to $O(2) \times U(1)$. Thus, we need to impose conditions on the vacuum configuration itself. As was noted in Ref. [14], vacua such as $(v, 0, 0)$ or $(\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \pm\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, 0)$ result in a single additional massless state; the form of the symmetry generators suggests that the continuous symmetry action can be localised to the $\{h_1, h_2\}$ sector. Regardless, in all viable vacuum configurations the single additional massless state is associated with the breaking of the global $U(1)$.

We shall refer to the symmetry informally as

$$U(1) \circ V_4$$

to denote the potential-equivalence class of central products. In particular we require any representative satisfying

$$U(1) \circ V_4 \equiv_{\text{pot}} \{U(1) \circ_{Z(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{G} \mid Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n, \mathcal{G}/Z(\mathcal{G}) \cong V_4\}, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

i.e., groups on the right are identified whenever they yield the same renormalisable scalar potential.

B Two different choices of the S_3 representations

We devote this appendix to the examination of two possible irreducible representations of the S_3 group, commenting on the sign ambiguity (\pm) of eq. (4.17).

The irreducible S_3 representations are given by $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}$. The most general renormalisable S_3 -invariant potential in the singlet-doublet representation, $(h_S)_1 \oplus (h_1 \ h_2)^T_2$, can be written as [74–77]:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2 (h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{SS}^2 h_{SS}, \\ & + \lambda_1 (h_{11} + h_{22})^2 + \lambda_2 (h_{12} - h_{21})^2 + \lambda_3 [(h_{11} - h_{22})^2 + (h_{12} + h_{21})^2] \\ & + \{\lambda_4 [h_{S1} (h_{12} + h_{21}) + h_{S2} (h_{11} - h_{22})] + \text{h.c.}\} + \lambda_5 h_{SS} (h_{11} + h_{22}) \\ & + \lambda_6 (h_{1S} h_{S1} + h_{2S} h_{S2}) + \{\lambda_7 (h_{S1}^2 + h_{S2}^2) + \text{h.c.}\} + \lambda_8 h_{SS}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Another possibility would be to consider the pseudosinglet-doublet representation [78], $(h_A)_{\mathbf{1}'} \oplus (h_1 \ h_2)^T_{\mathbf{2}}$. This representation would yield an equivalent scalar potential up to the λ_4 coupling:

$$\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{2} : \{ \lambda_4 [h_{S1} (h_{12} + h_{21}) + h_{S2} (h_{11} - h_{22})] + \text{h.c.} \}, \quad (\text{B.2a})$$

$$\mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2} : \{ \lambda'_4 [h_{A2} (h_{12} + h_{21}) - h_{A1} (h_{11} - h_{22})] + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{B.2b})$$

The scalar potentials are connected by a substitution of $h_S \leftrightarrow h_A$ along with an interchange of $h_1 \leftrightarrow h_2$. Consequently, the two representations are equivalent (at least in the scalar sector). As a result, the “ \pm ” signs of eq. (4.17) correspond to: “-” for $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{2}$, while “+” is for the $\mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}$ representation of S_3 .

The scalar potential discussed in Section 4.2 would then be a combination of both $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}$ up to the λ_4 term:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \mu_{11}^2 (h_{11} + h_{22}) + \mu_{33}^2 h_{33}, \\ & + \lambda_1 (h_{11} + h_{22})^2 + \lambda_2 (h_{12} - h_{21})^2 + \lambda_3 [(h_{11} - h_{22})^2 + (h_{12} + h_{21})^2] \\ & + \{ \lambda_4 [h_{31} (h_{12} + h_{21}) + h_{32} (h_{11} - h_{22})] + \text{h.c.} \} \\ & + \{ \lambda'_4 [h_{32} (h_{12} + h_{21}) - h_{31} (h_{11} - h_{22})] + \text{h.c.} \} \\ & + \lambda_5 (h_{11} + h_{22}) h_{33} + \lambda_6 (h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32}) + \{ \lambda_7 (h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.} \} + \lambda_8 h_{33}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where h_3 plays the role of both h_S and h_A . In this form, the scalar potential is identical to the CPc ($S_3 \times \text{GCP}_{\theta=\pi}$) of Ref. [13].

It should be noted that the above scalar potential has a redundant quartic term, which can be rotated away.

C List of generators

For the symmetry transformations given by eq. (6.13) we define the following (not unique) generators, which are grouped according to the patterns of eigenvalues:

- **$\mathbf{1}_4 \mathbf{1}_2 \mathbf{2}_1$:**
 $\circ V_{O(2) \times U(1)}$

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

we get $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ with $i\mu_{12}^2$. While for generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

we get $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

These can be presented in another representation. For generator

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta_1} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

we get $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$. And for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta_1} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

we end up with $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]} \times U(1)}$ and $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

• **1₄4₁:**

$\circ V_{U(1) \circ V_4}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

we get $V_{U(1) \circ V_4}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$. While for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

we get $V_{U(1) \circ V_4}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. In both cases we have $\lambda_{1212} \in \mathbb{R}$.

• **3₂2₁:**

$\circ V_{O(2)}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

we get $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $i\mu_{12}^2$, while for generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

we get $V_{O(2)_{[SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

These can be presented as generators in another representation, given by

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

yielding $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$. Also, generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\theta} & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

result in $V_{O(2)_{[U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]}}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

$\circ V_{S_3}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} e^{2i\pi/3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\pi/3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

we get V_{S_3} with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$, while for generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-2i\pi/3} & 0 \\ e^{2i\pi/3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

we get V_{S_3} with $\mu_{22}^2 = \mu_{11}^2$.

• **$2_2 4_1$** :

$\circ V_{U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.13})$$

we get $V_{U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. While for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

we get $V_{U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with μ_{12}^2 .

$\circ V_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$:

For

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.15})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. While for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.16})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$ with μ_{12}^2 .

$\circ V_{D_4}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.17})$$

we get V_{D_4} with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$. While for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.18})$$

we end up with V_{D_4} with $\mu_{22}^2 = -\mu_{11}^2$.

- **8₁:**

$\circ V_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$:

For

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.19})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with μ_{12}^2 , while for

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.20})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

$\circ V_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$:

For generators

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.21})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ with $\{\mu_{12}^2, \mu_{13}^2\}$. For

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{C.22})$$

we get $V_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ with $\mu_{ij}^2 = 0$.

D Different T-GOOFy-symmetric potentials

Here, we collect different quartic potentials, which can be expressed as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{GOOFy}} * \mathcal{G}_{\text{HF/GCP}}$. The form of the underlying symmetry groups can be deceiving since several different transformations can lead to identical quartic potentials.

D.1 HF-like invariant potentials

Categorised in terms of the eigenvalues patterns, different identified scalar potentials are:

- **1₈**

- For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [SU(3)]$ we get $V = 0$.

- **1₇1₁**

- For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(2)]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} h_{11}^2. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

- **1₆1₂**

This pattern of eigenvalues is unique in terms of the classification presented in Table 2.

- For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [[U(1) \times U(1)] \rtimes S_3]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} (h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2). \quad (\text{D.2})$$

- **1₆2₁**

This pattern of eigenvalues is unique in terms of the classification presented in Table 2.

- For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [O(2) \times U(1)]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ (as $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222} (h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

- For $[\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1] * [U(1) \times U(1)]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222} h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333} h_{33}^2. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

- For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [O(2) \times U(1)]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ (as $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} (h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2 - h_{33}^2). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

- **1₅1₃, |1₈|**

- For $\mathcal{G}_1 * SO(3)$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111} (h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2 + h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2 + h_{13}^2 + h_{31}^2 + h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

- **1₄1₃1₁**

- **|1₇1₁|**

- For $\mathcal{G}_6 * SU(2)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111} (h_{11} + h_{22} - h_{33})^2 \\ & + \lambda_{1122} (-h_{12} h_{21} + h_{13} h_{31} + h_{23} h_{32} + h_{11} h_{22} - h_{11} h_{33} - h_{22} h_{33}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * SU(2)$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11} + h_{22})^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}(h_{12}h_{21} - h_{11}h_{22}). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * SU(2)$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1122}(h_{11}h_{22} - h_{12}h_{21}) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2. \quad (\text{D.9})$$

• $\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_2\mathbf{2}_1$

– $|\mathbf{1}_6\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_6 * [O(2) \times U(1)]$ (as $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{1122}(-h_{11}h_{22} + h_{11}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{33}) \\ + \lambda_{1221}(-h_{12}h_{21} + h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}). \quad (\text{D.10})$$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [O(2) \times U(1)]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}(h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2 + h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2). \quad (\text{D.11})$$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_2\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \times U(1)]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22}. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [O(2) \times U(1)]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22}. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [U(1) \times U(1)]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22}. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [O(2) \times U(1)]$ (as $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

• $\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{4}_1$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_2\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \circ V_4]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{3333}(h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{2323}(h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2). \quad (\text{D.16})$$

◦ For $[\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1] * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.17})$$

◦ For $[\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_4] * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2). \quad (\text{D.18})$$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{4}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1)]_{h_3}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \left\{ \lambda_{1112}h_{11}h_{12} + \lambda_{1222}h_{12}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \quad (\text{D.19})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \quad (\text{D.20})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \circ V_4]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2). \quad (\text{D.21})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2). \quad (\text{D.22})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [U(1) \circ V_4]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2). \quad (\text{D.23})$$

• $\mathbf{2}_3\mathbf{1}_2, |\mathbf{1}_6\mathbf{1}_2|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * A_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \quad (\text{D.24})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * S_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}). \quad (\text{D.25})$$

• $\mathbf{3}_2\mathbf{2}_1$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{3}_1\mathbf{1}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_6 * SO(2)$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11} + h_{22} - h_{33})^2 \\ + \lambda_{1122}(-h_{11}h_{22} + h_{11}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{33} - h_{12}h_{21} + h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 - 2h_{11}h_{22} + 2h_{11}h_{33} + 2h_{22}h_{33}). \quad (\text{D.26})$$

– $|\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{1}_2\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * U(1)_1$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.27})$$

An equivalent approach would be to consider $\mathcal{G}_1 \times SO(2)$ (and not $O(2)$),

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \Lambda(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + i\lambda_{1112}(h_{11} + h_{22})(h_{12} - h_{21}) + \{\lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.28})$$

By utilising the basis transformation of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$ we arrive at the identical scalar potential.

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.29})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [SO(2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}(h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2 + h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2) + \{\lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.30})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_3 * SO(2)$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \Lambda(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + i\lambda_{1233}(h_{12} - h_{21})h_{33} + i\lambda_{1332}(h_{23}h_{31} - h_{13}h_{32}) + \{\lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.31})$$

By utilising the basis transformation of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$ we arrive at

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.32})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_3 * [SO(2) \times U(1)]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \Lambda(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + i\lambda_{1233}(h_{12} - h_{21})h_{33} + i\lambda_{1332}(h_{23}h_{31} - h_{13}h_{32}). \quad (\text{D.33})$$

By utilising the basis transformation of $\mathcal{R}_{(\frac{\pi}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, 0)}$ we arrive at

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}). \quad (\text{D.34})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * U(1)_1$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.35})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * O(2)$ (as $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.36})$$

• **2₂4₁**

– |**1₄1₂2₁**|

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [D_4]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}(h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{2323}(h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2) + \{\lambda_{1313}(h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.37})$$

– |**1₄4₁**|

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * \mathbb{Z}_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.38})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * D_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.39})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_3 * U(1)_{h_3}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \{\lambda_{1332}h_{13}h_{32} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.40})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_3 * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2). \quad (\text{D.41})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * U(1)_{h_3}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33}. \quad (\text{D.42})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * \mathbb{Z}_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.43})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ (as S_2) we get

$$V = \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33}. \quad (\text{D.44})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_4 * D_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ + \{\lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.45})$$

– $|\mathbf{2}_3\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For \mathcal{G}_6 we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{1122}(-h_{11}h_{22} + h_{11}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{33}) \\ + \lambda_{1221}(-h_{12}h_{21} + h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ + \{\lambda_{1212}(-h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.46})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_6 * D_4$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 + h_{33}^2) + \lambda_{1122}(-h_{11}h_{22} + h_{11}h_{33} + h_{22}h_{33}) \\ + \lambda_{1221}(-h_{12}h_{21} + h_{13}h_{31} + h_{23}h_{32}) \\ + \lambda_{1212}(-h_{12}^2 + h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}). \quad (\text{D.47})$$

– $|\mathbf{3}_2\mathbf{2}_1|$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2]_{(h_2-h_3)}$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \{\lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.48})$$

• $\mathbf{8}_1, |\mathbf{2}_2\mathbf{4}_1|$

◦ For \mathcal{G}_1 we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \left\{ \lambda_{1112}h_{11}h_{12} + \lambda_{1222}h_{12}h_{22} + \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} \right. \\ \left. + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \quad (\text{D.49})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 * [\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.50})$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 \\ + \{\lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}\}. \quad (\text{D.51})$$

- For \mathcal{G}_3 we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \{ \lambda_{1332}h_{13}h_{32} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}h_{13}^2 + \lambda_{2323}h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.52})$$

- For $\mathcal{G}_3 * [\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ (applied as $(S_2)_{(h_1, h_2)}$ and $(\mathbb{Z}_2)_{h_3}$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ + \{ \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.53})$$

- For \mathcal{G}_4 we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 - h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ + \{ \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.54})$$

- For $\mathcal{G}_4 * [\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ (applied as $(S_2)_{(h_1, h_2)}$ and $(\mathbb{Z}_2)_{h_3}$) we get

$$V = \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} \\ + \{ \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.55})$$

- For \mathcal{G}_5 we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \{ \lambda_{1323}h_{13}h_{23} + \lambda_{1332}h_{13}h_{32} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.56})$$

D.2 GCP-like invariant potentials

Categorised in terms of the eigenvalues patterns, different identified scalar potentials are:

- **1₄4₁**

- For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * [(U(1) \times D_4)/\mathbb{Z}_2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ + \{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \}. \quad (\text{D.57})$$

- **2₂4₁**

- **1₄1₂2₁**

- For \mathcal{G}_8^* we get

$$V = \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2 - h_{12}^2 - h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1122}(h_{11}h_{22} + h_{12}h_{21}) \\ + \lambda_{1112}(h_{22} - h_{11})(h_{12} + h_{21}) + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) \\ + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}). \quad (\text{D.58})$$

– $\mathbf{1}_4\mathbf{4}_1$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_1^* * U(1)_{h_3}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1112}h_{11}(h_{12} + h_{21}) + \lambda_{1222}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{22} + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) \\ & + i\lambda_{1233}(h_{12} - h_{21})h_{33} + i\lambda_{1332}(h_{23}h_{31} - h_{13}h_{32}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.59})$$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_1^* * \mathbb{Z}_4^*$ (CP4 as in eq. (4.19b)) we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \lambda_{1112}(h_{22} - h_{11})(h_{12} + h_{21}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.60})$$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * U(1)_{h_3}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) \\ & + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{2331}h_{23}h_{31} + \lambda_{1112}(h_{11} - h_{22})h_{21} + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.61})$$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * \mathbb{Z}_4^*$ (CP4 as in eq. (4.19a)) we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) \\ & + \left\{ \lambda_{1112}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{12} + \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2) + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.62})$$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * \mathbb{Z}_4$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) \\ & + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.63})$$

○ For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * [V_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^*]$ (as in eq. (4.23)) we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) + \lambda_{1112}(h_{22} - h_{11})(h_{12} + h_{21}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.64})$$

• $\mathbf{8}_1, |\mathbf{2}_2\mathbf{4}_1|$

○ For \mathcal{G}_1^* we get

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \lambda_{1111}h_{11}^2 + \lambda_{2222}h_{22}^2 + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\ & + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{31}^2) + \lambda_{2323}(h_{23}^2 + h_{32}^2) \\ & + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) + \lambda_{1112}h_{11}(h_{12} + h_{21}) + \lambda_{1222}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{22} \\ & + i\lambda_{1233}(h_{12} - h_{21})h_{33} + i\lambda_{1332}(h_{23}h_{31} - h_{13}h_{32}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.65})$$

◦ For \mathcal{G}_7^* we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) + \lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} + h_{31}h_{32}) \\
& + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{2331}h_{23}h_{31} + \lambda_{1112}(h_{11} - h_{22})h_{21} \right. \\
& \left. + \lambda_{1233}h_{12}h_{33} + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{32}^2) + \text{h.c.} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.66}$$

◦ For $\mathcal{G}_7^* * [\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \lambda_{1133}(h_{22} - h_{11})h_{33} + \lambda_{1331}(h_{13}h_{31} - h_{23}h_{32}) \\
& + \left\{ \lambda_{1212}h_{12}^2 + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 - h_{32}^2) + \text{h.c.} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.67}$$

In another basis, utilising $\mathcal{R}_{(\alpha,0,\theta,0)}$ transformation, it can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \lambda_{1111}(h_{11}^2 + h_{22}^2) + \lambda_{3333}h_{33}^2 + \lambda_{1221}h_{12}h_{21} + \lambda_{1122}h_{11}h_{22} \\
& + \lambda_{1212}(h_{12}^2 + h_{21}^2) + \lambda_{1313}(h_{13}^2 + h_{23}^2 + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + \lambda_{1233}(h_{12} + h_{21})h_{33} + \lambda_{1332}(h_{13}h_{32} + h_{23}h_{31}) \\
& + i\lambda_{1323}(h_{13}h_{23} - h_{31}h_{32}).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.68}$$

References

- [1] P. M. Ferreira and J. P. Silva, *Discrete and continuous symmetries in multi-Higgs-doublet models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 116007, [0809.2788].
- [2] I. P. Ivanov, V. Keus and E. Vdovin, *Abelian symmetries in multi-Higgs-doublet models*, *J. Phys. A* **45** (2012) 215201, [1112.1660].
- [3] I. P. Ivanov and E. Vdovin, *Discrete symmetries in the three-Higgs-doublet model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 095030, [1206.7108].
- [4] I. P. Ivanov and E. Vdovin, *Classification of finite reparametrization symmetry groups in the three-Higgs-doublet model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2309, [1210.6553].
- [5] V. Keus, S. F. King and S. Moretti, *Three-Higgs-doublet models: symmetries, potentials and Higgs boson masses*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 052, [1310.8253].
- [6] I. P. Ivanov and C. C. Nishi, *Symmetry breaking patterns in 3HDM*, *JHEP* **01** (2015) 021, [1410.6139].
- [7] I. P. Ivanov and J. P. Silva, *CP-conserving multi-Higgs model with irremovable complex coefficients*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 095014, [1512.09276].
- [8] A. Pilaftsis, *Symmetries for standard model alignment in multi-Higgs doublet models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 075012, [1602.02017].

- [9] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and I. P. Ivanov, *Recognizing symmetries in a 3HDM in a basis-independent way*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 015008, [1903.11110].
- [10] A. Kunčinas, *Properties of S_3 -symmetric three-higgs-doublet models*, Master's thesis. <http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/20467>.
- [11] N. Darvishi and A. Pilaftsis, *Classifying Accidental Symmetries in Multi-Higgs Doublet Models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 095008, [1912.00887].
- [12] A. Kunčinas, O. Ogreid, P. Osland and M. Rebelo, *S_3 -inspired three-Higgs-doublet models: A class with a complex vacuum*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 075052, [2001.01994].
- [13] I. Brée, D. D. Correia and J. P. Silva, *Generalized CP symmetries in three-Higgs-doublet models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 035028, [2407.09615].
- [14] A. Kunčinas, P. Osland and M. N. Rebelo, *$U(1)$ -charged Dark Matter in three-Higgs-doublet models*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 086, [2408.02728].
- [15] C. Döring and A. Trautner, *Symmetries from outer automorphisms and unorthodox group extensions*, **2410.11052**.
- [16] P. M. Ferreira, B. Grzadkowski, O. M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *New symmetries of the two-Higgs-doublet model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 234, [2306.02410].
- [17] M. Carena, I. Low, C. E. M. Wagner and M.-L. Xiao, *Entanglement suppression, enhanced symmetry, and a standard-model-like Higgs boson*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) L051901, [2307.08112].
- [18] M. Carena, G. Coloretti, W. Liu, M. Littmann, I. Low and C. E. M. Wagner, *Entanglement maximization and mirror symmetry in two-Higgs-doublet models*, *JHEP* **08** (2025) 016, [2505.00873].
- [19] G. Busoni, J. Gargalionis, E. N. V. Wallace and M. J. White, *Emergent symmetry in a two-Higgs-doublet model from quantum information and nonstabilizerness*, *Phys. Rev. D* **112** (2025) 035022, [2506.01314].
- [20] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, *Space Inversion, Time Reversal, and Other Discrete Symmetries in Local Field Theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **148** (1966) 1385–1404.
- [21] G. Ecker, W. Grimus and W. Konetschny, *Quark Mass Matrices in Left-right Symmetric Gauge Theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **191** (1981) 465–492.
- [22] G. Ecker, W. Grimus and H. Neufeld, *A Standard Form for Generalized CP Transformations*, *J. Phys. A* **20** (1987) L807.
- [23] H. Neufeld, W. Grimus and G. Ecker, *Generalized CP Invariance, Neutral Flavor Conservation and the Structure of the Mixing Matrix*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **3** (1988) 603–616.
- [24] I. P. Ivanov, *Two-Higgs-doublet model from the group-theoretic perspective*, *Phys. Lett. B* **632** (2006) 360–365, [hep-ph/0507132].

- [25] I. P. Ivanov, *Minkowski space structure of the Higgs potential in 2HDM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 035001, [[hep-ph/0609018](#)].
- [26] J. M. Gerard and M. Herquet, *A Twisted custodial symmetry in the two-Higgs-doublet model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 251802, [[hep-ph/0703051](#)].
- [27] I. P. Ivanov, *Minkowski space structure of the Higgs potential in 2HDM. II. Minima, symmetries, and topology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 015017, [[0710.3490](#)].
- [28] P. M. Ferreira, H. E. Haber and J. P. Silva, *Generalized CP symmetries and special regions of parameter space in the two-Higgs-doublet model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 116004, [[0902.1537](#)].
- [29] P. M. Ferreira, H. E. Haber, M. Maniatis, O. Nachtmann and J. P. Silva, *Geometric picture of generalized-CP and Higgs-family transformations in the two-Higgs-doublet model*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **26** (2011) 769–808, [[1010.0935](#)].
- [30] R. A. Battye, G. D. Brawn and A. Pilaftsis, *Vacuum Topology of the Two Higgs Doublet Model*, *JHEP* **08** (2011) 020, [[1106.3482](#)].
- [31] A. Pilaftsis, *On the Classification of Accidental Symmetries of the Two Higgs Doublet Model Potential*, *Phys. Lett. B* **706** (2012) 465–469, [[1109.3787](#)].
- [32] H. E. Haber, O. M. Ogreid, P. Osland and M. N. Rebelo, *Symmetries and Mass Degeneracies in the Scalar Sector*, *JHEP* **01** (2019) 042, [[1808.08629](#)].
- [33] M. P. Bento, R. Boto, J. P. Silva and A. Trautner, *A fully basis invariant Symmetry Map of the 2HDM*, *JHEP* **21** (2020) 229, [[2009.01264](#)].
- [34] P. M. Ferreira, B. Grzadkowski, O. M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *Symmetries of the 2HDM: an invariant formulation and consequences*, *JHEP* **02** (2021) 196, [[2010.13698](#)].
- [35] P. M. Ferreira, B. Grzadkowski, O. M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *Softly broken symmetries in the 2HDM – an invariant formulation*, *JHEP* **01** (2023) 143, [[2209.00152](#)].
- [36] M. A. Solberg, *Lie symmetry analysis of the two-Higgs-doublet model field equations*, [2510.09542](#).
- [37] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 1440–1443.
- [38] A. Kuncinas, *Dark Matter and CP Violation in Some Symmetry-Constrained 3HDMs*, PhD thesis, Lisbon U., 6, 2025, [2506.08197](#).
- [39] P. M. Ferreira and T. F. Pinto, *One-loop pseudoscalar mass in a 2HDM with a Z_3 symmetry*, *JHEP* **07** (2025) 264, [[2504.11602](#)].
- [40] G. A. Miller, L. E. Dickson and H. F. Blichfeldt, *Theory and applications of finite groups*. John Wiley & Sons, 2 ed., 1916.

- [41] W. M. Fairbairn, T. Fulton and W. H. Klink, *Finite and Disconnected Subgroups of $SU(3)$ and their Application to the Elementary-Particle Spectrum*, *J. Math. Phys.* **5** (1964) 1038.
- [42] A. Bovier, M. Luling and D. Wyler, *Representations and Clebsch-gordan Coefficients of Z Metacyclic Groups*, *J. Math. Phys.* **22** (1981) 1536.
- [43] A. Bovier, M. Luling and D. Wyler, *Finite Subgroups of $SU(3)$* , *J. Math. Phys.* **22** (1981) 1543.
- [44] W. M. Fairbairn and T. Fulton, *Some comments on finite subgroups of $SU(3)$* , *J. Math. Phys.* **23** (1982) 1747–1748.
- [45] C. Luhn, S. Nasri and P. Ramond, *The Flavor group $\Delta(3n^2)$* , *J. Math. Phys.* **48** (2007) 073501, [[hep-th/0701188](#)].
- [46] J. A. Escobar and C. Luhn, *The Flavor Group $\Delta(6n^2)$* , *J. Math. Phys.* **50** (2009) 013524, [[0809.0639](#)].
- [47] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, *Non-Abelian Discrete Symmetries in Particle Physics*, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **183** (2010) 1–163, [[1003.3552](#)].
- [48] W. Grimus and P. O. Ludl, *Principal series of finite subgroups of $SU(3)$* , *J. Phys. A* **43** (2010) 445209, [[1006.0098](#)].
- [49] P. O. Ludl, *On the finite subgroups of $U(3)$ of order smaller than 512*, *J. Phys. A* **43** (2010) 395204, [[1006.1479](#)].
- [50] P. O. Ludl, *Comments on the classification of the finite subgroups of $SU(3)$* , *J. Phys. A* **44** (2011) 255204, [[1101.2308](#)].
- [51] M. Holthausen, K. S. Lim and M. Lindner, *Lepton Mixing Patterns from a Scan of Finite Discrete Groups*, *Phys. Lett. B* **721** (2013) 61–67, [[1212.2411](#)].
- [52] D. Jurciukonis and L. Lavoura, *GAP listing of the finite subgroups of $U(3)$ of order smaller than 2000*, *PTEP* **2017** (2017) 053A03, [[1702.00005](#)].
- [53] H. U. Besche, B. Eick, E. O’Brien and M. Horn, “SmallGrp, the gap small groups library, Version 1.5.4.” <https://gap-packages.github.io/smallgrp/>, Jul, 2024.
- [54] *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.13.1*, <https://www.gap-system.org>, 2024.
- [55] J. Velhinho, R. Santos and A. Barroso, *Tree level vacuum stability in two Higgs doublet models*, *Phys. Lett. B* **322** (1994) 213–218.
- [56] F. Nagel, *New aspects of gauge-boson couplings and the Higgs sector*. PhD thesis, University of Heidelberg, 2004. [[10.11588/heidok.00004803](#)].
- [57] M. Maniatis, A. von Manteuffel, O. Nachtmann and F. Nagel, *Stability and symmetry breaking in the general two-Higgs-doublet model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **48** (2006) 805–823, [[hep-ph/0605184](#)].

- [58] M. Maniatis, A. von Manteuffel and O. Nachtmann, *Determining the global minimum of Higgs potentials via Groebner bases: Applied to the NMSSM*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **49** (2007) 1067–1076, [[hep-ph/0608314](#)].
- [59] M. Maniatis, A. von Manteuffel and O. Nachtmann, *CP violation in the general two-Higgs-doublet model: A Geometric view*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **57** (2008) 719–738, [[0707.3344](#)].
- [60] C. C. Nishi, *Physical parameters and basis transformations in the Two-Higgs-Doublet model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 055009, [[0712.4260](#)].
- [61] E. Derman, *Flavor Unification, τ Decay and b Decay Within the Six Quark Six Lepton Weinberg-Salam Model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **19** (1979) 317–329.
- [62] E. Derman and H.-S. Tsao, *$SU(2) \times U(1) \times S(n)$ Flavor Dynamics and a Bound on the Number of Flavors*, *Phys. Rev. D* **20** (1979) 1207.
- [63] A. Kunčinas, O. M. Ogreid, P. Osland and M. N. Rebelo, *Complex S_3 -symmetric 3HDM*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 013, [[2302.07210](#)].
- [64] I. P. Ivanov, C. C. Nishi, J. P. Silva and A. Trautner, *Basis-invariant conditions for CP symmetry of order four*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 015039, [[1810.13396](#)].
- [65] P. M. Ferreira, I. P. Ivanov, E. Jiménez, R. Pasechnik and H. Serôdio, *CP₄ miracle: shaping Yukawa sector with CP symmetry of order four*, *JHEP* **01** (2018) 065, [[1711.02042](#)].
- [66] A. Trautner, *Goofy is the new Normal*, *JHEP* **10** (2025) 051, [[2505.00099](#)].
- [67] H. E. Haber and P. M. Ferreira, *RG-stable parameter relations of a scalar field theory in absence of a symmetry*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **85** (2025) 541, [[2502.11011](#)].
- [68] P. M. Ferreira, B. Grzadkowski and O. M. Ogreid, *Imaginary scaling*, [2506.21145](#).
- [69] T. de Boer, F. Goertz and A. Incrocci, *The goofy-symmetric Standard Model and the Hierarchy Problem*, [2507.22111](#).
- [70] A. Trautner, *Goofy transformations and the hierarchy problem*, [2508.02646](#).
- [71] K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of Groups*, vol. 87 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer New York, NY, 1982, 10.1007/978-1-4684-9327-6.
- [72] G. Karpilovsky, *Group Representations, Volume 2*, vol. 177 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. North-Holland (Elsevier), Amsterdam, 1993.
- [73] C. A. Weibel, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, vol. 87 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1994, 10.1017/CBO9781139644136.
- [74] S. Pakvasa and H. Sugawara, *Discrete Symmetry and Cabibbo Angle*, *Phys. Lett. B* **73** (1978) 61–64.

- [75] J. Kubo, H. Okada and F. Sakamaki, *Higgs potential in minimal $S(3)$ invariant extension of the standard model*, *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 036007, [[hep-ph/0402089](#)].
- [76] T. Teshima, *Higgs potential in S_3 invariant model for quark/lepton mass and mixing*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 105013, [[1202.4528](#)].
- [77] D. Das and U. K. Dey, *Analysis of an extended scalar sector with S_3 symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 095025, [[1404.2491](#)].
- [78] D. Emmanuel-Costa, O. M. Ogreid, P. Osland and M. N. Rebelo, *Spontaneous symmetry breaking in the S_3 -symmetric scalar sector*, *JHEP* **02** (2016) 154, [[1601.04654](#)].