

Strong CP Problem and Symmetric Mass Solution

Juven Wang^{1,*}

¹*Center of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Harvard University, MA 02138, USA*

We propose a novel solution to the Strong CP problem — to explain why $SU(3)$ strong force has a nearly zero theta angle $\bar{\theta}_3 \simeq 0$ for the 4d Standard Model (SM). The new ingredient is Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG): symmetry-preserving mass or energy gap can be generated without breaking any symmetry G and without any quadratic *mean-field* mass deformation as long as G is all perturbative local and nonperturbative global anomaly-free. In our first model, we propose a disordered *non-mean-field* SMG gap (instead of the ordered Anderson-Higgs-induced mass gap) for the u quark (or generally a set of quarks and leptons totally anomaly-free in G) generated by multi-fermion interactions or by dynamical disordered mass fields, absorbing $\bar{\theta}_3$. Another variant of this first model is the SMG gapping a hypothetical hidden full fourth family of SM fermions. In our second model, we have a chiral SM and mirror SM together to respect the Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion-doubling and a parity-reflection \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry at high energy, so the $\bar{\theta}_3 = 0$. Then the SMG lifts only the mirror SM with a large energy gap but leaves the chiral SM at lower energy, which not only “spontaneously” breaks the parity-reflection symmetry maximally but also relates our solution to solve another nonperturbative chiral fermion regularization problem by removing the fermion doubling. The predictive signature of both SMG-based models is that some SM fermions or mirror fermions are highly interacting (beyond the conventional SM Higgs or SM gauge interactions) mediated through hypothetical direct multi-fermion or disordered mass-field interactions.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction, the Problem, and a New Solution	2
A. Strong CP Problem	2
1. $\mathfrak{su}(2)$'s θ_2 angle	2
2. $\mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$'s θ_1 angle	3
3. $\mathfrak{su}(3)$'s θ_3 angle	3
B. A New Solution based on Symmetry Mass Generation	4
II. Mass Mechanisms: Old and New	8
A. Properties of Mass	8
B. Mass Generating Mechanism	9
III. First Solution: Symmetric Mass Gap within the Chiral Fermion	10
A. Toy Model for QCD	10
B. Toy Model for the $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ Standard Model	12
C. Constraint and Prediction on the Hadron Data	17
IV. Second Solution: Symmetric Gapped Mirror Fermion	20
V. Conclusion and Comparison to Other Strong CP Solutions	27
VI. Acknowledgments	28
References	28

* jw@cmsa.fas.harvard.edu

I. INTRODUCTION, THE PROBLEM, AND A NEW SOLUTION

A. Strong CP Problem

The Standard Model (SM) is a chiral gauge theory of local Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ coupling to three families of 15 Weyl fermions of the representation

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R \\ & \sim (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_2 \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-3} \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})_1 \oplus (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_{-4} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_6 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

in a 4-dimensional spacetime (4d), with Yukawa-Higgs term to the electroweak Higgs field. However, their corresponding theta terms inserted into the SM path integral with a weight factor

$$\exp(i\theta_j n^{(j)}), \quad n^{(j)} \equiv \frac{1}{8\pi^2} g^2 \int \text{Tr}[F^{(j)} \wedge F^{(j)}] \quad (2)$$

(with the instanton number or topological charge $n^{(j)}$ [1–3] appropriately quantized and summed in the path integral for the 2-form field strength $F^{(j)} = dA^{(j)} - igA^{(j)} \wedge A^{(j)}$ of 1-form gauge connection $A^{(j)}$ of the Lie algebra sector $j = 1, 2, 3$ for $\mathfrak{u}(1)_Y \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(3)^1$) have different physical outcomes. The surprising experimental fact that Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix CP violating angle δ_{CP} is order 1, but the other CP violating theta angle is nearly zero $|\bar{\theta}_3| < 10^{-10}$ measured by the neutron electric dipole moment (EDM) [4, 5] for

$$\bar{\theta}_3 \equiv \theta_3 + \arg(\det(M_u M_d)) \quad (3)$$

(where M_u and M_d are two rank-3 matrices specifying the Yukawa-Higgs coupling, for u, c, t -type quarks and d, s, b -type quarks respectively, to be introduced later), is known as the Strong CP problem [4, 6–9].

Since there is no particular reason (not even an anthropic reason) for the SM to have $\bar{\theta}_3 \simeq 0$, the typical Strong CP solutions proposed in the past literature tend to modify or enlarge the SM to include some beyond the SM assumptions. For example,

- (1) some of the quarks (e.g., up quark) are massless [2],
- (2) extra continuous U(1) symmetry, then based on dynamical arguments on the “spontaneous” symmetry breaking which relaxes to $\bar{\theta}_3 \simeq 0$, e.g., Peccei-Quinn symmetry with axions [10–13] (although rigorously speaking, Peccei-Quinn symmetry is not a global symmetry once the Strong force $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ is dynamically gauged).
- (3) extra discrete P or CP symmetry imposed at high energy like Nelson-Barr [14, 15] or Parity Solution [16–19].

The purpose of this present work is to propose a new type of the Strong CP solution by involving the Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG, see a recent overview [20]) — fermions can become massive (also known as gapped) by a symmetric deformation from a massless (aka gapless) theory, without involving any symmetry breaking within an anomaly-free symmetry group. In the context of the global symmetry G being anomaly-free, this condition is well-known as the ’t Hooft anomaly free in G [21]. In this work, we provide a new Strong CP solution to the 3+1d SM based on the SMG mechanism in the SM chiral fermion sector alone, or in its mirror fermion sector.² Before we re-examine the mass origin to ask “what is mass,” we shall overview the roles of each θ_j for $j = 1, 2, 3$ to set up the problem.

1. $\mathfrak{su}(2)$'s θ_2 angle

Let us recall why the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$'s θ_2 can be rotated away to 0. The $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ only couples to the left-handed doublet ψ_L , including three colors r, g, b of quarks q_L and leptons l_L . The pertinent Adler-Bell-Jackiw (ABJ) perturbative local anomaly [23, 24] is captured by the triangle Feynman graph with vertices $\mathfrak{u}(1)_L$ - $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ ². Thus, under the $\mathfrak{u}(1)_L$ chiral symmetry transformation

$$\psi_L \mapsto e^{i\alpha_L} \psi_L,$$

the θ_2 is rotated to

$$\theta_2 \mapsto \theta_2 - \sum_{f=1,2,3} (\alpha_{q_L r f} + \alpha_{q_L g f} + \alpha_{q_L b f} + \alpha_{l_L f}). \quad (4)$$

¹ Carefully we use the mathfrak font $\mathfrak{u}(1)_Y, \mathfrak{su}(2), \mathfrak{su}(3)$ for the local structure Lie algebra. We use the U(1), SU(2), SU(3) for the global structure Lie group.

² In a companion work, we had provided an SMG solution to the analogous CT or P problem for a 1+1d toy model [22].

Here α_{qLrf} , α_{qLgf} , and α_{qLbf} are the left-handed quark q chiral rotation phase from $\psi_L \mapsto e^{i\alpha_L}\psi_L$, for the three kinds of colors (red r , green g , blue b from the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ fundamental), with $f = 1, 2, 3$ the index for the three families of SM fermions. We can do the baryon $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ rotation alone (with $\alpha_{qLrf} = \alpha_{qLgf} = \alpha_{qLbf} = \frac{1}{3}\alpha_{\mathbf{B}}$, and the same angle for each right-handed quark α_{qR} , thus also $\alpha_{qRrf} = \alpha_{qRgf} = \alpha_{qRbf} = \frac{1}{3}\alpha_{\mathbf{B}}$), such that the $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ does not generate complex phase to the mass matrix

$$m_q \mapsto m_q e^{i(\alpha_{qL} - \alpha_{qR})},$$

because it is invariant under the vector symmetry rotation due to $\alpha_{qL} = \alpha_{qR}$. The $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ also does not generate any extra complex phase to the CKM matrix, because $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ rotates all the left-handed quarks with the same angle (thus α_{qL} of u and d types cancel out in the CKM matrix). But the $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ can rotate θ_2 to 0. Notice above we leave out the lepton l 's lepton number $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{L}}$ rotation (set $\alpha_{lLf} = 0$, also $\alpha_{lRf} = 0$), so the argument $\theta_2 = 0$ is independent of whether we add the right-handed neutrino or not to the SM. Namely, $\theta_2 = 0$ holds regardless of whether we have 15 or 16 Weyl fermions in any family of the SM.

2. $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y$'s θ_1 angle

The $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y$'s θ_1 or $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{EM}}$'s $\theta_{\mathbf{EM}}$: No finite energy and action configurations carry the instanton number $n^{(1)}$ in the flat space \mathbb{R}^4 or $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$; thus typically people do not worry θ_1 within the SM vacuum (unless we encounter some domain wall or boundary effect that θ_1 jumps, then there could be Witten effect on the other side of vacuum).

More precisely, under the $\mathbf{u}(1)_L$ or $\mathbf{u}(1)_R$ symmetry transformation for all quarks/leptons of three families, due to the ABJ perturbative local anomaly captured by the triangle Feynman graph with vertices $\mathbf{u}(1)_L$ - $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y^2$ and $\mathbf{u}(1)_R$ - $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y^2$, the θ_1 is rotated to

$$\theta_1 \mapsto \theta_1 - \sum_{f=1,2,3} (3 \cdot (2\alpha_{qLf} - 16\alpha_{uRf} - 4\alpha_{dRf}) + 18\alpha_{lLf} - 36\alpha_{eRf}). \quad (5)$$

The $f = 1, 2, 3$ is the index for the three families of SM fermions. Following the notation (1), here the chiral rotation phase α_{qLf} is for the left-handed doublet quark q_L , while the α_{uRf} is for the right-handed singlet u -type quark u_R , the α_{dRf} is for the right-handed singlet d -type quark d_R ; the α_{lLf} is for the left-handed doublet lepton l_L , and the α_{eRf} is for the right-handed singlet electron e_R . The continuous baryon minus lepton ($\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$) vector symmetry (namely, when $3\alpha_q = \alpha_{\mathbf{B}} = -\alpha_{\mathbf{L}}$) is anomaly-free under the chiral $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y$ and the chiral $\mathfrak{su}(2)$: $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$ - $\mathbf{u}(1)_Y^2$ and $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$ - $\mathfrak{su}(2)^2$, also under the vector $\mathfrak{su}(3)$: $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$ - $\mathfrak{su}(3)^2$ (namely, the vector $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ has no mix anomaly with any vector symmetry). This also means that the anomaly-free $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$ cannot rotate any θ_j for $j = 1, 2, 3$. But either $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{B}}$ or $\mathbf{u}(1)_{\mathbf{L}}$ symmetry alone is anomalous thus can rotate the θ_1 and θ_2 , except a certain linear combination $\theta_1 + 18\theta_2$ cannot be rotated at all [25]. This $\theta_1 + 18\theta_2$ is indeed proportional to the $\theta_{\mathbf{EM}}$ for the electromagnetic $\mathbf{U}(1)_{\mathbf{EM}}$ — this is related to the fact that the \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{L} currents are both conserved under dynamical $\mathbf{U}(1)_{\mathbf{EM}}$. (This is also related to the fact that $\mathbb{Z}_{36N_g, \mathbf{B}+\mathbf{L}}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_g, \mathbf{B}+\mathbf{L}}$ [more precisely $\mathbb{Z}_{36N_c N_g, \mathbf{Q}+N_c \mathbf{L}}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_c N_g, \mathbf{Q}+N_c \mathbf{L}}$ in a properly integer quantized quark number \mathbf{Q} with the color number $N_c = 3$] is still respectively preserved under the dynamical $\mathbf{U}(1)$ or $\mathbf{SU}(2)$ gauge fields for the N_g families (or generations) of fermions [26, 27].) But people do not concern $\mathbf{U}(1)_{\mathbf{EM}}$, since it has no finite energy instanton configuration in the flat space \mathbb{R}^4 or $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ stated earlier.

3. $\mathfrak{su}(3)$'s θ_3 angle

The $\mathfrak{su}(3)$'s θ_3 : Under the $\mathbf{u}(1)_L$ or $\mathbf{u}(1)_R$ symmetry transformation for the u or d type of quarks of three families, due to the ABJ perturbative local anomaly captured by the triangle Feynman graph with vertices $\mathbf{u}(1)_L$ - $\mathfrak{su}(3)^2$ and $\mathbf{u}(1)_R$ - $\mathfrak{su}(3)^2$, the θ_3 is rotated to

$$\theta_3 \mapsto \theta_3 - \sum_{f=1,2,3} (\alpha_{uLf} + \alpha_{dLf} - \alpha_{uRf} - \alpha_{dRf}). \quad (6)$$

Again $f = 1, 2, 3$ is the index for the three families of SM fermions. Here the chiral rotation phase α_{uLf} is for the left-handed u -type quark u_L , while the α_{uRf} is for the right-handed u -type quark u_R ; the α_{dLf} is for the left-handed d -type quark d_L , while the α_{dRf} is for the right-handed d -type quark d_R . Recall that in the quark sector, the rank-3 CKM matrix $V_{\text{IJ}}^{\text{CKM}} = (U_u^{L\dagger} U_d^L)_{\text{IJ}}$ occurs in the term $W_\mu^+ J_W^{\mu+} + W_\mu^- J_W^{\mu-}$, such that the $W^+ = W^{*-}$ gauge bosons generate the weak-flavor-changing EM-charged current $J_W^{\mu+} \equiv \psi_{uL}^{\dagger} \bar{\sigma}^\mu (U_u^{L\dagger} U_d^L)_{\text{IJ}} \psi_{dR}^{\text{J}} = J_W^{\mu-*}$ (here the family index I runs through three u type quarks u, c, t while J runs through three d type quarks d, s, b). The CKM matrix appearance

is due to the diagonalization to the mass eigenstates of quarks in the Yukawa-Higgs term for the Standard Model Higgs field ϕ_H , with a hermitian conjugate term (H.c.),

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\lambda_{d,IJ}\psi_{qL}^{I\dagger}\phi_H\psi_{dR}^J + \lambda_{u,IJ}\epsilon^{ab}\psi_{qLa}^{I\dagger}\phi_{Hb}^*\psi_{uR}^J) + \text{H.c.} \\ \mapsto & -(\lambda_{d,IJ}^D\psi_{qL}^{I\dagger}\phi_H\psi_{dR}^I + \lambda_{u,IJ}^D\epsilon^{ab}\psi_{qLa}^{I\dagger}\phi_{Hb}^*\psi_{uR}^I) + \text{H.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

So the generic non-symmetric non-hermitian matrices $\lambda_d = U_d^L \lambda_d^D U_d^{R\dagger}$ and $\lambda_u = U_u^L \lambda_u^D U_u^{R\dagger}$ can be diagonalized to λ_d^D and λ_u^D with positive eigenvalues. The rank-3 V^{CKM} contains 3 rotational angles of $\text{SO}(3)$, and another 6 complex phases. The 6 left-handed quark chiral rotation (α_{uLf} and α_{dLf} for $f = 1, 2, 3$) can remove 5 complex phases, but leave 1 complex phase δ_{CP} remaining.

In this basis where the Yukawa-Higgs mass term is diagonalized, only the physical $\bar{\theta}_3$ defined in (3) is invariant under any quark chiral rotation.

The previous M_u and M_d matrices in (3) are indeed $M_u = \lambda_u^D \epsilon \phi_H^*$ and $M_d = \lambda_d^D \phi_H$, or precisely in a mean-field manner when $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$ gets a vacuum expectation value (vev),³

$$\langle M_{u,IJ} \rangle = \lambda_{u,IJ}^D \epsilon \langle \phi_H^* \rangle, \quad \langle M_{d,IJ} \rangle = \lambda_{d,IJ}^D \langle \phi_H \rangle.$$

- The charge-conjugation-parity CP transformation (similarly also under the time-reversal T) sends the instanton number $n^{(j)} \mapsto -n^{(j)}$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$. Thus given the periodicity $\theta_j = \theta_j + 2\pi N_j$ (where $N_j = 1$ typically, but N_j can be other integers, for SM with different $p = 1, 2, 3, 6$, or in the presence of fractional instantons [28]) implies that only the SM vacuum at $\theta_j = 0$ or $\theta_j = \pi N_j$ is kinematically CP and T invariant.

The aforementioned fact says that the θ_1 and θ_2 play no important roles, so there are only two CP violating sources in the SM quark sector: the δ_{CP} due to the weak force and the $\bar{\theta}_3$ due to the strong force. The experimental fact that CKM matrix CP violating angle δ_{CP} is order 1, but $\bar{\theta}_3$ is nearly zero [4, 5], is the Strong CP problem. Another way to phrase the Strong CP problem is that why does quantum chromodynamics (QCD) alone preserve CP symmetry?

B. A New Solution based on Symmetry Mass Generation

In the next sections, we will provide a Strong CP solution based on a mass-generating mechanism known as Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG, see a recent overview [20]). It turns out that our SMG solution to the Strong CP problem applies to all four versions of SM gauge groups

$$G_{\text{SM}_p} \equiv (\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)_Y) / \mathbb{Z}_p, \quad (8)$$

namely, it works for any $p = 1, 2, 3, 6$ [25, 28, 29]. Here in this subsection Sec. IB, we will quickly and briefly sketch the key essence of the SMG solution: Why does the SMG helps to solve the Strong CP problem?⁴

The conceptual idea of our solution focus on the re-examination and re-interpretation of the role of the mass matrix M in (3). We point out that the previous studies and solutions to the Strong CP problem in the past literature only or mainly rely on the mean-field mass such that mass matrix M is obtained via the mean-field expectation value $\langle M \rangle$. So what (3) really means schematically is

$$\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + \arg(\det \langle M \rangle). \quad (9)$$

Meanwhile, based on our understanding of the neutron electric dipole moment (EDM) [4, 5] (the available physical observable measuring $\bar{\theta}$), we also find that the neutron EDM only measures the mean-field contribution (see a mean-field explanation in [9]), agreeing with our speculation that $\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + \arg(\det \langle M \rangle)$. Henceforth, we will take (9) as our assumption and corrected definition of the $\bar{\theta}$.

Here in comparison to the Strong CP problem in (3), we can set the $\bar{\theta} = \bar{\theta}_3$ and $\theta = \theta_3$, while the fermion mass matrix M consists of the contribution of quark mass matrix M_u and M_d . Namely, the experimental measurement of the $\bar{\theta}$ (such as the neutron EDM in the SM) really involves the mean-field mass matrix $\langle M \rangle$. There the mass matrix M is schematically obtained from the fermion bilinear or quadratic term in the Lagrangian

$$\xi_I M_{IJ} \psi_J + \text{H.c.}, \quad (10)$$

³ To be absolutely clear, a vacuum expectation value (vev) of any observable \mathcal{O} is evaluated as the expectation of \mathcal{O} in the ground state sector $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle \equiv \langle \Psi_{\text{g.s.}} | \mathcal{O} | \Psi_{\text{g.s.}} \rangle$, where $|\Psi_{\text{g.s.}}\rangle$ is a ground state of quantum mechanical system, e.g., quantum field theory (QFT) and quantum many-body system. It could also be evaluated in the path integral with insertion $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{Z} \int [\mathcal{D}\dots] \mathcal{O} \exp(iS[\dots])$, where Z is the partition function (a path integral without insertion), S is a QFT action, and \dots are some fields that are integrated over.

⁴ In 3+1d, the theta term of non-abelian Yang-Mills field strength $\frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \int \text{Tr}[F \wedge F]$ is C even, P odd, and T odd. In 1+1d, the theta term of abelian field strength $\frac{\theta}{2\pi} \int F$ is C odd, P odd, and T even. We could also say that the small 3+1d theta term implies the P, T, CP, or CT problem in 3+1d; typically it is called the Strong CP problem for the SU(3) strong force. We could say that the small 1+1d theta term implies the C, P, CT, or PT problem [22]. So in general even-dimensional spacetime (both $4n$ or $4n + 2$ dimensions), the small theta term implies universally the P or CT problem. Ref. [22] provides the SMG solution to the 1+1d P or CT problem. In this present work, we tackle the 3+1d P or CT problem known as the Strong CP problem.

where ξ and ψ are fermion fields in appropriate representations. The M_{IJ} may receive a contribution from the dynamical fields like Higgs ϕ_H , etc., that gets a mean-field vacuum expectation value (vev) as $\langle\phi_H\rangle \neq 0$. The whole $\xi_I M_{IJ} \psi_J$ is a singlet scalar in a trivial representation of the Lorentz group.

Now, our new key idea is that SMG mechanism [20] can go beyond the mean-field mass, such that the SMG deformation

$$\xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J + \text{H.c.}, \text{ such that } \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0, \quad (11)$$

receives no mean-field value in $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0$ and also $\langle \xi_I \psi_J \rangle = 0$ but this (11) can still give symmetry-preserving *non-mean-field mass* energy gaps to the full set of fermions by preserving an anomaly-free symmetry G . The (11) may involve the *multi-fermion interaction*, e.g.,

$$\xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J + \text{H.c.} = g_{\text{SMG}} (\xi_I (\psi_{q'} \dots \psi_{q''} + \dots) \psi_J + \text{H.c.}) \quad (12)$$

(where interactions between ξ_I , $\psi_{q'}$, $\psi_{q''}$, and ψ_J , etc., with the SMG interaction strength g_{SMG}) and *disordered mass field interaction* (where $\mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ}$ may be regarded as the field operator that becomes disordered in the order parameter target space), beyond the quadratic fermion interaction [20]. The reason that $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0$ is due to that the condensation of these $\mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ}$ operators would often break the G symmetry (so nonzero $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle \neq 0$ often implies no SMG) in the low-energy ground state sector. In our approach, we shall generalize the mass matrix in (9) and (10) to \mathbf{M} so to include both the *mean-field* mass $M = \langle M \rangle$ (e.g., from Higgs) and the SMG's *non-mean-field* mass $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{IJ} &= M_{IJ} + \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ}, \\ \langle \mathbf{M}_{IJ} \rangle &= \langle M_{IJ} \rangle, \quad \text{while } \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0, \\ \xi_I \mathbf{M}_{IJ} \psi_J + \text{H.c.} &= \xi_I (M_{IJ} + \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ}) \psi_J + \text{H.c.}, \\ \bar{\theta} &\equiv \theta + \arg(\det \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle) = \theta + \arg(\det \langle M \rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here we should also provide a definition to extract the mass matrix \mathbf{M}_{IJ} from the QFT partition function Z and its action $S = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}$ with lagrangian \mathcal{L} . In 4d, we can write every fermion in terms of the left-handed Weyl fermions (here denoted as ξ_I and ψ_J), then⁵

$$\mathbf{M}_{IJ} = -\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \xi_I)(\delta \psi_J)}, \text{ where } \mathcal{L} \text{ contains a generic term } -(\xi_I \mathbf{M}_{IJ} \psi_J + \text{H.c.}). \quad (14)$$

Then our solution to the Strong CP problem requires at least *any one* of the fermions (call this fermion ζ) in the full theory to receive no mean-field mass at all (so there is at least one zero eigenvalue of the mean-field mass matrix $\langle M_{IJ} \rangle$) but this fermion ζ can still be massive or gapped due to the SMG contribution (namely $\mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \neq 0$ but $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0$). Thus, at least one of the eigenvalues of the mean-field mass matrix $\langle M \rangle$ being zero implies that the $\det \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle = \det \langle M \rangle = 0$. In that case, $\bar{\theta} = \theta$. Next, we can do the $u(1)_{\text{chiral}}$ chiral transformation only on this specific chiral fermion

$$\zeta \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \zeta \quad (15)$$

that has no mean-field mass, but ζ can receive the non-mean-field SMG mass. As long as there is an ABJ perturbative local anomaly between the $u(1)_{\text{chiral}}$ and the gauge Lie algebra of the theta term (in the case of QCD's θ_3 , it is captured by the triangle Feynman graph with vertices $u(1)_{\text{chiral}}\text{-}5u(3)^2$), this chiral transformation will send

$$\theta \mapsto \theta - \alpha, \quad (16)$$

while this also sends

$$M_{IJ} + \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \mapsto M_{IJ}(\alpha) + \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ}(\alpha) \quad (17)$$

presumably with α dependence. However, the

$$\langle M_{IJ} \rangle = \langle M_{IJ}(\alpha) \rangle$$

⁵ Here $\mathbf{M}_{IJ} = -\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \xi_I)(\delta \psi_J)}$ extracts the generalized mass matrix but avoids extracting the Dirac operator. Because the Dirac operator is obtained from the diagonal and the same species of Weyl fermions in particle and anti-particle paired in $\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \psi_I^\dagger)(\delta \psi_I)}$, or in the left-handed or right-handed Weyl fermion basis, $\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \psi_L^\dagger)(\delta \psi_L)}$ or $\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \psi_R^\dagger)(\delta \psi_R)}$. Here we write $-\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \xi_I)(\delta \psi_J)}$ all in the left-handed particle basis, thus extract only the \mathbf{M}_{IJ} but not the Dirac operator.

is not changed because the ζ has no mean-field mass. The mean-field

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}}(\alpha) \rangle = 0$$

anyway so it does not contribute to the $\bar{\theta}$. So we end up redefining $\bar{\theta}$ by a chiral transformation, with $\det \langle \mathbf{M}(\alpha) \rangle = 0$ still, so

$$\bar{\theta} = \theta - \alpha = 0 \tag{18}$$

can be appropriately chosen to be zero. This provides the solution of the Strong CP problem: The $\bar{\theta}$ is zero for the entire theory. The $\bar{\theta} = 0$ in principle solves the Strong CP problem at some energy scale, then we provide arguments how $\bar{\theta}$ remains zero or small at the IR low energy theory.

Order to Disorder the θ and mass field: There is another interpretation to look at our Strong CP solution setting $\bar{\theta} = 0$. We are looking at the *disordered* phase of the dynamical $\bar{\theta}$ (which includes the *disordered* dynamical θ and dynamical complex phase of mass field $\arg(\det \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle)$). Instead, Peccei-Quinn solution with axions [10–13] looked at the *ordered* phase of the dynamical $\bar{\theta}$ (i.e., the small fluctuation around the vacuum expectation value $\langle \bar{\theta} \rangle$ gives rise to axion mode). The *ordered* phase to the *disordered* phase of the $\bar{\theta}$ is analogous to the superfluid-to-insulator type of phase transition in the condensed matter [30].⁶

- When the $\bar{\theta}$ is in the ordered phase, it makes sense to ask the value of $\langle \exp(i\bar{\theta}) \rangle$, which determines the orientation of the $\bar{\theta}$ -clock and how it affects the CT or P breaking (also T or CP breaking in 3+1d).
- However, when the $\bar{\theta}$ is in the disordered phase, it makes no sense to extract the mean-field value of $\langle \exp(i\bar{\theta}) \rangle = 0$ — because the $\bar{\theta}$ -clock becomes fully disoriented, with no CT or P breaking (also T or CP breaking in 3+1d). The appropriately designed *disordered* phase of the dynamical $\bar{\theta}$ can also give the non-mean-field mass gap to a set of fermions via the SMG.

To solve the Strong CP problem, we will implement this particular non-mean-field massive fermion ζ in two approaches:

In Sec. III, we only need the original *chiral fermion* theory in the SM, without adding any *mirror fermion* sector. In this case, some of the original *chiral* fermion say ζ in the SM receives its full mass from the SMG, not from the Higgs condensation. Another possibility is that if there is an extra family of SM fermions (e.g. the 4th family), such that the extra family of SM fermions receive only the SMG mass (but no other mean-field mass), then it can also make $\bar{\theta}_3 = 0$.

In Sec. IV, instead, we will choose the ζ as a new set of *mirror fermions* (namely, not the SM fermions) being fully gapped by SMG. The *mirror fermion* sector is the *fermion doubling* of the original *chiral fermion* theory.

Quark masses: The crucial issue is — what do we really mean by the quark masses? Since in the real-world experiment, we do *not* directly measure the quark mass as the quarks are confined in the hadrons such as mesons or baryons due to the color confinement, we have to clarify how do we measure the quark mass? At which energy scale and by which method do we extract the quark mass?

In particular, 't Hooft massless u quark solution [2] that requires $m_u = 0$ has been ruled out by the lattice QCD data. So whatever new Strong CP solution that we will provide, we must interpret the lattice QCD data correctly without conflicting with our new Strong CP solution. According to Particle Data Group (PDG) [31], the current quark mass $m_u = 2.16$ MeV is an input to the QCD lagrangian at the energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV based on the modified minimal subtraction ($\overline{\text{MS}}$) renormalization scheme. Other current quark masses m_q are also nonzero, in order to produce the correct hadron mass (e.g. meson such as the pion mass 135 MeV or baryon such as the proton mass 938 MeV) observed at the low energy (say the Λ_{QCD} scale 200 MeV) in Nature confirmed by experiments [31]. We thus know this lattice data indeed rules out the 't Hooft massless u quark solution [2] because this solution requires to have zero current u quark masses $m_u = 0$ or zero Yukawa-Higgs- u -quark coupling for the QCD bare lagrangian under the electroweak Higgs mechanism at any energy scale above the chiral symmetry breaking scale (namely, at any energy scale below the electroweak scale $E_{\text{EW}} \sim 246$ GeV and above the QCD confinement scale Λ_{QCD} scale ~ 200 MeV, before the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle \neq 0$ kicks in).

We will advocate candidate resolutions to the Strong CP problem compatible with the up-to-date lattice QCD data [31]. One possibility is that the u quarks obtain its current quark mass m_u *not from* the electroweak Higgs mechanism *but from* the SMG in the real-world Nature. If so, we propose to study a toy model such that a QCD bare lagrangian including the SMG interactions between a set of quarks that preserve an anomaly-free symmetry. We imagine in this new scenario, such that even if both the $\text{su}(3)$ color Yang-Mills gauge force and the electroweak

⁶ Even more precisely, the continuous Peccei-Quinn symmetry would *not* be a global symmetry once the internal symmetry of the gauge group G is dynamically gauged. Due to the mixed anomaly between the G and Peccei-Quinn symmetry, the classical Peccei-Quinn symmetry is broken down by the Adler-Bell-Jackiw (ABJ) anomaly [23, 24] to its discrete subgroup. So rigorously speaking, neither *superfluid* nor *algebraic superfluid* exists as Peccei-Quinn symmetry-breaking phase in the G gauge theory. Nonetheless, at least in the weakly gauge or the global symmetry limit of G , we expect that the physical intuitive picture of the superfluid to insulator transition analogy still applies.

Yukawa-Higgs couplings are turned off to zero, there are still intrinsic direct multi-quark or multi-fermion (between quarks and leptons) interactions via the SMG interactions. Namely, in this new scenario, the familiar QCD lagrangian is modified to

$$-\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{\mu\nu a} - \frac{\bar{\theta}}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a + \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - \left(\lambda_u^D \langle \phi_H \rangle \lambda_{q,II}^D \delta_{IJ} \langle \phi_H \rangle \right))\psi + (\psi' \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \psi + \text{H.c.}) \quad (19)$$

where the Lie algebra generator index a is summed over and the μ, ν are spacetime vector indices are contracted summed. This modified QCD lagrangian consists of three kinds of interactions between quarks:

- (1) The $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ color Yang-Mills gauge force via $\bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu)\psi$ with the nonabelian covariant derivative $D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - igA_\mu^a T^a$.
- (2) The electroweak Yukawa-Higgs couplings $\bar{\psi}\lambda^D \langle \phi_H \rangle \psi$ that pairs left-handed and right-handed quarks. With an appropriate choice of basis within the SM matter content, now the diagonalized Yukawa-Higgs coupling $\lambda_u^D, \lambda_{q,II}^D, \langle \phi_H \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ all are chosen to be real. The $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \epsilon \phi_H^* \rangle$ with the $SU(2)$ doublet $\epsilon \phi_H^*$ notation is simplified to $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \phi_H \rangle$ once we choose $\langle \phi_H \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$ via a basis choice based on the appropriate $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ gauge transformation. Similarly, this basis choice works for other u type quarks.
- (3) The schematic SMG interaction

$$\psi' \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \psi + \text{H.c.} \equiv g_{\text{SMG}} (\psi' (\psi_{q'} \dots \psi_{q''} + \dots) \psi + \text{H.c.}) \quad (20)$$

can consist of the direct multi-quark or multi-fermion interactions (here interactions between $\psi', \psi_{q'}, \psi_{q''}$, and ψ , etc.), being non-mean-field with $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \psi' \psi \rangle = 0$. The SMG interaction is model-dependent and must be carefully tailor-made and designed. In Sec. III B, we will provide an explicit form of the SMG interaction for the full SM matter contents.

A possible resolution to the lattice QCD data [31] that seems to require $m_u \neq 0$ is that we can follow 't Hooft's $\lambda_u^D = 0$ and the u quark has a zero current mass $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \phi_H \rangle = 0$, the SMG interaction $\psi' \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \psi + \text{H.c.}$ can still give the u quark a nonzero SMG mass. Other fermions involved in the SMG also get a portion of SMG mass, other than the electroweak Higgs-induced mass $\lambda_{q,II}^D \langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$. Some comments on this (19) solution:

- Theoretically, this is a candidate solution — as long as we can verify that by re-running the lattice QCD simulation, the new QCD lagrangian (19) with a zero current mass $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \phi_H \rangle = 0$ but with the appropriate SMG interaction at $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV can still generate the correct hadron masses at low energy Λ_{QCD} scale. If so, this will be sufficient to satisfy the lattice simulation constraint and the low energy hadron mass constraint. In Sec. III B, we will provide an SMG interaction, and then also explain why this solves the Strong CP problem (at least theoretically).
- Phenomenologically, this candidate solution may suffer constraints by experiments. For example, if the SM's u quark and other quarks are indeed involved in the SMG interaction, then at a sufficiently high enough energy, the non-renormalizable multi-fermion interaction becomes nonperturbatively dominant. On one hand, this direct multi-fermion interaction indicates some of the quarks may not be genuinely *asymptotic-free* at arbitrary high energy, which indicates some falsifiable experimental predictions. On the other hand, this also means that there could be a different ultra-violet (UV) completion of SMG interaction by a parent UV theory lurking behind at very high energy.

The main purpose of this article is to provide a *theoretical SMG solution* to the Strong CP problem. Although we will try to elaborate on how this theoretical solution can fit into phenomenological constraints to be a *phenomenological SMG solution*, we will not pursue detailed phenomenological parameter fittings in this initial work, as those fittings can be very data dependent and model-dependent.

Our strategy is that if this specific SMG solution (19) (applied to the chiral fermion) elaborated in Sec. III is not favored due to (known or unknown) phenomenological constraints, we will look for a different SMG solution (applied to the mirror fermion) in Sec. IV. In general, there must be a certain version of SMG solution to the Strong CP problem being not only theoretically but also phenomenologically viable. The readers can decide which version is more promising to be realized in Nature based on their own taste.

The remaining part of the article is organized as follows:

In Sec. II, we overview and contrast between the familiar **symmetry-breaking** mass and the **Symmetric Mass Generation** (SMG via a **symmetry-preserving** mechanism) or the **Topological Mass Generation** (TMG, also symmetry-preserving by via a **symmetry-extension** mechanism [32]).

In Sec. III and Sec. IV, these two aforementioned approaches (without or with mirror fermions) provide two different solutions to the Strong CP problem.

In Sec. V, we conclude and make comparisons with other Strong CP solutions.

II. MASS MECHANISMS: OLD AND NEW

A. Properties of Mass

Below we recall some different concepts of masses, in particular the fermion masses, following [20].

- 1. Rest mass:** We can define the mass as an energy gap between the excitation energy E_{excited} above the ground state E_0 ,

$$m_{\text{rest}} = \Delta E = E_{\text{excited}} - E_0. \quad (21)$$

This definition works in general for many-body interacting quantum systems that can include arbitrary interactions without assuming any mean-field or quadratic Hamiltonian realization. This definition also works for both relativistic or nonrelativistic systems, also for both quantum field theories or not.

When the excitation is a fermion in a translational symmetry invariant theory where the momentum \vec{k} is a good quantum number, we could define the rest mass as the energy gap between the minimal value of energy band $E_{\vec{k}}$ above the chemical potential μ as $m_{\text{rest}} = \min(E_{\vec{k}}) - \mu$.

- 2. Inertial mass:** If there is an energy band $E_{\vec{k}}$ description, we can define a different type of mass — the inverse curvature of the fermion energy band dispersion:

$$m_{\text{inertial}} = \lim_{\vec{k} \rightarrow \vec{k}_{\text{min}}} (\nabla_{\vec{k}}^2(E_{\vec{k}}))^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

Note that this mass m_{inertial} is an inertial mass, where we can read its effective mass from the energy band dispersion

$$E_{\vec{k}} = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + |m|^2} = |m| + \frac{\vec{k}^2}{2m} + \dots$$

- 3. Mass read from the correlator:** There is also the mass m read from the inverse of the correlation length $\xi = \frac{1}{m}$. The correlation length ξ can be read from the exponentially decayed two-point fermion-fermion correlation function:

$$\langle \bar{\psi}(x_1)\psi(x_2) \rangle + \text{H.c.} \propto \exp(-|m||x_1 - x_2|) = \exp\left(-\frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{|\xi|}\right). \quad (23)$$

Here $\bar{\psi}$ and ψ are the shorthands of appropriate fermion creation and annihilation operators; for example the $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger \gamma^0$ for a Dirac fermion. In 4d spacetime, for Dirac fermion, we have $\bar{\psi}(x_1)\psi(x_2) = \psi_L^\dagger(x_1)\psi_R(x_2) + \psi_R^\dagger(x_1)\psi_L(x_2)$. For Majorana fermion, we have to pair the same Weyl fermion by $\psi_L^\dagger(x_1)(i\sigma^2)\psi_L^*(x_2) + \text{H.c.}$ with the standard Pauli matrices $(i\sigma^2)_{ab} = \epsilon_{ab}$.

- 4. Bilinear mean-field mass condensation:** We can also read the mean-field mass $\langle m \rangle$ from the two-point function when the two points x_1 and x_2 coincide:

$$\langle \psi'(x)\psi(x) \rangle = \langle m \rangle f(|m|), \quad (24)$$

where the function f is model dependent. This relation is due to the linear response theory on $m\psi'(x)\psi(x)$ at the mean-field level contains $\langle m \rangle \langle \psi'(x)\psi(x) \rangle$ such that $\langle m \rangle \propto \langle \psi'(x)\psi(x) \rangle$. Here ψ' and ψ may be paired by Dirac or Majorana type mass pairing.

The above different kinds of definitions of masses may not always be equivalent. Here are some comments on these definitions of masses:

- In a relativistic quantum field theory with translational symmetry (so the momentum \vec{k} is a good quantum number), the rest mass (1), the inertial mass (2), and the mass read from the correlator (3) all become the same mass. However, in a nonrelativistic quantum system, the rest mass (1) and the inertial mass (2) are generally different — the rest mass (1) is about the excitation energy gap $m_{\text{rest}} = \Delta E$, the inertial mass (2) is the inverse curvature of energy band dispersion.
- The rest mass (1) and the mass read from the correlator (3) are the more general form of mass in a quantum theory, without or with relativity, beyond the mean-field theory, beyond a quadratic Hamiltonian, and beyond the energy band theory. When we refer to the mass hereafter, we mean these two (1) and (3).
- The bilinear mass condensation (4) detects the *mean-field mass* (like Higgs-induced mass), but cannot detect the SMG-induced *non-mean-field mass*.

• **Fermionic Green's Function on mean-field mass vs non-mean-field mass:**

Consider a fermionic Green's Function $\mathcal{G}(k) = \mathcal{G}(E, \vec{k})$ in the energy E -momentum \vec{k} space with $k^\mu k_\mu = E^2 - \vec{k}^2$, in the time and spatial translational invariant system. Given a generic mass matrix \mathbf{M} read from (13),

(i) Green's Function with the mean-field mass $\langle \mathbf{M} \rangle \equiv \langle M \rangle$ shows

$$\mathcal{G}(k) = \frac{\gamma^\mu k_\mu + \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle}{k^\mu k_\mu - \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle^2} = \frac{\gamma^\mu k_\mu + \langle M \rangle}{k^\mu k_\mu - \langle M \rangle^2} \quad (25)$$

There are well-known **Green's function poles** $\mathcal{G}(E = \pm\sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + \langle M \rangle^2}, \vec{k}) \rightarrow \infty$ around the dispersion relation $k^\mu k_\mu - \langle M \rangle^2 = E^2 - \vec{k}^2 - \langle M \rangle^2 = 0$. Crossing the locations of these poles (along the dispersion $E = \pm\sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + \langle M \rangle^2}$, the $\det(\mathcal{G})$ flips sign, between $\det(\mathcal{G}) > 0$ and $\det(\mathcal{G}) < 0$, where the determinant is evaluated in the spinor and flavor component space.

(ii) Green's Function with the SMG-induced non-mean-field mass ($\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0$) shows

$$\mathcal{G}(k) = \frac{\gamma^\mu k_\mu + \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle}{k^\mu k_\mu - \langle \mathbf{M} \rangle^2} = \frac{\gamma^\mu k_\mu + \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle}{k^\mu k_\mu - |m|^2} = \frac{\gamma^\mu k_\mu}{k^\mu k_\mu - |m|^2}. \quad (26)$$

Here $|m|$ is the absolute magnitude of the SMG-induced non-mean-field mass that can be read from the rest mass (1) and the correlator (3). There is a **universal Green's function zero** when approaching $k_\mu = 0$ as $\mathcal{G}(k = 0) = \mathcal{G}(E = 0, \vec{k} = 0) = 0$ or $\det(\mathcal{G}(k = 0)) = 0$ [33, 34]. Crossing the locations of these zeros (along the dispersion $E = \pm|\vec{k}|$), the $\det(\mathcal{G})$ flips sign, between $\det(\mathcal{G}) > 0$ and $\det(\mathcal{G}) < 0$.

So this Green's function zero in (26) is a distinct feature, not happening to the mean-field mass (in contrast to (25)), but only for SMG-induced non-mean-field mass.

B. Mass Generating Mechanism

Here we enumerate and re-examine “How do we gain the mass? What are possible mass-generating mechanisms?” Conventionally, there are mean-field quadratic fermion bilinear mass terms that we can write down:

1. **Bilinear pair two Weyl fermions** (ψ_L and ψ'_L):

$$m(\psi_L^\dagger (i\sigma^2)\psi_L'^* + \psi_L'^T (-i\sigma^2)\psi_L) \equiv -m((\psi'_L \psi_L)^\dagger + \psi'_L \psi_L)$$

is most general, say in 4d, including both Dirac mass (when $\psi_R = (i\sigma^2)\psi_L'^*$) or Majorana mass (when $\psi_L = \psi'_L$).

2. **Anderson-Higgs mechanisms:** Developed by Nambu-Goldstone-Anderson-Higgs [35–41], the vacuum expectation value (vev) of a scalar Higgs $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$ and the mean-field behavior of Yukawa-Higgs term $\phi_H((\psi'_L \psi_L)^\dagger + \psi'_L \psi_L)$ induces $m \propto \langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$.

3. **Chiral symmetry breaking:** Even without any explicit scalar Higgs field, the dynamical quark chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle \neq 0$ in QCD generates a mass scale [21, 35, 36]:

$$L_{\text{ChSB}} = \langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle ((\psi'_L \psi_L)^\dagger + \psi'_L \psi_L),$$

which breaks a chiral symmetry but maintains a vector symmetry.

All the above mass generating mechanisms are based on a mean-field bilinear pair of fermion fields, with a lagrangian form

$$\mathcal{O}\psi'\psi + \text{H.c.} \quad (27)$$

such that the mean-field expectation value of $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle \neq 0$ is nonzero to generate a mean-field mass gap. Similarly, the $\langle \psi'\psi \rangle \neq 0$.

Recently it becomes clear that, beyond the conventional mean-field quadratic (less-interacting) mass listed above, there are other mass-generating mechanisms — non-mean-field, preserving more symmetry, furthermore interacting and nonperturbative, with a close analogy in the many-body interacting quantum matter contemporary developments [42–44]:

4. **Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG)** [20]: Given a G -anomaly-free theory, there always exists a G -symmetric deformation such that we can deform a G -symmetric gapless phase to a G -symmetric trivial gapped phase (a short-range entangled tensor product state). For example, G -symmetry can be a chiral symmetry, such that we can deform to gapped confinement without chiral symmetry breaking (known as the smooth s-confinement [45, 46]). Other examples include gapping 8 or multiple Majorana fermions in one dimensional spacetime [47, 48] or gapping multiple chiral Weyl fermions in even spacetime dimensions (history back to Eichten-Preskill [49], but SMG only appears in the recent advance [50–58]), see more references in the overview [20, 59].

In the case of fermions, the non-mean-field SMG deformation requires that

$$\psi' \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \psi + \text{H.c.} \equiv \psi' (\psi_{q'} \dots \psi_{q''} + \dots) \psi + \text{H.c.}, \quad \text{with } \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0 \text{ and } \langle \psi' \psi \rangle = 0. \quad (28)$$

5. **Symmetric Gapped Topological Order (SGTO)**: For certain G -anomalous theory for spacetime dimension $d \geq 3$ (i.e., precisely a certain type of 't Hooft anomalous G -symmetry that must have a nonperturbative global anomaly [60–64], instead of any perturbative local anomaly), there still exists a G -symmetric deformation such that we can deform a G -symmetric gapless phase to a G -symmetric gapped topologically ordered phase (now long-range entangled, with a low-energy topological quantum field theory [TQFT] below the finite energy gap). Originated from condensed matter examples (see a review [42]), one can formulate a systematic construction based on **Symmetry Extension** [60, 61] instead of Symmetry Breaking; where G -anomaly is trivialized to none in the pullback extended symmetry group \tilde{G} . Typically the TQFT's gauge group is a finite group, constructed from gauging a normal subgroup K of \tilde{G} with the quotient $\tilde{G}/K = G$ via a typical group extension (here a short exact sequence) $1 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \tilde{G} \rightarrow \tilde{G}/K = G \rightarrow 1$.

In the following, we apply the SMG to provide novel solutions to the Strong CP problem.

III. FIRST SOLUTION: SYMMETRIC MASS GAP WITHIN THE CHIRAL FERMION

A. Toy Model for QCD

Now we aim to apply the SMG for a new Strong CP solution. To motivate our solution, we first look at a QCD toy model — which turns out to fail our purpose eventually, but it serves to offer the key intuitions behind it. For simplicity, take $\text{SU}(N_c)$ QCD lagrangian with N_c color and N_f flavor Dirac fermions ψ with equal m :

$$L = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{\theta}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a + \bar{\psi} (i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m \mathbb{1}_{N_f} e^{i\theta' \gamma_5}) \psi, \quad (29)$$

where a is the Lie algebra generator index. The $\mathbb{1}_{N_f}$ is a rank- N_f identity matrix and ψ is an N_f -multiplet of Dirac fermions. The θ_3 in (3) is now called the θ .

- $\text{U}(1)_A$ axial symmetry $\psi \mapsto e^{i\alpha\gamma_5} \psi$ is anomalous, whose transformation sends $\theta \mapsto \theta - 2\alpha N_f$ and $\theta' \mapsto \theta' + 2\alpha$, but keeps $\theta + N_f \theta' \mapsto (\theta - 2\alpha N_f) + N_f(\theta' + 2\alpha) = \theta + N_f \theta'$ invariant.
- $\text{U}(1)_A$ has a mixed anomaly under the ABJ anomaly with the vertices $\text{U}(1)_A\text{-SU}(N_c)^2$ captured by a triangle Feynman graph. Since $[\text{SU}(N_c)]$ is dynamically gauged, $\text{U}(1)_A$ is broken down to a discrete $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_f, A}$ due to the $\text{SU}(N_c)$ instanton, the overall internal symmetry including the gauged $[\text{SU}(N_c)]$ is

$$G_{\text{QCD}} \equiv \frac{[\text{SU}(N_c)] \times \text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R \times \text{U}(1)_V}{\mathbb{Z}_{N_c} \times \mathbb{Z}_{N_f}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_f, A}$ is secretly already part of its subgroup.

The invariant $\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + \arg(\det(\mathbb{1}_{N_f} e^{i\theta'})) = \theta + N_f \theta'$ cannot be rotated away via the axial symmetry and is generally nonzero — this is exactly the Strong CP problem of this QCD model. Below we show that naïvely we can solve this problem, if a set of the quarks (in particular the u quark) obtained its mass not from Anderson-Higgs mechanism, but from SMG by preserving the $\text{SU}(N_c)$ and other vector symmetries of G_{QCD} in (30). Whether u or other quarks obtain some portion of its mass via the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle$ does not alter our argument. Because the chiral condensate occurs at a lower energy below the confinement scale Λ_{QCD} , but here we concern a QCD lagrangian at a higher energy much above Λ_{QCD} . So the chiral condensate does not affect the fact whether we can rotate the $\bar{\theta}$ to zero or not in the QCD lagrangian. The mass m is now treated as a dynamical field \mathbf{m} . The conventional Higgs-induced mass has $m = \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle \propto \langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$. In contrast, the SMG via a *disordered* field means that

$$\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle = 0, \quad \text{but only } \langle |\mathbf{m}|^n \rangle \neq 0, \quad (31)$$

of a higher power n of condensate driven by the disordered Yukawa-Higgs or Yukawa- \mathbf{m} multi-fermion interaction term. SMG says that even though $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle = 0$, appropriate disordered \mathbf{m} configurations can indeed give an energy gap, via: (i) smooth fluctuation (the correlation length $\xi_{\mathbf{m}}$ satisfies $l_{\text{UV}} \ll \xi_{\mathbf{m}} \ll l_{\text{system}}$ where l_{UV} is the UV cutoff of quantum field theory [QFT], or Planck scale in quantum gravity [QG], or some effective ‘‘lattice’’ constant), (ii) intermediate strength coupling (not too weak nor too strong, thus in a nonperturbative regime).

We can use the chiral rotation of all quarks $\psi \mapsto e^{i\alpha\gamma^5}\psi$ to rotate θ' to 0 while redefine θ by $\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + N_f\theta'$. Next, the u quark’s chiral rotation alone $\psi_u \mapsto e^{i\alpha_u\gamma^5}\psi_u$, sends the path integral $\int [\mathcal{D}\psi][\mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}][\mathcal{D}\mathbf{m}] e^{i \int d^4x L}$ to

$$\int [\mathcal{D}\psi][\mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}][\mathcal{D}\mathbf{m}] e^{i \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{\mu\nu a} + \alpha_u \partial_\mu J_u^{\mu 5} - \frac{(\bar{\theta} - 2\alpha_u)}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a + \bar{\psi} (i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - \left(\mathbf{m}_u e^{i2\alpha_u\gamma^5} (\mathbf{m}_q + \phi_H) \right)_{N_f-1} \right) \psi + \dots} \quad (32)$$

Assuming the u quark only contains the interacting non-mean-field mass from the SMG, so

$$\langle m_u \rangle = \langle \mathbf{m}_u \rangle = 0, \text{ only } \langle |\mathbf{m}_u|^n \rangle \neq 0 \quad (33)$$

for some higher $n > 1$. The crucial input is that

$$\bar{\psi}_u \langle \mathbf{m}_u \rangle e^{i2\alpha_u\gamma^5} \psi_u = 0,$$

so we can choose α_u to rotate $\bar{\theta} - 2\alpha_u$ to 0.

In contrast, other quark mass m_q contains the mean-field mass induced by Higgs condensation $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$,

$$\langle m_q \rangle = \langle \mathbf{m}_q \rangle + \langle \phi_H \rangle = \langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0,$$

in addition to other possible non-mean-field SMG contribution, such that $\langle \mathbf{m}_q \rangle = 0$, only $\langle |\mathbf{m}_q|^n \rangle \neq 0$ for some higher $n > 1$.

Thus this SMG solves the Strong CP problem within QCD via setting $\bar{\theta} - 2\alpha_u = 0$. Some comments on this solution:

(1) Compare to the *massless quark solution* ($m_u = 0$ [2]) of the Strong CP problem, our u quark now instead has a finite energy gap (although $\langle \mathbf{m}_u \rangle = 0$) induced by a non-mean-field disordered energy gap from a dynamical mass field \mathbf{m}_u .

(2) Compare to the *axion solution* [10–13] which makes the θ field dynamical, our solution instead makes the mass field \mathbf{m} dynamical. Instead of making the dynamical θ localized and *ordered* by a potential [10–13] to induce pseudo-Goldstone mode, our solution makes the dynamical \mathbf{m} *disordered* to generate an energy gap, namely here an interacting mass gap.

(3) This u quark energy spectrum above the disordered gap can still produce the conventional dispersion $E_u \propto \sqrt{m_u^2 + p_u^2}$ with momentum p_u [20]. Gapping the u and other quarks by SMG, and gapping other quarks also by the Higgs $\langle \phi_H \rangle$ may also change the quark multiplet from N_f flavor to $N_f - 1$ flavor. Thus this solution is pending to fit the SM phenomenology.

(4) In SM, the u quark is in a representation of the chiral $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ that carries a nonzero anomaly index to cancel the SM’s perturbative local anomaly. Because the SMG cannot be applied to a non-vanishing perturbative local anomaly, in order to apply the SMG to this SM’s u quark, either we need to include more quarks or leptons (e.g., 15 or 16 Weyl fermions [56, 57]) to gap them altogether, or we need to break down some continuous symmetry to discrete symmetry. The discrete symmetry may change the anomaly becoming a nonperturbative global anomaly, then we may obtain the SGTO with a low energy TQFT to match the nonperturbative global anomaly.

Because the issue (3) and (4) listed above may lead to disagreements with the SM phenomenology, this solution may *not* be favored by nature. Yet another issue is that the dynamics of the disorder field driving to a gapped phase are not analytically well-controlled, but only numerically verified (e.g., [65]). In principle, we have to modify the disorder mass field interaction term

$$\bar{\psi}_q \mathbf{m}_q \psi_q \text{ with } \langle \mathbf{m}_q \rangle = 0 \quad (34)$$

to the SMG interaction for the set of quarks schematically as

$$\bar{\psi}_q \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \psi_q \equiv g_{\text{SMG}} \bar{\psi}_q (\psi_{q'} \dots \psi_{q''} + \dots + \text{H.c.}) \psi_q, \quad \text{with } \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0. \quad (35)$$

The set of quarks (labeled by q, q', q'' , etc.) would interact through the multi-fermion interactions even in the absence of a dynamical $[\text{SU}(N_c)]$ gauge field. The multi-fermion interaction can involve more than four-fermion interactions [51]. The anomaly-free condition within the vector symmetry part of G_{QCD} guarantees us to find the SMG interaction such that (i) the interaction preserves at least the vector symmetry part of G_{QCD} , (ii) $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0$, and (iii) the full (35) is a singlet $\mathbf{1}$ in the trivial representation of the vector symmetry of G_{QCD} . We can also interpret that by integrating out the dynamical mass field in (34), we can induce the interaction (35) as a consequence.

Related designs of the SMG interaction terms similar to (35) are explored examples by examples in recent works, e.g., [20, 58]. We will not go into the further detail of the interaction design of (35), since this QCD toy model unfortunately fails in the context of solving the Strong CP problem for the full SM. Instead, we use this naïve QCD toy model in Sec. III A to motivate our SMG solution for the SM presented next in Sec. III B.

B. Toy Model for the $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ Standard Model

The quarks alone cannot fully cancel the anomaly for the chiral $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ symmetry in the full SM's gauge sector $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$. So the QCD toy model in Sec. III A fails to generate the SMG gap in the context of the full SM.

In particular, we have to at least include the quarks and the leptons, involving at least the 15 Weyl fermions ($\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R$) in (1) in one family, to cancel the anomaly within the full SM's gauge sector $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$. In this subsection, we modify the QCD toy model in Sec. III A to the new toy model for the full SM, which will become the first candidate Strong CP solution based on the SMG.

Before we present the detail of the model, a few more comments on this model follow:

- Although we have known by far the $N_g = 3$ families of quarks and leptons, our model does not necessarily require all 3 families of quarks and leptons to get involved in the SMG process. It could be that the SMG happens in one family of SM, such as the *first family* (or any one family out of the *three families*) of quarks and leptons. It could also be that the SMG happens in one new family of SM, such as the *fourth family* of hypothetical quarks and leptons. As long as *at least one family* of quarks and leptons get a portion of its mass by SMG, then we can readily apply a chiral rotation of a quark (say the u quark) to solve the Strong CP problem, at least theoretically. However, we must say that there are phenomenological constraints that may favor or disfavor this theoretical Strong CP solution. So without loss of generality, we will implement the SMG only for one family of quarks and leptons.
- We could consider the model with either the 15 Weyl fermions or the 16 Weyl fermions ($\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R \oplus \bar{\nu}_R$) including the right-hand neutrino ν_R . Both the 15 or 16 Weyl fermions can have the full anomaly cancellation with the full SM's $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$, so we could implement the SMG for both cases.

Now we present the step-by-step construction of the first candidate Strong CP solution based on SMG:

1. We follow the Razamat-Tong model [57] to embed the 15 or 16 Weyl-fermion SM into the 27 Weyl-fermion with the following fermion matter content:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_2 & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-3} & (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})_1 & (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_{-4} & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_6 \\ \hline (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_2 & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-3} & & & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0 \\ \hline (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_{-2} & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{+3} & & & (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0 \\ \hline \end{array} \cdot \quad (36)$$

In (36), the first row's

$$(\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_2 \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-3} \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})_1 \oplus (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_{-4} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_6 \sim (\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R)$$

has the original 15 Weyl fermions of the SM.⁷ However, the \bar{d}_R and l_L are doubled (in the first and the second rows) to become a doublet under a new $\mathfrak{su}(2)_R$. The anti-particle of right-handed neutrino $\bar{\nu}_R$ written as the left-handed particle, is also introduced, but also further doubled as the $\mathfrak{su}(2)_R$ doublet of $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0$ (in the second and the third rows). There are also extra new fermions $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_{-2}$ and $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{+3}$ denoted as \bar{d}'_R and l'_L .

So the SM's original G_{SM_p} and $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y \equiv \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_L$ is enlarged to

$$G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}} \equiv \frac{G_{\text{SM}_p} \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_{p'}} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_L \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_{p'}} \quad (37)$$

with $p, p' \in \{1, 2, 3, 6\}$. All of $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ are compatible with the Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_R \equiv \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_L \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_R$$

such that the 27-fermion representation in (36) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R \oplus \bar{\nu}_R) \oplus d'_L \oplus l'_R \\ & \sim ((\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{2,-1} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_{-3,3} \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1,-2} \oplus (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-4,2} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{6,-6} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{0,-3}) \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-2,4} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{3,0}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

⁷ For the left and right notations, we use the italic font L and R to denote that of spacetime symmetry, while use the text font L and R for that of internal symmetry.

2. The 27 to 16 Weyl fermions' deformation is done by a new scalar Higgs field $h_R = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{0,-3}$ that couples to the Weyl fermions by the following Higgs term

$$(\epsilon_R h_R (\bar{d}_R d'_L + \bar{l}'_R l_L) + (h_R^\dagger \bar{\nu}_R)(h_R^\dagger \bar{\nu}_R)) + \text{H.c.} \quad (39)$$

We shall write down explicitly the anti-symmetric tensor ϵ_R in the $SU(2)_R$ doublet subspace. But the ϵ_L and ϵ tensor for the $SU(2)_L$ and Lorentz $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subspace are omitted. In the Higgs condensed $\langle h_R \rangle \neq 0$ phase, the *lower* half of both $SU(2)_R$ doublets of \bar{d}_R and l_L get mass, while the dimension-5 term $(h_R^\dagger \bar{\nu}_R)(h_R^\dagger \bar{\nu}_R)$ gives Majorana mass to only the *upper* half of the $SU(2)_R$ doublet $\bar{\nu}_R$. Thus $\langle h_R \rangle \neq 0$ lifts 11 Weyl fermions with a mass gap, leaving 16 Weyl fermions at low energy, and breaks the symmetry from $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ down to $G_{\text{SM}_p} \times U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$.

3. The 27 to 15 Weyl fermions' deformation is done by adding yet another new scalar Higgs field $h' = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{0,6}$,

$$(\epsilon_R h_R (\bar{d}_R d'_L + \bar{l}'_R l_L) + h' (\epsilon_R \bar{\nu}_R \bar{\nu}_R)) + \text{H.c.} \quad (40)$$

The Higgs condensation $\langle h_R \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle h' \rangle \neq 0$ leave 15 Weyl fermions at low energy — the $h' (\epsilon_R \bar{\nu}_R \bar{\nu}_R)$ gives a Dirac mass to both upper and lower components of the $SU(2)_R$ doublet $\bar{\nu}_R$. This breaks the symmetry from $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ down to G_{SM_p} with no $U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$, and drives the transition from the 27 to the 15 Weyl-fermion phases.

4. The 27 Weyl fermion to the SMG deformation: The 27 Weyl-fermion model can be fully gapped by preserving *not only* the SM internal symmetry group G_{SM_p} for $p = 1, 2, 3, 6$, *but also* an additional continuous baryon minus lepton symmetry $U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$.

• *Mean-field* SMG that *cannot* solve the Strong CP problem: Tong [58] suggests fully gapping the 27 Weyl fermions to achieve the SMG by adding a scalar field ϕ in $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_{-3,3}$ when the generic condensation $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ occurs in this deformation

$$\epsilon_R \epsilon_L (\phi (\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}'_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) + \phi^{\dagger 2} \bar{u}_R d'_L) + \text{H.c.} \equiv (\phi (\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}'_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) + \phi^{\dagger 2} \bar{u}_R d'_L) + \text{H.c.} \quad (41)$$

Hereafter the ϵ_L , ϵ_R and ϵ tensors for the $SU(2)_L$, $SU(2)_R$ and Lorentz $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subspaces may be omitted. The deformation term (41) in a lagrangian is a singlet under all the representations.

The $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ phase still preserves the deformed SM internal symmetry $\frac{SU(3) \times SU(2)_{\text{diagonal}} \times U(1)_{\text{diagonal}}}{\mathbb{Z}_p} \times U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$. However, the $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ violates the no mean-field condensation condition that requires $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$ in (34) and (35). It can also be checked that this deformation cannot solve the Strong CP problem, due to the $\bar{\theta}$ (including the contribution from θ and the generic complex phase of $\langle \phi \rangle$) cannot be rotated away to $\bar{\theta} = 0$.

• *Non-mean-field* SMG and a multi-fermion interaction deformation: We propose to modify Tong's [58] deformation to the case of the dynamical ϕ with a random disorder configuration that we integrate over $\int [\mathcal{D}\phi]$ such that

$$\langle \phi \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \phi^2 \rangle = 0, \quad (42)$$

so there is no mean-field mass contribution to (41). This condition satisfies the no-mean-field version of the SMG criterion (35). Integrating over $\int [\mathcal{D}\phi]$ in the path integral also induces the multi-fermion interaction version of the deformation:

$$(\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}'_R + \bar{e}_R l_L)^2 (\bar{u}_R d'_L) + \text{H.c.} \quad (43)$$

There are also additional density-density interactions induced by integrating over $\int [\mathcal{D}\phi]$, such as

$$(\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}'_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) (\bar{q}_L d_R + l'_R \nu_R + \bar{l}_L e_R) + (\bar{u}_R d'_L) (\bar{d}'_L u_R). \quad (44)$$

Any higher power (larger than 1) of any Grassmann-number-valued fermion in a lagrangian density needs to be point-split, such as $\psi_R^2 \equiv \psi_R \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \psi_R$ or $\psi_R \sigma^\mu D_\mu \psi_R$ in the covariant derivative form, etc. If we like to have a lattice regularization to do the numerical simulation, we also have to point split $\psi_R^n(x) \equiv \psi_R(x) \psi_R(x+\varepsilon) \dots \psi_R(x+(n-1)\varepsilon)$ on neighbor sites where ε is the lattice constant.

The interaction terms, both the six-fermion (43) and the four-fermion (44) interactions, are irrelevant in the sense of perturbative renormalization group (RG). In order to drive from a nearly gapless phase to a gapped SMG phase, we require to turn on their coupling strength to a nonperturbative scale.

To justify that both the disorder scalar phase of the deformation ((41) and (42)) and the multi-fermion interaction deformation with an appropriate nonperturbative coupling strength ((43) and (44)) can fully gap the 27 Weyl fermions and can achieve the SMG, we apply the argument given in [50]:

“The G -symmetry preserving SMG can be obtained from the disorder scalar phase, if the following sufficient conditions are hold. First, breaking G to G_{sub} via the scalar condensation $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ can give the fully gapped symmetry-breaking theory. Second, there are no topological defects that can trap zero modes robust under any nonperturbative G -symmetry-preserving deformation. Namely, any zero modes can be gapped by some G -symmetry-preserving deformation.”

The first condition holds, because Tong [58] already shows that $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ gives the fully gapped phase. The second condition holds under the condition given in [50] if the homotopy group of the quotient space $\pi_d(G/G_{\text{sub}}) = 0$ for all the dimensions $0 \leq d \leq D + 1$ for the total spacetime dimension $D = 4$ here.

In the case of the $\mathfrak{so}(10)$ Grand Unified Theory (GUT) with a Spin(10) internal symmetry group, Ref. [50] verifies that $\pi_d(\frac{\text{Spin}(10)}{\text{Spin}(9)}) = \pi_d(S^9) = 0$ for $0 \leq d \leq 5$ is true. However, this is only a sufficient condition not a necessary condition. The 1+1d U(1)-symmetry chiral fermion model violates the sufficient condition because $\pi_d(U(1)) = \pi_d(S^1)$ gives \mathbb{Z} for $d = 1$. But a 1+1d U(1)-symmetry anomaly-free chiral fermion model can indeed have the SMG achieved by the multi-fermion interaction [51, 55, 66] or by the disorder scalar interaction [20, 67]. So what we really need is that any zero modes trapped by the defects (such as those from $\pi_d(G/G_{\text{sub}})$) can be gapped by some G -symmetry-preserving deformation.

In the case of $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ in (37), the defect of the $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ phase can be classified by the homotopy group

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_d\left(\frac{G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}}{G_{\text{sub}}}\right) &= \pi_d\left(\frac{\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_L \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1) \times 1 \times 1}\right) \\ &= \pi_d\left(\frac{S^3}{S^1} \times \frac{S^3}{S^1} \times S^1 \times S^1\right) = \pi_d(S^2 \times S^2 \times S^1 \times S^1) = \begin{cases} 0, & d = 0 \\ \mathbb{Z}^2, & d = 1 \\ \mathbb{Z}^2, & d = 2 \\ \mathbb{Z}^2, & d = 3 \\ \mathbb{Z}_2^2, & d = 4 \\ \mathbb{Z}_2^2, & d = 5 \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

All we require is that any zero modes trapped in these defects can be gapped by some G -symmetry-preserving deformation [53]. This is always doable, if and only if the starting theory is anomaly free within the G -symmetry in the given spacetime dimension D , so the G -symmetry preserving SMG phase exists. Here we only need to verify that the cobordism group $\text{TP}_{D+1}(G)$ proposed in Freed-Hopkins [68] that classifies the D -dimensional anomaly and the $D + 1$ -dimensional invertible topological field theory. We check that at $D = 4$ to find that [69–72]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times G_{\text{SM}_p}) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}^5 \times \mathbb{Z}_2, & p = 1, 3 \\ \mathbb{Z}^5, & p = 2, 6 \end{cases}. \quad (46) \\ \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}) &\text{ contains } \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \mathbb{Z}_2 \text{ classes.} \end{aligned}$$

The integer \mathbb{Z} class corresponds to the perturbative local anomaly classification captured by perturbative Feynman graphs and infinitesimal gauge-diffeomorphism transformations. The finite group class (here \mathbb{Z}_2) captures the non-perturbative global anomaly classification captured only by large gauge-diffeomorphism transformations. Indeed, we can check that the matter content (1), with or without $\bar{\nu}_R$, is still anomaly-free with the anomaly index 0, within the cobordism group $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times G_{\text{SM}_p})$. Similarly, the 27 Weyl-fermion matter content (38) is also anomaly-free with the anomaly index 0, within the cobordism group $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}})$. From this anomaly-free perspective, we now understand the distinctions between Tong’s model and our proposal:

- Tong’s model [58] on the $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ phase although counts as the SMG by preserving a modified $\frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_{\text{diagonal}} \times \text{U}(1)_{\text{diagonal}}}{\mathbb{Z}_p} \times \text{U}(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$, it is indeed a symmetry-breaking phase partially breaking the entire $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ down to $\frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_{\text{diagonal}} \times \text{U}(1)_{\text{diagonal}}}{\mathbb{Z}_p} \times \text{U}(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$. The mass gap is generated by the symmetry-breaking mean-field fermion bilinear mass term, so Tong’s model [58] would not directly solve the Strong CP problem.
- Our proposal, however, means to access the entire $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}} \equiv \frac{G_{\text{SM}_q} \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_{p'}} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_L \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_{p'}}$ -preserving SMG. Our model is based on the disorder scalar phase of the deformation ((41) and (42)) or the multi-fermion interaction deformation with an appropriate nonperturbative coupling strength ((43) and (44)). With the

criterion that any zero modes trapped in the defects (45) can be gapped by some G -symmetry-preserving deformation, we can assure that our deformation leads to the SMG phase with no mean-field condensate (e.g., $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$) but with disorder configuration under $\int [\mathcal{D}\phi]$ in the path integral.

In particular, for the defects classified by (45), a configuration $\phi \neq 0$ has its core occur at $\phi = 0$. This means that the codimension- $(d+1)$ defects (namely the $D - (d+1)$ -dimensional defects) in the spacetime is classified by $\pi_d(\frac{G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}}{G_{\text{sub}}})$. There are two \mathbb{Z} classes 0d point defects from π_3 , two \mathbb{Z} classes 1d line defects from π_2 , two \mathbb{Z} classes 2d surface defects from π_1 , etc. There are also possible $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$ classes of Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) terms constructed out of π_5 . But our construction demands that the zero modes trapped must be symmetry-preserving gappable. Our construction also needs to forbid the induction of any WZW terms. We can check that these conditions are fulfilled based on the method in [53].

Overall, all these conditions can be satisfied by the 27 Weyl fermion model (38), because it is anomaly-free in $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}}$ and it is in the trivial cobordism class (the anomaly index 0) in $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}})$.

5. In order to use the above model with the SMG mechanism to solve the Strong CP problem, our model must fit all the known constraints from the experiments in Nature, and the QCD lattice numerical simulation.

One major challenge to overcome is that according to Particle Data Group (PDG) [31], the current quark mass m_u of the u quark has $m_u = 2.16$ MeV as an input to the QCD lagrangian at the energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV based on the modified minimal subtraction ($\overline{\text{MS}}$) renormalization scheme. Other current quark masses m_q are also nonzero [31]. (See Table I later in Sec. III C for a summary of mass data.) Some comments about this current quark masses m_q :

- Note that this current quark mass m_q is already a renormalized mass with no divergence by the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, away from the bare quark mass m_0 that potentially suffered from divergence.
- The current quark mass m_q is an input to the lattice QCD lagrangian at the energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV. So the current quark mass m_q can receive contributions from any higher energy UV theory – such as:

- (1). The Higgs condensation $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$ by the electroweak symmetry breaking $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(1)_{\text{EM}}$ happened at a higher energy at the Fermi electroweak scale $E_{\text{EW}} \sim 246$ GeV.
- (2). What we hypothesize is that the SMG also contributes to the current quark mass m_q and the lepton mass, at least for one of three families, or for the new family (e.g., the fourth family) of SM matter content. The SMG happens at much higher energy above the electroweak scale E_{EW} , or happens at the earlier universe before the Higgs condensation $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$.
- (3). However, the current quark mass m_q at $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}}$ receives no contribution from the QCD chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle$. Because at the $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV scale, the QCD chiral symmetry is not yet broken since $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle = 0$, while the $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle \neq 0$ only happens at much lower energy like Λ_{QCD} around 200 MeV.

This lattice QCD evidence on the nonzero current quark mass $m_u \neq 0$ [31] rules out the famous 't Hooft massless u quark solution [2] that requires $m_u = 0$. Because under $\psi \mapsto e^{i\alpha\gamma^5} \psi$, from (32),

$$\alpha_u \partial_\mu J_u^{\mu 5} - \frac{(\bar{\theta} - 2\alpha_u)}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a - \bar{\psi}_u (m_u e^{i2\alpha_u\gamma^5}) \psi_u, \quad (47)$$

once the mean-field mass $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \epsilon \phi_H^* \rangle \neq 0$ or in an appropriate basis $m_u = \lambda_u^D \langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$ is nonzero, due to the nonzero diagonalized Yukawa-Higgs coupling $\lambda_u^D \neq 0$ in (7) and due to the Higgs condensate $\langle \phi_H \rangle \neq 0$, then it is impossible to rotate the $\bar{\theta} - 2\alpha_u = 0$ without introducing the complex phase $e^{i2\alpha_u}$ to the mean-field m_u .

Another way to explain the failure of the massless u quark solution [2] is that under the α_u variation on the above action S in (47), then taking its mean-field expectation $\langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta \alpha_u} \rangle |_{\alpha_u=0}$ (i.e., not taking it as the operators or the equations), we have

$$\langle \partial_\mu J_u^{\mu 5} \rangle = -\frac{2}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle + 2i \langle m_u \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle = -\frac{2}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle + 2i \langle m_u \rangle \langle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle. \quad (48)$$

The evaluation of the vev of $\langle m_u \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle = m_u \langle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle + \langle m_u \rangle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u - \langle m_u \rangle \langle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle$ based on the variational principle on varying $\bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u$ shows that $\langle m_u \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle = \langle m_u \rangle \langle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle$, since the mean-field $\langle m_u \rangle \propto \langle \bar{\psi}_u \gamma_5 \psi_u \rangle \neq 0$ is correlated based on the linear response theory. The extra mean-field current u quark mass $\langle m_u \rangle = m_u$ fails to obey the relation $\langle \partial_\mu J_u^{\mu 5} \rangle \propto \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle$, thus also fails to redefine $\bar{\theta}$ to 0 by the u quark chiral transformation.

However, if we hypothesize that the SMG interactions are involved to give a u quark some non-mean-field mass, then the pertinent terms from SMG (say (43) and (44)) for the u quark include:

$$((\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L)^2 (\bar{u}_R d'_L) + \text{H.c.}) + (\bar{q}_L d_R)(\bar{d}_R q_L) + ((\bar{q}_L d_R)(\bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) + \text{H.c.}) + (\bar{u}_R d'_L)(\bar{d}'_L u_R). \quad (49)$$

Among (49), the term that is transformed up to a phase under the left-handed L or the right-handed R u quark, u_L or u_R , chiral transformation, includes

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L)^2 (\bar{u}_R d'_L) + \text{H.c.}) + ((\bar{q}_L d_R)(\bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) + \text{H.c.}) \\ & \equiv \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi})u_L + \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L + \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi}) + \text{H.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

See the footnote,⁸ where we provide the explicit expression of the four-fermion $\bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi})u_L$ and six-fermion $\bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L + \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi})$ interactions. The $\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi}$ is some two-fermion term, the $\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi}$ is some four-fermion term, and the $\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi}$ is some five-fermion term, written in the footnote 8.

In summary, the analogous lagrangian term of (32) under the u quark's left L and right R chiral transformations ($u_L \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_L} u_L$ and $u_R \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_R} u_R$) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha_{u_L} \partial_\mu J_{u_L}^\mu + \alpha_{u_R} \partial_\mu J_{u_R}^\mu) - \frac{(\bar{\theta} - (-\alpha_{u_L} + \alpha_{u_R}))}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a - m_u (e^{i(\alpha_{u_L} - \alpha_{u_R})} u_R^\dagger u_L + \text{H.c.}) \\ & + g_{\text{SMG}} \left((e^{i(\alpha_{u_L} - \alpha_{u_R})} \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi})u_L + e^{i(\alpha_{u_L} - \alpha_{u_R})} \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L + e^{i(-\alpha_{u_R})} \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi}) + \text{H.c.}) + \dots \right) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The omitted \dots terms are extra terms in (43) and (44) that are invariant under α_{u_L} and α_{u_R} . Under the α_u variation on the above action S in (51), then taking its mean-field expectation $\langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta \alpha_u} \rangle |_{\alpha_u=0}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_\mu J_{u_L}^\mu \rangle &= -\frac{1}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle - (\langle m_u i u_R^\dagger u_L \rangle + \text{H.c.}) + g_{\text{SMG}} (i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi} + \mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L \rangle + \text{H.c.}) \\ \langle \partial_\mu J_{u_R}^\mu \rangle &= +\frac{1}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle + (\langle m_u i u_R^\dagger u_L \rangle + \text{H.c.}) - g_{\text{SMG}} (i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi} + \mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L \rangle + i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi}) \rangle + \text{H.c.}) \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Again $\langle m_u i u_R^\dagger u_L \rangle = \langle m_u \rangle \langle i u_R^\dagger u_L \rangle$ when $m_u = \langle m_u \rangle$ is just a mean-field mass. In this specific Strong CP solution in Sec. III B, we take $m_u = \langle m_u \rangle = 0$. Next we look at the third term on the right-hand side of (52), this term is part of the SMG interaction that gives no mean-field mass, thus $\langle u_R^\dagger u_L \rangle = 0$, same for its linear response $\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi} = \mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi} = 0$. Similarly, other fermion bilinear pairings also have zero mean-field values. Namely, in the schematic SMG deformation (11), we have $\langle \xi_I \psi_J \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \rangle = 0$ but we are left to evaluate the vev of full SMG term $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_J \rangle + \text{H.c.}$.

Once g_{SMG} is turned on, the small $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ starts to gradually develop. In fact, for a wide range of $g_{\text{SMG}} < g_{c,\text{SMG}}$ below the critical SMG strength $g_{c,\text{SMG}}$, the $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ is very small but nonzero. The $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ in general when $g_{\text{SMG}} \neq 0$.

Overall, we have to keep $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ contribution in (52). Eq.(52) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_\mu J_{u_L}^\mu \rangle &= -\frac{1}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} (i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi} + \mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L \rangle + \text{H.c.}) \\ \langle \partial_\mu J_{u_R}^\mu \rangle &= +\frac{1}{64\pi^2} g^2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\mu'\nu'} \langle F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu'\nu'}^a \rangle - g_{\text{SMG}} (i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi} + \mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L \rangle + i \langle \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi}) \rangle + \text{H.c.}) \end{aligned}$$

⁸ Specifically $(\phi(\bar{d}_R q_L + \bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L) + \phi^{\dagger 2} \bar{u}_R d'_L)$ contains the ϕ in $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_{-3,3}$ written in $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ doublet $\phi_{a,a'}$, the \bar{d}_R in $(\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{2,-1}$ written in $SU(2)_R$ doublet $(\bar{d}_{R,1})$, the q_L in $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1,-2}$ written in $SU(2)_L$ doublet (u_L^T) , the \bar{u}_R and d'_L are in $(\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-4,2}$ and $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-2,4}$ as the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ singlet. A pertinent term with u quark is $\phi \bar{d}_R q_L = \epsilon_L^{a,b} \epsilon_R^{a',b'} \phi_{a,a'} \bar{d}_{R,b'} q_{L,b} = \phi_{1,1} \bar{d}_{R,2} q_{L,2} + \phi_{1,2} \bar{d}_{R,1} q_{L,2} + \phi_{2,1} \bar{d}_{R,2} q_{L,1} + \phi_{2,2} \bar{d}_{R,1} q_{L,1} = \phi_{1,1} \bar{d}_{R,2} d_L + \phi_{1,2} \bar{d}_{R,1} d_L + \phi_{2,1} \bar{d}_{R,2} u_L + \phi_{2,2} \bar{d}_{R,1} u_L$. Another pertinent term with u quark is $\phi^{\dagger 2} \bar{u}_R d'_L = (\phi_{1,1} \phi_{2,2} + \phi_{1,2} \phi_{2,1} - \dots)^\dagger \bar{u}_R d'_L$ where we collect the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ singlet representation out of $\phi^{\dagger 2}$.

We can deduce that (49) contains the u quark field explicitly in:

- $(\bar{d}_R q_L)^2 (\bar{u}_R d'_L)$ contains $(\dots (\bar{d}_{R,2} d_L) (\bar{d}_{R,1} u_L) + \dots (\bar{d}_{R,1} d_L) (\bar{d}_{R,2} u_L)) (\bar{u}_R d'_L)$.
- $(\bar{d}_R q_L)(\bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L)(\bar{u}_R d'_L)$ contains $(\dots (\bar{d}_{R,2} d_L) (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,1}) + \dots (\bar{d}_{R,1} d_L) (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,1}) - \dots (\bar{d}_{R,1} u_L) (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,2}) - \dots (\bar{d}_{R,2} u_L) (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,2})) (\bar{u}_R d'_L)$.
- $(\bar{\nu}_R \bar{l}_R + \bar{e}_R l_L)^2 (\bar{u}_R d'_L)$ contains $(\dots (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,2}) (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,1}) + \dots (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,2}) (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,1}) - \dots (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,1}) (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,2}) - \dots (\bar{\nu}_{R,2} \bar{l}_{R,1} + \bar{e}_{R,2} l_{L,1}) (\bar{\nu}_{R,1} \bar{l}_{R,2} + \bar{e}_{R,1} l_{L,2})) (\bar{u}_R d'_L)$.

We collectively gather these terms into (50) as four-fermion $\bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi})u_L$ and six-fermion $\bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi})u_L + \bar{u}_R(\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi})$ interactions.

(53)

Some small SMG multi-fermion interaction condensates $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ that can mildly violate the anomalous current conservation (here $\langle \partial_\mu J_{u_L}^\mu \rangle$ and $\langle \partial_\mu J_{u_R}^\mu \rangle$) when $g_{\text{SMG}} < g_{c,\text{SMG}}$, but violate significantly and nonperturbatively when $g_{\text{SMG}} \geq g_{c,\text{SMG}}$. It will be interesting to compare these SMG multi-fermion interactions with those 't Hooft vertices with multi-fermion insertions [2, 3] in the future. Those $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ contributions have some other physical effects,⁹ but *not* on the Strong CP problem's θ defined in (13)

$$\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + \arg(\det\langle \mathbf{M} \rangle) = \theta + \arg(\det\langle -\frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{L}}{(\delta \xi_I)(\delta \psi_J)} \rangle) = \theta + \arg(\det\langle M \rangle) \quad (54)$$

— because the $\bar{\theta}$ receives a zero contribution from SMG's fermion bilinear $\langle \xi_I \psi_J \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \rangle = 0$. Thus, for now, we can switch gears to show how $\bar{\theta}$ can be set to zero. As long as some of the quarks have their entire mass from no mean-field mass, then $\det\langle M \rangle = 0$. Here in Sec. III B, we assume that the u quark gains its mass only from SMG, but not Higgs mechanism; hence, the mean-field mass eigenvalue for u quark is zero so $\det\langle M \rangle = 0$.

We end up redefining $\bar{\theta}$ by a chiral transformation, with $\det\langle \mathbf{M}(\alpha) \rangle = 0$ still, because the u quark mean-field mass eigenvalue is zero, so

$$\bar{\theta} = \theta - \alpha = 0 \quad (55)$$

is appropriately chosen to be zero. This provides the Strong CP solution: The $\bar{\theta}$ is zero for the entire theory.

The SMG multi-fermion interaction condensates $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J(\alpha) \rangle \neq 0$ has α dependence, and can be nonperturbatively nonzero above $g_{\text{SMG}} \geq g_{c,\text{SMG}}$. This has a consequence on the vortex dual variable of $\bar{\theta}$ in the $\bar{\theta}$ -disordered phase (see [22]). But it does not affect the $\bar{\theta} = 0$ as far as the Strong CP solution is concerned.

C. Constraint and Prediction on the Hadron Data

't Hooft massless u quark solution [2] that requires $m_u = 0$ has been ruled out by the lattice QCD data. So whatever new Strong CP solution that we provide, we must reconcile the lattice QCD data correctly without conflicting with our new Strong CP solution. According to Particle Data Group (PDG) [31], the current quark mass $m_u = 2.16$ MeV is an input to the QCD lagrangian at the energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV based on the modified minimal subtraction ($\overline{\text{MS}}$) renormalization scheme. Other current quark masses m_q are also nonzero, in order to produce the correct hadron mass (e.g. meson such as the pion mass 135 MeV or baryon such as the proton mass 938 MeV) observed at the low energy (say the Λ_{QCD} scale 200 MeV) in Nature confirmed by experiments [31].

In summary of Sec. III B's solution, In the conventional scenario (Table I (a)), all the quarks and other fermions obtain their masses from the Higgs mechanism. In contrast, in Sec. III B's solution scenario (Table I (b)), we hypothesized that the u current quark mass is fully due to SMG, other fermions also obtain a small portion of SMG mass, in addition to the major current mass contribution is from the Higgs mechanism. Namely, in Table I (b), we replace the u current quark mass $m_u = 2.16$ MeV to the u quark SMG mass.

Some of the important energy scales for Table I (b):

1. SMG scale Λ_{SMG} , much higher, like GUT scale or other scales.
2. Electroweak Higgs scale 246 GeV.
3. UV renormalization scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV, the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scale for the lattice QCD.
4. Λ_{QCD} scale 200 MeV.

Below the SMG scale, the multi-fermion interaction gives the set of fermion SMG-induced mass. Below the electroweak Higgs scale, the fermions also obtain the Higgs-induced mass. We note that just like the Higgs scale is not directly equal to the Higgs-induced mass. the SMG scale (say $g_{c,\text{SMG}}$) is not directly equal to the SMG-induced mass. Only below or around the Λ_{QCD} scale, the confinement happens and the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle \neq 0$ kicks in. Then the hadrons form and get about 98% of their mass from the confinement, while only a few 2% is from the Higgs mechanism and possibly also some from the SMG mechanism (Table I (b)). However, the lattice QCD lagrangian input is at $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV, which is way above the Λ_{QCD} scale, so the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle = 0$ at $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}}$ and does not contribute to the initial input of the lattice QCD lagrangian. In fact, the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}_q \psi_q \rangle \neq 0$ is generated spontaneously under the RG flow from running $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV to Λ_{QCD} scale in the lattice QCD simulation.

⁹ We expect to find physical observables related to $\langle \xi_I \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J \rangle \neq 0$ in the dual variable of $\bar{\theta}$ in the SMG disordered side of the story along the discussion in [22].

quark	current quark mass m_q	Higgs contribution	SMG contribution
u	2.16 MeV	All	No
d	4.67 MeV		
c	1.27 GeV		
s	93.4 MeV		
t	172.69 GeV		
b	4.18 GeV		
lepton	lepton mass m_q	Higgs contribution	SMG contribution
e	0.511 MeV	All	No
μ	105.66 MeV		
τ	1776.86 MeV		

quark	current quark mass m_q	Higgs contribution	SMG contribution
u	2.16 MeV	0	2.16 MeV
d	4.67 MeV	$4.67 \text{ MeV} - m_d^{\text{SMG}}$	m_d^{SMG}
c	1.27 GeV	Higgs condensation make up the non-SMG part	No SMG required, but still possible.
s	93.4 MeV		
t	172.69 GeV		
b	4.18 GeV		
lepton	lepton mass m_q	Higgs contribution	SMG contribution
e	0.511 MeV	$0.511 \text{ MeV} - m_e^{\text{SMG}}$	m_e^{SMG}
μ	105.66 MeV	Higgs condensation makes up the remains	No SMG required
τ	1776.86 MeV		

TABLE I. (a) The conventional mass-generating mechanism is attributed to the Higgs mechanism, see Fig. 1. (b) On the left-hand side of the table, the current quark mass m_q from [31] is based on fitting the quark mass as an input to the QCD lagrangian under $\overline{\text{MS}}$ at the energy scale 2 GeV for the lattice simulation, in order to produce the correct hadron mass (e.g. meson such as the pion mass 135 MeV or baryon such as the proton mass 938 MeV) observed at the low energy (say the Λ_{QCD} scale 200 MeV) in Nature confirmed by experiments. On the right-hand side of the table, we show the portion of the Higgs contribution (Fig. 2's red color) and the portion of the hypothetical SMG contribution (Fig. 2's blue color).




FIG. 1. A schematic plot on the Higgs-induced contribution (red) to quark and lepton masses in Table I(a). This data is meant to compare with the current quark mass of the lattice QCD lagrangian input at the RG energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2 \text{ GeV}$.




FIG. 2. A schematic plot on the SMG-induced (blue) and Higgs-induced (red) contribution to quark and lepton masses in Table I(b). This data is meant to compare with the current quark mass of the lattice QCD lagrangian input at the RG energy scale $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2 \text{ GeV}$. The SMG-induced contribution to a part of some generation of quark and lepton masses implies that we need to modify the conventional QCD lagrangian to include the SMG interaction term $\xi_i \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J$ into the UV lagrangian. In the scenario presented here, although the fermions u , d , and e receive SMG-induced mass from the same SMG interaction term, their SMG-induced masses do *not* need to be in the same value. Their SMG-induced masses depend on the multi-fermion-pairing structure of the SMG interaction term $\xi_i \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG},IJ} \psi_J$ (see the related discussion in [22]).

Falsifiable prediction: We can make a falsifiable test of our proposal. Suppose we start with a modified QCD and SM plus SMG lagrangian, and start with the mean-field current quark mass $m_u = 0$ at $E_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 2$ GeV, we can still have the SMG-induced mass for the u quark and other fermions. Then we predict that running the simulation in terms of this Table I (b) scenario, we could still reproduce the correct hadron spectrum at low energy to match the experimental data (say pion mass 135 MeV or proton mass 938 MeV). Although this simulation is a very challenging task, if this is indeed verified numerically, it will give a support to the Sec. III B's solution.

Other challenges: If u quark does get involved in a multi-fermion interaction to gain its SMG mass, it means that at high enough energy, the nonperturbative multi-fermion interaction will gradually dominate over the asymptotic free behavior of quarks. The good news for this nonperturbative multi-fermion interaction is that it gives another falsifiable prediction at higher energy that modifies the asymptotic freedom at much deeper UV. The bad news is that experiments already rule out any physics deviated from the QCD asymptotic freedom at least for energy as high as 10 TeV. QCD is a very good description of quarks at least to 10 TeV or even higher. This means that the Λ_{SMG} has to be higher if this scenario works.

Variants of scenarios: Even if the Sec. III B's solution (on the first family of fermions get SMG-induced mass) scenario fails, theoretically we could still propose some modification of similar kinds. Another theoretical solution is that a hypothetical fourth family of quarks and leptons get the SMG-induced mass. Some comments are this scenario:

- It could be that the fourth family of fermions get the full SMG-induced mass. (It is less likely any fourth family of fermions receives Higgs-induced mass, because that would cause observable effects on the Higgs channel that should be already tested and observed.)
- The fourth family of fermions should however get a large SMG-induced mass larger than the mass scale that has been tested. So the mass scale of the fourth family of fermions should be in principle larger than t quark mass above 173 GeV or TeV scales.
- The fourth family of quarks must couple to the same $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ strong force so that those quarks can absorb $\bar{\theta}$ away into the complex phase of its zero mean-field mass. (Namely, as emphasized previously, we must have at least one of the quarks receive its mass only from SMG but not from Higgs. We may as well just have the full fourth family of fermions get the full SMG-induced mass.) But this also implies some possible channels on the gluon-gluon interaction to observe of the evidence fourth family of quarks. This shall be a falsifiable statement with more phenomenological constraints.

In fact, because we directly apply the SMG scenario to at least one family of the chiral fermion sector of the SM, the phenomenological constraints (regardless known or unknown to the contemporary experiments) may more easily falsify or rule out all the models presented in Sec. III. If all these theoretical proposals are not favored by phenomenology, we can still propose another type of new scenario, in the next Sec. IV, to hide the SMG mechanism in the SMG-induced gapped mirror fermion sector.

IV. SECOND SOLUTION: SYMMETRIC GAPPED MIRROR FERMION

Our second SMG solution to the Strong CP problem is meant to be more flexible to fit experimental constraints. We will however still provide only the general strategy, but will not seek for the SM phenomenological fitting here. Here are step-by-step constructions and highlights of this solution, schematically shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4:




FIG. 3. (a) Our model has a chiral SM and a mirror SM sharing the same gauge group G_{SM_p} , placed on two domain walls, left-handed L on $y = -w$ or right-handed R on $y = w$ respectively shown on a spatial manifold (e.g., two ends of a 5d regularizable manifold $\mathcal{M}^4 \times I_y^1$). The \mathcal{M}^4 contains the 4d spacetime t, x_1, x_2, x_3 coordinates, while the I_y^1 contains the extra finite-width fifth-dimensional y coordinate. The cause of a chiral SM and a mirror SM is due to fermion doubling. But the mirror SM is eventually gapped by SMG. Thus the fermion doubler is removed by SMG and not observed at low energy. In the limit when the SM $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ gauge field is treated as background gauge field, the 5d theory is gapped, either a trivial gapped vacuum or a topological field theory at low energy. (b) The Higgs condensation profile (red curve) becomes dominant at the energy scale Λ_H but becomes exponentially small when going into the bulk ($+\hat{y}$ direction). On the other hand, the SMG strength becomes dominant at a higher energy scale Λ_{SMG} , also it becomes exponentially small when going into the bulk ($-\hat{y}$ direction). The horizontal axis labels the bulk direction, while the vertical axis labels both the energy scale and also schematically the strength of (Higgs condensate or SMG) interaction terms. In principle, it is preferred that the Higgs and SMG dynamics do not interfere with each other in any spacetime region (i.e., the red and blue curves do not both have nonzero values at the same region). However, even if the Higgs condensation and SMG interfere at the same spacetime region, as long as the SMG does not generate any mean-field mass as Higgs condensation does, we can still maintain our solution of the Strong CP problem to the low energy (IR below the Λ_H scale).

1. Dictated by the **Nielsen-Ninomiya (NN) fermion-doubling** [73], typically a chiral fermion theory with a UV completion on a Planck scale or lattice regularization can suffer from the mirror fermion doubling, which renders the full theory vector-like instead of being chiral. **Domain wall fermions** — The chiral and mirror fermions localized on the two domain walls are related to the lattice domain wall fermion construction [74], thus there is a UV completion of these models on a lattice [50–58]. It could be helpful to regard the 4d chiral SM and 4d mirror SM as two 4d boundaries of a 5d topological field theory with a finite-width extra bulk dimension, see Fig. 3.¹⁰ But because we are

¹⁰ For each 4d complex Weyl fermion with a $U(1)$ charge k global symmetry $\psi_L \mapsto e^{ik\alpha}\psi_L$, the 4d Weyl fermion theory is a 4d boundary of a 5d bulk partition function

$$\mathbf{Z}_5^{U(1)} \equiv \exp(i((k^3 \int_{M^5} A c_1^2) + \frac{k}{48} \text{CS}_3^T(\text{PD}(c_1)))). \quad (56)$$

This is a 5d iTFT evaluated on a 5d manifold M^5 that captures the cubic pure gauge $U(1)^3$ with a k^3 coefficient and mixed gauge-gravity $U(1)$ -(gravity)² anomalies with a k coefficient. In the SM, the anomaly is related to $U(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}^3$ and mixed gauge-gravity $U(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$ -(gravity)². The A is the $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2} U(1) \equiv \text{Spin}^c$ gauge field. The gravitational Chern-Simons 3-form is $\text{CS}_3^T M^3 \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^3=\partial M^4} \text{Tr}(\omega d\omega + \frac{2}{3}\omega^3) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^4} \text{Tr}(R(\omega) \wedge R(\omega))$ where M^3 is evaluated as a boundary ∂M^4 , while ω is the 1-connection of tangent bundle TM and $R(\omega)$ is the Riemann curvature 2-form of ω . In (56), we take $M^3 = \text{PD}(c_1)$ to be a 3-manifold Poincaré dual (PD) to the degree-2 first Chern class c_1 on the 5d M^5 . On a closed oriented M^4 , we further have $\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^4} \text{Tr}(R(\omega) \wedge R(\omega)) = 2\pi \int_{M^4} p_1(TM) = 2\pi \cdot 3\sigma$, where p_1 is the first Pontryagin class of TM and the σ is the M^4 's signature. Overall, the 5d term eq. (56) descends from a 6d anomaly polynomial on M^6 at the $U(1)$ -valued $\theta = 2\pi$: $\exp(i\theta((\int_{M^6} \frac{k^3}{2} c_1^3) + \frac{k}{16} \sigma(\text{PD}(c_1))))$. If we have an appropriate number of Weyl fermions (e.g., 8 left-moving and 8 right-moving in the 16-fermion SM), the anomaly coefficient in (56) cancels. This means that we need no 5d bulk. If we do not require any $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$ symmetry, then the 15-fermion SM can also have no anomaly (because then $A = 0$ and $c_1 = 0$ in eq. (56)), that also requires no 5d bulk. One can also write the $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ version of 5d Chern-Simons type theory of (56), but the 4d SM has no anomaly from the spacetime Spin and internal $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ symmetry. So that 5d bulk is trivial and not presented.




FIG. 4. The relations between the energy scale E and the Sec. IV's Strong CP solution $\bar{\theta}_3 = \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ imposed by \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} above the SMG scale, are explained in the main text. Since the energy scale $E \sim t_{\text{period}}^{-1}$ is inverse of the time scale t_{period} , this shows a schematic time evolution of some of the processes of this quantum universe from the early universe to the later universe.

dealing with a particular *anomaly-free* 4d SM, it is not entirely important nor necessary to have a 5d bulk, because the 5d bulk topological field theory becomes a trivial gapped vacuum.

Let us denote the left-handed and right-handed Weyl fermions as, ψ_L and ψ_R on the domain wall (say, at an extra-dimensional coordinate $y = -w$ of Fig. 3 (a)), while ψ'_L and ψ'_R on the mirror domain wall (at $y = +w$ of Fig. 3 (a)). Let us denote the F and F' as the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ field strength on the domain wall and the mirror domain wall respectively. Then we clarify the \mathbb{Z}_2^{P} parity symmetry, the \mathbb{Z}_2^{R} reflection symmetry, and the combined generalized \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} parity-reflection symmetry as *active* transformations acting on *fields*:

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{P}} : \psi_L(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi_R(t, -x_j), \quad \psi_R(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi_L(t, -x_j), \quad F \wedge F(t, x_j) \mapsto -F \wedge F(t, -x_j). \quad (57)$$

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{R}} : \psi_L(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi'_L(t, x_j), \quad \psi_R(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi'_R(t, x_j), \quad F \wedge F(t, x_j) \mapsto F' \wedge F'(t, x_j). \quad (58)$$

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{PR}} : \psi_L(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi'_R(t, -x_j), \quad \psi_R(t, x_j) \mapsto \psi'_L(t, -x_j), \quad F \wedge F(t, x_j) \mapsto -F' \wedge F'(t, -x_j). \quad (59)$$

The domain wall fermion construction (like Fig. 3) is similar but somehow different from the Parity Solution [16–18]. In the sense that the domain wall fermion has the chiral and mirror fermions respecting the combined generalized \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} parity-reflection symmetry. The \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} is a discrete spacetime symmetry, which, in terms of a *passive* transformation that acts on the *coordinates*, mapping the spatial coordinates:

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{PR}} : x \equiv (t, x_1, x_2, x_3, y) \mapsto x'_R \equiv (t, -x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -y). \quad (60)$$

For example, in Fig. 3 (a), one domain wall with chiral fermions at $y = -w$ and another domain wall with mirror fermions at $y = +w$ are mapped to each other under the reflection \mathbb{Z}_2^{R} (without flipping x_1, x_2, x_3) and the parity-reflection \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} (flipping also x_1, x_2, x_3). In contrast, the generalized parity symmetry in the Parity Solution [16–18] is typically a combined *spatial* parity symmetry with an *internal* discrete \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry that exchanges the two copies of the SM gauge group.

In fact, the original chiral fermion $\psi_L(x)$ and the mirror doubling $\psi'_R(x)$ are parity-reflection PR paired with each other under the *active* \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} transformation:

$$\psi_L(x) \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{PR}}} \text{PR} \psi_L(x) \text{R}^{-1} \text{P}^{-1} = \psi'_R(x'_R). \quad (61)$$

In Fig. 3(a), this PR symmetry sends the chiral fermion SM theory (left-handed L) on one domain wall A to the mirror fermion theory (mirror SM', right-handed R) on another domain wall B, along the y -axis via $y \leftrightarrow -y$. For illustration, we can imagine such a full PR-invariant vector-like system with two 4d domain walls placed on a finite-width strip (a two-brane model in a finite-width 5th dimension, on a 5d smooth triangulable manifold $\mathcal{M}^4 \times I_{x_4}^1$) as Fig. 3(a) shows.

2. Energy scales and parity-reflection PR symmetry:

In Fig. 4, we suggest that different physics are dominated at different energy scales E :

- (1). Near the Planck scale $M_P \sim 10^{19}\text{GeV}$, the PR must be dynamically gauged or explicitly broken due to the quantum gravity no-global-symmetry argument.
- (2). For $M_P > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$, the preserved \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry dictates the chiral SM and mirror SM are mapped into each other under the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} -symmetry. Then the $\bar{\theta}_3$ of SM and the $\bar{\theta}'_3$ of the mirror SM' has the constraint: $\bar{\theta}'_3 = -\bar{\theta}_3$, so that $\bar{\theta}_3 + \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ for the full theory. Since the full theory couples to the same $\mathfrak{su}(3)$, we may simply rotate to $\bar{\theta}_3 = \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$. So the Strong CP problem is solved at this stage.
- (3). For $\Lambda_{\text{SMG}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$, when the mirror SM is gapped at Λ_{SMG} , the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry is spontaneously broken.¹¹ Crucially the whole SMG process has the SM internal $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ symmetry preserved, thus we only need the same single copy of SM gauge group (without doubling the SM gauge group in the mirror sector).
- (4). For $E \leq \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$, the electroweak Higgs condensation and CKM matrix become crucial.

Below we will clarify more on the reasonings in depth.

3. Total Strong CP angle $\bar{\theta}_3 + \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ at UV: Let us first explain why the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry imposes

$$\frac{\theta_3}{8\pi^2} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F] + \frac{\theta'_3}{8\pi^2} \text{Tr}[F' \wedge F'] = 0 \quad \text{by} \quad \theta'_3 = -\theta_3. \quad (62)$$

The F and F' are the same kind of gauge fields (SM's $\mathfrak{su}(3)$) on the two domain walls on $y = -w$ and $y = w$. Next we will also explain why $\theta_3 + \theta'_3 = 0$.

Theta term in the parent theory: The parent theory can include a generic θ term (in particular, hereafter we mean $\theta = \theta_3$) with the field strength F and F' on two domain walls as

$$\frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}^4} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F] \Big|_{y=-w} + \frac{\theta'}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}'^4} \text{Tr}[F' \wedge F'] \Big|_{y=w}. \quad (63)$$

One domain wall has its 4d spacetime \mathcal{M}^4 , the other has its 4d spacetime \mathcal{M}'^4 . This 4d spacetime can be generally curved manifolds, where the $\mathcal{M}^4 \sqcup \overline{\mathcal{M}'^4} = \partial\mathcal{M}^5$ as the two boundaries of a 5d bulk manifold \mathcal{M}^5 , with the overline $\overline{\mathcal{M}'^4}$ implying the orientation reversal \mathcal{M}'^4 . For the specific configuration in Fig. 3 (a), we can choose $\mathcal{M}^4 = \mathcal{M}_{\text{space}}^3 \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{time}}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}'^4 = \mathcal{M}_{\text{space}}^3 \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{time}}^1$, where the 1d time $\mathcal{M}_{\text{time}}^1$ is shared and the $\mathcal{M}_{\text{space}}^3 \sqcup \overline{\mathcal{M}_{\text{space}}^3}$ is the boundary of a 4-dimensional strip or a cylinder. The generic θ and θ' vacua violate the R, C, P, and RP symmetries, if we treat the gauge fields on both domain walls distinctly.

However, the gauge fields from F and F' on both sides are the same gauge field, so we could even combine the effects into a combined theta term in the limit when the width w is small:

$$\frac{\theta + \theta'}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}^4} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F]. \quad (64)$$

In this case, we have to consider a finite-width strip as Fig. 3 (a), while \mathcal{M}^2 is identified as \mathcal{M}'^2 in the spacetime integration range.

Impose the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{PR}} \equiv \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{P}}$ parity-reflection symmetry on the theta term: If we impose the PR symmetry on the parent theory with chiral and mirror fermions and with the $\theta + \theta'$ term in (64) (above the energy $E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$), then the PR symmetry in (59) demands that the θ term on the domain wall on \mathcal{M}^4 maps to the θ' term on the domain wall on \mathcal{M}'^4

$$\frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}^4} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F(t, x_j)] \Big|_{y=-w} \mapsto \frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}'^4} -\text{Tr}[F' \wedge F'(t, -x_j)] \Big|_{y=w} = \frac{-\theta}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}'^4} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F(t, x_j)] \Big|_{y=w}. \quad (65)$$

¹¹ If the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} is dynamically gauged (such as $E \sim M_P$ due to the quantum gravity reasoning on no global symmetry), then the ‘‘gauge symmetry’’ is not a physical global symmetry, but a gauge redundancy (that many seemly distinct states are indeed the same state in the Hilbert space), thus the gauged \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} rigorously cannot be ‘‘spontaneously broken.’’ The modern quantum interpretation of ‘‘spontaneously broken discrete gauge symmetry’’ can be found in [75] and references therein. The quantum gravity interpretation of ‘‘spontaneously broken discrete parity-like symmetry’’ can be found in [76].

Note that the right-hand side also defines the $\frac{\theta'}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}^4} \text{Tr}[F' \wedge F']|_{y=w}$ term constrained by the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry on \mathcal{M}^4 . Thus, the PR symmetry for the full parent theory implies that $\theta' = -\theta$ in (64),

$$\theta + \theta' = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\theta + \theta'}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}^4} \text{Tr}[F \wedge F] = 0. \quad (66)$$

Namely (63) and (64) vanishes.

UV theory with $\bar{\theta}_3 + \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$: Moreover, to respect a \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry for an energy $E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$ (or likely within $M_{\text{P}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$), we must demand a full parent field theory with an action that maps back to itself under \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} :

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{PR}} : S_{\text{UV}} = \int dt d^3x (\mathcal{L}_{\text{UV}}(t, x_j, -w) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{UV}}(t, x_j, w)) \mapsto S_{\text{UV}} \quad (67)$$

with its Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\text{UV}}(x, y, t)$ on $y = -w$ and $y = w$ at UV. This implies that the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry is preserved at some UV scale, for the fermion doubling, all field contents, the kinetic, theta, and interaction terms in the Lagrangian at $y = -w$ and $y = w$, at least kinematically.

Without even assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), the imposed \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry demands the UV theory (67) satisfying $\theta = -\theta'$ and $\arg(\det M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}) = -\arg(\det M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^{\prime*} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}^{\dagger})$ in general. So all together $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' = 0$.

Note that (1) the chiral fermions on \mathcal{M}^4 and the mirror fermions on \mathcal{M}'^4 have the opposite chirality, and (2) their chiral symmetries (with the opposite chiralities on the two domain walls) coupled to the same $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ gauge field, the chiral U(1) symmetry transformation will rotate $\bar{\theta} \mapsto \bar{\theta} + \alpha$ and $\bar{\theta}' \mapsto \bar{\theta}' - \alpha$ oppositely, but keeps the $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \mapsto \bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}'$ invariant.

Because the above two reasons, this means that the PR $\equiv \mathcal{P}$ symmetry at the parent theory solves the zero theta angle problem at a high energy, since $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' = 0$ and the chiral transformation with an appropriate α like (18) allows us to choose both $\bar{\theta} = \theta - \alpha = 0$ and $\bar{\theta}' = \theta' + \alpha = 0$.

4. We avoid Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion-doubling to solve the *nonperturbative chiral fermion problem* [73] via SMG, by lifting the mirror SM fermion doubling spectrum to a finite energy gap Λ_{SMG} larger than the electroweak scale $\Lambda_{\text{EW}} \sim 246\text{GeV}$, leaving only the SM chiral fermion theory at the low energy (so to agree with phenomenology). The criteria to fully gap the mirror doubling via SMG through a *symmetric deformation of QFT* [56, 77, 78] is that the QFT of G_{SM_p} is fully anomaly-free (or in the zeroth G_{SM_p} -cobordism class) — luckily Ref. [69–72] checked all local or global anomalies of SM vanish in G_{SM_p} . We had done the same analysis in Sec. III B. Just like Sec. III B, we can use the modification of [57, 58]’s model to deform a gapless mirror SM to a featureless fully gapped mirror sector.

- (1). *15n or 16n Weyl-fermion SM and mirror SM:* We could consider the three-family $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ SM with the 15 or 16 left-handed Weyl fermions (in eq. (1))

$$(\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R) \oplus n_{\nu_R} \bar{\nu}_R$$

per family on one domain wall, including the right-handed neutrino or not, $n_{\nu_j} \in \{0, 1\}$. We like to gap the mirror SM with the right-handed Weyl fermion

$$(\bar{d}'_L \oplus l'_R \oplus q'_R \oplus \bar{u}'_L \oplus \bar{e}'_L) \oplus n_{\nu_R} \bar{\nu}'_L$$

but in the same $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ representation on the other domain wall. Note that chiral SM and mirror SM are only mapped onto each other under \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry transformation; each particle has its own anti-particle under the charge conjugation C.

We follow the Razamat-Tong model [57] to embed the 15 (or 16) Weyl-fermion SM into the 27 Weyl-fermion with the following fermion matter content (36) by introducing additional vector-like theory (3 right-handed and 3 left-handed Weyl fermions, in the second and third rows of (36)).

Following the Tong model [58], we can find an enlarged symmetry (37) $G_{\text{SM-LR}_{p,p'}} \equiv \frac{G_{\text{SM}_q} \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_{p'}} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_L \times \text{U}(1)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_{p'}}$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_R \equiv \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_L \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_R$ such that the 27-fermion representation in (36) becomes

chiral SM $\psi (\bar{d}_R \oplus l_L \oplus q_L \oplus \bar{u}_R \oplus \bar{e}_R \oplus \bar{\nu}_R) \oplus \bar{d}'_R \oplus l'_L$ or
mirror SM $\psi'_M (\bar{d}'_L \oplus l'_R \oplus q'_R \oplus \bar{u}'_L \oplus \bar{e}'_L \oplus \bar{\nu}'_L) \oplus \bar{d}''_L \oplus l''_R :$

$$\sim ((\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{2,-1} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_{-3,3} \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1,-2} \oplus (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-4,2} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{6,-6} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{0,-3}) \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{-2,4} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{3,0}. \quad (68)$$

The chiral fermion multiplet is ψ , while the mirror fermion multiplet is ψ'_M . (In the first line of (68), the prime ' field is meant to indicate the extra addition to the original SM content (1). While in the second line of (68), the last prime is meant to indicate the field's mirror doubling partner.) See footnote 7, for the left and right notations, we use the italic font L and R to denote that of spacetime symmetry, while use the text font L and R for that of internal symmetry.

(2). *Gapping 15n vs 16n Weyl-fermion mirror SM:*

- If we only preserve G_{SM_p} , then without or with the sterile neutrino $\bar{\nu}_R = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0$ (namely, 15 or 16 Weyl fermions per family) can lead to a short-range entangled SMG phase (without any low energy TQFT).
- However, if we preserve not only G_{SM_p} but also some $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$ symmetry, either we need a 16n Weyl-fermion model to achieve SMG, or we need a 15n Weyl-fermion model plus SGTO with a low energy TQFT [72, 79] to achieve a symmetric gapped phase.

5. Mean-field vs non-mean-field SMG gapping:

Mean-field gapping: Notice both Razamat-Tong model [57] and Tong model [58] propose certain SMG gapping terms, however there are either mean-field condensates [58] or generic complex coupling coefficients [57] — those make solving the Strong CP problem by Razamat-Tong or Tong's SMG deformation [57, 58] either difficult or impossible.¹²




FIG. 5. A schematic plot on the Higgs-induced contribution to SM's quark and lepton masses in Table I(a) (shown in the red color) while the SMG-induced mirror SM's quark and lepton masses entirely (shown in the blue color). The SMG-induced mirror SM's mass gap the fermion doubling completely hidden at UV, so only the original chiral SM is observed at low energy.

Non-mean-field gapping: In contrast, in Sec. III B, we already propose the non-mean-field multi-fermion interactions in (43) and (44) that can gap one generation of quarks and leptons. Then here we just need to apply the same non-mean-field multi-fermion interactions to gap the three generations of the mirror fermions. This mirror fermion gapping implies the mass spectrum like Fig. 5.

6. Solve the Strong CP problem $\bar{\theta}_3 = \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ from UV to IR:

Earlier we had explained that the imposed \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry makes the UV theory (67) with no Strong CP angle because $\bar{\theta}_3 = \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ at that $M_P > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$ scale.

¹² We had explained in Sec. III B why the mean-field condensates $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ fails to solve the Strong CP problem.

Here we explain why the smooth confinement deformation of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetrized SM's model in [57] is also difficult to solve the Strong CP problem. First, one introduces three copies of [57, 58]'s model with family indices $I, J \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and a new $SU(2)' \times SU(2)'' \times SU(2)'''$ gauge theory. Precisely, for the supersymmetrized $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral multiplets of (68) denoted in their superfield forms D, L, Q, U, E, D', L', N , their supersymmetric \mathcal{W} potential has three family mixing:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{UV} &= \lambda_{IJ}^U D^I D^J U^J + \lambda_{IJ}^Q L^I D^J Q^J + \lambda_{IJ}^D D^I N^J D'^J + \dots, \\ \mathcal{W}_{IR} &= \lambda_{IJ}^U \tilde{U}^I U^J + \lambda_{IJ}^Q \tilde{Q}^I Q^J + \lambda_{IJ}^D \tilde{D}^I D'^J + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Each $SU(2)$ couples to one of three families of an extended internal $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_1} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_2} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_3}$ symmetry of the $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ SM, which guarantees the mirror SM to reach the fully gapped SMG phase by the s-confinement once $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_1} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_2} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_3}$ are dynamically gauged. Any θ of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_1} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_2} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_{R_3}$ can be also removed by the chiral and mirror sectors imposed by the \mathbb{Z}_2^{R} symmetry, so $\theta = -\theta' = 0$. But there is another worry that any complex coefficient λ_{IJ} etc. in the superpotential can affect the $\bar{\theta}_3$.

Even if any $\lambda_{IJ} \in \mathbb{C}$ is rotated away via $\lambda_{IJ} \equiv U_{IJ}^\dagger \lambda_{IJ}^{\text{diag}} U_{IJ}^\dagger$, we need to further ask whether this basis redefinition by U rotation results in any analogous CKM matrix to the quarks coupling to $\mathfrak{su}(2)_R$ or $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L$. In general, there are too many complex coefficients in the [57]'s model. Generally, the complex coefficients in [57]'s model violate the CP and T symmetry, thus the Strong CP problem cannot be solved directly within [57].

However,

- (1) at the lower energy $E < \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$, the dominant SMG interaction only occurs at the mirror fermion sector;
 - (2) while even at a further lower energy $E < \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$, the dominant Higgs condensation only occurs at the original chiral fermion sector.
- both cases mean to “spontaneously” breaks the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry at IR (see footnote 11). Once \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} is broken at low energy, one may be worried that both $\bar{\theta}_3$ and $\bar{\theta}'_3$ can be deviated from zeros. We need to argue why $\bar{\theta}_3$ and/or $\bar{\theta}'_3$ stays close to zero at IR.

Similar to the argument of the UV parent theory, now at low energy IR, we include the generalized mass matrix M_{total} that

$$\langle M_{\text{total}} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \langle M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & \langle M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle M \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (70)$$

that includes the mean-field mass matrix $M = \langle M \rangle$ as well as the multi-fermion interaction type of SMG that offers no mean-field mass $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0$. The computation of the $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}'$ for the full theory with the total fermion mass M_{total} contribution of the whole system is:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' &\equiv \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det \langle M_{\text{total}} \rangle) \\ &\equiv \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det \langle M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle) + \arg(\det \langle M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle) \\ &= \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det \langle M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \cdot \det \langle M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle) \\ &= \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det(\langle M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \cdot \langle M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle)) \\ &= \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det(\langle M \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle M \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} g_{\text{SMG}}^* \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle)). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Here are some comments concerning the $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}'$ of the whole system at different energy scales E :

(1). $M_{\text{P}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$:

- Without even assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), the imposed \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry demands the UV theory (67) satisfying $\theta = -\theta'$ and $\arg(\det M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}) = -\arg(\det M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}})$ in general.
- Moreover, at this high energy scale $M_{\text{P}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$ at UV, there is no mean-field condensation yet (neither SM Higgs nor the SMG's $\xi_{\text{I}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_{\text{J}}$ condenses yet. So $\langle M \rangle = \langle M' \rangle = 0$ within $M_{\text{P}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$. In fact $\langle \xi_{\text{I}} \psi_{\text{J}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \rangle = 0$ is always strictly zero).
- Assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), then $\arg(\det \langle M + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle) = -\arg(\det \langle M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle) = 0$ is strictly zero within $M_{\text{P}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$. An appropriate chiral transformation α like (18) allows us to choose both $\bar{\theta} = 0$ and $\bar{\theta}' = 0$.

(2). $\Lambda_{\text{SMG}} > E > \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$: Below and around the SMG scale, the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry is “spontaneously” broken due to the SMG interaction $\langle \xi_{\text{I}}' \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi'_{\text{J}} \rangle \neq 0$ on the mirror fermion sector, but $\langle \xi_{\text{I}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \psi_{\text{J}} \rangle = 0$ on the original SM sector (also strictly $\langle \xi_{\text{I}} \psi_{\text{J}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \rangle = \langle \xi_{\text{I}}' \psi'_{\text{J}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG,IJ}} \rangle = 0$ always for non-mean-field SMG).

- Without even assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), we can still read that $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' = \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det(M M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} M'^{\dagger} + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} M + g_{\text{SMG}} g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}}))$. Ref. [22] argues that in terms of the configuration in Fig. 3 (b), the most dominant mass term in (71) is from $g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} M$.
- Assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \equiv \theta + \theta' + \arg(\det(\langle M \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}}^* \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle M \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} g_{\text{SMG}}^* \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle))$. Because $E > \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$, Higgs does not yet condense in the SM sector, so $\langle M \rangle = 0$, also $\langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = 0$.

(3). $E < \Lambda_{\text{EW}}$: Below and around Λ_{EW} , the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry is further “spontaneously” broken, because the Higgs induces $\langle M \rangle \neq 0$ on the SM sector.

- Without even assuming the mean-field interpretation of the theta angle in (13), Ref. [22] argues that in terms of the configuration in Fig. 3 (b), the most dominant mass term in (71) is from $g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}} M$. The Higgs-induced mass M is in the chiral fermion sector, while the SMG-induced mass with operator $g_{\text{SMG}}^* \mathcal{O}'_{\text{SMG}}$ is in the mirror fermion sector. Different mass-generating mechanisms on the chiral and mirror sector may give a generic complex nonzero phase.

However, because the SMG multi-fermion interaction and disorder scalar interaction are highly irrelevant operators at IR. The lower the energy, the weaker effects are these interactions on the IR correction of θ . There gives another

reason that the IR correction to our UV solution $\bar{\theta} = 0$ is extremely small.

- *Assuming the mean-field interpretation* of the theta angle in (13) which implies (71). Then, Higgs condense $\langle M \rangle \neq 0$ in the SM sector, but others have no mean-field values $\langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}^{\dagger} \rangle = 0$. Thus (71) only contains $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \equiv \theta + \theta'$ while the $(\langle M \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle M'^{\dagger} \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}}'^* \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}^{\dagger} \rangle \langle M \rangle + g_{\text{SMG}} g_{\text{SMG}}'^* \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}} \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_{\text{SMG}}^{\dagger} \rangle) = 0$.

As long as $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \equiv \theta + \theta' = 0$ at UV as (66) set by \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} , our solution has a smaller or zero $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \approx 0$ at IR, even better than the higher-loop calculation arguments given in Parity Solution [16–18]. Because Ref. [16–18] requires only the Higgs mechanism, thus Higgs mixing on both the chiral and mirror sectors can generate complex phases at the higher-order quantum corrections beyond the tree-level semiclassical analysis. Here instead we have two mechanisms in our solution: Higgs mechanism dominates on the chiral sector and the SMG dominates on the mirror sector, and there is *no mean-field mass matrix mixing* to generate quantum corrections to $\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}' \approx 0$.

We can take any fermion (here any mirror fermion) that receives its entire mass from SMG and do a chiral transformation with an appropriate α like (18) allows us to choose both $\bar{\theta} = \theta - \alpha \approx 0$ and $\bar{\theta}' = \theta' + \alpha \approx 0$ even including the IR correction. Theoretically this Scenario in Sec. IV provides a candidate Strong CP solution.

V. CONCLUSION AND COMPARISON TO OTHER STRONG CP SOLUTIONS

To conclude, let us summarize and compare the two SMG-based Strong CP solutions, of Sec. III and Sec. IV, with other well-known Strong CP solutions.

First Solution: Symmetric Mass Gap within the Chiral Fermion:

1. The first solution in Sec. III is related to the SMG modification of **'t Hooft massless u quark solution** [2]. In 't Hooft solution [2], if any of the quark ψ (say u quark) has no mean-field nor Higgs mass, then we can do the chiral transformation on this quark ψ alone to rotate the θ away but without gaining a complex phase in the mean-field mass matrix (since there is no mean-field mass for ψ). This sets $\bar{\theta} = 0$. Our SMG version in Sec. III modifies the 't Hooft solution by allowing the SMG-induced non-mean-field mass on the u quark and a set of G -symmetry anomaly-free fermions. For the SM example, we can take $G = G_{\text{SM},p} \equiv (\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)_Y)/\mathbb{Z}_p$, $p = 1, 2, 3, 6$ with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$.
2. The first solution in Sec. III is also related to the SMG modification of **Peccei-Quinn axion solution** [10–13]. In the weakly gauge limit or global symmetry limit of G , the Peccei-Quinn solution can be regarded as an “approximate symmetry breaking” solution (see footnote 6) that uses the mean-field Yukawa-Higgs symmetry breaking mass term. The arbitrariness of $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ can be relaxed by the symmetry-breaking dynamics to $\theta \simeq 0$. The fluctuation around a fixed $\theta = 0$ gives a low-energy Goldstone mode or an axion. The transition from the mean-field mass to the interacting SMG mass in Sec. III is analogous to the phase transition between the *ordered* phase and the *disordered* phase — for example, the famous superfluid-to-insulator type of phase transition in the condensed matter [30].

Second Solution: Symmetric Gapped Mirror Fermion:

We have combined four physics together to build our second model in Sec. IV:

- (i) *Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion-doubling* [73] imposes a discrete spatial parity-reflection \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry between the chiral SM and mirror SM.
- (ii) *Strong CP problem* is solved by respecting the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry so $\bar{\theta}_3 = \bar{\theta}'_3 = 0$ for the chiral and mirror SM.
- (iii) SMG gaps the mirror SM fermion doubler to leave only a chiral SM at low energy, which also solves the Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion-doubling and chiral fermion problems altogether.
- (iv) *Parity-reflection \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} symmetry is maximally broken* in the weak force due to gapping out the mirror fermion, which also gives a reason for parity violation in the weak force [80].

We compare our second model with other previously proposed Strong CP solutions. One class of solutions is based on imposing discrete CP [14, 15] or P symmetries [16–18, 81]:

1. Nelson-Barr [14, 15] starts with a CP invariant theory then spontaneously breaks the CP.
2. Barr-Chang-Senjanovic [18] implements the left-right model [82] or two copies of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R$ for the weak force, and imposes a diagonal symmetry mixing between the discrete CP or P and the discrete *internal* symmetry exchanges the left and right $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Typically, the gauge group needs to be doubled at least for the weak force (so $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R$).
3. In comparison, our second solution in Sec. IV is still different from all of the above — we impose the discrete parity-reflection spatial symmetry \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} only due to Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion doubling [73] between the energy $M_P > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$, but without imposing any extra discrete *internal* symmetry. The gauge group in principle needs not to be doubled, see for example the analogous 1+1d toy model does not double the gauge group [22]. However, it turns out that the convenient SMG deformation of the SM [57, 58] naturally happens to introduce $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R$.

In comparison, our second model is still different from all of the above — we respect a discrete reflection R symmetry only due to Nielsen-Ninomiya fermion doubling between the energy $M_P > E > \Lambda_{\text{SMG}}$, also we keep the original chiral SM gauge group with *only* a single $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L$, *not* the vector-like left-right model, *nor* need two copies of the gauge group.

In addition to the SM, our second Strong CP solution also works for other chiral fermion model (e.g., Georgi-Glashow [83] or flipped $\mathfrak{su}(5)$ [84]) and for the vector-like (e.g., Pati-Salam $\mathfrak{su}(4) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{su}(2)_R$ [85] or left-right [82]) models, by imposing the \mathbb{Z}_2^{PR} then gapping the mirror fermion sector via SMG.

One predictive signature of both SMG-based models, in Sec. III and Sec. IV, is that even if we turn off the conventional SM Higgs or SM gauge interactions, some SM fermions or mirror fermions can still be highly interacting, mediated through hypothetical direct multi-fermion or disordered mass-field interactions.

If our *theoretical solutions* in Sec. III and Sec. IV turn out to be also favored as valid *phenomenological solutions* to the Strong CP problem, then this implies that the fermions in our Nature can indeed be *more interacting* among fermions themselves than what we used to think of in the SM.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

JW especially thanks Yuta Hamada for the precious collaboration on [86], for several crucial discussions at the initial stage, and for various conversations during the development of this project. JW also thanks William Detmold, Daniel Jafferis, Dmitri Kharzeev, Zohar Komargodski, Matthew Reece, Matthew Strassler, Edward Witten, and Yi-Zhuang You for very helpful conversations. JW appreciates the generous feedback from many participants of Harvard CMSA Phase Transitions and Topological Defects in the Early Universe workshop (August 2-5, 2022) and Generalized Global Symmetries, Quantum Field Theory, and Geometry (September 19-23, 2022). JW is supported by Harvard University CMSA.

-
- [1] A.A. Belavin, Alexander M. Polyakov, A.S. Schwartz, and Yu.S. Tyupkin, “Pseudoparticle Solutions of the Yang-Mills Equations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **59**, 85–87 (1975).
- [2] Gerard ’t Hooft, “Symmetry Breaking Through Bell-Jackiw Anomalies,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 8–11 (1976).
- [3] Gerard ’t Hooft, “Computation of the Quantum Effects Due to a Four-Dimensional Pseudoparticle,” *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 3432–3450 (1976), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 18, 2199 (1978)].
- [4] C. A. Baker *et al.*, “An Improved experimental limit on the electric dipole moment of the neutron,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 131801 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ex/0602020](#).
- [5] M. Tanabashi *et al.* (Particle Data Group), “Review of Particle Physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 030001 (2018).
- [6] J. H. Smith, E. M. Purcell, and N. F. Ramsey, “Experimental limit to the electric dipole moment of the neutron,” *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 120–122 (1957).
- [7] C. Abel *et al.*, “Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081803 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11966 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [8] Michael Dine, “TASI lectures on the strong CP problem,” in *Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics (TASI 2000): Flavor Physics for the Millennium* (2000) pp. 349–369, [arXiv:hep-ph/0011376](#).
- [9] Anson Hook, “TASI Lectures on the Strong CP Problem and Axions,” *PoS TASI2018*, 004 (2019), [arXiv:1812.02669 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [10] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440–1443 (1977).
- [11] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1791–1797 (1977).
- [12] Steven Weinberg, “A New Light Boson?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223–226 (1978).
- [13] Frank Wilczek, “Problem of Strong P and T Invariance in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279–282 (1978).
- [14] Ann E. Nelson, “Naturally Weak CP Violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **136**, 387–391 (1984).
- [15] Stephen M. Barr, “Solving the Strong CP Problem Without the Peccei-Quinn Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 329 (1984).
- [16] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “CP Violation in Seesaw Models of Quark Masses,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1079 (1989).
- [17] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “A Solution to the Strong CP Problem Without an Axion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 1286 (1990).
- [18] Stephen M. Barr, D. Chang, and G. Senjanovic, “Strong CP problem and parity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 2765–2768 (1991).
- [19] Nathaniel Craig, Isabel Garcia Garcia, Giacomo Koszegi, and Amara McCune, “P not PQ,” *JHEP* **09**, 130 (2021), [arXiv:2012.13416 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] Juven Wang and Yi-Zhuang You, “Symmetric Mass Generation,” (2022), [arXiv:2204.14271 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [21] Gerard ’t Hooft, “Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking,” *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories. Proceedings, Nato Advanced Study Institute, Cargese, France, August 26 - September 8, 1979*, *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **59**, 135–157 (1980).
- [22] Juven Wang, “CT or P Problem and Symmetric Gapped Fermion Solution,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 125007 (2022), [arXiv:2207.14813 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] Stephen L. Adler, “Axial vector vertex in spinor electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2426–2438 (1969).
- [24] J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, “A PCAC puzzle: $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ in the σ model,” *Nuovo Cim.* **A60**, 47–61 (1969).
- [25] David Tong, “Line Operators in the Standard Model,” *JHEP* **07**, 104 (2017), [arXiv:1705.01853 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] Seth Koren, “A Note on Proton Stability in the Standard Model,” (2022), [arXiv:2204.01741 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] Juven Wang, Zheyuan Wan, and Yi-Zhuang You, “Proton Stability: From the Standard Model to Ultra Unification,” (2022), [arXiv:2204.08393 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] Ofer Aharony, Nathan Seiberg, and Yuji Tachikawa, “Reading between the lines of four-dimensional gauge theories,” *JHEP* **08**, 115 (2013), [arXiv:1305.0318 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] Zheya Wan, Juven Wang, and Yunqin Zheng, “Higher anomalies, higher symmetries, and cobordisms II: Lorentz symmetry extension and enriched bosonic / fermionic quantum gauge theory,” *Ann. Math. Sci. Appl.* **05**, 171–257 (2020), [arXiv:1912.13504 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [30] Matthew P. A. Fisher, Peter B. Weichman, G. Grinstein, and Daniel S. Fisher, “Boson localization and the superfluid-insulator transition,” *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 546–570 (1989).
- [31] “<https://pdg.lbl.gov/2022/tables/rpp2022-sum-quarks.pdf>,” .
- [32] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Edward Witten, “Symmetric Gapped Interfaces of SPT and SET States: Systematic Constructions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031048 (2018), [arXiv:1705.06728 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.06728).
- [33] Y.-Z. You, Z. Wang, J. Oon, and C. Xu, “Topological number and fermion Green’s function for strongly interacting topological superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 060502 (2014), [arXiv:1403.4938 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4938).
- [34] Yichen Xu and Cenke Xu, “Green’s function Zero and Symmetric Mass Generation,” *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2103.15865](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15865) (2021), [arXiv:2103.15865 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15865).
- [35] Yoichiro Nambu, “Quasiparticles and Gauge Invariance in the Theory of Superconductivity,” *Phys. Rev.* **117**, 648–663 (1960).
- [36] Yoichiro Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, “Dynamical Model of Elementary Particles Based on an Analogy with Superconductivity. 1.” *Phys. Rev.* **122**, 345–358 (1961).
- [37] J. Goldstone, “Field Theories with Superconductor Solutions,” *Nuovo Cim.* **19**, 154–164 (1961).
- [38] Jeffrey Goldstone, Abdus Salam, and Steven Weinberg, “Broken Symmetries,” *Phys. Rev.* **127**, 965–970 (1962).
- [39] Philip W. Anderson, “Plasmons, Gauge Invariance, and Mass,” *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 439–442 (1963).
- [40] F. Englert and R. Brout, “Broken Symmetry and the Mass of Gauge Vector Mesons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 321–323 (1964).
- [41] Peter W. Higgs, “Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 508–509 (1964).
- [42] T. Senthil, “Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases of Quantum Matter,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **6**, 299–324 (2015), [arXiv:1405.4015 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.4015).
- [43] Edward Witten, “Fermion Path Integrals And Topological Phases,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 035001 (2016), [arXiv:1508.04715 \[cond-mat.mes-hall\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.04715).
- [44] Xiao-Gang Wen, “Zoo of quantum-topological phases of matter,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 041004 (2017), [arXiv:1610.03911 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.03911).
- [45] Nathan Seiberg, “Exact results on the space of vacua of four-dimensional SUSY gauge theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 6857–6863 (1994), [arXiv:hep-th/9402044](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9402044).
- [46] N. Seiberg, “Electric - magnetic duality in supersymmetric nonAbelian gauge theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **435**, 129–146 (1995), [arXiv:hep-th/9411149](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9411149).
- [47] Lukasz Fidkowski and Alexei Kitaev, “Topological phases of fermions in one dimension,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075103 (2011).
- [48] Lukasz Fidkowski and Alexei Kitaev, “Effects of interactions on the topological classification of free fermion systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 134509 (2010).
- [49] Estia Eichten and John Preskill, “Chiral Gauge Theories on the Lattice,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B268**, 179–208 (1986).
- [50] Xiao-Gang Wen, “A lattice non-perturbative definition of an $SO(10)$ chiral gauge theory and its induced standard model,” *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **30**, 111101 (2013), [arXiv:1305.1045 \[hep-lat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1305.1045).
- [51] Juven Wang and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Non-Perturbative Regularization of 1+1D Anomaly-Free Chiral Fermions and Bosons: On the equivalence of anomaly matching conditions and boundary gapping rules,” (2013), [arXiv:1307.7480 \[hep-lat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.7480).
- [52] Yizhuang You, Yoni BenTov, and Cenke Xu, “Interacting Topological Superconductors and possible Origin of $16n$ Chiral Fermions in the Standard Model,” (2014), [arXiv:1402.4151 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4151).
- [53] Yi-Zhuang You and Cenke Xu, “Interacting topological insulator and emergent grand unified theory,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 125147 (2015), [arXiv:1412.4784](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.4784).
- [54] Yoni BenTov and A. Zee, “Origin of families and $SO(18)$ grand unification,” *Phys. Rev.* **D93**, 065036 (2016), [arXiv:1505.04312 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.04312).
- [55] Juven Wang and Xiao-Gang Wen, “A Solution to the 1+1D Gauged Chiral Fermion Problem,” *Phys. Rev.* **D99**, 111501 (2019), [arXiv:1807.05998 \[hep-lat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.05998).
- [56] Juven Wang and Xiao-Gang Wen, “A Non-Perturbative Definition of the Standard Models,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023356 (2020), [arXiv:1809.11171 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.11171).
- [57] Shlomo S. Razamat and David Tong, “Gapped Chiral Fermions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 011063 (2021), [arXiv:2009.05037 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.05037).
- [58] David Tong, “Comments on Symmetric Mass Generation in 2d and 4d,” (2021), [arXiv:2104.03997 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.03997).
- [59] David Tong and Carl Turner, “Notes on 8 Majorana Fermions,” (2019), [10.21468/SciPostPhysLectNotes.14, arXiv:1906.07199 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.07199).
- [60] Edward Witten, “The ”Parity” Anomaly On An Unorientable Manifold,” *Phys. Rev.* **B94**, 195150 (2016), [arXiv:1605.02391 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.02391).
- [61] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Edward Witten, “Symmetric Gapped Interfaces of SPT and SET States: Systematic Constructions,” *Phys. Rev.* **X8**, 031048 (2018), [arXiv:1705.06728 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.06728).
- [62] Zheyuan Wan and Juven Wang, “Adjoint QCD_4 , Deconfined Critical Phenomena, Symmetry-Enriched Topological Quantum Field Theory, and Higher Symmetry-Extension,” *Phys. Rev.* **D99**, 065013 (2019), [arXiv:1812.11955 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11955).
- [63] Clay Cordova and Kantaro Ohmori, “Anomaly Obstructions to Symmetry Preserving Gapped Phases,” (2019), [arXiv:1910.04962 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.04962).
- [64] Clay Cordova and Kantaro Ohmori, “Anomaly Constraints on Gapped Phases with Discrete Chiral Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 025011 (2020), [arXiv:1912.13069 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.13069).
- [65] Michael DeMarco and Xiao-Gang Wen, “A Novel Non-Perturbative Lattice Regularization of an Anomaly-Free 1 + 1d Chiral $SU(2)$ Gauge Theory,” (2017), [arXiv:1706.04648 \[hep-lat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04648).

- [66] Meng Zeng, Zheng Zhu, Juven Wang, and Yi-Zhuang You, “Symmetric Mass Generation in the 1+1 Dimensional Chiral Fermion 3-4-5-0 Model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 185301 (2022), [arXiv:2202.12355 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [67] Juven Wang, “CT or P Problem and Symmetric Gapped Fermion Solution,” (2022), [arXiv:2207.14813 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [68] Daniel S. Freed and Michael J. Hopkins, “Reflection positivity and invertible topological phases,” arXiv e-prints , [arXiv:1604.06527](#) (2016), [arXiv:1604.06527 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] Inaki Garcia-Etxebarria and Miguel Montero, “Dai-Freed anomalies in particle physics,” *JHEP* **08**, 003 (2019), [arXiv:1808.00009 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [70] Joe Davighi, Ben Gripaios, and Nakarin Lohitsiri, “Global anomalies in the Standard Model(s) and Beyond,” *JHEP* **07**, 232 (2020), [arXiv:1910.11277 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [71] Zheyuan Wan and Juven Wang, “Beyond Standard Models and Grand Unifications: Anomalies, Topological Terms, and Dynamical Constraints via Cobordisms,” *JHEP* **07**, 062 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14668 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [72] Juven Wang, “Anomaly and Cobordism Constraints Beyond the Standard Model: Topological Force,” (2020), [arXiv:2006.16996 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [73] Holger Bech Nielsen and M. Ninomiya, “No Go Theorem for Regularizing Chiral Fermions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **105**, 219–223 (1981).
- [74] David B. Kaplan, “A method for simulating chiral fermions on the lattice,” *Physics Letters B* **288**, 342–347 (1992).
- [75] Ruben Verresen, Umberto Borla, Ashvin Vishwanath, Sergej Moroz, and Ryan Thorngren, “Higgs Condensates are Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases: I. Discrete Symmetries,” (2022), [arXiv:2211.01376 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [76] Jacob McNamara and Matthew Reece, “Reflections on Parity Breaking,” (2022), [arXiv:2212.00039 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [77] Nathan Seiberg, ““Thoughts About Quantum Field Theory”,” (Talk at Strings 2019) (2019).
- [78] Juven Wang, Zheyuan Wan, and Yi-Zhuang You, “Cobordism and Deformation Class of the Standard Model,” (2021), [arXiv:2112.14765 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [79] Juven Wang, “Ultra Unification,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 105024 (2021), [arXiv:2012.15860 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [80] T. D. Lee and Chen-Ning Yang, “Question of Parity Conservation in Weak Interactions,” *Phys. Rev.* **104**, 254–258 (1956).
- [81] Anson Hook, “Anomalous solutions to the strong CP problem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 141801 (2015), [arXiv:1411.3325 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [82] G. Senjanovic and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **12**, 1502 (1975).
- [83] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, “Unity of All Elementary Particle Forces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 438–441 (1974).
- [84] Stephen M. Barr, “A New Symmetry Breaking Pattern for SO(10) and Proton Decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **112**, 219–222 (1982).
- [85] Jogesh C. Pati and Abdus Salam, “Lepton Number as the Fourth Color,” *Phys. Rev.* **D10**, 275–289 (1974), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 703(1975)].
- [86] Yuta Hamada and Juven Wang, “Flavor Hierarchy from Smooth Confinement,” (2022), [arXiv:2209.15244 \[hep-ph\]](#).