

Spontaneous CP Violation and Flavor Changing Neutral Currents in Minimal SO(10)

Xiyuan Gao  ^{†1}

[†] Institute for Theoretical Particle Physics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT),
Wolfgang-Gaede-Str. 1, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany

Abstract

We explore spontaneous CP violation (SCPV) in the minimal non-supersymmetric SO(10) grand unified theory (GUT), with a scalar sector comprising a CP-even 45_H , a 126_H , and a complex 10_H . All renormalizable couplings are real due to CP symmetry, and the Kobayashi-Maskawa phase arises solely from complex electroweak vacuum expectation values. The model requires an additional Higgs doublet fine-tuned below 500 GeV and constrains new Yukawa couplings, linking certain flavor-violating (FV) processes. Future proton decay observations may reveal correlated FV decay ratios, offering insights into minimal SO(10).

arXiv:2412.00196v1 [hep-ph] 29 Nov 2024

¹xiyuan.gao@kit.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Minimal CP Invariant SO(10) Grand Unification Theory	3
2.1	Yukawa Sector	4
2.2	Scalar Spectrum	5
2.3	The Low Energy Theory	7
3	Phenomenology	9
3.1	Is the Theory Safe?	9
3.2	A Window to Check SO(10)	10
4	Conclusion and Discussion	15
A	Mixing Matrix	17
B	Hadronic Elements	18

1 Introduction

SO(10) grand unification theory (GUT) [1] is one of the most appealing paradigms to understand the Standard Model (SM) of elementary particles and unveil new physics beyond it. Strong and electroweak interactions are successfully unified in renormalizable SO(10) theories without requiring light scalars [2, 3], due to the intermediate scales related to left-right (LR) [4, 5] or quark-lepton (QL) [6] symmetries. Proton decay is predicted, and the upper limit of proton lifetime is calculable, at least in certain minimal scenarios [7, 8]. Furthermore, SO(10) is a complete theory for matter unification. A family of SM Fermions plus a right-handed neutrino fit exactly into the spinor representation 16_F of SO(10). That explains the seemingly mysterious anomaly cancellation and charge quantization [9, 10].

Meanwhile, testing SO(10) is highly challenging. Technically, the direct energy scale of all realistic experiments can never reach the unification scale of about 10^{15} GeV. An alternative approach is to search the hints at low energy, because matter unification implies quarks and leptons behave somewhat similarly. Much effort is focused on numerically fitting the Fermion masses and mixing angles, such as [11–14]. However, in our view, these fitted central values should be regarded as predictions, because no uncertainties can be identified. For the realistic renormalizable SO(10) GUTs², no robust and discriminative results are found till now. Clearly, we need more flavour observables to test SO(10). The difficulty is, that SO(10) GUT itself does not require any new sub-TeV particles to mediate flavour transition.

We choose to specify the general SO(10) theory, by taking all its renormalizable couplings real. It leads to a more concise theory with fewer free parameters. CP symmetry, the combined transform of charge conjugation C and parity P, is enhanced in this limit. CP now serves as a fundamental symmetry of nature [15], neglecting gravitational effects [16]. The CP-odd Kobayashi-Maskawa phase [17] of weak interactions derives only from the complex vacuum expectation values (VEV) [18]. CP symmetry is spontaneously violated, in the sense that the physical solution does not respect CP symmetry although the Lagrangian does. SCPV is not possible in pure SM, because one can always rotate the CPV phase of the electroweak VEV away, using $U(1)_Y$ gauge redundancy [19, 20]. In unified theories, the VEVs for SO(10) or intermediate symmetry breaking sometimes get a physical phase, but the low energy theories are almost indistinguishable with the explicit CPV one. Such high scale SCPV is widely discussed in the literatures [21–25].

²We always take the non-supersymmetric (non-SUSY) framework.

Interestingly, we notice high scale SCPV is impossible in minimal renormalizable $SO(10)$, whose scalar sector only contains a CP-even 45_H , an 126_H and a complex 10_H [26, 27]. The 126_H field indeed contains a large complex VEV, but similar to SM, its phase is also unphysical. SCPV is possible and *only* possible together with electroweak symmetry breaking, requiring an additional light Higgs doublet. The new doublet is already contained in 126_H or 10_H , but its mass must be fine-tuned towards the electroweak scale [28, 29], just like the SM Higgs doublet. Bearing the fine-tuning, we arrive at a theory without decouple limit. Perturbative unitarity requires the new scalars lie below about 500 GeV [30]. The low energy theory becomes very similar to what T. Lee originally proposed [18]. The difference is that Yukawa-type couplings are more constrained than the general two-Higgs doublet models (2HDM) [19], because of the LR and QL symmetry of $SO(10)$.

Electroweak scale SCPV has been somehow overlooked in the past, partly due to the unavoidable flavour changing neutral currents (FCNC) [31]. But strictly speaking, the model is on the edge but not ruled out yet [29, 30], because completely eliminating FCNC is not necessary. We treat FCNC as key predictions and advocate greater efforts to measure a set of flavour violating (FV) observables with higher precision, including charged lepton flavour violation (cLFV), neutral meson oscillation, and heavy resonances decaying into FV final states at colliders. These signals do not just shed light on a new Higgs doublet, but also provide more flavour observables related by $SO(10)$. Considering proton decay branching ratios, we have more observables than free parameters. If the FV and proton decay signals are both precisely measured in near future, we will either get a strong hint on minimal CP-conserving $SO(10)$, or directly disprove it.

Our work is structured as follows. In Section 2, we revisit the minimal realistic $SO(10)$ theory and discuss its Yukawa Sector in the limit of CP symmetry. Then, we intuitively show why the scalar spectrum for electroweak scale SCPV contains light 2HDM. Following this, we derive the low energy theory at weak scale and specify its predictions. A more detailed phenomenological analysis is provided in Section 3. We firstly explain why the theory is not excluded, and then show how to test it by comparing the relative strength of a set of experimental observables. Finally, our findings and further discussions are summarized in Section 4.

2 Minimal CP Invariant $SO(10)$ Grand Unification Theory

Three generations of Fermionic representation $16_F = (Q_L, u_R, d_R) + (\ell_L, \nu_R, e_R)$ contain all quarks, leptons, and right-handed neutrinos. Then, how many new scalar fields must be included in a realistic $SO(10)$ theory? For realistic Fermions masses, the simplest choice is a complexified 10_H and 126_H [26]. Neither 10_H nor 126_H can directly break $SO(10)$ down to the SM gauge group $G_{\text{SM}} = SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. The minimal path is using an additional 45_H to firstly break $SO(10)$ to some intermediate groups, then reduce its rank with 126_H , and finally get G_{SM} [27]. Although potentially within the swampland, where the perturbative expansion lies around the edge of breaking down [32, 33], we still choose one 45_H , 126_H and a complexified (two real) $10_H = (10_H^1 + i10_H^2)/\sqrt{2}$ as the minimal scalar sector for a renormalizable $SO(10)$ GUT. The symmetry breaking chain is:

$$\begin{aligned}
SO(10) \times CP &\xrightarrow[M_{\text{GUT}}]{\langle(1,1,1,0)\rangle \in 45_H} SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times CP \\
&\xrightarrow[M_R]{\langle(1,1,3,1)\rangle \in 126_H} SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times CP \\
&\xrightarrow[M_W]{\langle(1,2,2,0)\rangle \in 126_H, 10_H} SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{\text{EM}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ quantum numbers are shown in the parenthesis. Alternatively, the intermediate symmetry can also be $SU(4)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_R \times CP$, while the other Pati-Salam type breaking patterns are not possible with the minimal scalar sector [3, 34],

unless adding more steps. If one defines the CP transform for the scalar particles as (with the SO(10) indices implicit):

$$45_H \rightarrow 45_H, \quad 126_H \rightarrow \overline{126}_H, \quad 10_H \rightarrow 10_H^*, \quad (2)$$

all couplings are restricted real. Furthermore, the vacuum of the adjoint representation 45_H is real. 126_H is a complex representation, but its vacuum expectation value (VEV) $\langle(1, 1, 3, 1)\rangle$ can always be chosen to be real by a phase redefinition [27]. As a result, it is impossible to break CP symmetry at high scales with the scalar sector defined in Eq 2. In this work, we will not discuss about other alternative definitions of CP symmetry, which may allow pure imaginary couplings. While as a remark, it has been discussed in [21] that with an extended scalar of a complex (one CP even, one CP odd) 45_H , C and CP break together at GUT scale. Whatever, within the minimal SO(10) scenario discussed here, the only possible VEV with a physical phase is from the Higgs $\langle(1, 2, 2, 0)\rangle$. CP is spontaneously violated, only together with electroweak symmetry breaking.

Spontaneous CP violation gives two degenerate vacua, leading to domain wall solutions, a disaster for cosmology [35]. A natural way out of the domain wall problem is requiring symmetry non-restoration in the very early universe, when the temperature $T \gtrsim M_W$ [36–38]. Unfortunately, such mechanism is not realistic with only two light Higgs doublets [39]. To keep CP non-restoration at high temperature, one needs at least a third light Higgs doublet, which requires another fine tuning. A more common solution to the domain wall problem is adding a tiny CP-odd perturbation (often called as biased term) to the Lagrangian, so the domain wall is unstable and collapse quickly after its formation [35, 40, 41]. Such a biased term may derive from effective operators due to quantum gravity, which is expected to violate all global symmetries [16, 42]. The biased term solution is what we choose in this work. In other words, we assume the renormalizable minimal SO(10) theory itself respects CP symmetry exactly. While all the unknown physics beyond grand unification, such as quantum gravity, can break CP but have only negligible effects on the low energy theory, except for destabilizing domain walls. The gravitational waves (GW) of domain wall collapse can serve as a smoking gun for electroweak scale discrete symmetry broken, but the amplitudes are in general quite small. For potential GW signals, we refer to [43, 44].

2.1 Yukawa Sector

The SO(10) invariant Yukawa Sector reads [23, 27, 45]:

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = Y_{10} 16_F 10_H 16_F + \tilde{Y}_{10} 16_F 10_H^* 16_F + Y_{126} 16_F \overline{126}_H 16_F + \text{h.c.} \quad (3)$$

Y_{10} , \tilde{Y}_{10} and Y_{126} are 3×3 symmetric matrices according to SO(10) algebra [46], and with the Hermitian condition imposed by CP symmetry, all the elements of Y_{10} , \tilde{Y}_{10} and Y_{126} are real [23]. As 10_H is a complex representation, 10_H and 10_H^* are independent degrees of freedom, and \tilde{Y}_{10} is in general non-zero. This is different from the scenarios with additional symmetries like $U(1)_{PQ}$ [26], relaxing the potential constraints from Fermions masses and mixing angles fit [11]. Both 126_H and 10_H contain two Higgs doublets Φ^u and Φ^d . So, there are in total four Higgs doublets (though not all light) in the generic basis: $\Phi^i = (\Phi_{10}^d, \tilde{\Phi}_{10}^u, \Phi_{126}^d, \tilde{\Phi}_{126}^u)$, where $\tilde{\Phi} = i\sigma_2 \Phi^*$. For simplicity, absorbing all common normalization factors into the Yukawa couplings ($Y_{10} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} Y_{10}$, $\tilde{Y}_{10} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \tilde{Y}_{10}$, $Y_{126} \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} Y_{126}$ [23]), the Higgs-Fermions interaction reads:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_Y \supset & \overline{Q}_L (Y_{10} \Phi_{10}^d - \tilde{Y}_{10} \tilde{\Phi}_{10}^u + Y_{126} \Phi_{126}^d) d_R + \overline{Q}_L (Y_{10} \Phi_{10}^u + \tilde{Y}_{10} \tilde{\Phi}_{10}^d + Y_{126} \Phi_{126}^u) u_R \\ & + \overline{\ell}_L (Y_{10} \Phi_{10}^d - \tilde{Y}_{10} \tilde{\Phi}_{10}^u - 3Y_{126} \Phi_{126}^d) e_R + \overline{\ell}_L (Y_{10} \Phi_{10}^u + \tilde{Y}_{10} \tilde{\Phi}_{10}^d - 3Y_{126} \Phi_{126}^u) \nu_R \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\nu}_R^c Y_{126} \Delta_R^0 \nu_R + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\ell}_L^c Y_{126} \Delta_L \ell_L + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Φ^i can develop non-zero complex VEVs: $v_i = (v_{10}^d, v_{10}^{u*}, v_{126}^d, v_{126}^{u*})$, spontaneously breaking CP together with the electroweak symmetry. The electroweak VEV is defined as $v^2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^4 |v_i|^2 = (246 \text{ GeV})^2$, neglecting small tadpole-induced VEVs of the scalar $SU(2)_L$ triplets ($Y = 0, 1$) in $45_H, 126_H$. Δ_R^0 is the neutral component of the $SU(2)_R$ triplet in 126_H , and its large VEV $\langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle = \langle (1, 1, 3, 1) \rangle$ provides right-handed neutrino masses. Δ_L is the $SU(2)_L$ triplet, also contributes to neutrino masses via Type-II seesaw.

The mass matrices for down-type quarks, up-type quarks, charged leptons, and neutrinos $M_D, M_U, M_E, M_{\nu L}$ can be derived from Eq 4:

$$\begin{aligned} M_E &= Y_{10} v_{10}^d - \tilde{Y}_{10} v_{10}^{u*} - 3Y_{126} v_{126}^d, & M_{\nu R} &= \frac{1}{2} Y_{126} \langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle, \\ M_D &= Y_{10} v_{10}^d - \tilde{Y}_{10} v_{10}^{u*} + Y_{126} v_{126}^d, & M_{\nu D} &= Y_{10} v_{10}^u + \tilde{Y}_{10} v_{10}^{d*} - 3Y_{126} v_{126}^u, \\ M_U &= Y_{10} v_{10}^u + \tilde{Y}_{10} v_{10}^{d*} + Y_{126} v_{126}^u, & M_{\nu L} &= -M_{\nu D}^T M_{\nu R}^{-1} M_{\nu D} + \frac{1}{2} Y_{126} \langle \Delta_L \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

As all Yukawa couplings are real, the non-zero phases of these Fermions mass matrices could only come from v_i , as the only source of CP violation. When $\tilde{Y}_{10} = 0$, M_E, M_D, M_U are linear dependent and thus could be simultaneously diagonalized if neglecting the all quark mixing angles [47]. Numerical fitting shows that this scenario is realistic even considering neutrino oscillation data [11, 13]. However, it is worthy to point out that this is not the intrinsic prediction of SO(10) as it requires additional global symmetries. In general, three Fermions mass matrices (or three Yukawa couplings $Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10}, Y_{126}$) are not all diagonal and should be parameterized with:

$$\begin{aligned} M_D &= D^* m_D D^\dagger, & M_U &= U^* m_U U^\dagger, & M_E &= E^* m_E E^\dagger, & M_{\nu L} &= N^* m_{\nu L} N^\dagger, \\ V_{\text{CKM}} &= U^\dagger D, & V_{\text{PMNS}} &= E^\dagger N, & V_E &= E^\dagger D. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$m_D, m_U, m_E, m_{\nu L}$ are diagonal matrices containing the physical masses for quarks and leptons. V_{CKM} is the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix and V_{PMNS} is the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) neutrino mixing matrix. Thanks to SO(10) algebra, the symmetric $Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10}, Y_{126}$ requires that the mixing matrices for left-handed or right-handed Fermions are the same, so the unknown physical matrix is merely V_E . In comparison, the general Yukawa potential with four Higgs doublets contains 16 independent general 3×3 coupling matrices, instead of just three real symmetric ones in Eq 4. This tells us that the flavour structure for Fermion-scalar interactions of minimal realistic SO(10) are strongly constrained at tree level, accounting for an important prediction of matter unification itself.

Does Eq 5 predict anything more? One may expect so because there are only 21 physical free parameters (taking one of the VEVs real, and one of the Yukawas diagonal) determining all SM flavour observables. Numerical analysis was performed in exactly the same scenario [23], and the best-fit solutions were found. However, those should not be interpreted as predictions, because no uncertainties can be quantified. Assuming one finds a million data points consistent with the SM Fermions masses and mixing angles, it still only represents a negligible part of the 21-dimension parameter space (10^{-15} , conservatively assuming 10 points can sample each dimension). Clearly, some (semi-)analytical analysis is required, and we have explored this approach. Unfortunately, we find no robust constrains at the end, and some details are shown in Appendix A. The main difficulty is that $M_{\nu L}$ depends on the mass matrices *non-linearly*, as a result of the seesaw mechanism. With some approximations, we find the mixing angles of V_E can range from zero to large values similar to the neutrino mixing angles. In addition, the VEVs also appear poorly constrained. Although we cannot rule out some potential undiscovered relationships, Eq 5 alone does not seem to yield robust predictions. SO(10) may leave clues about Fermions masses and mixing angles, but they are deeply hidden.

2.2 Scalar Spectrum

The natural mass scale of all non-chiral particles in minimal SO(10) is M_{GUT} , due to the large VEV of 45_H . Clearly, the naturalness criterion fails here, because the SM Higgs boson mass is




Figure 1: Geometrical illustration of spontaneous CP violation together with $U(1)_Y$, based on the planar diagram of T.Lee [18] (FIG-1). The 'Mexican Hat'-like potential itself has rotation ($U(1)_Y$) and reflection (CP) symmetries, but the stable physical solution doesn't, when the balls fall into the valleys and the spring is relaxed. The light-red ball implies there is a mirror solution $\theta \rightarrow -\theta$, and nature has to choose one as the true vacuum. The $\theta = 0$ state is invariant under reflection, but not stable. It's a local maximum, because the string is contracted and the total energy of the system increases.

125 GeV, much lighter than M_{GUT} . It has been realized for a long time, that electroweak scale SCPV requires two light Higgs doublets and double fine-tuning [28]. This is a model-independent result, and we gave a geometric illustration in Figure 1, based on the planar diagram of T. Lee [18] (FIG-1). The 'Mexican Hat'-like potential has rotation ($U(1)_Y$) and reflection (CP) symmetries, but they are broken when the spring-connected two balls fall into the valleys. As shown with the orange and dark-red balls, the true vacuum of the system corresponds to the state when the balls are at the bottom of the valleys and the spring is fully relaxed. A mirror vacuum solution is illustrated with the light-red ball, corresponding to $\theta \rightarrow -\theta$. These two degenerate solutions are separated by a local maximum, the $\theta = 0$ state. This is because the spring is contracted when $\theta = 0$, increasing energy of the whole system. As a result, although the $\theta = 0$ state preserves reflecting (CP) symmetry, it's not the stable solution of the system. Nature has to choose the true vacuum between the $\pm\theta$ states, spontaneously breaking CP symmetry. The rotation redundancy of the whole system corresponds to the Goldstone mode of $U(1)_Y$ broken G^0 . The massive degrees of freedoms can be identified as two radical modes of oscillating in the valleys h and H , and one axial mode vibrating along the spring A . The values of the masses are the corresponding oscillation frequencies. Within a perturbative theory, that valley curvature and the spring elastic coefficient are both bounded from above, by roughly the squared distance between the two peaks (in natural units). Therefore, we have a perturbative unitarity bound in analog to the single Higgs boson case [48]:

$$\sum_{h,H,A} \omega_{\text{osci}}^2 = m_h^2 + m_H^2 + m_A^2 \lesssim M_{\text{LQT}}^2 = (700 \sim 800 \text{ GeV})^2. \quad (7)$$

Although merely a geometrical illustration, Eq 7 aligns quite well with the explicit next-to leading order (NLO) analysis. If identifying h as the discovered 125 GeV SM Higgs boson, it is shown in [30] that m_H and m_A are individually bounded by 485 GeV and 545 GeV, so SCPV with $U(1)_Y$ indeed has no decouple limit. This is clearly a consistent requirement for the low energy spectrum, so adding more heavy Higgs doublets does not change the scenario, as recently proved in [49]. Generalization to the electroweak gauge symmetry $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, is straight forward.

Therefore, the low-energy particle spectrum for minimal CP conserving $SO(10)$ is same as light 2HDM. But remember, we have in total four Higgs doublets in the generic basis, two in 10_H and two in 126_H . To go to the low energy effective theory, we firstly define the following

light states:

$$h^{\text{SM}} = \frac{v_i^*}{v} \rho_i, \quad \tilde{H} = \frac{u_i^*}{u} \rho_i, \quad G^0 = \frac{v_i^*}{v} \eta_i, \quad \tilde{A} = \frac{u_i^*}{u} \eta_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\Phi_i = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i^+ \\ (v_i + \rho_i + i\eta_i)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_i = v_i^* - \left(\sum_{j=1}^4 v_j^{*2} \right) \frac{v_i}{v}, \quad u = \sum_{i=1}^4 |u_i|^2. \quad (9)$$

So h^{SM} and \tilde{H} lives in the plane spanned by v_i and v_i^* , the two degenerate vacuum solutions. It's straight forward to check $\sum_i^4 v_i^* u_i = 0$, so h^{SM} is orthogonal to \tilde{H} (and similarly for G^0 and \tilde{A}). In addition, there are other two linear-independent combinations of ρ_i (and η_i), accounting for the super-heavy neutral states irrelevant to phenomenology. Thus, ρ_i, η_i can be represented by:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i &= \frac{v_i}{v} h^{\text{SM}} + \frac{u_i}{u} \tilde{H} + \text{Super-heavy States}, \\ \eta_i &= \frac{v_i}{v} G^0 + \frac{u_i}{u} \tilde{A} + \text{Super-heavy States}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

What follows next is the same as the general 2HDMs [19, 50]. G^0 can be identified as the massless Goldstone mode, while the other two CP-even components h^{SM}, \tilde{H} and one CP-odd component \tilde{A} are still not the mass eigenstates. In general, they mix with each other, and the physical states can be parameterized with:

$$\begin{pmatrix} h \\ H \\ A \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{\alpha_c} & s_{\alpha_c} \\ 0 & -s_{\alpha_c} & c_{\alpha_c} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha_A} & 0 & s_{\alpha_A} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{\alpha_A} & 0 & c_{\alpha_A} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha_H} & s_{\alpha_H} & 0 \\ -s_{\alpha_H} & c_{\alpha_H} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h^{\text{SM}} \\ \tilde{H} \\ \tilde{A} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where $c_{\alpha_c} = \cos \alpha_c, s_{\alpha_c} = \sin \alpha_c$, etc. So, the discovered 125 GeV Higgs h may do not behave exactly as SM predictions. For example, consider Higgs-Gauge bosons interactions:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} \supset g^2 W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} \Phi_i^\dagger \Phi_i \supset \frac{1}{2} g^2 W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} v h^{\text{SM}} = \frac{1}{2} c_{\alpha_H} c_{\alpha_A} g^2 W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} v h. \quad (12)$$

So the $h W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu}$ coupling strength $g_{hWW} = \frac{1}{2} c_{\alpha_H} c_{\alpha_A} g^2 v$ might be smaller than $\frac{1}{2} g^2 v$ of SM. The ATLAS Run 2 data [51] tells $c_{\alpha_H} c_{\alpha_A} \gtrsim 0.99$ (0.96) at 68% (95%) CL. In the limit $\alpha_H, \alpha_A \ll 1$, one can expand Eq 11 and get a more concise expression:

$$\begin{aligned} h^{\text{SM}} &= h - |\epsilon| (c_{\tilde{\alpha}_c} H + s_{\tilde{\alpha}_c} A), \\ \tilde{H} + i\tilde{A} &= \epsilon h + e^{i\alpha_c} (H + iA). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\epsilon = \alpha_H + i\alpha_A$, $\tilde{\alpha}_c = \alpha_c - \arg \epsilon$. In analog to c_{α_β} in 2HDM [52], ϵ encodes the decoupling limit, that one can rewrite it as $\hat{\lambda} v^2 / m_H^2$, where $\hat{\lambda}$ is a dimensionless coupling. When m_H is large enough, ϵ goes to zero so the discovered 125 GeV Higgs becomes exactly SM-like. On the other hand, since we are working within a non-decoupled theory, m_H is bounded to around 500 GeV. As a consistency requirement, $\hat{\lambda}$ must therefore be small, while m_H tending toward its maximal possible value. The low-energy theory likely lies right at the edge where the perturbative expansion breaks down, similar to recent concerns about the UV regime [32, 33]. Fortunately, these potentially non-perturbative effects are flavour conserving and therefore do not overwhelm our predictions regarding flavor structures.

2.3 The Low Energy Theory

Eq 10 and Eq 13 allow us to rewrite Eq 4 in physical basis concisely (by replacing $\rho_i + i\eta_i \subset \Phi_i$ with $\frac{v_i}{v} h^{\text{SM}} + \frac{u_i}{u} (\tilde{H} + i\tilde{A})$, and solving $Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10}, Y_{126}$ from Eq 5). After dropping super-heavy

states and higher-order terms, we get the modified interacting Lagrangian for the light neutral scalars and SM Fermions:

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\Phi\bar{F}F} \supset \left(\frac{m_E}{v} + \epsilon Y_E^{\ell\ell'}\right) h \bar{\ell}_L \ell'_R + \left(\frac{m_D}{v} + \epsilon Y_D^{qq'}\right) \bar{d}_L^q d_R^{q'} h + \left(\frac{m_U}{v} + \epsilon Y_U^{qq'}\right) \bar{u}_L^q u_R^{q'} h \\ + \mathcal{Y}_E^{\ell\ell'} (H + iA) \bar{\ell}_L \ell'_R + \mathcal{Y}_D^{qq'} (H + iA) \bar{d}_L^q d_R^{q'} + \mathcal{Y}_U^{qq'} (H + iA) \bar{u}_L^q u_R^{q'} + \text{h.c.} \quad (14)$$

$$Y_E = \mathcal{C}_{EE} \frac{m_E}{v} + \mathcal{C}_{ED} V_E^* \frac{m_D}{v} V_E^\dagger + \mathcal{C}_{EU} V_E^* V_{\text{CKM}}^T \frac{m_U}{v} V_{\text{CKM}} V_E^\dagger, \\ Y_D = \mathcal{C}_{DE} V_E^T \frac{m_E}{v} V_E + \mathcal{C}_{DD} \frac{m_D}{v} + \mathcal{C}_{DU} V_{\text{CKM}}^T \frac{m_U}{v} V_{\text{CKM}}, \\ Y_U = \mathcal{C}_{UE} V_{\text{CKM}}^* V_E^T \frac{m_E}{v} V_E V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger + \mathcal{C}_{UD} V_{\text{CKM}}^T \frac{m_D}{v} V_{\text{CKM}} + \mathcal{C}_{UU} \frac{m_U}{v}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_F = e^{i\alpha_c} Y_F$, $\ell, \ell' = e, \mu, \tau$, $q, q' = d, s, b$ or u, c, t , running over the three families. Complex coefficients $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ ($F, F' = E, D, U$) read:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}_{EE} & \mathcal{C}_{ED} & \mathcal{C}_{EU} \\ \mathcal{C}_{DE} & \mathcal{C}_{DD} & \mathcal{C}_{DU} \\ \mathcal{C}_{UE} & \mathcal{C}_{UD} & \mathcal{C}_{UU} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{v}{u} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & -u_2 & -3u_3 \\ u_1 & -u_2 & u_3 \\ u_2^* & u_1^* & u_4^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_{10}^d & -v_{10}^{u*} & -3v_{126}^d \\ v_{10}^d & -v_{10}^{u*} & v_{126}^d \\ v_{10}^u & v_{10}^{d*} & v_{126}^u \end{pmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (16)$$

Direct calculation shows $\mathcal{C}_{EU} = \mathcal{C}_{DU}$, while we have also checked numerically that there are no other correlations among the elements in $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$. One may assume the dimensionless parameters $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ are in general all around $O(1)$, but strictly speaking, they are not predicted. Large hierarchies of two or more orders of magnitude in principle possible. For a better understanding, one can take the SUSY-like 2HDM potential [19] as an analogy, where:

$$\mathcal{C}_{EE} = \mathcal{C}_{DD} = \tan \beta, \quad \mathcal{C}_{UU} = \cot \beta, \quad \text{others} = 0. \quad (17)$$

There is only one theoretical constrain, that $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ should not be too large to ensure \mathcal{Y}_F is within the limit of perturbative unitarity. The lower limit for $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ depends on how the Fermions mass relationship in Eq 5 constrains v_i . It's likely that $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ can not be all zero, but as discussed at the end of Subsection 2.1, we can not conclude a robust lower bound.

Eq 15 has more freedom than the benchmark 2HDM without tree level FCNC [19], while it's also not the most general 2HDM. $SO(10)$ gives non-trivial constrains. Let's firstly try to intuitively understand it in the chiral limit. If Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10} and Y_{126} are all strictly zero, the whole theory is invariant under the chiral transform $16_F \rightarrow 16_F e^{i\theta}$ and all Fermions are massless. This is partly a good symmetry, because except for the top quark, all observed Fermions masses are far smaller than the electroweak scale. Clearly, the large top quark mass m_t explicitly breaks the chiral symmetry and requires large Yukawa couplings, but it is still reasonable to expect that many of the elements in Y_E, Y_D, Y_U are small. In fact, if ignoring all Fermion masses except for m_t , we approximately have:

$$Y_E^{\ell\ell'} \approx \mathcal{C}_{EU} V_E^* V_{\text{CKM}}^T \text{Diag}(0, 0, m_t) V_{\text{CKM}} V_E^\dagger \approx \mathcal{C}_{EU} \frac{m_t}{v} (V_E^{lb} V_E^{\ell'b})^*, \\ Y_D^{qq'} \approx \mathcal{C}_{DU} V_{\text{CKM}}^T \text{Diag}(0, 0, m_t) V_{\text{CKM}} \approx \mathcal{C}_{DU} \frac{m_t}{v} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq'}, \\ Y_U^{qq'} \approx \mathcal{C}_{UU} \text{Diag}(0, 0, m_t) \approx \mathcal{C}_{UU} \frac{m_t}{v} \delta^{qq'}. \quad (18)$$

The small 2-3 and 1-3 mixing angles in the CKM matrix are assumed far smaller than the corresponding ones in V_E , to simplify $Y_E^{\ell\ell'}$. The flavour structure of Y_E is Next-to Minimal Flavour Violation (NMFV) [53], which can be checked by experiments. Y_D then flavors Minimal Flavour Violation (MFV) [54], and Y_U is approximately diagonal. It's clear that \mathcal{C}_{EU} must be small, in order to avoid the tree-level FCNC in the leptonic sector. Remembering $\mathcal{C}_{EU} = \mathcal{C}_{DU}$, the quark sector is then automatically free from tree-level FCNC constrains. The theory can

be made safe from FV constrains, mainly because most of the couplings are suppressed by $m_\tau/v, m_b/v$ and small mixing angles. The only specific requirement is a small \mathcal{C}_{EU} .

Eq 18 is only for illustration, and the hierarchies among $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ elements might in practice be larger than m_t/m_b . However, there are still quantitative predictions on the non-diagonal flavour structure. Eq 5 tells Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10} and Y_{126} (and thus Y_E, Y_D, Y_U) are linear combinations of three symmetric Fermions masses matrices M_E, M_D and M_U . Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_E^{\ell\ell'} &\propto (V_E^{\ell b} V_E^{\ell' b})^* + o(\lambda^2)(V_E^{\ell b} + V_E^{\ell' b})^*, \quad \ell \neq \ell', \\ Y_D^{qq'} &\propto V_E^{\tau q} V_E^{\tau q'} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_{DU} m_t}{\mathcal{C}_{DE} m_\tau} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq'}, \quad q \neq q', \\ Y_U^{qq'} &\propto V_E^{\tau q} V_E^{\tau q'} + \frac{\mathcal{C}_{UD} m_b}{\mathcal{C}_{UE} m_\tau} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tq'} + o(\lambda), \quad q \neq q', \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$Y_E^{\ell\ell'}, Y_D^{qq'}$ is valid up to $o(m_b/m_t)$ corrections. $\lambda \sim 0.2$ is the Wolfstein parameter, so $o(\lambda^2)$ encodes the small 2-3 and 1-3 mixing angles in the CKM matrix. It is clear that as long as $|V_E^{\ell b}|$ and $|V_E^{\ell' b}|$ are larger than $o(\lambda^2)$, the flavour structure for lepton flavour violation is indeed NMFV, shedding light on the unknown mixing matrix V_E . On the other hand, the flavour structure for down-type quark sector is not fully clear. One may expect that to be MFV as of Eq 18, but NMFV is also possible because \mathcal{C}_{DU} should be suppressed to avoid FCNC. $Y_U^{qq'}$ may also receive $o(\lambda)$ corrections, because $V_E^T m_E V_E$ of Eq 15 is sandwiched between V_{CKM}^* and V_{CKM}^\dagger .

So far, we have not included the radiative corrections, so all results are only valid at tree level. The effects from QCD and possibly scalar self-interactions are expected to be large; however, they are fortunately flavour blinded. These corrections can be absorbed into the bare parameters such as $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$, so physical predictions are unchanged. Our quantitative prediction is about the flavour structure, which can only be changed by the non-diagonal Yukawa couplings through loop effects. Those corrections, as well known [55], are at most next-to leading order. Given that the tree-level prediction is only accurate to $o(\lambda^2)$, we will not discuss the radiative corrections to the flavour structure. Eq 15, although only defined at the GUT scale, is also a good approximation at low energy.

3 Phenomenology

3.1 Is the Theory Safe?

The second Higgs doublet, has $SU(2)_L$ and $U(1)_Y$ charge by definition. Its interactions with weak gauge bosons change the electroweak precision data. The most sensitive one is T parameter [56], when the new scalars' masses are nearly degenerate (custodial limit), we have approximately [57, 58]:

$$T = \frac{(m_{H^+}^2 - m_H^2)(m_{H^+}^2 - m_A^2)}{48\pi s_w^2 m_W^2 m_H^2} \approx 0.18 \times \left(\frac{m_{H^+} - m_H}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right) \left(\frac{m_{H^+} - m_A}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right). \quad (20)$$

Fixing $U = 0$, T should be smaller than 0.06 according to [59], excluding the CDF data [60]³. The theory is safe although the second Higgs doublet is not heavy, because its contribution to the T parameter is zero in the custodial limit. Consequently, the mass spectrum of H^+, H, A is expected to be quasi-degenerate.

Shall the second Higgs be directly observed at hadron colliders? It depends on the producing cross section and decay branching ratios. Assuming $o(1)$ $H\bar{t}t$ or $H\bar{b}b$ yukawa couplings, the total cross section at LHC is dominated by gluon-gluon fusion and associated production with quarks, and may reach $1 \sim 10$ pb for $m_H \sim 500$ GeV [62, 63]. If the $H\bar{\tau}\tau$ yukawa coupling

³ 1σ allowed CDF consistent range for T is $\{0.159, 0.210\}$ [61]

is also $o(1)$ (similar to MSSM with large $\tan\beta$), the theory is excluded because the current collider constrains for $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow \bar{\tau}\tau$ is quite tight [64]. $H\bar{\tau}\tau$ yukawa couplings are therefore required smaller, leading to the final states dominated by $\bar{t}t$ and $\bar{b}b$ pairs. This scenario has large background at a hadron colliders [65, 66], so is not yet excluded [67, 68]. Additionally, H may also be produced with the W/Z vector bosons, and/or decay to $ZZ + WW$ final states. This modes are suppressed by $|\epsilon|^2$ ($c_{\alpha\beta}^2$, if using the notation of 2HDM benchmarks). A small ϵ is then also a required by the collider constrains, along with the Higgs precision measurements discussed in subsection 2.2.

FCNC can not be completely eliminated, but they do not necessarily exceed the experimental limits. Let's start with all $\mathcal{C}_{FF'} \sim o(1)$ as a benchmark. The neutral Bs meson mixing induced by Y_D is clearly too large. Consequently, \mathcal{C}_{DU} must be suppressed by about:

$$|\mathcal{C}_{DU}| \lesssim \left(\frac{v}{m_t} \cdot \frac{1}{|V_{\text{CKM}}^{ts} V_{\text{CKM}}^{tb}|} \right) \times \frac{m_H/\sqrt{2}}{10^3 \text{ TeV}} \approx 0.013 \times \frac{m_H}{500 \text{ GeV}}, \quad (21)$$

in the limit $m_H \approx m_A$. Here, 10^3 TeV is the experimental limit for the cut-off of the dimension six operator $\mathcal{O}_4 = \bar{b}_{LQR} \bar{b}_{RQL}$ [69]. Fortunately, no further constrains for the other $\mathcal{C}_{FF'}$ are required. As a consequence of MFV, B_d and K mixing are less constrained than B_s mixing. For the other $\Delta F = 2$ processes, D mixing is suppressed by m_τ/v and m_b/v , and measurements on muonium–antimuonium oscillation is limited than those for neutral mesons. Given $|\mathcal{C}_{DU}| < 10^{-2}$, $\mathcal{C}_{EU} = \mathcal{C}_{DU}$, others = $o(1)$, all the $\Delta F = 1$ processes for down-type quark and charged leptons, such as $B \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$, are also suppressed due to the lack of sizable chirality-flipping interactions. The top quark flavor-violating decay and anomalous production could be sizable, but the experimental sensitivities are significantly poorer.

3.2 A Window to Check SO(10)

We now go to the predictions of SO(10). The general idea is to demonstrate that there are more observables than free parameters. We focus on the absolute magnitudes of the unknown 3×3 mixing matrix V_E . Unitarity provides five independent constrains on the nine elements $|V_E^{\ell q}|$, that the squared sum of any row or any column is one, minus the total. Physical predictions exist, as long as we can identify more than four direct experimental inputs. Various channels for Lepton flavour violating (LFV) scalar decays, neutral meson oscillation, and proton decay are our candidates, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Eq 19 tells the LFV decay of H and A can decide the elements in the third column of V_E :

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow H, A) \times \text{Br}(H, A \rightarrow \ell\ell') \propto \left| Y_E^{\ell\ell'} \right|^2 \propto |V_E^{\ell b} V_E^{\ell' b}|^2, \quad (22)$$

valid as long as $|V_E^{\ell b}|$ and $|V_E^{\ell' b}|$ are larger than $o(\lambda^2)$. At colliders, we expect signals of heavy resonances decaying into $e\tau, \mu\tau, e\mu$ final states. A recent analysis is given in [70]. There will be two peaks in the $e\mu$ invariant mass spectrum, centered at m_H and m_A . The prediction is about the relative total number of the excess events in each channel:

$$\frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{\tau\mu}} = \frac{|V_E^{eb}|^2}{|V_E^{\tau b}|^2}, \quad \frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{e\tau}} = \frac{|V_E^{\mu b}|^2}{|V_E^{\tau b}|^2}. \quad (23)$$

Here, $N_{\ell\ell'}$ is the total number of the excess events, normalized by the detection efficiency. If measured in future, the unitarity of the third column of V_E , $|V_E^{eb}|^2 + |V_E^{\mu b}|^2 + |V_E^{\tau b}|^2 = 1$, would allow a direct extraction of the absolute values of all these three elements.

Elements in the third row of V_E are related to quark FV. The down sector is better than the top quark one. It is partly because the top quark FV is much less precisely measured compared neutral meson oscillations. The other reason is the non-diagonal elements of Y_U receive $o(\lambda)$ correction from the CKM matrix, while those of Y_D get only $o(\lambda^2)$ corrections. h contribution




Figure 2: Proton decay, LFV, and neutral meson oscillation are linked through a 3×3 unitary matrix V_E . Together with the unitary conditions, the theory yields more observables than free parameters, leading to a non-trivial consistency check as we will shown in Eq 34.

is negligible in the small ϵ limit, and the dominate NP contribution to the $\Delta F = 2$ processes mainly comes from H and A . The non-diagonal elements in Y_D of Eq 14 gives an effective operator:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_{\text{NP}}^q &= -\frac{1}{2m_H^2} \left(Y_D^{bq} \bar{b}_{LqR} + Y_D^{qb*} \bar{b}_{RqL} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2m_A^2} \left(iY_D^{bq} \bar{b}_{LqR} - iY_D^{qb*} \bar{b}_{RqL} \right)^2 \\
 &\approx -\frac{2|Y_D^{bq}|^2}{m_H^2} \bar{b}_{LqR} \bar{b}_{RqL}, \quad q = d, s.
 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The Wilson coefficients for $\bar{b}_{LqR} \bar{b}_{LqR}$ and $\bar{b}_{RqL} \bar{b}_{RqL}$ vanish in the limit $m_H = m_A$ [77]. This quasi-degenerate limit is implied by the electroweak precision data, and can be cross checked by direct collider search. The operator $\bar{b}_{LqR} \bar{b}_{RqL}$ then dominants, whose coefficient $Y_D^{bq} Y_D^{qb*}$ is real because Y_D is symmetric. H_{NP}^q is therefore approximately CP conserving, and connected to experimental observables via:

$$\frac{\langle B_q^0 | H_{\text{NP}}^q | \bar{B}_q^0 \rangle}{\langle B_q^0 | H_{\text{SM}}^q | \bar{B}_q^0 \rangle} = \mathbf{h}_q e^{i\sigma_q} = \frac{M_{12}^{q\text{Exp}}}{M_{12}^{q\text{SM}}} - 1, \quad q = d, s. \tag{25}$$

$2|M_{12}^{q\text{Exp}}| = \Delta m_q$ is the oscillation frequency. \mathbf{h}_q is the experimental input for our work, accounting for possible NP contributions. In pure SM, \mathbf{h}_d and \mathbf{h}_s are exactly 0 by definition. According to [71], The current 95% CL upper limits for \mathbf{h}_d and \mathbf{h}_s are respectively 0.26 and 0.12, and the future sensitivities at high-intensity experiments can reach about $0.03 \sim 0.04$. We summarize them in Table 1.

H, A also contribute to K meson mixing:

$$(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}} = \frac{1}{m_K} \langle K^0 | H_{\text{NP}}^K | \bar{K}^0 \rangle \approx -\frac{2|Y_D^{sd}|^2}{m_K m_H^2} \langle K^0 | \bar{d}_{LsR} \bar{d}_{RSL} | \bar{K}^0 \rangle. \tag{26}$$

The CP violating parameter ϵ_K receives zero contribution in the limit $m_H = m_A$. The hadronic factors, along with those for B mesons, are shown in Appendix B. The SM prediction for Δm_K is partly swamped by the long distance contributions, and the effect from the additional Higgs is not necessarily subdominant. The current measurement on (ΔM_K) is $3.484(6) \times 10^{-15}$ GeV, and not likely to improve much in future [76]. The latest lattice calculation shows $(\Delta M_K)_{\text{SM}} =$

Table 1: Current experimental bounds and future expected sensitivities on the FV processes relevant for our analysis. The constrains for \mathbf{h}_d and \mathbf{h}_s , the parameters on how much B_d and B_s meson mixing derive from SM predictions, are shown with 95% CL, using the results of CKMfit [71]. The future sensitivity comes from LHCb and Belle II, with 300/fb and 250/ab integrated luminosity respectively. A further possible improvement with 5×10^{12} Z decays from a lepton collider like FCC-ee [72] is included in the bracket. $(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}$ is the maximally allowed NP contribution to the $K_L - K_s$ mass difference, where the SM long distance contribution is based on Lattice QCD [73, 74]. We take the assumption of snowmass 2021 [75], that the future lattice errors can achieve 5% level, for future sensitivity. All the observables in the Table are zero, if SM is exact.

Observable	Current limit	Future sensitivity
\mathbf{h}_d	0.26 [71]	0.049 [71] (0.038 [72])
\mathbf{h}_s	0.12 [71]	0.044 [71] (0.031 [72])
$ (\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}} $	5.2×10^{-15} GeV [74, 76]	0.2×10^{-15} GeV [75, 76]

$5.8(0.6)_{\text{stat}}(2.3)_{\text{sys}} \times 10^{-15}$ GeV [73, 74], allowing sizable NP contribution with a sign opposite to the SM estimation. It's expected reducing SM prediction uncertainty to 5% level is possible in future, with adequate computer resources [75].

Different from the leptonic sector, the FV structure for down-type quarks can be either MFV or NMFV. To distinguish, we notice the MFV scenario implies:

$$\frac{|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}| m_K}{\langle K^0 | \bar{d}_L s_R \bar{d}_R s_L | \bar{K}^0 \rangle} \approx \lambda^4 \cdot \frac{2\mathbf{h}_d |M_{12}^{d\text{SM}}| m_{B_d}}{\langle B_d^0 | \bar{b}_L d_R \bar{b}_R d_L | B_d^0 \rangle} \approx \lambda^6 \cdot \frac{2\mathbf{h}_s |M_{12}^{s\text{SM}}| m_{B_s}}{\langle B_s^0 | \bar{b}_L s_R \bar{b}_R s_L | B_s^0 \rangle}. \quad (27)$$

If no hierarchies are found, the flavour structure must be NMFV, and the mixing angles in V_E are typically larger than λ^2 . The prediction is:

$$\frac{|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|}{2\mathbf{h}_d |M_{12}^{d\text{SM}}| \xi_B} = \frac{|V_E^{\tau s}|^2}{|V_E^{\tau b}|^2}, \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_B = \frac{m_B \langle K^0 | \bar{d}_L s_R \bar{d}_R s_L | \bar{K}^0 \rangle}{m_K \langle B_d^0 | \bar{b}_L d_R \bar{b}_R d_L | B_d^0 \rangle}. \quad (28)$$

Valid as long as the left-hand side is measured much larger than $o(\lambda^4)$. We illustrate the physically interesting region in Figure 3. $|M_{12}^{d\text{SM}}|$ is referred from Eq 25, by taking $M_{12}^{q\text{Exp}} = 0.506 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [78] and the central value $\mathbf{h}_d = 0.075$, $\sigma_q = -1.4$ [71]. It's clear that for any non-zero value of $|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|$ that can be determined by near future lattice calculation, NMFV is the only possible flavour structure for Y_D . MFV requires very small $|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|$, as shown in the narrow green band. If both $|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|$ and \mathbf{h}_d is sizable, one can extract the third row of V_E using the unitarity condition of $|V_E^{\tau b}|^2 + |V_E^{\tau s}|^2 + |V_E^{\tau d}|^2 = 1$, assuming $|V_E^{\tau d}|$ is already extracted from the LFV decay of H or A .

The remaining unconstrained elements lie within the 2×2 top-left submatrix of V_E . At leading order, it does not appear the Yukawa couplings of Eq 2.3, due to the suppression of m_μ/m_τ and m_s/m_b . Fortunately, the Fermion mass hierarchies are not related to the proton decay amplitudes mediated by the gauge bosons. In addition, it has long been known [85] that the proton decay flavour structure can be significantly simplified when the Yukawa couplings are symmetric, as in our scenario. Therefore, using the symbols defined in Eq 6, the general mixing matrices $V_1 \sim V_4, V_{UD}, V_{EN}$ of [86] reduce to:

$$V_1 = V_4 = \mathbf{1}, \quad V_2 = V_3^\dagger = V_E, \quad V_{UD} = V_{\text{CKM}}, \quad V_{EN} = V_{\text{PMNS}}. \quad (29)$$

The neutrino channels are more predictive, as all three generations of neutrinos are summed over and V_E is eliminated [85]. If the intermediate symmetry of SO(10) breaking is left-right




Figure 3: $|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|$ versus \mathbf{h}_d , where the dependence of $|V_E^{\tau s}|/|V_E^{\tau b}|$ is represented by the color scale on the right. The white color indicates $|V_E^{\tau s}|/|V_E^{\tau b}| \gtrsim 1$, implying large mixing angles in V_E . The relationship of Eq 28 generally holds, except for the narrow green band of $|V_E^{\tau s}|/|V_E^{\tau b}| \lesssim \lambda^2 \sim 0.04$. Parameter extraction becomes challenging when $\mathbf{h}_d \rightarrow 0$ and $|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}| \rightarrow 0$, since SM is revealed in this limit.

or quark-lepton, the tree-level masses for superheavy gauge bosons are degenerate [27]. So, the width for $p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu}$ reads:

$$\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu}) = \frac{g_{\text{GUT}}^2 m_p}{2\pi M_{\text{GUT}}^4} A^2 \langle \pi^+ | (du)_{RdL} | p \rangle^2. \quad (30)$$

Here, g_{GUT} is the SO(10) gauge coupling at M_{GUT} , and A is the QCD renormalization factor. Related hadronic matrix elements are listed in Appendix B. Similarly, the decay $p \rightarrow K^+ \bar{\nu}$ also does not depend on the flavor mixings, and the ratio:

$$\frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+ \bar{\nu})} = \frac{4(1 - m_K^2/m_p^2)^{-2} \langle \pi^+ | (du)_{RdL} | p \rangle^2}{\langle K^+ | (us)_{RdL} | p \rangle^2 + \lambda^2 \langle K^+ | (ud)_{RSL} | p \rangle^2} \approx 81.2, \quad (31)$$

is fixed. This relation helps us distinguish whether proton decay processes is dominated by vector gauge bosons or scalar leptoquarks. Compared with gauge interactions, scalar interactions maximally violate flavour symmetry, so verifying Eq 31 implies the scalar contributions are negligible.

The branching ratios of proton decay to charged leptons are fixed up to V_E . Normalizing them with $\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu})$ and $\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+ \bar{\nu})$ dropping the $o(\lambda^2)$ terms in V_{CKM} , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+)}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu})} &= |V_E^{ed} + \frac{\lambda}{2} V_E^{es}|^2, & \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^+)}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu})} &= |V_E^{\mu d} + \frac{\lambda}{2} V_E^{\mu s}|^2, \\ \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 e^+)}{\xi_K \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+ \bar{\nu})} &= |V_E^{es} + \lambda V_E^{ed}|^2, & \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 \mu^+)}{\xi_K \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+ \bar{\nu})} &= |V_E^{\mu s} + \lambda V_E^{\mu d}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\text{with } \xi_K = \frac{2 \langle K^0 | (us)_{RuL} | p \rangle^2}{\langle K^+ | (us)_{RdL} | p \rangle^2 + \lambda^2 \langle K^+ | (ud)_{RSL} | p \rangle^2} \approx 6.4.$$

The $SU(2)_L$ isospin symmetry for u, d quarks is applied, to simplify the hadronic elements related to neutral and charged pions. The latest measurement of different proton decay branching ratios

Table 2: 90% CL limits from proton decay searches on $\tau(p \rightarrow X) \equiv 1/\Gamma(p \rightarrow X)$. Future sensitivities are expected to be improved by about one order of magnitude at Hyper-Kamiokande [79].

Decay Mode	$\ell = e^+$	$\ell = \mu^+$	$\ell = \bar{\nu}$
$p \rightarrow \pi\ell$	$> 2.4 \times 10^{34}$ yr [80]	$> 1.6 \times 10^{34}$ yr [80]	$> 3.9 \times 10^{32}$ yr [81]
$p \rightarrow K\ell$	$> 1.0 \times 10^{33}$ yr [82]	$> 3.6 \times 10^{33}$ yr [83]	$> 5.9 \times 10^{33}$ yr [84]

are listed in Table 2. Hyper-Kamiokande is expected to start operating as early as 2027 and improve the sensitivity by around one order of magnitude [79]. In Figure 4, we show the partial lifetimes of various proton decay channels, setting the benchmarks of $\tau(p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu}) = 3.9 \times 10^{32}$ years (current limit) or $\tau(p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu}) = 3.9 \times 10^{33}$ years. The bounds from Super-Kamiokande and expected limits of Hyper-Kamiokande experiments are respectively indicated with solid and dashed gray lines. The diagrams suggest that, if $p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu}$ is observed in near future, the lifetimes of proton decaying into charged leptons are generally within the limit of Hyper-Kamiokande, assuming elements in the 2×2 top-left submatrix of $|V_E|$ are sizable.

Eliminating the $o(\lambda)$ terms of Eq 32, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+)}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu})} - \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 e^+)}{\xi_K \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+\bar{\nu})} &= 2|V_E^{ed}|^2 - |V_E^{es}|^2, \\ \frac{2\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^+)}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu})} - \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 \mu^+)}{\xi_K \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+\bar{\nu})} &= 2|V_E^{\mu d}|^2 - |V_E^{\mu s}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

This result is valid up to $o(\lambda^2)$. So similar to what we did before, assuming $|V_E^{eb}|, |V_E^{\mu b}|$ are extracted from cLFV processes, we can calculate all the elements in the 2×2 top-left submatrix of V_E , using the unitarity relation of the first and second row, $|V_E^{ed}|^2 + |V_E^{es}|^2 + |V_E^{eb}|^2 = 1$ and $|V_E^{\mu d}|^2 + |V_E^{\mu s}|^2 + |V_E^{\mu b}|^2 = 1$.

In summary, we have identified five direct experimental observables, as shown in left-hand side of Eq 23, Eq 28, and Eq 33. They only depend on the absolute magnitudes of the elements of V_E , which can be parameterized by four free parameters. Therefore, if replacing $|V_E^{eb}|, |V_E^{\mu b}|, |V_E^{\tau b}|$, and $|V_E^{\tau s}|$ in Eq 23 and Eq 28 by $|V_E^{ed}|, |V_E^{es}|, |V_E^{\mu d}|, |V_E^{\mu s}|$, a concrete prediction emerges:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+)}{\Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^+\bar{\nu})} - \frac{\Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 \ell^+)}{\xi_K \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^+\bar{\nu})} \\ &= \left(\frac{3|(\Delta M_K)_{\text{NP}}|}{2\mathbf{hd}|M_{12}^{\text{dSM}}|\xi_B} - \frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{\tau\mu}} - \frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{e\tau}} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{\tau\mu}} + \frac{N_{e\mu}}{N_{e\tau}} + 1 \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+) &= \Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+) + \Gamma(p \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^+), \\ \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 \ell^+) &= \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 e^+) + \Gamma(p \rightarrow K^0 \mu^+), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

represents the total decay rate for both electron and muon the final states. Verifying this relation in future experiments gives a hint for the flavour structure predicted by minimal SO(10). If minimal SO(10) does not hold, the left and right hand sides of Eq 34 can differ by orders of magnitude. It's worth noting that Eq 34 serves only an illustration of a constraint. If various FCNC and proton decay modes are indeed measured in future, we suggest fitting the five observables with four independent parameters (three angles and a phase) of the 3×3 unitary matrix V_E , for numerical robustness.




Figure 4: Lifetimes for various proton decay modes as a function of the magnitudes of elements in the 2×2 top-left submatrix of $|V_E|$. The blue dashed and solid lines represent the lifetimes in the benchmark of setting $\tau(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu}) = 3.9 \times 10^{32}$ years (current limit) or $\tau(p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu}) = 3.9 \times 10^{33}$ years, respectively. The gray regions are excluded by Super-Kamiokande, as reported in Table 2. Prospective Hyper-Kamiokande bounds are shown with the dashed gray lines, assuming an order of magnitude improvement in sensitivity.

4 Conclusion and Discussion

In this article, we have analyzed the predictions of the minimal realistic version of $SO(10)$ grand unified theory, that only one CP-even 45_H , one 126_H and a complex 10_H are contained in the scalar sector. Additionally, we assumed CP symmetry for all renormalized interactions, which in our scenario can only be spontaneously broken. An additional light Higgs doublet is required, as a consistency requirement. Different from general two Higgs doublet models, the flavor structure of the predicted FCNC processes are connected to proton decay branching ratios, as a non-trivial constrain from matter unification.

The main uncertainty is the vacuum configuration of the Higgs doublets. They can not be clearly predicted from the scalar potential of $SO(10)$, and may receive large loop corrections due to the Higgs self-couplings. Perhaps, one can find some clues from fitting the charged Fermions masses and mixing angles, but we do not get any reliable prediction. Therefore, we can not estimate the absolute strengths of the FCNC signals. But fortunately, we can predict the relative strengths, provided various proton decay branching ratios are measured, since the flavour structure of minimal $SO(10)$ is quite constrained.

We acknowledge the widely known limit that the renormalizable $SO(10)$ GUT, if realistic, lacks predictive power. It does not allow direct calculation of the proton decay branching ratios. Meanwhile, there are no clear hints from the measured Fermions masses and mixing angles. One possibility is that unification is simply not achieved, but leaving charge quantization as an unexplained coincidence. Alternatively, $SO(10)$ GUT might be non-minimal and all predictions

are deeply hidden, so we can never prove it. However, we find minimal SO(10) GUT may give a hint for electroweak scale physics, if GUT is slightly extended—by additionally assuming CP is a fundamental symmetry, much like the common assumption of Lorentz invariance.

The trouble—and possibly the reason this approach is overlooked—is the requirement of an additional fine-tuning. But, SM itself is also fine-tuned. The electroweak scale $v \ll M_{\text{GUT}}$ leads to $m_h \sim v \ll M_{\text{GUT}}$. The weak-scale SCPV requires two degenerate vacuum $v, v^* \ll M_{\text{GUT}}$, implying double fine-tuning and two light Higgs doublets. As long as one accepts non-SUSY GUT, there is no reason to reject the weak-scale SCPV. The fine-tuning puzzle does not necessarily change the low energy theory [87]. Naturalness might be just hidden, for instance, via cosmological relaxation [88]. If one considers the possibility that naturalness could be implicit, a class of well-motivated and potentially predictive models might remain unexplored. These theories, overlooked due to the naturalness criteria, or swamped in the supersymmetric models, could provide new insights. We thus advocate that theories without explicit naturalness also deserve thorough study in the future.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Goran Senjanović, Ulrich Nierste, and Robert Ziegler for useful discussions and comments on manuscript. This research was partly supported the BMBF grant 05H21VKKBA, *Theoretische Studien für Belle II und LHCb*. X.G. also acknowledges the support by the Doctoral School “Karlsruhe School of Elementary and Astroparticle Physics: Science and Technology”.

Appendix

A Mixing Matrix

There are only three independent Yukawa coupling $Y_{10}, \tilde{Y}_{10}, Y_{126}$ in SO(10) generic basis, so the mass matrices in Eq 5 are connected via:

$$M_{\nu_L} = k_1(M_E - M_D) + k_2 M_U + k_3 M_U (M_E - M_D)^{-1} M_U, \quad (36)$$

where

$$k_1 = \frac{8(v_4^*)^2}{v_3 \langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle} - \frac{\langle \Delta_L \rangle}{8v_3}, \quad k_2 = \frac{16v_4^*}{\langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle}, \quad k_3 = \frac{8v_3}{\langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle}. \quad (37)$$

If rewriting Eq 36 with physical masses and mixing matrices, it reads:

$$V_E^T (V_{\text{PMNS}}^* m_{\nu_L}^{\text{diag}} V_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger - k_1 m_E^{\text{diag}}) V_E = -k_1 m_D^{\text{diag}} + k_2 (V_{\text{CKM}}^T m_U^{\text{diag}} V_{\text{CKM}}) + k_3 M_T, \quad (38)$$

where

$$M_T = V_{\text{CKM}}^T m_U^{\text{diag}} V_{\text{CKM}} (V_E^T m_E^{\text{diag}} V_E - m_D^{\text{diag}})^{-1} V_{\text{CKM}}^T m_U^{\text{diag}} V_{\text{CKM}}. \quad (39)$$

The complexity of M_T is the main barrier to solve V_E from Eq 38. However, some rough approximation can shed light on its magnitudes. Neglecting m_u, m_d, m_s , and all mixings angles in the CKM matrix, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} M_T &\approx \frac{m_\tau}{\det M_T} \times \begin{pmatrix} m_u^2 m_b \mathcal{D}_{11} & m_u m_c m_b \mathcal{D}_{12} & m_u m_t m_\mu \mathcal{D}_{13} \\ m_u m_c m_b \mathcal{D}_{21} & m_c^2 m_b \mathcal{D}_{22} & m_c m_t m_\mu \mathcal{D}_{23} \\ m_u m_t m_\mu \mathcal{D}_{31} & m_c m_t m_\mu \mathcal{D}_{32} & m_t^2 m_\mu \mathcal{D}_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{11} &= - (V_E^{\tau s})^2 + o\left(\frac{m_\mu}{m_b}\right), \quad \mathcal{D}_{22} = - (V_E^{\tau d})^2 + o\left(\frac{m_\mu}{m_b}\right), \\ \mathcal{D}_{33} &= (V_E^{\mu s} V_E^{\tau d} - V_E^{\mu d} V_E^{\tau s})^2 + o\left(\frac{m_s}{m_\mu}\right), \quad \mathcal{D}_{12} = \mathcal{D}_{21} = V_E^{\tau d} V_E^{\tau s} + o\left(\frac{m_\mu}{m_b}\right), \\ \mathcal{D}_{13} &= \mathcal{D}_{31} = (V_E^{\mu s} V_E^{\tau d} - V_E^{\mu d} V_E^{\tau s})(V_E^{\mu s} V_E^{\tau b} - V_E^{\mu b} V_E^{\tau s}) + o\left(\frac{m_s}{m_\mu}\right), \\ \mathcal{D}_{23} &= \mathcal{D}_{32} = (V_E^{\mu s} V_E^{\tau d} - V_E^{\mu d} V_E^{\tau s})(V_E^{\mu b} V_E^{\tau d} - V_E^{\mu d} V_E^{\tau b}) + o\left(\frac{m_s}{m_\mu}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Eq 36 is valued at M_{GUT} , so we take the hierarchy $m_\mu \approx 5m_s$ at M_{GUT} . This simplifies the leading order expression of M_T . Another important GUT scale relation is $m_t m_\mu \gg m_b m_c$. These relations give a clear hierarchy structure among the elements of M_T , assuming no elements of \mathcal{D}_{ij} is accidentally small.

M_T can be diagonalized with $M_T = V_T^* m_T^{\text{diag}} V_T^\dagger$. This leads to $V_T^{ij} \sim 1$ when $i = j$ and $V_T^{ij} \ll 1$ when $i \neq j$. Therefore, the right hand side of Eq 38 can be diagonalized with a 3×3 unitary matrix closed to identity, assuming no accidental cancellations. The same flavour structure must also hold for the left hand side, so the pattern of V_E is clear:

- $k_1 m_\tau \gg m_{\nu_L} \sim 0.1 \text{ eV}, V_E \sim \mathbf{1}$.
- $k_1 m_\tau \lesssim m_{\nu_L} \sim 0.1 \text{ eV}, V_E \sim V_{\text{PMNS}}$.

These two scenarios can be understood intuitively. Taking the limit that neutrinos are massless ($M_{\nu_L} = 0$), Eq 36 becomes a constrain for M_E, M_D, M_U . Ignoring the non-diagonal elements of the CKM matrix, both M_D, M_U can be taken as diagonal, and then M_E is automatically diagonal in this limit. Taking into account of the neutrino masses, the non-diagonal elements of V_E can be large, potentially as large as ones in the maximal flavour mixing matrix V_{PMNS} .

It is important to note that the discussion above is not robust. A careful reader may have already noticed that even with moderate cancellation, the predictions could change significantly. We discuss the potential structure of V_E here, mainly to give readers a feeling about how much information is available from the Fermion masses and mixing angles.

B Hadronic Elements

The hadronic matrix elements related to proton decay are given in [89]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle K^0|(us)_R u_L|p\rangle &= 0.103(3)(11) \text{ GeV}^2, & \langle K^0|(us)_L u_L|p\rangle &= 0.057(2)(6) \text{ GeV}^2, \\
\langle K^+|(us)_R d_L|p\rangle &= -0.049(2)(5) \text{ GeV}^2, & \langle K^+|(ud)_R s_L|p\rangle &= -0.134(4)(14) \text{ GeV}^2, \\
\langle \pi^+|(du)_R d_L|p\rangle &= -0.186(6)(18) \text{ GeV}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

For neutral meson oscillation, the corresponding hadronic matrix elements are commonly parameterized with bag parameters [90]. We translate the latest lattice results [91, 92] into the following explicit expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle K^0|\bar{d}_L s_R \bar{d}_L s_R|\bar{K}^0\rangle &= -0.039 \text{ GeV}^4, & \langle K^0|\bar{d}_L s_R \bar{d}_R s_L|\bar{K}^0\rangle &= 0.088 \text{ GeV}^4, \\
\langle B_d^0|\bar{b}_L d_R \bar{b}_L d_R|\bar{B}_d^0\rangle &= -0.52 \text{ GeV}^4, & \langle B_d^0|\bar{b}_R d_L \bar{b}_L d_R|\bar{B}_d^0\rangle &= 0.96 \text{ GeV}^4, \\
\langle B_s^0|\bar{b}_L s_R \bar{b}_L s_R|\bar{B}_s^0\rangle &= -0.84 \text{ GeV}^4, & \langle B_s^0|\bar{b}_R s_L \bar{b}_L s_R|\bar{B}_s^0\rangle &= 1.40 \text{ GeV}^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

The hadronic elements for B mesons are at the physical point, and those for kaons are at $\mu = 3 \text{ GeV}$. The uncertainties are typically at a few percent level. We do not renormalize them to $m_H \sim 500 \text{ GeV}$, because only the ratios contribute to the physical prediction, which are independent of the renormalization scale.

References

- [1] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, *Unified Interactions of Leptons and Hadrons*, *Annals Phys.* **93** (1975) 193–266.
- [2] Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, *Gauge Hierarchies and the Unification Mass*, *Phys. Lett. B* **85** (1979) 52–56.
- [3] S. Bertolini, L. Di Luzio and M. Malinsky, *Intermediate mass scales in the non-supersymmetric $SO(10)$ grand unification: A Reappraisal*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 015013, [[0903.4049](#)].
- [4] R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, *A Natural Left-Right Symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **11** (1975) 2558.
- [5] G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, *Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **12** (1975) 1502.
- [6] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, *Lepton Number as the Fourth Color*, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 275–289.
- [7] A. Preda, G. Senjanovic and M. Zantedeschi, *$SO(10)$: A case for hadron colliders*, *Phys. Lett. B* **838** (2023) 137746, [[2201.02785](#)].
- [8] A. Preda, G. Senjanović and M. Zantedeschi, *Minimal $SO(10)$ ante portas: the importance of being effective*, [2410.19408](#).
- [9] R. Foot, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, *Electric charge quantization*, *J. Phys. G* **19** (1993) 361–372, [[hep-ph/9209259](#)].
- [10] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, *Is There a Connection Between Quantization of Electric Charge and a Majorana Neutrino?*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** (1989) 938.
- [11] A. Dueck and W. Rodejohann, *Fits to $SO(10)$ Grand Unified Models*, *JHEP* **09** (2013) 024, [[1306.4468](#)].
- [12] K. S. Babu, B. Bajc and S. Saad, *Yukawa Sector of Minimal $SO(10)$ Unification*, *JHEP* **02** (2017) 136, [[1612.04329](#)].
- [13] T. Ohlsson and M. Pernow, *Fits to Non-Supersymmetric $SO(10)$ Models with Type I and II Seesaw Mechanisms Using Renormalization Group Evolution*, *JHEP* **06** (2019) 085, [[1903.08241](#)].
- [14] N. Haba, Y. Shimizu and T. Yamada, *Neutrino Mass in Non-Supersymmetric $SO(10)$ GUT*, [2304.06263](#).
- [15] L. D. Landau, *On the conservation laws for weak interactions*, *Nucl. Phys.* **3** (1957) 127–131.
- [16] D. Harlow and H. Ooguri, *Symmetries in quantum field theory and quantum gravity*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **383** (2021) 1669–1804, [[1810.05338](#)].
- [17] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 652–657.
- [18] T. D. Lee, *A Theory of Spontaneous T Violation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **8** (1973) 1226–1239.

- [19] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher and J. P. Silva, *Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models*, *Phys. Rept.* **516** (2012) 1–102, [[1106.0034](#)].
- [20] H. E. Haber and Z. Surujon, *A Group-theoretic Condition for Spontaneous CP Violation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 075007, [[1201.1730](#)].
- [21] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, *Connection Between Cosmological Matter - Antimatter Asymmetry and CP Nonconservation in K Decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53** (1984) 1419.
- [22] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra and M. K. Parida, *A New Approach to Left-Right Symmetry Breaking in Unified Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (1984) 1052.
- [23] K. M. Patel, *Minimal spontaneous CP-violating GUT and predictions for leptonic CP phases*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 075041, [[2212.04095](#)].
- [24] L. J. Hall and K. Harigaya, *Higgs Parity Grand Unification*, *JHEP* **11** (2019) 033, [[1905.12722](#)].
- [25] M. J. Baldwin and K. Harigaya, *Electroweak-Charged Dark Matter and SO(10) Unification with Parity*, [2407.01696](#).
- [26] B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, *Yukawa sector in non-supersymmetric renormalizable SO(10)*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 055001, [[hep-ph/0510139](#)].
- [27] S. Bertolini, L. Di Luzio and M. Malinsky, *Seesaw Scale in the Minimal Renormalizable SO(10) Grand Unification*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 095014, [[1202.0807](#)].
- [28] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, *Higgs-boson effects in grand unified theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **27** (Apr, 1983) 1601–1612.
- [29] M. Nebot, F. J. Botella and G. C. Branco, *Vacuum Induced CP Violation Generating a Complex CKM Matrix with Controlled Scalar FCNC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 711, [[1808.00493](#)].
- [30] U. Nierste, M. Tabet and R. Ziegler, *Cornering Spontaneous CP Violation with Charged-Higgs-Boson Searches*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020) 031801, [[1912.11501](#)].
- [31] G. C. Branco and R. N. Mohapatra, *Complex CKM from spontaneous CP violation without flavor changing neutral current*, *Phys. Lett. B* **643** (2006) 115–123, [[hep-ph/0607271](#)].
- [32] A. Milagre and L. Lavoura, *Unitarity constraints on large multiplets of arbitrary gauge groups*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **1004** (2024) 116542, [[2403.12914](#)].
- [33] K. Jarkovská, M. Malinský and V. Susič, *The trouble with the minimal renormalizable SO(10) GUT*, [2304.14227](#).
- [34] S. Ferrari, T. Hambye, J. Heck and M. H. G. Tytgat, *SO(10) paths to dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 055032, [[1811.07910](#)].
- [35] Y. B. Zeldovich, I. Y. Kobzarev and L. B. Okun, *Cosmological Consequences of the Spontaneous Breakdown of Discrete Symmetry*, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **67** (1974) 3–11.
- [36] S. Weinberg, *Gauge and Global Symmetries at High Temperature*, *Phys. Rev. D* **9** (1974) 3357–3378.

- [37] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, *Soft CP Violation at High Temperature*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42** (1979) 1651.
- [38] G. R. Dvali and G. Senjanovic, *Is there a domain wall problem?*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 5178–5181, [[hep-ph/9501387](#)].
- [39] G. R. Dvali, A. Melfo and G. Senjanovic, *Nonrestoration of spontaneously broken P and CP at high temperature*, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996) 7857–7866, [[hep-ph/9601376](#)].
- [40] A. Vilenkin, *Gravitational Field of Vacuum Domain Walls and Strings*, *Phys. Rev. D* **23** (1981) 852–857.
- [41] G. B. Gelmini, M. Gleiser and E. W. Kolb, *Cosmology of Biased Discrete Symmetry Breaking*, *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 1558.
- [42] B. Rai and G. Senjanovic, *Gravity and domain wall problem*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 2729–2733, [[hep-ph/9301240](#)].
- [43] T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki and K. Saikawa, *Gravitational Waves from Collapsing Domain Walls*, *JCAP* **05** (2010) 032, [[1002.1555](#)].
- [44] N. Chen, T. Li, Z. Teng and Y. Wu, *Collapsing domain walls in the two-Higgs-doublet model and deep insights from the EDM*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 081, [[2006.06913](#)].
- [45] V. S. Mummidi and K. M. Patel, *Leptogenesis and fermion mass fit in a renormalizable $SO(10)$ model*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 042, [[2109.04050](#)].
- [46] R. N. Mohapatra and B. Sakita, *$SO(2n)$ Grand Unification in an $SU(N)$ Basis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **21** (1980) 1062.
- [47] B. Bajc, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, *b - τ unification and large atmospheric mixing: A Case for noncanonical seesaw*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 051802, [[hep-ph/0210207](#)].
- [48] B. W. Lee, C. Quigg and H. B. Thacker, *The Strength of Weak Interactions at Very High-Energies and the Higgs Boson Mass*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 883–885.
- [49] C. Miró, M. Nebot and D. Queiroz, *Light states in real multi-Higgs models with spontaneous CP violation*, [[2411.00084](#)].
- [50] S. Inoue, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf and Y. Zhang, *CP-violating phenomenology of flavor conserving two Higgs doublet models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 115023, [[1403.4257](#)].
- [51] ATLAS collaboration, G. Aad et al., *A detailed map of Higgs boson interactions by the ATLAS experiment ten years after the discovery*, *Nature* **607** (2022) 52–59, [[2207.00092](#)].
- [52] J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, *The CP conserving two Higgs doublet model: The Approach to the decoupling limit*, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 075019, [[hep-ph/0207010](#)].
- [53] K. Agashe, M. Papucci, G. Perez and D. Pirjol, *Next to minimal flavor violation*, [[hep-ph/0509117](#)].
- [54] G. D’Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, *Minimal flavor violation: An Effective field theory approach*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **645** (2002) 155–187, [[hep-ph/0207036](#)].
- [55] M. E. Machacek and M. T. Vaughn, *Two Loop Renormalization Group Equations in a General Quantum Field Theory. 2. Yukawa Couplings*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **236** (1984) 221–232.
- [56] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, *A New constraint on a strongly interacting Higgs sector*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 964–967.

- [57] H.-J. He, N. Polonsky and S.-f. Su, *Extra families, Higgs spectrum and oblique corrections*, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 053004, [[hep-ph/0102144](#)].
- [58] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, O. M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *A Precision constraint on multi-Higgs-doublet models*, *J. Phys. G* **35** (2008) 075001, [[0711.4022](#)].
- [59] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, S. Navas et al., *Review of particle physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 030001.
- [60] CDF collaboration, T. Aaltonen et al., *High-precision measurement of the W boson mass with the CDF II detector*, *Science* **376** (2022) 170–176.
- [61] K. S. Babu, S. Jana and V. P. K., *Correlating W -Boson Mass Shift with Muon $g-2$ in the Two Higgs Doublet Model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** (2022) 121803, [[2204.05303](#)].
- [62] A. Djouadi, *The Anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. I: The Higgs boson in the standard model*, *Phys. Rept.* **457** (2008) 1–216, [[hep-ph/0503172](#)].
- [63] A. Djouadi, *The Anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. II. The Higgs bosons in the minimal supersymmetric model*, *Phys. Rept.* **459** (2008) 1–241, [[hep-ph/0503173](#)].
- [64] CMS collaboration, A. Tumasyan et al., *Searches for additional Higgs bosons and for vector leptoquarks in $\tau\tau$ final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 073, [[2208.02717](#)].
- [65] K. J. F. Gaemers and F. Hoogeveen, *Higgs Production and Decay Into Heavy Flavors With the Gluon Fusion Mechanism*, *Phys. Lett. B* **146** (1984) 347–349.
- [66] D. Dicus, A. Stange and S. Willenbrock, *Higgs decay to top quarks at hadron colliders*, *Phys. Lett. B* **333** (1994) 126–131, [[hep-ph/9404359](#)].
- [67] ATLAS collaboration, G. Aad et al., *ATLAS searches for additional scalars and exotic Higgs boson decays with the LHC Run 2 dataset*, [2405.04914](#).
- [68] ATLAS collaboration, G. Aad et al., *Search for heavy neutral Higgs bosons decaying into a top quark pair in 140 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *JHEP* **08** (2024) 013, [[2404.18986](#)].
- [69] M. Bona et al., *Overview and theoretical prospects for CKM matrix and CP violation from the UTfit Collaboration*, *PoS WIFAI2023* (2024) 007.
- [70] CMS collaboration, A. Tumasyan et al., *Search for heavy resonances and quantum black holes in $e\mu$, $e\tau$, and $\mu\tau$ final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *JHEP* **05** (2023) 227, [[2205.06709](#)].
- [71] J. Charles, S. Descotes-Genon, Z. Ligeti, S. Monteil, M. Papucci, K. Trabelsi et al., *New physics in B meson mixing: future sensitivity and limitations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 056023, [[2006.04824](#)].
- [72] FCC collaboration, A. Abada et al., *FCC-ee: The Lepton Collider: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 2*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **228** (2019) 261–623.
- [73] Z. Bai, N. H. Christ, T. Izubuchi, C. T. Sachrajda, A. Soni and J. Yu, *$K_L - K_S$ Mass Difference from Lattice QCD*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 112003, [[1406.0916](#)].
- [74] B. Wang, *Calculating Δm_K with lattice QCD*, *PoS LATTICE2021* (2022) 141, [[2301.01387](#)].

- [75] T. Blum et al., *Discovering new physics in rare kaon decays*, in *Snowmass 2021*, 3, 2022, [2203.10998](#).
- [76] KTeV collaboration, E. Abouzaid et al., *Precise Measurements of Direct CP Violation, CPT Symmetry, and Other Parameters in the Neutral Kaon System*, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 092001, [[1011.0127](#)].
- [77] A. Crivellin, A. Kokulu and C. Greub, *Flavor-phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models with generic Yukawa structure*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 094031, [[1303.5877](#)].
- [78] HFLAV collaboration, Y. S. Amhis et al., *Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of 2021*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 052008, [[2206.07501](#)].
- [79] HYPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, K. Abe et al., *Hyper-Kamiokande Design Report*, [1805.04163](#).
- [80] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, A. Takenaka et al., *Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow e^+\pi^0$ and $p \rightarrow \mu^+\pi^0$ with an enlarged fiducial volume in Super-Kamiokande I-IV*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 112011, [[2010.16098](#)].
- [81] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, K. Abe et al., *Search for Nucleon Decay via $n \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\pi^0$ and $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\pi^+$ in Super-Kamiokande*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 121802, [[1305.4391](#)].
- [82] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, K. Kobayashi et al., *Search for nucleon decay via modes favored by supersymmetric grand unification models in Super-Kamiokande-I*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 052007, [[hep-ex/0502026](#)].
- [83] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, R. Matsumoto et al., *Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow \mu^+K^0$ in 0.37 megaton-years exposure of Super-Kamiokande*, [2208.13188](#).
- [84] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, K. Abe et al., *Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow \nu K^+$ using 260 kiloton-year data of Super-Kamiokande*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 072005, [[1408.1195](#)].
- [85] P. Fileviez Perez, *Fermion mixings versus $d = 6$ proton decay*, *Phys. Lett. B* **595** (2004) 476–483, [[hep-ph/0403286](#)].
- [86] P. Nath and P. Fileviez Perez, *Proton stability in grand unified theories, in strings and in branes*, *Phys. Rept.* **441** (2007) 191–317, [[hep-ph/0601023](#)].
- [87] G. Senjanović, *Natural Philosophy versus Philosophy of Naturalness*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **35** (2020) 2030006, [[2001.10988](#)].
- [88] G. Dvali, *Cosmological Relaxation of Higgs Mass Before and After LHC and Naturalness*, [1908.05984](#).
- [89] Y. Aoki, T. Izubuchi, E. Shintani and A. Soni, *Improved lattice computation of proton decay matrix elements*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 014506, [[1705.01338](#)].
- [90] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, *A Complete analysis of FCNC and CP constraints in general SUSY extensions of the standard model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **477** (1996) 321–352, [[hep-ph/9604387](#)].
- [91] R. J. Dowdall, C. T. H. Davies, R. R. Horgan, G. P. Lepage, C. J. Monahan, J. Shigemitsu et al., *Neutral B-meson mixing from full lattice QCD at the physical point*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 094508, [[1907.01025](#)].

- [92] RBC, UKQCD collaboration, P. A. Boyle, F. Erben, J. M. Flynn, N. Garron, J. Kettle, R. Mukherjee et al., *Kaon mixing beyond the standard model with physical masses*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 034501, [[2404.02297](#)].