

Radiative Mass Mechanism: Addressing the Flavour Hierarchy and Strong CP Puzzle

Gurucharan Mohanta^{1,2,*}

¹*Theoretical Physics Division, Physical Research Laboratory,
Navarangpura, Ahmedabad-380009, India*

²*Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Palaj-382355, India*

Abstract

We propose a class of models based on the parity invariant Left-Right Symmetric Model (LRSM), which incorporates the mechanism of radiative generation of fermion masses while simultaneously possessing the solution to the Strong CP problem. A flavour non-universal gauged abelian symmetry is imposed on top of LRSM, which helps in inducing the masses of second and first-generation fermions at one-loop and two-loop, respectively, and thereby reproduces the hierarchical spectrum of the masses. Parity invariance requires the vanishing of the strong CP parameter at the zeroth order, and the non-zero contribution arises at the two-loop level, which is in agreement with the experimental constraints. The minimal model predicts flavour symmetry breaking scale and the $SU(2)_R$ symmetry breaking scale at the same level. Flavour non-universality of the new gauge interaction leads to various flavour-changing transitions both in quarks and leptonic sectors and, therefore, has various phenomenologically interesting signatures. The model predicts a new physics scale near 10^8 GeV or above for phenomenologically consistent solutions. This, in turn, restricts strong CP phase $\bar{\theta} \lesssim 10^{-14}$ as the parity breaking scale and flavour scale are related in the minimal framework.

arXiv:2411.13385v1 [hep-ph] 20 Nov 2024

* gurucharan.phy@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Fermion mass hierarchies and the strong CP, other than the Higgs mass hierarchy problem, remain the most puzzling feature of the flavour sector of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics. Several orders of mass hierarchies of the SM fermions and their incalculability ask for a better understanding of the mass-generating mechanism. Often, this requires new symmetries and different mechanisms, making the SM a low-energy effective theory. One such mechanism that explains the origin of the hierarchical pattern is radiative mass generation. In this mechanism, the masses of only third-family fermions are non-vanishing at the zeroth order, and the lighter family masses are induced radiatively using higher-order corrections in the perturbation theory. This mechanism not only explains the origin of mass hierarchy but also makes masses partially computable parameters of the theory [1–5]. The successful implementation of the mechanism requires new symmetries and/or new fields [6–11]. The new symmetries that incorporate this mechanism are needed to be flavour-dependent (see [12–25] for recent works in this direction).

The other issue in the flavour sector is the strong CP. In a general quantum field theory, the strong CP parameter is defined as:

$$\bar{\theta} = \theta_{QCD} + \text{Arg.}(\det(M_u M_d)), \quad (1)$$

where $M_{u(d)}$ is the mass matrix for the up (down) quark sector and θ_{QCD} is defined by the relation;

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta_{QCD}} = \frac{\theta_{QCD} g_s^2}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}^{a\mu\nu}. \quad (2)$$

This term, which is allowed by the SM gauge symmetry, is P and T (Parity and Time reversal symmetry) violating, and therefore CP violating. However, such a term is not physical and can be absorbed in the second term of eq. (1) or vice-versa through the redefinition of the quark fields. The physical parameter $\bar{\theta}$ appears in the neutron electric dipole moment (EDM) expression, and non-observation of neutron EDM puts a strong constraint of $\bar{\theta} < 10^{-10}$ [26]. As it is a dimensionless parameter, it is theoretically anticipated to assume $\mathcal{O}(1)$ value like the weak phase instead of taking a tiny value. This puzzle is known as the Strong CP problem. Popular solutions include Massless quarks solutions [27, 28], Pecci-Quinn axion solutions [29–35], Nelson-Barr class of solutions [36, 37], and Parity solutions [38–41]¹. In this article, we will discuss the Parity solutions to strong CP while simultaneously accommodating the mechanism of radiative mass generation for fermions and will explore the interconnections of these two mechanisms.

In parity solutions to strong CP class of models, a Left-Right Symmetric Model (LRSM) with parity invariance imposed is considered to forbid the θ_{QCD} at the leading order. The

¹ Recent developments in the direction of parity solutions of strong CP can be found in [42–47].

masses of the charged fermions in this class of models are generated through the universal seesaw mechanism. The mechanism requires an extra three generations of vector-like fermions for each kind of charged fermions, and the masses of all the SM fermions are induced at the tree level itself. By making mass matrices hermitian, parity invariance forbids the tree-level $\bar{\theta}$. Small and non-vanishing strong CP phase is generated at two-loop levels, which satisfies the neutron EDM constraints. Although these models have a natural tendency to explain the smallness of $\bar{\theta}$, the arbitrariness of the Yukawa couplings still have hierarchies of $Y \sim 10^{-3} - 1$. The present work aims to construct a model in the direction of solving strong CP by considering $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa couplings.

In this work, we first show that models of radiative fermion masses can also solve the strong CP problem when implemented in a parity invariant L-R symmetric theory. Here, parity invariance is used to obtain a small, strong CP phase, and the lighter generation SM fermions' masses are induced through quantum corrections. As the first two generation fermions are massless at the tree level, therefore the $Arg.(\det(M_u M_d))$ is vanishing at the leading order. This stands on equal footing with massless quark solutions as, at this stage, $\bar{\theta}$ is unphysical and can be completely rotated away by redefining the massless chiral fields. We impose a flavour non-universal abelian gauge symmetry G_F , which realises the radiative mass generation mechanism in the model. We also extend the fermion sector by an extra generation of VL fermions for each type of charged fermions, which gives tree-level seesaw masses to the third-generation SM fermions only. Masses of the first two generation fermions are induced at one loop and two loops through the gauge corrections and, therefore, explain the observed hierarchical spectrum of masses. The subsequent loop suppression contributes to the intergenerational hierarchy and, therefore, allows us to consider the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ values for the Yukawa couplings. The non-universal G_F that suffices the above mechanism is $U(1)_{2-3}$, which is the all-fermion version of the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry. Also, it is found that mass corrections induced only by gauge boson of G_F don't violate parity symmetry, and the respective strong CP phase remains vanishing at all orders of perturbation theory. However, a non-vanishing tiny $\bar{\theta}$ is generated when scalar corrections are included. The minimal version of the model predicts flavour symmetry breaking scale and the $SU(2)_R$ symmetry breaking scale at the same level. flavour non-universality of the new flavoured gauge interactions leads to various flavour-changing transitions both at quarks and leptonic sectors and, therefore, have various phenomenological interesting signatures. The relevant phenomenological analysis has already been done in [20, 23].

The rest of the article is arranged as follows: The explicit model, which implements the radiative mass generation mechanism and possesses a solution to strong CP, is discussed in section II. In section III, we study the induction of fermion masses and strong CP phase at different orders of perturbation theory. The phenomenological aspects of the model are outlined in section IV. Then, in section V, we discuss the qualitative features of the model. The study is summarised in section VI.

II. THE MODEL

The gauge symmetry for the model is $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times G_F$ with parity invariance imposed. Here $G_F = U(1)_{2-3}$ symmetry, is the generalised version of well-known $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry to include all fermions. The particle contents of the model are listed in Table I with $i = 1, 2, 3$ representing the three generations of SM fermions. Under the new flavour non-universal symmetry G_F , the second and third family fermions are charged, leaving the first family neutral. In addition to the SM fermions, a pair of vector-like fermions are added to each sector of charged fermions, which are neutral under the flavour symmetry.

Particles	\mathcal{G}_{LRSM}	G_F
$Q_{Li} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_{Li}$	$(3, 2, 1, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
$Q_{Ri} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_{Ri}$	$(3, 1, 2, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
$L_{Li} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}_{Li}$	$(1, 2, 1, -1)$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
$L_{Ri} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}_{Ri}$	$(1, 1, 2, -1)$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
H_{Li}	$(1, 2, 1, 1)$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
H_{Ri}	$(1, 1, 2, 1)$	$\{0, 1, -1\}$
$U_{L,R}$	$(3, 1, 1, \frac{4}{3})$	0
$D_{L,R}$	$(3, 1, 1, -\frac{2}{3})$	0
$E_{L,R}$	$(1, 1, 1, -2)$	0

TABLE I. Particle contents of the model.

The transformation properties of the above fields under the parity are defined below;

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_{Li} &\longleftrightarrow Q_{Ri}, & L_{Li} &\longleftrightarrow L_{Ri}, \\
 F_L &\longleftrightarrow F_R, & H_{Li} &\longleftrightarrow H_{Ri}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with $F = U, D, E$ representing three types of vector-like fermions with electromagnetic charges $\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, -1$ respectively .

The gauge covariant derivative can be written as:

$$D_\mu = \begin{cases} \partial_\mu + igW_{\mu L}^i \frac{\sigma^i}{2} + ig_1 B_\mu \frac{Y_1}{2} + ig_X X_\mu \frac{X}{2} & \text{For LH fields} \\ \partial_\mu + igW_{\mu R}^i \frac{\sigma^i}{2} + ig_1 B_\mu \frac{Y_1}{2} + ig_X X_\mu \frac{X}{2} & \text{For RH fields} \end{cases} . \tag{4}$$

Here g , g_1 and g_X are the couplings for the weak $SU(2)_{L,R}$ gauge bosons, $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge boson and $U(1)_F$ gauge boson respectively. The coupling g is made the same for both

$SU(2)_L$ and $SU(2)_R$ for invariance under the parity transformation $W_{\mu L} \leftrightarrow W_{\mu R}$. Y_1 and X are the $B - L$ and G_F quantum numbers for the fields on which the covariant derivative acts. When the scalars take vacuum expectation values (vevs), the full gauge symmetry is broken spontaneously, leaving $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}$ intact. Diagrammatically, the breaking pattern is;

$$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times G_F \xrightarrow{\langle H_{Ri} \rangle} SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \xrightarrow{\langle H_{Li} \rangle} SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}. \quad (5)$$

The hyper-charge Y and the electromagnetic charge Q , in this convention, are identified as:

$$\frac{Y}{2} = T_R^3 + \frac{Y_1}{2}, \quad Q = T_L^3 + \frac{Y}{2}. \quad (6)$$

Denoting the vevs of the scalars as:

$$\langle H_{Li} \rangle = v_{Li} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle H_{Ri} \rangle = v_{Ri}, \quad (7)$$

the masses of the charged gauged bosons can be written as;

$$M_{W_L^\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 \sum_i v_{Li}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad M_{W_R^\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2. \quad (8)$$

At the zeroth order, the charged gauged bosons don't mix with each other. However, the neutral gauge bosons mix, and the mass squared matrix for neutral gauge bosons ($W_{L\mu}^3, W_{R\mu}^3, B_\mu, X_\mu$) can be parameterised as:

$$M^2 = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} g^2 \sum_i v_{Li}^2 & 0 & -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Li}^2 & g g_X (v_{L3}^2 - v_{L2}^2) \\ 0 & g^2 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 & -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 & g g_X (v_{R3}^2 - v_{R2}^2) \\ -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Li}^2 & -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 & g_1^2 \sum_i (v_{Li}^2 + v_{Ri}^2) & g_1 g_X (v_{R3}^2 - v_{R2}^2) \\ g g_X (v_{L3}^2 - v_{L2}^2) & g g_X (v_{R3}^2 - v_{R2}^2) & g_1 g_X (v_{R3}^2 - v_{R2}^2) & g_X^2 (v_{R2}^2 + v_{R3}^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Here, we have assumed that H_{Li} gives negligible contributions to the mass and mixing terms of the X boson compared to H_{Ri} . It can be seen that the upper-left 3×3 block has a vanishing determinant. The corresponding massless eigenstate can be identified as photon A_μ with coupling constant defined by:

$$\frac{1}{e^2} = \frac{2}{g^2} + \frac{1}{g_1^2}. \quad (10)$$

Also, the submatrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} g^2 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 & -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 \\ -g g_1 \sum_i v_{Ri}^2 & g_1^2 \sum_i (v_{Li}^2 + v_{Ri}^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

has a vanishing eigenvalue in the limit $v_{Li} \rightarrow 0$. For small and non-zero v_{Li} , the lighter gauge boson with mass proportional to v_{Li} can be identified as the SM Z boson, and the

heavy state with mass proportional to v_{Ri} will be the Z_R boson. From eq. (9), the mixing of X with Z_R is suppressed by a factor $\mathcal{O}(\frac{v_{R3}^2 - v_{R2}^2}{v_{R3}^2 + v_{R2}^2})$. For multi-TeV X boson, the mixing with Z boson will be suppressed by $\mathcal{O}(\frac{m_Z^2}{M_X^2})$ and satisfies all the electroweak constraints (see, for example, [20]). In this minimal setup, H_{Ri} fields when assume vevs break the L-R symmetry as well as $U(1)_F$. Having the common source of breaking, the right-handed sector and the $U(1)_F$ gauge boson have masses of similar magnitude. Therefore, for further purposes, the masses of X, Z_R , and W_R^\pm are taken of the order of M_X i.e., the mass of X boson.

III. FERMION MASSES AND $\bar{\theta}$ AT LEADING ORDER AND BEYOND

A. Tree level

The imposition of well-defined parity symmetry forbids the θ_{QCD} in the Lagrangian and therefore, the contribution to $\bar{\theta}$ arises from the second term of eq. (1) i.e., from the phases of the quark mass matrices. With the set of fields given in Table I, the most general gauge and parity invariant renormalisable fermionic mass Lagrangian can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_y = & y_i^d (\bar{Q}_{Li} H_{Li} D_R + \bar{Q}_{Ri} H_{Ri} D_L) + y_i^e (\bar{L}_{Li} H_{Li} E_R + \bar{L}_{Ri} H_{Ri} E_L) \\ & + y_1^u (\bar{Q}_{L1} \tilde{H}_{L1} U_R + \bar{Q}_{R1} \tilde{H}_{R1} U_L) + y_2^u (\bar{Q}_{L2} \tilde{H}_{L3} U_R + \bar{Q}_{R2} \tilde{H}_{R3} U_L) \\ & + y_3^u (\bar{Q}_{L3} \tilde{H}_{L2} U_R + \bar{Q}_{R3} \tilde{H}_{R2} U_L) + m_U \bar{U}_L U_R + m_D \bar{D}_L D_R \\ & + m_E \bar{E}_L E_R + H.c. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The vector-like fermions mass terms $m_{U,D,E}$ are real because of parity invariance. Also, the redefinition of various fields allows us to absorb some of the phases of $y^{u,d,e}$. It can be seen that $y_i^{u,e}$ and y_3^d can be chosen real, leaving $y_{1,2}^d$ as only complex parameters of the theory. The latter generates the weak CP phase, which appears in the CKM matrix. It can also be noted that an accidental CP symmetry exists in the up-quark and the charged lepton sectors of the tree-level Lagrangian.

When the flavour symmetry, as well as the LR symmetry, is broken spontaneously to $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}$, the mass matrices for the charged fermions can be written as:

$$\mathcal{M}_u^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & y_1^u v_{L1} \\ & 0_{3 \times 3} & & y_2^u v_{L3} \\ & & & y_3^u v_{L2} \\ y_1^u v_{R1} & y_2^u v_{R3} & y_3^u v_{R2} & m_U \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_d^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & y_1^d v_{L1} \\ & 0_{3 \times 3} & & y_2^d v_{L2} \\ & & & y_3^d v_{L3} \\ y_1^{d*} v_{R1} & y_2^{d*} v_{R2} & y_3^d v_{R3} & m_D \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

with v_{Li}, v_{Ri} are the vevs defined in eq. (7) and are real. The mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_e^{(0)}$ for charged leptons can be obtained by replacing all y_i^d, y_i^{d*} with real y_i^e s. It can be seen that the above mass matrices are of Hermitian type, and two of the four eigenvalues are zero. Therefore,

at the tree level, a massless quark solution applies, and $\bar{\theta}$ is vanishing.

The mass matrices given in eq. (13) can be written in a compact form as:

$$\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu_f \\ \mu'_f & m_F \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

with m_F as the is the VL fermion mass term for F type, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_u &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^u v_{L1} & y_2^u v_{L3} & y_3^u v_{L2} \end{pmatrix}^T, & \mu'_u &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^u v_{R1} & y_2^u v_{R3} & y_3^u v_{R2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mu_d &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^d v_{L1} & y_2^d v_{L2} & y_3^d v_{L3} \end{pmatrix}^T, & \mu'_d &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^{d*} v_{R1} & y_2^{d*} v_{R2} & y_3^d v_{R3} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mu_e &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^e v_{L1} & y_2^e v_{L2} & y_3^e v_{L3} \end{pmatrix}^T, & \mu'_e &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1^e v_{R1} & y_2^e v_{R2} & y_3^e v_{R3} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

As mentioned earlier, the matrix $\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)}$ is of hermitian type as the complex part of μ_{fi} is proportional to y_i^d and that of μ'_{fi} is proportional to y_i^{d*} . Also, it has two non-vanishing eigenvalues, which can be identified as third-generation SM fermions and vector-like fermion states. In the seesaw limit, the effective 3×3 mass matrices for SM fermions can be written as:

$$M_f^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{m_F} \mu_f \mu'_f. \quad (16)$$

It can also be noted that the hermitian structure is retained by $M_f^{(0)}$ as complex parts of μ_f and μ'_f are conjugate of each other. Moreover, the above mass matrix gives masses only to third-generation fermions. The masses of lighter generation fermions arise at one-loop and two-loops as in [23] and, therefore, can have a possible contribution to the second term of eq. (1). The higher order corrections to $\bar{\theta}$ need to be computed only for the down-quark sector as the up-quark mass matrix given in eq. (16) is real and doesn't induce the complex parameters when gauge corrections are included.

The effects of quantum gravity are subject to the violation of all global symmetries. As parity falls under this category of symmetries, the gravity-induced corrections should be suppressed, maintaining the quality of the solution. The leading operators that could give possible contributions are:

$$\mathcal{L}^{d=5} = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{M_{Pl}} \bar{Q}_{Li} Q_{Rj} H_{Rj}^\dagger H_{Li} + .. \quad (17)$$

The above operators induce non-hermitian contributions to eq. (16). However, such contributions are much suppressed by the factor m_F/M_{Pl} . For $m_F \lesssim 10^{-6} M_{Pl}$, these terms don't even participate in inducing first-generation fermion masses; therefore, these corrections can be neglected.




FIG. 1. 1-loop diagrams generating the masses of second-generation fermions (left panel) and first-generation fermions (right panel).

B. 1-loop masses and $\bar{\theta}$

The 1-loop corrected fermion mass matrix can be parametrized as:

$$\mathcal{M}_f^{(1)} = \mathcal{M}_f^{(0)} + \delta\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)}, \quad (18)$$

where $\delta\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)}$ includes contributions from the 1-loop diagrams involving massive fermions and the X -gauge boson in the loop (see left panel of Fig. 1). It is evaluated as (see for example [20]):

$$\left(\delta\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} \equiv \left(\delta M_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} \simeq \frac{g_X^2}{4\pi^2} q_{Li} q_{Rj} \left(M_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} \left(B_0[M_X, m_3^{(0)}] - B_0[M_X, m_4^{(0)}]\right), \quad (19)$$

and $\left(\delta\mathcal{M}_f^{(0)}\right)_{\alpha 4} = \left(\delta M_f^{(0)}\right)_{4\alpha} = 0$ which is because of the vector-like fermions are chosen neutral under $U(1)_F$. Here B_0 is the usual Passarino-Veltmann function. It can be noticed that the terms proportional to Δ_ϵ of B_0 in $\delta M_{ij}^{(0)}$ cancel, rendering the loop-induced mass finite and calculable. The resulting $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$, therefore, can be written as:

$$\mathcal{M}_f^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\delta M_f^{(0)}\right)_{3\times 3} & \mu_f \\ \mu'_f & m_F \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

In the seesaw limit, the unitary matrices block diagonalising $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ given in eq. (20) can be approximated as:

$$\mathcal{U}_f^{(1)}{}_{L,R} \approx \begin{pmatrix} U_{fL,R}^{(1)} & -\rho_{fL,R}^{(1)} \\ \rho_{fL,R}^{(1)\dagger} U_{fL,R}^{(1)} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

with $\rho_f^{(1)}{}_{L,R} = \rho_f^{(0)}{}_{L,R}$ are the seesaw expansion parameters². $U_{fL,R}^{(1)}$ are the 3×3 unitary matrices which diagonalises the effective 1-loop corrected 3×3 mass matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(M_f^{(1)}\right)_{ij} &= \left(M_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} + \left(\delta M_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} \\ &= \left(M_f^{(0)}\right)_{ij} (1 + q_{Li} q_{Rj} C), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

² For the present model $\rho_f^{(0)}{}_L = -\mu_f/m_F$ and $\rho_f^{(0)\dagger}{}_R = -\mu'_f/m_F$.

with $C = g_X^2 (4\pi^2)^{-1} (B_0[M_X, m_3^{(0)}] - B_0[M_X, m_4^{(0)}])$. It can be seen that the determinant of the above mass matrix is vanishing, implying at least one massless state. For flavour nonuniversal charges, the masses of second-generation fermions are generated, and therefore, the diagonalisation of the effective mass matrix $M^{(1)}$ can be written as:

$$U_{fL}^{(1)\dagger} M_f^{(1)} U_{fR}^{(1)} = \text{Diag.} \left(0, m_{f2}^{(1)}, m_{f3}^{(1)} \right), \quad (23)$$

with $m_{fi}^{(n)}$ as mass of i^{th} generation fermion at n^{th} order. It also can be noticed from eq. (22) that the hermitian structure of the mass matrix is retained by the one-loop corrected mass matrix and, therefore, has a vanishing contribution to $\bar{\theta}$. The vanishing of $\bar{\theta}$ can also be understood in the following way: As one of the eigenvalues of the mass matrix $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ given in eq.(20) is zero; therefore $\bar{\theta}$ is still unphysical.

Apart from this, X-boson induced corrections $\delta\mathcal{M}$, given in eq. (18), the mass matrix also receives corrections from the diagrams involving physical neutral scalar mixings. It can be seen that these contributions give hermitian corrections to the mass matrix (see appendix B for detailed discussion) and don't induce the strong CP phase. However, such corrections can generate the first-generation masses, and the suppression requirement compared to second-generation fermions asks for a separate mechanism. Adding the scalar contributions also introduces several other potential parameters that are unconstrained and thereby lose the computability of the novel mechanism. However, such contributions can be made negligible by considering scalars heavy and/ or small mixing as pointed out in Ref. [20, 23].

C. 2-loop masses and $\bar{\theta}$

As mentioned earlier, the 1-loop gauge induced contributions generate the masses for second-generation fermions only. In this subsection, we show that 2-loop corrections can generate viable first-generation fermion masses. Following [23], the two-loop corrected mass matrix due to the X boson induced effects (see, right panel of Fig. 1) can be parameterized in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(M_f^{(2)} \right)_{ij} &= \left(M_f^{(0)} \right)_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{g_X^2}{4\pi^2} q_{Li} q_{Rj} (b_0[M_X, m_{f3}^{(1)}] - b_0[M_X, m_F]) \right) \\ &+ \left(\delta M_f^{(0)} \right)_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{g_X^2}{4\pi^2} q_{Li} q_{Rj} b_0[M_X, m_{f3}^{(1)}] \right) \\ &+ \frac{g_X^2}{4\pi^2} q_{Li} q_{Rj} \left(U_{fL}^{(1)} \right)_{i2} \left(U_{fR}^{(1)} \right)_{j2}^* m_{f2}^{(1)} (b_0[M_X, m_{f2}^{(1)}] - b_0[M_X, m_{f3}^{(1)}]), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $U_{L,R}^{(1)}$ are the unitary matrices which are defined in eq. (23) and b_0 is the finite part of B_0 in $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme. It can be seen that the first two terms are proportional to $M_f^{(0)}$ and $\delta M_f^{(0)}$, respectively, and therefore can not generate non-hermitian entries in the mass matrix. For up-quark sector and charged lepton sector $M_{u,e}^{(0)}$ and $\delta M_{u,e}^{(0)}$ as well as $U_{L,R}^{(1)}$ are

real matrices, so $M_u^{(2)}$ doesn't give contribution to $\bar{\theta}$ at two loop level. This is expected as there is accidental CP symmetry, mentioned in subsection III A, in the up sector at the leading order, and the gauge interactions of X boson with up quarks don't violate that symmetry.

For the down-quark sector, although the third term proportional to $\left(U_{dL}^{(1)}\right)_{i2} \left(U_{dR}^{(1)}\right)_{j2}^*$ seems to induce complex entries in the mass matrix, it can be shown that they will be of hermitian nature. $U_{dL}^{(1)}$ and $U_{dR}^{(1)}$ diagonalizes the matrices $M_d^{(1)} M_d^{(1)\dagger}$ and $M_d^{(1)\dagger} M_d^{(1)}$, respectively. As $M_d^{(1)}$ is of hermitian type, $M_d^{(1)} M_d^{(1)\dagger}$ and $M_d^{(1)\dagger} M_d^{(1)}$ has same phase. This can be understood as follows. Defining θ_i as the phase of y_i^d , the phases of μ_{di} and μ'_{di} will be θ_i and $-\theta_i$, respectively with $\theta_3 = 0$. Now the elements $\left(M_d^{(1)} M_d^{(1)\dagger}\right)_{ij}$ and $\left(M_d^{(1)\dagger} M_d^{(1)}\right)_{ij}$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(M_d^{(1)} M_d^{(1)\dagger}\right)_{ij} &= \frac{|\mu_{di}| |\mu_{dj}|}{m_F^2} e^{i\theta_{ij}} \sum_k |\mu'_{dk}|^2 (1 + C q_i q_k) (1 + C q_j q_k), \\ \left(M_d^{(1)\dagger} M_d^{(1)}\right)_{ij} &= \frac{|\mu'_{di}| |\mu'_{dj}|}{m_F^2} e^{i\theta_{ij}} \sum_k |\mu_{dk}|^2 (1 + C q_i q_k) (1 + C q_j q_k). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Here we have used $q_{Li} = q_{Ri} \cong q_i$ and $\theta_{ij} = \theta_i - \theta_j$, and the constant factor C is defined in eq. (22). From eq. (25), it is obvious that both $\left(M_d^{(1)} M_d^{(1)\dagger}\right)_{ij}$ and $\left(M_d^{(1)\dagger} M_d^{(1)}\right)_{ij}$ has the same phase, and their elements can be obtained from each other by the interchange $|\mu_i| \leftrightarrow |\mu'_i|$. As the phases of the earlier two are the same, therefore the phases of elements $\left(U_{dL}^{(1)}\right)_{ij}$ and $\left(U_{dR}^{(1)}\right)_{ij}$ will be the same (see, appendix C for clarity). It can be seen that the product $\left(U_{dL}^{(1)}\right)_{i2} \left(U_{dR}^{(1)}\right)_{j2}^*$ in eq. (24) will have the phase factor $e^{i\theta_{ij}}$. Also, the phase factors of $(M_d^{(0)})_{ij}$ and $(\delta M_d^{(0)})_{ij}$ will be $e^{i\theta_{ij}}$ as both are proportional to $\mu_{di} \mu'_{dj}$. Therefore, from eq. (24) the phase factor of $(M_f^{(2)})_{ij}$ will be $e^{i\theta_{ij}}$ and same for $(M_f^{(2)})_{ji}$ will be $e^{-i\theta_{ij}}$. This implies the hermitian nature of the mass matrix is retained, and the determinant is real. So,

$$\bar{\theta}_{2\text{-loop}}^{(X)} = \text{Arg}.\det(M_d^{(2)}) = 0. \quad (26)$$

D. Weak CP contribution to d_n^e

Herein, we compute the neutron electric dipole moment, d_n^e , induced at the 1-loop level due to the weak CP violating phases. It can be seen that attaching a photon line to the internal fermion lines of the left panel of Fig. 1 gives a possible contribution to d_n^e . This contribution is proportional to the imaginary part of δM_{11}^d . For the X-boson exchange diagram, δM_{11}^d is real at 1-loop level (see eq. (19)) and the same for the scalar mediated contribution given in eq. B4. Therefore;

$$d_n^e \propto \text{Im} \left((\delta M_d^{(X)})_{11} + (\delta M_d^{(S)})_{11} \right) = 0. \quad (27)$$

This is an interesting feature of our model, which results from the fact that vector-like fermion masses are real. This feature is not shared by the other class of models [39] that use the universal seesaw for generating fermion masses by considering vector-like fermion mass terms as complex parameters. Although in their model, non-vanishing d_n^e is induced at the 1-loop level, the value is small enough to fall under the experimentally allowed region.

IV. PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

As previously noted in last paragraph of section II, the model features both flavour symmetry breaking and left-right symmetry breaking occurring at a similar scale. Unlike other new particles, the X boson exhibits significant flavour-violating interactions with SM fermions, making it highly relevant for phenomenological investigations. Assuming the vector-like fermions are heavier than the X boson, with their coupling additionally suppressed by the see-saw expansion parameters $\mu/m_F, \mu'/m_F$; we focus on the flavour-changing neutral current (FCNC) effects mediated by the X boson for the remainder of this section.

The X boson's flavour-violating couplings naturally induce meson-antimeson oscillations at tree level. In the lepton sector, exchange of the X boson prompts flavour-violating processes such as $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in nuclei and trilepton decays $l_i \rightarrow 3l_j$ at the leading order. Processes like $l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma$ arise at the one-loop level. In our previous study (ref. [20]), a detailed phenomenological analysis of these flavour-violating effects was conducted, indicating a new physics scale around $M_X \approx 10^8$ GeV, consistent with all flavour constraints. A comparable bound is found in another study (ref. [23]) for the case of $\epsilon = 1$ in the model discussed there. For this new physics scale, the contribution to electro-weak precision observables arising from $Z - X$ mixing and $Z - Z_R$ mixing are automatically satisfied [20]. Also, such constraint is much more stringent compared to the W_R, Z_R mass constraint obtained in [41].

V. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The vanishing of new gauge correction induced $\bar{\theta}$ at 1-loop and 2-loop level can be guessed as the gauge interactions of X don't violate the parity symmetry. This can be easy to identify in the flavour basis. For example,

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = g_X X_\mu (q_{Li} \bar{f}_{Li} \gamma^\mu f_{Li} + q_{Ri} \bar{f}_{Ri} \gamma^\mu f_{Ri}) , \quad (28)$$

For the present model, $q_{Li} = q_{Ri} \cong q_i$, therefore the above interaction is invariant under the parity transformations defined in eq. (3).

In the mass basis of the fermions, the eq. (28) can be written as:

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = g_X X_\mu \left((Q_f^{(0)}{}_L)_{ij} \bar{f}'_{Li} \gamma^\mu f'_{Lj} + (Q_f^{(0)}{}_R)_{ij} \bar{f}'_{Ri} \gamma^\mu f'_{Rj} \right), \quad (29)$$

with

$$Q_f^{(0)}{}_{L,R} = U_f^{(0)\dagger}{}_{L,R} q U_f^{(0)}{}_{L,R}. \quad (30)$$

Here $U_f^{(0)}{}_{L,R}$ are the unitary matrices that diagonalise the tree-level effective mass matrix given in eq. (16). For the up-quark sector, these matrices are real orthogonal, so $Q_u^{(0)}{}_{L,R}$ doesn't induce complex parameters in the Lagrangian. For down-quark sector: following the argument given in the last paragraph of section III C and appendix C, it can be shown that $(U_d^{(0)}{}_L)_{ij}$ and $(U_d^{(0)}{}_R)_{ij}$ also shares a common phase. Identifying the phase as θ_{ij} , with $\theta_{ij} = \theta_i - \theta_j$, eq. (29) can be rewritten for down-quark sector as:

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = g_X X_\mu \left(|(Q_d^{(0)}{}_L)_{ij}| e^{-i\theta_{ij}} \bar{d}'_{Li} \gamma^\mu d'_{Lj} + |(Q_d^{(0)}{}_R)_{ij}| e^{-i\theta_{ij}} \bar{d}'_{Ri} \gamma^\mu d'_{Rj} \right). \quad (31)$$

It shows that the couplings of X in the left-handed sector and the right-handed sector have the same phase. As the mass terms require the mixing of both the chiralities, the product is always hermitian type. Also, the mass insertions m_D and m_3 are real, as the latter is proportional to the trace of the mass matrix given in eq. (16). Therefore, we conclude that the gauge corrections of X boson in any order of perturbation theory don't induce the strong CP phase.

The above argument can also be understood by comparing the model structure with [39]. Writing the Lagrangian of our model in the form:

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} + \mathcal{L}_X + \mathcal{L}_{\text{scalar}}, \quad (32)$$

It can be seen that the part $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} + \mathcal{L}_X$ doesn't violate the parity symmetry and mimics the role of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}}$ with Universal seesaw mechanism of [39]. Therefore, the corrections induced by \mathcal{L}_X don't generate $\bar{\theta}$ at all orders of perturbation theory. Parity symmetry is broken softly in the scalar sector, so the radiative effects of scalars give a potential non-vanishing strong CP phase. Following [39], scalar induced 2-loop $\bar{\theta}$ can be approximated as:

$$\bar{\theta} \sim \left(\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{v_L}{v_R} \right)^2 \phi^2. \quad (33)$$

Here, the phase ϕ can be originated from mixing various μ and μ' . The factor v_L/v_R is due to the mixing of H_{Li} and H_{Rj} . For ϕ as $\mathcal{O}(1)$, v_L as electroweak scale and v_R as the $U(1)_F$ breaking scale i.e, $v_R \sim M_X \sim 10^8$, it can be seen $\bar{\theta} \sim 10^{-14}$. This value is three orders of magnitude smaller than the current experimental limit. Therefore, the model provides a viable solution to the strong CP problem.

VI. SUMMARY

The mechanism of radiative generation of fermion masses not only has a tendency to reproduce the observed spectrum of hierarchical fermion masses but also makes the latter computable parameters of the theory. The model presented in this study accommodates the said mechanism and also has a potential solution to the well-known strong CP problem. A parity invariant L-R symmetric model is employed to achieve a small, strong CP phase and the radiative mass generation for the SM fermions is incorporated by extending the gauge sector by a flavour-dependent Abelian gauge symmetry, G_F . An additional generation of vector-like fermions, which are crucial for the mechanism, are added for each charged fermion type. This setup produces tree-level seesaw masses for the third-generation SM fermions, while the masses of the first two generations are generated at one- and two-loop levels via gauge corrections, allowing for $\mathcal{O}(1)$ values in the Yukawa couplings. The flavour non-universal symmetry G_F required for this mechanism is $U(1)_{2-3}$, analogous to an all-fermion version of the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry. The feature of successive increase of the rank of the mass matrices at different loops is also exploited to get a smaller strong CP phase at the higher order. It is found that the \mathcal{L}_X gauge corrections alone don't break parity symmetry, and the induced strong CP phase is vanishing for all orders of perturbation theory. However, scalar-induced corrections contribute to the non-vanishing $\bar{\theta}$ and at the 2-loop level, estimated to be the order of 10^{-14} . Precise measurement of $\bar{\theta}$ may falsify the model depending upon the measured value.

The minimal version of the model suggests that both the flavour symmetry breaking scale and the $SU(2)_R$ symmetry (parity) breaking scale are comparable. The non-universality of the new flavoured gauge interactions introduces various flavour-changing transitions in both quark and lepton sectors, leading to a range of phenomenologically intriguing signatures. From various flavour-violating processes, the new physics scale is constrained to be near 10^8 GeV or above. Compared to this constraint, the parity-breaking constraints are negligible. Although this large separation from the electroweak scale seems ugly, it is inherent in this type of class of models, which explains the mass hierarchy using gauge corrections. Moreover, such a fine-tuned solution is possible as numerous undetermined parameters exist in the scalar potential.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I sincerely thank Dr. Ketan M. Patel for his invaluable discussions, insightful suggestions, and meticulous review of the manuscript. I am also grateful to Dr. Saurabh K. Shukla for reading the draft and providing valuable feedback. This research is supported by the Department of Space (DoS), Government of India.

Appendix A: Scalar Potential

The gauge and parity invariant renormalisable scalar potential can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \mu_{Li}^2 H_{Li}^\dagger H_{Li} + \mu_{Ri}^2 H_{Ri}^\dagger H_{Ri} + (\lambda)_{ij} \left[(H_{Li}^\dagger H_{Li}) (H_{Lj}^\dagger H_{Lj}) + (H_{Ri}^\dagger H_{Ri}) (H_{Rj}^\dagger H_{Rj}) \right] \\
& + (\tilde{\lambda})_{ij} \left[(H_{Li}^\dagger H_{Lj}) (H_{Lj}^\dagger H_{Li}) + (H_{Ri}^\dagger H_{Rj}) (H_{Rj}^\dagger H_{Ri}) \right] + (\lambda^4)_{ij} (H_{Li}^\dagger H_{Li}) (H_{Rj}^\dagger H_{Rj}) \\
& + (\tilde{\lambda}^4)_{ij} (H_{Li}^\dagger H_{Lj}) (H_{Rj}^\dagger H_{Ri}) + H.c., \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

with $()$ bracket indicating weak singlets. Here $\mu_{Li}^2 \neq \mu_{Ri}^2$ is chosen to break the parity symmetry softly. Also, $\tilde{\lambda}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}^4$ can have vanishing diagonal elements without loss of generality. It can be seen that all the potential parameters are real. $\mu_{L,Ri}^2$, λ , $\tilde{\lambda}$ and λ^4 are real as the corresponding operators are self-conjugate. $(\tilde{\lambda}^4)_{ij}$ is real as the conjugate of its respective operator is the same as its parity-transformed one. As all the parameters of the potential are real, we assume that they lead to real vacuum expectation values. The latter is completely deterministic from the potential parameters. Denoting vevs as $v_{L,Ri}$, given in eq. (7), the minimisation of the potential gives;

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial v_{Li}} = 0 \implies 2\mu_{Li}^2 v_{Li} + 2(\lambda_{ij} + \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}) v_{Li} v_{Lj}^2 + 2(\lambda^4)_{ij} v_{Li} v_{Rj}^2 + (\tilde{\lambda}^4)_{ij} v_{Lj} v_{Ri} v_{Rj} = 0 \tag{A2}$$

A similar equation holds for $L \rightarrow R$. Considering small mixing between H_{Li} and H_{Ri} i.e., $\lambda^4, \tilde{\lambda}^4 \ll 1$, the above equations can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{Li}^2 + (\lambda_{ij} + \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}) v_{Lj}^2 &= 0 \\
\mu_{Ri}^2 + (\lambda_{ij} + \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}) v_{Rj}^2 &= 0 \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

On solving,

$$\frac{v_{Li}^2}{v_{Ri}^2} = \frac{\left((\lambda + \tilde{\lambda})^{-1} \cdot \mu_L^2 \right)_i}{\left((\lambda + \tilde{\lambda})^{-1} \cdot \mu_R^2 \right)_i} \tag{A4}$$

where $\mu_{L,R}^2 = \left(\mu_{L1,R1}^2 \ \mu_{L2,R2}^2 \ \mu_{L3,R3}^2 \right)^T$. The large separation between v_{Li} and v_{Ri} can be obtained only at the cost of tuning the parameters $\mu_{Li,Ri}^2$. Assuming the v_R as the $U(1)_F$ flavour symmetry breaking scale, The degree of fine-tuning required is $\Delta^{-1} = v_L^2/v_R^2 \sim 10^{-12}$. This hierarchy problem is intrinsic to the radiative mass models and is analogous to the gauge hierarchy problem.

Denoting h_{Li} and h_{Ri} as the electrically neutral components of H_{Li} and H_{Ri} , their 6×6 mixing matrix can be expressed as:

$$M_h^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{LL}^2 & m_{LR}^2 \\ m_{RL}^2 & m_{RR}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A5}$$

This is a real symmetric matrix with entries $m_{PP'}^2$ ($P, P' = L, R$) each of 3×3 dimension. It can be diagonalised by a real orthogonal matrix \mathcal{R} , which can be written in the form;

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}_{LL} & \mathcal{R}_{LR} \\ \mathcal{R}_{RL} & \mathcal{R}_{RR} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

The physical neutral scalars S_a , which are obtained using the above transformation, are of the form

$$S_a = \mathcal{R}_{ab}^T h_b, \quad (\text{A7})$$

with $h_a = (h_{Li} \ h_{Ri})^T$ and $a, b = 1, 2, \dots, 6$.

Appendix B: Scalar 1-loop contributions and real determinant

The interaction of physical neutral scalars with the fermions, for example, d quarks, in the mass basis will be written as:

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = (\tilde{y}_d)_{ia} \bar{d}'_{Li} S_a D'_R + (\tilde{y}'_d)_{ia} \bar{D}'_{Li} S_a d'_R + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\mu_d}{m_D}, \frac{\mu'_d}{m_D}\right), \quad (\text{B1})$$

with,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{y}_d)_{ia} &= \sum_j \left(U_{dL}^{(0)\dagger} \right)_{ij} y_j^d (\mathcal{R}_L)_{ja}, \\ (\tilde{y}'_d)_{ia} &= \sum_j \left(U_{dR}^{(0)T} \right)_{ij} y_j^{d*} (\mathcal{R}_R)_{ja}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

In the above, $\mathcal{R}_L = (\mathcal{R}_{LL} \ \mathcal{R}_{LR})$ and $\mathcal{R}_R = (\mathcal{R}_{RL} \ \mathcal{R}_{RR})$ are the 3×6 submatrices of \mathcal{R} . The presence of the above interactions also contributes to the self-energy corrections of the fermions at the 1-loop level, which is diagrammatically similar to the one on the left panel of Fig. 1 with X boson replaced by physical scalars S_a . The amplitude of this diagram has the form:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{(S)} = -\frac{m_D}{16\pi^2} \sum_a (\tilde{y}_d)_{ia} (\tilde{y}'_d)_{ja} B_0[m_{S_a}, m_D], \quad (\text{B3})$$

with $B_0[m_{S_a}, m_D]$ as two-point Passarino-Veltman function. Corrections to the mass matrix can be written as;

$$(\delta M^{(S)})_{ij} = \left(U_{dL}^{(0)} \sigma^{(S)} U_{dR}^{(0)\dagger} \right)_{ij} = -\frac{m_D}{16\pi^2} y_i^d y_j^{d*} \sum_a (\mathcal{R}_L)_{ia} (\mathcal{R}_R)_{ja} B_0[m_{S_a}, m_D]. \quad (\text{B4})$$

It can be seen that the above contribution is of hermitian nature as it is proportional to $y_i^d y_j^{d*}$. Also, these corrections, when added to the mass matrix given in eq. (22) can potentially generate the first-generation fermion masses at 1-loop level only. However, such corrections can be ignored under the circumstances mentioned at the end of section III B.

Including the scalar 1-loop contributions given in eq. (B4), the elements of the total 1-loop correct mass matrix can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} (M^{(1)})_{ij} &= (M^{(0)})_{ij} + (\delta M^{(0)(X)})_{ij} + (\delta M^{(0)(S)})_{ij} \\ &= -\frac{1}{m_F} (\mu_i \mu'_j + C \mu_i \mu'_j q_i q_j + \mu_i \mu'_j A_{ij}) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

with the real constant factor C defined in eq. (22) and

$$A_{ij} = -\frac{m_D^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{v_{Li} v_{Rj}} \sum_a (\mathcal{R}_L)_{ia} (\mathcal{R}_R)_{ja} B_0[m_{Sa}, m_D]. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Now, writing in matrix form:

$$M^{(1)} = \frac{-1}{m_F} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \mu'_1 (1 + C q_1 q_1 + A_{11}) & \mu_1 \mu'_2 (1 + C q_1 q_2 + A_{12}) & \mu_1 \mu'_3 (1 + C q_1 q_3 + A_{13}) \\ \mu_2 \mu'_1 (1 + C q_2 q_1 + A_{21}) & \mu_2 \mu'_2 (1 + C q_2 q_2 + A_{22}) & \mu_2 \mu'_3 (1 + C q_2 q_3 + A_{23}) \\ \mu_3 \mu'_1 (1 + C q_3 q_1 + A_{31}) & \mu_3 \mu'_2 (1 + C q_3 q_2 + A_{32}) & \mu_3 \mu'_3 (1 + C q_3 q_3 + A_{33}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

The absolute hermiticity of the above matrix would require $\mu_i = \mu'_i$ and $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ (since A_{ij} are real). Since, as already mentioned, the phase of μ_i and μ'_i are equal and opposite, the phase of $M_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $M_{ji}^{(1)}$ turn out to be equal and opposite. Therefore, the determinant is real. For this reason, these matrices are called the Hermitian type.

Appendix C: Phases of $U_{L,R}$

Eq. (25) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} (M^\dagger M)_{ij} &= c_{ij} e^{i\theta_{ij}} , \\ (MM^\dagger)_{ij} &= d_{ij} e^{i\theta_{ij}} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

where c_{ij} and d_{ij} are the real constants. Similar form can be obtained for $M^{(0,1)\dagger} M^{(0,1)}$ and $M^{(0,1)} M^{(0,1)\dagger}$. So, we have suppressed the super-scripts and subscripts for brevity. Now, inverting the bi-unitary diagonalization equations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (M^\dagger M)_{ij} &= \left(U_L D^2 U_L^\dagger \right)_{ij} , \\ (MM^\dagger)_{ij} &= \left(U_R D^2 U_R^\dagger \right)_{ij} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

with $D = \text{Diag.}(m_k)$. Now, putting eq. (C1) in eq. (C2) and using the fact $\theta_{ij} = \theta_i - \theta_j$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} c_{ij} &= \left(e^{-i\theta_{ik}} (U_L)_{ik} \right) m_k^2 \left(e^{-i\theta_{jk}} (U_L)_{jk} \right)^* , \\ d_{ij} &= \left(e^{-i\theta_{ik}} (U_R)_{ik} \right) m_k^2 \left(e^{-i\theta_{jk}} (U_R)_{jk} \right)^* , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

Since the quantities c_{ij} , d_{ij} and m_k^2 are real, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}(U_L)_{ik} &= a_{ik}^L e^{i\theta_{ik}}, \\ (U_R)_{ik} &= a_{ik}^R e^{i\theta_{ik}}\end{aligned}\tag{C4}$$

with $a_{ik}^{L,R}$ as any real elements. Hence it is shown that the phase of $(U_L)_{ik}$ and $(U_R)_{ik}$ are equal.

-
- [1] Steven Weinberg, “Electromagnetic and weak masses,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29**, 388–392 (1972).
 - [2] Howard Georgi and Sheldon L. Glashow, “Attempts to calculate the electron mass,” *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 2457–2463 (1973).
 - [3] Stephen M. Barr and A. Zee, “Calculating the Electron Mass in Terms of Measured Quantities,” *Phys. Rev. D* **17**, 1854 (1978).
 - [4] Frank Wilczek and A. Zee, “Horizontal Interaction and Weak Mixing Angles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 421 (1979).
 - [5] Tsutomu Yanagida, “Horizontal Symmetry and Mass of the Top Quark,” *Phys. Rev. D* **20**, 2986 (1979).
 - [6] B. S. Balakrishna, “Fermion Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1602 (1988).
 - [7] B. S. Balakrishna, A. L. Kagan, and R. N. Mohapatra, “Quark Mixings and Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections,” *Phys. Lett. B* **205**, 345–352 (1988).
 - [8] B. S. Balakrishna, “RADIATIVELY INDUCED LEPTON MASSES,” *Phys. Lett. B* **214**, 267–272 (1988).
 - [9] B. S. Balakrishna and R. N. Mohapatra, “Radiative Fermion Masses From New Physics at TeV Scale,” *Phys. Lett. B* **216**, 349–352 (1989).
 - [10] K. S. Babu and Xiao-Gang He, “Fermion mass hierarchy and the strong CP problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **219**, 342–346 (1989).
 - [11] K. S. Babu, B. S. Balakrishna, and R. N. Mohapatra, “Supersymmetric Model for Fermion Mass Hierarchy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **237**, 221–228 (1990).
 - [12] Bogdan A. Dobrescu and Patrick J. Fox, “Quark and lepton masses from top loops,” *JHEP* **08**, 100 (2008), [arXiv:0805.0822 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [13] Peter W. Graham and Surjeet Rajendran, “A Domino Theory of Flavor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 033002 (2010), [arXiv:0906.4657 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [14] Steven Weinberg, “Models of Lepton and Quark Masses,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 035020 (2020), [arXiv:2001.06582 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [15] Michael J. Baker, Peter Cox, and Raymond R. Volkas, “Has the Origin of the Third-Family Fermion Masses been Determined?” *JHEP* **04**, 151 (2021), [arXiv:2012.10458 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [16] Sudip Jana, Sophie Klett, and Manfred Lindner, “Flavor seesaw mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 115015 (2022), [arXiv:2112.09155 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [17] Cheng-Wei Chiang and Kei Yagyu, “Radiative Seesaw Mechanism for Charged Leptons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L111302 (2021), [arXiv:2104.00890 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [18] Cheng-Wei Chiang, Ryomei Obuchi, and Kei Yagyu, “Dark sector as origin of light lepton mass and its phenomenology,” *JHEP* **05**, 070 (2022), [arXiv:2202.07784 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] Michael J. Baker, Peter Cox, and Raymond R. Volkas, “Radiative muon mass models and $(g - 2)_\mu$,” *JHEP* **05**, 174 (2021), [arXiv:2103.13401 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] Gurucharan Mohanta and Ketan M. Patel, “Radiatively generated fermion mass hierarchy from flavor nonuniversal gauge symmetries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 075020 (2022), [arXiv:2207.10407 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] Gurucharan Mohanta and Ketan M. Patel, “Gauged $SU(3)_F$ and loop induced quark and lepton masses,” *JHEP* **10**, 128 (2023), [arXiv:2308.05642 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] Ravi Kuchimanchi, “Parity and Lepton Masses in the Left Right Symmetric Model,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.14480 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] Gurucharan Mohanta and Ketan M. Patel, “Loop-induced masses for the first two generations with optimum flavour violation,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.19179 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] We-Fu Chang, “Exploring a Gauge Horizontal Model for Charged Fermion Masses,” (2024), [arXiv:2408.02238 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] Sudip Jana, Sophie Klett, Manfred Lindner, and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “Radiative Origin of Fermion Mass Hierarchy in Left-Right Symmetric Theory,” (2024), [arXiv:2409.04246 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] C. Abel *et al.*, “Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081803 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11966 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [27] Howard Georgi and Ian N. McArthur, “INSTANTONS AND THE μ QUARK MASS,” (1981).
- [28] Kiwoon Choi, C. W. Kim, and W. K. Sze, “Mass Renormalization by Instantons and the Strong CP Problem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 794 (1988).
- [29] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440–1443 (1977).
- [30] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1791–1797 (1977).
- [31] Frank Wilczek, “Problem of Strong P and T Invariance in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279–282 (1978).
- [32] Steven Weinberg, “A New Light Boson?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223–226 (1978).
- [33] Jihn E. Kim, “Weak Interaction Singlet and Strong CP Invariance,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 103 (1979).
- [34] Mikhail A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and Valentin I. Zakharov, “Can Confinement Ensure Natural CP Invariance of Strong Interactions?” *Nucl. Phys. B* **166**, 493–506 (1980).
- [35] Michael Dine, Willy Fischler, and Mark Srednicki, “A Simple Solution to the Strong CP Problem with a Harmless Axion,” *Phys. Lett. B* **104**, 199–202 (1981).

- [36] Ann E. Nelson, “Naturally Weak CP Violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **136**, 387–391 (1984).
- [37] Stephen M. Barr, “Solving the Strong CP Problem Without the Peccei-Quinn Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 329 (1984).
- [38] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “CP Violation in Seesaw Models of Quark Masses,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1079 (1989).
- [39] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra, “A Solution to the Strong CP Problem Without an Axion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 1286 (1990).
- [40] Stephen M. Barr, D. Chang, and G. Senjanovic, “Strong CP problem and parity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 2765–2768 (1991).
- [41] Nathaniel Craig, Isabel Garcia Garcia, Giacomo Koszegi, and Amara McCune, “P not PQ,” *JHEP* **09**, 130 (2021), [arXiv:2012.13416 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] Ravi Kuchimanchi, “P/CP Conserving CP/P Violation Solves Strong CP Problem,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 116008 (2010), [arXiv:1009.5961 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] Ritu Deruz and K. S. Babu, “Resolving W boson mass shift and CKM unitarity violation in left-right symmetric models with a universal seesaw mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 095011 (2023), [arXiv:2212.09697 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] Ravi Kuchimanchi, “P and CP solution of the strong CP puzzle,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 095023 (2023), [arXiv:2306.03039 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] K. S. Babu, Rabindra N. Mohapatra, and Nobuchika Okada, “Parity solution to the strong CP problem and a unified framework for inflation, baryogenesis, and dark matter,” *JHEP* **01**, 136 (2024), [arXiv:2307.14869 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] K. S. Babu, Rabindra N. Mohapatra, and Anil Thapa, “Predictive Dirac neutrino spectrum with strong CP solution in $SU(5)_L \times SU(5)_R$ unification,” *JHEP* **04**, 049 (2024), [arXiv:2312.14096 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] Gang Li, Ding-Yi Luo, and Xiang Zhao, “Calculable neutrino Dirac mass matrix and one-loop θ^- in the minimal left-right symmetric model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 035030 (2024), [arXiv:2404.16740 \[hep-ph\]](#).