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Abstract

Standard lore ritualizes our quantum vacuum in the 4-dimensional spacetime (4d) governed by one of the candidate Standard Models (SMs), while lifting towards one of Grand Unifications (GUTs) at higher energy scales. In contrast, in our work, we introduce an alternative viewpoint that the SM is a low energy quantum vacuum arising from various neighbor GUT vacua competition in an immense quantum phase diagram. In general, we can regard the SM arising near the quantum criticality (either critical points or critical regions) between the competing neighbor vacua. In particular detail, we demonstrate how the \(su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)\) SM with 16n Weyl fermions arisen near the quantum criticality between the competing neighbor vacua of Georgi-Glashow \(su(5)\) model and Pati-Salam \(su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)\) model. Moreover, to manifest a Beyond-the-Standard-Model (BSM) quantum criticality between Georgi-Glashow and Pati-Salam models, we introduce a mother effective field theory of a modified \(so(10)\) GUT (with a Spin(10) gauge group) plus a new 4d discrete torsion class of Wess-Zumino-Witten-like term that saturates a nonperturbative global mixed gauge-gravity anomaly captured by a 5d invertible topological field theory \(w_2w_3(TM) = w_2w_3(V_{SO(10)})\). If the internal symmetries were treated as global symmetries (or weakly coupled to probe background fields), we show an analogous gapless 4d deconfined quantum criticality with new BSM fractionalized fragmentary excitations of Color-Flavor separation, and gauge enhancement including a Dark Gauge force sector. If the internal symmetries are dynamically gauged (as they are in our quantum vacuum), we show the gauge-enhanced 4d criticality as a boundary criticality such that only appropriately gauge enhanced dynamical GUT gauge fields can propagate into an extra-dimensional 5d bulk. The phenomena may be regarded as a BSM “morphogenesis.”
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Laozi (B.C. 600) - Dao De Jing - an excerpt
1 Introduction and Summary

It is a common ritual practice in high-energy physics (HEP) to regards our quantum vacuum in the 4-dimensional spacetime (denoted as 4d or 3+1d) governed by one of the candidate $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$ Standard Models (SMs) [1–4], while lifting towards one of some Grand Unifications (GUTs) [5–7] or String Theory at higher energy scales.\(^1\)

In contrast, in our present work, we initiate and introduce an alternative complementary perspective — we propose that the SM vacuum may be a low energy quantum vacuum arising from the quantum competition of various neighbor GUT vacua in an immense quantum phase diagram:\(^2\)

- In general, we propose that the SM may arise as one adjacent phase from the vicinity of quantum criticality (either critical points or critical regions, see an overview [8]) between the competing neighbor GUT vacua.
- In particular, we demonstrate how the $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$ SM [1–4] with 16n Weyl fermions (Fig. 1) could emerge near the quantum criticality between two neighbor vacua of Georgi-Glashow $su(5)$ model [5] (Fig. 2) and Pati-Salam $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$ model [6] (Fig. 3), which represents two distinct Higgs phases of the further unified $so(10)$ GUT (with a Spin(10) gauge group).

To introduce non-trivial competitions between Georgi-Glashow (GG) and Pati-Salam (PS) phases, we consider a new mother effective field theory of an upgraded $so(10)$ GUT, which includes not only the familiar $so(10)$ GUT [7] (Fig. 4), but also a new extra 4d discrete torsion class of Wess-Zumino-Witten-like (WZW) term that saturates a mod-2 class nonperturbative global anomaly of mixed gauge-gravitational (i.e., gauge-diffeomorphism) probes, captured by a 5d invertible topological quantum field theory (TQFT): $(-1)^f w_{2w3}(TM) = (-1)^f w_{2w3}(V_{SO(10)})$ type.\(^3\) The WZW term introduces nonperturbative interaction effects between different GUT-Higgs fields, which causes

---

\(^1\)Throughout our article, we denote nd for n-dimensional spacetime, or $n' + 1d$ as an $n'$-dimensional space and 1-dimensional time. We also denote the Lie algebra in the lower case such as $so(10)$, and denote the Lie group in the capital case such as Spin(10). For example, we follow the convention to call the model [7] as the $so(10)$ GUT, but it requires the Spin(10) gauge group.

\(^2\)Here quantum phases mean that we focus on the zero temperature physics where the quantum effect is dominant, see for example an overview [8].

\(^3\)The $w_j$ is the $j$-th Stiefel-Whitney (SW) characteristic class. The $w_j(TM)$ is the SW class of spacetime tangent bundle $TM$ of manifold $M$. The $w_j(V_G)$ is the SW class of the principal $G$ bundle. This mod 2 class $w_{2w3}$ global anomaly has been checked to be absent in the $so(10)$ GUT by Ref. [9,10]. This mixed gauge-gravitational anomaly is tightly related to the new $SU(2)$ anomaly [10] due to the bundle constraint $w_2w_3(TM) = w_2w_3(V_G)$ with $G$ can be substituted by $SO(3) \subset SO(10)$ related to the embedding $SU(2) = Spin(3) \subset Spin(10)$. However, as we will see, it is natural to introduce a new 4d WZW term (appending to the $so(10)$ GUT) with this $w_{2w3}$ global anomaly in order to realize the SM vacuum as the quantum criticality phenomenon between the nearby $SU(5)$ GUT and Pati-Salam vacua.

The $w_{2w3}$ global anomaly also occurs on a certain $Z_2$ gauge theory with fermionic strings [11] and all-fermion U(1) electrodynamics [12,13] which is a pure U(1) gauge theory whose electric, magnetic, and dyonic objects are all fermions. For these $Z_2$ and U(1) gauge theories, they do have the spacetime tangent bundle constraints on $TM$, but do not have the analogous gauge bundle constraints on $V_G$. So this $w_{2w3} = w_{2w3}(TM)$ anomaly becomes a pure gravitational anomaly for these $Z_2$ and U(1) gauge theories.

We recommend the following references [14–17] or this seminar video [18] for readers who wish to overview some modern perspectives about the anomalies of SM and GUT relevant gauge theories. In particular, we follow closely Ref. [17,18].

In summary, we may address anomalies with different adjectives to characterize their properties:

- Invertible vs noninvertible: We only focus on the invertible anomalies, which follow the standard definition of anomalies (also in high-energy physics) captured by one higher-dimensional invertible TQFT as the low energy theory of invertible topological phases. The d-dimensional invertible anomalies (also the $(d+1)$d invertible TQFTs) are classified by the cobordism group data $\Omega^\infty_{d+1} \equiv TP_d(G)$ defined in Freed-Hopkins [19]. The partition function $Z$ of a $(d+1)$d invertible TQFT satisfies $Z(M^{d+1}) = 1$ on a closed $M^{d+1}$-manifold.

In contrast, the noninvertible anomalies are non-standard (usually not named as anomalies in high-energy physics),
a substantial deformation of the field theory vacuum that cannot be smoothly connected to the conventional so(10) GUT vacuum.

We propose a schematic quantum phase diagram, shown in Fig. 5, interpolating between different quantum vacua: the upgraded so(10) GUT + WZW term, the su(5) GG GUT, the su(4) x su(2)_{L,R} PS model, and the su(3) x su(2) x u(1) SM. In fact, this \( w_2 w_3 \) global anomaly (hereafter \( w_2 w_3 \) as a shorthand for the precise bundle constraint \( w_2 w_3 (TM) = w_2 w_3 (V_{SO(10)}) \)) does not occur when the internal symmetry is within su(5) (for the GG su(5) GUT), nor occur within su(4) x su(2) x su(2) (for the PS model), nor occur within su(3) x su(2) x u(1) (for the SM). This \( w_2 w_3 \) global anomaly only occurs when the internal symmetry is Spin(10) (for the upgraded so(10) GUT + WZW term) in a quantum phase diagram (Fig. 5).

Case (1). If the internal symmetries were pretended to be global symmetries (or weakly gauged by probe background fields), then we are dealing with the quantum criticality between Landau-Ginzburg global symmetry breaking phases in 4d. Conventionally, the global symmetry breaking pattern can be triggered by the GUT-Higgs fields. Surprisingly, we discover a gapless quantum phase transition as an analogous 4d deconfined quantum criticality\(^4\) beyond the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson-Fisher critical phenomena. Specifically, we propose a 4d mother effective field theory, where the GUT-Higgs bosonic fields can be fractionalized to new fragmentary fermionic excitations, with extra gauge enhancement. An example of such gauge enhancement introduces a new U(1) gauge sector called \([U(1)]_{\text{emergent}}\), different from the SM electrodynamics \( U(1)_{\text{EM}} \). We name such a new theory as a fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model with emergent new fermions and new gauge fields, emergent only near the quantum criticality.

\(^4\)The concept of deconfined quantum transition was first developed in the condensed matter community [20], to describe a class of direct continuous transition between two distinct symmetry breaking phases with fractionalized excitations and gauge structures emerging in the low-energy spectrum at and only at the transition. It occurs when a quantum system with global symmetry \( G \) has the tendency to spontaneously break the symmetry to its distinct subgroups \( G_{\text{sub},1} \) and \( G_{\text{sub},2} \), while the low-energy effective field theory has \( G \)-anomaly but not \( G_{\text{sub},1} \)- or \( G_{\text{sub},2} \)-anomalies, in terms of ’t Hooft anomalies. Then the two symmetry breaking phases cannot share a trivial \( G \)-symmetric intermediate phase, paving ways for gapless phase transition and fractionalized excitations to emerge.

Several recent works explore the possible deconfined quantum criticality in 4d spacetime (see [21–24] and References therein). A hint toward our construction of 4d deconfined quantum criticality between symmetry breaking phase is the fact that the Spin(10) (treated as global symmetry) can have a ’t Hooft anomaly of gauge-gravity anomaly type (due to the aforementioned \( w_2 w_3 \) anomaly); while the smaller subgroups with Lie algebras su(5) of GG, su(4) x su(2) x su(2) of PS, or su(3) x su(2) x u(1) of SM, have no such \( w_2 w_3 \) anomaly. So the anomalous spacetime-internal Spin(10) symmetry hints a possible gapless continuous phase transition as a deconfined quantum criticality.

A crucial idea of deconfined quantum critical construction is that “the \( G_{\text{PS}} \)-symmetry-breaking topological defect of the GG GUT-Higgs model traps the fractionalized quantum number of unbroken GG internal symmetry group; while vice versa, the \( G_{\text{GG}} \)-symmetry-breaking topological defect of the PS GUT-Higgs model traps the quantum number of unbroken PS internal symmetry group.” Here \( G_{\text{PS}} \)-symmetry-breaking and \( G_{\text{GG}} \)-symmetry-breaking respectively refer to the internal symmetry groups \( G \) (i.e., gauge group) of PS and GG models are partly broken.

The terminology gauge enhanced quantum criticality is introduced in [24].
Case (2). If the internal symmetries are dynamically gauged (as they are not global symmetries but indeed are gauged in our quantum vacuum), we show the gauge-enhanced 4d criticality not merely has the emergent $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}}$ emergent gauge, but also has the enhanced Spin(10) gauge group. The Spin(10) gauge group and $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}}$ forms a gauge enhancement of the smaller gauge groups of the SM, GG or PS models, only near the quantum criticality, see Fig. 5.

Because the 5d invertible TQFT has the bundle constraint $w_2 w_3(TM) = w_2 w_3(V_{SO(10)})$, once the internal symmetries (such as the Spin(10)) are dynamically gauged, the 5d bulk is no longer an invertible TQFT. The Spin(10) gauge fields have also to be dynamically gauged in the 5d bulk. The Spin(10) gauge fields contribute deconfined gapless modes in 5d (in contrast to the confined non-abelian gauge fields being gapped in 4d). Remarkably, the Spin(10) gauge fields in 5d turns the previous TQFT $w_2 w_3(TM) = w_2 w_3(V_{SO(10)})$ into a 5d gapless bulk criticality!

In summary, when the internal symmetries are dynamically gauged (as in our gauged quantum vacuum),

- **4d gauge fields**: The gauge fields of SM, GG, and PS GUT ($su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$, $su(5)$, and $su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R$) are still restricted in 4d in their respective regions of quantum phase diagram (Fig. 5). There is still some emergent $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}}$ gauge field, also restricted in 4d, as a 4d boundary deconfined quantum criticality (the same as the previous Case (1) when internal symmetry is not gauged).

- **5d gauge fields**: However, when and only when the GUT gauge fields are appropriately gauge enhanced (to the Spin(10) gauge fields in our Fig. 5), then they can propagate into the extra-dimensional 5d bulk, and they can induce a 5d bulk criticality.

Indeed our proposal manifests additional Beyond-the-Standard-Model (BSM) excitations. After all, what are these BSM excitations near the quantum criticality in our theory?

- **Dark Gauge force sector**: the emergent $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}}$ gauge fields correspond to analogous Dark Photon. However, our $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}} \equiv [\text{U}(1)]_{\text{dark}}$ does not directly interact with the SM gauge forces, nor interact with the SM quarks and leptons. This Dark Photon sector can be a light Dark Matter candidate. The $[\text{U}(1)]_{\text{gauge}}$ only interacts with the fractionalized new fragmentary fermionic excitations that we name colorons and flavorons.

- **Fragmentary fermionic colorons and flavorons**: These are fractionalized excitations as the fermionic patrons. We implement the parton construction, where two (or multiple) of patrons ($\xi_a, \xi_b, \ldots$) can combine with emergent gauge fields to form the GUT-Higgs $\Phi$:

$$\Phi_{ab} \sim \xi_a^\dagger \xi_b.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

The GUT-Higgs $\Phi$ is also the basic degrees of freedom for the 4d WZW term that saturates the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly.

To rephrase what we had said, the GUT-Higgs $\Phi$ is split into the fractionalized fragmentary colorons and flavorons. Just as the GUT-Higgs $\Phi$ can interact with the SM particles and SM gauge forces, the fragmentary colorons and flavorons can also interact with the SM particles and SM gauge forces. The colorons carries the SM’s $SU(3)_c$ strong gauge charge, while the flavorons carries the SM’s $SU(2)_L$ weak gauge charge. Just like the GUT-Higgs are made to be very heavy, these colorons and flavorons are also heavy and can also be the heavy Dark Matter candidates.

- **The number of generations $N_{\text{generation}}$**: So far we have not yet specified the role of the number of generations $N_{\text{generation}}$ of quarks and leptons in our theory. It is inspiring to notice that this $Z_2$ class (or mod 2 class) global anomaly $w_2 w_3$ can play the same nontrivial effect when

$$N_{\text{generation}} = 1 \mod 2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)
For the simplicity of discussions, we mostly focus on \( N_{\text{generation}} = 1 \) in this article. Nonetheless, this (1.2) means that when \( N_{\text{generation}} = 3 \) as we indeed have three generations of quark and leptons in our vacuum, our proposal still applies. So perhaps our proposal on the gauge enhanced quantum criticality really happens between our SM quantum vacuum and the neighbor GUT vacua.

Figure 1: Standard Model (SM). The 15n Weyl fermions of SM contain the representation \((\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-\frac{1}{3}}_L \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})_{\frac{1}{3}}_L \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_{-\frac{1}{3}}_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_{1,L}\). The 16n Weyl fermions of SM add an extra \((\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0,L\).

Figure 2: Georgi-Glashow SU(5) model and the \( su(5) \) GUT. The 15 Weyl fermions of SM are \( 5 \oplus 10 \) of SU(5); namely, \((\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{3})_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -\frac{1}{2})_L \sim 5 \) and \((\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \frac{1}{6})_L \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, -\frac{2}{3})_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, 1)_L \sim 10 \) of SU(5). Also \((\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, 0)_L \sim 1 \) of SU(5), so the 16 Weyl fermions of SM are \( 5 \oplus 10 \oplus 1 \) of SU(5).

Figure 3: Pati-Salam (PS) model: \( G_{\text{PS}} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(4) \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_{q'}} \equiv \frac{\text{Spin}(6) \times \text{Spin}(4)}{\mathbb{Z}_{q'}} \) with \( q' = 1, 2 \). The 16 Weyl fermions of SM are \((\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})\) of \( su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R \), and the 16 of \( so(10) \) (or \( \text{Spin}(10) \)). These L and R are internal symmetry group indices. They are different from (but correlated with) the spacetime symmetry L and R. So \((\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, 1/6)_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2)_L \sim (\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_L\), and \((\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, 1/3)_L \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, -2/3)_L \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, 0)_L \sim (\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_L\) of PS model.
Figure 4: The so(10) GUT model: The 16 Weyl fermions of Spin(10), form the 16-dimensional representation of Spin(10).

Figure 5: One of our research motif is proposing and investigating this schematic quantum phase diagram. The phase diagram interpolates between different quantum EFT vacua: the so(10) GUT (Spin(10) group), the su(5) GUT (SU(5) group), the su(4) × su(2) L × su(2) R Pati-Salam model (PS), and the su(3) × su(2) × u(1) Standard Model (SM). We will explore the nature of phase transitions later in Sec. 3. We propose the white region as a possible quantum criticality region, which we explored in Sec. 3 and Sec. 4. Here \( r_R \) denotes the coefficient of the effective quadratic potential of \( \Phi_R \) field in the representation \( R \). The corresponding Higgs \( \Phi_R \) field will condense in the representation \( R \) if \( r_R < 0 \). Relatively speaking, the infrared (IR) low energy is drawn with the red color (for SM), the intermediate neighbor phases are drawn with the green or blue color (for PS or SU(5) models), while the ultraviolet (UV) higher energy is drawn with the violet purple color (for Spin(10)). These colors are also designed to match the colors of partitions of representations in Fig. 1 to Fig. 4.

In the remaining part of Section 1, we start from an overview on the basic required ingredients of SM and GUT in Sec. 1.1. Then we summarize some additional key results in Sec. 1.2. The outline of this article is given in the table of Contents.
1.1 Various Standard Models and Grand Unifications as Effective Field Theories

Unification, as a central theme in the modern fundamental physics, is a theoretical framework aiming to embody the "elementary" excitations and forces into a common origin. Assuming without any significant dynamical gravity effect at the subatomic scale (i.e., we are only limited to probe the underlying quantum theory by placing the quantum systems on any curved spacetime geometry, but without significant gravity back-reactions), the quantum field theory (QFT) provides a suitable framework for such a unification. Furthermore, assuming that we look at the QFT description valid below a certain energy scale (thus we are ignorant above that energy scale), we shall also implement the effective field theory (EFT) perspective.

In fact, from the EFT perspective, we should remind ourselves the "elementary" excitations are only "elementary" respect to a given EFT quantum vacuum. Moving away from the EFT vacuum (by tuning appropriate physical parameters) to a new quantum vacuum, we shall see that the "elementary" excitations of the new vacuum may be drastically different from the original "elementary" excitations of the previous EFT. So the "elementary" excitations reveal the limitations of our EFT descriptions of quantum vacua. Several examples of such 3+1d QFT and EFT paradigms for high energy physics (HEP) include Standard Model (SM) and Grand Unification (Grand Unified Theory or GUT) [1–7]:

1. **Standard Model (SM)**: Glashow-Salam-Weinberg (GSW) [1–4] proposed the electroweak theory of the unified electromagnetic and weak forces between elementary particles. The GSW theory together with the strong force [25, 26] becomes the Standard Model (SM), which is essential to describe the subatomic particle physics. The SM gauge group can be

\[ G_{SM_q} \equiv \frac{SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{\tilde{Y}}}{\mathbb{Z}_q} \]

with the mod \( q = 1, 2, 3, 6 \) so far undetermined by the current experiments (see an overview [27, 28] on this global structure of SM Lie group issue). The subscript \( c \) is for color, \( L \) is for the left-handed Weyl fermion in the standard HEP convention, and \( \tilde{Y} \) for electroweak hypercharge. The "elementary" particle excitations of this SM EFT, with 15n or 16n Weyl fermions, is constrained by the representation of \( G_{SM_q} \) as (see Fig. 1):

\[ (\overline{3}, 1)_{\frac{1}{3}, L} \oplus (1, 2)_{\frac{1}{2}, L} \oplus (\overline{3}, 2)_{\frac{1}{3}, L} \oplus (\overline{3}, 1)_{\frac{2}{3}, L} \oplus (1, 1)_{1,L} \oplus (1, 1)_{0,L}. \]  

(1.3)

The 16th Weyl fermion \((1, 1)_{0,L}\) is an extra sterile neutrino, sterile to the SM gauge force, also called the right-handed neutrino. We will focus on the 16n Weyl fermion model in this present work. In our convention, we write Weyl fermions in the left-handed (\( L \)) basis which means that each is a 2-component \( 2_L \) spinor of the spacetime symmetry group \( \text{Spin}(1,3) \).

2. **The \( su(5) \) Grand Unification (\( su(5) \) GUT)**: Georgi-Glashow (GG) [5] hypothesized that at a higher energy, the three SM gauge interactions merged into a single electronuclear force under a simple Lie algebra \( su(5) \), or precisely a Lie group

\[ G_{GG} \equiv SU(5) \]

Prominent examples occur in various topics concerning the duality and the order/disorder operators. Such as in the Ising model and Majorana fermion system in 1+1d.

In contrast, Ref. [29–31] considers the SM or GUT with 15n Weyl fermions and with a discrete variant of baryon minus lepton number \( B - L \) symmetry preserved. Ref. [29–31] then suggests the consequences that the missing 16th Weyl fermions can be substituted by additional 4d or 5d gapped topological quantum field theories (TQFTs), or by 4d gapless interacting conformal field theories (CFTs) to saturate a certain \( Z_{16} \) global anomaly. On the other hand, our present work does not introduce these \( Z_q \)-class anomalous sectors, because we already have implemented the 16n Weyl fermion models that already make the \( Z_{16} \) global anomaly fully cancelled.

In our present work, we shall focus on the SM or GUT with 16n Weyl fermions.
gauge theory. The su(5) GUT works for 15n Weyl fermions, also for 16n Weyl fermions (i.e., 15 or 16 Weyl fermions per generation). The “elementary” particle excitations of this SU(5) EFT, with 15n or 16n Weyl fermions, is constrained by the representation of SU(5) as (see Fig. 2):

\[ \bar{5} \oplus 10 \oplus 1, \]

again written all in the left-handed (L) Weyl basis. The 16th Weyl fermion is an extra sterile neutrino, sterile to the SU(5) gauge force, also called the right-handed neutrino.

3. The Pati-Salam model (PS model): Pati-Salam (PS) \[6\] hypothesized that the lepton forms the fourth color, extending SU(3) to SU(4). The PS also makes the left SU(2)L and a hypothetical right SU(2)R exchange symmetric. The PS gauge Lie algebra is \(su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R\), and the PS gauge Lie group is

\[ G_{PS,q'} = SU(4)_c \times (SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R) / \mathbb{Z}_{q'} = Spin(6) \times Spin(4) / \mathbb{Z}_{q'}, \]

with the mod \(q' = 1, 2\) depending on the global structure of Lie group. The “elementary” particle excitations of this PS EFT, with 16n Weyl fermions, is constrained by the representation of \(G_{PS,q'}\) as (see Fig. 3):

\[ (4, 2, 1) \oplus (\bar{4}, 1, 2), \]

written all in the left-handed (L) Weyl basis.\(^7\)

4. The so(10) Grand Unification (so(10) GUT): Georgi and Fritzsch-Minkowski \[7\] hypothesized that quarks and leptons become the 16-dimensional spinor representation

\[ 16^+ \text{ of } G_{so(10)} \equiv Spin(10) \text{ gauge group} \]

(with a local Lie algebra so(10)). Thus, the 16n Weyl fermions can interact via the Spin(10) gauge fields at a higher energy. In this case, the 16th Weyl fermion, previously a sterile neutrino to the SU(5), is no longer sterile to the Spin(10) gauge fields; it also carries a charge 1, thus not sterile, under the gauged center subgroup \(Z(Spin(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_4\).

We relegate several tables of data relevant for SMs and GUTs into Appendix A, for readers’ convenience to check the quantum numbers of various elementary particles or field quanta of SMs and GUTs.

---

\(^7\)To be clear, we have the Weyl spacetime spinor \(2_L\) of Spin(1,3) for \((4, 2, 1) \oplus (\bar{4}, 1, 2)\) of \(su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R\). In contrast, we can also write the:

\(2_L\) of Spin(1,3) for \((4, 2, 1)\) of \(su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R\), \(2_R\) of Spin(1,3) for \((4, 1, 2)\) of \(su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R\),

then the representations of spacetime spinor \(L\) (or \(R\)) would lock exactly with the internal spinor \(L\) (or \(R\)). Here we use the \(L\) and \(R\) to specify the left/right-handed spacetime spinor of Spin(1,3). We use the \(L\) and \(R\) to specify the left or right internal spinor representation of \(su(2)_L \times su(2)_R\).
1.2 Summary on Quantum Criticality as “Morphogenesis” Beyond the Standard Models

In this work, we investigate the “morphogenesis” beyond the SM. What we mean by morphogenesis is the following:

- Starting from the SM vacuum, could we tune parameters to explore the neighbor quantum vacua around SM vacuum? Possible parameters to tune (to explore quantum phases in a phase diagram or phase transitions) could be some energy potential term of matter fields (scalar bosons or spinor fermions). Then, could we develop a mother EFT to explore a wider range of this quantum phase diagram and the phase transitions?

- What are the nature of quantum phase transitions going away from SM vacuum to other neighbor quantum vacua? Also quantum phase transitions between neighbor quantum vacua? Are the quantum phase transitions discontinuous (e.g., the first order) or continuous (e.g., the second or higher order) transitions?

Based on our work, the answers to the above questions are summarized as follows:

1. First, we can look at the limit when the internal symmetry groups (e.g., SU(5) for the $su(5)$ GUT and Spin(10) for the $so(10)$ GUT) are not dynamically gauged, but only treated as internal global symmetries (or weakly gauged), then what we discover is an analog of deconfined quantum criticality [20] of some Ginzburg-Landau symmetry-breaking phases.

   - We will tune microscopic parameters in a mother EFT with the QFT potential to explore different quantum vacuum: from the SM to the $su(5)$ GUT, to the PS model, and to the $so(10)$ model.

   - We will show a single unified quantum phase diagram structure including subphases of:

     the SM, the $su(5)$ GUT, the PS model, and the $so(10)$ model.

We will show the nature of their quantum phase transitions. In particular,

  - The SM appears to be the intersection quantum vacuum phase between the two neighbor quantum vacuum phases of $su(5)$ GUT and the PS model.

  - There is a Gauge-Enhanced Quantum Criticality (GEQC) as a quantum phase transition or an intermediate critical phase between the $su(5)$ GUT and the PS model. Namely, we uncover a GEQC at the quantum critical region, by going to an extended Spin(10) internal symmetry group and also by necessarily including both

    \[
    \begin{cases} 
    (1) \text{ the } so(10) \text{ GUT contents with Spin(10) internal global symmetry group, and} \\
    (2) \text{ an additional discrete (torsion) class of a new type of Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) term,} 
    \end{cases}
    \]

    The WZW term is naturally a 4d term, but extendable to a 5d manifold with a 4d boundary. In this scenario, the modified 4d GUT plus the 4d WZW theory describes the GEQC, and admits a parton construction (i.e. a dual gauge theory description), which includes:

    \[
    \begin{cases} 
    (1) \text{ the emergent gauge structure, and} \\
    (2) \text{ additional fractionalized excitations,} 
    \end{cases}
    \]

only near the quantum critical region.
In summary, if the internal symmetries (i.e., $G_{SM_q}, G_{GG}$, or $G_{PS_{q'}}$) were treated as global symmetries (or weakly gauged by probe background fields), we show an analog of deconfined gauge-enhanced quantum criticality in 4d.

2. Second, we can revisit the problem when the internal symmetry groups $G_{int}$ are dynamically gauged (as they should be for the SM and GUTs), thus we deal with the quantum phase transitions between dynamical gauge theories of the SM and GUTs. In this scenario, the GEQC contains not only (1) the emergent gauge structure of the WZW, (2) the additional fractionalized excitations of WZW, but also

(3) the emergent gauge-enhanced $\text{Spin}(10)$ gauge group,

merely near the quantum critical region.\footnote{This emergent gauge group of GEQC is similar to the story explored in the context of an enhanced SU(2) gauge theory emerged between the quantum criticality of U(1) gauge theories shown in Ref. [24].}

In summary, if the internal symmetries (i.e., $G_{SM_q}, G_{GG}$, or $G_{PS_{q'}}$) are dynamically gauged (as they are in our quantum vacuum), we show that the gauge-enhanced criticality in 4d evolves from a boundary criticality to the case that the GUT gauge fields (Spin(10) gauge fields) propagating to the 5d bulk criticality.

We will summarize more about various physical discoveries of our mother effective field theory for BSM Gauge Enhanced Quantum Criticality in the Conclusion, in Sec. 4.
2 Standard Models from the competing phases of Grand Unifications

In Sec. 2, we start by enlisting and explaining some group embedding structures from some of relevant GUTs to SM in Sec. 2.1.

2.1 Spacetime-Internal Symmetry Group embedding of SMs and GUTs, and the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly

Here we use the inclusion notation $G_{\text{large}} \hookrightarrow G_{\text{small}}$ to imply that:

- $G_{\text{large}} \supset G_{\text{small}}$, namely the $G_{\text{large}}$ contains $G_{\text{small}}$ as a subgroup, or equivalently $G_{\text{small}}$ can be embedded in $G_{\text{large}}$.
- $G_{\text{large}}$ can be broken $G_{\text{small}}$ via symmetry breaking of Higgs condensation (which we will explore).

The internal symmetry group embedding structure has been explored, for example summarized in [32]:

\[
G_{\text{SM}_6} \equiv \frac{SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)}{Z_6} \rightarrow G_{\text{GG}} \equiv SU(5) \quad (2.1)
\]

\[
G_{\text{PS}_2} \equiv \frac{\text{Spin}(6) \times \text{Spin}(4)}{Z_2} \rightarrow \text{Spin}(10)
\]

We further include both the complete spacetime-internal symmetry group embedding structure as follows:

\[
\bar{G} \equiv G_{\text{spacetime}} \times_{N_{\text{shared}}} G_{\text{internal}} \equiv \left( \frac{G_{\text{spacetime}} \times G_{\text{internal}}}{N_{\text{shared}}} \right). \quad (2.2)
\]

\[
\bar{G}_{\text{SM}_6} \equiv \text{Spin} \times \frac{Z_4, X}{Z_2^F} \rightarrow \bar{G}_{\text{GG}} \equiv \text{Spin} \times \frac{Z_4, X}{Z_2^F} \times SU(5). \quad (2.3)
\]

We summarize how $Z_4, X$ can be obtained in Table 2 and Table 3. See more discussions on $Z_4, X$ in [14, 17, 29–31].

Some comments about (2.3) follow:

1. The Spin means the spacetime rotational symmetry group $\text{Spin} \equiv \text{Spin}(1, 3)$ for 4d Lorentz signature (or $\text{Spin} \equiv \text{Spin}(4)$ for 4d Euclidean signature). The Spin contains the fermionic parity $Z_2^F$ at the center subgroup thus Spin/$Z_2^F$ = SO where the SO is the bosonic spacetime (special orthogonal) rotational symmetry group (similarly, SO $\equiv$ SO(1, 3) for 4d Lorentz signature, or SO $\equiv$ SO(4) for 4d Euclidean signature). The notation $G_1 \times_{N_{\text{shared}}} G_2 \equiv \frac{G_1 \times G_2}{N_{\text{shared}}}$ means modding out their common normal subgroup $N_{\text{shared}}$. So Spin $\times_{Z_2^F} G$ $\equiv$ $\frac{\text{Spin} \times G}{Z_2^F}$ means modding out their common normal subgroup $Z_2^F$.

2. The $Z_4, X$ has the $X$-symmetry generator such that its square $(X)^2 = (-1)^F$ is the fermion parity operator, so $Z_{4, X} \supset Z_2^F$. Wilczek-Zee [33] firstly noticed that the $X \equiv 5(B - L) - 4Y$, with the baryon minus lepton number $B - L$ and the electroweak hypercharge $Y$, is a good global symmetry respect by SM and the $su(5)$ GUT. All known quarks and leptons carry a charge 1 of $Z_{4, X}$, in the left-handed Weyl spinor basis. The center of Spin(10) can be chosen exactly as $Z(\text{Spin}(10)) = Z_{4, X}$. We summarize how $Z_{4, X}$ can be obtained in Table 2 and Table 3. See more discussions on $Z_{4, X}$ in [14, 17, 29–31].
3. The \((X)^2 = (-1)^F\) relation is obeyed in the non-supersymmetric SM and GUT models, so it is natural to introduce the \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}\) structure in (2.3). However, it is possible to have new fermions, such as in supersymmetric SMs or GUTs, which does not necessarily obey \((X)^2 = (-1)^F\) relation. In that case, we can introduce just \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}\) structure. See a footnote for the alternative symmetry embedding with the \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}\) structure.\(^9\)

4. In this (2.3), we keep a structure of \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}\) which is essential to produce a mixed gauge-gravity nonperturbative global anomaly constraint of a \(\mathbb{Z}_{16}\) class. As already mentioned in footnote 6, in this article, we keep the \(16n\) Weyl fermions in all our SM and GUT models, thus the \(\mathbb{Z}_{16}\) global anomaly is already cancelled by \(16n\) chiral fermions.

5. In this (2.3), we also keep a structure of \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) — the cobordism group \(\Omega^d_G \equiv \text{TP}_d(G)\) shows \([9,15]\)

\[
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \text{but TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \text{Spin}(10)) = 0. \tag{2.5}
\]

This implies only the \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) structure offers a possible \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) class global anomaly in 4d that is captured by a 5d invertible TQFT with a partition function on a 5d manifold \(M^5\).\(^10\)

\[
\mathbb{Z}(M^5) = (-1)^{\int_{M^5} w_2(TM) w_3(TM)} = (-1)^{\int_{M^5} w_2(V_{SO(10)}) w_3(V_{SO(10)})}. \tag{2.8}
\]

But this mod 2 anomaly is absent and not allowed on the \(\text{Spin} \times \text{Spin}(10)\) structure. The difference between \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) and \(\text{Spin} \times \text{Spin}(10)\) is the following: the fermion charge under the \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F\) must be in the \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) normal subgroup of the center subgroup \(Z(\text{Spin}(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}\) so \((X)^2 = (-1)^F\) in order to impose the spacetime-internal \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) structure. However, in contrast, the \(\text{Spin} \times \text{Spin}(10)\) allows other fermions to not obey the \((X)^2 = (-1)^F\) relation.

\(^9\)Another version of the \(\text{spacetime-internal symmetry}\) group embedding (that is more suitable for supersymmetric SMs or GUTs) is

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{G}_{\text{SM}_6} &\equiv \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)_{Y}}{\mathbb{Z}_6} \rightarrow \tilde{G}_{\text{GG}} \equiv \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \text{SU}(5) , \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{G}_{\text{PS}_2} &\equiv \text{Spin} \times \frac{\text{Spin}(6) \times \text{Spin}(4)}{\mathbb{Z}_2} \rightarrow \tilde{G}_{\text{so}(10)} \equiv \text{Spin} \times \text{Spin}(10)
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{10}\)The invertible TQFT means that the TQFT path integral or partition function \(\mathbb{Z}(M)\) on any closed manifold \(M\) has its absolute value \(|\mathbb{Z}(M)| = 1\). Thus the dimension of its Hilbert space is always 1 also any closed spatial manifold, there is no topological ground state degeneracy. Here \(\mathbb{Z}(M^5) = (-1)^{w_2 w_3} = \pm 1\) on any closed \(M^5\) thus it is an invertible TQFT, such that when \(M^5\) is a Dold manifold \(\mathbb{C}P^2 \times S^1\) or a Wu manifold \(\text{SU}(3)/\text{SO}(3)\) generating a \(\mathbb{Z}(M^5) = -1\) \([10,15]\).

Here the \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) structure imposes the spacetime and gauge bundle constraint

\[
\begin{align*}
w_2(TM) &= w_2(V_G) \quad \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
\]

with \(G = \text{Spin}(10)/\mathbb{Z}_2^F = \text{SO}(10)\). Moreover, the Steenrod square \(\text{Sq}^1\) is an operation sending the second cohomology to the third cohomology class: \(H^2 \rightarrow H^3\), which we can regard \(\text{Sq}^1 = \frac{1}{2} \delta\) with \(\delta\) as a coboundary operator (see for example \([15]\)).

Then, in the case \(G = \text{SO}(10)\), we can deduce another bundle constraint:

\[
\begin{align*}
w_3(TM) + w_1(TM) w_2(TM) &= \text{Sq}^1 w_2(TM) = \text{Sq}^1 w_2(V_G) = w_3(V_G) \quad \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
\]

On the orientable spacetime, the first Stiefel-Whitney class \(w_1(TM) = 0\), so

\[
w_3(TM) = w_3(V_G).
\]

Thus combining the above formulas, on the orientable \(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)\) structure, we derive that \(w_2(TM) w_3(TM) = w_2(V_G) w_3(V_G)\) in \((2.8)\), shorthand as \(w_2 w_3 = w_2 w_3(TM) = w_2 w_3(V_G)\). This derivation also works for other \(G = \text{Spin}(n)/\mathbb{Z}_2^F = \text{SO}(n)\) for \(n \geq 3\).
As mentioned in Ref. [9, 10] and footnote 3, as Spin(10) ⊃ Spin(3) = SU(2), so 
\[ \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10) \supset \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(3) = \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{SU}(2). \] (2.9)

The Spin×\mathbb{Z}_2^F Spin(10)-structure is tightly related to the Spin×\mathbb{Z}_2^F SU(2) also known as the Spin^h-structure. We can project the Spin×\mathbb{Z}_2^F Spin(10)-structure to the Spin^h-structure. Then, in the Spin^h-structure, because the fermionic wavefunction gains a \((-1)^F\) statistical sign under a 2\pi self rotation on a Spin manifold is identified with the \((-1)^F\) as the center \(Z(\text{SU}(2)) = \mathbb{Z}_2^F\), we can read that imposing the Spin^h-structure [9, 10]:

- the fermions must be in the half-integer isospin representation 1/2, 3/2, ..., etc. of SU(2) (namely, the even-dimensional representations 2, 4, ..., etc. of SU(2)).
- the bosons must be in the integer isospin representation 0, 1, 2, ..., etc. of SU(2) (namely, the odd-dimensional representations 0, 1, 3, ..., etc. of SU(2)).

6. The last but the most important comment above all, is that in order to realize a possible continuous deconfined quantum phase transition, we do require to use the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly in (2.8), such that this anomaly occurs in the phase transition between the GG and PS models in Fig. 5. So we do aim to impose the Spin×\mathbb{Z}_2^F Spin(10)-structure as in (2.3) in order to implement the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly. In short, the readers can ask:

Why do we need the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly near the criticality for establishing
a possible continuous quantum phase transition between the GG and PS models?

The answer is that:

- The GG and PS models are Landau-Ginzburg symmetry breaking type of phases (when we treat the internal symmetry as global symmetry) or the gauge-symmetry breaking type of phases (when we treat the internal symmetry group as gauge group). The \(w_2w_3\) anomaly is saturated on two sides of phases by GG and PS models via symmetry breaking. (In fact, no \(w_2w_3\) anomaly is allowed in GG and PS models.)
- But the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly can protect a gapless quantum phase transition between the GG and PS models when we go through the Spin(10) symmetry for their phase transition. Their phase transition can be protected to be Spin(10)-symmetry-preserving gapless due to the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly exists only in the enlarged Spin(10) internal symmetry group.

Because the conventional so(10) GUT is free from the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly [9, 10], we will need to derive a new explicit mother EFT including the so(10) GUT but with some new BSM sectors to saturate the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly.

What is the new mother EFT partition function (i.e., QFT path integral)? What are the new BSM sectors within this mother EFT? To this end, we will start from writing down a GUT-Higgs model, adding this to the so(10) GUT, and then trying to modifying the GUT-Higgs model to saturate the \(w_2w_3\) anomaly. (That mother EFT will be the main achievement later in Sec. 3.)

2.2 Branching Rule of SMs and GUTs, and a GUT-Higgs model

In the following, we motivate the GUT model with GUT-Higgs as the gauge symmetry breaking pattern to go to the lower energy EFT (such as SM). Most of these breaking patterns are well-established and overviewed in [34]. The additional new input is that we try to unify several models into a GUT-Higgs model with as minimum amount of GUT-Higgs as possible. In Appendix B, we try to go through the logic again, and carefully examine the consequences and possibilities of the types of required GUT-Higgs. Later we will motivate the possible Lagrangian of the GUT-Higgs potential.

Here we summarize what we need from the analysis done in Appendix B:
- We can use a Lorentz scalar boson with a 45-dimensional real representation of \( so(10) \) or Spin(10):
  \[
  \Phi_{so(10),45} \equiv \Phi_{45} \in \mathbb{R},
  \]
  to break the Spin(10) of \( so(10) \) GUT to the SU(5) of GG model, also we can use this same \( \Phi_{45} \) to break \( G_{PS_2} \equiv \frac{\text{Spin}(6) \times \text{Spin}(4)}{Z_2} \) of PS model to the \( G_{SM_6} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3)_c \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y}{Z_6} \) of the SM.

- We can use a Lorentz scalar boson with a 54-dimensional real representation of \( so(10) \) or Spin(10):
  \[
  \Phi_{so(10),54} \equiv \Phi_{54} \in \mathbb{R},
  \]
  to break the Spin(10) of \( so(10) \) GUT to the \( G_{PS_2} \equiv \frac{\text{Spin}(6) \times \text{Spin}(4)}{Z_2} \) of PS model, also we can use this same \( \Phi_{54} \) to break SU(5) of GG model to the \( G_{SM_6} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3)_c \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y}{Z_6} \) of the SM.

- The combinations of the two facts above is summarized in Fig. 6, where we can use the \( \Phi_{45} \) and \( \Phi_{54} \) to write the GUT-Higgs model, that can induce the qualitative phase diagram similar to Fig. 5.

![Figure 6: Beware that the direction of the group symmetry breaking “→” is the opposite direction to the group inclusion “←.”](image)

These colors are also designed to match the colors in Fig. 1 to Fig. 4, and Fig. 5.

Given the \( so(10) \) GUT, to induce the three other models in Fig. 6, we can add the GUT-Higgs potential \( U(\Phi_R) \) with \( \Phi_R \) of some representation \( R \). The \( U(\Phi_R) \) is chosen to have positive \( \Phi^4 \) coefficients (thus \( \lambda_{45}, \lambda_{54} > 0 \)), while the \( r_{45} \) and \( r_{54} \) are real-number tunable parameters shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 7:

\[
U(\Phi_R) = \left( r_{45}(\Phi_{45})^2 + \lambda_{45}(\Phi_{45})^4 \right) + \left( r_{54}(\Phi_{54})^2 + \lambda_{54}(\Phi_{54})^4 \right).
\]  

A slice of Fig. 7 becomes the Fig. 5. (Temporarily now we get rid of the Higgs \( \Phi_1 \) thus get rid of \( r_1 \) axis in Fig. 7. More on this \( \Phi_1 \) later.) We can use this \( U(\Phi_R) \) potential in (2.12) to induce these interior parts of four phases (the \( so(10) \) GUT, the \( su(5) \) GUT, the PS model, and the SM).

- If \( \langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \) condenses, namely if \( r_{45} < 0 \) so \( \langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \neq 0 \), then the \( so(10) \) GUT becomes Higgs down to the \( su(5) \) GUT.

- If \( \langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \) condenses, namely if \( r_{54} < 0 \) so \( \langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \neq 0 \), then the \( so(10) \) GUT becomes Higgs down to the PS model.

- If \( \langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \) and \( \langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \) both condense, namely if \( r_{54} < 0 \) and \( r_{54} < 0 \) so that \( \langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \neq 0 \) and \( \langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \neq 0 \). The theory becomes Higgs down to the SM.
Figure 7: Schematic quantum phase diagram interpolating between the $so(10)$ GUT (Spin(10) group), the $su(5)$ GUT (SU(5) group), the $su(4) \times su(2)_L \times su(2)_R$ Pati-Salam model (PS), and the $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$ Standard Model (SM), and the symmetric mass generation (SMG). Here the real parameter $r_R \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the coefficient of the effective quadratic potential of $\Phi$ field in the representation $\mathbf{R}$. The corresponding Higgs $\Phi$ field will condense in the representation $\mathbf{R}$ if $r_R < 0$. Relatively speaking, the infrared (IR) low energy is drawn with the red color (for SM), the intermediate neighbor phases are drawn with the green or blue color (for PS or SU(5) models), while the ultraviolet (UV) higher energy is drawn with the violet purple color (for Spin(10)). These colors are also designed to match the colors of partitions of representations in Fig. 1 to Fig. 4.

However, we may be able to add deformations or extra terms to the potential $U(\Phi_R)$. Then it is not entirely clear what are the possible types of phase transitions that can happen between these interior parts of four phases (shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 7).

The purpose of the next Section 3 is to design various EFT and to explore the possible phase structures and phase transitions (of Fig. 5 and Fig. 7). In particular, we will write down a mother EFT such that it saturates the $w_2w_3$ global anomaly and it realizes an exotic quantum phase transition between the GG $su(5)$ GUT and the PS model.
3 Mother Effective Field Theory with Competing Higgs fields

3.1 Elementary GUT-Higgs model induces SM

In Section 2 (especially Sec. 2.2), we write down a GUT-Higgs potential $U(\Phi_R)$ in (2.12) appending to the so(10) GUT. Let us write down the full path integral $Z_{\text{GUT}}$ of such so(10) GUT plus $U(\Phi_R)$, in a Lorentzian signature, evaluated on a 4-manifold $M^4$:

$$Z_{\text{GUT}} \equiv \int [D\psi_L][D\psi_L^\dagger][DA][D\Phi_R] \cdots \exp(iS_{\text{GUT}}[\psi_L,\psi_L^\dagger, A, \Phi_R, \ldots])\bigg|_{M^4}. \quad (3.1)$$

The action $S_{\text{GUT}}$ is:

$$S_{\text{GUT}} = \int_{M^4} \left( \text{Tr}(F \wedge F) - \frac{\theta}{8\pi} g^2 \text{Tr}(F \wedge F) \right) + \int_{M^4} \left( \psi_L^\dagger (i\bar{\sigma}^\mu D_{\mu,A}) \psi_L \\
+ |D_{\mu,A} \Phi_R|^2 - U(\Phi_R) - ((\Phi_R)(\psi_L^\dagger \cdots)(\psi_L \cdots) + \text{h.c.}) + \cdots \right) d^4x. \quad (3.2)$$

The $S_{\text{YM}} = \int \text{Tr}(F \wedge F)$ part is the Yang-Mills gauge theory, with Lie algebra valued field strength curvature 2-form $F = dA - igA \wedge A$. Here $(\psi_L^\dagger \cdots)$ and $(\psi_L \cdots)$ imply indefinite multiple numbers of Weyl fermion fields. For the so(10) GUT, we have to sum over the Spin(10) gauge bundle, whose 1-form connection is the spin-1 Lorentz vector and Spin(10) gauge field, written as

$$A = \left( \sum_{a=1}^{45} \right) T^a A_{\text{Spin}(10),\mu}^a d\mu. \quad (3.3)$$

There are 45 of such Lie algebra generators, $T^a$, with:

- rank-16 matrix representations that act on the quark-and-lepton matter representation $16^+$ of Spin(10).
- rank-45 matrix representations that act on the $\Phi_{45}$ as the $45$ of Spin(10).
- rank-54 matrix representations that act on the $\Phi_{54}$ as the $54$ of Spin(10).

Locally the Spin(10) Lie algebra is the same as the so(10) Lie algebra, but globally we really need to define the principal Spin(10) gauge bundle $P_A$ to sum over. So more precisely the path integral over the gauge field measure really means $\int [DA] \cdots \equiv \sum_{\text{gauge bundle } P_A} \int [DA] \cdots$, where $A$ are gauge connections over each specific gauge bundle choice $P_A$. The $\theta$ term, $\theta \text{Tr}(F \wedge F)$, can be added or removed depending on the model. In this work, we shall set $\theta = 0$ or close to zero.

The $\psi_L$ is a 2-component spin-1/2 Weyl fermion $2_L$ of Spin(1,3). The $\dagger$ is the standard complex conjugate transpose. The $\bar{\sigma}^\mu$ and $\sigma^\mu$ are the standard spacetime spinor rotational $su(2)$ Lie algebra generators for $L$ and $R$ Weyl spinors. The action $S_{\text{GUT}}$ also includes the Weyl spinor kinetic term and GUT-Higgs kinetic term, coupling to gauge fields via the covariant derivative operator $D_{\mu,A} \equiv \nabla^\mu - ig A^\mu$. The $\nabla^\mu$ can contain the curve-spacetime covariant derivative data such as Christoffel symbols or the spinor’s spin-connection if needed. The $\cdots$ are possible extra deformation terms to be added later.

This subsection Sec. 3.1 mostly treats the spin-0 Lorentz scalar Higgs field $\Phi_R$ with some representation $R$ as the elementary Higgs field. We will however fractionalize this elementary Higgs field $\Phi_R$ to other further elementary fermionic fields in the later Sec. 3.3 and Sec. 3.4.
3.1.1 Without Wess-Zumino-Witten term, and Symmetric Mass Generation

Follow the choice in Sec. 2.2 and in (2.12), we can further adjust it to

\[ U(\Phi_R) = \left( r_{45}(\Phi_{45})^2 + \lambda_{45}(\Phi_{45})^4 \right) + \left( r_{54}(\Phi_{54})^2 + \lambda_{54}(\Phi_{54})^4 \right) + \left( r_1(\Phi_1)^2 + \lambda_1(\Phi_1)^4 \right). \] (3.4)

The property (whether \( \langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \neq 0 \) or \( \langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \neq 0 \) condenses, or both condense, namely whether \( r_{54} < 0 \) or \( r_{54} < 0 \) still follows Sec. 2.2. The theory becomes Higgs down to the \( su(5) \) GUT, or the PS model, or the SM, see Fig. 6. Here are some extra comments for adding \( \Phi_1 \) or other \( \Phi_R \) terms to Fig. 7:

- We can introduce a Lorentz scalar boson with a 1-dimensional trivial but real representation of \( so(10) \) or Spin(10):

\[ \Phi_{so(10),1} \equiv \Phi_1 \in \mathbb{R}. \] (3.5)

- If \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle = 0 \) does not condense, namely if \( r_1 > 0 \), the theory remains in the \( so(10) \) GUT.

- If \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle \neq 0 \) condenses, namely if \( r_1 < 0 \), for a small \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle < \Phi_{1,c} \), the theory still remains in the \( so(10) \) GUT (as \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle \) is an irrelevant perturbation).

- However, not only \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle \neq 0 \) condenses, but when \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle > \Phi_{1,c} \) exceeds a critical value, it can drive to the Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG) phase and gap out all fermions while preserving the G-symmetry (if the theory is free from all `t Hooft anomalies in \( G \)).\(^{11}\)

How do we associate \( \langle \Phi_1 \rangle > \Phi_{1,c} \) with the SMG effect? First notice that the four of the spinor representation \( \mathbf{16}^+ \) of Spin(10) can produce the tensor product decomposition \([50]\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{16} \otimes \mathbf{16} & = (\mathbf{10} \oplus \mathbf{120} \oplus \mathbf{126}) \otimes (\mathbf{10} \oplus \mathbf{120} \oplus \mathbf{126}) \\
& = (\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{10}) \oplus (\mathbf{120} \otimes \mathbf{120}) \oplus (\mathbf{126} \otimes \mathbf{126}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{120}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{126}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{120} \otimes \mathbf{126}) \\
& = (\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{54}) \oplus (\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{54} \oplus \mathbf{2(120)} \oplus \mathbf{770} \oplus \mathbf{945} \oplus \mathbf{1050} \oplus \mathbf{1050} \oplus \mathbf{4125} \oplus \mathbf{5940}) \\
& \quad \oplus (\mathbf{54} \oplus \mathbf{945} \oplus \mathbf{1050} \oplus \mathbf{2772} \oplus \mathbf{4125} \oplus \mathbf{6930}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{945} \oplus \mathbf{1050}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{1050}) \\
& \quad \oplus 2(\mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{945} \oplus \mathbf{1050} \oplus \mathbf{5940} \oplus \mathbf{6930}) \quad (3.6)
\end{align*}
\]

More systematically, with the symmetric (S) or anti-symmetric (A) matrix representation subscript indicated on the right hand side:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{16} \otimes \mathbf{16} & = \mathbf{10}_S \oplus \mathbf{120}_A \oplus \mathbf{126}_S, \\
\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{10} & = \mathbf{1}_S \oplus \mathbf{45}_A \oplus \mathbf{54}_S, \\
\mathbf{120} \otimes \mathbf{120} & = \mathbf{1}_S \oplus \mathbf{45}_A \oplus \mathbf{54}_S \oplus \mathbf{210}_S \oplus \mathbf{210}_A \oplus \mathbf{770}_S \oplus \mathbf{945}_A \oplus \mathbf{1050}_S \oplus \mathbf{1050}_S \oplus \mathbf{4125}_S \oplus \mathbf{5940}_A, \\
\mathbf{126} \otimes \mathbf{126} & = \mathbf{54}_S \oplus \mathbf{945}_A \oplus \mathbf{1050}_S \oplus \mathbf{2772}_S \oplus \mathbf{4125}_S \oplus \mathbf{6930}_A, \\
\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{120} & = \mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{945}, \\
\mathbf{10} \otimes \mathbf{126} & = \mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{1050}, \\
\mathbf{120} \otimes \mathbf{126} & = \mathbf{45} \oplus \mathbf{210} \oplus \mathbf{945} \oplus \mathbf{1050} \oplus \mathbf{5940} \oplus \mathbf{6930}. \quad (3.7)
\end{align*}
\]

From (3.6), we learn that four of \( \mathbf{16} \) can produce a trivial representation \( \mathbf{1} \) of \( so(10) \) or Spin(10). Therefore, in the mean field level, we can deduce the expectation of the GUT-Higgs \( \Phi_1 \) from some schematic effective four-fermion interactions of \( \psi \) in \( \mathbf{16} \) of Spin(10):\(^{12}\)

\[ \langle \Phi_1 \rangle \simeq \langle \psi \psi \psi \psi \rangle \neq 0. \] (3.8)

\(^{11}\)The Symmetric Mass Generation (SMG) mechanism is explored in various references, for some selective examples, by Fidkowski-Kitaev [35] in 0+1d, by Wang-Wen [36,37] for gapping chiral fermions in 1+1d, You-He-Xu-Vishwanath [38,39] in 2+1d, and notable examples in 3+1d by Eichten-Preskill [40], Wen [41], You-BenTov-Xu [42,43], BenTov-Zee [44], Kikukawa [45], Catterall et al [46,47], Razamat-Tong [48,49], etc.

\(^{12}\)Here fermions are anti-commuting Grassman variables, so this expression \( \langle \psi \psi \psi \psi \rangle \) is only schematic. The precise expression of \( \langle \psi \psi \psi \psi \rangle \) includes additional spacetime-internal representation indices and also includes possible additional spacetime derivatives (for point-splitting the fermions to neighbor sites if writing them on a regularized lattice).
But we do not wish to impose the ordinary Anderson-Higgs quadratic mass term induced by $\langle \psi \psi \rangle \neq 0$, otherwise this $\langle \psi \psi \rangle \neq 0$ will lead to $\text{Spin}(10)$ symmetry breaking, instead of the $\text{Spin}(10)$ symmetry preserving SMG. This means that we have to impose $\langle \psi \psi \rangle = 0$, so

$$\langle \psi \psi \rangle \psi \psi = 0, \quad \text{no conventional mass due to } \langle \psi \psi \rangle = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus the above argument implies that above a critical condensation value $\langle \Phi_1 \rangle > \Phi_{1,c}$ as the interaction strength goes above a critical value, we do obtain the SMG effect in Fig. 7!

To implement the SMG to gap out the 16 Weyl fermions in 16, a necessary check is that the fermions are free from all ’t Hooft anomalies in the $\text{Spin}(10)$, or more precisely free from all ’t Hooft anomalies in the spacetime-internal Spin $\times Z_2$ Spin(10) structure. This is true based on (2.5), because there is only a mod 2 class $w_2 w_3$ global anomaly, which the 16 Weyl fermions in 16 do not carry any $w_2 w_3$ global anomaly. So we are able to gap out the 16 Weyl fermions while preserving Spin $\times Z_2$ Spin(10)-symmetry.

To strengthen and improve Ref. [41]’s argument, we may regard our $\Phi$ as a bivector of two 10-dimensional vector $\phi_{so(10),10} \equiv \phi_{10}$ in 10 (or regard $\Phi$ as a bivector of two 120-dimensional vector $\phi_{so(10),120} \equiv \phi_{120}$ in 120). Thus, schematically

$$\langle \Phi_1 \rangle \simeq \langle \phi_{10} \phi_{10} \rangle + \langle \phi_{120} \phi_{120} \rangle + \cdots \simeq \langle \psi \psi \psi \rangle + \ldots \neq 0. \quad (3.10)$$

This $\langle \Phi_1 \rangle > \Phi_{1,c} \neq 0$ implies that the bi-linear of vectors (bivector) condense: $\langle \phi_{10} \phi_{10} \rangle \neq 0$ and/or $\langle \phi_{120} \phi_{120} \rangle \neq 0$, but the $\langle \phi_{10} \rangle = \langle \phi_{120} \rangle = 0$. So no ordinary quadratic fermion mass term is induced, but only the SMG is induced. The SMG causes the symmetry-preserving disordered mass.

But one of the mother EFTs that we will propose later in Sec. 3.1.2, indeed have extra bosonic sectors carry the mod 2 class $w_2 w_3$ global anomaly. The bosonic sectors include the WZW term. To reiterate, there is no conflict about gapping the 16 Weyl fermions, but having the extra bosonic sectors carry another anomaly. This simply implies that if we demand to preserve Spin $\times Z_2$ Spin(10)-symmetry, although we can gap out the Weyl fermions in 16, the extra bosonic sectors will still induce additional symmetry-preserving gapless modes.

- In the standard Anderson-Higgs electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism, Higgs coupling $(\psi_L^\dagger \Phi_R (i \sigma^2 \psi_L^* ) + \text{h.c.})$ is introduced in order to give quadratic masses to Weyl fermions. In this work, we may need to introduce more general Higgs fields $\Phi_R$ with various representations $R$. For a generic representation $R$, the Higgs field may couple to a product of even number (not limited to two) of fermion operators (e.g. $\psi_\dagger \psi_\dagger \psi_\psi$ or $\psi_\dagger \psi_\psi \psi$), such that the fermion representation can combine to match the corresponding Higgs field representation. (We shall not get distracted to handle the Anderson-Higgs electroweak symmetry breaking masses of Weyl fermions in this article, as this effect is well-studied. But we make some comments in Appendix B.)

So taking into account the GUT-Higgs condensation or non-condensation, we obtain a qualitative phase diagram in Fig. 7.

### 3.1.2 With Wess-Zumino-Witten term, and Deconfined Quantum Criticality

Now we propose a new mother EFT path integral by modifying the action $S_{\text{GUT}}$ to $S_{\text{GUT}}^{\text{WZW}}$ via adding the WZW term and other terms, in a Lorentzian signature path integral:

$$Z_{\text{GUT}}^{\text{WZW}} \equiv \int [\mathcal{D} \psi_L][\mathcal{D} \psi_L^\dagger][\mathcal{D} A][\mathcal{D} \Phi_R][\mathcal{D} \Phi][\mathcal{D} \bar{\phi}] \exp (i \int S_{\text{GUT}}[\psi_L, \psi_L^\dagger, A, \Phi_R, \Phi, \phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots]) |_{M_4}. \quad (3.11)$$
There are 16n complex Weyl fermions, each \( \psi_L \) is the 16 of Spin(10) minimally coupled to Spin(10) gauge field in the covariant derivative. Properties of the Spin(10) gauge field \( A \) and other familiar terms in \( S_{\text{GUT}} \) had been explained in the earlier Sec. 3.1.

2. An SO(10) real vector field \( \phi \in \mathbb{R} \) is in 10 of so(10) also of Spin(10). To be explicit, \( \phi \) contains one vector index, \( \phi_a \) with \( a \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\} \).

3. An SO(10) real bivector field \( \Phi^{bi} \in \mathbb{R} \) is obtained from the tensor product of the two \( \phi \), in the 10 \( \otimes \) 10 = 1_5 \( \otimes \) 45_A \( \otimes \) 54_S of so(10) also of Spin(10). To be explicit, \( \Phi^{bi} \) contains two vector indices, \( \Phi^{ab} \) with \( a, b \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\} \). We can arrange \( \Phi^{ab} \) into three different representations \( R \) of \( \Phi_R \) as the three GUT-Higgs fields \( \Phi_1, \Phi_{45} \) and \( \Phi_{54} \) (which appeared in Sec. 3.1.1):

\[
\Phi^{ab} = \phi_a \phi_b \text{ includes } \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{Tr}\Phi^{bi} = \sum_{a,b} \Phi^{ab}_{aa} \text{ gives } \Phi_R = \Phi_1 \text{ in } 1_5.
\Phi^{[a,b]} = \frac{1}{2} (\Phi^{ab}-\Phi^{ba}) = \frac{1}{2} (\phi_a \phi_b - \phi_b \phi_a) = \frac{1}{2} [\phi_a, \phi_b] \text{ gives } \Phi_R = \Phi_{45} \text{ in } 45_A.
\Phi^{\{a,b\}} = \frac{1}{2} (\Phi^{ab} + \Phi^{ba}) = \frac{1}{2} (\phi_a \phi_b + \phi_b \phi_a) = \frac{1}{2} \{\phi_a, \phi_b\} \text{ gives } \Phi_R = \Phi_{54} \text{ in } 54_S.
\end{array} \right.
\]

4. **GUT-Higgs field kinetic term and covariant derivative:** The kinetic term for the GUT-Higgs fields is written as 

\[
|D_{\mu,\lambda} \Phi|^2 \equiv (D^\mu_A \Phi_F)^\dagger (D_{\mu,\lambda} \Phi_R),
\]

with the complex conjugate transpose written as dagger. Moreover, we can also combine the kinetic terms for \( \Phi_1, \Phi_{45} \) and \( \Phi_{54} \) in terms of the kinetic term for the bivector \( \Phi^{bi} \). This kinetic term becomes 

\[
\text{Tr}((D^\mu_A \Phi^{bi})^\dagger (D_{\mu,\lambda} \Phi^{bi})),
\]

with the matrix transpose written as \(^T\), where the Trace \( \text{Tr} \) is over the 10-dimensional Lie algebra representation of so(10). We can write down the explicit form 

\[
(D_{\mu,\lambda} \Phi^{bi})_{ab} \equiv \nabla_\mu \Phi^{ab}_{\mu} - ig[A_{\mu,\lambda} \Phi^{bi}]_{ab} = \nabla_\mu \Phi^{ab}_{\mu} - ig(A_{\mu,ab} \Phi^{bi}_{bc} - \Phi^{bi}_{ab} A_{\mu,bc})
\]

with \( a, b, c \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\} \),

5. **Yukawa-like coupling terms:** We also have several Yukawa-like coupling terms, (i) between the GUT-Higgs bivectors \( \Phi^{bi} \) and the vectors \( \phi \), explicitly, \( \phi^{\dagger} \Phi^{bi} \phi \equiv \sum_{a,b} \phi^a \phi^b \Phi^{ab}_{ab} \).
(ii) between the GUT-Higgs vectors $\phi$ and the Weyl spinor $\psi_L$, the $(\psi_L^h i \sigma^2(\phi_{2a-1} \Gamma_{2a-1} - i \phi_{2a} \Gamma_{2a}) \psi_L + \text{h.c.})$ is apparently a hermitian scalar. The $\sigma^2$ matrix acts on the 2-component spacetime Weyl spinor $\psi_L$. $\Gamma_a$ (with $a \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$) are ten rank-16 matrices satisfying $\{\Gamma_{2a-1}, \Gamma_{2b}\} = 2\delta_{ab}$, $\{\Gamma_{2a}, \Gamma_{2b}\} = 2\delta_{ab}$, $[\Gamma_{2a-1}, \Gamma_{2b}] = 0$.

6. **Mean-field approximation**: If for a moment, we neglect the gauge field $A$ coupling in the covariant derivative, neglect the GUT-Higgs potential $U(\Phi_R)$, and neglect the possible WZW term $S^{WZW}[\phi\bar{b}]$, then we only have the quadratic Lagrangian in between GUT-Higgs vectors $\Phi^{bi}$, vectors $\phi$, and the Weyl spinor $\psi_L$. Then this quadratic Lagrangian, $\frac{1}{2} \phi^T \phi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^5 (\psi_L^h i \sigma^2(\phi_{2a-1} \Gamma_{2a-1} - i \phi_{2a} \Gamma_{2a}) \psi_L + \text{h.c.})$, at the mean-field level, can be integrated out to impose constraints and relations between the bivectors $\Phi^{bi}$, vectors $\phi$, and the Weyl spinor $\psi_L$. In some sense, what is integrated out becomes a Lagrange multiplier to impose a constraint on the remained fields. In this limit, we only need to regard the Weyl spinor $\psi_L$ as the elementary fields, the vectors $\phi$ is the 10 from the tensor product of two $\psi_L$ since $16 \otimes 16 = (10 \oplus 120 \oplus \overline{126})$. Then the bivector $\Phi^{bi}$ is from the tensor product of two $\phi$ as the $10 \otimes 10$, out of the quartic $\psi_L$'s $16 \otimes 16 \otimes 16 \otimes 16$.

7. **Wess-Zumino-Witten-like discrete torsion term**: For now, we directly provide our endgame answer to WZW term, later we will backup and derive this WZW term in details from scratch in Sec. 3.2. The schematic WZW action that we propose to match the mod 2 class $w_2 w_3$ global anomaly is:

$$
S^{WZW}[\Phi] = \pi \int_{M^5} B(\Phi) \wedge dC(\Phi),
$$

(3.14)

in terms of differential form with mod 2 valued forms of $B$ and $C$ fields, in the de Rham cohomology. The theory is defined on the 5d manifold $M^5$ whose boundary is the 4d space time $M_4 = \partial M^5$.

14 Here we normalize the usual differential form $B(\Phi^{bi})/\pi \rightarrow B(\Phi^{bi})$ and $C(\Phi^{bi})/\pi \rightarrow C(\Phi^{bi})$, so the usual differential form partition function $\exp(i \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \int_{M^5} B(\Phi^{bi}) \wedge dC(\Phi^{bi}))$ maps to $\exp(i \frac{\pi}{\hbar} \int_{M^5} B(\Phi^{bi}) \wedge dC(\Phi^{bi}))$. The quantization conditions on the closed cycles, also map from: $\oint B(\Phi^{bi})$ or $\oint C(\Phi^{bi}) = 2\pi \mod 2 \rightarrow \oint B(\Phi^{bi})$ or $\oint C(\Phi^{bi}) = \pi \mod 2$.

It can be verified that this WZW has two properties: (1) invertible and trivial as $Z(\Phi_R) = 1$ on a closed 5-manifold, (2) this WZW term really is a 4d theory, having physical impacts only on the 4d $M^4$, as a boundary of the extended $M^5$.

15 Generally, given a chain complex $C_\bullet$ and a short exact sequence of abelian groups:

$$0 \rightarrow A' \rightarrow A \rightarrow A'' \rightarrow 0,$$

we have a short exact sequence of cochain complexes:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C_\bullet, A') \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C_\bullet, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C_\bullet, A'') \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence we can obtain a long exact sequence of cohomology groups:

$$\cdots \rightarrow H^n(C_\bullet, A') \rightarrow H^n(C_\bullet, A) \rightarrow H^n(C_\bullet, A'') \xrightarrow{\partial} H^{n+1}(C_\bullet, A') \rightarrow \cdots ,$$

the connecting homomorphism $\partial$ is called Bockstein homomorphism. For instance, $\beta_{(n,m)} : H^n(-, Z_m) \rightarrow H^{n+1}(-, Z_n)$ is the Bockstein homomorphism associated with the extension $Z_n \xrightarrow{m} Z_m \rightarrow Z_m$ where -m is the group homomorphism given by multiplication by $m$. Specifically, $\beta_{(2,2^m)} = \frac{1}{2^m} \delta \mod 2$, thus the Steenrod square obeys $Sq^1 \equiv \beta_{(2,2)} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \mod 2$. 
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can downgrade the singular cohomology result (3.15) to reproduce the de Rham cohomology expression (3.14).

8. **GUT-Higgs potential** $U(\Phi_R)$, and a relation to non-linear sigma model (NLSM): Mostly we shall simply choose the GUT-Higgs potential written in (3.4),

$$U(\Phi_R) = \left( r_{45}(\Phi_{45})^2 + \lambda_{45}(\Phi_{45})^4 \right) + \left( r_{54}(\Phi_{54})^2 + \lambda_{54}(\Phi_{54})^4 \right) + \left( r_1(\Phi_1)^2 + \lambda_1(\Phi_1)^4 \right),$$

which is sufficient for a continuum QFT description. Some lattice or condensed matter based theorists may wonder whether there is a non-linear sigma model (NLSM) description at a deeper UV. One approach is to write down a potential with a NLSM constraint ($\text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) - R^2$) with the norm of GUT-Higgs centered around a radius $R$, and introduce a Lagrange multiplier $\lambda$, such that integrating out $\int [D\lambda] \ldots$ gives the fixed radius constraint at UV. With appropriate deformations, we anticipate a RG flow from UV to IR gives the GUT-Higgs potential. One reason to introduce a NLSM is that it is natural to adding the WZW term to NLSM. However, an NLSM description turns out to be not necessary for writing our WZW term.

9. **Deconfined Quantum Criticality (DQC):** The motivation to add this 4d $S^{WZW}[\Phi]$ into our 4d mother EFT is to induce the analoguous phenomenon called the deconfined quantum criticality [20]. The original deconfined quantum criticality [20] is proposed as a continuous quantum phase transition between two kinds of Landau symmetry breaking orders: Néel anti-ferromagnet order and Valence-Bond Solid (VBS) order in 3d (namely, $2+1$d).

Here in out gauge theory context in 4d (namely, $3+1$d), between the GG $\text{su}(5)$ GUT and the PS $\text{su}(4) \times \text{su}(2) \times \text{su}(2)$ model, we do not really have the conventional Landau symmetry breaking orders as both the $\text{su}(5)$ and $\text{su}(4) \times \text{su}(2) \times \text{su}(2)$ are dynamically gauged as gauge theories. But if we regard the $\text{su}(5)$ and $\text{su}(4) \times \text{su}(2) \times \text{su}(2)$ are internal global symmetries that are not yet gauged, then we are able to seek for a deconfined quantum criticality construction between the GG and PS models, as we will verify in the next Sec. 3.2.

### 3.2 Homotopy and Cohomology group arguments to induce a WZW term

We review the 3d WZW term construction in the familiar deconfined quantum criticality (dQCP) in 3d (namely, $2+1$d) [20], in Appendix C, based on more nonperturbative arguments from homotopy and cohomology groups, and anomaly classifications from cobordism. Here we proceed with the same logic, to construct the 4d WZW term in the new deconfined quantum criticality (DQC) in 4d (namely, $3+1$d) to justify what we claimed in (3.15).

Below we write $G$ as the original larger symmetry group, while $G_{\text{sub}}$ is the remained preserved unbroken symmetry in the corresponding order (i.e., Néel or VBS orders for 3d dQCP; the GG or PS for the 4d DQC we will propose). Then we have the following fibration structure:

$$G_{\text{sub}} \hookrightarrow G \twoheadrightarrow \frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}},$$

(3.16)

where the quotient space $\frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}}$ is the base manifold (i.e., the orbit) as the symmetry-breaking order parameter space. The $G$ is the total space obtained from the fibration of the $G_{\text{sub}}$ fiber (i.e., the stabilizer) over the base $\frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}}$.

Now we follow the similar logic for the 3d dQCP summorized in Appendix C, generalizing the idea to deal with our 4d DQC.
3.2.1 Induce a 4d WZW term between Georgi-Glashow $su(5)$ and Pati-Salam $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$ models on a 5d bulk $w_2(V_{SO(10)}) w_3(V_{SO(10)})$

Follow the principle in Appendix C, we aim to induce a 4d WZW term between Georgi-Glashow $su(5)$ and Pati-Salam $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$ models on a 5d bulk $w_2(V_{SO(10)}) w_3(V_{SO(10)})$. First we look at the order-parameter target manifold via the fibration structure (3.16), formed by the **bosonic** GUT-Higgs fields. For the bosonic GUT-Higgs fields, we only have the internal SO(10) symmetry not the Spin(10) symmetry, but we can include the orientation reversal which gives an $O(10) = SO(10) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. Then the fibration (3.16) becomes:

$$GG \ su(5) \ GUT: \ (G_{\text{sub}} = U(5)) \hookrightarrow (G = O(10)) \rightarrow \left( \frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}} = \frac{O(10)}{U(5)} \right). \quad (3.17)$$

Here we can keep the larger $U(5)$ instead of $SU(5)$ as the preserved internal symmetry of the $su(5)$ GUT.

$$PS \su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2): \ (G_{\text{sub}} = O(6) \times O(4)) \hookrightarrow (G = O(10)) \rightarrow \left( \frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}} = \frac{O(10)}{O(6) \times O(4)} \right). \quad (3.18)$$

Recall that $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$ has the same Lie algebra as $so(6) \times so(4)$. Here we also keep the larger $O(6) \times O(4)$ instead of $SO(6) \times SO(4)$ as the preserved internal symmetry of the PS model. Homotopy groups for these target manifolds of GUT-Higgs fields are in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\pi_0$</th>
<th>$\pi_1$</th>
<th>$\pi_2$</th>
<th>$\pi_3$</th>
<th>$\pi_4$</th>
<th>$\pi_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG $O(10)/U(5)$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS $O(10)/O(6) \times O(4)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O(10)$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O(4)$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z^2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O(6)$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U(5)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SO(10)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SO(4)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z^2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
<td>$Z_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SO(6)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SU(5)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$Z$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us comment about the construction of 4d WZW and its 4d 't Hooft anomaly, step by step,

1. Start with the hint from homotopy groups, we need to find **topological defects trapped in the order-parameter target manifold of bosonic GUT-Higgs fields** in the GG and PS models,\(^{16}\) classified by $\pi_{n_{\text{GG}}} \left( \frac{O(10)}{U(5)} \right)$ and $\pi_{n_{\text{PS}}} \left( \frac{O(10)}{(6) \times O(4)} \right)$ such that the dimensionality $n_{\text{GG}} + n_{\text{PS}} = d$ where the $d$ is the total spacetime dimension thus $d = 4$ (or one lower dimension compared with the 5d where the WZW is extended to put on). This suggests that we take

$$\pi_2 \left( \frac{O(10)}{U(5)} \right) = Z, \quad \pi_2 \left( \frac{O(10)}{(6) \times O(4)} \right) = Z_2, \quad n_{\text{GG}} + n_{\text{PS}} = 2 + 2 = 4.$$

Note that $\left( \frac{O(m+n)}{O(m) \times O(n)} \right) \equiv \text{Gr}(m, m+n)$ is a Grassmannian manifold. Here we need $\text{Gr}(6, 10) = \text{Gr}(4, 10)$.

\(^{16}\) **Caveat:** We had emphasized again and again that here we are considering topological defects in the order-parameter target manifold of bosonic GUT-Higgs fields. We are **not** talking about the topological objects of **fermionic** sectors (quarks/leptons) or gauge theory sectors in GUTs or SMs. For example, there are magnetic monopoles in the GG and PS gauge theories from $\pi_1(G_{SM_4}) = \pi_2(G_{GG}/G_{SM_4}) = \pi_2(G_{PS_4}/G_{SM_4}) = Z$, also from $\pi_1(G_{SM_5}) = \pi_2(G_{PS_5}/G_{SM_5}) = Z$ or from any $\pi_1(G_{SM_q}) = Z$ with $q = 1, 2, 3, 6$. But we are talking about different topological objects in the order-parameter target manifold of bosonic GUT-Higgs fields.
2. We will use the cohomology construction of the WZW term, furnished by the hints of homotopy groups. Then we need a relation between homotopy group and cohomology group.

In algebraic topology, an Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(G, n)$ is a topological space with a single nontrivial homotopy group, s.t. $\pi_n(K(G, n)) \cong G$ and $\pi_m(K(G, n)) = 0$ if $m \neq n$. It can be regarded as a building block for homotopy theory, also it provides a bridge between homotopy and cohomology. Let $X$ be a topological space or a manifold. The set $[X, K(G, n)]$ of based homotopy classes of based maps from $X$ to $K(G, n)$ is a natural bijection with the $n$-th singular cohomology group $H^n(X, G)$. In particular, when $\pi_n(X) \cong G$,

$$H^n(X, G) = \text{Hom}(\pi_n(X), G) = \text{Hom}(G, G). \quad (3.20)$$

There is a distinguished element $\omega \in H^n(X, G)$, as the generator of the cohomology group $H^n(X, G)$, corresponding to the identity morphism in $\text{Hom}(G, G)$. The morphism is realized as

$$\omega : \pi_n(X) \to G, \quad f \in \pi_n(X) \mapsto \int_{x \in S^n} \omega(f(x)) \in G. \quad (3.21)$$

3. With the above homotopy group (3.19) in mind, we can use the Serre spectral sequence to derive the following:

$$H^2(O(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad H^2(O(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2^2. \quad (3.22)$$

In fact, we just need one of the two components from $\text{SO}(10)/U(5)$, whose cohomology group:

$$H^2(\text{SO}(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}. \quad H^2(\text{SO}(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad (3.23)$$

4. We can also derive

$$H^2(\text{O}(10)/\text{O}(6) \times \text{O}(4)), \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_2. \quad H^2(\text{O}(10)/\text{O}(6) \times \text{O}(4)), \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2^2. \quad (3.24)$$

The mod 2 cohomology of real Grassmannian manifold is well-known from the theory of Stiefel-Whitney characteristic classes. The integral cohomology is trickier but it can be worked out.

5. We now take a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ cohomology class called $B(\Phi^{bi})$ out of

$$B(\Phi^{bi}) \in H^2(\text{O}(10)/\text{O}(6) \times \text{O}(4)), \mathbb{Z}_2), \quad (3.25)$$

and another $\mathbb{Z}_2$ cohomology class called $C(\Phi^{bi})$ out of

$$C(\Phi^{bi}) \in H^2(\text{O}(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}_2). \quad (3.26)$$

- The $B(\Phi^{bi})$-field as a second cohomology class, can be constructed out of the GUT-Higgs field $\Phi_{54}$ in the 54 representation of $\text{so}(10)$. In particular, we can also write $\Phi_{54}$ as a bivector GUT-Higgs field symmetric representation, 54 out of $10 \otimes 10$, called $(\Phi^{bi})$ that we detail in Sec. 3.3.
- The $C(\Phi^{bi})$-field as a second cohomology class, can be constructed out of the GUT-Higgs field $\Phi_{45}$ in the 45 representation of $\text{so}(10)$. In particular, we can also write $\Phi_{45}$ as a bivector GUT-Higgs field anti-symmetric representation, 45 out of $10 \otimes 10$, called $(\Phi^{bi})$ that we detail in Sec. 3.3.

Similar to the familiar 3d dQCP in Appendix C, we can also provide the physical intuitions on the link invariants between various topological defects: between the charged objects and the charge operators constructed from homotopy groups and cohomology groups. For example,

---

17We can answer in more general case $\text{O}(2n)/U(n)$. We will need the Universal Coefficient Theorem (UCT), so that $H^2(X, A) = \text{Hom}(H_2(X, A) \oplus \text{Ext}(H^1(X, A), A)$, for some topological space $X$ and any abelian group coefficient $A$. The space $\text{O}(2n)/U(n)$ has two connected components, each of which is diffeomorphic to $\text{SO}(2n)/U(n)$, so $H^4(\text{O}(2n)/U(n), A) = H^4(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n), A) \oplus H^4(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n), A)$.

For $n > 1$, the space $\text{SO}(2n)/U(n)$ is simply connected with $\pi_3(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n)) = \mathbb{Z}$, so by the Hurewicz Theorem we have $H_3(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n), \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ and $H_2(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n), \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore by UCT, so we have $H^2(\text{SO}(2n)/U(n), A) = \text{Hom}(Z, A) \oplus \text{Ext}(0, A) = A$. Thus, $H^2(\text{O}(2n)/U(n), A) = A^2$. 
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(i). **Georgi-Glashow GUT-Higgs target manifold and topological defects:**
The $C(\Phi^{bi}) \in \text{H}^2(O(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}_2)$ can be placed on a 2-surface called $\tilde{g}^2$, as a charge operator
\[ \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} C(\Phi^{bi})) = \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} c_1(V_{U(5)})) \] (i.e., symmetry generator) measures the charge of a preserved U(5) symmetry in the topological defect trapped in the target manifold O(10)/U(5). The first Chern class $c_1(V_{U(5)})$ of the associated vector bundle of U(5) evaluates a magnetic flux mod 2 on this 2-surface $\tilde{g}^2$. There is a topological defect line along a 1d loop called $\zeta_{GG}^1$, paired up with a 1-connection called $\tilde{v}$ gives a 1d line operator $\exp(i\pi \oint_{\zeta_{GG}^1} \tilde{v})$ as a charged object. The charge operator 2-surface $\tilde{g}^2$ can be linked with a charged 1d loop $\zeta_{GG}^1$ in the 4d spacetime. Follow the generalized higher global symmetry language [51], this nontrivial linking number $Lk$ implies a measurement of U(5) symmetry on the topological defect. Precisely, the linking number $Lk$, manifested as a statistical Berry phase, is evaluated via the expectation value of path integral:
\[ \langle \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} C(\Phi^{bi})) \cdot \exp(i\pi \int_{\zeta_{GG}^1} \tilde{v}) \rangle = (-1)^{Lk(\tilde{g}^2, \zeta_{GG}^1)} \bigg|_{M^4} \] (3.27)

(ii). **Pati-Salam GUT-Higgs target manifold and topological defects:**
The $B(\Phi^{bi}) \in \text{H}^2(O(10)/(O(6) \times O(4)), \mathbb{Z}_2)$ can be placed on a 2-surface called $\tilde{g}^2$, as a charge operator
\[ \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} B(\Phi^{bi}))) = \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} w_2(V_{O(6) \times O(4)})) \] (i.e., symmetry generator) measures the charge of a preserved (O(6) × O(4)) symmetry in the topological defect trapped in the target manifold O(10)/(O(6) × O(4)). There is a topological defect line along a 1d loop called $\zeta_{PS}^1$, paired up with a 1-connection called $\tilde{v}$ gives a 1d line operator $\exp(i\pi \oint_{\zeta_{PS}^1} \tilde{v})$ as a charged object. The charge operator 2-surface $\tilde{g}^2$ can be linked with a charged 1d loop $\zeta_{PS}^1$ in the 4d spacetime. Follow the generalized higher global symmetry language [51], this nontrivial linking number $Lk$ implies a measurement of (O(6) × O(4)) symmetry on the topological defect. Precisely, the linking number $Lk$, manifested as a statistical Berry phase, is evaluated via the expectation value of path integral:
\[ \langle \exp(i\pi \int_{\tilde{g}^2} B(\Phi^{bi}))) \cdot \exp(i\pi \int_{\zeta_{PS}^1} \tilde{v}) \rangle = (-1)^{Lk(\tilde{g}^2, \zeta_{PS}^1)} \bigg|_{M^4} \] (3.28)

(iii). If we extend the 4d spacetime $t, x, y, z$ to an extra 5th dimension $\varpi$, the previous 1d loop $\zeta_{GG}^1$ trajectory can be a 2d pseudo-worldsheet $\zeta_{GG}^2$ in the 5d $M^5$. Similarly, the previous 1d loop $\zeta_{PS}^1$ trajectory can be a 2d pseudo-worldsheet $\zeta_{PS}^2$ in the 5d $M^5$. Such two 2d configurations can be linked in 5d, with a linking number:

\[ Lk(\zeta_{GG}^2, \zeta_{PS}^2) \bigg|_{M^5} \]

This describes the link in the extended 5d spacetime of two charged objects, charged under U(5) and (O(6) × O(4)) respectively.

(iv). In a parallel story, the charge operators (of the above charged objects) are the 2d $C(\Phi^{bi})$ operator on $\tilde{g}^2$, and 2d $B(\Phi^{bi})$ surface operator on $\tilde{g}^2$. Such two configurations can be linked in 5d, with a linking number:

\[ Lk(C(\Phi^{bi}) \text{ on } \tilde{g}^2, B(\Phi^{bi}) \text{ on } \tilde{g}^2) \bigg|_{M^5} \]

This describes the link in the extended 45 spacetime of two charge operators.

We leave more of these picturesque discussions and imaginative figures, in a companion work [52].
6. Based on the above observations about the link invariants, follow Appendix C’s logic, our 4d DQC construction is valid if we introduce a mod 2 class 4d WZW term, defined on a 4d boundary $M^4$ of a 5d manifold $M^5$, schematically in a differential form or de Rham cohomology,

$$\exp(i S^{WZW}[\Phi]) = \exp(i \pi \int_{M^5} B(\Phi^{bi}) \wedge dC(\Phi^{bi})) \bigg|_{M^4=\partial M^5}. \quad (3.29)$$

Recall the footnote 14 about our normalizations of differential forms and cohomology classes. More precisely, we can improve this to construct WZW in the singular cohomology class:

$$\exp(i S^{WZW}[\Phi]) = \exp(i \pi \hat{\beta}_M W^{(b)} (\tilde{\Phi}^b) \cdot \delta C(\hat{\Phi}^b) \bigg|_{M^4=\partial M^5} = \exp(i 2\pi \hat{\beta}_M W^{(b)} (\tilde{\Phi}^b) \cdot Sq^1 C(\hat{\Phi}^b)) \bigg|_{M^4=\partial M^5}. \quad (3.30)$$

We thus succeed to verify our claims in (3.14) and (3.15), while all notations here follow there in Sec. 3.1.2.

7. Our 4d DQC construction will be supported by a 4d ’t Hooft anomaly in the spacetime-internal global symmetry $(Spin \times \mathbb{Z}_2 Spin(10))$ on a 4-manifold $M^4$, captured by a 5d bulk invertible TQFT [9,10] living on a 5-manifold $M^5$ with $\partial M^5 = M^4$:

$$\exp(i \pi \hat{\beta}_M w_2(V_{SO(10)} w_3(V_{SO(10)})) \bigg|_{M^4=\partial M^5}. \quad (3.31)$$

This 4d ’t Hooft anomaly is a mod 2 class global anomaly, mentioned already in (2.5) and (2.8). We comment more about the cobordism group data on perturbative local and nonperturbative global anomalies in various SMs and GUTs in Appendix D.

These conclude our derivation of 4d WZW and ’t Hooft anomaly for a candidate 4d DQC for GG-PS GUT transition.

### 3.3 Composite GUT-Higgs model within SM

Before analyzing the effect of the 4d WZW term, we will first review how $so(10)$ GUT, GG, PS, and SM can be unified in the same quantum phase diagram by the different condensation pattern of the $SO(10)$ bivector GUT-Higgs field. Follow Sec. 2.2, for this discussion, we will first turn off the WZW term, assuming that the theory has no additional $w_2 w_3$ anomaly. Starting from the $so(10)$ GUT phase, which has the highest symmetry, the GUT-Higgs field can be unified as a $SO(10)$ bivector field

$$\Phi^{bi}_{ab} \sim \phi_a \phi_b \quad (for \ a, b = 1, 2, \cdots, 10), \quad (3.32)$$

which can be considered as a composition of two $SO(10)$ vector fields $\phi_a$, where the $SO(10)$ vector $\phi_a$ can be further considered as a composition of two Weyl fermions $\psi$$

$$\phi_{2a-1} \sim \frac{1}{2} (\psi^T i \sigma^2 \Gamma_{2a-1} \psi + h.c.), \quad \phi_{2a} \sim \frac{1}{2i} (\psi^T i \sigma^2 \Gamma_{2a} \psi - h.c.), \quad (for \ a = 1, 2, \cdots, 5). \quad (3.33)$$

Here when two quantum fields $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$ are linearly coupled with each other in the field theory (as source and original fields), we denote them in this notation $\Phi_A \sim \Phi_B$, such that they are “dual” to each other and share exactly the same symmetry properties. There are $16 \times 16$ real symmetric matrices $\Gamma_a$ acting in the fermion flavor space, which are determined by the following algebraic relations (for $a, b = 1, 2, \cdots, 5$):

$$\{\Gamma_{2a-1}, \Gamma_{2b-1}\} = 2 \delta_{ab}, \quad \{\Gamma_{2a}, \Gamma_{2b}\} = 2 \delta_{ab}, \quad [\Gamma_{2a-1}, \Gamma_{2b}] = 0. \quad (3.34)$$
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In view of the above composite construction, we refer to the bivector representation $\Phi^{bi}$ as the composite GUT-Higgs field.

The composite Higgs field contains elementary Higgs components of both $\Phi_{45}$ and $\Phi_{54}$, since $10 \otimes 10 = 1 \oplus 45 \oplus 54$. Follow (3.13), we introduce the following notations to denote different irreducible representations of the composite Higgs field (in terms of SO(10) vector bilinears):

- $\text{Tr} \Phi^{bi} \sim \sum_a \phi_a \phi_a$ is equivalent to $\Phi_1$ as the 1S of SO(10).
- $\hat{\Phi}^{bi} : \Phi_{[a,b]}^{bi} \sim \frac{1}{2} \{ \phi_a, \phi_b \}$ is equivalent to $\Phi_{45}$ as the $45_A$ of SO(10).
- $\tilde{\Phi}^{bi} : \Phi_{\{a,b\}}^{bi} - \frac{1}{10} \text{Tr} \Phi^{bi} \delta_{ab} \sim \frac{1}{2} \{ \phi_a, \phi_b \} - \frac{1}{10} \sum_c \phi_c \phi_c \delta_{ab}$ is equivalent to $\Phi_{54}$ as the $54_S$ of SO(10).

The competition between $\Phi^{bi}$ and $\hat{\Phi}^{bi}$ condensation leads to different GUT or SM phases in the phase diagram. We enumerate all the symmetry breaking patterns (below “$\rightarrow$” means “breaking to”) as follows:

1. Spin(10) $\rightarrow \frac{\text{Spin(6)} \times \text{Spin(4)}}{Z_2} = \frac{\text{SU(4)} \times \text{SU(2)}_L \times \text{SU(2)}_R}{Z_2}$ by condensing $\tilde{\Phi}^{bi}$ (the $54_S$ representation) to the following specific configuration

$$\langle \tilde{\Phi}^{bi} \rangle = \left( -3 \sum_{a=1}^{10} + 2 \sum_{a=1}^{45} \right) \Phi_{[a,a]}^{bi} = \phi^T \begin{pmatrix} -3 \cdot 1_{2 \times 2} \\ 2 \cdot 1_{3 \times 3} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \sigma^0 \phi \in \frac{\text{O}(10)}{\text{O}(6) \times \text{O}(4)}.$$ (3.35)

The Higgs field $\tilde{\Phi}$ discriminates the SO(4) vector $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4)$ from the SO(6) vector $(\phi_5, \phi_6, \phi_7, \phi_8, \phi_9, \phi_{10})$, which breaks Spin(10) down to $\frac{\text{Spin(6)} \times \text{Spin(4)}}{Z_2}$ realizing the Pati-Salam symmetry $G_{PS2}$. The 16 Weyl fermions split as $16 \sim (4, 2, 1)_L \oplus (\bar{4}, 1, 2)_R$ under $\frac{\text{SU(4)} \times \text{SU(2)}_L \times \text{SU(2)}_R}{Z_2}$. The L/R sectors are distinguished by the operator

$$\chi = \psi^\dagger \prod_{a=1}^{10} \Gamma_a \psi = \pm 1.$$ (3.36)

Let $\rho_{[a,b]} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}[\phi_a, \phi_b]$ be the SU(4) generators (for $a, b = 5, 6, \cdots, 10$). Using algebraic relations, we can check that in the L sector, SU(4) acts as $\psi_L \mapsto e^{i \rho_{[a,b]}} \psi_L e^{-i \rho_{[a,b]}}$, matching the 4 representation; and in the R sector, SU(4) acts as $\psi_R \mapsto e^{-i \rho_{[a,b]}} \psi_R e^{i \rho_{[a,b]}}$, matching the 4 representation.

2. Spin(10) $\rightarrow \text{SU(5)} \times Z_{4,X}$ by condensing $\hat{\Phi}^{bi}$ (the $45_A$ representation) to the following specific configuration

$$\langle \hat{\Phi}^{bi} \rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{5} \Phi_{[2a-1, 2a]}^{bi} = -\frac{1}{2} \phi^T 1_{5 \times 5} \otimes i \sigma^2 \phi \in \frac{\text{O}(10)}{\text{U}(5)}.$$ (3.37)

If we combine the SO(10) vector $\phi_a$ into a 5-component complex vector $\varphi_a = (\phi_{2a-1} + i \phi_{2a})/\sqrt{2}$ (for $a = 1, 2, \cdots, 5$), $\varphi$ would transform as the $5_1$ under $\text{U}(5) = \frac{\text{SU(5)} \times \text{U}(1)_X}{\mathbb{Z}_5}$ in SO(10). The Higgs field $\hat{\Phi}^{bi} = \sum_{a=1}^{5} \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a$ itself defines the generator of the U(1)$_X$ group, whose $\mathbb{Z}_4$ subgroup defines $Z_{4,X}$. The 16 Weyl fermions split as $16 \sim 5_1 \oplus 10_1 \oplus 1_1$ under $\text{SU(5)} \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$. The $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$ generator in the Spin(10) spinor representation is given by

$$q_X = \sum_{a=1}^{5} \psi^\dagger i \Gamma_{2a-1} \Gamma_{2a} \psi.$$ (3.38)

---

19Recall in footnote 7, about the left or right spinors, the L/R notations here are for the internal-symmetry spinors, while the L/R notations are for the spacetime-symmetry Weyl spinors.
By diagonalizing \( q_X \) operator, we indeed found five-fold eigenvalues of \(-3\), ten-fold eigenvalues of \(1\) and a one-fold eigenvalue of \(5\). After mod 4, they all correspond to charge 1 under \( \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \). Further investigate the representation of SU(5) generators in each \( q_X \)-charge sectors, we can confirm that the \( q_X = -3 \) sector is indeed in the anti-fundamental representation \(\bar{5} \) and so on.

3. Spin(10) \(\xrightarrow{\text{SU(3)} \times \text{SU(2)} \times \text{U(1)}_Y} \mathbb{Z}_6 \times \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \) by simultaneously condensing \( \hat{\phi}^{bi} \) and \( \hat{\phi}^{bi} \) (both 54\(_S\) and 45\(_A\) representations) to configurations specified in Eqn. (3.35) and (3.37). The unbroken symmetry group is generated by the sub-algebra of so(10) that commute with both Higgs condensates \( \langle \hat{\phi}^{bi} \rangle \) and \( \langle \hat{\phi}^{bi} \rangle \), which must take the form of

\[
\phi^T \left( \begin{array}{cc} iA_{2 \times 2} & \sigma^0 \phi \\ \sigma^3 \phi & S_{3 \times 3} \end{array} \right) \otimes \phi^T \left( \begin{array}{cc} S_{2 \times 2} & \sigma^2 \phi \\ S_{3 \times 3} & \end{array} \right),
\]

where \( A_{n \times n} = -A_{n \times n}^T \in \mathbb{R}(n) \) are real antisymmetric matrices and \( S_{n \times n} = S_{n \times n}^T \in \mathbb{R}(n) \) are real symmetric matrices. They can be combined in the complex representation as

\[
\varphi^T \left( \begin{array}{cc} S_{2 \times 2} + iA_{2 \times 2} & \sigma^0 \phi \\ \sigma^3 \phi & S_{3 \times 3} + iA_{3 \times 3} \end{array} \right) \varphi = \varphi^T \left( \begin{array}{cc} H_{2 \times 2} & \sigma^2 \phi \\ \sigma^3 \phi & H_{3 \times 3} \end{array} \right) \varphi,
\]

such that \( H_{n \times n} = H_{n \times n}^T \in \mathbb{C}(n) \) are complex Hermitian matrices. There is no traceless condition imposed on \( H_{3 \times 3} \) and \( H_{2 \times 2} \) and they act independently in each subspace, so they generate the U(3) \(\times U(2)\) subgroup of U(5), which is further a subgroup of SO(10). The two U(1) subgroups of U(3) and U(2) are generated by \( \sum_{a=3}^5 \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a \) and \( \sum_{a=1}^2 \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a \) respectively. Since the U(1)\(_X\) generator has already been identified as \( \sum_{a=1}^5 \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a \), so the U(1)\(_Y\) generator must be given by the remaining U(1) generator \( -3 \sum_{a=1}^2 + 2 \sum_{a=3}^5 \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a \), which is represented in the Spin(10) spinor representation as

\[
q_Y = \frac{1}{2} \left( -\sum_{a=1}^2 + 2 \sum_{a=3}^5 \varphi_a^\dagger \varphi_a \right),
\]

By diagonalizing \( \chi \), \( q_Y \) and \( q_X \) operators jointly (defined in Eqns. (3.36), (3.41), (3.38)), we can classify the 16 Weyl fermions \( \psi \) (actually they are all in the left-handed spacetime Weyl spinor \( \psi_L \) basis) by the quantum numbers as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{U(1)}_Y )</th>
<th>( \text{U(1)}_X )</th>
<th>( \text{internal} )</th>
<th>( L/R )</th>
<th>( \text{SU(2)}_L^\dagger )</th>
<th>( \text{SU(2)}_R^\dagger )</th>
<th>( \psi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>\text{R}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( d_R )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>\text{L}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \nu_L )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>\text{L}</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( e_L )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\text{L}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( u_L )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\text{L}</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( d_L )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\text{R}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \bar{u}_R )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\text{R}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \bar{e}_R )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>\text{R}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \bar{\nu}_R )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

matching all the fermion contents in the SM (see Table 2).

**No bilinear mass generation by bivector GUT-Higgs:** Unlike the SM-Higgs that generates a bilinear mass for SM Weyl fermions, the GUT-Higgs in 45 and 54 do not generate a bilinear mass for SM Weyl fermions. Because the SO(10) bivector Higgs field \( \Phi^{bi} \) corresponds to four-fermion operators, which is supposed to be perturbatively irrelevant. Even if it condenses, it is not expected to gap out the Weyl fermions if its vacuum expectation value is small (but it will Higgs down the gauge group), so the theory remains gapless in the fermion sector in all phases. However, sufficiently strong Higgs condensation of Tr\( \Phi^{bi} \) (or \( \Phi_1 \) equivalently) can lead to symmetric mass generation (SMG) [35–49] as discussed previously.
3.4 Fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model beyond the SM

3.4.1 Low-Energy Descriptions for the WZW theory

The WZW term and its associated $w_2w_3$ global anomaly can significantly modify the dynamics in the GUT-Higgs sector. There are several possibilities for the low-energy fate of the WZW theory:

1. **Spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB).** The SO(10) internal symmetry of WZW term (or Spin(10) for the full modified so(10) GUT) is spontaneously broken by Higgs condensation. Within this scenario, there are a few different symmetry breaking patterns relevant to our discussion (recall Sec. 2.2):
   - $\langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \neq 0$, the so(10) GUT is Higgs down to the $su(5)$ GUT.
   - $\langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \neq 0$, the so(10) GUT is Higgs down to the PS model.
   - $\langle \Phi_{45} \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle \Phi_{54} \rangle \neq 0$, the so(10) GUT is Higgs down to the SM.

   In all three cases, the $w_2w_3(V_{SO(10)})$ anomaly is canceled by symmetry breaking the Spin(10) down to the GG, PS and SM groups. The resulting vacua is in the same quantum phase as the corresponding vacua in the absence of the WZW term.

2. The SO(10) symmetry remains unbroken, and the $w_2w_3$ anomaly persists to low-energy. The low-energy effective theory must saturate the anomaly requirement, which further leads to several different possibilities:

   (a) **WZW conformal field theory (CFT).** The WZW theory flows to a non-trivial CFT fixed point, where the Higgs field $\Phi$ remains gapless and disorder (not condensing), and also do not deconfine into fragmented excitations.

   (b) **Deconfined quantum criticality (DQC).** The Higgs field $\Phi$ deconfines into fragmented excitations: partons and emergent gauge fields, which are new particles beyond the SM. The low-energy physics will be described by new quantum electrodynamics (QED) or quantum chromodynamics (QCD) sectors. In any case, the total gauge group must be enlarged to include the emergent gauge structure of partons, which is a phenomenon called gauge enhanced quantum criticality (GEQC) [24], which can be viewed as the generalization of the deconfined quantum criticality (DQC) [20,53–55] to gauge-Higgs models. Possible field theory descriptions of the DQC can be classified by the parton statistics as:

   - **Fermionic parton** theory, where the fractionalized particles in the emergent matter sector are fermions; [focus of our following work]
   - **Bosonic parton** theory, where the fractionalized particles in the emergent matter sector are bosons.

   It is possible that two seemingly different descriptions (e.g., fermionic v.s. bosonic parton theories) may be related by dualities, as discussed in [55,56]. In this scenario, the $w_2w_3$ anomaly should be saturated either by the anomalous fermionic matter or by a non-trivial $\theta$-term of the emergent gauge field.

---

20However, the $Z_2$ class $w_2w_3(V_{SO(10)})$ anomaly of SO(10) bundle is split to different kinds of $w_2w_3$ anomalies of SO(6) and SO(4) bundles in the PS symmetry group: More precisely, see Appendix D in detail, $w_2(V_{SO(10)})w_3(V_{SO(10)}) = w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) + w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) \mod 2$, where the crossing term $w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(6)})$ may or may not survive depending on whether we include additional time-reversal $T$ or $CP$ type of discrete symmetries protection or not.
(c) **Topological order with low-energy non-invertible TQFT:** The $w_2 w_3$ anomaly could also be saturated by 4d topological order. A simplest possibility is the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological order, which can be considered as a descendent of the DQC when the emergent gauge group is reduced to $\mathbb{Z}_2$ by some further Higgsing.

Among the above possibilities: 1. The SSB scenario in the WZW theory has no substantial difference with our previous discussions without the WZW term, which will not be repeated here. 2.(a) The WZW CFT is a non-trivial possibility, which the authors are not aware of suitable theoretical tools to study it, which will thus be left for future exploration. 2.(b) The DQC scenario will be the focus of the following discussion. In particular, we will consider a QED$_4$ theory with fermionic partons as the effective field theory description. The WZW theory could potentially admits dual bosonic parton descriptions as well, but we will also leave this possibility for future study. 2.(c) The topological order scenario could be derived from the DQC scenario, which will also be left for future study.

### 3.4.2 QED$_4$ Fermionic Parton Theory

Here we propose a fermionic parton construction for the WZW term in Eqn. (3.14), which can also be viewed as a possible low-energy description of the WZW theory.

$$S_{\text{QED}_4}[\xi, \bar{\xi}, a, \Phi] = \int_{M^4} \bar{\xi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - \hat{\Phi}^{bi} - i\gamma^5\check{\Phi}^{bi})\xi \ d^4x. \quad (3.43)$$

The theory contains the following ingredients:

1. There are 10 Dirac fermions $\xi$ forming the 10 (vector representation) of SO(10). Here $\gamma^\mu$ are the standard $\gamma$ matrices of Dirac fermions with $\gamma^5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$ and $\bar{\xi} = \xi^\dagger\gamma^0$.

2. The covariant derivative $D_\mu = \nabla_\mu - ia_\mu - igA_\mu$ contains the minimal coupling of the fermionic parton $\xi$ to an emergent dynamical U(1) gauge field $a_\mu$, as well as the minimal coupling to the SO(10) gauge field $A_\mu$. We may treat the SO(10) gauge field $A_\mu$ as a background field for now, and discuss how it can be gauged later.

3. The GUT-Higgs field $\Phi$ is written as its $10 \times 10$ matrix representation $\Phi^{bi}$ of the SO(10) bivector form. It couples to the fermionic partons by taking its traceless symmetric component $\check{\Phi}^{bi}$ (the 54 of SO(10)) as the vector mass of $\xi$ and its antisymmetric component $\hat{\Phi}^{bi}$ (the 45 of SO(10)) as the axial mass of $\xi$. In this way, the SO(10) bivector GUT-Higgs boson effectively deconfines into two SO(10) vector fermions: $\Phi^{bi}_{ab} \sim \xi^a_i \xi^b_i$.

In the QED$_4$ theory $S_{\text{QED}_4}$, the GUT-Higgs field fractionalizes into gapless fermionic partons with emergent U(1) gauge interactions. The situation is similar to the U(1) Dirac spin liquid [57,58] discussed in the condensed matter physics context, therefore we may also call this QED$_4$ theory as the Fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model.

We first argue that the QED theory in Eqn. (3.43) saturates the same $w_2 w_3(V_{\text{SO}(10)})$ anomaly as the WZW term. The starting point is to identify that the spacetime-internal symmetry and gauge group of the fermionic parton is

$$G_{\text{QED}_4} = \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \ U(1) \times \text{SO}(10) \equiv \text{Spin}^c \times \text{SO}(10), \quad (3.44)$$
with fermions in the $\mathbf{10}_1$ representation of $U(1) \times SO(10)$. The $U(1)$ group is free of anomaly, which is consistent with the fact that this emergent $U(1)$ structure can be gauged. Gauging removes the spin structure of the fermion theory, allowing the gauge theory to be placed on non-spin manifolds. So the resulting theory is a bosonic theory with $SO(10)$ symmetry. It is expected that the $SO(10)$ group should carry the $w_2 w_3(V_{SO(10)})$ anomaly, and the anomaly could only originate from the fermionic partons in the QED theory without $\theta$-term.

To check the anomaly in the fermion sector, we first turn off the Higgs coupling (as it does not affect the anomaly analysis), such that the theory becomes as simple as $\int_{M^4} \tilde{\xi} \gamma^\mu D_\mu \xi \, d^4x$. Without coupling to the Higgs field, the theory has an enlarged $SU(2)$ gauge group, generated by $\xi^\dagger \xi$, $\text{Re} \xi^\dagger \gamma^5 \xi$, $\text{Im} \xi^\dagger \gamma^5 \xi$, among which $\xi^\dagger \xi$ generates the $U(1)$ gauge group as a subgroup of $SU(2)$. With the enlarged $SU(2)$ gauge group, the fermionic parton theory is promoted from a QED$_4$ theory to a QCD$_4$ theory (without enlarging the fermion content), whose group structure is

$$G_{\text{QCD4}} = \text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times SU(2) \times SO(10) \equiv \text{Spin}^h \times SO(10),$$

(3.45)

with fermion $\xi$ in the $(2, 10)$ representation of $SU(2) \times SO(10)$. This QED to QCD promotion does not change the anomaly structure, because the $SU(2)$ group is still free of anomaly (e.g., Witten $SU(2)$ anomaly [59]), given that there are even number (ten) of $SU(2)$ fundamental fermions. So the anomaly is still contained in the $SO(10)$ group. To match the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly, we make connection to the known new $SU(2)$ anomaly [10] by the following trick: we first embed $SU(2) \times SO(10)$ in $Sp(10)$ and use a sequence of maximal sub-algebra decomposition $Sp(10) \hookrightarrow Sp(2) \times Sp(8) \hookrightarrow SU(2)' \times Sp(8)$ to show that a different $SU(2)'$ subgroup carries the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly. Under the embedding, the representation of the fermionic parton $\xi$ splits as

$$U(1) \times SO(10) \hookrightarrow SU(2) \times SO(10) \hookrightarrow \text{Sp}(10) \hookrightarrow \text{Sp}(2) \times \text{Sp}(8) \hookrightarrow \text{SU}(2)' \times \text{Sp}(8) \hookrightarrow (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{10}) \sim (\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{16}),$$

(3.46)

Some comments on (3.46):

- The $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{16})$ is free of Witten $SU(2)'$ anomaly, but $(\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1})$ has the new-$SU(2)'$ anomaly $w_2 w_3(V_{SO(3)'})$ [10].

- Since we have argued that $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{10})$ in $SU(2) \times SO(10)$ has no Witten $SU(2)$ anomaly, so the new-$SU(2)'$ anomaly must come from $SO(10)$, therefore the $SO(10)$ symmetry has a ‘t Hooft anomaly described by $w_2 w_3(V_{SO(10)})$. Of course, it can also be interpreted as a gravitational anomaly $w_2 w_3(TM)$ due to the relation $(-1)^f w_2 w_3(TM) = (-1)^f w_2 w_3(V_{SO(10)})$ as mentioned before.

- The analysis establishes that the proposed QED$_4$ theory in Eqn. (3.43) at least has the same 4d global anomaly as the new proposed 4d WZW term in (3.15).

To reproduce the WZW term more explicitly, we extend the 4d QED theory to the 5d bulk

$$S_{\text{QED5}}[\xi, \bar{\xi}, a, \Phi] = \int_{M_5} \bar{\xi} (i \gamma^\mu D_\mu - m - \gamma^5 \bar{\Phi}^b i \gamma^0 - \gamma^0 i \bar{\Phi}^b) \xi \, d^5x,$$

(3.47)

where $\xi$ still forms the $\mathbf{10}_1$ under $U(1) \times SO(10)$. Note that in 5d, each Dirac fermion already defines five gamma matrices $\gamma^0, \gamma^1, \gamma^2, \gamma^3, \gamma^4$, which are $4 \times 4$ matrices. By doubling the fermion content, we are able to introduce two more gamma matrices, denoted $\gamma^5$ and $\gamma^6$, such that all seven gamma matrices $\gamma^0, \cdots, \gamma^6$ are $8 \times 8$ matrices satisfying the Clifford algebra relation $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2\delta^{\mu\nu}$. The bulk fermions

\textsuperscript{2}Here we apply the symplectic group notation under $Sp(n) = \text{Usp}(2n) = \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{C}) \cup \text{U}(2n)$, such that $Sp(1) = \text{Usp}(2) = SU(2) = \text{Spin}(3)$ and $Sp(2) = \text{Usp}(4) = \text{Spin}(5)$. The $G_1 \hookrightarrow G_2$ means that the inclusion $G_1 \subset G_2$ as a subgroup. The representations on two sides of “$\sim$” shows their decomposition relation.
are gapped by the mass term $m$. The boundary QED$_4$ theory (with massless fermions) is reduced from the bulk QED$_5$ theory (with massive fermions) as the effective domain wall theory, which lives on the 4d domain wall separating the $m > 0$ and $m < 0$ phases in 5d.

To show that the QED$_4$ theory is equivalent to the WZW theory, we only need to show that the bulk QED$_5$ theory can reproduce the WZW term (3.15). For this purpose, we introduce two 2-form $\mathbb{R}$ gauge fields $B = B_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$ and $C = C_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$ that couple to the fermionic parton as

$$S_{\text{QED5}}[\xi, \bar{\xi}, a, \Phi, B, C] = \int_{M_5} \bar{\xi}(i \gamma^\mu D_\mu - m - \gamma^5 \Phi^{bi} - \gamma^6 i \Phi^{bi} - i \gamma^5 \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu B_{\mu\nu} - i \gamma^6 \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu C_{\mu\nu}) \xi \, d^5x. \quad (3.48)$$

Integrating out the mass fermion $\xi$, we obtain the Chern-Simons 5-form $\text{CS}_5$ term with 2-form $B, C$ fields:

$$S_{\text{CS}_5}[B, C] = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{M_5} B \wedge dC, \quad (3.49)$$

with the constraint that the 2-form gauge fields $B$ and $C$ are locked to the cohomology classes that measure the topological defects in $\Phi^{bi}$ and $\Phi^{bi}$ respectively

$$B(\Phi^{bi}) = \frac{B}{\pi} = \frac{B(\Phi^{bi})}{\pi} \in H^2(O(10)/\{O(6) \times O(4)\}, \mathbb{Z}_2), \quad C(\Phi^{bi}) = \frac{C}{\pi} = \frac{C(\Phi^{bi})}{\pi} \in H^2(O(10)/U(5), \mathbb{Z}_2). \quad (3.50)$$

The emergent $U(1)$ gauge field $a$ decouples from the Higgs field $\Phi$ and the 2-form gauge fields $B, C$, which can be integrated out independently. Further integrate out the 2-form gauge fields $B, C$, we obtain an action for $\Phi$ (simply by substituting the constraint), $S_{\text{WZW}}[\Phi] = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{M_5} B(\Phi^{bi}) \wedge dC(\Phi^{bi})$. Recall the footnote 14 about our normalizations of differential forms and cohomology classes. This leads to the proposed WZW term in Eqn. (3.15)

$$S_{\text{WZW}}[\Phi] = \pi \int_{M_5} B(\Phi^{bi}) \sim \delta C(\Phi^{bi}), \quad (3.51)$$

which is expected to be placed on the 5d manifold $M_5$ whose boundary is the 4d spacetime $M_4 = \partial M_5$.

### 3.4.3 Color-Flavor Separation and Dark Gauge Sector: Deconfined Quantum Criticality

The QED$_4$ theory describes the DQC scenario of the WZW theory at low-energy. In this scenario, the GUT-Higgs field deconfines into fragmentary excitations, which are new 0d particles beyond the SM:

- 10 new fermions $\xi$ in the $10_1$ of $U(1) \times SO(10)$, as fermionic partons of the GUT-Higgs field;
- a new $U(1)$ photon $a_\mu$ in the $1_0$ of $U(1) \times SO(10)$, which mediates a new gauge force that exists between and only between fermionic partons. It does not couple to any particle in the SM sector, hence appears dark to us. Therefore, we will call it the dark photon.

The GUT-Higgs boson can be considered as the bound state of two fermionic partons (of opposite emergent $U(1)$ gauge charges) bind together by the the emergent $U(1)$ gauge force mediated by dark photons. From particle physic perspective, the fermionic partons and dark photons are more fundamental constituents of the GUT-Higgs boson. From condensed matter physics perspective, these fragmentary excitations are emergent collective motions of the GUT-Higgs field instead. The two complementary viewpoints are a matter of culture. The readers can take whichever interpretation that is more favorable to their mindset.
Because the QED theory do not confine in 4d, the fragmentary Higgs liquid is expected to be a stable phase in the phase diagram Fig. 5. It covers the quantum critical region (critical in the sense that excitations are gapless), and may possibly extend into the modified so(10) GUT phase (as long as fermionic partons remain deconfined). Starting from the fragmentary Higgs liquid phase, we can access the adjacent phases by Higgs condensation.

- $\langle \Phi^{bi} \rangle \neq 0$, the system enters the PS GUT phase, where fermionic partons are fully gapped by the vector mass.
- $\langle \Phi^{bi} \rangle \neq 0$, the system enters the $su(5)$ GUT phase, where fermionic partons are fully gapped by the axial mass.
- $\langle \Phi^{bi} \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle \Phi^{bi} \rangle \neq 0$, the system enters the SM phase, where fermionic partons are fully gapped by both vector and axial masses.

In all phases, the dark photon will remain gapless and decoupled from all the other particles, which provides a new candidate for light dark matter.

A substantial difference of fermionic partons in the fragmentary Higgs liquid from quarks and leptons in the SM lies in their distinct assignment of quantum numbers. Consider entering the SM phase from the fragmentary Higgs liquid, the fermionic partons, apart from gap opening, also has its representation split from $10_1$ under $U(1) \times SO(10)$ to

$$(1, 2)_{1,3,-2} + (3, 1)_{1,-2,-2} + (1, 2)_{1,-3,2} + (3, 1)_{1,2,2}$$

under $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)^{dark}_gauge \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_X$ of the SM. The weak $SU(2)$ flavor and the strong $SU(3)$ color quantum numbers separate to different fermions, called flavoron and coloron, denoted by $a$ and $o$ respectively, as summarized in Tab. 3.4.3. This phenomenon will be called color-flavor separation, as it is analogous to the spin-charge separation [60–62] in condensed matter physics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$U(1)^{dark}_gauge$</th>
<th>$SU(3)_{c,color}$</th>
<th>$SU(2)_{L,flavor}$</th>
<th>$U(1)_Y$</th>
<th>$U(1)_X$</th>
<th>$U(1)_{EM}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1 or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_R$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 or -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o_R$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The fermionic parton $\xi$ contains flavorons $a$ and colorons $o$. Please beware that the $U(1)^{dark}_gauge$ is for the Dark Gauge (dark photon) sector, which is totally distinct from the $U(1)_{EM}$. The $U(1)_{EM}$ is from the electroweak Higgs symmetry breaking of the $SU(2)_{L,flavor} \times U(1)_Y$ down to a subgroup $U(1)_{EM}$.

The flavoron can participate weak interaction but not strong interaction. On the contrary, the coloron can participate strong interaction but not electroweak interaction. Many of them also carry electromagnetic charge, such that they can also participate electromagnetic interaction. Beyond the SM interactions, the flavoron and coloron also interact among themselves by the emergent $U(1)$ gauge force mediated by the dark photon. Note that there exist a flavoron (in the $a_L$ sector) which do not participate strong and electromagnetic interactions. It only participate weak interaction (like neutrinos) and dark gauge interaction (unlike neutrinos), which makes it a potential candidate for heavy dark matter.
4 Conclusion: Mother Effective Field Theory for BSM Gauge Enhanced Quantum Criticality

4.1 Summary of Main Results:
EFT for Internal Spin(10) Global Symmetry or Dynamical Gauge Theory

To conclude, here we summarize our physical findings on the various quantum vacua of mother effective field theory of the modified 4d so(10) GUT + WZW term based on three binary conditions:

(a). Without or with the GUT-Higgs potential $U(\Phi_R)$ of Eqn. (3.4): (i) Whether we stays in the Spin(10) group of so(10) GUT, or (ii) add the GUT-Higgs potential to Higgs down the Spin(10) deforming it to $G_{GG}$, $G_{PS}$, and $G_{SM}$.

(b). Without or with the WZW term $S_{\text{WZW}}[\Phi] = \pi \int_{M_5} B(\dot{\Phi}^i) - \delta C(\dot{\Phi}^i)$ of Eqn. (3.15): Namely (i) Whether we stays in the so(10) GUT without the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly, or (ii) we consider the modified so(10) GUT + WZW with the $w_2 w_3$ anomaly.

(c). Without or with the dynamically gauged internal symmetry group $G = G_{\text{internal}}$: (i) Whether we keep the $[G_{\text{internal}}]$ symmetry as a global symmetry, or (ii) we gauge the $[G_{\text{internal}}]$, namely gauging $[Spin(10)], [G_{GG}], [G_{PS}],$ and $[G_{SM}]$.

The three binary conditions enumerate totally eight possibilities (where below we can use 3-bits, “???”; each bit labels a “x” or “o” to specify without or with that binary condition holds), which we enlist their physics interpretations, one by one:

1. xxx - Without $U(\Phi_R)$, without WZW, without gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$: We stay in the Landau-Ginzburg phase of the Spin(10) global symmetry.

2. oxx - With $U(\Phi_R)$, without WZW, without gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$: We stay in the Landau-Ginzburg phases, but the $U(\Phi_R)$ potentially breaks the Spin(10) global symmetry to other continuous Lie group global symmetries $G_{GG}$, $G_{PS}$, and $G_{SM}$, via spontaneous global symmetry breaking. There are 45, 24, 21, and 12 Lie algebra generators for each of these groups. So there are corresponding numbers of the low energy Nambu-Goldstone modes, matching the number of the broken Lie algebra generators based on the Goldstone’s theorem.

   In principle, because there is no ’t Hooft anomaly for the 16n chiral fermions with these $G_{\text{internal}}$ internal global symmetries, we can gap out all chiral fermions while preserving $G_{\text{internal}}$ via a symmetric mass generation through appropriate interactions.

3. xxo - Without $U(\Phi_R)$, without WZW, with gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$: We obtain the familiar so(10) GUT with the $[Spin(10)]$ gauged. At a deep UV higher energy, there shows the asymptotic freedom of 16n Weyl fermions (quarks and leptons are liberated with a weaker coupling at a shorter distance for such a non-abelian Lie group gauge force [25, 26]). At an IR lower energy, the Spin(10) gauge fields confine the 16n Weyl fermions, which is a strongly coupled gauge theory with all fermions can gain an energy gap (i.e., “mass” due to the confinement).

4. oxo - With $U(\Phi_R)$, without WZW, with gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$: Then we are in the dynamical gauge theory phases but with gauge symmetry breaking. The $U(\Phi_R)$

---

22We use the bracket notation on a group $[G_{\text{internal}}]$ to emphasize that group is dynamically gauged.
potentially breaks the Spin(10) gauge group to other continuous Lie gauge group $G_{GG}$, $G_{PS}$, and $G_{SM}$, via Anderson-Higgs mechanism of spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking. There are 45, 24, 21, and 12 Lie algebra generators for each of these groups. Recall in the global symmetry story, there are corresponding numbers of the low energy Nambu-Goldstone modes, matching the number of the broken Lie algebra generators based on the Goldstone’s theorem. But now some massless gauge fields can "eats" the degrees of freedom of Goldstone bosons, so to become the massive gauge field with extra degrees of freedom.

Note that again, at a deep UV higher energy, there shows the asymptotic freedom of Weyl fermions; while at an IR lower energy, the non-abelian Lie gauge forces of $G_{GG}$, $G_{PS}$, and $G_{SM}$ can confine some of the Weyl fermions. In this strongly coupled gauge theory, some fermions can gain an energy gap (i.e., “mass”) due to the confinement. But now the electroweak-Higgs causing spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking $su(2)_L \times u(1)_Y \rightarrow u(1)_{EM}$. The $u(1)_{EM}$ stays deconfined and propagate the gapless electromagnetic waves in our vacuum.

Here the fermion mass can come from a combination of mechanism from: the confinement mass, the Anderson-Higgs (gauge-)symmetry-breaking mass, or the gauge theory analog of the symmetric mass generation.

5. xox - Without $U(\Phi_R)$, with WZW, without gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$:
We stay in the Landau-Ginzburg phase of the Spin(10) global symmetry, but the 4d WZW term causes the 4d deconfined quantum criticality (DQC) with fractionalized fragmentary excitations.

This DQC is also a gauge-enhanced criticality (GEQC) because we have a new gauge force (that we call Dark Gauge force with $U(1)_{\text{dark gauge}}$ Dark Photons) emergent near the criticality. The fractionalized fragmentary excitations carry the $U(1)_{\text{gauge gauge}}$ gauge charge. If the $U(1)_{\text{gauge dark}}$ dark photons stay gapless dynamically at deep IR, then it is due to the protection of $w_2w_3$ anomaly.

6. oox - With $U(\Phi_R)$, with WZW, without gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$:
We stay in the Landau-Ginzburg phases, but the $U(\Phi_R)$ potentially breaks the Spin(10) global symmetry to other continuous Lie group global symmetries $G_{GG}$, $G_{PS}$, and $G_{SM}$, via spontaneous global symmetry breaking. Other than the low energy Nambu-Goldstone modes matching the number of the broken Lie algebra generators in the neighbor phases, we still have the fractionalized fragmentary excitations that also carries $U(1)_{\text{dark gauge}}$ gauge charge, with $U(1)_{\text{gauge dark}}$ Dark Photons.

7. xoo - Without $U(\Phi_R)$, with WZW, with gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$:
We obtain the modified so(10) GUT + WZW with the $\text{Spin}(10)$ gauged. At a deep UV higher energy, there shows the asymptotic freedom of 16n Weyl fermions. Other than the DQC and GEQC phenomena described above in the scenario 5., the theory shows:

- The Spin(10) gauge bosons can propagate or leak to the 5d bulk.
- The 16n Weyl fermions are gappable (because there is no anomaly protection for these 16n fermions).
- We have again the 10 fractionalized fragmentary fermions, gauge charged under $U(1)_{\text{gauge dark}}$ Dark Photon. Furthermore, the 10 fractionalized fragmentary fermions carry also the strong SU(3)$_c$ gauge charge, and the weak SU(2)$_L$ gauge charge, recall from Table 3.4.3.
- Here we are doing the Fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model beyond the SM (with 10 fractionalized fragmentary fermions coupled to $U(1)_{\text{gauge dark}}$ Dark Photon) of Sec. 3.4 that can match the $w_2w_3$ anomaly. In contrast, we are not thinking of the 10 gauge neutral bosons from Composite GUT-Higgs model within SM of Sec. 3.3 that does not have the $w_2w_3$ anomaly.

8. ooo - With $U(\Phi_R)$, with WZW, with gauged $[G_{\text{internal}}]$:
This scenario follows directly from the scenario 7., but with a GUT-Higgs potential triggering symmetry-breaking. All statements in the scenario 7. follow also here. Moreover,

- There is a sequence of various possibilities at various energy scales from the UV to the IR dynamical fates of this QFT. Here we only enlist the possibilities by $w_2w_3$ anomaly matching based on kinematics,
we do not know the definite answer of quantum dynamics. But the anomaly can constrain the quantum dynamical fates. The following dynamics saturate the $w_2w_3$ anomaly can be the quantum dynamics of the modified $so(10)$ GUT or the PS model + 4d WZW term (with 16n Weyl fermions):

i). Spin(10) gauge theory is asymptotic free at the deep UV.

ii). Spin(10) gauge group can be broken down to contain an SU(2) gauge subgroup (which is also asymptotic free) such that there is a new SU(2) anomaly $w_2w_3$ [10].

iii). The gauge group can be broken down to contain a U(1) gauge subgroup which can also have a $w_2w_3$ anomaly if the theory is all-fermion U(1) gauge theory [12,13].

iv). The gauge group can be broken down to contain a $Z_2$ gauge subgroup which can also have a $w_2w_3$ anomaly if the theory has fermionic strings [11].

4d boundary criticality and a 5d bulk bosonic invertible TQFT: Notice that we can interpret the above 4d criticality as a boundary criticality with the $w_2w_3$ anomaly on the 5d bulk of a mod 2 class invertible TQFT. The 4d WZW, that can be built from the bosonic GUT-Higgs fields alone, can saturate 4d $w_2w_3$ anomaly. So we only require the bulk as some 5d bosonic symmetry-protected topological states (bosonic SPTs, if we require an onsite Spin(10) symmetry. See the overview of modern quantum matter terminology and definitions in [63,64]).

Bosonic UV completion: For this 16n Weyl fermion models, the whole UV completion of the full 4d and 5d system requires only the bosons, as the local onsite Hilbert space with gauge-invariant bosonic operators.

Although above we focus on the 16n-Weyl-fermion SMs or GUTs, we can consider the 15n-Weyl-fermion models, especially for the $su(5)$ GUT and the SM + 4d WZW term, see Sec. 4.2.

4.2 16n vs 15n Weyl fermions: Give “mass” to “right-handed sterile” neutrinos, canceling mod 2 and mod 16 anomalies, and topological quantum criticality

Although we mostly focus on the 16n-Weyl-fermion SMs or GUTs in this work, here we comment about several ways to obtain the low-energy 15n-Weyl-fermion models (since the real-world experiments only observed the 15n-Weyl-fermion so far) by giving a large mass to the 16th Weyl fermions, the so-called “right-handed sterile” neutrinos (in any of the 3 generation of leptons).

What are examples of conventional ways [34] to give a large (Anderson-Higgs type quadratic) mass to the 16th Weyl fermions? We can pair Weyl fermion to itself (i.e., Majorana mass) or to another Weyl fermion:

1. Introduce a Higgs $\Phi_{so(10),126}$ which can be paired with $\bar{126}$ out of two Weyl fermions in $16 \otimes 16 = 10 \oplus 120 \oplus \bar{126}$.

2. Introduce a Higgs $\Phi_{so(10),16}$ and add an extra Weyl fermion (17th Weyl fermion) singlet $1$ under Spin(10). This works only if some of the following holds:

   (a) The 17th Weyl fermion is not charged under the $Z_{4,X}$-symmetry, so we have the $Z_{16}$-anomaly called already by 16n Weyl fermions. This is likely to be true because this 17th Weyl fermion is singlet $1$ under Spin(10), thus is also not acted by the center $Z($Spin(10)) = $Z_{4,X}$.

---

Note that the “right-handed sterile $\nu_R$” neutrino is just the conventional name used in the HEP phenomenology. We would mostly write this $\nu_R$ in the left-handed Weyl fermion basis. Also the $\nu_R$ although is sterile to the $G_{SM}$ and SU(5), the $\nu_R$ is not sterile to Spin(10) and $Z_{4,X}$.
(b) If the 17th Weyl fermion is also charged under the $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$-symmetry, then we require the $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$-symmetry is broken (thus the $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$-anomaly is removed), or the $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$-symmetry is preserved but $17 \mod 16$-anomaly is cancelled again by additional new sectors with $-1 \mod 16$-anomaly.

What are other new ways to leave only the observed 15n Weyl fermions at low energy, but the $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ global anomaly can still be cancelled in the full quantum system? To begin with, to characterize the full 4d anomaly of this 15n SMs or GUTs, we should combine the two types of anomalies: First, a potential global $\mathbb{Z}_2$ anomaly, $w_2w_3$ for our 4d WZW term, such as in the Fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model in Sec. 3.4. Second, the $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ global anomaly captured by a 5d version of Atiyah-Patodi-Singer (APS) eta invariant for the Spin $\times \mathbb{Z}_4$ $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$-structure from $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_4, \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}) = \mathbb{Z}_{16}$. We can write that 5d APS invariant in terms of the 4d APS invariant of $\text{Pin}^+$-structure from $\text{TP}_4(\text{Pin}^+) = \mathbb{Z}_{16}$. The two combined invertible TQFT, labeled by $p \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$, has a partition function $Z$ on $M^5$:

$$Z_{\text{4d-TQFT}}^{(p,\nu)} \equiv \exp(i \cdot \oint_{M^5} w_2w_3 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{16} \cdot \nu \cdot \eta(\mathcal{A}_{Z_4} \mod 2)\right) \bigg|_{M^5} ),$$

with $p \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, a 4d Atiyah-Patodi-Singer $\eta$ invariant $\equiv \eta_{\text{Pin}^+} \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$. (4.1)

The $\mathcal{A}_{Z_4} \in \text{H}^1(M,\mathbb{Z}_{4,X})$ is a cohomology class discrete gauge field of the $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$-symmetry.

Inspired by highly-entangled interacting quantum matter recent developments (see reviews in [63,64]), Ref. [29–31] proposed additional new sectors to cancel the anomalies, for example,

3. Symmetry-preserving anomalous gapped 4d TQFT.
4. Symmetric-preserving 5d invertible TQFT in the extra dimension.
5. Symmetry-breaking gapped phase of Landau-Ginzburg kinds.
6. Symmetry-preserving (or breaking) 5d topological gravity theory.
7. Symmetry-preserving or symmetry-breaking gapless phase, e.g., extra massless theories, free or interacting conformal field theories (CFTs). The interacting CFT can also be related to unparticle physics [65] in the high-energy phenomenology community.

The heavy gapped new sectors above can be heavy Dark Matter candidates. The interesting constraints from mod 2 and mod 16 global anomalies on our 4d DQC model are:

- **$\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ anomaly constraints on the GG and SM of 15n Weyl fermions**: On the Georgi-Glashow $su(5)$ GUT and the Standard Model $\text{SM}_{q=6}$ side, we can have 15n Weyl fermions, plus additional new sectors enlisted (above and in [29–31]) to match the $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ anomaly.

- **$\mathbb{Z}_2 w_2w_3$ anomaly constraints on the so(10) GUT and PS of 16n Weyl fermions**: On the so(10) GUT and the Pati-Salam model sides, there are various types of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ class $w_2w_3$ anomalies, of the SO(10), SO(6), or SO(4) bundles. The $\mathbb{Z}_2 w_2w_3$ anomaly is meant to be cancelled by our 4d WZW term.

- At the vicinity of the 4d DQC we have proposed, there can be another interplay between the 15n Weyl fermions (GG and SM) to 16n Weyl fermions (the so(10) GUT and PS), such that the DQC becomes a **topological quantum phase transition or topological quantum criticality**.

**4d boundary criticality to a 5d bulk criticality**: Compare with the phase diagram in Fig. 5. Notice that we can interpret the above 4d criticality as a **boundary criticality** —
• On the modified $so(10)$ GUT and the PS model + WZW term side with 16n Weyl fermions in Fig. 5: with the $w_2 w_3 Z_2$-class anomaly on the 5d bulk of a mod 2 class invertible TQFT.

• On the modified $su(5)$ GUT and the SM + WZW term side with 15n Weyl fermions in Fig. 5: with the $\eta(\text{PD}(A_{Z_4}) \mod 2)) Z_{16}$-class anomaly on the 5d bulk of a mod 2 class invertible TQFT.

Once the $[\text{Spin}(10)]$ is dynamically gauged,

• The 5d bulk on the modified $so(10)$ GUT and the PS model side (16n Weyl fermions): The $[\text{Spin}(10)]$ dynamical gauge fields can propagate and leak to the 5d bulk are deconfined and gapless.

• The 5d bulk on the modified $su(5)$ GUT and the SM side (15n Weyl fermions): Only the $[Z_{4,X}]$ subgroup ($Z(\text{Spin}(10)) = Z_{4,X}$) are dynamically gauged in the 5d bulk of the original fermionic invertible TQFT $\eta(\text{PD}(A_{Z_4}) \mod 2))$. Gauging $[Z_{4,X}]$ turns the 5d fermionic bulk to a 5d bosonic bulk TQFT (with long-range entanglement, gapped topological order, and described by gauged cohomology, gauged cobordism, or higher category theory). The 5d bulk can remain to be gapped.

Thus there is a phase transition between the deconfined and gapless 5d bulk to another side of gapped 5d bulk. This phase transition can be interpreted as a 5d bulk topological quantum criticality.
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A Quantum Numbers and Representations of SMs and GUTs in Tables

Here we summarize the representations of “elementary” chiral fermionic particles of quarks and leptons of SMs and GUTs in Tables.

Spacetime symmetry representation  Here Weyl fermions are spacetime Weyl spinors, which we prefer to write all Weyl fermions as

$$2_L \text{ of } \text{Spin}(1,3) = \text{SL}(2,C)$$

with a complex representation in the 4d Lorentz signature. On the other hand, the Weyl spinor is

$$2_L \text{ of } \text{Spin}(4) = \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$$

with a pseudoreal representation in the 4d Euclidean signature.
Internal symmetry representation  Below we provide two Tables, 2 and 3, to organize the internal symmetry representations of particle contents of the SM, the su(5) GUT, the Pati-Salam model, the so(10) GUT.

A.1 Embed the SM into the su(5) GUT, then into the so(10) GUT

There is a QFT embedding, the so(10) GUT ⊃ the su(5) GUT ⊃ the SM only for \( G_{SMq=6} \) via an internal symmetry group embedding:

\[
\text{Spin}(10) \supset G_{GG} \equiv SU(5) \supset SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)
\]

The representations of quarks and leptons for these models are organized in Table 2. There are two versions of electroweak hypercharge normalization listed in Table 2, such that the charge of \( U(1)_{\tilde{Y}} \) is \( \frac{1}{6} \) of the charge of \( U(1)_{\tilde{Y}} \).

| SM fermion spinor field | SU(3) | SU(2) | U(1)_{Y} | U(1)_{\tilde{Y}} | U(1)_{EM} | U(1)_{B-L} | U(1)_{X} | Z_{5,X} | Z_{4,X} | Z_{F}^{X} | SU(5) | Spin(10) |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|----------|-----------------|------------|-------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| \( d_{R} \)             | 3     | 1     | 1/3      | 2               | 1/3        | -1/3        | -3       | -3     | 1      | 1      | 5      | 3      |
| \( l_{L} \)             | 1     | 2     | -1/2     | -3              | 0 or -1    | -1          | -3       | -3     | 1      | 1      | 10     | 16     |
| \( q_{L} \)             | 3     | 1     | 1/6      | 1               | 2/3 or -1/3| 1/3         | 1        | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| \( \bar{u}_{R} = e_{L}^{c} \) | 1     | 1     | 1/3      | 6               | 1          | 1           | 1        | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| \( \bar{\nu}_{R} = \nu_{L}^{c} \) | 1     | 1     | 0        | 0               | 0          | 1           | 1        | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      |

Table 2: Embed the \( su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1) \) SM into the Georgi-Glashow \( su(5) \) GUT, then into the \( so(10) \) GUT. We show the quantum numbers of \( 15+1 = 16 \) left-handed Weyl fermion (spacetime spinors 2\( _{L} \) in Spin(1,3)) in each of three generations of matter fields in SM. The 15 of 16 Weyl fermion are \( 5 \oplus 10 \) of SU(5); namely, \( (3, 1, 1/3)_{L} \oplus (1, 2, -1/2)_{L} \sim 5 \) and \( (3, 2, 1/6)_{L} \oplus (3, 1, -2/3)_{L} \oplus (1, 1, 1)_{L} \sim 10 \) of SU(5). The 1 of 16 is presented neither in the standard GSW SM nor in the \( su(5) \) GUT, but it is within \( 16 \) of the \( so(10) \) GUT. The numbers in the Table entries indicate the quantum numbers associated with the representation of the groups given in the top row. We show a generation of SM fermion matter fields in Table 2. There are 3 generations, triplicating Table 2, in SM. All fermions have the fermion parity \( Z_{F}^{X} \) representation charge 1. In the \( su(5) \) GUT, by including the \( U(1)_{X} \), we have the \( (SU(5) \times U(1)_{X})/Z_{5} = U(5) \) structure. Here \( U(1)_{X} \supset Z_{4,X} \supset Z_{F}^{X} \) and \( SU(5) \supset U(1)_{Y} \). Both \( U(1)_{X} \) and \( U(1)_{B-L} \) are outside the SU(5).
A.2 Embed the SM into the Left-Right and Pati-Salam models, into the so(10) GUT

There are two version of internal symmetry groups for Pati-Salam (PS) model [6]:

\[ G_{PS^q} = \frac{SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R}{\mathbb{Z}_{q'}} \equiv Spin(6) \times Spin(4) \]

with \( q' = 1, 2 \). There are two version of internal symmetry groups for Senjanovic-Mohapatra's Left-Right (LR) model [66],

\[ G_{LR^q} = \frac{SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}}{\mathbb{Z}_{3q'}} \equiv Spin(6) \times Spin(4) \]

with \( q' = 1, 2 \). In general, there is a QFT embedding, the PS model \( \supset \) the LR model \( \supset \) the SM for both \( q' = 1, 2 \) via the internal symmetry group embedding:

\[ G_{PS^q} \supset G_{LR^q} \supset G_{SM_{q=3}} \]

Namely, when \( q' = 1 \), we have

\[ G_{PS_1} \supset G_{LR_1} \supset G_{SM_3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

Furthermore, only when \( q' = 2 \), we can have the whole into the Spin(10) for the so(10) GUT:

\[ Spin(10) \supset G_{PS_2} \supset G_{LR_2} \supset G_{SM_6} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

The representations of quarks and leptons for these models are organized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SM fermion spinor field</th>
<th>SU(3)</th>
<th>SU(2) (_L)</th>
<th>SU(2) (_R)</th>
<th>U(1) (_{B-L})</th>
<th>U(1) (_Y)</th>
<th>U(1) (_{Y_R})</th>
<th>U(1) (_{EM})</th>
<th>U(1) (_X)</th>
<th>Z(_4)</th>
<th>Z(_{2^F})</th>
<th>Spin(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( u_L )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>q(_L) : 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d_L )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>l(_L) : 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>-1/3</td>
<td>-1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>q(_R) : 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{u}_R )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1/6</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
<td>-1/6</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d_R )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1/6</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>-1/6</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\nu}_R = \nu_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e_R = e^+_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: **Embed the \( su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1) \) SM into the Pati-Salam \( su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2) \), then into the so(10) GUT**. We have \( T_{3,L} + Y = Q_{EM} \), the Lie algebra linear combination \( SU(2)_L \) (the third generator) and \( U(1)_Y \) gives the \( U(1)_{EM} \) charge. We have \( T_{3,R} + Y = \frac{B-L}{2} \), the Lie algebra linear combination of \( SU(2)_R \) (the third generator) and \( U(1)_Y \) gives the \( U(1)_{B-L} \). We choose the right-handed anti-particle to be in \( 2 \) of \( SU(2)_R \) (so its right-handed particle to be in \( 2 \) of \( SU(2)_R \)) that makes a specific assignment on the \( \pm \) sign of its \( T_{3,R} \) charge. So we have the formula, \( T_{3,L} - T_{3,R} = Q_{EM} - \frac{B-L}{2} \).
B Representation and Branching Rule for GUT-Higgs symmetry breaking

Here are we organize the set of branching rules of representations following the symmetry breaking pattern of various GUTs to SM (these rules are used in Sec. 2.1):

1. Spin(10) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(5) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(3) $\times$ SU(2)$_L$ $\times$ U(1)$_Y$ $\;_{Z_6}$ branching rules:
   - For Spin(10) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(5), also for SO(10) $\leftrightarrow$ U(5) = SU(5) $\times$ U(1)$_Y$ (or in terms of Lie algebra so(10) $\leftrightarrow$ su(5) $\times$ u(1) with a regular Lie subalgebra in [50])$^{24}$, the branching rule says:

     $\begin{align*}
     10 &\sim 5 \oplus \bar{5} \\
     16 &\sim 1 \oplus 5 \oplus 10 \\
     45 &\sim 1 \oplus 10 \oplus \bar{10} \oplus 24 \\
     54 &\sim 15 \oplus 15 \oplus 24 \\
     120 &\sim 5 \oplus \bar{5} \oplus 10 \oplus 24 \\
     126 &\sim 1 \oplus 10 \oplus 15 \oplus 45 \oplus 50
     \end{align*}$

   - For SU(5) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(3) $\times$ SU(2)$_L$ $\times$ U(1)$_Y$ $\;_{Z_6}$ (or in terms of Lie algebra su(5) $\leftrightarrow$ su(3) $\times$ su(2) $\times$ u(1) with a regular Lie subalgebra in [50]), the branching rule says:

     $\begin{align*}
     5 &\sim (1, 2)_{-3} \oplus (3, 1)_{2} \\
     10 &\sim (1, 1)_{-6} \oplus (3, 1)_{4} \oplus (3, 2)_{-1} \\
     15 &\sim (1, 3)_{-6} \oplus (3, 2)_{-1} \oplus (6, 1)_{4} \\
     24 &\sim (1, 1)_{0} \oplus (1, 3)_{0} \oplus (3, 2)_{5} \oplus (3, 2)_{-5} \oplus (8, 1)_{0} \\
     \ldots \\
     45 &\sim (1, 2)_{-3} \oplus (3, 1)_{2} \oplus (3, 2)_{-8} \oplus (3, 2)_{7} \oplus (3, 3)_{2} \oplus (6, 1)_{2} \oplus (8, 2)_{-3} \\
     50 &\sim (1, 1)_{12} \oplus (3, 1)_{2} \oplus (3, 2)_{7} \oplus (6, 1)_{-8} \oplus (6, 3)_{2} \oplus (8, 2)_{-3}.
     \end{align*}$

(1) First, in order to break the Spin(10) or SO(10) down to SU(5), we take the representation whose branching rule in (B.1) contains the 1 of SU(5) or 1$_0$ of U(5) on the right-handed side so that SU(5) or U(5) is left unbroken. This means that we may take a GUT-Higgs 45 that we name it as (2.10):

   $$\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45}. \quad (B.3)$$

(2) Second, in order to break SU(5) further down to G$_{SM_6}$, we take the representation whose branching rule in (B.2) contains the (1, 1)$_0$ of G$_{SM_6}$. This means that we can take the 24 of SU(5) as the second GUT-Higgs called $\Phi_{su(5), 24}$. But if we want to obtain this second GUT-Higgs from a higher-energy so(10) GUT, it turns out that we can find $\Phi_{su(5), 24}$ within (2.11):

   $$\Phi_{so(10), 54} \equiv \Phi_{54}. \quad (B.4)$$

---

$^{24}$It is subtle to point out that actually the Lie group embedding shows (the proof is given in [67])

Spin(10) $\supset$ SU(5) but Spin(10) $\nsubseteq$ U(5),

while

SO(10) $\supset$ SU(5) but also SO(10) $\supset$ U(5).

The embedding SO(10) $\supset$ U(5) cannot be lifted to Spin(10) thus Spin(10) $\nsubseteq$ U(5).
from (B.1) more naturally, as we will soon see.\(^{25}\)

2. Spin(10) $\leftrightarrow$ Spin(6)$\times$Spin(4) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(3)$\times$SU(2)$\times$U(1)\(^{Y}\) branching rules:

$\diamond$ For Spin(10) $\leftrightarrow$ Spin(6)$\times$Spin(4) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(3)$\times$SU(2)$\times$SU(2)\(^{Y}\), also for SO(10) $\leftrightarrow$ SO(6)$\times$SO(4) (or in terms of Lie algebra so(10) $\leftrightarrow$ so(6)$\times$so(4) or su(4)$\times$su(2)$\times$su(2) with a regular Lie subalgebra in [50])

$$\begin{cases}
10 \sim (1, 2, 2) \oplus (6, 1, 1), \\
16 \sim (4, 2, 1) \oplus (4', 1, 2), \\
45 \sim (1, 3, 1) \oplus (1, 1, 3) \oplus (6, 2, 2) \oplus (15, 1, 1), \\
54 \sim (1, 1, 1) \oplus (1, 3, 3) \oplus (6, 2, 2) \oplus (20', 1, 1), \\
120 \sim (1, 1, 2) \oplus (6, 3, 1) \oplus (6, 1, 3) \oplus (10, 1, 1) \oplus (10', 1, 1) \oplus (15, 2, 2), \\
126 \sim (6, 1, 1) \oplus (\overline{10}, 3, 1) \oplus (10, 1, 3) \oplus (15, 2, 2).
\end{cases}$$

(\text{B.5})

$\diamond$ For Spin(6)$\times$Spin(4) $\leftrightarrow$ SU(4)$\times$SU(2)$\times$SU(2)\(^{Y}\) (or in terms of Lie algebra so(6)$\times$so(4) or su(4)$\times$su(2)$\times$su(2) $\leftrightarrow$ su(3)$\times$su(2)$\times$u(1)), we find that the su(4) $\leftrightarrow$ su(3)$\times$u(1) (with a regular Lie subalgebra in [50]) branching rule says:

$$\begin{cases}
4 \sim 1_{-3} \oplus 3_{1}, \\
6 \sim 3_{-2} \oplus 3_{2}, \\
10 \sim 1_{-6} \oplus 3_{-2} \oplus 6_{2}, \\
15 \sim 1_{0} \oplus 3_{4} \oplus \overline{3}_{-4} \oplus 8_{0}.
\end{cases}$$

(\text{B.6})

(1) First, in order to break the Spin(10) down to G\(_{PS2}\) $\equiv$ Spin(6)$\times$Spin(4) $\equiv$ SU(4)$\times$SU(2)$\times$SU(2), we take the representation whose branching rule in (B.5) contains the (1,1,1) on the right-handed side so that G\(_{PS2}\) is left unbroken. This means that we may take a GUT-Higgs 54 that we had named it in (2.11) as

$$\Phi_{so(10), 54} \equiv \Phi_{54}.\,$$

(2) Second, in order to break G\(_{PS2}\) further down to G\(_{SM6}\) $\equiv$ SU(3)$\times$SU(2)$\times$SU(2)$\times$U(1)$^{Y}$, we take the representation whose branching rule in (B.2) contains the (1,1)\(_{0}\) of G\(_{SM6}\). This means that we can take the 15 of SU(4) as the second GUT-Higgs called $\Phi_{su(4), 15}$. But if we want to obtain this second GUT-Higgs from a higher-energy so(10) GUT, it turns out that we can find $\Phi_{su(4), 15}$ from what we had named in (2.10) called

$$\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45},$$

from (B.5) more naturally, as we will soon see.\(^{26}\)

3. SU(3)$\times$SU(2)$\times$U(1)$^{Y}$ $\leftrightarrow$ SU(3)$\times$SU(2)$\times$U(1)$^{EM}$ branching rules:

The Standard Model (SM) electroweak Higgs in the representation

$$\Phi_{SM} \text{ in } (1, 2)_{Y=\frac{1}{2}} = (1, 2)_{Y_W=1} = (1, 2)_{Y=-3} \text{ of } su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1) \tag{B.7}$$

\(^{25}\)It may be also possible to introduce the second GUT-Higgs of $\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45}$ (different from $\Phi_{45}$) which also contains the $\Phi_{su(5), 24}$ that can break SU(5) down to G\(_{SM6}\).

Another possible choice proposed in Georgi’s textbook [34] is that in addition to the first GUT-Higgs $\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45}$, one may also introduce a scalar Higgs of a 16 or a 126 of Spin(10) in order to Higgs down to G\(_{SM6}\).

However, these choices are not ideal for us, due to the reason of quantum criticality that we pursue later. The quantum criticality that we pursue only require $\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45}$ and $\Phi_{so(10), 54} \equiv \Phi_{54}$, from (2.10) and (2.11).

\(^{26}\)Another possible choice proposed in Georgi’s textbook [34] is that in addition to the first GUT-Higgs $\Phi_{so(10), 54} \equiv \Phi_{54}$, one may also introduce a scalar Higgs of a 16 or a 126 of Spin(10) in order to Higgs down to G\(_{SM6}\).

However, these choices are not ideal for us, due to the reason of quantum criticality that we pursue later. The quantum criticality that we pursue only require $\Phi_{so(10), 45} \equiv \Phi_{45}$ and $\Phi_{so(10), 54} \equiv \Phi_{54}$, from (2.10) and (2.11).
does the job to break $G_{\text{SM}_0} = \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y}{\mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_5}$ to $\frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{U}(1)_{\text{EM}}}{\mathbb{Z}_5}$. Then next, we can ask how to find $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$ from the representation of $su(5)$, or $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$, or $so(10)$.

- $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$ from $su(5)$: From the branching rule in (B.2), one can try to take the $\Phi_{su(5), 45}$ and $\Phi_{su(5), 27}$ which contains $(1, 2)^{-3}$ of $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$ which is the complex conjugation of $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$’s $(1, 2)^{-3}$.

- $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$ from $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$: From the branching rule in (B.6), one can try to take the $\Phi_{su(4), 45, 27}$ that contains $(1, 2)^{-3}$ of $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$, which is also the complex conjugation of $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$’s $(1, 2)^{-3}$. We may also need $\Phi_{su(4), 45, (4, 1, 2)}$ if we wish to break the $SU(2)^2$ completely.

- $\Phi_{\text{SM}}$ from $so(10)$: From the branching rule in (B.1), we can get the $\Phi_{su(5), 45}$ and $\Phi_{su(5), 27}$ out of $10, 120$ or $126$ of $so(10)$, which we can call $\Phi_{so(10), 10}, \Phi_{so(10), 120}$, and $\Phi_{so(10), 126}$. These $10, 120$ or $126$ are particular sensible according to [34], because these Higgs can be paired up with the fermion bilinear operators $\psi_i \psi_j$ whose representations are also in the tensor product $16 \otimes 16 = 10 \oplus 120 \oplus 126$.

From the branching rule in (B.5), we can get the $\Phi_{su(4), 45, 27}$ and $\Phi_{su(4), 45, (4, 1, 2)}$ out of $16$ of Spin(10), which we can call $\Phi_{so(10), 16}$.

C Induce a 3d WZW term between Néel $so(2)$ and VBS $so(3)$ on a 4d bulk $w_2(V_{SO(3)})w_2(V_{SO(2)})$

This Appendix provides a logical pedagogical account on the familiar 3d dQCP [20] proposed as a continuous quantum phase transition, on a 2+1d bosonic lattice model with an internal non-relativistic (iso)spin-1/2 bosons, between two kinds of Landau-Ginzburg symmetry breaking orders on each lattice site:

1. One side has the Néel anti-ferromagnet order: This order breaks the $\mathbb{Z}^2$-spatial lattice translation to $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$ on a lattice. It also breaks the SO(3) (iso)spin rotational symmetry (actually, breaking SO(3) faithfully, not SU(2))28. But it respects the spatial rotational symmetry, which is $\mathbb{Z}_4$ spatial rotational symmetry on a square lattice, but it preserves an enhanced SO(2) spatial rotational symmetry in the continuum.

2. Another side has the Valence-Bond Solid (VBS) order, which preserves a faithful SO(3) (iso)spin rotational symmetry (again, see footnote 28), because the VBS order pairs the two neighbor-site (iso)spin-1/2 bosons to an (iso)spin-0 state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow\rangle \downarrow \downarrow | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle \uparrow \uparrow)$. But the pattern of VBS breaks the $\mathbb{Z}_4$ spatial rotational symmetry on a square lattice, so the VBS breaks an SO(2) spatial rotational symmetry in the continuum.

---

27 What condensed matter people call the spin-1/2 bosons on site is actually the isospin-1/2 boson which is in the representation 2 of the internal symmetry SU(2), as the internal SU(2) doublet, or namely the qubit. The spin up $|\uparrow\rangle$ and down $|\downarrow\rangle$ are mapped to $|1\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$ of qubit. To emphasize again, the internal SU(2) here is not the spacetime SU(2) from the spin group.

28 There is an internal SU(2) spin rotational symmetry, but the center $Z(SU(2)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ does not act on the Hilbert space in a physical faithful or meaningful way. What faithful representation means physically here is that whether we can find states as that representation, being acted by any physical operator such that these states can be distinguished from each other. The answer is that we cannot distinguish the two states charged under $Z(SU(2)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ physically in this bosonic system.
If we take into account the discrete $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry (a time-reversal or a spatial reflection symmetry), the above $\text{SO}(2)$ symmetry becomes an $\text{O}(2) = \text{SO}(2) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, while the above $\text{SO}(3)$ symmetry becomes an $\text{O}(3) = \text{SO}(3) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry.

Below we write $G$ as the original symmetry group (such as $\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2)$ valid to the UV lattice scale), while $G_{\text{sub}}$ is the remained preserved unbroken symmetry in the corresponding order (Néel or VBS orders). Then we have the following fibration structure:

$$G_{\text{sub}} \hookrightarrow G \twoheadrightarrow G / G_{\text{sub}},$$

where the quotient space $G / G_{\text{sub}}$ is the base manifold (i.e., the orbit) as the symmetry-breaking order parameter space. The $G$ is the total space obtained from the fibration of the $G_{\text{sub}}$ fiber (i.e., the stabilizer) over the base $G_{\text{sub}}$. Here is a systematic table computation on the homotopy group $\pi_k$ of $(G / G_{\text{sub}})$ for Néel or VBS orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\pi_0$</th>
<th>$\pi_1$</th>
<th>$\pi_2$</th>
<th>$\pi_3$</th>
<th>$\pi_4$</th>
<th>$\pi_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Néel $S^2$</td>
<td>$\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2)$</td>
<td>$\text{SO}(2)$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBS $S^1$</td>
<td>$\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(1)$</td>
<td>$\text{SO}(1)$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{SO}(5)$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To our knowledge, the most systematic, physically intuitive, and mathematically transparent construction of the 3d dQCP and its 3d WZW term can be based on the following arguments:

1. The Néel order breaks an $\text{SO}(3)$ (iso)spin rotational symmetry down to an $\text{U}(1) = \text{SO}(2)$ (iso)spin rotational symmetry such as along the $z$ axis, such that (3.16) in the Néel order becomes:

$$\left( G_{\text{sub}} = \text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(2) \right) \hookrightarrow \left( G = \text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2) \right) \twoheadrightarrow \left( \frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}} = S^2 \right).$$

(ii). Hedgehog core, instanton, and magnetic monopole: The $\text{SO}(3)$ symmetry breaking hedgehog core has a 0d singularity in the spacetime. This 0d singularity of this hedgehog core in the 3d spacetime can be also regarded an instanton in the 3d spacetime. We can couple this whole configuration to $\text{SO}(3)$ background gauge field, this means that we can use the $w_2(V_{\text{SO}(3)})$ to measure the magnetic charge of $\text{SO}(3)$. We evaluate the $w_2(V_{\text{SO}(3)})$ over the Néel’s $\text{SO}(3)$ symmetry-breaking target space $S^2$, it turns out that there is a $2\pi$-flux over $S^2$. Therefore, the hedgehog core is not only an instanton event but also an $\text{SO}(3)$ magnetic monopole, living on a 0d open end of some non-dynamical 1d ’t Hooft line defect of $\text{SO}(3)$ background gauge field.

(ii). This $\text{SO}(3)$ symmetry-breaking hedgehog core traps a “fractionalized charge-1/2 object charged under the preserved $\text{SO}(2)$ symmetry (or $\mathbb{Z}_4$ symmetry on a lattice scale),” namely in the projective representation of $\mathbb{Z}_4$, which is in the unit integer representation $\mathbb{Z}_8$. Namely, the $\text{SO}(3)$-symmetry-breaking topological defect, hedgehog core in the Néel phase, traps the $\frac{1}{2}$-fractionalization of the unbroken $\text{SO}(2)$, or $\mathbb{Z}_4$, symmetry charge of VBS order.

(iii). The winding number of such Néel hedgehog configuration can be classified by

$$\pi_2\left( \frac{\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2)}{\text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(2)} \right) = \pi_2\left( \frac{\text{SO}(3)}{\text{SO}(2)} \right) = \pi_2(S^2) = \mathbb{Z}.$$ 

(C.4)
This says the $S^2$ as a 2d surface in 3d spacetime wrapping around the target $S^2$ of the Néel’s SO(3) symmetry-breaking target space (the base manifold and stabilizer in (C.3)). The spatial $S^2$ circle as a homology class (in $H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$, called this 2d sphere $\varrho^2$) can be paired up with a cohomology class $B \in H^2(M,\mathbb{Z})$. To make sense the unit generator of the winding $\mathbb{Z}$ class, the $B$ evaluated on $\varrho^2$ (bounding a 3-disk $\Sigma^3$ by $\varrho^2$ so $\partial \Sigma^3 = \varrho^2$) must have the following:

$$\oint_{\varrho^2=\partial \Sigma^3} B = \oint_{\varrho^2} w_2(V_{SO(3)}) = 1 \mod 2. \quad (C.5)$$

(iv). Now imagine in a 3d spacetime picture, we can regard:

- the 0d hedgehog core $\varrho^0_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}$ as the charged object, fractionalized charged under the preserved SO(2) (projective representation in $\mathbb{Z}_4$, precisely in $\mathbb{Z}_8$).
- the 2d $S^2$ called $\varrho^2$ with $B \in H^2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ on the $\varrho^2$, as the charge operator, or the symmetry generator of the SO(2).

Then, follow the higher symmetry or generalized global symmetry language [51], the measurement of the symmetry is exactly performed by evaluating the linking between the $\varrho^0_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}$ and $\varrho^2$ in a 3d spacetime $M^3$. Precisely, the linking number $Lk$, manifested as a statistical Berry phase, is evaluated via the expectation value of path integral:

$$\langle \exp(i\pi \oint_{\varrho^2=\partial \Sigma^3} B) \cdot \exp(i\pi \varphi_{\varrho^0_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}}) \rangle = (-1)^{Lk(\varrho^2,\varrho^0_{\text{Néel hedgehog}})} \bigg|_{M^3} \quad (C.6)$$

Here $\varphi_{\varrho^0_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}}$ is the 0d vertex operator evaluated around the 0d hedgehog core, which is again the 0d magnetic monopole at the open end of the SO(3) background-gauged 1d ’t Hooft line.

2. The VBS order breaks an SO(2) spatial rotational symmetry in the continuum (or breaks $\mathbb{Z}_4$ rotational symmetry on a lattice), such that (3.16) in the VBS order becomes:

$$\left( G_{\text{sub}} = \text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(1) \right) \longmapsto \left( G = \text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2) \right) \longmapsto \left( \frac{G}{G_{\text{sub}}} = S^1 \right). \quad (C.7)$$

(i). The SO(2) symmetry-breaking VBS vortex core has a 0d singularity trapping an (iso)spin-1/2 object called the (iso)spinon in the space (famously popularized by Levin-Senthil [68]), which indeed is a 1d vortex loop (called this 1d loop $\varphi^1_{\text{VBS vortex}}$) in the spacetime.

(ii). The (iso)spinon with (iso)spin-1/2 trapped at the VBS order parameter vortex core is a “fractionalized charge-1/2 object charged under the preserved symmetry SO(3),” namely in the projective representation of SO(3), which is in the fundamental representation 2 of SU(2). Namely, the SO(2)-symmetry-breaking topological defect, the vortex in the VBS phase, traps the $\frac{1}{2}$-fractionalization of SO(3) symmetry charge of Néel order.

(iii). The winding number of such VBS vortex configuration can be classified by

$$\pi_1\left( \frac{\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(2)}{\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(1)} \right) = \pi_1\left( \frac{\text{SO}(2)}{\text{SO}(1)} \right) = \pi_1(S^1) = \mathbb{Z}. \quad (C.8)$$

This says the spatial $S^1$ wrapping around the target $S^1$ of the VBS’s SO(2) symmetry-breaking target space (the base manifold and stabilizer in (C.7)). The spatial $S^1$ circle as a homology class (in $H_1(M,\mathbb{Z})$, called this 1d circle $\varrho^1$) can be paired up with a cohomology class $A \in H^1(M,\mathbb{Z})$. To make sense the unit generator of the winding $\mathbb{Z}$ class, the d$A$ evaluated on a 2-disk $\Sigma^2$ ( bounded by $\varrho^1$ so $\partial \Sigma^2 = \varrho^1$) must have the following Stoke theorem:

$$\oint_{\varrho^1=\partial \Sigma^2} A = \int_{\Sigma^2} dA = \int_{\Sigma^2} w_2(V_{SO(2)}) = 1 \mod 2. \quad (C.9)$$
(iv). Now imagine in a 3d spacetime picture, we can regard:

- the 1d vortex loop $\varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}$ as the \textit{charged object}, fractionalized charged under the preserved SO(3) (projective representation in SO(3), precisely in SU(2)).
- the 1d $S^1$ circle $\varrho^1$ with $A \in H^1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ on the loop, as the \textit{charge operator}, or the \textit{symmetry generator} of the SO(3).

Then, the measurement of the symmetry is exactly performed by evaluating the linking between the $\varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}$ and $\varrho^1$ in 3d spacetime. Precisely, the linking number $Lk$, manifested as a statistical Berry phase, is evaluated via the expectation value of path integral:

$$\langle \exp(i\pi \int_{\varrho^1=\partial S^2} A) \cdot \exp(i\pi \int_{\varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}} a) \rangle = (-1)^{Lk(\varrho^1, \varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}})} \bigg|_{M^3} \quad \text{(C.10)}$$

Here $a$ is a 1d background-gauged SO(2) connection evaluated around the 1d vortex loop.

3. Overall, combined the above data, we have learned that the 3d dQCP construction can be induced by the linking number $Lk(\varrho^2, \varsigma_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}^0) = 1$ and $Lk(\varrho^1, \varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}^1) = 1$ in the 3d spacetime. To furnish more physical intuitions, we can deduce that:

(i). If we extend the 3d spacetime $t, x, y$ to an extra 4th dimension $z$, the previous 0d hedgehog core $\varsigma_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}^0$ trajectory can be a 1d pseudo-worldline $\varsigma_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}^1$ in the 4d spacetime $M^4$. Similarly, the previous 1d vortex loop $\varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}^1$ trajectory can be a 2d pseudo-worldsheet $\varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}^2$ in the 4d spacetime $M^4$. Such two configurations can be linked in 4d, with a linking number:

$$Lk(\varsigma_{\text{Néel hedgehog}}^1, \varsigma_{\text{VBS vortex}}^2) \bigg|_{M^4}.$$ 

This describes the link in the extended 4d spacetime of two \textit{charged objects}, charged under SO(2) and SO(3) respectively.

(ii). In a parallel story, the \textit{charge operators} (of the above charged objects) are the 1d SO(2)-background gauged $A$ line operator on $\varrho^1$, and 2d SO(3)-background gauged $B$ surface operator on $\varrho^2$. Such two configurations can be linked in 4d, with a linking number:

$$Lk(A \text{ on } \varrho^1, B \text{ on } \varrho^2) \bigg|_{M^4}.$$ 

This describes the link in the extended 4d spacetime of two \textit{charge operators}, of SO(2) and SO(3) respectively.

These above facts together imply that:

(i). The 3d dQCP construction \cite{20} is valid if we introduce a mod 2 class 3d WZW term defined on a 3d boundary $M^3$ of a 4d manifold $M^4$. Based on the homotopy data $\pi_1(S^1) = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\pi_2(S^2) = \mathbb{Z}$, schematically the WZW in a differential form or de Rham cohomology is:

$$\exp(iS^{\text{WZW}}) = \exp(i\pi \int_{M^4} A \wedge dB) \bigg|_{M^3=\partial M^4} \quad \text{(C.11)}$$

More precisely, we can improve this to construct the cohomology class relying on $A \in H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ and $B \in H^2(S^2, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ classes, the WZW term is written in the singular cohomology class of $A$ and $B$:

$$\exp(iS^{\text{WZW}}) = \exp(i\pi \int_{M^4} A \sim \delta B) \bigg|_{M^3=\partial M^4} = \exp(i2\pi \int_{M^4} A \sim \text{Sq}^1B) \bigg|_{M^3=\partial M^4}, \quad \text{(C.12)}$$

\footnote{Here our differential form normalization follows the footnote 14. So we send $A/\pi \mapsto A$ and $B/\pi \mapsto B$. It can again be easily verified that this WZW has two properties: (1) invertible on $\mathbb{Z}(M^4) = 1$ on a closed 4-manifold, (2) this WZW term really is a 3d theory, having physical impacts only on the 3d $M^3$, as a boundary of the extended $M^4$.}
ii. The 3d dQCP construction [20] is supported by a 3d 't Hooft anomaly in the SO(3) × SO(2) global symmetry on a 3-manifold $M^3$, captured by a 4d bulk invertible TQFT [55] living on a 4-manifold $M^4$ with a boundary $\partial M^4 = M^3$:

$$\exp(i\pi \int_{M^4} w_2(V_{SO(3)})w_2(V_{SO(2)})) \cdot \text{Cob}^{\text{5th}}.$$  

(C.13)

This 3d 't Hooft anomaly is a mod 2 class global anomaly, whose 4d invertible TQFT corresponds to a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ generator in the following cobordism group $\Omega^4_d \equiv \text{TP}_d(G)$ (see the detailed computations in [67]):

- a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ generator $w_4(V_{SO(5)})$ in $\text{TP}_4(SO \times SO(5)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$,
- a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ generator $w_2(V_{SO(3)})w_2(V_{SO(2)})$ in $\text{TP}_4(SO \times SO(3) \times SO(2)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$.

(C.14)

With (C.12) and (C.13), these conclude our derivation of 3d WZW and 't Hooft anomaly for 3d dQCP for Néel-VBS transition.

D Perturbative Local and Nonperturbative Global Anomalies via Cobordism: Without or With $T$ or $CP$ symmetry

Here we enlist the results of perturbative local and nonperturbative global anomalies via cobordism mostly obtained from [15,17]. Some of these results are used in (2.5). For some spacetime-internal symmetry group $\tilde{G}$ of the SM or GUT models, we denote:

$$\tilde{G} \equiv G_{\text{spacetime}} \times N_{\text{shared}} G_{\text{internal}} \equiv \frac{(G_{\text{spacetime}} \times G_{\text{internal}})}{N_{\text{shared}}}.$$  

We apply a version of cobordism group $\Omega^d_G \equiv \text{TP}_d(\tilde{G})$ from Freed-Hopkins [19]. Ref. [9,15,17,67] had computed some of these 5th cobordism group $\text{TP}_5$ classifications of the 4d anomalies (via Thom-Madsen-Tillmann spectra [69,70], Adams spectral sequence [71], and Freed-Hopkins’s theorem [19]), to obtain:

$$\begin{align*}
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times G_{\text{SM}_4}) &= Z^5 \times Z_2 \times Z_4^2 \times Z_{16}, \quad q = 1, 3. \\
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times G_{\text{SM}_4}) &= Z \times Z_2 \times Z_{16}.
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times G_{\text{PS}_2}) &= \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times \text{Spin}(4)) = Z \times \mathbb{Z}_2^2. \\
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times G_{\text{PS}_1}) &= \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times \text{Spin}(6)) = Z \times \mathbb{Z}_2^3. \\
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times \text{Spin}(10)) &= \mathbb{Z}_2. \\
\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^5 \times \text{Spin}(10)) &= 0. \quad \text{(D.1)}
\end{align*}$$

For details about their 5d manifold generators and 5d invertible TQFTs, see Ref. [17]. Comments on these perturbative local and nonperturbative global anomalies are in order:

- **Perturbative local anomalies** are classified by integer $Z$ classes, detectable via the infinitesimal or small gauge or diffeomorphism transformations deformable to the identity element. Given the chiral fermion (quarks and leptons) contents in Appendix A, we can check that all the perturbative local anomalies (all $Z$ classes) are cancelled in SMs and GUTs. These perturbative local anomaly cancellations are well-known, verified in any standard text books on SMs and GUTs.

---

30The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ classification of the WZW term also comes from another quantum matter intuitive argument: When two copies of the WZW terms are put together, the system can be trivialized by an interlayer large coupling without breaking symmetry.
• **Nonperturbative global anomalies** are classified by finite torsion $\mathbb{Z}_n$ classes, detectable via the large gauge or diffeomorphism transformations, not deformable to the identity element.

- **The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\mathbb{Z}_4$ anomalies** in $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times X \times G_{\text{SM}_4})$ or $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \text{SU}(5))$ include the variants or mutated versions of the Witten anomaly [59], by modifying the original SU(2) bundle to some principal SU($n$) bundles. Also there is a $\mathbb{Z}_4$ class anomaly from the hypercharge $U(1)_Y^2$ pair with a $X$-background field with $(X)^2 = (-1)^F$. All these $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\mathbb{Z}_4$ anomalies are checked to be cancelled [29–31].

- **The $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ anomaly** in $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \mathbb{Z}_4 \times X \times G_{\text{SM}_4})$ or $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \text{SU}(5))$ can be cancelled if there are 16n Weyl fermions, each is charged under $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times X$ with $(X)^2 = (-1)^F$. Since we only observe 15n Weyl fermions so far by experiments, Ref. [29–31] proposed alternative scenarios to cancel $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ anomaly with 15n Weyl fermions at low energy — we revisit this issue separately in Sec. 4.2

- **Several $\mathbb{Z}_2$ anomalies** in $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F G_{\text{PS}_{4'}})$ or $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10))$ come from either the variants of the Witten SU(2) anomaly [59] (modifying the SU(2) gauge bundle to other bundles) or the variants of the new SU(2) anomaly [10] (modifying the $w_2(TM)w_3(TM) = w_2(V_{SO(3)})w_3(V_{SO(3)})$ of SO(3) bundle to other $SO(n)$ bundles). Follow [9,10], we can check that the chiral fermion sectors (of quarks and leptons) of PS and so(10) GUTs do not suffer from any of these $\mathbb{Z}_2$ global anomalies.

However, the hallmark of our 4d WZW term, and the Fragmentary GUT-Higgs Liquid model in Sec. 3.4, relies on matching them with the $w_2w_3$ anomaly. So below, we walk through the distinct properties of the various kinds of $w_2w_3$ anomalies listed in (D.1), in more details.

1. $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F \text{Spin}(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ is generated by a 5d invertible TQFT, explained in [9,10,15,17],

   $$(-1)^f w_2(TM)w_3(TM) = (-1)^f w_2(V_{SO(10)})w_3(V_{SO(10)}).$$

2. $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F G_{\text{PS}_1})$ includes $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^3$. One $\mathbb{Z}_2$ is closely related to the Witten SU(2) anomaly, see [17]. The other $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$ are generated by 5d invertible TQFTs:

   $$(-1)^f w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) \text{ and } (-1)^f \eta (w_2(V_{SO(4)})).$$

   The $\eta$ is a mod 2 index of 1d Dirac operator as a real massive 1d fermion, as a 1d cobordism invariant of $\text{TP}_1(\text{Spin}) = \mathbb{Z}_2$.

3. $\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^F G_{\text{PS}_2})$ includes $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$, which are generated by 5d invertible TQFTs:

   $$(-1)^f w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) \text{ and } (-1)^f w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}).$$

4. Now we can ask what are the relations between the $w_2w_3$ of SO(10) bundle (for the so(10) GUT), and that of SO(6) and SO(4) bundles (for the PS model)? We find that:

   $$w_2(V_{SO(n+m)})w_3(V_{SO(n+m)}) = w_2(V_{SO(n)})w_3(V_{SO(n)}) + w_2(V_{SO(m)})w_3(V_{SO(m)}) \mod 2,$$

   where the crossing terms become

   $$w_2(V_{SO(n)})w_3(V_{SO(m)}) + w_2(V_{SO(m)})w_3(V_{SO(n)}) = \text{Sq}^1(w_2(V_{SO(n)})w_2(V_{SO(m)})) = w_1(TM)(w_2(V_{SO(n)})w_2(V_{SO(m)})), \quad \text{(D.3)}$$

   based on the Wu formula using the Steenrod square $\text{Sq}^1$. This (D.3) vanishes if we restrict to the system without time-reversal $T$ symmetry (i.e., charge-conjugation-parity $CP$ symmetry) or on orientable
5. With a time-reversal $T$ or $CP$ symmetry, or a generic $T'$ such as $CT$ symmetry:

If we hope to have the crossing term

\[ w_2(V_{SO(10)})w_3(V_{SO(10)}) = w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) \quad \text{mod 2}. \]  

(D.4)

we can put the theory on an unorientable manifold with no $T$ or $CP$ symmetry, we simply relate a mod 2 anomaly of the $so(10)$, to two mod 2 anomalies of PS model:

\[ w_2(V_{SO(10)})w_3(V_{SO(10)}) = w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) \quad \text{mod 2}. \]  

(D.4)

Therefore, the crossing term in (D.5) can still contribute a potential anomaly. This crossing term

\[ w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(6)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) \]  

where $w_2$ is defined for a mod 2 anomaly of PS models, to enter the anomaly constraint in the PS models, we need to have

\[ Sq^1(w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_2(V_{SO(4)})) = w_1(TM)(w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_2(V_{SO(4)})) \neq 0, \]

this means that we need to include the time-reversal $T$ (or $CP$) symmetry, or a generic $T'$ such as $CT$ symmetry.

In the $so(10)$ GUT, there are actually two kinds of time-reversal symmetry square:

\[ T^2 = (-1)^F \text{ for } Pin^+, \quad T^2 = +1 \text{ for } Pin^- . \]  

(D.6)

There are two kinds of commutation relations between time-reversal $T$ and the $Spin(10)$ generators: either commute (direct product “$\times$”) or non-commute (semi-direct product “$\ltimes$”).

So if we include the time-reversal $T$ into the $(Spin \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10))$-structure, there are totally (at least) four kinds of time-reversal symmetries for the $so(10)$ GUT. Based on the computation in Ref. [67], we summarize the four versions of the $so(10)$ GUT with time-reversal symmetries, and their cobordism group $TP_5$:

\[
\begin{align*}
TP_5(Pin^+ \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)) &= \mathbb{Z}_2. \\
TP_5(Pin^- \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)) &= \mathbb{Z}_2. \\
TP_5(Pin^+ \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_3 \times Spin(10)) &= \mathbb{Z}_2. \\
TP_5(Pin^- \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_3 \times Spin(10)) &= \mathbb{Z}_2.
\end{align*}
\]  

(D.7)

Interestingly, for the cases of $TP_5(Pin^+ \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $TP_5(Pin^- \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, their 4d anomalies are generated by a subtilely distinct 5d invertible TQFT

\[ (-1)^Fw_2(TM)w_3(TM) = (-1)^Fw_2(V_{O(10)})w_3(V_{O(10)}). \]  

(D.8)

Notice now we have $w_2(V_{O(10)})w_3(V_{O(10)})$ instead of $w_2(V_{SO(10)})w_3(V_{SO(10)})$. The bundle constraints for $(Pin^+ \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10))$ and $(Pin^- \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10))$ are also different:

- $Pin^+ \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)$ constraint : $w_2(V_{O(10)}) = w_2(TM), \quad w_3(V_{O(10)}) = w_3(TM)$.
- $Pin^- \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \times Spin(10)$ constraint : $w_2(V_{O(10)}) = w_2(TM) + w_1(TM)^2$, $w_3(V_{O(10)}) = w_1(TM)w_2(TM) = w_3(TM) + w_1(TM)w_2(TM)$.

(D.9)

The punchline here in (D.9) is that because time-reversal $T$ (or $CP$) or some $T'$ is a valid global symmetry, we can put the theory on an unorientable manifold with $w_1(TM) \neq 0$ also $w_1(V_{O(10)}) \neq 0$. Therefore, the crossing term in (D.5) can still contribute a potential anomaly. This crossing term anomaly $w_2(V_{SO(6)})w_3(V_{SO(4)}) + w_2(V_{SO(4)})w_3(V_{SO(6)})$ turns out to play a possible crucial role in our construction of Sec. 3.4. See more discussions in a companion work [52].

Similar stories apply to a larger gauge group unification for three generations of fermions, such as the $so(18)$ GUT with a $Spin(18)$ gauge group. We simply replace all above discussions of $so(10)$ to $so(18)$, and replace $Spin(10)$ to $Spin(18)$.
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