

# Cobordism and Deformation Class of the Standard Model

Juven Wang,<sup>1</sup> Zheyuan Wan,<sup>2</sup> and Yi-Zhuang You<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Center of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Harvard University, MA 02138, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Yau Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, CA 92093, USA*

't Hooft anomalies of quantum field theories (QFTs) with an invertible global symmetry  $G$  (including spacetime and internal symmetries) in a  $dd$  spacetime are known to be classified by a  $d + 1$ d cobordism group  $\text{TP}_{d+1}(G)$ , whose group generator is a  $d + 1$ d cobordism invariant written as an invertible topological field theory (iTFT)  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$ . Deformation class of QFT is recently proposed to be specified by its symmetry  $G$  and an iTFT  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$ . Seemly different QFTs of the same deformation class can be deformed to each other via quantum phase transitions. In this work, we ask which cobordism class and deformation class control the 4d Standard Model (SM) of ungauged or gauged  $(\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1))/\mathbb{Z}_q$  group for  $q = 1, 2, 3, 6$  with a continuous or discrete baryon minus lepton  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$  like symmetry. We show that the answer contains some combination of 5d iTFTs: two  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes associated with  $(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L})^3$  and  $(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L})$ -(gravity)<sup>2</sup> 4d perturbative local anomalies, a  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  class Atiyah-Patodi-Singer  $\eta$  invariant and a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  class Stiefel-Whitney  $w_2 w_3$  invariant associated with 4d nonperturbative global anomalies, and additional  $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  global anomalies involving higher symmetries whose charged objects are Wilson electric or 't Hooft magnetic line operators. Out of the multiple infinite  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes of local anomalies and 24576 classes of global anomalies, we pin down a deformation class of SM labeled by  $(N_f, n_{\nu_R}, p', q)$ , the family number, total "right-handed sterile" neutrino number, magnetic monopole datum, and mod  $q$  relation. We show that Grand Unification such as Georgi-Glashow  $su(5)$ , Pati-Salam  $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$ , Barr's flipped  $u(5)$ , and familiar or modified  $so(n)$  models of Spin( $n$ ) gauge group, e.g., with  $n = 10, 18$  can all reside in an appropriate SM deformation class. We show that Ultra Unification, which replaces some of sterile neutrinos with new exotic gapped/gapless sectors (e.g., topological or conformal field theory) or gravitational sectors with topological origins via cobordism constraints, also resides in an SM deformation class. Neighbor quantum phases near SM or their phase transitions, and neighbor gapless quantum critical regions naturally exhibit beyond SM phenomena.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Quantum field theories (QFTs) can have symmetries, in the strict sense that the QFT is invariant under certain sets of transformations (i.e., symmetry transformations). The symmetry invariance of QFT may exhibit in versatile ways depending on how the QFT is formulated: (1) the path integral  $\mathbf{Z}_d$  (say in  $dd$  for  $d$ -dimensional spacetime) implies the symmetry transformation on quantum fields or spacetime coordinates leaves the  $\mathbf{Z}_d$  invariant, (2) the Hamiltonian approach implies that the symmetry transformation as an operator  $\hat{U}$  commutes with the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$ , i.e.,  $[\hat{H}, \hat{U}] = 0$ , (3) the axiomatic QFT approach relies on the functional analysis and operator algebra, such that the symmetry transformation acts on the correlation function of operators. Importantly, the symmetry invariant may be up to a global complex phase; for example, the symmetry transformation can map the path integral  $\mathbf{Z}_d \mapsto e^{i\Theta} \mathbf{Z}_d$ . If  $e^{i\Theta}$  cannot be eliminated by  $dd$  local counter terms, this  $e^{i\Theta}$  manifests a mild violation of symmetry invariance. Such kind of symmetry is still a symmetry of QFT, except that it is an *anomalous symmetry* (i.e., symmetry with 't Hooft anomaly [1]). In contrast, the symmetry that does not render any meaningful  $e^{i\Theta}$  is the *anomaly-free symmetry*. The  $e^{i\Theta}$  is invertible (i.e.,  $e^{i\Theta} \cdot e^{-i\Theta} = 1$ ), which via the *anomaly inflow* [2, 3] implies that it not only characterizes a  $dd$  invertible 't Hooft anomaly of a symmetry  $G$ , but also characterizes a one-higher dimensional *invertible topological field theory* (iTFT) with a partition function  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  of the symmetry  $G$ . The  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  turns out to be a *cobordism invariant* in  $d + 1$ d (see references therein [3–8]). Cobordism invariants as iTFTs  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  can be stacked together that defines group binary operations, with an identity element 1 and an inverse  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}^{-1}$ ; they also obey closure, associativity, and commutativity, thus they form an abelian group, known as a specific version of cobordism group  $\text{TP}_{d+1}(G)$  for smooth manifold  $M$  with  $G$ -structure [7].

**Deformation class of QFTs:** Symmetry helps to organize the quantum fields (including energy or momentum eigenstates) into the representations of the symmetry group, which also provides powerful selection rules constraining quantum dynamics. Anomaly is invariant under continuous deformations of parameters of QFTs, including a deformation of energy scales along the renormalization group flow [1] (see references therein [9, 10]). Given the importance of symmetry and its associated 't Hooft anomaly of QFT, Seiberg [11] and others conjectured that within the same symmetry  $G$  and same anomaly  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$ , seemly different  $dd$  QFTs can indeed be deformed to each other via adding degrees of freedom at short distances that preserve the same symmetry and that maintain the same overall anomaly. Namely, the whole system allows all symmetric interactions between the original QFT and any new symmetric QFTs

brought down from high energy. This organization principle that connects a large class of QFTs together within the same data  $(G, \mathbf{Z}_{d+1})$  via any symmetric deformation (possibly with discontinuous or continuous quantum phase transitions [12] between different phases) is called the *deformation class of QFTs* in  $dd$  [11], which is indeed controlled by the *cobordism or deformation class of iTFTs* in  $d + 1d$  [7].

However, it is widely believed that there is no global symmetry in quantum gravity (QG) (see references therein [13]). Skeptical readers may hold prejudice against this deformation class labeled by  $(G, \mathbf{Z}_{d+1})$ , possibly not universal nor useful in QG. Several reasons below suggest the importance of  $(G, \mathbf{Z}_{d+1})$  even in QG. First, there could still be various QFTs with global symmetries localized on a brane or obtained via compactification from QG. Second, McNamara-Vafa [14] suggests that if there is a nontrivial cobordism class  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  in  $d + 1d$  within a quantum gravity in a total spacetime  $Dd$ , it either suggests the theory belongs to the Swampland in QG, or suggests the  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  must be appropriately *trivialized* to zero in the full suitably interpreted QG's cobordism group, e.g., the trivialization of cobordism class via introducing new defects to cancel each other's cobordism class [14]. This original  $\mathbf{Z}_{d+1}$  theory can be connected to a finite-energy  $dd$  domain wall to another  $d + 1$  theory on the other side. This cobordism class also gives constraints on the compactification: compactifying  $(D - d - 1)d$  and  $(D - d)d$  spacetimes from the  $Dd$  QG to obtain the  $d + 1d$  theory and the  $dd$  domain wall. So we may say that Ref. [14] justifies the use of **deformation class of quantum gravity**. Third, although there is no global symmetry in QG, there can be either explicitly broken global symmetry or dynamically gauged symmetry (i.e., global symmetry is dynamically gauged as gauge symmetry, which we shall call Weyl's *gauge principle* [15]) in QG. Therefore, for all the reasons above, it is promising to explore the idea of cobordism and deformation class further, in the context of both QFT [11] and QG [14].

In this work, we shall focus on a specific question: **What are the cobordism class and deformation class of the 4d Standard Model** (SM) [16–19]? Before attempting to solve this, we shall sharpen the question further. We need to first specify the spacetime-internal symmetries of SM, typically written as

$$G \equiv \left( \frac{G_{\text{spacetime}} \times G_{\text{internal}}}{N_{\text{shared}}} \right) \equiv G_{\text{spacetime}} \times_{N_{\text{shared}}} G_{\text{internal}}. \quad (1)$$

The  $N_{\text{shared}}$  is the shared common normal subgroup symmetry between  $G_{\text{spacetime}}$  and  $G_{\text{internal}}$ , e.g.  $N_{\text{shared}}$  can be the fermion parity symmetry  $\mathbb{Z}_2^F$  that acts on fermion  $\psi \mapsto -\psi$ . The SM has an internal symmetry of local Lie algebra  $su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)$ , but the global structure of Lie group  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  has four versions (references therein [20, 21]):

$$G_{\text{SM}_q} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)_{\tilde{Y}}}{\mathbb{Z}_q}, \quad \text{with } q = 1, 2, 3, 6. \quad (2)$$

We also include the baryon minus lepton  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$  vector symmetry respected by the SM gauge structure and Yukawa-Higgs terms. We consider both a continuous  $\text{U}(1)_{\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{L}}$  or  $\text{U}(1)_X$ , or a discrete order-4 finite abelian  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  group of Wilczek-Zee's  $X \equiv 5(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}) - \frac{2}{3}\tilde{Y}$  chiral symmetry [22] with the electroweak hypercharge  $\tilde{Y}$ . We decide not to include extra discrete charge conjugation, parity, or time-reversal (C, P, or T) symmetries as they are already individually broken at the SM energy scale. The SM is a Lorentz invariant QFT that obeys the spacetime rotation and boost thus has the spacetime symmetry  $G_{\text{spacetime}} = \text{Spin}$  group which is a double cover of the bosonic special orthogonal SO group graded by the fermion parity symmetry  $\mathbb{Z}_2^F$ . (The Spin is Spin(3,1) in Lorentz signature and Spin(4) in Euclidean signature for the 4d SM.) Gather the above data, we learn that two physically pertinent versions of spacetime-internal symmetries of SM are:

$$G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\text{U}(1)} \equiv \text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{U}(1) \times G_{\text{SM}_q} \text{ and } G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}} \equiv \text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times G_{\text{SM}_q}. \quad (3)$$

Both versions of the symmetry (3) is compatible with the representation (rep) of the 3 families of 15 Weyl fermions of quarks and leptons (here written all as left-handed 2-component Weyl spinor of spacetime Spin group) confirmed by experiments, possibly with or without the 16th Weyl fermion (the right-handed neutrino sterile to SM gauge force):

$$(\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_2 \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-3} \oplus (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2})_1 \oplus (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1})_{-4} \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_6 \oplus n_{\nu_{j,R}} (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_0 \text{ for each family of } su(3) \times su(2) \times u(1)_{\tilde{Y}}. \quad (4)$$

We use  $n_{\nu_{e,R}}, n_{\nu_{\mu,R}}, n_{\nu_{\tau,R}} \in \{0, 1\}$  to label either the absence or presence of the 16th Weyl fermion for each of the three families of electron  $e$ , muon  $\mu$ , or tauon  $\tau$  types. In general, we can consider  $N_f$  family (typically  $N_f = 3$ ) and a total sterile neutrino number  $n_{\nu_R} \equiv \sum_j n_{\nu_{j,R}}$  that can be equal, smaller, or larger than 3.

In Sec. II, we consider the 4d SM with internal symmetry  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  ungauged as a global symmetry group. Both versions of spacetime-internal symmetries (3) are treated as global symmetries, so we study the global symmetries and their 't Hooft anomalies of the **ungauged Standard Model** at  $d = 4$ . However, based on the gauge principle, after gauging  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$ , the classification of 't Hooft anomalies of global symmetries directly descend to the classification of *dynamical gauge anomalies of gauge symmetries*. So we can use the cobordism group  $\text{TP}_5(G)$  of the spacetime-internal global symmetry  $G$  in (3) to also re-interpret the obtained 't Hooft anomaly data (when  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  is a global

symmetry) in terms of *dynamical gauge anomaly cancellation* constraints (when  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  is dynamically gauged). Thus, this  $\text{TP}_5(G)$  can be used to check the *anomaly cancellation consistency of the dynamically gauged theory*.

In Sec. III, the internal symmetry  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  is thereafter dynamically gauged and treated as a gauge group as the **gauged Standard Model** with dynamical Yang-Mills gauge fields as in our nature. We will see that the spacetime-internal symmetry eq. (3) has to be modified to a new  $G'$  by removing the gauge group  $[G_{\text{SM}_q}]$  out of the global symmetry, and including extra generalized *higher symmetry* [23] (which is also an internal global symmetry but whose charged objects are extended 1d Wilson-'t Hooft line operators). This  $\text{TP}_5(G')$  instead will be used to constrain the *quantum dynamics of chiral gauge theory*.

## II. STANDARD MODEL WITH INTERNAL SYMMETRY UNGAUGED AND 'T HOOFT ANOMALIES

We aim to determine the deformation class  $(G, \mathbf{Z}_5)$  of ungauged 4d SM with spacetime-internal symmetries  $G$  given in (3). Ref. [8, 24–29] consider highly relevant systematic anomaly classifications include several SM-like or Grand Unification (GUT)-like groups. To determine the 4d 't Hooft anomaly and hence the iTFT  $\mathbf{Z}_5$ , we gather the cobordism group data from [8, 28–32] to obtain

$$\text{TP}_5(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\text{U}(1)}) = \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{U}(1) \times G_{\text{SM}_q}) = \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin}^c \times G_{\text{SM}_q}) = \mathbb{Z}^{11}. \quad (5)$$

$$\text{TP}_5(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}}) = \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times G_{\text{SM}_q}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}^5 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{16}, & q = 1, 3. \\ \mathbb{Z}^5 \times \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_{16}, & q = 2, 6. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

To better digest these 5d cobordism groups, and their implications on 4d anomalies, several remarks are in order:

- To detect all possible invertible  $\mathbf{Z}_5 = e^{i\Theta}$  hence to detect all 't Hooft anomalies of  $G$  symmetry, we should turn on all possible *background fields* (which are also called *classical non-dynamical* fields, or *symmetry twists* [6], that are *not* summed over in the path integral) that can couple to the charged object of any symmetry of QFT, then we can perform all symmetry transformations of QFT by changing the values of background fields.
  - The symmetry  $G$  consists of *internal symmetry* and *spacetime symmetry*. Internal symmetry transformations act on charged objects of a representation (rep) of group  $G_{\text{internal}}$  by coupling the 0d charged particle to a 1d background gauge field  $A$ . Spacetime symmetry transformations act on the spacetime coordinates or metrics are known as spacetime diffeomorphisms. The anomalies detected via turning on (i) internal symmetry's background gauge field, (ii) spacetime symmetry's background field via diffeomorphism or via placing the theory on a generic  $G$ -structure manifold, or (iii) both internal-spacetime background fields, are commonly known respectively as (i) *gauge anomaly*, (ii) *gravitational anomaly*, or (iii) *mixed gauge-gravity* or *gauge-diffeomorphism anomaly*. These adjectives, *gauge* or *gravity*, characterize the nature of background fields of those anomalies.
  - Cobordism group  $\text{TP}_{d+1}(G)$  not only contains all finite subgroup  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  (the torsion part) of the standard bordism group  $\Omega_{d+1}^G$ , but also contains the integer  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes descended from those  $\mathbb{Z}$  (the free part) of the bordism group  $\Omega_{d+2}^G$ .
  - *dd perturbative local anomalies* [33–35]: detectable via infinitesimal gauge/diffeomorphism transformations continuously deformable from the identity, captured by Feynman diagram calculations. Their classification can be read from the integer  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes of  $\text{TP}_{d+1}(G)$ .
  - *dd nonperturbative global anomalies* [36–38]: detectable via large gauge/diffeomorphism transformations that *cannot* be continuously deformed from the identity. Their classification is the finite subgroup  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  classes of  $\text{TP}_{d+1}(G)$ .
- These adjectives, *perturbative* or *not*, characterize the *local* or *global* nature of those anomalies.

Now we can obtain the deformation class  $\mathbf{Z}_5$  by checking which 't Hooft anomaly persists in the ungauged SM:

1. For SM with a  $\text{U}(1)_{\text{B-L}}$  vector symmetry, eq. (5) shows  $\mathbb{Z}^{11}$  classes of local anomalies captured by triangle Feynman diagrams. Given the SM chiral fermion content (4), all of local anomalies cancel to zero [39] except two  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes [30]: the cubic pure gauge  $\text{U}(1)_{\text{B-L}}^3$  and mixed gauge-gravity  $\text{U}(1)_{\text{B-L}}(\text{gravity})^2$  anomalies. Their 5d iTFT evaluated on a 5d manifold  $M^5$  is

$$\mathbf{Z}_5^{\text{U}(1)} \equiv \exp(i(-N_f + n_{\nu_R}) \int_{M^5} (Ac_1^2 + \frac{1}{48} \text{CS}_3^T(\text{PD}(c_1)))) \quad (7)$$

depending on the family number  $N_f$  and total sterile neutrino number  $n_{\nu_R}$ . Typically for  $N_f = 3$ , we have

$$-N_f + n_{\nu_R} \equiv -N_f + \sum_j n_{\nu_{j,R}} = -3 + n_{\nu_{e,R}} + n_{\nu_{\mu,R}} + n_{\nu_{\tau,R}} + \dots$$

The  $A$  is the  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{U}(1)_{\text{B-L}} \equiv \text{Spin}^c$  gauge field, while  $2A$  is the ordinary abelian gauge field, whose first Chern class  $c_1 = \frac{d(2A)}{2\pi} = w_2(TM) \bmod 2$  is constrained under a spin-charge relation [40] with the second Stiefel-Whitney

class  $w_2(TM)$  of spacetime tangent bundle  $TM$  of the base manifold  $M$ . The gravitational Chern-Simons 3-form is  $CS_3^{TM^3} \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^3=\partial M^4} \text{Tr}(\omega d\omega + \frac{2}{3}\omega^3) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^4} \text{Tr}(R(\omega) \wedge R(\omega))$  where  $M^3$  is evaluated as a boundary  $\partial M^4$ , while  $\omega$  is the 1-connection of tangent bundle  $TM$  and  $R(\omega)$  is the Riemann curvature 2-form of  $\omega$ . Here we take  $M^3 = \text{PD}(c_1)$  to be a 3-manifold Poincaré dual (PD) to the  $c_1$  evaluated on the 5d  $M^5$ . On a closed oriented  $M^4$ , we further have  $\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{M^4} \text{Tr}(R(\omega) \wedge R(\omega)) = 2\pi \int_{M^4} p_1(TM) = 2\pi \cdot 3\sigma$ , where  $p_1$  is the first Pontryagin class of  $TM$  and the  $\sigma$  is the  $M^4$ 's signature. Overall, the 5d term (7) descends from a 6d anomaly polynomial on  $M^6$  at the  $U(1)$ -valued  $\theta = 2\pi$ :

$$\exp(i\theta(-N_f + n_{\nu_R}) \int_{M^6} (\frac{1}{2}c_1^3 + \frac{1}{16}\sigma(\text{PD}(c_1))).$$

Since  $U(1)_Y$  is fully anomaly-free, our above result is applicable to SM with a  $U(1)_{X \equiv 5(\mathbf{B-L}) - \frac{2}{3}\tilde{Y}}$  chiral symmetry [22]; we still obtain the same deformation class (7) as  $\mathbf{Z}_5^{U(1)}$  via adjusting  $U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$  to  $U(1)_X$ .

- For SM with a  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  chiral symmetry, given the fermion content (4), all  $\mathbb{Z}^5$  classes of local anomalies in (6) cancel to zero. All extra  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  classes of global anomalies in (6) also cancel, but the  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  mixed gauge-gravity global anomaly can be nonzero [30, 32], whose corresponding 5d iTFT is

$$\mathbf{Z}_5^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}} \equiv \exp(i(-N_f + n_{\nu_R}) \int_{M^5} \frac{2\pi i}{16} \eta_{4d}(\text{PD}(A_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}}))). \quad (8)$$

Background gauge field  $A_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}}$  is the generator of the cohomology group  $H^1(\text{B}\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$  with  $\mathbb{Z}_{2,X} \equiv \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}/\mathbb{Z}_2^F$  of  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$ -structure manifold  $M$ . The classifying space  $\text{B}^n \mathbf{A} \equiv K(\mathbf{A}, n)$  is the Eilenberg-MacLane space for an abelian group  $\mathbf{A}$ . Hereafter we use the standard convention, all cohomology classes are pulled back to the manifold  $M$  along the maps given in the definition of cobordism groups, thus  $H^1(\text{B}\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$  can be pulled back to  $H^1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ . Here a 5d  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  class Atiyah-Patodi-Singer (APS [41]) eta invariant  $\eta_{5d} = \eta_{4d}(\text{PD}(A_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}}))$  is written as the 4d eta invariant  $\eta_{4d} \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$  on the Poincaré dual (PD) submanifold of  $A_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}}$  (i.e., 4d  $\text{Pin}^+$ -manifold), based on a Smith homomorphism for the bordism group  $\Omega_5^{\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \mathbb{Z}_4} = \Omega_4^{\text{Pin}^+} = \mathbb{Z}_{16}$  [42–45].

- Thanks to the Lie group embedding  $(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times G_{\text{SM}_6}) \subset \text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{Spin}(10) \equiv G^{\text{Spin}(10)}$  [28], we can embed the 16-Weyl-fermion  $\text{SM}_6$  (i.e.,  $n_{\nu_{e,R}}, n_{\nu_{\mu,R}}, n_{\nu_{\tau,R}} = 1$ ) with rep  $\mathbf{16}$  into a  $\text{Spin}(10)$  chiral gauge theory as the case for  $so(10)$  GUT. We can again ask the deformation class  $(G^{\text{Spin}(10)}, \mathbf{Z}_5^{\text{Spin}(10)})$  of ungauged 4d model. Its cobordism group [8, 26, 28] says the only 5d iTFT shows a  $p \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  class 4d mixed gauge-gravity global anomaly (for  $n \geq 7$ ):

$$\text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{Spin}(n \geq 7)) = \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{Z}_5^{\text{Spin}(n)} \equiv \exp(i\pi p \int_{M^5} w_2 w_3) = \exp(i\pi p \int_{M^5} w_2(TM) w_3(TM)) = \exp(i\pi p \int_{M^5} w_2(V_{\text{SO}(n)}) w_3(V_{\text{SO}(n)})). \quad (10)$$

Here  $w_j(TM)$  or  $w_j(V_{\text{SO}(n)})$  is the  $j$ th Stiefel-Whitney class of the spacetime tangent bundle  $TM$ , or the associated vector bundle of the principal gauge bundle of  $\text{SO}(n) = \text{Spin}(n)/\mathbb{Z}_2^F$ . The conventional  $so(10)$  GUT [46] has no 4d anomaly thus resides in a  $p = 0$  trivial deformation class  $\mathbf{Z}_5^{\text{Spin}(10)} = 1$  [26, 38, 47]. Ref. [48, 49] construct a modified  $so(10)$  GUT with an extra discrete torsion class of 4d-5d Wess-Zumino-Witten term, out of the GUT-Higgs field; the modified  $so(10)$  GUT has a  $w_2 w_3$  anomaly, thus it resides in a  $p = 1$  deformation class. Since  $\text{Spin}(18) \supset \text{Spin}(10)$  contains the same  $w_2 w_3$  deformation class, one can work out a similar story for a  $\text{Spin}(18)$  chiral gauge theory or  $so(18)$  GUT [50]. In fact, within either  $p \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  deformation class, Ref. [48, 49] show that the SM can quantum-phase transition to the GUT-like models of  $su(5)$  [51],  $su(4) \times su(2) \times su(2)$  [52], or flipped  $u(5)$  [53] models. Especially for  $p = 1$  deformation class, Ref. [48, 49] suggests the *gapless deconfined quantum critical region* (analogous to [54]) with beyond-SM phenomena near the SM vacuum by tuning the GUT-Higgs potential.

In summary, the deformation class  $(G, \mathbf{Z}_5)$  of ungauged SM with  $U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$  or  $U(1)_X$  is  $(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{U(1)}, \mathbf{Z}_5^{U(1)})$ , and that of ungauged SM with  $\mathbf{Z}_5^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}}$  is  $(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}}, \mathbf{Z}_5^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}})$ , for any  $q = 1, 2, 3, 6$ . For the ungauged SM embeddable into a conventional or modified  $so(n)$  GUT, we obtain an extra deformation class data  $(G^{\text{Spin}(n)}, \mathbf{Z}_5^{\text{Spin}(n)})$ .

### III. STANDARD MODEL WITH INTERNAL SYMMETRY GAUGED AND WITH HIGHER SYMMETRIES

Next we aim to determine the deformation class of  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$ -dynamically gauged SM. Before solving that problem, we should emphasize that the deformation class of ungauged SM (Sec. II) still plays essential roles on the gauged SM:

- Those local and global 't Hooft anomalies that are canceled to zero for the ungauged SM (thus not presented in the deformation class  $\mathbf{Z}_5$ ), indeed one-to-one correspond to the crucial consistency checks on the *dynamical gauge-diffeomorphism anomaly cancellation* for the gauged SM.
- If the gauged SM has only  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  gauged, while keeping the global symmetry  $U(1)_{\mathbf{B-L}}$ ,  $U(1)_X$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  ungauged, then this SM deformation class still includes eq. (7), (8), and (10).
- If the gauged SM has not only  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  but also  $\mathbf{B-L}$  or  $X$  dynamically gauged, then the cobordism invariant 5d iTFT also has to be dynamically gauged to new *noninvertible* theories, either the noninvertible gapped TFT or gapless theories. In this scenario, we could no longer study the 4d SM on its own, but the 4d SM and 5d theories are strongly correlated and coupled with each other through  $\mathbf{B-L}$  or  $X$  gauge forces mediating long-range entanglements.
- In a gauge theory, the internal symmetry also includes *higher  $n$ -symmetries* as generalized global symmetries [23] that act on  $nd$  charged objects (1d lines, 2d surfaces, etc.) of a rep of higher classifying space of group  $G_{[n]}$  (denoted  $B^n G_{[n]}$ ) by coupling this  $nd$  object to a  $n+1$ d background gauge field. Once  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  is gauged, *kinematically*, we may obtain extra 1-form electric and magnetic symmetries,  $G_{[1]}^e$  and  $G_{[1]}^m$ , which are determined from the center of gauge group  $Z(G_{\text{SM}_q})$ , and the Pontryagin dual of the homotopy group  $\pi_1(G_{\text{SM}_q})^\vee$ ; moreover the 0d SM gauge charge fermionic particle (4) partially breaks the  $G_{[1]}^e$  from  $Z(G_{\text{SM}_q})$  to its diagonal subgroup [49, 55–57]:

	$Z(G_{\text{SM}_q})$	$\pi_1(G_{\text{SM}_q})^\vee$	1-form $e$ sym $G_{[1]}^e$	1-form $m$ sym $G_{[1]}^m$
$G_{\text{SM}_q} \equiv \frac{\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)_{\tilde{Y}}}{\mathbb{Z}_q}$	$\mathbb{Z}_{6/q} \times \text{U}(1)$	$\text{U}(1)$	$\mathbb{Z}_{6/q, [1]}^e$	$\text{U}(1)_{[1]}^m$

(11)

Thus, we have to modify (3), by removing  $G_{\text{SM}_q}$  and including  $G_{[1]}^e \times G_{[1]}^m$ , to

$$G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\text{U}(1)} \equiv \text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{U}(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_{6/q, [1]}^e \times \text{U}(1)_{[1]}^m \text{ and } G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}} \equiv \text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \mathbb{Z}_{6/q, [1]}^e \times \text{U}(1)_{[1]}^m. \quad (12)$$

Denote  $q' \equiv 6/q$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 6$  maps to  $q' = 6, 3, 2, 1$ . Define  $q' \equiv 2^{n_2} \cdot 3^{n_3}$  where  $q' = 1, 2, 3, 6$  corresponds to  $(n_2, n_3) = (0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)$ . Below we examine what are additional new terms in the deformation class of SM due to 't Hooft anomalies of higher symmetries of 1d line operators. We obtain all possible 4d invertible anomalies classified via the 5d cobordism groups  $\text{TP}_5$  of (12) and their 5d iTFTs [29]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}_5(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\text{U}(1)}) &= \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \text{U}(1) \times \text{B}\mathbb{Z}_{q'} \times \text{BU}(1)) = \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin}^c \times \text{B}\mathbb{Z}_{q'} \times \text{BU}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{q'}, \\ &\text{generated by } Ac_1^2, \quad \frac{1}{48} \text{CS}_3^{T(\text{PD}(c_1))}, \quad \text{and } B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e}^e (dB_{\text{U}(1), [1]}^m \text{ mod } q'). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}_5(G_{\text{SM}_q}^{\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}}) &= \text{TP}_5(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \text{B}\mathbb{Z}_{q'} \times \text{BU}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_{16} \times (\mathbb{Z}_4)^{n_2} \times \mathbb{Z}_{q'}, \\ &\text{generated by } \eta_{4\text{d}}(\text{PD}(A_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,X}})), \quad \eta'_{1\text{d}}(\text{PD}(\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e))), \quad \text{and } B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e}^e (dB_{\text{U}(1), [1]}^m \text{ mod } q'). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Below we determine the deformation class of gauged SM by enumerating which 5d iTFT, given by (13) and (14) persist to represent 4d 't Hooft anomalies of the gauged SM:

1. The  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  classes give the same 5d iTFTs already appeared in Sec. II. So the deformation class of ungauged SM in eq. (7) and (8) still remains in that of gauged SM.
2.  $B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e}^e$  and  $B_{\text{U}(1), [1]}^m$  are the background fields of 1-form electric and magnetic symmetries respectively, namely  $\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e$  and  $\text{U}(1)_{[1]}^m$  in (11). Again, all cohomology classes are pulled back to the manifold  $M$ . Since the maps  $M \rightarrow \text{B}^2 \mathbb{Z}_{q'}$  and  $M \rightarrow \text{B}^2 \text{U}(1)$  are given in the definition of cobordism group, so the cohomology classes  $B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e}^e \in \text{H}^2(\text{B}^2 \mathbb{Z}_{q'}, \mathbb{Z}_{q'})$  and  $B_{\text{U}(1), [1]}^m \in \text{H}^2(\text{B}^2 \text{U}(1), \text{U}(1))$  are pulled back to  $\text{H}^2(M, \mathbb{Z}_{q'})$  and  $\text{H}^2(M, \text{U}(1))$  respectively.
3.  $\eta'_{1\text{d}}(\text{PD}(\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e)))$ :  $\eta'_{1\text{d}}$  is a generator of the cobordism group  $\text{TP}_1(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_4^X) = \mathbb{Z}_4$ . The Pontryagin square  $\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e) \equiv B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e \smile B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e + B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e \smile_1 \delta B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e$  is a cohomology class in  $\text{H}^4(M, \mathbb{Z}_4)$ , while  $B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e$  is a cohomology class in  $\text{H}^2(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ , the  $\smile_j$  is the  $j$ -th cup product between cochains (that we make the 0-th cup product  $\smile$  implicit intentionally throughout the article), and  $\delta$  is a coboundary operator. Since  $M$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -orientable hence  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ -orientable, the Poincaré dual  $\text{PD}(\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e))$  is represented by a 1d  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \mathbb{Z}_4$ -submanifold of  $M$ , thus  $\eta'_{1\text{d}}(\text{PD}(\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e)))$  is well-defined. Whether the gauged SM has this mixed anomaly between the chiral  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  and the  $\mathbb{Z}_{q', [1]}^e$  symmetries at  $q' = 2, 6$  (thus  $q = 3, 1$ ) can be computed via the techniques in [58–61].

Ref. [60] finds that two adjoint Weyl fermions of  $\text{SU}(2)$  gauge theory with  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_8 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e$  symmetry has an anomaly index  $1 \in \mathbb{Z}_4$  class of  $A' \mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2, [1]}^e}^e)$  due to fractional  $\text{SO}(3)$  instantons, where  $A' \in \text{H}^1(\text{B}(\frac{\mathbb{Z}_8}{\mathbb{Z}_2}), \mathbb{Z}_4)$  is pulled

back to  $H^1(M, \mathbb{Z}_4)$ . In comparison, we consider that each family of SM has four fundamental Weyl fermions as  $SU(2)$  doublet  $\mathbf{2}$  gauged under  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge theory for each family of  $G_{SM_q}$  at  $q = 1, 3$  with  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2,[1]}^e$  symmetry. But this theory does not carry an anomaly index in the  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  class of  $\eta'_{1d}(\text{PD}(\mathcal{P}(B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,[1]}^e}^e)))$ , because the  $U(1)_X$  symmetry is *not* broken down to  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  due to  $SU(2)$  instantons. So there is *no* further mixed anomaly between the  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X} - \mathbb{Z}_{q',[1]}^e$  symmetry due to fractional  $U(2)$  instantons.

4.  $B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q',[1]}^e}^e(dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \text{ mod } q')$ : To define this 5d  $BdB'$ -like term mathematically precisely, we first define a generator  $\tilde{\tau}_3 \equiv dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \in H^3(B^2U(1), \mathbb{Z})$  represented by the identity map  $B^2U(1) = B^3\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow B^3\mathbb{Z} = B^2U(1)$ . The  $\tilde{\tau}_3$  is pulled back to  $H^3(M, \mathbb{Z})$  along the map  $M \rightarrow B^2U(1)$  given in the definition of the cobordism group. Here we regard  $B_{U(1),[1]}^m$  as the generator of  $H^2(B^2U(1), U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}$ . Also, we regard  $d$  as the boundary map in the long exact sequence  $\dots \rightarrow H^2(-, U(1)) \xrightarrow{d} H^3(-, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \dots$  induced from the short exact sequence  $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U(1) \rightarrow 1$ . Note that  $d$  is not the coboundary map  $\delta$  which sends a cochain to a coboundary. The factorization  $\mathbb{Z}_{q'} = (\mathbb{Z}_3)^{n_3} \times (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{n_2}$  implies  $B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q',[1]}^e}^e(dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \text{ mod } q') = -2n_3 B_{\mathbb{Z}_{3,[1]}^e}^e(dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \text{ mod } 3) + 3n_2 B_{\mathbb{Z}_{2,[1]}^e}^e(dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \text{ mod } 2)$ . We check that, for  $G_{SM_q}$  with Weyl fermion content in (4), there is indeed a 4d mixed higher anomaly of 1-form symmetries between  $\mathbb{Z}_{6/q,[1]}^e$  and  $U(1)_{[1]}^m$ . For any family, the gauged SM contains the anomaly index  $p' = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{q'}$  of the 5d iTFT. However, if the  $U(1)_{\tilde{Y}}$  magnetic monopole exists, kinematically it can break  $U(1)_{[1]}^m$  down to a discrete subgroup or to none (thus  $p' = 0$ ) at the higher-energy monopole scale; nonetheless  $U(1)_{[1]}^m$  can still re-emerge at the lower-energy SM scale. In short, the value  $p' \in \mathbb{Z}_{q'}$  depends on both the  $U(1)_{\tilde{Y}}$  magnetic monopole and the energy scale.
5. For a discrete  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$  vector or  $X$  chiral symmetry, we so far focus on  $(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X} \times \dots)$  for the SM. But we could have other alternatives, e.g.,  $(\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{2m} \times \dots)$  for  $m = 2, 3, 4, \dots$  for a larger discrete  $\mathbb{Z}_{2m,X}$  symmetry [43, 44]. We could also include the discrete  $\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{L}$  vector symmetry: the  $U(1)_{\mathbf{B}+\mathbf{L}}$  is explicitly broken down, to  $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_f, \mathbf{B}+\mathbf{L}}$  by the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly [33, 34] due to  $SU(2)$  instantons [62], or to  $\mathbb{Z}_{2N_f \#, \mathbf{B}+\mathbf{L}}$  with an extra  $q$ -dependent factor denoted as  $\#$  due to fractional instantons [56]. But we have excluded  $\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{L}$  in our work because it is not a good symmetry for the  $su(5)$  or other GUTs. We leave other scenarios for future directions.
6. In summary, out of the multiple  $\mathbb{Z}$  classes of local anomalies and  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  classes of global anomalies (counted as a total finite group order  $2 \cdot 4^2 \cdot 16 \cdot 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 6 = 2^{13} \cdot 3 = 24576$  from (5), (6), (9), (13), and (14)), we determine the deformation class of ungauged or gauged SM, labeled by the family number  $N_f$ , total sterile neutrino number  $n_{\nu_R}$ , and magnetic monopole datum  $p'$ , the mod  $q \equiv 6/q'$  of  $G_{SM_q}$ , can be written as a 5d iTFT:

$$\mathbb{Z}_5 \equiv \exp(i(-N_f + n_{\nu_R})(\dots)) + \frac{2\pi i p'}{q'} \int_{M^5} B_{\mathbb{Z}_{q',[1]}^e}^e(dB_{U(1),[1]}^m \text{ mod } q'). \quad (15)$$

Here the  $(\dots)$  are the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  or  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  class iTFT already detected in eq. (7) and (8). For the ungauged SM, if we embed the SM into the modified  $so(10)$  GUT [48, 49], we could add eq. (10) into (15). But again, once the  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$ ,  $X$ , or  $\text{Spin}(10)$  are dynamically gauged, the 4d SM and the 5d becoming *noninvertible* theories are correlated via mediating  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}$ ,  $X$ , or  $\text{Spin}(10)$  gauge forces.

The last term of (15) with  $p'/q'$  dependence imposes a dynamical constraint on the 4d quantum gauge theory of the gauged SM: the high energy theory or low energy fate of this gauged SM must match the same 't Hooft anomaly. For example, the  $B^e dB^m$  term suggests that either  $\mathbb{Z}_{q',[1]}^e$  or  $U(1)_{[1]}^m$  or both are spontaneously broken [23], or there is no symmetric gapped trivial vacuum. The  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  class 4d anomaly of (8) and (15) imposes another dynamical constraint in 4d: there is no symmetric gapped phase for the odd class in  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ , but there exists symmetric gapped phases (namely gapped without  $\mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  chiral symmetry breaking) with low energy TQFTs for the even class in  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  [43, 63–65].

7. Ultra Unification (UU) [30–32] replaces some of “right-handed sterile neutrinos” (sterile only to  $G_{SM_q}$  gauge force, but not sterile to  $X$  or certain GUT forces) by new exotic gapped/gapless sectors (e.g., topological or conformal field theory) or by gravitational sectors with topological origins, via nonperturbative global anomaly cancellation and cobordism constraints. Namely  $(-N_f + n_{\nu_R} + \dots) = 0$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  for  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{4,X}$  symmetry, where  $\dots$  is the anomaly index of the new gapped/gapless sectors from 4d or 5d. It can be generalized to  $\text{Spin} \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^F} \mathbb{Z}_{2^m,X}$  symmetry with the  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{m+2}}$  global anomaly constraint for  $m \geq 2$  [43, 44]. If we remove the new gapped/gapless sectors out of UU, the UU also resides in an SM deformation class. There is a rich interplay between SM, GUT, and UU, where **topological quantum phase transitions** occur between the 15 vs 16 Weyl fermion models. The new sectors [30–32, 48, 49] (gapped or gapless: quantum phases or transitions, and quantum critical regions), neighbor to the SM vacuum in the quantum phase diagram landscape and in the deformation class, naturally exhibit beyond SM phenomena thus may provide Dark Matter candidates. Gapless quantum criticality also challenges the spacetime concept near the highly

entangled critical regions, which may affect the energy density or pressure of spacetime, thus may relate to Dark Energy. The deformation between neutrinos and exotic gapped/gapless sectors may shed new light on the quantum version of the equivalence principle on the inertia mass (of the quantum gauge theory origin) and gravitational mass (of the gravitational origin).

*Acknowledgments* — JW thanks Mohamed Anber, Yuta Hamada, Miguel Montero, Cumrun Vafa, and Edward Witten for conversations. JW is supported by Harvard University CMSA. ZW is supported by the Shuimu Tsinghua Scholar Program. YZY is supported by a startup fund at UCSD.

CONTENTS		Ungauged and 't Hooft Anomalies	3
I. Introduction and Summary	1	III. Standard Model with Internal Symmetry Gauged and with Higher Symmetries	4
II. Standard Model with Internal Symmetry		References	7

- [1] Gerard 't Hooft, “Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking,” *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories. Proceedings, Nato Advanced Study Institute, Cargese, France, August 26 - September 8, 1979*, [NATO Sci. Ser. B](#) **59**, 135–157 (1980).
- [2] Curtis G. Callan, Jr. and Jeffrey A. Harvey, “Anomalies and Fermion Zero Modes on Strings and Domain Walls,” [Nucl. Phys.](#) **B250**, 427–436 (1985).
- [3] Edward Witten and Kazuya Yonekura, “Anomaly Inflow and the  $\eta$ -Invariant,” in *The Shoucheng Zhang Memorial Workshop Stanford, CA, USA, May 2-4, 2019* (2019) [arXiv:1909.08775 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] Anton Kapustin, “Symmetry Protected Topological Phases, Anomalies, and Cobordisms: Beyond Group Cohomology,” (2014), [arXiv:1403.1467 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [5] Anton Kapustin, Ryan Thorngren, Alex Turzillo, and Zitao Wang, “Fermionic Symmetry Protected Topological Phases and Cobordisms,” [JHEP](#) **12**, 052 (2015), [[JHEP12,052\(2015\)](#)], [arXiv:1406.7329 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [6] Juven C. Wang, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Field theory representation of gauge-gravity symmetry-protected topological invariants, group cohomology and beyond,” [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **114**, 031601 (2015), [arXiv:1405.7689 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [7] Daniel S. Freed and Michael J. Hopkins, “Reflection positivity and invertible topological phases,” arXiv e-prints , [arXiv:1604.06527](#) (2016), [arXiv:1604.06527 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] Zheyuan Wan and Juven Wang, “Higher Anomalies, Higher Symmetries, and Cobordisms I: Classification of Higher-Symmetry-Protected Topological States and Their Boundary Fermionic/Bosonic Anomalies via a Generalized Cobordism Theory,” [Ann. Math. Sci. Appl.](#) **4**, 107–311 (2019), [arXiv:1812.11967 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] Clay Cordova, Daniel S. Freed, Ho Tat Lam, and Nathan Seiberg, “Anomalies in the Space of Coupling Constants and Their Dynamical Applications I,” [SciPost Phys.](#) **8**, 001 (2020), [arXiv:1905.09315 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] Clay Cordova, Daniel S. Freed, Ho Tat Lam, and Nathan Seiberg, “Anomalies in the Space of Coupling Constants and Their Dynamical Applications II,” [SciPost Phys.](#) **8**, 002 (2020), [arXiv:1905.13361 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] Nathan Seiberg, ““Thoughts About Quantum Field Theory””, <https://www.ias.edu/sites/default/files/sns/files/QFT.pdf>,” (Talk at Strings 2019) (2019).
- [12] Subir Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [13] Daniel Harlow and Hiroshi Ooguri, “Symmetries in quantum field theory and quantum gravity,” [Commun. Math. Phys.](#) **383**, 1669–1804 (2021), [arXiv:1810.05338 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] Jacob McNamara and Cumrun Vafa, “Cobordism Classes and the Swampland,” (2019), [arXiv:1909.10355 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] H. Weyl, “Elektron und Gravitation. I,” [Zeitschrift fur Physik](#) **56**, 330–352 (1929).
- [16] S. L. Glashow, “Partial Symmetries of Weak Interactions,” [Nucl. Phys.](#) **22**, 579–588 (1961).
- [17] Abdus Salam and John Clive Ward, “Electromagnetic and weak interactions,” [Phys. Lett.](#) **13**, 168–171 (1964).
- [18] Abdus Salam, “Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions,” [Conf. Proc. C](#) **680519**, 367–377 (1968).
- [19] Steven Weinberg, “A Model of Leptons,” [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **19**, 1264–1266 (1967).
- [20] Ofer Aharony, Nathan Seiberg, and Yuji Tachikawa, “Reading between the lines of four-dimensional gauge theories,” [JHEP](#) **08**, 115 (2013), [arXiv:1305.0318 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] David Tong, “Line Operators in the Standard Model,” [JHEP](#) **07**, 104 (2017), [arXiv:1705.01853 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] Frank Wilczek and A. Zee, “Operator Analysis of Nucleon Decay,” [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **43**, 1571–1573 (1979).
- [23] Davide Gaiotto, Anton Kapustin, Nathan Seiberg, and Brian Willett, “Generalized Global Symmetries,” [JHEP](#) **02**, 172 (2015), [arXiv:1412.5148 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] Daniel S. Freed, “Pions and Generalized Cohomology,” [J. Diff. Geom.](#) **80**, 45–77 (2008), [arXiv:hep-th/0607134](#).
- [25] Inaki Garcia-Etxebarria and Miguel Montero, “Dai-Freed anomalies in particle physics,” [JHEP](#) **08**, 003 (2019), [arXiv:1808.00009 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [26] Juven Wang and Xiao-Gang Wen, “A Non-Perturbative Definition of the Standard Models,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023356 (2020), [arXiv:1809.11171 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] Joe Davighi, Ben Gripaio, and Nakin Lohitsiri, “Global anomalies in the Standard Model(s) and Beyond,” (2019), [arXiv:1910.11277 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] Zheyuan Wan and Juven Wang, “Beyond Standard Models and Grand Unifications: Anomalies, Topological Terms, and Dynamical Constraints via Cobordisms,” *JHEP* **07**, 062 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14668 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] Zheyuan Wan, Juven Wang, and et al., “Higher anomalies, higher symmetries, and cobordisms IV: Beyond Standard Models, Grand Unification, and Ultra Unification (2021),” (“2021”), [arXiv:21xx.xxxxx \[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] Juven Wang, “Anomaly and Cobordism Constraints Beyond the Standard Model: Topological Force,” (2020), [arXiv:2006.16996 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] Juven Wang, “Anomaly and Cobordism Constraints Beyond Grand Unification: Energy Hierarchy,” (2020), [arXiv:2008.06499 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] Juven Wang, “Ultra Unification,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 105024 (2021), [arXiv:2012.15860 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] Stephen L. Adler, “Axial vector vertex in spinor electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2426–2438 (1969), [,241(1969)].
- [34] J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, “A PCAC puzzle:  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  in the  $\sigma$  model,” *Nuovo Cim.* **A60**, 47–61 (1969).
- [35] Luis Alvarez-Gaume and Edward Witten, “Gravitational Anomalies,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B234**, 269 (1984), [,269(1983)].
- [36] Edward Witten, “An SU(2) Anomaly,” *Phys. Lett.* **117B**, 324–328 (1982), [,230(1982)].
- [37] Edward Witten, “Global Gravitational Anomalies,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **100**, 197 (1985), [,197(1985)].
- [38] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Edward Witten, “A New SU(2) Anomaly,” *J. Math. Phys.* **60**, 052301 (2019), [arXiv:1810.00844 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [39] Steven Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 2: Modern applications* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [40] Nathan Seiberg and Edward Witten, “Gapped Boundary Phases of Topological Insulators via Weak Coupling,” *PTEP* **2016**, 12C101 (2016), [arXiv:1602.04251 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [41] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi, and I. M. Singer, “Spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry 1,” *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* **77**, 43 (1975).
- [42] Yuji Tachikawa and Kazuya Yonekura, “Why are fractional charges of orientifolds compatible with Dirac quantization?” [arXiv e-prints](#), [arXiv:1805.02772 \(2018\)](#), [arXiv:1805.02772 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] Chang-Tse Hsieh, “Discrete gauge anomalies revisited,” (2018), [arXiv:1808.02881 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [44] Meng Guo, Kantaro Ohmori, Pavel Putrov, Zheyuan Wan, and Juven Wang, “Fermionic Finite-Group Gauge Theories and Interacting Symmetric/Crystalline Orders via Cobordisms,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **376**, 1073 (2020), [arXiv:1812.11959 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [45] Itamar Hason, Zohar Komargodski, and Ryan Thorngren, “Anomaly Matching in the Symmetry Broken Phase: Domain Walls, CPT, and the Smith Isomorphism,” *SciPost Phys.* **8**, 062 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14039 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [46] Harald Fritzsch and Peter Minkowski, “Unified Interactions of Leptons and Hadrons,” *Annals Phys.* **93**, 193–266 (1975).
- [47] Zheyuan Wan, Juven Wang, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “3+1d Boundaries with Gravitational Anomaly of 4+1d Invertible Topological Order for Branch-Independent Bosonic Systems,” (2021), [arXiv:2112.12148 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [48] Juven Wang and Yi-Zhuang You, “Gauge Enhanced Quantum Criticality Beyond the Standard Model,” (2021), [arXiv:2106.16248 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [49] Juven Wang and Yi-Zhuang You, “Gauge Enhanced Quantum Criticality Between Grand Unifications: Categorical Higher Symmetry Retraction,” (2021), [arXiv:2111.10369 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [50] Frank Wilczek and A. Zee, “Families from Spinors,” *Phys. Rev.* **D25**, 553 (1982).
- [51] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, “Unity of All Elementary Particle Forces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 438–441 (1974).
- [52] Jogesh C. Pati and Abdus Salam, “Lepton Number as the Fourth Color,” *Phys. Rev.* **D10**, 275–289 (1974), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 703(1975)].
- [53] Stephen M. Barr, “A New Symmetry Breaking Pattern for SO(10) and Proton Decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **112**, 219–222 (1982).
- [54] T. Senthil, Ashvin Vishwanath, Leon Balents, Subir Sachdev, and Matthew P. A. Fisher, “Deconfined Quantum Critical Points,” *Science* **303**, 1490–1494 (2004), [arXiv:cond-mat/0311326](#).
- [55] Zheyuan Wan, Juven Wang, and Yunqin Zheng, “Higher anomalies, higher symmetries, and cobordisms II: Lorentz symmetry extension and enriched bosonic / fermionic quantum gauge theory,” *Ann. Math. Sci. Appl.* **05**, 171–257 (2020), [arXiv:1912.13504 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] Mohamed M. Anber and Erich Poppitz, “Nonperturbative effects in the Standard Model with gauged 1-form symmetry,” (2021), [arXiv:2110.02981 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] Miguel Montero, Juven Wang, and et al., “(in preparation),” (to appear).
- [58] Hiroyuki Shimizu and Kazuya Yonekura, “Anomaly constraints on deconfinement and chiral phase transition,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 105011 (2018), [arXiv:1706.06104 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [59] Yuya Tanizaki, Yuta Kikuchi, Tatsuhiko Misumi, and Norisuke Sakai, “Anomaly matching for the phase diagram of massless  $Z_N$ -QCD,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 054012 (2018), [arXiv:1711.10487 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [60] Clay Cordova and Thomas T. Dumitrescu, “Candidate Phases for SU(2) Adjoint QCD<sub>4</sub> with Two Flavors from  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory,” (2018), [arXiv:1806.09592 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [61] Zheyuan Wan and Juven Wang, “Higher Anomalies, Higher Symmetries, and Cobordisms III: QCD Matter Phases Anew,” *Nucl. Phys. B* (2020), 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2020.115016, [arXiv:1912.13514 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [62] A.A. Belavin, Alexander M. Polyakov, A.S. Schwartz, and Yu.S. Tyupkin, “Pseudoparticle Solutions of the Yang-Mills Equations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **59**, 85–87 (1975).
- [63] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Edward Witten, “Symmetric Gapped Interfaces of SPT and SET States: Systematic

- Constructions,” *Phys. Rev.* **X8**, 031048 (2018), [arXiv:1705.06728 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [64] Clay Cordova and Kantaro Ohmori, “Anomaly Obstructions to Symmetry Preserving Gapped Phases,” (2019), [arXiv:1910.04962 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [65] Clay Cordova and Kantaro Ohmori, “Anomaly Constraints on Gapped Phases with Discrete Chiral Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 025011 (2020), [arXiv:1912.13069 \[hep-th\]](#).