

From mesinos and quarkinos to the Standard Model: the sBootstrap as a structural EFT from Seiberg confinement, charge–mass duality, and M-theory

A. Rivero*

Draft — March 22, 2026

Abstract

We develop a unified framework in which Standard Model fermions are identified with composite fermions of a confining $SU(3)_F$ family gauge theory: leptons are mesinos (fermionic partners of the meson superfield $M^i_j = Q^i \tilde{Q}_j$), and quarks are quarkinos arising through partial compositeness in the complementary Higgs phase. The confined spectrum naturally produces a doublet $(M_i, \text{adj}(M)_i)$ per family with the mathematical structure of an $\mathcal{N}=2$ hypermultiplet, emergent from confinement plus isospin. Breaking this doublet structure to $\mathcal{N}=1$ —by giving a mass to the auxiliary adjoint—generates electroweak isospin: the meson doublet $M^{1,2}$ becomes H_d and the adjugate doublet $\text{adj}(M)^{1,2}$ becomes H_u , producing two Higgs doublets, Yukawa couplings, and the up/down mass splitting from a single composite field.

Having established the identification, we observe that the mass spectrum of the extended meson sector of the Standard Model exhibits a precise algebraic regularity. The signed mass charge $\mathfrak{z}_k = z_0 + z_k$ (with $m_k = \mathfrak{z}_k^2$, $\sum z_k = 0$, and $\langle z_k^2 \rangle = z_0^2$) satisfies the energy-balance condition $K = 2/3$ as a trace identity of the $U(3)$ charge operator, independent of the Cartan direction. This regularity appears in the pseudoscalar mesons: the seed triple $(0, \pi, D_s)$ to 0.18% and the bloomed triple $(-\pi, D_s, B)$ to 0.10%; in the charged leptons (e, μ, τ) to 0.001%; in the inverse down quarks $K^{-1}(d, s, b)$ to 0.22%; and in the quark chain $(t, b, c) - (b, c, -s) - (c, s, 0) - (s, 0, m_u + m_d)$. The O’Raifeartaigh model produces the seed spectrum exactly when the coupling ratio satisfies $gv/m = \sqrt{3}$.

The electroweak gauge bosons are accommodated through a Casimir eigenvalue equation $x^2 + s(s+1)x - s(s+1) = 0$ that predicts $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.22310$ (0.4σ from PDG) and $M_W = 80.374 \text{ GeV}$ (0.39σ). A Diophantine system on the scalar composite content uniquely selects $N = 3$ generations, with the composites filling $\mathbf{24} \oplus \mathbf{15} \oplus \mathbf{\bar{15}}$ of $SU(5)_f$ —the representation content naturally contained in the $SO(32)$ adjoint but blocked by $E_8 \times E_8$. In the M-theory lift, mesons are M2-branes (C_3 sector) and baryons are M5-branes (C_6 sector), with the moduli-space involution $M_i \leftrightarrow \Lambda^4/M_i$ realised as electromagnetic duality of the C -field. The membrane dimensionality $p = 2$ is the unique value giving $K = 2/3$, connecting the charge-squared mass law to the geometry of M-theory.

*Corresponding author. rivero@unizar.es

Contents

1 Introduction: the sBootstrap philosophy

The Standard Model contains 13 free parameters in the flavour sector—six quark masses, three charged-lepton masses, three CKM angles, and a CP phase—with no known relations among them. This paper develops a programme that addresses this problem not by postulating new symmetries on the Yukawa matrices, but by *identifying the observed fermions with composite fermions* of a confining gauge theory, in the spirit of nuclear democracy [?] and hadronic supersymmetry [?, ?].

The foundational observation is the *sBootstrap* relation [?]:

$$m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2 \approx f_\pi^2, \quad (1)$$

where $f_\pi \approx 92.2 \text{ MeV}$ is the pion decay constant. Numerically, $m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2 = 8\,316 \text{ MeV}^2$ versus $f_\pi^2 = 8\,501 \text{ MeV}^2$ (a 2.2% discrepancy). This is the Volkov–Akulov mass formula for a pseudo-Goldstino—the muon—whose scalar partner—the pion—is a pseudo-Goldstone boson. If taken seriously, Eq. (??) implies that the pion and muon sit in the same $\mathcal{N}=1$ supermultiplet, broken at scale f_π .

This identification has a precise realisation in $\mathcal{N}=1$ SU(3) SQCD with $N_f = N_c = 3$ flavours. The confined meson superfield $M^i_j = Q^i \tilde{Q}_j$ contains both a complex scalar (the meson) and a Weyl fermion (the *mesino*). The sBootstrap postulate is:

Mesinos are leptons. The nine fermionic components of the 3×3 meson matrix furnish the SM lepton sector: $3L_i + 3e_i^c$ (three doublets plus three singlets).

The scalar components of the same superfield provide the Higgs doublets and sleptons.

The quark sector arises through a complementary mechanism. In the Higgs phase of the same theory—smoothly connected to the confining phase by the Fradkin–Shenker theorem [?—the “dressed quarks” $\psi_M^{ij} \sim \tilde{v}_j \psi_Q^i + v_i \psi_{\tilde{Q}}^j$ are the same fermions as the mesinos. Elementary quarks acquire mass through partial compositeness [?]: they mix linearly with composite operators carrying the same quantum numbers. The diquark partners needed to complete the SUSY multiplets fill the symmetric $\mathbf{15} + \overline{\mathbf{15}}$ of $\text{SU}(5)_f$ —a representation forbidden for point-like qq composites by a kinematic theorem (the Pauli obstruction), but naturally present in the $\text{SO}(32)$ string adjoint.

The paper is organised to follow the logical flow of the programme:

1. **Sections ??–??:** The composite identification (quarks as quarkinos, leptons as mesinos) and the exact Seiberg dynamics that governs the confined spectrum.
2. **Section ??:** The emergent $\mathcal{N}=2$ doublet structure and its breaking to $\mathcal{N}=1$, which generates electroweak isospin, the two Higgs doublets, and the Yukawa structure.
3. **Sections ??–??:** The charge-squared mass law $m = \mathfrak{z}^2$, the energy-balance condition, and the observation that extended SM mesons satisfy the same algebraic regularity.
4. **Section ??:** The Seiberg seesaw, inverse Koide, and the full chain of direct, inverse, and waterfall formulae.
5. **Section ??:** The role of the W and Z bosons: the Casimir eigenvalue equation and $\sin^2 \theta_W$.

6. **Sections ??–??:** Generation uniqueness, the $\text{SO}(32)$ embedding, and the M-theory lift.

Throughout, the mass of a particle is the *square* of a signed charge $\mathfrak{z}$: $m = \mathfrak{z}^2$. The charge $\mathfrak{z} = z_0 + z_k$ can be positive or negative; the mass is always non-negative. This is not a notational convention but a physical statement: the fundamental variable is the charge, and the mass is its norm-square—the field energy stored in the gauge flux of a confined composite state.

2 Quarks as quarkinos, leptons as mesinos

2.1 The Miyazawa superalgebra

The idea that mesons and baryons might be related by a fermionic symmetry predates conventional supersymmetry. Miyazawa [?] proposed in 1966 a graded Lie algebra connecting mesons ($q\bar{q}$, bosons) to baryons (qqq , fermions), with the supercharge carrying colour and flavour indices. Catto and Gürsey [?] developed this into an algebraic framework where the diquark $[qq]$ serves as the SUSY partner of the antiquark $\bar{q}$, so that the baryon $q[qq]$ is the fermionic partner of the meson $q\bar{q}$.

In this picture, every quark has a diquark partner, and every meson has a baryon partner. The sBootstrap [?] sharpens this: if the SUSY-breaking scale is f_π rather than the TeV scale, then the meson–lepton pairing is *literal*: the pion and muon are superpartners, split by chiral symmetry breaking.

2.2 The gauge-theoretic realisation

The natural arena for this identification is $\mathcal{N}=1$ $\text{SU}(3)_F$ SQCD with $N_f = N_c = 3$ flavours of chiral superfields $Q^i, \tilde{Q}_j$ ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$). Above the confinement scale Λ_F , the UV gauge group is

$$G_{\text{UV}} = \text{SU}(3)_F \times \text{SU}(3)_c \times \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{SU}(3)_F$ is the family (preon-colour) gauge group that confines at Λ_F , while the SM gauge factors are weakly gauged spectators.

The preons carry both family colour and electroweak quantum numbers. Embedding $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y \subset \text{SU}(3)_L$ via the branching rule $\mathbf{3}_L \rightarrow \mathbf{2}_{-1/2} \oplus \mathbf{1}_{+1}$, the preon field content is:

Field	$\text{SU}(3)_F$	$\text{SU}(3)_c$	$\text{SU}(2)_L$	$\text{U}(1)_Y$
Q_a^A ($A = 1, 2$)	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{2}$	$-1/2$
Q_a^3	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$+1$
$\tilde{Q}_i^a$	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	0

After $\text{SU}(3)_F$ confinement, the composite meson superfield decomposes as:

$$M^\alpha_i = \underbrace{M^{1,2}_i}_{(\mathbf{2}_{-1/2})} \oplus \underbrace{M^3_i}_{(\mathbf{1}_{+1})}. \quad (3)$$

The central sBootstrap identification is then:

$$\boxed{\psi_{M^{1,2}_i} \equiv L_i, \quad \psi_{M^3_i} \equiv e_i^c.} \quad (4)$$

The nine mesino fermions furnish the SM lepton sector: three lepton doublets plus three charged singlets, with anomaly cancellation guaranteed by ’t Hooft matching [?].

The scalar components of the same superfields provide:

SQCD object	$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$	sBootstrap role
M^A_i	$(\mathbf{2}, -1/2)$	L_i mesinos, H_d -type scalars
M^3_i	$(\mathbf{1}, +1)$	e_i^c mesinos, charged scalars
$\text{adj}(M)_A^i$	$(\mathbf{2}, +1/2)$	H_u -type composite operator
$B, \tilde{B}$	$(\mathbf{1}, 0)$	singlet baryonic superfields

2.3 The quark sector: diquarkinos and complementarity

Quarks are *not* mesinos—they carry colour. In the sBootstrap, quarks are identified with effective coloured multiplets that arise through Higgs–confinement complementarity [?]. For $SU(3)$ with $N_f = 3$ fundamentals, the centre $\mathbb{Z}_3$ is fully screened, and the Higgs and confinement regimes are analytically connected: no local order parameter distinguishes them.

In the Higgs phase, giving the squarks a diagonal VEV breaks all 8 generators of $SU(3)_F$. After Higgsing, $18 - 8 = 10$ light chiral multiplets remain, matching exactly the confined description: 9 mesons + 2 baryons – 1 constraint = 10. The “mesino” in the confined description is the *same fermion* as the “dressed quark” in the Higgs phase.

The diquark partners $D \sim \Lambda^2 Q$ needed to complete the SUSY multiplets encounter a **bare diquarkino obstruction**: requiring the meson doublet to furnish (L_i, e_i^c) forces the diquarkino singlet to carry hypercharge $Y = -4/3$ rather than $+1/3$ or $-2/3$. The resolution [?] completes the flavour sector into $\mathbf{15} \oplus \mathbf{\bar{15}} \oplus \mathbf{24}$ of $SU(5)_f$, with quarkino fields as effective coloured multiplets of this completion.

A kinematic theorem shows that *no* $J = 0$, colour- $\bar{3}$ diquark can have symmetric flavour—regardless of orbital angular momentum—so the sBootstrap diquark in the $\mathbf{15}$ cannot be a qq composite. It must be a fundamentally string-theoretic state, as we discuss in Section ??.

3 Seiberg confinement and the moduli space

3.1 The quantum-modified constraint

For $N_f = N_c = 3$, the theory confines with a quantum-modified moduli space. The infrared degrees of freedom—mesons M^i_j , baryon B , antibaryon $\tilde{B}$ —satisfy the exact quantum constraint

$$\det M - B\tilde{B} = \Lambda^6, \quad (5)$$

enforced by a Lagrange multiplier X through the superpotential

$$W = X(\det M - B\tilde{B} - \Lambda^6) + \sum_i m_i M^i_i. \quad (6)$$

The mass deformations m_i break the flavour symmetry. The F -term equations on the mesonic branch ($B = \tilde{B} = 0$) give the central result:

$$\langle M_i \rangle = \frac{\Lambda^2 P^{1/3}}{m_i}, \quad P = m_1 m_2 m_3. \quad (7)$$

Heavy preons produce light mesons, and vice versa. This is the Seiberg seesaw—the inverse relation that will connect the charged-lepton and down-quark sectors.

3.2 The adjugate mechanism

The adjugate of the meson matrix, $\text{adj}(M)_i = \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$, is a *polynomial* (quadratic) in the meson entries—holomorphic, no division required. On the constraint surface $\det M = \Lambda^6$:

$$\text{adj}(M) = \Lambda^6 M^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

so the adjugate provides a *holomorphic realisation of the matrix inverse*. From the F -term equations:

$$\text{adj}(M)_i = -\Lambda^3 m_i. \quad (9)$$

Thus the adjugate is proportional to the UV mass matrix, while $M \propto 1/m$. This gives two natural Yukawa operators at the confinement scale:

$$W_{\text{down}} \supset y_d q_L d^c \frac{M^{1,2}}{\Lambda}, \quad [H_d\text{-type}], \quad (10)$$

$$W_{\text{up}} \supset y_u q_L u^c \frac{\text{adj}(M)^{1,2}}{\Lambda^3}, \quad [H_u\text{-type}]. \quad (11)$$

Species coupling through M acquire masses $m_{\text{phys}} \propto 1/m_i$ (inverse hierarchy); species coupling through $\text{adj}(M)$ acquire $m_{\text{phys}} \propto m_i$ (direct hierarchy). There are no independent Yukawa parameters: the mass hierarchy *is* the family charge hierarchy.

4 The emergent $\mathcal{N}=2$ doublet and electroweak isospin

4.1 The composite doublet

The confined spectrum contains two composite operators per family: M_i (meson) and $\text{adj}(M)_i$ (adjugate). Their mass eigenvalues have opposite charge dependence:

$$\langle M_i \rangle \propto 1/m_i, \quad \text{adj}(M)_i \propto m_i. \quad (12)$$

This pairing has the mathematical structure of an $\mathcal{N}=2$ hypermultiplet: the two components are rotated by an $\text{SU}(2)_R$ that, in the $\mathcal{N}=2$ language, exchanges the scalar and its dual. Crucially, this doublet structure is *emergent*—it arises from confinement plus isospin, not from a UV $\mathcal{N}=2$ theory that is subsequently broken.

4.2 From $\mathcal{N}=2$ to $\mathcal{N}=1$: the old trick

The “old trick” of getting electroweak isospin from extended SUSY works as follows. Introduce an auxiliary adjoint chiral field Φ with mass μ_Φ and the standard $\mathcal{N}=2$ coupling $W \supset \sqrt{2} g \tilde{Q} \Phi Q$. Integrating out Φ via its F -term gives an effective $\mathcal{N}=1$ superpotential with a quartic remnant:

$$W_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{g^2}{\mu_\Phi} \left[\text{Tr}(Q\tilde{Q})^2 - \frac{1}{3} (\text{Tr} Q\tilde{Q})^2 \right] + m_i Q^i \tilde{Q}_i. \quad (13)$$

As $\mu_\Phi \rightarrow \infty$ (decoupling), the quartic vanishes and one recovers pure $\mathcal{N}=1$ SQCD. At finite μ_Φ , the quartic couples the direct and inverse branches.

The key structural consequence: the breaking $\mathcal{N}=2 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}=1$ splits the hypermultiplet $(M_i, \text{adj}(M)_i)$ into two separate chiral superfields with *different* electroweak quantum numbers:

- $M^{1,2}_i \sim (\mathbf{2}, -1/2)$: the down-type Higgs doublet H_d .
- $\text{adj}(M)^{1,2}_i \sim (\mathbf{2}, +1/2)$: the up-type Higgs doublet H_u .

Both MSSM Higgs doublets emerge from a single meson matrix. The $\text{adj}(M)$ is not an independent superfield but a holomorphic polynomial in M , constrained by the quantum constraint $\det M = \Lambda^6$. At the superpotential level, this constrains $\tan \beta$: $\langle \text{adj}(M)_i \rangle / \langle M_i \rangle = \Lambda^6 / \langle M_i \rangle^2$ is fixed by the quantum constraint (subject to Kähler corrections).

The pairing of a direct mass ($\text{adj}(M)_i \propto m_i$) with an inverse mass ($M_i \propto 1/m_i$) within each family is the composite manifestation of **electroweak isospin**: up-type and down-type quarks in each generation acquire masses from different faces of the same meson matrix.

4.3 The CST alternative

An alternative construction, due to Csaki, Shirman, and Terning [?], derives $\text{SU}(2)_L$ dynamically as the magnetic dual gauge group of a confining theory. Consider an electric theory $\text{SU}(N_e)$ with N_f flavours; Seiberg duality gives a magnetic theory with gauge group $\text{SU}(N_f - N_e)$. Setting $N_f - N_e = 2$, the magnetic gauge group is $\text{SU}(2)$, identified with $\text{SU}(2)_L$. The magnetic superpotential $W_{\text{mag}} = q \mathcal{M} \tilde{q} / \mu$ generates Yukawa couplings between magnetic quarks and the meson Higgs. This costs two extra parameters (Λ_{CST} and the electric gauge coupling) that do not enter any numerical prediction; the branching-rule embedding of the main text achieves the same Higgs identification with zero additional parameters.

5 The charge-squared mass law

5.1 Charges from $\text{U}(3)$ normalisation

Let the three generations transform as the fundamental $\mathbf{3}$ of $\text{U}(3)_F = \text{SU}(3)_F \times \text{U}(1)$. The Cartan charges satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 z_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^3 z_i^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (14)$$

with the $\text{U}(1)$ charge fixed by canonical normalisation: $z_0 = 1/\sqrt{6}$. The total signed charge of the i -th species is

$$\mathfrak{z}_i \equiv z_0 + z_i, \quad (15)$$

and the physical mass is

$$\boxed{m_i = \mu \mathfrak{z}_i^2}, \quad (16)$$

with μ a generation-independent scale. The charge can be positive or negative; the mass is always non-negative.

5.2 Why the square: four routes

The quadratic dependence $m \propto \mathfrak{z}^2$ has multiple independent motivations:

(i) Field energy. By Gauss's law, the chromoelectric field of a static preon with family charge $\mathfrak{z}_i$ is $|\mathbf{E}_i| \propto \mathfrak{z}_i$. Since $\mathcal{L} \supset -(1/4g^2)F_{\mu\nu}^2$, the stored field energy is $U_i = (2g^2)^{-1} \int d^3x \mathbf{E}_i^2 \propto \mathfrak{z}_i^2$ —quadratic in charge, like a capacitor $E = Q^2/(2C)$.

(ii) Bilinear composites. The meson $M_i^i = Q^i \tilde{Q}_i$ is a bilinear in the preon fields. If each preon contributes a factor proportional to $\mathfrak{z}_i$, the composite VEV scales as $\mathfrak{z}_i^2$. This is the mechanism identified by Koide [?]: any mass arising through *two* insertions of a VEV (a seesaw or radiative loop) gives $m \propto v^2$, which is the charge-squared structure.

(iii) Membrane area. In the M-theory lift, the meson is an M2-brane stretched between D6-branes. If both worldvolume directions scale linearly with $\mathfrak{z}_i$, the BPS mass is $m \propto T_2 \times \text{Area} \propto \mathfrak{z}_i^2$. This is the unique brane dimensionality that produces $K = 2/3$ (Section ??).

(iv) Uniqueness theorem. For monomial mass laws $m_i = c(z_0 + z_i)^n$, the generalised ratio $K_n = \sum (z_0 + z_i)^n / (\sum (z_0 + z_i)^{n/2})^2$ is independent of the Cartan direction α if and only if $n = 2$ (besides the trivial $n = 0$). For $n \geq 3$, the cubic Casimir $\sum z_i^3 \propto \cos 3\alpha$ introduces direction-dependent terms.

5.3 The energy-balance condition

For three charges $\mathfrak{z}_k = z_0 + z_k$ with $\sum z_k = 0$:

$$K = \frac{\sum \mathfrak{z}_k^2}{(\sum \mathfrak{z}_k)^2} = \frac{3z_0^2 + \sum z_k^2}{9z_0^2} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{\langle z_k^2 \rangle}{3z_0^2}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore:

$$\boxed{K = \frac{2}{3} \iff \langle z_k^2 \rangle = z_0^2.} \quad (18)$$

The energy balance condition says: the mean energy of the perturbations equals the energy of the unperturbed charge. This is neither perturbative ($\sigma \ll \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$, $K \rightarrow 1/3$, all masses equal) nor dominant ($\sigma \gg \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$, $K \rightarrow 1$, one mass dominates). The value $K = 2/3$ is the equipartition point.

One mass can vanish naturally: if $\langle z_k^2 \rangle = z_0^2$, a perturbation z_k can reach $|z_k| \sim z_0$, making $\mathfrak{z}_k = z_0 + z_k \approx 0$. A vanishing mass is the natural extreme of energy balance, not fine-tuning.

5.4 The shift parameter

Promoting the fixed offset $z_0 = 1/\sqrt{6}$ to a free shift parameter s , the Koide ratio on the direct branch becomes

$$K(s) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{18s^2}, \quad (19)$$

independent of the Cartan angle α . The condition $K = 2/3$ selects $s = 1/\sqrt{6}$ uniquely. Systematic fitting of all known tuples reveals that s is approximately *universal*: $s \in$

[0.33, 0.49] with a mean of $0.40 \approx z_0$, while the Cartan angle α spans 4° – 37° across sectors. The universality of s —not α —is the structural content of the regularity.

6 The extended meson spectrum

6.1 Seed triples

For a triple $(0, \mathfrak{z}_a, \mathfrak{z}_b)$ with one massless member, the energy balance condition requires:

$$\frac{\mathfrak{z}_a}{\mathfrak{z}_b} = 2 - \sqrt{3} \approx 0.2680, \quad (20)$$

a *universal* prediction: any charge triple with one zero member has the same charge ratio between the two massive members, regardless of their absolute scale.

The quark seed: $(0, s, c)$. The strange and charm quark charges give $\mathfrak{z}_s/\mathfrak{z}_c = 9.67/35.64 = 0.271$, deviating from the seed ratio by 1.2%. The Koide diagnostic gives $K = 0.664$ (0.35% from $2/3$).

The meson seed: $(0, \pi, D_s)$. The pion and D_s meson charges give $\mathfrak{z}_\pi/\mathfrak{z}_{D_s} = 11.81/44.37 = 0.266$, deviating by 0.6%. The Koide diagnostic gives $K = 0.668$ (0.18% from $2/3$). This is the **meson counterpart** of the quark seed—both involve the strange-charm sector. The two seeds are nearly parallel in charge space (0.3°): the meson seed is the composite image of the quark seed.

The lepton triple as “almost-seed.” The charged lepton triple (e, μ, τ) has $\mathfrak{z}_e = 0.715 \text{ MeV}^{1/2}$, which is small but nonzero. The leptons are not an exact seed—the electron, while very light, is not massless. But the triple is the same family: the near-critical charge puts one member close to zero.

6.2 The meson triple $(-\pi, D_s, B)$

With the pion charge *negative*, the triple satisfies:

$$K(-\pi, D_s, B) = \frac{m_\pi + m_{D_s} + m_B}{(-\mathfrak{z}_\pi + \mathfrak{z}_{D_s} + \mathfrak{z}_B)^2} = 0.6674, \quad (21)$$

deviating from $2/3$ by 0.10%—the second most precise charge triple known (after the leptons). The pion’s negative charge has physical meaning: as a pseudo-Goldstone boson, the pion approaches $\mathfrak{z} = 0$ from below as $m_q \rightarrow 0$. The sign encodes Goldstone nature.

Among $\binom{11}{3} \times 4 = 660$ combinations of the eleven pseudoscalar mesons with sign patterns, only $(-\pi, D_s, B)$ and the closely related $(-\pi, D_s, B_s)$ lie within 0.2% of $K = 2/3$. All six closest hits share the sign assignment $(-\pi, D_{(s)}, B_{(s,c)})$: a negative pion paired with charm- and bottom-containing mesons—the combination predicted by the $\text{SU}(5)_f$ flavour structure.

6.3 The O’Raifeartaigh mechanism

The seed-to-bloom transition has a precise SUSY-breaking realisation. The O’Raifeartaigh model with three chiral superfields and superpotential $W = f\Phi_0 + m\Phi_1\Phi_2 + g\Phi_0\Phi_1^2$ produces a fermionic mass spectrum $(0, m_-, m_+)$ with $m_{\pm} = (\sqrt{g^2v^2 + m^2} \pm gv)$. The charge ratio $\mathfrak{z}_-/\mathfrak{z}_+ = 2 - \sqrt{3}$ (the seed condition) requires:

$$\boxed{\frac{gv}{m} = \sqrt{3}}, \quad (22)$$

a *single algebraic constraint* on the superpotential parameters. The Koide condition on the seed is therefore one equation relating the cubic coupling, the pseudo-modulus VEV, and the bilinear mass parameter.

The bloom from seed to full triple is a phase rotation $\delta : 3\pi/4 \rightarrow \delta_{\text{phys}}$ in the Koide parametrisation, at fixed scale—mass redistributes among the three eigenvalues without changing their sum. The O’Raifeartaigh seed is an *unstable fixed point* of the R-breaking perturbation: any nonzero R-breaking pushes K away from $2/3$. The bloom must therefore be a nonperturbative rearrangement.

7 The Seiberg seesaw and the inverse sector

7.1 The dual Koide on (d, s, b)

At the Seiberg vacuum, $\langle M^j_j \rangle \propto 1/m_j$: heavy quarks produce light mesons and vice versa. This prompts the question: does the inverse-mass spectrum $\{1/m_i\}$ satisfy the energy-balance condition? Evaluating for the pure down-type quarks:

$$K(1/m_d, 1/m_s, 1/m_b) = 0.6652, \quad (23)$$

a 0.22% deviation from $2/3$ —better than any direct quark triple. No other quark triple comes close under the Seiberg seesaw (the next best, (d, s, c) , deviates by 4.2%).

This “dual Koide” connects the UV mass hierarchy to the IR meson condensates: the Seiberg constraint maps the down-type quark masses into a near-energy-balance spectrum of meson VEVs. The dual charges $\xi_j = 1/\mathfrak{z}_j$ are the charges of the Seiberg meson VEVs—the magnetic Koide is an energy balance on the meson condensate, not on quark masses.

A simple algebraic identity connects the seed to the seesaw: $K(a, b) = K(1/a, 1/b)$ identically for any two masses. The seed $(0, m_s, m_c)$ is thus the unique self-dual fixed point of the seesaw: the electric and magnetic energy-balance conditions coincide only when one mass vanishes.

7.2 The interleaving theorem and the waterfall

The two branches—direct ($a_i = \mu \mathfrak{z}_i^2$) and inverse ($d_i = \nu/\mathfrak{z}_i^2$)—have opposite orderings: $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ while $d_1 > d_2 > d_3$. This is the algebraic origin of the quark mass waterfall.

Theorem 1 (Interleaving). *The six unmixed masses form the alternating ladder $d_1 > a_3 > d_2 > a_2 > d_3 > a_1$ if and only if $\max(\mathfrak{z}_1^2\mathfrak{z}_3^2, \mathfrak{z}_2^4) < \nu/\mu < \mathfrak{z}_2^2\mathfrak{z}_3^2$.*

The SM quark masses satisfy this window condition. The resulting 6-rung ladder alternates strictly between inverse and direct entries, producing consecutive windows that

mix both branches. The sign flip in $K(b, c, -s)$ signals the branch mismatch in the mixed window.

The geometric mean $\sqrt{a_i \cdot d_i} = \sqrt{\mu\nu}$ is family-independent—a direct consequence of $\det M = \Lambda^6$.

7.3 The chain structure

The quark predictions arise from a chain of overlapping triples:

$$(t, b, c) - (b, c, s)^\pm - (c, s, 0) - (s, 0, m_u + m_d), \quad (24)$$

split into two regimes. On the **Fermi side** (above the SUSY-breaking scale): $K(m_t, m_b, m_c) \approx 2/3$ (standard, 0.39%). On the **chiral side** (below the breaking scale): $m_c/m_s = (2+\sqrt{3})^2 \approx 13.93$ and $m_s/(m_u+m_d) = (2+\sqrt{3})^2$. The bridge tuple (b, c, s) with a signed charge flip connects the two sides.

The v_0 -doubling relation $\mathfrak{z}_b = 3\mathfrak{z}_s + \mathfrak{z}_c$ matches PDG to 0.07% ($m_b = 4177$ vs. 4180 MeV). This arises from a bion Kähler correction $K_{\text{bion}} \propto |\sum s_k \mathfrak{z}_k|^2$ from monopole-instantons on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$.

7.4 CKM predictions

The self-dual charge spectrum has $R = (5 + \sqrt{21})/2$, the fundamental unit of $\mathbb{Z}[(1 + \sqrt{21})/2]$. The CKM elements:

Observable	Formula	Predicted	PDG 2024	Status
$ V_{us} $	$\sqrt{m_d/m_s}$	0.2236	0.2243 ± 0.0008	0.9σ
$ V_{cb} $	$1/(5R)$	0.0417	0.0422 ± 0.0008	0.6σ
$ V_{ub} $	$2\sqrt{2}/(7R^3)$	0.00367	0.00368 ± 0.00011	0.1σ
δ_{CP}	$\arctan \sqrt{R}$	65.4°	$65.7 \pm 3.4^\circ$	0.1σ
J	closed form	3.04×10^{-5}	3.08×10^{-5}	0.3σ

The CP phase is equivalent to $\cos^2(2\delta) = N/(N+4) = N/(2N+1)$, which holds only for $N = 3$ —the same condition as discriminant matching. The integers 5 and 7 are empirical pattern identifications; derivations from the operator basis remain open.

8 The W and Z bosons

8.1 The Casimir eigenvalue equation

Consider the eigenvalue equation

$$x^2 + C_2 x - C_2 = 0, \quad C_2 = s(s+1), \quad (25)$$

where C_2 is the quadratic Casimir of $\text{SU}(2)$ at spin s . This equation is pinned by three structural constraints: (i) no spin-independent mass term ($f_0 = 0$); (ii) a massless eigenstate at $s = 0$ ($g_0 = 0$); (iii) coefficient antisymmetry ($g_1 = -f_1$).

Evaluating at $s = 1/2$ ($C_2 = 3/4$) and $s = 1$ ($C_2 = 2$):

$$x_+(1/2) = \frac{1}{8}(-3 + \sqrt{57}), \quad x_+(1/2) m^2 = M_W^2, \quad (26)$$

$$x_+(1) = -1 + \sqrt{3}, \quad x_+(1) m^2 = M_Z^2. \quad (27)$$

The electroweak ratio is

$$R \equiv 1 - \frac{x_+(1/2)}{x_+(1)} = \frac{(\sqrt{19} - 3)(\sqrt{19} - \sqrt{3})}{16} \approx 0.22310, \quad (28)$$

to be compared with $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{os}} = 0.22320 \pm 0.00026$ (0.4σ). The predicted W mass is $M_W^{\text{pred}} = 80.374 \pm 0.002 \text{ GeV}$ (0.39σ from PDG).

8.2 The fourth eigenvalue

At $s = 1/2$, the second root gives $|M(1/2, -)| = 122.4 \text{ GeV}$, which is 2.3% below $M_H = 125.25 \text{ GeV}$. This eigenstate carries spin $1/2$ while the Higgs is spin 0; the near-degeneracy is noted as a numerical curiosity.

8.3 The scale parameter

Setting $x_+(1) m^2 = M_Z^2$ gives $m = M_Z / \sqrt{\sqrt{3} - 1} = 106.6 \text{ GeV} \approx m_\mu \times 10^3$.

8.4 Origin and scheme dependence

This observation was first made by H. de Vries (2004) and subsequently studied in [?]. The comparison uses the on-shell definition $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2 / M_Z^2 = 0.22320$, **not** the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ value 0.23122. Until a dynamical mechanism selecting the on-shell scheme is identified, the agreement should be regarded as suggestive but scheme-dependent.

9 Generation uniqueness and the $\text{SO}(32)$ embedding

9.1 The Diophantine system

The sBootstrap postulates that every scalar of the Supersymmetric Standard Model is a composite of two quarks (diquark) or of a quark–antiquark pair (meson). Matching composites to fermions, charge sector by charge sector:

$$rs = 2N, \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{r(r+1)}{2} = 2N, \quad (30)$$

$$r^2 + s^2 - 1 = 4N. \quad (31)$$

Theorem 2 (Generation uniqueness). *The system (??)–(??) has a unique positive-integer solution: $(N, r, s) = (3, 3, 2)$.*

With $r + s = 5$ light quarks forming the fundamental $\mathbf{5}$ of $\text{SU}(5)_f$, the composites organise into $\mathbf{24} \oplus \mathbf{15} \oplus \overline{\mathbf{15}}$. The counting equation (??) selects the *symmetric* product $\mathbf{15}$, not the antisymmetric $\overline{\mathbf{10}}$ —the Pauli obstruction for point-like diquarks.

9.2 Discriminant matching

Two numbers arise naturally for N generations: the algebraic discriminant $D_{\text{alg}} = (N+2)^2 - 4$ and the dynamical discriminant $D_{\text{dyn}} = N(2N+1)$. The condition $D_{\text{alg}} = D_{\text{dyn}}$ reduces to $N^2 - 3N = 0$:

$$\boxed{N = 3.} \tag{32}$$

At $N = 3$: $D = 21 = \dim \text{Sp}(6) = \dim \text{adj SO}(7)$.

9.3 The SO(32) adjoint

The SO(32) gauge group of Type I / heterotic string theory admits the chain $\text{SO}(32) \supset \text{SU}(16) \times \text{U}(1) \supset \text{SU}(5) \times \text{SU}(3) \times \text{U}(1)^2$. The adjoint **496** = $\wedge^2(\mathbf{32})$ decomposes to contain, in the neutral sector ($Q_A = Q_B = 0$): $\mathbf{24} \oplus \mathbf{1}$, and in the matter sector ($|Q_A| = 2$): $\mathbf{15} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{15}} \oplus \mathbf{10} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{10}} \oplus \mathbf{5} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{5}}$.

The sBootstrap representations **24** and $\mathbf{15} + \bar{\mathbf{15}}$ appear naturally. The remaining 442 states must be projected out by an orbifold or GSO-type condition—an open problem.

Why SO(32) and not $E_8 \times E_8$. Every decomposition of E_8 under SU(5) produces the antisymmetric **10**, never the symmetric **15**. The obstruction is irreducible: E_8 's simply-laced root lattice admits only antisymmetric tensor representations of SU(5). By contrast, SO(32)'s adjoint naturally contains the symmetric **15** through $\wedge^2(\mathbf{5} \otimes \mathbf{3}) \supset S^2(\mathbf{5}) \otimes \wedge^2(\mathbf{3}) = (\mathbf{15}, \bar{\mathbf{3}})$. The sBootstrap **constrains the string embedding to the Type I / SO(32) corner** of the landscape.

10 M-theory lift

10.1 Mesons as M2-branes, baryons as M5-branes

The Hanany–Witten brane construction [?] realises SU(3) SQCD in Type IIA using D4-branes between NS5-branes with D6-branes providing flavours. Lifted to M-theory, the configuration merges into a single M5-brane wrapping a holomorphic curve Σ .

Field theory	Type IIA	M-theory	Mass type
Meson $M^i_j = Q^i \tilde{Q}_j$	open string (D6–D6)	M2-brane	Dirac
Baryon $B = \epsilon Q^3$	wrapped D4 (vertex)	M5-brane	Majorana

The moduli-space involution $M_i \rightarrow \Lambda^4 / M_i$ exchanges the C_3 and C_6 descriptions—the *electromagnetic duality* of M-theory.

10.2 Why $p = 2$: the membrane signature

With U(3) family symmetry, D6-brane positions are $v_i = c \mathfrak{z}_i$. An M2-brane stretched to the i -th D6-brane spans two spatial directions, so its BPS mass is $m_i \propto \text{Area}_i \propto \mathfrak{z}_i^2$.

For a general p -brane:

p	Object	$m_i \propto$	K
1	string	$\mathfrak{z}_i$	0.478
2	M2-brane	$\mathfrak{z}_i^2$	2/3
3	3-brane	$\mathfrak{z}_i^3$	0.805
5	M5-brane	$\mathfrak{z}_i^5$	0.945

Only $p = 2$ yields $K = 2/3$: the energy-balance condition is a signature of the membrane.

10.3 The number 84

In 11d SUGRA, the C_3 field has $\binom{9}{3} = 84$ polarisations. Under $SU(9) \subset E_8$: $248 = 80 + 84 + \overline{84}$. In the SM with right-handed neutrinos, the 96 fermionic degrees of freedom split as $84 + 12$ under dual mass-protection symmetries. A fourth uniqueness criterion: $\binom{3N}{N} = (N+1) \cdot N(2N+1)$ holds only at $N = 3$, giving $84 = 4 \times 21$.

10.4 Strong CP and the involution as CP

Identifying the moduli-space involution with CP gives a Nelson–Barr structure: the superpotential is real in the CP-symmetric basis, so $\arg \det m_q = 0$ at tree level. The CKM phase arises from spontaneous CP violation. Radiative corrections: $\delta \bar{\theta} \sim (\alpha/4\pi)^2 J \sim 10^{-11}$, at or below the experimental bound $|\bar{\theta}| < 10^{-10}$.

11 The explicit Lagrangian

Below the family confinement scale Λ_F , the effective theory is specified by:

Kähler potential.

$$K = \underbrace{\text{Tr}(M^\dagger M) + |X|^2 + |B|^2 + |\bar{B}|^2}_{K_{\text{can}}} - \underbrace{\frac{|X|^4}{12\mu^2}}_{K_{\text{stab}}} + \underbrace{\frac{\zeta^2}{\Lambda^2} \left| \sum_k s_k \mathfrak{z}_k \right|^2}_{K_{\text{bion}}}, \quad (33)$$

where K_{stab} pins the pseudo-modulus at $\langle X \rangle = \sqrt{3} \mu$ (the Kähler pole), and K_{bion} enforces the v_0 -doubling condition $\mathfrak{z}_b = 3\mathfrak{z}_s + \mathfrak{z}_c$.

Superpotential.

$$W = \underbrace{\text{Tr}(\hat{m} M)}_{\text{chiral mass}} + \underbrace{X(\det M - B\bar{B} - \Lambda^6)}_{\text{Seiberg}} + \underbrace{c_3 \frac{(\det M)^3}{\Lambda^{18}}}_{\text{3-inst.}} + \underbrace{y_c H_u M^c_c + y_b H_d M^b_b + y_t H_u Q^t \bar{Q}_t}_{\text{Yukawa}} + \underbrace{\lambda_S S H_u \cdot H_d}_{\text{NMSSM}} \quad (34)$$

The three-instanton term $(\det M)^3/\Lambda^{18}$ generates a $\cos(9\delta)$ potential whose minima include the observed lepton Koide phase to 0.9σ in m_τ . The NMSSM singlet S is a separate field from the Lagrange multiplier X (dimensional analysis: $\lambda_{\text{Higgs}}/\lambda_{\text{max}} \sim 10^5$). At $\tan \beta = 1$, the Higgs mass is $m_h = \lambda_S v/\sqrt{2} = 125 \text{ GeV}$ for $\lambda_S = 0.72$.

Mixed triples require $\tan \beta = 1$. The quark Koide triples obligatorily mix up-type and down-type quarks. The translation from masses to Yukawa couplings depends on $\tan \beta$: K on masses equals K on Yukawas only when $\sin \beta = \cos \beta$, i.e., $\tan \beta = 1$.

Soft breaking. The soft terms arise from a spurion $\langle F_S \rangle = f_\pi^2$: $V_{\text{soft}} = f_\pi^2 \text{Tr}(M^\dagger M)$. The supertrace $\text{STr}[M^2] = 18 f_\pi^2$ receives contributions only from the nine soft meson masses.

12 SUSY breaking: F -terms are lepton masses

The SUSY-preserving vacuum is diagonal and does not break $\text{SU}(2)_L$. When electroweak symmetry breaks (all three Higgs doublet components acquire VEVs), the F -term system becomes overconstrained: 18 real equations for 12 real variables. SUSY *necessarily* breaks, with

$$|F_{2j}| = m_j, \quad j = e, \mu, \tau. \quad (35)$$

The SUSY-breaking auxiliary fields *are* the lepton masses. The goldstino is predominantly the τ -mesino, and $m_{3/2} = |F|/(\sqrt{3} M_{\text{Pl}}) \approx 4 \times 10^{-16} \text{ GeV}$.

The three Higgs doublets $H_i = M^{1,2}_i$ acquire hierarchical VEVs $v_i \propto m_{\ell,i}$: the SM Higgs is predominantly the τ -generation doublet ($v_\tau / \sqrt{\sum v_i^2} = 0.998$).

13 Numerical results and status

13.1 Parameter counting

The framework has four continuous inputs: k (overall scale, from m_e), α (sector angle, from m_μ), m_d and m_s ($\overline{\text{MS}}$ at 2 GeV, from PDG). From these, it produces:

Observable	Method	Predicted	PDG 2024	Status
m_τ	$K = 2/3$	1776.97 MeV	1776.86 ± 0.12	0.9σ
$K(e, \mu, \tau)$	trace identity	$2/3$	0.666661	0.001%
$K^{-1}(d, s, b)$	Seiberg seesaw	$\approx 2/3$	0.6652	0.22%
$K(-\pi, D_s, B)$	meson triple	$\approx 2/3$	0.6674	0.10%
m_c	$(2+\sqrt{3})^2 m_s$	1301 MeV	1273	2.4%
$m_u + m_d$	zero-charge	6.7 MeV	6.8	1.4%
$ V_{us} $	$\sqrt{m_d/m_s}$	0.2236	0.2243	0.9σ
$ V_{cb} $	$1/(5R)$	0.0417	0.0422	0.6σ
$ V_{ub} $	$2\sqrt{2}/(7R^3)$	0.00367	0.00368	0.1σ
δ_{CP}	$\arctan \sqrt{R}$	65.4°	65.7°	0.1σ
$\sin^2 \theta_W$	Casimir eq.	0.22310	0.22320	0.4σ
M_W	from above	80.374 GeV	80.369	0.39σ
m_b (bion)	v_0 -doubling	4177 MeV	4183	0.06σ
m_t (chain)	(t, b, c)	$\sim 171 \text{ GeV}$	172.8	1%

Table 1: Quantitative results. $R = (5 + \sqrt{21})/2$.

13.2 Epistemological classification

14 TeV-scale convergence

Three TeV-range scales emerge with no TeV-scale input:

Claim	Status	Comment
$K = 2/3$ from $U(3)$ charges	Derived	trace identity
$n = 2$ uniqueness	Derived	binomial theorem
Seiberg transparency $(W_S)_{kk} = 0$	Derived	det multilinearity
Involution $M \leftrightarrow \Lambda^4/M$	Derived	moduli space
Interleaving theorem	Derived	opposite orderings
$N = 3$ uniqueness (Diophantine)	Derived	$(r - 3)(r + 1) = 0$
$N = 3$ uniqueness (discriminant)	Conditional	equal quartic couplings
O’Raifeartaigh seed at $gv/m = \sqrt{3}$	Derived	fermion eigenvalues
Pauli theorem (no symmetric $J=0$ diquark)	Derived	angular momentum
$\tan \beta = 1$ from mixed triples	Derived	$\sin \beta = \cos \beta$
$SO(32)$ but not $E_8 \times E_8$	Derived	15 vs. 10
Lepton Koide $K = 2/3$ to 0.001%	Observed	2.8σ after LEE
Meson triple $(-\pi, D_s, B)$ to 0.10%	Observed	1.1σ after LEE
v_0 -doubling: m_b to 0.07%	Observed	bion Kähler
Casimir $R = 0.22310$ vs. $\sin^2 \theta_W$	Observed	scheme-dependent
Dual Koide $K^{-1}(d, s, b) = 0.665$	Observed	0.22% from 2/3
$ V_{cb} = 1/(5R)$, integers 5, 7	Empirical	no derivation yet
α_{lep} origin	Open	Kähler modulus

Table 2: Logical status of claims.

1. The emergent adjoint mass $\mu_{\text{crit}} \approx 4.5 \text{ TeV}$ (below which the Koide vacuum ceases to exist).
2. The composite stop mass $M_S(X_t = 0) \approx 4.6 \text{ TeV}$ required for $m_h = 125 \text{ GeV}$ via the Coleman–Weinberg formula.
3. The inverse Koide crossing scale $\mu_K \approx 1 \text{ TeV}$ where $K^{-1}(d, s, b)$ passes through 2/3 under 5-loop SMDR running.

The full scale hierarchy is $\mu_{N=2} \gtrsim 37 \text{ TeV} > \Lambda_{\text{CST}} > v_{\text{EW}} = 246 \text{ GeV} > \Lambda_F \approx 80 \text{ MeV}$.

15 Open problems

1. **The Kähler metric.** Computing the Kähler potential on the quantum-modified moduli space is the master obstruction: v_{EW} , $\tan \beta$, the overall scale k , Z_c/Z_s , and the scalar spectrum all depend on it.
2. **The origin of α_{lep} .** The sector angle $\alpha_{\text{lep}} = 0.2222 \text{ rad}$ determines the lepton mass ratios but is fitted, not derived. All $SU(3)$ -invariant potentials have extrema at $\alpha = 0$ and $\pi/3$; fixing α_{lep} requires non-perturbative Kähler effects or UV input. The three-instanton potential $-\cos(9\delta)$ provides one candidate mechanism.
3. **The CKM integers.** The integers 5 and 7 in $|V_{cb}| = 1/(5R)$ and $|V_{ub}| = 2\sqrt{2}/(7R^3)$ are pattern identifications. Whether they encode Clebsch–Gordan coefficients, dimensions, or M-theoretic data ($84 = \binom{9}{3}$, $\pi/84$) is unknown.
4. **PMNS mixing.** The baryonino Majorana matrix is diagonal on the mesonic branch. Large lepton mixing angles require non-diagonal Kähler corrections to the baryonic sector.

5. **The quartic ε .** Computing the inter-branch coupling requires the non-perturbative Kähler metric, entangled with Z_c/Z_s and the waterfall pattern.
6. **The SO(32) projection.** Of the 496 adjoint states, 442 must be projected out. No mechanism has been identified.
7. **The Casimir equation.** The dynamical origin of the eigenvalue equation $x^2 + C_2x - C_2 = 0$ and the preferred renormalisation scheme remain open.

16 Conclusions

We have presented a unified framework that begins with the identification of Standard Model fermions as composite fermions of a confining $SU(3)_F$ family gauge theory—leptons as mesinos, quarks as quarkinos—and follows the consequences through five levels of structure:

1. The composite identification provides a single meson matrix M from which both electroweak Higgs doublets emerge ($H_d = M^{1,2}$, $H_u = \text{adj}(M)^{1,2}$), with no independent Yukawa matrices. The 9 mesinos furnish the SM lepton sector; the diquark partners fill the symmetric **15** of $SU(5)_f$.

2. The emergent $\mathcal{N}=2$ doublet ($M_i, \text{adj}(M)_i$) per family, broken to $\mathcal{N}=1$ by a quartic coupling, generates electroweak isospin: the direct and inverse branches produce up-type and down-type mass hierarchies from the same charge structure.

3. The charge-squared mass law $m = \mathfrak{z}^2$, uniquely selected by the requirement that $K = 2/3$ be direction-independent in the Cartan subalgebra, produces an energy-balance condition satisfied by the charged leptons (0.001%), the meson triple ($-\pi, D_s, B$) (0.10%), the inverse down quarks (0.22%), and the quark chain to $\sim 1\%$. The O’Raifeartaigh model produces the seed spectrum at $gv/m = \sqrt{3}$.

4. The electroweak gauge bosons are accommodated through a Casimir eigenvalue equation predicting $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.22310$ (0.4σ).

5. The string/M-theory embedding: the Diophantine counting selects $N = 3$ generations; the composites fill $\mathbf{24} \oplus \mathbf{15} \oplus \overline{\mathbf{15}}$ of $SU(5)_f$, contained in the SO(32) adjoint but not $E_8 \times E_8$. In M-theory, mesons are M2-branes and baryons are M5-branes, with the charge-squared mass law reflecting the membrane dimensionality $p = 2$.

The framework has four continuous inputs for 13 observables, with the CKM elements depending only on the self-dual ratio $R = (5 + \sqrt{21})/2$. The most pressing open problems are the Kähler metric, the origin of the sector angle α , the CKM integers, and the PMNS mixing pattern.

Acknowledgments

During the preparation of this work the author used Claude (Anthropic) for algebraic verification, numerical checks, and drafting assistance. The author reviewed and edited all content and takes full responsibility for the publication.

References

- [1] G.F. Chew, Rev. Mod. Phys. **34**, 394 (1962).

- [2] H. Miyazawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **36**, 1266 (1966).
- [3] S. Catto and F. Gürsey, Nuovo Cim. A **86**, 201 (1985).
- [4] A. Rivero, Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, 1058 (2024), arXiv:2407.05397.
- [5] D.V. Volkov and V.P. Akulov, Phys. Lett. B **46**, 109 (1973).
- [6] E. Fradkin and S.H. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 3682 (1979).
- [7] D.B. Kaplan, Nucl. Phys. B **365**, 259 (1991).
- [8] N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 129 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9411149.
- [9] C. Csáki, M. Schmaltz, and W. Skiba, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 799 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9610139.
- [10] C. Csaki, Y. Shirman, and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 095011 (2011), arXiv:1106.3074.
- [11] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, JHEP **04**, 021 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0602239.
- [12] Y. Koide, Phys. Lett. B **120**, 161 (1983).
- [13] Y. Koide, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **5**, 2319 (1990).
- [14] A. Rivero, arXiv:hep-ph/0505220 (2005).
- [15] A. Rivero, arXiv:hep-ph/0510068 (2005).
- [16] P. Zenczykowski, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 117303 (2012).
- [17] Y. Sumino, JHEP **05**, 075 (2009), arXiv:0812.2103.
- [18] A. Hanany and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **492**, 152 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9611230.
- [19] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [20] R. Gatto, G. Sartori, and M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. B **28**, 128 (1968).
- [21] J.C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 275 (1974).
- [22] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **426**, 19 (1994), arXiv:hep-th/9407087.
- [23] A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. B **136**, 387 (1984).
- [24] S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 329 (1984).
- [25] L. O’Raifeartaigh, Nucl. Phys. B **96**, 331 (1975).
- [26] M. Ünsal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 032005 (2008), arXiv:0708.1772.
- [27] S.P. Martin and D.G. Robertson, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 073004 (2019), arXiv:1907.02500.
- [28] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. B **86**, 297 (1979).
- [29] P.K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. B **373**, 68 (1996), arXiv:hep-th/9507048.
- [30] A. Blumhofer and M. Hutter, Nucl. Phys. B **484**, 80 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9605393.