Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Applied Physics and Mathematical Modeling
DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

Gauge Structure, Experimental Successes, and Open Problems in the Standard Model

Leon Jia Chen Yu

Prince of Wales Secondary School, Vancouver, Canada
leonyu09@gmail.com

Abstract. The Standard Model provides the present theoretical basis for describing elementary particles and three of the four known fundamental interactions, namely the electromagnetic, weak, and strong forces. Rather than emerging from a single discovery, the framework was gradually established through the interaction of quantum-field-theoretical developments and increasingly precise experiments. Its ability to reproduce a wide range of measured particle properties constitutes one of its principal achievements. An especially important milestone was reached in 2012, when the Higgs boson was observed at the Large Hadron Collider, supplying experimental support for the mechanism through which electroweak symmetry breaking generates particle masses. Nevertheless, experimental success does not make the minimal theory complete. It neither incorporates gravity nor contains a satisfactory particle candidate for cosmological dark matter. Moreover, the observation of neutrino oscillations demonstrates that neutrinos possess nonzero masses, a feature absent from the Minimal Standard Model. This paper reviews the gauge organization underlying the theory, the role of electroweak precision measurements, the discovery and subsequent study of the Higgs boson, and two major indications of physics beyond the minimal framework: neutrino mass and dark matter. Taken together, these examples show that the Standard Model remains exceptionally predictive while simultaneously providing clear directions for the search for a more complete description of fundamental physics.

Keywords: Standard Model, gauge symmetry, electroweak precision tests, Higgs boson, neutrino oscillations, dark matter

1. Introduction

One of the enduring questions in physics is how the elementary constituents of matter interact and how apparently different forces can be represented within a common theoretical language. During the twentieth century, advances in quantum mechanics, relativity, field theory, and accelerator experiments gradually produced what is now called the Standard Model of particle physics. Within its established range of applicability, this framework gives a quantitative account of electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions between elementary particles and has survived a remarkably broad set of experimental tests [1].

The predictive character of the theory became particularly evident as particles and interactions anticipated by its mathematical structure were experimentally confirmed. An important final step in

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

establishing the particle content of the minimal theory occurred in 2012, when the ATLAS and CMS experiments independently observed a Higgs-like boson at the Large Hadron Collider. Subsequent measurements showed that the newly discovered particle was consistent with the Higgs boson expected in the Standard Model. Its observation supplied direct experimental support for electroweak symmetry breaking and for the mechanism through which the W and Z bosons, as well as fermions, acquire mass [2, 3].

The achievements of the Standard Model, however, should be distinguished from the question of whether the theory is fundamental and complete. Several observations cannot be explained within its minimal particle content. Gravity is not incorporated into the framework, no accepted Standard Model particle can account for cold dark matter, and neutrino oscillation measurements require nonzero neutrino masses. Problems such as the origin of the matter-antimatter imbalance and the hierarchy associated with the electroweak scale also remain open [1]. Consequently, the same theory that provides highly successful predictions also identifies phenomena for which additional physics is required.

This paper examines that contrast between success and incompleteness. It first considers the gauge structure on which the Standard Model is built. It then discusses electroweak precision tests and the experimental discovery of the Higgs boson as major confirmations of the theory. Finally, neutrino masses and dark matter are considered as two particularly clear reasons why the minimal formulation cannot be regarded as the final description of fundamental particles and interactions.

2. Gauge structure of the standard model

At the mathematical level, the Standard Model is a quantum field theory organized by local gauge symmetries. Its gauge group is

$$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \tag{1}$$

where the three factors encode different parts of the known non-gravitational interactions. The $SU(3)_C$ sector is associated with the strong interaction, whereas $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ provides the starting symmetry for the electroweak sector. Once the particle fields are assigned to representations of these groups, gauge invariance strongly restricts the possible interactions and determines the corresponding gauge fields [1].

The strong interaction is described by quantum chromodynamics (QCD), whose underlying symmetry is $SU(3)_C$. Quarks possess color charge and therefore couple to gluons, the gauge bosons of QCD. Eight gluon fields arise from this symmetry. Unlike the photon in an Abelian gauge theory, gluons themselves carry the relevant gauge charge and consequently interact with one another. This non-Abelian property is essential for understanding the distinctive energy dependence of the strong force. At short distances, the effective interaction between quarks becomes weaker, leading to asymptotic freedom, whereas at low energies quarks and gluons are not observed as isolated free particles, a behavior associated with confinement [4, 5].

The weak and electromagnetic forces originate from a different part of the gauge structure. Before electroweak symmetry breaking, they are represented through $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. The theory treats the two chiralities of fermions differently: left-handed fermions participate in $SU(2)_L$ doublets, whereas their right-handed counterparts are $SU(2)_L$ singlets. Following symmetry breaking, combinations of the original electroweak gauge fields become the physical W^+, W^-, Z^0,

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

and photon fields. The residual electromagnetic $U(1)_{EM}$ symmetry is not broken, which is why the photon remains massless, while the weak gauge bosons become massive [6-8].

This change in the symmetry structure is produced through the Higgs field. Its lowest-energy configuration has a nonzero vacuum expectation value, so the vacuum does not preserve the full electroweak symmetry even though the underlying theory remains gauge invariant. Interactions between this Higgs background and the electroweak gauge fields generate the masses of the $W^{\pm}$ and Z^0 bosons. Fermion masses arise differently: Yukawa couplings connect fermion fields to the Higgs field, and after symmetry breaking these interactions appear as mass terms for charged leptons and quarks [6-8].

An important strength of this construction is that it does more than classify particles. Because masses, interaction strengths, and electroweak observables are connected by the gauge structure, measurable quantities must satisfy definite relationships. Tests performed at LEP, SLC, the Tevatron, and the LHC have shown broad agreement with these predictions, often at very high experimental precision [1]. Such agreement provides evidence that the gauge-theory description is not merely a convenient organization of known particles but captures important features of their dynamics.

At the same time, the gauge principle does not determine every quantity appearing in the Standard Model. The numerical values of the Yukawa couplings are inputs rather than predictions, and the theory does not explain why fermions occur in three generations. The minimal construction also lacks a satisfactory explanation for neutrino masses and for the observed dominance of matter over antimatter. These unresolved features are consistent with the possibility that the Standard Model is an effective low-energy description embedded in a broader theory at higher energy scales [1].

3. Electroweak precision tests

Electroweak precision measurements provide a particularly demanding way of testing the Standard Model because they compare observables measured with high accuracy against predictions that include detailed quantum corrections. Rather than searching only for new particles that can be directly produced, this approach examines whether measured quantities remain mutually consistent when interpreted through the electroweak theory. Even small departures from the predicted relationships could therefore indicate contributions from physics not contained in the Standard Model [1].

Much of the precision program was developed using data from LEP and SLC and was later supplemented by measurements from the Tevatron and the LHC. The observables considered include the masses of the W and Z bosons, the effective weak mixing angle, decay widths of the Z, and several asymmetries in electroweak processes. These measurements are valuable partly because quantum loop corrections allow particles that are not directly produced in a given reaction to influence observable quantities. Precision measurements can consequently carry information about heavy states through their virtual effects.

A global electroweak analysis places many such measurements into a single theoretical framework. According to the Particle Data Group, the overall consistency between Standard Model calculations and the available electroweak data is very strong [1]. Agreement at this level also tests the quantum structure of the theory: higher-order radiative corrections are necessary to reproduce the measured observables accurately. The success of these calculations therefore supports the renormalizable gauge-theory formulation of the electroweak interaction.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

One of the historically important consequences of precision analysis concerned the Higgs sector. Before a Higgs boson had been observed directly, loop corrections in electroweak quantities already restricted the range of Higgs masses compatible with the Standard Model. The particle later discovered near 125 GeV lies within the range favored by the earlier indirect information, providing an additional consistency check of the framework [9]. The same precision methodology can be used to constrain possible non-Standard-Model effects, including those summarized through the oblique parameters S, T, and U [1].

Not every electroweak measurement is numerically identical in its implications, and differences among some determinations-most notably measurements related to the W -boson mass-continue to receive attention. Such discrepancies must be assessed together with experimental uncertainties, correlations among measured quantities, and the accuracy of higher-order calculations [1]. Their existence does not by itself establish new physics, but increasing precision may make electroweak observables sensitive to departures too small to be detected through direct particle searches. For this reason, precision tests remain complementary to high-energy collider searches.

4. Discovery of the Higgs boson by ATLAS and CMS

The 2012 observation of a new boson at the LHC was a decisive experimental development because the Higgs sector had remained the last unconfirmed component of the Minimal Standard Model. On 4 July 2012, the ATLAS and CMS collaborations separately reported evidence for a new particle with a mass in the vicinity of 125 GeV . The statistical strength of the observations satisfied the standard discovery criterion in high-energy physics, and the consistency between two independent experiments greatly strengthened the interpretation of the signals [2, 3].

The analyses used proton-proton collision samples collected at center-of-mass energies of 7 TeV and 8 TeV. Because a Standard Model Higgs boson can be both produced and decay in several ways, the searches combined information from multiple processes. Relevant production mechanisms included gluon fusion, vector-boson fusion, associated production with a W or Z boson, and production involving top quarks. Particularly important discovery sensitivity was obtained from final states with comparatively good invariant-mass resolution, especially

$$H \to \gamma\gamma \tag{2}$$

and

$$H \to ZZ^* \to 4l \tag{3}$$

while channels such as

$$H \to WW^* \tag{4}$$

provided additional evidence [4, 5].

ATLAS initially reported a mass close to 126 GeV, whereas the corresponding CMS result was close to 125 GeV. In each experiment, the local statistical significance of the observed excess

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

reached the five-standard-deviation level conventionally required for a discovery claim. The two results were therefore not simply modest deviations from background expectations; together they represented compelling experimental evidence for a previously unobserved boson [4, 5].

Discovery alone was not sufficient to establish that this state was the Standard Model Higgs boson. Subsequent analyses used larger collision samples to investigate its detailed characteristics, including mass, spin and parity, production strengths, decay rates, and couplings. Measurements from ATLAS and CMS have shown that, within present uncertainties, these characteristics are compatible with the Standard Model expectation [10]. Observation of Higgs interactions with fermions and measurements across several production mechanisms are especially important because they test whether the new particle participates in the mass-generation framework in the manner expected from electroweak symmetry breaking.

The experimental confirmation of a Higgs-like state therefore strongly supports the mechanism built into the Standard Model, but it does not answer every question associated with the Higgs sector. The theory still leaves open the hierarchy problem and the deeper reason for the observed electroweak scale. Nor does Higgs discovery explain dark matter or the mechanism responsible for neutrino mass. Precision studies of Higgs production and decay thus serve a second purpose: small, reproducible departures from Standard Model expectations could provide indirect clues about additional particles or interactions [1].

5. Neutrino masses

Neutrino oscillation is one of the most direct experimental observations showing that the minimal form of the Standard Model cannot be complete. In that formulation, only left-handed neutrino fields are present and neutrinos are treated as massless. If neutrino mass eigenstates were absent, the flavor composition established when a neutrino is produced would not undergo the oscillatory propagation now observed experimentally. Flavor conversion therefore requires a mismatch between flavor and mass eigenstates and, consequently, nonzero neutrino masses.

The atmospheric-neutrino results reported by the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration in 1998 provided decisive evidence for this phenomenon. Super-Kamiokande detects neutrinos through interactions in a large water Cherenkov detector. Atmospheric neutrinos are generated when cosmic rays interact with the Earth's atmosphere, allowing the experiment to compare neutrinos that have propagated over very different distances. A deficit was observed in the upward-going muon-neutrino sample relative to expectations, while the behavior of electron-neutrino events was different. Because upward-going neutrinos cross a substantial portion of the Earth before detection, the dependence of the deficit on propagation distance was naturally explained by conversion of muon neutrinos into another flavor. The observed pattern strongly favored neutrino oscillations and thereby supplied evidence for nonzero neutrino mass [11].

Measurements of solar and reactor neutrinos provided an independent part of the oscillation picture. The Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) was particularly important because it could distinguish between reactions sensitive specifically to electron neutrinos and reactions sensitive to the total active-neutrino flux. SNO found that the solar electron-neutrino component was smaller than expected while the combined active-neutrino flux remained compatible with predictions of solar models. This showed that the solar-neutrino deficit resulted from transformation among neutrino flavors rather than simply from an incorrect total solar-neutrino production rate [12].

The KamLAND reactor experiment supplied complementary evidence by observing electron-antineutrino disappearance over much shorter terrestrial distances. Both the energy dependence and the distance dependence of the measured deficit agreed with the oscillation interpretation,

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

supporting the large-mixing-angle solution of the solar-neutrino problem [13]. Together with accelerator and atmospheric measurements, these experiments established the three-flavor neutrino-oscillation framework with high precision [1].

Oscillation experiments determine mass-squared differences, not the individual absolute neutrino masses. Even so, the existence of nonzero mass differences means that at least two neutrino mass eigenstates cannot have zero mass. This result conflicts with the massless-neutrino assumption of the Minimal Standard Model and requires some extension to its particle content or interactions.

Several possibilities have been developed to account for these masses. Introducing right-handed neutrinos permits the construction of Dirac mass terms, while alternative models allow neutrinos to be Majorana particles. The seesaw mechanism provides an influential example in which very light observed neutrinos are connected to much heavier neutral fermionic states. Different neutrino-mass theories can therefore be classified in part by whether the neutrino is Dirac or Majorana and by what additional fields or high-energy interactions are introduced [14]. The experimental existence of neutrino mass is established, but the underlying mass-generation mechanism remains unknown.

6. Dark matter

Dark matter represents a second major limitation of the Standard Model, although the evidence for it originates primarily from astronomy and cosmology rather than laboratory particle experiments. A variety of observations require more gravitationally active matter than can be provided by visible baryons alone. The Particle Data Group summarizes this evidence within the standard ΛCDM cosmological picture, in which cold non-baryonic dark matter contributes approximately 26% of the total cosmic energy density and about 84% of the matter content [1].

The case for dark matter does not depend on a single measurement. Galaxy rotation, the motion of galaxies within clusters, gravitational lensing, cosmic microwave background anisotropies, and the development of large-scale cosmic structure all indicate the gravitational influence of an unseen component. Although the relevant scales and physical systems differ, the same general conclusion emerges: the mass associated with luminous baryonic matter is insufficient to account for the observed gravitational behavior [1].

No particle in the Standard Model has all of the properties required for the dominant cold-dark-matter component. Electrically charged particles would interact electromagnetically and would therefore not remain dark in the required sense. Free quarks cannot provide the missing matter because confinement prevents their existence as isolated macroscopic relics. Standard neutrinos are neutral and interact weakly, but their masses and thermal history make them unsuitable as the principal cold-dark-matter component. Because ordinary neutrinos remained relativistic for an extended period in the early Universe, they behave as hot rather than cold dark matter and cannot reproduce the observed pattern of cosmic structure by themselves [1].

These difficulties have motivated a broad range of proposed particles beyond the Standard Model. Frequently discussed possibilities include weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs), axions, sterile neutrinos, and states predicted in extensions such as supersymmetric theories. Their cosmological abundances may arise through several mechanisms, including thermal freeze-out, freeze-in, nonthermal processes, phase-transition-related production, or the decay of heavier particles [15].

Experimental searches are commonly divided into direct detection, indirect detection, and collider production. Direct-detection experiments attempt to observe the small recoil of ordinary nuclei after scattering with a dark-matter particle. To suppress backgrounds, these detectors are usually operated in highly shielded underground environments. Indirect searches instead look for

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

particles that could result from dark-matter decay or annihilation, such as gamma rays, neutrinos, or antimatter. Collider experiments take a third approach: they attempt to create dark-sector particles in high-energy collisions. Because an invisible particle would escape the detector without depositing its energy, its production could be inferred through an imbalance in measured transverse momentum.

These complementary searches have eliminated or restricted substantial regions of the parameter space associated with many proposed models, but no dark-matter particle has yet been conclusively identified [1]. An example is provided by the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) experiment. Using its initial 60-day exposure with a 5.5-tonne liquid-xenon time-projection chamber, LZ searched for interactions expected from WIMPs. No statistically significant nuclear-recoil excess attributable to WIMPs was observed. The resulting upper limit on the spin-independent WIMP-nucleon scattering cross section reached approximately $9.2\times10^{-48}\,\mathrm{cm}^2$ for a WIMP mass of approximately $36\,\mathrm{GeV/c}^2$ [16]. The result demonstrates the high sensitivity achieved by modern underground detectors while also illustrating the continuing lack of a confirmed conventional WIMP signal.

Dark matter therefore illustrates an important boundary of the Standard Model. The model is highly successful in describing known elementary particles, yet the gravitational evidence for an additional cosmological matter component cannot be accommodated by those particles. Establishing the microscopic identity of dark matter remains one of the principal experimental and theoretical motivations for extending particle physics beyond the Standard Model.

7. Conclusion

The Standard Model has achieved a level of experimental confirmation reached by very few physical theories. Its gauge structure,

$$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{\mathrm{Y}} \tag{5}$$

organizes the strong and electroweak interactions within a mathematically consistent quantum field theory. QCD accounts for the strong interaction through the $\mathrm{SU(3)_C}$ sector, while the electroweak part of the theory combines $\mathrm{SU(2)_L}$ and $\mathrm{U(1)_Y}$. Spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking and the Higgs field then provide a mechanism through which the weak gauge bosons and charged fermions acquire mass without abandoning the underlying gauge principle.

The accuracy of electroweak precision measurements provides one line of evidence for this framework, while the discovery of the Higgs boson by ATLAS and CMS provides another. The observed Higgs mass near $125\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and subsequent measurements of its production and decay properties are broadly consistent with Standard Model expectations. These achievements show that the theory successfully connects an abstract gauge structure to experimentally measurable quantities.

At the same time, experimental observations establish that the Minimal Standard Model cannot be the complete description of nature. Neutrino oscillations demonstrate that neutrinos have nonzero masses, requiring physics not contained in the minimal formulation. Cosmological and astronomical measurements independently require dark matter, yet none of the established Standard Model particles can provide the dominant cold-dark-matter component. Questions involving the hierarchy of physical scales, the cosmic matter-antimatter asymmetry, and a quantum treatment of gravity further reinforce the expectation that a more comprehensive framework remains to be developed.

Future progress will therefore depend both on increasing the precision of Standard Model tests and on extending experimental sensitivity to new phenomena. The High-Luminosity Large Hadron

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.38963

Collider will enable more detailed measurements of Higgs and electroweak processes; next-generation neutrino experiments will refine the neutrino-mixing picture and investigate unresolved properties of neutrinos; and increasingly sensitive dark-matter experiments will continue to explore previously inaccessible interaction strengths and mass ranges. Whether the next major advance appears as a small inconsistency in precision data or as the direct observation of an entirely new particle, such results will build upon the Standard Model rather than erase its achievements. The theory is therefore best understood as an extraordinarily successful description of presently established particle physics and, at the same time, as the foundation from which searches for a deeper theory proceed.

References

[1] Navas, S., et al. (2024). Review of particle physics. *Physical Review D, 110*(3), 030001. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001

[2] The CMS Collaboration. (2012). Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC. *Physics Letters B, 716*(1), 30–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021

[3] The ATLAS Collaboration. (2012). Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Physics Letters B, 716*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020

[4] Gross, D. J., & Wilczek, F. (1973). Ultraviolet behavior of non-Abelian gauge theories. *Physical Review Letters, 30*(26), 1343–1346. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.30.1343

[5] Politzer, H. D. (1973). Reliable perturbative results for strong interactions? *Physical Review Letters, 30*(26), 1346–1349. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.30.1346

[6] Englert, F., & Brout, R. (1964). Broken symmetry and the mass of gauge vector mesons. *Physical Review Letters, 13*(9), 321–323. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321

[7] Higgs, P. W. (1964). Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons. *Physical Review Letters, 13*(16), 508–509. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508

[8] Guralnik, G. S., Hagen, C. R., & Kibble, T. W. B. (1964). Global conservation laws and massless particles. *Physical Review Letters, 13*(20), 585–587. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.585

[9] ALEPH Collaboration et al. (n.d.). Precision electroweak measurements and constraints on the standard model. *arXiv.org*. Retrieved August 25, 2026, from https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.2367v2

[10] ATLAS and C. Collaborations. (2016). Measurements of the Higgs boson production and decay rates and constraints on its couplings from a combined ATLAS and CMS analysis of the LHC collision data at 7 and 8 TeV. *Journal of High Energy Physics, 2016*(8), 45. https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2016)045

[11] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration et al. (1998). Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos. *Physical Review Letters, 81*(8), 1562–1567. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.1562

[12] SNO Collaboration et al. (2002). Direct evidence for neutrino flavor transformation from neutral-current interactions in the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory. *Physical Review Letters, 89*(1), 011301. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.011301

[13] KamLAND Collaboration et al. (2003). First results from KamLAND: Evidence for reactor antineutrino disappearance. *Physical Review Letters, 90*(2), 021802. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.021802

[14] Mohapatra, R. N., et al. (2007). Theory of neutrinos: A white paper. *Reports on Progress in Physics, 70*(11), 1757–1867. https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/70/11/R02

[15] Bertone, G. (2018). History of dark matter. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 90*(4). https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.90.045002

[16] LUX-ZEPLIN Collaboration et al. (2023). First dark matter search results from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) experiment. *Physical Review Letters, 131*(4), 041002. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.041002