

# Novel nonlinear kinetic terms for gravitons

Wenliang LI<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*APC, Université Paris 7, CNRS/IN2P3, CEA/IRFU, Obs. de Paris,  
Sorbonne Paris Cité, Bâtiment Condorcet, 10 rue Alice Domon et Léonie Duquet,  
F-75205 Paris Cedex 13, France (UMR 7164 du CNRS)*

<sup>2</sup>*Crete Center for Theoretical Physics (CTTP) and Crete Center for Quantum Complexity and Nanotechnology (CCQCN),  
Department of Physics, University of Crete, P.O. Box 2208, 71003, Heraklion, Greece*

(Dated: March 5, 2022)

A set of novel derivative terms for spin-2 fields are proposed. They are the wedge products of curvature two-forms and vielbeins. In this work, we investigate the properties of novel two-derivative terms in the context of bi-gravity. Based on a minisuperspace analysis, we identify a large class of bi-gravity models where the Boulware-Deser ghost could be absent. We give a new perspective that Weyl Gravity and New Massive Gravity belong to this class of bi-gravity models involving novel derivative terms. In addition, we discuss the UV cut-off scales, dynamical symmetric conditions and novel higher-derivative terms.

## I. INTRODUCTION.

In the pursuit of going beyond Einstein, extensive efforts have been devoted to constructing gravitational theories that are different from general relativity. It is believed that the Einstein-Hilbert action with a cosmological constant is the only consistent nonlinear action for single massless spin-two field, so additional ingredients are necessary: Fierz-Pauli theory gives the graviton a mass term [1]; Brans-Dicke theory introduces a scalar degree of freedom [2]; Lovelock theory involves higher spacetime dimensions and higher derivative terms [3].

Motivated by the unexpected accelerating expansion of the present universe [4], more models were constructed in recent attempts, such as high derivative scalar theories [5] and nonlinear massive gravity [6]. One of the guiding principles is that a consistent model should be free of Ostrogradsky's ghost arising from higher order equations of motion.

Antisymmetrization is a universal element in these new models. Based on this ingredient, a general framework was developed for ghost-free<sup>1</sup>, Lorentz-invariant, Lagrangian field theories [7, 8]. In this framework, a set of novel kinetic terms for spin-2 fields were proposed

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} = R(E^{(1)}) \wedge E^{(2)} \wedge \cdots \wedge E^{(d-1)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $d$  is the number of spacetime dimensions. They are the wedge products of geometric differential forms: a curvature two-form and several vielbeins. The vielbeins  $E^{(k)}$  can be the same or different<sup>2</sup>. Geometric intuition was used to construct these nonlinear terms.

Along the line of Lovelock theory, we can build novel higher-derivative terms for spin-2 fields by introducing more curvature two-forms into the wedge products

$$R(E^{(1)}) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E^{(1)}) \wedge E^{(2)} \wedge \cdots \wedge E^{(n)}, \quad (2)$$

which is possible when spacetime has more than four dimensions. Lovelock terms correspond to the cases where all the vielbeins are the same.

If the wedge products do not involve derivative terms, they are nonlinear potential terms for spin-2 fields

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pot}} = E^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge E^{(d)}. \quad (3)$$

which include the cosmological constant term and other interacting potentials for spin-2 fields [6, 9–11] in the vielbein formulation [10]<sup>3</sup>. These potential terms are usually free of the Boulware-Deser (BD) ghost<sup>4</sup>. For simplicity, they are denoted by de Rham-Gabadadze-Tolley (dRGT) terms<sup>5</sup>.

The search for new derivative interactions was initiated in [14] where a new BD-ghost-free term in 4d was discovered

$$h_{\mu}^{[\mu} h_{\nu}^{\nu} \partial_{\rho} \partial^{\rho} h_{\sigma}^{\sigma]}. \quad (4)$$

This cubic term can be thought of as a generalization of the perturbative Lovelock and dRGT terms and there are more possible terms in higher dimensions [15]. It was also conjectured that they should admit nonlinear completions in parallel to the dRGT terms in the context of massive gravity [15].

Some of the novel kinetic terms in (1) are nonlinear, multi-gravity completions of this cubic term in terms of differential

\* lii.wenliang@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Let us clarify that "ghost-free" in this framework means the building blocks are potentially free of Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost. In other words, the corresponding equations of motion for the scalar modes could be at most of second order. The scalar modes may come from the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition of tensor fields.

<sup>2</sup> If all the vielbeins coincide, we have the standard Einstein-Hilbert kinetic term.

<sup>3</sup> In 1970, J. Wess and B. Zumino already proposed to use vielbeins, rather than metrics, as the building blocks of the low energy effective potentials for spin-2 fields [12]. However, it is still not fully clear why the vielbein formulation is more efficient in eliminating the Boulware-Deser ghost.

<sup>4</sup> In a concrete model, the BD ghost may be present even if the building blocks themselves are free of it. For example, the BD ghost is excited if loop-type interactions are introduced in the metric formulation [10]. Analogously, we find constraints on novel derivative terms.

<sup>5</sup> We refer to [13] for reviews of this subject.

forms<sup>6</sup>. If we consider two spin-2 fields, impose the symmetric condition [16] and fix the second metric to Minkowski, the novel kinetic terms reduce to the two-derivative terms proposed in [17], which are nonlinear derivative terms for a massive graviton around a Minkowski background. They can also be obtained by dimensionally deconstructing the Gauss-Bonnet term [18].

In the discussions of [17] and [18], only one metric is dynamical and the Boulware-Deser ghost was shown to be present. **In this work, we will not make the single dynamical metric assumption, and the conclusion is different concerning the fate of the Boulware-Deser ghost.**

In [18], new kinetic interactions in 4d with a dynamical metric and a fixed Minkowski metric were investigated in detail. In the minisuperspace approximation, problematic  $N^{-2}$  terms were found in the Lagrangians and the corresponding Hamiltonians are nonlinear in the lapse function  $N$ . This indicates the secondary constraint from the time derivative of  $\pi_N = 0$  is an equation for  $N$ <sup>7</sup>. Then the dangerous, sixth degree of freedom remains dynamical. In 4d massive gravity, the sixth degree of freedom is ghost-like. It plagues a generic nonlinear completion of Fierz-Pauli theory and is known as the Boulware-Deser (BD) ghost [19]<sup>8</sup>. This ghost-like degree of freedom is eliminated in nonlinear massive gravity [6] thanks to the existence of a secondary constraint and an associated tertiary constraint [20]. Besides the minisuperspace discussion, an impressive no-go theorem was established in [18] on new kinetic interactions for single dynamical metric models that are Lorentz-invariant and free of the BD ghost.

Inspired by the successful extensions of massive gravity [6] to bi-gravity [9] and multi-gravity [10], we would like to examine the bi-gravity models involving the novel derivative terms (1). Given that pathologies were found in single dynamical metric models, it is very likely that the bi-gravity theories are sick as well. In fact, more recently, bi-gravity models with new kinetic interactions were studied in the first order formulation [21], where negative results were presented again<sup>9</sup>. Other obstructions were discussed in [22] as well.

Contrary to the single dynamical metric models, our analysis in section III show that the sixth degree of freedom could be absent in some bi-gravity models constructed from (1). But the price to pay is that one of the linearized kinetic terms has a wrong sign or at least one of them vanishes. In the former case, we encounter spin-2 ghosts, which can lead to tree-level non-unitarity upon quantization. In the latter

case, the bi-gravity theories are strongly coupled due to the absence of kinetic terms.

The presence of a spin-2 ghost is a well-known feature of a generic model of higher derivative gravity. In this work, we propose a new viewpoint that, when the couplings to matter are not introduced, a large type of bi-gravity models are equivalent to higher derivative gravity without Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost. They include Weyl gravity, 3d New Massive Gravity and some of their generalizations.

At the classical level, a spin-0 ghost is more dangerous than a spin-2 ghost. Usually, the Hamiltonian of a scalar ghost is unbounded from below, while that of a massless spin-2 field may simply vanish. In this sense, it is more crucial to eliminate the Boulware-Deser ghost. Furthermore, the Boulware-Deser ghost should be removed if a massive spin-2 field contains a correct number of dynamical degrees of freedom, which is at most 5 in four dimensions.

Upon quantization, a spin-2 ghost will lead to tree-level non-unitarity when coupled to matter. Let us remind that a notorious problem in quantizing gravity is that the Einstein-Hilbert action is non-renormalizable [23], which is very different from the other fundamental forces. By introducing higher order curvature terms (thus unitarity is sacrificed), one can improve the short-distance behaviour of the propagators and obtain a perturbative renormalizable theory for gravity [24]. Roughly speaking, the improved high energy behaviour are due to the relatively negative contributions from the ghost modes, which is analogous to the role of heavy ghost-like modes in Pauli-Villars regularization and superpartners in supersymmetric theories.

From a different perspective, we can consider a metric as an effective description of some microscopic physics. In an effective field theory (EFT) of gravity, higher order curvature terms are expected in a low energy expansion, because they are compatible with the symmetries [25]. Even if gravity itself is not quantized, they can be generated by quantum corrections from the matter. Therefore, some bi-gravity models with novel kinetic terms belong to a special class of effective field theories of gravity where Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost is removed.

The cut-off scale of an EFT of gravity is usually associated with the Planck mass. However, if some of the high order curvature terms have unnaturally large coefficients, then the cut-off scale will be lowered. By eliminating the BD ghost, we could increase the cut-off scale set by large high order curvature corrections.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we give the precise formulation of the novel kinetic terms for 4d bi-gravity models. In section III, we carry out a minisuperspace analysis to identify the candidate theories that are free of the dangerous, sixth degrees of freedom. In section IV, we perform a field redefinition to obtain more explicit expressions of the novel kinetic terms. In section V, we focus on the novel kinetic term  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  and discuss its relation to higher curvature gravity. In section VI, we linearize the nonlinear models and

<sup>6</sup> When the first version of this work appeared in arxiv, we were informed that similar nonlinear completions were studied before by K. Hinterbichler and R. A. Rosen.

<sup>7</sup> The absence of an additional constraint was already found in [17], which should be present after a change of variables.

<sup>8</sup> By an abuse of terminology, the sixth degree of freedom of a massless spin-2 field in 4d is also denoted by the Boulware-Deser (BD) ghost.

<sup>9</sup> To avoid confusion, let us emphasize that we consider second order formulation in this work, so spin connections are not independent. In other words, we assume the torsion-free condition.

diagonalize the quadratic actions. In section VII, the issue of spin-2 ghost is discussed. In section VIII, we examine the cut-off scales of the effective field theories of gravity involving novel kinetic terms. In section IX, we explain how to obtain the symmetric condition from the equations of motion. In section X, higher derivative generalizations are discussed and a general argument for the absence of the BD ghost is presented. In section XI, we summarize our results and discuss their implications.

## II. NOVEL KINETIC TERMS FOR BI-GRAVITY

To be more specific, we mainly consider four dimensional spacetime and models with two vielbeins/metrics. There are six possible nonlinear kinetic terms

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge E \wedge E, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{kin}} = R(F) \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{kin}} = R(F) \wedge F \wedge E, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_6^{\text{kin}} = R(F) \wedge E \wedge E, \quad (10)$$

where  $R(E)$ ,  $R(F)$  are curvature two-forms

$$R(E) = d\omega^E + \omega^E \wedge \omega^E, \quad (11)$$

$$R(F) = d\omega^F + \omega^F \wedge \omega^F. \quad (12)$$

Both  $E$  and  $F$  are dynamical vielbeins.  $\omega^E$  and  $\omega^F$  are the spin connections compatible with  $E$  and  $F$  respectively

$$D^E E = dE + \omega^E \wedge E = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$D^F F = dF + \omega^F \wedge F = 0. \quad (14)$$

Notice that one of the vielbeins in  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{kin}}$  are Lagrange multipliers. Another interesting observation is that  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_6^{\text{kin}}$  can be thought of as the Palatini formulation of the Einstein-Hilbert term, where the spin-connections are expressed in terms of the associated vielbeins<sup>10</sup>.

We also have five potential terms

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge E \wedge E \wedge E, \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge E \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge E \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (17)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge F \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (18)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}} = F \wedge F \wedge F \wedge F. \quad (19)$$

When we discuss other dimensions, the subscripts  $n$  in  $\mathcal{L}_n$  means that the number of  $F$  vielbeins in a wedge product is

$(n-1)$ . The two vielbeins  $E_\mu^A$  and  $F_\mu^A$  are related to two metrics  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $f_{\mu\nu}$

$$g_{\mu\nu} = E_\mu^A E_\nu^B \eta_{AB}, \quad f_{\mu\nu} = F_\mu^A F_\nu^B \eta_{AB}. \quad (20)$$

The nonlinear kinetic terms  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_4$  are the standard Einstein-Hilbert kinetic terms, while  $\mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3, \mathcal{L}_5, \mathcal{L}_6$  are novel kinetic terms for spin-2 fields.

To simplify our notation, the Levi-Civita symbol  $\epsilon_{ABCD}$  is not written explicitly in a wedge product. In terms of the components, the bi-gravity kinetic terms (5-10) and the bi-gravity potential terms (15-19) are

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(E)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} E_\rho^C E_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(E)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} E_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (22)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(E)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} F_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(F)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} F_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(F)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} F_\rho^C E_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_6^{\text{kin}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R(F)_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB} E_\rho^C E_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (26)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} E_\mu^A E_\nu^B E_\rho^C E_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} E_\mu^A E_\nu^B E_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} E_\mu^A E_\nu^B F_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} E_\mu^A F_\nu^B F_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}} = \delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_\mu^A F_\nu^B F_\rho^C F_\sigma^D d^4x, \quad (31)$$

where  $R_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB}$  are the components of the curvature two-forms. The antisymmetric Kronecker delta or the generalized Kronecker delta is an antisymmetric product of the Kronecker deltas

$$\delta_{ABCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \delta_A^{[\mu} \delta_B^{\nu} \delta_C^{\rho} \delta_D^{\sigma]}, \quad (32)$$

where the antisymmetrization [...] is not normalized. The Planck mass is not written explicitly. Greek letters  $\mu, \nu, \rho, \sigma, \dots$  indicate external spacetime indices and capital Latin letters  $A, B, C, D, \dots$  denote internal Lorentz indices.

To minimize the numbers of dynamical degrees of freedom, we impose the symmetric condition or the Deser-van Nieuwenhuizen condition [16]. In section IX, we discuss how the symmetric condition originates in equations of motion.

## III. MINISUPERSPACE ANALYSIS

In this section, we study the minisuperspace approximation of the bi-gravity models constructed from (5-10). The minisuperspace analysis is a simple test of the ghost-free condition before investigating the fully nonlinear structure. Although it is not sufficient to prove healthiness, it is very efficient in detecting pathologies. For example, it was used in [26] to show

<sup>10</sup> The difference is that varying the action with respect to the vielbein in the curvature two-form will give rise to second order equations. "Torsion-free condition" is not the only solution, so  $E$  and  $F$  are not necessarily proportional to each other.

that loop-type interactions of multi-gravity in the metric formulation can excite the BD ghost.

In [18], new kinetic interactions with single dynamical metric were ruled out, because their Hamiltonians are not linear in the lapse function in the minisuperspace approximation, which indicates the presence of the BD-ghost. Despite the failure of single dynamical metric models, a large class of bi-gravity theories do satisfy the criterion that the minisuperspace Hamiltonians are linear in lapse functions, as we discuss below.

Now we start the minisuperspace analysis. The two metrics in the minisuperspace approximation are diagonal

$$ds_1^2 = g_{\mu\nu}^E dx^\mu dx^\nu = -(N_1)^2 dt^2 + e^{2A} dx^2, \quad (33)$$

$$ds_2^2 = g_{\mu\nu}^F dx^\mu dx^\nu = -(N_2)^2 dt^2 + e^{2B} dx^2. \quad (34)$$

where the metric components are functions of time

$$N_1 = N_1(t), \quad N_2 = N_2(t), \quad A = A(t), \quad B = B(t). \quad (35)$$

The corresponding symmetric vielbeins are

$$E_\mu^A = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^A \delta_i^j \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_\mu^A = \begin{pmatrix} N_2 & 0 \\ 0 & e^B \delta_i^j \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Let us consider a linear combination of  $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_6^{\text{kin}}$ , so the Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} = a_1 \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}} + a_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + a_3 \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} + b_1 \mathcal{L}_4^{\text{kin}} + b_2 \mathcal{L}_5^{\text{kin}} + b_3 \mathcal{L}_6^{\text{kin}}. \quad (37)$$

In the minisuperspace approximation, it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{mini}} = & a_1 \frac{1}{N_1} (\dot{A})^2 e^{3A} + b_1 \frac{1}{N_2} (\dot{B})^2 e^{3B} \\ & + a_2 \frac{1}{N_1} \left( \dot{A}^2 + 2\dot{A}\dot{B} - \frac{N_2}{N_1} \dot{A}^2 e^{A-B} \right) e^{2A+B} \\ & + a_3 \frac{1}{N_1} \left( 2\dot{A}\dot{B} - \frac{N_2}{N_1} \dot{A}^2 e^{A-B} \right) e^{A+2B} \\ & + b_2 \frac{1}{N_2} \left( \dot{B}^2 + 2\dot{A}\dot{B} - \frac{N_1}{N_2} \dot{B}^2 e^{B-A} \right) e^{A+2B} \\ & + b_3 \frac{1}{N_2} \left( 2\dot{A}\dot{B} - \frac{N_1}{N_2} \dot{B}^2 e^{B-A} \right) e^{2A+B}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where some normalization factors are inserted to simplify the expression of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mini}}$ . Time derivatives are denoted by dots

$$\frac{d}{dt} A = \dot{A}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} B = \dot{B}. \quad (39)$$

Integration by parts is performed in order to eliminate

$$\dot{N}_1, \quad \dot{N}_2, \quad \ddot{A}, \quad \ddot{B}. \quad (40)$$

The conjugate momenta can be derived from the minisuperspace Lagrangian

$$P_A = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{mini}}}{\partial \dot{A}}, \quad P_B = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{mini}}}{\partial \dot{B}}, \quad (41)$$

$$P_{N_1} = P_{N_2} = 0, \quad (42)$$

where the second line are primary constraints. Then we derive the minisuperspace Hamiltonian by the Legendre transform

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}} = \dot{A} P_A + \dot{B} P_B - \mathcal{L}_{\text{mini}}. \quad (43)$$

Using the relations between momenta and velocities, one can express the Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}$  in terms of

$$N_1, N_2, A, B, P_A, P_B. \quad (44)$$

The explicit expression of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}$  is a fraction

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}} = \frac{\mathcal{H}_n}{4\mathcal{H}_d}, \quad (45)$$

where the numerator  $\mathcal{H}_n$  and the denominator  $\mathcal{H}_d$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n = & (b_3 e^A + b_2 e^B) e^{-2A} P_A^2 (N_1)^3 \\ & + (a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B) e^{-2B} P_B^2 (N_2)^3 \\ & + 2(b_3 e^A + b_2 e^B) e^{-(A+B)} P_A P_B (N_1)^2 N_2 \\ & + 2(a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B) e^{-(A+B)} P_A P_B N_1 (N_2)^2 \\ & - (b_2 e^A + b_1 e^B) e^{-2A} P_A^2 (N_1)^2 N_2 \\ & - (a_1 e^A + a_2 e^B) e^{-2B} P_B^2 N_1 (N_2)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_d = & (b_3 e^A + b_2 e^B) [(a_1 + b_3) e^A + (a_2 + b_2) e^B] (N_1)^2 \\ & + (a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B) [(a_2 + b_2) e^A + (a_3 + b_1) e^B] (N_2)^2 \\ & - [(a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_3) e^{2A} + (a_2 b_1 - a_3 b_2) e^{2B} \\ & + (a_1 b_1 - a_3 b_3) e^{A+B}] N_1 N_2. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

We require  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}$  to be linear in  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ , so  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  are Lagrange multipliers. Then the secondary constraints

$$\dot{P}_{N_1} = \{P_{N_1}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}\} \approx 0, \quad (48)$$

$$\dot{P}_{N_2} = \{P_{N_2}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}\} \approx 0 \quad (49)$$

are equations for the canonical variables and could remove the scalar modes related to the BD ghost<sup>11</sup>. The Poisson bracket is defined as

$$\{\alpha, \beta\} = \sum_{q=A, B, N_1, N_2} \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial q} \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial P_q} - \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial P_q} \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial q} \right) \quad (50)$$

The numerator  $\mathcal{H}_n$  and the denominator  $\mathcal{H}_d$  are polynomials of degree three and two in  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ . To satisfy the requirement that lapse functions are Lagrange multipliers,  $\mathcal{H}_d$  should be a factor of  $\mathcal{H}_n$ . This is true when only one of the three monomials in  $\mathcal{H}_d$  has non-zero coefficient, which indicates two classes of bi-gravity models:

<sup>11</sup> Strictly speaking, we should use the total Hamiltonian which contains the primary constraints to compute the time derivative.



- The first class is

$$a_2 = a_3 = b_2 = b_3 = 0, \quad (51)$$

where the Lagrangian contains two Einstein-Hilbert terms and the minisuperspace Hamiltonian reads

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}^I = N_1 \left( \frac{e^{-3A}}{4a_1} P_A^2 \right) + N_2 \left( \frac{e^{-3B}}{4b_1} P_B^2 \right). \quad (52)$$

One can introduce the cosmological constant terms (15, 19). The interactions between the two metrics are through the nonlinear potential terms (16, 17, 18). The minisuperspace Hamiltonian is still linear in the lapse functions.

Since we have two Planck masses in front of two Einstein-Hilbert terms, one can take the limit where one of them goes to infinity. In this decoupling limit, a bi-gravity model reduces to that of single dynamical metric with a fixed metric.

- The second class is

$$a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 0 \quad (53)$$

or

$$b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = 0. \quad (54)$$

The bi-gravity models in the second class contain at most one Einstein-Hilbert kinetic term (no EH term if  $a_1 = b_1 = 0$ ), so one can not take the decoupling limit that fixes one of the metrics<sup>12 13 14</sup>. Therefore, they are not ruled out by the no-go theorems in [18]. We focus on the case of (54) in the discussions below.

The minisuperspace Hamiltonian with (54) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}^{\text{II}} = & N_1 \left[ \frac{e^{-(A+B)}}{2(a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B)} P_A P_B \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{(a_1 e^A + a_2 e^B) e^{-2B}}{4(a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B)^2} P_B^2 \right] \\ & + N_2 \left[ \frac{e^{-2B}}{4(a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B)} P_B^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where we assume  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  are not zero at the same time.

<sup>12</sup> There exists another single metric limit

$$E - F = H/\lambda, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad (55)$$

where the novel kinetic terms reduce to the Einstein-Hilbert term.

<sup>13</sup> The failure of obtaining nonlinear partially massless gravity from a consistent truncation of conformal gravity [27] is related to the absence of this decoupling limit.

<sup>14</sup> The fact that only certain combinations of kinetic terms are allowed is analogous to the scalar-tensor theories discussed [28], where the degeneracy conditions can break down for some combinations of degenerate Lagrangians.

We can introduce the potential terms  $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}}$ . The lapse functions will still be Lagrange multipliers in the Hamiltonians.

From the holographic point of view, the diagonal diffeomorphism invariance is fundamental in bi-gravity and multi-gravity theories [29]. In the context of the AdS/CFT correspondence, a conformal field theory with conserved stress tensor is dual to a diffeomorphism invariant theory. The massive gravitons (or more general the spin-2 fields without gauge invariance) correspond to spin-2 operators that are not conserved. From this perspective, a massive gravity theory should always admit enhancement to a diffeomorphism invariant theory by turning on the conserved stress tensor in the boundary field theory. However, the converse is less justified. A bi-gravity or a multi-gravity theory may not have a decoupling limit that breaks the diagonal diffeomorphism symmetry, which indicates the conserved stress tensor decouples.

According to the minisuperspace Hamiltonians, there are two classes of bi-gravity models that are potentially free of the Boulware-Deser ghost. The first class of bi-gravity theories were proposed in [9] by promoting the fixed metric in consistent non-linear massive gravity [6]. Only the standard Einstein-Hilbert kinetic terms are used. The absence of the BD ghost was proved in [20].

The second class of bi-gravity models (54) are in a different region of the parameter space where novel kinetic terms are used. Let us investigate them in more detail. We can compute the Poisson bracket of the two constraints associated with  $N_1$  and  $N_2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}^{\text{II}}}{\partial N_1}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{mini}}^{\text{II}}}{\partial N_2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{a_3 e^{-2B} P_B^2}{8(a_2 e^A + a_3 e^B)^4} \left[ a_1 e^{A-B} P_B \right. \\ & \quad \left. - a_3 e^{-(A-B)} P_A - a_2 (P_A - P_B) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

If  $a_2 \neq 0$  and  $a_3 = 0$ , the Poisson bracket (57) vanishes. It seems that the two constraints are first class constraints, which could be associated with two sets of gauge symmetries. If  $a_2 \neq 0$  and  $a_3 \neq 0$ , an independent constraint is generated by the stability of secondary constraints, which involves cubic momentum terms according to (57). This constraint eliminates one more dynamical variable, which signals the complete absence of the sixth degree of freedom.

Note that it is not justified to take the minisuperspace approximation before computing Poisson brackets. But this simple computation does capture the essential features of the Hamiltonian structure:

1. when  $a_3 = 0$ , the Poisson brackets of secondary constraints vanish on the constraint surface;
2. when  $a_3 \neq 0$ , an independent tertiary constraint is generated, rendering absent the sixth degree of freedom.

At this point, it is not clear whether the minisuperspace results can be extended to the full theories. To verify this, we need to examine the Hamiltonian structure of the full theories, which is highly technical.

In the first class of bi-gravity models (51), the kinetic terms are the standard Einstein-Hilbert terms. The secondary constraints are those in general relativity supplemented by the contribution from the potential terms (16, 17, 18), which do not involve momenta and spatial derivatives. To compute the Poisson brackets of the constraints, one can use Dirac's hypersurface deformation algebra.

However, in the second class of bi-gravity models (54), the kinetic part of the Lagrangians are modified by the novel kinetic terms. To obtain the Hamiltonians already requires some work. The constraints have more involved dependence on momenta and spatial derivative terms. Dirac's algebra is not applicable. The computations of constraint brackets are considerably more challenging. We leave the technical analysis of the Hamiltonian structure to a separate work [30] in which we verify that the sixth degrees of freedom are indeed eliminated, and the case  $a_2 \neq 0$ ,  $a_3 = 0$  does describe two interacting massless spin-2 fields.

#### IV. FIELD REDEFINITIONS

Let us derive the explicit expressions of the novel kinetic terms. It is difficult to achieve this step directly because the components of a curvature two-form are complicated functions of the associated vielbein. To circumvent this difficulty, we make use of a mathematical identity for tensors in  $d$  dimensions<sup>15</sup>

$$T^{[\mu_1 \dots \mu_d]}_{\dots} = \det(E) T^{\nu_1 \dots \nu_d}_{\dots} (E^{-1})_{\nu_1}^{[\mu_1} \dots (E^{-1})_{\nu_d}^{\mu_d]}, \quad (58)$$

where the antisymmetrized product of  $E^{-1}$  gives  $\det(E^{-1})$  and cancel  $\det(E)$  out. For example, in two dimensions we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^{01} - T^{10} &= \det(E) T^{01}_{\dots} [(E^{-1})_0^0 (E^{-1})_1^1 - (E^{-1})_0^1 (E^{-1})_1^0] \\ &\quad + \det(E) T^{10}_{\dots} [(E^{-1})_1^0 (E^{-1})_0^1 - (E^{-1})_1^1 (E^{-1})_0^0]. \end{aligned}$$

We notice the minisuperspace Lagrangian (38) contains the ratio of two lapse functions. From the mathematical identity (58), it is natural to introduce a new tensor field as the "ratio" of two vielbeins

$$e_\mu{}^\nu = F_\mu{}^A (E^{-1})^\nu{}_A, \quad (59)$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are external spacetime indices and  $A$  is an internal Lorentz index.

Using the identity (58), the novel kinetic terms become

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} &= d^4x \sqrt{-g} R(g)_{ab}{}^{\mu\nu} \delta_\mu^{[a} \delta_\nu^{b} \delta_\rho{}^\rho e_\sigma{}^\sigma], \\ \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} &= d^4x \sqrt{-g} R(g)_{ab}{}^{\mu\nu} \delta_\mu^{[a} \delta_\nu^{b} e_\rho{}^\rho e_\sigma{}^\sigma]. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

<sup>15</sup> By an abuse of notation, the local Lorentz indices are denoted by Greek letters as well.

After simple manipulations, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = (-) \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{-g} R(g)_{\mu\nu}{}^{[\mu\nu} e_\rho{}^\rho] d^4x, \quad (61)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{-g} R(g)_{\mu\nu}{}^{[\mu\nu} e_\rho{}^\rho e_\sigma{}^\sigma] d^4x, \quad (62)$$

where the antisymmetrization  $[\dots]$  is not normalized. The normalization factors in (61) and (62) are made precise. These choices simplify the expressions below. More explicitly,  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$  are functions of the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and the new tensor field  $e_\mu{}^\nu$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = \sqrt{-g} \left( R_\mu{}^\nu - \frac{1}{2} R \delta_\mu{}^\nu \right) e_\nu{}^\mu d^4x, \quad (63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} &= \sqrt{-g} \left[ R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma} e_\rho{}^\mu e_\sigma{}^\nu - 2 R_\mu{}^\nu (e_\nu{}^\mu e_\rho{}^\rho - e_\nu{}^\rho e_\rho{}^\mu) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} R (e_\mu{}^\mu e_\nu{}^\nu - e_\mu{}^\nu e_\nu{}^\mu) \right] d^4x. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

In terms of the new tensor field  $e_{\mu\nu}$ , the potential terms (15-19) are

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} = \sqrt{-g}, \quad (65)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} = \sqrt{-g} e_\mu{}^\mu, \quad (66)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} = \sqrt{-g} e_\mu{}^{[\mu} e_\nu{}^{\nu]}, \quad (67)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}} = \sqrt{-g} e_\mu{}^{[\mu} e_\nu{}^\nu e_\rho{}^\rho], \quad (68)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}} = \sqrt{-g} e_\mu{}^{[\mu} e_\nu{}^\nu e_\rho{}^\rho e_\sigma{}^\sigma]. \quad (69)$$

We can lower and raise the indices of  $e_\mu{}^\nu$  by the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and its inverse  $g^{\mu\nu}$ . For example, we have

$$e_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu{}^\rho g_{\rho\nu} = F_\mu{}^A E_\nu{}^B \eta_{AB}. \quad (70)$$

The symmetric condition then translates into

$$e_{\mu\nu} = F_\mu{}^A E_\nu{}^B \eta_{AB} = F_\nu{}^A E_\mu{}^B \eta_{AB} = e_{\nu\mu} \quad (71)$$

and we have

$$e^\mu{}_\rho e^\rho{}_\nu = g^{\mu\alpha} e_{\alpha\beta} g^{\beta\rho} e_{\rho\nu} = g^{\mu\alpha} f_{\alpha\nu}. \quad (72)$$

When  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is symmetric,  $e^\mu{}_\nu$  is the square root of  $g^{-1}f$  with  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $f_{\mu\nu}$  defined in (20).

#### V. $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$ & QUADRATIC CURVATURE GRAVITY

In this section, we focus on the novel kinetic term  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  and explain its connections to the models of quadratic curvature gravity.

##### A. Gauge symmetries of $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$

As anticipated in the minisuperspace analysis, the case of  $a_3 = 0$ ,  $a_2 \neq 0$  seems to be related to bi-gravity models with two sets of gauge symmetries. Let us emphasize that the coefficient  $a_1$  of the Einstein-Hilbert term is not fixed.

From the explicit form of  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$ , we can see linear combination of  $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  are invariant under several gauge transformations:

- Standard diffeomorphism invariance

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \delta e_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_\xi e_{\mu\nu}, \quad (73)$$

where  $\xi^\mu$  is a four-vector. This symmetry is expected in a covariant bi-gravity theory.

- Additional “diffeomorphism invariance”

$$\delta e_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_{\xi'} g_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \xi'_\nu + \nabla_\nu \xi'_\mu, \quad (74)$$

where  $\xi^\mu$  is a four-vector. The Lagrangians are invariant because  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  is the product of Einstein tensor and the new tensor  $e_{\mu\nu}$ . After integrating by parts, the covariant derivative acts on the Einstein tensor and the change in the Lagrangians vanish due to the second Bianchi identity.

- Local Lorentz invariance

$$E_\mu^A \rightarrow \Lambda_B^A E_\mu^B, \quad F_\mu^A \rightarrow \Lambda_B^A F_\mu^B. \quad (75)$$

For an infinitesimal transformation, we have

$$\delta E_\mu^A = \omega_B^A E_\mu^B, \quad \delta F_\mu^A = \omega_B^A F_\mu^B, \quad (76)$$

where

$$\Lambda_B^A = \delta_B^A + \omega_B^A + \mathcal{O}(\omega^2). \quad (77)$$

From the definition (59), we know  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is invariant under a diagonal local Lorentz transformation, so the Lagrangians are invariant as well.

- Additional “local Lorentz invariance”

$$\delta e_{\mu\nu} = t_{\mu\nu}, \quad t_{\mu\nu} = -t_{\nu\mu} \quad (78)$$

or in the infinitesimal form

$$\delta F_\mu^A = \omega_B^A E_\mu^B, \quad \omega_{AB} = -\omega_{BA}. \quad (79)$$

The antisymmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is projected out by the symmetric Einstein tensor, so the Lagrangians are invariant under a change in the antisymmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}$ .

Since the antisymmetric part drops out when  $a_3 = 0$ , we can identify the symmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sym}}$  with the square root of a metric product  $g^{\mu\rho} f_{\rho\nu}^{\text{sym}}$ .<sup>16</sup>

These gauge symmetries persist even if we turn on the potential terms  $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}}$ , which are related to the cosmological constant. However, the “additional” gauge symmetries will be broken when  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}}$  are introduced.

It should be noted that the additional “invariances” are not the precise transformations according to their names, but they do have the same amount and similar forms of gauge symmetries as indicated. To be more precise, if we substitute  $\delta e_{\mu\nu}$  on the left hand side of (74) with  $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\delta F_\mu^A$  on the left hand side of (79) with  $\delta E_\mu^A$ , they become the off-diagonal gauge transformations.

<sup>16</sup> Note that the metric  $f_{\mu\nu}^{\text{sym}}$  is different from  $f_{\mu\nu}$  defined in (20) and they coincide only when the antisymmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  vanishes.

## B. New Massive Gravity

One may suspect the bi-gravity models with  $a_3 = 0$  can be transformed into two Einstein-Hilbert terms after some field redefinitions. It is not clear what field redefinition can make this connection. Nevertheless, it was shown in [31] that  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  in (63) can be obtained by taking a scaling limit of two Einstein-Hilbert terms

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \left[ \sqrt{-f} R(f) - \sqrt{-g} R(g) \right] \\ & \rightarrow \sqrt{-g} \left( R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R g^{\mu\nu} \right) e_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is defined as

$$f_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + e_{\mu\nu}/\lambda \quad (81)$$

with

$$\lambda \rightarrow \infty. \quad (82)$$

In fact,  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  in the form of (63) already appeared in the auxiliary field representation of 3d New Massive Gravity [32, 33], which is a theory of quadratic curvature gravity.

In our language, the Lagrangian of 3d New Massive Gravity reads<sup>17</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_{NMG} = \sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} + \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + c_1 \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} + c_3 \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}}, \quad (83)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} = R(E) \wedge E, \quad (84)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge F, \quad (85)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge E \wedge E, \quad (86)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (87)$$

where  $\sigma = \pm 1$  is the sign of the Einstein-Hilbert term,  $c_1$  is proportional to the cosmological constant,  $c_3$  corresponds to the mass squared  $m^2$ . The usual auxiliary field is identified with the second tensor field

$$e_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^\rho g_{\rho\nu} = F_\mu^A E_\nu^B \eta_{AB}. \quad (88)$$

Note that the symmetric condition

$$e_{\mu\nu} = e_{\nu\mu} \quad (89)$$

is imposed dynamically by the equations of motion<sup>18</sup>.

Therefore, New Massive Gravity is an example of 3d bi-gravity models in the second class. It is known that 3d New Massive Gravity do not contain the Boulware-Deser ghost [34], which furnishes evidence that the second class of bi-gravity models are free of the BD ghost.

<sup>17</sup> In this representation, we can see one of the BD-ghost-free potentials already appeared in the context of New Massive Gravity.

<sup>18</sup> In section IX, we discuss how to generalize this example of dynamical symmetric condition.

A straightforward generalization of 3d New Massive Gravity is to introduce other potential terms  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}}$  [31]

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (90)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}} = F \wedge F \wedge F. \quad (91)$$

Note that, if  $\mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}}$  is considered, the Lagrangian does not reduce to that of quadratic curvature gravity when  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is integrated out. Instead, it contains infinitely many higher order curvature corrections.

In 3d New Massive Gravity, the Einstein-Hilbert term is always present. One of the reasons may be that the second spin-2 field  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is usually considered to be an auxiliary field, which seems to have no dynamics. We want to emphasize that  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  is a kinetic term as well, and the use of the Einstein-Hilbert term is not necessary<sup>19</sup>. Therefore, the Einstein-Hilbert term could be absent, then the 3d bi-gravity Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} = a_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + \sum_{i=1}^4 c_i \mathcal{L}_i^{\text{pot}}, \quad a_2 \neq 0. \quad (92)$$

The number of dynamical degrees of freedom should be the same as that of New Massive Gravity and the Boulware-Deser ghost should not be not propagating. The cases without the Einstein-Hilbert term are related to the generalized NMG in [31] by a field redefinition

$$e_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow e_{\mu\nu} + c g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (93)$$

where  $c$  depends on the coefficients of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$ .

In 3d,  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  is the only novel kinetic term from (1) due to the limited number of spacetime indices. Since a massless graviton in 3d has no dynamical degree of freedom, we can choose  $a_2$  such that the kinetic term of the massive graviton has a correct sign. Then (92) is a unitary theory of 3d massive gravity. The special case of  $c_1 = c_2 = c_4 = 0$  was discussed in [35] and that of  $c_1 \neq 0$ ,  $c_2 = c_4 = 0$  in [36].

### C. Critical gravity

There exists a continuous family of critical points [37] in the parameter space of 3d New Massive Gravity (83) and its higher dimensional generalization [38],

$$\mathcal{L} = R(E) \wedge E \wedge \cdots \wedge (E + F) \\ + E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge (\Lambda E \wedge E + m^2 F \wedge F), \quad (94)$$

which are known as critical gravity. At these critical points, the cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  is proportional to the mass

<sup>19</sup> To eliminate the second order time-derivative terms due to the curvature tensor in  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$ , we need to supplement the action by boundary terms analogous to the York-Gibbons-Hawking term. Then  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  generates a time derivative term  $\partial_t e_{\mu\nu}$  in the Lagrangian, so both  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $e_{\mu\nu}$  have dynamical degrees of freedom. Furthermore, if we expand the Lagrangian around a Minkowski background and diagonalize the quadratic kinetic terms,  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  will give rise to two linearized Einstein-Hilbert terms.

squared  $m^2$  with dimension-dependent coefficients. Integrating out the auxiliary field, the linearized 4th order equation of motions contains two massless spin-2 modes<sup>20</sup>.

Here we want to point out that

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge F \quad (95)$$

and its higher dimensional version

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} = R(E) \wedge E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge F \quad (96)$$

can be thought of as a special limit of critical gravity in the bi-gravity formulation<sup>21</sup>. Note that in this limit,  $e_{\mu\nu}$  can not be integrated out because it is a Lagrange multiplier.

It is shown in the Hamiltonian analysis of [30] that  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  in 4d has two sets of first-class constraints, corresponding to two sets of gauge symmetries. More general, the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = a_1 \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{kin}} + a_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + c_1 \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} + c_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} \quad (97)$$

with

$$a_2 \neq 0 \quad (98)$$

are interacting theories of two massless gravitons in various dimensions ( $d > 2$ ), where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are related to the cosmological constant<sup>22</sup>.

The same gauge symmetries are also realized in higher derivative counterparts of the two-derivative term  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$

$$R(E) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E) \wedge E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (99)$$

where one of the E-vielbeins in the Lovelock terms [3] is replaced by an F-vielbein. The additional symmetries are due to the fact that Lovelock tensors are both symmetric and divergence-free.

Along the line of the second class bi-gravity theories (54), we propose a general Lagrangian describing two interacting, massless, gauge invariant gravitons, which is a linear combination of Lovelock terms, the novel derivative terms (96, 99) and two potential terms

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge \cdots \wedge E, \quad \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} = E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (100)$$

where at least one of the novel derivative terms is present<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> However, the total number of dynamical degrees of freedom should be the same as that of 1 massless and 1 massive gravitons. The second massless graviton seems to be an artifact of the linearized equation of motion at the critical points, as there is no symmetry enhancement. For example, logarithmic modes are allowed if we do not assume the Brown-Henneaux boundary conditions [39]. They were claimed to be dual to Logarithmic Conformal Field Theories [36, 40–42].

<sup>21</sup> The Einstein-Hilbert term is absorbed into  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  by redefining  $F$ .

<sup>22</sup> There is a no-go theorem for interacting theories of massless, gauge invariant, spin-2 fields if the Lagrangian has at most two derivatives [43]. This is not in contradiction to the present work, because one of the linearized kinetic terms has a wrong sign, which violates one of the assumptions in the no-go theorem. The details of the linearized actions are discussed in section VI. A recent construction of color-decorated gravity [44] evades this no-go theorem by including extra fields.

<sup>23</sup> Deforming these massless models by other potential terms with two vielbeins, one obtains the generalizations of New Massive Gravity proposed in [31].



### D. Weyl gravity

Weyl gravity is a well-known theory of quadratic curvature gravity in 4d, which is both diffeomorphism and conformal invariant. Interestingly, the Lagrangian of Weyl gravity in the two-derivative representation [45] has a compact form in terms of Vielbeins<sup>24</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Weyl}} = R(E) \wedge E \wedge F + E \wedge E \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (101)$$

where  $F$  has dimension 2.

Then the absence of Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost is translated into the absence of the BD ghost. Ostrogradsky's spin-2 ghost in the four-derivative formulation now becomes a basic spin-2 ghost due to a wrong sign kinetic term.

In this representation, Weyl gravity is built from a novel kinetic term and a dRGT potential term. Despite the presence of a spin-2 ghost, Weyl gravity is the first example of nonlinear completions of Fierz-Pauli massive gravity that are free of the BD ghost, where the nonlinear theory was proposed 20 years before the linear one.

Furthermore, Weyl gravity is a special bi-gravity model in the second class (54) with an emergent gauge symmetry (conformal symmetry). This gauge symmetry is a nonlinear completion of the additional gauge symmetry of a massive spin-2 field around de-Sitter background at the partially massless point [27]. To make this connection more clear, we linearize (101) around de-Sitter background and diagonalize the quadratic Lagrangian in the next section.

## VI. LINEARIZED LAGRANGIANS

In the previous section, we show that some of the bi-gravity models with novel kinetic terms are equivalent to higher derivative gravity models. It is well known that higher derivative gravity models usually contain spin-2 ghosts, which could lead to the problem of non-unitarity. In this section, we derive the quadratic actions of the novel kinetic terms and examine whether this is a general feature of the bi-gravity theories in the second class (54).

### A. Minkowski background

Consider a bi-gravity model in 4d whose Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} = a_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} + a_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + a_3 \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}, \quad (102)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}}$  is the Einstein-Hilbert kinetic term

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} = \sqrt{-g} R(g), \quad (103)$$

$\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$  are the novel nonlinear kinetic terms defined in (61, 62).

Let us expand the metric field  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and the symmetric tensor field  $e_{\mu\nu}$  around the Minkowski background

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (104)$$

$$e_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \quad (105)$$

where we assume there is no numerical factors in front of  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ . These factors can always be absorbed into  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $a_3$  by redefining  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $e_{\mu\nu}$ .

Note that  $e_{\mu\nu}$  simply vanishes in a different kind of background solutions. The two kinds of background solutions are related by a redefinition of  $F_\mu^A$

$$F' = F + E. \quad (106)$$

To the quadratic order, the linearized Lagrangian reads

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = c_1 \delta g_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \delta g_\rho^{\rho]} + c_2 \delta g_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \delta e_\rho^{\rho]}, \quad (107)$$

where the first term is the linearized Einstein-Hilbert term and the coefficients are

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{4}(-a_1 + a_2 - a_3), \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{2}a_2 - a_3. \quad (108)$$

Now we can diagonalize the quadratic Lagrangian

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = c_1 \left( h_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu h_\rho^{\rho]} - H_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu H_\rho^{\rho]} \right), \quad (109)$$

where we assume  $c_1 \neq 0$  and the diagonalized spin-2 fields are

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \delta g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{c_2}{2c_1} \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \quad H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{c_2}{2c_1} \delta e_{\mu\nu}. \quad (110)$$

If  $c_1 = 0$  and  $c_2 \neq 0$ , then the first term in (107) vanishes and the diagonalized Lagrangian is

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = c_2 \left( h_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu h_\rho^{\rho]} - H_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu H_\rho^{\rho]} \right), \quad (111)$$

and the diagonalized fields are

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta g_{\mu\nu} + \delta e_{\mu\nu}), \quad H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta g_{\mu\nu} - \delta e_{\mu\nu}). \quad (112)$$

The linearized Lagrangian after diagonalization is a linear combination of two linearized Einstein-Hilbert terms<sup>25</sup> except in some special cases. The diagonalized kinetic terms always have opposite signs due to the absence of quadratic term of  $e_{\mu\nu}$ , which can be traced back to the absence of  $R(F)$ .

<sup>24</sup> By redefining  $F = F' + E$ , one have the auxiliary field reformulation of Weyl gravity with an Einstein-Hilbert term and a cosmological constant term. where the second spin-2 field  $e_{\mu\nu}$  can be thought of as a matter field couples to the Einstein tensor.

<sup>25</sup> The diagonalized form is invariant under a continuous family of field redefinitions

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mu\nu} &= \cosh(\theta) h'_{\mu\nu} + \sinh(\theta) H'_{\mu\nu}, \\ H_{\mu\nu} &= \sinh(\theta) h'_{\mu\nu} + \cosh(\theta) H'_{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

The special cases are

$$c_2 = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{2}a_2 = a_3, \quad (114)$$

then  $H_{\mu\nu} = 0$  and the second diagonalized kinetic term vanishes. The first kinetic term has a right sign when

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{4}(-a_1 + a_3) < 0. \quad (115)$$

A more extreme case is

$$c_1 = c_2 = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad a_1 = \frac{1}{2}a_2 = a_3, \quad (116)$$

then the linearized Lagrangian is empty. In these special cases, the bi-gravity models are strongly coupled due to the absence of some linearized kinetic terms.

Note that the Lagrangians of these special cases can be schematically written as

$$\mathcal{L} = (a_1 - a_3) R \wedge E \wedge E + a_3 R \wedge (F - E) \wedge (F - E). \quad (117)$$

If we consider the other kind of background solutions where  $\bar{e}_{\mu\nu}$  vanishes, both of the two linearized kinetic terms are present and there is no issue of strong coupling. So the problem of strong coupling depends on the choice of background solutions.<sup>26</sup> The existence of these strongly coupled backgrounds is related to the presence of spin-2 ghosts.

The potential terms (65-69) can generate linear terms around a Minkowski background, which signals a wrong choice of vacuum. In the next subsection, we discuss the linearized actions around general maximally symmetric backgrounds.

## B. Constant curvature background

Let us introduce nonlinear potential terms to the 4d Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & a_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} + a_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + a_3 \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}} \\ & + b_1 \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{pot}} + b_2 \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{pot}} + b_3 \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} \\ & + b_4 \mathcal{L}_4^{\text{pot}} + b_5 \mathcal{L}_5^{\text{pot}}, \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

where the potential terms are defined in (65)-(69).

The spin-2 fields  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $e_{\mu\nu}$  are expanded around a cosmological background  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu} &= \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}, \\ e_{\mu\nu} &= \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

where the background spacetime has constant curvature

$$\bar{R}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{\Lambda}{3}(\bar{g}_{\mu\rho}\bar{g}_{\nu\sigma} - \bar{g}_{\mu\sigma}\bar{g}_{\nu\rho}). \quad (120)$$

We assume the background value of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  vanishes, which is not necessary. However, if the background solution of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is proportional to the background metric  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ , then we can always set it to zero by a shift in  $F_\mu^A$ <sup>27</sup>.

To avoid strong coupling problem, we require

$$a_2 \neq 0, \quad (121)$$

otherwise we should consider a different background solution.

Around a background solution, the linear terms in the perturbative Lagrangian should vanish, which indicates

$$b_1 = -2a_1 \Lambda, \quad b_2 = a_2 \Lambda. \quad (122)$$

Before the shift in  $F$ , the two equations correspond to the solution of the background metric  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$  and the ratio between two background spin-2 fields.

The linearized Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}} = & \sqrt{-\bar{g}} c_1 \left( \delta g_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu \delta g_\rho^{\rho]} + \delta g_\mu^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] \delta g_\nu^\rho \right) \\ & + \sqrt{-\bar{g}} c_2 \left( \delta e_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu \delta g_\rho^{\rho]} + \delta e_\mu^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] \delta g_\nu^\rho \right) \\ & + \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left[ 2a_1 \Lambda - a_1 \Lambda \left( \frac{1}{4} \delta g_\mu^\mu \delta g_\nu^\nu - \frac{1}{2} \delta g_\mu^\nu \delta g_\nu^\mu \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + a_2 \Lambda \left( \frac{1}{2} \delta g_\mu^\mu \delta e_\nu^\nu - \delta g_\mu^\nu \delta e_\nu^\mu \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + b_3 (\delta e_\mu^\mu \delta e_\nu^\nu - \delta e_\mu^\nu \delta e_\nu^\mu) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

where the coefficients

$$c_1 = -\frac{1}{4}a_1, \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{2}a_2 \quad (124)$$

are simplified due to a shift in  $F$ . Total derivative terms are neglected.

If  $a_1 \neq 0$ , the diagonalized fields are

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \delta g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{a_2}{a_1} \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \quad H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{a_2}{a_1} \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \quad (125)$$

the linearized Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}} = & -\frac{1}{4}a_1 \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( h_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu h_\rho^{\rho]} + h_\mu^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] h_\nu^\rho \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}a_1 \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( H_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu H_\rho^{\rho]} + H_\mu^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] H_\nu^\rho \right) \\ & + \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left[ -a_1 \Lambda \left( \frac{1}{4} h_\mu^\mu h_\nu^\nu - \frac{1}{2} h_\mu^\nu h_\nu^\mu \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + a_1 \Lambda \left( \frac{1}{4} H_\mu^\mu H_\nu^\nu - \frac{1}{2} H_\mu^\nu H_\nu^\mu \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + b_3 \left( \frac{a_1}{a_2} \right)^2 (H_\mu^\mu H_\nu^\nu - H_\mu^\nu H_\nu^\mu) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

where the constant term is neglected. The first four lines are the linearized Einstein-Hilbert terms with cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  around the background solutions. The last line is the

<sup>26</sup> If we consider backgrounds that  $e_{\mu\nu}$  vanish, then  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$  will not contribute to the linearized Lagrangian. We will encounter the strong coupling problem when  $a_2 = 0$ .

<sup>27</sup> The definitions of fluctuating fields are modified accordingly.

Fierz-Pauli mass term for  $H_{\mu\nu}$ . The coefficient of the massless spin-2 field  $h_{\mu\nu}$  is  $a_1$ , while that of  $H_{\mu\nu}$  is  $-a_1$ . One of them is a spin-2 ghost. The mass squared of  $H_{\mu\nu}$  is determined by  $b_3$ .

If  $a_1 = 0$ , the diagonalized fields are

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta g_{\mu\nu} + \delta e_{\mu\nu}), \quad H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta g_{\mu\nu} - \delta e_{\mu\nu}). \quad (127)$$

In addition,  $b_3$  should vanish in order to be consistent with our choice of background solution  $\bar{e}_{\mu\nu} = 0$ , so the mass terms vanish. The linearized Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}} = & \frac{1}{2}a_2\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( h_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu h_\rho^{\rho]} + h_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] h_\nu{}^\rho \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}a_2\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( H_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu H_\rho^{\rho]} + H_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] H_\nu{}^\rho \right) \\ & + \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left[ 2a_2\Lambda \left( \frac{1}{4}h_\mu{}^\mu h_\nu{}^\nu - \frac{1}{2}h_\mu{}^\nu h_\nu{}^\mu \right) \right. \\ & \left. - 2a_2\Lambda \left( \frac{1}{4}H_\mu{}^\mu H_\nu{}^\nu - \frac{1}{2}H_\mu{}^\nu H_\nu{}^\mu \right) \right], \quad (128) \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to two interacting massless gravitons.

### C. Linearized Weyl gravity

In this subsection, we would like to discuss the linearized action of Weyl gravity (101) around the de-Sitter background. As shown in [27], the conformal transformation in Weyl gravity can be recast into nonlinear partially massless transformation for spin-2 matter field after some field redefinitions. So we expect after diagonalization the massive spin-2 field has linear partially massless gauge symmetry.

The explicit expression of (101) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Weyl}} = & \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}} + \mathcal{L}_3^{\text{pot}} \\ = & \sqrt{-g} \left[ \left( R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g^{\mu\nu} \right) e_{\mu\nu} \right. \\ & \left. + e_\mu{}^\mu e_\nu{}^\nu - e_{\mu\nu} e^{\mu\nu} \right], \quad (129) \end{aligned}$$

where the equations of motion for  $e_{\mu\nu}$  is

$$e_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{12}R g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (130)$$

The nonlinear gauge symmetry transformations are

- conformal invariance

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow (1 + 2\phi)g_{\mu\nu}, \quad e_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow e_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \phi; \quad (131)$$

- diffeomorphism invariance

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow g_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu}, \quad e_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow e_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_\xi e_{\mu\nu}. \quad (132)$$

Let us consider the de-Sitter background solution

$$\bar{g}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{dS}}, \quad \bar{e}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\Lambda}{6}g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{dS}}, \quad (133)$$

where we keep the non-zero background value of  $e_{\mu\nu}$ .

The fluctuations around the de-Sitter vacuum are

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \delta e_{\mu\nu} = e_{\mu\nu} - \bar{e}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (134)$$

Then we can expand the full action to the quadratic order

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{Weyl}} = & \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left[ -\frac{\Lambda^2}{3} + (\delta e^2 - \delta e_{\mu\nu} \delta e^{\mu\nu}) \right. \\ & + \frac{\Lambda}{6} (\delta e \delta g - 4\delta e_{\mu\nu} \delta g^{\mu\nu}) - \frac{\Lambda^2}{72} (\delta g^2 - 4\delta g_{\mu\nu} \delta g^{\mu\nu}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( \delta e_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu \delta g_\rho^{\rho]} + \delta e_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] \delta g_\nu{}^\rho \right) \\ & \left. - \frac{\Lambda}{24}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( \delta g_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu \delta g_\rho^{\rho]} + \delta g_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] \delta g_\nu{}^\rho \right) \right], \quad (135) \end{aligned}$$

where total derivative terms are neglected, the covariant derivative  $\bar{\nabla}$  is compatible with the background metric  $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$  and

$$\delta g = \delta g_\mu{}^\mu, \quad \delta e = \delta e_\mu{}^\mu. \quad (136)$$

The diagonalized fields are

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \frac{6}{\Lambda} \delta e_{\mu\nu}, \quad H_{\mu\nu} = \delta g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{6}{\Lambda} \delta e_{\mu\nu}. \quad (137)$$

The quadratic Lagrangian in terms of  $h_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $H_{\mu\nu}$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{Weyl}} = & \frac{\Lambda}{24}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( h_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu h_\rho^{\rho]} + h_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] h_\nu{}^\rho \right) \\ & - \frac{\Lambda^2}{48}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( h_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}h^2 \right) \\ & - \frac{\Lambda}{24}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( H_\mu^{[\mu} \bar{\nabla}_\nu \bar{\nabla}^\nu H_\rho^{\rho]} + H_\mu{}^\nu [\bar{\nabla}_\rho, \bar{\nabla}^\mu] H_\nu{}^\rho \right) \\ & + \frac{\Lambda^2}{18}\sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left( H_{\mu\nu} H^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}H^2 \right), \quad (138) \end{aligned}$$

where we neglect the constant term. We can see  $h$  is a massless spin-2 field with a negative Planck mass, while  $H$  is a massive spin-2 field with a positive Planck mass. The signs of the kinetic terms are opposite.

We can further examine the gauge symmetries at the linearized level:

- linearized conformal symmetry

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta g_{\mu\nu} + 2\phi \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (139)$$

$$\delta e_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta e_{\mu\nu} - \bar{\nabla}_\mu \partial_\nu \phi, \quad (140)$$

and

$$h_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{6}{\Lambda} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \partial_\nu \phi, \quad (141)$$

$$H_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow H_{\mu\nu} + \left( \bar{\nabla}_\mu \partial_\nu + \frac{\Lambda}{3} \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} \right) \left( \frac{6}{\Lambda} \phi \right). \quad (142)$$

- linearized diffeomorphism symmetry

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta g_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\nabla}_\mu \xi_\nu + \bar{\nabla}_\nu \xi_\mu, \quad (143)$$

$$\delta e_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta e_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\Lambda}{6} (\bar{\nabla}_\mu \xi_\nu + \bar{\nabla}_\nu \xi_\mu), \quad (144)$$

and

$$h_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow h_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\nabla}_\mu \xi_\nu + \bar{\nabla}_\nu \xi_\mu, \quad (145)$$

$$H_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow H_{\mu\nu}. \quad (146)$$

Therefore, the linear partially massless gauge transformation

$$H_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow H_{\mu\nu} + \left( \bar{\nabla}_\mu \partial_\nu + \frac{\Lambda}{3} \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} \right) \alpha \quad (147)$$

is a combination of linearized conformal and diffeomorphism transformations.

Interestingly, only the massless spin-2 field  $h$  transforms under a change of coordinate. The massive spin-2 field can not transform because the Lagrangian of massive mode is not invariant.

In this way, we provide a different perspective of Weyl gravity by using a novel kinetic term and a dRGT term. In this representation, one may understand better why unitary partially massless gravity in 4d is not found [46]<sup>28</sup>. Along the line of dRGT massive gravity, there have been many recent investigations on nonlinear partially massless gravity [47–49]. In 4d, a promising candidate was identified in dRGT massive gravity [47], which makes use of precisely the same potential term

$$E \wedge E \wedge F \wedge F, \quad (148)$$

but the kinetic term is assumed to be the Einstein-Hilbert term and the  $F$  vielbein is fixed to be de-Sitter. Partially massless gauge symmetry is only an artifact of the perturbative Lagrangian at low orders. We also confirm the suspicion in [48] that a new kinetic term is required in order to extend the partially massless symmetry to the nonlinear level, which becomes trivial from our bi-gravity reformulation of Weyl gravity.

The fact that the novel kinetic terms have no non-trivial single dynamical metric limit indicates that we can not truncate Weyl gravity in a consistent manner to obtain a nonlinear theory of partially massless gravity with single dynamical metric and a fixed de-Sitter metric.

In addition, partially massless gauge symmetry in 4d can be thought of as an emergent gauge symmetry of the 4d bi-gravity models constructed from novel kinetic terms and dRGT potential terms. It is tempting to consider the case of three dimensions, where a massless spin-2 field has no dynamical degree of freedom and we do not need to worry about the

sign of its kinetic term. However, there is only one new kinetic term in 3d, and these bi-gravity models were well investigated along the line of 3d New Massive Gravity. In particular, the 3d version of Weyl gravity proposed in [35] is an example of the conflict between diffeomorphism and conformal invariances in three dimensions. Partially massless symmetry has no nonlinear extension in 3d up to date.

## VII. SPIN-2 GHOST

In the previous section, we show that, generically, the two linearized kinetic terms have opposite signs. A kinetic term with a wrong sign usually results in an unbounded Hamiltonian and non-unitarity. If we associate the Hamiltonian with the energy, then we could extract infinite energy from a system whose Hamiltonian is unbounded from below, which leads to classical instability. Non-unitarity in a quantum theory means unphysical negative probability. Therefore, when a kinetic term has a wrong sign, the corresponding degree of freedom is considered to be an unwanted “ghost”.

From the classical point of view, it is not clear which is the correct sign for a massless spin-2 kinetic term, as the Hamiltonian simply vanishes on-shell. Naively, the Einstein-Hilbert term seems to have a wrong sign in the minisuperspace approximation (33)

$$\sqrt{-g} R(g) \rightarrow -\frac{12}{N} (\dot{A})^2 e^{3A}, \quad N > 0, \quad (149)$$

but the Hamiltonian is still bounded because it vanishes. If we modify the sign of the Einstein-Hilbert term, Newton’s constant will become negative and gravity be a repulsive force. Certainly, this contradicts with our physical world, but this is not ruled out as a theoretical possibility. We know the Coulomb force is repulsive for like charges.

The Hamiltonian of novel kinetic terms vanishes on-shell as well [30], which is expected in covariant theories, so a bounded Hamiltonian is not a strong evidence for classical stability. One might need to examine other definitions of energy. As the local definition of gravitational energy is controversial, it may be more sensible to consider global energies (masses) according to the isometries of asymptotic spacetime. They are the conserved charges associated with the global symmetries of the vacuum where the infinite-dimensional diffeomorphism group is spontaneously broken to a finite-dimensional global symmetry group. In critical gravity models, the Abbott-Deser-Tekin mass [50] of black hole solutions were shown to be zero [38]. As discussed before, the novel kinetic term  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{kin}}$  can be considered as the special limit of critical gravity, and we expect it has the same property.

From the quantum perspective, the correct sign for spin-2 kinetic terms has a more definite answer. Unitarity requires particle poles to have positive residues. A propagator can be derived from the quadratic action, so the correct signs of the kinetic term and the mass term are determined.

<sup>28</sup> To be more precise, we require the off-shell action to be gauge invariant.



The residue of a spin-2 propagator depends on the coupling to matter. It vanishes if the spin-2 field is not coupled to the energy-momentum tensor. So one can avoid negative residues by identifying the physical metric with the spin-2 field with a correct sign kinetic term. Using the effective metric [51], we can escape the problem of tree-level non-unitarity.

Furthermore, to obtain the solutions of a model we need boundary conditions. When the Lagrangian allows for ghost-like excitations, they can still be avoided by proper boundary conditions. In this way, we could eliminate the ghost-like modes whose kinetic terms have wrong signs, then the bi-gravity models should reduce to healthy vector-tensor theories when the mass squared has a correct sign.

### VIII. CUT-OFF SCALE

Ghosts are ubiquitous in the framework of effective field theories. Their presence do not disqualify the models from describing nature. They just tell us when the theories stop providing consistent descriptions and microscopic details become important.

As an effective field theory, Einstein's gravity has a cut-off scale set by the Planck mass. Higher curvature terms are also compatible with diffeomorphism invariance, so they should be present. The natural values of their coefficients are of order unity in terms of the Planck mass, and the cut-off scale remains the same. Ostrogradsky's ghosts due to higher derivative equations of motion are not excited below the Planck scale because their masses are around the Planck value. The corrections due to higher curvature terms are negligible at low energy scale.

However, if for some unknown reasons, the coefficients of some correction terms are considerably larger than their natural values, then we need to worry about Ostrogradsky's instability even below the Planck scale. The cut-off scale of an effective field theory of gravity is lowered by the ghost modes.

Let us consider an example in 4d which admits a bi-gravity reformulation

$$\mathcal{L} = M_p^2 \sqrt{-g} [R + R(e + ee + \dots) + \Lambda(1 + e) + m^2(ee + eee + \dots)], \quad (150)$$

where the tensor structures are not written explicitly, the two spin-2 fields  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $e_{\mu\nu}$  are dimensionless. After linearization and diagonalization,  $m^2$  corresponds to the mass of the massive spin-2 field which is ghost-like<sup>29</sup>. In principle, higher curvature terms are also allowed.

Integrating out the auxiliary field  $e_{\mu\nu}$ , we have a Lagrangian of higher curvature gravity, which schematically

reads

$$\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-g} \left( M_p^2 \Lambda + M_p^2 R + \frac{M_p^2}{m^2} R R + \dots \right). \quad (151)$$

We can see a small mass in the bi-gravity formulation translates into large higher curvature terms.

To be more precise, there are two kinds of Ostrogradsky's ghosts in a model of higher curvature gravity, which can be rephased more transparently in the bi-gravity formulation. In the bi-gravity representation, the massive modes contain two kinds of ghost-like degrees of freedom. The first one is the ghost-like spin-2 mode due to a wrong sign kinetic term<sup>30</sup>. The second one is Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost or the Boulware-Deser ghost in a generic theory of massive spin-2 field.

For simplicity, let us assume Minkowski spacetime is the background solution. We also assume, after linearization and diagonalization, the kinetic terms of (150) are given by the linearized Einstein-Hilbert terms to avoid more ghosts. These assumptions already constrain the possible terms in (150). The scale of the quadratic potential terms is set by the mass squared  $m^2$ . Then both the spin-2 ghost and the scalar ghost are excited and interact with the healthy modes at a low scale

$$\Lambda = m. \quad (152)$$

By requiring that the quadratic term of the linearized Lagrangian takes the form of Fierz-Pauli mass term, the scalar ghost is absent in the quadratic action. But it can still appear in the interaction terms, which is known as the BD ghost. If we assume the effective Lagrangian is given by the bi-gravity models in the second class (54), this scalar ghost can be eliminated completely. Then we can focus on the problem of spin-2 ghosts.

To increase the cut-off scale, let us first examine the quadratic action in detail. The massive spin-2 field is denoted by  $H_{\mu\nu}$ . According to section VI, its linearized action is given by Fierz-Pauli theory

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = M_p^2 (H_\mu^{[\mu} \partial_\nu \partial^\nu H_{\rho}^{\rho]} + \alpha m^2 H_\mu^{[\mu} H_{\nu}^{\nu]}), \quad (153)$$

where the kinetic term has a wrong sign and  $\alpha$  is a model-dependent numerical factor.

Let us decompose  $H_{\mu\nu}$  à la Helmholtz

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{M_p} H_{\mu\nu}^T + \frac{1}{M_p m} (\partial_\mu A_\nu + \partial_\nu A_\mu) + \frac{1}{M_p m^2} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi, \quad (154)$$

$$\partial^\mu H_{\mu\nu}^T = 0, \quad \partial^\mu A_\mu = 0. \quad (155)$$

<sup>29</sup> It is assumed that the coefficients of the potential terms are of the same order, which is not a necessary assumption. When their magnitude are different, the smallest one is the most important.

<sup>30</sup> The kinetic term of the helicity-1 mode is from the mass terms, so they are ghost when the spin-2 ghost is also a tachyon. Let us assume the mass squared is positive.

where the dimensions of  $H_{\mu\nu}^T$ ,  $A_\mu$ ,  $\phi$  are 1 and the use of  $M_p$ ,  $m$  is to canonically normalize the kinetic terms of the decomposed fields <sup>31</sup>.

In terms of the decomposed modes, the Fierz-Pauli Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & \partial_\mu (H^T)_{\nu\rho} \partial^\mu (H^T)^{\nu\rho} - \partial_\mu (H^T)_\nu{}^\rho \partial^\mu (H^T)_\rho{}^\nu \\ & + \alpha m^2 \left[ (H^T)_\mu{}^\mu (H^T)_\nu{}^\nu - (H^T)_{\mu\nu} (H^T)^{\mu\nu} \right] \\ & - 2\alpha \partial_\mu A_\nu \partial^\mu A^\nu + 2\alpha (H^T)_\mu{}^\mu (\square\Phi),\end{aligned}\quad (158)$$

where total derivative terms are neglected. The last term is a cross term, so we introduce

$$\bar{H}_{\mu\nu} = H_{\mu\nu}^T + \frac{\alpha}{3}\phi\eta_{\mu\nu}\quad (159)$$

to diagonalize the kinetic terms. After diagonalization, the Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & \partial_\mu \bar{H}_{\nu\rho} \partial^\mu \bar{H}^{\nu\rho} - \partial_\mu \bar{H}_\rho{}^\rho \partial^\mu \bar{H}_\nu{}^\nu \\ & + \alpha m^2 (\bar{H}_\mu{}^\mu \bar{H}_\nu{}^\nu - \bar{H}_{\mu\nu} \bar{H}^{\mu\nu}) \\ & + \frac{4}{3}\alpha^2 \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi + 2\alpha^2 m^2 \bar{H}_\mu{}^\mu \phi + \frac{4}{3}\alpha^3 m^2 \phi^2 \\ & - 2\alpha \partial_\mu A_\nu \partial^\mu A^\nu.\end{aligned}\quad (160)$$

The kinetic terms of  $\bar{H}_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\phi$  have wrong signs. If  $\alpha > 0$ , then the helicity-1 modes  $A_\mu$  are healthy modes. Although the ghost-like modes can be excited at scale  $\Lambda = m$ , they are harmless before healthy degrees of freedom are coupled to them. The cut-off scales are then determined by the lowest scale of the interaction terms that involve both the ghosts and the healthy modes.

By considering nonlinear redefinitions, we can always make the massless spin-2 field transverse

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{M_p} h_{\mu\nu}^T.\quad (161)$$

Then we perform a general power counting of the possible perturbative terms without using the specific structures of the nonlinear terms. From the two derivative terms, we have

$$M_p^{2-i-2j-k-l} m^{-2j-2k} \partial^2 (H^T)^i (\partial A)^{2j} (\partial\partial\phi)^k (h^T)^l.\quad (162)$$

Assuming the coefficients of the potential terms in (150) are of the same order, we have

$$M_p^{2-i-2j-k-l} m^{2-2j-2k} (H^T)^i (\partial A)^{2j} (\partial\partial\phi)^k (h^T)^l.\quad (163)$$

<sup>31</sup> Another natural decomposition is with respect to the covariant derivative of the massless spin-2 field  $h_{\mu\nu}$

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{M_p} H_{\mu\nu}^T + \frac{1}{M_p m} (\nabla_\mu^{(h)} A_\nu + \nabla_\nu^{(h)} A_\mu) + \frac{1}{M_p m^2} \nabla_\mu^{(h)} \partial_\nu \phi\quad (156)$$

$$\nabla^{(h)\mu} H_{\mu\nu}^T = 0, \quad \nabla^{(h)\mu} A_\mu = 0.\quad (157)$$

The interaction terms start from the cubic order

$$i + 2j + k + l = 3, 4, 5, \dots,\quad (164)$$

and a perturbative term

$$M_p^{-a} m^{-b} \partial^m (H^T)^i (A)^{2j} (\phi)^k (h^T)^l.\quad (165)$$

becomes important at the energy scale

$$\Lambda = (M_p m^b)^{1/(a+b)}.\quad (166)$$

The lowest scales of the interaction terms involving both the ghost-like modes  $(H^T, \phi)$  and the healthy modes  $(h^T, A)$  <sup>32</sup> can be found:

- The lowest scale of the two-derivative terms is

$$\Lambda_5 = (M_p m^4)^{1/5},\quad (167)$$

where the cubic terms

$$j = k = 1, \quad i = l = 0,\quad (168)$$

and

$$k = 2, \quad l = 1, \quad i = j = 0\quad (169)$$

become important.

- The lowest scale of the potential terms is

$$\Lambda_3 = (M_p m^2)^{1/3},\quad (170)$$

where infinitely many terms

$$j = 1, \quad k = 1 + n, \quad i = l = 0\quad (171)$$

and

$$k = 2 + n, \quad l = 1, \quad i = j = 0\quad (172)$$

$$n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\quad (173)$$

become important.

The cut-off scale of the two-derivative terms is lower than that of the potential terms, so a generic bi-gravity model in the second class (54) is a consistent effective field theory at least up to  $\Lambda_5$ . <sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> If  $\alpha < 0$ , then the helicity-1 mode  $A_\mu$  becomes a ghost due to a wrong sign kinetic term. If  $a = 0$ , the helicity-1 mode is strongly coupled. In addition,  $A_\mu$  could be Ostrogradsky's vector ghost if the equations of motion involve higher order time derivative terms of  $A_\mu$ . But from the constraint analysis [30], we can count the numbers of dynamical degrees of freedom, and we know the novel kinetic terms do not contain Ostrogradsky's vector ghost.

<sup>33</sup> If the potential terms are modified, then Ostrogradsky's scalar ghost is eliminated only at the linear level. If the massive spin-2 field has a correct sign kinetic term, then the cut-off scale set by the Boulware-Deser ghost is  $\Lambda_5$  as well.

We can further improve this by turning off  $\mathcal{L}_3^{\text{kin}}$ , then the kinetic terms have more gauge symmetries. The kinetic terms contain only helicity-2 modes whose the interaction scale is set by the Planck mass. In this way, we are able to increase the cut-off scale to at least  $\Lambda_3$ <sup>34</sup>

$$\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_3 \equiv (M_p m^2)^{1/3}. \quad (174)$$

It should be noted that we need to make sure the spin-2 ghost does not couple to the matter below the cut-off scale. This indicates we should consider an effective metric [51]<sup>35</sup>.

In a different region of parameter space, it is possible that the massless spin-2 field has a wrong sign, while the massive one is healthy. By eliminating the BD-ghost and using the gauge-invariant kinetic terms, the cut-off scale is set by the interaction terms  $k = 2 + n$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $i = j = 0$  from the potentials, which is  $\Lambda_3$  again. When the mass squared has a correct sign, these effective field theory contain a ghost-free massive graviton and a decoupled ghost-like, massless spin-2 field below the cut-off scale.

Here we want to give one possible reason for “naturally” large coefficients of the higher curvature terms. In the bi-gravity formulation, the gauge symmetries are enhanced when

$$m^2 = 0, \quad a_3 = 0, \quad (175)$$

so small values of  $m^2$  and  $a_3$  are technically natural, which is analogous to the mass of electron. Quantum corrections to these parameters should be multiplicative, rather than additive.

## IX. SYMMETRIC CONDITION

In the above sections, we impose the symmetric condition or the Deser-van Nieuwenhuizen condition [16] to minimize the numbers of dynamical degrees of freedom. In this section, we present a general way to derive the symmetric condition from the equations of motion.

Let us decompose the rank-2 tensor  $e_{\mu\nu}$  into two parts

$$e_{\mu\nu} = F_\mu^A E_\nu^B \eta_{AB} = e_{\mu\nu}^s + e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}. \quad (176)$$

where  $e_{\mu\nu}^s$  is the symmetric part and  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$  is the antisymmetric part

$$e_{\mu\nu}^s = e_{\nu\mu}^s, \quad e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}} = -e_{\nu\mu}^{\text{as}}. \quad (177)$$

In the Lagrangians, an antisymmetric product vanishes if it contains an odd number of  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$ . In 4d bi-gravity models, the antisymmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  only appears in the terms below

$$R_{\mu\nu}^{[\mu\nu]} (e^{\text{as}})_\rho{}^\rho (e^{\text{as}})_\sigma{}^\sigma, \quad (178)$$

<sup>34</sup> In [52], it was shown that the  $\Lambda_3$  interaction terms vanish in some cases which are equivalent to quadratic curvature gravity. This indicates the cut-off scale may be higher than  $\Lambda_3$ .

<sup>35</sup> But the BD ghost will be revived at some scale above  $\Lambda_3$  due to the use of an effective metric.

$$(e^{\text{as}})_\mu^{[\mu} (e^{\text{as}})_{\nu}{}^{\nu]}, \quad (e^{\text{as}})_\mu^{[\mu} (e^{\text{as}})_{\nu}{}^{\nu} (e^s)_\rho{}^\rho (e^s)_\sigma{}^\sigma], \quad (179)$$

$$(e^{\text{as}})_\mu^{[\mu} (e^{\text{as}})_{\nu}{}^{\nu} (e^s)_\rho{}^\rho (e^s)_\sigma{}^\sigma], \quad (180)$$

$$(e^{\text{as}})_\mu^{[\mu} (e^{\text{as}})_{\nu}{}^{\nu} (e^{\text{as}})_\rho{}^\rho (e^{\text{as}})_\sigma{}^\sigma]. \quad (181)$$

We argue that the equations of motion for  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$  generally lead to the symmetric condition

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}} \int \mathcal{L} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}} = 0, \quad (182)$$

because the equations for  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$  can be written in a matrix form

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu, \rho\sigma} (e^{\text{as}})^{\rho\sigma} = 0, \quad (183)$$

which gives the symmetric condition if  $\mathcal{A}$  is invertible. An important point is that the Lagrangians do not contain linear terms, so the equations of motion for  $e^{\text{as}}$  are homogeneous<sup>36</sup>.

The argument is clear if (181) is not considered. When the Lagrangian contains (181), the equations of motion contain cubic terms of  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$ . Then we can write the cubic terms as products of quadratic terms and linear terms, and think of the quadratic terms as part of the matrix  $\mathcal{A}$ .<sup>37</sup>

We do not have a proof that the above argument works in general, but we check several examples and always find that

$$\det \mathcal{A} \neq 0. \quad (184)$$

The spirit is close to [10], where the symmetric condition is derived from a local Lorentz transformation. In addition, we do not rule out the possibility that  $\mathcal{A}$  could be degenerate at some singular points of the phase space.

## X. HIGHER DERIVATIVE GENERALIZATIONS

Along the line of Lovelock terms, the novel kinetic terms can be generalized to novel higher-derivative terms [7]<sup>38</sup>

$$R(E) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E) \wedge E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge F \wedge \cdots \wedge F, \quad (185)$$

which might be inconsistent with terms involving  $R(F)$ .

In section V, we discuss the special cases with only one  $F$  vielbein

$$R(E) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E) \wedge E \wedge \cdots \wedge E \wedge F, \quad (186)$$

<sup>36</sup> We assume the matter does not couple to the antisymmetric part of  $e_{\mu\nu}$  linearly. For example, if the physical vielbein is a linear combination of  $E_\mu^A$  and  $F_\mu^B$ , the corresponding physical metric will contain a quadratic term  $e_{\mu\rho}^{\text{as}} e_{\nu}^{\text{as}\rho}$ , so the equations of motion for  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$  are homogeneous.

<sup>37</sup> Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  can be degenerate for special values of  $e_{\mu\nu}^{\text{as}}$  if they are not the solutions of the equations of motion at the same time.

<sup>38</sup> If we impose the symmetric condition and fix the second metric to be Minkowski, they are equivalent to the higher derivative interactions proposed in [17].

which have the same gauge symmetries as  $R(E) \wedge E \wedge F$ . They describe the derivative interactions between two massless, gauge invariant spin-2 fields, where the Boulware-Deser ghost is absent. We expect other higher derivative terms in (185) do not contain the BD ghost as well.

For the extension to multi-gravity, we have

$$R(E^{(1)}) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E^{(1)}) \wedge E^{(2)} \wedge \cdots \wedge E^{(d-n)}, \quad (187)$$

where  $n$  is the number of curvature 2-forms and  $E^{(k)}$  vielbeins can be the same or different. Lovelock terms and dRGT terms are unified in (187).

In the end, we would like to connect with some results in the literature. The bi-gravity models with (186) in the metric formulation were already proposed in [31] as generalizations of New Massive Gravity. The BD ghost was argued to be absent by counting the degrees of freedom using symmetries [31, 53]. The antisymmetric structure guarantees that the equations of motion for the decomposed fields

$$e_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{e}_{\mu\nu} + \nabla_\mu A_\nu + \nabla_\nu A_\mu + \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \phi \quad (188)$$

are of second order, so additional degrees of freedom are avoided<sup>39</sup>. Then one can count the dynamical degrees of freedom in the bi-gravity models and show that the total number is at most  $(d^2 - 2d - 1)$ , which is that of a massless and a massive spin-2 fields. Therefore, the Boulware-Deser ghost is absent<sup>40</sup>.

From this argument, we can see why the curvature tensors should be associated with the same spin-2 field  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . If a curvature tensor contains the second spin-2 field  $e_{\mu\nu}$ , then the equations of motion for the decomposed modes will usually be of higher order, because they are not gauge modes in a curvature tensor and no apparent antisymmetric structure is protecting them<sup>41</sup>.

The decomposed field argument concerning (186) is based on the fact that Lovelock tensors are divergence-free. For the other novel derivative terms in (187), we can generalize this argument by using the second Bianchi identity

$$\nabla_{[\mu} R_{\nu\rho]}^{\alpha\beta} = 0. \quad (189)$$

The covariant derivatives in front of the decomposed fields will not act on the Riemann tensor after integrating by parts,

<sup>39</sup> This argument is dangerous. The equation of motion for the decomposed field  $\phi$  contains third order derivative terms of the metric, in the form of covariant derivatives of curvature tensors. In addition, if one varies the action with respect to the metric after the substitution, the equations of motion will contain third order derivative terms of  $\phi$  due to the variations of covariant derivatives. But it is possible that the third order time derivative terms can be removed by the time derivatives of some second order equations [54], then the counting of the degrees of freedom is correct.

<sup>40</sup> When there are additional gauge symmetries, the number of dynamical degrees of freedom is reduced.

<sup>41</sup> In [55], an Einstein-Hilbert term for  $e_{\mu\nu}$  was introduced to obtain unitary models. However, we suspect the absence of ghost-like degrees of freedom is an artifact of linearization. For example, in the minisuperspace approximation, the Hamiltonians are not linear in the lapse functions.

so the equations of motion for the decomposed fields will not contain 4th order derivative terms of the metric. The variation of a Riemann tensor  $R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}$  contains some second covariant derivative terms of  $\delta g_\mu{}^\nu$  which are antisymmetrized, so the equations of motion for the metric will not contain 4th order derivative terms of  $\phi$ .

In the vielbein formulation, the second Bianchi identity stems from a basic identity of exterior derivative

$$d^2 = 0, \quad (190)$$

which is the key element of the unifying framework [7, 8].

## XI. CONCLUSION

In summary, we present evidence that

$$R(E^{(1)}) \wedge \cdots \wedge R(E^{(1)}) \wedge E^{(2)} \wedge \cdots \wedge E^{(n)} \quad (191)$$

are basic building blocks for the actions of interacting spin-2 fields that are free of the Boulware-Deser ghost<sup>42</sup>. Models that can be constructed from these building blocks include Einstein gravity, Weyl gravity, Lovelock gravity, New Massive Gravity, dRGT massive gravity and some of their generalizations. The parameter space is further extended by novel derivative terms.

Curiously, the building blocks (191) can be obtained from Lovelock terms by replacing some of the vielbeins in the wedge products with other vielbeins.

The novel two-derivative terms in 4d are studied in detail:

- Based on a minisuperspace analysis, a large class of bi-gravity models (54) are identified, which are potentially free of the Boulware-Deser ghost.
- The bi-gravity models in this class (54) do not have the usual single dynamical metric limit with a fixed metric, which is in accordance with the no-go theorem for new kinetic interaction for single dynamical metric in [18].
- We reformulate some well-understood models of higher curvature gravity as bi-gravity models in this class (54). Their spectra are known to contain 1 massless and 1 massive spin-2 fields without the BD ghost.
- The argument that New Massive Gravity is free of the BD ghost is extended to other bi-gravity models in this class (54), which applies to novel higher-derivative terms as well<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Parity is assumed to be preserved, otherwise there are more possible terms. For example, in 3d, one could introduce a gravitational Chern-Simons term which violates parity [56]. The critical points of higher derivative gravity theories were first investigated in this context [57].

<sup>43</sup> The absence of the BD ghost in 4d novel kinetic terms is proved by the constraint analyses in [30].



This class of bi-gravity models are interesting despite the issue of spin-2 ghosts. Firstly, as toy models of quantum gravity, they have better chance to be perturbative renormalizable and there are less negative norm states because the BD-ghost is absent. Secondly, as effective field theories of gravity, they can increase the cut-off scale set by higher derivative terms with large coefficients<sup>44</sup>.

In general, we can avoid the ghost modes by reducing the number of dynamical degrees of freedom. A useful strategy of eliminating ghost modes is to impose specific boundary conditions. Another method to remove the spin-2 ghosts is simply setting the decomposed helicity-2 modes  $\tilde{e}_{\mu\nu}$  in (188) to zero. They may give rise to healthy vector-tensor theories<sup>45</sup>.

In the light of the AdS/CFT correspondence [59], the large class of non-unitary bi-gravity models may be dual to non-unitary conformal field theories. It is interesting to explore non-unitary holography in the extended parameter space.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment: I would like to give special thanks to Xian Gao, Elias Kiritsis and Ryo Saito for inspiring discussions. I am grateful to E. Babichev, C. Charmousis, E. Joung, J. Mourad, V. Niarchos, F. Nitti, K. Noui and D. Steer for useful comments or/and discussions. I want to thank C. de Rham, K. Hinterbichler, A. Matas, A. Solomon and A. Tolley for correspondence. I also thank A. Tseytlin for pointing out a missed reference.

This work was supported in part by European Union's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreements (FP7-REGPOT-2012-2013-1) no 316165, the EU program "Thales" MIS 375734 and was also cofinanced by the European Union (European Social Fund, ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) under "Funding of proposals that have received a positive evaluation in the 3rd and 4th Call of ERC Grant Schemes".

- 
- [1] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **173**, 211 (1939).
  - [2] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).
  - [3] D. Lovelock, J. Math. Phys. **12**, 498 (1971).
  - [4] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) doi:10.1086/300499 [astro-ph/9805201]; S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) doi:10.1086/307221 [astro-ph/9812133].
  - [5] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **10**, 363 (1974); A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]]; C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084003 (2009) [arXiv:0901.1314 [hep-th]]; C. Deffayet, S. Deser and G. Esposito-Farese, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 064015 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1967 [gr-qc]]; C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 064039 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].
  - [6] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 044020 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.044020 [arXiv:1007.0443 [hep-th]]; C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].
  - [7] W. Li, arXiv:1508.03247 [gr-qc].
  - [8] W. Li, arXiv:1510.05496 [hep-th].
  - [9] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1202**, 126 (2012) [arXiv:1109.3515 [hep-th]].
  - [10] K. Hinterbichler and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1207**, 047 (2012) [arXiv:1203.5783 [hep-th]].
  - [11] E. A. Bergshoeff, S. de Haan, O. Hohm, W. Merbis and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, no. 11, 111102 (2013) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, no. 25, 259902 (2013)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.111102, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.259902 [arXiv:1307.2774].
  - [12] B. Zumino, Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory v.2, Cambridge, Mass.: Brandeis Univ., pp. 437-500
  - [13] K. Hinterbichler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.84.671 [arXiv:1105.3735 [hep-th]]; C. de Rham, Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 7 (2014) doi:10.12942/lrr-2014-7 [arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th]]; A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, J. Phys. A **49**, no. 18, 183001 (2016) doi:10.1088/1751-8113/49/18/183001 [arXiv:1512.00021 [hep-th]].
  - [14] S. Folkerts, A. Pritzel and N. Wintergerst, arXiv:1107.3157 [hep-th].
  - [15] K. Hinterbichler, JHEP **1310**, 102 (2013) [arXiv:1305.7227 [hep-th]].
  - [16] S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 411 (1974). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.411
  - [17] R. Kimura and D. Yamauchi, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 084025 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.084025 [arXiv:1308.0523 [gr-qc]].
  - [18] C. de Rham, A. Matas and A. J. Tolley, Class. Quant. Grav. **31**, 165004 (2014) [arXiv:1311.6485 [hep-th]].
  - [19] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 3368 (1972). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.6.3368
  - [20] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 041101 (2012) [arXiv:1106.3344 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan, R. A. Rosen and A. Schmidt-May, JHEP **1202**, 026 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2012)026 [arXiv:1109.3230 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1204**, 123 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2012)123 [arXiv:1111.2070 [hep-th]].
  - [21] C. de Rham, A. Matas and A. J. Tolley, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, no. 21, 215027 (2015) [arXiv:1505.00831 [hep-th]].
  - [22] A. Matas, Class. Quant. Grav. **33**, no. 7, 075004 (2016) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/33/7/075004 [arXiv:1506.00666 [hep-th]].
  - [23] G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, Annales Poincare Phys. Theor. A **20**, 69 (1974); S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen,

<sup>44</sup> An important question is whether the special structure of BD-ghost-free building blocks are detuned by quantum corrections.

<sup>45</sup> We refer to [58] for recent developments on vector-tensor models,

- Phys. Rev. D **10**, 401 (1974). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.401; S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 401 (1974). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.401; M. H. Goroff and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **266**, 709 (1986). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90193-8.
- [24] K. S. Stelle, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 953 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.953; K. S. Stelle, Gen. Rel. Grav. **9**, 353 (1978). doi:10.1007/BF00760427.
- [25] J. F. Donoghue, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3874 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.50.3874 [gr-qc/9405057].
- [26] K. Nomura and J. Soda, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 084052 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.084052 [arXiv:1207.3637 [hep-th]].
- [27] S. Deser, E. Joung and A. Waldron, J. Phys. A **46**, 214019 (2013) doi:10.1088/1751-8113/46/21/214019 [arXiv:1208.1307 [hep-th]].
- [28] D. Langlois and K. Noui, JCAP **1602**, no. 02, 034 (2016) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/02/034 [arXiv:1510.06930 [gr-qc]].
- [29] E. Kiritsis, JHEP **0611**, 049 (2006) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/11/049 [hep-th/0608088]; E. Kiritsis and V. Niarchos, JHEP **0808**, 044 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/08/044 [arXiv:0805.4234 [hep-th]]; E. Kiritsis and V. Niarchos, Nucl. Phys. B **812**, 488 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2008.12.010 [arXiv:0808.3410 [hep-th]].
- [30] W. Li, arXiv:1512.06386 [hep-th].
- [31] M. F. Paulos and A. J. Tolley, JHEP **1209**, 002 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2012)002 [arXiv:1203.4268 [hep-th]].
- [32] E. A. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 201301 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.201301 [arXiv:0901.1766 [hep-th]].
- [33] E. A. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 124042 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.124042 [arXiv:0905.1259 [hep-th]].
- [34] M. Blagojevic and B. Cvetkovic, JHEP **1101**, 082 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2011)082 [arXiv:1010.2596 [gr-qc]]; M. Sadegh and A. Shirzad, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 084040 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.084040 [arXiv:1010.2887 [hep-th]].
- [35] S. Deser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 101302 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.101302 [arXiv:0904.4473 [hep-th]].
- [36] E. A. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm, J. Rosseel and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 104038 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.104038 [arXiv:1102.4091 [hep-th]].
- [37] Y. Liu and Y. w. Sun, JHEP **0904**, 106 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/106 [arXiv:0903.0536 [hep-th]].
- [38] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 181302 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.181302 [arXiv:1101.1971 [hep-th]]; S. Deser, H. Liu, H. Lu, C. N. Pope, T. C. Sisman and B. Tekin, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 061502 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.061502 [arXiv:1101.4009 [hep-th]].
- [39] J. D. Brown and M. Henneaux, Commun. Math. Phys. **104**, 207 (1986). doi:10.1007/BF01211590
- [40] D. Grumiller and N. Johansson, JHEP **0807**, 134 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/134 [arXiv:0805.2610 [hep-th]].
- [41] D. Grumiller and O. Hohm, Phys. Lett. B **686**, 264 (2010) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.02.065 [arXiv:0911.4274 [hep-th]].
- [42] M. Alishahiha and R. Fareghbal, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 084052 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.084052 [arXiv:1101.5891 [hep-th]].
- [43] N. Boulanger, T. Damour, L. Gualtieri and M. Henneaux, Nucl. Phys. B **597**, 127 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(00)00718-5 [hep-th/0007220].
- [44] S. Gwak, E. Joung, K. Mkrtchyan and S. J. Rey, JHEP **1604**, 055 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)055 [arXiv:1511.05220 [hep-th]].
- [45] M. Kaku, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **69B**, 304 (1977). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(77)90552-4
- [46] E. Joung, W. Li and M. Taronna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 091101 (2014) [arXiv:1406.2335 [hep-th]].
- [47] C. de Rham and S. Renaux-Petel, JCAP **1301**, 035 (2013) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/01/035 [arXiv:1206.3482 [hep-th]].
- [48] C. de Rham, K. Hinterbichler, R. A. Rosen and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 2, 024003 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.024003 [arXiv:1302.0025 [hep-th]].
- [49] S. Deser, M. Sandora and A. Waldron, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 10, 101501 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.101501 [arXiv:1301.5621 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, Phys. Lett. B **726**, 834 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.09.021 [arXiv:1208.1797 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 184010 (2013) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/30/18/184010 [arXiv:1212.4525 [hep-th]]; S. Deser and A. Waldron, S. Deser, M. Sandora and A. Waldron, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 10, 101501 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.101501 [arXiv:1301.5621 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan, A. Schmidt-May and M. von Strauss, Universe **1**, no. 2, 92 (2015) doi:10.3390/universe1020092 [arXiv:1303.6940 [hep-th]]; M. Fasiello and A. J. Tolley, JCAP **1312**, 002 (2013) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/12/002 [arXiv:1308.1647 [hep-th]]; S. Alexandrov and C. Deffayet, JCAP **1503**, no. 03, 043 (2015) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/03/043 [arXiv:1410.2897 [hep-th]]; S. Garcia-Saenz and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1505**, 042 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)042 [arXiv:1410.8734 [hep-th]].
- [50] L. F. Abbott and S. Deser, Nucl. Phys. B **195**, 76 (1982). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90049-9; S. Deser and B. Tekin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 101101 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.101101 [hep-th/0205318]; S. Deser and B. Tekin, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 084009 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.67.084009 [hep-th/0212292].
- [51] C. de Rham, L. Heisenberg and R. H. Ribeiro, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, 035022 (2015) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/32/3/035022 [arXiv:1408.1678 [hep-th]]; J. Noller and S. Melville, JCAP **1501**, 003 (2015) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/01/003 [arXiv:1408.5131 [hep-th]]; C. de Rham, L. Heisenberg and R. H. Ribeiro, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 124042 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.124042 [arXiv:1409.3834 [hep-th]].
- [52] K. Hinterbichler and M. Saravani, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 065006 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.065006 [arXiv:1508.02401 [hep-th]].
- [53] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, D. Pirtskhalava, A. J. Tolley and I. Yavin, JHEP **1106**, 028 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2011)028 [arXiv:1103.1351 [hep-th]].
- [54] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and D. A. Steer, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 084013 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.084013 [arXiv:1506.01974 [gr-qc]].
- [55] A. Akhavan, M. Alishahiha, A. Naseh, A. Nematy and A. Shirzad, JHEP **1605**, 006 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2016)006 [arXiv:1603.03270 [hep-th]].
- [56] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Annals Phys. **140**, 372

- (1982) [Annals Phys. **281**, 409 (2000)] Erratum: [Annals Phys. **185**, 406 (1988)]. doi:10.1006/aphy.2000.6013, 10.1016/0003-4916(82)90164-6
- [57] W. Li, W. Song and A. Strominger, JHEP **0804**, 082 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/082 [arXiv:0801.4566 [hep-th]].
- [58] G. Tasinato, JHEP **1404**, 067 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)067 [arXiv:1402.6450 [hep-th]]; L. Heisenberg, JCAP **1405**, 015 (2014) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2014/05/015 [arXiv:1402.7026 [hep-th]]; M. Hull, K. Koyama and G. Tasinato, JHEP **1503**, 154 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2015)154 [arXiv:1408.6871 [hep-th]]; M. Hull, K. Koyama and G. Tasinato, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 6, 064012 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.064012 [arXiv:1510.07029 [hep-th]]; E. Allys, P. Peter and Y. Rodriguez, JCAP **1602**, no. 02, 004 (2016) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/02/004 [arXiv:1511.03101 [hep-th]]; A. De Felice, L. Heisenberg, R. Kase, S. Tsujikawa, Y. I. Zhang and G. B. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 10, 104016 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.104016 [arXiv:1602.00371 [gr-qc]]; A. De Felice, L. Heisenberg, R. Kase, S. Mukohyama, S. Tsujikawa and Y. I. Zhang, JCAP **1606**, no. 06, 048 (2016) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/06/048 [arXiv:1603.05806 [gr-qc]]; A. De Felice, L. Heisenberg, R. Kase, S. Mukohyama, S. Tsujikawa and Y. I. Zhang, arXiv:1605.05066 [gr-qc]; L. Heisenberg, R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1605.05565 [hep-th]; E. Allys, J. P. Beltran Almeida, P. Peter and Y. Rodriguez, arXiv:1605.08355 [hep-th].
- [59] J. M. Maldacena, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113 (1999) [Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998)] [hep-th/9711200]; S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00377-3 [hep-th/9802109]; E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998) [hep-th/9802150].