

Palatini quadratic gravity: spontaneous breaking of gauged scale symmetry and inflation

D. M. Ghilencea *

Department of Theoretical Physics, National Institute of Physics
and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest 077125, Romania

Abstract

We study quadratic gravity $R^2 + R_{[\mu\nu]}^2$ in the Palatini formalism where the connection and the metric are independent. This action has a *gauged* scale symmetry (also known as Weyl gauge symmetry) of Weyl gauge field $v_\mu = (\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu)/2$, with $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ (Γ_μ) the trace of the Palatini (Levi-Civita) connection, respectively. The underlying geometry is non-metric due to the $R_{[\mu\nu]}^2$ term acting as a gauge kinetic term for v_μ . We show that the gauge field becomes massive by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism by absorbing the derivative of the dilaton ($\partial_\mu \ln \phi$). Palatini quadratic gravity with dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \sim v_\mu$ is thus a gauged scale invariant theory broken spontaneously. In the broken phase one finds the Einstein-Proca action of v_μ of mass near the Planck scale (M) with a positive cosmological constant. Below this scale v_μ decouples, the connection becomes Levi-Civita and metricity and Einstein gravity are recovered. These results remain valid in the presence of non-minimally coupled matter, with Palatini connection. This is similar to recent results by the author for Weyl quadratic gravity, up to different non-metricity effects. When coupled to a Higgs-like scalar field, Palatini quadratic gravity gives successful inflation and a specific prediction for the tensor-to-scalar ratio $0.007 \leq r \leq 0.01$ for current spectral index n_s (at 95%CL) and $N = 60$ e-folds. This value of r is mildly larger than in inflation in Weyl gravity, due to different non-metricity. This establishes a connection between non-metricity and inflation predictions and enables us to test these theories by future CMB experiments.

*E-mail: dimitru.ghilencea@cern.ch

1 Introduction

At a fundamental level gravity may be regarded as a theory of connections. An example is the “Palatini approach” to gravity due to Einstein [1,2], hereafter called EP approach [3,4]. In this case the “Palatini connection” ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) is a priori independent of the metric ($g_{\alpha\beta}$) and is actually determined by its equations of motion, from the action considered. For simple actions, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ plays an auxiliary role only, with no dynamics. For example, for an Einstein action in the EP approach the variation principle gives that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is actually equal to the Levi-Civita connection (Γ). With this solution for $\tilde{\Gamma}$, one then recovers Einstein gravity - the metric formulation and EP approach are equivalent.

However, this equivalence is not true in general, for complicated actions, with matter present, etc, see e.g. [5–18]. For example, for quadratic gravity actions of the type studied in this work in the EP approach, the equations of motion for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ become complicated second-order differential equations, with new effects, e.g. $\tilde{\Gamma}$ becomes dynamical in a sense discussed shortly. The question remains, however, if such general actions in the EP formalism and *in the absence of matter* can recover *dynamically* the Levi-Civita connection and Einstein gravity. If true, this would be similar to the original Weyl quadratic gravity theory [19–22] as we showed recently in [23–25]. The main goal of this paper is to answer this question.

To address this question we study a gravity action in the EP approach with *gauged* scale symmetry also called Weyl gauge symmetry¹, see [23,24] for an example. This symmetry, present in Weyl gravity [19–21], is important for mass scales generation, hence our interest. This symmetry demands us to consider a quadratic gravity action, with no dimensionful parameters. For such action we shall: 1) explain the spontaneous breaking of this symmetry and the emergence of Levi-Civita connection, Einstein gravity and Planck scale in the broken phase, even in the absence of matter; this answers the above question; 2) study the relation of this action to Weyl theory [19–21] of similar symmetry; 3) study its inflation predictions.

Consider first $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ gravity in the EP approach. This action is local scale invariant, as reviewed in Section 2. Here $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ denotes the scalar curvature in the EP approach. The connection is shown to be conformally related to the Levi-Civita connection. When “fixing the gauge” of this symmetry, the “auxiliary” scalar field ϕ introduced to “linearise” the R^2 term decouples. As a result, one finds that $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$ and Einstein action is obtained.

Consider now the quadratic action $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 + R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2$ in the EP approach, with notation $R_{[\mu\nu]} \equiv (R_{\mu\nu} - R_{\nu\mu})/2$. The trace $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ of the Palatini connection (assumed symmetric) is now *dynamical* in the sense that $R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2$ acts as a gauge kinetic term for $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ or, more exactly, for the vector field² $v_\mu \sim \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu$, ($\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\alpha}^\alpha$, $\Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\alpha}^\alpha$). With $\tilde{\Gamma}$ independent of $g_{\mu\nu}$, we notice that the local scale symmetry of this action is actually a *gauged* scale symmetry of gauge field v_μ . Sections 3 and 4 study this action called hereafter “EP quadratic gravity”.

Due to the dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \sim v_\mu$, EP quadratic gravity is³ *non-metric* $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, with

¹See e.g. [19–44] for models with gauged scale symmetry and [45–66] for conformal or global scale symmetry.

²Unlike $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ and Γ_μ , $v_\mu \propto \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu$ is indeed a vector (see Appendix). We assume $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$ (no torsion).

³Non-metricity means that under parallel transport along a curve a vector changes its norm (is path dependent); it must be suppressed by a large scale (e.g. Planck) to avoid atomic spectral lines changes [19].

non-metricity field v_μ (also called Weyl gauge field). For the same reason, the equations of motion of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ become now complicated second-order differential equations. In this case the usual EP approach in $f(R)$ theories to solve algebraically for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ [4] does not work, due to local scale symmetry and non-metricity. Even so, we show that the action obtained for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ *onshell* is equivalent to a ghost-free second order gauged scale invariant theory with an *additional* dynamical field (dilaton) (while the differential equations become of first order).

An important result of this work is that the gauged scale invariance of the above action is broken by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism [67–69] (Section 3). The gauge field v_μ becomes massive, with mass (m_v) near the Planck scale (M), by “absorbing” the derivative of the dilaton field ($\partial_\mu \ln \phi$). When “gauge fixing” the Weyl gauge symmetry, near the scale $M \sim \langle \phi \rangle$ we obtain the Einstein-Proca action of v_μ . Further, below the scale $m_v \propto M$, the field v_μ decouples and we recover metricity, Levi-Civita connection and Einstein gravity. The Planck scale M is an emergent scale where this symmetry breaks. The results remain true if the theory has extra scalar fields (higgs, etc) non-minimally coupled with Palatini connection, while respecting gauged scale invariance (Section 4). Briefly, the EP quadratic gravity with dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is shown to be a gauged scale invariant theory broken à la Stueckelberg to an Einstein-Proca action and a positive cosmological constant. This will answer the main question of the paper, presented earlier.

Another theory where the connection is not determined by the metric itself is the original Weyl quadratic gravity of gauged scale invariance [19–21] (also [22]). With hindsight, it is then not too surprising that the above results are similar to those in [23–25] for Weyl theory. This theory came under early criticism from Einstein [19] for its non-metricity implying e.g. changes of the atomic spectral lines, in contrast to experiment; however, if the Weyl “photon” (v_μ) of non-metricity is actually massive (mass $\sim M$) by the same Stueckelberg mechanism, metricity and Einstein gravity are recovered below its decoupling scale (\sim Planck scale). Non-metricity effects are then strongly suppressed by a large M (their current lower bound seems low [70, 71]). Hence, long-held criticisms that implicitly assumed v_μ be massless are avoided and Weyl gravity is then viable [23–25]. As outlined, in this work we obtain similar results in Einstein-Palatini quadratic gravity, up to different non-metricity effects.

We also study inflation in EP quadratic gravity, with new, interesting results (Section 4). We consider this theory with an extra scalar field (Higgs-like) with perturbative non-minimal coupling and Palatini connection, that plays the role of the inflaton. We compute the potential after the gauged scale symmetry breaking. With the Planck scale a simple phase transition scale in our theory, field values above M are natural. Interestingly, the inflaton potential is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity [25], up to couplings and field redefinitions (due to a different non-metricity of the theory). We show that inflation in EP quadratic gravity has a specific prediction for the tensor-to-scalar ratio $0.007 \leq r \leq 0.010$ for the current spectral index n_s at 95% CL. This range of r is distinct from that predicted by inflation in Weyl quadratic gravity [25, 44] and will soon be reached by CMB experiments [72–74]. We thus establish an interesting connection between non-metricity and testable inflation predictions of these theories. Our Conclusions are presented in Section 5, followed by an Appendix with some useful formulae used in the text.

2 Palatini R^2 gravity

For later reference, we first review R^2 gravity in the EP formalism (no dynamics for $\tilde{\Gamma}$) [75]. As discussed below, the action is local scale invariant (unlike its Riemannian counterpart):

$$L_1 = \sqrt{g} \frac{\xi_0}{4!} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2, \quad \xi_0 > 0, \quad (1)$$

where

$$R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}), \quad R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \partial_\lambda \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda - \partial_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}_{\lambda\nu}^\lambda + \tilde{\Gamma}_{\rho\lambda}^\lambda \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\rho\mu}^\lambda \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\lambda}^\rho \quad (2)$$

$R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ is the metric-independent Ricci tensor in the EP formalism. Our conventions are as in [76] with metric $(+, -, -, -)$, $g \equiv |\det g_{\mu\nu}|$ and we assume there is no torsion i.e. $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\rho$.

There is an equivalent “linearised” version of L_1 , found by using an auxiliary field ϕ

$$L_1 = \sqrt{g} \frac{\xi_0}{4!} \left\{ -2\phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Indeed, (1) is recovered if we use in (3) the solution $\phi^2 = -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ of the equation of motion of the scalar field ϕ . With the connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$ independent of the metric, (3) and (1) have local scale symmetry i.e. are invariant under a Weyl transformation $\Omega = \Omega(x)$ with⁴

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \sqrt{\hat{g}} = \Omega^4 \sqrt{g}, \quad \hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \phi, \quad \hat{R}(\tilde{\Gamma}, \hat{g}) = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g). \quad (4)$$

Unlike in the metric case, $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ is invariant under (4) while $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ transforms covariantly, hence (1), (3) are invariant. L_1 has a shift symmetry $\ln \phi \rightarrow \ln \phi - \ln \Omega$ and $\ln \phi$ plays the role of a Goldstone field of this symmetry (dilaton).

Let us solve the equation of motion for $\tilde{\Gamma}$, then find the action for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell⁵. The change of $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ under a variation of the connection is $\delta R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda (\delta \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda) - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu (\delta \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda)$, where the operator $\tilde{\nabla}$ depends on $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Then from (3) the equation of motion of $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ gives

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda (\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) - \frac{1}{2} \left[\tilde{\nabla}_\rho (\sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi^2) \delta_\lambda^\nu + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

Setting $\nu = \lambda$ and then summing over, then

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\rho (\sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi^2) = 0, \quad (6)$$

⁴From $\phi^2 = -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$, ϕ^2 transforms under metric rescaling like $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$, as expected for a scalar field.

⁵Obviously, with $\Omega^2 = \xi_0 \phi^2 / (6M^2)$ (with M the Planck scale), one can set ϕ to a constant (fix the “gauge” of local scale symmetry). L_1 becomes $L_1 = \sqrt{-g} \left\{ -(1/2)M^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - 3/(2\xi_0)M^4 \right\}$. This is the Palatini formulation of Einstein action; via eqs motion then $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ where $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu$ is computed with $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Hence $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a Levi-Civita connection. However, this approach obscures the role of local scale symmetry, relevant later.

To simplify notation, introduce an auxiliary dimensionful “metric” $h_{\mu\nu} \equiv \phi^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, then

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{h} h^{\mu\nu}) = 0. \quad (7)$$

This means that in terms of $h_{\mu\nu}$, the connection is Levi-Civita⁶

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(h) = (1/2) h^{\alpha\lambda} (\partial_\mu h_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu h_{\lambda\mu} - \partial_\lambda h_{\mu\nu}), \quad (9)$$

or, in terms of $g_{\mu\nu}$:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(g) + (1/2) (\delta_\nu^\alpha u_\mu + \delta_\mu^\alpha u_\nu - g^{\alpha\lambda} g_{\mu\nu} u_\lambda), \quad u_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2, \quad (10)$$

with Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(g) = (1/2) g^{\alpha\lambda} (\partial_\mu g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\lambda\mu} - \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu})$. From (10) one has

$$R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) = R(g) - 3\nabla_\mu u^\mu - \frac{3}{2} g^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu, \quad (11)$$

with the Ricci scalar $R(g)$ for $g_{\mu\nu}$ while ∇ is defined with the Levi-Civita connection (Γ). Using this in (3) of the same metric, then

$$L_1 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{\xi_0}{2} \left[-\frac{1}{6} \phi^2 R(g) - (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 - \frac{1}{12} \phi^4 \right] \right\}. \quad (12)$$

This is a second order theory with an additional ghost *demand*ed by symmetry (4) and rather expected: using (11) in (1) then L_1 is a higher derivative action (for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell).

Lagrangian (12) has a local scale symmetry so one may like to “fix the gauge”. We choose the Einstein gauge obtained after a particular transformation $\Omega^2 = \xi_0 \phi^2 / (6M^2)$ that is ϕ -dependent, taking ϕ to a *constant* (M is the Planck scale, $M \sim \langle \hat{\phi} \rangle$). Then L_1 becomes

$$L_1 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ \frac{-1}{2} M^2 \hat{R}(\hat{g}) - \frac{3}{2\xi_0} M^4 \right\}, \quad (13)$$

Hence Einstein action is recovered and the dilaton decoupled (see also [77]). With ϕ “gauge fixed”, then from (7) $h_{\mu\nu} \propto g_{\mu\nu}$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$ and metricity is present⁷. Note that action (12) has a “fake” local scale symmetry [78–80] since its associated current is vanishing (this will change in Section 3), so it is not surprising ϕ decoupled. This situation is unlike that in Riemannian case of $R(g)^2$ gravity [81] (eq.2.11), see also [82], where in the Einstein frame a kinetic term for ϕ remains present⁸.

⁶One shows $\tilde{\nabla} h_{\mu\nu} = 0$ by using $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h^{\mu\nu} = -h^{\mu\sigma} h^{\nu\rho} \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h_{\sigma\rho}$, and $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \sqrt{h} = (1/2) \sqrt{h} h^{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h_{\alpha\beta}$. (8)

⁷This result is also valid for Palatini $f(R)$ action instead of action (1); we do not consider it here since it violates Weyl scale symmetry, but one may then use the trace of the equation for $g_{\mu\nu}$, to solve for R , finding $f'(R) \propto \phi^2 = \text{constant}$, then $h_{\mu\nu} \propto g_{\mu\nu}$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$ so metricity and Einstein action are recovered e.g. [3,4].

⁸In metric $R(g)^2$ gravity no kinetic term is present in (12) but emerges in the Einstein frame.

3 Palatini quadratic gravity with gauged scale symmetry

3.1 The Lagrangian and its expression for onshell $\tilde{\Gamma}$

Consider now the following EP quadratic gravity, with $\alpha=\text{constant}$ and $R_{[\mu\nu]} \equiv (R_{\mu\nu} - R_{\nu\mu})/2$

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{\xi_0}{4!} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma}) R^{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \right\}. \quad (14)$$

With $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ from eq.(2) and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ symmetric in (μ, ν) , L_2 has a more intuitive form

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{\xi_0}{4!} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) F^{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \right\}. \quad (15)$$

This is a natural extension of L_1 of eq.(1), with the second term above indicating we now have a *dynamical* trace ($\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$) of the Palatini connection, as seen from the notation below:

$$F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \tilde{\nabla}_\mu v_\nu - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu v_\mu; \quad v_\mu = (1/2)(\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu(g)), \quad (16)$$

with $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda$ and $\Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda$. Since $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu v_\nu = \partial_\mu v_\nu - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha v_\alpha$, then we have $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu v_\nu - \partial_\nu v_\mu = (\partial_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}_\nu - \partial_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu)/2 = -R_{[\mu\nu]}$, and eqs.(14), (15) are equivalent. While $\Gamma_\mu(g)$ does not contribute to $F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2$, it is needed to ensure that v_μ is a vector under coordinate transformation (which is not true for $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ or Γ_μ , see Appendix). v_μ is called Weyl field⁹ and measures the trace of the deviation of the Palatini connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma(g)$. L_2 is quadratic in R but for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ offshell resembles a second order theory.

As in previous section, write L_2 in an equivalent “linearised” form useful later on

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{\xi_0}{12} \phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2 - \frac{\xi_0}{4!} \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (17)$$

The equation of motion for ϕ has solution $\phi^2 = -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ which replaced in L_2 recovers (15).

Since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ does not transform under (4) and with $\Gamma_\mu(g) = \partial_\mu \ln \sqrt{g}$ that follows from the definition of Levi-Civita connection, then L_2 is invariant under (4) extended by

$$\hat{v}_\lambda = v_\lambda - \partial_\mu \ln \Omega^2. \quad (18)$$

The invariance of L_2 under transformations (4), (18), is referred to as *gauged* scale invariance or Weyl gauge symmetry, with a (dilatation) group isomorphic to \mathbf{R}^+ , as in Weyl gravity.

Let us then compute the connection $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ from its equation of motion which is

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) - \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_\lambda^\nu \left[\tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\rho} \phi^2) - \frac{6\sqrt{g}}{\alpha^2 \xi_0} \nabla_\rho F^{\rho\mu} \right] + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} = 0. \quad (19)$$

⁹Definition (16) of gauge field v_μ is general, it also applies to Weyl gravity of similar symmetry (Appendix).

Here $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu$ and ∇_μ are evaluated with the Palatini ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) and Levi-Civita (Γ) connections, respectively. Setting $\lambda = \nu$ and summing over gives (compare against eq.(6))

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\rho} \phi^2) = \frac{10}{\alpha^2} \frac{1}{\xi_0} \sqrt{g} \nabla_\rho F^{\rho\mu}. \quad (20)$$

Replacing (20) back in (19) leads to

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) - \frac{1}{5} \left\{ \delta_\lambda^\nu \tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi^2) + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} = 0 \quad (21)$$

Note that, if one now used the equation of motion of ϕ of solution $\phi^2 = -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$, then (21) would be a *second-order* differential equation for $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$, since $\partial\phi^2 \sim \partial R \sim \partial^2 \tilde{\Gamma}$, with further complications. It is however easier to keep eq.(21) as a first-order differential equation by regarding ϕ hereafter as an independent variable (i.e. no use of its equation of motion) in terms of which one then easily computes $\tilde{\Gamma}$, as we do below¹⁰. To find a solution introduce [7]

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) = (-2)\sqrt{g} \phi^2 (\delta_\lambda^\mu V^\nu + \delta_\lambda^\nu V^\mu), \quad (22)$$

where V_μ is some arbitrary vector field; this field is introduced since eq.(21) for $\lambda = \nu$ (summed over) is automatically respected (μ fixed), hence eq.(21) leaves four undetermined components (due to underlying symmetry). Replacing eq.(22) in eq.(21), the latter is indeed verified. Hence we must find $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from (22)¹¹. First, by multiplying (22) by $g_{\mu\nu}$ one has

$$V_\lambda = -(1/2) \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \ln(\sqrt{g} \phi^4). \quad (23)$$

From (22), (23)

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\phi^2 g_{\mu\nu}) = (-2) (g_{\mu\nu} V_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} V_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} V_\mu) \phi^2. \quad (24)$$

Hence the theory is non-metric. From this we find the solution¹² for $\tilde{\Gamma}$:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(\phi^2 g) - (3 g_{\mu\nu} V_\lambda - g_{\nu\lambda} V_\mu - g_{\lambda\mu} V_\nu) g^{\lambda\alpha}, \quad (25)$$

$$\text{with } \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(\phi^2 g) = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(g) + 1/2 (\delta_\nu^\alpha \partial_\mu + \delta_\mu^\alpha \partial_\nu - g^{\alpha\lambda} g_{\mu\nu} \partial_\lambda) \ln \phi^2,$$

with $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(g)$ a Levi-Civita connection for $g_{\mu\nu}$. Then $\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda = \Gamma_\lambda(\phi^2 g) + 2V_\lambda$ and from (16), (23)

$$v_\lambda = -(1/2) \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \ln \sqrt{g}, \quad (26)$$

¹⁰The consequence of doing so is that ϕ will acquire a kinetic term and become dynamical, see later.

¹¹One cannot solve algebraically (22) as done in Palatini $f(R)$ theories [3, 4] due to non-vanishing rhs (dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$) and to the conformal symmetry of L_2 , absent in $f(R)$ theories, see discussion in [83], p.5-6.

¹²Use that $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\rho g_{\rho\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\lambda}^\rho g_{\mu\rho}$, for cyclic permutations of indices and combine them.

and hence $V_\lambda = v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2$. Using this, the solution $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in (25) (also eq.(24)) is easily expressed in terms of v_λ , ϕ (not shown) and will be used below to find the action for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell. One can check that (24) and (25) are invariant under transformations (4), (18) for any $\Omega(x)$ (since $\phi^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, V_λ , $\sqrt{g} \phi^4$ are invariant under these).

As expected, v_λ is the Weyl field of non-metricity $Q_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ ($Q_{\lambda\mu\nu} \equiv \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}$), since from (26) the trace $Q_{\lambda\mu}^\mu = -4 v_\lambda$. Non-metricity is a consequence of the dynamical connection, see (20). Eq.(26) is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity of similar symmetry (e.g.[30]).

Using (2) and solution (25) we compute $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ and the scalar curvature¹³ $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$

$$R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) = R(g) - 6g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \ln \phi - 6(\nabla_\mu \ln \phi)^2 - 12(\nabla_\lambda V^\lambda + V^\lambda \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2) - 6V_\mu V^\mu, \quad (28)$$

with $R(g)$ the usual Ricci scalar and V_λ is replaced by $v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2$. Finally, from (17),(28)

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{\xi_0}{12} [\phi^2 R(g) + 6(\partial_\mu \phi)^2] + \frac{\xi_0}{2} \phi^2 (v_\mu - \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{\xi_0}{4!} \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (29)$$

This Lagrangian has $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell and is gauged scale invariant: it is invariant under (4), (18) for any $\Omega(x)$. This is a scalar-vector-tensor theory of gravity. L_2 is a second order ghost-free theory with a positive kinetic term for ϕ . This is relevant since initial action (15) which seemed to be of second order is actually a four-derivative theory¹⁴ for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell due to a presence of $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ in (15) with replacement (28) that contains $R^2(g) + \dots$; this higher derivative theory has an equivalent second order formulation but with additional ϕ in (29).

Lagrangian (29) (also initial (15)), is similar to that of Weyl quadratic gravity [23, 24], up to a Weyl tensor-squared term not included here. However, here $\tilde{\Gamma}$ remains ϕ -dependent; there, non-metricity is assumed from the onset by the underlying Weyl conformal geometry, while here it emerges by computing $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from its equation of motion. If $v_\mu = \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2$ (“pure gauge”), the situation is similar to Weyl integrable models and (29) recovers (12).

3.2 Stueckelberg breaking to Einstein-Proca action

Given L_2 in (29) with gauged scale symmetry we would like to “fix the gauge”. We choose the Einstein gauge obtained from (29) by transformations (4), (18) of a special $\Omega^2 = \xi_0 \phi^2 / (6M^2)$ fixing ϕ to a constant ($\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$). We find, after removing the hats ($\hat{\cdot}$) on transformed g, v_μ, R

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M^2 R(g) + 3 M^2 v_\mu v_\nu g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{3}{2\xi_0} M^4 \right\}. \quad (30)$$

This is the Einstein-Proca action for the gauge field v_μ with a positive cosmological constant, in which we identified M with the Planck scale, with $M^2 \equiv \xi_0 \langle \phi \rangle^2 / 6$, see eq.(29).

¹³One has for $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ (which by contraction with $g^{\mu\nu}$ gives $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ of (28)):

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) &= R_{\mu\nu}(g) - 3g_{\mu\nu}(\nabla^\lambda V_\lambda + V^\lambda \partial_\lambda \theta) - (\nabla_\mu V_\nu - \nabla_\nu V_\mu) - 6V_\mu V_\nu + 1/2(\partial_\mu \theta)(\partial_\nu \theta) \\ &- 1/2 g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha \theta)(\partial_\beta \theta) - 1/2 g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda \partial_\lambda \theta + 1/2 \nabla_\nu \partial_\mu \theta - 3/2 \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \theta, \quad \theta \equiv \ln \phi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

¹⁴This agrees with e.g.[17] that in general in a Palatini model its metric part leads to a fourth order theory.

The initial gauged scale invariance is broken by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism [67–69]: the massless ϕ is not part of the action anymore, but v_μ has become massive, after “absorbing” the derivative $\partial_\mu(\ln \phi)$ of the Stueckelberg field (dilaton) in eq.(29). Note the term $\partial_\mu(\ln \phi)$ is also the Goldstone of special conformal symmetry - this Goldstone is not independent but is determined by the derivative of the dilaton [84]. The number of degrees of freedom (dof) other than graviton is conserved in going from (29) to (30), as it should be for spontaneous breaking: massless v_μ and dynamical ϕ are replaced by massive v_μ (dof=3). The mass of v_μ is $m_v^2 = 6\alpha^2 M^2$ which is near Planck scale M (unless one fine-tunes $\alpha \ll 1$).

Using the same transformation Ω , from (24)

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = (-2)(g_{\mu\nu} v_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} v_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} v_\mu). \quad (31)$$

Finally, after the massive field v_μ decouples, metricity is recovered below m_v , $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ so $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma(g)$. To conclude, Einstein action is a “low energy” limit of Einstein-Palatini quadratic gravity with dynamical connection; M is a phase transition scale (up to coupling α)¹⁵.

For comparison, in Weyl quadratic gravity e.g. [23, 24], non-metricity is different¹⁶

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = -g_{\mu\nu} v_\lambda. \quad (32)$$

Interestingly, the different non-metricity of these theories (giving different $\tilde{\Gamma}$) has phenomenological impact, see Section 4. In both theories the non-metricity scale $m_v \sim$ Planck scale is large enough (above current bounds [70, 71]) to suppresses unwanted effects e.g. atomic spectral lines spacing. Past critiques of non-metricity assumed a massless v_μ .

3.3 Conserved current

Eqs.(20) and (22) show there is now a non-trivial current

$$J^\mu = \sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi (\partial_\rho - 1/2 v_\rho) \phi, \quad \nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0, \quad (33)$$

due to the dynamical connection presence, and is conserved since $F_{\mu\nu}$ in (20) is anti-symmetric. To obtain (33) we used that the lhs of (20) and of (22) (with $\lambda = \nu$) are equal and replaced $V_\lambda = v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2$. The current J^μ is the same as that in Weyl quadratic gravity [23] (eq.18) which has similar symmetry but different non-metricity. The presence of this conserved current extends to the case of the *gauged* scale symmetry a similar conservation for a global scale symmetry [59]; for a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric with ϕ only t -dependent and vanishing v_λ , this naturally leads to ϕ =constant [59]; this means a dynamical “gauge fixing” and a breaking of scale symmetry. Note that since eq.(30) has ϕ =constant (assumed $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$), then from (33) one has $\nabla_\mu v^\mu = 0$ which is a condition similar to that for a Proca (massive) gauge field, leaving 3 degrees of freedom for v_μ in (30).

¹⁵A special case: consider (17) with $\phi^2 = 6M^2/\xi_0$ =constant, i.e. a different initial action with no symmetry! then (28), (29) simplify; we still find (30) but there is no dynamical ϕ and thus no Stueckelberg mechanism.

¹⁶Contracting (31),(32) by $g^{\mu\nu}$ gives the same non-metricity trace, justifying our normalization of v_μ eq.(16)

4 Palatini quadratic gravity: additional fields and inflation

Consider now Palatini quadratic gravity coupled to a scalar χ which can be the SM Higgs field. We re-do the previous analysis in this case, then study inflation (with χ as inflaton).

4.1 Adding matter

The general Lagrangian of the field χ , with gauged scale invariance, eqs.(4), (18), is then

$$L_3 = \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{\xi_0}{4!} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{12} \xi_1 \chi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{D}_\mu \chi)^2 - \frac{\lambda_1}{4!} \chi^4 \right], \quad (34)$$

with the potential dictated by this symmetry; χ couples with Palatini $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and

$$\tilde{D}_\mu \chi = (\partial_\mu - 1/2 v_\mu) \chi. \quad (35)$$

Under (4), (18) the Weyl-covariant derivative transforms as $\hat{\tilde{D}}_\mu \hat{\chi} = (1/\Omega) \tilde{D}_\mu \chi$. As in previous sections, replace $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 \rightarrow -2\phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \phi^4$ to find an equivalent “linearised” L_3

$$L_3 = \sqrt{g} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \rho^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{D}_\mu \chi)^2 - \mathcal{V}(\chi, \rho) \right], \quad (36)$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}(\chi, \rho) \equiv \frac{1}{4!} \left[\frac{1}{\xi_0} (6\rho^2 - \xi_1 \chi^2)^2 + \lambda_1 \chi^4 \right], \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^2 = \frac{1}{6} (\xi_1 \chi^2 + \xi_0 \phi^2). \quad (37)$$

We replaced the scalar field ϕ by the new, radial direction field ρ ¹⁷.

The equation of motion for $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is similar to (19) but with a replacement $\phi \rightarrow \rho$ and with an additional contribution from the kinetic term of χ . Following the same steps as in the previous section, we find

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda (\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \rho^2) - \frac{1}{5} \left\{ \delta_\lambda^\nu \tilde{\nabla}_\sigma (\sqrt{g} g^{\sigma\mu} \rho^2) + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} = 0. \quad (38)$$

This gives

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda (\rho^2 g_{\mu\nu}) = (-2)\rho^2 (g_{\mu\nu} V_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} V_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} V_\mu), \quad (39)$$

where $V_\mu = (-1/2)\tilde{\nabla}_\mu \ln(\sqrt{g}\rho^4) = v_\mu - \partial_\mu \ln \rho^2$. From (39) one finds the Palatini connection solution with a result similar to (25) but with $\phi \rightarrow \rho$. We use this solution for the connection back in the action to find, for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell:

¹⁷ $\ln \rho$ transforms as $\ln \rho \rightarrow \ln \rho - \ln \Omega$ and plays the role of the dilaton field.

$$L_3 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{-1}{2} \left[\rho^2 R(g) + 6(\partial_\mu \rho)^2 \right] + 3\rho^2 (v_\mu - \partial_\mu \ln \rho^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{D}_\mu \chi)^2 - \mathcal{V}(\chi, \rho) \right\}. \quad (40)$$

L_3 has a gauged scale symmetry and extends (29) in the presence of scalar field χ .

Finally, we choose the Einstein gauge by using transformation (4),(18) of a particular $\Omega = \rho/M$ which sets $\hat{\rho}$ to a *constant*. In terms of the new variables (with a hat) we find

$$L_3 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M^2 R(\hat{g}) + 3M^2 \hat{v}_\mu \hat{v}^\mu - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{D}_\mu \hat{\chi})^2 - \mathcal{V}(\hat{\chi}, M) \right\}, \quad (41)$$

with $\hat{D}_\mu \hat{\chi} = (\partial_\mu - 1/2 \hat{v}_\mu) \hat{\chi}$ and we identify M with the Planck scale ($M = \langle \hat{\rho} \rangle$). As in the absence of matter, we obtained the Einstein-Proca action of a gauge field that became massive after Stueckelberg mechanism of “absorbing” the derivative term $\partial_\mu \ln \rho$. A canonical kinetic term of $\hat{\chi}$ remained present in the action, since only one degree of freedom (radial direction ρ) was “eaten” by v_μ . The mass of v_μ is $m_v^2 = 6\alpha^2 M^2$. The potential becomes

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{3M^4}{2\xi_0} \left[1 - \frac{\xi_1 \hat{\chi}^2}{6M^2} \right]^2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{4!} \hat{\chi}^4. \quad (42)$$

For a “standard” kinetic term for $\hat{\chi}$, similar to a “unitary gauge” in electroweak case, we remove the coupling $\hat{v}^\mu \partial_\mu \hat{\chi}$ in the Weyl-covariant derivative in (41) by a field redefinition

$$\hat{v}'_\mu = \hat{v}_\mu - \partial_\mu \ln \cosh^2 \left[\frac{\sigma}{2M\sqrt{6}} \right], \quad \hat{\chi} = 2M\sqrt{6} \sinh \left[\frac{\sigma}{2M\sqrt{6}} \right], \quad (43)$$

which replaces $\hat{\chi} \rightarrow \sigma$. We find our final Lagrangian

$$L_3 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M^2 \hat{R} + 3M^2 \cosh^2 \left[\frac{\sigma}{2M\sqrt{6}} \right] \hat{v}'_\mu \hat{v}'^\mu - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} \hat{F}'^2_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\hat{g}^{\mu\nu}}{2} \partial_\mu \sigma \partial_\nu \sigma - \hat{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma) \right\} \quad (44)$$

with

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma) = \hat{\mathcal{V}}_0 \left\{ \left[1 - 4\xi_1 \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{2M\sqrt{6}} \right]^2 + 16 \lambda_1 \xi_0 \sinh^4 \frac{\sigma}{2M\sqrt{6}} \right\}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{V}}_0 \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{M^4}{\xi_0}. \quad (45)$$

In (44) one finally rescales $\hat{v}'_\mu \rightarrow \alpha \hat{v}'_\mu$ for a canonical gauge kinetic term.

For *small* field values, $\sigma \ll M$, then $\hat{\chi} \approx \sigma$ (up to $\mathcal{O}(\sigma^3/M^2)$) and a SM Higgs-like potential is recovered¹⁸, see eq.(42). For $\xi_1 > 0$ it has spontaneous breaking of the symmetry carried by σ i.e. electroweak (EW) symmetry if σ is the Higgs; this is triggered by the non-minimal coupling to gravity ($\xi_1 \neq 0$) and Stueckelberg mechanism. The negative mass term originates in (37) due to the ϕ^4 term (itself induced by \tilde{R}^2). The mass $m_\sigma^2 \propto \xi_1 M^2 / \xi_0$ may be small enough, near the EW scale by tuning $\xi_1 \ll \xi_0$. It may be interesting to study if the gauged scale symmetry brings some “protection” to m_σ at the quantum level.

¹⁸We shall see shortly that inflation “prefers” ultraweak or vanishing values for λ_1 in (37) and (42).

This Lagrangian is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity with a non-minimally coupled scalar/Higgs field [23–25]¹⁹, up to a rescaling of the couplings (ξ_1, λ_1) and fields (σ) . This difference is due to the different non-metricity of the two theories, eqs.(31), (32). Both cases give a gauged scale invariant theory of quadratic gravity coupled to matter, and recover Einstein gravity and metricity in their broken phase below the scale $m_v \sim \alpha M$ ($\alpha \leq 1$). This result may be more general and may apply to other theories with this symmetry.

4.2 Palatini R^2 inflation

For *large* field values, the same potential in (45) can also be used for inflation (hereafter Palatini R^2 inflation), with σ as the inflaton²⁰. Since M is just a phase transition scale, field values $\sigma \geq M$ are natural here. $\hat{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma)$ is similar to that studied in Weyl gravity R^2 -inflation, see [25] for details²¹ but, as mentioned, its couplings and field normalization differ (for similar initial couplings in the action and same trace of non-metricity); hence the spectral index n_s and tensor-to-scalar ratio r are different, too, and need to be analyzed separately.

The potential is shown in Figure 1 for perturbative values of the couplings relevant for successful inflation. This demands $\lambda_1 \xi_0 \ll \xi_1^2 \ll 1$, with the first relation from demanding that the initial energy be larger than at the end of inflation $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_0 > \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\min}$, respected by choosing a small enough λ_1 for given $\xi_{0,1}$. Therefore, we shall work in the leading order in $(\lambda_1 \xi_0)$.

The slow-roll parameters are:

$$\epsilon = \frac{M^2}{2} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\mathcal{V}}'(\sigma)}{\hat{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma)} \right\}^2 = \frac{4}{3} \xi_1^2 \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M\sqrt{6}} + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^3) \quad (46)$$

$$\eta = M^2 \frac{\hat{\mathcal{V}}''(\sigma)}{\hat{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma)} = -\frac{2}{3} \xi_1 \cosh \frac{\sigma}{M\sqrt{6}} + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^2) \quad (47)$$

Then

$$n_s = 1 + 2\eta_* - 6\epsilon_* = 1 - \frac{4}{3} \xi_1 \cosh \frac{\sigma_*}{M\sqrt{6}} + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^2) \quad (48)$$

where σ_* is the value of σ at the horizon exit. With $r = 16\epsilon_*$ we have²²

$$r = 12(1 - n_s)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^2) \quad (49)$$

The contribution of ϵ is subleading for small ξ_1 considered here. The slope of the curves in the plane (n_s, r) , shown in leading order in (49), is steeper than in Weyl R^2 inflation [25] (or Starobinsky model) where $r = 3(1 - n_s)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^2)$.

¹⁹For comparison to Weyl gravity Lagrangian see e.g. eqs.(39)-(41) in [23] and eqs.(21), (22) in [24].

²⁰Unlike in Starobinsky models, there is no scalaron here, its counterpart was “eaten” by massive v_μ .

²¹For related works on inflation in the Einstein-Palatini formalism see e.g. [85–94].

²²There is also a constraint on the parametric space from the normalization of CMB anisotropy $\mathcal{V}_0/(24\pi^2 M^4 \epsilon_*) = \kappa_0$, $\kappa_0 = 2.1 \times 10^{-9}$ and $r = 16\epsilon_*$ with $r < 0.07$ [95] then $\xi_0 = 1/(\pi^2 r \kappa) \geq 6.89 \times 10^8$. The aforementioned condition $\lambda_1 \xi_0 \ll \xi_1^2$ is then respected for perturbative $\xi_1, 1/\xi_0$ by choosing small $\lambda_1 \ll \xi_1^2/\xi_0$.




Figure 1: **Left plot:** The potential $\hat{V}(\sigma)/\hat{V}_0$ for $\lambda_1 \xi_0 = 10^{-10} \ll \xi_1^2$ with different $\xi_1 \ll 1$. For larger $\lambda_1 \xi_0$ the curves move to the left while the minimum of the rightmost ones is lifted. Larger values of $\lambda_1 \xi_0$ are allowed, but inflation becomes less likely when $\lambda_1 \xi_0 \sim \xi_1^2$. The flat region is wide for a large range of σ , with the width controlled by $1/\sqrt{\xi_1}$ while its height is $\hat{V}_0 \propto 1/\xi_0$. We have $\hat{V}/\hat{V}_{\min} \propto \xi_1^2/(\lambda_1 \xi_0)$. **Right plot:** The values of (n_s, r) for different values of ξ_1 that enable values of $n_s = 0.9670 \pm 0.0037$ at 68% CL (blue band) and 95% CL (light blue region). For each curve $N = 60$ e-folds is marked by a red point and the dark blue interval corresponds to $55 \leq N \leq 65$. Curves of $\xi_1 < 10^{-3}$ are degenerate with the red one while those with $\xi_1 > 2.5 \times 10^{-2}$ have $N > 65$.

The exact numerical results for (n_s, r) in our model, for different e-folds number N , are shown in Figure 1. From experimental data $n_s = 0.9670 \pm 0.0037$ (68% CL) and $r < 0.07$ (95% CL) from Planck 2018 (TT, TE, EE + low E + lensing + BK14 + BAO) [95]. Using this data, Figure 1 (right plot) shows that a specific, small range for r is predicted in our model for the current range for n_s at 95% CL:

$$N = 60, \quad 0.007 \leq r \leq 0.010, \quad [\text{Palatini } R^2 \text{ inflation}]. \quad (50)$$

Similar values for r can be read from Figure 1 for $55 \leq N \leq 65$. The lower bound on r comes from that for n_s while the upper one corresponds to a saturation limit, $\xi_1 \rightarrow 0$, with values $\xi_1 < 10^{-3}$ having similar (n_s, r) . One should also respect the constraint $\lambda_1 \leq \xi_1^2/\xi_0$, giving $\lambda_1 \sim 10^{-12}$ or smaller (with the CMB anisotropy constraint $\xi_0 \geq 6.89 \times 10^8$).

For comparison, in Weyl R^2 -inflation for same n_s at 95% CL one has a smaller r [25, 44]

$$N = 60, \quad 0.00257 \leq r \leq 0.00303, \quad [\text{Weyl } R^2 \text{ inflation}]. \quad (51)$$

The different range for r in eq.(50) versus eq.(51) is important since it enables us to distinguish these two inflation models based on gauged scale invariance, and is due to their different non-metricity²³. Such values for $r \sim 10^{-3}$ will soon be reached by various CMB experiments [72–74] that will then be able to test both models. This establishes an interesting

²³In the Starobinsky model [96] for similar n_s one has $r \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, e.g. $r = 0.0034$ ($N = 55$) [97].

connection between non-metricity and testable inflation predictions.

Similar values for r were found in other recent inflation models in Palatini R^2 gravity [92–94] but these are not gauged scale invariant. In the absence of this symmetry, other successful models (e.g. Starobinsky model [96]) have corrections to r from higher curvature operators (R^4 , etc) of unknown coefficients [98]. Such operators (and their corrections) are not allowed here because they must be suppressed by some effective scale whose presence would violate scale invariance²⁴. Another advantage is that due to the *gauged* scale symmetry Palatini R^2 inflation is allowed by black-hole physics (similarly for Weyl R^2 inflation [25]), in contrast to models of inflation with *global* scale symmetry²⁵.

5 Conclusions

At a fundamental level gravity may be regarded as a theory of connections. An example is the Einstein-Palatini (EP) approach to gravity where the connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) is a priori independent of the metric, and is determined by its equation of motion, from the action. For simple actions $\tilde{\Gamma}$ plays an auxiliary role only (no dynamics). In particular, for Einstein action in the EP approach one finds that the connection is actually equal to the Levi-Civita connection (of the metric formulation); then Einstein gravity is recovered, so the metric and EP approaches are equivalent. However, this equivalence is not true in general, for complicated actions, etc. In this work we considered quadratic gravity actions in the EP approach, with the goal to show that, while this equivalence does not hold true, one can still find actions that do recover *dynamically* the Levi-Civita connection, metricity and Einstein gravity in some “low-energy” limit, even in the *absence of matter*.

We considered a quadratic action with Weyl scale symmetry $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 + R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2$ where $R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2$ can be regarded as a gauge kinetic term for the vector field $v_\mu \sim \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu$ where $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ (Γ_μ) denotes the trace of the Palatini (Levi-Civita) connections, respectively. We observed that this theory actually has a *gauged* scale symmetry, with v_μ as the Weyl gauge field (“photon”) of non-metricity. Our motivation was to show that this action, even in the absence of matter, has a spontaneous breaking of this symmetry, with the emergence of metricity, Levi-Civita connection and Einstein gravity in the broken phase. We also compared this theory to Weyl gravity of similar gauged scale symmetry and studied inflation predictions.

Due to a dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \sim v_\mu$, the theory is non-metric, hence $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. For the same reason the usual first order differential equations of the connection become of second order. As a result, while this theory initially appears of second order, after solving it for the connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell) it is a *higher derivative* theory since the $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ term of the action contains a (higher derivative) metric contribution $R(g)^2 + \dots$. This action is equivalent to a second order theory with an additional dynamical scalar field (dilaton), while preserving onshell the gauged scale symmetry of the theory.

One important result is that the gauged scale symmetry of the action is broken by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism. The derivative of the dilaton (Stueckelberg field)

²⁴The dilaton field cannot suppress them itself since it is “eaten” to all orders by the gauge field v_μ .

²⁵A global symmetry is broken since global charges can be eaten by black holes which then evaporate [99].

$\partial_\mu \ln \phi$ is “eaten” by v_μ which becomes massive. One obtains the Einstein-Proca action for the gauge field and a positive cosmological constant. This is a “low-energy” broken phase of the initial action with gauged scale symmetry. The gauge field v_μ has a mass near the Planck scale (M), $m_v \sim \alpha M$ (unless one is tuning the coupling α to $\alpha \ll 1$). Below the scale m_v , metricity and the Einstein action are recovered. Non-metricity effects are strongly suppressed by a large scale $\propto M$, which is important for the theory to be viable.

The above results remain valid in the presence of scalar matter (Higgs, etc) with a (perturbative) non-minimal coupling to this theory, with a Palatini connection; in such case and following the Stueckelberg mechanism, the scalar potential also has a breaking of the symmetry under which this scalar is charged, e.g. electroweak symmetry in the higgs case.

To summarize, Einstein-Palatini quadratic gravity $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 + R_{[\mu\nu]}^2(\tilde{\Gamma})$ is a gauged theory of scale invariance that is spontaneously broken to the Einstein-Proca action for the Weyl field with a positive cosmological constant (plus a potential of non-minimally coupled scalar fields, if these were initially present).

This picture is very similar to a recent analysis for the original Weyl quadratic gravity, despite the different non-metricity of these two theories. With hindsight, this is not too surprising, since in both theories there is a gauged scale symmetry and the connection is not fixed by the metric, except that in Weyl gravity non-metricity is present from the onset (due to underlying Weyl conformal geometry) while here it emerges for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell. It is worth studying further the relation of these two theories, by including the remaining operators (on the Einstein-Palatini side) that have this symmetry.

There are also interesting predictions from inflation. While the scalar potential is Higgs-like for small field values ($\ll M$), for large field values it can be used for inflation. With the Planck scale M a simple phase transition scale, field values above M are natural. The inflaton potential is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity, up to couplings and field redefinitions (due to different non-metricity of the two theories). We find a specific prediction for the tensor-to-scalar ratio, $0.007 \leq r \leq 0.01$, for the current value of the spectral index at 95% CL. This value of r is mildly larger than that predicted by inflation in Weyl gravity. This result enables us to distinguish these two theories and test them by future CMB experiments that will reach such values of r . It also establishes an interesting connection between non-metricity and inflation predictions.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Graham Ross for helpful discussions on this topic at an early stage of this work.

Appendix

For a self-contained presentation, we include here basic aspects of the Palatini formalism used in the text. In the (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry, the Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma(g)$ is determined by the metric. In general, however, the connection can be introduced without reference to $g_{\mu\nu}$. In the Palatini approach the connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a priori independent of the metric and is determined by the equations of motion. To ensure the covariant derivatives

transform under coordinate change ($x \rightarrow x'(x)$) as true tensors, Palatini connection has a transformation law

$$\tilde{\Gamma}'_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu} \frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial x'^\nu} \frac{\partial x'^\lambda}{\partial x^\rho} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta}{}^\rho + \frac{\partial x'^\lambda}{\partial x^\sigma} \frac{\partial^2 x^\sigma}{\partial x'^\mu \partial x'^\nu} \quad (52)$$

with $\tilde{\Gamma}' = \tilde{\Gamma}'(x')$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}(x)$. In the text we also assumed $\tilde{\Gamma}'_{\mu\nu}{}^\rho = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}{}^\rho$ (no torsion). The Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda(g)$ has a similar transformation

$$\Gamma'_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda(g) = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu} \frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial x'^\nu} \frac{\partial x'^\lambda}{\partial x^\rho} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}{}^\rho(g) + \frac{\partial x'^\lambda}{\partial x^\sigma} \frac{\partial^2 x^\sigma}{\partial x'^\mu \partial x'^\nu}. \quad (53)$$

Note that the difference of these connections transforms as a tensor

$$\tilde{\Gamma}'_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda - \Gamma'_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda(g) = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu} \frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial x'^\nu} \frac{\partial x'^\lambda}{\partial x^\rho} (\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta}{}^\rho(x) - \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}{}^\rho(g)). \quad (54)$$

Setting $\lambda = \nu$ and with the notation $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}{}^\nu$, $\Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\nu}{}^\nu$, etc, then

$$\tilde{\Gamma}'_\mu - \Gamma'_\mu(g) = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha - \Gamma_\alpha(g)) \quad (55)$$

and therefore v_μ introduced in Section 3 transforms as a covariant vector

$$v'_\mu(x') = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial x'^\mu} v_\alpha(x) \quad (56)$$

Further, the covariant derivatives used in the text are

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\nu v_\mu = \partial_\nu v_\mu - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}{}^\lambda v_\lambda, \quad \tilde{\nabla}_\nu v^\mu = \partial_\nu v^\mu + \tilde{\Gamma}_{\lambda\nu}{}^\mu v^\lambda. \quad (57)$$

One also has $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}{}^\rho g_{\rho\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\lambda}{}^\rho g_{\rho\mu}$, also used in the text.

In Section 3 we introduced the gauge field v_μ in eq.(16). This is general. For example, in Weyl gravity of similar gauged scale symmetry, an identical formula exists for the gauge field. To see this, note that in Weyl gravity [23,24], see also eq.(32) in the text, non-metricity is different from EP quadratic gravity: $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = -v_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}$. Contracting this equation with $g^{\mu\nu}$ and using $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \sqrt{g} = (1/2)\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ we find $v_\lambda = (-1/2)\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \ln \sqrt{g}$. This is similar to Palatini case, eq.(26) in the text, although the connection is different. From these last two equations, by writing the action of $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda$ on $g_{\mu\nu}$ one immediately finds

$$v_\mu = (1/2)(\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu(g)) \quad (58)$$

with the trace of Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma_\mu(g) = \partial_\mu \ln \sqrt{g}$. Eq.(58) is thus similar to the definition we used to introduce the gauge field in Einstein-Palatini quadratic gravity, eq.(16).

References

- [1] A. Einstein, “Einheitliche Feldtheories von Gravitation und Electrizaritat”, Sitzungber Preuss Akad. Wiss (1925) 414-419.
- [2] M. Ferraris, M. Francaviglia and C. Reina, “Variational formulation of general relativity from 1915 to 1925, “Palatini’s method” discovered by Einstein in 1925”, Gen. Rel. Grav. 14 (1982) 243-254.
- [3] For a review and references, see G. J. Olmo, “Palatini Approach to Modified Gravity: f(R) Theories and Beyond,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **20** (2011) 413 [arXiv:1101.3864 [gr-qc]].
- [4] Another review is: T. P. Sotiriou and S. Liberati, “Metric-affine f(R) theories of gravity,” Annals Phys. **322** (2007) 935 [gr-qc/0604006]. T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, “f(R) Theories Of Gravity,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **82** (2010) 451 [arXiv:0805.1726 [gr-qc]].
- [5] H. A. Buchdahl, “Representation Of The Einstein-proca Field By An A(4)*,” J. Phys. A **12** (1979) 1235.
- [6] H. A. Buchdahl, “Non-linear Lagrangians and cosmological theory,” Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **150** (1970) 1.
- [7] D. N. Vollick, “Einstein-Maxwell and Einstein-Proca theory from a modified gravitational action,” gr-qc/0601016.
- [8] D. N. Vollick, “Born-Infeld-Einstein theory with matter,” Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 084026 [gr-qc/0506091].
- [9] S. Cotsakis, J. Miritzis and L. Querella, “Variational and conformal structure of nonlinear metric connection gravitational Lagrangians,” J. Math. Phys. **40** (1999) 3063 [gr-qc/9712025].
- [10] B. Shahid-Saless, “First Order Formalism Treatment of $R + R^{**2}$ Gravity,” Phys. Rev. D **35** (1987) 467.
- [11] E. E. Flanagan, “Palatini form of $1/R$ gravity,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 071101 [astro-ph/0308111].
- [12] E. E. Flanagan, “Higher order gravity theories and scalar tensor theories,” Class. Quant. Grav. **21** (2003) 417 [gr-qc/0309015].
- [13] M. Borunda, B. Janssen and M. Bastero-Gil, “Palatini versus metric formulation in higher curvature gravity,” JCAP **0811** (2008) 008 [arXiv:0804.4440 [hep-th]].
- [14] L. Järvi, M. Rünkla, M. Saal and O. Vilson, “Nonmetricity formulation of general relativity and its scalar-tensor extension,” Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.12, 124025 [arXiv:1802.00492 [gr-qc]].
- [15] L. Querella, “Variational principles and cosmological models in higher order gravity,” gr-qc/9902044.
- [16] V. Vitagliano, T. P. Sotiriou and S. Liberati, “The dynamics of generalized Palatini Theories of Gravity,” Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 084007 [arXiv:1007.3937 [gr-qc]].

- [17] G. Allemandi, A. Borowiec, M. Francaviglia and S. D. Odintsov, “Dark energy dominance and cosmic acceleration in first order formalism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005), 063505 [arXiv:gr-qc/0504057 [gr-qc]].
- [18] A. Kozak and A. Borowiec, “Palatini frames in scalar–tensor theories of gravity,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) no.4, 335 [arXiv:1808.05598 [hep-th]].
- [19] Hermann Weyl, *Gravitation und elektrizität*, Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1918), pp.465; Einstein’s critical comment appended (on atomic spectral lines changes).
- [20] Hermann Weyl “Eine neue Erweiterung der Relativitätstheorie” (“A new extension of the theory of relativity”), *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* (4) 59 (1919), 101-133.
- [21] Hermann Weyl “Raum, Zeit, Materie”, vierte erweiterte Auflage. Julius Springer, Berlin 1921 “Space-time-matter”, translated from German by Henry L. Brose, 1922, Methuen & Co Ltd, London.
- [22] For review and references on Weyl’s theory, see E. Scholz, “The unexpected resurgence of Weyl geometry in late 20-th century physics,” *Einstein Stud.* **14** (2018) 261 [arXiv:1703.03187 [math.HO]];
- [23] D. M. Ghilencea, “Spontaneous breaking of Weyl quadratic gravity to Einstein action and Higgs potential,” *JHEP* **1903** (2019) 049 [arXiv:1812.08613 [hep-th]].
- [24] D. M. Ghilencea, “Stueckelberg breaking of Weyl conformal geometry and applications to gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.4, 045010 [arXiv:1904.06596 [hep-th]].
- [25] D. M. Ghilencea, “Weyl R^2 inflation with an emergent Planck scale,” *JHEP* **1910** (2019) 209 [arXiv:1906.11572 [gr-qc]].
- [26] P. A. M. Dirac, “Long range forces and broken symmetries,” *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **333** (1973) 403. doi:10.1098/rspa.1973.0070
- [27] L. Smolin, “Towards a Theory of Space-Time Structure at Very Short Distances,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **160** (1979) 253.
- [28] H. Cheng, “The Possible Existence of Weyl’s Vector Meson,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 2182.
- [29] I. Quiros, “Scale invariant theory of gravity and the standard model of particles,” E-print arXiv:1401.2643 [gr-qc].
- [30] T. Fulton, F. Rohrlich and L. Witten, “Conformal invariance in physics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **34** (1962) 442.
- [31] J. T. Wheeler, “Weyl geometry,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **50** (2018) no.7, 80 [arXiv:1801.03178 [gr-qc]].
- [32] M. de Cesare, J. W. Moffat and M. Sakellariadou, “Local conformal symmetry in non-Riemannian geometry and the origin of physical scales,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) no.9, 605 [arXiv:1612.08066 [hep-th]].
- [33] H. C. Ohanian, “Weyl gauge-vector and complex dilaton scalar for conformal symmetry and its breaking,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **48** (2016) no.3, 25 [arXiv:1502.00020 [gr-qc]].

- [34] D. M. Ghilencea and H. M. Lee, “Weyl symmetry and its spontaneous breaking in Standard Model and inflation,” arXiv:1809.09174 [hep-th].
- [35] A. Barnaveli, S. Lucat and T. Prokopec, “Inflation as a spontaneous symmetry breaking of Weyl symmetry,” arXiv:1809.10586 [gr-qc].
- [36] J. W. Moffat, “Scalar-tensor-vector gravity theory,” JCAP **0603** (2006) 004 [gr-qc/0506021].
- [37] L. Heisenberg, “Scalar-Vector-Tensor Gravity Theories,” arXiv:1801.01523 [gr-qc].
- [38] J. Beltran Jimenez, L. Heisenberg, T. S. Koivisto, “Cosmology for quadratic gravity in generalized Weyl geometry,” JCAP **1604** (2016) no.04, 046 [arXiv:1602.07287 [hep-th]].
- [39] J. Beltran Jimenez, T. S. Koivisto, “Spacetimes with vector distortion: Inflation from generalised Weyl geometry,” Phys. Lett. B **756** (2016) 400 [arXiv:1509.02476 [gr-qc]].
- [40] C. T. Hill, “Inertial Symmetry Breaking,” arXiv:1803.06994 [hep-th].
- [41] E. Scholz, “Higgs and gravitational scalar fields together induce Weyl gauge,” Gen. Rel. Grav. **47** (2015) no.2, 7 [arXiv:1407.6811 [gr-qc]].
- [42] W. Drechsler and H. Tann, “Broken Weyl invariance and the origin of mass,” Found. Phys. **29** (1999) 1023 [gr-qc/9802044].
- [43] S. Dengiz, “A Note on Noncompact and Nonmetricit Quadratic Curvature Gravity Theories,” Turk. J. Phys. **42** (2018) no.1, 70 [arXiv:1404.2714 [hep-th]].
- [44] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill, J. Noller and G. G. Ross, “Scale-independent R^2 inflation,” Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.12, 123516 [arXiv:1906.03415 [gr-qc]].
- [45] G. ’t Hooft, “Local conformal symmetry: The missing symmetry component for space and time,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **24** (2015) no.12, 1543001.
- [46] I. Bars, P. Steinhardt, N. Turok, “Local Conformal Symmetry in Physics and Cosmology,” Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) no.4, 043515 [arXiv:1307.1848 [hep-th]].
- [47] G. ’t Hooft, “Imagining the future, or how the Standard Model may survive the attacks,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. **31** (2016) no.16, 1630022.
- [48] G. ’t Hooft, “Local conformal symmetry in black holes, standard model, and quantum gravity,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **26** (2016) no.03, 1730006.
- [49] M. Shaposhnikov and D. Zenhausern, “Quantum scale invariance, cosmological constant and hierarchy problem,” Phys. Lett. B **671** (2009) 162 [arXiv:0809.3406 [hep-th]].
- [50] R. Armillis, A. Monin and M. Shaposhnikov, “Spontaneously Broken Conformal Symmetry: Dealing with the Trace Anomaly,” JHEP **1310** (2013) 030 [arXiv:1302.5619 [hep-th]].
- [51] F. Bezrukov, G. K. Karananas, J. Rubio and M. Shaposhnikov, “Higgs-Dilaton Cosmology: an effective field theory approach,” Physical Review D **87** (2013) no.9, 096001 [arXiv:1212.4148 [hep-ph]].
- [52] F. Gretsches and A. Monin, “Perturbative conformal symmetry and dilaton,” Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.4, 045036 [arXiv:1308.3863 [hep-th]].

- [53] D. M. Ghilencea, “Quantum implications of a scale invariant regularization,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.7, 075015 [arXiv:1712.06024 [hep-th]]; “Manifestly scale-invariant regularization and quantum effective operators,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.10, 105006 [arXiv:1508.00595 [hep-ph]]; “One-loop potential with scale invariance and effective operators,” *PoS CORFU 2015* (2016) 040 [arXiv:1605.05632 [hep-ph]].
- [54] D. M. Ghilencea, Z. Lalak and P. Olszewski, “Two-loop scale-invariant scalar potential and quantum effective operators,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.12, 656 [arXiv:1608.05336 [hep-th]].
- [55] D. M. Ghilencea, Z. Lalak and P. Olszewski, “Standard Model with spontaneously broken quantum scale invariance,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.5, 055034 [arXiv:1612.09120 [hep-ph]].
- [56] J. Kubo, M. Lindner, K. Schmitz and M. Yamada, “Planck mass and inflation as consequences of dynamically broken scale invariance,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.1, 015037 [arXiv:1811.05950 [hep-ph]].
- [57] R. Foot, A. Kobakhidze, K. L. McDonald and R. R. Volkas, “Poincaré protection for a natural electroweak scale,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) no.11, 115018 [arXiv:1310.0223 [hep-ph]].
- [58] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “Scale-Independent Inflation and Hierarchy Generation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **763** (2016) 174 [arXiv:1603.05983 [hep-th]].
- [59] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “Inertial Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking and Quantum Scale Invariance,” arXiv:1801.07676 [hep-th].
- [60] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “Weyl Current, Scale-Invariant Inflation and Planck Scale Generation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) no.4, 043507 [arXiv:1610.09243 [hep-th]].
- [61] E. J. Chun, S. Jung and H. M. Lee, “Radiative generation of the Higgs potential,” *Phys. Lett. B* **725** (2013) 158 Erratum: [*Phys. Lett. B* **730** (2014) 357] [arXiv:1304.5815 [hep-ph]].
- [62] O. Lebedev and H. M. Lee, “Higgs Portal Inflation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1821 [arXiv:1105.2284 [hep-ph]].
- [63] Z. Lalak and P. Olszewski, “Vanishing trace anomaly in flat spacetime,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.8, 085001 [arXiv:1807.09296 [hep-th]].
- [64] E. Elizalde, S. D. Odintsov and A. Romeo, “Manifestations of quantum gravity in scalar QED phenomena,” *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995), 4250-4253 [arXiv:hep-th/9410028 [hep-th]].
- [65] I. Buchbinder, S. Odintsov and I. Shapiro, “Effective action in quantum gravity,” Published in Bristol, UK: IOP (1992) 413 p.
- [66] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity,” *JHEP* **1406** (2014) 080 [arXiv:1403.4226 [hep-ph]].
A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity up to infinite energy,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) no.2, 124 [arXiv:1705.03896 [hep-th]].
- [67] E. C. G. Stueckelberg, “Interaction forces in electrodynamics and in the field theory of nuclear forces,” *Helv. Phys. Acta* **11** (1938) 299.
- [68] R. Percacci, “Gravity from a Particle Physicists’ perspective,” *PoS ISFTG* (2009) 011 [arXiv:0910.5167 [hep-th]].

- [69] R. Percacci, “The Higgs phenomenon in quantum gravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **353** (1991) 271 [arXiv:0712.3545 [hep-th]].
- [70] A. D. I. Latorre, G. J. Olmo and M. Ronco, “Observable traces of non-metricity: new constraints on metric-affine gravity,” Phys. Lett. B **780** (2018) 294 [arXiv:1709.04249 [hep-th]].
- [71] I. P. Lobo and C. Romero, “Experimental constraints on the second clock effect,” Phys. Lett. B **783** (2018) 306 [arXiv:1807.07188 [gr-qc]].
- [72] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* [CMB-S4 Collaboration], “CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition,” arXiv:1610.02743 [astro-ph.CO]. <https://cmb-s4.org/>
- [73] J. Errard, S. M. Feeney, H. V. Peiris and A. H. Jaffe, “Robust forecasts on fundamental physics from the foreground-obscured, gravitationally-lensed CMB polarization,” JCAP **1603** (2016) no.03, 052 [arXiv:1509.06770 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [74] A. Suzuki *et al.*, “The LiteBIRD Satellite Mission - Sub-Kelvin Instrument,” J. Low. Temp. Phys. **193** (2018) no.5-6, 1048 [arXiv:1801.06987 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [75] For an early study of this theory, see F. Englert, E. Gunzig, C. Truffin and P. Windey, “Conformal Invariant General Relativity with Dynamical Symmetry Breakdown,” Phys. Lett. **57B** (1975) 73.
- [76] D. Gorbunov, V. Rubakov, “Introduction to the theory of the early Universe”, World Scientific, 2011.
- [77] A. Ederly and Y. Nakayama, “Palatini formulation of pure R^2 gravity yields Einstein gravity with no massless scalar,” Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.12, 124018 [arXiv:1902.07876 [hep-th]].
- [78] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, “Fake Conformal Symmetry in Conformal Cosmological Models,” Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.6, 067501 [arXiv:1407.8545 [gr-qc]].
- [79] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, “New Setting for Spontaneous Gauge Symmetry Breaking?,” Fundam. Theor. Phys. **183** (2016) 159 [arXiv:1511.00994 [hep-th]].
- [80] G. 't Hooft, “Local Conformal Symmetry: the Missing Symmetry Component for Space and Time,” arXiv:1410.6675 [gr-qc]. (Essay written for the Gravity Research Foundation - 2015 Awards for Essays on Gravitation).
- [81] C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and N. Toumbas, “ R^2 inflation from scale invariant supergravity and anomaly free superstrings with fluxes,” Fortsch. Phys. **63** (2015) 12 [arXiv:1409.7076 [hep-th]].
- [82] L. Alvarez-Gaume, A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, “Aspects of Quadratic Gravity,” Fortsch. Phys. **64** (2016) no.2-3, 176 [arXiv:1505.07657 [hep-th]].
- [83] D. N. Vollick, “Modified Palatini action that gives the Einstein-Maxwell theory,” Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.4, 044061 [arXiv:1612.05829 [gr-qc]].
- [84] K. i. Kobayashi and T. Uematsu, “Nonlinear Realization of Superconformal Symmetry,” Nucl. Phys. B **263** (1986) 309. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90119-7
- [85] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, “Higgs-Palatini Inflation and Unitarity,” Phys. Lett. B **698** (2011) 425 [arXiv:1012.2900 [hep-ph]].

- [86] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, “Inflation with Non-Minimal Coupling: Metric versus Palatini Formulations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **665** (2008) 222 [arXiv:0803.2664 [hep-ph]].
- [87] T. Koivisto and H. Kurki-Suonio, “Cosmological perturbations in the palatini formulation of modified gravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 2355 [astro-ph/0509422].
- [88] S. Rasanen and P. Wahlman, “Higgs inflation with loop corrections in the Palatini formulation,” *JCAP* **1711** (2017) 047 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2017/11/047 [arXiv:1709.07853 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [89] V. M. Enckell, K. Enqvist, S. Rasanen and E. Tomberg, “Higgs inflation at the hilltop,” *JCAP* **1806** (2018) 005 [arXiv:1802.09299 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [90] T. Markkanen, T. Tenkanen, V. Vaskonen and H. Veermäe, “Quantum corrections to quartic inflation with a non-minimal coupling: metric vs. Palatini,” *JCAP* **1803** (2018) 029 [arXiv:1712.04874 [gr-qc]].
- [91] L. Järv, A. Racioppi and T. Tenkanen, “Palatini side of inflationary attractors,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.8, 083513 [arXiv:1712.08471 [gr-qc]].
- [92] I. Antoniadis, A. Karam, A. Lykkas and K. Tamvakis, “Palatini inflation in models with an R^2 term,” *JCAP* **1811** (2018) 028 [arXiv:1810.10418 [gr-qc]].
- [93] V. M. Enckell, K. Enqvist, S. Rasanen and L. P. Wahlman, “Inflation with R^2 term in the Palatini formalism,” *JCAP* **1902** (2019) 022 [arXiv:1810.05536 [gr-qc]].
- [94] I. D. Gialamas and A. Lahanas, “Reheating in R^2 Palatini inflationary models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.8, 084007 [arXiv:1911.11513 [gr-qc]].
- [95] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation,” arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO].
- [96] A. A. Starobinsky “A New Type of Isotropic Cosmological Models Without Singularity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 99 [*Phys. Lett.* **91B** (1980) 99] [*Adv. Ser. Astrophys. Cosmol.* **3** (1987) 130].
- [97] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” *Chin. Phys. C* **40** (2016) no.10, 100001.
- [98] J. Edholm, “UV completion of the Starobinsky model, tensor-to-scalar ratio, and constraints on nonlocality,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) no.4, 044004 [arXiv:1611.05062 [gr-qc]] and references therein.
- [99] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, D. A. Linde and L. Susskind, “Gravity and global symmetries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 912 [hep-th/9502069].