

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 R^2 gravity with a dynamical connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$) in the Palatini formalism where the connection and the metric are independent. The action has a *gauged* scale symmetry (Weyl gauging) of gauge field $v_\mu \propto \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu$, with $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu$ (Γ_μ) the trace of the Palatini (Levi-Civita) connection, respectively. In this case the associated geometry is non-metric. We show that the gauge field becomes massive by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism by absorbing the derivative of the dilaton $\partial_\mu \ln \phi$ (where the scalar ϕ “linearises” the R^2 term). Palatini quadratic gravity with dynamical v_μ is then 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. The 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 $N = 60$ efolds. 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). In this case the “Palatini connection” ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) is apriori independent of the metric ($g_{\alpha\beta}$) and hence different from the Levi-Civita connection (Γ) (of the metric formulation); it is actually determined by its equations of motion. Sometimes $\tilde{\Gamma}$ plays an auxiliary role only, with no dynamics. However, this is not general, so here we study gravity actions in the EP approach [3, 4] in which $\tilde{\Gamma}$ defines *dynamical* degrees of freedom.

In the Einstein action in the EP approach the variation principle gives that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ equals the Levi-Civita connection (Γ). One then recovers Einstein gravity - the metric and EP approach are equivalent. However, this equivalence does not hold in general, for complicated actions, with dynamical connection, matter present, etc [49–61]. The question remains, however, if an action in the EP approach with a dynamical connection 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 [5–8] as we showed recently in [9–11] (even in the absence of matter). The goal of this paper is to answer this question.

To address this question we study actions with (Weyl) local scale symmetry, hence we consider a quadratic gravity action. For a dynamical $\tilde{\Gamma}$ this symmetry is a *gauged* scale symmetry or Weyl gauge symmetry¹ [5–7]. We shall then: 1) explain the spontaneous breaking of this symmetry and the emergence of Levi-Civita connection, Einstein gravity and Planck scale (even in the absence of matter), thus answering the above question; 2) study the relation of such action to Weyl theory [5–7] of similar symmetry; 3) study inflation.

Consider $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ gravity in the EP approach which is local scale invariant, as reviewed in Section 2. The connection is 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 $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ gravity in which $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is *dynamical*. By this we mean that this action also contains a gauge kinetic term $(-1/4)F_{\mu\nu}^2$ for the vector field $v_\mu \sim \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\alpha}^\alpha - \Gamma_{\mu\alpha}^\alpha$ which measures the trace of the deviation of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from Γ . With $\tilde{\Gamma}$ independent of the metric rescaling, the local scale symmetry of this action becomes a *gauged* scale symmetry, with gauge field v_μ (also known as Weyl field)². This symmetry, known from Weyl gravity [5–7], is important for mass scales generation, hence our interest. In this work (Sections 3 and 4) we study this action, hereafter called “EP quadratic gravity”.

Due to the dynamical connection, the EP quadratic gravity is³ *non-metric* i.e. $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, with the trace of lhs proportional to v_μ . The equations of motion of the connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$ become now 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, with the connection a function of the dilaton, we show that the action obtained for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ *onshell* is a ghost-free, 2-nd order gauged scale invariant theory with a dilaton field.

¹See e.g. [5–30] for models with gauged scale symmetry and [31–48] for conformal or global scale symmetry.

²In this work we consider theories without torsion i.e. the connection is symmetric $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$.

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 (Planck, etc) to avoid atomic spectral lines changes [5], etc.

An important result of this work is that the gauged scale invariance of the above action is broken by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism [62–64] (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 a 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. Then the Planck scale M is an emergent scale where this symmetry breaks. These results remain true if this theory has extra scalar fields (higgs, inflaton, etc) non-minimally coupled with Palatini connection, while respecting gauged scale invariance (Section 4). Briefly, the EP quadratic gravity with a dynamical connection is a gauged scale invariant theory broken à la Stueckelberg to an Einstein-Proca action and a positive cosmological constant.

Another theory where the connection is not determined by the metric itself is the original Weyl quadratic gravity of gauged scale invariance [5–7] (also [8]). With hindsight, it is then not too surprising that the above results are similar to those in [9–11] for Weyl theory. This theory came under early criticism from Einstein [5] for its non-metricity implying changes of 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 [65, 66]). Hence, long-held criticisms that assumed v_μ be massless are avoided and Weyl gravity is then viable [9–11]. 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 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 [11], up to couplings and field redefinitions due to a different non-metricity. 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 is distinct from that in Weyl gravity theory [11, 30] and will soon be reached by CMB experiments [67–69]. We thus establish an interesting connection between non-metricity and testable inflation predictions. Our Conclusions are in Section 5.

2 Palatini R^2 gravity

For later reference, we first review R^2 gravity in the EP formalism (no dynamics for $\tilde{\Gamma}$) [70]. 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 [71] 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

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

Indeed, (1) is recovered if we use 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, $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ transforms covariantly. 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

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

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 $g_{\mu\nu}$:

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

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.

⁶To see this, use that: $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h^{\mu\nu} = -h^{\mu\sigma} h^{\nu\rho} \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h_{\sigma\rho}$, and $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \sqrt{h} = (1/2) \sqrt{h} h^{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda h_{\alpha\beta}$. (8)

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 *demanded* 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, $M \sim \langle \hat{\phi} \rangle$)⁷. 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 [72]). With ϕ “gauge fixed”, then from (7) $h_{\mu\nu} \propto g_{\mu\nu}$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$ and metricity is present⁸. Note that action (12) has a “fake” local scale symmetry [73–75] 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 [76] (eq.2.11), see also [77], where in the Einstein frame a kinetic term for ϕ remains present⁹.

3 Palatini quadratic gravity with gauged scale symmetry

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

Consider now the EP quadratic gravity with a *dynamical* (trace of the) Palatini connection

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

with

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\nabla}_\mu v_\nu - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu v_\mu; \quad v_\mu = (1/2)(\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu(g)), \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda, \quad \Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda, \quad (15)$$

$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is assumed symmetric in (μ, ν) , so $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu v_\nu - \partial_\nu v_\mu = (\partial_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}_\nu - \partial_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu)/2$, and $\Gamma_\mu(g)$ does not contribute to the kinetic term. L_2 is quadratic in R but it resembles a second order

⁷In fact for a FRW metric, ϕ evolves to a constant vev [43] so $M^2 \equiv \xi_0 \langle \hat{\phi} \rangle^2 / 6$, see later (section 3.3).

⁸This 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].

⁹In metric $R(g)^2$ gravity no kinetic term is present in (12) but emerges in the Einstein frame.

theory. Unlike in the previous section, $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \sim v_\mu$ is now a dynamical field. The vector field v_μ measures the trace of the deviation of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from the Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma(g)$.

As before, write L_2 in an equivalent form useful later on

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{\xi_0}{12} \phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})^2 - \frac{\xi_0}{4!} \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (16)$$

The equation of motion for ϕ has solution $\phi^2 = -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ which replaced in L_2 recovers (14).

Since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ does not transform under (4) and with $\Gamma_\mu(g) = \partial_\mu \ln \sqrt{g}$, then L_2 is invariant under (4) extended by

$$\hat{v}_\lambda = v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \Omega^2. \quad (17)$$

The invariance of L_2 under transformations (4), (17), 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

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) - \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_\lambda^\nu \left[\tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\rho} \phi^2) - \frac{6\sqrt{g}}{\alpha^2 \xi_0} \nabla_\rho F^{\rho\mu} \right] + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} = 0. \quad (18)$$

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 (6))

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\rho} \phi^2) = \frac{10}{\alpha^2} \frac{1}{\xi_0} \sqrt{g} \nabla_\rho F^{\rho\mu}. \quad (19)$$

Replacing (19) back in (18) leads to

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) - \frac{1}{5} \left\{ \delta_\lambda^\nu \tilde{\nabla}_\rho(\sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi^2) + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} = 0 \quad (20)$$

Notice that, had we not introduced ϕ in the first place to “linearise” the R^2 term in the action, (20) would have been similar but with $\phi^2 \rightarrow -R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$; then (20) would be a second-order differential equation for $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$, because $\partial\phi^2 \sim \partial R \sim \partial^2 \tilde{\Gamma}$, with further complications. This shows the role of ϕ as an independent variable (no use of its equation of motion), in terms of which one then easily computes $\tilde{\Gamma}$, as we do below. To find a solution introduce [51]

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda(\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} \phi^2) = (-2)\sqrt{g} \phi^2 (\delta_\lambda^\mu V^\nu + \delta_\lambda^\nu V^\mu), \quad (21)$$

where V_μ is some *arbitrary* vector field; this field is introduced since eq.(20) for $\lambda = \nu$ (summed over) is automatically respected (μ fixed), hence it leaves four undetermined components (due to underlying symmetry). Replacing eq.(21) in eq.(20), the latter is indeed

verified. Hence we must find $\tilde{\Gamma}$ from (21)¹⁰. First, by multiplying (21) by $g_{\mu\nu}$ one has

$$V_\lambda = -(1/2) \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \ln(\sqrt{g} \phi^4), \quad (22)$$

From (21), (22)

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda (\phi^2 g_{\mu\nu}) = (-2) (g_{\mu\nu} V_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} V_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} V_\mu) \phi^2. \quad (23)$$

Hence the theory is non-metric. From this we find the solution¹¹

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(\phi^2 g) - (3 g_{\mu\nu} V_\lambda - g_{\nu\lambda} V_\mu - g_{\lambda\mu} V_\nu) g^{\lambda\alpha}, \quad (24)$$

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

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 (15), (22)

$$v_\lambda = -(1/2) \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda \ln \sqrt{g}, \quad (25)$$

and hence $V_\lambda = v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2$. Using this, the solution $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in (24) (also eq.(23)) 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 (23) and (24) are invariant under transformations (4), (17) 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 field of non-metricity defined as $Q_{\lambda\mu\nu} \equiv \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}$, since from (25) the trace $Q_{\lambda\mu}^\mu = -4 v_\lambda$. Non-metricity is a consequence of the dynamical connection, see (19). Eq.(25) is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity of similar gauge symmetry (e.g.[16]).

Using solution (24) we compute $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ and then the scalar curvature¹² $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$

$$R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) = R(g) - 6g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \ln \phi - 6(\nabla_\mu \ln \phi)^2 - 12 (\nabla_\lambda V^\lambda + V^\lambda \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2) - 6V_\mu V^\mu, \quad (27)$$

with $R(g)$ the usual Ricci scalar and V_λ is replaced by $v_\lambda - \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2$. Finally, from (16),(27)

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{\xi_0}{12} [\phi^2 R(g) + 6(\partial_\mu \phi)^2] + \frac{\xi_0}{2} \phi^2 (v_\mu - \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{\xi_0}{4!} \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (28)$$

This Lagrangian has $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell and is gauged scale invariant: it is invariant under (4), (17) for any $\Omega(x)$. This is a scalar-vector-tensor theory of gravity. L_2 is a second order

¹⁰One cannot solve algebraically (21) 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 [78], p.5-6).

¹¹Use 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.

¹²One has for $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ (which by contraction with $g^{\mu\nu}$ gives $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$ of (27)):

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) &= R_{\mu\nu}(g) - 3g_{\mu\nu} (\nabla^\lambda V_\lambda + V^\lambda \partial_\lambda \ln \phi^2) - (\nabla_\mu V_\nu - \nabla_\nu V_\mu) - 6V_\mu V_\nu + 1/2 (\partial_\mu \theta)(\partial_\nu \theta) \\ &- 1/2 g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha \theta)(\partial_\beta \theta) - 1/2 g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda \partial_\lambda \theta + 1/2 \nabla_\nu \partial_\mu \theta - 3/2 \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \theta, \quad \theta \equiv \ln \phi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

ghost-free theory with a positive kinetic term for ϕ . This is relevant since initial action (14) which was of second order is actually a four-derivative theory for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ *onshell* due to $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ in (14) with (27); this has an equivalent second order formulation with additional ϕ in (28).

Lagrangian (28) (also initial (14)), is similar to that of Weyl quadratic gravity [9, 10], 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 (28) recovers (12).

3.2 Stueckelberg breaking to Einstein-Proca action

Given L_2 in (28) with gauged scale symmetry we would like to “fix the gauge”. We choose the Einstein gauge obtained from (28) by transformations (4), (17) of special $\Omega^2 = \xi_0 \phi^2 / (6M^2)$, fixing ϕ to a *constant* ($\propto \langle \phi \rangle$). We find, after removing the hats ($\hat{\cdot}$) on transformed g , v_μ , R

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M^2 R(g) + 3 M^2 v_\mu v_\nu g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{3}{2\xi_0} M^4 \right\}. \quad (29)$$

This is the Einstein-Proca action for the gauge field v_μ with a positive cosmological constant, in which M is identified with the Planck scale. The initial gauged scale invariance is broken by a gravitational Stueckelberg mechanism [62–64]: 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.(28). 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 [79]). The number of degrees of freedom (dof) other than graviton is conserved in going from (28) to (29), as it should 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 of the order of the Planck scale (unless one fine-tunes $\alpha \ll 1$).

Using the same transformation Ω , from (23)

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = (-2)(g_{\mu\nu} v_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} v_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} v_\mu). \quad (30)$$

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 and M is a phase transition scale (up to coupling α)¹³.

For comparison, in Weyl quadratic gravity e.g. [9, 10], non-metricity is different¹⁴

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

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 [65, 66]) to suppresses unwanted effects e.g. atomic spectral lines spacing. Past critiques of non-metricity assumed a massless v_μ .

¹³A special case: consider (16) with $\phi^2 = 6M^2/\xi_0 = \text{constant}$, i.e. a different initial action with no symmetry! then (27), (28) simplify; we still find (29) but there is no dynamical ϕ and thus no Stueckelberg mechanism.

¹⁴Contracting (30), (31) by $g^{\mu\nu}$ gives the same non-metricity trace, justifying our normalization of v_μ eq.(15)

3.3 Conserved current

Eqs.(19) and (21) show there is now a non-trivial current

$$J^\mu = \sqrt{g} g^{\rho\mu} \phi (\partial_\rho - 1/2 v_\rho) \phi, \quad \nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0, \quad (32)$$

due to a dynamical connection, and is conserved since $F_{\mu\nu}$ in (19) is antisymmetric. To obtain (32) we used that the lhs of (19) and of (21) (with $\lambda=\nu$) are equal. J^μ is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity [9] (eq.18) which has similar symmetry. In a related context, for a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric with ϕ only t -dependent it was shown [43] that such current conservation naturally leads to $\phi=\text{constant}$ i.e. to a dynamical gauge fixing and thus a breaking of the scale symmetry. Then from (28) the Planck scale is $M^2 = \xi_0 \langle \phi \rangle^2 / 6$.

Eq.(29) has $\phi=\text{constant}$ ($\langle \phi \rangle$), then from (32) 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 (29).

Finally, notice that initial action (14) is actually (using eq.(2) and $R_{[\mu\nu]} = R_{\mu\nu} - R_{\nu\mu}$):

$$L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{\xi_0}{4!} R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 - \frac{1}{8\alpha^2} R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma}) R^{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \right], \quad (33)$$

which we re-wrote as in (28), broken à la Stueckelberg to (29). Note the negative sign above.

4 Palatini quadratic gravity: additional fields and inflation

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

4.1 Adding matter

The starting Lagrangian of χ with gauged scale invariance, eqs.(4), (17), 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), (17) the Weyl-covariant derivative transforms as $\hat{\tilde{D}}_\mu \hat{\chi} = (1/\Omega) \tilde{D}_\mu \chi$. As in previous section, replace $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2 \rightarrow -2\phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g) - \phi^4$, to find an equivalent 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

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

We replaced the scalar field ϕ by the radial direction field ρ ¹⁵.

The equation of motion for $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is similar to (18) 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 with a result similar to (24) but with $\phi \rightarrow \rho$. We use this solution for the connection back in the action to find, for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell:

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

This has a gauged scale symmetry and extents (28) in the presence of scalar fields.

Finally, we choose the Einstein gauge by using transformation (4),(17) 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.

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 $\partial_\mu \ln \rho$. The mass of v_μ is $m_v^2 = 6\alpha^2 M^2$. A canonical kinetic term of $\hat{\chi}$ remains, since only one degree of freedom (radial direction ρ) is “eaten” by v_μ . 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 $\hat{v}^\mu \partial_\mu \hat{\chi}$ from the 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

¹⁵ $\ln \rho$ transforms as $\ln \rho \rightarrow \ln \rho - \ln \Omega$ and plays the role of the dilaton field.

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

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 $\hat{\chi} = \sigma + \mathcal{O}(\sigma^3/M^2)$ and a SM Higgs-like potential is recovered, 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 quantum level.

This Lagrangian is similar to that in Weyl quadratic gravity with a non-minimally coupled scalar/Higgs field [9–11]¹⁶, 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.(30), (31). 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 potential in (45) can also be used for inflation (hereafter Palatini R^2 inflation), with σ as the inflaton¹⁷. 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 R^2 -inflation, see [11] for details¹⁸ 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.

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:

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

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

¹⁶For comparison to Weyl gravity Lagrangian see for example eqs.(39)-(41) in [9] and eqs.(21), (22) in [10].

¹⁷Unlike in Starobinsky models, there is no scalaron here, its counterpart was “eaten” by massive v_μ .

¹⁸For related works on inflation in the Einstein-Palatini formalism see e.g. [80–88].




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. 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 $N > 65$.

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 have¹⁹

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

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 [11] (or Starobinsky model) where $r = 3(1 - n_s)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi_1^2)$.

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) [89]. 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 N between 55 to 65. The lower bound on

¹⁹There is an additional constraint on the parametric space from the normalization of the 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 $r < 0.07$ [89] then $\xi_0 = 1/(\pi^2 r \kappa) \geq 6.89 \times 10^8$. Condition $\lambda_1 \xi_0 \ll \xi_1^2$ in the text is then respected for any perturbative ξ_1 , $1/\xi_0$ by choosing small $\lambda_1 \ll \xi_1^2/\xi_0$.

r comes from that for n_s while the upper one corresponds to a saturation limit ($\xi_1 \rightarrow 0$). This range for r does not overlap with that in Weyl R^2 inflation (same n_s , 95% CL) [11, 30]

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

The different predicted range for r is important since it enables us to distinguish these two models; this is ultimately due to their different non-metricity²⁰. Such values for r will soon be reached by CMB experiments [67–69]. We thus established an interesting connection between non-metricity and testable inflation predictions. Similar values were found in other inflation models in Palatini R^2 gravity [87, 88] but they are not gauged scale invariant.

Unlike in other successful models (e.g. Starobinsky model [92]) where higher curvature operators (R^4 , etc) of unknown coefficients bring corrections to r [93], such operators and corrections are not allowed here. They must be suppressed by some scale whose presence here would violate the symmetry of the theory. The only scale of the theory, from the dilaton field vev, is not available since this field was already “eaten” to all orders by the gauge field v_μ . Another advantage is that, given the *gauged* scale symmetry, Palatini R^2 inflation is allowed by black-hole physics (similar for Weyl R^2 inflation [11]), in contrast to models of inflation with *global* scale symmetry²¹. Finally, unlike in other models of inflation (e.g. “Higgs inflation”) demanding a large non-minimal coupling (ξ_1), here we have $\xi_1 < 1$.

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 apriori independent of the metric. For simple actions $\tilde{\Gamma}$ plays an auxiliary role only (no dynamics), but this is not general. In this work we considered $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)^2$ gravity with a *dynamical* connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$). This means that this action contains an additional 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. This theory has a gauged scale symmetry, with v_μ as the Weyl field (“photon”).

Our motivation was: a) to show that this simple action, even *in the absence of matter*, has a spontaneous breaking of this symmetry with the emergence of Einstein gravity and Planck scale in the broken phase; b) to compare this theory to Weyl gravity of similar gauged scale symmetry; c) to study the predictions of inflation in this case.

Due to a dynamical connection, the theory is non-metric, hence $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. While this theory appears of second order, after solving it for the connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$ onshell) it is a higher derivative theory (as in a metric case). This action is equivalent to a second order theory with an extra scalar field (dilaton), while preserving onshell the gauged scale symmetry.

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) $\partial_\mu \ln \phi$ 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

²⁰In the Starobinsky model [92] for similar n_s one has $r \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, e.g. $r = 0.0034$ ($N = 55$) [90].

²¹A global symmetry is broken since global charges can be eaten by black holes which then evaporate [91].

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 relevant 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 (electroweak symmetry in the higgs case).

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

This picture is very similar to a recent analysis by the author for the original Weyl quadratic gravity theory, despite the different non-metricity of these two theories. With hindsight, this is not too surprising, since in both cases 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 would be interesting to study further the relation of these theories with such symmetry.

There are also interesting results for 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 the different non-metricity of the two theories. We find a specific prediction $0.007 \leq r \leq 0.01$ for the tensor-to-scalar ratio, for the current value of the spectral index at 95% CL. This value of r is mildly larger than that predicted by Weyl R^2 inflation. This result enables us to distinguish and test these two theories by future CMB experiments. It also establishes an interesting connection between non-metricity and testable inflation predictions.

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

References

- [1] A. Einstein, “Einheitliche Feldtheories von Gravitation und Electricitat”, 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] 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).
- [6] Hermann Weyl “Eine neue Erweiterung der Relativitätstheorie” (“A new extension of the theory of relativity”), *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* (4) 59 (1919), 101-133.
- [7] 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.
- [8] 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]];
- [9] D. M. Ghilencea, “Spontaneous breaking of Weyl quadratic gravity to Einstein action and Higgs potential,” *JHEP* **1903** (2019) 049 [arXiv:1812.08613 [hep-th]].
- [10] 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]].
- [11] D. M. Ghilencea, “Weyl R^2 inflation with an emergent Planck scale,” *JHEP* **1910** (2019) 209 [arXiv:1906.11572 [gr-qc]].
- [12] P. A. M. Dirac, “Long range forces and broken symmetries,” *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **333** (1973) 403. doi:10.1098/rspa.1973.0070
- [13] L. Smolin, “Towards a Theory of Space-Time Structure at Very Short Distances,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **160** (1979) 253.
- [14] H. Cheng, “The Possible Existence of Weyl’s Vector Meson,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 2182.
- [15] I. Quiros, “Scale invariant theory of gravity and the standard model of particles,” E-print arXiv:1401.2643 [gr-qc].
- [16] T. Fulton, F. Rohrlich and L. Witten, “Conformal invariance in physics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **34** (1962) 442.
- [17] J. T. Wheeler, “Weyl geometry,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **50** (2018) no.7, 80 [arXiv:1801.03178 [gr-qc]].
- [18] 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]].
- [19] 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]].
- [20] D. M. Ghilencea and H. M. Lee, “Weyl symmetry and its spontaneous breaking in Standard Model and inflation,” arXiv:1809.09174 [hep-th].

- [21] A. Barnaveli, S. Lucat and T. Prokopec, “Inflation as a spontaneous symmetry breaking of Weyl symmetry,” arXiv:1809.10586 [gr-qc].
- [22] J. W. Moffat, “Scalar-tensor-vector gravity theory,” JCAP **0603** (2006) 004 [gr-qc/0506021].
- [23] L. Heisenberg, “Scalar-Vector-Tensor Gravity Theories,” arXiv:1801.01523 [gr-qc].
- [24] 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]].
- [25] 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]].
- [26] C. T. Hill, “Inertial Symmetry Breaking,” arXiv:1803.06994 [hep-th].
- [27] E. Scholz, “Higgs and gravitational scalar fields together induce Weyl gauge,” Gen. Rel. Grav. **47** (2015) no.2, 7 [arXiv:1407.6811 [gr-qc]].
- [28] W. Drechsler and H. Tann, “Broken Weyl invariance and the origin of mass,” Found. Phys. **29** (1999) 1023 [gr-qc/9802044].
- [29] S. Dengiz, “A Note on Noncompact and Nonmetricity Quadratic Curvature Gravity Theories,” Turk. J. Phys. **42** (2018) no.1, 70 [arXiv:1404.2714 [hep-th]].
- [30] 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]].
- [31] G. ’t Hooft, “Local conformal symmetry: The missing symmetry component for space and time,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **24** (2015) no.12, 1543001.
- [32] 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]].
- [33] G. ’t Hooft, “Imagining the future, or how the Standard Model may survive the attacks,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. **31** (2016) no.16, 1630022.
- [34] G. ’t Hooft, “Local conformal symmetry in black holes, standard model, and quantum gravity,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **26** (2016) no.03, 1730006.
- [35] M. Shaposhnikov and D. Zenhausern, “Quantum scale invariance, cosmological constant and hierarchy problem,” Phys. Lett. B **671** (2009) 162 [arXiv:0809.3406 [hep-th]].
- [36] 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]].
- [37] 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]].
- [38] F. Gretsche and A. Monin, “Perturbative conformal symmetry and dilaton,” Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.4, 045036 [arXiv:1308.3863 [hep-th]].

- [39] 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]]. 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]].
- [40] 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]].
- [41] 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]].
- [42] 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]].
- [43] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “Inertial Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking and Quantum Scale Invariance,” arXiv:1801.07676 [hep-th].
- [44] 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]].
- [45] 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]].
- [46] O. Lebedev and H. M. Lee, “Higgs Portal Inflation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1821 [arXiv:1105.2284 [hep-ph]].
- [47] Z. Lalak and P. Olszewski, “Vanishing trace anomaly in flat spacetime,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.8, 085001 [arXiv:1807.09296 [hep-th]].
- [48] 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]].
- [49] H. A. Buchdahl, “Representation Of The Einstein-proca Field By An $A(4)^*$,” *J. Phys. A* **12** (1979) 1235.
- [50] H. A. Buchdahl, “Non-linear Lagrangians and cosmological theory,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **150** (1970) 1.
- [51] D. N. Vollick, “Einstein-Maxwell and Einstein-Proca theory from a modified gravitational action,” gr-qc/0601016.
- [52] D. N. Vollick, “Born-Infeld-Einstein theory with matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 084026 [gr-qc/0506091].
- [53] 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].
- [54] B. Shahid-Saless, “First Order Formalism Treatment of $R + R^{*2}$ Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **35** (1987) 467.

- [55] E. E. Flanagan, “Palatini form of $1/R$ gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** (2004) 071101 [astro-ph/0308111].
- [56] E. E. Flanagan, “Higher order gravity theories and scalar tensor theories,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** (2003) 417 [gr-qc/0309015].
- [57] 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]].
- [58] L. Järv, 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]].
- [59] L. Querella, “Variational principles and cosmological models in higher order gravity,” gr-qc/9902044.
- [60] 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]].
- [61] 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]].
- [62] E. C. G. Stueckelberg, “Interaction forces in electrodynamics and in the field theory of nuclear forces,” *Helv. Phys. Acta* **11** (1938) 299.
- [63] R. Percacci, “Gravity from a Particle Physicists’ perspective,” *PoS ISFTG* (2009) 011 [arXiv:0910.5167 [hep-th]].
- [64] R. Percacci, “The Higgs phenomenon in quantum gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **353** (1991) 271 [arXiv:0712.3545 [hep-th]].
- [65] 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]].
- [66] I. P. Lobo and C. Romero, “Experimental constraints on the second clock effect,” *Phys. Lett. B* **783** (2018) 306 [arXiv:1807.07188 [gr-qc]].
- [67] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* [CMB-S4 Collaboration], “CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition,” arXiv:1610.02743 [astro-ph.CO]. <https://cmb-s4.org/>
- [68] 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]].
- [69] 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]].
- [70] 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.
- [71] D. Gorbunov, V. Rubakov, “Introduction to the theory of the early Universe”, World Scientific, 2011.
- [72] A. Edery 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]].

- [73] 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]].
- [74] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, “New Setting for Spontaneous Gauge Symmetry Breaking?,” *Fundam. Theor. Phys.* **183** (2016) 159 [arXiv:1511.00994 [hep-th]].
- [75] 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).
- [76] 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]].
- [77] 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]].
- [78] 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]].
- [79] 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
- [80] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, “Higgs-Palatini Inflation and Unitarity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **698** (2011) 425 [arXiv:1012.2900 [hep-ph]].
- [81] 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]].
- [82] T. Koivisto and H. Kurki-Suonio, “Cosmological perturbations in the palatini formulation of modified gravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 2355 [astro-ph/0509422].
- [83] 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]].
- [84] 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]].
- [85] 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]].
- [86] 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]].
- [87] 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]].
- [88] 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]].
- [89] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation,” arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO].
- [90] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” *Chin. Phys. C* **40** (2016) no.10, 100001.

- [91] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, D. A. Linde and L. Susskind, “Gravity and global symmetries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 912 [hep-th/9502069].
- [92] 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].
- [93] 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.