

# New Dynamical Degrees of Freedom from Invertible Transformations

Pavel Jiroušek,<sup>a</sup> Keigo Shimada,<sup>c</sup> Alexander Vikman<sup>b</sup> and Masahide Yamaguchi<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*High Energy Physics, Cosmology & Astrophysics Theory Group, University of Cape Town, Private Bag, Cape Town, South Africa, 7700*

<sup>b</sup>*CEICO - Central European Institute for Cosmology and Fundamental Physics, FZU - Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Na Slovance 1999/2, 18221 Prague 8, Czech Republic*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan*

E-mail: [pavel.jirousek@uct.ac.za](mailto:pavel.jirousek@uct.ac.za), [shimada.k.ah@m.titech.ac.jp](mailto:shimada.k.ah@m.titech.ac.jp), [vikman@fzu.cz](mailto:vikman@fzu.cz), [gucci@phys.titech.ac.jp](mailto:gucci@phys.titech.ac.jp)

**Abstract.** We show that invertible transformations of dynamical variables can change the number of dynamical degrees of freedom. Moreover, even in cases when the number of dynamical degrees of freedom remains unchanged, the resulting dynamics can be essentially different from the one of the system prior to transformation. After giving concrete examples in point particle cases, we discuss changes in dynamics due to invertible disformal transformations of the metric in gravitational theories.

---

## Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Adding Degrees of Freedom to Non-Relativistic Free Particle</b>            | <b>2</b>  |
| 2.1      | Hamilton analysis   | 4         |
| 2.2      | Non-trivial kinetic term  | 6         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Even More Extra Degrees of Freedom for Relativistic Free Particle</b>      | <b>8</b>  |
| 3.1      | Einbein Transformation  | 9         |
| 3.2      | Hamiltonian analysis  | 11        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Example of Invertible Disformal Transformation resulting in Mimetic DM</b> | <b>12</b> |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Conclusions and Discussion</b>   | <b>14</b> |
| <b>A</b> | <b>Transformation with higher derivatives</b>                                 | <b>17</b> |

---

## 1 Introduction

Transformations of variables provide one of the main tools in theoretical physics. It is always advantageous to formulate a theory in such a way that it is covariant with respect to a large class of transformations. For instance, Lagrangian mechanics allows for general coordinate transformations contrary to the usual Cartesian coordinates of Newtonian mechanics, whereas the Hamiltonian canonical description extends permitted transformations even further. Among different transformations, the *invertible* once plays a special role. Here we define an invertible transformation such that it has a one-to-one correspondence between the original variables and the new one. One can expect that such one-to-one correspondence automatically implies that the dynamics of the systems before and after the transformation would be essentially (physically) the same. Hence, we could only analyze one set of variables to understand the dynamics. In fact, it is shown in Ref. [1] that any solution of the Euler-Lagrange equations in an original system is mapped to a solution of Euler-Lagrange equations in a new system, and vice versa provided the transformation is (regular) invertible. The main conclusion of our work is that this is not always the case for invertible transformations. That is, an invertible transformation of variables or fields can change the number of dynamical degrees of freedom (DoF). Moreover, even in the case when the number of dynamical degrees of freedom is preserved, completely different dynamics can emerge after an invertible transformation.

The invertibility of a transformation can be judged by the famous inverse function theorem, which states that, as long as the Jacobian (the determinant of the Jacobian matrix) of the transformation is non-vanishing (that is, the transformation is regular), such a transformation is invertible (at least locally).<sup>1</sup> However, it should be noticed that the inverse function theorem provides only a *sufficient* condition for the invertibility. In fact, even if a transformation is singular, that is, its Jacobian vanishes at some point, the transformation can be invertible. A well-known example for such a case is a transformation  $y(x) = x^{2n+1}$  with integer  $n$  larger than unity, which is actually invertible even though the Jacobian of the transformation vanishes at the origin ( $x = y = 0$ ).

In our previous paper [4], we have shown that the essential reason why a new DoF appears in mimetic gravity [5] lies in the singular nature (that is, in the vanishing Jacobian) of a transformation whichever it is invertible or non-invertible. Later Ref. [6] fully confirmed our results.

---

<sup>1</sup>The extension of this inverse function theorem to the case of transformations with derivatives was recently given in Refs. [2, 3].

In the current paper, we will explicitly show that *singular* but *invertible* transformations can actually change the number of the DoF.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In the next section, we begin with an example of a simple non-relativistic point particle system in which an invertible transformation actually changes the number of dynamical degrees of freedom. This finding is confirmed by the Hamiltonian analysis. Another interesting example is also given, where a completely new dynamics appears after an invertible transformation with keeping the number of dynamical degrees of freedom. In section 3, we give an example of a relativistic point particle system. In section 4, a concrete example of a mimetic gravity obtained via an invertible disformal transformation is discussed, that is, mimetic dark matter [5] appears after such a transformation. The final section is devoted to conclusions and discussion. In the appendix, we also give an example of transformation with higher derivatives.

## 2 Adding Degrees of Freedom to Non-Relativistic Free Particle

Let us demonstrate how one can gain extra DoF on a simple ordinary mechanics example - a unit mass free particle, with the action

$$S[q] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \dot{q}^2, \quad (2.1)$$

where we use standard notation  $\dot{q} \equiv dq/dt$ . This system clearly has only a single degree of freedom, which is reflected in the presence of exactly two integration constants in the solutions of its equation of motion  $\ddot{q} = 0$ . These constants are, of course, the initial velocity  $v_0$  and the initial position  $q_0$  in the general solution

$$q(t) = q_0 + v_0 t. \quad (2.2)$$

Now we introduce a non-trivial but *invertible* transformation of the field  $Q \leftrightarrow q$  that will be facilitated by a novel variable  $\phi$

$$q(Q, \dot{\phi}) = Q^3 + \dot{\phi}. \quad (2.3)$$

This transformation is clearly invertible since for any given  $\phi$  we are able to find an inverse transformation

$$Q(q, \dot{\phi}) = \sqrt[3]{q - \dot{\phi}}. \quad (2.4)$$

The existence of this inverse is, however, not implied by the inverse function theorem. Indeed, due to the third power of  $Q$  in (2.3) the Jacobian of the transformation

$$J = \frac{\partial q}{\partial Q} = 3Q^2, \quad (2.5)$$

has a singular point at  $Q = 0$ , which violates the assumptions of the inverse function theorem. Crucially, this singular point then necessarily appears as a solution of the  $Q$ -equation of motion. Indeed, by varying the transformed action

$$S[Q, \phi] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left( \ddot{\phi} + 3Q^2 \dot{Q} \right)^2, \quad (2.6)$$

with respect to both  $Q$  and  $\phi$  we obtain the following set of equations of motion

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta Q} = -\ddot{q} J = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi} = \frac{d}{dt} \ddot{q} = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Clearly, the solutions of the original theory are also solutions of these equations of motion. However, these are not the only possible solutions. Indeed, the  $Q$ -equation of motion either reproduces the equation of motion of the original untransformed system ( $\ddot{q} = 0$ ), or requires the Jacobian to vanish ( $J = 0$ ). Hence, there are *two branches* of solutions: the *regular branch* describing the original dynamics and the *singular branch* corresponding to the singular point of the Jacobian ( $Q = 0$ ).

The  $\phi$ -equation of motion (3.20) is identically satisfied on the regular branch. In the regular branch, we are away from the singular point of the invertible transformation and the dynamics are equivalent to those of the original theory. Since there was only a single equation of motion before transformation (2.3), there is only a single non-trivial equation after transformation. Nevertheless, we are using two variables instead of one to describe the original system - so we must ask what happens to this redundancy. The answer is that there is an obvious gauge freedom in action (2.40)

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi + \epsilon, \quad \text{along with} \quad Q^3 \rightarrow Q^3 - \dot{\epsilon}, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\epsilon(t)$  is an arbitrary function of time. This gauge freedom in action (2.40) corresponds to the identity

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi} + \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\delta S}{\delta Q^3} = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

From the perspective of theory given by action (2.40) with two variables, the original variable  $q$  given by combination (2.3) is a gauge invariant variable. It is crucial that gauge transformation (2.9) cannot be linearized around the singular point  $Q = 0$ . Moreover, it is clear that equation of motion (2.7) is not gauge invariant, due to the presence of the Jacobian. Though, the equation of motion becomes gauge invariant when  $Q \neq 0$ . Note that (2.7) has  $\ddot{Q}$ , while (2.8) has  $\dot{\phi}$  so that naively one would count that maximum there is two DoF from (2.8) and one DoF from (2.7), however one DoF can be eliminated due to gauge freedom (2.9) so that maximum two DoF may remain.

In the singular branch,  $\phi$ -equation of motion reduces to

$$\frac{d^4}{dt^4} \phi = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

which yields the solution

$$\phi(t) = c_0 + c_1 t + c_2 \frac{t^2}{2} + c_3 \frac{t^3}{6}, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $c_i$  are four constants of integration. A crucial point here is that transformation (2.3) does not become trivial at the singular point. Instead, it reduces to

$$q(Q, \dot{\phi})|_{Q=0} = \dot{\phi}. \quad (2.13)$$

Thus, the gauge invariant quantity  $q$  depends on three integration constants. More importantly, the motion  $q(t)$  instead of a *free particle* (2.2), describes now an *accelerated particle*

$$q(t) = c_1 + c_2 t + c_3 \frac{t^2}{2}, \quad (2.14)$$

where the constant acceleration  $c_3$  should be provided by initial conditions. Note that the correct formulation of the action principle in new variables in (2.40) requires standard boundary conditions corresponding to

$$\delta Q(t_1) = \delta Q(t_2) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta \phi(t_1) = \delta \phi(t_2) = \delta \dot{\phi}(t_1) = \delta \dot{\phi}(t_2) = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

These conditions imply that the gauge function  $\epsilon(t)$  should vanish at the boundaries along with its time derivative  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$ . Hence, one cannot make a residual gauge transformation to eliminate

$c_0$ . Therefore, the number of initial data needed to specify the motion is four and the number of DoF is two. We will confirm this conclusion in the next section. But before going there, it is important to stress that the presence of time derivatives in the transformation (2.3) is only important if accompanied with the singularity of the Jacobian. Indeed, one can easily check that transformation

$$q_1(Q, \dot{\phi}) = Q + \dot{\phi} , \quad (2.16)$$

does not change the number of DoF or dynamics. On the other hand, singular transformations without time derivatives are also trivial and do not change dynamics. For instance, this is the case for

$$q_2(Q, \dot{\phi}) = Q^3 + \dot{\phi} . \quad (2.17)$$

## 2.1 Hamilton analysis

Let us count the DoF in the transformed theory (2.40) using canonical analysis. The transformed action (2.40) clearly describes a higher derivative theory in the field  $\phi$ . Therefore our first step is to reduce the order of derivatives by introducing a constraint so that Lagrangian becomes

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \left( 3Q^2 \dot{Q} + \dot{\theta} \right)^2 + \lambda(\dot{\phi} - \theta) . \quad (2.18)$$

This straightforwardly gives the following canonical momenta

$$p_\theta = \dot{q} , \quad (2.19)$$

$$p_Q = 3Q^2 \dot{q} , \quad (2.20)$$

$$p_\phi = \lambda , \quad (2.21)$$

$$p_\lambda = 0 , \quad (2.22)$$

where  $\dot{q} = 3Q^2 \dot{Q} + \dot{\theta}$ . The last two expressions clearly represent primary constraints. However, substituting the first equality into the second to eliminate  $\dot{q}$  reveals an additional primary constraint in the theory

$$p_Q = p_\theta 3Q^2 . \quad (2.23)$$

Hence we have only a single unconstrained momentum  $p_\theta$ . Note that we are therefore unable to solve for both  $\dot{\theta}$  and  $\dot{Q}$  separately. Nevertheless the relation (2.19) is enough to eliminate the dependence on all dotted variables in the Hamiltonian. Indeed, after a bit of algebra one can find the Dirac Hamiltonian

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} p_\theta^2 + p_\phi \theta + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta) + \beta p_\lambda + \gamma (p_\phi - \lambda) . \quad (2.24)$$

Note that we have used the primary constraints (2.21) to (2.23) to get this form. The consistency condition for the primary constraints (2.21) and (2.22) allows us to determine the multipliers  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ :

$$\{p_\phi - \lambda, H_D\} = -\beta = 0 , \quad (2.25)$$

$$\{p_\lambda, H_D\} = \gamma = 0 . \quad (2.26)$$

Hence the Hamiltonian simplifies to

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} p_\theta^2 + p_\phi \theta + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta) . \quad (2.27)$$

Finally the consistency condition induced by the last primary constraint (2.23) gives

$$\{p_Q - p_\theta 3Q^2, H_D\} = 3Q^2 p_\phi = 0 . \quad (2.28)$$

The above condition is a product of two factors, this reflects the branching nature of the theory. We may either impose the secondary constraint  $Q = 0$ , which clearly corresponds to the singular point of the Jacobian (2.5), or we take  $p_\phi = 0$ , which, as we shall see, corresponds to the regular branch.

Let us now analyse these branches separately. We will first focus on the regular branch by introducing the secondary constraint  $p_\phi = 0$ . This constraint commutes with all the primary constraints (2.21) to (2.23) and with the Hamiltonian itself. Hence we do not generate tertiary constraints. Furthermore this means that  $p_\phi = 0$  is a first class constraint. Analysing the commutation relations of the primary constraint we find that (2.23) is also first class, while (2.21) and (2.22) are second class. Since the phase space is 8 dimensional we get the following degree of freedom count

$$\#D.o.F. = \frac{8 - 2 \times 2 - 2 \times 1}{2} = 1 . \quad (2.29)$$

To demonstrate that this branch indeed corresponds to the phase space of the original theory we can directly confirm that  $\ddot{q} = 0$ :

$$\dot{q} = \{q, H_D\} = p_\theta , \quad (2.30)$$

$$\ddot{q} = \{\dot{q}, H_D\} = p_\phi = 0 , \quad (2.31)$$

where in the last line we use the secondary constraint  $p_\phi = 0$ . Finally, since (2.23) is a first class constraint, the associated multiplier  $\alpha$  remains in the Hamiltonian. This implies that there is a gauge symmetry in our description, which is generated by the constraint (2.23). However, we can confirm that both  $q = Q^3 + \theta$  and the associated  $p_q = \dot{q} = p_\theta$  are invariant under this symmetry

$$\delta_{\epsilon'} q \equiv \epsilon' \{q, p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta\} = 0 , \quad (2.32)$$

$$\delta_{\epsilon'} p_q \equiv \epsilon' \{p_q, p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta\} = 0 . \quad (2.33)$$

Let us now return and analyze the singular branch. Here the secondary constraint is  $Q = 0$ , while  $p_\phi$  is left undetermined. The crucial difference in comparison to the regular branch is that  $Q = 0$  is not a first class constraint. This can be seen from its non-vanishing commutator with (2.23). In turn (2.23) becomes a second class constraint as well. Consequently, the consistency condition for  $Q = 0$  allows us to determine the last multiplier  $\alpha$ :

$$\{Q, H_D\} = \alpha = 0 . \quad (2.34)$$

Therefore we get the Hamiltonian

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} p_\theta^2 + p_\phi \theta . \quad (2.35)$$

Here, it should be noticed that the Hamiltonian depends linearly on the momentum  $p_\phi$ , that is different from the case of the regular branch with  $p_\phi = 0$ , which is the manifestation of the Ostrogradsky ghost<sup>2</sup>, see [8, 9]. If one would like to avoid the appearance of such a ghost degree of freedom, one can consider the model with  $L = 1/2q^2$ , for example, in which there is no dynamics in the regular branch, but a new healthy degree of freedom appears in the singular branch. Crucially, the fact that  $Q = 0$  and (2.23) are second class is reflected in the number of degrees of freedom in the theory, which is now

$$\#D.o.F. = \frac{8 - 4 \times 1}{2} = 2 , \quad (2.36)$$

which has clearly increased in comparison with the regular branch. This can be easily traced to the consistency condition (2.28), where the Jacobian (2.5) enters as an overall factor. Hence

---

<sup>2</sup>The Ostrogradsky ghost is usually considered to imply instability, but there is a recent exception [7] from this common lore.

any singular point of the Jacobian can be taken as a novel branch of the theory. This allows us to evade the constraint  $p_\phi = 0$  opening the possibility of non-vanishing second derivative of  $q$ . Instead we get

$$\ddot{q} = \{p_\phi, H_D\} = 0 . \quad (2.37)$$

Lastly, let us note that the gauge symmetry (2.33) no longer exists in the singular branch, since its action does not preserve the secondary constraint  $Q = 0$ . This is in agreement with our observation that the symmetry (2.9) cannot be applied to the singular branch.

## 2.2 Non-trivial kinetic term

The novel degree of freedom we have found in the last section is clearly tied to the newly introduced variable  $\phi$ , which has not appeared in the action prior to transformation (2.3) in section 2. It is therefore natural to ask, whether the number of degrees of freedom will still increase even when a degree of freedom associated to  $\phi$  has already exists in the theory before we introduce it through (2.3). We explore this option by modifying the toy model (2.1) by including a kinetic term for the field  $\phi$ .

$$S[q, \phi] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left( \dot{q}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2 \right) . \quad (2.38)$$

Let us now consider the same transformation (2.3) applied to the above action. Since  $\phi$  already exists in the theory we have to extend this transformation to  $\phi$ . We chose the following trivial extension

$$\begin{aligned} q &= Q^3 + \phi , \\ \phi &= \phi . \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

After this transformation the action becomes

$$S[Q, \phi] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left[ \left( \ddot{\phi} + 3Q^2 \dot{Q} \right)^2 + \dot{\phi}^2 \right] , \quad (2.40)$$

and the equations of motion associated to  $Q$  and  $\phi$  respectively are

$$\ddot{q} Q^2 = 0 , \quad (2.41)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ \ddot{q} - \dot{\phi} \right] = 0 . \quad (2.42)$$

We can immediately see that the structure of the first equation remains unchanged. We again obtain two branches in the solution space - the regular branch ( $\ddot{q} = 0$ ) and the singular one ( $Q = 0$ ). In the regular branch the  $\phi$  equation of motion is, however, no longer empty and implies linear evolution for the variable  $\phi$

$$\ddot{\phi} = 0 . \quad (2.43)$$

This is clearly the  $\phi$  equation of motion of the original theory (2.38). Hence we see that the original dynamics of the action (2.1) is recovered in the regular branch. Unlike in section 2, we now have two degrees of freedom instead of one due to  $\phi$  being dynamical to begin with. This can be further tied to the fact that the gauge symmetry (2.9), which can be held responsible for the missing degree of freedom, is manifestly broken due to the addition of the kinetic term for  $\phi$ . The singular branch is given by the vanishing of the Jacobian (2.5), which simplifies the relation (2.39) to  $q = \dot{\phi}$ . Hence the  $\phi$  equation of motion (2.42) becomes

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ \ddot{\phi} - \phi \right] = 0 , \quad (2.44)$$

giving us the solution for  $\phi$

$$\phi = c_0 + c_1 t + c_2 \cosh(t) + c_3 \sinh(t) . \quad (2.45)$$

Here  $c_i$  are 4 constants of integration, suggesting that there are again 2 degrees of freedom in the singular branch. We see that there was no increase in the number of degrees of freedom between the two branches this time. Nevertheless the solutions encountered in the singular branch are significantly altered in comparison to the solutions of the original theory. This is true for the variable  $q$  as well as for  $\phi$

$$q = \dot{\phi} = c_1 + c_2 \sinh(t) + c_3 \cosh(t) . \quad (2.46)$$

We proceed to the Hamiltonian analysis in this modified example to confirm our naive counting of the degrees of freedom. We again introduce the field  $\theta$  in order to reduce the order of derivatives but we can also use it to convert the kinetic term for  $\phi$  to a potential term for  $\theta$ .

$$L \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}(Q, \theta)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 + \lambda(\dot{\phi} - \theta) . \quad (2.47)$$

Since the modification now appear only as a potential term much of the analysis remains unaffected by its addition. In particular we obtain only one non-constrained canonical momentum

$$p_\theta = \dot{q} , \quad (2.48)$$

along with three primary constraints

$$p_\phi = \lambda , \quad (2.49)$$

$$p_\lambda = 0 , \quad (2.50)$$

$$p_Q = 3Q^2 p_\theta . \quad (2.51)$$

The Hamiltonian is therefore only modified by the potential term  $\theta^2/2$

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} p_\theta^2 + p_\phi \theta - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta) + \beta p_\lambda + \gamma (p_\phi - \lambda) . \quad (2.52)$$

The consistency conditions for the constraints (2.49) and (2.50) also remain unchanged and therefore we get  $\beta = 0$  and  $\gamma = 0$  as in (2.25) and (2.26). So the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} p_\theta^2 + p_\phi \theta - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_\theta) . \quad (2.53)$$

Finally, the consistency condition for primary constraint (2.51) is different from section 2.1. In particular, we get

$$\{p_Q - p_\theta 3Q^2, H_D\} = 3Q^2 (p_\phi - \theta) = 0 . \quad (2.54)$$

Like in section 2.1 this consistency introduces a secondary constraint to the theory, which is given as a product of two factors. These correspond to the two branches - regular and singular - as we have identified them in our analysis of equation of motion (2.41). The secondary constraint characterizing the singular branch remains unchanged as it is given by  $Q = 0$ . However, the constraint corresponding to the regular branch obtains an additional term  $-\theta$ . Namely

$$p_\phi - \theta = 0 . \quad (2.55)$$

This novel term in the constraint changes the commutation relation between (2.55) and (2.51), which now does not vanish. This means that the secondary constraint in the regular branch is second class and we can use it to determine the multiplier  $\alpha$ . In particular we get the following consistency condition

$$\{p_\phi - \theta, H_D\} = -p_\theta + \alpha 3Q^2 . \quad (2.56)$$

Hence the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}p_\theta^2 + p_\phi\theta - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 + p_\theta \left( \frac{p_Q}{3Q^2} - p_\theta \right) . \quad (2.57)$$

Moreover unlike in section 2.1 the secondary constraint is second class even in the regular branch, this results in a higher number of the degrees of freedom. In particular we get

$$\#\text{D.o.F.} = \frac{8 - 4 \times 1}{2} = 2 . \quad (2.58)$$

In the singular branch the constraint structure is exactly the same as the singular branch in section 2.1. In particular the secondary constraint  $Q = 0$  is second class as it does not commute with (2.51). Hence we obtain the following consistency condition

$$\{Q, H_D\} = \alpha = 0 . \quad (2.59)$$

The final Hamiltonian is thus only changed by the  $\theta$  potential

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}p_\theta^2 + p_\phi\theta - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 . \quad (2.60)$$

Consequently, we get 2 degrees of freedom as expected.

### 3 Even More Extra Degrees of Freedom for Relativistic Free Particle

So far we have demonstrated that the dynamics originating in the singular point of the Jacobian (2.5) can introduce a single novel degree of freedom. This appearance could be traced not only to the singular point but also to the appearance of  $\dot{\phi}$  in the transformation (2.3). In this section, we aim to demonstrate the amount of degrees of freedom introduced to the theory due to an invertible transformation featuring  $\dot{\phi}$  may be larger than one. We show this on the model for free relativistic particle of unit mass in n-dimensional Minkowski background<sup>3</sup>

$$S[x^\mu, e] = -\frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \left( \frac{\dot{x}^2}{e} + e \right) . \quad (3.1)$$

Here  $x^\mu$  are the coordinates of the particle trajectory in the target spacetime,  $\tau$  is the time coordinate on the worldline and  $e$  is the einbein. We are using a shorthand  $\dot{x}^2 = \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}$ . The equations of motion for the coordinate variables are

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\dot{x}_\mu}{e} = 0 . \quad (3.2)$$

The equation of motion associated with the einbein  $e$  is

$$\frac{\dot{x}^2}{e^2} = 1 . \quad (3.3)$$

which we can solve for the einbein directly to obtain

$$e = \sqrt{\dot{x}^2} . \quad (3.4)$$

Plugging this into (3.2) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\dot{x}^\mu}{\sqrt{\dot{x}^2}} = 0 . \quad (3.5)$$

Hence we see that the theory in 1 dimension is particularly simple as there are no dynamics whatsoever.

---

<sup>3</sup>We use the signature convention  $(+, -, -, -)$ .

The field  $e$  is clearly just an auxiliary variable that can be solved from its own equation of motion algebraically. Thus we can integrate it out by plugging the solution back into the action (3.1) returns the better known action for the free particle

$$S[x^\mu] = - \int d\tau \sqrt{\dot{x}^2} . \quad (3.6)$$

The canonical analysis of the theory (3.1) is fairly simple. The canonical momenta corresponding to  $x^\mu$  and  $e$  respectively are

$$p_\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{x}^\mu} = \frac{\dot{x}_\mu}{e} , \quad \text{and} \quad \pi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{e}} = 0 . \quad (3.7)$$

We see that we have one primary constraint  $\pi = 0$ . The Dirac Hamiltonian is therefore

$$H_D = \frac{e}{2}(p^2 - 1) + \lambda \pi . \quad (3.8)$$

Here  $\lambda$  is an undetermined multiplier and  $p^2 = \eta^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu$ . The consistency condition associated with the primary constraint reads

$$\{\pi, H_D\} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p^2) = 0 . \quad (3.9)$$

Hence we obtain a secondary constraint, which commutes with the Hamiltonian

$$\{p^2 - 1, H_D\} = 0 . \quad (3.10)$$

The two constraints commute with each other

$$\{p^2 - 1, \pi\} = 0 , \quad (3.11)$$

hence we have two first class constraints. Since we have started with  $n + 1$  independent fields the dimensionality of the phase space is  $2(n + 1)$ . The first class constraints are subtracted twice so we have the final number of degrees of freedom being  $n - 1$ . In the special case of  $n = 1$  this returns 0 which agrees with our intuition from the equations of motion.

### 3.1 Einbein Transformation

Let us construct a transformation of the einbein  $e$  in hopes that we can increase the D.o.F. count of the above theory. In order to do so, we consider a novel einbein  $f$  and an additional scalar  $\phi$  to facilitate the following relationship

$$e = (f - \dot{\phi})^3 + \dot{\phi}^3 = f \left( 3\dot{\phi}^2 - 3f\dot{\phi} + f^2 \right) , \quad (3.12)$$

where expression in the brackets on the right hand side emulates the gauge transformations of the einbein due to the time reparametrisation. Note that the transformation also maps the field  $\phi$  to itself

$$\phi = \phi . \quad (3.13)$$

The transformation of the field  $\phi$  is trivial and therefore the invertibility of the entire transformation depends only on the map between the two vierbeins (3.12), which is in our case indeed invertible. This can be seen directly by solving for  $f$  as

$$f = \sqrt[3]{e - \dot{\phi}^3} + \dot{\phi} . \quad (3.14)$$

Despite this, the transformation is not regular everywhere. In fact it has a vanishing Jacobian at  $f = \dot{\phi}$ . For the Jacobian we get

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{\partial e}{\partial f} = 3(f - \dot{\phi})^2 . \quad (3.15)$$

Correspondingly the inverse transformation is non-differentiable at  $e = \dot{\phi}^3$ . We now apply the transformation (3.12) to the theory (3.1). Let us first take a look at the equations of motion of the transformed theory. The equation for the fields  $x^\mu$  remain unchanged and read

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\dot{x}_\mu}{e} = 0 . \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand, the equation of motion for  $f$  consists of two multiplicative factors

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\dot{x}^2}{e^2} \right) 3(f - \dot{\phi})^2 = 0 . \quad (3.17)$$

The first factor clearly corresponds to the original equation of motion for  $e$  (3.4), while the second factor corresponds to the Jacobian of the transformation (3.12). Hence we have two branches of solutions. The original ones satisfying (3.4) or a branch that satisfies

$$f = \dot{\phi} . \quad (3.18)$$

Here we can introduce an undetermined field  $\rho$  to parametrize the freedom which results from our choice

$$1 - \frac{\dot{x}^2}{e^2} = \rho . \quad (3.19)$$

From this example, it is clear that introducing  $\rho$  is equivalent to merely introducing a notation for the factor  $1 - \frac{\dot{x}^2}{e^2}$ , which remains undetermined from the equation of motion (3.17). Finally the equation of motion for  $\phi$  reads

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\dot{x}^2}{e^2} \right) 3(2\dot{\phi}f - f^2) \right] = 0 . \quad (3.20)$$

Clearly this equation is satisfied trivially on the original solutions (3.4). In the novel branch; however, it allows us to determine the factor  $\rho$ . Indeed, by substituting from the above equations we can rewrite it as

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\rho f^2) = 0 . \quad (3.21)$$

From these equations, we can already glimpse that the novel branch indeed introduces novel degrees of freedom. Let us demonstrate this in the simplest case  $n = 1$  which has zero degrees of freedom in the original theory. Its equations of motion imply

$$\frac{\dot{x}}{e} = c_1 , \quad (3.22)$$

where  $c_1$  is a constant. Plugging this into (3.19) we find

$$\rho = 1 - c_1^2 = \text{const.} \quad (3.23)$$

The equation of motion (3.20) then implies

$$f = c_2 = \text{const.} \quad (3.24)$$

For  $\phi$  we get

$$\phi = c_2 t + c_3 , \quad (3.25)$$

where  $c_3$  is a constant. For the original vierbein we get

$$e = c_2^3 , \quad (3.26)$$

and hence the field  $x$  is

$$x = \frac{c_1}{c_2^3} t + c_4 . \quad (3.27)$$

We see that we obtained 4 constants of integration  $c_i$  from solving the novel equations of motion and hence we can expect there to be 2 more degrees of freedom in the transformed theory. Note that  $f = c_2 = 0$  leads to inconsistencies as  $x$  is not well defined in such cases. Furthermore, it implies that  $e = 0$ , which is clearly not a physical solution.

### 3.2 Hamiltonian analysis

Let us try to confirm the above estimate by performing the canonical analysis. The canonical momenta for the transformed theory are

$$p_\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{x}^\mu} = \frac{\dot{x}_\mu}{e}, \quad (3.28)$$

$$\pi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{f}} = 0, \quad (3.29)$$

$$p_\phi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p^2)3f(2\dot{\phi} - f). \quad (3.30)$$

In the last equation, we have already solved for  $\dot{x}$ . At first glance this theory has a single primary constraint  $\pi = 0$ ; however, the momentum associated to  $\phi$  is only solvable for  $\dot{\phi}$  when  $p^2 \neq 1$  and  $f \neq 0$ . On the other hand, constraining  $p^2 = 1$  or  $f = 0$  then implies  $p_\phi = 0$  and thus we obtain two additional primary constraints. Therefore we get up to 3 constraints in the theory at this step. We will generally assume  $f \neq 0$  as that clearly corresponds to unphysical solutions. However, in principle, one can carry out the analysis in such cases as well. Let us now assume that  $p^2 \neq 1$ . Then the Dirac Hamiltonian has the following form

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}e(p^2 - 1) + p_\phi \dot{\phi} + \lambda \pi. \quad (3.31)$$

Here  $\lambda$  is an undetermined factor associated with the primary constraint  $\pi = 0$ . Note that we have deliberately opted to keep  $\dot{\phi}$  and  $e$  explicit in order to increase the readability of the equation. However,  $\dot{\phi}$  can be clearly solved easily as

$$\dot{\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{2p_\phi}{1 - p^2} \frac{1}{3f} + f \right]. \quad (3.32)$$

The theory has a single primary constraint and thus we will obtain consistency conditions. This calculation is rather tedious so we first evaluate several terms individually. By differentiating (3.30) we get

$$\{\pi, \dot{\phi}\} = \frac{\dot{\phi} - f}{f}. \quad (3.33)$$

Using this result we can determine

$$\{\pi, f - \dot{\phi}\} = -\frac{\dot{\phi}}{f}. \quad (3.34)$$

And finally

$$\{\pi, e\} = 3(\dot{\phi} - f)\dot{\phi}. \quad (3.35)$$

Finally, we can use these expressions to evaluate the consistency condition

$$\{\pi, H_D\} = -\frac{3}{2}(f - \dot{\phi})^2(p^2 - 1) = 0. \quad (3.36)$$

Clearly, we are getting two options from our secondary constraint, which correspond to the two branches of solutions in the transformed theory. The first is  $p^2 = 1$  and clearly corresponds to the constraint structure of the original theory. However, by assumption, we have  $p^2 \neq 1$  and therefore we get

$$\dot{\phi} = f. \quad (3.37)$$

This clearly corresponds to the vanishing of the Jacobian (3.15) and consequently to the novel branch of solutions in the theory. Due to (3.34) we can see that this secondary constraint and  $\pi = 0$  are second class. Consequently the consistency condition

$$\{f - \dot{\phi}, H_D\} = -\lambda = 0 \quad (3.38)$$

allows us to fix  $\lambda$  and it does not produce any further constraints. Thus we have  $n + 2$  fields producing a  $2n + 4$  dimensional phase space in which we have 2 second class constraints giving us a total of  $n + 1$  degrees of freedom. This is indeed 2 more than the original theory, which confirms our guess from the equations of motion.

Let us now also analyze the second possible choice  $p^2 - 1$ . We expect this option to correspond to the original theory. The Dirac Hamiltonian in this case is

$$H_D = \frac{e}{2}(p^2 - 1) + \lambda_1 \pi + \lambda_2 p_\phi . \quad (3.39)$$

where  $\lambda_{1,2}$  are undetermined multiplier. Clearly, all the primary constraints commute with each other and therefore we do not obtain any further secondary constraints. Furthermore, we see that they are all first-class constraints. Hence the degree of freedom count is  $n - 1$  as in the original theory. The resulting Hamiltonian above corresponds to the Hamiltonian (3.8) with the addition of primary first class constraint  $p_\phi = 0$ , which does not affect the dynamics of other variables.

#### 4 Example of Invertible Disformal Transformation resulting in Mimetic DM

In order to construct an example, which would provide us with mimetic DM and which would be invertible, we have to understand when it is possible to invert the disformal transformation [10]. The regular disformal transformations are often employed in recent studies of modified gravity, see e.g. [11–17]. It is actually not too difficult to construct singular and invertible disformal transformations

$$g_{\mu\nu} = C(Y, \phi)h_{\mu\nu} + D(Y, \phi)\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi , \quad (4.1)$$

since they are at most linear in all but one component of the metric  $h_{\mu\nu}$ . The only non-triviality stems from the possible complicated dependence on the  $\phi\phi$  component of  $h_{\mu\nu}$ , which is represented by the kinetic term  $Y$ . We can try to invert the relation (4.1) by expressing  $h_{\mu\nu}$  as

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \frac{g_{\mu\nu} - D(Y, \phi)\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi}{C(Y, \phi)} . \quad (4.2)$$

This is clearly only possible if  $C \neq 0$ . The above relation gives us the components of  $h_{\mu\nu}$  as functions of the components of  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ; however, this is not a true inverse since there is an additional dependence on  $Y$ , which still depends on  $h_{\mu\nu}$ . Hence it is clear that if we can express  $Y$  through  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\phi$  then plugging such expression into (4.2), will yield the inverse map to (4.1). This is actually not very difficult because  $Y$  can be related directly to the kinetic term  $X$ . Direct calculation gives

$$X(Y, \phi) = \frac{Y}{C + DY} . \quad (4.3)$$

Hence we can see that if this relation is invertible, then the entire transformation (4.1) is invertible as well. In addition to these considerations, we also require that the transformation provides us with mimetic dark matter. In other words the equation

$$C = C_Y Y + D_Y Y^2 , \quad (4.4)$$

must have a real solution, see [4, 6, 18, 19]. This condition has a direct impact on the possible relations between  $X$  and  $Y$ . Indeed taking a partial derivative of  $X$  with respect to  $Y$  we obtain

$$\partial_Y X = \frac{1}{(C + DY)^2} (C - C_Y Y - D_Y Y^2) . \quad (4.5)$$

Hence we know that the  $X(Y, \phi)$  has a point with a vanishing derivative in the  $Y$  direction, whenever the theory supports a mimetic solution. Clearly, if this point is a local maximum or

minimum the local invertibility of (4.3) is automatically spoiled around such point. Consequently, the global invertibility is ruined as well. This clearly leaves us with the conclusion that  $C = C_Y Y + D_Y Y^2$  must correspond to an inflection point in the function  $X(Y, \phi)$ .

Let us now apply what we have learned to construct a particular transformation that satisfies our requirements. The best place to start is to directly propose the relation between  $X$  and  $Y$  such that it is invertible and has an inflection point. The simplest such function is the cubic function. Hence we propose

$$X = (Y - 1)^3 + 1 , \quad (4.6)$$


with no direct dependence on  $\phi$ . Note that we offset the inflection point away from 0 to  $Y = 1$  because we know that the vanishing of the derivative corresponds to the mimetic solution and a mimetic solution at  $Y = 0$  implies  $C = 0$ . Similarly, we know that under some reasonable assumptions on  $C$  and  $D$  the signatures of  $X$  and  $Y$  have to agree. Thus we also offset the inflection point away from  $X = 0$  to  $X = 1$  so that the signature agrees with  $Y$ . Finally, we set  $D = 0$  just to make our life simple. Our choices then give us<sup>4</sup>.

$$X = \frac{Y}{C} = (Y - 1)^3 + 1 , \quad (4.8)$$

which implies

$$C(Y, \phi) = \frac{Y}{(Y - 1)^3 + 1} . \quad (4.9)$$

Note that we define the value of  $C$  at  $Y = 0$  by its limit which gives  $C(0) = 1/3$ . This function is always positive and thus it satisfies  $C \neq 0$  as well as the  $C + DY > 0$ , see fig. 1. For our choice



**Figure 1.** Graph of the function  $C(Y)$  given by equation (4.9). The maximum lies at  $Y = 3/2$ .

of conformal factor  $C$  the metric transformation reads

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{Y}{(Y - 1)^3 + 1} h_{\mu\nu} . \quad (4.10)$$

The singularity condition for the function  $C$  gives

$$C - C_Y Y = -\frac{3Y^2}{((Y - 1)^3 + 1)^2} (Y - 1)^2 = 0 . \quad (4.11)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that taking the offset in  $Y$  and  $X$  to be the same ends up being kind of a lucky choice. A more general expression of this type

$$X = (Y - a)^3 + b . \quad (4.7)$$

suffers from problems whenever  $a \neq b$ . The resulting functions  $C$  will in general have point where it blows up and will always pass through zero. None of this happens for  $a = b \neq 0$ .

This equation has a single solution  $Y = 1$  as intended. Note that for  $Y \rightarrow 0$  the above expression has a non-vanishing limit and thus  $Y = 0$  is not a solution. Therefore we will have a single mimetic solution due to this transformation. The expression (4.6) is by design invertible and this inverse can be easily calculated as

$$Y = \sqrt[3]{X - 1} + 1 . \quad (4.12)$$

Plugging this into (4.2) we find the inverse transformation

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \frac{X}{\sqrt[3]{X - 1} + 1} g_{\mu\nu} , \quad (4.13)$$


which clearly exists. As we may expect the inverse transformation is going to have some strange features which enable the "removal" of particular degrees of freedom. This can be glanced from the conformal factor of this transformation which is

$$C^{-1}(Y(X)) = \frac{X}{\sqrt[3]{X - 1} + 1} . \quad (4.14)$$

Its derivative inherits several interesting features from the function  $C$  and the relation between  $X$  and  $Y$ . Indeed, a direct calculation gives

$$\partial_X C^{-1}(Y(X)) = -C^{-2} C_Y \partial_X Y . \quad (4.15)$$

We see that the conformal factor will have a minimum corresponding to the maximum of  $C$  at  $Y = 3/2$  which corresponds to  $X = 9/8$ . More importantly, the derivative  $\partial_X Y$  will tend to infinity since the derivative of the inverse function tends to zero for  $Y = 1$  or  $X = 1$ . See fig. 2. Hence the action will be ultra sensitive to  $X$  at this point. Following our paper [4], we can be sure that the singular configurations correspond to the Mimetic Gravity [5].



**Figure 2.** Graph of the function  $C^{-1}(Y(X))$  given by equation (4.14).

## 5 Conclusions and Discussion

Following the arguments of our previous work [4], we have explicitly shown that an invertible transformation can change the number of degrees of freedom. This phenomenon may sound strange and would seemingly contradict to the very definition of an invertible transformation. Indeed, by definition, invertibility means a one-to-one correspondence between original and new

variables or fields. However, based on the action principle, the dynamics of a system is given by a stationary path with vanishing variation, that is, satisfying the extremum condition. After a transformation of dynamical variables or fields, such an extremum condition can be satisfied not only by the original *regular* stationary path, but also by *singular* configurations, where the Jacobian of the transformation vanishes.<sup>5</sup> This is a crucial point of our discussion.

As is well known, a singular transformation is not necessarily non-invertible, while the inverse function theorem says that a regular transformation with non-vanishing Jacobian is at least locally invertible. Therefore, singular but invertible transformations give rise to novel dynamics absent in the original theory.

We have verified our arguments by explicitly constructing models in point particle systems. We have discussed the dynamics of both of regular and singular branches of solutions separately.

Then, we have confirmed by the Hamiltonian analysis that the number of DoF can change after an invertible transformation in the singular branch. Moreover, even in cases when the number of DoF is preserved, completely different dynamics can emerge in the singular branch. As a further application, we have discussed novel singular but invertible disformal transformations [10] of the metric. These transformations result in emergence of a new degree of freedom of the same type as in mimetic gravity [5].

Our argument will be extended furthermore in several directions. One direction is to use this kind of singular but invertible transformation to find new modified gravity theories such as scalar-tensor theories. Some of degenerate higher-order scalar-tensor theories (DHOST) theories [20] can be obtained from the Horndeski construction [21–23] through an invertible *regular* disformal transformation [18]. It might be interesting to apply this kind of construction to a singular but invertible transformation. In the standard regular case, both gravity theories are physically equivalent without essentially different matter couplings (that is, if we transform the matter couplings as well). But, in our singular case, a transformed theory could represent a completely new theory, even if the number of degrees of freedom is preserved.

Another direction is to extend our argument to more generic transformations with derivatives. In this case, the standard inverse function theorem does not apply as it is, rather, degeneracy conditions are necessary to prevent the appearance of additional degrees of freedom, see [2, 3]. However, even in this case, at the final step to judge the invertibility, the same argument of singular nature can appear. It would be interesting to investigate whether such a more generic higher derivative transformation allows for a singular but invertible transformation. If it is possible, such transformations could open another new class of theories after the transformation. Yet another direction is to apply our argument to singular, but invertible transformations in phase space in Hamiltonian formalism. This would constitute an interesting extension of the usual canonical transformations.

To conclude, we think that singular invertible transformations provide an important tool and a playground to construct and analyze variety of physical theories relevant to modified gravity and beyond.

## Acknowledgments

Our collaboration is supported by the Bilateral Czech-Japanese Mobility Plus Project JSPS-21-12 (JPJSBP120212502). P. J. acknowledges funding from the South African Research Chairs Initiative of the Department of Science and Technology and the National Research Foundation of South Africa. A. V. acknowledges support from the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (GAČR grant 20-28525S). M. Y. acknowledges financial support from JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. JP18K18764, JP21H01080, JP21H00069.

---

<sup>5</sup>Just to recall: for a usual function  $f(y)$  with extremum at  $y_m$ , one can make a transformation  $y(x)$ . The extremum with respect to  $x$  is located at configurations where  $df/dy \cdot dy/dx = 0$ . Thus, on top of  $y_m$  one gets new configurations for which  $dy/dx = 0$ .

## References

- [1] K. Takahashi, H. Motohashi, T. Suyama, and T. Kobayashi, “General invertible transformation and physical degrees of freedom,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 8, (2017) 084053, [arXiv:1702.01849 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [2] E. Babichev, K. Izumi, N. Tanahashi, and M. Yamaguchi, “Invertible field transformations with derivatives: necessary and sufficient conditions,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **25** no. 2, (2021) 309–325, [arXiv:1907.12333 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [3] E. Babichev, K. Izumi, N. Tanahashi, and M. Yamaguchi, “Invertibility conditions for field transformations with derivatives: Toward extensions of disformal transformation with higher derivatives,” *PTEP* **2022** no. 1, (2022) 013A01, [arXiv:2109.00912 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] P. Jiroušek, K. Shimada, A. Vikman, and M. Yamaguchi, “Disforming to Conformal Symmetry,” [arXiv:2207.12611 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [5] A. H. Chamseddine and V. Mukhanov, “Mimetic Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **11** (2013) 135, [arXiv:1308.5410 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] A. Golovnev, “The Variational principle, Conformal and Disformal transformations, and the degrees of freedom,” [arXiv:2208.04082 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [7] C. Deffayet, S. Mukohyama, and A. Vikman, “Ghosts without Runaway Instabilities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** no. 4, (2022) 041301, [arXiv:2108.06294 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [8] M. Ostrogradsky, “Mémoires sur les équations différentielles, relatives au problème des isopérimètres,” *Mem. Acad. St. Petersburg* **6** no. 4, (1850) 385–517.
- [9] R. P. Woodard, “Avoiding dark energy with  $1/r$  modifications of gravity,” *Lect. Notes Phys.* **720** (2007) 403–433, [arXiv:astro-ph/0601672](#).
- [10] J. D. Bekenstein, “The Relation between physical and gravitational geometry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 3641–3647, [arXiv:gr-qc/9211017](#).
- [11] D. Bettoni and S. Liberati, “Disformal invariance of second order scalar-tensor theories: Framing the Horndeski action,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 084020, [arXiv:1306.6724 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [12] G. Domènech, S. Mukohyama, R. Namba, A. Naruko, R. Saitou, and Y. Watanabe, “Derivative-dependent metric transformation and physical degrees of freedom,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 8, (2015) 084027, [arXiv:1507.05390 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] M. Crisostomi, K. Koyama, and G. Tasinato, “Extended Scalar-Tensor Theories of Gravity,” *JCAP* **04** (2016) 044, [arXiv:1602.03119 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] J. Ben Achour, D. Langlois, and K. Noui, “Degenerate higher order scalar-tensor theories beyond Horndeski and disformal transformations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** no. 12, (2016) 124005, [arXiv:1602.08398 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [15] M. Crisostomi, M. Hull, K. Koyama, and G. Tasinato, “Horndeski: beyond, or not beyond?,” *JCAP* **03** (2016) 038, [arXiv:1601.04658 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] K. Takahashi and T. Kobayashi, “Extended mimetic gravity: Hamiltonian analysis and gradient instabilities,” *JCAP* **11** (2017) 038, [arXiv:1708.02951 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [17] C. Deffayet and S. Garcia-Saenz, “Degeneracy, matter coupling, and disformal transformations in scalar-tensor theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 6, (2020) 064037, [arXiv:2004.11619 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] M. Zumalacárregui and J. García-Bellido, “Transforming gravity: from derivative couplings to matter to second-order scalar-tensor theories beyond the Horndeski Lagrangian,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 064046, [arXiv:1308.4685 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [19] N. Deruelle and J. Rua, “Disformal Transformations, Veiled General Relativity and Mimetic Gravity,” *JCAP* **09** (2014) 002, [arXiv:1407.0825 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [20] D. Langlois and K. Noui, “Degenerate higher derivative theories beyond Horndeski: evading the Ostrogradski instability,” *JCAP* **02** (2016) 034, [arXiv:1510.06930 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [21] G. W. Horndeski, “Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10** (1974) 363–384.

- [22] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer, and G. Zahariade, “From k-essence to generalised Galileons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 064039, [arXiv:1103.3260 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, “Generalized G-inflation: Inflation with the most general second-order field equations,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126** (2011) 511–529, [arXiv:1105.5723 \[hep-th\]](#).

## A Transformation with higher derivatives

In this part of the section, we will extend the transformation introduced in the paper to higher derivatives. Namely, we shall consider the transformation of the form,

$$q = Q^3 + \dot{\phi}^{(n)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The Hamiltonian analysis of the theory will be done in a similar fashion to the main part of the paper. Using  $\theta_n$ , rather than  $\theta$ , the higher derivative Lagrangian reduces to the following first derivative theory,

$$L \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}(Q, \theta_n)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_k (\dot{\theta}_{n-k} - \theta_{n-k+1}) + \lambda_n (\dot{\phi} - \theta_1). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The variables of this theory is  $(Q, \phi, \theta_k, \lambda_k)$  with  $k$  running from 1 to  $n$ , thus the phase space has the dimension of  $4n + 4$ .

The canonical momenta are,

$$p_Q = 3Q^2 \dot{q}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$p_{\theta_n} = \dot{q}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$p_{\theta_k} = \lambda_{n-k} \quad (1 \leq k \leq n-1), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$p_\phi = \lambda_n, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$p_{\lambda_k} = 0 \quad (1 \leq k \leq n). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Which leads to  $(2n+1)$  primary constraints,

$$p_{\theta_k} = \lambda_{n-k} \quad (1 \leq k \leq n-1), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$p_\phi = \lambda_n, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$p_{\lambda_k} = 0 \quad (1 \leq k \leq n), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$p_Q = 3Q^2 p_{\theta_n}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The Hamiltonian will then become,

$$\begin{aligned} H_D = & \frac{1}{2} (p_Q + p_{\theta_n})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k \theta_{n-k+1} + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_{\theta_n}) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k p_{\lambda_k} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \gamma_k (p_{\theta_{n-k}} - \lambda_k) + \gamma_n (p_\phi - \lambda_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The consistency conditions for the constraints  $p_{\lambda_k} = 0$ ,  $p_{\theta_k} = \lambda_{n-k}$  and  $p_\phi - \lambda_n$  computes  $\beta_k = 0$  and  $\gamma_k = \theta_{n-k+1}$ . So the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2} (p_Q + p_{\theta_n})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} p_{\theta_{n-k}} \theta_{n-k+1} + p_\phi \theta_1 + \alpha (p_Q - 3Q^2 p_{\theta_n}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Finally, the consistency condition for primary constraint (A.11) computes

$$\{p_Q - 3Q^2 p_{\theta_n}, H_D\} = 3Q^2 p_{\theta_{n-1}} = 0 . \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We again find two branches, one being  $Q = 0$  and the other  $p_{\theta_{n-1}} = 0$ . As for the former branch, it's consistency condition leads to

$$\{Q, H_D\} = \alpha = 0 . \quad (\text{A.15})$$

All constraints that are derived are second-class. Therefore, since we started off with an  $(4n + 4)$  dimensional phase space, the DoF count is  $(4n + 4 - 2n - 2)/2 = n + 1$ , and we have obtained  $n$  extra degrees of freedom compared to the original action.

If we choose the branch  $p_{\theta_{n-1}} = 0$ , however, the consistency condition computes,

$$\{p_{\theta_{n-1}}, H_D\} = p_{\theta_{n-2}} . \quad (\text{A.16})$$

This leads to a series of new constraints,  $p_{\theta_{n-k}} = 0$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$  and  $p_\phi = 0$ , which are all first class constraints. Noting that (A.11) is also a first-class constraint, the  $(4n + 4)$  dimensional phase space, is reduced to  $(4n + 4 - 2n - 2 \times (n + 1))/2 = 1$ , and there are no new degrees of freedom compared to the original action.