

Standard Model in Weyl conformal geometry

D. M. Ghilencea^a *

^a Department of Theoretical Physics, National Institute of Physics
and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN), Bucharest, 077125 Romania

Abstract

We study the Standard Model (SM) in Weyl conformal geometry. This embedding is truly minimal *with no new fields* beyond the SM spectrum and Weyl geometry. The action inherits a gauged scale symmetry $D(1)$ (known as Weyl gauge symmetry) from the underlying geometry. The associated Weyl quadratic gravity undergoes spontaneous breaking of $D(1)$ by a geometric Stueckelberg mechanism in which the Weyl gauge field (ω_μ) acquires mass by “absorbing” the spin-zero mode of the \tilde{R}^2 term in the action. This mode also generates the Planck scale. The Einstein-Hilbert action emerges in the broken phase. In the presence of the SM, this mechanism receives corrections (from the Higgs) and it can induce electroweak (EW) symmetry breaking. The Higgs field has direct couplings to the Weyl gauge field while the SM fermions only acquire such couplings following the kinetic mixing of the gauge fields of $D(1) \times U(1)_Y$. One consequence is that part of the mass of Z boson is not due to the usual Higgs mechanism, but to its mixing with massive ω_μ . Precision measurements of Z mass set lower bounds on the mass of ω_μ which can be light (few TeV), depending on the mixing angle and Weyl gauge coupling. The Higgs mass and the EW scale are proportional to the vev of the Stueckelberg field. In the early Universe the Higgs field can have a geometric origin, by Weyl vector fusion, and the Higgs potential can drive inflation. The dependence of the tensor-to-scalar ratio r on the spectral index n_s is similar to that in Starobinsky inflation but mildly shifted to lower r by the Higgs non-minimal coupling to Weyl geometry.

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

1 Motivation

The Standard Model (SM) with the Higgs mass parameter set to zero has a scale symmetry. This may indicate that this symmetry plays a role in model building for physics beyond the SM [1]. Scale symmetry is natural in physics at higher scales or in the early Universe when all states are essentially massless. In such scenario, the scales of the theory such as the Planck scale and the electroweak (EW) scale will be generated by the vacuum expectation values (vev's) of some scalar fields. In this work we consider the SM with a *gauged* scale symmetry (also called Weyl gauge symmetry) [2–4] which we prefer to the more popular *global* scale symmetry, since the latter is broken by black-hole physics [5]. A natural framework for this symmetry is the Weyl conformal geometry [2–4] where this symmetry is built in. We thus consider the SM embedded in the Weyl conformal geometry and study the implications.

The Weyl geometry is defined by classes of equivalence $(g_{\alpha\beta}, \omega_\mu)$ of the metric $(g_{\alpha\beta})$ and the Weyl gauge field (ω_μ) , related by the Weyl gauge transformation, see (a) below. If matter is present, (a) must be extended by transformation (b) of the scalars (ϕ) and fermions (ψ)

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad \hat{g}_{\mu\nu} &= \Sigma^d g_{\mu\nu}, & \hat{\omega}_\mu &= \omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma, & \sqrt{\hat{g}} &= \Sigma^{2d} \sqrt{g}, \\ (b) \quad \hat{\phi} &= \Sigma^{-d/2} \phi, & \hat{\psi} &= \Sigma^{-3d/4} \psi, & & (d = 1). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here d is the Weyl charge of $g_{\mu\nu}$, α is the Weyl gauge coupling¹, $g = |\det g_{\mu\nu}|$ and $\Sigma > 0$. This is a non-compact gauged dilatation symmetry, denoted $D(1)$. Since it is Abelian, the normalization of the charge d is not fixed². In this paper we take $d = 1$. The case of arbitrary d is recovered from our results by simply replacing $\alpha \rightarrow d\alpha$. A discussion on symmetry (1) and a brief introduction to Weyl geometry are found in Appendix A.

To study the SM in Weyl geometry, all one needs to know for the purpose of this work is the expression of the connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) of this geometry, which differs from the Levi-Civita connection (Γ) of (pseudo-)Riemannian case used in Einstein gravity. The Weyl connection is a solution to $\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = -\alpha \omega_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ where $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu$ is defined by $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$. This solution is (see Appendix)

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda + (1/2) \alpha \left[\delta_\mu^\lambda \omega_\nu + \delta_\nu^\lambda \omega_\mu - g_{\mu\nu} \omega^\lambda \right]. \quad (2)$$

$\tilde{\Gamma}$ is invariant under (1), as it should be, since the parallel transport of a vector must be gauge independent. Taking the trace in (2), with a notation $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\nu$ and $\Gamma_\mu = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\nu$, then

$$\omega_\mu \propto \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu. \quad (3)$$

The Weyl field is thus a measure of the (trace of the) deviation from a Levi-Civita connection.

The general quadratic gravity action defined by Weyl geometry [2–4], invariant under (1), is written in terms of scalar and tensor curvatures of this geometry. Using $\tilde{\Gamma}$ of (2) and standard formulae one can express these curvatures in terms of their Riemannian counterparts and re-write the action in a more familiar Riemannian notation (as we shall do). In the limit $\omega_\mu = 0$ i.e. when: i) ω_μ is ‘pure gauge’ or ii) ω_μ became massive and decoupled,

¹Our convention is $g_{\mu\nu} = (+, -, -, -)$ while the curvature tensors are defined as in [6].

²For example $d = 1$ is a convention used in e.g. [7] while $d = 2$ was considered in [8].

then $\tilde{\Gamma}=\Gamma$ and then Weyl geometry becomes Riemannian! This is an interesting transition, relevant later. In i) invariance under (1) reduces to local scale invariance (no ω_μ).

The role of Weyl gauge symmetry in model building beyond SM was studied before [7–26]. We go beyond these models which were limited to actions *linear* in the scalar curvature \tilde{R} of Weyl geometry and also introduced *additional states* (scalar fields beyond the Higgs field) to maintain symmetry (1) and to generate the mass scales (Planck, etc) of the theory.

Our approach here to model building is truly *minimal*, in the sense that *no new fields* are added to the SM spectrum - we simply embed the SM in Weyl geometry! Note that the Weyl gauge field present here is part of the underlying geometry and of Weyl gravity³. The gravity part of the action is fixed by the Weyl geometry [2–4], is actually *quadratic* and is automatically invariant under (1) a) (since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is invariant). This minimal approach builds on our recent results in [27] (also [28–30]) that showed that the original Weyl quadratic gravity action *in the absence of matter* is broken spontaneously to the Einstein action. Therefore, this breaking is geometric in nature.

With this result, embedding the SM in Weyl geometry is immediate: one sets the Higgs mass parameter to zero and ‘upgrades’ the SM covariant derivatives, to respect symmetry (1) inherited from Weyl geometry. Thus, both the Lagrangian and its underlying geometry ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) have the same Weyl gauge symmetry. This is a *unique* feature, not shared by the models with local scale symmetry based on Riemannian geometry (i.e. with no ω_μ). It adds mathematical consistency to the model and motivated this study. Hereafter we refer to this model as SMW.

There is additional motivation to study the SMW:

- a) Einstein gravity emerges naturally. After a Stueckelberg mechanism, the Weyl gauge field ω_μ becomes massive by “eating” the spin zero-mode (ϕ_0) of geometric origin propagated by the \tilde{R}^2 term in the action; after ω_μ decouples, the Einstein action is naturally obtained as a broken phase of Weyl gravity. The Planck scale (M_p) is also generated by ϕ_0 .
- b) The theory has a symmetry $D(1) \times U(1)_Y \times SU(2)_L \times SU(3)$, so a gauge kinetic mixing of ω_μ with the hypercharge field B_μ of $U(1)_Y$ is possible, with implications that we address.
- c) The Higgs field has couplings to ω_μ . The SM gauge bosons and fermions do not usually couple to ω_μ [8]; but we show the gauge kinetic mixing induces fermions couplings to ω_μ .
- d) The SM Higgs potential is recovered for small Higgs field values (relative to Planck scale); the EW symmetry breaking is then induced by gravitational effects, with the Higgs mass and electroweak scale obtained for perturbative couplings in the gravity sector.
- e) Intriguingly, part of the Z boson mass is not due to the Higgs mechanism, but to the geometric Stueckelberg mechanism giving mass to ω_μ . Experimental constraints on m_Z provide constraints on the Weyl gauge coupling α and on the mass of ω that we discuss.
- f) The Higgs potential at large field values drives inflation. Interestingly, the origin of the Higgs field in the early Universe is geometrical, from the Weyl boson fusion, see c). The prediction for the tensor-to-scalar ratio (r) (for given spectral index n_s) is bounded from above by that in the Starobinsky model with similar dependence $r(n_s)$, due to the \tilde{R}^2 term.

These interesting properties of the SMW are studied in Section 2. The relation to other scale-invariant models follows (Section 3). The Conclusions are in Section 4. The Appendix has a brief, self-contained introduction to Weyl conformal geometry.

³The literature often calls Weyl gravity the square of the Weyl tensor in Riemannian geometry. We actually consider the original Weyl quadratic gravity in Weyl geometry which has additional terms (Section 2.1).

2 SM in Weyl conformal geometry

2.1 Einstein action from spontaneous breaking of Weyl quadratic gravity

Consider first the original Weyl gravity action [2–4] and here we follow [27]. The action is

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{4!} \frac{1}{\xi^2} \tilde{R}^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right], \quad (4)$$

with couplings $\xi, \eta \leq 1$. Here $F_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\nabla}_\mu \omega_\nu - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu \omega_\mu$ is the field strength of ω_μ , with $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu \omega_\nu = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho \omega_\rho$. Since $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$ is symmetric, $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \partial_\nu \omega_\mu$. $\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and \tilde{R} are the Weyl tensor and scalar curvature in Weyl geometry, derived from eq.(2). Their relations to Riemannian Weyl-tensor $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and scalar curvature R are shown in eqs.(A-11), (A-14):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 &= C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 F_{\mu\nu}^2, \\ \tilde{R} &= R - 3\alpha \nabla_\mu \omega^\mu - \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The rhs of these equations is in a Riemannian notation, so $\nabla_\mu \omega^\lambda = \partial_\mu \omega^\lambda + \Gamma_{\mu\rho}^\lambda \omega^\rho$.

Each term in \mathcal{L}_0 is invariant under $D(1)$ of (1). Indeed, \tilde{R} transforms as $\tilde{R} \rightarrow (1/\Sigma) \tilde{R}$ (see Appendix), so $\sqrt{g} \tilde{R}^2$ is invariant. Also $\sqrt{g} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ and $F_{\mu\nu}^2 \sqrt{g}$ are invariant; similar for $\sqrt{g} \tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$. The term $\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ ensures that \mathcal{L}_0 is a general Weyl action and is largely spectator under the transformations below, so its impact could be analysed separately. But it is needed at a quantum level, so we included it here anyway (it brings a massive spin-2 ghost [31]).

In \mathcal{L}_0 we replace $\tilde{R}^2 \rightarrow -2\phi_0^2 \tilde{R} - \phi_0^4$ with ϕ_0 a scalar field. Doing so gives a classically equivalent \mathcal{L}_0 , since by using the solution $\phi_0^2 = -\tilde{R}$ of the equation of motion of ϕ_0 in the modified \mathcal{L}_0 , one recovers action (4). With eq.(5), \mathcal{L}_0 becomes in a Riemannian notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 &= \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{-1}{2\xi^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \phi_0^2 R + (\partial_\mu \phi_0)^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \nabla_\mu (\omega^\mu \phi_0^2) \right] - \frac{\phi_0^4}{4! \xi^2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{8\xi^2} \phi_0^2 \left[\omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \phi_0^2 \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4\gamma^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right\}, \quad \text{with} \quad 1/\gamma^2 \equiv 1 + 6\alpha^2/\eta^2 \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

\mathcal{L}_0 is also invariant under (1) and we must then “fix the gauge” of this symmetry; we do so by applying to \mathcal{L}_0 specific transformation (1) that is scale-dependent $\Sigma = \phi_0^2/\langle \phi_0^2 \rangle$, thus fixing ϕ_0 to its vev. In terms of the transformed fields (with a “hat”), \mathcal{L}_0 becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left[-\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \alpha^2 \gamma^2 \hat{\omega}_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu - \frac{3}{2} \xi^2 M_p^4 - \frac{1}{4} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right], \quad M_p^2 \equiv \frac{\langle \phi_0^2 \rangle}{6\xi^2}, \quad (7)$$

with constraint $\nabla_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu = 0$. We identify M_p with the Planck scale. Eq.(7) is the Einstein gauge (frame) and also the unitary gauge of action (6). By Stueckelberg mechanism [32–34], ω_μ has become a massive Proca field, after “eating” the derivative $\partial_\mu \ln \phi_0$ of the Stueckelberg field ($\ln \phi_0$) in (6) [27]. The number of degrees of freedom is conserved: in addition to the graviton, the massless ϕ_0 and massless ω_μ were replaced by massive ω_μ with a mass $m_\omega^2 = (3/2)\alpha^2 \gamma^2 M_p^2$. We expect m_ω be near M_p , but it can also be light if $\alpha \ll 1$ [35, 36].

The Einstein-Proca action in (7) is a broken phase of \mathcal{L}_0 of (6). When ω_μ decouples, the Einstein action alone is obtained as a ‘low-energy’ effective theory of Weyl gravity [27] with M_p controlled by $\xi < 1$. Hence, Einstein gravity appears to be the “Einstein gauge”-fixed version of the Weyl action. However, *the breaking is more profound and is not the result of a mere ‘gauge choice’*: it is accompanied by a Stueckelberg mechanism and by a transition from Weyl to Riemannian geometry: indeed, when ω_μ decouples then $\tilde{\Gamma}$ of (2) is replaced by Γ .

Note that the Stueckelberg term in (6)

$$(\alpha^2/4)\phi_0^2 [\omega_\mu - 1/\alpha \partial_\mu \ln \phi_0^2]^2 = (\tilde{D}_\mu \phi_0)^2, \quad \tilde{D}_\mu \phi_0 \equiv [\partial_\mu - \alpha/2 \omega_\mu] \phi_0, \quad (8)$$

is simply a Weyl-covariant kinetic term of the Stueckelberg field that became the mass term of ω_μ in (7). That is, a Weyl gauge-invariant kinetic term of a (Weyl-charged) scalar in Weyl geometry is a mass term for ω_μ in the (pseudo)Riemannian geometry underlying (7). This gives a geometric interpretation to the origin of mass, as a transition from Weyl to Riemannian geometry, without any scalar field present in the final spectrum. The field ϕ_0 also generated the Planck mass and was “extracted” from the \tilde{R}^2 term i.e. is of geometric origin, giving an elegant breaking mechanism.

This leaves the question of how ϕ_0 acquired a vev. From (6) the equation of motion of ω_μ shows that there is a conserved current [27], $J_\rho = \xi \alpha \phi_0 (\partial_\rho - \alpha/2 \omega_\rho) \phi_0$ with $\nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0$. In a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker Universe $\omega_\rho(t) = 0$ so J_ρ simplifies. From the conservation of this simplified J_ρ , one easily notices that $\phi_0(t)$ evolves to a constant value [37–39].

In conclusion, Weyl action (4), (6) is more fundamental than Einstein-Proca action (7) which is its broken phase. Thus, ultimately the underlying geometry of our Universe may be Weyl geometry. Its Weyl gauge symmetry could also explain a small cosmological constant.

2.2 Weyl quadratic gravity and “photon” - photon mixing

Consider now \mathcal{L}_0 in the presence of the SM hypercharge gauge group $U(1)_Y$. A kinetic mixing of ω_μ (Weyl “photon”) with the B_μ gauge field of $U(1)_Y$ is allowed by the direct product symmetry $U(1)_Y \times D(1)$. Such mixing was mentioned in the literature [20] but not investigated. Consider then

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{1}{4! \xi^2} \tilde{R}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left[F_{\mu\nu}^2 + 2 \sin \chi F_{\mu\nu} F_y^{\mu\nu} + F_{y\mu\nu}^2 \right] - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right\}. \quad (9)$$

where F_y is the field strength of B_μ . The source of B_μ is the SM fermionic Lagrangian (not shown in eq.(9)) which is invariant under (1) and is independent of the Weyl gauge field [8] (see next section). We repeat the steps in Section 2.1 and after transformation (1) under which B_μ is invariant, $\hat{B}_\mu = B_\mu$, we find \mathcal{L}_1 in terms of the new fields (with a hat):

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \alpha^2 \hat{\omega}_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu - \frac{3\xi^2}{2} M_p^4 - \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 + 2 \sin \chi \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \hat{F}_y^{\mu\nu} + \hat{F}_{y\mu\nu}^2 \right] - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right\}. \quad (10)$$

The kinetic mixing is removed by a transformation [40] to new (‘primed’) fields

$$\hat{\omega}_\mu = \gamma \omega'_\mu \sec \tilde{\chi}, \quad \hat{B}_\mu = B'_\mu - \omega'_\mu \tan \tilde{\chi}, \quad \text{with} \quad \sin \tilde{\chi} \equiv \gamma \sin \chi, \quad (11)$$

where, for a simpler notation, we introduced $\sin \tilde{\chi}$ (note that $\gamma \leq 1$)⁴. The result is

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} + \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \alpha^2 \gamma^2 \sec^2 \tilde{\chi} \omega'_\mu \omega'^\mu - \frac{1}{4} (F_{\mu\nu}^{\prime 2} + F_{y\mu\nu}^{\prime 2}) - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right\}, \quad (12)$$

with $F'_{y\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu B'_\nu - \nabla_\nu B'_\mu = \partial_\mu B'_\nu - \partial_\nu B'_\mu$ and $F'_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega'_\nu - \partial_\nu \omega'_\mu$.

As in the previous section, we obtain again the Einstein-Proca action but with diagonal gauge kinetic terms for both gauge fields. However, the final, canonical hypercharge gauge field B'_μ has acquired a dependence on the Weyl gauge field, see (11), due to the initial kinetic mixing. In the full model, upon the electroweak symmetry breaking the photon field (A_μ) is a mixing of the hypercharge (B'_μ) with $SU(2)_L$ neutral gauge field (A_μ^3)

$$A_\mu = B'_\mu \cos \theta_w + A_\mu^3 \sin \theta_w = [\hat{B}_\mu + \hat{\omega}_\mu \sin \chi] \cos \theta_w + \sin \theta_w A_\mu^3. \quad (13)$$

where θ_w is the Weinberg angle and in the second step we used eq.(11).

Due to the gauge kinetic mixing the photon field includes a small component of the initial Weyl gauge field, suppressed by $\sin \chi$ and by the mass ($\sim M_p$) of ω_μ , but still present⁵; however, it exists only in the presence of matter e.g. fermionic fields that act as the source of B_μ . Such mixing in models with Abelian gauge fields beyond the hypercharge exists in string models, with similar massive *and* anomaly-free gauge fields (as ω_μ , see later) and similar mass mechanism [41]. However, here ω_μ is a gauge field of a space-time (dilatation) symmetry. The mixing is not forbidden by the Coleman-Mandula theorem - the overall symmetry is always a direct product $U(1)_Y \times D(1)$ and both symmetries are subsequently broken spontaneously⁶.

2.3 Fermions

Consider now the SM fermions (ψ) in Weyl geometry and examine their action. To begin with, to avoid a complicated notation we do not display the SM gauge group dependence:

$$\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{g} \bar{\psi} i \gamma^a e_a^\mu \tilde{\nabla}_\mu \psi + h.c., \quad \tilde{\nabla}_\mu \psi = \left(\partial_\mu - \frac{3}{4} \alpha \hat{\omega}_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{s}_\mu^{ab} \sigma_{ab} \right) \psi. \quad (14)$$

Here \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} is the Weyl geometry spin connection. In (14), the Weyl charge of the fermions is $(-3/4)$ according to our convention in (1) ($d = 1$). The relation of the Weyl spin connection to the spin connection s_μ^{ab} of (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry is (see Appendix A)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}_\mu^{ab} &= s_\mu^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \alpha (e_\mu^a e^{\nu b} - e_\mu^b e^{\nu a}) \hat{\omega}_\nu, \\ s_\mu^{ab} &= (-1) e^{\lambda b} (\partial_\mu e_\lambda^a - e_\nu^a \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

⁴In the limit $\gamma = 1$ there is no $\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ term in the initial action (formally $\eta \rightarrow \infty$).

⁵In a sense this says that Weyl's unfortunate attempt to identify ω_μ to the photon was not entirely wrong.

⁶The theorem implies that $D(1)$ cannot be part of an internal non-Abelian symmetry so d cannot be fixed.

where $\sigma_{ab} = \frac{1}{4}[\gamma_a, \gamma_b]$ while $\Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$ is the Levi-Civita connection, $g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \eta_{ab}$ and $e_\mu^a e_\nu^a = \delta_\nu^\mu$. It can be checked that, similar to the Weyl connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$), the Weyl spin connection \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} is invariant under (1). This is seen by using that s_μ^{ab} transforms under (1) as

$$\hat{s}_\mu^{ab} = s_\mu^{ab} + (e_\mu^a e^{\nu b} - e_\mu^b e^{\nu a}) \partial_\nu \ln \Sigma^{1/2}. \quad (16)$$

With \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} invariant, one checks that \mathcal{L}_f is Weyl gauge invariant. In fact one can easily show that $(-3/4)\alpha \hat{\omega}_\mu$ in $\gamma^\mu \tilde{\nabla}_\mu \psi$ is cancelled by the $\hat{\omega}_\mu$ -presence in the Weyl spin connection. This cancellation also happens between fermions and anti-fermions [8] (eqs. 36, 37)⁷. This is so because both fermions and anti-fermions have the same *real* Weyl charge (no i factor in $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu \psi$). As a result, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{g} \bar{\psi} i \gamma^a e_a^\mu \nabla_\mu \psi + h.c., \quad \nabla_\mu \psi = \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} s_\mu^{ab} \sigma_{ab} \right) \psi. \quad (17)$$

Thus the SM fermions do not couple [8] to the Weyl field ω_μ and there is no gauge anomaly.

We can now restore the SM gauge group dependence and the Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{g} \bar{\psi} i \gamma^a e_a^\mu \left[\partial_\mu - ig \vec{T} \vec{A}_\mu - i Y g' \hat{B}_\mu + \frac{1}{2} s_\mu^{ab} \sigma_{ab} \right] \psi + h.c., \quad (18)$$

with the usual quantum numbers of the fermions under the SM group (not shown), $\vec{T} = \vec{\sigma}/2$, and with g and g' the gauge couplings of $SU(2)_L$ and $U(1)_Y$. But this is not the final result.

Since the fermions are $U(1)_Y$ charged and the initial field \hat{B}_μ in (18) is shifted by the gauge kinetic mixing, as seen in eq.(11), then ω'_μ is still present in \mathcal{L}_f :

$$\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{g} \bar{\psi} i \gamma^a e_a^\mu \left[\partial_\mu - ig \vec{T} \vec{A}_\mu - i Y g' (B'_\mu - \omega'_\mu \tan \tilde{\chi}) + \frac{1}{2} s_\mu^{ab} \sigma_{ab} \right] \psi + h.c. \quad (19)$$

We thus find a new coupling of the SM fermions to ω'_μ , of strength $Y g' \tan \tilde{\chi}$. This coupling comes with the usual fermions hypercharge assignment (which is anomaly-free). After the electroweak symmetry breaking B'_μ is replaced in terms of the mass eigenstates $A_\mu, Z_\mu, Z_\mu^\omega$ and ω'_μ is a combination of Z_μ, Z_μ^ω (see later, eq.(43)).

Regarding the Yukawa interactions, notice that the SM Lagrangian is invariant under (1)

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \sqrt{g} \sum_{\psi=l,q} \left[\bar{\psi}_L Y_\psi H \psi_R + \bar{\psi}_L Y'_\psi \tilde{H} \psi'_R \right] + h.c. \quad (20)$$

where H is the Higgs $SU(2)_L$ doublet and $\tilde{H} = i\sigma_2 H^\dagger$, the sum is over leptons and quarks; Y, Y' are the SM Yukawa matrices. \mathcal{L}_Y is invariant under (1): indeed, since the Weyl charge is real, the sum of charges of the fields in each Yukawa term is vanishing: two fermions (charge $2 \times (-3)/4$), the Higgs (charge $-1/2$) and \sqrt{g} (charge 2). Hence the Yukawa interactions have the same form as in SM in the (pseudo-)Riemannian space-time.

⁷but only for the Weyl charge in (14) can we write a Weyl invariant \mathcal{L}_f without a scalar compensator in [8].

2.4 Gauge bosons

Regarding the SM gauge bosons, their SM action is invariant under transformation (1) [8]. A way to understand this is that a gauge boson of the SM enters under the corresponding covariant derivative acting on a field charged under it and should transform (have same weight) as ∂_μ acting on that field; since coordinates are kept fixed under (1), the gauge fields do not transform either. Their kinetic terms are then similar to those of the SM in flat space-time, since the Weyl connection is symmetric. Explicitly, this is seen from the equation below, where the sum is over the SM gauge group factors: $SU(3) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$

$$\mathcal{L}_g = - \sum_{\text{groups}} \frac{\sqrt{g}}{4} g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}, \quad (21)$$

$F_{\mu\nu}$ involves the difference $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu A_\nu - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu A_\mu$, where A is a generic notation for a SM gauge boson and since $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu A_\nu = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho A_\rho$, then for a symmetric $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\mu}^\rho$ one sees that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and its ω_μ -dependence cancel out in the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, \mathcal{L}_g does not depend on ω_μ and has the same form in Weyl and in (pseudo)Riemannian geometries.

2.5 Higgs sector

• **The action:** Let us now consider the SM Higgs doublet (H) in Weyl conformal geometry:

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{R}^2}{4! \xi^2} - \frac{\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2}{\eta^2} - \frac{\xi_h}{6} |H|^2 \tilde{R} + |\tilde{D}_\mu H|^2 - \lambda |H|^4 - \frac{1}{4} \left(F_{\mu\nu}^2 + 2 \sin \chi F_{\mu\nu} F_y^{\mu\nu} + F_y^2 \right) \right\}. \quad (22)$$

The $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times D(1)$ derivative acting on H is

$$\tilde{D}_\mu H = [\partial_\mu - i\mathcal{A}_\mu - (1/2)\alpha\omega_\mu] H, \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_\mu = (g/2)\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{A}_\mu + (g'/2)B_\mu$; \vec{A}_μ is the $SU(2)_L$ gauge boson, B_μ is the $U(1)_Y$ boson.

We consider the electroweak unitary gauge where $H = (1/\sqrt{2})h\zeta$, $\zeta^T \equiv (0, 1)$, therefore

$$|\tilde{D}_\mu H|^2 = |(\partial_\mu - \alpha/2\omega_\mu)H|^2 + H^\dagger \mathcal{A}_\mu \mathcal{A}^\mu H, \quad (24)$$

with

$$H^\dagger \mathcal{A}_\mu \mathcal{A}^\mu H = (h^2/8)\mathcal{Z}, \quad \mathcal{Z} \equiv [g^2(A_\mu^1{}^2 + A_\mu^2{}^2) + (gA_\mu^3 - g'B_\mu)^2]. \quad (25)$$

As done earlier, in \mathcal{L}_H replace $\tilde{R}^2 \rightarrow -2\phi_0^2 \tilde{R} - \phi_0^4$ to find a classically equivalent action; using the equation of motion of ϕ_0 and its solution $\phi_0^2 = -\tilde{R}$ back in the action, one recovers (22). After this replacement, the non-minimal coupling term in (22) is modified

$$-\frac{1}{6}\xi_h |H|^2 \tilde{R} \rightarrow \frac{-1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{\xi^2} \phi_0^2 + \xi_h h^2 \right) \tilde{R}. \quad (26)$$

The term $(1/\xi^2)\tilde{R}^2$ in (22) was replaced by a term with a large coupling, since $1/\xi^2 > 1$. The full Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_H after step (26) is presented in the Appendix, see eq.(B-1).

Next, to fix the gauge, apply transformation (1) to \mathcal{L}_H with a special *scale-dependent* Σ which fixes the fields combination $(\phi_0^2/\xi^2 + \xi_h h^2)$ to a constant:

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Sigma g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \hat{\phi}_0^2 = \frac{\phi_0^2}{\Sigma}, \quad \hat{\omega}_\mu = \omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma, \quad \hat{B}_\mu = B_\mu, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}_\mu, \quad \Sigma \equiv \frac{\phi_0^2/\xi^2 + \xi_h h^2}{\langle \phi_0^2/\xi^2 + \xi_h h^2 \rangle}. \quad (27)$$

In terms of the transformed fields and metric (with a ‘hat’), \mathcal{L}_H becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_H = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \left[\hat{R} - 3\alpha \nabla_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu - \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 \hat{\omega}_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu \right] - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{1}{2} |(\partial_\mu - \alpha/2 \hat{\omega}_\mu) \hat{h}|^2 + \frac{1}{8} \hat{h}^2 \hat{\mathcal{Z}} \right. \\ \left. - \hat{V} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 + 2 \sin \chi \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \hat{F}_y^{\mu\nu} + \hat{F}_{y\mu\nu}^2 \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where we used (5), the notation $\hat{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathcal{Z}(B_\mu \rightarrow \hat{B}_\mu, \vec{A}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{A}_\mu)$, with $\gamma \leq 1$ defined in (6) and

$$M_p^2 \equiv \frac{1}{6} \left\{ \frac{1}{\xi^2} \langle \phi_0^2 \rangle + \xi_h \langle h^2 \rangle \right\}, \quad (29)$$

and finally

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{4!} \left[6 \lambda \hat{h}^4 + \xi^2 (6M_p^2 - \xi_h \hat{h}^2)^2 \right]. \quad (30)$$

We found again a massive ω_μ in (28) by Stueckelberg mechanism after ‘eating’ the radial direction field $(1/\xi^2 \phi_0^2 + \xi_h h^2)$, with constraint $\nabla_\mu \omega^\mu = 0$. We identify M_p with the Planck scale; M_p and thus also m_ω receive contributions from both the Higgs and ϕ_0 (due to \tilde{R}^2).

The term proportional to ξ^2 in \hat{V} is ultimately due to the $(1/\xi^2) \tilde{R}^2$ term in the action and is ultimately responsible for the EW symmetry breaking and for inflation, see later.

Eq.(28) contains a mixing term $\hat{\omega}^\mu \partial_\mu \hat{h}$ from the Weyl-covariant derivative of \hat{h} . We choose the unitary gauge for the D(1) symmetry i.e. eliminate this term by replacing

$$\hat{h} = M_p \sqrt{6} \sinh \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}}, \quad \hat{\omega}_\mu = \hat{\omega}'_\mu + \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \cosh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}}. \quad (31)$$

Then \mathcal{L}_H becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_H = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \alpha^2 \hat{\omega}'_\mu \hat{\omega}'^\mu \cosh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \sigma)^2 - \hat{V} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \hat{\mathcal{Z}} \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^2} \hat{F}'_{\mu\nu}{}^2 + 2 \sin \chi \hat{F}'_{\mu\nu} \hat{F}'_y{}^{\mu\nu} + \hat{F}'_{y\mu\nu}{}^2 \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with the potential \hat{V} expressed now in terms of the field σ , using (30), (31).

• **Kinetic mixing:** Finally, remove the gauge kinetic mixing in \mathcal{L}_H by replacing $\hat{\omega}'_\mu, \hat{B}_\mu$ by

$$\hat{\omega}'_\mu = \gamma \omega'_\mu \sec \tilde{\chi}, \quad \hat{B}_\mu = B'_\mu - \omega'_\mu \tan \tilde{\chi}, \quad (\sin \tilde{\chi} \equiv \gamma \sin \chi); \quad (33)$$

and \mathcal{L}_H becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_H = & \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \alpha^2 \gamma^2 (\sec^2 \tilde{\chi}) \omega'_\mu \omega'^\mu + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \sigma)^2 - \hat{V} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \left[\mathcal{Z}' + \alpha^2 \gamma^2 (\sec^2 \tilde{\chi}) \omega'_\mu \omega'^\mu \right] \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} - \frac{1}{4} (F_{\mu\nu}'^2 + F_{y\mu\nu}'^2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where F' (F'_y) is the field strength of ω' (B') and

$$\mathcal{Z}' = \left[g'(B'_\mu - \omega'_\mu \tan \tilde{\chi}) - g \hat{A}_\mu^3 \right]^2 + g^2 (\hat{A}_\mu^{12} + \hat{A}_\mu^{22}) \quad (35)$$

Note the presence in \mathcal{L}_H of the coupling $\Delta\mathcal{L}_H = (1/8) \sigma^2 \omega'_\mu \omega'^\mu (g'^2 \tan^2 \tilde{\chi} + \alpha^2 \gamma^2 \sec^2 \tilde{\chi})$; this is ultimately due to the gauge kinetic mixing and to the Higgs coupling to ω_μ , eq.(23). This coupling can be large, depending on the amount of mixing χ and on γ and α . This is relevant for phenomenology and can help constrain these parameters.

• **Higgs potential:** One may write \mathcal{L}_H in a more compact form

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \sqrt{\hat{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 - \frac{1}{4} (F_{\mu\nu}'^2 + F_{y\mu\nu}'^2) + \mathcal{L}_h + m_W^2(\sigma) W_\mu^- W^{+\mu} + \frac{1}{2} X^T \mathcal{M}^2(\sigma) X \right\} \quad (36)$$

with the σ -dependent mass $m_W(\sigma)$ of $SU(2)_L$ bosons $W_\mu^\pm = 1/\sqrt{2} (A_\mu^1 \mp i A_\mu^2)$ given by

$$m_W^2(\sigma) = \frac{3g^2}{2} M_p^2 \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} = \frac{g^2}{4} \sigma^2 + \mathcal{O}(\sigma^4/M_p^2). \quad (37)$$

The σ -dependent matrix $\mathcal{M}(\sigma)$ written in eq.(36) in the basis $X \equiv (B'_\mu, A_\mu^3, \omega'_\mu)$ is presented in the Appendix, eq.(B-3). Finally we have

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \sigma)^2 - \hat{V}(\sigma) \quad (38)$$

and

$$\hat{V}(\sigma) = \frac{3}{2} M_p^4 \left\{ 6\lambda \sinh^4 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} + \xi^2 \left(1 - \xi_h \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (39)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{9} \xi_h \xi^2 + \frac{1}{6} \xi_h^2 \xi^2 \right) \sigma^4 - \frac{1}{2} \xi_h \xi^2 M_p^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{3}{2} \xi^2 M_p^4 + \mathcal{O}(\sigma^6/M_p^2). \quad (40)$$

This is the Higgs potential in our SMW model in the unitary gauge for the EW and $D(1)$ symmetries. The second line is valid for small field values $\sigma \ll M_p$ when we recover a Higgs potential similar to that in the SM; the quadratic term has a negative coefficient (with $\xi_h > 0$, as needed for inflation, see later). This follows when the Higgs field contributes positively to the Planck scale, eq.(29) and “to compensate” for its contribution to M_p , a negative sign emerges in (30) and in $\hat{V}(\sigma)$. The EW symmetry is thus broken at tree level.

2.6 EW scale and Higgs mass

The small field regime $\sigma \ll M_p$ in (40) gives realistic predictions in the limit $\xi_h \xi^2 \ll 1$; indeed, in this case the quartic Higgs coupling becomes λ and the EW scale $\langle \sigma \rangle$ and the Higgs mass are

$$\langle \sigma \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda} \xi_h \xi^2 M_p^2, \quad m_\sigma^2 = 2 \xi_h \xi^2 M_p^2. \quad (41)$$

To comply with the values of the Higgs mass and EW vev we must set $\xi \sqrt{\xi_h} \sim 3.5 \times 10^{-17}$. This means one or both perturbative couplings ξ_h and ξ take small values, while $\lambda \sim 0.12$ as in the SM and the regime $\sigma \ll M_p$ is respected. Recall that ξ is the coupling of the term $(1/\xi^2)\tilde{R}^2$, hence we see the relevance of this term for the hierarchy of scales.

The SMW model with the Higgs action as in eqs.(22), (36) has similarities to Agravity [42, 43] which is a global scale invariant model. Unlike in Agravity, we only have the Higgs scalar, while the role of the second scalar field (s) in [42], that generated the Planck scale and Higgs mass in Agravity is played in our model by the “geometric” Stueckelberg field (ϕ_0). This field was not added “ad-hoc” and cannot couple to the Higgs field, being extracted from the \tilde{R}^2 term itself (see eq.(22)). Hence, there is no classical coupling between the Higgs field and the field generating M_p in SMW, while in [42] a coupling $\lambda_{HS} h^2 s^2$ is present.

However, the SMW contains the field ω_μ (part of Weyl geometry), not present in [42]. Our preference here for a local, gauged scale symmetry, that brought in the Weyl gauge field, is motivated by three aspects: firstly, we already have a “geometric” mass generation mechanism which does not need adding ad-hoc an extra scalar; secondly, global symmetries do not survive black-hole physics [5] and finally, the Weyl gauge symmetry of the action is also a symmetry of the underlying geometry (connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$), as we think it should be the case.

Although the quantum corrections to m_σ deserve a separate study, note that large corrections to m_σ could arise from quantum corrections due to ω_μ . But this field may in principle be light, possibly near the TeV scale [36], rather than near M_p ; this is possible if the Weyl gauge symmetry breaking scale is low. The mass of ω_μ is then the only physical scale for the low-energy observer above which the full gauged scale invariant action is restored together with its ultraviolet (UV) protection role. Hence, if the mass of ω_μ is not far above TeV-scale, its loop corrections to m_σ may be under control. In this way the Weyl gauge symmetry may protect the Higgs sector.

From (41), using the Planck scale expression eq.(29) then

$$\langle \sigma \rangle^2 \approx \frac{\xi_h}{6\lambda} \langle \phi_0^2 \rangle. \quad (42)$$

With $\xi \sqrt{\xi_h} \sim 3 \times 10^{-17}$ fixed earlier, one still has a freedom of either a hierarchy or comparable values of these two vev’s, depending on the exact values of $\xi_h < 1$. Eq.(42) relates the EW scale physics to the underlying Weyl geometry represented by the \tilde{R}^2 term in the action (from which ϕ_0 is “extracted”).

2.7 Constraints from Z mass

Let us now compute the eigenvalues of the Higgs-dependent matrix $\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma)$, eqs.(36), (B-3), and examine the constraints from the mass of Z on the model parameters α and χ . Since Z_μ and ω_μ mix, part of Z boson mass is not due the Higgs mechanism, but to this mixing and ultimately, to the Stueckelberg mechanism giving mass to ω_μ . After the electroweak symmetry breaking, in the mass eigenstates basis of $\mathcal{M}^2(\langle\sigma\rangle)$, one has the photon field (A_μ) (it is massless, since $\det \mathcal{M}^2 = 0$), the neutral gauge boson (Z) and the Weyl field (Z^ω).

$\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma)$ is brought to diagonal form by two rotations (B-4), (B-5) giving

$$\begin{pmatrix} B'_\mu \\ A_\mu^3 \\ \omega'_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_w & -\sin \theta_w \cos \zeta & -\sin \theta_w \sin \zeta \\ \sin \theta_w & \cos \theta_w \cos \zeta & \cos \theta_w \sin \zeta \\ 0 & -\sin \zeta & \cos \zeta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ Z_\mu \\ Z_\mu^\omega \end{pmatrix} \quad (43)$$

Denote by U the matrix relating the gauge eigenstates ($B'_\mu, A_\mu^3, \omega'_\mu$) to the mass eigenstates ($A_\mu, Z_\mu, Z_\mu^\omega$); then $\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma)$ is diagonalised into $\mathcal{M}_d^2 = U^T \mathcal{M}^2 U$ for a suitable ζ

$$\tan 2\zeta = \frac{-2g'(g^2 + g'^2)^{1/2}}{g^2(1 - 2\delta^2) \csc 2\tilde{\chi} + (g^2 + 2g'^2) \cot 2\tilde{\chi}} \quad \text{with} \quad \delta^2 = \frac{\alpha^2 \gamma^2}{g^2} \coth^2 \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle}{M_p \sqrt{6}}. \quad (44)$$

The masses of Z boson (m_Z) and Weyl gauge field (m_ω) are then found⁸

$$m_{Z,\omega}^2 = \frac{3}{4} M_p^2 \sinh^2 \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle^2}{M_p \sqrt{6}} \left\{ g^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sec^2 \tilde{\chi} \left[2g'^2 + 2\alpha^2 \gamma^2 \coth^2 \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle}{M_p} \pm \sqrt{\mathcal{P}} \right] \right\}, \quad (46)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \mathcal{P} = 4g'^2(g^2 + g'^2) \sin^2 2\tilde{\chi} + \left[g^2(1 - 2\delta^2) + (g^2 + 2g'^2) \cos 2\tilde{\chi} \right]^2. \quad (47)$$

Since $\langle\sigma\rangle \ll M_p$ (see conditions after eq.(41))

$$m_Z^2 = \frac{1}{4} (g^2 + g'^2) \langle\sigma\rangle^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle^2}{18M_p^2} \left[1 - \frac{3g'^2}{\alpha^2} \sin^2 \chi \right] + \mathcal{O}(\langle\sigma\rangle^4/M_p^4) \right\}. \quad (48)$$

The factor in front is the mass of Z boson (hereafter m_{Z^0}) in the SM; m_Z has a negligible correction from Einstein gravity ($\propto \langle\sigma^2\rangle/M^2$). But there is also a correction ($\propto \sin^2 \chi/\alpha^2$) from the Weyl field i.e. due to deviations from Einstein gravity induced by Weyl geometry. This can be significant and it *reduces* m_Z by a relative amount:

$$\varepsilon \equiv \frac{\Delta m_Z}{m_{Z^0}} = -\frac{g'^2 \langle\sigma\rangle^2 \sin^2 \chi}{12 M_p^2 \alpha^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\langle\sigma\rangle^4}{M_p^4}\right) = -\frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{\langle\sigma\rangle}{m_\omega}\right)^2 (g' \tan \tilde{\chi})^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\langle\sigma\rangle^4}{m_\omega^4}\right). \quad (49)$$

⁸If there is no mixing $\chi = 0$, then $\zeta = 0$, and with M_p of (29) then

$$m_\omega^2 = (3/2) \alpha^2 \gamma^2 M_p^2 \left(1 + \sinh^2 \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle}{M_p \sqrt{6}} \right) \quad m_Z^2 = (3/2) (g^2 + g'^2) M_p^2 \sinh^2 \frac{\langle\sigma\rangle}{M_p \sqrt{6}}. \quad (45)$$

In the second step we replaced the mass of ω and the definition of $\tilde{\chi}$ in eq.(33).

The effect in (49) is significant if $\sin \chi/\alpha \gg 1$. From the mass of Z boson and with Δm_Z at 1 σ deviation, one has $|\varepsilon| \leq 2.3 \times 10^{-5}$, then eq.(49) gives a lower bound on the Weyl gauge coupling α , for a given non-zero gauge kinetic mixing:

$$\alpha \geq 2.17 \times 10^{-15} \sin \chi. \quad (50)$$

Note that for an arbitrary charge d of the metric, the results depending on α are modified by replacing $\alpha \rightarrow d \times \alpha$. In terms of the mass of ω_μ one finds

$$\frac{m_\omega}{\text{TeV}} \geq 6.35 \times \tan \tilde{\chi}. \quad (51)$$

This gives a lower bound on the mass of the Weyl field in terms of the mixing angle χ and γ . A larger m_ω allows a larger amount of mixing. For a mixing angle of e.g. $\tilde{\chi} = \pi/4$ then $m_\omega \geq 6.35$ TeV. Note that if there is no term $(1/\eta) \tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ in the original gravity action, then $\gamma = 1$ and then $\chi = \tilde{\chi}$. Alternatively, using the current lower bound on the non-metricity scale (represented by m_ω) which is of the order of the TeV scale [36], then

$$\tan \tilde{\chi} \leq 0.16 \quad (52)$$

This is consistent with the non-metricity constraint.

These bounds are significant and affect other phenomenological studies. To give an example, consider the impact of ω_μ on the $g - 2$ muon magnetic moment, due to the new coupling of ω_μ in \mathcal{L}_f , eq.(19). Using [44, 45] an estimate of the correction of ω_μ to Δa_μ is

$$\Delta a_\mu \sim \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \frac{m_\mu^2}{m_\omega^2} (g' \tan \tilde{\chi})^2 = 2.56 \times 10^{-13}, \quad (53)$$

where we used constraints (49), (51). These do not allow Δa_μ to account for the SM discrepancy with the experiment [46]; however, this discrepancy may be only apparent, according to lattice-based results [47]. One can also use these constraints when studying the role of ω_μ for phenomenology in other examples, such as the dark matter problem [48], in which case it may even provide a solution (of geometric origin!) to this problem; other implications can be for example in the birefringence of the vacuum induced by ω_μ . This can impact on the propagation of the observed polarization of the gamma-ray bursts [49]⁹ or of the CMB [50].

2.8 Inflation

The SMW model can have successful inflaton. The Higgs potential in (39) can drive inflation as discussed in [28, 29, 51]. But who “ordered” the Higgs in the early Universe? the Higgs could initially be produced by the Weyl gauge boson fusion, by the coupling $\omega_\mu \omega^\mu H H^\dagger$ dictated by the symmetry, eq.(22). This means, rather interestingly, that the Higgs can be regarded as having a *geometric origin* like ω_μ which is part of the Weyl connection¹⁰.

⁹I thank Tiberiu Harko (Babeş-Bolyai University) for bringing this paper to my attention.

¹⁰In a sense this is also true for fermions, by subsequent Higgs decay (20), or for B_μ by Higgs- $\omega_\mu \rightarrow B_\mu$ -Higgs.

As seen from (34) this coupling becomes $\omega_\mu \omega^\mu f(\sigma)$ with σ the neutral Higgs. But in a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe considered below, $g_{\mu\nu} = (1, -a(t)^2, -a(t)^2, -a(t)^2)$, the vector field background compatible with the metric is $\omega_\mu(t) = 0$ [29]. The fluctuations of σ and of (longitudinal component of) ω_μ do not mix since $\omega_\mu(t)\delta\omega^\mu\delta\sigma$ is then vanishing. As a result, the single-field inflation formalism in the Einstein gravity applies, with σ as the inflaton. Since M_p is simply the scale of Weyl gauge symmetry breaking, $\sigma > M_p$ is natural.

The predictions of the Higgs inflation are then [28, 29]

$$r = 3(1 - n_s)^2 - \frac{16}{3}\xi_h^2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi_h^3). \quad (54)$$

Here r is the tensor-to-scalar ratio and n_s is the scalar spectral index. Up to small corrections from ξ_h that can be neglected for $\xi_h < 10^{-3}$, the above dependence $r = r(n_s)$ is similar to that in the Starobinsky model [52] of inflation where $r = 3(1 - n_s)^2$. For mildly larger $\xi_h \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$, eq.(54) departs from the Starobinsky model prediction and r is mildly reduced relative to its value in the Starobinsky case, for given n_s . These results require a hierarchy $\lambda \ll \xi_h^2 \xi^2$ which may be respected for a sufficiently small λ and¹¹ $\xi_h \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$.

A relatively very small λ means that it is actually the squared term in (39) multiplied by ξ^2 (see also (30)) that is mostly responsible for inflation, and that is ultimately due to the initial term ϕ_0^4 “extracted” from the quadratic curvature $(1/\xi^2)\tilde{R}^2$ term in (22); this explains the similarities to the Starobinsky inflation¹². Thus a negligible λ is required for successful inflation (as the numerical values of r below also show it). A value of λ at the EW scale as in the SM can then be induced by the SM quantum corrections.

The numerical results give that for $N = 60$ e-folds and with $n_s = 0.9670 \pm 0.0037$ at 68% CL (TT, TE, EE+low E + lensing + BK14 + BAO) [53] then [28, 29, 51]

$$0.00257 \leq r \leq 0.00303, \quad (55)$$

while for n_s at 95% CL:

$$0.00227 \leq r \leq 0.00303. \quad (56)$$

The case of Starobinsky model for $N = 60$ corresponds to the upper limit of r above and is reached for the smallest ξ_h , when this limit is saturated, according to relation (54).

The small value of r found above may be reached by the next generation of CMB experiments CMB-S4 [54, 55], LiteBIRD [56, 57], PICO [58], PIXIE [59] that have sensitivity to r values as low as 0.0005. Such sensitivity will be able to test this inflation model and to distinguish it from other models. For example, similarly small but distinct values of r are found in other models with Weyl gauge symmetry [29, 30] based on the Palatini approach to gravity action (4) used in this paper; however these models do not respect relation (54) and the slope of the curve $r(n_s)$ is different, due to their different vectorial non-metricity. The above experiments also have the sensitivity to distinguish inflation in this model from the Starobinsky model for $\xi_h \sim 10^{-2}$ when the curve $r(n_s)$ is shifted by ξ_h below that of the Starobinsky model, towards smaller r (for fixed n_s).

¹¹From the normalization of the CMB anisotropy one also finds that $\xi^2 < 1.45 \times 10^{-9}$ [28].

¹²This is more like a Starobinsky-Higgs inflation; the initial Higgs field h (of $\xi_h \neq 0$) still plays a role, for a minimum of \hat{V} . The Higgs and Starobinsky/ R^2 inflation usually mix, especially at the quantum level [60].

3 SMW and its properties

In this section we discuss some features of our model and the differences from other SM-like models with local scale invariance. The main aspect of our model is that scale symmetry is *gauged*, eq.(1). The Weyl gauge symmetry is not only a symmetry of the action but also of the underlying Weyl geometry; indeed, the Weyl connection is invariant under (1). This adds consistency to SMW and distinguishes it from models with an action that is Weyl or conformal invariant (with no ω_μ) and built in a (pseudo-)Riemannian space - their connection and thus the underlying geometry do not share the symmetry of the action.

An important feature of the SMW is the spontaneous breaking of Weyl gauge symmetry even in the *absence of matter*, as seen in section 2.1. Hence, this breaking is ultimately of geometric origin. This is different from previous models with this symmetry [7–26] where some scalar fields were introduced “ad-hoc” to induce spontaneous breaking of their symmetry and to generate M_p and Einstein action from a $\phi^2 R$ term. In the SMW the necessary scalar field (ϕ_0) is “extracted” from the (geometric) R^2 -term, plays the role of the Stueckelberg field and is eaten by ω_μ which becomes massive. This was possible since the model was quadratic in curvature - this is another difference from models [7–26] which were linear-only in R . Therefore, the Einstein-Proca action and the Planck scale emerge in the broken phase of the SMW.

The breaking of the Weyl gauge symmetry is accompanied by a change of the underlying geometry. When ω_μ decouples, the Weyl connection becomes Levi-Civita, so Weyl geometry becomes Riemannian and the theory is then metric¹³. Thus, the breaking of the symmetry in Section 2.1 (see [27]) is not just a result of a “gauge fixing” to the Einstein frame, as it happens in Weyl or conformal theories with no ω_μ ; it is accompanied by the Stueckelberg mechanism and by a change of the underlying geometry¹⁴.

The SMW avoids some situations present in interesting models with local scale invariance (without ω_μ), like a negative kinetic term of the scalar field [66] (also [67–69]), or an imaginary vev [70, 71] of the scalar that generates¹⁵ M_p . Such situations may not be a cause of concern, see however the discussion in [15, 17]. Gauging the scale symmetry avoids such situations - in SMW this scalar field plays the role of a would-be Goldstone of the Weyl gauge symmetry (eaten by ω_μ). See also eq.(6) where the (negative) kinetic term in the first square bracket is cancelled by that in the second square bracket corresponding to a Stueckelberg mechanism¹⁶.

In some local scale invariant models (without ω_μ) the associated current can be trivial, leading to so-called “fake conformal symmetry” [72, 73]; in the SMW the current is non-trivial

¹³A similar Weyl gauge symmetry breaking and change of geometry exists in a Palatini version [29, 30].

¹⁴An aspect of models with Weyl gauge symmetry relates to their geodesic completeness, see [15, 17]. In conformal/Weyl invariant models (without ω_μ) this aspect seems possible in the (metric) Riemannian spacetime where geodesic completeness or incompleteness is related to a gauge choice (and singularities due to an unphysical conformal frame) [61–63]. In models in Weyl geometry, the geodesics are determined by the affine structure. Differential geometry demands the existence of the Weyl gauge field [64] for the construction of the affine connection, because this ensures that geodesics are invariant (as necessary on physical grounds, the parallel transport of a vector should not depend on the gauge choice). Hence the Weyl gauge field/symmetry may actually be required! After the breaking of this symmetry, w_μ decouples, we return to (pseudo)Riemannian geometry and geodesics are then given by extremal proper time condition. Since a dynamical ω_μ also brings in non-metricity, geodesic completeness seems related to non-metricity.

¹⁵It seems to us this means a negative Σ and therefore a metric signature change in transformation (1).

¹⁶This Stueckelberg mechanism may apply to more general metric affine theories studied in detail in [65].

even in the absence of matter, due to dynamical ω_μ [27]. If ω_μ were not dynamical ($F = 0$) it could be integrated out algebraically to leave a local scale-invariant action; in this case Weyl geometry would be integrable and metric, see e.g. [16, 17]. But since ω_μ is dynamical, the theory is also non-metric. This non-metricity would indeed be a physical problem if ω_μ were massless (assuming this, non-metricity of a theory was used as an argument against such theory by Einstein¹⁷ [2]). However, non-metricity became here an advantage, since Weyl geometry with dynamical ω_μ enabled the Stueckelberg breaking mechanism, ω_μ acquired a mass (above current non-metricity bounds [36]), and the Einstein-Proca action was naturally obtained in the broken phase.

The SMW differs from the SM with conformal symmetry of [75] or [70, 71] and from conformal gravity models [76–78] formulated in the (pseudo)Riemannian space and based on $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ term; these models are metric and do not have a gauged scale symmetry; in our case the $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ term is largely spectator and may even be absent in a first instance; it was included because its Weyl geometry counterpart contributed a threshold correction to α and it is needed at the quantum level. And unlike the conformal gravity action [79] which is metric, the SMW has a gauge kinetic term for the Weyl field, which breaks the special conformal symmetry. This symmetry and non-metricity do not seem compatible.

Concerning the quantum calculations in the SMW, one has two options: one can use the “traditional” dimensional regularization (DR) that breaks explicitly the Weyl gauge symmetry by the presence of the subtraction scale (μ); alternatively, one can use a regularisation similar to [80] that preserves Weyl gauge symmetry at the quantum level. This is possible by using our Stueckelberg field ϕ_0 as a *field-dependent regulator*, to replace the subtraction scale μ generated later by $\mu \sim \langle \phi_0 \rangle$ (after symmetry breaking). This would allow the computation of the quantum corrections without explicitly breaking the Weyl gauge symmetry¹⁸. Such study would indicate if a quantum Weyl gauge symmetry can provide a protective role on the hierarchy m_σ versus M_p , in a technically natural way.

It would be interesting to study the renormalizability of the SMW. Quadratic gravity in the (pseudo-)Riemannian case is known to be renormalizable but not unitary due to massive spin-2 ghost [85]. The SMW is based on quadratic gravity in Weyl geometry, where no higher order operators are allowed in (4) by the symmetry (there is no initial scale to suppress them). In a Riemannian notation SMW simply brings an additional (anomaly-free) Weyl gauge field which becomes massive by the Stueckelberg mechanism which cannot affect renormalizability; naively, one then expects the SMW be renormalizable.

4 Conclusions

Since the SM with a vanishing Higgs mass parameter is scale invariant, it is natural to study the effect of this symmetry. This is relevant for physics at high scales or in the early Universe, where this symmetry seems natural. Since a *global* scale symmetry does not survive black-hole physics, we explored the possibility that the SM has a *gauged* scale symmetry. The natural framework is the Weyl geometry where this symmetry is built in. Hence, we considered the SM in Weyl geometry. This embedding is minimal i.e. *no new degrees of freedom* were added

¹⁷Actually, a similar situation exists [29, 30] in quadratic gravity in Palatini approach due to Einstein [74].

¹⁸A similar approach exists in the global case [81–84].

beyond those of the SM and of Weyl geometry.

The model has the special feature that both the action *and* its underlying geometry (connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and spin connection $\tilde{\omega}_\mu^{ab}$) are Weyl gauge invariant. This adds consistency to the model and distinguishes it from previous SM-like models with local scale symmetry and built on a (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry (connection) which does not share the local scale invariance of the action.

The SMW model has another attractive feature. In Weyl conformal geometry there exists a (geometric) Stueckelberg mechanism in which this symmetry is spontaneously broken. The original Weyl quadratic gravity associated to this geometry is broken spontaneously to the Einstein-Proca action. The Stueckelberg field has a geometric origin, being “extracted” from \tilde{R}^2 in the Weyl action, and is subsequently eaten by ω_μ . Once the Weyl gauge field decouples, Weyl connection becomes Levi-Civita and Einstein gravity is recovered. The Planck scale is also fixed by the Stueckelberg field vev. Also, the origin of the mass term of the Weyl-Proca field is on the Weyl geometry side just a Weyl-covariant kinetic term of the same Stueckelberg field. These aspects relate symmetry breaking and mass generation to a geometry change; the latter is itself related to the non-metricity due to dynamical ω_μ .

The SMW gauge group is a direct product of the SM group and $D(1)$ of the Weyl gauge symmetry. A kinetic mixing of the gauge fields of $U(1)_Y \times D(1)$ is then allowed by this symmetry and was studied, with both $D(1)$ and SM symmetry broken spontaneously.

In the absence of the gauge kinetic mixing, only the Higgs field of the SM spectrum couples directly to ω_μ . With this coupling, the Weyl gauge symmetry may then have a protective role for the Higgs mass at a quantum level. The fermions also acquire a coupling ($Y g' \tan \tilde{\chi}$) to ω_μ due to this gauge kinetic mixing. As a result of the Higgs coupling to ω_μ and kinetic mixing, part of Z boson mass is not due to the Higgs mechanism, but to the mixing of Z with the massive Weyl field which has a Stueckelberg mass; hence, part of Z mass has a geometric origin, due to a departure from the (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry and Einstein gravity.

From the very small experimental error of Z mass one obtains significant constraints on the Weyl gauge coupling and the mass of ω , for a given amount of kinetic mixing. We showed how these bounds can be used in other phenomenological studies; if ω_μ is light (few TeV) its effects may be amenable to experimental tests and it may have far reaching consequences for phenomenology e.g. for the dark matter, vacuum birefringence, etc, that can test the model.

The SMW has successful Higgs inflation. Intriguingly, in the early Universe the Higgs may be produced via Weyl vector fusion, thus having a geometric origin. With M_p a simple phase transition scale, Higgs field values larger than M_p are natural. While the inflationary potential is that of the Higgs, due to the scalar fields mixing it is ultimately a contribution to this potential from the initial scalar mode in the \tilde{R}^2 term that is responsible for inflation. This explains the similarities to the Starobinsky inflation. With the scalar spectral index n_s fixed to its measured value, the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \leq 0.00303$. Compared to the Starobinsky model, the curve $r(n_s)$ is similar but shifted to smaller r (for same n_s) by the Higgs non-minimal coupling to Weyl geometry. These results deserve further investigation.

Appendix

A Brief guide to Weyl conformal geometry

Weyl conformal geometry is defined by equivalent classes of $(g_{\mu\nu}, \omega_\mu)$ of the metric and Weyl gauge field (ω_μ) related by Weyl gauge transformations:

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Sigma^d g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \sqrt{\hat{g}} = \Sigma^{2d} \sqrt{g}, \quad \hat{\omega}_\mu = \omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma, \quad \hat{e}_\mu^a = \Sigma^{d/2} e_\mu^a, \quad \hat{e}_a^\mu = \Sigma^{-d/2} e_a^\mu \quad (\text{A-1})$$

where d is the Weyl weight (charge) of $g_{\mu\nu}$ and α is the Weyl gauge coupling. Various conventions exist in the literature for d e.g. $d = 1$ in [7] and $d = 2$ in [8]. The latter may be more motivated since from the relation $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu$ with dx^μ and dx^ν fixed under (A-1) the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ transforms like ds^2 . In the text we used $d = 1$, but our results can be immediately changed to arbitrary d by simply rescaling the coupling in our results $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha \times d$.

The Weyl gauge field is related to the Weyl connection ($\tilde{\Gamma}$) which is the solution of

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = -d \alpha \omega_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} \quad (\text{A-2})$$

where $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu$ is defined by $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\rho g_{\rho\nu} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\lambda}^\rho g_{\rho\mu}. \quad (\text{A-3})$$

Eq.(A-2) says that Weyl geometry is *non-metric*; it may be written as $(\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda + d \alpha \omega_\lambda) g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ as in a metric case, indicating that one can use metric formulae in which replaces the partial derivative ∂_λ acting on a field, metric, etc, by a Weyl-covariant counterpart as in:

$$\partial_\lambda \rightarrow \tilde{\partial}_\lambda + \text{weight} \times \alpha \times \omega_\lambda, \quad (\text{A-4})$$

where 'weight' is the corresponding Weyl charge (of the field, etc). We shall use this later.

The solution to (A-2) is found using cyclic permutations of the indices and combining the equations so obtained, then

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda + \alpha \frac{d}{2} \left[\delta_\mu^\lambda \omega_\nu + \delta_\nu^\lambda \omega_\mu - g_{\mu\nu} \omega^\lambda \right]. \quad (\text{A-5})$$

where $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is the usual Levi-Civita connection

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\lambda\mu} - \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}). \quad (\text{A-6})$$

$\tilde{\Gamma}$ is invariant under (A-1) as one can easily check. Conversely, one may actually derive the transformation of the Weyl gauge field in (A-1) by imposing that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be invariant under the metric change in (A-1), since parallel transport should be independent of the gauge choice. Taking the trace in the last equation and denoting $\Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda$ then

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu = \Gamma_\mu + 2d \alpha \omega_\mu. \quad (\text{A-7})$$

Thus, the Weyl gauge field can be thought of as the trace of the departure of the Weyl connection from the Levi-Civita connection. Using $\tilde{\Gamma}$ one computes the scalar and tensor curvatures of Weyl geometry, using formulae similar to those in Riemannian case but with $\tilde{\Gamma}$ instead of Γ . For example

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu\sigma}^{\lambda} = \partial_{\nu}\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\sigma}^{\lambda} - \partial_{\sigma}\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda} + \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu\rho}^{\lambda}\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\sigma}^{\rho} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma\rho}^{\lambda}\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}, \quad \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{R}_{\mu\lambda\sigma}^{\lambda}, \quad \tilde{R} = g^{\mu\sigma}\tilde{R}_{\mu\sigma}. \quad (\text{A-8})$$

After some algebra one finds

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha d)(\nabla_{\mu}\omega_{\nu} - 3\nabla_{\nu}\omega_{\mu} - g_{\mu\nu}\nabla_{\lambda}\omega^{\lambda}) + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha d)^2(\omega_{\mu}\omega_{\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\lambda}\omega^{\lambda}), \quad (\text{A-9})$$

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{R}_{\nu\mu} = 2d\alpha F_{\mu\nu}, \quad (\text{A-10})$$

$$\tilde{R} = R - 3d\alpha\nabla_{\mu}\omega^{\mu} - (3/2)(d\alpha)^2\omega_{\mu}\omega^{\mu}, \quad (\text{A-11})$$

where the rhs is in a Riemannian notation, so ∇_{μ} is given by the Levi-Civita connection (Γ).

An important property is that \tilde{R} transforms covariantly under (A-1)

$$\hat{\tilde{R}} = (1/\Sigma^d)\tilde{R}, \quad (\text{A-12})$$

which follows from the transformation of $g^{\mu\sigma}$ that enters its definition above and from the fact that $\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is invariant (since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is so). Then the term $\sqrt{g}\tilde{R}^2$ is Weyl gauge invariant.

In Weyl geometry one can also define a Weyl tensor $\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ that is related to that in Riemannian geometry $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ as follows

$$\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - \frac{\alpha d}{4}(g_{\mu\rho}F_{\nu\sigma} + g_{\nu\sigma}F_{\mu\rho} - g_{\mu\sigma}F_{\nu\rho} - g_{\nu\rho}F_{\mu\sigma}) + \frac{\alpha d}{2}F_{\mu\nu}g_{\rho\sigma} \quad (\text{A-13})$$

which gives [19]

$$\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 = C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{3}{2}(\alpha d)^2 F_{\mu\nu}^2, \quad (\text{A-14})$$

used in the text, eq.(4). $\sqrt{g}\tilde{C}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2$ and its above separation are invariant under (A-1).

To introduce the Weyl spin connection, consider first the spin connection in the Riemannian geometry

$$s_{\mu}^{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\left[e^{\nu a}(\partial_{\mu}e_{\nu}^b - \partial_{\nu}e_{\mu}^b) - e^{\nu b}(\partial_{\mu}e_{\nu}^a - \partial_{\nu}e_{\mu}^a) - e^{\rho a}e^{\sigma b}e_{\mu}^c(\partial_{\rho}e_{\sigma c} - \partial_{\sigma}e_{\rho c})\right]. \quad (\text{A-15})$$

One verifies that an equivalent form is

$$s_{\mu}^{ab} = -e^{\lambda b}(\partial_{\mu}e_{\lambda}^a - \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^{\nu}e_{\nu}^a). \quad (\text{A-16})$$

Under a transformation of the metric (A-1)

$$\hat{s}_{\mu}^{ab} = s_{\mu}^{ab} + (e_{\mu}^a e^{\nu b} - e_{\mu}^b e^{\nu a})\partial_{\mu}\ln\Sigma^{d/2}. \quad (\text{A-17})$$

For the Weyl geometry spin connection, one simply replaces the partial derivative in eq.(A-15) by a Weyl-covariant derivative that takes into account the charge of the field on which it acts (A-4). For the spin connection $\partial_\mu e_\nu^b \rightarrow [\partial_\mu + (d/2)\alpha\omega_\mu] e_\nu^b$ since according to (A-1) e_ν^b has Weyl weight $d/2$. Using this replacement in (A-15) we find the spin connection \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} in Weyl geometry

$$\tilde{s}_\mu^{ab} = s_\mu^{ab} + (d/2)\alpha(e_\mu^a e^{\nu b} - e_\mu^b e^{\nu a})\omega_\nu. \quad (\text{A-18})$$

Under transformation (A-1) one checks that \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} is invariant, similar to Weyl connection $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Let us now consider matter fields and find their charges in Weyl geometry by demanding that: a) their Weyl-covariant derivatives transform under (A-1) like the fields themselves and b) that their kinetic terms be invariant. More explicitly, take the kinetic term for a scalar of charge d_ϕ : $\sqrt{g}(\tilde{D}_\mu\phi)^2$ where \tilde{D}_μ is the Weyl-covariant derivative which we demand it transform under (A-1) just like the scalar field itself, i.e. it has same charge d_ϕ . From the invariance of this action under (A-1) one has that $d_\phi = -d/2$. The Weyl covariant derivative is then found according to (A-4) and the kinetic term is

$$L_\phi = \sqrt{g}g^{\mu\nu}\tilde{D}_\mu\phi\tilde{D}_\nu\phi, \quad \tilde{D}_\mu\phi = (\partial_\mu - d/2\alpha\omega_\mu)\phi. \quad (\text{A-19})$$

with L_ϕ invariant, while ϕ transforms as

$$\hat{\phi} = \Sigma^{-d/2}\phi. \quad (\text{A-20})$$

For a fermion ψ the Weyl charge is found in a similar way, by using (A-4) to write their Weyl covariant derivative, hence the action has the form

$$L_\psi = \frac{i}{2}\sqrt{g}\bar{\psi}\gamma^a e_a^\mu \tilde{\nabla}_\mu\psi + h.c., \quad \tilde{\nabla}_\mu\psi = \left[\partial_\mu + d_\psi\alpha\omega_\mu + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{s}_\mu^{ab}\sigma_{ab}\right]\psi \quad (\text{A-21})$$

where $\sigma_{ab} = 1/4[\gamma_a, \gamma_b]$. Since we saw earlier that \tilde{s}_μ^{ab} is Weyl gauge invariant then the above derivative $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu\psi$ transforms covariantly just like a fermion field itself of charge d_ψ . From the structure of the kinetic term and its invariance it follows that $d_\psi = -3d/4$ so, under (A-1)

$$\hat{\psi} = \Sigma^{-3d/4}\psi. \quad (\text{A-22})$$

With this charge and using (A-21), (A-18) one shows that ω_μ cancels out:

$$\gamma^a e_a^\mu \tilde{\nabla}_\mu\psi = \gamma^a e_a^\mu \left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2}s_\mu^{ab}\sigma_{ab}\right]\psi. \quad (\text{A-23})$$

Hence, the fermionic kinetic term has the same form as in the Riemannian geometry

$$L_\psi = \frac{i}{2}\sqrt{g}\bar{\psi}\gamma^a e_a^\mu \nabla_\mu\psi + h.c., \quad \nabla_\mu\psi = \left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2}s_\mu^{ab}\sigma_{ab}\right]\psi, \quad (\text{A-24})$$

used in Section 2.3. Eqs.(A-1), (A-20), (A-22) define the Weyl gauge transformation in the presence of matter, as introduced in the text, eq.(1). For more information see also [8, 19].

B Higgs sector: \mathcal{L}_H and the matrix $\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma)$

For convenience, we write here in the Riemannian notation and in the symmetric phase the form of \mathcal{L}_H shown in the text in the Weyl geometry notation eq.(22) after step (26)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_H = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{-1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \theta^2 R + (\partial_\mu \theta)^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \nabla_\mu (\theta^2 \omega^\mu) \right] - \frac{1}{\eta^2} C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \alpha^2 \theta^2 \left[\omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \nabla_\mu \ln \theta^2 \right]^2 - V \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} |(\partial_\mu - \alpha/2 \omega_\mu) h|^2 + \frac{1}{2} h^2 \mathcal{A}_\mu \mathcal{A}^\mu - \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + 2 \sin \chi F_{\mu\nu} F_y^{\mu\nu} + F_{y\mu\nu}^2 \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-1})$$

where $\theta^2 = (1/\xi^2) \phi_0^2 + \xi_h h^2$ denotes the radial direction in the fields space with

$$V = \frac{1}{4!} \left[6\lambda h^4 + \xi^2 (\theta^2 - \xi_h h^2)^2 \right], \quad (\text{B-2})$$

and $\langle \theta \rangle^2 = 6M_p^2$. The first line in \mathcal{L}_H is similar to that of a single field case, see eq.(6) for $\theta^2 \leftrightarrow (1/\xi^2) \phi_0^2$. Note that \mathcal{L}_H is invariant under the Weyl gauge transformation eq.(1) (one checks that the first square bracket is invariant, while for the remaining terms this is easily verified). From this action eq.(28) then follows, via a Stueckelberg mechanism.

The Higgs-dependent matrix $\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma)$ introduced in eq.(36) in basis $X = (B'_\mu, A_\mu^3, \omega'_\mu)$ is

$$\mathcal{M}^2(\sigma) = \frac{3M_p^2}{2} \sinh^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} g'^2 & -gg' & -g'^2 \tan \tilde{\chi} \\ -gg' & g'^2 & gg' \tan \tilde{\chi} \\ -g'^2 \tan \tilde{\chi} & gg' \tan \tilde{\chi} & g'^2 \tan^2 \tilde{\chi} + \alpha^2 \gamma^2 \sec^2 \tilde{\chi} \coth^2 \frac{\sigma}{M_p \sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B-3})$$

This mass matrix is diagonalised by two successive rotations of the fields; first:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ Z_{1\mu} \\ Z_{2\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_w & \sin \theta_w & 0 \\ -\sin \theta_w & \cos \theta_w & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B'_\mu \\ A_\mu^3 \\ \omega'_\mu \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B-4})$$

After this, $Z_1 - Z_2$ mass mixing usually exists, diagonalized by a final rotation of suitable ζ

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ Z_\mu \\ Z_\mu^\omega \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \zeta & -\sin \zeta \\ 0 & \sin \zeta & \cos \zeta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ Z_{1\mu} \\ Z_{2\mu} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B-5})$$

Combining these two rotations we find a matrix relating the mass eigenstates $(A_\mu, Z_\mu, Z_\mu^\omega)$ to the gauge eigenstates $X_\mu = (B'_\mu, A_\mu^3, \omega'_\mu)$. The inverse of this matrix is shown in eq.(43).

Acknowledgement:

The author thanks Graham Ross (University of Oxford) for interesting discussions on this work. This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-2255.

References

- [1] W. A. Bardeen, FERMILAB-CONF-95-391-T(1995).
- [2] 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.
- [3] Hermann Weyl "Eine neue Erweiterung der Relativitätstheorie" ("A new extension of the theory of relativity"), Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) (4) 59 (1919), 101-133.
- [4] 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.
- [5] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, D. A. Linde and L. Susskind, "Gravity and global symmetries," Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995), 912-935 [arXiv:hep-th/9502069 [hep-th]].
- [6] D. Gorbunov, V. Rubakov, "Introduction to the theory of the early Universe", World Scientific, 2011.
- [7] L. Smolin, "Towards a Theory of Space-Time Structure at Very Short Distances," Nucl. Phys. B **160** (1979) 253.
- [8] K. Hayashi and T. Kugo, "Everything about Weyl's gauge field" Prog. Theor. Phys. **61** (1979), 334; K. Hayashi, M. Kasuya and T. Shirafuji, "Elementary Particles and Weyl's Gauge Field," Prog. Theor. Phys. **57** (1977), 431 [erratum: Prog. Theor. Phys. **59** (1978), 681]
- [9] P. A. M. Dirac, "Long range forces and broken symmetries," Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **333** (1973) 403.
- [10] H. Cheng, "The Possible Existence of Weyl's Vector Meson," Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 2182.
- [11] T. Fulton, F. Rohrlich and L. Witten, "Conformal invariance in physics," Rev. Mod. Phys. **34** (1962) 442.
- [12] J. T. Wheeler, "Weyl geometry," Gen. Rel. Grav. **50** (2018) no.7, 80 [arXiv:1801.03178 [gr-qc]].
- [13] 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]].
- [14] H. Nishino and S. Rajpoot, "Implication of Compensator Field and Local Scale Invariance in the Standard Model," Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009), 125025 [arXiv:0906.4778 [hep-th]].
- [15] 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]].
- [16] I. Quiros, "On the physical consequences of a Weyl invariant theory of gravity," [arXiv:1401.2643 [gr-qc]].
- [17] I. Quiros, "Scale invariance: fake appearances," [arXiv:1405.6668 [gr-qc]].
- [18] J. W. Moffat, "Scalar-tensor-vector gravity theory," JCAP **0603** (2006) 004 [gr-qc/0506021].

- [19] W. Drechsler and H. Tann, “Broken Weyl invariance and the origin of mass,” *Found. Phys.* **29** (1999) 1023 [gr-qc/9802044].
- [20] E. I. Guendelman, H. Nishino and S. Rajpoot, “Local scale-invariance breaking in the standard model by two-measure theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.5, 055022
- [21] D. M. Ghilencea and H. M. Lee, “Weyl gauge symmetry and its spontaneous breaking in the Standard Model and inflation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) no.11, 115007 [arXiv:1809.09174 [hep-th]].
- [22] P. Jain, S. Mitra and N. K. Singh, “Cosmological Implications of a Scale Invariant Standard Model,” *JCAP* **03** (2008), 011 [arXiv:0801.2041 [astro-ph]].
- [23] P. K. Aluri, P. Jain and N. K. Singh, “Dark Energy and Dark Matter in General Relativity with local scale invariance,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **24** (2009), 1583-1595 [arXiv:0810.4421 [hep-ph]].
- [24] P. Jain and S. Mitra, “One Loop Calculation of Cosmological Constant in a Scale Invariant Theory,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **24** (2009), 2069-2079 [arXiv:0902.2525 [hep-ph]].
- [25] P. K. Aluri, P. Jain, S. Mitra, S. Panda and N. K. Singh, “Constraints on the Cosmological Constant due to Scale Invariance,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **25** (2010), 1349-1364 [arXiv:0909.1070 [hep-ph]].
- [26] N. K. Singh, P. Jain, S. Mitra and S. Panda, “Quantum Treatment of the Weyl Vector Meson,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011), 105037 [arXiv:1106.1956 [hep-ph]].
- [27] D. M. Ghilencea, “Spontaneous breaking of Weyl quadratic gravity to Einstein action and Higgs potential,” *JHEP* **1903** (2019) 049 [arXiv:1812.08613 [hep-th]]. 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]].
- [28] D. M. Ghilencea, “Weyl R^2 inflation with an emergent Planck scale,” *JHEP* **1910** (2019) 209 [arXiv:1906.11572 [gr-qc]].
- [29] D. M. Ghilencea, “Gauging scale symmetry and inflation: Weyl versus Palatini gravity,” [arXiv:2007.14733 [hep-th]].
- [30] D. M. Ghilencea, “Palatini quadratic gravity: spontaneous breaking of gauged scale symmetry and inflation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** no.12, 1147 [arXiv:2003.08516 [hep-th]].
- [31] L. Alvarez-Gaume, A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, “Aspects of Quadratic Gravity,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **64** (2016) no.2-3, 176-189 [arXiv:1505.07657 [hep-th]].
- [32] E. C. G. Stueckelberg, “Interaction forces in electrodynamics and in the field theory of nuclear forces,” *Helv. Phys. Acta* **11** (1938) 299.
- [33] R. Percacci, “Gravity from a Particle Physicists’ perspective,” *PoS ISFTG* (2009) 011 [arXiv:0910.5167 [hep-th]].
- [34] R. Percacci, “The Higgs phenomenon in quantum gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **353** (1991) 271 [arXiv:0712.3545 [hep-th]].
- [35] C. g. Huang, D. d. Wu and H. q. Zheng, “COSMOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS TO WEYL’S VECTOR MESON,” *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **14** (1990), 373-378 BIHEP-TH-89-40.

- [36] For non-metricity bounds, see: 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]]. I. P. Lobo and C. Romero, “Experimental constraints on the second clock effect,” *Phys. Lett. B* **783** (2018) 306 [arXiv:1807.07188 [gr-qc]].
- [37] 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]].
- [38] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “Inertial Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking and Quantum Scale Invariance,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.11, 116012 [arXiv:1801.07676 [hep-th]].
- [39] P. G. Ferreira, C. T. Hill and G. G. Ross, “No fifth force in a scale invariant universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) no.6, 064038 [arXiv:1612.03157 [gr-qc]].
- [40] K. S. Babu, C. F. Kolda and J. March-Russell, “Implications of generalized Z - Z-prime mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998), 6788-6792 [arXiv:hep-ph/9710441 [hep-ph]].
- [41] D. M. Ghilencea, L. E. Ibanez, N. Irges and F. Quevedo, “TeV scale Z-prime bosons from D-branes,” *JHEP* **08** (2002), 016 [arXiv:hep-ph/0205083 [hep-ph]]. D. M. Ghilencea, “U(1) masses in intersecting D-brane SM - like models,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **648** (2003), 215-230 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208205 [hep-ph]].
- [42] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity,” *JHEP* **06** (2014), 080 [arXiv:1403.4226 [hep-ph]].
- [43] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity up to infinite energy,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) no.2, 124 [arXiv:1705.03896 [hep-th]].
- [44] C. Biggio, M. Bordone, L. Di Luzio and G. Ridolfi, “Massive vectors and loop observables: the $g - 2$ case,” *JHEP* **10** (2016), 002 [arXiv:1607.07621 [hep-ph]].
- [45] H. Davoudiasl, H. S. Lee and W. J. Marciano, “Muon $g-2$, rare kaon decays, and parity violation from dark bosons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) no.9, 095006 [arXiv:1402.3620 [hep-ph]].
- [46] B. Abi *et al.* [Muon $g-2$], “Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.46 ppm,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021) no.14, 141801 [arXiv:2104.03281 [hep-ex]].
- [47] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, J. N. Guenther, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, L. Lellouch, T. Lippert, K. Miura, L. Parato and K. K. Szabo, *et al.* “Leading hadronic contribution to the muon magnetic moment from lattice QCD,” *Nature* 593 (2021) no.7857, 51-55 [arXiv:2002.12347 [hep-lat]].
- [48] Y. Tang and Y. L. Wu, “Weyl Symmetry Inspired Inflation and Dark Matter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **803** (2020), 135320 [arXiv:1904.04493 [hep-ph]].
- [49] K. S. Cheng, T. Harko and X. Y. Wang, “Radiation transport equations in non-Riemannian space-times,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005), 103001 [arXiv:gr-qc/0505014 [gr-qc]].
- [50] Y. Minami and E. Komatsu, “New Extraction of the Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck 2018 Polarization Data,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020) no.22, 221301 [arXiv:2011.11254 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] 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]].
- [52] 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].

- [53] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation,” arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* [CMB-S4 Collaboration], “CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition,” arXiv:1610.02743 [astro-ph.CO]. <https://cmb-s4.org/>
- [55] 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]].
- [56] 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]].
- [57] T. Matsumura *et al.*, “Mission design of LiteBIRD,” J. Low Temp. Phys. **176** (2014), 733 [arXiv:1311.2847 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [58] S. Hanany *et al.* [NASA PICO], “PICO: Probe of Inflation and Cosmic Origins,” [arXiv:1902.10541 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [59] A. Kogut, D. Fixsen, D. Chuss, J. Dotson, E. Dwek, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw, S. Meyer, S. Moseley, M. Seiffert, D. Spergel and E. Wollack, “The Primordial Inflation Explorer (PIXIE): A Nulling Polarimeter for Cosmic Microwave Background Observations,” JCAP **07** (2011), 025 [arXiv:1105.2044 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] D. M. Ghilencea, “Two-loop corrections to Starobinsky-Higgs inflation,” Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.10, 103524 [arXiv:1807.06900 [hep-ph]].
- [61] J. v. Narlikar and A. k. Kembhavi, “Space-Time Singularities and Conformal Gravity,” Lett. Nuovo Cim. **19** (1977), 517-520
- [62] C. Bambi, L. Modesto and L. Rachwał, “Spacetime completeness of non-singular black holes in conformal gravity,” JCAP **05** (2017), 003 [arXiv:1611.00865 [gr-qc]].
- [63] L. Modesto and L. Rachwał, “Finite Conformal Quantum Gravity and Nonsingular Spacetimes,” [arXiv:1605.04173 [hep-th]].
- [64] J. Ehlers, F. A. E. Pirani and A. Schild, “The geometry of free fall and light propagation”, in: General Relativity, papers in honour of J. L. Synge. Edited by L. O’Raifeartaigh. Oxford, Clarendon Press 1972, pp. 63–84. Republication in Gen. Relativ. Gravit. (2012) 44:1587–1609.
- [65] R. Percacci and E. Sezgin, “New class of ghost- and tachyon-free metric affine gravities,” Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.8, 084040 [arXiv:1912.01023 [hep-th]].
- [66] I. Bars, P. Steinhardt and N. Turok, “Local Conformal Symmetry in Physics and Cosmology,” Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) no.4, 043515 [arXiv:1307.1848 [hep-th]].
- [67] I. Bars, S. H. Chen, P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, “Complete Set of Homogeneous Isotropic Analytic Solutions in Scalar-Tensor Cosmology with Radiation and Curvature,” Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012), 083542 [arXiv:1207.1940 [hep-th]].
- [68] I. Bars, S. H. Chen, P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, “Antigravity and the Big Crunch/Big Bang Transition,” Phys. Lett. B **715** (2012), 278-281 [arXiv:1112.2470 [hep-th]].
- [69] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, “Universality Class in Conformal Inflation,” JCAP **07** (2013), 002 [arXiv:1306.5220 [hep-th]].

- [70] G. 't Hooft, “Local conformal symmetry: The missing symmetry component for space and time,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24** (2015) no.12, 1543001. “Local conformal symmetry in black holes, standard model, and quantum gravity,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26** (2016) no.03, 1730006.
- [71] G. 't Hooft, “A class of elementary particle models without any adjustable real parameters,” *Found. Phys.* **41** (2011), 1829-1856 [arXiv:1104.4543 [gr-qc]].
- [72] 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]].
- [73] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, “New Setting for Spontaneous Gauge Symmetry Breaking?,” *Fundam. Theor. Phys.* **183** (2016) 159 [arXiv:1511.00994 [hep-th]].
- [74] 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.
- [75] K. A. Meissner and H. Nicolai, “Conformal Symmetry and the Standard Model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **648** (2007), 312-317 [arXiv:hep-th/0612165 [hep-th]].
- [76] P. D. Mannheim, “Making the Case for Conformal Gravity,” *Found. Phys.* **42** (2012), 388-420 [arXiv:1101.2186 [hep-th]].
- [77] F. F. Faria, “Massive conformal gravity,” *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2014** (2014), 520259 [arXiv:1312.5553 [gr-qc]].
- [78] F. F. Faria, “Quantum massive conformal gravity,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.4, 188 [arXiv:1503.04355 [gr-qc]].
- [79] M. Kaku, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Gauge Theory of the Conformal and Superconformal Group,” *Phys. Lett. B* **69** (1977), 304-308
- [80] F. Englert, C. Truffin and R. Gastmans, “Conformal Invariance in Quantum Gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **117** (1976), 407-432
- [81] M. Shaposhnikov and D. Zenhausern, “Quantum scale invariance, cosmological constant and hierarchy problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **671** (2009), 162-166 [arXiv:0809.3406 [hep-th]].
- [82] R. Armillis, A. Monin and M. Shaposhnikov, “Spontaneously Broken Conformal Symmetry: Dealing with the Trace Anomaly,” *JHEP* **10** (2013), 030 [arXiv:1302.5619 [hep-th]].
- [83] D. M. Ghilencea, “Manifestly scale-invariant regularization and quantum effective operators,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.10, 105006 [arXiv:1508.00595 [hep-ph]]. “Quantum implications of a scale invariant regularization,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.7, 075015 [arXiv:1712.06024 [hep-th]].
- [84] 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]]. “Two-loop scale-invariant scalar potential and quantum effective operators,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.12, 656 [arXiv:1608.05336].
- [85] K. S. Stelle, “Renormalization of Higher Derivative Quantum Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16** (1977), 953-969