

Parameterized post-Newtonian limit of the Nieh-Yan modified teleparallel gravity

Haomin Rao

Interdisciplinary Center for Theoretical Study, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China and Peng Huanwu Center for Fundamental Theory, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

The recently proposed Nieh-Yan modified teleparallel gravity is a parity violating gravity model which modifies the general relativity equivalent teleparallel gravity by a Nieh-Yan term. This model is healthy and simple in form. In this paper, we consider the application of this model to the solar system and investigate its slow-motion and weak-field approximation in terms of the parameterized post-Newtonian formalism. We find that all the post-Newtonian parameters of the model are the same as those of general relativity, which makes the model compatible with the solar system experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Parity violating (PV) gravities attracted a lot of interests in recent years. A famous and frequently studied PV gravity is the so-called Chern-Simons (CS) modified gravity [1, 2], in which general relativity (GR) is modified by a gravitational CS term: $S_{CS} \sim \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \theta(x) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\alpha\beta} R_{\rho\sigma\alpha\beta}$, where $\theta(x)$ is a coupled scalar field, $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the Levi-Civita tensor and $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the Riemann tensor constructed from the metric. The CS modified gravity makes a difference between the amplitudes of the left- and right-handed polarized components of gravitational waves (GWs), but no difference between their velocities. This is the so-called amplitude birefringence phenomenon. However, the CS gravity suffers from the problem of ghost instability [3] which is essentially originated from the higher derivatives in CS term. To circumvent this problem, further extensions to the CS gravity were explored in Ref. [4–6]. But all such kind of models have much more complex forms.

Recently, a new PV gravity model was proposed in [7, 8]. This model is healthy and simple in form. It is based on the theory of teleparallel gravity (TG) [9, 10], which is equivalent to GR but formulated in flat spacetime with vanishing curvature and vanishing non-metricity. The gravity in TG theory is identical to the spacetime torsion. The PV model [7, 8] modified the TG theory by an extra PV term: $S_{NY} \sim \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \theta(x) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu} \mathcal{T}^A{}_{\rho\sigma}$, here $\mathcal{T}^A{}_{\mu\nu}$ is the torsion two form. Except the coupling with a scalar field, this PV term is in fact the reduced Nieh-Yan term [11] within the framework of teleparallelism. So we call this model the Nieh-Yan modified Teleparallel Gravity (NYTG) model. Different from the CS modified gravity, the Nieh-Yan term in this model hides no higher derivatives and successfully avoids the ghost mode. Also in Ref. [7, 8], the NYTG model has been applied to cosmology. The model makes a difference between the propagating velocities of the left- and right-handed polarized components of GWs, but no difference between their amplitudes. This is the so-called velocity birefringence phenomenon.

As a new modified gravity model, it is worth exploring more properties of the NYTG model. In this paper, in order to find out whether the NYTG model is compatible with the solar system experiments, we will explore its slow-motion and weak-field approximation.

The parameterized post-Newtonian (PPN) formalism [12–14] is a natural framework to test the slow-motion and weak-field limit of a gravity theory. This is a formalism that has achieved great success in testing various modified gravity theories or models. In the PPN formalism, the metric of the modified gravity can be solved in the slow-motion and weak-field limit. The result is that the metric can be expressed as an expansion around the Minkowski metric in terms of gravitational potentials. These potentials are called PPN potentials, and are constructed from matter variables in the imitation of the Newtonian gravitational potential. The coefficients in front of these potentials are called PPN parameters, which depend on the gravity theory under study. It means that, in the slow-motion and weak-field limit, the metric predicted by most theories of gravity has the same structure. The only way that one theory differs from another is the values of PPN parameters. Different gravity theories may give different PPN parameters.

Once the PPN parameters are obtained, one can compute the effects of the gravity theory, such as the light deflection and the perihelion shift of Mercury. Then encounter the theoretical PPN parameters with the experimental results, one can constrain or even exclude some modified gravities [15–17].

In this paper, we will apply the NYTG model to the solar system and calculate its PPN parameters. Through the PPN parameters, we can figure out whether the NYTG model has a suitable post-Newtonian approximation to pass the local tests in the solar system. Sometimes the PPN parameters constrained by the experiments in turn constrain the parameter of the model, just like the case of Brans-Dicke theory [15, 16], or we need new PPN parameters and new PPN potentials to describe the post-Newtonian approximation of the model, such as the case of the CS modified gravity [18]. Just like the CS gravity, the NYTG model is also divided into dynamical and non-dynamical. Since the non-dynamical NYTG model is unsatisfactory in cosmology and PPN expansion, we argue that the dynamical NYTG model is a more natural and realistic model. Therefore, we should adopt the results of the dynamical NYTG model. Under appropriate assumptions, we will show the surprising result that all the PPN parameters of the dynamical NYTG model are the same as GR. In the post-Newtonian order, the PV effect does not contribute to the PPN parameters of the dynamical NYTG model. Therefore, we do not need to introduce new PPN parameters and new PPN potentials, and the current PPN parameters put no constraint on the dynamical NYTG model.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we briefly introduce the NYTG model proposed in [7, 8]. In section III, we briefly introduce the required knowledge of PPN formalism. In section IV, we expand the field equations to sufficient orders and solve the perturbations to obtain all PPN parameters of the dynamical NYTG model. In section V, we explore the PPN expansion of the non-dynamical NYTG model. The conclusion is presented in section VI.

II. THE HEALTHY PARTY VIOLATING GRAVITY MODEL BASED ON TG THEORY

In this paper, we adopt the unit “ $8\pi G = 1$ ” and “the speed of light $c = 1$ ”, and use the signature $(+, -, -, -)$ for the metric. The local space tensor indices are denoted by $A, B, C, \dots = 0, 1, 2, 3$. They are lowered and raised by the Minkowski metric η_{AB} and its inverse η^{AB} . The spacetime tensor indices are denoted by Greek $\mu, \nu, \rho, \dots = 0, 1, 2, 3$, and lowered and raised by the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and its inverse $g^{\mu\nu}$. The indices of its spatial components are denoted by Latin $i, j, k, \dots = 1, 2, 3$. The building blocks of the TG theory are the tetrad e^A_μ , which relates to the metric as $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{AB} e^A_\mu e^B_\nu$, and the spin connection $\omega^A_{B\mu}$. Furthermore, we need to distinguish the original affine connection $\hat{\Gamma}^\rho_{\mu\nu}$ and its associated covariant derivative $\hat{\nabla}$ from the Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu}$ (constructed from the metric) and its associated covariant derivative ∇ respectively. The Levi-Civita tensor $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = (1/\sqrt{-g})\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is related with an antisymmetric symbol $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ which satisfies $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$. And ϵ_{ijk} is an antisymmetric symbol which satisfies $\epsilon_{123} = 1$.

The TG theory is formulated in a flat spacetime and compatible with the metric, so both the curvature two form and the non-metricity one form vanish, i.e., $(\hat{R}^A_B)_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2(\partial_{[\mu}\omega^A_{|B|\nu]} + \omega^A_C{}_{[\mu}\omega^C_{|\nu]}) = 0$ and $(Q_{AB})_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu\eta_{AB} - 2\omega_{(AB)\mu} = 0$, where the square brackets represent the anti-symmetrization and the round brackets represent the symmetrization. These teleparallel constraints dictate that the spin connection should have the following properties,

$$\omega^A_{B\mu} = (\Lambda^{-1})^A_C \partial_\mu \Lambda^C_B, \quad (1)$$

where Λ^A_B represents the element of Lorentz transformation matrix which is position dependent and satisfies the relation $\eta_{AB}\Lambda^A_C\Lambda^B_D = \eta_{CD}$ at any spacetime point. In TG theory, the gravity is attributed to the spacetime torsion instead of the curvature. The torsion two form generally depends on both the tetrad and the spin connection,

$$\mathcal{T}^A_{\mu\nu} = 2(\partial_{[\mu}e^A_{\nu]} + \omega^A_{B[\mu}e^B_{\nu]}) . \quad (2)$$

With these building blocks, the action of TG theory is written as

$$S_g = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \|e\| \mathbb{T} \equiv \int d^4x \|e\| \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{T}_\mu \mathcal{T}^\mu + \frac{1}{8} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha\beta\mu} \mathcal{T}^{\alpha\beta\mu} + \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha\beta\mu} \mathcal{T}^{\beta\alpha\mu} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\|e\| = \sqrt{-g}$ is the determinant of the tetrad, $\mathcal{T}^\rho_{\mu\nu} = e^\rho_A \mathcal{T}^A_{\mu\nu}$ is torsion tensor, \mathbb{T} is the torsion scalar, and $\mathcal{T}_\mu = \mathcal{T}^\nu_{\mu\nu}$ is the torsion vector. This action is invariant under diffeomorphism and local Lorentz transformation.

Furthermore, it is identical to the Einstein-Hilbert action up to a surface term. Therefore, we say that the TG theory is equivalent to GR at the level of equations of motion.

In Ref. [7, 8], we proposed the NYTG model which modifies TG theory by introducing into the TG action a Nieh-Yan term,

$$S_{NY} = \frac{c}{4} \int d^4x \parallel e \parallel \theta \mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu}, \quad (4)$$

where c is the PV coupling constant, θ is a coupled scalar field, and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} = (1/2)\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\mathcal{T}^A_{\rho\sigma}$ is the dual of the torsion two form. Let us briefly explain why we consider the Nieh-Yan term (4). Firstly, Maxwell's electromagnetic theory can be regarded as a gauge theory of U(1) group. The corresponding gauge field strength is electromagnetic tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$. A widely studied electromagnetic PV term [19] is the CS term of U(1) group $S_{PV} \sim \int \theta F \wedge F$. Secondly, GR can be regarded as a gauge theory of Lorentz group [20]. The corresponding gauge field strength is curvature two form $(R^A_B)_{\mu\nu}$. The CS gravity [1, 2] is a widely studied PV gravity which modifies GR by adding the CS term of Lorentz group $S_{PV} \sim \int \theta R^A_B \wedge R^B_A$. Finally, the TG theory can be regarded as a gauge theory of translation group [9, 21]. The corresponding gauge field strength is the torsion two form $\mathcal{T}^A_{\mu\nu}$. Therefore, if one wants to consider the PV effect of gravity in the teleparallel framework, it is natural to consider the CS term of the translation group $S_{PV} \sim \int \theta \mathcal{T}^A \wedge \mathcal{T}_A$. And this is the Nieh-Yan term (4). Some people extend the notion of the Nieh-Yan term to a more general geometric framework [22].

Just like the CS gravity, the NYTG model is also divided into dynamical and non-dynamical. In the non-dynamical NYTG model, the scalar field θ is an externally prescribed background field. The action of non-dynamical NYTG model is

$$S[e, \Lambda] = \int d^4x \parallel e \parallel \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{T} + \frac{c}{4} \theta \mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} \right) + S_m, \quad (5)$$

where S_m is the action of matter which coupled minimally through the metric. We treat the tetrad e^A_μ and the Lorentz matrix element Λ^A_B , which expressed the spin connection in Eq. (1), as the basic independent variables. The equations of motion follow from the variation of the action (5) with respect to e^A_μ and Λ^A_B separately:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + N_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (6)$$

$$N_{[\mu\nu]} = 0, \quad (7)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, $T_{\mu\nu} = (2/\sqrt{-g})(\delta S_m/\delta g^{\mu\nu})$ is the energy-momentum tensors for the matter, and $N^{\mu\nu} = c e^A_\nu \partial_\rho \theta \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\rho}$. We can see that the Eq. (6) already contains the Eq. (7). So below we only need to consider the equation (6). In order to facilitate the calculation of PPN parameters, we rewrite the Eq. (6) as

$$R_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} - N_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}(T - N)g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (8)$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}$ is Ricci tensor associated with Levi-Civita connection, $T = g^{\mu\nu}T_{\mu\nu}$, and $N = g^{\mu\nu}N_{\mu\nu}$. In the non-dynamical NYTG model, there is no equation of motion for the scalar field θ . The scalar field θ is an externally prescribed background field. So the non-dynamical NYTG model is not diffeomorphism invariant. Without the dynamics of the scalar field θ , the Bianchi identities $\nabla_\mu G^{\mu\nu} = 0$ and conservation of energy momentum tensor $\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ will impose an additional constraint

$$\mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (9)$$

It will make the model do not have a real closed FRW solution when the metric and connections are required to be homogeneous and isotropic [8]. It seems that the non-dynamical NYTG model is unsatisfactory in cosmology.

Therefore, we prefer to consider the dynamical NYTG model. In the dynamical NYTG model, we also take into account the kinetic and potential terms of the scalar field θ . The full action of the dynamical NYTG model is

$$S[e, \Lambda, \theta] = \int d^4x \parallel e \parallel \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{T} + \frac{c}{4} \theta \mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\mu \theta \nabla^\mu \theta - V(\theta) \right] + S_m. \quad (10)$$

One can see that only the first order derivatives of the fundamental variables appeared in the action, it is expected that this model is free from the ghost instability caused by higher order derivatives. The quadratic action in the cosmological perturbation theory has confirmed this result [7, 8]. The equations of motion follow from the variation of the action (10) with respect to e^A_μ and Λ^A_B separately:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + N_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu}^\theta, \quad (11)$$

$$N_{[\mu\nu]} = 0, \quad (12)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}^\theta = \nabla_\mu\theta\nabla_\nu\theta - g_{\mu\nu}[\nabla_\sigma\theta\nabla^\sigma\theta/2 - V(\theta)]$ is the energy-momentum tensors for the scalar field θ . We can see that the Eq. (11) already contains the Eq. (12). So below we only need to consider the equation (11). In order to facilitate the calculation of PPN parameters, we rewrite the Eq. (11) as

$$R_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu}^\theta - N_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}(T + T^\theta - N)g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (13)$$

where $T^\theta = g^{\mu\nu}T_{\mu\nu}^\theta$. There is another equation following from the variation of the action (10) with respect to θ ,

$$\square\theta + V'(\theta) - \frac{c}{4}\mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (14)$$

where $\square = g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu$ and prime represents the derivative with respect to θ . All these equations of motion are consistent with the Bianchi identity $\nabla_\mu G^{\mu\nu} = 0$ and the covariant conservation law $\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$.

The dynamical NYTG model has two kinds of gauge symmetries: the diffeomorphism invariance and the local Lorentz invariance, the latter transformation makes the following change:

$$e^A_\mu \rightarrow (L^{-1})^A_B e^B_\mu, \quad \Lambda^A_B \rightarrow \Lambda^A_C L^C_B, \quad (15)$$

where $L^A_B(x)$ is also the element of Lorentz matrix. We would like to use different notations to distinguish two kinds of Lorentz matrices, $\Lambda^A_B(x)$ is used to express the spin connection as in Eq. (1), but $L^A_B(x)$ represents the local transformation which makes a shift from one local frame to another. It's easy to prove that the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and torsion tensor $\mathcal{T}^\rho_{\mu\nu}$ are invariant under the local Lorentz transformation (15), so is the action (10). Due to the local Lorentz invariance, we can always choose the gauge $\Lambda^A_B = \delta^A_B$, i.e., $\omega^A_{B\mu} = 0$. This is the Weitzenböck connection which was frequently adopted in the literature. This gauge is also called the Weitzenböck gauge.

It should be emphasized that once the Weitzenböck gauge $\omega^A_{B\mu} = 0$ is adopted, our model will no longer be local Lorentz invariant. This is different from the original TG theory. In the original TG theory, even if the Weitzenböck gauge is adopted, the theory still has local Lorentz symmetry: $e^A_\mu \rightarrow L^A_B e^B_\mu$. The local Lorentz transformation just change one flat spacetime connection to another flat spacetime connection. In general, the modified TG theory no longer has the local Lorentz symmetry when fixed to the Weitzenböck gauge.

III. THE PARAMETERIZED POST-NEWTONIAN FORMALISM

The main tool we use in this paper is the parameterized post-Newtonian formalism [12–14, 23–26], which we will briefly review in this section. We assume that the matter is contributed by a perfect fluid, whose velocity $v \equiv |\vec{v}|$ in a fixed frame of reference is small. All physical quantities relevant for the gravitational field equations can be expanded in velocity orders of $\mathcal{O}(n) \sim v^n$. Then, the equations of motion can be subsequently solved order by order. We also assume that the gravitational field is quasi-static, so that changes are only induced by the motion of source matter. Therefore, the time derivative $\partial_0 \sim v^i\partial_i$ is weighted with an additional velocity order $\mathcal{O}(1)$. In this paper, we ignore the evolution of the universe and think that the background spacetime is the Minkowski spacetime.

For the gravitational sector, we choose to work in the Weitzenböck gauge $\omega^A_{B\mu} = 0$. So we only need to expand the tetrad. We expand the tetrad around a flat diagonal background tetrad,

$$e^A_\mu = \delta^A_\mu + B^A_\mu = \delta^A_\mu + {}^{(1)}B^A_\mu + {}^{(2)}B^A_\mu + {}^{(3)}B^A_\mu + {}^{(4)}B^A_\mu + \mathcal{O}(5). \quad (16)$$

Here we use superscript “(n)” to denote velocity order, i.e., each term $^{(n)}B_\mu^\alpha$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Note that velocity orders beyond the fourth velocity order are not considered in the PPN formalism. Using the relation $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{AB} e_\mu^A e_\nu^B$, the tetrad decomposition (16) gives the usual metric as an expansion around the Minkowski background,

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + {}^{(1)}h_{\mu\nu} + {}^{(2)}h_{\mu\nu} + {}^{(3)}h_{\mu\nu} + {}^{(4)}h_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(5) . \quad (17)$$

A detailed analysis shows that not all components of metric perturbations need to be expanded to fourth velocity order. Some components vanish due to time reversal symmetry [12–14]. The only non-vanishing components of metric perturbations we need to determine are

$${}^{(2)}h_{00} , {}^{(2)}h_{ij} , {}^{(3)}h_{0i} , {}^{(4)}h_{00} . \quad (18)$$

For the tetrad perturbations, it is more convenient to define $B_{\mu\nu} \equiv \delta_\mu^A \eta_{AC} B_\nu^C$. As a result, the non-vanishing components of tetrad perturbations we need to determine are

$${}^{(2)}B_{00} , {}^{(2)}B_{ij} , {}^{(3)}B_{0i} , {}^{(3)}B_{i0} , {}^{(4)}B_{ij} . \quad (19)$$

We also give the relations between the metric perturbations and the tetrad perturbations,

$${}^{(2)}h_{00} = 2 {}^{(2)}B_{00} , {}^{(2)}h_{ij} = 2 {}^{(2)}B_{(ij)} , {}^{(3)}h_{0i} = 2 {}^{(3)}B_{(0i)} , {}^{(4)}h_{00} = 2 {}^{(4)}B_{00} + \left({}^{(2)}B_{00} \right)^2 . \quad (20)$$

Due to the diffeomorphism invariance of the dynamical NYTG model, we can always choose the gauge such that

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij,j} + B_{ji,j} - B_{,i} &= \mathcal{O}(4) , \\ B_{0i,i} + B_{i0,i} - B_{ii,0} &= \mathcal{O}(5) , \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $B = -\eta^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}$ and subscript “, μ ” represents the derivative with respect to x^μ . The gauge conditions (21) expressed by the metric components are

$$\begin{aligned} h_{ij,j} - \frac{1}{2} h_{,i} &= \mathcal{O}(4) , \\ h_{0i,i} - \frac{1}{2} h_{ii,0} &= \mathcal{O}(5) , \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $h = -\eta^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu}$. This is the usual PPN gauge conditions [12].

For the matter sector, the energy-momentum tensor of a perfect fluid takes the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + \rho\Pi + p)u_\mu u_\nu - pg_{\mu\nu} , \quad (23)$$

where ρ is rest energy density, Π is specific internal energy, p is pressure and u^μ is four-velocity. The velocity of source matter is given by $v^i = u^i/u^0$. From the normalization of the four-velocity $g_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = 1$, we can find

$$u^0 = 1 - B_{00} + \frac{1}{2}v^2 + \mathcal{O}(4) . \quad (24)$$

Based on their orders of magnitude in solar system [12–14], we assign the velocity orders $\rho \sim \Pi \sim \mathcal{O}(2)$ and $p \sim \mathcal{O}(4)$. Then the energy-momentum tensor (23) can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{00} &= \rho (1 + \Pi + v^2 + 2B_{00}) + \mathcal{O}(6) , \\ T_{0i} &= -\rho v^i + \mathcal{O}(5) , \\ T_{ij} &= \rho v^i v^j + p\delta_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(6) . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

For the dynamical scalar field θ , we can expand it around its homogeneous background θ_0 ,

$$\theta = \theta_0 + \vartheta = \theta_0 + {}^{(1)}\vartheta + {}^{(2)}\vartheta + {}^{(3)}\vartheta + {}^{(4)}\vartheta + \mathcal{O}(5) , \quad (26)$$

where we assume θ_0 to be of order $\mathcal{O}(0)$ and the perturbation ${}^{(n)}\vartheta$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(n)$ as usual. We also expand the potential $V(\theta)$ as

$$V(\theta) = \mathcal{V}_0 + \mathcal{V}_1\vartheta + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_2\vartheta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\vartheta^3), \quad (27)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_0 = V(\theta_0)$, $\mathcal{V}_1 = V'(\theta_0)$ and $\mathcal{V}_2 = V''(\theta_0)$. We assume all these expansion coefficient to be of order $\mathcal{O}(0)$. Note that at the zeroth velocity order, the Eq. (13) gives $\mathcal{V}_0 = 0$ and the Eq. (14) gives $\mathcal{V}_1 = 0$. Since the PV coupling constant has an impact on cosmological perturbation [7, 8], the value of the PV coupling constant c cannot be too large. Therefore, we also assume the PV coupling constant c to be of order $\mathcal{O}(0)$.

In the standard PPN formulation, after solving the equations of motion and taking the standard PPN gauge, the metric can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{00} &= 1 - 2U + 2\beta U^2 + 2\xi\Phi_W - (2\gamma + 2 + \alpha_3 + \zeta_1 - 2\xi)\Phi_1 - 2(3\gamma + 1 - 2\beta + \zeta_2 + \xi)\Phi_2 \\ &\quad - 2(1 + \zeta_3)\Phi_3 - 2(3\gamma + 3\zeta_4 - 2\xi)\Phi_4 - (2\xi - \zeta_1)\mathcal{A}, \\ g_{0i} &= \frac{1}{2}(4\gamma + 3 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \zeta_1 - 2\xi)V_i + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha_2 - \zeta_1 + 2\xi)W_i, \\ g_{ij} &= -(1 + 2\gamma U)\delta_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $\gamma, \beta, \xi, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4$ are PPN parameters which depend on specific gravity theory. And the PPN potentials $U, \Phi_W, \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3, \Phi_4, \mathcal{A}, V_i, W_i$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \quad \Phi_1 = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'v'^2}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'U'}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \quad \Phi_4 = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{p'}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \\ \mathcal{A} &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'[\vec{v}' \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{x}')]^2}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|^3}, \quad V_i = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'v'_i}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \quad W_i = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'[\vec{v}' \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{x}')] (\vec{x} - \vec{x}')_i}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|^3}, \\ \Phi_3 &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{\rho'\Pi'}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|}, \quad \Phi_W = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3x' \int d^3x'' \rho' \rho'' \frac{(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|^3} \cdot \left(\frac{\vec{x}' - \vec{x}''}{|\vec{x}' - \vec{x}''|} - \frac{\vec{x} - \vec{x}''}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}''|} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $\rho' = \rho(t, \vec{x}')$, $v' = v(t, \vec{x}')$ and so on. Once the PPN parameters are obtained, one can judge whether a theory is compatible with most solar system experiments by comparing the theoretical and experimental values of the PPN parameters. Sometimes it will constrain or even exclude some modified theories of gravity. The current limits on PPN parameters are shown in Table I [13].

TABLE I: Current limits on the PPN parameters

Parameter	Effect	Limit	Remarks
$\gamma - 1$	time delay	2.3×10^{-5}	Cassini tracking
	light deflection	2×10^{-4}	VLBI
$\beta - 1$	perihelion shift	8×10^{-5}	$J_{2\odot} = (2.2 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-7}$
	Nordtvedt effect	2.3×10^{-4}	$\eta_N = 4\beta - \gamma - 3$ assumed
ξ	spin precession	4×10^{-9}	millisecond pulsars
α_1	orbital polarization	10^{-4}	Lunar laser ranging
		7×10^{-5}	PSR J1738+0333
α_2	spin precession	2×10^{-9}	millisecond pulsars
α_3	pulsar acceleration	4×10^{-20}	pulsar \dot{P} statistics
ζ_1		2×10^{-2}	combined PPN bounds
ζ_2	binary acceleration	4×10^{-5}	\ddot{P}_p for PSR 1913 + 16
ζ_3	Newton's 3rd law	10^{-8}	lunar acceleration
ζ_4		—	$6\zeta_4 = 3\alpha_3 + 2\zeta_1 - 2\zeta_3$

Actually, a more general form of PPN metric can be obtained by performing a post-Galilean transformation on Eq. (28), but such a procedure shall not be necessary in this paper. Note that additional parameters or potentials may be needed to deal with some theories, such as CS gravity theory [18].

IV. PPN PARAMETERS OF THE DYNAMICAL NYTG MODEL

In this section, we will solve the perturbed equations to obtain all the PPN parameters of the dynamical NYTG model. Note that we don't really need to find all the components of tetrad. In order to obtain the PPN parameters, we only need to find all the tetrad components that contribute to the metric.

First, let's solve the scalar field θ . Only maintain the lowest order term,

$$\mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu} = 4\epsilon_{ijk}(B_{00,i}B_{0j,k} + B_{li,0}B_{lj,k} - B_{l0,i}B_{lj,k}) . \quad (30)$$

It can be seen that the $\mathcal{T}_{A\mu\nu}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{A\mu\nu}$ is at least $\mathcal{O}(5)$. So at the first velocity order, Eq. (14) gives

$${}^{(1)}\vartheta_{,ii} - \mathcal{V}_2 {}^{(1)}\vartheta = 0 , \quad (31)$$

Note that the perturbation caused by the matter should vanish at a distant far away from the source, i.e. $\vartheta \rightarrow 0$ for $|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'| \rightarrow \infty$. So the solution of Eq. (31) is ${}^{(1)}\vartheta = 0$. At the second velocity order, using the result ${}^{(1)}\vartheta = 0$, Eq. (14) gives

$${}^{(2)}\vartheta_{,ii} - \mathcal{V}_2 {}^{(2)}\vartheta = 0 , \quad (32)$$

The same analysis as before can get that the solution of Eq. (32) is ${}^{(2)}\vartheta = 0$. And so on, we can also get ${}^{(3)}\vartheta = 0$ and ${}^{(4)}\vartheta = 0$. It means that ϑ is at least $\mathcal{O}(5)$. Only maintain the lowest order term,

$$T_{\mu\nu}^\theta = \vartheta_{,\mu}\vartheta_{,\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu}(\vartheta_{,i}\vartheta_{,i} + \mathcal{V}_2\vartheta^2) , \quad (33)$$

$$N^{\mu\nu} = c\vartheta_{,\alpha}\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\rho\sigma}B_{\rho,\sigma}^\nu . \quad (34)$$

It can be seen that the $T_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ is at least $\mathcal{O}(10)$ and $N_{\mu\nu}$ is at least $\mathcal{O}(7)$. So it can be expected that $T_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ and $N_{\mu\nu}$ will not contribute to the PPN parameters.

The following work is to solve the components of the metric through Eq. (13). At the second velocity order, taking the gauge conditions (21), the Eq. (13) gives

$${}^{(2)}B_{00,ii} = \frac{1}{2}\rho , \quad (35)$$

$${}^{(2)}B_{(ij),kk} = \frac{1}{2}\rho\delta_{ij} . \quad (36)$$

The solutions of these equations are

$${}^{(2)}B_{00} = -U , \quad (37)$$

$${}^{(2)}B_{(ij)} = -U\delta_{ij} . \quad (38)$$

We can further obtain ${}^{(2)}h_{00,ii} = \rho$, which is the Poisson equation in Newtonian gravity. It can be seen that we get the correct Newtonian limit at the second velocity order. At the third velocity order, taking the gauge conditions (21), the Eq. (13) gives

$${}^{(3)}B_{(0i),jj} = -\frac{1}{2}{}^{(2)}B_{00,0i} - \rho v_i . \quad (39)$$

The solution of this equation is

$${}^{(3)}B_{(0i)} = \frac{7}{4}V_i + \frac{1}{4}W_i . \quad (40)$$

At the fourth velocity order, taking the gauge conditions (21), the Eq. (13) gives

$${}^{(4)}B_{00,ii} = -\frac{1}{2}\left({}^{(2)}B_{00}\right)_{,ii}^2 + 2{}^{(2)}B_{00,i}{}^{(2)}B_{00,i} - 2{}^{(2)}B_{ij}{}^{(2)}B_{00,ij} + \rho\left({}^{(2)}B_{00} + \frac{1}{2}\rho\Pi + \rho v^2 + \frac{3}{2}p\right) . \quad (41)$$

The solution of this equation is

$${}^{(4)}B_{00} = \frac{1}{2}U^2 - 2\Phi_1 - 2\Phi_2 - \Phi_3 - 3\Phi_4 . \quad (42)$$

Finally, using the relation (20), we can get the metric components as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{00} &= 1 - 2U + 2U^2 - 4\Phi_1 - 4\Phi_2 - 2\Phi_3 - 6\Phi_4 , \\ g_{0i} &= \frac{7}{2}V_i + \frac{1}{2}W_i , \\ g_{ij} &= -(1 + 2U)\delta_{ij} . \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Since the metric (43) is already in the standard PPN gauge, the PPN parameters can be read off immediately,

$$\gamma = \beta = 1 , \quad \xi = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = \zeta_3 = \zeta_4 = 0 . \quad (44)$$

It can be seen that all the PPN parameters are the same as GR and all the PPN parameters are compatible with current experimental limits in the Table I. The PV term (4) shows no effect to the PPN parameters. This result indicates that the dynamical NYTG model is indistinguishable from GR in the solar system scale up to the post-Newtonian order. This is a result consistent with the current solar system experiments.

V. PPN EXPANSION OF THE NON-DYNAMICAL NYTG MODEL

In the previous section, we can see that the reason why the PV term (4) does not affect the PPN parameters is because the equation of motion (14) determines that $\theta_{,\mu}$ is at least $\mathcal{O}(5)$. But in the non-dynamical NYTG model, the scalar field θ is no longer determined by the equation of motion, but an externally prescribed background field. It can be expected that we can make the PV term (4) have an effect in the post-Newtonian order by choosing an appropriate background field θ . This does work in the non-dynamical CS gravity. Therefore, it is worth exploring the PPN expansion of the non-dynamical NYTG model.

In the non-dynamical NYTG model, an important issue is how to choose the background field θ . We do not consider the trivial case where θ is a constant, because it makes the PV term (4) a boundary term so that the model is equivalent to GR. A natural, simple and non-trivial choice is $\theta = \theta(t)$, which is the choice used in the PPN expansion of non-dynamical CS gravity [18]. Naturally, we also give priority to choosing the background field as $\theta = \theta(t)$. Only maintain the lowest order term,

$$N_{ij} = -c\theta_{,0} \epsilon_{ikl} {}^{(2)}B_{jk,l} . \quad (45)$$

Then the antisymmetric part of the equation of motion $N_{[ij]} = 0$ gives

$${}^{(2)}B_{j^i,j} - {}^{(2)}B_{j,j^i} = 0 . \quad (46)$$

Using the relation (20), Eq. (46) can be further transformed into

$${}^{(2)}h_{ij,i} - {}^{(2)}h_{ii,j} = 0 \quad (47)$$

In the standard PPN formulation, the leading term of h_{ij} should be $-2\gamma U\delta_{ij}$. Then, Eq. (47) gives $\gamma = 0$. This is a result that is incompatible with the experimental limits in Table I. It means that $\theta = \theta(t)$ is not an appropriate choice in the non-dynamical NYTG model.

The key to avoiding the above problem is that the leading term of N_{ij} cannot be Eq. (45). This puts forward requirements for the background field θ . It requires $(\theta_{,0}/\theta_{,i}) \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then, only maintain the lowest order term,

$$\begin{aligned} N_{00} &= -c\epsilon_{ijk} {}^{(3)}B_{0i,j} \theta_{,k} , \\ N_{0i} &= -c\epsilon_{jkl} {}^{(2)}B_{ij,k} \theta_{,l} , \\ N_{i0} &= -c\epsilon_{ijk} {}^{(2)}B_{00,j} \theta_{,k} - c\theta_{,0}\epsilon_{ijk} {}^{(3)}B_{0j,k} , \\ N_{ij} &= -c\theta_{,0} \epsilon_{ikl} {}^{(2)}B_{jk,l} + c\epsilon_{ikl} \theta_{,l} \left({}^{(2)}B_{jk,0} - {}^{(3)}B_{j0,k} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In order for $N_{\mu\nu}$ to play a role in the post-Newtonian order, we need $\theta_{,i} \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then, in order to ensure that the correction caused by $N_{\mu\nu}$ is smaller than the contribution of $T_{\mu\nu}$, we need $\theta_{,i} \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$. So we only consider the case of $\theta_{,i} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. In this way, $N_{00} \sim \mathcal{O}(4)$, $N_{i0} \sim N_{0i} \sim \mathcal{O}(3)$, and $N_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(4)$. Note that although the model lacks diffeomorphism symmetry, we can always choose a coordinate system to satisfy condition (21). So similar to the previous section, at the second velocity order, the Eq. (8) gives

$${}^{(2)}B_{00} = -U, \quad {}^{(2)}B_{(ij)} = -U\delta_{ij}. \quad (49)$$

Using these results, the antisymmetric part of the equation of motion $N_{[\mu\nu]} = 0$ gives

$$\theta_{,i} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{j,j} - \theta_{,j} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{j,i} = 0, \quad (50)$$

$$2U_{,0}\theta_{,i} - 2U_{,i}\theta_{,0} + \theta_{,i} {}^{(3)}B_{j0,j} - \theta_{,j} {}^{(3)}B_{j0,i} + \epsilon_{ijk} \left(\theta_{,0} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{j,k} + \theta_{,j} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{k,0} \right) = 0, \quad (51)$$

where ${}^{(2)}\lambda_i = -\epsilon_{ijk} {}^{(2)}B_{jk}$. Given an appropriate background field θ , these two constraint equations can be solved for ${}^{(3)}B_{i0}$ and ${}^{(2)}\lambda_i$. For example, if we choose $\theta = \alpha_0\sqrt{U}$, where α_0 is a constant, then ${}^{(2)}\lambda_i = 0$ and ${}^{(3)}B_{i0} = 0$ is the solution of Eq. (50) and Eq. (51). Similar to the previous section, at the third velocity order, the Eq. (8) gives

$${}^{(3)}B_{(0i)} = \frac{7}{4}V_i + \frac{1}{4}W_i + \kappa_i, \quad (52)$$

where κ_i satisfies $\kappa_{i,jj} = -c\epsilon_{ijk}U_{,j}\theta_{,k}$. Similar to the previous section, at the fourth velocity order, the Eq. (8) gives

$${}^{(4)}B_{00} = \frac{1}{2}U^2 - 2\Phi_1 - 2\Phi_2 - \Phi_3 - 3\Phi_4 - \tau. \quad (53)$$

where τ satisfies $\tau_{,ii} = c\theta_{,0} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{i,i} - c\theta_{,i} {}^{(2)}\lambda_{i,0} - c\epsilon_{ijk}(2V_i + \kappa_i)_{,j}\theta_{,k}$. Both κ_i and τ depend on the background field θ . For example, if we choose $\theta = \alpha_0\sqrt{U}$, where α_0 is a constant, then $\kappa_i = 0$ and τ satisfies $\tau_{,ii} = -(c\alpha_0/\sqrt{U})\epsilon_{ijk}V_{i,j}U_{,k}$. If α_0 is small enough, the correction term τ will also be small enough.

Finally, using the relation (20), we can get the metric components as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{00} &= 1 - 2U + 2U^2 - 4\Phi_1 - 4\Phi_2 - 2\Phi_3 - 6\Phi_4 - 2\tau, \\ g_{0i} &= \frac{7}{2}V_i + \frac{1}{2}W_i + 2\kappa_i, \\ g_{ij} &= -(1 + 2U)\delta_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

We can read off the PPN parameters of the non-dynamical NYTG model by comparing Eq. (54) and Eq. (28): $\gamma = \beta = 1$ and $\xi = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = \zeta_3 = \zeta_4 = 0$. All the PPN parameters are the same as GR. However, Eq. (54) contains two extra term τ_i and τ , which cannot be modeled by the standard PPN metric of Eq. (28). These two extra items depend on the choice of the background field θ . It means that the correction caused by the PV term (4) in the non-dynamical NYTG model depends on the choice of background field θ .

Although we can adjust the background field θ to make the model compatible with current experimental limits in the Table I. The non-dynamical NYTG model lacks a mechanism for matter to affect the scalar field θ . So it seems very unnatural to require the background field θ to satisfy $(\theta_{,0}/\theta_{,i}) \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$. The most natural choice, $\theta = \theta(t)$, works in the non-dynamical CS gravity [18], but it does not work in the non-dynamical NYTG model. From this point of view, the non-dynamical NYTG model is unsatisfactory in the PPN expansion.

Since the non-dynamical NYTG model is unsatisfactory in cosmology and PPN expansion, we think that we should treat the non-dynamical NYTG model as a toy model that might help us gain some insight into the dynamical NYTG model. The dynamical NYTG model is a more natural and realistic model. Some people hold similar views on the CS gravity [2]. Therefore, for the post-Newtonian approximation of the NYTG model, we should directly adopt the result of the dynamical NYTG model in section IV. In the dynamical NYTG model, the scalar field θ is dynamical. For any dynamical field, the time derivative ∂_0 is weighted with $\mathcal{O}(1)$, so the condition $(\theta_{,0}/\theta_{,i}) \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$ is automatically satisfied. The metric can be completely modeled by the standard PPN metric and all the PPN parameters are compatible with current experimental limits in the Table I.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we explored the slow-motion and weak-field approximation of the the recently proposed NYTG model in Refs. [7, 8] in terms of the PPN formalism. We applied the NYTG model to the solar system and expanded the gravitational field around the Minkowski background. We assumed that the gravitational field is quasi-static, so that changes are only induced by the motion of source matter. We also argued that we should adopt the results of the NYTG model under the dynamical framework. After solving the equations of motion order by order, we found that the modifications by the model only contributes the terms at the order higher than post-Newtonian. Therefore all the PPN parameters of the model are the same as GR and all the PPN parameters are compatible with current experimental limits. It means that the model has the appropriate Newtonian and Post-Newtonian approximations. This is a result consistent with the result of most local tests in solar system.

Acknowledgement: This work is supported by NSFC under Grant No. 12075231, 11653002, 12047502 and 11947301.

-
- [1] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 104012 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.104012 [[arXiv:gr-qc/0308071](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [2] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, Phys. Rept. **480**, 1-55 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2009.07.002 [[arXiv:0907.2562](#) [hep-th]].
 - [3] S. Dyda, E. E. Flanagan and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 124031 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.124031 [[arXiv:1208.4871](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [4] M. Crisostomi, K. Noui, C. Charmousis and D. Langlois, Phys. Rev. D **97**, no.4, 044034 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.044034 [[arXiv:1710.04531](#) [hep-th]].
 - [5] X. Gao and X. Y. Hong, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.6, 064057 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064057 [[arXiv:1906.07131](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [6] W. Zhao, T. Zhu, J. Qiao and A. Wang, “Waveform of gravitational waves in the general parity-violating gravities,” Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.2, 024002 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.024002 [[arXiv:1909.10887](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [7] M. Li, H. Rao and D. Zhao, JCAP **11**, 023 (2020) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/11/023 [[arXiv:2007.08038](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [8] M. Li, H. Rao and Y. Tong, [[arXiv:2104.05917](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [9] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Teleparallel Gravity*, Vol. 173. Springer, 23 Dordrecht, (2013).
 - [10] S. Bahamonde, K. F. Dialektopoulos, C. Escamilla-Rivera, G. Farrugia, V. Gakis, M. Hendry, M. Hohmann, J. L. Said, J. Mifsud and E. Di Valentino, [[arXiv:2106.13793](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [11] H. T. Nieh and M. L. Yan, J. Math. Phys. **23**, 373 (1982) doi:10.1063/1.525379
 - [12] C. M. Will, Theory and experment in gravitational physics (Cambridge University Press, 1993)
 - [13] C. M. Will, Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 4 (2014) doi:10.12942/lrr-2014-4 [[arXiv:1403.7377](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [14] C. M. Will, Theory and experment in gravitational physics (Cambridge University Press, 2018)
 - [15] R. V. Wagoner, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 3209-3216 (1970) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.1.3209
 - [16] L. Perivolaropoulos, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 047501 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.047501 [[arXiv:0911.3401](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [17] G. J. Olmo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 261102 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.261102 [[arXiv:gr-qc/0505101](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [18] S. Alexander and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 124022 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.124022 [[arXiv:0704.0299](#) [hep-th]].
 - [19] S. M. Carroll, G. B. Field and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1231 (1990) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.41.1231
 - [20] R. Utiyama, Phys. Rev. **101**, 1597-1607 (1956) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.101.1597
 - [21] K. Hayashi and T. Nakano, Prog. Theor. Phys. **38**, 491-507 (1967) doi:10.1143/PTP.38.491
 - [22] F. Bombacigno, S. Boudet, G. J. Olmo and G. Montani, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.12, 124031 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.124031 [[arXiv:2105.06870](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [23] J. T. Li, Y. P. Wu and C. Q. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.4, 044040 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.044040 [[arXiv:1312.4332](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [24] Z. C. Chen, Y. Wu and H. Wei, Nucl. Phys. B **894**, 422-438 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2015.03.012 [[arXiv:1410.7715](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [25] U. Ualikhanova and M. Hohmann, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.10, 104011 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.104011 [[arXiv:1907.08178](#) [gr-qc]].
 - [26] K. Flathmann and M. Hohmann, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.2, 024005 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.024005 [[arXiv:1910.01023](#) [gr-qc]].