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Abstract

We discuss gauge theories of scale invariance beyond the Standard Model (SM) and Einstein gravity. We show that the non-metricity of their underlying 4D geometry is at the origin of mass generation and discuss phenomenological implications. Examples of such theories are Weyl’s original quadratic gravity theory and its Palatini formulation. Non-metricity leads to spontaneous breaking of this gauged scale symmetry to Einstein gravity. All mass scales: the Planck scale, the cosmological constant and the mass ($m_\omega$) of the Weyl gauge boson of scale symmetry ($\omega_\mu$) are proportional to a scalar field vev that has a (non-metric) geometric origin, in the $\tilde{R}^2$ term. With $\omega_\mu$ of geometric origin, the SM Higgs field has a (non-metric) geometric origin too, being generated by Weyl boson fusion in the early Universe. This appears as a microscopic realisation of “matter creation from geometry” discussed in the thermodynamics of open systems applied to cosmology. Unlike in a locally scale invariant theory (no $\omega_\mu$ present) with an underlying (metric) pseudo-Riemannian geometry, here there are no ghost degrees of freedom or additional fields beyond the SM and their underlying Weyl/Palatini geometry, the cosmological constant is predicted positive and their connection shares the symmetry of the action. An intuitive picture of non-metricity in solid state physics is also provided, where it is associated with point defects (metric anomalies) of the crystalline structure.
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1 Motivation

Scale symmetry may play a role in physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) and Einstein gravity. This is suggested by the fact that the SM with a vanishing Higgs mass (parameter) is scale invariant [1]. Moreover, at high energies or in the early Universe, the states of the SM are essentially massless and the theory can have a scale symmetry (global, local or gauged scale symmetry). But Einstein gravity breaks such symmetry, hence one can attempt to generate it as a spontaneously broken phase of a theory with a local or gauged scale symmetry (regarding global scale symmetry, it does not survive black hole physics [2]).

Since gravity “is” geometry, the immediate question is what the underlying 4D spacetime geometry of a theory beyond Einstein gravity and SM is. If the action is locally scale invariant (Weyl, conformal), one could expect that this should also be, for consistency, a symmetry of the underlying geometry i.e. of the connection. But the (pseudo)-Riemannian geometry and its Levi-Civita connection are not locally scale invariant. One may then seek an alternative geometry whose connection has the space-time symmetry of the action. A stronger motivation to do so is the gauge principle: similarly to the SM as a gauge theory, we seek a gauge theory of scale invariance that recovers Einstein gravity in its broken phase.

We are thus led to consider the Weyl conformal geometry [3-5] since its connection has a gauged scale symmetry (also known as Weyl gauge symmetry). We also consider the Palatini approach to gravity [6] where the offshell connection, independent of the metric, has this symmetry. This is a departure from theories beyond SM and Einstein gravity that assume that the underlying geometry is a (metric) (pseudo)Riemannian geometry ($\nabla_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) e.g. conformal gravity [7], supergravity [8] or strings embedding [9]. In a gauged scale invariant theory its underlying Weyl geometry is non-metric i.e. $\nabla_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$. The Palatini version with such symmetry is also non-metric [10]. This is because the gauge field of scale transformations ($\omega_\mu$) is dynamical (as in a gauge theory), which is not true in (pseudo)-Riemannian cases [11] (see also [12,13]). This has interesting effects for mass generation.

Weyl geometry was criticized for its non-metricity [3] but remained of interest [14] even after it failed to describe gravity “plus” electromagnetism as Weyl initially intended [3-5]. Actually, the same original theory of Weyl ($\tilde{R}^2 + F^2$) which is a quadratic gravity theory defined by Weyl geometry is a realistic gauge theory of scale symmetry [15,16]: it has spontaneous breaking (Stueckelberg mechanism) to Einstein gravity plus a Proca action of the Weyl gauge boson of scale symmetry. This boson $^1$ is a massive gauge field of dilatations that decouples at a high scale (mass $\propto M_p$), below which a (metric) (pseudo)-Riemannian geometry and Einstein gravity are found [15,16]. So Weyl geometry and its gauged scale invariance give a UV completion of (pseudo)-Riemannian geometry and Einstein gravity.

In theories with scale symmetry dimensionful couplings are forbidden. The mass scales e.g. Planck scale ($M_p$), cosmological constant, are often generated by vacuum expectation values (vev) of some additional scalar field(s) beyond the SM Higgs. These extra fields are usually added ad-hoc as a “patch up” solution and sometimes they are ghosts - we would like to avoid these two issues. A mechanism by which they acquire a vev should be provided, rather than assumed. Since gravity is related to the underlying geometry it would also be nice to find a geometric origin to the Planck scale and the cosmological constant.

In this work we show how non-metricity solves these issues, giving a natural solution to mass generation; we study its phenomenological aspects and how it generates all mass scales in Weyl quadratic gravity [15,16] or its Palatini version [10] as well as the SM Higgs field.

$^1$which Weyl unfortunately (and wrongly) attempted to identify with the real photon.
2 A “metric” example

To detail the above ideas, consider first the (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry and

\[ \mathcal{L}_E = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\tilde{g}} (M_p^2 R + 2 M_p^2 \Lambda) \]  

(1)

where \( M_p \) is the Planck scale and \( \Lambda \) is the cosmological constant. One can regard \( \mathcal{L}_E \) as a spontaneously broken phase of a locally scale invariant action; this symmetry is defined by invariance under (i) below, extended by (ii) if real scalars (\( \phi \)) or fermions (\( \psi \)) are present

(i)  \( \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Sigma g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \sqrt{\tilde{g}} = \Sigma^{2q} \sqrt{g}, \)

(ii)  \( \hat{\phi} = \Sigma^{-q/2} \phi, \quad \hat{\psi} = \Sigma^{-3q/4} \psi, \)  

(2)

where \( q = |\det g_{\mu\nu}| \) and \( \Sigma(x) > 0 \) and we set the charge \( q = 1 \) without loss of generality.

Consider implementing this symmetry using [18,19], so one adds “by hand” a scalar \( \phi \), then

\[ \mathcal{L}_E = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [\frac{1}{6} \phi^2 R + (\partial_{\mu} \phi)^2] \pm \lambda \phi^4 \right\}, \]

(3)

is invariant under (2). By a formal transformation (2), with \( \Sigma = \phi^2 / \langle \phi \rangle^2 \), one fixes the gauge of this symmetry i.e. fixes \( \phi \) to a constant vev assumed to exist \( \langle \phi^2 \rangle = 6 M_p^2 \), so gauge fixing confirms a dynamical breaking (not vice-versa). Then one generates the first term in (1) and \( \phi \) decouples. The second term in (1) is found if \( \phi^4 \) is also added “by hand” to (3) with the right sign. For interesting models beyond SM with this symmetry see e.g. [20–25].

For our later comparison to “non-metric” cases, notice the following (see also [26–28]):

a) Symmetry (2) enforces the sign of the kinetic term to be negative so \( \phi \) is a ghost. It is a common feature of conformal and superconformal methods that \( \phi \) which acts as a compensator rather than a physical field, has a kinetic term of “wrong” sign. It would be nice to avoid a ghost in a classical action.

b) In the absence of matter, the current associated to this symmetry vanishes and in some cases this may raise concerns on the physical meaning of the symmetry [29, 30].

c) One usually assumes that \( \phi \) acquires a vev; it would be nice to see how this happens.

d) \( \phi \) is added “by-hand” to enforce symmetry (2), as a “compensator”, so it is not related to the underlying geometry of Einstein gravity emergent in the broken phase. So the Planck scale generated by \( \langle \phi \rangle \) is not related to geometry. Can \( M_p \) and \( \phi \) have a geometric origin?

e) while \( \mathcal{L}_E \) is invariant under (2), the underlying geometry i.e. the Levi-Civita connection is not. One can ask if it is really consistent to impose a space-time symmetry on an action whose underlying geometry (connection) does not have such symmetry - can we avoid this?

In the following we shall see how the above issues a), b), c), d), e) are answered in the gauge theory of scale symmetry of Weyl (based on Weyl geometry) or in its Palatini version. They can ensure a geometric interpretation of this symmetry, something that is not so obvious in the local scale symmetry eq.(2) (for a discussion see [22],[20]).

---

2 Our convention is \( g_{\mu\nu} = (+, -, -, -) \), \( q = |\det g_{\mu\nu}| \) while the curvature tensors are defined as in [17].

3 The case of arbitrary \( q \) in transformations (2) and (4) is recovered by replacing \( \alpha \rightarrow q \alpha \) in the results.

4 This has additional implications e.g. for the scalar potential in 4D N=1 supergravity [8].

5 Alternatively, if one changed the sign of \( \mathcal{L}_E \), then \( \langle \phi^2 \rangle < 0, \Sigma < 0 \) but then \( g_{\mu\nu} \) changes signature by (2).
3 Non-metricity as the origin of mass generation

3.1 Weyl geometry: metricity vs non-metricity

• **Metric case:** Consider first the case of Weyl conformal geometry\(^6\). Weyl geometry is defined by classes of equivalence \((g_{\alpha\beta}, \omega^\mu)\) of the metric \((g_{\alpha\beta})\) and the Weyl gauge field \((\omega^\mu)\), related by the Weyl gauge symmetry transformation. This is defined by (2) together with:

\[
\hat{\omega}^\mu = \omega^\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma,
\]

with \(\alpha\) the Weyl gauge coupling. The non-metricity is due to the presence of \(\omega^\mu\):

\[
\tilde{\nabla}^\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = -\alpha \omega^\mu g_{\alpha\beta},
\]

where \(\tilde{\nabla}\) is defined by the Weyl geometry connection \(\tilde{\Gamma}\). One finds (see eq.(A-6))

\[
\tilde{\Gamma}^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} = \Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \alpha \left[ \delta^{\lambda}_{\nu} \omega^\mu + \delta^{\lambda}_{\mu} \omega^\nu - g_{\mu\nu} \omega^\lambda \right].
\]

\(\Gamma\) is the Levi-Civita connection \(\Gamma^{\alpha}_{\mu\nu}(g) = (1/2) g^{\alpha\lambda} (\partial_\mu g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\lambda\mu} - \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu})\). \(\tilde{\Gamma}\) is invariant under combined (2), (4). If \(\omega^\mu\) decouples (\(\omega^\mu = 0\)) or is “pure gauge”, the theory is Weyl integrable and metric. Denote by \(\tilde{\Gamma}^\nu_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu, \Gamma^\nu_{\mu\nu} = \Gamma_\mu\), then

\[
\omega^\mu = (1/2) (\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu).
\]

\(\omega^\mu\) measures the deviation (of the trace) of the connection from the Levi-Civita connection. Since \(\omega^\mu\) is part of the connection \(\tilde{\Gamma}\), it obviously has a (non-metric) geometric origin.

The simplest gravity action in Weyl geometry, with symmetry (2), (4) is

\[
\mathcal{L}_1 = \sqrt{g} \frac{1}{4! \xi^2} \tilde{R}^2, \quad \xi < 1.
\]

where \(\tilde{R} = R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)\) is the scalar curvature of Weyl geometry, defined by \(\tilde{\Gamma}\) of (6) with the usual formulae. \(\mathcal{L}_1\) is invariant under (2), (4). This is because \(\tilde{R} = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})\) where \(\tilde{\Gamma}\) is invariant, hence under (2), (4), \(\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}/\Sigma\) and \(\mathcal{L}_1\) is invariant. One can then show

\[
\tilde{R} = R - 3 \alpha \nabla_\mu \omega^\mu - \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu,
\]

where the rhs is in a Riemannian notation, so \(\nabla_\mu \omega^\lambda = \partial_\mu \omega^\lambda + \Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\rho} \omega^\rho\). One can replace (9) in \(\mathcal{L}_1\). Since \(\tilde{R}^2\) contains Riemannian \(R^2\), \(\mathcal{L}_1\) is a higher derivative theory that propagates a spin-zero mode (from \(R^2\)), in addition to the graviton. It is easy to “unfold” this higher derivative theory into a second order one and extract this spin-zero mode from \(\tilde{R}^2\). To this purpose, replace \(\tilde{R}^2 \rightarrow -2 \phi^2 \tilde{R} - \phi^2\) in \(\mathcal{L}_1\), where \(\phi\) is a scalar field, to obtain

\[
\mathcal{L}_1 = \sqrt{g} \frac{1}{4! \xi^2} \left[ -2 \phi^2 \tilde{R} - \phi^2 \right].
\]

\(^6\)For a brief introduction to Weyl conformal geometry and relevant formulae see Appendix A in [16].
The equation of motion of $\phi$ has solution $\phi^2 = -\tilde{R}$ which replaced in the action recovers eq.(5), so eqs.(5) and (10) are classically equivalent. Next, the equation of motion of $\omega_\mu$ is

$$\omega_\mu = \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2,$$

so $\omega_\mu$ is “pure gauge” and can be integrated out. Using this back in the action, then

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

$L_1$ is similar to the Riemannian case eq.(6); there is a “wrong” sign of the kinetic term and a “fake” conformal symmetry (vanishing current). This is a Weyl integrable case since $\omega_\mu$ is not dynamical (field strength $F_{\mu\nu} = 0$ due to (11)). The theory is metric: after applying (11) with $\Sigma = \ln \phi^2$, then $\dot{\omega}_\mu = 0$, $\Gamma = \Gamma$, $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ and the geometry is Riemannian.

**Non-metric case:** The situation is different if $\omega_\mu$ has a kinetic term. This brings us to the original Weyl gravity action [5] which has a gauged scale symmetry. The action is

$$L'_1 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{1}{4! \xi^2} \tilde{R}^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Here $F_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\nabla}_\mu \omega_\nu - \tilde{\nabla}_\nu \omega_\mu$ is the field strength of $\omega_\mu$, with $\tilde{\nabla}_\mu \omega_\nu = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\rho \omega_\rho$. Since $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$ is symmetric, $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \partial_\nu \omega_\mu$, just like in flat space-time.

In this case one proceeds as before to linearise the quadratic curvature term with the aid of $\phi$ and replace $\tilde{R}$ in terms of Riemannian $R$, eq.(9), to find

$$L'_1 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{-1}{2 \xi^2} \frac{\phi^2}{6} R + (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \nabla_\mu (\omega^\mu \phi^2) \right\} - \frac{\phi^4}{4! \xi^2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{8 \xi^2} \phi^2 \left[ \omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2 \right]^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 \right\}. \quad (14)$$

From (14) the equation of motion of $\phi$ is found

$$\Box \phi^2 = 0, \quad \Box = \nabla^\mu \nabla_\mu. \quad (15)$$

This gives $\partial^\mu (\sqrt{g} \partial_\mu \phi^2) = 0$. For a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric (FRW), $g_{\mu\nu} = (1, -a(t)^2, -a(t)^2, -a(t)^2)$ with $\phi = \phi(t)$, one obtains $\ddot{K} + 3H \dot{K} = 0$ with $K = \phi^2$, or $\phi(\tau)^2 = \int_0^\infty c_0 dt / a(t)^3 + c_1$ with $c_{0,1}$ some constants; hence $\phi(t)$ evolves in the FRW case to a constant vev [21], similarly to the global case [22, 46].

Further, the equation of motion of $\omega_\mu$ shows that $J^\mu = -(\alpha / \xi^2) g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\nu - \alpha \omega_\nu) \phi^2$ is a conserved current: $\nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0$ [15, 16]. For the case of Weyl integrable geometry discussed earlier, eq.(11), one verifies that $J_\mu = 0$ so the current is then trivial, as already mentioned.

One would like to “fix the gauge” of the Weyl gauge symmetry. Since in the FRW case $\phi$ evolves to a constant, the current conservation then gives $\nabla_\mu \omega^\mu = 0$, specific to a massive $\omega_\mu$. So this gauge fixing follows a spontaneous breaking of symmetry [2], [4], under which $\phi$ is charged. In $L'_1$ gauge fixing may be implemented by applying to it transformation [2], [4] with a special $\Sigma = \phi^2 / \langle \phi^2 \rangle$; this is simply setting $\phi$ to its constant vev found earlier i.e. replace $\phi \rightarrow \langle \phi \rangle$ in eq.(14). In terms of the transformed fields (with a “hat”), $L'_1$ becomes:
\[ L'_1 = \sqrt{g} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} M_p^2 \hat{R} + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \hat{\omega}_\mu \hat{\omega}^\mu - \Lambda M_p^2 \frac{1}{4} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 \right], \quad (16) \]

with the notation
\[ M_p^2 = \langle \phi^2 \rangle / 6 \xi^2, \quad \Lambda = \frac{1}{4} \langle \phi^2 \rangle, \quad m_\omega^2 = \alpha^2 \langle \phi^2 \rangle / 4 \xi^2. \quad (17) \]

Eq.(16) is the Einstein-Proca Lagrangian for the Weyl vector \[15,16\], in the Einstein gauge ("frame"). The Weyl gauge field has absorbed the derivative of the field \( \ln \phi \) in a Stueckelberg mechanism \[37\]: the massless \( \omega_\mu \) and real, dynamical \( \phi \) are replaced by a massive \( \omega_\mu \), with the number of degrees of freedom conserved (as expected for a spontaneous breaking). The mass of \( \omega_\mu \), \( m_\omega \sim \alpha M_p \), is close to \( M_p \) unless one is tuning \( \alpha \ll 1 \); hence, any (unwanted) non-metricity effects due to \( \omega_\mu \) are suppressed by its mass.

Since \( \omega_\mu \) is massive, it decouples to leave in the broken phase below \( m_\omega \) the Einstein gravity with a positive cosmological constant. At the same time, since \( \omega_\mu \) decouples from the Lagrangian, metricity is restored below \( m_\omega \): the connection \( \hat{\Gamma} \) of (6) becomes Levi-Civita (\( \Gamma \)) and the geometry becomes Riemannian. Hence, the Weyl geometry with its gauged scale invariance essentially acts as a non-metric ultraviolet (UV) completion (above \( m_\omega \sim M_p \)) of the Riemannian geometry.

### 3.2 Palatini theories: metricity vs non-metricity

- **Metric case:** Let us now consider a gauged scale invariant theory in the Palatini approach (due to Einstein \[6\]). In this approach the connection is independent of the metric and so it is invariant under (2). It is then determined from its equations of motion and this solution is used back in the initial action. Hence, the underlying geometry (connection) and thus its metricity or non-metricity are determined by the action and by its symmetries, as we shall see shortly: if the theory is invariant under (2) the theory is metric; while if it is Weyl gauge invariant, it is non-metric.

To begin with, consider first an action with symmetry (2) in a Palatini approach
\[ L_2 = \sqrt{g} \frac{1}{4! \xi^2} R(\hat{\Gamma}, g)^2 \quad (18) \]

where
\[ R(\hat{\Gamma}, g) = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(\hat{\Gamma}), \quad R_{\mu\nu}(\hat{\Gamma}) = \partial_\lambda \hat{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu \hat{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\lambda\nu} + \hat{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\rho\lambda} \hat{\Gamma}_\rho^{\mu\nu} - \hat{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\rho\mu} \hat{\Gamma}_\rho^{\nu\lambda}. \quad (19) \]

This is the Palatini version of action (8) in Weyl geometry, but now \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is unknown. \( R_{\mu\nu}(\hat{\Gamma}) \) is the metric-independent Ricci tensor in the Palatini formalism. Here \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is independent of the \( g_{\mu\nu} \), so \( \hat{\Gamma} \) and \( R_{\mu\nu}(\hat{\Gamma}) \) are invariant under transformation (2). Then \( R(\hat{\Gamma}, g) \) transforms like \( g^{\mu\nu} \), so under (2):
\[ \hat{R}(\hat{\Gamma}, \hat{g}) = \frac{1}{\Sigma} R(\hat{\Gamma}, g). \quad (20) \]

As a result, \( L_2 \) is invariant under (2) and this is the simplest Palatini case that has local scale symmetry (2). \( L_2 \) can be linearised as in the Weyl case (eq.(10)): replace \( R(\hat{\Gamma}, g)^2 \rightarrow -2 \phi^2 R(\hat{\Gamma}, g) - \phi^4 \) to obtain a classically equivalent action to (18). For this \( L_2 \) one writes
and solves the equation of motion for $\tilde{\Gamma}$. The solution is (see [10], Section 2):
\[
\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha(g) + (1/2) \left( \delta_{\mu}^\alpha u_\mu + \delta_{\nu}^\alpha u_\nu - g^{\alpha\lambda}g_{\mu\nu}u_\lambda \right), \quad u_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu \ln \phi^2,
\]  
(21)

with $\Gamma$ the Levi-Civita connection. With this $\tilde{\Gamma}$, one computes the scalar curvature
\[
R(\tilde{\Gamma},g) = R(g) - 3\nabla_\mu u^\mu - \frac{3}{2} g^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu.
\]
(22)

$R(g)$ is the scalar curvature for $g_{\mu\nu}$ while $\nabla$ is defined by the Levi-Civita connection ($\Gamma$). Using the last equation back in $L_2$, one finds
\[
L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{6} \phi^2 R(g) + (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{4!} \phi^4 \right\}.
\]
(23)

This is the onshell version of (18) and contains a dynamical $\phi$. This is because the metric part of the Palatini quadratic gravity\cite{12} makes the action a four-derivative theory: according to (22) onshell $R(\tilde{\Gamma},g)^2$ contains $R(g)^2$. Action (23) is similar to that seen in eqs.(3) and (12) and its associated current vanishes again. Fixing the gauge of the symmetry which essentially means setting $\phi \to \langle \phi \rangle$ then
\[
L_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} M_5^2 R(\hat{g}) - \frac{3}{2\xi_2} M_4^4 \right\}
\]
(24)

And since $\phi$ is fixed to a constant, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$, so the theory is metric, see e.g. discussion in [10]. This is similar to the Weyl integrable (metric) case discussed earlier.

- **Non-metric case:** The situation changes dramatically if the theory has a gauged scale invariance. Consider
\[
L'_2 = \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{1}{4! \xi_2} R(\tilde{\Gamma},g)^2 - \frac{1}{4\alpha_2} R_{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma}) R^{[\mu\nu]}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \right\}
\]
(25)

where $R_{[\mu\nu]} \equiv (1/2) (R_{\mu\nu} - R_{\nu\mu})$ with $R_{\mu\nu}$ as in eq.(19). Additional scale invariant operators of dimension $d=4$ can be present. One can check that the two terms in the action above are invariant under (2). Next, define
\[
F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \nabla_\mu v_\nu - \nabla_\nu v_\mu, \quad \text{where} \quad v_\mu \equiv (1/2)(\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu - \Gamma_\mu), \quad (\tilde{\Gamma}_\mu \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\rho}, \ \Gamma_\mu \equiv \Gamma_{\mu\rho}).
\]
(26)

so $F_{\mu\nu}$ is a function of $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is assumed symmetric in the lower indices, then $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu v_\nu - \partial_\nu v_\mu = \partial_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}_\nu - \partial_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu = -R_{[\mu\nu]}$. Hence, the last term in (25) acts as a kinetic term for $v_\mu$. Under (2), $v_\mu$ transforms like $\omega_\mu$ of the Weyl case, while $F_{\mu\nu}$ is invariant. Therefore, action (25) has a bigger symmetry: it is Weyl gauge invariant, being invariant under eqs.(2) and (4) with $\omega_\mu \to v_\mu$ i.e. $\tilde{v}_\mu = v_\mu - (1/\alpha) \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma$. We denoted by $v_\mu$ the Weyl gauge field in the Palatini case, playing the role of $\omega_\mu$. With this, eq.(25) is a Palatini version of the Weyl action in eq.(13) but now $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is unknown - it will be determined by its equations of motion.

From (25) one proceeds as in the Weyl case to “linearise” the $R(\tilde{\Gamma},g)^2$ term in (25) with the aid of an auxiliary scalar $\phi$, so replace $R(\tilde{\Gamma},g) \to -2\phi^2 R(\tilde{\Gamma},g) - \phi^4$. From the resulting,
equivalent Lagrangian one can then write the equations of motion of the connection $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$ which can be solved. The solution is a function of $\phi$ and is used to evaluate $R_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma})$ and then $R(\tilde{\Gamma}, g)$. Using this result back in action (25) one finally finds

$$L'_{2} = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\phi^2}{\xi^2} \left[ \frac{1}{6} R + (\partial_{\mu}\phi)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{4!} \frac{\alpha^2}{2 \xi^2} \phi^2 \left[ v_{\mu} - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \partial_{\mu} \ln \phi^2 \right] - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 \right\}. \quad (27)$$

This is the “onshell” Lagrangian, that is using the solution of $\tilde{\Gamma}$. $L'_{2}$ is invariant under combined eqs. (2), (4) (with $\omega_{\mu} \rightarrow v_{\mu}$). To fix the gauge, the same discussion as in the Weyl case applies. At the level of the Lagrangian this “gauge fixing” may simply be implemented by setting $\phi$ to a constant vev; this then brings us to the Einstein-Proca Lagrangian

$$L'_{2} = \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_{p}^2 R + 3 M_{p}^2 v_{\mu} v^{\mu} - \frac{1}{4} \xi^2 M_{p}^4 \right\}, \quad M_{p}^2 = \frac{\langle \phi \rangle^2}{6 \xi^2}. \quad (28)$$

There is again a Stueckelberg mechanism, similar to the Weyl case by which $v_{\mu}$ becomes massive after “absorbing” the dynamical $\phi$ which disappeared from the spectrum of (28). The Einstein-Proca action of $v_{\mu}$ is thus found. We see that the Stueckelberg breaking of a gauged scale symmetry is valid in a Palatini quadratic gravity model, too. This mechanism seems common in gravity theories where the connection is a dynamical variable [38, 39].

There are however two differences from the Weyl case: Firstly, there are additional quadratic operators [40] with gauged scale invariance that were not included in the analysis and that can affect the overall result. Secondly, the vectorial non-metricity obtained in the Palatini case for action (25), shown in the Appendix eq. (A-15), is different from that in the Weyl case eq. (5). This explains a different numerical coefficient in (27) versus (14).

To conclude, these two examples show that non-metricity which follows from the gauged scale symmetry, is accompanied by a spontaneous breaking of this symmetry, similarly in Weyl and Palatini geometry [8].

4 Phenomenology

4.1 Mass scales from non-metricity

We saw that Einstein gravity is a spontaneously broken phase of the original Weyl quadratic gravity action or its Palatini version. All mass scales of the theory: $M_{p}$, $m_{\omega}$, $\Lambda$ are proportional to the vev of the Stueckelberg field $\langle \phi \rangle$ eaten by the Weyl boson. We thus see that all masses are related to the non-metricity of the action that is due to dynamical $\omega_{\mu}$ ($v_{\mu}$ in Palatini case): indeed, $\omega_{\mu}$ ($v_{\mu}$) is part of the underlying non-metric geometry, while $\phi$ is introduced by a geometric term in the action ($\tilde{R}^2$), so all masses are of geometric origin. There is a difference from the Higgs mechanism as there is no $\phi$ in the final spectrum. The cosmological constant is positive definite (non-vanishing), due to $\phi^4$ term (induced by $\tilde{R}^2$).

As in all theories with scale symmetry one can only predict ratios of scales in terms of dimensionless couplings of the theory. Hence, one can obtain the correct ratios

$$\Lambda/M_{p}^2 \sim \xi^2, \quad m_{\omega}^2/M_{p}^2 \sim \alpha^2 \quad (29)$$

*For an interesting and related scale invariant de Sitter gauge theory see [41].
by adjusting the values of these two couplings of the theory.

We see that issues a), b), c), d), e) encountered in the (pseudo-)Riemannian case with Weyl symmetry of Section 2 are nicely solved. To detail: a) There is no ghost degree of freedom in the final spectrum, since $\phi$ is eaten by $\omega$. Also, the Einstein gravity is recovered and the sign of $\Lambda$ is predicted positive, due to the $\sqrt{g} \tilde{R}^2$ term; b) The current associated to Weyl gauge symmetry is non-trivial ($J^\mu \neq 0$) and is related to the existence of a dynamical $\omega$ i.e. to non-metricity; c) The field $\phi$ acquires dynamically a vev. d) $\phi$ was “extracted” from the $\sqrt{g} \tilde{R}^2$ term, hence it has a (non-metric) geometric origin and the same is true about the mass scales it generated; e) Finally, the underlying geometry i.e. the Weyl or Palatini connection is invariant under the gauged scale symmetry of the action.

4.2 Higgs from non-metric geometry

The discussion so far was in the absence of matter, hence it was about “geometry”. The next step is to see the effect of non-metricity in the presence of the SM. Consider then embedding the SM in Weyl conformal geometry - this is indeed possible, as shown in [16]. We refer the reader to this work for the technical details how this is done. This embedding is truly minimal and natural and does not require any additional degrees of freedom beyond those of the SM and of Weyl geometry ($\phi, \omega, g_{\mu\nu}$). This is possible because the SM with a vanishing Higgs mass parameter is scale invariant. In fact, one can easily notice that the Lagrangian of the SM gauge bosons and fermions in the Weyl conformal geometry has a form identical to that in the (pseudo-)Riemannian geometry and has a gauged scale symmetry. Hence, the SM gauge bosons and fermions do not have any direct couplings to the Weyl gauge boson [44] (with one special exception for the SM fermions [16]).

However, the SM Higgs sector is modified by the Weyl gauge symmetry [16]. First, there is a non-minimal coupling of the Higgs to Weyl geometry $\sqrt{g} H^1 H \tilde{R}$ which is Weyl gauge invariant; here $H$ is the $SU(2)_L$ Higgs doublet. The Higgs kinetic term is also modified: the SM covariant derivative $D_\mu H$ is replaced by the Weyl-covariant derivative that includes the Weyl gauge boson of scale invariance:

$$D_\mu H \rightarrow (D_\mu - \alpha/2 \omega_\mu) H,$$

so that this derivative transforms like the Higgs under transformations (2), (4). Hence, the Weyl gauge invariant Higgs kinetic term becomes $\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu} [D_\mu - \alpha/2 \omega_\mu] H^\dagger (D_\nu - \alpha/2 \omega_\nu) H^2$.

Further, the neutral Higgs boson mixes with the field $\phi$ that “linearized” $\tilde{R}^2$; their “radial direction” combination is now the new Stueckelberg field eaten by $\omega_\mu$ (as shown earlier), while the “angular direction” field is the SM neutral Higgs ($\sigma$).

In the canonical Lagrangian, the coupling of $\omega_\mu$ to $\sigma$ is [16][10][11].

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{g} \alpha^2 \omega_\mu \sigma^2 + O(\sigma^2/M_p^2).$$

This is the only direct coupling of the SM to the Weyl gauge boson. It has interesting consequences. In the early Universe, assuming there was no Higgs boson, this coupling can

---

9For related models, linear rather than quadratic in $\tilde{R}$, with extra scalar fields beyond SM see [42][43].

10See in particular eq.(32) and text after eq.(36) and eq.(38) in [16].

11This coupling is coming from the kinetic term. The non-minimal coupling $\sqrt{g} H^1 H \tilde{R}$ impacts on the form of the Higgs potential and the mixing with initial $\phi$, see Section 2.5 in [16].
generate the Higgs from the Weyl vector boson fusion
\[ \omega_\mu + \omega_\mu \rightarrow \sigma + \sigma. \] (32)

Since \( \omega_\mu \) is part of the non-metric geometry (connection), the Higgs boson itself has a non-metric, geometric origin! And since the Higgs generates the masses of the SM states while the Stueckelberg field (“extracted” from the \( R^2 \) term) generated \( M_\mu \), \( \Lambda \) and \( m_\omega \), one concludes that \( \omega_\mu \) and non-metric geometry are the origin of all the masses of the theory. This happens without any additional degrees of freedom beyond the SM or Weyl geometry.

Interestingly, the Weyl boson fusion can have an additional effect at a cosmological level, of mitigating any anisotropy that the Weyl vector would otherwise bring. This deserves careful study. A similar coupling and generation of the Higgs via Weyl boson fusion exists when considering the Higgs sector in Palatini gravity with Weyl gauge symmetry [10] (eq.(45)).

The generation of the Higgs from the non-metric geometry (Weyl or Palatini), via the \( \omega_\mu - \omega_\mu \) fusion in the early Universe is intriguing. This process appears as a possible microscopic realisation of “matter creation from geometry” discussed in a phenomenological-macroscopic description in the thermodynamics of open systems applied to cosmology [15]. In such approach the creation of matter occurs as a process corresponding to transfer of energy from the gravitational field(s) (in our case \( \omega_\mu \)) or space-time curvature (\( R^2 \) that depends on \( \omega_\mu \)) to the matter created (in our case Higgs). The second law of thermodynamics allows space-time geometry transform into matter but the inverse transformation is forbidden. Therefore the process of matter creation from the underlying geometry is irreversible. However, this result is not valid in general but only if the specific entropy per particle (s) is \( s \leq 0 \) (otherwise matter destruction takes place) [17]. If so, it would be interesting to study how irreversibility could emerge from the microscopic picture provided by our SM Lagrangian in Weyl geometry. Notice however that what from the Weyl geometry viewpoint looks like matter creation from (Weyl) geometry (\( \omega_\mu \)), from a Riemannian picture obtained after the symmetry breaking, \( \omega_\mu \) looks just like another field of the theory that interacts with the Higgs! Similar considerations apply in the Palatini case.

With the Higgs and Planck scale related to the underlying non-metric geometry, their hierarchy may be be related to this, too. The scale of non-metricity is given by the mass of the gauge boson of scale invariance, \( m_\omega \sim \alpha M_\gamma \); below this scale metricity is restored. In general, one would expect that this scale be close to the Planck scale. But it must be mentioned that the current lower bound on the non-metricity scale is very low, of few TeV only [15]. Theoretically, this is realised by tuning the coupling \( \alpha \ll 1 \). Such small \( \alpha \) is not unnatural, given that it is one of the gravity couplings of the theory (\( \xi, \alpha \)).

If the non-metricity scale \( m_\omega \) is low, in the TeV region, then the Higgs mass is natural. To see this note that quantum corrections \( \delta m^2 \) to the Higgs mass are quadratic in the scale of new physics (\( m_\omega \)) so
\[ \delta m^2_\sigma \sim m^2_\omega. \] (33)

Above the mass of \( \omega_\mu \), the gauged scale symmetry is restored together with its protection for the Higgs mass; indeed, this is so since no mass term is then allowed and quantum corrections above \( m_\omega \) could only be of logarithmic type. This hints at a solution to the hierarchy problem that is technically natural, based on a gauged scale symmetry [12].

It would also be interesting to construct a supersymmetric version of Weyl quadratic action [13] - to our
4.3 Non-metricity in solid state physics

We saw that there is a link of non-metricity to mass generation which is an essentially geometric mechanism, valid even in the absence of matter fields; only the degrees of freedom of the Weyl geometry, like the metric, connection and curvature-squared terms were involved. The same applied to the Palatini case. One question is whether there is a physical interpretation of non-metricity and its link to mass generation in the condensed matter physics, as it was the case for the Higgs mechanism.

Let us then discuss about non-metricity in solid state physics, following [49,50]. For this one needs the notion of “material space” of a crystalline solid. This is a natural configuration of a body where it is described only in terms of the intrinsic structure of constituting matter. The material space is the configuration found by relaxing the solid of all internal and external stresses. If the crystalline structure has no defects, the corresponding geometry of this material space is Euclidean. If there is a (continuous) distribution of defects, that destroy the crystalline order, the associated geometry is non-Euclidean.

For a 3D crystalline structure we have defects of dimension d=0, also known as point defects or metric anomalies, which are destroying the crystalline order; they are modifying the local notion of length, usually associated with this order. These defects can be vacancies (missing atoms), interstitials (extra atoms of same kind), substitutionals (extra atoms of different kind). Further, there are d=1 defects such as dislocations and disclinations; d=2 defects (phase boundary, domain walls, etc) or d=3 defects (inhomogeneities). With these defects distributed continuously, they give rise to effective fields of defect densities.

The material space is then described geometrically by an affine connection of a non-Riemannian space that has a non-vanishing curvature, non-metricity and torsion [49,50]. Non-metricity, which we know it modifies the local notion of length must therefore be related to a density of the d=0 defects. Then the relation of mass generation to non-metricity that we found is somewhat expected, given that mass terms in the action break the local Weyl symmetry of the action, much like d=0 defects destroy the local order of the crystalline. At low energy metricity is recovered in our case, while the local d=0 defects are not seen at large distances relative to the lattice size. This view gives an intuitive picture to non-metricity and its relation to mass generation in our theory.

4.4 The multiple roles of the Stueckelberg field $\phi$

It is worth noting the multiple role plaid by the scalar mode $\phi$ of $\tilde{R}^2$ in Weyl and Palatini cases: 1) It acts as a Stueckelberg field eaten by $\omega_\mu$, 2) In a cosmological evolution in the FRW universe, it acquires a non-zero vacuum expectation value; 3) Its vev generates $M_p$, $\Lambda$, $m_\omega$, playing the role of the dilaton (note that $\ln \phi$ has a shift symmetry in (2)). 4) When the SM is embedded in Weyl geometry, it mixes with the Higgs, leading to a Stueckelberg-Higgs potential which for small Higgs field values recovers the SM potential [16]. 5) The contribution of $\phi$ to this potential drives inflation in such $\tilde{R}^2$ models [10,16,52,53]. This explains why the inflation prediction for the tensor-to-scalar ratio ($r \sim 10^{-3}$) is similar to knowledge there is no such version in the current literature.

Further, the curvature tensor in this space is associated with a density of disclinations. In the absence of torsion (as in our Weyl and Palatini cases) the material connection is similar to Weyl connection and the geometry is in this case Weylian. If torsion is present, the geometry is modified and torsion is associated with dislocations. The material connection can then be expressed in terms of torsion, non-metricity and the metric, rather similar to more general theories of gravity beyond Einstein gravity, see e.g. [51].
that in the Starobinsky model \[54\] in the Weyl case, but larger in the Palatini case due to different coefficients in the scalar potential (caused by different vectorial non-metricity) \[55\].

### 4.5 Renormalizability

In a most general case, the action in the Weyl theory \[13\] can include (up to a topological term) one additional operator that also has a gauged scale invariance. This is \(\tilde{C}^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\), where \(\tilde{C}^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\) is the Weyl tensor in Weyl geometry. This is related to the usual Riemannian Weyl tensor \(C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\) via \(\tilde{C}^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + (3/2)\alpha^2 F^2_{\mu\nu}\) where \(F^2_{\mu\nu}\) is the kinetic term of \(\omega_{\mu}\). The operator \(\tilde{C}^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\) is essentially spectator under the mechanism of symmetry breaking presented earlier and does not affect the results shown. In a quantum analysis, it might be generated as a loop counterterm. The Riemannian version of this term \(C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\) was extensively analysed \[7\], while the extra \(F^2_{\mu\nu}\) contribution only brings a redefinition of coupling \(\alpha\).

Given the gauged scale invariance of the action, there are no operators of dimension larger than four that can be present in the action, since there is no scale to suppress them. In a Riemannian notation, the overall Lagrangian thus involves only \((R-3\alpha \nabla_{\mu} \omega^{\mu} - 3/2 \alpha^2 \omega_{\mu} \omega^{\mu})^2\) coming from \(\tilde{R}^2\) that is linearised with the aid of \(\phi\), then \(F^2_{\mu\nu}\) and \(C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\). The Weyl vector is anomaly free and massive, of mass acquired via spontaneous breaking which cannot affect renormalizability. Further, it is known that the usual quadratic gravity in the (pseudo)-Riemannian case is renormalizable \[56\]. For the Weyl theory, based on the symmetry of the action forbidding higher dimensional counterterms, the analysis of \[56\] and power-counting arguments, one expects that this theory be renormalizable (but not unitary, due to spin-2 ghost of \(C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\)).

In the Palatini case a similar discussion is very difficult: there are many additional Weyl gauge invariant operators that may be present in the action \[10,40\]. In this case even solving analytically the equations of motion for the connection and finding the non-metricity of the theory is very difficult.

### 4.6 Non-metricity: Weyl vs Palatini

There is a long held view since Einstein \[3\], that non-metricity makes a theory unphysical.\[13\] Firstly, since \(\nabla_{[\mu} g_{\alpha\beta]} \neq 0\), under the parallel transport of a (Weyl-covariant-constant) vector, this vector changes not only direction (as in the Riemannian geometry) but also its norm. Hence, this value of the norm is path dependent (in the symmetric phase). The details of this argument are presented in the Appendix for both the Weyl and Palatini cases under the assumption of a massless Weyl gauge boson of scale invariance. The ultimate consequence of this effect is the distance between the spectral lines of two identical atoms of different path history will differ, in contrast to experiment (second clock effect) \[3\].

In our view this critique is implicitly assuming a formalism which appears to break the symmetry of the action - as seen when setting the momenta on the mass shell \(p^2 = m^2\) in the analysis of \[57\]; this means a mass term is present in the action, or we already explained that in the broken phase the theory becomes metric, hence the formalism and critique cannot apply. While in the (non-metric) symmetric phase i.e. without masses present, it is hard to explain how this experiment could actually be physically realised: comparing a gauge theory (of scale invariance in our case) to experiment first requires a “gauge fixing” of the symmetry! from the equations of motion of the Weyl field \[16\] and for the Stueckelberg field

---

\[13\] This was the original critique of Einstein to Weyl’s failed theory of gravity “plus” electromagnetism.
\( (\phi) \), such gauge fixing follows, as we saw, a dynamical fixing of the vev of \( \phi \), which in turn breaks this symmetry; so we are back to the (metric) broken phase. This line of reasoning seems to imply that the second clock effect is not there.

In any case, our results are not affected by the above discussion: as reviewed earlier, we know that the gauged scale symmetry is broken, both in the Weyl quadratic gravity and in the Palatini case. When this symmetry is broken, the massive \( \omega_{\mu} \) decouples (at some high scale) from the Lagrangian and its underlying geometry: the connection becomes Levi-Civita and the theory is then metric; any non-metricity effects and implications mentioned above (if present) are then suppressed by \( m_\omega \). As long as \( m_\omega \) is large enough, such effect can be ignored. As mentioned, the current lower bound on non-metricity is low \((\text{TeV})\) [48].

Finally, we would like to comment on the different vectorial non-metricity of Weyl versus the Palatini case, compare eq.\((A-3)\) to \((A-15)\). This has additional implications for the parallel transport of the vectors. As shown in the Appendix, in the Weyl case the ratio of the norms of two vectors \( u, v \) of equal Weyl charge is invariant under parallel transport

\[
d \frac{|u|^2}{|v|^2} = 0.
\]  

(34)

So the relative length is invariant and this is consistent with physics being independent of the units of length. In the Palatini case, however, this ratio is not invariant, as seen from eq.\((A-17)\)

\[
d \frac{|u|^2}{|v|^2} \neq 0.
\]  

(35)

Compared to \((34)\), one may consider on physical grounds that the Weyl case is the only acceptable. However, the Palatini case is affected by additional operators not included in our analysis that can change \((35)\). It may even be possible that a most general Palatini quadratic gravity with gauged scale invariance may yield onshell (after solving the equations of motion for the connection) a Weylian non-metricity and connection. This would give an interesting offshell realisation of Weyl quadratic gravity.

5 Conclusions

We discussed phenomenological aspects of non-metricity in theories beyond the SM and Einstein gravity that have a gauged scale symmetry. One argument in favour of this symmetry is the gauge principle: similarly to the SM as a gauge theory, we seek a gauge theory of scale invariance that recovers Einstein gravity in its broken phase.

What is the 4D underlying geometry of such theories? One can consider theories based on the Weyl geometry which has a gauged scale symmetry by construction i.e. the Weyl connection has this symmetry. A second option is to consider the Palatini approach to gravity in which the (offshell) connection of the underlying geometry also has this symmetry, being independent of the metric. The consequence is that the underlying geometry of these theories is non-metric. This situation is different from theories based on the (metric) pseudo-Riemannian geometry with a local scale symmetry (no gauge field) under which its Levi-Civita connection is not invariant i.e. the geometry does not share the (space-time) symmetry of the action - this may raise questions about their consistency.

Non-metricity plays a crucial role in mass generation. It ensures the mass generation
takes place via spontaneous breaking in quadratic gravity of Weyl or Palatini cases, in the absence of matter. This is a consequence of a dynamical Weyl gauge field present. This breaking is not possible in the absence of non-metricity, as we showed (in such case the Weyl gauge boson $\omega_\mu$ is “pure gauge” and can be integrated out, the theory is Weyl integrable and the geometry is metric).

Our results show that the Planck mass, the cosmological constant and the mass of $\omega_\mu$ are all proportional to $\langle \phi \rangle$; their different values are due to different couplings of the $\tilde{R}^2$ and $F^2$ terms in the action. A hierarchy of these scales is attributed to the smallness of these dimensionless gravitational couplings at the classical level. The field $\phi$ has a geometric origin, being the spin-zero mode propagated by the $\tilde{R}^2$ term, therefore $M_p$, $\Lambda$ and $m_\omega$ have a non-metric geometry origin, in the quadratic curvature term. Hence, unlike in local scale invariant theories (no gauge field $\omega_\mu$ present) based on the (metric) pseudo-Riemannian geometry, no additional scalar fields are needed here to generate all the mass scales of the theory and no ghosts are present; moreover, the cosmological constant is predicted to be positive and originates in this $\tilde{R}^2$ term, too.

Metricity is still recovered below $m_\omega$ after the massive Weyl gauge boson of scale symmetry decouples from the spectrum. In this decoupling limit the connection becomes Riemannian (Levi-Civita) and the geometry is metric. The scale where this happens ($m_\omega$) is naively expected to be high ($\propto \alpha M_p$), but current bounds on the non-metricity scale are actually very low (TeV scale). A low value of $m_\omega$ can be realised by tuning the coupling $\alpha$.

These results also apply to the Palatini formulation of the Weyl quadratic gravity theory studied here.

The above mass mechanism remains valid if the SM is embedded in Weyl geometry. This is a natural embedding, without any new degrees of freedom beyond the SM and Weyl geometry. In this case, of the SM spectrum only the Higgs field ($\sigma$) has a direct coupling to $\omega_\mu$ of the form $\omega_\mu \omega^\mu \sigma^2$. This leads to the intriguing possibility that the Higgs be generated by Weyl vector fusion in the early Universe. Since $\omega_\mu$ has geometric origin, this means that the Higgs itself has an origin in Weyl’s non-metric geometry, too. Therefore, not only the scales of quadratic gravity are of geometric origin but this extends, in a sense, to the SM masses generated by the Higgs. This suggests that Weyl geometry is more fundamental and it provides a UV completion of the (pseudo)Riemannian geometry underlying Einstein gravity. These results also apply in the Palatini case, even though in this case there are corrections from additional operators not included in our analysis.

Can these ideas be tested experimentally? One possibility may be to analyse a possible imprint on the gravitational waves due to the Weyl gauge boson of scale symmetry. The second and perhaps the most interesting possibility is in Higgs physics, assuming a light $\omega_\mu$ near its lower bound; in this case the term $\omega_\mu \omega^\mu \sigma^2$, relating Higgs physics to non-metricity, brings corrections to the Higgs couplings (e.g. quantum corrections to the quartic coupling). In this way one may set lower bounds on $m_\omega$ which is the scale of “new physics” in this case. A third possibility is via the Stueckelberg-Higgs inflation, which predicts a low ($\sim 10^{-3}$) tensor-to-scalar ratio ($r$) value, testable in the near future experiments. Work to explore these interesting possibilities is in progress.
Appendix

We discuss the parallel transport in Weyl and Palatini geometry used in the text, Section 4.6.

- Weyl case: Weyl geometry is represented by classes of equivalence of \( (g_{\mu\nu}, w_\mu) \) related by (A-1). Scalars \( \phi \) and fermions \( \psi \) transform under (A-1) as shown in (A-2) below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} &= \Sigma g_{\mu\nu}, \\
\sqrt{\hat{g}} &= \Sigma^{2q} \sqrt{g}, \\
\hat{\omega}_\mu &= \omega_\mu - \frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\mu \ln \Sigma \\
\hat{\phi} &= \Sigma^{-q/2} \phi, \\
\hat{\psi} &= \Sigma^{-3q/2} \psi
\end{align*}
\]

(A-1)

The gauge covariant derivative of the scalar \( \phi \) transforms just like the scalar itself and equals \( D_\mu \phi = [\partial_\mu - (q/2) \alpha w_\mu] \phi \). Here it is assumed that \( q \) is the Weyl charge of the metric. One often sets \( q = 1 \) and the general case is restored by simply rescaling the coupling \( \alpha \to \alpha q \).

Weyl geometry has vectorial non-metricity

\[
\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = -\alpha q \omega_\mu g_{\alpha\beta},
\]

(A-3)

where \( \tilde{\nabla} \) is defined by the Weyl connection \( \tilde{\Gamma} \):

\[
\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} - \tilde{\Gamma}^\rho_{\mu\alpha} g_{\rho\beta} - \tilde{\Gamma}^\rho_{\beta\mu} g_{\rho\alpha}.
\]

(A-4)

Eq. (A-3) may be written in a “metric” format

\[
\tilde{\nabla}_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad \tilde{\nabla}' = \tilde{\nabla} \bigg|_{\partial_\lambda \to \partial_\lambda + \alpha q \omega_\lambda}.
\]

(A-5)

Therefore the Weyl connection \( \tilde{\Gamma} \) is found from the Levi-Civita connection (\( \Gamma \)) in which one makes the same substitution: \( \tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma|_{\partial_\lambda \to \partial_\lambda + \alpha q \omega_\lambda} \), or by “standard” calculation, as for the Levi-Civita case. This gives

\[
\tilde{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\mu\nu} = \Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu} + (q/2) \alpha \left[ \delta^\lambda_\mu \omega_\nu + \delta^\lambda_\nu \omega_\mu - g_{\mu\nu} \omega^\lambda \right].
\]

(A-6)

Consider now a vector \( u^\mu \) of some Weyl charge:

\[
\hat{u}^\mu = \Sigma^{z_u/2} u^\mu
\]

(A-7)

The parallel transport of a constant vector (in a Weyl-covariant sense) is defined by

\[
\frac{Du^\mu}{d\tau} = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad D \equiv dx^\lambda D_\lambda, \quad D_\lambda u^\mu = \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda u^\mu \bigg|_{\partial_\lambda + (z_u/2) \alpha \omega_\lambda},
\]

(A-8)

with

\[
\tilde{\nabla}_\lambda u^\mu = \partial_\lambda u^\mu + \tilde{\Gamma}^\mu_{\lambda\rho} u^\rho,
\]

(A-9)

and \( x = x(\tau) \). Then from (A-8) the “standard” differential variation of the vector is

\[
d u^\mu = -dx^\lambda \left[ (z_u/2) \alpha \omega_\lambda u^\mu + \tilde{\Gamma}^\mu_{\lambda\rho} u^\rho \right], \quad \text{where} \quad d u^\mu \equiv dx^\lambda \partial_\lambda u^\mu.
\]

(A-10)

For a brief introduction to Weyl conformal geometry see Appendix A in [16].
Then under the parallel transport, the product \( \langle u, v \rangle = u^\mu v^\nu g_{\mu\nu} \) of vectors \( u, v \) changes as
\[
d\langle u, v \rangle = dx^\lambda \left[ \tilde{\nabla}_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} - \alpha \omega_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} (z_u + z_v)/2 \right] u^\mu v^\nu.
\] (A-11)

This can immediately be integrated along a given path \( \gamma(\tau) \).

Using non-metricity \( (A-3) \), then the norm \( |u| \) of the vector varies according to
\[
d|u|^2 = dx^\lambda |u|^2 \omega_\lambda (-\alpha)(q + z_u),
\] (A-12)
or, integrating this along a path \( \gamma(\tau) \):
\[
|u|^2 = |u_0|^2 e^{-\alpha(q+z_u)} f_\lambda dx^\lambda.
\] (A-13)

The integral and the norm are path-dependent, except when \( \omega_\mu \) is an exact one-form. In this case, if the path is closed the integral vanishes and the norm is invariant. This is the case of Weyl integrable geometry (conformal to Riemannian geometry).

In Weyl geometry the ratio of two vectors (of same Weyl weight) is invariant under the parallel transport. This is seen by using (A-12)
\[
d\frac{|u|^2}{|v|^2} = \alpha dx^\lambda \left( -\omega_\lambda (2q + z_u) |u|^2 + 4q u_\lambda u_\beta v_\beta \right),
\] (A-14)
This vanishes if \( z_u = z_v \), result used in Section 4.6. This is of interest since for physical purposes the relative length should be invariant under parallel transport. This would be consistent with physics being independent of the units of length.

- **Palatini case:** In the Palatini case the non-metricity is found from action \( (25) \) by solving the equations of motion of the connection \( \tilde{\Gamma} \). The result is \( (10) \)
\[
\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = (2)\alpha q (g_{\mu\nu} v_\lambda - g_{\mu\lambda} v_\nu - g_{\nu\lambda} v_\mu),
\] (A-15)
where \( v_\mu \) is the Weyl boson in this case. Then the change of the norm of a vector under the parallel transport can be computed from (A-11) in which one is using the Palatini non-metricity. One finds
\[
d|u|^2 = \alpha dx^\lambda \left[ -\omega_\lambda (2q + z_u) u^2 + 4q u_\lambda (u_\beta v_\beta) \right].
\] (A-16)
From this one also finds the change of the ratio of the norms of two vectors
\[
d\frac{|u|^2}{|v|^2} = dx^\lambda \alpha \left( (z_u - z_v) \omega_\lambda + 4 q \omega_\beta \left( \frac{u_\lambda u_\beta}{|u|^2} - \frac{v_\lambda v_\beta}{|v|^2} \right) \right).
\] (A-17)
Unlike in Weyl geometry, the ratio of the norms of two vectors changes under parallel transport even when the vectors have the same Weyl charge. This result is used in Section 4.6.
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