

Palatini versus metric formulation in higher-curvature gravity

Mónica Borunda*, Bert Janssen† and Mar Bastero-Gil‡

Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos and
Centro Andaluz de Física de Partículas Elementales
Universidad de Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain

Abstract

We compare the metric and the Palatini formalism to obtain the Einstein equations in the presence of higher-order curvature corrections that consist of contractions of the Riemann tensor, but not of its derivatives. We find that there is a class of theories for which the two formalisms are equivalent. This class contains the Palatini version of Lovelock theory, but also more Lagrangians that are not Lovelock, but respect certain symmetries. For the general case, we find that imposing the Levi-Civita connection as an Ansatz, the Palatini formalism is contained within the metric formalism, in the sense that any solution of the former also appears as a solution of the latter, but not necessarily the other way around. Finally we give the conditions the solutions of the metric equations should satisfy in order to solve the Palatini equations.

*E-mail: mborunda@ugr.es

†E-mail: bjanssen@ugr.es

‡E-mail: mbg@ugr.es

1 Introduction

One of the main lessons of General Relativity is that spacetime is not just a static playground in which physics takes place, but that it acts as a dynamical entity, with physical degrees of freedom, just like the matter and field content. In General Relativity the gravitational interaction is related to the curvature of spacetime, which in turn is determined by the energy-momentum content of the spacetime. Free test particles will follow geodesic curves, which in general in a curved manifold will not be straight lines. Whereas in Newtonian Mechanics the deviation from a straight line is interpreted as a force acting from a distance, in General Relativity it is seen as a purely geometrical property of the spacetime. The mathematical picture of spacetime that thus arises from General Relativity is that of a D -dimensional manifold, equipped with a metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and a connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho$, whose dynamics is described by the Principle of Minimal Action.

In differential geometry, the metric and the connection are two independent quantities: the former measures distances between points of the manifold and angles between vectors in the tangent space, the latter defines parallel transport of vectors and tensors and hence determines the intrinsic curvature of the manifold. However assuming the connection to be symmetric ($\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^\rho$) and metric compatible ($\nabla_\mu g_{\nu\rho} = 0$), one finds that the connection (and hence the curvature of the manifold) is uniquely determined by the metric components:

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\lambda}\left(\partial_\mu g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\lambda} - \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}\right). \quad (1.1)$$

This connection is called the Levi-Civita connection and due to its symmetries, the torsion (*i.e.* the antisymmetric part of the connection) vanishes identically and many of the curvature tensor identities simplify considerably.

In General Relativity, one usually (tacitly) assumes that the Levi-Civita connection describes correctly the physics in Nature and hence that the metric is the only dynamical variable in the theory. Besides the uniqueness and simplicity arguments given above, there are also physical reasons to prefer the Levi-Civita connection among more general ones. A first reason is that the Equivalence Principle, the corner stone of General Relativity which states that the gravitational force can be locally gauged away by a convenient choice of coordinates, translates mathematically into the ability to set the connection components locally to zero, $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho(p) = 0$. However, due to the tensorial character of the torsion, this is only possible if the connection is completely symmetric.

A second physical reason to prefer the Levi-Civita connection is that for arbitrary connections, affine geodesics and metric geodesics do not coincide. Metric geodesics describe the shortest curve between two points, while affine geodesics are curves with covariantly constant tangent vectors. Physically the former would represent curves obtained via an action principle, while the latter represent unaccelerated trajectories. If both curves do not coincide, it is not clear which one would represent the trajectories of free particles, even possibly giving rise to problems with causality [1].

Despite the many arguments in favour of the Levi-Civita connection, it would be nice to have a rigorous, mathematical argument to select this one among more general ones. In fact, such an argument exists, at least in standard Einstein gravity. In the so-called Palatini formalism one assumes that the Ricci tensor in the Einstein-Hilbert action is independent of the metric and depends only on the (yet undetermined) connection. The metric appears in fact only in the volume element and the contractions of the Ricci tensor, such that the Einstein equation, the variation of the action with respect to the metric, is straightforward, albeit involving curvature tensors in terms of an arbitrary connection. On the other hand, the variation of the action with respect to the connection then yields that the connection should be symmetric and metric compatible and hence identifies it uniquely as Levi-Civita. Hence the combination of the equations of motion of the metric and the connection is physically equivalent to the equation of motion coming from the variation of the metric in the action assuming directly the Levi-Civita connection [2]. In this sense Levi-Civita arises as a natural solution to the Principle of Minimal Action.

Though the Einstein-Hilbert action is the natural choice for an action for gravity in four dimensions, there is no reason to exclude higher-order curvature corrections in higher dimensions. Already in the 1930's Lanczos [3] added a specific combination of curvature-squared terms, giving

rise to a second order, divergence-free, modified Einstein equation and in the 1970's Lovelock [4] generalised this result to arbitrary dimensions and arbitrary higher-order curvature terms. In string theory higher-order corrections appear naturally as stringy corrections to the supergravity action [5], and in the 1980's it was pointed out by Zwiebach [6] and Zumino [7] that these stringy corrections would bring in ghosts and spoil the consistency of the theory unless the corrections appear precisely in the combinations found by Lanczos and Lovelock. Furthermore it was noted in [7] that the n -th order term of this series is precisely the $2n$ -dimensional Euler character, but elevated to arbitrary dimensions $D > 2n$. The relative coefficients between the different orders are not determined by first principles, but can be fixed by the requirement that the theory should have the maximum number of degrees of freedom [8].

The absence of ghosts make Lovelock gravities the natural extension of Einstein gravity to dimensions higher than four. Not all the higher-order corrections that appear in string theory are of the Lovelock type [9], but possibly the presence of other fields, in particular the dilaton, might cure the problem. Recently higher-order curvature corrections have attracted a lot of attention in cosmology, where it is investigated whether these terms could lead to corrections to the FRW dynamics that mimic dark matter or cause late-time acceleration [10]. Likewise their effects have been explored in the context of string and brane world cosmology [11]. The derivation of the equations of motion of these higher-order curvature terms through the metric formalism is an increasingly difficult task, so it is a natural question to ask whether the Palatini formalism remains valid in the presence of these higher-curvature corrections, especially given its simplicity for the Einstein-Hilbert case.

The Palatini formalism has recently been studied in detail in different contexts, such as $f(R)$ gravity, Ricci-squared gravities and comparing the diffeomorphism symmetries of both formalisms [12, 1, 13, 14]. In general the Palatini formalism can lead to more general connections than Levi-Civita. In order to compare both formalisms, it is natural therefore to impose the Levi-Civita connection as an Ansatz in the Palatini formalism. It was recently pointed out [1] that, for a large class of theories in which the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda)$ is a functional of metric and the curvature tensors, but not of its derivatives, the Palatini formalism is only equivalent to the metric formalism for those actions that describe Lovelock gravities. We will confirm the results of [1] and show that there are more Lagrangians for which the two formalisms are equivalent provided that the Lagrangians have sufficient symmetries. In general however, the two formalisms are not equivalent as they lead to different equations of motion and we find that in this case the Palatini formalism implies the metric formalism for all actions $\mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda)$, while the opposite is not true in general. Solutions of the Palatini equations will always appear as solutions of the metric equations, but the metric solutions only solve the Palatini equations if they have enough symmetries.

The organisation of this letter is as follows: in section 2 we will briefly discuss the Palatini formalism for the Einstein-Hilbert action, basically to review the formalism and to set our notation. In section 3 we will compare the metric formalism and the Palatini formalism for the explicit example of quadratic curvature corrections (*i.e.* Gauss-Bonnet gravity with arbitrary coefficients) and in section 4 we will give a general proof for all Lagrangians of the type $\mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda)$ that the Palatini formalism implies the metric one, but not necessarily the other way around. We also study under which conditions solutions of one of the formalism also solves the other one. Finally, in section 5 we will give a concrete counterexample of a solution of the metric equations that does not satisfy the equations of the Palatini formalism and in section 6 we summarise our results.

2 The Palatini formalism for Einstein-Hilbert

The dynamics of spacetime is traditionally described by the Einstein-Hilbert action,

$$S(g) = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(g), \quad (2.1)$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}(g)$ is the Ricci tensor of the spacetime metric¹ $g_{\mu\nu}$. The explicit derivation of the Einstein equations from the Einstein-Hilbert action is rather involved, as the action is non-linear and second-order in the metric, such that one would at first sight expect the fields equations to be of fourth order. However, an explicit calculation shows that the contribution from the variation of the Ricci tensor vanishes² and only the variation of the volume element and the inverse metric of the Ricci scalar contribute to the field equations, yielding the well-known vacuum Einstein equation

$$R_{\mu\nu}(g) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R(g) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

There exists also a shorter way to obtain the same result, namely the so-called Palatini formalism. The formalism consists in assuming that the spacetime manifold is equipped with an arbitrary connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho$, independent of the metric, such that the Einstein-Hilbert action is a function of both the metric and the connection, which should now be considered as two independent fields,

$$S(g, \Gamma) = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma). \quad (2.3)$$

Since the Ricci tensor does no longer depend on the metric, the variation with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$ gives rise directly to the Einstein equations,

$$R_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R(\Gamma) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

though now the Ricci tensor and scalar are no longer related to the spacetime metric. Yet we should also vary the action with respect to the connection, the other independent field in the action. Using the Palatini identity for arbitrary connections

$$\delta R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda = \nabla_\mu(\delta\Gamma_{\nu\rho}^\lambda) - \nabla_\nu(\delta\Gamma_{\mu\rho}^\lambda) + T_{\mu\nu}^\sigma(\delta\Gamma_{\sigma\rho}^\lambda), \quad (2.5)$$

and integrating by parts, the variation of the action (2.3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \equiv \delta S(g, \Gamma) &= \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} (\delta\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda) \left[\nabla_\lambda g^{\mu\nu} + \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{\sigma\tau} \nabla_\lambda g_{\sigma\tau} + T_{\lambda\sigma}^\sigma \right) g^{\mu\nu} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \nabla_\rho g^{\rho\nu} \delta_\lambda^\mu - \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{\sigma\tau} \nabla_\rho g_{\sigma\tau} + T_{\rho\sigma}^\sigma \right) g^{\rho\nu} \delta_\lambda^\mu + g^{\rho\nu} T_{\rho\lambda}^\mu \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Since the variation (2.6) is proportional to the covariant derivative of the metric and the torsion, it is clear that the integral vanishes if the connection is metric-compatible and torsionless, in other words: Levi-Civita. Since the Levi-Civita connection is completely determined by the metric, as in (1.1), the Einstein equation (2.4) reduces immediately to the Einstein equation (2.2), obtained through the metric formalism.

For standard Einstein gravity the Palatini formalism has two big advantages: a practical one and a philosophical one. The practical one is that it is much easier to calculate the Einstein equation than in the metric formalism, and the philosophical one is that it tells us that the Levi-Civita connection is not just a convenient choice, but a physical requirement, a minimum of the action. Let us briefly comment of both issues.

The easiness of calculating (2.4) in comparison to (2.2) is obvious, the most involved part of the Palatini formalism consists in the calculation of the variation (2.6). However, the conclusion drawn from (2.6) remain valid if we couple the theory to (bosonic) matter by adding a matter Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_ϕ , as long as the matter couples minimally to gravity. In that case, \mathcal{L}_ϕ will contain only factors of the metric, not of the curvature tensors and (2.6) will not be affected by the presence

¹Our conventions are as follows: for the metric we use the mostly minus convention, the Riemann tensor is given by $R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda = 2\partial_{[\mu}\Gamma_{\nu]\rho}^\lambda + 2\Gamma_{[\mu|\sigma]}^\lambda\Gamma_{\nu]}^\sigma$, the Ricci tensor by $R_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\lambda\nu}{}^\lambda$, the Ricci scalar by $R = g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$ and the torsion by $T_{\mu\nu}^\rho = 2\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\rho$.

²The fact that the variation of the Ricci tensor does not yield higher-order differential equations is due to the fact that the Einstein-Hilbert action is in fact the first-order term of Lovelock gravity.

of \mathcal{L}_ϕ . The only modification occurs in the Einstein equations, that will get a contribution from the matter Lagrangian in the form of the energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$:

$$R_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R(\Gamma) = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.7)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G_N$. This scenario, however will no longer hold if matter is coupled non-minimally or, the case where we are interested in, in the presence of higher-curvature corrections.

The philosophical advantage is probably at least as important as the practical one. In most works on General Relativity, the Levi-Civita connection is silently assumed, mostly without even questioning possible alternatives. Equation (2.6) tells us that the Levi-Civita connection is not just a convenient choice, but appears as a solution to the equations of motion of the connection. Any other connection would not (necessarily) be a minimum of the action.

In the next sections we will investigate how far the equivalence between the metric formalism and the Palatini formalism remains valid in the presence of higher-order curvature corrections and look up to which point the mentioned advantages of the Palatini formalism still hold.

3 Comparison for the quadratic curvature corrections

As a first test case to compare the metric and the Palatini formalism, we will look at the simplest non-trivial example, namely the case of quadratic curvature corrections.

In the metric formalism, the most general Lagrangian that is quadratic in the Riemann tensor and preserves parity is given by

$$S = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \left[\alpha R^2 + 4\beta R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + \gamma R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} R^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where α , β and γ are arbitrary constants. For the case where the coefficients take the values $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (1, -1, 1)$ the action becomes the well-known Gauss-Bonnet term, which is a topological invariant (the Euler character) in four dimensions, but dynamical in $D > 4$. The easiest way to calculate the Einstein equation is then to write (3.1) in terms of the Riemann tensor,

$$S = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \left[\alpha g^{\mu\rho} g^{\sigma\alpha} \delta_\lambda^\nu \delta_\beta^\tau + 4\beta g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\rho\alpha} \delta_\lambda^\nu \delta_\beta^\tau + \gamma g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\nu\tau} g^{\rho\alpha} g_{\lambda\beta} \right] R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda R_{\sigma\tau\alpha}{}^\beta, \quad (3.2)$$

and vary S with respect to the explicit metric and the metrics inside the Riemann tensors. The latter is done via the chain rule, using that for the Levi-Civita connection, the variation of the Riemann tensor and the Christoffel symbols are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda &= \nabla_\mu(\delta\Gamma_{\nu\rho}^\lambda) - \nabla_\nu(\delta\Gamma_{\mu\rho}^\lambda), \\ \delta\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho &= \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\lambda} \left[\nabla_\mu(\delta g_{\lambda\nu}) + \nabla_\nu(\delta g_{\mu\lambda}) - \nabla_\lambda(\delta g_{\mu\nu}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The variation of (3.2) is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\delta S(g)}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} &\equiv H_{\mu\nu} = \alpha \left[2\nabla_\mu \partial_\nu R - 2g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 R + 2R_{\mu\nu} R - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} R^2 \right] \\ &+ 4\beta \left[\nabla_\mu \partial_\nu R - \nabla^2 R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 R - 2R_{\rho\mu\lambda\nu} R^{\rho\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} R_{\rho\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda} \right] \\ &+ \gamma \left[2\nabla_\mu \partial_\nu R - 4\nabla^2 R_{\mu\nu} - 4R_{\mu\rho} R_\nu{}^\rho - 4R_{\rho\mu\nu\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda} + 2R_{\mu\rho\lambda\sigma} R_\nu{}^{\rho\lambda\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} R_{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} R^{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that for $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (1, -1, 1)$, all the terms that contain derivatives of the curvatures cancel out and $H_{\mu\nu}$ reduces to the so-called Lanczos tensor,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mu\nu} &= 2RR_{\mu\nu} + 4R_{\rho\mu\nu\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda} + 2R_{\mu\rho\lambda\sigma} R_\nu{}^{\rho\lambda\sigma} - 4R_{\mu\rho} R_\nu{}^\rho \\ &- \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} \left[R^2 - 4R_{\rho\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda} + R_{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} R^{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

which is purely algebraic in the Riemann tensor, such that the Einstein equation $H_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$ contains only second derivatives of the metric. This is due to the fact that the Gauss-Bonnet term is in fact the second-order Lovelock gravity Lagrangian.

It is useful to observe that the divergence of $H_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes, $\nabla_\mu H^{\mu\nu} = 0$, not only for the case of the Lanczos tensor, but for general values of (α, β, γ) . This is an attractive property, since it implies that even though in the general case ghosts will appear, at least energy conservation is satisfied.

Let us now compare this equation with the corresponding set of equations from the Palatini formalism. Here the situation is a bit more complicated: due to the fact that we are dealing with an arbitrary connection, the curvature tensors do not possess the same symmetry properties as in the metric formalism and hence there are many possible generalisations of the metric action (3.1) for arbitrary connections. The most general quadratic curvature action that reduces to the action (3.1) when imposing the Levi-Civita connection is given by³

$$\begin{aligned}
S(g, \Gamma) = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} & \left[\alpha R^2 + \beta_1 R_{\mu\nu} R^{\nu\mu} + 2\beta_2 R_{\mu\nu} \tilde{R}^{\nu\mu} + \beta_3 \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{R}^{\nu\mu} \right. \\
& + \beta_4 R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + 2\beta_5 R_{\mu\nu} \tilde{R}^{\mu\nu} + \beta_6 \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{R}^{\mu\nu} \\
& \left. + \gamma_1 R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda\mu\nu} + \gamma_2 R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} R^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} + \gamma_3 R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \right]. \quad (3.6)
\end{aligned}$$

The great number of terms is due to the fact that, for arbitrary connections, we can define two inequivalent contractions of the Riemann tensor, namely the Ricci tensor $R_{\mu\nu}$ and the co-Ricci tensor $\tilde{R}_\mu{}^\lambda$

$$R_{\mu\rho} \equiv R_{\mu\lambda\rho}{}^\lambda \quad \tilde{R}_\mu{}^\lambda \equiv g^{\nu\rho} R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda. \quad (3.7)$$

Furthermore, in general neither the Ricci tensor nor the co-Ricci tensor are symmetric, hence the six different contractions between both in (3.6). Note that for the Levi-Civita connection, $\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}$ reduces to the Ricci tensor for Levi-Civita (upto a minus sign). The action (3.6) then reduces to (3.1) upon imposing Levi-Civita and choosing $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^6 \beta_i$ and $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_3$.

For future convenience, it is useful to define the gravitational tensor $\tilde{H}_{\mu\nu}$, the variation of the action with respect to the metric, and the connection tensor $K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$, the variation of the action with respect to the connection, as

$$\tilde{H}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\delta S(g, \Gamma)}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}, \quad K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\delta S(g, \Gamma)}{\delta \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda}. \quad (3.8)$$

The gravitational tensor $\tilde{H}_{\mu\nu}$ for the action (3.6) is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{H}_{\mu\nu} = & 2\alpha R_{\mu\nu} R + \beta_1 (R_{\mu\lambda} R^\lambda{}_\nu + R_{\lambda\mu} R_\nu{}^\lambda) - \beta_2 (2R_{(\nu|\lambda\sigma|\mu)} R^{\lambda\sigma} + \tilde{R}^\lambda{}_\mu R_{\nu\lambda} + \tilde{R}^\lambda{}_\nu R_{\mu\lambda}) \\
& + 2\beta_3 R_{\lambda(\nu|\rho|\mu)} \tilde{R}^{\lambda\rho} + \beta_4 (R_{\mu\lambda} R_\nu{}^\lambda + R_{\lambda\mu} R^\lambda{}_\nu) - \beta_5 (2R_{(\nu|\lambda\sigma|\mu)} R^{\sigma\lambda} + \tilde{R}^\lambda{}_\mu R_{\lambda\nu} + \tilde{R}^\lambda{}_\nu R_{\lambda\mu}) \\
& + 2\beta_6 R_{\lambda(\nu|\rho|\mu)} \tilde{R}^{\rho\lambda} + \gamma_1 (R_{\rho\lambda\sigma\mu} R_\nu{}^{\sigma\lambda\rho} + R_{\rho\mu\sigma\lambda} R^{\sigma\lambda\rho}{}_\nu) + 2\gamma_3 R_{\mu\rho\sigma\lambda} R_\nu{}^{\rho\lambda\sigma} \\
& + \gamma_2 (R_{\rho\lambda\sigma\mu} R^{\rho\lambda\sigma}{}_\nu + 2R_{\mu\lambda\sigma\rho} R_\nu{}^{\lambda\sigma\rho} - R_{\rho\lambda\mu\sigma} R^{\rho\lambda}{}_\nu{}^\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}, \quad (3.9)
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L} is the Lagrangian that appears in the action (3.6). On the other hand the connection tensor $K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = & 2\alpha \left[g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda R - \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla_\mu R \right] + 2\beta_1 \left[\nabla^\lambda R_{\nu\mu} - \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla^\sigma R_{\sigma\mu} \right] \\
& - 2\beta_2 \left[-\nabla^\lambda \tilde{R}_{\nu\mu} + \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla^\sigma \tilde{R}_{\sigma\mu} + g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\sigma R^{\sigma\lambda} - \nabla_\mu R_\nu{}^\lambda \right]
\end{aligned}$$

³We are grateful to Q. Exirifard and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari for drawing out attention to this point.

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2\beta_3 \left[\nabla_\mu \tilde{R}_\nu^\lambda - g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\sigma \tilde{R}^{\sigma\lambda} \right] + 2\beta_4 \left[\nabla^\lambda R_{\mu\nu} - \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla^\sigma R_{\mu\sigma} \right] \\
& - 2\beta_5 \left[-\nabla^\lambda \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} + \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla^\sigma \tilde{R}_{\mu\sigma} + g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\sigma R^{\lambda\sigma} - \nabla_\mu R^\lambda{}_\nu \right] \\
& + 2\beta_6 \left[-g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\sigma \tilde{R}^{\lambda\sigma} + \nabla_\mu \tilde{R}^\lambda{}_\nu \right] + 2\gamma_1 \nabla^\sigma \left[R^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu\sigma} - R^\lambda{}_{\mu\sigma\nu} \right] \\
& + 4\gamma_2 \nabla^\sigma R_{\nu\sigma}{}^\lambda{}_\mu + 4\gamma_3 \nabla^\sigma R_{\nu\sigma\mu}{}^\lambda + \mathcal{O}(\nabla^\lambda g_{\mu\nu}) + \mathcal{O}(T_{\mu\nu}^\lambda), \tag{3.10}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\nabla^\lambda g_{\mu\nu})$ and $\mathcal{O}(T_{\mu\nu}^\lambda)$ denote terms proportional to the covariant derivative of the metric and the torsion respectively, which we will not write down explicitly, for reasons that will become clear later on.

At first sight, the equation (3.4) is very different from (3.9) and (3.10). Note that although (3.9) contains a number of terms of (3.4), it lacks, among others, the derivatives of the curvature tensor. A direct consequence of this is that the divergence $\nabla_\mu \tilde{H}^{\mu\nu}$ does not vanish, which seems to suggest that the Einstein equation in the Palatini formalism, $\tilde{H}_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$ is not consistent.

In Ref. [1] the equivalence between the metric and the Palatini formalism is defined by demanding $K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \equiv 0$ for Levi-Civita (*i.e.* demanding that the Levi-Civita connection solves the equation of motion of the connection). Here we will use a different definition: instead we take the Levi-Civita connection as an Ansatz, substitute it in the equations of motion and see whether the remaining equations are equivalent to the Einstein equation of the metric formalism.

Imposing the Levi-Civita connection simplifies the expressions for $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \tilde{H}_{\mu\nu}|_{\text{Levi-Civita}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \equiv K_{\mu\nu}^\lambda|_{\text{Levi-Civita}}$ considerably,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} &= 2\alpha R_{\mu\nu} R + 4\beta \left(R_{\mu\rho} R_{\nu}{}^\rho + R_{\mu\rho\lambda\nu} R^{\rho\lambda} \right) + 2\gamma R_{\mu\rho\lambda\sigma} R_{\nu}{}^{\rho\lambda\sigma} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \left[\alpha R^2 - \beta R_{\rho\lambda} R^{\rho\lambda} + \gamma R_{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} R^{\rho\lambda\sigma\tau} \right], \\
\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda &= 2(\alpha + \beta) g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda R + 4(\beta + \gamma) \nabla^\lambda R_{\mu\nu} \\
&\quad - 2(\alpha + \beta) \delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla_\mu R - 4(\beta + \gamma) \nabla_\mu R_{\nu}{}^\lambda. \tag{3.11}
\end{aligned}$$

The point now is to compare the equations obtained in the different formalisms. As mentioned above, the main difference between $H_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ is the presence of second derivative terms in the former. It is then natural to try to write the difference between these two tensors in terms of derivatives of $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$. Indeed, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\lambda \mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda &= -2(\alpha + \beta) \left(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu R - g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 R \right) - 4(\beta + \gamma) \left(\nabla^\lambda \nabla_\mu R_{\nu\lambda} - \nabla^2 R_{\mu\nu} \right), \\
\nabla^\mu \mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda &= -2(\alpha + \beta) \left(\delta_\nu^\lambda \nabla^2 R - \nabla_\nu \nabla^\lambda R \right) - 4(\beta + \gamma) \left(\nabla^2 R^\lambda{}_\nu - \nabla^\rho \nabla^\lambda R_{\rho\nu} \right), \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

it is not difficult to see that in this case one can write $H_{\mu\nu}$ in terms of $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ and $(\nabla\mathcal{K})_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{K}_{(\mu\nu)}^\lambda + \frac{1}{4} g_{\lambda\mu} \nabla^\rho \mathcal{K}_{\rho\nu}^\lambda + \frac{1}{4} g_{\lambda\nu} \nabla^\rho \mathcal{K}_{\rho\mu}^\lambda. \tag{3.13}$$

In other words, the Einstein equation in the metric formalism, $H_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$, can be obtained through the Palatini formalism via the above combination of the equations of motion of the metric and the connection. In the same way, energy conservation in the Palatini formalism is guaranteed on-shell, since $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ will be divergence-free when the connection tensor vanishes, $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\rho = 0$.

But there is more. From (3.11) it is clear that for $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (1, -1, 1)$, the connection tensor $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is identically zero and hence $H_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$. Note that this is precisely the Gauss-Bonnet case in the metric formalism. In the Palatini formalism however, one has to be careful, since it turns out that not all combinations of β_i with $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^6 \beta_i = -1$ in (3.6) have vanishing connection tensor. This is a result of the fact that different choices of the parameters β_i in (3.6) lead to

physically different theories, even though they all reduce to (3.1) when we impose the Levi-Civita connection.

Explicitly, in terms of the β_i , formula (3.11) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda &= 2(\alpha - \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_5 + \beta_6)g_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\lambda R + 4(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \gamma)\nabla^\lambda R_{\mu\nu} \\ &\quad - 2(\alpha + \beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_4 - \beta_5)\delta_\nu^\lambda\nabla_\mu R - 4(-\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \gamma)\nabla_\mu R_\nu^\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

It is then straightforward to see that $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ vanishes for any Lagrangian (3.6) with

$$\alpha = \gamma \neq 0, \quad \beta_1 + \beta_4 = \beta_3 + \beta_6, \quad \alpha + \beta_1 + \beta_4 - \beta_2 - \beta_5 = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that the quadratic Lovelock Lagrangian in the Palatini formalism,

$$\begin{aligned} S(g, \Gamma) &= \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \begin{vmatrix} g^{\mu_1\nu_1} & \dots & g^{\mu_1\nu_4} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ g^{\mu_4\nu_1} & \dots & g^{\mu_4\nu_4} \end{vmatrix} R_{\mu_1\mu_2\nu_1\nu_2} R_{\mu_3\mu_4\nu_3\nu_4} \\ &= \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \left[R^2 - R_{\mu\nu}R^{\nu\mu} - 2R_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\nu\mu} - \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\nu\mu} + R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}R^{\rho\lambda\mu\nu} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

indeed satisfies the above requirements, such that we reproduce the results of [1], that for Lovelock gravities the metric and the Palatini formalism are equivalent. However it is also clear that there are other combinations of the parameters that satisfy the conditions (3.15), but are not Lovelock in the sense of (3.16). For example the combinations

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta = R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\mu\nu}, \quad \mathcal{L}_\beta = R_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.17)$$

lead also to vanishing connection tensor and hence equivalence between both formalisms. The reason why these Lagrangians lead to the same result is because they mimic the symmetries of the Riemann tensor in the metric formalism [15]. In certain sense what we are finding is that the expression (3.16) for the definition of Lovelock gravity is too restrictive and that there are more inequivalent Lagrangians in the Palatini formalism that lead to divergence-free, second order Einstein equations, as originally demanded by Lovelock [4].

4 More general Lagrangians

The relation (3.13) between the gravitational tensors $H_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ and the connection tensor $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ is remarkable. We will show that this is in fact a general result for any Lagrangian that contains contractions of the Riemann tensor, but not of its derivatives, and discuss what this means for the equivalence of the two formalisms.

Let us now derive the above results for the general case where the action is a functional of the metric and (contractions of) the Riemann tensor, but not of its derivatives,

$$S = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda). \quad (4.1)$$

The derivation of the equations of motion of the metric and the connection in both the metric and the Palatini formalism is completely analogous to the derivation illustrated in section 3. In the metric formalism the gravitational tensor $H_{\mu\nu}$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}[\nabla_\alpha, \nabla_\beta] \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\alpha\beta\rho}{}^\lambda} \right) g_{\rho(\mu}\delta_{\nu)}^\lambda \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\rho\nabla_\alpha \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\alpha\beta\rho}{}^\lambda} \right) g_{\beta(\mu}\delta_{\nu)}^\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\rho\nabla_\beta \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\alpha\beta\rho}{}^\lambda} \right) g_{\alpha(\mu}\delta_{\nu)}^\lambda \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^\lambda\nabla_\alpha \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\alpha\beta\rho}{}^\lambda} \right) g_{\beta(\mu}g_{\nu)\rho} - \frac{1}{2}\nabla^\lambda\nabla_\beta \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\alpha\beta\rho}{}^\lambda} \right) g_{\alpha(\mu}g_{\nu)\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

while the gravitational tensor $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ and the connection tensor $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\nu}$ are of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L} \\ \mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho} &= \nabla_\nu \left[\left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\rho\nu\mu\lambda}} \right) - \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\nu\rho\mu\lambda}} \right) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

where in $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\nu}$ we have already substituted the Levi-Civita Ansatz. Again it is not difficult to see that $H_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ are related via the general expression

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\rho\mathcal{K}_{(\mu\nu)}^\rho + \frac{1}{2}g_{\lambda\mu}\nabla^\rho\mathcal{K}_{(\nu\rho)}^\lambda + \frac{1}{2}g_{\lambda\nu}\nabla^\rho\mathcal{K}_{(\mu\rho)}^\lambda.\tag{4.4}$$

In Ref. [12] the above result has been derived, but through a completely different approach: there the Levi-Civita connection was imposed via a Lagrange multiplier, such that the connection is not really an independent field. We, in contrast, following the original Palatini philosophy, substitute the Levi-Civita connection only as an Ansatz in the connection equation, which really appears as a completely independent equation. Yet it is remarkable that both methods yield the same results.

The question now arises whether the two sets of equations are really equivalent, *i.e.*, whether any solution of one set also solves equations of the other set⁴. Apart from the cases where $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is identically zero, as in Lovelock gravity [1], clearly, formula (3.13) states that the Palatini formalism is contained within the metric formalism: any solution of the equations of motion in the Palatini formalism

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}, \quad \mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0,\tag{4.5}$$

is obviously also a solution of the Einstein equation in the metric formalism, which using (4.4) can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\rho\mathcal{K}_{(\mu\nu)}^\rho + \frac{1}{2}g_{\lambda(\mu}\nabla^\rho\mathcal{K}_{\nu)\rho}^\lambda + \frac{1}{2}g_{\lambda(\nu}\nabla^\rho\mathcal{K}_{\mu)\rho}^\lambda = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}.\tag{4.6}$$

The opposite however is not necessarily true: in a general solution the different terms in the left-hand side of (4.6) will conspire to satisfy the equation, rather than spontaneously decompose along the lines of (4.5). In next section we will give an explicit example of a solution of the metric Einstein equations that does not satisfy the Palatini equations.

A natural question then is to ask under which conditions solutions of the metric formalism also solve the Palatini equations and what the physical meaning of these conditions is. From (4.5) we see that a necessary and sufficient condition is that the connection tensor vanishes, while from (4.3) we see that $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}$ has the structure of a divergence,

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho} = \nabla_\nu B^{\nu\mu\rho}{}_\lambda.\tag{4.7}$$

The vanishing of $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}$ therefore implies a conserved current $B^{\nu\mu\rho}{}_\lambda$, which depends on the Lagrangian under consideration. Since $B^{\nu\mu\rho}{}_\lambda$ can be written in terms of contractions of the Riemann tensor, the connection equation imposes certain extra symmetry requirements on the metric and only those solutions of the metric equations that possess this symmetry are also solutions of the Palatini formalism.

Let us look at some specific examples. For the Einstein-Hilbert action, the vanishing of $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}$ is automatically satisfied, as $B^{\nu\mu\rho}{}_\lambda$ is proportional to the metric,

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}(\text{EH}) = \nabla_\nu \left[g^{\mu\nu}\delta_\lambda^\rho - g^{\rho\nu}\delta_\lambda^\mu \right] \equiv 0.\tag{4.8}$$

This is the reason why for standard Einstein gravity, the Palatini formalism is equivalent to the metric formalism: the connection equation does not impose any extra condition. A similar expression can be found for other theories with vanishing connection tensors.

⁴One has to be careful when comparing explicit solutions of both sets of equations, as the expressions for the metric are only determined up to coordinate transformations. However, as both sets of equations are fully covariant, this should not lead to confusion.

For $\mathcal{L} = R^2$ however, the connection equation demands

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}(R^2) = -2\nabla_\nu \left[\delta_\lambda^\rho g^{\mu\nu} R - \delta_\lambda^\nu g^{\mu\rho} R \right] = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

which is solved by metrics with constant Ricci scalar $R = \Lambda$. In a similar fashion, for the Lagrangians

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta = R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + 2R_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{R}^{\mu\nu}, \quad \mathcal{L}_\gamma = R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}R^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}, \quad (4.10)$$

the vanishing of the connection tensor impose the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}(\mathcal{L}_\beta) &= 4\nabla_\nu \left[\delta_\lambda^\nu R^{\rho\mu} + g^{\rho\mu} R^\nu{}_\lambda - \delta_\lambda^\rho R^{\mu\nu} - g^{\mu\nu} R^\rho{}_\lambda \right] = 0, \\ \mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\mu\rho}(\mathcal{L}_\gamma) &= 4\nabla_\nu R^{\mu\nu\rho}{}_\lambda = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

which are fulfilled by Einstein spaces and constant curvature spaces (*i.e.* maximally symmetric spaces) respectively⁵, since for these spaces the Ricci tensor and the Riemann tensor are proportional to (combinations of) the metric, $R_{\mu\nu} = \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ and $R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} = \Lambda(g_{\mu\rho}g_{\nu\lambda} - g_{\nu\rho}g_{\mu\lambda})$.

Note that, although not necessarily the most general solution to the connection condition, the solutions presented above are in certain sense the generalisation of the metric \mathbf{g}_{ab} introduced in [13] in the context of Ricci-tensor-squared gravity. It is then straightforward to generalise the result for arbitrary Lagrangians: for a given Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda)$, a solution of the metric equations is also a solution of the Palatini equations if

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta R_{\mu\nu\rho}{}^\lambda} = \Lambda (g^{\mu\rho} \delta_\lambda^\nu - g^{\nu\rho} \delta_\lambda^\mu). \quad (4.12)$$

5 An example: FRW in (pseudo) Gauss-Bonnet gravity

In this section we will illustrate the inequivalence of both formalism, by comparing the cosmological solutions of both formalisms for the case of a Lagrangian that is Gauss-Bonnet in the metric formalism, but not Lovelock Gauss-Bonnet (3.16) in the Palatini approach,

$$S = \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} \left[R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}R^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

Note that indeed this action does not satisfy the conditions (3.15) and instead imposes the constraint

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mu\rho}^\lambda \Big|_{\text{pseudo-Gauss-Bonnet}} = -4\nabla^\lambda G_{\mu\rho} - 4\nabla_\mu G_\rho{}^\lambda = 0, \quad (5.2)$$

which clearly is solved for metrics that are cosmological vacuum solution $G_{\mu\nu} = \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$, with $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R$.

Consider now an Ansatz of the FRW type

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - e^{2A}\bar{g}_{mn}dx^m dx^n \quad (5.3)$$

where $A = A(t)$ is a function of t and $\bar{g}_{mn} = \bar{g}_{mn}(x)$ is the metric on the spatial sections, which for simplicity we assume to be flat, *i.e.* $R_{mnp}{}^q = 0$. Using Eq. (3.5), we find that for the metric (5.3), the gravitational tensor of the metric formalism is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{tt} &= -\frac{(D-1)!}{2(D-5)!} (A')^4, \\ H_{mn} &= \frac{(D-2)!}{(D-5)!} e^{2A}\bar{g}_{mn} \left[2A''(A')^2 + \frac{1}{2}(D-1)(A')^4 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

⁵Obviously these are not the only solutions. For example, locally symmetric spaces, *i.e.* spaces with covariant constant Riemann tensor also satisfy the above conditions.

where the prime denotes a derivative with respect to t .

We will parametrise the energy content by a perfect fluid with pressure P , energy density ρ and equation of state $P = \omega\rho$, such that conservation of energy implies that the energy scales with A as

$$\rho = \rho_0 e^{-(D-1)(1+\omega)A}, \quad (5.5)$$

where ρ_0 is the energy density at the initial time $t = t_0$. In order to solve the Einstein equation $H_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$, we have to distinguish between $\omega = -1$ (*i.e.* a cosmological constant) and $\omega \neq -1$. For the case $\omega = -1$ the solution is given by de Sitter space

$$A(t) = \beta t, \quad \beta = \left[\frac{2(D-5)! \kappa \rho_0}{(D-1)!} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (5.6)$$

while for $\omega \neq -1$ we find a power law behaviour

$$e^{A(t)} = \beta \left(\frac{t}{t_0} \right)^{\frac{4}{(D-1)(1+\omega)}}, \quad \beta^{(D-1)(1+\omega)} = \frac{(D-1)^3 (D-5)!}{2^7 (D-2)!} \kappa \rho_0 (1+\omega)^4. \quad (5.7)$$

In the Palatini formalism, by substituting the Ansatz (5.3) in the expressions (3.9) and (3.11) for $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ obtained in section 3, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{tt} &= -(D-1)(D-2) \left[4(A'')^2 + 4A''(A')^2 + \frac{1}{2}(D-3)(D-4)(A')^4 \right], \\ \mathcal{H}_{mn} &= e^{2A} \bar{g}_{mn} \left[-4(D-2)(A'')^2 + 2(D-2)^2(D-5)A''(A')^2 + \frac{(D-1)!}{2(D-5)!} (A')^4 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{tt}^t &= -8(D-1)(D-2)A''A', \\ \mathcal{K}_{mt}^p &= 8(D-2) \delta_m^p A''A', \\ \mathcal{K}_{tm}^p &= -4(D-2) \delta_m^p \left[A''' + (D-2)A''A' \right], \\ \mathcal{K}_{mn}^t &= 4(D-2) e^{2A} \bar{g}_{mn} \left[A''' + (D-2)A''A' \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

It is straightforward to see that the de Sitter solution (5.6) satisfies the connection equation $\mathcal{K}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0$, as hence also the Einstein equation $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$, as expected from (3.13). The power law solution (5.7) however does not satisfy the connection equation, nor the Einstein equation.

This is indeed what one would expect from the analysis of the previous section. In contrast to the de Sitter space, the power law solution does not satisfy the vacuum cosmological Einstein equations $G_{\mu\nu} = \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$. Or, the other way around, pseudo-Gauss-Bonnet gravity supports FRW type solutions only when the matter Lagrangian satisfies the symmetry requirement imposed by the connection condition (5.2), *i.e.* if we have a perfect fluid with $\omega = -1$.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we have compared the Einstein equations obtained via the metric formalism with the equations obtained via the Palatini formalism for Lagrangians that contain arbitrary contractions of the Riemann tensor, but not of its derivatives. We find that for a certain class of theories, including (but not exclusively) Lovelock gravities, the two formalisms lead to physically equivalent sets of equations, when imposing the Levi-Civita connection as an Ansatz, as discussed in section 3. In general however, this is no longer the case.

In general, using the Levi-Civita connection either automatically in the metric formalism or as an Ansatz in the Palatini formalism, the Einstein equation of the metric formalism can be written as a combination of the Einstein equation of the Palatini formalism and the divergence of the

connection tensor, as in Eq. (4.6), but the two sets are not equivalent, in the sense that they do not have the same solutions. The Palatini formalism is contained within the metric formalism, as any solution of the Palatini equations is also a solution of the metric equations. The opposite, however, is in general not true: only those solutions of the metric formalism that have a vanishing connection tensor are also solutions of the Palatini equations. Clearly, the set of solutions of the Palatini formalism is a non-trivial subset of the solutions of the metric formulation.

As the connection condition in the Palatini formalism has the structure of a conservation law, one can interpret this condition as a symmetry requirement that needs to be satisfied by both the matter and gravity Lagrangians in order to become a solution of the Palatini equations. In this paper we listed the necessary symmetries for some specific theories.

In the introduction we stated that the Palatini formalism in the Einstein-Hilbert action has two advantages: the practical advantage was that it was easier to compute the Einstein equations assuming that the curvature tensors are independent of the metric, while the philosophical advantage was that the Levi-Civita connection is not just a convenient choice, but a physical solution to the Principle of Minimal Action. We see now that in general only a small part of these advantages remains in the presence of higher-order curvature corrections: although it is in principle still possible to compute the metric gravitational tensor $H_{\mu\nu}$ using the Palatini formalism via the relation (3.13), in practice the effort of computing $H_{\mu\nu}$ directly from (4.2) is not much more than the effort of calculating the connection equation (4.3) and its divergences. Concerning the philosophical advantage, we had hoped to find a mathematical argument that would pick out the Levi-Civita connection among all other possible connections, as a minimum of the action. However, strictly speaking, we can only affirm this for a subset of all solutions of the (metric) Einstein equations, namely those that are also solutions of the Palatini formalism. For the other solutions, we have no arguments to assume that the Levi-Civita connection is more than just a (physically perfectly reasonable) choice.

However for the special class of theories we found, the practical and philosophical advantages are as obvious as for the Einstein-Hilbert case. The fact that the connection tensor is identically zero, simplifies the Einstein equation and selects the Levi-Civita connection as a minimum of the action. It is remarkable that this occurs precisely for Lovelock theories, which were already considered a natural extension of standard Einstein gravity due to its divergence-free, second order equations.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Q. Exirifard and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari for enlightening discussions and private communications, and also D. Blas, M. Blau, L. Boubekeur, R. Emparan, J. Pons, T. Ortín and P. Townsend for their useful comments. The work of M.B. is done as part of the program *Juan de la Cierva* and the work of B.J. and M.B.G. is done as part of the program *Ramón y Cajal*, both of the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencias (M.E.C.) of Spain. The authors are also partially supported by the M.E.C. under contract FIS 2007-63364 and by the Junta de Andalucía group FQM 101.

References

- [1] Q. Exirifard and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Phys. Lett. B661 (2008) 158, [arXiv:0705.1879 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] A. Palatini, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo 43, (1919) 203.
- [3] C. Lanczos, Ann. Math. 39 (1938) 842.
- [4] D. Lovelock, Aequationes Math. 4 (1970) 127; D. Lovelock, J. Math. Phys. 12 (1971) 498.
- [5] P. Candelas, G. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B258 (1985) 46; D. Gross and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 277 (1986) 1; T. Grisar and D. Zanon, Phys. Lett. B

- 177 (1986) 347; A.A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B 276 (1986) 391; Q.H. Park and D. Zanon, Phys. Rev. D 35 (1987) 4038; R.R. Metsaev and A.A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B 293 (1987) 385.
- [6] B. Zwiebach, Phys. Lett B 156 (1985) 315.
- [7] B. Zumino, Phys. Rep. 137 (1986) 109.
- [8] R. Troncoso and J. Zanelli, Class. Quant. Grav. 17 (2000) 4451, [hep-th/9907109](#).
- [9] A.A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B 176 (1986) 92.
- [10] A.L. Maroto and I.L. Shapiro, Phys. Lett. B 414 (1997) 34, [hep-th/9706179](#); G. Calcagni, S. Tsujikawa and M. Sami, Class. Quant. Grav. 22 (2005) 3977 [hep-th/0505193](#); M. Iihoshi and S.V. Ketov, [arXiv:0707.3359 \[hep-th\]](#); M. Iihoshi and S.V. Ketov, [arXiv:0803.2577 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] M.C. Bento and O. Bertolami, Phys. Lett. B 368 (1996) 198, [gr-qc/9503057](#); G. Kofinas, R. Maartens and E. Papantonopoulos, JHEP 0310 (2003) 066, [hep-th/0307138](#); M. Borunda and L. Boubekeur, JCAP 0610 (2006) 002, [hep-th/0604085](#); E. Elizalde, S. Jhingan, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, M. Sami and I. Thongkool, Eur. Phys. J. C53 (2008) 447, [arXiv:0705.1211](#).
- [12] S. Cotsakis, J. Miritzis and L. Querella, J. Math. Phys. 40 (1999) 3063, [gr-qc/9712025](#); L. Querella, [gr-qc/9902044](#).
- [13] B. Li, J.D. Barrow and D.F. Mota, Phys. Rev. D 76, 104047 (2007), [arXiv:0707.2664 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [14] S. de Haro, A. Sinkovics and K. Skenderis, Phys. Rev. D68 (2003) 066001, [hep-th/0302136](#); G. Allemandi, A. Borowiec, M. Francaviglia and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D72 (2005) 063505, [gr-qc/0504057](#); T.P. Sotiriou and S. Liberati, Annals Phys. 322 (2007) 935, [gr-qc/0604006](#); V. Tapia and M. Ujevic, Class. Quant.Grav. 15 (1998) 3719, [gr-qc/0605132](#); A. Iglesias, N. Kaloper, A. Padilla and M. Park, Phys. Rev. D76 (2007) 104001, [arXiv:0708.1163 \[astro-ph\]](#); S. Samanta, [arXiv:0708.3300 \[hep-th\]](#); F. Bauer and D.A. Demir, [arXiv:0803.2664 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] Q. Exirifard and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, private communications.