

Every Poincaré gauge theory is conformal: a compelling case for dynamical vector torsion

Will Barker,^{1,2,*} Michael Hobson,^{1,†} Anthony Lasenby,^{1,2,‡} Yun-Cherng Lin,^{1,2,§} and Zhiyuan Wei^{1,3,¶}

¹*Astrophysics Group, Cavendish Laboratory, JJ Thomson Avenue, Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK*

²*Kavli Institute for Cosmology, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*

³*Institute for Complex Quantum Systems, Ulm University, Albert-Einstein-Allee, 89069 Ulm, DE*

The Poincaré gauge theory (PGT) of gravity provides a viable formulation of general relativity (Einstein–Cartan theory), and a popular model-building framework for modified gravity with torsion. Notoriously, however, the PGT terms which propagate vector torsion lead to strongly-coupled ghosts: the modern view is that only scalar torsion can propagate. To fix this, we revisit the concept of embedding explicit mass scales in scale-invariant theories, showing how the Klein–Gordon theory naturally leads to a slowly-rolling inflaton. We then show that the unique scale-invariant embedding of PGT leads to two new terms, one of which is the Maxwell term for vector torsion. We provide the full spectrum of quantum particles in the resulting theory. Our result means that every PGT is conformal and – after a two-decade hiatus – vector torsion is back on the menu.

Introduction to torsion — General relativity (GR) offers a remarkably successful description of gravity as spacetime curvature [1]. An open problem is the degree – if any – to which spacetime *torsion* also participates in the gravitational interaction. There are excellent theoretical reasons to consider torsion: it was shown by Utiyama [2], Kibble [3] and Sciama [4] that when fermions are coupled to gravity, the natural result is a local gauge theory not only of spacetime translations (i.e. the diffeomorphisms of GR), but also of spatial rotations and Lorentz boosts. In this *Poincaré gauge theory* (PGT) of gravity [5], the fundamental fields can be the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ and an a priori independent affine connection $\Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}$ which gives rise (as we will show later) to torsion and curvature as the field strength tensors of spacetime translations and rotations, respectively:

$$T^\alpha_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2\Gamma^\alpha_{[\mu\nu]}, \quad (1a)$$

$$R^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu} \equiv 2\left(\partial_{[\mu}\Gamma^\rho_{\nu]\sigma} + \Gamma^\rho_{[\mu\alpha}\Gamma^\alpha_{\nu]\sigma}\right). \quad (1b)$$

To connect this to textbook GR, if $T^\alpha_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow 0$ in Eq. (1a) then $\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}$ loses its independence from the metric¹ and is fixed by the Christoffel formula $\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho} \rightarrow \overset{\circ}{\Gamma}^\mu_{\nu\rho} \equiv g^{\mu\lambda}(\partial_{(\nu}g_{\rho)\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\lambda g_{\nu\rho})$. In this torsion-free limit, Eq. (1b) defines the *Riemannian* curvature $R^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu} \rightarrow \overset{\circ}{R}^\rho_{\sigma\mu\nu}$. Despite concrete theoretical provenance from PGT, there is uncertainty over what a signal for torsion might look like in the phenomena. This is in contrast to curvature, whose presence can be inferred e.g. through the geodesic motion of test particles. To understand this uncertainty, notice that we can always do the field reparameterisation² $\Gamma \mapsto \overset{\circ}{\Gamma} + T$ (leading to $R \mapsto \overset{\circ}{R} + \partial T + T^2$ with indices suppressed). This *post-Riemannian expansion* from variables $\{g_{\mu\nu}, \Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}\}$ to $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T^\lambda_{\mu\nu}\}$ reveals all PGT models to be nothing more than metric-based gravity coupled –

minimally or otherwise – to the field $T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \equiv T^\lambda_{[\mu\nu]}$ as if it were an exotic kind of matter. Notice how there are infinitely many such models: if there are models for all experimental outcomes, then the theoretical framework ceases to be useful. The classic example of a useful PGT which establishes a predictive baseline is the minimal Einstein–Cartan theory (ECT) [6–12]. ECT shares the Einstein–Hilbert action of GR

$$S_{\text{ECT}} \equiv \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{m_{\text{P}}^2}{2} R - m_{\text{P}}^2 \Lambda + \text{matter} \right], \quad (2)$$

where $R \equiv R^\mu_{\mu} \equiv R^{\mu\nu}_{\mu\nu}$. With $\Lambda \equiv 0$ and in the absence of matter, Eq. (2) implies the vacuum Einstein equations $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and the auxiliary equation $T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Inclusion of matter leads to a contact spin-torsion coupling; the torsion integrates out to leave effective four-Fermi interactions [3, 13–18]. Such interactions have many phenomenological applications [14, 18–58], such as to fermionic dark matter production. Thus, non-propagating torsion might reasonably be constrained (albeit weakly) by dark matter abundances. Propagating torsion, on the other hand, can come from any number of next-to-minimal $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T^\lambda_{\mu\nu}\}$ models: it could be sufficiently heavy to evade current bounds, or conveniently account for any new scalar or vector bosons that might be observed (note that $T^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ contains various bosons up to spin-two). In other words, the phenomenological richness of the full $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T^\lambda_{\mu\nu}\}$ theory-space, which has infinitely many parameters, renders it non-predictive.

No-go theorem for vector torsion — Happily, the literature has a convincing way to deal with this problem. Just as PGT motivates torsion, so the usually assumed structure of its action also endows torsionful model-building with predictivity. The logic is that PGT should be restricted (see e.g. [59–63]) to a *Yang–Mills-type* action

$$S_{\text{PGT}} \equiv \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{m_{\text{P}}^2}{2} R - m_{\text{P}}^2 \Lambda + \alpha_1 R^2 + R_{\mu\nu} (\alpha_2 R^{\mu\nu} + \alpha_3 R^{\nu\mu}) + R_{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} (\alpha_4 R^{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} + \alpha_5 R^{\mu\sigma\nu\lambda} + \alpha_6 R^{\sigma\lambda\mu\nu}) + T_{\mu\nu\sigma} (\beta_1 T^{\mu\nu\sigma} + \beta_2 T^{\nu\mu\sigma}) + \beta_3 T_\mu T^\mu + \text{matter} \right], \quad (3)$$

* wb263@cam.ac.uk

† mph13@cam.ac.uk

‡ a.n.lasenby@mrao.cam.ac.uk

§ yunclin54@gmail.com

¶ zhiyuan.wei@uni-ulm.de

¹ We will assume the metricity condition throughout.

² Note $\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho} - \overset{\circ}{\Gamma}^\mu_{\nu\rho}$ is sometimes called *contortion*, and is linear in torsion.

where $T_\mu \equiv T_{\nu\mu}^\nu$, and Eq. (3) extends Eq. (2) by only admitting quadratic field strength invariants³. Evidently, Eq. (3) occupies just a small corner of the $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T_{\mu\nu}^\lambda\}$ theory-space: the Yang–Mills structure is similar to the gauge boson sector of the standard model (SM), and it imposes surprising limits on the phenomenology. Firstly, the parameters in Eq. (3) must be carefully tuned to eliminate ghosts and tachyons from the linearised spectrum [5, 61–106]. Even then, inconsistencies usually reappear at non-linear order due to strongly coupled particles [55, 59, 62, 103, 107–129] (for general strong coupling see [118–120, 124, 130–134]) and the breaking of so-called ‘accidental’ symmetries which only survive linearly [61, 62, 129, 135–144] (see also [5, 29, 60, 62, 65, 67, 68, 79, 98, 145–147]). Weakly coupled, consistent PGTs are very rare: the current consensus is that only spin-zero scalar torsion is allowed to propagate, and then only with very specific non-linear interactions [61, 62, 138, 139] (see e.g. [70, 71, 74, 76–78, 82, 86, 89, 91, 97, 101] for applications, [63, 75, 80, 81, 95] for reviews, and [88, 96, 99, 100, 148–153] for similar analyses of spacetime non-metricity). Spin-one vector torsion, on the other hand, is ruled out [61, 62]. Purely vector torsion can only be linearly propagated by the $R_{[\mu\nu]}R^{[\mu\nu]}$ term, reached by setting $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 0$ in Eq. (3). However, that term carries in strongly-coupled ghosts, so the resulting theory is inconsistent [61, 62]. In a recent attempt to evade this no-go theorem, we introduced multiplier fields which pacify this strong coupling [55]. A fair criticism of our approach, however, was that it effectively reduced $R_{[\mu\nu]}R^{[\mu\nu]}$ to the post-Riemannian Maxwell term $\partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]}$ which – though non-linearly consistent – is absent from Eq. (3). This Maxwell term can still be added by hand, as was done for example in [104]. The problem with adding terms manually is that, since almost any desired dynamics can then be fabricated, the resulting models are less predictive and compelling. To summarise: every PGT in Eq. (3) has a post-Riemannian expansion, but not every covariant model of $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T_{\mu\nu}^\lambda\}$ is the post-Riemannian expansion of a PGT in Eq. (3).

In this letter — We show that the $\partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]}$ term is a Yang–Mills-type term in disguise, without which Eq. (3) is actually *incomplete*. Our reasoning is that PGT is not the most fundamental gauge theory of gravity. Recently we developed an *extended*⁴ version of *Weyl gauge theory* (eWGT), which gauges the full conformal group [154–158]. We will show that the covariant derivative of eWGT reduces precisely to that of PGT when it is expressed in terms of scale-invariant variables (equivalent to fixing the scale gauge, and so breaking the conformal symmetry to Poincaré symmetry). The Yang–Mills-type action of eWGT reduces to Eq. (3) plus new terms (to be shown in Eq. (19)). This provides a concrete motivation for vector torsion, which was hitherto lacking. Before ob-




FIG. 1. Massive scalar perturbations in Eq. (4) have a unique, non-linear, scale-invariant embedding given in Eq. (5). This embedding can lead to only one qualitative alteration in Eqs. (8a) and (8b): the quadratic potential (dashed, with a unit-circle illustrating the mass scale m) develops a non-linear plateau (cyan) whose depth and height depend on model parameters ν and σ . The plateau is consistent with current CMB constraints on a slowly-rolling inflaton (arrow).

taining these results, we introduce scale-invariant embeddings with a simple toy model.

Scale-invariant embedding — For our toy model, we work just with the matter sector. Let us suppose we know that some scalar perturbations $\delta\varphi$ have a Klein–Gordon mass m

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \delta\varphi \partial^\mu \delta\varphi - \frac{m^2}{2} \delta\varphi^2 + \text{gravity} \right], \quad (4)$$

where we allow the theory to be minimally coupled to a metric-based gravity theory (e.g. GR). This situation already arises in cosmology: we typically infer that the canonical inflaton potential is approximated by a mass term $U(\varphi) = m^2 \varphi^2 / 2 + \dots$ in order to facilitate reheating into the SM plasma after the end of inflation⁵ [163]. This inference does not, however, place constraints on $U(\varphi)$ beyond the $\delta\varphi$ linear regime. For a host of reasons the most favoured non-linear completion envisages φ rolling off a plateau in $U(\varphi)$ sufficiently slowly to drive $N \sim 55$ e-folds of inflation [164–166]. Quite how this plateau should be motivated through fundamental theory is not yet settled. What we want to show here is that, starting purely from the linear model in Eq. (4), there is a way to build up the non-linear plateau by asking that m be a dynamically acquired mass scale in a locally scale-invariant ‘embedding’ theory (see Fig. 1). There is precedent here, since Eq. (4) also describes pions [167–170]. Pion masses, however, emerge long after reheating, through chiral and electroweak symmetry breaking [171, 172]. Moreover, the absence of explicit mass scales only makes the SM *globally* scale-invariant. Under *local* rescalings the metric deforms as $g_{\mu\nu} \mapsto e^{2\rho} g_{\mu\nu}$ and the scalar as $\varphi \mapsto e^{-\rho} \varphi$ for local $\rho \equiv \rho(x)$. Considering the first term in Eq. (4), we must therefore introduce a *Weyl* vector $B_\mu \mapsto B_\mu - \partial_\mu \rho$ to define a new covariant derivative on

³ In this letter we omit the parity-odd invariants only out of simplicity; there are no convincing theoretical grounds for excluding them [64, 65].

⁴ Given the considerations to be presented in this letter, perhaps it would be more appropriate to replace ‘extended’ with ‘economical’. Nonetheless, we retain the original nomenclature for consistency with the existing literature.

⁵ Strictly, this is only true for ‘textbook’ slow-roll inflation [159–161]. We particularly note that Higgs inflation does not require a reheating mass [162].

scalars $\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv (\partial_\mu - B_\mu)\varphi$. The kinematic d.o.f are thus increased from $\{g_{\mu\nu}, \varphi\}$ to $\{g_{\mu\nu}, \varphi, B_\mu\}$. Next, considering the second term in Eq. (4), we must introduce a *compensator* scalar $\phi \mapsto e^{-\rho}\phi$ to make up the mass dimension of m , which now becomes a dimensionless parameter. In the effective field theory approach, the non-linear completion of Eq. (4) includes all scale-invariant operators of mass-dimension four in the new variables $\{g_{\mu\nu}, \varphi, B_\mu, \phi\}$, namely

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}^\mu \varphi + \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}^\mu \phi + \frac{\nu}{2} \mathcal{D}_\mu \phi \mathcal{D}^\mu \phi - \frac{\mu^2}{2} \phi^2 \varphi^2 - \frac{\xi}{16} H_{\mu\nu} H^{\mu\nu} + \text{gravity} \right], \quad (5)$$

where μ, σ, ν and ξ are dimensionless model parameters, and $H_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2\partial_{[\mu} B_{\nu]}$ is the natural Weyl field-strength tensor, i.e. $\mathcal{D}_{[\mu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu]} \varphi \equiv -\frac{1}{2} H_{\mu\nu} \varphi$. For brevity we omit the φ^4 and ϕ^4 self-interaction terms, which would not qualitatively alter our conclusions⁶.

Scale-invariant variables — One can compare B_μ to the electromagnetic four-vector potential. But unlike in scalar electrodynamics, where the matter fields carry a non-physical phase as well as a physical magnitude, the fields φ and ϕ each have only one real d.o.f which merges entirely with the choice of scale gauge. This means that the field equations of Eq. (5) cannot simultaneously propagate φ and ϕ from the initial data: we must first declare a global solution for one of these fields. Remembering that we want to recover Eq. (4), we may take the opportunity to eliminate ϕ by assuming constant $\phi = \phi_0$. This is the *Einstein* choice of scale gauge. Rather than imposing the Einstein gauge, it is instead possible to completely eliminate ϕ from Eq. (5) through the field reparameterisations $g_{\mu\nu} \mapsto (\phi_0/\phi)^2 \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\varphi \mapsto \phi \hat{\varphi}/\phi_0$ and $B_\mu \mapsto \hat{B}_\mu + \partial_\mu \ln \phi$, resulting in

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \hat{\varphi} - (\hat{\varphi} - \sigma \phi_0) \hat{B}_\mu) (\partial^\mu \hat{\varphi} - \hat{\varphi} \hat{B}^\mu) - \frac{\mu^2 \phi_0^2}{2} \hat{\varphi}^2 - \frac{\xi}{16} \hat{H}_{\mu\nu} \hat{H}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\nu \phi_0^2}{2} \hat{B}_\mu \hat{B}^\mu + \text{gravity} \right], \quad (6)$$

where we note $\hat{H}_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2\partial_{[\mu} \hat{B}_{\nu]} \equiv 2\partial_{[\mu} B_{\nu]} \equiv H_{\mu\nu}$. By construction, the new fields $\{\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{B}_\mu\}$ are *scale-invariant variables*. The gauge symmetry in Eq. (6) seems to be destroyed, but we now understand that the rescaling transformations are still happening internally within the new fields. Scale-invariant variables and the Einstein gauge choice both result in Eq. (6), a key feature of which is that the dimensionless couplings are now accompanied by powers of ϕ_0 . We will return to the natural values of these couplings later.

Bootstrapping inflation — Dropping the hats, and for perturbations $\delta\varphi$ and δB_μ around the vacuum $\varphi = B_\mu = 0$,

we find that Eq. (6) reduces to

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \delta\varphi \partial^\mu \delta\varphi - \frac{m^2}{2} \delta\varphi^2 - \frac{\xi}{4} \partial_{[\mu} \delta B_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} \delta B^{\nu]} + \frac{\xi M^2}{2} \delta B_\mu \delta B^\mu + \text{gravity} \right], \quad (7)$$

where $m^2 \equiv 4\nu\mu^2\phi_0^2/(4\nu - \sigma^2)$ and $M^2 \equiv \nu\phi_0^2/\xi$. This result is very interesting. Not only do we recover Eq. (4) in the first line of Eq. (7), but we see how local scale invariance additionally points to the presence of a new Proca field. To compare, the Higgs mechanism pointed to the presence of a new massive scalar, which was later observed experimentally [173]. Arguably, there is no need for a new vector in particle physics or cosmology. But whilst $\nu \rightarrow 0$ predicts two radiative d.o.f which are not observed, taking instead $\xi \rightarrow 0$ nonetheless gives a heavy-enough Proca to evade all observational bounds (even better, it may be a dark matter candidate [154]). Beyond the perturbative regime, the Proca and Klein–Gordon fields acquire non-linear interactions. For $\xi \rightarrow 0$ the Proca can be eliminated as $B_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \ln(\varphi^2 - \sigma\phi_0\varphi + \nu\phi_0^2)$ on-shell, and Eq. (6) becomes

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial^\mu \varphi - U(\varphi) + \text{gravity} \right], \quad (8a)$$

$$U(\varphi) \equiv \frac{\mu^2 \phi_0^4}{2} \left[\frac{\sigma}{2} + \sqrt{\nu - \frac{\sigma^2}{4}} \sinh \left(\frac{(\varphi - c)/\phi_0}{\sqrt{\nu - \frac{\sigma^2}{4}}} \right) \right]^2, \quad (8b)$$

where c is an integration constant. The non-linear potential (see Fig. 1) is identical to that found in [48, 174], though the motivations are unrelated. The predictions from the inflationary plateau approach the universal values for the spectral index $n_s \approx 1 - 2/N$ and also the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \approx 12/N^2$. This agrees with current cosmic microwave background (CMB) measurements [166, 175], pending future experiments [176–179]. We hope to develop this toy model in future work, but we first need to make the ‘+ gravity’ term more concrete.

Recap and extension — Collecting our results so far:

1. Gravitational coupling to fermions naturally leads to PGT as a leading formulation of gravity. PGT does not have local scale invariance.
2. The $\partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]}$ term for vector torsion T_μ is notoriously absent from the PGT action in Eq. (3).
3. Theories with mass scales have locally-scale-invariant embeddings which can lead to excellent phenomenology (inflation) besides a new massive vector B_μ .

We will now connect these three observations by showing that eWGT is the unique scale-invariant embedding of PGT. This will identify $T_\mu/3$ with the vector B_μ when expressed in scale-invariant variables, and thereby reveal $\partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]}$ to be a Yang–Mills-type term.

⁶ The φ^4 operator deforms the potential without compromising the desired slow-roll plateau; the ϕ^4 operator provides a cosmological constant.

Poincaré gauge theory (PGT) — Gauge theories of gravity can be formulated on completely flat Minkowski space-time, just like the SM [154]. In this formulation, we use holonomic Greek indices and Lorentz Roman indices. Translational gauge fields b^i_μ and inverses h_i^μ obey $b^i_\mu h_i^\nu \equiv \delta^\nu_\mu$ and $b^i_\mu h_j^\mu \equiv \delta^i_j$, and give rise to the curved-space metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ through $b^i_\mu b^j_\nu \eta_{ij} \equiv g_{\mu\nu}$. We assume contraction with these fields eliminates all coordinate indices of general (i.e. not necessarily scalar) matter fields φ , which have only suppressed Lorentz (or spinor) indices. A general φ with Weyl weight w and belonging to the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ representation with Lorentz generators $\Sigma_{ij} \equiv \Sigma_{[ij]}$ transforms as $\varphi \mapsto e^{w\rho + \omega^{ij}\Sigma_{ij}/2}\varphi$, where $\omega^{ij} \equiv \omega^{[ij]}(x)$ are finite angles. The rotational gauge field is $A^{ij}_\mu \equiv A^{[ij]}_\mu$. The transformations $b^i_\mu \mapsto e^\rho \Lambda^i_j b^j_\mu$ and $A^{ij}_\mu \mapsto \Lambda^i_k \Lambda^j_l A^{kl}_\mu - \Lambda^{jk} \partial_\mu \Lambda^i_k$ — where $\Lambda \equiv e^\omega$ is the Lorentz matrix — ensure that the derivative $\mathcal{D}_i \equiv h_i^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu$ with

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} A^{ij}_\mu \Sigma_{ij} \right) \varphi, \quad (9)$$

is Lorentz-covariant. The field strengths from the commutator $b^{[i]_\mu} b^{j]_\nu} \mathcal{D}_{[i} \mathcal{D}_{j]} \varphi \equiv \frac{1}{4} b^i_\sigma b^j_\lambda R^{\sigma\lambda}_{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{ij} \varphi - \frac{1}{2} T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \varphi$ are

$$T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2h_i^\lambda \left(\partial_{[\mu} b^i_{|\nu]} + A^i_{j[\mu} b^j_{|\nu]} \right), \quad (10a)$$

$$R^{\rho\sigma}_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2h_i^\rho h_j^\sigma \left(\partial_{[\mu} A^{ij}_{|\nu]} + A^i_{k[\mu} A^{kj}_{|\nu]} \right), \quad (10b)$$

where Eqs. (10a) and (10b) are equivalent to Eqs. (1a) and (1b) — the reparameterisation from gauge-theoretic $\{b^i_\mu, A^{ij}_\mu\}$ to geometric $\{g_{\mu\nu}, \Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}\}$ is described in [5, 154].

Weyl gauge theory (eWGT) — From our toy model, the Weyl-covariant extension of Eq. (9) is

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} A^{ij}_\mu \Sigma_{ij} + w B_\mu \right) \varphi, \quad (11)$$

and this construction defines the well-known *Weyl gauge theory* (WGT) of gravity [180, 181]. Whilst $R^{\rho\sigma}_{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (10b) is already Weyl-covariant, we have under local dilations

$$T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \mapsto T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} - 2\delta^\lambda_{[\mu} \partial_{\nu]} \rho \Rightarrow T_\mu \mapsto T_\mu - 3\partial_\mu \rho, \quad (12)$$

so from Eq. (12) only the combination

$$\tilde{T}^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \equiv T^\lambda_{\mu\nu} - 2\delta^\lambda_{[\mu} B_{\nu]}, \quad (13)$$

is covariant, indeed $b^{[i]_\mu} b^{j]_\nu} \mathcal{D}_{[i} \mathcal{D}_{j]} \varphi \equiv \frac{1}{4} b^i_\sigma b^j_\lambda R^{\sigma\lambda}_{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{ij} \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T}^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \varphi + \frac{1}{2} w H_{\mu\nu} \varphi$. Following Eq. (5), the parity-even Yang–Mills-type embedding of Eq. (3) must then be strictly

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{WGT}} \equiv & \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{\zeta \phi^2}{2} R - \lambda \phi^4 + \alpha_1 R^2 + R_{\mu\nu} (\alpha_2 R^{\mu\nu} \right. \\ & + \alpha_3 R^{\nu\mu}) + R_{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} (\alpha_4 R^{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} + \alpha_5 R^{\mu\sigma\nu\lambda} + \alpha_6 R^{\sigma\lambda\mu\nu}) \\ & + \phi^2 \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu\sigma} (\gamma_1 \tilde{T}^{\mu\nu\sigma} + \gamma_2 \tilde{T}^{\nu\mu\sigma}) + \phi^2 \gamma_3 \tilde{T}_\mu \tilde{T}^\mu + \frac{\nu}{2} \mathcal{D}_\mu \phi \mathcal{D}^\mu \phi \\ & \left. - \frac{\xi}{16} H_{\mu\nu} H^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\chi}{2} R_{\mu\nu} H^{\mu\nu} + \text{matter} \right], \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

with dimensionless $\zeta, \lambda, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \nu, \xi, \chi$ and α_1 through α_6 . Crucially, everything is quadratic in field strengths.

Extended Weyl gauge theory (eWGT) — In moving from PGT to WGT, we have enlarged the kinematic space from $\{b^i_\mu, A^{ij}_\mu\}$ to $\{b^i_\mu, A^{ij}_\mu, B_\mu, \phi\}$, just like in our toy model. Unlike for our toy model, however, the enlargement proves unnecessary: it is more economical to recycle B_μ from the rotational gauge field. Let the traceless part of the latter field be $\tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu \equiv \tilde{A}^{[ij]}_\mu$ with only 20 d.o.f, such that $h_j^\nu \tilde{A}^{ij}_\nu \equiv 0$. Then, using $\{b^i_\mu, \tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu, B_\mu, \phi\}$ there is one (and *only* one) way to emulate the combined Poincaré and Weyl covariance of Eq. (11), namely

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \left[\tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu - \frac{2}{3} b^{[i]_\mu} h^{j]_\nu} (3B_\nu - 2h_k^\lambda \partial_{[\lambda} b^k_{|\nu]}) \right] \Sigma_{ij} + w B_\mu \right) \varphi. \quad (15)$$

We will soon show that Eq. (15) is just one notational way to write the unique eWGT covariant derivative from [154]. Because eWGT shares the symmetries of WGT, it must also share the Yang–Mills-type action in Eq. (14). The difference is that we must replace A^{ij}_μ , as when going from Eq. (11) to Eq. (15). After this change, we notice from Eq. (13) that $\tilde{T}_\mu \equiv 0$ identically. Thus, γ_3 in Eq. (14) drops out of eWGT.

Equivalence of PGT and eWGT — With the field reparameterisation $B_\mu \mapsto V_\mu + \frac{2}{3} h_k^\lambda \partial_{[\lambda} b^k_{|\mu]}$ we find Eq. (15) is

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \left[\tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu - 2b^{[i]_\mu} h^{j]_\nu} V_\nu + w \left[V_\mu + \frac{2}{3} h_k^\lambda \partial_{[\lambda} b^k_{|\mu]} \right] \right] \right) \Sigma_{ij} \varphi. \quad (16)$$

In this $\{b^i_\mu, \tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu, V_\mu, \phi\}$ formulation V_μ is a ‘Lorentz’ boson, not a ‘Weyl’ boson, because $V_\mu \mapsto V_\mu - \frac{1}{3} h^\lambda_l b^m_\mu \Lambda^l_k \partial_\lambda \Lambda^k_m$. Relabelling $A^{ij}_\mu \equiv \tilde{A}^{ij}_\mu - 2b^{[i]_\mu} h^{j]_\nu} V_\nu$, where $A^{ij}_\mu \equiv A^{[ij]}_\mu$ carries 24 d.o.f, ensures the PGT transformation of A^{ij}_μ . In this $\{b^i_\mu, A^{ij}_\mu, \phi\}$ formulation Eq. (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \equiv & \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} A^{ij}_\mu \Sigma_{ij} + \frac{w}{3} h_k^\lambda \left[2\partial_{[\lambda} b^k_{|\mu]} + 3b_{l\mu} A^{kl}_\lambda \right] \right) \varphi \\ \equiv & \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} A^{ij}_\mu \Sigma_{ij} + \frac{w}{3} T_\mu \right) \varphi, \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

where we used Eq. (10a) in the last equality. New fields should not be introduced where they are not needed: in hindsight it was obvious from Eq. (12) that PGT contained a vector $T_\mu/3$ which already performed the function of B_μ . This fact was observed by Obukhov in [182], and the covariant derivative in Eq. (17) was first written down in [154] (see also [183]). One could interpret Eq. (17) as a hint that PGT descends from a scale-invariant theory. Explicit scales emerge in the $\{\hat{b}^i_\mu, \hat{A}^{ij}_\mu\}$ formulation, with scale-invariant variables $b^i_\mu \mapsto \phi_0 \hat{b}^i_\mu / \phi$ and $A^{ij}_\mu \mapsto \hat{A}^{ij}_\mu$. Dropping the hats, and with the identifications

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{P}}^2 \equiv & \zeta \phi_0^2, \quad \Lambda \equiv \lambda \phi_0^2 / \zeta, \quad \beta_1 \equiv \gamma_1 \phi_0^2, \\ \beta_2 \equiv & \gamma_2 \phi_0^2, \quad \beta_3 \equiv (\nu - 6(2\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)) \phi_0^2 / 18, \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

we conclude from Eq. (14) that the only remaining difference between PGT and eWGT is in the natural choice of action. Concretely, the $H_{\mu\nu}$ terms in Eq. (14) yield a correction:

$$S_{\text{eWGT}} \equiv S_{\text{PGT}} + \frac{1}{3} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\chi R_{[\mu\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]} - \frac{\xi}{12} \partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]} \right]. \quad (19)$$

This is our central result: the relationship between Eq. (19) and Eq. (3) is analogous to the relationship between Eq. (8a) and Eq. (4). Put another way, the traditional PGT action unfairly omits two specific terms, which are naturally motivated by the unique, scale-invariant embedding. This embedding allows us to claim that all PGT models are ultimately conformal, irrespective of the explicit mass scales in their spectra. We confirm in the supplemental material [184] that eWGT, as formulated in Eqs. (13) to (15), and the extension of PGT in Eqs. (3), (10a), (10b) and (19), have completely equivalent spectra. In the expressions for masses and pole residues, Eq. (18) maps the dimensionful couplings to their dimensionless counterparts. As a final, parenthetic remark, we return to the natural values of the dimensionless couplings. When we are concerned with physics at the length-scale ℓ_{phy} , it is helpful to work in units of ℓ_{phy} . This can be done by taking $\phi_0 \ell_{\text{phy}} \equiv 1$ as a gauge choice, and in this picture the dimensionless couplings ‘run’ with ℓ_{phy} . If we expect GR to be the low-energy limit of Eq. (19), then the strength of gravity and the cosmological constant are the only known scales:

$$\zeta \equiv \left(\frac{\ell_{\text{phy}}}{\ell_{\text{p}}} \right)^2, \quad \frac{\lambda}{\zeta} \sim 1 \times 10^{-122} \left(\frac{\ell_{\text{phy}}}{\ell_{\text{p}}} \right)^2. \quad (20)$$

A natural advantage of this convention, where $\ell_{\text{p}} m_{\text{p}} \equiv 1$, is that the cosmological constant approaches $\lambda/\zeta \sim 1$ at the scale $\ell_{\text{phy}} \sim 10$ Gpc, which is close to the Hubble horizon.

Implications for the PGT spectrum — Since we have made a substantial correction to the PGT Lagrangian, it is important to update the well-known PGT particle spectrum in [60]. To do this, we take $\lambda = \Lambda = 0$ and focus on the linearisation near Minkowski spacetime. As shown in Appendix A and Fig. 4, the propagator of S_{eWGT} in Eq. (19) contains a *quartic* pole in the parity-odd spin-one sector

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \left[(2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5) \xi - \chi^2 \right] k^4 + 3 \left[96\alpha_2 (2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) \right. \\ & + 8 \left[24\alpha_4 (2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) + 6\alpha_5 (2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) \right. \\ & + \chi (4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{p}}^2) \left. \right] + (4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{p}}^2) \xi \left. \right] k^2 \\ & + 72(4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{p}}^2)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3 + m_{\text{p}}^2). \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

The pole takes the familiar $k^2 - M^2$ form when the k^4 coefficient is removed from Eq. (21). For example, the branch $2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \chi = 0$ contains the Einstein-Proca theory (EPT) $S_{\text{EPT}} \equiv \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{2} m_{\text{p}}^2 \mathring{R} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_{[\mu} T_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]} + \frac{1}{2} M^2 T_{\mu} T^{\mu} + \text{matter} \right]$ in $\{g_{\mu\nu}, T^{\alpha}_{\mu\nu}\}$ variables. EPT is evidently not strongly coupled, so this is the much-sought-after

vector torsion. The more general branch $\alpha_5 = \chi^2/\xi - 2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ leads to the new mass spectrum in Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f), as shown in Fig. 5. It is also interesting to instead remove the *constant* term in Eq. (21). This produces a $k^2(k^2 - M^2)$ pole, which affects the massless spectrum. As shown in Fig. 6, we find an example case $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 - 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_6 = 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = 4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{p}}^2 = 0$ which propagates (without ghosts or tachyons) the Einstein graviton, one heavy scalar, one heavy pseudoscalar, and a *one extra massless scalar*. To understand where this scalar comes from, we strip away all the uninvolved operators to show in Fig. 7 that the model

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\chi R_{[\mu\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} T^{\nu]} + \beta_3 T_{\mu} T^{\mu} \right], \quad (22)$$

propagates, for $\chi \neq 0$, one massless scalar with the no-ghost condition $\beta_3 > 0$. For $\chi = 0$, the spectrum is empty. In fact Eq. (22) can be reduced even further by removing b^i_{μ} , and keeping only the axial-free part of A^{ij}_{μ} . This part has the index symmetries of a Curtright field $C_{\mu\nu\sigma}$, i.e. $C_{\mu\nu\sigma} \equiv C_{[\mu\nu]\sigma}$ with $C_{[\mu\nu\sigma]} \equiv 0$ [185], and Eq. (22) reduces (linearly) to

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\beta_3 C^{\mu} C_{\mu} + \frac{\chi}{12} C_{\mu\nu} \left(C^{\mu\nu} - \frac{4}{3} \partial_{\sigma} C^{\mu(\nu\sigma)} \right) \right], \quad (23)$$

with trace $C_{\mu} \equiv C^{\nu}_{\mu\nu}$ and field strength $C_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2\partial_{[\mu} C_{\nu]}$. As shown in Fig. 8, Eqs. (22) and (23) have the same spectra. Finally, in the branch $\xi = \chi = 0$ we recover the known spectrum of S_{PGT} in Eq. (3), as first presented in [60].

Closing remarks — Poincaré gauge theory (PGT) strongly motivates spacetime torsion [2–4], but the consensus since the turn of the millennium has been that PGT prohibits vector torsion from propagating [61, 62, 70, 71, 74, 76–78, 82, 86, 89, 91, 97, 101, 138, 139]. Separately, the full conformal group is a more appealing gauge group than the Poincaré group. With this context, our letter achieved three objectives:

1. Starting just with the inflaton mass, scale-invariant embedding leads to the slow-roll plateau in Eq. (8b) and Fig. 1. This is an intriguing, stand-alone result.
2. We showed that PGT has a unique scale-invariant embedding as *extended Weyl* gauge theory (eWGT) [154–158]. In other words, PGT descends from a conformal theory. This also means that the natural Yang–Mills-type PGT action is missing the two terms in Eq. (19).
3. The new terms provide the first compelling argument for propagating vector torsion. The updated mass spectrum of PGT is shown in Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f). The new terms reveal that the Curtright field in Eq. (23) is embedded in the PGT dynamics.

Further work is needed to develop our inflaton model in the full eWGT-PGT framework. One key question is whether the model is susceptible to the Weyl anomaly [186]. Also, the implications of the new PGT terms for strong coupling should be investigated [128]. Finally, the Yang–Mills-type actions in Eqs. (3) and (14) are restricted to parity-even terms for simplicity: the parity-odd extensions should be considered.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for useful discussions with Carlo Marzo and Sebastian Zell.

WB is grateful for the kind hospitality of Leiden University and the Lorentz Institute, and the support of Girton College, Cambridge. Y-CL acknowledges support from the Ministry of Education of Taiwan and the Cambridge Commonwealth, European & International Trust via a Taiwan Cambridge Scholarship and financial support from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

This work used the DiRAC Data Intensive service (CSD3 www.csd3.cam.ac.uk) at the University of Cambridge, managed by the University of Cambridge University Information Services on behalf of the STFC DiRAC HPC Facility (www.dirac.ac.uk). The DiRAC component of CSD3 at Cambridge was funded by BEIS, UKRI and STFC capital funding and STFC operations grants. DiRAC is part of the UKRI Digital Research Infrastructure.

This work also used the Newton server, access to which was provisioned by Will Handley, and funded through an ERC grant.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss **18**, 844 (1915).
- [2] R. Utiyama, Invariant theoretical interpretation of interaction, *Phys. Rev.* **101**, 1597 (1956).
- [3] T. W. B. Kibble, Lorentz invariance and the gravitational field, *J. Math. Phys.* **2**, 212 (1961).
- [4] D. W. Sciama, On the analogy between charge and spin in general relativity, in *Recent developments in general relativity* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1962) p. 415.
- [5] M. Blagojevic, *Gravitation and gauge symmetries* (CRC Press, Bristol and Philadelphia, 2002).
- [6] É. Cartan, Sur une généralisation de la notion de courbure de Riemann et les espaces à torsion, *Comptes Rendus, Ac. Sc. Paris* **174**, 593 (1922).
- [7] É. Cartan, Sur les variétés à connexion affine et la théorie de la relativité généralisée (première partie), in *Annales scientifiques de l'École normale supérieure*, Vol. 40 (Gauthier-Villars, 1923) pp. 325–412.
- [8] É. Cartan, Sur les variétés à connexion affine, et la théorie de la relativité généralisée (première partie)(suite), in *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, Vol. 41 (Gauthier-Villars, 1924) pp. 1–25.
- [9] É. Cartan, Sur les variétés à connexion affine, et la théorie de la relativité généralisée (deuxième partie), in *Annales scientifiques de l'École normale supérieure*, Vol. 42 (Gauthier-Villars, 1925) pp. 17–88.
- [10] A. Einstein, Einheitliche Feldtheorie von Gravitation und Elektrizität, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss **22**, 414 (1925).
- [11] A. Einstein, Riemanngeometrie mit Aufrechterhaltung des Begriffes des Fern-Parallelismus, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss **17**, 217 (1928).
- [12] A. Einstein, Neue Möglichkeit für eine einheitliche Feldtheorie von Gravitation und Elektrizität, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss **18**, 224 (1928).
- [13] V. I. Rodichev, Twisted Space and Nonlinear Field Equations, *Zhur. Eksptl'. i Teoret. Fiz.* **40**, 1029 (1961).
- [14] L. Freidel, D. Minic, and T. Takeuchi, Quantum gravity, torsion, parity violation and all that, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 104002 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0507253](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0507253).
- [15] S. Alexandrov, Immirzi parameter and fermions with non-minimal coupling, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25**, 145012 (2008), [arXiv:0802.1221 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.1221).
- [16] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Einstein–Cartan gravity, matter, and scale-invariant generalization, *JHEP* **10**, 177, [arXiv:2007.16158 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.16158).
- [17] G. K. Karananas, M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, and S. Zell, Matter matters in Einstein–Cartan gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 064036 (2021), [arXiv:2106.13811 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.13811).
- [18] C. Rigouzzo and S. Zell, Coupling metric-affine gravity to the standard model and dark matter fermions, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 124067 (2023), [arXiv:2306.13134 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13134).
- [19] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, Inflation with Non-Minimal Coupling: Metric versus Palatini Formulations, *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 222 (2008), [arXiv:0803.2664 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0803.2664).
- [20] N. J. Poplawski, Matter-antimatter asymmetry and dark matter from torsion, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 084033 (2011), [arXiv:1101.4012 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.4012).
- [21] D. Diakonov, A. G. Tumanov, and A. A. Vladimirov, Low-energy General Relativity with torsion: A Systematic derivative expansion, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 124042 (2011), [arXiv:1104.2432 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2432).
- [22] I. B. Khriplovich, Gravitational four-fermion interaction on the Planck scale, *Phys. Lett. B* **709**, 111 (2012), [arXiv:1201.4226 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.4226).
- [23] J. a. Magueijo, T. G. Zlosnik, and T. W. B. Kibble, Cosmology with a spin, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 063504 (2013), [arXiv:1212.0585 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.0585).
- [24] I. B. Khriplovich and A. S. Rudenko, Gravitational four-fermion interaction and dynamics of the early Universe, *JHEP* **11**, 174, [arXiv:1303.1348 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.1348).
- [25] T. Markkanen, T. Tenkanen, V. Vaskonen, and H. Veermäe, Quantum corrections to quartic inflation with a non-minimal coupling: metric vs. Palatini, *JCAP* **03**, 029, [arXiv:1712.04874 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.04874).
- [26] P. Carrilho, D. Mulryne, J. Ronayne, and T. Tenkanen, Attractor Behaviour in Multifield Inflation, *JCAP* **06**, 032, [arXiv:1804.10489 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.10489).
- [27] V.-M. Enckell, K. Enqvist, S. Rasanen, and L.-P. Wahlman, Inflation with R^2 term in the Palatini formalism, *JCAP* **02**, 022, [arXiv:1810.05536 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05536).
- [28] S. Rasanen and E. Tomberg, Planck scale black hole dark matter from Higgs inflation, *JCAP* **01**, 038, [arXiv:1810.12608 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12608).
- [29] J. Beltrán Jiménez and F. J. Maldonado Torralba, Revisiting the stability of quadratic Poincaré gauge gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 611 (2020), [arXiv:1910.07506 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07506).
- [30] J. Rubio and E. S. Tomberg, Preheating in Palatini Higgs inflation, *JCAP* **04**, 021, [arXiv:1902.10148 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.10148).
- [31] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, and S. Zell, Standard Model Meets Gravity: Electroweak Symmetry Breaking and Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 033006 (2021), [arXiv:2001.09088 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.09088).
- [32] G. K. Karananas, M. Michel, and J. Rubio, One residue to rule them all: Electroweak symmetry breaking, inflation

- and field-space geometry, *Phys. Lett. B* **811**, 135876 (2020), arXiv:2006.11290 [hep-th].
- [33] M. Långvik, J.-M. Ojanperä, S. Raatikainen, and S. Rasanen, Higgs inflation with the Holst and the Nieh–Yan term, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083514 (2021), arXiv:2007.12595 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Higgs inflation in Einstein–Cartan gravity, *JCAP* **02**, 008, [Erratum: *JCAP* **10**, E01 (2021)], arXiv:2007.14978 [hep-ph].
- [35] Y. Mikura, Y. Tada, and S. Yokoyama, Conformal inflation in the metric-affine geometry, *EPL* **132**, 39001 (2020), arXiv:2008.00628 [hep-th].
- [36] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Einstein–Cartan Portal to Dark Matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 161301 (2021), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **127**, 169901 (2021)], arXiv:2008.11686 [hep-ph].
- [37] M. Kubota, K.-Y. Oda, K. Shimada, and M. Yamaguchi, Cosmological Perturbations in Palatini Formalism, *JCAP* **03**, 006, arXiv:2010.07867 [hep-th].
- [38] V.-M. Enckell, S. Nurmi, S. Räsänen, and E. Tomberg, Critical point Higgs inflation in the Palatini formulation, *JHEP* **04**, 059, arXiv:2012.03660 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] D. Iosifidis and L. Ravera, The cosmology of quadratic torsionful gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 736 (2021), arXiv:2101.10339 [gr-qc].
- [40] F. Bombacigno, S. Boudet, G. J. Olmo, and G. Montani, Big bounce and future time singularity resolution in Bianchi I cosmologies: The projective invariant Nieh–Yan case, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 124031 (2021), arXiv:2105.06870 [gr-qc].
- [41] A. Racioppi, J. Rajasalu, and K. Selke, Multiple point criticality principle and Coleman–Weinberg inflation, *JHEP* **06**, 107, arXiv:2109.03238 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] D. Y. Cheong, S. M. Lee, and S. C. Park, Reheating in models with non-minimal coupling in metric and Palatini formalisms, *JCAP* **02** (02), 029, arXiv:2111.00825 [hep-ph].
- [43] C. Dioguardi, A. Racioppi, and E. Tomberg, Slow-roll inflation in Palatini F(R) gravity, *JHEP* **06**, 106, arXiv:2112.12149 [gr-qc].
- [44] M. Piani and J. Rubio, Higgs-Dilaton inflation in Einstein–Cartan gravity, *JCAP* **05** (05), 009, arXiv:2202.04665 [gr-qc].
- [45] F. Dux, A. Florio, J. Klarić, A. Shkerin, and I. Timiryasov, Preheating in Palatini Higgs inflation on the lattice, *JCAP* **09**, 015, arXiv:2203.13286 [hep-ph].
- [46] C. Rigouzzo and S. Zell, Coupling metric-affine gravity to a Higgs-like scalar field, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024015 (2022), arXiv:2204.03003 [hep-th].
- [47] G. Pradisi and A. Salvio, (In)equivalence of metric-affine and metric effective field theories, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 840 (2022), arXiv:2206.15041 [hep-th].
- [48] A. Salvio, Inflating and reheating the Universe with an independent affine connection, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103510 (2022), arXiv:2207.08830 [hep-ph].
- [49] S. Rasanen and Y. Verbin, Palatini formulation for gauge theory: implications for slow-roll inflation 10.21105/astro.2211.15584 (2022), arXiv:2211.15584 [astro-ph.CO].
- [50] I. D. Gialamas and K. Tamvakis, Inflation in metric-affine quadratic gravity, *JCAP* **03**, 042, arXiv:2212.09896 [gr-qc].
- [51] I. D. Gialamas and H. Veermäe, Electroweak vacuum decay in metric-affine gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* **844**, 138109 (2023), arXiv:2305.07693 [hep-th].
- [52] I. D. Gialamas, A. Karam, T. D. Pappas, and E. Tomberg, Implications of Palatini gravity for inflation and beyond, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **20**, 2330007 (2023), arXiv:2303.14148 [gr-qc].
- [53] M. Piani and J. Rubio, Preheating in Einstein–Cartan Higgs Inflation: oscillon formation, *JCAP* **12**, 002, arXiv:2304.13056 [hep-ph].
- [54] A. Poisson, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Critical points in Palatini Higgs inflation with small non-minimal coupling, *JHEP* **03**, 130, arXiv:2306.03893 [hep-ph].
- [55] W. Barker and S. Zell, Einstein–Proca theory from the Einstein–Cartan formulation, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 024007 (2024), arXiv:2306.14953 [hep-th].
- [56] G. K. Karananas, M. Shaposhnikov, and S. Zell, Scale invariant Einstein–Cartan gravity and flat space conformal symmetry, *JHEP* **11**, 171, arXiv:2307.11151 [hep-th].
- [57] R. Martini, G. Paci, and D. Sauro, Radiative corrections to the Starobinsky Lagrangian from Torsion fluctuations, (2023), arXiv:2312.16681 [gr-qc].
- [58] M. He, M. Hong, and K. Mukaida, Starobinsky inflation and beyond in Einstein–Cartan gravity, *JCAP* **05**, 107, arXiv:2402.05358 [gr-qc].
- [59] K. Hayashi and T. Nakano, Extended translation invariance and associated gauge fields, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **38**, 491 (1967).
- [60] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, Gravity From Poincare Gauge Theory of the Fundamental Particles. 4. Mass and Energy of Particle Spectrum, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **64**, 2222 (1980).
- [61] H.-j. Yo and J. M. Nester, Hamiltonian analysis of Poincare gauge theory scalar modes, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **8**, 459 (1999), arXiv:gr-qc/9902032.
- [62] H.-J. Yo and J. M. Nester, Hamiltonian analysis of Poincare gauge theory: Higher spin modes, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11**, 747 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0112030.
- [63] D. Puetzfeld, Status of non-Riemannian cosmology, *New Astron. Rev.* **49**, 59 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0404119.
- [64] G. K. Karananas, The particle spectrum of parity-violating Poincaré gravitational theory, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 055012 (2015), arXiv:1411.5613 [gr-qc].
- [65] M. Blagojević and B. Cvetković, General Poincaré gauge theory: Hamiltonian structure and particle spectrum, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 024014 (2018), arXiv:1804.05556 [gr-qc].
- [66] E. Sezgin, Class of Ghost Free Gravity Lagrangians With Massive or Massless Propagating Torsion, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 1677 (1981).
- [67] M. Blagojevic and I. A. Nikolic, Hamiltonian dynamics of Poincare gauge theory: General structure in the time gauge, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 2455 (1983).
- [68] M. Blagojevic and M. Vasilic, EXTRA GAUGE SYMMETRIES IN A WEAK FIELD APPROXIMATION OF AN $R + T^{*2} + R^{*2}$ THEORY OF GRAVITY, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 3748 (1987).
- [69] R. Kuhfuss and J. Nitsch, Propagating Modes in Gauge Field Theories of Gravity, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **18**, 1207 (1986).
- [70] H.-J. Yo and J. M. Nester, Dynamic Scalar Torsion and an Oscillating Universe, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **22**, 2057 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0612738.
- [71] K.-F. Shie, J. M. Nester, and H.-J. Yo, Torsion Cosmology and the Accelerating Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 023522 (2008), arXiv:0805.3834 [gr-qc].
- [72] V. P. Nair, S. Randjbar-Daemi, and V. Rubakov, Massive Spin-2 fields of Geometric Origin in Curved Spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 104031 (2009), arXiv:0811.3781 [hep-th].
- [73] V. Nikiforova, S. Randjbar-Daemi, and V. Rubakov, Infrared Modified Gravity with Dynamical Torsion, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 124050 (2009), arXiv:0905.3732 [hep-th].
- [74] H. Chen, F.-H. Ho, J. M. Nester, C.-H. Wang, and H.-J. Yo, Cosmological dynamics with propagating Lorentz connection modes of spin zero, *JCAP* **10**, 027, arXiv:0908.3323 [gr-qc].
- [75] W.-T. Ni, Searches for the role of spin and polarization in grav-

- ity, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **73**, 056901 (2010), arXiv:0912.5057 [gr-qc].
- [76] P. Baekler, F. W. Hehl, and J. M. Nester, Poincaré gauge theory of gravity: Friedman cosmology with even and odd parity modes. Analytic part, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 024001 (2011), arXiv:1009.5112 [gr-qc].
- [77] F.-H. Ho and J. M. Nester, Poincaré gauge theory with even and odd parity dynamic connection modes: isotropic Bianchi cosmological models, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **330**, 012005 (2011), arXiv:1105.5001 [gr-qc].
- [78] F.-H. Ho and J. M. Nester, Poincaré Gauge Theory With Coupled Even And Odd Parity Dynamic Spin-0 Modes: Dynamic Equations For Isotropic Bianchi Cosmologies, *Annalen Phys.* **524**, 97 (2012), arXiv:1106.0711 [gr-qc].
- [79] Y. C. Ong, K. Izumi, J. M. Nester, and P. Chen, Problems with Propagation and Time Evolution in f(T) Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 024019 (2013), arXiv:1303.0993 [gr-qc].
- [80] D. Puetzfeld and Y. N. Obukhov, Prospects of detecting spacetime torsion, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23**, 1442004 (2014), arXiv:1405.4137 [gr-qc].
- [81] W.-T. Ni, Searches for the role of spin and polarization in gravity: a five-year update, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **40**, 1660010 (2016), arXiv:1501.07696 [hep-ph].
- [82] F.-H. Ho, H. Chen, J. M. Nester, and H.-J. Yo, General Poincaré Gauge Theory Cosmology, *Chin. J. Phys.* **53**, 110109 (2015), arXiv:1512.01202 [gr-qc].
- [83] G. K. Karananas, *Poincaré, Scale and Conformal Symmetries Gauge Perspective and Cosmological Ramifications*, Ph.D. thesis, Ecole Polytechnique, Lausanne (2016), arXiv:1608.08451 [hep-th].
- [84] Y. N. Obukhov, Gravitational waves in Poincaré gauge gravity theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 084028 (2017), arXiv:1702.05185 [gr-qc].
- [85] M. Blagojević, B. Cvetković, and Y. N. Obukhov, Generalized plane waves in Poincaré gauge theory of gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 064031 (2017), arXiv:1708.08766 [gr-qc].
- [86] H.-H. Tseng, *Gravitational Theories with Torsion*, Ph.D. thesis, Taiwan, Natl. Tsing Hua U. (2018), arXiv:1812.00314 [gr-qc].
- [87] Y.-C. Lin, M. P. Hobson, and A. N. Lasenby, Ghost and tachyon free Poincaré gauge theories: A systematic approach, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 064001 (2019), arXiv:1812.02675 [gr-qc].
- [88] J. Beltrán Jiménez and A. Delhom, Ghosts in metric-affine higher order curvature gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 656 (2019), arXiv:1901.08988 [gr-qc].
- [89] H. Zhang and L. Xu, Late-time acceleration and inflation in a Poincaré gauge cosmological model, *JCAP* **09**, 050, arXiv:1904.03545 [gr-qc].
- [90] K. Aoki and K. Shimada, Scalar-metric-affine theories: Can we get ghost-free theories from symmetry?, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 044037 (2019), arXiv:1904.10175 [hep-th].
- [91] H. Zhang and L. Xu, Inflation in the parity-conserving Poincaré gauge cosmology, *JCAP* **10**, 003, arXiv:1906.04340 [gr-qc].
- [92] J. Beltrán Jiménez and F. J. Maldonado Torralba, Revisiting the stability of quadratic Poincaré gauge gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 611 (2020), arXiv:1910.07506 [gr-qc].
- [93] Y.-C. Lin, M. P. Hobson, and A. N. Lasenby, Power-counting renormalizable, ghost-and-tachyon-free Poincaré gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 064038 (2020), arXiv:1910.14197 [gr-qc].
- [94] R. Percacci and E. Sezgin, New class of ghost- and tachyon-free metric affine gravities, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 084040 (2020), arXiv:1912.01023 [hep-th].
- [95] W. E. V. Barker, A. N. Lasenby, M. P. Hobson, and W. J. Handley, Systematic study of background cosmology in unitary Poincaré gauge theories with application to emergent dark radiation and H_0 tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 024048 (2020), arXiv:2003.02690 [gr-qc].
- [96] J. Beltrán Jiménez and A. Delhom, Instabilities in metric-affine theories of gravity with higher order curvature terms, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 585 (2020), arXiv:2004.11357 [gr-qc].
- [97] F. J. Maldonado Torralba, *New effective theories of gravitation and their phenomenological consequences*, Ph.D. thesis, Cape Town U., Dept. Math. (2020), arXiv:2101.11523 [gr-qc].
- [98] W. E. V. Barker, A. N. Lasenby, M. P. Hobson, and W. J. Handley, Nonlinear Hamiltonian analysis of new quadratic torsion theories: Cases with curvature-free constraints, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 084036 (2021), arXiv:2101.02645 [gr-qc].
- [99] C. Marzo, Ghost and tachyon free propagation up to spin 3 in Lorentz invariant field theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 065017 (2022), arXiv:2108.11982 [hep-ph].
- [100] C. Marzo, Radiatively stable ghost and tachyon freedom in metric affine gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024045 (2022), arXiv:2110.14788 [hep-th].
- [101] A. de la Cruz Dombriz, F. J. Maldonado Torralba, and D. F. Mota, Dark matter candidate from torsion, *Phys. Lett. B* **834**, 137488 (2022), arXiv:2112.03957 [gr-qc].
- [102] A. Baldazzi, O. Melichev, and R. Percacci, Metric-Affine Gravity as an effective field theory, *Annals Phys.* **438**, 168757 (2022), arXiv:2112.10193 [gr-qc].
- [103] J. Annala and S. Rasanen, Stability of non-degenerate Ricci-type Palatini theories, *JCAP* **04**, 014, [Erratum: JCAP 08, E02 (2023)], arXiv:2212.09820 [gr-qc].
- [104] Y. Mikura, V. Naso, and R. Percacci, Some simple theories of gravity with propagating torsion, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 104071 (2024), arXiv:2312.10249 [gr-qc].
- [105] Y. Mikura and R. Percacci, Some simple theories of gravity with propagating nonmetricity, (2024), arXiv:2401.10097 [gr-qc].
- [106] W. Barker and C. Marzo, Particle spectra of general Ricci-type Palatini or metric-affine theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 104017 (2024), arXiv:2402.07641 [hep-th].
- [107] C. Møller, Conservation Law and Absolute Parallelism in General Relativity, *K. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk. Mat. Fys. Skr.* **1**, 1 (1961).
- [108] C. Pellegrini and J. Plebanski, Tetrad Fields and Gravitational Fields, *K. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk. Mat. Fys. Skr.* **2**, 1 (1963).
- [109] Y. M. Cho, Einstein Lagrangian as the Translational Yang-Mills Lagrangian, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2521 (1976).
- [110] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, New general relativity., *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 3524 (1979), [Addendum: Phys.Rev.D 24, 3312–3314 (1982)].
- [111] A. Dimakis, The Initial Value Problem of the Poincare Gauge Theory in Vacuum. 1: Second Order Formalism, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Phys. Theor.* **51**, 371 (1989).
- [112] A. Dimakis, THE INITIAL VALUE PROBLEM OF THE POINCARÉ GAUGE THEORY IN VACUUM. 1: FIRST ORDER FORMALISM, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Phys. Theor.* **51**, 389 (1989).
- [113] J. Lemke, Shock waves in the Poincare gauge theory of gravitation, *Phys. Lett. A* **143**, 13 (1990).
- [114] R. D. Hecht, J. Lemke, and R. P. Wallner, Tachyonic torsion shock waves in Poincare gauge theory, *Phys. Lett. A* **151**, 12 (1990).
- [115] R. D. Hecht, J. Lemke, and R. P. Wallner, Can Poincare gauge theory be saved?, *Phys. Rev. D* **44**, 2442 (1991).
- [116] N. Afshordi, D. J. H. Chung, and G. Geshnizjani, Cuscuton:

- A Causal Field Theory with an Infinite Speed of Sound, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 083513 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0609150.
- [117] J. Magueijo, Bimetric varying speed of light theories and primordial fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 043525 (2009), arXiv:0807.1689 [gr-qc].
- [118] C. Charmousis and A. Padilla, The Instability of Vacua in Gauss-Bonnet Gravity, *JHEP* **12**, 038, arXiv:0807.2864 [hep-th].
- [119] C. Charmousis, G. Niz, A. Padilla, and P. M. Saffin, Strong coupling in Horava gravity, *JHEP* **08**, 070, arXiv:0905.2579 [hep-th].
- [120] A. Papazoglou and T. P. Sotiriou, Strong coupling in extended Horava-Lifshitz gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* **685**, 197 (2010), arXiv:0911.1299 [hep-th].
- [121] D. Baumann, L. Senatore, and M. Zaldarriaga, Scale-Invariance and the Strong Coupling Problem, *JCAP* **05**, 004, arXiv:1101.3320 [hep-th].
- [122] G. D'Amico, C. de Rham, S. Dubovsky, G. Gabadadze, D. Pirtskhalava, and A. J. Tolley, Massive Cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 124046 (2011), arXiv:1108.5231 [hep-th].
- [123] A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, C. Lin, and S. Mukohyama, Anisotropic Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe from nonlinear massive gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* **717**, 295 (2012), arXiv:1206.2723 [hep-th].
- [124] A. Wang, Hořava gravity at a Lifshitz point: A progress report, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26**, 1730014 (2017), arXiv:1701.06087 [gr-qc].
- [125] C. Mazuet, S. Mukohyama, and M. S. Volkov, Anisotropic deformations of spatially open cosmology in massive gravity theory, *JCAP* **04**, 039, arXiv:1702.04205 [hep-th].
- [126] J. Beltrán Jiménez and A. Jiménez-Cano, On the strong coupling of Einsteinian Cubic Gravity and its generalisations, *JCAP* **01**, 069, arXiv:2009.08197 [gr-qc].
- [127] A. Jiménez Cano, *Metric-affine Gauge theories of gravity. Foundations and new insights*, Ph.D. thesis, Granada U., Theor. Phys. Astrophys. (2021), arXiv:2201.12847 [gr-qc].
- [128] W. E. V. Barker, Supercomputers against strong coupling in gravity with curvature and torsion, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 228 (2023), arXiv:2206.00658 [gr-qc].
- [129] A. Delhom, A. Jiménez-Cano, and F. J. Maldonado Torralba, *Instabilities in Field Theory: A Primer with Applications in Modified Gravity* (Springer, 2022) arXiv:2207.13431 [gr-qc].
- [130] A. I. Vainshtein, To the problem of nonvanishing gravitation mass, *Phys. Lett. B* **39**, 393 (1972).
- [131] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, and A. I. Vainshtein, Nonperturbative continuity in graviton mass versus perturbative discontinuity, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 044026 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0106001.
- [132] C. Deffayet and J.-W. Rombouts, Ghosts, strong coupling and accidental symmetries in massive gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 044003 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0505134.
- [133] C. de Rham, Massive Gravity, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17**, 7 (2014), arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th].
- [134] S. Deser, M. Sandora, A. Waldron, and G. Zahariade, Covariant constraints for generic massive gravity and analysis of its characteristics, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 104043 (2014), arXiv:1408.0561 [hep-th].
- [135] G. Velo and D. Zwanziger, Noncausality and other defects of interaction lagrangians for particles with spin one and higher, *Phys. Rev.* **188**, 2218 (1969).
- [136] C. Aragone and S. Deser, Constraints on gravitationally coupled tensor fields, *Nuovo Cim. A* **3**, 709 (1971).
- [137] W.-H. Cheng, D.-C. Chern, and J. M. Nester, Canonical Analysis of the One Parameter Teleparallel Theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **38**, 2656 (1988).
- [138] R. D. Hecht, J. M. Nester, and V. V. Zhytnikov, Some Poincaré gauge theory Lagrangians with well posed initial value problems, *Phys. Lett. A* **222**, 37 (1996).
- [139] H. Chen, J. M. Nester, and H.-J. Yo, Acausal PGT modes and the nonlinear constraint effect, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **29**, 961 (1998).
- [140] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann, and C. Pfeifer, Hamiltonian and primary constraints of new general relativity, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 084025 (2019), arXiv:1811.11137 [gr-qc].
- [141] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann, M. Krššák, and C. Pfeifer, Hamiltonian analysis in new general relativity, in *15th Marcel Grossmann Meeting on Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics, and Relativistic Field Theories* (2019) arXiv:1905.11919 [gr-qc].
- [142] D. Blixt, M.-J. Guzmán, M. Hohmann, and C. Pfeifer, Review of the Hamiltonian analysis in teleparallel gravity, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **18**, 2130005 (2021), arXiv:2012.09180 [gr-qc].
- [143] K. Krasnov and E. Mitsou, Pure Lorentz spin connection theories and uniqueness of general relativity, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 205009 (2021), arXiv:2106.05803 [gr-qc].
- [144] S. Bahamonde, K. F. Dialektopoulos, C. Escamilla-Rivera, G. Farrugia, V. Gakis, M. Hendry, M. Hohmann, J. Levi Said, J. Mifsud, and E. Di Valentino, Teleparallel gravity: from theory to cosmology, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **86**, 026901 (2023), arXiv:2106.13793 [gr-qc].
- [145] M. Blagojević and B. Cvetković, Three-dimensional gravity with propagating torsion: Hamiltonian structure of the scalar sector, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 104032 (2013), arXiv:1309.0411 [gr-qc].
- [146] M. Blagojević and B. Cvetković, Poincaré gauge theory in 3D: canonical stability of the scalar sector, (2013), arXiv:1310.8309 [gr-qc].
- [147] K. Aoki, Nonlinearly ghost-free higher curvature gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 124049 (2020), arXiv:2009.11739 [hep-th].
- [148] J. Beltrán Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, and T. S. Koivisto, The Geometrical Trinity of Gravity, *Universe* **5**, 173 (2019), arXiv:1903.06830 [hep-th].
- [149] R. Percacci and E. Sezgin, New class of ghost- and tachyon-free metric affine gravities, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 084040 (2020), arXiv:1912.01023 [hep-th].
- [150] M. Piva, Massive higher-spin multiplets and asymptotic freedom in quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 045006 (2022), arXiv:2110.09649 [hep-th].
- [151] D. Iosifidis, R. Myrzakulov, L. Ravera, G. Yergaliyeva, and K. Yerzhanov, Metric-Affine Vector-Tensor correspondence and implications in F(R,T,Q,T,D) gravity, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **37**, 101094 (2022), arXiv:2111.14214 [gr-qc].
- [152] A. Jiménez-Cano and F. J. Maldonado Torralba, Vector stability in quadratic metric-affine theories, *JCAP* **09**, 044, arXiv:2205.05674 [gr-qc].
- [153] D. Iosifidis and K. Pallikaris, Describing metric-affine theories anew: alternative frameworks, examples and solutions, *JCAP* **05**, 037, arXiv:2301.11364 [gr-qc].
- [154] A. Lasenby and M. Hobson, Scale-invariant gauge theories of gravity: theoretical foundations, *J. Math. Phys.* **57**, 092505 (2016), arXiv:1510.06699 [gr-qc].
- [155] M. P. Hobson and A. N. Lasenby, Fresh perspective on gauging the conformal group, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 104042 (2021), arXiv:2008.09053 [gr-qc].
- [156] M. P. Hobson and A. N. Lasenby, Weyl gauge theories of gravity do not predict a second clock effect, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 084040 (2020), arXiv:2009.06407 [gr-qc].

- [157] M. Hobson and A. Lasenby, Note on the absence of the second clock effect in Weyl gauge theories of gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, L021501 (2022), arXiv:2112.09967 [gr-qc].
- [158] M. Hobson, A. Lasenby, and W. E. V. Barker, Manifestly covariant variational principle for gauge theories of gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 024022 (2024), arXiv:2309.14783 [gr-qc].
- [159] M. P. Hobson, G. P. Efstathiou, and A. N. Lasenby, *General relativity: An introduction for physicists* (2006).
- [160] J. A. Vázquez, L. E. Padilla, and T. Matos, Inflationary cosmology: from theory to observations, *Rev. Mex. Fis. E* **17**, 73 (2020), arXiv:1810.09934 [astro-ph.CO].
- [161] A. Achúcarro *et al.*, Inflation: Theory and Observations, (2022), arXiv:2203.08128 [astro-ph.CO].
- [162] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, The Standard Model Higgs boson as the inflaton, *Phys. Lett. B* **659**, 703 (2008), arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th].
- [163] R. Allahverdi, R. Brandenberger, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, and A. Mazumdar, Reheating in Inflationary Cosmology: Theory and Applications, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **60**, 27 (2010), arXiv:1001.2600 [hep-th].
- [164] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2013 results. XXII. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A22 (2014), arXiv:1303.5082 [astro-ph.CO].
- [165] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2015 results. XX. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A20 (2016), arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO].
- [166] Y. Akrami *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A10 (2020), arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO].
- [167] H. Georgi, *Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Theory* (1984).
- [168] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, and B. R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the standard model*, Vol. 2 (CUP, 2014).
- [169] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, *Heavy quark physics*, Vol. 10 (2000).
- [170] S. Scherer and M. R. Schindler, *A Primer for Chiral Perturbation Theory*, Vol. 830 (2012).
- [171] P. W. Higgs, Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 508 (1964).
- [172] G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen, and T. W. B. Kibble, Global Conservation Laws and Massless Particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 585 (1964).
- [173] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS), Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 30 (2012), arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex].
- [174] W. Barker and S. Zell, Consistent particle physics in metric-affine gravity from extended projective symmetry, (2024), arXiv:2402.14917 [hep-th].
- [175] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (BICEP, Keck), Improved Constraints on Primordial Gravitational Waves using Planck, WMAP, and BICEP/Keck Observations through the 2018 Observing Season, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 151301 (2021), arXiv:2110.00483 [astro-ph.CO].
- [176] R. Laureijs *et al.* (EUCLID), Euclid Definition Study Report, (2011), arXiv:1110.3193 [astro-ph.CO].
- [177] A. Weltman *et al.*, Fundamental physics with the Square Kilometre Array, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral.* **37**, e002 (2020), arXiv:1810.02680 [astro-ph.CO].
- [178] K. Abazajian *et al.*, CMB-S4 Science Case, Reference Design, and Project Plan, (2019), arXiv:1907.04473 [astro-ph.IM].
- [179] E. Allys *et al.* (LiteBIRD), Probing Cosmic Inflation with the LiteBIRD Cosmic Microwave Background Polarization Survey, *PTEP* **2023**, 042F01 (2023), arXiv:2202.02773 [astro-ph.IM].
- [180] H. Weyl, Gravitation and electricity, *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.)* **1918**, 465 (1918).
- [181] H. Weyl, *Geometrie und Physik*, *Naturwissenschaften* **49**, 19 (1931).
- [182] Y. N. Obukhov, CONFORMAL INVARIANCE AND SPACE-TIME TORSION, *Phys. Lett. A* **90**, 13 (1982).
- [183] G. K. Karananas, M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, and S. Zell, Scale and Weyl invariance in Einstein-Cartan gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 124014 (2021), arXiv:2108.05897 [hep-th].
- [184] W. Barker, M. Hobson, A. Lasenby, Y.-C. Lin, and Z. Wei, *Supplemental materials hosted at <https://github.com/wevbarker/SupplementalMaterials-2406>*.
- [185] T. Curtright, GENERALIZED GAUGE FIELDS, *Phys. Lett. B* **165**, 304 (1985).
- [186] D. M. Capper and M. J. Duff, Trace anomalies in dimensional regularization, *Nuovo Cim. A* **23**, 173 (1974).
- [187] J. M. Martín-García, xPerm: fast index canonicalization for tensor computer algebra, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **179**, 597 (2008), arXiv:0803.0862 [cs.SC].
- [188] W. Barker, Particle spectra of gravity based on internal symmetry of quantum fields, (2023), arXiv:2311.11790 [hep-th].
- [189] W. Barker, C. Marzo, and C. Rigouzzo, PSALTER: Particle Spectrum for Any Tensor Lagrangian, (2024), arXiv:2406.09500 [hep-th].
- [190] D. Blixt, R. Ferraro, A. Golovnev, and M.-J. Guzmán, Lorentz gauge-invariant variables in torsion-based theories of gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 084029 (2022), arXiv:2201.11102 [gr-qc].
- [191] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann, T. Koivisto, and L. Marzola, Teleparallel bigravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 1120 (2023), arXiv:2305.03504 [gr-qc].

A. Detailed tree-level spectra

The particle spectra are obtained using the *Particle Spectrum for Any Tensor Lagrangian (PSALTER)* software [106, 174, 188, 189]. Recall that the kinematic variables of PGT were $\{b^i_\mu, A^{ij}_\mu\}$, and that the inverse h_i^μ is determined by b^i_μ . This means that we are free to use $\{h_i^\mu, A^{ij}_\mu\}$ instead. Working in the weak-field regime, we take A^{ij}_μ to be inherently perturbative. We define the exact perturbation $h_i^\mu \equiv \delta_i^\mu + f_i^\mu$, where we make the ‘Kronecker’ choice of Minkowski vacuum (see alternative vacua [188, 190, 191]). There are a priori 16 d.o.f in f_i^μ , and 24 d.o.f in A^{ij}_μ . Conjugate to f_i^μ and A^{ij}_μ are the translational source (i.e. the asymmetric stress-energy tensor) τ^i_μ , and the matter spin current σ_{ij}^μ [17, 18, 46]. To lowest order in the field perturbations, the Greek and Roman indices are interchangeable. For this reason the final set of fields used in the linearised analysis is $\{f_{\mu\nu}, A_{\mu\nu\sigma}\}$, with conjugate sources $\{\tau^{\mu\nu}, \sigma^{\mu\nu\sigma}\}$. The various SO(3) irreducible parts of these quantities are presented in Figs. 2 and 3, and they have spin-parity (J^P) labels to identify them. Duplicate J^P states can arise, and these are distinguished by extra labels #1, #2, etc.

The actual analysis of the theory in Eq. (19) was performed across 64 AMD[®] *Ryzen Threadripper* CPUs. For the completely unrestricted case in Eq. (19) the mass expressions associated with the roots of the quartic pole are expected to be very cumbersome, so we abort the computation before

Fundamental field	Symmetries	Decomposition into SO(3) irrep(s)	Source
f_{ab}	Symmetry[2, $f^{\bullet 1 \bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$\frac{1}{3} \eta_{ab} f_0^{\bullet 2} + f_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1} + f_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2} + f_{1^{\bullet 1} \beta}^{\bullet 1} n_a + f_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2} n_\beta - \frac{1}{3} f_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1} n_a n_\beta + f_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2} n_a n_\beta$	Γ_{ab}
SO(3) irrep	Symmetries	Expansion in terms of the fundamental field	Source SO(3) irrep
$f_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[0, $f_0^{\bullet 1}$, { }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$f_a^{\bullet 1} - f^{ab} n_a n_\beta$	$\Gamma_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1}$
$f_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[0, $f_0^{\bullet 2}$, { }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$f^{ab} n_a n_\beta$	$\Gamma_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2}$
$f_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[2, $f_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ -(1,2) } }]	$\frac{f_{ab}}{2} - \frac{f_{ba}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} f_\beta^X n_a n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\beta^X n_a n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma + \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma + \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma$	$\Gamma_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$
$f_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[1, $f_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$ }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$f_\beta^{\bullet 1} n_\beta - f^{\beta\alpha} n_a n_\beta n_\gamma$	$\Gamma_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$
$f_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[1, $f_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$ }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$f_\beta^{\bullet 2} n_\beta - f^{\beta\alpha} n_a n_\beta n_\gamma$	$\Gamma_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$
$f_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[2, $f_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ (1,2) } }]	$\frac{f_{ab}}{2} + \frac{f_{ba}}{2} - \frac{1}{3} \eta_{ab} f_\gamma^X + \frac{1}{3} f_\gamma^X n_a n_\beta - \frac{1}{2} f_\beta^X n_a n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\beta^X n_a n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^X n_\beta n_\gamma + \frac{1}{3} \eta_{ab} f^{X\delta} n_\gamma n_\delta + \frac{2}{3} f^{X\delta} n_a n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta$	$\Gamma_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$

FIG. 2. Kinematic structure of the tetrad perturbation $f_{\mu\nu}$, as used in Eqs. (3) and (19). These definitions are used in Figs. 4 to 11.

Fundamental field	Symmetries	Decomposition into SO(3) irrep(s)	Source
$\mathcal{A}_{a\beta\chi}$	Symmetry[3, $\mathcal{A}^{\bullet 1 \bullet 2 \bullet 3}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$, $\bullet 3 \rightarrow c$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ -(1,2) } }]	$-\frac{1}{2} \eta_{\beta\chi} \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} a}^{\bullet 1} + \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\alpha\chi} \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} \beta}^{\bullet 1} + \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} ab\chi}^{\bullet 1} + \frac{1}{3} \eta_{\beta\chi} \mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1} n_a + \mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 1} \beta\chi}^{\bullet 1} n_a - \frac{1}{3} \eta_{\alpha\chi} \mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1} n_\beta - \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} a\chi}^{\bullet 1} n_\beta - \mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 1} \alpha\chi}^{\bullet 2} n_\beta + \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1} n_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} \beta}^{\bullet 1} n_a n_\gamma - \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} \beta}^{\bullet 2} n_a n_\gamma + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} a}^{\bullet 1} n_\beta n_\gamma + \mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} a}^{\bullet 2} n_\beta n_\gamma - \frac{1}{6} \eta_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1} n^\delta$	$\sigma_{a\beta\chi}$
SO(3) irrep	Symmetries	Expansion in terms of the fundamental field	Source SO(3) irrep
$\mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[0, $\mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1}$, { }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$\mathcal{A}_a^\beta n^\alpha$	$\sigma_{0^{\bullet 1}}^{\bullet 1}$
$\mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[0, $\mathcal{A}_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2}$, { }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$-\epsilon \eta_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \mathcal{A}^{\beta\gamma\delta} n^\alpha$	$\sigma_{0^{\bullet 2}}^{\bullet 2}$
$\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[2, $\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ -(1,2) } }]	$\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\alpha} n^\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\delta} n_a n^\alpha n^\delta + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} n_\beta n^\alpha n^\delta$	$\sigma_{1^{\bullet 1} ab}^{\bullet 1}$
$\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[2, $\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ -(1,2) } }]	$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha + \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\delta} n_a n^\alpha n^\delta - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} n_\beta n^\alpha n^\delta$	$\sigma_{1^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$
$\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[1, $\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$ }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$-\mathcal{A}_a^\beta + \mathcal{A}_\beta^X n_a n^\beta + \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\beta n^\alpha$	$\sigma_{1^{\bullet 1} \alpha}^{\bullet 1}$
$\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[1, $\mathcal{A}_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$ }, StrongGenSet{ }, GenSet{ }]	$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\beta n^\alpha$	$\sigma_{1^{\bullet 2} \alpha}^{\bullet 2}$
$\mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$	Symmetry[2, $\mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ (1,2) } }]	$\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\alpha} n^\alpha - \frac{1}{3} \eta_{ab} \mathcal{A}_\gamma^\delta n^\alpha + \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}_\gamma^\delta n_a n_\beta n^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\delta} n_a n^\alpha n^\delta + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} n_\beta n^\alpha n^\delta$	$\sigma_{2^{\bullet 2} ab}^{\bullet 2}$
$\mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 1} ab\chi}^{\bullet 1}$	Symmetry[3, $\mathcal{A}_{2^{\bullet 1} ab\chi}^{\bullet 1}$, { $\bullet 1 \rightarrow a$, $\bullet 2 \rightarrow b$, $\bullet 3 \rightarrow c$ }, StrongGenSet{ {1, 2}, GenSet{ -(1,2) } }]	$\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\chi} + \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\beta\chi} \mathcal{A}_a^\delta - \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\chi\alpha} + \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\alpha\chi} \mathcal{A}_\beta^\delta - \frac{3}{8} \mathcal{A}_\beta^\delta n_a n_\gamma + \frac{3}{8} \mathcal{A}_\alpha^\delta n_\beta n_\gamma + \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\gamma\delta} n_a n^\delta + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\delta\chi} n_a n^\delta + \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\chi\delta\beta} n_a n^\delta + \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\beta\chi} \mathcal{A}_\delta^\epsilon n_a n^\delta - \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\chi} n_\beta n^\delta - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\chi} n_\beta n^\delta - \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\chi\delta\alpha} n_\beta n^\delta - \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\alpha\chi} \mathcal{A}_\delta^\epsilon n_\beta n^\delta - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} n_\chi n^\delta - \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\beta\delta} n_\chi n^\delta + \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\beta\delta\alpha} n_\chi n^\delta + \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\beta\chi} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\delta\epsilon} n^\epsilon - \frac{3}{8} \eta_{\alpha\chi} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\delta\epsilon} n^\epsilon - \frac{3}{8} \mathcal{A}_{\beta\delta\epsilon} n_a n_\chi n^\delta + \frac{3}{8} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha\delta\epsilon} n_\beta n_\chi n^\delta n^\epsilon$	$\sigma_{2^{\bullet 1} ab\chi}^{\bullet 1}$

FIG. 3. Kinematic structure of the spin connection perturbation $\mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu\sigma}$, as used in Eqs. (3) and (19). Note that the 2^- state has a hidden multi-term cyclic symmetry on all its indices, which is not accommodated by the C language implementation of the Butler–Portugal algorithm [187]. These definitions are used in Figs. 4 to 11.

they are computed: the structure of the wave operator and saturated propagator, without the mass spectrum, is shown in Fig. 4. Before the evaluation of the ‘general’ branch for which the k^4 coefficient in Eq. (21) is removed, the condition $\alpha_5 = \chi^2/\xi - 2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ must be imposed on the linearised action. To avoid Lagrangian couplings appearing on the denominator of the linearised action⁷ we impose the con-

straint by introducing a new coupling θ and setting in Eq. (19)

$$\alpha_5 \mapsto \theta^2 \xi - 2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4), \quad \chi \mapsto \theta \xi. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The results are shown in Fig. 5, we see that apart from the two massless polarisations of the Einstein graviton, up to six torsion particles can propagate with the following square masses, where we eliminate θ in terms of χ and ξ using Eq. (A1)

$$(m_{0+})^2 \equiv \frac{m_{\text{P}}^2 (2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{2(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3)(6\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_3 - 2\alpha_4 + 2\alpha_6 + \chi^2/\xi)}, \quad (\text{A2a})$$

$$(m_{0-})^2 \equiv -\frac{8\beta_1 - 8\beta_2 + m_{\text{P}}^2}{4\alpha_2 + 12\alpha_4 - 2\chi^2/\xi}, \quad (\text{A2b})$$

$$(m_{1+})^2 \equiv \frac{-32\beta_1^2 + 16\beta_2^2 - 10\beta_2 m_{\text{P}}^2 + m_{\text{P}}^4 + 4\beta_1 (4\beta_2 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{4(\alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4 - 4\alpha_6)(2\beta_1 - \beta_2)}, \quad (\text{A2c})$$

$$(m_{1-})^2 \equiv -\frac{24(4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{P}}^2)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{\xi(48\beta_3 \chi^3/\xi^3 + 4\beta_1(1 + 8\chi/\xi + 24\chi^2/\xi^2) + 2\beta_2(1 + 8\chi/\xi + 24\chi^2/\xi^2) - m_{\text{P}}^2 - 8m_{\text{P}}^2 \chi/\xi)}, \quad (\text{A2d})$$

$$(m_{2+})^2 \equiv \frac{(4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{P}}^2) m_{\text{P}}^2}{4(2\beta_1 + \beta_2)(3\alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4 - 4\alpha_6 - 2\chi^2/\xi)}, \quad (\text{A2e})$$

$$(m_{2-})^2 \equiv \frac{4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{P}}^2}{4\alpha_2 - 2\chi^2/\xi}. \quad (\text{A2f})$$

By adding up the $1 + 1 + 3 + 3 + 5 + 5$ spin multiplicities of Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f) we recover the $16 + 24$ kinematic d.o.f in $\{b_{\mu}^i, A_{\mu}^{ij}\}$, less the $2 \times (4 + 6)$ gauge d.o.f associated with Poincaré gauge symmetry — the only surviving symmetry of the embedded theory. The branch $2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \chi = 0$

is likewise found by setting $\alpha_5 \mapsto -2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ and $\chi \mapsto 0$ in Eq. (19). The analysis is presented in Fig. 9, and shows that the mass spectrum is fully consistent with imposing $\chi \mapsto 0$ in Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f). Finally, the case $\xi = \chi = 0$ in Eq. (19) without any further restrictions leads in Fig. 10 to the general case of PGT in Eq. (3), which was found previously in [60], namely

$$(m_{0+})^2 \equiv \frac{m_{\text{P}}^2 (2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{2(6\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 + 2\alpha_6)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3)}, \quad (\text{A3a})$$

$$(m_{0-})^2 \equiv -\frac{8\beta_1 - 8\beta_2 + m_{\text{P}}^2}{4\alpha_4 - 2\alpha_5}, \quad (\text{A3b})$$

$$(m_{1-})^2 \equiv -\frac{(4\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - m_{\text{P}}^2)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 3\beta_3 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{2(2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)}, \quad (\text{A3c})$$

$$(m_{2+})^2 \equiv \frac{m_{\text{P}}^2 (-4\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + m_{\text{P}}^2)}{4(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4 + 2\alpha_5 + 4\alpha_6)(2\beta_1 + \beta_2)}, \quad (\text{A3d})$$

⁷ As a mild technical limitation, coupling coefficients in the denominator can

cause PSALTer to become slow.

$$(m_{2^-})^2 \equiv \frac{-4\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + m_P^2}{2(4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5)}. \quad (\text{A3e})$$

Whilst we confirmed already that the $\chi \rightarrow 0$ limit of Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f) was continuous, it is evident from Eq. (A2d) that once $\chi \rightarrow 0$ has been taken the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$ eliminates the 1^- vector in which we have been so interested. In fact, this is not surprising, because taking $\chi \rightarrow 0$ at finite ξ

corresponds to setting $2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = 0$. From Eq. (A3c) we see how this latter condition would equivalently kill the 1^- mode in Eq. (3) (we confirm this in Fig. 11), and the Eq. (3) theory-space is reached by $\xi \rightarrow 0$.




FIG. 4. Partial particle spectrograph of the completely general theory in Eq. (19). From the 1^- sector of the saturated propagator we may read off the quartic pole in Eq. (21). All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3.




FIG. 5. Particle spectrum of the branch $\alpha_5 = \chi^2/\xi - 2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ of Eq. (19), which gives rise to the mass spectra in Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f). All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3 and Eq. (A1).

Unity conditions
(Timeout after 60 seconds)




FIG. 7. Particle spectrograph of Eq. (22), i.e. the minimal PGT realisation of the novel massless scalar particle which appears in Fig. 6. All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3.




FIG. 8. Particle spectrograph of Eq. (23), i.e. the minimal model of the novel scalar particle which appears in Figs. 6 and 7. We use the rotational gauge field perturbation $A_{\mu\nu\sigma} \equiv A_{[\mu\nu]\sigma}$ as a proxy for the Curtright field $C_{\mu\nu\sigma} \equiv C_{[\mu\nu]\sigma}$ with $C_{[\mu\nu\sigma]} \equiv 0$, because the latter multi-term symmetry is a difficult attribute to declare in the *PSALTER* framework. It can be confirmed (by applying transformation rules to the Lagrangian density in this figure, and repeating the analysis) that the axial part $A_{[\mu\nu\sigma]}$ does *not* contribute to the spectrum. All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3.




FIG. 9. Particle spectrograph of the branch $\alpha_5 = -2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ with $\chi = 0$ of Eq. (19), which gives rise to the $\chi \mapsto 0$ limit of the mass spectra in Eqs. (A2a) to (A2f) (see Fig. 5). All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3 and Eq. (A1).




FIG. 10. Particle spectrograph of the branch $\xi = \chi = 0$ of Eq. (19), which gives rise to the mass spectra in Eqs. (A3a) to (A3e), as first presented in [60]. All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3.




FIG. 11. Particle spectrograph of the branch $\alpha_3 = -2(\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4)$ of Eq. (3), confirming that the 1^- mode is removed. All quantities are defined in Figs. 2 and 3.