

Reduced geometry and its role in explicit spacetime symmetry violation

Carlos M. Reyes ^a, César Riquelme ^{a,b}, Marco Schreck ^c, Alex Soto ^d

^a*Centro de Ciencias Exactas, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chillán, Casilla 447, Chile*

^b*Departamento de Física, Universidad de Concepción, Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Chile*

^c*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Maranhão, Campus Universitário do Bacanga, São Luís (MA), 65085-580, Brazil*

^d*School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK*

Abstract

The incompatibility of explicit diffeomorphism violation with Riemannian geometry within the gravitational Standard-Model Extension (SME) is revisited. We review two methods of how to deal with this problem. The first is based on an approach proposed originally by Stückelberg and the latter is to restrict spacetime geometry via the dynamical field equations and the second Bianchi identity. Moreover, a third technique is introduced, which is novel and relies on isometries of a gravitational system. Our conclusion is that an SME background field configuration compatible with Riemannian geometry is more likely to be determined the more diffeomorphisms are isometries of the particular system. This finding has the potential to provide an alternative treatment of explicit spacetime symmetry violation in gravity.

Keywords: Spacetime symmetry violation, Modified gravity, Differential geometry

PACS: 11.30.Cp, 04.50.Kd, 02.40.-k

1. Introduction

General Relativity (GR) is intrinsically nonlinear, which makes finding solutions of the Einstein equations a highly challenging task. Therefore, it turns out to be valuable to impose symmetries before solving the dynamical field equations for a gravitational system under consideration. In this context, Noether symmetries are of paramount interest. They arise when the variation of the action of a field theory vanishes under certain infinitesimal transformations. Invariances under diffeomorphisms and gauge transformations are prominent examples for Noether symmetries.

Based on that, the literature distinguishes between Noether symmetries generated by Killing vector fields and those admitting conformal Killing vector fields; see, e.g., Ref. [1]. The former are related to isometries, i.e., transformations leaving the metric form-invariant. The latter leave the metric form-invariant except for an overall Weyl rescaling. We also note in passing that the equations of motion can exhibit symmetries that the action does not have. These are known as Lie symmetries, but they will not be of significance in our *Letter*.

In the following, we focus on spacetime symmetry violation, in particular, violations of diffeomorphism invariance, which is one of the most remarkable proper-

ties of GR. Whenever we speak of diffeomorphism violation, we actually refer to particle diffeomorphisms [2], whereas the theory is understood to be invariant under general coordinate transformations (observer diffeomorphisms [2]).

In general, there are two possibilities of how to violate a symmetry, which is by either spontaneous or explicit means. The first rests upon tensor-valued fields acquiring symmetry-violating vacuum expectation values dynamically. Such mechanisms were already proposed in bosonic string field theory at the beginning of the 90s [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Spontaneous diffeomorphism violation has been the preferred option for spacetime symmetry violation in the gravitational Standard-Model Extension (SME) [8, 9] for two decades since it was demonstrated to be dynamically consistent with Riemannian geometry [11, 12].

In contrast, explicit diffeomorphism violation is plagued by conflicts between the dynamics and Riemannian geometry. Reconciling the modified Einstein equations with the contracted second Bianchi identity for the Riemann tensor implies a number of coupled partial differential equations for the SME background coefficients, which are challenging to solve. This important finding has been coined the no-go result in the contem-

porary literature [2, 8, 9, 10] and it has basically led to two possible interpretations. A nondynamical SME background field is either restricted severely when Riemannian geometry is to be maintained or one is forced to work in a beyond-Riemannian setting such as Finsler geometry [13, 14, 15, 16].

Until now two approaches of how to tackle this problem while maintaining Riemannian geometry have been presented in the literature. The first is to use a procedure that is known as the Stückelberg trick. Stückelberg originally introduced an auxiliary scalar field into Proca theory [17, 18] to restore gauge symmetry such that there is a smooth limit when the Proca mass approaches zero. This idea was taken over to massive gravity [19, 20] as well as to the gravitational SME with explicit diffeomorphism breaking [21], where it works at the level of linearized gravity. Here, the technique rests upon several auxiliary fields that mimic the Nambu-Goldstone modes arising in a setting of spontaneous spacetime symmetry violation. Therefore, the minimum number of excitations is reintroduced to restore the broken symmetries. By doing so, at least some of the essential properties of a setting of spontaneous spacetime symmetry breaking are recovered, although the background field is nondynamical. However, the approach does not reintroduce the Higgs-like modes, which also arise naturally when symmetry breaking is spontaneous.

The second method is to restrict spacetime geometry to suppress diffeomorphism violation dynamically. In particular, this approach was applied by Jackiw and Pi to the gravitational Chern-Simons (CS) term in four spacetime dimensions [22]. The latter can be expressed as a divergence of the CS topological current, which, after suitable integrations by parts, is identified with the Chern-Pontryagin scalar density $2^*R^\sigma{}_\tau{}^{\mu\nu}R^\tau{}_{\sigma\mu\nu} =: 2^*RR$, where $R^\tau{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}$ is the Riemann curvature tensor and $^*R^\tau{}_{\sigma}{}^{\mu\nu} := (1/2)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R^\tau{}_{\sigma\alpha\beta}$ is its dual. Using a suitable normalization and integrating the latter over spacetime provides a \mathbb{Z}_2 topological quantity, which is known as the second Chern number or the gravitational instanton number [23]. Now, for the CS-like term to be consistent with the second contracted Bianchi identity, one must impose that $^*RR = 0$, which reduces the space of all possible geometries to those obeying this requirement. Consequently, the topological properties characterized by the second Chern number must be trivial for spacetimes to be dynamically consistent in this case.

Very recently, another example of how to reduce spacetime geometry for a dynamically consistent theory with nondynamical background fields was presented by Bailey *et al.* in Ref. [24]. They study the gravi-

tational sector of the minimal SME with tensor-valued background fields u , $s^{\mu\nu}$, and $t^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}$ violating diffeomorphism invariance explicitly. In particular, we refer to their Eq. (5) for $e_{4,5,6} = 0$ with Eq. (6) inserted. The latter holds for the scalar coefficient u , the trace of the s coefficients, and the double trace of the t coefficients. These traces must be considered as hybrid coefficients since they contain the dynamical spacetime metric.

Separating their Eq. (6) into its independent parts leads to three requirements on subsets of background field coefficients to be satisfied such that explicit diffeomorphism violation is dynamically consistent. Each of these requirements involves the Ricci scalar, i.e., they can be interpreted to reduce all spacetime geometries to the subset characterized by $R = 0$. In particular, for the u sector, a necessary condition is $R\nabla^\mu u = 0$, which, interestingly, can already be inferred from the comment in brackets found above Sec. 3 in Ref. [22]. So spacetimes are only then dynamically consistent in these cases if their scalar curvature vanishes.

Recently, the cosmology in the t sector of the minimal gravitational SME with explicit symmetry violation has also been explored [25]. Isotropy and homogeneity of spacetime, which many cosmological models are based on, were imposed on the modified-gravity theory considered. This was accomplished by ensuring two essential properties of the purely spacelike part of the second-rank tensor that contains the background field and modifies the Einstein equations. It was required that the latter be form-invariant under the six isometries generated by their corresponding spatial Killing vector fields and that its symmetric, traceless part vanish. As a result, spacetime geometry is effectively restricted such that it is not in conflict with dynamics. At least, this holds when focusing on diffeomorphism breaking induced by the purely spacelike background coefficients t^{abcd} .

We emphasize that reducing geometry is a procedure that is, in a certain sense, related to the dynamics of the modified-gravity theory under study. The modified Einstein equations still have to be solved for a specific system of interest. However, restricting spacetime geometry provides a guidance for proposing a suitable metric *ansatz* such that inconsistencies between dynamics and geometry can be neatly avoided. An example for a spacetime geometry consistent with both $^*RR = 0$ and $R = 0$ is based on the Schwarzschild *ansatz* for a static, spherically symmetric gravitational system without the presence of matter energy-momentum.

In the next section, we will describe the basic ideas behind the third possibility of how to render a setting of explicit spacetime symmetry violation consistent with the dynamical field equations. This approach was orig-

inally motivated by the previously mentioned results of Ref. [25]. It consists of restricting spacetime geometry by imposing symmetries on the metric according to certain properties of a gravitational system at hand. The forthcoming formulation crucially relies on the concept of Killing vector fields outlined at the beginning.

2. Killing fields, isometries, and explicit breaking

Let us consider the following generic gravitational action:

$$S = \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} [R + \mathcal{L}'(g_{\mu\nu}, \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega})] + S_B, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G_N$ with Newton's constant G_N , the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ with determinant $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu})$, and the associated Ricci scalar R . The Lagrange density $\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}'$ involves the coefficients $\bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$ of a generic nondynamical background field, which makes the action noninvariant under particle diffeomorphisms. Moreover, for consistency with the stationary-action principle, we include a suitable extension of the Gibbons-Hawking-York boundary term [26, 27, 28] described by S_B . The action is constructed to be invariant under observer diffeomorphisms. Then, the variation of S with respect to such transformations reads:

$$\delta S_{\text{obs}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} (G^{\mu\nu} + T'^{\mu\nu}) \delta g_{\mu\nu} + \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} J_{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} \delta \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} = 0, \quad (2a)$$

where we defined

$$T'^{\mu\nu} =: \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}'}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}}, \quad J_{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} =: \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}'}{\delta \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}}. \quad (2b)$$

Since the presence of the background field violates particle diffeomorphism invariance, there is a mismatch between the variations of the action with respect to general coordinate transformations and particle diffeomorphisms. The latter can be expressed via the following integral equation:

$$\delta S_{\text{part}} + \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} J_{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} \delta \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} = \delta S_{\text{obs}}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, Eq. (3) describes the origin of the clash between nondynamical background fields and Riemannian geometry in a succinct manner. For a diffeomorphism being an isometry with Killing vector field χ , we demand that the metric be form-invariant under this transformation: $\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_\chi g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, where \mathcal{L}_χ denotes the Lie

derivative [29, 30] along χ . Moreover, we specifically use $\delta \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} = \mathcal{L}_\chi \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$. Then, Eq. (2) implies

$$\delta S_{\text{obs}} = 0 = \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} J_{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} \mathcal{L}_\chi \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}. \quad (4)$$

Hence, there only remains the Lie derivative part of the background field. This leads to the requirement

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} = 0, \quad (5)$$

such that the isometry is imposed on the background field. For a diffeomorphism that is not an isometry, it holds that $\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu + \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu$ and $\delta \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} = \mathcal{L}_\xi \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$, with the Lie derivative \mathcal{L}_ξ along the generator ξ of the diffeomorphism. Performing several integrations by parts in Eq. (2) and employing the contracted second Bianchi identity $\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0$, we arrive at the relationship

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\mu T'^{\mu\nu} = & J_{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} \nabla_\nu \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega} + \nabla_\lambda (J_{\nu\beta\dots\omega} \bar{k}^{\lambda\beta\dots\omega}) \\ & + \nabla_\lambda (J_{\alpha\nu\dots\omega} \bar{k}^{\alpha\lambda\dots\omega}) + \dots + \nabla_\lambda (J_{\alpha\beta\dots\nu} \bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\lambda}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For the theory to be dynamically consistent, a critical requirement is that the following differential equations be satisfied [8, 9]:

$$\nabla_\mu T'^{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (7)$$

Note that the latter result has been well-known for around 20 years. However, below, we intend to provide an alternative view on this problem. The previous equations enable us to understand how the conflict between explicit spacetime symmetry breaking and dynamics can be resolved, at least for particular systems equipped with isometries. Equation 3 clearly shows the conflict in the variation of the action with respect to observer and particle diffeomorphisms in the presence of a nondynamical background field. Each of the 4 equations holds for 1 out of the 4 diffeomorphism generators. Thus, our current interest is in isometries related to diffeomorphisms, whereas isometries associated with local Lorentz transformations are of minor importance for our purpose.

First of all, let us assume that the system does not exhibit any isometries that can be identified with diffeomorphisms. In this case, we must resort to Eq. (7). For a rather generic metric of complicated form, the latter set of coupled nonlinear partial differential equations is likely to heavily reduce the degrees of freedom of the background field, maybe even to the point that all the coefficients vanish identically. However, there may be a

way out for gravitational systems that exhibit at least a single diffeomorphism corresponding to an isometry, as we shall argue below.

By following this line of reasoning, suppose that the gravitational system is characterized by its invariance under a certain diffeomorphism. For example, the Schwarzschild *ansatz*, which describes a static metric, is invariant under infinitesimal time diffeomorphisms. Such a diffeomorphism is then an isometry of the metric, which allows us to identify the generator of this diffeomorphism with a Killing vector field χ . Now, Eq. (5) applies, whereupon the nondynamical background field must be compatible with the symmetry of the metric. Consistency between dynamics and Riemannian geometry demands that Eq. (7) also be valid. The latter is a consistency requirement, whereas the former takes the role of a physical statement on a symmetry that the gravitational system possesses.

The role of the isometry is to reduce the number of degrees of freedom in both the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the background field $\bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$. By doing so, the differential equations of Eq. (7) are supposed to simplify, which contributes to finding nontrivial solutions $\bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$ compatible with the dynamics. The presence of each further isometry that can be identified with a diffeomorphism reduces the complexity of $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$ even more. Consequently, the system of differential equations to be solved for the coefficients of the background field is expected to be ever more manageable.

For simple background fields to start with such as the coordinate scalar u , all these conditions are likely to only permit a vanishing background field. However, if the number of Lorentz indices in $\bar{k}^{\alpha\beta\dots\omega}$ increases, in particular, for the nonminimal SME, the background field is supposed to have enough degrees of freedom such that some nonzero coefficients are expected to survive. Note that the method described in its generality in the present *Letter* was successfully applied to the t coefficients in Ref. [25] very recently, which showcases a specific example. Thus, isometries turn out to be critical in the quest for nondynamical background fields giving rise to a consistent theory.

When there are exactly 4 isometries with Killing vector fields $\chi^{(i)}$, $i = 1 \dots 4$ being identified with each of the 4 diffeomorphisms, we have 4 equations of the form of Eq. (5). Then, the problematic term on the left-hand side of Eq. (3) vanishes, which automatically removes any clash between Riemannian geometry and dynamics. In this case, the requirement of Eq. (7) is supposed to be satisfied identically and should not contain further physical information. Recall that maximally symmetric spacetimes, which have 4 isometries corresponding to




Figure 1: Space of all possible spacetime metrics containing metric *ansätze* as well as solutions of the dynamical field equations. This space involves subspaces of metrics with an ever-increasing number of isometries described by $N_{\text{tot}} \in [1, 10]$ Killing vector fields. The innermost subspace comprises maximally symmetric spacetimes with $N_{\text{tot}} = 10$, where examples are the de-Sitter (S^4), Minkowski (\mathbb{R}^4), and anti-de-Sitter (H^4) metrics. Examples for $N_{\text{tot}} = 6$ are the FLRW-type metrics, for $N_{\text{tot}} = 5$ the metric of the Gödel Universe, for $N_{\text{tot}} = 4$ the Schwarzschild metric, and for $N_{\text{tot}} = 2$ the Kerr metric.

4 diffeomorphisms, are already described by quite simple metrics, which are diagonal and exhibit uninvolved dependencies on the spacetime coordinates.

The well-known three classes of these geometries are de-Sitter (S^4), Minkowski (\mathbb{R}^4), and anti-de-Sitter (H^4) spacetimes. For example, take $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}$, which is the Minkowski metric. The latter has 10 isometries, where 4 of these are identified with translations (diffeomorphisms). By working in Cartesian coordinates, the associated Killing vector fields $\chi^{(i)}$ for $i = 1 \dots 4$ can be chosen to have constant coefficients. Then, Eq. (5) definitely holds for constant background field coefficients. This is a convenient property of the nongravitational SME, which is free of any geometrical inconsistencies with dynamics.

Moreover, the presence of isometries can be interpreted as reducing spacetime geometry in an analogous way as it occurs for the gravitational CS term [22] and the treatment of the minimal gravitational SME in Ref. [24], as explained in Sec. 1. To understand this, we start from the space of all possible spacetime metrics $g_{\mu\nu}$ without any symmetries imposed, which contains all real and symmetric (4×4) matrices depending on the spacetime coordinates. Let $\chi^{(i)}$ be a Killing vector for $i = 1 \dots N_{\text{diff}}$ where $1 \leq N_{\text{diff}} \leq 4$ such that the maximum $N_{\text{diff}} = 4$ matches the total number of diffeomorphisms. For each isometry that exists, the initial

space of all metrics is reduced to a subspace, which involves only the metrics in agreement with the isometry required. Increasing the number of Killing vectors one by one, steadily increases the symmetry of the metric and reduces the number of its independent degrees of freedom (see Fig. 1).

3. Conclusions

In this *Letter*, some of the essential aspects of explicit diffeomorphism violation in gravity were reconsidered. First, we explained in a transparent way the possible inconsistency between dynamics and spacetime geometry through Eqs. (3), (6). Second, the approach of restricting spacetime geometry in the cases of the gravitational CS term [22] and the minimal gravitational SME [24] was revisited. For consistency, one must impose spacetime geometries with $*RR = 0$ for the CS term and $R = 0$ for a subset of the u , s , and t coefficients. Third, we introduced a novel approach, which substantially relies on isometries of a gravitational system. As shown in Ref. [25] in the specific setting of the t coefficients in a FLRW spacetime, it allows for a treatment of explicit diffeomorphism violation in gravity. This technique is expected to be applicable to other gravitational systems such as black holes, which are also accompanied by isometries.

Bailey *et al.* [24] showed recently how linearized-gravity theories with explicit diffeomorphism violation can imply more than 2 propagating physical degrees of freedom, where the additional ones are not suppressed by SME coefficients. This poses an excellent opportunity to look for such modes in gravitational waves and to rule out these extensions if additional modes are not detected. Our approach relies on the full nonlinear modified-gravity theory defined by the action of the gravitational SME. It demonstrates how isometries can be valuable for constructing nondynamical background fields that do not clash with Riemannian geometry, at least for a subset of metrics compatible with the symmetries of the system. These results form a robust theoretical base for studying the phenomenology of such settings further in the future.

Acknowledgements

We thank J. Belinchon for bringing to our attention the different kinds of continuous symmetries that were recapitulated in Sec. 1. CMR acknowledges partial support to the Fondecyt Regular 1341369 project and is grateful to M. Schreck and M.M. Ferreira, Jr. for their

kind hospitality as well as the postgraduate program of the Physics Department at UFMA where this work was finished. MS is indebted to CNPq Produtividade 310076/2021-8 and CAPES/Finance Code 001.

References

- [1] M. Blau, *Lecture Notes on General Relativity*, lecture notes (Bern University, 2002), <http://www.blau.itp.unibe.ch/GRlecturenotes.html>.
- [2] R. Bluhm, “Explicit versus spontaneous diffeomorphism breaking in gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 065034 (2015), arXiv:1401.4515 [gr-qc].
- [3] V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, “Spontaneous breaking of Lorentz symmetry in string theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 683 (1989).
- [4] V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, “Phenomenological gravitational constraints on strings and higher-dimensional theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 224 (1989).
- [5] V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, “Gravitational phenomenology in higher-dimensional theories and strings,” *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1886 (1989).
- [6] V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, “CPT and strings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **359**, 545 (1991).
- [7] V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, “CPT, strings, and meson factories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 3923 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9501341.
- [8] V.A. Kostelecký, “Gravity, Lorentz violation, and the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 105009 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0312310.
- [9] V.A. Kostelecký and Z. Li, “Backgrounds in gravitational effective field theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 024059 (2021), arXiv:2008.12206 [gr-qc].
- [10] R. Bluhm and A. Shic, “Noether identities in gravity theories with nondynamical backgrounds and explicit spacetime symmetry breaking,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104034 (2016), arXiv:1610.02892 [hep-th].
- [11] R. Bluhm and V.A. Kostelecký, “Spontaneous Lorentz violation, Nambu-Goldstone modes, and gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 065008 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0412320.
- [12] R. Bluhm, S.H. Fung, and V.A. Kostelecký, “Spontaneous Lorentz and diffeomorphism violation, massive modes, and gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 065020 (2008), arXiv:0712.4119 [hep-th].
- [13] V.A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, “Classical kinematics for Lorentz violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **693**, 443 (2010), arXiv:1008.5062 [hep-ph].
- [14] V.A. Kostelecký, “Riemann-Finsler geometry and Lorentz-violating kinematics,” *Phys. Lett. B* **701**, 137 (2011), arXiv:1104.5488 [hep-th].
- [15] V.A. Kostelecký, N. Russell, and R. Tso, “Bipartite Riemann-Finsler geometry and Lorentz violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 470 (2012), arXiv:1209.0750 [hep-th].
- [16] M. Schreck, “Classical Lagrangians and Finsler structures for the nonminimal fermion sector of the Standard-Model Extension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 105017 (2016), arXiv:1512.04299 [hep-th].
- [17] E.C.G. Stueckelberg, “Die Wechselwirkungskräfte in der Elektrodynamik und in der Feldtheorie der Kernkräfte. Teil II und III., *Helv. Phys. Acta* **11**, 299 (1938).
- [18] H. Ruegg and M. Ruiz-Altaba, “The Stueckelberg field,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **19**, 3265 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0304245.
- [19] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Georgi, and M.D. Schwartz, “Effective field theory for massive gravitons and gravity in theory space,” *Annals Phys.* **305**, 96 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0210184.

- [20] K. Hinterbichler, “Theoretical aspects of massive gravity,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 671 (2012), arXiv:1105.3735 [hep-th].
- [21] R. Bluhm, H. Bossi, and Y. Wen, “Gravity with explicit space-time symmetry breaking and the Standard-Model Extension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 084022 (2019), arXiv:1907.13209 [gr-qc].
- [22] R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, “Chern-Simons modification of general relativity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 104012 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0308071.
- [23] Y.N. Obukhov and F.W. Hehl, “On the relation between quadratic and linear curvature Lagrangians in Poincaré gauge gravity,” *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **27**, 2685 (1996), arXiv:gr-qc/9602014.
- [24] Q.G. Bailey, K. O’Neal-Ault, and N.A. Nilsson, “You shall not pass! – explicit diffeomorphism violation ‘no-go’ results,” arXiv:2407.04918 [gr-qc].
- [25] C.M. Reyes, C. Riquelme, and A. Soto, “Cosmology with explicit and spontaneous background fields,” arXiv:2407.13041 [gr-qc].
- [26] J.W. York, Jr., “Role of Conformal Three-Geometry in the Dynamics of Gravitation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 1082 (1972).
- [27] G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, “Action integrals and partition functions in quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752 (1977).
- [28] C.M. Reyes and M. Schreck, “The boundary of the gravitational standard-model extension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 104013 (2023), arXiv:2305.07060 [gr-qc].
- [29] K. Yano, *Lie Derivatives and its Applications* (North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam; P. Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, The Netherlands, 1957 — Reprinted by Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY (USA), 2020).
- [30] S.M. Carroll, *Lecture notes on general relativity*, arXiv:gr-qc/9712019.