

International Journal of Modern Physics A
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

Degrees of freedom and Hamiltonian formalism for $f(T)$ gravity

María José Guzmán

*Departamento de Física y Astronomía, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de La Serena,
 Av. Juan Cisternas 1200, La Serena 1720236, Chile
 maria.j.guzman.m@gmail.com*

Rafael Ferraro

*Instituto de Astronomía y Física del Espacio (IAFE), CONICET, Universidad de Buenos Aires,
 Casilla de Correo 67, Sucursal 28, Buenos Aires 1428, Argentina
 Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Buenos
 Aires, Ciudad Universitaria, Pabellón I, Buenos Aires 1428, Argentina
 ferraro@iafe.uba.ar*

Received Day Month Year
 Revised Day Month Year

The existence of an extra degree of freedom (d.o.f.) in $f(T)$ gravity has been recently proved by means of the Dirac formalism for constrained Hamiltonian systems. We will show a toy model displaying the essential feature of $f(T)$ gravity, which is the pseudo-invariance of T under a local symmetry, to understand the nature of the extra d.o.f.

Keywords: Teleparallel gravity; $f(T)$ gravity; constrained Hamiltonian systems.

PACS numbers: 04.50.Kd, 11.10.Ef

1. $f(T)$ Gravity

The teleparallel equivalent of general relativity (TEGR) is a reformulation of general relativity (GR) in terms of a field of tetrads. It encompasses the vector basis $\mathbf{e}_a = e_a^\mu \partial_\mu$ and its co-basis $\mathbf{E}^a = E_\mu^a dx^\mu$, which are mutually dual: $E_\mu^a e_b^\mu = \delta_b^a$. Tetrads are related to the spacetime metric through the orthonormality condition

$$\eta_{ab} = g_{\mu\nu} e_a^\mu e_b^\nu, \quad g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} E_\mu^a E_\nu^b. \quad (1)$$

The spacetime underlying TEGR is endowed with a curvatureless, metric-compatible spin connection. Usually the Weitzenböck connection $\omega^a_{b\mu} = 0$ is chosen, which in coordinate bases means $\Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu} = e_a^\rho \partial_\mu E_\nu^a$. TEGR Lagrangian is built from the torsion $T^\rho_{\mu\nu} = e_a^\rho (\partial_\mu E_\nu^a - \partial_\nu E_\mu^a)$ through the torsion scalar T defined as¹

$$T = -\frac{1}{4} T_{\rho\mu\nu} T^{\rho\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} T_{\rho\mu\nu} T^{\mu\rho\nu} + T^\rho_{\mu\rho} T^\sigma{}^\mu{}_\sigma. \quad (2)$$

TEGR Lagrangian $L = ET$ (E stands for $\det(E_\mu^a) = |g|^{1/2}$) and GR Lagrangian $L = -ER$ (R being the Levi-Civita scalar curvature) are dynamically equivalent

2 *M. J. Guzmán & R. Ferraro*

since they differ in a boundary term: $E(R + T) = \partial_\mu(ET^\nu{}^\mu)$. So, both TEGR and GR govern the same d.o.f., which are associated with the metric tensor. The metric tensor is invariant under local Lorentz transformations of the tetrad, $\mathbf{E}^a \rightarrow \mathbf{E}^{a'} = \Lambda^{a'}_a(x)\mathbf{E}^a$, which is thus a gauge symmetry of TEGR. The TEGR Lagrangian is used as a starting point to describe generalizations to GR inspired in $f(R)$ theories; the so called $f(T)$ gravity is governed by the action²

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int d^4x E f(T). \quad (3)$$

2. A Toy Model with Rotational Pseudo-Invariance

TEGR Lagrangian $L = ET$ is not gauge invariant but pseudo-invariant, because $T^\nu{}^\mu$ in the above mentioned boundary term is not invariant under local Lorentz transformations of the tetrad. Therefore, a general function f will not allow the boundary term to be integrated out in the $f(T)$ action (3); as a consequence, the theory will suffer a partial loss of the local Lorentz symmetry;² so an extra d.o.f. not related to the metric could appear. We will analyze this issue by resorting to a simple toy model with rotational pseudo-invariance (a similar one was introduced in a previous work,³ but the boundary term was simpler). Let be the Lagrangian

$$L = 2 \left(\frac{d}{dt} \sqrt{z\bar{z}} \right)^2 - U(z\bar{z}) + \dot{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z, \bar{z}) + \dot{\bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} g(z, \bar{z}). \quad (4)$$

The two first terms are invariant under local rotations $z \rightarrow e^{i\alpha(t)}z$. The rest of L is a total derivative; it does not take part in the dynamics but can be affected by the local rotation. So, the Lagrangian L is just *pseudo-invariant* under a local rotation. As any gauge invariance the local pseudo-invariance implies the existence of constraints among the canonical momenta; a unique primary constraint is obtained in this case:

$$G^{(1)} \equiv z \left(p_z - \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \right) - \bar{z} \left(p_{\bar{z}} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{z}} \right) \approx 0. \quad (5)$$

$G^{(1)}$ is an angular momentum; it generates rotations. In fact, it is $\{G^{(1)}, z\bar{z}\} = 0$, which means that the dynamical variable $|z|$ is gauge invariant. As can be seen, the angular momentum not only is conserved in this case; since the symmetry is local (time-dependent), the conserved value is constrained to be zero.

Primary constraints have to be consistent with the evolution, as controlled by the primary Hamiltonian $H_p = H + u(t)G^{(1)}$. In the case (4)-(5) it results that the consistency is fulfilled without specifying the Lagrange multiplier $u(t)$. Thus, the evolution of any variable that does not commute with $G^{(1)}$ is affected by an undetermined function $u(t)$; this is the case of the phase of z , which become a “pure gauge” variable, but not the case of $|z|$, which is a genuine d.o.f. or observable. $G^{(1)}$ is called *first-class*, since it commutes with all the constraints (it is the only constraint in this example). As it is well known, each first class constraint removes one d.o.f. from a Hamiltonian constrained system. In this toy model, one d.o.f. is removed from the pair (z, \bar{z}) , showing that $|z|$ is the only d.o.f. of the theory.

3. Modified toy model

We will *deform* the toy model of the previous section by introducing the Lagrangian $f(L)$. Let us show that this can be done by means of the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \phi L - V(\phi), \quad (6)$$

where ϕ is an auxiliary canonical variable. Equation (6) resembles the Jordan-frame representation of $f(R)$ gravity. From \mathcal{L} one gets the equation of motion for ϕ : $L = V'(\phi)$. Thus, \mathcal{L} is (on-shell) equal to the Legendre transform of $V(\phi)$; therefore it depends only on L , i.e. $\mathcal{L} = f(L)$ (from the inverse Legendre transform we also know that $\phi = f'(L)$). Thus the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is dynamically equivalent to a $f(L)$ theory. As expected for a $f(L)$ theory, \mathcal{L} is not pseudo-invariant under local rotations. This is because the total derivative coming with L is now multiplied by ϕ in (6). We will present the main outcomes of the Hamiltonian formalism for this $f(L)$ model and see the implications of the lost pseudo-invariance.

By computing the canonical momenta for \mathcal{L} one gets two primary constraints: the angular momentum and the momentum conjugated to ϕ ,

$$G^{(1)} = z \left(p_z - \phi \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \right) - \bar{z} \left(p_{\bar{z}} - \phi \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{z}} \right) \approx 0, \quad G_{\pi}^{(1)} = \pi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} \approx 0. \quad (7)$$

The Poisson bracket between the constraints is

$$\{G^{(1)}, G_{\pi}^{(1)}\} = -z \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} + \bar{z} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{z}}, \quad (8)$$

which depends on the function $g(z, \bar{z})$ appearing in the boundary term of L . Depending on g , the Poisson bracket could be zero or not, which would drastically affect the counting of d.o.f. So, we will separate two cases:

- **Case (i):** $g(z, \bar{z}) \neq v(z\bar{z})$. In this case it is $\{G^{(1)}, G_{\pi}^{(1)}\} \neq 0$, so the constraints are *second class*. The consistency is guaranteed by choosing the Lagrange multipliers $u^{\pi}(t)$ and $u(t)$ associated with G_{π} and $G^{(1)}$, respectively. In particular, it results $u^{\pi} = 0$ which implies that ϕ does not evolve but is a constant. The constancy of ϕ also implies that $|z|$ evolves like in the undeformed theory governed by L . But now the evolution of the phase of z is determined too, because the Lagrange multiplier $u(t)$ is no longer left free. Since the evolution is already consistent at this step, then the algorithm is over. The counting of d.o.f. goes like this: from the set of three canonical variables (ϕ, z, \bar{z}) , just *one* d.o.f. is removed due to the appearance of *one pair* of second class constraints. We are left with two d.o.f., which can be represented by the variables (z, \bar{z}) . The Lagrangian $f(L)$ determines not only the modulus of z but its phase as well.
- **Case (ii):** $g(z, \bar{z}) = v(z\bar{z})$. In this case it is $\{G^{(1)}, G_{\pi}^{(1)}\} = 0$. This case is trivial because if $g(z, \bar{z}) = v(z\bar{z})$ the entire Lagrangian L will depend exclusively on $|z|$, so being locally invariant. Thus we do not expect an

extra d.o.f. in the deformed $f(L)$ theory. So, let us check that Dirac's algorithm yields the right answer. The consistency of the constraints with the evolution leads to a new *secondary* constraint $G^{(2)} = L - V'(\phi) \approx 0$. Since $\{G^{(1)}, G^{(2)}\} = 0$, and $\{G_\pi^{(1)}, G^{(2)}\} = V''(\phi)$, then $G^{(1)}$ is first-class, while $G_\pi^{(1)}, G^{(2)}$ are second-class. The Lagrange multiplier $u^\pi(t)$ is fixed by the consistency equations. Instead $u(t)$ (associated with $G^{(1)}$ in H_p) is not fixed by the algorithm, so meaning that the variables that are sensitive to rotations, like the phase of z , will remain as pure gauge variables. The counting of d.o.f. goes like this: from the three canonical variables (ϕ, z, \bar{z}) we remove two d.o.f., one coming from $G^{(1)}$ being first-class, and the other one because the pair $G_\pi^{(1)}, G^{(2)}$ is second-class, leaving us with the genuine d.o.f. $|z|$. Remarkably, $u^\pi(t)$ results in a non zero function; therefore ϕ is not a constant and affects the evolution of $|z|$, that departs from the evolution it had in the original undeformed theory L .

3.1. Conclusions

In principle $f(T)$ gravity is case-(i), since TEGR Lagrangian is pseudo-invariant under local Lorentz transformations of the tetrad. This means that $f(T)$ gravity entails an extra d.o.f. associated with the orientation of the tetrad. However we could wonder whether $f(T)$ gravity can be case-(ii) on-shell. This is an interesting point because, even though $f(T)$ gravity is case-(i), there could exist particular solutions to the equations of motion making zero the value of the Poisson bracket (8). For such solutions, ϕ (and so T too) would be an evolving field, and no extra d.o.f. would manifest. Remarkably, flat FRW spacetime seems to be a good arena to test this conjecture, because it contains both solutions with T equal to a constant⁵ and $T = -6H^2(t)$ an evolving function.²

Acknowledgments

M.J.G. has been funded by CONICYT-FONDECYT Postdoctoral grant No. 3190531. R.F. has been funded by CONICET and Universidad de Buenos Aires. R.F. is a member of Carrera del Investigador Científico (CONICET, Argentina).

References

1. R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Teleparallel Gravity* (Springer, Dordrecht, 2013).
2. R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 084031 (2007).
3. R. Ferraro and M. J. Guzmán, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 124037 (2018).
4. R. Ferraro and M. J. Guzmán, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 104028 (2018).
5. C. Bejarano, R. Ferraro and M. J. Guzmán, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 825 (2017).