

$f(R)$ gravity with broken Weyl gauge symmetry, cosmological backreaction, and its effects on CMB anisotropy

Jiwon Park, Tae Hoon Lee

Department of Physics, Soongsil University, Seoul 06978, Korea

Abstract

We propose a new class of $f(R)$ theory where its Weyl gauge symmetry is broken in the primordial era of the universe. This symmetry forces one to adopt a new scalar field, namely a Weyl field and a gauge vector boson. Furthermore, an equivalent form of the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian with a non-minimally coupled scalar field corresponding to the function $f(R)$ is found. Due to the geometrical feature of the Weyl field, it turns out that the symmetry breaking induces a non-minimal coupling, which cannot be expected in the standard $f(R)$ theories. We explain how this affects the evolution of the universe at cosmological scales. It is shown that there may be a value shift in the Planck constant and the cosmological constant. This can be regarded as a genuine exemplification of the cosmological backreaction. Furthermore, one also finds new features in the evolution of perturbational variables and cosmic microwave background anisotropy. Moreover, we prove that when a specific $f(R)$ model invokes inflation, the amplitude of the primordial gravitational waves affects the evolution of scalar perturbation due to the new non-minimal coupling. As a case study, we explain how this can be embodied in the Starobinsky inflation. Finally, we discuss some impacts that this physics can bear and the possibility of giving a new restriction of the estimation of cosmological variables such as the gravitational wave amplitude with experiments.

1. Introduction

Symmetries and their breaking phenomena are essential concepts in modern physics. Especially after the theoretical prediction [1] and experimental discovery [2] of the Higgs particle, research on symmetry breaking has become one of the main study areas of particle physics. The idea of symmetry breaking has been vigorously studied also in cosmology [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. However, there have not been enough attempts to apply the concept to the geometrical symmetry of spacetime itself in the cosmological context. For example, [10] studies how

Email address: `cosmosapjw@soongsil.ac.kr` (Jiwon Park)

the diffeomorphism may be broken explicitly or spontaneously in some modified gravity models like Chern-Simons gravity and bimetric gravity and investigate their post-Newtonian limits but did not consider the cosmological situation. The diffeomorphism invariance in $f(R)$ gravity was studied in [11], but the idea of symmetry breaking was not applied. Hence, we are motivated to explore how symmetry breaking may affect modified cosmological models, especially in the primordial era.

Meanwhile, a new class of theories satisfying a new geometrical symmetry known as Weyl geometry has attracted the interest of many cosmologists. It originated from the philosophy that the physical theory should allow and include the most considerable gauge symmetry possible [12, 13]. In this context, Weyl geometry can be viewed as an extension of Einstein's general relativity (GR) with just a bigger gauge group [14]. On the other hand, it can be derived from the Brans-Dicke theory when one applies the Palatini formalism, which claims that the metric and the connection are independent of each other [15, 16]. Since the idea has many relationships with various research themes of cosmology, many studies have applied it to many problems of cosmology, such as dark energy and inflationary cosmology [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21].

Recently, We attempted to apply the idea of symmetry breaking in Weyl geometry. In [22], we have shown the possibility of distinguishing two types of primordial symmetry breaking, model A and B, with an observation of cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropy observables. Model A originates from Zee's broken-symmetric theory of gravity [23], and model B applies Palatini formalism to model A. Significantly, the symmetry breaking of Weyl geometry appeared in model B, which has a particular interest because it has a new salient geometrical feature that the standard explanation for symmetry breaking cannot have.

In this study, we expand this previous study on geometrical symmetry breaking in Weyl geometry to the case where the Einstein-Hilbert action is replaced with an arbitrary scalar curvature function, i.e., $f(R)$ gravity. Currently, many $f(R)$ gravity models are vigorously studied in cosmology and quantum gravity. These include attempts to find an appropriate inflation model and search for a possible resolution for the dark energy problem [24, 25, 26]. In this context, it would be worth studying how the geometrical symmetry breaking has a distinctive effect on these subjects. It is especially shown that there can be a shift in values of fundamental physical constants such as the Planck constant. Furthermore, we explore what consequences in the evolution of the universe and CMB observables this modified $f(R)$ gravity leads by studying the Integrated-Sachs-Wolfe (ISW) effect of CMB temperature anisotropy spectra. For $f(R)$ inflation models, it is found that the amplitude scale of primordial gravitational waves (GW) brings changes to the evolution of scalar perturbation variables. This contrasts with the fact that they do not interfere with each other in principle in standard cosmology.

This paper consists as follows: In Section 2, we construct a class of $f(R)$ theories satisfying the geometrical gauge symmetry of Weyl geometry. By adopting an auxiliary scalar field and regarding the vector field as an electromagnetic po-

tential, we establish a connection between the scalar field and the Weyl field. One can see thereby that the potential of the additional scalar field induces the dynamics of the Weyl field. Section 3 shows that the constructed model is equivalent to Einstein gravity with two different scalar fields: One is a scalar field coming from the modified gravitational action, and the other may be deemed the Weyl field. They both exhibit non-minimal coupling valid only at the perturbational scale. In Section 4, we study how the evolution of cosmological observables in our modification differs from the standard model without primordial Weyl symmetry breaking, in large scales and the first-order perturbation theory. As one interesting feature of the model, we found that there may be shifts in values of the Planck constant and the cosmological constant. In addition, when considering $f(R)$ inflation models, the existence of primordial GW also affects the evolution of scalar perturbation variables, not only of tensor perturbation variables. Section 5 investigates how the results from section 4 are reflected in the CMB anisotropy observables with a case study on the Starobinsky inflation. Mainly, we examine how the ISW effect differs from Einstein's gravity by analyzing their cosmological impacts in detail. Finally, we prove our claim that the primordial Weyl symmetry breaking may give an incidental restriction in the decision of the primordial GW amplitude when compared with observational data. Section 6 summarizes our study and discusses its advantages and drawbacks. We also suggest a few possible extensions of our research.

2. $f(R)$ gravity from Weyl geometry

To begin with, we first show how to construct $f(R)$ gravity theory satisfying Weyl gauge symmetry. In the standard formalism of GR, a covariant derivative ∇ is taken to be dependent on the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$. This dependency is called metric compatibility and is given by the following relationship:

$$\nabla_{\alpha}g_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (1)$$

From (1), one can obtain a usual expression of the connection Γ only using the metric tensor as follows:

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\gamma}(g_{\gamma\mu,\nu} + g_{\gamma\nu,\mu} - g_{\mu\nu,\gamma}), \quad (2)$$

which is known as the Levi-Civita connection. However, one may allow more degrees of freedom to obtain a broader class of theories. One of them we adopt here is the Weyl integrable geometry, which introduces a new scalar field ϕ to define a new covariant derivative $\bar{\nabla}$ (or a new connection $\bar{\Gamma}$):

$$\bar{\nabla}_{\alpha}g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\phi_{,\alpha}}{M_{\text{P}}}, \quad (3)$$

where M_{P} is a Planck mass. One intriguing property of (3) is that it manifests a new kind of symmetry. That is, (3) is invariant under the following transformation:

$$(g_{\mu\nu}, \phi) \rightarrow (\Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}, \phi + 2M_{\text{P}} \ln \Omega), \quad (4)$$

where Ω is a gauge fixing parameter. Therefore, we can understand (3) as a scaling symmetry associated with the scalar field ϕ . This symmetry is often called the Weyl gauge symmetry. We call the scalar field ϕ giving Weyl gauge symmetry to spacetime a Weyl scalar field. Now one finds that a volume form invariant under the transformation is $dx^4\sqrt{-g}e^{-2\phi}$, where g denotes a determinant of the metric. Similarly, a corresponding invariant scalar curvature is $e^\phi\mathcal{R}$, where \mathcal{R} is a Ricci scalar computed with the new connection $\bar{\Gamma}$. Hence the standard Einstein-Hilbert action should be modified as follows:

$$S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} e^\phi \mathcal{R} = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-g} e^{-\phi} \mathcal{R}. \quad (5)$$

By the same token, we can easily write an action with respect to the metric for an $f(R)$ gravity satisfying the Weyl gauge symmetry:

$$S_g = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} f(e^\phi \mathcal{R}). \quad (6)$$

However, one may claim that (6) is not a complete form of the action, as we can introduce the dynamics for the Weyl scalar field. For this reason, we now want to include an action for the Weyl scalar field ϕ . But herein follows a caution since it is tempting to write the entire action as follows:

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} [f(e^\phi \mathcal{R}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\phi g^{\mu\nu} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \phi \bar{\nabla}_\nu \phi - V(\phi)], \quad (7)$$

where $V(\phi)$ is a potential for ϕ . However, as [16] correctly points out, this attempt is not correct because the kinetic term $e^\phi g^{\mu\nu} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \phi \bar{\nabla}_\nu \phi$ is not invariant under the transformation (4). Here we follow the discussion in the article above that we have just mentioned to tame this issue. By making use of the result from [16], we are forced to adopt one more additional vector field B_μ corresponding to a gauge boson for the Weyl geometry. Therefore, a fully gauge-invariant form of the action becomes

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} [f(e^\phi \mathcal{R}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\phi g^{\mu\nu} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_\mu \phi \bar{\mathcal{D}}_\nu \phi - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4} H_{\mu\nu} H^{\mu\nu}], \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_\mu \equiv \bar{\nabla}_\mu + \alpha B_\mu$ is a gauge covariant derivative, $H_{\mu\nu} \equiv \bar{\nabla}_\nu W_\mu - \bar{\nabla}_\mu W_\nu$ is a field strength tensor for $W_\mu \equiv \phi B_\mu / M_{\text{P}}$, and α is a coupling constant. To ensure invariance in all respects, it is required that the following further transformation rules for the gauge boson and the potential hold,

$$(W_\mu, V(\phi)) \rightarrow (W_\mu - 2\alpha^{-1} \bar{\nabla}_\mu \ln \Omega, \bar{V}(\phi + 2M_{\text{P}} \ln \Omega)), \quad (9)$$

where \bar{V} is a specific form of the potential setting the action to be invariant. We call the action (8) a class of theories of Weyl $f(R)$ gravity.

Since the theory is invariant, one may choose a specific frame for one's purpose. The frame we have used until now $(g_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ is called a Weyl frame.

However, it is helpful to choose another frame when we derive equations of motion. This new frame $(\gamma_{\mu\nu}, 0)$ with a gauge choose $\phi = -2M_{\text{P}} \ln \Omega_0$, where $\gamma_{\mu\nu} \equiv e^{-\phi/M_{\text{P}}} g_{\mu\nu}$, is called a Riemannian frame. One crucial property of the Riemannian frame is that the connection $\bar{\Gamma}$ behaves like Γ , i.e., the standard Levi-Civita connection. To be explicit, we have an effective kind of metric compatibility that holds with the following modified metric:

$$\nabla_{\alpha} \gamma_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (10)$$

This property is convenient when we conduct a computation under a theory satisfying (4) since we can treat the derivative with the rescaled metric $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ just as we do in GR. So it is straightforward to see that (6) is exactly equivalent with

$$S_{\gamma} = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-\gamma} f(R_{\gamma}), \quad (11)$$

where R_{γ} is a Ricci scalar defined with the standard Levi-Civita connection. Though, one must note that all the connections and R_{γ} should not be computed with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$ but $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$. By following the transformation rule, we obtain the action in the Riemannian frame as follows:

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-\gamma} [f(R_{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}], \quad (12)$$

where we have assumed that $\bar{V}(0) = 0$, $F_{\mu\nu} \equiv \nabla_{\nu} A_{\mu} - \nabla_{\mu} A_{\nu}$ is a field strength tensor for A_{μ} , and $A_{\mu} \equiv W_{\mu} - 2\alpha^{-1} \nabla_{\mu} \ln \Omega_0 = W_{\mu} + \alpha^{-1} M_{\text{P}}^{-1} \nabla_{\mu} \phi$ is a redefined vector field. Here we want to emphasize that we let the electromagnetic field action survive, differing from the original discussion of [16]. In the Riemannian frame, of course, the motivation for why we have adopted the gauge field becomes obsolete. However, it does not obstruct us from abandoning it. In fact, it seems that there is no clue for us to set $A_{\mu} = 0$, at least from the transformation rules (9). Nevertheless, if we introduce an auxiliary scalar field and its potential $\bar{\phi}$ and $V_{\bar{\phi}}(\bar{\phi})$, one may suggest that A_{μ} acts like the ordinary electromagnetic potential. If this is the case, the action becomes

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-\gamma} [f(R_{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_{\mu} \bar{\phi} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} \bar{\phi} - V_{\bar{\phi}}(\bar{\phi}) - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}], \quad (13)$$

where we have defined $\mathcal{D}_{\mu} \equiv \nabla_{\mu} + \alpha A_{\mu}$ a Riemannian gauge covariant derivative. If we put $\bar{\phi} = M_{\text{P}}$ and $V_{\bar{\phi}}(M_{\text{P}}) = \bar{V}(0) = 0$, this is equivalent to (12). However, writing out an action for $\bar{\phi}$ as if it has dynamical values turns out to be helpful. To clarify what we mean, we want to pass over the function of A_{μ} to the new scalar field. If we require A_{μ} to play a role as an electromagnetic potential, one must impose the following transformation rules similar to (4) so that (13) is left invariant thereunder:

$$(\bar{\phi}, A_{\mu}, V_{\bar{\phi}}(\bar{\phi})) \rightarrow (\bar{\phi}\varphi/M_{\text{P}}, A_{\mu} - \alpha^{-1} \nabla_{\mu} \ln(\varphi/M_{\text{P}}), \hat{V}_{\bar{\phi}}(\bar{\phi}\varphi/M_{\text{P}})), \quad (14)$$

where φ is a gauge fixing parameter, and $\hat{V}_{\bar{\phi}}$ is a modified potential to obey the invariance. If we now pick a specific gauge so that $\nabla_{\mu} \ln(\varphi/M_{\text{P}}) = \alpha A_{\mu}$,

we can safely neglect terms on A_μ . Now putting $\bar{\phi} = M_{\text{P}}$ back again, we can encapsulate our discussion as the following action:

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \int dx^4 \sqrt{-\gamma} [f(R_\gamma) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}_\nu \varphi - V_\varphi(\varphi)], \quad (15)$$

where we have set $V_\varphi(\varphi) \equiv \hat{V}_{\bar{\phi}}(\varphi)$. Hence, we may deem the gauge fixing parameter φ to behave like the dynamical field in this frame. Furthermore, since φ is related to the Weyl field ϕ with gauge conditions, we can expect that the dynamics of φ would also bring on the evolution of the Weyl field. By taking the computational steps from now on reversely, one can recover the original theory (8) from (15). From this context, we may say that the Weyl symmetry is hidden but could be manipulated with the help of $V_\varphi(\varphi)$. This feature will be elaborated on in Section 3 in detail.

For completeness, we close this section by finding equations of motion of (15). Taking a variation with the rescaled metric and the Weyl scalar field, we obtain the following equations for the metric and the Weyl scalar field:

$$\begin{aligned} (R_\gamma)_{\mu\nu} F(R_\gamma) - \frac{1}{2} R_\gamma \gamma_{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathcal{D}_\nu F(R_\gamma) + \gamma_{\mu\nu} \square F(R_\gamma) \\ = \kappa T_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(\varphi)}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\square \varphi = \frac{dV_\varphi}{d\varphi}, \quad (17)$$

where $F \equiv \partial f / \partial \mathcal{R}$, $\square \equiv \gamma^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathcal{D}_\nu$ is the D'Alembertian operator, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is an energy-momentum(EM) tensor for ordinary matter, including the cosmological constant, and the EM tensor for the Weyl field in the Riemannian frame $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\varphi)}$ is defined by

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\varphi)} \equiv \frac{1}{2} [\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}_\nu \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \{ \gamma^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D}_\alpha \varphi \mathcal{D}_\beta \varphi + V_\varphi(\varphi) \}]. \quad (18)$$

3. Equivalence with two non-minimally coupled scalar fields

From now on, we will work only in the Riemannian frame with a gauge choice so that the vector field vanishes. For this reason, we write ∇_μ instead of \mathcal{D}_μ for the covariant derivative with no worry about confusion. To invoke primordial symmetry breaking of φ at the Planck scale, we adopt the following Higgs-type potential:

$$V_\varphi(\varphi) = V_0 (\varphi^2 - M_{\text{P}}^2)^2. \quad (19)$$

To explain how the symmetry breaking of φ is connected to the Weyl gauge symmetry breaking, let us recall the relationship between the electromagnetic potential and scalar fields: $\alpha A_\mu = \nabla_\mu \ln(\varphi/M_{\text{P}}) = \alpha W_\mu + \nabla_\mu(\phi/M_{\text{P}})$. If we assume the coupling constant α is small enough, we have $\varphi \approx M_{\text{P}} e^{\phi/M_{\text{P}}}$. Thus, we claim that the potential (19) also naturally induces the Weyl symmetry breaking, not only the symmetry of φ , by bringing down the symmetry (4) from

all scales to perturbational scales only. And by the same logic, we will from now on work with φ rather than ϕ and call it the Weyl field. After the symmetry breaking, we expand $\varphi = M_{\text{P}}(1 + \delta\varphi)$ where $\delta\varphi$ is a perturbation of φ . In the same manner, R_γ can be expanded up to the first order of $\delta\varphi$ as follows:

$$R_\gamma = \gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu} - 3\Box\delta\varphi, \quad (20)$$

where $(R_g)_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the Ricci tensor with the Levi-Civita connection with respect to the original metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Note that we have exploited the fact that $\gamma_{\mu\nu} = e^{-\phi/M_{\text{P}}}g_{\mu\nu} \approx (1 - \delta\varphi)g_{\mu\nu}$ when computing the connection and the Ricci tensor. However, the reader should be aware that we regard $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ as fixed and not perturbed by the expansion of φ so as to exploit the metric compatibility (10) in the Riemannian frame. Moreover, after the symmetry breaking, the equation of motion for $\delta\varphi$ becomes

$$\Box\delta\varphi \approx m_\varphi^2\delta\varphi, \quad (21)$$

where $m_\varphi^2 \equiv 4V_0M_{\text{P}}^2$. Here one should note that this is not an exact form of the equation of motion for $\delta\varphi$, as we did not consider the effect of the symmetry breaking in the gravity action yet. However, we will use this equation as an approximation when we transform the action as a standard gravity with a non-minimally coupled field at the non-perturbative scale. This assumption is, of course, not the fully exact way to compute the action. However, we will see that this has some benefits as we may reduce the high-order derivative part of the action.

Our goal in this section is to find an equivalent form of (19) whose gravitational sector of the action is the Einstein-Hilbert action with a non-minimally coupled scalar field. The effect of the modified action will be reflected in the potential of the scalar field. To find such a theory, let us first review how one can find an equivalent theory with the scalar field in general $f(R)$ theories without symmetry breaking, following the methodology of [24]. We claim that the following action is equivalent to the action of $f(R)$ theory, that is, $S_g = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}(M_{\text{P}}^2/2)f(R)$:

$$S_g = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2}[f(\chi) + f'(\chi)(R - \chi)], \quad (22)$$

where we have adopted an auxiliary field χ . Varying (22) with respect to the new field χ , one finds that $f''(\chi)(R - \chi) = 0$ so that $\chi = R$ and our claim is proved provided that $f''(\chi) \neq 0$. If we define a new field $\zeta \equiv f'(\chi)$, one may rewrite (22) as

$$S_g = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2}\zeta R - U(\zeta)\right], \quad (23)$$

where the potential $U(\zeta)$ is given by

$$U(\zeta) \equiv \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2}[\chi(\zeta)\zeta - f(\chi(\zeta))]. \quad (24)$$

Now the action (23) can be expressed as a non-minimally coupled one when adopting an appropriate metric rescaling. However, when one tries to find an

equivalent action in the presence of Weyl symmetry breaking, one needs to pay more attention because the newly defined field ζ is clearly associated with the perturbative terms of $\delta\varphi$. Here we want to restrict that the non-minimally coupled scalar field only comes from the non-perturbative part of $f(R_\gamma)$ to see new effects from the symmetry breaking more clearly. So it would be of some comfort to abstract the perturbative part from the original action. To this end, we extract the gravity part of the action (19) up to the first order of $\delta\varphi$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\gamma &= \int d^4x \sqrt{-\gamma} \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} f(\gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu}) - 3\Box\delta\varphi \\
&= \int d^4x \sqrt{-\gamma} \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} f(\gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu}) \\
&\quad - \int d^4x \sqrt{-\gamma} \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} [3f'(\gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu})m_{\delta\varphi}^2\delta\varphi]. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the relation (21) to reduce the high derivative order of the field $\delta\varphi$. The readers should be aware that we have expanded the action only up to the first order of the perturbed Weyl field. To be consistent with the procedure when we compute a perturbation of the action, we would have to consider up to the second order of $\delta\varphi$. However, since our current goal is merely to consider the effect of the primordial symmetry breaking in the $f(R)$ theory, we expect that only considering up to the first order in the function f would be enough for our current purpose. Note that we suppress the Weyl field part of the action and only consider S_γ for the moment for consistency and convenience.

From this expression, we introduce a new scalar field that only comes from the non-perturbative part of $f(R_\gamma)$:

$$\chi \equiv f'(\gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu}). \tag{26}$$

Proceeding similar steps as we saw from (22) to (24), we express (25) as

$$S_\gamma = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\gamma} \left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} (\chi + \psi) R_\gamma - U(\chi, \psi) \right], \tag{27}$$

where we have defined

$$\psi \equiv -3m_{\delta\varphi}^2 f''(\gamma^{\mu\nu}(R_g)_{\mu\nu}) \delta\varphi, \tag{28}$$

and the potential is given by

$$U(\chi, \psi) = \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} [(\chi + \psi) R_\gamma - f(R_\gamma)]. \tag{29}$$

To clarify the effect of the Weyl symmetry breaking on the potential, we split the potential as $U(\chi, \psi) = U_\chi(\chi) + \delta U(\chi, \psi)$, where δU is valid only at the perturbative scale. Expanding (29) with respect to $\delta\varphi$ to the first order at

most, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\chi(\chi) &= \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} [\chi \gamma^{\mu\nu} (R_g)_{\mu\nu} - f(\gamma^{\mu\nu} (R_g)_{\mu\nu})] \\ &= \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} [\chi (f')^{-1}(\chi) - f((f')^{-1}(\chi))] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta U(\chi, \psi) &= \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \psi \gamma^{\mu\nu} (R_g)_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \psi (f')^{-1}(\chi). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Now we may perform a conformal transformation to find an action that is non-minimally coupled with the scalar field χ at the non-perturbative scale. First, let us define the rescaled metric

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu} = \chi \gamma_{\mu\nu}. \quad (32)$$

Note that this transformation does not correspond to the gauge transformation (4) and is merely a technique for obtaining the non-minimally coupled action. Rewriting our action (27) with respect to the newly defined metric (32), we finally arrive at the following result:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\hat{\gamma}} &= \int d^4x \sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}} \left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} (1 + \psi e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}) R_{\hat{\gamma}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu} \hat{\nabla}_\mu \zeta \hat{\nabla}_\nu \zeta - V(\zeta) - \delta V(\zeta, \psi) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where the terms with hat denote that it is with respect to the rescaled metric $\hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}$, $\zeta/M_{\text{P}} \equiv \sqrt{3/2} \ln \chi$, and

$$V(\zeta) \equiv e^{-2\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}} U(e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}), \quad (34)$$

$$\delta V(\zeta, \psi) \equiv e^{-2\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}} \delta U(e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}, \psi). \quad (35)$$

Hence, the effect of Weyl symmetry breaking is manifested as an additional non-minimal coupling only valid at the perturbative scale. Recovering the suppressed action for φ , we write the total action with an action for ordinary matter S_{M} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\hat{\gamma}} &= \int d^4x \sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}} \left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} (1 - 3m_{\hat{\delta}\varphi}^2 f''((f')^{-1}(e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}})) e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}} \delta\varphi) \hat{\mathcal{R}} \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu} \hat{\nabla}_\mu \zeta \hat{\nabla}_\nu \zeta - V(\zeta) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu} \hat{\nabla}_\mu \delta\varphi \hat{\nabla}_\nu \delta\varphi - \frac{1}{2} m_{\hat{\varphi}}^2 \delta\varphi^2 \\ &\quad \left. - \delta V(\zeta, -3m_{\hat{\delta}\varphi}^2 f''((f')^{-1}(e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}})) \delta\varphi) \right] + S_{\text{M}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

4. Two effects of symmetry breaking

To clarify how our modification differs from the original $f(R)$ gravity, we study how cosmological evolution differs from one in standard cosmology. To this end, we want to force the field ϕ to be suppressed. We take this crude approach to emphasize phenomena that may differ from Λ CDM cosmology and to distinguish them from the effect of specific $f(R)$ models. This enables us to guarantee that the other phenomena we seek from now on purely originate from the result of Weyl symmetry breaking. That is, one may neglect effects from modifying the gravitational action, i.e., the Einstein-Hilbert action to the $f(R)$ form at large or nonperturbative scales. Nevertheless, we leave the Weyl field part as it is so we can observe the effects of the symmetry breaking. Also, the potential for the Weyl field depends on the form of the function $f(R)$. So one still can distinguish what $f(R)$ model is chosen in the first place.

From the discussion above, we assume that the field ζ is stabilized enough to hide the scalar field ζ part of the action. To be more concrete, we suppress the kinetic term of the scalar field, that is, $|\hat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu}\hat{\nabla}_\mu\zeta\hat{\nabla}_\nu\zeta| \ll |V(\zeta)|$, even though it must be regarded as a dynamical variable as it evolves through time. Furthermore, we assume that the field is stabilized to a local(or global) minimum of the potential. Say $V_* = V(\zeta_*)$ as such a value of the potential, where ζ_* is a stable attracting point of the field. Now the action (29) can be read as

$$S_{\hat{\gamma}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}} \left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \{1 - m_{\delta\varphi}^2 (C_1 \delta\varphi_* + C_2)\} R_{\hat{\gamma}} - V_* - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \hat{\nabla}_\mu \delta\varphi_* \hat{\nabla}_\nu \delta\varphi_* - \frac{1}{2} m_\varphi^2 \delta\varphi_*^2 \right] + S_{\text{M}}, \quad (37)$$

where $\delta\varphi_*$ is defined so that $V(\delta\varphi_*) = m_\varphi^2 \delta\varphi_*^2 / 2$, and the coefficients C_1 and C_2 depends on the $f(R)$ model. To be more specific, the change in the minimum the potential $V(\delta\varphi)$, which derives the coefficient C_2 , comes from the δV . If ζ_* has a finite value, there would be a possibility that $C_2 \neq 0$. Otherwise, if $\zeta_* = \infty$, it is likely to be zero as it would be suppressed by the exponential factor $e^{-2\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}$ in (35). For many $f(R)$ models with no transcendental function of R , the corresponding field is likely to be stabilized as $\zeta \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, the dominating term in the potential is the exponential one, that is, $V(\zeta) \approx V_0 e^{-\alpha_0 \sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}$, where V_0 and α_0 are some constants. If one supposes that the selected $f(R)$ model should play a role as the dark energy, it can be deemed that, in this case, the scalar field ζ acts as a quintessence. In a way, one may suspect that many $f(R)$ dark energy models would behave similarly to quintessence models with exponential potential. Furthermore, for this case, V_* may be regarded as Λ in the standard scenario, so the field perfectly mimics the cosmological constant.

Let us clarify the meaning of these coefficients by studying equations of motion. Up to the first-order perturbation, we find the equations of motion:

$$\{1 - m_{\delta\varphi}^2 (C_1 \delta\varphi_* + C_2)\} (G_{\hat{\gamma}})_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{M}} + \kappa T_{\mu\nu}^{(\delta\varphi_*)}, \quad (38)$$

$$\hat{\square}\delta\varphi_* = m_\varphi^2(\delta\varphi_* + \frac{C_1 M_{\text{P}}^2}{2}\delta R_{\hat{\gamma}}), \quad (39)$$

where $\kappa \equiv 2/M_{\text{P}}^2$, $T_{\mu\nu}^M$ is the energy-momentum tensor for ordinary matter with V_* or the dark energy, $\delta R_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is a perturbed Ricci tensor and

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\delta\varphi_*)} \equiv \hat{\nabla}_\mu\delta\varphi_*\hat{\nabla}_\nu\delta\varphi_* - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}[\frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\nabla}_\mu\delta\varphi_*\hat{\nabla}_\nu\delta\varphi_* + \frac{1}{2}m_\varphi^2\delta\varphi_*^2] - C_1 m_{\delta\varphi}^2(\hat{\nabla}_\mu\hat{\nabla}_\nu - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}\hat{\square})\delta\varphi_*. \quad (40)$$

Now one easily finds a genuine change at the nonperturbative level when considering C_2 . Rewriting (38) by ignoring perturbative terms, the Einstein equation is changed as follows:

$$(1 - m_{\delta\varphi}^2 C_2)(G_{\hat{\gamma}})_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}^M. \quad (41)$$

One may think that this corresponds to the effective change of the the cosmological constant and the Planck mass are given by

$$\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^* \equiv \frac{\Lambda}{(1 - m_{\delta\varphi}^2 C_2)}, \quad (42)$$

$$M_{\text{P}} \rightarrow M_{\text{P}}^* \equiv (1 - m_{\delta\varphi}^2 C_2)^{1/2} M_{\text{P}}. \quad (43)$$

Hence we arrive at our first important observation. Even though they are not perturbational variables, as this shift of values of the cosmological constant and the Planck mass is only viable by considering perturbational theory, this effect could be viewed as a new example of backreaction effects. Of course, there is no clue that the Weyl symmetry breaking really happened. Nevertheless, we believe that this result might be one of many reasons to consider backreaction in the early universe.

Primarily, many researches on the $f(R)$ gravity theory want to supply novel alternatives to the Λ CDM model that may give us a better explanation of cosmological problems. In contrast with these studies, we would especially like to emphasize that our model suggests neither a new model for dark energy nor an unnecessary modification of the background equations. Of course, there must be additional changes when adopting dark energy models differing from a cosmological constant. However, when the equation of state for the dark energy model converges to $w \approx -1$ enough, we expect that one could obtain almost the same result independent of the models except for the value of C_2 . On top of that, it is presumably natural to consider high-curvature correction to the Einstein-Hilbert action from the motivation of quantum gravity. Also, symmetry-breaking phenomena are universal in physics, and there is no reason not to consider them also in gravity. Hence, it would be quite conceivable to imagine this kind of scenario or at least a similar one in studying quantum gravity. Additionally, many experiments are already out there in which constraints allowed values of the gravitational constant. For this reason, we suggest a need for a much deeper investigation without the crude approximation. However, this will require a further detailed study beyond this manuscript's current scope, and we leave this as

a future study topic. By now, we suspect that there would be not so much room for $f(R)$ models with nonzero values of C_2 allowing primordial Weyl symmetry breaking, as more restrictive experimental data are coming out nowadays.

Now let us focus on the perturbational regime and its consequences on CMB anisotropy. From now on, we assume that a specific $f(R)$ model is suggested to give inflation in the universe. Also, from now on, we set C_2 as zero or has a very close value to zero, at least. This condition can be justified if there appears no higher order terms than R^2 when expanding $f(R)$ with polynomials because C_2 basically comes from the value of f'' . Now we consider what function C_1 has. Let us now write the perturbed Einstein equation explicitly:

$$\delta(G_{\hat{\gamma}})_{\mu\nu} = \kappa\delta T_{\mu\nu}^M - C_1 m_{\delta\varphi}^2 \{(\hat{\nabla}_{\mu}\hat{\nabla}_{\nu} - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}\hat{\square})\delta\varphi - \langle T_{\mu\nu}^M \rangle \delta\varphi\}, \quad (44)$$

where $\langle \rangle$ denotes an averaged value. From this equation, we find that the model approaches GR as $m_{\delta\varphi} \rightarrow 0$ and C_1 plays a role in amplifying an oscillation of $\delta\varphi$, so that gives more metric fluctuations; besides, C_1 also has a meaning that could rival the meaning of C_2 , by showing an imprint of the tensor perturbation on the evolution of scalar perturbation variables when one considers an $f(R)$ theory as an inflationary model. The reason why is that the initial amplitude for primordial GW \mathcal{P}_T arising from the inflation depends on a form of the inflationary potential $V(\phi)$, that is, the form of the function $f(R)$.

Thus, we arrive at our second important conclusion: the coefficient C_1 is a function of \mathcal{P}_T . And since this genuine feature is independent of the type of $f(R)$ theories, the primordial Weyl symmetry breaking must leave some footprints of primordial GW during the evolution of scalar variables. In fact, this modification only affects the scalar part, as it comes from a new perturbative scalar field. There is no additional source for GW; their behavior merely depends on what type of inflation the given $f(R)$ model provides. From the discussion, we conclude that we need to dive into how CMB anisotropies change in $f(R)$ inflationary models with the Weyl symmetry breaking. This new phenomenon is impossible in the standard cosmology in principle by the orthogonality between the spherical harmonics for scalar and tensor, which we adopt when we conduct the scalar-vector-tensor decomposition of perturbational variables.

5. Case study: Starobinsky inflation

In this section, we want to investigate the imprint of the tensor perturbation on the CMB scalar anisotropy with an example of $f(R)$ gravity models, which is known as Starobinsky inflation [27], whose function f is given by

$$f(R) = R + \frac{R^2}{6M^2}, \quad (45)$$

where M is a mass scale constant. From now on, R means $R_{\hat{\gamma}}$ always, and we denote $\hat{R} \equiv R_{\hat{\gamma}}$ and so on. Although many modifications of Starobinsky inflation are already out there, we believe that it would suffice to study only the original Starobinsky model, as (45) has terms only up to the second order of the

Ricci tensor, i.e., $C_2 = 0$. Moreover, we expect that most of the modifications would exhibit no further extraordinary features except for what we have already shown in the previous paragraph. For a detailed study, we now repeat the steps we have previously discussed: first, the Weyl gauge symmetry becomes broken at the Planck energy scale due to the Higgs-type potential. After the symmetry breaking, the transformation formula (4) is only valid at the perturbative scale, and the Weyl scalar field becomes a perturbative variable. At non-perturbative scales, the potential $V(\zeta)$ is known as Starobinsky potential:

$$V(\zeta) = \frac{3}{4}M^2M_{\text{P}}^2(1 - e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}})^2. \quad (46)$$

For the Starobinsky model, we find that

$$\psi = -\left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\delta\varphi, \quad (47)$$

$$\delta V(\zeta, \delta\varphi) \equiv \frac{3}{2}m_\varphi^2M_{\text{P}}^2e^{-2\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}(1 - e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}})\delta\varphi. \quad (48)$$

From now on, let us restrict our interest to the first-order perturbation theory. Varying the action (36) with $\hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}$ and ζ , we obtain equations of motion:

$$\{1 + \psi e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}\}\hat{G}_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}^{(\zeta)} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int}}, \quad (49)$$

$$\hat{\square}\zeta = \partial_\zeta[V(\zeta) + \delta V(\zeta, \psi)], \quad (50)$$

where $\kappa \equiv 2/M_{\text{P}}^2$ and

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\zeta)} \equiv \hat{\nabla}_\mu\zeta\hat{\nabla}_\nu\zeta - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}[\frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\nabla}_\mu\zeta\hat{\nabla}_\nu\zeta + V(\zeta)], \quad (51)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int}} \equiv -\left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2(\hat{\nabla}_\mu\hat{\nabla}_\nu - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}\hat{\square})(e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}}\delta\varphi) - \hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu}\delta V(\zeta, \psi), \quad (52)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int}}$ denotes the interaction between $\delta\varphi$ and ζ . One might think that the additional terms may affect the perturbation of the inflaton field ζ . However, we can fix $\delta\varphi = \delta\zeta = 0$ if we adopt the following gauge:

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu} = -dt^2 + a(t)^2dx^2[(1 - 2\mathcal{A})\delta_{ij} + h_{ij}], \quad (53)$$

where \mathcal{A} and h_{ij} are gauge variables satisfying $\partial_i h^{ij} = h_i{}^i = 0$. Hence one can prove that there is no effect from Weyl gauge symmetry breaking on quantum fluctuations during inflation.

After the inflation, the gravity sector of the action becomes

$$S_\gamma = \int d^4x\sqrt{-\gamma}\left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2}\left\{1 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\delta\varphi\right\}R\right]. \quad (54)$$

Here one must note that we may use the original metric before the conformal transformation at the first order scale since $\chi = e^{\sqrt{2/3}\zeta/M_{\text{P}}} \approx 1$, so $\hat{\gamma}_{\mu\nu} \approx \gamma_{\mu\nu}$. From the action (54), we can see that the non-minimal coupling of the Weyl field $\delta\varphi$ and the scalar curvature still survives. Furthermore, as we have mentioned, this coupling gives us one of the crucial imprints of the inflation theory when one recalls that the mass M inside the coupling constant is related to the tensor power spectrum \mathcal{P}_{T} by the result of the Starobinsky inflation [24]:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{T}} \approx \frac{4}{\pi} \left(\frac{M}{M_{\text{P}}} \right)^2. \quad (55)$$

Hence, it is evident that the existence of primordial GW affects the results, especially for scalar perturbation, as we expected. This feature clearly distinguishes the effect of Weyl symmetry breaking in Starobinsky gravity from our previous result [22], wherein the results cannot be associated with the inflation theory. Furthermore, since a smaller amplitude of GW requires a stronger non-minimal coupling, one may expect that our model poses a more considerable minimum value for a scalar-to-tensor ratio than in standard Λ CDM cosmology when compared with observational data. We will investigate this issue deeper in later.

Now let us bring the Weyl field action again to observe how this affects the cosmological observables.

$$\begin{aligned} S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\gamma} & \left[\frac{M_{\text{P}}^2}{2} \left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M} \right)^2 \delta\varphi \right\} R \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \delta\varphi \nabla_\nu \delta\varphi - \frac{1}{2} m_\varphi^2 \delta\varphi^2 \right] \\ & + S_{\text{M}}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where S_{M} is the action for ordinary matters, including matters coming from the fluctuation during inflation. Up to the first order of $\delta\varphi$, we obtain the equation of motion for the metric.

$$\left[1 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M} \right)^2 \delta\varphi \right] G_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu} - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M} \right)^2 (\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu - \gamma_{\mu\nu} \square) \delta\varphi, \quad (57)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu} \equiv R_{\mu\nu} - R\gamma_{\mu\nu}/2$ is the Einstein tensor and $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{M})}$ is the energy-momentum tensor of ordinary matters. Meanwhile, one must be careful when one tries to derive an equation of motion for $\delta\varphi$ since it is only valid at the perturbative level. That is, the gravity action coupled with $\delta\varphi$ is not the whole part of the scalar curvature but only its first-order perturbative part, namely δR . Hence, the new equation of motion for $\delta\varphi$ is given as follows:

$$\square \delta\varphi = m_\varphi^2 [\delta\varphi + M^{-2} \delta R]. \quad (58)$$

Now, let us find the complete form of the Einstein equation at the perturbative scale. We expand the Einstein tensor up to the first order of $\delta\varphi$:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} - (\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \delta\varphi - \gamma_{\mu\nu} \square \delta\varphi), \quad (59)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor with respect to the original metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Furthermore, since we only consider the first-order theory, all the derivatives, such as $\nabla_\alpha\delta\varphi$ and $\square\delta\varphi$, are now reduced to be also defined with $g_{\mu\nu}$. Finally, we obtain the following results:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} &= \kappa\delta T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)} + \kappa\left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2 \langle T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)} \rangle \delta\varphi \\ &\quad + \left[1 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\right](\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}\square)\delta\varphi,\end{aligned}\quad (60)$$

where $\langle T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)} \rangle$ is the average value of the energy-momentum tensor. Taking a Trace of (60) to find δR and substituting it into (58), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\square\delta\varphi &= \left[1 + 3\left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\left\{1 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\right\}\right]^{-1} \times \\ &\quad \left[m_\varphi^2 - \left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\kappa T\right]\delta\varphi - \kappa\left(\frac{m_\varphi}{M}\right)^2\delta T,\end{aligned}\quad (61)$$

where δT is a trace of $\delta T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)}$ and T is a trace of $\langle T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)} \rangle$.

For comparison with the Weyl symmetry breaking in case $f(R) = R$, we recall the result of [22]:

$$\delta\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} = \kappa\delta T_{\mu\nu}^{(M)} + \kappa(\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}\square)\delta\varphi,\quad (62)$$

$$\square\delta\varphi = m_\varphi^2\delta\varphi.\quad (63)$$

These equations correspond to model B in our previous paper, wherein we adopted the initial value of $\delta\varphi$ as $\delta\varphi_{\text{ini}} = \sqrt{2}A_s$ and $(\delta\varphi)_{\text{ini}} = 0$, where A_s is the initial amplitude of the scalar fluctuation. With the limit $m_\varphi \rightarrow \infty$, (62) and (63) approach the results of GR. However, we expect that with such initial values, we cannot find any reasonable limit by which we can obtain the results of GR because of the term $(m_\varphi/M)^2$. Hence, for the initial values of the current theory (60) and (61), we adopt the following:

$$\delta\varphi_{\text{ini}} = 0,\quad (64)$$

$$(\delta\varphi)_{\text{ini}} = 0.\quad (65)$$

Note that in our previous study of model B, all the observational results would be equivalent to GR with this choice of initial values, as there can be no evolution of the Weyl field. However, since we now have an additional source term δR in the equation of motion for the Weyl field, we expect that there must be some evolution of the Weyl field, even with this simplest initial value choice. In addition, one can clearly see that one can obtain the results of GR in the limit $m_{\delta\varphi} \rightarrow 0$, contrary to our previous study.

From now on, we establish how one can observationally verify the Weyl symmetry breaking in the Starobinsky inflation and check the expectations we made above. For numerical computations, we have used CLASS, which computes perturbational quantities in the cosmological background and CMB multipoles at




Figure 1: CMB temperature power spectra $\ell(\ell+1)C_\ell/2\pi$ in a unit of μK^2 , with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r . As m_φ increases r decreases, the power spectra at the low- ℓ region increase dramatically. The spectra at high- ℓ region ($\ell \gtrsim 10^2$) shows much fewer changes.

high accuracy [28].¹ For numerical values in the code, we have used Planck 2018 best-fit values [30]: $H_0 = 67.32$, $\Omega_b h^2 = 0.022383$, $\Omega_c h^2 = 0.12011$, $\tau = 0.0543$, $\ln(10^{10} A_s) = 3.0448$, $n_s = 0.96605$ and assumed the homogeneous and isotropic universe with a cosmological constant and a flat spatial curvature, i.e., $K = 0$.

First, we plot the CMB TT spectrum by varying the Weyl field mass and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r to understand how the change manifests in CMB observables.

As Figure 1 shows, the effect of symmetry breaking is most dominant in the low- ℓ region of the multipoles. As the Weyl field mass m_φ increases, the values at the low- ℓ region grow up dramatically, whereas they decrease as r gets bigger values. For the detailed analysis, we investigate how the perturbational values and multipoles evolved in the universe's early era. To analyze how this feature is achieved, we adopt the conformal Newtonian gauge:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = -a^2(\eta)[\{1 + 2\Psi(\eta, \mathbf{x})\}d\eta^2 + \{1 - 2\Phi(\eta, \mathbf{x})\}\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j], \quad (66)$$

where a is the scale factor of the universe, and $d\eta \equiv dt/a$ is conformal time. Also, we make a normal mode decomposition. First, let us denote $Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ as an eigenmode of the generalized Helmholtz equation

$$\nabla^2 Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}) = k^2 Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}), \quad (67)$$

where $\nabla^2 \equiv a^2 \delta_{ij} \nabla^i \nabla^j$ is a Laplacian and $k^2 \equiv |\mathbf{k}|^2$. With this function, we

¹We also used the Fortran code CAMB for reference: [29].

may decompose an arbitrary quantity X as follows:

$$X(\eta, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} X_k(\eta, \mathbf{k}) Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}), \quad (68)$$

where the subscript k denotes that it is a decomposed form. From now on, we assume all the quantities are decomposed and suppress the subscript unless needed. From the Einstein equation (60), the anisotropic stress part is given as follows:

$$k^2(\Phi - \Psi) = 12\pi G(\bar{\rho} + \bar{p})\pi_k + [1 - (\frac{m_\varphi}{M})^2]k^2\delta\varphi, \quad (69)$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ and \bar{p} are the average energy density and pressure and $(\rho + p)\pi_k \equiv -(\hat{k}^i \hat{k}^j - \delta^{ij}/3)\Pi_{ij}$ where \hat{k}_i is the unit vector of \mathbf{k} and Π_{ij} is the anisotropic part of the energy-momentum tensor. To connect metric fluctuations with the CMB temperature anisotropy, let us expand the photon energy density perturbation $\delta_\gamma \equiv 1 - \rho_\gamma/\bar{\rho}_\gamma$ with Legendre polynomials $\mathcal{P}_l(\mu)$, where ρ_γ and $\bar{\rho}_\gamma$ are the photon energy density and its average.

$$\Theta_l = (-i)^{-l} \int_{-1}^{-1} \frac{d\mu}{2} \mathcal{P}_l(\mu) \delta_\gamma(\mu), \quad (70)$$

where $\mu = \mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is a projection of the vector \mathbf{k} to the z -axis. The CMB TT power spectra C_l is given by

$$C_l = 4\pi \int \frac{dk}{k} |\Theta_l(\eta_0, k)|^2 \Delta_{\mathcal{R}}^2(k), \quad (71)$$

where η_0 is a current conformal time, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$ denotes dimensionless matter power spectra. Meanwhile, it is well known that Θ_l can be separated into a few parts [31]. One of them is called ISW part, written as

$$\Theta_l^{(\text{ISW})} \equiv \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_0} d\eta [\Phi'(k, \eta) + \Psi'(k, \eta)] j_l(k(\eta_0 - \eta)), \quad (72)$$

where η_* is a conformal time at decoupling and j_l is a spherical Bessel function. The critical point of the ISW term is that it contributes to CMB power spectra when the gravitational potential, i.e., Φ or Ψ , varies through time. In GR, it is known that this phenomenon happens only in the radiation-dominated era and the dark-energy-dominated era. From (69), we may write

$$\Theta_l^{(\text{ISW, Weyl})} = \Theta_l^{(\text{ISW, GR})} - [(\frac{m_\varphi}{M})^2 - 1] \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_0} d\eta \delta\varphi' j_l(k(\eta_0 - \eta)), \quad (73)$$

where $\Theta_l^{(\text{ISW, Weyl})}$ denotes the ISW effect in our current model and $\Theta_l^{(\text{ISW, GR})}$ denotes one in GR. From (66), we expect that effects in CMB TT multipoles




Figure 2: Evolution of the time derivative of the perturbed Weyl field $\delta\varphi$ through time for $k = 0.5$, with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r . Time is in units of Megaparsec. The black vertical line denotes when the field crosses the Hubble horizon, and the field drastically shrinks after crossing the Hubble horizon.

come from how the time derivative of the perturbed Weyl field evolves through time.

Figure 2 shows how $\delta\varphi'$ varies with the values of m_φ and r . It evident from the evolution equation (62) that the field has more oscillation when the mass of the field gets heavier and the tensor amplitude becomes smaller. In addition, the oscillation directly shrinks after the field crosses the Hubble horizon. That is, this feature is more notable in the early era of the universe. This is not surprising because the source of the oscillation largely comes from the photon fluctuation, which tends to hold non-zero values inside the Hubble horizon but becomes damped out beyond the Hubble crossing. In the late-time, on the other hand, the effects from the oscillation would cancel out themselves because they tend to be negative for the equal possibility, just as the values are likely to be positive.

In Figure 3, we also plot how the Weyl potential evolves through time, defined by

$$\Psi_{\text{Weyl}} \equiv \Phi'(k, \eta) + \Psi'(k, \eta), \quad (74)$$

to show how the effect from the Weyl field manifests in the metric fluctuation. It is easy to notice that there appear additional oscillative features in the Weyl potential in the late era. The reason why the oscillation is more intensive in the late era is that the effect of the Weyl field is integrated through time, which is clear when one observes the equation (73). Hence, we conclude that the late-time ISW effect is dominant in CMB temperature anisotropy multipoles, where we also demonstrate the feature graphically in Figure 4.

In Figure 5, we plot the CMB polarization EE spectrum and its cross-spectrum with the temperature TE spectrum. The figure shows that changes with varying m_φ in EE and TE spectra are relatively negligible compared with




Figure 3: Evolution of the Weyl potential Ψ_{Weyl} through time for $k = 0.5$, with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r . Time is in units of Megaparsec.




Figure 4: Integrated Sachs-Wolfe (ISW) effect in CMB temperature power spectra in a unit of μK^2 , with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r . Note that we have multiplied a factor of 10^{10} by C_ℓ for convenience.




Figure 5: CMB EE and TE power spectra in a unit of μK^2 , with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r .

the TT spectra. In Figure 6, we also plot the CMB polarization BB spectra. Basically, they show no other extraordinary feature and thus have less importance than the TT spectra. There are some small deviations in the plot varying r , but they directly originate from the change of the GW amplitude rather than the effect of the symmetry breaking.

To investigate how these modifications affect the evaluation of cosmological variables, we convey a Bayesian Monte-Carlo simulation with the public python code Cobaya [32, 33]. We have run a multiple of chains and checked a convergence with Gelmann-Rubin statistics $R - 1 < 0.01$ and used data sets from Planck collaboration, including lensing data [34, 35], and Bicep/Keck collaboration [36]. Since the changes in the ISW effect may give us a different value of the current Hubble parameter when comparing models with data, one may expect that this might be a novel solution to Hubble tension, one of the most notorious problems in cosmology today. However, we see almost no difference




Figure 6: CMB BB power spectra in a unit of μK^2 , with varying values of the Weyl field mass m_φ and the scalar-to-tensor ratio r .

in the values of the Hubble parameter in Table 1 and Figure 7. Rather, as predicted before, our model in this section tends to allow a much bigger value for the tensor-to-scalar ratio at $k = 0.05\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ because smaller values for $r_{0.05}$ would contribute to the more considerable ISW effect, which brings the computed CMB anisotropy values deviate from the observational data. In Figure 8, we further show what differences appear when using two different data sets. The addition of the B-mode data from the Bicep/Keck data gives a stronger constraint to the upper bound of the tensor-to-scalar ratio. However, there are fewer effects on the most probable value, the lower bound of $r_{0.05}$, and the overall distribution for the Weyl field mass.

Moreover, from the table 1, the result does not allow the absence of the primordial GW and even has a nonzero minimum bound for them under the 68% confidence region. Of course, we have presumed that the inflationary period exists, so it is no wonder that the primordial GW should naturally be accompanied. However, the fact that one has a lower bound value more significant than zero, even negligible, and has a much more profound meaning. This allows us to refute the model or to allow more preference by further precise observations. By differing from the original Starobinsky model, which would still allow the possibility of retaining the model, even though much smaller constraints for the tensor-to-scalar ratio releases out there, our modification with Weyl symmetry breaking presents a stricter standard to verify our model. In this respect, the primordial Weyl gauge symmetry breaking has a significant chance of being verified by future experiments or observations.

6. Conclusion

In this article, we have studied how Weyl gauge symmetry breaking can arise in $f(R)$ gravity and how this affects the values of the cosmological vari-

ables and the CMB observables. We assumed the connection satisfies a new kind of geometrical gauge symmetry, and from that, we have derived the corresponding version of $f(R)$ gravity, satisfying that symmetry. Next, we invoked the symmetry breaking at the Planck scale of the universe with the Higgs-type potential for the Weyl scalar field. We considered the perturbed field $\delta\varphi$ after the symmetry breaking up to first order in the gravity side of the action and found an additional non-minimal coupling with the perturbed Weyl field only valid at the perturbative level.

As an important conclusion, we have found two significant changes in cosmological observables. The first one is the value shift of the Planck constant and the cosmological constant, which may be a new genuine example of the cosmological backreaction effect. Furthermore, we have discovered that the amplitude of the primordial GW affects the CMB scalar anisotropy observables, enabling us to verify the model more easily with observational data. We next studied how Starobinsky inflation works in our model as a case study. We found no change in the quantum fluctuation of the metric, and hence the matter power spectra stay the same. However, it appears that the perturbed Weyl field can affect the CMB observables, especially the ISW effect in the late era of the universe. We could see that the CMB TT power spectra increase overall in the low- ℓ region. Although we have not found any clues to resolve cosmological puzzles such as the Hubble tension, we believe that a much deeper investigation including other types of $f(R)$ theories might give us some remedies, or at least some alleviations.

We now compare our results with studies on CMB anisotropy in other theories. First, we discuss the CMB anisotropy in the original version of the Brans-Dicke theory, which does not include the potential for the Brans-Dicke field. There are many studies out regarding Brans-Dicke-type theories with potential, for example, see: [37, 38]. This research includes many interesting new phenomena, such as an additional ISW effect like our paper. Nevertheless, this model also requires background modification, which clearly differs from ours. Especially many of them are motivated to resolve the dark energy problem. Therefore it is natural to assume that there will be a difference in the ISW effect in the late era. In fact, some of the dark energy models in Brans-Dicke-type theories are suggested to cure the Hubble tension in the first place. However, in our model, the non-minimal coupling appears only at the perturbative level; there is no reason to suspect the change in the ISW part of the CMB spectra at face value. The modified temporal evolution of the gravitational potential comes purely from the perturbation theory.

Next, let us briefly review our previous research [22] for comparison. We have studied how primordial symmetry could be broken in two different situations. The first one, namely model A, originated from Zee's broken-symmetric theory of gravity [23], a Brans-Dicke-type theory with a Higgs-type potential to invoke primordial symmetry braking, and the second one, model B, is a modification of the first one by adopting Palatini formalism to the action of model A. With this method, we could establish new gravity models with an additional geometrical gauge symmetry called Weyl geometry. This corresponds to when we set $f(R) = R$ in equation (15). Contrary to model B, we have not assumed

Palatini formalism in our current research and directly adopted the Weyl gauge symmetry. Then $f(R)$ models satisfying this symmetry are found. One could apply Palatini formalism also to the action in the Weyl frame, that is, an action with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$, wherein the Weyl field appears as if it has a non-minimal coupling with the scalar curvature. However, it would bring a different result that would not coincide with Weyl geometry due to higher-order curvature. For instance, there is no coupling with the Weyl field for the quadratic term, i.e., the R^2 term in our action (15), even in the Weyl frame. In this case, we would have to study Palatini formalism in $f(\varphi, R)$ gravity, where there would be no such simple geometrical symmetry as (4). Model A has the same feature as model B. That is, the non-minimal coupling is only valid at the perturbative scale. However, the effect of symmetry was relevant only in the early era of the universe. In contrast, the evolution of the Weyl field constitutes the changes in the metric fluctuation in the late era.

Moreover, one must note that we have adopted different initial values of the perturbed Weyl field and its time derivative of the current model, i.e., $\delta\varphi_{\text{ini}} = 0$ and $(\delta\dot{\varphi})_{\text{ini}} = 0$, whereas, in our previous study, we adopted $\delta\varphi_{\text{ini}} = \sqrt{2}A_s$ and $(\delta\dot{\varphi})_{\text{ini}} = 0$ to give initial evolution for the field. In the model in this article, we did not need to adopt such values since there exists an external source from the ordinary matters due to the non-minimal coupling from higher curvature terms. Furthermore, these values would not give us meaningful results for the CMB observable because of the term $(m_\varphi/M)^2$ in the perturbed Einstein equation (53). For the perturbed Weyl field to have a small enough effect with such nonzero initial conditions we must impose a significant immense value presumably above Planck mass, as the more massive the field, the faster it will decrease. Nevertheless, (60) would then prevent the results from converging at the limit $m_\varphi \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the initial conditions in our model were chosen to avoid this issue; hence one might think that this is too intentional because in [22], we found these non-minimal initial conditions with an analogy to initial values of the primordial gravitational waves. We suspect this kind of the problem could be alleviated by adopting a coupling constant for the Weyl scalar field like ω in Brans-Dicke theory and leave this as a future study topic.

Last but not least, we compare our study with the research on standard $f(R)$ gravity out there. Since many models in $f(R)$ gravity also require modification of the background equations, we think that comparing our model with all types of $f(R)$ gravity models would not be so meaningful. In addition, we focused only on the Starobinsky model in our paper. So it would be enough only to compare with the original Starobinsky inflation model. One interesting feature is that even though we have adopted a new scalar field, there is no change in the matter power spectra originating from the inflation. However, we might be able to verify our model by observing the primordial gravitational waves and the smoking gun for inflation, although it would be nearly impossible if the perturbed Weyl field has a very light mass. Also, while there are many studies on Palatini formalism in $f(R)$ gravity and higher-derivative theories of gravity [39, 40, 41, 42], there were not so many studies on Palatini formalism in $f(\varphi, R)$ gravity, primarily focused on the geometrical symmetry. Hence, it would be

interesting to study an application of Palatini formalism in $f(\varphi, R)$ gravity to find their new possible symmetry and its breaking phenomena.

Before closing our manuscript, let us reflect on the research we have conducted. First of all, our study exploits some extraordinary assumptions, which might be harmful in some cases. We have especially assumed that the coupling constant α is small, so one can directly connect φ with ϕ . Also, we have used an approximated equation of motion (21) when we find an equivalent action with a scalar field. This strategy was to reduce the higher-order derivatives in our theory. However, in principle, one must abandon such an assumption to construct a completely exact form of the theory. Also, we had to adopt Weyl geometry in the first place and did not use Palatini formalism, which gave us the original motivation to extend the symmetry of GR [15]. Of course, there is no fundamental difference or advantage to using Palatini formalism. However, at least it would be worth applying it to action (8) to investigate whether there would be some new class of geometrical gauge symmetry.

The physics at the energy scale we have tried to deal with is still totally unknown to us. And, what is worse, although the higher-order correction of the action we considered could arise from the high-energy quantum correction, this would turn out to be, of course, not true. Furthermore, it is even needless to say that the inflationary scenario itself is still not fully confirmed, although many cosmologists today believe it would be true. Nevertheless, we might be able to think of our model as one of the practical descriptions of gravity under the assumption that there existed an inflationary period during the evolution of the universe. Only a more profound study will tell us whether our idea might turn out to be valid.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Jubin Park and Chaemin Yoon for their valuable comments. Also, we appreciate Heamin Ko and Eunseok Hwang for helping us use the OMEG computing server. Finally, we would like to show our gratitude to Antony Lewis for help when using the code CAMB and Cobaya. This research was supported by the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea, funded by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (Grant No. NRF-2017R1D1A1B06032249, Grant No. NRF-2021R1A6A1A03043957).

References

- [1] Peter W. Higgs. Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 13:508–509, Oct 1964.
- [2] ATLAS collaboration. Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model higgs boson with the atlas detector at the lhc. *Physics Letters B*, 716(1):1–29, 2012.




Figure 7: The 68% and 95% contour plots of cosmological parameters estimation from MCMC simulation using Planck data (with lensing). We see no big difference between the standard Λ CDM cosmology (red color) and our model (blue color) except for the value of the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r_{0.05}$.




Figure 8: The contour plots for the Weyl field mass m_φ in units of the Planck mass (red color) and the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r_{0.05}$ (blue color) using Planck data only and with Bicep/Keck data. Regions with deeper colors denote 68% confidence and 95% confidence regions are depicted with brighter colors. The evaluation with Planck and Bicep/Keck data gives much bigger constraints on the values of both variables.

Planck data				
Parameter	Λ CDM (68% confidence)	Λ CDM (95% confidence)	$f(R)$ (68% confidence)	$f(R)$ (95% confidence)
$\log(10^{10} A_s)$	$3.044^{+0.013}_{-0.015}$	$3.044^{+0.029}_{-0.028}$	3.044 ± 0.014	$3.044^{+0.029}_{-0.028}$
n_s	0.9649 ± 0.0042	$0.9649^{+0.0083}_{-0.0084}$	0.9655 ± 0.0042	$0.9655^{+0.0083}_{-0.0081}$
$r_{0.05}$	< 0.0505	< 0.107	$0.055^{+0.017}_{-0.049}$	< 0.127
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02235 ± 0.00015	$0.02235^{+0.00029}_{-0.00028}$	0.02235 ± 0.00015	$0.02235^{+0.00029}_{-0.00029}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.1200 ± 0.0012	$0.1200^{+0.0024}_{-0.0024}$	0.1198 ± 0.0012	$0.1198^{+0.0024}_{-0.0024}$
τ_{reio}	0.0541 ± 0.0074	$0.054^{+0.015}_{-0.014}$	0.0545 ± 0.0074	$0.054^{+0.015}_{-0.014}$
H_0	67.36 ± 0.55	$67.4^{+1.1}_{-1.1}$	67.41 ± 0.55	$67.4^{+1.1}_{-1.1}$
σ_8	0.8105 ± 0.0060	$0.810^{+0.012}_{-0.012}$	0.8104 ± 0.0060	$0.810^{+0.012}_{-0.012}$

Planck+Bicep/Keck data				
Parameter	Λ CDM (68% confidence)	Λ CDM (95% confidence)	$f(R)$ (68% confidence)	$f(R)$ (95% confidence)
$\log(10^{10} A_s)$	3.045 ± 0.014	$3.045^{+0.029}_{-0.027}$	3.045 ± 0.014	$3.045^{+0.028}_{-0.027}$
n_s	0.9643 ± 0.0041	$0.9643^{+0.0082}_{-0.0080}$	0.9645 ± 0.0041	$0.9645^{+0.0082}_{-0.0080}$
$r_{0.05}$	$0.0161^{+0.0061}_{-0.013}$	< 0.0348	$0.0196^{+0.0076}_{-0.012}$	$0.020^{+0.020}_{-0.019}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02234 ± 0.00015	$0.02234^{+0.00029}_{-0.00028}$	0.02235 ± 0.00014	$0.02235^{+0.00029}_{-0.00028}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.1201 ± 0.0012	$0.1201^{+0.0023}_{-0.0023}$	0.1201 ± 0.0012	$0.1201^{+0.0023}_{-0.0023}$
τ_{reio}	$0.0545^{+0.0067}_{-0.0075}$	$0.054^{+0.015}_{-0.014}$	0.0545 ± 0.0074	$0.055^{+0.015}_{-0.014}$
H_0	67.30 ± 0.53	$67.3^{+1.0}_{-1.0}$	67.32 ± 0.53	$67.3^{+1.0}_{-1.0}$
σ_8	0.8113 ± 0.0057	$0.811^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$	0.8111 ± 0.0058	$0.811^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$

Table 1: The best-fit values for main cosmological parameters and their 68% and 95% confidence bounds, using Planck data only and Planck+Bicep/Keck data. There are subtle and not significant changes except for the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r_{0.05}$. As expected, it will likely have a bigger value when assuming the Starobinsky inflation with the Weyl symmetry breaking.

- [3] Andreas Albrecht and Paul J. Steinhardt. Cosmology for grand unified theories with radiatively induced symmetry breaking. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 48:1220–1223, Apr 1982.
- [4] Daniel Boyanovsky. Spontaneous symmetry breaking in inflationary cosmology: On the fate of goldstone bosons. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:023509, Jul 2012.
- [5] Eric Greenwood, Evan Halstead, Robert Poltis, and Dejan Stojkovic. Electroweak vacua, collider phenomenology, and possible connection with dark energy. *Phys. Rev. D*, 79:103003, May 2009.
- [6] H. Mohseni Sadjadi, M. Honardoost, and H.R. Sepangi. Symmetry breaking and onset of cosmic acceleration in scalar field models. *Physics of the Dark Universe*, 14:40–47, 2016.
- [7] D Kazanas. Dynamics of the universe and spontaneous symmetry breaking. *Astrophys. J., Lett. Ed.; (United States)*, 241:2, 10 1980.
- [8] PANKAJ JAIN and SUBHADIP MITRA. Cosmological symmetry breaking, pseudo-scale invariance, dark energy and the standard model. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 22(22):1651–1661, 2007.
- [9] M. Sami and Radouane Gannouji. Spontaneous symmetry breaking in the late universe and glimpses of the early universe phase transitions à la baryogenesis. *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 30(13):2130005, 2021.
- [10] Robert Bluhm. Explicit versus spontaneous diffeomorphism breaking in gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91:065034, Mar 2015.
- [11] Amir Ghalee. Notes on diffeomorphisms symmetry of $f(r)$ gravity in the cosmological context. *The European Physical Journal C volume 76, 136*, 2016.
- [12] Hermann Weyl. Eine neue erweiterung der relativitätstheorie. *Annalen der Physik*, 364, 101-133, 1919.
- [13] Hermann Weyl. *Space, Time, Matter*. Dover, New York, 1952.
- [14] J. B. Fonseca-Neto C. Romero and M. L. Pucheu. General relativity and weyl geometry. *Class. Quantum Grav.* 29 155015, 2012.
- [15] T. S. Almeida, M. L. Pucheu, C. Romero, and J. B. Formiga. From brans-dicke gravity to a geometrical scalar-tensor theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89:064047, Mar 2014.
- [16] M. Montes José Edgar Madriz Aguilar. Interacting quintessence from new formalism of gravitoelectromagnetism formulated on a geometrical scalar–tensor gauge theory of gravity. *Physics of the Dark Universe*, 21:47–54, September 2018.

- [17] D.M. Ghilencea. Spontaneous breaking of weyl quadratic gravity to einstein action and higgs potential. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 2019, 49, 2019.
- [18] Stefano Lucat Alexander Barnaveli and Tomislav Prokopec. Inflation as a spontaneous symmetry breaking of weyl symmetry. *JCAP 01, 022*, 2019.
- [19] D. M. Ghilencea and Hyun Min Lee. Weyl gauge symmetry and its spontaneous breaking in the standard model and inflation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99:115007, Jun 2019.
- [20] M. L. Pucheu, C. Romero, M. Bellini, and José Edgar Madriz Aguilar. Gauge invariant fluctuations of the metric during inflation from a new scalar-tensor weyl-integrable gravity model. *Phys. Rev. D*, 94:064075, Sep 2016.
- [21] M. L. Pucheu, F. A. P. Alves Junior, A. B. Barreto, and C. Romero. Cosmological models in weyl geometrical scalar-tensor theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 94:064010, Sep 2016.
- [22] Jiwon Park and Tae Hoon Lee. Probing primordial symmetry breaking with the cosmic microwave background anisotropy. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101:123528, Jun 2020.
- [23] A. Zee. Broken-symmetric theory of gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 42:417–421, Feb 1979.
- [24] De Felice A. and S. Tsujikawa. $f(r)$ theories. *Living Rev. Relativ.* 13, 3, 2010.
- [25] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov. Unified cosmic history in modified gravity: from $f(r)$ theory to lorentz non-invariant models. *Phys. Rept.* 505 (2011), 59-144, 2011.
- [26] S. D. Odintsov S. Nojiri and V. K. Oikonomou. Modified gravity theories on a nutshell: Inflation, bounce and late-time evolution. *Phys. Rept.* 692 (2017), 1-104, 2017.
- [27] A. A. Starobinsky. Spectrum of relict gravitational radiation and the early state of the universe. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters*, 30, 682, 1979.
- [28] Thomas Tram Diego Blas, Julien Lesgourgues. The cosmic linear anisotropy solving system (class) ii: Approximation schemes. *JCAP 07 (2011) 034*, 2011.
- [29] Antony Lewis, Anthony Challinor, and Anthony Lasenby. Efficient computation of cosmic microwave background anisotropies in closed friedmann-robertson-walker models. *ApJ* 538 473, 2000.
- [30] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results - vi. cosmological parameters. *A&A*, 641:A6, 2020.

- [31] Oliver Piattella. *Lecture Notes in Cosmology*. Springer Cham, 2018.
- [32] Antony Lewis Jesus Torrado. Cobaya: Code for bayesian analysis of hierarchical physical models. *JCAP 05 (2021) 057*, 2021.
- [33] Antony Lewis Jesus Torrado. Cobaya: Bayesian analysis in cosmology. *Astrophysics Source Code Library, record ascl:1910.019*, 2019.
- [34] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results. v. cmb power spectra and likelihoods. *A&A 641, A5 (2020)*, 2020.
- [35] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results. viii. gravitational lensing. *A&A 641, A8 (2020)*, 2020.
- [36] BICEP/Keck Collaboration. Bicep / keck xiii: Improved constraints on primordial gravitational waves using planck, wmap, and bicep/keck observations through the 2018 observing season. *Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 151301 (2021)*, 2021.
- [37] Alex Zucca, Levon Pogosian, Alessandra Silvestri, Yuting Wang, and Gong-Bo Zhao. Generalized brans-dicke theories in light of evolving dark energy. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101:043518, Feb 2020.
- [38] M. Ballardini, D. Sapone, C. Umiltà, F. Finelli, and D. Paoletti. Testing extended jordan-brans-dicke theories with future cosmological observations. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2019(05):049–049, may 2019.
- [39] Mónica Borunda, Bert Janssen, and Mar Bastero-Gil. Palatini versus metric formulation in higher-curvature gravity. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2008(11):008, nov 2008.
- [40] Thomas P Sotiriou. Constraining $f(r)$ gravity in the palatini formalism. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 23(4):1253–1267, feb 2006.
- [41] Xin-Juan Yang and Da-Ming Chen. $f(R)$ gravity theories in the Palatini formalism constrained from strong lensing. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 394(3):1449–1458, 04 2009.
- [42] Kucukakca Y. and Camci U. Noether gauge symmetry for $f(r)$ gravity in palatini formalism. *Astrophys Space Sci 338, 211–216*, 2012.