If you google “relativity theorists interested in strong force”, you don’t get very specific results. Why? Look at the following image:

There are plenty of theorists attempting the other way: from elementary particles (left side of diagram) toward gravitation using the concept of ‘graviton’ as mediator. But there’s two hidden assumptions in this approach:
1. relativity theorists are assuming elementary particle theorists know what they’re doing when they employ the hypothetical graviton
2. the graviton actually exists as mediator for gravity

Not unreasonable both but, both could be flat-out wrong.

Just a naive glance at the diagram shows it should be possible to attempt gravitation + strong from the right, a relativistic approach toward unification. This has been done in my framework – it’s called temporal elasticity and has basis in engineering concepts. If you mention that to theoretical physicists, they automatically dismiss you because they arrogantly think/feel that engineering is a kind of subordinate discipline with respect to physics. In some valid ways, they’re right. But that does not mean engineering has nothing to offer physics.
Impedance is core to electromagnetic theory in engineering. When I took the course Fields and Waves at FIU in the early 90s, I realized the impedance-of-space is a core-feature of our universe physicists ignore. It is directly related to the speed of light in a vacuum via components of impedance, permittivity and permeability:

$$Z_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0}{\varepsilon_0}} \quad c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_0\varepsilon_0}}$$

To declare the impedance-of-space is nothing more than an ‘artifact’ or implication of c is extremely naive and ignores an entire sub-discipline – electromagnetism within engineering. Rather, it is the other way around:

$$c \text{ is an implication of } Z_0$$

Evidence I’m correct came later when I derived the relationship:

$$e^2 = \frac{k\hbar}{Z_0}$$

where k is a dimensionless constant

What it says in English is: charge-moment is impeded spin. This is an insanely wonderful discovery – a fundamental relationship between charge and spin.

After many years of wrestling with time, space, and the related concept of elasticity, I discovered another core feature of our universe – $Y_0$, the elasticity of time. I will defer the exact relationship to mass in order to discuss the implications.

Temporal elasticity, via time dilation, unifies General and Special Relativity. It also allows direct coupling / unification of Relativity and the strong-nuclear force because both are exclusively attractive. Temporarily ignoring the ‘weak nuclear force’, the following scale diagram shows the predominance of each ‘force’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEI</th>
<th>ATOMS</th>
<th>MOLECULES</th>
<th>PLANETS-STARs</th>
<th>GALAXIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>te-em</td>
<td>em te</td>
<td>em te</td>
<td>te em</td>
<td>te em</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temporal elasticity dominates electromagnetism in most domains; whereas in the atoms-molecules domain, it is the other way around. The reason te-em is hyphenated under the nuclei domain is because only in the nucleus is there more of a 'balance of power' between them. Nuclear electrostatic repulsion between protons is a primary feature; so is temporal elasticity between nucleons; other features are relatively secondary to those such as spin and excitation.

If we insist on adhering to the notion 'weak nuclear force', we merely append that to electromagnetism above, changing em to ew for electro-weak. It does not impact temporal elasticity in the slightest.

So it is my guess simple academic snobbery prohibits physicists from listening to me. It’s too bad because there are potential positive implications such as: https://msu.edu/~micheal/history-TE.pdf which is a humorous discussion them. Whatever the case, any attempt at unification from left-to-right is doomed to failure; the only viable approach is from right-to-left.