Pre-inflation & CMB Power Loss

[arXiv: |309.34|3] [arXiv: |404.xxxx]

Francisco Gil Pedro



in collaboration with: Michele Cicoli, Bhaskar Dutta, Sean Downes, and Alexander Westphal

Outline:

▶ Inflation in 2014 The standard inflationary picture The spectrum of slow-roll inflation Observational hints for power loss Slow-roll steepening Pre-inflation Universality in power loss Summary



Inflation in 2014





Inflation in 2014

Planck 2013



Inflation in 2014

Claimed detection of primordial gravitational waves BICEP II 2014



Awaiting confirmation by Planck's B-mode analysis



The standard picture

 $\ln aH$



The standard picture

 $\ln aH$





 t_{60}

 t_e

Francisco Gil Pedro, Bologna, 26 March 2014

DESY





The Mukhanov-Sasaki Equation

curvature perturbation: ζ $u \equiv \zeta z$ with $z \equiv a \sqrt{2\epsilon_H}$

$$u'' + \left(k^2 - \frac{z''}{z}\right)u = 0$$

Useful to use efolds as 'time' coordinate

Assume background of the form: $aH \sim e^{\xi N}$

 $\xi = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon_H, \eta_H\right)$

$$u_{\alpha\alpha} + \xi \, u_{\alpha} + \left\{ \left(\frac{k}{aH}\right)^2 - (1+\xi) \right\} \, u = 0$$



The Mukhanov-Sasaki Equation $L_{hor} \equiv H^{-1}$ Behaviour of curvature pert. depends on during inflation: $k > a H \leftrightarrow \lambda_{phys} < H^{-1}$ inside horizon, ζ decays $k < a H \leftrightarrow \lambda_{phys} > H^{-1}$ outside horizon, ζ freezes $u = C^{(1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi a H}} H^{(1)}_{\nu} \left(\frac{k}{\xi a H}\right) + C^{(2)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi a H}} H^{(2)}_{\nu} \left(\frac{k}{\xi a H}\right)$ $\nu = \left| \frac{2+\zeta}{2\xi} \right|$ $C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}$ set by ics/vacuum choice

deep inside horizon $\lambda_{phys} \ll H^{-1}$ modes do not feel curvature



deep inside horizon $\lambda_{phys} \ll H^{-1}$ modes do not feel curvature

flat space mode functions

Bunch-Davis bcs:

$$C^{(1)} = \sqrt{\pi/2}$$
$$C^{(2)} = 0$$











Scale invariance is excluded by more than 5 σ



Observational hints for power-loss

Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. 0_Like_top 26th March 2013 © ESO 2013

Planck 2013 results. XV. CMB power spectra and likelihood

Planck Collaboration: P. A. R. Ade⁸⁹, N. Aghanim⁵², C. Armitage-Caplan⁵⁴, M. Arnaud⁵⁶, M. Ashdown^{73,6}, F. Atrio-Barandela⁷⁹, J. Aumont⁵², C. Baccigalupi¹⁸, A. J. Banday^{97,10}, R. B. Barreiro⁷⁰, J. G. Bartlett^{1,71}, E. Battaner⁹⁸, K. Benabed^{63,96}, A. Benolt⁶⁰, A. Benoit-Lévy^{26,53,96} J.-P. Bernard¹⁰, M. Bersanelli^{36,52}, P. Bielewicz^{97,038}, J. Bobin⁵⁶, J. J. Bock^{71,11}, A. Bonaldi⁷², L. Bonavera³⁰, J. R. Bond⁹, J. Borrill^{14,91} F. Bernard, M. Bersanetti, P. Bierewicz, A. Boolin, P. J. Boolin, P. J. Boolin, P. J. Boolin, P. S. Colombi^{63,96}, L. P. L. Colombo^{25,71}, C. Combet⁷⁸, F. Couchot⁷⁴, A. Coulais⁷⁵, B. P. Crill^{71,85}, A. Curto^{5,70}, F. Cuttaia⁵¹, L. Danese⁸⁸, R. D. Davies⁷², R. J. Davis⁷², P. de Bernardis³⁵, A. de Rosa⁵¹, G. de Zotti^{68,88}, J. Delabrouille¹, J.-M. Delouis^{63,96}, F.-X. Désert⁵⁵, C. Dickinson⁷², J. M. Diego⁷⁰, H. Dole^{62,61}, S. Donzelli⁵², O. Doré^{71,11}, M. Douspis⁶², J. Dunkley⁶⁴, X. Dupac¹⁰, G. Efstathiou⁶⁶, F. Elsner^{60,86}, T. A. Enßlin⁸¹, H. K. Eriksen⁶⁸, F. Finelli^{51,53}, O. Forni^{47,10}, M. Frailis⁵⁰, A. A. Fraisse²⁸, E. Franceschi⁵¹, T. C. Gaier²¹, S. Galeotta⁵⁰, S. Galli⁵³, K. Ganga¹, M. Giard^{47,10}, G. Giardino⁴⁴, Y. Giraud-Héraud⁴, E. Gjerløw⁵⁸, J. González-Nuevo^{70,88}, K. M. Górski^{71,100}, S. Gratton^{73,66}, A. Gregorio^{37,59} A. Gruppuso⁵¹, J. E. Gudmundsson²⁸, F. K. Hansen⁶⁸, D. Hanson^{82,71,9}, D. Harrison^{66,73}, G. Helou¹¹, S. Henrot-Versillé²⁴ C. Hernández-Monteagudo^{13,31}, D. Herranz²⁰, S. R. Hildebrandt¹¹, E. Hivon^{63,66}, M. Hobson⁶, W. A. Holmes²¹, A. Hornstrup¹⁷, W. Hovest⁴¹, K. M. Huffenberger⁶⁹, G. Hurier^{62,78}, T. R. Jaffe⁶³, J. Jewell⁷¹, W. C. Jones²⁸, M. Juvela²⁷, E. Keihänen²⁷, R. Keskitalo^{23,14} K. Kiiveri^{27,47}, T. S. Kisner⁴⁰, R. Kneissl^{42,4}, J. Knoch⁸¹, L. Knox³⁰, M. Kunz^{18,62,3}, H. Kurki-Suonio^{27,47}, G. Lagache⁶², A. Lähteenmäki^{2,47}, J.-M. Lamarre⁷⁵, A. Lasenby^{6,23}, M. Lattanzi⁵⁴, R. J. Laureijs⁴⁴, C. R. Lawrence⁷¹, M. Le Jeune¹, S. Leach⁸⁸, J. P. Leahy⁷², R. Leonardi⁴³ J. León-Tavares^{45,2}, J. Lesgourgues^{90,87}, M. Liguori³³, P. B. Lilje⁶⁸, V. Lindholm^{27,47}, M. Linden-Vørnle¹⁷, M. López-Caniego⁷⁰, P. M. Lubin³¹, J. F. Macías-Pérez⁷⁸, B. Maffei⁷², D. Maino^{96,52}, N. Mandolesi^{51,5,54}, D. Marinucci³⁹, M. Maris⁵⁰, D. J. Marshall⁵⁶, P. G. Martin⁹, E. Martínez-González⁷⁰, S. Masi³³, S. Matarrese³³, F. Matthai⁸¹, P. Mazzotta³⁸, P. R. Meinhold³¹, A. Melchiorri^{33,54}, L. Mendes⁴³, E. Menegoni³³ A. Mennella^{36,52}, M. Migliaccio^{66,73}, M. Millea³⁰, S. Mitra^{57,71}, M.-A. Miville-Deschênes^{62,9}, D. Molinari⁵¹, A. Moneti⁶³, L. Montier^{97,30} G. Morgante³¹, D. Mortlock⁵⁸, A. Moss³⁰, D. Munshi⁸⁹, P. Naselsky^{84,40}, F. Nati³³, P. Natoli^{34,431}, C. B. Netterfield²¹, H. U. Nørgaard-Nielsen¹⁷, F. Noviello⁷², D. Novikov⁵⁸, L. Novikov⁵⁴, I. J. O'Dwyer⁷¹, F. Orieux⁶⁰, S. Osborne⁹⁰, C. A. Oxborrow¹⁷, F. Paci⁸⁸, L. Pagano^{10,54}, F. Pajot⁶², R. Paladini⁷⁹, D. Paoletti^{51,53}, B. Partridge⁴⁶, F. Pasian⁵⁰, G. Patanchon¹, P. Paykari⁷⁵, O. Perdereau⁷⁴, L. Perotto⁷⁸, F. Perrotta⁸⁸, F. Piacentini⁷⁵, M. Piat¹, E. Pierpaoli²⁵, D. Pietrobon²¹, S. Plaszczynski²⁴, E. Pointecouteau^{97,19}, G. Polenta^{4,49}, N. Ponthieu^{62,55}, L. Popa⁶⁴, T. Poutanen^{62,272} G. W. Pratt⁷⁶, G. Prézeau^{11,71}, S. Prunet^{63,96}, J.-L. Puget⁶², J. P. Rachen^{22,81}, A. Rahlin²⁸, R. Rebolo^{69,15,41}, M. Reinecke⁸¹, M. Remazeilles^{62,1} C. Renault⁷⁸, S. Ricciardi⁵¹, T. Riller⁸¹, C. Ringeval^{67,03,96}, I. Ristorcelli^{97,10}, G. Rocha^{71,11}, C. Rosset¹, G. Roudier^{1,25,71}, M. Rowan-Robinson⁵⁸ J. A. Rubiño-Martín^{40,41}, B. Rusholme⁵⁹, M. Sandri⁵¹, L. Sanselme⁷⁸, D. Santos⁷⁸, G. Savini⁸⁶, D. Scott²⁴, M. D. Seiffert^{71,11}, E. P. S. Shellard¹², L. D. Spencer⁸⁹, J.-L. Starck²⁶, V. Stolyarov^{6,73,92}, R. Stompor¹, R. Sudiwala⁸⁹, F. Sureau²⁶, D. Sutton^{66,73}, A.-S. Suur-Uski^{27,67}, J.-F. Sygnet⁶³, J. A. Tauber⁴⁴, D. Tavagnacco^{30,37}, L. Terenzi⁵¹, L. Toffolatti^{20,70}, M. Tomasi⁵², M. Tristram⁷⁴, M. Tucci^{18,74}, J. Tuovinen⁸³, M. Türler⁵⁶, L. Valenziano⁵¹, J. Valiviita^{43,27,68}, B. Van Tent⁷⁹, J. Varis⁸³, P. Vielva⁷⁰, F. Villa⁵¹, N. Vittorio³⁸, L. A. Wade⁷¹, B. D. Wandelt^{63,96,32}, I. K. Wehus⁷¹, M. White²⁹, S. D. M. White⁸¹, D. Yvon¹⁶, A. Zacchei³⁰, and A. Zonca³¹

(Affiliations can be found after the references)

Preprint online version: 26th March 2013

Abstract

urXiv:1303.5075v2 [astro-ph.CO] 25 Mar 201

3

This paper presents the Planck likelihood, a complete statistical description of the two-point correlation function of the CMB temperature fluctuations that accounts for all known relevant uncertainties, both instrumental and astrophysical in nature. We use this likelihood to derive our best estimate of the CMB angular power spectrum from Planck over three decades in multipole moment, l, covering 2 ≤ l ≤ 2500. The main source of error at l ≤ 1500 is cosmic variance. Uncertainties in small-scale foreground modelling and instrumental noise dominate the error budget at higher 4s. For l < 50, our likelihood exploits all Planck frequency channels from 30 to 353 GHz, separating the cosmological CMB signal from diffuse Galactic foregrounds through a physically motivated Bayesian component separation technique. At l 2 50, we employ a correlated Gaussian likelihood approximation based on a fine-grained set of angular cross-spectra derived from multiple detector combinations between the 100, 143, and 217 GHz frequency channels, marginalizing over power spectrum foreground templates. We validate our likelihood through an extensive suite of consistency tests, and assess the impact of residual foreground and instrumental uncertainties on the final cosmological parameters. We find good internal agreement among the high-t cross-spectra with residuals below a few µK² at t ≤ 1000, in agreement with estimated calibration uncertainties. We compare our results with foreground-cleaned CMB maps derived from all Planck frequencies, as well as with cross-spectra derived from the 70 GHz Planck map, and find broad agreement in terms of spectrum residuals and cosmological parameters. We further show that the best-fit ACDM cosmology is in excellent agreement with preliminary Planck EE and TE polarisation spectra. We find that the standard ACDM cosmology is well constrained by Planck from the measurements at ℓ ≤ 1500. One specific example is the spectral index of scalar perturbations, for which we report a 5.4 σ deviation from scale invariance, n, ≠ 1. Increasing the multipole range beyond $\ell \simeq 1500$ does not increase our accuracy for the ACDM parameters, but instead allows us to study extensions beyond the standard model. We find no indication of significant departures from the ACDM framework. Finally, we report a tension between the Planck best-fit ACDM model and the lowspectrum in the form of a power deficit of 5–10% at $\ell \le 40$, with a statistical significance of 2.5–3 σ . Without a theoretically motivated model for this power deficit, we do not elaborate further on its cosmological implications, but note that this is our most puzzling finding in an otherwise remarkably consistent dataset.

Key words. Cosmology: cosmic background radiation - Surveys - Methods: data analysis



Observational hints for power-loss

Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. 0_Like_top 26th March 2013

J.-P. Bernar F. R. Bou

A. Catalano²⁸ S. Color

Mar 201

S

2

[astro-ph

5075v2

..1203

C.

I.

© ESO 2013

Planck 2013 results. XV. CMB power spectra and likelihood

Planck Collaboration: P. A. R. Ade⁸⁹, N. Aghanim⁵², C. Armitage-Caplan⁵⁴, M. Arnaud⁵⁶, M. Ashdown^{73,6}, F. Atrio-Barandela⁷⁹, J. Aumont⁶², C. Baccigalupi⁸⁸, A. J. Banday^{97,10}, R. B. Barreiro⁷⁰, J. G. Bartlett^{1,71}, E. Battaner⁹⁸, K. Benabed^{65,96}, A. Benolt⁶⁰, A. Benoit-Lévy^{25,63,96}

Abstract

R. D. Davies This paper presents the *Planck* likelihood, a complete statistical description of the two-point correlation function of the CMB temperature fluctuations that accounts J. M. Diego H. K. Erik en for all known relevant uncertainties, both instrumental and astrophysical in nature. We use this likelihood to derive our best estimate of the CMB angular power M. Giard 7,8 spectrum from *Planck* over three decades in multipole moment, ℓ , covering $2 \le \ell \le 2500$. The main source of error at $\ell \le 1500$ is cosmic variance. Uncertainties in C. Herní dez small-scale foreground modelling and instrumental noise dominate the error budget at higher ℓ s. For $\ell < 50$, our likelihood exploits all *Planck* frequency channels K. M. Juffer K. Kiiv 127,47 from 30 to 353 GHz, separating the cosmological CMB signal from diffuse Galactic foregrounds through a physically motivated Bayesian component separation J.-M. amar J. León favare technique. At $\ell \ge 50$, we employ a correlated Gaussian likelihood approximation based on a fine-grained set of angular cross-spectra derived from multiple detector . F. Ma combinations between the 100, 143, and 217 GHz frequency channels, marginalizing over power spectrum foreground templates. We validate our likelihood through E. Mart nez-Got an extensive suite of consistency tests, and assess the impact of residual foreground and instrumental uncertainties on the final cosmological parameters. We find A. dennelli G. M gante³¹, good internal agreement among the high- ℓ cross-spectra with residuals below a few μK^2 at $\ell \leq 1000$, in agreement with estimated calibration uncertainties. We F. 1 wiello72, R. P. ladini⁵⁹, I compare our results with foreground-cleaned CMB maps derived from all Planck frequencies, as well as with cross-spectra derived from the 70 GHz Planck map, M Piat1, E. Pi and find broad agreement in terms of spectrum residuals and cosmological parameters. We further show that the best-fit ACDM cosmology is in excellent agreement G W. Pratt⁷⁶. lenault78, S. with preliminary Planck EE and TE polarisation spectra. We find that the standard ACDM cosmology is well constrained by Planck from the measurements at . Rubiño-M D. Spencer $\ell \leq 1500$. One specific example is the spectral index of scalar perturbations, for which we report a 5.4 σ deviation from scale invariance, $n_s \neq 1$. Increasing the J. A. Taube In Valence multipole range beyond $\ell \simeq 1500$ does not increase our accuracy for the ACDM parameters, but instead allows us to study extensions beyond the standard model. We find no indication of significant departures from the ACDM framework. Finally, we report a tension between the Planck best-fit ACDM model and the low-l spectrum in the form of a power deficit of 5–10% at $\ell \leq 40$, with a statistical significance of 2.5–3 σ . Without a theoretically motivated model for this power deficit, we do not elaborate further on its cosmological implications, but note that this is our most puzzling finding in an otherwise remarkably consistent dataset.

Abstract

This paper previous the Planck likelihood, a complete statistical description of the two-point correlation function of the CMB temperature fluctuations that accounts for all known devant uncertainties, both instrumental and astrophysical in nature. We use this likelihood to derive our best estimate of the CMB angular power spectrum frog Planck over three decades in multipole moment, l, covering 2 ≤ l ≤ 2500. The main source of error at l ≤ 1500 is cosmic variance. Uncertainties in small-scale preground modelling and instrumental noise dominate the error budget at higher ℓs. For ℓ < 50, our likelihood exploits all Planck frequency channels from 30 to 53 GHz, separating the cosmological CMB signal from diffuse Galactic foregrounds through a physically motivated Bayesian component separation technique At ℓ ≥ 50, we employ a correlated Gaussian likelihood approximation based on a fine-grained set of angular cross-spectra derived from multiple detector combing ons between the 100, 143, and 217 GHz frequency channels, marginalizing over power spectrum foreground templates. We validate our likelihood through an extensive suite of consistency tests, and assess the impact of residual foreground and instrumental uncertainties on the final cosmological parameters. We find good j ternal agreement among the high- ℓ cross-spectra with residuals below a few μK^2 at $\ell \leq 1000$, in agreement with estimated calibration uncertainties. We re our results with foreground-cleaned CMB maps derived from all Planck frequencies, as well as with cross-spectra derived from the 70 GHz Planck map, and not broad agreement in terms of spectrum residuals and cosmological parameters. We further show that the best-fit ACDM cosmology is in excellent agreement preliminary Planck EE and TE polarisation spectra. We find that the standard ACDM cosmology is well constrained by Planck from the measurements at 1500. One specific example is the spectral index of scalar perturbations, for which we report a 5.4 σ deviation from scale invariance, n, \neq 1. Increasing the ltipole range beyond ℓ ≈ 1500 does not increase our accuracy for the ACDM parameters, but instead allows us to study extensions beyond the standard model. e find no indication of significant departures from the ACDM framework. Finally, we report a tension between the Planck best-fit ACDM model and the lowctrum in the form of a power deficit of 5–10% at $\ell \le 40$, with a statistical significance of 2.5–3 σ . Without a theoretically motivated model for this power deficit, e do not elaborate further on its cosmological implications, but note that this is our most puzzling finding in an otherwise remarkably consistent dataset,

Key words. Cosmology: cosmic background radiation - Surveys - Methods: data analysis

Observational hints for power-loss



Figure 39. Power spectrum amplitude, q, relative to the best-fit *Planck* model as a function of ℓ_{max} , as measured by the low- ℓ *Planck* and *WMAP* temperature likelihoods, respectively. Error bars indicate 68 and 95% confidence regions.

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k) = \mathcal{P}_{0}(k) \left\{ 1 - \exp\left[-\left(\frac{k}{k_{c}}\right)^{\lambda_{c}}\right] \right\}$$

Model	$-2\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}_{max}$	$\ln B_{0X}$	Parameter	Best fit value
Wiggles	-9.0	1.5	$lpha_{ m w}$ ω arphi	0.0294 28.90 0.075 π
Step-inflation	-11.7	0.3	\mathcal{A}_{f} ln (η_{f} /Mpc) ln x_{d}	0.102 8.214 4.47
Cutoff	-2.9	0.3	$\frac{\ln(k_c/Mpc^{-1})}{\lambda_c}$	-8.493 0.474

Table 11. Improvement in fit and logarithm of the Bayes factor with respect to power law Λ CDM and best fit parameter values for the wiggles, step-inflation, and cutoff models. The larger ln B_{0X} , the greater the preference for a featureless power law spectrum.



Cosmic variance

We only have one sky

Measurements on largest scales are statistically limited

[Planck XV]

Cosmic variance

CV is the simplest explanation for low- ℓ anomaly

CV can be decreased using LSS data [1309.4060]



Figure 37. The 2013 *Planck* CMB temperature angular power spectrum. The error bars include cosmic variance, whose magnitude is indicated by the green shaded area around the best fit model. The low- ℓ values are plotted at 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.5, 11.5, 13.5, 16, 19, 22.5, 27, 34.5, and 44.5.



?? What if inflation was short ??



?? What if inflation was short ??

Freivogel et al. 2007 McAllister et al. 2013

 $\alpha > 0$

theoretically well motivated:

 $P(N_e) \sim \left(\frac{1}{N_e}\right)^{\alpha}$



?? What if inflation was short ??

Freivogel et al. 2007 McAllister et al. 2013

 α

theoretically well motivated:

$$P(N_e) \sim \left(\frac{1}{N_e}\right)$$

 $\alpha > 0$

Can this leave an imprint on the power spectrum?

Modifies large scale part of spectrum

Francisco Gil Pedro, Bologna, 26 March 2014

 P_{ζ}













The conservative approach



Inflation in Type IIB string compactifications Inflaton is a Kahler modulus

$$\mathcal{V} = \sqrt{\tau_1} \tau_2 - \tau_3^{3/2}$$

[Cicoli et al., 2008]



Fibre modulus' potential generated by perturbative corrections

$$\tau_1 \equiv e^{\kappa \phi} \qquad \qquad \kappa = 2/\sqrt{3}$$

$$V = V_0 \left(1 - C_{1/2} e^{-\kappa\phi/2} + C_2 e^{-2\kappa\phi} + C_1 e^{\kappa\phi} \right)$$

DESY







DESY







DESY

 \mathcal{M}_4

Too much expansion power loss <u>unobservable</u>

Need steeper potential after inflection point







Decreases ΔN_e between suppression region and pivot scale

Renders suppression observable



Modification of the string-loop effects generating V

What pre-inflation?

Move **beyond slow-roll** and consider different dynamics:

• Fast-roll

 $\xi = -2$

Contaldi et al. 2003

- Climbing scalars
- Radiation domination
- Matter domination
- Curvature domination
- Super inflation
- Emergent Universe

Francisco Gil Pedro, Bologna, 26 March 2014

- $\xi = -1$
- $\xi = -1/2$

 $\xi = 0$

 $\xi = 2$

Sagnotti et al. 2012/14

Nicholson&Contaldi 2007 Kinney&Powell 2008

Cline et al. 2003

Linde et al. 1998,...,2011

Liu et al. 2013




Pre-inflation and power spectrum

Want to compute $P_k \equiv k^3 \left| \frac{u}{z} \right|^2$ after the end of inflation

Analytical computation, assuming instantaneous transition

Similar to QM: require continuity&diff. of u across transitions

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{i_{Max}}^{(1)} \\ C_{i_{Max}}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{A}^{i_{Max} \to i_{Max} - 1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}^{3 \to 2} \times \mathcal{A}^{2 \to 1} \times \begin{pmatrix} C_{1}^{(1)} \\ C_{1}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$P_{k} \sim k^{n_{s} - 1} \times \frac{H^{2}}{\epsilon_{H}} \times \left| C^{(1)} - C^{(2)} \right|^{2}$$
encodes pre-inflationary physics

encodes pre-initiationary physics



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes





Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



large scale spectrum feels pre-inflationary vacuum

DESY

Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes

vacuum $\begin{aligned} &\xi \sim 1 \\ \nu \sim 3/2 \end{aligned} \qquad k \gg aH|_0 \quad \to P_k \sim \frac{H_{inf}^2}{\epsilon_H} \end{aligned}$ $k \sim aH|_0$ aHln $k \ll aH|_0$ N_e



large scale

spectrum feels

pre-inflationary

Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes large scale spectrum feels pre-inflationary vacuum



large scale

spectrum feels

pre-inflationary

Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes

vacuum $k \gg aH|_0 \quad \rightarrow P_k \sim \frac{H_{inf}^2}{\epsilon_H}$ $\frac{\xi \sim 1}{\nu \sim 3/2}$ $k \sim aH|_0$ aHln $k \ll aH|_0$ N_e frozen: $\xi < -2$ decaying: $-2 < \xi < 0$ frozen with $n_s > 1$

Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes large scale spectrum feels pre-inflationary vacuum



Decelerated expansion: H decreases Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes large scale spectrum feels pre-inflationary vacuum



Type I backgrounds







DESY

Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from superhorizon modes



Type II backgrounds

r



red
$$\xi = -1/3$$

green $\xi = -1/4$
blue $\xi = -1/5$





red $\xi = -1/3$ green $\xi = -1/4$ blue $\xi = -1/5$

Same qualitative behaviour

Enhancement of power in the deep IR





red $\xi = -1/3$ green $\xi = -1/4$ blue $\xi = -1/5$

Same qualitative behaviour

Enhancement of power in the deep IR

Data hints at 5-10% suppression





red $\xi = -1/3$ green $\xi = -1/4$ blue $\xi = -1/5$

Same qualitative behaviour

Enhancement of power in the deep IR

Data hints at 5-10% suppression

?suppression in intermediate
k range?





 $\xi = -1/3$ red green $\xi = -1/4$ blue $\xi = -1/5$

Same qualitative behaviour

Enhancement of power in the deep IR

Data hints at 5-10% suppression

?suppression in intermediate k range?



Francisco Gil Pedro, Bologna, 26 March 2014

Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation





Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation





Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation



DESY

Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation





Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation



Decelerated expansion: H decreases

Large scale spectrum from modes that left horizon in pre-inflation





Type III backgrounds







red $\xi =$ green $\xi =$ blue $\xi =$

$$\xi = 1/2 \\ \xi = 1/3 \\ \xi = 2/3$$

1 10

Enhancement of power in the deep IR




















Type IV backgrounds



red
$$\xi = 3/2$$

green $\xi = 2$
blue $\xi = 5/2$

super-inflation



Type IV backgrounds



$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{red} & \xi = 3/2 \\ \mathrm{green} & \xi = 2 \\ \mathrm{blue} & \xi = 5/2 \end{array}$$

super-inflation

Different peak amplitude Different low-k fall-off



Type IV backgrounds



$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{red} & \xi = 3/2 \\ \mathrm{green} & \xi = 2 \\ \mathrm{blue} & \xi = 5/2 \end{array}$$

super-inflation

Different peak amplitude Different low-k fall-off

Same broad features



Pre-inflation and power loss



DESY

Pre-inflation and power loss



Degeneracy: 2 one-parameter families of primordial spectra



Pre-inflation and power loss



Degeneracy: 2 one-parameter families of primordial spectra



Interesting hints: [1311.1599] & [1402.1418]

claim these spectra are better fits than simpler monotonic parametrization



Summary

- Persistent hints from COBE / WMAP / PLANCK
- Short inflation modifies large scale/low- ℓ power spectrum
- We might be seeing pre-inflationary phase
- Different ways to reduce power
- Degeneracy/universality in power loss
- Better understanding requires fit to the data

