

Inflationary Magnetogenesis and Anomaly Cancellation in Electro-dynamics

Sumanta Chakraborty^{*1}, Supratik Pal^{†2} and Soumitra SenGupta^{‡1}

¹Department of Theoretical Physics, Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata-700032, India

²Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata-700108, India

August 5, 2022

Abstract

Primordial magnetic field generated in the inflationary era can act as a viable source for present day intergalactic magnetic field of significant strength. We present a fundamental origin for such primordial generation of magnetic field, namely through anomaly cancellation of $U(1)$ gauge field in quantum electrodynamics. Addition of this term explicitly breaks conformal invariance of the theory necessary to generate magnetic field of sufficient strength. We have analysed at length the power spectrum of the magnetic field thus generated. We have also found that magnetic power spectrum has significant scale-dependance giving rise to a non-trivial magnetic spectral index, a key feature of this model. Interestingly, there exists a large parameter space where magnetic field of significant strength can be produced.

1 Introduction and Motivation

Magnetic fields have made their presence felt at all the scales we have probed so far. Presence of magnetic fields at various length scales is a universal phenomenon as they cover a very broad scale, from planetary physics to galaxy clusters [1–6]. There have been significant debate on the origin of this pervasive magnetic field at large scales. Broadly speaking, there exist two equally motivated pathways that one may follow to understand the origin of such large scale magnetic field. The first one advocates for an astrophysical origin, amplified later on by various mechanisms, e.g., dynamo mechanism [6–9]. While the other one ascribes the magnetic field to be of primordial origin, i.e., possible generation of magnetic field during the inflationary epoch [10–30] or alternative scenarios like bouncing cosmology [31, 32]. Possible detection of magnetic field in voids may act as an acid test to favour one notion over the other.

Among all those possibilities, the primordial origin starting from inflation is much more appealing compared to others, primarily because of the elegance of the inflationary paradigm itself that gives rise to a natural mechanism of generating seeds of cosmological perturbations as well as its concordance with recent Cosmic

*sumantac.physics@gmail.com

†supratik@isical.ac.in

‡tpssg@iacs.res.in

Microwave Background (CMB) observations like WMAP 9 [33], Planck 2015 [34] and very recently, Planck 2018 [35] data, among others. With future CMB missions like CORe [36], LiteBIRD [37, 38], CMB-S4 [39], PRISM [40], PIXIE [41] etc. chipping in, this is an exciting time to explore this particular possibility further and corroborate the results with those upcoming data.

However, in spite of all those appealing features, the inflationary magnetogenesis is riddled with several difficulties. The most severe issue among them is how to generate the desired amount of magnetic field strength that is consistent with the galactic scale results today [21–23, 42]? Conformal invariance of any electromagnetic action demands the magnetic field strength to decrease as $\sim 1/a^2$, which leads to a very feeble value for the magnetic field strength, that is clearly unable to account for the present day observations. This suggests that if one wishes to have a primordial origin for the magnetic field, conformal invariance of the electromagnetic action must be broken at the first place. As obvious, the usual Maxwell’s equations in Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) background would not serve the purpose, as it leads to a conformally invariant theory, see for example [3–6, 8, 43]. Several possibilities to break the conformal invariance of the electromagnetic action have been invoked. This includes any nontrivial coupling of the inflaton with the Maxwell’s action. Several such models with interesting features are in vogue [10–30, 44–50]. However, most of these models are plagued with at least one of the two drawbacks, namely the strong coupling and the back-reaction problem [10, 18, 29, 46]. The strong coupling problem relates large values of the effective electric charge, rendering the effective field theory calculation invalid. On the other hand, if the strength of the magnetic field increases beyond the energy density of the background spacetime, effect of back-reaction cannot be neglected, resulting into the back-reaction problem. Another problematic avenue corresponds to presence of Schwinger effect [46, 51–55]. If the strength of the electric field becomes strong enough there will be creation of particle anti-particle pair. These created particles being charged will increase the conductivity of the ambient medium, which in turn will reduce the magnetic field strength. Alternatively, in order to break conformal invariance one can also take shelter of nonlinear electrodynamics [56] or 3-form fields [57, 58]. However, these models take into account several assumptions and approximations. Alternatively, one may still work with conformally invariant Lagrangian, but which generates helical magnetic field. In contrast to non-helical fields, for helical magnetic fields power can be transferred from small to large scales through inverse cascading [8, 59] and hence may generate magnetic field of sufficient strength. Presence of helical magnetic field may also have distinct signatures in the temperature anisotropy and polarizations of the CMB photons, providing interesting observational consequences [60]. There exists several other proposal to generate large scale magnetic field, e.g., the idea of resonant magnetic field [61], inhomogeneous magnetic field [16, 62] along with possibility of going beyond 4-dimensional electromagnetic theory [47] are also around. In a completely different perspective, primordial magnetogenesis have also been realised to some extent in non-inflationary setup, say in the context of bouncing cosmology [13, 31, 32]. Each of the proposals discussed above sound interesting and worth exploring further.

While it is very much true that the investigation for a more suitable model should go on in the above-mentioned directions, at the very outset, one notices that most of the models considered till date are phenomenological in nature. As the subject advances, one wonders if one can have a rather well-motivated framework of electromagnetic theory with strong theoretical background that can result in considerable magnetic field strength at the early universe. Herein lies the primary motivation of the present work.

In this paper, we try to provide a consistent model of magnetogenesis from a fundamental perspective, namely, from a consistent quantum electromagnetic theory. We also restrict ourselves to the good old 4-dimensional scenario and background inflationary setup. Besides obtaining the desired field strength

for the magnetic field in the present epoch, it turns out that one can indeed avoid the above problems associated with the generation of primordial magnetic field. Thus we provide a completely new viewpoint to the inflationary magnetogenesis scenario, where we need not have to invoke any ad-hoc coupling between the scalar field and Maxwell's action by hand, rather starting from a fundamental theory we have been able to demonstrate the possibility to arrive at a viable scenario. Interestingly enough, as it will turn out the model has the potential to predict non-trivial features for the primordial magnetic field in general, which using future measurements can either reinforce the model or possibly rule it out. For example, we would explore if one can have scale-dependent power spectrum for the magnetic field (along with the standard scale-invariant power spectrum), and if yes, what can be the possible constraints on the corresponding 'magnetic spectral index', which would eventually be a non-trivial parameter of the model under consideration.

The paper is organized as follows: In [Section 2](#), we jot down basic field equations for the electromagnetic theory under consideration. We then engage ourselves in finding out the corresponding Maxwell's equations in FRW background keeping in mind inflationary evolution of the universe in [Section 3](#). [Section 4](#) is entirely devoted to finding out the power spectra for electric and magnetic fields and subsequent solution of the vector potential. In [Section 5](#), we analyse the strength of the magnetic field and explore if this scenario can generate sufficient magnetic field along with associated features therefrom. We finally conclude with some open issues.

Notations and Conventions: Throughout this paper we have set the fundamental constants G , c and \hbar to unity. We will work exclusively in the mostly positive signature. All the Greek letters are used to depict four dimensional coordinates, while Latin letters are used to present coordinates on the spatial sector.

2 Basic Field Equations: Setting Up The Stage

In this section, we will put forward the modified action for electrodynamics that intrinsically takes care of the anomaly cancellation. Besides providing the theoretical motivation for the additional terms in the modified electromagnetic action that will eventually lead to modified Maxwell's equations, we will also discuss how the field equations for the electromagnetic field as well as the associated energy momentum tensor gets modified, ultimately breaking the conformal invariance of the gravitational action. We would like to emphasize that this will be achieved in four dimensional spacetime, without introducing any arbitrary coupling of the inflation field to the good old Maxwell's action, i.e., to the $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ term.

Even though classical electromagnetic field enjoys conformal symmetry in four dimensions, it leads to several problematic features in the quantum domain. Just to mention one such drawback, the gauge invariance is explicitly broken when one computes higher loop corrections due to conformal anomaly terms associated with the Maxwell's action. To compensate for such anomalous behaviour and to restore gauge invariance one often adds an additional term to the electromagnetic action [[63–68](#)]. In what follows we shall briefly describe the structure of the action by incorporating such a term. In this connection it is worth emphasizing that the appearance of gauge anomalies and their implications for abelian gauge fields are well known, for a detailed discussion see [[69](#)]. In particular, it has been shown explicitly that for the abelian gauge field theories the anomaly term can become significant. This is mainly due to the axial current, which is conserved classically but is anomalous after quantum corrections. Furthermore, the anomaly term

for abelian gauge theories are very well connected with the corresponding Dirac operator. Subsequently, it has also been demonstrated that in the presence of an antisymmetric second rank tensor field (possibly the Kalb-Ramond field) one can invoke a gauge Chern-Simons anomaly cancellation term which also restores the underlying gauge symmetries of the gauge and the Kalb-Ramond fields, see [70]. This results into a new coupling between the abelian gauge field A_μ and the Kalb-Ramond field $B_{\mu\nu}$. The field strength of the Kalb-Ramond field, which in four-dimension is dual to a scalar field ϕ (also known as axion), can be written as $H_{\mu\nu\rho} = \partial_{[\mu}B_{\nu\rho]} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\partial^\sigma\phi$. This new coupling term between the Maxwell field and the scalar ϕ is exactly the anomaly term which we have considered in this work. Further implications of such anomaly cancellation term in four dimensional as well as higher dimensional models have been explored in [71, 72]. Thus the anomaly cancellation term in the action involves the vector potential A_μ , the field tensor $F^{\mu\nu}$ and the scalar field ϕ , which is dual to the Kalb-Ramond field. Hence the action for the vector potential along with the scalar field takes the following form [70, 73] (also see [48, 74–77]),

$$\mathcal{A} = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \bar{\alpha} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\alpha\beta} + \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is the completely antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor defined as, $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = \sqrt{-g}[\mu\nu\alpha\beta]$, where $[\mu\nu\alpha\beta]$ is the permutation symbol such that $[0123] = 1$. The first term corresponds to the canonical gauge invariant kinetic term for the electromagnetic field, while the third term deals with the canonical kinetic term and the potential for the scalar field. One can consider this scalar field as inflation. However, that would put further constraints on inflationary model building part from its coupling with other terms as given by the second term. While that is doable in principle, in this article our primary intention is not to engage ourselves in modelling inflation. We would rather assume that inflation has happened with the background evolution given by (quasi) de-Sitter; and try to explore if desired amount of magnetic field strength can be generated therefrom using the action Eq. (1). So, in this article, we will safely consider the scalar field to be an auxiliary field that drives the dynamics of electromagnetism nontrivially at the early stage of evolution.

Lastly, the middle term corresponds to the interaction term between the scalar field and the electromagnetic field, which is responsible for the gauge invariance of scattering amplitude at the quantum level involving higher loop corrections. One can rewrite it as $-\phi \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta}$ by subtracting away a total derivative term. Note that we have introduced a dimension-full coupling constant $\bar{\alpha}$ in the interaction term, whose dimension can be inferred along the following lines: The dimension of the scalar field in four dimension corresponds to $\text{dim}[\phi] = \sqrt{(\text{Mass}/\text{Length})}$. If we set $\hbar = 1$, it follows that $\text{Mass} = \text{Length}^{-1}$ and hence $\text{dim}[\phi] = \text{Length}^{-1/2}$. Along identical lines we find $\text{dim}[A_\mu] = \text{Length}^{-1/2}$ and hence dimension of the coupling coefficient becomes $\text{dim}[\bar{\alpha}] = \text{Length}^{1/2}$.

A crucial question in this regard corresponds to gauge invariance of the additional term, since the vector potential appears explicitly in the same. To show that the interaction term is indeed gauge invariant, we compute change in the action due to gauge transformation, $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \Psi$ and $\phi \rightarrow \phi$,

$$\delta_\Psi \mathcal{A}_{\text{int}} = \bar{\alpha} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \Psi = \text{Tot. Derv.} - \bar{\alpha} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \Psi F_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi = \text{Tot. Derv.}, \quad (2)$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric in the (μ, ν) indices, while $\partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi$ is symmetric in them. Thus under gauge transformation the action do change, but *only* by an

integral over a total derivative term. In other words, the two Lagrangians before and after the gauge transformation differ by a total derivative term. It is well known in classical field theory that if two Lagrangians differ by total derivatives they must yield the same field equations [43]. Thus in the present context as well the field equations derived from the above Lagrangian are identical. This translates into the desired result, namely the field equations are invariant under the gauge transformation. Note that under certain circumstances the Lagrangian is also invariant under gauge transformation. To see this one needs to evaluate the total derivative term, which will inherit contribution from both spacelike and timelike boundaries of the integration volume. The timelike boundary is taken to be at spatial infinity and since all the fields are assumed to decay sufficiently rapidly at infinity, there will be no contribution to the boundary integral coming from this surface. While there will be contributions from two $t = \text{constant}$ slices, which are taken to be the spacelike boundaries. Due to presence of the Levi-Civita tensor, the contributions on these two spacelike surfaces come from the spatial derivative of the scalar field as well as the magnetic field associated with the vector potential. In the cosmological setting, the spatial derivative of the scalar field identically vanishes, owing to homogeneity and isotropy of cosmological spacetime. Thus in such contexts even the two Lagrangians do not differ under gauge transformation, as the total derivative term identically vanishes.

The above action depends explicitly on three dynamical variables — (a) the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$; (b) the vector potential A_μ and (c) the scalar field ϕ . Thus we need to vary the action with respect to all of them. Variation with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$ will lead to the energy momentum tensor associated with electromagnetic and scalar field, while variation with respect to A_μ and ϕ will lead to respective field equations. We start by variation of the above action with respect to the metric, which results in the following energy momentum tensor

$$T_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{4\pi} F_{\mu\alpha} F^\mu{}_\beta - \frac{1}{16\pi} g_{\alpha\beta} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) + \nabla_\alpha \phi \nabla_\beta \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \{ \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi + 2V(\phi) \} + 2\bar{\alpha} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} g_{\alpha\beta} + \bar{\alpha} \left\{ -4\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}{}_\alpha \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\beta} - 2\epsilon_\alpha{}^{\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\beta \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} - 2\epsilon^\mu{}_\alpha{}^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\beta F_{\rho\sigma} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

The most straightforward check of conformal invariance given the above expression comes from vanishing of the trace of the energy momentum tensor. Thus we can immediately check whether or not the above action is conformally invariant simply by computing the trace of the energy momentum tensor written down in Eq. (3), which yields,

$$T = T^\alpha{}_\alpha = \frac{1}{4\pi} F_{\mu\alpha} F^{\mu\alpha} - \frac{1}{16\pi} 4 (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) + \nabla_\alpha \phi \nabla^\alpha \phi - \frac{1}{2} \times 4 \{ \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi + 2V(\phi) \} + 8\bar{\alpha} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} + \bar{\alpha} \left\{ -8\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} \right\} = -\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi. \quad (4)$$

Thus even with the interaction term, the electromagnetic Lagrangian has retained the conformal invariance. As first glance this may appear problematic for generating magnetic fields of sufficient strength, but as we will see, the differential equation for the vector potential will be non-trivially modified in such a manner that significant magnetic field can still be generated.

Proceeding further, we vary the action presented in Eq. (1) with respect to the gauge field A_μ to determine the modified Maxwell's equations. For simplicity, by neglecting the terms involving total divergences in the variation of the action, we finally obtain the field equations for the gauge field A_μ as,

$$\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu} + 8\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\nabla_\mu\phi F_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \quad (5)$$

Here we have invoked antisymmetry of the Levi-Civita tensor in order to write $\nabla_\mu A_\beta$ as $(1/2)F_{\mu\beta}$. Thus the only remaining part to be extracted from the above action corresponds to the dynamics of the scalar field, whose field equation becomes,

$$\square\phi = \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} . \quad (6)$$

Here, the d'Alembertian $\square\phi$ stands for $(1/\sqrt{-g})\partial_\mu(\sqrt{-g}\partial^\mu\phi)$ and in order to arrive at the last line, we have used the fact that $\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\rho}\nabla_\alpha F_{\beta\rho} = 0$, as well as we have written the anti-symmetric part of $\nabla_\alpha A_\beta$ as $(1/2)F_{\alpha\beta}$.

We have thus arrived at the system of field equations that we will deal with in this article. In course we have also verified that even though the vector potential appears explicitly in the above action, due the structure of the action it does not spoil the gauge invariance, i.e., $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu\Psi$ is still a symmetry of the action. We have also derived the energy momentum tensor and have explicitly demonstrated that it does *not* break the conformal invariance of the Maxwell's action, even with the interaction term, since trace of the energy momentum tensor identically vanishes. Further, the field equations for the vector potential and the scalar field have also been derived, which we will now use in the context of cosmology and explore primordial genesis of magnetic field therefrom.

3 Modified Maxwell's Equations in Cosmological Background

Having analysed the structure of the basic field equations starting from the conformally non-invariant action presented in Eq. (1), in this section we would like to explore the field equation for the scalar field as well as the corresponding ones for the vector potential in cosmological background given by the spatially flat¹ FRW metric ansatz,

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) . \quad (7)$$

It is possible to write down the above metric ansatz in many different coordinate systems. Among all there is one coordinate of significant interest, owing to its conformal flat form. This is achieved by introducing a conformal time coordinate η , defined as $d\eta = dt/a(t)$ and hence the above metric can be recasted in the following form,

$$ds^2 = a^2(\eta) (-d\eta^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) . \quad (8)$$

In what follows we will use this conformally flat form of the metric throughout our computations. Returning back to the dynamics of the scale factor, note that the gravitational field equations determine the evolution of the scale factor $a(\eta)$, with certain matter energy density and pressure acting as the source. In the present context the scalar field acts as one of the source for the cosmological evolution. As a consequence, the isotropy and homogeneity of the universe demands the scalar field to be dependent on the conformal time alone, i.e., $\phi = \phi(\eta)$. Thus in the rest of the paper spatial derivatives of the scalar field will be taken to

¹To be precise the estimate of spatial curvature corresponds to $\Omega_k = 0.0007 \pm 0.0037$ from latest Planck 2018 data through TT, TE, EE + lowE + lensing + BAO data [35]. Here TT means temperature temperature cross-correlation of CMB data, TE means cross-correlation between temperature and electric type polarization of CMB data and finally BAO stands for Baryon Acoustic Oscillation.

vanish identically. Further, there can be additional matter fields present in the universe, which can be the inflaton field (or, matter/radiation) in case of an inflationary scenario (or, matter/radiation dominated universe). Since these fields only couple to the metric, they will not directly affect the evolution of the electromagnetic field and hence we will not consider them explicitly in this work.

However, the electromagnetic field will be assumed to depend on both time and spatial coordinates. This does not affect the homogeneity and isotropy of the universe, since the energy density of the electromagnetic field is assumed to be not back-reacting on the background geometry. Thus given the background spacetime geometry presented in Eq. (7) the quantity $\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (5) turns out to be,

$$\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \partial_\mu (\sqrt{-g} F^{\mu\nu}) = \frac{1}{a^4} \partial_\mu (a^4 F^{\mu\nu}) . \quad (9)$$

Since we want to write down the modified Maxwell's equations in the cosmological background, it is legitimate to break it up into temporal and spatial pieces. This requires computation of temporal and spatial components of $\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu}$ presented in Eq. (9). Writing down the field tensor $F^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of the vector potential, the temporal component of Eq. (9) reads,

$$\nabla_\mu F^{\mu 0} = -\frac{1}{a^4} \partial_i (\partial_i A_0 - \partial_0 A_i) = \frac{1}{a^4} \partial_\eta \partial_i A_i - \frac{1}{a^4} \partial_i \partial_i A_0 . \quad (10)$$

In the above expression all the spatial derivatives are ordinary derivatives with respect to flat 3-space, such that the overall factor of a^2 outside the spatial flat slice has already been extracted. Thus one can freely raise or lower the spatial indices present in the final expression. In the same vein, we obtain the spatial components of Eq. (9) as,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\mu F^{\mu i} &= -\frac{1}{a^4} \partial_\eta (\partial_\eta A_i - \partial_i A_0) + \frac{1}{a^4} (\partial_j \partial_j A_i - \partial_i \partial_j A_j) \\ &= -\frac{1}{a^4} \partial_\eta^2 A_i + \frac{1}{a^4} \partial_\eta \partial_i A_0 + \frac{1}{a^4} (\partial_j \partial_j A_i - \partial_i \partial_j A_j) . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Proceeding further, we can compute the zeroth component of the second term in Eq. (5) to obtain,

$$8\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{\mu 0\alpha\beta} \nabla_\mu \phi F_{\alpha\beta} = -8\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{0ijk} \nabla_i \phi F_{jk} = 0 , \quad (12)$$

where we have used the result that $\phi = \phi(t)$ and hence its spatial derivative identically vanishes. Similarly, for the spatial component we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} 8\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{\mu i\alpha\beta} \nabla_\mu \phi F_{\alpha\beta} &= 8\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{0ijk} \phi' F_{jk} + 16\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{j0k} \nabla_j \phi F_{0k} \\ &= -8\pi\bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{a^4} \right) \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' (\partial_j A_k - \partial_k A_j) = -16\pi\bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{a^4} \right) \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' \nabla_j A_k . \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we have used the result, $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = -(1/\sqrt{-g})[\mu\nu\alpha\beta]$, with $[\mu\nu\alpha\beta]$ being the completely antisymmetric permutation, with $[0123] = 1$. Here as well all the spatial indices are to be raised/lowered using the flat space metric and 'prime' denotes a derivative with respect to the conformal time η . Thus combining Eq. (10) and Eq. (12), we can write down the zeroth component of the field equation for the vector potential in this background, which reads,

$$\partial_\eta (\partial_i A_i) - \partial_i \partial_i A_0 = 0 , \quad (14)$$

while the spatial component of the field equation for the vector potential can be determined using Eq. (11) and Eq. (13) respectively, which reads,

$$-\partial_\eta^2 A_i + \partial_\eta \partial_i A_0 + (\partial_j \partial_j A_i - \partial_i \partial_j A_j) - 16\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon_{ijk}\phi'\nabla_j A_k = 0 . \quad (15)$$

At this stage we would like to emphasize that the gauge freedom present in the action has not been exploited yet. Using this freedom will possibly simplify the above equations quite a bit, and, as a result, they might be more tractable. Keeping this in mind we shall use the Coloumb gauge in which the zeroth component of the vector potential A_0 identically vanishes. Under this gauge choice the field equations for the electromagnetic field, presented in Eq. (14) can be immediately satisfied by the condition $\partial_i A_i = 0$, while Eq. (15) takes the following form,

$$A_i'' + 16\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon_{ijk}\phi'\partial_j A_k - \partial_j \partial_j A_i = 0 . \quad (16)$$

Thus use of the gauge invariance has indeed simplified the field equations for the vector potential to a large extent. Further the two equations combine into a single dynamical equation, involving two time derivatives of the vector potential as presented in Eq. (16). This finishes our discussion regarding the differential equation satisfied by the vector potential in the expanding background. For completeness, we must mention the field equation for the scalar field as well, presented in Eq. (6), which in this background geometry takes the following form,

$$\frac{1}{a^4}\partial_\mu (a^4 g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu\phi) = 2\bar{\alpha}\epsilon^{0ijk}F_{0i}F_{jk} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} = 2\bar{\alpha}\left(-\frac{1}{a^4}\right)\epsilon_{ijk}F_{0i}F_{jk} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} . \quad (17)$$

Expanding out the field tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ in terms of the vector potential A_μ and remembering that the spatial derivative of the scalar field must vanish, the above equation can be recasted in the following form,

$$\frac{1}{a^4}\partial_\eta \{-a^2\phi'\} = 4\bar{\alpha}\left(-\frac{1}{a^4}\right)\epsilon_{ijk}(\partial_0 A_i - \partial_i A_0)\partial_j A_k + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} . \quad (18)$$

Imposing the gauge condition $A_0 = 0$ further simplifies the structure, leading to

$$\phi'' + 2\mathcal{H}\phi' + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} = 4\bar{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{a^2}\right)\epsilon_{ijk}A_i'\partial_j A_k , \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$ is the Hubble parameter in the conformal time coordinate. Thus having described the modified Maxwell's equations as well as the field equation of the scalar field in the background of expanding universe, we shall subsequently analyse these equations to extract out information about the power spectrum and field strength of the primordial electric and magnetic fields.

4 Power Spectra for Electric and Magnetic Fields

4.1 Power spectra in terms of vector potential

In this section, we will derive the power spectrum associated with both the electric and magnetic fields. The computation of the power spectrum requires two ingredients, first of all we must know the energy

density associated with the electric and magnetic fields and secondly the vacuum state associated with the electromagnetic field in the expanding background must be properly constructed. For that purpose, we need to analyse the various components of the matter energy momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. Since computation of energy density is our prime focus, the understanding of the T_0^0 (which is nothing but $-a^{-2}T_{00}$) component of the matter energy momentum tensor will suffice. Consequently, Eq. (3) results into the following expression for the T_{00} component of the energy momentum tensor associated with the electromagnetic field,

$$T_{00} = \frac{1}{4\pi} F_{i0} F^i{}_0 - \frac{1}{16\pi} g_{00} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + 2\bar{\alpha} g_{00} (\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma}) + \bar{\alpha} \{-4\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho 0} \partial^\mu \phi A^\nu F_0^\rho - 2\epsilon_{0\nu\rho\sigma} \phi' A^\nu F^{\rho\sigma} - 2\epsilon_{\mu 0\rho\sigma} \partial^\mu \phi A_0 F^{\rho\sigma}\} . \quad (20)$$

Since we are working in the Coloumb gauge, Characterized by $A_0 = 0$, the last term in the above expression for T_{00} does not contribute. Furthermore, among the other terms, the contributions from the Maxwell term in the expanding background reads,

$$F_{i0} F^i{}_0 = \{-A'_i\} \frac{1}{a^2} \{-A'_i\} = \frac{1}{a^2} (A'_i)^2 ; \quad F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} = F_{ij} F^{ij} + 2F^{0i} F_{0i} = -\frac{2}{a^4} (A'_i)^2 + \frac{1}{a^4} F_{ij} F_{ij} , \quad (21)$$

where $(A'_i)^2 \equiv \delta^{ij} A'_i A'_j$. Similarly, we also have the following results, for the rest of the quantities appearing in the T_{00} component

$$-4\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho 0} \partial^\mu \phi A^\nu F_0^\rho = -\frac{4}{a^6} \epsilon_{ijk0} \partial_i \phi A_j F_{k0} = 0 \quad (22)$$

$$-2\epsilon_{0\nu\rho\sigma} \phi' A^\nu F^{\rho\sigma} = -\frac{2}{a^6} \epsilon_{0ijk} \phi' A_i F_{jk} = -\frac{2}{a^2} \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' A_i F_{jk} \quad (23)$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \phi A_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} = -\frac{1}{a^4} \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' A_i F_{jk} \quad (24)$$

Taken together, the T_0^0 component of the matter energy momentum tensor turns out to be,

$$T_0^0 = -\frac{1}{a^2} T_{00} = -\frac{1}{a^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{4\pi a^2} (A'_i)^2 + \frac{a^2}{16\pi} \left(-\frac{2}{a^4} (A'_i)^2 + \frac{1}{a^4} F_{ij} F_{ij} \right) - 2a^2 \bar{\alpha} \left(-\frac{1}{a^4} \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' A_i F_{jk} \right) - \frac{2\bar{\alpha}}{a^2} \epsilon_{ijk} \phi' A_i F_{jk} \right\} = -\frac{1}{8\pi a^4} (A'_i)^2 - \frac{1}{16\pi a^4} F_{ij} F_{ij} \quad (25)$$

We are now in a position to separate out the energy density associated with the electric and magnetic fields from the above expression for the energy density of the matter energy momentum tensor. The first term in Eq. (25) is obviously the density of the electric field, while the other one depending only on the spatial derivatives of the vector potential contributes to the magnetic field. However, note that the notion of electric and magnetic fields are observer dependent. Given a Maxwell field tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ one can construct the electric and magnetic field by projecting it appropriately using the four velocity of the desired observer, see e.g., [43, 78]. In this case the observer measuring the above electric and magnetic field corresponds to the fundamental observer moving with the cosmic flow. Hence the vacuum expectation value of the energy density associated with the electric field can be written as,

$$\rho_E = \langle 0 | T_0^0{}^{(E)} | 0 \rangle = -\frac{1}{8\pi a^4} \langle 0 | A_i'^2 | 0 \rangle , \quad (26)$$

where $|0\rangle$ corresponds to the Bunch-Davies vacuum state associated with the initial electromagnetic field configuration. Note that, this vacuum expectation value is directly related to the power spectrum associated with electric and magnetic fields. This is because, the power spectrum is the Fourier transform of a two-point correlation function and the energy momentum tensor being quadratic in the field variable, encapsulates the information about the power spectrum. In a similar fashion, the energy density associated with the magnetic field can also be written down as

$$\rho_B = \langle 0|T_0^{(B)}|0\rangle = \frac{1}{a^4} \langle 0| \left(-\frac{1}{16\pi} F_{ij} F_{ij} \right) |0\rangle . \quad (27)$$

One then quantize the electromagnetic field by simply expanding it in the Fourier basis and writing in terms of the creation and annihilation operators, as:

$$A_i(\eta, \mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{4\pi} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{p=1}^2 \epsilon_{pi} \left\{ b_{(p)}(\mathbf{k}) A_p(\mathbf{k}, \eta) \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}) + b_{(p)}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) A_p^*(\mathbf{k}, \eta) \exp(-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}) \right\} . \quad (28)$$

Here ϵ_{1i} and ϵ_{2i} are the polarization vectors in the standard linear polarization basis. However, due to presence of the Levi-Civita symbol in the Lagrangian it is instructive to rotate the linear polarization basis to the helicity basis, which is defined as $\epsilon_{\pm}^i = (1/\sqrt{2})(\epsilon_1^i \pm i\epsilon_2^i)$. For the rest of the discussion we will work with the helicity modes alone. The creation and annihilation operators associated with the vector potential are defined such that, $b_{(p)}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$ as well as its hermitian conjugate should vanish, where $|0\rangle$ is the Bunch-Davies vacuum state. Substituting the expression for the vector potential expressed in Eq. (28), in the expectation values for energy density of the electric and magnetic field following Eq. (26) and Eq. (27), we obtain

$$\rho_{(p)}^E = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dk \frac{k^2}{a^4} |A_p'(k, \eta)|^2 ; \quad (29)$$

$$\rho_{(p)}^B = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dk \left(\frac{k}{a} \right)^4 |A_p(k, \eta)|^2 . \quad (30)$$

Here we have used the fact that only the term involving $\langle 0|b_{(p)}(\mathbf{k})b_{(q)}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}')|0\rangle$ will contribute, as $b_{(p)}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$ and its hermitian conjugate identically vanishes. Further, the following identity involving sum over polarizations has also been used,

$$\sum_p \epsilon_{pi}\epsilon_{pk} = \delta_{ik} - \frac{1}{k^2} k_i k_k . \quad (31)$$

Given the energy density associated with the electric and magnetic field as an integral over the momentum space, one can arrive at the following expressions for power spectra of electric and magnetic fields, namely

$$\frac{d\rho_{(p)}^E}{d\ln k} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{k^3}{a^4} |A_p'(k, \eta)|^2; \quad \frac{d\rho_{(p)}^B}{d\ln k} = \frac{k}{2\pi^2} \frac{k^4}{a^4} |A_p(k, \eta)|^2 . \quad (32)$$

As evident the power spectrum for the electric field depends on the time derivative of the vector potential, while the magnetic power spectrum is dependent on the vector potential alone. Further the k dependence is also different in the two scenarios, in the electric power spectrum the dependence is through the k^3 term,

while for magnetic power spectrum it is k^5 . Hence it is very much likely, that when magnetic field power spectrum becomes scale invariant, the electric field power spectrum is not and vice versa. To understand the full dependence of the electric and magnetic power spectrum on the wave number, we need to solve for the electromagnetic vector potential. This is what we take up next.

4.2 Solving for the vector potential

In this section we would like to determine the vector potential $A(k, \eta)$, which is crucial in obtaining the power spectrum and its associated scale dependence. For this purpose, we need the evolution equation for the vector potential in terms of the conformal time, which has already been written down in Eq. (16). That equation was written in the real space, but we need to rewrite it in Fourier space. This can be achieved by substituting the Fourier decomposition of the vector potential in Eq. (16), which casts it in the following form

$$\epsilon_{\pm i} A_{\pm}''(k, \eta) + 16\pi\bar{\alpha}\epsilon_{ijk}\phi'(ik_j)\epsilon_{\pm k}A_{\pm}(k, \eta) - \epsilon_{\pm i}(ik_j)(ik_j)A_{\pm}(k, \eta) = 0 . \quad (33)$$

As pointed out earlier, $\epsilon_{\pm i}$ corresponds to the polarization vectors associated with the helical modes of the electromagnetic wave (see also Eq. (28)). The above expression can be simplified further as the polarization vectors satisfy the following condition, namely, $\epsilon_{ijk}k_j\epsilon_{\pm k} = \mp i|\mathbf{k}|\epsilon_{\pm i}$. Broadly speaking, this relation holds as the photon polarization directions and the propagation direction of the electromagnetic waves are orthogonal. Thus the following differential equation for the Fourier component of the vector potential can be obtained,

$$A_{\pm}''(k, \eta) + \{|\mathbf{k}|^2 \pm \bar{\alpha}|\mathbf{k}|\phi'(\eta)\} A_{\pm}(k, \eta) = 0 . \quad (34)$$

The above differential equation provides the final form of the differential equation for the vector potential, which one need to solve to get the power spectrum. Note that depending on the helicity of the modes the sign in front of $\bar{\alpha}$ changes. This explicitly demonstrates that the two helicity modes will evolve differently and hence will generate magnetic helicity. Further, the mode with negative helicity will be amplified and hence will lead to instability. Thus we will concentrate on the stable mode with positive helicity and shall drop the subscript from the vector potential.

The first hindrance towards solving the differential equation for the vector potential, presented in Eq. (34) has to do with the fact that $\phi(\eta)$ is otherwise an arbitrary function of η (remember this scalar field is, in general, an auxiliary field). Thus the above equation for the vector potential can not give rise to an unique solution unless we specify some form of $\phi(\eta)$. So, in order to keep life simple and demonstrate the mechanism to work perfectly, we will concentrate on a particular situation when $\phi'(\eta) = b/\eta^2$ with b as an arbitrary constant. This is completely different from the scenario considered in [48], where the ϕ' term was taken to be $\sim \eta^{-1}$. Even though this has resulted into a scale-invariant spectrum for the magnetic field, the electric field strength may exceed the inflationary energy scale, leading to back-reaction problem. The choice presented above, as we shall see later, will lead to scale dependent spectrum and hence will bypass the problem mentioned above.

In the standard inflationary setup, this is somewhat identical to considering a (quasi) de-Sitter evolution for which the Mukhanov-Sasaki equation has a term $a''/a \sim -2/\eta^2$. Thus, our framework indeed is respecting inflationary evolution for the background, albeit the fact that ϕ is an auxiliary field here grants us the freedom of choice of its parameters, this feature will be revealed in due course. We, however, remind the

reader that one can, in principle, make any other choice and redo the calculations afresh to check if that leads to a viable scenario.

Under this choice the so-called *Mukhanov-Sasaki equation* for the vector potential takes the following form,

$$A''(k, \eta) + \left\{ |\mathbf{k}|^2 + \frac{\bar{\alpha}|\mathbf{k}|b}{\eta^2} \right\} A(k, \eta) = 0 . \quad (35)$$

In order to solve the above equation, let us now introduce a new variable $x = -k\eta$ (here and in what follows we denote $k = |\mathbf{k}|$), along with a new vector potential $\mathcal{A}(x) = (A/\sqrt{x})$, such that the above equation takes the form,

$$x^2 \frac{d^2 \mathcal{A}}{dx^2} + x \frac{d\mathcal{A}}{dx} + \left\{ x^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \bar{\alpha}kb \right) \right\} \mathcal{A} = 0 . \quad (36)$$

Note that in order to arrive at Eq. (36) we have also multiplied the differential equation throughout by $x^{3/2}$. As evident, the above differential equation is a Bessel's differential equation with the following well-known solution,

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = C_1 J_\nu(x) + C_2 Y_\nu(x); \quad \nu^2 = \frac{1}{4} (1 - 4\bar{\alpha}kb) , \quad (37)$$

where C_1 and C_2 are arbitrary constants, J_ν is the Bessel's function for first kind and Y_ν is the modified Bessel's function. At this stage it is worth emphasizing that unlike the normal scenarios, in the present context, the index of the Bessel function itself, namely ν depends on the wave number k . Therefore, returning back to the conformal time coordinate and the original dynamical variable A from \mathcal{A} , the solution for the vector potential takes the following form,

$$A(k, \eta) = \sqrt{-k\eta} \left\{ C_1 J_\nu(-k\eta) + C_2 Y_\nu(-k\eta) \right\} . \quad (38)$$

However rather than using the modified Bessel function it is advantageous to replace the modified Bessel function Y_ν to Bessel functions J_ν and $J_{-\nu}$ with appropriate coefficients, such that the above solution for the vector potential involving both J_ν and Y_ν can be rewritten as,

$$A(k, \eta) = \sqrt{-k\eta} \left\{ D_1 J_\nu(-k\eta) + D_2 J_{-\nu}(-k\eta) \right\} . \quad (39)$$

Here we have introduced a new set of arbitrary constants D_1 and D_2 , which are algebraically related to the original ones. Finally in order to determine the constants D_1 and D_2 we need to use appropriate boundary conditions, which correspond to super and sub-horizon scales. First of all consider the limit $k\eta \rightarrow 0$, this in turn implies k^{-1} becoming larger, i.e., the modes are in the super-horizon scale, much larger than the Hubble radius. In this case we can use the power law expansion of the Bessel function, leading to,

$$A(k, \eta)|_{k\eta \rightarrow 0} = \sqrt{-k\eta} \left\{ \frac{D_1}{2^\nu \Gamma(\nu + 1)} (-k\eta)^\nu + \frac{D_2}{2^{-\nu} \Gamma(-\nu + 1)} (-k\eta)^{-\nu} \right\} . \quad (40)$$

Similarly, for modes living deep within the Hubble horizon we have k^{-1} to be small, which in turn implies a large $k\eta$ limit. In this context the Bessel's function can be expanded in terms of Sines and Cosines

with appropriate argument. These expansions when substituted in the expression for the vector potential presented in Eq. (39) yields,

$$A(k, \eta)|_{k\eta \rightarrow \infty} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \left[D_1 \cos \left(-k\eta - \frac{\pi}{2} \left\{ \nu + \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right) + D_2 \sin \left(-k\eta + \frac{\pi}{2} \left\{ \nu + \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right) \right]. \quad (41)$$

Rather than writing in terms of sinusoidal functions it is also possible to expand out the vector potential in terms of $\exp(\pm ik\eta)$. This is advantageous because, the initial condition for the vector potential has to do with the fact that the vector potential should be made out of positive frequency mode functions alone, deep inside the Hubble radius, such that,

$$A(k, \eta)|_{k\eta \rightarrow -\infty} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} e^{-ik\eta}. \quad (42)$$

Thus imposing this condition on the expansion of the vector potential presented in Eq. (41), we can determine the respective expressions for the unknown coefficients D_1 and D_2 . Therefore, finally plugging back all the expressions for the unknown coefficients, the vector potential in the super-horizon scale takes the following form,

$$A(k, \eta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \left\{ A_1 (-k\eta)^{\nu+(1/2)} + A_2 (-k\eta)^{-\nu+(1/2)} \right\}, \quad (43)$$

where the constants A_1 and A_2 have been introduced for convenience, having the following definitions,

$$A_1 = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} e^{-i(\pi/2)\{\nu+(1/2)\}}}{2^{\nu+1} \cos(\pi\nu + \{\pi/2\}) \Gamma(\nu+1)}; \quad A_2 = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} e^{i(\pi/2)\{\nu+(3/2)\}}}{2^{1-\nu} \cos(\pi\nu + \{\pi/2\}) \Gamma(-\nu+1)}. \quad (44)$$

An important point to note over here is that even though it appears that the above constants are independent of k , such is not the case. The dependence on the wave number is through the quantity ν appearing in the above expression, which corresponds to, $\nu^2 = (1/4)(1 - 4\bar{\alpha}kb)$. This is not surprising as the term ν is related to the corresponding spectral index n_B that takes care of the scale-dependence of the magnetic power spectrum, if any. We will elaborate on this in the next section.

5 Strength of The Magnetic Field and its Scale Dependance

Having derived the vector potential, let us now assess the strength of the electromagnetic field, in particular that of the magnetic field. This requires the knowledge of the solution for the vector potential derived above, which has two independent branches. The strength and power spectrum of the magnetic field will depend on whichever of the two branches dominate, as the other one can be safely neglected. This in turn depends on the sign of the parameter ν . Thus for positive and negative choices of ν the strength as well as the power spectrum of the magnetic field will be different as we pick up the dominating solution and neglect the sub-dominant one. For $\nu > 0$, it is evident that $\{\nu + (1/2)\} > \{-\nu + (1/2)\}$ and hence in the super-horizon scale the second term in Eq. (43) dominates, while for $\nu < 0$, the situation is just the opposite. Consequently, from Eq. (32) we have the following power spectrum for the magnetic field,

$$\frac{d\rho_B}{d \ln k} = \frac{|A_2|^2}{2\pi^2} H^4 (-k\eta)^{5-2\nu}; \quad \nu > 0, \quad (k/a) \simeq -Hk\eta; \quad (45)$$




Figure 1: Scale dependence of magnetic power spectrum has been demonstrated. The figure on the left demonstrates normalized magnetic power spectrum for negative values of ν , while that on the right demonstrates the normalized electric power spectrum for positive choices of ν . As evident, for smaller values of ν the scale dependence of the power spectrum is much weaker. See, text for more discussion.

$$\frac{d\rho_B}{d \ln k} = \frac{|A_1|^2}{2\pi^2} H^4 (-k\eta)^{5+2\nu}; \quad \nu < 0, (k/a) \simeq -Hk\eta. \quad (46)$$

On the other hand, the determination of the strength of the electric field will require the derivative of the vector potential as well, which can be determined straightaway from Eq. (43). This leads to the following expression for the power spectrum of the electric field,

$$\frac{d\rho_E}{d \ln k} = \frac{|A_2|^2}{2\pi^2} \left(-\nu + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 H^4 (-k\eta)^{3-2\nu}; \quad \nu > 0, (k/a) \simeq -Hk\eta; \quad (47)$$

$$\frac{d\rho_E}{d \ln k} = \frac{|A_1|^2}{2\pi^2} \left(\nu + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 H^4 (-k\eta)^{3+2\nu}; \quad \nu < 0, (k/a) \simeq -Hk\eta. \quad (48)$$

Note that in plain sight it may appear that whenever $\nu = 5/2$ (or, $\nu = -5/2$), the magnetic power spectrum for positive ν (or, negative ν) is scale invariant. However, the parameter ν itself depends on the pivot scale k and hence the power spectrum is never scale invariant. Thus in this particular model, in contrast to some other scenarios (see e.g., [48]), it is not possible to make the electric and magnetic power spectrum scale invariant i.e., independent of the pivot scale of measurement. Consequently, one can define a magnetic spectral index n_B for different values of ν (and hence of $\bar{\alpha}b$), which will act as a non-trivial parameter, along with the magnetic power spectrum, under consideration². *This acts as a distinct signature of our model.*

This feature has been explicitly demonstrated in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 respectively. In particular Fig. 1 depicts the behaviour of magnetic power spectrum, normalized to some appropriate scale by H^4 with the wave number k for both negative and positive choices of ν . As evident, the scale dependence of the magnetic power spectrum is manifest in the plots. Only for smaller values of the quantity $\bar{\alpha}b$, the scale dependence

²In principle, one can also define an electric spectral index with similar arguments, but as it will turn out, the electric field strength is not going to play significant role here and hence, we will eventually ignore it.




Figure 2: The above figures demonstrate scale dependence of electric power spectrum. The figure on the left demonstrates the normalized electric power spectrum for negative choices of ν , while that on the right demonstrates the normalized electric power spectrum for positive values ν . Alike the magnetic power spectrum, these figures also depict the scale dependant nature of electric power spectrum as well.

is much weaker. A very much similar feature is maintained in the power spectrum for electric field as well. Hence scale dependence of power spectrum is a distinct signature of this model.

Let us now concentrate on the strength of the magnetic field in the present epoch, i.e., it is important to know whether the model can generate magnetic field of sufficient strength. For that purpose we need to know the quantity (σ/H) , where σ is the conductivity of the Plasma and H is the associated Hubble parameter, both during the inflationary epoch and immediately after the same. During inflation the universe was a very poor electrical conductor [79] and hence we need not worry much about the magneto-hydrodynamics of the plasma, as electric currents were small. However after inflation the universe becomes a very good conductor and hence the electric currents become important. This can be understood along the following lines: One starts with the collision time scale τ_c for a charged particle moving in that plasma and determines the terminal velocity associated therewith. If the temperature of the plasma is T , then the scattering cross-section turns out to be, $\sigma \sim (ne^2\tau_c/T)$, where n is the number density of charged particles with charge e and we have set the Boltzmann's constant $k_B = 1$. The determination of τ_c follows from the scattering of the charge particle with another one. This essentially leads to,

$$\sigma \sim \frac{T}{\alpha \ln \Lambda} , \quad (49)$$

where $\alpha \sim e^2$ is sort of a ‘‘fine structure constant’’ and Λ is a parameter depending on the details of the scattering. At the end of the inflation, we assume instant pre-heating, i.e., the universe makes a sudden jump from de-Sitter phase to radiation dominated universe. Then in the radiation dominated universe, we have one of the Einstein's equations to read, $t = H^{-1} = (m_{\text{pl}}^2/T^2)$, where m_{pl}^2 is the inverse of the Newton's gravitational constant. Therefore using Eq. (49) we obtain, $(\sigma/H) \sim (m_{\text{pl}}/T) \gg 1$.

Thus after inflationary epoch due to high electrical conductivity of the Plasma we can write $J^i = \sigma E^i$, where E^i are the components of the electric field. Then the corresponding vector potential have two solutions, one independent of time and the other behaving as $\exp(-4\pi\sigma t)$. Since $\sigma t \sim (\sigma/H)$, it follows

that the exponential will be vanishingly small. Thus the vector potential remains constant with time. This suggests that the electric field has very little contribution, while the magnetic field is the dominant piece. Hence one can use the information that universe was a very good conductor post inflation to argue that the energy density of the magnetic field in the present epoch must be related to that at the end of the inflation through the relation, $\{\rho_B(0)/\rho_B(t_f)\} = \{a_f/a_0\}^4$. Here t_f denotes the time scale depicting end of inflation and a_f is the scale factor at the end of the inflation. To determine the ratio of the scale factors one may use conservation of entropy, leading to,

$$\frac{a_0}{a_f} = \left(\frac{g_f}{g_0}\right)^{1/3} \frac{T_f}{T_0}, \quad (50)$$

where g stands for the average number of particle species present at a certain epoch in the universe. Thus using this expression and writing down the temperature in terms of Hubble parameter using the Einstein's equations we obtain the ratio of the scale factors to be,

$$\frac{a_0}{a_f} = 0.9 \times 10^{29} \left(\frac{H}{10^{-5} M_{\text{pl}}}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (51)$$

Finally, to get an estimate for the strength of the magnetic field we choose $\nu = (5/2)$ and $k\eta \sim -1$, which yields $A_2 = -(3/\sqrt{2})$ and $\bar{a}b \sim -6$. Then using the fact that energy density of the electromagnetic field falls off as a^{-4} , we can relate the strength of the magnetic field at the end of inflation to the present day strength of the same using Eq. (51). This results into the following strength for the magnetic field in the present epoch, given the above parameter values, namely

$$B_0 \sim 0.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ Gauss}. \quad (52)$$

The above result gives us a typical value for the magnetic field strength in the present epoch as obtained from our framework. However, this choice of ν apparently gives rise to only scale-invariant power spectrum for the magnetic field, as apparent from the discussions after Eq. (45). However, since ν depends on k , the power spectrum or strength so obtained is actually scale dependent. We will comment on this later on.

As argued earlier, one can, however, arrive at a scale-dependent power spectrum in the present scenario for any other value of $\nu \neq (5/2)$, resulting in a magnetic spectral index $n_B \neq 1$. This can be achieved by exploiting the freedom of choice of the parameter ν (by choosing the free parameter $\bar{a}b$ in our theory), which is also scale dependent. This is interesting in particular, since Planck 2015 [34] and the following Planck 2018 [35] results show a signature of scale-dependent power spectrum, at least for the scalar perturbations, at $5\text{-}\sigma$. So, in principle, its magnetic counterpart may also have some scale-dependence, and if so, that needs to be explored.

Keeping this in mind we have represented numerical estimations of the magnetic field strength for various choices of the parameter $\bar{a}b$ for different pivot scales of measurement k in Table. 1. As explicit from the table, given appropriate choices of the parameters, the magnetic field strength can range from $\sim 10^{-13}$ Gauss to $\sim 10^{-16}$ Gauss respectively. For larger values of $\bar{a}b$, the strength of magnetic field also increases. However, note that the back-reaction of the electromagnetic field on the background spacetime can be ignored if $\bar{a}b < 1$. Thus for such smaller values of the combination $\bar{a}b$, the strength of the large scale magnetic field also decreases. Hence in order to generate magnetic fields of appreciable strength today one may have to choose the combination $\bar{a}b$ to be large enough so that back-reaction effects become




Figure 3: The above figure demonstrates the magnetic field strength in Gauss in the present epoch with positive values for ν (determined by the parameter $|\bar{\alpha}b|$), with both the pivot scale k (in Mpc^{-1}) and the parameter $\bar{\alpha}b$. Each contour depicts one constant value of the magnetic field. As evident from the colour coding the strength of the magnetic field varies from $B_0 \sim 10^{-13}$ Gauss for large k and $|\bar{\alpha}b|$ to $B_0 \sim 10^{-15}$ Gauss for small k and small $|\bar{\alpha}b|$.

important. Thus, as discussed in [14], in the case of a helical magnetic field there is indeed a certain tension between ignoring the back-reaction effect and generation of significant magnetic field. Further, in the model presented here, the magnetic field also shows scale dependence, as for the same choice of $\bar{\alpha}b$, for different pivot scales, the strength varies significantly. This feature is presented more robustly in Fig. 3, where we have drawn various contours of constant magnetic field strength in the $(\bar{\alpha}b, k)$ plane. The colour coding demonstrates the strength of the magnetic field and shows that for smaller values of $\bar{\alpha}b$ and k the strength is weak. Further, we have also investigated how the parameter n_B (n_B being the magnetic spectral index) varies with different pivot scales k and the parameter $\bar{\alpha}b$ in Fig. 4. For various choices of k and the parameter $\bar{\alpha}b$, the parameter n_B goes from values larger than unity to values smaller than one. Reminiscent to scalar spectral index, any deviation of this parameter from unity essentially indicates to scale-dependence of the power spectrum under consideration. So, this plot gives rise to a (non-exhaustive) parameter space where one can have significant deviation from scale-invariant magnetic power spectrum. In particular, we can get both blue and red spectral tilt. As pointed out earlier, this essentially means that,

Table 1: The numerical estimations of present day magnetic field strength in Gauss is being presented for different choices of the parameter $\bar{\alpha}b$ for five different choices of the pivot scale k (in Mpc^{-1}). As evident for smaller values of the parameter $|\bar{\alpha}b|$ as well as choice of the pivot scale, the magnetic field strength decreases. See text for more discussion.

Strength of The Magnetic Field				
$ \bar{\alpha}b $	(Pivot scale k=0.09)	(Pivot scale k=0.05)	(Pivot scale k=0.01)	(Pivot scale k=0.005)
1	1.591×10^{-13}	4.571×10^{-14}	1.779×10^{-15}	4.382×10^{-16}
2	1.831×10^{-13}	5.264×10^{-14}	1.844×10^{-15}	4.478×10^{-16}
3	2.108×10^{-13}	5.830×10^{-14}	1.911×10^{-15}	4.575×10^{-16}
4	2.423×10^{-13}	6.449×10^{-14}	1.981×10^{-15}	4.674×10^{-16}
5	2.779×10^{-13}	7.124×10^{-14}	2.052×10^{-15}	4.774×10^{-16}
6	3.179×10^{-13}	7.858×10^{-14}	2.125×10^{-15}	4.876×10^{-16}
7	3.628×10^{-13}	8.655×10^{-14}	2.201×10^{-15}	4.980×10^{-16}
8	4.129×10^{-13}	9.519×10^{-14}	2.278×10^{-15}	5.086×10^{-16}
9	4.688×10^{-13}	1.045×10^{-13}	2.358×10^{-15}	5.193×10^{-16}
10	5.310×10^{-13}	1.146×10^{-13}	2.441×10^{-15}	5.303×10^{-16}

along with magnetic power spectrum, one needs to estimate and constrain one more parameter, namely, magnetic spectral index, in order to get a hold on primordial magnetic field. Until now we have very feeble constraint on this, as analysed here using the lower bound of magnetic field strength as expected from CMB. We do feel this feature is going to play a crucial role in constraining models for primordial magnetic field with upcoming CMB observations. Thus we can get very interesting power spectrum and appreciable magnetic field strength along with appropriate magnetic spectral index for a wide parameter range in the model under consideration.

6 Conclusions

Generation of large scale magnetic field of appreciable strength in the present universe is a challenge. The most promising origin of such a magnetic field is primordial in nature. However, it turns out that due to conformal invariance, Maxwell's theory cannot account for the current strength of the large scale magnetic field. So far several models have been proposed which break the scale invariance or introduce additional helical modes of the electromagnetic theory. Unfortunately most of these models remained adhoc without much justification to the choice of various terms in the Lagrangian. In this work, we have proposed a new model which inhibits a term in addition to the Maxwell's action, which originates naturally from anomaly cancellation of the $U(1)$ gauge theory. This additional piece in the electromagnetic Lagrangian is absolutely essential to maintain gauge invariance of the electromagnetic Lagrangian at the quantum level. However, classically this term is sufficient to warrant that conformal invariance is kept intact while helical modes are generated. This raises the hope of arriving at a model of primordial magnetogenesis which has its




Figure 4: The above figure demonstrates the magnetic spectral index n_B with both the pivot scale k (in Mpc^{-1}) and the parameter $\bar{a}b$. Each contour depicts one constant value of the magnetic spectral index. As evident from the colour coding the spectral index varies from values greater than unity to values less than unity, while passing through one, which would depict scale invariance power spectrum.

origin from a fundamental picture. Starting from the associated action, we have derived the matter energy momentum tensor originating from the same and hence the modified Maxwell's equation. Due to explicit breaking of parity symmetry, the field equations satisfied by the vector potential in Fourier space inherits additional contribution depending on the time derivative of a scalar field appearing naturally in the theory. For some suitable choice of the time variation of the scalar field, we could arrive at the power spectrum of electric and magnetic field, which is intrinsically scale dependent. It turns out that the scale dependence of the magnetic power spectrum is an important feature of this theory. Further, for reasonable values of the parameter $\bar{a}b$ (originating from the action) for different pivot scale of observation k , we could generate magnetic field having appreciable strength. By choosing the parameters appropriately we have been able to generate magnetic field strength with variations ranging from 10^{-13} Gauss to 10^{-16} Gauss. This makes the model robust enough by generating magnetic field strength of desired amount along with concrete observational ramification in terms of scale dependent power spectrum with a fundamental origin.

Acknowledgements

Research of SC is funded by the INSPIRE Faculty fellowship (Reg. No. DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/000893) from Department of Science and Technology, Government of India and the research of SSG is partially supported by the SERB-Extra Mural Research Grant No. (EMR/2017/001372), Government of India.

Appendices

A Stability of the scalar field

Let us now analyse briefly the stability of the auxiliary scalar field under consideration. In particular, we have assumed the scalar field to behave as $\sim \eta^{-1}$, which needs to be consistent with its field equation and therefore possibly determining its potential as well. For that we reconsider the evolution equation for the scalar field with its spatial derivatives $\partial_j \phi$ vanishing. Hence, in terms of conformal time the field equation reads,

$$\phi'' + 2\mathcal{H}\phi' + a^2 \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} = 0. \quad (53)$$

In general, the right hand side of the above equation should be non-zero, depending on the wave number k and the vector potential. However, since our interest is in deep inside the Hubble radius i.e., the $k\eta \rightarrow 0$ limit, the term on the righthand side depending on k explicitly, can be approximated to be vanishing. Among the terms on the left hand side, we have $\phi' \sim b\eta^{-2}$ and hence, $\phi'' \sim -2b\eta^{-3}$. Since for inflation the background is (quasi) de-Sitter, it follows that $a(t) \sim a_0 e^{H_0 t}$ and hence the conformal time co-ordinate becomes, $\eta \propto \exp(-H_0 t)$. As a consequence the scale factor becomes, $a(\eta) \sim -(1/H_0 \eta)$ and hence $\mathcal{H} = a'/a \sim -(1/\eta)$. Substituting back all these results to the evolution equation for the scalar field, we obtain the potential for the scalar field to satisfy,

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} \sim \frac{4bH_0^2}{\eta}. \quad (54)$$

Thus the potential must have the form, $V(\phi) \sim -(1/2)4H_0^2\phi^2$, i.e., the potential is quadratic in the scalar field but with an opposite sign. A priori this does not pose a serious problem, since the total energy needs to be bounded from below for stability. Such a computation of the total energy for the scalar field yields, $(b^2/2\eta^4) - (2H_0^2 b^2/\eta^2)$, which is always positive deep inside the Hubble radius. Thus the stability of the scalar field is ensured.

References

- [1] D. Grasso and H. R. Rubinstein, “Magnetic fields in the early universe,” *Phys. Rept.* **348** (2001) 163–266, [arXiv:astro-ph/0009061](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [2] R. Beck, “Galactic and extragalactic magnetic fields,” *Space Sci. Rev.* **99** (2001) 243–260, [arXiv:astro-ph/0012402](#) [[astro-ph](#)].

- [3] L. M. Widrow, “Origin of galactic and extragalactic magnetic fields,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74** (2002) 775–823, [arXiv:astro-ph/0207240](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [4] A. Kandus, K. E. Kunze, and C. G. Tsagas, “Primordial magnetogenesis,” *Phys. Rept.* **505** (2011) 1–58, [arXiv:1007.3891](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [5] R. Durrer and A. Neronov, “Cosmological Magnetic Fields: Their Generation, Evolution and Observation,” *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **21** (2013) 62, [arXiv:1303.7121](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [6] K. Subramanian, “The origin, evolution and signatures of primordial magnetic fields,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79** no. 7, (2016) 076901, [arXiv:1504.02311](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [7] R. M. Kulsrud and E. G. Zweibel, “The Origin of Astrophysical Magnetic Fields,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **71** (2008) 0046091, [arXiv:0707.2783](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [8] A. Brandenburg and K. Subramanian, “Astrophysical magnetic fields and nonlinear dynamo theory,” *Phys. Rept.* **417** (2005) 1–209, [arXiv:astro-ph/0405052](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [9] K. Subramanian, “Magnetic fields in the early universe,” *Astron. Nachr.* **331** (2010) 110–120, [arXiv:0911.4771](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [10] R. Sharma, S. Jagannathan, T. R. Seshadri, and K. Subramanian, “Challenges in Inflationary Magnetogenesis: Constraints from Strong Coupling, Backreaction and the Schwinger Effect,” *Phys. Rev.* **D96** no. 8, (2017) 083511, [arXiv:1708.08119](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [11] R. Sharma, K. Subramanian, and T. R. Seshadri, “Generation of helical magnetic field in a viable scenario of inflationary magnetogenesis,” *Phys. Rev.* **D97** no. 8, (2018) 083503, [arXiv:1802.04847](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [12] R. K. Jain and M. S. Sloth, “Consistency relation for cosmic magnetic fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 123528, [arXiv:1207.4187](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [13] R. Koley and S. Samtani, “Magnetogenesis in Matter - Ekpyrotic Bouncing Cosmology,” *JCAP* **1704** no. 04, (2017) 030, [arXiv:1612.08556](#) [[gr-qc](#)].
- [14] R. Durrer, L. Hollenstein, and R. K. Jain, “Can slow roll inflation induce relevant helical magnetic fields?,” *JCAP* **1103** (2011) 037, [arXiv:1005.5322](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [15] S. Kanno, J. Soda, and M.-a. Watanabe, “Cosmological Magnetic Fields from Inflation and Backreaction,” *JCAP* **0912** (2009) 009, [arXiv:0908.3509](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [16] L. Campanelli, “Helical Magnetic Fields from Inflation,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D18** (2009) 1395–1411, [arXiv:0805.0575](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [17] J. Martin and J. Yokoyama, “Generation of Large-Scale Magnetic Fields in Single-Field Inflation,” *JCAP* **0801** (2008) 025, [arXiv:0711.4307](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [18] V. Demozzi, V. Mukhanov, and H. Rubinstein, “Magnetic fields from inflation?,” *JCAP* **0908** (2009) 025, [arXiv:0907.1030](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [19] K. Bamba and M. Sasaki, “Large-scale magnetic fields in the inflationary universe,” *JCAP* **0702** (2007) 030, [arXiv:astro-ph/0611701](#) [[astro-ph](#)].
- [20] B. Ratra, “Cosmological ‘seed’ magnetic field from inflation,” *Astrophys. J.* **391** (1992) L1–L4.

- [21] **Planck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, “Planck 2015 results. XIX. Constraints on primordial magnetic fields,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A19, [arXiv:1502.01594 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [22] K. Dolag, M. Kachelriess, S. Ostapchenko, and R. Tomas, “Lower limit on the strength and filling factor of extragalactic magnetic fields,” *Astrophys. J.* **727** (2011) L4, [arXiv:1009.1782 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [23] A. Neronov and I. Vovk, “Evidence for strong extragalactic magnetic fields from Fermi observations of TeV blazars,” *Science* **328** (2010) 73–75, [arXiv:1006.3504 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [24] D. Chowdhury, L. Sriramkumar, and M. Kamionkowski, “Enhancing the cross-correlations between magnetic fields and scalar perturbations through parity violation,” [arXiv:1807.07477 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [25] T. Vachaspati, “Magnetic fields from cosmological phase transitions,” *Phys. Lett.* **B265** (1991) 258–261.
- [26] M. S. Turner and L. M. Widrow, “Inflation Produced, Large Scale Magnetic Fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **D37** (1988) 2743.
- [27] K. Takahashi, K. Ichiki, H. Ohno, and H. Hanayama, “Magnetic field generation from cosmological perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** (2005) 121301, [arXiv:astro-ph/0502283 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [28] I. Agullo and J. Navarro-Salas, “Conformal anomaly and primordial magnetic fields,” [arXiv:1309.3435 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [29] R. J. Z. Ferreira, R. K. Jain, and M. S. Sloth, “Inflationary magnetogenesis without the strong coupling problem,” *JCAP* **1310** (2013) 004, [arXiv:1305.7151 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [30] K. Atmjeet, T. R. Seshadri, and K. Subramanian, “Helical cosmological magnetic fields from extra-dimensions,” *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 103006, [arXiv:1409.6840 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [31] D. Chowdhury, L. Sriramkumar, and R. K. Jain, “Duality and scale invariant magnetic fields from bouncing universes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D94** no. 8, (2016) 083512, [arXiv:1604.02143 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] D. Chowdhury, L. Sriramkumar, and M. Kamionkowski, “Cross-correlations between scalar perturbations and magnetic fields in bouncing universes,” [arXiv:1807.05530 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [33] **WMAP** Collaboration, G. Hinshaw *et al.*, “Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results,” *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208** (2013) 19, [arXiv:1212.5226 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [34] **Planck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, “Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13, [arXiv:1502.01589 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [35] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] **COre** Collaboration, F. R. Bouchet *et al.*, “COre (Cosmic Origins Explorer) A White Paper,” [arXiv:1102.2181 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [37] T. Matsumura *et al.*, “Mission design of LiteBIRD,” [arXiv:1311.2847 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#). [J. Low. Temp. Phys.176,733(2014)].

- [38] A. Suzuki *et al.*, “The LiteBIRD Satellite Mission - Sub-Kelvin Instrument,” in *17th International Workshop on Low Temperature Detectors (LTD 17) Kurume City, Japan, July 17-21, 2017*. 2018. [arXiv:1801.06987 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [39] **CMB-S4** Collaboration, K. N. Abazajian *et al.*, “CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition,” [arXiv:1610.02743 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [40] **PRISM** Collaboration, P. Andr *et al.*, “PRISM (Polarized Radiation Imaging and Spectroscopy Mission): An Extended White Paper,” *JCAP* **1402** (2014) 006, [arXiv:1310.1554 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [41] A. Kogut *et al.*, “The Primordial Inflation Explorer (PIXIE): A Nulling Polarimeter for Cosmic Microwave Background Observations,” *JCAP* **1107** (2011) 025, [arXiv:1105.2044 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [42] A. M. Taylor, I. Vovk, and A. Neronov, “Extragalactic magnetic fields constraints from simultaneous GeV-TeV observations of blazars,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **529** (2011) A144, [arXiv:1101.0932 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [43] T. Padmanabhan, *Gravitation: Foundations and Frontiers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010.
- [44] T. Fujita and S. Mukohyama, “Universal upper limit on inflation energy scale from cosmic magnetic field,” *JCAP* **1210** (2012) 034, [arXiv:1205.5031 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [45] C. Caprini and L. Sorbo, “Adding helicity to inflationary magnetogenesis,” *JCAP* **1410** no. 10, (2014) 056, [arXiv:1407.2809 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [46] T. Kobayashi, “Primordial Magnetic Fields from the Post-Inflationary Universe,” *JCAP* **1405** (2014) 040, [arXiv:1403.5168 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] K. Atmjeet, I. Pahwa, T. R. Seshadri, and K. Subramanian, “Cosmological Magnetogenesis From Extra-dimensional Gauss Bonnet Gravity,” *Phys. Rev.* **D89** no. 6, (2014) 063002, [arXiv:1312.5815 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [48] T. Fujita, R. Namba, Y. Tada, N. Takeda, and H. Tashiro, “Consistent generation of magnetic fields in axion inflation models,” *JCAP* **1505** no. 05, (2015) 054, [arXiv:1503.05802 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] L. Campanelli, “Lorentz-violating inflationary magnetogenesis,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C75** no. 6, (2015) 278, [arXiv:1503.07415 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [50] G. Tasinato, “A scenario for inflationary magnetogenesis without strong coupling problem,” *JCAP* **1503** (2015) 040, [arXiv:1411.2803 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] K. Rajeev, S. Chakraborty, and T. Padmanabhan, “A comment on generalized Schwinger effect,” [arXiv:1712.06621 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [52] R. Sharma and S. Singh, “Multifaceted Schwinger effect in de Sitter space,” *Phys. Rev.* **D96** no. 2, (2017) 025012, [arXiv:1704.05076 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [53] M. B. Frb, J. Garriga, S. Kanno, M. Sasaki, J. Soda, T. Tanaka, and A. Vilenkin, “Schwinger effect in de Sitter space,” *JCAP* **1404** (2014) 009, [arXiv:1401.4137 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] C. Stahl and S.-S. Xue, “Schwinger effect and backreaction in de Sitter spacetime,” *Phys. Lett.* **B760** (2016) 288–292, [arXiv:1603.07166 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [55] C. Stahl, “Schwinger effect impacting primordial magnetogenesis,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B939** (2019) 95–104, [arXiv:1806.06692 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] L. Campanelli, P. Cea, G. L. Fogli, and L. Tedesco, “Inflation-Produced Magnetic Fields in Nonlinear Electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 043001, [arXiv:0710.2993 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [57] T. S. Koivisto and F. R. Urban, “Three-magnetic fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 083508, [arXiv:1112.1356 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [58] F. R. Urban, “The anisotropy of a three- and a one-form,” *JCAP* **1308** (2013) 008, [arXiv:1306.6429 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [59] L. Campanelli, “Evolution of Magnetic Fields in Freely Decaying Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 251302, [arXiv:0705.2308 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [60] N. Seto and A. Taruya, “Polarization analysis of gravitational-wave backgrounds from the correlation signals of ground-based interferometers: Measuring a circular-polarization mode,” *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 103001, [arXiv:0801.4185 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [61] C. T. Byrnes, L. Hollenstein, R. K. Jain, and F. R. Urban, “Resonant magnetic fields from inflation,” *JCAP* **1203** (2012) 009, [arXiv:1111.2030 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] A. Lewis, “CMB anisotropies from primordial inhomogeneous magnetic fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 043011, [arXiv:astro-ph/0406096 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [63] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Anomaly Cancellation in Supersymmetric D=10 Gauge Theory and Superstring Theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **149B** (1984) 117–122.
- [64] P. H. Frampton and T. W. Kephart, “Explicit Evaluation of Anomalies in Higher Dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 1343. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 51,232(1983)].
- [65] L. Baulieu, “Anomalies and Gauge Symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B241** (1984) 557–588.
- [66] J. H. Schwarz, “Superstring Theory,” *Phys. Rept.* **89** (1982) 223–322.
- [67] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Consequences of anomalous Ward identities,” *Phys. Lett.* **37B** (1971) 95–97.
- [68] L. Alvarez-Gaume and P. H. Ginsparg, “The Structure of Gauge and Gravitational Anomalies,” *Annals Phys.* **161** (1985) 423. [,423(1984)].
- [69] A. Bilal, “Lectures on Anomalies,” [arXiv:0802.0634 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [70] P. Majumdar and S. SenGupta, “Parity violating gravitational coupling of electromagnetic fields,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) L89–L94, [arXiv:gr-qc/9906027 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [71] S. Kar, P. Majumdar, S. SenGupta, and A. Sinha, “Does a Kalb-Ramond field make space-time optically active?,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C23** (2002) 357–361, [arXiv:gr-qc/0006097 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [72] B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Sen, and S. SenGupta, “Bulk antisymmetric tensor fields in a Randall-Sundrum model,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 121501, [arXiv:0709.3428 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [73] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory. Vol. 2: Loop Amplitudes, Anomalies and Phenomenology*. 1988. <http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/physics/theoretical-physics-and-mathematical-physics/superstring-theory-volume-2>.

- [74] W. D. Garretson, G. B. Field, and S. M. Carroll, “Primordial magnetic fields from pseudoGoldstone bosons,” *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 5346–5351, [arXiv:hep-ph/9209238](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [75] P. Adshead, J. T. Giblin, T. R. Scully, and E. I. Sfakianakis, “Gauge-preheating and the end of axion inflation,” *JCAP* **1512** no. 12, (2015) 034, [arXiv:1502.06506](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [76] P. Adshead, J. T. Giblin, T. R. Scully, and E. I. Sfakianakis, “Magnetogenesis from axion inflation,” *JCAP* **1610** (2016) 039, [arXiv:1606.08474](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [77] P. Adshead, J. T. Giblin, and Z. J. Weiner, “Gravitational waves from gauge preheating,” *Phys. Rev.* **D98** no. 4, (2018) 043525, [arXiv:1805.04550](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [78] K. S. Thorne and D. MacDonald, “Electrodynamics in Curved Spacetime - 3+1 Formulation,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **198** (Jan., 1982) 339.
- [79] J. D. Barrow and C. G. Tsagas, “Cosmological magnetic field survival,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **414** (2011) 512, [arXiv:1101.2390](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].