

Hearing Higgs with Gravitational Wave Detectors

Alberto Salvio

*Physics Department, University of Rome Tor Vergata,
via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133 Rome, Italy*

*I. N. F. N. - Rome Tor Vergata,
via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133 Rome, Italy*

Abstract

The relic gravitational wave background due to tensor linear perturbations generated during Higgs inflation is computed. Both the Standard Model and a well-motivated phenomenological completion (that accounts for all the experimentally confirmed evidence of new physics) are considered. We focus on critical Higgs inflation, which improves on the non-critical version and features an amplification of the tensor fluctuations. The latter property allows us to establish that future space-borne interferometers, such as DECIGO, BBO and ALIA, may detect the corresponding primordial gravitational waves.

Email: alberto.salvio@roma2.infn.it

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Relic background of gravitational waves from inflation	3
3	(Critical) Higgs inflation	7
3.1	Classical aspects	8
3.2	Quantum aspects and critical version	9
4	Relevant gravitational wave detectors	9
5	The Standard Model case	10
6	A well-motivated BSM scenario	12
6.1	Definition of the ν MSM	12
6.2	Inflationary gravitational waves in the ν MSM	14
7	Conclusions	15

1 Introduction

The observation in 2015 of a gravitational wave (GW) event (named GW150914) from binary black hole mergers [1, 2] has opened the era of GW astronomy and has naturally reinforced the interest in any source of gravitational radiation.

From the point of view of particle physics there are several interesting phenomena that can generate GWs within the reach of present or future detectors. Examples are provided by strong first-order phase transitions. The phase transitions in the Standard Model (SM), such as the electroweak (EW) one or the confinement/deconfinement transition in quantum chromodynamics (QCD), are not of this type. Therefore, the observation of a GW event that is unambiguously generated by the EW or QCD transitions would be considered as a clear evidence of new physics.

Other interesting sources of GWs are the quantum tensor fluctuations that are generated during inflation. A detection of such GW background would provide further evidence for inflation and, remarkably, a direct observational confirmation of the quantum nature of gravity. Furthermore, since inflation is often implemented via quantum scalar fields and typically involves extremely high energies, detecting this type of GWs would give us valuable information on the microscopic theory governing the fundamental interactions between particles.

The experimental confirmation of the existence of the Higgs boson in 2012 [3, 4] has further increased the interest in the already very popular Higgs inflation (HI) possibility, where the inflaton is identified with the Higgs field [5]. In Refs. [5–8] a viable HI was achieved by introducing a very large non-minimal coupling between the Higgs and the Ricci scalar.

It was pointed out [9], however, that such a coupling would break perturbative unitarity at a scale much below the Planck mass. While this does not directly exclude the HI of [5–8] as unitarity can still be satisfied non perturbatively, it does prevent us from computing with current techniques the implications of the theory in some sub-Planckian energy regimes and for some background

metrics [10]. Furthermore, when the mentioned coupling is very large, it is necessary to tune the high energy values of some parameters in order to preserve the quantum inflationary predictions: if this is not done large higher derivative terms in the effective action are generated by quantum corrections, changing the output of the model [11–13] (see also Ref [14] for a related study).

These problems can be avoided [15, 16] by realizing HI very close to the critical surface in the parameter space [17–19], which is located at the border between the absolute stability and the metastability of the EW vacuum [20]. Indeed, this version, known as critical Higgs inflation (CHI), features a much smaller value of the non-minimal coupling, solving both the problems mentioned above. At the same time, remarkably, CHI leads to larger quantum tensor fluctuations [15–19] and one may hope that the corresponding relic background of GWs could be detected, leading to the exciting possibility that the Higgs manifests itself in GW astronomy.

The purpose of this paper is to compute the GW spectrum (as a function of frequency) associated with the tensor linear perturbations in CHI and investigate whether this gravitational radiation can be detected with future GW interferometers.

HI (including the critical version) was originally proposed in the SM, which is very successful in predicting the results of most of particle physics experiments. However, one has to keep in mind that the SM certainly needs to be extended. Indeed, the observed neutrino oscillations and dark matter are enough to establish the existence of some physics beyond the SM (BSM). Due to the very high energy scales during inflation, it is conceivable that the extra degrees of freedom could affect both the inflationary observables and the relic background of GWs. For this reason it is relevant to investigate the production of inflationary GWs both in the SM and in a scenario that can account for the experimentally confirmed evidence of BSM physics. We do so in this work.

Here is an outline of the paper. In Sec. 2 we provide in a model-independent way the gravitational wave spectral density generated by the inflationary tensor fluctuations without committing ourselves to HI and without assuming a specific model. We do make, however, some simplifying assumptions regarding the properties of the extra light particles and the reheating phase, which are satisfied in HI and CHI (and in the specific models we consider in the rest of the paper). In Sec. 3 we give the main properties of CHI that are used in the subsequent sections. A description of future GW detectors that would be able to test CHI is given in Sec. 4. The SM case is then analyzed in Sec. 5, while Sec. 6 is devoted to the corresponding analysis in a well-motivated phenomenological completion of the SM below the Planck scale [16, 21, 22]. The conclusions are given in Sec. 7.

2 Relic background of gravitational waves from inflation

GWs produced during inflation as quantum tensor fluctuations form today a relic stochastic background of GWs (see Ref. [23] for a textbook introduction to this topic). If sufficiently strong this background could be detected in future GW experiments. Therefore, in this section we provide the key formulæ for such background in a way that is as model independent as possible, hoping that this could be relevant not only for the specific models of Secs. 5 and 6, but also for some future activities.

The main quantity we would like to compute is the following dimensionless function of the

frequency f (the spectral density)

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) \equiv \frac{f}{\rho_{\text{cr}}} \frac{d\rho_{\text{GW}}}{df}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\rho_{\text{cr}} \equiv 3H_0^2 \bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2$ is the critical energy density, \bar{M}_{Pl} is the reduced Planck mass, H_0 is the present value of the Hubble rate and ρ_{GW} is the energy density carried by the stochastic background. Indeed, this is the quantity normally constrained in the context of interferometers and pulsar timing array experiments. $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ is related to the power spectrum of tensor fluctuations at the present time $\mathcal{P}_{t,0}(f)$ by

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) = \frac{\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f^2 \mathcal{P}_{t,0}(f). \quad (2.2)$$

In turn $\mathcal{P}_{t,0}(f)$ can be expressed in terms of the power spectrum of tensor fluctuations $\mathcal{P}_{t,\text{in}}(f)$ (at the time when the mode with frequency f re-entered the horizon after inflation) through the transfer function \mathcal{T}_{GW} :

$$\mathcal{P}_{t,0}(f) = |\mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}}(f)|^2 \mathcal{P}_{t,\text{in}}(f). \quad (2.3)$$

Let us recall now the definition of \mathcal{T}_{GW} . As we will write explicitly below, this quantity is related to the tensor fluctuations of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, that appear in¹ $\delta g_{ij}(\tau, \vec{x}) = a^2(\tau) h_{ij}(\tau, \vec{x})$. Using the conformal Newtonian gauge, the h_{ij} , besides being symmetric ($h_{ij} = h_{ji}$), also satisfy

$$h_{ii} = 0, \quad \partial_i h_{ij} = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

It is convenient to perform a Fourier transform

$$h_{ij}(\tau, \vec{x}) = \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \sum_{\lambda=\pm 2} h_\lambda(\tau, \vec{q}) e_{ij}^\lambda(\hat{q}), \quad (2.6)$$

where $e_{ij}^\lambda(\hat{q})$ are the usual polarization tensors for helicity $\lambda = \pm 2$. We recall that for \hat{q} along the third axis the polarization tensors that satisfy (2.5) are given by

$$e_{11}^{+2} = -e_{22}^{+2} = 1/\sqrt{2}, \quad e_{12}^{+2} = e_{21}^{+2} = i/\sqrt{2}, \quad e_{3i}^{+2} = e_{i3}^{+2} = 0, \quad e_{ij}^{-2} = (e_{ij}^{+2})^* \quad (2.7)$$

and for a generic momentum direction \hat{q} we can obtain $e_{ij}^\lambda(\hat{q})$ by applying to (2.7) a rotation that connects the third axis with \hat{q} . The polarization tensors defined in this way obey $e_{ij}^\lambda(\hat{q})(e_{ij}^{\lambda'}(\hat{q}))^* = 2\delta^{\lambda\lambda'}$. The EOM of h_λ in the vacuum is

$$h_\lambda'' + 2\mathcal{H}h_\lambda' + q^2 h_\lambda = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\mathcal{H} \equiv a'/a$, $q \equiv |\vec{q}|$ and a prime denotes the derivative with respect to τ . Eq. (2.8) has to be solved with the initial condition that at the time τ_{in} the function h_λ reduces to the constant value

¹As usual μ, ν, \dots are spacetime indices, while i, j, \dots are space indices. $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$ is the fluctuation of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, τ is the conformal time and the background metric has the spatially-flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) form:

$$ds^2 = a(\tau)^2 (d\tau^2 - \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j). \quad (2.4)$$

at horizon exit after inflation. Both this condition and Eq. (2.8) depend on \vec{q} only through q so we can write that h_λ is a function of τ and q only, i.e. $h_\lambda(\tau, q)$. The transfer function is defined by

$$h_\lambda(\tau_0, q) \equiv \mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}}(f)h_\lambda(\tau_{\text{in}}, q), \quad (2.9)$$

where a subscript 0 denotes the present time, and q is related to the frequency f via $f \equiv q/(2\pi)$.

The free-streaming of the active neutrinos, the photon and other light particles (if any) could generate a non-vanishing right-hand side of Eq. (2.8). However, for the frequency range relevant for ground-based and space-borne interferometers and pulsar timing arrays (i.e. $10^{-9} \text{ Hz} \lesssim f \lesssim 10^3 \text{ Hz}$) the neutrino and the photon free-streaming does not affect the amplitude of GWs [24]. Should the specific model at hand contain extra light particles, one would have to take into account a possible sizeable effect of these extra species on Eq. (2.8).

The GWs that are within the sensitivities of ground-based and space-borne interferometers as well as pulsar timing arrays all correspond to tensor modes that re-entered the horizon during the radiation dominated era much before the time of radiation-matter equality. Solving Eq. (2.8) for these modes and performing a time average, the transfer function can be approximated by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}}(f) \simeq \frac{a(\tau_q)}{\sqrt{2}a_0} = \frac{a(\tau_q)}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (2.10)$$

where τ_q is the time when the mode with momentum q re-entered the horizon, i.e. $\mathcal{H}(\tau_q) = q$, and, as usual, we have conventionally set $a_0 = 1$.

On the other hand, using entropy conservation and again the fact that the tensor modes re-entered the horizon during the radiation dominated era, one obtains

$$a(\tau_q) \simeq \left(\frac{g_*(T_q)}{\bar{g}_*} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\bar{g}_*^S}{g_*^S(T_q)} \right)^{2/3} \frac{H_0 \Omega_R^{1/2}}{q}, \quad (2.11)$$

where T_q is the value of the (photon) temperature T when the mode with momentum q enters the horizon and $g_*^{(S)}$ is the (entropy) effective number of relativistic species. These functions of T are defined as usual by

$$g_*(T) \equiv \sum_b g_b \left(\frac{T_b}{T} \right)^4 + \frac{7}{8} \sum_f g_f \left(\frac{T_f}{T} \right)^4 \quad (2.12)$$

$$g_*^S(T) \equiv \sum_b g_b \left(\frac{T_b}{T} \right)^3 + \frac{7}{8} \sum_f g_f \left(\frac{T_f}{T} \right)^3, \quad (2.13)$$

where the sum over b runs over all relativistic bosons, that over f runs over all relativistic fermions (with number of spin or helicity states g_b and g_f and temperatures T_b and T_f , respectively). Moreover, in Eq. (2.11) $\bar{g}_*^{(S)}$ is the value of $g_*^{(S)}$ at a reference temperature T_r below that of e^\pm annihilation, but such that the three active neutrinos are still relativistic. The quantity Ω_R denotes as usual the ratio of (today's) energy density in radiation to ρ_{cr} , which can be conventionally expressed in terms of the effective number of neutrino species $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$ and the ratio Ω_γ of the photon energy density $\rho_\gamma = \pi^2 T_0^4/15$ to ρ_{cr} :

$$h^2 \Omega_R = h^2 \Omega_\gamma \left[1 + N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)} \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{4}{11} \right)^{4/3} \right], \quad (2.14)$$

where as usual T_0 is today's temperature and $h \equiv H_0/(100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1})$.

Note that $h^2\Omega_R$ can be computed once $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$ is known because $h^2\Omega_\gamma$ is determined by the known value of T_0 [25]:

$$h^2\Omega_\gamma = h^2 \frac{\rho_\gamma}{\rho_{\text{cr}}} = \frac{\pi^2 T_0^4}{45 \bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left(\frac{h}{H_0} \right)^2, \quad (2.15)$$

which is independent of the value of H_0 because this quantity only appears in the ratio h/H_0 . At the temperature T_r , by definition, all active neutrinos are relativistic and would contribute to $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$, but it is important to keep in mind that near the present epoch at least two active neutrinos are non relativistic (see Refs. [26, 27] for recent bounds on their masses). The value of Ω_R depends on whether today the lightest neutrino is relativistic or not. In order to compute the active neutrino contribution to $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$ and to the parameters \bar{g}_* and \bar{g}_*^S , which also enter Eq. (2.11), one should recall that a relativistic neutrino species after e^\pm annihilation features a temperature $T_\nu = (4/11)^{1/3}T$. Moreover, generically $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$ and the parameters \bar{g}_* and \bar{g}_*^S can also receive a contribution from extra species that are relativistic at the temperature T_0 and T_r , respectively (if any).

In order to use (2.11) we need to estimate the dependence of T_q on q . This can be obtained by applying the entropy conservation in the form

$$g_*^S(T_q) T_q^3 a^3(\tau_q) = g_{*0}^S T_0^3. \quad (2.16)$$

The quantity $g_{*0}^S \equiv g_*^S(T_0)$ certainly receives a contribution from photons, but can also receive a contribution from one active neutrino (depending on its mass) and other possible extra species that are relativistic at the present time (if any). By using (2.11) in (2.16) one finds

$$T_q = \left(\frac{g_{*0}^S}{\bar{g}_*^S} \right)^{1/3} \frac{c(T_q) T_0 q}{H_0 \Omega_R^{1/2}}, \quad (2.17)$$

where $c(T)$ is a slowly-varying function of T given by

$$c(T) = \left(\frac{g_*(T)}{\bar{g}_*} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\bar{g}_*^S}{g_*^S(T)} \right)^{-1/3}. \quad (2.18)$$

Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18) can be used to estimate T_q as a function of q : we can first approximate $c(T_q)$ with its value at the q -independent temperature $T_{q0} \equiv T_r$, i.e. $c(T_q) \simeq c(T_{q0}) = 1$, which gives in the right-hand side of Eq. (2.17)

$$T_{q1} \equiv \left(\frac{g_{*0}^S}{\bar{g}_*^S} \right)^{1/3} \frac{T_0 q}{H_0 \Omega_R^{1/2}}. \quad (2.19)$$

Next we approximate $c(T_q) \simeq c(T_{q1})$, which gives through (2.17)

$$T_{q2} \equiv \left(\frac{g_{*0}^S}{\bar{g}_*^S} \right)^{1/3} \frac{c(T_{q1}) T_0 q}{H_0 \Omega_R^{1/2}}, \quad (2.20)$$

Reiterating this procedure a few times one obtains a good estimate of T_q . In practise, $T_q \simeq T_{q2}$ is already good enough for our purposes.

One can obtain a more convenient expression for $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ by writing

$$\mathcal{P}_{t,\text{in}}(f) = r(q_*)A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) \left(\frac{f}{f_*}\right)^{n_t}, \quad (2.21)$$

where q_* is a pivot scale used in cosmic microwave background (CMB) observations, $A_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the amplitude of the (scalar) curvature perturbation, r is the tensor-to-scalar ratio, $f_* = q_*/(2\pi)$ and n_t is the spectral index of tensor perturbations. In the specific case of single-field inflation (which is the relevant one in CHI) $n_t = -r/8$, but Eq. (2.21) holds even in multi-field inflationary scenarios. By inserting (2.21) in (2.2)-(2.3) one obtains

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) = \frac{\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f^2 |\mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}}(f)|^2 r(q_*) A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) \left(\frac{f}{f_*}\right)^{n_t}. \quad (2.22)$$

This formula might be changed by the reheating era, but for the frequency range relevant for ground-based and space-borne interferometers as well as pulsar timing arrays, we checked that these corrections are negligible for a reheating temperature T_{RH} above the 10^{10} GeV scale. As we will see in Sec. 3, this is the case in HI, which we focus on in this work.

As a final remark for this section, note that $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}$ as well as T_q and \mathcal{T}_{GW} are independent of H_0 and thus their determination is not affected by the problem of the Hubble tension (see Ref. [28] for a recent review).

3 (Critical) Higgs inflation

In this work we focus on the case in which the role of the inflaton is played by the Higgs field. However, we would like to provide a model-independent treatment: in this section we do not assume to work within the SM.

A viable HI means in particular that, in the presence of other scalar fields, the Higgs direction in the potential should be relatively flat compared to the other ones. Moreover, there should be a non-minimal coupling between the Higgs doublet H and the Ricci scalar² R , which appears in the following term in the action

$$- \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \xi_H |H|^2 R. \quad (3.1)$$

This term is present together with the standard Einstein-Hilbert term in what is known as the Jordan-frame action. By performing a field redefinition one can trade the non-minimal coupling with a modification of the other terms (minimally coupled to gravity) where the matter fields appear, such as the scalar potential. This set of redefined fields is known as the Einstein frame (see Refs. [29,30] for a general discussion in the presence of an arbitrary number of scalar, vector and fermion fields). As well-known, and as will become clear shortly, the ξ_H term in (3.1) is needed to have a sufficiently flat Higgs potential in the Einstein frame.

Also, reheating after inflation occurs very efficiently in HI (both in the critical and non-critical versions) [31,32] because the Higgs has sizable couplings to other SM particles. Even restricting to the SM, this leads to a high reheating temperature, $T_{\text{RH}} \gtrsim 10^{13}$ GeV. The presence of extra particles in a BSM scenario can further increase T_{RH} because of possible extra Higgs decay channels.

²For the signature of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ we use the mostly minus convention, g is the metric determinant, $R \equiv g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}$, where $R_{\mu\nu} \equiv R_{\rho\mu}{}^{\rho}{}_{\nu}$, $R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho}{}_{\sigma} \equiv \partial_{\mu}\Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^{\rho} - \partial_{\nu}\Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^{\rho} + \Gamma_{\mu\tau}^{\rho}\Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^{\tau} - \Gamma_{\nu\tau}^{\rho}\Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^{\tau}$ and $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}$ is the Levi-Civita connection.

3.1 Classical aspects

Studying Higgs inflation in the unitary gauge, the Einstein-frame potential of the canonically normalized Higgs field ϕ' is given by (see e.g. [15])

$$U_H \equiv \frac{V_H}{\Omega_H^4} = \frac{\lambda_H \phi(\phi')^4}{4(1 + \xi_H \phi(\phi')^2/\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2)^2}, \quad (3.2)$$

where ϕ is the Higgs field non-minimally coupled to gravity that is related to ϕ' through

$$\frac{d\phi'}{d\phi} = \Omega_H^{-2} \sqrt{\Omega_H^2 + \frac{3\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \left(\frac{d\Omega_H^2}{d\phi}\right)^2}, \quad (3.3)$$

Ω_H^2 is defined by

$$\Omega_H^2 \equiv 1 + \frac{2\xi_H |H|^2}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \quad (3.4)$$

and $V_H = \lambda_H \phi^4/4$ corresponds to the Higgs potential in the Jordan frame, which involves the Higgs quartic coupling λ_H . Eq. (3.2) tells us that U_H becomes flat for a sufficiently large ϕ (and thus ϕ' , as this is a monotonically increasing function of ϕ) at least for $\xi_H > 0$. We impose this positivity condition in the present work.

In a spatially flat FRW geometry the equations for the spatially homogeneous field $\phi'(t)$ and the cosmological scale factor $a(t)$ are

$$\ddot{\phi}' + \frac{\sqrt{3\dot{\phi}'^2 + 6U_H}}{\sqrt{2}\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}} \dot{\phi}' + \frac{dU_H}{d\phi'} = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$H_I^2 = \frac{\dot{\phi}'^2 + 2U_H}{6\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

where a dot represents the derivative with respect to cosmic time t and $H_I \equiv \dot{a}/a$.

In the slow-roll approximation the parameters

$$\epsilon_H \equiv \frac{\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{U_H} \frac{dU_H}{d\phi'} \right)^2, \quad \eta_H \equiv \frac{\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2}{U_H} \frac{d^2 U_H}{d\phi'^2} \quad (3.7)$$

are small and one can simplify considerably the calculation of the functions $\phi'(t)$ and $a(t)$ and the inflationary observables.

To be successful, inflation must last long enough, which leads to a lower bound on the number of e-folds

$$N \equiv \int_{t_b}^{t_e} dt H_I(t), \quad (3.8)$$

where t_e is the time when inflation ends and t_b is the time when the various inflationary observables such as $A_{\mathcal{R}}$, the corresponding spectral index n_s and r are determined through observations. In the slow-roll approximation N is expressed as a function of the field ϕ'_b (at t_b) rather than as a function of time,

$$N = \int_{\phi'_e}^{\phi'_b} \frac{U_H}{\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left(\frac{dU_H}{d\phi'} \right)^{-1} d\phi', \quad (3.9)$$

where ϕ'_e is the field value at the end of inflation.

3.2 Quantum aspects and critical version

At quantum level the formulæ of Sec. 3.1 remain approximately valid except that one must consider λ_H and ξ_H as functions of ϕ' . Since the definition of these functions can be ambiguous [6, 7, 18, 33, 34] here we adopt the quantization used in [15, 16], which can be embedded in a UV completion of gravity [35–38] (see Refs. [29, 30] for reviews). In this approach the ϕ' -dependence of λ_H and ξ_H is obtained by solving the renormalization group equations (RGEs), which depends on the specific model one considers. This procedure, however, applies both to the critical and non-critical version of Higgs inflation.

With this approach $n_s(q_*)$, $A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*)$ and $r(q_*)$ can be computed through

$$n_s(q_*) = 1 - 6\epsilon_H + 2\eta_H, \quad r(q_*) = 16\epsilon_H, \quad A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) = \frac{U_H/\epsilon_H}{24\pi^2 \bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^4}, \quad (3.10)$$

evaluated at ϕ'_b .

These theoretical predictions must satisfy the observational limits, which put constraints on specific models realizing CHI. In 2018 Planck released its last cosmological observations related to inflation [39]:

$$n_s(q_*) = 0.9649 \pm 0.0042 \text{ (68\%CL)}, \quad r(q_*) < 0.076 \text{ (95\%CL)}, \quad (3.11)$$

while for the curvature power spectrum

$$A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) = (2.10 \pm 0.03)10^{-9}, \quad (3.12)$$

where the pivot scale $q_* = 0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ is used.

The main features of CHI are a bigger value of r and a smaller value of ξ_H compared to the non-critical HI. The former property gives us the hope to detect primordial gravitational waves in the near future, as we will see in the next sections. The latter one pushes the scale of the perturbative breaking of unitarity $\sim \bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}/\xi_H$ (pointed out in Refs. [9]) very close to the Planck scale, where anyhow new degrees of freedom are needed to UV complete Einstein gravity. As shown in [10, 16] CHI is a viable effective field theory: the cutoff (i.e. the maximal energy below which consistency is possible) is much above the inflationary energy $U_H^{1/4}$. In the rest of the paper we will assume that the new degrees of freedom required by the UV completion do not already appear at or just above $U_H^{1/4}$. The viability of such assumption has been established in [10, 16]. This guarantees that the predictions for the inflationary observables are not significantly altered by the above-mentioned degrees of freedom.

4 Relevant gravitational wave detectors

How sensitive should a GW detector be in order to observe the spectral density $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}$ in (2.22)? This depends essentially on the four quantities \mathcal{T}_{GW} , $r(q_*)$, $A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*)$ and n_t . To make a rough estimate we can consider the SM, which will be analyzed in more detail in Sec. 5. Using (2.10) and (2.11), this case corresponds to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}} \sim 10^{-21} \text{ Hz}/f$ and inserting in (2.22) one obtains the order-of-magnitude estimate

$$h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) \sim 10^{-16} \left(\frac{r(q_*)}{0.076} \right) \left(\frac{A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*)}{2.10 \times 10^{-9}} \right) \left(\frac{f}{f_*} \right)^{n_t}. \quad (4.1)$$

Planck data [39] put some constraints on multi-field inflationary scenarios so we can approximate $n_t \simeq -r/8$, which means that $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ has a weak dependence on f (cf. the bound on r in (3.11)). So using the observational information in (3.11) and (3.12), the estimate in (4.1) tells us that a GW detector should reach a sensitivity corresponding to $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim 10^{-16}$. This is some orders of magnitude below the sensitivity of ground-based interferometers and the Laser Interferometer Space Antenna (LISA) [40]. However, some future space-borne experiments may reach it.

One of these is the proposed Japanese mission DECI-hertz Interferometer Gravitational wave Observatory (DECIGO) [41], which would reach the sensitivity to $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim 10^{-17}$ around the scale $f \sim 0.1$ Hz. Indeed, the primary objective of DECIGO is to directly observe the beginning of the universe.

Another space-based gravitational-wave detector that can reach a similar sensitivity is the proposed Big Bang Observer (BBO) [42, 43], which is intended as a follow on mission to LISA. Although LISA's sensitivity is several orders of magnitude away from the required 10^{-16} , BBO can reach this goal. The Advanced Laser Interferometer Antenna (ALIA) [42, 44] is yet another proposed space-based interferometer with similar characteristics, although with a slightly smaller frequency scale where the maximal sensitivity is reached.

5 The Standard Model case

Let us first apply these results to the SM or, more generically, to any model where all extra fields are decoupled.

In this case the temperature-frequency relation in Eq. (2.17) is uniquely determined up to a small uncertainty due to the fact that the lightest neutrino can be relativistic or non relativistic today:

$$T_{2\pi f} \simeq 10^7 \text{ GeV} \frac{f}{\text{Hz}} \times \begin{cases} 3.87 & \text{(relativistic lightest neutrino)} \\ 3.91 & \text{(non-relativistic lightest neutrino)} \end{cases} . \quad (5.1)$$

Here we focus on the case $T \gtrsim 100$ GeV as this corresponds to frequencies that space-borne as well (as ground-based) GW detectors are sensitive to. The uncertainty in (5.1) can be neglected within the approximations performed in Sec. 2. The two cases above, however, lead to a sizeable difference when computing the transfer function because of its dependence on $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$, cf. Eqs. (2.10), (2.11) and (2.14):

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{GW}}(f) \simeq 10^{-21} \frac{\text{Hz}}{f} \times \begin{cases} 1.25 & \text{(relativistic lightest neutrino)} \\ 1.13 & \text{(non-relativistic lightest neutrino)} \end{cases} . \quad (5.2)$$

The next step is to determine the inflationary observables appearing in (2.22). We realize CHI in the SM as explained in Ref. [15]. Regarding the determination of the dependence λ_H and ξ_H on ϕ' , we solve here the RGEs given in the appendix of [45] with the procedure outlined in [15]. Since we are at criticality, the values of the relevant SM couplings at the EW scale are actually chosen differently compared to the current central values, which would correspond to living too far from the border between the absolute stability and the metastability of the EW vacuum. In particular, we set $M_t \simeq 171.04$ GeV, which, following Ref. [15], corresponds to the critical point (see Ref. [46] for the experimental value of M_t).




Figure 1: The GW spectral density as a function of the frequency f in the SM. The two distinct cases of relativistic and non-relativistic lightest neutrino are considered and this corresponds to the width of the quasi-horizontal black band in the right plot (computed with $\xi_H(\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}) \simeq 12.3$). In the left plot we also display the dependence on the number of e-folds N around the value 60. The SM GW spectral density is also compared to sensitivity curves of future GW detectors in the right plot. In the right plot we also give the predictions in the νMSM corresponding to the parameter values quoted in the text (purple quasi-horizontal dashed lines).

In Fig. 1 we show $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ in two distinct cases: when the lightest (active) neutrino is still relativistic today and when it is not. As shown in the left plot of that figure the result depends on the number of e-folds N , which is taken there to be around 60, and, more importantly, on whether today the lightest neutrino is relativistic or not. In computing N we have taken into account the exact equation of motion of the Higgs field without using the slow-roll approximation. This is significantly more precise than using the slow-roll expression because of the presence of a (quasi) inflection point in the CHI potential [15]. In the right plot of Fig. 1 it is shown how the primordial GWs generated by CHI are within the sensitivity of the future space-borne GW detectors BBO, DECIGO and ALIA. The experimental curves are power-law integrated sensitivity curves, which are determined following the method described in [47,48]. In Fig. 1 we also show the predictions of a BSM scenario that will be discussed in Sec. 6.

Note that $M_t \simeq 171.04$ GeV that we used in the SM is about 2σ away from the current central value [46]. CHI in the SM also predicts inflationary observables that are in tension with the most recent Planck bounds [39], namely [15]

$$n_s(q_*) \simeq 0.97, \quad r(q_*) \simeq 0.076, \quad A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) \simeq 2.2 \times 10^{-9}, \quad (5.3)$$

where we used the value of N quoted in Fig. 1. Similar tensions were also pointed out in Ref. [49]. However, we should keep in mind that the SM certainly has to be extended because of well-established observations (e.g. neutrino oscillations and DM) as we discussed in the introduction.

6 A well-motivated BSM scenario

We then move to consider the $a\nu$ MSM case [16, 21]. This is an SM extension (defined in Sec. 6.1) that can account for all the experimentally confirmed signals of BSM physics (neutrino oscillations and dark matter) and can solve other issues of the SM (baryon asymmetry, the strong CP problem³, the metastability of the EW vacuum and inflation) *at the same time*.

6.1 Definition of the $a\nu$ MSM

We now give the details of the $a\nu$ MSM that are needed for the following discussion (see Refs. [16, 21] for further details). To the SM fields one adds three sterile neutrinos N_i and the fields of the Kim-Shifman-Vainshtein-Zakharov (KSVZ) QCD axion model [51] (two Weyl quarks q_1, q_2 neutral under $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ and a complex scalar A). This provides a simple but realistic implementation of the Peccei-Quinn mechanism [52], which solves the strong CP problem.

The SM Lagrangian, \mathcal{L}_{SM} , is extended by adding three terms,

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \mathcal{L}_N + \mathcal{L}_{\text{axion}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{gravity}}, \quad (6.1)$$

\mathcal{L}_N represents the sterile-neutrino-dependent piece:

$$i\bar{N}_i \not{\partial} N_i + \left(\frac{1}{2} N_i M_{ij} N_j + Y_{ij} L_i H N_j + \text{h.c.} \right), \quad (6.2)$$

where the Majorana mass matrix M is taken diagonal and real, $M = \text{diag}(M_1, M_2, M_3)$, without loss of generality. $\mathcal{L}_{\text{axion}}$ is the KSVZ piece:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{axion}} = i \sum_{j=1}^2 \bar{q}_j \not{\partial} q_j + |\partial A|^2 - (y q_2 A q_1 + \text{h.c.}) - \Delta V(H, A),$$

where $\Delta V(H, A)$ is the A -dependent term in the classical potential

$$\Delta V(H, A) \equiv \lambda_A (|A|^2 - f_a^2/2)^2 + \lambda_{HA} (|H|^2 - v^2) (|A|^2 - f_a^2/2),$$

f_a is the axion decay constant and $v \simeq 174$ GeV is the EW breaking scale. Finally,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gravity}} = - \left(\frac{\bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} + \xi_H (|H|^2 - v^2) + \xi_A (|A|^2 - f_a^2/2) \right) R - \Lambda, \quad (6.3)$$

where R is the Ricci scalar, ξ_H and ξ_A represent the non-minimal couplings of H and A to gravity and Λ is the cosmological constant. In the $a\nu$ MSM the inflaton is identified with the Higgs; like in the SM, it is possible to do so with $\xi_H \sim \mathcal{O}(10)$, as discussed in Ref. [16], when we are close to the frontier between the stability and the metastability of the EW vacuum (critical Higgs inflation)⁴.

³The other two fine-tuning problems of the SM (the Higgs mass and cosmological constant problems) could be addressed, unlike the strong CP one, with anthropic arguments [50].

⁴A variant of the $a\nu$ MSM, where the M_{ij} are generated through the vacuum expectation value of A (which we denote by $\langle A \rangle$) and $|A|$ takes part in a multi-field inflationary dynamics, has been subsequently proposed in [53–55]. See also Ref. [56] for a study of the corresponding inflationary GW spectrum.

The active-neutrino masses m_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are obtained by diagonalizing the matrix

$$m_\nu = \frac{m_{D1}m_{D1}^T}{M_1} + \frac{m_{D2}m_{D2}^T}{M_2} + \frac{m_{D3}m_{D3}^T}{M_3}, \quad (6.4)$$

where the arrays m_{Di} ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the columns of the Dirac mass matrix $m_D = vY$ i.e. $m_D = (m_{D1}, m_{D2}, m_{D3})$. We then express Y in terms of the M_i and m_i as done in Refs. [16, 21].

On the other hand, the PQ symmetry breaking induced by $\langle A \rangle = f_a/\sqrt{2}$ gives to the extra quarks a Dirac mass $M_q = yf_a/\sqrt{2}$ and to the extra scalar a squared mass

$$M_A^2 = f_a^2 \left(2\lambda_A + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{v^2}{f_a^2} \right) \right). \quad (6.5)$$

Since

$$f_a \gtrsim 10^8 \text{ GeV} \quad (6.6)$$

(see Ref. [57] for a review), the $\mathcal{O}(v^2/f_a^2)$ term is very small and will be neglected.

One may wonder whether the PQ symmetry breaking generates a first-order phase transition in this model, such that one may hope to detect the corresponding GWs as well. The answer to this question is negative [58, 59] (see also Ref. [48] for a previous related discussion), although one can build different BSM scenarios where instead that happens [58–60]. Nevertheless, as we show in Sec. 6.2, CHI in the ν MSM can lead to an inflationary background of GWs, which can be observed by future detectors.

Let us now discuss the other generic observational bounds that are relevant for our purposes (see Refs. [16, 21] for a discussion of the remaining observational bounds).

Regarding the active-neutrinos, here we take the currently most precise values reported in [26, 27] for normal ordering (which is currently preferred) of the following quantities: Δm_{21}^2 , Δm_{31}^2 (where $\Delta m_{ij}^2 \equiv m_i^2 - m_j^2$), the active-neutrino mixing angles and the CP phase in the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix. One must also take into account the cosmological upper bound on the sum of the neutrino masses [61]

$$\sum_i m_i < 0.12 \text{ eV}. \quad (6.7)$$

Regarding the SM sector, we also have to fix the values of the relevant SM couplings at the EW scale, which we identify conventionally with the top mass⁵ $M_t \simeq 172.5 \text{ GeV}$ [46]. We take the values computed in [20], which expresses these quantities in terms of M_t , the Higgs mass $M_h \simeq 125.1 \text{ GeV}$ [62], the strong fine-structure constant renormalized at the Z mass, $\alpha_s(M_Z) \simeq 0.1184$ [63] and $M_W \simeq 80.379 \text{ GeV}$ [62] (see the quoted references for the uncertainties on these quantities).

Regarding the axion, besides the lower bound in (6.6) we have an upper bound on f_a that is obtained by requiring that dark matter is not overproduced. Such bound has a mild logarithmic dependence on λ_A (for e.g. λ_A around the scale 10^{-1} , it is about $5 \times 10^{10} \text{ GeV}$ [22]). When f_a saturates this bound the axion accounts for the whole dark matter [64, 65], while for smaller values the rest of dark matter can be explained with the lightest sterile neutrino [66–69], forming a two-component DM [22].

Finally, as far as the determination of the dependence λ_H and ξ_H on ϕ' is concerned, we solve here the RGEs given in the appendix of [22] as explained in [16].

⁵In the ν MSM (unlike in the SM) we take the central value $M_t \simeq 172.5 \text{ GeV}$ for the top mass.

6.2 Inflationary gravitational waves in the $a\nu$ MSM

We now apply the formalism of Sec. 2 to determine the primordial GW spectrum generated by CHI in the $a\nu$ MSM.

Here we have an extra very light particle, the axion. Note that the effect of axion free-streaming is only at the % level (see e.g. Fig. 8 of Ref. [56]) and can be neglected within the approximations that have been performed here. This means that we can keep solving the vacuum equation (2.8) for the tensor perturbations h_λ .

A crucial ingredient to compute the GW spectrum of interest is $a(\tau_q)$, which has been estimated in Eq. (2.11). Let us analyse in turn the various ingredients that are needed to determine $a(\tau_q)$ in the $a\nu$ MSM.

A first quantity that we need is the reference temperature T_r , which enters $a(\tau_q)$ because $\bar{g}_*^{(S)}$ is the value of $g_*^{(S)}$ at T_r . In the $a\nu$ MSM we take T_r by definition to be below that of e^\pm annihilation, but such that the three active neutrinos *and* the axion are still relativistic. Such a temperature exists thanks to the lower bound on f_a in (6.6) (which provides an upper bound on the axion mass m_a , see again Ref. [57] for a review).

Moreover, generically $N_{\text{eff}}^{(\nu)}$ can receive an axion contribution, which, however, is very small. The value of Ω_R that enters $a(\tau_q)$, therefore, essentially only depends on whether today the lightest neutrino is relativistic or not, like in the SM.

Other quantities that appear in $a(\tau_q)$ are \bar{g}_* and \bar{g}_*^S ; besides the photons and active neutrinos, the QCD axions respecting the lower bound in (6.6) gives an extra contribution to these parameters (which is also quite small).

Finally, in the $a\nu$ MSM $g_{*0}^S \equiv g_*^S(T_0)$, which is one of the quantities needed to compute the dependence of T_q on q , can also receive a contribution from the axion (depending on its mass).

These axion contributions can be computed explicitly knowing the decoupling temperature⁶ T_{dec}^a of axions [56, 70] and their temperature after decoupling [57]

$$T_a = T_\nu \left\{ \frac{2}{g_*^S(T_h) - 1} \left[\left(\frac{T}{T_\nu} \right)^3 + \frac{21}{8} \right] \right\}^{1/3} = T_\nu \left(\frac{43}{4(g_*^S(T_h) - 1)} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (6.9)$$

where T_h represents some high value of T at a time when all particles shared the same temperature. Thermal axion production has been studied in detail in Ref. [71] (see also Refs. [70, 72] for previous studies).

Moreover, realizing CHI in the $a\nu$ MSM can also provide values of the inflationary parameters in agreement with the most recent Planck bounds [39], in addition to accounting for neutrino oscillations, dark matter and baryon asymmetry, solving the strong CP problem and stabilizing the EW vacuum (all at the same time). This is the case, for example, setting the experimental inputs as in Sec. 6.1 and the values of the other parameters as follows: $M_1 = 10^{11}$ GeV, $M_2 = 6.4 \times 10^{13}$ GeV,

⁶A simple formula for T_{dec}^a was proposed by [70]

$$T_{\text{dec}}^a \simeq 9.6 \times 10^6 \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{f_a}{10^{10} \text{ GeV}} \right)^{2.246}. \quad (6.8)$$

We observe that this formula gives a T_{dec}^a always below f_a as long as $f_a \lesssim 10^{12}$ GeV, which is required in order not to overproduce dark matter [22].

$M_3 > \bar{M}_{\text{Pl}}$, $f_a \simeq 5 \times 10^{10}$ GeV, $\lambda_{HA}(M_A) \simeq 0.016$, $\lambda_A(M_A) \simeq 0.10$, $y(M_A) = 0.1$, $\xi_H(M_A) \simeq 14$ and $\xi_A(M_A) \simeq -2.6$. This gives the following values of the inflationary observables

$$n_s(q_*) \simeq 0.965, \quad r(q_*) = 0.048, \quad A_{\mathcal{R}}(q_*) = 2.1 \times 10^{-9} \quad (6.10)$$

and a number of e-folds around 60. These values are in perfect agreement with the Planck constraints in (3.11) and (3.12). Moreover, in the $a\nu$ MSM all tensions between theoretical predictions and experimental values, which occur in the SM (cf. the end of Sec. 5), are removed. The rather high value of r predicted by CHI in the $a\nu$ MSM may be tested with other CMB observations, such as those of BICEP and the Keck Array [73]. Future planned CMB experiments (e.g. CMB S4 [74] and LiteBIRD [75]) will be sensitive to smaller values of r and thus will be able to test further CHI, even in a larger class of models.

The corresponding GW predictions are compared with the BBO, DECIGO and ALIA sensitivities in Fig. 1 (right plot). As clear from that plot, these space-borne interferometers have the potential to detect directly these inflationary GWs.

The model does not predict other GW sources that could hide such signals. Indeed, The QCD and the electroweak transitions are too weak to generate GWs both in the SM (as well known) and in the $a\nu$ MSM: the BSM degrees of freedom are either too massive or they couple too weakly to the SM particles to obtain first order phase transitions, which are necessary to generate observable GWs. Another possible source of GWs is preheating after inflation, which can occur through parametric resonance or tachyonic effects. However, such GWs are always peaked at a much higher frequency, $\gtrsim 10^7$ Hz [76, 77] and so should not overlap significantly with the signals discussed here. Finally, the amplitude of gravitational waves produced by QCD axion string-wall networks is too small to be observed even in future gravitational wave detectors with high sensitivities [78].

7 Conclusions

In this work we have explored the possibility to test the Higgs sector through GW interferometers. In particular, we have computed the inflationary GW background due to the tensor linear perturbations coming from quantum fluctuations during HI. We have focused on CHI because in this case one can push the scale of the perturbative breaking of unitarity due to ξ_H very close to the Planck scale, where anyhow new degrees of freedom are needed to UV complete Einstein gravity. Furthermore, in the CHI, unlike in the non-critical variant, it is not necessary to fine tune the high energy values of any parameters in order to preserve the quantum inflationary predictions, as commented in the introduction. This is possible because CHI features a moderate value of ξ_H , of order 10.

After a rather general calculation of the inflationary GW spectral density $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ due to the tensor linear perturbations, both the SM and a well-motivated phenomenological completion below the Planck scale have been studied in detail. The latter model, dubbed the $a\nu$ MSM, features three right-handed neutrinos and a KSVZ axion sector in addition to the SM fields. Despite being very simple, the $a\nu$ MSM accounts for neutrino oscillations, dark matter, the baryon asymmetry in the universe, solves the strong CP problem and stabilizes the EW vacuum at the same time. While in the SM CHI is in tension with some particle physics data (in particular M_t) and cosmological

CMB observations, the av MSM allows us to implement CHI without any tension with our current experimental knowledge.

We have established that, both in the SM and in the above-mentioned BSM scenario, CHI generates an inflationary GW spectrum due to the tensor linear perturbations that is within the reach of some space-borne GW interferometers, such as DECIGO, BBO and ALIA.

References

- [1] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations], “Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016) [[arXiv:1602.03837](#)].
- [2] B. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], “GW150914: Implications for the stochastic gravitational wave background from binary black holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no.13, 131102 (2016) [[arXiv:1602.03847](#)].
- [3] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS], “Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012), 1-29 [[arXiv:1207.7214](#)].
- [4] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS], “Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012), 30-61 [[arXiv:1207.7235](#)].
- [5] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, “The Standard Model Higgs boson as the inflaton,” *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 703 [[arXiv:0710.3755](#)].
- [6] F. L. Bezrukov, A. Magnin and M. Shaposhnikov, “Standard Model Higgs boson mass from inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **675** (2009) 88 [[arXiv:0812.4950](#)].
- [7] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, “Standard Model Higgs boson mass from inflation: Two loop analysis,” *JHEP* **0907** (2009) 089 [[arXiv:0904.1537](#)].
- [8] A. Salvio, “Higgs Inflation at NNLO after the Boson Discovery,” *Phys. Lett. B* **727** (2013) 234 [[arXiv:1308.2244](#)].
- [9] C. P. Burgess, H. M. Lee and M. Trott, “Power-counting and the Validity of the Classical Approximation During Inflation,” *JHEP* **0909** (2009) 103 [[arXiv:0902.4465](#)]. J. L. F. Barbon and J. R. Espinosa, “On the Naturalness of Higgs Inflation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 081302 [[arXiv:0903.0355](#)]. M. P. Hertzberg, “On Inflation with Non-minimal Coupling,” *JHEP* **1011** (2010) 023 [[arXiv:1002.2995](#)]. C. P. Burgess, S. P. Patil and M. Trott, “On the Predictiveness of Single-Field Inflationary Models,” *JHEP* **1406** (2014) 010 [[arXiv:1402.1476](#)]. C. P. Burgess, H. M. Lee and M. Trott, “Comment on Higgs Inflation and Naturalness,” *JHEP* **1007** (2010) 007 [[arXiv:1002.2730](#)].
- [10] F. Bezrukov, A. Magnin, M. Shaposhnikov and S. Sibiryakov, “Higgs inflation: consistency and generalisations,” *JHEP* **01** (2011), 016 [[arXiv:1008.5157](#)].
- [11] A. Salvio and A. Mazumdar, “Classical and Quantum Initial Conditions for Higgs Inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **750** (2015) 194 [[arXiv:1506.07520](#)].
- [12] Y. Ema, “Dynamical Emergence of Scalaron in Higgs Inflation,” *JCAP* **09** (2019), 027 [[arXiv:1907.00993](#)].
- [13] X. Calmet and I. Kuntz, “Higgs Starobinsky Inflation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.5, 289 [[arXiv:1605.02236](#)].
- [14] K. Kannike, G. Hutsi, L. Pizza, A. Racioppi, M. Raidal, A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Dynamically Induced Planck Scale and Inflation,” *JHEP* **1505** (2015) 065 [[arXiv:1502.01334](#)].
- [15] A. Salvio, “Initial Conditions for Critical Higgs Inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **780** (2018), 111-117 [[arXiv:1712.04477](#)].

- [16] A. Salvio, “Critical Higgs inflation in a Viable Motivated Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) no.1, 015037 [[arXiv:1810.00792](#)].
- [17] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, K. y. Oda and S. C. Park, “Higgs Inflation is Still Alive after the Results from BICEP2,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) no.24, 241301 [[arXiv:1403.5043](#)].
- [18] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, “Higgs inflation at the critical point,” *Phys. Lett. B* **734** (2014) 249 [[arXiv:1403.6078](#)].
- [19] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, K. y. Oda and S. C. Park, “Higgs inflation from Standard Model criticality,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 053008 [[arXiv:1408.4864](#)].
- [20] D. Buttazzo, G. Degrassi, P. P. Giardino, G. F. Giudice, F. Sala, A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Investigating the near-criticality of the Higgs boson,” *JHEP* **12** (2013), 089 [[arXiv:1307.3536](#)].
- [21] A. Salvio, “A Simple Motivated Completion of the Standard Model below the Planck Scale: Axions and Right-Handed Neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **743** (2015) 428 [[arXiv:1501.03781](#)].
- [22] A. Salvio and S. Scollo, “Axion-Sterile-Neutrino Dark Matter,” [[arXiv:2104.01334](#)].
- [23] M. Maggiore, “Gravitational Waves. Vol. 2: Astrophysics and Cosmology,” Oxford University Press, 3, 2018.
- [24] K. Saikawa and S. Shirai, “Primordial gravitational waves, precisely: The role of thermodynamics in the Standard Model,” *JCAP* **05**, 035 (2018) [[arXiv:1803.01038](#)].
- [25] D. J. Fixsen, “The Temperature of the Cosmic Microwave Background,” *Astrophys. J.* **707** (2009), 916-920 [[arXiv:0911.1955](#)].
- [26] I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz and A. Zhou, “The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations,” *JHEP* **09**, 178 (2020) [[arXiv:2007.14792](#)].
- [27] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, S. Gariazzo, P. Martínez-Miravé, O. Mena, C. A. Ternes, M. Tórtola and J. W. F. Valle, “2020 Global reassessment of the neutrino oscillation picture,” [[arXiv:2006.11237](#)].
- [28] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, “In the Realm of the Hubble tension – a Review of Solutions,” [[arXiv:2103.01183](#)].
- [29] A. Salvio, “Quadratic Gravity,” *Front. in Phys.* **6** (2018), 77 [[arXiv:1804.09944](#)].
- [30] A. Salvio, “Dimensional Transmutation in Gravity and Cosmology,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **36** (2021) no.08n09, 2130006 [[arXiv:2012.11608](#)].
- [31] F. Bezrukov, D. Gorbunov and M. Shaposhnikov, “On initial conditions for the Hot Big Bang,” *JCAP* **0906** (2009) 029 [[arXiv:0812.3622](#)].
- [32] J. Garcia-Bellido, D. G. Figueroa and J. Rubio, “Preheating in the Standard Model with the Higgs-Inflaton coupled to gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 063531 [[arXiv:0812.4624](#)].
- [33] F. Bezrukov, J. Rubio and M. Shaposhnikov, “Living beyond the edge: Higgs inflation and vacuum metastability,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) no.8, 083512 [[arXiv:1412.3811](#)].
- [34] F. Bezrukov, M. Pauly and J. Rubio, “On the robustness of the primordial power spectrum in renormalized Higgs inflation,” *JCAP* **1802** (2018) no.02, 040 [[arXiv:1706.05007](#)].
- [35] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity,” *JHEP* **1406** (2014) 080 [[arXiv:1403.4226](#)].
- [36] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Agravity up to infinite energy,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) no.2, 124 [[arXiv:1705.03896](#)].
- [37] A. Salvio, “Metastability in Quadratic Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) no.10, 103507 [[arXiv:1902.09557](#)].
- [38] A. Salvio, “Quasi-Conformal Models and the Early Universe,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) no.9, 750 [[arXiv:1907.00983](#)].
- [39] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “Planck 2015 results. XX. Constraints on inflation,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A20 [[arXiv:1502.02114](#)]. Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A10 [[arXiv:1807.06211](#)].

- [40] P. Amaro-Seoane *et al.* [LISA], “Laser Interferometer Space Antenna,” [[arXiv:1702.00786](#)]. T. Robson, N. J. Cornish and C. Liu, “The construction and use of LISA sensitivity curves,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) no.10, 105011 [[arXiv:1803.01944](#)].
- [41] S. Kawamura *et al.*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006), S125-S132. M. Musha [DECIGO Working group], “Space gravitational wave detector DECIGO/pre-DECIGO,” *Proc. SPIE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng.* 10562, 105623T (2017). S. Kawamura *et al.*, “Current status of space gravitational wave antenna DECIGO and B-DECIGO,” [[arXiv:2006.13545](#)]. See also the [DECIGO webpage](#).
- [42] J. Crowder and N. J. Cornish, “Beyond LISA: Exploring future GW missions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 083005 (2005) [[arXiv:gr-qc/0506015](#)].
- [43] G. Harry, P. Fritschel, D. Shaddock, W. Folkner and E. Phinney, “Laser interferometry for the big bang observer,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 4887-4894 (2006). V. Corbin and N. J. Cornish, “Detecting the cosmic GW background with the big bang observer,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 2435-2446 (2006) [[arXiv:gr-qc/0512039](#)].
- [44] X. Gong, Y. K. Lau, S. Xu, P. Amaro-Seoane, S. Bai, X. Bian, Z. Cao, G. Chen, X. Chen and Y. Ding, *et al.* “Descope of the ALIA mission,” *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **610** (2015) no.1, 012011 [[arXiv:1410.7296](#)].
- [45] K. Allison, “Higgs xi-inflation for the 125-126 GeV Higgs: a two-loop analysis,” *JHEP* **1402** (2014) 040 [[arXiv:1306.6931](#)].
- [46] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* 2020, 083C01 (2020).
- [47] E. Thrane and J. D. Romano, “Sensitivity curves for searches for gravitational-wave backgrounds,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) no.12, 124032 [[arXiv:1310.5300](#)].
- [48] P. S. B. Dev, F. Ferrer, Y. Zhang and Y. Zhang, “Gravitational Waves from First-Order Phase Transition in a Simple Axion-Like Particle Model,” *JCAP* **11** (2019), 006 [[arXiv:1905.00891](#)].
- [49] I. Masina, “Ruling out Critical Higgs Inflation?,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.4, 043536 [[arXiv:1805.02160](#)].
- [50] S. Weinberg, “Anthropic Bound on the Cosmological Constant,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1987) 2607. V. Agrawal, S. M. Barr, J. F. Donoghue and D. Seckel, “The Anthropic principle and the mass scale of the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 5480 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9707380](#)]. G. D’Amico, A. Strumia, A. Urbano and W. Xue, “Direct anthropic bound on the weak scale from supernovae explosions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.8, 083013 [[arXiv:1906.00986](#)].
- [51] J. E. Kim, “Weak interaction singlet and strong CP invariance,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43** (1979) 103. M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, “Can confinement ensure natural CP invariance of strong interactions?,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **166** (1980) 493.
- [52] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, “CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 1440. R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, “Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16** (1977) 1791.
- [53] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, “Unifying inflation with the axion, dark matter, baryogenesis and the seesaw mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (2017) no.7, 071802 [[arXiv:1608.05414](#)].
- [54] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, “Standard Model-axion-seesaw-Higgs portal inflation. Five problems of particle physics and cosmology solved in one stroke,” *JCAP* **1708** (2017) no.08, 001 [[arXiv:1610.01639](#)].
- [55] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, “Several Problems in Particle Physics and Cosmology Solved in One SMASH,” *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* **6** (2019), 55 [[arXiv:1904.05594](#)].
- [56] A. Ringwald, K. Saikawa and C. Tamarit, “Primordial gravitational waves in a minimal model of particle physics and cosmology,” *JCAP* **02** (2021), 046 [[arXiv:2009.02050](#)].

- [57] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi and L. Visinelli, “The landscape of QCD axion models,” *Phys. Rept.* **870** (2020), 1-117 [[arXiv:2003.01100](#)].
- [58] L. Delle Rose, G. Panico, M. Redi and A. Tesi, “Gravitational Waves from Supercool Axions,” *JHEP* **04** (2020), 025 [[arXiv:1912.06139](#)].
- [59] B. Von Harling, A. Pomarol, O. Pujolà and F. Rompineve, “Peccei-Quinn Phase Transition at LIGO,” *JHEP* **04** (2020), 195 [[arXiv:1912.07587](#)].
- [60] A. Ghoshal and A. Salvio, “Gravitational waves from fundamental axion dynamics,” *JHEP* **12** (2020), 049 [[arXiv:2007.00005](#)]. A. Salvio, “A fundamental QCD axion model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **808** (2020), 135686 [[arXiv:2003.10446](#)].
- [61] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A6 [[arXiv:1807.06209](#)].
- [62] M. Tanabashi *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 030001 (2018).
- [63] S. Bethke, “World Summary of α_s (2012),” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **234** (2013) 229 [[arXiv:1210.0325](#)].
- [64] J. Preskill, M. Wise, F. Wilczek, “Cosmology of the invisible axion,” *Phys. Lett. B* **120** (1983) 127. L. Abbott and P. Sikivie, “A cosmological bound on the invisible axion,” *Phys. Lett. B* **120** (1983) 133. M. Dine and W. Fischler, “The not so harmless axion,” *Phys. Lett. B* **120** (1983) 137.
- [65] R. L. Davis, “Cosmic Axions from Cosmic Strings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **180** (1986), 225-230. D. Harari and P. Sikivie, “On the Evolution of Global Strings in the Early Universe,” *Phys. Lett. B* **195** (1987), 361-365. R. L. Davis and E. P. S. Shellard, “Do Axions Need Inflation?,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **324** (1989), 167-186. R. A. Battye and E. P. S. Shellard, “Global string radiation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **423** (1994), 260-304 [[arXiv:astro-ph/9311017](#)]. M. Nagasawa and M. Kawasaki, “Collapse of axionic domain wall and axion emission,” *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994), 4821-4826 [[arXiv:astro-ph/9402066](#)]. T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki, K. Saikawa and T. Sekiguchi, “Production of dark matter axions from collapse of string-wall systems,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012), 105020 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012), 089902] [[arXiv:1202.5851](#)]. M. Kawasaki, K. Saikawa and T. Sekiguchi, “Axion dark matter from topological defects,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, no.6, 065014 (2015) [[arXiv:1412.0789](#)]. M. Gorghetto, E. Hardy and G. Villadoro, “Axions from Strings: the Attractive Solution,” *JHEP* **07** (2018), 151 [[arXiv:1806.04677](#)]. M. Gorghetto, E. Hardy and G. Villadoro, “More Axions from Strings,” *SciPost Phys.* **10** (2021), 050 [[arXiv:2007.04990](#)].
- [66] S. Dodelson and L. M. Widrow, “Sterile-neutrinos as dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 17-20 (1994) [[arXiv:hep-ph/9303287](#)].
- [67] X. D. Shi and G. M. Fuller, “A New dark matter candidate: Nonthermal sterile neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2832-2835 (1999) [[arXiv:astro-ph/9810076](#)].
- [68] L. Boyle, K. Finn and N. Turok, “CPT-Symmetric Universe,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) no.25, 251301 [[arXiv:1803.08928](#)].
- [69] L. Boyle, K. Finn and N. Turok, “The Big Bang, CPT, and neutrino dark matter,” [[arXiv:1803.08930](#)].
- [70] P. Graf and F. D. Steffen, “Thermal axion production in the primordial quark-gluon plasma,” *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 075011 (2011) [[arXiv:1008.4528](#)].
- [71] A. Salvio, A. Strumia and W. Xue, “Thermal axion production,” *JCAP* **01** (2014), 011 [[arXiv:1310.6982](#)].
- [72] E. Masso, F. Rota and G. Zsembinszki, “On axion thermalization in the early universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002), 023004 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0203221](#)].
- [73] For more information see the webpage <https://lweb.cfa.harvard.edu/CMB/bicep3/>
- [74] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* [CMB-S4], “CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition,” [[arXiv:1610.02743](#)].
- [75] For more information see the webpage <http://litebird.jp/eng/?pageid=2>

- [76] J. Garcia-Bellido and D. G. Figueroa, “A stochastic background of gravitational waves from hybrid preheating,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 061302 (2007) [[arXiv:astro-ph/0701014](#)].
- [77] D. G. Figueroa and F. Torrenti, “Gravitational wave production from preheating: parameter dependence,” *JCAP* **10**, 057 (2017) [[arXiv:1707.04533](#)].
- [78] T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki, K. Saikawa and T. Sekiguchi, “Axion cosmology with long-lived domain walls,” *JCAP* **01**, 001 (2013) [[arXiv:1207.3166](#)].