

The Sign of non-Gaussianity and the Primordial Black Holes Abundance

Hassan Firouzjahi^{1,*} and Antonio Riotto^{2,3,†}

¹*School of Astronomy, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)
P. O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran*

²*Département de Physique Théorique, Université de Genève,
24 quai E. Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

³*Gravitational Wave Science Center (GWSC), Université de Genève,
24 quai E. Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

The abundance of primordial black holes changes in the presence of local non-Gaussianity. A positive non-linear parameter f_{NL} increases the abundance while a negative one reduces it. We show that in non-attractor single-field models of inflation which enhance the curvature power spectrum and may give rise to primordial black holes, f_{NL} is always positive, when computed in correspondence of the peak of the curvature power spectrum where the primordial black hole abundance has its maximum. This implies that the interpretation of the recent pulsar timing arrays data from scalar-induced gravitational waves generated at primordial black hole formation may not be supported by invoking non-Gaussianity within non-attractor single-field models.

Introduction. Very recently the NANOGrav [1, 2], EPTA [4–6], PPTA [7–9] and CPTA [10] collaborations have provided evidence for a stochastic background of Gravitational Waves (GWs) detected through the pulsar timing arrays. One immediate question is under which circumstances such GWs can be associated to the formation of Primordial Black Holes (PBHs) during which GWs are inevitably generated at second-order [11]. Their amount is proportional to the the square of the amplitude of the dimensionless curvature perturbation power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}^2$. The abundance of PBHs is exponentially sensitive to the same amplitude, $f_{\text{PBH}} \sim \exp(-1/\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}})$, where f_{PBH} is the PBH abundance with respect to the total dark matter. The problem is that the observed stochastic GW background is explained by a relatively large values of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$, which has been claimed to lead to a too large PBH abundance [12–16]. While this negative conclusion may be invalidated by the recent observation that corrections from the non-linear radiation transfer function and the determination of the true physical horizon crossing decrease the PBH abundance [17], one can also rely on the introduction of some local Non-Gaussianity (NG) in the curvature perturbation

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{g}} + \frac{3}{5}f_{NL}(\mathcal{R}_{\text{g}}^2 - \langle \mathcal{R}_{\text{g}}^2 \rangle), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{R}_{g} is the Gaussian component¹. The short-scale power spectrum \mathcal{P}_S responsible for the PBH formation is modulated by the presence of a long mode \mathcal{R}_L . The threshold \mathcal{R}_c for the formation of the PBHs is shifted approximately by [18]

$$\mathcal{R}_c \simeq \mathcal{R}_c^{\text{g}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{5}f_{NL}\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{g}} \right), \quad (2)$$

compared to the threshold \mathcal{R}_c^{g} in the Gaussian theory. Therefore, around peaks of the power spectrum of the curvature perturbation, a positive f_{NL} increases the abundance of the PBHs, while a negative f_{NL} has the opposite effect, thus helping the agreement with the recent pulsar timing array observations. This remains true even when calculating the abundance through a more correct variable, the averaged density contrast [19, 20].

Under general assumptions, in this paper we will show that the sign of f_{NL} at the peak scale of the power spectrum, where PBHs are mostly formed, is always positive in non-attractor single-field models. This no-go result is intimately related to the fact that f_{NL} measures the response of the short-scale power spectrum \mathcal{P}_S to the presence of a long mode and the sign of the NG is determined by the rate of growth of \mathcal{P}_S . The latter is positive if PBHs needs to be produced and this sets the sign of f_{NL} . Our findings automatically imply that NG may not help non-attractor single-field models to relax the tension between the observed stochastic GW background in pulsar timing arrays and the overproduction of PBHs.

Non-attractor single-field models and the sign of NG. In attractor single-field models the curvature perturbation is constant on superhorizon scales and is equivalent in the spatially flat gauge to a field fluctuation $\mathcal{R} = -\delta\phi/\phi'$, where primes denote derivatives with respect to the number of e-folds. The phase-space trajectory of the long mode perturbation follows that of the background itself. Short-scale modes evolving in a long mode perturbation then follow the phase-space trajectory of the background, with the only difference being the local e-folds which determines the relation between the comoving and the physical wavenumbers. The NG is therefore proportional to

¹ We are adopting this quadratic expansion to be model independent, even though in general the exact relation between \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}_{g} can be worked out model by model. However, since typically $f_{NL}\mathcal{R}_{\text{g}} \lesssim 1$, the quadratic expansion is justified.

the variation of the short-scale power spectrum due to the long-wavelength mode

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_S(x) &= \mathcal{P}_S \left[1 - \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{d \ln k_S} \mathcal{R}_L(x) \right] \\ &= \left[1 + \frac{12}{5} f_{NL} \mathcal{R}_L(x) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

This modulation is zero at the peak of the short-scale power spectrum and corresponds to a dilation of scales rather than an amplitude enhancement.

In non-attractor single-field models, the attractor condition $\delta\phi' = (\phi''/\phi')\delta\phi$ is violated. In fact, during an Ultra-Slow-Roll (USR) phase, the curvature perturbation grows like $\mathcal{R} \sim a^3$, being a the scale factor, and therefore in the spatially flat gauge $\delta\phi = -\phi'\mathcal{R} = \text{constant}$, implying that $\delta\phi' = 0$. Because of the dependence of the background evolution on the initial kinetic energy, the perturbation may not be mapped into a change in the background clock along the same phase-space trajectory. The long mode perturbations carry no corresponding $\delta\phi'$ and so they shift the USR trajectory to one with a different relationship between ϕ and ϕ' . In other words, a local measurement is sensitive to ϕ' as different observers provide different measurements of the short-scale power spectrum depending on their relative position in the long-wavelength mode. This implies that in USR models the corresponding value of f_{NL} can be large, even at the peak of the short-scale power spectrum.

We consider single field models of inflation with the potential $V(\phi)$ for a canonically normalized scalar field with the sound speed of perturbations being equal to the speed of the gravitational waves perturbations. To be general, we do not specify the form of the potential. We assume that inflation has multiple stages, containing at least three distinct phases. The first stage is a conventional slow-roll (SR) phase in which the observed large scales, such as the CMB scales, leave the horizon. The power spectrum of these perturbations are fixed by the CMB observations [21] to be $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{-9}$ with \mathcal{R} being the curvature perturbations. The second phase is when the power spectrum experiences a rapid growth with a prime peak in power spectrum to generate PBHs [22–26]. A common mechanism for the enhancement of the power spectrum may be the USR setup where the potential is flat [27, 28]. However, we consider a general case and for this purpose, we may call this intermediate non-attractor phase as a ‘‘USR-type’’ phase. All we require from the form of the potential to be such that the power spectrum to increase monotonically during the second phase. The final phase is an attractor SR regime which is extended towards the end of inflation. The transitions between the stages can be either sharp or mild. We present our results for a three-phase setup SR \rightarrow non-attractor \rightarrow SR, and the extension of the results to higher multiple phases is

straightforward. We do not consider the stochastic random motion of the background field so the behaviour of ϕ is monotonic. The non-attractor phase is extended in the region $\phi_e < \phi < \phi_s$ during the time interval $t_s < t < t_e$ and we are interested in the growth of power spectrum for the modes which leave the Hubble radius during the non-attractor phase.

For PBH formation, we are interested in the short-scale power spectrum and in particular the PBH mass function will be dominated by the PBHs forming when the scale k_{pk} corresponding to the peak of the power spectrum will re-enter the Hubble radius. Let us consider therefore the effect of the long mode $k_L \lesssim k_{\text{pk}} \sim k_S$. Notice that long mode is itself suffering a period of USR phase, but it has exited the Hubble radius earlier than the scale k_S . The measurements of the power spectrum and the bispectrum are made at the end of inflation $t = t_f$ when the modes are frozen. The effects of the long mode on the short modes can be viewed as the modulation of the background quantities at the end of non-attractor phase $t = t_e$. As in separate universe approach, one can view the effects of the long mode as affecting nearby patches slightly differently. Consequently, different patches approach the final attractor phase with slightly different initial conditions modulated by the long mode at the end of non-attractor phase. With this picture in mind the bispectrum for two short modes under the modulation of a long mode can be written as

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle \simeq \langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \langle \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle_{\mathcal{R}_L^e} \rangle \quad (4)$$

in which \mathcal{R}_S and \mathcal{R}_L represent the short and long modes while the superscript f and e indicate the corresponding values at $t = t_f$ and $t = t_e$, respectively. The assumption of having a single-field setup is essential in writing the above relation. If there are extra light fields, then one has to include the modulations by them in the right-hand side of Eq. (4) as well.

In non-attractor single-field models \mathcal{R}_L and $\dot{\mathcal{R}}_L$ are to be treated as independent variables [29]. Expanding $\langle \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle_{\mathcal{R}_L^e}$ to leading order yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle &\simeq \left\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \left(\mathcal{R}_L^e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{R}_L^e} \langle \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e} \langle \mathcal{R}_S^f \mathcal{R}_S^f \rangle \right) \right\rangle.\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

An implicit assumption in performing the above expansion is that \mathcal{R} and $\dot{\mathcal{R}}$ to be continuous across the transition. This is the usual assumption that one needs to impose for the continuity of the metric and the extrinsic curvature across the transition. Having said this, we do not impose any assumption on the potential $V(\phi)$ and its derivatives, as long as \mathcal{R} and $\dot{\mathcal{R}}$ are continuous across the transition.

Expressing the left hand side of Eq. (5) in terms of the usual non-Gaussianity parameter f_{NL} and defining the power spectrum in Fourier space as $\langle \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2) P(k_1)$ and discarding the trivial factors of $(2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\mathbf{k})$ which matches automatically from the momentum conservation, we obtain

$$\frac{12}{5} f_{NL} P_L^f P_S^f \simeq \langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_L^e \rangle \frac{\partial P_S^f}{\partial \mathcal{R}_L^e} + \langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e \rangle \frac{\partial P_S^f}{\partial \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e}, \quad (6)$$

in which P_S^f and P_L^f represents the power spectrum at the end of inflation for the short and long modes respectively.

From the above expression we have to calculate correlations like $\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_L^e \rangle$ for the long mode perturbations at two different times t_e and t_f . As explained before, this is because the long mode at the end of non-attractor phase modulates the power spectrum of the short modes which are measured at the end of inflation.

Since the long mode is far outside the horizon at the end of non-attractor phase, we can treat it as classical and relate $\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_L^e \rangle$ to P_L^f via the ratio of the mode functions at these two times:

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \mathcal{R}_L^e \rangle = \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} \right) P_L^f, \quad (7)$$

and similarly

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_L^f \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^f}{\mathcal{R}_L^e} \right) \frac{dP_L^e}{dt}. \quad (8)$$

Plugging the above relations into Eq. (6) yields

$$\frac{12}{5} f_{NL} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} \right) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \mathcal{R}_L^e} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^f}{\mathcal{R}_L^e} \right) \frac{\dot{\mathcal{P}}_L^e}{\mathcal{P}_L^f} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L^e}, \quad (9)$$

in which the dimensionless power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is related to the power spectrum via

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \equiv \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} P_{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (10)$$

We should now trade the two independent variables $(\mathcal{R}_L, \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L)$ with two other variables in which then partial derivative has a more transparent meaning. From the point of view of a local observer within a region of size $\sim 1/k_S$, the long mode perturbation evolves with time, but with negligible spatial gradients so the metric takes the following form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) e^{2\mathcal{R}_L(t)} d\mathbf{x}^2, \quad (11)$$

We can absorb the long mode into the scale factor via $\tilde{a} \equiv a e^{\mathcal{R}_L}$ and the corresponding Hubble rate will change as $\tilde{H} = H + \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L$. Consequently

$$d \ln \tilde{a} = d\mathcal{R}_L \quad (12)$$

and

$$d\tilde{H} = d\dot{\mathcal{R}}_L. \quad (13)$$

Eqs. (12) and (13) are two differential relations that can be used to relate $(d\mathcal{R}, d\dot{\mathcal{R}})$ to $(d \ln \tilde{a}, d \ln \tilde{H})$. More specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d \ln \mathcal{P}_S &= \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \mathcal{R}_L} d\mathcal{R}_L + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L} d\dot{\mathcal{R}}_L \\ &= \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{a}} d \ln \tilde{a} + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{H}} d \ln \tilde{H}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Using the relations between $(d \ln \tilde{a}, d \ln \tilde{H})$ and $(d\mathcal{R}, d\dot{\mathcal{R}})$, from the second line of the above equation we obtain

$$d \ln \mathcal{P}_S = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{a}} d\mathcal{R}_L + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{H}} d\dot{\mathcal{R}}_L. \quad (15)$$

Comparing this differential equation with the first line of Eq. (14) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \mathcal{R}_L} = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{a}} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \dot{\mathcal{R}}_L} = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S}{\partial \ln \tilde{H}}. \quad (17)$$

Now, plugging the above relations into formula (9) and replacing \tilde{a} and \tilde{H} simply by a and H yields

$$\frac{12}{5} f_{NL} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} \right) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \ln a_e} + \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^f}{\mathcal{R}_L^e} \right) \frac{\dot{\mathcal{P}}_L^e}{2H_e^2 \mathcal{P}_L^f} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \ln H_e}. \quad (18)$$

One can think of Eq. (18) as an extension of Maldacena's consistency condition [30] to the non-attractor setups (see also [31, 32]). The importance of this consistency condition is that we can read off the value of f_{NL} from the properties of the power spectrum and without the need to calculate the bispectrum using either δN or in-in formalisms for higher orders perturbation theory.

So far our analysis was general relying only on the assumption of a single-field inflation model undergoing non-attractor phase(s) during inflation. The working assumption is that the power spectrum experiences rapid growth until it reaching a peak associated to the narrow scale where PBHs are formed. For the modes which leave the Hubble radius during the non-attractor phase and near the peak, the power spectrum locally has the following form in momentum space

$$\mathcal{P}_S = f(a_e) \left(\frac{k_S}{a_e H_e} \right)^{n_{\mathcal{R}} - 1}, \quad (19)$$

in which $n_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the spectral index and $f(a)$ is a function of the background which controls the rapid growth

of the power spectrum. Technically speaking, the factor $f(a)$ comes from the fact that the first slow-roll parameter $\epsilon \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2$ falls off rapidly during the non-attractor phase so the the power spectrum $\mathcal{P} \propto \epsilon^{-1}$ experiences a rapid growth during the non-attractor phase. For example, in the conventional USR phase $\epsilon \propto a^{-6}$ and correspondingly $f(a) = a^6$. In our analysis, we do not rely on the particular type of the transition and the form of $f(a)$ and all we assume is that $f(a)$ is a growing function of a to ensure the rapid growth of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$ during the non-attractor phase. We emphasize again that the form of power spectrum given in Eq. (19) is valid only locally near the peak which is followed by a rapid increase in power spectrum. The general form of the power spectrum in k -space is more complicated and may not be even described by a power law behaviour. For example, it can have oscillatory features after the prime peak as in conventional USR setup [22–26]. However, since we are interested in power spectrum slightly prior and around the peak associated to the narrow scales where the PBHs are formed, then the ansatz (19) is physically justified.

From Eq. (19) we infer

$$\frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \ln H_e} = -\frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{d \ln k_S} = 1 - n_{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (20)$$

Near the peak of the power spectrum by definition ($n_{\mathcal{R}} - 1) \simeq 0$ and correspondingly we obtain

$$f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} = \frac{5}{12} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} \right) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_S^f}{\partial \ln a_e}. \quad (21)$$

We note that the prefactor $(\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f)$ appears because the mode function in general evolves after the non-attractor phase. This is because the transition from the non-attractor phase to the final attractor phase may be mild so the mode keeps evolving in time until it reaches its final attractor value [33]. The long mode is far outside the horizon after the peak, evolving from its initial value \mathcal{R}_L^e at $t = t_e$ to its final value \mathcal{R}_L^f at $t = t_f$. Therefore, \mathcal{R}_L^f is in phase with \mathcal{R}_L^e in k -space. However, as the background quantities such as the slow-roll parameters are evolving during a mild transition, the mode function may change sign so the ratio $(\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f)$ may become negative. On the other hand, if the transition is mild, then the peak in power spectrum will not be significant as the power spectrum evolves in subsequent evolution so it is not a viable model for PBHs formation in the first place. Therefore, in what follows, we make an implicit assumption that the transition from the intermediate non-attractor phase to the final attractor phase is sharp enough such that $(\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f)$ remains positive. Since the power spectrum is an increasing function of time during the intermediate non-attractor phase, we conclude that

$$f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} > 0. \quad (22)$$

While our conclusion about the sign of f_{NL}^{pk} is general (with the implicit assumption of a sharp enough transition), let us examine it for some non-trivial examples. Let us consider a setup in which a USR phase is followed by an attractor SR phase in which the transition to the final attractor phase can be either sharp or mild. Defining the slow-roll parameter associated to the derivative of the potential at the final attractor phase by $\sqrt{2\epsilon_V} \equiv V_{\phi}/V$, the sharpness of the transition from the intermediate USR phase to the final attractor phase is determined by the parameter h given by [33]

$$h \equiv -6\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}}, \quad (23)$$

in which ϵ_e is the value of the slow-roll parameter at the end of USR phase. Note that in this convention $h < 0$. For a very sharp transition $|h| \gg 1$ while for a mild transition h may be comparable to slow-roll parameters. In order to have sharp enough transition such that the ratio $(\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f)$ remains positive, we assume $\eta_V \rightarrow 0$ in which η_V is the second slow-roll parameter given by $\eta_V = V_{\phi\phi}/V$.

The mode function for the modes which leave the horizon during the USR phase is given by [33]

$$\mathcal{R}_k^f = \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \right) \frac{H}{\sqrt{4\epsilon_V k^3}}. \quad (24)$$

Since during the USR phase the slow-roll parameter falls off like a^{-6} , then $\epsilon_e \propto a_e^{-6}$. Taking the derivative with respect to a_e we find

$$\frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}^f}{d \ln a_e} = 6\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \right)^{-1} = \frac{6h}{h-6}. \quad (25)$$

On the other hand, the ratio $\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f$ yields an additional factor

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \right)^{-1} = \frac{h}{h-6}. \quad (26)$$

We see that the ratio $(\mathcal{R}_L^e/\mathcal{R}_L^f)$ is positive as expected. Using Eqs. (25) and (26) in our formula (21) yields

$$f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} = \frac{5h^2}{2(6-h)^2} > 0. \quad (27)$$

For an infinitely sharp transition with $h \rightarrow -\infty$ in which the mode function is frozen immediately after the transition with $\mathcal{R}_L^e = \mathcal{R}_L^f$, from Eq. (27) we obtain the expected result $f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} = 5/2$. The expression Eq. (27) agrees with the result for f_{NL} obtained in [33] where the power spectrum is scale-invariant as well.

As a second example, now suppose we extend the above setup such that there is an upward shift ΔV in the potential at the end of non-attractor phase, followed by the

final SR phase. As in Ref. [34], suppose the upward step in the potential is instantaneous, yielding to a sudden change in inflaton's velocity. Imposing the conservation of energy, the inflaton velocity at the end of upward transition π_d is related to the velocity at the end of non-attractor phase π_e via

$$\pi_d = -\sqrt{\pi_e^2 - 6\frac{\Delta V}{V}}, \quad (28)$$

in which $\pi \equiv \phi'$ with a prime denoting the derivative with respect to the number of e-folds. The linear mode function is given by [34]

$$\mathcal{R}_k^f = \left(\frac{1}{g} + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_V}{\epsilon_e}} \right) \frac{H}{\sqrt{4\epsilon_V k^3}}, \quad (29)$$

in which $g \equiv \pi_d/\pi_e$ with $0 < g < 1$. Correspondingly, this yields

$$\frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}^f}{d \ln a_e} = \frac{6hg^4 + 36g^2 - 36}{g^2(g^2h - 6)}, \quad (30)$$

in which the sharpness parameter h is now defined as $h \equiv -(6/g)\sqrt{\epsilon_V/\epsilon_e}$. In addition, the ratio of the mode functions is given by

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_L^e}{\mathcal{R}_L^f} = \frac{hg^2}{hg^2 - 6} > 0. \quad (31)$$

Note that if we set $g = 1$ so $\Delta V = 0$, Eqs. (31) and (30) reduce to Eqs. (26) and (25) respectively. Now plugging Eqs. (31) and (30) into our master formula Eq. (21) yields

$$f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} = \frac{5h(hg^4 + 6g^2 - 6)}{2(g^2h - 6)^2}, \quad (32)$$

in exact agreement with [34] for a scale-invariant power spectrum. If we set $g = 1$, corresponding to no bump in potential, then Eq. (32) reduces to Eq. (27). Noting that $h < 0$ and $0 < g < 1$, one can check that $f_{NL}^{\text{pk}} > 0$ for all allowed values of (h, g) as our theorem predicts. Note that the above value of f_{NL} was calculated in [34] using the δN formalism to second order in perturbation theory. However, in our approach based on consistency condition, we only need to calculate the linear mode function without the need to go to higher orders in perturbation theory.

As a corollary, our theorem implies that in the setups where the power spectrum experiences a suppression going through a minimum, then $f_{NL} < 0$ at the minimum as was observed in a specific setup in [35].

Conclusions. In this note we have shown that the non-linear parameter f_{NL} in single-field non-attractor models is always positive if calculated for the peak of the

enhanced power spectrum. This result implies the NG always increases the PBH abundance. The sign of the NG is fixed by the response of the short-scale power spectrum to the presence of a long mode. If PBHs need to be formed, the short-scale power spectrum needs to grow and this sets the sign of f_{NL}^{pk} uniquely. This logic implies that our no-go result does not hold in the case in which the NG is generated after the inflationary phase, e.g. in the presence of a spectator field. Indeed, one can generate PBHs within a spiky model where the comoving curvature power spectrum is enhanced at small scales through a spectator isocurvature field [36]. This isocurvature perturbation will then subsequently decay into radiation perturbation and become a curvature mode after inflation. In such a case the long mode cannot be reabsorbed by a redefinition of the scale factor and therefore the sign of the NG is not defined. As a consequence, f_{NL} can be negative in models with extra fields. We comment that our conclusion about the sign of f_{NL}^{pk} requires an implicit assumption that the transition from the non-attractor phase to the final attractor phase be sharp enough so the mode function keeps its original sign. Physically, this is the relevant case for PBHs formation since if the transition is not sharp enough, then the peak is not prominent and PBHs may not form in the first place.

Acknowledgments. H.F. thanks the Department of Theoretical Physics at the University of Geneva for the kind hospitality when part of this work has been done. We thank M. Sasaki and M. H. Namjoo for insightful discussions and comments. A.R. thanks the Boninchi Foundation for support.

* frouz@ipm.ir

† antonio.riotto@unige.ch

- [1] G. Agazie *et al.* [NANOGrav], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, no.1, L8 (2023) [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16213](#)].
- [2] G. Agazie *et al.* [NANOGrav], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, no.1, L9 (2023) [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16217](#)].
- [3] J. Antoniadis *et al.* [EPTA], [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16214](#)].
- [4] J. Antoniadis *et al.* [EPTA], [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16214](#)].
- [5] J. Antoniadis *et al.* [EPTA], [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16224](#)].
- [6] J. Antoniadis *et al.* [EPTA], [[astro-ph.CO/2306.16227](#)].
- [7] D. J. Reardon, A. Zic, R. M. Shannon, G. B. Hobbs, M. Bailes, V. Di Marco, A. Kapur, A. F. Rogers, E. Thrane and J. Askew, *et al.* *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, no.1, L6 (2023) [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16215](#)].
- [8] A. Zic, D. J. Reardon, A. Kapur, G. Hobbs, R. Mandow, M. Curyło, R. M. Shannon, J. Askew, M. Bailes and N. D. R. Bhat, *et al.* [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16230](#)].
- [9] D. J. Reardon, A. Zic, R. M. Shannon, V. Di Marco, G. B. Hobbs, A. Kapur, M. E. Lower, R. Mandow,

- H. Middleton and M. T. Miles, *et al.* *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, no.1, L7 (2023) [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16229](#)].
- [10] H. Xu, S. Chen, Y. Guo, J. Jiang, B. Wang, J. Xu, Z. Xue, R. N. Caballero, J. Yuan and Y. Xu, *et al.* *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **23**, no.7, 075024 (2023) [[astro-ph.HE/2306.16216](#)].
- [11] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka and S. Yokoyama, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35**, no.6, 063001 (2018) [[astro-ph.CO/1801.05235](#)].
- [12] G. Franciolini, A. Iovino, Junior., V. Vaskonen and H. Veermae, [[astro-ph.CO/2306.17149](#)].
- [13] L. Liu, Z. C. Chen and Q. G. Huang, [[astro-ph.CO/2307.01102](#)].
- [14] Y. F. Cai, X. C. He, X. Ma, S. F. Yan and G. W. Yuan, [[gr-qc/2306.17822](#)].
- [15] K. Inomata, K. Kohri and T. Terada, [[astro-ph.CO/2306.17834](#)].
- [16] Q. H. Zhu, Z. C. Zhao and S. Wang, [[astro-ph.CO/2307.03095](#)].
- [17] V. De Luca, A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, [[astro-ph.CO/2307.13633](#)].
- [18] S. Young and C. T. Byrnes, *JCAP* **04**, 034 (2015) [[astro-ph.CO/1503.01505](#)].
- [19] A. Kehagias, I. Musco and A. Riotto, *JCAP* **12**, 029 (2019) [[astro-ph.CO/1906.07135](#)].
- [20] V. De Luca and A. Riotto, *Phys. Lett. B* **828**, 137035 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137035 [[astro-ph.CO/2201.09008](#)].
- [21] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A10 [[astro-ph.CO/1807.06211](#)].
- [22] C. T. Byrnes, P. S. Cole and S. P. Patil, *JCAP* **06**, 028 (2019), [[astro-ph.CO/1811.11158](#)].
- [23] P. S. Cole, A. D. Gow, C. T. Byrnes and S. P. Patil, [[astro-ph.CO/2204.07573](#)].
- [24] P. Carrilho, K. A. Malik and D. J. Mulryne, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.10, 103529 (2019), [[astro-ph.CO/1907.05237](#)].
- [25] O. Özsoy and G. Tasinato, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, no.2, 023524 (2022), [[astro-ph.CO/2111.02432](#)].
- [26] G. Tasinato, [[hep-th/2305.11568](#)].
- [27] W. H. Kinney, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 023515 (2005) [[gr-qc/0503017](#)].
- [28] M. H. Namjoo, H. Firouzjahi and M. Sasaki, [[astro-ph.CO/1210.3692](#)].
- [29] M. H. Namjoo, S. Baghran and H. Firouzjahi, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 083527 (2013) [[astro-ph.CO/1305.0813](#)].
- [30] J. M. Maldacena, *JHEP* **05**, 013 (2003), [[astro-ph/0210603](#)].
- [31] R. Bravo, S. Mooij, G. A. Palma and B. Pradenas, *JCAP* **05**, 024 (2018) [[astro-ph.CO/1711.02680](#)].
- [32] B. Finelli, G. Goon, E. Pajer and L. Santoni, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.6, 063531 (2018) [[hep-th/1711.03737](#)].
- [33] Y. F. Cai, X. Chen, M. H. Namjoo, M. Sasaki, D. G. Wang and Z. Wang, *JCAP* **05** (2018), 012 [[astro-ph.CO/1712.09998](#)].
- [34] Y. F. Cai, X. H. Ma, M. Sasaki, D. G. Wang and Z. Zhou, *JCAP* **12**, 034 (2022) [[astro-ph.CO/2207.11910](#)].
- [35] G. Domènech, G. Vargas and T. Vargas, [[astro-ph.CO/2309.05750](#)].
- [36] M. Kawasaki, N. Kitajima and T. T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no.6, 063519 (2013) [[hep-ph/1207.2550](#)].