

Proving the absence of large one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of curvature perturbations in transient ultra-slow-roll inflation within the path-integral approach

Ryodai Kawaguchi^{1a}, Shinji Tsujikawa^{1b}, and Yusuke Yamada^{2c}

¹ *Department of Physics, Waseda University, 3-4-1 Okubo, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan and*

² *Waseda Institute for Advanced Study, Waseda University,
1-21-1 Nishi Waseda, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-0051, Japan*

(Dated: July 30, 2024)

We revisit one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of curvature perturbations ζ in an inflationary scenario containing a transient ultra-slow-roll (USR) period. In Ref. [1], it was argued that one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of ζ can be larger than the tree-level one within the parameter region generating the seeds of primordial black holes during the USR epoch, which implies the breakdown of perturbation theory. We prove that this is not the case by using a master formula for one-loop corrections to the power spectrum obtained in Ref. [2]. We derive the same formula within the path-integral formalism, which is simpler than the original derivation in [2]. To show the smallness of one-loop corrections, the consistency relations and the effective constancy of tree-level mode functions of ζ for super-Hubble modes play essential roles, with which the master formula gives a simple expression for one-loop corrections. For concreteness, we provide a reduced set of interactions including the leading-order one, while establishing the consistency relations in a self-consistent manner. We also show how the consistency relations of various operators hold explicitly, which plays a key role in proving the absence of large one-loop corrections.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
A. What is a problem?	3
B. What do we discuss?	4
II. Transient ultra-slow-roll inflation	5
A. Second-order action and enhancement of small-scale linear perturbations	6
B. The effective constancy of curvature perturbations for super-Hubble modes	9
C. Cubic-order action	10
III. Master formula for one-loop corrections within the path-integral formalism	10
A. In-in path-integral formalism	10
B. Master formula	13
1. Cubic interactions	14
2. Quartic interactions	18
IV. Consistency relation of $\langle\zeta\zeta\zeta\rangle$ in the transient USR model	19
V. Effective description of the transient USR model and other consistency relations	22
A. Consistency relations for $\langle\zeta\zeta\zeta\rangle$ and $\langle\zeta\zeta'\zeta\rangle$	24
B. Schwinger-Dyson equation	24
C. $\langle\zeta D_2\zeta\zeta\rangle$ and $\langle\zeta D_2\zeta'\zeta\rangle$	25
VI. One-loop corrections to the power spectrum in transient USR inflation	29
VII. Conclusion	30
Acknowledgements	30
A. Path-integral formalism for general models with derivative couplings	31

^a ryodai0602@fuji.waseda.jp

^b tsujikawa@waseda.jp

^c y-yamada@aoni.waseda.jp

B. Boundary term interactions in the in-in path-integral formalism	35
1. Three-point correlation function	36
2. Four-point correlation function	36
3. Comment on the one-loop case	37
C. Proof of the identity (3.28)	38
D. Note on renormalization	39
E. Explicit computations of the master formula	40
References	44

I. INTRODUCTION

The inflationary paradigm was originally proposed to address several drawbacks in the big-bang cosmology—such as the flatness and horizon problems [3–8]. Moreover, in this paradigm, the origins of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature anisotropies and large-scale structures of the Universe can be explained by stretching quantum vacuum fluctuations over the super-Hubble scales during inflation [9–13]. The standard inflationary scenario is based on a single canonical scalar field ϕ dubbed “inflaton” with a slowly varying potential $V(\phi)$, which is given by the action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi) \right], \quad (1.1)$$

where g is a determinant of the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, M_{Pl} is the reduced Planck mass, R is the Ricci scalar, and $\partial_\mu \phi = \partial\phi/\partial x^\mu$ with a four-dimensional coordinate x^μ . To address the evolution of cosmological perturbations during inflation, the commonly used line element is of the following Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) form [14]

$$ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + h_{ij} (dx^i + N^i dt) (dx^j + N^j dt), \quad (1.2)$$

where N is the lapse, N^i is the shift, and

$$h_{ij} = a^2(t) e^{2\zeta(t, x^i)} \delta_{ij}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here, a is the scale factor that is a function of the cosmic time t , and ζ is the curvature perturbation depending on both t and the spatial coordinate x^i . A spatially-flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) background corresponds to $N = 1$, $N^i = 0$, and $\zeta = 0$. During slow-roll (SR) inflation driven by the inflaton potential $V(\phi)$, the scale factor exhibits quasi-exponential growth and hence the Hubble expansion rate $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is nearly constant (where a dot represents the derivative with respect to t). To address the flatness and horizon problems, we require that the number of e-foldings $N = \ln(a_f/a_i)$, where a_i and a_f are the scale factors at the beginning and the end of inflation, is at least larger than 65.

Besides the metric perturbations $\alpha = N - 1$, $N_i = \partial_i \psi$, and ζ , the inflaton field has a perturbation $\delta\phi = \phi - \phi_0$, where ϕ_0 is the background value. By choosing the unitary gauge

$$\delta\phi = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

and using the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints to eliminate α and ψ , the linearized curvature perturbation ζ_k in Fourier space obeys [15–18]

$$(\epsilon a^2 \zeta_k') + \epsilon a^2 k^2 \zeta_k = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \quad (1.6)$$

is the first SR parameter, $k = |\mathbf{k}|$ is an absolute value of the comoving wavenumber \mathbf{k} , and a prime represents the derivative with respect to the conformal time $\tau = \int a^{-1} dt$. After the Hubble radius crossing ($k < aH$), the second term on the left-hand side of Eq. (1.5) can be negligible and hence the resulting solution is given by

$$\zeta_k = c_1 + c_2 \int \frac{d\tau}{\epsilon a^2}. \quad (1.7)$$

where c_1 and c_2 are constants. Since ϵ is nearly constant in standard slow-roll inflation, the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (1.7) decays quickly. Therefore, ζ_k approaches a constant value c_1 after the Hubble radius crossing. During SR inflation, the Hubble expansion rate slowly varies over time and hence the power spectrum of curvature perturbations slightly deviates from the scale-invariant Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum.

The CMB temperature anisotropies correspond to the wavelength of perturbations that crossed the Hubble radius about 60 e-foldings before the end of inflation. The primordial power spectrum of curvature perturbations \mathcal{P}_ζ computed in the framework of single-field SR inflation is consistent with the CMB temperature anisotropies observed by the WMAP [19] and Planck [20] satellites. The amplitude of the power spectrum of curvature perturbations is constrained to be of the order $\mathcal{P}_\zeta = 2 \times 10^{-9}$, with the scalar spectral index $n_s = 0.965 \pm 0.004$ at the pivot wavenumber $k_0 = 0.002 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ (68% CL) [21, 22].

Since the perturbations with shorter wavelengths (wavenumber $k \gg k_0$) have been less constrained from observations, there is a possibility for breaking a nearly scale-invariant power spectrum. If such small-scale modes are enhanced in some non-standard inflationary scenarios, they can be responsible for the seeds of primordial black holes (PBHs) [23–26]. In the presence of high-density regions that exceed a certain threshold, PBHs may form in the radiation-dominated epoch after inflation (see [27–36] for recent reviews). Unlike astrophysical black holes, PBHs can have a variety of masses depending on the epoch when curvature perturbations are subject to growth during inflation. PBHs may play important roles as the source for dark matter [37, 38] and as the possible origins of binary black holes detected by gravitational waves [39–42] and supermassive black holes at the center of galaxies [43].

So far, a large number of inflationary models realizing the enhancement of small-scale curvature perturbations has been proposed to generate the seeds of PBHs. One of the most well-known scenarios is a transient ultra-slow-roll (USR) model, in which the inflaton potential has a very flat region (USR region) in which $V_{,\phi} \equiv dV/d\phi$ almost vanishes [44–48]. On the spatially-flat FLRW background, the gravitational and scalar-field equations of motion are given by

$$3M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H^2 = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad 2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \dot{H} = -\dot{\phi}^2, \quad \ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V_{,\phi} = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Here and in the following, we omit the subscript “0” for the background inflaton field. Since $V_{,\phi} \simeq 0$ in the USR regime, we have $\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} \simeq 0$ and hence the inflaton velocity decreases as $\dot{\phi} \propto a^{-3}$. This rapid decrease of $\dot{\phi}$ toward 0 leads to the almost de-Sitter background with $\epsilon \propto \dot{\phi}^2 \propto a^{-6}$. In this regime, the second term on the left-hand side of Eq. (1.7) increases after the Hubble radius crossing, which results in the enhancement of curvature perturbations ζ_k . So long as the small-scale power spectrum \mathcal{P}_ζ is amplified by more than 10^7 times, it is possible to produce a sufficient amount of PBHs responsible for dark matter.

On the other hand, it was pointed out by Kristiano and Yokoyama [1, 49] (see also Refs. [50, 51]) that the strong amplification of small-scale curvature perturbations can modify the power spectrum on scales relevant to CMB. Since one-loop corrections to the large-scale power spectrum may exceed the tree-level contribution, this spoils the perturbative control of underlying theory [1]. Follow-up papers [52–76] claim various arguments, which may support the original one or may not, or improve some technical points. However, the issue of one-loop corrections within the transient USR model is unsettled and yet controversial.

A. What is a problem?

Before going to the quantitative discussion, it would be worthwhile to illustrate the heart of the controversy. In the work of Kristiano and Yokoyama [1], it was argued that super-Hubble perturbations may be affected by a late-time event through quantum corrections by short modes that experience the late-time event inside the Hubble radius, even if the super-Hubble modes exit the Hubble radius well before the late-time event takes place. The late-time event we refer to is the short-time USR phase with SR-USR-SR phase transitions. The USR stage can cause the strong enhancement of curvature perturbations for wavelengths smaller than the CMB scale, with the generation of CMB-scale perturbations during the first SR phase.

It seems possible that large one-loop corrections are generated up to super-Hubble modes simply because the couplings of curvature perturbations may be controlled by the second SR parameter

$$\eta \equiv \frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{H\epsilon}. \quad (1.9)$$

While $\epsilon = -\dot{H}/H^2$ is negligibly small, η reaches the value -6 during the USR epoch. Furthermore, there is a cubic interaction proportional to $\dot{\eta}$, which may become very large if the phase transition occurs suddenly.

On the other hand, corrections to super-Hubble perturbations (without volume suppression) seem rather peculiar in the following sense. Suppose the first slow-roll phase continues for 100 e-foldings and consider the mode that exits

the Hubble radius almost at the beginning of the first SR inflation. In such a case, at the USR phase transition, the momentum of the corresponding mode is roughly $k \sim e^{-100} H_i$, where H_i is the Hubble expansion rate when the mode exits the horizon. As the momentum is quite small, such a perturbation cannot be distinguished from the zero mode ζ_0 of ζ . However, the zero mode is eliminated by a coordinate transformation, since $a^2(t)e^{2\zeta(t,x^i)}$ in Eq. (1.2) is invariant under the changes

$$\zeta(t, x^i) \rightarrow \zeta(t, x^i) + \delta\zeta, \quad \text{and} \quad a(t) \rightarrow a(t)e^{-\delta\zeta}. \quad (1.10)$$

Therefore, the constant zero mode of ζ is unphysical and should decouple from the shorter wavelength perturbations. Now, a mode having $k \sim e^{-100} H_i$ should be approximately a zero mode and would decouple from all the dynamics, which is the physical reason why we expect the conservation of super-Hubble curvature perturbations. If this is the case, there would be no large one-loop corrections to sufficiently long-wavelength modes whatever late-time events happen (as long as the zero mode is constant at leading order).

The above physical reasoning is based on the symmetry of spacetime mentioned above, and therefore, it seems that symmetry is a key to proving the constancy of super-Hubble curvature perturbation. In quantum field theory, consistency relations first shown by Maldacena [77] manifest the intuitive property of ζ . They follow from the hidden conformal symmetry of the FLRW background [78–82]. In literature, consistency relations or corresponding conformal symmetry play crucial roles in proving the constancy of ζ on super-Hubble scales [2, 83]. In the context of the transient USR model, the authors of Ref. [66] used the same argument to show that the large one-loop corrections to super-Hubble curvature perturbations are absent by improving the work of Fumagalli [64]. However, due to the incorrect argument regarding the regularization of ultra-violet (UV) divergences, the results of Ref. [66] were criticized in Ref. [68].¹

In the proof of the ζ -constancy for super-Hubble perturbations given in Ref. [2], detailed information is not necessary and can be applied to any models satisfying

- Consistency relations for all operators appearing in cubic interactions,
- The super-Hubble curvature perturbation under consideration is constant at the tree level.

The latter condition is not independent of the former, but we have just distinguished it for technical reasons. In particular, the derivation of the formula in Ref. [2] does not rely on particular inflationary models. It should be applied to the transient USR model as long as the above properties are satisfied. Nevertheless, it would be important to note that the second requirement may not be satisfied e.g., by the modes that exit the Hubble radius near the USR phase transition. In such a case, our result may not be applied directly, and it requires more detailed consideration.

Another advantage of the master formula in Ref. [2] is its independence from the Lagrangian we use. Indeed, the controversy also originates from the subtlety of time-total-derivative interactions and associated terms proportional to the free equations of motion (EOMs), which can be treated also by performing a field redefinition [77, 84–88]. At the tree level, their contributions can be incorporated by the field redefinition but may become subtle at one-loop order. More importantly, such terms turn out to be crucial in proving the consistency relations of some operators with various momenta. Since the effective constancy of ζ can be proven only when the consistency relations hold [2], the subtle interaction terms must be treated very carefully. Nevertheless, on the formal level, without specifying the concrete Lagrangian we use, the master formula tells us that as long as the consistency relations and the constancy of free mode functions hold for the modes under consideration, we expect that one-loop corrections to the super-Hubble modes are small, contrary to the claim in Ref. [1]. In this sense, if we assume the above-mentioned requirements that would be true even in the transient USR model, we do not need to discuss further, and simply conclude that there are no large one-loop corrections. Nevertheless, it would be worth showing the absence of large one-loop corrections explicitly.

B. What do we discuss?

In this work, we revisit one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of curvature perturbations in the transient USR model on the basis of Ref. [2], which proves the time-independence of the super-Hubble mode of ζ . The key observation made in Ref. [2] is that various contributions to the two-point correlation function $\langle \zeta_k \zeta_k \rangle$ from cubic interactions as well as quartic ones can be summarized into a simple formula. Taking the super-Hubble limit $k \ll aH$ of an external ζ_k and using the consistency relations, one can show that the two-point function acquires no time-dependence, namely,

¹ We will comment on the regularization issue later.

it is constant over time.² As we will review, the soft limit of the external momentum leads to a simple formula that is similar to the one given in Ref. [66] but is a more general form [2]. It turns out that the leading order one-loop corrections can be evaluated as a total derivative form in the loop momentum depending only on the small momentum mode, which finally shows the smallness of one-loop corrections. Note that a consistency relation has been examined in Refs. [49, 58, 66, 75, 90] within the transient USR model, but it is of the bispectrum of ζ without derivatives. To prove the above-mentioned result, we need to check other sets of three-point functions as will be clear from the master formula. We also comment on the regularization of the UV modes used in Ref. [66] but criticized in Ref. [68].

We should emphasize that our results are mostly based on the earlier work [2]. Nevertheless, our work contains several new results: First, we will derive the master formula within the path-integral formalism, which seems simpler than the operator formalism used in Ref. [2]. Secondly, we particularly focus on a subset of cubic interactions that possibly give rise to large one-loop corrections due to unsuppressed couplings during the USR epoch. We also check whether the master formula of Ref. [2] yields the same conclusion within the transient USR model by examining the consistency relations of relevant cubic interactions. It will turn out that one should include quartic interactions that must exist in the Lagrangian for consistency relations or the symmetry of the zero mode of ζ to hold. With an appropriate subset of interactions we can show the consistency relations that are essential to the final result, and we find no significant enhancement of the power spectrum due to one-loop corrections. It is also worth emphasizing that the same results should be derived within the operator formalism by just following the discussion in Ref. [2]. The only difference with our result would be rather technical. For instance, as we will discuss, the EOM terms play crucial roles within the path-integral formalism, whereas the boundary terms do in the operator formalism and the EOM terms automatically vanish for interaction picture field operators. So long as the consistency relations of all relevant correlators are satisfied, the master formula for one-loop corrections applies and it will give us a simple answer.³

The rest of this work is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we revisit the dynamics of linear perturbations in the transient USR model and the cubic-order action of curvature perturbations. In Sec. III, we derive the master formula for one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of curvature perturbations within the path-integral formalism. This formula is rather independent of the Lagrangian of a scalar field we consider. In Sec. IV, we analytically compute the three-point correlation $\langle \zeta^3 \rangle$ in the squeezed limit for the transient USR model. This analysis reveals that, in the limit of small ϵ , we need only three leading-order terms to reproduce the consistency relation of $\langle \zeta^3 \rangle$. Based on such an observation, we consider a reduced Lagrangian that consists of the aforementioned leading-order interactions. Adding quartic interactions necessary for consistency relations of three-point functions including spatial derivatives, we prove the consistency relations within the reduced Lagrangian system in Sec. V, justifying the master formula. Then, we explicitly evaluate one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of super-Hubble curvature perturbations in Sec. VI, which shows that there are no corrections at the leading order in the momentum expansion. Sec. VII is devoted to conclusions.

We have several Appendices: In Appendix A, we discuss the path-integral formulation with time-derivative interactions. In Appendix B, we briefly show that the boundary terms in the Lagrangian do not contribute to the correlation functions with our prescription of the path-integral formalism. We give some detail of the equality of (3.28) in Appendix C. In Appendix D, we briefly comment on the structure of UV divergences within the transient USR model and the standard SR models. We also give some details of one-loop corrections within our reduced system and discuss some subtlety associated with the time-ordering of operators in Appendix E, which however does not affect our results.

II. TRANSIENT ULTRA-SLOW-ROLL INFLATION

In the transient USR inflationary model which belongs to the action (1.1), we review the dynamics of linear perturbations and the cubic-order action of curvature perturbations relevant to the computation of one-loop corrections performed later in Sec. III. We consider the 1st SR stage followed by the transient USR regime, which finally connects to the 2nd SR phase. The field equations of motion on the spatially-flat FLRW background with the line element $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j$ are given by (1.8). As we already mentioned in Introduction, the USR stage can be realized by an inflaton potential with a very flat region. During the SR stages, the SR parameters $\epsilon = \dot{H}/H^2$ and $\eta = \dot{\epsilon}/(H\epsilon)$ are much smaller than 1, whereas in the USR regime, we have $\epsilon \propto a^{-6}$ and $\eta \simeq -6$. The time dependence of η may be quantified as

$$\eta(t) = \Delta\eta [\theta(t - t_s) - \theta(t - t_e)], \quad \Delta\eta = -6, \quad (2.1)$$

² The all-order proof of the constancy can be found in Ref. [89] and another all-order proof is given in Ref. [83], but provided that constancy of ζ holds at tree level in both of the proofs.

³ We note that the absence of large one-loop corrections is also shown in Ref. [72], where the author uses a spatially flat gauge. Since the method is quite different from what we will discuss, it is not easy to compare the results directly, but they would be related to each other.

where

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } t > 0 \\ 1/2 & \text{for } t = 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } t < 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

is the Heaviside step function, and t_s and t_e are the instants at which the USR period starts and ends, respectively. Here we assume that $\eta = 0$ in two SR regimes, which allows us to approximate ϵ to be constant. Integrating the relation $\eta = \dot{\epsilon}/(H\epsilon)$ with neglect of the time-dependence of H , it follows that

$$\epsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_1 & \text{(1st SR stage)} \\ \epsilon_1 e^{\Delta\eta H(t-t_s)} & \text{(USR stage)} \\ \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1 e^{\Delta\eta H(t_e-t_s)} & \text{(2nd SR stage)} \end{cases}, \quad (2.3)$$

where ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are constants. Due to the rapid decrease of ϵ during the USR regime, ϵ_2 is smaller than ϵ_1 .

A. Second-order action and enhancement of small-scale linear perturbations

To study the evolution of cosmological perturbations for the transient USR model mentioned above, we take into account a Gibbons-Hawking-York boundary term to the action (1.1), such that

$$\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \int_{\mathcal{V}} d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi) \right] + \mathcal{S}_{\text{GHY}}, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{GHY}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \oint_{\partial\mathcal{V}} d^3y \sqrt{|h|} \varepsilon_b K. \quad (2.5)$$

Here, h is a determinant of the 3-space metric h_{ij} appearing in Eq. (1.2), $K = K_{ij} h^{ij}$ is the trace of an extrinsic curvature $K_{ij} = (\dot{h}_{ij} - \nabla_i^{(3)} N_j - \nabla_j^{(3)} N_i)/(2N)$ with $\nabla_i^{(3)}$ being the 3-space covariant derivative operator, and ε_b is a parameter that is -1 at temporal boundaries and $+1$ at spatial boundaries. The Gibbons-Hawking-York action \mathcal{S}_{GHY} is required for boundary value problems to be well defined.

To study the evolution of linear perturbations, we expand the action up to quadratic order in perturbed variables. We choose the unitary gauge (1.4) and consider the metric perturbations in the ADM line element (1.2) as $N = 1 + \alpha$ and $N_i = \partial_i \psi$, so that

$$ds^2 = -[(1 + \alpha)^2 - a^{-2} e^{-2\zeta} (\partial\psi)^2] dt^2 + 2\partial_i \psi dt dx^i + a^2 e^{2\zeta} \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (2.6)$$

where $(\partial\psi)^2 \equiv (\partial_i \psi)(\partial_i \psi) = (\partial_{x^1} \psi)^2 + (\partial_{x^2} \psi)^2 + (\partial_{x^3} \psi)^2$. We can rewrite the action (2.4) in the form of the 3 + 1 ADM decomposition as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} = \int_{\mathcal{V}} dt d^3x \sqrt{h} & \left[\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} N \left(R^{(3)} + K^{ij} K_{ij} - K^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2N} \dot{\phi}^2 - NV(\phi) \right] \\ & + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int_{\mathcal{V}} dt d^3x \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sqrt{h} K \right) + (\text{spatial boundary terms}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where $R^{(3)}$ is the 3-dimensional Ricci scalar of hypersurfaces foliating \mathcal{V} . Expanding the action up to quadratic order in perturbations and eliminating the non-dynamical perturbations α and ψ on account of their constrained equations of motion, the resulting second-order action for ζ is expressed in the form

$$\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int d\tau d^3x \left[\epsilon a^2 \zeta'^2 - \epsilon a^2 (\partial\zeta)^2 - \frac{d}{d\tau} f_2 \right], \quad (2.8)$$

where we recall that a prime represents the derivative with respect to $\tau = \int a^{-1} dt$, and we have kept the temporal boundary term

$$f_2 = 9a^3 H \zeta^2 - \frac{a}{H} (\partial\zeta)^2, \quad (2.9)$$

just for completeness.⁴ Varying Eq. (2.8) with respect to ζ , the linear curvature perturbation obeys

$$(\epsilon a^2 \zeta')' - \epsilon a^2 \partial^2 \zeta = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

We decompose the curvature perturbation in the real space coordinate $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3)$ in terms of the Fourier modes $\zeta_k(\tau)$, as

$$\zeta(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3k \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \quad \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) = \zeta_k(\tau) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau) \hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ are the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, satisfying the commutation relations

$$[\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_1}, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger] = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2), \quad [\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_1}, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_2}] = [\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_1}^\dagger, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger] = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

The canonical commutation relation $[\zeta(\tau, \mathbf{x}), \pi_\zeta(\tau, \mathbf{y})] = i\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$, where π_ζ is a canonical momentum of ζ , yields the normalization condition on the mode function ζ_k , as

$$\zeta_k \bar{\zeta}_k' - \zeta_k' \bar{\zeta}_k = \frac{i}{2a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (2.13)$$

where a bar represents the complex conjugate. From (2.10), the mode function in Fourier space satisfies Eq. (1.5), which is expressed in the form

$$\zeta_k'' + \frac{(z^2)'}{z^2} \zeta_k' + k^2 \zeta_k = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where $z \equiv a M_{\text{Pl}} \sqrt{2\epsilon}$. Introducing a canonically normalized field $u_k = z \zeta_k$, Eq. (2.14) reduces to

$$u_k'' + \left(k^2 - \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\tau^2} \right) u_k = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

with

$$\nu^2 = \tau^2 \frac{z''}{z} + \frac{1}{4} \simeq \left(\frac{3 + \eta}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \eta' \tau, \quad (2.16)$$

where we assumed that the first slow-roll parameter ϵ is negligibly small and the background spacetime is given by a quasi de Sitter background, so that $\tau \simeq -1/(aH)$.

Since we are considering the case in which η is given by (2.1), we can deal with ν as constants in each stage. This enables us to solve Eq. (2.15) analytically. During the two SR regimes, we have $\eta \simeq 0$, whereas, in the USR stage, $\eta \simeq -6$. Hence it follows that $\nu^2 = 9/4$ in both SR and USR regions. Imposing the Bunch-Davies vacuum condition $u_k(\tau \rightarrow -\infty) = e^{-ik\tau}/\sqrt{2k}$ in the asymptotic past, the solutions to curvature perturbations can be expressed in the form

$$\zeta_k(\tau) = i \frac{H}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\epsilon(\tau)k^3}} \xi(k\tau, k\tau_s, k\tau_e), \quad (2.17)$$

$$\xi(x, y, z) = \mathcal{A}_k(y, z)(1 + ix)e^{-ix} + \mathcal{B}_k(y, z)(1 - ix)e^{+ix}, \quad (2.18)$$

where τ_s and τ_e are the conformal times at which the USR stage starts and ends, respectively, and $x = k\tau$, $y = k\tau_s$, and $z = k\tau_e$. The coefficients \mathcal{A}_k and \mathcal{B}_k , which depend on y and z , can be determined by matching the solutions of ζ_k at $\tau = \tau_s$ and $\tau = \tau_e$. From Eq. (2.14), we impose the following matching conditions

$$\zeta_k(\tau_{i-}) = \zeta_k(\tau_{i+}), \quad \text{and} \quad z^2(\tau_{i-})\zeta_k'(\tau_{i-}) = z^2(\tau_{i+})\zeta_k'(\tau_{i+}), \quad (2.19)$$

where $i = s, e$, and the subscripts \pm represent $\tau_{i\pm} = \tau_i \pm 0$, respectively. Substituting Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18) and their τ -derivatives into Eq. (2.19), the coefficients in each epoch are determined to be [91]

⁴ The spatial translation invariance implies that there are no spatial boundary contributions to the action, whereas we would have initial and final spacelike surfaces, which can be regarded as temporal boundary surfaces. Indeed, some surface terms can contribute to the correlation functions when the perturbations are quantized.




FIG. 1. The power spectrum of curvature perturbations in the transient USR model for $\tau_s/\tau_e = 10.0041$ and $\epsilon_1 = 0.01$. We normalize $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ and k by the power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(0)$ in the long-wavelength limit and k_s corresponding to the wavenumber at $\tau = \tau_s$, respectively. The increased power for small-scale perturbations ($k \gtrsim k_s$) arises from the enhancement of $|\zeta_k|$ during the transient USR period.

- 1st SR stage

$$\mathcal{A}_k = 1, \quad \mathcal{B}_k = 0, \quad (2.20)$$

- USR stage

$$\mathcal{A}_k = 1 + \frac{3i(1+y^2)}{2y^3}, \quad \mathcal{B}_k = \frac{3i(-i+y)^2 e^{-2iy}}{2y^3}, \quad (2.21)$$

- 2nd SR stage

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \frac{1}{4y^3 z^3} \left[-9(-i+y)^2(i+z)^2 e^{2i(z-y)} + (3i+3iy^2+2y^3)(-3i-3iz^2+2z^3) \right], \quad (2.22)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \frac{3i}{4y^3 z^3} \left[(-i+y)^2(3i+3iz^2+2z^3) e^{-2iy} - (-i+z)^2(3i+3iy^2+2y^3) e^{-2iz} \right]. \quad (2.23)$$

For long-wavelength perturbations, we take the τ -derivatives of the above solutions and pick up the leading-order terms with respect to small values of k . This manipulation leads to

$$\zeta'_k(\tau) \simeq i \frac{H}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\epsilon_1} k^3} k^2 \tau, \quad (1\text{st SR stage}), \quad (2.24)$$

$$\zeta'_k(\tau) \simeq i \frac{H}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\epsilon(\tau)} k^3} \frac{6+k_s^5 \tau^5}{5k_s^2 \tau^2} k^2 \tau, \quad (\text{USR stage}), \quad (2.25)$$

$$\zeta'_k(\tau) \simeq i \frac{H}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\epsilon_2} k^3} \left(\frac{k_s^3}{k_e^3} - \frac{6k_e^3 \tau}{5k_s^2} + \frac{6k_s^3 \tau}{5k_e^2} \right) k^2 \tau, \quad (2\text{nd SR stage}), \quad (2.26)$$

where k_s and k_e are comoving wavenumbers that exit the Hubble horizon at $\tau = \tau_s$ and $\tau = \tau_e$, i.e., $k_s = a(\tau_s)H(\tau_s) \simeq -1/\tau_s$ and $k_e = a(\tau_e)H(\tau_e) \simeq -1/\tau_e$, respectively. For finite values of k , we have the time dependence $|\zeta'_k(\tau)| \propto a^{-1}$ during the two SR stages and $|\zeta'_k(\tau)| \propto a^4$ during the USR stage. So long as k is not much smaller than k_s , there is the enhancement of $|\zeta_k(\tau)|$ proportional to a^3 during the USR period. In the limit that $k/k_s \rightarrow 0$, however, $\zeta'_k(\tau)$ vanishes in all three periods.

The tree-level power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\tau_*, k)$ at a particular moment $\tau = \tau_*$ is defined by the following vacuum expectation value

$$\langle 0 | \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_2) | 0 \rangle = \frac{2\pi^2}{k_1^3} \mathcal{P}_\zeta(\tau_*, k_1) (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2), \quad (2.27)$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the Bunch-Davies vacuum state. By using Eq. (2.11), we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\tau_*, k) = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} |\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2 = \frac{H^2}{8\pi^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1} |\mathcal{A}_k(\tau_*) + \mathcal{B}_k(\tau_*)|^2. \quad (2.28)$$

To compute the power spectrum at the end of inflation ($\tau_* \rightarrow 0$), we substitute the coefficients (2.22) and (2.23) into Eq. (2.28). In Fig. 1, we plot an example of the power spectrum normalized by the one in the large-scale limit versus the normalized wavenumber k/k_s . In this plot, the ratio τ_s/τ_e is about 10 and hence the number of e-foldings acquired during the USR period corresponds to 2.3. We observe that small-scale curvature perturbations ($k \gtrsim k_s$) are subject to strong enhancement compared to large-scale modes ($k \ll k_s$). This property arises from the growth $|\zeta_k| \propto a^3$ during the USR period for small-scale modes.

B. The effective constancy of curvature perturbations for super-Hubble modes

In the subsequent sections, we often exploit the fact that sufficiently long-wavelength perturbations such as those relevant to CMB temperature anisotropies behave as effectively constant in time even during the USR phase. It is worth quantifying it more explicitly to confirm how the effective constancy is valid. This amounts to expanding the solution (2.17) with respect to the small momentum k , yielding

$$\zeta_k(\tau) = i \frac{H}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\epsilon_1 k^3}} [1 + r_k(\tau)], \quad (2.29)$$

where the next-to-leading order terms in $r_k(\tau)$ are given by

$$r_k(\tau) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} k^2 \tau^2 & (\text{for } \tau < \tau_s), \\ -\frac{2}{5} (k\tau_s)^2 \left(\frac{\tau_s}{\tau}\right)^3 & (\text{for } \tau_s < \tau < \tau_e), \\ \frac{2}{5} (k\tau_s)^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_s}\right)^3 \left(\frac{\tau_s}{\tau_e}\right)^6 & (\text{for } \tau > \tau_e). \end{cases} \quad (2.30)$$

This shows that r_k has the scale-factor dependence $r_k \propto a^{-2}$, $r_k \propto a^3$, and $r_k \propto a^{-3}$ during the 1st SR, USR, and 2nd SR stages, respectively.

Here, we notice that the next-to-leading order correction is universally bounded for $\forall \tau > \tau_s$ as

$$|r_k(\tau)| < |r_k(\tau_e)| = \frac{2}{5} e^{-2\Delta N_k + 3\Delta N_{\text{USR}}}, \quad (2.31)$$

where $\Delta N_k \equiv -\log(k\tau_s) = -\log[a(\tau_k)/a(\tau_s)]$ is the number of e-foldings between the time τ_k of Hubble radius crossing of the k -mode and the time τ_s , and similarly, $\Delta N_{\text{USR}} = \log[a(\tau_e)/a(\tau_s)]$ is the number of e-foldings acquired during the USR era.

The above bound is crucial for our later discussion in the sense that despite the presence of a growing mode during the USR phase, if k is sufficiently small, namely, ΔN_k is large enough, the mode function ζ_k is approximately constant. For the CMB modes ($k \ll k_s$) with $\Delta N_k \gg (3/2)\Delta N_{\text{USR}}$, taking the typical values $\Delta N_k = 40$ and $\Delta N_{\text{USR}} = 3$ relevant to the seed generation of PBHs, we have that $|r_k(\tau)| < 6 \times 10^{-32}$ for $\forall \tau > \tau_s$. Thus, we can neglect the time dependence of ζ_k for the CMB modes satisfying the condition $\Delta N_k \gg (3/2)\Delta N_{\text{USR}}$. In the subsequent discussion, we often approximate a super-Hubble mode function by constant for $\tau > \tau_s$. We should remember that it is correct up to $r_k(\tau)$, which is bounded by (2.31).

One may wonder if the time derivative of $\zeta_k(\tau)$ is small particularly during the USR phase. For $\tau_s < \tau < \tau_e$, the k -expansion of $\zeta'_k(\tau)$ yields

$$\left| \frac{\tau \zeta'_k(\tau)}{\zeta_k(\tau)} \right| \simeq \frac{6}{5} (k\tau_s)^2 \left(\frac{\tau_s}{\tau}\right)^3 < \frac{6}{5} e^{-2\Delta N_k + 3\Delta N_{\text{USR}}}, \quad (2.32)$$

or equivalently

$$|\zeta'_k(\tau)| < \frac{3|r_k(\tau_e)|}{\tau} |\zeta_k(\tau)|. \quad (2.33)$$

Once again, we find a similar bound, and as is clear from the above discussion, we may neglect $\zeta'_k(\tau)$ for a typical CMB mode thanks to the smallness of $r_k(\tau_e)$. Thus we showed that, even during the USR phase, the time derivative of ζ_k sufficiently outside the Hubble horizon is negligible.

C. Cubic-order action

For the calculation of one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of ζ , we need to expand the action (2.4) higher than second order in perturbations. The cubic-order action was first derived by Maldacena [77] in the context of inflationary non-Gaussianities. Keeping the boundary terms associated with the τ -derivatives and using the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints, the cubic-order action following from (2.4) can be expressed in the form

$$\mathcal{S}^{(3)} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int d\tau d^3x \left[a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta \zeta'^2 + a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta (\partial\zeta)^2 - a\epsilon \left(2 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \right) \zeta' \partial_i \zeta \partial_i \chi + \frac{a^2}{2} \epsilon \eta' \zeta^2 \zeta' + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \partial^2 \zeta (\partial\chi)^2 + 2f(\zeta) D_2 \zeta - \frac{d}{d\tau} f_3 \right], \quad (2.34)$$

where

$$\chi = a\epsilon \partial^{-2} \zeta', \quad D_2 \zeta = \frac{d}{d\tau} (a^2 \epsilon \zeta') - a^2 \epsilon \partial^2 \zeta, \quad (2.35)$$

$$f(\zeta) = \frac{1}{4} \eta \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{aH} \zeta \zeta' - \frac{1}{4a^2 H^2} [(\partial\zeta)^2 - \partial^{-2} (\partial_i \partial_j (\partial_i \zeta \partial_j \zeta))] + \frac{1}{2a^2 H} [(\partial_i \zeta) (\partial_i \chi) - \partial^{-2} (\partial_i \partial_j (\partial_i \zeta \partial_j \chi))] \quad (2.36)$$

$$f_3 = 9a^3 H \zeta^3 + \frac{1}{2} a^2 \epsilon \eta \zeta^2 \zeta' + \frac{\epsilon a}{H} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \zeta \zeta'^2 - (1 - \epsilon) \frac{a}{H} \zeta (\partial\zeta)^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2H^2} \zeta \zeta' \partial^2 \zeta + \frac{1}{4aH^3} [(\partial\zeta)^2 \partial^2 \zeta - 2H \zeta \partial_i \partial_j \chi (\partial_i \partial_j (\zeta - H\chi))] . \quad (2.37)$$

Note that the boundary terms associated with the spatial derivatives of ζ have been dropped after the integration by parts. The first five contributions to (2.34) correspond to the bulk terms. The contributions $2f(\zeta)D_2\zeta$, which we call the EOM terms, are proportional to the linear perturbation equation of ζ . The last contributions $-df_3/d\tau$ correspond to the boundary terms. In the operator formalism, we cannot generally ignore the boundary terms, while the EOM terms may be neglected [85, 86, 92, 93]. In Ref. [88], it was shown in the context of slow-roll inflation that the path-integral formalism allows us to neglect the boundary terms, while the EOM terms bring contributions to cosmological correlation functions. As we will show in subsequent sections, the latter property in the path-integral formalism holds in general, including the case of transient USR inflation.

III. MASTER FORMULA FOR ONE-LOOP CORRECTIONS WITHIN THE PATH-INTEGRAL FORMALISM

In this section, we prove the master formula of one-loop corrections to the two-point correlation function of ζ by using the path-integral formalism. In Sec. II, we considered the theory given by (2.4) and derived the cubic-order action (2.34) of ζ . In this section, we will consider the case in which more general interacting Lagrangians are present. Indeed, the master formula itself can be derived without any details of the Lagrangian and background field configurations such as the time dependence of slow-roll parameters. While the same formula was obtained in Ref. [2] within the operator formalism, we recognize that the path-integral approach is simpler than the former in its derivation.

A. In-in path-integral formalism

In this subsection, we briefly review the in-in path-integral formalism and introduce necessary tools for proving the master formula of one-loop corrections. This is also known as the Schwinger-Keldysh path-integral formalism, see Refs. [94, 95] for further details. Readers who are familiar with this formalism may directly go to the next subsection III B.

Within the in-in path-integral scheme, we evaluate the expectation values of quantum operators rather than the transition amplitudes given as S -matrices. Accordingly, there are two fields, the $+$ and $-$ fields, which correspond to the “ket” and “bra” fields, respectively. The generating functional for interacting systems can formally be written as

$$Z[J^+, J^-] = \mathcal{N} \exp \left[i\mathcal{S}_{\text{int}} \left[\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+} \right] - i\mathcal{S}_{\text{int}} \left[\frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-} \right] \right] Z_0[J^+, J^-], \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathcal{N} is a normalization factor, J^\pm are external source fields, \mathcal{S}_{int} is an interacting part of the action and Z_0 is a

generating functional for the free field, which is given by

$$Z_0[J^+, J^-] = \mathcal{N}_0 \int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- \delta(\zeta^+(\tau_f, \mathbf{x}) - \zeta^-(\tau_f, \mathbf{x})) \exp \left[i\mathcal{S}^{(2)}[\zeta^+] - i\mathcal{S}^{(2)}[\zeta^-] + i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x (J^+ \zeta^+ - J^- \zeta^-) \right], \quad (3.2)$$

where τ_f is the time on the final slice. We have a few remarks about the path-integral formulation. We will deal with interactions that contain time derivatives of ζ . As we will clarify in Appendix A, the canonical momentum π_ζ is no longer linearly related to ζ' and therefore, there are non-trivial additional terms that are not present in the original Lagrangian. Such additional terms may have a singular factor $\delta^{(4)}(0)$, but we generally prove that they are necessary to cancel unphysical singular contributions associated with derivative interactions. For notational simplicity, we make the additional terms implicit and simply neglect the unphysical singular contributions since they should be canceled by the terms with the singular coefficient. The second remark is about the prescription for the final time τ_f . We take τ_f to be later than the time at which we evaluate operators' expectation values. As we will prove in Appendix B, we can neglect the boundary interactions within this prescription. A simple explanation of this fact is due to causality since the boundary interactions are at τ_f , which cannot affect the operators in their past.

From the above generating functional, the expectation values of ζ fields can be calculated by the functional derivatives with respect to J^\pm . For example, the three-point correlation function of the ζ^+ field can be obtained by

$$\langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_3) \rangle = \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_3)} Z[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0}. \quad (3.3)$$

In practice, we can use diagrammatic calculations of the correlation functions with a set of Feynman rules, which we will briefly describe below (see Ref. [95] for the derivation).

- Free propagators

Since there are two types of the ζ fields (+ and -), we have four free propagators given below.

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Delta_{++}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2)} Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} = \langle 0 | T \{ \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \} | 0 \rangle \\ &= \theta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)} + \theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Delta_{+-}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1)} \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2)} Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} = \langle 0 | \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1) | 0 \rangle \\ &= \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Delta_{-+}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2)} Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} = \langle 0 | \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) | 0 \rangle \\ &= \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Delta_{--}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1)} \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2)} Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} = \langle 0 | \bar{T} \{ \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \} | 0 \rangle \\ &= \theta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)} + \theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where ζ_k is the mode function of ζ in Fourier space defined in Eq. (2.11) and the solution to ζ_k is given by Eq. (2.17) in the transient USR model, and T (\bar{T}) denotes the (anti-)time-ordered symbol. For the correlation function of real fields to be real, the Heaviside step function needs to be defined as Eq. (2.2). The propagators in Fourier space corresponding to Eqs. (3.4)-(3.7) are given, respectively, by

$$G_{++}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) \theta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2) \theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1), \quad (3.8)$$

$$G_{+-}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2), \quad (3.9)$$

$$G_{-+}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2), \quad (3.10)$$

$$G_{--}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_1) \zeta_k(\tau_2) \theta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \zeta_k(\tau_1) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) \theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1). \quad (3.11)$$


In Fig. 2, we show the diagrammatic rules for propagators, where the black and white dots denote the $+$ and $-$ fields, respectively. Later, we use the following formulas of the (anti-)time-ordered propagator,

$$D_2 G_{\pm\pm}(k; \tau, \tau_*) = \mp \frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$D_2 G_{\pm\mp}(k; \tau, \tau_*) = 0, \quad (3.13)$$

where D_2 is the EOM derivative operator defined in Eq. (2.35).



$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 \bullet \text{---} k \text{---} \bullet \tau_2 &= G_{++}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) \\ \tau_1 \bullet \text{---} k \text{---} \circ \tau_2 &= G_{+-}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) \\ \tau_1 \circ \text{---} k \text{---} \bullet \tau_2 &= G_{-+}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) \\ \tau_1 \circ \text{---} k \text{---} \circ \tau_2 &= G_{--}(k; \tau_1, \tau_2) \end{aligned}$$

FIG. 2. From top to bottom, we show the propagators corresponding to (3.8),(3.9),(3.10), and (3.11), respectively. The black and white dots denote the $+$ and $-$ type ζ fields, respectively.

- Vertices

Let us consider a general form of the interacting Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\zeta) = \lambda(\tau) \mathcal{D}_1 \zeta \mathcal{D}_2 \zeta \mathcal{D}_3 \zeta, \quad (3.14)$$

where λ is a function of τ , \mathcal{D}_i 's are derivative operators including the identity operator. At first order in $\lambda(\tau)$, the correction to the generating functional in Eq. (3.1) from the $+$ field is

$$i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) Z_0[J^+, J^-]. \quad (3.15)$$

By further applying the functional derivative with respect to the remaining J^\pm and taking the limit $J^\pm \rightarrow 0$ at the end, we obtain the three-point correlation function with (external) legs labeled by A, B, C as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{3-point vertex by the } + \text{ field}) &= i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \lambda(\tau) (\mathcal{D}_1 G_{+s_A}(k_A; \tau, \tau_A)) (\mathcal{D}_2 G_{+s_B}(k_B; \tau, \tau_B)) (\mathcal{D}_3 G_{+s_C}(k_C; \tau, \tau_C)) \\ &\quad + (\text{5 perms}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where $s_{A,B,C}$ are either $+$ or $-$, and $k_{A,B,C}$ and $\tau_{A,B,C}$ are the momenta and times of each propagator. Note that we have just applied the functional derivatives $-is_i \delta / \delta J^{s_i}(k_i, \tau_i)$ ($i = A, B, C$) to the residual source functions and have taken the limit $J^\pm \rightarrow 0$, and therefore the points A, B, C could be connected to each other by propagators. In Eq. (3.16), “5 perms” means summing up all the possible combinations of (1, 2, 3) and (A, B, C) . We note that the derivative operators \mathcal{D}_i act on the propagators.

Similarly, the three-point correlation induced by the $-$ field is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{3-point vertex by the } - \text{ field}) &= -i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \lambda(\tau) (\mathcal{D}_1 G_{-s_A}(k_A; \tau, \tau_A)) (\mathcal{D}_2 G_{-s_B}(k_B; \tau, \tau_B)) (\mathcal{D}_3 G_{-s_C}(k_C; \tau, \tau_C)) \\ &\quad + (\text{5 perms}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

The Feynman diagrams representing the three-point vertices generated from the $+$ and $-$ fields are shown in Fig. 3. Again, the $+$ and $-$ fields are represented by the black and white dots, respectively.




FIG. 3. 3-point vertices corresponding to (3.16) (left) and (3.17) (right), respectively.

- Feynman rules

1. Determine the number of interaction vertices, namely the order of perturbations and the number of external points corresponding to the correlation functions we evaluate. In most cases, we consider the correlation functions of operators at equal time. In such a case, external legs can be either + or - as equal-time correlators would have no distinction between (anti-)time-ordered or non-time-ordered ones.
2. Draw vertices and here one has to implement both black and white vertices. If a diagram consists of multiple interaction vertices, each vertex can be + or -.
3. Connect all the external points and vertices with propagators. Assign the momentum to propagators so that it is conserved at each vertex.
4. The calculations are carried out according to the rules in Figs. 2 and 3. For the diagrams including loops, we should integrate over the loop momentum.

Note that some of the diagrams can be related to their complex conjugations. In particular, when we evaluate real correlation functions, we expect some reduction in the number of possible diagrams to compute. See e.g., Ref. [95].

Before deriving the master formula in the path-integral approach, we would like to give a few comments on the differences between the path-integral and operator formalisms, which was also noted in our previous work [88].

The first remark is that, in the path-integral formalism, the operator insertion done by a source functional derivative $\delta/(\pm i\delta J^\pm)$ yields the expectation value of a Heisenberg picture operator. This is because the source function is the one for a Heisenberg picture operator but not for an interaction picture one. On the other hand, in the operator formalism, one has to be careful particularly if one considers the insertion of operators with time derivatives simply because $\zeta'_I(\tau) \neq \zeta'_H(\tau)$, where the subscripts I and H denote the interaction picture and Heisenberg picture operators, respectively. This difference leads to an “effective Hamiltonian” [2]. In the path-integral formalism, such an effective Hamiltonian does not appear. It may seem peculiar, but there is another crucial difference, which is discussed below.

In the operator formalism, the interaction terms which are proportional to the free EOM should automatically vanish for perturbation theory in the interacting picture. This is not the case for path-integral formalism since the (anti-)time-ordered propagator gives non-vanishing contributions to correlation functions. Crudely speaking, in the path integral, the derivatives acting on operators are multiplied to propagators, for instance, $\langle T\zeta'(\tau_1)\zeta(\tau_2) \rangle_{\text{path-int}} = \partial_{\tau_1} G_{++}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$. On the other hand, in operator formalism, one would evaluate the expectation value of the operator with a time derivative directly. This is why EOM terms vanish in the operator formalism, whereas not in the path-integral formalism. Therefore, one should not mix the result in each formulation, and can compare only the final result. Nevertheless, each formalism is self-consistent.

B. Master formula

Now, we are ready to show the master formula of one-loop corrections under the in-in path-integral formalism. At one-loop order, only cubic- or quartic-order operators contribute to the two-point correlation functions. Therefore, we are only concerned with the interactions

$$\mathcal{L}^{(3)} = \sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)}(\tau) \prod_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \zeta, \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^{(4)} = \sum_{A=1}^m \lambda_4^{(A)}(\tau) \prod_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \zeta, \quad (3.19)$$

where A represents the label of each interaction, n, m denote the total number of different terms in the Lagrangian, $\lambda_{3,4}^{(A)}$ are the time-dependent coupling constants, and $\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}$'s are the derivative operators acting on the i -th ζ of the A -th term. We also have particular quartic interactions that play important roles in proving consistency relations including operators with spatial derivatives [2, 96]. For instance, when we have cubic interactions

$$\mathcal{L}^{(3)} \supset \lambda_3^A \zeta' (\partial \zeta)^2 + \lambda_3^B \zeta (\partial \zeta)^2, \quad (3.20)$$

where $\lambda_3^{A,B}$ are coupling constants, there should be quartic interactions

$$\mathcal{L}^{(4)} \supset -2\lambda_4^A \zeta \zeta' (\partial \zeta)^2 - \lambda_4^B \zeta^2 (\partial \zeta)^2. \quad (3.21)$$

These quartic terms must appear to realize a rescaling symmetry $x^i \rightarrow e^{-\delta\zeta} x^i$ and $\zeta(\tau, x^i) \rightarrow \zeta(\tau, x^i) + \delta\zeta$ with a constant $\delta\zeta$, which follows from the definition of ζ in the line element $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2 e^{2\zeta} \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j$.⁵ Therefore, the nonlinear expression of operators reproducing the interactions (3.20) and (3.21) should be of the form

$$\lambda_3^A \zeta \frac{1}{e^{2\zeta}} (\partial \zeta)^2 - \frac{1}{2e^{2\zeta}} \lambda_3^B (\partial \zeta)^2. \quad (3.22)$$

We will consider particular quartic interactions like (3.21) associated with the cubic interactions with spatial derivatives. The one-loop corrections consist of contractions of the two external legs with either two $\mathcal{L}^{(3)}$ or a single $\mathcal{L}^{(4)}$, which we will discuss separately.

1. Cubic interactions

By using the generating functional (3.1) of one-particle-irreducible (1PI) diagrams, the one-loop corrections from two cubic vertices associated with $\mathcal{L}^{(3)}$ can be generally written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2) \rangle_{1\text{-loop}, 1\text{PI}}^{(3)} &= \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)} \right) Z[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0}^{1\text{-loop}, 1\text{PI}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)} \right) \left(i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\mathcal{L}^{(3)} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) - \mathcal{L}^{(3)} \left(\frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) \right] \right)^2 \\ &\quad \times Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0}^{1\text{-loop}, 1\text{PI}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)} \right) i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^3 \underbrace{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})}} - \prod_{i=1}^3 \underbrace{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau, \mathbf{x})}} \right) \right] \\ &\quad \times Z^{(1)}[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0}^{1\text{-loop}, 1\text{PI}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$Z^{(1)}[J^+, J^-] = i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau' \int d^3y \left[\mathcal{L}^{(3)} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau', \mathbf{y})} \right) - \mathcal{L}^{(3)} \left(\frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau', \mathbf{y})} \right) \right] Z_0[J^+, J^-]. \quad (3.24)$$

Here, $Z^{(1)}[J^+, J^-]$ is the generating functional with the first-order correction by cubic interactions. Notice also that a functional derivative of an external leg \mathbf{x}_2 and one of the functional derivatives in cubic interactions at \mathbf{x} (indicated by wavy underlines) yield propagators connecting \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}_2 , and therefore

$$\langle \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2) \rangle_{1\text{-loop}, 1\text{PI}}^{(3)}$$

⁵ The shift of the zero mode of ζ is equivalent to rescaling of the scale factor $a(t)$ as well.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) \dots \dots \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) \right] \underline{\underline{Z^{(1)}[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0}}}. \quad (3.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we further notice that the remaining functional derivatives acting on $Z^{(1)}[J^+, J^-]$ bring us the expectation values of tree-level three-point functions, which are indicated by the double or dotted underlines. Thus, we obtain the final expression

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2) \rangle_{1\text{-loop,1PI}}^{(3)} \\
&= i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \right\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right) \right], \quad (3.26)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \rangle_{\text{tree}}$ indicates that the three-point functions are evaluated at tree level (namely, at first order in cubic interactions), and no loop diagram forms. In the above discussion, we have put aside the non-1PI contribution such as

$$\left\langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \right\rangle \supset \mathcal{D}_{j_1}^{(A)} \Delta_{++}(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau, \mathbf{x}) \mathcal{D}_{j_2}^{(A)} \langle \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \rangle_{1\text{st}}, \quad (3.27)$$

where $j_1, j_2 \neq i$, $\langle \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \rangle_{1\text{st}}$ denotes the (one-loop) tadpole terms arising from the first-order correction with cubic interactions. The non-1PI diagram refers to the one shown in Fig. 4. The contributions from non-1PI diagrams contain UV divergences which have to be regulated in a covariant way as discussed in Ref. [2]. Thus, all the one-loop diagrams from cubic interactions are either the 1PI ones or the non-1PI ones, and we concentrate on the 1PI contributions in the following. The formula (3.26) can be diagrammatically understood as Fig. 5.




FIG. 4. Schematic figure of non-1PI three-point correlation functions with a tadpole diagram

The Fourier transformation of the above formula is

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_\zeta^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1) \equiv \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle_{1\text{-loop,1PI}}^{(3)} \\
&= \frac{i}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle\langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$




FIG. 5. Schematic figure of Eq. (3.26). The dotted lines denote uncontracted legs of vertex a .

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{i}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right) \right], \quad (3.28)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle\langle \dots \rangle\rangle$ is the expectation value without the momentum δ -function, i.e.,

$$\langle X(\mathbf{k}_1) X(\mathbf{k}_2) \dots \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 + \dots) \langle\langle X(\mathbf{k}_1) X(\mathbf{k}_2) \dots \rangle\rangle, \quad (3.29)$$

and (i_1, i_2, i_3) runs over all the possible permutations of $(1, 2, 3)$. In the second equality of Eq. (3.28), we have changed the upper limit of τ -integration to be τ_* . In Appendix C, we will prove this equality.⁶

We discuss whether the CMB modes that are supposed to exit the Hubble radius well before the USR transition can be amplified during the USR phase. We formally separate the \mathbf{k} -integration as

$$\int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} = \int_{k > k_{\min}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} + \int_{k < k_{\min}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (3.30)$$

We choose k_{\min} to be sufficiently larger than k_1 but much smaller than the momentum that exits the Hubble horizon at the beginning of the USR phase, i.e.,

$$k_1 \ll k_{\min} \ll k_s = -\tau_s^{-1}. \quad (3.31)$$

Then, we can take the squeezing limit within the loop momentum, so that the consistency relations hold as will be discussed later. The second integral on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.30) does not give significant contributions. Therefore, only the first integral would give possibly large contributions to the power spectrum, and hereafter, we consider the momentum integration in the range $k > k_{\min}$.

We also separate the time-integration region as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_0} d\tau + \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau, \quad (3.32)$$

where τ_0 is an arbitrary time before the USR transition but after the k_1 mode exits the Hubble horizon, and we will assume it to be the time slightly before the USR period starts, $\tau_0 \simeq \tau_s$. Since the time region $-\infty < \tau < \tau_0$ is before the onset of the USR, there should be no large enhancement effects. Thus, we are only concerned with the second integral in Eq. (3.32) hereafter.

From the above argument for the ranges of integrals, the 1PI one-loop corrections to the power spectrum associated with cubic vertices can be summarized as

$$P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1)$$

⁶ Technically speaking, the upper limit of τ -integration is infinitesimally greater than τ_* such that the possible contribution from δ -function can be included. See Appendix C.

$$\simeq \frac{i}{2} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int_{k > k_{\min}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int_{k > k_{\min}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right) \right]. \quad (3.33)$$

Let us consider another crucial property of ζ , consistency relations. If they hold, this implies that, for sufficiently small k_1 , the three-point function is approximated as

$$\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \xrightarrow{k_1 \rightarrow 0} -P_{\zeta}^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_1) \frac{1}{k^3} \frac{d \left(k^3 \langle \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_k^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right)}{d \log k}, \quad (3.34)$$

where $P_{\zeta}^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_1)$ is the tree-level power spectrum defined by

$$P_{\zeta}^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_1) \equiv \langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}}, \quad (3.35)$$

which differs from the dimensionless one by a factor $k_1^3/(2\pi^2)$. Recall that we did not introduce the same factor for $P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}$ in Eq. (3.28) either. Note that Eq. (3.34) corresponds to the leading expression in k_1 . Here, we have assumed the unusual forms of consistency relations since the super-Hubble mode $\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1)$ corresponds to the time τ_* different from τ appearing in the other operators. Nevertheless, the effective constancy of $\tilde{\zeta}$ discussed in Sec. II B justifies this since it just follows from the property of the tree-level mode function. Furthermore, we have assumed that the consistency relations of three-point functions consisting of the $+$ and $-$ fields yield the same result. This is rather nontrivial, but we will show it within our reduced system later.

What is the consequence of consistency relations? To perform the momentum integration properly, we use dimensional regularization, which results in⁷

$$\frac{P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1)}{P_{\zeta}^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_1)} \\ \simeq -\frac{i}{2} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \left[\sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{s+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int_{k_{\min}}^{k_{\max}} \frac{d^p k}{(2\pi)^p} \frac{1}{k^p} \frac{d \left(\mu^{-\delta} k^p \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^s(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^s(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right)}{d \log k} \right] \\ = -i \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \left[\sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{s+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{p/2} \Gamma(p/2)} \left(\mu^{-\delta} k^p \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^s(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^s(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right) \right]_{k_{\min}}^{k_{\max}}, \quad (3.36)$$

where $p \equiv 3 + \delta$, μ is the renormalization scale introduced to keep the correct dimensionality, s denotes the sign of the fields, and we used $P_{\zeta}^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_1) = \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}} = \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}}$. In the last equality, we dropped the contribution from k_{\max} , which does not contribute when we apply dimensional regularization. In Ref. [66], it was argued that the $i\epsilon$ prescription cuts off the contribution from UV modes, and such an argument was criticized in Ref. [68].⁸ Nevertheless, the claim that $k_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$ does not give contributions is correct for the following reasons: We define the momentum integration in spatial dimension $3 + \delta$ and take $\text{Re } \delta$ to be negative such that $k_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$ is convergent (under which the dependence on k_{\max} disappears). Then, we analytically continue the result to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Hence only logarithmic divergence may generally appear as the terms are proportional to the negative powers of δ .⁹ Thus, when Eq. (3.34) holds, the 1PI one-loop corrections to the power spectrum are summarized as (3.36). As anticipated from the above expression, we can readily show that the 1PI one-loop corrections are small assuming that Eq. (3.36) holds.

One may wonder whether the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ leads to singular terms, namely, whether logarithmic divergence exists or not. The answer is no, and there are no $1/\delta$ poles. For the UV divergent cases, $1/\delta$ is associated with the Γ

⁷ Strictly speaking, we need to include the corrections from quartic interactions. For now, we assume such contributions are implicitly included.

⁸ Indeed, the argument in Ref. [66] cannot be applied if we consider a manifestly unitary $i\epsilon$ -prescription suggested in Ref. [97], where the interacting Hamiltonian is modified as $H_I(t) \rightarrow H_I(t) e^{\epsilon t}$ such that it is turned off in the asymptotic past $t \rightarrow -\infty$, while the time evolution operator $U_{\epsilon} = T \exp \left(-i \int_{-\infty}^t dt' H_I(t') e^{\epsilon t'} \right)$ is manifestly unitary.

⁹ An interesting discussion about the relation between dimensional regularization and cut-off regularization can be found e.g., in Ref. [98], which would clarify the above comments regarding the analytic continuation.

function with a negative integer argument that appears when we perform momentum integration within dimensional regularization. However, unlike the usual case, the momentum integration is performed as that of total derivative terms and therefore, there is no room for the Γ function of a negative integer to appear in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$. The mode function behaves continuously for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, which may be understood as follows: The dimensional regularization leads to $\nu \simeq (3 + \eta)/2 \rightarrow (3 + \delta + \eta)/2$ in Eq. (2.16). Therefore, it only leads to a small shift of the second slow-roll parameter η . Some powers of the scale factor and momentum can also change, but such factors do not give any $1/\delta$ singularity. Thus, as it is consistent with Ref. [2], we can safely neglect the UV divergences of 1PI one-loop corrections. Nevertheless, we will give a few comments on the UV divergences in Appendix D.

2. Quartic interactions

Let us also consider one-loop corrections arising from quartic interactions of the form (3.19). They are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2) \rangle_{1\text{-loop, 1PI}}^{(4)} \\
&= \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)} \right) \left(i \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\mathcal{L}^{(4)} \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) - \mathcal{L}^{(4)} \left(\frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) \right] \right) Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} \\
&= \left(\frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{x}_1)} \right) i \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\sum_{A=1}^m \lambda_4^{(A)} \sum_{i=1}^4 \left(\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{i\delta J^+(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \frac{\delta}{-i\delta J^-(\tau, \mathbf{x})} \right) \right] Z_0[J^+, J^-] \Big|_{J^\pm=0} \\
&= i \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int d^3x \left[\sum_{A=1}^m \lambda_4^{(A)} \sum_{i=1}^4 \left(\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}_1, \tau_*) \prod_{i \neq j} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}_1, \tau_*) \prod_{i \neq j} \mathcal{D}_j^{(A)} \zeta^-(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \right) \right] \\
&\simeq \frac{i}{2} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int d^3x \\
&\quad \times \left[\sum_{A=1}^m \lambda_4^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}_1, \tau_*) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \left\langle \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \mathcal{D}_{i_4}^{(A)} \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)}(-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_*, \mathbf{x}_2)) \left\langle \zeta^+(\mathbf{x}_1, \tau_*) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \zeta^-(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \left\langle \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \zeta^-(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \mathcal{D}_{i_4}^{(A)} \zeta^-(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \right) \right], \tag{3.37}
\end{aligned}$$

where the overall factor $1/2$ is a symmetric factor, (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) runs over all the possible permutations of $(1, 2, 3, 4)$, and, in the last equality, we used the fact that the four-point functions should be the products of the two-point function at one-loop order. Note that we understand the two-point function of the same spacetime points will be defined in a way that it is regulated. The Fourier transform of the above contribution (with dimensional regularization) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{1\text{-loop, 1PI}}^{(4)} \\
&\simeq \frac{i}{2} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \\
&\quad \times \left[\sum_{A=1}^m \lambda_4^{(A)} \int \frac{\mu^{-\delta} d^p k}{(2\pi)^p} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_4}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_4}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right) \right]. \tag{3.38}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we are interested in the contributions from short-wavelength modes \mathbf{k} experiencing the USR phase inside the Hubble horizon to the power spectrum of a long-wavelength mode \mathbf{k}_1 associated with the CMB, we will further take the squeezing limit $k_1 \ll k$ later. As shown later, such squeezing limit results in the contributions that restore consistency relations of operators with spatial derivatives.

IV. CONSISTENCY RELATION OF $\langle\zeta\zeta\zeta\rangle$ IN THE TRANSIENT USR MODEL

In the previous section, we showed that, if the consistency relations (3.34) and the effective constancy of super-Hubble perturbations hold, we can exploit the very simple formula (3.36) to evaluate one-loop correction to the power spectrum of super-Hubble modes at leading order. If we want to prove the consistency relations of all the three-point functions that appear in interactions, it is rather cumbersome since the number of cubic interactions is not a few. Therefore, we consider a method to find a self-consistent set of interactions that keeps the symmetry of the system, namely, that shows the correct consistency relations.

We will construct a reduced Lagrangian by the following strategy: First, we compute the three-point function

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle \equiv \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_2)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_3)\rangle\rangle, \quad (4.1)$$

with all the cubic interactions in the original action. It will turn out that at leading order of the squeezing limit and slow-roll limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (while $\eta \neq 0$), only a few interactions give the leading contributions, and we will identify them as leading interactions in the transient USR model. Then, we will find a reduced Lagrangian.

In this section, as a first step to find the reduced Lagrangian, we explicitly compute the three-point function $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle$ and look for the set of interaction terms that are necessary to show the consistency relations for arbitrary wavenumbers $\mathbf{k}_2 \sim -\mathbf{k}_3$ in the squeezing limit $|\mathbf{k}_1| \rightarrow 0$.

Before entering the detailed computations, we give a few technical remarks. One is that when a correlation function is evaluated at the same moment, choosing either $+$ or $-$ fields as external fields does not give differences. Therefore, we take all the external fields to be the $+$ field for simplicity. Another is that the boundary terms in the interaction Lagrangian give no contribution under our prescription given in Ref. [88] and in Appendix B. Therefore, we are only concerned with the bulk and EOM terms.




FIG. 6. The diagram corresponding to the bispectrum $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_2)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_3)\rangle\rangle$.

We consider a single scalar-field theory given by the action (2.4) and compute the three-point correlation function of ζ for the diagram illustrated in Fig. 6. As we showed in Eq. (2.34), the cubic-order action of ζ consists of the five bulk contributions, EOM terms, and boundary terms. Since the boundary terms do not contribute to the three-point function in the in-in path-integral formalism, we will compute $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle$ arising from each of the bulk and EOM terms. In the following, we will denote the contributions to the three-point function from the $+$ and $-$ vertices, as $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_+$ and $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_-$, respectively.

The contributions arising from each of the bulk terms in Eq. (2.34) are given by

- $\mathcal{L}_{1,\text{bulk}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta \zeta'^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_+ &= 2iM_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \bar{\zeta}'_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}'_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau) \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_- = -2iM_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}), \quad (4.3)$$

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_+ + \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^3\rangle\rangle_- = 4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \text{Im} (\zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*)) + (2 \text{ perms}) \quad (4.4)$$

where we used the symbol “2 perms” for the symmetric terms with respect to the wavenumbers $\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3$.

- $\mathcal{L}_{2,\text{bulk}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta (\partial \zeta)^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_+ &= -2i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_3 \cdot \mathbf{k}_1) \left(\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau) \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_- = 2i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_3 \cdot \mathbf{k}_1) \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) , \quad (4.6)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = -4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_3 \cdot \mathbf{k}_1) \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \text{Im} (\zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*)) . \quad (4.7)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{3,\text{bulk}} = -M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a \epsilon \left(2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \zeta' \partial_i \zeta \partial_i \chi = -M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon^2 \left(2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \zeta' \partial_i \zeta \partial_i \partial^{-2} \zeta' \simeq -2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta' \partial_i \zeta \partial_i \partial^{-2} \zeta'$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_+ &= -2i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3}{k_3^2} \left(\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \bar{\zeta}'_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}'_{k_3}(\tau) \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (5 \text{ perms}) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_- = 2i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3}{k_3^2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (5 \text{ perms}) , \quad (4.9)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = -4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3}{k_3^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^2 \text{Im} (\zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*)) + (5 \text{ perms}) . \quad (4.10)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{bulk}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{a^2}{2} \epsilon \eta' \zeta^2 \zeta'$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_+ &= i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon \eta' \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon \eta' \bar{\zeta}'_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau) \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_- = -i M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon \eta' \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}) , \quad (4.12)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = 2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon \eta' \text{Im} (\zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*)) + (2 \text{ perms}) . \quad (4.13)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{5,\text{bulk}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon}{4} \partial^2 \zeta (\partial \chi)^2 = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{a^2}{4} \epsilon^3 \partial^2 \zeta (\partial_i \partial^{-2} \zeta')^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_+ &= \frac{i}{2} M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2 k_3^2} \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 \left(\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^3 \zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^3 \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}'_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}'_{k_3}(\tau) \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*) \zeta_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle_- = -\frac{i}{2} M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2 k_3^2} \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^3 \zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*) \right) + (2 \text{ perms}) , \quad (4.15)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2 k_3^2} \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau a^2 \epsilon^3 \text{Im} (\zeta_{k_1}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \zeta'_{k_3}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_{k_3}(\tau_*)) + (2 \text{ perms}) . \quad (4.16)$$

For the EOM terms, the $-$ type vertex does not contribute to $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ due to the property $D_2 G_{-+} = 0$. Each contribution arising from the EOM terms in Eq. (2.34) is

- $\mathcal{L}_{1,\text{EOM}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\eta}{2} \zeta^2 D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = \frac{\eta(\tau_*)}{2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2 + (2 \text{ perms}), \quad (4.17)$$

where we used the relation (3.12).

- $\mathcal{L}_{2,\text{EOM}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{2}{aH} \zeta \zeta' D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2a(\tau_*)H} (|\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2)' |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2 + (5 \text{ perms}). \quad (4.18)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{3,\text{EOM}} = -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2a^2 H^2} (\partial \zeta)^2 D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2}{2a^2(\tau_*)H^2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2 + (2 \text{ perms}). \quad (4.19)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{EOM}} = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2a^2 H^2} \partial^{-2} (\partial_i \partial_j (\partial_i \zeta \partial_j \zeta)) D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = -\frac{1}{2a^2(\tau_*)H^2} \frac{(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3)(\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3)}{k_3^2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2 + (2 \text{ perms}). \quad (4.20)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{5,\text{EOM}} = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{a^2 H} (\partial_i \zeta)(\partial_i \chi) D_2 \zeta = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon}{aH} (\partial_i \zeta)(\partial_i \partial^{-2} \zeta') D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = \frac{\epsilon(\tau_*)}{4a(\tau_*)H} \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2}{k_2^2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 (|\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2)' + (5 \text{ perms}). \quad (4.21)$$

- $\mathcal{L}_{6,\text{EOM}} = -\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{a^2 H} \partial^{-2} (\partial_i \partial_j (\partial_i \zeta \partial_j \chi)) D_2 \zeta = -M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon}{aH} \partial^{-2} (\partial_i \partial_j (\partial_i \zeta \partial_j \partial^{-2} \zeta')) D_2 \zeta$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle = -\frac{\epsilon(\tau_*)}{4a(\tau_*)H} \frac{(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3)(\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{k}_3)}{k_2^2 k_3^2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 (|\zeta_{k_2}(\tau_*)|^2)' + (5 \text{ perms}). \quad (4.22)$$

Let us consider the transient USR model in which η and ϵ evolve according to Eqs. (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. During the whole SR+USR+SR stages, ϵ is much smaller than 1, while η exhibits the transition from the SR value $\eta \simeq 0$ to the USR value $\eta \simeq -6$. In the squeezed limit ($|\mathbf{k}_1| \ll |\mathbf{k}_2| \simeq |\mathbf{k}_3|$), the contributions to $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ arising from Eqs. (4.19)-(4.22) are suppressed relative to those from Eqs. (4.17) and (4.18). The first three bulk terms $\mathcal{L}_{1,\text{bulk}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{2,\text{bulk}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{3,\text{bulk}}$ and the last one $\mathcal{L}_{5,\text{bulk}}$ give rise to contributions to $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ of order ϵ^2 and ϵ^3 , respectively, so that they are negligible relative to (4.17) and (4.18). In the transient USR model, the derivative η' is not small during the transition from the SR to USR stages and hence the contribution (4.13) from the fourth bulk term $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{bulk}}$ cannot be ignored.¹⁰

In summary, in the context of transient USR inflation, the dominant contributions to $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ come from the three terms (4.13), (4.17), and (4.18). For the computation of $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ arising from these dominant contributions, we exploit the background Eq. (2.1) for η and use the approximations $\zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \simeq 0$ after the Hubble radius crossing for the large-scale mode with $k_1 = |\mathbf{k}_1|$, and $\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*) \simeq \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_s) \simeq \zeta_{k_1}(\tau_e)$, where τ_s and τ_e correspond to conformal times at the start and end of the USR period, respectively. Picking up the leading-order terms around $k_1 \rightarrow 0$, the squeezed-limit bispectrum is given by¹¹

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle\rangle \simeq |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 \left[4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon_1 \Delta \eta}{\tau_s^2 H^2} \text{Im} (\zeta'_k(\tau_s) \zeta_k(\tau_s) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*)) \theta(\tau_* - \tau_s) \right]$$

¹⁰ In standard slow-roll inflation where $|\eta|$ is at most of the same order as ϵ , the $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{bulk}}$ contributions to $\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^3 \rangle\rangle$ can be neglected relative to (4.17) and (4.18).

¹¹ Here, we use the inequality $|\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2 \ll |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2$ for the wavenumber k much larger than k_1 . When the transient USR period is present, the small-scale dimensionless power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = k^3 |\zeta_k|^2 / (2\pi^2)$ can be enhanced by a factor of order 10^7 relative to the value $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1) = k_1^3 |\zeta_{k_1}|^2 / (2\pi^2)$ on CMB scales, see Fig. 1. Provided that $k/k_1 \gg 10^{7/3}$, however, the inequality $|\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2 \ll |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2$ holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
& -4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon_2 \Delta \eta}{\tau_e^2 H^2} \text{Im} \left(\zeta'_k(\tau_e) \zeta_k(\tau_e) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \right) \theta(\tau_* - \tau_e) \\
& + \eta(\tau_*) |\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2 - \tau_* (|\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2)' \Big]. \tag{4.23}
\end{aligned}$$

By using the mode function (2.17), it follows that

$$\eta(\tau_*) |\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2 - \tau_* (|\zeta_k(\tau_*)|^2)' = -\frac{H^2}{4\epsilon(\tau_*) M_{\text{Pl}}^2 k^2} \frac{\partial |\xi(x, y, z)|^2}{\partial x} \frac{dx}{dk} \Big|_{(x, y, z) = (k\tau_*, k\tau_s, k\tau_e)}, \tag{4.24}$$

$$4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon_1 \Delta \eta}{\tau_s^2 H^2} \text{Im} \left(\zeta'_k(\tau_s) \zeta_k(\tau_s) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \right) \theta(\tau_* - \tau_s) = -\frac{H^2}{4\epsilon(\tau_*) M_{\text{Pl}}^2 k^2} \frac{\partial |\xi(x, y, z)|^2}{\partial y} \frac{dy}{dk} \Big|_{(x, y, z) = (k\tau_*, k\tau_s, k\tau_e)}, \tag{4.25}$$

$$-4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\epsilon_2 \Delta \eta}{\tau_e^2 H^2} \text{Im} \left(\zeta'_k(\tau_e) \zeta_k(\tau_e) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_*) \right) \theta(\tau_* - \tau_e) = -\frac{H^2}{4\epsilon(\tau_*) M_{\text{Pl}}^2 k^2} \frac{\partial |\xi(x, y, z)|^2}{\partial z} \frac{dz}{dk} \Big|_{(x, y, z) = (k\tau_*, k\tau_s, k\tau_e)} \tag{4.26}$$

where $\xi(x, y, z)$ is defined in Eq. (2.18). Then, the three-point correlation function in the squeezed limit yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle & \simeq -\frac{H^2}{4\epsilon(\tau_*) k^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau_*)|^2 \frac{d|\xi(k\tau_*, k\tau_s, k\tau_e)|^2}{dk} \\
& = -\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \frac{1}{k^3} \frac{d \left(k^3 \langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right)}{d \ln k}, \tag{4.27}
\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the consistency relation originally derived by Maldacena in the context of slow-roll inflation [77]. We proved that the same consistency relation also holds in the context of transient USR inflation, as it is consistent with the numerical analysis in Ref. [58, 66].¹² Note that the relation (4.27) is a general result valid for the momentum \mathbf{k} in the squeezed limit ($|\mathbf{k}| \gg |\mathbf{k}_1|$). Moreover, it holds at any time τ_* during inflation after the large-scale mode \mathbf{k}_1 exits the Hubble horizon. These properties are important to show the absence of large one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of long-wavelength perturbations. As it is clear from the above proof, even in the presence of multiple USR stages, the three-point correlation function would be proportional to the change of $|\xi|^2$ with respect to k , which should finally translate into the consistency relation (4.27).

From the above discussion, we have found that the leading-order interactions in the transient USR model are those yielding (4.13), (4.17), and (4.18). In Sec. V, we study whether the reduced Lagrangian consisting of the leading-order terms proves consistency relations by themselves.

V. EFFECTIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE TRANSIENT USR MODEL AND OTHER CONSISTENCY RELATIONS

In this section, we consider a reduced Lagrangian that consists of leading-order terms, which gives the correct consistency relations of three-point correlation functions. In the literature, it is often the case that only the interaction term $\mathcal{L}_{1, \text{bulk}} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon \eta' \zeta^2 \zeta' / 2$ is taken into account for computing quantum corrections to the power spectrum. However, this is inadequate since it cannot prove the consistency relation of the simplest three-point function. Indeed, from our analytic results in Sec. IV, we showed that a reduced cubic action which results in the correct consistency relation consists of the terms $\mathcal{L}_{4, \text{bulk}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{1, \text{EOM}}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{2, \text{EOM}}$, i.e.,¹³

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(3)} = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int d\tau d^3x \left(\frac{a^2}{2} \epsilon \eta' \zeta^2 \zeta' + \frac{\eta}{2} \zeta^2 D_2 \zeta + \frac{2}{aH} \zeta \zeta' D_2 \zeta \right), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$D_2 \zeta = \frac{d}{d\tau} (a^2 \epsilon \zeta') - a^2 \epsilon \partial^2 \zeta. \tag{5.2}$$

¹² The results of Refs. [58, 66] seem to be based on the operator formalism, and they use total time-derivative Hamiltonian terms rather than the EOM terms.

¹³ In Refs. [58, 66], it was shown that the leading bulk term $\mathcal{L}_{1, \text{bulk}}$ and the boundary terms $\mathcal{L}_\partial = [-(a\epsilon/H)\zeta\zeta'^2 - (a^2\epsilon\eta/2)\zeta^2\zeta']$ lead to the correct consistency relation of $\langle \zeta^3 \rangle$ for a very wide range of momentum modes. Since they use the operator formalism, we are not able to find the one-to-one correspondence between our results and theirs. Nevertheless, we suspect that their sets of interactions would be the self-consistent reduced Hamiltonian within the operator formalism. It would be worth proving the consistency relations corresponding to their reduced Hamiltonian interactions as we will do in the path integral formalism, which would justify the application of the master formula within the operator formalism self-consistently.

We emphasize that the reduced Lagrangian (5.1) is yet a candidate for a self-consistent reduced Lagrangian. This is because we have not yet proven the consistency relations of three-point functions that appear in the interactions. As we will show below, the result in Sec. IV immediately shows the consistency relation of $\langle\langle \zeta^2 \zeta' \rangle\rangle$ that corresponds to the first term in the reduced interaction Lagrangian (5.1). To use the master formula (3.36), we need to prove consistency relations of the three-point functions $\langle\langle \zeta^2 D_2 \zeta \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle \zeta \zeta' D_2 \zeta \rangle\rangle$ as well. Here, it is required to include quartic interactions, since the D_2 operator contains two spatial derivatives. To find necessary quartic interactions, we need to consider the following nonlinear completion of the Lagrangian that respects the trivial symmetry associated with the zero mode of curvature perturbations:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(3)} \supset M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(-\frac{a^2 \epsilon \eta}{2} \zeta^2 \partial^2 \zeta - \frac{2a\epsilon}{H} \zeta \zeta' \partial^2 \zeta \right) \rightarrow M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(-\frac{a^2 \epsilon \eta}{4} e^{-2\zeta} \partial^2 \zeta + \frac{a\epsilon}{H} \zeta' e^{-2\zeta} \partial^2 \zeta \right). \quad (5.3)$$

One would be able to reproduce the cubic interaction by expanding the exponential factor, while recovering the shift symmetry of ζ compensated by coordinate rescalings $\zeta \rightarrow \zeta + \delta\zeta$ and $x^i \rightarrow e^{-\delta\zeta} x^i$ with a constant $\delta\zeta$. Accordingly, we should have the following quartic action

$$\mathcal{S}^{(4)} \supset M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int d\tau d^3x \left(\frac{a^2 \epsilon \eta}{3} \zeta^3 \partial^2 \zeta + \frac{2a\epsilon}{H} \zeta^2 \zeta' \partial^2 \zeta \right). \quad (5.4)$$

Note that quartic interactions may cause the UV divergences at one-loop order. However, the UV divergences appear only in the forms respecting the original symmetry of the system. The local Lagrangian respecting the residual diffeomorphism on the FLRW cosmological background is summarized as the effective field theory of inflation (EFToI) [99], in which all perturbative UV divergences should be renormalized by the interactions of the EFToI. As shown in Ref. [2], the counter terms to tadpole UV divergences are also related to the quadratic UV divergent terms that appear due to quartic interactions. If we absorb the tadpole counterterm within the EFToI, we automatically introduce quadratic counterterms that cancel the UV divergent quadratic terms associated with quartic interactions. This should be the case as long as perturbative corrections do not spoil the original symmetry of the Lagrangian.¹⁴

The cubic-order action (5.1) consists of the interactions of the three products $\zeta^2 \zeta'$, $\zeta^2 (D_2 \zeta)$, and $\zeta \zeta' (D_2 \zeta)$. In the expression of one-loop corrections to the power spectrum arising from cubic-order vertices (3.33), they correspond to the expectation values (see Appendix E for details):

$$\langle\langle \zeta_L \zeta_S \zeta_S \rangle\rangle, \quad \langle\langle \zeta_L \zeta'_S \zeta_S \rangle\rangle, \quad \langle\langle \zeta_L D_2 \zeta_S \zeta_S \rangle\rangle, \quad \langle\langle \zeta_L D_2 \zeta_S \zeta'_S \rangle\rangle, \quad (5.5)$$

where we omitted the \pm signs of fields. Here and in the following, ζ_L is the large-scale mode with the wavenumber $\mathbf{k}_L = \mathbf{k}_1$, whereas ζ_S 's are the small-scale modes with the wavenumbers $\mathbf{k}_S = \mathbf{k}$ and $-\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k} \simeq -\mathbf{k}_S$. As we mentioned in Eq. (3.31), we are concerned with one-loop corrections from the wavenumber in the range $k \geq k_{\text{min}} \gg k_L (= k_1)$, which means that the loop momentum k always corresponds to a short mode in the above sense. We are interested in showing whether the following sets of consistency relations hold

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}'(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \stackrel{?}{\simeq} -\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}'(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S}, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \stackrel{?}{\simeq} -\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}'(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \stackrel{?}{\simeq} -\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}'(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S}, \quad (5.8)$$

where $\tau_0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_*$ and τ_0 approximately corresponds to the time at which the USR period starts ($\tau_0 \simeq \tau_s$). In the following, we will prove that the consistency relations hold, with some modifications to Eqs. (5.6), (5.7), and (5.8). For the first relation associated with Eq. (5.6), we perform straightforward calculations including all the contributions from the cubic interactions (5.1). As for Eqs. (5.7) and (5.8), we will resort to the Schwinger-Dyson equation, which enables us to show the consistency relations simpler than the brute force calculations. In the latter two cases, the quartic interactions (5.4) become important. Indeed, the last two correlation functions satisfy the consistency relations

¹⁴ The series of terms in the EFToI are spatial derivative expansions, and the contractions of multiple derivative interactions can lead to UV divergent new derivative interactions as is usual in non-renormalizable theory. Such terms cannot be absorbed into lower-order terms in the EFToI but by higher-order ones. In any case, the UV divergent terms would be absorbed into the EFToI Lagrangian.

only after the compensation by quartic interactions due to spatial derivatives. By proving the leading-order expression for one-loop corrections to the power spectrum (3.36), it is possible to show that one-loop corrections are sufficiently small and that the perturbative analysis is under control within the transient USR model, which will be studied in Sec. VI.

Notice also that Eqs. (5.6)-(5.8) take unusual forms in the sense that the time argument of the long-wavelength mode differs from others. However, we will resort to the fact that the effective constancy of large-scale curvature perturbations holds within the time range we consider. Nevertheless, we will not exploit such a property to the very end of the computations for consistency relations or loop corrections.

A. Consistency relations for $\langle\zeta\zeta\zeta\rangle$ and $\langle\zeta\zeta'\zeta\rangle$

In Sec. IV, we showed the consistency relation of $\langle\zeta^3\rangle$ for the equal time τ_* . However, the three-point function appearing in the master formula (3.36) is of the form

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle, \quad (5.9)$$

namely, the time argument of the large-scale mode differs from those of small-scale modes. Since the tree-level super-Hubble curvature perturbation is effectively constant, we have that $\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \simeq \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_L)$ for $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_*]$ (see Sec. II B). By using the consistency relation (4.27) shown in Sec. IV, it follows that

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \simeq -\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d\left(k_S^3 \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d \ln k_S}. \quad (5.10)$$

Thus, we proved the consistency relation of $\langle\zeta^3\rangle$ associated with the master formula (3.36).

Let us now discuss the three-point correlation function containing one time derivative $\langle\zeta\zeta'\zeta\rangle$. We consider a particular linear combination of such three-point functions that can be written as the time derivative of $\langle\zeta\zeta\zeta\rangle$, as

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\{\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\}'\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle', \quad (5.11)$$

where $\tilde{\zeta}^+$ here corresponds to a Heisenberg operator rather than the interaction picture ones (see the comments at the end of Sec. III B).¹⁵

Substituting the consistency relation (5.10) into the right-hand side of Eq. (5.11) and taking the τ derivative of the left-hand side of Eq. (5.11) further, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle + \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \right) \\ & \simeq -\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \left[\frac{d\left(k_S^3 \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d \ln k_S} + \frac{d\left(k_S^3 \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d \ln k_S} \right], \quad (5.12) \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \simeq \tilde{\zeta}(\tau, \mathbf{k}_L)$ and the effective constancy of $\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle$ within the time range we are concerned with. This consistency relation differs from Eq. (5.6), but such a consistency relation is sufficient as the above form precisely appears in the master formula (3.36).

We should note that the above discussion is based on the three-point function of the fields $\langle\zeta^+\zeta^+\zeta^+\rangle$. Nevertheless, we can confirm that $\langle\zeta^+\zeta^-\zeta^-\rangle$ yields the same result despite possible subtleties due to the sign difference. We have illustrated the possible subtlety in Appendix E. Since the subtlety appears only at the (measure zero) point $\tau = \tau_*$, it turns out that our result does not suffer from any subtlety.

B. Schwinger-Dyson equation

We will use the Schwinger-Dyson equation to prove the consistency relations (5.7) and (5.8) containing the EOM derivative operator. Here we briefly discuss its derivation within the in-in formalism. Let us consider the generalized

¹⁵ In the operator formalism, we need to be careful since the derivative acting on the Heisenberg picture field leads to nontrivial additional corrections as quoted in Ref. [2].

form of path integral,

$$Y = \int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-] \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] , \quad (5.13)$$

where F is an arbitrary functional of ζ^+ and ζ^- . By changing the integration variable $\zeta^+(x)$ to $\zeta^+(x) + \delta\zeta^+(x)$, where $\delta\zeta^+(x)$ is an arbitrary infinitesimal parameter, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- F[\zeta^+ + \delta\zeta^+(x), \zeta^-] \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+ + \delta\zeta^+(x)] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-] \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] \\ &\quad + \int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- \int d\tau d^3x \left(\frac{\delta F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-]}{\delta \zeta^+(x)} + iF[\zeta^+, \zeta^-] \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[\zeta^+]}{\delta \zeta^+(x)} \right) \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] \delta\zeta^+(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Note that the integration measure $\mathcal{D}\zeta^+$ is unchanged under this transformation as $\delta\zeta^+(x)$ is independent of ζ^+ . Since the first line of the above equation is just Y in Eq. (5.13), we find the general form of the Schwinger-Dyson equation in the in-in formalism,

$$\int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- \left(\frac{\delta F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-]}{\delta \zeta^+(x)} + iF[\zeta^+, \zeta^-] \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[\zeta^+]}{\delta \zeta^+(x)} \right) \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] = 0. \quad (5.15)$$

The same should hold when considering the infinitesimal shift of ζ^- . By choosing an appropriate form of $F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-]$, we can rewrite the correlation functions. In particular, notice that

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta \zeta} = -2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 D_2 \zeta + \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}^{(3)}}{\delta \zeta} = -2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 D_2 \zeta + \sum_{A=1}^n \tilde{\lambda}_3^{(A)}(\tau) \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \zeta \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \zeta. \quad (5.16)$$

Here we have omitted the quartic interactions since we would consider F to be two of ζ and cubic contributions from quartic interactions cannot give non-zero values.¹⁶ The first term contains the EOM derivative operator D_2 , which appears on the left-hand side of both Eqs. (5.7) and (5.8). We apply the Schwinger-Dyson equations to rewrite them and prove the consistency relations.

C. $\langle \zeta D_2 \zeta \zeta \rangle$ and $\langle \zeta D_2 \zeta \zeta' \rangle$

To rewrite Eq. (5.7), we substitute $F = \zeta^+(y)\zeta^+(z)$ to the Schwinger-Dyson equation (5.15), which yields

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[\zeta^+]}{\delta \zeta^+(x)} \zeta^+(y) \zeta^+(z) \right\rangle = i \langle \zeta^+(y) \rangle \delta^{(4)}(x-z) + i \langle \zeta^+(z) \rangle \delta^{(4)}(x-y) = 0, \quad (5.17)$$

provided that the tadpole is properly eliminated by renormalization and $\langle \zeta \rangle = 0$.¹⁷ Similarly, we obtain

$$\int \mathcal{D}\zeta^+ \mathcal{D}\zeta^- \left(\frac{\delta F[\zeta^+, \zeta^-]}{\delta \zeta^-(x)} - iF[\zeta^+, \zeta^-] \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-]}{\delta \zeta^-(x)} \right) \exp [i (\mathcal{S}[\zeta^+] - \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-])] = 0, \quad (5.18)$$

and

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[\zeta^-]}{\delta \zeta^-(x)} \zeta^+(y) \zeta^-(z) \right\rangle = -i \langle \zeta^+(y) \rangle \delta^{(4)}(x-z) - i \langle \zeta^-(z) \rangle \delta^{(4)}(x-y) = 0, \quad (5.19)$$

where we assumed that the tadpole is removed by appropriate counter terms.

From the Schwinger-Dyson equation, we can rewrite the three-point correlation function with the EOM derivative operator as the effective four-point correlation functions,

$$\left\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \right\rangle$$

¹⁶ The roles of quartic interactions appear differently as will be shown later.

¹⁷ As we quoted, there are tadpole UV divergent terms from the contraction of cubic interactions, which contribute to the non-1PI diagrams. We assume that it is properly removed. See also Ref. [2].

$$= \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \sum_{A=1}^{\tilde{n}} \tilde{\lambda}_3^{(A)}(\tau) \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{q}) \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S - \mathbf{q}) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \right\rangle. \quad (5.20)$$

This operation is schematically illustrated in Fig. 7. The leg from vertex A with the EOM derivative operator is replaced by $\delta\mathcal{S}^{(3)}/\delta\zeta$ and thus branches into two uncontracted legs. It is then contracted by these two new legs and the two remaining legs (one originating from the same vertex A and the other from the external source), so that it is effectively regarded as a set of four-point correlation functions.




FIG. 7. Schematic figure of Eq. (5.20). The dotted lines denote uncontracted legs of vertex A .

As a next step, we evaluate the right-hand side of Eq. (5.20). Notice that we consider the one-loop corrections made of two cubic vertices and that the consistency relation to be proven is at tree level. Indeed, Eq. (3.28) has a coupling $\lambda_3^{(A)}$ explicitly and the expectation value of the three-point function implicitly has another one. Now, the right-hand side of Eq. (5.20) has a coupling $\tilde{\lambda}_3^{(A)}$, and therefore the contraction of the four-point function is given only by the products of two-point functions up to one-loop level. Therefore, the effective four-point correlations in Eq. (5.20) can be written down as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \sum_{A=1}^{\tilde{n}} \tilde{\lambda}_3^{(A)}(\tau) \left[\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle \langle \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle + (1 \leftrightarrow 1') \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

Thus, we have found that the three-point correlation functions are expressed by the products of two-point functions even before taking the squeezing limit.

Let us evaluate Eq. (5.21) more concretely for the transient USR model. From the cubic action (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{(3)}}{\delta\zeta} &\simeq M_{\text{Pl}}^2 (-6\zeta D_2\zeta - 4a^2\epsilon\zeta\partial^2\zeta) \\ &\quad + \frac{a\epsilon}{H} [-2\zeta'\partial^2\zeta - 4(\partial\zeta')(\partial\zeta) + 6\zeta'\zeta''] + a^2\epsilon [3\eta\zeta'^2 - \eta(\partial\zeta)^2], \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

up to leading order in the slow-roll approximation of ϵ , with η of order 1 during the USR regime. Furthermore, the terms on the second line of Eq. (5.22) contain either time or spatial derivatives for both ζ . Therefore, as ζ'_{k_1} and $k_1\zeta_{k_1}$ are suppressed for the super-Hubble Fourier mode, we can neglect those terms in Eq. (5.22)¹⁸. Therefore, substituting the terms on the first line of Eq. (5.22) into Eq. (5.21), we obtain

$$\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle \simeq -3 \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle \langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S + \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S - \mathbf{k}_L) \rangle$$

¹⁸ The term containing ζ'' in the second line of Eq. (5.22) may lead to contributions proportional to $\delta(\tau - \tau_*)$ in the right-hand side of Eq. (5.21). Notice that the time-dependent couplings in Eq. (5.1), which explicitly appear in Eq. (3.33), are negligibly small at $\tau = \tau_*$. Therefore, such contributions do not affect one-loop corrections and hence we neglect them in the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S+\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle \\
& \simeq -\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\frac{1}{k^3}\frac{d\left(k^3\langle\langle D_2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d\ln k} \\
& -2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle, \quad (5.23)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\langle\langle D_2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k})\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k})\rangle\rangle$ is a k -independent variable and taken the limit $k_1 \ll k$. As we will show in Sec. VI, the two-point function including D_2 is a singular object that can be removed by the mechanism discussed in Appendix A. Nevertheless, we leave it to prove the consistency relation. The above result is equivalent to the statement

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)D_2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle + 2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \\
& \simeq -\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\frac{1}{k_S^3}\frac{d\left(k_S^3\langle\langle D_2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d\ln k_S}. \quad (5.24)
\end{aligned}$$

This does not prove the consistency relation for $\langle\zeta^2 D_2 \zeta\rangle$ yet. It shows that unless the second line of Eq. (5.23) is canceled, the consistency relation does not hold.

This is the place where the quartic interactions (5.4) play the role. Consider the one-loop correction from the first term of (5.4) and take the limit $k_1 \rightarrow 0$. Namely, we drop the term proportional to k_1 , which reads

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle_{1\text{-loop,1PI}}^{(4)} \\
& \simeq i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} 2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\eta(\tau) \left[G_{++}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \right. \\
& \quad \left. - G_{+-}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \right], \quad (5.25)
\end{aligned}$$

where the abbreviation $\int_{k>k_{\min}} d^3 k \rightarrow \int d^3 k_S$ was used. Notice also that the three-point function above appears in the one-loop correction as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle_{1\text{-loop,1PI}}^{(3)} \\
& \supset i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \eta(\tau) \left[G_{++}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)D_2\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)D_2\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right] \\
& \simeq i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \eta(\tau) \left[G_{++}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*) \left(-\frac{1}{k_S^3}\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle \frac{d\left(k_S^3\langle\langle D_2\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d\ln k_S} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - 2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_L;\tau,\tau_*) \left(-\frac{1}{k_S^3}\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle \frac{d\left(k_S^3\langle\langle D_2\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle\right)}{d\ln k_S} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - 2a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L)\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\partial^2\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle \right) \right], \quad (5.26)
\end{aligned}$$

where we exploited Eq. (5.23) in the approximate equality on the second line. The sum of the 1PI contribution from the cubic and quartic interactions leaves only the terms that take the desired consistency relation forms of the three-point function $\langle\zeta^2 D_2 \zeta\rangle$ as expected. Thus, with the aid of the quartic interaction in Eq. (5.4), we have proven that the consistency relation (5.7) correctly holds after the cancellation of the second line in Eq. (5.23).

Now, let us discuss the consistency relation of $\langle\zeta D_2 \zeta'\rangle$ in the same way as the previous case. From the Schwinger-Dyson equation, we have

$$\langle\langle\tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*,\mathbf{k}_L)D_2\tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau,\mathbf{k}_S)\tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau,-\mathbf{k}_L-\mathbf{k}_S)\rangle\rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\simeq \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \sum_{A=1}^{\tilde{n}} \tilde{\lambda}_3^{(A)}(\tau) \left(\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \mathcal{D}_1^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S + \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle + (1 \leftrightarrow 1') \right) \\
&\simeq -3 \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \\
&\quad - 2a^2(\tau) \epsilon(\tau) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle, \tag{5.27}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Eq. (5.22). This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle + 2a^2(\tau) \epsilon(\tau) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \\
&\simeq - \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{\pm'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S}. \tag{5.28}
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we need to consider the quartic interaction. In this case, we focus on the second term in Eq. (5.4), which yields the one-loop contribution

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle_{1\text{-loop, 1PI}|2\text{nd}}^{(4)} \\
&\simeq i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{4a(\tau) \epsilon(\tau)}{H} \left[G_{++}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{+'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{-'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right]. \tag{5.29}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we dropped contributions including $\zeta'(\tau(\tau_*), \pm \mathbf{k}_1)$ and k_1 , which only leaves the pair of two-point functions here. The 1PI one-loop corrections from the cubic interaction include

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle_{1\text{-loop, 1PI}}^{(3)} \\
&\supset i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{2}{a(\tau) H} \left[G_{++}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{+'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{-'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L - \mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle_{\text{tree}} \right] \\
&\simeq i \int d\tau \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{2}{a(\tau) H} \left[G_{++}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \left(- \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{+'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 2a^2(\tau) \epsilon(\tau) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{+'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_L; \tau, \tau_*) \left(- \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{k_S^3} \frac{d \left(k_S^3 \langle\langle D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{-'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right)}{d \ln k_S} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 2a^2(\tau) \epsilon(\tau) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_L) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_L) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \partial^2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \tilde{\zeta}^{-'}(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle\rangle \right) \right], \tag{5.30}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Eq. (5.27) in the approximate equality. As in the previous case, we find the precise cancellation of Eq. (5.29) with the second and the fourth lines of the last approximate equality of (5.30). This proves the consistency relation (5.8).

Since we showed all the consistency relations, the master formula (3.36) for one-loop corrections to the tree-level power spectrum holds within our reduced set of interactions in a self-consistent manner. We expect that the consistency relations should hold even by incorporating all the interactions, but the proof by explicit computations would be rather cumbersome. In the next section, we use the proven formula (3.36) to evaluate one-loop corrections to the power spectrum in the transient USR model.

VI. ONE-LOOP CORRECTIONS TO THE POWER SPECTRUM IN TRANSIENT USR INFLATION

In the previous section, we proved the four consistency relations, with which the formula of one-loop corrections (3.36) can be used. In this section, we show that large one-loop corrections argued in Ref. [1] are absent by using the formula (3.36). The contributions to Eq. (3.36) contain the expectation values of cubic interactions, where, in our case, we have picked up the (self-consistent) set of leading terms (5.1). Therefore, we separately evaluate the contributions from each cubic interaction in the following. As we have seen, the terms with spatial derivatives should be accompanied by quartic interactions, and we also take such terms into account.

- Interaction 1: $\mathcal{L}_1 = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int d\tau d^3x \frac{a^2}{2} \epsilon \eta' \zeta^2 \zeta'$

In this case, the coupling $\lambda = \lambda_3^{(A)}(\tau)$ and derivative operators \mathcal{D} 's in Eq. (3.18) are given by

$$\lambda = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{a^2}{2} \epsilon \eta', \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D} = \partial_\tau, 1, 1. \quad (6.1)$$

Substituting them into the master formula (3.36), the ratio between the one-loop correction and the tree-level power spectrum is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_\zeta^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_L)}{P_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_*, k_L)} &\simeq \left[M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon \Delta \eta \left(\text{Im}(\zeta'_{k_L}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_L}(\tau_*)) \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau, k_{\min}) + 2 \text{Im}(\zeta_{k_L}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_L}(\tau_*)) \partial_\tau \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau, k_{\min}) \right) \right]_{\tau_s}^{\tau_e} \\ &\simeq \left[M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^2 \epsilon \Delta \eta \left(\frac{\text{Im}(\zeta'_{k_L}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_L}(\tau)) \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau, k_{\min})}{=-(4a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{-1}} + \frac{2 \text{Im}(\zeta_{k_L}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_L}(\tau)) \partial_\tau \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau, k_{\min})}{=0} \right) \right]_{\tau_s}^{\tau_e} \\ &\simeq -\frac{\Delta \eta}{4} \left[\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_s, k_{\min}) - \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau_e, k_{\min}) \right] \simeq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

where we used $\zeta_{k_L}(\tau_*) \simeq \zeta_{k_L}(\tau)$ and the normalization condition of the mode function (2.13). Note that the power spectrum on the right-hand side is the dimensionless one $\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{(\text{tree})}(\tau, k) = [k^3 / (2\pi^2)] \langle \zeta(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \zeta(\tau, -\mathbf{k}) \rangle$, not the one in Eq. (3.35). The last equality is justified since k_{\min} is chosen to be far outside the horizon at the beginning of the USR phase, i.e., in the range (3.31). Since $k_{\min} \ll k_s$, the effective constancy of curvature perturbations during the USR period holds for the mode k_{\min} . Note that the final approximate equality in Eq. (6.2) denotes the equality up to the corrections by non-constant parts of the mode function, which would be proportional to $r_{k_{\min}}(\tau_*)$. However, they are supposed to be negligibly small as long as we are concerned with the mode that exits the Hubble horizon well before the USR phase.

- Interactions 2, 3: $\mathcal{L}_2 = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{\eta}{2} \zeta^2 D_2 \zeta + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{a^2 \epsilon \eta}{3} \zeta^3 \partial^2 \zeta$ and $\mathcal{L}_3 = M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{2}{aH} \zeta \zeta' D_2 \zeta + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \frac{2a\epsilon}{H} \zeta^2 \zeta' \partial^2 \zeta$

One can readily substitute the coupling and derivative operators into (3.36). However, as we showed in Eqs. (5.24) and (5.28), the resultant three-point function becomes the product of the large-scale mode power spectrum and the two-point function of operators including D_2 . This is achieved only after including the quartic interactions that compensate the terms containing spatial derivatives, to prove the correct consistency relations as we have explicitly shown. The resultant correlation function takes the form $\langle \langle D_2 \zeta^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \zeta^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle \rangle = \mp i \delta(0) (2M_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{-1}$, which follows from Eq. (3.12). We can generally remove such a singular term by the mechanism discussed in Appendix A. Therefore, the terms proportional to $\langle \langle D_2 \zeta^\pm(\tau, \mathbf{k}_S) \zeta^\pm(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_S) \rangle \rangle$ give no contributions to (3.36). It is also possible that D_2 acts on the propagator that explicitly appears in Eq. (3.36), but it leads to $\delta(\tau - \tau_*)$ and the time-dependent couplings become negligibly small since τ_* is sufficiently far from τ_e . Thus, we can simply neglect such contributions.

Thus, we showed that leading-order one-loop corrections to the tree-level power spectrum are suppressed in transient USR inflation. We recall that there exists a correction to the large-scale mode roughly proportional to the factor r_k , see Eq. (2.30). Since r_k is very much smaller than 1, this correction is strongly suppressed even in the presence of the USR period during which the curvature perturbation can be enhanced. However, the enhancement of the CMB mode is negligibly small in realistic transient USR models. Therefore, as we have seen, the proof of the time-independence of ζ given in Ref. [2] applies more or less in the same manner. Notice that our result is practically independent of whether η is continuous in time and of replacing the USR phase with a constant roll phase. Such a rather background-independent result arises as a consequence of the symmetry that inflationary spacetime has. For completeness, we explicitly present all the one-loop contributions from the reduced Lagrangian (5.1) in Appendix E.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have shown that one-loop corrections to the tree-level power spectrum of large-scale curvature perturbations induced by the growth of small-scale perturbations are suppressed to be small in the context of transient USR inflation. As emphasized in Introduction, this result is based on the work by Pimentel, Senatore, and Zaldarriaga [2], where the consistency relation plays a crucial role in proving the constancy of ζ against one-loop corrections. The consistency relation is expected to hold as it originates from the symmetry of curvature perturbations trivially present on the FLRW background. The absence of large one-loop corrections is rather natural from physical intuition that effective zero modes would be unphysical for local observers inside the horizon.

Using the master formula shown in Ref. [2] achieves the independence of the form of an interaction Lagrangian (Hamiltonian). The key to applying the formula is the consistency relation and the constancy of ζ for long-wavelength perturbations at tree level, which we discussed in Sec. II B. As we showed explicitly, the CMB-scale curvature perturbation stays as an effective constant during the USR phase, despite the enhancement of ζ for small-scale modes relevant to the seed generation of PBHs. Indeed, the effective constancy of ζ for CMB perturbations after the Hubble radius crossing is necessary to show that the consistency relations hold. In other words, if we consider one-loop corrections to the power spectrum of a mode that is not constant during the USR phase, our result does not apply.¹⁹ In this sense, we are not sure whether the perturbation theory of sub-Hubble modes during the USR phase transition leads to large one-loop corrections, which is beyond the scope of this work.²⁰

At technical levels, the boundary and EOM terms may cause the subtlety of one-loop corrections, and one of the lessons from this work is that we need to reduce the effective Lagrangian in such a way that the resulting Lagrangian effectively reproduces the property of symmetry of the system. Namely, the consistency relations hold not just for $\langle \zeta^3 \rangle$ but for all the three-point functions that appear in the interactions, as we have proven explicitly.

Although we have used the path-integral formalism to derive the master formula (3.36) simply, one can apply the formula in Ref. [2] based on the operator formalism, but we expect no differences between them. Unfortunately, it seems difficult to find the origin of the discrepancy between ours and that in Ref. [1] due to multiple differences in formulations and approximations besides the “leading-order” interactions taken into account. However, we emphasize again that the generality of the master formula requires only the tree-level constancy of ζ and the consistency relations, both of which are satisfied within the transient USR model. In other words, if our result were somehow falsified, at least one of the requirements would be false.

It is expected that the master formula also holds for more general single-field inflation with second-order equations of motion (dubbed Horndeski’s theories) [103, 104]. Indeed, the seed generation of PBHs was studied in the context of Higgs inflation [47], $f(R)$ gravity [105], nonminimal derivative couplings to gravity [106], Galileons [59], scalar Gauss-Bonnet couplings [107], Higgs Gauss-Bonnet inflation [108] and so on, which all belong to the subclasses of Horndeski’s theories. Upon using the cubic-order action derived in Refs. [109, 110] for full Horndeski’s theories, it would be of interest to study whether one-loop corrections to the large-scale power spectrum remain small by proving more general consistency relations possibly arising from additional operators.

Throughout this work, we have considered one-loop corrections to the two-point function where only cubic and quartic interactions contribute. One may wonder e.g., whether higher loop corrections yield large corrections. Our result cannot be applied and another way of investigation would be necessary. Nevertheless, the all-order proof of the constancy of ζ shown in Ref. [89] only assumes the constancy at the tree level, and the constancy against higher-order corrections is shown by induction. Therefore, we expect that the approximate constancy of super-Hubble modes within the transient USR model would suffice the assumptions used in Ref. [89]. Then, the absence of enhancement of CMB modes should be true in all-order in perturbation series. We will discuss it elsewhere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Mohammad Ali Gorji, Keisuke Inomata, Jason Kristiano, Yusuke Mikura, Yuichiro Tada, and Shuichiro Yokoyama for useful discussions. RK is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. 24KJ2108. ST is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the JSPS No. 22K03642 and Waseda University Special Research Project No. 2024C-474.

¹⁹ Such a situation is exceptional also in the all-order-proof of the ζ constancy [83, 89], since both proofs assume the tree-level conservation of ζ . Furthermore, as explicitly shown in Ref. [58] (Figure 9), the consistency relation does not hold for the mode that exits the Hubble horizon slightly before the end of the USR stage $-k_L \tau_e = 0.1$. Our result cannot be applied to such momentum modes since neither the consistency relations nor the effective constancy hold.

²⁰ Recently, non-perturbative approaches using lattice simulations have also been studied in inflation models with small-scale features [100–102].

Appendix A: Path-integral formalism for general models with derivative couplings

We review how to treat the system with derivative interactions based on the analysis in Ref. [111]. In particular, we consider the terms up to quartic order as they are relevant to this work.²¹ We consider the most general Lagrangian up to quartic order given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\zeta, \zeta') = \sum_{n=2}^4 \sum_{m=0}^n \lambda_{n-m}^{(n)} \zeta^{n-m} (\zeta')^m, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the couplings $\lambda_{n-m}^{(n)}$'s are generally time-dependent and may contain spatial derivatives acting on each ζ .²² From the above Lagrangian, the canonical conjugate momentum of ζ is

$$\pi_\zeta = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \zeta'} = \sum_{n=2}^4 \sum_{m=1}^n m \lambda_{n-m}^{(n)} \zeta^{n-m} (\zeta')^{m-1}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

From Eq. (A2), we can express ζ' as a series in ζ and π_ζ , as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta'(\zeta, \pi_\zeta) &= \frac{1}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}} \left(\pi_\zeta - \lambda_1^{(2)} \zeta \right) \\ &- \frac{3\lambda_0^{(3)}}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \pi_\zeta^2 - \frac{\zeta \pi_\zeta}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \left(3\lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(3)} - 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)} \right) - \frac{\zeta^2}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \left(3(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(3)} - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + 4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_2^{(3)} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\pi_\zeta^3}{16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} \right) - \frac{3\zeta \pi_\zeta^2}{16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left[\lambda_1^{(2)} \left(9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} \right) + 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \left(-3\lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + \lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(4)} \right) \right] \\ &+ \frac{\zeta^2 \pi_\zeta}{16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left[3(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \left(9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} \right) + 12\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(2)} \left(-3\lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + \lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(4)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \left(2(\lambda_1^{(3)})^2 + 3\lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} - 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_2^{(4)} \right) \right] \\ &- \frac{\zeta^3}{16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left[(\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 \left(9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} \right) + 6\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \left(-3\lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + \lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(4)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(2)} \left(2(\lambda_1^{(3)})^2 + 3\lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} - 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_2^{(4)} \right) + 8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \left(-\lambda_1^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} + \lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_3^{(4)} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A3}) \end{aligned}$$

The Legendre transform of the Lagrangian yields the Hamiltonian in the form

$$\mathcal{H}(\zeta, \pi_\zeta) = \pi_\zeta \zeta'(\zeta, \pi_\zeta) - \mathcal{L}(\zeta, \zeta'(\zeta, \pi_\zeta)) = \sum_{n=2}^4 \sum_{m=0}^n \tilde{\lambda}_{n-m}^{(n)} \zeta^{n-m} \pi_\zeta^m, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_0^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{4\lambda_0^{(2)}}, & \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(2)} &= -\frac{\lambda_1^{(2)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}}, & \tilde{\lambda}_2^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{4\lambda_0^{(2)}} \left((\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_2^{(2)} \right), \\ \tilde{\lambda}_0^{(3)} &= -\frac{\lambda_0^{(3)}}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3}, & \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \left(3\lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(3)} - 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)} \right), \\ \tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)} &= -\frac{1}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \left(3(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(3)} - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + 4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_2^{(3)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

²¹ The reduced Lagrangian (5.1) discussed in the main text includes the second derivative of ζ with respect to time in the EOM terms. However, the original Lagrangian consists of polynomials of at most first-order derivatives of the fields, and the second-order derivative terms such as EOM terms appear due to the technique of integration-by-parts. In this sense, Eq. (A1) is the most general case we would have.

²² The spatial derivatives can be treated as constant parameters in Fourier space, and therefore, we deal with the spatial derivatives as if they were constant and implicitly include them in the couplings.

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}_3^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \left((\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 \lambda_0^{(3)} - 2\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(3)} + 4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_2^{(3)} - 8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \lambda_3^{(3)} \right), \\
\tilde{\lambda}_0^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{64(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} \right), \\
\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(-9\lambda_1^{(2)} (\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 + 6\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + 4\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(4)} - 2(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(4)} \right), \\
\tilde{\lambda}_2^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{32(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(27(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 36\lambda_0^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + 8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(3)})^2 + 12(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 12\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(4)} + 12(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(4)} - 8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \lambda_2^{(4)} \right), \\
\tilde{\lambda}_3^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{32(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(-18(\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 (\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 + 36\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} - 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(3)})^2 - 24(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \lambda_1^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} + 8\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 \lambda_0^{(4)} - 12(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(4)} + 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_2^{(4)} - 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^4 \lambda_3^{(4)} \right), \\
\tilde{\lambda}_4^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{64(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5} \left(9(\lambda_1^{(2)})^4 (\lambda_0^{(3)})^2 - 24\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_1^{(3)} + 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(3)})^2 + 24(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_0^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 32(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)} \lambda_2^{(3)} + 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^4 (\lambda_2^{(3)})^2 - 4\lambda_0^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(2)})^4 \lambda_0^{(4)} + 8(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(2)})^3 \lambda_1^{(4)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 16(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3 (\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_2^{(4)} + 32(\lambda_0^{(2)})^4 \lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_3^{(4)} - 64(\lambda_0^{(2)})^5 \lambda_4^{(4)} \right). \tag{A5}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider sourced generating functional of ζ and its canonical momentum π_ζ . For now, we consider the generating functional for time-ordered products, which can be straightforwardly generalized to the in-in formalism. The generating functional $Z[J, K]$ of ζ and π_ζ is given by

$$Z[J, K] = \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \mathcal{D}\pi_\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x (\pi_\zeta \zeta' - \mathcal{H}(\zeta, \pi_\zeta) + J\zeta + K\pi_\zeta) \right], \tag{A6}$$

where J and K are external source fields. The Hamiltonian can be decomposed into the free and interaction parts, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{free}}$ and \mathcal{H}_{int} . Here, we assign quadratic terms in the Hamiltonian as the free part and higher-order terms as the interaction part. Substituting $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{free}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$ into Eq. (A6) and performing the Gauss integral in terms of π_ζ , we can rewrite the generating functional $Z[J, K]$, as

$$Z[J, K] = N_0 \exp \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J(x)}, \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta K(x)} \right) \right] Z_0[J, K], \tag{A7}$$

where N_0 is the normalization factor and $\delta/\delta X$ is the functional derivative with respect to X . Z_0 is a free part of the generating functional given by

$$Z_0[J, K] = \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x \left(\mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} + \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})} K + \lambda_0^{(2)} K^2 + J\zeta \right) \right], \tag{A8}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{free}}$ and $\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}$ are free parts of the Lagrangian and classical canonical momentum, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} = \lambda_0^{(2)} (\zeta')^2 + \lambda_1^{(2)} \zeta(\zeta') + \lambda_2^{(2)} \zeta^2, \tag{A9}$$

$$\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{free}}}{\partial \zeta'} = 2\lambda_0^{(2)} \zeta' + \lambda_1^{(2)} \zeta. \tag{A10}$$

Due to the presence of derivative couplings, we cannot easily pull \mathcal{H}_{int} back into the integral, which is evident from the fact that Eq. (A7) contains K^2 in the integrand. Let us look at a specific example. A term $\lambda_1^{(3)} \zeta(\zeta')^2$ in the interaction Lagrangian leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} &= -\frac{\lambda_1^{(3)}}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta \pi_\zeta^2 + \frac{\lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)}}{2(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta - \frac{(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(3)}}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta^3 \\
&\quad + \frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)})^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta^2 - \frac{\lambda_1^{(2)} (\lambda_1^{(3)})^2}{2(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \zeta^3 \pi_\zeta + \frac{(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 (\lambda_1^{(3)})^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^3} \zeta^4. \tag{A11}
\end{aligned}$$

The first and second lines show the cubic and quartic Hamiltonians, respectively. Let us focus on the first term in the cubic part,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \supset \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)} \zeta \pi_\zeta^2 \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)} \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J} \right) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta K} \right)^2. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Substituting it into Eq. (A7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z[J, K] \Big|_{J, K=0} &\supset \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J(y)} \right) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta K(y)} \right)^2 \right] Z_0[J, K] \Big|_{J, K=0} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y) \zeta(y) \left((\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y))^2 - 2i\hbar\lambda_0^{(2)}(y)\delta^{(4)}(0) \right) \right] \exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 x \mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} \right) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}(\zeta(y), \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y)) - 2i\hbar\lambda_0^{(2)}(y)\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y)\zeta(y)\delta^{(4)}(0) \right) \right] \exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 x \mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

at linear order in $\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} Z[J, K] \Big|_{J, K=0} &\supset \frac{1}{2} \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta J(y)} \right) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta K(y)} \right)^2 \right]^2 Z_0[J, K] \Big|_{J, K=0} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y) \zeta(y) \left((\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y))^2 - 2i\hbar\lambda_0^{(2)}(y)\delta^{(4)}(0) \right) \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{8i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \lambda_0^{(2)}(y) (\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y))^2 \zeta^2(y) (\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y))^2 \right] \exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 x \mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} \right) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}(\zeta(y), \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y)) - 2i\hbar\lambda_0^{(2)}(y)\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y)\zeta(y)\delta^{(4)}(0) \right) \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{4i}{\hbar} \int d^4 y \lambda_0^{(2)}(y) (\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}(y))^2 \zeta^2(y) (\pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}(y))^2 \right] \exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^4 x \mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

at quadratic order in $\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)}$.²³ It can be seen that two types of non-trivial terms appear in Eqs. (A13) and (A14) due to the K^2 term in Z_0 . One is the term containing $\delta^{(4)}(0)$, which arises when one of the two K -functional derivatives in an interaction acts on K^2 in Z_0 and the other on K , which has appeared outside Z_0 due to the previous operation. As this term has a factor \hbar , it can be expected that it only gives contributions at the loop level and not at the tree level. As our purpose is the loop calculation, such additional terms may also need to be taken into account. We will discuss more details later. Another is the effective quartic term appearing in Eq. (A14). It arises when one K -functional derivative in one of the interactions acts on K^2 in Z_0 and one K -functional derivative in another of the interactions acts on K , which has appeared outside Z_0 due to the previous operation. This effective quartic term exactly cancels the contribution from the original quartic Hamiltonian, the first term in Eq. (A11). Similarly, there are effective quartic terms from the second-order contributions of the cubic Hamiltonian, as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)} \zeta \pi_\zeta^2 \right) \times \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta \right) &\rightarrow \lambda_0^{(2)} \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(3)} \tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)} \zeta^3 \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}, \\ \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta \right) \times \left(\tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta \right) &\rightarrow \lambda_0^{(2)} (\tilde{\lambda}_2^{(3)})^2 \zeta^4, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

and they cancel the contributions from the original quartic Hamiltonian, the second and third terms in Eq. (A11). This process results in all contributions from the quartic Hamiltonian generated from the cubic Lagrangian vanishing. Therefore, the path integral is given by

$$Z[J, K] \Big|_{J, K=0} = \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3 x \left(\mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} - \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}^{(\text{cubic})}(\zeta, \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}) + i\hbar\delta^{(4)}(0)\alpha(\zeta, \zeta') \right) \right]$$

²³ Here, we drop \hbar^2 terms because it is irrelevant up to the one-loop level.

$$= \int \mathcal{D}\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x \left(\mathcal{L}_{\text{free}} + \lambda_1^{(3)} \zeta(\zeta')^2 + i\hbar\delta^{(4)}(0)\alpha(\zeta, \zeta') \right) \right], \quad (\text{A16})$$

where $\alpha(\zeta, \zeta')$ is a function of ζ and ζ' , and we used

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}^{(\text{cubic})} = -\frac{\lambda_1^{(3)}}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta \pi_\zeta^2 + \frac{\lambda_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^{(3)}}{2(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta^2 \pi_\zeta - \frac{(\lambda_1^{(2)})^2 \lambda_1^{(3)}}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} \zeta^3 \xrightarrow{\pi_\zeta \rightarrow \pi_{\zeta, \text{free}}^{(\text{cl})}} -\lambda_1^{(3)} \zeta(\zeta')^2. \quad (\text{A17})$$

Thus, there are terms proportional to $\delta^{(4)}(0)$ in addition to the original Lagrangian.

Let us start with the more general Lagrangian (A1) and specify the form of $\alpha(\zeta, \zeta')$ (see Ref. [111] for detailed discussion). We define the ‘‘effective Lagrangian’’ \mathcal{L}_{eff} by

$$\exp \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \right) \equiv N \int \mathcal{D}\pi_\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x (\pi_\zeta \zeta' - \mathcal{H}(\zeta, \pi_\zeta)) \right], \quad (\text{A18})$$

where N is a normalization factor. To perform the integration of π_ζ , we need to expand the Lagrangian terms around a ‘‘stationary point’’, namely, around a classical solution

$$\pi_\zeta \zeta' - \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}} \left(\pi_\zeta - \pi_{\zeta, \text{cl}}^{(\text{cl})} \right)^2 + \dots, \quad (\text{A19})$$

where \mathcal{L} is the classical Lagrangian given by Eq. (A1). The classical solution satisfies $\zeta' = \partial \mathcal{H} / \partial \pi_\zeta$ and is given by $\pi_\zeta = \pi_{\zeta, \text{cl}}^{(\text{cl})} = \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \zeta'$. The ellipses denote the terms that give rise to $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$ contributions in the effective Lagrangian, which we ignore at the one-loop order. Substituting Eq. (A19) into Eq. (A18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \mathcal{D}\pi_\zeta \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d\tau d^3x (\pi_\zeta \zeta' - \mathcal{H}(\zeta, \pi_\zeta)) \right] \\ & \simeq \prod_j \exp \left(i \frac{\Omega}{\hbar} \mathcal{L} \right) \int d\pi_{\zeta, j} \exp \left[-i \frac{\Omega}{2\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} \left(\pi_{\zeta, j} - \pi_{\zeta, j}^{(\text{cl})} \right)^2 \right] \\ & = \prod_j \left(\frac{i\pi\hbar}{\Omega \partial^2 \mathcal{H}_0 / \partial \pi_\zeta^2} \right)^{1/2} \exp \left(i \frac{\Omega}{\hbar} \mathcal{L} \right) \left[1 + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} / \partial \pi_\zeta^2}{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}_0 / \partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} \right]^{-1/2} \\ & \simeq \prod_j \left(\frac{2i\pi\hbar\lambda_0^{(2)}}{\Omega} \right)^{1/2} \exp \left[i \frac{\Omega}{\hbar} \mathcal{L} - \lambda_0^{(2)} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} + (\lambda_0^{(2)})^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

Here, we have taken the discrete limit of spacetime with an infinitesimal 4-volume Ω , approximated the exponent by a quadratic term in the first equality, performed the Gaussian integration in the second equality, and used $\partial^2 \mathcal{H}_0 / \partial \pi_\zeta^2 = (1/2)\lambda_0^{(2)}$ and $(1+x)^{-1/2} = \exp(-x/2 + x^2/4) + \mathcal{O}(x^3)$ in the third equality. In the continuous limit $\Omega \rightarrow 0$, we identify the exponent as the effective Lagrangian given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L} + i\hbar\delta^{(4)}(0)\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2), \quad (\text{A21})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha & = \lambda_0^{(2)} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} - \lambda_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}}{\partial \pi_\zeta^2} \Big|_{\text{cl}, j} \right)^2 \right] \\ & = -\frac{\lambda_1^{(3)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}} \zeta - \frac{3\lambda_0^{(3)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}} \zeta' + \left(\frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)})^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} - \frac{\lambda_2^{(4)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}} \right) \zeta^2 - \frac{3\lambda_1^{(4)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}} \zeta \zeta' + \left(\frac{9(\lambda_0^{(3)})^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2} - \frac{3\lambda_0^{(4)}}{\lambda_0^{(2)}} \right) (\zeta')^2 + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

Finally, we discuss the role of α -terms for the computation of correlation functions. The α terms in the effective Lagrangian contain \hbar , which implies their relevance to one-loop corrections. The divergences including $\delta^{(4)}(0)$ arise from one-loop corrections consisting of vertices generated from interactions containing two or more ζ' . Such unphysical divergences can be properly removed by taking into account the α -terms. Hereafter, we take the natural unit $\hbar = 1$.

Let us consider the same term in the interaction part of Lagrangian, $\lambda_1^{(3)}\zeta(\zeta')^2$, as before. In this case, the effective Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \lambda_0^{(2)}(\zeta')^2 + \lambda_1^{(2)}\zeta\zeta' + \lambda_2^{(2)}\zeta^2 + \lambda_1^{(3)}\zeta(\zeta')^2 - i\delta^{(4)}(0)\frac{\lambda_1^{(3)}}{2\lambda_0^{(2)}}\zeta + i\delta^{(4)}(0)\frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)})^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)})^2}\zeta^2. \quad (\text{A23})$$




FIG. 8. Feynman diagrams of the one loop and α -term contributions to the two-point function.

As an illustration, let us consider a one-loop correction to the two-point function diagrammatically shown in Fig. 8. The first diagram in the figure is the 1PI one-loop diagram consisting of two cubic interactions, whereas the second one consists of the last quadratic term in Eq. (A23), which has the divergent factor $\delta^{(4)}(0)$.

Focusing on the cubic interaction $\zeta(\zeta')^2$ with the coupling $\lambda_1^{(3)}$, we find the following contribution to the left diagram in Fig. 8,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Left figure}) &\supset \frac{1}{2}2^2i^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\tau d\tau' \lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau)\lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau')G(k_1; \tau, \tau_1)\partial_{\tau\tau'}G(k; \tau, \tau')\partial_{\tau\tau'}G(|\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}|; \tau, \tau')G(k_2; \tau', \tau_2) \\ &\supset \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\tau \frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau))^2}{(\lambda_0^{(2)}(\tau))^2}G(k_1; \tau, \tau_1)G(k_2; \tau, \tau_2)\delta(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\delta^{(4)}(0) \int d\tau \frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau))^2}{(\lambda_0^{(2)}(\tau))^2}G(k_1; \tau, \tau_1)G(k_2; \tau, \tau_2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

where a factor $1/2$ in the first line is a symmetry factor, $\partial_{\tau\tau'} \equiv \partial_\tau\partial_{\tau'}$, and as noted before, the coupling may contain spatial derivatives which just become constant factors. In the second equality, we used $\partial_{\tau\tau'}G(k; \tau, \tau') \supset i\delta(\tau-\tau')/2\lambda_0^{(2)}$. On the other hand, from the right diagram in Fig. 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Right figure}) &= 2i \int d\tau i\delta^{(4)}(0)\frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau))^2}{4(\lambda_0^{(2)}(\tau))^2}G(k_1; \tau, \tau_1)G(k_2; \tau, \tau_2) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^{(4)}(0) \int d\tau \frac{(\lambda_1^{(3)}(\tau))^2}{(\lambda_0^{(2)}(\tau))^2}G(k_1; \tau, \tau_1)G(k_2; \tau, \tau_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

As a result, the singular term due to the two time-derivatives acting on the time-ordered propagator is canceled out by the contribution from the α term. Thus, the unphysical divergences that differ from the UV divergence due to high-energy modes can be simply canceled by the divergent pieces appearing in the effective Lagrangian. In practice, keeping the interactions proportional to $\delta^{(4)}(0)$ is cumbersome. Therefore, we simply omit the unphysical divergent contributions both in the effective Lagrangian as well as in the computation of correlation functions on the basis of the above observation.

Appendix B: Boundary term interactions in the in-in path-integral formalism

This Appendix will show that the temporal total derivative terms do not contribute to the correlation functions within the path-integral formalism under an appropriate prescription. Instead of proving it in general, we present

some explicit computations relevant to the ones in the main text including the diagrams with an internal line and a loop. The prescription is based on our previous work [88], where only the tree-level contribution without internal lines has been discussed. Here, we extend it to the case with internal lines and a loop.

1. Three-point correlation function

Let us consider a general form of “boundary” interactions,

$$\mathcal{L}_\partial = \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(\lambda^{(\partial)} \mathcal{D}_1^{(\partial)} \zeta \mathcal{D}_2^{(\partial)} \zeta \mathcal{D}_3^{(\partial)} \zeta \right), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\mathcal{D}_i^{(\partial)}$'s represent either a time-derivative operator or an identity operator,²⁴ and $\lambda^{(\partial)}$ is (generally) a time-dependent coupling. We calculate the first-order correction from the boundary interaction to a three-point correlation function $\langle \zeta_1 \zeta_2 \zeta_3 \rangle$ with possibly different time arguments τ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), which is represented in Fig. 9 [88]. Here, we take the prescription $\tau_f > \tau_i$, namely, the temporal boundary is at the future of operators we are concerned with. The black and white squares denote the + and - types of interaction (B1), respectively. From these figures, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Left figure}) &= i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(\lambda^{(\partial)}(\tau) \mathcal{D}_1^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_1) \mathcal{D}_2^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_2; \tau, \tau_2) \mathcal{D}_3^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_3; \tau, \tau_3) \right) + (5 \text{ perms}) \\ &= i \lambda^{(\partial)}(\tau_f) \mathcal{D}_1^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau_f, \tau_1) \mathcal{D}_2^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_2; \tau_f, \tau_2) \mathcal{D}_3^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k_3; \tau_f, \tau_3) + (5 \text{ perms}), \\ (\text{Right figure}) &= -i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(\lambda^{(\partial)}(\tau) \mathcal{D}_1^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_1) \mathcal{D}_2^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_2; \tau, \tau_2) \mathcal{D}_3^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_3; \tau, \tau_3) \right) + (5 \text{ perms}) \\ &= -i \lambda^{(\partial)}(\tau_f) \mathcal{D}_1^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau_f, \tau_1) \mathcal{D}_2^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_2; \tau_f, \tau_2) \mathcal{D}_3^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k_3; \tau_f, \tau_3) + (5 \text{ perms}). \quad (\text{B2}) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, so long as the Lagrangian has at most second-order time derivatives, the operators $\mathcal{D}_i^{(\partial)}$ include at most a single time derivative as there is an overall time derivative. Therefore, $\mathcal{D}_i^{(\partial)} G_{++}(k; \tau_f, \tau_i) = \mathcal{D}_i^{(\partial)} G_{-+}(k; \tau_f, \tau_i)$ is satisfied by setting the final slice time τ_f to a time later than all of τ_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$). The contributions from the left and right figures therefore cancel each other thanks to our prescription that the final time is taken to be the future of any operator insertions we consider.²⁵




FIG. 9. Feynman diagrams for the three-point correlation function from boundary term interactions. The square vertices denote contributions from boundary terms. Black and white represent the + and - types, respectively.

2. Four-point correlation function

Next, let us consider a bit non-trivial case, the second-order correction from the cubic interaction to a four-point correlation function, which contains a single internal line. We consider corrections to a four-point correlation function

²⁴ This means that ζ without time derivatives may appear.

²⁵ In the case where the external operators of which we take the expectation value have time derivatives, the δ -function contribution may emerge when the time derivatives act on the (anti-) time-ordered propagator. However, the δ -function is of the form $\delta(\tau_f - \tau_i)$, which vanishes by our prescription since $\forall \tau_i < \tau_f$ and τ_i being the time argument of the external field. Thus, the cancellation is true even in such a case.

from two cubic vertices, and one of the vertices to be the boundary interaction (B1), while the other to be a bulk interaction. Notice that, by distributing the total time derivative in the boundary interaction, we may regard the boundary term as a set of bulk terms, and therefore, the following discussions apply to the case where two vertices are the boundary interaction. Here, we formally assume the bulk interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_b = \lambda^{(b)} \mathcal{D}_1^{(b)} \zeta \mathcal{D}_2^{(b)} \zeta \mathcal{D}_3^{(b)} \zeta, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\lambda^{(b)}$ is a coupling constant and $\mathcal{D}_i^{(b)}$'s are the time derivative operators (or identity) as is the case of the boundary term. In this case, the four diagrams differ in the choice of either $+$ or $-$ vertex for each interaction as shown in Fig. 10. Looking at the two diagrams in the upper part of Fig. 10 while focusing on the cubic vertices in Fig. 9 as sub-diagrams, we notice that the sum of the two cancels with each other as the case of the previous one, and similarly for the lower two diagrams. However, there is a subtlety: When more than two derivatives act on the internal line of the type either $(++)$ or $(--)$, a δ -function from the (anti-)time-ordered propagator appears. Note that both the $(+-)$ and $(-+)$ type propagators do not give rise to the δ -function. Therefore, only one diagram is non-vanishing among the upper and lower diagrams, respectively. Suppose that $\partial_{\tau\tau'}$ acts on internal propagators. Then, from the upper one, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Upper figures}) &\supset i^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \cdots \partial_{\tau\tau'} G_{++}(|\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2|; \tau, \tau')|_{\tau'=\tau_f} \cdots \\ &\supset - \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \cdots \frac{i}{2a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau - \tau_f) \cdots, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

where ellipses denote the other components in the integrand. The omitted terms are canceled by the above argument, but the δ -function term remains, namely, the δ -function contribution cannot be canceled among the sum of the upper diagrams. Notice however that a similar thing happens to the lower diagrams and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Lower figures}) &\supset (-i)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \cdots \partial_{\tau\tau'} G_{--}(|\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2|; \tau, \tau')|_{\tau'=\tau_f} \cdots \\ &\supset - \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \cdots \frac{-i}{2a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau - \tau_f) \cdots. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

Thus, we find that the remaining terms cancel between the contributions from the upper and lower diagrams due to the opposite sign, which originates from the difference of time-ordered and anti-time-ordered propagators. Although we have checked only the simplest case, it is straightforward to extend it to the case with additional interactions by replacing the external point with the interaction vertices.

3. Comment on the one-loop case

We finally comment on the case with loops. We consider a one-loop diagram and can take one of the vertices to be the boundary term and the other to be the bulk one without loss of generality, as we explained previously. Once again, we have four types of diagrams as shown in Fig. 11. In most of the terms, the cancellation mechanism works in the same way as the tree-level cases. Only the nontrivial case we see in the one-loop diagrams is that multiple time derivatives act both of the two internal propagators, which results in two δ -functions with the same argument. The δ -function with the same argument leads to an unphysical divergent factor $\delta^{(4)}(0)$. Notice however that such an unphysical contribution should be eliminated by the α -terms discussed in the previous section. As we emphasized, the total derivative terms can become a set of bulk terms. This is so since the total derivative terms appear to reorganize derivatives by performing integration by parts. Therefore, according to the general discussions about the derivative interactions in Appendix A, there should be induced counter terms (α -terms) that precisely cancel the unphysical divergent terms. Thus, the problematic divergent term that is not canceled by the reasons mentioned above can be properly removed by incorporating the α -terms. Hence there are no contributions from the boundary interactions, which justifies that we deal with only the bulk and EOM terms in the main text. Although we have discussed just a one-loop case, we expect that a similar argument should hold due to the causality: If the boundary terms appear only in the asymptotic future, they cannot contribute to changing the physical quantities at any finite time.




FIG. 10. Feynman diagrams for the four-point correlation function arising from the interactions of one boundary term and one bulk term.




FIG. 11. Feynman diagrams for one-loop correction to the power spectrum from the interactions of one boundary term and one bulk term.

Appendix C: Proof of the identity (3.28)

Here, we will show some details for the derivation of the equality in Eq. (3.28). Recall that the first equality of Eq. (3.28) is

$$P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= i \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \left[\sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, i_3)} \left(\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{D}_{i_3}^{(A)} \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle_{\text{tree}} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{C1})
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that there is a single vertex to evaluate $\langle \dots \rangle$, which is formally given by $\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau_1 \sum_{A=1}^n \lambda_3^{(A)} \mathcal{L}_3^{(A)}(\tau_1)$. From now on, we neglect the derivative operators, momentum integration, and couplings for notational simplicity, and focus on the propagators and time integration. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1) \\
&\simeq - \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau_1 \\
&\times \left[G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \left\{ G_{++}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) G_{++}(k, \tau, \tau_1) G_{++}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) - G_{+-}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) G_{+-}(k, \tau, \tau_1) G_{+-}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \left\{ G_{++}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) G_{-+}(k, \tau, \tau_1) G_{-+}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) - G_{+-}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) G_{--}(k, \tau, \tau_1) G_{--}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) \right\} \right], \quad (\text{C2})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{k} = |\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}|$. To simplify this equation further, we decompose the time integration as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_f} d\tau_1 = \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau_1}_{(i)} + \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_*} d\tau \int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau_1}_{(ii)} + \underbrace{\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} d\tau_1}_{(iii)} + \underbrace{\int_{\tau_*}^{\tau_f} d\tau \int_{\tau}^{\tau_f} d\tau_1}_{(iv)}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

We will show that the integrals (ii), (iii), and (iv) vanish, as expected from causality. To see this, notice the following. For (ii), since $\tau_1 > \tau_* > \tau$, we have $G_{++}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) = G_{+-}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1)$ and $G_{++}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1) = G_{+-}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1)$. Then, the terms on the first line of the curly bracket in Eq. (C2) cancel each other. For a similar reason, the terms on the second line also cancel out. For (iii), we have $\tau > \tau_*$ and $G_{++}(k_2; \tau, \tau_*) = G_{-+}(k_2; \tau, \tau_*)$, and since $\tau > \tau_1$, there is also the relation $G_{++}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1) = G_{-+}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1)$. Therefore, the terms on the first line are exactly canceled by the corresponding terms on the second line. For (iv), it follows that $\tau_1 > \tau > \tau_*$, and then we have $G_{++}(k; \tau_*, \tau_1) = G_{+-}(k; \tau_*, \tau_1)$ and $G_{++}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1) = G_{+-}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1)$. Hence the terms on the first line cancel out and a similar argument leads to the cancellation of terms on the second line. Thus we are left with (i) only, so that we reached the expression (3.28).

However, the above manipulation has a subtlety. Although we have omitted the derivative operators from interactions, the second-order time derivative operator acting on the propagators may lead to the δ -function with respect to time. However possible δ -functions are the following three types, $\delta(\tau - \tau_*)$ from $G_{++}(k_2; \tau, \tau_*)$, $\delta(\tau_* - \tau_1)$ from $G_{++(-)}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1)$, and $\delta(\tau - \tau_1)$ from $G_{++(-)}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau_1)$. For either choice, we notice that the integral over $\tau \in [\tau_*, \tau_f]$ cancels out, and therefore, the upper limit of the τ integration can be taken as τ_* . Note that the double δ -function can appear with the same argument, which causes a singular factor $\delta(0)$. However, such an unphysical divergence should be canceled out by the mechanism discussed in Appendix A. So, in general, we may assume the τ integration to be τ_* . Notice also that the time integration appears from the interaction vertices, and the two integrations should be symmetric. Therefore, we may also take the upper limit of τ_1 integration to be τ_* . This can be simply understood as the consequence of causality since we are concerned with the quantum corrections to the operator inserted at $\tau = \tau_*$ ($< \tau_f$) and future events should not affect their expectation values.

Appendix D: Note on renormalization

We give a few comments on the renormalization issue in the transient USR model. As we already argued, there are no UV divergences for the 1PI contributions from cubic vertices. This is expected from the general result [2], where the background dynamics is not specified. In general, a non-smooth background leads to unphysical behavior of physical quantities due to the excitation of short wavelength modes by discontinuity. Indeed, in our model, the non-smoothness causes the quantity \mathcal{B}_k in Eq. (2.23) decaying only some power in k , but on a smooth background, we expect the exponential decay of \mathcal{B}_k instead. In our discussion, thanks to the symmetric property of ζ , the unphysical behavior does not occur but in general, one should be careful when dealing with the non-smooth background.

Furthermore, if the background is replaced by a smooth one, namely, the unphysical behavior is properly removed, we expect that the renormalization of various quantities should be done in the same way as the usual slow-roll inflation even in the transient USR model. This is because the structure of the UV divergence is independent of the background field configuration. More concretely, we can examine formal heat kernel expansion (see e.g. [112]) or adiabatic regularization [113, 114] in computing the UV divergent part of expectation values of the operators. As long as the state under consideration is physically a reasonable one, or more specifically, the class of Hadamard states whose two-point functions have a singularity structure similar to that of the Minkowski vacuum state²⁶, the renormalization can be done without specifying field profiles. Then, since the difference between a slow-roll model and the transient USR model comes from the time dependence of $a(t)$, the counter-term we need should be the same in both cases. Such a property originates from the fact that for Hadamard states the UV modes contributing to the divergence do not feel e.g., the background spacetime curvature, and therefore, the UV divergence can be formally written without specifying the background field configuration. In the literature, one-loop corrections to the power spectrum from the leading-order cubic interaction has explicit UV-cutoff dependence, which requires renormalization and the finite part is dealt with by implicitly or explicitly assuming the renormalization of the corrections [1, 53, 57]. We expect that it is an artifact of the technical complications. If there were, counter-terms would be necessary, which implies the time-dependence to the super-Hubble modes [2]. If such a divergence were to appear in the transient USR model, this implies that we would have slow-roll models breaking the constancy of ζ . As we have shown, this is not the case. An exception is the tadpole term, but it can be removed by an appropriate renormalization condition [2].

Appendix E: Explicit computations of the master formula

We show the explicit form of one-loop corrections for the reduced Lagrangian (5.1). Using the formula (3.33), we find

$$P_{\zeta}^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1) \simeq \frac{i}{2} M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\eta'(\tau)}{2} F_1 + \frac{\eta(\tau)}{2} F_2 + \frac{2}{a(\tau)H} F_3 \right], \quad (\text{E1})$$

where $F_{1,2,3}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 = & + 2G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle + 2G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & + 2\partial_{\tau} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - 2G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{-\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - 2G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{-\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - 2\partial_{\tau} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_2 = & + 2G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle + 2G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - \frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - 2G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - 2G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 = & + G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle + G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & + \partial_{\tau} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle + \partial_{\tau} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - \frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - \frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{-\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{-\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ & - \partial_{\tau} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - \partial_{\tau} G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) D_2 \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E4})$$

Note that a prime represents the partial derivative with respect to τ . Following the results in Sec. VC, we may neglect the three-point functions including the D_2 operator since they give terms proportional to $\delta^{(4)}(0)$ and should be canceled by the α -terms following from the general discussion given in Appendix A. Dropping the terms that contain three-point functions including D_2 , the leading-order terms of $F_{1,2,3}$ yield

$$F_1^{\text{LO}} = + 2G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \{ \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \}' \rangle\rangle + 2\partial_{\tau} G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle$$

²⁶ See e.g., Ref. [115] for a review of the Hadamard states.

$$-2G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \{ \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \}' \rangle\rangle - 2\partial_\tau G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle, \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$F_2^{\text{LO}} = -\frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle, \quad (\text{E6})$$

$$F_3^{\text{LO}} = -\frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle - \frac{i\delta(\tau - \tau_*)}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle. \quad (\text{E7})$$

By using these results, we obtain

$$P_\zeta^{(1\text{-loop})}(\tau_*, k_1) \simeq \frac{i}{2} M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_*} d\tau \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)\eta'(\tau)}{2} F_1^{\text{LO}} \right] + \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\eta(\tau_*)}{4} \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \\ + \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2a(\tau_*)H} \left[\langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle + \langle\langle \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \tilde{\zeta}^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{\zeta}^{+\prime}(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle\rangle \right] \Big|_{\tau \rightarrow \tau_*}. \quad (\text{E8})$$

Notice that the first term is the one included in Eq. (6.2). On the other hand, the rest of terms are evaluated at a future time τ_* ($> \tau_e$). By assumption, the slow-roll parameter η becomes negligibly small in the secondary SR phase within our model, which implies that the second integral in Eq. (E8) is negligible. Furthermore, since $|\tau_*| \ll |\tau_e|$, the third integral in Eq. (E8), which is proportional to $(a(\tau_*)H)^{-1} \simeq -\tau_*$, should be also small. Therefore, only the first integral gives the leading-order contribution to Eq. (E8). Note that the momentum integration of these terms can be also evaluated as Eq. (3.36) since the consistency relation holds. Thus, we have confirmed the validity of our discussion in Sec. VI.

We also comment on a technical issue associated with the relation between the correlation functions of $+$ and $-$ fields. The origin of these fields is the presence of the time-evolution operator and its Hermitian conjugate, and formally, the difference between $\zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1)$ and $\zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1)$ would disappear if we consider correlation functions at the equal time. This argument is correct up to the possible δ -functions associated with the canonical commutation relations when the external fields have time derivatives. As an illustration, we consider

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta^{+\prime}(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle = \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | T \{ \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta'(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) \} | 0 \rangle = -i \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{++}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}; \tau_2, \mathbf{y}) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \partial_{\tau_2} |\zeta_k(\tau_2)|^2 e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})}. \quad (\text{E9})$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta^{-\prime}(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle = -i \partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{+-}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}; \tau_2, \mathbf{y}) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta'_k(\tau_2) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})}, \quad (\text{E10})$$

which differs from the former. This is due to our prescription of the Heaviside step function, and not the difference between the path-integral and operator formalisms, since, even for the operator formalism, we would have

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | T \{ \zeta(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta'(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) \} | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle 0 | \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}) \zeta'(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) + \zeta'(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) \zeta(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}) | 0 \rangle, \quad (\text{E11})$$

which reproduces the above result. Now, the difference between (E9) and (E10) is given by

$$\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta^{+\prime}(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle - \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}) \zeta^{-\prime}(\tau_2, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle \\ = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} [\bar{\zeta}'_k(\tau_2) \zeta_k(\tau_2) - \zeta'_k(\tau_2) \bar{\zeta}_k(\tau_2)] e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} \\ = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{i}{2a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} = \frac{i}{4a^2 \epsilon M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \quad (\text{E12})$$

where we used the normalization condition (2.13). This is also expected from the operator formalism. Hence, the equal time limit of the (anti-)time-ordered products may lead to some subtlety depending on the definition of the Heaviside step function. Notice however that e.g., in the evaluation of the connected three-point functions, we take the contraction of “external fields” with the fields in interaction terms, which form three propagators. Then, the equal time limit of the external fields causes no subtlety since the external fields are contracted only with the fields in

interaction terms. In other words, for connected diagrams, the ordering ambiguity does not provide any contributions. Nevertheless, this argument has a possible loophole discussed below.

The possible loophole of the above argument is the case that some operators have two (or more) time derivatives such as D_2 since such derivatives give rise to a time-dependent δ -function, which enforces the equal time limit of some operators. To illustrate the subtlety and its resolution, we consider a simple interacting system

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = \lambda \zeta^2 D_2 \zeta, \quad (\text{E13})$$

where λ is a coupling. Now, let us evaluate the correlation function

$$\langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle, \quad (\text{E14})$$

and

$$\langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle, \quad (\text{E15})$$

at first order in λ . Notice that we have two interactions consisting of either $+$ or $-$ fields. Summing up the contributions from the \pm -vertices for the former, we find

$$i 2\lambda \int d\tau_1 d^3 \mathbf{y} (-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) (-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_1 - \tau) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{y}) + (3 \leftrightarrow 1) + (3 \leftrightarrow 2), \quad (\text{E16})$$

where the first i comes from the $+$ vertex, and we used $D_2(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) = -i(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{-1} \delta(\tau_1 - \tau) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{y})$. The latter is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} & i 2\lambda \int d\tau_1 d^3 \mathbf{y} (-i\Delta_{+-}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) (-i\Delta_{+-}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_1 - \tau) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}) \\ & - i 2\lambda \int d\tau_1 d^3 \mathbf{y} (-i\Delta_{+-}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) (-i\Delta_{--}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) \frac{+i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_1 - \tau) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}) + (2 \leftrightarrow 3), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E17})$$

where the first and second lines arise from the $+$ and $-$ vertices, respectively, and we used $D_2(-i\Delta_{--}(\tau, \mathbf{x}; \tau_1, \mathbf{y})) = +i(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{-1} \delta(\tau_1 - \tau) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{y})$. After evaluating the δ -function, we obtain the same result from both. In this sense, we may choose either of the signs for the external fields. Thus, even though the intermediate results differ from each other, we have confirmed that the equal time limit of $\langle \zeta^+ \zeta^+ \zeta^+ \rangle$ and $\langle \zeta^+ \zeta^- \zeta^- \rangle$ coincide in this case. As we will see below, this case is special since the external operators have no time derivatives.

Actual subtlety arises when the external operators have time derivatives. Let us consider

$$\langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{+'}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle, \quad (\text{E18})$$

and

$$\langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{-'}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle. \quad (\text{E19})$$

Here, we need to be more careful how to define the coincident time limit of these operators. The appropriate way is to define them as

$$\langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{+'}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle \equiv \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{+'}(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau_3, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle |_{\tau_1, 2, 3 \rightarrow \tau}. \quad (\text{E20})$$

The former is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} & 2i\lambda \int d\tau_4 d^3 \mathbf{y} \left[(-i\Delta_{++}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) (-i\partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{++}(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_3) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{y}) \right. \\ & \quad + (-i\Delta_{++}(\tau_3, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) (-i\partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{++}(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_1) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}) \\ & \quad \left. + (-i\Delta_{++}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) (-i\Delta_{++}(\tau_3, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \partial_{\tau_2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_2) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}) \right]_{\tau_1, 2, 3 \rightarrow \tau} \\ & = \frac{\lambda}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \int \frac{d^3 k_1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3 k_2}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3)} + \frac{1}{2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(|\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 \right) e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_2)} \Big], \quad (\text{E21})$$

whereas the latter gives

$$\begin{aligned} & 2i\lambda \int d\tau_4 d^3\mathbf{y} \left[-(-i\Delta_{+-}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_4, \mathbf{y}))(-i\partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{--}(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{+i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_3) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{y}) \right. \\ & \quad + (-i\Delta_{-+}(\tau_3, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_4, \mathbf{y}))(-i\partial_{\tau_2} \Delta_{-+}(\tau_2, \mathbf{x}_2; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{-i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_1) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}) \\ & \quad \left. - (-i\Delta_{+-}(\tau_1, \mathbf{x}_1; \tau_4, \mathbf{y}))(-i\Delta_{--}(\tau_3, \mathbf{x}_3; \tau_4, \mathbf{y})) \frac{+i}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \partial_{\tau_2} \delta(\tau_4 - \tau_2) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}) \right]_{\tau_{1,2,3} \rightarrow \tau} \\ & = \frac{\lambda}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \int \frac{d^3k_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3k_2}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3)} + |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \zeta'_{k_2}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_2}(\tau) e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\{ |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 \zeta'_{k_1}(\tau) \bar{\zeta}_{k_1}(\tau) + \frac{1}{2} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} |\zeta_{k_2}(\tau)|^2 \right\} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) + i\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_2)} \right]. \quad (\text{E22}) \end{aligned}$$

One can take the differences between them and find

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{+'}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle - \langle 0 | \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{x}_1) \zeta^{-'}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_2) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{x}_3) | 0 \rangle \\ & = \frac{i\lambda}{4a^2(\tau)\epsilon(\tau)M_{\text{Pl}}^4} \int \frac{d^3k_1}{(2\pi)^3} |\zeta_{k_1}(\tau)|^2 \left[e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_3)} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) + e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3)} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \right]. \quad (\text{E23}) \end{aligned}$$

Once again, we find the contact contribution associated with the ordering ambiguity. Notice that like the case of the previous argument, as long as we are concerned with connected correlation functions at different space points, the ambiguity does not contribute to the correlation function since the spatial δ -function trivially vanishes. Nevertheless, we have found the subtlety associated with the EOM operators: They may give contact contributions proportional to the spatial δ -function, which may give rise to ambiguities of correlation functions unless we consider the expectation values of operators at different points. Since we are concerned with loop contributions, one may wonder if the above-mentioned subtlety causes problems in our discussion. Fortunately, this is not the case as discussed below.

We find that despite possible subtlety, it turns out that our computations do not suffer from the above ordering issue. To illustrate this point, we consider F_1^{LO} appearing in Eq. (E8), which have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^{\text{LO}} \supset & +2\partial_\tau G_{++}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \zeta^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \\ & -2\partial_\tau G_{-+}(k_1; \tau, \tau_*) \langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \zeta^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle. \quad (\text{E24}) \end{aligned}$$

From the contraction with the third term in Eq. (5.1), we have

$$\langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \zeta^+(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \zeta^+(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \supset \frac{4}{a(\tau)H} \partial_{\tau_1} \left[G_{++}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) \left(G_{++}(k; \tau, \tau_1) + G_{++}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) \right) \right]_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau}, \quad (\text{E25})$$

whereas

$$\langle \zeta^+(\tau_*, \mathbf{k}_1) \zeta^-(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \zeta^-(\tau, -\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1) \rangle \supset \frac{4}{a(\tau)H} \partial_{\tau_1} \left[G_{+-}(k_1; \tau_*, \tau_1) \left(G_{--}(k; \tau, \tau_1) + G_{--}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau_1) \right) \right]_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau}, \quad (\text{E26})$$

where we defined $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_1| = \tilde{k}$. Thus, the integrand contains

$$F_1^{\text{LO}} \supset \frac{8}{a(\tau)H} \left[\{(\partial_\tau G_{++}(k_1, \tau, \tau_*))^2 - (\partial_\tau G_{-+}(k_1, \tau, \tau_*))^2\} \{G_{++}(k; \tau, \tau) + G_{++}(\tilde{k}; \tau, \tau)\} \right], \quad (\text{E27})$$

where we used $G_{++}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau) = G_{--}(k(\tilde{k}); \tau, \tau)$. Strictly speaking, this quantity is not real at $\tau = \tau_*$ but in our case, it is just a point with measure zero. Except that point, $G_{++}(k_1, \tau, \tau_*) = \bar{G}_{-+}(k_1, \tau, \tau_*)$ holds for $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_*]$, which is the region of integration. Then, the integrand becomes pure imaginary, which yields a real correction to the power spectrum with the overall imaginary unit i . One can confirm similar results for other contributions. Therefore, there is no ordering issue within our model.

Although the ordering subtlety does not appear within our model, we give a few comments related to the solution to the above ordering issue in general. We would have several options: One is to use the Keldysh basis $\zeta_c = (\zeta_+ + \zeta_-)/2$ and $\zeta_q = (\zeta_+ - \zeta_-)$ (see e.g., Ref. [116]) as basic variables and to compute the expectation values of ζ_c . Such a computation corresponds to taking the average over possible sign assignments on the fields. We may also employ the wave functional approach [77, 117]. These approaches would avoid the above-mentioned issue.

-
- [1] J. Kristiano and J. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 221003 (2024), arXiv:2211.03395 [hep-th].
- [2] G. L. Pimentel, L. Senatore, and M. Zaldarriaga, *JHEP* **07**, 166 (2012), arXiv:1203.6651 [hep-th].
- [3] A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **91**, 99 (1980).
- [4] K. Sato, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **195**, 467 (1981).
- [5] D. Kazanas, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **241**, L59 (1980).
- [6] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [7] A. D. Linde, *Phys. Lett. B* **108**, 389 (1982).
- [8] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1220 (1982).
- [9] S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Lett. B* **115**, 295 (1982).
- [10] A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **117**, 175 (1982).
- [11] A. H. Guth and S. Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1110 (1982).
- [12] V. F. Mukhanov and G. V. Chibisov, *JETP Lett.* **33**, 532 (1981).
- [13] J. M. Bardeen, P. J. Steinhardt, and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 679 (1983).
- [14] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 1997 (2008), arXiv:gr-qc/0405109.
- [15] J. M. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1882 (1980).
- [16] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **78**, 1 (1984).
- [17] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman, and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rept.* **215**, 203 (1992).
- [18] B. A. Bassett, S. Tsujikawa, and D. Wands, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 537 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0507632.
- [19] D. N. Spergel et al. (WMAP), *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0302209.
- [20] P. A. R. Ade et al. (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A16 (2014), arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
- [21] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [22] Y. Akrami et al. (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A10 (2020), arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO].
- [23] Y. B. Zel'dovich and I. D. Novikov, *Soviet Astronomy* **10**, 602 (1967).
- [24] S. Hawking, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **152**, 75 (1971).
- [25] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **168**, 399 (1974).
- [26] B. J. Carr, *Astrophys. J.* **201**, 1 (1975).
- [27] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35**, 063001 (2018), arXiv:1801.05235 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] B. Carr and F. Kuhnel, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **70**, 355 (2020), arXiv:2006.02838 [astro-ph.CO].
- [29] A. M. Green and B. J. Kavanagh, *J. Phys. G* **48**, 043001 (2021), arXiv:2007.10722 [astro-ph.CO].
- [30] B. Carr, K. Kohri, Y. Sendouda, and J. Yokoyama, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **84**, 116902 (2021), arXiv:2002.12778 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] P. Villanueva-Domingo, O. Mena, and S. Palomares-Ruiz, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* **8**, 87 (2021), arXiv:2103.12087 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] B. Carr and F. Kuhnel, *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes* **48**, 1 (2022), arXiv:2110.02821 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] A. Escrivà, F. Kuhnel, and Y. Tada, arXiv:2211.05767 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] A. Karam, N. Koivunen, E. Tomberg, V. Vaskonen, and H. Veermäe, *JCAP* **03**, 013 (2023), arXiv:2205.13540 [astro-ph.CO].
- [35] O. Özsoy and G. Tasinato, *Universe* **9**, 203 (2023), arXiv:2301.03600 [astro-ph.CO].
- [36] S. Choudhury and M. Sami, arXiv:2407.17006 [gr-qc].
- [37] G. F. Chapline, *Nature* **253**, 251 (1975).
- [38] P. Meszaros, *Astron. Astrophys.* **38**, 5 (1975).
- [39] S. Bird, I. Cholis, J. B. Muñoz, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, M. Kamionkowski, E. D. Kovetz, A. Raccanelli, and A. G. Riess, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 201301 (2016), arXiv:1603.00464 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 061101 (2016), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121, 059901 (2018)], arXiv:1603.08338 [astro-ph.CO].
- [41] S. Clesse and J. García-Bellido, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **15**, 142 (2017), arXiv:1603.05234 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] S. Wang, Y.-F. Wang, Q.-G. Huang, and T. G. F. Li, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 191102 (2018), arXiv:1610.08725 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] R. Bean and J. Magueijo, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 063505 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0204486.
- [44] J. Garcia-Bellido and E. Ruiz Morales, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **18**, 47 (2017), arXiv:1702.03901 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] K. Kannike, L. Marzola, M. Raidal, and H. Veermäe, *JCAP* **09**, 020 (2017), arXiv:1705.06225 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] C. Germani and T. Prokopec, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **18**, 6 (2017), arXiv:1706.04226 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] J. M. Ezquiaga, J. Garcia-Bellido, and E. Ruiz Morales, *Phys. Lett. B* **776**, 345 (2018), arXiv:1705.04861 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] H. Motohashi and W. Hu, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 063503 (2017), arXiv:1706.06784 [astro-ph.CO].

- [49] J. Kristiano and J. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103541 (2024), arXiv:2303.00341 [hep-th].
- [50] S.-L. Cheng, D.-S. Lee, and K.-W. Ng, *Phys. Lett. B* **827**, 136956 (2022), arXiv:2106.09275 [astro-ph.CO].
- [51] K. Inomata, M. Braglia, and X. Chen, *JCAP* **04**, 011 (2023), arXiv:2211.02586 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] A. Riotto, arXiv:2301.00599 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] S. Choudhury, M. R. Gangopadhyay, and M. Sami, arXiv:2301.10000 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] S. Choudhury, S. Panda, and M. Sami, *Phys. Lett. B* **845**, 138123 (2023), arXiv:2302.05655 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] A. Riotto, arXiv:2303.01727 [astro-ph.CO].
- [56] S. Choudhury, S. Panda, and M. Sami, *JCAP* **11**, 066 (2023), arXiv:2303.06066 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] H. Firouzjahi, *JCAP* **10**, 006 (2023), arXiv:2303.12025 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] H. Motohashi and Y. Tada, *JCAP* **08**, 069 (2023), arXiv:2303.16035 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] S. Choudhury, S. Panda, and M. Sami, *JCAP* **08**, 078 (2023), arXiv:2304.04065 [astro-ph.CO].
- [60] H. Firouzjahi and A. Riotto, *JCAP* **02**, 021 (2024), arXiv:2304.07801 [astro-ph.CO].
- [61] G. Franciolini, A. Iovino, Junior., M. Taoso, and A. Urbano, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 123550 (2024), arXiv:2305.03491 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] G. Tasinato, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 043526 (2023), arXiv:2305.11568 [hep-th].
- [63] S.-L. Cheng, D.-S. Lee, and K.-W. Ng, *JCAP* **03**, 008 (2024), arXiv:2305.16810 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] J. Fumagalli, arXiv:2305.19263 [astro-ph.CO].
- [65] S. Maity, H. V. Ragavendra, S. K. Sethi, and L. Sriramkumar, arXiv:2307.13636 [astro-ph.CO].
- [66] Y. Tada, T. Terada, and J. Tokuda, *JHEP* **01**, 105 (2024), arXiv:2308.04732 [hep-th].
- [67] J. H. P. Jackson, H. Assadullahi, A. D. Gow, K. Koyama, V. Vennin, and D. Wands, *JCAP* **05**, 053 (2024), arXiv:2311.03281 [astro-ph.CO].
- [68] H. Firouzjahi, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 043514 (2024), arXiv:2311.04080 [astro-ph.CO].
- [69] M. W. Davies, L. Iacconi, and D. J. Mulryne, *JCAP* **04**, 050 (2024), arXiv:2312.05694 [astro-ph.CO].
- [70] L. Iacconi, D. Mulryne, and D. Seery, arXiv:2312.12424 [astro-ph.CO].
- [71] H. Firouzjahi, arXiv:2403.03841 [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] K. Inomata, arXiv:2403.04682 [astro-ph.CO].
- [73] S. Choudhury, arXiv:2403.07343 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] G. Ballesteros and J. G. Egea, arXiv:2404.07196 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] J. Kristiano and J. Yokoyama, arXiv:2405.12145 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] J. Kristiano and J. Yokoyama, arXiv:2405.12149 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] J. M. Maldacena, *JHEP* **05**, 013 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0210603.
- [78] P. Creminelli, J. Noreña, and M. Simonović, *JCAP* **07**, 052 (2012), arXiv:1203.4595 [hep-th].
- [79] K. Hinterbichler, L. Hui, and J. Khoury, *JCAP* **08**, 017 (2012), arXiv:1203.6351 [hep-th].
- [80] V. Assassi, D. Baumann, and D. Green, *JCAP* **11**, 047 (2012), arXiv:1204.4207 [hep-th].
- [81] K. Hinterbichler, L. Hui, and J. Khoury, *JCAP* **01**, 039 (2014), arXiv:1304.5527 [hep-th].
- [82] N. Kundu, A. Shukla, and S. P. Trivedi, *JHEP* **01**, 046 (2016), arXiv:1507.06017 [hep-th].
- [83] V. Assassi, D. Baumann, and D. Green, *JHEP* **02**, 151 (2013), arXiv:1210.7792 [hep-th].
- [84] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, *JCAP* **06**, 001 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0604209.
- [85] F. Arroja and T. Tanaka, *JCAP* **05**, 005 (2011), arXiv:1103.1102 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] C. Burrage, R. H. Ribeiro, and D. Seery, *JCAP* **07**, 032 (2011), arXiv:1103.4126 [astro-ph.CO].
- [87] M. Braglia and L. Pinol, arXiv:2403.14558 [astro-ph.CO].
- [88] R. Kawaguchi, S. Tsujikawa, and Y. Yamada, arXiv:2403.16022 [hep-th].
- [89] L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, *JHEP* **09**, 148 (2013), arXiv:1210.6048 [hep-th].
- [90] M. H. Namjoo and B. Nikbakht, arXiv:2401.12958 [astro-ph.CO].
- [91] C. T. Byrnes, P. S. Cole, and S. P. Patil, *JCAP* **06**, 028 (2019), arXiv:1811.11158 [astro-ph.CO].
- [92] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, *JCAP* **06**, 003 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0503692.
- [93] X. Chen, M.-x. Huang, S. Kachru, and G. Shiu, *JCAP* **01**, 002 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0605045.
- [94] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043514 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0506236.
- [95] X. Chen, Y. Wang, and Z.-Z. Xianyu, *JCAP* **12**, 006 (2017), arXiv:1703.10166 [hep-th].
- [96] L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, *JCAP* **08**, 001 (2012), arXiv:1203.6884 [astro-ph.CO].
- [97] M. Baumgart and R. Sundrum, *JHEP* **03**, 080 (2021), arXiv:2010.10785 [hep-th].
- [98] C. Branchina, V. Branchina, F. Contino, and N. Darvishi, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 065007 (2022), arXiv:2204.10582 [hep-th].
- [99] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan, and L. Senatore, *JHEP* **03**, 014 (2008), arXiv:0709.0293 [hep-th].
- [100] A. Caravano, E. Komatsu, K. D. Lozanov, and J. Weller, *JCAP* **12**, 010 (2021), arXiv:2102.06378 [astro-ph.CO].
- [101] A. Caravano, K. Inomata, and S. Renaux-Petel, arXiv:2403.12811 [astro-ph.CO].
- [102] Y. Mizuguchi, T. Murata, and Y. Tada, arXiv:2405.10692 [astro-ph.CO].
- [103] G. W. Horndeski, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10**, 363 (1974).
- [104] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126**, 511 (2011), arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th].
- [105] D. Frolovsky, S. V. Ketov, and S. Saburov, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **37**, 2250135 (2022), arXiv:2205.00603 [astro-ph.CO].
- [106] C. Fu, P. Wu, and H. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 063532 (2019), arXiv:1907.05042 [astro-ph.CO].
- [107] S. Kawai and J. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 083545 (2021), arXiv:2108.01340 [astro-ph.CO].
- [108] R. Kawaguchi and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063508 (2023), arXiv:2211.13364 [astro-ph.CO].
- [109] X. Gao and D. A. Steer, *JCAP* **12**, 019 (2011), arXiv:1107.2642 [astro-ph.CO].
- [110] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 083504 (2011), arXiv:1107.3917 [gr-qc].

- [111] A. Abolhasani and H. Goodhew, *JCAP* **06**, 032 (2022), arXiv:2201.05117 [hep-th].
- [112] D. V. Vassilevich, *Phys. Rept.* **388**, 279 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0306138.
- [113] Y. B. Zeldovich and A. A. Starobinsky, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **61**, 2161 (1971).
- [114] L. Parker and S. A. Fulling, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 341 (1974).
- [115] I. Khavkine and V. Moretti, “Algebraic QFT in Curved Spacetime and quasifree Hadamard states: an introduction,” in *Advances in algebraic quantum field theory*, edited by R. Brunetti, C. Dappiaggi, K. Fredenhagen, and J. Yngvason (2014) pp. 191–251, arXiv:1412.5945 [math-ph].
- [116] J. Berges, arXiv:1503.02907 [hep-ph].
- [117] D. Harlow and D. Stanford, arXiv:1104.2621 [hep-th].