

Returning Back to Mukhanov Parametrization of Inflationary Equation of State

Barun Kumar Pal^{1,*}

¹*Netaji Nagar College For Women, Kolkata-700092, West Bengal, India*

We have re-examined Mukhanov parametrization for inflationary equation of state $1+\omega = \frac{\beta}{(N+1)^\alpha}$, in the light of Planck 2018 results and latest bound on tensor-to-scalar ratio employing Hamilton-Jacobi formalism. We have found the current observational values of scalar spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio can be used efficiently to constrain the model parameters. The recent findings of $r < 0.032$ has been used to put an upper bound on one of the model parameter. Whereas the $1-\sigma$ bound of the scalar spectral index $0.9607 \leq n_s \leq 0.9691$ along with the upper bound of scalar-to-tensor ratio provided restriction on the other model parameter $1.50 \leq \alpha \leq 2.20$. This bound depends on the number of e-foldings still left before the end of inflation and whenever $1.50 \leq \alpha \leq 2.20$ we can find appropriate values of the other model parameter β so that the observational predictions are in tune with the latest available inflationary observables.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cosmic inflation, by far the best bet for early universe scenario, has started its journey more than four decades ago in order to figure out the Big Bang puzzles. It has resolved the problems of Big Bang theory in a very elegant way. Not only that, inflation has surprised us by supplying quantum seeds for cosmological fluctuations observed in the large scale structure of matter and in cosmic microwave background radiation. Unfortunately due to the lack of specific compelling model of inflation, it is still a paradigm. During its long existence plenty of inflationary models have been proposed. But the situation has changed drastically since the availability of precise observational data. The finespun data of late [1–4] has ruled out many inflationary models already. The CMB missions in the likes of BICEP2/Keck [5], CMB-S4 [6], LiteBird [7] will further reduce the number of viable inflationary models.

Nowadays scalar spectral index has come out as the main eliminator between different inflationary models along with the tensor-to-scalar ratio. Recent analysis from Planck [1, 2], WMAP and Bicep/Keck observations has set an upper-bound $r < 0.036$ [8] whereas it has been claimed that $r < 0.032$ in Ref.[9]. Throughout this work we have adhered to the following constraint on tensor-to-scalar ratio $r < 0.032$.

The inflationary paradigm has been explored mostly through the avenue of defining a particular potential for the inflaton, which may be of field theoretic origin or may be purely phenomenological. The advantage of this approach is that we can directly establish link with the underlying physics behind cosmic inflation. There are other alternative approaches which may not have direct field theoretic motivation but may have viable observational predictions. The equation of state formalism is one such alternative approach, first introduced in [10] and later discussed in several works [11–16]. Though originally equation of state formalism has been advertised as the model independent way to investigate inflationary paradigm. But in reality we shall see that specifying an equation of state boils down to choosing a particular potential for inflation [17].

In this article we have re-investigated Mukhanov parametrization employing Hamilton-Jacobi formulation. We have derived exact form of the potential involved in Mukhanov parametrization of inflationary equation of state parameter for different values of the model parameter. Using the latest available data for spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio we have provided bounds on the model parameters.

2. MUKHANOV PARAMETRIZATION

Recently inflationary paradigm has been investigated through the parametrization of inflationary Equation-of-State (EoS henceforth) as a function of number of e-foldings, N . The main motivation was to develop a model independent framework for the investigation and confrontation of cosmic inflation with recent observations. Following EoS parameter has been proposed in Ref.[10]

$$1 + \omega = \frac{\beta}{(N + 1)^\alpha} \quad (1)$$

*Electronic address: terminatorbarun@gmail.com

where α and β are two dimensionless positive constants and N is the number of e-foldings. Above EoS captures a wide range of inflationary models with various observational predictions [15]. It has been argued that with EoS parametrization, inflationary scenario can be studied model independently [10]. But this may not be true as we shall see that specifying a particular EoS directly translates into choosing a specific potential as pointed out in Ref.[17].

Since choosing an inflaton potential directly maps into the underlying high energy physics, it is the most efficient way to learn inflation. But nowadays highly sophisticated data are coming through various observational probes which are now leading the thoughts about cosmic inflation. With a specific EoS we might find inflationary observables more easily. So EoS formalism may be seen as bottom-up approach towards cosmic inflation. Our aim here is to find the exact expression for the potential involved with the above EoS parametrization and set limit on the model parameters applying Hamilton-Jacobi formulation using latest constraints on inflationary observables.

3. HAMILTON JACOBI FORMALISM

The Friedmann equations Hamilton Jacobi formulation boils down to the following first order second degree non-linear differential equations [18–26]

$$\begin{aligned} [H'(\phi)]^2 - \frac{3}{2M_P^2}H(\phi)^2 &= -\frac{1}{2M_P^4}V(\phi) \\ \dot{\phi} &= -2M_P^2H'(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where prime and dot denote derivatives with respect to the scalar field ϕ and time respectively, and $M_P \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi G}}$ is the reduced Planck mass. The acceleration equation here is given by

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = H^2(\phi) [1 - \epsilon_H] \quad (4)$$

where ϵ_H has been defined as

$$\epsilon_H = 2M_P^2 \left(\frac{H'(\phi)}{H(\phi)} \right)^2. \quad (5)$$

So the accelerated expansion is uniquely determined by $\epsilon_H < 1$ and ends exactly at $\epsilon_H = 1$. Generally, it is very difficult to solve Hamilton-Jacobi equations without having prior knowledge of the Hubble parameter or the potential.

The inflationary EoS can be written as

$$\epsilon_H = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{3}{2}(1 + \omega). \quad (6)$$

It is to be noted that ϵ_H is not the usual slow-roll parameter, ϵ_H measures the relative contribution of the inflaton's kinetic energy to its total energy [22]. Another associated parameter is

$$\eta_H = -\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{H\dot{\phi}} \quad (7)$$

which determines the ratio of field's acceleration relative to the friction acting on it due to the expansion of the universe [22].

The amount of inflation is represented by number of e-foldings

$$N \equiv \ln \frac{a_{\text{end}}}{a} = \frac{1}{M_P} \int_{\phi_{\text{end}}}^{\phi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\epsilon_H}} d\phi. \quad (8)$$

So at the end of inflation $N = 0$ and N increases as we go back in time. In order to solve Big Bang puzzles we need at least 50 – 60 e-foldings before the end of inflation, though total number of e-foldings could be much larger. During this observable period inflationary EoS may be assumed very slowly varying or even almost constant.

4. FROM EOS TO INFLATIONARY POTENTIAL

Since inflation is a high energy phenomena, working with a specific form of the potential directly establishes the link with high energy physics. Whereas employing EoS formalism we can get observational predictions at ease without going into the details of underlying physics. Now we shall see in the following analysis that within Hamilton-Jacobi formulation, choosing an EoS is equivalent to specify a particular Hubble parameter which in turn provides shape of the potential and vice versa.

The Hubble parameter may be written as

$$H(N) = H_0 \exp\left(\int \epsilon_H(N) dN\right). \quad (9)$$

In the present context we have,

$$\epsilon_H = \frac{3\beta}{2(N+1)^\alpha} \quad (10)$$

The end of inflation occurs naturally when $\epsilon_H = 1$ and from the definition of e-foldings $N = 0$ at the end of inflation. Considering these two we get a lower-bound of the parameter $\beta > 2/3$, since $\beta \leq 2/3$ would always imply $\epsilon_H < 1$ and inflation goes on forever. It is to be noted that graceful exit does not depend on the other parameter α . Now using the following relation

$$\epsilon_H = 2M_P^{-2} \left(\frac{d\phi}{dN}\right)^2, \quad (11)$$

we obtain the evolution of the scalar field as a function of e-foldings,

$$\phi = \begin{cases} \phi_{end} + \sqrt{3\beta}M_P (\ln(1+N) - 1) & \text{if } \alpha = 2 \\ \phi_{end} + \frac{\sqrt{3\beta}}{1-\alpha/2} M_P \left((1+N)^{1-\alpha/2} - 1\right) & \text{if } \alpha \neq 2 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where ϕ_{end} is the value of the inflaton at the end of inflation.

Now putting the above expression of ϵ_H into Eq.(9) and performing the integration we find that

$$H = \begin{cases} H_0 (1+N)^{\frac{3\beta}{2}} & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ H_0 \exp\left(\frac{3\beta}{2(1-\alpha)} (1+N)^{1-\alpha}\right) & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The above equation can be used to determine the Hubble parameter in terms of the scalar field and we find

$$H = \begin{cases} H_0 (2\sqrt{3\beta})^{-3\beta} (\phi/M_P)^{3\beta} & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ H_0 \exp\left(-\frac{3\beta}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\phi}{\sqrt{3\beta}M_P}\right)\right) & \text{if } \alpha = 2 \\ H_0 \exp\left(-\frac{3\beta\left(\frac{2-\alpha}{2\sqrt{3\beta}}\right)^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}}}{2(1-\alpha)} (\phi/M_P)^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\right) & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1, 2 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Finally substituting Eq.(14) into Eq.(2) we obtain the desired expression for the potential

$$V(\phi) = \begin{cases} M_P^4 2^{-6\beta} 3^{1-3\beta} \beta^{-3\beta} \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^{6\beta-2} \left(\left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^2 - 6\beta^2\right) & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ M_P^4 \frac{3}{2} \left(2e^{\frac{2\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}}} - \beta\right) \exp\left(-3\beta e^{-\frac{\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}}} - \frac{2\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\right) & \text{if } \alpha = 2 \\ M_P^4 \exp\left(\frac{2^{-\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}} 3^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} \beta \left(-\frac{(\alpha-2)\phi}{\sqrt{\beta}M_P}\right)^{\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}}}{\alpha-1}\right) \left(3 - \frac{2^{-\frac{2-3\alpha}{\alpha-2}} 9^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} \beta^2 \left(-\frac{(\alpha-2)\phi}{\sqrt{\beta}M_P}\right)^{\frac{4(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}}}{(\alpha-2)^2 \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^2}\right) & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1, 2. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

So the EoS Eq.(1) actually corresponds to the scalar field potential given by Eq.(15). Therefore we may conclude that specifying an EoS directly leads to a particular inflationary model as pointed out in [17].

5. FROM EOS TO INFLATIONARY OBSERVABLES

Considering N as new time variable it is possible to express all the inflationary observables in terms of the EoS [12, 27], which up to the first order in slow-roll parameters are given by

$$n_s \simeq 1 - 3(1 + \omega) + \frac{d}{dN} \ln(1 + \omega) \quad (16)$$

$$\alpha_s \simeq 3 \frac{d}{dN} (1 + \omega) - \frac{d^2}{dN^2} \ln(1 + \omega) \quad (17)$$

$$r \simeq 24(1 + \omega) \quad (18)$$

$$n_T \simeq -3(1 + \omega) \quad (19)$$

$$\alpha_T \simeq 3 \frac{d}{dN} (1 + \omega). \quad (20)$$

To confront the prediction of any inflationary model the above observable quantities are evaluated at the time of horizon crossing i.e. when there are 50-60 e-foldings still left before the end of inflation. In this work we have focused mainly on the scalar spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio using their latest available bounds from recent observations [8, 9]. For the model under consideration we have

$$n_s \sim 1 - \frac{3\beta}{(1+N)^\alpha} - \frac{\alpha}{(1+N)} \quad (21)$$

$$r \sim \frac{24\beta}{(1+N)^\alpha} \quad (22)$$

From Eq.(21) and Eq.(22) we can get the following relation between tensor-to-scalar ratio and scalar spectral index,

$$\frac{r}{8} \sim (1 - n_s) - \frac{\alpha}{(1+N)}. \quad (23)$$

We shall later see that for $\alpha < 1.50$ the Mukhanov parametrization is unable to explain current observations and also for $\alpha > 2.20$. However when $1.5 \leq \alpha \leq 2.2$ the parametrization yields excellent match with observations. In the following section we have investigated the model for different values of the model parameter α .

6. INFLATIONARY MODELS

In this section we shall investigate few inflationary models by fixing the model parameter, α . In Fig.1 we have plotted the inflationary potentials for different values of the model parameter α and for four values of β in logarithmic scale. From the figure it is very clear that the potential has adequate flat region which is required in order to get sufficient amount of inflation to resolve big-bang puzzles.

6.1. Case $\alpha = 1$

For $\alpha = 1$, the inflationary potential may be put simply in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &= 2^{-6\beta} 3^{1-3\beta} \beta^{-3\beta} \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^{6\beta-2} \left(\left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^2 - 6\beta^2 \right) \\ &\equiv V_0 \left[\left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^{6\beta} - 6\beta^2 \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^{6\beta-2} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

which represents power law potential and the corresponding inflationary scenario is the chaotic inflation [28, 29]. The second term within the square brackets i.e., $-6\beta^2 \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^{6\beta-2}$ differs from the original work in [10] as we are working in Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of inflation as it produces more accurate results. For $\beta = 1/3$ Eq.(24) represents quadratic potential whereas for $\beta = 2/3$ it yields quartic potential. Later we shall show that both those values of β are disfavoured as they produce higher amount of gravitational waves than that are observationally permitted.




FIG. 1: Logarithmic variation of the potential with scalar field for four different values of the model parameter α , β .

The spectral index and the tensor to scalar ratio in this case turn out to be

$$n_s \sim 1 - \frac{3\beta + 1}{1 + N} \quad (25)$$

$$r \sim \frac{24\beta}{1 + N} \quad (26)$$

From the observational constraint on the scalar spectral index, $0.9607 \leq n_s \leq 0.9691$, we find that $0.243 \leq \beta \leq 0.40$ for $N = 55$. The lowest allowed value of $\beta = 0.243$ comes up with tensor-to-scalar ratio of 0.10 which is way too high for the recent findings of $r < 0.032$ [9]. So there is no feasible value of the model parameter β which can simultaneously agree with present constraints on tensor-to-scalar ratio and scalar spectral index for $\alpha = 1$. Which is also transparent from Fig.2. The chaotic inflationary models with power law potential has already been ruled out due to the production of higher amount of primordial gravity waves than allowed observationally.

6.2. Case $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$

The inflaton potential in this case boils down to

$$V(\phi) = M_P^4 3e^{\frac{288\beta^2}{(\phi/M_P)^2}} \left(1 - 55296 \frac{\beta^4}{(\phi/M_P)^6} \right) \quad (27)$$




FIG. 2: Variation of the tensor-to-scalar ratio with the spectral index for 3 different values of number of e-foldings. The shaded region corresponds to the latest bounds on the spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio.




FIG. 3: Left Panel: Logarithmic variation of the potential with scalar field for different values of β . Right Panel: Variation of the end value of the inflaton with the model parameter β .

In Fig.3 we have shown the logarithmic variation of the potential for three different values of the model parameter β . In this model inflation occurs at high values of the scalar field, which increases with the model parameter as can be seen from the right panel of the Fig.3. This high value of inflaton results in large tensor-to-scalar ratio. In order to become observationally viable this type of inflationary model requires small values of the model parameter β .

The spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio in this case are given by

$$n_s \sim 1 - \frac{3\beta}{(1+N)^{3/2}} - \frac{3}{2(1+N)} \quad (28)$$

$$r \sim \frac{24\beta}{(1+N)^{3/2}} \quad (29)$$




FIG. 4: Left Panel: Variation of the tensor-to-scalar ratio with the model parameter β . Right Panel: Variation of the tensor-to-scalar ratio with spectral index for three different values of e-foldings β .

From the bound of tensor-to-scalar ratio, $r < 0.032$, we can impose an upper bound on the model parameter which turns out to be $\beta < 0.56$ for $N = 55$. Also the observational constraint on scalar spectral index demands $0.575 < \beta < 1.75$ for $N = 55$. In the left panel of Fig.4 we have plotted tensor-to-scalar ratio for three different values of e-foldings, $N = 50, 55, 60$, with the model parameter β . The shaded area refers to observationally viable region. In the right panel of Fig.4 we have shown the variation of tensor-to-scalar ratio with the scalar spectral index for three different values of e-foldings, $N = 50, 55, 60$. The shaded region corresponds to the $1 - \sigma$ bound for spectral index and $r < 0.032$.

Here again we find that there is no feasible value of the model parameter, β , which is capable of explaining present bounds on tensor-to-scalar ratio and scalar spectral index simultaneously. But if we consider $N = 50$, at the time of horizon crossing, we have a very small window where observational predictions for this model agree with the latest constraints. Since for $N = 50$, the observational constraint on tensor-to-scalar ratio implies $\beta < 0.486$ while the $1 - \sigma$ bound on spectral index demands $0.181 < \beta < 1.20$. So in this case the model parameter, β , has a tiny window, $0.181 < \beta < 0.486$, where observational bounds on tensor-to-scalar ratio and scalar spectral index are met.

6.3. Case $\alpha = 2$

In this case, the inflationary potential may be written explicitly as

$$V(\phi) = M_P^4 \frac{3}{2} \left(2e^{\frac{2\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}}} - \beta \right) \exp \left(-3\beta e^{-\frac{\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}}} - \frac{2\phi/M_P}{\sqrt{3\beta}} \right) \quad (30)$$

In the left panel of Fig.5 we have shown the variation of the potential with inflaton for four different values of β and in the right panel we have plotted the ϕ_{end} with model parameter β , which we have obtained by solving the equation $\epsilon_H = 1$. From the figure we notice that for $\beta < 0.67$ we have negative ϕ_{end} which we are not interested in here and we shall only focus on the regime where $\beta \geq 0.67$. The scalar spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio in this case turns out to be

$$n_s \sim 1 - \frac{3\beta + 2 + 2N}{(1 + N)^2} = 1 - \frac{2}{(1 + N)} - \frac{3\beta}{(1 + N)^2} \quad (31)$$

$$r \sim \frac{24\beta}{(1 + N)^2} \quad (32)$$

From the latest constraint on the spectral index we find that $\beta < 3.75$ and that of tensor-to-scalar ratio implies $\beta < 4.18$. So in this case the inflationary predictions are in tune with the latest available data for the model parameter within the range $0.67 < \beta < 3.75$. In the left panel of Fig.6 we have shown the variation of the spectral index with the model parameter β and we see that spectral index is almost independent of β which is also clear from Eq.(31). In the right panel of Fig.6 we have shown the variation of spectral index with the tensor-to-scalar ratio. The shaded region in Fig.6 again refers to the observationally viable part. From the plot we clearly see that the model can simultaneously satisfy the constraints on tensor-to-scalar ratio and spectral index if we consider $N = 55$.




FIG. 5: Left Panel: Variation of the potential with scalar field for different values of β .
Right Panel: Variation of the end value of the inflaton with the model parameter β .




FIG. 6: Left Panel: Variation of the spectral index with scalar model parameter β .
Right Panel: Variation of tensor-to-scalar ratio with the scalar spectral index along with their observational bounds.

6.4. Case $\alpha > 2$

Finally we come to case $\alpha > 2$ and the potential is precisely given by

$$V(\phi) = M_P^4 \exp\left(\frac{2^{-\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}} 3^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} \beta \left(-\frac{(\alpha-2)\phi}{\sqrt{\beta}M_P}\right)^{\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}}}{\alpha-1}\right) \left(3 - \frac{2^{\frac{2-3\alpha}{\alpha-2}} 9^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} \beta^2 \left(-\frac{(\alpha-2)\phi}{\sqrt{\beta}M_P}\right)^{\frac{4(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-2}}}{(\alpha-2)^2 \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^2}\right) \quad (33)$$

In the left panel of Fig.7 we have shown the logarithmic variation of the involved potential with the scalar field. In the right panel we have plotted the variation of ϕ_{end} with the model parameter β .

The expressions for the scalar spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio are given by Eq.(21). The observational constraint on tensor-to-scalar ratio, $r < 0.032$, imposes following restriction on the model parameter β

$$\beta < \frac{(1+N)^\alpha}{750}. \quad (34)$$

Again from the above expression of the spectral index Eq.(21) we obtain

$$3\beta \simeq (1-n_s) \times (1+N)^\alpha - \alpha(1+N)^{\alpha-1}, \quad (35)$$




FIG. 7: Left Panel: Variation of the potential with the scalar field for 4 different values of the model parameter β and for a fixed $\alpha = 2.2$.

Right Panel: Variation of the end value of the inflaton with the model parameter β for $\alpha = 2.2$.

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{3} \left((1 - n_s|_{\text{upper}}) \times (1 + N)^\alpha - \alpha(1 + N)^{\alpha-1} \right) \lesssim \beta \lesssim \frac{1}{3} \left((1 - n_s|_{\text{lower}}) \times (1 + N)^\alpha - \alpha(1 + N)^{\alpha-1} \right). \quad (36)$$

where $n_s|_{\text{upper/lower}}$ corresponds to Planck-2018 $1 - \sigma$ upper and lower bounds of the scalar spectral index respectively. Combining Eq.(34) and Eq.(36) we obtain the following upper-bound of the model parameter

$$\beta < \min \left\{ \frac{(1 + N)^\alpha}{750}, \frac{1}{3} \left((1 - n_s|_{\text{lower}}) \times (1 + N)^\alpha - \alpha(1 + N)^{\alpha-1} \right) \right\} \quad (37)$$

In Fig.8 we have shown the feasible region of the model parameter β along with the other free parameter, α . The region shaded in red corresponds to the values of β which are in agreement with the latest bound of the scalar spectral index, whereas the region in cyan represents values of β satisfying current bound on tensor-to-scalar ratio for $N = 55$. From Fig.8 it is also obvious that the model is not capable of explaining the inflationary observables whenever $\alpha \leq 1.5$ or $\alpha \geq 2.2$ for $N = 55$. This bound obviously depends on number of e-foldings. But whenever $1.5 < \alpha \leq 2.2$ we can easily find suitable values of β which will simultaneously satisfy constraints on scalar spectral index and tensor-scalar-ratio. In Fig.9 we plotted the same as in Fig.8 but now for $N = 50$ and $N = 60$ respectively.

In Fig.10 we have plotted the variation of tensor-to-scalar ratio with the scalar spectral index for $\alpha = 2.1$ and 2.2 . As before the shaded part refers to the $1 - \sigma$ bound on the spectral index and $r < 0.032$.

7. CONCLUSION

In this short article we have reviewed the prospect and consequences of Mukhanov Parametrization of inflationary paradigm through the equation of state formalism employing Hamilton-Jacobi formulation. Though we see that the initial claim of model independent study of inflation is not quite true, still EoS formalism can be very effectively utilized to describe early universe scenario. We found that the two parameters α and β with numerical values close to unity can mimic the recent observations at ease. In the process we have derived exact expressions for the potential which differs slightly from the original ones as we are working in the Hamilton-Jacobi formalism which is more accurate than the usual approach.

We found that EoS as parametrized in Eq.(1) is in very good agreement with the recent observations for a decent range of the model parameters. Though we did not do rigorous numerical analysis but still able to put stringent constraints on the model parameters α and β using latest bounds on the inflationary observables. We found that whenever $1.5 \leq \alpha \leq 2.2$, we can find suitable value of the other model parameter, β , so that the inflationary observables are in tune with the recent findings. In other words EoS formalism is capable of explaining the latest observations efficiently.

The primordial gravity waves are yet to be detected which will further restrict the spectrum of inflationary models. The ever improving accuracy of the spectral index and bound on the primordial gravity waves will certainly help to




FIG. 8: Variation of the model parameters α and β . The red shaded region corresponds to the model parameters satisfying the latest constraint on the spectral index and the region with cyan represents models where constraint on tensor-to-scalar ratio is in tune.




FIG. 9: Variation of the model parameters α and β . The red shaded region corresponds to the model parameters satisfying the latest constraint on the spectral index and the region with cyan represents models where constraint on tensor-to-scalar ratio is in tune for $N = 50$ and $N = 60$ respectively.




FIG. 10: Plot of tensor-to-scalar ratio with the scalar spectral index. The shaded region corresponds to the latest constraint on the spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio.

constrain the two model parameters α and β further.

-
- [1] Y. Akrami, F. Arroja, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, et al., *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A10 (2020).
 - [2] N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. Banday, R. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, et al., *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A6 (2020).
 - [3] P. A. Ade, N. Aghanim, C. Armitage-Caplan, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, F. Atrio-Barandela, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, A. J. Banday, R. Barreiro, et al., *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **571**, A22 (2014).
 - [4] D. N. Spergel et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **170**, 377 (2007).
 - [5] P. Ade, Z. Ahmed, R. Aikin, K. Alexander, D. Barkats, S. Benton, C. Bischoff, J. Bock, R. Bowens-Rubin, J. Brevik, et al., *Physical review letters* **121**, 221301 (2018).
 - [6] K. N. Abazajian et al., arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02743 (2016).
 - [7] T. Matsumura, Y. Akiba, J. Borrill, Y. Chinone, M. Dobbs, H. Fuke, A. Ghribi, M. Hasegawa, K. Hattori, M. Hattori, et al., *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **176**, 733 (2014).
 - [8] P. Ade et al., *PRL* **127**, 151301 (2021).
 - [9] M. Tristram et al., *PRD* **105**, 083524 (2022).
 - [10] V. Mukhanov, *EPJC* **73**, 2486 (2013).
 - [11] D. Roest, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2014**, 007 (2014).
 - [12] J. Garcia-Bellido and D. Roest, *PRD* **89**, 103527 (2014).
 - [13] L. Barranco, L. Boubekeur, and O. Mena, *Physical Review D* **90**, 063007 (2014).
 - [14] L. Boubekeur, E. Giusarma, O. Mena, and H. Ramírez, *Physical Review D* **91**, 083006 (2015).
 - [15] S. Gariazzo, O. Mena, H. Ramírez, and L. Boubekeur, *Physics of the dark universe* **17**, 38 (2017).
 - [16] B. K. Pal, *IJMPD* **32**, 2350019 (2023).
 - [17] J. Martin, in *The Cosmic Microwave Background* (Springer, 2016), pp. 41–134.
 - [18] D. Salopek and J. Bond, *PRD* **42**, 3936 (1990).
 - [19] A. Muslimov, *CQG* **7**, 231 (1990).
 - [20] A. R. Liddle, P. Parsons, and J. D. Barrow, *PRD* **50**, 7222 (1994).
 - [21] W. Kinney, *PRD* **56**, 2002 (1997).
 - [22] J. E. Lidsey, A. R. Liddle, E. W. Kolb, E. J. Copeland, T. Barreiro, and M. Abney, *RMP* **69**, 373 (1997).
 - [23] B. K. Pal, S. Pal, and B. Basu, *JCAP* **04**, 009 (2012).
 - [24] B. K. Pal, *EPJC* **78**, 358 (2018).
 - [25] B. K. Pal, S. Pal, and B. Basu, *JCAP* **01**, 029 (2010).
 - [26] B. K. Pal, S. Pal, and B. Basu, *IJMPD* **21**, 1250017 (2012).
 - [27] V. F. Mukhanov, *Physical Foundations of Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
 - [28] A. D. Linde, *PLB* **129**, 177 (1983).
 - [29] A. D. Linde, *JETP Lett.* **38**, 176 (1983).