

Cosmological perturbations meet Wheeler DeWitt

Federico Piazza and Siméon Vareilles

Aix Marseille Univ, Université de Toulon, CNRS, CPT, Marseille, France

Abstract

We study solutions of the Wheeler DeWitt (WdW) equation in order to recover standard results of cosmological perturbation theory. In mini-superspace, we introduce a dimensionless gravitational coupling α that is typically very small and functions like \hbar in a WKB expansion. We seek solutions of the form $\Psi = e^{iS/\alpha}\psi$ that are the closest quantum analog of a given classical background spacetime. The function S satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, while ψ obeys a Schrödinger-like equation and has a clear probabilistic interpretation. By using the semiclassical limit we express the relation between ψ and the wavefunction of the universe in perturbation theory, ψ_P . We apply our formalism to two main examples. The first is a scalar field with a purely exponential potential, of which particularly simple, scaling solutions are known. The other is a slow-roll scenario expanded in the vicinity of the origin in field space. We discuss possible deviations from the classical background trajectory as well as the higher “time” derivative terms that are present in the WdW equation but not in the perturbative approach. We clarify the *conditional probability* content of the wavefunctions and how this is related with the standard gauge fixing procedure in perturbation theory.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminary considerations	4
2.1	(Super-Hubble) patches as physical systems	4
2.2	Perturbation theory in mini-superspace	6
2.3	Gauge fixing and conditional probability	7
3	The WdW viewpoint	9
3.1	Going with the (classical) flow	10
3.2	Degrees of freedom, probabilities etc.	11
3.3	Apples to apples	12
3.4	Higher time derivatives	14
3.5	Non-gaussian terms and deviations from the classical behavior	15
4	Perturbation theory for a scalar field	16
4.1	Perturbations	17
4.2	Scalar field models	19
5	Application to Model 1	21
5.1	Unitary gauge	22
5.2	Spatially flat gauge	22
6	Application to Model 2	23
6.1	Unitary gauge	24
6.2	Spatially flat gauge	26
7	Discussion and future plans	27
A	More about the Hamilton Jacobi equation	28
A.1	The Klein Gordon example	28
A.2	Use of Fermi coordinates	29

1 Introduction

It is common practice in cosmology to study the behavior of small perturbations around a classical background solution of the Einstein equations. These perturbations can and should be considered at the full quantum level, as suggested by the standard inflationary paradigm. The purpose of this paper is to better—and somewhat pedantically—understand the relation between cosmological perturbation theory and the Wheeler DeWitt (WdW) equation [1]. The latter is widely believed to govern the wavefunction of the universe non-perturbatively, *i.e.* without any reference to a classical background, at least in the sub-Planckian regime of validity of general relativity. There is little doubt that perturbative quantum gravity is contained in the WdW equation in some way, but showing this relation explicitly is not necessarily straightforward. In Minkowski and AdS spaces this has been done in [2] and [3] respectively. Cosmological spacetimes differ from Minkowski and AdS in at least two regards.

First, in cosmology there is one or more dominant components (e.g. radiation) driving the expansion. We cannot take the semiclassical limit $G \rightarrow 0$ of the WdW equation too naively, or we would end up decoupling matter from gravity and expanding around a *vacuum* solution of the Einstein equations. This is the wrong saddle point for cosmology. The correct semiclassical limit is discussed below in Sec. 2.1.

Related to this, as a consequence of the spontaneously broken time translations [4–6] cosmology is the realm of the gravitational adiabatic scalar mode, which is not present in empty Minkowski and AdS spaces. The mini-superspace approximation adopted in this paper will “kill” the on-shell gravitons, i.e. the tensor modes, but will keep the scalar mode alive.

Secondly, cosmological spacetimes are time dependent. In general, quantum averages evolve in time differently than classical solutions, so one could end up recovering perturbative quantum gravity around a (slightly) different background! This is a complication and, at the same time, a potential insight of the non-perturbative WdW approach. We expand on this aspect in Sec. 3.5 below, as well as in the rest of the paper.

The key objects to compare between the two approaches are their respective wavefunctions and the equations that govern them. While equal-time correlators remain the most extensively studied object in cosmology, there is growing interest in exploring the *perturbative wavefunction of the universe* ψ_P and its fascinating analytical properties (e.g. [7, 8] and references therein). This can be considered as the most primitive of all cosmological observables, the one from which all correlators can be derived. It satisfies a Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t\psi_P(\zeta_k, t) = H\psi_P(\zeta_k, t). \quad (1.1)$$

In the above we have chosen the Fourier-space curvature on comoving surfaces ζ as the reference dynamical variable and the Hamiltonian H should be worked out at the required order of approximation in perturbation theory. We would like to understand the relation between ψ_P and the WdW wavefunction Ψ , satisfying an equation different than the above.

$$\mathcal{H}\Psi = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

One main limitation of this paper is the use throughout of the mini-superspace approximation. It seems to us that all subtleties that are peculiar of dealing with a cosmological setup are basically already present at the mini-superspace level. Extending our result to the “real thing” should be relatively straightforward, at least conceptually. At the same time, despite its obvious limitations (e.g. [9]), the mini-superspace approach should have its own regime of applicability, as argued in Sec. 2.1.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our minisuperspace approximation and some relevant scales. We also review some basics of the standard perturbation theory approach. In Section 3, we turn to the WdW equation, point out the main differences

between the two approaches and related the two respective wavefunctions, ψ_P and Ψ . We then highlight these differences in detail in the case of a scalar field. In Sec. 4 we describe our two scalar field models and their standard (albeit mini-superspace-) treatment in perturbation theory. Then we approach these models with the WdW equation. The first model (Sec. 5) is that of a purely exponential potential that allows a complete analytic study of the WdW equation. The second model is a slow-roll potential (Sec. 6), that we work out in the slow roll approximation in the vicinity of the origin in field space. We finally draw some conclusion in Sec. 7.

Note on Bibliography

Much of this paper builds on ideas and techniques that are scattered through the extensive literature on the WdW equation. We feel that our citations of the original works could be largely improved and we happily welcome any suggestions on this matter. We have learned a great deal from Refs. [10–17]. While many of these works focus on the no-boundary proposal [18, 19], in this paper we are mostly concerned with the *evolution* of the state of the universe and keep agnostic about the initial conditions.

2 Preliminary considerations

In the mini-superspace approach, all relevant scales and couplings are often set conventionally to one. Here we find it helpful to spell out some of these scales. In particular, H_\star is a reference Hubble parameter, $\ell \sim M_P^2 H_\star^{-3}$ a (very super-Hubble) length and $\alpha \equiv 1/(\ell H_\star)$ the dimensionless coupling of the quantum theory. ($M_P = 1/\sqrt{8\pi G}$ is the reduced Planck mass.)

2.1 (Super-Hubble) patches as physical systems

The mini-superspace approximation best applies to a spatially closed universe, where the scale factor a can be immediately identified with the “zero-mode” of the system—the total size of the spatial slices. However, the same formalism should also be able to capture the average expansion of a *patch* of universe, if the patch is sufficiently homogeneous and isotropic. The latter properties seem to characterize the super-Hubble regions of our universe at any time.¹

Say we want to describe the system at around some time t_\star when we can set the scale factor to $a = e^\rho = 1$ (we are taking the spatially flat limit where $ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + e^{2\rho} d\vec{x}^2$). We can then consider a region of about the Hubble size $\sim H_\star^{-1}$ and follow its comoving evolution as long as it stays outside the horizon. For an accelerating universe, this corresponds to

¹These considerations are reminiscent of, and ideally supported by, the *separate-universe* approach in cosmological perturbation theory (e.g. [20–24]).

following the evolution *forward in time*, as comoving regions tend to fall out of causal contact. In a decelerating universe we can track the *backward* evolution of the comoving region.

By integrating the Einstein Hilbert action $\int d^4x \sqrt{-g} M_P^2 R/2 + \dots$ over a large homogeneous volume one gets an action for ρ and the other fields of the theory. In the case when matter is represented by a scalar field one obtains that the system is described by the following action

$$I = \ell \int dt e^{3\rho} \left(-\frac{3\dot{\rho}^2}{N} + \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2N} - NH_\star^2 V(\phi) \right). \quad (2.1)$$

The spatial integration of the original action over at least a Hubble volume has produced the very large length $\ell \sim M_P^2 H_\star^{-3}$. Notice that we have normalized ϕ to be dimensionless (*i.e.* $\phi = \hat{\phi}/M_P$ with $\hat{\phi}$ a canonical scalar field), and V to be of order one at t_\star , so that the classical Friedman equation yields the Hubble parameter $\dot{\rho}(t_\star) = H_\star$.

The scalar field model above is a good reference to keep in mind, we will go back to it in the final sections of this paper. It is however convenient to develop the formalism around a more general model (e.g. [13]),

$$I = \ell \int dt \left(\frac{1}{2N} g_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu - NH_\star^2 U(q^\mu) \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where q^μ are $d + 1$ (dimensionless) dynamical variables. The metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ has signature $(-, +, \dots, +)$ because the scale factor ρ (represented here by q^0) appears in the action with the wrong sign. We highlight that, here and throughout the paper, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the *field (mini-super-) space metric*, which has nothing to do with the spacetime metric.

The classical solutions satisfy the constraint equation

$$g_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu + 2H_\star^2 U N^2 = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

obtained by varying Eq. (2.2) with respect to N . As apparent from the form of the spacetime metric, $N = 1$ corresponds to choosing the standard proper time of cosmological observers as a clock, although other choices are also possible (see e.g. in the subsection below). When $N = 1$, the equations of motion read

$$\ddot{q}^\mu + \Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu \dot{q}^\sigma = -H_\star^2 \partial^\mu U. \quad (2.4)$$

Were it not for the potential, these are just geodesics equations in the minisuperspace $g_{\mu\nu}$ metric. We indicate with $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ a solution of (2.3)-(2.4) and, more specifically, *the* solution that we want to describe quantum mechanically with the WdW approach.

As mentioned in the introduction, when we take the *semi-classical limit* in cosmology, we want to make sure that the fields keep feeding the metric while $M_P \rightarrow \infty$. With the fields q^i

already defined to be dimensionless, this is simply achieved by keeping H_\star constant in the process, as clear from (2.3).

In the WdW equation, ℓ and H_\star only enter in the combination

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{1}{\ell H_\star} \sim \frac{H_\star^2}{M_P^2}. \quad (2.5)$$

This is the “loop coupling” parameter that, in practice, takes the place of \hbar in the calculations. The semiclassical limit corresponds to *sending α to zero while keeping H_\star constant*.

Notice that the sizes of these scales depend on the system. If we take t_\star during the observable window of inflation, from the observed primordial power spectrum one can estimate that $\alpha \sim 10^{-9}\epsilon$, with ϵ the slow-roll parameter. Regions exiting during eternal inflation can have a much higher α , depending on the model. In fact, the condition for eternal inflation can be rephrased as $\alpha/\epsilon \gtrsim 1$. For a quadratic potential one can estimate $\alpha \gtrsim 10^{-5}$, which reiterates that the system-universe is still perturbative during this phase, as observed in [25]. The smallness of α after inflation shows the unbearable irrelevance of late-time quantum gravity effects.

2.2 Perturbation theory in mini-superspace

Despite the presence of $d + 1$ fields q^μ , the system (2.2) has only d degrees of freedom. One way to see this is to notice that the constraint (2.3) gives an expression for N which inserted back into the action gives

$$I = \mp \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\alpha} \int dt \sqrt{g_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu} U. \quad (2.6)$$

The kinetic terms appear inside a square root, making explicit that the theory is invariant under time-reparameterizations $t \rightarrow \tilde{t}(t)$. In particular, time can be directly identified with one of the fields, say $t = q^0 H_\star^{-1}$. This is a possible *gauge fixing* choice, albeit not the only one, in this mini-superspace framework. One is then left with only the d “spatial” degrees of freedom q^i , governed by the action

$$I = \mp \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\alpha} \int dq^0 \sqrt{(g_{00} + 2g_{0i} \partial_0 q^i + g_{ij} \partial_0 q^i \partial_0 q^j)} U. \quad (2.7)$$

The perturbations around a classical background solution of (2.7), $\bar{q}^i(q^0)$, can be quantized straightforwardly. Notice that, in a full cosmological setup, one chooses the background on symmetry principles (homogeneity and isotropy). At this mini-superspace level, the distinction between background and perturbations is completely artificial, so $\bar{q}^i(q^0)$ is simply

one possible solution. By defining

$$\varphi^i = q^i - \bar{q}^i(q^0), \quad (2.8)$$

one can expand (2.7) to quadratic order in φ^i . The quantization proceeds in the standard way by promoting the canonical variables φ^i to operators and identifying the conjugate momenta with $p_i \sim -i\partial_{\varphi^i}$.

The perturbation theory wavefunction ψ_P evolves in time with the quadratic Hamiltonian and thus obeys a Schrödinger equation of the type

$$i \frac{\partial \psi_P}{\partial q^0} = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \nabla_{\varphi^i}^2 \psi_P + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{M_{ij}(q^0) \varphi^i \varphi^j}{2} \psi_P, \quad (2.9)$$

with $\nabla_{\varphi^i}^2$ a suitably defined “spatial” Laplacian that depends on q^0 and contains up to second order derivatives with respect to φ^i . M_{ij} a mass term.

This is the type of equation that we would like to recover within the WdW formalism. It is already written in a “relational” form, in the sense that one of the variables is used as time. There is a very cheap way to recover standard perturbation theory in cosmic time t (e.g. eq. (1.1)), which is making use of the background solution $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ in order to express q^0 in terms of t . We are still in a gauge in which q^0 is not fluctuating, so this corresponds to fixing $N = 1 + \delta N$, with δN such that $\delta q^0 = 0$ (see the *unitary* ($\delta\phi = 0$) and *spatially flat* ($\delta\rho = 0$) examples throughout the paper).

This way of introducing the proper time of the cosmological observers presumes a classical one-to-one correspondence between q^0 and t . In a fully-quantum cosmology setup time should instead be introduced as an additional degree of freedom (e.g. [26, 27] for recent discussions). This will be done in a subsequent paper.

2.3 Gauge fixing and conditional probability

To the perturbative wavefunction ψ_P is associated the standard probability density

$$dP(q^i | q^0) = |\psi_P|^2 d^d q. \quad (2.10)$$

In fact, the Schrödinger wavefunction ψ_P is naturally interpreted in terms of *conditional* probability—to find the system in some configuration q^i *given that* the clock measures q^0 . However, already in perturbation theory, what we decide to call “time” is a mere gauge choice. At the level of the wavefunction fixing the gauge can really be seen as deciding which combination of variables to use as a “condition” in the conditional probability expression. This is even more striking from the perspective of the WdW equation (see also [28] on this), in the sense that $\Psi(q^\mu)$ is completely agnostic about gauge choices. However, in order

to extract a probability from it, one needs to decide which sections of the field space to consider—roughly speaking, which combination of coordinates is “time” (see Sec. 3.2).

For the scalar field example of action (2.1) the situation is depicted in Fig. 1. In the simplified minisuperspace setup one can mimic, in perturbation theory, some popular gauge choices of standard inflationary cosmology,

$$\text{Unitary gauge :} \quad \delta\phi = 0, \quad \delta\rho = \zeta \quad (2.11)$$

$$\text{Spatially flat gauge :} \quad \delta\phi = \varphi, \quad \delta\rho = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

and some of the features of the “true” curvature perturbations $\zeta(t, \vec{x})$ on super-Hubble scales are indeed replicated at the minisuperspace level.²




Figure 1: The WdW wavefunction $\Psi(\phi, \rho)$ (in blue) is approximately centered around the classical trajectory $\bar{\rho}(\phi)$. In order to obtain a probability from it one has to choose how to section the field space, *i.e.* which variable should be used as “time”. If we use ϕ , we are going to calculate the conditional probability $dP(\zeta|\phi)$ (in green) of getting some value of ρ , or of $\zeta = \rho - \bar{\rho}(\phi)$, *given that* the scalar field evaluates ϕ . This is the unitary gauge in perturbation theory. The main alternative is using ρ as time, which defines the *spatially flat gauge* (in red).

²The relation between the minisuperspace- and the standard- ζ variables is studied in great depth in [29]. We thank these authors for discussions and for sharing a preliminary version of their draft.

3 The WdW viewpoint

Another way of dealing with the system (2.6) is to directly calculate the canonical momenta for each of the variables q^μ ,

$$p_\mu = \frac{\ell}{N} g_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\nu. \quad (3.1)$$

and write the Hamiltonian before substituting the constraint,

$$\ell \mathcal{H} = N \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2} p_\mu p^\mu + U(q^\mu) \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Variation with respect to N gives, simply, $\mathcal{H} = 0$, or its quantum version, the WdW equation

$$\boxed{\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} \square + U(q^\mu) \right) \Psi(q^\mu) = 0.} \quad (3.3)$$

In the above, $\square \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \partial_\mu (g^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} \partial_\nu)$ is the covariant d’Alambert operator in the $d + 1$ dimensional field space. This is the only choice for $p_\mu p^\mu$ which seems to make sense—any other choice would not be invariant under field redefinitions (see also [9]).

Eq. (3.3) is clearly different from the equation governing the perturbative wavefunction (2.9) and we do not expect the exact same physics from the two approaches. However, they should share the same classical limit. We tend to associate a classical behavior to a quantum system when the wavefunction consists of a rapidly oscillating phase, $\Psi \sim e^{iS}$. This way, the value of the momentum is highly correlated with the position,

$$p_\mu \Psi = -i \partial_\mu \Psi \sim (\partial_\mu S) \Psi, \quad (3.4)$$

which makes us identify S with the Hamilton’s principal function. As in classical statistics, the system is most surely on some classical path where $p_\mu \sim \partial_\mu S(q)$, except that we do not know which one! In other words, despite the strong correlation position-momentum, the position itself is completely undetermined at this stage. We should thus³ equip Ψ with a slowly-varying modulation factor ψ ,

$$\Psi = e^{iS/\alpha} \psi. \quad (3.5)$$

For convenience, in the above we have redefined S by including a factor of $1/\alpha$. When we stick (3.5) into (3.3) we obtain terms containing different powers of α . At zeroth order in α

³A nice recent review of classicality criteria is found in [30]

we have the Hamilton Jacobi (HJ) equation for S ,

$$\partial_\mu S \partial^\mu S + 2U = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Once S is found, all remaining terms in the WdW equation compose a Schrödinger-like equation for ψ ,

$$i \left(\partial^\mu S \partial_\mu \psi + \frac{1}{2} \square S \cdot \psi \right) = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \square \psi. \quad (3.7)$$

Obviously, the above procedure is just the WKB approximation in more than one dimension [31] applied to eq. (3.3).

3.1 Going with the (classical) flow

A very elegant way to set boundary conditions for this system of equations is the no-boundary proposal [18,19]⁴. To leading order in α this corresponds to finding a classical complex saddle that describes a smooth euclidean geometry at early times. The corresponding S contains an imaginary part that goes to zero in the large field limit where the metric becomes Lorentzian (e.g. [17]). Here we are not concerned with the initial conditions of the universe. We just aim to reproduce, well within the Lorentzian regime, the closest quantum analog Ψ to some classical background solution $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$. For this reason, we take S to be real.

The solutions of (3.6) are far from unique (see App. A on this). One concrete way to compute a S that fits our purposes is the following. One chooses a (surface-orthogonal) congruence of classical solutions $q_{\text{cl}}^\mu(t)$ of which $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ is an element. By comparing (3.6) with the classical constraint (2.3), one sees that inside a “tube” around $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ one can set

$$\partial^\mu S = \dot{q}_{\text{cl}}^\mu / H_\star. \quad (3.8)$$

Not surprisingly, one can build a Fermi coordinate system around $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$, and S satisfies, locally, along the curve, an equation similar to Raychaudhuri’s (see App. A.2).

On the RHS of (3.7), ψ is hit by the vector field $\partial^\mu S \partial_\mu$. It is useful to see this term in a coordinate system adapted to the classical solution $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$. By keeping q^0 as “time”, in (2.8) we have introduced spatial coordinates φ^i , with the property of vanishing on the classical solution $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$. However, there is a more special set of coordinates, ζ^i , that Vilenkin calls *comoving* in [11]. They have the additional property to be classically conserved, in the sense that $\dot{\zeta}^i = 0$ is always a classical solution, which in the Lagrangian for the perturbations is tantamount to the absence of any potential term. Curves of constant ζ^i represent alternative

⁴See also [13,16] for a useful summary and a comprehensive bibliography of this topic

trajectories close to $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$. The curvature perturbation on comoving surfaces ζ_k in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ has this property, which motivates this choice of notation.

As $\dot{\zeta}_{\text{cl}}^i = 0$ by construction, it is clear from (3.8) that in these coordinates the only non vanishing component of $\partial^\mu S$ is $\partial^0 S$,

$$\partial^\mu S \partial_\mu \psi = H_\star^{-1} \partial_t \psi. \quad (\text{comoving coordinates } \zeta^i) \quad (3.9)$$

In the process, the congruence of classical solutions $q_{\text{cl}}^\mu(t)$ has been used to turn q^0 into cosmic time t .

Other choices of coordinates φ^i do not enjoy classical conservation and thus appear in the quadratic Lagrangian with a potential term (this is the general situation, (2.9)). The spatial components of $\partial^\mu S$ in these coordinates vanish only on the trajectory. In this case, the vector field $\partial^\mu S \partial_\mu$ produces also spacial derivative terms (at least-) *linear* in φ^i . Schematically,

$$\partial^\mu S \partial_\mu \psi \simeq H_\star^{-1} \partial_t \psi + \# \varphi^i \partial_{\varphi^i} \psi. \quad (\text{generic coordinates } \varphi^i) \quad (3.10)$$

3.2 Degrees of freedom, probabilities etc.

In a standard quantum mechanical system there are as many degrees of freedom as the number of independent variables inside the wavefunction *at a given time* (the Schrödinger picture is assumed throughout). The WdW equation (3.3) constrains the shape of Ψ *in the absence* of time. In order to match the standard counting, one should, roughly speaking, subtract one dimension from the total configuration space. The idea is that one of the fields, say q^0 , should be used as a time variable. After this choice is made, we are free to decide “initial conditions” for the remaining fields on some $q^0 = \text{const.}$ surface in field-space.⁵

These considerations are inevitably related with the probability interpretation of the wavefunction. As mentioned, the natural interpretation of the standard wavefunction $\psi_P(\varphi^i|t)$ of the perturbations is that of a *conditional probability amplitude*—of finding the system at some coordinate-point φ^i *given that* the time variable evaluates t . Accordingly, the normalization of ψ_P does not involve integration over t and it is in fact preserved through the t –evolution.

In the case of WdW one is forced to a relational interpretation where one combination of the variables q^μ is used as time and the remaining ones are the true dynamical degrees of freedom. Accidentally, WdW, as Klein Gordon, enjoys a conservation law *internal* to the

⁵WdW features second order derivatives in all variables, so the initial conditions on the $q^0 = \text{const.}$ surface would, strictly speaking, include the q^0 -derivative of Ψ on that surface. As sketched in Sec. 3.4, however, the second q^0 -derivatives can be seen as terms of higher order in α in the semiclassical expansion, so they can be dropped in a first approximation.

configuration space,

$$j^\mu \equiv \frac{i}{2} \sqrt{-g} (\Psi \partial^\mu \Psi^* - \Psi^* \partial^\mu \Psi), \quad \partial_\mu j^\mu = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

The above expression can be used to define a *conditional probability*. By taking q^0 as the internal time for simplicity, we should thus interpret j^0 as a probability density, which is conserved during time evolution.

This interpretation is famously plagued by the fact that j^0 is not positive-definite. Most likely, this issue should be addressed in the context of a third quantization (*i.e.* like for the solutions of the Klein Gordon equation, one should see Ψ as a field, not as a wavefunction). At any rate, close to the semiclassical regime we are interested in, j^0 is positive. By expressing it in terms of S and ψ we obtain

$$dP(q^i|q^0) = \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{\alpha} \partial^0 S |\psi|^2 + \frac{i}{2} (\psi \partial^0 \psi^* - \psi^* \partial^0 \psi) \right] d\vec{q}. \quad (3.12)$$

To leading order in α this quantity is always positive (or always negative, in which case we should change the sign on the RHS) as long as $\partial^0 S$ does not switch sign along the trajectory, which would constitute a breakdown of the semiclassical approximation (see also [11]).

3.3 Apples to apples

A direct comparison between the probability density in perturbation theory (2.10) and that of WdW (3.12) in the semiclassical limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ suggests the following relation between the two wavefunctions,

$$\psi_P = e^{if(q)/\alpha} (\sqrt{-g} \partial^0 S)^{1/2} \psi + \mathcal{O}(\alpha). \quad (3.13)$$

In Sec. 6 we verify the accuracy of this relation in the case of a slow-roll scenario.

Since both ψ_P and ψ appear only through their squared moduli in the expression of the probability, it is not surprising that they are related by a field dependent phase $f(q)$ in (3.13). Attached to this phase there is a solution of a little puzzle, which is the following.

As mentioned, in a general coordinate system φ^i that is not comoving the quadratic Lagrangian, and the Schrödinger equation, features a potential term. However, eq. (3.7) does not seem to be able accommodate any potential. In fact, in the semiclassical expansion, the potential has been already taken care of by the HJ equation (3.6).

Phases and canonical transformations: a free particle example

Let us look at the problem in the simplest possible terms. Let's consider the Lagrangian of a single-free particle in standard quantum mechanics,

$$L^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\zeta}^2. \quad (3.14)$$

We are already in comoving variable as $\dot{\zeta} = 0$ is always a solution of the classical equations of motion. The Schrödinger equation reads

$$i \partial_t \psi_P = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\zeta}^2 \psi_P. \quad (3.15)$$

A less fortunate choice of position variable is $\varphi \equiv \zeta g^{-1}(t)$, with g some function of the time, in terms of which the Lagrangian becomes

$$L^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(g^2 \dot{\varphi}^2 + 2\dot{g}g \varphi \dot{\varphi} + \dot{g}^2 \varphi^2 \right). \quad (3.16)$$

After integrating by parts we obtain

$$L^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(g^2 \dot{\varphi}^2 - g\ddot{g} \varphi^2 \right). \quad (3.17)$$

The seemingly innocent integration by parts has defined a new Lagrangian $L^{(1)} \rightarrow L^{(2)}$ and thus a new conjugate momentum, related to the original one by means of a *canonical transformation*. At the level of the wavefunction written in position representation this corresponds to a multiplication by a phase (see e.g. [32]). From the point of view of the path integral this is clear. The Lagrangians $L^{(1)}$ and $L^{(2)}$ differ by a total derivative which, integrated inside the action, simply adds a phase to the final state. More explicitly, the Hamiltonians produced by (3.16) and (3.17) give two different Schrödinger equations,

$$i \left(\partial_t - \frac{\dot{g}}{g} \varphi \partial_{\varphi} \right) \psi_P^{(1)} = -\frac{1}{2g^2} \partial_{\varphi}^2 \psi_P^{(1)}, \quad (3.18)$$

$$i \partial_t \psi_P^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2g^2} \partial_{\varphi}^2 \psi_P^{(2)} + \frac{g\ddot{g}}{2} \varphi^2 \psi_P^{(2)}. \quad (3.19)$$

One can check that $\psi_P^{(1)}$ and $\psi_P^{(2)}$ are related by

$$\psi_P^{(2)}(\varphi, t) = g^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left(-i \frac{g\dot{g}}{2} \varphi^2 \right) \psi_P^{(1)}(\varphi, t). \quad (3.20)$$

Notice that (3.15) and (3.18) is the same differential equation (*i.e.* the same differential

operator equated to zero), just written in different (configuration space + time) coordinates $(t, \zeta) \rightarrow (t, \varphi)$. On the other hand, between (3.18) and (3.19) there is a (canonical) transformation of momenta and Hamiltonians, which implies a redefinition of the wavefunction. The spatial first derivative term on the LHS of (3.18) is, upon a canonical transformation, completely equivalent to a *potential* term, i.e. the second term on the RHS of (3.19).

This is of course relevant to our setting because the equation for ψ , (3.7), cannot contain a potential term. However, once expressed in some generic perturbation variables φ^i , terms of the type “ $i\varphi\partial_\varphi\psi$ ” are produced, as discussed at length around Eq. (3.10). In order to reabsorb these terms we need to multiply the wavefunction by a phase. This procedure fixes the phase f in (3.13) univocally and, at the same time, it recovers the correct potential term of perturbation theory. This can be all seen explicitly in the spatially flat example of Sec. 6.

3.4 Higher time derivatives

We have seen that perturbation theory and WdW equation match in the semiclassical limit ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$), if the two wavefunctions are related as in (3.13), and if we use the rules for the probabilities (2.10) and (3.12). It also follows quite trivially that no deviation from the classical behavior is expected in the semiclassical limit. This is best seen by using the Schrodinger equation of perturbation theory, that in comoving coordinates ζ^i and for $\alpha = 0$ simply reduces to $i\partial_t\psi_P = 0$. One can initially prepare the system in some smooth normalizable wavefunction $\psi_P(\zeta^i)$. The wavefunction and its associated probability is simply constant in time, so if initially peaked at $\zeta^i = 0$, it remains peaked there at any time.

The diffusive terms of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ lead to deviations from the classical behavior, as well as to different predictions between the perturbative and the WdW approaches. The distinctive feature of WdW is the presence of second order derivatives with respect to all dynamical fields present, including the field that is going to be used as time. In fact, eq. (3.7) contains a d’Alambertian operator \square on the RHS, while the equation for ψ_P , (2.9), features a spatial Laplacian. When one obtains the Schrödinger equation as the non-relativistic limit of the Klein Gordon (KG) equation, one finds that higher t -derivatives are suppressed by higher powers of the speed of light c . Similarly, one can see here that higher time derivatives are effectively suppressed by higher powers of α .

We show this heuristically in a simplified 1+1 dimensional setup. We assume a Gaussian ansatz for ψ , centered around the classical trajectory. In the comoving coordinate ζ ,

$$\psi(\zeta, q^0) = \mathcal{N}(q^0) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\Omega(q^0)\zeta^2\right], \quad (3.21)$$

where some field q^0 has been chosen as time ($\partial_0 \equiv \partial_{q^0}$ in what follows). By sticking this

ansatz inside a simplified version of (3.7),

$$i\partial_0\psi = -\frac{\alpha}{2}(\partial_\zeta^2 + B\partial_0^2)\psi, \quad (3.22)$$

for some constant B , one can regroup terms of different orders in ζ . To zeroth order one gets an equation for the normalization factor,

$$\partial_0\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{O}(\alpha). \quad (3.23)$$

The terms proportional to ζ^2 , equated to zero, give

$$i\partial_0\Omega = \alpha\Omega^2 - \alpha\frac{B}{2}\partial_0^2\Omega + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2), \quad (3.24)$$

where (3.23) has been used.

We can imagine a smooth situation where the variance of ζ smoothly evolves along q^0 like in Fig. 1. In this case we would attempt to solve for Ω around a constant solution, plus α -corrections that slowly evolve in time. By inserting this type of ansatz inside (3.24) one sees that the term proportional to B gives a contribution only to order α^2 .

3.5 Non-gaussian terms and deviations from the classical behavior

The WdW approach is, as we are seeing, certainly more convoluted than perturbation theory. However, it very naturally conveys an “exact” result, in the sense that all non-linear terms are easily and automatically included in the WdW equation for ψ (3.7). On the other hand, in the perturbative approach the Lagrangian/Hamiltonian needs to be expanded to the required order before being used. In the applications in Secs. 5 and 6 we have not pushed perturbation theory further than the quadratic order so we do not know how carefully the two approaches agree on non-gaussian terms.

One possible matter on which the WdW viewpoint could be of help is the study of the deviations from the classical background solutions. Quantum averages evolve in time differently than classical solutions, in general. The Ehrenfest theorem, for a particle at position x in a potential $V(x)$, famously implies

$$\langle\ddot{x}\rangle = -\langle V'(x)\rangle, \quad (3.25)$$

Crucially, $\langle V'(x)\rangle \neq V'(\langle x\rangle)$ in general. Depending on its spread, the wave-function can “feel” regions of the potential away from its peak. Quantum tunneling is the most spectacular display of this phenomenon, but milder deviations from the classical behavior are ubiquitous.

One would expect to see these deviations also in perturbation theory and this is certainly true for ordinary (finite-dimensional) quantum mechanical systems. If we expand around a

classical solution $\bar{x}(t)$ by defining $\delta x = x - \bar{x}(t)$, the action for the perturbations will generally take the form

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int dt A(t) \delta \dot{x}^2 - B(t) \delta x^2 + C(t) \delta x^3 + \dots \quad (3.26)$$

As one tries to evolve e.g. an initially Gaussian wavepacket with the Hamiltonian derived from this action one finds that the interaction term proportional to $C(t)$ not only generates non-gaussianity, it also shifts the peak of the wavepacket away from $\delta x = 0$. In other words, $\langle \delta x(t) \rangle = 0$ is inconsistent with the dynamics. This is how perturbation theory “sees” that $\langle x(t) \rangle \neq \bar{x}(t)$.

In standard *cosmological* perturbation theory, however, averages of perturbations are always zero by construction. The expectation value of a Fourier mode, $\langle \zeta_k \rangle$ vanishes simply because of translational invariance. However, deviations from the classical solutions are clearly seen at the mini-superspace both in the WdW framework and in perturbation theory where they are conceived, as we have seen, as non-gaussianity. What sense should be made of these deviations? Again, mini-superspace results apply most straightforwardly to the zero mode of a spatially closed universe. In this context, deviations from classicality have already been noticed in [33]. However, by reasoning along the lines of Sec. 2.1, one could argue that these deviations could also be a generic feature of any super-Hubble patch as it causally detaches from the rest of the universe.

How large is the effect? It is suppressed by the small parameter α defined in (2.5) so one has to go beyond the semiclassical limit to characterise it. However, it is enhanced during inflation by a factor of $1/\epsilon$ (see Eq. (6.13)). So, the regime where deviations become sizable is the one of eternal inflation, which is in fact characterized by $\alpha/\epsilon \gtrsim 1$. The picture (e.g. [34–36]) is that during eternal inflation the fluctuations of the field compete with the classical evolution over a Hubble time, and the field effectively behaves stochastically. Our deviations, on the other hand, are deterministic and computable, given some initial condition. So they seem to *add* to the standard stochastic picture rather than rephrase it.

4 Perturbation theory for a scalar field

In order to apply the formalism that we have discussed we work in mini-superspace with a metric of the form

$$ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + e^{2\rho(t)} d\vec{x}^2, \quad (4.1)$$

with a matter-dominant component modeled by a scalar field $\phi(t)$. In the minisuperspace approximation the action reads

$$I = \ell \int dt \left[e^{3\rho} \left(-\frac{3\dot{\rho}^2}{N} + \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2N} - NH_\star^2 V(\phi) \right) \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

We have in mind a classical solution such that $H_\star^2 \simeq \dot{\rho}^2(t_\star)$ at a reference time t_\star , at which the field satisfies $\phi(t_\star) = 0$. The minisuperspace metric to the associated action in Eq. (4.2) reads

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^{3\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

Varying with respect to N , ρ and ϕ and then setting $N = 1$ gives the classical Hamiltonian constraint and the two equations of motion,

$$3\dot{\rho}^2 = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + H_\star^2 V(\phi), \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\ddot{\rho} = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2, \quad (4.4b)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + H_\star^2 V'(\phi) = 0 \quad (4.4c)$$

These equations are shift-invariant under $\rho \rightarrow \rho + \rho_0$. This can be used to produce a congruence of classical solutions once we have found one.

Despite involving two fields, the scalar-field coupled to the FLRW-gravity system possesses only one dynamical degree of freedom. This can be understood by perturbing around a classical background solution of eqs. (4.4).

4.1 Perturbations

Distilling the unique scalar degree of freedom of single field inflation is by now a standard calculation (e.g. [37, 38]). Here we are dealing with a particularly simple system because we are working, strictly, at zero momentum.

Variation of Eq. (4.2) w.r.t. N gives the constraint,

$$N = \sqrt{\frac{3\dot{\rho}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2}{H_\star^2 V(\phi)}}. \quad (4.5)$$

By substituting this back into the action we obtain

$$I = -\frac{2}{\alpha} \int dt e^{3\rho} \sqrt{V(\phi) \left(3\dot{\rho}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 \right)}. \quad (4.6)$$

One is free to choose the value of N , as this corresponds to choosing a time coordinate. Small perturbations around a solution $\bar{\rho}(t)$, $\bar{\phi}(t)$ transform, under an infinitesimal time-diffeomorphism $t \rightarrow t + \delta t$, as

$$\delta\rho \rightarrow \delta\rho + \dot{\bar{\rho}} \delta t, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\delta\phi \rightarrow \delta\phi + \dot{\bar{\phi}} \delta t. \quad (4.8)$$

Clearly, by appropriately rescaling time, one can set either $\delta\phi = 0$ or $\delta\rho = 0$, which defines the *gauge choice*. The classical background solutions are denoted by $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\phi}$. However, to simplify the notation in this section, we will drop the overbar symbols. Thus, ρ and ϕ should be understood as background quantities, i.e., $\rho \rightarrow \rho + \delta\rho$ and $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \delta\phi$.

Unitary gauge

It is customary to call unitary gauge that gauge choice in which most degrees of freedom are encoded in the gauge fields, in this case in the metric. This corresponds to setting

$$\delta\phi = 0, \quad \delta\rho = \zeta, \quad (4.9)$$

which just defines the variable ζ . By expanding directly inside Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6), this gauge choice can be enforced by choosing $N = 1 + \delta N$, with

$$\delta N = \frac{3\dot{\rho}}{H_\star^2 V(\phi)} \dot{\zeta}, \quad (4.10)$$

and the action for ζ reads, up to quadratic order,

$$I_\zeta = \frac{3\ell}{2} \int dt \frac{e^{3\rho} \dot{\phi}^2}{H_\star^2 V(\phi)} \dot{\zeta}^2. \quad (4.11)$$

The Hamiltonian for this model is simply

$$H_\zeta = \frac{e^{-3\rho}}{6\ell} \frac{H_\star^2 V(\phi)}{\dot{\phi}^2} p_\zeta^2. \quad (4.12)$$

By expressing the conjugate momentum to ζ as $p_\zeta = -i\partial_\zeta$, one gets to the following Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t \psi_P = -\frac{e^{-3\rho}}{6\ell} \frac{H_\star^2 V(\phi)}{\dot{\phi}^2} \partial_\zeta^2 \psi_P. \quad (4.13)$$

The behavior of this minisuperspace variable $\zeta(t)$ bears similarities with the famous $\zeta(\vec{x}, t)$ variable of cosmological perturbation theory. When the latter is taken on super Hubble scales, they are both “conserved”, meaning, quantum mechanically, that their variances tend to a constant and tends to it with the same speed. However, the imaginary parts of their wavefunctions behaves differently in that ζ does not become as squeezed as $\zeta(\vec{x}, t)$.

Spatially flat gauge

Setting instead $\delta\rho = 0$ is reminiscent of the cosmological *spatially flat gauge*, where one choses the time coordinate in such a way to carve $t = \text{const.}$ spatial surfaces that are intrinsically flat. In this simplified model this simply means that the degree of freedom is encoded in the scalar field,

$$\delta\phi = \varphi, \quad \delta\rho = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

This gauge is enforced by the choice

$$\delta N = -\frac{\dot{\phi}\dot{\varphi} + H_\star^2 V'(\phi)\varphi}{2H_\star^2 V(\phi)}. \quad (4.15)$$

The action for φ then reads

$$I_\varphi = \frac{3\ell}{2} \int dt \frac{\dot{\rho}^2 e^{3\rho}}{H_\star^2 V(\phi)} \left[\dot{\varphi}^2 - H_\star^2 \left(V''(\phi) - \frac{V'(\phi)^2}{V(\phi)} \right) \varphi^2 \right], \quad (4.16)$$

from which we can derive the associated Schrödinger equation following the same procedure as in the unitary gauge. It reads,

$$i\partial_t \psi_P = -\frac{1}{6\ell} \frac{H_\star^2 V(\phi)}{\dot{\rho}^2 e^{3\rho}} \partial_\varphi^2 \psi_P - \frac{3\ell \dot{\rho}^2 e^{3\rho}}{2 V(\phi)} \left(\frac{V'(\phi)^2}{V(\phi)} - V''(\phi) \right) \varphi^2 \psi_P. \quad (4.17)$$

4.2 Scalar field models

We concentrate our study on two specific potentials $V(\phi)$ of interest, defining each a different model.

Model 1: Exponential potential

The first is an exponential potential

$$V(\phi) = (3 - \epsilon)e^{-\sqrt{2\epsilon}\phi}, \quad (4.18)$$

which allows attractor scaling solutions of constant slow-roll parameter ϵ ,

$$\rho(t) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \ln \frac{t}{t_\star}, \quad \phi(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\epsilon}} \ln \epsilon H_\star t. \quad (4.19)$$

Here *scaling* refers to the property of this classical solution of maintaining a constant equation of state so that the kinetic and potential components remain in the same proportions during time evolution. With an appropriate choice of the constant t_\star we can express the background

solution above in a non-parametric way,

$$\rho(\phi) = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}. \quad (4.20)$$

The slow-roll parameter $\epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}$ here does not need to be small (the model could be used to mimic some dominant component also during deceleration, e.g. $\epsilon = 2$ and $\epsilon = 3/2$ during radiation and matter dominance respectively). We find it convenient to use it instead of $w \equiv p/\rho$. On the scaling solution we indeed have the relation between ϵ and w being given by $\epsilon = \frac{3}{2}(w + 1)$.

In Sec. 5 we apply the WdW equation to this potential. Because of the scaling behavior, this is a highly symmetric model. One sees that the combination of derivatives of V that gives rise to a mass term for φ in the spatially flat gauge (eq. (4.16)) vanishes in this case. In order to have a non-vanishing mass in perturbation theory, and verify the general formalism of Sec. 3.3, we need to extend the pure exponential model, for example by adding a non-vanishing η slow-roll parameter.

Model 2: Slow-roll

The second potential allows both slow-roll parameters

$$\epsilon(\phi) \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}, \quad \eta(\phi) \equiv \frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{\epsilon H}, \quad (4.21)$$

to be nonzero. In the regime where they are both small, one finds

$$\epsilon(\phi) = \epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\eta\phi + \dots, \quad (4.22)$$

where, here and throughout, $\epsilon \equiv \epsilon(0)$ and $\eta \equiv \eta(0)$. Using the classical Eqs. (4.4) one also finds the relation between the kinetic term and the potential

$$V(\phi) = \frac{3 - \epsilon(\phi)}{\epsilon(\phi)} \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2}. \quad (4.23)$$

This allows to build the potential with the following expansion at the exponent

$$V(\phi) = (3 - \epsilon) \exp \left[-\sqrt{2\epsilon} \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{6} \right) \phi - \frac{\eta}{4} \phi^2 + \dots \right]. \quad (4.24)$$

The approximate classical solutions for this model will be worked out in Sec. 6. Notice that for this model the mass term in the spatially flat gauge is proportional to η , and the

Schrödinger equation in this gauge reads

$$iH_\star^{-1}\partial_t\psi_P = -\frac{\alpha}{6}\left[3 - \left(\epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\eta\rho\right)\right]e^{-3\rho}\partial_\phi^2\psi_P - \frac{1}{2\alpha}(3e^{3\rho}\epsilon\eta)\varphi^2\psi_P, \quad (4.25)$$

where the term in parentheses proportional to φ^2 is the mass term of the model in this gauge.

5 Application to Model 1

In this section we want to obtain the WdW equation to our scalar-field coupled to FLRW-gravity model in the case where the potential is given by Eq. (4.18). The HJ equation (3.6) for this model reads

$$-\frac{1}{6}(\partial_\rho S)^2 + (\partial_\phi S)^2 + 2(3 - \epsilon)e^{6\rho - \sqrt{2\epsilon}\phi} = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

whose solution can be chosen to be

$$S(\rho, \phi) = -2e^{3\rho - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\phi}. \quad (5.2)$$

We can associate the above with the congruence of classical solutions

$$\rho_{\text{cl}}(\phi) = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}} + \rho_0, \quad (5.3)$$

obtained from (4.20) by applying shift symmetry. The d'Alembertian of S reads

$$\square S = (3 - \epsilon)e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\phi}. \quad (5.4)$$

By using the above expressions we finally get the following equation for ψ ,

$$ie^{-\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\phi}\left(\partial_\rho\psi + \sqrt{2\epsilon}\partial_\phi\psi + \frac{3-\epsilon}{2}\psi\right) = \frac{\alpha}{2}e^{-3\rho}\left(\frac{1}{6}\partial_\rho^2\psi - \partial_\phi^2\psi\right), \quad (5.5)$$

which is exact, in the sense that it contains all the remaining pieces of the WdW equation after the HJ equation has been applied. We still have to choose which field, ρ or ϕ , will play the role of “time”. We expect that the first two terms on the LHS will arrange to give a time derivative, once we expand around the classical trajectory (see discussion around eqs. (3.8) and (3.9)). The last, third term on the LHS comes instead from the d'Alembertian (5.4), which is only dependent on ϕ because of the shift symmetry in ρ . If we then consider ρ as the dynamical variable and ϕ as time this will be a time dependent—but constant in space—potential term in the Schroedinger equation that will only affect the normalization of the wavefunction. This suggests the use of the *unitary gauge* in which ϕ is treated as time.

5.1 Unitary gauge

It is convenient to use the coordinates in the field space adapted to the scaling solution in Eq. (4.20)

$$\begin{cases} \zeta(\rho, \phi) = \rho - \bar{\rho}(\phi), \\ \phi(\rho, \phi) = \phi, \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

namely in the case where $\bar{\rho}(\phi) = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}$.

This field-space coordinate transformation induces a chain-rule transformation on the partial derivatives that should be applied on both sides of (5.5). Notice that ζ is the same at linear order as that defined in Eq. (4.9). With these substitutions Eq. (5.5) simplifies to

$$i e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\phi} \left(\sqrt{2\epsilon} \partial_\phi \psi + \frac{3-\epsilon}{2} \psi \right) = -\frac{\alpha}{12} \frac{3-\epsilon}{\epsilon} e^{-\frac{3}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}\phi} (1 - 3\zeta + \dots) \left[\partial_\zeta^2 \psi + \frac{6\epsilon}{3-\epsilon} \left(\partial_\phi^2 \psi - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\epsilon}} \partial_\zeta \partial_\phi \psi \right) \right], \quad (5.7)$$

where the black terms match the predictions of the perturbative approach, while the red terms are new to the WdW approach. The non-Gaussian terms that multiply the diffusive term on the right-hand side are likely also present in perturbation theory beyond quadratic order (although we have not explicitly verified this). However, the higher time derivatives within the square brackets on the RHS are distinctly unique to the WdW equation. As discussed in Sec. 3.4, these terms are effectively suppressed by higher powers of α .

On the left-hand side of the equation, the zero-th order terms are recovered exactly, as expected. To verify this, one simply needs to substitute in Eq. (4.13) the scaling solution for $\phi(t)$ from Eq. (4.19) and Eq. (3.13), using in that case that,

$$\left(\sqrt{-g} \partial^\phi S \right)^{1/2} = \left(2\sqrt{\frac{3}{\epsilon}} (3-\epsilon) \exp \left[3\zeta + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}} (3-\epsilon) \phi \right] \right)^{1/2}.$$

5.2 Spatially flat gauge

If instead ρ is chosen as the time variable in (5.5) one should expand around the inverted classical scaling solution in Eq. (4.20), $\bar{\phi}(\rho) = \sqrt{2\epsilon} \rho$. In this case it is natural to introduce the perturbative variable φ defined in (4.14), as $\varphi = \phi - \bar{\phi}(\rho)$.

The Schrödinger equation in this case takes the form

$$i e^{\epsilon\rho} \left(\partial_\rho \psi + \frac{3-\epsilon}{2} \psi \right)$$

$$= -\frac{\alpha}{6}(3-\epsilon)e^{-3\rho} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\varphi + \dots\right) \left[\partial_\varphi^2\psi + \frac{1}{3-\epsilon} \left(\sqrt{2\epsilon}\partial_\varphi\partial_\rho\psi - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho^2\psi\right)\right]. \quad (5.8)$$

Consequently, deviations arise exclusively from non-Gaussianities not captured by the quadratic-perturbative approach. The equation does not include any mass term, as it vanishes in this specific model under perturbation theory. This contrasts to the scenario in the slow-roll model 2, which acquires a mass term as we will now explore in details.

6 Application to Model 2

In this section, we aim to derive a Schrödinger-like equation using the WdW approach under the slow-roll approximation, where $\epsilon \ll 1$ and $\eta \ll 1$. The potential is specified by Eq. (4.24) and to simplify the analysis, we rescale the field ϕ as follows

$$\chi \equiv \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}. \quad (6.1)$$

By using the Hamilton-Jacobi method of using ϕ as time (see discussion around eq. (2.7)) we get an equation for the classical behaviour of $\rho(\chi)$,

$$\rho'' - \left(1 + \frac{V'}{V} \frac{\rho'}{2\epsilon}\right) (3\rho'^2 - \epsilon) = 0, \quad (6.2)$$

where a prime denotes derivative with respect to χ . We solve the above by expanding around $\chi = 0$ where we fix position and velocity as $\bar{\rho}(0) = 0$ and $\bar{\rho}'(0) = 1$. We find

$$\bar{\rho}(\chi) = \chi - \frac{(3-\epsilon)\eta}{12}\chi^2 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{12}\chi^3 + \dots. \quad (6.3)$$

We can now exploit the shift symmetry of the system under $\rho \rightarrow \rho + \rho_0$ and write an entire congruence of classical solutions $\bar{\rho}(\chi) + \rho_0$. By using standard slow-roll manoeuvring one finds an approximate expression for $\dot{\chi}$ and then, using Eq. (6.3), for $\dot{\rho}$, along the congruence of solutions,

$$\dot{\chi} = H_\star e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 + \frac{(3-\epsilon)\eta}{6}\chi\right), \quad (6.4)$$

$$\dot{\rho} = H_\star e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4}\chi^2\right). \quad (6.5)$$

A factor of $e^{-\epsilon\chi}$ has been pulled out of these expressions for convenience, but these are still expansions valid at small χ . Similarly, one can write the potential written in Eq. (4.24) as

$$V(\chi) = (3 - \epsilon) \exp \left[-2\epsilon \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{6} \right) \chi - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{2} \chi^2 \right]. \quad (6.6)$$

Eqs. (6.4)-(6.5) represent the two components of the vector tangent to some congruence \bar{q}^μ , so we can attempt to find S by posing $H_\star \partial^\mu S = \dot{\bar{q}}^\mu$. One can double-check that these vectors satisfy the HJ equation,

$$-6\dot{\rho}^2 + 2\epsilon\dot{\chi}^2 + 2V = 0, \quad (6.7)$$

where a factor of $e^{3\rho}$ has been simplified from each term. Then we should check that the corresponding covariant vector field \bar{q}_μ is surface orthogonal, $\partial_\chi \bar{q}_\rho - \partial_\rho \bar{q}_\chi = 0$, so that it can be written as the gradient of S . This is indeed the case barring terms of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$. In summary, at the relevant order in slow-roll, we find

$$S = -2e^{3\rho - \epsilon\chi} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4} \chi^2 \right). \quad (6.8)$$

From which one calculates

$$\square S = \left[(3 - \epsilon) \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{6} \right) - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{2} \chi - \frac{3\epsilon\eta}{4} \chi^2 \right] e^{-\epsilon\chi}. \quad (6.9)$$

We have now all the ingredients to write the equation for ψ (3.7). It reads,

$$i \left[e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4} \chi^2 \right) \partial_\rho \psi + e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 + \frac{(3 - \epsilon)\eta}{6} \chi \right) \partial_\chi \psi + \frac{\psi}{2} \square S \right] = \frac{\alpha}{2} e^{-3\rho} \left(\frac{1}{6} \partial_\rho^2 \psi - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \partial_\chi^2 \psi \right). \quad (6.10)$$

The above does not contain any approximation other than slow-roll and the expansion at small χ . It is thus valid in the vicinity of the axis $\chi = 0$.

6.1 Unitary gauge

In this gauge we use the field χ as time and the coordinate $\zeta = \rho - \bar{\rho}(\chi)$, centered on the classical solution. We thus apply to Equation (6.10) the change of variables $(\chi, \rho) \rightarrow (\chi, \zeta)$. By applying the chain rules

$$\partial_\rho \rightarrow \partial_\zeta \quad (6.11)$$

$$\partial_\chi \rightarrow \partial_\chi - \bar{\rho}'(\chi) \partial_\zeta \quad (6.12)$$

one sees that the partial derivatives with respect to ζ on the LHS cancel exactly,

$$\begin{aligned} & i \left[e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 + \frac{(3-\epsilon)\eta}{6}\chi \right) \partial_\chi + \frac{1}{2} \square S \right] \psi \\ &= -\alpha e^{-3\bar{\rho}(\chi)} e^{-3\zeta} \left[\frac{3-\epsilon}{12\epsilon} \partial_\zeta^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon} \left((\bar{\rho}'^2 - 1) \partial_\zeta^2 - \bar{\rho}'' \partial_\zeta - 2\bar{\rho}' \partial_\chi \partial_\zeta + \partial_\chi^2 \right) \right] \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

This equation descends from the WdW equation and should be compared with what is obtained in perturbation theory. From eq. (4.13) by making the semiclassical ansatz

$$\psi_P = (\sqrt{-g} \partial^\chi S)^{1/2} \psi \simeq \exp \left[\frac{3}{2} (\bar{\rho}(\chi) - \epsilon\chi) + \frac{3-\epsilon}{12} \eta \chi + \frac{3\zeta}{2} \right] \psi \quad (6.14)$$

after some algebra we find

$$\begin{aligned} & i \left[e^{-\epsilon\chi} \left(1 + \frac{(3-\epsilon)\eta}{6}\chi \right) \partial_\chi + \frac{1}{2} \square S \right] \psi \\ &= -\alpha e^{-3\bar{\rho}(\chi)} \left[\frac{3-\epsilon}{12\epsilon} \partial_\zeta^2 + \frac{3-\epsilon}{12\epsilon} \left(-\frac{\epsilon\eta}{3} \chi \partial_\zeta^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{3} \chi \right) \left(3\partial_\zeta + \frac{9}{4} \right) \right) \right] \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

We highlighted in red the mismatch between WdW (6.13) and the Schrödinger equation of perturbation theory (6.15). The two equations coincide in the semiclassical limit $\alpha = 0$ as they should. At order α , however, there is no reason to expect a perfect agreement between (6.13) and (6.15). Among the terms on the RHS, the main diffusive term $\partial_\zeta^2 \psi$ starts deviating at order η , in that it is multiplied in the two equations by two slightly different “time” (χ -) dependent functions. Other than this there are two main sources of disagreement

1. *Non-gaussian terms.* In perturbation theory we have developed the action only to quadratic order. This is most probably the reason why eq. (6.15) does not contain the factor of $e^{-3\zeta} = 1 - 3\zeta + \dots$ on the RHS. These terms produce non-gaussianity in the wave function as well as deviations from the classical trajectory. Such deviations are α -suppressed, clearly, but enhanced by a factor of $1/\epsilon$. So, the regime where the effect becomes in principle sizable is the one of eternal inflation, which is in fact characterized by $\alpha/\epsilon \gtrsim 1$.
2. *Higher “time” derivatives.* As WdW features a field-space d’Alembert operator \square , it obviously contains higher χ -derivatives. We argued in Sec. 3.4 that such terms are effectively α -suppressed. However, also in this case one should notice that a compensating $1/\epsilon$ factor is present which make them in principle important during eternal inflation.

6.2 Spatially flat gauge

The change of variable in this case is given by $(\rho, \chi) \rightarrow (\rho, \varphi)$ where ρ plays the role of time and $\varphi = \chi - \bar{\chi}(\rho)$ describes the “spatial” displacement from the classical solution. After applying the chain rules the derivatives transform according to

$$\partial_x \rightarrow \partial_\varphi \quad (6.16)$$

$$\partial_\rho \rightarrow \partial_\rho - \bar{\chi}'(\rho)\partial_\varphi \quad (6.17)$$

and at leading-order in slow-roll eq. (6.10) becomes

$$i \left[\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4}(\rho + \varphi)^2\right) \partial_\rho \psi + \frac{\psi}{2} \square S + \left(\frac{3-\epsilon}{6}\eta\varphi + \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4}(\varphi^2 + 2\varphi\rho)\right) \partial_\varphi \psi \right] = -\frac{\alpha}{2} e^{-(3-\epsilon)\rho + \frac{\epsilon\eta}{4}\rho^2} e^{\epsilon\varphi} \left[\left(-\frac{1}{6}\bar{\chi}'^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\right) \partial_\varphi^2 \psi + \frac{1}{6}\bar{\chi}'' \partial_\varphi \psi \right]. \quad (6.18)$$

This is a clear example where the coordinate transformation has not managed to get rid of all spatial (i.e. φ -) derivative terms on the LHS of (6.18). The reason is that the φ coordinate is not comoving in the sense described in Sec. 3.1 and we are in the situation depicted in Eq. (3.9).

As explained in Sec. 3.3 we need a phase-shift redefinition of the wavefunction of the type

$$\tilde{\psi} = \psi \exp\left(-\frac{if(\varphi, \rho)}{\alpha}\right). \quad (6.19)$$

By inspection we find that

$$f(\varphi, \rho) \equiv 6e^{-((-3+\epsilon)\rho + \epsilon\varphi)} \left[\frac{\eta(12 + \epsilon^2\varphi(-2 + 6\rho + 3\varphi) + 2\epsilon(-1 + 3\rho + 6\varphi))}{12(-3 + \epsilon)\epsilon} \right], \quad (6.20)$$

the left-hand side of Eq. (6.18) written for $\tilde{\psi}$ no longer contains a space derivative (i.e., a derivative with respect to φ). As a result, the equation acquires a mass term at order $1/\alpha$, which matches precisely the mass term in the perturbative Schrödinger equation in the spatially flat gauge (4.25).

This result confirms that a change in the phase of the wave function eliminates the spatial derivative of the wave function at order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^0)$ in the Schrödinger equation and introduces a mass term that precisely matches the expected mass term in the perturbative approach to order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1})$.

7 Discussion and future plans

Primordial inflation is a great example of a quantum gravity experiment conducted at energies lower than the Planck scale, i.e., within the regime of validity of general relativity. In this regime there are two almost equivalent—but not obviously identical—approaches to the problem. In standard perturbation theory one writes a generic metric as a classical background solution plus perturbations and expands the Lagrangian of the system at the desired order in these perturbations. The latter can be described quantum mechanically by a wavefunction ψ_P . Or, one can quantize the system as it is, without reference to a background and write the WdW equation for the nonperturbative wavefunction Ψ .

In this paper we have tried to highlight the relation between Ψ and ψ_P (see eq. (3.13) and the examples in Secs. 5 and 6). We have done this a little pedantically and “by hands”. It would be nice to develop an *effective field theory* approach to include the WdW corrections in the perturbative framework in a more systematic way. To this end, it could perhaps be helpful to treat the wavefunctions as fields, write their Lagrangians and apply some more standard QFT methods of approximation—instead of dealing all the time with partial differential equations.

One other important spin-off of this work will be to include cosmic time as an independent degree of freedom in this quantum cosmology framework. In this paper we have used a classical solution, or a congruence of classical solutions, to translate the value of a field (say, q^0) used as time into the proper time t of the cosmic comoving observers. This relation is classical and one-to-one, but it should instead contain some uncertainty, representing the fact that the geodesic of the cosmic observer can be embedded in a given spacetime with a superposition of initial values of their clocks (see e.g. [26, 27]). We plan to turn to this problem next.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge useful conversations and exchanges with Niayesh Afshordi, Thomas Colas, Angelo Esposito, Julien Grain, Lam Hui, Matthew Johnson, Jean-Luc Lehners, Mehrdad Mirbabayi, Alberto Nicolis, Alessandro Podo, Sergey Sibiryakov, Alexander Taskov, Andrew J. Tolley and Vincent Vennin. This work received support from the French government under the France 2030 investment plan, as part of the Initiative d’Excellence d’Aix-Marseille Université - A*MIDEX (AMX-19-IET-012). This work is also supported by the Programme National GRAM of CNRS/INSU with INP and IN2P3 co-funded by CNES.

A More about the Hamilton Jacobi equation

A.1 The Klein Gordon example

Sidney Coleman famously stated that the career of a theoretical physicist consists of treating the harmonic oscillator in ever-increasing levels of abstraction. For those who want to waste their time on quantum gravity an equally important paradigm is certainly the Klein Gordon (KG) equation, which is a simple example of (3.3) with $\alpha = 1$, $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $U(q) = m^2/2$.

$$\left(\eta^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta - m^2\right)\Psi = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The classical solutions are straight lines in Minkowski space. For example, those that go through the origin can be parameterized by their momentum \vec{p} ,

$$\bar{q}^0 = Et, \quad \vec{q} = \vec{p}t, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with $E = \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{p}^2}$ from the constraint equation (2.3). The Hamilton Jacobi equation reads

$$(\partial_0 S)^2 - (\partial_i S)^2 - m^2 = 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

One can always find a solution S such that

$$\nabla^\mu S = \dot{\bar{q}}^\mu \quad (\text{A.4})$$

on the trajectory. This is apparent from (2.3) and (3.6). We call a solution S *associated* to the trajectory \bar{q}^μ if the above applies. However, the associated solution is far from unique. For example, the plane wave

$$S_{plane}(q) = -E q^0 + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{q}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

is associated to (A.2). But another legitimate choice is the “hyperboloid” solution

$$S_{hyp}(q) = m\sqrt{-q_\mu q^\mu}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Different choices of S can be seen as different congruences of classical trajectories to which $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ can belong. For example, the nearby classical trajectories that are orthogonal to the flat wavefront (A.5) are all parallel to each other while those orthogonal to the hyperboloid share a common point at $q^\mu = 0$ (Fig. 2). For many purposes it is most convenient to choose (at least, locally-) flat wavefronts for S . However this is generally not possible beyond this KG example, as we show below.




Figure 2: Two examples of solutions of the HJ equation associated with a given classical trajectory (think, green). Dotted in blue, some neighboring trajectories for each case.

A.2 Use of Fermi coordinates

The above example shows that S is all but unique. While $\nabla_\mu S$ is fixed by $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$, $\nabla^2 S$ is free to vary. In other words, the wavefront S can be a curved surface in field space. Since we are interested in approximating Ψ close to the classical trajectory we can try to be pragmatic and choose S in such a way that $\nabla^2 S = 0$ on $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$. However, this can be done in the KG case but not in general. In order to see this, let us build a Fermi coordinate system x^μ around the classical trajectory.⁶

First, notice that $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$ is accelerated in virtue of the potential term in (2.4). Also, by (2.3), the proper time τ along the curve is related with the parameter t through $d\tau = \sqrt{2U} dt$. The proper acceleration then reads

$$a^\mu = \frac{D}{d\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \bar{q}^\mu = -\frac{1}{2U} h^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu U, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where h is the projector orthogonal to \bar{q}^μ .

The metric components in Fermi coordinates (by construction, $x^0 = \tau$) read

$$g^{00} = -1 + 2a_i(\tau)x^i + M_{ij}(\tau)x^i x^j + \mathcal{O}(x)^3, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$g^{0i} = \mathcal{O}(x)^2, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$g^{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(x)^2, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where M_{ij} is a combination of components of the Riemann tensor and of the acceleration (see e.g. [39]). Notice that, by (A.7), $a_0 = 0$ in these coordinates. A similar “tubular” expansion

⁶In the highly symmetric example of the KG equation going to Fermi coordinates merely corresponds to boosting the classical solution (A.2) into $\bar{q}^0 = mt, \vec{q} = 0$.

can be done for S ,

$$S(x^\mu) = - \int^\tau d\tau' m(\tau') + \frac{1}{2} S_{ij}(\tau) x^i x^j + \mathcal{O}(x)^3. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Terms linear in x^i are excluded because the gradient of S at $x^i = 0$ is parallel to the curve. Making the wavefront of S locally flat around the classical trajectory would correspond to setting $S_{ij} = 0$. We see in the following that this condition, in general, cannot be preserved in time. The potential U can also be expanded around $x^i = 0$.

By sticking these ingredients inside the Hamilton Jacobi equation (3.6) we obtain

$$-m^2 + mS'_{ij}x^i x^j + 2m^2 a_i x^i + m^2 M_{ij} x^i x^j + S_{ki} S_{kj} x^i x^j + 2U + 2\partial_i U x^i + \partial_i \partial_j U x^i x^j = \mathcal{O}(x)^3. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By equating the terms at $x^i = 0$ we get

$$m^2(\tau) = 2U(\tau), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

which nicely cancels the terms linear in x^i using (A.7). The terms quadratic in x^i give

$$\boxed{mS'_{ij} + S_{ki} S_{kj} = -m^2 M_{ij} - \partial_i \partial_j U.} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Not surprisingly, this is reminiscent of the Raychaudhuri equation, governing the expansion of a congruence of curves. We see from the above that both the potential U and the Riemann curvature in field space act as sources for S_{ij} . Meaning, in general, that the wavefront $S = \text{const.}$ cannot remain flat all along the classical solution $\bar{q}^\mu(t)$.

References

- [1] B. S. DeWitt, Quantum Theory of Gravity. 1. The Canonical Theory, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113–1148, 1967.
- [2] K. Kuchar, Ground state functional of the linearized gravitational field, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 3322–3334, 1970.
- [3] T. Chakraborty, J. Chakravarty, V. Godet, P. Paul and S. Raju, The Hilbert space of de Sitter quantum gravity, *JHEP* **01**, 132, 2024, [arXiv:2303.16315 [hep-th]].
- [4] P. Creminelli, M. A. Luty, A. Nicolis and L. Senatore, Starting the Universe: Stable Violation of the Null Energy Condition and Non-standard Cosmologies, *JHEP* **12**, 080, 2006, [arXiv:hep-th/0606090].
- [5] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan and L. Senatore, The Effective Field Theory of Inflation, *JHEP* **03**, 014, 2008, [arXiv:0709.0293 [hep-th]].
- [6] F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, Effective Field Theory of Cosmological Perturbations, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 214007, 2013, [arXiv:1307.4350 [hep-th]].

- [7] S. A. Salcedo, M. H. G. Lee, S. Melville and E. Pajer, The Analytic Wavefunction, *JHEP* **06**, 020, 2023, [[arXiv:2212.08009 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [8] P. Benincasa, Amplitudes meet Cosmology: A (Scalar) Primer, 2022, [[arXiv:2203.15330 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [9] A. Nicolis, F. Piazza and K. Zeghari, Rotating cosmologies: classical and quantum, *JCAP* **10**, 059, 2022, [[arXiv:2204.04110 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [10] J. J. Halliwell, Derivation of the Wheeler-De Witt Equation from a Path Integral for Minisuperspace Models, *Phys. Rev. D* **38**, 2468, 1988.
- [11] A. Vilenkin, The Interpretation of the Wave Function of the Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 1116, 1989.
- [12] J. J. Halliwell, INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON QUANTUM COSMOLOGY, in *7th Jerusalem Winter School for Theoretical Physics: Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universes*, pp. 159–243, 1989. [[arXiv:0909.2566 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [13] O. Janssen, Slow-roll approximation in quantum cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 095003, 2021, [[arXiv:2009.06282 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [14] J. B. Hartle, Space-time quantum mechanics and the quantum mechanics of space-time, in *Les Houches Summer School on Gravitation and Quantizations, Session 57*, pp. 0285–480, 1992. [[arXiv:gr-qc/9304006](#)].
- [15] J. Maldacena, The role of the wdw equation?, YouTube, 2015.
- [16] J.-L. Lehners, Review of the no-boundary wave function, *Phys. Rept.* **1022**, 1–82, 2023, [[arXiv:2303.08802 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [17] J. Maldacena, Comments on the no boundary wavefunction and slow roll inflation, 2024, [[arXiv:2403.10510 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [18] S. W. Hawking, The Boundary Conditions of the Universe, *Pontif. Acad. Sci. Scr. Varia* **48**, 563–574, 1982.
- [19] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Wave Function of the Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 2960–2975, 1983.
- [20] D. S. Salopek and J. R. Bond, Nonlinear evolution of long wavelength metric fluctuations in inflationary models, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3936–3962, 1990.
- [21] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, A General analytic formula for the spectral index of the density perturbations produced during inflation, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **95**, 71–78, 1996, [[arXiv:astro-ph/9507001](#)].
- [22] D. Wands, K. A. Malik, D. H. Lyth and A. R. Liddle, A New approach to the evolution of cosmological perturbations on large scales, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 043527, 2000, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0003278](#)].
- [23] C. Pattison, V. Vennin, H. Assadullahi and D. Wands, Stochastic inflation beyond slow roll, *JCAP* **07**, 031, 2019, [[arXiv:1905.06300 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#)].
- [24] D. Artigas, J. Grain and V. Vennin, Hamiltonian formalism for cosmological perturbations: the separate-universe approach, *JCAP* **02**, 001, 2022, [[arXiv:2110.11720 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#)].
- [25] P. Creminelli, S. Dubovsky, A. Nicolis, L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, The Phase Transition to Slow-roll Eternal Inflation, *JHEP* **09**, 036, 2008, [[arXiv:0802.1067 \[hep-th\]](#)].

- [26] C. Goeller, P. A. Hoehn and J. Kirklin, Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and dynamical frames in gravity: reconciling bulk locality with general covariance, 2022, [[arXiv:2206.01193 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [27] E. Witten, Algebras, Regions, and Observers, 2023, [[arXiv:2303.02837 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [28] F. Piazza, Glimmers of a post-geometric perspective, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **40**, 165014, 2023, [[arXiv:2108.12362 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [29] L. Hui, A. Nicolis and A. Podo To appear.
- [30] R. Khan, The Semiclassical Approximation: Its Application to Holography and the Information Paradox, 2023, [[arXiv:2309.08116 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [31] H. M. Van Horn and E. E. Salpeter, WKB Approximation in Three Dimensions, *Phys. Rev.* **157**, 751–758, 1967.
- [32] V. Bozza, M. Giovannini and G. Veneziano, Cosmological perturbations from a new physics hypersurface, *JCAP* **05**, 001, 2003, [[arXiv:hep-th/0302184](#)].
- [33] J.-L. Lehners and J. Quintin, Delicate curvature bounces in the no-boundary wave function and in the late universe, 2024, [[arXiv:2403.15205 \[gr-qc\]](#)].
- [34] A. D. Linde, Eternally Existing Selfreproducing Chaotic Inflationary Universe, *Phys. Lett. B* **175**, 395–400, 1986.
- [35] A. D. Linde, ETERNAL CHAOTIC INFLATION, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **1**, 81, 1986.
- [36] A. H. Guth, Eternal inflation and its implications, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 6811–6826, 2007, [[arXiv:hep-th/0702178](#)].
- [37] J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov, Perturbations in k-inflation, *Phys. Lett. B* **458**, 219–225, 1999, [[arXiv:hep-th/9904176](#)].
- [38] J. M. Maldacena, Non-Gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models, *JHEP* **05**, 013, 2003, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0210603](#)].
- [39] A. I. Nesterov, Riemann normal coordinates, Fermi reference system and the geodesic deviation equation, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16**, 465–477, 1999, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0010096](#)].