

Hamilton-Jacobi method in reheating predictions for non-minimal coupling inflation

Feng-Yi Zhang,^{1,2,*} Li-Yang Chen,³ and Rongrong Zhai^{4,†}

¹*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of South China, Hengyang, 421001, China*

²*Hunan Key Laboratory of Mathematical Modeling and Scientific Computing,
University of South China, Hengyang, 421001, China*

³*College of Physics and Engineering Technology,
Chengdu Normal University, Chengdu, Sichuan 611130, China*

⁴*Department of Physics, Xinzhou Normal University, Xinzhou 034000, Shanxi, China*

The Hamilton-Jacobi method offers a natural and concise framework for describing inflation, with implications that extend to the reheating phase. Additionally, reheating plays a crucial role in constraining the observationally viable parameter space of inflationary models. In this study, we employ the Hamilton-Jacobi approach to investigate reheating predictions within non-minimally coupled inflation models, comparing the metric and Palatini formulations. Our results show that the coupling effect suppresses the tensor-to-scalar ratio, aligning predictions with the Planck CMB and BICEP/Keck data in both formulations. Additionally, reheating predictions in the Palatini formulation are more sensitive to coupling strength variations, leading to a stronger suppression of the tensor-to-scalar ratio. This highlights a key difference in reheating dynamics between the metric and Palatini formulations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Inflation refers to the phase of exponential expansion that occurred in the early universe, resolving key issues in the standard cosmological model, including the flatness problem, the horizon problem, and the monopole problem [1–4]. On large scales, inflation predicts a nearly scale-invariant primordial perturbation power spectrum, which is in strong agreement with the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) observations. On smaller scales, the amplification of the primordial perturbation power spectrum plays a significant role in the formation of primordial black holes and the generation of gravitational waves [5–12]. However, due to limitations in observational sensitivity, particularly in detecting small-scale perturbations, the current comprehension of the small-scale primordial perturbation power spectrum remains incomplete. Consequently, the study of inflation primarily relies on indirect evidence from CMB observations. Additionally, the CMB observations provide important constraints on the spectral index of the primordial curvature perturbations n_s and the tensor-to-scalar ratio r . The latest Planck CMB and BICEP/Keck data have ruled out several inflationary models, including those with simple quadratic and quartic potentials [13, 14].

However, when considering extensions to gravity, such as non-minimal coupling of the inflaton to gravity, models that are excluded in general relativity (GR) remain consistent with observational data [15–17]. The discussion of gravitational degrees of freedom is particularly prominent in non-minimal coupling theories, especially in the metric and Palatini formalisms [18–27]. The independent variables in the metric formalism are the metric tensor

and its first-order derivative, while the independent variables in the Palatini formalism are the metric tensor and the connection. Both have equivalent background equations in GR unless extended gravity is introduced, such as non-minimal coupled gravity [18, 19]. Additionally, in Palatini formalism, the tensor-to-scalar ratio is consistently suppressed compared to metric formalism [28].

After inflation, the universe enters the reheating phase, where the inflaton oscillates around the potential minimum and decays into particles, initiating thermalization and the transition to a radiation-dominated era. Reheating mechanisms include the perturbative decays of oscillating inflatons [29–31] and non-perturbative effects, such as parametric resonances or tachyon instabilities [32–40]. At the end of reheating, the cosmic temperature T_{re} must be lower than the energy scale of inflation ($\sim 10^{16}$ GeV) and higher than the temperature of Big Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) ($\sim 10^{-2}$ GeV) [41]. Despite the limited observational constraints on the reheating temperature, valuable insights into the reheating process can still be gained by studying the relation between inflationary and reheating parameters. This relation is established by tracing the evolution of cosmic expansion, from the point when the observable CMB scales exit the Hubble radius during inflation to their eventual re-entry. Moreover, this correlation offers complementary constraints on inflationary models by defining the permissible range of reheating parameters, leading to extensive studies on reheating predictions within these models [42–60].

Recently, the Hamilton-Jacobi method has been extensively used to analyze various inflationary models [61–78]. Unlike the traditional slow-roll approximation, the Hamilton-Jacobi formalism treats the scalar field as a time variable in cosmological background equations, assuming monotonic evolution of the field. This approach shifts the focus from specifying the inflaton potential $V(\phi)$ to defining the Hubble parameter $H(\phi)$, a geometric quantity that directly characterizes the expan-

* zfy@usc.edu.cn

† Corresponding author: zrr1054@163.com

sion rate of the universe. Furthermore, this method simplifies the analysis of inflation by avoiding certain perturbative issues, especially in extended gravity theories, such as non-minimal derivative coupling [70]. The Hamilton-Jacobi formalism enables the reconstruction of inflationary potentials beyond the slow-roll approximation. Examples of models include tachyonic inflation [68], quasi-exponential inflation [72], anisotropic inflation [78], and k-inflation [77], which consistently yield predictions matching observational data.

The Hamilton-Jacobi method has been applied to non-minimal coupling inflation to investigate inflationary solutions by specifying different scalar potentials [79]. However, the application of this method to reheating predictions in inflationary models remains underexplored. This motivates our analysis of reheating in non-minimal coupling inflation, using both metric and Palatini formulations with specified Hubble parameters. We compare these predictions with the latest observational data to enhance our understanding of the reheating phase and its implications for inflationary models. The organization of this paper is as follows. In the next section, we outline the cosmological background equations governing non-minimal coupling theories. Section III applies the Hamilton-Jacobi method to inflationary scenarios. In Section IV, we examine the reheating process by specifying the functional form of the Hubble parameter. Section V presents the numerical results, followed by our conclusions in Section VI. This paper uses the metric signature $(-, +, +, +)$, adopts natural units with $c = \hbar = 1$, and establishes the reduced Planck mass as $M_{pl} = 1/\sqrt{8\pi G} = 1$.

II. BACKGROUND EQUATIONS IN THE SCALAR FIELD THEORY WITH NON-MINIMAL COUPLING

In this section, we provide a brief overview of the cosmological background equations for scalar field theory with non-minimal coupling, examining both the metric and Palatini formalisms, and considering the Jordan and Einstein frames.

A. In the Jordan frame

The action of non-minimally coupled inflation differs from that of standard inflation by an additional coupling term, where the inflaton field ϕ is coupled to the Ricci scalar $R(\Gamma)$. The action in the Jordan frame is then expressed as:

$$S_J = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} f(\phi) R(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi) \right], \quad (1)$$

where g denotes the determinant of the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, and $f(\phi) \equiv 1 - \xi\phi^2$ is the coupling function [80].

Here, ξ represents the non-minimal coupling constant, constrained to $\xi \leq 10^{-3}$ in chaotic models [81], with $\xi = 0$ corresponding to minimal coupling. $V(\phi)$ is the inflaton field potential.

Understanding this framework requires distinguishing between the metric and Palatini formalisms, as they treat the connection Γ differently. In the metric formalism, the connection is the Levi-Civita connection, which depends on the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, i.e., $\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}(g_{\mu\nu})$. However, in the Palatini formalism, the connection is given by [18]:

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\gamma + \delta_\nu^\gamma \partial_\nu \ln \sqrt{f(\phi)} + \delta_\nu^\gamma \partial_\mu \ln \sqrt{f(\phi)} - g_{\mu\nu} \partial^\gamma \ln \sqrt{f(\phi)}. \quad (2)$$

When $f(\phi) = 1$ (i.e., $\xi = 0$), the theory reduces to GR, and the field equations derived from both formalisms are identical. However, when non-minimal coupling is introduced, the gravitational theories in the two formalisms differ.

To explore these dynamics, we adopt the spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (3)$$

and use it to derive the background equations, which are given by:

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)} \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + 6\xi H \phi \dot{\phi} - \frac{3\sigma\xi\alpha\dot{\phi}^2}{1-\alpha} \right], \quad (4)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{(1-\alpha)V_{,\phi}(\phi)}{\beta} + \frac{\xi\phi \left\{ 4V(\phi) - [1 - (1-\sigma)6\xi] \dot{\phi}^2 \right\}}{\beta} = 0. \quad (5)$$

Here $a(t)$ is the scale factor, $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter, $\alpha \equiv \xi\phi^2$, and $\beta \equiv 1 - \alpha [1 - (1-\sigma)6\xi]$. The dot denotes a derivative with respect to cosmic time t , and the subscript “ ϕ ” refers to differentiation with respect to the scalar field ϕ . The parameter σ distinguishes between the metric ($\sigma = 0$) and Palatini ($\sigma = 1$) formulations.

B. In the Einstein frame

For convenience, we apply a conformal transformation to convert the action (1) from the Jordan frame to the Einstein frame:

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = f(\phi) g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (6)$$

where a hat denotes quantities in the Einstein frame. We then derive the relationship between the line elements in the Einstein and Jordan frames as:

$$d\hat{s}^2 = f(\phi) ds^2 = -d\hat{t}^2 + \hat{a}^2(\hat{t}) \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (7)$$

which gives the following relations:

$$\hat{a}(\hat{t}) = \sqrt{f(\phi)a(t)}, \quad \hat{t} = \sqrt{f(\phi)t}. \quad (8)$$

Thus, the action in the Einstein frame is derived as

$$S_E = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\partial}_\mu \hat{\phi} \hat{\partial}^\mu \hat{\phi} - \hat{V}(\hat{\phi}) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The new scalar field $\hat{\phi}$ and potential $\hat{V}(\hat{\phi})$ are related to the original field ϕ and potential $V(\phi)$ as:

$$\frac{d\hat{\phi}}{d\phi} = \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{1-\alpha} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{V(\phi)}{f^2(\phi)}. \quad (11)$$

Finally, the background equations in the Einstein frame can be written as

$$3\hat{H}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\phi}'^2 + \hat{V}(\hat{\phi}), \quad (12)$$

$$\hat{\phi}'' + 3\hat{H}\hat{\phi}' + \hat{V}_{,\hat{\phi}}(\hat{\phi}) = 0, \quad (13)$$

where the prime indicates differentiation with respect to the new time \hat{t} . The quantities $\hat{\phi}'$ and \hat{H} can be expressed in terms of their corresponding counterparts in the Jordan frame as follows:

$$\hat{\phi}' = \frac{d\hat{\phi}}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{dt}{d\hat{t}} = \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{(1-\alpha)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \dot{\phi}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$\hat{H} \equiv \frac{\hat{a}'}{\hat{a}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{f}} \left(H + \frac{\dot{f}}{2f} \right), \quad (15)$$

respectively.

III. HAMILTON-JACOBI METHOD IN INFLATION

We will analyze the dynamics of inflation with non-minimal coupling using the Hamilton-Jacobi method [61], considering both the metric and Palatini formalisms. To achieve nearly exponential expansion during inflation, the slow-roll conditions need to be satisfied: $|\dot{\phi}/\phi| \ll H$, $|\ddot{\phi}/\dot{\phi}| \ll H$, and $\dot{\phi}^2 \ll V(\phi)$. Under these conditions, the background equations (4) and (5) take the following approximate form:

$$3(1-\alpha)H^2 \simeq V(\phi), \quad (16)$$

$$3H\dot{\phi} \simeq -\frac{4\xi\phi V(\phi) + (1-\alpha)V_{,\phi}(\phi)}{\beta}. \quad (17)$$

To solve these equations, we consider the Hubble parameter as a function of the inflaton field, $H = H(\phi)$. By differentiating Eq. (16) with respect to ϕ and substituting the result into Eq. (17), we derive

$$\dot{\phi} \simeq -\frac{2(1-\alpha)\mathcal{H}(\phi)}{\beta}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{H}(\phi) \equiv \xi\phi H(\phi) + (1-\alpha)H_{,\phi}(\phi)$. Substituting this result into Eq. (4), we obtain the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$3(1-\alpha)H^2(\phi) = V(\phi) + \frac{2(1-\alpha)^2\mathcal{H}^2(\phi)}{\beta^2} - \frac{12\xi\phi(1-\alpha)H(\phi)\mathcal{H}(\phi)}{\beta} - \frac{12\xi\sigma\alpha(1-\alpha)\mathcal{H}^2(\phi)}{\beta^2}. \quad (19)$$

As a result, the potential $V(\phi)$ takes the form

$$V(\phi) = 3(1-\alpha)H^2(\phi) - \frac{2(1-\alpha)^2\mathcal{H}^2(\phi)}{\beta^2} + \frac{12\xi\phi(1-\alpha)H(\phi)\mathcal{H}(\phi)}{\beta} + \frac{12\xi\sigma\alpha(1-\alpha)\mathcal{H}^2(\phi)}{\beta^2}. \quad (20)$$

In order to properly describe the inflationary process, we define two slow-roll parameters [62]:

$$\epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \simeq \frac{2(1-\alpha)H_{,\phi}(\phi)\mathcal{H}(\phi)}{\beta^2 H^2(\phi)}, \quad (21)$$

$$\eta \equiv -\frac{d \ln H_{,\phi}}{d \ln a} = -\frac{H_{,\phi\phi}\dot{\phi}}{H H_{,\phi}} \simeq \frac{2(1-\alpha)H_{,\phi\phi}\mathcal{H}(\phi)}{\beta H H_{,\phi}}. \quad (22)$$

During slow-roll inflation, the parameters satisfy $\epsilon, |\eta| \ll 1$, and inflation ends when $\epsilon = 1$ or $\eta = 1$. The e-folding number during inflation is

$$N_* \equiv \int_{t_*}^{t_{\text{end}}} H dt = \int_{\phi_*}^{\phi_{\text{end}}} \frac{H(\phi)}{\dot{\phi}} d\phi, \quad (23)$$

where the subscripts “*” and “end” refer to two specific moments: the exit of the pivot scale from the Hubble horizon and the end of inflation.

In the case of a scalar field with non-minimal coupling to gravity, the scalar and tensor power spectra remain invariant under the conformal transformation between the Jordan and Einstein frames [82–87]. Thus, the scalar and tensor power spectra can be expressed respectively in terms of

$$P_s = \hat{P}_s = \frac{\hat{H}^4}{4\pi^2 \hat{\phi}'^2} = \frac{[(1-\alpha)H - \xi\phi\dot{\phi}]^4}{4\pi^2 \dot{\phi}^2 (1-\alpha)^3 \beta}, \quad (24)$$

and

$$P_T = \hat{P}_T = \frac{2\hat{H}^2}{\pi^2} = \frac{2[(1-\alpha)H - \xi\phi\dot{\phi}]^2}{\pi^2 (1-\alpha)^3}. \quad (25)$$

The spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio can be expressed as

$$n_s \equiv 1 + \left(\frac{d \ln P_s}{d \ln k} \right)_{k=aH} \approx 1 + \frac{\dot{\phi} P_{s,\phi}(\phi)}{H P_s(\phi)}, \quad (26)$$

and

$$r \equiv \frac{P_T}{P_s} = \frac{8\dot{\phi}^2 \beta}{\left[(1-\alpha)H - \xi\phi\dot{\phi} \right]^2}, \quad (27)$$

where k is the wave number.

IV. THE REHEATING PHASE

After inflation, the universe enters a reheating phase, during which the inflaton decays and produces light particles that thermalize the universe. We can establish a relation between inflationary parameters and reheating by the CMB pivot scale:

$$k_* = a_* H_* = \frac{a_*}{a_{\text{end}}} \frac{a_{\text{end}}}{a_{\text{re}}} \frac{a_{\text{re}}}{a_0} a_0 H_*. \quad (28)$$

Here, the subscripts “re” and “0” represent the end of reheating and the current epoch, respectively. For convenience, we set $a_0 = 1$.

The e -folding number during reheating is defined as $N_{\text{re}} = \ln(a_{\text{re}}/a_{\text{end}})$, and thus, the first two factors in the last step of Eq. (28) can be expressed as

$$\frac{a_*}{a_{\text{end}}} \frac{a_{\text{end}}}{a_{\text{re}}} = e^{-N_* - N_{\text{re}}}. \quad (29)$$

The relation between a_{re} and a_0 can be derived by considering the conservation of entropy in the comoving volume after reheating. The entropy conservation equation results in

$$g_{\text{re}} a_{\text{re}}^3 T_{\text{re}}^3 = g_\gamma T_\gamma^3 + \frac{7}{8} g_\nu T_\nu^3 = \left(\frac{43}{11} \right) T_\gamma^3, \quad (30)$$

where g_{re} represents the effective number of degrees of freedom at the end of reheating. For subsequent numerical calculations, we set $g_{\text{re}} = 106.5$. The subscripts “ γ ” and “ ν ” correspond to photon and neutrino, respectively, $T_\gamma = 2.7255$ K denotes the temperature of CMB photons. Additionally, for the result of Eq. (30) we use $g_\gamma = 2$, $g_\nu = 6$, and $T_\nu^3 = (4/11)T_\gamma^3$. Hence, we arrive at

$$\frac{a_{\text{re}}}{a_0} = \left(\frac{43}{11g_{\text{re}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{T_\gamma}{T_{\text{re}}}. \quad (31)$$

Substituting Eqs. (29) and (31) into Eq. (28) gives the expression for T_{re} as

$$T_{\text{re}} = \left(\frac{43}{11g_{\text{re}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{T_\gamma}{k_*} \right) a_0 H_* e^{-N_* - N_{\text{re}}}. \quad (32)$$

The end of reheating marks the beginning of the radiation-dominated era, and the cosmic energy density can be expressed in terms of cosmic temperature as follows:

$$\rho_{\text{re}} = \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_{\text{re}} T_{\text{re}}^4. \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, applying the continuity equation of cosmic energy density and assuming a constant equation of state parameter w_{re} during reheating, we derive the cosmic energy density at the end of reheating to be

$$\rho_{\text{re}} = \rho_{\text{end}} e^{-3N_{\text{re}}(1+w_{\text{re}})}, \quad (34)$$

where

$$\rho_{\text{end}} = \frac{3}{2} V(\phi_{\text{end}}) \quad (35)$$

which represents the energy density at the end of inflation.

By simultaneously solving Eqs. (32)–(35), we can derive a relation between the inflation and reheating parameters:

$$(3w_{\text{re}} - 1) N_{\text{re}} = \ln \left(\frac{45}{\pi^2 g_{\text{re}}} \right) + \ln V(\phi_{\text{end}}) + \frac{4}{3} \ln \left(\frac{11g_{\text{re}}}{43} \right) + 4 \ln \left(\frac{k_*}{a_0 H_* T_\gamma} \right) + 4N_*. \quad (36)$$

This equation can be used to constrain the inflation parameters based on the CMB observations. In particular, when $w_{\text{re}} = 1/3$ (or $N_{\text{re}} = 0$), the left-hand side of the equation becomes zero, which makes it independent of changes in N_{re} (or w_{re}).

V. RESULTS ANALYSIS

In this section, we apply a specific form of $H(\phi)$ to derive concrete results for an inflaton field with non-minimal coupling in both formulations. We express the Hubble parameter as a classical power-law function of the scalar field,

$$H(\phi) = \lambda \phi^n, \quad (37)$$

where n is the model parameter and λ is a constant parameter that can be determined by the power spectrum amplitude of curvature perturbations [13]:

$$\ln(10^{10} A_s) = 3.044 \pm 0.014. \quad (38)$$

Using the equation (37), the slow-roll parameters ϵ and η can be expressed as

$$\epsilon = \frac{2n(1-\alpha)(\alpha+n-n\alpha)}{\phi^2 \beta} \quad (39)$$




FIG. 1. The plots of N_{re} and $\text{Log}_{10}[T_{\text{re}}/\text{GeV}]$ as functions of n_s for $n = 0.98, 1$ and 1.02 with varying ξ in the metric case. The dot-dashed, solid and dashed lines represent the cases of $\xi = 0, -0.1$ and -10 , respectively. The purple, blue, green, orange and red curves correspond to $w_{\text{re}} = -1/3, 0, 1/3, 2/3$ and 1 , respectively. The brown region represents the 1σ bound on the spectral index from the Planck 2018 CMB observations [13]. The gray region shows that temperatures are below the electroweak scale, 10^2GeV , and temperatures below $T_{\text{re}} < 10^{-2}\text{GeV}$ shown as the green region are ruled out by the BBN.

and

$$\eta = \frac{2(n-1)(1-\alpha)(\alpha+n-n\alpha)}{\phi^2\beta}. \quad (40)$$

It can be seen that ϵ will reach 1 before η . Therefore, the inflation process will end when $\epsilon(\phi_{\text{end}}) = 1$, at which point the scalar field takes the following value:

$$\phi_{\text{end}} = 2\sqrt{\frac{n^2}{1 + 2n\xi(2n-1) + \sqrt{1 - 4n\xi[1 + n\xi(12\sigma - 13)]}}}. \quad (41)$$

These results are consistent with the minimal coupling case in Ref. [70] when $\xi = 0$. Note that if we consider the strong coupling case $|\alpha| \gg 1$, the slow-roll parameter will be approximated as:

$$\epsilon \approx \frac{2n\xi(1-n)}{1 - (1-\sigma)6\xi}. \quad (42)$$

In this scenario, the slow-roll parameter becomes constant, depending only on ξ and n , which prevents inflation from either occurring or ending. Therefore, we exclude the strong coupling case from further consideration.

Next, we will numerically analyze the reheating predictions of non-minimal coupled inflaton field applying the Hamiltonian Jacobi method between the metric and Palatini formulations. According to Eq. (26), n_s is determined by ϕ_* , ξ , and n . Furthermore, the relationship described by Eq. (36), in which N_* depends on ϕ_* , implies that N_{re} can be expressed as a function of n_s when the values of w_{re} , ξ , and n are fixed. Similarly, combining

Eq. (32), we can obtain T_{re} as a function of n_s . We consider w_{re} within the range $[-1/3, 1]$, specifically choosing $w_{\text{re}} = -1/3, 0, 1/3, 2/3$, and 1 . The value $w_{\text{re}} = -1/3$ corresponds to the equation of state at the end of inflation, while the upper limit of $w_{\text{re}} \leq 1$ ensures the avoidance of causality violations. For N_{re} , we examine the range $[0, 70]$, where 70 represents the maximum number of e-foldings during inflation.

A. The metric case

We present the reheating predictions for N_{re} and $\text{Log}_{10}[T_{\text{re}}/\text{GeV}]$ as functions of n_s for different values of n , ξ and w_{re} , as shown in Fig. 1. It is clear that when $n < 1$, the curves shift toward lower values of n_s as $|\xi|$ increases, while for $n \geq 1$, the curves shift toward higher values of n_s with increasing $|\xi|$. In the minimal coupling case (i.e., $\xi = 0$), instantaneous reheating ($N_{\text{re}} = 0$) is allowed by the Planck CMB observations for all values of n . Similarly, this holds for all values of ξ when $n = 1$. For $n = 0.98$, the scenario with $\xi = -0.1$ agrees with both the Planck CMB and BBN data if $w_{\text{re}} \geq 1/3$. Conversely, for $n = 1.02$, the cases with $\xi = -0.1$ and $\xi = -10$ are consistent with the observations when $w_{\text{re}} < 1/3$.

In Fig. 2, we present the reheating predictions for $N_* - n_s$ (the first row) and $r - n_s$ (the second row) with varying n and ξ . We observe that for $n < 1$, the predicted values of N_* increase with increasing $|\xi|$, while for $n \geq 1$, N_* decreases as $|\xi|$ increases. Moreover, the predicted N_* ranges for the case of $n = 1$ with all values of ξ almost completely overlap. Detailed results are provided in Table I. Comparison with the latest Planck CMB




FIG. 2. N_* (the first row panel) and r (the second row panel) against n_s for $n = 0.98, 1$ and 1.02 with varying ξ in the metric case. In the first row panel, the brown region indicates the 1σ bound on n_s from the Planck 2018 TT, TE, EE+lowE+lensing [13]. In the second row panel, the dot-dashed and dashed lines represent the cases of $\xi = 0, -0.1$ and -10 , respectively. For each curve, the blue, red and green parts correspond to $-1/3 < w_{re} < 0$, $0 < w_{re} < 1/3$ and $1/3 < w_{re} < 1$, respectively. The green and blue shaded regions illustrate the constraints on n_s and r at the pivot scale $k_* = 0.002 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, derived from the Planck 2018 CMB observations [13] and the BICEP/Keck survey [14], respectively. These regions correspond to the 68% and 95% confidence level (CL) contours, represented by dark and light shading, respectively.

TABLE I. Predicted range of N_* allowed by the Planck CMB observations in the metric case. (The slash “/” indicates a nonexistent range.)

n	$\xi = 0$	$\xi = -0.1$	$\xi = -10$
0.98	$49.9 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 63.7$	$57.4 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 70.0$	/
1	$50.4 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 64.6$	$49.6 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 63.1$	$48.6 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 62.2$
1.02	$50.8 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 64.8$	$44.6 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 55.3$	$37.3 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 45.1$

and BICEP/Keck data reveals that the minimal coupling cases for all n are ruled out by observations. However, as $|\xi|$ increases, the tensor-to-scalar ratio r decreases, bringing certain cases into agreement with the Planck CMB observations. For $n \geq 1$, both $\xi = -0.1$ and $\xi = -10$ are consistent with the BICEP/Keck data. Similarly, for $n = 0.98$ with $\xi = -0.1$, the predictions align well with the BICEP/Keck data, while larger values of $|\xi|$ are excluded by the observations.

B. The Palatni case

In Fig. 3, we present the reheating results for N_{re} and $\log_{10}[T_{re}/\text{GeV}]$ as functions of n_s in the Palatini formulation. The figure demonstrates that for both $n > 1$ and $n < 1$, the curves shift with changing $|\xi|$ exhibit a behavior similar to that observed in the metric equation. However, for $n = 1$, the curves initially shifts towards

decreasing n_s as $|\xi|$ increases, before reversing direction and moving towards increasing n_s , with instantaneous reheating allowed by observations for all values of ξ . For $n = 0.99$ and $n = 1.01$ with $\xi = 0$ and $\xi = -0.05$, instantaneous reheating remains consistent with the observations. Furthermore, for $n = 1.01$ with $\xi = -0.5$, compatibility with the Planck CMB and BBN data is achieved only for small values of w_{re} , such as $w_{re} = -1/3$.

In Fig. 4, we present the reheating predictions for N_* (the first row) and r (the second row) as functions of n_s in the Palatini formulation. For both $n > 1$ and $n < 1$, the behavior of the predicted N_* changed with varying $|\xi|$ is similar to the metric formulation. Differently, for the case of $n = 1$, the predicted N_* increases as $|\xi|$ increases in the Palatini formulation. The observationally allowed range of N_* is provided in Table II for further analysis. For the reheating predictions of r and n_s , we find that for $n < 1$, only $\xi = -0.05$ is consistent with the BICEP/Keck data, while both the minimal coupling case




FIG. 3. The plots of N_{re} and $\text{Log}_{10}[T_{re}/\text{GeV}]$ as functions of n_s for $n = 0.99, 1$ and 1.01 with varying ξ in the Palatini case. The dot-dashed, solid and dashed lines represent the cases of $\xi = 0, -0.05$ and -0.5 , respectively. The other colored curves and regions are represented similarly to those in Fig. 1.




FIG. 4. N_* (the first row panel) and r (the second row panel) against n_s for $n = 0.99, 1$ and 1.01 with varying ξ in the Palatini case. In the second row panel, the dot-dashed, solid and dashed lines represent the cases of $\xi = 0, -0.05$ and -0.5 , respectively. The other colored curves and shaded regions follow the same representation as in Fig. 2.

TABLE II. Predicted range of N_* allowed by the Planck CMB observations in the Palatini case.

n	$\xi = 0$	$\xi = -0.05$	$\xi = -0.5$
0.99	$50.2 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 63.9$	$54.2 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 69.5$	/
1	$50.2 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 64.3$	$51.8 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 65.6$	$51.8 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 65.6$
1.01	$50.5 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 64.5$	$49.2 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 62.2$	$36.4 \lesssim N_* \lesssim 42.8$

and larger values of $|\xi|$ are ruled out by the observations. For $n \geq 1$, both $\xi = -0.05$ and $\xi = -0.5$ are in good agreement with the BICEP/Keck data. These trends are similar to those in the metric formulation. However, with the difference that the value of r is suppressed lower and the predicted parameter changes are more sensitive due to the enhancement of the coupling in the Palatini formulation.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The Hamilton-Jacobi approach offers a more natural and straightforward description of inflationary evolution, especially within modified gravity theories. Reheating, a critical phase that follows the end of inflation, plays a crucial role in constraining inflationary models through its predictions. In this study, we apply the Hamilton-Jacobi method to the reheating predictions of non-minimally coupled inflation models, comparing the outcomes in the metric and Palatini formulations. Using a non-minimal coupling function $f(\phi) = 1 - \xi\phi^2$ and a power-law form for the Hubble parameter, $H(\phi) = \lambda\phi^n$, we specifically research the relational equations linking inflationary parameters to reheating variables based on the cosmic expansion history at the CMB observational scale.

In the metric formulation, we have analyzed the reheated e-folding number N_{re} and temperature T_{re} in terms of the spectral index n_s . We find that for $n < 1$, n_s shifts to lower values as the coupling strength $|\xi|$ increases, while for $n \geq 1$, n_s shifts to higher values with increasing $|\xi|$. This result indicates that non-minimal coupling has a significant impact on the predictions of inflationary models, particularly in the variation trend of the spectral index. Specifically, for the case of $n = 0.98$ with $\xi = -0.1$, consistency with the Planck CMB data requires a higher w_{re} ($w_{\text{re}} \geq 1/3$). Conversely, for $n = 1.02$, consistency is achieved for $\xi = -0.1$ and -10 with a

lower w_{re} ($w_{\text{re}} < 1/3$). Instantaneous reheating is well-supported for $n = 1$ or $\xi = 0$ (the minimally coupled case). We further examine the relation between the inflationary e-folding number N_* and the tensor-to-scalar ratio r as functions of n_s . Observationally allowed ranges for N_* show that for $n < 1$, N_* increases with growing $|\xi|$, while for $n \geq 1$, N_* decreases. Stronger couplings ($\xi = -0.1$ and $\xi = -10$) lead to a suppression of the tensor-to-scalar ratio r , thereby aligning the predictions with the BICEP/Keck data for $n = 1$ and $n = 1.02$. For $n = 0.98$, consistency with the BICEP/Keck data is achieved for $\xi = -0.1$, while larger coupling strengths are excluded.

In the Palatini formulation, n_s and N_* follow trends similar to the metric formulation for both $n > 1$ and $n < 1$. However, for $n = 1$, n_s initially moves to lower values and then moves to higher values as $|\xi|$ increases, while N_* consistently grows. For all values of n , r behaves similarly to the metric formalism, but the predictions are more significantly suppressed as $|\xi|$ increases, making the parameter space for reheating and inflation more sensitive to variations in ξ . These results indicate that the Hamilton-Jacobi method can be successfully applied to reheating predictions to constrain inflationary models. Moreover, in both the metric and Palatini formulations, the inflationary models show excellent agreement with the latest observational data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11973025). We also express our gratitude for the support provided by the Talent Introduction Scientific Research Special Project of Chengdu Normal University (Grant No. YJRC202443).

-
- [1] A. Starobinsky, *Physics Letters B* **91**, 99 (1980).
 - [2] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1220 (1982).
 - [3] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
 - [4] A. Linde, *Physics Letters B* **108**, 389 (1982).
 - [5] S. Hawking, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **152**, 75 (1971).
 - [6] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **168**, 399 (1974).
 - [7] H. Motohashi and W. Hu, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 063503 (2017).
 - [8] H. Di and Y. Gong, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018**, 007 (2018).
 - [9] Y. Tada and S. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023537 (2019).
 - [10] W.-T. Xu, J. Liu, T.-J. Gao, and Z.-K. Guo, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 023505 (2020).
 - [11] R. Zhai, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 023517 (2022).
 - [12] L.-Y. Chen, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063537 (2022).
 - [13] Y. Akrami *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A10 (2020).
 - [14] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (BICEP/Keck Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 151301 (2021).
 - [15] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **571**, A22 (2014).
 - [16] S. Tsujikawa, J. Ohashi, S. Kuroyanagi, and A. De Felice, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 023529 (2013).
 - [17] C. Germani and A. Kehagias, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 011302 (2010).
 - [18] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, *Physics Letters B* **665**, 222 (2008).
 - [19] N. Tamanini and C. R. Contaldi, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 044018 (2011).
 - [20] T. Tenkanen, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle*

- Physics **2017**, 001 (2017).
- [21] L. Järv, A. Racioppi, and T. Tenkanen, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 083513 (2018).
- [22] P. Carrilho, D. Mulryne, J. Ronayne, and T. Tenkanen, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018**, 032 (2018).
- [23] J. P. B. Almeida, N. Bernal, J. Rubio, and T. Tenkanen, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2019**, 012 (2019).
- [24] T. Tenkanen, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063517 (2020).
- [25] I. D. Gialamas and A. B. Lahanas, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 084007 (2020).
- [26] Y. Fan, P. Wu, and H. Yu, *Physics Letters B* **746**, 230 (2015).
- [27] C. Fu, P. Wu, and H. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 103542 (2017).
- [28] S. Räsänen and P. Wahlman, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2017**, 047–047 (2017).
- [29] A. Dolgov and A. Linde, *Physics Letters B* **116**, 329 (1982).
- [30] L. Abbott, E. Farhi, and M. B. Wise, *Physics Letters B* **117**, 29 (1982).
- [31] A. Albrecht, P. J. Steinhardt, M. S. Turner, and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1437 (1982).
- [32] J. H. Traschen and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2491 (1990).
- [33] Y. Shtanov, J. Traschen, and R. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 5438 (1995).
- [34] M. A. Amin, M. P. Hertzberg, D. I. Kaiser, and J. Karouby, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **24**, 1530003 (2014).
- [35] B. A. Bassett, S. Tsujikawa, and D. Wands, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 537 (2006).
- [36] C. Fu, P. Wu, and H. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 063532 (2019).
- [37] B. R. Greene, T. Prokopec, and T. G. Roos, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 6484 (1997).
- [38] L. Kofman, A. Linde, and A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 3258 (1997).
- [39] L. Kofman, A. Linde, and A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 3195 (1994).
- [40] P. B. Greene, L. Kofman, A. Linde, and A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 6175 (1997).
- [41] G. Steigman, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **57**, 463–491 (2007).
- [42] J. Martin and C. Ringeval, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 023511 (2010).
- [43] P. Creminelli, D. L. Nacir, M. Simonović, G. Trevisan, and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 083513 (2014).
- [44] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, and V. Vennin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 081303 (2015).
- [45] J. L. Cook, E. Dimastrogiovanni, D. A. Easson, and L. M. Krauss, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2015**, 047 (2015).
- [46] R.-G. Cai, Z.-K. Guo, and S.-J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 063506 (2015).
- [47] M. R. Haque, D. Maity, and S. Pal, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 103540 (2021).
- [48] L. Dai, M. Kamionkowski, and J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 041302 (2014).
- [49] F.-Y. Zhang, P. Wu, and H. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 103530 (2021).
- [50] Y. Ueno and K. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 083524 (2016).
- [51] A. Di Marco, P. Cabella, and N. Vittorio, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 103502 (2017).
- [52] R. Goswami and U. A. Yajnik, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018**, 018 (2018).
- [53] D. Maity and P. Saha, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2019**, 018 (2019).
- [54] Z. Deng, F.-Y. Zhang, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **38**, 101135 (2022).
- [55] S. S. Mishra, V. Sahni, and A. A. Starobinsky, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2021**, 075 (2021).
- [56] J.-O. Gong, G. Leung, and S. Pi, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2015**, 027 (2015).
- [57] S. Mizuno, S. Mukohyama, S. Pi, and Y.-L. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 021301 (2020).
- [58] F.-Y. Zhang, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **39**, 101169 (2023).
- [59] F.-Y. Zhang, H. Yu, and W. Lin, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **44**, 101482 (2024).
- [60] F.-Y. Zhang and W. Lin, *Physics Letters B* **855**, 138765 (2024).
- [61] D. S. Salopek and J. R. Bond, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3936 (1990).
- [62] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, in *Cosmological Inflation and Large-Scale Structure* (Cambridge University Press, 2000) p. 36–57.
- [63] A. G. Muslimov, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **7**, 231 (1990).
- [64] J. E. Lidsey, *Physics Letters B* **273**, 42 (1991).
- [65] A. R. Liddle, P. Parsons, and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 7222 (1994).
- [66] W. H. Kinney, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 2002 (1997).
- [67] Z.-K. Guo, Y.-S. Piao, R.-G. Cai, and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 043508 (2003).
- [68] A. Aghamohammadi, A. Mohammadi, T. Golanbari, and K. Saaidi, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 084028 (2014).
- [69] J. R. Villanueva and E. Gallo, *The European Physical Journal C* **75** (2015), 10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3464-z.
- [70] H. Sheikahmadi, E. N. Saridakis, A. Aghamohammadi, and K. Saaidi, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2016**, 021 (2016).
- [71] K. Sayar, A. Mohammadi, L. Akhtari, and K. Saaidi, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 023501 (2017).
- [72] N. Videla, *The European Physical Journal C* **77**, 142 (2017).
- [73] K. Asadi and K. Nozari, *Nuclear Physics B* **949**, 114827 (2019).
- [74] G. Álvarez, L. Martínez Alonso, E. Medina, and J. L. Vázquez, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **61**, 043501 (2020).
- [75] A. Achúcarro, S. Céspedes, A.-C. Davis, and G. A. Palma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 191301 (2019).
- [76] E. Medina and L. M. Alonso, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 103517 (2020).
- [77] R.-J. Yang and M. Liu, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **46**, 101560 (2024).
- [78] F. Cicciarella, J. Mabillard, M. Pieroni, and A. Ricciardone, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2019**, 044 (2019).
- [79] S. Koh, S. P. Kim, and D. J. Song, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043523 (2005).
- [80] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, *Physics Letters B* **659**, 703 (2008).
- [81] T. Futamase and K.-i. Maeda, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 399

- (1989).
- [82] J. M. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1882 (1980).
- [83] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **78**, 1 (1984).
- [84] N. Makino and M. Sasaki, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **86**, 103 (1991).
- [85] V. Mukhanov, H. Feldman, and R. Brandenberger, *Physics Reports* **215**, 203 (1992).
- [86] R. Fakir, S. Habib, and W. Unruh, *Astrophysical Journal* **394**, 396 (1992).
- [87] E. Komatsu and T. Futamase, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 064029 (1999).