

Power Spectra in Double-Field Inflation Using Renormalization-Group Techniques

Bohdan Grzadkowski^a and Marco Piva^b

*University of Warsaw, Faculty of Physics,
Pasteura 5, 02-093 Warsaw, Poland*

^abohdan.grzadkowski@fuw.edu.pl ^bmpiva@fuw.edu.pl

Abstract

A perturbative strategy for inflation described by two-inflaton fields is developed using a mathematical analogy with the renormalization-group. Two small quantities, α and λ , corresponding to standard slow-roll parameters are defined and systematic expansions of all inflationary quantities in terms of powers of α and λ are found. No other slow-roll parameters are needed. To illustrate this perturbative method in the multi-field context, we adopt a simple two-inflaton model with quadratic potentials in the parameter range where both fields contribute similarly to the dynamics of inflation. The model, even though it is not a viable alternative for phenomenological description of the inflationary period, nicely illustrates subtleties of the perturbative approach. In particular, this method allows us to derive two independent gauge-invariant scalar perturbations that are conserved in the superhorizon limit, overcoming typical problems that emerge in multi-field inflation. Furthermore, it is possible to perform nonperturbative resummations that allow to study the model in a true multi-field regime. We derive tensor and scalar power spectra to the next-to-next-to-leading and next-to-leading orders, respectively, as well as their spectral indices. The hierarchy between the two scalar perturbations allows us to single out the dominant entry of the scalar power-spectrum matrix. Modifications due to the second inflaton occur already at the leading order. Finally, we explain why the quadratic two-inflaton model is not compatible with the present experimental constraints even though non-trivial corrections to scalar perturbations do emerge.

1 Introduction

The inflationary paradigm [1, 2, 3, 4] provides an efficient yet simple solution to the main puzzles of primordial cosmology (e.g. the horizon and the flatness problems) and easily accommodates the present observations concerning the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [5]. Such results are obtained assuming that, during the initial phase of the universe, a scalar field with a certain potential has a nontrivial, time-dependent but spatially homogeneous background. Then for the potential that implies slowly-rolling scalar background one finds exponentially growing solution of the Friedmann equations, known as the inflation (quasi-de Sitter).

Finally, quantum perturbations of the scalar field, together with those of the spacetime metric, accounts for the small temperature fluctuations observed in the CMB.

The simplest class of potentials, i.e. monomials, either do not fit the data or reproduce them poorly, and alternatives should be used. One possibility is to add new free parameters by considering polynomial potentials, which weakens the predictive power of a given model. Another way to better fit the data without introducing new free parameters is to consider more exotic potentials that are not polynomials in the fields (see [6] for a complete list). However, this choice spoils the simplicity of the models since such potentials are somehow unusual from a particle-physics point of view, where renormalizability and power counting severely restrict the range of possibilities. The only nonpolynomial potential that is allowed by power counting is the Starobinsky one [2]. In fact, it can be obtained by adding the R^2 term to the Hilbert action, which is the only term with dimension 4 that does not introduce ghosts. For renormalizability it is necessary to include also the cosmological constant, which is irrelevant for primordial cosmology, and the $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$ term [7]. The latter introduces a massive spin-2 ghost. Unitarity can be recovered by using an alternative quantization prescription for the ghost, turning it into a so-called “purely virtual particle” [8, 9, 10]. Its presence modifies the power spectra [11] introducing small deviations from Starobinsky predictions that could be tested in the near future [12].

Yet another possibility considered in the literature is to introduce additional fields that actively participate to inflation dynamics. In fact, the assumptions of homogeneity and isotropy of cosmological spacetime allows for any scalar degree of freedom to have a non-trivial background. Since several beyond-the-standard-model models assume the existence of new scalars, it is interesting to study their possible participation to the inflationary phase.

Various multi-field models have been studied in the literature (see for example [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]). However, most of the results rely either on numerical calculations

or on the assumption that the background fields follow a specific trajectory in field space. Furthermore, the additional fields are often chosen to be spectators, effectively reducing the model to single-field inflation [19, 20], and systematic derivations of analytical predictions for truly multi-inflaton cases are usually missing.

In this paper we study a double-field model with quadratic potential for both fields, denoted by χ and ϕ , and use the formalism developed in [21, 22] to obtain analytical and perturbative power spectra. These techniques make use of a mathematical correspondence between the background evolution during the inflationary phase and the renormalization-group flow in quantum field theory. In this analogy the small slow-roll parameters play the role of coupling constants, their equations of motion correspond to equations satisfied by running coupling constants as a function of the regularization scale μ , its counterpart being the conformal time τ . Finally, the conservation of correlation functions on superhorizon scales is the analog of the Callan-Symanzik equation. These ingredients define a sort of renormalization-group flow that describes the evolution of the universe during the inflationary era. We stress that this is just a mathematical analogy. In particular, the “beta functions” do not account for quantum corrections. They rather represent the background dynamics during the slow-roll phase in a perturbative way. More details on this approach can be found in [22].

The free parameters of the model are the two masses m_χ and m_ϕ and we do not assume any relation between them. Other known cases, e.g. single-field or spectator-field cases, can be recovered from our formulas as limiting cases. Moreover, we address the problem of the nonconservation of scalar perturbations, which is a typical issue in multi-field inflation. In fact, when more than one scalar field participate to inflation we can define a gauge-invariant scalar perturbation for each field. However, in general they are not conserved on superhorizon scales, making it more difficult to confront them with experimental data. Thanks to the perturbative techniques adopted here, we are able to define two independent gauge-invariant perturbations that are conserved on superhorizon scales. Moreover, due to the difference in their magnitude, it is possible to identify a dominant component. These features make their power spectra good candidates for observables to be compared with experiments. Then, in a consistent way, order by order in powers of small quantities, parameters of the model could be constrained.

Finally, we mention that a similar investigation has been done in [23], where the theory studied in [11] is supplemented by an additional scalar field with a quadratic potential. However, in that case the presence of the second inflaton only affects the subleading corrections, while in the model studied here even the leading order is modified. This is due to certain nonperturbative resummations that can be identified thanks to a symmetry

emerging in the model.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the renormalization-group analogy in the context of the double-field model and derive all the background quantities as perturbative series in two independent slow-roll parameters. In section 3 we solve the differential equations for the slow-roll parameters. In section 4 we discuss the strategy that we adopt to derive conserved perturbations and their power spectra and work them out to the next-to-next-to-leading (NNL) order for tensors and to the next-to-leading (NL) order for scalars. Finally, section 5 contains our conclusions.

2 Double-field model and background equations in the renormalization-group analogy

In this section we show the background-field equations of the model and introduce the quantities used in the renormalization-group analogy that we adopt through the paper.

The action is

$$S(g, \phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{\kappa^2} R + \partial_\mu \chi \partial_\nu \chi g^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi g^{\mu\nu} - m_\chi^2 \chi^2 - m_\phi^2 \phi^2 \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$ and G is Newton constant. Assuming isotropy and homogeneity we consider the background scalar fields that depend exclusively on time and the line-element squared of the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker form

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = dt^2 - a(t)^2 d\mathbf{x}^2. \quad (2.2)$$

The background-field equations are

$$H^2 = \frac{\hat{\kappa}^2}{2} \rho, \quad \dot{H} = -\frac{3}{4} \hat{\kappa}^2 (\rho + p), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\ddot{\chi} + 3H\dot{\chi} + m_\chi^2 \chi = 0, \quad \ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + m_\phi^2 \phi = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$H(t) = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}, \quad \hat{\kappa} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \kappa, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \left(\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2 + m_\chi^2 \chi^2 + m_\phi^2 \phi^2 \right), \quad p = \frac{1}{2} \left(\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2 - m_\chi^2 \chi^2 - m_\phi^2 \phi^2 \right). \quad (2.6)$$

Since we want to define a perturbative regime where we can apply the renormalization-group analogy mentioned above, we introduce the following slow-roll parameters ¹

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{\hat{\kappa}\dot{\chi}}{2H}, \quad \lambda \equiv \frac{\hat{\kappa}\dot{\phi}}{2H} \quad (2.7)$$

and express every other quantity as a perturbative series in α and λ , possibly up to an overall nonpolynomial function. For this purpose it is convenient to introduce also the following quantities

$$v \equiv -\frac{1}{aH\tau}, \quad \beta_\alpha \equiv \frac{d\alpha}{d \ln |\tau|}, \quad \beta_\lambda \equiv \frac{d\lambda}{d \ln |\tau|}, \quad (2.8)$$

where τ is the conformal time

$$\tau = -\int_t^\infty \frac{dt'}{a(t')}. \quad (2.9)$$

In terms of these quantities the background-field equations of motion (EoM) read

$$\frac{\hat{\kappa}^2}{4} (m_\chi^2 \chi^2 + m_\phi^2 \phi^2) = H^2 (1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2), \quad \dot{H} = -3H^2(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) \quad (2.10)$$

$$-v\beta_\alpha = -3\alpha(1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2) - \frac{\hat{\kappa}m_\chi^2\chi}{2H^2}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$-v\beta_\lambda = -3\lambda(1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2) - \frac{\hat{\kappa}m_\phi^2\phi}{2H^2}. \quad (2.12)$$

For future use, we also define

$$\varrho \equiv \frac{m_\chi^2}{m_\phi^2}, \quad \zeta \equiv \varrho + \frac{1}{\varrho}. \quad (2.13)$$

Hereafter we assume $\alpha, \lambda > 0$ and we consider slow-roll inflation defined by the condition $\alpha, \lambda \ll 1$. Our first task is to solve background equations of motion (2.10)-(2.12) in terms of power series in α and λ .

We start by assuming a general expansion for the beta functions

$$\beta_\alpha(\alpha, \lambda) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \alpha^m b_{nm}, \quad \beta_\lambda(\alpha, \lambda) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \alpha^m c_{nm}, \quad (2.14)$$

where b_{nm} and c_{nm} are numerical coefficients to be determined. From the results of [22] we know that in single-field inflation case with a monomial potential the beta function is of order 3. Here that case is recovered by setting either α or λ to zero. Therefore, we require

$$\beta_\alpha(\alpha, 0) = \mathcal{O}(\alpha^3), \quad \beta_\lambda(0, \lambda) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3), \quad (2.15)$$

¹In the single inflaton (ϕ) scenario, λ would be related to the standard inflation parameter $\varepsilon \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2$ by $\varepsilon = 3\lambda^2$.

which leads to

$$b_{00} = b_{01} = b_{02} = c_{00} = c_{10} = c_{20} = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Since, every background quantity depends on time exclusively through $\alpha(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$, it is useful to express the time derivative in terms of partial derivatives with respect to α and λ as follows

$$\frac{d}{dt} = -Hv \left(\beta_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \right). \quad (2.17)$$

The first equation we need is obtained by applying one time derivative to the definition of v in (2.8). This gives

$$\beta_\alpha \frac{\partial v}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial v}{\partial \lambda} = 1 - 3(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) - v, \quad (2.18)$$

which can be solved by assuming that v is a power series

$$v(\alpha, \lambda) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \alpha^m v_{nm}, \quad (2.19)$$

where v_{nm} are coefficients. Then from the definitions of α and λ we obtain

$$\beta_\alpha \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \lambda} = -\frac{2\alpha}{v\hat{\kappa}}, \quad \beta_\alpha \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \lambda} = -\frac{2\lambda}{v\hat{\kappa}}, \quad (2.20)$$

while from the second equation in (2.10) we get

$$\beta_\alpha \frac{\partial H}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda} = 3(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) \frac{H}{v}. \quad (2.21)$$

It turns out that the last three equations cannot be solved by assuming a power series for χ , ϕ and H . Instead, we have to adopt the following ansatz

$$\chi(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \right)^n \alpha^m \chi_{nm}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$\phi(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{n,m=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \right)^n \alpha^{m-1} \phi_{nm}, \quad (2.23)$$

$$H(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \right)^n \alpha^m h_{nm}, \quad (2.24)$$

where χ_{nm} , ϕ_{nm} and h_{nm} are coefficients.

We shall note that all formulas must be invariant under the exchanges

$$\alpha \leftrightarrow \lambda, \quad m_\chi \leftrightarrow m_\phi, \quad (2.25)$$

since the role of the two fields can be switched without affecting the results. However, the expansions (2.22)–(2.24) seem to violate such property. This apparent asymmetry between α and λ is due to the fact that we choose to expand first in λ and then in α , which implicitly assumes that $\lambda < \alpha$. In order to recover the symmetry (2.25) we should resum the powers of λ/α . After solving the equations (2.21) and (2.20) for the coefficients χ_{nm} , ϕ_{nm} and h_{nm} , we find that indeed the powers of λ/α can be resummed into geometric series and the expansions have the form

$$\chi(\alpha, \lambda) = -\frac{2}{3\hat{\kappa}f_\chi}\tilde{\chi}(\alpha, \lambda), \quad \phi(\alpha, \lambda) = -\frac{2}{3\hat{\kappa}f_\phi}\tilde{\phi}(\alpha, \lambda), \quad H(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{m_\chi}{3f_H}\tilde{H}(\alpha, \lambda), \quad (2.26)$$

where

$$f_\chi \equiv \frac{f_H^2}{\alpha}, \quad f_\phi \equiv \frac{f_H^2}{\varrho\lambda}, \quad f_H \equiv \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho\lambda^2}, \quad (2.27)$$

and $\tilde{\chi}$, $\tilde{\phi}$ and \tilde{H} are power series that do not depend on the order in which we expand. It is important to highlight that recovering the symmetry (2.25) allows us to treat the model in a true multi-field regime, where there is no distinction between roles of χ and ϕ .

All together we find

$$v(\alpha, \lambda) = 1 - 3(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) - 18[\alpha^4 + \lambda^4 + (4 - \zeta)\alpha^2\lambda^2] + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (2.28)$$

$$\tilde{\chi}(\alpha, \lambda) = 1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2\varrho + \alpha^2\lambda^2\left(3 - \frac{1}{\varrho}\right) + \alpha^4 + \lambda^4(3\varrho - \varrho^2 - 1) + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (2.29)$$

$$\tilde{\phi}(\alpha, \lambda) = 1 - \lambda^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{\varrho} + \alpha^2\lambda^2(3 - \varrho) + \lambda^4 + \alpha^4\left(\frac{3}{\varrho} - \frac{1}{\varrho^2} - 1\right) + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (2.30)$$

$$\tilde{H}(\alpha, \lambda) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) + \frac{7}{8}(\alpha^4 + \lambda^4) + \frac{1}{4}\alpha^2\lambda^2(19 - 6\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (2.31)$$

$$\beta_\alpha(\alpha, \lambda) = -3\alpha^3 + 3\alpha\lambda^2(\varrho - 2) + 3\alpha^3\lambda^2\left(\varrho - 3 - \frac{2}{\varrho}\right) + 3\alpha\lambda^4(\varrho + \varrho^2 - 4) - 6\alpha^5 + \mathcal{O}(7), \quad (2.32)$$

$$\beta_\lambda(\alpha, \lambda) = -3\lambda^3 + 3\lambda\alpha^2\left(\frac{1}{\varrho} - 2\right) + 3\lambda^3\alpha^2\left(\frac{1}{\varrho} - 3 - 2\varrho\right) + 3\lambda\alpha^4\left(\frac{1}{\varrho} + \frac{1}{\varrho^2} - 4\right) - 6\lambda^5 + \mathcal{O}(7). \quad (2.33)$$

We have used the notation $\mathcal{O}(N) \equiv \mathcal{O}(\alpha^n \lambda^m)$ with $n + m = N$ to label the higher orders in α and λ . Note that if we perform the substitutions (2.25) the quantities v and H are invariant, while

$$\chi \leftrightarrow \phi, \quad \beta_\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta_\lambda \quad (2.34)$$

as it should be. This fact can be used throughout the paper as a consistency check.

It is interesting to compare the two-field case with the single-field inflation where the following parameters are usually adopted²

$$\varepsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = 3(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2), \quad \eta_H \equiv \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}}{H\varepsilon} = -2v \frac{\alpha\beta_\alpha + \lambda\beta_\lambda}{\alpha^2 + \lambda^2}, \quad w \equiv \frac{p}{\rho} = -1 + 2(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2). \quad (2.35)$$

For $\alpha, \lambda \ll 1$, ε and $w + 1$ are small, as expected, regardless if one considers one or two inflatons. However, the case of η_H is different. Indeed, we find

$$\eta_H = \frac{6}{\alpha^2 + \lambda^2} [(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2)^2 + \alpha^2 \lambda^2 (2 - \zeta) + \mathcal{O}(6)] = \frac{2}{\varepsilon} [\varepsilon^2 + 9\alpha^2 \lambda^2 (2 - \zeta) + \mathcal{O}(6)], \quad (2.36)$$

which, for $\zeta \gg 1$, could be large, in contrast with the single-field case where $\eta_H = 2\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$, so it is guaranteed to be small for near-de-Sitter geometry³.

For completeness, we also define the following parameters

$$\delta_\chi \equiv -\frac{\ddot{\chi}}{H\dot{\chi}} = 3\alpha^2 + 3\lambda^2 + v \frac{\beta_\alpha}{\alpha}, \quad \delta_\phi \equiv -\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{H\dot{\phi}} = 3\alpha^2 + 3\lambda^2 + v \frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda}, \quad (2.37)$$

which are related to ε and η_H by

$$6(\alpha^2 \delta_\chi + \lambda^2 \delta_\phi) = \varepsilon(2\varepsilon - \eta_H). \quad (2.38)$$

Again, in the single-field case, e.g. $\lambda = 0$, the usual relation is recovered

$$\eta_H = 2(\varepsilon - \delta_\chi). \quad (2.39)$$

Finally, we mention that α and λ are convenient and small inflation parameters when the background quantities are considered. However, it turns out that for power spectra and spectral indices it is better to use the following variables

$$x \equiv \frac{\alpha^2}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda^2}}, \quad y \equiv \frac{\varrho \lambda^2}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda^2}}. \quad (2.40)$$

²The parameter η_H is usually [24] denoted as η . We introduce the subscript H to avoid confusion with the rescaled conformal time defined in the next section.

³It is also worth seeing that $(2 - \zeta) = -(\varrho - 1)^2/\varrho$, so that this term vanishes for the $O(2)$ -invariant limit, i.e. $\varrho = 1$. The same happens in higher orders, since $\varrho = 1$ is equivalent to single-field inflation.

In fact, using (2.40) those quantities can be written as power series up to overall factors, while it is not possible using α and λ (see section 4). Nevertheless, we choose to use α and λ until the very end, since it is easier to relate them to the standard parameters.

3 Running of slow-roll parameters

The slow-roll parameters α and λ satisfy the equations (2.11) and (2.12), which formally resemble those of running coupling constants in quantum field theory. In fact, in the previous section we have shown that the right-hand sides of (2.11) and (2.12) are power series in α and λ , and using the definition of beta function (2.8) they can be written as

$$\frac{d\alpha(\ell)}{d\ell} = -3\alpha [\alpha^2 + (2 - \varrho)\lambda^2] + \mathcal{O}(5), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\frac{d\lambda(\ell)}{d\ell} = -3\lambda \left[\lambda^2 + \left(2 - \frac{1}{\varrho} \right) \alpha^2 \right] + \mathcal{O}(5), \quad (3.2)$$

where we have introduced the rescaled conformal time η and its logarithm

$$\eta \equiv -k\tau, \quad \ell \equiv \ln \eta. \quad (3.3)$$

Here k is a parameter of mass-dimension 1 which, in our analogy, plays the role of the renormalization scale and is later identified with the modulus of space momentum of cosmological perturbations.

We choose the initial conditions at $\ell = 0$, which means $\tau = -1/k$, and label them as $\alpha(0) = \alpha_k$ and $\lambda(0) = \lambda_k$. This introduces an implicit dependence on k , which was not present in the first place, since the equations (3.1) and (3.2) are k -independent and so do their solutions. Such independence can be expressed as

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d \ln k} = 0, \quad \frac{d\lambda}{d \ln k} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Again, this is in analogy with quantum field theory, where the coupling constants do not depend on the renormalization scale. From equations (3.4), we can obtain the derivatives of α_k and λ_k with respect to $\ln k$, which will be used in the next sections to derive the spectral indices. In fact, we can write

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d \ln k} = \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \alpha_k} \frac{d\alpha_k}{d \ln k} + \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_k} \frac{d\lambda_k}{d \ln k} + \beta_\alpha(\alpha, \lambda) = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\frac{d\lambda}{d \ln k} = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \alpha_k} \frac{d\alpha_k}{d \ln k} + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \lambda_k} \frac{d\lambda_k}{d \ln k} + \beta_\lambda(\alpha, \lambda) = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

where in the last term of both equations we have used the fact that $\partial \ln \eta = \partial \ln |\tau|$. These equations hold for any ℓ . In particular, we can set $\ell = 0$ and since α_k and λ_k do not depend on ℓ we get

$$\frac{d\alpha_k}{d \ln k} = -\beta_\alpha(\alpha_k, \lambda_k), \quad \frac{d\lambda_k}{d \ln k} = -\beta_\lambda(\alpha_k, \lambda_k). \quad (3.7)$$

Finally, the solutions of (3.1), (3.2) can be obtained perturbatively in α_k and λ_k . We find

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\ell) = & \alpha_k - 3\ell\alpha_k^3 + 3\ell(\varrho - 2)\alpha_k\lambda_k^2 - \frac{3\ell}{\varrho} [2 + 3\varrho - \varrho^2 + 3\ell(2 - 9\varrho + 4\varrho^2)] \alpha_k^3\lambda_k^2 \\ & + \frac{3}{2}\ell [3\ell(8 - 6\varrho + \varrho^2) + 2(-4 + \varrho + \varrho^2)] \alpha_k\lambda_k^4 + \frac{3}{2}\ell(9\ell - 4)\alpha_k^5 + \mathcal{O}(6), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\ell) = & \lambda_k - 3\ell\lambda_k^3 + \frac{3\ell}{\varrho}(1 - 2\varrho)\alpha_k^2\lambda_k - \frac{3\ell}{\varrho} [3\varrho - 1 + 2\varrho^2 + 3\ell(4 - 9\varrho + 2\varrho^2)] \alpha_k^2\lambda_k^3 \\ & + \frac{3\ell}{2\varrho^2} [2 + 2\varrho - 8\varrho^2 + 3\ell(1 - 6\varrho + 8\varrho^2)] \alpha_k^4\lambda_k + \frac{3}{2}\ell(9\ell - 4)\lambda_k^5 + \mathcal{O}(6). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

These functions are useful to express quantities that are conserved in the superhorizon limit, where the dependence on ℓ drops and all the dependence on k is encoded in α_k and λ_k , as shown at the end of the next section.

The equations (3.1) and (3.2) can also be solved exactly at each order of the beta functions. This is equivalent to resummation of the leading logs by powers of $\alpha_k^2\ell$, $\lambda_k^2\ell$ and $\alpha_k\lambda_k\ell$, pretty much like in quantum field theory, where the leading logs are resummed into the running coupling constants. However, for a general value of ϱ it is not easy to find analytical solutions. Nevertheless, it is worth to notice that a change of variables can help, at least for the purpose of computing the number of e-folds before the end of inflation. First, notice that if we use the variables

$$\xi \equiv x + y = \frac{\alpha^2 + \varrho\lambda^2}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho^2\lambda^2}}, \quad \omega \equiv \frac{x + \varrho y}{\sqrt{\varrho}} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho^2\lambda^2}}{\sqrt{\varrho}}, \quad (3.10)$$

at the leading order the beta function of ξ does not depend on ω and we find

$$\frac{d\xi(\ell)}{d\ell} = -3\xi^3 + \mathcal{O}(5) \quad (3.11)$$

$$\frac{d\omega(\ell)}{d\ell} = 6\omega^3 + 3\omega\xi^2 - \frac{6(\varrho + 1)}{\sqrt{\varrho}}\omega^2\xi + \mathcal{O}(5). \quad (3.12)$$

At this order, the first equation can be solved analytically and with the initial condition $\xi(0) = \xi_k$ gives

$$\xi(\ell) = \frac{\xi_k}{\sqrt{1 + 6\xi_k^2\ell}}, \quad (3.13)$$

which is the same as for a single-field inflation with a cubic beta function [22]. Then we define the variable $z \equiv \omega/\xi$ and take the ratio of (3.12) and (3.11) obtaining

$$\xi \frac{dz(\xi)}{d\xi} = -2z + \frac{2(\varrho + 1)}{\sqrt{\varrho}} z^2 - 2z^3. \quad (3.14)$$

In principle, knowing $z(\xi)$ and $\xi(\ell)$ can lead to $\omega(\ell)$. We can find a constant of motion from (3.14) by means of the separation of variables

$$\ln \xi^2 + \frac{1}{\varrho - 1} \ln \left| \frac{z - \sqrt{\varrho}}{\sqrt{\varrho}z - 1} \right| - \ln \left| \frac{\sqrt{\varrho}z - 1}{z} \right| = \text{const}. \quad (3.15)$$

Again, depending on ϱ an analytical solution for $z(\xi)$ might not exist. However, using the variables (3.10) is enough to estimate the number of e-folds

$$N(k) = \int_{t_k}^{t_f} dt H(t), \quad (3.16)$$

where t_k is the time when the modes with momentum k exited the horizon and t_f is the time when inflation ended. Recalling that $\dot{\xi} = -vH \frac{d\xi}{d\ell}$, at the leading order we have

$$N(k) = \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_f} \frac{d\xi'}{\xi'} H \simeq \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_f} \frac{d\xi'}{3\xi'^3} = \frac{1}{6\xi_k^2} + \mathcal{O}(0), \quad (3.17)$$

where $\xi_k = \xi(t_k)$ and $\xi_f = \xi(t_f)$. In terms of α_k and λ_k (3.17) gives

$$N(k) \simeq \frac{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2}{6(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2)^2}. \quad (3.18)$$

In section 4 we discuss the relation between $N(k)$ and the tensor-to-scalar ratio.

4 Perturbations

In this section we study the perturbations of the metric and the scalar fields, derive their linearized equations of motion and obtain the power spectra from their solutions. The general strategy for these derivations works as follows. First, we parametrize the metric as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -a^2, -a^2, -a^2) - 2a^2 (u\delta_\mu^1\delta_\nu^1 - u\delta_\mu^2\delta_\nu^2 + \tilde{u}\delta_\mu^1\delta_\nu^2 + \tilde{u}\delta_\mu^2\delta_\nu^1) \\ + 2\text{diag}(\Phi, a^2\Psi, a^2\Psi, a^2\Psi) - a\delta_\mu^0\delta_\nu^i\partial_i B - a\delta_\mu^i\delta_\nu^0\partial_i B, \quad (4.1)$$

and the scalar fields as

$$\chi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\chi}(t) + \delta\chi(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad \phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\phi}(t) + \delta\phi(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (4.2)$$

where $\Psi, \Phi, B, u, \tilde{u}, \delta\chi, \delta\phi$ are perturbations while $\bar{\chi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ denotes the background fields.

We work in the spatially-flat gauge, i.e. $\Psi = 0$ and neglect vector perturbations, since they do not contribute in the superhorizon limit.

Then we perform the spatial Fourier transform, which for a generic perturbation $u(t, \mathbf{x})$ is written as $u_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$. To simplify the notation, we drop the subscript and for quadratic terms it is understood that u^2 means $u_{\mathbf{k}}u_{-\mathbf{k}}$, the same with \dot{u}^2 , and the modulus of the space momentum is labeled as $k \equiv |\mathbf{k}|$. Moreover, in what follows we use the word ‘‘action’’ for the integral over time of the lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_u of a perturbation u , and label it as S_u . This means that the full quadratic action is

$$S = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} S_u, \quad S_u = \int dt \mathcal{L}_u. \quad (4.3)$$

Finally, we apply a change of variables $u \rightarrow w$ such that the quadratic action in the rescaled conformal time η reads

$$S_w = \frac{1}{2} \int d\eta \left(w'^2 - w^2 + \frac{2 + \sigma}{\eta^2} w^2 \right), \quad (4.4)$$

where $w' = \frac{dw}{d\eta}$ and σ is a series in α and λ that depends on the type of perturbation. This is also known as the Mukhanov-Sasaki action.

From (4.4) we get the corresponding equation of motion

$$w'' + w - \frac{2 + \sigma}{\eta^2} w = 0, \quad (4.5)$$

which can be solved perturbatively by expanding its solution $w(\eta)$ in powers of α_k and λ_k

$$w(\eta) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} w_{nm}(\eta) \alpha_k^n \lambda_k^m, \quad (4.6)$$

where $w_{nm}(\eta)$ are functions to be determined.

In the following we are going to discuss solutions of (4.5) in the superhorizon limit, i.e. for $k/(aH) \rightarrow 0$. It is useful to rewrite the limit in terms of η adopting the definition of v from (2.8):

$$\frac{k}{aH} = \eta v = \eta [1 + \mathcal{O}(2)]. \quad (4.7)$$

Then it is clear that the superhorizon limit $k/(aH) \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Analogously, the opposite limit $k/(aH) \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, which is where we fix the Bunch-Davies boundary condition

$$w(\eta) \rightarrow \frac{e^{i\eta}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.8)$$

since $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ is the infinite past. In terms of w_{nm} the condition (4.8) reads

$$w_{00}(\eta) \rightarrow \frac{e^{i\eta}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad w_{nm}(\eta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.9)$$

for every other combination of n and m . Given n and m the equation for w_{nm} takes the form

$$w_{nm}'' + w_{nm} - \frac{2}{\eta^2} w_{nm} = \frac{f_{nm}(\eta)}{\eta^2}, \quad (4.10)$$

where $f_{nm}(\eta)$ are functions determined once the w_{nm} of the previous orders are derived. Then the solution can be written as [21]

$$w_{nm}(\eta) = \int_{\eta}^{\infty} d\eta' \frac{f_{nm}(\eta')}{\eta\eta'^3} [(\eta - \eta') \cos(\eta - \eta') - (1 + \eta\eta') \sin(\eta - \eta')]. \quad (4.11)$$

In general, tensor and scalar perturbations require separated discussions. However, we report here a set of functions that are useful to write the solutions of (4.10) in a more compact form. Following the notation of [22] we define

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= \frac{i(1 - i\eta)}{\eta\sqrt{2}} e^{i\eta}, & W_2 &= 3 [\text{Ei}(2i\eta) - i\pi] W_0^* + \frac{6W_0}{(1 - i\eta)}, \\ W_3 &= [6(\ln \eta + \tilde{\gamma}_M)^2 + 24i\eta F_{2,2,2}^{1,1,1}(2i\eta) + \pi^2] W_0^* + \frac{24W_0}{(1 - i\eta)} - 4(\ln \eta + 1)W_2, \\ W_4 &= -\frac{16W_0}{1 + \eta^2} + \frac{2(13 + i\eta)W_2}{9(1 + i\eta)} + \frac{W_3}{3} + 4G_{2,3}^{3,1}(-2i\eta |_{0,0,0}^{0,1}) W_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_M = \gamma_M - \frac{i\pi}{2} = \gamma_E + \ln 2 - \frac{i\pi}{2}$, γ_E being the Euler-Mascheroni constant, while Ei denotes the exponential-integral function, $F_{b_1, \dots, b_q}^{a_1, \dots, a_p}(z)$ is the generalized hypergeometric function ${}_pF_q(\{a_1, \dots, a_p\}, \{b_1, \dots, b_q\}; z)$ and $G_{p,q}^{m,n}$ is the Meijer G function.

Before we proceed it is useful to highlight some properties of the equation (4.5) and its solution. In [21], it was proved that the solution $w(\eta)$ can be decomposed as

$$\eta w = Q(\ln \eta) + Y(\eta), \quad (4.13)$$

where Q is a power series in $\ln \eta$ while Y is a power series in η and $\ln \eta$ such that $Y \rightarrow 0$ term by term for $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Since we are interested in the correlation functions in the superhorizon limit, the quantity Q is the most relevant one. It is possible to find an equation for Q by inserting the decomposition (4.13) in the equation (4.5), which gives

$$\frac{d^2 Q}{d \ln \eta^2} - 3 \frac{dQ}{d \ln \eta} - \sigma Q = \eta^2 \frac{d^2 Y}{d \eta^2} - 2\eta \frac{dY}{d \eta} - \sigma Y - \eta^2 (Y + Q). \quad (4.14)$$

The right-hand side of the equation above goes to zero for $\eta \rightarrow 0$, then both sides are zero independently, and for Q we get

$$\left(\frac{d}{d \ln \eta} - 3\right) \frac{dQ}{d \ln \eta} = \sigma Q. \quad (4.15)$$

Furthermore, we can perturbatively invert the operator in the parenthesis to get rid of solutions that goes to zero for $\eta \rightarrow 0$, which by definition do not belong to Q , i.e.

$$\frac{dQ}{d \ln \eta} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{d}{d \ln \eta}} (\sigma Q), \quad (4.16)$$

where the operator on the right-hand side must be understood as the perturbative series

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{d}{d \ln \eta}} F(\ln \eta) = F(\ln \eta) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^n} \frac{d^n F(\ln \eta)}{d \ln^n \eta}, \quad (4.17)$$

F being any function of $\ln \eta$.

Finally, if we fix a reference scale k , we can view $Q(\ln \eta)$ as a function $\tilde{Q}(\alpha, \lambda, \alpha_k, \lambda_k)$ and write

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \eta} = \beta_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \equiv D. \quad (4.18)$$

Then \tilde{Q} satisfies

$$D\tilde{Q} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3} D} (\sigma \tilde{Q}). \quad (4.19)$$

The solution of(4.19) can be parametrized as

$$\tilde{Q}(\alpha, \lambda, \alpha_k, \lambda_k) = \tilde{Q}_0(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{J(\alpha, \lambda)}{J(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}, \quad (4.20)$$

where $\tilde{Q}_0(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \equiv Q(0)$, and J satisfies (4.19). The advantage of introducing J is that it allows us to find perturbations that are conserved in the superhorizon limit without spoiling their gauge invariance. In fact, we can define the perturbation

$$w^C(\eta) \equiv \frac{C}{k^{3/2}} \frac{\eta w(\eta)}{J(\alpha, \lambda)} = \frac{C}{k^{3/2}} \left[\frac{\tilde{Q}_0(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}{J(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)} + \frac{Y(\eta)}{J(\alpha, \lambda)} \right], \quad (4.21)$$

where the factor $k^{3/2}$ is introduced for dimensional reasons and C is an arbitrary dimensionless constant. It is easy to see that the perturbation (4.21) is conserved in the superhorizon limit by construction. Indeed,

$$w^C(\eta) \simeq \frac{C}{k^{3/2}} \frac{\tilde{Q}_0(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}{J(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}, \quad \text{for } \eta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.22)$$

Finally, since J is a function of background quantities only, if ηw is gauge invariant, also w^C is gauge invariant.

Here we have shown the derivation of the equation (4.19) for a single perturbation $w(\eta)$. However, since in this paper we consider a double-field model, a similar equation can be derived for scalar perturbations, where w would be a 2-component vector while σ a 2×2 matrix.

In the following two subsections we adopt the strategy described here for tensor and scalar perturbations.

4.1 Tensor perturbations

Tensor perturbations are parametrized by u and \tilde{u} , which are gauge invariant. The quadratic action for \tilde{u} is identical to that of u , so we derive only the latter and account for \tilde{u} at the end. To the quadratic order in u , the action is

$$S_u = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \int dt a^3 \left(\dot{u}^2 - \frac{k^2}{a^2} u^2 \right). \quad (4.23)$$

To obtain the action in the Mukhanov-Sasaki form (4.4), first we perform the change of variables

$$u = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{2ka}} w_t, \quad (4.24)$$

then switch to the rescaled conformal time η . Finally, using the definitions (2.8) we find

$$S_{w_t} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\eta \left(w_t'^2 - w_t^2 - \frac{2 + \sigma_t}{\eta^2} w_t^2 \right), \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$\sigma_t = \frac{2(1 - v^2) - 3(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2)}{v^2}, \quad (4.26)$$

and using (2.28) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t = & 9(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) + 108 \left[\alpha^4 + \lambda^4 + \frac{2}{3} \alpha^2 \lambda^2 \left(5 - \frac{1}{\varrho} - \varrho \right) \right] + 1683(\alpha^6 + \lambda^6) \\ & + 9\alpha^4 \lambda^2 \left(1217 + \frac{40}{\varrho^2} - \frac{388}{\varrho} - 308\varrho \right) + 9\alpha^2 \lambda^4 \left(1217 - \frac{308}{\varrho} - 388\varrho + 40\varrho^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(8). \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Writing

$$w_t = \sum_{n,m} w_{nm}^{(t)} \alpha_k^n \lambda_k^m \quad (4.28)$$

and solving the equation (4.10) for each $w_{nm}^{(t)}$, up to order 4 we obtain

$$w_{00}^{(t)} = W_0, \quad w_{02}^{(t)} = w_{20}^{(t)} = W_2, \quad (4.29)$$

$$w_{01}^{(t)} = w_{10}^{(t)} = w_{11}^{(t)} = w_{21}^{(t)} = w_{12}^{(t)} = w_{03}^{(t)} = w_{30}^{(t)} = 0, \quad (4.30)$$

$$w_{22}^{(t)} = 5W_2 - \frac{3}{2\varrho}(1 - 3\varrho + \varrho^2)W_3 + \frac{9}{2}W_4 \quad w_{40}^{(t)} = w_{04}^{(t)} = \frac{5}{3}W_2 + \frac{3}{4}W_3 + \frac{9}{4}W_4. \quad (4.31)$$

As explained in the previous subsection, we use the decomposition (4.13) for w_t

$$\eta w_t = Q_t(\ln \eta) + Y_t(\eta). \quad (4.32)$$

Then \tilde{Q}_t satisfies

$$D\tilde{Q}_t = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3}D} \left(\sigma_t \tilde{Q}_t \right) \quad (4.33)$$

and following (4.20) we parametrize \tilde{Q}_t as

$$\tilde{Q}_t(\alpha, \lambda, \alpha_k, \lambda_k) = \tilde{Q}_{0t}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{J_t(\alpha, \lambda)}{J_t(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}, \quad (4.34)$$

where $\tilde{Q}_{0t}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \equiv Q_t(0)$. Then the conserved perturbation is

$$w_t^C(\eta) \equiv \frac{C_t}{k^{3/2}} \frac{\eta w_t(\eta)}{J_t(\alpha, \lambda)}, \quad C_t = \frac{m_\chi \hat{k}}{2\sqrt{3}}, \quad (4.35)$$

where the constant C_t is chosen so that

$$w^C(\eta) = u(t(\eta)). \quad (4.36)$$

In fact, in the case of tensor perturbations there is only one independent gauge-invariant perturbation u , which is also conserved in the superhorizon limit. Therefore, the perturbation w^C that we just build must coincide with u , up to an arbitrary constant. To prove this we compare (4.24) with (4.35) and show that

$$\frac{m_\chi}{3HvJ_t} = \text{constant}. \quad (4.37)$$

Using (2.18) and (2.21) it is easy to see that $\frac{m_\chi}{3Hv}$ satisfies (4.15), hence the relation (4.37). Setting the arbitrary constant to one we get

$$J_t(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{m_\chi}{3Hv} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho\lambda^2}}{\tilde{H}v}. \quad (4.38)$$

Therefore, the function J_t can be obtained either by solving (4.33), or by means of (4.38). Finally, \tilde{Q}_{0t} is derived by comparing (4.20) with (4.28) at $\ln \eta = 0$ order by order. The results are

$$\frac{J_t(\alpha, \lambda)}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho\lambda^2}} = 1 + \frac{7}{2}(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) + \frac{223}{8}(\alpha^4 + \lambda^4) + \frac{\alpha^2\lambda^2}{4}(355 - 66\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (4.39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{0t}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) = & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \left[1 - 3(\alpha_k^2 + \lambda_k^2)(\tilde{\gamma}_M - 2) + \frac{3(\alpha_k^4 + \lambda_k^4)}{4}(24 + \pi^2 - 6\tilde{\gamma}_M(2 + \tilde{\gamma}_M)) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{3\alpha_k^2\lambda_k^2}{2}(6(4 + 2\tilde{\gamma}_M - 3\tilde{\gamma}_M^2) - \pi^2 - \zeta(6(2 - \tilde{\gamma}_M)\tilde{\gamma}_M - \pi^2)) \right] + \mathcal{O}(6). \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

The two-point function is derived as usual by canonically quantizing w_t^C . We introduce the operator

$$\hat{w}_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{k}}^C(\eta) = w_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{k}}^C(\eta)\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{k}}^{C*}(\eta)\hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \quad (4.41)$$

where $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ and $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$ are creation and annihilation operators which satisfy

$$[\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger] = (2\pi)^3\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'). \quad (4.42)$$

Then the power spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{w_t^C}$ of the perturbations w_t^C is defined by the two-point function

$$\langle \hat{w}_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{k}}^C(\eta)\hat{w}_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{k}'}^C(\eta) \rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')\frac{2\pi^2}{k^3}\mathcal{P}_{w_t^C}, \quad (4.43)$$

which gives the tensor power spectrum

$$\mathcal{P}_t \equiv 16\mathcal{P}_{w_t^C} = 16\frac{k^3}{2\pi^2}|w_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{k}}^C|^2, \quad (4.44)$$

where the factor 16 comes from the summation over tensor polarizations. In the super-horizon limit, we obtain for the tensor power spectrum

$$\mathcal{P}_t \simeq 16\frac{|C_t|^2}{2\pi^2}\left|\frac{\tilde{Q}_{0t}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}{J_t(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}\right|^2. \quad (4.45)$$

The result to the next-to-next-to-leading order is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_t = & \frac{2m_\chi^2\kappa^2}{9\pi^2(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho\lambda_k^2)} \left\{ 1 + (\alpha_k^2 + \lambda_k^2)(5 - 6\gamma_M) - (\alpha_k^4 + \lambda_k^4)(31 + 12\gamma_M - 6\pi^2) \right. \\ & \left. - \alpha_k^2\lambda_k^2 \left[128 - 15\pi^2 - 12\gamma_M(4 - 3\gamma_M) - \frac{3}{2}\zeta(22 - \pi^2 - 12(2 - \gamma_M)\gamma_M) \right] + \mathcal{O}(6) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

Finally, we derive the spectral index, which is defined as

$$n_t \equiv \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_t}{d \ln k} = \frac{d\alpha_k}{d \ln k} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_t}{\partial \alpha_k} + \frac{d\lambda_k}{d \ln k} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_t}{\partial \lambda_k}. \quad (4.47)$$

Then using the equations (3.7) we get

$$n_t = -\beta_\alpha(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_t}{\partial \alpha_k} - \beta_\lambda(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_t}{\partial \lambda_k}. \quad (4.48)$$

To the NNL order this gives

$$n_t = -6(\alpha_k^2 + \lambda_k^2) + 18(1 - 2\gamma_M)(\alpha_k^4 + \lambda_k^4) + 36\alpha_k^2\lambda_k^2 [3 - 4\gamma_M - \zeta(1 - \gamma_M)] + \mathcal{O}(6). \quad (4.49)$$

This method is crucial in the case of scalar perturbations, where the usual adiabatic and isocurvature perturbations are not conserved and it is not trivial to find combinations that are both gauge-invariant and conserved in the superhorizon limit .

4.2 Scalar perturbations

In the spatially-flat gauge, the relevant fields for the study of scalar perturbations are Φ , B , $\delta\chi$ and $\delta\phi$. The first two are auxiliary fields and after integrating them out the quadratic action is

$$S_{\delta\chi\delta\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \int dt a^3 \left[\dot{\delta\chi}^2 - \Omega_\chi \delta\chi^2 + \dot{\delta\phi}^2 - \Omega_\phi \delta\phi^2 + 2\Omega_{\chi\phi} \delta\chi \delta\phi \right], \quad (4.50)$$

where

$$\Omega_\chi \equiv m_\chi^2 + \frac{k^2}{a^2} + 6H^2 [2v\alpha\beta_\alpha - 3\alpha^2 (1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)], \quad (4.51)$$

$$\Omega_\phi \equiv m_\phi^2 + \frac{k^2}{a^2} + 6H^2 [2v\lambda\beta_\lambda - 3\lambda^2 (1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)], \quad (4.52)$$

$$\Omega_{\chi\phi} \equiv 6H^2 [v(\alpha\beta_\lambda + \lambda\beta_\alpha) - 3\alpha\lambda (1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)]. \quad (4.53)$$

Then, we perform the change of variables

$$\delta\chi = \frac{U}{a\sqrt{k}}, \quad \delta\phi = \frac{V}{a\sqrt{k}} \quad (4.54)$$

and move to the rescaled conformal time η . In this way, we obtain the action in the Mukhanov-Sasaki form

$$S_{w_s} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\eta \left[w_s'^T w_s' - \left(1 - \frac{2}{\eta^2}\right) w_s^T w_s + \frac{1}{\eta^2} w_s^T \Sigma w_s \right], \quad w_s \equiv \begin{pmatrix} U \\ V \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.55)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_U & \sigma_{UV} \\ \sigma_{UV} & \sigma_V \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.56)$$

$$\sigma_U = \sigma_t - \frac{m_\chi^2}{H^2 v^2} - \frac{6\alpha}{v^2} [2\beta_\alpha v - 3\alpha(1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)], \quad (4.57)$$

$$\sigma_V = \sigma_t - \frac{m_\phi^2}{H^2 v^2} - \frac{6\lambda}{v^2} [2\beta_\lambda v - 3\lambda(1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)], \quad (4.58)$$

$$\sigma_{UV} = -\frac{6}{v^2} [v(\lambda\beta_\alpha + \alpha\beta_\lambda) - 3\alpha\lambda(1 - \alpha^2 - \lambda^2)]. \quad (4.59)$$

At the leading order the matrix Σ reads

$$\Sigma = 18 \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \rho)\lambda^2 & \alpha\lambda \\ \alpha\lambda & 2\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\right)\alpha^2 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(4). \quad (4.60)$$

Following the same approach of the previous subsection, we write

$$w_s = \sum_{n,m} w_{nm}^{(s)} \alpha_k^n \lambda_k^m \quad (4.61)$$

and solve the equations up to the order $\mathcal{O}(4)$ imposing the Bunch-Davies condition

$$w_s \rightarrow \frac{e^{i\eta}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.62)$$

We find

$$w_{00}^{(s)} = W_0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_{11}^{(s)} = 2W_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_{02}^{(s)} = W_2 \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 - \varrho \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_{20}^{(s)} = W_2 \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 - 1/\varrho \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.63)$$

$$w_{22}^{(s)} = W_2 \begin{pmatrix} 19\varrho - 17 \\ \frac{19}{\varrho} - 17 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{3}{2}W_3 \begin{pmatrix} 3 - \frac{1}{\varrho} - 2\varrho \\ 3 - \varrho - \frac{2}{\varrho} \end{pmatrix} + 9W_4 \begin{pmatrix} \varrho - 2 \\ \frac{1}{\varrho} - 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.64)$$

$$w_{40}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2}W_2 \begin{pmatrix} -3 \\ 5 + \frac{8}{\varrho} - \frac{3}{\varrho^2} \end{pmatrix} + \frac{3}{4}W_3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{\varrho^2 - 1}{\varrho^2} \end{pmatrix} + 9W_4 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{(\varrho - 1)^2}{4\varrho^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.65)$$

$$w_{04}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2}W_2 \begin{pmatrix} 5 + 8\rho - 3\rho^2 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{3}{4}W_3 \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \rho^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + 9W_4 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(\rho-1)^2}{4} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.66)$$

$$w_{01}^{(s)} = w_{10}^{(s)} = w_{21}^{(s)} = w_{12}^{(s)} = w_{30}^{(s)} = w_{03}^{(s)} = 0. \quad (4.67)$$

The field operators are defined as

$$\hat{w}_{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{k}} = w_{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{k}}\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{k}}^*\hat{a}_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \quad \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \hat{a}_{U\mathbf{k}} \\ \hat{a}_{V\mathbf{k}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.68)$$

with

$$\left[\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \right] = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \mathbf{1}, \quad \left[\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'} \right] = \left[\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger \right] = 0, \quad (4.69)$$

where $\hat{a}_{U\mathbf{k}}$ and $\hat{a}_{V\mathbf{k}}$ are the creation operators of U and V , respectively. At this point, there is an important difference between the tensor and scalar perturbations. While in the tensor case we have only one independent gauge-invariant variable u , in this case we have two independent ways of building gauge-invariant variables. Indeed, given a scalar quantity $\varphi = \bar{\varphi} + \delta\varphi$, where $\bar{\varphi}$ is the background and $\delta\varphi$ its perturbation, we can always build a gauge-invariant variable as

$$\mathcal{R}_\varphi = \Psi + H \frac{\delta\varphi}{\dot{\varphi}}. \quad (4.70)$$

Since in our model we have two independent scalars, then in the spatially-flat gauge, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\chi = H \frac{\delta\chi}{\dot{\chi}} = \frac{\hat{\kappa}Hv\eta U}{2k^{3/2}\alpha}, \quad \mathcal{R}_\phi = H \frac{\delta\phi}{\dot{\phi}} = \frac{\hat{\kappa}Hv\eta V}{2k^{3/2}\lambda}. \quad (4.71)$$

Moreover, any independent pair of linear combinations

$$A\mathcal{R}_\chi + B\mathcal{R}_\phi, \quad C\mathcal{R}_\chi + D\mathcal{R}_\phi, \quad (4.72)$$

where A , B , C and D are functions of background quantities, is also gauge invariant, and in general they are not conserved in the superhorizon limit. For example, the perturbations (4.71) in the superhorizon limit are

$$\mathcal{R}_\chi = \frac{i}{\alpha_k \sqrt{\alpha_k^2 + \rho\lambda_k^2}} \frac{\hat{\kappa}m_\chi}{k^{3/2}6\sqrt{2}} \left[1 + \alpha_k^2 \left(\frac{17}{2} - 6\tilde{\gamma}_M \right) + \lambda_k^2 \left(\frac{5}{2} + 3\tilde{\gamma}_M(\rho - 1) - 6\rho + 6\ell \right) - 6\alpha_k\lambda_k(\tilde{\gamma}_M - 2 + \ell) \right] + \mathcal{O}(4) \quad (4.73)$$

and analogous expression for \mathcal{R}_ϕ obtained from \mathcal{R}_χ by means of the exchanges $\alpha_k \leftrightarrow \lambda_k$ and $m_\chi \leftrightarrow m_\phi$. Both these perturbations are not conserved⁴ since they depend explicitly on ℓ .

Another example, typically used in the context of double-field inflation, is given by the so-called adiabatic and isocurvature perturbations, which are of the form (4.72) with

$$A = \frac{\dot{\chi}^2}{\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2}, \quad B = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2}, \quad C = -D = \frac{\dot{\chi}\dot{\phi}}{\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2}. \quad (4.74)$$

In the spatially-flat gauge they are

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{ad}} = H \frac{\dot{\chi}\delta\chi + \dot{\phi}\delta\phi}{\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\text{iso}} = H \frac{\dot{\phi}\delta\chi - \dot{\chi}\delta\phi}{\dot{\chi}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2}, \quad (4.75)$$

respectively. Also these perturbations are not conserved in the superhorizon limit. Therefore, we would like to find alternative combinations of the form (4.72) that are conserved.

In order to find such quantities, we proceed in analogy with the tensor perturbations and decompose w_s as

$$\eta w_s = Q_s(\ln \eta) + Y_s(\eta), \quad (4.76)$$

where now Q_s and Y_s are 2-component vectors. Then Q_s satisfies the analog of (4.19), which reads

$$DQ_s = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3}D} \Sigma Q_s. \quad (4.77)$$

We parametrize the solutions as

$$\tilde{Q}_s(\alpha, \lambda, \alpha_k, \lambda_k) = \mathcal{J}(\alpha, \lambda) \mathcal{J}^{-1}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \tilde{Q}_{0s}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k), \quad (4.78)$$

where \mathcal{J} is a 2×2 matrix and \tilde{Q}_{0s} is a constant vector. The matrix \mathcal{J} can be found by solving (4.77), while the vector \tilde{Q}_{0s} is determined by comparison with ηw_s . We obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(\alpha, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha Z J_1 - \frac{\sqrt{\varrho} \lambda^2 \alpha}{Z^3} J_2 \\ \lambda Z J_1 \quad \frac{\lambda \alpha^2}{\sqrt{\varrho} Z^3} J_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z \equiv \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \varrho \lambda^2}, \quad (4.79)$$

$$\tilde{Q}_{0s}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - 3(\tilde{\gamma}_M - 2) [2\alpha_k^2 + 2\alpha_k \lambda_k - (\varrho - 1)\lambda_k] \\ 1 - 3(\tilde{\gamma}_M - 2) \left[2\lambda_k^2 + 2\alpha_k \lambda_k - \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} - 1\right) \alpha_k \right] \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(4), \quad (4.80)$$

⁴Note that for $\lambda_k = 0$ (single field case) or $\lambda_k = \alpha_k$ and $\varrho = 1$ (two copies of the same field), \mathcal{R}_χ is conserved.

where

$$J_1 = \frac{J_t}{Z}, \quad J_2 = 1 + \mathcal{O}(2). \quad (4.81)$$

The inverse of \mathcal{J} is

$$\mathcal{J}^{-1}(\alpha, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{J_1 Z^3} & \frac{\rho \lambda}{J_1 Z^3} \\ \frac{-\sqrt{\rho} Z}{J_2 \alpha} & \frac{\sqrt{\rho} Z}{J_2 \lambda} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.82)$$

Then the perturbations that are conserved in the superhorizon limit read

$$\mathcal{R}^C = \frac{C_s}{k^{3/2}} \mathcal{J}^{-1}(\alpha, \lambda) \eta w_s, \quad C_s = \frac{C_t}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\varrho \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.83)$$

where the constant matrix C_s has been fixed so the first entry of \mathcal{R}^C reproduces \mathcal{R}_χ at $\phi = 0$ (and \mathcal{R}_ϕ at $\chi = 0$) and such that \mathcal{R}^C is explicitly invariant under (2.25). Defining the power-spectrum matrix elements \mathcal{P}_{ij} as

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathbf{k}i}^C \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathbf{k}'j}^C \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_{ij}, \quad (4.84)$$

in the superhorizon limit we find

$$\mathcal{P}_{11} = \frac{C_t^2}{6\pi^2} \left[(\mathcal{J}_{k,11}^{-1})^2 |\tilde{Q}_{0s,1}|^2 + (\mathcal{J}_{k,12}^{-1})^2 |\tilde{Q}_{0s,2}|^2 \right], \quad (4.85)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{22} = \frac{C_t^2}{6\pi^2 \varrho^2} \left[(\mathcal{J}_{k,21}^{-1})^2 |\tilde{Q}_{0s,1}|^2 + (\mathcal{J}_{k,22}^{-1})^2 |\tilde{Q}_{0s,2}|^2 \right], \quad (4.86)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{12} = \frac{C_t^2}{6\pi^2 \varrho} \left[\mathcal{J}_{k,11}^{-1} \mathcal{J}_{k,21}^{-1} |\tilde{Q}_{0s,1}|^2 + \mathcal{J}_{k,12}^{-1} \mathcal{J}_{k,22}^{-1} |\tilde{Q}_{0s,2}|^2 \right], \quad (4.87)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{k,ij}^{-1}$ are the matrix elements of $\mathcal{J}^{-1}(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)$. At the leading order the components of \mathcal{P}_{ij} are

$$\mathcal{P}_{11} = \frac{m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{54(4\pi^2)} \frac{1}{(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2)^3} [\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2 + \mathcal{O}(4)], \quad (4.88)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{22} = \frac{m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{54(4\pi^2)} \frac{(\alpha_k^2 + \lambda_k^2)}{\alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2} [\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2 + \mathcal{O}(4)], \quad (4.89)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{12} = \frac{m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{54(4\pi^2)} \frac{\varrho - 1}{\sqrt{\varrho}(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2)} [1 + \mathcal{O}(2)]. \quad (4.90)$$

Since $0 < \alpha_k, \lambda_k < 1$, the leading entry of \mathcal{P}_{ij} is \mathcal{P}_{11} , which we can write up to the NL order

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{11} = & \frac{m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{54(4\pi^2)} \frac{1}{(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2)^3} [\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2 + (17 - 12\gamma_M)(\alpha_k^4 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^4) \\ & + 12(2 - \gamma_M)(\alpha_k^3 \lambda_k + \varrho^2 \alpha_k \lambda_k^3) + \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 (5 - 24\varrho + 5\varrho^2 - 6\gamma_M (\varrho - 1)^2) + \mathcal{O}(6)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.91)$$

Therefore, we choose \mathcal{R}_1^C and \mathcal{R}_2^C as alternative gauge-invariant quantities instead of the adiabatic and isocurvature perturbations, respectively.

The spectral indices $n_{ij}(k) \equiv 1 + \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_{ij}}{d \ln k}$ are given by

$$n_{ij}(k) - 1 = -\beta_\alpha(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{ij}}{\partial \alpha_k} - \beta_\lambda(\alpha_k, \lambda_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{ij}}{\partial \lambda_k} \quad (4.92)$$

and to the leading order they read

$$n_{11}(k) - 1 = -\frac{6 [2\alpha_k^4 + 2\lambda_k^4 \varrho^2 + \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 (1 + \varrho)^2]}{\alpha_k^2 + \lambda_k^2 \varrho^2} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(4), \quad (4.93)$$

$$n_{22}(k) - 1 = -\frac{6(\varrho - 1)\alpha^4 - \varrho\lambda^4}{\varrho(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2)} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(4), \quad (4.94)$$

$$n_{12}(k) - 1 = -6(\alpha^2 + \lambda^2) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(4), \quad (4.95)$$

where the corrections denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(N)$ are of the form

$$\frac{P_n(\alpha_k, \lambda_k)}{(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2)^m}, \quad n + 2m = N, \quad (4.96)$$

where P_n is a polynomial of degree n .

Finally, using the tensor power spectrum (4.46) the tensor-to-scalar ratio reads

$$r(k) \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_t(k)}{\mathcal{P}_{11}(k)} = 48 \frac{(\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2)^2}{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(4), \quad (4.97)$$

where, again, the corrections are not polynomial in α_k and λ_k .

If we compare (4.93) and (3.17) we get

$$n_{11}(k) - 1 = -\frac{2}{N(k)} - \frac{6\alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 (\varrho - 1)^2}{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2}. \quad (4.98)$$

Therefore, the double-field dynamics modifies the relation between $N(k)$ and n_{11} . On the other hand, comparing (4.97) with (3.17) we see that

$$N(k) \simeq \frac{8}{r(k)} \quad (4.99)$$

at the leading order, which coincides with the single-field relation in the case of a quadratic potential. This was already noticed in [25] using the δN formalism [26]. However, the conserved gauge-invariant perturbation build in subsection 4.2 and used to derive the dominant component of the scalar power-spectrum matrix does not coincide with that

of [25]. Using (4.82) and (4.83) we can write \mathcal{R}_1^C in terms of the gauge-invariant perturbations (4.71)

$$\mathcal{R}_1^C = \frac{\dot{\bar{\chi}}^2}{\dot{\bar{\chi}}^2 + \varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}^2} \mathcal{R}_\chi + \frac{\varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}^2}{\dot{\bar{\chi}}^2 + \varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}^2} \mathcal{R}_\phi. \quad (4.100)$$

while the one used in [25] is given by [26]

$$\mathcal{R}_{\delta N} = \frac{\partial N}{\partial \bar{\chi}_k} \delta \chi + \frac{\partial N}{\partial \bar{\phi}_k} \delta \phi = \frac{\partial N}{\partial \bar{\chi}_k} \frac{\dot{\bar{\chi}}}{H} \mathcal{R}_\chi + \frac{\partial N}{\partial \bar{\phi}_k} \frac{\dot{\bar{\phi}}}{H} \mathcal{R}_\phi, \quad (4.101)$$

where in the last step we have used the spatially-flat gauge. However, at the leading order in the slow-roll approximation the two perturbations coincide. This can be shown in the following way. First, formula (3.17) in terms of background fields gives

$$N(k) \simeq \frac{\kappa^2}{4} (\bar{\chi}_k^2 + \bar{\phi}_k^2), \quad (4.102)$$

where we have used that at the leading order in α_k and λ_k

$$\bar{\chi}_k \simeq -\frac{2}{3\hat{\kappa}} \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2}, \quad \bar{\phi}_k \simeq -\frac{2}{3\hat{\kappa}} \frac{\varrho \lambda_k}{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho \lambda_k^2}. \quad (4.103)$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\delta N} \simeq \frac{\dot{\bar{\chi}}_k \dot{\bar{\chi}}}{\dot{\bar{\chi}}_k^2 + \varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}_k^2} \mathcal{R}_\chi + \frac{\varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}_k \dot{\bar{\phi}}}{\dot{\bar{\chi}}_k^2 + \varrho \dot{\bar{\phi}}_k^2} \mathcal{R}_\phi. \quad (4.104)$$

Once the background quantities are expanded in powers of α_k and λ_k , at the leading order we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\delta N} \simeq \mathcal{R}_1^C. \quad (4.105)$$

Nevertheless, the perturbation $\mathcal{R}_{\delta N}$ is not conserved on superhorizon scales. This becomes evident at the NL order in α_k and λ_k .

Finally, as mentioned in section 2, it is convenient to rewrite the observables in terms of the following variables

$$x_k \equiv \frac{\alpha_k^2}{\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2}}, \quad y_k \equiv \frac{\varrho \lambda_k^2}{\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 + \varrho^2 \lambda_k^2}}, \quad (4.106)$$

that replace α_k and λ_k . In fact, using (4.106) all the relevant quantities can be written as power series, times overall functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{11}(k) = & \frac{m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{54(4\pi^2)(x_k + y_k)^3(x_k + \varrho y_k)} \left[1 + (17 - 12\gamma_M)(x_k^2 + y_k^2) \right. \\ & \left. - x_k y_k (24 + 6\gamma_M(\zeta - 2) - 5\zeta) - \frac{12}{\sqrt{\varrho}} \sqrt{x_k y_k} (x_k + \varrho y_k) (\gamma_M - 2) + \mathcal{O}(4) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.107)$$

$$n_{11}(k) - 1 = -12 \left[x_k^2 + y_k^2 + x_k y_k \left(1 + \frac{\zeta}{2} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(4), \quad (4.108)$$

$$r(k) = 48(x_k + y_k)^2 \left\{ 1 + 6(\gamma_M - 2) \left[(x_k - y_k)^2 + \frac{2\sqrt{x_k y_k}}{\sqrt{\varrho}}(x_k + \varrho y_k) \right] \right\} + \mathcal{O}(6), \quad (4.109)$$

$$\beta_{\mathcal{P}}(k) = \frac{(x_k + y_k)^3 (x_k^2 + y_k^2 + \zeta x_k y_k)}{x_k y_k} [x_k + y_k + \mathcal{O}(3)], \quad (4.110)$$

where the quantity $\beta_{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined as the ratio

$$\beta_{\mathcal{P}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_{22}}{\mathcal{P}_{11} + \mathcal{P}_{22}}, \quad (4.111)$$

analogous to β_{iso} used in [27].

For completeness we write the tensor power spectrum and its spectral index using the variables (4.106). To the leading order we have

$$\mathcal{P}_t \simeq \frac{2m_\chi^2 \kappa^2}{9\pi^2} \frac{1}{(x_k + y_k)(x_k + \varrho y_k)}, \quad n_t \simeq -6(x_k^2 + y_k^2 + \zeta x_k y_k). \quad (4.112)$$

It is worth to note that the single-field relation $r + 8n_t \simeq 0$ is violated already at the leading order. Indeed

$$r + 8n_t \simeq -48x_k y_k (\zeta - 2). \quad (4.113)$$

To summarize, we can extract meaningful predictions from a double-field model by means of the perturbative technique presented here. In particular, it is possible to single out a dominant scalar perturbation that is conserved in the superhorizon limit, which makes its power spectrum a good candidate to be compared with experimental data. In the case of the present model the relation between the number of e-folds and the tensor-to-scalar ratio reduces to that of the single-field case (at the leading order).

5 Conclusions

We have developed a perturbative method that allows to discuss multicomponent inflation models in a consistent manner. The strategy enables a systematic study of inflationary dynamics order by order in perturbation expansion in powers of small quantities, which are analogues of small slow-roll parameters in the conventional description. The method is illustrated by a simple model of two-field inflation possessing only mass terms as the potential. The model properly and nicely reveals various theoretical aspects of the perturbative strategy, even though it is not phenomenologically viable. We have computed

the tensor and scalar power spectra to the NNL and NL orders, respectively, although it is straightforward to obtain results up to an arbitrary order. In the case considered here contributions to the inflation dynamics that originate from each inflaton are of the same order, so that this is indeed a truly two-component inflation. It is the case for the background dynamics and it remains true for perturbations as well. In particular, thanks to nonperturbative resummations, multi-field modifications are present already at the leading order, both in the tensor and scalar power spectra.

We have derived new independent gauge-invariant scalar perturbations that are conserved on superhorizon scales. As it is very well known, the single-field scenario with quadratic potential is excluded by the present experimental data. It turns out that, at the leading order, in the presence of a second field with quadratic potential, the relation between the number of e-folds $N(k)$ and the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r(k)$ is the same as for the single-field quadratic inflation. On the other hand the relation between $N(k)$ and the spectral index n_{11} is modified. Nevertheless, the modification of the single-field quadratic inflation are not sufficient to withstand comparison with the Planck [5] and BICEP/Keck [28] collaborations.

Acknowledgements

Authors thank Anish Ghoshal for his interest at the early stage of this project. M.P. thanks A. Melis for useful discussions. The work of B.G. was supported in part by the National Science Centre (Poland) within the research project 2023/49/B/ST2/00856.

References

- [1] R. Brout, F. Englert, and E. Gunzig, *The Creation of the Universe as a Quantum Phenomenon*, *Annals Phys.* **115** (1978) 78.
- [2] A. A. Starobinsky, *A New Type of Isotropic Cosmological Models Without Singularity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 99–102.
- [3] A. H. Guth, *The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems*, *Phys. Rev. D* **23** (1981) 347–356.
- [4] A. D. Linde, *A New Inflationary Universe Scenario: A Possible Solution of the Horizon, Flatness, Homogeneity, Isotropy and Primordial Monopole Problems*, *Phys. Lett. B* **108** (1982) 389–393.

- [5] **Planck** Collaboration, Y. Akrami et al., *Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A10, [[arXiv:1807.06211](#)].
- [6] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, and V. Vennin, *Encyclopædia Inflationaris: Opiparous Edition*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **5-6** (2014) 75–235, [[arXiv:1303.3787](#)].
- [7] K. S. Stelle, *Renormalization of Higher Derivative Quantum Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **16** (1977) 953–969.
- [8] D. Anselmi and M. Piva, *A new formulation of Lee-Wick quantum field theory*, *JHEP* **06** (2017) 066, [[arXiv:1703.04584](#)].
- [9] D. Anselmi, *On the quantum field theory of the gravitational interactions*, *JHEP* **06** (2017) 086, [[arXiv:1704.07728](#)].
- [10] D. Anselmi and M. Piva, *The Ultraviolet Behavior of Quantum Gravity*, *JHEP* **05** (2018) 027, [[arXiv:1803.07777](#)].
- [11] D. Anselmi, E. Bianchi, and M. Piva, *Predictions of quantum gravity in inflationary cosmology: effects of the Weyl-squared term*, *JHEP* **07** (2020) 211, [[arXiv:2005.10293](#)].
- [12] M. Hazumi et al., *LiteBIRD: A Satellite for the Studies of B-Mode Polarization and Inflation from Cosmic Background Radiation Detection*, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **194** (2019), no. 5-6 443–452.
- [13] D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky, *Spectra of perturbations produced by double inflation with an intermediate matter dominated stage*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **385** (1992) 623–650.
- [14] A. A. Starobinsky and J. Yokoyama, *Density fluctuations in Brans-Dicke inflation*, in *4th Workshop on General Relativity and Gravitation*, p. 381, 11, 1994. [gr-qc/9502002](#).
- [15] J. Garcia-Bellido and D. Wands, *Constraints from inflation on scalar - tensor gravity theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 6739–6749, [[gr-qc/9506050](#)].
- [16] C. Gordon, D. Wands, B. A. Bassett, and R. Maartens, *Adiabatic and entropy perturbations from inflation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2000) 023506, [[astro-ph/0009131](#)].

- [17] Z. Lalak, D. Langlois, S. Pokorski, and K. Turzynski, *Curvature and isocurvature perturbations in two-field inflation*, *JCAP* **07** (2007) 014, [arXiv:0704.0212].
- [18] A. Avgoustidis, S. Cremonini, A.-C. Davis, R. H. Ribeiro, K. Turzynski, and S. Watson, *The Importance of Slow-roll Corrections During Multi-field Inflation*, *JCAP* **02** (2012) 038, [arXiv:1110.4081].
- [19] A. Gundhi and C. F. Steinwachs, *Scalaron-Higgs inflation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **954** (2020) 114989, [arXiv:1810.10546].
- [20] M. Kubota, K.-y. Oda, S. Rusak, and T. Takahashi, *Double inflation via non-minimally coupled spectator*, *JCAP* **06** (2022), no. 06 016, [arXiv:2202.04869].
- [21] D. Anselmi, *Cosmic inflation as a renormalization-group flow: the running of power spectra in quantum gravity*, *JCAP* **01** (2021) 048, [arXiv:2007.15023].
- [22] D. Anselmi, F. Fruzza, and M. Piva, *Renormalization-group techniques for single-field inflation in primordial cosmology and quantum gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021), no. 22 225011, [arXiv:2103.01653].
- [23] D. Anselmi, *Perturbation spectra and renormalization-group techniques in double-field inflation and quantum gravity cosmology*, *JCAP* **07** (2021) 037, [arXiv:2105.05864].
- [24] D. Baumann, *Cosmology*. Cambridge University Press, 7, 2022.
- [25] S. A. Kim and A. R. Liddle, *Nflation: multi-field inflationary dynamics and perturbations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 023513, [astro-ph/0605604].
- [26] 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** (1996) 71–78, [astro-ph/9507001].
- [27] **Planck** Collaboration, Y. Akrami et al., *Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A10, [arXiv:1807.06211].
- [28] **BICEP, Keck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade et al., *Improved Constraints on Primordial Gravitational Waves using Planck, WMAP, and BICEP/Keck Observations through the 2018 Observing Season*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** (2021), no. 15 151301, [arXiv:2110.00483].