

# A Power-law Inflation Tail for the Standard $R^2$ -Inflation and the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture

S.D. Odintsov<sup>1,2\*</sup> and V.K. Oikonomou<sup>3,4†</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *Institute of Space Sciences (ICE, CSIC) C. Can Magrans s/n, 08193 Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>2)</sup> *ICREA, Passeig Luis Companys, 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>3)</sup> *Department of Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece*

<sup>4)</sup> *L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University - Astana, 010008, Kazakhstan*

The conceptual problems of the standard slow-roll inflationary scenario include the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture issue, which severely restricts the tensor-to-scalar ratio in the standard minimally coupled scalar field inflation. Motivated by the fact that a scalar field in its vacuum configuration can be minimally coupled to gravity, or conformally coupled, and also that the first quantum corrections of the scalar field action include  $R^2$  corrections, in this work we assume that  $R^2$  gravity in the presence of a scalar field with constant equation of state parameter co-exist and control the early Universe. Constant equation of state parameter scalar field result from exponential scalar potentials. In our approach, the standard slow-roll era is controlled by the  $R^2$  gravity and is followed by a power-law inflationary tail governed by a minimally coupled scalar field with an quintessential equation of state parameter, stemming from an exponential scalar potential. The fact that the total equation of state parameter after the end of the slow-roll era is equal to the value determined by the scalar field, has an effect on the duration of the  $R^2$  governed slow-roll era, and it actually shortens the duration of the slow-roll era, by an extent which depends on the reheating temperature too, after all the inflationary patches have ended. The power-law inflationary tail to the standard  $R^2$  inflation, solves the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture issues, and also the Swampland conjecture can be amended in this context. We also perform a dynamical system study to confirm numerically our findings.

PACS numbers: 04.50.Kd, 95.36.+x, 98.80.-k, 98.80.Cq, 11.25.-w

## I. INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL MOTIVATION

One of the most fundamental theories for the primordial Universe is inflation [1–4], a theory which can actually be realistically tested and verified observationally. Currently, inflation is being scrutinized observationally by the Planck collaboration [5], but promising new experiments and observational collaboration are expected to further probe the effects of the inflationary era. Specifically, the stage 4 Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) experiments [6, 7] will directly probe the  $B$ -modes of the inflationary era, if these exist, and this will be a smoking gun for the direct verification of inflation, since the  $B$ -mode pattern in the CMB will reveal the tensor perturbations. There is an other way of indirectly verifying the occurrence of inflation, by detecting a stochastic gravitational wave background in future gravitational wave experiments like LISA, DECIGO, Einstein Telescope and so on [8–16]. In 2023 NANOGrav and other Pulsar Timing Arrays experiments have confirmed the existence of a stochastic gravitational wave background [17–20], however inflation is at odds in explaining that stochastic signal [21]. In principle, if the future gravitational wave experiments reveal a stochastic gravitational wave background, it could be challenging to pinpoint which theory can explain the stochastic signal. To this end, the synergistic approach of multiple distinct experiments will be needed or even different theories can explain the combined stochastic gravitational wave background pattern [22].

There exist various theories that may describe an inflationary era, standard inflation is described by a minimally coupled scalar field theory, in which the dominance of the potential during the inflaton evolution is profound, known as slow-roll evolution, which is needed to provide solution to the flatness problems of standard Big Bang cosmology. Inflation also solves other known problems of standard Big Bang cosmology, such as the horizon and monopoles problems, see for example [1–4]. Apart from the standard minimally coupled scalar field description of inflation, there exists the possibility of having a geometrical induced inflationary era, being generated by some modified gravity [23–26]. The geometric description of inflation and also of other evolutionary eras of our Universe is strongly motivated for various reasons, firstly the standard slow-rolling scalar field description of inflation requires multiple couplings of the inflaton to the Standard Model particles in order for reheating to occur in the Universe, which is rather unappealing and somewhat fine-tuned. Also, the general relativistic approaches toward describing the dark energy era cannot

\* odintsov@ice.csic.es

† voikonomou@gapps.auth.gr; v.k.oikonomou1979@gmail.com

easily accommodate a phantom evolution, which is observationally allowed, in a concise and formally rigid manner. In both cases, modified gravity offers conceptually appealing descriptions, thus it is strongly motivated for describing both inflation and the dark energy era. The most important modified gravity candidate theory, and the simplest one, is  $F(R)$  gravity, [27–40] in the context of which, inflation and dark energy can be described in a unified way, see the pioneer article on this [27]. From a theoretical point of view, it is highly possible that some modified gravity controls the primordial Universe, in the presence of some scalar field. Scalar fields are motivated and argued to be present in our classical four dimensional Universe by string theory. Often, scalars or axion-like particle, are the moduli of some fundamental string theory, so it is possible to find remnants of these moduli in our ordinary four dimensional Universe. But how does modified gravity is involved in this context? When a scalar field, possibly a remnant from string theory, is evaluated in its vacuum configuration, it can either be minimally coupled or conformally coupled, and therefore the quantum corrections to the action will either be included in conformally coupled single scalar field Lagrangians, or alternatively to minimally coupled scalar field Lagrangians. The quantum corrections include higher order derivatives of the metric, in the form of  $R^2$ ,  $R^3$  or coupled forms of the Ricci and Riemann tensors as we evince in the next section. Thus it is highly possible that a combined  $f(R, \phi)$  theory controls the primordial Universe.

On the other hand, inflation in the context of a slow-rolling scalar field faces quite strong challenges, related with the Swampland criteria and also the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture (TCC). The latter results in severely constraining the value of the scalar field potential at the end of inflation and also the tensor-to-scalar ratio, thus putting the whole standard inflationary framework into a consistency peril. These problems can be dealt in various ways, see Ref. [41] and references therein, resorting to non-standard multi-inflationary theories and so on. We shall adopt the approach used by Ref. [41] where instead of a string-gas cosmology followed by a short scalar field inflationary era, we shall assume a standard  $R^2$  inflationary era followed by a short period of inflationary power-law tail evolution driven by a constant equation of state (EoS) scalar field. The inflationary power-law tail driven by the scalar field is generated by a scalar field having an exponential potential. Exponential potentials in minimally coupled scalar fields are motivated by several factors in cosmology, both theoretical and phenomenological. These potentials arise in different contexts within high-energy physics and cosmology, particularly in the study of inflation, dark energy, and scalar field cosmology. In the next section we further analyze these motivations for using exponential potentials in more detail. In our context, the inflationary power-law tail era takes place right after the slow-roll inflationary era governed by  $R^2$  gravity, thus it is essentially part of the inflationary era. The total EoS of the Universe will be taken to be  $w_{eff} < -1/3$  during this inflationary power-law tail period, in effect the total number of  $e$ -foldings of the slow-roll inflationary era is somewhat shortened. Apart from this feature, the inflationary power-law tail era resolves the Swampland issues and the TCC issues, since the evolution of the Universe at the end of the inflationary era is basically a inflationary power-law evolution. We show this in some detail. We also extend our approach by allowing an interaction between the scalar field effective fluid and the dark matter fluid, which may dominate the evolution right after the inflationary era and before the radiation domination era commences after the inflationary power-law tail. We study the induced autonomous dynamical system formed by the scalar fluid and the dark matter fluid, in the presence and absence of an interaction between them. The fixed points of the induced dynamical system contain precious information regarding the dynamics of the mixed fluid system and as we show, dark matter plays no role in determining the attractors of the cosmological system, which are controlled by the scalar field.

This article is outlined as follows: In section II we discuss the motivation for using a combined  $R^2$  gravity with a constant EoS scalar field with exponential potential. We mention the problems of standard cosmology with a minimally coupled scalar and we motivate how the combined  $R^2$ -constant EoS-scalar field theory is theoretically motivated. In section III we analyze the combined  $R^2$  inflation era followed by a scalar field dominated inflationary power-law tail. We show how this evolutionary combination may resolve the TCC and Swampland issues occurring in standard slow-roll inflation. In section IV we demonstrate how the inclusion of a inflationary power-law tail era at the end of inflation results in a shortening of the  $e$ -foldings number for the slow-roll inflationary era, and we investigate the changes in the inflationary phenomenology imposed by this  $e$ -foldings number shortening. In section V we study the dynamical system of fluids composed by the dark matter fluid and the constant EoS scalar field fluid, in the presence and absence of an interaction between them. We analyze the phase space trajectories and we highlight the physical significance of the fixed points of the system, in the presence and absence of an interaction between them. Finally the conclusions of the article are presented in the end of the article.

## II. MOTIVATION TO USE AN $f(R, \phi)$ GRAVITY THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INFLATION AND PROBLEMS OF STANDARD INFLATION

The standard inflationary paradigm of a minimally coupled scalar field, has some serious issues related with the Swampland criteria and the TCC. Specifically, the TCC, initially proposed in [42–47] states that scales which were Trans-Planckian during the early Universe, must remain inside the Hubble horizon for all times and never enter in

the classical evolution of our Universe. Assuming that this conjecture is correct, this imposes a stringent bound on the upper value of the scalar field potential at the end of inflation, namely  $V_e < 10^{10}$  GeV, which in turn restricts the tensor-to-scalar ratio to have an upper bound  $r < 10^{-30}$ . It is conceivable that such a bound basically eliminates most of the candidate models of minimally coupled scalar field theories. In this work we aim to present a way to reconcile an  $R^2$  inflationary theory with the TCC bound, by adding a inflationary power-law tail in it, driven by a scalar fluid component in the Universe, in which the scalar field had an exponential potential and therefore has a constant EoS parameter during its evolution. In this section we shall discuss how such a combined scalar field and  $R^2$  theory is theoretically motivated, and why an exponential model for the scalar field may be a correct and motivated description for an early Universe scalar field component.

To start off, let us consider first the motivation for using a scalar field theory in the presence of an  $R^2$  gravity term. Let us consider a scalar field evaluated in its vacuum configuration, so it can be minimally coupled or conformally coupled. Therefore, the quantum corrections will be considered for either the non-minimally or minimally coupled scalar field theories. To quantify our considerations, the most general scalar field theory Lagrangian in four dimensions and which contains, at most, order two derivatives, is the following,

$$\mathcal{S}_\varphi = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{1}{2} Z(\varphi) g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\nu \varphi + \mathcal{V}(\varphi) + h(\varphi) R \right), \quad (1)$$

and as we already mentioned, when the scalar field is evaluated in its vacuum configuration, the scalar field must be conformally coupled or minimally coupled. For the purposes of this paper we focus on the minimally coupled scalar field theory so we take  $Z(\varphi) = -1$  and  $h(\varphi) = 1$  in the gravitational action (1). The quantum corrected effective action for the above gravitational action (1), which is compatible with diffeomorphism invariance and also contains up to fourth order derivatives, have the following form [48],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{eff} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} & \left( \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2 R + \Lambda_3 R^2 + \Lambda_4 R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_5 R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_6 \square R \right. \\ & \left. + \Lambda_7 R \square R + \Lambda_8 R_{\mu\nu} \square R^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_9 R^3 + \mathcal{O}(\partial^8) + \dots \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with the parameters  $\Lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  being appropriate dimensionful constants. Thus the combination of a scalar field and of higher powers of the Ricci scalar is a rather natural selection motivated theoretically by the one-loop corrected gravitational action for a minimally coupled scalar field theory. In this work we shall consider only the  $R^2$  corrections, so in our case we essentially have an  $f(R, \varphi)$  gravitational action of the form,

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{F(R)}{2\kappa^2} - \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\nu \varphi - \mathcal{V}(\varphi) \right), \quad (3)$$

with  $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G = \frac{1}{M_p^2}$  and also  $M_p$  denotes the reduced Planck mass, and in addition,

$$F(R) = R + \frac{R^2}{M^2}, \quad (4)$$

where  $M$  being a mass scale which is constrained by inflationary phenomenology. In the literature, such combinations of  $R^2$ -corrected scalar field theories have been considered in [49–58], but in the context of inflation and without assuming that the scalar field has a constant EoS parameter. In addition, in most of the cases, the inflationary framework is considered in the Einstein frame, thus treating the theory as a two scalar field theory. Our approach is different since we consider the Jordan frame theory, in which the perturbations that generate the large scale structure of the Universe are generated during the  $R^2$  inflationary era, and then the inflationary power-law tail driven by the scalar field occurs right after the  $R^2$  inflationary era. In this inflationary era which is the tail of the slow-roll  $R^2$  driven inflationary era, cosmological perturbations are also generated but the modes that exit the horizon after the slow-roll era have extremely small wavelength, certainly much smaller than 10Mpc, so these modes reenter the Hubble horizon at the first stages of the radiation era, thus do not contribute to the linear component of the CMB.

Now let us discuss the motivation to use a scalar field theory with an exponential potential, which makes the scalar field have a constant EoS parameter. Exponential potentials in minimally coupled scalar fields are motivated by several factors in cosmology, both theoretical and phenomenological. These exponential potentials arise in different contexts within high-energy physics and cosmology, particularly in the study of inflation, dark energy, and scalar field cosmology. In certain string theory models and higher-dimensional theories like supergravity or Kaluza-Klein compactifications, exponential potentials often appear naturally. For example, when fields like moduli (parameters describing the size and shape of extra dimensions) evolve, their dynamics can lead to effective four-dimensional theories with exponential potentials for scalar fields. The dimensional reduction from higher-dimensional theories can also

produce terms that behave like exponential potentials. These often appear in the context of dilaton fields or other axion-like particles associated with compactified extra dimensions. Also exponential potentials are frequently used in scalar-tensor theories and quintessence theories. Indeed, in scalar-tensor theories of gravity, scalar fields that are minimally coupled to gravity (but not directly to matter) can be responsible for the late-time acceleration of the Universe (quintessence). Exponential potentials are a common choice in these models because they lead to attractor solutions, where the scalar field evolves in a manner that mimics or dominates the cosmic expansion. Quintessence models with exponential potentials have a wide range of dynamical behaviors, including scaling solutions where the energy density of the scalar field tracks that of the dominant component (e.g., matter or radiation), which is useful in explaining dark energy and cosmic acceleration. Also attractor solutions are quite often related with exponential potentials. This is one of the key motivations for using exponential potential, namely the fact that these potentials lead to attractor solutions in the equations of motion for scalar fields. In these solutions, the scalar field evolves in a predictable manner regardless of initial conditions. For example, in inflationary models or in the late Universe (quintessence), an exponential potential can lead to power-law inflation or scaling behavior. Also, another motivation for using exponential potentials, is scale-invariance and other symmetry arguments. Exponential potentials can be motivated by considerations of scale invariance or certain symmetries in field theory. The exponential form respects scale invariance in some cases, which is a desirable property for constructing models that are not fine-tuned or that have certain symmetries in the early Universe. In certain supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric string theory compactifications, these potentials also preserve specific symmetries related to the evolution of the moduli fields.

### III. HOW A SCALAR FIELD POWER-LAW INFLATIONARY TAIL OF A SLOW-ROLL INFLATION CAN RECONCILE INFLATION WITH TCC

Let us discuss now how a stiff era generated by a scalar field with an exponential potential can reconcile inflation with the TCC. We shall follow closely the considerations of [41] which assumed that an inflationary era with constant EoS followed a string gas era. Our assumption is that a inflationary power-law tail era follows a standard slow-roll  $R^2$  inflationary era. If the scalar field theory has an exponential potential, then the following condition holds necessarily true,

$$\dot{\phi}^2 = \beta V(\phi), \quad (5)$$

thus,

$$\ddot{\phi} = \frac{\beta V'}{2}. \quad (6)$$

In Ref. [41] the requirement was that  $\beta < 1$  in order to describe an inflationary power-law era, and we will take  $\beta = 0.99$ . The scalar field equation reads,

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V' = 0, \quad (7)$$

so in view of the above, we have,

$$\left(\frac{\beta + 2}{2}\right)^2 (V')^2 = 9H^2 \dot{\phi}^2, \quad (8)$$

which in turn yields,

$$V = V_0 e^{-\sqrt{\frac{6\beta}{\beta+2}} \kappa \phi}. \quad (9)$$

This is exactly the potential we shall assume in this article, and we define  $\lambda$  as follows,

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{6\beta}{\beta+2}}, \quad (10)$$

so the scalar potential is written as follows,

$$V(\phi) = V_0 e^{-\lambda \phi \kappa}. \quad (11)$$

The EoS parameter for the scalar field is equal to,

$$w_\phi = \frac{\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V}{\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V}, \quad (12)$$

hence for the exponential potential and due to the relation (5), we have,

$$w_\phi = \frac{\beta - 2}{\beta + 2}. \quad (13)$$

Let us now consider how the inflationary power-law tail of a standard  $R^2$  slow-roll era may relax the TCC constraints on standard inflation. Following closely the argument of Ref. [41], applied in our case, the evolution of the energy density of the scalar field after the end of the slow-roll inflation has the following form,

$$\rho_\phi \sim a^{-\frac{3\beta}{1+\frac{\beta}{2}}}. \quad (14)$$

In order to have spatial flatness in the Universe, the fractional contribution of the spatial curvature to the critical energy density  $\Omega_K$  must satisfy,

$$\Omega_K < 10^{-2} \frac{T_0 T_{eq}}{T_R^2}, \quad (15)$$

where  $T_0$ ,  $T_{eq}$  and  $T_R$  are the temperatures of the Universe at present day, at matter-radiation equilibrium and at the end of the inflationary power-law tail era, where we also assumed that after the inflationary power-law tail era, the Universe is directly radiation dominated. Demanding that the decrease of the curvature density during the inflationary power-law tail era is larger than the relative increase occurring after the inflationary power-law tail era, we must have,

$$\left(\frac{a_i}{a_R}\right)^{2-\frac{3\beta}{1+\frac{\beta}{2}}} < 10^{-2} \frac{T_0 T_{eq}}{T_R^2}, \quad (16)$$

thus we assumed that the flatness issue of the Universe is already resolved between the beginning of the inflationary power-law tail era, with scale factor  $a_i$  and the end of the inflationary power-law tail era with scale factor  $a_R$ . We require that the comoving scale which corresponds to the current Hubble radius is larger than the Hubble length at the beginning of the inflationary power-law tail era  $H^{-1}(t_i)$ , that is,

$$H^{-1}(t_i) < H_0^{-1} \frac{T_0 a_i}{T_R a_R}. \quad (17)$$

During the inflationary power-law tail era, the Friedmann equation is,

$$3H^2 = \kappa^2 \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) V, \quad (18)$$

and also we currently have,

$$H_0^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3} g^* T_0^3 T_{eq}, \quad (19)$$

with  $g^*$  being the number of relativistic degrees of freedom. If a radiation domination era follows after the inflationary power-law tail era, we have,

$$\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) V_R = g^* T_R^4, \quad (20)$$

where  $T_R$  and  $V_R$  are the temperature and the potential at the end of the inflationary power-law tail era. Thus we have,

$$\frac{V_R}{V_i} < \frac{T_R^2}{T_0 T_{eq}} \left(\frac{a_i}{a_R}\right)^2, \quad (21)$$

where  $V_i$  is the scalar potential value at the beginning of the inflationary power-law tail era. So by using the Friedmann equations, which for the exponential potential yield a power-law evolution for the scale factor, we have,

$$\frac{V_i}{V_R} = \left(\frac{a_R}{a_i}\right)^{\frac{3\beta}{\sqrt{1+\frac{\beta}{2}}}}, \quad (22)$$

and then Eq. (21), becomes,

$$\left(\frac{a_i}{a_R}\right)^{2-\frac{3\beta}{\sqrt{1+\frac{\beta}{2}}}} > \frac{T_0 T_{eq}}{T_R^2}, \quad (23)$$

If the inflationary power-law tail era was a period of slow-roll inflation, in which  $\beta \sim 0$  ( $w_\phi \sim -1$ ), the above inequality and that of Eq. (16) would be in conflict. However, for large values of  $\beta$ , the two inequalities are compatible. In this paper we shall consider  $\beta \sim 0.99$  which yields  $w_\phi \sim -0.337793$ , which is a slightly quintessential acceleration EoS. Note however, that the scale factor  $a_i$  in both Eqs. (16) and (23) describes the scale factor at the end of the preceding  $R^2$  slow-roll era, and at the same time the scale factor of the Universe at the beginning of the power-law tail. Now in the hypothetical scenario that the power-law tail was another slow-roll era, sequential to the  $R^2$  slow-roll era, then Eqs. (16) and (23) would indeed be in conflict. But the core assumption of this work is that the power-law tail with initial scale factor  $a_i$  is not a slow-roll sequence of the  $R^2$  slow-roll era, but a power-law evolution with  $\beta = 0.99$ . Thus for this value of  $\beta$ , Eqs. (16) and (23) are rendered compatible.

Regarding the TCC, this is expressed mathematically as,

$$\frac{a_R}{a_i} \ell_{pl} < H^{-1}(t_R), \quad (24)$$

where  $\ell_{pl}$  is the Planck length. Following closely [41], this can be written,

$$\left(\frac{a_i}{a_R}\right)^2 > \frac{g^*}{3} \left(\frac{T_R}{M_p}\right)^4. \quad (25)$$

In order for inflation to solve the flatness problem, there is the bound of Eq. (16), which can be consistent with the TCC only if the following inequality is satisfied by the temperature at the end of the inflationary power-law tail of standard slow-roll  $R^2$  inflation, which is basically the energy scale at the end of inflation [41],

$$\frac{T_R}{M_p} < (3/g^*)^{(1-\tilde{\beta})/(6-4\tilde{\beta})} \times 10^{-2/(6-4\tilde{\beta})} \left(\frac{T_0 T_{eq}}{M_p}\right)^{1/(6-4\tilde{\beta})}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\tilde{\beta} = \frac{3\beta}{\beta+2}$ . For our case, for  $\beta = 0.99$  we must have a significantly small temperature after the end of the power-law inflationary tail era  $T_R < 10^{-30} \times M_p$ , however the flatness issue is already resolved by the  $R^2$  inflation era if it lasts for at least  $\geq 48$   $e$ -folds in the worst case, as we show later on. Also such a low final temperature of the Universe at the end of the power-law tail, is not in conflict with the tensor-to-scalar ratio or the scalar perturbations, since the power-law inflationary patch is completely detached from the slow-roll patch, and does not contribute at all to the CMB. In Ref. [41], this final inflationary temperature was found to be of the order  $\sim 240$  GeV, since the authors used a value  $\beta = 1/2$ . We used  $\beta = 0.99$  which basically means that the inflationary power-law scalar field driven patch is nearly quintessential (the value  $\beta = 0.99$  yields an EoS parameter slightly smaller than the non-acceleration value  $w = -1/3$ ). We need to note that if someone uses a larger  $\beta$ , then the temperature at the end of the inflationary power-law tail of  $R^2$  inflation can increase and become significantly larger, depending on the value of  $\beta$ . But when  $\beta > 1$  we are no longer talking about an inflationary patch, but for a scalar field dominated evolution with EoS  $-1/3 < w \leq 1$ , but this scenario has a lot of different features, which could be studied in another work.

Finally regarding the Swampland constraint,

$$\frac{|V'|}{V} \geq \frac{c}{M_p} \quad (27)$$

where  $c \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ , and in our case, taking into account that it applies during the power-law inflationary era, we have,

$$\frac{|V'|}{V} = \frac{|-\lambda|}{M_p}, \quad (28)$$

and since for  $\beta \sim 0.99$  we have  $\lambda \sim 1.40$ , the Swampland criterion is satisfied. Thus in this section we demonstrated that a inflationary power-law tail extension of a standard inflationary era may smoothen the standard problems of canonical slow-roll inflation. In the next section we also demonstrate that the duration of the slow-roll inflation era is also shortened if the total EoS at the end of inflation is distinct from that of radiation.

Now an important comment is in order regarding whether the sub-Planckian modes exit the Hubble horizon during the  $R^2$  inflation era. When the  $R^2$  inflation begins at first horizon crossing, the Hubble horizon is quite large and gradually shrinks in an inverse exponential way, since the  $R^2$  model produces a nearly de Sitter evolution. Thus during the  $R^2$  inflation, the sub-Planckian modes remain way too deeply in the Hubble horizon. As  $R^2$  inflation proceeds though, more and more low wavelength modes exit the horizon. Thus the peril of having sub-Planckian modes exiting the Hubble horizon increases. Thus the issue with sub-Planckian modes exiting the horizon concerns the last stages of the  $R^2$  inflationary era, where the Hubble horizon has significantly shrunk and may include the sub-Planckian modes. Thus the problem with sub-Planckian modes may occur at the last e-foldings of inflation where the Hubble horizon is too small and may include some of the sub-Planckian modes. However, in our analysis this is where the power-law tail occurs, thus the sub-Planckian modes remain sub-Hubble with this power-law tail continuation of the  $R^2$  inflation era.

#### IV. INFLATION IN $F(R)$ GRAVITY IN THE PRESENCE OF A SCALAR FIELD

Let us consider now the inflationary phenomenology of the gravitational action (3) with the  $F(R)$  gravity being the  $R^2$  model of Eq. (4). The parameter  $M$  appearing in Eq. (3) is chosen to be  $M = 1.5 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{N}{50}\right)^{-1} M_p$ , for phenomenological reasoning [59], and  $N$  denotes the  $e$ -foldings number. For a flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric,

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 \sum_{i=1,2,3} (dx^i)^2, \quad (29)$$

the field equations read,

$$\begin{aligned} 3H^2 F_R &= \frac{RF_R - F}{2} - 3H\dot{F}_R + \kappa^2 \left( \rho_r + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \right), \\ -2\dot{H}F &= \kappa^2 \dot{\phi}^2 + \ddot{F}_R - H\dot{F}_R + \frac{4\kappa^2}{3}\rho_r, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = 0 \quad (31)$$

with  $F_R = \frac{\partial F}{\partial R}$ , and the ‘‘dot’’ indicates a differentiation with respect to  $t$ , while the ‘‘prime’’ denotes differentiation with respect to  $\phi$ . For our considerations we shall assume that the slow-roll era has a low inflationary scale of the order  $H_I = 10^{13}$  GeV, and in addition we further assume that  $V_0$  in Eq. (9) of the scalar field potential is slightly smaller than the Planck allowed value due to the amplitude of the scalar perturbations, and specifically we assume that  $V_0 \sim 9.6 \times 10^{-15} \times M_p^4$ . Hence, for a sub-Planckian valued scalar field, the potential has values of the order  $\kappa^2 V \sim 1.44935 \times 10^{42} \text{ eV}^2$ , where we took  $\beta \sim 0.99$ . Now, for  $H_I = 10^{13}$  GeV and  $N \sim 60$ , the parameter  $M$  is approximately  $M \simeq 3.04375 \times 10^{22} \text{ eV}$  and assuming a slow-roll era initially, we have  $R \sim 1.2 \times 10^{45} \text{ eV}^2$  and also  $R^2/M^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1.55 \times 10^{45}) \text{ eV}^2$ . Apparently, due to the constant EoS evolution of the scalar field controlled by Eq. (5), the scalar field kinetic terms are of the same order as the potential, thus the  $R^2$  gravity term dominates initially the inflationary era, which recall is a slow-roll era. Hence, the field equations initially acquire the form,

$$\ddot{H} - \frac{\dot{H}^2}{2H} + \frac{HM^2}{2} = -3H\dot{H}. \quad (32)$$

and since the slow-roll conditions apply, we get,

$$-\frac{M^2}{6} = \dot{H}, \quad (33)$$

which has a quasi-de Sitter evolution as solution,

$$H(t) = H_I - \frac{M^2}{6}t. \quad (34)$$

The inflationary evolution of  $F(R)$  gravity is quantified by the dynamics of the slow-roll indices, [23, 60, 61],

$$\epsilon_1 = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}, \quad \epsilon_2 = 0, \quad \epsilon_3 = \frac{\dot{F}_R}{2HF_R}, \quad \epsilon_4 = \frac{\ddot{F}_R}{H\dot{F}_R}, \quad (35)$$

and the spectral index of the primordial scalar perturbations and the tensor-to-scalar ratio are written as follows [23, 60],

$$n_s = 1 - \frac{4\epsilon_1 - 2\epsilon_3 + 2\epsilon_4}{1 - \epsilon_1}, \quad r = 48 \frac{\epsilon_3^2}{(1 + \epsilon_3)^2}. \quad (36)$$

Using the Raychaudhuri equation for  $F(R)$  gravity, we obtain,

$$\epsilon_1 = -\epsilon_3(1 - \epsilon_4), \quad (37)$$

therefore we have approximately,

$$n_s \simeq 1 - 6\epsilon_1 - 2\epsilon_4, \quad (38)$$

and also,

$$r \simeq 48\epsilon_1^2. \quad (39)$$

Also considering  $\epsilon_4 = \frac{\ddot{F}_R}{H\dot{F}_R}$  we get,

$$\epsilon_4 = \frac{\ddot{F}_R}{H\dot{F}_R} = \frac{\frac{d}{dt}(F_{RR}\dot{R})}{HF_{RR}\dot{R}} = \frac{F_{RRR}\dot{R}^2 + F_{RR}\frac{d(\dot{R})}{dt}}{HF_{RR}\dot{R}}, \quad (40)$$

and due to the fact that,

$$\dot{R} = 24\dot{H}H + 6\ddot{H} \simeq 24H\dot{H} = -24H^3\epsilon_1, \quad (41)$$

combined with Eq. (40) we get,

$$\epsilon_4 \simeq -\frac{24F_{RRR}H^2}{F_{RR}}\epsilon_1 - 3\epsilon_1 + \frac{\dot{\epsilon}_1}{H\epsilon_1}. \quad (42)$$

By using,

$$\dot{\epsilon}_1 = -\frac{\ddot{H}H^2 - 2\dot{H}^2H}{H^4} = -\frac{\ddot{H}}{H^2} + \frac{2\dot{H}^2}{H^3} \simeq 2H\epsilon_1^2, \quad (43)$$

$\epsilon_4$  becomes,

$$\epsilon_4 \simeq -\frac{24F_{RRR}H^2}{F_{RR}}\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_1. \quad (44)$$

The spectral index of the scalar perturbations is,

$$n_S = 1 - 4\epsilon_1 - 2\epsilon_2 + 2\epsilon_3 - 2\epsilon_4, \quad (45)$$

which in view of the above equations, is simplified as follows,

$$n_S \simeq 1 - (2 - x)\epsilon_1 + 2\epsilon_3. \quad (46)$$

In addition, the scalar-to-tensor ratio in terms of the slow-roll indices is [23, 60, 61],

$$r \simeq 48\epsilon_1^2. \quad (47)$$

For the  $R^2$  gravity,  $x = 0$ , therefore we have,

$$\epsilon_1 = -\frac{6M^2}{(M^2t - 6H_I)^2}, \quad (48)$$



and also by solving  $\epsilon_1(t_f) = 1$ , we obtain the time instance  $t_f$  where inflation ends,

$$t_f = (6H_I + \sqrt{6}M)/M^2. \quad (49)$$

Using,

$$N = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} H(t) dt, \quad (50)$$

and also in conjunction with Eq. (49), the time instance of the first horizon crossing is,

$$t_i = \frac{2\sqrt{9H_I^2 - 3M^2Y} + 6H_I}{M^2}, \quad (51)$$

hence the first slow-roll index at the first horizon crossing reads,

$$\epsilon_1(t_i) = \frac{1}{1 + 2N}, \quad (52)$$

therefore the spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio acquire the following forms  $n_s \sim 1 - \frac{2}{N}$  and  $r \sim \frac{12}{N^2}$ . The dominance of the  $R^2$  term ceases to occur after nearly 60  $e$ -folds, where  $\epsilon_1$  approaches unity. After that the scalar field starts to dominate the evolution and the power-law inflationary tail takes place.

An important comment is in order. There is the question whether the power-law inflationary tail produces primordial curvature perturbations. The answer is of course yes, however, the wavelength of these perturbations is particularly small, since recall these modes exit the horizon during the power-law tail, after the slow-roll era, hence, for sure, are not expected to contribute to the linear modes of the CMB, probed by Planck data. In fact, these modes that exit the Hubble horizon during the power-law inflationary tail, will have probably a wavelength  $\lambda \ll 10$  Mpc, thus these will re-enter the Hubble horizon during the first steps of reheating and do not contribute to the linear part of the CMB probed by the Planck collaboration. However, due to the fact that after the slow-roll era, the background EoS is not that of radiation, but is nearly  $w \simeq -1/3$ , the total duration of the inflationary era is actually shortened in the following way, [62–64],

$$N = 56.12 - \ln\left(\frac{k}{k_*}\right) + \frac{1}{3(1+w)} \ln\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{\rho_k^{1/4}}{\rho_{end}^{1/4}}\right) + \frac{1-3w}{3(1+w)} \ln\left(\frac{\rho_{reh}^{1/4}}{\rho_{end}^{1/4}}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{\rho_k^{1/4}}{10^{16}\text{GeV}}\right), \quad (53)$$

where  $k_* = 0.05\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ , is the CMB pivot scale, with  $\rho_k$  standing for the total energy density of the Universe during the first horizon crossing of the mode  $k$  (primordially during the commence of the slow-roll inflationary era),  $\rho_{end}$  denotes the Universe's energy density at the end of inflation, and also  $\rho_{reh}$  denotes the Universe's energy density at exactly the end of the reheating era, with a reheating temperature  $T_r$ . An important comment is in order at this point. With  $T_r$ , we denote the reheating temperature, which is different from  $T_R$ , which is the temperature of the Universe at the end of the power-law tail and at the beginning of the reheating era, which appears in the previous section in the inequality (26). So  $T_r$  and  $T_R$  are two different and distinct quantities. As we mentioned,  $T_r$  is the reheating temperature, that is, the maximum temperature that the Universe acquires, and it is reached at the end of the reheating era, via some reheating mechanism, either geometrically due to the  $R^2$  theory and curvature perturbations, or due to oscillations of the scalar field, or even both mechanisms. Now,  $T_R$  is the temperature of the Universe at the end of the power-law tail, and at the onset of the reheating era. In our case, for  $\beta = 0.99$ , the value

TABLE I. *Maximum  $e$ -foldings number, and the inflationary observational indices for  $\beta = 0.99$ , and  $w = -0.337793$  for three reheating temperatures  $T_r$ .*

Reheating Temperature	Maximum $e$ -foldings	Spectral Index $n_s$	Tensor-to-scalar Ratio
$T_r = 10^2\text{GeV}$	$N_{max} = 36.4299$	$n_s = 0.945$	$r = 0.009$
$T_r = 10^7\text{GeV}$	$N_{max} = 48$	$n_s = 0.9584$	$r = 0.00518$
$T_r = 10^{12}\text{GeV}$	$N_{max} = 59$	$n_s = 0.96653$	$r = 0.00335$

of the temperature at the onset of the reheating era was found to be  $T_R < 10^{-30} \times M_p$ , just below Eq. (26) in the text. So  $T_R \sim 10^{-11}\text{GeV}$  hence, the Universe after the power-law tail and at the beginning of the reheating era is quite cold. Now  $T_r$  is the reheating temperature, thus the maximum temperature reached during the reheating era

TABLE II. *Maximum  $e$ -foldings number, and the inflationary observational indices for  $\beta = 0.9$ , and  $w = -0.37931$  for three reheating temperatures  $T_r$ .*

Reheating Temperature	Maximum $e$ -foldings	Spectral Index $n_s$	Tensor-to-scalar Ratio
$T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$	$N_{max} = 32$	$n_s = 0.93882$	$r = 0.011225$
$T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$	$N_{max} = 45$	$n_s = 0.9564$	$r = 0.0056$
$T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$	$N_{max} = 59$	$n_s = 0.96617$	$r = 0.00343$

of the Universe. The reheating temperature  $T_r$  is quite larger than  $T_R$ , see the choices for  $T_r$  later on in this section, where we shall use a high reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ , an intermediate  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$ , and a low reheating temperature,  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ . So these are quite larger than the temperature  $T_R$  at the beginning of the reheating era, or equivalently the end of the power-law tail era. Also, one crucial assumption we make is that we assume that the EoS of the Universe will not change during the era after the end of the power-law tail, until the reheating temperature is reached. Having this issue clarified, using  $\rho = \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_* T^4$  we can express the  $e$ -foldings number in terms of the reheating temperature and other crucial temperatures. Let us assume for simplicity three distinct reheating temperatures, a high reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ , an intermediate  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$ , and a low reheating temperature,  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ . Although low-reheating temperatures might seem unnatural, these occur frequently in the literature [65]. In order to have a direct idea of the shortening of the inflationary era due to the non-trivial EoS after the slow-roll era, let us evaluate the  $e$ -foldings number for the three distinct reheating temperatures and for  $w = -0.337793$ , a value which corresponds to the choice  $\beta = 0.99$ . For  $w = -0.337793$  and a reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ , we have,  $N = 59.7659$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we would have  $N = 64.5358$ . Thus the observational indices are in this case marginally different than the radiation case, and specifically for  $w = -0.337793$  we have  $n_s = 0.966536$ ,  $r = 0.0033595$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we have  $n_s = 0.969009$ ,  $r = 0.00288124$ . Now for  $w = -0.337793$  and a reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$ , we have,  $N = 48.0979$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we would have  $N = 64.5358$ . Thus the observational indices are in this case significantly different than the radiation case, and specifically for  $w = -0.337793$  we have  $n_s = 0.958606$ ,  $r = 0.00514035$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we have  $n_s = 0.969009$ ,  $r = 0.00288124$ . Also for  $w = -0.337793$  and a reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ , we have,  $N = 36.4299$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we would have  $N = 64.5358$ . Thus the observational indices are in this case significantly different than the radiation case, and specifically for  $w = -0.337793$  we have  $n_s = 0.9451$ ,  $r = 0.00904201$ , while for  $w = 1/3$  we have  $n_s = 0.969009$ ,  $r = 0.00288124$ . Therefore, it is vital that the reheating temperature is significantly large in order for this combined  $R^2$  slow-roll inflation with a scalar field driven power-law tail inflation to be phenomenologically viable. In fact, a low-reheating temperature seems not to be viable at all, since the slow-roll era is significantly shortened, and in fact the modes corresponding to the power-law tail might then contribute to the CMB spectrum. This scenario however is something undesirable. Thus a large reheating temperature is needed in order for the combined  $R^2$  inflation with a power-law inflationary tail to be a viable inflationary model. In order to have a good grasp of the phenomenology of the model under study, let us compare the results with the Planck data. We shall also consider the case  $\beta = 0.9$ , in addition to  $\beta = 0.99$  in order to see how does the EoS parameter  $w$  and the reheating temperature affect the viability of the model. In Tables I and II we gathered the values of the maximum  $e$ -foldings number, and the inflationary observational indices for  $\beta = 0.99$ , and  $w = -0.337793$  and for  $\beta = 0.9$ , and  $w = -0.37931$  respectively. We used three reheating temperatures  $T_r$  a high reheating temperature  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ , an intermediate  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$ , and a low reheating temperature,  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ . Now in order to assess the viability of the models, in Figs. 1 and 2 we confront the models with the Planck data for the two distinct values of  $\beta$ , namely  $\beta = 0.9$  and  $\beta = 0.99$ . Specifically, in Fig. 1 we present the inflationary phenomenology for  $\beta = 0.9$ , and  $w = -0.37931$  versus the Planck 2018 data. In all the plots of Fig. 1, the black thick line corresponds to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 95%CL, the dash dotted curve to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 68%CL. In the upper left plot of Fig. 1, the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [28, 32]$ , in the upper right plot of Fig. 1 the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [40, 45]$  and in the bottom plot of Fig. 1 the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [50, 59]$ . As it can be seen, only the high reheating temperature phenomenology is viable. Also in Fig. 2 we present the inflationary phenomenology for  $\beta = 0.99$ , and  $w = -0.337793$  versus the Planck 2018 data. In all the plots of Fig. 2, the black thick line corresponds to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 95%CL, the dash dotted curve to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 68%CL. In the upper left plot of Fig. 2, the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [30, 36]$ , in the upper right plot of Fig. 2 the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^7 \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [40, 48]$  and in the bottom plot of Fig. 2 the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$  for  $N = [50, 59]$ . As it can be seen in this case too, only the high reheating temperature phenomenology is viable. Thus the model is viable for a wide choice of EoSs, but only for high reheating temperatures.

In this section our approach towards describing the inflationary  $R^2$  era combined with the scalar field driven power-




FIG. 1. Inflationary phenomenology for  $\beta = 0.9$ , and  $w = -0.37931$  versus the Planck 2018 data. In all the plots, the black thick line corresponds to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 95%CL, the dash dotted curve to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 68%CL. In the upper left plot, the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^2$  GeV for  $N = [28, 32]$ , in the upper right plot the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^7$  GeV for  $N = [40, 45]$  and in the bottom plot the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^{12}$  GeV for  $N = [50, 59]$ . As it can be seen, only the high reheating temperature phenomenology is viable.

law inflationary tail, was mainly quantitative at the level of field equations. In the next section we shall approach our description at the dynamical system level. For generality, we shall allow the scalar field fluid to interact with the dark matter fluid. As it proves, and as expected of course, the dark matter fluid plays no role in the dynamics of the model, even in the presence of an interaction between the fluids. The result is quite interesting since we will show that the unstable de Sitter attractor reached by the  $R^2$  model is followed by an inflationary attractor with  $w \leq -1/3$  which is however stable. As we discuss, this stability is an issue for the combined model and only when the  $R^2$  model fluctuations initiate the reheating era, might make the model depart from the power-law tail inflationary attractor.

## V. DYNAMICS OF THE UNIVERSE AFTER INFLATION AND DURING THE POWER-LAW INFLATIONARY TAIL ERA

In this section we shall investigate the dynamics of the two inflationary patches, namely the one driven by the slow-roll  $R^2$  gravity and its power-law tail driven by a constant EoS scalar field, from a dynamical system point of view. Let us start with the  $R^2$  patch first. In the standard  $R^2$  gravity, as the slow-roll inflation era tends to its end, curvature fluctuations  $\langle R^2 \rangle$  become strong enough to make the de Sitter attractor unstable. This is also the case in our scenario, and as we now demonstrate, the  $R^2$  dynamics is attracted towards an unstable de-Sitter attractor. This is a unique feature of  $R^2$  inflation, which enjoys an elevated importance among inflationary theories, from a dynamical system point of view, see [66]. Considering solely the  $F(R)$  gravity field equations, we introduce the following dimensionless variables,

$$x_1 = -\frac{\dot{F}_R(R)}{F_R(R)H}, \quad x_2 = -\frac{F(R)}{6F_R(R)H^2}, \quad x_3 = \frac{R}{6H^2}, \quad (54)$$




FIG. 2. Inflationary phenomenology for  $\beta = 0.99$ , and  $w = -0.337793$  versus the Planck 2018 data. In all the plots, the black thick line corresponds to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 95%CL, the dash dotted curve to the Planck 2018 likelihood curve at 68%CL. In the upper left plot, the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^2$  GeV for  $N = [30, 36]$ , in the upper right plot the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^7$  GeV for  $N = [40, 48]$  and in the bottom plot the red curve corresponds to  $T_r = 10^{12}$  GeV for  $N = [50, 59]$ . As it can be seen in this case too, only the high reheating temperature phenomenology is viable.

and by expressing the dynamics of the variables as functions of the  $e$ -foldings number, we can write the  $F(R)$  gravity field equations in terms of an autonomous dynamical system as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx_1}{dN} &= -4 - 3x_1 + 2x_3 - x_1x_3 + x_1^2, \\ \frac{dx_2}{dN} &= 8 + m - 4x_3 + x_2x_1 - 2x_2x_3 + 4x_2, \\ \frac{dx_3}{dN} &= -8 - m + 8x_3 - 2x_3^2, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where  $m$  is defined to be,

$$m = -\frac{\ddot{H}}{H^3}. \quad (56)$$

The dynamical system of Eq. (55) is an autonomous dynamical system for constant values of the parameter  $m$ . For a quasi-de Sitter evolution with scale factor  $a(t) = e^{H_0 t - H_i t^2}$ , the parameter  $m$  is equal to zero. The total EoS of the cosmological fluids is equal to [23],

$$w_{eff} = -1 - \frac{2\dot{H}}{3H^2}, \quad (57)$$

which can be expressed in terms of the dimensionless variable  $x_3$  as follows,

$$w_{eff} = -\frac{1}{3}(2x_3 - 1). \quad (58)$$

The fixed points of the dynamical system of Eq. (55) with  $m = 0$ , are the following two,

$$\phi_*^1 = (-1, 0, 2), \quad \phi_*^2 = (0, -1, 2), \quad (59)$$

with the corresponding eigenvalues of the linearized matrix corresponding to the dynamical system for  $\phi_*^1$  are  $(-1, -1, 0)$ , and for fixed point  $\phi_*^2$  these are  $(1, 0, 0)$ . Hence, the dynamical system of Eq. (55) possesses two non-hyperbolic fixed points, with  $\phi_*^1$  being stable and the fixed point  $\phi_*^2$  is unstable. Both fixed points are de Sitter fixed points, since for both  $x_3 = 2$  and therefore, for both, the total EoS is  $w_{eff} = -1$ . The unstable de Sitter fixed point is more important phenomenologically, since it is directly related to  $R^2$  gravity, and notice that the analysis so far did not specify an  $F(R)$  gravity model. Let us show how this unstable fixed point is directly related to  $R^2$  gravity. To this end, since  $\phi_*^2 = (0, -1, 2)$  this means that  $x_1 \simeq 0$  and  $x_2 \simeq -1$  which imply,

$$-\frac{d^2 F}{dR^2} \frac{\dot{R}}{H \frac{dF}{dR}} \simeq 0, \quad -\frac{F}{H^2 \frac{dF}{dR}} \simeq -1. \quad (60)$$

Assuming a slow-roll evolution during an inflationary era, the Ricci scalar curvature is approximated as follows  $R \simeq 12H^2$ , for a quasi-de Sitter evolution, thus we can write,

$$F \simeq \frac{dF}{dR} \frac{R}{2}, \quad (61)$$

which yields,

$$F(R) \simeq \alpha R^2, \quad (62)$$

with  $\alpha$  an arbitrary integration constant. Hence, the unstable de Sitter fixed point of the total de Sitter phase space of a general  $F(R)$  gravity, is always related to an  $R^2$  gravity, which is a valuable result. Hence, for  $R^2$  gravity, the dynamical system is attracted towards the unstable quasi-de Sitter attractor, however once this attractor is reached, the system is instantly repelled from it. Now, once this instability occurs in the  $R^2$  dynamical system, the power-law inflationary tail commences, which is governed by a constant EoS scalar field. Let us assume for the sake of generality that the scalar field fluid interacts strongly with the dark matter fluid, with an interaction  $Q$  to be specified later. Usually for inflation, the effect of matter fluids are omitted, since these do not contribute strongly to the dynamics. As we will show, this is indeed true, since the effect of the non-trivial interaction on the dynamics is absent completely. The field equations including the  $F(R)$  gravity are,

$$3H^2 F_R = \frac{R F_R - F}{2} - 3H \dot{F}_R + \kappa^2 \left( \rho_r + \rho_m + \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \right), \quad (63)$$

$$-2\dot{H}F = \kappa^2 \dot{\phi}^2 + \ddot{F}_R - H \dot{F}_R + \frac{4\kappa^2}{3} \rho_r,$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = \frac{Q}{\phi}, \quad (64)$$

where  $Q$  denotes the interaction between the matter and scalar field fluids. Due to this non-trivial interaction, the dark matter and scalar field fluids are not perfect fluids as we show shortly. The field equations can be written in an Einstein-Hilbert form as follows,

$$3H^2 = \kappa^2 \rho_{tot}, \quad (65)$$

$$-2\dot{H} = \kappa^2 (\rho_{tot} + P_{tot}),$$

where  $\rho_{tot} = \rho_\phi + \rho_G + \rho_r + \rho_m$  denotes the total energy density, which is composed by all the cosmological fluids present, and  $P_{tot} = P_r + P_\phi + P_G$  denotes the total pressure of the cosmological fluids present, which are the dark matter fluid with  $\rho_m$  and with a zero pressure, the scalar field fluid, with  $\rho_\phi$  and with pressure  $P_\phi$ , which are equal to

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V(\phi), \quad P_\phi = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V(\phi). \quad (66)$$

Also the radiation fluid is present with  $\rho_r$  and pressure  $P_r = \frac{\rho_r}{3}$ , and finally the geometric fluid with  $\rho_G$  and pressure  $P_G$  which are equal to,

$$\rho_G = \frac{F_R R - F}{2} + 3H^2(1 - F_R) - 3H \dot{F}_R, \quad (67)$$

$$P_G = \ddot{F}_R - H\dot{F}_R + 2\dot{H}(F_R - 1) - \rho_G. \quad (68)$$

Now the evolution of the fluids is as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m) &= -Q, \\ \dot{\rho}_\phi + 3H(\rho_\phi + P_\phi) &= Q, \\ \dot{\rho}_r + 3H(\rho_r + P_r) &= 0, \\ \dot{\rho}_G + 3H(\rho_G + P_G) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

All the fluids compose the total fluid, which is a perfect fluid,

$$\dot{\rho}_{tot} + 3H(\rho_{tot} + P_{tot}) = 0. \quad (70)$$

Let us assume that the interaction  $Q$  has the following form [67],

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\kappa\beta\rho_m\dot{\phi}, \quad (71)$$

with  $\beta$  defined earlier, it is the parameter that enters in the dynamics of the scalar field. Near the end of the slow-roll era, before the reheating, the constant EoS scalar field controls the dynamics, so let us assume that also dark matter affects the dynamics of the system. Disregarding the effects of  $F(R)$  gravity, the field equations read,

TABLE III. *The Fixed Points of the Dynamical System of Eq. (81) for General Values of  $\beta$  and  $\lambda$ .*

Name of Fixed Point	Fixed Point Values for General $\beta$ and $\lambda$
$P_1^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (-1, 0)$
$P_2^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (1, 0)$
$P_3^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (\frac{2\beta}{3}, 0)$
$P_4^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{6}}, -\frac{\sqrt{2\beta\lambda^2 - 12\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda^3 + 6\sqrt{6}\lambda}}{\sqrt{6}\sqrt{\sqrt{6}\lambda - 2\beta}})$
$P_5^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{6}}, \frac{\sqrt{2\beta\lambda^2 - 12\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda^3 + 6\sqrt{6}\lambda}}{\sqrt{6}\sqrt{\sqrt{6}\lambda - 2\beta}})$
$P_6^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (-\frac{3}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda}, -\frac{\sqrt{\frac{6\lambda^2}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - \frac{2\sqrt{6}\beta\lambda}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - \frac{18}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - 4\beta + \sqrt{6}\lambda}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\sqrt{6}\lambda - 2\beta}})$
$P_7^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (-\frac{3}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda}, \frac{\sqrt{\frac{6\lambda^2}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - \frac{2\sqrt{6}\beta\lambda}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - \frac{18}{2\beta - \sqrt{6}\lambda} - 4\beta + \sqrt{6}\lambda}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\sqrt{6}\lambda - 2\beta}})$

$$3H^2 = \kappa^2\rho_m + \frac{\kappa^2\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V, \quad (72)$$

which can be cast as,

$$\Omega_m + \Omega_\phi = 1, \quad (73)$$

with,

$$\Omega_\phi = \frac{\kappa^2\rho_\phi}{3H^2}, \quad \Omega_m = \frac{\kappa^2\rho_m}{3H^2}. \quad (74)$$

The total EoS parameter  $w_{tot}$  for the case at hand is,

$$w_{tot} = \frac{P_\phi}{\rho_\phi + \rho_m} = w_\phi\Omega_\phi, \quad (75)$$

and also the total energy density of the scalar field-dark matter system, satisfies,

$$\dot{\rho}_{tot} + 3H(1 + w_{tot})\rho_{tot} = 0, \quad (76)$$

TABLE IV. *Fixed Points of the Dynamical System of Eq. (81) for  $\beta = 0.99$ .*

Name of Fixed Point	Fixed Point Values for $\beta = 0.99$
$P_1^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (-1, 0)$
$P_2^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (1, 0)$
$P_3^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (0.66, 0)$
$P_4^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (0.575416, -0.817861)$
$P_5^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (0.575416, 0.817861)$
$P_6^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (2.03736, -1.67516)$
$P_7^*$	$(x_*, y_*) = (2.03736, 1.67516)$

and also the components satisfy,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_m + 3H\rho_m &= -Q, \\ \dot{\rho}_\phi + 3H(\rho_\phi + P_\phi) &= Q. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Let us introduce the following dimensionless variables,

$$x = \frac{\kappa^2 \dot{\phi}^2}{6H^2}, \quad y = \frac{\kappa^2 V}{3H^2}, \quad (78)$$

and using these we can express,

$$w_\phi = \frac{x^2 - y^2}{x^2 + y^2}, \quad \Omega_\phi = x^2 + y^2 \leq 1, \quad (79)$$

and also the Raychaudhuri equation can be written as follows,

$$-2\dot{H} = 3H^2(1 + x^2 - y^2). \quad (80)$$

Using the above, we can construct the following two-dimensional autonomous dynamical system [68],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dN} &= -3x + \frac{\lambda\sqrt{6}}{2}y^2 + \frac{3x}{2}(1 + x^2 - y^2) + \beta(1 - x^2 - y^2), \\ \frac{dy}{dN} &= -\frac{\lambda\sqrt{6}}{2}xy + \frac{3y}{2}(1 + x^2 - y^2), \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

with  $e$ -foldings number  $N$  being the dynamical variable. We shall study the above dynamical system for  $\beta = 0.99$  and recall that  $\lambda$  is defined in Eq. (10). Let us present the fixed points of the dynamical system at hand, for  $\beta = 0.99$

TABLE V. *Eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix for the dynamical system (81) for  $\beta = 0.99$ .*

Name of Fixed Point	Eigenvalues	Stability
$P_1^*$	(4.98, 4.72625)	unstable
$P_2^*$	(1.27375, 1.02)	unstable
$P_3^*$	(1.01408, -0.8466)	saddle
$P_4^*$	(-2.1527, -2.00669)	stable
$P_5^*$	(-2.1527, -2.00669)	stable
$P_6^*$	(4.52339, -4.0064)	saddle
$P_7^*$	(4.52339, -4.0064)	unstable

and for the corresponding  $\lambda$ . For general values of  $\beta$  and  $\lambda$ , the fixed points are given in III, while for  $\beta = 0.99$  the fixed points are presented in Table IV. The stability can be determined by the eigenvalues of the corresponding Jacobian matrix and these are given in Table V. Only the fixed points  $P_4^*$  and  $P_5^*$  are stable, the fixed points  $P_6^*$  and  $P_7^*$  are unphysical. The fixed points  $P_4^*$  and  $P_5^*$  are stable attractor points with, totaly scalar field dominated with

$w = -0.337793$ . These points are exactly the attractors described by the power-law tail inflation. As we can see, the interaction with matter plays no role at all. The fixed points  $P_1^*$  and  $P_2^*$  are unstable kinetic attractors, and their significance, if any, will be determined by a phase space plot. The same numerical analysis will reveal the attractor property of the fixed points  $P_4^*$  and  $P_5^*$ . We solved numerically the dynamical system (81) for a plethora of initial conditions, and in Fig. 3 we present the  $(x(N), y(N))$  trajectories as functions of the  $e$ -foldings number  $N$ . With blue dashed curves we represent  $x(N)$ , while the red thick curves represent  $y(N)$ . The two green lines represent the points  $(0.575416, 0.817861)$ . As it can be seen, the fixed point  $P_4^*$  is a stable attractor of the theory, but note that we chose initial conditions to be positive, with regards to  $y(N)$ . In order to have a more general idea for the behavior

TABLE VI. *Physical parameters for the fixed points of the dynamical system of Eq. (81) for  $\beta = 0.99$ .*

Name of Fixed Point	$w_{tot}$	$\Omega_\phi$	$w_\phi$	$\Omega_m$	Stability
$P_1^*$	1	1	1	0	unstable
$P_2^*$	1	1	1	0	unstable
$P_3^*$	0.4356	0.4356	1	0.5644	unstable
$P_4^*$	-0.337793	1	-0.337793	0	stable
$P_5^*$	-0.337793	1	-0.337793	0	stable
$P_6^*$	1.34466	6.95699	0.193281	-5.95699	unstable
$P_7^*$	1.34466	6.95699	0.193281	-5.95699	unstable




FIG. 3. Phase space trajectories  $x(N)$  (dashed blue curve) and also  $y(N)$  (thick red curve) for the dynamical system (81) for positive initial conditions.

of the trajectories, in Fig. 4 we present the phase space trajectories for the dynamical system (81) in the combined  $x(N) - y(N)$  plane using various initial conditions, including negative values for  $y(N)$ . We can see in Fig. 4 that the stable fixed points  $P_4^*$  and  $P_5^*$  are indeed the final attractors and that these are actually scalar field attractors with a constant EoS  $w = -0.337793$ . We can also see an interesting feature, that some of the trajectories pass from the stiff



unstable fixed point  $P_3^*$ , and this is rather interesting. Thus we verified numerically, that the dynamics of inflation




FIG. 4. Phase space trajectories in the plane  $x(N) - y(N)$  plane for the dynamical system (81) using various initial conditions, including negative values for  $y(N)$ . Notice the blue thick and the magenta dashed curves, which pass through the unstable fixed point  $P_3^*$  before ending up to the stable scalar field accelerating attractors  $P_4^*$  and  $P_5^*$  respectively.

after the  $R^2$  slow-roll era is dominated by the constant EoS scalar field and that the attractor is a final acceleration point which is scalar field dominated with  $w = -0.337793$ . As a future study we leave the combined study of the total  $F(R)$  gravity and scalar field dynamical system. This study however is too extended to be inserted here and it would be out of the scopes of this article. We hope though to address this issue in a future work.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we studied the scenario in which the slow-roll era of inflation is followed by a power-law inflationary tail governed by a scalar field with constant EoS parameter. The slow-roll inflationary era is governed by an  $R^2$  gravity. This scenario is motivated by the fact that the first quantum corrections of a scalar field in its vacuum configuration contains  $R^2$  terms but also higher order curvature terms. As we showed, there are two inflationary patches in this framework, one in which the slow-roll era occurs and the main problems of Standard Big Bang cosmology are smoothly resolved, and one patch controlled by the scalar field with constant EoS. The first patch, which is controlled by the  $R^2$  gravity solely, is responsible for the primordial tensor and scalar perturbations which have large wavelength and exited the Hubble horizon almost instantly after inflation started. These modes are basically related with the CMB observations, since these have wavelength significantly larger than 10Mpc and thus contribute to the linear modes of perturbations which are observed by the Planck collaboration. On the contrary, the second inflationary patch initiates when small wavelength modes enter the Hubble horizon, and these modes have quite small wavelength, much smaller than 10Mpc. Thus these modes, although contribute to structure formation via their tensor and mainly scalar curvature perturbations generated during this era, cannot have a direct effect on the CMB. These modes would possibly contribute to the non-linear features of the CMB, although marginally since the wavelength of these modes is significantly small, so small that these are the first modes that reenter the Hubble horizon after the second inflationary era ends. The functionality of the secondary inflationary era, namely that of the power-law tail of the standard slow-roll  $R^2$  inflationary era, is that it basically helps to resolve basic problems of the standard slow-roll inflationary era, namely it provides an elegant solution to the TCC problem and also helps resolve the de-Sitter swampland criterion. We demonstrated explicitly how this resolution may be achieved, although our crucial assumption is that the radiation era commences directly after the end of the second inflationary patch. Another effect which we discussed is the fact that due to the fact that in the end of first slow-roll inflationary era, the total background EoS is dominated by the scalar field EoS parameter, and is thus different from a radiation domination era, the actual duration of the slow-roll inflationary era is somewhat shortened, and in fact this feature depends on the total reheating temperature achieved in the Universe after the two inflationary eras end. We also studied the phase space of the combined dark matter-scalar field subsystem for the power-law inflationary patch and after. As we demonstrated, the final attractors of the dynamical system are two accelerating attractors which are stable fixed points of the dynamical system, and as expected, dark matter does not affect at all the dynamics of the cosmological system. What we did not address in this article is the study of the total dynamical system composed by  $F(R)$  gravity and the scalar field, which we aim to do so in a future work. Also, relaxing the TCC constraints if a post-inflationary reheating era with EoS distinct than

that of radiation must also be appropriately addressed, but we need to note that this is technically demanding. Also it is always interesting to discover quantum gravitational effects in effective actions, except from the standard scalar field  $R^2$  effects which we studied here, in the line of research of Refs. [69–71]. Certainly such studies are interesting and we hope to address these in some future works.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by the program Unidad de Excelencia Maria de Maeztu CEX2020-001058-M, Spain (S.D.O). This research has been is funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP19674478) (Vasilis K. Oikonomou).

- 
- [1] A. D. Linde, Lect. Notes Phys. **738** (2008) 1 [arXiv:0705.0164 [hep-th]].
  - [2] D. S. Gorbunov and V. A. Rubakov, “Introduction to the theory of the early universe: Cosmological perturbations and inflationary theory,” Hackensack, USA: World Scientific (2011) 489 p;
  - [3] A. Linde, arXiv:1402.0526 [hep-th];
  - [4] S. D. Odintsov, V. K. Oikonomou, I. Giannakoudi, F. P. Fronimos and E. C. Lymperiadou, Symmetry **15** (2023) no.9, 1701 doi:10.3390/sym15091701 [arXiv:2307.16308 [gr-qc]].
  - [5] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020), A6 [erratum: Astron. Astrophys. **652** (2021), C4] doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [6] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* [CMB-S4], [arXiv:1610.02743 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [7] M. H. Abitbol *et al.* [Simons Observatory], Bull. Am. Astron. Soc. **51** (2019), 147 [arXiv:1907.08284 [astro-ph.IM]].
  - [8] S. Hild, M. Abernathy, F. Acernese, P. Amaro-Seoane, N. Andersson, K. Arun, F. Barone, B. Barr, M. Barsuglia and M. Beker, *et al.* Class. Quant. Grav. **28** (2011), 094013 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/28/9/094013 [arXiv:1012.0908 [gr-qc]].
  - [9] J. Baker, J. Bellovary, P. L. Bender, E. Berti, R. Caldwell, J. Camp, J. W. Conklin, N. Cornish, C. Cutler and R. DeRosa, *et al.* [arXiv:1907.06482 [astro-ph.IM]].
  - [10] T. L. Smith and R. Caldwell, Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.10, 104055 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.104055 [arXiv:1908.00546 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [11] J. Crowder and N. J. Cornish, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005), 083005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.72.083005 [arXiv:gr-qc/0506015 [gr-qc]].
  - [12] T. L. Smith and R. Caldwell, Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.4, 044036 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.044036 [arXiv:1609.05901 [gr-qc]].
  - [13] N. Seto, S. Kawamura and T. Nakamura, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001), 221103 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.221103 [arXiv:astro-ph/0108011 [astro-ph]].
  - [14] S. Kawamura, M. Ando, N. Seto, S. Sato, M. Musha, I. Kawano, J. Yokoyama, T. Tanaka, K. Ioka and T. Akutsu, *et al.* [arXiv:2006.13545 [gr-qc]].
  - [15] A. Weltman, P. Bull, S. Camera, K. Kelley, H. Padmanabhan, J. Pritchard, A. Raccanelli, S. Riemer-Sørensen, L. Shao and S. Andrianomena, *et al.* Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral. **37** (2020), e002 doi:10.1017/pasa.2019.42 [arXiv:1810.02680 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [16] P. Auclair *et al.* [LISA Cosmology Working Group], [arXiv:2204.05434 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [17] G. Agazie *et al.* [NANOGrav], doi:10.3847/2041-8213/acdac6 [arXiv:2306.16213 [astro-ph.HE]].
  - [18] J. Antoniadis, P. Arumugam, S. Arumugam, S. Babak, M. Bagchi, A. S. B. Nielsen, C. G. Bassa, A. Bathula, A. Berthereau and M. Bonetti, *et al.* [arXiv:2306.16214 [astro-ph.HE]].
  - [19] D. J. Reardon, A. Zic, R. M. Shannon, G. B. Hobbs, M. Bailes, V. Di Marco, A. Kapur, A. F. Rogers, E. Thrane and J. Askew, *et al.* doi:10.3847/2041-8213/acdd02 [arXiv:2306.16215 [astro-ph.HE]].
  - [20] H. Xu, S. Chen, Y. Guo, J. Jiang, B. Wang, J. Xu, Z. Xue, R. N. Caballero, J. Yuan and Y. Xu, *et al.* doi:10.1088/1674-4527/acdfa5 [arXiv:2306.16216 [astro-ph.HE]].
  - [21] S. Vagnozzi, JHEAp **39** (2023), 81-98 doi:10.1016/j.jheap.2023.07.001 [arXiv:2306.16912 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [22] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, Phys. Dark Univ. **46** (2024), 101562 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2024.101562 [arXiv:2407.00491 [gr-qc]].
  - [23] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, Phys. Rept. **692** (2017) 1 [arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc]].
  - [24] S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, Phys. Rept. **509**, 167 (2011);  
V. Faraoni and S. Capozziello, Fundam. Theor. Phys. **170** (2010).
  - [25] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, eConf **C0602061**, 06 (2006) [Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **4**, 115 (2007)].
  - [26] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, Phys. Rept. **505**, 59 (2011);
  - [27] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 123512 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.123512 [arXiv:hep-th/0307288 [hep-th]].
  - [28] S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone and A. Troisi, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005), 043503 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.043503 [arXiv:astro-ph/0501426 [astro-ph]].

- [29] J. c. Hwang and H. Noh, *Phys. Lett. B* **506** (2001), 13-19 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)00404-X [arXiv:astro-ph/0102423 [astro-ph]].
- [30] G. Cognola, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and S. Zerbini, *JCAP* **02** (2005), 010 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2005/02/010 [arXiv:hep-th/0501096 [hep-th]].
- [31] Y. S. Song, W. Hu and I. Sawicki, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007), 044004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.044004 [arXiv:astro-ph/0610532 [astro-ph]].
- [32] T. Faulkner, M. Tegmark, E. F. Bunn and Y. Mao, *Phys. Rev. D* **76** (2007), 063505 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.063505 [arXiv:astro-ph/0612569 [astro-ph]].
- [33] G. J. Olmo, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007), 023511 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.023511 [arXiv:gr-qc/0612047 [gr-qc]].
- [34] I. Sawicki and W. Hu, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007), 127502 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.127502 [arXiv:astro-ph/0702278 [astro-ph]].
- [35] V. Faraoni, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007), 067302 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.067302 [arXiv:gr-qc/0703044 [gr-qc]].
- [36] S. Carloni, P. K. S. Dunsby and A. Troisi, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008), 024024 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.024024 [arXiv:0707.0106 [gr-qc]].
- [37] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **657** (2007), 238-245 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.10.027 [arXiv:0707.1941 [hep-th]].
- [38] N. Deruelle, M. Sasaki and Y. Sendouda, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **119** (2008), 237-251 doi:10.1143/PTP.119.237 [arXiv:0711.1150 [gr-qc]].
- [39] S. A. Appleby and R. A. Battye, *JCAP* **05** (2008), 019 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2008/05/019 [arXiv:0803.1081 [astro-ph]].
- [40] P. K. S. Dunsby, E. Elizalde, R. Goswami, S. Odintsov and D. S. Gomez, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010), 023519 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.023519 [arXiv:1005.2205 [gr-qc]].
- [41] V. Kamali and R. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.10, 103512 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.103512 [arXiv:2002.09771 [hep-th]].
- [42] J. Martin and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001), 123501 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.123501 [arXiv:hep-th/0005209 [hep-th]].
- [43] R. H. Brandenberger and J. Martin, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **16** (2001), 999-1006 doi:10.1142/S0217732301004170 [arXiv:astro-ph/0005432 [astro-ph]].
- [44] A. Bedroya and C. Vafa, *JHEP* **09** (2020), 123 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2020)123 [arXiv:1909.11063 [hep-th]].
- [45] R. Brandenberger, *LHEP* **2021** (2021), 198 doi:10.31526/lhep.2021.198 [arXiv:2102.09641 [hep-th]].
- [46] R. Brandenberger and V. Kamali, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) no.9, 818 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10783-2 [arXiv:2203.11548 [hep-th]].
- [47] A. Berera, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995), 3218-3221 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3218 [arXiv:astro-ph/9509049 [astro-ph]].
- [48] A. Codello and R. K. Jain, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016) no.22, 225006 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/33/22/225006 [arXiv:1507.06308 [gr-qc]].
- [49] Y. Ema, *Phys. Lett. B* **770** (2017), 403-411 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.04.060 [arXiv:1701.07665 [hep-ph]].
- [50] Y. Ema, K. Mukaida and J. Van De Vis, *JHEP* **02** (2021), 109 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2021)109 [arXiv:2008.01096 [hep-ph]].
- [51] V. R. Ivanov and S. Y. Vernov, [arXiv:2108.10276 [gr-qc]].
- [52] S. Gottlober, J. P. Muckel and A. A. Starobinsky, *Astrophys. J.* **434** (1994), 417-423 doi:10.1086/174743 [arXiv:astro-ph/9309049 [astro-ph]].
- [53] V. M. Enckell, K. Enqvist, S. Rasanen and L. P. Wahlman, *JCAP* **01** (2020), 041 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/01/041 [arXiv:1812.08754 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] J. Kubo, J. Kuntz, M. Lindner, J. Rezaeck, P. Saake and A. Trautner, *JHEP* **08** (2021), 016 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2021)016 [arXiv:2012.09706 [hep-ph]].
- [55] D. Gorbunov and A. Tokareva, *Phys. Lett. B* **788** (2019), 37-41 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.11.015 [arXiv:1807.02392 [hep-ph]].
- [56] X. Calmet and I. Kuntz, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.5, 289 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4136-3 [arXiv:1605.02236 [hep-th]].
- [57] V. K. Oikonomou, *Annals Phys.* **432** (2021), 168576 doi:10.1016/j.aop.2021.168576 [arXiv:2108.04050 [gr-qc]].
- [58] V. K. Oikonomou and I. Giannakoudi, *Nucl. Phys. B* **978** (2022), 115779 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2022.115779 [arXiv:2204.02454 [gr-qc]].
- [59] S. A. Appleby, R. A. Battye and A. A. Starobinsky, *JCAP* **1006** (2010) 005 [arXiv:0909.1737 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] J. c. Hwang and H. Noh, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005), 063536 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.063536 [arXiv:gr-qc/0412126 [gr-qc]].
- [61] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Lett. B* **807** (2020), 135576 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135576 [arXiv:2005.12804 [gr-qc]].
- [62] P. Adshead, R. Easther, J. Pritchard and A. Loeb, *JCAP* **02** (2011), 021 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2011/02/021 [arXiv:1007.3748 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] J. B. Munoz and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) no.4, 043521 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.043521 [arXiv:1412.0656 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [64] A. R. Liddle and S. M. Leach, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003), 103503 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.103503 [arXiv:astro-ph/0305263 [astro-ph]].
- [65] T. Hasegawa, N. Hiroshima, K. Kohri, R. S. L. Hansen, T. Tram and S. Hannestad, *JCAP* **12** (2019), 012 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/12/012 [arXiv:1908.10189 [hep-ph]].
- [66] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.10, 104049 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.104049 [arXiv:1711.02230 [gr-qc]].

- [67] C. Wetterich, *Astron. Astrophys.* **301** (1995), 321-328 [arXiv:hep-th/9408025 [hep-th]].
- [68] C. G. Boehmer, G. Caldera-Cabral, R. Lazkoz and R. Maartens, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008), 023505 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.023505 [arXiv:0801.1565 [gr-qc]].
- [69] S. P. Miao, N. C. Tsamis and R. P. Woodard, [arXiv:2409.12003 [gr-qc]].
- [70] S. P. Miao, N. C. Tsamis and R. P. Woodard, [arXiv:2405.01024 [gr-qc]].
- [71] S. P. Miao, N. C. Tsamis and R. P. Woodard, *JHEP* **07** (2024), 099 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2024)099 [arXiv:2405.00116 [gr-qc]].