

# Inflation and Braneworlds

James E. Lidsey<sup>1</sup>

*Astronomy Unit, School of Mathematical Sciences,  
Queen Mary, University of London, Mile End Road, LONDON, E1 4NS, U.K.*

## Abstract

An introductory review of the Randall-Sundrum type II braneworld scenario is presented, with emphasis on the relationship between the density and gravitational wave perturbations that are generated during inflation. The implications of relaxing the reflection symmetry in the fifth dimension are considered. The effects of including a Gauss-Bonnet combination of higher-order curvature invariants in the bulk action are briefly discussed.

*Invited plenary talk presented at the Fifth Mexican School of Gravitation and Mathematical Physics: 'The Early Universe and Observational Cosmology', Playa del Carmen, November, 2002.*

<sup>1</sup>Electronic mail: J.E.Lidsey@qmul.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

A unified description of the origin and very early evolution of the universe that is consistent both with our understanding of unified field theory and astrophysical observations is one of the primary goals of particle cosmology. A synthesis of these two disciplines provides a unique window to high energy physics that would otherwise be inaccessible to any form of terrestrial experiment.

From the observational side, recent years have witnessed rapid advances in the quality and availability of high precision data from numerous cosmic microwave background (CMB) and high redshift surveys. This is resulting in ever more stringent constraints on models of the early universe and the trend is certain to continue in light of the anticipated data that will become available in the near future. Specifically, recent measurements from the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) [1] are entirely consistent with a universe that has a total density that is very close to the critical density, implying that the curvature of the universe is very close to spatial flatness [2]. On the other hand, there is by now considerable evidence from a variety of sources – including the CMB power spectrum, galaxy clustering statistics, peculiar velocities, the baryon mass fraction in galaxy clusters and Lyman- $\alpha$  forest data – that the density of clumped baryon and non-baryonic matter can be no more than 30% of the critical density. Moreover, spectral and photometric data from high redshift surveys of type Ia supernovae [3] indicate that the expansion of the universe may be accelerating at the present epoch, thereby requiring the existence of some form of exotic ‘dark energy’ or ‘quintessence’ field that contributes the remaining 70% of the total energy density.

The popular explanation of this diverse set of observations is the *inflationary scenario* [4], whereby the universe underwent an epoch of very rapid, accelerated expansion sometime before the electroweak phase transition. Inflation is presently the cornerstone of modern, early universe cosmology. (For a review, see, e.g., Ref. [5]). Not only is inflation able to resolve the horizon and flatness problems of the hot, big bang model, it also provides the mechanism for generating the primordial density perturbations necessary for galaxy formation [6]. In the simplest class of inflationary models, the accelerated expansion is driven by the potential energy arising through the self-interactions of a single quantum scalar field, referred to as the *inflaton* field and denoted  $\phi$ . If the potential is sufficiently flat and smooth, the field is able to slowly roll towards the minimum of its potential. In this case, the kinetic energy of the field is subdominant and its pressure becomes sufficiently negative for the strong energy condition of General Relativity to become violated. Inflation ends as the field reaches its ground state and the hot big bang model is recovered through a reheating process.

It is now widely believed that the observed large-scale structure in the universe evolved through the process of gravitational instability from density perturbations that were generated *quantum mechanically* during the inflationary expansion. In

single field inflationary models, the perturbations are predicted to be adiabatic, nearly scale-invariant and Gaussian distributed. Moreover, inflation results in an effectively flat universe. The current CMB data, most notably from WMAP [2, 7, 8, 9], supports these predictions whilst simultaneously providing strong constraints on such models [10, 11]. In particular, an anti-correlation between the temperature and polarization E-mode maps of the CMB on degree scales has been detected by WMAP [8], thereby providing strong evidence for correlations on length scales beyond the Hubble radius [12].

Despite the success of inflationary cosmology in passing these key observational tests, there is presently no canonical theory for explaining the origin of the inflation field. Consequently, it is imperative to establish that inflation can arise generically within the context of unified field theory. Superstring theory has emerged as the leading candidate for such a theory of the fundamental interactions, including gravity. Developments over recent years towards a non-perturbative formulation of the theory have indicated that the five, anomaly-free, supersymmetric perturbative string theories – known respectively as types I, IIA, IIB, SO(32) heterotic and  $E_8 \times E_8$  heterotic – represent different limits of a more fundamental theory referred to as M-theory. (For reviews, see, e.g., Refs. [13, 14]). M-theory was originally defined as the strong coupling limit of the type IIA superstring [16]. However, since its infra-red (low-energy) limit is eleven-dimensional supergravity, it must be more than another theory of superstrings [16, 17].

Given this change of perspective, it is crucial to study the cosmological consequences of string/M-theory [15]. Supersymmetry implies that a consistent quantum string theory can only be formulated if spacetime is higher-dimensional. Given that these extra dimensions are not observed, some mechanism is required to ensure that they remain undetected. One possibility is that the dimensions are compactified through the Kaluza-Klein mechanism. In this case, tests of quantum electrodynamics limit the size of the extra dimensions to be less than  $10^{-17}$  cm.

On the other hand, a key theoretical development has been the realization that the standard model fields (quarks, electrons, photons, etc.) may be confined to a four-dimensional domain wall or ‘membrane’ that is embedded in a higher-dimensional space (referred to as the bulk). This picture has developed following the discovery that the quantum dynamics of D-branes can be described by open strings whose ends are fixed on the brane [18]. In string theory, branes are static, solitonic configurations extending over a number of spatial, tangential dimensions. Thus, a 0-brane may be viewed as a pointlike particle or a black hole, a 1-brane represents a string, a 2-brane a membrane, and so forth. In this picture, our observable, four-dimensional universe is interpreted as a 3-brane. The spatial dimensions tangential to our 3-brane describe our familiar three-dimensional space of length, width and height. The only long-range interaction that propagates in the bulk dimensions is gravitational. In this case, corrections to Newton gravity necessarily arise, but the weak nature of gravity implies that any modifications can not presently be observed below scales of

1 mm. In principle, therefore, the extra dimensions may extend over scales that are many orders of magnitude larger than previously thought possible and, depending on the model, may even be infinite in extent. This paradigm shift in our understanding of the observable universe is referred to as the *braneworld scenario*.

The radical proposal, therefore, is that *our universe is a brane embedded in a higher-dimensional space*. The implications for cosmology, and for our understanding of the inflationary scenario in particular, are significant and there is presently a high level of active research in this field. Broadly speaking, the key objectives from the astrophysical and cosmological perspectives are:

- To determine the nature of cosmological solutions that are possible in braneworld scenarios, to investigate their asymptotic early- and late-time behaviours, and to uncover important differences and similarities between braneworld scenarios and conventional cosmologies based on Einstein gravity.
- To establish the conditions whereby inflation may occur, both in the arena of the early universe and at the present epoch (quintessence scenarios) and to determine whether inflation is more or less generic in this new paradigm.
- To investigate the production of scalar (density), vector (electromagnetic) and tensor (gravitational wave) perturbations during braneworld inflation.
- To develop cosmological tests of inflationary braneworld scenarios and determine whether the perturbations generated are compatible with limits imposed by the CMB power spectrum and large-scale structure observations.

Ultimately, such a programme will yield unique information on the dimensionality of the universe.

## 2 Types of Braneworlds

It is impossible in a talk of this nature to fully review the vast body of work in this field. The emphasis from a cosmological point of view has focused on models consisting of a single brane or of two or more parallel branes. (For early papers see, e.g., Refs. [19]). From an historical point of view, a significant development was the interpretation by Hořava and Witten of the strongly coupled limit of the  $E_8 \times E_8$  heterotic string as M-theory compactified on the eleven-dimensional orbifold  $R^{10} \times S^1/Z^2$  [20]. The weakly coupled limit of this string theory then corresponds to the limit where the radius of the circle (as parametrized by the value of the dilaton field) tends to zero. The orbifold  $S^1/Z_2$  may be viewed as the segment of the real line bounded by two fixed points on the circle, such that the orientation of the circle is reversed by the  $Z_2$  transformation,  $y \rightarrow -y$ . Gravitational anomalies are cancelled by placing the two sets of  $E_8$  gauge supermultiplets on each of the ten-dimensional orbifold fixed planes. An effective five-dimensional theory may then be derived by compactifying on an appropriate Calabi–Yau surface [21].

Cosmological solutions admitted in this theory were found and analyzed [22]. In particular, models where the branes approach and move away from each other were




Figure 1: Illustrating possible braneworld configurations: (a) a single brane embedded in a higher-dimensional space; (b) two parallel branes with equal and opposite tension; (c) intersecting branes.

found and interpreted in terms of the pre-big bang scenario, an earlier string-inspired inflationary scenario driven by the kinetic energy of a scalar field [23]. Recently, the idea of interpreting the big bang in terms of brane collisions has been advocated through the ‘ekpyrotic’ scenario [24]. In these models, the brane dynamics is reduced to an effective four-dimensional theory, where a scalar field parametrizes the brane separation.

A further key development was the proposal that the hierarchy problem of particle physics (namely the problem of understanding why the weak scale is so much smaller than the Planck scale) could be alleviated if the volume of the extra dimensions were to be made sufficiently large [25]. In general, the four-dimensional Planck scale,  $m_4$ , is related to the  $(4 + n)$ -dimensional Planck scale,  $M$ , through the relationship  $m_4^2 = M^{n+2}V_n$ , where  $V_n$  is the volume of the compact space. In the model of Ref. [25], the extra dimensions were assumed to be topologically equivalent to a  $n$ -torus and a single brane configuration was considered. Pursuing such ideas further, Randall and Sundrum considered two parallel branes, with equal and opposite tension, embedded in five-dimensional Anti-de Sitter (AdS) space, with a  $Z_2$  reflection symmetry imposed in the fifth dimension [26]. In this model, the weak scale is generated from a larger (Planck) scale through an exponential hierarchy arising directly from the five-dimensional AdS geometry.

Perhaps of more interest from a cosmological viewpoint is the second Randall-Sundrum ‘type II’ (RSII) scenario, consisting of a single brane embedded in five-

dimensional AdS space [27]. Formally, this model may be interpreted in terms of the first Randall–Sundrum model, where the negative tension brane is taken to infinity. The bulk space may also contain a black hole. In this case it corresponds to the five–dimensional Schwarzschild–AdS solution. The RSII model is interesting because it is simple enough for analytical results to be derived, yet is sufficiently rich for new physics to be uncovered. Indeed, one of the key areas of interest in theoretical physics at present is focused towards the ‘holographic principle’ [28]. In short, the holographic principle implies that the number of degrees of freedom associated with gravitational dynamics is determined by the boundary of the spacetime rather than by its volume. This follows naturally from the idea that the state of maximal entropy for a given volume,  $V$ , is determined by the size of the largest black hole that can be contained within  $V$  [28]. The AdS/Conformal Field Theory (CFT) correspondence provides a realization of this principle within the context of string theory by establishing a duality between semi–classical  $d$ –dimensional gravity in AdS space and a quantum CFT located on its boundary [29]. It has recently become apparent that the AdS/CFT correspondence is closely related to braneworld cosmology and the RSII scenario in particular [30]. More specifically, one may view the RSII braneworld as being dual to a CFT (with an ultra–violet cut off) that is coupled to gravity on the brane. Remarkably, when one identifies the entropy, mass and Hawking temperature of the AdS black hole with the entropy, energy and temperature of the CFT, it is found that the Cardy entropy formula of the CFT coincides precisely with the Friedmann equation when the brane passes the black hole event horizon [31].

We focus on the RSII scenario in the remainder of this talk. Before proceeding, however, it is worth highlighting an alternative class of ‘intersecting’ braneworlds. Configurations in supergravity theories that describe the intersection of two or more  $p$ –branes have played a prominent role in advances in string theory [32]. A  $p$ –brane can be supported, for example, when the components of the antisymmetric form fields that arise in the string and M–theory effective actions have non–trivial flux over the compactifying manifold. Depending on the degree of the form field and the nature of the internal space, such a model may represent the intersection of two higher–dimensional branes (See Fig. 1c). One specific example is the intersection of two 5–branes over a 3–brane [32]. In this picture, our observable four–dimensional universe corresponds to the intersection of the branes. Solutions representing curved (time–dependent), intersecting domain walls were recently found [33].

### 3 The Randall–Sundrum Type II Braneworld

In the Randall–Sundrum type II scenario, a co–dimension one brane is embedded in five–dimensional AdS space with a  $Z_2$  reflection symmetry imposed on the bulk. The action is given by

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^5x \sqrt{G} [2M^3 \hat{R} - \Lambda] + \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^4x \sqrt{h} (\lambda + L_{\text{matter}}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{R}$  is the Ricci curvature scalar of the bulk spacetime,  $\mathcal{M}$ , with metric  $G_{AB}$ ,  $\Lambda$  is the five-dimensional (negative) cosmological constant,  $G \equiv \det G_{AB}$ ,  $h$  is the determinant of the metric induced on the boundary of  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\lambda$  is the tension of the brane,  $L_{\text{matter}}$  is the Lagrangian density of the matter on the brane and  $M$  is the five-dimensional Planck mass.

The bulk solution has a metric of the form [27]

$$ds^2 = e^{-2k|y|} (-dt^2 + dx_3^2) + dy^2 \quad (2)$$

for a given constant,  $k$ . This geometry is non-factorizable due to the presence of the exponential warp factor, in contrast to the standard Kaluza–Klein compactification schemes based on the periodic boundary conditions. Consequently, the fifth dimension ( $y$ ) may extend to infinity. Imposing four-dimensional Poincaré invariance on the brane world-volume such that the metric corresponds to flat Minkowski spacetime requires the bulk cosmological constant to be fine-tuned with the brane tension [27]:

$$\Lambda = -24M^3k^2, \quad \lambda = 24M^3k. \quad (3)$$

The remarkable feature of this model is that the graviton equation of motion admits a zero energy ground state solution that is localized around the domain wall. This ground state is naturally interpreted (by a four-dimensional observer) as the four-dimensional, massless spin-2 graviton. A continuum of massive states also arises in the spectrum and these lead to corrections to the form of the Newton potential. However, these corrections fall as the cube of the distance,  $r$  [27]:

$$V(r) \approx \frac{G_N m_1 m_2}{r} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k^2 r^2} \right) \quad (4)$$

and, if the warping of the bulk geometry is sufficiently strong (i.e. the constant  $k$  is sufficiently large), these massive states are suppressed near the brane and are therefore harmless. This indicates that *the curvature of the five-dimensional world effectively determines the four-dimensional physics.*

The cosmology of the RSII scenario arises due to the motion of the brane through the bulk space. An observer confined to the surface of the brane interprets such motion in terms of cosmic expansion or contraction [34, 35, 36]. The ‘Friedmann’ equation describing the cosmic dynamics may be derived within the context of the thin wall formalism of (five-dimensional) General Relativity. Since we are interested primarily in late-time inflationary dynamics, we focus on the simplest case where the world-volume of the brane corresponds to the spatially flat, Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) metric and consider a pure AdS bulk. The effect of a bulk black hole on the four-dimensional brane dynamics is formally equivalent to that of a relativistic perfect fluid contribution to the energy–momentum tensor and so is rapidly redshifted away by the accelerated motion of the brane.

It is convenient to work with the five-dimensional metric expressed in static coordinates:

$$ds^2 = G_{AB}dx^A dx^B = -\frac{r^2}{L^2}dt^2 + \frac{L^2}{r^2}dr^2 + r^2 dE_3^2, \quad (5)$$

where the constant  $L$  is related to the bulk cosmological constant. The induced metric on the wall then has the desired form:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{AB} &= G_{AB} + n_A n_B \\ ds_4^2 &= -d\tau^2 + a^2(\tau)dE_3^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $n^A$  is the unit normal vector to the brane. Cosmic time as measured on the brane is parametrized by  $\tau$ , defined such that

$$d\tau^2 = \frac{r^2}{L^2}dt^2 - \frac{L^2}{r^2}dr^2 \quad (7)$$

and the radial coordinate of the brane in the bulk space determines the scale factor,  $a(\tau)$ :

$$r = r[a(\tau)]. \quad (8)$$

The effective Friedmann equation is then derived directly from the Israel junction conditions [37]:

$$K_{AB} = -4\pi G_5 \left( T_{AB} - \frac{1}{3} T h_{AB} \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $G_5$  is the five-dimensional Newton constant. These conditions relate the energy-momentum tensor,  $T_{AB}$ , of the matter confined on the brane directly to the brane's extrinsic curvature,  $K_{AB} \equiv h^C_{(A} h_{B)}^D \nabla_C n_D$ . Note that we have taken into account the  $Z_2$  symmetry in this expression and that  $T \equiv T^A_A$  is the trace of the energy-momentum.

Conservation of energy-momentum on the brane then follows as a direct consequence of the Codazzi equation:

$$\nabla_B K^B_A - \nabla_A K = \hat{R}_{BC} G^B_A n^C. \quad (10)$$

It is straightforward to verify that for the case of a pure AdS bulk geometry, the right-hand side of Eq. (10) is identically zero. Thus, substitution of the Israel junction conditions (9) into Eq. (10) implies conservation of energy-momentum on the brane:

$${}^{(4)}\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (11)$$

We will further assume that the energy-momentum tensor of the matter on the brane is given by the perfect fluid form

$$T^A_B|_{\text{brane}} = \delta(y) \text{diag}(-\rho, p, p, p, 0), \quad (12)$$

where  $\rho$  and  $p$  represent the energy density and pressure, respectively. Hence, we recover the standard expression of conventional cosmology:

$$\dot{\rho} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\rho + p) = 0, \quad (13)$$

where a dot denotes  $d/d\tau$ .

The spatial components of the Israel junction conditions (9), as given by

$$K_{ij} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{L^2} + \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2}}\delta_{ij}, \quad (14)$$

are now sufficient to derive the effective Friedmann equation. (The time–time components of Eq. (9) provide no new information for the model we are considering). We therefore deduce that [38, 39, 40, 34, 36, 41]

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = \left(\frac{4\pi G_5 \rho}{3}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{L^2}. \quad (15)$$

Although the quadratic dependence of the Friedmann equation (15) may appear to be inconsistent with the Hubble expansion, and particularly with constraints from primordial nucleosynthesis, we must recall that the vacuum brane has a tension,  $\lambda$ . This implies that the total matter content on the brane can effectively be separated into two components, the dynamical matter,  $\rho_B$ , and the tension. Substituting into Eq. (15) then implies that

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G_4}{3}\rho_B \left(1 + \frac{\rho_B}{2\lambda}\right) + \left(\frac{4\pi G_5 \lambda}{3}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{L^2}, \quad (16)$$

where  $G_4 \equiv 4\pi\lambda G_5^2/3$ . The constant terms are then cancelled by imposing the fine–tuning condition (3), resulting in a Friedmann equation of the form [38, 39, 40, 34, 36, 41]

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3m_4^2}\rho \left[1 + \frac{\rho}{2\lambda}\right], \quad (17)$$

where the subscript ‘ $B$ ’ is dropped for notational simplicity and we define the four–dimensional Planck mass,  $m_4 \equiv G_4^{-1/2}$ . The standard form of the Friedmann equation is recovered at low energy scales,  $\rho \ll \lambda$ , whereas the dependence on the energy density is modified to a quadratic form at high energies,  $\rho \gg \lambda$ .

We now consider the implications of this term for inflationary cosmology.

## 4 Braneworld Inflation

### 4.1 Scalar Field Dynamics

Eqs. (13) and (17) are sufficient to fully determine the cosmic dynamics on the brane once an equation of state has been specified for the matter sources. In what follows,

we assume that the brane matter consists of a single scalar field that is confined to the brane and is self-interacting through a potential,  $V(\phi)$ . The conservation equation (13) then implies that

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V' = 0, \quad (18)$$

where a prime denotes differentiation with respect to the scalar field. We further assume the slow-roll approximation,  $\dot{\phi}^2 \ll V$  and  $|\ddot{\phi}| \ll H|\dot{\phi}|$ . Eq. (18) then simplifies to  $3H\dot{\phi} \approx -V'$ .

The slow-roll parameters,  $\epsilon \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2$  and  $\eta \equiv V''/(3H^2)$ , may then be written in the form [42]

$$\epsilon \simeq \frac{m_4^2}{4\pi} \left( \frac{V'}{V} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{1 + V/\lambda}{(2 + V/\lambda)^2} \right] \quad (19)$$

$$\eta \simeq \frac{m_4^2}{8\pi} \left( \frac{V''}{V} \right) \left[ \frac{2\lambda}{2\lambda + V} \right] \quad (20)$$

and inflation occurs for  $\epsilon < 1$ . Self-consistency of the slow-roll approximation requires that  $\max\{\epsilon, |\eta|\} \ll 1$ . The number of e-foldings of inflationary expansion that occur when the scalar field rolls from some value,  $\phi$ , to the value,  $\phi_e$ , corresponding to the end of inflation is given by

$$N \equiv \ln a = \int_t^{t_e} dt H \approx -\frac{8\pi}{m_4^2} \int_\phi^{\phi_e} \frac{V}{V'} \left( 1 + \frac{V}{2\lambda} \right) d\phi. \quad (21)$$

The effect of the brane corrections is to enhance the value of the Hubble parameter relative to what it would be for a given pure Einstein gravity model of the same energy density [42]. This introduces additional friction on the scalar field and further resists its motion down the potential, thereby enabling a steeper class of potentials to support inflation. This is the basis behind the steep inflationary scenario [43]. The quadratic correction relaxes the condition for slow-roll inflation in the RSII scenario relative to the corresponding condition for the standard model. Generically, steep inflation proceeds in the region of parameter space where  $\rho \gg \lambda$  and naturally comes to an end when  $\rho \approx \lambda$ , since the conventional cosmological dynamics is recovered in this regime.

## 4.2 Density Perturbations

We now consider the generation of scalar and tensor perturbations in RSII inflation. Since many of the issues of perturbation theory in conventional inflationary models have already been covered in lectures at this school, we omit detailed discussions here and focus instead on the differences that arise between the two scenarios. We employ the normalization conventions of Ref. [44].

We begin by recalling that the scalar perturbations generated during inflation that is driven by a single, self-interacting scalar field are *adiabatic*. The curvature

perturbation on uniform density hypersurfaces is then given by  $\zeta = H\delta\phi/\dot{\phi}$  and is determined by the scalar field fluctuation,  $\delta\phi$ , on spatially flat hypersurfaces [6]. Conservation of energy–momentum implies that  $\zeta$  is conserved on large scales, a result that is independent of the specific form of the gravitational physics [45]. This implies that the amplitude of a mode when it re–enters the Hubble radius after inflation is related to the curvature perturbation by  $A_S^2 = 4\langle\zeta^2\rangle/25$ , where the right–hand side is evaluated when the mode with comoving wavenumber,  $k$ , goes beyond the Hubble radius during inflation, i.e., when

$$k(\phi) = a_e H(\phi) \exp[-N(\phi)], \quad (22)$$

where a subscript ‘e’ denotes values at the end of inflation and  $N = \int dt H(t)$  corresponds to the number of e–foldings of inflationary expansion that elapse between the time when the scale crosses the Hubble radius and the end of inflation [cf. Eq. (21)]. Finally, the Gibbons–Hawking temperature of de Sitter space determines the magnitude of the field fluctuation,  $\langle\delta\phi^2\rangle = H^2/(4\pi^2)$ , and we therefore deduce that the scalar perturbation amplitude has the form

$$A_S^2 = \frac{1}{25\pi^2} \frac{H^4}{\dot{\phi}^2} \Big|_{k=aH} \quad (23)$$

This is given in terms of the potential by [42]

$$A_S^2 = \frac{512\pi}{75m_4^6} \frac{V^3}{V'^2} \left(1 + \frac{V}{2\lambda}\right)^3 \quad (24)$$

after substitution of the Friedmann equation (17). We see that the amplitude is enhanced over that of the standard scenario by the bracketed term.

### 4.3 Gravitational Waves

Although to first–order the gravitational waves decouple from the matter, the calculation of the tensor perturbation spectrum is more involved in braneworld cosmology because the perturbations extend into the bulk. In this subsection we review the method of Langlois, Maartens and Wands [46]. To proceed analytically, it is necessary to assume pure de Sitter expansion on the brane and this is a good approximation if the inflation field is slowly rolling. It proves convenient to express the perturbed, five–dimensional metric in the form

$$ds_5^2 = \mathcal{A}^2[-dt^2 + a^2(\delta_{ij} + E_{ij})dx^i dx^j] + dy^2, \quad (25)$$

where  $E_{ij}$  represents the perturbations. The warp factor is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = (H/\alpha) \sinh[\alpha(y_h - |y|)], \quad (26)$$

where the Cauchy horizons,  $g_{00}(\pm y_h) = 0$ , are located at  $y = \pm y_h$ , and the constant  $\alpha = \kappa_4/\kappa_5 = (-\Lambda/6)^{1/2}$  is determined by the bulk cosmological constant,  $\Lambda$ . Here and throughout,  $\kappa_4^2 \equiv 8\pi m_4^{-2}$  and  $\kappa_5^2 \equiv 8\pi M^{-3}$ .

The standard approach is to expand the metric perturbations as a Fourier series. In this case, and assuming that any anisotropic stresses are negligible, the linearly perturbed junction conditions (9) reduce to

$$\left. \frac{dE}{dy} \right|_{y=0} = 0, \quad (27)$$

where  $E(t, y; \vec{k})$  denotes the amplitude of the modes. Assuming a pure de Sitter expansion of the brane world-volume allows us to separate the corresponding gravitational wave equation of motion and then expand the amplitude into eigenmodes such that  $E(t, y; \vec{k}) = \int dm \varphi_m(t; \vec{k}) \mathcal{E}_m(y)$ , where  $\varphi_m(t; \vec{k})$  and  $\mathcal{E}_m(y)$  depend on the world-volume and bulk coordinates, respectively, and  $m$  represents the separation constant. It can then be shown that the solution for the zero mode ( $m = 0$ ) is determined in full generality up to a quadrature [46]:

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = C_1 + C_2 \int^y dy' \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}^4(y')}, \quad (28)$$

where  $C_{1,2}$  are constants. In general, if a given mode diverges at the Cauchy horizon, it can not form part of the spectrum of orthonormal modes that constitute the basis of the Hilbert space for the quantum field. (Heuristically, this is because such a mode would produce an infinite contribution to the action and so it would cost too much energy to excite it). However, we must specify  $C_2 = 0$  to satisfy the boundary condition (27) and this removes the divergent part of the zero-mode. Thus, the physically relevant solution for the zero-mode is  $\mathcal{E}_0 = C_1$ . The non-zero modes are not excited – modes where  $m < 3H/2$  remain divergent at the Cauchy horizon even when Eq. (27) is satisfied and modes satisfying  $m > 3H/2$  remain in the vacuum state during inflation [46].

The zero-mode,  $\varphi_0$ , remains constant on super-Hubble radius scales, as in the four-dimensional scenario. The amplitude of the quantum fluctuation in this mode is then calculated by deriving an effective, five-dimensional action for the tensor perturbations and integrating over the fifth dimension. This results in a four-dimensional action that corresponds formally to a massless scalar field propagating in a FRW universe. The standard four-dimensional analysis may then be employed to determine the amplitude if the action is normalized appropriately when integrating over the fifth dimension. This requires that

$$2 \int_0^{y_h} dy C_1^2 \mathcal{A}^2 = 1 \quad (29)$$

and implies that  $C_1 = \sqrt{\alpha} F(x)$ , where

$$\frac{1}{F^2} = \sqrt{1+x^2} - x^2 \sinh^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{x} \right) \quad (30)$$

and  $x \equiv H/\alpha$ . Finally, the tensorial amplitude follows once each polarization state is interpreted as a quantum field propagating in a time-dependent potential [46]:

$$A_T^2 = \frac{\kappa_4^2}{50\pi^2} H^2 F^2 \Big|_{k=aH}. \quad (31)$$

The effects of the brane modifications are parametrized in terms of the ‘correction’ function  $F$ . In the low-energy limit ( $\rho \ll \lambda, x \ll 1$ ),  $F \approx 1$ , whereas  $F^2 \approx [27H^2 m_4^2 / (16\pi\lambda)]^{1/2}$  in the high-energy limit.

#### 4.4 The Consistency Equation

Since the scalar field slowly rolls down its potential, the amplitudes of the perturbations are not precisely scale-invariant. These variations are parametrized in terms of the spectral indices, or *tilts*, of the spectra and are defined by

$$n_S \equiv 1 + d \ln A_S^2 / d \ln k, \quad n_T \equiv d \ln A_T^2 / d \ln k \quad (32)$$

for the scalar and tensor perturbations, respectively. The scalar spectral index may be expressed in terms of the slow-roll parameters:

$$n_S - 1 = -6\epsilon + 2\eta. \quad (33)$$

In the high energy limit ( $\rho \gg \lambda, x \gg 1$ ), the tilts are given in terms of the potential and its first two derivatives by

$$n_S - 1 \approx -\frac{m_4^2 \lambda}{2\pi V} \left[ 3 \frac{V'^2}{V^2} - \frac{V''}{V} \right] \quad (34)$$

$$n_T \approx -\frac{3m_4^2 \lambda V'^2}{4\pi V^3}. \quad (35)$$

It is well known that since the scalar and tensor perturbations share a common origin through the inflaton potential,  $V(\phi)$ , it is possible to relate them in a way that is independent of the functional form of the potential. (For a review, see, e.g., Ref. [44]). This relationship is known as the *consistency equation* and, to lowest-order in the slow-roll approximation, determines the relative amplitudes of the tensor and scalar perturbations directly in terms of the tilt of the gravitational wave spectrum:

$$\frac{A_T^2}{A_S^2} = -\frac{1}{2} n_T. \quad (36)$$

Since it is independent of the potential, Eq. (36) represents a powerful test of single-field inflationary models and, in principle, failure to satisfy such a constraint could be employed to rule out such a class of models. At present, the contribution of tensor perturbations to the large-angle CMB power spectrum is constrained to be

no more than 30 % and, in practice, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to measure the tilt of the tensor spectrum to a sufficient level of accuracy. Nevertheless, a cosmological background of gravitational waves could be detected through their contribution to the B-mode (curl) of the CMB polarization [48] and interest is growing in this possibility in light of the recent detections of polarization in the CMB [47, 8]. In any case, even in the event that such a detection is not made, the consistency relation remains important because it removes a free parameter (usually chosen to be  $n_T$ ) when determining the best-fit models to the data.

Given the importance of the consistency equation, it is clearly of interest to determine the form of the corresponding relations in braneworld cosmologies [49, 50]. We have seen that in the case of the RSII scenario, the amplitudes of the perturbations are modified by the brane effects and these modifications become progressively more important at higher energy scales. Consequently, it is to be anticipated that the form of the consistency equation should reflect these differences. If so, this would provide a potentially observable test of RSII inflation.

In the standard scenario, the consistency equation (36) is derived by first differentiating the tensorial spectrum with respect to comoving wavenumber,  $k$ , and then relating a given scale to the corresponding value of the inflaton field through Eq. (22). Any dependence on the first derivative of the inflaton potential may then be eliminated by substituting for the scalar perturbation amplitude and any remaining dependence on the inflaton potential itself may be removed by substituting for the tensor perturbation amplitude.

In principle, an identical approach could be followed to derive the consistency equation in RSII inflation. However, given the complicated form of the amplitudes, this is algebraically very difficult (but not impossible) to accomplish. In view of this, we adopt a more elegant approach and proceed by defining a pair of new variables [50]

$$b \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sinh^{-1} x \quad (37)$$

$$\beta \equiv \kappa_4 \frac{d\phi}{dN}, \quad (38)$$

where  $x$  is defined after Eq. (30). This implies that the Friedmann equation (17) and scalar field equation (18) reduce to a first-order, non-linear system of differential equations:

$$\dot{b} = - \left( \frac{3\kappa_4^2}{8\lambda} \right)^{1/2} \dot{\phi}^2 \quad (39)$$

$$\beta = - \left( \frac{8\lambda}{3} \right)^{1/2} \frac{b'}{H}. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the correction function (30) arising in the gravitational wave amplitude (31) depends only on the single variable,  $b$ , and may be expressed in terms of a single




Figure 2: In the asymmetric RSII braneworld scenario, there is no reflection symmetry imposed on the bulk dimension and the cosmological constant may take different values on either side of the brane.

quadrature:

$$\frac{1}{F^2} = -4 \sinh^2 2b \int \frac{db}{\sinh^3 2b}, \quad (41)$$

whereas the scalar perturbations (23) depend on  $\beta$ :

$$A_S^2 = \frac{\kappa_4^2 H^2}{25\pi^2 \beta^2}. \quad (42)$$

We are now in a position to derive the form of the consistency equation in this scenario. By employing the definitions (22), (37) and (38) and substituting Eqs. (31), (40) and (42) into Eq. (41), we find that

$$\frac{1}{A_T^2} = 2 \int \frac{d \ln k}{A_S^2}. \quad (43)$$

Thus, differentiation with respect to comoving wavenumber recovers the consistency equation [49, 50]

$$\frac{A_T^2}{A_S^2} = -\frac{1}{2} n_T. \quad (44)$$

Remarkably, the form of the consistency equation is *identical* to that of standard, single-field inflation. This is particularly surprising given that the gravitational physics is manifestly different in the two scenarios. Formally, this degeneracy between the consistency equations arises because the combination of observable parameters in Eq. (44) is independent of the brane tension, but it is not immediately transparent from Eqs. (24), (30) and (31) why this should be so.

## 5 Asymmetric Braneworld Inflation

We now proceed in this Section to consider an extension of the RSII scenario where the  $Z_2$  reflection symmetry in the bulk dimension is no longer imposed. This implies

that the brane may be embedded in five-dimensional AdS space where the value of the cosmological constant differs on either side of the brane (Fig. 2). Similar analyses to those summarized in Sections 3 and 4 may be followed to derive the Friedmann equation and the inflationary perturbation spectra. Here, we omit many of the details and simply highlight the main results.

The spatial components of the junction conditions reduce to [34, 51, 52]

$$\left(\alpha_+ + H^2\right)^{1/2} + \left(\alpha_- + H^2\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\kappa_5^2 \rho}{3}, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\alpha_{\pm} \equiv -\kappa_5^2 \Lambda_{\pm} / 6 \quad (46)$$

and  $\Lambda_{\pm}$  are the bulk cosmological constants either side of the brane. Dimensional reduction relates the four- and five-dimensional Newton constants:

$$\frac{\kappa_5^2}{\kappa_4^2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_+}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_-}} \right). \quad (47)$$

Solving Eq. (45) yields the Friedmann equation [34, 51, 52]:

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa_5^4 \rho^2}{36} - \frac{1}{2} (\alpha_- + \alpha_+) + \frac{9}{4\kappa_5^4 \rho^2} (\alpha_- - \alpha_+)^2 \quad (48)$$

and, as in the symmetric scenario, a brane tension may be introduced in order to recover the required linear dependence on the energy density at low energy scales. Relaxing the  $Z_2$  symmetry results in the appearance of the third term on the right-hand side of Eq. (48). Note how this term is proportional to  $\rho^{-2}$  and becomes negligible at high energies. (However, this does not imply that such a term diverges at very low energies, since the density as shown here represents the total energy density on the brane. This consists of both the matter contributions as well as the brane tension,  $\lambda$ ). It is worth remarking that the Friedmann equation (48) exhibits an infra-red/ultra-violet duality, in the sense that it is invariant under the transformation of the energy density,  $\kappa_5^2 \rho \leftrightarrow 9|\alpha_+ - \alpha_-| / (\kappa_5^2 \rho)$ .

Since the bulk space on either side of the brane is AdS, the Gauss-Codazzi equation (10) once more implies that energy-momentum is conserved on the brane and Eq. (13) therefore remains valid. This is important because it implies that the argument of Section 4.2 may be employed once more to determine the amplitude of the scalar perturbations. Consequently, the amplitude is given by Eq. (23), although its specific dependence on the inflaton potential is altered from that of the symmetric scenario due to the additional term arising in the Friedmann equation (48). Indeed, substituting Eq. (48) and the scalar field equation (18) into Eq. (23) implies that [50]

$$A_S^2 = \frac{9}{25\pi^2} \frac{1}{V'^2} \left[ \frac{\kappa_5^4 (V + \lambda)^2}{36} - \frac{1}{2} (\alpha_- + \alpha_+) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{9}{4\kappa_5^4(V + \lambda)^2} (\alpha_- - \alpha_+)^2 \Big|_{k=aH}^3 \quad (49)$$

The tensor spectrum for this model has been calculated in Ref. [50] by extending the method of Ref. [46]. The result is

$$A_T^2 = \frac{\kappa_5^2}{50\pi^2} H^2 J^2 \Big|_{k=aH} \quad (50)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{J^2} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha_-}F^2(x_-)} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha_+}F^2(x_+)}, \quad (51)$$

the functional form of  $F = F(x_\pm)$  is given by Eq. (30) and  $x_\pm \equiv H/\sqrt{\alpha_\pm}$ . At low energy scales ( $x_\pm \ll 1$ ), we find that  $J \rightarrow \kappa_4/\kappa_5$ , implying that the standard expression is recovered in this limit, as expected.

The consistency equation can be derived in this model [50]. Given the results of Section 4, the simplest approach is to assume *a priori* that the consistency equation has the same form as that of Eq. (36) and to then verify that this is indeed the case. Let us therefore substitute the scalar and tensor perturbations, Eqs. (23) and (50), directly into Eq. (36). We find that

$$\frac{d \ln(HJ)}{dH} \frac{dH}{dN} = -\frac{\kappa_5^2}{18} \frac{J^2 V'^2}{H^4}, \quad (52)$$

where we have employed the slow-roll approximation in the form  $d \ln k \approx d \ln a = dN$ . Noting that the scalar field equation,  $3H\dot{\phi} = -V'$ , may be expressed in the somewhat unconventional form

$$\frac{dH}{dN} = -\frac{dH}{dV} \frac{V'^2}{3H^2} \quad (53)$$

then allows us to simplify Eq. (52) through substitution of Eq. (53) [50]:

$$H^4 \frac{dH}{dV} \frac{d(HJ)^{-2}}{dH} = -\frac{\kappa_5^2}{3}. \quad (54)$$

Eq. (54) represents a *necessary* condition for the consistency equation (36) to hold. It should be emphasized that this condition applies to any (single field) braneworld scenario, where energy-momentum is conserved on the brane. In general, a given braneworld model may be characterized by the functional form of its Friedmann equation, i.e., by the dependence of the Hubble parameter on the inflaton potential,  $H = H(V)$ . Once this relation has been established, Eq. (54) may then be interpreted as a constraint that must be satisfied by the correction function,  $J = J(H)$ , if the consistency equation is to remain degenerate. To illustrate this, consider the standard scenario, where  $H \propto V^{1/2}$ . We see immediately that the left-hand side of Eq. (54) is constant when  $J = 1$ .

It is possible, after some lengthy algebra, to confirm that Eq. (54) is indeed satisfied for the asymmetric RSII scenario when the correction to the tensor spectrum takes the form given by Eq. (51) and we therefore conclude that even in this generalized, asymmetric RSII model, the consistency equation remains degenerate [50]:

$$\frac{A_T^2}{A_S^2} = -\frac{1}{2}n_T. \quad (55)$$

Before concluding this Section, we briefly consider the braneworld model of Ref. [53], where the brane is embedded in a five-dimensional bulk space with a stabilized radius. This model differs from the RSII scenario in that the Friedmann equation, and therefore the scalar perturbation spectrum, remain unmodified. However, the presence of the fifth dimension becomes apparent through a correction to the tensor spectrum. Thus, one would certainly expect the consistency equation to be modified in this model. However, surprisingly, this is not the case – the correction to the gravitational wave amplitude is given by  $J^2 = (1 - \alpha H^2)^{-2}$ , where  $\alpha$  is a constant with a numerical value determined by the radius of the extra dimension [53]. One may readily deduce that a correction of this form satisfies Eq. (54) and, moreover, represents the general solution to Eq. (54) when the Friedmann equation has the standard form. Thus, we now know of four classes of inflationary cosmologies, modelled on different gravitational physics, where the consistency equation remains robust.

Such a degeneracy implies that the task of identifying the correct inflationary model through observations will be more difficult. On the other hand, although the consistency equation may be interpreted as a prediction of single field inflation, it should be emphasized that it is a prediction relating the *primordial* perturbations. In particular, in the above analyses we have neglected the influence of the bulk space on the subsequent evolution of the perturbations. This is equivalent to assuming that the projection of the five-dimensional Weyl tensor vanishes to linear order. More generally, however, the backreaction of the bulk will perturb the bulk space away from conformal invariance and generate a non-trivial Weyl tensor in five dimensions. This results in a non-local energy-momentum source in the gravitational field equations when projected down to four dimensions [54]. As a result, the background dynamics is altered. The subsequent evolution of the perturbations is difficult to determine in general, because the system of equations is not closed, although it is expected that it will be model-dependent to some extent.

A further assumption that we have made is that the field is rolling sufficiently slowly down its potential. This assumption can be relaxed in the standard scenario by working to the ‘next-to-leading’ order in the slow-roll approximation. In this regime, it has been shown that the consistency equation (36) receives modifications [55]:

$$n_T = -2\frac{A_T^2}{A_S^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{A_T^2}{A_S^2} + (1 - n_S) \right]. \quad (56)$$

The question that naturally arises, therefore, is whether the corresponding consistency equations in the RSII scenarios receive similar corrections or whether the degeneracy can be lifted by moving away from the slow-roll approximation. The answer to this and related questions must be left for future work.

## 6 Gauss–Bonnet Braneworld Cosmology

As well as developing the framework for testing braneworld inflation through a confrontation with observations, another important task is to enhance the connection of the scenario with string/M–theory. One approach towards this goal is to include combinations of higher–order curvature invariants in the bulk action [56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63]. Within the context of the AdS/CFT correspondence, such terms arise as next–to–leading order corrections in the  $1/N$  expansion of the CFT [64]. The Gauss–Bonnet combination,  $\hat{R}^2 - 4\hat{R}_{ab}\hat{R}^{ab} + \hat{R}_{abcd}\hat{R}^{abcd}$ , is of particular relevance, given that it is the unique combination in five dimensions that results in second–order field equations in the metric and it also appears as a leading–order quantum correction in the heterotic string theory action [65, 66, 67].

The extension of the RSII scenario to include this term is presently attracting attention. The five–dimensional field equations admit Schwarzschild–AdS space as a solution [66, 68] and the Friedmann equation may be derived through a variety of methods. These include generalizing Birkhoff’s theorem [59], varying the boundary terms in the action [60], or by employing the formalism of differential forms [61]. When the bulk space is  $Z_2$  symmetric, the Friedmann equation takes the form [59, 60, 61]

$$H^2 = \frac{c_+ + c_- - 2}{8\alpha}, \quad (57)$$

where

$$c_{\pm} = \left\{ \left[ \left(1 + \frac{4}{3}\alpha\Lambda\right)^{3/2} + \frac{\alpha}{2}\kappa_5^4\rho^2 \right]^{1/2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2}\kappa_5^2\rho} \right\}^{2/3}, \quad (58)$$

the bulk cosmological constant is  $\Lambda$  and  $\alpha > 0$  represents the Gauss–Bonnet coupling constant. As in the models discussed above, conservation of energy–momentum on the brane follows directly from the Gauss–Codazzi equations.

Despite the rather complicated form of Eq. (57), it is possible to make progress analytically by introducing a new variable,  $r$  [63]:

$$\rho \equiv \left( \frac{2b}{\alpha\kappa_5^4} \right)^{1/2} \sinh r \quad (59)$$

and defining the constant

$$b \equiv \left(1 + \frac{4}{3}\alpha\Lambda\right)^{3/2}. \quad (60)$$

Substituting Eqs. (59) and (60) into Eq. (58) then implies that

$$c_{\pm} = b^{1/3} \exp(\pm 2r/3) \quad (61)$$

and, as a result, the Friedmann equation (57) simplifies considerably [63]:

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{4\alpha} \left[ b^{1/3} \cosh\left(\frac{2r}{3}\right) - 1 \right]. \quad (62)$$

It may be verified that the Friedmann equation (62) exhibits a quadratic dependence on the total energy density in the low energy limit corresponding to the RSII model. At sufficiently high energies, however, the dependence scales as  $H^2 \propto \rho^{2/3}$ . The condition for inflation to proceed in this regime is simply that the pressure of the matter be negative,  $p < 0$ . More precisely, slow-roll parameters may be introduced and, in the slow-roll limit where the inflaton potential dominates the brane tension,  $\lambda$ , they are given by [63]

$$\epsilon = \left( \frac{2\lambda}{\kappa_4^2} \frac{V'^2}{V^3} \right) \left[ \frac{2b^{2/3}}{27} \frac{\sinh(2r/3) \tanh r \sinh^2 r}{[b^{1/3} \cosh(2r/3) - 1]^2} \right], \quad (63)$$

$$\eta = \left( \frac{2\lambda}{\kappa_4^2} \frac{V''}{V^2} \right) \left[ \frac{2b^{1/3}}{9} \frac{\sinh^2 r}{b^{1/3} \cosh(2r/3) - 1} \right]. \quad (64)$$

The terms in the square brackets parametrize the effects of the Gauss–Bonnet contribution. These are monotonically decreasing functions of  $r$  and tend to unity from above as  $\{r, \alpha\} \rightarrow 0$ . In this limit, the slow-roll parameters reduce to those of the RSII model. It follows, therefore, that the Gauss–Bonnet contribution tightens the constraints for inflation to proceed relative to the RSII scenario.

A further consequence of introducing a Gauss–Bonnet term is that the spectrum of perturbations is altered. For example, in the high-energy limit where  $H^2 \propto \rho^{2/3}$ , we find that  $A_S^2 \propto H^4/\dot{\phi}^2 \propto H^6/V'^2 \propto (V/V')^2$ . Thus, for the case of an exponential potential, the spectrum is pushed very close to a scale-invariant form [63]. This is interesting given that potentials of this nature generically arises in a number of particle physics inspired settings.

Finally, it would be of interest to determine whether the degeneracy of the inflationary consistency equation is lifted by introducing a Gauss–Bonnet term into the bulk action. To date, the gravitational wave spectrum in this model has yet to be determined. The calculation of the spectrum is more involved than that of the RSII scenario, because the linearly perturbed junction conditions must be employed to impose the necessary boundary conditions on the perturbations.

## 7 Concluding Remark

To summarize, inflationary cosmology based on Randall–Sundrum braneworlds remains a rich environment for future work. The scenario has already revealed unex-

pected surprises and surely has more to offer. It is well motivated from a string theoretic perspective in view of its close relationship with the AdS/CFT correspondence. It is sufficiently simple to provide a framework for performing analytical calculations and thereby making observational predictions. Thus, it provides a unique window into higher-dimensional physics.

JEL is supported by the Royal Society. It is a pleasure to thank G. Huey and N. Nunes with whom various results presented in Sections 4 & 5 and Section 6 were derived.

## References

- [1] C. L. Bennett *et al.*, astro-ph/0302207; G. Hinshaw *et al.*, astro-ph/0302217.
- [2] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, astro-ph/0302209.
- [3] B. P. Schmidt *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **507**, 46 (1998); A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999).
- [4] A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett.* **91B**, 99 (1980); A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev.* **D23**, 347 (1981); A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1220 (1982); S. W. Hawking and I. G. Moss, *Phys. Lett.* **110B**, 35 (1982); A. D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **108B**, 389 (1982); A. D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **129B**, 177 (1983).
- [5] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, *Cosmological Inflation and Large-Scale Structure* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [6] V. Mukhanov and G. Chibisov, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **33**, 549 (1981) [*JETP Lett.* **33**, 532 (1981), astro-ph/0303077]; A. H. Guth and S. Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1110 (1982); S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Lett.* **115B**, 295 (1982); A. D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **116B**, 335 (1982); A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett.* **117B**, 175 (1982); A. A. Starobinsky, *Sov. Astron. Lett.* **9**, 302 (1983); J. M. Bardeen, P. J. Steinhardt, and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **D28**, 679 (1983); D. H. Lyth, *Phys. Rev.* **D31**, 1792 (1985).
- [7] H. V. Peiris *et al.*, astro-ph/0302225.
- [8] A. Kogut *et al.*, astro-ph/0302213.
- [9] E. Komatsu *et al.*, astro-ph/0302223.
- [10] S. L. Bridle, A. M. Lewis, J. Weller, and G. Efstathiou, astro-ph/0302306.

- [11] S. Dodelson and L. Hui, astro-ph/0305113; W. H. Kinney, E. W. Kolb, A. Melchiorri, and A. Riotto, astro-ph/0305130; A. R. Liddle and S. M. Leach, astro-ph/0305263.
- [12] W. Hu and M. White, *Astrophys. J.* **479**, 568 (1997); D. N. Spergel and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2180 (1997).
- [13] J. Polchinski, *String Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [14] C. V. Johnson, *D-Branes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [15] J. E. Lidsey, D. Wands, and E. J. Copeland, *Phys. Rep.* **337**, 343 (2000); M. Quevedo, hep-th/0210292; M. Gasperini and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Rep.* **373**, 1 (2003).
- [16] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B443**, 85 (1995).
- [17] P. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B350**, 184 (1995).
- [18] J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4724 (1995).
- [19] K. Akama, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **176**, 267 (1982), hep-th/0001113; V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **125B**, 136 (1983); M. Visser, *Phys. Lett.* **159B**, 22 (1985).
- [20] P. Hořava and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B460**, 506 (1996); P. Hořava and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B475**, 94 (1996).
- [21] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle, and D. Waldram, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 086001 (1999).
- [22] K. Benakli, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D8**, 153 (1999); K. Benakli, *Phys. Lett.* **B447**, 51 (1999); A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, and D. Waldram, *Phys. Rev.* **D60**, 086001 (1999); H. S. Reall, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 103506 (1999); J. E. Lidsey, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17**, L39 (2000).
- [23] M. Gasperini and G. Veneziano, *Astropart. Phys.* **1**, 317 (1991).
- [24] J. Khoury, B. A. Ovrut, P. J. Steinhardt, and N. Turok, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 123522 (2001).
- [25] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B429**, 263 (1998); I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B436**, 257 (1998).
- [26] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3370 (1999).
- [27] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4690 (1999).

- [28] G. 't Hooft, gr-qc/9310026; L. Susskind, *J. Math. Phys.* **36**, 6337 (1995).
- [29] J. M. Maldacena, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998); E. Witten, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 505 (1998); S. Gubser, I. Klebanov, and A. Polyakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B428**, 105 (1998); O. Aharony, S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, and Y. Oz, *Phys. Rep.* **323**, 183 (2000).
- [30] S. W. Hawking, T. Hertog, and H. S. Reall, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** 043501 (2000); S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and S. Zerbini, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** 064006 (2000); S. Nojiri and S. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett.* **B484**, 119 (2000); L. Anchordoqui, C. Nunez, and K. Olsen, *J. High Energy Phys.* **10**, 050 (2000); S. Nojiri and S. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett.* **B494**, 135 (2000); S. Gubser, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 084017 (2001); T. Shiromizu and D. Ida, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 044015 (2001).
- [31] E. Verlinde, hep-th/0008140; I. Savonije and E. Verlinde, *Phys. Lett.* **B507**, 305 (2001).
- [32] R. Argurio, hep-th/9807171; J. P. Gauntlett, hep-th/9705011.
- [33] J. E. Lidsey, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 063507 (2001).
- [34] P. Kraus, *J. High Energy Phys.* **12**, 011 (1999); D. Ida, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09**, 014 (2000).
- [35] H. A. Chamblin and H. S. Reall, *Nucl. Phys.* **B562**, 133 (1999); H. A. Chamblin, M. J. Perry, and H. S. Reall, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09**, 014 (1999).
- [36] C. Barcelo and M. Visser, *Phys. Lett.* **B482**, 183 (2000).
- [37] W. Israel, *Nuovo Cim.* **44B**, 1 (1966).
- [38] P. Binétruy, C. Deffayet, and D. Langlois, *Nucl. Phys.* **B565**, 269 (2000); P. Binétruy, C. Deffayet, U. Ellwanger, and D. Langlois, *Phys. Lett.* **B477**, 285 (2000).
- [39] E. E. Flanagan, S. -H. Tye, and I. Wasserman, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 044039 (2000).
- [40] J. M. Cline, C. Grojean, and G. Servant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4245 (1999); C. Csáki, M. Graesser, C. Kolda, and J. Terning, *Phys. Lett.* **B462**, 34 (1999).
- [41] T. Shiromizu, K. Maeda, and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 024012 (2000).
- [42] R. Maartens, D. Wands, B. Bassett, and I. Heard, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 041301 (2000).
- [43] E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle, and J. E. Lidsey, *Phys. Rev.* **D64**, 023509 (2001).

- [44] J. E. Lidsey, A. R. Liddle, E. W. Kolb, E. J. Copeland, T. Barreiro, and M. Abney, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69**, 373 (1997).
- [45] D. Wands, K. A. Malik, D. H. Lyth, and A. R. Liddle, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 043527 (2000).
- [46] D. Langlois, R. Maartens, and D. Wands, *Phys. Lett.* **B489**, 259 (2000).
- [47] J. Kovac *et al.*, *Nat.* **420**, 772 (2002).
- [48] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky, and A. Stebbins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2058 (1997); U. Seljak and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2054 (1997).
- [49] G. Huey and J. E. Lidsey, *Phys. Lett.* **B514**, 217 (2001).
- [50] G. Huey and J. E. Lidsey, *Phys. Rev.* **D66**, 043514 (2002).
- [51] H. Stoica, S. -H. Tye, and I. Wasserman, *Phys. Lett.* **B482**, 205 (2000).
- [52] H. Collins and B. Holdom, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 105009 (2000); N. Deruelle and T. Dolezel, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 103502 (2000); P. Bowcock, C. Charmousis, and R. Gregory, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17**, 4745 (2000); W. B. Perkins, *Phys. Lett.* **B504**, 28 (2001).
- [53] G. F. Giudice, E. W. Kolb, J. Lesgourgues, and A. Riotto, *Phys. Rev.* **D66**, 083512 (2002).
- [54] C. Gordon and R. Maartens, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 044022 (2001).
- [55] E. J. Copeland, E. W. Kolb, A. R. Liddle, and J. E. Lidsey, *Phys. Rev.* **D49**, 1840 (1994).
- [56] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07**, 049 (2000); M. Giovannini, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 064011 (2001); S. Mukohyama, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 104025 (2001); G. Kofinas, *J. High Energy Phys.* **08**, 034 (2001); S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and S. Ogushi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A16**, 5085 (2001); S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and S. Ogushi, *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 023521 (2002).
- [57] J. E. Kim, B. Kyae, and H. M. Lee, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 045013 (2000); N. Deruelle and T. Dolezel, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 103502 (2000); I. Low and A. Zee, *Nucl. Phys.* **B585**, 395 (2000); O. Corradini and Z. Kakushadze, *Phys. Lett.* **B494**, 302 (2000); J. E. Kim, B. Kyae, and H. M. Lee, *Nucl. Phys.* **B582**, 296 (2000); Erratum–*ibid* **B591**, 587 (2000); J. E. Kim and H. M. Lee, *Nucl. Phys.* **B602**, 346 (2001); B. Abdesselam and N. Mohammedi, *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 084018 (2002); C. Germani and C. F. Sopuerta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 231101 (2002); J. E. Lidsey, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, *J. High Energy Phys.* **06**, 026 (2002).

- [58] N. E. Mavromatos and J. Rizos, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 124004 (2000); I. P. Neupane, J. High Energy Phys. **09**, 040 (2000); I. P. Neupane, Phys. Lett. **B512**, 137 (2001); K. A. Meissner and M. Olechowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3708 (2001); Y. M. Cho, I. Neupane, and P. S. Wesson, Nucl. Phys. **B621**, 388 (2002).
- [59] C. Charmousis and J. Dufaux, Class. Quantum Grav. **19**, 4671 (2002).
- [60] S. C. Davis, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 024030 (2003).
- [61] E. Gravanis and S. Willison, hep-th/0209076.
- [62] P. Binetruy, C. Charmousis, S. C. Davis, and J. Dufaux, Phys. Lett. **B544**, 183 (2002).
- [63] J. E. Lidsey and N. Nunes, astro-ph/0303168.
- [64] A. Fayyazuddin and M. Spalinski, Nucl. Phys. **B535**, 219 (1998); O. Aharony, A. Fayyazuddin, and J. Maldacena, J. High Energy Phys. **07**, 013 (1998).
- [65] B. Zwiebach, Phys. Lett. **156B**, 315 (1985); A. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1846 (1985); R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B293**, 385 (1987).
- [66] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2656 (1985).
- [67] N. Deruelle and J. Madore, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A1**, 237 (1986); N. Deruelle and L. Farina-Busto, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3696 (1990).
- [68] R. G. Cai, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 084014 (2002).