

Primordial perturbations with pre-inflationary bounce

Yong Cai^{1*}, Yu-Tong Wang^{1†}, Jin-Yun Zhao^{1‡}, and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2§}

¹ *School of Physics, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China and*

² *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,*

P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China

Abstract

Based on the effective field theory (EFT) of nonsingular cosmologies, we build a stable model, without the ghost and gradient instabilities, of bounce inflation (inflation is preceded by a cosmological bounce). We perform a full simulation for the evolution of scalar perturbation, and find that the perturbation spectrum has a large-scale suppression (as expected), which is consistent with the power deficit of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) TT-spectrum at low multipoles, but unexpectedly, it also shows itself one marked lower valley, which actually provides a better fit to the dip at multipole $l \sim 20$. The depth of valley is relevant with the physics around the bounce scale, which is model-dependent.

PACS numbers:

* caiyong13@mails.ucas.ac.cn

† wangyutong12@mails.ucas.ac.cn

‡ zhaojinyun15@mails.ucas.ac.cn

§ yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Inflation [1][2][3][4] is the current paradigm of early universe. It predicts nearly scale-invariant scalar perturbation, which is consistent with the cosmic microwave background (CMB) observations [5][6], as well as the gravitational waves (GWs). However, it is not the final story of the early universe. As pointed out by Borde, Vilenkin and Guth [7][8], inflation is past-incomplete, and “*inflationary models require physics other than inflation to describe the past boundary of the inflating region of spacetime.*” [8].

This past-incompletion (singularity) of inflation has inspired radical alternatives to inflation, e.g., [9][10][11][12]. However, how to make the inflation happen in a past-complete scenario is also a noteworthy issue. In certain sense, this actually requires that the pre-inflationary phase should be past-complete. One possibility is that it is slow contracting, so that the infinite past is complete Minkowski spacetime. In such a scenario, a nonsingular bounce preceding inflation must occur (so-called the bounce inflation scenario) [13].

Recently, the Planck collaboration [14][15] have observed the power deficit of CMB TT-spectrum at large scale. This might be a hint of the pre-inflationary physics, which happens around ~ 60 e-folds, e.g., [16]. The idea of bounce inflation accounted for not only the power deficit on large angular scales [13][17][18], but also a large dipole power asymmetry [17][19] in the CMB fluctuation. Thus we conjectured that the physics hinted by the CMB anomalies might be relevant with the pre-inflationary bounce, see also [20][21][22][23][24][25][26][27].

In physical time, the equation of motion of scalar perturbation ζ is

$$\ddot{\zeta}_k + \left(3H + \frac{\dot{Q}_s}{Q_s} \right) \dot{\zeta}_k + c_s^2 \frac{k^2}{a^2} \zeta_k = 0. \quad (1)$$

Generally, $Q_s \sim \epsilon_{cont} = const. \gg 1$ for the contraction, while $Q_s \sim \epsilon_{inf} < 1$ for the inflation, where $\epsilon = -\dot{H}/H^2$. Thus Q_s inevitably shows itself a jumping around the nonsingular bounce, even if this phase lasts shortly enough. Previous studies neglected the effect of Q_s on the perturbation spectrum, since this effect is ambiguous without a fully stable (without the ghost and gradient instabilities) nonsingular bounce. Recently, with the effective field theory (EFT) of nonsingular cosmologies [28][29][30], we have been able to stably manipulate the bounce [31][32], see also [33][34]. This impels us to reconsider the relevant issue.

In this paper, inspired by [28][29][31][32], we build a fully stable model of bounce inflation, in which initially the universe is in the ekpyrotic contraction. By numerically solving Eq.

(1), we find that the pre-inflationary bounce not only brings the power deficit of the CMB TT-spectrum at low multipoles (as expected in [13][17]), but unexpectedly, also provides a better explanation to the dip at multipole $l \sim 20$ hinted by Planck [6].

II. THE LAGRANGIAN

Recently, it has been found that the nonsingular cosmological models usually suffer from the ghost or gradient instabilities ($c_s^2 < 0$) [35][36], see also [37][38]. Based on the EFT of nonsingular cosmologies [28][29][30], this No-go result has been clearly illustrated. The cubic Galileon interaction $\sim \square\phi$ in Horndeski theory [39][40][41] only moves the period of $c_s^2 < 0$ to the outside of bounce phase, but cannot dispels it completely [42][43]. It has been found first in [28][29] that the operator $R^{(3)}\delta g^{00}$ in EFT could play significant role in curing the gradient instability of scalar perturbation. Recently, we have built fully stable cosmological bounce models in Ref. [31] by applying the covariant $L_{R^{(3)}\delta g^{00}}$.

We follow Ref. [31], and after defining $\phi_\mu = \nabla_\mu\phi$, $\phi^\mu = \nabla^\mu\phi$, $\phi_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\nu\nabla_\mu\phi$, $X = \phi_\mu\phi^\mu$ and $\square\phi = \phi^\mu{}_{,\mu}$, write the effective Lagrangian of nonsingular bounce inflation as (ϕ is set dimensionless)

$$\begin{aligned}
L \sim & \underbrace{\frac{M_p^2}{2}R - \frac{M_p^2}{2}X - V(\phi)}_{\text{Contraction + Inflation}} \\
& + \underbrace{\tilde{P}(\phi, X)}_{\text{(Ghost free) Bounce}} + \underbrace{L_{\delta g^{00}R^{(3)}}}_{\text{Removing } c_s^2 < 0} + L_{\delta K\delta g^{00}}, \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\delta g^{00}R^{(3)}} &= \frac{f_1(\phi)}{2}\delta g^{00}R^{(3)} \\
&= \frac{f}{2}R - \frac{X}{2}\int f_{\phi\phi}d\ln X - \left(f_\phi + \int \frac{f_\phi}{2}d\ln X\right)\square\phi \\
&\quad + \frac{f}{2X}[\phi_{\mu\nu}\phi^{\mu\nu} - (\square\phi)^2] - \frac{f - 2Xf_X}{X^2}[\phi^\mu\phi_{\mu\rho}\phi^{\rho\nu}\phi_\nu - (\square\phi)\phi^\mu\phi_{\mu\nu}\phi^\nu], \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\delta K\delta g^{00}} &= \frac{g_1(\phi)}{2}\delta K\delta g^{00} \\
&= \frac{g}{2\sqrt{-X}}\left(\frac{\phi^\mu\phi_{\mu\nu}\phi^\nu}{X} - \square\phi\right) - \frac{3}{2}gH, \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$f = f_1(\phi)\left[1 + \frac{X}{f_2(\phi)}\right], \quad g = g_1(\phi)\left[1 + \frac{X}{f_2(\phi)}\right], \tag{5}$$

with $f_2 = \frac{X}{\delta g^{00} - 1} = \dot{\phi}^2(t)$, $R^{(3)}\delta g^{00}$ and $\delta K\delta g^{00}$ being the EFT operators ($R^{(3)}$ is the 3-dimensional Ricci scalars on the spacelike hypersurface). We briefly review the EFT of nonsingular cosmologies in Appendix A, see (A3) for the definition of δg^{00} and δK . Though $L_{\delta g^{00}R^{(3)}}$ has the higher order of the second order derivative of ϕ , it is Ostrogradski ghost-free [44][45]. Additionally, $L_{\delta g^{00}R^{(3)}}$ and $L_{\delta K\delta g^{00}}$ do not affect the cosmological background.

III. A STABLE MODEL OF BOUNCE INFLATION

A. Background




FIG. 1: A sketch of the bounce inflation scenario.

A sketch of the bounce inflation scenario is plotted in Fig. 1. We will show how to build its stable model with the Lagrangian (2).

As a specific model, we set

$$\tilde{P}(\phi, X) = \frac{\alpha_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} M_p^2 X/2 + \frac{\beta_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} X^2/4, \quad (6)$$

$$V(\phi) = -\frac{V_0}{2} e^{\sqrt{2/3}\phi} \left[1 - \tanh\left(\frac{\phi}{\lambda_2}\right) \right] + \frac{\Lambda}{2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\phi}{\lambda_3}\right)^2 \right)^2 \left[1 + \tanh\left(\frac{\phi}{\lambda_2}\right) \right], \quad (7)$$

with the positive constants $\lambda_{1,2,3}$ and q, α_0, β_0 being dimensionless. We have $\tilde{P}(\phi, X) \neq 0$ only around $\phi \simeq 0$ [46][47][48], while $\tilde{P}(\phi, X) = 0$ for $|\phi| \gg \lambda_1$.

Thus we have

$$3H^2 M_p^2 = \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} \right] M_p^2 \dot{\phi}^2/2 + \frac{3\beta_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} \phi^4/4 + V(\phi), \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{H} M_p^2 = - \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} \right] M_p^2 \dot{\phi}^2/2 - \frac{\beta_0}{(1 + (\phi/\lambda_1)^2)^2} \phi^4/2. \quad (9)$$

In infinite past, the universe is almost Minkowski, which will experiences the ekpyrotic contraction. In the ekpyrotic phase ($\phi \ll -\lambda_1$ and $-\lambda_2$), we have $\tilde{P} = 0$ and $V_{ekpy} = -V_0 e^{\sqrt{\frac{2}{q}}\phi}$ ($q \ll 1$). Thus we could write Eqs. (8) and (9) as

$$3H^2 = \dot{\phi}^2/2 - \frac{V_0}{M_p^2} e^{\sqrt{\frac{2}{q}}\phi}, \quad \dot{H} = -\dot{\phi}^2/2. \quad (10)$$

By solving (10), we have

$$a \sim (-t)^{1/\epsilon}, \quad \dot{\phi} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\epsilon}} (-t)^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$\phi(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\epsilon}} \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon - 3}}{\epsilon \sqrt{V_0}/M_p} (-t)^{-1} \right], \quad (12)$$

where $\epsilon = -\dot{H}/H^2 = 1/q \gg 1$, which suggests $H = -\epsilon^{-1}(-t)^{-1}$.

When $\phi \simeq \lambda_1$, we could have

$$\dot{H} \simeq \left(\frac{\alpha_0}{4} - \frac{\beta_0 \dot{\phi}^2}{4M_p^2} - 1 \right) \dot{\phi}^2/2 > 0, \quad (13)$$

the nonsingular bounce will occur. While after $\phi \gg \lambda_1, \lambda_2$, the field ϕ will be canonical ($\tilde{P} = 0$) again. We have

$$3H^2 = \dot{\phi}^2/2 + \frac{\Lambda}{M_p^2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\phi}{\lambda_3} \right)^2 \right)^2, \quad \dot{H} = -\dot{\phi}^2/2. \quad (14)$$

Thus the slow-roll inflation will occur. Actually, after the nonsingular bounce, the Lagrangian (2) will reduce to $L \sim M_p^2 R/2 - M_p^2 X/2 - V_{inf}$ with V_{inf} being the potential of slow-roll inflation.

We plot the background evolution in Fig. 2 with $\alpha_0 = 20$, $\beta_0 = 5 \times 10^9$, $\lambda_1 = 0.224$, $\lambda_2 = 0.0667$, $\lambda_3 = 12$, $V_0 = 5 \times 10^{-9} M_p^4$, $q = 0.1$, $\Lambda = 2.5 \times 10^{-9} M_p^4$. The initial values are set by (11) and (12).




FIG. 2: The background evolution of our model with $\alpha_0 = 20$, $\beta_0 = 5 \times 10^9$, $\lambda_1 = 0.224$, $\lambda_2 = 0.0667$, $\lambda_3 = 12$, $V_0 = 5 \times 10^{-9} M_p^4$, $q = 0.1$, $\Lambda = 2.5 \times 10^{-9} M_p^4$.

B. Simulation for the scalar perturbation spectrum

In unitary gauge $\delta\phi = 0$, the quadratic action of scalar perturbation ζ for (2) is (see Appendix A and also our [28])

$$S_\zeta^{(2)} = \int a^3 Q_s \left(\dot{\zeta}^2 - c_s^2 \frac{(\partial\zeta)^2}{a^2} \right) d^4x, \quad (15)$$

in which

$$Q_s = \frac{2\dot{\phi}^4 \tilde{P}_{XX} - M_p^2 \dot{H}}{\gamma^2} + 3 \left(\frac{g_1}{2\gamma M_p} \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

$$c_s^2 Q_s = \frac{\dot{c}_3}{a} - M_p^2, \quad c_3 = \frac{a M_p^2}{\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{2f_1}{M_p^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

with $\gamma = H + \frac{g_1}{2M_p^2}$.

The stabilities require $Q_s > 0$ and $c_s^2 > 0$. Generally, $Q_s > 0$ can be obtained by applying

$\tilde{P}(\phi, X)$. While around the bounce point $H \simeq 0$,

$$c_s^2 \sim -\dot{\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{2f_1}{M_p^2} \right) + \frac{2\dot{f}_1\gamma}{M_p^2} - \gamma^2. \quad (18)$$

We will have $c_s^2 > 0$ only for $2f_1 < -M_p^2$, as has been clarified in Refs. [28][30]. Thus the gradient instability ($c_s^2 < 0$) is cured by $L_{\delta g^{00}R^{(3)}}$, since if $f_1 \equiv 0$, we have $c_s^2 \sim -\dot{\gamma} - \gamma^2 < 0$ around the bounce point. Here, we always could set $c_s^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ with a suitable $f_1(\phi)$ (see also [30]) satisfying

$$2f_1(\phi) = \frac{\gamma}{a} \int a (Q_s c_s^2 + M_p^2) dt - M_p^2. \quad (19)$$

In conformal time $\eta = \int dt/a$, the motion equation of ζ is

$$u'' + \left(c_s^2 k^2 - \frac{z_s''}{z_s} \right) u = 0, \quad (20)$$

where $u = z_s \zeta$ and $z_s = \sqrt{2a^2 Q_s}$. In infinite past, the universe is almost Minkowski, and will come through the ekpyrotic phase. The perturbation modes have the wavelength $\lambda \simeq 1/k \ll \sqrt{z_s/z_s''}$ and $c_s^2 = 1$. Thus the initial state of the perturbation is

$$u \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} e^{-ik\eta}. \quad (21)$$

The perturbation modes will pass through the ekpyrotic phase, the bounce phase and the inflation phase, sequentially. The resulting spectrum P_ζ of ζ (at $-k\eta \ll 1$) is

$$P_\zeta = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} |\zeta|^2. \quad (22)$$

In physical time, the motion equation of ζ is (1). In the ekpyrotic phase, $z_s \sim a \sim (-\eta)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_{ekpy}-1}}$, since $Q_s \sim \epsilon_{ekpy} = \text{const.} \gg 1$. While in the inflationary phase, $\epsilon_{inf} < 1$. This suggests that Q_s (or $z_s \sim a\sqrt{Q_s}$) will show itself a jumping around the nonsingular bounce, which will inevitably affect P_ζ . Whether the jumping of Q_s is gentle or not is model-dependent. We will simulate its effect on P_ζ by numerically solving Eq. (1), with $c_s^2 = 1$ set by Eq.(19).

It should be mentioned that if $g_1 = 0$ ($L_{\delta K \delta g^{00}}$ is absent), we will have $\gamma = H = 0$ at the bounce point and $Q_s \sim 1/\gamma^2$ is divergent, see (17), so that Eq. (1) is singular. Here, in order to avoid it, we apply $g_1(\phi)$, see also [30].

Without loss of generality, we set

$$Q_s = \mathcal{A}_Q \left[\mathcal{B} - \tanh \left(\frac{t}{t_*} \right) \right], \quad (23)$$

which requires

$$g_1(\phi(t)) = -\frac{2HM_p^2Q_s - 2\sqrt{3H^2M_p^6Q_s + M_p^4(3M_p^2 - Q_s)\left(\dot{H}M_p^2 - 2\dot{\phi}^4\tilde{P}_{XX}\right)}}{Q_s - 3M_p^2} \quad (24)$$

in Lagrangian (2), see (17). We plot the spectrum P_ζ of scalar perturbation in Fig. 3 for the background in Fig. 2 and the different values of \mathcal{B} and t_* , where $P_\zeta^{inf} = \frac{H_{inf}^2}{8Q_s^{inf}\pi^2M_p^2} \left(\frac{k}{\mathcal{H}_{inf}}\right)^{n_s-1}$ is that of the inflation, with Q_s^{inf} being the value of Q_s during inflation, $n_s - 1 \simeq 0$ (but is slightly red). The evolutions of Q_s , g_1 and $|\zeta|$ with respect to t , respectively, are plotted in Figs. 7 and 8 of Appendix B.

As expected in [13], P_ζ shows itself a large-scale cutoff, but is flat (with a damped oscillation) at small scale. However, due to the step-like evolution of Q_s , the peaks and valleys of the oscillations are obviously pulled lower. Actually, after the nonsingular bounce, with Eq. (1), we shortly have the effective Hubble parameter

$$H_{inf}^{eff} = H_{inf} + \frac{\dot{Q}_s}{3Q_s} < H_{inf}, \quad (25)$$

since $\dot{Q}_s < 0$, see Figs. 7(b) and 8(b) in Appendix B. Thus P_ζ is pulled lower at the corresponding scale, since $P_\zeta \sim (H_{inf}^{eff})^2$. The change rate of Q_s is relevant to the physics of nonsingular bounce, as showed in Eq. (23), so the depth of valley pulled lower is actually model-dependent.

In Sec. IV B, we will show that such a marked lower valley at corresponding scale helps to explain the dip around $l \simeq 20$ hinted by Planck [6].

IV. MORE ON THE SPECTRUM

A. Analytical estimation

We will attempt to analytically estimate P_ζ . The equation of motion for ζ is (20). In [26], the spectrum of primordial GWs has been calculated. Here, if the effect of Q_s is neglected, the calculation will be similar.

The bounce phase is the evolution with $\dot{H} > 0$. We define that it begins and ends at η_{B-} and η_{B+} , respectively, at which $\dot{H} = 0$. We set that $H = 0$ at η_B , which corresponds to the bounce point. Generally, $\Delta\eta_B = \eta_{B+} - \eta_{B-} \lesssim 1/\mathcal{H}_{B+}$.




FIG. 3: P_ζ/P_ζ^{inf} with background set by Fig. 2, where the {solid brown, dotdashed magenta, dashed orange, blue dotted} curves correspond to $\mathcal{A}_Q = \{3, 3, 3, 3\}$, $\mathcal{B} = \{1.3, 1.8, 2, 3\}$, $t_* = \{4, 4, 2.5, 4\} \times 10^4$, respectively.

In our model (Sec. III), the contracting phase ($\eta < \eta_{B-}$) is ekpyrotic-like, a is almost constant for $\epsilon_{ekpy} \gg 1$. Considering the continuities of a and H at η_{B-} , we have

$$a(\eta) = a_{B-} \left[\frac{x}{(\epsilon_{ekpy} - 1)^{-1} \mathcal{H}_{B-}^{-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_{ekpy} - 1}}, \quad (26)$$

see [26] for the details, where \mathcal{H}_{B-} is the comoving Hubble parameter at η_{B-} and $x = \eta - \eta_{B-} + (\epsilon_{ekpy} - 1)^{-1} \mathcal{H}_{B-}^{-1}$. We have $z_s''/z_s = a''/a$, since Q_s is constant. Thus the solution of (20) is

$$u_k = \frac{\sqrt{\pi|x|}}{2} c_{1,1} H_{\nu_1}^{(1)}(-kx) \quad (27)$$

where $\nu_1 = 1/2$ for $\epsilon_{ekpy} \gg 1$, and the initial condition (21) has been used.

In the nonsingular bounce phase ($\eta_{B-} < \eta < \eta_{B+}$), H should cross 0. We parameterize it as $H = \alpha(t - t_B)$ [49] with $\alpha M_P^2 \ll 1$. We have

$$a \simeq a_B e^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha(t-t_B)^2} \simeq a_B \left[1 + \frac{\alpha}{2}(t - t_B)^2 \right], \quad (28)$$

where $a = a_B$ at the bouncing point $t = t_B$. The continuities of a and \mathcal{H} at η_{B-} and η_{B+} suggest $\mathcal{H}_{B+} = \mathcal{H}_{B-} + \alpha a_B^2 (\eta_{B+} - \eta_{B-})$. In our models, $|\mathcal{H}_{B-}| \lesssim \mathcal{H}_{B+}/4$, see Figs. 7 and 8 in Appendix B, so that we approximately have

$$\mathcal{H}_{B+} \simeq \alpha a_B^2 \Delta\eta_B. \quad (29)$$

Thus in this phase the equation (20) is

$$u_k'' + (k^2 - \alpha a_B^2)u_k = 0. \quad (30)$$

Its solution is

$$u_k(\eta) = c_{2,1}e^{l(\eta-\eta_B)} + c_{2,2}e^{-l(\eta-\eta_B)}, \quad (31)$$

where $l = \sqrt{\alpha a_B^2 - k^2}$. Here, we have neglected the effect of Q_s , or it is difficult to solve Eq. (20).

In inflationary phase ($\eta \geq \eta_{B+}$), Q_s^{inf} is almost constant. Considering the continuities of a and \mathcal{H} at η_{B+} , we have

$$a_{inf}(\eta) = a_{B+} (-y\mathcal{H}_{B+})^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_{inf}-1}}, \quad (32)$$

where $y = \eta - \eta_{B+} + 1/\mathcal{H}_{B+}$, and $H_{B+} = \mathcal{H}_{B+}/a$, $H_{inf} \lesssim H_{B+}$. The solution of (20) is

$$u_k = \frac{\sqrt{\pi|y|}}{2} [c_{3,1}H_{\nu_2}^{(1)}(-ky) + c_{3,2}H_{\nu_2}^{(2)}(-ky)] \quad (33)$$

where $\nu_2 = \frac{\epsilon_{inf}-3}{2(\epsilon_{inf}-1)}$.

We have P_ζ as

$$P_\zeta(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, \mathcal{H}_{B-}, \Delta\eta) \approx \frac{H_{inf}^2}{8\pi^2 Q_s^{inf} M_p^2} |c_{31} - c_{32}|^2 = P_\zeta^{inf} |c_{31} - c_{32}|^2, \quad (34)$$

where $P_\zeta^{inf} = \frac{H_{inf}^2}{8\pi^2 Q_s^{inf} M_p^2}$ is that of the slow-roll inflation. Requiring the continuities of ζ and $\dot{\zeta}$, we could write the coefficients as

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{3,1} \\ c_{3,2} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{M}^{(3,2)} \times \mathcal{M}^{(2,1)} \times \begin{pmatrix} c_{1,1} \\ c_{1,2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

see Appendix C for the matrices $\mathcal{M}^{(2,1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(3,2)}$.

The effects of bounce has been encoded in $\mathcal{M}^{(3,2)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(2,1)}$ (or $|c_{3,1} - c_{3,2}|^2$). We approximately have

$$|c_{3,1} - c_{3,2}|^2 \approx 1 - \mathcal{A} \sin\left(\frac{2k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}\right) - \mathcal{A} \sin\left(\frac{2k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}} + 2k\Delta\eta_B\right) \quad (36)$$

for $k \gg \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}{k} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha a_B^2}{2\mathcal{H}_{B+}} \Delta\eta_B\right) \simeq \frac{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}{2k} \quad (37)$$

and (29) is used, which suggests that on small scale $k \gg \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, P_ζ is flat with a rapidly damped oscillation, its maximal oscillating amplitude is around $k \simeq \mathcal{H}_{B+}$. However, if the bounce phase lasts shortly enough, $\Delta\eta_B \ll 1/\mathcal{H}_{B+}$, (36) will be

$$|c_{3,1} - c_{3,2}|^2 \approx 1 - \frac{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}{k} \sin\left(\frac{2k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}\right). \quad (38)$$

While on large scale $k \ll \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, $P_\zeta \sim k^2$ will have a strongly blue tilt, since

$$|c_{3,1} - c_{3,2}|^2 \approx w(\Delta\eta_B) \left(\frac{k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}}\right)^2 \quad (39)$$

where

$$w(\Delta\eta_B) = \left[\left(1 - \frac{l^2 \Delta\eta_B}{2\mathcal{H}_{B+}}\right) \cosh(l\Delta\eta_B) + \frac{l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}} - \Delta\eta_B + \frac{l^2}{4\mathcal{H}_{B+}} \Delta\eta_B^2\right) \sinh(l\Delta\eta_B) \right]^2, \quad (40)$$

which is $w(\Delta\eta_B) \simeq 1$ for $\Delta\eta_B \simeq 0$.

We plot P_ζ for (34) in Figs. 4 for the different values of $\Delta\eta$ and \mathcal{H}_{B-} . We see that for $k > \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, $P_\zeta \sim k^0$ but has a damped oscillation, while for $k < \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, $P_\zeta \sim k^2$ shows itself a large-scale cutoff. Thus (34) is consistent with our simulation result (see Fig. 7 in Sec. III) well at large and small scales, respectively.

However, since we have neglected the step-like evolution of Q_s , the pull-lower around $k \simeq \mathcal{H}_{B+}$ in Fig. 7(d) cannot be reflected in (34).




FIG. 4: The power spectrum with different $\Delta\eta$ and different $\mathcal{H}_{B-}/\mathcal{H}_{B+}$.

B. Template

To conveniently fit the observation data, a simple “*Template*” capturing the essential shape of P_ζ is indispensable. Based on the simulation in Sec. III and the analytical estimate

in Sec. IV A, we write it as

$$P_\zeta = F(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d) \cdot P_\zeta^{inf}, \quad (41)$$

where $P_\zeta^{inf} = A_{inf}(\frac{k}{k_*})^{n_{inf}-1}$ is the spectrum predicted by slow-roll inflation, and A_{inf} is the amplitude at the pivot scale k_* , n_{inf} is its tilt, and

$$F(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d) = \left\{ 1 + e^{-(k/\mathcal{H}_{B+})^2} \left(\frac{k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}} \right)^2 + e^{-(k/\mathcal{H}_{B+})^2} - \frac{\sin(2k/\mathcal{H}_{B+})}{k/\mathcal{H}_{B+}} \right\} \cdot \left[1 - A_d \cdot e^{-\omega_d(\frac{k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}} - \pi)^2} \right]. \quad (42)$$

Here, the parameters set $(\mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d)$ reflects the effect of pre-inflationary bounce on the spectrum. Around $k \gtrsim \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, we have

$$F(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d) \simeq 1 - A_d e^{-\mathcal{O}(1)\omega_d}, \quad (43)$$

so A_d and ω_d (related with the parameter $\Delta\eta < 1/\mathcal{H}_{B+}$ in Sec. IV A) depict the width and depth of valley around $k \gtrsim \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, respectively. Here, A_d is related with the change rate of Q_s (neglected in Sec. IV A). With Eq. (25), we have approximately

$$A_d \simeq \frac{2 \left| \dot{Q}_s \right|_{max}}{3H_{inf}Q_s} \quad (44)$$

noting $\dot{Q}_s < 0$. In (42), we have

$$F(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d) \sim 1 - \frac{\sin(2k/\mathcal{H}_{B+})}{k/\mathcal{H}_{B+}} \quad (45)$$

for $k \gg \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, which equals to (38), while for $k \ll \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, we approximately have $F(k, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d) \simeq (\frac{k}{\mathcal{H}_{B+}})^2$, which is consistent with (39). P_ζ for the “Template” (42) is plotted in Fig. 5. We see that (42) has effectively captured the essential shape of P_ζ showed in Fig. 3.

C. Data fitting

We modified the CAMB and CosmoMC code package and perform a global fitting with Planck2015 data. The parameter set of the lensed- Λ CDM model is $\{\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, 100\theta_{MC}, \tau, \ln(10^{10} A_{inf}), n_{inf}\}$, with $\Omega_b h^2$ the baryon density, $\Omega_c h^2$ the cold dark

matter density, θ_{MC} the angular size of the sound horizon at decoupling, and τ the reionization optical depth. We also include the parameters set $\{\mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d\}$ (so-called the bounce 3-parameters) defined in (42), which captures the physics of pre-inflationary bounce, as has been argued. We set the pivot scale $k_* = 0.05 Mpc^{-1}$, roughly in the middle of the logarithmic range of scales probed by Planck.

With (42), we plot the CMB TT-spectrum $D_l^{TT} \equiv l(l+1)C_l^{TT}/2\pi$ and ΔD_l^{TT} in Fig. 6 with the best-fit parameters set $\{\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, 100\theta_{\text{MC}}, \tau, \ln(10^{10} A_{\text{inf}}), n_{\text{inf}}, \mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d\}$. Since WMAP and Planck, some models attempting to explain the anomalies of CMB at large scale (but not solving the initial singularity) have been proposed [50][51][52][53][54][55]. We see that the spectrum (42) of scalar perturbation predicted by our model could fit better not only the power deficit of the CMB TT-spectrum at low multipoles, but also the dip at $l \sim 20$. Actually, after we add the bounce 3-parameters $\{\mathcal{H}_{B+}, A_d, \omega_d\}$ into the parameter set of the Λ CDM model, the corresponding $\Delta\chi^2$ value can be greatly improved. The details will be presented in upcoming work.

V. CONCLUSION

In bounce inflation scenario, the inflation is singularity-free (past-complete). However, its pathology-free model has been still lacking. Here, we showed such a model. The nonsingular bounce is implemented by applying $\tilde{P}(\phi, X)$, see (6), which is ghost-free, while $c_s^2 < 0$ is dispelled by $L_{\delta g^{00} R^{(3)}}$ [31].

We perform a full simulation for the evolution of scalar perturbation, and find that the spectrum P_ζ has a suppression at large scale $k \ll \mathcal{H}_{B+}$ but is flat (with a damped oscillation) at small scale $k \gg \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, which confirms the earlier results showed in [13][17] and is consistent with the power deficit of the CMB TT-spectrum at low multipoles $l \lesssim 30$; but unexpectedly, P_ζ also shows itself one marked lower valley at $k \gtrsim \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, though the depth is model-dependent. We show that this lower valley actually provides a better fit to the dip at $l \sim 20$ hinted by Planck [6]. Based on the simulation and the analytical estimation for the perturbation spectrum, we also offer a “*Template*” of P_ζ (effectively capturing the physics of bounce) to fit data.

The equation of motion of GWs mode γ_{ij} for (2) is

$$\ddot{\gamma}_k + \left(3H + \frac{\dot{Q}_T}{Q_T}\right) \dot{\gamma}_k + c_T^2 \frac{k^2}{a^2} \gamma_k = 0, \quad (46)$$

which is unaffected by the operators $R^{(3)}\delta g^{00}$ and $\delta K\delta g^{00}$, where $Q_T = M_p^2$. We plot the primordial GWs spectrum P_T in Fig. 5 (the black dot curve) with $P_T^{inf} = \frac{2H_{inf}^2}{\pi^2 M_p^2}$, see also [26]. It should be mentioned that if $Q_T \neq M_p^2$ around the nonsingular bounce (the gravity is modified completely), P_T will be different. It is also possible that the corresponding gravity has a large parity violation [56], which might be imprinted in CMB.

Our work highlight the conjecture again that the physics hinted by the large-scale anomalies of CMB is related with the pre-inflationary bounce. The nonsingular cosmological bounce also has been implemented in some models of modified gravity [57–68], see also [69][70] for reviews. Confronting the corresponding models with the CMB data will be interesting.




FIG. 5: The black dotted curve is the spectrum P_T/P_T^{inf} of the primordial GWs in bounce inflation scenario, see [26], while the {green dotdashed, red dashed, brown solid} curves are those of the primordial scalar perturbation based on the results of “*Template*” (42) with $A_d = \{0.25, 0.8, 0.8\}$, $d = \{\pi, \pi, \pi\}$ and $\omega_d = \{0.25, 0.25, 0.1\}$, which are consistent with those in Fig. 3.

Acknowledgments

YC would like to thank Youping Wan and Yi-Fu Cai for discussions and hospitalities during his visit at University of Science and Technology of China. YSP thanks Mingzhe Li for helpful suggestions in USTC-ICTS seminar. We acknowledge the use of CAMB and




FIG. 6: The green points show the Planck2015 data with 1σ errors. The best-fit values of parameters are $\ln(10^{10}A_{inf}) = 3.091$, $n_{inf} = 0.966$, $\ln(\mathcal{H}_{B+}) = -7.51$, $A_d = 0.87$, $\omega_d = 5.47$.

CosmoMC. This work is supported by NSFC, No. 11575188, 11690021, and also supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program of CAS, No. XDA04075000, XDB23010100.

Appendix A: The EFT of nonsingular cosmologies

In this Appendix, we briefly review the EFT of nonsingular cosmologies, see [28] for the details.

With the ADM 3 + 1 decomposition, we have

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} N_k N^k - N^2 & N_j \\ N_i & h_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad g^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -N^{-2} & \frac{N^j}{N^2} \\ \frac{N^i}{N^2} & h^{ij} - \frac{N^i N^j}{N^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

and $\sqrt{-g} = N\sqrt{h}$, where $N_i = h_{ij}N^j$. The induced metric on 3-dimensional hypersurface is $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu$, where $n_\mu = n_0(dt/dx^\mu) = (-N, 0, 0, 0)$, $n^\nu = g^{\mu\nu}n_\mu = (1/N, -N^i/N)$ is orthogonal to the spacelike hypersurface, and $n_\mu n^\mu = -1$. Thus

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} N_k N^k & N_j \\ N_i & h_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad h^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h^{ij} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The EFT is [28]

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{M_p^2}{2} f(t) R - \Lambda(t) - c(t) g^{00} \right. \\
& + \frac{M_2^4(t)}{2} (\delta g^{00})^2 - \frac{m_3^3(t)}{2} \delta K \delta g^{00} - m_4^2(t) (\delta K^2 - \delta K_{\mu\nu} \delta K^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{\tilde{m}_4^2(t)}{2} R^{(3)} \delta g^{00} \\
& - \tilde{m}_4^2(t) \delta K^2 + \frac{\tilde{m}_5(t)}{2} R^{(3)} \delta K + \frac{\bar{\lambda}(t)}{2} (R^{(3)})^2 + \dots \\
& \left. - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(t)}{M_p^2} \nabla_i R^{(3)} \nabla^i R^{(3)} + \dots \right], \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta g^{00} = g^{00} + 1$, $R^{(3)}$ is the 3-dimensional Ricci scalar, $K_{\mu\nu} = h_\mu^\sigma \nabla_\sigma n_\nu$ is the extrinsic curvature, $\delta K_{\mu\nu} = K_{\mu\nu} - h_{\mu\nu} H$.

Here, we focus on building a stable model of bounce inflation. We only consider the coefficients set $(f, c, \Lambda, M_2, m_3, \tilde{m}_4)$, and set other coefficients in (A3) equal to 0. We always could set $f = 1$, which suggests $c(t) = -M_p^2 \dot{H}$ and $c(t) + \Lambda(t) = 3M_p^2 H^2$.

As pointed out in Ref. [33], the $R^{(3)} \delta K$ operator in EFT could play similar role as $R^{(3)} \delta g^{00}$, which we will consider elsewhere. Mapping (2) into the EFT (A3), we have $M_2^4(t) = X^2 \tilde{P}_{XX}$, $m_3^3(t) = -g_1(\phi)$ and $\tilde{m}_4^2 = f_1(\phi)$. Only with $(M_2, m_3, \tilde{m}_4) \neq 0$, the quadratic action of scalar perturbation ζ is (see, e.g., our [28])

$$S_\zeta^{(2)} = \int d^4x a^3 Q_s \left(\dot{\zeta}^2 - c_s^2 \frac{(\partial\zeta)^2}{a^2} \right), \tag{A4}$$

where

$$Q_s = \frac{2M_2^4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{3m_3^6}{4M_p^2 \gamma^2} - \frac{\dot{H} M_p^2}{\gamma^2}, \tag{A5}$$

$$c_s^2 Q_s = \frac{\dot{c}_3}{a} - M_p^2 \tag{A6}$$

$$c_3 = \frac{a M_p^2}{\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{m}_4^2}{M_p^2} \right), \tag{A7}$$

where $\gamma = H - m_3^3/(2M_p^2)$. Only if $Q_s > 0$ and $c_s^2 > 0$, the nonsingular cosmological model is healthy. In models with the operator $(\delta g^{00})^2$, $Q_s > 0$ always can be obtained, since $(\delta g^{00})^2$ contributes $\dot{\zeta}^2$. While $c_s^2 > 0$ requires $\dot{c}_3 > a M_p^2$, which is

$$c_3|_{t_f} - c_3|_{t_i} > M_p^2 \int_{t_i}^{t_f} a dt. \tag{A8}$$

The inequality (A8) suggests that c_3 must cross 0 ($\tilde{m}_4^2 = -M_p^2/2$ or γ is divergent), since the integral $\int a dt$ is infinite. Thus if the $R^{(3)} \delta g^{00}$ operator is absent, $c_s^2 > 0$ throughout is

impossible. We can set $c_s^2 \simeq 1$ by

$$2m_4^2 = \frac{\gamma}{a} \int a (Q_s c_s^2 + M_p^2) dt - M_p^2. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Appendix B: More on the simulation

We plot the evolutions of Q_s , g_1 , $|\zeta|$ with respect to t , and also $P_\zeta(k)$ for the background in Fig. 2, with different values of \mathcal{B} and t_* in this Appendix.

We see how $|\zeta|$ evolves with a in different phases. Theoretically, $\zeta \sim 1/a$ for the perturbation modes with $k \gg \sqrt{z_s''/z_s}$, while $\zeta \sim \text{const.}$ for the perturbation modes with $k \ll \sqrt{z_s''/z_s}$, which is consistent with our Figs. 7(c) and 8(c).




FIG. 7: We set $\mathcal{A}_Q = 3$, $\mathcal{B} = 2$, $t_* = 4 \times 10^4$ and the background is given by Fig. 2.




FIG. 8: We set $\mathcal{A}_Q = 3$, $\mathcal{B} = 1.6$, $t_* = 3 \times 10^4$ and the background is given by Fig. 2.

Appendix C: The matrices elements of $\mathcal{M}^{(2,1)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(3,2)}$

We define $l = \sqrt{\alpha a_B^2 - k^2}$, $x_1 = 1/|\mathcal{H}_{B-}|$, $x_2 = \mathcal{H}_{B+}$, $y_{1,2} = (\eta_{B\mp} - \eta_B)$, and have

$$\mathcal{M}_{11}^{(2,1)} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi x_1}}{4l} \left[(l + \alpha a_B^2 y_1) H_{\nu_1}^{(1)}(k x_1) - k H_{\nu_1-1}^{(1)}(k x_1) \right] e^{-l y_1}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{12}^{(2,1)} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi x_1}}{4l} \left[(l + \alpha a_B^2 y_1) H_{\nu_1}^{(2)}(k x_1) - k H_{\nu_1-1}^{(2)}(k x_1) \right] e^{-l y_1}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{21}^{(2,1)} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi x_1}}{4l} \left[(l - \alpha a_B^2 y_1) H_{\nu_1}^{(1)}(k x_1) - k H_{\nu_1-1}^{(1)}(k x_1) \right] e^{l y_1}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{22}^{(2,1)} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi x_1}}{4l} \left[(l - \alpha a_B^2 y_1) H_{\nu_1}^{(2)}(k x_1) - k H_{\nu_1-1}^{(2)}(k x_1) \right] e^{l y_1}, \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{11}^{(3,2)} = \frac{i\sqrt{\pi x_2}}{2} \left[(l - \alpha a_B^2 y_2) H_{\nu_2}^{(2)}(kx_2) + k H_{\nu_2-1}^{(2)}(kx_2) \right] e^{ly_2}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{12}^{(3,2)} = \frac{i\sqrt{\pi x_2}}{2} \left[-(l + \alpha a_B^2 y_2) H_{\nu_2}^{(2)}(kx_2) + k H_{\nu_2-1}^{(2)}(kx_2) \right] e^{-ly_2}, \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$-\mathcal{M}_{21}^{(3,2)} = \frac{i\sqrt{\pi x_2}}{2} \left[(l - \alpha a_B^2 y_2) H_{\nu_2}^{(1)}(kx_2) + k H_{\nu_2-1}^{(1)}(kx_2) \right] e^{ly_2}, \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$-\mathcal{M}_{22}^{(3,2)} = \frac{i\sqrt{\pi x_2}}{2} \left[-(l + \alpha a_B^2 y_2) H_{\nu_2}^{(1)}(kx_2) + k H_{\nu_2-1}^{(1)}(kx_2) \right] e^{-ly_2}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

- [1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981).
- [2] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **108B**, 389 (1982).
- [3] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982).
- [4] A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. **91B**, 99 (1980).
- [5] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016) [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [6] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A20 (2016) [arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] A. Borde and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3305 (1994) [gr-qc/9312022].
- [8] A. Borde, A. H. Guth and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 151301 (2003) [gr-qc/0110012].
- [9] J. Khoury, B. A. Ovrut, P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 123522 (2001) [hep-th/0103239].
- [10] Y. F. Cai, T. Qiu, Y. S. Piao, M. Li and X. Zhang, JHEP **0710**, 071 (2007) [arXiv:0704.1090 [gr-qc]].
- [11] Y. S. Piao and E. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 083515 (2003) [hep-th/0308080]; Z. G. Liu, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 063508 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5713].
- [12] P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis and E. Trincherini, JCAP **1011**, 021 (2010) [arXiv:1007.0027 [hep-th]].
- [13] Y. S. Piao, B. Feng and X. m. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 103520 (2004) [hep-th/0310206]; Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 087301 (2005) [astro-ph/0502343]; Y. S. Piao, S. Tsujikawa and X. m. Zhang, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 4455 (2004) [hep-th/0312139].
- [14] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A1 (2014) [arXiv:1303.5062 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [15] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A16 (2016) [arXiv:1506.07135 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] Y. Cai, Y. T. Wang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 2, 023518 (2015) [arXiv:1501.01730 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] Z. G. Liu, Z. K. Guo and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 063539 (2013) [arXiv:1304.6527 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] T. Biswas and A. Mazumdar, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 025019 (2014) [arXiv:1304.3648 [hep-th]].
- [19] Z. G. Liu, Z. K. Guo and Y. S. Piao, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, no. 8, 3006 (2014) [arXiv:1311.1599 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] F. T. Falciano, M. Lilley and P. Peter, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 083513 (2008) [arXiv:0802.1196 [gr-qc]]; M. Lilley, L. Lorenz and S. Clesse, *JCAP* **1106**, 004 (2011) [arXiv:1104.3494 [gr-qc]].
- [21] J. Mielczarek, *JCAP* **0811**, 011 (2008) [arXiv:0807.0712 [gr-qc]].
- [22] J. Q. Xia, Y. F. Cai, H. Li and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 251301 (2014) [arXiv:1403.7623 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] Z. G. Liu, H. Li and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 8, 083521 (2014) [arXiv:1405.1188 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [24] T. Qiu and Y. T. Wang, *JHEP* **1504**, 130 (2015) [arXiv:1501.03568 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] Y. Wan, T. Qiu, F. P. Huang, Y. F. Cai, H. Li and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **1512**, no. 12, 019 (2015) [arXiv:1509.08772 [gr-qc]].
- [26] H. G. Li, Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 12, 699 (2016) [arXiv:1605.09586 [gr-qc]].
- [27] S. Ni, H. Li, T. Qiu, W. Zheng and X. Zhang, arXiv:1707.05570 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] Y. Cai, Y. Wan, H. G. Li, T. Qiu and Y. S. Piao, *JHEP* **1701**, 090 (2017) [arXiv:1610.03400 [gr-qc]].
- [29] P. Creminelli, D. Pirtskhalava, L. Santoni and E. Trincherini, *JCAP* **1611**, no. 11, 047 (2016) [arXiv:1610.04207 [hep-th]].
- [30] Y. Cai, H. G. Li, T. Qiu and Y. S. Piao, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, no. 6, 369 (2017) [arXiv:1701.04330 [gr-qc]].
- [31] Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, *JHEP* **1709**, 027 (2017) [arXiv:1705.03401 [gr-qc]].
- [32] R. Kolevatov, S. Mironov, N. Sukhov and V. Volkova, *JCAP* **1708**, no. 08, 038 (2017)

- [arXiv:1705.06626 [hep-th]].
- [33] Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, arXiv:1707.01017 [gr-qc].
- [34] A. Ijjas and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Lett. B **764**, 289 (2017) [arXiv:1609.01253 [gr-qc]].
- [35] M. Libanov, S. Mironov and V. Rubakov, JCAP **1608**, no. 08, 037 (2016) [arXiv:1605.05992 [hep-th]].
- [36] T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 4, 043511 (2016) [arXiv:1606.05831 [hep-th]].
- [37] R. Kolevatov and S. Mironov, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 12, 123516 (2016) [arXiv:1607.04099 [hep-th]].
- [38] S. Akama and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 6, 064011 (2017) [arXiv:1701.02926 [hep-th]].
- [39] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **10**, 363 (1974).
- [40] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 064039 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].
- [41] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **126**, 511 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].
- [42] A. Ijjas and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, no. 12, 121304 (2016) [arXiv:1606.08880 [gr-qc]].
- [43] D. A. Easson, I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, JCAP **1111**, 021 (2011) [arXiv:1109.1047 [hep-th]].
- [44] D. Langlois and K. Noui, JCAP **1602**, no. 02, 034 (2016) [arXiv:1510.06930 [gr-qc]].
- [45] D. Langlois and K. Noui, JCAP **1607**, no. 07, 016 (2016) [arXiv:1512.06820 [gr-qc]].
- [46] E. I. Buchbinder, J. Khoury and B. A. Ovrut, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 123503 (2007) [hep-th/0702154].
- [47] L. Battarra, M. Koehn, J. L. Lehnert and B. A. Ovrut, JCAP **1407**, 007 (2014) [arXiv:1404.5067 [hep-th]].
- [48] M. Koehn, J. L. Lehnert and B. Ovrut, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 10, 103501 (2016) [arXiv:1512.03807 [hep-th]].
- [49] Y. F. Cai et.al, JCAP **0803**, 013 (2008) [arXiv:0711.2187 [hep-th]].
- [50] C. R. Contaldi, M. Peloso, L. Kofman and A. D. Linde, JCAP **0307**, 002 (2003) [astro-ph/0303636].
- [51] E. Dudas, N. Kitazawa, S. P. Patil and A. Sagnotti, JCAP **1205**, 012 (2012) [arXiv:1202.6630 [hep-th]].

- [52] S. Das, G. Goswami, J. Prasad and R. Rangarajan, *JCAP* **1506**, no. 06, 001 (2015) [arXiv:1412.7093 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [53] Y. F. Cai, E. G. M. Ferreira, B. Hu and J. Quintin, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 12, 121303 (2015) [arXiv:1507.05619 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] K. Wang, L. Santos, J. Q. Xia and W. Zhao, *JCAP* **1701**, no. 01, 053 (2017) [arXiv:1608.04189 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [55] E. A. Kontou, J. J. Blanco-Pillado, M. P. Hertzberg and A. Masoumi, *JCAP* **1704**, no. 04, 034 (2017) [arXiv:1701.01706 [hep-th]].
- [56] Y. T. Wang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **741**, 55 (2015) [arXiv:1409.7153 [gr-qc]].
- [57] D. Yoshida, J. Quintin, M. Yamaguchi and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no. 4, 043502 (2017) [arXiv:1704.04184 [hep-th]].
- [58] Y. Misonoh, M. Fukushima and S. Miyashita, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 4, 044044 (2017) [arXiv:1612.09077 [gr-qc]].
- [59] M. Giovannini, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 8, 083506 (2017) [arXiv:1612.00346 [hep-th]].
- [60] S. Banerjee and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 6, 063523 (2017) [arXiv:1604.06932 [gr-qc]].
- [61] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto and A. Mazumdar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 031101 (2012) [arXiv:1110.5249 [gr-qc]]; T. Biswas, A. S. Koshelev, A. Mazumdar and S. Y. Vernov, *JCAP* **1208**, 024 (2012) [arXiv:1206.6374 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] M. Vasilic, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 12, 123506 (2017) [arXiv:1704.02589 [gr-qc]].
- [63] Y. B. Li, J. Quintin, D. G. Wang and Y. F. Cai, *JCAP* **1703**, 03, 031 (2017) [arXiv:1612.02036 [hep-th]].
- [64] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 2, 024016 [arXiv:1504.06866 [gr-qc]]; S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 6, 064036 [arXiv:1502.06125 [gr-qc]]; S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 12, 124083 [arXiv:1410.8183 [gr-qc]].
- [65] S. H. Hendi, M. Momennia, B. Eslam Panah and M. Faizal, *Astrophys. J.* **827**, 2, 153 (2016) [arXiv:1703.00480 [gr-qc]]; S. H. Hendi, M. Momennia, B. Eslam Panah and S. Panahiyan, *Universe* **16**, 26 (2017) [arXiv:1705.01099 [gr-qc]].
- [66] S. Chinaglia, A. Colleaux and S. Zerbini, arXiv:1708.08667 [gr-qc].
- [67] M. Giovannini, arXiv:1708.08713 [hep-th].
- [68] S. Farnsworth, J. L. Lehnert and T. Qiu, arXiv:1709.03171 [gr-qc].

- [69] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, Phys. Rept. **692**, 1 (2017) [arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc]].
- [70] D. Battefeld and P. Peter, Phys. Rept. **571**, 1 (2015) [arXiv:1406.2790 [astro-ph.CO]].