

Primordial non-Gaussianity and power asymmetry with quantum gravitational effects in loop quantum cosmology

Tao Zhu^{a,b,*}, Anzhong Wang^{a,b,†}, Klaus Kirsten^{c,‡}, Gerald Cleaver^{d,§} and Qin Sheng^{c,¶}

^a *Institute for Advanced Physics & Mathematics,*

Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310032, China

^b *GCAP-CASPER, Physics Department, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798-7316, USA*

^c *GCAP-CASPER, Mathematics Department, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798-7328, USA*

^d *EUCOS-CASPER, Physics Department, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798-7316, USA*

(Dated: September 25, 2017)

Loop quantum cosmology (LQC) provides a resolution of the classical big bang singularity in the deep Planck era. The evolution, prior to the usual slow-roll inflation, naturally generates excited states at the onset of the slow-roll inflation. It is expected that these quantum gravitational effects could leave its fingerprints on the primordial perturbation spectrum and non-Gaussianity, and lead to some observational evidences in the cosmic microwave background (CMB). While the impact of the quantum effects on the primordial perturbation spectrum has been already studied and constrained by current data, in this paper we continue studying such effects on the non-Gaussianity of the primordial curvature perturbations. In this paper, we present detailed and analytical calculations of the non-Gaussianity and show explicitly that the corrections due to quantum effects are in the same magnitude of the slow-roll parameters in the observable scales and thus are well within current observational constraints. Despite this, we show that the non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit can be enhanced at superhorizon scales and further, these effects may yield a large statistical anisotropy on the power spectrum through the Erickcek-Kamionkowski-Carroll mechanism.

I. INTRODUCTION

Primordial non-Gaussianities have attracted a great deal of attention in recent years, because the existence of their signatures in the CMB spectrum would be a powerful probe of the physics of inflation [1–4]. While the predictions regarding the nearly scale invariant and Gaussian part of the spectrum of primordial density fluctuations arising from inflation are highly degenerate for different models, the deviations from a perfect Gaussian distribution, the non-Gaussianity, have been proven to contain valuable information to distinguish among different models of inflation. In general, the amount of non-Gaussianities produced by the simplest single field slow-roll inflationary models is at a level proportional to the slow-roll parameters, i.e., $f_{\text{NL}} \sim 10^{-2}$, and thus unlikely to be observed by the next generation of CMB experiments and large scale surveys [4–6]. For this reason, a detection of non-Gaussianities in CMB would rule out the standard single-field slow-roll scenarios, leading to the study of exotic inflationary models or even theories with different dynamics for the generation of primordial perturbations. In addition, different patterns of non-Gaussianities which are predicted by inflationary models or background dynamics beyond the standard single-field slow-roll inflation also provide close connections to the quantum theory of gravity near the Planck scale; see [4, 5] for detailed reviews.

In standard calculations of non-Gaussianities, the primordial perturbation modes are in general assumed to be at the Bunch-Davies (BD) vacuum state when they were inside the Hubble horizon at the beginning of inflation. Thus, it is interesting to ask whether a deviation from the BD states can leave any observational signatures in primordial non-Gaussianities to current/forthcoming observations. Such considerations have attracted a great deal of recent attentions, in which the non-Gaussianity generated from excited states during inflation is analyzed by several authors (for instance, see [2, 7–13] and references therein). Depending on different types of inflationary models, the initial state effects may lead to enhancements in the associated non-Gaussianity in certain momentum configurations. These enhancements are sizable and could be well within detection in the forthcoming CMB experiments and large scale surveys. Even for the simplest single field slow-roll inflation, as shown in [8, 10], such enhancements could occur in the squeezed configurations which involve very different scales.

On the other hand, recently released Planck data reported a hemispherical power asymmetry in the CMB fluctuations and provided an independent measurement on this anomaly [14, 15], which was reported earlier in the Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe data [16–18]. Such a power asymmetry can be modeled as a dipolar modulation of a statistically isotropic CMB sky in terms of temperature fluctuations in the direction \mathbf{n} :

$$\frac{\delta T}{T}(\mathbf{n}) = s(\mathbf{n})[1 + A \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}], \quad (1.1)$$

where $s(\mathbf{n})$ is a statistically isotropic map, A characterizes the amplitude of the dipolar asymmetry, and \mathbf{p} is its direction. Then, the corresponding amplitude can be given by $A = 0.066 \pm 0.021$ for the CMB power spectrum

* tao_zhu@baylor.edu

† anzhong.wang@baylor.edu

‡ klaus.kirsten@baylor.edu

§ gerald.cleaver@baylor.edu

¶ qin.sheng@baylor.edu

with $l \lesssim 64$ [14, 15]. This asymmetry, however, seems to vanish at larger scales, i.e. at scales $l \gtrsim 600$, indicating a non-trivial scale-dependent dipole asymmetry [19, 20]. This dipole asymmetry can be related to the primordial curvature perturbation power spectrum with a modulation as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mod}}(k, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k) \left(1 + 2A(k) \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}}{x_{\text{cmb}}} \right), \quad (1.2)$$

where x_{cmb} is the comoving distance to the surface of the last scattering and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$ is the isotropic power spectrum. While such an asymmetry is very difficult to explain in a single-field slow-roll inflationary model, the challenge is therefore to find a mechanism being able to generate it only at large scales. One of the interesting scenarios accounted for this power asymmetry is the Ericcek-Kamionkowski-Carroll (EKC) mechanism proposed in [21, 22]. This mechanism produces power asymmetry through a non-Gaussian coupling which requires having a growing amplitude in the squeezed limit between the observable scales and a large-amplitude perturbation mode at superhorizon scales. It is interesting to mention that both the superhorizon modes and enhanced non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit could naturally arise from the effects of the non-BD excited states at the onset of the inflation [25]¹.

An example of generating a non-BD initial state arises naturally from the loop quantum cosmology, in which there is a bouncing phase prior to inflation. Remarkably, the dominating quantum geometry effects of LQC at the Planck scale provide a natural resolution of the standard big bang singularity (see [27–30] and references therein). In such a picture, the singularity is replaced by a finite non-zero universe, which eventually evolves to the desired slow-roll inflation with very high probability [31–34]. The evolution of primordial perturbations during the pre-inflationary phase with different quantization approaches in LQC and their fingerprints on primordial power spectra have also been extensively studied both numerically and analytically [35–49]. The main characteristic of the associated effects is that the evolution of perturbations during the pre-inflationary phase produces particles, and as a consequence the perturbations are no longer in the BD states at the onset of the slow-roll inflation, but instead in an excited state.

Therefore, it is important to find if the bouncing effects can provide any significant fingerprints on non-Gaussianities to produce observational effects. In fact, the non-Gaussianity and its effects on power asymmetry have been already studied in [50] by using numerical calculations. The purpose of this paper is to provide a detailed and analytical study on non-Gaussianity in the

primordial curvature perturbations and their effects on the power asymmetry for a single field inflation in the framework of loop quantum cosmology, where there is a bouncing phase prior to inflation. Specifically, we focus on the primordial perturbations derived from the dressed metric approach in LQC, in which the bouncing effects are more important at large scales. We calculate in detail the analytical expression of the non-Gaussianity with quantum effects. With these calculations, we show that the non-Gaussianity is negligible at observable scales, but enhanced when one of the coupled modes is at scales beyond our current Hubble horizon. We show explicitly, by using the EKC mechanism, that this large mode naturally leads to a significant modulation on observable scales which may provide an explanation of the observed power asymmetry in the CMB.

We organize the rest of this paper as follows. In Sec. II, we provide a brief introduction to the evolution of both background and primordial perturbation modes during the bouncing phase and their effects on the primordial perturbation spectrum. Sec. III is devoted to analytical computations of the non-Gaussianity of the primordial curvature perturbation. We show that the contributions due to quantum effects are of the same magnitude as the slow-roll parameter at observable scales, i.e., $f_{\text{NL}} \sim \mathcal{O}(0.01)$. In Sec. IV, the non-Gaussianity for a superhorizon mode coupled to observed scales is considered. We show that it can get enhanced and thus can lead to the observed power asymmetry in the CMB. Our main conclusions are presented in Sec. V.

II. NON-BD STATE GENERATED BY PRE-INFLATIONARY PHASE AND ITS EFFECTS ON PRIMORDIAL SPECTRUM

A robust prediction of LQC is the occurrence of a non-singular bouncing phase, which removed the initial singularity in the early stage of the classical universe. In this section we present a brief introduction to both the evolution of the background with this pre-inflationary phase and its effects on primordial perturbations. For more details the reader is referred to [48, 49].

A. Evolution of background during bouncing phase

We first consider the evolution of the background for a flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) universe with a single scalar field ϕ . In LQC, an effective semi-classical dynamics can be described by the modified Friedmann and Klein-Gordon equations,

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3m_{\text{Pl}}^2} \rho \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \right), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V_{,\phi} = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ denotes the Hubble parameter and the dot represents the derivative with respect to the cosmic

¹ It is worth noting that such superhorizon modes as well as the power spectrum modulation that account for this power asymmetry could arise from a lot of models. For examples see [23, 24, 26] and references therein.

time t , $m_{\text{Pl}} = 1/\sqrt{G}$ is the Planck mass, $\rho = \dot{\phi}^2/2 + V(\phi)$ is the energy density of the universe with $V(\phi)$ being the potential of the scalar field, and ρ_c is the critical energy density which represents the maximum value of the energy density in LQC and it is about $\rho_c \simeq 0.41m_{\text{Pl}}^4$, as suggested in black hole entropy calculations.

Eq. (2.1) indicates that the universe starts at $\rho = \rho_c$, where the energy density reaches its maximum value and the Hubble parameter becomes zero. The background evolution with a bouncing phase has been extensively studied, and one of the main results is that, immediately following the quantum bounce, a desired slow-roll inflation phase is almost inevitable [27, 31–34].

To understand the background evolution, we first consider the initial conditions, which can be determined by specifying the values of the scalar field ϕ_B and its velocity $\dot{\phi}_B$. Among the whole $(\phi_B, \dot{\phi}_B)$ space which satisfies $\dot{\phi}_B^2/2 + V(\phi_B) = \rho_c$, we will focus on those parts in which the kinetic energy dominates at the beginning (or bounce) for two reasons. First, for kinetic energy dominated initial conditions, the background evolution during the bouncing phase is universal and can be solved analytically [48, 49]. Second, a potential dominated bounce either is not able to produce the desired slow-roll inflation because of a lack of the initial kinetic energy or leads to a large e-folds of the slow-roll inflation. As pointed out in [39, 47, 48], the latter possibility is out of our interest, because a huge amount of the slow-roll inflation washes out all the observational information of quantum effects and leads to the same perturbation spectrum as that in GR.

When the kinetic energy of the inflation dominates in the beginning, it is found that the evolution of the universe can be divided universally into three stages prior to the reheating [48, 49]: *the bouncing, transition and slow-roll inflation*, as shown schematically in Fig. 1 for the evolution of the equation of state $w(\phi) \equiv (\dot{\phi}^2 - 2V)/(\dot{\phi}^2 + 2V)$. The universe is initially dominated by the kinetic energy ($w_\phi \simeq 1$), and then stays with $w_\phi \simeq 1$ during the whole bouncing phase. Then, the kinetic energy suddenly decreases and is soon dominated by the potential energy ($w_\phi \simeq -1$), whereby the slow-roll inflation takes over. It is remarkable that the above division of the three different phases is universal, and does not depend on the inflationary models and initial conditions, as long as the universe was dominated by the kinetic energy of the inflation in the beginning.

For kinetic energy dominated initial states, the potential term in both Friedmann and Klein-Gordon equations can be ignored, and therefore we observe that

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 \left(1 - \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2\rho_c} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

The above couple of equations can be solved analytically.




FIG. 1. Three different stages of the evolution of the universe from its initial state ($\rho = \rho_c$) until the end of the slow-roll inflation: *the bouncing, transition, and slow-roll inflation phases*.

From the Klein-Gordon equation (2.4) we obtain

$$\dot{\phi}(t) = \pm \sqrt{2\rho_c} \left(\frac{a(t)}{a_B} \right)^{-3}. \quad (2.5)$$

Here \pm correspond to cases where $\dot{\phi}_B$ is positive or negative at the bounce, respectively. Substituting this into Eq. (2.3), we find

$$a(t) = a_B \left(1 + \gamma_B \frac{t^2}{t_{\text{Pl}}^2} \right)^{1/6}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\gamma_B \equiv \frac{24\pi\rho_c}{m_{\text{Pl}}^4}$ is a dimensionless constant. With the analytical solution of $a(t)$, from Eq. (2.5) we acquire that

$$\phi(t) = \phi_B \pm \frac{m_{\text{Pl}}}{2\sqrt{3}\pi} \text{arcsinh} \left(\sqrt{\gamma_B} \frac{t}{t_{\text{Pl}}} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\dot{\phi}(t) = \pm \frac{\sqrt{2\rho_c}}{(1 + \gamma_B t^2/t_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{1/2}}. \quad (2.8)$$

B. Generations of the non-BD state during pre-inflationary phase

Generally speaking, there are different ways to implement cosmological perturbations in the framework of LQC, namely the dressed metric approach [35–37] and the deformed algebra approach [43]. In this paper, we tend to focus on the dressed metric approach introduced in [35–37]. We only consider scalar perturbations which can be described via the effective equation of motion,

$$\mu_k^{(s)}(\eta)'' + \left(k^2 - \frac{a''}{a} + U^{(s)}(\eta) \right) \mu_k^{(s)}(\eta) = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mu_k^{(s)}(\eta) = z_s \mathcal{R}$ is related to the comoving curvature perturbations \mathcal{R} with $z_s \equiv a\dot{\phi}/H$, and

$$U^{(s)}(\eta) = a^2 (\mathfrak{f}^2 V(\phi) + 2V_{,\phi}(\phi) + V_{,\phi\phi}(\phi)), \quad (2.10)$$

with $\mathfrak{f} \equiv \sqrt{24\pi G\dot{\phi}}/\sqrt{\rho}$. Above, a prime denotes the derivative with respect to the conformal time η , which in terms of the cosmic time is given as

$$\eta = \int_{t_{\text{end}}}^t \frac{dt'}{a(t')}, \quad (2.11)$$

where t_{end} is the time when the inflation ends. Thus correspondingly, we have

$$\eta_{\text{end}} = 0, \quad \eta_{\text{B}} = \int_{t_{\text{end}}}^{t_{\text{B}}} \frac{dt}{a(t)}, \quad (2.12)$$

where t_{B} and η_{B} denote the cosmic and conformal times, respectively, at the bounce.

During the bouncing phase, as the kinetic energy dominates, $U^{(s)}(\eta)$ is negligible. Then for the purpose of studying the evolution of $\mu_k^{(s)}(\eta)$ during the bouncing phase, we consider the term

$$\mathcal{V}(\eta) \equiv \frac{a''}{a} = a_{\text{B}}^2 \frac{\gamma_{\text{B}} m_{\text{Pl}}^2 (1 - \gamma_{\text{B}} t^2 / t_{\text{Pl}}^2)}{9(1 + \gamma_{\text{B}} t^2 / t_{\text{Pl}}^2)^{5/3}}. \quad (2.13)$$

Obviously, if Eq. (2.9) can be considered as the Schrödinger equation, then $\mathcal{V}(\eta)$ serves as an effective barrier during the bouncing phase. This potential can be approximated by a Pöschl-Teller (PT) potential,

$$\mathcal{V}^{\text{PT}}(\eta) = \mathcal{V}_0 \cosh^{-1} \alpha(\eta - \eta_{\text{B}}), \quad (2.14)$$

for which the analytical solution of the corresponding Schrödinger equation is known, where $\mathcal{V}_0 = a_{\text{B}}^2 \gamma_{\text{B}} m_{\text{Pl}}^2 / 3$ and $\alpha^2 = 2a_{\text{B}}^2 \gamma_{\text{B}} m_{\text{Pl}}^2$.

Introducing two new variables x and $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ via

$$x(\eta) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-2\alpha(\eta - \eta_{\text{B}})}}, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}(x) = \left(x(1-x)\right)^{\frac{ik}{2\alpha}} \mu_k^{(s)}(\eta), \quad (2.16)$$

we find that Eq. (2.9) reduces to

$$x(1-x) \frac{d^2 \mathcal{Y}}{dx^2} + [a_3 - (a_1 + a_2 + 1)x] \frac{d\mathcal{Y}}{dx} - a_1 a_2 \mathcal{Y} = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$a_1 \equiv \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 - 4\mathcal{V}_0}}{2\alpha} - \frac{ik}{\alpha}, \quad (2.18)$$

$$a_2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 - 4\mathcal{V}_0}}{2\alpha} - \frac{ik}{\alpha}, \quad (2.19)$$

$$a_3 \equiv 1 - \frac{ik}{\alpha}. \quad (2.20)$$

Note that in deriving the above equation, we have ignored the $U^{(s)}(\eta)$ term in Eq. (2.9) as we are in the bouncing phase. The above equation is the standard hypergeometric equation, and its general solution is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k^{(s)}(\eta) &= a_k x^{ik/(2\alpha)} (1-x)^{-ik/(2\alpha)} \\ &\times {}_2F_1(a_1 - a_3 + 1, a_2 - a_3 + 1, 2 - a_3, x) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ b_k [x(1-x)]^{-ik/(2\alpha)} {}_2F_1(a_1, a_2, a_3, x). \quad (2.21)$$

Here a_k and b_k are two integration constants to be determined by the initial conditions. To impose them, let us first specify the initial time. A natural choice is right at the bounce, at which the initial state can be constructed as the fourth-order adiabatic vacuum [37]. While such constructions work well for large k , ambiguity however remains for modes with $k \lesssim k_{\text{B}}$ [37]. Another choice that has been frequently used is the remote past [40, 41]. In this paper we adopt the latter and in [48], we have proved that these two different choices actually lead to the same results [48]. As pointed out in [40, 41, 48], during the contracting phase right before the bounce, all the relevant perturbation modes are well inside the horizon, so that we can naturally choose the BD vacuum state as the initial conditions. Then the coefficients a_k and b_k can be determined as

$$a_k = 0, \quad b_k = \frac{e^{ik\eta_{\text{B}}}}{\sqrt{2k}}. \quad (2.22)$$

After the quantum bounce, the universe will soon turn into the slow-roll inflation, and the mode function is given by

$$\mu_k^{(s)}(\eta) = \alpha_k \frac{e^{-ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}} \left(1 - \frac{i}{k\eta}\right) + \beta_k \frac{e^{ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}} \left(1 + \frac{i}{k\eta}\right). \quad (2.23)$$

Matching this solution with that during the bouncing phase, it is easy to show that at the onset of the slow-roll inflation, the perturbation modes take the form

$$\mu_k^{(s)}(\eta) = \alpha_k \frac{e^{-ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}} + \beta_k \frac{e^{ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}}, \quad (2.24)$$

with

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\Gamma(a_3)\Gamma(a_3 - a_1 - a_3)}{\Gamma(a_3 - a_1)\Gamma(a_3 - a_2)} e^{2ik\eta_{\text{B}}}, \quad (2.25)$$

$$\beta_k = \frac{\Gamma(a_3)\Gamma(a_1 + a_2 - a_3)}{\Gamma(a_1)\Gamma(a_2)}. \quad (2.26)$$

In GR, one in general imposes the BD vacuum state when the modes are inside the Hubble horizon, i.e., $\alpha_k = 1$, $\beta_k = 0$. However, we show clearly that if there is a bouncing phase prior to the slow-roll inflation, β_k now does not vanish generically. This leads to modifications at the onset of the slow-roll inflation on the standard nearly scale invariant power spectrum,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k) = |\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2 \frac{H^2}{8\pi^2 m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1^2}, \quad (2.27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2 &= 1 + \left[1 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)\right] \text{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_{\text{B}}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sqrt{2} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \sqrt{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right) + \cosh\left(\frac{2\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_B}\right)} \\
& \times \operatorname{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_B}\right) \cos(2k_B\eta_B + \varphi_k), \quad (2.28)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\epsilon_1 \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2$ and

$$\varphi_k \equiv \arctan \left\{ \frac{\Im[\Gamma(a_1)\Gamma(a_2)\Gamma^2(a_3 - a_1 - a_2)]}{\Re[\Gamma(a_1)\Gamma(a_2)\Gamma^2(a_3 - a_1 - a_2)]} \right\}.$$

C. Observational range of pre-inflationary effects

A bouncing phase prior to inflation leads to an excited state at the onset of the slow-roll inflation. This excited state in turn produces scale dependent features in the primordial perturbation spectrum, as described in (2.27). These effects are encoded in the Bogoliubov coefficients α_k and β_k , and essentially depend on the parameter k_B . Thus they represent a characteristic feature of the LQC.

The quantum effects on the primordial perturbation spectrum can be constrained by recent observational data. Recently, by utilizing the Planck 2015 data, we found that the parameter k_B/a_0 is constrained by Planck TT + lowP (Planck TT, TE, EE + lowP) to [48, 49],

$$\frac{k_B}{a_0} < 3.12 \times 10^{-4} \text{Mpc}^{-1} (3.05 \times 10^{-4}), \quad (2.29)$$

at 95% C.L. and constrained by Planck TT + lowP + tensor (Planck TT, TE, EE + lowP + tensor) to

$$\frac{k_B}{a_0} < 3.14 \times 10^{-4} \text{Mpc}^{-1} (3.14 \times 10^{-4}), \quad (2.30)$$

at 95% C.L.. Considering the fact that the observable modes lie in the range of $(k_{\min}/a_0, k_{\max}/a_0)$ with $k_{\min}/a_0 = H_0 \simeq 3.3 \times 10^{-4} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ and $k_{\max}/a_0 \simeq 1 \text{Mpc}^{-1}$, it is easy to infer from the above constraints that

$$\frac{k_B}{a_0} \lesssim \frac{k_{\min}}{a_0}. \quad (2.31)$$

This indicates that the modes with $k \lesssim k_B$ are outside of the current Hubble horizon and only modes with $k \gtrsim k_B$ could lie in the observational range.

Based on the above constraints, the bouncing effects in the Bogoliubov coefficients α_k , β_k and the corresponding power spectrum can be divided into three different regions, the enhanced region, observable region, and suppressed region.

The enhanced region corresponds to the modes with $k \ll k_B$. For these modes, it is convenient to expand the Bogoliubov coefficients α_k and β_k about k/k_B as

$$|\alpha_k| \simeq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \frac{k_B}{k} \gg 1, \quad (2.32)$$

$$|\beta_k| \simeq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \frac{k_B}{k} \gg 1. \quad (2.33)$$

This implies that the state of perturbation modes dramatically deviate from the BD state and the corresponding effects dominate on these scales. As a result, the primordial perturbation spectrum is significantly enhanced due to the existence of these excited states.

The suppressed region corresponds to another limit with $k \gg k_B$. For these modes, the two Bogoliubov coefficients can be approximately expressed as

$$|\alpha_k| \simeq 1 + \left[1 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)\right] e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k}{k_B}}, \quad (2.34)$$

$$|\beta_k| \simeq 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k}{k_B}}. \quad (2.35)$$

In this limit, the relevant modes reduce to the standard BD state, ie., $\alpha_k \rightarrow 1$ and $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$. Thus the bouncing effects are suppressed by the factor $e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k}{k_B}}$ and the resulting power spectrum then reduces to the standard one.

The most interesting region, which relates to the observable region with significant bouncing effects, corresponds to the modes with $k \gtrsim k_B$. To estimate the bouncing effects, it is convenient to calculate the Bogoliubov coefficients α_k and β_k at $k = k_B$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha_k| &= \operatorname{csch}\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}\right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \cosh\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\pi\right)}, \\
|\beta_k| &= \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \operatorname{csch}\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}\right). \quad (2.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Approximately we find $|\alpha_k| \simeq 1.06$ and $|\beta_k| \simeq 0.37$ when $k = k_B$. These results shall play an essential role in the estimation of the non-Gaussianity in the observational range in the next section.

III. NON-GAUSSIANITY IN BISPECTRUM FROM QUANTUM BOUNCE EFFECTS

In this section, we begin studying the non-Gaussianity of the comoving curvature perturbation \mathcal{R}_k . It is important to note that the non-Gaussianity with quantum gravitational effects has been calculated numerically in [50]. In this section, we shall follow the procedure in [50] while employing our analytical solution obtained in the previous section.

In general, the non-Gaussianity of the comoving curvature perturbations \mathcal{R}_k is characterized by the bispectrum $B_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$, which is defined in terms of a three-point correlation function as

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_3} \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3) B_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1, k_2, k_3), \quad (3.1)$$

where the three point function for the comoving curvature perturbation can be calculated via

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_3} \rangle \simeq -i \left\langle \left[\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{k}_3}, \int_{t_0}^t dt' H_3(t') \right] \right\rangle,$$

(3.2) expressed as [5]

$$H_3(t) = - \int d^3x \left\{ a^3 \epsilon_1^2 \mathcal{R} \dot{\mathcal{R}}^2 + a \epsilon_1^2 \mathcal{R} (\partial \mathcal{R})^2 - 2a^3 \epsilon_1^2 \dot{\mathcal{R}} \partial \mathcal{R} \partial (\partial^{-2} \dot{\mathcal{R}}) + \partial_t \left(-\frac{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2}{2} a^3 \mathcal{R}^2 \dot{\mathcal{R}} \right) \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

where $H_3(t)$ denotes the cubic Hamiltonian of the comoving curvature perturbation $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ in the metric and it is

Performing the integral in Eq. (3.2) for the mode function in Eq. (2.23) with a general α_k and β_k , one obtains ²

$$\begin{aligned} & B_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \\ &= (2\pi)^4 \left(\frac{H^2}{8\pi^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1} \right)^2 \frac{(\alpha_{k_1} + \beta_{k_1})(\alpha_{k_2} + \beta_{k_2})(\alpha_{k_3} + \beta_{k_3})}{8k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2} \\ & \times \left\{ (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2) \frac{k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2}{2k_1 k_2 k_3} \left[K(\alpha_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^*) + K_3(\alpha_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^*) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + K_2(\alpha_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^*) - K_1(\alpha_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^*) \right] \right. \\ & + \left[\left(\frac{4(k_1^2 k_2^2 + k_3^2 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_3^2) - (k_1 k_2 + k_3 k_2 + k_1 k_3)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) - (k_1^4 + k_2^4 + k_3^4)}{K k_1 k_2 k_3} + 1 \right) \epsilon_1 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{k_2 k_1^2 + k_3 k_1^2 + k_2^2 k_1 + k_3^2 k_1 + k_2 k_3^2 + k_2^2 k_3}{2k_1 k_2 k_3} \epsilon_2 \right] (\alpha_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{iK\eta_0}) - \beta_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{-iK\eta_0})) \\ & + \left[\left(\frac{4(k_1^2 k_2^2 + k_3^2 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_3^2) - (k_1 k_2 - k_3 k_2 - k_1 k_3)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) - (k_1^4 + k_2^4 + k_3^4)}{K_3 k_1 k_2 k_3} - 1 \right) \epsilon_1 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{k_2 k_1^2 - k_3 k_1^2 + k_2^2 k_1 + k_3^2 k_1 + k_2 k_3^2 - k_2^2 k_3}{2k_1 k_2 k_3} \epsilon_2 \right] (\alpha_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{iK_3\eta_0}) - \beta_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{-iK_3\eta_0})) \\ & + \left[\left(\frac{4(k_1^2 k_2^2 + k_3^2 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_3^2) - (k_1 k_3 - k_1 k_2 - k_3 k_2)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) - (k_1^4 + k_2^4 + k_3^4)}{K_2 k_1 k_2 k_3} - 1 \right) \epsilon_1 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{-k_2 k_1^2 + k_3 k_1^2 + k_2^2 k_1 + k_3^2 k_1 - k_2 k_3^2 + k_2^2 k_3}{2k_1 k_2 k_3} \epsilon_2 \right] (\alpha_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{iK_2\eta_0}) - \beta_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{-iK_2\eta_0})) \\ & - \left[\left(\frac{4(k_1^2 k_2^2 + k_3^2 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_3^2) - (k_3 k_2 - k_1 k_3 - k_1 k_2)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) - (k_1^4 + k_2^4 + k_3^4)}{K_1 k_1 k_2 k_3} - 1 \right) \epsilon_1 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{k_2 k_1^2 + k_3 k_1^2 - k_2^2 k_1 - k_3^2 k_1 + k_2 k_3^2 + k_2^2 k_3}{2k_1 k_2 k_3} \epsilon_2 \right] (\alpha_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_2}^* \beta_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{-iK_1\eta_0}) - \beta_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_2}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* (1 - e^{iK_1\eta_0})) \left. \right\} \\ & + \text{c.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $K \equiv k_1 + k_2 + k_3$ and $K_i \equiv K - 2k_i$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then to describe the amplitude of the bispectrum, it is

also convenient to define the amplitude f_{NL} as

$$f_{\text{NL}} \equiv \frac{\frac{5}{6} B_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1, k_2, k_3)}{P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1)P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_2) + P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_1)P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_3) + P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_2)P_{\mathcal{R}}(k_3)}, \quad (3.5)$$

² The non-Gaussianity with non-BD states has been also calculated in [7–13]

where

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}(k) \equiv |\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2 \frac{H^2}{8\pi^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1} \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3}. \quad (3.6)$$

In general, the amplitude $f_{\text{NL}} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$, i.e., it is suppressed by the slow-roll parameters. As $\alpha_k = 1$ and $\beta_k = 0$, it is readily observed that $f_{\text{NL}} \sim 0.01$. Thus it is too small to be detectable. When $\beta_k \neq 0$, there are two specific momentum configurations, the folded and squeezed configurations, that are expected to produce large non-Gaussianities.

A. Folded configuration

For the folded limit ($k_1 = k_2 = \frac{k_3}{2}$), we have $K_3 \rightarrow 0$. Thus one expects that the bispectrum is dominated by the term $\frac{1 - e^{\pm i K_3 \eta_0}}{K_3}$. In this case we adopt the limitation

$$\lim_{K_3 \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - e^{\pm i K_3 \eta_0}}{K_3} = \mp i \eta_0. \quad (3.7)$$

It follows immediately that

$$f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{folded}} \simeq \epsilon_1 \times \mathcal{O}(1) \times k_3 \eta_0. \quad (3.8)$$

Considering the fact that the mode k_3 should be well within the horizon at the onset of the slow-roll inflation (or right after the bounce), we have

$$-k_3 \eta_0 \gg 1. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, we may anticipate that $k_3 \eta_0$ should make significant contributions to the non-Gaussianity. However, as pointed out in [7], when we consider the two-dimensional projections of the three point function into the CMB, this factor $k_3 \eta_0$ will essentially disappear. So this result is not enhanced but will be of the same order as that from the local redefinitions and the two-point function.

B. Squeezed configuration

For the squeezed configuration ($k_2 \simeq k_3 \gg k_1$), we have

$$\frac{1}{K_2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{k_1}, \quad \frac{1}{K_3} \rightarrow \frac{1}{k_1}. \quad (3.10)$$

Considering that k_1 is small enough compared to the other two modes in this case, we find

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}} &\simeq \frac{10}{3} \epsilon_1 \left[\frac{k_3}{k_1} + \frac{9}{4} \frac{k_1}{k_3} + \mathcal{O}(k_1^2/k_3^2) \right] \\ &\times \text{Re} \left[\frac{(\alpha_{k_1} + \beta_{k_1})(\alpha_{k_3} + \beta_{k_3})^2}{|\alpha_{k_1} + \beta_{k_1}|^2 |\alpha_{k_3} + \beta_{k_3}|^2} \right. \\ &\left. \times \left(\alpha_{k_1}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* \beta_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_1}^* \beta_{k_3}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

In the observational range, k_3/k_1 could be as large as $k_{\text{max}}/k_{\text{min}} \sim 10^4$. Thus, in general one expects in the squeezed limit the non-Gaussianity gets enhanced due to the excited state, i.e., $\beta_k \neq 0$. However, whether the non-Gaussianity gets enhanced or not also depends on the magnitude of the term in the second line of Eq. (3.11). In order to see the quantum effects in this limit, let us study this term in detail.

We take the large scale k_1 as the largest scale we could observe today, thus we can identify it as the typical scale of quantum effects k_{B} . With this consideration we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}} + \beta_{k_{\text{B}}})(\alpha_{k_3} + \beta_{k_3})^2}{|\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}} + \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}|^2 |\alpha_{k_3} + \beta_{k_3}|^2} \left(\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* \beta_{k_3}^* - \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}^* \beta_{k_3}^* \alpha_{k_3}^* \right) \\ &\simeq \frac{\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}}^* - \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}^*}{\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}}^* + \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}^*} \alpha_{k_3}^* \beta_{k_3}^* + \mathcal{O}(\beta_{k_3}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where we assumed that $k_3 \gg k_{\text{B}}$ thus $|\beta_{k_3}| \ll 1$. Using the approximate form

$$\beta_{k_3}^* \simeq i2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}}} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}}}), \quad (3.13)$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}} &\lesssim \frac{20}{3} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \epsilon_1 \times \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}}} \\ &\times \text{Im} \left(\frac{\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}}^* - \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}^*}{\alpha_{k_{\text{B}}}^* + \beta_{k_{\text{B}}}^*} \alpha_{k_3}^* \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where the second line of the above equation is of the order of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and

$$\frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}}} \ll e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}} \simeq 0.28. \quad (3.15)$$

Therefore, the above expression shows that the quantum effects in the squeezed limit are strongly suppressed by the factor $e^{-\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{k_3}{k_{\text{B}}}}$, even though $k_3/k_{\text{B}} \gg 1$. This leads to one of the main conclusion of this paper: the quantum gravitational effects on the non-Gaussianity only contribute to the same order as that in a single field slow-roll inflation in the observable range. It is far beyond our current or forthcoming detections. It is worth to mention that our result presented is in a good agreement with the discussion in [50].

IV. ENHANCED QUANTUM EFFECTS AT SUPERHORIZON SCALES AND POWER ASYMMETRY

We now turn to the non-Gaussianity at scales beyond our current Hubble horizon and its possible effects on the observational power spectrum. According to the mechanism proposed in [21, 22], the enhanced non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit for coupling between superhorizon

mode and observable scales could lead to a large modulation of the primordial spectrum. Thus providing an origin for the power asymmetry. In this section, we follow this idea to consider enhanced quantum effects at superhorizon scales on the non-Gaussianity and their impacts on the power asymmetry of a CMB spectrum.

To illustrate the scenario with quantum effects, let us first consider the non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit for a coupling between a superhorizon mode with $k_1 = k_{\text{sh}} \ll k_{\text{B}}$ and two large scale modes with $k_2 = k_3 = k \gtrsim k_{\text{B}}$ in the observational range. From Eq. (3.11), we have

$$f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}} \simeq \frac{10}{3} \epsilon_1 \frac{k}{k_{\text{sh}}} \text{Re} \left[\frac{(\alpha_{k_{\text{sh}}} + \beta_{k_{\text{sh}}})(\alpha_k + \beta_k)^2}{|\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2 |\alpha_{k_{\text{sh}}} + \beta_{k_{\text{sh}}}|^2} \times \left(\alpha_{k_{\text{sh}}}^* \alpha_k^* \beta_k^* - \beta_{k_{\text{sh}}}^* \beta_k^* \alpha_k^* \right) \right]. \quad (4.1)$$

More explicitly we need to calculate effects due to the Bogoliubov coefficients $\alpha_{k_{\text{sh}}}$ and $\beta_{k_{\text{sh}}}$, since they are expected to be enhanced as we show in Sec. II. C. Performing the Taylor expansions about $k_{\text{sh}}/k_{\text{B}}$, we acquire that

$$f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}}(k) \simeq \epsilon_1 \frac{20\sqrt{6}}{3} \frac{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) \text{csch}\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_{\text{B}}}\right) k k_{\text{B}}}{H_{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}} + H_{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}}} \frac{k k_{\text{B}}}{k_{\text{sh}}^2} \times \text{Im} \left(\frac{\alpha_k + \beta_k}{\alpha_k^* + \beta_k^*} \alpha_k^* \right), \quad (4.2)$$

where H_ν represents the harmonic number. Considering

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{\alpha_k + \beta_k}{\alpha_k^* + \beta_k^*} \alpha_k^* \right) \sim \mathcal{O}(1), \quad (4.3)$$

and $k_{\text{sh}} \ll k_{\text{B}} \lesssim k$, it is obvious that $f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}}$ is scale dependent (depends on k). It is enhanced dramatically by the factor $k k_{\text{B}}/k_{\text{sh}}^2$ at large scales, but suppressed by $\text{csch}(\pi k/(\sqrt{6}k_{\text{B}}))$ at small scales. The presence of the superhorizon mode k_{sh} and its coupling to observational scales are the key ingredients to make f_{NL} enhanced.

The non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit given in Eq. (4.2) can produce modulation on the primordial curvature power spectrum. In particular, due to the EKC mechanism [21, 22], the superhorizon mode could bring modifications at observational scales, which is expected as an approximately linear function of positions. This, naturally, could provide an explanation for the observed power asymmetry in the CMB spectrum. According to the analysis given in [51, 52], the relation between the power asymmetry and non-Gaussianity is given by

$$A(k) = \frac{6}{5} |f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{squeezed}}(k)| k_{\text{sh}} x_{\text{cmb}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}^{1/2}(k_{\text{sh}}). \quad (4.4)$$

This equation is also known as the consistency condition, relating the amplitude of power asymmetry to the amplitude of the non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit. The remarkable feature of the non-Gaussianity produced by the quantum effects in the squeezed limit here is that it is sensitive to different scales. The amplitude of the non-Gaussianity in the squeezed limit, which is enhanced at

large scales but suppressed at small scales (as we showed above), could provide a physical explanation for the observational fact that the power asymmetry is only significant on the cosmological scale but becomes small at the Mpc scale.

Specifically, let us consider the primordial curvature perturbation spectrum at superhorizon scales. According to Eq. (2.27), it is approximately given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k_{\text{sh}}) \simeq \frac{6(1 + \cos(\pi/\sqrt{3})) k_{\text{B}}^2}{\pi^2} \frac{H^2}{k_{\text{sh}}^2 8\pi^2 m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Then substituting this equation into Eq. (4.4) and using Eq. (4.2) we obtain

$$A(k) \simeq -\epsilon_1 \frac{48\sqrt{1 + \cos(\pi/\sqrt{3})} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\right)}{\pi \left(H_{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}} + H_{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}} \right)} \times \text{csch}\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_{\text{B}}}\right) \frac{k_{\text{B}}^2}{k_{\text{sh}}^2} \frac{k x_{\text{cmb}}}{a_0} \sqrt{\frac{H^2}{8\pi^2 m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon_1}}. \quad (4.6)$$

The Planck 2015 data showed that $\epsilon_1 < 0.0068$ at 95% C.L. and the best-fit value of $H^2/(8\pi^2 m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \epsilon)$ reads 2.2×10^{-9} . Substituting these values into $A(k)$ yields an upper bound,

$$A(k) \lesssim 5.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{csch}\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_{\text{min}}}\right) \frac{k_{\text{min}}^2}{k_{\text{sh}}^2} \frac{k x_{\text{cmb}}}{a_0}, \quad (4.7)$$

where the constraint $k_{\text{B}} < k_{\text{min}}$ from Eq. (2.31) has been also applied. Typically, the magnitude of $A(k)$ at different scales is a function of k_{sh} . Namely, as $A(k) \sim 0.066$ at large scales $(k/a_0)^{-1} \gtrsim (a_0/k_{\text{min}})^{-1} \sim 3$ Gpc, we expect

$$\frac{k_{\text{sh}}}{a_0} \lesssim 1.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{Mpc}^{-1}, \quad (4.8)$$

where we have used $x_{\text{cmb}} = 14$ Gpc. At small scales, as the Bogoliubov coefficient β_k is highly suppressed, the non-Gaussianity amplitude f_{NL} reduces to the usual magnitude with $\beta_k = 0$, i.e., $f_{\text{NL}} \sim n_s - 1$. Thus, at small scales, the power asymmetry is small, which is consistent with the constraint from quasars [19].

In conclusion, we have shown analytically that the quantum gravitational effects can produce a large-amplitude superhorizon mode which could account for the observed power asymmetry in the CMB. This is in agreement with the results obtained from numerical calculations in [50], in which the calculations are limited to specific initial conditions and the potential of the scalar field. In addition, we also would like to emphasize that, although the quantum effects produce power asymmetry which is consistent with observation, their effects in both the primordial perturbation spectrum and non-Gaussianity are well within current observational constraints.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have provided a detailed analytical study of the non-Gaussianity in the primordial comoving curvature perturbation, as well as its effects on power asymmetry for a single field inflation in the framework of loop quantum cosmology, in which a quantum bouncing era prior to inflation exists. The quantum effects naturally generate an excited state on the primordial comoving curvature perturbation rather than the usual BD vacuum state at the onset of slow-roll inflation. We have also showed that the excited state may produce enhanced effects at large scales, but reduces to the BD state at small scales. With this excited state, we calculate explicitly underlying non-Gaussianity of primordial curvature perturbations. It has been shown that the amplitude of the non-Gaussianity in a squeezed limit due to these effects is small at observable scales. This is due to the fact that the

squeezed limit involves two very different scales. While one of the scales is large, the other is definitely small with suppressed effects. We have further shown that the non-Gaussianity can still be enhanced if we consider a superhorizon mode that couples to the observable modes at large scales. It is this enhanced non-Gaussianity that leads to a modulation on the isotropic primordial power spectrum at observed scales, and thus an explanation of the power asymmetry observed in the CMB spectrum can be naturally concluded.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Wen Zhao for valuable comments and suggestions. This work is supported in part by Chinese NSF Grants, Nos. 11375153 (A.W.), 11675145(A.W.), 11675143 (T.Z.), and 11105120 (T.Z.). K.K. was supported by the Baylor University Summer Sabbatical Research Program.

-
- [1] N. Bartolo, S. Matarrese, and A. Riotto, Primordial non-Gaussianity from different cosmological scenarios, *Nucl. Phys. B. Proc. Suppl.* **148** (2005) 56.
 - [2] X. Chen, M. Huang, S. Kachru, and G. Shiu, Observational signatures and non-Gaussianities of general single-field inflation, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **01** (2007) 002.
 - [3] E. Komatsu *et. al.*, Non-Gaussianity as a Probe of the Physics of the Primordial Universe and the Astrophysics of the Low Redshift Universe, [arXiv:0902.4759](https://arxiv.org/abs/0902.4759) [astro-ph].
 - [4] X. Chen, Primordial Non-Gaussianities from Inflation Models, *Advances in Astronomy 2010*, 1 (2010).
 - [5] Y. Wang, Inflation, Cosmic Perturbations and Non-Gaussianities, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **62**, 109 (2014).
 - [6] J. Maldacena, Non-gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models, *J. High. Energy. Phys.* **05** (2003) 013.
 - [7] R. Holman and A. J. Tolley, Enhanced non-Gaussianity from excited initial states, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **08** (2008) 001.
 - [8] I. Agullo and L. Parker, Non-Gaussianities and the stimulated creation of quanta in the inflationary universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 063526 (2011).
 - [9] I. Agullo and L. Parker, Stimulated creation of quanta during inflation and the observable universe, *Gen Relativ Gravit* **43** (2011) 2541.
 - [10] J. Ganc, Calculating the local-type f_{NL} for slow-roll inflation with a non-vacuum initial state, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 063514.
 - [11] I. Agullo, J. Navarro-Salas, and L. Parker, Enhanced local-type inflationary trispectrum from a non-vacuum initial state, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **05**, 019 (2012).
 - [12] P. D. Meerburg, J. P. van der Schaar, and P. S. Corasaniti, Signatures of Initial State Modifications on Bispectrum Statistics, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **05**, 018 (2009).
 - [13] X. Chen, Folded resonant non-Gaussianity in general single field inflation, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **12**, 003 (2010).
 - [14] P. A. R. Ade *et. al.* (Planck Collaboration), Planck 2013 results. XXIII. Isotropy and statistics of the CMB, *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A23 (2014).
 - [15] P. A. R. Ade *et. al.* (Planck Collaboration), Planck 2015 results - XVI. Isotropy and statistics of the CMB, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A16 (2016).
 - [16] F. K. Hansen, A. J. Banday, and K. M. Gorski, Testing the cosmological principle of isotropy: local power-spectrum estimates of the WMAP data, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **354**, 641 (2004).
 - [17] H. K. Eriksen, A. J. Banday, K. M. Gorski, and P. B. Lilje, The N-Point Correlation Functions of the First-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe Sky Maps, *Astrophys. J.* **622**, 58 (2005).
 - [18] Y. Akrami, Y. Fantaye, A. Shafieloo, H. K. Eriksen, F. K. Hansen, A. J. Banday, and K. M. Gorski, Power asymmetry in Wmap and Planck temperature sky maps as measured by a local variance estimator, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **784**, L42 (2014).
 - [19] C.M. Hirata, Constraints on cosmic hemispherical power anomalies from quasars, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **09** (2009) 011.
 - [20] S. Flender and S. Hotchkiss, The small scale power asymmetry in the cosmic microwave background, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **09** (2013) 033.
 - [21] A. L. Erickcek, S. M. Carroll, and M. Kamionkowski, Superhorizon perturbations and the cosmic microwave background, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 083012 (2008).
 - [22] A. L. Erickcek, M. Kamionkowski, and S. M. Carroll, A hemispherical power asymmetry from inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 123520 (2008).
 - [23] Z.-G. Liu, Z.-K. Guo, and Y.-S. Piao, Obtaining the CMB anomalies with a bounce from the contracting phase to inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 063539 (2013).
 - [24] X. Gao, Can relic superhorizon inhomogeneities be responsible for large-scale CMB anomalies?, *Phys. Lett.*

- B702**, 12-15 (2011).
- [25] F. Schmidt and L. Hui, Phys. Cosmic Microwave Background Power Asymmetry from Non-Gaussian Modulation, *Rev. Lett.* **110**, 011301 (2013).
- [26] Y.-F. Cai, W. Zhao, and Y. Zhang, Cosmic microwave background power asymmetry from primordial sound speed parameter, *Phys. Rev.* **D89**, 023005 (2014).
- [27] A. Ashtekar and P. Singh, *Loop quantum cosmology: a status report*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **28**, 213001 (2011).
- [28] A. Ashtekar and A. Barrau, *Loop quantum cosmology: from pre-inflationary dynamics to observations*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32**, 234001 (2015).
- [29] A. Barrau and B. Bolliet, *Some conceptual issues in loop quantum cosmology*, [arXiv:1602.04452](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.04452).
- [30] J. Yang, Y. Ding, and Y. Ma, *Alternative quantization of the Hamiltonian in loop quantum cosmology*, *Phys. Lett. B.* **682**, 1 (2009).
- [31] P. Singh, K. Vandersloot, and G. V. Vereshchagin, *Non-singular bouncing universes in loop quantum cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 043510 (2006).
- [32] J. Mielczarek, T. Cailleteau, J. Grain, and A. Barrau, *Inflation in loop quantum cosmology: Dynamics and spectrum of gravitational waves*, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 104049 (2010).
- [33] X. Zhang and Y. Ling, *Inflationary universe in loop quantum cosmology*, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **08**, 012 (2007).
- [34] L. Chen and J.-Y. Zhu, *Loop quantum cosmology: The horizon problem and the probability of inflation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 084063 (2015).
- [35] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, Quantum Gravity Extension of the Inflationary Scenario, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 251301 (2012).
- [36] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, Extension of the quantum theory of cosmological perturbations to the Planck era, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 043507 (2013).
- [37] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar, and W. Nelson, The pre-inflationary dynamics of loop quantum cosmology: confronting quantum gravity with observations, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **30**, 085014 (2013).
- [38] B. Bonga and B. Gupt, Inflation with the Starobinsky potential in loop quantum cosmology, *Gen Relativ Gravit* **48**, 1 (2016).
- [39] B. Bonga and B. Gupt, Phenomenological investigation of a quantum gravity extension of inflation with the Starobinsky potential, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 063513 (2016).
- [40] B. Bolliet, J. Grain, C. Stahl, L. Linsefors, and A. Barrau, Comparison of primordial tensor power spectra from the deformed algebra and dressed metric approaches in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084035 (2015).
- [41] S. Schander, A. Barrau, B. Bolliet, L. Linsefors, and J. Grain, Primordial scalar power spectrum from the Euclidean bounce of loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 023531 (2016).
- [42] B. Bolliet, A. Barrau, J. Grain, and S. Schander, *Observational Exclusion of a Consistent Quantum Cosmology Scenario*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 124011 (2016).
- [43] J. Grain, The perturbed universe in the deformed algebra approach of Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25**, 1642003 (2016) [[arXiv:1606.03271](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.03271)].
- [44] J. Mielczarek, *Gravitational waves from the big bounce*, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **11**, 011 (2008).
- [45] J. Mielczarek, Possible observational effects of loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D81**, 063503 (2010).
- [46] L. Linsefors, T. Cailleteau, A. Barrau, and J. Grain, Primordial tensor power spectrum in holonomy corrected Ω loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 107503 (2013).
- [47] I. Agullo and N. A. Morris, Detailed analysis of the predictions of loop quantum cosmology for the primordial power spectra, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 124040 (2015).
- [48] T. Zhu, A. Wang, G. Cleaver, K. Kirsten, and Q. Sheng, Pre-inflationary universe in loop quantum cosmology, [arXiv: 1705.07544](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.07544).
- [49] T. Zhu, A. Wang, K. Kirsten, G. Cleaver, and Q. Sheng, Universal features of quantum bounce in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, 196 (2017) [[arXiv:1607.06329](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.06329)].
- [50] I. Agullo, Loop quantum cosmology, non-Gaussianity, and CMB power asymmetry, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 064038 (2015).
- [51] D. H. Lyth, The CMB modulation from inflation, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **08** (2013) 007.
- [52] M. H. Namjoo, S. Baghran, and H. Firouzjahi, Hemispherical asymmetry and local non-Gaussianity: A consistency condition, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 083527 (2013).