

Inflation and Decoupling

Gia Dvali^{a,b}, Alex Kehagias^c, Antonio Riotto^{d,e}

^aArnold Sommerfeld Center, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Theresienstraße 37, 80333 München, Germany

^bMax-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany

^cPhysics Division, National Technical University of Athens 15780 Zografou Campus, Athens, Greece

^dDépartement de Physique Théorique and Centre for Astroparticle Physics (CAP),
Université de Genève, 24 quai E. Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland

^eINFN, Sezione di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, 00185, Roma, Italy

Decoupling of heavy modes in effective low energy theory is one of the most fundamental concepts in physics. It tells us that modes must have a negligible effect on the physics of gravitational backgrounds with curvature radius larger than their wavelengths. Despite this, there exist claims that trans-Planckian modes put severe bound on the duration of inflation even when the Hubble parameter is negligible as compared to the Planck mass. If true, this would mean that inflation violates the principle of decoupling or at least requires its reformulation. We clarify the fundamental misconception on which these bounds are based and respectively refute them. Our conclusion is that inflation fully falls within the validity of a reliable effective field theory treatment and does not suffer from any spurious trans-Planckian problem.

One of the most fundamental concepts in physics tells us that modes operating at some UV -wavelength $L_{UV} \equiv \Lambda_{UV}^{-1}$ decouple from the low energy processes taking place at IR -scale $L_{IR} \gg L_{UV}$. That is, in an Effective Field Theory (EFT), formulated at a low energy scale L_{IR} , the short wavelength physics sums itself up in effective coefficients of renormalizable interactions and in infinite series of non-renormalizable contact interactions suppressed by powers of L_{UV} . At the same time, any long-distance correlator generated by the exchange of UV -modes, is exponentially suppressed by a factor of the type $\exp(-L_{IR}/L_{UV})$. Although this concept is usually referred to as *Wilsonian decoupling*, it goes beyond the regime of standard Wilsonian UV -completion. For example, it remains equally correct also if UV -completion above the cutoff Λ_{UV} happens via *classicalization* phenomenon [1, 2]. In such theories the states of energy $M \gg \Lambda_{UV}$, instead of being represented by single-particle states of wavelength $L \ll L_{UV}$, are described by classical configurations composed of many soft quanta of wavelength $L \gg L_{UV}$ [3–5]. That is, putting it shortly, Wilsonian decoupling holds even when the UV -completion is non-Wilsonian.

In the first part of the present paper, we shall stay within the range of validity of the standard Wilsonian picture of UV -completion, whereas in the second part we shall extend our results to a non-Wilsonian domain.

A classic example of the decoupling at work is provided by Einstein's theory of gravity. Indeed, already in lowest order, the interactions of graviton are represented by non-renormalizable operators suppressed by powers of the Planck mass M_P . Despite this fact, the effective low energy theory allows to predict phenomena with extraordinary accuracy, without any need to worry about the quantum gravitational corrections from the Planck scale physics. The reason is that the quantum gravitational coupling among the elementary particles of wavelength

$L \gg L_P$ is extremely small,

$$\alpha_{GR} = \frac{1}{(LM_P)^2}. \quad (1)$$

Correspondingly, for many sources, the expansion in series of α_{GR} is highly reliable. For instance, for a graviton of wavelength comparable to earth-moon distance ($L \sim 10^{10}\text{cm}$), the coupling is $\alpha_{GR} \sim 10^{-86}$. Obviously, only the very heavy classical sources (such as the earth) can compensate this enormous suppression. The bonus is that for such sources the effect (e.g., the lunar orbit) can be computed extremely accurately. Obviously, the dominant contribution into the exchange comes from the gravitons of the wavelengths $\sim L$. At the same time, the corrections from gravitons of the shorter wavelengths is exponentially small.

In general, the criterion of insensitivity towards the short-scale physics can be formulated in terms of the curvature invariants. Namely, for the classical backgrounds of large curvature radius $L \gg L_P$, the corrections from Planck-scale physics is expected to be highly suppressed.

A well-known manifestation of the above concept is the success of the inflationary paradigm [6, 7]. According to Guth's original idea, our Universe underwent through a De Sitter like epoch during which the scale factor $a(t)$ was increasing exponentially $a(t) \propto e^{Ht}$. Here H is the inflationary Hubble parameter which sets the curvature radius H^{-1} and is approximately constant in cosmic time t . In this way, the inflation addresses the most fundamental cosmological questions such as the horizon and flatness.

Obviously, the decoupling principle tells us that as long as $H \ll M_P$, the inflation can be treated reliably within the low energy EFT. The leading corrections from Planck wavelength physics may come in form of

the higher curvature invariants. These, however, are suppressed by powers of H^2/M_P^2 relative to Einstein, see e.g. [8].

Now, it is very important to understand that the decoupling principle fully permits the microscopic physics to have significant macroscopic effects on sufficiently long time-scales. For example, a macroscopic tank of water can be emptied due to proton-decay mediated by *UV*-physics. Likewise, the time-scale on which the microscopic quantum corrections to De Sitter and inflation become important is given by the following *quantum break-time* [9, 10],

$$t \sim H^{-1} \frac{M_P^2}{H^2}. \quad (2)$$

After this time, in general, the microscopic theory must be taken into account. Without entering into much details, here, we can justify (2) by the following simple short-cut dimensional argument. Indeed, the largest rate of a quantum process taking place at energy H and controlled by a cutoff scale $\Lambda_{UV} = M_P$ is given by $\Gamma \sim H^3/M_P^2$. Then, it is obvious that (2) is a minimal time-scale, $t = \Gamma^{-1}$, required for such a process to become effective. Of course, in theories with a lower cutoff Λ_{UV} the time scale is shortened accordingly.

For the future comparison, it is important that microscopic considerations lead [9] to derivation of a second, logarithmic, time-scale,

$$t \sim H^{-1} \ln M_P^2/H^2. \quad (3)$$

This was obtained as a characteristic time after which the De Sitter quantum state can become one-particle entangled¹. The main thing for the present discussion is that after (3) the back reaction to De Sitter is still negligible and cannot affect the validity of inflation.

To summarize, in accordance with the decoupling principle, the microscopic effects from quantum gravity do not invalidate the EFT treatment of De Sitter on the time-scales shorter than (2). This gives a large domain of validity for standard inflation. For example, for $H \sim 10^{13}$ GeV, the available number of e-foldings, $\mathcal{N}_e \equiv tH$, would be over $\mathcal{N}_e \sim 10^{12}$.

Despite the above, in the literature one encounters discussions that can be referred to as the *trans-Planckian*

problem of inflation, see e.g. [13–15]. The argument can be summarized as follows. Let us consider an inflationary fluctuation that is detected at some later time, e.g., today. At the moment of crossing outside the inflationary Hubble patch this fluctuation had a wavelength $L \sim H$. This wavelength is a result of the stretching due to the exponential expansion of the scale factor. Thus, scaled back in time by \mathcal{N}_e inflationary *e*-foldings, it shrinks to a size $L_{in} = Le^{-\mathcal{N}_e}$. Hence, if inflation lasted longer than

$$\mathcal{N}_e = \ln M_P/H, \quad (4)$$

some perturbations would inevitably reach the trans-Planckian wave-lengths in the past. This reasoning prompted the authors of Ref. [16] to conjecture that (4) must be accepted as an upper bound on the number of inflationary *e*-foldings. This is the so-called *Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture*.

The coincidence of the time-scale (4) with (3) is obvious but the interpretation given to it by Ref. [16] is fundamentally different as it signals a complete breakdown of inflation as EFT. If this were true, it would imply that inflation violates the decoupling principle, or the least, demands its fundamental rethinking and reformulation. Indeed, according to this view, for a low energy observer operating at distance H^{-1} , it takes only a logarithmic time to be strongly affected by the Planck scale physics! This would be a truly remarkable prospect.

Unfortunately, the above is not the case and neither (3) nor (4) represent the sensible bound on the duration of inflation. The reason lies in a certain misconception slipped though the above thought experiment during which the inflationary perturbations have been scaled back in time.

The point is that it makes no physical sense to scale a given fluctuation arbitrarily far back in time. This is because, prior to a certain initial moment, the fluctuation simply *did not exist*. That is, an overwhelming majority of De Sitter quantum fluctuations are produced with wavelengths $L \sim H^{-1}$. Only an exponentially-suppressed fraction $\sim e^{-1/(HL)}$ is created with wavelengths $L \ll H^{-1}$. Obviously, it is misleading to scale the modes back in time past their “birth date”. Or putting it differently, once we shrink the mode beyond H^{-1} , we must weight it with a probability that the mode was already *real* and not the part of the *unmaterialized vacuum spectrum*. This probability is suppressed by the above exponential factor even much *earlier* the mode shrinks down to the Planck length. This suppression was not taken into account in the reasoning that leads to the bound (4).

In order to grasp the above more clearly, let us reduce to bare essentials the physical mechanism of creation of De Sitter quantum fluctuations. Let us consider a quantum field (e.g. a graviton) in the De

¹ The scale (3) was proposed in [9] as the De Sitter analog of so-called information scrambling limit [11]. The quantum field theoretic meaning given to it in [12] is of a lower limit on time after which a system with Lyapunov instability starts developing chaos. These interpretations are secondary for the present discussion and we shall not enter there. An interested reader is referred to the original papers cited above and references therein.

Sitter Universe. An each momentum mode of the field represents a quantum oscillator. The main effect of the expansion is that the frequency of the oscillator ω changes in time. This change leads to a particle-creation since the modes that at certain moment of time t are in the vacuum, at the later times, are above it. This is a stationary process and the only control-parameter is the rate by which the frequency ω changes in time. This rate is set by the Hubble H and therefore is constant. As a result, the modes that are created out of the vacuum have frequencies $\omega \sim H$. The modes of a higher frequency $\omega \gg H$ are exponentially suppressed. No matter how long an observer shall wait, the production of the high frequency modes shall not become more probable. In particular, if $H \ll M_P$, an observer shall see the production of Planck frequency modes extremely rarely: One per Hubble patch per exponentially long time $\sim H^{-1} e^{-1/(HL)}$.

This way of looking at things makes it obvious that there cannot possibly be any trans-Planckian problem in inflation. The reason is simple: a soft inflationary background cannot produce the Planck energy quanta. For comparison, an inflationary Universe with Hubble $H \sim 10^{13}$ GeV is less sensitive to the Planck scale physics than the energy levels of the Hydrogen atom are to the weak interaction!

In order to make the point sharper, let us monitor the de Sitter quantum fluctuation by a parallel particle physics process. For definiteness, we take our current Universe which is known to be De Sitter like. In this Universe we shall consider the two parallel quantum processes. One is the usual process of creation of particles (gravitons) in De Sitter that was already considered above. Another one, is a decay process mediated by a high dimensional operator. For instance, let us take a hypothetical proton-decay in which one of the final state particles is a photon. The two processes are analogous in the following sense. Both interactions are suppressed by respective cutoffs and both suppressions are compensated by the magnitude of the respective macroscopic sources. In case of gravity, this is the energy of the entire De Sitter patch. In case of the proton-decay, the source is a large tank of water that contains many protons.

Now, after being produced in an expanding De Sitter universe, both the graviton and the photon will get redshifted and after some time can be detected by a future observer (Alice). Now, if Alice will scale the two modes back to an indefinite past, she will arrive to a wrong conclusion that in some distant past both modes had the trans-Planckian wavelengths. For the photon this is obviously wrong since it was produced in a decay of a proton. Then, obviously the same must be true about the graviton since the two particles were produced simultaneously.

This completes the first part of our discussion in which we clarify the source of fictional non-decoupling problem arising by a naive past-scaling of modes. As explained, this scaling does not take into account the suppressed probability for materializing perturbations with the wavelengths shorter than Hubble.

We now wish to clarify the second grave misconception that arises by the above naive past-scaling of modes to so-called *trans-Planckian* regime. The trans-Planckian regime is usually understood as the past epoch in which a wavelength of a given mode L was shorter than the Planck length. Such a definition already carries in it a dangerous fuzziness as we shall now explain. In ordinary renormalizable theories with Wilsonian *UV*-completion (e.g., such as QCD), one can in principle probe an arbitrarily short distance scale L . All is needed, is to arrange a $2 \rightarrow 2$ particle scattering with momentum-transfer $\sim L^{-1}$. That is, in such theories we can localize an elementary particle within an *arbitrarily small* region of space L provided we invest energy $M \sim 1/L$.

In contrast, in Einstein gravity such a reasoning works only till the Planck length L_P . That is, in Einstein gravity an excitation of a center of mass energy $M \gg M_P$ cannot be described as a single-particle state of any elementary quantum field [2]. Instead, it *classicalizes* and represents a black hole. Correspondingly, the minimal localization radius is set by the *classical* gravitational radius $\sim ML_P^2 \gg L_P$. The latter exceeds the quantum Compton wavelength $1/M$. This fact already signals that the object is classical. This phenomenon is a fundamental property of Einstein gravity and is completely independent of the details of trans-Planckian theory [2]. It tells us that, no matter how profound the *UV*-theory is, the heavy modes must decouple since from the low energy perspective they represent classical black holes.

Once again, in order to avoid misunderstanding, we stress that this discussion is *not* about advocating any particular scenario of *UV*-completion. Rather, we wish to make it clear that classicalization of heavy modes into black holes - which is not an assumption but a property of Einstein theory - ensures that the decoupling holds *universally* regardless of the properties of *UV*-theory. To put it differently, irrespectively what miraculous properties one mentally assigns to *UV*-theory, the decoupling of heavy modes cannot be questioned. The fact that such modes represent black holes, is fully controlled by *IR*-theory.

In order to remove any doubts whether the black holes of *IR*-theory can be eliminated by assuming some exotic modifications of dispersion relations at trans-Planckian distances, we wish to point out that such modifications are impossible without sacrificing the most fundamental

consistency properties such as causality and positivity of norm and energy. As explained in details in [2], the basic analyticity properties severely restrict the pole structure of any possible modification of graviton propagator. In particular, any *UV*-modification of the graviton dispersion relation that would abolish classicalization of high energy states into *IR*-black holes, requires appearance of ghost poles in graviton propagator and therefore is excluded. This restriction is non-perturbative and follows from the properties of spectral representation of most general graviton propagator. We shall naturally not be interested in such inconsistent modifications. Thus, again, regardless what mechanism is responsible for *UV*-completion above the energy M_P , the excitations with such center of mass energies classicalize into black holes. This information suffices for our further analysis.

Now, it is clear that when one talks about scaling the inflationary perturbations back in time towards the trans-Planckian regime, in reality, one talks about scaling them past the point of their *classicalization*. The only way one could give a consistent physical meaning to such a scaling is to weight it by a probability of materializing the De Sitter perturbation of trans-Planckian energy outside of their gravitational radius. By now, it should be obvious for a reader that by any sensible estimate this probability must be totally negligible.

For illustrative purposes, we shall estimate it for a limiting case when the energy of a would-be trans-Planckian mode is comparable to the energy of the entire Hubble patch, $M \sim M_P^2/H$. The gravitational radius of a corresponding black hole is obviously of the order of the Hubble radius H^{-1} . We shall now estimate the probability of producing such a mode in De Sitter in its particle form. That is, the probability that De Sitter materializes modes outside of the gravitational radius of center of mass energy M . We shall perform the estimate in three different ways and show that they all agree.

The first way is to think of De Sitter as a (approximate) thermal bath with Gibbons-Hawking temperature $T_{GH} \sim H$ [17]. The probability of producing a mode of energy M is then exponentially suppressed by a Boltzmann factor,

$$\Gamma \sim e^{-M/T_{GH}} \sim e^{-M_P^2/H^2}. \quad (5)$$

The second method is to think of the entropy-suppression. Indeed, by giving away a half of its energy into a single elementary quantum of a very low entropy, the total entropy of the system decreases. Namely, the De Sitter Gibbons-Hawking entropy, $S_{GH} = M_P^2/H^2$, decreases by an order-one fraction. This decrease must

result into an entropy suppression price of the process, $\sim e^{-S_{GH}}$, which fully matches (5).

Finally, perhaps the most systematic estimate of the transition is within the picture in which the De Sitter Hubble patch is resolved as a coherent state $|\text{dS}\rangle$ of soft gravitons of frequency H and occupation number $N \sim M_P^2/H^2$ [9, 10]. Following these works, the transition can be computed as an *S*-matrix process in which order N soft gravitons merge into a single (or a pair) of very hard gravitons of energy M . Using an explicit computation of the multi-particle graviton amplitude performed in [5], the rate of the process was obtained in [10] and it is given by

$$\Gamma \sim N! \alpha_{GR}^N \sim e^{-N} \quad (6)$$

in the large N . This again matches (5). In other words, the classicalization forces the trans-Planckian mode to “dive” into the vacuum whereas the probability to survive in any other form is exponentially small. Notice, in this language the suppression has the following physical meaning: it represents an exponential suppression characteristic of a quantum transition between many soft and few hard quanta.

We thus observe that the three different estimates of the transition between a would-existing trans-Planckian graviton and De Sitter (Boltzmann, entropy and *S*-matrix process) give one and the same exponential suppression (5). For $H \ll M_P$ this is vanishing beyond any repair.

In conclusion, the inflationary Universe is subject to the same laws of decoupling as any other physical system within the validity of EFT treatment. In particular, there is no trans-Planckian problem in inflation and the bound (4) is spurious. Instead, the Wilsonian decoupling indicates that the time-scale of validity of De Sitter is not shorter than (2) which gives a significant room for inflation.

Acknowledgements

We thank R. Brandenberger and W. Kinney for discussions on the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture. Also, special thanks are due to Goran Senjanovic. The work of G.D. was supported in part by the Humboldt Foundation under Humboldt Professorship Award, by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC-2111 - 390814868, and Germany’s Excellence Strategy under Excellence Cluster Origins. A.R. is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), project *The non-Gaussian Universe and Cosmological Symmetries*, project number: 200020-178787.

-
- [1] G. Dvali, G. F. Giudice, C. Gomez and A. Kehagias, JHEP **1108**, 108 (2011), [[hep-ph/1010.1415](#)].
 - [2] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, [[hep-th/1005.3497](#)].
 - [3] G. Dvali, C. Gomez and A. Kehagias, JHEP **1111**, 070 (2011) [[hep-th/1103.5963](#)].
 - [4] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 742 (2013) [[hep-th/1112.3359](#)].
 - [5] G. Dvali, C. Gomez, R. S. Isermann, D. Lüst and S. Stieberger, Nucl. Phys. B **893**, 187 (2015) [[hep-th/1409.7405](#)].
 - [6] A. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 347.
 - [7] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rept. **314**, 1 (1999) [[hep-ph/9807278](#)].
 - [8] N. Kaloper, M. Kleban, A. E. Lawrence and S. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 123510 (2002) [[hep-th/0201158](#)].
 - [9] G. Dvali, C. Gomez, JCAP **1401** (2014) 023, [[hep-th/1312.4795](#)];
 - [10] G. Dvali, C. Gomez, S. Zell, JCAP **1706** (2017) 028, [[hep-th/1701.08776](#)].
 - [11] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, JHEP **0709** (2007) 120, [[hep-th/0708.4025](#)].
 - [12] G. Dvali, D. Flassig, C. Gomez, A. Pritzel, N. Wintergerst, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 12, 124041, [[hep-th/1307.3458](#)].
 - [13] J. Martin and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 123501 (2001) [[hep-th/0005209](#)].
 - [14] R. Easther, B. R. Greene, W. H. Kinney and G. Shiu, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 023518 (2002) [[hep-th/0204129](#)].
 - [15] R. H. Brandenberger and J. Martin, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 113001 (2013) [[astro-ph.C0/1211.6753](#)].
 - [16] A. Bedroya, R. Brandenberger, M. Loverde and C. Vafa, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.10, 103502 [[hep-th/1909.11106](#)].
 - [17] G.W. Gibbons, S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977) 2738.