

Is the NANOGrav signal a hint of dS decay during inflation?

Hao-Hao Li^{1*}, Gen Ye^{1†}, and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2,3,4‡}

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

³ *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China*

³ *School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study,
UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China and*

⁴ *International Center for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific, Beijing/Hangzhou, China*

Abstract

The NANOGrav collaboration recently has reported evidence for a stochastic common-spectrum process in its 12.5-yr dataset. We show that such a signal might be a hint of de Sitter (dS) decay during inflation. As suggested by the swampland conjectures, dS space is highly unstable if it exists at all. During inflation, the short-lived dS states will decay through a cascade of first-order phase transitions (PT). We find that the gravitational waves (GWs) yielded by such a PT will be “reddened” by subsequent dS expansion, which may result in a slightly red-tilt stochastic GW background at the low-frequency band, compatible with the NANOGrav 12.5-yr result.

PACS numbers:

* lihaohao18@mails.ucas.ac.cn

† yegen14@mails.ucas.ac.cn

‡ yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

The primordial GW background (GWB) [1, 2] spans a broad frequency band, $10^{-18} - 10^{10}\text{Hz}$, e.g.[3–5]. It is usually thought that the discovery of primordial GWs will solidify our confidence on inflation. The primordial GWs at ultra-low frequency $10^{-18} - 10^{-16}\text{Hz}$ may induce B-mode polarization in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [6, 7]. The search for the primordial GWs with CMB has been still on the way.

The Pulsar Timing Array (PTA) experiments, sensitive to GWs with frequency $f \sim 1/\text{yr}$, have also been searching for such a background. Recently, the NANOGrav collaboration [8], based on the analysis of 12.5-yr data, reported evidence for a stochastic common-spectrum process with frequency $f \sim 1/\text{yr}$ ($\sim 10^{-8}\text{Hz}$), which might be interpreted as a stochastic GWB with a spectrum $\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim f^{-1.5 \sim 0.5}$ at 1σ level. It is actually difficult for inflation to yield such a stochastic GWB, see recent [9], which seems to require a highly blue-tilt GW spectrum e.g.[10, 11], see also [12, 13].

It is well-known that evolution of the Universe must be described in an effective field theory (EFT) that has a UV-completion. Recently, the Trans-Planckian Censorship Conjecture (TCC) has been proposed in Ref.[14], which states that the sub-Planckian fluctuations will never have its length scale larger than the Hubble scale, otherwise the EFTs will belong to the swampland (without UV-completion). The swampland conjectures [15, 16] actually suggest that dS space is highly unstable if it exists at all, while AdS phase is ubiquitous, see e.g.[17, 18] for its implications to the observable Universe. According to TCC, inflation in the early Universe can only last for a limited e-folding number $\int H dt < \ln \frac{M_P}{H}$ [19], see also Refs.[20–23] for multi-stage inflation. It has been proposed in Refs.[14, 24] that, during inflation, the short-lived dS state ($\Delta t < \frac{1}{H} \ln \frac{M_P}{H}$) will decay to a dS state with lower energy through the non-perturbative nucleation of bubbles [25], so a cascade of dS decay will be present, see also earlier [26–28]. It is significant to ask if such short-lived dS vacua have any observable imprint.

We will present this possibility. A novelty of our result is that the NANOGrav signal, if being a stochastic GWB, will be a hint of dS decay during inflation. The first-order PT that dS bubbles nucleate and collide yields a sub-horizon GWB with a peculiar spectrum P_T^{PT} [29–31], it will alter the initial state of GW mode if $P_T^{PT} \gg P_T^{BD}$ for $k \gg aH$, where P_T^{BD} is the Bunch-Davis spectrum. Usually, the low-frequency GWB (at PTA band) requires low-energy PT. Here, though the PT occurred during inflation, which is at a high-energy scale, the subsequent inflation will stretch the corresponding sub-horizon GW mode outside

the horizon, which not only redshifts their frequency but also reddens their spectra [32, 33]. We will show how such a scenario works.

The scenario we consider is sketched in Fig-1. The e-folding number that the j -th stage of inflation lasts is bounded by $N_j \simeq H_j \Delta t_j < \ln \frac{M_P}{H_j}$, where $H_j^2 = \frac{\Lambda_j}{3M_P^2}$ with Λ_j being the vacuum energy of the j -th stage. During Δt_j , a first-order PT must occur. Until $\Gamma_j/H_j^4 \gtrsim 1$ [34], the PT completes, where $\Gamma_j \sim e^{\beta(t-t_*)}$ is the nucleating rate of bubbles with vacuum energy Λ_{j+1} . The relevant physics underlying the PT is encoded in β , which is not our focus here (as an example, we present a phenomenological model in the Appendix). When the bubbles collide, the energy of bubble walls is efficiently released, e.g.[35–37], and rapidly diluted with the expansion of the Universe. Hereafter, the $(j+1)$ -th stage inflation with $\rho = \Lambda_{j+1}$ will start, and last $N_{j+1} < \ln \frac{M_P}{H_{j+1}}$ until $\Gamma_{j+1}/H_{j+1}^4 \gtrsim 1$.




FIG. 1: A sketch of the dS cascade. Initially, the inflation with $\rho = \Lambda_j$ occurred. After the first-order PT, inflation continues but with lower $\rho = \Lambda_{j+1} < \Lambda_j$, and so on.

According to the swampland conjectures, just one-stage slow-roll inflation could not bring a large enough e-folding number N , so the multi-stage inflation model in Fig-1 is interesting. We present a phenomenological model of multi-stage inflation with the first-order PT in the Appendix, in which each stage of inflation satisfies the swampland conjectures.

The tensor perturbation is $\gamma_{ij}(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \sum_{\lambda=+, \times} \hat{\gamma}_\lambda(\tau, \mathbf{k}) \epsilon_{ij}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbf{k})$, where

$\hat{\gamma}_\lambda(\tau, \mathbf{k}) = \gamma_k(\tau) \hat{a}_\lambda(\mathbf{k}) + c.c..$ Its equation of motion is

$$\frac{d^2 u_k}{d\tau^2} + \left(k^2 - \frac{a''}{a} \right) u_k = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $u_k = \frac{a M_p}{2} \gamma_k$. Initially, the GW modes should be deep inside the horizon, i.e., $k^2 \gg \frac{a''}{a}$, so the initial state is $u_k = C(k) e^{-ik\tau}$ with $C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}$.

For a stochastic gravitational wave background, it is not contested that the power law of energy spectrum on the low frequency satisfies $\Omega_{GW}(k) \propto k^3$ due to causality[38]. It is hard to calculate a concrete expression of the energy spectrum $\Omega_{GW}(k)$ for a complex source if one does not do some special assumptions. Thus for the PT source of GWs, we follow the numerical simulation results in Refs.[31, 39, 40]. In our model the next stage of inflation begins after a PT, so, instead of the Bunch-Davies vacuum, our initial condition is set by PT

$$\Omega_{GW}^j(k) = \Omega_{GW,c} \frac{(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}) k_c^{\mathcal{B}} k^{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathcal{B} k_c^{(\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B})} + \mathcal{A} k^{(\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B})}}, \quad (2)$$

$$\Omega_{GW,c} = \kappa^2 \left(\frac{\Delta \Lambda_j}{\Lambda_j} \right)^2 \left(\frac{H_j}{\beta} \right)^2 \frac{0.11 v_b^3}{0.42 + v_b^2}, \quad (3)$$

where $\kappa \simeq 1$ for $\Lambda_{j+1} \ll \Lambda_j$, the bubble being sub-horizon requires $H_j/\beta < 1$, v_b is the bubble wall velocity and $\Delta \Lambda_j = \Lambda_j - \Lambda_{j+1}$. According to the numerical simulation, on the low frequency $k < k_c \approx a_* \beta$, $\mathcal{A} = 3$ and $\mathcal{B} = 1$ are precise enough. Thus at the beginning of the $(j+1)$ -th stage inflation, the initial state u_k of GWs modes will be inevitably modified as (2).

The energy density of GW is [41]

$$\rho_{GW} = \sum_{\lambda=+, \times} \rho_{GW}^\lambda = \frac{M_p^2}{4} \int \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{|\gamma'_k|^2 + k^2 |\gamma_k|^2}{a^2} \right) d \ln k. \quad (4)$$

According to $\Omega_{GW}^j = \frac{d\rho_{GW}}{\rho_j(d \ln k)}$, we have for sub-horizon modes

$$|C(k)|^2 = 3\pi^2 M_p^2 H_j^2 \frac{a_*^4}{k^5} \Omega_{GW}^j, \quad (5)$$

where a_* is the scale factor at PT and $\rho_j = \Lambda_j$. The inflation with $\Lambda_{j+1} < \Lambda_j$ will start after the PT completes. Thus the sub-horizon GWs (with wavelength $\lambda < H_j^{-1} \ll H_{j+1}^{-1}$) will be stretched outside the horizon $1/H_{j+1}$. By requiring that the solution of Eq.(1) in the sub-horizon limit is $u_k = C(k) e^{-ik\tau}$, we obtain $u_k(\tau) = -C(k) \sqrt{\frac{-\pi k \tau}{2}} H_{3/2}^{(1)}(-k\tau)$ with $C(k)$

being (5). On super-horizon scale, the Hankel function $H_{3/2}^{(1)}(-k\tau) \xrightarrow{-k\tau \rightarrow 0} -i\sqrt{2/(-\pi k^3 \tau^3)}$. Thus the primordial GW spectrum is

$$P_T = \frac{4k^3}{\pi^2 M_P^2 a^2} |u_k|^2 = \frac{12H_j^2 H_{j+1}^2}{(k/a_*)^4} \Omega_{GW}^j. \quad (6)$$

The physics of short-lived dS space is encoded in Ω_{GW}^j , so P_T . We see that the sub-horizon state (2) is reddened by the $(j+1)$ -stage inflation, $P_T \sim \Omega_{GW}^j/k^4$, so P_T also records the “reddening” character of inflation.

We have $v_b = 1$ for $\Lambda_{j+1} \ll \Lambda_j$, noting that the swampland conjecture [24] requires $\Delta\Lambda_j \simeq \Lambda_j$. We set $\mathcal{A} \simeq 3$ and $\mathcal{B} \simeq 1$ [29–31] (see also [39, 42]) in (2). In addition, the peak momentum of Ω_{GW}^j is $\frac{k_c}{2\pi\beta a_*} = 0.62/(1.8 - 0.1v_b + v_b^2)$ [31], which suggests $k_c \simeq 1.4\beta a_*$ for $v_b \simeq 1$. Thus Eq.(6) becomes

$$P_T \simeq (\beta^{-1} H_j)^6 \left(\frac{\Lambda_{j+1}}{\Lambda_j} \right) \cdot \frac{\left(\frac{k}{k_c} \right)^{-1}}{1 + 3 \left(\frac{k}{k_c} \right)^4}, \quad (7)$$

where $V_{j/j+1} = 3M_P^2 H_{j/j+1}^2$. The wavelength of GW mode being initially sub-horizon suggests a low-frequency cutoff $k_{cutoff} = a_* H_j$ for P_T . We have $k_c/k_{cutoff} \simeq 1.4\beta/H_j$, which is consistent with the requirement that the bubble is sub-horizon, $H_j/\beta < 1$. According to (7), $P_T \sim k^{-5}$ for $k \gg k_c$ is strongly red, while $\sim k^{-1}$ for $k \ll k_c$. The maximal value of P_T , i.e., $P_{T,max}$, is at $k = k_{cutoff}$. We have

$$P_{T,max} \simeq (\beta^{-1} H_j)^5 \left(\frac{\Lambda_{j+1}}{\Lambda_j} \right). \quad (8)$$

Thus if $\Lambda_{j+1}/\Lambda_j = 0.2$ and $H_j/\beta \sim 0.4$, we will have $P_{T,max} \sim 10^{-3}$, far larger than that in slow-roll inflation scenarios.

It is interesting to connect (6) with recent experimental results. The analysis result of NANOGrav 12.5-yr data is modeled as a signal with the characteristic strain amplitude [8] $h_c(f) = A(f/f_{yr})^{(3-\gamma)/2}$. Thus the corresponding energy spectrum $\Omega_{GW} = \frac{2\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f^2 h_c^2(f)$ is

$$\Omega_{GW} = \frac{2\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f_{yr}^2 A^2 \left(\frac{f}{f_{yr}} \right)^{5-\gamma}, \quad (9)$$

where $f_{yr} = 1/yr$. Present energy spectrum $\Omega_{GW}(\tau_0)$ of GWs (6) is [43]

$$\Omega_{GW}(\tau_0) = \frac{k^2}{12a_0^2 H_0^2} P_T(k) \left[\frac{3\Omega_m j_1(k\tau_0)}{k\tau_0} \sqrt{1.0 + 1.36 \frac{k}{k_{eq}} + 2.50 \left(\frac{k}{k_{eq}} \right)^2} \right]^2, \quad (10)$$

see also [41, 44, 45]. Here, $\Omega_m = \rho_m/\rho_c$ and $\rho_c = 3H_0^2/(8\pi G)$ is the critical energy density, $1/k_{eq}$ is the Hubble scale at matter-radiation equality. According to (9), if the NANOGrav signal is regarded as the stochastic GWB (10), we have

$$A = \left(\frac{3H_0^2 \Omega_{GW}(f_0)}{2\pi^2 f_{yr}^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{f_{yr}}{f_0} \right)^{(5-\gamma)/2} \quad \text{for } f_0 = 5 \times 10^{-9} Hz \quad (11)$$

and $\gamma \simeq 6$. We plot $\Omega_{GW}(\tau_0)$ in the left panel of Fig-2 for $\Lambda_{j+1}/\Lambda_j = 0.2$. Thus if $H_j/\beta \simeq 0.4$, we have $\Omega_{GW} \sim 10^{-9}$ with the frequency at $(f_{cutoff}, 1.4f_{cutoff}\beta/H_j)$, which might explain the NANOGrav result for $f_{cutoff} \simeq 2.5 \times 10^{-9} Hz$.




FIG. 2: Left panel: The stochastic GWB (10) at the NANOGrav frequency band. Violin points plot marginalized posteriors of the equivalent amplitude of the first five frequency bins in a free-spectrum analysis of the NANOGrav 12.5-yr data [8]. We set $H_j/\beta = 0.35, 0.43$, respectively, for $f_c \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{-8} Hz$. There is a low-frequency cutoff $f_{cutoff} \simeq 2.5 \times 10^{-9} Hz$, since the initial GWB (2) yielded by PT must be sub-horizon. Right panel: the 1σ and 2σ contours of the amplitude A and tilt γ for a power-law NANOGrav signal. The colorbar represents the values of $\{A-\gamma\}$ for (10) with respect to H_j/β .

We plot the 1σ and 2σ NANOGrav contours of $\{A-\gamma\}$ in the right panel of Fig-2. As expected, if $H_j/\beta \sim 0.4$, the short-lived dS decay predicts $A \sim 10^{-15}$ and $\gamma \simeq 6$, which fits the NANOGrav data at 1σ level. The subsequent PT will occur after the $(j+1)$ -th inflation with lower dS energy Λ_{j+1} lasting for efolds $N_{j+1} < \ln\left(\frac{M_P}{H_{j+1}}\right)$, see Fig-1, so a “reddened” stochastic GWB will be also possibly imprinted in high frequency, which might be detectable by GW detectors such as LISA, TAIJI and TianQin. It is noted that the stochastic GWB in the cosmic string scenario corresponds to $\gamma \lesssim 5$ [46, 47], see also [48–57] for other GW sources, while ours is $\gamma \simeq 6$.

In summary, we showed that the NANOGrav signal might be telling us the existence of short-lived dS vacua. As suggested by the swampland conjectures [15, 16, 24], the dS space is highly unstable. During inflation, assuming the swampland conjectures, dS cascade seems to be inevitably present. We found that the GWs yielded by the corresponding PT will be reddened by subsequent dS expansion, which results in a stochastic GWB at low frequency, compatible with the recent NANOGrav result at 1σ level. It should be mentioned that the NANOGrav collaboration did not claim a detection of GWs, since the signal seems not exhibiting quadrupole correlations. However, our spectrum (except the amplitude) of the stochastic GWB is universal for the dS decay during inflation. Though the model we consider is quite simplified, it highlights an unexpected point that the short-lived dS vacua, emerging in a consistent UV-complete theory, might imprint unique voiceprint in our observable Universe.

Acknowledgments

Hao-Hao Li thanks Yu-Tong Wang for helpful discussions. YSP is supported by NSFC, Nos.12075246, 11690021. The contour plot in Fig-2 is produced using the publicly available code¹ Enterprise, Enterprise-extension together with PTMCMC [58], libstempo² and TEMPO2³.

Appendix

In this Appendix, we present a model of multi-stage inflation in Fig.1, which is compatible with the swampland conjectures (SCs). Then we estimate the parameters β and H_j/β .

We consider a set of canonical scalar fields $\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ with the potential as follows

$$V(\Phi) = V_{PT}(\phi_1, \phi_2) + V_{inf}(\phi_2), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$V_{PT}(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \left[A(\phi_2) \left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_*} \right)^4 + B(\phi_2) \left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_*} \right)^3 + C(\phi_2) \left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_*} \right)^2 \right] \Lambda_j + \Lambda_{j+1}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with coefficients $A(\phi_2) = (-8 + 16\sigma)$, $B(\phi_2) = (14 - 32\sigma)$, $C(\phi_2) = (-5 + 16\sigma)$ and $\sigma = \lambda(\alpha - \ln(\phi_2/m_2))$. Here, m_2 has the mass dimension. The parameters ϕ_*, λ, α are

¹ <https://github.com/nanograv>

² <http://vallis.github.io/libstempo/>

³ <https://bitbucket.org/psrsoft/tempo2/src/master/>




FIG. 3: Illustration of Φ evolution in the field space with color coding for the e-folding number.

constant, ϕ_1 is the field responsible for PT, ϕ_2 is the inflation field, σ depends on ϕ_2 and is constant in the ϕ_1 -direction. V_{PT} has two minima along the ϕ_1 -direction with $\Lambda_j + \Lambda_{j+1}$ and Λ_{j+1} at $\phi_1 = \phi_*$ and $\phi_1 = 0$ respectively. The height of the barrier between two minima is about $\sigma\Lambda_j$. V_{inf} drives inflation on ϕ_2 -direction at $\phi_1 = \phi_*$. Before PT, the universe is dominated by $V_{PT} \simeq \Lambda_j$ which requires $V_{inf} < V_{PT}$ and $\Lambda_{j+1} \ll \Lambda_j$. We plot the potential in Fig-3.

In the following, we show this model is established in a stable dS space that can satisfy the SCs, especially the de Sitter swampland conjecture (dSC). The refined dSC in mutli-field requires either [59]

$$M_P \frac{|\nabla V|}{V} = M_P \frac{\sqrt{G^{ab} \partial_a V \partial_b V}}{V} > c \quad \text{or} \quad M_P^2 \frac{\min(\nabla_a \nabla_b V)}{V} < -c', \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for some constants $c, c' \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. For canonical fields, the field space metric $G_{ab} = \delta_{ab}$. In our model, when inflation begins on the ϕ_2 -direction, $\left. \frac{\partial V_{PT}}{\partial \phi_1} \right|_{\phi_1=\phi_*} = 0$ and $V_{PT}(\phi_1 = \phi_*) \simeq \Lambda_j$, where Λ_{j+1} is much smaller that can be ignored. So Eq. (A.3) becomes

$$M_P \frac{|\nabla V|}{V} \simeq \frac{M_P V'_{inf}(\phi_2)}{\Lambda_j + V_{inf}(\phi_2)} > c \quad \text{or} \quad M_P^2 \frac{\min(\nabla_a \nabla_b V)}{V} \simeq \frac{M_P^2 V''_{inf}(\phi_2)}{\Lambda_j + V_{inf}(\phi_2)} < -c', \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the prime denotes derivation with respect to ϕ_2 . Being compatible with the Eq.(A.4) requires fast-roll inflation on the ϕ_2 -direction.

If we assume the j -th stage inflation begins near the GUT energy scale $H_j \sim 10^{15}\text{GeV}$, then the e-folding number in fast-roll inflation can be as large as $\Delta N \simeq 10$ [60]. The e-folding number is bounded by TCC to be $\Delta N_j^{TCC} = \ln\left(\frac{M_P}{H_j}\right) \sim 10$, which is compatible with our model. Thus several stages of inflation separated by PT are enough to give a total e-folding number as expected while also being compatible with SCs.

The nucleating rate of bubble is $\Gamma \sim e^{-S_E}$, and in the thin-wall approximation[61] we have

$$S_E = \frac{27\pi^2 S_1^4}{2(\Delta\Lambda)^3}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with the bubble wall surface tension $S_1 \simeq \sqrt{2\sigma\Lambda_j}\phi_*$, thus $(\Lambda_j \gg \Lambda_{j+1})$

$$\Gamma \propto \exp\left[-54\pi^2\sigma^2\frac{\phi_*^4}{\Lambda_j}\right]. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The equation of motion of ϕ_2 is

$$\ddot{\phi}_2 + 3H_j\dot{\phi}_2 + V'_{inf} = 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

In the fast roll scenario, $\ddot{\phi}_2 \gg 3H_j\dot{\phi}_2$ so the Hubble friction term can be ignored. For a fast-rolling regime with $|V''_{inf}| = 4H_j^2$, one has

$$\phi_2 \simeq \phi_2^i e^{H_j(t-t^i)}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where ϕ_2^i is the initial value of ϕ_2 . With a proper choice of ϕ_2^i , one can have $\Delta\Phi = \Delta\phi_2 < M_p$ within one stage of inflation. Taking $m_2 = \phi_2^i$ for convenience, one has $\sigma^2 = \lambda^2\alpha^2(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha}H_j(t-t^i))$ with $\alpha \gg H_j(t-t^i)$. Inserting into Eq. (A.6), we get $\Gamma \propto \exp[\beta(t-t^i)]$ and

$$\frac{H_j}{\beta} \simeq \frac{\Lambda_j}{108\pi^2\alpha\lambda^2\phi_*^4}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus by a suitable choice of parameters ϕ_* , α and λ , which affects the width and height of the potential barrier, it is possible to have some values of H_j/β compatible with the NANOGrav 12.5-yr observation plotted in Fig-2.

[1] A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **30**, 682 (1979).

[2] V. A. Rubakov, M. V. Sazhin and A. V. Veryaskin, Phys. Lett. **115B**, 189 (1982).

- [3] P. D. Lasky *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **6**, 1, 011035 (2016) [arXiv:1511.05994 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] Y. T. Wang, Y. Cai, Z. G. Liu and Y. S. Piao, JCAP **1701**, 01, 010 (2017) [arXiv:1612.05088 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [5] C. Caprini and D. G. Figueroa, Class. Quant. Grav. **35**, no. 16, 163001 (2018) [arXiv:1801.04268 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [6] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky and A. Stebbins, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7368 (1997) [astro-ph/9611125].
- [7] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky and A. Stebbins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2058 (1997) [astro-ph/9609132].
- [8] Z. Arzoumanian *et al.* [NANOGrav Collaboration], arXiv:2009.04496 [astro-ph.HE].
- [9] S. Vagnozzi, arXiv:2009.13432 [astro-ph.CO].
- [10] Y. S. Piao and Y. Z. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 063513 (2004) [astro-ph/0401231].
- [11] M. Baldi, F. Finelli and S. Matarrese, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 083504 (2005) [astro-ph/0505552].
- [12] Y. Cai, Y. T. Wang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 6, 063005 (2016) [arXiv:1510.08716 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] Y. Cai, Y. T. Wang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 4, 043002 (2016) [arXiv:1602.05431 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] A. Bedroya and C. Vafa, JHEP **09**, 123 (2020) [arXiv:1909.11063 [hep-th]].
- [15] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **766**, 21 (2007) [hep-th/0605264].
- [16] G. Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko and C. Vafa, arXiv:1806.08362 [hep-th].
- [17] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no. 8, 083507 (2020) [arXiv:2001.02451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, arXiv:2008.10832 [astro-ph.CO].
- [19] A. Bedroya, R. Brandenberger, M. Loverde and C. Vafa, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.10, 103502 (2020) [arXiv:1909.11106 [hep-th]].
- [20] H. H. Li, G. Ye, Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no. 6, 063527 (2020) [arXiv:1911.06148 [gr-qc]].
- [21] A. Berera and J. R. Calderón, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.12, 123530 (2019) [arXiv:1910.10516 [hep-ph]].
- [22] M. Dhuria and G. Goswami, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.12, 123518 (2019) [arXiv:1910.06233 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] M. Torabian, Fortsch. Phys. **68**, no.2, 1900092 (2020) [arXiv:1910.06867 [hep-th]].

- [24] A. Bedroya, M. Montero, C. Vafa and I. Valenzuela, arXiv:2008.07555 [hep-th].
- [25] S. R. Coleman and F. De Luccia, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 3305 (1980).
- [26] K. Freese and D. Spolyar, JCAP **0507**, 007 (2005) [hep-ph/0412145].
- [27] K. Freese, J. T. Liu and D. Spolyar, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 123521 (2005) [hep-ph/0502177].
- [28] Y. Liu, Y. S. Piao and Z. G. Si, JCAP **0905**, 008 (2009) [arXiv:0901.2058 [hep-th]].
- [29] A. Kosowsky, M. S. Turner and R. Watkins, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4514 (1992).
- [30] C. Caprini, R. Durrer and G. Servant, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 124015 (2008) [arXiv:0711.2593 [astro-ph]].
- [31] S. J. Huber and T. Konstandin, JCAP **0809**, 022 (2008) [arXiv:0806.1828 [hep-ph]].
- [32] Y. T. Wang, Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Lett. B **789**, 191 (2019) [arXiv:1801.03639 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [33] H. Jiang, T. Liu, S. Sun and Y. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **765**, 339 (2017) [arXiv:1512.07538 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [34] M. S. Turner, E. J. Weinberg and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2384 (1992).
- [35] R. Watkins and L. M. Widrow, Nucl. Phys. B **374**, 446 (1992).
- [36] E. W. Kolb and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 3313 (1997) [astro-ph/9602095].
- [37] J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 043507 (2010) [arXiv:1004.2333 [hep-th]].
- [38] C. Caprini, R. Durrer, T. Konstandin and G. Servant, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 083519 (2009) [arXiv:0901.1661 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] D. J. Weir, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 12, 124037 (2016) [arXiv:1604.08429 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] D. Cutting, M. Hindmarsh and D. J. Weir, Phys. Rev. D **97**, no.12, 123513 (2018) [arXiv:1802.05712 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] L. A. Boyle and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 063504 (2008) [astro-ph/0512014].
- [42] R. Jinno and M. Takimoto, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 2, 024009 (2017) [arXiv:1605.01403 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] M. S. Turner, M. J. White and J. E. Lidsey, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4613 (1993) [astro-ph/9306029].
- [44] W. Zhao and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 043503 (2006) [astro-ph/0604458].
- [45] S. Kuroyanagi, T. Takahashi and S. Yokoyama, JCAP **1502**, 003 (2015) [arXiv:1407.4785 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] J. Ellis and M. Lewicki, arXiv:2009.06555 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] S. Blasi, V. Brdar and K. Schmitz, arXiv:2009.06607 [astro-ph.CO].

- [48] V. Vaskonen and H. Veerm?e, arXiv:2009.07832 [astro-ph.CO].
- [49] V. De Luca, G. Franciolini and A. Riotto, arXiv:2009.08268 [astro-ph.CO].
- [50] Y. Nakai, M. Suzuki, F. Takahashi and M. Yamada, arXiv:2009.09754 [astro-ph.CO].
- [51] W. Buchmuller, V. Domcke and K. Schmitz, arXiv:2009.10649 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] A. Addazi, Y. F. Cai, Q. Gan, A. Marciano and K. Zeng, arXiv:2009.10327 [hep-ph].
- [53] K. Kohri and T. Terada, arXiv:2009.11853 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] W. Ratzinger and P. Schwaller, arXiv:2009.11875 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] R. Samanta and S. Datta, arXiv:2009.13452 [hep-ph].
- [56] L. Bian, J. Liu and R. Zhou, arXiv:2009.13893 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] A. Neronov, A. Roper Pol, C. Caprini and D. Semikoz, arXiv:2009.14174 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] Justin Ellis and Rutger van Haasteren, jellis18/PTMCMCSampler: Official Release,
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1037579>
- [59] H. Ooguri, E. Palti, G. Shiu and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **788**, 180-184 (2019) [arXiv:1810.05506 [hep-th]].
- [60] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, S. Prokushkin and M. Shmakova, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 105016 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0110089 [hep-th]].
- [61] S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2929-2936 (1977) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1248 (1977)]