

On analytic bounces at large radii

Silvia Vicentini* and Massimiliano Rinaldi†

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trento,

Via Sommarive 14, I-38123 Povo (TN), Italy and

Trento Institute for Fundamental Physics and Applications (TIFPA)-INFN,

Via Sommarive 14, I-38123 Povo (TN), Italy

Abstract

We study analytic solutions of scalar field bounces near the false vacuum. We extend our previous work on massless or light fields to include massive scalar fields, scalar field theories with time-dependent couplings, and higher-order kinetic terms, as they may have important physical implications. We consider also such theories in space dimensions other than three. We include Einstein-Hilbert gravity when the false vacuum has a flat geometry. Finally, we improve our numerical method, which now is based on maximization, to find the bounce.

arXiv:2101.03520v1 [gr-qc] 10 Jan 2021

* silvia.vicentini@unitn.it

† massimiliano.rinaldi@unitn.it

I. INTRODUCTION

Metastable states are separated from regions of lower energy by potential barriers with finite height and are classically stable at zero temperature. However, they can decay due to quantum tunnelling. The decay rate of metastable fields depends on the solution of the Euclidean equations of motion called bounce [1, 2]. This is a trajectory between the tunnelling point beyond the potential barrier and the false vacuum, which is reached within an infinite Euclidean time. Once that the bounce is found, one can compute the decay rate from a combination of the on-shell action and a prefactor, called fluctuation determinant. For specific single scalar field theories an analytic bounce solution has been found long ago [4, 5]. This is seldom the case, though, as the equations of motion are highly non-linear. An approximate solution may be computed when the energy difference among the false vacuum and the true one is sufficiently small, i.e. when the thin wall approximation is valid [1–3, 6, 7]. For most cases one needs to resort to numerical procedures to calculate the bounce trajectory, the most popular being the shooting method. The bounce is found as the solution of the equations of motion that separates undershoot trajectories, i.e. trajectories in which the field makes multiple oscillations in the Euclidean potential well until it gets to rest in its bottom, and overshoot trajectories, in which the scalar field reaches the false vacuum with finite, non vanishing velocity. Computational limits aside, one can determine such trajectory with arbitrary precision. There are also other techniques that work for single and multiple scalar field theories [8–15] but they have not been generalized to include gravity so far, an exception being [16, 17]. Moreover, also numerical methods to compute the fluctuation determinant have been recently investigated [18, 19]. The possibility of computing gravitational corrections to single scalar field bounces on a Euclidean background has been addressed in [20, 21], when the gravitational backreaction on the scalar field is small.

In a preliminary work we noted that the $O(4)$ -symmetric bounce of a single scalar field theory is independent on the form of the potential near the false vacuum. This region is probed for large values of the coordinate on which it depends, which is the radius of a Euclidean four-dimensional spacetime [22]. We required the scalar field to be massless, or light, and cubic self-interactions to be small. Our calculation was extended to include Einstein-Hilbert gravity, as long as the false vacuum has a flat geometry, which implies that the potential vanishes there. We were able to verify that the following existence conditions for the bounce are met:

1. no inconsistency arises in the Einstein equations in the asymptotic region, i.e. given the asymptotic behaviour of the scalar field, the approximate solution to the Einstein equations at arbitrary large radii on the bounce is flat space;

2. the on-shell action exists and it is finite.

Our results allowed also to introduce a novel numerical method to find the bounce, which is based on minimization of some functional, closely related to the action. Due to technical difficulties, we overlooked some scalar theories which are actually of great physical interest, in particular massive scalar fields and higher-derivative kinetic terms. The former may be important in determining existence conditions for the bounce of the Higgs field, for example when modified gravity is included. The latter has been found to be a candidate high-energy correction to solve the hierarchy problem [24–27] and solves the unitarity problem in the agravity theory [28]. To determine the asymptotic bounce in both cases, it proves useful to extend first our results to a time-dependent potential. Another interesting possibility is to find the asymptotic bounce in a number of space dimensions d other than three, as there are recent proposals for analogue experiments with $d < 3$ [29–35]. Also, it has been recently proposed that our four-dimensional Universe may live on a five-dimensional bubble [36–39]. One expects that gravity may be straightforwardly accounted for as in our previous work, as long as the false vacuum lives on flat space.

A separate issue concerns the numerical method that we described in [22]: first, it does not work for single scalar field theories unless Einstein-Hilbert gravity is included. Moreover, it is largely dependent on our hypotheses on the potential, and it is likely to break down in more general scenarios, for example the ones analyzed in this paper. Even when this is not the case, one should verify that the functional has a minimum on the bounce separately for each theory. So, it would be useful to find a functional or a function that has a minimum or a maximum on it independently on the particular asymptotic behaviour.

In this paper, we find the bounce at large radii (for short “asymptotic bounce”) of the aforementioned scalar field theories, and improve the minimization method to make it more general. Existence conditions 1. and 2. are tested for each theory. One might expect that they do not generally break down in the simple theories that we analyze. This might occur in more complicated scenarios, for example when modified gravity terms are added, resulting in a stabilization of the false vacuum.

An outline of the content of this paper follows. First, in Sec.II, we summarize our previous results about analytic solutions of the asymptotic bounce in order to provide the necessary tools for the rest of the article. Then, in Sec.III, we consider a time-dependent potential. We provide conditions on the time dependence of the potential such that the scalar field, near the false vacuum, behaves as $\phi(t) \sim t^{-2}$. This result might prove useful for theories with n scalar fields, in some cases. Moreover, our method is helpful in Sec.IV, where we find the asymptotic bounce of a massive single scalar field theory. We also get a closer look to the minimization method discussed in [22], as it needs to be improved for the reasons explained

above. Then, we turn to higher-order kinetic terms in Sec.V and prove that such terms do not influence the asymptotic bounce, that go over the massless or massive one, depending on other terms in the potential. Finally, we look at the asymptotic bounce in a number of space dimensions other than three in Sec.VI. We find that, when larger than three, similar considerations hold, while when smaller than three a more careful analysis is needed.

II. PREVIOUS RESULTS

In this section we quickly review the original idea explained in [22]. In the following Sections, we repeat the calculations from scratch, but it is useful to briefly recap our previous results: in this way, we provide both a first example of our method and some basic formulas that we will need for the rest of the paper.

A. Settings

We consider a single scalar field theory on a four-dimensional Euclidean spacetime, with canonical kinetic term

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \phi + V(\phi) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Following the original Coleman's prescription, we focus on $O(4)$ symmetric scalar fields, namely, ϕ depend on spacetime coordinates (τ, \vec{x}) only as a function of $t \equiv \sqrt{\tau^2 + |\vec{x}|^2}$. The equation of motion is

$$\ddot{\phi} + \frac{3\dot{\phi}}{t} = \frac{dV}{d\phi} \quad (2)$$

where the dot indicates derivative with respect to t . As t is the coordinate that controls the equations of motion and in analogy with Eq.(21), in the following we will refer to such coordinate at "time". We consider a scalar field potential with a local minimum at ϕ_{fv} , the false vacuum, such that $V(\phi_{fv}) = 0$. This is separated by a potential barrier from a region $V(\phi) < 0$, which we consider to lie at positive values of the scalar field $\phi > 0$. The bounce trajectory is a non-trivial solution¹ to the equation of motion with boundary conditions

$$\phi(\infty) = 0, \quad \dot{\phi}(0) = 0 \quad (3)$$

and finite on-shell action. The decay rate of the metastable state is given by

$$\Gamma = A e^{-B}, \quad (4)$$

¹ That is, a solution with initial condition $\phi(0) = \phi_0 \neq 0$

where $B = S^E - S^{fv}$ is the difference among the action computed on the bounce trajectory and the false vacuum action, which vanishes in our case. A is the quantum fluctuation determinant. It can be estimated as [40]

$$A = T_U^3 \mathcal{R}^{-4} \quad (5)$$

and thus the decay time $\tau = \Gamma^{-1}$ may be written as

$$\tau = T_U \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}^4}{T_U^4} \right) e^{S^E}. \quad (6)$$

We will label the initial condition $\phi(0)$ for the bounce as ϕ_0 , while ϕ_{in} indicates any other initial condition for the scalar field. As ϕ_0 is typically of order $O(0.1)G^{-1/2}$, we measure masses in units of $G^{-1/2}$ (so the time unit is $G^{1/2}$).

B. Previous results

As anticipated in the Introduction, there exist only a few analytic bounce solutions for single scalar field theories. In particular, in [4, 5] it was found that a scalar field with scale-invariant potential $\lambda\phi^4$ has a family of bounces, labelled by a constant C_0

$$\phi(t) = \frac{16C_0}{32t^2 + C_0^2|\lambda|}. \quad (7)$$

C_0 is related to the bounce radius $\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{\phi(0)}{2}$ as $C_0 = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{|\lambda|}}\mathcal{R}$. At large t we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(t) = \frac{C_0}{2t^2}. \quad (8)$$

In [22], we found that the asymptotic time dependence of the scalar field in Eq.(8) is a quite general feature of the bounce of single scalar field theories described by the action Eq.(1). Basically, one finds that the potential gives a negligible contribution to the equations of motion in that region, and so the solution is given by

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{\phi}}{t+a} \approx 0 \quad (9)$$

which in turn gives Eq.(8). Moreover, this result is valid also when we add Einstein-Hilbert gravity, provided that the potential on the false vacuum ϕ_{fv} vanishes $V(\phi_{fv}) = 0$ and, thus, the false vacuum lives on flat space. To prove this more rigorously, and get some insight on C_0 , which is fixed by the dynamics, we considered a generic undershoot trajectory near the bounce, and we expanded the equation of motion of the scalar field around the turning point, namely, the time t^* at which the field inverts its velocity for the first time (which is

called t_{tp} in [22]). We give now a sketch of the proof, as the calculation is similar to the ones that we will do in the following sections. The subscript $*$ in the following indicates a quantity evaluated at t^* . The bounce corresponds to the limit $t^* \rightarrow +\infty$. The equation of motion expanded around t^* is

$$\ddot{\phi} + \frac{3}{t}\dot{\phi} = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*^{(n)} \frac{(t-t^*)^n}{n!} \quad (10)$$

and may be approximated as

$$\ddot{\phi} + \frac{3}{t}\dot{\phi} = \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_* \quad (11)$$

for sufficiently large t^*, t , and $t \leq t^*$, under some conditions on the potential. In Eq.(10) we indicated with (n) a time derivative of order n . In order for Eq.(11) to hold in a large region around t^* we need that

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*^{(n)} t^{*n} \ll \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*. \quad (12)$$

If (see [22]),

$$\left(\frac{d^j V}{d\phi^j} \right)_* \ddot{\phi}_*^{j-2} (t^* + a)^{2j-2} \ll 1 \quad \text{for } j \geq 2 \text{ and large } t^* \quad (13)$$

we have

$$\left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*^{(n+1)} = \sum_{i=0}^{i=\bar{i}-2} \tilde{A}_i \left(\frac{dV^{\bar{i}-i}}{d\phi^{\bar{i}-i}} \right)_* \frac{\ddot{\phi}_*^{\bar{i}-i-1}}{(t_* + a)^{2i+1}} \quad \text{even } n, \text{ with } n + 5 - 2\bar{i} = 3 \quad (14)$$

$$\left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*^{(n+1)} = \sum_{i=0}^{i=\bar{i}-2} \tilde{A}_i \left(\frac{dV^{\bar{i}-i}}{d\phi^{\bar{i}-i}} \right)_* \frac{\ddot{\phi}_*^{\bar{i}-i-1}}{(t_* + a)^{2i}} \quad \text{odd } n \text{ with } n + 5 - 2\bar{i} = 2 \quad (15)$$

which satisfies Eq.(12). Moreover, if derivatives of $V(\phi)$ are finite for $\phi \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\lim_{t^* \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_* t^{*4} = \lim_{t^* \rightarrow +\infty} \ddot{\phi}_* t^{*4} = 0 \quad (16)$$

Eq.(13) is always satisfied for $j > 2$. Instead,

$$\left(\frac{d^2 V}{d\phi^2} \right)_* t^{*2} \ll 1 \quad \text{for large } t^* \quad (17)$$

should be separately imposed. For

$$\lim_{t^* \rightarrow +\infty} \ddot{\phi}_* t^{*4} = 4C_0 \quad (18)$$

we should also require that

$$\left(\frac{d^3 V}{d\phi^3} \right)_* 4C_0 \ll 1. \quad (19)$$

As, in the end, we are interested in the limit $\phi_* \rightarrow 0$, $t^* \rightarrow +\infty$, these conditions imply that the scalar field should be massless and cubic self-interactions $g\phi^3$ should be sufficiently small $24gC_0 \ll 1$. If the scalar field is not massless but light, we expect this approximation to be valid for large t such that $t \ll \frac{1}{m}$. Under these assumptions, Eq.(11) gives

$$\lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \dot{\phi}(t) = -\frac{C_0}{t^3} \quad \lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_* = \frac{4C_0}{t^{*4}} \quad \lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \phi(t) = \frac{C_0}{2t^2} \quad (20)$$

from sufficiently large t up to $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Notice that, despite the asymptotic bounce is as in Eq.(7), we cannot use our method for a theory described by a pure quartic potential, as it has no potential barrier and so no undershoot trajectory.

This procedure may be extended to include Einstein-Hilbert gravity. We choose an $O(4)$ symmetric line element with Euclidean signature

$$ds^2 = dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\Omega_3^2. \quad (21)$$

The action is (we set $G = 1$)

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left[-\frac{R}{16\pi} + \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \phi + V(\phi) \right]. \quad (22)$$

and the equations of motion are

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3 \frac{\dot{\rho} \phi}{\rho} = \frac{dV}{d\phi} \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{\rho}^2 = 1 + \frac{8\pi}{3} \rho^2 \left(\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V(\phi) \right) \quad (24)$$

where the dot indicates derivative with respect to the Euclidean time t . If the false vacuum lives on flat space (that is $V(\phi_{fv}) = 0$), we have

$$\frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} \approx \frac{1}{t+a} \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (25)$$

sufficiently near the bounce at large times. We find

$$\lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \dot{\phi} = -\frac{C_0}{(t+a)^3} \quad (26)$$

and analogously, Eq.s (20) hold with $t^* \rightarrow t^* + a$, $t \rightarrow t + a$.

We used this result to provide a numerical method to find the bounce of single scalar field theories with Einstein-Hilbert gravity, via minimization of the functional

$$S_C^E \equiv S_{C,1}^E + S_{C,2}^E \quad (27)$$

$$S_{C,1}^E \equiv -2\pi^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \bar{\rho}(t)^3 V(\bar{\phi}) dt \quad (28)$$

$$S_{C,2}^E \equiv 2\pi^2 \int_{\bar{t}}^{\infty} t^3 \left(\frac{C^2}{2t^6} + V\left(\frac{C}{2t^2}\right) \right) dt \quad (29)$$

where $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{\phi}$ are computed numerically on-shell, and $S_{C,2}^E$ depends on C and some matching time \bar{t} , which is determined by continuity and derivability. In particular, we find \bar{t} as

$$\bar{t} + 2 \frac{\phi(\bar{t})}{\dot{\phi}(\bar{t})} = 0. \quad (30)$$

If such \bar{t} do not exist (as it might be the case for undershoot trajectories) we consider the point of closes approach

$$3 - 2 \frac{\phi(\bar{t})}{\phi(\bar{t})^2} \ddot{\phi}(\bar{t}) = 0. \quad (31)$$

With this choice, one can see that $\bar{t} \rightarrow +\infty$ on the bounce. Moreover, S_C^E is finite if $S_{C,1}^E$ is and, for some $C = C_0$, $\bar{t} \rightarrow +\infty$ we have

$$\frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta C^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{9a^2}. \quad (32)$$

Once that C_0 and \bar{t} are found ² we can compute the on-shell action as

$$S^E = -2\pi^2 \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \rho(t)^3 V(\phi) dt + \int_{\bar{t}}^{\infty} t^3 V(\phi_{+\infty}) dt \right) \quad (33)$$

where $\phi_{+\infty}$ is the asymptotic bounce,

$$\phi_{+\infty} \equiv \lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \phi(t) \quad (34)$$

which in this case is as in Eq.(20). Both Eq.(27) and Eq.(33) are off-shell for $t > \bar{t}$ away from the bounce, but this contribution is smaller and smaller the closer we get to it. We choose Eq.(27) instead of Eq.(33) for minimization because the latter has a saddle point on the bounce. If the scalar field moves on a background flat spacetime, the on-shell action may be computed as

$$S^E = 2\pi^2 \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} t^3 \left(\frac{\dot{\phi}}{2} + V(\phi) \right) dt + \int_{\bar{t}}^{\infty} t^3 \left(\frac{\dot{\phi}_{+\infty}^2}{2} + V(\phi_{+\infty}) \right) dt \right). \quad (35)$$

This has a saddle point for $\bar{t} \rightarrow +\infty$, too. In this case we were not able to find a functional as Eq.(27) that has a minimum or a maximum on the bounce.

² As we do not determine the bounce with infinite precision numerically, \bar{t} will actually be finite.

III. SCALAR FIELD WITH TIME-DEPENDENT POTENTIAL

In this Section we derive the asymptotic behaviour of the bounce for a single scalar field with a time-dependent potential. Before entering the details of the calculation, we briefly comment on the possible origin of such time dependence. Of course, a time-dependent coupling may be put by hand, if the underlying physical phenomenon that the field theory wants to describe contains such feature. Another possibility is that it arises from a time independent potential if we are sufficiently close to the bounce. For example, if we consider a n scalar field theory, in which all scalar fields but one are decoupled from the others, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_i} \quad \text{is a function of } \phi_i \text{ only, for } i = 2, \dots, n \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_1} \quad \text{is a function of all scalar fields} \quad (37)$$

the equations of motion for the scalar fields (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n) are

$$\ddot{\phi}_i + 3\frac{\dot{\phi}_i}{t} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_i}(\phi_i) \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, n \quad \ddot{\phi}_1 + 3\frac{\dot{\phi}_1}{t} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_1}(\phi_1, \phi_i). \quad (38)$$

We can choose initial conditions $\phi_i(0)$ such that ϕ_i for $i = 2, \dots, n$ are on the bounce and ϕ_1 lies on a undershoot trajectory. Thus we can write

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_1}(\phi_1, \phi_i) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi_1}(\phi_1, \phi_{i,b}(t)) \equiv \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi}(\phi, t) \quad (39)$$

where $\phi_{i,b}(t)$ are the bounces for the decoupled scalar fields and we renamed ϕ_1 as ϕ . In this way, the potential depends on time both through the scalar field ϕ and explicitly.

Now we derive the asymptotic behaviour of the bounce, in the case of a time-dependent potential. We focus on under which conditions Eq.(8) holds. First, we expand the right-hand side of Eq.(2) in a Taylor series around the turning point t^*

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} = \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_* + \sum_{n \geq 1} f_n \frac{(t - t^*)^n}{n!} \quad (40)$$

$$f_n \equiv \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_*^{(n)}(\phi_*, t^*) \quad (41)$$

where (n) represents the n -th order total time derivative, which can be expanded in partial derivatives in the scalar field and in time. As in [22], we need to determine under which conditions the zeroth-order term is dominant with respect to the others. When this is the case, then Eq.(8) holds. The calculation is carried out in the Appendix A and it is very similar to the one in Appendix A of [22]. The explicit time dependence of the scalar field

potential introduces new terms which should be account for - the other ones are already taken care of if we impose Eq.(13). We find that, besides Eq.(17)-(19), we need

$$\left(\frac{\partial^{i+j}V}{\partial\phi^i\partial t^j}\right)_* t^{*j} \ll 1 \quad \text{for } i \geq 2 \text{ and } j \geq 1 \quad (42)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial^{i+1}V}{\partial\phi\partial t^i}\right)_* t^{*i} \ll \ddot{\phi}_* \quad \text{for } i \geq 1. \quad (43)$$

If this is the case, then Eq.(8) is satisfied. If instead the scalar field is massive, we expect Eq.(60) to hold. As mentioned in the previous section, if we include Einstein-Hilbert gravity with a flat spacetime for $\phi = \phi_{fv}$, and we are sufficiently close to the bounce, the friction term satisfies Eq.(25) and thus we obtain the same result as above, taking $t \rightarrow t + a$. We now turn to massive scalar field theories.

IV. MASSIVE SCALAR FIELD

The procedure outlined in Sec.II excludes massive scalar fields, as Eq.(17) is clearly violated at large t^* . Moreover, the action Eq.(1) would diverge on the bounce if we had Eq.(8), as

$$\int_0^{+\infty} dt t^3 \phi^2 \approx \ln(t)|_0^{+\infty}. \quad (44)$$

Our calculations suggest that each order in the Taylor expansion is dominated by the mass term, and that every order is equally important. We don't know though which term on the left-hand side of Eq.(2) dominate on the bounce at large times. We show now that in this regime

$$\ddot{\phi} \approx m^2\phi, \quad (45)$$

namely, the friction term gets subdominant with respect to the other contributions in the equation of motion ³. In this approximation we have

$$\phi(t) = C_0 e^{-mt} \quad (46)$$

which verifies

$$\left|\frac{3\dot{\phi}}{t}\right| \ll \ddot{\phi} \approx m^2\phi. \quad (47)$$

³ This is the thin-shell condition as formulated by [1–3], but now it holds only in a small region around the false vacuum and thus it is not fitted to find the on-shell action analytically.

In order to see this, we repeat the analysis of the previous sections considering both the friction term and the mass term as contributions to $\frac{dV}{d\phi}$. We neglect other terms in the potential, which we suppose to satisfy Eq.(17)-(19). We write

$$\frac{\dot{\phi}}{t} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\phi}{t} \right) + \frac{\phi}{t^2} \quad (48)$$

and the equation of motion as

$$\ddot{\phi} = m(t)^2 \phi - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{3\phi}{t} \right) \quad m(t)^2 = m^2 - \frac{3}{t^2}. \quad (49)$$

We also define

$$\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} \equiv m(t)^2 \phi \quad \frac{\partial V_2}{\partial \phi} \equiv -\frac{3\phi}{t} \quad (50)$$

so we have

$$\ddot{\phi} = \frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} + \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial V_2}{\partial \phi} \right). \quad (51)$$

Our goal is to find which terms in the Taylor expansion

$$\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} + \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial V_2}{\partial \phi} \right) = m^2 \phi_* + \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\left(\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n)} + \left(\frac{\partial V_2}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n+1)} \right) \frac{(t-t^*)^n}{n!} \quad (52)$$

dominate for $t - t^* \approx t^*$. For such values of t we have

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\left(\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n)} + \left(\frac{\partial V_2}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n+1)} \right) (t-t^*)^n = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n)} t^{*n} + \sum_{n \geq 2} \left(\frac{\partial V_2'}{\partial \phi} \right)^{(n)} t^{*n} \quad (53)$$

with V_2' defined as

$$\frac{\partial V_2'}{\partial \phi} = -\frac{3\phi}{t t^*} \quad (54)$$

apart from numerical factors. For our purposes, Eq.(53) is tantamount to the Taylor expansion for a theory with equation of motion

$$\ddot{\phi} = m(t)^2 \phi \quad m^2(t) = m^2 - \frac{3}{t^2} - \frac{3}{t t^*} \quad (55)$$

apart from the zeroth and the first-order term. So, if we find the time-dependent part to be negligible with respect to the constant mass term at each order in the Taylor expansion, we expect that the same holds for our theory. We have

$$\frac{\partial^{2+j}(V_1 + V_2')}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^j} (\phi_*, t^*) t^{*j} \approx t^{*-2} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (56)$$

which satisfies Eq.(42) for $t^* \rightarrow +\infty$, and

$$\frac{\partial^{i+1}(V_1 + V_2')}{\partial \phi \partial t^i}(\phi_*, t^*) t^{*i} \approx t^{*-2} \phi(t^*) \quad \text{for } i \geq 1; \quad (57)$$

so Eq.(43) holds in the same limit. Thus, as regards the time-dependent part of the potential, the zeroth-order term of the Taylor expansion dominates in the large t^* limit. The constant mass term instead should be accounted for at each order in the Taylor expansion. Thus, the equation of motion reduces to

$$\ddot{\phi} \approx m^2 \phi \quad (58)$$

for large t^* near the bounce. For finite t^* a solution to Eq.(58) is

$$\phi(t) = \frac{\phi_*}{2} e^{mt^*} (e^{-mt} + e^{-2mt^*} e^{mt}) \quad (59)$$

with integration constants such that $\dot{\phi}(t^*) = 0$ and $\phi(t^*) = \phi_*$. Thus, taking the limit $t^* \rightarrow +\infty$ we have

$$\phi(t) = C_0 e^{-mt} \quad \ddot{\phi}_* = m^2 C_0 e^{-mt^*}. \quad (60)$$

This implies that other terms in the potential become negligible with respect to the quadratic one for $t \geq m^{-1}$, in agreement with our estimation in [22]. Moreover, we can verify that

$$\lim_{t^* \rightarrow +\infty} \ddot{\phi}_* t^{*4} = 0 \quad (61)$$

so the same applies at each order in the Taylor expansion. Using Eq.(60) in Eq.(22) and Eq.(24) we can verify that conditions 1. and 2. of Sec.I hold. Notice also that our result agrees with the ones in [23], in which is stated that massless fields dominate the bounce for $\mathcal{R}m \ll 1$, and the mass is important only for large values of t , thus giving just a small contribution to the on-shell action. At large times, we have that energy is approximately conserved, as

$$\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V(\phi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \phi(t) = C_0 e^{-mt} \text{ and } V(\phi) = \frac{m^2}{2} \phi^2. \quad (62)$$

At earlier times, we expect that $\phi(t) \propto t^{-2}$ for sufficiently small t such that the right-hand side of Eq.(2) is negligible with respect to the left-hand side. So, one may think that if we add a mass term to a scalar field theory with quartic potential the field tends to overshoot for all possible values of ϕ_{in} , as without the mass term we have $\phi(t) \propto (t^2 + \mathcal{R}^2)^{-1}$ for all times, and if Eq.(60) holds at some point the energy loss is reduced. Actually, the field undershoots: the reason is that the scalar field decays as a power of time even when the mass term dominates over the quartic one, for sufficiently small times such that their contribution to the equation of motion is negligibly small with respect to the friction term and $\ddot{\phi}$. Such mass term induces additional loss of energy in the system, and the field cannot climb the hill to reach the false vacuum. In this way, we recover the well known result that a massive scalar field theory with a quartic potential does not have a bounce [23].

A. Numerical method

We would like to extend the numerical method that we derived in our previous work to include more general scenarios. While in [22] we focused on finding a functional that resembles the action, it is better to relax this requirement, as it suffers of multiple issues. Besides the ones mentioned above, the chosen functional may have other minima than the bounce which are not stationary points of the action ⁴, and they partially spoil the bisection method. Moreover, while our choice of the matching time is particularly simple, it enters non-trivially in the functional, and thus sometimes making it difficult to assess whether it is a minimum, a maximum or a saddle point. We can get rid of all these issues considering maximization of the matching time in place of minimization of some functional. In fact, if the matching time reflects the property of the bounce being a limiting undershoot (overshoot) trajectory, we should have that it is a monotonically increasing (decreasing) function of the initial condition near it, and thus suitable for maximization. Of course this depends on our ability of determining such time (which depends on the particular asymptotical behaviour), but its monotonicity is a general property. It does not depend on gravity being dynamical, so we expect our method to hold equally well for single scalar field theories. In the case of massless fields, such matching time has already been determined in [22] and it is reported in Sec.II.

We derive now the matching time for a massive field. We set $\bar{t} \geq \frac{1}{m}$, as, for $\bar{t} \ll \frac{1}{m}$, matching conditions are as in Sect.II. As Eq.(62) holds at asymptotically large times on the bounce, then we may choose \bar{t} as the time that satisfies it for nearby trajectories. Undershoot trajectories have typically smaller values of $|\dot{\phi}|$ than the bounce, so we expect that, at some finite time \bar{t} , Eq.(62) is fulfilled. This might not be the case for overshoot trajectories. If this happens, we may find the point of closest approach

$$\ddot{\phi}(\bar{t}) - m^2\phi = 0. \tag{63}$$

The bounce may be found as a limiting undershoot trajectory as above, but it is also a limiting overshoot trajectory with vanishing velocity when the false vacuum is reached. Thus, we expect to have that \bar{t} on neighbouring trajectories increases as we get closer and closer to the bounce. Thus, \bar{t} is a monotonically increasing function of the initial condition ϕ_{in} for $\phi_{in} < \phi_0$, while it is decreasing for $\phi_{in} > \phi_0$. If there are multiple matching times for a given trajectories, we are guaranteed that only the largest one shows the appropriate behaviour. Nonetheless, this is extremely inconvenient if our purpose is to reduce the typical time

⁴ Such points should have finite \bar{t} .

for which we need to solve the equations of motion of the scalar field to find the bounce. However, we can take the smallest one that shows such monotonicity for some ϕ_{in} . We expect that larger matching times show the same behaviour. If instead the matching time we chose (for example, the first matching time encountered for a given trajectory) seems regular for all ϕ_{in} there might be a larger one that instead shows the appropriate behaviour. Regarding this matter, choosing m^{-1} as limiting value for the validity of Eq.(62) is somehow arbitrary, as actually we need $\bar{t} \gg m^{-1}$. This choice should be irrelevant on the bounce, as $\bar{t} \rightarrow +\infty$, but it may be determinant far away from it. In absence of a proper matching time in such region this condition may be slightly changed, depending on the individual system considered. More on this matter will be explained in the following, where we give an example of the determination of the bounce and calculation of the decay rate.

As described above, the matching time - as a function of the initial condition ϕ_{in} - diverges on the bounce. The bisection method, as well as the improved shooting method (described in [22]), are thus suitable to determine it, by finding the initial condition ϕ_0 . At each step of the maximization procedure, we can compute the action Eq.(33) (if gravity is dynamical) or Eq.(35) (on a flat spacetime) with $\phi_{+\infty}$ as

$$\phi_{+\infty} = \begin{cases} \frac{C}{2\bar{t}^2} & t < \frac{1}{m} \\ Ce^{-mt} & t > \frac{1}{m} \end{cases} . \quad (64)$$

where C is found as

$$C = \begin{cases} -\dot{\phi}(\bar{t})\bar{t}^3 & t < \frac{1}{m} \\ e^{m\bar{t}}\phi(\bar{t}) & t > \frac{1}{m} \end{cases} . \quad (65)$$

Our accuracy in determining the on-shell action may be set as Eq.(33) or Eq.(35) not varying more than 10^{-3} in a further step. We won't compare our results to the shooting method ones, as we expect it to have similar properties of the minimization method outlined in [22].

We report in Fig.(1),(2) the matching time \bar{t} as a function of the initial condition ϕ_{in} for a theory

$$V(\phi) = \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 - \phi^4 + \phi^6 \quad \text{with } m^2 \in [2 \times 10^{-6}, 10^{-4}] \text{ and Einstein-Hilbert gravity(66)}$$

and

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4 - \phi^6 + \phi^8 \quad \text{with } \lambda \in [4 \times 10^{-6}, 2 \times 10^{-1}]. \quad (67)$$




FIG. 1. Matching time \bar{t} against the initial condition ϕ_{in} , for a massive scalar field with potential Eq.(66). The mass squared ranges from 10^{-6} (green dots) to 10^{-4} , (pink dots). The matching time diverges on the bounce, and it is monotonically increasing (decreasing) for $\phi_{in} < \phi_0$ ($\phi_{in} > \phi_0$).

Each curve displays a divergence at some value of ϕ_{in} , which marks the initial condition of the bounce ($\phi_0 = \phi_{in}$), and its position varies with the coupling. Overshoot trajectories are not displayed in the massive case as convergence to the bounce is much slower than the undershoot ones - for a given distance from the bounce, \bar{t} is much smaller for overshoot trajectories than for undershoot ones. The reason lies in how we chose \bar{t} . In fact, for some trajectories (that we label by their initial condition ϕ_{in}) we had multiple choices for the matching time. We found that the matching given by Eq.(62) occurs at a larger time than the ones given by Eq.(30), and this last condition is sometimes satisfied multiple times. In some cases instead we found no matching given by Eq.(62), and only one given by Eq.(30). In order to avoid ambiguities, we used Eq.(62) for matching when possible, and Eq.(30) otherwise. Imposing Eq.(62) in a region resulted in a much higher \bar{t} than in the other. Anyway, both trajectories showed a ever-increasing \bar{t} as we got closer to the bounce, up to accuracy.

For completeness, we report the on-shell action computed on the bounce for both theories. We set the accuracy as described above. The age of the universe is estimated as $T_U \sim 10^{61}\sqrt{G}$. We found $S^E = 36.3$ ($S^E = 47.4$) for the massless theory with $\lambda = 10^{-6}$ ($\lambda = 2 \times 10^{-1}$) corresponding to a decay time $\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -226$ ($\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -221$). The massive scalar field theory with Einstein-Hilbert gravity gives instead $S_C^E = 6.69$ ($S_C^E = 7.02$) for $m^2 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ ($m^2 = 10^{-2}$), corresponding to a decay time $\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -236$ ($\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -239$).




FIG. 2. Matching time \bar{t} against the initial condition ϕ_{in} , for a scalar field with potential Eq.(67). λ ranges from 4×10^{-6} (red dots) to $\approx 2 \times 10^{-1}$ (bluedots).

V. HIGHER-ORDER KINETIC TERMS

Quantum tunnelling through an energy barrier has an exponentially small probability to occur in the semi-classical approximation. The smallness of some numbers, for example the ratio among the Higgs vacuum expectation value and the Planck mass, may be viewed in terms of such exponential suppression, thus alleviating the hierarchy problem [24–27]. The vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field is induced by instanton effects

$$\langle \phi \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\phi \phi e^{-S} = e^{-W_b} \quad (68)$$

where the generating functional W_b is computed on the bounce. It is found by solving the equations of motion of the original theory with a pointlike source, which is

$$\phi(0) \equiv e^{\psi(0)} = \exp \left(\int d^4x \delta(x) \psi(x) \right). \quad (69)$$

The source generates a singular instanton at $t = 0$. The singularity drives W_b to infinity. It has been shown that a possible way to make it finite is to add higher order kinetic terms

$$(\partial\psi)^n \quad n > 2 \quad (70)$$

to the Lagrangian. Among these, the case $n = 4$ is particularly interesting as it is scale-invariant and keeps the agravity theory unitary, avoiding the Ostragadski instability which usually appears when the graviton kinetic term has four derivatives [28]. It thus may be useful to know the asymptotic bounce for a theory containing such term. First, we compute the contribution of higher-order kinetic terms to the equations of motion. It is

$$n \square \psi (\partial\psi)^{n-2} \quad n > 2. \quad (71)$$

Notice that

$$\square\psi (\partial\psi)^{n-2} \ll \left| \frac{3\dot{\psi}}{t} \right| \approx \ddot{\phi} \quad \text{for } n > 2, \phi(t) \propto t^{-2} \quad (72)$$

$$\square\psi (\partial\psi)^{n-2} \ll m^2\phi \approx \ddot{\phi} \quad \text{for } n > 2, \phi(t) \propto e^{-mt}. \quad (73)$$

So a naive reasoning would suggest that such term does not influence the asymptotic behaviour of the bounce. We test this result giving a proof as in the previous section: we Taylor expand $\frac{dV}{d\phi}$, evaluate it for $t - t^* \approx t^*$, take the large t^* limit and see if the zeroth-order term dominates over the others. We suppose that besides the higher-order kinetic term there are non-derivative terms that generate a potential barrier, through which the scalar field can tunnel.

Eq.(71) gives a vanishing contribution to the zero-order term, as $\dot{\phi}(t^*) = 0$. Moreover, it appears in the Taylor expansion of ϕ^{n-1} at n -th order, namely

$$(\psi^{n-1})^{(n)} = \square\psi (\partial\psi)^{n-2} + \dots \quad (74)$$

If there aren't any incidental cancellations among the first term on the right-hand side and the ones in \dots ⁵, we can trade the Taylor expansion of the higher-order term with the one for $(\psi^{n-1})^{(n)}$. Moreover we can write

$$\sum_{m=1} (\psi^{n-1})^{(n+m)}_* \frac{(t - t^*)^m}{m!} \stackrel{t \approx 2t^*}{=} \sum_{m=n+1} \left(\frac{\psi^{n-1}}{t^{*n}} \right)_*^{(m)} \frac{t^{*m}}{m!}. \quad (75)$$

Thus our considerations are the same as for a theory with potential

$$V(\psi) = \frac{\psi^n}{t^{*n}} \quad n > 2 \quad (76)$$

apart from the first few orders of the Taylor expansion. Here t^{*-n} is a time independent coupling which vanishes in the limit $t^* \rightarrow +\infty$. As we saw in Sect.II, for $n \geq 4$ each term in the Taylor expansion is negligibly small even if it had a non-vanishing coupling. For $n = 3$ we need to impose Eq.(19) which gives

$$t^{*-3}4C_0 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } t^* \rightarrow +\infty \quad (77)$$

and thus also this contribution is negligible in the large t^* limit. We conclude that higher-order kinetic terms do not affect significantly the Taylor expansion. Moreover, their contribution to zero order vanishes. Thus, we conclude that Eq.(8) holds for massless ψ when such terms are added to the Lagrangian. If ψ is massive, then Eq.(60) holds.

⁵ Our proof in the Appendix does not account for numerical coefficients, and so it does not for incidental cancellations either. So even if there are incidental cancellations, if we find that higher order terms in the Taylor expansion are subdominant with respect to the zeroth-order for $(\psi^{n-1})^{(n)}$ we expect to be the same for $\square\psi (\partial\psi)^{n-2}$




FIG. 3. Matching time \bar{t} against the initial condition ϕ_{in} , for a scalar field with potential Eq.(67) in $d = 4$ space dimensions. λ ranges from 4×10^{-6} (blue dots) to 4×10^{-3} (red dots).

VI. CHANGING THE NUMBER OF SPACETIME DIMENSIONS

We consider here whether our findings may be extended to a theory defined on a spacetime of arbitrary dimension $d + 1$ (d space dimensions) with a $O(1 + d)$ metric

$$ds^2 = dt^2 + \rho(t)^2 d\Omega_d^2. \quad (78)$$

Now the equation of motion for the scalar field is

$$\ddot{\phi} + \frac{3d}{t}\dot{\phi} = \frac{dV}{d\phi}. \quad (79)$$

Our considerations on the Taylor expansion in four spacetime dimensions ($d = 3$) do not depend on d apart from numerical factors. We need only to verify when Eq.(13) holds for arbitrary d , and thus find the conditions on the potential such that the zeroth-order term of the Taylor expansion dominates over higher order terms. We start by imposing the masslessness condition Eq.(17), which does not depend on d . We will deal with massive scalar fields later. If the field is massless and the zeroth-order term dominates, the equation of motion have a d dependent solution that, in the limit of large t^* gives

$$\lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \dot{\phi}(t) = -\frac{C}{t^d}, \quad \lim_{\substack{\phi_* \rightarrow 0 \\ t^* \rightarrow +\infty}} \left(\frac{dV}{d\phi} \right)_* = \frac{C}{(1+d)t^{*d+1}}. \quad (80)$$

From the discussion in Sect.II, we see that for $d+1 > 4$, that is $d > 3$, no additional conditions need to be imposed. The equation of motion for the scale factor if we include Einstein-Hilbert gravity is as in Eq.(24) for $d \geq 2$, with the factor 3 replaced with a d -dependent factor. Thus the equations of motion at large times on the bounce is

$$\dot{\rho}^2 = 1 + O(t^{2-2d}) \quad \text{for } \rho(t) \approx t \text{ and } \phi(t) \propto t^{-d+1} \quad (81)$$

which consistently gives $\dot{\rho} \approx 1$ for $t \rightarrow +\infty$ for $d \geq 2$. The matching time may be determined as a solution of

$$t + \frac{(d-2)\phi}{\dot{\phi}} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad (d-1) - \frac{(d-2)\phi}{\dot{\phi}^2} \ddot{\phi} = 0. \quad (82)$$

Thus, for $d > 3$, the asymptotic behaviour of the scalar field is as in Eq.(80) if the scalar field is massless. An example is shown in Fig. 3. We plotted the matching time \bar{t} against the initial condition ϕ_{in} for a theory as in Eq.(67), in $d = 4$ space dimensions, and matching time determined by Eq.(82). The on-shell action is $S^E = 615$ ($S^E = 618$) for $\lambda = 10^{-6}$ ($\lambda = 10^{-3}$) corresponding to a decay time $\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx 26$ ($\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx 27$).

A more careful analysis is needed for $d < 3$. In $d = 2$ we have additional conditions on the potential

$$\left(\frac{d^3V}{d\phi^3}\right)_* t^* C_0 \ll 1 \quad \left(\frac{d^4V}{d\phi^4}\right)_* C_0 \ll 1 \quad (83)$$

so in this case also cubic terms are excluded. In $d = 1$, we have

$$\left(\frac{d^jV}{d\phi^j}\right)_* \ddot{\phi}_*^{j-2} (t^* + a)^{2j-2} \sim t^{*2} \quad \text{for } j > 2 \text{ and large } t^* \quad (84)$$

and thus Eq.(80) does not hold for any j . In fact, the on-shell Euclidean Lagrangian in arbitrary dimension d is

$$\mathcal{L} = t^d \left[\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V \left(\frac{C}{(d-1)t^{d-1}} \right) \right]$$

and thus the on-shell action

$$S^E = \int d^{d+1}x \mathcal{L}$$

is divergent for $d = 1$ if Eq.(80) holds.

Massive scalar fields instead dominate the Taylor expansion. Our proof in Sect.IV is independent on the number of spacetime dimensions and so we expect that Eq.(60) holds for arbitrary $d \neq 1$, if other terms in the potential satisfy Eq.(17) in $d > 3$, Eq.(17) and Eq.(19) in $d = 3$ and Eq.(17) and Eq.(83) in $d = 2$. Including Einstein-Hilbert gravity does not affect this result as an exponentially small scalar field does not spoil $\rho \approx t$ at large times. An example is shown in Fig.4, in which we plotted the matching time \bar{t} against ϕ_{in} for a theory

$$V(\phi) = \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 - \phi^6 + \phi^8 \quad \text{for } m \in [10^{-3}, 10^{-2}] \text{ with Einstein-Hilbert gravity} \quad (85)$$

with $d = 2$. Our choice for the matching time is as in the example reported in Sec.IV. The matching time for overshoot trajectories is typically smaller than the undershoot one also in this case, and it corresponds to the line in the bottom of the plot. The on-shell action is $S^E = 0.005$ ($S^E = 0.018$) for $m^2 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ ($m^2 = 10^{-4}$) corresponding to a decay time $\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -233$ ($\log_{10}(\tau T_U^{-1}) \approx -236$).




FIG. 4. Matching time \bar{t} against the initial condition ϕ_{in} , for a massive scalar field with potential Eq.(85) in $d = 2$ space dimensions. The square mass ranges from 10^{-3} (green dots) to 10^{-2} (pink dots).

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Bounce solutions for scalar field theories with dynamical gravity are usually found with numerical methods, unless the gravitational backreaction is very small, or the thin-wall approximation is valid. Necessary (but not sufficient) existence conditions for the bounce are the finiteness of the action and the consistency of boundary conditions for all fields. To verify whether such stabilization happens, we do not need the full analytic solution: the asymptotic behaviour suffices. In this work, we found it for single scalar field theories with and without dynamical gravity that were overlooked in our previous work. First, we applied our method to massive scalar fields and compared our results to the ones of [23] as a consistency check. We also found that higher-order kinetic terms do not play a relevant role on the asymptotic behaviour of the bounce. Moreover, we determined the asymptotic behaviour of the bounce for both massless and massive scalar fields in a number of space dimensions different than three. In both cases, we found a similar result for any $d \neq 1$, while in one dimension our analysis fails. We improved the numerical method previously developed: the bounce is found by maximizing the matching time, as it is positive and divergent there. This is a general property of the matching time, and thus should be easily applied to other settings also.

In the simple setting that we analyzed, conditions 1., 2. of Sec.I were always satisfied. This might not be the case in more complicated scenarios, for example in modified gravity. In particular, gravity terms beyond the Einstein-Hilbert one are required by perturbative renormalizability, and it would be interesting to analyze their effect on the bounce. We will report soon on these issues [41].

Finally, we note that one important limitation of our method is that dynamical gravity is included only when the false vacuum lives on flat space. To study cosmological applications, however, it is better to introduce de Sitter false vacua in our analysis, which will be our next goal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

S. V. acknowledges the financial support of the Italian National Institute for Nuclear Physics (INFN) for her Doctoral studies. This work has been partially performed using the software Mathematica.

Appendix A: Time-dependent Taylor expansion of the potential

Here we compute the coefficients f_n of Eq.(40). We denote (total) time derivatives of arbitrary order with the index (n) , while time derivatives of first and second order of the scalar field are denoted by one dot or two dots respectively. Partial derivatives in the scalar field and in time are denoted with the symbol ∂ . Partial derivatives of order i are indicated as ∂^i . The equations are implicitly evaluated at time t^* (such that $\dot{\phi}(t^*) = 0$) and field value ϕ_* . Using the equation of motion for the scalar field we can write

$$\frac{\partial^i V^{(n+1)}}{\partial \phi^i} = \left(\frac{\partial^{i+1} V}{\partial \phi^{i+1}} \dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial^{i+1} V}{\partial t \partial \phi^i} \right)^{(n)}, \quad \phi^{(n)} = \left(\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \right)^{(n-3)} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} B_i \frac{\phi^{(i)}}{(t+a)^{n-i}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where B_i s are numerical factors, whose value is not relevant for the following discussion. As the explicit time dependence of the potential makes the calculation more involved with respect to the time independent case (reported in [22]), we omit numerical coefficients for simplicity in the following. Using the first equation in (A1), we can write the $(n+1)$ -th derivative of $\frac{dV}{d\phi}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V^{(n+1)}}{\partial \phi} &= \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(n+1)} + \dots + \left(\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \right)^{(n-1)} \ddot{\phi} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \phi^{(n)} = \ddot{\phi} \left(\left(\frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3} \right)^{(n-3)} \ddot{\phi} + \dots + \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3} \phi^{(n-1)} \right) + \phi^{(3)} \left(\left(\frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3} \right)^{(n-4)} \ddot{\phi} + \dots + \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3} \phi^{(n-2)} \right) + \dots + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(n+1)} + \\ &+ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(n)} + \dots + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(n-2)} \ddot{\phi} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \phi^{(n-1)} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial t \partial \phi^2} \phi^{(j+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

which can be further expanded using again Eq.(A1). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial V^{(n+1)}}{\partial \phi} &= \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^{n+1}} + \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^j} \phi^{(n+1-j)} + \sum_j \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3 \partial t^j} (\ddot{\phi} \phi^{(n-1-j)} + \phi^{(3)} \phi^{(n-2-j)} + \dots + \\
&\quad + \phi^{(n+1)/2} \phi^{(n+1)/2-j}) + \sum_j \frac{\partial^4 V}{\partial \phi^4 \partial t^j} (\ddot{\phi}^2 \phi^{(n-3-j)} + \phi^{(3)} \ddot{\phi} \phi^{(n-4-j)} + \dots + \\
&\quad + \phi^{(n+1)/3} \phi^{(n+1)/3} \phi^{(n+1)/3-j}) + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

where sums on j run from $j = 0$ to some upper limit, for which derivatives of the scalar field are of order two. The result is similar to the time independent case: each term $\frac{\partial^{i+j} V}{\partial \phi^i \partial t^j}$ in Eq.(A3) is multiplied by $i - 1$ terms, which are derivatives of $\ddot{\phi}$. Such derivatives are of order $n + 5 - 2i$ or lower, thus these terms are non-vanishing only if $n + 5 - 2i > 1$. So, the highest-order derivative $\frac{\partial^i V}{\partial \phi^i}$ that appears in Eq.(A3) is the one satisfying $n + 5 - 2i = 3$ for even n and $n + 5 - 2i = 2$ for odd n . The difference with respect to the time independent case is that now the potential contains also partial derivatives in time and such terms are multiplied by $i - 1$ terms, which are derivatives of $\ddot{\phi}$, the only exception being time derivatives of $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi}$. For example, the sixth-order time derivative $\frac{\partial V^{(6)}}{\partial \phi}$ ($n = 5$) is expanded in terms of $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2}$, $\frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3}$ and $\frac{\partial^4 V}{\partial \phi^4}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial V^{(6)}}{\partial \phi} &= \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(6)} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t} \phi^{(5)} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^2} \phi^{(4)} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^3} \phi^{(3)} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^4} \phi^{(2)} + \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3} (\ddot{\phi} \phi^{(4)} + \\
&\quad + \phi^{(3)} \phi^{(3)}) + \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3 \partial t} \ddot{\phi} \phi^{(3)} + \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3 \partial t^2} \ddot{\phi}^2 + \frac{\partial^4 V}{\partial \phi^4} \ddot{\phi}^3 + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^6}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

We expand time derivatives of $\ddot{\phi}$ in Eq.s(A1) using Eq.(A3). We find

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^{(n+1)} &= \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t^j} \phi^{(n-1-j)} + \sum_j \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^3 \partial t^j} (\phi^{(n-3-j)} \ddot{\phi} + \phi^{(n-4-j)} \phi^{(3)} + \dots) + \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n B_i \frac{\phi^{(i)}}{(t+a)^{n-i+1}} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^{n-1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

As a result, using Eq.(A5), we can express Eq.(A3) in terms of partial derivatives of the potential with respect to the scalar field and time, $\ddot{\phi}$ and t^* only. We order such terms according to the order of the derivative of the potential in the scalar field, which will be labelled with i in the following. Partial derivatives in time of the potential should be compensated with appropriate powers of t^* with respect to the $j = 0$ term. Moreover, time

derivatives of $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi}$ compensate for some factors $\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{t^j}$ with respect to the time independent case, as can be seen from Eq.(A5). We can carry out the calculation in the time independent case, as explained in [22], and then add terms $\frac{\partial^{i+j}V}{\partial \phi^i \partial t^j} t^j$ to $\frac{\partial^i V}{\partial \phi^i}$ and $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^j}$ to $\frac{\dot{\phi}}{t^j}$. All such terms that are multiplied by a negative or vanishing power of t^* contribute. It is easier to see how this works with some examples. The highest-order derivative (the \bar{i} -th term) is multiplied only by time derivatives of the scalar field of order 2 or 3 and thus it contributes as

$$\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}}} \ddot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-1} \quad \text{odd } n, \quad \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-1}}{(t^* + a)} \left(\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}}} + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}} \partial t} (t^* + a) \right) + \ddot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-2} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}}} \quad \text{even } n \quad (\text{A6})$$

to f_n . The first term for even and odd n is present also in the time independent case: two additional terms appear, one that replaces $\frac{\dot{\phi}}{t^*}$ and a time derivative which is compensated by an additional power of time. As positive powers of time cannot appear, there should be no other terms in the highest-order derivative.

The second-highest derivative $\bar{i} - 1$ is multiplied by time derivatives of the scalar field of order 2, 3, 4, 5. Using Eq.(A5), derivatives of order 4 and 5 may be expressed in terms of lower order derivatives. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{odd } n \quad & \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-2}}{(t^* + a)^2} \left[\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} (t^* + a)^2 \right) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} (t^* + a) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}+1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t^2} (t^* + a)^2 \right] + \\ & + \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-3}}{(t^* + a)} \left(\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^2} (t^* + a) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} (t^* + a) \right) + \\ & + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \ddot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-4} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{even } n \quad & \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-2}}{(t^* + a)^3} \left[\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} (t^* + a)^2 + \frac{\partial^3 V}{\partial \phi^2 \partial t} (t^* + a)^3 \right) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}} \partial t} (t^* + a) \right. \\ & \left. \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} (t^* + a)^2 \right) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}+1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t^2} (t^* + a)^2 + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}+2} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t^3} (t^* + a)^3 \right] + \\ & + \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-3}}{(t^* + a)^2} \left[\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \left(1 + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} (t^* + a)^2 \right) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^2} (t^* + a) + \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} (t^* + a) + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}+1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t^2} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^2} + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^3} \right] + \\ & + \frac{\dot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-4}}{(t^* + a)} \left[\frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} + \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} (t^* + a) + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\partial^{\bar{i}-1} V}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-1} \partial t} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^2} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t} (t^* + a) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

The first term for even and odd n are the same as in the time independent case, and other contributions appear with additional time derivatives, following the rules described above. Terms that appeared as

$$\frac{\partial^i V}{\partial \phi^i} t^{2i-1} \ddot{\phi}^{i-2} \quad (\text{A9})$$

in the time independent case, are now

$$\frac{\partial^{j+i} V}{\partial \phi^i \partial t^j} t^{2i-1+j} \ddot{\phi}^{i-2} \quad (\text{A10})$$

and thus they are much smaller than one if

$$\frac{\partial^{j+i} V}{\partial \phi^i \partial t^j} t^j \ll 1 \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (\text{A11})$$

and the ones described in Sec.II hold. If this is the case, then we have

$$\frac{\partial V^{(n+1)}}{\partial \phi} = \sum_{i=0}^{i=\bar{i}-2} \sum_{m=0}^{\bar{i}-i-1} \sum_{j_0, \dots, j_m} \sum_{n=0}^{2i+1} \frac{\partial V^{\bar{i}-i}}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-i} \partial t^{j_0}} \frac{\ddot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-i-1-m}}{(t+a)^{2i+1-n}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^{j_1}} \times \dots \times \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi \partial t^{j_m}} \quad (\text{A12})$$

where $j_0 + \dots + j_m = n$, while in the time independent case we had

$$\frac{\partial V^{(n+1)}}{\partial \phi} = \sum_{i=0}^{i=\bar{i}-2} \frac{\partial V^{\bar{i}-i}}{\partial \phi^{\bar{i}-i}} \frac{\ddot{\phi}^{\bar{i}-i-1}}{(t+a)^{2i+1}} \quad (\text{A13})$$

which is negligible with respect to the zeroth-order term under conditions described in Sec.II. Thus we need also to impose that

$$\frac{\partial^j V}{\partial \phi \partial t^j} t^j \ll \ddot{\phi}_*. \quad (\text{A14})$$

In conclusion, if

$$\frac{\partial^{j+i} V}{\partial \phi^i \partial t^j} t^j \ll 1 \quad \frac{\partial^j V}{\partial \phi \partial t^j} t^j \ll \ddot{\phi} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (\text{A15})$$

hold, besides Eq.(17) and Eq.(19), then Eq.(8) is satisfied in the time-dependent case. As in Sec.II we can repeat the calculation for a scalar field theory with Einstein-Hilbert gravity which gives a flat spacetime on the bounce trajectory at large times. The same result holds, replacing t^* with $t^* + a$.

[1] S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977), 2929-2936 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1248

[2] C. G. Callan, Jr. and S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **16** (1977), 1762-1768 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1762

- [3] S. R. Coleman and F. De Luccia, *Phys. Rev. D* **21** (1980), 3305 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.21.3305
- [4] Lee, K., & Weinberg, E. J. (1986). Tunneling without barriers. *Nuclear Physics B*, 267(1), 181–202. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90150-1
- [5] A. D. Linde, *Nucl. Phys. B* **216** (1983), 421 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(83)90072-X 2020
- [6] D. Garfinkle and R. Gregory, *Phys. Rev. D* **41** (1990), 1889 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.41.1889
- [7] K. Eckerle, [arXiv:2003.04365 [hep-th]].
- [8] S. Chigusa, T. Moroi and Y. Shoji, *Phys. Lett. B* **800** (2020), 135115 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.135115 [arXiv:1906.10829 [hep-ph]].
- [9] P. John, *Phys. Lett. B* **452** (1999), 221-226 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00272-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/9810499 [hep-ph]].
- [10] A. Kusenko, *Phys. Lett. B* **358** (1995), 51-55 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)00994-V [arXiv:hep-ph/9504418 [hep-ph]].
- [11] A. Kusenko, P. Langacker and G. Segre, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996), 5824-5834 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.54.5824 [arXiv:hep-ph/9602414 [hep-ph]].
- [12] I. Dasgupta, *Phys. Lett. B* **394** (1997), 116-122 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(96)01685-1 [arXiv:hep-ph/9610403 [hep-ph]].
- [13] J. M. Moreno, M. Quiros and M. Seco, *Nucl. Phys. B* **526** (1998), 489-500 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00283-1 [arXiv:hep-ph/9801272 [hep-ph]].
- [14] M. Claudson, L. J. Hall and I. Hinchliffe, *Nucl. Phys. B* **228** (1983), 501-528 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(83)90556-4
- [15] A. Masoumi, K. D. Olum and B. Shlaer, *JCAP* **01** (2017), 051 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2017/01/051 [arXiv:1610.06594 [gr-qc]].
- [16] J. R. Espinosa, *JCAP* **07** (2018), 036 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/07/036 [arXiv:1805.03680 [hep-th]].
- [17] J. R. Espinosa, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.10, 104007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.104007 [arXiv:1808.00420 [hep-th]].
- [18] G. V. Dunne and H. Min, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005), 125004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.72.125004 [arXiv:hep-th/0511156 [hep-th]].
- [19] J. Baacke and G. Lavrelashvili, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004), 025009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.025009 [arXiv:hep-th/0307202 [hep-th]].
- [20] G. Isidori, V. S. Rychkov, A. Strumia and N. Tetradis, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008), 025034 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.025034 [arXiv:0712.0242 [hep-ph]].
- [21] A. Salvio, A. Strumia, N. Tetradis and A. Urbano, ‘On gravitational and thermal corrections to vacuum decay,’ *JHEP* **09** (2016), 054 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2016)054 [arXiv:1608.02555 [hep-ph]].

- [22] S. Vicentini and M. Rinaldi, [arXiv:2009.04435 [gr-qc]].
- [23] I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. B **191** (1981), 429 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90307-2
- [24] M. Shaposhnikov and A. Shkerin, Phys. Lett. B **783** (2018), 253-262 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.06.068 [arXiv:1803.08907 [hep-th]].
- [25] M. Shaposhnikov and A. Shkerin, JHEP **10** (2018), 024 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2018)024 [arXiv:1804.06376 [hep-th]].
- [26] A. Shkerin, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.11, 115018 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.115018 [arXiv:1903.11317 [hep-th]].
- [27] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin and S. Zell, [arXiv:2001.09088 [hep-th]].
- [28] A. Salvio, [arXiv:2012.11608 [hep-th]].
- [29] O. Fialko, B. Opanchuk, A. I. Sidorov, P. D. Drummond and J. Brand, EPL **110** (2015) no.5, 56001 doi:10.1209/0295-5075/110/56001 [arXiv:1408.1163 [cond-mat.quant-gas]].
- [30] O. Fialko, B. Opanchuk, A. I. Sidorov, P. D. Drummond and J. Brand, J. Phys. B **50** (2017) no.2, 024003 doi:10.1088/1361-6455/50/2/024003 [arXiv:1607.01460 [cond-mat.quant-gas]].
- [31] J. Braden, M. C. Johnson, H. V. Peiris and S. Weinfurtner, JHEP **07** (2018), 014 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2018)014 [arXiv:1712.02356 [hep-th]].
- [32] J. Braden, M. C. Johnson, H. V. Peiris, A. Pontzen and S. Weinfurtner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123** (2019) no.3, 031601 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.031601 [arXiv:1806.06069 [hep-th]].
- [33] J. Braden, M. C. Johnson, H. V. Peiris, A. Pontzen and S. Weinfurtner, JHEP **10** (2019), 174 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2019)174 [arXiv:1904.07873 [hep-th]].
- [34] F. Michel, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.4, 045021 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.045021 [arXiv:1911.12765 [quant-ph]].
- [35] M. G. Abed and I. G. Moss, [arXiv:2006.06289 [hep-th]].
- [36] S. Banerjee, U. Danielsson and S. Giri, JHEP **04** (2020), 085 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2020)085 [arXiv:2001.07433 [hep-th]].
- [37] S. Banerjee, U. Danielsson, G. Dibitetto, S. Giri and M. Schillo, JHEP **10** (2019), 164 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2019)164 [arXiv:1907.04268 [hep-th]].
- [38] S. Banerjee, U. Danielsson, G. Dibitetto, S. Giri and M. Schillo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121** (2018) no.26, 261301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.261301 [arXiv:1807.01570 [hep-th]].
- [39] I. Koga and Y. Ookouchi, [arXiv:2011.07437 [hep-th]].
- [40] P. B. Arnold and S. Vokos, Phys. Rev. D **44** (1991), 3620-3627
- [41] S. Vicentini, M. Rinaldi, in preparation.