

# Gravitational Particle Production and the Validity of Effective Descriptions in Loop Quantum Cosmology

G. S. Vicente,<sup>1,\*</sup> Rudnei O. Ramos,<sup>2,†</sup> and L. L. Graef<sup>3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Faculdade de Tecnologia, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, 27537-000 Resende, RJ, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, 20550-013 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*

<sup>3</sup>*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense, 24210-346 Niterói, RJ, Brazil*

The effective approach in Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC) has provided means to obtain predictions for observable quantities in LQC models. While an effective dynamics in LQC has been extensively considered in different scenarios, a robust demonstration of the validity of effective descriptions for the perturbative level still requires further attention. The consistency of the description adopted in most approaches requires the assumption of a test field approximation, which is limited to the cases in which the backreaction of the particles gravitationally produced can be safely neglected. Within the framework of LQC, some of the main approaches to quantize the linear perturbations are the dressed metric, the hybrid approaches and the closed/deformed algebra approach. Here, we analyze the consistency of the test field assumption in these frameworks by computing the energy density stored in the particles gravitationally produced compared to the background energy density. This analysis ultimately provides us with a consistency test of the effective descriptions of LQC.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the early 80's the inflationary scenario opened up a new and promising avenue for connecting fundamental physics with experiment. Inflation was the first theory within which it was possible to make predictions about the structure of the Universe on large scales based on causal physics [1]. Many decades later, with the improvement on experiments aiming to accurately measure the Cosmic Radiation Background (CMB), several inflationary scenarios still show good agreement with data [2, 3]. However, as it is well known, many inflationary scenarios only work if the fields are initially very homogeneous and/or start with precise initial conditions. This leaves inflation at a crossroads, since General Relativity (GR) inevitably implies in an initial singularity, where it is not clear how to impose the initial conditions. Inflation is very sensitive to Planck-scale physics [4]. The assumption adopted in inflationary cosmology that “the space-time can be treated classically” is clearly questionable. The well known successes of inflation motivates the community to search for means to past complete this cosmological scenario with a more fundamental and consistent quantum gravity theory in the ultraviolet (UV) scale.

In the last years, progresses on quantization of homogeneous cosmological spacetimes using techniques of loop quantum gravity (LQG), a nonperturbative quantum gravity theory, has opened new avenues to explore Planck scale physics. Cosmological spacetimes have the advantage of being highly symmetric, since spatial homogeneity reduces the infinite number of degrees of freedom to a finite number, significantly simplifying the quantization of these spacetimes. The reduced version of LQG,

which uses the symmetries considered in cosmology, is Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC) [5–15]. Besides allowing for the construction of viable non-singular models of the very early Universe, the increasing progress on the analysis of cosmological fluctuations in LQC has bridged quantum gravity with cosmological observations [16].

In the framework of LQC, the background evolution can be divided into two classes: The kinetic dominated bounce and the potential dominated bounce. A potential dominated bounce is either unable to produce the desired slow-roll inflation or leads to a large amount of  $e$ -folds of expansion [17]. In the latter case, all the new physics is washed out, and no signal from the quantum regime is present. In the case of kinetic energy initial domination, the early evolution can always be divided into three phases after the contraction: The bouncing phase (with equation of state  $\omega = 1$ ), the transition phase ( $-1 < \omega < 1$ ) and inflation ( $\omega \simeq -1$ ). The presence of these three stages is universal in the kinetic dominated case and does not depend on the form of the inflaton potential.

Unlike the general evolution of the background (zero-modes), the linear perturbations depend on the methods used to quantize them. Within the framework of LQC, there are mainly four different approaches: The dressed metric [18, 19], the closed/deformed algebra [20, 21], the hybrid [22] and separated universe approach [23, 24].

In the dressed metric approach, the background metric is quantized by the loop method, while its perturbative degrees of freedom are quantized following the Fock quantization procedure. As long as the energy density in the perturbations remains small as compared to the Planck energy, the quantum dynamics of the perturbations can be described by a quantum field propagating on a dressed background spacetime. In the dressed metric approach, as well as in the other approaches considered in this work, it is well known that whenever a potential is added to the relevant scalar field, the dynamics becomes sufficiently intricate that an effective description usually

\* gustavo@fat.uerj.br

† rudnei@uerj.br

‡ leilagraef@id.uff.br

must come into hand.

In the hybrid quantization approach, the background and the perturbed degrees of freedom are also treated differently, since a LQG-like quantization of the background is performed along with a Fock-like quantization of the perturbations [25–30]. As a result of the nonhomogeneous degrees of freedom being not loop but Fock quantized, the kinematic Hilbert space is a tensor product of the individual Hilbert space for each sector, that is,  $\mathcal{H}_{kin} = \mathcal{H}_{kin}^{grav} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{kin}^{matt} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  [31]. While the background geometry is loop quantized, the zero-mode of the scalar field is quantized in the standard Schrodinger representation, and the nonhomogeneous perturbations are Fock quantized. Similar to the dressed metric approach, for sharply peaked semiclassical background states, there exists an effective description of the quantum dynamics, which greatly simplifies the dynamical equations<sup>1</sup>. Although the hybrid approach shares these common features with the dressed metric approach and also provides effective equations for the perturbations that are similar to the latter, the way in which they incorporate quantum gravity corrections in those equations leads to some differences [33]. In Ref. [31] it was provided a robust evidence of differences in predictions between dressed and hybrid approaches due to the respective underlying constructions in the context of the modified LQC-I model (mLQC-I) [34, 35]. Although it has been shown that, in the effective description, these approaches do not lead to significant differences in the observable parts of the spectrum, the behavior of the non-observable part of the CMB spectrum deserves investigation. As shown in Ref. [36], for the case of the dressed metric approach, the behavior of the non-observable range of mode frequencies would imply, if it were not for invalidating the effective description of the approach, in a pre-inflationary phase dominated by radiation, which would delay and shorten the inflationary phase.

Another important framework is the closed/deformed algebra approach [37, 38]. In the deformed algebra approach, no knowledge of underlying quantum theory is required. It is based on the effective constraints arising from the quantum corrections (either inverse triad or holonomy connections) and the requirement that the effective constraint algebra be closed after the quantum corrections are taken into account. This anomaly-free condition helps the counterterms in the effective constraint and the resulting Poisson bracket of the scalar constraint with itself is deformed by a factor which is not present in the classical case. The same factor is also present in the quantum equations of motion for cosmological perturbations and lies at the center of the problem called *signature change*, which refers to the indication that the signature of space-time can effectively change

from Lorentzian to Euclidean at extremely high curvatures [38, 39]. The transition point between Lorentzian and Euclidean space-time leads to a state of silence, characterized by the vanishing speed of sound. This behavior can be interpreted as a decoupling of different space points [40]. This effect is basically due to the requirement of anomaly freedom, that is, to the necessity to have a closed/deformed algebra of quantum corrected effective constraints when holonomy corrections from loop quantum gravity are included (the situation is less clear when inverse-triad terms are also added).

Finally, in the separate universe approach [23, 24], the cosmological spacetime with small perturbations is discretized into a lattice and loop quantization is applied to each cell, which are assumed to be homogeneous and non-interacting with each other. In this way, the dynamics of cosmological perturbations can be approximated by the effective equations when the wave functions in each cell is sharply peaked. Although up to now this is the only approach that performs loop quantization to both background and perturbations at the same time, the results are applicable only to the infrared (IR) modes, ignoring short-wavelength perturbations. For this reason, we do not address this approach in this work.

An important open question in all of the above approaches concerns the choice of initial conditions for the evolution of the nonhomogeneities. Usually, in the traditional scenario, the initial data is provided at the onset of inflation or during the slow-roll regime. However, the situation is very different in LQC, since it is not clear where to set the initial conditions and whether a vacuum state can be defined at those points. This is one of the most important conceptual questions to be understood in such scenarios. As shown in Refs. [38, 41–48], in addition to the differences at the perturbative level, different choices of initial conditions can severely affect the duration of inflation in LQC.

While in the dressed metric and hybrid approaches the initial conditions are set either in the contracting phase or in the bounce, in the closed/deformed algebra approach the initial conditions must be set at the silent point, soon after the bounce. This state is the beginning of the Lorentzian phase in this approach, and, in some sense, the beginning of time [40]. As discussed in Ref. [38], this is the only known initial condition that can lead to a spectrum compatible with the observations in this approach. On the other hand, in the dressed metric and hybrid approaches, both the usual Bunch-Davis vacuum and adiabatic-like initial conditions for the perturbations at the bounce, or at the contracting phase, have been considered.

As mentioned before, most of the approaches in LQC relies on effective descriptions to provide more treatable equations for the nonhomogeneous sector. For such effective description to be valid, the backreaction of the modes gravitationally produced must be negligible. However, according to the Parker Gravitational Particle Production (GPP) mechanism [49, 50], a test scalar field  $\chi$ ,

<sup>1</sup> For a different treatment on the hybrid approach, which does not consider effective background equations, see, for example, Ref. [32].

evolving from a pre-bounce Minkowski vacuum state to a post-bounce different Minkowski vacuum state will develop a final state containing  $\chi$  particles, similarly to linear cosmological perturbations on the cosmological background. This effect is usually negligible in inflationary phases, but in a bounce phase the situation can be different [51–58]. In the dressed metric approach, the gravitational particle production was calculated in Ref. [36]. In that work it was shown that the relativistic particles gravitationally produced during the bounce would come to dominate the energy content of the Universe before inflation, which invalidates the test field approximation required in this approach. Motivated by this result, we revisit the particle production in the dressed metric approach and we also investigate whether the test field approximation is valid in the closed/deformed algebra and in the hybrid approaches. We proceed by comparing the energy density stored in particles gravitationally produced with the background energy density in each approach.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we describe the background dynamics of the LQC model with a kinetic dominated bounce. In Sec. III, we present the dynamics of the perturbative modes in the dressed metric, hybrid and deformed/closed algebra approaches and introduce the GPP mechanism. In Sec. IV, we present the results for the energy density of the particles produced in each case. Finally, our concluding remarks are presented in Sec. V.

## II. BACKGROUND MODEL

We consider LQC as our quantum background scenario, which provides GR in the classical regime and quantum corrected GR equations in the Planck regime. The scale factor  $a$  arises from the definition of a fixed fiducial cubic cell, whose volume is given by  $v = \mathcal{V}_0 a^3 m_{\text{Pl}}^2 / (2\pi\gamma)$ , where  $\mathcal{V}_0$  is the comoving volume of the fiducial cell,  $\gamma$  is the Barbero-Immirzi parameter of LQC and whose value we are going to consider is  $\gamma \simeq 0.2375$ , which comes from black hole's entropy calculations [59],  $m_{\text{Pl}} \equiv 1/\sqrt{G} = 1.22 \times 10^{19}$  GeV is the Planck mass and  $G$  is the Newtonian constant of gravitation. The conjugate momentum to  $v$  is denoted by  $b$  and it is given by  $b = -4\pi\gamma P_{(a)} / (3a^2 \mathcal{V}_0 m_{\text{Pl}}^2)$ , where  $P_{(a)}$  is the conjugate momentum to the scale factor.

The quantum Friedmann equation is the solution of the LQC effective equations, which reads [45]:

$$\frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{\dot{v}}{v} \right)^2 \equiv H^2 = \frac{\sin^2(2\lambda b)}{4\gamma^2 \lambda^2} = \frac{8\pi}{3m_{\text{Pl}}^2} \rho \left( 1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \right), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\lambda = (48\pi^2 \gamma^2 / m_{\text{Pl}}^4)^{1/4}$ ,  $b$  ranges over  $(0, \pi/\lambda)$ ,  $\rho$  is the energy density,  $\rho_c = 3m_{\text{Pl}}^2 / (8\pi\gamma^2 \lambda^2) \approx 0.41 m_{\text{Pl}}^4$  is the critical density in LQC and dots here denote derivatives with respect to the cosmic time. The energy density  $\rho$  relates to the LQC variable  $b$  through

$\rho = 3m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \sin^2(\lambda b) / (8\pi\gamma^2 \lambda^2)$ . For  $\rho \ll \rho_c$ , we recover GR as a classical limit. Due to quantum effects, the singularity is avoided in this model and a bounce phase is obtained when the energy density approaches the critical density. After the bounce, the Universe transits in to a decelerated expansion phase with a subsequent inflationary phase.

We consider a cosmological scenario in which the Universe is dominated by an homogeneous inflaton field, with a potential energy  $V(\phi)$  and the standard equation of motion,

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

We also consider in this set up an extra scalar field  $\chi$ , that only couples to  $\phi$  and to the Standard Model (SM) particles gravitationally, which behaves as a *spectator* field [15, 18, 60, 61]. This field will be produced gravitationally in the bounce phase and it is assumed to be dynamically relevant only in the post-bounce evolution, particularly in the pre-inflationary dynamics, where it might behave as radiation. Considering that  $\chi$  has a sufficiently small or negligible mass (compared, e.g., to  $H$  in the post-bounce phase),  $\chi$  behaves essentially as radiation during the whole pre-inflationary phase. The analysis of the GPP of a spectator scalar field  $\chi$  has already been considered in the dressed metric approach [15, 18, 60, 61] and in the hybrid approach [62]. The equation of motion of scalar perturbations and the scalar field equations are formally the same as the usual equations appearing in a classical spacetime in GR. We will later analyze the GPP associated with this scalar field  $\chi$ , now including other well motivated initial conditions and other approaches to treat perturbations in LQC, which can change considerably the results. Here we will follow an analysis similar to the one used in Ref. [36], which was originally applied to the dressed metric approach.

The evolution of the inflaton field can be parameterized by a barotropic fluid with equation of state  $p = \omega\rho$ . In LQC, the solution for the scale factor for single fluid reads (see, e.g., Ref. [63])

$$a(t) = a_B \left[ 1 + \frac{\gamma_B(1+\omega)^2}{4} \left( \frac{t}{t_{\text{Pl}}} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{3(1+\omega)}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\gamma_B \equiv 24\pi\rho_c/m_{\text{Pl}}^4 \simeq 30.9$  and  $t_{\text{Pl}} \equiv 1/m_{\text{Pl}}$  is the Planck time. The evolution until the end of inflation can be divided in the contracting phase, the bounce phase and the classical slow-roll phase. Below we summarize the results of Ref. [64] where a full computation of the background dynamics in each phase can be found. As an example, we consider in the following the chaotic model for the inflaton field. However, as we will see, the results for particle production in the dressed and hybrid approaches do not depend on the choice of the potential for the inflaton field, as the GPP happens mainly during the kinetic energy dominated bounce phase. However, we will see that to obtain results for the closed algebra

approach, they will explicitly involve the background dynamics after the bounce phase.

For later reference, let us briefly review below the background dynamics in LQC. We consider the chaotic quadratic inflaton potential  $V(\phi) = m^2 \phi^2/2$  as an example, although the overall description is not expected to change significantly for other form of potentials.

**a. Contracting Phase:** The scale factor in the classical contracting phase, written in terms of the conformal time  $\eta$  ( $dt = a d\eta$ ), follows the expression

$$a(\eta) = \lambda_0 \eta^2, \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_0 = \frac{a_{in} H_{in}^2}{4}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $a_{in}$  and  $H_{in}$  are the initial values for the scale factor and for the Hubble parameter, respectively.

There are two time scales in our original system of equations. One is given by  $1/m$ , associated with the classical evolution of the inflaton field. The other one is  $1/\sqrt{G\rho_c}$ , which is associated with the quantum regime. The ratio between these two timescales is defined by the quantity  $\Gamma$ ,

$$\Gamma = \frac{m}{\sqrt{24\pi G\rho_c}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\Gamma \ll 1$ . Here, we assume  $m = 10^{-6} m_{\text{Pl}}$ , as suggested by the observations. Since  $\rho_c = 0.41 m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ , this leads to  $\Gamma \sim 2 \times 10^{-7}$ . By also defining

$$x(t) \equiv \frac{m\phi}{\sqrt{2\rho_c}}, \quad y(t) \equiv \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\sqrt{2\rho_c}}, \quad (2.6)$$

in the classical contracting phase,  $x$  and  $y$  can be expressed as

$$x(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\rho(t)}{\rho_c}} \sin(mt + \theta_0), \quad (2.7)$$

$$y(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\rho(t)}{\rho_c}} \cos(mt + \theta_0). \quad (2.8)$$

When  $H \approx -m/3$ , the term proportional to  $H$  in Eq. (2.2) becomes dominant. It can be considered as the end of the pre-bounce contracting phase and the start of the bouncing phase. We denote the density at the end of the contracting phase by  $\rho_A$ , which is given by  $\rho_A = \Gamma^2 \rho_c$ , so that before the bounce phase starts, there are still no significant quantum effects.

**b. Bounce Phase:** We can define the starting of the bounce phase when  $\rho = \rho_A$ . At this time, the quantities  $x$  and  $y$  can be written as

$$x_A = \Gamma \sin \theta_A, \quad y_A = \Gamma \cos \theta_A. \quad (2.9)$$

The inflaton field kinetic energy dominates in the bounce phase and this phase is then like stiff matter, i.e., like a fluid with equation of state  $\omega \approx 1$ . From Eq. (2.9), one can see that we must have  $\cos \theta_A \sim 1$  due to the

kinetic energy domination in this phase. In particular, with ( $\omega \approx 1$ ) from Eq. (2.3), the scale factor reads

$$a(t) = a_B \left( 1 + \gamma_B \frac{t^2}{t_{\text{Pl}}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{6}}. \quad (2.10)$$

The evolution of the inflaton field in this phase is described by

$$\phi(t) = \phi_B \pm \frac{m_{\text{Pl}}}{2\sqrt{3}\pi} \text{arcsinh} \left( \sqrt{\gamma_B} \frac{t}{t_{\text{Pl}}} \right), \quad (2.11)$$

where the plus sign applies when  $\dot{\phi} > 0$  and the minus sign for  $\dot{\phi} < 0$ . The inflaton amplitude at the bounce,  $\phi_B$ , expressed in terms of the variable  $x_B$ , can be written as

$$x_B = x_A - \epsilon \Gamma \ln \left( \frac{1}{2} \Gamma \cos \theta_A \right), \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\epsilon \equiv \text{sgn}(\cos \theta_A)$ .

**c. Slow-Roll Phase:** When the slow-roll phase starts, in a time that we denote by  $t_{SR}$ , the energy density at this time is  $\rho \ll \rho_c$  and the Universe is already classical. The time of the beginning of this phase can be determined by solving  $\dot{\rho}(t_{SR}) = 0$ . This condition allows us to obtain the relation  $t_{SR} = t_B + f/m$ , where  $f$  is written in terms of the Lambert function  $W$ , which is the solution of  $z = W(z)e^{W(z)}$ , and its given by

$$f \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{W(z)}} \quad , \quad \text{with} \quad z = \frac{8}{\Gamma^2} \exp \left( \frac{2|x_B|}{\Gamma} \right). \quad (2.13)$$

For  $\cos \theta_A \sim 1$  and  $\Gamma = 2 \times 10^{-7}$  as we are considering, we have that  $f \sim 0.18$ .

At the time  $t_{SR}$  we have that [64]

$$x_{SR} = x_A - 2\epsilon \Gamma \ln \left( \frac{1}{2} \Gamma \sqrt{\frac{|\cos \theta_A|}{f}} \right). \quad (2.14)$$

Shortly after  $t_{SR}$ , one has that  $y_{SR} \equiv -\epsilon \Gamma$  and a very small slow-roll parameter is achieved, as expected, and its given by:

$$\epsilon_H = 3 \left| \frac{\Gamma}{x_{SR}} \right|^2, \quad (2.15)$$

which for the values of  $\Gamma$  and  $\cos \theta_A$  that we are using assumes the value  $\epsilon_H \sim 0.003$ .

The Hubble parameter in this phase is given by

$$H(t) = H_{SR} \left| 1 - \epsilon \frac{\Gamma}{x_{SR}} m(t - t_{SR}) \right|, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $H_{SR} = \sqrt{8\pi G\rho_c/3} |x_{SR}|$  (and  $a_{SR} = a_B \Gamma^{-1/3}$ ).

### III. SOLVING FOR THE QUANTUM FIELD MODES IN LQC

We are interested in how the GPP of an spectator scalar field  $\chi$  can affect the pre-inflationary phase of LQC for each approach and for the different initial conditions. In this section we will describe the mechanism of GPP for each approach within the framework of LQC.

The quantum fields are described using the standard procedure for classical spacetimes, but using techniques from LQG to incorporate quantum gravity effects [61], which are suitable to treat curvature and matter densities at the Planck scale. We first introduce each approach of LQC we are considering in this paper, highlighting the equations of motion for the Fourier modes of the spectator fields. In the sequence, we introduce the general details about the Parker mechanism for these fields, which has absent or negligible interactions to the other components of the Universe, except to gravity.

One very important aspect is that in order to have a solvable model, the usual procedure is to assume effective equations based on the supposition that quantum corrections due to fluctuations are small enough so that they have negligible influence on the evolution of expectation values. Including a significant backreaction would result that the evolution becomes more quantum, i.e., more dependent on how the quantum variables behave. As a consequence states can spread and deform from an initial Gaussian distribution. The backreaction results in changing the shape of a quantum state, which influences the motion of its expectation values. This effect is important for the long-term evolution of cosmology. Therefore, in order for the usual quantization scheme to be valid and to obtain a self-consistent solution in the effective description, we must assure that the energy density of perturbations is much smaller than the energy density of the background [60] ( $\rho_{\text{pert}}/\rho_{\text{bg}} \ll 1$ ) during the whole evolution. Either the backreaction is ignored in the effective equations, or we need to perform a full quantum gravity theory (for a further discussion on this aspect, see for example Ref. [65]).

Regarding the evolution of the spectator field, we work directly in terms of its Fourier  $k$ -modes  $\chi_k$ . The Fourier expansion of the field  $\chi$  in terms of the  $k$ -modes, in conformal time, reads

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}, \eta) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \left[ \chi_k(\eta) a_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + \chi_k^*(\eta) a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where  $a_{\mathbf{k}}$  and  $a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$  are the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, that satisfy the canonical commutation relation. In the following, we introduce the dynamics for the Fourier modes of the spectator field  $\chi_k$  in each LQC approach that we will be considering in this paper. This will later provide us with means to verify the test field supposition,  $\rho_{\text{pert}}/\rho_{\text{bg}} \ll 1$ .

#### A. Dressed Metric Approach

The effective equation of motion for the spectator field  $k$ -modes in the dressed metric approach reads [66]:

$$\chi_k''(\eta) + \left[ k^2 - \frac{a''(\eta)}{a(\eta)} + U_d(\eta) \right] \chi_k(\eta) = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $a''/a$  is given by [67]

$$\frac{a''}{a} = \frac{4\pi}{3m_{\text{Pl}}^2} a^2 \left[ \rho \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \right) - 3p \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \right) \right], \quad (3.3)$$

where  $p$  is the pressure density, prime here denotes derivative with respect to the conformal time and  $U_d(\eta)$  in Eq. (3.2) is given by  $U_d(\eta) = a^2(f^2 V(\phi) + 2fV_{,\phi}(\phi) + V_{,\phi\phi}(\phi))$  is the effective potential, with  $f \equiv \sqrt{2\pi G}(\phi'/a)/\sqrt{\rho}$ . In this approach, the variables  $a$ ,  $\eta$  and  $U(\eta)$  represent the quantum expectation values in the background state  $\Psi_0(a, \phi)$ . For sharply peaked background states, as adopted in the literature, the dressed effective quantities are well approximated by their peaked values  $a$ ,  $\eta$  and  $U_d(\eta)$ .

The effective potential  $U_d$  can be shown [41] to be negligible in the bounce and transition phases and it can then be neglected. Thus, the equation of motion in the bounce and transition phases can be simply be written as

$$\chi_k''(\eta) + \left[ k^2 - \frac{a''(\eta)}{a(\eta)} \right] \chi_k(\eta) = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $-a''(\eta)/a(\eta)$  corresponds to an effective square mass term for the modes.

From the scale factor, Eq. (2.10), we can define the characteristic momentum scale at the bounce,  $k_B = \sqrt{a''(t)/a(t)}|_{t=t_B} = \sqrt{\gamma_B/3} a_B m_{\text{Pl}}$ . The momentum  $k_B$  plays the role of the characteristic energy scale at the bounce in the dressed approach. It is also useful to define a characteristic length scale  $\lambda = \sqrt{a(t)/a''(t)}$ , which plays a role analogous to that of the comoving Hubble radius. Modes with  $k \gg k_B$  are always oscillatory and inside the radius. On the other hand, modes with  $k \approx k_B$  are well inside  $\lambda$  in the contracting phase, exit  $\lambda$  during the bounce phase and then enter again in the transition phase.

#### B. Hybrid Approach

The effective equation of motion for the spectator field modes in the hybrid approach is given by [22, 67]

$$\chi_k''(\eta) + \left[ k^2 - \frac{4\pi}{3m_{\text{Pl}}^2} a^2 (\rho - 3p) + \mathcal{U}_h(\eta) \right] \chi_k(\eta) = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

where the variables are the same ones described in the dressed metric approach, but now  $\mathcal{U}_h(\eta) = a^2 (V_{,\phi\phi} + 48\pi G V + 6a'\phi'V_{,\phi}/(a^3\rho) - 48\pi G V^2/\rho)$ . In

the bounce phase, where the gravitational particle production is more relevant, and up to the transition phase, the kinetic energy of the scalar field dominates the energy content of the Universe. In these regimes, we can neglect the contribution of  $\mathcal{U}_h(\eta)$  such that Eq. (3.5) becomes

$$\chi_k'' + \left[ k^2 - \frac{4\pi}{3m_{\text{Pl}}^2} a^2 (\rho - 3p) \right] \chi_k = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

with  $-4\pi a^2 (\rho - 3p) / (3m_{\text{Pl}}^2)$  corresponding to the effective square mass term for the modes in the hybrid case. Also, in the transition phase, the energy density drops down to about  $10^{-12} \rho_c$  [68],  $a''/a$  in Eq. (3.3) reduces to  $4\pi a^2 (\rho - 3p) / (3m_{\text{Pl}}^2)$  and we recover the standard expression of the Fourier modes, with the effective mass term as in Eq. (3.6).

Analogously to the dressed metric approach, we can also define a characteristic momentum scale in the hybrid approach, which reads  $k_H = k_B / \sqrt{3}$ . The modes behave similarly to the dressed metric approach, but now with respect to the characteristic momentum  $k_H$ , which is subtly different from  $k_B$ .

We can now draw a parallel between the hybrid and the dressed metric approaches regarding the impact of its quantization strategies in the evolution equations for the modes [67]. There are two main differences in the evolution equations. Firstly, the effective potential  $U(\eta)$  is different in each approach. However, since in the scenarios considered here these potentials can always be neglected in the relevant moments for GPP, it does not affect our results. Secondly, and most important, the effective mass term is different throughout the evolution in each approach.

These differences are due to the treatment of the phase space of the perturbed Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker cosmologies in each formalism. In the hybrid case, the whole phase space is treated as a symplectic manifold. The effective mass term is then expressed in terms of canonical variables. The expectation value of the operator representing this canonical expression is evaluated on trajectories described by the effective dynamics of LQC. On the other hand, in the dressed metric case, one does not have a global canonical symplectic structure on the truncated phase space. The effective mass in the dressed metric approach is evaluated on effective solutions to LQC. The difference between the dressed metric and hybrid approaches is explained in details in Ref. [67], for example.

Despite the differences between the two approaches, the procedure for obtaining the Bogouliubov coefficients in both approaches, which is relevant for the GPP, is basically the same. In both approaches one can realize that the equation of motion for  $\chi_k$  can be seen as analogous to a type of the Schrödinger-type equation with the effective mass terms in Eq. (3.4) and in Eq. (3.6) acting like a potential, which behaves as an effective barrier during the bouncing phase. This potential,  $\mathcal{V}(\eta) \equiv -m_{\text{eff}}^2(\eta)$  in each case, can be well approximated by a Pöschl-Teller potential at the bounce,

$$\mathcal{V}_{PT}(\eta) = \mathcal{V}_0 \cosh^{-2}[\alpha(\eta - \eta_B)], \quad (3.7)$$

for which we know the analytical solution. In the latter equation,  $\mathcal{V}_0$  is the height of the effective potential and the quantity  $-2\mathcal{V}_0\alpha^2$  is the curvature of the potential at its maximum. In the case of the dressed approach, the height  $\mathcal{V}_0$  can be obtained from the expression of  $a''/a$ , being equal to  $\mathcal{V}_0 = k_B = \alpha^2/6$ , while for the hybrid, the scale  $k_B$  is replaced by  $k_H$ . Hereafter, we use the notation  $k_{B/H}$  when we want to refer to the characteristic scale at the bounce in the dressed ( $k_B$ ) and hybrid approaches ( $k_H$ ), respectively.

The solution for  $\chi_k$ , both in the dressed and hybrid approaches, can be put in the form of the solution of a standard hypergeometric equation, which is given by [41]

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_k(\eta) = & a_k x^{ik/2\alpha} (1-x)^{-ik/2\alpha} \\ & \times {}_2F_1(a_1 - a_3 + 1, a_2 - a_3 + 1, 2 - a_3, x) \\ & + b_k [x(1-x)]^{-ik/2\alpha} {}_2F_1(a_1, a_2, a_3, x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where  $x \equiv x(\eta) = \{1 + \exp[-2\alpha(\eta - \eta_B)]\}^{-1}$ ,

$$a_1 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{32\pi\rho_c}{3\alpha^2}} \right) - \frac{ik}{\alpha}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$a_2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{32\pi\rho_c}{3\alpha^2}} \right) - \frac{ik}{\alpha}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$a_3 \equiv 1 - \frac{ik}{\alpha}, \quad (3.11)$$

and  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  are integration constants to be determined by the initial conditions.

### C. Closed/Deformed Algebra Approach

Within the framework of closed/deformed algebra approach, the effective equation of motion for the modes in Fourier space is given by [20, 21, 69]

$$\chi_k''(\eta) + W_{k,\text{eff}}^2(\eta) \chi_k(\eta) = 0, \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$W_{k,\text{eff}}^2(\eta) = \Omega(\eta) k^2 - \frac{z''(\eta)}{z(\eta)}, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\Omega \equiv 1 - \frac{2\rho}{\rho_c}. \quad (3.14)$$

When  $W_{k,\text{eff}}^2 < 0$ , the modes are outside the Hubble horizon and are decaying/growing modes, whereas for  $W_{k,\text{eff}}^2 > 0$  the modes are inside the Hubble horizon and are oscillatory.

In this approach, there is no effective potential  $U(\eta)$  like in the dressed metric and hybrid ones. However, we need to be careful with the factor  $\Omega$ , which change signs at  $\rho = \rho_c/2$ . The instant  $t = t_S$  when  $\rho = \rho_c/2$ , i.e.,  $\Omega = 0$ , is called the *silent point*. At  $t_S$  all the space points are uncorrelated [40]. According to the signature of  $\Omega$ , there are two distinctive regions: The Euclidean regime ( $\rho_c/2 < \rho < \rho_c$ ) and the Lorentzian regime ( $\rho < \rho_c/2$ ).

In order to avoid difficulties in the calculations in the Euclidean regime [70], it is usual to consider the modes only in the Lorentzian region, which means that  $t \geq t_S$ .

#### D. Gravitational Particle Production

Let us now consider the evolution of the Fourier modes  $\chi_k$  of the (here assumed) massless spectator scalar field  $\chi$ , whose equation of motion represent a set of uncoupled oscillators with time variable frequency. Due to the time variable frequency, we can define a different vacuum for each instant  $\eta$ . The effect of GPP was introduced by Parker [49, 50], who established conditions for the definition of a time dependent particle number  $n(\eta)$  and which are: (i) its vacuum expectation value varies slowly as possible with time as the expansion rate of the Universe is sufficiently slow and (ii) this expansion period must occur between two “Minkowskian” vacuum states. In the following we summarized the mathematical treatment of GPP.

The Hamiltonian for  $\chi_k(\eta)$  in terms of its Fourier modes is given by

$$H(\eta) = \int d^3k \left( 2E_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k + F_k^* \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_{-k} + F_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_{-k}^\dagger \right), \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$E_k(\eta) = \frac{1}{2} |\chi'_k(\eta)|^2 + \frac{\omega_k^2}{2} |\chi_k(\eta)|^2, \quad (3.16)$$

$$F_k(\eta) = \frac{1}{2} (\chi'_k(\eta))^2 + \frac{\omega_k^2}{2} (\chi_k(\eta))^2, \quad (3.17)$$

and  $\omega_k(\eta)$  is the frequency in the massless approximation for the  $\chi$  field. The diagonalized Hamiltonian is obtained by performing the following Bogoliubov transformation:

$$\hat{b}_k = \alpha_k(\eta) \hat{a}_k + \beta_k^*(\eta) \hat{a}_{-k}^\dagger, \quad (3.18)$$

where the Bogoliubov coefficients  $\alpha_k(\eta)$  and  $\beta_k(\eta)$  satisfy the constraint  $|\alpha_k(\eta)|^2 - |\beta_k(\eta)|^2 = 1$  due to the normalization of the modes. The diagonalized Hamiltonian results then to be given by

$$H(\eta) = \int d^3k \omega_k b_k^\dagger b_k, \quad (3.19)$$

and Eq. (3.16), for instance, becomes

$$E_k(\eta) = \omega_k \left[ \frac{1}{2} + |\beta_k(\eta)|^2 \right]. \quad (3.20)$$

Defining the vacuum states  $|0_{(a)}\rangle$  and  $|0_{(b)}\rangle$  such that  $a_k|0_{(a)}\rangle = b_k|0_{(b)}\rangle = 0$ , we can compute the expectation value of the number operator  $\hat{N}_k^{(b)} = b_k^\dagger b_k$  in the vacuum  $|0_{(a)}\rangle$ ,

$$n_k(\eta) = \langle {}_{(a)}0 | \hat{N}_k^{(b)} | {}_{(a)}0 \rangle = |\beta_k(\eta)|^2. \quad (3.21)$$

The quantity  $|\beta_k(\eta)|^2$  is interpreted as the particle number per mode. Therefore, from Eq. (3.20), we obtain

that  $E_k(\eta) = \omega_k [1/2 + n_k(\eta)]$  is the energy contribution due to GPP. The Bogoliubov coefficients relate the initial Minkowskian vacuum states  $\chi_k^{(i)}$  to the final ones  $\chi_k^{(f)}$ , such that

$$\chi_k^{(f)}(\eta) = \alpha_k \chi_k^{(i)}(\eta) + \beta_k \chi_k^{(i)*}(\eta). \quad (3.22)$$

When  $\beta_k = 0$  for all times, there is no particle production and the constraint  $|\alpha_k(\eta)|^2 - |\beta_k(\eta)|^2 = 1$  gives  $\alpha_k = 1$  and, then,  $\chi_k^{(i)} = \chi_k^{(f)}$  for the whole evolution.

From the definition of the particle number per mode, Eq. (3.21), we can obtain the total particle number density  $n_p(\eta)$  and the total energy density  $\rho_p(\eta)$  that are produced. The integrated total particle number density is given by

$$\begin{aligned} n_p(\eta) &= \frac{1}{a^3(\eta)L^3} \left( \frac{L}{2\pi} \right)^3 \int_0^\infty d^3k n_k(\eta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2 a^3(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^2 |\beta_k(\eta)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

whereas the total energy density  $\rho_p(\eta)$  is

$$\rho_p(\eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2 a^4(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^2 \omega_k |\beta_k(\eta)|^2. \quad (3.24)$$

Equations (3.23) and (3.24) give us the particle number density and the energy density associated with the particles that are gravitationally produced.

It is important to mention that Eq. (3.24) gives the net energy density produced between two Minkowskian vacuum states. On the other hand, we can also obtain the energy density of produced particles due to the GPP effect from the expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor of  $\chi$  field at any time  $\eta$ , which reads [71]

$$\rho_p^{\text{EM}}(\eta) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2 a^4(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^2 \left[ |\chi'_k(\eta)|^2 + \omega_k^2 |\chi_k(\eta)|^2 \right]. \quad (3.25)$$

Far from the bounce, when the expansion rate is negligible, the energy difference due to produced particles with respect to the initial vacuum reduces to Eq. (3.24). However, one needs to be careful when we are not sufficiently far from the bounce.

The Minkowskian initial condition imposed at contracting phase is called the Bunch-Davies (BD) vacuum [72]. Alternatively, it is also possible to impose an initial condition at the bounce, which is the fourth-order adiabatic vacuum state [73]. However, it must be noted that the quantum contributions computed with the BD vacuum initial condition and the fourth-order adiabatic vacuum one are the same only for the modes with  $k \geq k_B$  ( $k \geq k_H$ ) in the dressed metric (hybrid approach). For other modes, the fourth-order adiabatic vacuum state at the bounce is not applicable [41], while the BD vacuum

initial state can still be applied to these modes but in the contracting phase.

We can also mention other two types of initial conditions, which are the non oscillating vacuum [33, 74, 75] and the silent point vacuum [40]. The former relates to a method for minimizing the oscillations in the resulting power spectrum of perturbations, which can be considered in dressed and hybrid approaches, whereas the latter is particular to the closed/deformed algebra approach and it is necessary for its consistency.

Explicitly numerically solving for the mode equations given above is computationally intensive. This is particularly true in the regimes with rapidly-oscillating high-momentum modes. We need also handle the UV divergences that appear and then the particle production energy density needs to be renormalized appropriately. A typical approach is to use a Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) approximation for the modes to tackle these problems [76]. But even so, there are issues with both how to fix the upper limit for the momentum integrals and further issues in the infrared, which also demands to consider a lower limit for the momentum integrals when computing the total energy density due to GPP. This is also not free from ambiguities. It is important, thus, to have a computation as analytical as possible and in such ways one can overcome the above mentioned issues, but still having a reliable computation for the GPP. In the following section, we give approximate analytical solutions for the equations of motion for the scalar modes in each approach and from which we can estimate the GPP in appropriate ways.

#### IV. RESULTS

We present approximated analytical results for GPP in the dressed metric, hybrid and closed/deformed algebra approaches of LQC. To obtain these results, instead of fully computing the real-time backreaction effect of the particles produced in the background, we instead estimate the energy density stored in those after the bounce, and then compare the result with the background energy density. As we are going to see, these estimates are already sufficiently for a qualitative analysis. Later, we compare how the energy density of the produced particles redshifts with the scale factor in comparison with the behavior of the dominant background energy content. These results will help to gauge the validity of each of those approaches in LQC. We compute the energy density of gravitationally produced particles in each approach, which consists in computing the corresponding analytical expression for  $\beta_k$ .

##### 1. Dressed Metric Approach

From the results of Ref. [41], by matching the analytical solutions for the bounce phase within the Pöschl-

Teller potential approximation, the transition phase and the slow-roll phase, the Bogoliubov coefficients can be obtained and they are given by

$$\alpha_k = \sqrt{2k} \left[ a_k \frac{\Gamma(2-a_3)\Gamma(a_1+a_2-a_3)}{\Gamma(a_1-a_3+1)\Gamma(a_2-a_3+1)} + b_k \frac{\Gamma(a_3)\Gamma(a_1+a_2-a_3)}{\Gamma(a_1)\Gamma(a_2)} \right] e^{ik\eta_B}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\beta_k = \sqrt{2k} \left[ a_k \frac{\Gamma(2-a_3)\Gamma(a_3-a_1-a_2)}{\Gamma(1-a_1)\Gamma(1-a_2)} + b_k \frac{\Gamma(a_3)\Gamma(a_3-a_1-a_2)}{\Gamma(a_3-a_1)\Gamma(a_3-a_2)} \right] e^{-ik\eta_B}, \quad (4.2)$$

where the pairs  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$  and  $(a_k, b_k)$  are arbitrary constants at the bounce phase and slow-roll inflation solution for the  $k$ -modes, respectively, and  $\eta_B$  is the conformal time at the bounce. The Bogoliubov coefficients are determined when we impose initial conditions, i.e., choose  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ .

Assuming the absence of particles at the onset of inflation, one would impose that  $\alpha_k = 1$  and  $\beta_k = 0$ . However the value of  $\alpha_k$  and  $\beta_k$  must be obtained starting from vacuum initial conditions in the previous phases. Two different types of initial conditions were already considered in the literature [41], which are the aforementioned BD vacuum in the contracting phase [77] and the fourth-order adiabatic vacuum at the bounce [61], which are, respectively, given by

$$\chi_k^{(\text{BD})}(\eta) = \frac{1}{2k} e^{-ik\eta}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\chi_k^{(\text{WKB})}(\eta) = \frac{1}{2k} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_B^2}{k^2} - \frac{29}{32} \frac{k_B^4}{k^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k_B}{k}\right)^6 \right], \quad (4.4)$$

where  $k_B = \sqrt{\gamma_B/3} a_B m_{Pl}$  is the characteristic energy scale at the bounce in the dressed approach. The “WKB” in Eq. (4.4) refers to the WKB approximation, used to obtain this result. These initial conditions lead to the same results for GPP in the case considered here and as computed explicitly in Ref. [36]. Setting the previous initial conditions, it then follows from Eq. (4.2) that

$$|\beta_k|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right) \right] \text{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_B}\right). \quad (4.5)$$

The quantity  $|\beta_k|^2$  is the number of particles produced per mode  $k$ , namely  $n_k$ . Using this quantity, it was obtained in Ref. [36] the energy density of particles produced with and without backreaction. However, unlike the procedure used in that reference, here we are going to consider the contribution from all the modes for the density of produced particles, not only the modes that exits and reenter the effective horizon during the pre-inflationary phase. Note also that using all the modes is typically the procedure adopted in studies of GPP in general [76]. The produced modes are effectively considered as particles after they reenter the horizon. Therefore, the



energy density of the particles created is given by

$$\rho_p(\eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2 a^4(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^2 n_k(\eta) \omega_k, \quad (4.6)$$

Using  $n_k \equiv |\beta_k|^2$ , with  $|\beta_k|^2$  given by Eq. (4.5) and  $\omega_k \sim k$  for relativistic  $\chi$  particles, we obtain that

$$\rho_p(\eta) = \frac{1 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)}{4\pi^2 a^4(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^3 \operatorname{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_B}\right). \quad (4.7)$$

By performing the integration, Eq. (4.7) gives

$$\rho_p(\eta) \simeq 12.5 \times 10^{-3} \frac{k_B^4}{a^4(\eta)} \simeq 1.3 \frac{m_{\text{Pl}}^4}{a^4(\eta)}. \quad (4.8)$$

We are considering the case where the kinetic energy density of the inflaton is the dominant energy component at the bounce. Thus, the background energy evolves like stiff matter, with  $\rho_{bg} = \rho_c a^{-6}$ . On the other hand, the gravitationally produced particles evolve like relativistic matter, with  $\rho_p \propto a^{-4}$ . In a previous work [36], it was estimated that in order to remain subdominant up to the beginning of inflation, the energy density stored in the produced particles must satisfy the condition  $\rho(t_s) < 2 \times 10^{-5} m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ . The time  $t_s$ , when  $a''/a = 0$ , is when the maximum of GPP happens. This value was estimated by considering an equal amount of energy density in radiation and in the inflaton potential energy at the beginning of inflation, and then receding this radiation density backwards in time by multiplying it to  $a^4$  until the time  $t = t_s$ . By assuming  $a_B = 1$ , at the time  $t_s = 0.3t_{\text{Pl}}$ , the scale factor is found to be  $a(t_s) \approx 1.248$ . Thus, from Eq. 4.8 we can estimate that  $\rho_p(t_s) \approx 0.54 m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ . Therefore, we confirm that in the context of the dressed metric approach, the GPP density for relativistic  $\chi$  particles will eventually dominate the dynamics, which is inconsistent with the premise that backreaction must be small for the dressed metric approach to be valid and as far as the production of massless spectator scalar particles are concerned.

## 2. Hybrid Approach

The analytic form of the solutions and the matching conditions in the hybrid approach are analogous to the previous case (see Ref. [68] for more details). It is straightforward to obtain the Bogoliubov coefficients  $\alpha_k$  and  $\beta_k$  by matching the solutions in the bounce phase, transition phase and slow-roll phase, whose procedure follows similarly to that done for the dressed metric approach.

Considering the BD vacuum as the initial condition [43] the Bogoliubov coefficients then reads now

$$|\beta_k|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \cos\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right) \right] \operatorname{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_H}\right), \quad (4.9)$$

where, as already defined earlier,  $k_H = k_B/\sqrt{3}$  is the characteristic energy scale at the bounce in the hybrid approach. The quantum effects in both dressed metric and hybrid approaches effective equations are qualitatively the same [68], but exhibit two quantitative differences. These differences are the characteristic energy scales,  $k_B$  and  $k_H$ , and the numerical factor before the hyperbolic function in Eqs. (4.5) and (4.9). In addition, in the hybrid case we have a positive time-dependent effective mass as one approaches the bounce, while in the dressed metric case the time-dependent effective mass is negative when approaching the bounce and around it [67].

Quantitatively, by comparing Eq. (4.5) with Eq. (4.9), we notice that the only differences will be a factor of  $1/\sqrt{3}$  from the characteristic scale  $k_H$  as compared to  $k_B$ , in addition to the factor of  $\sqrt{5}$  in the cosine argument. Then, the corresponding expression to Eq. (4.7) in the hybrid approach is simply

$$\rho_p(\eta) = \frac{1 + \cos\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)}{4\pi^2 a^4(\eta)} \int_0^\infty dk k^3 \operatorname{csch}^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{\sqrt{6}k_H}\right). \quad (4.10)$$

Again, the integral is dominated by the UV limit and Eq. (4.10) gives

$$\rho_p(\eta) \simeq 6.5 \times 10^{-3} \frac{k_H^4}{a^4(\eta)} \simeq 7.5 \times 10^{-2} \frac{m_{\text{Pl}}^4}{a^4(\eta)}. \quad (4.11)$$

If we estimate the energy density stored in the particles produced only for the modes that exits and reenter the effective horizon  $\lambda$  during the pre-inflationary phase we obtain the value  $\rho_p(\eta) = 10^{-3} m_{\text{Pl}}^4/a^4(\eta)$ . Equation (4.11) is only defined for  $t \gtrsim t_s$ , when the modes are well inside the horizon to be considered as particles, and which is the moment when  $\rho_p$  assumes its highest value. From Eq. (4.11), we obtain that  $\rho(t_s) \approx 3.1 \times 10^{-2} m_{\text{Pl}}^4$  for the density of particles produced at  $t = t_s$ , which is approximately the instant that GPP ceases. As discussed previously, in order to remain subdominant up to the beginning of inflation, the energy density stored in the produced particles must satisfy the condition  $\rho_s < 2 \times 10^{-5} m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ . Despite we have shown through Eq. (4.11) that  $\rho_s$  is smaller than the corresponding quantity in the dressed metric approach, we can see that the condition required for the produced particles not to dominate the background energy density is still *not* satisfied in the hybrid approach as well. Analogously to what happens in the dressed approach, this invalidates the effective description usually considered in these approaches. as far as the production of massless spectator scalar particles are again involved.

Therefore, despite the difference in the maximum density of produced particles, the conclusions for the dressed and hybrid approach will be basically the same. In Ref. [74] (and more recently in Ref. [75]), another proposal was suggested to select the initial vacuum state. It consists in picking out the initial conditions for each mode in such a way that it minimizes the time variation of the amplitude of the spectator field modes from

the bounce to the beginning of inflation. As shown in Ref. [33], such “non-oscillating” initial conditions yield a primordial power spectrum where the large oscillations are not present. However, one can check that the number density of particles produced in this case, given by the quantity  $|\beta_k|^2$  will not change considerably in our framework, since they get rid of the oscillations by avoiding the fast oscillating term which we have already averaged out in our analysis above. Therefore, one should not expect that this method would prevent the excessive particle production. This motivates us to move further to the investigation of the particle production in another framework. In the next section we are going to consider the framework of the closed/deformed algebra approach, which consists in another way of treating the perturbations, possibly leading to different results.

### 3. Closed/Deformed Algebra Approach

Here we follow the same approach considered in the previous cases to obtain the parameter  $\beta_k$  in the closed algebra approach. However, this case is rather involved than the previous ones. This is due to the fact that the description of the propagation of the modes in the transition from the Lorentzian to the Euclidean phase is not so rigorous [40] due to the presence of the silent point. This is called the *signature change problem* [64, 70, 78, 79]. The solution to this problem is to impose the initial conditions for the modes at the silent point,  $t = t_s$ , in the Lorentzian phase after the bounce, where the signature changes from Euclidean to Lorentzian. In the silent point all points become uncorrelated, since the space-dependent term in the equation of motion for the modes drops out and the two-point function in this surface becomes zero. Therefore, after the silent point, in this approach, the modes  $\chi_k(\eta)$  obeys Eq. (3.12). Particularly, during the bouncing and transition phases, using the analytical approximations given by Eqs. (2.10) and (2.11), from Eq. (3.14) we obtain that

$$\Omega(\eta) = \frac{\tau^2 - 1}{\tau^2 + 1}, \quad (4.12)$$

where  $\tau = t/\tau_B$  [38].

We can obtain leading-order approximate solutions for the mode functions of Eq. (3.12) using the uniform asymptotic approximation (UAA) method [80, 81]. The complete evaluation of the solutions were presented in Ref. [38]. Here, we summarize the main steps for completeness. First, by appropriately changing variables, the mode equation can be expressed in the form

$$\frac{d^2 \chi_k(y)}{dy^2} = [g(y) + q(y)] \chi_k(y), \quad (4.13)$$

where  $y = -k\eta$  and the functions  $g$  and  $q$  are defined as

$$g(y) = \frac{1 - \tau^2}{1 + \tau^2} + \frac{\gamma_B}{4k^2\tau^2} + \frac{\gamma_B(18 + 21\tau^2 - \tau^4)}{9k^2\tau^2(\tau^2 + 1)^{5/3}}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$q(y) = -\frac{\gamma_B}{4k^2\tau^2}. \quad (4.15)$$

The analytical solution of Eq. (4.13) is found to be given by [38]

$$\chi_k(t) = \left(\frac{\xi}{g}\right)^{1/4} [a_k \text{Ai}(\xi) + b_k \text{Bi}(\xi)], \quad (4.16)$$

where  $\text{Ai}(\xi)$  and  $\text{Bi}(\xi)$  are the Airy functions of the first and second kind, respectively, and the parameter  $\xi$  is related to the function  $g$  through

$$\xi = \begin{cases} \left(-\frac{3k}{2} \int_{t_+}^t \frac{\sqrt{g}}{a} dt\right)^{2/3}, & t < t_+ \\ -\left(\frac{3k}{2} \int_{t_+}^t \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{a} dt\right)^{2/3}, & t > t_+ \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

where  $t_+$  is the turning point, where  $g(y) = 0$ . Also, the Wronskian condition implies that

$$\chi_k \dot{\chi}_k^* - \chi_k^* \dot{\chi}_k = i/a, \quad (4.18)$$

$$a_k b_k^* - a_k^* b_k = i\pi/k. \quad (4.19)$$

The qualitative behavior of  $g(y)$  remains the same for all modes, having only one turning point in the bouncing and transition phases for any  $k$ . However, the precise location of the turning point  $t_+$  depends on the co-moving wavenumber  $k$ .

Even though we cannot explicitly obtain the GPP in general from the above equations, we can still get a clear picture of GPP in the small and long wavelength approximations.

**a. The small wavelengths regime** In the transition phase,  $\xi(t)$  approaches to asymptotic negative infinity. In this region, the Airy functions assume their asymptotic form. Considering the previous definitions given above and together with the equation for the modes given by Eq. (4.16), we can then write the solution for the modes as

$$\chi_k(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}(-g)^{1/4}} \left\{ a_k \cos \left[ \frac{2}{3}(-\xi)^{3/2} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right] + b_k \sin \left[ \frac{2}{3}(-\xi)^{3/2} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \right\}. \quad (4.20)$$

After some algebra, it is possible to show that Eq. (4.20) can be put in the form

$$\chi_k = \frac{e^{-i\pi/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} (a_k - ib_k) e^{ik(\eta - \eta_{\text{TB}})} + (ia_k - b_k) e^{-ik(\eta - \eta_{\text{TB}})}. \quad (4.21)$$

On the other hand, in the transition phase, as the horizon goes to negative infinity, the equation of motion for the modes reduces to

$$\chi_k'' + k^2 \chi_k = 0, \quad (4.22)$$

whose solution is

$$\chi_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}(\tilde{\alpha}_k e^{-ik\eta} + \tilde{\beta}_k e^{ik\eta}). \quad (4.23)$$

By comparing Eqs. (4.21) and (4.23), we can match the two sets of integration constants, which allows us to obtain the coefficients in the UV limit,

$$\alpha_k = \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}(ia_k - b_k)e^{ik\eta_{\text{FB}} - i\pi/4}, \quad (4.24)$$

$$\beta_k = \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}(a_k - ib_k)e^{-ik\eta_{\text{FB}} - i\pi/4}, \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$\eta_{\text{FB}} = \eta_f - \int_{\eta_+}^{\eta_f} \sqrt{-g(\eta)} d\eta. \quad (4.26)$$

The coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  are obtained by matching the power spectrum to the one given by GR. This is possible because in the regime that we are interested, the equation of motion for the spectator field modes  $\chi_k$  has the same behavior as the equation of motion of the inflaton field and of the curvature perturbations, which are basically due to the inflaton fluctuations. Therefore, the dynamics of the modes we are computing here must not present divergences, since those would be translated to divergences in the power spectrum. In order to define a behavior for the scalar modes that can be consistent with the observations in the closed algebra approach, we will interpret such modes analogously to the ones which will enter in the expression for the power spectrum of the model. Its possible to show that the only possible initial condition that allows a compatibility of the power spectrum with the current CMB data is given by (for details, see, e.g., Ref. [38])

$$a_k = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2k}} \quad , \quad b_k = -i\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2k}}. \quad (4.27)$$

These coefficients lead to a spectrum equal to the classical GR result in the observational window (the observed modes in CMB correspond to the UV limit). By inserting these coefficients in Eq. (4.24), we obtain that

$$\alpha_k = ie^{i(k\eta_{\text{FB}} - \pi/4)} \quad , \quad \beta_k = 0. \quad (4.28)$$

Any other initial condition implies in a correction term (with respect to GR spectrum) proportional to the wavenumber, which leads to a divergent spectrum in the UV. We can see from the above expressions that  $|\alpha_k|^2 = 1$ , which is consistent with the condition  $|\alpha_k|^2 - |\beta_k|^2 = 1$ . This corresponds exactly to the classical case in GR. As the parameter  $|\beta_k|^2 = 0$ , this implies in no gravitational particle production in the UV limit of this model. Therefore, in this framework, from the UV modes with such initial conditions (the only ones that do not produce divergences), we see no particle production in any scenario that provides a power spectrum consistent with the data. However, as discussed in Ref. [38], in the planckian UV

regime, new ingredients are expected to take place, as modified dispersion relations, for example, which could avoid possible divergences or even change the behavior of the modes. In the absence of a definite model for this regime, we are instead going to focus in the case of IR modes in order to check whether some considerably energy density can be gravitationally produced in this regime. Since in the UV regime either we have no particle production, or otherwise a new physics would be coming into play, the lack of information required to obtain definite results from the UV regime motivates us to re-discuss the possible initial conditions in the context of the IR modes. In the following we discuss the behavior of such modes.

**b. Long wavelengths regime** In the IR regime,  $k < m_{\text{Pl}}$ , through the bounce and transition phases the equation for the modes is found to have the solution

$$\chi_k(\eta) = a_k z(\eta) + b_k z(\eta) \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_{\text{end}}} \frac{d\eta'}{z^2(\eta')} + \mathcal{O}(k^2), \quad (4.29)$$

where  $\eta_*$  denotes some particular reference time. It can be shown that this result leads to the following IR limit of the power spectrum [64],

$$P^{IR} \approx \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} \left| b_k \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_{\text{end}}} \frac{d\eta'}{z^2(\eta')} \right|^2. \quad (4.30)$$

Here, we are going to consider initial conditions (i.e., the expressions for  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ ) that lead to a spectrum in agreement to what we observe. Starting from Eq. (4.30), we can consider different approaches that set the initial conditions at the vicinity of the silent point. The choice of the vicinity of the silent point to set the initial conditions is justified in order to avoid the complications arising from the signature change near the bounce. The calculations in the IR regime are based on the fact that there exist analytical solutions of the mode function equations when the term  $k^2$  is ignored. Let us first write a more general parametrization to the coefficients,

$$a_k \equiv a_0 k^n, \quad b_k \equiv b_0 e^{-i\theta} k^l, \quad (4.31)$$

where  $\theta$  is the relative phase between  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ . Besides,  $a_0$  and  $b_0$  are both positive and independent of  $k$ , and have dimensions of  $m_{\text{Pl}}^{-2n}$  and  $m_{\text{Pl}}^{-2l}$  respectively. The quantities  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  satisfy the Wronskian condition,

$$a_k b_k^* - a_k^* b_k = i. \quad (4.32)$$

Considering the parametrization given by Eq. (4.31), the above condition implies in

$$2a_0 b_0 \sin(\theta) = 1, \quad n + l = 0. \quad (4.33)$$

Therefore, we can see that the only initial condition that can lead to a scale invariant spectrum is:

$$a_k \propto k^{3/2}, \quad b_k \propto k^{-3/2}, \quad (4.34)$$

and it implies in scale invariance at any time until the end of the slow-roll phase, since in the IR regime the

term proportional to  $b_k$  in Eq. ((4.29)) will be dominant. The term  $b_k$  can be obtained by matching the solution for the modes in the contracting and the bounce phase. It is straightforward to show that  $b_k = (3i/\sqrt{2})\lambda_0 k^{-3/2}$  (see, e.g., Ref. [64] for further details).

By comparing the expression given by Eq. (4.30) with the GR spectrum we can identify that

$$P^{IR} \approx \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} |b_k|^2 \left( \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_{\text{end}}} \frac{d\eta'}{z^2(\eta)} \right)^2 = P_{GR} |\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2 \approx 2.2 \times 10^{-9} |\alpha_k + \beta_k|^2. \quad (4.35)$$

Despite the initial conditions are related to the Bogoliubov coefficients through Eq. (4.35), it is not possible to identify which contribution corresponds specifically to  $\beta_k$ , which enter in the expression of the particle production. However, the above equation allows us to establish an upper limit in  $\beta_k$ . Taking into account the well known property  $|\alpha_k + \beta_k| \lesssim |\alpha_k| + |\beta_k|$  and remembering the normalization condition  $|\alpha_k|^2 - |\beta_k|^2 = 1$ , we can show that

$$|\alpha_k + \beta_k| \lesssim |\alpha_k| + |\beta_k| \lesssim 1 + 2|\beta_k|. \quad (4.36)$$

Therefore, from Eq. (4.35) we obtain the limit

$$|\beta_k|^2 \lesssim \frac{\lambda_0^2 \times 10^9}{\pi^2} \left| \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_{\text{end}}} \frac{d\eta'}{z^2(\eta)} \right|^2, \quad (4.37)$$

where  $\eta_{\text{end}}$  is the value of  $\eta$  at the end of inflation and  $z(\eta) = a\dot{\phi}/H$ . In the above equation, we made use of Eq. (4.35) and that  $b_k = (3i/\sqrt{2})\lambda_0 k^{-3/2}$ . The integral in Eq. (4.37) depends only on the background, being independent of  $k$ . At this point it is important to stress that while we have argued that it can be meaningless to define two-point correlation functions before the silent point, concerning the background there is in fact no problem in starting the initial conditions in the contracting phase. This was done in Ref. [38] and we will consider the same here. In this case, for the background dynamics we can consider the evolution presented in Sec. II. During slow-roll inflation, when the spectrum is computed, we have that  $z(\eta)^2 = 2a^2\epsilon$ , being  $\epsilon$  the slow-roll parameter given by  $\epsilon \simeq \dot{\phi}^2/(2H^2)$  during inflation. Therefore, from now on we can consider the approximation  $z(\eta) \approx a(\eta)\sqrt{4\pi/(3m_{\text{Pl}}^2)}$ . Therefore, the integration in Eq. (4.37) can be computed using Eq. (2.16). This procedure leads in particular to the result

$$I(\eta_e) \equiv \int_{\eta_*}^{\eta_{\text{end}}} \frac{d\eta'}{a^2(\eta)} = \frac{-m}{18\lambda_0} \frac{1}{|\cos\theta_A|} \ln \left( \frac{1}{2} \Gamma \sqrt{\frac{|\cos\theta_A|}{f}} \right). \quad (4.38)$$

In the above expression we can use the values  $m = 10^{-6}m_{\text{Pl}}$ ,  $\Gamma = 2 \times 10^{-7}$ ,  $f \approx 0.18$ ,  $\lambda_0 = a_{\text{in}}H_{\text{in}}^2/4$  and  $\cos\theta_A \approx 1$ , as obtained and discussed in Sec. II. One must remember that  $\Gamma$  is the ratio between timescales as defined in Eq. (2.5), while the quantity  $\Gamma \cos\theta_A$  corresponds to the value of  $y$  at the onset of the bounce phase.

The quantity  $f$  is associated with the time of the beginning of the slow-roll phase, since  $t_{SR} = t_B + f/m$  with  $f$  defined in Eq. (2.13). With such values, we obtain the following result, we obtain that Eq. (4.38) is estimated to be  $I(\eta_e) \sim 10^{-6}/\lambda_0$ . Therefore, using the expression for  $b_k$ , Eq. (4.37) becomes

$$|\beta_k|^2 \lesssim \frac{\lambda_0^2 \times 10^9}{\pi^2} \frac{I(\eta_e)^2}{16} \approx 10^{-5}. \quad (4.39)$$

By substituting  $|\beta_k|^2$  from the equation above in Eq. (4.6), we obtain the following expression for the estimated upper limit on the density of particles gravitationally produced,

$$\rho_p \lesssim \frac{10^{-5}}{2\pi^2 a^4} \int_0^{m_{\text{Pl}}} dk k^3 \approx \frac{10^{-6}}{a^4} m_{\text{Pl}}^4, \quad (4.40)$$

where we only have integrated modes with  $k \lesssim m_{\text{Pl}}$  since we are restricted to the IR limit. In the latter equation, we have considered  $\omega_k(\eta) \approx \sqrt{\Omega(\eta)} k$ , since the modes only contribute to the density of particles after they are well inside the effective horizon. Also, we see that the expression of  $\omega_k$  has a correction factor in the closed algebra approach (see Eqs. (3.13) and (3.14)), which is given by  $\Omega(\eta) = 1 - 2\rho/\rho_c$ . In the silent point we have  $\Omega = 0$ , and after that  $\Omega(\eta)$  increases until it reaches the value  $\Omega = 1$ , when  $\rho \ll \rho_c$ . Since  $\Omega(\eta)$  does not depend on  $k$ , we simply consider its upper limit  $\Omega = 1$  in the above equation, since we want to obtain an upper limit for the density of produced particles. The fact that  $\Omega$  is zero at the silent point and then increases means that in fact the particles start being produced right after the silent point. Since the particles produced behave as radiation, its energy density will then evolve as

$$\rho_p = \rho_s a^{-4}, \quad (4.41)$$

where  $\rho_s$  is the density of particles produced right after the silent point. By comparing it with Eq. (4.40), we can see that:

$$\rho_s \lesssim 10^{-6} m_{\text{Pl}}^4, \quad (4.42)$$

which is right after the silent point, when the important modes are already inside the horizon. In order to know if the produced particles will not dominate the energy content of the Universe before inflation, we must compare the density of particles produced,  $\rho_p$ , with the background energy density,  $\rho_{bg}$ , at the beginning of inflation. Unlike the particles produced, which behave as radiation,  $\rho_p = \rho_s a^{-4}$ , the background energy density, on the other hand, evolves as stiff matter,  $\rho_{bg} = \rho_c a^{-6}$ , before inflation sets in. Therefore, in order for the density of produced particles not to come to dominate before the onset of inflation, we must have the following condition satisfied,

$$\rho_s a^{-4} < \rho_c a^{-6},$$

and which must be satisfied in the beginning of inflation. The value of the scale factor in the beginning of inflation

depends on the value of some parameters associated with the initial conditions. However, since the evolution of the background is the same in all approaches, based in previous works (see, e.g., Refs. [47, 48] for example) we can estimate an amount of 4 to 5 e-folds of pre-inflationary expansion (from the bounce to the beginning of inflation). In the case of 4 pre-inflationary e-folds, we have that in the onset of inflation  $a_{\text{infl}} \sim 55$ . We can consider that near the silent point  $\rho_s = \rho_c/2 \sim \rho_c a_s^{-6}$ , which leads to  $a_s^{-6} \sim 1/2$  and, consequently,  $a_s^6 \sim 2$ . Therefore, it is a good approximation to consider  $a_s \approx 1$ . Considering this value, the condition for the produced particles not to come to dominate can be written as  $\rho_s \lesssim 10^{-4} m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ . Since Eq. (4.42) shows that  $\rho_s \sim 10^{-6} m_{\text{Pl}}^4$ , we can safely conclude that the particles gravitationally produced will not dominate the background energy density before inflation in the deformed algebra approach. This proves that the test field approximation is consistently valid in this approach with this choice of initial conditions, unlike in the hybrid and dressed approaches.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Giving the importance of the effective description of LQC in providing means to obtain the relevant cosmological quantities, it is of utmost importance to further analyze the validity of such description. Motivated by the results obtained in a previous work [36], we extended the analysis of the backreaction from gravitational particle production to other approaches.

Firstly, for the hybrid approach, we obtain a result similar to the case of the dressed metric one, where the energy density stored in the particles produced during the bounce phase dominates the energy content of the Universe prior to inflation. Therefore, if we extend the validity of the effective description beyond the test field approximation, this would imply in a pre-inflationary radiation dominated phase in these scenarios. This scenario would be similar to a model of including the radiation effects in LQC, as studied in Ref. [47]. A radiation dominated phase in the earlier stages of expansion in these scenarios tends to imply in a small delay in the beginning of the inflationary phase in such models. Also, the backreaction effect leads to a state significantly different from the BD vacuum at the onset of inflation. Indeed,

radiation has been claimed to be an important ingredient in setting appropriate initial conditions for inflation (see, e.g., Ref. [82] for a further discussion). However, since one should not expect that the dressed metric and hybrid approaches should be self-consistent in this regime, our analysis actually put in check the validity of these approaches with the initial conditions considered.

On the other hand, in the case of the closed algebra approach, we obtain that the process of gravitational particle production leads to a negligible backreaction effect. The energy stored in the produced particles are very small compared to the energy density of the background all the way up to the onset of inflation. This result was obtained by considering initial conditions in the vicinity of the silent point, which is justified in order to avoid complications arising from the signature change near the bounce. Our result corroborates the validity of the test field approximation in this framework, showing the robustness of the effective description of LQC in the closed algebra approach. Nevertheless we must point out that this result is strictly related to the initial conditions which are chosen in such a way that guarantee the consistency of the model with CMB data. Any dynamics that could lead to significant particle production in this scenario would imply in a divergent power spectrum.

In order to further confirm the analytical results obtained here, it would be important to perform a numerical analysis capable of including the backreaction effects of the particles in the background simultaneously to its production. This will be done in a future work.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank A. Wang for the useful discussions. R.O.R. is partially supported by research grants from CNPq, Grant No. 307286/2021-5, and from FAPERJ, Grant No. E-26/201.150/2021. L.L.G is supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), under the Grant No. 307052/2019-2, and by the Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ), Grant No. E-26/201.297/2021. L.L.G. would like to thank the Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (IPMU) for the kind hospitality.

- 
- [1] R. H. Brandenberger, Inflationary cosmology: Progress and problems, [arXiv:hep-ph/9910410 [hep-ph]].
  - [2] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck], Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A10 (2020) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833887 [arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [3] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020) [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652**, C4 (2021)]

- doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] D. Baumann, Inflation, doi:10.1142/9789814327183\_0010 [arXiv:0907.5424 [hep-th]].
- [5] M. Bojowald, Absence of singularity in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5227-5230 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5227 [arXiv:gr-qc/0102069 [gr-qc]].

- [6] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawłowski and P. Singh, Quantum nature of the big bang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 141301 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.141301 [arXiv:gr-qc/0602086 [gr-qc]].
- [7] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawłowski and P. Singh, Quantum Nature of the Big Bang: An Analytical and Numerical Investigation. I., *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 124038 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.124038 [arXiv:gr-qc/0604013 [gr-qc]].
- [8] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawłowski and P. Singh, Quantum Nature of the Big Bang: Improved dynamics, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 084003 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.084003 [arXiv:gr-qc/0607039 [gr-qc]].
- [9] A. Ashtekar, A. Corichi and P. Singh, Robustness of key features of loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 024046 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.024046 [arXiv:0710.3565 [gr-qc]].
- [10] P. Singh, Are loop quantum cosmos never singular?, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 125005 (2009) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/26/12/125005 [arXiv:0901.2750 [gr-qc]].
- [11] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawłowski, P. Singh and K. Vandersloot, Loop quantum cosmology of  $k=1$  FRW models, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 024035 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.024035 [arXiv:gr-qc/0612104 [gr-qc]].
- [12] L. Szulc, W. Kaminski and J. Lewandowski, Closed FRW model in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 2621-2636 (2007) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/24/10/008 [arXiv:gr-qc/0612101 [gr-qc]].
- [13] A. Ashtekar and P. Singh, Loop Quantum Cosmology: A Status Report, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28**, 213001 (2011) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/28/21/213001 [arXiv:1108.0893 [gr-qc]].
- [14] A. Barrau, T. Cailleteau, J. Grain and J. Mielczarek, Observational issues in loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 053001 (2014) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/31/5/053001 [arXiv:1309.6896 [gr-qc]].
- [15] A. Ashtekar, W. Kaminski and J. Lewandowski, Quantum field theory on a cosmological, quantum space-time, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 064030 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.064030 [arXiv:0901.0933 [gr-qc]].
- [16] I. Agullo and P. Singh, Loop Quantum Cosmology, doi:10.1142/9789813220003\_0007 [arXiv:1612.01236 [gr-qc]].
- [17] A. Ashtekar and A. Barrau, Loop quantum cosmology: From pre-inflationary dynamics to observations, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, no.23, 234001 (2015) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/32/23/234001 [arXiv:1504.07559 [gr-qc]].
- [18] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar and W. Nelson, A Quantum Gravity Extension of the Inflationary Scenario, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 251301 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.251301 [arXiv:1209.1609 [gr-qc]].
- [19] M. Benetti, L. Graef and R. O. Ramos, Observational Constraints on Warm Inflation in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *JCAP* **10**, 066 (2019) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/10/066 [arXiv:1907.03633 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] M. Bojowald, G. M. Hossain, M. Kagan and S. Shankaranarayanan, Anomaly freedom in perturbative loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 063547 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.063547 [arXiv:0806.3929 [gr-qc]].
- [21] T. Cailleteau, J. Mielczarek, A. Barrau and J. Grain, Anomaly-free scalar perturbations with holonomy corrections in loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29**, 095010 (2012) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/29/9/095010 [arXiv:1111.3535 [gr-qc]].
- [22] M. Fernandez-Mendez, G. A. Mena Marugan and J. Olmedo, Hybrid quantization of an inflationary universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 024003 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.024003 [arXiv:1205.1917 [gr-qc]].
- [23] E. Wilson-Ewing, Separate universes in loop quantum cosmology: framework and applications, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25**, no.08, 1642002 (2016) doi:10.1142/S0218271816420025 [arXiv:1512.05743 [gr-qc]].
- [24] E. Wilson-Ewing, Testing loop quantum cosmology, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **18**, 207-225 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.crhy.2017.02.004 [arXiv:1612.04551 [gr-qc]].
- [25] L. C. Gomar, M. Fernández-Méndez, G. A. M. Marugán and J. Olmedo, Cosmological perturbations in Hybrid Loop Quantum Cosmology: Mukhanov-Sasaki variables, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.6, 064015 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.064015 [arXiv:1407.0998 [gr-qc]].
- [26] M. Martin-Benito, L. J. Garay and G. A. Mena Marugan, Hybrid Quantum Gowdy Cosmology: Combining Loop and Fock Quantizations, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 083516 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.083516 [arXiv:0804.1098 [gr-qc]].
- [27] G. A. Mena Marugan and M. Martin-Benito, Hybrid Quantum Cosmology: Combining Loop and Fock Quantizations, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **24**, 2820-2838 (2009) doi:10.1142/S0217751X09046187 [arXiv:0907.3797 [gr-qc]].
- [28] L. J. Garay, M. Martin-Benito and G. A. Mena Marugan, Inhomogeneous Loop Quantum Cosmology: Hybrid Quantization of the Gowdy Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 044048 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.044048 [arXiv:1005.5654 [gr-qc]].
- [29] M. Martin-Benito, G. A. M. Marugan and E. Wilson-Ewing, Hybrid Quantization: From Bianchi I to the Gowdy Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 084012 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.084012 [arXiv:1006.2369 [gr-qc]].
- [30] D. Brizuela, G. A. D. Mena Marugan and T. Pawłowski, Big Bounce and inhomogeneities, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 052001 (2010) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/27/5/052001 [arXiv:0902.0697 [gr-qc]].
- [31] B. F. Li, J. Olmedo, P. Singh and A. Wang, Primordial scalar power spectrum from the hybrid approach in loop cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 126025 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.126025 [arXiv:2008.09135 [gr-qc]].
- [32] L. C. Gomar, M. Martín-Benito and G. A. M. Marugán, Gauge-Invariant Perturbations in Hybrid Quantum Cosmology, *JCAP* **06**, 045 (2015) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/06/045 [arXiv:1503.03907 [gr-qc]].
- [33] L. Castelló Gomar, G. A. Mena Marugán, D. Martín De Blas and J. Olmedo, Hybrid loop quantum cosmology and predictions for the cosmic microwave background, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.10, 103528 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.103528 [arXiv:1702.06036 [gr-qc]].

- [34] B. F. Li, P. Singh and A. Wang, Genericness of pre-inflationary dynamics and probability of the desired slow-roll inflation in modified loop quantum cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.6, 063513 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.063513 [arXiv:1906.01001 [gr-qc]].
- [35] B. F. Li, P. Singh and A. Wang, Qualitative dynamics and inflationary attractors in loop cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.6, 066016 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.066016 [arXiv:1807.05236 [gr-qc]].
- [36] L. L. Graef, R. O. Ramos and G. S. Vicente, Gravitational particle production in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.4, 043518 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.043518 [arXiv:2007.02395 [gr-qc]].
- [37] A. Barrau, Testing different approaches to quantum gravity with cosmology: An overview, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **18**, no.3-4, 189-199 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.crhy.2017.05.001 [arXiv:1705.01597 [gr-qc]].
- [38] B. F. Li, T. Zhu, A. Wang, K. Kirsten, G. Cleaver and Q. Sheng, Preinflationary perturbations from the closed algebra approach in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no.10, 103536 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.103536 [arXiv:1812.11191 [gr-qc]].
- [39] S. Schander, A. Barrau, B. Bolliet, L. Linsefors, J. Mielczarek and J. Grain, Primordial scalar power spectrum from the Euclidean Big Bounce, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no.2, 023531 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.023531 [arXiv:1508.06786 [gr-qc]].
- [40] J. Mielczarek, L. Linsefors and A. Barrau, Silent initial conditions for cosmological perturbations with a change of spacetime signature, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **27**, no.05, 1850050 (2018) doi:10.1142/S0218271818500505 [arXiv:1411.0272 [gr-qc]].
- [41] T. Zhu, A. Wang, G. Cleaver, K. Kirsten and Q. Sheng, Pre-inflationary universe in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.8, 083520 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.083520 [arXiv:1705.07544 [gr-qc]].
- [42] L. Linsefors and A. Barrau, Duration of inflation and conditions at the bounce as a prediction of effective isotropic loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no.12, 123509 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.123509 [arXiv:1301.1264 [gr-qc]].
- [43] K. Martineau, A. Barrau and S. Schander, Detailed investigation of the duration of inflation in loop quantum cosmology for a Bianchi-I universe with different inflation potentials and initial conditions, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.8, 083507 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.083507 [arXiv:1701.02703 [gr-qc]].
- [44] B. Bolliet, A. Barrau, K. Martineau and F. Moulin, Some Clarifications on the Duration of Inflation in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **34**, no.14, 145003 (2017) doi:10.1088/1361-6382/aa7779 [arXiv:1701.02282 [gr-qc]].
- [45] A. Ashtekar and D. Sloan, Probability of Inflation in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **43**, 3619-3655 (2011) doi:10.1007/s10714-011-1246-y [arXiv:1103.2475 [gr-qc]].
- [46] L. L. Graef and R. O. Ramos, Probability of Warm Inflation in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.2, 023531 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.023531 [arXiv:1805.05985 [gr-qc]].
- [47] L. N. Barboza, L. L. Graef and R. O. Ramos, Warm bounce in loop quantum cosmology and the prediction for the duration of inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.10, 103521 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103521 [arXiv:2009.13587 [gr-qc]].
- [48] L. N. Barboza, G. L. L. W. Levy, L. L. Graef and R. O. Ramos, Constraining the Barbero-Immirzi parameter from the duration of inflation in Loop Quantum Cosmology, [arXiv:2206.14881 [gr-qc]].
- [49] L. Parker, Particle creation in expanding universes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 562-564 (1968) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.21.562
- [50] L. Parker, Quantized fields and particle creation in expanding universes. 1., *Phys. Rev.* **183**, 1057-1068 (1969) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.183.1057
- [51] J. Quintin, Y. F. Cai and R. H. Brandenberger, Matter creation in a nonsingular bouncing cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.6, 063507 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.063507 [arXiv:1406.6049 [gr-qc]].
- [52] Y. Tavakoli and J. C. Fabris, Creation of particles in a cyclic universe driven by loop quantum cosmology, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24**, no.08, 1550062 (2015) doi:10.1142/S0218271815500625 [arXiv:1412.0775 [gr-qc]].
- [53] J. Haro and E. Elizalde, Gravitational particle production in bouncing cosmologies, *JCAP* **10**, 028 (2015) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/10/028 [arXiv:1505.07948 [gr-qc]].
- [54] D. C. F. Celani, N. Pinto-Neto and S. D. P. Viteni, Particle Creation in Bouncing Cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.2, 023523 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.023523 [arXiv:1610.04933 [gr-qc]].
- [55] A. Scardua, L. F. Guimarães, N. Pinto-Neto and G. S. Vicente, Fermion Production in Bouncing Cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.8, 083505 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.083505 [arXiv:1807.06118 [gr-qc]].
- [56] F. Zago and A. Kosowsky, Quantum particle production effects on the cosmic expansion, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.4, 045023 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.045023 [arXiv:1811.02697 [gr-qc]].
- [57] W. S. Hipolito-Ricaldi, R. Brandenberger, E. G. M. Ferreira and L. L. Graef, Particle Production in Ekpyrotic Scenarios, *JCAP* **11**, 024 (2016) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/11/024 [arXiv:1605.04670 [hep-th]].
- [58] L. L. Graef, W. S. Hipolito-Ricaldi, E. G. M. Ferreira and R. Brandenberger, Dynamics of Cosmological Perturbations and Reheating in the Anamorphic Universe, *JCAP* **04**, 004 (2017) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2017/04/004 [arXiv:1701.02654 [gr-qc]].
- [59] K. A. Meissner, Black hole entropy in loop quantum gravity, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 5245-5252 (2004) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/21/22/015 [arXiv:gr-qc/0407052 [gr-qc]].
- [60] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar and W. Nelson, The pre-inflationary dynamics of loop quantum cosmology: Confronting quantum gravity with observations, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 085014 (2013) doi:10.1088/0264-9381/30/8/085014 [arXiv:1302.0254 [gr-qc]].
- [61] I. Agullo, A. Ashtekar and W. Nelson, Extension of the quantum theory of cosmological perturbations to

- the Planck era, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no.4, 043507 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.043507 [arXiv:1211.1354 [gr-qc]].
- [62] P. Friedrich and T. Prokopec, Scalar field dark matter in hybrid approach, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.8, 083504 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.083504 [arXiv:1704.03340 [gr-qc]].
- [63] E. Wilson-Ewing, Ekpyrotic loop quantum cosmology, *JCAP* **08**, 015 (2013) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/08/015 [arXiv:1306.6582 [gr-qc]].
- [64] B. Bolliet, J. Grain, C. Stahl, L. Linsefors and A. Barrau, Comparison of primordial tensor power spectra from the deformed algebra and dressed metric approaches in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, no.8, 084035 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.084035 [arXiv:1502.02431 [gr-qc]].
- [65] M. Bojowald, Quantum nature of cosmological bounces, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 2659-2683 (2008) doi:10.1007/s10714-008-0645-1 [arXiv:0801.4001 [gr-qc]].
- [66] T. Zhu, A. Wang, K. Kirsten, G. Cleaver and Q. Sheng, Universal features of quantum bounce in loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, 196-202 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.08.025 [arXiv:1607.06329 [gr-qc]].
- [67] B. Elizaga Navascués, D. Martin de Blas and G. A. Mena Marugán, Time-dependent mass of cosmological perturbations in the hybrid and dressed metric approaches to loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.4, 043523 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.043523 [arXiv:1711.10861 [gr-qc]].
- [68] Q. Wu, T. Zhu and A. Wang, Nonadiabatic evolution of primordial perturbations and non-Gaussianity in hybrid approach of loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.10, 103528 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.103528 [arXiv:1809.03172 [gr-qc]].
- [69] T. Cailleteau, A. Barrau, J. Grain and F. Vidotto, Consistency of holonomy-corrected scalar, vector and tensor perturbations in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 087301 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.087301 [arXiv:1206.6736 [gr-qc]].
- [70] L. Linsefors, T. Cailleteau, A. Barrau and J. Grain, Primordial tensor power spectrum in holonomy corrected  $\Omega$  loop quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no.10, 107503 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.107503 [arXiv:1212.2852 [gr-qc]].
- [71] T. S. Bunch, ADIABATIC REGULARIZATION FOR SCALAR FIELDS WITH ARBITRARY COUPLING TO THE SCALAR CURVATURE, *J. Phys. A* **13**, 1297-1310 (1980) doi:10.1088/0305-4470/13/4/022
- [72] T. S. Bunch and P. C. W. Davies, Quantum Field Theory in de Sitter Space: Renormalization by Point Splitting, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **360**, 117-134 (1978) doi:10.1098/rspa.1978.0060
- [73] A. Ashtekar and D. Sloan, Loop quantum cosmology and slow roll inflation, *Phys. Lett. B* **694**, 108-112 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.09.058 [arXiv:0912.4093 [gr-qc]].
- [74] D. M. de Blas and J. Olmedo, Primordial power spectra for scalar perturbations in loop quantum cosmology, *JCAP* **06**, 029 (2016) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/06/029 [arXiv:1601.01716 [gr-qc]].
- [75] B. Elizaga Navascués, G. A. M. Marugán and S. Prado, Non-oscillating power spectra in Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, no.3, 035001 (2020) doi:10.1088/1361-6382/abc6bb [arXiv:2005.10194 [gr-qc]].
- [76] E. A. Calzetta and B. L. B. Hu, Nonequilibrium Quantum Field Theory, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008) doi:10.1017/CBO9780511535123
- [77] A. Barrau and B. Bolliet, Some conceptual issues in loop quantum cosmology, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25**, no.08, 1642008 (2016) doi:10.1142/S0218271816420086 [arXiv:1602.04452 [gr-qc]].
- [78] B. Bolliet, A. Barrau, J. Grain and S. Schander, Observational exclusion of a consistent loop quantum cosmology scenario, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 124011 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.124011 [arXiv:1510.08766 [gr-qc]].
- [79] J. Grain, The perturbed universe in the deformed algebra approach of Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25**, no.08, 1642003 (2016) doi:10.1142/S0218271816420037 [arXiv:1606.03271 [gr-qc]].
- [80] T. Zhu, A. Wang, G. Cleaver, K. Kirsten and Q. Sheng, Gravitational quantum effects on power spectra and spectral indices with higher-order corrections, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.6, 063503 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.063503 [arXiv:1405.5301 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] T. Zhu, A. Wang, K. Kirsten, G. Cleaver and Q. Sheng, High-order Primordial Perturbations with Quantum Gravitational Effects, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no.12, 123525 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.123525 [arXiv:1604.05739 [gr-qc]].
- [82] M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, R. Brandenberger, I. G. Moss, R. O. Ramos and J. G. Rosa, The role of fluctuation-dissipation dynamics in setting initial conditions for inflation, *JCAP* **01**, 002 (2018) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/01/002 [arXiv:1612.04726 [astro-ph.CO]].