

The Primordial Black Hole Formation from Single-Field Inflation is Not Ruled Out

Antonio Riotto¹

¹ *Department of Theoretical Physics and Gravitational Wave Science Center,
24 quai E. Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*

Abstract

A standard scenario to form primordial black holes in the early universe is based on a phase of ultra-slow-roll in single-field inflation when the amplitude of the short scale modes is enhanced compared to the CMB plateau. Based on general arguments, we show that the loop corrections to the large-scale linear power spectrum from the short modes are small and conclude that the scenario is not ruled out.

¹ antonio.riotto@unige.ch

I. INTRODUCTION

Primordial Black Holes (PBHs) and the possibility that they form all (or a fraction) of the dark matter in the universe have become a hot topic again [1–6] after the detection of two $\sim 30M_\odot$ black holes through the gravitational waves generated during their merging [7].

A standard mechanism to create PBHs in the early universe is through the enhancement of the curvature perturbation ζ at small scales [8–10]. Such an enhancement can occur within single-field models of inflation [11] if there is an Ultra Slow Roll (USR) period in which the inflaton potential is extremely flat. For such a mechanism to work, an enhancement of the power spectrum of the curvature perturbation must occur, from its $\sim 10^{-9}$ value at large Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) scales to $\sim 10^{-1}$ on small scales. A reasonable question is therefore what is the impact on the small amplitude large-scale power spectrum of loops containing large amplitude short modes. Indeed, if loop corrections from the short modes are larger than the tree-level contribution to the large-scale power spectrum, the USR mechanism to generate PBHs will be inevitably ruled out, as recently advocated in Ref. [12].

In this short note we argue that the PBH Formation from single-field inflation is not ruled out. The short modes may change the large-scale power spectrum plateau in two ways:

1. they propagate in an unperturbed universe and a long mode may be generated by the superposition of two short modes. This contribution is Poisson-like and largely suppressed compared to the large-scale power spectrum;
2. alternatively, the short modes propagate in a universe which is perturbed by the presence of the long CMB mode. However, the time dependence of such linear long CMB mode is insignificant (otherwise the all scenario will be ruled already at the tree-level!) and the short modes experience its presence as a background which can be absorbed by a short momentum rescaling. The corresponding loop correction involve the correlation between the short mode expectation value and the long wavelength mode which, in turn, is dictated by the corresponding consistency relation [13] and vanishes in the limit of exact scale invariance. At this stage, the expert reader might be confused by this statement as it is well-known that the consistency relation is violated in USR [14]. The crucial point is that this is true for those linear fluctuations whose decaying mode becomes larger than the growing (in fact constant) mode during the USR phase. This does not happen for the linear long CMB fluctuation whose decaying mode is always exponentially smaller than the constant mode. We will argue therefore that these loop corrections are as well not dangerous.

This short note is organised as follows. In Section II we will elaborate about these general arguments and in Section III we will discuss a specific example.

II. GENERAL ARGUMENTS

We suppose that the universe goes through a period of Slow-Roll (SR), followed by a period of USR, followed again by a period of SR during inflation and focus on the dynamics of the long linear CMB modes, those which have left the Hubble radius much earlier (about 20 e-folds earlier for PBHs masses of $\sim 30M_\odot$) than the USR phase.

Including loop corrections to the long linear CMB modes amounts to solving the non-linear equation for a long mode ζ_L . It takes schematically the form [16]

$$\hat{O}[\zeta_L] = \mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L], \quad (\text{II.1})$$

where \mathcal{S} represents a generic sum of operators which, at one-loop, are quadratic in the short wavelength modes ζ_S and \hat{O} is the operator acting on the long mode. It is important to notice that, once a short mode goes outside the Hubble radius, it becomes classical in the sense that $[\zeta_S, \zeta'_S] \simeq 0$ [15] or in the sense that the phase space of states is larger, because of the USR phase, than H^2/k_S^2 (H being the Hubble rate during inflation) which is much larger than the quantum contribution equal to $1/2$. This is true for both fast and slow transitions [14], so that we can treat the mode as a classical variable and no difference between a quantum and a classical approach is expected.

Formally, the solution of the dynamics is given by

$$\zeta_L = \hat{O}^{-1} [\mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L]]. \quad (\text{II.2})$$

The one-loop power spectrum of the long modes will then be the sum of two pieces, again schematically

$$\langle \zeta_L \zeta_L \rangle = \langle \hat{O}^{-1} [\mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L = 0]] \hat{O}^{-1} [\mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L = 0]] \rangle + \langle \hat{O}^{-1} [\mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L]] \zeta_L \rangle. \quad (\text{II.3})$$

There are indeed two ways the short modes may alter the long mode power spectrum, which we describe in turn.

II.A The first contribution

The first term in Eq. (II.3) corresponds to the case in which the source of the short modes evolve in an unperturbed metric, that is it does not depend on the long mode, but still the superposition of two short-scale modes can lead to a long scale mode. Once the long mode is well outside of the Hubble radius, the various Hubble patches spanned within one wavelength of ζ_L are uncorrelated. This means that the fluctuations of the short modes quickly average out and are not able to provide the coherent effect that would be necessary to source a time dependence on large-scales. In order for the short mode diagrams to be able to induce a large correction to the power spectrum of the long mode, one needs coherence of the short modes on a comoving distance of the order of the inverse of the long mode momentum $\sim k_L^{-1}$. However, since the short modes are enhanced only on a finite range of momenta which are much larger than k_L , the corresponding fluctuations are coherent at most on a scale $\sim k_S^{-1}$, and therefore the source from the short modes becomes quickly uncorrelated as the short mode spans several Hubble regions.

One expects therefore the first contribution to the long mode from the short modes to be independent from the momentum k_L , *i.e.* Poisson distributed, and to be suppressed by the inverse of the number of independent Hubble patches in a box of radius $\sim k_L^{-1}$, that is by $(k_L/k_S)^3$. By dimensional arguments one will get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta P_\zeta(k_L) &\sim \frac{A_S^2}{k_S^3} \simeq \left(\frac{A_S^2}{A_L}\right) \left(\frac{k_L}{k_S}\right)^3 \frac{A_L}{k_L^3} \sim 10^{-17} \frac{A_L}{k_L^3} \lll \frac{A_L}{k_L^3}, \\ P_\zeta(k_L) &= \frac{A_L}{k_L^3},\end{aligned}\tag{II.4}$$

where $A_L \sim 10^{-9}$ and $A_S \sim 10^{-1}$ are the amplitudes of the long and short mode power spectra respectively and we have taken $k_L \sim 10^{-2} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $k_S \sim 10^6 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ for PBHs of mass about $10 M_\odot$.

II.B The second contribution

We elaborate now about the second term, in Eq. (II.3). Let us consider a source which is quadratic in the short modes, $\mathcal{S} \sim \zeta_S^2$, as in the example we will describe below and that was adopted in Ref. [12]. The two-point correlator of the long modes is of the form

$$\langle \zeta_L \zeta_L \rangle \sim \langle \widehat{O}^{-1} [\mathcal{S}[\zeta_S, \zeta_L]] \zeta_L \rangle \sim \langle \langle \zeta_S \zeta_S \rangle_{\zeta_L} \zeta_L \rangle,\tag{II.5}$$

that is proportional to the bispectrum in the squeezed limit. The latter is determined by the consistency relation (for the USR case, see Refs. [17, 18]), where primes denote again derivative with respect to the number of e-folds,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \langle \zeta_S \zeta_S \rangle_{\zeta_L} \zeta_L \rangle &\sim P'_\zeta(k_L) P'_\zeta(k_S) - \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S)}{d \ln k_S} P_\zeta(k_S) P_\zeta(k_L), \\ \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) &= \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} P_\zeta(k).\end{aligned}\tag{II.6}$$

Such consistency relation can be easily derived using the ADM parametrisation and adopting the ζ -gauge defined by imposing that the spatial metric take the form $h_{ij} = a^2(N) e^{2\zeta_L(N)} \delta_{ij}$ (where a is the scale factor and N the number of e-folds). This gauge choice leaves some large scale residual gauge choice, one can for example shift the long mode curvature perturbation by $\zeta_L(N) \rightarrow \zeta_L(N) + \alpha(N)$ (together with a change in the shift vector N_i) and rescale the spatial coordinates $x^i \rightarrow e^{\alpha(N)} x^i$. These transformations are responsible for the first and the second pieces of Eq. (II.6), respectively. Such a residual symmetry leading to the consistency relation (II.6) is valid for long modes which can be time dependent, but whose spatial derivatives are negligible.

We will show in the following that the linear long CMB mode is practically constant in time, that is $P'_\zeta(k_L) \lll P_\zeta(k_L)$, even during the USR phase. The consistency relation then reduces to the one of SR [13]

$$\langle \langle \zeta_S \zeta_S \rangle_{\zeta_L} \zeta_L \rangle \sim - \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S)}{d \ln k_S} P_\zeta(k_S) P_\zeta(k_L).\tag{II.7}$$

This can be understood as follows. If the linear long CMB mode is constant in time, it acts as a rescaling of the coordinates and we can absorb it by rescaling the momenta

$$k_S \rightarrow \tilde{k}_S = e^{\zeta_L} k_S, \quad (\text{II.8})$$

dictating that no correlation between short and long modes is present if the short mode power spectrum is scale invariant. In such a case, in the expectation value of the source composed by the short modes, the loop is integrated over all the short mode momenta and the rescaling is irrelevant; no correlation between the short-scale power and the long mode exists. This simple argument tells that the short modes may influence the long mode only when their power spectrum is not exactly scale invariant.

We expect therefore (up to a numerical factor dictated by the time evolution)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta P_\zeta(k_L) &\sim P_\zeta(k_L) \int \frac{d^3 k_S}{(2\pi)^3} P_\zeta(k_S) \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S)}{d \ln k_S} = P_\zeta(k_L) \int d \ln k_S \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S) \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S)}{d \ln k_S} \\ &= P_\zeta(k_L) \Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.9})$$

where the variation of the dimensionless power spectrum $\Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta$ has to be evaluated in the range where it is not scale invariant. Since its maximum variation is of the order of the power spectrum of the short modes at its peak, $\Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta \simeq 10^{-1}$, we expect such a correction to be small as well.

These considerations are general and are valid beyond one-loop. Another important point to remark is that neither IR nor UV divergences are expected since the non scale invariance of the power spectrum is expected only in a finite range of momenta.

II.C The constancy over time of the long CMB mode

The argument proposed earlier regarding the second contribution is valid since the linear long CMB mode is basically constant on super-Hubble scales during the USR phase. The equation for the linear curvature perturbation ζ_{k_L} as a function of the number of e-folds N to go till the end of inflation reads at the linear level

$$\zeta_{k_L}'' + \frac{(a^3 \epsilon)'}{(a^3 \epsilon)} \zeta_{k_L}' + \frac{k_L^2}{a^2 H^2} \zeta_{k_L} = 0, \quad (\text{II.10})$$

where $\epsilon = -H'/H$ is the slow-roll parameter. For long modes the solution is given approximately as

$$\zeta_{k_L}(N) \simeq A_{k_L} + B_{k_L} \int_N \frac{dN'}{a^3(N') \epsilon(N')}, \quad (\text{II.11})$$

where A_{k_L} and B_{k_L} are constant in time. During the standard SR phase, $(a^3 \epsilon) \sim a^3$ and the piece proportional to the constant B_k is identified with the decaying mode. However, when $(a^3 \epsilon)'/(a^3 \epsilon)$ changes sign, for instance during a period of USR when $(a^3 \epsilon) \sim a^{-3}$, the decaying mode is indeed growing. One is always free to include arbitrary contributions from the decaying mode in the growing mode. Nonetheless, it is convenient to identify the constant A_{k_L}

as an approximate solution for the growing mode on sufficiently large-scales. Rewriting Eq. (II.10) in an iterative form, the lowest order solution for the growing mode solution after the USR phase, when there are still N_f e-folds to go till the end of inflation is given by [19]

$$\zeta_{k_L}(N_f) \simeq \alpha_{k_L} \zeta_{k_L}(N_k), \quad (\text{II.12})$$

where

$$\alpha_{k_L} \simeq 1 + \int_{N_f}^{N_{k_L}} \frac{dN'}{a(N')} \frac{a^2(N_{k_L})}{a^2(N')} \frac{\epsilon(N_{k_L})}{\epsilon(N')}. \quad (\text{II.13})$$

and N_{k_L} is the time at which the mode k_L leaves the Hubble radius. Only modes which have $|\alpha_{k_L}| \gg 1$ grows during the USR phase.

Suppose now there is a period of SR, followed by a period of USR, followed in turn by another period of SR. We are interested in modes which exit the Hubble radius approximately 60 e-folds to go till the end of inflation, that is on CMB scales. Typically, the USR period when PBHs are generated takes place at about $N_i \simeq 40$ e-folds (for PBH masses of the order of $10 M_\odot$) to go and last for a number of e-folds around unity. We take these figures as indicative, our results will not change for different assumptions. We get

$$\alpha_{k_L} - 1 \simeq e^{-2(N_{k_L} - N_i)} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon(N_i)}{\epsilon(N_f)}} \simeq e^{-40} \cdot 10^4 \simeq e^{-40} \cdot e^{10} = e^{-30} \lll 1. \quad (\text{II.14})$$

This means that

$$\frac{P'_\zeta(k_L, N_f)}{P_\zeta(k_L, N_f)} \lll 1. \quad (\text{II.15})$$

This simple derivation makes it clear why linear modes which have exited the Hubble radius much earlier than the USR phase, like the ones relative the CMB modes, suffer no growth during the USR phase. For them the decreasing mode remain always much smaller than the growing (constant) mode. This is why the linear CMB modes do not grow during the USR phase, they remain constant in time. Only modes which exit the Hubble radius in the proximity of the USR phase may grow significantly. Long CMB modes can be absorbed by a momentum rescaling of the short modes.

III. AN EXAMPLE

Let us now consider the same action as in Ref. [12]

$$S[\zeta] = M_{\text{pl}}^2 H \int d^3x dN a^3 \epsilon \left[\zeta'^2 - \frac{(\nabla \zeta)^2}{(aH)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \eta' \zeta' \zeta^2 \right], \quad (\text{III.16})$$

where $\eta = (\epsilon'/\epsilon)$. The corresponding equation of motion for the long modes in the CMB range reads

$$\zeta_{k_L}'' + \frac{(a^3\epsilon)'}{(a^3\epsilon)}\zeta_{k_L}' + \frac{1}{4} \frac{(a^3\epsilon\eta)'}{(a^3\epsilon)} \int \frac{d^3k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_{k_S} \zeta_{\vec{k}_L - \vec{k}_S} = 0, \quad (\text{III.17})$$

whose integration leads to

$$\zeta_{k_L} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_{N_i}^N \frac{dN'}{a^3(N')\epsilon(N')} \int_{N_i}^{N'} dN'' [a^3(N'')\epsilon(N'')\eta'(N'')] \int \frac{d^3k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_{k_S}(N'') \zeta_{\vec{k}_L - \vec{k}_S}(N''). \quad (\text{III.18})$$

Typical models of single-field inflation which generate peaks in the power spectrum are characterised by a rapid transition from the initial SR phase to the subsequent USR like phase, back to the SR phase. During the USR phase the modes grow approximately as $\epsilon^{-1/2} \sim a^3 \sim e^{3(N_i - N)}$. Notice that on super-Hubble scales the time evolution of the parameter ϵ dictates the time evolution of the short mode fluctuations, even in the case of sudden transitions, and ζ_S and ζ_S' commute as operators; they can be considered as classical objects².

The parameter η jumps from small values to -6 , back to small values at N_f e-folds to go till the end of inflation, which takes place at $N = 0$. Under these circumstances, we obtain

$$\zeta_{k_L}(N = 0) \simeq -\frac{3}{2} \int \frac{d^3k_S}{(2\pi)^3} \zeta_{k_S}(N_f) \zeta_{\vec{k}_L - \vec{k}_S}(N_f). \quad (\text{III.19})$$

The first type of correction at one-loop to the power spectrum of the CMB modes comes when the source of the short modes evolve in an unperturbed metric

$$\delta P_\zeta(k_L, N = 0) = 2 \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \int \frac{d^3k_S}{(2\pi)^3} P_\zeta(k_S, N_f) P_\zeta(|\vec{k}_L - \vec{k}_S|, N_f). \quad (\text{III.20})$$

As already argued, in the limit $k_S \gg k_L$, the correction is Poisson-like, that is it does not depend upon k_L . This is because the short modes with large amplitude A_S are correlated at most on a scale $\sim k_S^{-1}$. In the case of a sharp transition the power spectrum of the short modes may at most have a growth of $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S) \sim k^5$ [20, 21] up to a peak at k_c [20, 21]. One then obtains what expected from the general arguments in the previous section, that is

$$\delta P_\zeta(k_L, N = 0) \sim 10^{-2} \frac{A_S^2}{k_c^3} = 10^{-2} \left(\frac{A_S^2}{A_L}\right) \left(\frac{k_L}{k_c}\right)^3 \left(\frac{A_L}{k_L^3}\right) \ll P_\zeta(k_L), \quad (\text{III.21})$$

where again we have taken $k_L \sim 10^{-2} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $k_c \sim 10^6 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ for PBH of mass about $10 M_\odot$. Notice also that for the time variation of the long CMB mode of the curvature perturbation one has $\delta P'_\zeta(k_L, N = 0) \sim$

² As one can check, for instance, taking the Super-Hubble limit of the mode functions in Eqs. (16) and (17) of Ref. [12].

$[a^3(N_f)\epsilon(N_f)/a^3(N=0)\epsilon(N=0)]^2\delta P_\zeta(k_L, N=0) \ll P_\zeta(k_L)$ so that in the consistency relation (II.6) one can comfortably neglect the first term even at higher orders.

The second contribution to the correction to the power spectrum of the long CMB modes comes from correlating the average of the source of the short modes in the presence of a long mode ζ_{k_L} with another long mode

$$\langle \zeta_{k_L}(N=0) \rangle \simeq -\frac{3}{2} \int \frac{d^3 \tilde{k}_S}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \zeta_{\tilde{k}_S}(N_f) \zeta_{-\tilde{k}_S}(N_f) \rangle, \quad \tilde{k}_S = e^{\zeta_L} k_S. \quad (\text{III.22})$$

which gives the following correction at the end of inflation

$$\delta P_\zeta(k_L, N=0) \simeq -\frac{3}{2} P_\zeta(k_L) \Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S, N_f), \quad (\text{III.23})$$

where we recall that $\Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S, N_f)$ must be computed over the range where the power spectrum is not scale invariant. Since the fall of the power spectrum can be at most its initial amplitude, $\Delta \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_S, N_f) \sim 10^{-1}$, we infer that this correction is as well negligible. Notice again that $\delta P'_\zeta(k_L, N=0)$ is suppressed compared to $\delta P_\zeta(k_L, N=0)$ by a factor $[a^3(N_f)\epsilon(N_f)/a^3(N=0)\epsilon(N=0)]^2 \lll 1$.

One may wonder what happens for the case of a smooth transition. Despite the fact that the parameter η and η' vary dramatically, the exact solution for the mode functions remain scale invariant up to small corrections $\mathcal{O}(\eta_V)$ [14]. Indeed, even if the curvature perturbation still evolves during the transition, and is finally fixed after the SR attractor phase is attained, the resulting power spectrum in this period remains nearly scale invariant. Taking during the smooth transition $\eta' \simeq 6/(N_f - N_{\text{SR}})$ and approximately constant, where N_{SR} is the time the SR attractor is reached, the integration with time needs to be done from the time of the transition N_f to N_{SR} and we obtain

$$\delta P_\zeta(k_L) \simeq \frac{\eta_V A_S}{(N_f - N_{\text{SR}})} P_\zeta(k_L) \ln \frac{k_S^{\text{SR}}}{k_S^f}, \quad (\text{III.24})$$

where k_S^{SR} is the short scale corresponding to the moment the SR attractor is attained and k_S^f the scale at which the USR ends. Again this correction is small.

Finally, let us comment on the effect of three extra one-loop contributions which might appear from the cubic interactions and which are not suppressed by gradients on super-Hubble scales. The first, proportional to $\zeta'_L \zeta_S'^2$, is suppressed by the derivative of the long mode; the second, proportional to $\zeta_L \zeta_S'^2$, is suppressed by ϵ^2 , the third, arising from the redefinition $\zeta \rightarrow \zeta_n + \eta \zeta_n^2/4 + \zeta_n \zeta'_n$ (to remove a boundary term) [13] is suppressed in the SR phase following the USR period. The corresponding loops are therefore suppressed.

We conclude that the PBH formation scenario through a period of USR is not ruled out.

Acknowledgements

We thank M. Biagetti, R. Bravo, C. Byrnes, V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, A. Iovino, S. Patil, M. Sasaki, and A. Urbano for useful discussions and the organizers of the workshop ‘‘Messengers of the very early universe: Gravitational Waves

and Primordial Black Holes” (12-14 Dec 2022, Centro Universitario Padovano, Padova, Italy) for the nice atmosphere where this work has been completed. A.R. is supported by the Boninchi Foundation for the project “PBHs in the Era of GW Astronomy”.

-
- [1] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **168**, 399 (1974).
 - [2] P. Meszaros, *Astron. Astrophys.* **37**, 225 (1974).
 - [3] B. J. Carr, *Astrophys. J.* **201**, 1 (1975).
 - [4] S. Bird et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no. 20, 201301 (2016) [[astro-ph.CO/1603.00464](#)].
 - [5] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka and S. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, no. 6, 061101 (2016) [[astro-ph.CO/1603.08338](#)].
 - [6] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka and S. Yokoyama, [[astro-ph.CO/1801.05235](#)].
 - [7] B. P. Abbott et al. [LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016) [[gr-qc/1602.03837](#)].
 - [8] P. Ivanov, P. Naselsky and I. Novikov, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 7173 (1994).
 - [9] J. García-Bellido, A.D. Linde and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996) 6040 [[astro-ph/9605094](#)].
 - [10] P. Ivanov, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 7145 (1998) [[astro-ph/9708224](#)].
 - [11] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, *Phys. Rept.* **314** (1999), 1, [[hep-ph/9807278](#)].
 - [12] J. Kristiano and J. Yokoyama, [[hep-th/2211.03395](#)].
 - [13] J. M. Maldacena, *JHEP* **05** (2003), 013 [[astro-ph/0210603](#)].
 - [14] Y. F. Cai, X. Chen, M. H. Namjoo, M. Sasaki, D. G. Wang and Z. Wang, *JCAP* **05** (2018), 012 [[astro-ph.CO/1712.09998](#)].
 - [15] C. Kiefer and D. Polarski, *Adv. Sci. Lett.* **2** (2009), 164-173 [[astro-ph/0810.0087](#)].
 - [16] G. L. Pimentel, L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, *JHEP* **07** (2012), 166 [[hep-th/1203.6651](#)].
 - [17] R. Bravo, S. Mooij, G. A. Palma and B. Pradenas, *JCAP* **05** (2018), 024 [[astro-ph.CO/1711.02680](#)].
 - [18] B. Finelli, G. Goon, E. Pajer and L. Santoni, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.6, 063531 [[hep-th/1711.03737](#)].
 - [19] S. M. Leach, M. Sasaki, D. Wands and A. R. Liddle, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001), 023512, [[astro-ph/0101406](#)].
 - [20] C. T. Byrnes, P. S. Cole and S. P. Patil, *JCAP* **06** (2019), 028 [[astro-ph.CO/1811.11158](#)].
 - [21] A. Karam, N. Koivunen, E. Tomberg, V. Vaskonen and H. Veermäe, [[astro-ph.CO/2205.13540](#)].