# M ass Density Perturbations from In ation with Thermal D issipation

Wolung Lee and Li-ZhiFang

Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

(April 14, 2024)

## Abstract

We study the power spectrum of the mass density perturbations in an in ation scenario that includes therm all dissipation. We show that the condition on which the therm all uctuations dominate the primordial density perturbations can easily be realized even for weak dissipation, i.e., the rate of dissipation is less than the Hubble expansion. We not that our spectrum of primordial density perturbations follows a power law behavior, and exhibits a \therm odynamical" feature { the amplitude and power index of the spectrum depend mainly on the therm odynamical variable M, the in ation energy scale. Comparing this result with the observed temperature uctuations of the cosm icm icrow ave background, we not that both amplitude and index of the power spectrum can be fairly well tted if M  $10^{15}$   $10^{16}$  GeV. PACS number(s): 98.80.Cq, 98.80 Bp, 98.70.V c

Typeset using REVT<sub>E</sub>X

In the past decade, there has been a num ber of studies on dissipative processes associated with the in aton decay during its evolution. These studies have shed light into the possible e ects of the dissipative processes. For instance, it was realized that dissipation e ectively slows down the rolling of the in aton scalar eld toward the true vacuum. These processes are capable of supporting the scenario of in ation [1,2]. Recently, inspired by several new developments, the problem of in ation with therm all dissipation has attracted many re-investigations.

The rst progress is from the study of the non-equilibrium statistics of quantum elds, which has found that, under certain conditions, it seems to be reasonable to introduce a dissipative term (such as a friction-like term) into the equation of motion of the scalar eld

to describe the e ect of heat contact between the eld and a thermal bath. These studies shown that the thermal dissipation and uctuation will most likely appear during the in ation if the in atom is coupled to light elds  $\beta$ ]. However, to realize su cient e-folds of in ation with thermal dissipation, this theory needs to introduce tens of thousands of scalar and fermion elds interacting with the in atom in an ad hoc manner [4]. Namely, it is still far from a realistic model. Nevertheless, this study indicates that the condition necessary for the \standard" reheating evolution { a coupling of in atom with light elds { is actually also the condition under which the e ects of thermal dissipation during in ation should be considered.

Secondly, in the case of a therm albath with a tem perature higher than the H awking tem – perature, the therm all uctuations of the scalar eld plays an important and even dom inant role in producing the prim ordial perturbations of the universe. Based on these results, the warm in ation scenario has been proposed. In this model, the in ation epoch can smoothly evolve to a radiation-dom inated epoch, without the need of a reheating stage [5,6]. D ynam – ical analysis of system s of in atom with therm ald issipation [7] gives further support to this model. It is found that the warm in ation solution is very common. A rate of dissipation

2

as small as 10  $^7$  H, H being the Hubble parameter during in ation, can lead to a smooth exit from in ation to radiation.

W am in ation also provides explanation to the super-H ubble suppression. The standard in ationary cosm ology, which is characterized by an isentropic de Sitter expansion, predicts that the particle horizon should be much larger than the present-day Hubble radius  $c=H_0$ . However, a spectral analysis of the COBE-DMR 4-year sky maps seem s to show a lack of power in the spectrum of the prim ordial density perturbations on scales equal to or larger than the Hubble radius  $c=H_0$  [8,9]. A possible explanation of this super-Hubble suppression is given by hybrid models, where the prim ordial density perturbations are not purely adiabatic, but mixed with an isocurvature component. The warm in ation is one of the mechanism s which can naturally produce both adiabatic and isocurvature initial perturbations [6].

In this paper, we study the power spectrum of mass density perturbations caused by in ation with them all dissipation. One purpose of developing the model of warm in ation is to explain the amplitudes of the initial perturbations. U sually, the amplitude of initial perturbations from quantum uctuation of the in aton depends on some unknown param – eters of the in ation potential. However, for the warm in ation model, the amplitude of the initial perturbations is found to be mainly determined by the energy scale of in ation, M. If M is taken to be about  $10^{15}$  G eV, the possible amplitudes of the initial perturbations are found to be in a range consistent with the observations of the temperature uctuations of the cosm ic m icrow ave background (CMB) [10]. That is, the therm ally originated initial perturbations apparently do not directly depend on the details of the in ation potential, but only on some therm odynam ical variables, such as the energy scale M. This result is not unexpected, because like m any therm odynam ical system s, the therm all properties including density uctuations should be determined by the therm odynam ical conditions, regardless of other details.

O by iously, it would be interesting to nd more \therm odynam ical" features which contain only observable quantities and therm odynam ical param eters, as these predictions would be more useful for confronting models with observations. Guided by these considerations,

3

we will extend the above-mentioned qualitative estimation of the order of the density perturbations to a quantitative calculation of the power spectrum of the density perturbations. We show that the power spectrum of the warm in ation does not depend on unknown parameters of the in aton potential and the dissipation, but only on the energy scale M. The spectrum is found to be of power law, and the index of the power law can be larger or less than 1. More interestingly, we nd that for a given M, the amplitude and the index of the power law are not independent from each other. In other words, the amplitude of the power spectrum is completely determined by the power index and the number M. C on paring this result with the observed temperature uctuations of the CMB, we nd that both amplitude and index of the power spectrum can be fairly well tted if M  $10^{15}$   $10^{6}$  GeV.

This paper is organized as follow: In Sec. II we discuss the evolution of the radiation component for in ationary models with dissipation prescribed by a eld-dependent friction term. In particular, we scrutinize the physical conditions on which the thermal uctuations dom inate the prim ordial density perturbations. Section III carries out the calculations of the power spectrum of the density perturbations of the warm in ations. And nally, in Sec. IV we give the conclusions and discuss further observational tests.

# II. IN FLAT ION W ITH THERMAL DISSIPATION

#### A.Basic equations

Let us consider a at universe consisting of a scalar in atom eld and a therm albath. Its dynamics is described by the following equations [5]. The equations of the expanding universe are

$$2H_{-} + 3H^{2} = \frac{8}{m_{Pl}^{2}} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{7} + \frac{1}{3} r V ();$$
 (2.1)

$$H^{2} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{1}{m_{P1}^{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{-2}{2} + V(); \qquad (2.2)$$

where H = R = R is the Hubble parameter, and  $m_{P1} = \frac{q}{1=G}$  the P lanck mass. V () is the elective potential for eld, and <sub>r</sub> is the energy density of the therm albath. A ctually the scalar eld is not uniform due to uctuations. Therefore, the eld in Eqs.(2.1) and (2.2) should be considered as an average over the uctuations.

The equation of motion for scalar eld in a de-Sitter universe is

$$+ 3H -+ - e^{2Ht}r^{2} + V^{0}() = 0;$$
 (2.3)

where the friction term  $-\text{describes the interaction between the eld and a heat bath.} Obviously, for a uniform ed eld, or averaged , the term r<sup>2</sup> of Eq. (2.3) can be ignored. Statistical mechanics of quantum open systems has shown that the interaction of quantum elds with them al or quantum bath can be described by a general uctuation-dissipation relation [11]. It is probably reasonable to describe the interaction between the in aton and the heat bath as a \decay" of the in aton [12]. These results support the idea of introducing a damping or friction term into the eld equation of motion. In particular, the friction term with the form in Eq. (2.3), -, is a possible approximation for the dissipation of eld in a heat bath environment in the near-equilibrium circum stances. In principle, can be a function of . In the cases of polynom ial interactions between eld and bath environment, one may take the polynom ial of for , i.e., = m<sup>m</sup>. The friction coe cient must be positive de nite, hence m > 0, and the dissipative index of friction m should be zero or even integer if V () is invariant under the transform ation !$ 

The equation of the radiation component (therm al bath) is given by the rst law of therm odynamics as

$$_{r} + 4H_{r} = -\frac{2}{2}$$
: (2.4)

The tem perature of the therm albath can be calculated by  $_r = (^2=30)g_e T^4$ ,  $g_e$  being the electric number of degrees of freedom at tem perature T.

The warm in ation scenario is generally de ned by a characteristic that the therm al uctuations of the scalar eld dom inate over the quantum origin of the initial density perturbations. Because the therm aland quantum uctuations of the scalar eld are proportional to T and H respectively, a necessary condition for warm in ation models is the existence of a radiation component with temperature

$$T > H$$
 (2.5)

during the in ationary expansion. Eq. (2.5) is also necessary for maintaining the thermal equilibrium of the radiation component. In general, the time scale for the relaxation of a radiation bath is shorter for higher temperature. A coordingly, to have a relaxing time of the bath shorter than the expansion of the universe, a temperature higher than H is generally needed.

As a consequence of Eq. (2.5), warm in ation scenario requires that the solutions of Eqs. (2.1) - (2.4) should contain an in ation era, followed by smooth transition to a radiationdom inated era. Dynamical system analysis also con rm ed that for a massive scalar eld  $V() = \frac{1}{2}M^{2} r^{2}$ , the warm in ation solution of Eqs. (2.1) - (2.4) is very common. A smooth exit from in ation to radiation era can be established even for a dissipation with as small as 10<sup>7</sup> H [7]. A typical solution of warm in ation will be given in next section.

## B.Evolution of R adiation component during in ation

Since warm in ation solution does not rely on a speci c potential, we will employ the popular  $^4$  potential commonly used for the \new " in ation models. It is

$$V() = (2^{2} + 2)^{2}$$
: (2.6)

To have slow-roll solutions, the potential should be at enough, i.e.,  $(M = m_{Pl})^4$ , where V (0)  $M^4 = {}^4$ .

For models based on the potential of Eq. (2.6), the existence of a thermal component during in ation seems to be inevitable. In order to maintain the eld close to its minimum at the onset of the in ation phase transition, a thermal force is generically necessary. In other words, there is, at least, a weak coupling between eld and other elds contributing to the therm al bath. During the slow roll period of in ation, the potential energy of the eld is fairly constant, and their kinetic energy is sm all, so that the interaction between the

eld with the elds of the therm al bath rem ains about the sam e as at the beginning. As such, there is no compelling reason to ignore these interactions.

Strictly speaking, we should use a nite tem perature e ective potential V (;T). However, the correction due to nite tem perature is negligible. The leading tem perature correction of the potential (2.6) is  $T^{2-2}$ . On the other hand, as mentioned above, we have  $(M = m_{P1})^4$  for the atness of the potential. Therefore,  $T^2 = M^6 = m_{P1}^4 = (M = m_{P1})^2 H^2 = H^2$ , i.e., the in uence of the nite tem perature e ective potential can be ignored when  $< m_{P1}$ .

Now, we try to nd warm in ation solutions of Eqs. (2.1) - (2.4) for weak friction < H. In this case, Eqs. (2.1) - (2.3) are actually the same as the \standard" new in ation model when

$$_{\rm r}$$
 V (0): (2.7)

N amely, we have the slow-roll solution as

$$-' \quad \frac{\nabla^{0}()}{3H + ()} ' \quad \frac{\nabla^{0}()}{3H}; \qquad (2.8)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{2} = V(0);$$
 (2.9)

and

$$H^{2} H_{i}^{2} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{V(0)}{m_{Pl}^{2}} + \frac{M}{m_{Pl}}^{2} M^{2};$$
 (2.10)

where the subscript i denotes the starting time of the in ation epoch.

During the stage of , it is reasonable to neglect the  $^3$  term in Eq. (2.3). We have then

$$+ (3H + ) - 4^{2} = 0;$$
 (2.11)

C onsidering < H , an approximate solution of can immediately be found as

$$= _{i}e^{Ht};$$
 (2.12)

where  $'^{1=2} (m_{P1}=M)^2=2$  and is the initial value of the scalar eld.

Substituting solution (2.12) into Eq. (2.4), we have the general solution of (2.4) as

$$r(t) = Ae^{(m+2)Ht} + Be^{4Ht}$$
 (2.13)

where  $A = {}^{2}H_{m} {}^{m+2}_{i} = [(m + 2) + 4], B = {}_{r}(0) A$ , and  ${}_{r}(0)$  is the initial radiation density. Obviously, the term B in Eq. (2.12) describes the blowing away of the initial radiation by the in ationary exponential expansion, and the term A is due to the generation of radiation by the eld decay.

A coording to Eq. (2.13), the evolution of the radiation has two phases. Phase 1 covers the period during which the B term is dominant, and radiation density drops drastically due to the in ationary expansion. The component of radiation evolves into phase 2 when the A term becomes dominant, where the radiation density increases due to the friction of the eld. Namely, both heating and in ation are simultaneously underway in phase 2. Therefore, this phase is actually the era of in ation plus reheating.

The transition from phase 1 to phase 2 occurs at time  $t_b$  determined by (d =dt)\_{t\_b} = 0. We have

$$H t_{b}' \frac{1}{(m+2) + 4} \ln \left( \frac{4[(m+2) + 4]}{(m+2)^{-3}H} - \frac{aM^{-4}}{m^{-m+2}} \right); \qquad (2.14)$$

where a  $(^2=30)g_e$  . Then the radiation density at the rebound time becomes

$$r(t_b) = \frac{1}{4} [(m + 2) + 4] A \exp[(m + 2) H t_b]$$
: (2.15)

From Eqs. (2.12) and (2.13), the radiation density in phase 2 is given by

$$r(t) = \frac{1}{4} {}^{2} H {}^{2}(t) ' \frac{1}{16} {}^{2} \frac{m_{Pl}}{M} {}^{4} H {}^{2}(t):$$
 (2.16)

Since H '  $(M = m_{P1})M$ , Eq. (2.16) can be rewritten as

$$_{r}(t) = \frac{m_{P1}}{M} \frac{2}{H} - \frac{(t)^{12}}{V} (0):$$
 (2.17)

On the other hand, from (2.12), we have

$$\frac{1}{2} - (t)^{2} \prime = \frac{m_{P1}}{M}^{2} - \frac{(t)^{2}}{M} V (0): \qquad (2.18)$$

Therefore, in the case of weak dissipation < H , we have

$$_{\rm r}$$
 (t) < --(t)<sup>2</sup>=2: (2.19)

This is consistent with the condition of in ation Eq. (2.7) when Eq. (2.9) holds.

Eqs. (2.7) and (2.9) indicate that the in ation will come to an end at time  $t_f$  when the energy density of the radiation components, or the kinetic energy of eld, -2=2, become large enough, and comparable to V (0). From Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18),  $t_f$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{1} = 2 \frac{m_{Pl}}{M}^2 \frac{(t_f)^2}{(t_f)^2}$$
 1: (2.20)

In general, at the time when the phase 2 ends, or a radiation-dom inated era starts, the potential energy m ay not be fully exhausted yet. In this case, a non-zero potential V will remain in the radiation-dom inated era, and the process of decaying into light particles is still continuing.

However, considering  $^{1=2} (m_{Pl} = M)^2 (= H) < 1$ , the right hand side of Eq. (2.17) will always be less than 1 when (t) is less than . This means that, for weak dissipation, phase 2 cannot term inate at (t) < , or V (  $(t_f)$ )  $\in$  0. Therefore, under weak dissipation, phase 2 will end at the time  $t_f$  when the potential energy V () is completely exhausted, i.e.,

$$(t_{f})$$
 : (2.21)

This means that no non-zero V remains once the in ation exits to a radiation-dominated era, and the heating of decay also ends at  $t_f$ .

#### C.Tem perature of radiation

From Eq. (2.13), one can not the temperature T of the radiation in phases 1 (t <  $t_b$ ) and 2 (t >  $t_b$ ) as

$$T(t) = \begin{cases} 8 \\ \stackrel{\text{\ensuremath{\hat{k}}}}{\stackrel{\quad \ensuremath{\hat{k}}}{\stackrel{\quad \}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}, if t = t_{i} t$$

where

$$T_{b} = (4a)^{1=4} [(m + 2) + 4]^{1=4} A^{1=4} exp \frac{m + 2}{4} H t_{b}$$
: (2.23)

The tem perature  $T_f$  at the end of phase 2 is

$$T_{f} = T(t_{f}) = T_{b}e^{(m+2) H(t_{f} t_{b})=4};$$
 (2.24)

where  $t_f$  is given by Eq. (2.21).

Since T (t) is increasing with t in phase 2, the condition (2.5) for warm in ation can be satis ed if T ( $t_f$ ) > H , or

$$_{\rm r}$$
 (t<sub>f</sub>) > aH  $_{\rm i}^4$ : (2.25)

Using Eqs. (2.17) and (2.21), condition (2.25) is realized if

$$\frac{1}{H} > \frac{2}{m_{Pl}} \frac{M}{m_{Pl}}^4$$
: (2.26)

Namely, can be as small as  $10^{12}$  H for M  $10^{6}$  GeV, and  $10^{9}$  GeV. Therefore, the radiation solution (2.13), or warm in ation, should be taken into account in a very wide range of dissipation

$$10^{12} H < H :$$
 (2.27)

This result is about the same as that given by dynamical system analysis [7]: a tiny friction may lead the in atom to a smooth exit directly at the end of the in ation era.

A typical solution of the evolution of radiation tem perature T (t) is demonstrated in Fig. 1, for which parameters are taken to be  $M = 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$ ,  $= 2.24 \quad 10^{6} \text{ GeV}$ ,  $_2 = 10^{5} \text{ H}_{10}$ and  $g_e = 100$ . Actually,  $g_e$  -factor is a function of T in general. However, as can be seen below, the unknown function  $g_e$  (T) has only a slight e ect on the problem s under investigation. Figure 1 shows that the rebound tem perature  $T_b$  can be less than H. In this case, the evolution of T (t) in phase 2 can be divided into two sectors: T < H for  $t < t_e$ , and T > H for  $t > t_e$ , where  $t_e$  is defined by T ( $t_e$ ) = H. We should not consider the solution of radiation to be physical if T < H since it is in possible to maintain a thermalized heat bath with the radiation temperature less than the Hawking temperature H of an expanding universe. Nevertheless, the solution (2.13) should be available if  $t > t_e$ . Therefore, one can only consider the period of  $t_e < t < t_f$  as the epoch of the warm in ation.

Figure 1 also plots the Hubble parameter H (t). The evolution of H (t) is about the same as in the standard new in ation model, i.e., H (t)  $H_i$  in both phases 1 and 2. In Fig. 1, it is evident that the in ation smoothly exits to a radiation era at  $t_f$ . The Hubble parameter H (t) also evolves from the in ation H (t) constant to a radiation regime H (t) /  $t^1$ .

The duration of the warm in ation is represented by  $(t_f \ t_i)$  then. The number of e-folding growth of the comoving scale factor R during the warm in ation is given by

$$N = \int_{t_e}^{z_{t_f}} H dt' \frac{4}{(m+2)} \ln \frac{T_f}{H}$$
(2.28)

One can also form ally calculate the number of e-folds of the growth in phase 2 as

$$N_{2} = \prod_{t_{b}}^{2} H dt' = \frac{4}{(m+2)} \ln \frac{T_{f}}{T_{b}}; \qquad (2.29)$$

and the number of e-folds of the total grow th as

$$N_{t} = \int_{0}^{Z_{t_{f}}} H dt' \frac{4}{(m+2)} \ln \frac{T_{f}}{T_{b}} + H t_{b}: \qquad (2.30)$$

It can be found from Eqs. (2.28) - (2.30) that both N<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>t</sub> depend on the initial value of the eld <sub>i</sub> via T<sub>b</sub>, but N does not. The behavior of T at the period t > t<sub>e</sub> is completely determined by the competition between the diluting and producing radiation at t > t<sub>b</sub>. Initial information about the radiation has been washed out by the in ationary expansion. Hence, the initial <sub>i</sub> will not lead to uncertainty in our analysis if we are only concerned the problem s of warm evolution at the period t<sub>e</sub> < t < t<sub>f</sub>.

The uctuations of eld can be calculated by the similar way as stochastic in ations [14]. Recall that the coarse-grained scalar eld is actually determined from the decomposition between background and high frequency modes, i.e.

$$(x;t) = (x;t) + q(x;t);$$
 (3.1)

where (x;t) is the scalar eld satisfying

$$+ 3H - e^{2Ht}r^{2} + V^{0}() = 0:$$
 (3.2)

q(x;t) in Eq.(3.1) contains all high frequency m odes and gives rise to the therm al uctuations. Since the mass of the eld can be ignored for the high frequency m odes, we have

$$q(x;t) = {}^{Z} d^{3}kW (j_{k}j) {}^{h} a_{k} {}_{k} (t)e^{ik x} + a_{k}^{Y} {}_{k} (t)e^{ik x^{i}}$$
(3.3)

where k is comoving wave vector, and modes  $_{k}$  (t) is given by

$$_{k}$$
 (t) =  $\frac{1}{(2)^{3-2}} p \frac{1}{2k}$  H  $\frac{H}{k}$  e<sup>ik</sup> ; (3.4)

and =  $H^{1} \exp(Ht)$  is the conform altime. Eq.(3.3) is appropriate in the sense that the self-coupling of the eld is negligible. Considering the high frequency modes are mainly determined by the heat bath, this approximation is reasonable. The window function W (j; j) is properly chosen to liter out the modes at scales larger than the horizon size  $H^{-1}$ , i.e., W(k) = (k - k(t)), where  $k_h(t)$  (1= )H exp(Ht)<sup>1</sup> is the lower limit to the wavenum ber of thermal uctuations.

From Eqs.(3.1) and (3.3), with the slow-roll condition, Eq.(3.2) renders

<sup>1</sup>The coe cient 1= actually depends on the details of the cut-o function, which may not be step-function-like. For instance, considering causality, the cut-o function can be soft, and the longest wavelength of uctuations can be a few times of the size of horizon [9]

$$3H - e^{2Ht}r^{2} + V^{0}()j_{=} = 3H (x;t); \qquad (3.5)$$

and

$$(x;t) = \frac{\theta}{\theta t} + \frac{1}{3H} e^{2H t} r^{2} q(x;t):$$
 (3.6)

Eq.(3.5) can be rew ritten as

$$\frac{d(x;t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{3H} \frac{F[(x;t)]}{F[(x;t)]} + (x;t)$$
(3.7)

where

$$F[] = \int_{-\infty}^{Z} d^{3}x \frac{1}{2} (e^{Ht}r)^{2} + V()$$
(3.8)

Eq. (3.7) is, in fact, the rate equation of the order parameter of a system with free energy F []. It describes the approach to equilibrium for the system during phase transition.

U sing the expression of free energy (3.8), the slow-roll solution (2.8) can be rew ritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{1}{3H + \frac{dF[]}{d}}$$
(3.9)

Hence, in the case of weak dissipation ( < H), Eq. (3.7) is essentially the same as the slow-roll solution (2.8) or Eq. (3.9) but with uctuations . The existence of the noise eld ensures that the dynamical system properly approaches the global minimum of the in aton potential V ( ). Strictly speaking, both the dissipation and uctuations are consequences derived from q(x;t). They should be considered together. However, it seems to be reasonable to calculate the uctuations alone if the dissipation is weak.

Unlike (3.2), the Langevin equation (3.7) is of rst order (-) due to the slow-roll condition. Generally, therm all uctuations will cause both growing and decaying modes  $[3]^2$ . Therefore, the slow-roll condition simplifies the problem from two types of uctuation modes to one, i.e., we can directly calculate the total uctuation as the superposition of various

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>W$  e thank the referee for pointing this problem out.

uctuations. It has been shown [15] that during the eras of dissipations, the growth of the structures in the universe is substantially the sam e as surface roughening due to stochastic noise. The evolution of the noise-induced surface roughening is described by the so-called KPZ-equation [16]. Eqs.(3.5) or (3.7), which includes term s of non-linear drift plus stochastic uctuations, is a typical KPZ-like equation.

From Eq.(3.6), the two-point correlation function of (x;t) can be found as

h (x;t) 
$$(x^{0};t^{0})i = \frac{H^{3}}{4^{2}} 1 + \frac{2}{\exp(H = T)} \frac{\pi}{1} \frac{\sin(k_{h}jx x^{0}j)}{k_{h}jx x^{0}j}$$
 (t  $\theta$ ; (3.10)

where  $1 = [exp(H = T) \quad 1]$  is the Bose factor at tem perature T. Therefore, when T > H, we have

h (x;t) (x;t) 
$$i = \frac{H^2 T}{2}$$
 (t t): (3.11)

This result can also be directly obtained via the uctuation-dissipation theorem [17,18]. In order to accord with the dissipation term s of Eq. (3.7), the uctuation-dissipation theorem requires the ensemble average of to be given by

$$h i = 0$$
 (3.12)

and

h (x;t) (x;t) 
$$i = D$$
 (t t): (3.13)

The variance D is determined by

$$D = 2\frac{1}{U}\frac{T}{3H +}; \qquad (3.14)$$

where  $U = (4 = 3)H^{-3}$  is the volum e with Hubble radius  $H^{-1}$ . In the case of weak dissipation, we then recover the same result as in Eq.(3.11),

$$D = H^2 T = 2$$
 : (3.15)

W hen T = H, we obtain

$$D = \frac{H^{3}}{2}; (3.16)$$

which agrees exactly the result derived from quantum uctuations of - eld [14]. Therefore, the quantum uctuations of in ationary eld are equivalent to the thermal noises stim – ulated by a thermal bath with the Hawking temperature H. Eqs. (3.15) and (3.16) show that the condition (2.5) is necessary and su cient for a warm in ation.

For long-wavelength modes, the V<sup>0</sup>() term is not negligible. It may lead to a suppression of correlations on scales larger than  $\mathbf{j}V^{0}(\mathbf{j})\mathbf{j}^{1=2}$ . However, before the in atom actually rolls down to the global minimum, we have  $\mathbf{j}V^{0}(\mathbf{j})\mathbf{j}^{1=2}$  H<sup>1</sup>. The so-called abnorm all dissipation of density perturbations [19] may produce more longer correlation time than H. Therefore in phase 2, i.e., the warm in ation phase H < T < M, the long-wavelength suppression will not substantially change the scenario presented above.

The uctuations of the eld can be found from linearizing Eq. (3.7). If we only consider the uctuations crossing outside the horizon, i.e., with wavelength  $H^{1}$ , the equation of is

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{H^2 + V^{(0)}()}{3H +} + : \qquad (3.17)$$

For the slow-roll evolution, we have  $\mathbf{j}V^{\infty}(\mathbf{j}) = 9H^2$  [2]. One can ignore the  $V^{\infty}(\mathbf{j})$  term on the right hand side of Eq. (3.17). Accordingly, the correlation function of the uctuations is

h (t) (bi' 
$$D \frac{3H + 2H^2}{2H^2} e^{(t t^0)H^2 = (3H + 1)}; t > t^0;$$
 (3.18)

hence

h( )<sup>2</sup>i 
$$\frac{3}{4}$$
HT (3.19)

Thus, in the period  $t_e < t < t_f$  the density perturbations on large scales are produced by the therm all uctuations that leave the horizon with a Gaussian-distributed amplitude having a root-m ean-square dispersion given by Eq. (3.19).

Principally, the problem of horizon crossing of them all uctuations given by Eq. (3.7) is different from the case of quantum inductions, because the equations of H and H-, (2.1) and (2.2) contain terms in  $_r$ . However, these terms are insigning cant for weak dissipation Eq. (2.19)] in phase 2. Thus Eqs.(2.1) and (2.2) depend only nominally on the evolution of  $_r$ . A coordingly, for weak dissipation, the behavior of them all inductions at horizon crossing can be treated by the same way as the evolutions of quantum inductions in stochastic in ation. In that theory, quantum inductions of in atom are assumed to become classical upon horizon crossing and act as stochastic forces. O by by, this assumption is not necessary for therm all inductions. Moreover, we will show that in phase 2 the therm all stochastic forces H T is contingent upon the comoving scale of perturbations by a power law Eqs. (2.21) and (3.21)], and therefore the power spectrum of the therm all inductions obeys the power law. This make it more easier to estimate the constraint quantity in the super-horizon regime.

A coordingly, the density perturbations at the horizon re-entry epoch are characterized by [2]

$$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{V^{0}()}{-2 + (4=3)_{r}} :$$
(3.20)

All quantities in the right-hand side of Eq. (3.20) are calculated at the time when the relevant perturbations cut across the horizon at the in ationary epoch.

Using the solutions of and  $_{\rm r}$  of warm in ation (2.12) and (2.13), Eq. (3.20) gives

$$- \frac{!}{_{h}} - \frac{5 \frac{3m}{2^{m+3}} = 2+4}{2^{m+3} \frac{1}{m} = 2+3} + \frac{! \frac{1}{m+2}}{g_{e}} - \frac{m}{g_{e}} + \frac{! \frac{1}{m+2}}{H} - \frac{T}{H} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m}{m+2}\right); \quad (3.21)$$

where the dimensionless parameter  $_{\rm m}$   $_{\rm m}$  H  $^{\rm m-1}$ , and T is the temperature at the time when the considered perturbations  $_{\rm r}$  crossing out of the horizon H  $^{1}$  H $_{\rm i}^{-1}$ . Eq. (3.21) shows that the density perturbations are insensitive to the g $_{\rm e}$  -factor.

#### B.Powerlaw index

Since in ation is immediately followed by the radiation dom inated epoch, the comoving scale of a perturbation with crossing over (the Hubble radius) at time t is given by

$$\frac{k}{H_0} = 2 \frac{H}{H_0} \frac{T_0}{T_f} e^{H (t t_f)};$$
(3.22)

where  $T_0$  and  $H_0$  are the present CM B temperature and Hubble constant respectively. Eq. (3.22) shows that the smaller t is, the smaller k will be. This is the so-called  $\$  rst out - last in" of the evolution of density perturbations produced by the in ation.

Using Eqs. (222) and (322), the perturbations (321) can be rew ritten as

$$- \frac{!_{2}}{h} / k^{(m-6)} = 4; \quad \text{if } k > k_{e}; \quad (3.23)$$

where  $k_e$  is the wavenum ber of perturbations crossing out of horizon at  $t_e$ . It is

$$k_e = 2 \ H \frac{T_0}{T_f} e^{H (t_e t_f)} / 2 \ H \frac{T_0}{T_f} e^{N}$$
 : (3.24)

Therefore, the prim ordial density perturbations produced during warm in ation are of power law with an index (m 6) =4. We may also express the power spectrum of the density perturbations at a given time t. It is

$$- \frac{!_{2^{+}}}{!_{t}} / k^{3+n}; \quad \text{if } k > k_{e}; \qquad (3.25)$$

where the spectral index n is

$$n = 1 + \frac{m - 6}{4} \quad : \tag{3.26}$$

Clearly, for m = 6, the warm in ation model generates a at power spectrum n = 1, yet the power spectrum s will be tilted for  $m \in 6$ . The dissipation models  $m^m$  may not be realistic for higher m, but we will treat m like a free parameter in order to show that the results we concerned actually are not very sensitive to these parameters.

The warm in ation scenario requires that all perturbations on comoving scales equal to or less than the present Hubble radius originate in the period of warm in ation. Hence, the longest wavelength of the perturbations (3.24), i.e.,  $2 = k_e$ , should be larger than the present Hubble radius H<sub>0</sub><sup>1</sup>. We have then

$$N > \ln \frac{H T_0}{H_0 T_f} = \ln \frac{T_0}{H_0} \ln \frac{T_f}{H} 55;$$
 (3.27)

where we have used  $(T_0=H_0)$   $(T_f=H)$ , as  $T_f$  M.U sing Eq. (2.28), the condition (3.27) gives an upper bound to for a given m as

$$m_{max} = -\frac{4}{m+2} - \frac{\ln (T_f = H)}{\ln (T_0 = H_0)}$$
: (3.28)

Thus, the possible area of the index n can be found from Eq. (3.27) as

0

\*

$$n = \begin{cases} \overset{\circ}{\gtrless} 1 & (6 & m)_{max} = 4 \text{ to } 1; \text{ if } m < 6; \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & 1 \text{ to } 1 + (m & 6)_{max} = 4; \text{ if } m > 6: \end{cases}$$
(3.29)

Therefore, the power spectrum is positive-titled (i.e., n > 1) if m > 6, and negative-titled (n < 1) if m < 6. Figure 2 plots the allowed area of n as a function of the in ation m ass scale M. Apparently, for  $M = 10^{16}$  GeV, the tilt  $j_1 = 1$  should not be larger than about 0.15 regardless of the values of m from 2 to 12.

## C.Amplitudes of perturbations

To calculate the amplitude of the perturbations we rewrite spectrum (3.25) into

$$- \frac{!_{2}^{+}}{k_{h}} = A \frac{k_{h}^{!_{h}}}{k_{0}}; \quad \text{if } k > k_{e}; \quad (3.30)$$

where  $k_0 = 2 H_0$ . A is the spectrum amplitude normalized on scale  $k = k_0$ , corresponding to the scale on which the perturbations re-enter the Hubble radius 1=H<sub>0</sub> at present time. From Eqs. (3.21), and (3.23), we have

$$A = \frac{5 \frac{3n}{2} = 2 + 4}{2^{m+3} \frac{m}{m} = 2 + 3} \frac{\frac{2}{m+2}}{q_{e}^{m}} \frac{\frac{2}{m+2}}{q_{e}^{m}} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{m+2}}{\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{m+2}} \frac{H_{0}T_{f}}{H_{0}T_{f}} \frac{n}{H} \frac{1}{H} \frac{T}{H} e^{(n-1)H_{0}(t_{f}, t)}$$
(3.31)

Applying Eq. (2.21), the radiation temperature at the moment of horizon-crossing, t, can be expressed as T (t) =  $T_f \exp[(m + 2) H$  (t  $t_f$ )=4]. W ith the help of Eq. (2.28), we obtain

$$\frac{T}{H} = \frac{\frac{m-6}{m+2}}{H} = \frac{T_{f}}{H} = e^{(n-1)H(t_{f}-t)} = \exp((n-1)1 + \frac{m+2}{4} = N \quad : \quad (3.32)$$

On the other hand, using Eqs. (2.20), (2.23) and (2.28), one has

$$_{m} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{2} \frac{m}{2} \frac{g_{e}}{30} \frac{M}{m_{Pl}} \frac{2^{m}}{3} \frac{3}{2} \frac{m}{2}$$
(3.33)

Substituting Eqs. (3.32) and (3.33) into Eq. (3.31), we have nally

$$A = \frac{3^{4 m}}{64^{3 + \frac{m}{2}}} \cdot \frac{2}{m + 2} + \frac{M}{m_{P1}} \cdot \frac{4m}{m + 2} + \frac{H_{0}}{T_{0}} \cdot \frac{m + 1}{m + 2} + \frac{M + 2}{4} + \frac{M + 2}{4} = N : (3.34)$$

Eq. (3.34) shows that the amplitude A does not contain the unknown  $g_e$  -factor. M oreover, can be expressed by n and m through Eq. (3.26), and N can be expressed by and M via Eq. (2.28). Therefore, the amplitude of the initial density perturbations, A, is only a function of M, n, and m.

Figures 3 and 4 plot the relations between the amplitude A and index n for various parameters M and m. In the case of m = 6, n = 1, the relation of A and is plotted in Fig. 5. It can be seen from Figs. 3, 4 and 5 that for either m 6 or m < 6, the amplitude A is signi cantly dependent on M, but not so sensitive to m. Namely, the testable A-n relationship is mainly determined by a therm odynamical variable, the energy scale M. This is a \therm odynamical" feature. The relationship between A and N plotted in Figs. 6 and 7 also show this kind of \therm odynamical" feature: the A-N relation depends mainly on M.

For comparison, the observed results of A and n derived from the 4-year COBE-DMR data (quadrupole moment  $Q_{\rm rm \ s \ P \ S}$   $15 \cdot 3^{3:7}_{2:8}$  K and n 12  $0 \cdot 3$  [10]) are plotted in Figs. 3, 4 and 5. The observationally allowed A-n range is generally in a good agreement with the predicted A-n curve if M  $10^{5}$   $10^{6}$  G eV, regardless the parameter m . Figures 3 and 4 also indicate that if the tilt of spectrum in 1 j is larger than 0.1, the parameter area of M  $10^{4}$  G eV will be ruled out. Therefore, the warm in ation seems to fairly well reconcile the initial perturbations with the energy scale of the initial perturbations with the energy scale of the initial perturbations.

#### IV.CONCLUSIONSAND DISCUSSION

A ssum ing that the in aton - eld undergoes a dissipative process with  $-^2$ , we have studied the power spectrum of the mass density perturbations. In this analysis, we have employed the popular <sup>4</sup> potential. However, only one parameter, the mass scale of the ination M, is found to be important in predicting the observable features of power spectrum, i.e., the amplitude A and index n. A ctually, the warm in ation scenario is based on two them odynam ical requirements: (a) the existence of a therm alized heat bath during in ation, and (b) that the initial uctuations are given by the uctuation-dissipation theorem. Therefore, we believe that the \therm odynam ical" features { A and n depend only on M { would be generic for the warm in ation. This feature is useful for m odel testing. Hence, the warm in ation can be employed as an elective working m odel when m ore precise data about the observable quantities A, n etc. become available. The current observed data of A and n from CMB are consistent with the warm in ation scenario if the mass scale M of the in ation is in the range of  $10^{15}$   $10^6$  G eV.

### ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e would like to thank an anonymous refere for a detailed report that improved the presentation of the paper. Wolung Lee would like to thank Hung Jung Lu for helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Albrecht, P. J. Steinhardt, M. S. Turner and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1437
  (1982); J. Yokoyam a and K. Maeda, Phys. Lett. 207B, 31 (1988).
- [2] For a review of the standard in ationary cosm ology, please see E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, The Early Universe (Addison-Wesley, New York, NY, 1990).
- [3] M. G leiser and R.O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. D 50, 2441 (1994); M. Morikawa, Phys. Rev. D 33, 3607 (1986); D. Boyanovsky, H.J. de Vega, R. Holman, D.-S. Lee and A. Singh, Phys. Rev. D 51, 4419 (1995).
- [4] A. Berera, M. Gleiser and R.O. Ramos, hep-ph/9803394, Phys. Rev. D. in press(1998);
  J. Yokoyam a and A. Linde, hep-ph/9809409 (1998).
- [5] A.Berera and LZ.Fang, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1912 (1995); A.Berera, Phys.Rev.Lett. 75, 3218 (1995).
- [6] W . Lee and L Z. Fang, Int. J. M od. Phys. D 6, 305 (1997).
- [7] H.P. de O liveira and R.O. Ram os, Phys. Rev. D 57, 741 (1998).
- [8] Y P. Jing and L Z. Fang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1882 (1994); L Z. Fang and Y P. Jing,
  M od. Phys. Lett. A 11, 1531 (1996)
- [9] A. Berera, L.Z. Fang and G. Hinshaw, Phys. Rev. D 57, 2207 (1998).
- [10] C.L.Bennett, et al. A strophys. J. 464, L1 (1996).
- [11] U.W eiss, Quantum Dissipative Systems (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1993.)
- [12] D. Boyanovsky, R. Holm an and S. P. Kum ar, Phys. Rev D 56, 1958 (1997).
- [13] See, for example, N.G oldenfeld, Lectures on Phase Transitions and the Renorm alization Group (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1992).
- [14] A A. Starobinsky, in Fundam ental Interactions (MGPIPress, Moscow, 1984), p. 55; S.

J.Rey, Nucl.Phys.B 284, 706 (1987); M. Saaski, Y. Nam bu and K. Nakao, Nucl.Phys. B 308, 868, (1988); A. Hosaya, M. Morikawa, and K. Nakayama, Int.J. Mod.Phys.A 4, 2613 (1989); D.S. Salopek and J.R. Bond, Phys. Rev. 43D, 1005 (1991) and references therein.

- [15] A.Berera and LZ.Fang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 458 (1994).
- [16] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, and Y. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 889 (1986).
- [17] P.C. Hohenberg and B.J. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 49, 435 (1977).
- [18] B L. Hu and A. M atacz, Phys. Rev. D 51, 1577 (1995); A. M atacz, Phys. Rev. D 55, 1860, (1997).
- [19] T.R.Kirkpatrick and D.Belitz, J.Stat. Phys. 87, 1307 (1997).

#### FIGURES

FIG.1. A typical solutions of the evolutions of eld and radiations in warm in ation in which =  $_2 ^2$ , V() =  $(^2 ^2)^2$  and  $^4 = M^4$ , M being the in aton energy scale. The parameters are taken to be M =  $10^{15}$ GeV, = 2.24  $10^9$  GeV,  $_2 = 10^5$  H<sub>i</sub> and  $g_e = 100$ . The dot-dashed and solid lines are for H (t) and the radiation temperature T respectively.  $t_b$  is the time at which the temperature rebound ( $T_b$ ) and  $t_e$  the time of T = H. The in ation ends at  $\frac{1}{2}$  when the temperature is  $T_f$ . T and H are in units of H<sub>i</sub> [B V (0)=3m  $\frac{2}{p_1}$ ]<sup>1=2</sup>, and t is in units of H<sub>i</sub><sup>1</sup>.

FIG.2. The allowed area of power law index n as a function of the mass scale M for various m. For given M and m, the possible n should lie between the line n = 1 and the corresponding curve of m. For m = 6, the only solution is n = 1.

FIG.3. The amplitudes of the power spectrum as a function of n in the area of n < 1. The mass scales M are labeled at the curves. The dotted, dashed, and solid lines are for m = 0; 2 and 4 respectively. All curves end at the points when the corresponding warm in ation durations N are less than 55. The region within the dot-dashed box is the allowed area of (n;A) given by the 4-year COBE-DMR data.

FIG.4. The same as Fig. 3, but for n > 1. The dotted, dashed, and solid lines are form = 8; 10 and 12 respectively.

FIG.5. The relation A and for m = 6. In this case, n = 1. The dot-dashed line represents the COBE-DMR data at n = 1 and  $Q_{m s PS} = 153$  K, i.e., A ' 35 10<sup>6</sup>.

FIG.6. The amplitudes of the power spectrum as a function of the thermal duration N at three in atom mass scales M and in the range of n < 1. The dotted, dotted and dashed lines are for m = 0; 2 and 4 respectively.

FIG.7. The same as Fig. 6, but for n 1. The dotted, dotted and dashed lines are for m = 8; 10 and 12 respectively.









n



α



