Stationary solutions in Brans{Dicke stochastic in ationary cosmology

Juan Garc a{Bellidd

A stronom y C entre, School of M athem atical and Physical Sciences, U niversity of Sussex, Brighton BN1 90 H, UK.

AndreiLinde²

Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305{4060, USA

Abstract

In B rans{D icke theory the U niverse becom es divided after in ation into m any exponentially large dom ains with di erent values of the e ective gravitational constant. Such a process can be described by di usion equations for the probability of nding a certain value of the in aton and dilaton elds in a physical volum e of the U niverse. For a typical chaotic in ation potential, the solutions for the probability distribution never become stationary but grow forever towards larger values of the elds. We show here that a non-m inim al conform al coupling of the in aton to the curvature scalar, as well as radiative corrections to the elds analyze the possibility of large nonperturbative jumps of the uctuating in aton scalar eld, which was recently revealed in the context of the E instein theory. We nd that in the B rans{D icke theory the am plitude of such jumps is strongly suppressed.

¹ E-m ail: jbellido@ sussex.ac.uk

² E-m ail: linde@ physics.stanford.edu

1 Introduction

A fter fteen years of development of in ationary cosmology, the basic principles of this theory seem to be well understood, see e.g. Ref. [1]. However, there is still a very long way from these basic principles to the naltheory. One of the main problem s is the absence of the nalversion of the underlying particle theory. Fortunately, many properties of in ationary cosmology are very stable with respect to the change of its particular realization. In particular, most in ationary models predict a at Universe (=1) with a nearly scale-independent spectrum of density perturbations. Still some important deviations from the standard brem ay appear when one goes from one theory of elementary particles to another. For example, in a certain class of theories, one can obtain an open [2] or a closed [3, 4] Universe, or even a Universe consisting of di erent causally disconnected regions with all possible values of <1 [4]. It would be important to nd out whether some other modi cations of the in ationary paradigm may appear when one implements it in di erent theories of fundam ental interactions.

An interesting playground for testing the robustness of various ideas about in ation is provided by the Brans{Dicke theory [5]. It remains to be seen whether this theory or some of its generalizations can have a su ciently good motivation, e.g. from the point of view of string theory [6]{ [8]. In any case, however, some qualitatively new elects which appear in the BD in ationary cosm ology may justify its investigation.

One of these e ects is the possibility to avoid the graceful exit problem of the rst-order in ation [9]. This possibility, however, requires the introduction of an elective potential and/or a nonminimal kinetic term for the Brans{Dicke eld [10], which makes the corresponding theory rather complicated and may lead to certain problems [11]. In some of the recent versions of these models the end of in ation occurs in the standard way, during the stage of slow rolling [12].

In what follows we will be interested in another speci c e ect which may appear in the in ationary Brans{Dicke cosmology. In this theory quantum uctuations of the Brans{Dicke eld during in ation driven by the in atom eld lead to the division of the Universe into di erent exponentially large regions where the e ective gravitational constant $G = M_p^2 = \frac{1}{2^{-2}}$ can take all possible values from 0 to 1, see Ref. [13].

This e ect becomes especially interesting if one takes into account the process of self-reproduction of in ationary universe. This process can be studied in a most adequate way by using the stochastic approach to in ation and investigating the probability distribution $P_p(; ;; t)$, which gives the relative fraction of the volume of the Universe containing the in atom eld and the B rans{D icke eld at the moment t. A detailed study of the distribution P_p was performed recently in Ref. [14], where it was shown that in many in ationary models based on the E instein theory of gravity (i.e. the theory with a constant B rans{D icke eld) this probability distribution rapidly approaches a stationary regime. This means that if one takes a section of the U niverse at a given time t and calculates the relative fraction of domains of the U niverse with given properties, the result will not depend on the time t, both during in ation and after it.

However, the stationary character of the probability distribution P_p in general relativity is closely related to the existence of the P lanck boundary, where the potential energy density V () becomes comparable with the P lanck density M_p^4 . Typically the distribution $P_p(;t)$ rapidly moves towards large , for the reason that the volume of domains with large V () grows very fast. The distribution $P_p(;t)$ becomes stabilized as it approaches the P lanck boundary, where, as it is argued in [14]{[16], the process of self-reproduction of in ationary domains is less e cient, or in ation becomes in possible altogether.

M eanwhile, in the Brans{D icke theory the situation is more complicated [17, 18]. Since the e ective P lanck m ass in this theory depends on $M_p^2() = \frac{2}{1} + \frac{2}{2}$, the P lanck boundary instead of being a point becomes a line $4 = \frac{1^2}{4^2} V()$. Then the distribution $P_p(;;t)$ rst moves towards the P lanck boundary, and after that it slides along this boundary in the direction where the rate of expansion of the U niverse becomes greater. Such runaway solutions typically lead to the distributions P_p rapidly moving towards inde nitely large values of and . As a consequence, a typical value of the P lanck m ass at the end of in ation also becomes inde nitely large, and the elective gravitational constant vanishes.

In fact, runaway solutions may appear even in the ordinary E instein theory. This may happen if the in atom eld is nonminimally coupled to curvature due to the existence of the interaction $\frac{1}{2}$ ²R, with < 0 [16]. On the other hand, in the theories with > 0 one may encounter many dimensioned event regimes. Depending on the value of , one may not have in ation at all, or one may have in ation without self-reproduction of in ationary domains, or in ation and self-reproduction with a stationary distribution P_p.

This suggests us to study a more general version of the Brans{Dicke theory, where not only the Brans{dicke eld, but also the in atom eld is nonminimally coupled to gravity. Some models of this type have been discussed before in [19, 20]. Note that this fram ework seems to be much more natural than the standard one, where it is assumed that only one of the two scalar elds (the Brans{Dicke eld) is nonminimally coupled to gravity.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the problem of runaway solutions

in the Brans{D icke stochastic in ation. In Section 3 we derive a set of equations for in ation in the Brans{D icke theory with a non minimally coupled in aton scalar eld. We study the case of a purely massive scalar eld and nd that it provides a natural cuto for the motion of the in aton and dilaton elds, resulting in the existence of stationary solutions to the di usion of both elds. In order to test the stability of the results, we analyse the same em odel in the presence of a non zero self-coupling of the in aton. We nd that such a term is enough to destroy the stationarity of the probability distribution, making such a stationarity rather in probable. In Section 3.1 we propose a di erent solution to the nunaway behavior of the scalar elds by considering 1 (bop corrections to the e ective potential. For certain values of the parameters of the model, it is possible that the e ective potential of the in aton eld acquires a maximum at exponentially large values of . This provides a natural cuto for the rate of in ation and makes the distribution P_p stationary. Furtherm ore, the P landk mass in this model is exponentially larger than the only scale in the problem , the mass of the in aton, thus naturally explaining a hierarchy of scales. In Section 5 we explore the possibility of very large quantum jumps of the scalar eld [21] in the context of the B rans-D icke theory. In Section 6 we draw some conclusions.

2 Runaway solutions in Brans{Dicke in ation

In this section we will introduce the problem of runaway solutions in Brans{Dicke $\cos m$ ology. For a detailed analysis see Refs. [17, 18]. Consider the evolution of the in atom eld with a generic chaotic potential in a JBD theory of gravity with dilatom eld ,

$$S = {}^{2} d^{4}x^{p} - \frac{1}{g} \frac{1}{8!} {}^{2}R - \frac{1}{2} (0)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} (0)^{2} - V(); \qquad (1)$$

where P lanck m ass is written in terms of the dilaton eld as M $_{P}^{2}$ () = $\frac{2}{!}$ ². For generic in aton potentials of the type V () = $\frac{2}{2n}$ ²ⁿ, the equations of motion for the hom ogeneous elds in the slow-roll approximation are

$$\frac{-}{-} = \frac{H}{!}; \qquad - = \frac{n}{2} \frac{H}{!} \frac{^2}{^2}; \qquad (2)$$

This im plies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} = 0;$$
(3)

which means that the elds move along a circle of radius $r^2 = \frac{2}{2} + \frac{7}{2}$, with $r^2 = \frac{2}{n} \frac{2}{n}$, see Ref. [13]. In ation begins at the P lanck boundary $2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p}{2n}$ and ends somewhere at the line $\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2}$. This implies that if in ation begins at 0 or it will end at if we nd a reason why 0 should be large, we will be able to explain why M $_{\rm P} = \frac{q}{2} \frac{2}{n} \frac{q}{2} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{0}$ is also large. This simple picture becomes much more complicated if one takes into account that in addition to the classical motion, the elds and experience quantum jumps with a typical amplitude $\frac{H}{2}$ during each time interval H⁻¹. One can easily verify that (for) these jumps are greater than the classical rolling of the elds for

$$\frac{3^{2}}{1^{3}}^{4} < V() < \frac{4^{2}}{1^{2}}^{4};$$
(4)

the last inequality corresponding to the P lanck boundary. Thus, if the eld is not very far away from the P lanck boundary (but still su ciently far away so that our approach remains reliable), the motion of the eld occurs not due to classical rolling but due to B rownian jumps in all possible directions. The jumps in the direction of greater H ubble constant lead to m uch m ore rapid expansion of space. As a result, very soon (in the synchronous time t) the main part of the physical volume of the U niverse shifts towards the P lanck boundary where the H ubble constant takes its greatest values. A fler that the eld can take all possible values along the P lanck boundary, and therefore the value of the eld in the domains reaching the boundary of the end of in ation does not depend on the initial value $_0$.

However, the Hubble constant H (;) is di erent in di erent parts of the P lanck boundary. If it has a maximum at some point = $_{max}$ along the P lanck boundary, then the main part of the volume of the U niverse will be produced as a result of exponentially rapid in ation near this point. Therefore the main part of the volume of the U niverse after in ation will be produced with M_P $\frac{q}{\frac{4}{n!}}$ max [17].

Unfortunately, as we have shown in [17, 18], this regime is not realized in the model (1) with $V() = \frac{2n}{2n} e^{2n}$, nor in the models with exponentially growing potentials. The reason is very simple: The Hubble parameter in such theories grows along the Planck boundary. Therefore the leading contribution to the volume of the Universe is given by the domains expanding with ever growing speed and containing indenitely large values of the elds and . The di usion equations describing this process have runaway solutions which describe distributions $P_p(;;t)$ running towards in nitely large . In many cases, the center of the distribution P_p reaches in nitely large values of within nite time.

This does not necessarily mean that the corresponding theories are physically unacceptable. It may happen that our idea that we should live in a part of the Universe corresponding to a maximum of $P_p(;;t)$ at a given time t is incorrect; see Ref. [17] for a discussion of this issue. In particular, as it was shown in [14, 17], the behavior of the distribution $P_p(;;t)$ depends on the choice of time parametrization. If one studies, e.g. the probability distribution $P_p(;;)$, where $= \ln a(t)$, its behavior may be quite di erent, and it may not exhibit any runaway solutions.

M oreover, it is very easy to stabilize the distribution Pp(;;;t) by making the e ective potential

V () very curved and unsuitable for in ation at large . Still it would be interesting to study this phenom enon in a more detailed way and to see whether the distribution $P_p(;;t)$ in the B rans{D icke theory can be stabilized in a naturalway. If this stabilization can occur only at very large values of the eld , then the typical value of the B rans{D icke eld at the end of in ation will also be extrem ely large. This may give us a tentative explanation of the anom alously large value of the P lanck m ass.

3 A more general theory

Let us now turn to a scenario in which some of the problem discussed above could be resolved. For that purpose we will consider the classical evolution of the in atom eld with a generic chaotic potential, in the context of the Jordan {B rans{D icke theory of gravity and a curvature coupled in atom with a non minimal coupling ,

$$S = {}^{Z} d^{4}x^{P} - g \frac{1}{8!} {}^{2}R - \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}R - \frac{1}{2} (0)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} (0)^{2} - V () :$$
 (5)

In this theory the P lanck m ass takes the form

$$M_{P}^{2}(;) = 16 = 8 \frac{1}{4!}^{2} 2;$$
 (6)

where plays the role of the Brans{D icke scalar. The value of the Brans{D icke parameter ! is bounded by the post-Newtonian experiments [22] and primordial nucleosynthesis [23] to be very large, ! > 500, and therefore it is reasonable to use the approximation ! 1 in the following analysis. The parameter , on the other hand, is unconstrained and could take positive or negative values. Here we will consider the case of a sm all and negative .

The equations of motion for the theory (5) can be written as

$$r^{2} = \frac{1}{4!} R;$$

 $r^{2} = V^{0}() R;$
(7)

$$\frac{1}{4!} \ ^{2} \ ^{2} R \ \frac{1}{2}g R = g V () + r r g r^{2} \frac{1}{4!} \ ^{2} \ ^{2}$$

$$+ Q Q \ \frac{1}{2}g (Q)^{2} + Q Q \ \frac{1}{2}g (Q)^{2} :$$
(8)

We can then write the exact equations for the hom ogeneous elds in at space (k = 0) as

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2!} + \frac{3}{2!} + (1 - 6) + r^{2} = 4V() + V^{0}(); \qquad (9)$$

$$\frac{1}{4!} 1 + \frac{3}{2!} {}^{2} (1 {}^{6})^{2} R = 4V () {}^{6} V^{9} () (1 {}^{6})^{2} 1 + \frac{3}{2!} {}^{2} ;$$

$$\frac{1}{4!} {}^{2} {}^{2} 3H^{2} = V () + 6 H - \frac{1}{2} {}^{2} \frac{3}{2!} H - \frac{1}{2} {}^{2} ;$$
(10)

where $R = 12H^2 + 6H$. Note that for = 0 and $= {}^2=8!$ we recover the usual BD equations. From now on we will drop the last two terms of Eqs. (10) since they are subleading for large !.

During in ation, we can write the equations of motion of the hom ogeneous elds and for small j jand large !, in the slow-roll approximation ($H - H^2$), as

$$- = \frac{H}{!};$$

$$- = \frac{H}{!} 1 \frac{V^{0}}{4V} \frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{2};$$

$$H^{2} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{4V()}{2};$$

(11)

where 4! j j. Note that for small they reduce to the usual BD equations.

3.1 Massive curvature-coupled in atom

Let us consider in some detail the theory (5) with V () = $\frac{1}{2}m^2$ at large and very small < 0. In this case it is useful to make a change of variables to polar coordinates $r^2 = 2 + \frac{1}{2}$; $z = \frac{1}{2}$; $r^2 = 2(1 + 6j)^2$. In these coordinates, the equations of motion (11) take the form

$$\underline{z} = \frac{zH}{!} z^{2} + 1 = 2 ;$$

$$\underline{r} = \frac{rH}{!} \frac{=2}{1+z^{2}} ;$$

$$H^{2} = \frac{!}{3} \frac{m^{2}}{z^{2} + =2} :$$
(12)

One can solve these equations parametrically in the z-variable, for $\frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{dr}{dz} = \frac{r}{z(1+z^2)(z^2+1)}; \qquad r_0 = r(z_0);$$

$$r(z) = r_0 \frac{z}{z_0} = \frac{(2-1)}{1+z_0^2}; \qquad \frac{1+z^2}{1+z_0^2}; \qquad \frac{z^2+1}{z_0^2+1} = 2^{1-1};$$
(13)

which gives

(z) = r(z)
$$(1 + z^2)^{1=2}$$
;
(14)
(z) = r(z) $(1 + z^2)^{1=2}$:

For j j 1, the condition for existence of in ation ($j_{H-j} < H^2$) is $_2^2 < V$,

$$(z^2 = 2)^2 < \frac{3!}{2} (z^2 + =2);$$
 (15)

which gives a slightly modi ed condition for the end of in ation, $z_e^2 + =2 = 3! =2$.

For very small, the trajectory is very close to a circle in the plane (';). However, for arbitrary the scalar elds move along a more complicated trajectory. There are regions of parameter space for which in ation never ends. For instance, if > 2 and $z^2 < (2)=2$, then z < 0 and in ation never ends (unless the eld tunnels (di uses) to its large values quantum mechanically). This is a rather surprising result since there is nothing singular in our equations (12) at = 2. The reason of this unexpected behavior is that the eld in the regime for > 2 grows much faster than the eld , so it never approaches the end of in ation with .

The value of the e ective P lanck m ass at the end of in ation is given by (see Eq.13),

$$M_{P} = \frac{s}{\frac{2}{!}} r(z_{e}) \frac{z_{e}^{2} + =2}{z_{e}^{2} + 1} , \frac{s}{\frac{2}{!}} r_{o} z_{o} \frac{2}{2z_{o}^{2}} ; \frac{1}{2} r_{o} z_{o}$$
(16)

where we have used the fact that $z_e = 1$ and $z_o = 1$. Note that the value of the P lanck m ass at the end of in ation is very sensitive to initial conditions and, for the reason explained above, it becomes exponentially large when $! 2: M_P = \frac{q}{4 \text{ j j}_o} \exp z_o^2$.

We should now discuss possible initial conditions and the regime of self-reproduction of the Universe in this model. The Planck boundary in this theory looks like an ellipse

$${}^{2} + \frac{\max}{2} = \frac{2}{\max} ;$$

$$\max \frac{m}{8} \frac{p}{2j};$$
(17)

There is no constraint on ; however, we will assume that and 1=! are both of the same order of magnitude. We will see that this is a consistent approximation in this scenario.

The amplitude of quantum uctuations of the scalar elds, and , whose wavelengths are stretched beyond the horizon and act on the quasi{hom ogeneous background elds like a stochastic force, can be computed as in [17, 18] and they are given by (for ! 1 and j j 1)

$$' \frac{H}{2};$$
 $' \frac{H}{2}:$ (18)

Density perturbations in our model can be calculated as in Refs. [17, 18, 24]. For the theory

V () = $\frac{1}{2}m^{2}$, in the large ! lim it³, we nd

$$- \frac{50\,\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P}}}: \tag{19}$$

Note that the larger is the P lanck m ass at the end of in ation in a given region of the U niverse, the smaller will be density perturbations in this region. This suggests that the large value of P lanck m ass M_P in our part of the U niverse m ay be related to the small value of the am plitude of density perturbations — 5 150 [17]. In other words, instead of two independent small parameters, $\frac{m}{M_P}$ 1 and — 5 10, we have only one.

As we already discussed in the previous section, those in ationary domains where quantum jumps during the time H¹ are more important than their classical motion, enter the regime of self reproduction. One can easily show that in our case the region where this regime is possible is the interior of the ellipse

$${}^{2} + \frac{2}{2} = \frac{2}{4};$$

$$\frac{p}{6j} \frac{3}{j} = 2;$$

$$1 + (2 + 1)^{1-2};$$
(20)

In our model the Hubble constant takes its maximal values along the line = 0 (i.e. z = 0). A long this line there is a wide region where self-reproduction is possible. This region begins at the P lanck boundary (17) and ends at the self-reproduction boundary (20):

$$\frac{m}{8 \overline{2j}} < < \frac{p}{4 \overline{6j}} = \frac{m}{6j}$$
(21)

Since this interval is limited, runaway solutions here are impossible. In such a situation the probability distribution $P_p(;;t)$ should be stationary, with a maximum somewhere at this line, in the interval (21).

Note, however, that this maximum should be relatively smooth, since the value of the Hubble constant does not depend on along the line = 0:

H (= 0) =
$$\frac{m}{6j \frac{3}{2}}$$
: (22)

For a complete investigation of the probability distribution $P_p(;;t)$ and of the value of M_p at the end of in ation one should solve num erically the di usion equations for $P_p(;;t)$, as we did in Ref. [17]. To get a rough idea of the resulting distribution of possible values of M_p at the end

 $^{^3{\}rm N}$ ote that during the last stages of in ation, there is an approximate equivalence of the Einstein and Jordan frames.

of in ation one can simply take all points at the boundary of self-reproduction and treat them as initial conditions for the solutions (13), (16). However, one can get a much better picture if one takes into account that the main contribution to the probability distribution on this boundary is given by the part of the boundary of the region of self-reproduction with the highest value of H. This value is achieved for = (20) at the line = 0. The peak cannot be wider than $\frac{P}{2}$ in the -direction, and in fact it is expected to be much more narrow. Estimates of the values of the excluse of the main signer much greater than $\frac{P}{2}$. If, for example, one considers the evolution of domains with initial values of the elds and $> \frac{H}{2}$ (due to unavoidable quantum jumps near = 0), Eq. (16) yields

$$\frac{m}{M_{P}} > \frac{q}{3} \frac{4j^{2}}{2}^{\frac{1}{2}} :$$
 (23)

O ne can then estim ate the allowed values of j j from the amplitude of density perturbations (19). For '1 we nd j j < 1 10, which is consistent with the constraint ! > 500 and our condition '1. Note also that $\frac{m}{M_{P}}$ ' $\frac{p}{6} \exp \frac{1}{2j\frac{3}{2}}$ for ! 2, and it becomes very easy to obtain a very small ratio of $\frac{m}{M_{P}}$ even for not too small values of j j. Therefore, we have a natural realization of our model without the need for very small numbers. In fact one could argue that ! 500 is not such a large number, if we understand it as the dimensionless coupling of m atter to the dilaton in the Einstein frame [25], 2 = (2! + 3)¹⁼² 0.03.

3.2 Self-coupled in aton

W e must now consider possible corrections to the in atom potential, in order to see whether our results are stable with respect to small modi cations of the theory. Let us add an in atom self-coupling to the theory, V () = $\frac{1}{2}m^2$ + $\frac{4}{4}$. The corresponding equations of motion read

$$\underline{z} = \frac{zH}{!} \frac{2m^{2}(1+z^{2})(2z^{2}+2) + r^{2}(1+2z^{2})}{4m^{2}(1+z^{2}) + r^{2}};$$

$$\underline{r} = \frac{rH}{!} \frac{2m^{2}(1+z^{2}) + r^{2}}{(4m^{2}(1+z^{2}) + r^{2})(1+z^{2})};$$

$$H^{2} = \frac{!}{6} \frac{4m^{2}(1+z^{2}) + r^{2}}{(1+z^{2})(2z^{2}+1)};$$
(24)

There is a bifurcation line in the plane (z;r) that separates domains for which in ation never ends. This is the line $\underline{z} = 0$,

$$z^{2} = \frac{2}{2} \frac{r^{2}}{4m^{2}} \frac{1+2z^{2}}{1+z^{2}} :$$
 (25)

For > 2 and $r^2 < 2m^2$ (2)=, there are values of z for which z < 0, which could suggest, just as in the previous model with V () = $\frac{1}{2}m^2$, that the end of in ation cannot be reached. However, as r increases (24), z eventually changes sign and in ation ends.

The boundary of self-reproduction in this theory is given by

$$^{2} + ^{2} 1 \frac{2^{!}}{\frac{2}{c}} = 1 + \frac{2^{!}}{\frac{2}{c}};$$
 (26)

where and were de ned in (20).

The Planck boundary for this theory is

$$^{2} + ^{2} = _{\max} 1 + \frac{2^{!}}{2} ;$$
 (27)

where $_{max}$ was given in (17) and $_{c}$ $2m^{2} = {}^{p} -$. At small this boundary boks like an ellipse, but at large it becomes a straight line. For $_{max} < _{c}$ these two parts of the P lanck boundary are disconnected: both lines cross the axis at di erent points. For $_{max} > _{c}$ these two lines form a continuous curve. The greatest values of the H ubble parameter appear along the part of the P lanck boundary with ! 1. Therefore in this model there always exist runaway solutions describing the probability distribution $P_{p}(; ; t)$ rapidly m oving towards inde nitely large values of and . In other words, the existence of a stationary regime which we have found in the previous model appears to be unstable with respect to a small modi cation of the e ective potential of the in atom eld. It makes this model less attractive.

4 One loop corrections

Now let us return back to the simple Brans{Dicke theory (1) with the in aton eld minimally coupled to gravity, but let us take into account quantum corrections to the elective potential V (). In the one-loop approximation one can represent the elective potential in the following way:

$$V() = \frac{1}{4} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 0 \end{array} \right)^2 + \begin{array}{c} 4 \ln \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \end{array} ;$$
 (28)

where ${}_0^2 = m^2 = is$ the value of the in atom eld at the minimum of the potential, and depends on the values of coupling constants in the theory. For example, if the scalar eld interacts with the fermion eld with the coupling constant h, one obtains = $(9\ ^2\ 4h^2)=32\ ^2$ [26]. Note, that will be negative for h^2 ². In that case, a new maximum will appear at exponentially large ,

$$\max' \circ \exp \frac{1}{4jj} \circ ; \qquad (29)$$

followed by a very sharp fall-o to negative values of the potential, rendering the vacuum unstable [26]. In our case this sharp fall-o m ay act e ectively as a natural boundary for the di usion of the in atom eld . In such a situation the probability distribution $P_p(; ; t)$ becomes stationary, with the maximum concentrated near the P lanck boundary at $= m_{ax}$.

In the theory (28), the equations of m otion for $_0$ and = 0, become

$$-= \frac{H}{!};$$

$$-= \frac{V^{0}()}{3H}; \qquad \frac{H^{2}}{!};$$

$$H^{2} = \frac{4!V()}{3^{2}};$$
(30)

For $_0$ max the classical motion is circular, just as in the theory 4 , and we can de ne polar coordinates (r;z) as usual, with z = -. Therefore one can obtain the following estimate of the P lanck mass after the end of in ation:

$$M_{P} = \frac{s}{\frac{2}{!}} \max_{\max} \frac{s}{\frac{2}{!}} \exp \frac{1}{4j j}; \qquad (31)$$

Note that in this case the elective P lanck mass for j j becomes exponentially large. In the regime when it is much greater than $_0$ the amplitude of density perturbations is given by the standard expression -16^{p} . Thus, one does not get anything new from the point of view of density perturbations, but one can obtain a natural explanation of the very large value of the P lanck mass as compared with other mass scales in the theory.

5 Non-perturbative e ects

All results obtained in the present paper are related to the probability distribution $P_p(;;t)$, which shows the fraction of the volume of the Universe with the elds and at a given moment of time t in synchronous coordinates. We should emphasize again that this is not a unique choice of measure in quantum cosmology. One could study, for example, the probability distribution $P_p(;;)$, where $\ln a(t)$. This distribution is considerably different from $P_p(;;t)$. This does not allow us to make unambiguous predictions until the issue of measure in quantum cosmol-ogy is resolved, see a discussion of this issue in Refs. [14, 17, 16]. Still we believe that investigation of $P_p(;;t)$ gives us very interesting information about the structure of in ationary universe.

Recently it was shown, in the context of chaotic in ation based on the usual E instein theory, that the main fraction of volume of the U niverse in a state with a given density at any given moment of time t is concentrated near the centers of deep exponentially wide spherically sym – metric holes in the density distribution [21]. For the reason discussed above, interpretation of this result is not unambiguous, and we are not sure that it in plies that we must live near the center of a spherically sym metric void. However, we think that this result is very nontrivial and deserves further investigation [27].

Here we would like to study whether a similar e ect occurs in the context of the Brans{Dicke theory. As we will see, the e ect does take place, but its amplitude is signi cantly dierent. In order to understand it, we should brie y remind the origin of this e ect in the Einstein theory, with one scalar eld (the in ation eld), and then we will make a generalization to the Brans{ Dicke case.

The best way to exam ine this scenario is to investigate the probability distribution P_p (;t). The distribution P_p (;t) obeys the following di usion equation (see Ref. [14] and references therein):

$$\frac{@P_{p}}{@t} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{@}{@} - \frac{H^{3=2}()}{2}\frac{@}{@} - \frac{H^{3=2}()}{2}P_{p} + \frac{V^{0}()}{3H()}P_{p} + 3H()P_{p};$$
(32)

Here we tem porarily use the system of units $M_p = 1$. One may try to obtain solutions of equation (32) in the form of the series $P_p(;t) = {P \atop s=1}^{p} e^{st} s()$. In the limit of large time to nay the term with the largest eigenvalue 1 survives, $P_p(;t) = e^{1t} 1()$. The function 1 in the limit t! 1 has a meaning of a normalized time-independent probability distribution to nd a given eld in a unit physical volume, whereas the function e^{1t} shows the overall grow th of the volume of all parts of the Universe, which does not depend on in the limit t! 1. In this limit one can write Eq. (32) in the form

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{0}{0} - \frac{H^{3=2}()}{2}\frac{0}{0} - \frac{H^{3=2}()}{2}\frac{1}{1}() + \frac{0}{0} - \frac{V^{0}()}{3H()}\frac{1}{1}() + 3H()\frac{1}{1}() = \frac{1}{1}() : (33)$$

In the simplest theory with V () = $\frac{1}{4}$ and H = $\frac{q}{\frac{2}{3}}$ ², Eq. (33) reads [14]:

$${}^{00}_{1} + {}^{0}_{1} \frac{6}{5} + \frac{9}{5} + \frac{9}{1} + {}^{1}_{1} \frac{6}{6} + \frac{15}{2} + \frac{36}{4} \frac{1}{6} \frac{6}{6} = {}^{3=2} = 0 :$$
(34)

This equation can be solved both analytically and num erically. The result is that the eigenvalue 1 is given by d() H_{max}. Here d() is the fractal dimension, which approaches 3 in the limit ! 0, while H_{max} is the maximum possible value of the Hubble constant during in ation, which in our case corresponds to its value at the Planck boundary V () = M_P⁴ = 1. This gives H_{max} = $2^{q} \frac{2}{3}$. Thus, in the small limit one has $1 = 3H_{max} = 2^{p} \frac{2}{6}$ 8:68.

The distribution $_1$ depends on very sharply. One can easily check that at small the leading terms in Eq. (34) are the second and the last ones. (This means, in particular, that the di usion terms in Eqs. (32), (33) can be neglected.) Therefore the solution of equation (34) for small corresponding to the last stages of in ation is given by

$$p_{\frac{6}{1}}$$
 : (35)

This is an extrem ely strong dependence. For example, $_1$ $^{10^8}$ for the realistic value 10^{13} .

Consider all in ationary domains which contain a given eld at a given moment of time t. Let us try to nd a typical value of this eld in those domains at the earlier moment t H ¹. In order to do it, one should add to the value of its classical drift _H ¹. One should also add the amplitude of quantum jumps . The usual estimate of the magnitude of a typical jump is $\frac{H}{2}$. This is a correct estimate if we are interested in a typical amplitude of jumps at any given point. However, if we are considering all dom ains with a given and trying to nd all those dom ains from which the eld could originate, the answer form ay be quite di erent. The total volum e of all dom ains with a given eld at any moment of time t strongly depends on $p_{\frac{6}{6}}$, see Eq. (35). This means that the total volume of all dom ains $: P_{p}() _{1}()$ which could jump towards the given $e^{\frac{1}{6}}$ from the value + will be enhanced by a large additional factor $\frac{P_{p}(+)}{P_{p}(-)}$ 1+ - . On the other hand, the probability of large jumps is suppressed by the Gaussian factor exp $\frac{2}{H^2} \frac{2}{2}$. The product of these two factors has a sharp maximum at $= \frac{H}{2}$. In other words, most of the domains of a given eld are form ed due to the jum ps which have de nite sign (they are decreasing the value of the scalar eld), and which are greater than the \typical" ones by the amplication factor N = $_1$. In the usual notation, this amplication factor is given by

$$N = \frac{1}{M_{p}^{2}}; \qquad (36)$$

where $_{1} = 3H_{max} = 2^{p} \overline{6} M_{p}$ 8:68M_P. For $4:5M_{P}$ (the scale at which the large scale structure of our part of the Universe has been form ed), the ampli cation factor in our theory is about 40. However, the value of this factor is very sensitive to our assumptions concerning the P lanck boundary, it can be much bigger or much sm aller than 40. A sexplained in [21], this e ect does not alter the standard theory of density perturbations in in ationary universe, but it puts these perturbations on the top (or, more precisely, to the bottom) of the distribution of the scalar eld which appears as a result of its large jumps.

We can now return to the Brans{Dicke theory with ! 1. In this case both elds and move and uctuate, and therefore one should write a two-dimensional di usion equation for these elds [17]. However, at the last stages of in ation the classical motion of the scalar eld is

very slow, and, as we argued above, di usion in the rst approximation can be neglected. Then the problem reduces to the one we have already solved, and the amplication coecient will be given by eq. (36). The only difference is that now the value of the coecient $_1 = 3H_{max}$ will be determined not by the P lanck mass at the end of in ation, but by the much smaller P lanck mass at the place near the P lanck boundary corresponding to the peak of the distribution $P_p(;)$. If the distribution is stationary due to the existence of some kind of boundary at $= m_{ax}$, then the peak is concentrated at the P lanck boundary near m_{ax} . In this case one can show that $1 = 3H(m_{ax}) = 2 m_{ax} \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{2}$, for V() $= \frac{4}{4}$. Meanwhile, the typical P lanck mass after in ation is given by M_P $\frac{2}{1} m_{ax}$ [17]. This leads to the following realization of Eq. (36) for the B rans{D icke theory:

N 6!
$$p - 1=2 \frac{1}{M_{P}}$$
; (37)

which gives N $4.5^{\circ} 6!^{\circ}$, for $4.5M_{P}$. Note that for 10^{13} and ! 10° the factor N becomes very small, and therefore all the nonperturbative elects discussed above will be negligible, contrary to the case in general relativity [21].

Note that in this investigation we have assumed the existence of the upper boundary $_{max}$. The situation will be quite diment if there were no stationary solutions for P_p . In such a case the nonperturbative elects will be extremely strong. However, then we will meet the problem of nunaway solutions which would suggest that M_p ! 1 in the main part of the physical volume of the Universe. In this paper we have shown that in principle it is possible to avoid runaway solutions in the Brans{Dicke theory. But then from our results it follows that the same trick which makes the distribution stationary simultaneously kills the nonperturbative elects in the in ationary Brans{Dicke cosmology.

6 Conclusions

Investigation of the probability distribution P_p gives us a lot of interesting inform ation about the properties of the in ationary universe. Some of these properties (such as the very existence of the regime of self-reproduction and the fractal structure of the Universe) do not depend on the choice of time parametrization, and therefore their interpretation is relatively straightforward. Some other properties of P_p do depend on the choice of time parametrization. Sometimes it is not enough to know P_p , we need to know also whether all parts of the Universe which are described by this distribution are equally well suited for existence of life. In such situations interpretation of the results becomes increasingly speculative. Nevertheless we believe that even in these cases investigation of P_p and attempts of its interpretation can be very useful. We are learning how to

formulate questions in the context of quantum cosm ology. In some cases we are obtaining results which look obviously incorrect or contradict observational data; then we may conclude that we are using quantum cosm ology in a wrong way. In some other cases quantum cosm ology allows us to obtain important results which cannot be obtained by other methods. This may be considered as an indication that we are on the right track. Thus, by this trial and error method we may nally learn how to use quantum cosm ology.

To give a particular example one may consider the old issue of the wave function of the Universe. The two most popular candidates are the Hartle-Hawking wave function, which in the context of in ationary cosmology reads exp $\frac{3M_p^4}{16V(\cdot)}$ [28], and the tunneling wave function [29]. Neither of these two functions was rigorously derived. For some reason which exp is not related to its derivation, the square of the H artle-H aw king wave function correctly describes tunneling between two di erent de Sitter universes with di erent values of V () [30]. However if one makes an attempt to apply it to the probability of creation of the in ationary universe, one com es to a physically incorrect conclusion that it is much easier to create an in nitely large in at ionary universe with V ()! 0 than a P lanck-size universe with V () M_{P}^{4} . The tunneling wave function leads to a qualitatively correct description of quantum creation of the Universe \from nothing," but one should not uncritically apply it to, e.g. the form ation of black holes [31]. The reasons for the limited applicability of each of these functions are explained in Ref. [1], whereas in Ref. [14] it is shown that expressions of the type of exp $\frac{3M\frac{p}{4}}{16V()}$ or exp $\frac{3M\frac{p}{4}}{16V()}$ appear in m any problem s of quantum cosm ology which are not related in any obvious way to the original \derivations" of the Hartle Hawking and tunneling wave functions.

Som ething sim ilar m ay occur with our investigation of the probability distribution P_p . This distribution is certainly very useful, but som etim es it becomes tem pting to use it in the situations where its interpretation is ambiguous and the nal success is not guaranteed. However, the possibility to obtain very strong results and to bok at the interplay between particle physics and cosm ology from an entirely new point of view suggests us to continue this trial-and-error investigation. Here we may mention our attempt to address the cosm ological constant problem in the context of the Starobinsky model [16] and the possibility to explain why in the main part of the U niverse the scalar-tensor theories of gravity are reduced to the E instein theory [32]. In this paper (see also our previous publications [13, 17, 18]) we demonstrated that in the context of in ationary B rans{D icke theory it may be the possible to explain the anom alously large value of the P lanck m as M $_P$. We have shown also that the structure of our part of the U niverse which could appear as a result of nonperturbative e ects in quantum cosm ology [21] may be extrem ely sensitive to the properties of the theory at nearly P lanckian densities and to the presence or absence of stationary solutions for the distribution P_p . At the very least, what we have found

can be considered as a description of rather nontrivial properties of hypersurfaces of a given synchronous time in the in ationary universe. However, we hope that some of our results may have deeper physical signin cance.

A cknow ledgem ents

J.G.-B. is supported by a PPARC postdoctoral fellow ship. He would like to thank the warm hospitality and nancial support of the Theoretical A strophysics G roup at Ferm ilab, where part of this work was developed. The work by A L. was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-8612280.

References

- A D. Linde, Particle Physics and In ationary Cosmology (Harwood, Chur, Switzerland, 1990).
- [2] JR.Gott, III, Nature 295, 304 (1982); JR.Gott, III, and T.S.Statler, Phys.Lett.B136, 157 (1984); M. Sasaki, T. Tanaka, K. Yam am oto, and J. Yokoyama, Phys.Lett.B317, 510 (1993); M. Bucher, A.S. Goldhaber, and N. Turok, \An Open Universe From In a-tion," Princeton University preprint PUPT-1507, hep-ph/9411206 (1994); K. Yam am oto, T. Tanaka, and M. Sasaki, Phys.Rev.D15 (1995), pp.2968 and 2979.
- [3] A D. Linde, Nucl. Phys. B 372, 421 (1992).
- [4] A D. Linde, \In ation with Variable ," Stanford University preprint SU-ITP-95-5 (1995), hep-th/9503097, to apper in Phys. Lett. B.
- [5] P. Jordan, Nature (London) 164 (1949) 637; Z. Phys. 157, 112 (1959); C H. Brans and R H. D icke, Phys. Rev. 124, 925 (1961); R H. D icke, Phys. Rev. 125, 2163 (1962); C H. Brans, Phys. Rev. 125, 2194 (1962).
- [6] B.Campbell, K.O live and A.Linde, Nucl. Phys. B 355, 146 (1991).
- [7] J.Garc a{Bellido and M.Quiros, Nucl. Phys. B 368, 463 (1992).
- [8] T. Damour and A.M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B 423, 532 (1994); T. Damour and A.M. Polyakov, \String Theory and Gravity", Report gr-qc/9411069 (1994).
- [9] D. La and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 376 (1989).
- [10] P.J. Steinhardt and F.S. Accetta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2740 (1990); JD. Barrow and K. Maeda, Nucl. Phys. B 341, 294 (1990); J.G arc a {Bellido and M.Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 243, 45 (1990).
- [11] A R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, Phys. Lett. B 291, 391 (1992).
- [12] R.Crittenden and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Lett. B 293, 32 (1992).
- [13] A D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B 238, 160 (1990).
- [14] A D. Linde and A. Mezhlum ian, Phys. Lett. B 307, 25 (1993); A D. Linde, D A. Linde, and A. Mezhlum ian, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1783 (1994).
- [15] A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 846 (1995).

- [16] J.Garc a {Bellido and A.D.Linde, Phys. Rev. D 51, 429 (1995).
- [17] J.Garc a{Bellido, A.D.Linde, and D.A.Linde, Phys.Rev.D 50, 730 (1994).
- [18] J.Garc a{Bellido, Nucl. Phys. B 423, 221 (1994).
- [19] A D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D 49, 748 (1994).
- [20] A M. Laycock and A R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1827 (1994).
- [21] A D. Linde, D A. Linde and A. Mezhlum ian, Phys. Lett. B 345, 203 (1995).
- [22] C M .W ill, Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics (Cambridge U P., 1993).
- [23] JA. Casas, J. Garc a {Bellido and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 278, 94 (1992); F.S. Accetta, L M. K rauss and P. Rom anelli, Phys. Lett. B 248, 146 (1990).
- [24] A A. Starobinsky, J. Yokoyama, \D ensity F luctuations in Brans{D icke In ation", preprint astro-ph/9502002, to appear in the proceedings of the Fourth W orkshop on G eneral Relativity and G ravitation, eds. K. M aeda et. al., K yoto, Japan (1994).
- [25] JA. Casas, J. Garc a {Bellido and M. Quiros, Nucl. Phys. B 361, 713 (1991); L.J. Garay and J. Garc a {Bellido, Nucl. Phys. B 400, 416 (1993).
- [26] I.V.Krive and A.D.Linde, Nucl. Phys. B 117, 265 (1976).
- [27] A D. Linde, D A. Linde, and A. Mezhlum ian, in preparation.
- [28] A.Vilenkin, Phys.Lett.B117, 25 (1982); J.B.Hartle and S.W. Hawking, Phys.Rev.D 28, 2960 (1983).
- [29] A D. Linde, JETP 60, 211 (1984); Lett. Nuovo C in . 39, 401 (1984); YaB. Zeklovich and A A. Starobinsky, Sov. A stron. Lett. 10, 135 (1984); V A. Rubakov, Phys. Lett. 148B, 280 (1984); A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 30, 549 (1984).
- [30] A. Starobinsky, in H.J. de Vega and N. Sanchez, Eds., Current Topics in Field Theory, Quantum Gravity and Strings, Lecture Notes in Physics 206, (Heidelberg: Springer) (1986);
 A.Goncharov and A.Linde, Sov.J.Part.Nucl.17, 369 (1986); A.Linde, Nucl.Phys.B 372, 421 (1992).
- [31] SW. Hawking and SF. Ross, \Duality between Electric and Magnetic Black Holes", preprint DAM TP/R-95/8, hep-th/9504019 (1995).
- [32] J. G arc a {Bellido and D. W ands, \General Relativity as an Attractor of Scalar{Tensor Stochastic In ation", preprint SUSSEX - AST -95/3-1, gr-qc/9503049 (1995).