Stabilities of Vector Fields during Inflationary Epochs

Ryo Namba

McGill University

Gravity and Cosmology 2018 @ YITP: February 16, 2018

Emami, Mukohyama, Namba & Zhang, JCAP 1703, 03, 058 (2017) Beltran Jimenez, Heisenberg, Kase, Namba & Tsujikawa, PRD 95, 6, 063533 (2017) Namba, Dimastrogiovanni & Peloso, JCAP 1311, 045 (2013) Namba, Phys. Rev. D 86, 083518 (2012)



Inflation + Hot Big Bang cosmology

- Compelling description of the evolution of the universe
- Inflation solves puzzles in HBB
 - $\diamond~$ Horizon problem sky $\sim {\cal O}(10^4)$ causally-disconnected patches
 - ♦ Flatness problem $|1 \Omega_0| \lesssim O(10^{-3})$
 - Unwanted relics problem topological defects in early universe
 - Seeds of inhomogeneity large-scale structure

Symmetries for inflation

● Homogeneity ⇔ spatial translation ⇔ momentum conservation

$$\triangleright \ \langle \zeta(\vec{k}) \, \zeta(\vec{k}') \rangle = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') \, k^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{\zeta}(\vec{k})$$

● Spatial isotropy ⇔ rotational symmetry

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(\vec{k}) = P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|)$

• **De Sitter** \Leftrightarrow invariance under $t \rightarrow t + c, x^i \rightarrow e^{-Hc}x^i$

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|) \approx \text{const.}$

Symmetries for inflation

● Homogeneity ⇔ spatial translation ⇔ momentum conservation

$$\triangleright \ \langle \zeta(\vec{k}) \, \zeta(\vec{k}') \rangle = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') \, k^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{\zeta}(\vec{k})$$

Spatial isotropy ⇔ rotational symmetry

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(\vec{k}) = P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|)$

• **De Sitter** \Leftrightarrow invariance under $t \rightarrow t + c, x^i \rightarrow e^{-Hc}x^i$

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|) \approx \text{const.}$

We know: Soft breaking of de Sitter

▷ Quasi de Sitter $H \neq$ const. — inflation ends

▷ Small $|\vec{k}|$ dependence (spectral index $|n_s - 1| \ll 1$)

Ryo Namba (Mcgill)

Sac

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

Symmetries for inflation

● Homogeneity ⇔ spatial translation ⇔ momentum conservation

$$\triangleright \ \langle \zeta(\vec{k})\,\zeta(\vec{k}')\rangle = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{k}+\vec{k}')\,k^{-3}\mathcal{P}_{\zeta}(\vec{k})$$

● Spatial isotropy ⇔ rotational symmetry

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(\vec{k}) = P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|)$

• **De Sitter** \Leftrightarrow invariance under $t \rightarrow t + c, x^i \rightarrow e^{-Hc}x^i$

 $\triangleright P_{\zeta}(|\vec{k}|) \approx \text{const.}$

Ryo Namba (Mcgill)

Stability of Vector Inflation

GC2017

Vector fields driving inflation

Difficult to sustain a prolonged period of expansion

Standard gauge fields conformally couple to gravity (in 4D)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{EM}}^{\mathsf{free}} = -rac{\sqrt{-g}}{4}\,g^{\mu
ho}g^{
u\sigma}\mathcal{F}_{\mu
u}\mathcal{F}_{
ho\sigma}\,\,\,\mathsf{invariant}\,\,\mathsf{under}\,\,\,g_{\mu
u}
ightarrow\Omega^2\,g_{\mu
u}$$

▷ "Standard" massless vectors do not feel/drive expanding universe

Vector fields driving inflation

Difficult to sustain a prolonged period of expansion

Standard gauge fields conformally couple to gravity (in 4D)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{EM}}^{\mathsf{free}} = -rac{\sqrt{-g}}{4}\,g^{\mu
ho}g^{
u\sigma}\mathcal{F}_{\mu
u}\mathcal{F}_{
ho\sigma}\,\,\,\mathsf{invariant}\,\,\mathsf{under}\,\,\,g_{\mu
u}
ightarrow\Omega^2\,g_{\mu
u}$$

Standard" massless vectors do not feel/drive expanding universe

PAST ATTEMPTS: Need to break conformal invariance

- ♦ Potential term: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu})$
- ♦ Fixed norm: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} v^2)$
- ◊ Coupling to gravity: ∆L = ξΑ_μ<件

Ford '89

Ackerman, Carroll & Wise '07

Golovnev, Mukhanov & Vanchurin '08

・ロト ・四ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

Sac

These models suffer **ghost instabilities**

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

< ロ > < 団 > < 団 > < 団 > .

 \diamond Models break gauge invariance \implies additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$$S = \int d^4x \, m_{\scriptscriptstyle eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{A}_{\scriptscriptstyle
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

♦ Turned out $m_{\rm eff}^2 < 0 \Rightarrow \text{ghost}$

These models suffer **ghost instabilities**

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

 \diamond Models break gauge invariance \implies additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{\scriptscriptstyle eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{\cal A}_{\scriptscriptstyle
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

♦ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0 \Rightarrow \text{ghost}$

 $\triangleright \Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu}) \Rightarrow$ to sustain long anisotropic period

These models suffer **ghost instabilities**

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

(ロ) (同) (E) (E) (E) (E)

 \diamond Models break gauge invariance \implies additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{e\! f\! f}^2(t) \left[\dot{A}_{
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

- ♦ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0 \Rightarrow \text{ghost}$
 - $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu}) \Rightarrow \text{ to sustain long anisotropic period } \Rightarrow \textbf{L}$

Sac

These models suffer ghost instabilities

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

 $\diamond\,$ Models break gauge invariance $\implies\,$ additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{\it eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{\cal A}_{
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

◊ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0$ ⇒ ghost

 $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu}) \Rightarrow \text{ to sustain long anisotropic period } \Rightarrow \textbf{L}$

 $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} - v^2) \Rightarrow$ to produce large-scale fluctuation

SQ C

These models suffer ghost instabilities

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

 $\diamond\,$ Models break gauge invariance $\implies\,$ additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{\it eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{\cal A}_{
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

◊ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0$ ⇒ ghost

 $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu}) \Rightarrow \text{ to sustain long anisotropic period } \Rightarrow$

 $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} - v^2) \Rightarrow$ to produce large-scale fluctuation \Rightarrow

These models suffer ghost instabilities

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

 $\diamond\,$ Models break gauge invariance $\implies\,$ additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{\it eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{\cal A}_{
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

◊ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0$ ⇒ ghost

 $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu}) \Rightarrow \text{ to sustain long anisotropic period} \Rightarrow \square$ $\triangleright \ \Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda(A_{\mu}A^{\mu} - v^{2}) \Rightarrow \text{ to produce large-scale fluctuation} \Rightarrow \square$

 $\triangleright \Delta \mathcal{L} = \xi R A_{\mu} A^{\mu} \Rightarrow$ to sustain long anisotropic period

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶

These models suffer ghost instabilities

Himmetoglu, Contaldi & Peloso '08

 $\diamond\,$ Models break gauge invariance $\implies\,$ additional d.o.f. (longitudinal mode)

$${\cal S} = \int d^4x \, m_{\it eff}^2(t) \left[\dot{\cal A}_{
m longitudinal}^2 + \dots
ight]$$

◊ Turned out $m_{eff}^2 < 0$ ⇒ ghost



- Potential term: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu})$
- Fixed norm: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} v^2)$
- Coupling to gravity: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \xi R A_{\mu} A^{\mu}$

Ford '89

Ackerman, Carroll & Wise '07

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

Golovnev, Mukhanov & Vanchurin '08

• Potential term: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = V(A_{\mu}A^{\mu})$

Ford '89

- Fixed norm: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \lambda (A_{\mu}A^{\mu} v^2)$
- Coupling to gravity: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \xi R A_{\mu} A^{\mu}$

Ackerman, Carroll & Wise '07

Golovnev, Mukhanov & Vanchurin '08

< ロ > < 団 > < 団 > < 団 > .

• Horndeski-Yang-Mills · · · non-Abelian field: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \beta R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \tilde{F}^{a}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{a}_{\rho\sigma}$ Davydov & Gal'tsov '15





• Gauge-flation · · · non-Abelian field: $\Delta \mathcal{L} = \kappa \left(F^{a}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{a,\mu\nu} \right)^{2}$ Maleknejad & Sheikh-Jabbari '11









How can we get stable, vector-driven inflationary models?

Ryo Namba (Mcgill)

Stability of Vector Inflation

GC2017 6/10

Generalized Proca Theory

Broken gauge invariance allows many terms

General model is useful to identify stability conditions

< ∃⇒

Generalized Proca Theory

Broken gauge invariance allows many terms

General model is useful to identify stability conditions

Generalized Proca Theory

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{GP}} = \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4 + \mathcal{L}_5 + \mathcal{L}_6$$

Heisenberg '14; Allys, Peter & Rodriguez '15; Jiménez & Heisenberg '16

No Ostrogradsky (higher-derivative) ghosts

 \diamond Cosmol. solution with H = const. available \implies Late-time applications

De Felice et al. '16

Generalized Proca Theory

Broken gauge invariance allows many terms

General model is useful to identify stability conditions

Generalized Proca Theory

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{GP}} = \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4 + \mathcal{L}_5 + \mathcal{L}_6$$

Heisenberg '14; Allys, Peter & Rodriguez '15; Jiménez & Heisenberg '16

No Ostrogradsky (higher-derivative) ghosts

◊ Cosmol. solution with H = const. available \implies Late-time applications De Felice et al. '16

Suitable deformations

- ♦ Isotropy \Leftrightarrow 3 vector fields $A^{(1)}_{\mu}$, $A^{(2)}_{\mu}$, $A^{(3)}_{\mu}$ with O(3) \Rightarrow $\mathcal{L}_3 = \mathcal{L}_5 = 0$
- $\diamond \ \ \text{Neglect} \ \mathcal{L}_6 \ \text{for simplicity}$

$$\left(\mathcal{L}=G_2(\mathcal{A}^2,\mathcal{F}^2,\mathcal{F} ilde{\mathcal{F}},\mathcal{AAFF})+G_4(\mathcal{A}^2)\mathcal{R}+G_{4,X}\left[\left(
abla_{\mu}\mathcal{A}^{\mu}
ight)^2-
abla_{\mu}\mathcal{A}^{
u}
abla_{
u}\mathcal{A}^{\mu}
ight]$$

Inflationary background

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \ , \qquad \langle A^{(a)}_i
angle = a(t) A_{\mathsf{BG}}(t) \, \delta^a_i \ , \quad \langle A^{(a)}_0
angle = 0$$

Quasi de Sitter solution

$$H=rac{\dot{a}}{a}pprox ext{const.}$$
, $A_{ ext{BG}}pprox ext{const.}$

- A local attractor under **isotropic ansatz** \implies [1] condition
- A local attractor against anisotropic expansion $\implies 1$ condition

200

< ロ > < 団 > < 団 > < 団 > .

Inflationary background

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \ , \qquad \langle A^{(a)}_i
angle = a(t)\,A_{ ext{BG}}(t)\,\delta^a_i \ , \quad \langle A^{(a)}_0
angle = 0$$

Quasi de Sitter solution

$$H=rac{\dot{a}}{a}pprox ext{const.}$$
, $A_{ ext{BG}}pprox ext{const.}$

- A local attractor under **isotropic ansatz** \implies 1 condition
- A local attractor against anisotropic expansion $\implies 1$ condition

Perturbations – # of dynamical D.o.F.:

- Vector fields $\delta A^{(a)}_{\mu}$: $3 \times 3 = 9 = 3$ "scalar" + 4 "vector" + 2 "tensor"
- Metric $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$: Same as GR = 2 tensor (after gauge fixing)
- Total: 3 scalar + 4 vector + 4 tensor

No ghost + Gradient stability

Positive kinetic term + Real & positive c_s^2

- Tensor modes: 2 + 3 = 5 conditions
- Vector modes: 2 + 3 = 5 conditions
- Scalar modes: 3 + 5 = 8 conditions

One interesting observation:

 $\triangleright A^{(a)}_{\mu}A^{(a)}_{\nu}F^{(b)\,\mu\rho}F^{(b)\,\nu}_{\rho} \text{ or } A^{(a)}_{\mu}A^{(b)}_{\nu}F^{(a)\,\mu\rho}F^{(b)\,\nu}_{\rho} \text{ is strictly necessary}$

 \implies (16) conditions

No ghost + Gradient stability

Positive kinetic term + Real & positive c_s^2

- Tensor modes: 2 + 3 = 5 conditions
- Vector modes: 2 + 3 = 5 conditions
- Scalar modes: 3 + 5 = 8 conditions

One interesting observation:

 $\triangleright A^{(a)}_{\mu}A^{(a)}_{\nu}F^{(b)\,\mu\rho}F^{(b)\,\nu}_{\rho} \text{ or } A^{(a)}_{\mu}A^{(b)}_{\nu}F^{(a)\,\mu\rho}F^{(b)\,\nu}_{\rho} \text{ is strictly necessary}$

AN EXAMPLE — can satisfy all 18 conditions

$$\mathcal{L} = F(A^{2}, F^{2}) + c_{1} A_{\mu}^{(a)} A_{\nu}^{(a)} F^{(b) \mu \rho} F^{(b) \nu}{}_{\rho} + c_{2} A_{\mu}^{(a)} A_{\nu}^{(b)} F^{(a) \mu \rho} F^{(b) \nu}{}_{\rho} + \left(c_{3} - \frac{c_{4}}{2} A^{2}\right) R + c_{4} \left[(\nabla_{\mu} A^{\mu})^{2} - \nabla_{\mu} A^{\nu} \nabla_{\nu} A^{\mu} \right]$$

with $c_2 > 0$ and $|c_4| \gg c_2 A_{BG}^2$.

Emami, Mukohyama, RN & Zhang '17

 \implies (16) conditions

Concluding remarks

Q.: Can we get stable, only vector-driven inflationary models?

→ E → < E →</p>

nac

Concluding remarks

Q.: Can we get stable, only vector-driven inflationary models?

A.: Yes, but dedicated terms necessary

< 口 > < 同

ヨト・モヨト

Concluding remarks

Q.: Can we get stable, only vector-driven inflationary models?

A.: Yes, but dedicated terms necessary

Existing vector-driven inflation models suffered ghost instabilities

 \triangleright Violation of gauge invariance + slow-roll conditions forced $m_{\rm eff}^2 < 0$

Analysis on a general setup - Generalized Proca Theory

- Identified 18 conditions for stable inflationary attractor solutions
- ▷ Provided an example with a viable parameter space to satisfy all conditions

Other possibilities

- ▷ Non-Abelian fields have specific self-interaction $\epsilon^{abc}\partial_{\mu}A^{a}_{\nu}A^{b,\mu}A^{c,\nu}$
- Massive/Higgsed Gauge-flation proposed

Nieto & Rodríguez '16; Adshead & Sfakianakis '17

Further considerations – Phenomenology

- Parity violation in tensor and vector sectors
- Existence of extra tensor modes ~ gravitational-wave physics?

nan