Non-Gaussianity in multiple three-form field inflation

K. Sravan Kumar [1,2],[a] David J. Mulryne [3],[b] Nelson J. Nunes [4],[c] João Marto [1,2],[d] and Paulo Vargas Moniz [1,2e]

[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidade da Beira Interior, 6200 Covilhã, Portugal*
[2]*Centro de Matemática e Aplicações da Universidade da Beira Interior (CMA-UBI), 6200 Covilhã, Portugal*
[3]*School of Physics and Astronomy, Queen Mary University of London,*
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom
[4]*Faculdade de Ciências, Instituto de Astrofísica e Ciências do Espaço,*
Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande, PT1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal
(Dated: November 9, 2016)

In this work, we present a method for implementing the δN formalism to study the primordial non-Gaussianity produced in multiple three-form field inflation. Using a dual description relating three-form fields to noncanonical scalar fields, and employing existing results, we produce expressions for the bispectrum of the curvature perturbation in terms of three-form quantities. We study the bispectrum generated in a two three-form field inflationary scenario for a particular potential that for suitable values of the parameters was found in earlier work to give values of the spectral index and ratio of tensor to scalar perturbations compatible with current bounds. We calculate the reduced bispectrum for this model, finding an amplitude in equilateral and orthogonal configurations of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and in the squeezed limit of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$. We confirm, therefore, that this three-form inflationary scenario is compatible with present observational constraints.

I. INTRODUCTION

Inflation is a successful paradigm that solves the horizon and flatness problems [1]. Measurements of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies confirm that the primordial density perturbations are close to scale invariant, adiabatic and Gaussian [2–4]. This is expected from the simplest models of inflation and confirms inflation as our favored theory for the origin of structure. The results from Plank 2015 [2] and the BICEP2/Keck Array and Planck joint analysis [5] also severely constrain the amplitude of gravitational waves produced by inflation, with the latest bounds on the tilt of the scalar power spectrum (n_s) and the tensor to scalar ratio (r) given by [3]

$$n_s = 0.968 \pm 0.006 \quad \text{and} \quad r_{0.002} < 0.09 \quad \text{at 95\% C.L.} \tag{1.1}$$

Despite its observational successes, however, there are a considerable variety of different models of inflation that can be motivated theoretically [6, 7]. These include multifield models, and models with noncanonical scalar fields. The degeneracy of the predictions from various models of inflation is an ongoing problem for cosmologists. One way to probe further the nature of inflation is to study the statistics of the perturbations it produces beyond the two-point correlation function [8], starting with the three-point function. This is parametrized in Fourier space by the bipsectrum [9–14], a function of the amplitude of three wave vectors that sum to zero as a consequence of momentum conservation. Although most canonical single field models of inflation produce an unobservably small bispectrum, multifield and noncanonical models in particular can produce levels in tension with present or detectable by future probes. The former produces a bispectrum of close to the "local shape". This is a function of three wave numbers that peaks in the squeezed limit where two wave numbers are much larger than the third. The latter produces a bispectrum of "equilateral shape" that tends to zero in the squeezed limit, but peaks when all three wave numbers are similar in size (see e.g. [14, 15] for reviews). A third shape is often considered that peaks on folded triangles, where two wave numbers are approximately half of the third, and can be produced by models with non-Bunch-Davis initial conditions [14]. Planck 2015 has put constraints on these shapes. Introducing three parameters $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm loc}$, $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm equi}$ and $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm ortho}$,

which parametrize the overall amplitude of a local, equilateral and orthonormal shape template for the bispectrum, Planck 2015 tells us that

$$f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{local}} = 0.8 \pm 5.0\,, \quad f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{equi}} = -4 \pm 43\,, \quad f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{ortho}} = -26 \pm 21, \tag{1.2}$$

at 68% C.L. (see Ref. [16]). These bounds are stringent, though it is too early to exclude noncanonical or multifield inflationary models by means of Gaussianity (see e.g. [17–19].)

Despite the success of inflation driven by scalar fields, three-forms provide a viable alternative (and a viable model of dark energy) [20–27]. Inflation considering multiple three-form fields has been investigated in the past as these models are important due to their connection to string theory scenarios [28]. Typically they have been written down with quadratic potentials but it useful to consider generalizations. In this article we therefore study how to calculate the bispectrum in any multiple three-form inflationary scenario. To do so we develop a method to adapt the δN formalism [29–33] to the three-form setting. We then calculate the bispectrum generated in a concrete model with two three-forms. Inflationary scenarios with two three-forms were proposed in [26], and shown under a suitable choice of the three-form potential and initial conditions to satisfy the Planck data concerning the power spectrum and tensor to scalar ratio. Here we compute the bispectrum for the successful example considered in that paper and check that it is also consistent with the latest observational constraints.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Sec.II we briefly summarize the $\mathbb{N}$ three-form inflationary model studied in Ref. [26]. Subsequently, in Sec. III we discuss the bispectrum and describe a procedure to adapt the δN formalism [34] to multiple three-forms to calculate it. We explain a numerical method for calculating derivatives of the unperturbed number of e-foldings with respect to the unperturbed three-form field values at sound horizon crossing, and show how these derivatives can be related to those of a dual scalar field description. In turn these can be used in combination with existing results to compute the bispectrum. We stress that although our method utilizes the dual scalar field description, it is not possible in general to simply pass to that description and work solely with a scalar field model. In Sec. IV we consider an explicit example from Ref. [26] that provides a power-spectrum compatible with Planck constraints and compute the bispectrum in that model. We quantify and compare the momentum dependent contribution and momentum independent contributions of the reduced bispectrum and plot the shape of the bispectrum. We conclude in Sec.V.

II. MULTIPLE THREE-FORM INFLATION

In this section, we briefly present the inflationary model with $\mathbb{N}$ three-form fields introduced in [26]. We take a flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmology, described with the metric $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)d\boldsymbol{x}^2$, where $a(t)$ is the scale factor with t cosmic time. The general action for two three-form fields minimally coupled to Einstein gravity can be written as[1]

$$S = -\int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2}R - \sum_{I=1}^{\mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{1}{48}F_I^2 + V(A_I^2) \right) \right]\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where $A_{\beta\gamma\delta}^{(I)}$ is the Ith three-form field and squared quantities indicate contraction of all the indices. The strength tensor of the three-form is given by[2]

$$F_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^{(I)} \equiv 4\nabla_{[\alpha}A_{\beta\gamma\delta]}^{(I)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where antisymmetrisation is denoted by square brackets. As we have assumed a homogeneous and isotropic universe, the three-form fields depend only on time and hence only the spacelike components are dynamical. Therefore the nonzero components are given by [21]

$$A_{ijk}^{(I)} = a^3(t)\epsilon_{ijk}\chi_I(t) \quad \Rightarrow A_I^2 = 6\chi_I^2, \tag{2.3}$$

---

[1] We work in the units of Planck mass $M_{\mathrm{Pl}} = 1$.

[2] Throughout this article, the latin index "I" will be used to refer to the number of the quantity (e.g., the three-form field) or the Ith quantity/field. The other latin indices, which take the values $i, j = 1, 2, 3...$, will indicate the three-dimensional quantities; whereas the greek indices are used to denote four-dimensional quantities and they stand for $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

where $\chi_I(t)$ is a comoving field associated to the nth three-form field and ϵ_{ijk} is the standard three-dimensional Levi-Civita symbol.

In general, any p-form in d dimensions has a dual of $(d-p)-$form [22, 24]. In our case three-form field (A) and its field tensor four-form (F) are dual to a vector and a scalar field respectively which can be expressed as [24]

$$A_{\mu\nu\rho} = \epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu\rho}B^\alpha, \quad F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\phi, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is an antisymmetric tensor.

The corresponding action for the scalar field dual representation of the $\mathbb{N}$ three-forms is [24, 26]

$$S = -\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{1}{2}R + P\left(X, \phi_I\right)\right], \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$P\left(X, \phi_I\right) = \sum_{I=1}^{\mathbb{N}}\left(\chi_I V_{I,\chi_I} - V\left(\chi_I\right) - \frac{\phi_I^2}{2}\right), \tag{2.6}$$

with $X = -\frac{1}{2}G^{IJ}\left(\phi\right)\partial_\mu\phi_I\partial^\mu\phi_J$. In this model the field metric is $G^{IJ}\left(\phi\right) = \delta^{IJ}$, therefore we have $X = \sum X_I$. The three-from fields still present on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.6) should be viewed as functions of the kinetic terms X_I though the inverse of the relation

$$X_I = \frac{1}{2}V_{,\chi_I}^2. \tag{2.7}$$

Considering the large amount of noncanonical scalar fields studies in cosmology, it might be tempting to think that given a three-form theory the best way to proceed would be to simply pass to the dual scalar field theory and work solely with scalar field quantities. However, starting from a set of massive three-form fields makes the task of analytically writing the dual scalar field theory very difficult, except for very particular potentials [24]. This can be seen by noting the technical difficulty found when one tries to invert Eq. (2.7). Yet, in a similar manner to that advocated in Ref. [24] for the single field case, we see that we can still make use of the dual theory indirectly.

For a background unperturbed FLRW cosmology, we can use the dualities defined in Eq. (2.4) to write the following relation between a three-form field and its dual scalar field

$$\phi_I = \dot{\chi}_I + 3H\chi_I. \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover from action (2.1) the background Klein-Gordon equations for the $\mathbb{N}$ three-form fields read

$$\ddot{\chi}_I + 3H\dot{\chi}_I + 3\dot{H}\chi_I + V_{,\chi_I} = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

The Friedmann equations are

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{6}\left[\sum_{I=1}^{\mathbb{N}}\left(\dot{\chi}_I + 3H\chi_I\right)^2 + 2V\right], \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{I=1}^{\mathbb{N}}V_{,\chi_I}\chi_I\right]. \tag{2.11}$$

We express the field equations of motion (2.9) in terms of e-folding time, $N = \ln a(t)$, as

$$H^2\chi_I'' + \left(3H^2 + \dot{H}\right)\chi_I' + 3\dot{H}\chi_I + V_{,\chi_I} = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\chi_I' \equiv d\chi_I/dN$. And the Hubble parameter from Eq. (2.10) can be expressed as

$$H^2 = \frac{V\left(\chi_I\right)}{3\left(1 - \sum_I w_I^2\right)}. \tag{2.13}$$

where $w_I = \frac{\chi_I' + 3\chi_I}{\sqrt{6}}$.

The three-form field equations (2.12) can also be written in the autonomous form as [26]

$$\chi_I' = 3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} w_I - \chi_I \right),$$
(2.14)

$$w_I' = \frac{3}{2} \left(1 - \sum_I w_I^2 \right) \left[\lambda_I \left(\chi_I w_I - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \right) + \sum_{\substack{J=1 \\ I \neq J}}^{\mathbb{N}} \chi_J \lambda_J \right],$$
(2.15)

where $\lambda_n = V_{,\chi_I}/V$. The fixed points of the dynamical system (2.14)-(2.15) are

$$\chi_{Ic} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} w_I, \qquad w_{Ic} = \frac{\lambda_I}{\sqrt{\sum_I \lambda_I^2}},$$
(2.16)

Based on the analytical and numerical studies of two three-form inflation, which is detailed in Ref. [26], we can have the following two types of slow-roll inflationary scenarios (corresponding to the different trajectories in $\mathbb{N}$ three-form fields space),

- Type I inflation: It precisely produces straight line trajectories in field space, where all the three-form fields driving inflation satisfy $\chi_I' \approx 0$. This scenario shares some similarities with multiple scalar fields assisted inflation [35]. In this case, the three-form fields sit near their respective fixed points (2.16) until the end of inflation. Subsequently, they oscillate collectively at the potential minimum.

- Type II inflation: It produces curved trajectories in field space where all the three-form fields driving inflation satisfy $\chi_I' \not\approx 0$. In this case, the three-form fields have the freedom to slowly evolve away from their respective fixed points (2.16) until the end of inflation. Finally, and also in this scenario, they oscillate collectively at the potential minimum.

In Ref. [26] it was explicitly shown that the type I inflation does not produce any isocurvature perturbations that may source the curvature perturbations on superhorizon scales. Therefore, we naively expect negligible non-Gaussianities in the type I scenario. Whereas in type II inflation, where the three-form fields present a different dynamics, we can expect a significant signal of non-Gaussianities. Therefore, in the present work we exclusively focus our attention on the type II inflationary scenarios.

In subsequent sections, our strategy (based on the three-form duality) to calculate non-Gaussianities will be to use equations derived for multiple scalar fields. However, we express the quantities involved in terms of the three-form fields. In particular, we need the following derivatives, which we compute here for later use,

$$P_{,X} \equiv \sum_I P_{,X_I} = \sum_I P_{,\chi_I} \left(\frac{\partial \chi_I}{\partial X_I} \right) = \sum_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{\chi_I}}.$$
(2.17)

And similarly

$$P_{,X_I X_I} = \frac{1}{V_{,\chi_I \chi_I} V_{,\chi_I}^2} - \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}^3}.$$
(2.18)

$$P_{,X_I X_I X_I} = -\frac{V_{,\chi_I \chi_I \chi_I}}{V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}^3 V_{,\chi_I}^2} + \frac{3\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}^5} - \frac{3}{V_{,\chi_I}^4 V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}}.$$
(2.19)

$$P_{,I} = -\phi_I = -\sqrt{6} H w_I.$$
(2.20)

III.   NON-GAUSSIANITY AND THE δN FORMALISM

A.   The δN formalism

The δN formalism is based on the separate universe assumption [29–33, 36] and provides a powerful tool to evaluate the superhorizon evolution of the curvature perturbation. In the case of multiple three-forms, however, the direct implementation of the δN formalism would be cumbersome. Using the formal relation between three-forms and

their scalar field duals [24, 26], however, one can indirectly implement the δN formalism while still employing only three-form quantities that are easy to calculate.

The δN formalism allows the evolution of the curvature perturbation to be calculated, on scales larger than the horizon scale where one can neglect spatial gradients, using only the evolution of unperturbed "separate universes". The central result is that the difference in the number of e-folds that occurs from different positions on an initial flat slice of space-time to a final uniform density slice, when compared with some fiducial value, is related to the curvature perturbation. Writing the number of e-foldings as a function of the initial and final time on the relevant hypersurfaces,

$$N\left(t, t_i, x\right) = \int_{t_i}^{t} dt' H\left(t', x\right) , \tag{3.1}$$

the primordial curvature perturbation can be expressed as

$$\zeta\left(t, x\right) = N\left(t, t_i, x\right) - N_0\left(t, t_i\right) , \tag{3.2}$$

where $N_0\left(t, t_i\right) = \int_{t_i}^{t} dt' H_0\left(t'\right)$. Taking $t_i = t_*$, the time corresponding to the modes exiting the horizon ($kc_s = aH$), the curvature perturbation on superhorizon scales can be written in terms of partial derivatives of N with respect to the unperturbed scalar field values at horizon exit, while holding the initial and final hypersurface constant. More precisely

$$\zeta\left(t, x\right) = \sum_I N_{,I}\left(t\right) \delta\phi_*^I(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{IJ} N_{,IJ}\left(t\right) \delta\phi_*^I\left(x\right) \delta\phi_*^J\left(x\right) + \cdots , \tag{3.3}$$

where $N_{,I} = \frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_I^*}$. In momentum space we have

$$\zeta(k) = N_{,I}\delta\phi_*^I(k) + \frac{1}{2} N_{,IJ} \left[\delta\phi_*^I \star \delta\phi_*^J\right](k) + \cdots , \tag{3.4}$$

where $\star$ indicates a convolution.

B. The bispectrum

In Fourier space the two- and three-point functions are defined, respectively, by

$$\langle \zeta\left(\mathbf{k_1}\right) \zeta\left(\mathbf{k_2}\right) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3\left(\mathbf{k_1} + \mathbf{k_2}\right) P_\zeta\left(k_1\right) , \tag{3.5}$$

$$\langle \zeta\left(\mathbf{k_1}\right) \zeta\left(\mathbf{k_2}\right) \zeta\left(\mathbf{k_3}\right) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3\left(\mathbf{k_1} + \mathbf{k_2} + \mathbf{k_3}\right) \mathcal{B}_\zeta\left(k_1, k_2, k_3\right) , \tag{3.6}$$

where $P_\zeta(k)$ is the power spectrum, and $B_\zeta\left(k_1, k_2, k_3\right)$ the bispectrum. Often the bispectrum is normalized to form the reduced bispectrum $f_{\mathrm{NL}}\left(k_1, k_2, k_3\right)$

$$B_\zeta\left(k_1, k_2, k_3\right) = \frac{6}{5} f_{\mathrm{NL}}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \left[P_\zeta\left(k_1\right) P_\zeta\left(k_2\right) + P_\zeta\left(k_2\right) P_\zeta\left(k_3\right) + P_\zeta\left(k_3\right) P_\zeta\left(k_1\right)\right] , \tag{3.7}$$

C. Calculating the bispectrum with δN

The power spectrum and bispectrum of field fluctuations at horizon crossing follow from the two- and three-point correlations of these perturbations as

$$\langle \delta\phi_*^I(\mathbf{k_1}) \delta\phi_*^J(\mathbf{k_2}) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 G^{IJ} \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}^* \delta\left(\mathbf{k_1} + \mathbf{k_2}\right) \tag{3.8}$$

$$\langle \delta\phi_*^I(\mathbf{k_1}) \delta\phi_*^J(\mathbf{k_2}) \delta\phi_*^K(\mathbf{k_3}) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \frac{4\pi^4}{\Pi_i k_i^3} \mathcal{P}^{*2} A^{IJK}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \delta\left(\mathbf{k_1} + \mathbf{k_2} + \mathbf{k_2}\right) , \tag{3.9}$$

where $\mathcal{P} = Pk^3/(2\pi^2)$. Employing the δN expansion one finds that

$$P_\zeta(k) = N_I N_I P^* \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$f_{\mathrm{NL}} = f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)} + f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)} + \cdots , \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)} = \frac{5}{6} \frac{N_{,I} N_{,J} N_{,K} A^{IJK}}{\left(G^{IJ} N_{,I} N_{,J}\right)^2 \sum_i k_i^3},$$

$$f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)} = \frac{5}{6} \frac{G^{IK} G^{JL} N_{,I} N_{,J} N_{,KL}}{\left(G^{IJ} N_{,I} N_{,J}\right)^2} . \tag{3.12}$$

Here $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)}$ is momentum dependent, whereas $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)}$ is momentum independent (which is the definition of local f_{NL}) [3]. In general, the dominant contribution, $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)}$ or $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)}$, is model dependent. For example, in the case of multiple canonical scalar fields inflation, $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)}$ can become significant . In contrast, for noncanonical models, $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)}$ can become large.

For general multi-field non-canonical models in slow-roll (which is the situation relevant to our models), utilising the In-In formalism to calculate the statistics of the scalar field perturbations on flat hypersurfaces at horizon crossing it was found that

$$P_* = \frac{H^2}{2k^3 P_{,X}}, \tag{3.13}$$

and that [39]

$$A_{IJK} = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{P_{,X}}{2}} \tilde{A}_{IJK}, \tag{3.14}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}^{IJK} =& G^{IJ} \epsilon^K \frac{u}{\epsilon} \left[\frac{4 k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2}{K^3} - 2 \left(\mathbf{k_1}.\mathbf{k_2}\right) k_3^2 \left(\frac{1}{K} + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{K^2} + \frac{2 k_1 k_2}{K^3} \right) \right] \\
& - G^{IJ} \epsilon^K \left[6 \frac{k_1^2 k_2^2}{K} + 2 \frac{k_1^2 k_2^2 (k_3 + 2 k_2)}{K^2} + k_3 k_2^2 - k_3^3 \right] \\
& + G^{IJ} \left[\left(3 \frac{u}{\epsilon} + 4u + 4 \right) \tilde{\epsilon}^K + \tilde{\epsilon}_{,X}^K \frac{12 H^2}{P_{,X}} \right] \times \\
& \left[-\frac{k_1^2 k_2^2}{K} - \frac{k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3}{K^2} + \left(\mathbf{k_1}.\mathbf{k_2}\right) \left(-K + \frac{\sum\limits_{i>j} k_i k_j}{K} + \frac{k_1 k_2 k_3}{K^2} \right) \right] \\
& + \frac{\epsilon^{IJ}}{\epsilon} \epsilon^K \left(\frac{2\lambda}{H^2 \epsilon^2} - \frac{u}{\epsilon} \right) \frac{4 k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2}{K^3} + \text{perms.} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where $K = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$, and the Hubble parameter H, the sound speed squared $\left(c_s^2\right)$, and slow-roll parameters $\left(\epsilon, \epsilon^I, ..., \text{etc.}\right)$ are evaluated at sound horizon exit $c_s k = aH$. Expressions for c_s^2, u and λ are given in Ref. [39] for non-Canonical models[4]. In this work, we express all of these parameters in terms of three-form quantities using Eqs. (2.6) and (2.8). First u is defined as

$$u \equiv \frac{1}{c_s^2} - 1 , \tag{3.16}$$

where the effective speed of sound is given by

$$c_s^2 = \frac{P_{,X}}{2 X P_{,XX} + P_{,X}} = \frac{\sum\limits_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}}}{\sum\limits_I V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}^{-1}} . \tag{3.17}$$

---

[3] Technically these results are valid only when there is not a large hierarchy between the three wave numbers of the bispectrum and they can all be assumed to cross the horizon at roughly the same time. This provides a good approximation even for large hierarchies as long as there is not a significant evolution between the horizon crossing times of the three modes (see Refs. [37, 38] for a full discussion)

[4] We have corrected typos in the first and third lines of Eq. (3.15) that were present in Ref. [39].

We also define λ, such that

$$\lambda = X^2 P_{,XX} + \frac{2}{3} X^3 P_{,XXX} = -\sum_I \frac{V_{,\chi_I}^3 V_{\chi_I \chi_I \chi_I}}{12 V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}^3}. \tag{3.18}$$

The various slow-roll quantities are defined by

$$\epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{\sum\limits_I \chi_I V_{,\chi_I}}{V} \left(1 - \sum_I w_I^2\right), \tag{3.19}$$

$$\epsilon^{IJ} = \frac{P_{,X} \dot{\phi}^I \dot{\phi}^J}{2H^2} = \frac{P_{,X} \sqrt{X_I X_J}}{2H^2} = \epsilon^I \epsilon^J, \tag{3.20}$$

where

$$\epsilon^I = \sqrt{\frac{X_I P_{,X}}{2H^2}} = \sqrt{\frac{3 V_{,\chi_I}^2}{4V} \left(\sum_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}}\right) \left(1 - \sum_I w_I^2\right)}, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_I = -\frac{P_{,I}}{3\sqrt{2P_{,X}} H^2} = \frac{\sqrt{6} w_I}{3\sqrt{2 \sum\limits_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}}} H}. \tag{3.22}$$

Using the Friedmann equation in Eq. (2.10) we obtain

$$\tilde{\epsilon}^I_{,X} = -\frac{P_{,XI}}{3\sqrt{2P_{,X}} H^2} + P_{,I} \left[\frac{2X P_{,XX} + P_{,X}}{9\sqrt{2P_{,X}} H^4} + \frac{P_{,XX}}{6\sqrt{2} P_{,X}^{3/2} H^2}\right],$$

$$= -\sqrt{6} H w_I \left[\frac{\sum\limits_I V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}^{-1}}{\sqrt{2 \sum\limits_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}}} V} + \frac{\sum\limits_I \left(V_{,\chi_I \chi_I}^{-1} V_{,\chi_I}^{-2} - \chi_I V_{,\chi_I}^{-3}\right)}{3\sqrt{2} \left(\sum\limits_I \frac{\chi_I}{V_{,\chi_I}}\right)^{3/2} V}\right] \left(1 - \sum_I w_I^2\right). \tag{3.23}$$

Note that the dual scalar field action in Eq. (2.6) satisfies $P_{,XI} = 0$.

In the squeezed limit i.e., $k_2 \to 0$, it can be seen from Eq. (3.15) that $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(3)}$ reduces to the order of slow-roll parameters. Therefore $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{(4)}$ is expected to be dominant in this limit if non-Gaussianity is significant.

D. The δN for two three-forms

The crucial step, when it comes to computing f_{NL}, is the calculation of the derivatives of N with respect to the fields at the sound horizon crossing. In general $N_{,I}$ and $N_{,IJ}$ evolve on superhorizon scales and except in a few cases (see e.g., Ref. [40]) the analytical computation of these quantities is not tractable. For this reason we do our computations numerically using a method that is explained in section IV.

First of all we must rewrite the derivatives in terms of three-forms. Here we do this explicitly for two three-forms. The same procedure can be extended trivially to $\mathbb{N}$ three-form fields. We can infer the following relations from Eqs. (2.8) and (2.13) relating two three-forms to the two noncanonical scalar fields

$$\phi_1 = \sqrt{6} H w_1 \equiv \phi_1 \left(\chi_1, \chi_2, w_1, w_2\right), \tag{3.24}$$

$$\phi_2 = \sqrt{6} H w_2 \equiv \phi_2 \left(\chi_1, \chi_2, w_1, w_2\right), \tag{3.25}$$

It is highly nontrivial to invert the relations in Eqs. (3.24) and (3.25). While the fields are slowly rolling, one can verify that the approximation $w_I \approx \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \chi_I$ is accurately satisfied (see Ref.[26]). As a consequence, we express the N derivatives $N_{,I}$ and $N_{,IJ}$ in terms of the two three-forms χ_1, χ_2 as

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_1^*} = \frac{\partial N}{\partial \chi_1^*} \frac{\partial \chi_1^*}{\partial \phi_1^*} + \frac{\partial N}{\partial \chi_2^*} \frac{\partial \chi_2^*}{\partial \phi_1^*}, \tag{3.26}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\phi_1^*\partial\phi_2^*} = \frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_1^*}\frac{\partial^2\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^*\partial\phi_2^*} + \frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_2^*}\frac{\partial^2\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^*\partial\phi_2^*} + \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^{*2}}\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_2^*}$$
$$+ \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_2^{*2}}\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_2^*} + \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^*\partial\chi_2^*}\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_2^*} + \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^*\partial\chi_2^*}\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_2^*}\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^*},\tag{3.27}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\phi_1^{*2}} = \frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_1^*}\frac{\partial^2\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^{*2}} + \frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_2^*}\frac{\partial^2\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^{*2}} + \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^{*2}}\left(\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_2^{*2}}\left(\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\right)^2 + 2\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^*\partial\chi_2^*}\frac{\partial\chi_1^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}\frac{\partial\chi_2^*}{\partial\phi_1^*}.\tag{3.28}$$

derivatives of ϕ_2. These equations define the relations among the N derivatives ($N_{,I}$ and $N_{,IJ}$) with respect to scalar field ϕ_I^* to the N derivatives with respect to three-form fields at horizon crossing $\frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_1^*}$, $\frac{\partial N}{\partial\chi_2^*}$, $\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^*\partial\chi_2^*}$, $\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_1^{*2}}$, $\frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial\chi_2^{*2}}$. In other words, we have indirectly transported the δN formalism from scalar fields to three-form fields. However, we still need to calculate the derivatives of the three-form fields with respect to the dual scalar fields. For this purpose we differentiate the relations (3.24) and (3.25) keeping in mind that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are independent fields. Then we have that

$$\frac{d\phi_1}{d\phi_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}w_1}\frac{\partial H}{\partial\phi_1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}H}\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial\phi_1} = 1\,.\tag{3.29}$$

$$\frac{d\phi_1}{d\phi_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}w_1}\frac{\partial H}{\partial\phi_2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}H}\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial\phi_2} = 0\,.\tag{3.30}$$

$$\frac{d\phi_2}{d\phi_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}w_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial\phi_2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}H}\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial\phi_2} = 1\,.\tag{3.31}$$

$$\frac{d\phi_2}{d\phi_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}w_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial\phi_1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}H}\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial\phi_1} = 0\,.\tag{3.32}$$

Solving Eqs. (3.29)-(3.32) for a potential of the form $V = V(\chi_1) + V(\chi_2)$, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial\chi_1}{\partial\phi_1} = \frac{\chi_2 V_{,\chi_2} + H^2\left(6 - 9\chi_1^2\right)}{3H\left(6H^2 + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1} + \chi_2 V_{,\chi_2}\right)}$$
$$\frac{\partial\chi_1}{\partial\phi_2} = -\frac{\chi_1\left(V_{,\chi_2} + 9H^2\chi_2\right)}{3H\left(6H^2 + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1} + \chi_2 V_{,\chi_2}\right)}\tag{3.33}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2\chi_1}{\partial\phi_1^2} = \frac{-1}{9H^2\left(6H^2 + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1} + \chi_2 V_{,\chi_2}\right)^3}\left\{\chi_1 V_{,\chi_1}^2\left[\chi_2\left(\chi_2 V_{,\chi_2\chi_2} + 2V_{,\chi_2}\right) + H^2\left(9\chi_1^2 - 6\right)\right]\right.$$
$$- 2V_{,\chi_1}\left[-3H^2\chi_2\left(3V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}\chi_1^2\chi_2 + 6V_{,\chi_2}\chi_1^2 + 4V_{,\chi_2}\right) - V_{,\chi_2}^2\chi_2^2 + 18H^4\left(3\chi_1^2 - 2\right)\right]$$
$$+ \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\left(\chi_2 V_{,\chi_2} + H^2\left(6 - 9\chi_1^2\right)\right)^2$$
$$\left. - 9\chi_1 H^2\left(-3H^2\chi_2\left(3V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}\chi_1^2\chi_2 + 12V_{,\chi_2}\right) - 3V_{,\chi_2}^2\chi_2^2 + 54H^4\left(3\chi_1^2 - 2\right)\right)\right\}.\tag{3.34}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2\chi_1}{\partial\phi_2^2} = \frac{-1}{9H^2\left(6H^2 + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1} + \chi_2 V_{,\chi_2}\right)^3}\left\{\chi_1\left[18V_{,\chi_2}H^2\chi_2\left(V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\chi_1^2 - 18H^2\right) - 2V_{,\chi_2}^3\chi_2\right]\right.$$
$$+ \chi_1 V_{,\chi_2}^2\left[\chi_1\left(\chi_1 V_{,\chi_1\chi_1} - 2V_{,\chi_1}\right) - 3H^2\left(3\chi_2^2 + 10\right)\right] + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}\left[V_{,\chi_1}\chi_1 + H^2\left(6 - 9\chi_2^2\right)\right]^2$$
$$\left. + 9\chi_1 H^2\left[3H^2\chi_1\left(3V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\chi_1\chi_2^2 + 4V_{,\chi_1}\right) + V_{,\chi_1}^2\chi_1^2 - 18H^4\left(9\chi_2^2 - 2\right)\right]\right\}.\tag{3.35}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2\chi_1}{\partial\phi_1\partial\phi_2} = \frac{1}{9H^2\left(6H^2 + \chi_1 V_{,\chi_1} + \chi_2 V_{,\chi_2}\right)^3}\left\{-V_{,\chi_2}^3\chi_2^2 + V_{,\chi_2}^2\chi_2\left[V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\chi_1^2 + 3H^2\left(-4 + 3\chi_1^2 - 3\chi_2^2\right)\right]\right.$$
$$+ V_{,\chi_2}\left[3H^2\chi_1\left(V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\chi_1\left(-3\chi_1^2 + 3\chi_2^2 + 2\right) + 3V_{,\chi_1}\left(\chi_1^2 - \chi_2^2 + 2\right)\right) + V_{,\chi_1}^2\chi_1^2\right]$$
$$+ 36V_{,\chi_2}H^4\left(6\chi_1^2 - 3\chi_2^2 - 1\right) + \chi_2\left(V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}V_{,\chi_1}^2\chi_1^2 + 3V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}V_{,\chi_1}H^2\chi_1\left(3\chi_1^2 - 3\chi_2^2 + 2\right)\right) +$$
$$\left. \chi_2\left[162H^6\left(9\chi_1^2 - 2\right) + 27H^4\chi_1\left(\chi_1\left(-3V_{,\chi_1\chi_1}\chi_1^2 + 2V_{,\chi_1\chi_1} - 3V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}\chi_2^2 + 2V_{,\chi_2\chi_2}\right) + 4V_{,\chi_1}\right)\right]\right\}.\tag{3.36}$$

The remaining derivatives can be obtained from these by interchanging $1 \leftrightarrow 2$. Following Eqs. (3.26)-(3.28) the quantities obtained in Eqs. (3.33)-(3.36) are to be evaluated at $kc_s = aH$. However, the derivatives of N with respect to the three-form fields evolve on superhorizon scales.

IV.   TWO THREE-FORM NON-GAUSSIANITY AND OBSERVATIONAL DATA


FIG. 1:   The numerical solutions of (2.12) for $\chi_1(N)$ (solid line) and $\chi_2(N)$ (dashed line). The dash-dotted line corresponds to the slow-roll parameter $\epsilon(N)$ and $\epsilon = 1$ indicates the end of inflation at $N = 60.35$. We have considered the potentials $V_1 = V_{10}\left(\chi_1^2 + b_1\chi_1^4\right)$ and $V_2 = V_{20}\left(\chi_2^2 + b_2\chi_2^4\right)$ with $V_{10} = 1$, $V_{20} = 0.93$, $b_{1,2} = -0.35$ and taken the initial conditions $\chi_1(0) \approx 0.5763$, $\chi_2(0) \approx 0.5766$, $\chi_1'(0) = -0.000224$, $\chi_2'(0) = 0.00014$.

In this section, we aim to update the observational status of two three-form inflation [26] by means of calculating the reduced bispectrum f_{NL}. Assuming a slow-roll regime, from Eq. (3.19) and in the case of two three-forms, $\epsilon \ll 1$ leads to the following condition

$$w_1^2 + w_2^2 \approx 1\,, \tag{4.1}$$

which we can parametrize as

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &\approx \cos\theta\,, \\ w_2 &\approx \sin\theta\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Subsequently, from (2.14), we can establish the initial conditions for the field derivatives as

$$\begin{cases} \chi_1' \approx 3\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\,\cos\theta - \chi_1\right), \\ \chi_2' \approx 3\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\,\sin\theta - \chi_2\right). \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

As described in Sec. II, there exist two kinds of inflationary dynamics to consider, namely, type I and type II solutions. In the type I case, the trajectories in field space are straight lines and the two three-form fields stay near the fixed points

$$\chi_{1c} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\cos\theta_c \quad, \quad \chi_{2c} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sin\theta_c \quad, \quad \theta_c = \arctan\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)\Big|_{\chi_1=\chi_{1c},\chi_2=\chi_{2c}}. \tag{4.4}$$

Notice that we have used Eqs. (2.16) and (4.2) to obtain (4.4). Given the potential $V(\chi_1, \chi_2)$ we can find the critical angle θ_c that gives us initial conditions for which the three-form fields evolve almost identically and generate straight line trajectories in field space. In this scenario, there are no isocurvature perturbations produced during inflation and as a consequence the reduced local bispectrum f_{NL} is negligible. In the type II case, we choose an initial condition away from θ_c that leads to a situation where three-form fields evolve away from (χ_{1c}, χ_{2c}) leading to curved trajectories in field space. Moreover, different types of potentials $V(\chi_1, \chi_2)$ will diversely affect the particular form of the curved trajectory. In Refs. [23, 41] suitable potentials for three-forms were proposed for being adequate to avoid ghost and Laplacian instabilities $(0 < c_s^2 \lesssim 1)$. It was shown that the potentials with a quadratic behavior when

$\chi_I \to 0$ were free from ghost instabilities and displayed an oscillatory behavior near the end of inflation [26, 27]. In this regard, potentials of the form $V(\chi_I) = a\chi_I^2 + b\chi_I^{2n}$ with $b < 0$ are free from ghost instabilities and consistent with a sound speed $0 < c_s^2 \lesssim 1$. Finally, it is important to point out that we can also have other more generalized potentials like $V(\chi_I) = \exp(\nu\chi_I^2) - 1$ or $\tanh(\nu\chi_I^2)$ [23, 26].

In Ref. [26], type II solutions with potentials $V(\chi_1, \chi_2) = V_{10}f(\chi_1) + V_{20}f(\chi_2)$, where $f(\chi_I) = \chi_I^2 + b\chi_I^{2n}$, using tuned initial conditions were shown to be consistent with Planck 2013 data, predicting the scalar spectral index $n_s \sim 0.967$ and the tensor to scalar ratio $r \sim 0.0422$. The fine-tuning process consists in introducing a tiny asymmetry in the potential by means of taking $V_{10} \neq V_{20}$. This asymmetry corresponds to a curved trajectory in field space, thus giving rise to a controlled growth of curvature perturbation on superhorizon scales. This fine-tuning is essential to keep the running of the spectral index $\left(\frac{dn_s}{dlnk}\right)$ negligible and compatible with the observational data.[5]. The two three-forms dynamics that give rise to these consistent predictions are plotted in Fig. 1. We have taken the same initial conditions and the parameter values [6] as in [26].

The observational prediction of non-Gaussianity for multifield inflation is deeply associated with the evolution of isocurvature perturbations. In the single field inflation the statistics of the curvature perturbation evaluated at horizon exit can be confronted with the observation. This is because the curvature perturbation is conserved on superhorizon scales if the system is adiabatic [32, 42, 43]. Whereas for multifield models, the statistics evolve on superhorizon scales and non-Gaussianity can be generated as a consequence of the presence of isocurvature perturbations. This can happen in two regimes, namely, (i) during inflation [44–47] and (ii) after inflation such as in the curvaton model [48–59]. In general the statistics continue to evolve until all isocurvature perturbations decay, the so-called adiabatic limit [46]. We evaluate f_{NL} at the end of inflation, this is a good approximation as long as reheating proceeds quickly, and curvaton type effects do not occur.

FIG. 2: In this plot we depict f_{NL} against N for squeezed $(k_2 \ll k_1 = k_3)$ equilateral $(k_1 = k_2 = k_3)$ and orthogonal $(k_1 = 2k_2 = 2k_3)$ configurations. We have considered the potentials $V_1 = V_{10}\left(\chi_1^2 + b_1\chi_1^4\right)$ and $V_2 = V_{20}\left(\chi_2^2 + b_2\chi_2^4\right)$ with $V_{10} = 1, V_{20} = 0.93, b_{1,2} = -0.35$ and taken the initial conditions $\chi_1(0) \approx 0.5763, \chi_2(0) \approx 0.5766, \chi_1'(0) = -0.000224, \chi_2'(0) = 0.00014$.

To calculate f_{NL} given in Eq. (3.11), we need to compute the N derivatives with respect to the initial conditions of three-form fields defined in Eqs. (3.26)-(3.28). To compute these numerically, we define the following discrete

———

[5] See the discussion in section 5 of Ref. [26] for details concerning the effect of isocurvature modes on the running spectral index.

[6] The initial conditions considered in Fig. 1 correspond to the values of three-form fields at horizon crossing, whereas initial conditions in Ref. [26] were taken at an instant preceding the slow-roll regime. Nevertheless, we study the same inflationary trajectory which was proved to be compatible with the Planck 2013 data in Ref. [26].

derivatives that can in principle, be extended to any number of fields,

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{,\chi_1^*} &= \frac{N\left(\chi_1^* + \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^*\right) - N\left(\chi_1^* - \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^*\right)}{2\Delta\chi_1}, \\
N_{,\chi_1^*\chi_1^*} &= \frac{N\left(\chi_1^* + \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^*\right) - 2N\left(\chi_1^*\right) + N\left(\chi_1^* + \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^*\right)}{\Delta\chi_1^2}, \\
N_{,\chi_1^*\chi_2^*} &= [N\left(\chi_1^* + \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^* + \Delta\chi_2\right) - N\left(\chi_1^* + \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^* - \Delta\chi_2\right) - \\
&\quad N\left(\chi_1^* - \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^* + \Delta\chi_2\right) + N\left(\chi_1^* - \Delta\chi_1 \,,\, \chi_2^* - \Delta\chi_2\right)]\left(4\Delta\chi_1^2\right)^{-1},
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.5}
$$

and similarly we can obtain the remaining derivatives by interchanging $1 \leftrightarrow 2$. In the above expression, $N\left(\chi_1, \chi_2\right)$ is the number of e-foldings that occur starting at initial conditions $\{\chi_1^*, \chi_2^*\}$ and ending at a given final energy density. This final energy density is defined by the condition that $N\left(\chi_1, \chi_2\right) = 60.35$ at the point $\epsilon = 1$. That is the central point in the finite difference represents a trajectory that undergoes 60 e-folds of inflation, from the initial field value until inflation ends, and the density at that time is used as the final density for all the other points in the difference scheme. These other points therefore represent slightly different amounts of inflation, and we note that their associated trajectories do not end exactly at the point $\epsilon = 1$. In our numerical results we take $\Delta\chi_I \sim 10^{-5}$. Using the N derivatives calculated from (4.5) and evaluating the amplitude given by Eq. (3.14), we compute f_{NL} in (3.11). We obtain the momentum independent contribution $f_{NL}^{(4)}$ in (3.12) to be very small $\mathcal{O}\left(10^{-3}\right)$. In Fig. 2 we plot the total f_{NL} versus N for squeezed ($k_2 \ll k_1 = k_3$), equilateral ($k_1 = k_2 = k_3$) and orthogonal ($k_1 = 2k_2 = 2k_3$) triangles.

It is convenient to express the reduced bispectrum in terms of the following independent variables [60, 61]

$$
\alpha = \frac{k_2 - k_3}{k} \quad , \quad \beta = \frac{k - k_1}{k} \quad \text{where} \quad k = \frac{k_1 + k_2 + k_3}{2}, \tag{4.6}
$$

where $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and, $-(1-\beta) \leq \alpha \leq (1-\beta)$. In Fig. 3 we depict the shape of a slice through the reduced bispectrum $f_{\mathrm{NL}}\left(k_1, k_2, k_3\right)$ at $N = 60$ using these variables. The bispectrum shape reveals details about the dominant interaction contributions [62]. In general, the presence of a signal in the squeezed limit represents the interaction of the long wavelength mode, which already exited the horizon, with the short wavelength modes still being within the horizon. This can happen in the case where more than one light scalar field drives the period of inflation. When, instead, we observe a peak in the equilateral limit, the dominant interaction between the fields occurs when the modes are exiting the horizon at the same time during inflation. This is taken to be the distinctive feature of models with a noncanonical kinetic term or models involving higher derivative interactions [14]. In the case of multiple noncanonical scalar field inflation (which is effectively happening in the two three-form inflation scenario), it is possible that we would encounter a mixture of shapes [14, 62]. Although in the example we explored there is no significant signal in the squeezed limit.

V.   CONCLUSIONS

In this article we presented a generic framework to compute primordial non-Gaussianity in the case of multiple three-form field inflation. We followed the δN formalism which is a well-known method to study the evolution of curvature perturbations on superhorizon scales in the case of multiple scalar fields. Because of the fact that the three-form fields are dual to noncanonical scalar fields, which was shown in [24], we developed an indirect methodology to implement δN formalism to three-form fields. For a specific case of two three-form fields, we derived a relation between the derivatives of N with respect to unperturbed values of scalar field duals at horizon exit $c_s k = aH$ and the N derivatives with respect to three-form fields. We employed a numerical finite difference approach for this purpose. We computed the bispectrum at horizon exit for the two three-form field case using known expressions for three-point field space correlations for a general multiscalar field model. Then using the N derivatives we determined the complete superhorizon evolution of f_{NL} for squeezed, equilateral and orthogonal configurations until the end of inflation. We considered a suitable choice of potentials and specific values of model parameters that were consistent with $n_s \sim 0.967$ and $r \sim 0.0422$ [26]. We obtained the corresponding f_{NL} predictions for the two three-form inflationary model as $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{sq}} \sim -2.6 \times 10^{-3}$, $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{eq}} \sim 1.409$, $f_{\mathrm{NL}}^{\mathrm{orth}} \sim 0.495$. Therefore, the model is well within the observational bounds of Planck 2015 data but in principal, could be falsifiable with the future probes.

We have computed f_{NL} for two three-forms with potentials of the form $\chi_I + b\chi_I^4$, but our results may not be significantly different with more generic potentials like $\exp\left(\nu\chi_I^2\right) - 1$ or $\tanh\left(\nu\chi_I^2\right)$, under an appropriate fine-tuning in the initial conditions. From the conclusions drawn from the two three-form scenario (which is simpler), we cannot precisely anticipate the generation of non-Gaussianities in $\mathbb{N}$ three-form inflation beyond the fact that the existence

FIG. 3: Graphical representation of the non-Gaussianity shape $f_{\mathrm{NL}}(\alpha, \beta)$. We have considered the potentials $V_1 = V_{10}\left(\chi_1^2 + b_1\chi_1^4\right)$ and $V_2 = V_{20}\left(\chi_2^2 + b_2\chi_2^4\right)$ with $V_{10} = 1$, $V_{20} = 0.93$, $b_{1,2} = -0.35$ and taken the initial conditions $\chi_1(0) \approx 0.5763$, $\chi_2(0) \approx 0.5766$, $\chi_1'(0) = -0.000224$, $\chi_2'(0) = 0.00014$.

of curved trajectories in field space is also expected in the more complex case. Therefore, one can extend the present work to $\mathbb{N}$ three-form fields but in such cases a much more careful analysis is needed in fine tuning the parameters and initial conditions such that (n_s, r) and more importantly the running of spectral index $\left(\frac{dn_s}{dlnk}\right)$ are well within the current observational bounds. Another interesting possibility, to extend this study, is to explore a curvaton type of scenario with three-form fields with an adequate choice of potentials. Finally, the study of the trispectrum in this model constitutes an interesting direction that we consider for future investigation.

Acknowledgments

[1] A. H. Guth, "The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems," *Phys.Rev.* **D23** (1981) 347–356.
[2] **Planck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, "Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters," `arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[3] **Planck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, "Planck 2015 results. XX. Constraints on inflation," `arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[4] **Planck** Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, "Planck 2015 results. XVII. Constraints on primordial non-Gaussianity," `arXiv:1502.01592 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[5] **BICEP2, Planck** Collaboration, P. Ade *et al.*, "Joint Analysis of BICEP2/Keck Array and Planck Data," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** (2015) 101301, `arXiv:1502.00612 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[6] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, and V. Vennin, "Encyclopaedia Inflationaris," *Phys.Dark Univ.* (2014) , `arXiv:1303.3787 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[7] J. Martin, "The Observational Status of Cosmic Inflation after Planck," 2015. `arXiv:1502.05733 [astro-ph.CO]`.
[8] S. Tsujikawa, "Distinguishing between inflationary models from cosmic microwave background," *PTEP* **2014** no. 6, (2014) 06B104, `arXiv:1401.4688 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[9] J. M. Maldacena, "Non-Gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models," *JHEP* **0305** (2003) 013, arXiv:astro-ph/0210603 [astro-ph].

[10] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, "Primordial non-Gaussianities from multiple-field inflation," *JCAP* **0509** (2005) 011, arXiv:astro-ph/0506056 [astro-ph].

[11] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, "Primordial non-Gaussianities in single field inflation," *JCAP* **0506** (2005) 003, arXiv:astro-ph/0503692 [astro-ph].

[12] X. Chen, M.-x. Huang, S. Kachru, and G. Shiu, "Observational signatures and non-Gaussianities of general single field inflation," *JCAP* **0701** (2007) 002, arXiv:hep-th/0605045 [hep-th].

[13] D. Wands, "Local non-Gaussianity from inflation," *Class.Quant.Grav.* **27** (2010) 124002, arXiv:1004.0818 [astro-ph.CO].

[14] X. Chen, "Primordial Non-Gaussianities from Inflation Models," *Adv.Astron.* **2010** (2010) 638979, arXiv:1002.1416 [astro-ph.CO].

[15] C. T. Byrnes, "Lecture notes on non-Gaussianity," 2014. arXiv:1411.7002 [astro-ph.CO]. http://inspirehep.net/record/1329941/files/arXiv:1411.7002.pdf.

[16] **Planck Collaboration** Collaboration, P. Ade *et al.*, "Planck 2013 Results. XXIV. Constraints on primordial non-Gaussianity," arXiv:1303.5084 [astro-ph.CO].

[17] J. Elliston, D. J. Mulryne, and R. Tavakol, "What Planck does not tell us about inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D88** (2013) 063533, arXiv:1307.7095 [astro-ph.CO].

[18] D. Baumann, D. Green, and R. A. Porto, "B-modes and the Nature of Inflation," *JCAP* **1501** no. 01, (2015) 016, arXiv:1407.2621 [hep-th].

[19] V. Vennin, K. Koyama, and D. Wands, "Encyclopaedia curvatonis," *JCAP* **1511** no. 11, (2015) 008, arXiv:1507.07575 [astro-ph.CO].

[20] T. S. Koivisto and N. J. Nunes, "Three-form cosmology," *Phys.Lett.* **B685** (2010) 105–109, arXiv:0907.3883 [astro-ph.CO].

[21] T. S. Koivisto and N. J. Nunes, "Inflation and dark energy from three-forms," *Phys.Rev.* **D80** (2009) 103509, arXiv:0908.0920 [astro-ph.CO].

[22] C. Germani and A. Kehagias, "P-nflation: generating cosmic Inflation with p-forms," *JCAP* **0903** (2009) 028, arXiv:0902.3667 [astro-ph.CO].

[23] A. De Felice, K. Karwan, and P. Wongjun, "Stability of the 3-form field during inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D85** (2012) 123545, arXiv:1202.0896 [hep-ph].

[24] D. J. Mulryne, J. Noller, and N. J. Nunes, "Three-form inflation and non-Gaussianity," *JCAP* **1212** (2012) 016, arXiv:1209.2156 [astro-ph.CO].

[25] T. S. Koivisto and N. J. Nunes, "Coupled three-form dark energy," arXiv:1212.2541 [astro-ph.CO].

[26] K. S. Kumar, J. Marto, N. J. Nunes, and P. V. Moniz, "Inflation in a two 3-form fields scenario," *JCAP* **1406** (2014) 064, arXiv:1404.0211 [gr-qc].

[27] B. J. Barros and N. J. Nunes, "Three-form inflation in type II Randall-Sundrum," *Phys. Rev.* **D93** no. 4, (2016) 043512, arXiv:1511.07856 [astro-ph.CO].

[28] K. Groh, J. Louis, and J. Sommerfeld, "Duality and Couplings of 3-Form-Multiplets in N=1 Supersymmetry," *JHEP* **05** (2013) 001, arXiv:1212.4639 [hep-th].

[29] D. Lyth, "Large Scale Energy Density Perturbations and Inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D31** (1985) 1792–1798.

[30] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, "A General analytic formula for the spectral index of the density perturbations produced during inflation," *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **95** (1996) 71–78, arXiv:astro-ph/9507001 [astro-ph].

[31] D. Wands, K. A. Malik, D. H. Lyth, and A. R. Liddle, "A New approach to the evolution of cosmological perturbations on large scales," *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 043527, arXiv:astro-ph/0003278 [astro-ph].

[32] D. H. Lyth, K. A. Malik, and M. Sasaki, "A General proof of the conservation of the curvature perturbation," *JCAP* **0505** (2005) 004, arXiv:astro-ph/0411220 [astro-ph].

[33] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, "Non-Gaussianity from the second-order cosmological perturbation," *Phys.Rev.* **D71** (2005) 123508, arXiv:astro-ph/0502578 [astro-ph].

[34] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, "The Inflationary prediction for primordial non-Gaussianity," *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **95** (2005) 121302, arXiv:astro-ph/0504045 [astro-ph].

[35] A. R. Liddle, A. Mazumdar, and F. E. Schunck, "Assisted inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D58** (1998) 061301, arXiv:astro-ph/9804177 [astro-ph].

[36] A. A. Starobinsky, "Multicomponent de Sitter (Inflationary) Stages and the Generation of Perturbations," *JETP Lett.* **42** (1985) 152–155. [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.42,124(1985)].

[37] Z. Kenton and D. J. Mulryne, "The squeezed limit of the bispectrum in multi-field inflation," *JCAP* **1510** no. 10, (2015) 018, arXiv:1507.08629 [astro-ph.CO].

[38] Z. Kenton and D. J. Mulryne, "The Separate Universe Approach to Soft Limits," arXiv:1605.03435 [astro-ph.CO].

[39] X. Gao, "Primordial Non-Gaussianities of General Multiple Field Inflation," *JCAP* **0806** (2008) 029, arXiv:0804.1055 [astro-ph].

[40] F. Vernizzi and D. Wands, "Non-gaussianities in two-field inflation," *JCAP* **0605** (2006) 019, arXiv:astro-ph/0603799 [astro-ph].

[41] A. De Felice, K. Karwan, and P. Wongjun, "Reheating in 3-form inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D86** (2012) 103526, arXiv:1209.5156 [astro-ph.CO].

[42] G. I. Rigopoulos and E. P. S. Shellard, "The separate universe approach and the evolution of nonlinear superhorizon

cosmological perturbations," *Phys. Rev.* **D68** (2003) 123518, `arXiv:astro-ph/0306620 [astro-ph]`.

[43] A. J. Christopherson and K. A. Malik, "The non-adiabatic pressure in general scalar field systems," *Phys. Lett.* **B675** (2009) 159–163, `arXiv:0809.3518 [astro-ph]`.

[44] C. T. Byrnes, K.-Y. Choi, and L. M. H. Hall, "Conditions for large non-Gaussianity in two-field slow-roll inflation," *JCAP* **0810** (2008) 008, `arXiv:0807.1101 [astro-ph]`.

[45] C. M. Peterson and M. Tegmark, "Testing Two-Field Inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D83** (2011) 023522, `arXiv:1005.4056 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[46] J. Elliston, D. J. Mulryne, D. Seery, and R. Tavakol, "Evolution of fNL to the adiabatic limit," *JCAP* **1111** (2011) 005, `arXiv:1106.2153 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[47] J. Elliston, L. Alabidi, I. Huston, D. Mulryne, and R. Tavakol, "Large trispectrum in two-field slow-roll inflation," *JCAP* **1209** (2012) 001, `arXiv:1203.6844 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[48] S. Mollerach, "Isocurvature baryon perturbations and inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D42** (1990) 313–325.

[49] A. D. Linde and V. F. Mukhanov, "Nongaussian isocurvature perturbations from inflation," *Phys.Rev.* **D56** (1997) 535–539, `arXiv:astro-ph/9610219 [astro-ph]`.

[50] K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, "Adiabatic CMB perturbations in pre - big bang string cosmology," *Nucl.Phys.* **B626** (2002) 395–409, `arXiv:hep-ph/0109214 [hep-ph]`.

[51] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, "Generating the curvature perturbation without an inflaton," *Phys.Lett.* **B524** (2002) 5–14, `arXiv:hep-ph/0110002 [hep-ph]`.

[52] T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, "Effects of cosmological moduli fields on cosmic microwave background," *Phys.Lett.* **B522** (2001) 215–221, `arXiv:hep-ph/0110096 [hep-ph]`.

[53] K. Enqvist and S. Nurmi, "Non-gaussianity in curvaton models with nearly quadratic potential," *JCAP* **0510** (2005) 013, `arXiv:astro-ph/0508573 [astro-ph]`.

[54] A. D. Linde and V. Mukhanov, "The curvaton web," *JCAP* **0604** (2006) 009, `arXiv:astro-ph/0511736 [astro-ph]`.

[55] K. A. Malik and D. H. Lyth, "A numerical study of non-gaussianity in the curvaton scenario," *JCAP* **0609** (2006) 008, `arXiv:astro-ph/0604387 [astro-ph]`.

[56] M. Sasaki, J. Valiviita, and D. Wands, "Non-Gaussianity of the primordial perturbation in the curvaton model," *Phys.Rev.* **D74** (2006) 103003, `arXiv:astro-ph/0607627 [astro-ph]`.

[57] J. Meyers and E. R. M. Tarrant, "Perturbative Reheating After Multiple-Field Inflation: The Impact on Primordial Observables," *Phys.Rev.* **D89** (2014) 063535, `arXiv:1311.3972 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[58] J. Elliston, S. Orani, and D. J. Mulryne, "General analytic predictions of two-field inflation and perturbative reheating," *Phys.Rev.* **D89** (2014) 103532, `arXiv:1402.4800 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[59] C. T. Byrnes, M. Corts, and A. R. Liddle, "Comprehensive analysis of the simplest curvaton model," *Phys. Rev.* **D90** no. 2, (2014) 023523, `arXiv:1403.4591 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[60] J. R. Fergusson and E. P. S. Shellard, "The shape of primordial non-Gaussianity and the CMB bispectrum," *Phys. Rev.* **D80** (2009) 043510, `arXiv:0812.3413 [astro-ph]`.

[61] J. R. Fergusson, M. Liguori, and E. P. S. Shellard, "General CMB and Primordial Bispectrum Estimation I: Mode Expansion, Map-Making and Measures of f_{NL}," *Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 023502, `arXiv:0912.5516 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[62] D. Babich, P. Creminelli, and M. Zaldarriaga, "The Shape of non-Gaussianities," *JCAP* **0408** (2004) 009, `arXiv:astro-ph/0405356 [astro-ph]`.