

Scalar Field Dark Energy Perturbations and their Scale Dependence

Sanil Unnikrishnan,^{1,*} H. K. Jassal,^{2,†} and T. R. Seshadri^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics & Astrophysics, University of Delhi, Delhi : 110007, India*

²*Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Allahabad 211 019, India*

(Dated: November 4, 2018)

We estimate the amplitude of perturbation in dark energy at different length scales for a quintessence model with an exponential potential. It is shown that on length scales much smaller than hubble radius, perturbation in dark energy is negligible in comparison to that in dark matter. However, on scales comparable to the hubble radius ($\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$) the perturbation in dark energy in general cannot be neglected. As compared to the ΛCDM model, large scale matter power spectrum is suppressed in a generic quintessence dark energy model. We show that on scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$, this suppression is primarily due to different background evolution compared to ΛCDM model. However, on much larger scales perturbation in dark energy can effect matter power spectrum significantly. Hence this analysis can act as a discriminator between ΛCDM model and other generic dark energy models with $w_{de} \neq -1$.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.65.-r

I. INTRODUCTION

Cosmological observations suggest that about 70% content of our universe is made of a form of matter which drives the accelerated expansion of the universe[1]. These observations include Supernova type Ia observations [2], observations of Cosmic Microwave Background [3, 4, 5] and large scale structure [7, 8, 9]. The accelerated expansion of the universe can of course be explained by introducing a cosmological constant Λ in the Einstein's equation [10, 11]. However, the cosmological constant model is plagued by the fine tuning problem [10]. This has motivated the study of dark energy models to explain the current accelerated expansion of the universe. The simplest model as an alternative to cosmological constant model is to assume that this accelerated expansion is driven by a canonical scalar field with a potential $V(\phi)$. This class of dark energy models are known as quintessence models and the scalar field is known as a quintessence field. Various quintessence models have been studied in literature [12, 13, 14]. There exists another class of string theory inspired scalar field dark energy models known as tachyon models [16, 17]. Models of dark energy which allow $w < -1$ are known as phantom models [18]. Phantom type dark energy can also be realized in a scalar tensor theory of gravitation. (See for example Ref.[19].) Other scalar field models include k-essence field [15], branes [20], Chaplygin gas model and its generalizations [21]. There are also some phenomenological models [22], field theoretical and reorganization group based models (see e.g. [23]), models that unify dark matter and dark energy [24], holographic dark energy models [25] and many others like those based on

horizon thermodynamics (e.g. see [26]). For reviews of dark energy models see for instance Ref.[27] and for constraining parameters using observations see Ref.[28].

Homogeneous dark energy distribution leads to accelerated expansion of the Universe which, in turn, governs the luminosity distance and angular diameter distance. The rate of expansion also influences growth of density perturbations in the universe. This is evident from the abundance of rich clusters of galaxies and their evolution and the Integrated Sachs Wolfe effect [29].

In this paper we present a set of argument which lead to the conclusion that inhomogeneous dark matter with homogeneous dark energy at all length scales is inconsistent with Einstein's equation if $p_{de} \neq -\rho_{de}$. We further analyze how dark matter power spectrum is influenced by perturbation in dark energy with an evolving equation of state parameter.

Dark energy perturbations have been extensively studied in the linear approximation [32, 33, 34]. It was shown in Ref.[32] that dark energy perturbations affect the low l quadrupole in the CMB angular power spectrum through the ISW effect. This analysis was done for a constant equation of state parameter. For models with $w > -1$ this effect is enhanced while for phantom like models it is suppressed. In these models dark matter perturbations and dark energy perturbations are anti-correlated for large effective sound speeds. This anti-correlation is a gauge dependent effect [33]. Detailed studies in dark energy perturbations also include [35, 36]. Clustering of dark energy within matter over density and voids were studied by Mota et al[31].

In this paper we study the evolution of perturbation in dark energy in a quintessence model which results in an evolving equation of state parameter different from that considered in Refs.[30, 32]. We use a specific model of scalar field dark energy with an exponential potential. We find that although for scales much smaller than hubble radius the perturbation in dark energy is small, for scales $\geq H^{-1}$ the perturbation in dark energy can

*Electronic address: sanil@physics.du.ac.in

†Electronic address: hkj@mri.ernet.in

‡Electronic address: trs@physics.du.ac.in

be comparable to that in matter. Hence, although on small scales ($\ll H^{-1}$) the dark energy can be treated as homogeneous, one has to take into account the perturbation in dark energy over scales $\sim H^{-1}$ if $w_{de} \neq -1$. Clearly, in the specific case of $w_{de} = -1$ the dark energy is homogeneous at all scales.

We choose to work in the longitudinal gauge as in that case we can directly relate the metric perturbation Φ to the gravitational potential perturbation. For a specific model, we investigate how quintessence dark energy influences matter power spectrum. We show that on scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$, the matter power spectrum is not significantly affected whether or not we include fluctuations in the quintessence field in perturbation equations. However, on much larger scales, including or excluding fluctuations in quintessence field does result in significant changes in the matter power spectrum.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we discuss the background cosmology for matter and the scalar field system and describe the cosmological perturbation equation in longitudinal gauge for this system. In Section III we obtain the numerical solution of the perturbation equation to determine the ratio of the perturbations in dark energy to the perturbations in matter at various length scales. Section IV summarizes the results.

II. INHOMOGENEOUS MATTER AND DARK ENERGY

We shall consider a system of minimally coupled matter (dark + baryonic) and canonical scalar field ¹ with Lagrangian of the form :

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - V(\phi) \quad (1)$$

As a simple example, we consider a scalar field potential of the form [37, 38, 39, 40]:

$$V(\phi) = V_o \exp\left[-\sqrt{\lambda}\frac{\phi}{M_p}\right] \quad (2)$$

Here λ and V_o are two parameters of the potential and $M_p = (8\pi G)^{-1/2}$ is the Planck mass. This potential leads to scaling solutions[13, 14, 39]. However, for treating exponential potential as a possible candidate for dark energy, we require that the scalar field should not enter the scaling regime. This is possible to achieve by restricting the choice of the parameter in the exponential potential [39].

A spatially flat homogeneous and isotropic line element is described by the FRW metric of the form :

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t)[dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2] \quad (3)$$

For the system of pressureless matter and quintessence with exponential potential the background evolution $a(t)$ is completely determined by solving the following Friedmann equation and the Klein Gordon equation :

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\left[\rho_m a^{-3} + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V_o \exp\left(-\sqrt{\lambda}\frac{\phi}{M_p}\right)\right] \quad (4)$$

and

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\phi} - \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{M_p}V_o \exp\left[-\sqrt{\lambda}\frac{\phi}{M_p}\right] = 0 \quad (5)$$

A. Equations for Perturbations

For analyzing perturbations in scalar fields and matter we work in the longitudinal gauge [41, 42, 43] (For a recent pedagogical review see, [44]). For scalar field and for pressureless matter (described as perfect fluid), the perturbed energy momentum tensor has no anisotropic term *i.e.* δT^i_j is diagonal (where $i, j = 1, 2, 3$)². Einstein's equations would then imply that the scalar metric perturbations in this gauge are completely described by a single scalar variable Φ . For such a system, perturbed FRW metric in longitudinal gauge attains the form [43]:

$$ds^2 = (1 + 2\Phi)dt^2 - a^2(t)(1 - 2\Phi)[dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2] \quad (6)$$

It is a good approximation to treat Dark Matter, baryonic matter, etc. as perfect fluids. The energy momentum tensor of a perfect fluid is described as:

$$T^\mu_\nu = (\rho + p)u^\mu u_\nu - p\delta^\mu_\nu \quad (7)$$

Perturbations in the energy density ρ , pressure p and the four velocity u^μ are defined as:

$$\rho(t, \vec{x}) = \rho_o(t) + \delta\rho(t, \vec{x}) \quad (8)$$

$$p(t, \vec{x}) = p_o(t) + \delta p(t, \vec{x}) \quad (9)$$

$$u^\mu = {}^{(o)}u^\mu + \delta u^\mu \quad (10)$$

where ${}^{(o)}u^\mu = \{1, 0, 0, 0\}$; $\rho_o(t)$ and $p_o(t)$ are average values of the energy density and pressure respectively on a constant time hypersurface. The peculiar velocity is given by δu^i . Substituting Eqs. (8), (9) and (10) in Eq. (7) and neglecting second and higher order perturbation terms we get:

$$\delta T^0_0 = \delta\rho \quad (11)$$

$$\delta T^i_0 = (\rho_o + p_o)\delta u^i \quad (12)$$

$$\delta T^i_j = -\delta p\delta^i_j \quad (13)$$

¹ We shall denote scalar field by ϕ and the metric perturbation in the longitudinal gauge by Φ

² Please note that through out this paper $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $i, j = 1, 2, 3$

For scalar (quintessence) field with Lagrangian of the form Eq.(1), we define the perturbations as :

$$\phi(\vec{x}, t) = \phi_o(t) + \delta\phi(\vec{x}, t) \quad (14)$$

where $\phi_o(t)$ is the average value of the scalar field on the constant time hypersurface. The energy momentum tensor for the scalar field is given by

$$T^\mu{}_\nu = \partial^\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - \mathcal{L}_\phi\delta^\mu{}_\nu \quad (15)$$

Substituting Eq.(14) in Eq.(15) and subtracting the homogeneous part in the energy momentum tensor we get

$$\delta T^0{}_0 = \delta\rho_\phi = \dot{\phi}_o\dot{\delta\phi} - \Phi\dot{\phi}_o^2 + V'(\phi_o)\delta\phi \quad (16)$$

$$\delta T^i{}_j = -\delta p_\phi\delta_j^i = -\left[\dot{\phi}_o\dot{\delta\phi} - \Phi\dot{\phi}_o^2 - V'\delta\phi\right]\delta_j^i \quad (17)$$

$$\delta T^0{}_i = (\rho_{\phi_o} + p_{\phi_o})\delta u_{i(\phi)} = \dot{\phi}_o\delta\phi_{,i} \quad (18)$$

B. Inhomogeneous Dark energy

The existence of inhomogeneity in non relativistic matter (dark + baryonic) is evident from direct observations. We ask : is it reasonable to assume that dark energy is in general homogeneous given the observational fact that matter (dark + baryonic) is clustered? Dark energy has equation of state $p < -\frac{1}{3}\rho$, leading to the accelerated expansion of the universe. The fluid with such an equation of state behaves gravitationally as a repulsive form of matter and opposes gravitational clustering.

Our assumption that matter and scalar field are minimally coupled implies that energy momentum tensor for both matter and scalar field are individually conserved. This would then imply that for both these components the variables defining the perturbations $\delta\rho$, δp and δu^i would satisfy the following two equations³ :

$$\dot{\delta\rho} + (\rho_o + p_o)\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{\delta u} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\delta\rho + \delta p) - 3\dot{\Phi}(\rho_o + p_o) = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$(\rho_o + p_o)\dot{\delta u}_i + \dot{p}_o\delta u_i - \delta p_{,i} - \Phi_{,i}(\rho_o + p_o) = 0 \quad (20)$$

If dark energy with $w \neq -1$ were to be homogeneously distributed, *i.e* if $\delta T^\mu{}_\nu(DE) = 0$, then, Eqs.(19) and (20) imply that the gravitational potential does not depend on space and time (*i.e.* $\Phi = \text{constant}$). If this is the case then in the line element (6), we can rescale time and space coordinate such that Eq.(6) becomes FRW metric (3). This would then imply that $\delta\rho_m = 0$. Hence homogeneously distributed dark energy at all length scales would naturally imply that matter is also distributed homogeneously. As we see structures over different scales, this is

³ Note that for scalar field $\delta T^0{}_i = \dot{\phi}_o\delta\phi_{,i}$. This could also be written as $\delta T^0{}_i = (\rho_{\phi_o} + p_{\phi_o})\delta u_{i(\phi)}$ where $\delta u_{i(\phi)} = \dot{\phi}^{-1}\delta\phi_{,i}$.




FIG. 1: This plot shows the variation of Ω_m and Ω_ϕ as a function of scale factor. We have chosen $\lambda = 1$. In the x-axis, “Log” refers to the logarithm to base 10.

an observational evidence that the matter in the universe is clearly not homogeneously distributed. Hence, if we assume that dark energy with $w \neq -1$ is homogeneously distributed at all length scales, then it is inconsistent with the observed features of the Universe[32, 33, 34].

C. Linearized Einstein’s Equation

The perturbed Einstein’s Equation about a flat FRW metric are given by $\delta G^\mu{}_\nu = 8\pi G \delta T^\mu{}_\nu$. In our case $\delta T^\mu{}_\nu = \delta T^\mu{}_\nu(\text{matter}) + \delta T^\mu{}_\nu(\phi)$. Since matter has negligible pressure we set $\delta T^i{}_{j(\text{matter})} = 0$. Fluctuation in pressure is contributed only by the scalar field. Calculating the perturbed Einstein’s tensor $\delta G^\mu{}_\nu$ from the line element (6) and substituting $\delta T^\mu{}_\nu$ from Eqs.(11) to (13) and from Eqs.(16) to (17), we obtain the following linearized Einstein’s equations :

$$3\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2}\Phi + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\Phi} + \frac{k^2\Phi}{a^2} = -4\pi G \left[\delta\rho_m + \dot{\phi}_o\dot{\delta\phi} - \Phi\dot{\phi}_o^2 + V'(\phi_o)\delta\phi \right] \quad (21)$$

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 4\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\Phi} + \left(2\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2}\right)\Phi = 4\pi G \left[\dot{\phi}_o\dot{\delta\phi} - \Phi\dot{\phi}_o^2 - V'(\phi_o)\delta\phi \right] \quad (22)$$

$$\dot{\Phi} + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\Phi = 4\pi G(\rho_o a^{-3}v_m + \dot{\phi}_o\delta\phi) \quad (23)$$

where $V'(\phi_o) = \partial V(\phi_o)/\partial\phi_o$ and v_m is the potential for the matter peculiar velocity such that $\delta u_i = \nabla_i v_m$. Since these equations are linear, we have fourier decomposed the perturbed quantities such as Φ , $\delta\phi$, $\delta\rho_m$ and v_m and replaced ∇^2 by $-k^2$, where k is the wave number defined as $k = 2\pi/\lambda_p$ and λ_p is the comoving length scale of perturbation. In these equations all the perturbed quantities correspond to the amplitude of perturbations in the k^{th} mode.




FIG. 2: This plot shows the variation of equation of state parameter w_ϕ as a function of scale factor. We have chosen $\lambda = 1$. In the x-axis, “Log” refers to the logarithm to base 10.

Eq.(22) is the dynamical equation for the metric perturbation Φ and the perturbation in the scalar field turns out to be the driving term. The unknown variables are Φ , $\delta\phi$ and $\delta\rho_m$. Once $\Phi(t)$ and $\delta\phi(t)$ are known then the potential for matter peculiar velocity v_m can be determined using Eq.(23). Also it is interesting to note that once $\Phi(t)$ and $\delta\phi(t)$ are known then even the matter density perturbation $\delta\rho_m$ can be determined using Eq. (21). Hence for such a system of pressureless matter and scalar field, the dynamics of perturbations is uniquely determined if we know the solution $\Phi(t)$ and $\delta\phi(t)$. Hence we need just two second order equations connecting $\Phi(t)$, $\delta\phi(t)$. We choose Eq. (22) as one of these equations. In addition to this, the dynamical equation for the perturbations in the scalar field $\delta\phi(t)$ is obtained from the scalar field Lagrangian (1) and this is given by :

$$\delta\ddot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\delta\dot{\phi} + \frac{k^2\delta\phi}{a^2} + 2\Phi V'(\phi_o) - 4\dot{\Phi}\dot{\phi}_o + V''(\phi_o)\delta\phi = 0 \quad (24)$$

For any quintessence potential $V(\phi)$, in a system of matter and scalar field, one can solve the coupled Eqs.(22) and (24) to study the behavior of the perturbed system. Once the solution $\Phi(t)$ and $\delta\phi(t)$ is obtained, we can then calculate the fractional density perturbation defined as:

$$\delta = \frac{\delta\rho}{\rho_o}, \quad (25)$$

for both matter as well as scalar field from Eqs. (16) and (21). This is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\phi &= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}_o^2 + V(\phi_o)} \left[\dot{\phi}_o\delta\dot{\phi} - \Phi\dot{\phi}_o^2 + V'(\phi_o)\delta\phi \right] \quad (26) \\ \delta_m &= -\frac{1}{4\pi G\rho_{m_o}a^{-3}} \left\{ 3\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2}\Phi + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\Phi} + \frac{k^2\Phi}{a^2} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta\phi}{\rho_{m_o}a^{-3}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}_o^2 + V(\phi_o) \right] \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$




FIG. 3: This plot shows the how the gravitational potential evolve with time. The bold line shows how gravitational potential $\Phi_N(a)$ evolves with the scale factor in the Λ CDM model, while the dotted lines shows $\Phi_N(a)$ for the dark energy model considered in this paper. Here the parameter $\lambda = 1$. In this plot the wave length of perturbation $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$.

Using these two equations we shall calculate δ_m and δ_ϕ for a system consisting of dark matter with negligible pressure and quintessence dark energy with exponential potential.

III. NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS

For solving the background equations [Eqs.(4) and (5)], we introduce the following dimensionless variables:

$$y = \frac{\phi_o - \phi_{oi}}{M_p} \quad (28)$$

$$s = \frac{a}{a_i} \quad (29)$$

$$x = H_i(t - t_i) \quad (30)$$

where a_i , ϕ_{oi} and H_i are the values of the scale factor, scalar field, and the hubble parameter at some initial time $t = t_i$.

In terms of these new variables, the two equations [Eqs.(4) and (5)] describing the background cosmology becomes:

$$\frac{s'^2}{s^2} - \Omega_{mi}s^{-3} - \frac{1}{3} \left[\frac{y'^2}{2} + \bar{V} \exp(-\sqrt{\lambda}y) \right] = 0 \quad (31)$$

$$y'' + 3\frac{s'}{s}y' - \sqrt{\lambda}\bar{V} \exp(-\sqrt{\lambda}y) = 0 \quad (32)$$

where prime “ ’ ” corresponds to the derivative with respect to x , $\bar{V} = V_o H_i^{-2} M_p^{-2} \exp(-\sqrt{\lambda} M_p^{-1} \phi_{oi})$ and Ω_{mi} is the dimensionless matter density parameter at the initial epoch $t = t_i$.

Since $\Omega_{\text{total}} = \Omega_{mi} + \Omega_{\phi_i} = 1$, it follows that:

$$\bar{V} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \Omega_{mi})(1 - w_i) \quad (33)$$

$$y'_i = \sqrt{3(1 - \Omega_{mi})(1 + w_i)} \quad (34)$$




FIG. 4: This plot shows how matter perturbation δ_m evolves with scale factor. The bold lines on this plot corresponds to Λ CDM model, while the dotted lines in the same plot shows how the matter perturbations evolves with scale factor for the dark energy model considered in this paper. Here the parameter $\lambda = 1$ and the wave length of perturbation $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$.

where w_i is the value of the equation of state parameter of the scalar field ϕ at $t = t_i$. Choosing w_i to be very close to -1 at say red shift of $z_i = 1000$, we solve the two background equations [Eqs.(4) and (5)].

Fig.1 shows the plot of Ω_m and Ω_ϕ as a function of scale factor. This figure gives the value of scale factor at the matter dark energy equality $a_{eq} = 0.68$. The corresponding redshift of matter dark energy equality is $z_{eq} = 0.46$. The red shift at which the universe underwent a transition from decelerated expansion phase to accelerated expansion phase turns out to be $z_{acc} = 0.81$. Fig.2 shows the evolution of the equation of state parameter w_ϕ as function of scale factor. For the choice $\lambda = 1$, this gives the value of the w_ϕ at the present epoch to be $w_{\phi_o} = -0.83$. If $\lambda = 0.1$, then $w_{\phi_o} = -0.98$.

For numerically solving the two perturbation equations Eqs.(22) and (24), we introduce the following two dimensionless variables :

$$\Phi_N = \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_i} \quad (35)$$

$$\delta y = \frac{\delta\phi}{\Phi_i M_p} \quad (36)$$

Here Φ_N is the normalized gravitational potential with Φ_i being the value of the metric potential at the initial time $t = t_i$. In terms of these two new variables, the Eqs. (22) and (24) can be rewritten as

$$\Phi_N'' + 4\frac{s'}{s}\Phi_N' + \left(2\frac{s''}{s} + \frac{s'^2}{s^2}\right)\Phi_N - \frac{1}{2}\left[y'\delta y' - \Phi_N y'^2 + \sqrt{\lambda}\bar{V} \exp(-\sqrt{\lambda}y)\delta y\right] = 0 \quad (37)$$




FIG. 5: The ratio of power spectra $P(k)_{QCDM}/P(k)_{\Lambda CDM}$ as a function of length scale of perturbation λ_p . If the potential parameter $\lambda = 1$, then it turns out that at the present epoch, the equation of state parameter $w_0 = -0.83$, and if $\lambda = 0.1$ then $w_0 = -0.98$. In the x-axis, “Log” refers to the logarithm to base 10.

$$\delta y'' + 3\frac{s'}{s}\delta y' + (\lambda\delta y - 2\Phi_N\sqrt{\lambda})\bar{V} \exp(-\sqrt{\lambda}y) - 4\Phi_N' y' + \frac{\bar{k}^2\delta y}{\beta s^2} = 0 \quad (38)$$

Here $\bar{k} = k/H_o$, where H_o is the hubble parameter at the present epoch, is the wave number scaled with respect to the hubble radius. In Eq. (38) the constant $\beta = \frac{1}{s_o'^2}$, where s_o' is the value of s' at the present epoch. This can be determined numerically from the Eq. (31).

We assume that the perturbation in the scalar field in the matter dominated epoch at $z \approx 1000$ is negligibly small compared to other perturbed quantities such as Φ , δ_m etc. The scalar field can then be treated as initially homogeneous at $t = t_i$. This corresponds to setting the initial condition $\delta y_i = 0$ and $\delta y_i' = 0$. The only initial condition that needs to be determined is the value of Φ_{N_i}' at $t = t_i$. In the matter dominated epoch ($z \approx 1000$), the linearized Einstein's equation (22) can be analytically solved to obtain the solution $\dot{\Phi}(t) \propto t^{-8/3}$. Hence $\dot{\Phi}(t)$ decays to zero in the matter dominated epoch for all values of wave number k and we can set the initial condition $\Phi_{N_i}'(k) = 0$.

After solving the two perturbation equations using the above initial conditions we can now determine the dimensionless density perturbations δ_m and δ_ϕ defined in Eq.(27) and Eq. (26). In terms of the dimensionless variable defined in Eq. (35) and Eq. (36), we can express δ_m and δ_ϕ in the following form:

$$\frac{\delta_\phi}{\Phi_i} = \frac{y'\delta y' - \Phi_N y'^2 - \sqrt{\lambda}\delta y\bar{V} \exp\{-\sqrt{\lambda}y\}}{\frac{y'^2}{2} + \bar{V} \exp\{-\sqrt{\lambda}y\}} \quad (39)$$

$$\frac{\delta_m}{\Phi_i} = -\frac{1}{\Omega_{mi}s^{-3}} \left[2\frac{s'^2}{s^2}\Phi_N + 2\frac{s'}{s}\Phi_N' + 2\frac{\bar{k}^2}{3s^2\beta}\Phi_N + \frac{1}{3}(y'\delta y' - \Phi_N y'^2 - \sqrt{\lambda}\delta y\bar{V} \exp\{-\sqrt{\lambda}y\}) \right] \quad (40)$$




FIG. 6: This plot shows how perturbations in dark energy δ_ϕ evolve with scale factor. Here the parameter $\lambda = 1$ and the wave length of perturbation $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$.

In Fig. 3 we have plotted Φ_N as a function of scale factor for the value of the parameter $\lambda = 1$. The dotted line in this figure shows $\Phi_N(a)$ for the model of dark energy considered in this paper. We can see that in the matter dominated epoch $\Phi_N = 1$ and it is constant. Once the dark energy dominated epoch begins, the gravitational potential starts to decay. For comparison, in the same figure we had plotted [see bold line in Fig.3] the form of $\Phi_N(a)$ in the Λ CDM model. This implies that the behavior of Φ_N in the matter dominated era is the same in both Λ CDM model and the model of dark energy considered in this paper. But once the dark energy dominated phase begins, $\Phi_N(a)$ decays faster than the corresponding $\Phi_N(a)$ in the Λ CDM model. In this figure the wavelength of perturbation was fixed to $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$. With $H_o = 73 Km/s \times Mpc^{-1}$ [6], this value of λ_p corresponds to $\bar{k} = k/H_o \approx 26$.

In Fig. 4, we have plotted the matter perturbations δ_m as a function of scale factor for the dark energy potential parameter $\lambda = 1$. In this plot the solid line corresponds to $\delta_m(a)$ for Λ CDM model and the dotted line in the same plot shows $\delta_m(a)$ for the dark energy model considered in this paper. Matter perturbation $\delta_m(a)$ initially grows linearly with scale factor in the matter dominated epoch, however, once the universe undergoes transition from the decelerated expansion phase to accelerated expansion phase, the growth of $\delta_m(a)$ is suppressed. In fact the growth of $\delta_m(a)$ is suppressed more in the dark energy model with exponential potential than the corresponding $\delta_m(a)$ in the Λ CDM model. At the present epoch, for the same set of initial conditions we find that:

$$QCDM \delta_m^2(z=0) = 0.96^{(\Lambda CDM)} \delta_m^2(z=0) \quad (41)$$

where QCDM corresponds to the quintessence + cold dark matter. Hence, the matter power spectrum is suppressed in QCDM model considered in this paper than the corresponding value in the Λ CDM model. This nearly 4% suppression corresponds to the length scale of perturbation $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$ and for the value of the parameter $\lambda = 1$. By 4% suppression, we mean




FIG. 7: This plot shows the dependence of the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m at the present epoch on the wave length of perturbations λ_p . In this plot the parameter $\lambda = 1$. In both the axis, “Log” refers to the logarithm to base 10.




FIG. 8: This plot shows the dependence of the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m at the present epoch on the equation of state parameter w_o . It is the value of the parameter λ in the potential $V(\phi)$ which determine the present value of the equation of state parameter w_o . In this plot the wave length of perturbation $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$.

that $[(P(k)_{\Lambda CDM} - P(k)_{QCDM})/P(k)_{\Lambda CDM}] \times 100 = 4$. (Here $P(k)$ is the matter power spectrum which by definition is proportional to δ_m^2 .) In Fig.5, we plot the ratio $P(k)_{QCDM}/P(k)_{\Lambda CDM}$ as a function of length scale of perturbation λ_p . This figure implies that greater the length scale λ_p and greater is the value of the parameter λ , more is the percentage of suppression. In fact at $\lambda_p = 10^5 Mpc$, matter power spectrum is suppressed by about 15% if the potential parameter $\lambda = 1$. This implies that if $\lambda = 1$ then at $\lambda_p = 10^5 Mpc$, $P(k)_{\Lambda CDM} - P(k)_{QCDM} = 0.15 \times P(k)_{\Lambda CDM}$. Since $P(k)_{\Lambda CDM}$ at $10^3 Mpc$ is at least an order of magnitude greater than the corresponding value at $10^5 Mpc$ [45], it follows that although the percentage of suppression is larger at larger scales, the actual difference $P(k)_{\Lambda CDM} - P(k)_{QCDM}$ is smaller at larger scales.

In Fig. 6, we have plotted the perturbation in dark energy δ_ϕ as a function of scale factor for $\lambda = 1$. We can see that initially, at around $z = 1000$, perturbation δ_ϕ is almost zero. Once the dark energy dominated epoch




FIG. 9: The left plot shows the ratio of perturbation in dark energy to the matter perturbation at the present epoch for length scale of perturbation of 500Mpc as a function of potential parameter λ . At this scale the ratio remains at almost 10^{-5} . The plot on the right shows the ratio at the present epoch for length scale of perturbation of 10^5 Mpc as a function of parameter λ . At this length scales, for different value of the parameter λ between 0.1 and 2, the ratio varies from 0.01–0.33.

begins the perturbations in dark energy grow.

A. Dependence of the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m on length scales

In Figs. 4 and 6 we have scaled δ_m and δ_ϕ with respect to Φ_i , the initial value of the metric perturbation. From Fig.4 and 6, we find that at the present epoch [$z = 0$], the ratio of dark energy perturbations to matter perturbations at $\lambda_p = 10^3 Mpc$ and $\lambda = 1$ is given by

$$\left(\frac{\delta_\phi}{\delta_m}\right)_{(z=0)} = 10^{-4}. \quad (42)$$

Given a fixed λ , the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m would depend on the length scale of perturbation λ_p . In Fig. 7, we plot the value of this ratio at the present epoch as a function of length scale λ_p . This figure shows that at small scales [$\lambda_p < 1000Mpc$], the perturbations in dark energy can be neglected in comparison with the perturbations in matter. This is because in these length scales $\delta_\phi \simeq 10^{-5}\delta_m$. And since δ_m itself is small, this value of δ_ϕ corresponds to higher order term. In the linear regime, for scales $\lambda_p < 1000Mpc$ we can neglect the perturbations in dark energy (for this model) and we can treat dark energy to be homogeneous. The effect on the matter perturbation by dark energy on these scales would be through background $a(t)$.

On large scales [for $\lambda_p > 1000Mpc$], the dark energy perturbations can become comparable to δ_m . In Fig. 7, for $\lambda_p = 10^5 Mpc$, we find that $(\delta_\phi/\delta_m)_{(z=0)} = 0.17$. Even on large scales, the perturbations in dark energy can be neglected if the equation of state parameter at the present epoch is very close to -1 . This matches with the fact that in a pure cosmological constant model of dark energy with $w = -1$, its energy density is distributed homogeneously at all length scales.

In Fig.8, we have plotted the variation of the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m at the present epoch as a function of w_o which is the equation of state parameter at the present epoch.

Each value of λ would result in a specific value of the equation of state parameter w_o as determined by the background equations (4) and (5) for a fixed set of initial conditions. This figure shows that this ratio $\delta_\phi/\delta_m \rightarrow 0$ when $w_o \rightarrow -1$. This result is true for all length scales of perturbations and it is consistent with the argument presented in Sec.II that perturbation in matter implies perturbation in dark energy if $w_{de} \neq -1$.

The two plots in Fig. 9, show the ratio δ_ϕ/δ_m as function of λ at length scale of perturbations of 500Mpc and $10^5 Mpc$ respectively. Note that the figure on the left is scaled by a factor 10^5 . These figures imply that on large scales the dependence on the parameter λ is stronger than on small scales.

B. The role of quintessence on the matter power spectrum

It is evident from Eq.(41) and Fig.5 that matter perturbation is suppressed relative to Λ CDM model. On length scales $\lambda_p < 1000Mpc$, the perturbation in dark energy is negligibly small compared to the perturbation in matter (see Fig.7). However, even on these scales matter power spectrum is suppressed relative to that in Λ CDM model. This is evident from Fig.5. It is therefore necessary to distinguish the role of background evolution $a(t)$ and perturbation in dark energy on the suppression of matter power spectrum relative to Λ CDM.

In order to address this issue we evaluate the suppression of matter power spectrum relative to Λ CDM if we treat dark energy as homogeneous. In such a scenario, this suppression would be solely a consequence of different background evolution relative to Λ CDM. Since we are considering quintessence model of dark energy, by “*homogeneous dark energy*” we mean that we are assuming that quintessence field is homogeneous in the longitudinal gauge. There exists a gauge known as uniform field gauge where by definition the quintessence field is homogeneous. However, the coordinate transformation from




FIG. 10: In this plot the bold line (labeled as QCDM) shows how matter perturbation δ_m evolves with scale factor if we include perturbations in the quintessence field. For comparison the dashed line (labeled as HQCDM) corresponds to $\delta_m(a)$ assuming homogeneous quintessence field. In this plot $k = 5 \times 10^{-4} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ and parameter $\lambda = 1$.

uniform field gauge to the longitudinal gauge would necessarily result in non zero fluctuation in the quintessence field. Here our aim is to calculate the suppression of matter power spectrum relative to ΛCDM if we forcefully impose the assumption that the quintessence field is homogeneous at all length scales and compare the same without imposing this assumption.

If the quintessence field is homogeneous, then the evolution of the metric perturbation Φ is determined by the following equation :

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 4\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\Phi} + \left[\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \left(2 - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m(a) \right) \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} \right] \Phi = 0 \quad (43)$$

This equation follow from Eq.(22). Consequently the evolution of the matter perturbation is determined by the following equation :

$${}^{(HQCDM)}\delta_m^2 = -\frac{2}{3H^2\Omega_m(a)} \left\{ 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\Phi} + \frac{k^2\Phi}{a^2} + \left[\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \left(2 + \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m(a) \right) \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} \right] \Phi \right\} \quad (44)$$

Here the superscript ‘‘HQCDM’’ stands for homogeneous quintessence + cold dark matter. The above equation [Eq.44] follows from Eqs.(21) and (22).

In Fig.10, we have plotted the evolution of ${}^{(HQCDM)}\delta_m(a)$ with the scale factor $a(t)$. For comparison bold line in the same figure shows ${}^{(QCDM)}\delta_m(a)$, which corresponds to matter perturbations if we include quintessence fluctuations in our calculations. From this figure, it follows that although matter perturbation is suppressed relative ΛCDM , it is in fact enhanced in comparison to matter perturbation obtained by treating quintessence field as homogeneous. Hence perturbation in dark energy actually enhances matter perturbation. This is also intuitively expected as both dark matter and




FIG. 11: This plot shows the ratio $P(k)_{QCDM}/P(k)_{HQCDM}$ at the present epoch for different length scales and for two different value of the parameter λ . In the x-axis, ‘‘Log’’ refers to the logarithm to base 10.

dark energy clusters not anti cluster in the model considered in this paper. This is evident from Fig.4 and Fig.6 since both δ_m and δ_ϕ have same sign. The consequent effect of this on the gravitational potential results in this enhancement of matter perturbation relative to the homogeneous dark energy case. The accelerated expansion of the of universe determined by $a(t)$ dilutes the metric perturbation Φ and consequently the overall growth of matter perturbation δ_m is suppressed.

In Fig. 11, we plot the ratio $P(k)_{QCDM}/P(k)_{HQCDM}$ at the present epoch as function of length scale of perturbation for values of the parameter $\lambda = 0.1$ and $\lambda = 1$. On length scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$, we find that $P(k)_{QCDM} \approx P(k)_{HQCDM}$ and this is independent of the choice of parameter λ . This implies that on these scales, including or excluding quintessence fluctuation in the perturbation equation does not influence the matter power spectrum significantly. The suppression of matter power spectrum on these scales (as shown in Fig.5) is therefore primarily due to different background evolution relative to that in ΛCDM model.

However, on large scales $\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$, $P(k)_{QCDM}$ deviates significantly from $P(k)_{HQCDM}$ for larger value of the parameter λ (see Fig.11). Hence on these scales, including or excluding quintessence fluctuation in the perturbation equation does influence the matter power spectrum significantly.

Fig.5 implies that $P(k)_{QCDM} < P(k)_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. However, Fig.11 implies that $P(k)_{QCDM} > P(k)_{HQCDM}$. This means that $P(k)_{HQCDM} < P(k)_{QCDM} < P(k)_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. This implies that matter power spectrum is suppressed relative to that in ΛCDM model even if treat quintessence field as homogeneous. This also implies that although large scale matter perturbation is suppressed in generic quintessence dark energy model compared to that in ΛCDM , perturbations in dark energy (in quintessence) *enhance* matter perturbation relative to the corresponding matter perturbation obtained by treating quintessence field as homogeneous. This enhance-




FIG. 12: In the figure we plot the ratio of dark energy perturbations to dark matter perturbations for $V(\phi) = 1/2m^2\phi^2$. The results agree with those shown in Fig.7. In both the axis, “Log” refers to the logarithm to base 10.

ment is significant on large scales *i.e* for $\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$ (see Fig. 11).

We compare our results with a different scalar field potential $V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2$. In Fig. 12 we plot the ratio of dark energy perturbations to matter perturbations as a function of length scale. The parameter m is fixed to $m = 0.94H_0$ in natural units and the present day equation of state parameter is $w = -0.87$. The results are consistent with those shown in Fig.7. Hence our result that quintessence dark energy can be treated as homogeneous at scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$ is a generic result.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have investigated the perturbations in dark energy. This is motivated by the fact that the assumption that the distribution of dark energy (with $w \neq -1$) is homogeneous at all length scales is inconsistent with the observational fact that dark matter is distributed inhomogeneously. On length scales comparable to or greater than the Hubble radius ($\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$), the perturbation in dark energy can become comparable to perturbation in matter if $w_{de} \neq -1$. The model parameters we have chosen correspond to $w \approx -0.8$ and $w \approx -0.9$, which are within the range allowed by Supernova observations and WMAP5 observations. Given this range, the evolution of perturbations differs significantly. For scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$, the perturbation in dark energy δ_ϕ can be neglected in comparison with the

perturbation in matter δ_m at least in the linear regime. We have demonstrated this using an exponential potential for the quintessence field. This result agrees with those presented in Ref.[31] on sub-Hubble scales.

We have further demonstrated that quintessence dark energy results in suppression of matter power spectrum relative to ΛCDM model. We found that at length scale of $\lambda_p = 1000\text{Mpc}$ and for the value of the parameter $\lambda = 1$, the matter power spectrum is suppressed by about 4% compared to its value in the ΛCDM model for the same set of initial condition. However, at $\lambda_p = 10^5\text{Mpc}$, matter power spectrum is suppressed by about 15% compared to its value in the ΛCDM model. We have demonstrated that on scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$ this suppression is primarily due to different background evolution relative to ΛCDM model. The resultant matter power spectrum is nearly invariant even if we assume that quintessence field is homogeneous on these scales. However, on much larger scale $\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$, including or excluding fluctuation in the quintessence field results in significant changes in the matter power spectrum.

All these results emphasize that dark energy can indeed be treated as nearly homogeneous on scales $\lambda_p < 1000\text{Mpc}$. However, on much larger scales ($\lambda_p > 1000\text{Mpc}$), if the equation of state parameter deviates from -1, then perturbations in dark energy does influence matter power spectrum significantly. If a definitive detection of perturbations in dark energy is made, it will certainly rule out the cosmological constant at least as the sole candidate of dark energy.

Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous referee for very useful comments and suggestions. We also thank T. Padmanabhan, K. Subramanian, J. S. Bagla and L. Sriramkumar for useful discussions. SU acknowledges C.S.I.R, Govt. of India for senior research fellowships. TRS thanks Department of Science and Technology, India for the financial assistance. HKJ thanks Department of Science and Technology, India for the financial assistance through project number SR/WOS-A/PS-11/2006. SU and TRS would like to thank HRI, Allahabad for hospitality where a part of this work was carried out and acknowledge the facilities at IUCAA Reference Centre at Delhi University. Computational work for this study was carried out at the cluster computing facility at HRI, Allahabad.

[1] J. P. Ostriker and P. J. Steinhardt, Nature (London) **377**, 600 (1995); S. D. M. White, J. F. Navarro, A. E. Evrard and C. S. Frenk, Nature (London) **366**, 429 (1993); J. S. Bagla, T. Padmanabhan, and J. V. Narlikar, Comments on Astrophysics

18, 275 (1996)[arXiv:astro-ph/9511102]; G. Efstathiou, W. J. Sutherland, and S. J. Maddox, Nature (London) **348**, 705 (1990).

[2] J. L. Tonry *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **594**, 1 (2003) [astro-ph/0305008]; B. J. Barris *et al.*, Astrophys.

- J. **602**, 571 (2004) [astro-ph/0310843]; A. G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004) [astro-ph/0402512]; P. Astier *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006) [astro-ph/0510447].
- [3] A. Melchiorri *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **536**, L63 (2000) [astro-ph/9911445].
- [4] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003) [astro-ph/0302209].
- [5] S. L. Bridle, O. Lahav, J. P. Ostriker, and P. J. Steinhardt, *Science* **299**, 1532 (2003).
- [6] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **170**, 377 (2007) [astro-ph/0603449].
- [7] E. Hawkins *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **346**, 78 (2003) [astro-ph/0212375].
- [8] A. C. Pope *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 655 (2004) [astro-ph/0401249].
- [9] M. Tegmark *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004) [astro-ph/0310723].
- [10] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
- [11] T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rep.* **380**, 235 (2003) [hep-th/0212290]; P. J. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 559 (2003) [astro-ph/0207347]; V. Sahni and A. Starobinsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **9**, 373 (2000) [astro-ph/9904398]; J. Ellis, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **361**, 2607 (2003) [astro-ph/0304183]; T. Padmanabhan, *Curr. Sci.* **88**, 1057 (2005) [astro-ph/0411044].
- [12] P. J. Steinhardt, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **361**, 2497 (2003); A. D. Macorra and G. Piccinelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 123503 (2000) [hep-ph/9909459]; L. A. Ureña-López and T. Matos, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 081302 (2000) [astro-ph/0003364]; P. F. González-Díaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 023513 (2000) [astro-ph/0004125]; R. de Ritis and A. A. Marino, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 083509 (2001) [astro-ph/0007128]; S. Sen and T. R. Seshadri, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **12**, 445 (2003) [gr-qc/0007079]; C. Rubano and P. Scudellaro, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **34**, 307 (2002) [astro-ph/0103335]; S. A. Bludman and M. Roos, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 043503 (2002) [astro-ph/0109551]; I. Zlatev, L. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896 (1999) [astro-ph/9807002]; A. Albrecht and C. Skordis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2076 (2000) [astro-ph/9908085]. Z. K. Guo, N. Ohta and Y. Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 023504 (2005) [astro-ph/0505253].
- [13] P. G. Ferreira and M. Joyce, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4740 (1997) [astro-ph/9707286]; P. G. Ferreira and M. Joyce, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 023503 (1998) [astro-ph/9711102].
- [14] A. R. Liddle and R. J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 023509 (1998) [astro-ph/9809272].
- [15] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 103510 (2001) [astro-ph/0006373]; T. Chiba, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 063514 (2002) [astro-ph/0206298]; M. Malquarti, E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 123503 (2003) [astro-ph/0302279]; L. P. Chimento and A. Feinstein, *Mod. Phys. Letts. A* **19**, 761 (2004) [astro-ph/0305007]; R. J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **93**, 011301 (2004) [astro-ph/0402316].
- [16] T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 021301 (2002) [hep-th/0204150].
- [17] J. S. Bagla, H. K. Jassal and T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 063504 (2003) [astro-ph/0212198]; H. K. Jassal, *Pramana* **62**, 757 (2004) [astro-ph/0303406]; J. M. Aguirregabiria and R. Lazkoz, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 123502 (2004) [hep-th/0402190]; A. Sen, *Phys. Scripta* **T 117**, 70 (2005) [hep-th/0312153]; V. Gorini, A. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella and V. Pasquier, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 123512 (2004) [hep-th/0311111]; G. W. Gibbons, *Class. Quan. Grav.* **20**, S321 (2003) [hep-th/0301117]; C. Kim, H. B. Kim and Y. Kim, *Phys. Lett. B* **552**, 111 (2003) [hep-th/0210101]; G. Shiu and I. Wasserman, *Phys. Lett. B* **541**, 6 (2002) [hep-th/0205003]; D. Choudhury, D. Ghoshal, D. P. Jatkar and S. Panda, *Phys. Lett. B* **544**, 231 (2002) [hep-th/0204204]; A. Frolov, L. Kofman and A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 8 (2002) [hep-th/0204187]; G. W. Gibbons, *Phys. Lett. B* **537** 1, (2002) [hep-th/0204008]; A. Das, S. Gupta, T. Deep Saini and S. Kar, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043528 (2005) [astro-ph/0505509]; I. Y. Aref'eva, astro-ph/0410443; G. Calcagni, A. R. Liddle, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 043528 (2006) [astro-ph/0606003]; E. J. Copeland, M. R. Garousi, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 043003 (2005) [hep-th/0411192].
- [18] R. R. Caldwell, *Phys. Letts. B* **545**, 23 (2002) [astro-ph/9908168]; J. Hao and X. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 043501 (2003) [hep-th/0305207]; G. W. Gibbons, hep-th/0302199; V. K. Onemli and R. P. Woodard, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 107301 (2004) [gr-qc/0406098]; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Letts. B* **562**, 147 (2003) [hep-th/0303117]; S. M. Carroll, M. Hoffman and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023509 (2003) [astro-ph/0301273]; P. Singh, M. Sami and N. Dadhich, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023522 (2003) [hep-th/0305110]; P. H. Frampton, *Mod. Phys. Letts. A* **19**, 801 (2004) [hep-th/0302007]; J. Hao and X. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 107303 (2003) [gr-qc/0302100]; P. González-Díaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 021303 (2003) [astro-ph/0305559]; M. P. Dabrowski, T. Stachowiak and M. Szydlowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 103519 (2003) [hep-th/0307128]; J. M. Cline, S. Jeon and G. D. Moore, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043543 (2004) [hep-ph/0311312]; W. Fang, H. Q. Lu, Z. G. Huang, and K. F. Zhang, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 199 (2006) [hep-th/0409080]; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odinstov, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 023003 (2005) [hep-th/0505215]; S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 123529 (2004) [astro-ph/0410309]; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odinstov, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 103522 (2004) [hep-th/0408170]; E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odinstov, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043539 (2004) [hep-th/0405034]; S. Nojiri, S. D. Odinstov and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063004 (2005) [hep-th/0501025]. Z. K. Guo, N. Ohta and Y. Z. Zhang, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **22**, 883 (2007) [astro-ph/0603109].
- [19] B. Boisseau, G. Esposito-Farese, D. Polarski, A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2236 (2000) [gr-qc/0001066].
- [20] K. Uzawa and J. Soda, *Mod. Phys. Letts. A* **16**, 1089 (2001) [hep-th/0008197]; H. K. Jassal, hep-th/0312253; C. P. Burgess, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **12**, 1737 (2003); K. A. Milton, *Grav. Cosmol.* **9**, 66 (2003) [hep-ph/0210170]; P. F. González-Díaz, *Phys. Letts. B* **481**, 353 (2000) [hep-th/0002033].
- [21] A. Y. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella and V. Pasquier, *Phys. Letts. B* **511**, 265 (2001) [gr-qc/0103004]; N. Bilic, G. B. Tupper and R. D. Viollier, *Phys. Letts. B* **535**, 17 (2002) [astro-ph/0111325]; M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043507 (2002) [gr-qc/0202064]; M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 063003

- (2003) [astro-ph/0210468]; M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **35**, 2063 (2003) [gr-qc/0305086]; M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami, N. M. C. Santos and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063501 (2005) [astro-ph/0412638]; O. Bertolami, N. M. C. Santos and A. A. Sen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **353**, 329 (2004) [astro-ph/0402387]; A. Dev, D. Jain and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 023515 (2003) [astro-ph/0209379].
- [22] R. Holman and S. Naidu, *astro-ph/0408102*.
- [23] T. Padmanabhan, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 107 (2005) [hep-th/0406060]; I. Shapiro and J. Sola, *JHEP* **0202**, 006 (2002) [hep-th/0012227]; J. Sola and H. Stefancic, *Phys. Lett. B* **624**, 147 (2005) [astro-ph/0505133].
- [24] T. Padmanabhan and T. R. Choudhury, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 081301 (2002) [hep-th/0205055]; V. F. Cardone, A. Troisi and S. Capozziello, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 083517 (2004) [astro-ph/0402228]; P. F. González-Díaz, *Phys. Lett. B* **562**, 1 (2003) [astro-ph/0212414]; M. A. M. C. Calik, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **21**, 1241 (2006) [gr-qc/0505035]; S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **632**, 597 (2006) [hep-th/0507182].
- [25] P. Horava and D. Minic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1610 (2000) [hep-th/0001145]; S. D. Thomas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 081301 (2002); M. R. Setare, *Phys. Lett. B* **653**, 116 (2007) [arXiv:0705.3517 [hep-th]]; M. R. Setare, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **50**, 991 (2007) [hep-th/0701085]; M. R. Setare, *Phys. Lett. B* **654**, 1 (2007) [0708.0118 [hep-th]].
- [26] V. K. Onemli and R. P. Woodard, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 4607 (2002) [gr-qc/0204065]; T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Reports* **49**, 406 (2005) [gr-qc/0311036]; T. Padmanabhan, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 5387 (2002) [gr-qc/0204019]; A. A. Andrianov, F. Cannata and A. Y. Kamenshchik, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043531 (2005) [gr-qc/0505087]; R. Lazkoz, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *JCAP* **0511**, 010 (2005) [astro-ph/0503230]; M. Szydlowski, W. Godlowski and R. Wojtak, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **38**, 795 (2006) [astro-ph/0505202];
- [27] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753 (2006) [hep-th/0603057]; V. Sahni, *astro-ph/0403324*; T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rept.* **380**, 235 (2003) [hep-th/0212290]; P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 559 (2003) [astro-ph/0207347]; T. Padmanabhan, *arXiv:0705.2533 [gr-qc]*; T. Padmanabhan, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **861**, 179 (2006) [astro-ph/0603114].
- [28] H. K. Jassal, J. S. Bagla and T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 103503 (2005) [astro-ph/0506748]; H. K. Jassal, J. S. Bagla and T. Padmanabhan, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **356**, L11 (2005) [astro-ph/0404378]; H. K. Jassal, J. S. Bagla and T. Padmanabhan, *astro-ph/0601389*; M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213 (2001) [gr-qc/0009008]; E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003) [astro-ph/0208512]; Y. Wang, V. Kostov, K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and P. Gondolo, *JCAP* **0412**, 003 (2004) [astro-ph/0402080]; B. A. Bassett, P. S. Corasaniti and M. Kunz, *Astrophys. J.* **617**, L1 (2004) [astro-ph/0407364]; S. Lee, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123528 (2005) [astro-ph/0504650]; M. Li, *Phys. Lett. B* **603**, 1 (2004) [hep-th/0403127]; S. Hannestad and E. Mörtzell, *JCAP* **0409**, 001 (2004) [astro-ph/0407259]; L. Perivolaropoulos, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **848**, 698 (2006) [astro-ph/0601014];
- Y. Wang, *arXiv:0712.0041 [astro-ph]*; R. C. Santos, J. V. Cunha and J. A. S. Lima, *arXiv:0709.3679 [astro-ph]*; L. Samushia, G. Chen and B. Ratra, *arXiv:0706.1963 [astro-ph]*; H. Wei and S. N. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **654**, 139 (2007) [arXiv:0704.3330 [astro-ph]]; Y. Wang and P. Mukherjee, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 103533 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0703780]; C. Cattoen and M. Visser, *gr-qc/0703122*; Y. Gong, A. Wang, Q. Wu and Y. Z. Zhang, *JCAP* **0708**, 018 (2007) [astro-ph/0703583]; C. Clarkson, M. Cortes and B. A. Bassett, *JCAP* **0708**, 011 (2007) [astro-ph/0702670]; S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *JCAP* **0702**, 025 (2007) [astro-ph/0612653]; P. U. Wu and H. W. Yu, *Phys. Lett. B* **643**, 315 (2006) [astro-ph/0611507]; S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **66**, 012005 (2007) [hep-th/0611071]; R. J. Colistete and R. Giotri, *astro-ph/0610916*; L. Amendola, G. Camargo Campos and R. Rosenfeld, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 083506 (2007) [astro-ph/0610806]; S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *JCAP* **0701**, 018 (2007) [astro-ph/0610092]; V. Sahni and A. Starobinsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 2105 (2006) [astro-ph/0610026]; L. Samushia and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. J.* **650**, L5 (2006) [astro-ph/0607301]; M. A. Dantas, J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain and A. Dev, *Astron. Astrophys.* **467**, 421 (2007) [astro-ph/0607060]; J. C. Fabris, S. V. B. Goncalves, F. Casarejos and J. F. Villas da Rocha, *Phys. Lett. A* **367**, 423 (2007) [astro-ph/0606171]; Y. Wang and P. Mukherjee, *Astrophys. J.* **650**, 1 (2006) [astro-ph/0604051];
- [29] H. V. Peiris and D. N. Spergel, *Astrophys. J.* **540**, 605 (2000) [astro-ph/0001393].
- [30] L. Amendola, M. Kunz and D. Sapone, *arXiv:0704.2421*.
- [31] D. F. Mota, D. J. Shaw and J. Silk, *arXiv:0709.2227 [astro-ph]*
- [32] J. Weller and A. M. Lewis, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **346**, 987 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0307104];
- [33] R. Bean and O. Dore, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 083503 (2004) [astro-ph/0307100];
- [34] N. Bartolo, P. S. Corasaniti, A. R. Liddle and M. Malquarti, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043532 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0311503]; W. Hu, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 047301 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0410680]; C. Gordon and W. Hu, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 083003 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0406496]; C. Gordon, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **148**, 51 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0503680]; C. Gordon and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123505 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0504132]; L. R. Abramo and F. Finelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 083513 (2001) [astro-ph/0101014];
- [35] J. C. Fabris, S. V. B. Goncalves and P. E. de Souza, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **34**, 53 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0103083]; W. Zimdahl and J. C. Fabris, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 4311 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0504088]; S. Silva e Costa, M. Ujevic and A. Ferreira dos Santos, *arXiv:gr-qc/0703140*; V. Gorini, A. Y. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella, O. F. Piattella and A. A. Starobinsky, *arXiv:0711.4242 [astro-ph]*;
- [36] S. Dutta and I. Maor, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 063507 (2007) [arXiv:gr-qc/0612027]; I. Maor and O. Lahav, *JCAP* **0507** (2005) 003 [arXiv:astro-ph/0505308]; P. Wang, *Astrophys. J.* **640**, 18 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0507195]; D. F. Mota and C. van de Bruck, *Astron. Astrophys.* **421**, 71 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0401504]; N. J. Nunes and D. F. Mota, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **368**, 751 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0409481]; C. Horellou and

- J. Berge, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **360**, 1393 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0504465]; L. R. Abramo, R. C. Batista, L. Liberato and R. Rosenfeld, JCAP **0711**, 012 (2007) [arXiv:0707.2882 [astro-ph]].
- [37] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Phys.Rev. D **37**, 3406 (1988).
- [38] A. B. Burd and J. D. Barrow, Nucl. Phys. B **308**, 929 (1988).
- [39] E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **57** 4686 (1998) [arXiv:gr-qc/9711068].
- [40] J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Lett. B **185**, 341 (1987); F. Lucchin and S. Matarrese, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 1316 (1985); C. Wetterich, Astron. Astrophys. **301**, 321 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9408025].
- [41] J. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1882 (1980)
- [42] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl., **78**, 1 (1984).
- [43] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rep. **215**, 203 (1992).
- [44] T. Padmanabhan, astro-ph/0602117.
- [45] M. Tegmark *et al.*, Astrophys.J. **606**, 702 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0310725v2].