

Can triple interacting fluid model resolve the cosmic triple coincidence problem?

Mubasher Jamil*, Farook Rahaman†

*Center for Advanced Mathematics and Physics, National University of Sciences and Technology,
Peshawar Road, Rawalpindi - 46000, Pakistan

†Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata - 700032, India

May 29, 2019

Abstract

We here investigate a cosmological model in which three fluids interact with each other involving certain coupling parameters and energy exchange rates. The motivation of the problem stems from the puzzling ‘triple coincidence problem’ which naively asks why the cosmic energy densities of matter, radiation and dark energy are almost of the same order of magnitude at the present time. Our model of interacting fluids presents a solution of this problem by giving a phantom crossing scenario.

Keywords: Interacting dark energy; cosmological constant; cosmic coincidence problem; phantom energy; phantom crossing.

*mjamil@camp.edu.pk

†farook_rahaman@yahoo.com

1 Introduction

Despite several successes of the standard big bang cosmology based on Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) model, there is still a series of problems to be resolved like horizon problem, flatness problem, dark matter (or missing mass) problem, structure formation, topological defects, matter-antimatter asymmetry and cosmic coincidence problem etc. Most of these problems are related with the cosmic past of the observable universe but the cosmic coincidence problem has its origin in the present time since it naively asks why certain cosmological phenomenon are occurring in our presence or in our times. Recent astrophysical observations give convincing evidence of an accelerating universe caused by dark energy characterized by the equation of state (EoS) parameter ω with value around to -1 . It is still unknown why the present energy density of the dark energy is approximately equal to that of dust-like matter. This is termed as cosmic coincidence problem [1]. Up till now several explanations have been proposed to solve this problem such as ‘tracker field’ [2], oscillating dark energy [3] and the variable constants approach [4], to name a few. It appears that the energy density of the radiation component is also almost equivalent to that of the matter and the dark energy i.e. $\rho_m \sim \rho_r \sim \rho_\Lambda$ or $\Omega_m \sim \Omega_r \sim \Omega_\Lambda$, the so-called ‘cosmic triple coincidence problem’ [5]. The question is: why this happens in the current or in recent times. The history of the parameter ω suggests that it is no more a constant but possesses a parametric form $\omega(z)$, where z is the redshift parameter. Thus in the past $\omega = 1/3$ corresponds to radiation and then $\omega = 0$ for matter. Later it evolved to quintessence $\omega < -1/3$ to cosmological constant $\omega = -1$. This behavior suggests that in future, ω will be super-negative i.e. $\omega < -1$, which corresponds to the phantom energy. Thus in totality, we have the transition from $\omega > -1$ to $\omega < -1$ the so-called ‘phantom crossing’ or ‘phantom divide’ scenario, while we are observing $\omega = -1$ at the current time [6]. The coincidence problem in this context is rephrased as ‘why is $\omega = -1$ now?’

In recent years, the usual coincidence problem is addressed by proposing an exotic interaction between dark energy and matter in which energy from ρ_Λ is diluted or decayed into the ρ_m [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. It is recently proposed that if these two components interact then some energy might dissipate into a third component ρ_x which is as yet hypothetical [19]. The third component can be known form of matter or an altogether exotic fluid in which case some new physics will be required to explain the interaction. If we assume $\rho_x = \rho_r$ then the interaction between three fluids i.e. matter, radiation and dark energy will be quite interesting. It is well-known that matter and radiation were decoupled at the time of emission of cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation at a redshift $z \sim 1100$. Thus both matter and radiation are almost non-interacting components but it can be anticipated that these two components do supposedly interact with the dark energy. Thus if dark energy and matter interact, the energy dissipated in the interaction is assumed to transfer to the radiation component and vice

versa for the radiation and the dark energy interaction. This dynamic interaction than hugely alters the effective equation of state of the three interacting fluids. Our analysis in this paper suggests that effective EoS of the three fluids will be interlinked to each other considerably and also constrained by coupling parameters. Moreover, the interaction naturally leads to the phantom crossing scenario.

We here present a model in which three anonymous cosmic fluids interact with each other with equal degree of freedom. Hence there are three coupling parameters involved which can take arbitrary positive or negative values with the exclusion of zero. The positive and negative values correspond to back and forth nature of energy exchange between the fluids. We emphasis here that the coupling parameters in our model are only constrained by the choices of effective EoS of the fluids. Thus in our model, exact EoS of the fluids like in the non-interacting FRW model is not possible. As the exact EoS for the dark energy is unknown, its interaction with other fluids creates ambiguities in the determination of the exact EoS of the other fluids. Hence we also stress that precise values of the EoS's can be deduced only empirically from the phenomenology of the interacting fluids.

2 The model of triple interacting fluids

We start by assuming the background to be spatially flat, homogeneous and isotropic FRW spacetime

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \left[dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor. We consider three fluids having the equations of state (EoS) $p_i = \omega_i \rho_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ where p_i and ρ_i are the corresponding pressures and the energy densities of the fluids, respectively. Also ω_i are the dimensionless EoS parameters. For the sake of simplicity, we assume the three fluids to be perfect fluid-like since in general, interaction between fluids might lead to local inhomogeneities, which are ignored in the present paper. The equations governing the interaction of three fluids are expressed as

$$\dot{\rho}_1 + 3H(1 + \omega_1)\rho_1 = Q_3 - Q_2, \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_2 + 3H(1 + \omega_2)\rho_2 = Q_1 - Q_3, \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_3 + 3H(1 + \omega_3)\rho_3 = Q_2 - Q_1. \quad (4)$$

Here the energy exchange (or dissipative) terms Q_i are specified by [20]

$$Q_i = \lambda_i H \rho_{i0} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (5)$$

See [21] for more exotic expressions for Q_i . In the above equations, λ_i are the coupling constants which can take positive or negative values to yield two-sided energy exchange

rather than one-sided. Also Eqs. (2) to (5) show that this a coupled system of three differential equations which needs to be solved. Further ρ_{i_o} are the constant energy densities at some reference time $t = t_o$. Also $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is Hubble parameter which determines the rate of expansion of the universe. Sum of Eqs. (2) to (4) yield the combined energy conservation

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 [\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(1 + \omega_i)\rho_i] = 0, \quad (6)$$

Also the energy conservation for the individual component (for the case of non-interacting fluids) yields

$$\dot{\rho}'_i = \rho_{i_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (7)$$

Here ρ_{i_o} are integration constants. Combining Eqs. (2), (3) and (4), we arrive at the density evolution of the interacting fluids as

$$\rho_1 = C_1 a^{-3(1+\omega_1)} + \frac{\lambda_2 \rho_{2_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_2)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_2 - \omega_1} + \frac{\lambda_3 \rho_{3_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_3)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_1 - \omega_3}, \quad (8)$$

$$\rho_2 = C_2 a^{-3(1+\omega_2)} + \frac{\lambda_3 \rho_{3_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_3)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_3 - \omega_2} + \frac{\lambda_1 \rho_{1_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_1)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_2 - \omega_1}, \quad (9)$$

$$\rho_3 = C_3 a^{-3(1+\omega_3)} + \frac{\lambda_1 \rho_{1_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_1)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_1 - \omega_3} + \frac{\lambda_2 \rho_{2_o} a^{-3(1+\omega_2)}}{3} \frac{1}{\omega_3 - \omega_2}. \quad (10)$$

Here C_i 's are constants of integration. Now addition of Eqs. (8), (9) and (10) results in

$$\rho = \rho'_1 X_1 + \rho'_2 X_2 + \rho'_3 X_3, \quad (11)$$

where

$$X_1 = 1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{3} \frac{\omega_2 - \omega_3}{(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_2 - \omega_1)}, \quad (12)$$

$$X_2 = 1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{3} \frac{\omega_3 - \omega_1}{(\omega_2 - \omega_1)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}, \quad (13)$$

$$X_3 = 1 + \frac{\lambda_3}{3} \frac{\omega_1 - \omega_2}{(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}. \quad (14)$$

Here we have assumed $C_i = \rho_{i_o}$ and $\rho \equiv \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_3$ is the total energy density of the interacting fluids. Note that the case of non-interacting fluids is obtained by choosing $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ which yield $X_1 = X_2 = X_3 = 1$ i.e. $\rho = \rho'_1 + \rho'_2 + \rho'_3$. Using the first FRW equation

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho. \quad (15)$$

Differentiating Eq. (7) w.r.t t , we obtain

$$\dot{\rho}'_i = -3(1 + \omega_i)H\rho_{i_o}a^{-3(1+\omega_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (16)$$

Differentiating Eq. (15) w.r.t t and then using Eqs. (11) and (16), we find

$$\dot{H} = -H\sqrt{24\pi G}\sum_{i=1}^3[\rho'_i(1+\omega_i)X_i]\left(\sum_{i=1}^3\rho'_iX_i\right)^{-1/2}. \quad (17)$$

The parameter \dot{H} is significant as its possible signature governs the dynamics of the universe. For instance $\dot{H} < 0$ represents the deceleration phase of the expanding universe. This slowing down in the expansion takes place when

$$\omega_1 > -1, \quad \lambda_1 > \frac{3(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_2 - \omega_1)}{\omega_3 - \omega_2}, \quad (18)$$

$$\omega_2 > -1, \quad \lambda_2 > \frac{3(\omega_2 - \omega_1)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}{\omega_1 - \omega_3}, \quad (19)$$

$$\omega_3 > -1, \quad \lambda_3 > \frac{3(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}{\omega_2 - \omega_1}. \quad (20)$$

Thus \dot{H} will be negative when all the $\omega_i > -1$. This result corresponds to the quintessence dominated universe.

Note that the vanishing \dot{H} in Eq. (17) will yield a de Sitter universe or a cosmological constant dominated universe i.e.

$$\dot{H} = 0 \implies \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = -1. \quad (21)$$

Moreover $\dot{H} > 0$ corresponds to an accelerating universe. This situation arises in our model when

$$(1 + \omega_1)X_1 < 0, \quad (22)$$

$$(1 + \omega_2)X_2 < 0, \quad (23)$$

$$(1 + \omega_3)X_3 < 0. \quad (24)$$

The above Eqs. (22), (23) and (24) yield respectively

$$\omega_1 < -1, \quad \lambda_1 > \frac{3(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_2 - \omega_1)}{\omega_3 - \omega_2}, \quad (25)$$

$$\omega_2 < -1, \quad \lambda_2 > \frac{3(\omega_2 - \omega_1)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}{\omega_1 - \omega_3}, \quad (26)$$

$$\omega_3 < -1, \quad \lambda_3 > \frac{3(\omega_1 - \omega_3)(\omega_3 - \omega_2)}{\omega_2 - \omega_1}. \quad (27)$$

Thus \dot{H} will be positive when all the $\omega_i < -1$. This result corresponds to the phantom energy dominated universe. Note that the coupling parameters λ_i have to be positive both

for the decelerating and the accelerating universe. This result turns out to be consistent with [22] that coupling parameters cannot be negative to avoid violation of second law of thermodynamics. Moreover the same investigation shows that small positive values for the coupling parameters are motivated from the empirical results. Therefore the universe evolves from the earlier quintessence to cosmological constant and then later to the phantom energy dominated universe. Hence the interacting triple fluids can explain the cosmic-coincidence problem effectively.

3 Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we have attempted to resolve the cosmic triple coincidence problem which naively asks why the energy densities of the three major ingredients of the cosmic composition namely matter, radiation and dark energy are of same order at current time. Rephrasing, why ω has evolved to -1 in recent times. We here point out that the EoS $p = \omega\rho$ used in this paper is not, in general, a true EoS for any cosmic fluid. Rather it is a phenomenological relationship suitable for the configuration. The actual EoS may not be that simple and may have dependencies on various other cosmological parameters like redshift, time, Hubble parameter and its derivatives etc [8]. However to a first order approximation, it may be taken for such analysis. Further, the standard non-interacting FRW model cannot resolve the coincidence problem since it predicts a hierarchial system in which radiation density decreases faster compared to matter, while density of dark energy remains either constant (if it is cosmological constant) or increases (if it is phantom energy). Therefore it contradicts with the observations where all the three components have equivalent densities. Model of interacting dark energy, which is a modification of the FRW model, has enormous potential to explain this cosmological conundrum. It naturally predicts that if the cosmic fluids interact with each other, it leads to a scenario compatible with the observations [23].

In our analysis, we assumed three fluids to interact mutually. The strength of the interaction is determined by the coupling parameters λ_i . These coupling constants are expressed in terms of the equation of state parameters ω_i . Since each ω_i is allowed to change during the interaction, it yields λ_i to alter consequently. It shows the very dynamic nature of the interaction unlike the standard FRW model where matter and radiation preserve fixed equations of state. We here stress that the exact nature of the interaction is largely unknown i.e. the mediating particles of the interaction are not yet identified. Any interacting dark energy model should, in principle, be motivated from the particle physics or the corresponding phenomenology, however there are as yet no sound theoretical models which could identify the particle interactions. There are some arguments that the phantom-like dark energy can decay into at least one ordinary particle

and some other phantom-like particles [24].

We have found that in the interacting fluid model, the three fluids can achieve super-negative equation of state. If matter and radiation are among the components then they will induce negative pressure along with the dark energy to produce accelerated expansion. This result has earlier been shown for the interacting Chaplygin gas model in [7]. Moreover the three components can induce deceleration and de Sitter expansion by interacting cohesively. Finally, the question that we posed in the title is answered in the affirmative.

Acknowledgments

One of us (MJ) would like to thank John D. Barrow for useful correspondence and to Muneer A. Rashid for proof reading the paper.

References

- [1] P.J. Steinhardt et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1999) 123504.
- [2] L. Wang et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 896.
- [3] S. Nojiri et al, arXiv: hep-th/0603062.
- [4] F. Rahaman et al, arXiv: gr-qc/0809.4314v1 .
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 4434.
- [6] H. Stefancic, arXiv: astro-ph/0504518v3.
- [7] M. Jamil and M.A. Rashid, arXiv: astro-ph/0802.1146v3 (To appear in *Eur. Phys. J. C*).
- [8] M. Jamil and M.A. Rashid, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **56** (2008) 249.
- [9] M. Jamil and M.A. Rashid, arXiv: astro-ph/0802.1144v3
- [10] M. Szydlowski, *Phys. Lett.* **B 632** (2006) 1.
- [11] J.D. Barrow and T. Clifton, *Phys. Rev.* **D 73** (2006) 103520
- [12] A. de la Macorra, arXiv: astro-ph/0701635v1
- [13] N.P. Neto and B.M.O. Fraga, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **40** (2008) 1653.
- [14] M.R. Setare, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **52** (2007) 689.
- [15] M. Jamil, arXiv: gr-qc/0810.2896v2
- [16] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, arXiv: hep-th/0505215
- [17] W. Zimdahl and D. Pavon, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **36** (2004) 1483.
- [18] L.P. Cimento et al, *Phys. Rev.* **D 67** (2003) 087302.

- [19] N. Cruz et al, *Phys. Lett.* **B** 663 (2008) 338.
- [20] H.M. Sadjadi and M. Alimohammadi, *Phys. Rev. D* 74 (2006) 103007.
- [21] H. Wei and S.N. Zhang, *Phys. Lett.* **B** 654 (2007) 139.
- [22] C. Feng et al, *Phys. Lett.* **B** 665 (2008) 111.
- [23] S. del Campo et al, *Phys. Rev. D* 74 (2006) 023501.
- [24] S. Carroll et al, *Phys. Rev. D* 68 (2003) 023509.