

A gracious exit from the matter-dominated phase in a quantum cosmic phantom model

Pedro F. González-Díaz^a, Alberto Rozas-Fernández^{a,b}

^aColina de los Chopos, Instituto de Física Fundamental, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Serrano 121, 28006 Madrid, Spain

^bInstitute of Cosmology and Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Dennis Sciama Building, Portsmouth PO1 3FX, United Kingdom

Abstract

The most recent observational constraints coming from Planck, when combined with other cosmological data, provide evidence for a phantom scenario. In this work we consider a quantum cosmic phantom model where both the matter particles and scalar field are associated with quantum potentials which make the effective mass associated with the matter particles to vanish at the time of matter-radiation equality, resulting in a cosmic system where a matter dominance phase followed by an accelerating expansion is allowed.

Keywords: quantum models, dark energy

The problem of dark energy still remains unsolved. Its equation of state (EoS), which is defined as $w = p/\rho$, where p and ρ are the pressure and energy density of dark energy, respectively, could be in the phantom regime ($w < -1$) [1] according to the most recent observational constraints [2]. Planck latest results [2] plus WMAP low- l polarisation (WP), when combined with Supernova Legacy Survey (SNLS) data, favour the phantom domain at 2σ level for a constant w

$$w = -1.13_{-0.14}^{+0.13} \text{ (95\%; Planck + WP + SNLS) }, \quad (1)$$

while the Union2.1 compilation of 580 Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) is more consistent with a cosmological constant ($w = -1$). If we combine Planck+WP with measurements of H_0 [3], we get for a constant w

$$w = -1.24_{-0.19}^{+0.18} \quad (2)$$

which is in tension with $w = -1$ at more than the 2σ level. The constant w models are of limited physical interest. If

$w \neq -1$ then it is likely to change with time. For a flat universe and for a non-constant w ($w = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$) [4, 5] the combined data from Planck+WP+ H_0 leads to

$$w_0 = -1.04_{-0.69}^{+0.72} \quad (3)$$

with a negative w_a , away from $w = -1$ at just under the 2σ level. Furthermore, with the release of the first results from Planck [2], claims for $w < -1$ at $\geq 2\sigma$ have been presented, such as [6], which features high-quality data and a careful analysis including systematic errors [7]. Also, the authors in [8] found that for the SNLS3 and the Pan-STARRS1 survey (PS1 SN) data sets, the combined SNe Ia + Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) + Planck data yield a phantom equation of state at $\sim 1.9\sigma$ confidence. Therefore, we find ourselves in a situation in which we can say [8], at 2σ confidence level, that given Planck data, either the SNLS3 and PS1 data have systematics that have not been accounted for yet, or the Hubble constant is below 71 km/s/Mpc, or else $w < -1$.

The above observational results, in addition to theoretical motivations, are compelling enough to justify the study of the phantom regime in more depth. Given that the standard cosmological model (Λ CDM) with $w = -1$ cannot accommodate this scenario, different solutions have

Email address: a.rozas@iff.csic.es (Alberto Rozas-Fernández)

been proposed. There are two main approaches. The first one includes a scalar field with a negative kinetic energy term [1] but this leads to violent quantum instabilities [9, 10]. The second one is more radical and advocates a modification of general relativity. In this modified gravity scenario there are prescriptions that do not have any ghost degree of freedom, such as the the Brans-Dicke type gravity [11], the scalar-Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity [12], and the $F(R)$ gravity [13]. These three proposals are also free of perturbative instabilities but one should also investigate the corrections to the Newton law, perform the PPN analysis [14] etc., in order to ensure that they are consistent with the more accurate solar-system and experimental data. Furthermore, it was recently realised by some authors that the most general second order scalar tensor Lagrangian (and thus, ghost-free) that still produces second order equations of motion is the so-called Horndeski Lagrangian [15, 16, 17, 18], a model that includes four arbitrary functions of the scalar field and its kinetic energy, and of which Brans-Dicke, Gauss-Bonnet and $F(R)$ are just particular examples.

Alternatively, a theory which is self-consistent and agrees with all the above observational data [2] has been proposed [19, 20, 21]. It is most economical as it only uses general relativity and quantum mechanics without inserting any kind of vacuum fields or introducing any extra terms in the Hilbert- Einstein gravitational action. In such a framework one can get essentially two relevant quantum solutions both of which can be seen as quantum perturbations to the de Sitter space [20], which is recovered in the classical limit where $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. It has also been shown that out of these two possible solutions only one of them satisfies the second law of thermodynamics [21], and hence is physically meaningful. It corresponds to a phantom universe [1] but does not show any quantum instability [9, 10] nor the sort of inconsistency coming from having a negative kinetic term for the scalar field - in fact, these models do not actually contain any scalar or other kinds of vacuum fields in their final equations and do not show neither a future singularity (Big Rip) [1, 22] nor classical violations of the energy conditions. It is for these reasons that such a cosmic model has also been denoted as [20, 21] *benigner* phantom model.

On the other hand, in Ref. [23] (see also [24]) it was shown that it is impossible to find a sequence of matter and scaling acceleration for any scaling Lagrangian

which can be approximated as a polynomial because a scaling Lagrangian is always singular in the phase space so that either the matter-dominated era is prevented or the region with a viable matter is isolated from that where the scaling acceleration occurs. Such as it happens with other aspects of the current accelerating cosmology, the problem is to some extent reminiscent of the difficulty initially confronted by earliest inflationary accelerating models [25] which could not smoothly connect with the following Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) decelerating evolution [26]. As is well known, such a difficulty was solved by invoking the new inflationary scenario [27]. In fact, the problem posed in [23] for dark energy can be formulated by saying that a previous decelerating matter-dominated era cannot be followed by an accelerating universe dominated by dark energy and it is in this sense that it can be somehow regarded as the time-reversed version of the early inflationary exit difficulty. Ways out from this problem required assuming either a sudden emergence of dark energy domination or a cyclic occurrence of dark energy, both assumptions being quite hard to explain and implement. The aim of this work is to show that in the *benigner* phantom model [20, 21] such problems are no longer present due to the quantum characteristics that can be assigned to particles and radiation in this model.

If we apply the real part of the Klein-Gordon wave equation to a quasi-classical wave function $R \exp(iS/\hbar)$, where the probability amplitude R ($P = |R|^2$) and the action S are real functions of the relativistic coordinates, and define the classical energy $E = \partial S / \partial t$ and momentum $p = \nabla S$, we can write the modified Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$E^2 - p^2 + \tilde{V}_Q^2 = m_0^2, \quad (4)$$

where m_0 is the rest mass of the involved particle and \tilde{V}_Q is a relativistic quantum potential,

$$\tilde{V}_Q^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{R} \left(\nabla^2 R - \frac{\partial^2 R}{\partial t^2} \right), \quad (5)$$

which should be interpreted according to Bohm's idea [30] as the hidden quantum potential that accounts for precisely defined unobservable relativistic variables whose effects would physically manifest in terms of the indeterministic behaviour shown by the given particles. From Eq. (4) it immediately follows that $p = \sqrt{E^2 + \tilde{V}_Q^2 - m_0^2}$.

Thus, since classically $p = \partial\tilde{L}/\partial[\dot{q}(t)]$ (with \tilde{L} being the Lagrangian of the system and q the spatial coordinates, which depends only on time t , $q \equiv q(t)$), we have for the Lagrangian

$$\tilde{L} = \int d\dot{q}p = \int dv \sqrt{\frac{m_0^2}{1-v^2} + M^2}, \quad (6)$$

in which $v = \dot{q}$ and $M^2 = \tilde{V}_Q^2 - m_0^2$. In the classical limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, $\tilde{V}_Q \rightarrow 0$, and hence we are just left with the classical relativistic Lagrangian for a particle with rest mass m_0 .

We start with an action integral that contains all the ingredients of our model. Such an action is a generalisation of the one used in [23] which contains a time-dependent coupling between dark energy and matter and leads to a general Lagrangian that admits scaling solutions formally the same as those derived in [23]. Setting the Planck mass to unity, our Lorentzian action reads

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} [R + p(X, \phi)] + S_m[\psi_i, \xi, m_i(\tilde{V}_Q), \phi, g_{\mu\nu}] + ST(K, \psi_i, \xi), \quad (7)$$

where g is the determinant of the four-metric, p is a generically non-canonical general Lagrangian for the dark energy scalar field ϕ with kinetic term $X = g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi$, formally the same as the one used in [23], S_m corresponds to the Lagrangian for the matter fields ψ_i , each with mass m_i , which is going to depend on the quantum potential \tilde{V}_Q in a way that will be made clear in what follows, so as on the time-dependent coupling ξ of the matter field to the dark energy field ϕ . The term ST denotes the surface term which generally depends on the trace on the second fundamental form K , the matter fields ψ_i and the time-dependent coupling $\xi(t)$ between ψ_i and ϕ for the following reasons.

We first of all point out that in the theory being considered the coupling between the matter and the scalar fields can generally be regarded to be equivalent to a coupling between the matter fields and gravity plus a set of potential energy terms for the matter fields. In fact, if we restrict ourselves to this kind of theories, a scalar field ϕ can always be mathematically expressed in terms of the scalar curvature R [28]. More precisely, for the scaling accelerating phase we shall consider a quantum

dark energy model (see [30] and [20, 21]) in which the Lagrangian for the field ϕ vanishes in the classical limit where the quantum potential is made zero; i.e. we take $p = L = -V(\phi) \left(E(x, k) - \sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2} \right)$, where $V(\phi)$ is the density of potential energy associated to the field ϕ and $E(x, k)$ is the elliptic integral of the second kind, with $x = \arcsin \sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}$ and $k = \sqrt{1 - V_Q^2/V(\phi)^2}$, and the over-head dot means derivative with respect to time. We do not expect \tilde{V}_Q to remain constant along the universal expansion but to increase like the volume of the universe $V \propto a^3$ does. It is the quantum potential density $V_Q = \tilde{V}_Q/V$ appearing in the Lagrangian L what should be expected to remain constant at all cosmic times. Using then a potential energy density for ϕ and the quantum medium [note that the quantum potential energy density becomes constant [20, 21] (see later on)], we have for the energy density and pressure, $\rho \propto X(HV_Q/\dot{H})^2 = p(X)/w(t)$, with $H \propto \phi V_Q + H_0$, $\dot{H} \propto \sqrt{2X}V_Q$, where H_0 is constant. For the resulting field theory to be finite, the condition that $2X = 1$ (i.e. $\phi = C_1 + t$) had to be satisfied [20, 21], and from the Friedmann equation the scale factor ought to be given by $a(t) \propto \exp(C_2 t + C_3 t^2)$, with C_1 , C_2 and C_3 being constants. It follows then that for at least a flat space-time, we generally have $R \propto 1 + \alpha \phi^2$ (where α is another constant and we have re-scaled time) in that type of theories, and hence the matter fields - scalar field couplings, which can be generally taken to be proportional to $\phi^2 \psi_i^2$, turn out to yield $\xi R \psi_i^2 - K_0 \psi_i^2$, with K_0 again a given constant. The first term of this expression corresponds to a coupling between matter fields and gravity which requires an extra surface term, and the second one ought to be interpreted as a potential energy term for the matter fields $V_i \equiv V(\psi_i) \propto \psi_i^2$. In this way, for a general theory that satisfied the latter requirement, the action integral (7) should be rewritten as

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} [R(1 - \xi \psi_i^2) + p(X, \phi)] + S_m[\psi_i, V_i, m_i(V_Q), g_{\mu\nu}] - 2 \int d^3x \sqrt{-h} \text{Tr} K(1 - \xi \psi_i^2), \quad (8)$$

in which h is the determinant of the three-metric induced on the boundary surface and it can be noticed that the scalar field ϕ is no longer involved in the matter Lagrangian. We specialise now in the minisuperspace that

corresponds to a flat FRW metric in conformal time $\eta = \int dt/a(t)$

$$ds^2 = -a(\eta)(-d\eta^2 + a(\eta)^2 dx^2), \quad (9)$$

with $a(\eta)$ the scale factor. There are two choices for ξ of particular interest. The first one is $\xi = 0$, i.e., there is no coupling of the field with the spacetime scalar curvature. This is called *minimal coupling*. With this choice, we do not have the most general equation of motion for a scalar field in a curved spacetime background. The second choice is the one we shall take, $\xi = 1/6$, known as the conformal coupling. This is a case of great interest in cosmological scenarios given that the FRW metrics are conformally flat. Therefore, if we assume a time-dependence of the coupling such that it reached the value $\xi(\eta_c) = 1/6$ at the time of matter-radiation equality η_c and choose suitable values for the arbitrary constants entering the above definition of R in terms of ϕ^2 , then the action at this time of equality would reduce to

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\eta \left[a'^2 - \sum_i (\chi_i'^2 - \chi_i^2) + a^4 \left(p(X, \phi) + \sum_i m_i (V_Q)^2 \right) \right], \quad (10)$$

where the prime ' denotes derivative with respect to conformal time η and $X = \frac{1}{2a^2}(\phi')^2$. Clearly, the fields χ_i would then behave like though if they formed a collection of conformal radiation fields were it not by the presence of the nonzero mass terms m_i^2 also at the time of matter-radiation equality. If for some physical cause the latter mass terms could all be made to vanish at this time of equality, then all matter fields would behave like though they were a collection of radiation fields filling the universe at around this equality time and there would not be the disruption of the evolution from a matter-dominated era to a stable accelerated scaling solution of the kind pointed out in [23], but the system smoothly would enter the accelerated regime after a given brief interlude where the matter fields behave like pure radiation. In what follows we shall show that in the quantum scenario considered above such a possibility can actually be implemented.

At the end of the day, any physical system always shows the actual quantum nature of its own. One of the

most surprising implications though by dark energy and phantom energy scenarios is that the universal system is not exception on that at any time or value of the scale factor. Thus, we shall look at the particles making up the matter fields in the universe as satisfying the Klein-Gordon wave equation [29] for a Bohmian quasi-classical wave function [30] $\Psi_i = R_i \exp(iS_i/\hbar)$, where we have restored an explicit Planck constant, R_i is the probability amplitude for the given particle to occupy a certain position within the whole homogeneous and isotropic spacetime of the universe, as expressed in terms of relativistic coordinates, and S_i is the corresponding classical action also defined in terms of relativistic coordinates.

The quantum potential for each particle is given by (see Eq. (5))

$$\tilde{V}_{Qi} = \hbar \sqrt{\frac{\nabla^2 R_i - \dot{R}_i}{R_i}}, \quad (11)$$

that should also satisfy the continuity equation (i.e. the probability conservation law) for the probability flux, $J = \hbar \text{Im}(\Psi^* \nabla \Psi)/(mV)$ (with $V \propto a^3$ the volume), stemming from the imaginary part of the expression that results by applying the Klein-Gordon equation to the wave equation Ψ . Thus, if the particles are assumed to move locally according to some causal laws [30], then the classical expressions for E_i and p_i will be locally satisfied. Therefore we can now interpret the cosmology resulting from the above formulae as a classical description with an extra quantum potential, and average the modified Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$E_i^2 - p_i^2 + \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 = m_{0i}^2, \quad (12)$$

with a probability weighting function for which we take $P_i = |R_i|^2$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \int \int d^3x P_i (E_i^2 - p_i^2 + \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2) \\ &= \langle E_i^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} - \langle p_i^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} + \langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} = \langle m_{0i}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with the averaged quantities coinciding with the corresponding classical quantities and the averaged total quantum potential squared being given by $\langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} = \hbar^2 (\langle \nabla^2 P \rangle_{\text{av}} - \langle \dot{P} \rangle_{\text{av}})$.

It is worth noticing that in the above scenario the velocity of the matter particles should be defined to be given

by

$$\langle v_i \rangle_{\text{av}} = \frac{\langle p_i^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}^{1/2}}{\left(\langle p_i^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} + \langle m_{0i}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} - \langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} \right)^{1/2}}. \quad (14)$$

It follows that in the presence of a quantum potential, a particle with nonzero rest mass $m_{0i} \neq 0$ can behave like though if was a particle moving at the speed of light (i.e. a radiation massless particle) provided $\langle m_{0i}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} = \langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}$. Thus, if we introduce an effective particle rest mass $m_{0i}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\langle m_{0i}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} - \langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}}$, then we get that the speed of light again corresponds to a zero effective rest mass. It has been noticed [20, 21], moreover, that in the cosmological context the averaged quantum potential defined for all existing radiation in the universe can be expressed in terms of a scalar field ϕ , and would actually make up our scaling dark energy solution. At the time of matter-radiation equality, that idea should actually extend in the present formalism to also encompass in an incoherent way, together with the averaged quantum potential for CMB radiation, the averaged quantum potential for matter particles, as a source of dark energy. On the other hand, as it has been pointed out above as well as in [20, 21], the quantum potential ought to depend on the scale factor $a(t)$ in such a way that it steadily increases with time, being the quantum energy density satisfying the above continuity equation what keeps constant along the whole cosmic evolution.

Assuming the mass m_i appearing in the action (10) is an effective particle mass, it turns out that the onset of dark energy dominance would then be precisely at the time of matter-radiation equality when $\langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}} \equiv \langle \tilde{V}_{Qi}(a)^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}$ reached a value which equals $\langle m_{0i}^2 \rangle_{\text{av}}$ and all the matter fields behaved in this way like a collection of radiation fields which are actually irrelevant to the issue of the incompatibility of the previous eras with a posterior stable accelerated current regime. In this case, the era of matter dominance can be smoothly followed by the current accelerated expansion where all matter fields would effectively behave like though if they cosmologically were tachyons. This interpretation would ultimately amount to the unification of dark matter and dark energy, as the dark energy model being dealt here with is nothing but a somehow quantised version of tachyon dark energy [31], so that one should expect both effective tachyon matter and tachyon dark energy to finally decay to dark matter, so

providing a consistent solution to the cosmic coincidence problem.

Now, from our action integral (10) one can derive the equation of motion for the field ϕ ; that is (see also [32] and [33])

$$\ddot{\phi} (p_X + 2X p_{XX}) + 3H p_X \dot{\phi} + 2X p_{X\rho} - p_\phi = \frac{\delta S}{a^3 \delta \phi}, \quad (15)$$

where we have restored the cosmic time t , using the notation of Refs. [23], [32] and [33], so that a suffix X or ϕ denotes a partial derivative with respect to X or ϕ , respectively, and now the last coupling term is time-dependent. Note that if we confine ourselves to the theory where $a(t)$ accelerates in an exponential fashion and $\dot{\phi}^2 = 1$ then the first term of this equation would vanish. Anyway, in terms of the energy density ρ for the scalar field ϕ the above general equation becomes formally the same as that which was derived in [23]

$$\frac{d\rho}{dN} + 3(1+w)\rho = -Q\rho_m \frac{d\phi}{dN}, \quad (16)$$

with ρ_m the energy density for the matter field, $N = \ln a$, and $Q = -\frac{1}{a^3 \rho_m} \frac{\delta S_m}{\delta \phi}$. We can then derive the condition for the existence of scaling solutions for time-dependent coupling which, as generally the latter two equations are formally identical to those derived in [23], is the same as that was obtained by these authors. Hence, we have the generalised master equation for p [23]

$$\left[1 + \frac{2dQ(\phi)}{\lambda Q^2 d\phi} \right] \frac{\partial \ln p}{\partial \ln X} - \frac{\partial \ln p}{\lambda Q \partial \phi} = 1, \quad (17)$$

whose solution was already obtained in [23] to be

$$p(X, \phi) = X Q(\phi)^2 g \left(X Q(\phi)^2 e^{\lambda \kappa(\phi)} \right) \quad (18)$$

where g is an arbitrary function, λ is a given function of the parameters of the equations of state for matter and ϕ and the energy density for ϕ , being $\kappa = \int^\phi Q(\xi) d\xi$ (see [23]). In the phase space we then have an equation-of-state effective parameter for the system $w_{\text{eff}} = -1 - \frac{2\dot{H}}{3H^2} = g x^2 + z^2/3$, with H the Hubble parameter and x and z respectively being $x = \dot{\phi}/(\sqrt{6}H)$ and $z = \sqrt{\rho_{\text{rad}}/(3H^2)}$. At the time of equality where we have just radiation ($z \neq 0$ and $\rho_m = \rho_{\text{rad}}$) the effective equation of state is [23] $w_{\text{eff}} = 1/3$. Hence at the time of equality interval we

can only have radiation, neither matter or accelerated expansion domination, just the unique condition that would allow the subsequent onset of the accelerated expansion era where conformal invariance of the field χ no longer holds.

Thus, in the considered quantum cosmic phantom model, a previous matter-dominated phase can be evolved first into a radiation phase at a physical regular short stage which is then destroyed to be finally followed by the required new, independent phase of current accelerating expansion. This conclusion can be more directly drawn if one notices that there is no way by which the general form of the Lagrangian (18) can accommodate the Lagrangian final form $L \equiv p = f(a, \dot{a})\dot{\phi}^2 V_Q^2$ which characterises quantum dark energy models whose pressure p vanishes in the limit $V_Q \rightarrow 0$. Hence, at least these models can be taken to be counter examples to the general conclusion that current dark energy and modified gravity models (see however [34]) are incompatible with the existence of a previous matter-dominated phase, as suggested in [23].

We finally notice, moreover, that the kind of quantum dark energy theory providing the above counter example is one which shows no classical analog (i.e. the Lagrangian, energy density and pressure are all zero in the classical limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$) and is thereby most economical of all. Thus, the above conclusion can also be stated by saying that, classically, a previous phase of matter dominance is always compatible with the ulterior emergence of a dominating phase made up of "nothing". In this way, similarly to as the abrupt, nonphysical exit of the old inflationary problem was circumvented by introducing [27] a scalar field potential with a flat plateau leading to a "slow-rollover" phase transition, the abrupt disruption of the scaling phase after matter dominance can be also avoided by simply considering a vanishing scalar field potential that smooths the transition and ultimately makes it to work.

Acknowledgments

ARF is supported by the 'Fundación Ramón Areces' and Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (Spain) through project number FIS2012-38816.

References

- [1] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B **545** (2002) 23 [astro-ph/9908168].
- [2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
- [3] A. G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, H. Lampeitl, H. C. Ferguson, A. V. Filippenko, S. W. Jha and W. Li *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **730** (2011) 119 [Erratum-ibid. **732** (2011) 129] [arXiv:1103.2976 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **10** (2001) 213 [gr-qc/0009008].
- [5] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 091301 [astro-ph/0208512].
- [6] A. Rest, D. Scolnic, R. J. Foley, M. E. Huber, R. Chornock, G. Narayan, J. L. Tonry and E. Berger *et al.*, arXiv:1310.3828 [astro-ph.CO].
- [7] D. Scolnic, A. Rest, A. Riess, M. E. Huber, R. J. Foley, D. Brout, R. Chornock and G. Narayan *et al.*, arXiv:1310.3824 [astro-ph.CO].
- [8] D. L. Shafer and D. Huterer, arXiv:1312.1688 [astro-ph.CO].
- [9] S. M. Carroll, M. Hoffman and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 023509 [astro-ph/0301273].
- [10] J. M. Cline, S. Jeon and G. D. Moore, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 043543 [hep-ph/0311312].
- [11] E. Elizalde, S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 043539 [hep-th/0405034].
- [12] S. 'i. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 123509 [hep-th/0504052].
- [13] S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rept. **505** (2011) 59 [arXiv:1011.0544 [gr-qc]].
- [14] C. M. Will, Living Rev. Rel. **9** (2006) 3 [gr-qc/0510072].
- [15] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **10** (1974) 363.

- [16] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 064039 [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].
- [17] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. 'i. Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **126** (2011) 511 [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].
- [18] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 023518 [hep-th/0609155].
- [19] P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz, AIP Conf. Proc. **878** (2006) 227 [hep-th/0608204].
- [20] P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz and A. Rozas-Fernandez, Phys. Lett. B **641** (2006) 134 [astro-ph/0609263].
- [21] P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz and A. Rozas-Fernandez, Class. Quant. Grav. **25** (2008) 175023 [arXiv:0807.2055 [gr-qc]].
- [22] R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N. N. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003) 071301 [astro-ph/0302506].
- [23] L. Amendola, M. Quartin, S. Tsujikawa and I. Waga, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 023525 [astro-ph/0605488].
- [24] A. R. Gomes and L. Amendola, arXiv:1306.3593 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 347.
- [26] T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rept. **380** (2003) 235 [hep-th/0212290].
- [27] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108** (1982) 389; A. Albrecht, P. J. Steinhardt, M. S. Turner and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1437.
- [28] S. 'i. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and O. G. Gorbunova, J. Phys. A **39** (2006) 6627 [hep-th/0510183]; S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Lett. B **631** (2005) 1 [hep-th/0508049].
- [29] Strictly speaking, observable baryonic matter fields should be described by the Dirac equation rather than the Klein-Gordon equation. However, for our present purposes the use of the latter equation will suffice. On the other hand, even before coincidence time, most of the matter content had to be in the form of dark matter, a material whose nature is still unknown.
- [30] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85** (1952) 166; D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85** (1952) 180.
- [31] G. W. Gibbons, Phys. Lett. B **537** (2002) 1 [hep-th/0204008].
- [32] F. Piazza and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **0407** (2004) 004 [hep-th/0405054].
- [33] S. Tsujikawa and M. Sami, Phys. Lett. B **603** (2004) 113 [hep-th/0409212].
- [34] S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and A. Troisi, Phys. Lett. B **639** (2006) 135 [astro-ph/0604431].