

Constraining the runaway dilaton and quintessential dark energy

Ishwaree P. Neupane and Holly Trowland

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8020, New Zealand
E-mail: ishwaree.neupane@canterbury.ac.nz*

ABSTRACT: We investigate a form of quintessential dark energy for which the time evolution of a scalar dilaton field ϕ is given by $|\phi(a)|/m_P \equiv \alpha_1 \ln t + \alpha_2 t^n = \alpha \ln a + \beta a^{2\zeta}$, where a is the scale factor of a spatially flat FRW universe. This ansatz for ϕ is motivated by generic solutions of a scalar dilaton field in some effective string theory models in four dimensions, which also captures basic features of many models of quintessence. Using a compilation of current data from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) shift, baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), supernovae type Ia (SNIa) and legacy survey (SNLS), we impose observational constraints on the combination $\alpha + 2\zeta$ and discuss the relation of our results to analytical constraints on various cosmological parameters, including the dark energy equation of state (EoS). With the input $\Omega_{0,m} = 0.27$, we find the constraint $|\alpha + 2\zeta| = 0.313 (\pm 0.294)$ at low redshift ($z \lesssim 1$). This constraint is stronger than the one obtained by simply demanding that the dark energy equation of state lies in the range $-1.11 < w_\phi < -0.86$ as inferred from a combination of BAO, SNIa and WMAP data at a 95% confidence level, which gives $\alpha + 2\zeta = 0 (\pm 0.5)$, and the one required simply to get a cosmic acceleration, $|\phi'_0|/m_P \equiv m_P^{-1} \left| \frac{d\phi}{d \ln a} \right|_{a=a_0} < 0.8$ (with $\Omega_{0m} > 0.24$). By allowing a non-minimal coupling between dark matter and scalar dilaton (or quintessence), and by least squares curve fitting to observational results for the growth of structure (in the redshift range $0.15 < z < 3$), we find $Q = 0.27 \pm 0.20$, where $Q \equiv \frac{1}{m_P} \frac{d \ln A}{d \phi}$ and $A(\phi)$ measures the scalar field - (dark) matter coupling. Further, with the input $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27 \pm 0.03$, and using the best-fit values of the model parameters, it is found that cosmic acceleration began in the redshift range $0.6 < z < 0.9$. The constraints of this model are shown to encompass the cosmological constant limit within 1σ error bars.

KEYWORDS: Runaway dilaton, dark energy, scalar-tensor gravity, coupled quintessence.

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Quintessence: Theoretical motivation | 3 |
| 3. The growth of matter | 9 |
| 4. Analytic solutions | 11 |
| 5. Constraints on the model | 13 |
| 5.1 Constraints from supernova | 13 |
| 5.2 Constraints from CMB | 15 |
| 5.3 Constraints from structure formation | 17 |
| 5.4 Overview of constraints | 18 |
| 6. Dynamical behaviour | 18 |
| 7. Effect on the background | 19 |
| 8. Conclusion | 21 |

1. Introduction

The discovery of a cosmic acceleration of the universe [1] has added a new challenge for fundamental theories of physics and cosmology. NASA’s observations [2–4] show that the kind of matter of which stars and galaxies are made, forms less than 5% of the universe’s total mass. Several independent observations indicate that about 73% of the total energy density of the universe is in the form of mysterious dark energy or gravitationally repulsive energy, and about 22% is in the form of non-baryonic cold dark matter particles which clump gravitationally, but which have never been directly detected. These scientific enigmas suggest we should look to new physics beyond the theories of the standard model of particle physics and Einstein’s theory of General Relativity.

The cosmic acceleration of the universe is often attributed to the existence of some form of dark energy. Understanding the nature of this cosmic acceleration is one of the most challenging theoretical problems facing present-day cosmology. There is no shortage of ideas for what dark energy might be, from the quantum vacuum to a (ultra-) light scalar field, e.g., coming from modified $f(R)$ gravity [5], scalar-tensor theories [6,7], string-inspired cosmologies [8,9], or spacetime fluctuations of a holographic origin [10] and the likes. In some other approaches, cosmic acceleration is a manifestation of new gravitational physics, which may involve modification of gravity at long distances [11], cosmology with extra dimensions [12], or warped extra dimensions [13]. There are also proposals which explain the supernova observations using gravitational effects of density inhomogeneities [14]. The

majority of work in the subject of cosmic acceleration as well as the reviews on dark energy [15] has shown that any viable theory of gravity must look in the far infrared, or on astrophysical scales, like a combination of scalar fields and gauge fields (weakly) interacting with General Relativity. Moreover, since the cosmological backgrounds of interest are time-dependent, for the consistency of any sensible dark energy model or theory of cosmic acceleration, such scalar fields must roll but only slowly as time progresses.

The Λ CDM model is the simplest known cosmological model for concurrent universe where it is assumed that most matter is in the form of cold dark matter, and dark energy is simply described by the vacuum energy $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle_{\text{vac}} \propto \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ in Einstein's field equations

$$R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg^{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G(T_{\text{matter}}^{\mu\nu} + T_{\text{vac}}^{\mu\nu}). \quad (1.1)$$

The value of the constant Λ is *not* set by the theory [16], so it may be chosen to match with observations. Vacuum energy does not vary with space or time and is not dynamical. This solution seems to be the best fit to most observations, especially in regard the dark energy equation of state, but it does lead to a couple of extremely unlikely scenarios leading us to question the validity of using a cosmological constant to describe dark energy. The first scenario is the “why now?” problem. At the present epoch the universe is composed of approximately 27% matter, both baryons and dark matter, and 73% Dark Energy. If we lived in a slightly earlier or later time these values would be of several orders of magnitude different, so how come they are comparable at the current epoch? If the dark energy and matter density were similar at some earlier epoch, cosmic acceleration would have began earlier and there would not have been enough time to form structures including our galaxy.

It is intuitive to think of the cosmological constant as a vacuum energy or the energy contained in free space. As the universe expands, more space is created so there is more gravitational vacuum energy or free space. As a result the energy density due to a cosmological constant remains the same throughout time. But, since a quantum field must be quantized at each and every point in space, it is also useful to think of a vacuum as not just empty space but containing a simple harmonic oscillator at each point. Any vibrations in this field space can propagate through space as a wave. In the absence of ordinary matter, the hypothetical simple harmonic oscillators will be in the ground state which has non-zero vacuum energy. Integrating the ground state energy over all space and renormalising it gives us the vacuum energy density. The theoretical value predicted in this way is, however, larger by a huge factor of at least 10^{15} than the observed value of gravitational vacuum energy density, which is $\rho_{\Lambda}^{1/4} \simeq 10^{-3}$ eV. Although the quantity ρ_{Λ} may conceivably be linked with small numbers such as the neutrino mass ($m_{\nu} \sim \rho_{\Lambda}^{1/4}$), or the ratio $\rho_{\text{EW}}/\rho_{\text{Planck}} \sim \rho_{\Lambda}$, a firm theoretical prediction for the value of $\rho_{\Lambda}^{1/4} \sim 10^{-3}$ eV is currently lacking.

The theory contending a cosmological constant as a solution to dark energy is generally called “quintessence”. In models of quintessence, one assumes that dark energy is dynamical in nature instead of being a constant in time and space by utilizing a standard scalar field. In all modern unified theories including Kaluza-Klein theory, supergravity and superstring, a fundamental scalar field called the *dilaton* exists along with a spin-2 graviton – the messenger of gravitational force. In extra-dimensional theories of gravity, such a scalar field can be the radion field that encodes the distance between the two branes (or brane-antibrane pairs) in the fifth dimension. There can be many such scalar fields in higher dimensional braneworld theories that may cause cosmic acceleration if they were to

self interact and generate a positive potential. A canonical scalar field ϕ having large self interacting potential but almost negligibly small kinetic term behaves almost as Einstein’s cosmological constant, at least, from a viewpoint of its equation of state.

In addition to exhibiting an effect on the rate of expansion of the universe, a scalar field, if it interacts with dark matter, may lead to an observable effect on how the large scale structure is growing. Recent observations show that clusters of galaxies may have formed as a result of small density fluctuations in the primordial plasma when tiny quantum fluctuations were amplified by inflation to form pockets of space that were more dense than the average energy density. Once matter begins to dominate, gravitational collapse would amplify the tiny inhomogeneities left by inflation and visible structures begin to grow into the already formed dark matter halos. In a scenario where dark energy or a scalar quintessence field interacts with dark matter, the rate of growth of the dark matter halos would be affected, and thus the formation of visible structure.

Another important motivation for considering a dynamical scalar field is an essence of one or more dynamical energy components in the early universe, so called “inflaton”. This inflaton field could easily release its potential energy to matter and radiation as the field rolls down to its lowest (or metastable) energy state. It is quite plausible that the late time quintessential scalar field (together with dilatonic dark matter) is a remnant of the inflaton field (see, e.g. [17]) although there is no guarantee they are the same.

In this paper we demand a specific form for the scalar field itself, which is indeed an approximation to some generic solutions for a dilaton in some effective string theory models in four dimensions. Our choice is motivated from the fact that a similar ansatz would be useful when considering the early inflation of the universe. Starting with the standard form of scalar-tensor theory of gravity, we will derive field equations that depend on both the scalar field and the coupling of that field to dark matter. We impose constraints on the parameters by fitting the model to observational data from the the cosmic microwave background (CMB) shift [18], baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) [19], SNIa (Gold+HST sample) [20] and SNLS [21]. Observational results from CMB can be used to tightly constrain many useful cosmological parameters, including the parameters of inflation. The growth of structure is also expected to depend on the way that dark energy is coupled to dark matter, granting yet another constraint. Our focus in this work is to explore ways to constrain the parameters of the solutions, which include χ^2 curve fittings to the WMAP+BAO+SNIa+SNLS data sets. Also, we will consider how the links between quintessential dark energy and inflation may constrain the parameters of the model. Finally we discuss on how the results on structure formations constrain the model parameters and the matter fluctuation growth rate. Using those constraints we show that the solutions of the model encompass the cosmological constant limit within 1σ error bars.

2. Quintessence: Theoretical motivation

Einstein formulated gravity as a tensor theory, where the field equations of general relativity can be obtained by varying the action

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x R + \int \kappa^2 \mathcal{L}_m[\Psi_m, g_{\mu\nu}] \sqrt{-g} d^4x, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\kappa \equiv m_P^{-1} = \sqrt{8\pi G}$ is the inverse of the Planck mass and G is Newton’s gravitational constant. The first integral is the gravitational part of the action and the second integral

is the matter part, and \mathcal{L}_m is the matter Lagrangian. Varying this action with the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ gives Einstein's field equations

$$\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \left(R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{\mu\nu} \right) = - \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_m}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \equiv T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the energy momentum tensor describing the density and flux of energy.

Dirac was the first to introduce a scalar field into Einstein field equations, suggesting that the Newton's constant could be viewed as a time-dependent parameter. Thereafter Jordan and independently Brans and Dicke introduced a monomial scalar field known as Brans-Dicke dilaton [22], which also assumes a time varying gravitational constant and incorporates a scalar field into Einstein's tensor theory. It was motivated by Mach's principle, that "mass there influences inertia here". This was interpreted by Dicke to mean *the gravitational constant should be a function of the mass distribution of the universe*, implying that $\frac{1}{G} \propto \frac{M}{R}$, or that a scalar field somewhat plays the role of the inverse of Newton's constant, $\frac{1}{G} \propto \varphi$. Unfortunately, the Brans-Dicke dilaton, with the action

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x \left(\varphi R + \frac{\omega}{\varphi} \partial_i \varphi \partial^i \varphi \right) + \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x \mathcal{L}_m[g_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m], \quad (2.3)$$

that is without a field potential for φ , has been found to be unacceptable since a massless scalar field might create a long range fifth force which however does not seem to exist in nature. One can therefore modify the Brans-Dicke type gravitational action as

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x (f(\varphi)R + \mathcal{L}_\varphi) + \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x \mathcal{L}_m[g_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m], \quad (2.4)$$

where \mathcal{L}_φ is a scalar field Lagrangian in Jordan frame. In the particular picture of Brans-Dicke model, one defines $f(\varphi) \propto \varphi$. This is a special case of a general scalar-tensor theory in the Jordan-Fierz frame, where φ is directly coupled to the Ricci scalar [23].

By using a canonical transformation, one can write the action (2.4) in the Einstein frame

$$S = \int \left(\frac{R}{2\kappa^2} + \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\phi}} \right) \sqrt{-g} d^4x + \int \mathcal{L}_m[\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m] \sqrt{-\tilde{g}} d^4x, \quad (2.5)$$

where the scalar field Lagrangian has the usual form

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = -\frac{\gamma}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \hat{\phi} \partial_\nu \hat{\phi} - V(\hat{\phi}), \quad (2.6)$$

where $\gamma = \pm 1$ depending on whether the scalar field is the real or imaginary part of some complex modulus or axio-dilaton field present in higher dimensional theories of gravity, such as string theory. For brevity, we will drop the hat from ϕ and assume that ϕ is a canonical field in Einstein frame where ϕ couples to ordinary matter fields nonminimally.

To generalize the action (2.5) further, we assume that there is a number of different species of matter, including cold dark matter and baryons, say j components, each coupling to the metric differently with coupling function, $A_j(\phi)$. As the simplest possibility, we choose exponential couplings

$$A_j(\phi) \propto e^{\kappa Q_j \phi}, \quad (2.7)$$

where in general, Q_j can be a function of ϕ . The Einstein frame metric $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}$ can be related to the Jordan frame metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ via $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} \equiv A(\phi)^2 g_{\mu\nu}$. The matter Lagrangian is now the sum of all components, accounting for all the different sectors,

$$\mathcal{L}_m[\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m^{(j)}] \equiv \sum_j \mathcal{L}_j[e^{2\kappa Q_j \phi} g_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m^{(j)}]. \quad (2.8)$$

We are considering here a scenario in which a purely dark sector interaction exists, resulting from a nonminimal coupling of dark matter to a fundamental scalar field or quintessence. Such couplings give rise to additional forces on dark matter particles in addition to gravity.

In the early 90's Damour, Gibbons and Gundlach [24] showed that a cosmological model with two sectors, cold dark matter with coupling $Q_c(\phi)$, and normal (baryonic) matter with coupling $Q_b(\phi)$, satisfies both the weak equivalence principle (WEP) and constraints from Solar System observations, provided that

$$m_P \left| \frac{dQ_b(\phi)}{d\phi} \right|_{\phi_0} \lesssim 10^{-2}, \quad (2.9)$$

where ϕ_0 is the present-day cosmological background value of ϕ . On the other hand, since the nature of both dark energy and dark matter are still unknown, there is no physical argument that excludes a possible interaction between them. Furthermore, the magnitude of the baryonic coupling is constrained from radar time-delay measurements, $|Q_b| < 0.032$ which limits the cold dark matter coupling to $|Q_{CDM}| < 1$.

In this paper, we specialize to models where the couplings are identical in all the different sectors, $A_j(\phi) \equiv A(\phi)$, or $Q_j(\phi) \equiv Q(\phi)$, for all j , in which case the theory satisfies the weak equivalence principle (WEP). It is a simplification when we say that DE couples to matter, when actually it is meant that DE couples to DM and that the baryonic component is negligible. Our analysis can easily be generalized to the case where $Q_b(\phi) = 0$, in which case the scalar field is coupled only to dark matter, which then automatically satisfies the solar system constraint [25, 26], see also [27] for some related discussions.

Here we assume that the spatial curvature of our universe was erased with inflation in the early universe and choose a spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\mathbf{x}^2, \quad (2.10)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor, normalized such that $a \equiv a_0 = 1$ at present, i.e. at $t = t_0$. This metric assumes the universe is homogeneous and isotropic on largest scales, which is a good approximation at large scales and is consistent with CMB observations [3]. For simplicity, we also assume that all forms of matter, including dark energy, behave as a perfect fluid. Each form of matter may be characterized by the fluid equation of state, $w_i \equiv p_i/\rho_i$. In particular, the cosmological constant may be thought of as a fluid with the equation of state $w_\Lambda \equiv p_\Lambda/\rho_\Lambda = -1$. Other forms of matter or energy are assumed to be perfect fluids as well, for radiation or relativistic particles, $w_\gamma = -1/3$ and for baryons or cold dark matter $w_m \simeq 0$. The equation of state for a scalar quintessence is defined as

$$w_\phi \equiv \frac{p_\phi}{\rho_\phi} = \frac{\frac{\gamma}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi)}{\frac{\gamma}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)}, \quad (2.11)$$

which varies with time.

The variation of the action (2.5) with respect to $g^{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ gives

$$-\frac{3}{\kappa^2} H^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + A^4(\phi) \sum_i \rho_i = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \left(2\dot{H} + 3H^2 \right) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) + A^4(\phi) \sum_i (w_i \rho_i) = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\gamma \left(\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} \right) + \frac{dV(\phi)}{d\phi} - A^3 \frac{dA(\phi)}{d\phi} \sum_i (1 - 3w_i) \rho_i = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where $H(t) \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. For the derivation of these equations, see [26, 28]. In (2.14), it can be seen that ϕ couples to the trace of the stress-energy tensor,

$$T^\mu_\mu = g^{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu} = \sum_i (1 - 3w_i) \rho_i. \quad (2.15)$$

For radiation ($w_\gamma = 1/3$), the stress-energy tensor is traceless, so there is no interaction between dark energy and radiation. Equations (2.12)-(2.14) can be supplemented by a fourth equation arising from the conservation of energy and momentum tensor

$$\tilde{T}^\mu_{(m)\nu;\mu} + \tilde{T}^\mu_{(\phi)\nu;\mu} = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

where a semicolon represents a covariant derivative which may be expanded in terms of the Christoffel symbol as $\tilde{T}^\mu_{\nu;\mu} = \tilde{T}^\mu_{\nu,\mu} + \tilde{\Gamma}^\mu_{\alpha\mu} \tilde{T}^\alpha_\nu - \tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\nu\mu} \tilde{T}^\mu_\alpha$. An observer unaware of dark energy looking out to the universe would come to the conclusion that energy is not conserved. That is not the case however, it is the combination of matter and dark energy that is conserved when there are interactions in cosmology's dark sector. Summing the terms and remembering that \tilde{T}^μ_ν is diagonal and the relevant Christoffel symbols are $\tilde{\Gamma}^0_{00} = 0$; $\tilde{\Gamma}^1_{01} = \tilde{\Gamma}^2_{02} = \tilde{\Gamma}^3_{03} = \tilde{H}$, gives the conservation equation for a perfect fluid

$$\dot{\tilde{\rho}}_i + 3\tilde{H}\tilde{\rho}_i(1 + w_i) = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_i \propto (a A(\phi))^{-3(1+w_i)}$. The fractional energy densities are defined as

$$\Omega_i = \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{crit}} = \frac{8\pi G \rho_i}{3H^2}, \quad (2.18)$$

so that for each component $0 \leq \Omega_i \leq 1$. Using the expressions $\tilde{\rho}_i = A^4 \rho_i$ and $\tilde{a} = A(\phi)a$ and carefully considering the derivatives involved, the fluid equation becomes

$$\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(1 + w_i) \rho_i = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{A(\phi)} \frac{dA(\phi)}{d\phi} (1 - 3w_i) \rho_i. \quad (2.19)$$

Out of the four equations, (2.12)-(2.14) and (2.19), only three are independent [26]. That is, equation (2.19) may have been derived from (2.12)-(2.14), without assuming (2.16).

From eqs. (2.12) and (2.13), we find

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} \left[\sum_{i=1} (\rho_i + 3p_i) + (\rho_\phi + 3p_\phi) \right]. \quad (2.20)$$

A species that contributes to positive cosmic acceleration ($\ddot{a} > 0$) must have $(\rho + 3p) < 0$, that is the equation of state w must be $< -1/3$. This gives us limits on the range of values the equation of state the scalar field may have over time if it is to contribute a gravitationally repulsive force, $w_\phi < -1/3$. Indeed, the WMAP data combined with BAO and SNIa observations has put much stronger limits on the DE equation of state, at present ($z \sim 0$), it lies in the range $-1.11 < w_{\text{DE}} < -0.86$ (95% *CL*) [4]. This range includes values of equation of state less than -1 , which is outside a theoretical limit set for a canonical scalar field and belongs to “phantom cosmology”. However, it is possible to get at low redshifts $w_\phi < -1$ by allowing the scalar field to couple with dark matter non-minimally [26], especially, by allowing the coupling between ϕ and dark matter to grow with time, or allowing $A(\phi)^2$ to increase monotonically with ϕ .

It is practical to express the above equations in terms of the e-folding time, defined by $N \equiv \ln[a(t)]$. This is a useful time parameter when considering the expansion history of the universe, including late time cosmology. We also utilize the identity $\partial\phi/\partial N = \frac{1}{H} \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t}$ and denote the differentiation with respect to N by a dash, $\partial/\partial N \equiv \prime$ and the time derivative represented by a dot, $\partial/\partial t \equiv \dot{}$. Using following definitions

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}, \quad Q \equiv \frac{d \ln [A(\phi)]}{d(\kappa\phi)}, \quad \Omega_i \equiv \frac{\kappa^2 A^4 \rho_i}{3 H^2}, \quad \Omega_\phi \equiv \frac{\kappa^2 \rho_\phi}{3 H^2}, \quad w_\phi \equiv \frac{p_\phi}{\rho_\phi}, \quad (2.21)$$

one can write the equations (2.12)-(2.14) and (2.19) in the following form

$$\sum_i \Omega_i + \Omega_\phi = 1, \quad (2.22a)$$

$$2\epsilon + 3(1 + w_\phi)\Omega_\phi + 3 \sum_i (1 + w_i)\Omega_i = 0, \quad (2.22b)$$

$$\Omega'_\phi + 2\epsilon\Omega_\phi + 3\Omega_\phi(1 + w_\phi) + \phi' Q \sum_i (1 - 3w_i)\Omega_i = 0, \quad (2.22c)$$

$$\sum_i \Omega'_i + 2\epsilon \sum_i \Omega_i + 3 \sum_i \Omega_i (1 + w_i) - \phi' Q \sum_i (1 - 3w_i)\Omega_i = 0, \quad (2.22d)$$

where the sum over i represents the sum over all forms of matter or energy. It is important to note that in minimal coupling case, $A(\phi) = 1$, Q vanishes and the field equations have one less parameter making them easier to handle. Solutions of these equations can be used to reconstruct the behavior of ϕ over time. The behavior of the scalar field is generally characterized by its potential, which is given by

$$\kappa^2 V(\phi) = H^2(\phi) \left(3\Omega_\phi - \frac{\gamma\kappa^2}{2} \phi'^2 \right). \quad (2.23)$$

For simplicity, one can make a specific ansatz for the form of the potential in order to reduce the number of degrees of freedom and hence solve the set of field equations analytically. For many potentials discussed in the literature, the initial value of ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$ must be finely tuned to obtain the correct values of Ω_ϕ and w_ϕ today. The tuning of the initial field expectation value is required in addition to tuning the potential parameters.

Given many alternative form of (quintessential) potentials it is useful to try and understand the properties of DE in a model independent manner. As discussed later, in this paper, we make an ansatz for the form of the scalar field so that the form of the potential,

together with a number of cosmological parameters, can be reconstructed. This is a valid way to study the effects of the scalar field on the background since it is required that the potential must be fairly flat today. This is because the scalar field must be rolling slowly (with a small kinetic term) to force the equation of state close to -1 as inferred by cosmological observations (the WMAP data combined with BAO and SNIa observations)

The scalar field equation of state is another important feature to study. From (2.22b), we get

$$w_\phi = -\frac{2\epsilon + 3 \sum_i (1 + w_i) \Omega_i + 3 \Omega_\phi}{3 \Omega_\phi}, \quad (2.24)$$

Other parameters of interest are the effective equation of state and the deceleration parameter. The effective equation of state describes the average equation of state, taking into account all the energy components of the universe:

$$w_{\text{eff}} \equiv \frac{p_{\text{tot}}}{\rho_{\text{tot}}}, \quad p_{\text{tot}} \equiv p_\phi + \sum_i p_i e^{4\kappa Q_i \phi}, \quad \rho_{\text{tot}} \equiv \rho_\phi + \sum_i \rho_i e^{4\kappa Q_i \phi}. \quad (2.25)$$

From equation (2.22b) and the definitions in (2.21), we find

$$p_{\text{tot}} = \frac{3 H^2(\phi)}{\kappa^2} \left(-\frac{2\epsilon}{3} - \Omega_\phi - \sum_i \Omega_i \right), \quad w_{\text{eff}} = -1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{3}. \quad (2.26)$$

The remaining important quantity is the deceleration parameter

$$q \equiv -(1 + \epsilon) = -\frac{\ddot{a}}{a H^2} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{H} \right) - 1. \quad (2.27)$$

This parameter is defined such that it is negative for an accelerating expansion ($\ddot{a} > 0$) and positive for a decelerating expansion ($\ddot{a} < 0$).

In the literature, various probes of dark energy equation of state are based on the following parameterization proposed by Chevallier and Polarski, and Linder [29]

$$w(a) = \tilde{w}_0 + \tilde{w}_1(1 - a), \quad (2.28)$$

where \tilde{w}_0 represents the present-day value of w_{DE} , and \tilde{w}_1 determines the change in w_{DE} with the scale factor a . This ansatz for w_{DE} is just a phenomenological input rather than being the one motivated by fundamental physics, so it may easily lead to an erroneous reconstruction of the dark energy equation of state in a maximum likelihood approach. This point has been discussed by many authors (see, e.g. [30]). Here we emphasize that, at least, for a standard quintessence model, an unambiguous expression for w_ϕ is

$$w(a(\phi)) \equiv w_\phi(a) = \frac{\gamma \kappa^2 (\phi')^2 - 3 \Omega_\phi}{3 \Omega_\phi}, \quad (2.29)$$

which is obtained by substituting the expression for $V(\phi)$, eq. (2.23), into the definition of w_ϕ in eq. (2.21). In our analysis, we only consider a canonical quintessence with $\gamma = 1$.

3. The growth of matter

Cosmological models are probed by observing the effects of dark energy on the expansion of the universe through measuring the distances to far off galaxies [31]. Other than this there are not many ways to check models that account for the late time acceleration of the universe. However, if dark energy does interact with dark matter even weakly, it may have an observable effect on the early stages of structure formation.

The early universe was a uniform place, driven by inflation to be spatially flat (within $\pm 2\%$), isotropic and almost homogeneous. Measurements of the CMB after inflation or well before the radiation dominated epoch show that the anisotropy was merely one part in 10^5 . These anisotropies were the seeds of large scale structures, but the density perturbations in the baryon fluid couldn't gravitationally collapse at this time because of radiation pressure from photons. However, dark matter doesn't interact through the electromagnetic force so the radiation pressure did not stop dark matter from collapsing to form dense regions long before the baryons. Not until there was matter-radiation equality at redshift, $z \simeq 3230^{+88}_{-89}$ [2] could baryons begin to collapse gravitationally to form large scale structure in the dark matter halos. Since dark matter guides the way for the formation of observed structure, any interaction between dark energy and dark matter would have an effect on the manner that visible structure was formed. In particular, we investigate how the rate of structure growth is affected by a non-zero coupling of dark matter to a fundamental scalar field.

Matter fluctuations evolve according to the standard linear differential equation

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} = 4\pi G\rho_m\delta, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\delta \equiv \delta\rho_m/\rho_m$ is the linear matter density contrast. This linear growth equation comes from the perturbed equations of motion of Einstein's general relativity, see, e.g [32]. This equation may be numerically solved to reconstruct the growth of these matter fluctuations, but as yet there is no physical theory that relates the matter density contrast to the matter density. In [33] it was proposed that the growth rate of matter perturbations, defined as

$$f \equiv \frac{\delta'}{\delta} = \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{d\delta}{d \ln a} = \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{d\delta}{dN}, \quad (3.2)$$

can be characterized by the following simple expression

$$f = [\Omega_m(N)]^A. \quad (3.3)$$

This ansatz works well at low redshifts ($z \lesssim 2$) and for coupled dark energy models with a small coupling parameter. For the Λ CDM model, $A \simeq 0.56$ [33] and for modified DGP gravity, $A \simeq 0.68$ [34]. This ansatz is associated with a solution to (3.1) approximated by

$$\delta(N) = \exp\left(\int_0^N d\tilde{N} [\Omega_m(\tilde{N})]^A\right). \quad (3.4)$$

However, this ansatz does have the drawback that $f \leq 1$ since $0 \leq \Omega_m \leq 1$. This is fine for the standard Λ CDM model which assumes $f = 1$ during the matter dominated era for high redshift, but does not hold for all models of dark energy.

For the present model of quintessential dark energy, as discussed in [35] in more details, the linear growth equation (3.1) is modified to be

$$\delta_c'' + (2 + \varepsilon + Q_c \phi') \delta_c' = \frac{3}{2} (1 + 2Q_c^2) \delta_c \Omega_c + \frac{3}{2} (1 + 2Q_b Q_c) \delta_b \Omega_b, \quad (3.5a)$$

$$\delta_b'' + (2 + \varepsilon + Q_b \phi') \delta_b' = \frac{3}{2} (1 + 2Q_b^2) \delta_b \Omega_b + \frac{3}{2} (1 + 2Q_b Q_c) \delta_c \Omega_c, \quad (3.5b)$$

respectively for baryonic and CDM components. The couplings constant Q_b and Q_c are generally coupled, so in general it is not possible to express these equations as a single differential equation. In [35], Amendola made a naive estimation that in the limit $|Q_b| \ll |Q_c|$ and $\Omega_b \ll \Omega_c$, one can write

$$\delta'' + (2 + \varepsilon + Q \phi') \delta' = \frac{3}{2} \Omega_m (1 + 2Q^2) \delta, \quad (3.6)$$

where $Q \equiv Q_c$ and $\delta \approx \delta_c$ (to leading order). In a sense, the baryonic component Ω_b is assumed to be negligible. But one should also note that δ_b and its derivatives are non-negligible, otherwise the equation (3.5b) would be inconsistent. Equation (3.6), which reduces to the standard result when $Q = 0$, is a close approximation rather than being an exact result. In the following discussion, we will assume that $\delta_c \Omega_c \gg \delta_b \Omega_b$.

In spacetime backgrounds dominated by baryonic matter, the effect of dark matter may be neglected ($\Omega_c = 0$). The effective Newton's constant \tilde{G} , and two dimensionless post Newtonian parameters $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are related to the coupling constants

$$Q(\phi) \equiv m_P \frac{\partial \ln A(\phi)}{\partial \phi}, \quad X(\phi) \equiv m_P \frac{\partial Q(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \quad (3.7)$$

via [36]

$$\tilde{G} = G [A^2(\phi)(1 + Q^2)]_{\phi_0}, \quad \hat{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{2Q^2}{1 + Q^2}, \quad \hat{\beta} = 1 + \frac{Q^2 X}{2(1 + Q^2)^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

For an exponential coupling $A(\phi) \propto e^{Q_b \kappa \phi}$, with Q_b behaving (almost) as a constant, the local gravity constraint $|1 - \hat{\gamma}| < 2 \times 10^{-3}$ implies that $Q_b^2 \equiv (1 - \hat{\gamma})/(1 + \hat{\gamma}) < 0.031$ and hence $|Q_b| < 0.178$. This constraint is much weaker than the one arising from weak equivalence principle violation [37, 38]. With $Q_b \simeq \text{const}$, one has $|1 - \hat{\beta}| \simeq 0$ to a large accuracy. The effective Newton's constant is now modified but it must be within the limit for the time variation of Newton's constant $|\frac{d\tilde{G}/dt}{\tilde{G}}| < 10^{-14} \text{yrs}^{-1}$, see e.g. [39], which is generally the case when $|Q_b| \lesssim 0.1$ is satisfied. In most of the discussion below we will assume that $|Q_c| \gg |Q_b| \simeq 0$ and $Q_c \equiv Q$.

In the non-minimally coupled theory, the linear growth rate (3.1) is modified from the uncoupled case; the quantity $\delta \equiv \delta \rho_m / \rho_m$ now depends on the values of Q and ϕ' . The result of this is a modification of the expression for the growth rate, (3.3), where it is renormalized by either the parameter A and/or a coefficient f_0 :

$$f = [\Omega_m(N)]^{\tilde{A}}, \quad f = f_0 [\Omega_m(N)]^A. \quad (3.9)$$

Following the analysis in [40], if the growth rate is modified by a coefficient, it may be dependent on the coupling by

$$f = [\Omega_m(N)]^A (1 + c Q^2 + \dots), \quad (3.10)$$

which reduces to (3.4) for minimal coupling ($Q = 0$). This expression of f is merely a phenomenological fit where A and c may be determined by fitting the standard approximate solution (3.10) to a numerical solution to equation (3.5a) or (3.6). The best fit parameters found from this numerical analysis in [40] are $A \simeq 0.56$ and $c \simeq 2.1$. The physical theory pertaining to the dependence of Ω_m and Q on the perturbation growth rate is as yet unknown so this kind of generalized fit is just an approximation. Determining the growth rate over time and comparing to observational results gives limits to the model that are independent of limits from fitting the model to supernova and WMAP data sets. This grants an independent check for the consistency of the model.

4. Analytic solutions

In order to be able to analytically solve the generalized field equations obtained in Section 2, there must be more assumptions made to reduce the number of degrees of freedom. The defining feature of this paper is the particular choice of the form of the scalar dilaton field ϕ . Instead of making an ansatz for the scalar field potential, we wish to reconstruct relevant cosmological parameters from a reasonable ansatz for the scalar field itself. There are two simple approximations to the form of this time-varying scalar field (see, e.g. [41, 42]),

$$\kappa|\phi| = 2\alpha_1 \ln t + \text{const}, \quad \kappa|\phi| = \alpha_2 t^n + \text{const}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\kappa \equiv m_P^{-1}$, and α_i, n are some numerical constants. For instance, during matter dominated epoch ($a(t) \propto t^{2/3}$), these yield $\phi/m_P = 3\alpha_1 \ln a + \text{const}$ and $\phi/m_P \propto a^{3n/2} + \text{const}$, respectively. The above two asymptotic solutions for ϕ may be written as [17]

$$\kappa|\phi(a)| \equiv \alpha \ln a + \phi_1, \quad \kappa|\phi(a)| = \beta a^{2\zeta} + \phi_2. \quad (4.2)$$

These ansatzë may be viewed as the asymptotic limits (i.e. $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $t \rightarrow 0$) of some more general solutions for a runaway dilaton in some string theory models in four dimensions [9, 41–43]. Indeed, various models of quintessential dark energy satisfy the first or the second ansatz with some particular choice of α or ζ . Particularly, with the first ansatz alone, the leading term of the reconstructed potential is given by

$$V(\phi) \equiv V_0 e^{\alpha\kappa\phi} + \dots, \quad (4.3)$$

where the dots represent some other terms which arise, for instance, due to the effects of matter-scalar interactions. For the second ansatz in eq. (4.2), we get

$$V(\varphi) \equiv V_1 e^{-\zeta\varphi^2} (3 - 2\zeta^2\varphi^2) + \dots, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\varphi \equiv |\Delta\phi|/m_P = (\phi_0 - \phi)/m_P$. In [28], only the first approximation in (4.2) was considered. This was sufficient to explain a late time acceleration, which gives $w_\phi < -0.86$ when $|\alpha| < 0.56$ (with $\Omega_{0m} \simeq 0.26$). However, if we require the scalar field to bear some generic behaviour of a fundamental dilaton in some scalar-tensor theories [44], or effective string theory models in four dimensions, then this ansatz may not be sufficient.

In this paper, we propose that the time-evolution of ϕ is described by the combination

$$\kappa(\phi_0 - \phi(a)) = \alpha \ln a + \beta e^{2\zeta \ln a}. \quad (4.5)$$

In the following, using the freedom to rescale N ($\equiv \ln a$) or shift ϕ , we set $\beta = 1$. The model then contains two free parameters, α and ζ , so there is more freedom to tune them according to the observational constraints. However, if we wish to put limits on this model, there is another degree of freedom that must be constrained. This extra parameter, which is the coupling constant between the dark matter and the scalar field ϕ , is a mixed blessing, it makes the system easier to tune but it also makes the solutions more complicated. In the limit where $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $\zeta \rightarrow 0$, the scalar field becomes a constant and $w_\phi \rightarrow -1$. The conditions $|\zeta|, |\alpha| \ll 1$ are a kind of slow roll approximations, which generally satisfy the condition $V(d^2V/d\phi^2) - (dV/d\phi)^2 \ll V^2$ (see [45, 46] for some other ways of constraining dark energy and/or quintessential potentials).

Other than an ansatz for ϕ , the model requires some initial conditions for it to be analytically solved. These conditions can be defined on the current composition of the universe, as measured by WMAP plus other observations [4] and are $\Omega_b \simeq 0.05$, $\Omega_{CDM} \simeq 0.22$, $\Omega_r \simeq 10^{-4}$ and $\Omega_\phi \simeq 0.73$. The baryon component (subscript b) is quite small compared to the cold dark matter component (subscript CDM), so even though there are tight limits on any baryon-dark energy coupling, it is sufficient to assume a general dark energy coupling to Ω_m , ($\Omega_m \equiv \Omega_b + \Omega_{CDM} \simeq 0.27$). Henceforth the only components of the universe that are not considered negligible are dark matter and the dark energy component, up to $z \sim \mathcal{O}(10^2)$ when radiation starts playing a major role. Also, it is assumed that the dark matter equation of state is the same as that of ordinary matter (or dust), $w_m \simeq 0$. Using these assumptions, and for simplicity setting $\kappa = 1$ from now on, the system of equations, (2.22a-2.22d), are simplified to

$$\Omega_m + \Omega_\phi = 1 \quad (4.6a)$$

$$2\epsilon + 3(1 + w_\phi)\Omega_\phi + 3\Omega_m = 0 \quad (4.6b)$$

$$\Omega'_\phi + 2\epsilon\Omega_\phi + 3\Omega_\phi(1 + w_\phi) + \phi'Q\Omega_m = 0 \quad (4.6c)$$

$$\Omega'_m + 2\epsilon\Omega_m + 3\Omega_m - \phi'Q\Omega_m = 0. \quad (4.6d)$$

Equations (4.6a)-(4.6d) can now be solved to find explicit expressions for w_ϕ , ϵ and Ω_m . Solving the equations directly gives the solution for Ω_m and ϵ in terms of α , ζ and Q (α and ζ are parameters from the ansatz for ϕ , and Q is the coupling term).

The explicit solutions for Ω_m and ϵ are given by

$$\Omega_m = \frac{X(N)}{C_0 - 3 \int X(N) dN}, \quad \epsilon = -\frac{3}{2}\Omega_m - \frac{1}{2}\phi'^2 = -\frac{3}{2}\Omega_m - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + 2\zeta e^{2\zeta N})^2, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$X = X(N = \ln a) \equiv \exp \left[(\alpha Q + \alpha^2 - 3)N + (2\alpha + Q)e^{2\zeta N} + \zeta e^{4\zeta N} \right]. \quad (4.8)$$

The scale factor $a(t)$ is normalized such that $a(z = 0) \equiv a_0 = 1$, so in the past $a < 1$ and hence $N \equiv \ln a < 0$. This implies that the term proportional to $e^{2\zeta N}$ can be negligibly small in the past ($N \ll 0$ or $a \ll a_0 \equiv 1$), particularly, when $\zeta > 0$ ¹. The relationships among the scale factor a , redshift z and e-folding time N are

$$\frac{a_0}{a} = \frac{1}{1+z}, \quad N = \ln(a) = -\ln(1+z). \quad (4.9)$$

¹If one wants to use the same ansatz to study inflationary cosmology, then one should probably take a negative ζ , since $N \equiv \ln(a/a_i) \geq 0$, where a_i is the initial value of the scale factor.

So, at $t = t_0$, $z = N = 0$. To solve the integral (4.7), in the small ζ limit, we may use the approximation $e^{\zeta N} \approx 1 + N\zeta$. The solution for Ω_m is now given by

$$\Omega_m = \frac{3 - \tilde{\alpha}^2 - Q\tilde{\alpha}}{3 + C_1 \exp[-\tilde{\alpha}^2 N - Q\tilde{\alpha} N + 3N]}, \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$\tilde{\alpha} \equiv \alpha + 2\zeta. \quad (4.11)$$

The solution for Ω_m automatically gives the solution for Ω_ϕ which is simply $\Omega_\phi = 1 - \Omega_m$, in using Friedmann constraint. The integration constant C_1 can be fixed by using the initial conditions of the model, assuming $\Omega_m(t_0) \equiv \Omega_{m0}$, where t_0 is the time now.

The Hubble parameter may be evaluated by solving the differential equation associated with the relation $H\epsilon = H'$. This again introduces an integration constant which can be fixed by the normalization $H(t_0) \equiv H_0$. From the solutions for Ω_m and ϵ , the other parameters discussed in Section 2 can also be derived. The expression for w_ϕ is given by eq. (2.24), while $V(\phi)$ is given by eq. (2.23) using the solutions for Ω_m and H .

From the second equation in (4.7), we can see that (retaining the 4d gravitational constant κ)

$$\kappa^2 \phi'^2 = 1 + q - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m. \quad (4.12)$$

Requiring that $q < 0$ (as implied by the type Ia supernovae) and imposing a generous lower bound on the value of Ω_m , which is $\Omega_{0m} > 0.24$, one obtains the safe upper bound

$$\kappa|\phi'_0| < 0.8.$$

However, to make the present model compatible with various other data sets, including WMAP observations, one may be required to satisfy $\kappa|\phi'_0| \lesssim 0.4$, which encompasses the cosmological constant limit within 1σ error.

5. Constraints on the model

5.1 Constraints from supernova

In this Subsection, we use several sets of data from recent cosmological observations and put constraints on our model, limiting the values of α , ζ and Q . To do this, code for χ^2 curve fitting given by Nesseris and Perivolaropoulos [39] has been utilized along with our solution for w_ϕ and the standard form for the Hubble parameter, in terms of the two parameters,

$$w_0 \equiv \tilde{\alpha}^2, \quad w_1 \equiv -Q\tilde{\alpha}, \quad (5.1)$$

where as before, $\tilde{\alpha} \equiv \alpha + 2\zeta$. In the Einstein frame, the matter density decreases as $\rho_m \propto 1/(A(\phi)a(t))^3$, where the scale factor is modified by the coupling function $A(\phi)$. The Hubble parameter in this frame is

$$H = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{0m} a^{-3-w_1} + (1 - \Omega_{0m}) a^{-w_0}}. \quad (5.2)$$

In this standard form, it is plain to see that this is the Einstein frame, since the matter part goes as a^{-3-w_1} , the density evolution is modified by the factor w_1 , associated with the coupling Q . However, there are assumptions embedded into the curve fitting code that w_0

and w_1 are associated with an ansatz for the equation of state, which we have not made. Even more deeply embedded in the initial analysis of the data sets is the assumption that models are in the Jordan canonical frame, such as in the luminosity distance relation, where it is assumed that matter density evolves as a^{-3} . To make our model compatible with the code, curve fitting is carried out for the minimally coupled case, i.e. assuming that $|Q| \ll 1$ and hence $3 + w_1 \approx 3$.

Curve fitting with one parameter (i.e. w_0) using only the Gold sample of type Ia supernova minimizes χ^2 for the values w_0 (and hence $\tilde{\alpha}$) shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The best fit form of $w_\phi(z)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$ for the SNIa Gold data sets:

| Ω_{0m} | w_0 | $ \tilde{\alpha} $ | $w_\phi(z=0)$ (mean) | χ^2_{min} |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 0.26 | 0.271 ± 0.286 | $0.521 (\pm 0.275)$ | -0.878 | 177.98 |
| 0.27 | 0.194 ± 0.298 | $0.441 (\pm 0.339)$ | -0.911 | 177.76 |
| 0.28 | 0.112 ± 0.312 | $0.335 (\pm 0.466)$ | -0.948 | 177.54 |
| 0.29 | 0.026 ± 0.327 | $0.161 (\pm 1.012)$ | -0.988 | 177.31 |
| 0.30 | -0.065 ± 0.344 | - | < -1 | 177.09 |

Combining all the sets of data of SNIa (Gold), CMB shift from WMAP, baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) and Supernova Legacy Survey (SNLS) observations gives the best fit parameters shown in Table 2, which are consistent with the fit for the SNIa Gold data alone within the 1σ errors. The errors of these fits are shown in Figs. 1 and 2. For the combined data sets χ^2 is minimum when $\Omega_{0m} \approx 0.27$.

Table 2: The best fit form of $w_\phi(z)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$ for the WMAP+BAO+SNIa+SNLS data sets:

| Ω_{m0} | w_0 | $ \tilde{\alpha} $ | $w_\phi(z=0)$ (mean) | χ^2_{min} |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 0.26 | 0.123 ± 0.178 | 0.350 ± 0.254 | -0.945 | 283.54 |
| 0.27 | 0.098 ± 0.1842 | 0.313 ± 0.294 | -0.955 | 283.24 |
| 0.28 | 0.072 ± 0.190 | 0.268 ± 0.354 | -0.967 | 283.61 |
| 0.29 | 0.045 ± 0.197 | 0.209 ± 0.454 | -0.979 | 284.61 |
| 0.30 | 0.018 ± 0.203 | 0.133 ± 0.762 | -0.991 | 284.19 |

It is indeed the SNLS data that lowers w_ϕ towards the value -1 , which is clearly seen from the following best-fit values

$$\Omega_{0m} = 0.26 : \quad w_0 = -0.006 \pm 0.274, \quad \chi^2 = 104.14, \quad (5.3a)$$

$$\Omega_{0m} = 0.27 : \quad w_0 = -0.081 \pm 0.285, \quad \chi^2 = 104.13, \quad (5.3b)$$

$$\Omega_{0m} = 0.28 : \quad w_0 = -0.159 \pm 0.297, \quad \chi^2 = 104.12, \quad (5.3c)$$

The supernovae legacy survey (SNLS) data naively suggests a small cross over range between the cosmological constant $w_\Lambda = -1$ and the phantom dark energy $w_\phi < -1$ (or equivalently $w_0 < 0$), but the error bars are too large. For the combined data sets (from WMAP, BAO, SNIa and SNLS) the best-fit value of w_ϕ falls in the range $-0.94 > w_\phi > -1$.

The cosmological constant limit is when the scalar field has zero kinetic energy, $\phi' = 0$. For our ansatz for ϕ , using the small ζ approximation, we get $|\phi'| = \tilde{\alpha}$. Thus, the solution $\tilde{\alpha} = 0$ simply represents a cosmological constant. From the relationships above, and also




Figure 1: The scalar field equation of state w_ϕ as a function of redshift (z) with 1σ and 2σ errors (light and dark gray shades), overlaid by w_ϕ defined by (2.29) with $\zeta = -0.2, -0.15, -0.1, 0$ (top to bottom) (green, pink, red, blue, online). In each plot $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$. (Left plot) SN1a+WMAP+BAO+SNLS, $\tilde{\alpha}$ given in Table 2. (Right plot) SN1a only, α given in Table 1.




Figure 2: As in Figure 1 but with $\zeta = 0.2, 0.15, 0.1, 0$ (bottom to top) (blue, red, pink, green, online).

noticing that for the combined data sets the scalar field equation of state is closer to -1 over a longer time in Fig. 2, we find that the solution using all the data sets is compatible with a cosmological constant. This analysis has provided a limit to the relationship between α and ζ but there is still a degree of freedom for choosing the value of α or ζ . This degree of freedom proves hard to constrain since for other observational tests, it is only required that α and ζ be of comparable magnitude, or that $\zeta = 0$. The plots of w_ϕ in Figures 1 and 2 show that the chi-squared is minimized when ζ is small since cosmological reconstructions for large ζ diverge from the best fit line, particularly, if $\zeta < 0$.

5.2 Constraints from CMB

Another test of our model to the observational constraints is to demand that the equation of state presently lies in the range, $-1.11 < w_\phi < -0.86$, as implied by the WMAP data combined with BAO and type Ia SN [4]. This is illustrated in the contour plot, Fig. 3, where the outer contour corresponds to $w_\phi = -0.91$ and the innermost contour corresponds

to $w_\phi = -0.99$. For w_ϕ to lie within the limit $-1.11 < w_\phi < -0.86$, the constraint is

$$\tilde{\alpha} = 0(\pm 0.5) \quad (5.4)$$

where the value of the coupling has no much impact. This relationship holds for small $|\zeta| \lesssim 0.1$. It is reasonable to assume that the value of the scalar field equation of state has not changed much in the recent past. Using this tighter restriction, by inspecting Fig. 3, we get a tighter relationship between α and ζ , as $z \rightarrow 3$, error in relationship (5.4) goes to ± 0.2 .




Figure 3: (Left plot) Contour plot of w_ϕ in the range $(-0.91, -0.99)$ (top to bottom) at $z = 0$. (Right plot) The dark energy EoS (solid line, blue online) and the effective EoS (dotted line, red online) as a function of redshift z ($\alpha = 0.231$, $\zeta = 0.05$).

There is still a degree of freedom in the choice of the value of α or ζ , so we look to a possible link between inflation and late time acceleration to set it. Quintessence is designed such that the scalar field that drives the late time acceleration may be the same, or an evolved form of the inflaton field that drove inflation. It may not be the same scalar field, or the inflaton field may have completely decayed through phase transitions in the early universe, but it is reasonable to suppose that these two fields are somehow related. If we assume that it is in fact the same field that drives both of these accelerating epochs, we may impose extra conditions on the model by requiring the quintessence field to satisfy the constraints of inflation. One such constraining parameter is the spectral index, which describes the slope of the angular power spectrum of the CMB. The WMAP data inferred a red-tilted spectrum, $n_s < 1$, which is consistent with most inflationary models. The spectral index can be approximated in the small, positive ζ limit, as [17]

$$n_s \simeq 1 - \alpha^2. \quad (5.5)$$

For the WMAP+BAO+SN mean value of $n_s = 0.960^{+0.014}_{-0.013}$ [4] and $\alpha = 0.200 \pm 0.035$ by using the relationship between α and ζ determined by the combined data sets in table 2, we obtain $\zeta = 0.04 \pm 0.15$ or $\zeta = -0.24 \pm 0.15$. For our approximation to be valid, we must have $\zeta \gtrsim 0$ at late times, so the solution $\zeta = -0.24$ may be ignored. The other value of ζ may be fixed such that it is consistent with the data sets in Section 5.1. When the scalar field equation of state is plotted, it is within the 2σ errors. This is because small ζ fits best to the data sets, as shown in Figures 1 and 2.

5.3 Constraints from structure formation

A final test of our model is fitting the parameters of our model to the observations of the growth rate of matter fluctuations. As discussed in Section 3, the matter fluctuation growth rate can be written in the generalized form

$$f \equiv \delta'/\delta = f_0 (\Omega_m(z))^A, \quad (5.6)$$

where $\delta \equiv \delta\rho/\rho$ is the density contrast for a particular matter component, like $\delta = \delta_c$ for CDM. Using some particular observed values for the growth rate at different low redshifts (listed below in table), we can determine the values of f_0 and A that best match the data. There are very few measurements of the growth rate at low redshifts however, often f can only be evaluated by assuming a Λ CDM model, for which $A \approx 0.56$.

Table 3: Observed matter fluctuation growth rate as compiled in [48, 49]:

| z | 0.15 | 0.35 | 0.55 | 0.77 | 1.4 | 3 |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| f_{obs} | 0.51 ± 0.11 | 0.70 ± 0.18 | 0.75 ± 0.18 | 0.91 ± 0.36 | 0.90 ± 0.24 | 1.46 ± 0.29 |

First, we will assume that our model doesn't deviate far from Λ CDM. The least squares curve fitting to the data is illustrated by Fig. 4, where the best fit parameter is

$$f_0 = 1.16 \pm 0.34, \quad Q = 0.27 \pm 0.20. \quad (5.7)$$

In deriving the value of Q , we have used the normalization $f_0 = 1 + 2.1Q^2$ used in [40]. This indicates that within the 1σ errors, the normalization constant f_0 is compatible with a minimally coupled quintessence scenario. Of course, this is what we expect since the data used contained implicit assumptions of the Λ CDM model. In further studies, the data may be used more effectively to investigate models of quintessence by following the discussion in [48] (see also references therein), where the current matter density is modified so that the model of dark energy has the same redshift-distance relation as Λ CDM. Thus the bias towards Λ CDM is eliminated. If it is instead the parameter A that is renormalized, say $A \simeq 0.68$ [34] as in modified gravity proposed by Dvali, Gabadadze and Porrati, the fit to the data in Fig. 4 seems to be closer.




Figure 4: (Left plot) Best fit curve to the observed values of the growth rate, with $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$. The solid line corresponds to a best fit with $A = 0.56$ (blue, online) and the dashed line corresponds to $A = 0.68$ (red, online). (Right plot) Effect of coupling on the matter fluctuation growth rate.

Of course, one may find the best-fit values of Q and A using some other inputs. For example, taking $\alpha + 2\zeta \simeq 0$ and making the ansatz

$$f(z) = (1 + 2.1Q^2) (\Omega_m(z))^A,$$

we find that $(Q, A) = (0.19, 0.57)$ and $(0.18, 0.63)$ respectively for $\Omega_{0m} = 0.24$ and $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$. In obtaining these values we have dropped the last entry from table 3 (as the results from high redshift data are not quite unanimous).

5.4 Overview of constraints

Through the last three methods, we obtained a relationship between α and ζ , but no clear constraint on their individual values apart from the somewhat naive constraint that $|\alpha| \simeq 0.2$ by assuming that the quintessence field is the same as the inflation field. This inability to constrain all the parameters in the model may be a fundamental limitation due to the approximation of the solution of Ω_m . To get a solution for Ω_m the small ζ limit had to be taken, so Ω_m was only in terms of $\tilde{\alpha} \equiv \alpha + 2\zeta$. If this limit had to be taken to get a solution for ϵ , the model would have been reduced to the simpler model with only one parameter, $\tilde{\alpha}$ and the introduction of the additional parameter ζ would have been meaningless. Luckily, the small ζ limit was not necessary in the solution for ϵ and Ω_m so the two parameter model was secure. The parameters that are only dependent on Ω_m like the growth rate, f can only yield constraints on $\tilde{\alpha}$, not the individual values for α and ζ . The scalar field equation of state is dependent on ϵ , but the constraint that it is close to -1 is only on the equation of state today ($z \sim 0$), so only $\tilde{\alpha}$ is involved. Similarly, in order to put the Hubble parameter into the standard form and to put w_ϕ into a form with the same parameters, we had to take the small ζ limit, so this analysis only involved $\tilde{\alpha}$.

6. Dynamical behaviour

In this section we examine how the scalar field varies over time and how this depends on the parameters α , ζ and Q . The constraints found above only put a limit on the relationship between α and ζ , so there must be a choice of the value of one of them. By plotting different values of α and ζ (bounded by the relation in table 2), and in Fig. 1, it seems that small values of these parameters fit best within $1\text{-}\sigma$ error. Hence, as a specific example, in the discussion below, we take a small value for ζ , such as $\zeta = 0.05$, and $\alpha = 0.231$ using the combined fits (with $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$) and $Q = 0.27 \pm 0.20$ from the analysis of structure formation. In our analysis perhaps the most relevant parameter is the field velocity of ϕ , i.e. $\phi' \equiv d\phi/d\ln a$, which is practically a measurable quantity either by accurately measuring the equation of state w_ϕ , or by placing a constraint on the dark matter-scalar coupling.

One can think of the scalar field “rolling down” the potential, like a skier on a mountain. It can be seen from Fig. 5 that the slope of the potential now is not quite flat rather the scalar field is rolling with a changing velocity. This is apparent when taking the time derivative of the scalar field, $\phi' = -\alpha - 2\zeta e^{2\zeta N}$. At $N = 0$, i.e. $a = a_0$, $|\phi'| \sim \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha + 2\zeta$. Indeed, we require that the scalar field is rolling slowly so that the kinetic energy is small compared to the potential energy. The scalar field rolls at a slowly changing velocity for a small value of ζ and the acceleration is $\phi''(N = 0) = -4\zeta^2$, so we expect that the value of ζ^2 to be much less than 1. Furthermore, ϕ'' is negative so the scalar field is slowing down, it is in a ‘freezing’ phase. The model approaches the Λ CDM model as $\alpha, \zeta \rightarrow 0$.

The shape of the reconstructed potential shown in Fig. 5 is essentially an exponential. In particular, in the limit $\zeta \rightarrow 0$, it is a simple exponential, $V(\phi) \propto e^{\alpha\phi}$, and for the non-zero ζ case this is modified by extra terms proportional to $e^{c\phi} (\phi - \phi_0)^2$. The reconstructed potential shown on the left panel of Fig. 5 displays a range of possible values of Q ; for




Figure 5: (Left) Form of the scalar potential with $Q = 0.2, 0$ and -0.2 (top to bottom), where z is varied from 4 to 0. (Right plot) The shape of the reconstructed scalar field potential.

larger Q the potential is steeper and for smaller Q it is flatter and even changes shape for a negative Q .




Figure 6: (Left) The scalar field equation of state w_ϕ as a function of redshift (z) with 1σ and 2σ errors (light and dark gray shades) for a compilation of data from WMAP+BAO+SNIa+SNLS, overlaid by w_ϕ with $Q = -0.2$ (top, red online) and $Q = 0.2$ (bottom, blue online) and $\alpha = 0.231$, $\zeta = 0.05$ and $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$. As seen in the plot, a positive Q lowers the value of w_ϕ towards -1 .

The equation of state for our choice of the parameters is currently within the limits from WMAP, $-1.11 < w_\phi < -0.86$, and does not change much up to redshift $z \sim 1$. The effect of a nonzero coupling Q on the equation of state is shown in Fig. 6. At low redshift, a positive value of Q drives w_ϕ closer to -1 .

7. Effect on the background

An intrinsic property of dark energy is that it does not interact with light. The only way that it may be observed is through its effect on the evolution of the background and its possible interaction with dark matter. In this Section we look into how this model for quintessential dark energy affects the background by quantitatively looking at its effects on the rate of cosmic acceleration and the fractional densities of dark matter and dark energy. A useful parameter used when considering cosmic acceleration is the “deceleration

parameter, q . In an accelerating epoch, $q < 0$. In Fig. 7, we have shown a typical variation in the value of q with redshift. The important feature of this reconstruction is that q drops from positive to negative at $z \approx 0.7$, when cosmic acceleration began. A nonzero coupling has an effect on the redshift when cosmic acceleration started, z_{acc} , the positive coupling ($Q > 0$) implies an earlier start and the negative coupling ($Q < 0$) implies a later start. Within the errors of our model, we have $0.6 < z_{acc} < 0.9$, which is within the predicted redshift for the Λ CDM model, $z_{acc} = 0.76 \pm 0.10$ [1, 50].




Figure 7: (Left) Deceleration parameter for varying α ($\zeta = 0.05$, $Q = 0.2$). (Right) History of cosmic acceleration for $Q = 0.2, 0$ and -0.2 (bottom to top) ($\zeta = 0.05$, $\alpha = 0.231$).

An alternative way of looking at the start of cosmic acceleration is to see when the effective equation of state drops below $-1/3$ in Fig. 8. At a high redshift, the effective equation of state goes towards 0, which is expected in the matter dominated epoch ($w_m \simeq 0$). For all values of α , the effective equation of state goes to ~ 0 during the matter dominated epoch, but for large values of α , $w_{eff} > 0$. This is because the relative energy density of dark matter and dark energy now is fixed and the matter equation of state is constant, but the scalar equation of state is closer to 0 for a larger α , as shown in Fig. 3. At least, at low redshifts ($z < 1$), the effective equation of state does not vary much for different values of the coupling.




Figure 8: (Left plot) The scalar field equation of state and (right plot) the effective equation of state with ($\zeta = 0.05$, $\alpha = 0.231$ and $Q = -0.2, 0$ and $+0.2$ (from top to bottom)).

The relative energy density of dark matter to dark energy is affected by changes in the α parameter as seen in Fig. 9. For smaller values of α , the matter density tends towards a lower value at high redshift. That is, due to the Friedmann condition (4.6a), there is a higher proportion of dark energy during the matter dominated epoch for a small α component. Here, it is clear that there has been an assumption made for the matter density today. The right hand side plot of Fig. 9 illustrates the effect of a non-minimal coupling Q on the evolution of matter density. The effect is not great within this small range, but there is a difference. A smaller value of the coupling parameter, Q , leads to an increase in the proportion of matter in the matter dominated epoch. This study is valid for a range of low redshift, but will break down at high redshift when we enter the radiation dominated epoch because we have made the assumption that the radiation component is negligible.




Figure 9: (Left plot) Matter density for varying α ($\zeta = 0.05$, $Q = 0.2$) with $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$. (Right plot) Matter density for $Q = -0.2, 0$ and 0.2 (top to bottom) ($\zeta = 0.05$, $\alpha = 0.231$).

One requirement of the potential is that it must dominate the kinetic term so that the scalar field equation of state, w_ϕ , may be driven towards -1 . It can be seen that this is satisfied by examining Figure 8. Recently, the authors of [30] have found two new diagnostic tools for distinguishing quintessential dark energy from Einstein’s cosmological constant. Their method may be extended to a non-minimally coupled theory for which $|Q| > 0$. Here we simply note that for small values of α and ζ , satisfying the constraints given in table 2, the constraints of the present model encompass the cosmological constant limit at the 1σ level at low redshifts.

8. Conclusion

In this paper a scalar-tensor theory of quintessential dark energy has been reconstructed. This reconstruction rests on the general action (2.5), in which the tensor theory of general relativity is modified by including a fundamental scalar field. The scalar field affects the gravitational part of the action by introducing a gravitationally repulsive term which drives the cosmic acceleration, and is coupled to the matter part of the action, giving rise to a nontrivial dark matter - dark energy interaction. As for all quintessence models, this action reduces to the one of general relativity, when the scalar field is time-independent and the coupling of dark matter to a scalar field (or dark energy) is minimal.

We made an ansatz for the form of the scalar field itself, in order to be able to reconstruct relevant cosmological parameters, including $\Omega_m, \Omega_\phi, \epsilon$ and w_ϕ . The ansatz $|\phi_0 - \phi|/m_p = \alpha \ln a + \exp(2\zeta \ln a) + \text{const}$ for the scalar field was motivated by generic solutions of the dilaton field in some effective string theory models in four dimensions. The two new parameters, α and ζ as well as the matter scalar coupling parameter, Q , were constrained using several cosmological methods. Primarily, the relationship between α and ζ was constrained by curve fitting to various cosmological data sets. For example, with $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$, using just the SN1a data, minimizing χ^2 gave $\alpha = -2\zeta \pm 0.44 (\pm 0.34)$ and using all the data sets available gave $\alpha = -2\zeta \pm 0.31 (\pm 0.29)$. A value for the coupling Q could not be found using these data sets because the curve fitting code was not compatible with our particular model.

We also considered the effect of dark energy on the growth of large scale structure. The effect of a non-minimal coupling on the standard expression for the rate of growth of matter perturbations, $f = [\Omega_m(N)]^A$, was considered. A modified ansatz for the dependence of matter density and dark matter-dark energy coupling on the matter fluctuation growth rate was introduced and then fitted to some observed values of the growth rate at low redshift. This analysis gave a low value for the coupling $Q = 0.27 \pm 0.2$ (with the input $\Omega_{0m} \simeq 0.27$), which is compatible with the minimally coupled scalar field case. These methods of constraining the variables of the model have succeeded in constraining $\alpha + 2\zeta$, but failed in constraining the separate values of α and ζ . This is a direct result of taking the small ζ limit when analyzing the solutions. Further study is needed to resolve this problem.

To further analyze the solutions of the model, a small value of ζ was chosen $\zeta = 0.05$ and using the relation in table 2, $\alpha = 0.231$ (for $\Omega_{0m} = 0.27$), while Q was constrained by structure formation data to be $Q = 0.27 \pm 0.20$. The shape of the scalar potential, which is generally an exponential type, becomes flatter for a negative Q and steeper for a positive Q . Likewise, for a larger value of α the slope of the potential was steeper. For a positive value of the coupling, the scalar field equation of state w_ϕ is quickly driven towards -1 (as compared to a negative coupling). This may indicate that in this sign convention for the field equations, a positive Q is more physical as we expect the equation of state not to vary far from -1 at late times. For a larger value of α , the effective equation of state $w_{\text{eff}} > 0$ for redshift $z > 2$, while the scalar field equation of state $w_\phi \approx 0$. For our model and choice of parameters, it is found that cosmic acceleration began in the region of $0.6 < z_{\text{acc}} < 0.9$.

Our analysis showed that the present model of coupled quintessence is compatible with a cosmological constant (where $\alpha, \zeta = 0$ and $Q = 0$), within 1σ error bars. This means that dark energy may still simply be a cosmological constant, but even a small deviation away from this limit results in a very different source of cosmic acceleration, with time varying behavior. The number of parameters of this model may make it hard to rule out, as they may be tuned to satisfy many more constraints. In this work, the matter scalar coupling parameter was chosen to be a constant. This was not motivated physically but was chosen for the solvability of the system. Indeed, there is no physical reason why the dark energy - (dark) matter interaction should not vary in time, it is in all likelihood a function of ϕ . There needs to be further study to explore this ϕ dependence of Q . Also, the links between quintessential dark energy and inflation deserve further investigation.

References

- [1] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201];
S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133];
A.G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004) [astro-ph/0402512]; R. A. Knop *et al.* *Astroph. J.* **598**, 102(K) [astro-ph/0309368].
- [2] <http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/>
- [3] D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], *First Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Determination of Cosmological Parameters*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003).
- [4] D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], *Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) three year results: implications for cosmology*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **170**, 377 (2007) [astro-ph/0603449].
- [5] S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden and M. S. Turner, *Is cosmic speed-up due to new gravitational physics?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0306438];
S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, S. Carloni and A. Troisi, *Curvature quintessence matched with observational data*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **12**, 1969 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0307018];
S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Modified gravity with negative and positive powers of the curvature: Unification of the inflation and of the cosmic acceleration*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 123512 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0307288];
- [6] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Cosmology with a time variable cosmological ‘constant’*, *Astrophys. J.* **325**, L17 (1988);
C. Wetterich, *Cosmology and the Fate of Dilatation Symmetry*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302**, 668 (1988);
I. Zlatev, L. M. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, *Quintessence, Cosmic Coincidence, and the Cosmological Constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9807002].
- [7] E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, D. Saez and V. Faraoni, *Reconstructing the universe history, from inflation to acceleration, with phantom and canonical scalar fields*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 106005 (2008) [arXiv:0803.1311 [hep-th]].
- [8] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and M. Sasaki, *Gauss-Bonnet dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123509 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0504052];
B. M. N. Carter and I. P. Neupane, *Dynamical relaxation of dark energy: Solution to both the inflation and the cosmological constant*, *Phys. Lett. B* **638**, 94 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0510109];
B. M. N. Carter and I. P. Neupane, *Towards inflation and dark energy cosmologies from modified Gauss-Bonnet theory*, *JCAP* **0606**, 004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0512262];
I. P. Neupane, *Towards inflation and accelerating cosmologies in string-generated gravity models*, arXiv:hep-th/0605265;
S. Tsujikawa and M. Sami, *String-inspired cosmology: Late time transition from scaling matter era to dark energy universe caused by a Gauss-Bonnet coupling*, *JCAP* **0701**, 006 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0608178].
- [9] I. P. Neupane, *On compatibility of string effective action with an accelerating universe*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 7493 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0602097].
- [10] M. Li, *A model of holographic dark energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **603**, 1 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0403127];
H. Wei and R. G. Cai, *A New Model of Agegraphic Dark Energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 113 (2008) [arXiv:0708.0884 [astro-ph]];

- I. P. Neupane, *Remarks on Dynamical Dark Energy Measured by the Conformal Age of the Universe*, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 123006 (2007) [arXiv:0709.3096 [hep-th]];
- I. P. Neupane, *A Note on Agegraphic Dark Energy*, arXiv:0708.2910 [hep-th] (to appear in Phys. Lett. B).
- [11] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, *Accelerated universe from gravity leaking to extra dimensions*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044023 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0105068].
- [12] P. K. Townsend and M. N. R. Wohlfarth, *Accelerating cosmologies from compactification*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 061302 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0303097];
 C. M. Chen, P. M. Ho, I. P. Neupane and J. E. Wang, *A note on acceleration from product space compactification*, JHEP **0307**, 017 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0304177];
 I. P. Neupane, *Accelerating cosmologies from exponential potentials*, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 4383 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0311071].
- [13] I. P. Neupane, *Simple cosmological de Sitter solutions on $dS_4 \times Y_6$ spaces*, arXiv:0901.2568 [hep-th].
- [14] D. L. Wiltshire, *Exact solution to the averaging problem in cosmology*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 251101 (2007) [arXiv:0709.0732 [gr-qc]];
 D. L. Wiltshire, *Dark energy without dark energy*, arXiv:0712.3984 [astro-ph].
- [15] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *The cosmological constant and dark energy*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 559 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0207347];
 U. Alam, V. Sahni, T. D. Saini and A. A. Starobinsky, *Is there Supernova Evidence for Dark Energy Metamorphosis?*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **354**, 275 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0311364];
 V. Sahni, *Dark matter and dark energy*, Lect. Notes Phys. **653** (2004) 141 [arXiv:astro-ph/0403324];
 E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, *Dynamics of dark energy*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0603057];
 M. Sami, *Dark energy and possible alternatives*, arXiv:0901.0756 [hep-th].
- [16] S. Weinberg, *The cosmological constant problem*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989);
 V. Sahni, *The cosmological constant problem and quintessence*, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 3435 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0202076];
 T. Padmanabhan, *Cosmological constant: The weight of the vacuum*, Phys. Rept. **380**, 235 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0212290].
- [17] I. P. Neupane, *Reconstructing a model of quintessential inflation*, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 125013 (2008) [arXiv:0706.2654 [hep-th]].
- [18] E. Komatsu *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], *Five-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Interpretation*, arXiv:0803.0547 [astro-ph].
- [19] D. J. Eisenstein *et al.* [SDSS Collaboration], *Detection of the Baryon Acoustic Peak in the Large-Scale Correlation Function of SDSS Luminous Red Galaxies*, Astrophys. J. **633**, 560 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0501171].
- [20] A. G. Riess *et al.*, *New Hubble Space Telescope Discoveries of Type Ia Supernovae at $z > 1$: Narrowing Constraints on the Early Behavior of Dark Energy*, Astrophys. J. **659**, 98 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0611572].
- [21] P. Astier *et al.* [The SNLS Collaboration], *The Supernova Legacy Survey: Measurement of Ω_M , Ω_Λ and w from the First Year Data Set*, Astron. Astrophys. **447**, 31 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0510447].
- [22] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, *Mach's principle and a relativistic theory of gravitation*, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).

- [23] Y. M. Cho, *Reinterpretation of Jordan-Brans-Dicke theory and Kaluza-Klein cosmology*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3133 (1992);
Y. M. Cho and J. H. Kim, *Dilatonic dark matter and its experimental detection*, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 023504 (2009) [arXiv:0711.2858 [gr-qc]].
- [24] T. Damour, G. W. Gibbons and C. Gundlach, *Dark matter, time varying G, and a dilaton field*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 123.
- [25] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese, *Tensor-scalar gravity and binary-pulsar experiments*, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1474 (1996) [arXiv:gr-qc/9602056].
- [26] B. M. Leith and I. P. Neupane, *Gauss-Bonnet cosmologies: crossing the phantom divide and the transition from matter dominance to dark energy*, JCAP **0705**, 019 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0702002];
I. P. Neupane, *Constraints on Gauss-Bonnet Cosmologies*, arXiv:0711.3234 [hep-th].
- [27] R. Bean, E. E. Flanagan, I. Laszlo and M. Trodden, *Constraining interactions in cosmology's dark sector*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123514 (2008) [arXiv:0808.1105 [astro-ph]];
M. B. Gavela, D. Hernandez, L. L. Honorez, O. Mena and S. Rigolin, *Dark coupling*, arXiv:0901.1611 [astro-ph].
- [28] I. P. Neupane and C. Scherer, *Inflation and Quintessence: Theoretical Approach of Cosmological Reconstruction*, JCAP **0805**, 009 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2468 [astro-ph]].
- [29] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Accelerating universes with scaling dark matter*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **10**, 213 (2001) [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008];
E. V. Linder, *Exploring the expansion history of the universe*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 091301 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512].
- [30] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and A. A. Starobinsky, *Two new diagnostics of dark energy*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 103502 (2008) [arXiv:0807.3548 [astro-ph]].
- [31] C. Cattoen and M. Visser, *Cosmographic Hubble fits to the supernova data*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 063501 (2008) [arXiv:0809.0537 [gr-qc]].
- [32] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, John Wiley and Sons, United State, 1972.
- [33] O. Lahav, P. B. Lilje, J. R. Primack and M. J. Rees, *Dynamical effects of the cosmological constant*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **251**, 128 (1991).
- [34] L. Guzzo *et al.*, *A test of the nature of cosmic acceleration using galaxy redshift distortions*, Nature **451** (2008) 541 [arXiv:0802.1944 [astro-ph]].
- [35] L. Amendola, *Linear and non-linear perturbations in dark energy models*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 103524 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0311175].
- [36] T. Damour and K. Nordtvedt, *Tensor - scalar cosmological models and their relaxation toward general relativity*, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3436 (1993).
- [37] T. Damour, F. Piazza and G. Veneziano, *Runaway dilaton and equivalence principle violations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 081601 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0204094].
- [38] T. Chiba, T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. Yokoyama, *Time variation of proton-electron mass ratio and fine structure constant with runaway dilaton*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 043516 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0610027].
- [39] S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *The limits of extended quintessence*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 023517 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0611238];
S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Testing LCDM with the Growth Function: Current Constraints*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 023504 (2008) [arXiv:0710.1092 [astro-ph]].

- [40] C. Di Porto and L. Amendola, *Observational constraints on the linear fluctuation growth rate*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 083508 (2008) [arXiv:0707.2686 [astro-ph]].
- [41] I. Antoniadis, J. Rizos and K. Tamvakis, *Singularity - free cosmological solutions of the superstring effective action*, Nucl. Phys. B **415**, 497 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9305025].
- [42] M. Gasperini, F. Piazza and G. Veneziano, *Quintessence as a runaway dilaton*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 023508 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0108016].
- [43] T. Barreiro, B. de Carlos and E. J. Copeland, *Stabilizing the Dilaton in Superstring Cosmology*, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 083513 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805005].
- [44] B. Boisseau, G. Esposito-Farese, D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky, *Reconstruction of a scalar-tensor theory of gravity in an accelerating universe*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2236 (2000) [arXiv:gr-qc/0001066];
C. Armendariz-Picon, V. F. Mukhanov and P. J. Steinhardt, *Essentials of k-essence*, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 103510 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0006373].
- [45] V. Sahni and A. Starobinsky, *Reconstructing Dark Energy*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 2105 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0610026].
- [46] R. J. Scherrer and A. A. Sen, *Thawing quintessence with a nearly flat potential*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 083515 (2008) [arXiv:0712.3450 [astro-ph]];
R. J. Scherrer and A. A. Sen, *Phantom Dark Energy Models with a Nearly Flat Potential*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 067303 (2008) [arXiv:0808.1880 [astro-ph]];
S. Dutta and R. J. Scherrer, *Hilltop Quintessence*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123525 (2008) [arXiv:0809.4441 [astro-ph]].
- [47] L. Samushia and B. Ratra, *Constraints on Dark Energy from Galaxy Cluster Gas Mass Fraction versus Redshift data*, Astrophys. J. **680**, L1 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3775 [astro-ph]].
- [48] H. Wei, *Growth Index of DGP Model and Current Growth Rate Data*, Phys. Lett. B **664**, 1 (2008) [arXiv:0802.4122 [astro-ph]];
H. Wei and S. N. Zhang, *How to Distinguish Dark Energy and Modified Gravity?*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 023011 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3292 [astro-ph]].
- [49] U. Alam, V. Sahni and A. A. Starobinsky, *Reconstructing Cosmological Matter Perturbations using Standard Candles and Rulers*, arXiv:0812.2846 [astro-ph].
- [50] A. Melchiorri, L. Pagano and S. Pandolfi, *When Did Cosmic Acceleration Start?*, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 041301 (2007) [arXiv:0706.1314 [astro-ph]].