

Dark Energy from Eternal Pair-production of Fermions

Jiro Hashiba

We study a toy model in which Majorana or Dirac fermions behave as the source for a small vacuum energy in the present Universe. In the model, a self-interacting scalar boson coupled with fermions induces attractive and repulsive interactions between the fermions simultaneously. These interactions allow for the existence of a metastable state with positive energy density comprised of fermions degenerate inside a Fermi surface. The energy density of the metastable state remains constant as the Universe expands. This is because pair-productions of fermions from the vacuum continuously take place at no energy cost and keep supplying fermions uniformly to the Universe. The observed vacuum energy density $\sim 10^{-47}$ GeV⁴ is reproduced for the fermion and scalar mass of the order 10^{-3} eV.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1998, a couple of independent research groups announced their groundbreaking discoveries in particle physics and astrophysics. One was the neutrino oscillation, which showed that neutrinos had mass [1]. The other was the accelerating expansion of the Universe [2]. A non-vanishing cosmological constant is the simplest explanation of this observation. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that the accelerating expansion is caused by a form of dynamically generated energy, which is now dubbed *dark energy* [3]. The year of announcement was not the only coincidence of these discoveries. If the dark energy arises from a zero-point energy inherent in quantum field theory, its density is expected to take a value $\sim M_P^4$, where M_P is the Planck scale. However, the quartic root of the observed dark energy density is of the order 10^{-3} eV [4], which is not far from the upper bound of active neutrino mass ~ 2 eV [5]. Motivated by this mass scale similarity, some researchers have attempted to explain the connection between the dark energy and neutrinos. Among such researches are models based on mass varying neutrino (MaVaN) [6–8], neutrino condensate [9, 10], and the vacuum condensate of neutrino mixing [11]. In addition, the author of [12] has recently presented a qualitative argument that, if the space is filled with “dark energy particles” with mass $\sim 10^{-3}$ eV, the pair-production of such particles leads to an accelerated expansion of the Universe. In this article, we propose a specific model in which the vacuum energy originates from non-trivial dynamics of fermions induced by a scalar field. It is shown that, similarly to the existing literature, the energy scale of the dark energy can be explained if the fermion has mass comparable to that of active neutrinos. However, as shown in the article, the fermion in the model cannot be identified with active neutrinos, but possibly with a fermion which has not yet been discovered.

II. THE MODEL

We assume a homogeneous and isotropic Universe described by the Robertson-Walker metric with the cosmic

scale factor a . The matter sector consists of a Majorana fermion ψ and a real scalar ϕ . We only consider the case where ψ is a Majorana spinor in this article, but our model also works for the case of Dirac fermion. The fermion and the scalar interact with each other through a Yukawa coupling. The Lagrangian of the model is given by

$$L \equiv \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi} (i\cancel{\partial} - m) \psi - \frac{g}{2} \phi \bar{\psi} \psi + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4} \phi^4 \right], \quad (1)$$

where ψ satisfies the Majorana condition $\psi = \psi^c \equiv C\bar{\psi}^T$, with $C \equiv -i\gamma^2\gamma^0$ being the charge conjugation matrix. We do not include the cubic term of ϕ in (1) for simplicity, although L has no symmetry that precludes the cubic term. There exist four model parameters: fermion mass m , scalar mass m_ϕ , Yukawa coupling g , and scalar self-coupling $\lambda > 0$.

We impose two key assumptions on the system described by the Lagrangian (1) as follows.

Assumption 1:

The Lagrangian (1) implicitly contains the counter terms which cancel out divergent terms depending on some cutoff scale, say, the Planck scale M_P .

Assumption 2:

The system is in thermodynamic equilibrium. In addition, the temperature T and the entropy S of the system are sufficiently small, to the extent that TS is much smaller than the internal energy U of the metastable state discussed later.

Among the above assumptions, a few comments on Assumption 1 are in order. A zero-point energy is an example of the divergent terms supposed in Assumption 1. In this article, we assume that the vacuum energy is generated by a combination of two mechanisms. First, some unknown mechanism like supersymmetry fixes the zero-point energy exactly at zero, which otherwise is expected to take a value $\sim M_P^2$. The first mechanism is followed by a second one that lifts the vacuum energy from zero to the observed tiny level of $(10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4$. Our

goal is to present the second mechanism, while the first one is beyond the scope of this article.

In the following, we derive an effective Lagrangian for ψ by integrating out high energy modes of ϕ . Assuming that ϕ is time-independent, we write down the equation of motion of ϕ as

$$\frac{g}{2}\bar{\psi}\psi + (-\nabla^2 + m_\phi^2)\phi + \lambda\phi^3 = 0. \quad (2)$$

By treating the Laplacian ∇^2 as if it is just a numerical coefficient, we can formally solve (2) for ϕ as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \phi_0(\bar{\psi}\psi/2), \\ \phi_0(z) &\equiv \left[\sqrt{\left(\frac{-\nabla^2 + m_\phi^2}{3\lambda}\right)^3 + \left(\frac{gz}{2\lambda}\right)^2} - \frac{gz}{2\lambda} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ &\quad - \left[\sqrt{\left(\frac{-\nabla^2 + m_\phi^2}{3\lambda}\right)^3 + \left(\frac{gz}{2\lambda}\right)^2} + \frac{gz}{2\lambda} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The formula (3) is a closed form expression for the formal power series expansion of the solution to (2) in terms of $\bar{\psi}\psi/2$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= -g \int d^3y \Delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \frac{(\bar{\psi}\psi)(\mathbf{y})}{2} \\ &\quad + \lambda g^3 \int d^3y \Delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \left[\int d^3z \Delta(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}) \frac{(\bar{\psi}\psi)(\mathbf{z})}{2} \right]^3 \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}((\bar{\psi}\psi/2)^5), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we defined the propagator, or the Yukawa potential, by

$$\Delta(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}}}{|\mathbf{p}|^2 + m_\phi^2} = \frac{e^{-m_\phi|\mathbf{x}|}}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}|}. \quad (5)$$

Note that $\phi_0(\cdot)$ is a non-local functional of $\bar{\psi}\psi/2$, which depends on spatial coordinates in general. However, we can let $\phi_0(\cdot)$ be an ordinary function by setting $\nabla^2 = 0$ in (3), when $\bar{\psi}\psi/2$ is a constant. By replacing ϕ in (1) with ϕ_0 , we obtain an effective Lagrangian for ψ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{eff}} &\equiv \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}(i\partial - m)\psi - g\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) \frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2}\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) (-\nabla^2 + m_\phi^2)\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right)^4 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &\equiv \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}(-i\boldsymbol{\gamma}\cdot\nabla + m)\psi + g\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) \frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) (-\nabla^2 + m_\phi^2)\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi_0 \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2}\right)^4 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let V be the spatial volume of the system. We expand the field ψ by discrete momentum \mathbf{p} as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{p},\sigma} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_{|\mathbf{p}|}V}} \left[u(\mathbf{p},\sigma)e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} a(\mathbf{p},\sigma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + v(\mathbf{p},\sigma)e^{-i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p},\sigma) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\omega_p \equiv \sqrt{p^2 + m^2}$ and $a^\dagger(\mathbf{p},\sigma)$ (resp. $a(\mathbf{p},\sigma)$) is the creation (resp. annihilation) operator of the fermion with momentum \mathbf{p} and spin index σ ¹. The creation and annihilation operators are normalized so that they satisfy the anti-commutation relation $\{a(\mathbf{p},\sigma), a^\dagger(\mathbf{q},\sigma')\} = \delta_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\delta_{\sigma,\sigma'}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the Fock space constructed by multiplying creation operators on the vacuum $|0\rangle$ which satisfies $a(\mathbf{p},\sigma)|0\rangle = 0$. Then, the internal energy U of the system is

$$U = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \ln \left(\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} e^{-\beta\hat{H}} \right), \quad (9)$$

where $\beta \equiv 1/T$ is the inverse temperature. If the temperature T is sufficiently low as stated in Assumption 2, U is dominated by the ground state in \mathcal{H} . In other words, the information about the local minima of \hat{H} is lost, if we sum over all states in (9). However, the dark energy might correspond to a local minimum of \hat{H} , not to the global minimum². Therefore, we shall not calculate U , but attempt to search for local minima of \hat{H} . Since it is impossible to exhaust all states in \mathcal{H} when looking for the local minima, we restrict ourselves to a subspace \mathcal{H}' of \mathcal{H} defined by

$$\mathcal{H}' \equiv \left\{ |\Lambda\rangle = \left[\prod_{|\mathbf{p}|\leq\Lambda, \sigma=\pm} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p},\sigma) \right] |0\rangle \mid \Lambda \in \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

As in (10), it is natural to consider only the rotationally symmetric states where fermions are degenerate in all

¹ In the remainder of the article, we often use the vector notation for creation and annihilation operators like $a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger = (a^\dagger(\mathbf{p},+), a^\dagger(\mathbf{p},-))^T$ to simplify some formulas.

² Here, by the global or local minimum of \hat{H} , we mean taking the extrema of $\langle\Psi|\hat{H}|\Psi\rangle$ with respect to $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. For instance, the state $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi_0\rangle$ that minimizes $\langle\Psi|\hat{H}|\Psi\rangle$ is the ground state of \hat{H} , as derived from the variational principle.

states with $|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda$ for some positive Λ in an isotropic Universe.

To find local minima of \hat{H} , we simplify \hat{H} with a mean field approximation. Specifically, we expand \hat{H} by fermion bilinear terms $\bar{\psi}\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi$ and $\bar{\psi}\psi$ around their expectation values conditional on the state $|\Lambda\rangle$, and discard the second and higher order terms. Let $\rho(\Lambda)V$ be the zeroth order term, where $\rho(\Lambda)$ equals the energy density $\langle \Lambda | \hat{H} | \Lambda \rangle / V$ under the mean field approximation. Then, \hat{H} is expressed as

$$\hat{H} \simeq \rho(\Lambda)V + \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_I, \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_I$ is the first order term. We explain how to decompose the first order term into \hat{H}_0 and \hat{H}_I later.

Let us first calculate the energy density $\rho(\Lambda)$. The expectation value of the kinetic energy density in (7) is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} K(\Lambda) &\equiv \left\langle \Lambda \left| \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi} (-i\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} + m) \psi \right| \Lambda \right\rangle \\ &= 2 \int_{|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \omega_{|\mathbf{p}|} \\ &= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\omega_\Lambda \Lambda (m^2 + 2\Lambda^2) + m^4 \ln \left(\frac{\omega_\Lambda - \Lambda}{m} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We also define the fermionic condensate

$$\begin{aligned} W(\Lambda) &\equiv \left\langle \Lambda \left| \frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2} \right| \Lambda \right\rangle \\ &= 2 \int_{|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m}{\omega_{|\mathbf{p}|}} \\ &= \frac{m}{2\pi^2} \left[\omega_\Lambda \Lambda + m^2 \ln \left(\frac{\omega_\Lambda - \Lambda}{m} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Lambda) &= K(\Lambda) + P(W(\Lambda)) \\ P(w) &\equiv g\phi_0(w)w + \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi_0(w)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi_0(w)^4, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

using (7). When computing $K(\Lambda)$ and $W(\Lambda)$ above, we dropped the terms that diverge without cutoff, following Assumption 1. The equalities $K(0) = W(0) = 0$ derived from Assumption 1 in turn ensure that $\rho(\Lambda = 0) = 0$. Thus, Assumption 1 can be rephrased as the postulate that the vacuum energy in the absence of fermions exactly vanishes.

Next, we calculate the first order term in \hat{H} . Let Λ_0 be the value of Λ such that $\rho(\Lambda_0)$ is a local minimum of $\rho(\Lambda)$ if it exists. For $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$, the expansion of the Hamiltonian by fermion bilinears up to the first order

has a simple form,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &\simeq \rho(\Lambda_0)V + \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi} (-i\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} + m) \psi - K(\Lambda_0) \right] \\ &\quad + g\phi_0(W(\Lambda_0)) \int d^3x \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}\psi}{2} - W(\Lambda_0) \right) \\ &= \rho(\Lambda_0)V + \sum_{|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0} E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger + \sum_{|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0} E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \cdot a_{\mathbf{p}} \\ &\quad - g \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{\phi_0(W(\Lambda_0)) |\mathbf{p}|}{2\omega_{|\mathbf{p}|}} \left(a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \cdot M a_{-\mathbf{p}}^\dagger + a_{-\mathbf{p}} \cdot M^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we defined $M \equiv (p_i \cdot \sigma_i)(i\sigma_2)/|\mathbf{p}|$ using the Pauli matrices σ_i and

$$E_p \equiv \left| \omega_p + g\phi_0(W(\Lambda_0)) \frac{m}{\omega_p} \right| = \omega_p \left| 1 - \left(\frac{\omega_{\Lambda_0}}{\omega_p} \right)^2 \right|. \quad (16)$$

In (16), we used the extremality condition

$$\rho'(\Lambda_0) = \frac{\Lambda_0^2}{\pi^2} \left[\omega_{\Lambda_0} + g\phi_0(W(\Lambda_0)) \frac{m}{\omega_{\Lambda_0}} \right] = 0. \quad (17)$$

Finally, we decompose the first order part of (15) into \hat{H}_0 and \hat{H}_I . We wish to define \hat{H}_0 and \hat{H}_I so that they give a free Hamiltonian and interaction part of \hat{H} , respectively. Such a definition is naturally given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_0 &\equiv \sum_{|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0} E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger + \sum_{|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0} E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \cdot a_{\mathbf{p}}, \\ \hat{H}_I &\equiv \frac{\omega_{\Lambda_0}^2}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{2\omega_{|\mathbf{p}|}} \left(a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \cdot M a_{-\mathbf{p}}^\dagger + a_{-\mathbf{p}} \cdot M^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since all particle states with $|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0$ are occupied in $|\Lambda_0\rangle$, excited states are obtained by applying $a_{\mathbf{p}}$ with $|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0$ or $a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger$ with $|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0$ on $|\Lambda_0\rangle$. We refer to these excitations as ‘‘excited particles’’ if $|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0$, or ‘‘holes’’ if $|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0$. As (18) indicates, $E_p \geq 0$ describes the dispersion relation of the excited particles and holes. The interaction part \hat{H}_I contains pair-creation and pair-annihilation interactions of fermions.

III. METASTABLE STATE AND DARK ENERGY

Let us investigate if there exists a positive local minimum of $\rho(\Lambda)$, which is a potential candidate for the dark energy. All possible parameter space will not be exhaustively searched, but we just attempt to find a parameter region which is consistent with the observation of the vacuum energy density. We consider only the case $g = 3$ and $\lambda = 0.01$ as an illustrative example of the model. As depicted in FIG. 1, a local minimum exists for a range of model parameters. If we demand $\rho(\Lambda_0) = (10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4$, the fermion mass takes values $m = (2.0 \times 10^{-3} - 3.7 \times 10^{-3}) \text{ eV}$ for $m/m_\phi = 2.0 - 2.05$.




FIG. 1. Functional dependence of $\rho(\Lambda)$ on $\Lambda \in [0, 8m_\phi]$ for $g = 3$ and $\lambda = 0.01$. The horizontal and vertical axis stands for Λ/m_ϕ and $\rho(\Lambda)/m_\phi^4$, respectively. The graphs for five representative values of $m/m_\phi \in [1.9, 2.1]$ are shown. A positive local minimum exists at least for $2.0 \leq m/m_\phi \leq 2.05$.

In principle, there exists no upper bound for m , since $\rho(\Lambda_0)/m_\phi^4$ can be made arbitrarily small if we appropriately adjust m/m_ϕ , as FIG. 1 indicates. However, more fine-tuning of m/m_ϕ is necessary to obtain larger values of m consistent with $\rho(\Lambda_0) = (10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4$. From now on, the sphere in the momentum space defined by $|\mathbf{p}| = \Lambda_0$ is referred to as the Fermi surface.

A physical explanation of the reason why $\rho(\Lambda)$ has a local minimum is as follows. If Λ is sufficiently small, $\rho(\Lambda)$ is approximated by

$$\rho(\Lambda) = K(\Lambda) - \frac{g^2}{2m_\phi^2} W(\Lambda)^2, \quad (19)$$

as derived from (4) and (14). The second term of the r.h.s. of (19) is an attractive potential between fermions induced by one scalar exchange. As Λ increases and the decrease in the negative attractive potential dominates the increase in $K(\Lambda)$, $\rho(\Lambda)$ begins decreasing at its local maximum shown in FIG. 1. However, as Λ increases further, the higher order terms in $V(W(\Lambda))$ contributes to $\rho(\Lambda)$ by a positive amount. This positive contribution by $V(W(\Lambda))$ is regarded as a repulsive interaction between fermions. Because of this repulsive potential, $\rho(\Lambda)$ begins increasing again. In summary, at the local minimum $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$, the increase in the kinetic energy plus repulsive potential exactly balances the decrease in the attractive potential, when a small number of fermions are added on the Fermi surface.

So far, we have only found that there exists a parameter range in which the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ is metastable along the subspace \mathcal{H}' of \mathcal{H} . However, it is also possible to show that the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ is metastable along the directions in \mathcal{H} not parallel to \mathcal{H}' . The remainder of this section is devoted to showing this statement.

Let us consider an excited particle state $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle \equiv a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|\Lambda_0\rangle$ with $|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0$, but not $|\mathbf{p}| \gg \Lambda_0$. This

state has an excitation energy $E_{|\mathbf{p}|}$, as can be seen from (18). Note that the excitation energy $E_{|\mathbf{p}|}$ vanishes at the Fermi surface $|\mathbf{p}| = \Lambda_0$. Therefore, the excited particle exhibits tachyon-like behavior and decays into many fermions with nearly vanishing energy as follows. Because $E_{\Lambda_0} = 0$, there must exist a state

$$|n, \Lambda_0\rangle \equiv \prod_{|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0, \sigma} a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)^{n_{\mathbf{p}, \sigma}} \prod_{|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0, \sigma} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)^{n_{\mathbf{p}, \sigma}} |\Lambda_0\rangle \quad (20)$$

which has the same four-momentum and spin as those of $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$, and satisfies $n_{\mathbf{p}, \sigma} = 1$ only if $\Lambda_0 - \delta\Lambda_0 < |\mathbf{p}| < \Lambda_0 + \delta\Lambda_0$ with a small $\delta\Lambda_0$. Recall that the Yukawa coupling of the fermion with high energy modes of the scalar has been ignored by integrating out the time-dependent component of ϕ in (1). Through such a coupling, the state $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$ immediately transition to the multi-particle state $|n, \Lambda_0\rangle$. In a similar way, the state $a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|\Lambda_0\rangle$ corresponding to a hole with $|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0$ instantaneously decays into a state of the form $|n, \Lambda_0\rangle$. Since the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ has a macroscopically large number of fermions, it is almost impossible to distinguish $|n, \Lambda_0\rangle$ from $|\Lambda_0\rangle$. Thus, we conclude that excited particles and holes are unstable and eventually transition to a state which is virtually identical with $|\Lambda_0\rangle$.

IV. ETERNAL PAIR-PRODUCTION OF FERMIONS IN THE EXPANDING UNIVERSE

It is straightforward to show that the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ satisfies the equation of state $w \equiv p/\rho \simeq -1$ consistent with the latest observation [4], where p is the pressure of the system. The internal energy U is written as $U = TS - pV + \mu N$, where μ is the chemical potential and N is the number of fermions in $|\Lambda_0\rangle$. Since N is not conserved, $\mu = 0$ at chemical equilibrium. Hence $\rho + p = (U + pV)/V \simeq 0$ follows from Assumption 2. As a result, the energy density of the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ depends on the scale factor a of the Universe as $\rho(\Lambda_0) \propto a^{-3(w+1)} = a^0$. However, it might sound strange that the energy density of particles does not vary as the Universe expands. In fact, the energy density of free relativistic (resp. non-relativistic) particles is diluted as $\rho \propto a^{-4}$ (resp. $\rho \propto a^{-3}$) as a increases.

To understand why $\rho(\Lambda_0)$ remains constant, suppose that the scale factor a increases by a small amount δa . Then, the state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ is red-shifted to $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$, with $\Delta\Lambda = (\delta a/a)\Lambda_0$. Now we can show that the state $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ is unstable and transitions to the state $|\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle$, as follows. The excitation energy of the state $a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ relative to $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ can be read off from the commutation relation

$$[\hat{H}_0, a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)] = \begin{cases} -E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) & (|\mathbf{p}| \leq \Lambda_0) \\ E_{|\mathbf{p}|} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) & (|\mathbf{p}| > \Lambda_0) \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Note that $E_p \simeq (2\Lambda_0/\omega_{\Lambda_0})|p - \Lambda_0|$ for $p \simeq \Lambda_0$, from (16). Therefore, the fermions with $\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda < |\mathbf{p}| < \Lambda_0$ have




FIG. 2. The transition process from $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ to $|\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle$. Straight and dotted lines stand for the fermion ψ and scalar propagator $\Delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$, respectively. This process is kinematically allowed, since the kinetic energy of the pair-produced fermions (red straight lines) is exactly canceled by the negative potential energy generated by the fermions in $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$.

negative energy $-E_{|\mathbf{p}|}$, which is canceled by the positive energy $E_{2\Lambda_0 - |\mathbf{p}|} = E_{|\mathbf{p}|}$ of the fermions with momentum $2\Lambda_0 - |\mathbf{p}| \in [\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda]$. This implies that the state $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ immediately decays into $|\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ through the pair-production of fermions with momentum \mathbf{p} in the interval $[\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda, \Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda]$. The fact that the transition $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle \rightarrow |\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ is possible is attributed to the equality $E_{|\mathbf{p}|} \simeq 0$ in the vicinity of the Fermi surface, which follows from $\rho'(\Lambda_0) = 0$. The negative term $g\phi_0(W(\Lambda_0))(m/\omega_{\Lambda_0})$ in (17) is the potential energy felt by one fermion in the background of other fermions. Therefore, the condition $\rho'(\Lambda_0) = 0$ given by (17) indicates that the kinetic energy ω_{Λ_0} of an excited particle on the Fermi surface is canceled by the negative potential energy generated by the particles in $|\Lambda_0\rangle$.

We depict a Feynman diagram for the transition process $|\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle \rightarrow |\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle$ in FIG. 2. The pair-production of fermions ψ occurs via the interaction \hat{H}_I . Therefore, after the states with momentum $|\mathbf{p}| \in [\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda, \Lambda_0]$ become unoccupied due to red-shift, other fermions instantaneously fill up the states with momentum $|\mathbf{p}| \in [\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda, \Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda]$. Then, Λ is red-shifted again from $\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda$ to $\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda$. The process of red-shift followed by fermion pair-production never terminates as long as the Universe expands. As a consequence, $|\Lambda\rangle$ fluctuates around the Fermi surface with a small amplitude $\Delta\Lambda$, as if no red-shift occurs. The fluctuation amplitude $\Delta\Lambda$ must be evaluated by a careful analysis involving the Hubble parameter $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ and the transition amplitude of $|\Lambda_0 + \Delta\Lambda\rangle \rightarrow |\Lambda_0 - \Delta\Lambda\rangle$. However, we may conclude that $\Delta\Lambda$ is sufficiently small even without such an analysis, since the expansion rate of the present Universe, $H_0 \equiv \sqrt{\rho(\Lambda_0)}/3M_P^2 \sim 10^{-33}$ eV, is extremely smaller than the characteristic scale of the model $\sim 10^{-3}$ eV.

V. FATE OF METASTABLE DARK ENERGY

In this section, we evaluate the probability of the metastable state $|\Lambda_0\rangle$ penetrating the potential barrier and migrating to the true vacuum $|0\rangle$. The decay rate of a false vacuum in a scalar field theory has been calculated by Coleman and Callan in [13]. We first briefly review the methodology presented in [13], and then apply that methodology to our model.

The authors of [13] considered the Euclidean action for a real scalar field φ ,

$$S_\varphi = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\tau} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla\varphi|^2 + U(\varphi) \right], \quad (22)$$

where $U(\varphi)$ is a potential with the global minimum at $\varphi = \varphi_-$ and a local minimum $\varphi = \varphi_+$ separated by a potential barrier. It is assumed that the local minimum is zero, namely $U(\varphi_+) = 0$. The global and local minima correspond to the true and a false vacuum of the system, respectively. Let us define a radial coordinate $r \equiv (\tau^2 + |\mathbf{x}|^2)^{1/2}$. The equation of motion derived from the action S_φ admits a $O(4)$ symmetric solution $\bar{\varphi}(r)$ with the boundary condition

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\varphi}(r) = \varphi_+, \quad \left. \frac{\partial\bar{\varphi}(r)}{\partial r} \right|_{r=0} = 0. \quad (23)$$

In addition to the trivial solution $\bar{\varphi}(r) = \varphi_+$, there is a non-trivial solution corresponding to the vacuum transition from φ_+ to φ_- . Such a solution is referred to as the ‘‘bounce solution’’. We define ‘‘the bounce action’’ B by the value of the action S_φ under the bounce solution $\varphi = \bar{\varphi}$, as

$$B \equiv 2\pi^2 \int_0^\infty r^3 dr \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial\bar{\varphi}}{\partial r} \right)^2 + U(\bar{\varphi}) \right]. \quad (24)$$

The decay rate of the false vacuum per unit volume is then given by

$$\Gamma/V \sim A \exp(-B), \quad (25)$$

where A is a quantity with dimension $[\text{mass}]^4$ that depends on the detail of the model.

For a specific form of the potential $U(\varphi)$, an analytic expression for B can be obtained. An example of such potential is

$$U(\varphi) = \frac{\kappa}{4} \varphi^2 (\varphi + 2b)^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2b} (\varphi + 2b), \quad (26)$$

where κ , b , and ϵ are positive constants. If ϵ is sufficiently small, $\varphi_- \simeq 0$ and $\varphi_+ \simeq -2b$. An approximate expression for the bounce action under small ϵ has been calculated in [13] as

$$B \simeq \frac{2\pi^2 \kappa^2 b^{12}}{3\epsilon^3}. \quad (27)$$

Next, let us utilize the above methodology to estimate the tunneling probability of our model. To this end, we have to return to the Lagrangian L in (1) and integrate out the fermion ψ , to obtain a model that contains only the scalar ϕ . Since L is bilinear in terms of ψ , it is possible to exactly carry out the functional integration with respect to ψ . However, such a naive integration is inappropriate for our current purpose, as we will see now. The effective action for ϕ obtained by the path integral $\int[\mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}\mathcal{D}\psi]\exp(i\int dtL)$ contains the term

$$\ln \text{Det} \left[\frac{1}{2}(i\cancel{\partial} - m) - \frac{g}{2}\phi \right]. \quad (28)$$

The expansion of (28) in terms of ϕ gives the self-interaction terms of ϕ mediated by the virtual fermion circulating around an internal loop. In other words, fermions only appear as unobservable virtual particles in the system under consideration. However, as revealed in the preceding sections, the Universe in the metastable state is filled with observable *on-shell* fermions, not with intermediate off-shell fermions. Therefore, the exact functional integration does not properly describes the dark energy predicted by our model.

To find a pure scalar field theory suitable for our goal, let us write down the Hamiltonian density $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ derived directly from L as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{H}} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\pi_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + V(\phi, \psi), \\ V(\phi, \psi) &\equiv \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}(-i\boldsymbol{\gamma}\cdot\nabla + m)\psi + \frac{g}{2}\phi\bar{\psi}\psi, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where π_ϕ is the conjugate momentum of ϕ . To appropriately eliminate ψ from $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, it is helpful to use a mean field approximation again. In the present case, we take the expectation value of $V(\phi, \psi)$ with the state $|\Lambda\rangle$ and minimize it with respect to Λ . The effective potential for ϕ defined this way is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) &\equiv \min_{\Lambda} \langle \Lambda | V(\phi, \psi) | \Lambda \rangle \\ &= \min_{\Lambda} [K(\Lambda) + g\phi W(\Lambda)] + \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The minimum condition in (30) reads

$$\Lambda^2 \left(\omega_\Lambda + g\phi \frac{m}{\omega_\Lambda} \right) = 0. \quad (31)$$

The solution to (31) that gives the minimum of (30) is given by $\Lambda = \Lambda_\phi \equiv \sqrt{m|g\phi + m|}$ for $\phi < -m/g$ and $\Lambda = 0$ for $\phi \geq -m/g$. As a consequence, we obtain

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \begin{cases} K(\Lambda_\phi) + g\phi W(\Lambda_\phi) + \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4 & (\phi < -m/g) \\ \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4 & (\phi \geq -m/g) \end{cases}. \quad (32)$$




FIG. 3. The scalar effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ for the same parameter range as that given in FIG. 1. At least for $2.0 \leq m/m_\phi \leq 2.05$, there is a positive local minimum corresponding to the dark energy, which is separated from the true vacuum at $\phi = 0$ by a potential barrier.

We depict the graphs of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ in FIG. 3 for the same parameter range as the one used for calculating $\rho(\Lambda)$ in FIG. 1. The functional dependence of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ on ϕ is similar to that of $\rho(\Lambda)$. In fact, all the global or local extrema of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ have the same value as those of $\rho(\Lambda)$. This is not accidental. In fact, $\rho(\Lambda)$ and $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ are obtained by minimizing the same function $\langle \Lambda | V(\phi, \psi) | \Lambda \rangle$ with ϕ and Λ , respectively (recall the expression of $\rho(\Lambda)$ in (14)). The local minimum of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ with $\phi < 0$ and $m/m_\phi \lesssim 2$ arises from the negative attractive potential between fermions. This implies that fermions are appropriately treated as observable particles (not virtual particles), in the definition (30) of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$.

Finally, let us calculate the tunneling probability in the case $m/m_\phi = 2.05$. Note that, in that case, $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ can be well approximated by a quartic polynomial $U(\varphi)$ in (26) with small ϵ . This rather bold approximation is admissible since our aim is just to obtain a rough estimate of the tunneling probability³. Let ϕ_m and $\phi_+ < 0$ be the value of ϕ that give the local maximum and minimum of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$, respectively. We determine κ , b , and ϵ by assuming that the following three values are the same between $U(\varphi)$ and $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$: 1) local maximum, 2) horizontal position of the local minimum, and 3) difference between the local maximum and minimum. Then, we obtain three equalities as follows:

$$\kappa b^4/4 \simeq V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_m), \quad -2b \simeq \phi_+, \quad \epsilon \simeq V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_+). \quad (33)$$

For $m/m_\phi = 2.05$, we have $\phi_m \simeq -3m_\phi$ and $\phi_+ \simeq -7m_\phi$. From a dimensional analysis, we make another bold assumption about the coefficient A as

$$A = CM^4, \quad (34)$$

³ Actually, $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ differs from $U(\phi)$ by a constant ϵ . This difference does not affect the evaluation of the tunneling probability.

where C is a constant not significantly different from unity and $M = 10^{-3}$ eV is the characteristic scale of the model. The tunneling probability we wish to compute is obtained by multiplying on Γ/V the age H_0^{-1} and the volume H_0^{-3} of the observable Universe. Hence, from (25), (27), (33), and (34), the tunneling probability is roughly evaluated as

$$\frac{A}{H_0^4} \exp(-B) \sim C \times 10^{-10^7}. \quad (35)$$

The extremely small probability (35) indicates that the dark energy is stable against vacuum decay at least for a period comparable to the present age of the Universe.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this article, we have proposed a simple model that explains the origin of dark energy with the dynamics of fermion and scalar. For a range of model parameters, a metastable state with positive energy density can exist. This metastable state, or a false vacuum, is stabilized by the attractive and repulsive interactions between fermions mediated by the scalar. *Eternally pair-produced fermions* are also responsible for the stability of the vacuum energy density against the cosmic expansion. We have confirmed, for a certain parameter set, that the metastable dark energy is expected to survive for a period

substantially longer than the age of the Universe. The observed value of the vacuum energy density is naturally explained if the fermion has mass of the order 10^{-3} eV, which is comparable to the current neutrino mass bound. However, active neutrinos cannot be the candidate for the fermion in the model, because the model does not allow for stable fermionic excitations of the metastable state. Instead, ψ might be a sterile neutrino, the existence of which the LSND anomaly [14] and MiniBooNE experiment [15] have hinted at, though the interpretation of these experimental results is still controversial.

Our model offers a novel scenario for generating the dark energy, but a couple of issues remain to be resolved. For instance, we have not evaluated the probability of the false vacuum ascending the potential barrier and falling down to the true vacuum through a thermal transition. Unless the temperature of the system is low enough, such a transition is possible. Moreover, it is a challenging problem to incorporate our toy model into the standard model (SM) in a way consistent with numerous observational constraints. For example, if the fermion ψ or scalar ϕ in our model are coupled with SM particles, high energy ψ particles are produced via such couplings. High energy fermions are dangerous because they immediately decay into a large number of fermions as explained in section III, and might destroy the potential barrier. Thus, the coupling between our model and SM must be highly suppressed. If the above issues are addressed, our model might be a promising solution to the problem of dark energy.

-
- [1] Y. Fukuda *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).
 [2] A. Riess *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter *et al.*, *ibid.* **517**, 565 (1999).
 [3] For a review of dark energy, see E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006).
 [4] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), arXiv:1807.06209.
 [5] C. Patrignani *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C **40**, 100001 (2016).
 [6] P. Q. Hung, hep-ph/0010126.
 [7] R. Fardon, A. E. Nelson, and N. Weiner, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. **2004**, 005 (2004); D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson, and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 091801 (2004).
 [8] R. D. Peccei, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 023527 (2005).
 [9] D. G. Caldi and A. Chodos, hep-ph/9903416.
 [10] J. R. Bhatt, B. R. Desai, E. Ma, G. Rajasekaran, and U. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B **687**, 75 (2010).
 [11] A. Capolupo, S. Capozziello, and G. Vitiello, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **23**, 4979 (2008).
 [12] M. J. Lake, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **883**, 012001 (2017).
 [13] S. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2929 (1977); C. G. Callan and S. Coleman, *ibid.* **16**, 1762 (1977).
 [14] C. Athanassopoulos *et al.* (LSND Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3082 (1996).
 [15] A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.* (The MiniBooNE Collaboration), arXiv:1805.12028.