Exploring some cosmological aspects of Kaniadakis entropy

Miguel Cruz¹, * Samuel Lepe², \dagger and Joel Saavedra², \dagger

¹Facultad de Física, Universidad Veracruzana 91097, Xalapa, Veracruz, México,

²Instituto de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Casilla 4950, Valparaíso, Chile.

(Dated: February 25, 2025)

Adopting the modifications induced by the Kaniadakis entropy on the Friedmann equations, we explore some relevant aspects of this cosmological scenario at the background level. We analyze the constraint imposed on the parameter K obtained from the accelerated cosmic expansion condition, and we also study the role of such a parameter as a cosmological constant.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of late-time cosmic acceleration remains one of the most intriguing challenges in modern cosmology. Although the Λ CDM model has been remarkably successful in describing observational data [1], fundamental questions about the nature of dark energy and cosmic expansion persist. In this sense, the intersection of gravity and thermodynamics has been a fertile ground for theoretical physics since Bekenstein and Hawking's groundbreaking work on black hole thermodynamics [2]. The gravity-thermodynamic conjecture, which suggests a deep connection between gravitational dynamics and thermodynamic principles, has provided valuable insights into the nature of spacetime and cosmic evolution; see, for instance, [3]. In recent years, exploring generalized entropy formulations [4] has opened new avenues to understand these connections, with the Kaniadakis entropy emerging as a particularly intriguing framework [5]. The Kaniadakis entropy formulation, which generalizes standard Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics while maintaining crucial mathematical and physical properties, has found successful applications in various physical systems exhibiting power-law behavior [6]. When applied to cosmological scenarios, especially in late-time evolution, this framework provides natural modifications to standard gravitational dynamics that could address current observational tensions without invoking exotic forms of matter or energy; see Ref. [7] as an example.

This letter focuses on the late-time cosmological implications of the Kaniadakis entropy formalism, and we examine the consequences of the modifications to the standard cosmological equations introduced by this entropy. Of particular interest is how this framework naturally incorporates features that could explain the observed acceleration without explicitly introducing a cosmological constant. The structure of the letter is as follows: In the next section, the generalities of the cosmological equations at the background level are described, we explore some conditions to have accelerated cosmic expansion in the model, and we end the section by exploring the identification of the Kaniadakis parameter as the cosmological constant. Finally, in section III, we give some final comments on our work.

II. COSMOLOGICAL MODEL

In this section, we provide some highlights of the cosmological model to consider in our analysis for a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) spacetime with null spatial curvature in the context of the apparent horizon description, $8\pi G = c = 1$ units will be used. The subscript zero will denote the evaluation of cosmological quantities at the present time. It is well-known that in the context of black holes physics, the Kaniadakis entropy (K) can be written in terms of the quarter area Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (BH), as follows

$$S_{\rm K} = \frac{1}{K} \sinh(KS_{\rm BH}),\tag{1}$$

where K is the Kaniadakis parameter restricted to the interval, 0 < K < 1. As mentioned above, $S_{\rm BH} = A/4$ being A the area of the apparent horizon, $A = 4\pi R_A^2$ with radius given by $R_A = H^{-1}$, as usual for a flat spacetime, the radius of the apparent horizon is the inverse of the Hubble scale. If only small deviations from the BH entropy are expected, then the Eq. (1) takes the following form after a series expansion

$$S_{\rm K} = S_{\rm BH} + \frac{K^2}{6} S_{\rm BH}^3 + \mathcal{O}(K^4),$$
 (2)

from which it is clear to observe that the limit, $K \to 0$, recovers the BH entropy. From the gravitythermodynamics conjecture, it was found that entropy (1) leads to the following set of cosmological equations modulus an integration constant, usually denoted as Λ , for a flat spacetime [8]

$$3H^2 \left[\cosh\left(KS_{\rm BH}\right) - KS_{\rm BH} \sin\left(KS_{\rm BH}\right)\right] = \rho_{\rm m},\qquad(3)$$

$$\dot{H}\cosh(KS_{\rm BH}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\rho_{\rm m} + p_{\rm m}),$$
 (4)

where $\operatorname{shi}(x)$ is a mathematical odd function of x whose definition is $\operatorname{shi}(x) = \int_0^x \frac{\sinh(x')}{x'} dx'$ and the dot stands for derivatives with respect to cosmic time. It is worth mentioning that under the series expansions of the function

^{*} miguelcruz02@uv.mx

[†] samuel.lepe@pucv.cl

[‡] joel.saavedra@pucv.cl

 $\cosh x = 1 + \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^4}{24} + \dots$ and $\sinh(x) = x + \frac{x^3}{18} + \frac{x^5}{600} + \dots$, the dynamical equations (3) and (4) coincide with those obtained in Ref. [9], as discussed in Ref. [10].

Ref. [8] discussed the role of the integration constant Λ ; the case $\Lambda = 0$ imposes the condition $K \neq 0$ since K = 0 only describes a CDM scenario. For this scenario, K should vary consistently with the observational range of $\Omega_{m,0}$. However, in such a study, the case $\Lambda \neq 0$ was chosen since it reproduces the thermal history of the universe (matter and dark energy epochs), and under the limit $K \to 0$, the Λ CDM model is recovered. Additionally, $\Lambda = 0$ leads to a dark energy sector that behaves as phantom dark energy in the past, and only in the far future, a de Sitter phase dominates the cosmic evolution;

as stated by the authors of [8], this latter scenario is less attractive. During the study of Ref. [8], the presence of Λ and the parameter K was studied separately. We will discuss this aspect of the model below. An interesting fact of the set of equations (3)-(4) is that the geometry of the field equations is modified due to the generalization of the entropy; then these emergent geometric terms can be associated to a dark energy sector whose origin is known; for K = 0, we recover the CDM scenario and thus we must impose the condition $K \neq 0$ in order to have extra contributions. If we assume a barotropic EoS for the matter sector, $p_{\rm m} = \omega \rho_{\rm m}$, together with Eq. (4), we can write the deceleration parameter $q(t) = -1 - \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}$, as follows.

$$1 + q(t) = \frac{1}{2}(1+\omega)\frac{\rho_{\rm m}}{H^2 \cosh(KS_{\rm BH})} = \frac{3}{2}(1+\omega)\left[1 - \frac{KS_{\rm BH} \sin(KS_{\rm BH})}{\cosh(KS_{\rm BH})}\right],\tag{5}$$

where Eq. (3) was also considered. Taking the derivative w.r.t. cosmic time of Eq. (3) we get $\dot{\rho}_{\rm m} = -6H^3(1 + q)\cosh(KS_{\rm BH})$, then if we insert the term given in the first equality of Eq. (5), we obtain the usual conservation equation for the matter sector, $\dot{\rho}_{\rm m} + 3H(1 + \omega)\rho_{\rm m} = 0$.

In order to have an accelerated cosmic expansion, the condition q(t) < 0, must be satisfied. According to the expression (5) for K = 0, we obtain $q = (1/2)(1 + 3\omega)$, which coincides with the standard cosmology for a single fluid described by the parameter state ω . Taking into account the condition q(t) < 0, the values taken by the term $\frac{KS_{\text{BH}}\text{shi}(KS_{\text{BH}})}{\cosh(KS_{\text{BH}})}$ must be restricted.

In Fig. (1), we show the intervals of $\frac{KS_{BH}shi(KS_{BH})}{cosh(KS_{DH})}$ $\cosh(KS_{\rm BH})$ leading to q(t) < 0, we observe that for a matter content given by radiation ($\omega = 1/3$) or stiff matter ($\omega = 1$) the possible values of $\frac{KS_{\rm BH} {\rm shi}(KS_{\rm BH})}{{\rm cosh}(KS_{\rm BH})}$ lie within the interval obtained for CDM ($\omega = 0$). Therefore, the range of the function $\frac{KS_{BH}shi(KS_{BH})}{rack(KS_{BH})}$ must be constrained to the $\cosh(KS_{\rm BH})$ half-open interval (1/3, 1/2] to have a physically consistent cosmic evolution, i.e., we must exclude radiation and stiff matter as possible sources of the accelerated cosmic expansion, as is well known; this latter condition is very restrictive for the K parameter. As expected, the value of the parameter state ω that describes the content of the universe determines the type of cosmic evolution. As observed, accelerated cosmic evolution can be obtained from Kaniadakis's cosmology for a universe filled with a CDM fluid without needing a dark-energy contribution.

If we consider the expression (2) for the Kaniadakis entropy, we can compute its derivative w.r.t. time, yielding

$$\dot{S}_{\rm K} = \frac{2\pi}{H} [1 + q(t)] \left(1 + \frac{K^2}{2} S_{\rm BH} \right),$$
 (6)

therefore the second law of thermodynamics [11], $\dot{S}_{\rm K} \geq 0$,



Figure 1: Validity region for the term $\frac{KS_{\text{BH}} \text{shi}(KS_{\text{BH}})}{\cosh(KS_{\text{BH}})}$ for which q(t) < 0 with $\omega = 0$ (solid line), $\omega = 1/3$ (dotted line) and $\omega = 1$ (dashed line).

is guaranteed always that $q(t) \geq -1$, i.e., quintessence scenario. This can be fulfilled since for cosmic expansion we have H(t) > 0. As commented above, the condition $q(t) \geq -1$ is contained in the expression given in Eq. (5).

For thermodynamics consistency, two conditions must be satisfied simultaneously by the entropy, positive production, $\dot{S}_{\rm K} > 0$, and the convexity condition, $\ddot{S}_{\rm K} < 0$, from our previous result we obtain that $\ddot{S}_{\rm K} < 0$ is satisfied for

$$\dot{q}(t) < -[1+q(t)]^2 \left(2\pi + 3K^2 S_{\rm BH}^2\right) \left(\frac{2\pi}{H} + K^2 S_{\rm BH}^2\right)^{-1},\tag{7}$$

no change of sign is expected in the expression given above, then both conditions can be satisfied by the Kaniadakis entropy always that $q(t) \ge -1$.

A. Interpreting the role of the *K*-parameter

According to our definitions, the parameter K and the Hubble constant are related by the following equation

$$KS_{\rm BH,0} = \frac{\pi K}{H_0^2}.$$
 (8)

Consequently, the fractional energy density, $\Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}$, associated with the Kaniadakis parameter will be simply the equation given above divided by 3. Therefore, at second order in $\Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}$, the deceleration parameter (5) with $\omega = 0$, takes the form

$$q_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{6\Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}^3}{2 + \Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}^2} \right), \tag{9}$$

where $6\Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}^3 > 2 + \Omega_{\mathcal{K},0}^2$ in order to have $q_0 < 0$. This condition can be fulfilled since $0 < \Omega_{\mathcal{K},0} < 1$. For K = 0, the expression given above is consistent with the CDM scenario $q_0 = 1/2$. As commented previously, the accelerated phase for the universe with a CDM sector can be possible due to the presence of the parameter K. Using the series expansion mentioned before, we obtain the modified Friedmann equation (3)

$$H^{2}(z) \simeq \frac{\rho_{\rm m}(z)}{6} \left[1 + \sqrt{1 + 2\left(\frac{3\pi K}{\rho_{\rm m}(z)}\right)^{2}} \right],$$
 (10)

where z is the redshift given by the usual formula $1 + z = a(t)^{-1}$. Assuming the typical behavior for the CDM sector, $\rho_{\rm m}(z) = \rho_{\rm m,0}(1+z)^3$, in the limit $z \to -1$, we have

$$H(z \to -1) \to \sqrt{\frac{\pi K}{\sqrt{2}}},$$
 (11)

which is a constant value corresponding to de Sitter evolution. This latter result indicates that the model has a self-accelerated branch since $\rho_{\rm m}(z \to -1) \to 0$. It is worth mentioning this kind of cosmic evolution, as given by Eqs. (10) and (11), was also obtained within the context of a variable dark energy known as *ghost dark energy* in which the CDM contribution is considered [12, 13].

From the result given above in Eq. (11), we can establish a correspondence between the cosmological constant, Λ , and the Kaniadakis parameter by establishing $\Lambda/3 = \pi K/\sqrt{2}$. Then, in this case, we have

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{K},0} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \Omega_{\Lambda}.$$
 (12)

As can be seen, the accelerated stage of cosmic evolution will be dominated by a de Sitter phase carried out by the parameter K that mimics a cosmological constant. Notice that in this case, the well-known fundamental problem regarding the value of the cosmological constant can be solved since, in this case, K emulates such a constant, therefore $\Omega_{K,0}$ only should vary consistently with the observational range of $\Omega_{DE,0}$. Therefore, in contrast to what was done in Ref. [8], if we do not think in deviations from the Λ CDM model and treat the Kaniadakis

III. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have investigated the cosmological implications arising from the application of gravitythermodynamics conjecture using the Kaniadakis entropy formalism.

Our analysis has revealed several significant findings that contribute to our understanding of cosmic evolution and the fundamental relationship between gravity and thermodynamics. As the first main result of this work, we note that the cosmic evolution of the model can have an accelerated stage for a universe filled with a CDM fluid due to the presence of the parameter Kwithout the need for dark energy contribution, as can be seen from the expression for the deceleration parameter in which the relation between ω and q is more complex than in the standard case. Secondly, the model's aforementioned characteristic is backed by the identification of the mimicry between the parameter K and the cosmological constant at a certain stage of cosmic evolution. Therefore, Kaniadaki's cosmology is free of some issues inherent to the cosmological constant when interpreted as a fundamental constant of gravitational theory.

On the other hand, we also found that the model exhibits similarities to some other dynamical dark energy models with the following two important characteristics: the existence of a self-accelerated branch and de Sitter evolution recovered in the far future. However, several important questions remain open for future investigation. As found in this work, the precise physical interpretation of the K-parameter in a cosmological context requires further exploration, as does the potential connection between this formalism and quantum gravity approaches. Furthermore, given this new correspondence between K and Λ , more detailed observational tests will be necessary to fully constrain the model's parameters and establish its viability as a competitive cosmological framework, particularly those involving structure formation and cosmic microwave background data. This point will be crucial to fully validate the model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M. Cruz work was partially supported by S.N.I.I. (SECIHTI-México). J. Saavedra acknowledges the FONDECYT grant N°1220065, Chile.

- P. A. R. Ade, et al. (Planck Collaboration), Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016); P. A. R. Ade, et al. (Planck Collaboration), Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A16 (2014); N. Aghanim, et al. (Planck Collaboration), Astron. Astrophys. **641**, A1 (2020).
- [2] J. D. Bekenstein, Lett. Nuovo Cimento 4, 737 (1972); Phys. Rev. D 7, 2333 (1973); Phys. Rev. D 9, 3292 (1974); S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 1344 (1971); G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D 15, 2738 (1977); J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D 23, 287 (1981); J. D. Bekenstein, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 28, 967 (1989).
- [3] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1260 (1995).
- [4] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. 52, 479 (1988); M. L. Lyra and C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 53 (1988); J. D. Barrow, Phys. Lett. B 808, 135643 (2020); S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and T. Paul, Phys. Lett. B 831, 137189 (2022); S. D. Odintsov and T. Paul, Phys. Dark Univ. 39, 101159 (2023).
- [5] G. Kaniadakis, Phys. Rev. E 66, 056125 (2002); Phys. Rev. E 72, 036108 (2005).
- [6] A. P. Santos, R. Silva, J. S. Alcaniz and D. H. A. L. Anselmo, Phys. Lett. A 375, 352 (2011).
- [7] M. Yarahmadi and A. Salehi, Eur. Phys. J. C 84, 443 (2024).

- [8] A. Lymperis, S. Basilakos and E. N. Saridakis, Eur. Phys. J. C 81, 1037 (2021).
- [9] A. Sheykhi, Phys. Lett. B 850, 138495 (2024).
- [10] A. Salehi, arXiv:2309.15956 [gr-qc].
- [11] H. B. Callen, Thermodynamics and an introduction to Thermostatistics, John Wiley, (1985).
- [12] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 156, 269 (1979); G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B 159, 213 (1979); C. Rosenzweig, J. Schechter and C. G. Trahern, Phys. Rev. D 21, 3388 (1980); P. Nath and R. L. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. D 23, 473 (1981); K. Kawarabayashi and N. Ohta, Nucl. Phys. B 175, 477 (1980).
- [13] F. R. Urban and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Lett. B
 688, 9 (2010); N. Ohta, Phys. Lett. B 695, 41 (2011); A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D 92, 043512 (2015); A. O. Barvinsky and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. D 98, 045008 (2018); B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B 697, 351 (2011); A. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. D 90, 054510 (2014); Rong-Gen Cai, Zhong-Liang Tuo, Hong-Bo Zhang and Qiping Su, Phys. Rev. D 84, 123501 (2011); Rong-Gen Cai, Zhong-Liang Tuo, Ya-Bo Wu and Yue-Yue Zhao, Phys. Rev. D 86, 023511 (2012); M. Biswas, U. Debnath, S. Ghosh and B. K. Guha, Eur. Phys. J. C 79, 659 (2019); M. Rezaei, J. Solà-Peracaula and M. Malekjani, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 509, 2593 (2021); H. Hossienkhani, H. Yousefi, N. Azimi and Z. Zarei, Astrophys. Space Sci. 365, 59 (2020).