

Non-Affine Extensions of the Raychaudhuri Equation in the K-essence Framework

Samit Ganguly,^{1,2,*} Goutam Manna^{a,3,4,†} Debashis Gangopadhyay,^{5,‡}
Eduardo Guendelman,^{6,7,8,§} and Abhijit Bhattacharyya^{1,¶}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Calcutta, 92, A.P.C. Road, Kolkata-700009, India*

²*Department of Physics, Haldia Government College, Haldia, Purba Medinipur 721657, India*

³*Department of Physics, Prabhat Kumar College, Contai, Purba Medinipur 721404, India*

⁴*Institute of Astronomy Space and Earth Science, Kolkata 700054, India*

⁵*Department of Physics, School of Natural Sciences, Sister Nivedita University,
DG 1/2, Action Area 1 Newtown, Kolkata 700156, India.*

⁶*Department of Physics, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel*

⁷*Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies (FIAS),*

Ruth-Moufang-Strasse 1, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

⁸*Bahamas Advanced Study Institute and Conferences, 4A Ocean Heights,
Hill View Circle, Stella Maris, Long Island, The Bahamas.*

(Dated: March 6, 2025)

The Raychaudhuri equation (RE) governs the evolution of geodesic congruences in curved spacetime. Here, we extend the classical RE by incorporating non-affine parametrization within the framework of k-essence scalar field dynamics. The non-affine parametrization introduces deviations from purely geodesic congruences (motion), allowing investigation of non-gravitational interactions and external forces. Using a DBI-type k-essence Lagrangian, we analyze the behavior of non-geodesic flow curves in the background FLRW metric, elucidating their role in cosmic acceleration and structure formation. The emergent metric formalism is used to derive a modified RE, revealing new geometric and dynamical features induced by the k-essence field. The cosmological implications of our model are studied by constraining key parameters using observational data from the PANTHEON+SHOES+BAO and Hubble datasets. Our results suggest that non-affine parametrization, coupled with k-essence dynamics, can provide a viable explanation for late-time cosmic acceleration while addressing the Hubble tension. Further, we reinterpret the modified RE as an anti-damped harmonic oscillator, revealing quantum-like effects in cosmic expansion. These results suggest a deep connection between scalar field dynamics and modified gravity, offering new perspectives on the nature of the universe's expansion history.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 04.50.Kd, 04.20.Cv, 98.80.-k, 98.80.Es

Keywords: Raychaudhuri equation, Non-affine connection, K-essence geometry, Early universe, Dark energy, Observational data analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

The Raychaudhuri equation (RE) [1, 2] provides insights into the intricate behavior of geodesics and their congruences in curved spacetime. It offers a quantitative framework for analyzing the expansion, shear, and rotation of geodesic flows, showing how the curvature of spacetime, as described by gravitational field equations, dictates the evolution of these flows. It is crucial for investigating gravitational collapse, black hole generation, and cosmic dynamics, proving the singularity theorems of Hawking and Penrose [3, 4]. The equation quantifies the complex relationship between matter-energy content and spacetime geometry, enhancing our understanding of the universe's structure and thereby emphasizing the predictive capability of relativity theory [5]. The RE is a frame-independent geometric identity manifesting as a scalar equation [6–8]. Incorporating the

Ricci tensor from the Einstein field equation provides dynamic behavior. Wherever vector fields represent a physical or geometrical quantity, corresponding Raychaudhuri equations must exist independent of any theory of gravity [6, 8]. This allows the utilization of any theory to establish the geometry and investigate the evolution of geodesic congruences irrespective of whether they are governed by affine or non-affine parametrization.

Non-affine parametrization allows for the incorporation of extrinsic forces or spacetime modifications that deviate from geodesic motion, providing insights into non-geodesic flow dynamics, potential new physical phenomena, and deviations from standard gravitational theory, thereby expanding the RE's applications [6]. This is important in scenarios where non-gravitational interactions impact geodesics or in alternative gravitational theories that depart from general relativity. The use of a non-affine parameter may allow for elucidating dissipative effects, energy transfer, anisotropic stresses, and congruences in spacetimes with designated structures, such as those emerging in quantum gravity or string theory frameworks.

The K-essence theory [9–24] represents a non-canonical framework that investigates many possi-

* samitgphy07@gmail.com

† goutammanna.pkc@gmail.com

^aCorresponding author

‡ debashis.g@snuniv.ac.in

§ guendel@bgu.ac.il

¶ abhattacharyyacu@gmail.com

bilities in cosmological research. The theoretical formulation of the Lagrangian for the K-essence field is non-canonical, represented as $\mathcal{L}(X, \phi) = -V(\phi)F(X)$ [9, 10, 12–15], or $\mathcal{L}(X, \phi) = F(X) - V(\phi)$ [21, 22], or $\mathcal{L}(X, \phi) \equiv \mathcal{L}(X) = F(X)$ [18, 23], where $F(X) \equiv \mathcal{L}(X)$ ($\neq X$) is the non-canonical kinetic component, $V(\phi)$ is the canonical potential component, and $X = \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\mu\phi\nabla^\nu\phi$ is the canonical kinetic component. This theory asserts that the kinetic component prevails over the potential component and exhibits a dynamic behavior that ensures late-time acceleration without requiring fine-tuning. A further compelling feature of the K-essence concept is its capacity to produce a dark energy component with a sound speed (c_s) that remains perpetually lower than the speed of light. At substantial angular scales, this characteristic may mitigate perturbations in the cosmic microwave background (CMB). Manna et al. [25–33] used the Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI) action [34, 35] to derive a basic expression for the K-essence gravitational metric $\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$. This variant of the metric lacks explicit conformal equivalence and diverges from the normal gravitational metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$. The primary distinction between K-essence theories with non-canonical kinetic terms and relativistic field theories with canonical kinetic terms is in the dynamical solutions of the K-essence equations of motion. The solution demonstrates both spontaneous Lorentz invariance violation and the metric alterations for the associated perturbations. These features induce perturbations that propagate across the developing curved spacetime, referred to as analog spacetime. This can replicate the background metric, resulting in late-time acceleration at the appropriate stage in the universe’s history. The results of the Planck collaborations [36–38] have scrutinized the empirical data supporting the notion of K-essence with a DBI-type non-canonical Lagrangian, in addition to other modified theories. This idea may serve as a comprehensive framework for dark energy and dark matter [18, 19]. The K-essence theory has been offered as applicable to a model of dark energy [25, 26, 30] and from a gravitational perspective [27, 28, 31, 32], excluding the dark components of the universe. Furthermore, it has been revealed that the K-essence theory demonstrates a notable attribute within the context of loop quantum cosmology [39–41]. Additionally, K-essence theory may be used to investigate unified dark energy and dust dark matter [42] within the domains of inflation and dark energy [43] in an alternative context. The emergence of k-essence dynamics without fine-tuning has also been demonstrated within the Two-Measures Field Theory (TMT) framework, which provides a natural foundation for scalar field cosmology [44].

The inclusion of non-canonical k-essence scalar field dynamics into the RE enhances our understanding of geodesic or non-geodesic congruences and spacetime dynamics [24, 45, 46]. In the setting of the RE, the k-essence field introduces additional elements to the energy-momentum tensor, altering the effective stress energy that dictates the dynamics

of geodesic expansion, shear, and rotation [24, 45]. So phenomena such as non-linear sound speeds, field-dependent anisotropies, and the impact of dynamic energy fluxes in spacetime become relevant [47]. Investigation of alternative gravity theories, evaluating the influence of scalar fields on structure development, and examining the interaction between matter fields and the curvature of the universe [48] also become relevant. All of this expands the scope of geodesic congruence analysis and establishes a framework for testing k-essence model predictions against observation.

In this work, we develop the non-affinely parameterized generalized RE for a DBI-type k-essence Lagrangian. We use it to investigate the convergence or divergence of non-geodesic flow curves in the FLRW background. The resulting modified RE offers distinct insights into the universe’s acceleration and its temporal evolution influenced by the k-essence scalar field. The DBI-type k-essence Lagrangian is selected because of its solid theoretical basis and its experimentally verifiable framework in cosmology [19]. Its foundation in string theory [49, 50], intrinsic relativistic properties and predictive structure make it a higher-up choice relative to other k-essence models [51].

Beyond its direct impact on cosmic expansion, our formulation has broader implications for modified gravity theories, emergent spacetime models, and quantum gravity scenarios. The emergence of a repulsive force due to non-affine RE suggests potential connections to entropic gravity [52, 53], emergent metric formulations [54], and quantum-like modifications of gravitational dynamics. Moreover, deviations from affine parametrization may introduce observable imprints on early-universe physics, large-scale structure formation, and cosmic anisotropies. By uncovering these deeper connections, our framework offers a novel direction for probing the fundamental nature of dark energy and late-time cosmic acceleration.

The plan is as follows: Section II constructs the k-essence geometry with particular emphasis on a Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI)-type Lagrangian, highlighting its role in driving both late-time cosmic acceleration and the initial clumping of matter. In Section III, we derive the non-affinely parametrized RE within the framework of k-essence emergent geometry and show how non-affine parametrization introduces new terms that significantly influence the dynamics of cosmic evolution. Section IV extends this analysis in the background of the FLRW universe. Section V focuses on cosmological implications within the context of the non-affinely parametrized RE. A comprehensive data analysis is done to fit our model against observational datasets, including Hubble, Pantheon, and BAO data. This places constraints on key cosmological parameters. Next, we reformulate the RE in the form of a harmonic oscillator with particular

emphasis on the existence of non-affinity in generating new physics beyond the usual affine connection. Finally, in the concluding section, we reflect on the significance of our findings, exploring how the non-affinely parametrized RE enriches our understanding of cosmic dynamics and the evolving nature of dark energy.

II. THE K-ESSENCE GEOMETRY

The significance of the k-essence model lies in its ability to reproduce early clustering of matter and late time acceleration without any fine-tuning [9, 55, 56]. In this section, we discuss the emergence of new geometry due to the interactions of the k-essence field with the background gravitational metric. The action for minimally coupled k-essence scalar field can be written as

$$S_k[\phi, g_{\mu\nu}] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \mathcal{L}(\phi, X) \quad (1)$$

With $X = \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla_\nu\phi$, $\mathcal{L}(\phi, X) = -V(\phi)F(X)$ is the non-canonical Lagrangian. Note that Davari et al. [57] have investigated minimally and non-minimally linked scalar field models as potential candidates for dark energy (DE), the enigmatic energy component responsible for the universe's accelerating expansion. The choice of a non-minimally coupled scalar field comes from research that shows the minimally coupled scalar field is slightly better than the non-minimally coupled scalar field when looking at cosmological models and comparing them with new cosmological data. The corresponding energy-momentum tensor of the k-essence scalar field is :

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta S_k}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} = -2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} + \mathcal{L} \\ &= -\mathcal{L}_X \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi + g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_X = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial X}$, $\mathcal{L}_{X\phi} = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi \partial X}$, $\mathcal{L}_\phi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi}$ and covariant derivative ∇_μ is defined with respect to the background metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

The corresponding scalar field equation of motion (EoM) is:

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta S_k}{\delta \phi} = \bar{G}^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi + 2X \mathcal{L}_{X\phi} - \mathcal{L}_\phi \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{G}_{\mu\nu}$ is the effective emergent metric, which is defined as

$$\bar{G}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{c_s}{\mathcal{L}_X^2} [\mathcal{L}_X g_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{XX} \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \phi], \quad (4)$$

with $1 + \frac{2X \mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X} > 0$ and $c_s^2 = (1 + 2X \frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X})^{-1}$. The inverse metric is given by [15, 25, 26]:

$$\bar{G}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\mathcal{L}_X}{c_s} [g_{\mu\nu} - c_s^2 \frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi] \quad (5)$$

Using the relation $\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{c_s}{\mathcal{L}_X} \bar{G}_{\mu\nu}$ [25, 26], we get

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X + 2X \mathcal{L}_{XX}} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi \quad (6)$$

It is essential to observe that $\mathcal{L}_X \neq 0$ for the positive definiteness of c_s^2 to be maintained, hence rendering Eqs. (4)–(6) physically relevant. Upon examining Eq. (6), it may be concluded that the emergent metric ($\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$) is not conformally equal (*i.e.*, disformally related [58]) to the conventional gravitational metric ($g_{\mu\nu}$). Again assuming Lagrangian (\mathcal{L}) to only depend on X , not directly dependent on k-essence scalar field ϕ , the EoM (3) reduces to,

$$\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi = 0. \quad (7)$$

Considering a form of k-essence DBI kind Lagrangian is given as [15, 19, 34, 35]:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi, X) = -V(\phi) \sqrt{1 + \frac{2X}{\alpha(\phi)}} \quad (8)$$

But here we are only interested in the kinetic k-essence model [18, 19] for which we take $\alpha(\phi) = -V(\phi) = -1$ and find the simplified DBI Lagrangian [59] as

$$L(X) = -\sqrt{1 - 2X} \quad (9)$$

While the assumption of a constant potential simplifies the analysis, it does not diminish its effectiveness in revealing new physics, particularly about the inflationary dynamics of the early cosmos and the late-time acceleration phenomena. In addition, the kinetic DBI k-essence Lagrangian is a natural addition to models that look into deviations from general relativity. It does this by including nonlinear kinetic factors that could change the gravitational sector indirectly through the scalar field. In this regard, we must mention that Babichev and Scherrer [18, 60] have shown that for any non-linear pure k-essence model, we can choose $\mathcal{L} \equiv \mathcal{L}(X) (\neq X)$. Particularly the form of the lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(X) = const. - K_1 \sqrt{1 - 2X}$ has been deduced in [23], where there K_1 is a constant. There is also a physical reason behind the choice of $\mathcal{L}(X)$. Since k-essence models require the dominance of kinetic energy over potential energy, the potential V can be treated as a constant and its effects are neglected. Consequently, the Lagrangian is taken to depend explicitly on X alone, rather than on ϕ directly. For the above-chosen Lagrangian (9) we get the sound speed as $c_s^2 = (1 - 2X)$, therefore, the effective emergent metric (6) simplifies to:

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi = g_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi \quad (10)$$

ϕ is a scalar field.

Following [27], the connection coefficient for this k-essence emergent geometry is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha &= \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}^{\alpha\rho} (\partial_\mu \tilde{G}_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu \tilde{G}_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}) \\ &= \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha - \frac{1}{2(1 - 2X)} [\delta_\mu^\alpha \partial_\nu + \delta_\nu^\alpha \partial_\mu] X \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

This connection differs from the standard connection ($\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$) associated with the background gravitational

metric, as additional terms emerge from the inclusion of the k-essence scalar field. Note that the connection remains symmetric concerning its lower two indices, ensuring it is torsion-free and retains the fundamental properties of the background metric.

Following Ref. ([19]), we write the energy-momentum tensor in perfect fluid form as:

$$T_{\nu}^{\mu} = (\rho + P)u^{\mu}u_{\nu} - P\delta_{\nu}^{\mu}, \quad (12)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\mu} &= \frac{\partial_{\mu}\phi}{\sqrt{2X}} \quad ; \quad u_{\mu}u^{\mu} = 1 \\ \rho &= 2X\mathcal{L}_X - \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-2X}} \\ P &= \mathcal{L} = -\sqrt{1-2X} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we have used Eqs. (2) and (12).

In Ref. ([19]), the authors have proposed a unified model where a single scalar field with a DBI-type Lagrangian acts as cluster dark matter at a small scale and smooth dark energy at a large scale. By averaging the field over the entire scale, the model naturally transitions from a pressureless dark matter state ($P = 0$) that is responsible for gravitational clustering to the negative pressure ($P = -\rho$) state driving cosmic acceleration. This eliminates the need for separate components for dark matter and a cosmological constant or quintessence for dark energy. Therefore, this approach provides a unified framework for both cosmic components (*viz.* dark matter and dark energy), which offers a theoretical elegance and observational consistency for cosmic structure and acceleration.

Here we follow the same approach of Ref. ([19]) and consider the stress-energy tensor as the sum of two distinct components: (a) one resembling *dust* with $P = 0$ and (b) the other characterized by negative pressure (*dark energy*), following the equation of state $P = -\rho$. Therefore we break up the energy density and pressure to write ([19]):

$$\rho = \rho_V + \rho_{DM} \quad ; \quad P = P_V + P_{DM} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{DM} &= \frac{2X}{\sqrt{1-2X}} \quad , \quad P_{DM} = 0 \\ \rho_V &= \sqrt{1-2X} \quad , \quad P_V = -\rho_V. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The first component (ρ_{DM} ; P_{DM}) represents cold dark matter, a pressureless fluid that contributes to gravitational clustering and the formation of large-scale structures in the universe. It governs the dynamics of the early universe, where its energy density dominates over other components, driving the formation of galaxies and cosmic web-like structures. In contrast, the second component (ρ_V ; P_V) corresponds to vacuum energy or dark energy, characterized by a negative pressure that leads to a repulsive gravitational effect. This component becomes significant in the later stages of cosmic evolution, causing

the accelerated expansion of the universe observed today. The transition from dark matter dominance to dark energy dominance marks a critical shift in the universe's expansion history, defining its current and future dynamics.

III. DERIVATION OF NON-AFFINELY PARAMETERIZED RAYCHOUDHURY EQUATION IN THE PRESENCE OF K-ESSENCE SCALAR FIELD

The derivation of the RE is inherently geometric [6, 7], which allows us to extend this framework to the emergent metric space influenced by the k-essence scalar field, where the dynamical solutions of the EoM are altered due to the field's effects [11]. Our aim is to figure out the RE in the most natural manner, preserving the acceleration term for non-geodesic flow curves. We start with the very definition of the Riemann tensor ($\tilde{R}_{\alpha\mu\rho}^{\gamma}$) in the k-essence geometry, which encodes how vectors change as they are parallel transported around a closed loop on a curved manifold. In our study, we particularly focus on the time-like velocity vector (\tilde{v}^{μ}) fields and write [61, 62]:

$$[D_{\mu}, D_{\rho}]\tilde{v}^{\gamma} = \tilde{R}_{\alpha\mu\rho}^{\gamma}\tilde{v}^{\alpha}, \quad (16)$$

where the time-like velocity vector field is taken to be $\tilde{v}^{\mu} = f(\tilde{s})\tilde{u}^{\mu}$ where $f(\tilde{s})$ is some function of our non affine parameter \tilde{s} and \tilde{u}^{μ} satisfies the orthogonality condition in the emergent metric ($\tilde{u}^{\mu}\tilde{u}_{\mu} = 1$) [61, 63]. Here D_{μ} is the covariant derivative in the proper time emergent geometry, which is defined as,

$$D_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\alpha} = \partial_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\alpha} + \tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha}\tilde{v}^{\nu} \quad (17)$$

Using Eq. (11) we get [24],

$$D_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\alpha} = \nabla_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2(1-2X)}(\delta_{\mu}^{\alpha}\partial_{\nu}X + \delta_{\nu}^{\alpha}\partial_{\mu}X)\tilde{v}^{\nu} \quad (18)$$

Contracting Eq.(16) with \tilde{v}^{ρ} and also over the indices γ and μ we can write,

$$[D_{\mu}, D_{\rho}]\tilde{v}^{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\rho} = \tilde{R}_{\alpha\rho}\tilde{v}^{\alpha}\tilde{v}^{\rho} \quad (19)$$

Expanding Eq. (19) we get,

$$D_{\mu}\dot{\tilde{v}}^{\mu} - (D_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\rho})(D_{\rho}\tilde{v}^{\mu}) - \frac{d\tilde{\theta}}{d\tilde{s}} = \tilde{R}_{\alpha\rho}\tilde{v}^{\alpha}\tilde{v}^{\rho} \quad (20)$$

where we define $D_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\mu} = \tilde{\theta}$ is the expansion scalar and $\dot{\tilde{v}}^{\mu} = \tilde{v}^{\rho}D_{\rho}\tilde{v}^{\mu} = \kappa\tilde{v}^{\mu} \equiv \tilde{A}^{\mu}$ (*say*) is the acceleration in the emergent spacetime, with κ being the non-affine parameter. This term $\dot{\tilde{v}}^{\mu}$ ($= \tilde{A}^{\mu}$) is non-zero in our study, since we are dealing with the non-affine parameterization of the RE in k-essence geometry.

Now we write the second term of the LHS of Eq. (20) as

$$(D_{\mu}\tilde{v}^{\rho})(D_{\rho}\tilde{v}^{\mu}) = 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 - 2\tilde{\omega}^2 + \frac{\tilde{\theta}^2}{3}, \quad (21)$$

with the definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\sigma}_{\mu\rho} &= \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\tilde{v}_\rho + D_\rho\tilde{v}_\mu) - \frac{1}{3}\tilde{h}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{\theta} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mu\rho} &= \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\tilde{v}_\rho - D_\rho\tilde{v}_\mu),\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_{\mu\nu}$ is the shear term which accounts for the distortion in the shape of the congruence without changing its volume, $\tilde{\omega}_{\mu\rho}$ representing the vorticity tensor, describing the rotation of the flow curves relative to each other and $\tilde{h}_{\mu\rho}$ being the orthogonal hypersurface defined by $\tilde{h}_{\mu\rho} = \tilde{G}_{\mu\rho} - \frac{\tilde{v}_\mu\tilde{v}_\rho}{\|\tilde{v}\|^2}$. Take note of that due to the non-affinity of the velocity vector field with respect to the emergent spacetime metric it is essential to normalize the velocity field to find a hypersurface orthogonal to the flow curves. This approach provides a precise comprehension of the kinematic and geometric features of the congruence while considering the subtleties brought by the non-affine parameterization of the velocity field in the emergent spacetime.

Another important consequence for a non-affinely parameterized congruence is that the volume evolution of the flow curves is no longer solely determined by the expansion scalar ($\tilde{\theta} \neq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{h}}}\frac{d}{d\tilde{s}}\sqrt{\tilde{h}}$ where $\sqrt{\tilde{h}}$ is the volume element of the hypersurface). The non-affine term κ introduces additional contributions that may distort the congruence, potentially leading to non-trace-free shear. This reflects the fact that the congruence is no longer purely geodesic and may experience external forces or effects.

So, we can write the *modified RE* in the k-essence emergent geometry for non-geodesics flow curves as:

$$\frac{d\tilde{\theta}}{d\tilde{s}} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}^2}{3} = -\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\rho - 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2\tilde{\omega}^2 + D_\mu\tilde{A}^\mu \quad (23)$$

As the congruence is hypersurface orthogonal, therefore according to Frobenius' theorem, we take the rotation term to be identically zero [5, 62].

The significance of the above equation (23) lies in its ability to demonstrate how gravity influences the behavior of flow curves. Specifically, gravity tends to focus flow curves, meaning that an initially diverging congruence (flow curves moving apart) will diverge more slowly over time, while an initially converging congruence (flow curves coming together) will converge more rapidly in the future. In this process, the term $\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\rho$, representing spacetime curvature, and the shear act to enhance convergence, whereas rotation and acceleration work against it, defying the focusing effect. Our goal is to try and understand how this effect being modified due to the presence of k-essence scalar field.

It is important to highlight the notable distinction between affine and non-affine parametrization of flow curves, especially in the context of geodesic and non-geodesic motion. The difference arises due to the presence of the term $f(\tilde{s})$ which introduces non-zero acceleration in the equation of motion. Unlike affine parameterization, where geodesics follow the natural path dictated by spacetime curvature without

external forces, non-affine parameterization alters the trajectory by incorporating the acceleration term [62, 64].

This modification has profound implications for the RE. The inclusion of the term $f(\tilde{s})$ effectively alters the RE, enabling the study of the convergence or divergence of non-geodesic flow curves. In particular, this modified equation accounts for the influence of external forces or non-gravitational effects that act on the flow curves, providing a more comprehensive framework to analyze their behavior. When dealing with non-geodesic flows, these additional factors beyond spacetime curvature play a role in shaping the dynamics of the congruence.

IV. K-ESSENCE INDUCED GEOMETRIC EVOLUTION IN FLRW BACKGROUNDS

As indicated in the preceding section, the emergent spacetime geometry generated by the k-essence field introduces new terms and dynamics that influence the universe's evolution. By coupling the k-essence scalar field to the Raychaudhuri framework, we can possibly gain a deeper understanding of how the expansion, shear, and curvature terms evolve under the influence of this field.

This section analyzes the modified RE for non-affine parametrization inside the FLRW background, including k-essence contributions. This methodology emphasizes the significance of scalar field dynamics and offers an extensive framework for analyzing phenomena including cosmic acceleration, structure development, and deviations from conventional cosmological models.

The background FLRW metric is known to be written as,

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t)(dr^2 + r^2d\theta^2 + r^2\sin^2\theta d\Phi^2) \quad (24)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor that characterizes the expansion of the universe.

Now, referring to Eq. (10), the emergent metric can be expressed as,

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = (1 - \dot{\phi}^2)dt^2 - a^2(t)(dr^2 + r^2d\theta^2 + r^2\sin^2\theta d\Phi^2) \quad (25)$$

where '*dot*' denotes the derivative with respect to coordinate time. Given the homogeneity of the background, we may describe our k-essence scalar field as $\phi \equiv \phi(t)$. To put it another way, we use a homogeneous K-essence scalar field denoted as $\phi(r, t) \equiv \phi(t)$. The dynamical solutions of K-essence scalar fields cause spontaneous Lorentz symmetry violation; hence, the homogenous choice of the field is suitable. According to Eq. (25), the values of $\dot{\phi}^2$ must fall between 0 and 1, preserving the emergent metric's well-behaved nature.

We take the proper time for a comoving observer as $d\tau = \sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2} dt$ and define the emergent metric (25) in the proper time frame to be:

$$ds^2 = d\tau^2 - a^2(\tau)(dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2\theta d\Phi^2) \quad (26)$$

We choose the time-like velocity vector field as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}^\alpha &= f(t)u^\alpha \\ &= (f(t), 0, 0, 0) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where in the proper time frame, we consider the normalized velocity vector field given by, $u^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, which satisfies the geodesic equation $u^\mu D_\mu u^\nu = 0$. In other words, we can say that here we consider the velocity vector fields u^μ to be affinely connected, not the \tilde{v}^μ . Consequently, the relationship between the proper time τ and coordinate time t is governed by the non affinity function, which is defined as

$$\frac{d\tau}{dt} = f(t) = \sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}. \quad (28)$$

We have chosen the *coordinate time t as the non-affine parameter* in the proper time emergent metric (26) through the relation (28). This formulation encapsulates the deviation from affine parametrization, with the function $f(t)$ characterizing the rate at which proper time evolves with respect to coordinate time in the presence of the scalar field ϕ . We will utilize the preceding relation (28) for all subsequent derivations. This choice is crucial because, in the presence of a non-canonical scalar field, proper time τ differs from coordinate time t , and the emergent metric (26) reflects this modification. By expressing our equations in terms of t , we ensure consistency in comparing our results with standard cosmological models while maintaining the physical effects of non-affinity. This approach allows us to track deviations from purely geodesic motion, which are central to our study of non-affinely parameterized Raychaudhuri evolution.

With that velocity vector field \tilde{v}^α , the acceleration vector is computed as: $\tilde{A}^\mu = \tilde{v}^\rho D_\rho \tilde{v}^\mu = \kappa \tilde{v}^\mu$ with $\kappa = \frac{\dot{f}}{f}$ where we define $\kappa = \frac{(\tilde{v}^\mu D_\mu \tilde{v}^\nu) \tilde{v}_\nu}{\tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}_\mu}$ [63]. Hence we get:

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu \tilde{A}^\mu &= D_\mu (\kappa \tilde{v}^\mu) \\ &= \kappa D_\mu \tilde{v}^\mu + \tilde{v}^\mu D_\mu \kappa \\ &= \kappa \tilde{\theta} + \tilde{v}^\tau \partial_\tau \kappa \\ &= \kappa \tilde{\theta} + \partial_t \kappa \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where we have to use the relation (28).

Referring to Eqs. (22), (26) and using (28), we obtain the shear:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_{\tau\tau} &= \frac{\dot{f}}{f}, & \tilde{\sigma}_{rr} &= \frac{\dot{f}}{3f} \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{\theta\theta} &= \tilde{\sigma}_{rr} r^2, & \tilde{\sigma}_{\phi\phi} &= \tilde{\sigma}_{\theta\theta} \sin^2\theta \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In our case, the rotation tensor ($\tilde{\omega}_{\mu\rho}$) is zero, which follows from Forbenius' theorem [62]. Alternatively,

we may set it to 0 for our isotropic background metric. Since there is no preferred direction in an isotropic backdrop, vorticity ($\tilde{\omega}^2$) has to vanish.

In the emergent metric, the curvature term can be expressed in terms of mass-energy density as [62, 63]:

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}^\rho = \left(\tilde{T}_{\mu\rho} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T} \tilde{G}_{\mu\rho} \right) \tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}^\rho \quad (31)$$

which we can find from the emergent Einstein's field equation:

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{R} = \tilde{T}_{\mu\rho} \quad (32)$$

where we consider $\kappa = 8\pi G = 1$. The corresponding emergent stress-energy tensor ($\tilde{T}_{\mu\rho}$) and the background stress-energy tensor ($T_{\mu\rho}$) are related by,

$$\tilde{T}_{\mu\rho} = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial \tilde{x}^\mu} \frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial \tilde{x}^\rho} T_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (33)$$

We can directly express the curvature term using Eqs. (12), (28), (33) and (34) as

$$\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}^\rho = \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\rho} + 3\tilde{P}) f^2 \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}$ and \tilde{P} represent the total energy density and isotropic pressure, respectively, which corresponds to an ideal fluid model (12) and can be written as:

$$\tilde{\rho} = \frac{\rho}{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}; \quad \tilde{P} = P. \quad (35)$$

This result highlights a key feature of the emergent metric formulation: while the pressure remains unchanged compared to the standard affine case, the energy density undergoes a modification due to the factor $\frac{1}{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}$. This rescaling suggests that the effective energy density perceived in the emergent spacetime is dynamically enhanced as $\dot{\phi}^2$ approaches unity ($0 < \dot{\phi}^2 < 1$), leading to significant departures from the conventional dynamics of an ideal fluid. Such modifications can have profound implications for the evolution of cosmological models, particularly in scenarios where the kinetic part of the scalar field $\dot{\phi}^2$ plays a dominant role, such as in inflationary dynamics, or emergent spacetime descriptions. Furthermore, the presence of the curvature term in the given form (34) suggests that the effective gravitational response of the system is altered, leading to possible deviations in the congruence of geodesic motion. This framework thus provides a new avenue for exploring deviations from standard cosmology through the modified RE (23), where non-affine parametrization acts as a mechanism for introducing new physical effects beyond the standard mechanism of general relativity.

Therefore, following Eq. (23) we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{\theta}}{dt} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}^2}{3} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\tilde{\rho}_i + 3\tilde{P}_i) - 2\kappa^2 + \kappa\tilde{\theta} + \partial_t \kappa \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\tilde{\rho}_i + 3\tilde{P}_i) - 2\left(\frac{\dot{f}}{f}\right)^2 + \frac{\dot{f}}{f}\tilde{\theta} + \partial_t \left(\frac{\dot{f}}{f}\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\tilde{\rho}_i + 3\tilde{P}_i) - 3\left(\frac{\dot{f}}{f}\right)^2 + \frac{\dot{f}}{f}\tilde{\theta} + \frac{\ddot{f}}{f} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where we put all expressions that we have calculated in (29), (30) and (34). Here ' i ' stands for the different components of the energy density of the k-essence scalar field denoted by $\tilde{\rho}_V$ (dark energy) and $\tilde{\rho}_{DM}$ (dark matter).

On the other hand, based on the definition of the scalar expansion ($\tilde{\theta}$) [62], we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta} &= D_\mu \tilde{v}^\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\tilde{G}}} \partial_\mu (\sqrt{-\tilde{G}} \tilde{v}^\mu) \\ &= \frac{3\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{f}}{f} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

with $\sqrt{-\tilde{G}} = r^2 \sin\theta a^3$ (using (26)) and the derivative of the expansion scalar with respect to the coordinate time t (i.e., non-affine parameter) is written as :

$$\frac{d\tilde{\theta}}{dt} = 3\left[\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} - \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2\right] + \frac{\ddot{f}}{f} - \left(\frac{\dot{f}}{f}\right)^2 \quad (38)$$

The key consequence of the non-affine parametrization is that it generates an apparent force-like term and also introduces a non-zero shear component in a system that would otherwise be free of these effects in affine parametrization. The effective acceleration term mimics a modification of gravity or the presence of some external force. The introduction of shear in the velocity field suggests a deviation from perfect isotropy, as shear affects the expansion rate differently in different directions, which leads to emergent anisotropic behavior. This could have implication in large scale structure formation of the universe. Therefore, non-affine parametrization does not merely redefine time but actively modifies the geodesic structure, inducing apparent force and also generating shear, thereby opening avenues for new physics.

In a nutshell, we may say that the inclusion of shear in the RE for homogeneous scalar fields underlines the importance of anisotropic effects in cosmic development, even if we do not employ the anisotropic spacetime signature here. It is essentially the emergent outcome of investigating the non-affine connection of the k-essence model via the RE. It introduces complexity to the dynamics, modifies scalar field behavior, and leaves possible observable fingerprints in cosmic data.

V. STUDY OF COSMOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF NON-AFFINELY PARAMETERIZED RAYCHAUDHURY EQUATION

This section is to examine the modified RE with non-affinity resulting from the k-essence scalar field, elucidating its influence on the universe's development and the physical consequences of its dynamics. This study may provide a deeper understanding of how non-affine parameterization in the presence of the k-essence scalar field shapes the universe's evolution, offering potential insights into the deviations from conventional cosmic evolution. We will specifically deal with the evolution of the cosmological acceleration in the context of the emergent RE. Using Eqs. (36) and (38) we can write another form of the *modified RE* as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= \frac{1}{3} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\tilde{\rho}_i + 3\tilde{P}_i) f^2 + \frac{\ddot{\phi}^2 [1 - 4\dot{\phi}^2]}{3(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)^2} \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{\rho}_i (1 + 3\tilde{\omega}_i) f^2 + \frac{\ddot{\phi}^2 [1 - 4\dot{\phi}^2]}{9(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)^2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{\rho}_i (1 + 3\tilde{\omega}_i) f^2 + G(\dot{\phi}, \ddot{\phi}) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where we denote $G = \frac{\ddot{\phi}^2 [1 - 4\dot{\phi}^2]}{9(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)^2}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_i = \frac{\tilde{P}_i}{\tilde{\rho}_i}$ is the equation of state parameter in the emergent metric for different component of the k-essence scalar field. We know that, in general relativity, the expression $\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}^\rho > 0$ satisfies the Strong Energy Condition (SEC), which ensures that the presence of matter leads to the focusing or convergence of timelike and null geodesics. This behavior arises from the attractive nature of gravity. Physically, this means that in the presence of normal matter, geodesics (the paths of free-falling particles or light rays) bend inward, leading to gravitational collapse rather than divergence. The SEC guarantees negative acceleration, which drives geodesic convergence and decelerates cosmic expansion. Hence, any scenario with sustained acceleration must violate the SEC. In cosmology, this violation happens during the inflationary phase and later in the universe's evolution. This SEC violation causes the expansion to speed up, which is a key feature for figuring out problems like the horizon and flatness problems. We have already discussed the role that the above energy density will play in the evolution of the universe. Where the component ρ_V being the dark energy drives the late-time accelerated phase of the universe, the component ρ_{DM} acts like dust, representing dark matter, to assist the early universe clumping.

In the first term of the RHS of Eq. (39) the modified energy density ($\tilde{\rho}_i$), the equation of state parameter ($\tilde{\omega}_i$) and f depends on the non-canonical scalar field $\dot{\phi}^2$. This dependence suggest that the effective energy density and pressure are altered by the presence of the scalar field, $\dot{\phi}^2$ which leads to modification in the acceleration equation. This implies that the

expansion of the universe is not only driven by the conventional matter and dark energy but also on the dynamics of the scalar field. This outcome happens because the acceleration of the universe comes from the evolution of the scalar field without the need for a cosmological constant.

On the other hand, the second term of RHS in Eq. (39) derived from the dynamics of the k-essence scalar field, can be interpreted as a non-gravitational force introduced due to the non-affine parametrization of the emergent metric. Unlike conventional forces driven by mass-energy within general relativity, this force stems from the intrinsic properties of the scalar field and its coupling to spacetime geometry through the emergent structure. In this context, G represents an additional term that modifies the universe's expansion dynamics independently of the standard gravitational interaction dictated by the Einstein field equations. Its magnitude and sign depend on the time evolution of the scalar field, specifically on $\dot{\phi}$ and $\ddot{\phi}$, with the condition $\dot{\phi}^2 < 1$ ensuring a consistent metric signature. Physically, this force alters the effective pressure in the cosmological fluid, influencing whether the universe experiences acceleration or deceleration.

When $\dot{\phi}^2 > \frac{1}{4}$, G contributes negatively to the acceleration, acting like a decelerating force analogous to standard matter-dominated behavior, reinforcing gravitational collapse. Conversely, when $\dot{\phi}^2 < \frac{1}{4}$, it becomes a positive force that drives acceleration, aiding the late-time cosmic acceleration without invoking a cosmological constant. This non-gravitational force reflects the dynamic influence of non-affine parametrization, where the emergent geometry allows new degrees of freedom to study non-geodesic congruences and expansion rates. Consequently, G encapsulates the role of non-affine parametrization in generating a non-gravitational acceleration, offering a novel explanation for deviations from the standard cosmic evolution driven purely by general relativity and traditional matter-energy content. This perspective broadens our understanding of the universe's expansion history by incorporating additional force driven by the scalar field and arising from modified spacetime parametrization.

To proceed further, we seek a relation between the scalar field ($\phi(t)$) and the scale factor ($a(t)$). This relation can be derived from the equation of motion (7), expressed in the emergent metric using Eqs. (26) and (28) as:

$$\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)} = -3H\dot{\phi} \quad (40)$$

The solution of this Eq. (40) comes out to be:

$$\dot{\phi}^2(t) = \frac{C}{C + a(t)^6} \quad (41)$$

where C is the integration constant. While the theory predicts this specific form, *for the purpose of data analysis* and with the motivation to have $\dot{\phi}^2$ always less than 1, we take generalization of the solution

(41) and the scaling equation as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\phi}^2(t) &= \frac{C}{C + a^n} \\ \frac{\ddot{\phi}}{(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)} &= -\frac{nH\dot{\phi}}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where n is treated as a free parameter to achieve a better fit with observational data. With this generalized solution, we proceed to perform model fitting using the latest observational datasets, including the *PANTHEON+SHOES* data [68], *Hubble* data [69–81] and *BAO* data [82–85].

Now, using the above relation (42), and Eq. (15), we can express the energy density and pressure of the different components of the k-essence scalar field in background FLRW metric,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{DM} &= \frac{C}{a^{\frac{n}{2}}\sqrt{C + a^n}} \quad , \quad P_{DM} = 0 \\ \rho_V &= \frac{a^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\sqrt{C + a^n}} \quad , \quad P_V = -\rho_V. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Now, following Eq. (35) in the emergent metric this component changes to:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{DM} &= \frac{\sqrt{C + a^n}}{a^{\frac{3n}{2}}} \quad , \quad \tilde{P}_{DM} = 0 \\ \tilde{\rho}_V &= \frac{\sqrt{C + a^n}}{a^{\frac{n}{2}}} \quad , \quad \tilde{P}_V = -\frac{a^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\sqrt{C + a^n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

with respect to the above energy density and pressure, then the equation of state parameter in the emergent metric can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}_{DM} &= \frac{\tilde{P}_{DM}}{\tilde{\rho}_{DM}} = 0 \\ \tilde{\omega}_V &= \frac{\tilde{P}_V}{\tilde{\rho}_V} = -\frac{a^n}{C + a^n}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

To fit the model against any available dataset to find cosmological parameters, we need to change the scale factor (a) to redshift distance (z) with the following relationship [91, 92]:

$$a = \frac{1}{1 + z} \quad (46)$$

Here we define dimensionless density parameters [91]:

$$\Omega_i = \frac{\tilde{\rho}_i}{3\tilde{H}^2} = \frac{\rho_i}{3H^2} \quad (47)$$

Here ' i ' stands for two different components of the scalar field energy density namely $\tilde{\Omega}_V$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_{DM}$ corresponding to the dimensionless density parameter of the dark energy and dark matter sector. Now with respect to the dimensionless density parameter (47), we can write the acceleration term using Eqs. (39), (42), (44) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= -H^2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^2 (\Omega_i(1 + 3\tilde{\omega}_i)) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{n^2}{36} (\tilde{\omega}_V + 1)(4\tilde{\omega}_V + 3) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where we write $G = -\frac{n^2 H^2}{36}(\tilde{\omega}_V + 1)(4\tilde{\omega}_V + 3)$ by using Eqs. (42), (45). The Eq. (48) is nothing but *another form of modified RE*.

Using Eqs. (46) and (48) we express:

$$\frac{dH}{dz} = \frac{H}{1+z} \left(\frac{3}{2}(1 + \Omega_V \tilde{w}_V) + \frac{n^2}{36}(\tilde{w}_V + 1)(4\tilde{w}_V + 3) \right) \quad (49)$$

where we have used $\dot{z} = -H(1+z)$. This Eq. (49) is also an *alternative form of the modified RE in terms of the Hubble parameter (H) and redshift (Z)*.

Now we find a differential equation for the rate of change of the dimensionless density parameter (Ω_V) of the dark energy sector with respect to redshift as:

$$\frac{d\Omega_V}{dz} = -\frac{\Omega_V}{(1+z)} \left(\frac{n}{2}(1 + \tilde{w}_V) + \frac{2(1+z)}{H} \frac{dH}{dz} \right) \quad (50)$$

with $\tilde{\omega}_V = -(1 - \dot{\phi}^2)$, which we get by using Eqs. (42) and (45). Now using Eqs. (42), (45), (49), (50) we will fit the model against the available *PANTHEON+SHOES* [68], *Hubble* [69–81] and *BAO*[82–85] datasets to find H_0 , Ω_{V0} , ω_0 and n , corresponding to the present values of the Hubble constant, dark energy density, the equation of state parameter for dark energy density, and the power n . It is also possible to derive a differential equation for the dark matter density parameter (Ω_{DM}). However, since the two density parameters are related by $\Omega_{DM} + \Omega_V = 1$, we can choose either one to describe the system. Note that we should also have another density component corresponding to radiation (Ω_R) but in the present universe, the contribution of radiation (photons and relativistic neutrinos) to the total energy density is extremely small compared to dark matter and dark energy. Since the Universe has expanded significantly since the radiation-dominated era, the current value of Ω_R is on the order of $\approx 10^{-5}$ [38], making it negligible in late-time cosmological evolution. Therefore we neglect the radiation component.

A. Data Analysis and Model Fitting

The *PANTHEON+SHOES* dataset consists of 1701 light curves of 1550 distinct Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) ranging in redshift from $z = 0.00122$ to 2.2613 [68]. The model parameters are to be fitted by comparing the observed and theoretical value of the distance moduli. The distance moduli can be defined as

$$\mu(z, \theta) = 5 \log_{10}(d_l(z)) + 25 \quad (51)$$

where $d_l(z)$ is the dimensionless luminosity distance defined as [91]:

$$d_l(z) = (1+z)c \int_0^z \frac{dz}{H(z)}. \quad (52)$$

Taking the derivative with respect to z we can obtain a differential equation for $d_l(z)$ as:

$$\frac{dd_l(z)}{dz} = \frac{d_l(z)}{1+z} + \frac{c(1+z)}{H(z)} \quad (53)$$

where c is the speed of light measured in unit of km/s .

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) are an essential tool in modern cosmology to probe the history of expansion in the universe [86]. To interpret BAO measurements from large-scale galaxy surveys, cosmologists use different distance scales, namely the transverse comoving distance (D_M), the volume-averaged distance (D_V), and the Hubble distance (D_H). These distances allow us to convert observed angular and redshift separations into physical distances and to extract cosmological parameters like the Hubble constant (H_0) and the dark energy equation of state $w(z)$.

In a spectroscopic survey, the BAO feature appears in both the line-of-sight direction and the transverse direction. Along the line-of-sight direction, a measurement of the redshift interval Δz , over which the BAO feature extends, provides a means to directly measure the Hubble parameter, $H(z) = \frac{c\Delta z}{r_d}$ [82, 86–88]. Equivalently, it measures the Hubble distance at redshift z :

$$D_H(z) = \frac{c}{H(z)}. \quad (54)$$

Along the transverse direction, the BAO scale corresponds to an angle $r_d = D_M(z)\Delta\theta$. Measuring the angle $\Delta\theta$ subtended by the BAO feature at a given redshift provides a means to estimate the (comoving) angular diameter distance, $DM(z)$, which depends on the expansion history as [82, 86–88]:

$$D_M(z) = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')} \quad (55)$$

Here, the sound horizon r_d is the comoving distance that a sound wave could travel in the early universe before the epoch of recombination. It serves as a standard ruler for BAO measurements. It can be expressed as [89, 90]:

$$r_d = \int_{z_{drag}}^{\infty} \frac{c_s}{H(z)} dz \quad (56)$$

Here $z_{drag} \approx 1020$ is the baryon drag epoch, the redshift at which baryons were released from the photon-baryon plasma and c_s is the sound speed of the photon-baryon fluid. But nonetheless, in our analysis, we use r_d as the free parameter or fitting parameter of the model.

When considering the dependence of r_d on cosmology, the quantities that the BAO measurements directly constrain are $\frac{D_M(z)}{r_d}$ and $\frac{D_H(z)}{r_d}$. The BAO measurements were also historically summarized by a single quantity representing the spherically-averaged distance [82, 86–88]:

$$D_V(z) = [z D_M(z)^2 D_H(z)]^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (57)$$

This measurement is particularly useful for low-redshift BAO surveys where the separation between transverse and radial measurements is not strong. Since at low redshift, the distinction between radial and transverse distances is weak, it is convenient to summarize the measurement with a single, isotropic quantity $D_V(z)$, which combines both components.

There are two BAO data set we are going to analyze. The first one contains 8 data points from Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [82, 83] called SDSSBAO and the second set contains 7 data points from Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) [84, 85] called DESBAO. In the following discussion we call the combined dataset (SDSSBAO and DESBAO) as BAO data. These data sets are comprehensively tabulated in Table II and Table III.

Here, we construct four-parameter ($\mathbf{p}=(H_0, \Omega_{V0}, \omega_0, n)$) using the differential Eqs. (48), (49), (52), the solution of which with the initial condition will be fitted against the available data set of the type Ia supernova data (*PANTHEON+SHOES* data) [68], *Hubble* data [69–81] and for *BAO* dataset [82–85] we need to add another parameter (r_d). Therefore to analyze three datasets together we need to construct a five-parameter given as ($\mathbf{p}=(H_0, \Omega_{V0}, \omega_0, n, r_d)$). We use χ^2 statistics to constrain the model parameters to measure the discrepancy between observed data and a theoretical model. It is widely used in statistical hypothesis testing and model fitting to assess how well a model describes the given data. For fitting of the Bayesian model [93], χ^2 is often used in likelihood functions: $L \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2)$. This connects chi-squared minimization to Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE), which is useful for Bayesian posterior sampling.

For the model with model parameters (\mathbf{p}) we compute the χ^2 function for *Hubble* dataset given in Table I as [94] :

$$\chi_H^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{43} \left(\frac{H^{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p}) - H^{obs}(z_i)}{\sigma_i} \right)^2, \quad (58)$$

where $H^{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p})$ stands for the theoretical value that we obtained by solving the differential equations and $H^{obs}(z_i)$ corresponds to the value given in $H(z)$ of the Table I data set and σ_i is the error/uncertainties in the measurement of $H(z)$ mentioned in the same table.

The χ^2 for BAO data can be computed as:

$$\chi_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{X_i^{th}(z, \mathbf{p}) - X_i^{obs}(z_i)}{\sigma_i} \right)^2, \quad (59)$$

where X_i^{th} is either of $\frac{D_M}{r_d}$, $\frac{D_H}{r_d}$ or $\frac{D_V}{r_d}$ calculated theoretically by model fitting. So the total χ_i^2 corresponding to *BAO* dataset is obtained as $\chi_i^2 = \left(\chi_{\left(\frac{D_M}{r_d}\right)}^2 + \chi_{\left(\frac{D_V}{r_d}\right)}^2 + \chi_{\left(\frac{D_H}{r_d}\right)}^2 \right)$.

For the *PANTHEON* data set corresponding to SN Ia supernova we follow a different method to obtain

z	H(z)	σ_H	Method	Ref.
0.0708	69.0	± 19.68	a	[69]
0.09	69.0	± 12.0	a	[70]
0.12	68.6	± 26.2	a	[69]
0.17	83.0	± 8.0	a	[70]
0.179	75.0	± 4.0	a	[71]
0.199	75.0	± 5.0	a	[71]
0.2	72.9	± 29.6	a	[69]
0.240	79.69	± 2.65	b	[78]
0.27	77.0	± 14.0	a	[70]
0.28	88.8	± 36.6	a	[69]
0.35	84.4	± 7.0	b	[80]
0.352	83.0	± 14.0	a	[71]
0.38	81.2	± 2.2	a	[72]
0.3802	83.0	± 14.0	a	[73]
0.4	95	± 17.0	a	[70]
0.4004	77.0	± 10.2	a	[73]
0.4247	87.1	± 11.2	a	[73]
0.43	86.45	± 3.68	b	[78]
0.44	82.6	± 7.8	b	[79]
0.4497	92.8	± 12.9	a	[73]
0.47	89	± 50	a	[74]
0.4783	80.9	± 9.0	a	[73]
0.48	97.0	± 62.0	a	[74]
0.51	90.90	± 2.1	a	[72]
0.57	92.4	± 4.5	b	[81]
0.593	104.0	± 13.0	a	[71]
0.6	87.9	± 6.1	b	[79]
0.61	98.96	± 2.2	a	[72]
0.68	92.0	± 8.0	a	[71]
0.73	97.3	± 7.0	b	[79]
0.781	105.0	± 12.0	a	[71]
0.875	125.0	± 17.0	a	[71]
0.88	90.0	± 40.0	a	[74]
0.9	117.0	± 23.0	a	[70]
1.037	154.0	± 20.0	a	[71]
1.3	168.0	± 17.0	a	[70]
1.363	160.0	± 33.6	a	[75]
1.43	177.0	± 18.0	a	[70]
1.53	140.0	± 14.0	a	[70]
1.75	202.0	± 40.0	a	[70]
1.965	186.5	± 50.4	a	[75]
2.34	222.0	± 7.0	b	[76]
2.36	226.0	± 8.0	b	[77]

Table I: Here the unit of $H(z)$ is $kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1}$ 'a' quoted in this table means the $H(z)$ value is deduced from cosmic chronological method/differential age method whereas 'b' corresponds to that obtained from BAO data and the corresponding reference from where the data are collected is mentioned in the References

χ^2 as we have a covariance matrix (C) of dimension 1701×1701 corresponding to the measurement error of the distance modulus ($\mu(z)$) for all 1701 light curves. The expression of χ^2 is [94]:

$$\chi_{SN}^2 = (\mu_{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p}) - \mu_{obs}(z_i))^T C^{-1} (\mu_{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p}) - \mu_{obs}(z_i)) \quad (60)$$

where $\mu_{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p})$ is the theoretical value we obtain from Eq. (51) by solving the differential equations listed in Eqs. (49), (50), (53) with initial condition and model parameter (\mathbf{p}) as constraints and μ_{obs} is

\tilde{z}	0.15	0.38	0.51	0.70	0.85	1.48	2.33	2.33
$D_V(\tilde{z})/r_d$	4.47 ± 0.17				$18.33^{+0.57}_{-0.62}$			
$D_M(\tilde{z})/r_d$		10.23 ± 0.17	13.36 ± 0.21	17.86 ± 0.33		30.69 ± 0.80	37.6 ± 1.9	37.3 ± 1.7
$D_H(\tilde{z})/r_d$		25.00 ± 0.76	22.33 ± 0.58	19.33 ± 0.53		13.26 ± 0.55	8.93 ± 0.28	9.08 ± 0.34

Table II: SDSSBAO measurements

\tilde{z}	0.295	0.510	0.706	0.930	1.317	1.491	2.330
$D_V(\tilde{z})/r_d$	7.93 ± 0.15					26.07 ± 0.67	
$D_M(\tilde{z})/r_d$		13.62 ± 0.25	16.85 ± 0.32	21.71 ± 0.28	27.79 ± 0.69		39.71 ± 0.94
$D_H(\tilde{z})/r_d$		20.98 ± 0.61	20.08 ± 0.60	17.88 ± 0.35	13.82 ± 0.42		8.52 ± 0.17

Table III: DESBAO measurements


the observed value available in PANTHEON data set [68] and C^{-1} stands for inverse covariance matrix.

We used Bayesian inference with the No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS), a variant of the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo method [93], to estimate the cosmological parameters from supernova, Hubble data and BAO data. The model incorporated differential equations describing the cosmological evolution, including parameters for the dark energy density (Ω_{V0}), Hubble constant (H_0), and equation of state parameters (ω_0). Likelihood evaluation was based on the distance modulus difference, weighted by the inverse covariance matrix, and the Hubble constant measurement weighted by the corresponding standard deviation. The Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) [95] sampling provided posterior distributions for each parameter, ensuring uncertainty quantification. The best-fit parameters were extracted from the posterior means and the chi-squared statistic evaluated the goodness-of-fit of the model, while the distribution plots visualized the confidence contours of 1σ and 2σ .


The optimized best-fit parameters are summarized in comprehensive detail in Table IV, providing a detailed comparison of the derived values from different datasets. From the results of the Planck Collaboration (CMB data, 2018), we get $H_0 \approx 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ [96] and for the local distance ladder measurement (SHOES) the accepted value is $H_0 \approx 73.2 \pm 1.3 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ [97].

Our analysis demonstrates that incorporating multiple cosmological datasets significantly refines parameter constraints, offering deeper insights into the expansion history of the universe and the nature of dark energy. Each dataset provides unique constraints on key parameters such as the Hubble constant (H_0), dark energy equation of state parameter (ω_0), and vacuum energy density parameter (Ω_{V0}). The first graph (Fig. 1a), based solely on Hubble data, suggests a lower value of $H_0 = 70.5 \pm 1.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, reflecting the results from direct measurements of cosmic expansion. The second graph


(Fig. 1b) constrained using only Pantheon supernova data, produces a higher estimate of $H_0 = 72.84 \pm 0.22 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, consistent with SHOES results, which are based on Type Ia supernovae calibrated with Cepheid variables [68]. The third graph (Fig. 1c), which combines Hubble and Pantheon data, results in an intermediate constraint of $H_0 = 73.76 \pm 0.17 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$. The fourth graph (Fig. 1d), which includes Hubble, Pantheon, and BAO data, yields the tightest constraints, with $H_0 = 74.39 \pm 0.16 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, which indicates a high expansion rate, demonstrating that different datasets yield varying estimates, contributing to the well-known Hubble tension—the discrepancy between locally measured values of H_0 and those inferred from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) via the Planck 2018 results, which favor a much lower value of $67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ [96] under the standard Λ CDM model. This persistent deviation suggests that new physics beyond standard cosmology may be required to resolve the tension. Possible explanations include modifications to early universe physics, such as the existence of an Early Dark Energy (EDE) component, which could increase the expansion rate before recombination, or new dark sector interactions affecting cosmic evolution. Late-time modifications to dark energy, such as phantom models ($\omega < -1$) [98] or decaying dark matter [99], could also play a role. Furthermore, systematic uncertainties in observational methods, such as Cepheid calibrations and supernova evolution effects, may contribute to the discrepancy. Our results favor a higher H_0 , closely aligning with direct measurements from Pantheon+SHOES, rather than the CMB-inferred value from Planck. The inclusion of BAO data further improves constraints, indicating that a higher expansion rate is supported by multiple independent probes. This suggests that modifications to cosmic expansion, including the impact of a dynamical equation of state parameters for dark energy, play a crucial role in addressing these discrepancies. Nevertheless, the model suggests a compelling departure from the standard cosmology and thus indicates




(a) Fitting of model parameters to Hubble data



(c) Fitting of model parameters concerning the combined data set of Hubble and Pantheon



(b) Fitting of model parameters with respect to SN Ia data (Pantheon)



(d) Fitting of model parameters for the combined data set of Hubble+ Pantheon+ BAO data

Figure 1: This plot represents 1σ (dark region) and 2σ (lighter region) confidence level plot for the four parameter using Hubble, Pantheon+SHOES and Hubble+Pantheon dataset for the first three graph and the fourth plot includes BAO data where the sound horizon (r_d) is introduced as a fifth parameter to refine the model fit

at new physics beyond the standard Λ CDM model.

The fourth graph (Fig. 1d), incorporating Hubble, Pantheon, and BAO data, reveals both a higher sound horizon ($r_d = 175.5 \pm 1.3$ Mpc) and a higher Hubble constant ($H_0 = 74.39 \pm 0.16$ km/s/Mpc), which presents an intriguing deviation from the standard Λ CDM expectation, where these parameters are typically inversely correlated. A larger r_d suggests a slower expansion in the early universe, which allows the acoustic waves to propagate farther before recombination, while a higher H_0 indicates an accelerated late-time expansion. This dual effect hints at

possible modifications to both early and late cosmic evolution, which is likely influenced by the dynamical equation of state of dark energy of the model. If dark energy exhibited a nontrivial evolution, it could have subtly altered the balance of radiation and matter at early times, shifting the sound horizon while simultaneously enhancing late-time acceleration. Additionally, variations in pre-recombination physics, such as altered photon-baryon interactions, early dark energy, or modified gravity, could have impacted r_d , leading to the observed anomaly. The fact that the BAO model assumes a standard r_d re-

Parameter	Initial Cond.	Hubble Data	PANTHEON+SHOES	Hubble+PANTHEON	Hubble+PANTHEON+BAO
H_0	Uniform[50,99]	70.5 ± 1.5	72.84 ± 0.22	73.76 ± 0.17	74.39 ± 0.16
Ω_{V_0}	Uniform[0.6,0.8]	$0.740^{+0.025}_{-0.023}$	0.640 ± 0.018	0.7333 ± 0.0095	0.7792 ± 0.0069
ω_0	Uniform[-1.2,-0.8]	$-0.99977^{+0.00015}_{-0.00024}$	$-0.9967^{+0.0013}_{-0.0037}$	$-0.99977^{+0.00013}_{-0.00019}$	$-0.999816^{+0.000071}_{-0.000088}$
n	Gaussian[6,0.1]	5.99 ± 0.099	5.99 ± 0.10	5.99 ± 0.10	6.007 ± 0.099
r_d	Uniform[100,300]	-	-	-	175.5 ± 1.3

Table IV: Comparison of cosmological parameters from different data sources.

rived from CMB-based Λ CDM model may also lead to the above discrepancies.

The initial conditions for the parameters are presented in Table IV. In this setup, all parameters, except for n , have been assigned uniform prior distributions within specific ranges. However, the parameter n is modeled using a Gaussian prior distribution rather than a uniform one. This choice is driven by the need to validate our theoretical predictions.

By adopting a Gaussian prior for n , centered around its expected value with a small standard deviation, we avoid imposing a rigid constraint, such as fixing $n = 6$. This approach introduces a degree of freedom, enabling the parameter n to vary slightly while remaining close to its theoretically motivated value. Consequently, other parameters in the model can adjust accordingly, which leads to a more comprehensive exploration of the parameter space and also potentially uncover subtle correlations or deviations that might be overlooked by fixing its value.

An important point to emphasize is that the Gaussian prior provides a soft constraint on the parameter, meaning if the likelihood (χ^2) strongly favors a n value outside the prior's typical range, the posterior distribution can still shift accordingly. This reflects the Bayesian approach's capacity to update beliefs based on empirical evidence, ensuring that the final inference remains primarily data-driven while incorporating reasonable theoretical expectations.

With the carefully chosen initial conditions outlined in Table IV, we find that the resulting value of n remains very close to 6 or nearly identical to it, which validates our theoretical prediction through the scaling relation (41) with the field. This agreement not only serves as a strong consistency check but also highlights the robustness of our approach in capturing the expected physical behavior within the model.

In this regard, we also want to examine how the deceleration parameter changes concerning redshift distance. The expression for the deceleration parameter is :

$$\begin{aligned}
 q &= -\frac{\ddot{a}a}{\dot{a}^2} = -1 - \frac{dH}{H^2} = -1 + \frac{1+z}{H} \frac{dH}{dz} \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + 3\Omega_V \tilde{w}_V) + \frac{n^2}{36}(\tilde{w}_V + 1)(4\tilde{w}_V + 3) \quad (61)
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have to use Eq. (49) to write the last expression. We now plot the deceleration parameter (q) vs. redshift by using the best fit parameter obtained from the combined dataset (*PANTHEON + Hubble + BAO*).




Figure 2: Deceleration parameter (q) vs. Redshift (z) graph with parameter scheme $H_0 = 74.39$, $\Omega_{V_0} = 0.7792$, $\omega_0 = -0.999816$ and $n = 6.007$.

The deceleration parameter $q(z)$ describes how the universe's expansion changes over time. At high redshifts ($z > 0.92$), matter dominates, causing deceleration ($q > 0$), as shown in the blue region in Fig. (2). At the transition point i.e., $z_t = 0.92$, dark energy started influencing expansion, marking the transition to acceleration. For $z < 0.92$, dark energy became dominant, driving acceleration ($q < 0$), represented by the red region. The current value $q_0 = -0.67$ confirms an accelerating universe, which is nearly consistent with the Λ CDM model and observations of dark energy's influence.

VI. EMERGENT OSCILLATORY DYNAMICS FROM K-ESSENCE

This section analyzes the reformulation of the modified RE into a harmonic oscillator model. This method not only presents a fresh mathematical viewpoint but may also provide substantial scientific insights on the influence of the k-essence scalar field on cosmic evolution.

Following [6], we redefine $\tilde{\theta} = 3\frac{\dot{\tilde{F}}}{\tilde{F}}$ and using Eqs. (19)–(23), we can express the modified RE (23) as:

$$\ddot{\tilde{F}} - \kappa \dot{\tilde{F}} + \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{v}^\mu \tilde{v}^\rho - D_\mu \tilde{v}^\mu + \tilde{\sigma}^2)\tilde{F} = 0 \quad (62)$$

The given differential equation describes the evolution of \tilde{F} , a function related to the expansion of a bundle of flow curves, in a non-affine parametrization.

This Eq. (62) resembles a damped Hill-type equation, with κ acting as a damping or anti-damping (depending on sign of κ) term that depends on the k-essence scalar field, which modifies the dynamics of congruence. The presence of the Ricci curvature term $\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\nu$ accounts for the influence of spacetime curvature on the flow curves, while the shear scalar $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ introduces anisotropic distortions that tend to amplify the convergence of flow curves. Additionally, the term $D_\mu\dot{\tilde{v}}^\mu$ reflects the acceleration of the flow curves in the presence of non-affinity, caused by non-gravitational forces or modified gravity effects in k-essence models. The term κ , determined by the k-essence field, plays a crucial role in regulating the rate at which the congruence evolves, affecting whether it collapses (leading to singularity formation) or expands indefinitely. In contrast to the standard Riccati-type equation for geodesic expansion [6], the non-affine parametrization introduces additional complexity, as κ modifies the natural evolution of the congruence, potentially leading to deviations from classical singularity theorems. This modification is significant when considering exotic matter scenarios, such as k-essence models, where violations of standard energy conditions (*viz.*, SEC, NEC, WEC) may allow for geodesic defocusing, preventing singularity formation. The interplay between κ , spacetime curvature, and the k-essence field determines whether the flow curves focus or diverge, ultimately shaping the causal structure of the spacetime and also influence scenarios such as late-time cosmic acceleration, avoidance of singularities, and modifications to focusing conditions beyond General Relativity.

Now, in this harmonic oscillator setup we can write $\omega^2(t) = \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\rho - D_\mu\dot{\tilde{v}}^\mu + \tilde{\sigma}^2)$. Where $\omega^2(t)$ can be interpreted as a time dependent frequency which represents the dynamical influence of space time curvature, shear and acceleration. Physically, it determines whether geodesics tend to converge, diverge, or oscillate over time. Therefore, we can rewrite the Eq. (61) in the form:

$$\ddot{\tilde{F}} - \kappa\dot{\tilde{F}} + \omega^2(t)\tilde{F} = 0 \quad (63)$$

In this equation, two competing time-dependent terms (*viz.* $\kappa(t)$ and $\omega^2(t)$ ($= \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\rho - D_\mu\dot{\tilde{v}}^\mu + \tilde{\sigma}^2)$)) exist which govern the dynamics of the evolution equation. Though $\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}$ is dependent on both space and time, but the term $\tilde{R}_{\mu\rho}\tilde{v}^\mu\tilde{v}^\rho$ is solely time dependent via the Eq. (27), which can easily verified through the Eq. (34). In the context of non-geodesic flow curves with non-affine parametrization, where κ represents an external acceleration-related damping or anti-damping term, different regimes emerge depending on the sign of $\omega^2(t)$.

A positive $\omega^2(t)$ corresponds to a stabilizing effect, meaning flow curves are influenced by curvature and shear, tending to bring neighboring curves back toward equilibrium. This regime is relevant in cases where external forces act to stabilize the separation between flow curves, such as in a uniformly expanding universe or perturbation evolution in a gravitational potential. A negative $\omega^2(t)$ indicates

an effective repulsive behavior, meaning flow curves tend to exponentially diverge rather than oscillate. This scenario occurs in cases of strong repulsive gravity (such as in inflationary models), anti-trapped surfaces (inside black hole interiors), or violations of energy conditions leading to repulsive effects and when $\omega^2 = 0$, we can write the general solution of Eq. (62) as: $\tilde{F}(t) = c_1 + c_2 \int f(t)dt$ with f being defined as $\sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}$ which will always remain positive thus leading to a runaway divergence under external acceleration.

Some important physical consequences also arise depending on the sign of $\kappa(t)$:

When $\kappa(t)$ is negative, the system dissipates energy over time. This dissipation leads to a gradual stabilization of the scalar expansion. The scalar expansion begins to converge, reducing the divergence of the flow curves. Over time, this convergence may lead to the formation of caustics, regions where non-geodesic flow curves cross and density becomes extremely high. Caustic formation could signify the clustering of matter or the formation of structures such as galaxies and stars in the universe.

When $\kappa(t)$ is positive, the system exhibits anti-damping, meaning energy is injected into the system. The scalar expansion grows with time, causing the flow curves to diverge rather than converge. This divergence prevents the formation of caustics, ensuring that the universe remains smooth and avoids density singularities. Such behavior is consistent with phases of accelerated cosmic expansion, such as inflation or the current dark energy-dominated epoch. Note that in our situation, $\kappa(t) \neq 0$ since we consider non-affine parametrization of the geodesic congruences.

We can write κ using Eqs. (28) and (41) as,

$$\kappa = \frac{\dot{f}}{f} = -\frac{\ddot{\phi}\dot{\phi}}{(1-\dot{\phi}^2)} = \frac{nH\dot{\phi}^2}{2}. \quad (64)$$

While, $\kappa = -\frac{\ddot{\phi}\dot{\phi}}{(1-\dot{\phi}^2)}$ may be positive or negative depending on the sign of $\ddot{\phi}$ but here we use a scaling relation via Eq. (42) which make κ to always stay positive. Hence, in our scenario, the Eq. (59) serves as an anti-damping equation. Thus, we may infer that in our situation, the non-affine parametrization in the presence of the k-essence field assures that the expansion scalar continues to grow indefinitely, ultimately leading to expanding divergence.

We can express the Eq. (62) in terms of the redshift parameter by using the transformation (from 46)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \equiv -H(1+z)\frac{d}{dz} \quad (65)$$

and Eqs. (29), (30), (34), (35), (36), (42), (44), (45), (46), (47) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2F}{dz^2} + \frac{1}{2(1+z)}\frac{dF}{dz} & \left[3(1 + \Omega_V\tilde{\omega}_V) + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{n^2}{18}(\tilde{\omega}_V + 1)(4\tilde{\omega}_V + 3) + 2 + n(\tilde{\omega}_V + 1) \right] + \\ & \frac{1}{2(1+z)^2} \left[3\Omega_V\tilde{\omega}_V + 1 + \frac{n^2(\tilde{\omega}_V + 1)}{3} \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$




Figure 3: Expansion scalar (θ) vs. Redshift (z) graph with parameter scheme $H_0 = 74.39$, $\Omega_{V0} = 0.7792$, $\omega_0 = -0.999816$ and $n = 6.007$.

We solve the Eq. (64) numerically and plot $\tilde{\theta} = \frac{\dot{F}}{F}$ vs. z (redshift parameter), where we put the present value of expansion scalar ($\tilde{\theta}$) calculated by using the best-fit parameter we obtain from *Hubble* + *PANTHEON* + *BAO* data. The graph (Fig. 3) reflects the universe's expansion history, showing a transition from a slower, matter-dominated phase at high redshift to the current accelerated expansion driven by dark energy. This is consistent with the Λ CDM model and observations from supernovae, baryon acoustic oscillations, and the cosmic microwave background. Though in our study we have not used the conventional Λ CDM model. In one of our cited paper, Mukohyama et al. [23] showed that, unlike generic k-essence theories, DBI scalar fields avoid caustic formation, similar to standard canonical scalar fields. The findings suggest that effective field descriptions of brane dynamics (via DBI) remain valid longer than previously assumed, as they avoid caustic singularities. Our model supports their claim as we also get the prevention of caustic formation in this setup. Alternatively, the work by Das et al. [24] shows that, under some circumstances, affinely connected geodesics investigated within the context of the k-essence model may generate caustics. The study also occurs with the conditional existence of expansion, resulting in a singularity-free universe.

In classical cosmology, caustics form when the flow curve of a fluid converges, leading to infinite density regions. However, in non-affinely connected studies of k-essence models, the non-canonical kinetic terms modify the equation of state to add an effective pressure factor, preventing such singularities. This trend might indicate a possible existence of quantum phenomena in the cosmos.

Therefore, k-essence field dynamics, influenced by its non-canonical kinetic form, can be understood as a macroscopic manifestation of underlying quantum properties, such as uncertainty or non-locality. This non-local behavior of k-essence models arises due to their higher-derivative kinetic terms, which modify

causal propagation in the early universe. This leads to a smearing of energy density fluctuations, similar to how quantum wave functions extend non-locally in space.

In the standard inflationary scenario, quantum fluctuations of the inflaton field get stretched to superhorizon scales due to rapid expansion, becoming classical density perturbations [11, 100]. A similar mechanism arises in k-essence cosmology. The k-essence field, due to its non-canonical kinetic structure, experiences quantum fluctuations at subhorizon scales. Unlike standard slow-roll inflation, k-essence can exhibit sound speeds different from the speed of light, altering the growth of perturbations and modifying the power spectrum of inhomogeneities [65].

These effects indicate that the formation of large-scale structures in k-essence cosmology is fundamentally linked to quantum mechanics, as the initial inhomogeneities arise due to quantum fluctuations. This supports the idea that the prevention of caustics in k-essence theories is not purely a classical effect but also a quantum mechanical consequence of field fluctuations.

VII. CONCLUSION

The investigation of non-affine parametrization in the Raychaudhuri equation (RE) offers a fresh viewpoint on the dynamics of cosmic expansion, especially in the context of a k-essence scalar field. The conventional method for analyzing the RE utilizes affine parametrization, which presumes that congruences exhibit purely geodesic motion determined by spacetime curvature; however, the inclusion of non-affine parametrization permits the consideration of extrinsic forces and non-geodesic influences. Our study is particularly relevant in modified gravity scenarios and alternative dark energy models, where deviations from classical general relativity become significant.

One of the most profound consequences of non-affine parametrization is its role in modifying the expansion dynamics through an additional acceleration term. This term, introduced by the k-essence field, directly affects the equation of state parameter, which determines whether the universe undergoes accelerated or decelerated expansion. Unlike the standard Λ CDM model, where dark energy is represented by a constant vacuum energy density with an equation of state parameter fixed at $\omega = -1$, the k-essence framework allows for a dynamical evolution of ω . The non-affine parameter, in this context, alters the effective stress-energy tensor and introduces new contributions to the energy-momentum dynamics, leading to a scenario where the dark energy equation of state can evolve over time.

Moreover, the modifications induced by the non-affine parameter highlight the rich interplay between k-essence and corresponding emergent spacetime geometry. The additional degrees of freedom introduced by non-affine flows modify the standard con-

vergence and divergence behavior, allowing for a more flexible and physically motivated description of cosmic acceleration. This approach helps address key challenges in cosmology, such as the late-time acceleration of the universe and potential deviations from the standard model predictions.

From an observational standpoint, the effects of the non-affine parameter may provide testable predictions in future cosmological surveys. By influencing the growth rate of cosmic structures and the expansion history, these modifications could be constrained using Type Ia supernova data, baryon acoustic oscillations, and Hubble data. The model also has implications for addressing the Hubble tension, as the dynamical nature of the equation of state could allow for a reconciliation of the observed discrepancies in the local and early-universe measurements of the Hubble constant. Furthermore, this model fitting ($n = 6$) also validates our theoretical prediction of the scaling relation provided in Eq. (41). This successful match between theory and data could be hinting at strong evidence supporting the underlying framework governing the evolution of the scalar field through the modified RE in our cosmological scenario.

From the harmonic oscillator viewpoint, including a k-essence scalar field with a non-affine parametrization prevents caustic formation by introducing an effective repulsive interaction, akin to quantum mechanical effects. This can be attributed to a quantum-like pressure which is analogous to how the uncertainty principle prevents trajectory collapse in quantum systems. The k-essence field modifies the phase-space structure, introducing corrections that counteract singularity formation, similar to quantum gravity effects where Planck-scale corrections prevent singularities. This mechanism ensures a well-behaved evolution, which prevents classical singularities through an effective repulsive force emerging from the modi-

fied dynamics.

In conclusion, the non-affine parameter extends the traditional Raychaudhuri framework and offers a powerful tool for understanding the evolution of dark energy in the k-essence paradigm. By enabling a non-trivial interaction between the scalar field and the background metric, it enhances our comprehension of the fundamental forces governing cosmic acceleration. This work paves the way for further investigations into emergent geometries, non-standard fluid dynamics, and their implications for future observational tests of dark energy models.

Acknowledgement: G.M. would like to extend thanks to all the undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral students who significantly enriched him.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data availability: The data used in this study are readily accessible from public sources for validation of our model; however, we did not generate any new datasets for this research.

Declaration of competing interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing: The authors state that they do not support the use of AI tools to analyze and extract insights from data as part of the study process.

-
- [1] A. Raychaudhuri, ‘Relativistic Cosmology. I’. *Phys. Rev.*, **98**, 4, 1123–26, (1955). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.98.1123>.
- [2] A. Raychaudhuri, ‘Singular State in Relativistic Cosmology’. *Phys. Rev.*, **106**, 1, 172–73, (1957). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.106.172.2>.
- [3] R. Penrose, ‘Gravitational collapse and Space-Time singularities’. *Phys. Rev. L.*, **14**, 3, 57–59, (1965). <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.14.57>
- [4] S.W. Hawking, R. Penrose, ‘The singularities of gravitational collapse and cosmology.’ *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London a Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, **314**, 1519, 529–548, (1970). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1970.0021>
- [5] S.W.Hawking, and G. F. R. Ellis. ‘The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time’. 1st ed., *Cambridge University Press*, 1973.<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511524646>.
- [6] S.Kar, and S.Sengupta. “The Raychaudhuri Equations: A Brief Review.” *Pramana*, **69**, 1, 49–76,(2007).<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12043-007-0110-9>
- [7] N. Dadhich, “Derivation of the Raychaudhuri Equation”, arXiv:gr-qc/0511123 (2005)<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.gr-qc/0511123>
- [8] S. Hensh, S. Liberati, “Raychaudhuri equations and gravitational collapse in Einstein-Cartan theory”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **104**, 084073, (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.084073>
- [9] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour, and V. Mukhanov, ‘k-Inflation’, *Phys. Lett. B*, **458**, 209, (1999). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(99\)00603-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00603-6).
- [10] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanovand, P. J. Steinhardt, ‘Essentials of k-essence’, *Phys. Rev. D*, **63**, 103510, (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.63.103510>.
- [11] E. Babichev, V. Mukhanov and A. Vikman, “k-essence, superluminal propagation, causality and emergent geometry”, *JHEP*, **02**, 101, (2008).<https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/02/101>.
- [12] D. Gangopadhyay, ‘Estimating temperature fluctuations in the early universe’, *Gravit. Cosmol.*, **16**, 231–238, (2010).<https://doi.org/10.1134/S0202289310030072>.
- [13] A. Bandyopadhyay, D. Gangopadhyay, and A.

- Moulik, “Semiclassical treatment of a k-essence effect on cosmic temperature”, *Gravit. Cosmol.*, **23**, 184–194, (2017). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1406.2308>.
- [14] D. Gangopadhyay and S. Mukherjee, “An accelerated universe with negative equation of state parameter in inhomogeneous cosmology with K-essence scalar field”, *Phys. Dark Univ.*, **32**, 100800, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2021.100800>.
- [15] A. Vikman, “K-essence: Cosmology, causality and Emergent Geometry”, Dissertation an der Fakultät für Physik, Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics, der LudwigMaximilians-Universität München, München (2007).
- [16] L. P. Chimento, “Extended tachyon field, Chaplygin gas, and solvable k-essence cosmologies”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **69**, 123517, (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.69.123517>.
- [17] M. Visser, C. Barcelo and S. Liberati, “Analogue models of and for gravity”, *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, **34**, 1719–1734, (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020180409214>
- [18] R.J. Scherrer, ‘Purely Kinetic Essence as Unified Dark Matter’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93**, 011301, (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.011301>.
- [19] T. Padmanabhan and T. Roy Choudhury. ‘Can the Clustered Dark Matter and the Smooth Dark Energy Arise from the Same Scalar Field?’ *Phys. Rev. D*, **66**, 8, 081301, (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.66.081301>
- [20] V. Mukhanov, *Physical foundations of Cosmology*, **Cambridge University Press**, New York, (2005).
- [21] J. Dutta, W. Khylllep, H. Zonunmawia, ‘Cosmological dynamics of the general non-canonical scalar field models’, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **79**, 4, 359, (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6885-2>.
- [22] J. De-Santiago, J. L. Cervantes-Cota, and D. Wands, “Cosmological phase space analysis of the $F(X) - V(\phi)$ scalar field and bouncing solutions”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **87**, 023502, (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.023502>.
- [23] S. Mukohyama, R. Namba, and Y. Watanabe, “Is the DBI scalar field as fragile as other k-essence fields?”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **94**, 2, 023514, (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.023514>.
- [24] S. Das, A. Panda, G. Manna, S. Ray, ‘Raychaudhuri Equation in K -essence Geometry: Conditional Singular and Non-Singular Cosmological Models’, *Fortschr. Phys.*, **71**, 4-5, 2200193, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.202200193>
- [25] D. Gangopadhyay, G. Manna, “The Hawking temperature in the context of dark energy”, *Euro. Phys. Lett.* **100**, 4, 49001 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/100/49001>
- [26] G. Manna, D. Gangopadhyay, “The Hawking temperature in the context of dark energy for Reissner–Nordstrom and Kerr background”, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **74**, 2811, (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2811-9>.
- [27] G. Manna, “Gravitational collapse for the K-essence emergent Vaidya spacetime”, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **80**, 9, 813, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-8383-y>.
- [28] G. Manna, P. Majumdar, and B. Majumder, “K-essence emergent spacetime as a generalized Vaidya geometry”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **101**, 12, 124034, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.124034>.
- [29] G. Manna, B. Majumder, and A. Das, “Thermodynamics for the k-essence emergent Reissner–Nordstrom–de Sitter spacetime”, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, **135**, 1, 107, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjp/s13360-020-00177-2>.
- [30] G. Manna and B. Majumder, “The Hawking temperature in the context of dark energy for Kerr–Newman and Kerr–Newman–AdS backgrounds”, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **79**, 7, 553, (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7066-z>.
- [31] B. Majumder, S. Ray, and G. Manna, “Evaporation of Dynamical Horizon with the Hawking Temperature in the K-essence Emergent Vaidya Spacetime”, *Fortschr. Phys.*, **71**, 10-11, 2300133, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.202300133>.
- [32] B. Majumder, M. Khlopov, S. Ray, and G. Manna, “Geodesic structure of generalized Vaidya spacetime through the K-essence”, *Universe*, **9**, 12, 510, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3390/universe9120510>.
- [33] G. Manna, A. Panda, A. Karmakar, S. Ray, and Md. R. Islam, ‘ $f(\bar{R}, L(X))$ -gravity in the context of dark energy with power law expansion and energy conditions’, *Chin. Phys. C*, **47**, 2, 025101, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/ac9f9be>.
- [34] M. Born, L. Infeld, “Foundations of the new field theory”, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond A* **144**, 852, 425-51, (1934). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1934.0059>.
- [35] P. A. M. Dirac, “An extensible model of the electron”, *Royal Society of London Proceedings Series A*, **268**, 1332, 57, (1962). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1962.0124>.
- [36] P. A. R. Ade et al. (Planck Collaboration), “Planck 2015 results-XIV. dark energy and modified gravity”, *A & A*, **594**, A14, (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525814>.
- [37] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck Collaboration), ‘Planck 2018 results-VI. Cosmological parameters’, *A & A*, **641**, A6, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910>.
- [38] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck Collaboration), ‘Planck 2018 results. I. Overview and the cosmological legacy of Planck’, *A & A*, **641**, A1, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833880>.
- [39] Bo-Hai Chen et al., ‘Dynamical Stability and Geometrical Diagnostic of the Power Law K-Essence Dark Energy Model with Interaction’, *Universe*, **6**, 12, 244, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3390/universe6120244>.
- [40] Bo-Hai Chen et al., “The Phase Space Analysis of Interacting K-Essence Dark Energy Models in Loop Quantum Cosmology”, *Universe*, **8**, 10, 520, (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3390/universe8100520>.
- [41] J. Shi and Jian-Pin Wu, ‘Dynamics of k-essence in loop quantum cosmology’, *Chin. Phys. C*, **45**, 4, 045104, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/abe111>.
- [42] E. Guendelman, R. Herrera, D. Benisty, ‘Unifying inflation with early and late dark energy with multiple fields: Spontaneously broken scale invariant two measures theory’, *Phys. Rev. D*, **105**, 124035, (2022). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.124035>.
- [43] E. Guendelman, R. Herrera, “Unification: Emergent universe followed by inflation and dark epochs from multi-field theory”, *Annal. Phys.*, **460**, 169566

- , (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2023.169566>.
- [44] E. I. Guendelman, and A. B. Kaganovich. ‘Fine-Tuning Free Paradigm of Two-Measures Theory: K -Essence, Absence of Initial Singularity of the Curvature, and Inflation with Graceful Exit to the Zero Cosmological Constant State’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **75**, 8, 083505, (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.75.083505>.
- [45] A. Panda, D. Gangopadhyay, G. Manna “Form Invariance of Raychaudhuri equation in the presence of Inflaton-type fields.”, *Fortschritte Der Physik*, **72**, 9–10, 2400134, (2024). doi:10.1002/prop.202400134.
- [46] A. Panda, D. Gangopadhyay, and G. Manna, “ NEC violation in $f(R, T)$ gravity in the context of a non-canonical theory via modified Raychaudhuri equation”, *Astropart. Phys.*, **165**, 103059, (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2024.103059>
- [47] L. García, et al. ‘K-Essence Scalar Field as Dynamical Dark Energy’, (2012). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1210.5259>.
- [48] A. Panda, et al. ‘Reconstruction of $f(R, T)$ Gravity Model via the Raychaudhuri Equation’. *Phys. of the Dark Univ.*, **43**, 101397, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2023.101397>
- [49] A.H.Guth, ‘Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **23**, 2, 347–56, (1981).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.23.347>
- [50] A. D. Linde, ‘A New Inflationary Universe Scenario: A Possible Solution of the Horizon, Flatness, Homogeneity, Isotropy and Primordial Monopole Problems’. *Phys. Lett. B*, **108**, 6, 389–93, (1982).[https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(82\)91219-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(82)91219-9)
- [51] S. Panpanich, et al. ‘Cosmological Dynamics of D-Blonic and DBI Scalar Field and Coincidence Problem of Dark Energy’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **95**, 10, 103520, (2017).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.103520>.
- [52] T. Padmanabhan, ‘Thermodynamical Aspects of Gravity: New Insights’. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, **73**, 4, 046901, (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/73/4/046901>.
- [53] E. Verlinde, ‘On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton’. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, **2011**, 4, 29, (2011). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2011\)029](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2011)029).
- [54] E. Verlinde, ‘Emergent Gravity and the Dark Universe’. *SciPost Physics*, **2**, 3, 016, (2017). <https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.2.3.016>.
- [55] C. Armendariz-Picon, et al. ‘Dynamical Solution to the Problem of a Small Cosmological Constant and Late-Time Cosmic Acceleration’. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **85**, 21, 4438–41, (2000).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.4438>
- [56] T. Chiba, ‘Tracking k -Essence’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **66**, 6, 063514, (2002).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.66.063514>
- [57] Z. Davari, et al. ‘Cosmological Constrains on Minimally and Non-Minimally Coupled Scalar Field Models’. *MNRAS*, stz3096, (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz3096>
- [58] J. D. Bekenstein, *Relation between physical and gravitational geometry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3641, (1993) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.48.3641>
- [59] R. De Putter,, and Eric V. Linder. ‘Kinetic K-Essence and Quintessence’. *Astroparticle Phys.*, **28**, 3, 263–72, (2007).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2007.05.011>
- [60] E. Babichev. ‘Formation of Caustics in K-Essence and Horndeski Theory’. *Jour. of High Ener. Phys.*, **2016**, 4, 1–18, (2016).[https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2016\)129](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2016)129)
- [61] M. Blau, Lecture Notes on General Relativity ,(8thOctober,2022) , <http://www.blau.itp.unibe.ch/GRlecturenotes.html>,
- [62] Eric. Poisson., A Relativist’s Toolkit: The Mathematics of Black-Hole Mechanics. *Cambridge University Press*, (2004).<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511606601>
- [63] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity*, The University of Chicago Press, (1984) (Indian Edition, (2006)), <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226870373.001.0001>
- [64] J. L. Synge and Alfred Schild. *Tensor Calculus*. Nachdr., *Dover Publ.*, (2009).
- [65] J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov. ‘Perturbations in K-Inflation’. *Phys. Lett. B*, **458**, 2–3, 219–25, (1999). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(99\)00602-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00602-4).
- [66] C. Armendariz-Picon,, V. Mukhanov, and P.J. Steinhardt, ‘Essentials of k-essence’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **63**, 10, (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.63.103510>
- [67] Poulin, Vivian, et al. ‘Early Dark Energy Can Resolve the Hubble Tension’. *Phys. Rev. L*, **122**, 22, 221301, (2019).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301>
- [68] D.Brout et al. “The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints.” *The Astrophysical Journal*, **938**, 2, 110, (2022). <http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac8e04>
- [69] T. M. C. Abbott, et al. ‘Dark Energy Survey Year 1 Results: A Precise H0 Estimate from DES Y1, BAO, and D/H Data’. *MNRAS*, **480**, 3, 3879–88, (2018).<https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1939>.
- [70] Shadab Alam, et al. ‘The Clustering of Galaxies in the Completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Cosmological Analysis of the DR12 Galaxy Sample’. *MNRAS*, **470**, 3, 2617–52, (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx721>.
- [71] Fotios K. Anagnostopoulos, and Spyros Basilakos. ‘Constraining the Dark Energy Models with $H(z)$ Data: An Approach Independent of H_0 ’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **97**, 6, 063503, (2018).<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.063503>.
- [72] Metin Ata, et al. ‘The Clustering of the SDSS-IV Extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey DR14 Quasar Sample: First Measurement of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations between Redshift 0.8 and 2.2’. *MNRAS*, **473**, 4, 4773–94, (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2630>.
- [73] Éric Aubourg, et al. ‘Cosmological Implications of Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurements’. *Phys. Rev. D*, **92**, 12, 123516, (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.123516>.
- [74] Julian E. Bautista, et al. ‘Measurement of Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Correlations at $z = 2.3$ with SDSS DR12 Ly α -Forests’. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **603**, A12, (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201730533>.
- [75] M. Betoule, et al. ‘Improved Cosmological Con-

- straints from a Joint Analysis of the SDSS-II and SNLS Supernova Samples'. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **568**, A22, (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201423413>.
- [76] F. Beutler, et al. 'The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant: 6dFGS: BAOs and the Local Hubble Constant'. *MNRAS*, **416**, 4, 3017–32, (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x>.
- [77] F. Beutler, et al. 'The Clustering of Galaxies in the Completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Anisotropic Galaxy Clustering in Fourier Space'. *MNRAS*, **466**, 2, 60, (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw3298>.
- [78] E. Gaztañaga, et al. 'Clustering of Luminous Red Galaxies - IV. Baryon Acoustic Peak in the Line-of-Sight Direction and a Direct Measurement of $H(z)$ '. *MNRAS*, **399**, 3, 1663–80, (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15405.x>.
- [79] C. Blake, et al. 'The WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey: Mapping the Distance-Redshift Relation with Baryon Acoustic Oscillations: WiggleZ Survey: BAOs in Redshift Slices'. *MNRAS*, **418**, 3, 1707–24, (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19592.x>.
- [80] X. Xu, et al. 'Measuring DA and H at $Z=0.35$ from the SDSS DR7 LRGs Using Baryon Acoustic Oscillations'. *MNRAS*, **431**, 3, 2834–60, (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt379>.
- [81] L. Samushia, et al. 'The Clustering of Galaxies in the SDSS-III DR9 Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Testing Deviations from Λ and General Relativity Using Anisotropic Clustering of Galaxies'. *MNRAS*, **429**, 2, 1514–28, (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sts443>.
- [82] S. Alam, et al. 'Completed SDSS-IV Extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Cosmological Implications from Two Decades of Spectroscopic Surveys at the Apache Point Observatory'. *Phys. Rev. D*, **103**, 8, 083533, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.083533>.
- [83] K. S. Dawson, et al. 'THE SDSS-IV EXTENDED BARYON OSCILLATION SPECTROSCOPIC SURVEY: OVERVIEW AND EARLY DATA'. *The Astronomical Journal*, **151**, 2, 44, (2016). Institute of Physics, <https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-6256/151/2/44>.
- [84] DESI Collaboration, et al. DESI 2024 VI: Cosmological Constraints from the Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations. *arXiv*, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.03002>.
- [85] Levi, Michael E., et al. The Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI). *arXiv:1907.10688*, *arXiv*, (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1907.10688>.
- [86] D.J. Eisenstein, et al. 'Detection of the Baryon Acoustic Peak in the Large-Scale Correlation Function of SDSS Luminous Red Galaxies'. *The Astrophysical Journal*, **633**, 2, 560–74, (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1086/466512>.
- [87] W.J. Percival, et al. 'Baryon Acoustic Oscillations in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 Galaxy Sample'. *MNRAS*, **401**, 4, 2148–68, (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15812.x>.
- [88] C. Blake, and K. Glazebrook. 'Probing Dark Energy Using Baryonic Oscillations in the Galaxy Power Spectrum as a Cosmological Ruler'. *The Astrophys. J.*, **594**, 2, 665–73, (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1086/376983>.
- [89] W. Hu, and N. Sugiyama. 'Small-Scale Cosmological Perturbations: An Analytic Approach'. *The Astrophysical J.*, **471**, 2, 542–70, (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1086/177989>.
- [90] D.J Eisenstein., and W. Hu. 'Baryonic Features in the Matter Transfer Function'. *The Astrophysical J.*, **496**, 2, 605–14, (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1086/305424>.
- [91] S. Weinberg, '*Cosmology*'. **Oxford university press**, (2008)
- [92] S. Dodelson, '*Modern Cosmology*'. **Academic Press**, (2003) .
- [93] M. D.Hoffman, & A. Gelman, . The No-U-Turn Sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **15**, 1593–1623, (2014). <https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.4246>
- [94] David W. Hogg, et al. Data Analysis Recipes: Fitting a Model to Data. *arXiv*, (2010), <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1008.4686>.
- [95] A. Lewis, and S. Bridle. 'Cosmological Parameters from CMB and Other Data: A Monte Carlo Approach'. *Physical Review D*, **66**, 10, 103511, (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.66.103511>.
- [96] Planck Collaboration, et al. 'Planck 2018 Results: VI. Cosmological Parameters (Corrigendum)'. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, **652**, C4, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910e>.
- [97] Adam G. Riess, et al. 'Cosmic Distances Calibrated to 1 percent Precision with Gaia EDR3 Parallaxes and Hubble Space Telescope Photometry of 75 Milky Way Cepheids Confirm Tension with Λ CDM'. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, **908**, 1, L6, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/abdbaf>.
- [98] P.M. Dabrowski. 'PHANTOM DARK ENERGY AND ITS COSMOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES'. The Eleventh Marcel Grossmann Meeting, World Scientific Publishing Company, 1761–63, (2008). https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812834300_0248.
- [99] A. Nygaard, et al. 'Decaying Dark Matter and the Hubble Tension'. *The Hubble Constant Tension*, Springer Nature, 481–92, (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-0177-7_25.
- [100] V. Mukhanov, et all 'Theory of Cosmological Perturbations'. *Physics Reports*, **215**, 5–6, 203–333, (1992). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573\(92\)90044-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(92)90044-Z).