

Hint for Quintessence-like Scalars from Holographic Dark Energy

B. Guberina* and R. Horvat†

Rudjer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia

H. Štefančić‡§

Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Matèria,

Universitat de Barcelona, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Abstract

We use the generalized holographic dark energy model, in which both the cosmological constant (CC) and Newton's constant G_N are scale-dependent, to set constraints on the renormalization-group (RG) evolution of both quantities phrased within quantum field theory (QFT) in a curved background. Considering the case in which the energy-momentum tensor of ordinary matter stays individually conserved, we show from the holographic dark energy requirement that the RG laws for the CC and G_N are completely determined in terms of the lowest part of the particle spectrum of an underlying QFT. From simple arguments one can then infer that the lowest-mass fields should have a Compton wavelength comparable with the size of the current Hubble horizon. Hence, although the models with the variable CC (or with both the CC and the G_N varying) are known to lead to successful cosmologies without introducing a new light degree of freedom, we nonetheless find that holography actually brings us back to the quintessence proposal. An advantage of having two different components of the vacuum energy in the cosmological setting is also briefly mentioned.

* guberina@thphys.irb.hr

† horvat@lei3.irb.hr

‡ stefancic@ecm.ub.es

§ On leave of absence from the Rudjer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia

Considering a contribution to the vacuum energy only from states that do exist in a gravitational holographic theory of gravity [1, 2, 3, 4], provides us with the most elegant solution to the (“old”) cosmological constant (CC) problem [5]. The reason behind this miraculous match between theory and observation lies in the fact that holography limits the true dynamical degrees of freedom accessible to a system.

Another important reason to discuss holography in the context of the CC problem is that it promotes the vacuum energy density to a scale-dependent quantity, thus potentially giving a chance to understand also the “new” CC problem, that is, the “coincidence problem” [6]. Indeed, applying the entropy bound proposed by Bekenstein *et al.* [7] to local QFTs suggests they must break down in an arbitrary large volume. Additional relationship between the size of the region L (providing an IR cutoff) and the UV cutoff was proposed by Cohen *et al.* [2], in order to prevent formation of black holes within the effective field-theoretical description. The proposed relationship between the UV and IR cutoff results in an upper bound on the zero-point energy (ZPE) density ρ_Λ . The largest ρ_Λ saturating this inequality can be written as

$$\rho_\Lambda(\mu) \simeq \mu^2 G_N^{-1}(\mu), \quad (1)$$

where μ represents the IR cutoff. As pointed by one of us in [8], the application of the more stringent bound of Cohen *et al.* [2] to conventional QFTs, in general promotes not only ρ_Λ , but also Newton’s constant G_N to a dynamical quantity. Accordingly, we phrase Eq. (1), in which both G_N and ρ_Λ are varying, as a generalized holographic dark energy model. Specifying L as the size of the present Hubble distance ($L = H_0^{-1} \simeq 10^{28}$ cm), one immediately arrives at the observed value for the dark energy density today $\rho_\Lambda \simeq 10^{-47}$ GeV⁴.

On the other hand, if ρ_Λ from (1) is considered as an energy density of a noninteracting perfect fluid (taking also G_N to be a constant), then for some choices of the IR cutoff (the inverse of the size of the region) one fails to recover the equation of state (EOS) for a dark energy-dominated universe, as noted in [9]. Specifically, choosing for L to be the size of the observable universe today, *i. e.*, the current Hubble horizon, one finds that matter and dark energy always scale identically (for flat space), $\rho_\Lambda \sim \rho_m$, thus hindering a decelerating era of the universe for redshifts $z \gtrsim 0.5$, a feature confirmed by the observation of the SNe Ia [10]. Very recently it was found [11] that if the large scale is cut off with the proper event future horizon, the correct EOS for an accelerated universe might be obtained. The related

issues were discussed in [12].

In the above examples, an obvious modeling of dark energy of Eq. (1) is through self-interacting scalar fields, which still behave as a perfect fluid. We feel, however, that since Eq. (1) was derived using ZPEs, the most natural interpretation regarding dark energy in Eq. (1) is through the variable (or interacting) but “true” CC, with the EOS $\omega_\Lambda \equiv p_\Lambda/\rho_\Lambda$ being precisely -1 [9]. To compare such a model with observation, one should however adapt the framework of the effective EOS, as defined in [13]. How this works for models involving the “true” CC, see in [14, 15].

The transfer of energy between the various components in the universe, in the framework where also the gravitational constant can be time dependent, is given by the generalized equation of continuity ¹

$$\dot{G}_N(\rho_\Lambda + \rho_m) + G_N\dot{\rho}_\Lambda + G_N(\dot{\rho}_m + 3H\rho_m) = 0 . \quad (2)$$

Eq. (2) is valid for pressureless matter and overdots denote time derivatives. Notice also that ρ_Λ in Eq. (2) will be affected not only by matter, but also by a time-dependent gravitational coupling.

In the present paper, we use the holographic restriction (1), supplemented with the generalized equation of continuity, Eq. (2), to constrain the parameters of the RG evolution in a conventional field-theoretical model in curved space. Such a model was based on the observation [18] that even a “true” CC in such theories cannot be fixed to any definite constant (including zero) owing to the renormalization-group (RG) running effects. The variation of the CC arises solely from particle field fluctuations, without introducing any quintessence-like scalar fields. Particle contributions to the RG running of the CC which are due to vacuum fluctuations of massive fields have been properly derived in [19], with a somewhat peculiar outcome that more massive fields do play a dominant role in the running at any scale. When the RG running scale μ is below the lowest mass in the theory, we can write the RG laws for ρ_Λ and G_N as [19, 20]

$$\rho_\Lambda = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n \mu^{2n} , \quad (3)$$

¹ In Eq. (2) the quantity $G_N T_{total}^{\mu\nu}$ is conserved. In a special case where G_N is static, the total energy-momentum tensor is conserved. The possibility of net creation of energy in the framework of sourced Friedmann equations was studied in the transplackian approach to inflation in [16], and in the holographic energy density in [17].

$$G_N^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n \mu^{2n} . \quad (4)$$

The energy scale μ , associated with the RG running and appearing in Eqs. (3) and (4), cannot be set (within QFT and standard cosmology) from the first principles. We assume that both series converge well and can be well approximated by retaining just a first few terms. From the studies of the cosmologies with the running ρ_Λ and G_N in the formalism of QFT in curved spacetime [18, 19, 20] we know that generally $C_1 \sim m_{max}^2$, $C_2 \sim N_b - N_f \sim 1$, $C_3 \sim 1/m_{min}^2$, etc.; $D_0 = M_{Pl}^2$, $D_1 \sim 1$, $D_2 \sim 1/m_{min}^2$, etc.. Here m_{max} and m_{min} denote the largest and the smallest masses of massive fields in the theory, respectively, and N_b and N_f stand for the number of bosonic and fermionic massive degrees of freedom in the theory, respectively. C_0 represents the ground state of the vacuum (coinciding with the IR limit of the CC here), which, of course, cannot be unambiguously set in the theory.

We set our context by fixing the matter component in Eq. (2) to evolve in a canonical way, $\rho_m \sim a^{-3}$, *i. e.*, that there is no energy transfer between this component and both the variable vacuum term and the time-dependent gravitational field. In this framework, Eq. (2) is reduced to

$$G'_N(\mu)(\rho_\Lambda(\mu) + \rho_m) + G_N(\mu)\rho'_\Lambda(\mu) = 0 . \quad (5)$$

Here the prime denotes differentiation with respect to the scale μ . We show below that the scale μ can be univocally fixed ² only in this framework, provided RG laws for both quantities are known. Indeed, after inserting the holographic dark energy requirement (1) into (5), we find

$$\mu = -\frac{G'_N(\mu)\rho_m}{2} , \quad (6)$$

which means that there is no more freedom in identification of μ (that is, the IR cutoff in this case) once $G_N(\mu)$ is known. Some scaling properties of ρ_Λ and G_N as implied by holography can be easily inferred from (6). Namely, from the requirement of the positivity of the scale μ , $\mu > 0$, it is seen that $G'_N(\mu) < 0$, which consequently means that $\dot{G}_N(t) > 0$, *i. e.*, $G_N(t)$ increases as a function of cosmic time. Such a scale dependence implies that the coupling G_N is asymptotically free; a feature exhibited, for instance, by higher-derivative quantum gravity models at the 1-loop level [22]. The asymptotic freedom of G_N may also have an

² Here, the scale-fixing is purely phenomenological [21] and is obtained from the equations of continuity, like (2) and (5), and not from the first-principle considerations of quantum gravity.

effect on the dynamics of galaxy and their rotation curves [23, 24]. By similar arguments as above, one can show that $\dot{\rho}_\Lambda(t) < 0$, *i. e.*, dark energy decreases as a function of cosmic time.

In the following we apply the requirement from the generalized holographic dark energy model (1) to the RG laws as given by Eqs. (3) and (4). This relates the coefficients C 's and D 's in the following way:

$$C_0 = 0; \quad C_n \simeq D_{n-1}. \quad (7)$$

Before embarking on the discussion of the announced case, $G_N = G_N(t)$, $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\Lambda(t)$, $\rho_m \sim a^{-3}$, let us briefly mention the case with $G_N = const.$. In this case, one immediately obtains,

$$C_0 = 0; \quad m_{max}^2 \simeq M_{Pl}^2, \quad (8)$$

with $\rho_\Lambda \sim m_{max}^2 \mu^2$. On the other hand, the observational data suggest that $\mu_0 \sim H_0$, where the subscript '0' denotes the present-day value. It is important to note that this does not fix the scale at $\mu \sim H$, as one might naively expect. Indeed, from the continuity equation in the case when $\dot{G}_N = 0$,

$$\dot{\rho}_\Lambda + (\dot{\rho}_m + 3H\rho_m) = 0, \quad (9)$$

one easily sees that the scale μ cannot be univocally fixed. Eq. (9) implies a continuous transfer of energy from matter to the CC and *vice versa* (depending on the sign of the interaction term). This means that the energy density of matter will dilute in a rate whose deviation from the canonical case $\rho_m \sim a^{-3}$ depends decisively on the choice for μ . The choice $\mu \sim H$ has been employed in the model [25]. In the light of the assumed merging of QFT with quantum gravity, also note that $m_{max} \sim M_{Pl}$ might represent the effective value of mass owing to multiplicities of particles having masses just below the Planck scale.

Returning to the most interesting case when both G_N and ρ_Λ are varying, we insert the expression (4) into the scale-fixing relation (6), to arrive at the following expression for the scale μ :

$$\mu^2 \simeq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \frac{D_1}{D_0^2} \rho_m}{\frac{D_2}{D_1} - \frac{D_1}{D_0}}. \quad (10)$$

Using the estimates for the coefficients D 's we finally arrive at

$$\mu^2 \simeq \frac{1}{2} m_{min}^2 (1 - M_{Pl}^{-4} \rho_m). \quad (11)$$

Regarding Eq. (11), several comments are in order. The value of the scale μ as given by (11) is at least marginally acceptable as far as the convergence of the expressions (3) and (4) is concerned.³ In addition, from $G'_N(\mu) < 0$ we obtain that $D_1 \simeq C_2 > 0$. Eq. (11) shows an extremely slow variation of the scale with the scale factor (or cosmic time). Once the RG scale crosses below the lowest mass in the theory, it effectively freezes at a value $\sim (1/\sqrt{2}) m_{min}$. Confronting ρ_Λ as given by (3) with observation, with the scale μ taken from Eq. (11), we immediately arrive at $m_{min} \sim H_0 \sim 10^{-33}$ eV. We thus find quintessence-like particles in the spectrum. This is the main result of our paper. It is interesting to notice that what holography actually does is to expand the particle spectrum from either side to the extremum; on one side the heaviest possible masses lie near the Planck scale, on the other side the lowest possible masses are given by the lowest mass scale in our universe, H_0 . Moreover, the ‘‘coincidence problem’’ is easy to understand since ρ_Λ today is simply given by the product of squared masses of the particles lying both on the top and bottom of the spectrum.

Our results suggest that we may have two different contributions to the vacuum energy in cosmological settings. This may help to resolve some of the cosmological problems, like that with the effective phantom phase of the universe. Such a superaccelerating phase is indicated by the most recent observational data, (see, *e. g.*, [26]). We refer to a recent model [15], comprising both the variable CC and dark energy modeled as a scalar field, where a temporary phantom phase can be obtained with a nonphantom scalar field, having EOS larger than -1. Also, this model was shown to be free from arguments leading to the Big Rip [27] of the universe.

In conclusion, we have shown how merging of a model with a variable CC based on the RG effects from standard QFT, with the concept of holographic dark energy density, results in remarkable consequences for the particle spectrum of the former theory. Restricting to the case where the matter energy density has the usual scaling behavior, we have been able to specify the RG laws for both the CC and Newton’s constant in such a manner as to obtain the univocal results after conjunction with holography. Although the presence of quintessence-like scalar fields in the QFT approach to dark energy is redundant and

³ Note that Eq. (11) is still an order-of-magnitude estimate. For instance, having $N_b - N_f \sim 100$ would raise the scale μ in Eq. (11) by a factor of ten. In this case, one should include more terms from the series (3) and (4) to obtain a consistent expression for μ .

not required for consistency with observational data, we have shown that consistency with holographic predictions calls for their appearance in the particle spectrum. Also, in the light of the most recent cosmological data, we have pointed out to a benefit of having two (or several) different components of the vacuum energy in the cosmological setup. Although we are aware of a “toy” nature of the holographic energy density, we still feel that our order-of-magnitude estimates may indicate that this interpretation of the dark energy problem, which favors putting different approaches together, ought to be an important ingredient of any realistic dark energy model. Forthcoming astrophysical data will put such a scheme to test.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport of the Republic of Croatia under contract No. 0098002 and 0098011, and partially supported through the Agreement between the Astrophysical Sector, S.I.S.S.A., and the Particle Physics and Cosmology Group, RBI. H. Š. is supported by the Secretaría de Estado de Universidades e Investigación of the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia of Spain under the program “Ayudas para movilidad de Profesores de Universidad e Investigadores españoles y extranjeros”. The work of H. Š. is also supported by MCYT FPA 2004-04582-C02-01 and CIRIT GC 2001 SGR-00065.

-
- [1] T. Banks, *SUSY Breaking, Cosmology, Vacuum Selection and the Cosmological Constant in String Theory* [hep-th/9601151]; *Cosmological Breaking of Supersymmetry?* [hep-th/0007146].
 - [2] A. Cohen, D. Kaplan, and A. Nelson, *Effective Field Theory, Black Holes, and the Cosmological Constant*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 4971 [hep-th/9803132].
 - [3] P. Horava and D. Minic, *Probable Values of the Cosmological Constant in a Holographic Theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 1610 [hep-th/0001145].
 - [4] S. Thomas, *Holography Stabilizes the Vacuum Energy*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 081301.
 - [5] S. Weinberg, *The Cosmological Constant Problem*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 61 (1989) 1.
 - [6] P. J. Steinhardt, in “Critical Problems in Physics”, edited by V. L. Fitch and Dr. R. Marlow (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1997).
 - [7] J. D. Bekenstein, *Black Holes and Entropy*, Phys. Rev. D7 (1973) 2333; *A Universal Upper Bound on the Entropy to Energy Ratio for Bounded Systems*, Phys. Rev. D23 (1981) 287.

- [8] R. Horvat, *Holography and a Variable Cosmological Constant*, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 087301 [astro-ph/0404204].
- [9] S. D. Hsu, *Entropy Bounds and Dark Energy*, Phys. Lett. B594 (2004) 13 [hep-th/0403052].
- [10] A. G. Reiss et al., *Type Ia Supernova Discoveries at $z > 1$ From the Hubble Space Telescope: Evidence for Past Deceleration and Constraints on Dark Energy Evolution* [astro-ph/0402512].
- [11] M. Li, *A Model of Holographic Dark Energy*, Phys. Lett. B603 (2004) 1 [hep-th/0403127].
- [12] Q-C. Huang and Y. Gong, *Supernova Constraints on a holographic dark energy model*, JCAP 0408 (2004) 006 [astro-ph/0403590]; Y. Gong, *Extended Holographic dark energy*, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 064029 [hep-th/0404030]; Q-C. Huang and M. Li, *The Holographic Dark Energy in a Non-flat Universe*, JCAP 0408 (2004) 013 [astro-ph/0404229]; K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, *A CMB/Dark Energy Cosmic Duality*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 221302; S. Hsu and A. Zee, *A speculative relation between the cosmological constant and the Planck mass*, [hep-th/0406142]; K. Ke and M. Li, *Cardy-Verlinde Formula and Holographic Dark Energy* [hep-th/0407056]; Y. S. Myung, *Holographic principle and dark energy*, [hep-th/0412224]; Y. S. Myung, *Cosmic holographic bounds with UV and IR cutoffs*, [hep-th/0501023]; A. J. M. Medved, *A not so brief commentary on cosmological entropy bounds*, [hep-th/0501100]; B. Wang, E. Abdalla and R-K. Su, *Constraints on the dark energy from holography*, Phys.Lett. B611 (2005) 21 [hep-th/0404057]; F. Bauer, *The Running of the Cosmological and the Newton Constant controlled by the Cosmological Event Horizon*, [gr-qc/0501078].
- [13] E. V. Linder and A. Jenkins, *Cosmic Structure Growth and Dark Energy*, MNRAS 346 (2003) 573 [astro-ph/0305286]; E. V. Linder, *Probing Gravitation, Dark Energy, and Acceleration*, Phys.Rev. D70 (2004) 023511 [astro-ph/0402503].
- [14] P. Wang and X. Meng, *Can vacuum decay in our Universe?*, Class. Quant. Grav. 22 (2005) 283 [astro-ph/0408495].
- [15] E. Elizalde, S. Nojri, S. D. Odintsov and P. Wang, *Dark Energy: Vacuum Fluctuations, the Effective Phantom Phase, and Holography*, [hep-th/0502082].
- [16] U. H. Danielsson, *Transplanckian energy production and slow roll inflation*, Phys. Rev. D71 (2005) 023516 [hep-th/0411172].
- [17] Y. S. Myung, *Sourced Friedmann equations with holographic energy density*, [hep-th/0502128].
- [18] I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, *On the scaling behavior of the cosmological constant and the possible existence of new forces and new light degrees of freedom*, Phys. Lett. B475 (2000) 236

- [hep-ph/9910462].
- [19] A. Babic, B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, *Renormalization-group running of the cosmological constant and its implication for the Higgs boson mass in the Standard Model*, Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 085002 [hep-ph/0111207]; B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, *Renormalization-group running of the cosmological constant and the fate of the universe*, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 083001 [hep-ph/0211184].
- [20] I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, *Scaling behavior of the cosmological constant: interface between quantum field theory and cosmology*, JHEP 0202 (2002) 006 [hep-th/0012227].
- [21] A. Babic, B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, *Renormalization-group running cosmologies - a scale-setting procedure*, [astro-ph/0407572].
- [22] J. Julve and M. Tonin, *Quantum gravity with higher derivative terms*, Nuovo Cimento B46 (1978) 137; E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, *Higher derivative quantum gravity: one loop counterterms and asymptotic freedom*, Nucl. Phys. B201 (1982) 469; E. G. Avramidi and A. O. Barvinsky, *Asymptotic freedom in higher derivative quantum gravity*, Phys. Lett. B159 (1985) 269.
- [23] O. Bertolami and J. G. Bellido, *Astrophysical and cosmological constraints on a scale dependent gravitational coupling*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D5 (1996) 363.
- [24] I. L. Shapiro, J. Sola and H. Stefancic, *Running G and Λ at low energies from physics at M_X : possible cosmological and astrophysical implications*, JCAP 0501 (2005) 012 [hep-ph/0410095].
- [25] I. L. Shapiro, J. Sola, C. Espana-Bonet and P. Ruiz-Lapuente, *Variable Cosmological Constant as a Planck Scale Effect*, Phys. Lett. B574 (2003) 149 [astro-ph/0303306]; C. Espana-Bonet, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, *Testing the running of the cosmological constant with Type Ia Supernovae at high z* , JCAP 0402 (2004) 006 [hep-ph/0311171].
- [26] Y. Wang and M. Tegmark, *New dark energy constraints from supernovae, microwave background and galaxy clustering*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 241302 [astro-ph/0403292]; S. Capozziello, V. Cardone, M. Funaro and S. Andreon, *Constraining dark energy models using the lookback time to galaxy clusters and the age of the universe*, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 123501 [astro-ph/0410268]; S. Hannestad and E. Mortsell, *Cosmological constraints on the dark energy equation of state and its evolution*, JCAP 0409 (2004) 001 [astro-ph/0407259].
- [27] R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N. Weinberg, *Phantom Energy and Cosmic Doomsday*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 071301 [astro-ph/0302506].