

The Ghost (Phantom) Universe: A Model in which the Universe is Flat, Quantum Ghost Matter and Vacuum Dominated and Accelerating

Ramy Naboulsi

May 22, 2019

Tokyo Institute of Technology, Department of Physics, O-Okoyama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo

Abstract

We propose a modification of the Standard Hot Big Bang Cosmology (SHBBC), in which the Universe is flat, quantum matter dominated, and accelerating. The total energy density of the Universe is taken to be the sum of two terms: the quantum contributions from vacuum and plus an additional quantum (ghost) term (with negative pressure) which is responsible of the dominant driver of expansion at a late epoch of the Universe. When the new term dominates, the scalar factor varies as $R \propto t^{\frac{4}{3}}$ (Accelerating Flat Ghost Universe). The quantum energy density required to close the Ghost Universe is found to be much smaller than in SHBBC, so that quantum matter can be sufficient to provide a flat geometry. Quantum matter particles interactions are interpreted as a quantum fifth force and it is found to vary as $F(r) \propto r^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

The Universe we live in is dynamic, in other word the space-time is expanding. It is it full of all kinds of exotic objects. Edwin Hubble discovered this in the 1920s. When Hubble looked at galaxies outside of our own, he saw that they were all racing away from us. That might suggest there was an initial explosion that we sat at the center of. But it would be unreasonable to assume that our galaxy is the center of the universe! So, instead, we deduce that the fabric of space-time, the sheet in which all these galaxies sit, is itself expanding.

What causes the universe to expand? That's actually two different interesting questions.

The first question is: What gave the universe its initial kick? Basically, what was the Big Bang that gave rise to the current expansion of the universe? It really lies at the intersection of the physics of gravity and of quantum mechanics, an interface we just don't understand well today.

But the other question, what makes the universe keep expanding, is pretty simple to answer. It's just inertia, or the momentum of the expansion. It's a lot like shooting a rocket up in the air. If there's no gravity, it will just keep going forever. But, like that rocket, if there is gravity, the motion is slowed down. In the universe, it is the gravity of the mass and energy that counteracts the expansion. And, just like a rocket, if there is enough gravity, the universe's expansion could halt at some point and it could recollapse.

What's been discovered in the last few years is that this expansion is not slowing down, but instead it is accelerating. Normal mass and energy cannot cause this - their self gravity always counteracts expansion. Instead, it is hypothesized that there is some form of "missing energy" that is not diluted by the expansion of the universe like most mass and energy. Such an energy density can help the expansion continue, and possible even accelerate it. Understanding the nature of this dark energy is one of most important problems in astronomy today.

The first evidence for the accelerating universe came from observations of distant supernovae [1,2]. However, the data were also consistent with an open universe - a universe that would expand forever because the total energy density was less than the so-called critical density - with a low mass density and no cosmological constant. The energy density of the universe is composed of matter (both ordinary visible matter and invisible or "dark" matter) and the energy density of the vacuum. The size of the latter, which is sometimes called quintessence or "dark energy", defines the cosmological constant. This constant was first introduced by Einstein to explain why the universe did not appear to be expanding. Hubble later showed that the universe was expanding, causing Einstein to call it his "biggest blunder". This new accelerating energy has a larger energy density than the mass density of the Universe. Many authors have explored a cosmological constant, a decaying vacuum energy [3,4], and quintessence [5,6,7] as possible explanations for such an acceleration.

In the quantum field theories, which underlie modern particle physics, the notion of empty space has been replaced with that of a vacuum state, defined to be the ground (lowest energy density) state of a collection of quantum fields. A peculiar and truly quantum mechanical feature of the quantum fields is that they exhibit zero-point fluctuations everywhere in space, even in regions, which are otherwise 'empty' (i.e. devoid of matter and radiation). These zero-point fluctuations of the quantum fields, as well as other 'vacuum phenomena' of quantum field theory, give rise to an enormous vacuum energy density [9].

Zero-point energies of particle physics theories cannot be ignored when gravitation is taken into account and densities are given by $\rho_{vac} \approx \frac{m^4 c^3}{\hbar^3}$, where m is the ultra-violet cut-off. In recent papers [10,11], as an explanation for acceleration, we proposed a cosmological brane model with additional quantum energy ($\rho_m \approx \frac{3m^2 c^4}{8\pi G \hbar^2}$, $m \leq \frac{\hbar H}{c^2}$) to the FRW equation (H is the Hubble constant).

Here we propose a totally opposite approach, where the Universe is flat, and yet consists only of vacuum energy with density ρ_{vac} and our additional quantum or ghost density ρ_m . In others words, we take the total energy density to be the sum of two terms: the contributions from vacuum and plus our new interaction term. We call it the *Ghost Expansion Model* or simply the *Ghost* or *Spectre* or *Phantom Universe*.

This ghost term may arise from self-interactions between particles. The nature of this force is unclear, but could be interpreted as a long-range quantum fifth force, that is $F(r) \propto r^{\alpha-1}$. From equilibrium and statistical mechanics considerations based on the scaling of the partition function, one finds the equation of state $p = -(\frac{\alpha}{3})\rho$.

The Ghost model has then the attractive characteristic that quantum matter alone is sufficient to provide a flat geometry. As a first approximation, we will suppose that is of the same nature in both densities ρ_{vac} and ρ_m . The Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) equation is modified by the addition of this new term and takes one of the forms:

$$H^2 = A\rho_{vac} + B(\rho_{vac})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (1)$$

$$H^2 = A\rho_m + B(\rho_m)^2 \quad (2)$$

where $H \equiv \frac{\dot{R}}{R}$, R is the scale factor of the Universe, A, B, c, G and \hbar are all constants. We take $A = \frac{8\pi G}{3}$ to be consistent with standard FRW and dS (de Sitter) cosmology (where $B = 0$).

In fact, one can consider the vacuum state of a particle field as containing itself virtual pairs of particles with an affective density $n \propto \frac{1}{\lambda_c}$ where $\lambda_c \approx \frac{\hbar}{mc}$ is the Compton wavelength. Then one can considers the gravitational interaction energy of these virtual pairs, which is $\frac{G}{m^2}\lambda$ for one pair, thus leading to a contribution to an effective energy density in the vacuum of order of magnitude $\rho_c = \frac{Gm^6 c^4}{\hbar^4}$. If we take now the energy density to be the sum of three terms: ρ_m , ρ_{vac} and ρ_c , then the following equations holds:

$$H^2 = A(\rho_{vac})^{\frac{3}{2}} + B(\rho_{vac}) + C(\rho_{vac})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3)$$

$$H^2 = A(\rho_m) + B(\rho_m)^2 + C(\rho_m)^3 \quad (4)$$

$$H^2 = A(\rho_c) + B(\rho_c)^{\frac{2}{3}} + C(\rho_c)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (5)$$

In fact, such equations may arise from fundamental theories of gravity in higher dimensions [12,13] or from an extra contribution to the energy-momentum tensor on the right hand side of (ordinary four dimensional) Einstein's equations as our cosmological model [10,11]. Equation (2) is identical (at least in form) to the one obtained in standard brane cosmology [12] (matter, in this model, is confined to four-dimensional hypersurfaces (three-branes) whereas one extra compact dimension is felt by gravity only), as well as in Cardassian models [13,14,15,16], but the major difference is that the matter energy ρ is replaced by ρ_m . Only when $m = \frac{\hbar H}{c^2}$, $\rho = \rho_m$ and we fall into the classical and standard model. So, we have in our model only microscopic and quantum contributions, and so there are no curvature terms.

Here, we study and discuss the phenomenology of the ansatz in equation (1). We first mention that the ghost contribution ρ_m has a negative pressure (simple calculations gives $p_m = -\frac{1}{2}\rho_m$), which is responsible for the Universe's acceleration. In this way, the quantum fifth force varies as $F(r) \propto R^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

From equation (1), it is clear that this kind of behavior is qualitatively very different from the standard braneworld cosmology (as equation (2)) because it implies a modification of gravity at very low energy scales rather than very high ones.

We suppose that the new density in equation (1) is considered to be initially negligible. It only comes to dominate recently, at the redshift $z_{eq} \approx O(1)$ indicated by the supernovae observations. Once the second term dominates, it causes the universe to accelerate even if there is no macroscopic matter contribution. We take the vacuum density to scale with the redshift as $\rho_{vac} \propto R^{-3}$. It is then clear, that when the second term in equation (1) dominates, it causes the Universe to accelerate as the scale factor grows as $R \propto t^{\frac{4}{3}}$, so that $\ddot{R} > 0$. Here appear another important feature of our model: its acceleration while there is no macroscopic matter at all. The second term starts to dominate at a redshift z_{eq} when $A\rho(z_{eq}) = B\rho^{0.5}(z_{eq})$. In this way,

$$A = \frac{H_0^2}{\rho_{0,vac}} - \frac{B}{\sqrt{\rho_{0,vac}}} \quad (6)$$

$$B = \frac{H_0^2(1+z_{eq})^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\rho_{0,vac}[1+(1+z_{eq})^{\frac{3}{2}}]} \quad (7)$$

where $\rho_{0,vac}$ is the actual vacuum density. We have one parameter in this model, z_{eq} or B . Observations of the cosmic background radiation show that we live in a flat Universe. We define

the critical quantum density as

$$\rho_c \equiv \frac{3m_0^2 c^4}{8\pi G \hbar^2} \times \frac{1}{[1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{\frac{3}{2}}]} \quad (8)$$

where $m_0 = \frac{\hbar H_0}{c^2}$. In this way, if we take z_{eq} ,

$$\rho_{c,vac} \approx 0.35 \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi G} \approx 0.35 \times 1.88 \times 10^{-29} h_0^2 \text{ gm} \times \text{cm}^{-3} \quad (9)$$

where h_0 is the Hubble constant today in unit of 100km/s/Mpc. In this way, the critical density is much lower than previously estimated and satisfy most of the observational constraints. It became much lower if we reformulate the problem with equation (5), but here the acceleration is constant.

Several characteristics of this model will be discussed in a future works.

References

- [1] S. Perlmutter et al. [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], *Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae*, *Astrophys. J.* 517, 565 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133].
- [2] A. G. Riess et al. *Supernova Search Team Collaboration, Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant*, *Astron. J.* 116, 1009 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201].
- [3] K. Freese, F.C. Adams, J.A. Frieman, and E. Mottola, *Nucl. Phys.* B287, 797 (1987).
- [4] J. Frieman, C. Hill, A. Stebbins, and I. Waga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 2077 (1995).
- [5] L. Wang and P. Steinhardt, *Astrophys. J.* 508, 483 (1998).
- [6] R. Caldwell, R. Dave, P. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 1582 (1998).
- [7] G. Huey, L. Wang, R. Dave, R. Caldwell, and P. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev.* D59, 063005 (1999).
- [8] <http://www-supernova.lbl.gov/public/misc/formargon/SNAPoverview.pdf>. [9] S.E. Rugh and H. Zinkernagel, Symposium, Hellebkgade 27, Copenhagen N, Denmark.

- [10] R. Naboulsi, gr-qc/0301115.
- [11] R. Naboulsi, gr-qc/0301027.
- [12] P. Binétruy, C. Deffayet, and D. Langlois, *Nucl. Phys.* B565, 269 (2000).
- [13] D.J. Chung and K. Freese, *Phys. Rev.* D61, 023511 (2000).
- [14] K. Freese and M. Lewis, *Phys. Lett.* B540, 1 (2002) [astro-ph/0201229].
- [15] K. Freese, hep-ph/0208264.
- [16] P. Gondolo and K. Freese, hep-ph/0209322.