

Interacting Holographic Dark Energy: Scalar Field Models

Supriya Pan¹

Subenoy Chakraborty²

Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata-700 032, India.

Abstract

Holographic dark energy models have got tremendous enthusiasm recently both from theoretical and observational point of view. In the present work we assume that the universe is dominated by dark matter (DM) and dark energy (DE) which do not evolve separately but interact nongravitationally with one another. We consider different holographic dark energy (HDE) models characterized by the IR cut off lengths. We show that the interacting HDE model can be considered as the unified DM and DE model. Finally, we establish the equivalence between HDE with different scalar field models.

Keywords : Holographic Dark energy, Interaction, Unified model, Scalar field.

Pacs no : 04.60.Cf, 98.80.Es

1 Introduction

At present various cosmological observations particularly SN Ia[1], the cosmic microwave background radiation[2] and the large-scale structure[3,4] have predicted that the universe is in accelerating phase only in recent past. These observed results are not in accord with the prediction of standard cosmology. So it is speculated that in addition to the normal cold dark matter the universe is dominated in recent times by an exotic matter (known as dark energy) with negative pressure and as a result we have the present accelerating phase of the universe.

The possible choice of dark energy that first comes in mind is the cosmological constant (i.e vacuum energy) Λ having equation of state $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda$. Although this model is in general agree with recent astronomical observations but it suffers from the well known cosmological constant problem[5], coincidence problem[6] and age problem[7]. Further, present data reveal that the choice of DE should be such that there is a smooth transition across the phantom barrier from the above in near past[8]. During the last decade several models for DE have been proposed namely, quintessence[9], phantom [10], k-essence[11], tachyon[12], quintom[8,13], Chaplygin gas[14], holographic DE[15], the new age graphic DE[16], the Ricci DE[17] and so on. In this connection, it is worthwhile to mention that an alternative to incorporate the above mentioned cosmological observations in the framework of standard cosmology is to modify the gravity theory itself. For such extension to gravity one may refer to works namely in f(R)

¹pansupriya051088@gmail.com

²schakraborty@math.jdvu.ac.in

theory[18] or theories with other curvature invariants[19],coupling the Ricci scalar to a scalar field[20] by introducing a vector field contribution[21] or by gravity thory in higher dimensional spacetimes[22].

Now,among the several proposals for dark energy,HDE models have got special attention both from theoretical as well as observational point of view.In this model the dark energy density is connected to the cosmic horizon which is a global property of the universe.Also this model has a close relationship to the space-time foam[23].Further,the HDE model greatly alleviates the coincidence problem and shows compatibility at 1σ confidence level with the age of old quasar APM 08279+5255[24].

Now starting with holographic principle and using effective quantum field theory,the energy density of HDE model is related to the IR cut off(L).In the literature,there are various choices of HDE model, considering different system's IR cut off,for example (i) $L = H^{-1}$,the Hubble radius,which can solve the coincidence problem as well as can drive accelerated expansion[25] , (ii) $L = R_E$,the radius of the event horizon,which is used to obtain correct equation of state and the desired accelerating universe[26] , (iii) $L = (\dot{H} + 2H^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, the Ricci length,which corresponds to the size of the maximal perturbation leading to the formation of a black hole[27] , (iv) $L = \alpha H^2 + \beta \dot{H}$ which satisfies the restrictions imposed by the current observational data and avoids the causality problem(as in the second case)[28].In the present work we consider couplings in the dark sector species.This is in part motivated by the fact that until today we can only extract information of these components through gravitational interaction.These interacting models were first proposed by Wetterich[29] to lower down the value of the cosmological term and subsequently,it was found to resolve the cosmic coincidence problem[30].At first in section 2 we show that the above interacting two fluid system is equivalent to a single fluid which may be identified as the modified chaplygin gas model-a unified DM and DE model.The equivalence between HDE model and a scalar field has been presented in section III for various scalar field models namely,quintessence,tachyonic,k-essence and dilatonic.Finally,at the end,in section IV there is a short discussion and concluding remarks.

2 Unified single fluid model of DM and HDE:Modified Chaplygin Gas

We consider the homogeneous and isotropic model of the universe having the line element

$$dS^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - \kappa r^2} + r^2 d\Omega_2^2\right] \quad (1)$$

with $\kappa = 0, \pm 1$ for flat,closed and open model of the universe.However,the recent observations[2,3,31] are compatible with a closed universe with a small positive curvature i.e, $\Omega_\kappa \sim 0.02$.As we are dealing with present cosmological epoch,So neglecting the contributions from matter and radiation[28],the first Friedmann equation becomes

$$H^2 + \frac{\kappa}{a^2} = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_d) \quad (2)$$

Here ρ_m is the energy density of DM(assuming in dust form) and ρ_d is the energy density for HDE which is chosen as perfect fluid with equation of state $p_d = \omega_d \rho_d$.It should be noted that $\omega_d < -\frac{1}{3}$ is no longer a constant and p_d is the thermodynamic pressure.The energy conservation relations for these two dark components are given by

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H\rho_m = Q \quad (3)$$

and

$$\dot{\rho}_d + 3H(1 + \omega_d)\rho_d = -Q \quad (4)$$

Where the interaction term $Q > 0$ indicates an energy flow from DE to DM. Note that $Q < 0$ indicates a transfer of energy in the opposite direction (i.e, from DM to DE) and we shall omit this situation due to its contradiction with the second law of thermodynamics[32] and this view is also supported by observations[33]. The explicit form of Q is chosen in the form[25]

$$Q = 3\lambda H\rho_d \quad (5)$$

Where λ is a small dimensionless positive quantity and factor '3' is chosen for simplicity of calculations. This choice of Q appears to be phenomenological but it is compatible with observations[25,34] like SN Ia, CMB, large scale structure, age constraints ($H(z)$) and recently in galactic clusters.

Now substituting(5) in the energy conservation equations, we have

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(1 - \frac{\lambda}{u})\rho_m = 0 \quad (6)$$

and

$$\dot{\rho}_d + 3H(1 + \lambda + \omega_d)\rho_d = 0 \quad (7)$$

where $u = \rho_m/\rho_d$

This shows that we have effectively non-interacting two fluid system, both have the same energy densities as before, only pressure changes. We define $\rho_t = \rho_m + \rho_d$ as the total energy density, then using the conservation relations (i.e equations (3) and (4)) we obtain

$$\dot{\rho}_t = -3H\rho_m - 3H(1 + \omega_d)\rho_d \quad (8)$$

Now solving for ρ_m and ρ_d we get

$$\rho_d = \frac{\rho_t + \rho_t'}{-\omega_d} \quad , \quad \rho_m = \frac{\rho_t' + (1 + \omega_d)\rho_t}{\omega_d} \quad (9)$$

with $\prime \equiv \frac{d}{d(\ln a^3)}$.

Now eliminating ρ_d from equations (7) and first of equations (9), we obtain a second order differential equation in ρ_t :

$$\rho_t'' + (2 + \omega_d + \lambda - \frac{\dot{\omega}_d}{3H\omega_d})\rho_t' + (1 + \omega_d + \lambda - \frac{\dot{\omega}_d}{3H\omega_d})\rho_t = 0 \quad (10)$$

which has a first integral

$$\int \frac{dz}{z^2 + (2 + \omega_d + \lambda - \frac{\dot{\omega}_d}{3H\omega_d})z + (1 + \omega_d + \lambda - \frac{\dot{\omega}_d}{3H\omega_d})} = \tau_0 - \tau \quad (11)$$

Here $z = \frac{\rho_t'}{\rho_t}$, τ_0 is the integration constant, and $\tau = 3 \ln a$. However, if ω_d is assumed to be constant, then we have the complete solution:

$$\rho_t = \rho_0 a^{-3} + \rho_1 a^{-3(1+\omega_d+\lambda)} \quad (12)$$

with ρ_0, ρ_1 as integration constants. Further, equation (8) can be written as

$$\dot{\rho}_t = -3H\rho_t - 3H\omega_d\rho_d \quad (13)$$

$$i.e., \dot{\rho}_t + 3H(1 + \omega_t)\rho_t = 0 \quad (14)$$

with

$$\omega_t = \frac{\omega_d\rho_d}{\rho_t} = \frac{\omega_d\Omega_d}{1 + \Omega_\kappa} \quad (15)$$

where ω_t is the equation of state parameter. Here $\Omega_d = \frac{\rho_d}{\frac{3H^2}{8\pi G}}$ is the density parameter for the dark energy which is related to the density parameters for dark matter(Ω_m) and curvature(Ω_κ) by the relation ,

$$\Omega_d + \Omega_m = 1 + \Omega_\kappa \quad (16)$$

One may note that even if ω_d , the equation of state parameter for dark energy is chosen to be constant, ω_t is still a variable, i.e, the effective one fluid model has always varying equation of state. Also as $\omega_d < -\frac{1}{3}$, $\Omega_\kappa > 0$ and $\Omega_d < 1$. So $\omega_t < -\frac{1}{3}$, i.e, the one fluid system is always of DE nature. Therefore, interacting two fluid system-one in the form of dark matter(dust) and other in the form of dark energy(perfect fluid) is equivalent to a single dark fluid with variable equation of state ($< -\frac{1}{3}$) .

We shall now examine whether the above unified one fluid model of DM and HDE may be considered as modified chaplygin gas(MCG) model[35] which has the equation of state

$$p = \gamma\rho - \frac{B}{\rho^n} \quad (17)$$

with $B, n > 0$ and $0 < \gamma \leq 1$

The IR cut off lengths(L) for HDE are chosen as the four possibilities used in the literature namely (i) Hubble radius, i.e, $L = H^{-1}$ (ii) radius of the event horizon, i.e, $L = R_E$ (iii) Ricci length scale, i.e, $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and (iv) $L = (\alpha H^2 + \beta \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Now using effective quantum field theory and the Holographic principle, the energy density for HDE can be written as[15]

$$\rho_d = \frac{3c^2}{8\pi GL^2} \quad (18)$$

where c^2 a dimensionless quantity carries the uncertainties of the theory and is usually assumed to be constant while the factor '3' is introduced for convenience.

2.1 Hubble radius as IR cut off , i.e, $L = H^{-1}$

Here,

$$\rho_d = \frac{3c^2}{8\pi G} H^2 \quad (19)$$

For flat FRW model the ratio of the energy densities turns out to be constant, i.e,

$$u = \frac{\rho_m}{\rho_d} = \frac{1 - c^2}{c^2}. \quad (20)$$

Thus the coincidence problem can be alleviated. The equation of state parameter for HDE turns out to be constant, i.e.,

$$\omega_d = -\frac{\lambda}{1-c^2} \quad (21)$$

and we have the restrictions: $1-3\lambda \leq c^2 < 1-\lambda$ in quintessence era and $c^2 > 1-\lambda$ in phantom like phase. So the effective equation of state parameter for the combined single fluid system becomes

$$\omega_t = -\frac{\lambda\Omega_d}{1-c^2} \quad (22)$$

On the other hand, for MCG model the energy conservation relation $\dot{\rho} + 3H(p + \rho) = 0$ gives on integration

$$\rho^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\gamma+1} \left[B + \frac{\delta}{a^{3(\gamma+1)(n+1)}} \right] \quad (23)$$

where δ be the constant of integration. Now comparing (22) with the equation of state parameter for MCG one gets ,

$$\gamma - \frac{B(\gamma+1)}{B + \frac{\delta}{a^\mu}} = -\frac{\lambda\Omega_d}{1-c^2} \quad (24)$$

where $\mu = 3(\gamma+1)(n+1)$

Now integrating the energy conservation equation (7), we have on simplification

$$\lambda_0(t-t_0) = \int a^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{3\lambda c^2}{1-c^2})} \sqrt{\frac{B - \frac{\delta\gamma}{a^\mu}}{B + \frac{\delta}{a^\mu}}} da \quad (25)$$

where $\lambda_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda\rho_{d0}}{3(1-c^2)}}$ and t_0 and ρ_{d0} are integration constants. Thus in principle we have the complete solution and the effective one fluid system may be considered as MCG model.

2.2 Radius of the event horizon as IR cut off, i.e, $L = R_E$

The equation of the state parameter for HDE is given by

$$\omega_d = -\lambda - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c} \quad (26)$$

with $\rho_d = \frac{3c^2}{8\pi G R_E^2}$ as the energy density for HDE. So, from equation (15) we have

$$\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c} \right) \Omega_d = \frac{B - \frac{\delta\gamma}{a^\mu}}{B + \frac{\delta}{a^\mu}} \quad (27)$$

which on simplification takes the form

$$\theta x^3 - \alpha x^2 - \xi = 0 \quad (28)$$

with $\theta = \frac{2}{3c}$, $\alpha = (\lambda + \frac{1}{3})$ and $\xi = \frac{B - \frac{\delta\gamma}{a^\mu}}{B + \frac{\delta}{a^\mu}}$ and $x = \sqrt{\Omega_d}$.

In MCG model, the pressure is positive at the early stages of the evolution of the universe. Subsequently it decreases with the evolution and becomes zero in the matter dominated era. So, at present, when DE dominates over normal matter, it is reasonable to choose pressure to be negative and as a result we have

$$\frac{\delta\gamma}{a^\mu} < B, \text{ i.e., } \xi > 0. \quad (29)$$

Thus the above cubic equation has at most one positive real root and at most two negative roots. The root structure is one of the following:

- i) One positive and two negative real roots.
- ii) One positive real root and two complex conjugate roots.

Thus in any case we have a positive solution for x , i.e., $\sqrt{\Omega_d}$ and hence in principle the combined one fluid system can be effectively considered as MCG model. Further, this estimated value of Ω_d can be matched to the observed value so that λ can be determined.

2.3 Ricci length scale as IR cut off, i.e, $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

Similar to the second case the equation of state parameter for HDE is not constant here but has a simple form

$$\omega_d = \frac{1}{3\Omega_d} - \frac{2}{3c^2} \quad (30)$$

one may note that ω_d does not depend on the choice of the explicit form of Q . Now equating both sides of equation (15) we get

$$\Omega_d = \frac{c^2}{2} \left[\frac{4B + \frac{\delta(1-3\gamma)}{a^\mu}}{B + \frac{\delta}{a^\mu}} \right] \quad (31)$$

Note that the right hand side of the above equation is always positive due to the inequality in (29) and the variation of Ω_d with the evolution of the universe is presented in figure 1. So it is not unlikely to consider MCG model as the effective one fluid system at least in principle.




Fig.1 - The graph of Ω_d is shown against the variation of 'a' and 'c' for the choice of $B = 1 = \delta$, $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\mu = 7$

2.4 IR cut off length L is taken as $L = (\alpha H^2 + \beta \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

So here

$$\rho_d = \frac{3}{8\pi G}(\alpha H^2 + \beta \dot{H}) \quad (32)$$

where α and β are constants which must satisfy the restrictions imposed by the current observational data. Similar to the first case here also the HDE equation of state parameter ω_d is a constant, i.e.,

$$\omega_d = -1 + \frac{2(\alpha - 1)}{3\beta} \quad (33)$$

Note that as in the 3rd choice, ω_d does not depend on the choice of the interaction term. Now for accelerated expansion α, β are restricted by the following inequalities:

In quintessence era,

$$1 < \alpha \leq 1 + \beta, \beta > 0 \quad (34)$$

or

$$1 + \beta \leq \alpha < 1, \beta < 0, \quad (35)$$

In phantom like era,

$$\alpha > 1, \beta < 0 \quad (36)$$

or

$$\alpha < 1, \beta > 0, \quad (37)$$

Then from the equation(15), using conservation equation(7) (after integration) we have

$$\lambda_0(t - t_0) = \int a^{(\frac{\alpha-1}{\beta} + \frac{3\lambda}{2} - 1)} \sqrt{\frac{Ba^\mu - \gamma\delta}{Ba^\mu + \delta}} da \quad (38)$$

with $\lambda_0 = \frac{\rho_{d0}}{3-2(\frac{\alpha-1}{\beta})}$ and ρ_{d0}, t_0 , being constants of integration.

Thus at least in principle it is possible to have an equivalence between unified single fluid and MCG model.

3 A correspondence between HDE fluid with scalar field models

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \quad (39)$$

and

$$p_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) \quad (40)$$

we assume that this quintessence scalar field model of HDE is the effective underlying theory. So we chose $\rho_\phi = \rho_d$ and $p_\phi = p_d$ for the holographic model. Thus the equation of state parameter is given by

$$\omega_d = \frac{p_d}{\rho_d} = \frac{p_\phi}{\rho_\phi} \quad (41)$$

and as a result, we have

$$V(\phi) = \frac{3}{2}(1 - \omega_d)H^2\Omega_d \quad (42)$$

and

$$\phi = \int \frac{\sqrt{(1 + \omega_d)}\sqrt{(3\Omega_d)}}{\Omega'_d} d\Omega_d \quad (43)$$

where $'$ stands for differentiation with respect to $x = \ln a$. The energy density for HDE is given by equation(18) where the IR cut off length L is chosen as (i) the radius of the event horizon, or (ii) the Ricci length scale.

3.0.1 IR cut off length is equal to the radius of the event horizon, i.e, $L = R_E$:

So we have the equation of the state parameter (ω_d) given by equation(26) and the evolution of the density parameter is given by

$$\Omega'_d = \Omega_d[(1 - \omega_d)(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c}) - 3\lambda\Omega_d] \quad (44)$$

so from (42) and (43) we obtain

$$V(\phi) = \Omega_d(\frac{3\lambda}{2} + 2 + \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c})H^2 \quad (45)$$

and

$$\phi = 2 \int \frac{\sqrt{2(1 - \frac{z}{c}) - 3\lambda}}{[(1 - z^2)(1 + \frac{2z}{c}) - 3\lambda z^2]} dz + \phi_0 \quad (46)$$

where $z = \sqrt{\Omega_d}$ and ϕ_0 is the constant of integration. Thus both ϕ and $V(\phi)$ are obtained as a function of the density parameter Ω_d and it is not possible to express V as a function of ϕ . Fig 2 shows the variation of the potential V over Ω_d and c .




Fig.2 - The potential function V is plotted against Ω_d and c for the choice of $\lambda = 1$ and present estimated value of Hubble parameter namely $H_0 = 71$ km/megaparsec/sec.

3.0.2 IR cut off length L is taken as Ricci length scale, i.e, $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$:

In this case the equation of state parameter is given by equation (30), so the explicit form of the scalar field and the potential functions are

$$\phi = \int \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{3c^2}{2} - 1\right) \left[\frac{4Ba^\mu + \delta(1 - 3\gamma)}{Ba^\mu + \delta}\right]} \frac{da}{a} + \phi_0 \quad (47)$$

and

$$V(\phi) = \left[\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{3c^2}{4} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{4Ba^\mu + \delta(1 - 3\gamma)}{Ba^\mu + \delta}\right)\right] H^2 \quad (48)$$

So here ϕ and $V(\phi)$ can be expressed with scale factor 'a' as the parameter and figure 3 shows the graphical representation of V .




Fig.3 - The figure shows the variation of the potential function with the evolution of the universe and the variation of the parameter (c). Here we choose $B=1, \delta, \gamma = \frac{1}{3}, H = H_0 = 71 \text{ km/megaparsec/sec}, \mu = 12$.

3.1 Tachyonic scalar field:

The effective Lagrangian for the tachyonic scalar field is given by [36]

$$L = -V(\phi)\sqrt{1 - g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi} \quad (49)$$

Now we compare the corresponding energy momentum tensor for the Tachyonic field to that of the perfect fluid namely

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)u_\mu u_\nu - pg_{\mu\nu} \quad (50)$$

Here, $u^\mu = \frac{\partial^\mu\phi}{(\partial_\nu\phi\partial^\nu\phi)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ is the four velocity of the tachyonic field and ρ and p , the usual energy density and pressure of the tachyon are given by

$$\rho = \frac{V(\phi)}{\sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2}} \quad (51)$$

and

$$p = -V(\phi)\sqrt{1 - \dot{\phi}^2} \quad (52)$$

so

$$\omega_t = \frac{p}{\rho} = \dot{\phi}^2 - 1 \quad (53)$$

is the equation of state parameter for the tachyon field. Hence for correspondence with HDE we have

$$\dot{\phi}^2 = 1 + \omega_d \quad (54)$$

and

$$V(\phi) = 3\sqrt{-\omega_d}\Omega_d H^2 \quad (55)$$

Thus the explicit form of the scalar field and the potential function are

$$\phi = \int \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}(1 - \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c}) - \lambda}}{H\Omega_d[(1 - \Omega_d)(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c}) - 3\lambda\Omega_d]} d\Omega_d + \phi_0 \quad (56)$$

And

$$V(\phi) = 3\sqrt{(\lambda + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c})\Omega_d} H^2 \quad , \quad (57)$$

for $L=R_E$

Here figure 4 shows the graphical representation of V given in equation(57).




Fig.4 - The figure shows the plot of V for variation of Ω_d and c, as before we choose $\lambda = 1$, and $H=H_0 = 71\text{km/megaparsec/sec}$.

Also

$$\phi = \int \sqrt{(1 - \frac{2}{3c^2}) + \frac{1}{3\Omega_d}} dt + \phi_0 \quad (58)$$

$$V(\phi) = \sqrt{3(\frac{2}{c^2} - \frac{1}{\Omega_d})}\Omega_d H^2 \quad (59)$$

for $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

3.2 k-essence scalar field:

In the literature, there are attempts to explain the present accelerating phase using k-essence scalar field, which is characterized by a noncanonical kinetic energy. The general form of the action integral is given by [37]

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} P(\phi, X) \quad (60)$$

where Lagrangian density $P(\phi, X)$ represents a pressure density and $X = -\frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2}$. As a result, the energy density and pressure can be represented as [37, 38]

$$\rho(\phi, X) = f(\phi)(-X + 3X^2) \quad (61)$$

and

$$p(\phi, X) = f(\phi)(-X + X^2) \quad (62)$$

with $f(\phi)$, the k-essence potential.

So the equation of state parameter for k-essence is given by

$$\omega_k = \frac{X - 1}{3X - 1} \quad (63)$$

3.2.1 IR cut off length is equal to the radius of the event horizon, i.e., $L = R_E$:

For this IR cut off we have,

$$\frac{X - 1}{3X - 1} = \omega_d = -\lambda - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c} \quad (64)$$

i.e.,

$$X = \frac{\frac{4}{3} + \lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c}}{2 + 3\lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c}} \quad (65)$$

and

$$f(\phi) = \frac{\rho_d}{X(3X - 1)} = \frac{3\Omega_d H^2 (2 + 3\lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c})^2}{2(\frac{4}{3} + \lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c})} \quad (66)$$

Note that as X is positive definite so it is not possible to have a real k-essence scalar field for which $\dot{\phi}^2 = -2X$. So we conclude that k-essence scalar field model can not be made equivalent to the HDE model when IR cut off is the radius of the event horizon.

3.2.2 IR cut off length L is taken as Ricci length scale, i.e., $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$:

In this case

$$X = \frac{1 + \frac{2}{3c^2} - \frac{1}{3\Omega_d}}{1 - \frac{1}{\Omega_d} + \frac{2}{c^2}} \quad (67)$$

and

$$f(\phi) = \frac{3\Omega_d H^2 (1 - \frac{1}{\Omega_d} + \frac{2}{c^2})^2}{2(1 + \frac{2}{3c^2} - \frac{1}{3\Omega_d})} \quad (68)$$

Here for real k-essence field X should be negative so the density parameter is restricted by the relation

$$\frac{1}{3 + \frac{2}{c^2}} < \Omega_d < \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{c^2}} \quad (69)$$

and hence $f(\phi)$ is also positive. Also the k-essence scalar field has the explicit form

$$\phi = \sqrt{2} \int \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{2}{3c^2} - \frac{1}{3\Omega_d}}{\frac{1}{\Omega_d} - 1 - \frac{2}{c^2}}} dt \quad (70)$$

So here also the density parameter takes the role of a parameter for both the k-essence scalar field and its potential. Figure 5 shows the graphical representation of $f(\phi)$ for variation of Ω_d and c .




Fig.5 - The figure represents variation of $f(\phi)$ over Ω_d and c for the choice of the present value of the Hubble parameter, $H=H_0 = 71 \text{ km/megaparsec/sec}$.

3.3 Dilatonic scalar field:

The dilatonic scalar field may be used as a candidate for dark energy model because it can explain the DE puzzle and eliminate quantum instabilities (at least partly) due to phantom field models of DE[39]. Similar to the k-essence model, the Lagrangian density of the dilatonic field is represented by the pressure density of the scalar field as[40]

$$p(X, \phi) = -X + \alpha \exp(\lambda\phi) X^2 \quad (71)$$

where $X = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2}$ and α and λ are positive constants. The corresponding energy density is given by

$$\rho(X, \phi) = -X + 3\alpha \exp(\lambda\phi) X^2 \quad (72)$$

so the equation of state parameter has the expansion

$$\omega_d = \frac{\alpha \exp(\lambda\phi) X - 1}{3\alpha \exp(\lambda\phi) X - 1} \quad (73)$$

In this connection one may note that the scaling solution for the present model corresponds to $X \exp(\lambda\phi) = \text{constant}$ [40].

3.3.1 IR cut off length is equal to the radius of the event horizon, i.e., $L = R_E$:

Using equation(26) for ω_d we have from equation(73)

$$\alpha \exp(\lambda\phi)X = \frac{\frac{4}{3} + \lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c}}{2 + 3\lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c}} \quad (74)$$

Now as $X = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2}$, so integrating the above equation we obtain

$$\phi = \frac{2}{\lambda} \ln \left[\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \int \sqrt{\frac{\frac{4}{3} + \lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{3c}}{2 + 3\lambda + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c}}} dt \right] \quad (75)$$

Note that for scaling solution we have from equation(74) $\Omega_d = \text{constant}$ and hence from(71) $\phi \sim \ln t$, which is similar to those obtained in[40,41].

3.3.2 IR cut off length L is taken as Ricci length scale, i.e., $L = (2H^2 + \dot{H})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$:

Using the equation of state parameter we have from equation(73)

$$\alpha \exp(\lambda\phi)X = \frac{\frac{1}{3\Omega_d} - \frac{2}{3c^2} - 1}{\frac{1}{\Omega_d} - \frac{2}{c^2} - 1} \quad (76)$$

So for real dilatonic scalar field ϕ we must have either

$$\Omega_d < \frac{1}{\frac{2}{c^2} + 3} \quad (77)$$

or,

$$\Omega_d > \frac{1}{\frac{2}{c^2} + 1} \quad (78)$$

and the integral form of ϕ is

$$\phi = \frac{2}{\lambda} \ln \left[\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \int \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{3\Omega_d} - \frac{2}{3c^2} - 1}{\frac{1}{\Omega_d} - \frac{2}{c^2} - 1}} dt \right] \quad (79)$$

Here also Ω_d becomes a constant for scaling solution and as before $\phi \sim \ln t$.

4 Discussion and concluding remarks:

The paper deals with a detailed study of interacting dark sector species. One of the dark components namely the DE is chosen as HDE model due to its importance from theoretical as well as observational point of view. At first we have shown that the interacting two fluid system is equivalent to a single DE fluid having variable equation of state. Subsequently, we have examined whether this single fluid may be equivalent to the MCG model. We have considered all four possible choices for IR cut off length for HDE model and have shown that in principle all the four models may be matched to MCG with some restrictions in the parameters involved in some cases. Then we have made an attempt to have a correspondence between HDE model with different scalar field models namely (i) the quintessence, (ii) the tachyon, (iii) the k-essence and (iv) the dilaton. It is found that for HDE model with event horizon as the IR cut off, no correspondence is possible with k-essence scalar field. However, in all other cases HDE model is shown to be equivalent to all the scalar field models mentioned above. Further, to have a correspondence with k-essence scalar field, the HDE model with Ricci length scale as the IR cut off, the density parameter Ω_d is restricted to the interval $(\frac{1}{3+\frac{2}{c^2}}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{2}{c^2}})$ [see equation (69)]. So if we take the observed value of Ω_d to be 0.73 then c may be estimated as $c \simeq 0.73$, which agree with observed value of c . Also in case of dilatonic scalar field it is possible to have scaling solution with scalar field varies as logarithm of cosmic time. In all the cases due to complicated form of the expressions involved, it is not possible to express the potential $V(\phi)$ explicitly as a function of the scalar field, rather both ϕ and $V(\phi)$ are expressed with Ω_d or scale factor 'a' as the parameter. Therefore we conclude that a HDE model consists of two fluids is always equivalent to a single DE fluid which may be considered as scalar field or MCG model.

Acknowledgements: One of the authors (SC) is thankful to Inter University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Pune, India, for their warm hospitality because a part of the work was done there during a visit. Also SC is thankful to DRS programme in the Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University. SP is thankful to Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India, for junior research fellowships.

References

- [1] A.G.Reiss et al., *Astron.J.* **116** (1998) 1009 ;S.Perlmutter et al., *Astrophys.J.* **517** (1999) 565.
- [2] D.N.Spergel et al., *Astrophys.J.Suppl.Ser.* **148** (2003) 175; **170** (2007) 377.
- [3] M.Tegmark et al., *Phys.Rev.D* **69** (2004) 103501.
- [4] D.J.Eisentein et al., *Astrophys.J.* **633** (2005) 560.
- [5] S.Weinberg ,*Rev.Mod.Phys.* **61** (1989) 1; S.M.Carrol ,*Living Rev.Relativity.* **4** (2001) 1.
- [6] E.J.Copeland, M.Sami and S.Tsujikawa ,*int.J.Mod.Phys.D* **15** (2006) 1753.
- [7] R.J.Yang and S.N.Zhang ,*Mot.Not.R.Astron.Soc.* **407** (2010) 1835.
- [8] B.Feng, X.L.Wang and X.M.Zhang ,*Phys.Lett.B* **607** (2005) 35.
- [9] R.R.Caldwell, R.Dave and R.J.Steinhardt ,*Phys.Rev.Lett* **80** (1998) 1582.
- [10] R.R.Caldwell ,*Phys.Lett.B* **545** (2002) 23.

- [11] C.Armendariz-Picon ,V.Mukhanov and P.J.Steinhardt ,*Phys.Rev.D* **63** (2001) 103510.
- [12] T.Padmanavan ,*Phys.Rev.D* **66** (2002) 021301 ;A.Sen ,*Phys.Scr.T* **117** (2005) 70.
- [13] E.Elizadle ,S.Nojiiri and S.D.Odintsov ,*Phys.Rev.D* **70** (2004) 043539.
- [14] A.Kamenshchik ,U.Moschella and V.Pasquier ,*Phys.Lett.B* **511** (2001) 265 ; M.C.Bento ,O.bertolami and A.A.Sen ,*Phys.Rev.D* **66** (2002) 043507.
- [15] A.G.Cohen ,D.B.Caplan and A.E.Nelson ,*Phys.Rev.Lett.* **82** (1999) 4971 ; M.Li ,*Phys.Lett.B* **603** (2004) 1.
- [16] H.Wei and R.G.Cai ,*Phys.Lett.B* **663** (2008) 1 ; H.Wei and R.G.Cai ,*Phys.Lett.B* **660** (2008) 113.
- [17] C.Gao ,F.Wu ,X.Chen and Y.G.Shen ,*Phys.Rev.D* **79** (2009) 043511.
- [18] S.Capozziello and M.Francaviglia ,*Gen.Relat.Grav.* **40** (2007) 357 ; S.Nojiiri and S.D.Odintsov ,*Phys.Rep.* **505** (2011) 59 ; S.Capozziello and V.Faraoni ,*Beyond Einstein Gravity* ,Fundamental Theories of Physics ,Vol.170(Springer,Dordrecht,2011) ; T.P.Sotiriou and V.Faraoni ,*Rev.Mod.Phys.* **82** (2010) 451.
- [19] A.Defelice ,D.F.Mota and S.Tsujikawa ,*Phys.Rev.D* **81** (2010) 023532.
- [20] H.Farajollahi ,M.Farhoudi and H.Shojaie ,*Int.J.Theo.Phys.* **49** (2010) 2558.
- [21] J.Zuntz ,T.G.Zlosnik ,F.Bourliot ,P.G.Ferreira and G.D.Starkman ,*Phys.Rev.D* **81** (2010) 104015.
- [22] M.La Camera ,*Mod.Phys.Lett.A* **25** (2010) 25.
- [23] Y.J.Ng ,*Phys.Rev.Lett.* **86** (2001) 2946 ; M.Arzano ,T.W.Kephart and Y.J.Ng ,*Phys.Lett.B* **649** (2007) 243 ;I.Duran and Diego Pavan ,*J.Phys.Conf.Ser.* **314** (2011) 012058.
- [24] S.Del Campo ,J.C.Fabris ,R.Herrera and W.Zimdahl ,*Phys.Rev.D* **83** (2011) 123006 ; I.Duran ,D.Pavon and W.Zimdahl ,*arXiv:1007.0390* (astro-ph.co).
- [25] D.Pavon and W.Zimdahl ,*Phys.Lett.B* **628** (2005) 206 ; *Class.Quant.Grav.* **24** (2007) 5461 ; I.Duron ,D.Pavon and W.Zimdahl ,*J.Cosmol.Astropart.Phys.* **07** (2010) 018.
- [26] M.Li ,*Phys.Lett.B* **2004** 01.
- [27] R.Brustein 2008 "Cosmological Entropy Bounds" in String Theories and Fundamental Interactions(Lecture notes in Physics Vol.737) eds M.Gasperini and J.Maharana (Heidelberg : Springer)pp 619-659.
- [28] L.N.Granda and A.Oliveros ,*Phys.Lett.B* **669** (2008) 275 ; *Phys.Lett.B* **671** (2009) 199.
- [29] C.Wetterich ,*Nucl.Phys.B* **302** (1988) 668 ; ibi d.Astron.Astrophys **301** (1995) 321.
- [30] L.Amendola ,*Phys.Rev.D***62** (2010) 043551 ; L.Amendola and D.Tocchini-Valentini , it Phys Rev.D **64** (2001) 043509 ; L.P.Chimento ,A.S.Jacubi ,D.Pavon and W.Zimdahl ,*Phys.Rev.D* **67** (2003) 083513.
- [31] C.L.Bennet et al.,*Astrophys.J.Suppl.* **148** (2003) 1 ; U.Seljak, A.Slosar, P.McDonald ,*J.Cosmol.Astropart.Phys* **10** (2006) 014.

- [32] D.Pavan and B.Wang ,*Gen.Relat.grav.* **41** (2009) 1.
- [33] E.Abdalla ,L.R.Abramo and J.C.C.Souza ,*arxiv* : 0910.5236.
- [34] A.A.Sen and D.Pavon ,*Phys.Lett.B* **664** (2008) 7.
- [35] U.Debnath ,A.Banerjee and S.Chakraborty ,*Class.Quant.Grav.* **21** (2004) 5609.
- [36] A.Sen ,*J.High Energy Phys.* **04** (2002) 048 ;*Int.J.Mod.Phys.A* **20** (2005) 5513.
- [37] C.Armendariz-Picon ,T.Damour and V.F.Mukhanov ,*Phys.Lett.B* **458** (1999) 209 ; C.Armendariz-Picon ,V.F.Mukhanov and P.J.Steinhardt ,*Phys.Rev.D* **63** (2001) 103510.
- [38] E.J.Copeland ,M.Sami and S.Tsujikawa ,*Int.J.Mod.Phys.D* **15** (2006) 1753.
- [39] S.M.Carrol ,M.Hoffman and M.Trodden ,*Phys.Rev.D* **68** (2003) 023509.
- [40] F.Piazza and S.Tsujikawa ,*J.Cosmol.Astropart.Phys.* **07** (2004) 004.
- [41] A.Sheykhi ,*Phys.Rev.D* **84** (2011) 107302.