

# Cosmological Interactions with Phantom Scalar Field: Revisiting Background Phase-Space Analysis with Compactified Variables

Genly Leon,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Daya Shankar,<sup>3,†</sup> Amlan Halder,<sup>3,‡</sup> and Andronikos Paliathanasis<sup>2,4,1,3,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Católica del Norte,*

*Avda. Angamos 0610, Casilla 1280 Antofagasta, Chile*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Systems Science, Durban University of Technology, Durban 4000, South Africa*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Sciences, Woxsen University, Hyderabad 502345, Telangana, India*

<sup>4</sup>*School for Data Science and Computational Thinking and Department of Mathematical Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, 7602, South Africa*

Energy transfer in the dark sector of the universe gives rise to new phenomena of special interest in modern cosmology. When dark energy is modeled as a phantom scalar field, interactions become crucial to avoid Big Rip singularities. In this work, we revisit the phase-space analysis of the field equations by introducing a new set of dimensionless variables distinct from the traditional Hubble normalization approach. These new variables define a compactified phase space for the evolution of physical parameters. We demonstrate that these compactified variables offer fresh insights into the phase-space analysis in gravitational theories, particularly when the dark energy fluid is allowed to possess a negative energy density.

Keywords: Cosmological interactions; phantom scalar field; dynamical analysis

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The detailed analysis of cosmological observations [1–4] implies that the universe is dominated by two matter components that do not interact with light: dark matter and dark energy. Dark matter was introduced to explain the velocity profiles of galaxies and, on

---

\*Electronic address: genly.leon@ucn.cl

†Electronic address: daya.shankar@woxsen.edu.in

‡Electronic address: amlankanti.halder@woxsen.edu.in

§Electronic address: anpaliat@phys.uoa.gr

cosmic scales, is described as a dust fluid source [5]. On the other hand, dark energy [6, 7] has a negative pressure component and is responsible for the current cosmic acceleration. Although the cosmological constant is the simplest dark energy candidate, it cannot explain the entire cosmological history [8]. As a result, a plethora of dark energy models have been proposed in the literature [9–19].

Gravitational theories are inherently nonlinear, and analytic methods are essential for a deeper understanding of cosmic evolution and the viability of proposed models. In the case of a spatially flat Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) universe, introducing the cosmological constant leads to a set of differential equations that describe the physical parameters. These equations can be linearized and admit closed-form solutions. However, in modified theories of gravity or when scalar fields are introduced, the theory of variational symmetries [20–23] and singularity analysis [24, 25] have been widely applied to derive analytic solutions. The Eisenhart-Duval lift [26] recently has been introduced for analyzing cosmological field equations [27, 28].

Phase-space analysis remains a powerful tool for studying nonlinear gravitational models. In this approach, the field equations are expressed as dimensionless variables and stationary points are determined. Each stable/unstable stationary point corresponds to a specific asymptotic late-time/early-time solution, enabling the identification of cosmological eras and epochs provided by a given gravitational model. The phase-space analysis for the exponential potential in the quintessence model was performed in [29], while it was explored in [30, 31] for nonminimally coupled scalar fields. For the phantom scalar field, dynamical system analysis is presented in [32], for the Galileon in [33], and for multiscalar field models in [34–38]. Dynamical system analysis has also been extensively applied to anisotropic and inhomogeneous gravitational models [39–43]. This analysis is essential for assessing the viability of gravitational models, introducing constraints on the free parameters [44], and addressing the initial value problem [45, 46].

This study focuses on the phase-space analysis of a cosmological model with interactions [47–50] between dark energy and dark matter. Cosmological interacting scenarios have been proposed to address the coincidence problem [51], and cosmological tensions [53–55]. We assume that a phantom scalar field describes dark energy [56], allowing the energy density of the scalar field to be negative and the violation of the weak energy condition. Phase-space analysis of interacting models with a scalar field has been examined in [57–61]. Cosmological

interactions involving a phantom scalar field were investigated in [62], where it was found that a nonzero interaction term can avoid Big Rip singularities. Recently, new interacting models [63] have been introduced where the interaction function is not proportional to the scalar field's derivative. As detailed in [64], these models suffer from singularities that make them unviable.

In the following, we introduce a new set of dimensionless variables distinct from the Hubble normalization approach. We review previous results on the cosmological interactions between the phantom field and dark matter. The new set of variables is compactified, allowing for the direct determination of all stationary points. These variables provide fresh insights into the analysis of cosmological models. The structure of the paper is as follows:

In Section 2, we introduce the concept of dark matter-dark energy interaction, where dark matter is described as a pressureless ideal gas and dark energy as a phantom scalar field. The spatially flat FLRW metric is adopted for the geometry of space. In Section 3, we introduce the new dimensionless variables normalized with a positive quantity dependent on the cosmological fluid. Unlike the Hubble normalization approach, where the dimensionless variables are not compactified and require a second set for detailed analysis, these new variables are compactified from the outset. To illustrate their novelty, we introduce two interacting models, assume an exponential potential for the scalar field, and perform a detailed analysis of stationary points and asymptotic solutions. Finally, we present our conclusions in Section 4.

## 2. COSMOLOGICAL INTERACTIONS

On very large scales, the universe is described by the line element of the spatially flat FLRW geometry

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (1)$$

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

Within the framework of General Relativity with two fluid components, the phantom field, and the dark matter, the gravitational field equations for the line element (1) are

$$G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)},$$

in which  $G_{\mu\nu}$  is the Einstein tensor and  $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)}$ ,  $T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}$  are the energy-momentum tensors for the

phantom field and the dark matter defined as

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)} = -\phi_{,\mu}\phi_{,\nu} + g^{\mu\nu} \left( -\frac{1}{2}g^{\kappa\sigma}\phi_{,\kappa}\phi_{,\sigma} + V(\phi) \right), \quad (2)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} = \rho_m u_\mu u_\nu, \quad (3)$$

in which  $u_\mu = \delta_\mu^t$  is the comoving observer, and we have assumed that the cosmological fluid inherits the symmetries of the background geometry (1), that is,  $\phi = \phi(t)$  and  $\rho_m = \rho_m(t)$ . The function  $V(\phi)$  gives the scalar field potential that drives the dynamics.

The cosmological field equations read

$$3H^2 = \rho_\phi + \rho_m, \quad (4)$$

$$-2\dot{H} - 3H^2 = p_\phi, \quad (5)$$

in which

$$\rho_\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad (6)$$

$$p_\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi), \quad (7)$$

and  $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$  is the Hubble function.

The Bianchi identity leads to the continuous equation

$$T^{(\phi)\mu\nu}{}_{;\nu} + T^{(m)\mu\nu}{}_{;\nu} = 0, \quad (8)$$

or equivalently,

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

$$\dot{\rho}_\phi + 3H(\rho_\phi + p_\phi)\rho_\phi = -Q, \quad (10)$$

where function  $Q$  defines the interacting scenario.

In the following, we consider the function  $Q$  is defined by the following two models [65, 66]:

$$\text{Model A : } Q_A = \beta_0 \dot{\phi} \rho_m,$$

$$\text{Model B : } Q_B = \beta_0 \dot{\phi} \rho_\phi.$$

Where necessary the interactions are proportional to  $\dot{\phi}$  in order to avoid the appearance of singularities, see the discussion in [64].

At this point, it is important to mention that the interacting model  $Q_A$  has a geometric origin, and it follows from the Weyl Integrable Spacetime [67, 68], and it describes the Chameleon mechanism [69, 70].

### 3. COMPACTIFIED NORMALIZATION

In contrast to the Hubble normalization studied in the recent work [64]; we adopt a different normalization approach based on matter. Following the methodology established in [71], we introduce a new set of dimensionless variables

$$\chi = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\sqrt{2}D}, \quad \zeta^2 = \frac{V(\phi)}{D^2}, \quad \xi^2 = \frac{\rho_m}{D^2}, \quad \eta = \frac{\sqrt{3}H}{D}, \quad \lambda = \frac{V_{,\phi}}{V}, \quad d\tau = Ddt \quad (11)$$

where

$$D = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + \rho_m}. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, by definition, it follows

$$\Xi \equiv \chi^2 + \zeta^2 + \xi^2 = 1, \quad (13)$$

which means that variables  $\chi$ ,  $\zeta$  and  $\xi$  are compactified and take values on the surface of a unitary sphere.

In terms of the new dimensionless variables (11) the first Friedmann equation reads

$$-\eta^2 - \chi^2 + \zeta^2 + \xi^2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

which provides a second constraint for the dynamical variables.

#### 3.1. Interacting Model $Q_A$

In terms of the new variables, the field equations for model  $Q_A$  read

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 4\lambda\zeta^2 (\zeta^2 + \xi^2) - 2\beta_0\xi^2 - \left( \sqrt{6}\eta\chi\xi^2 - 4\beta_0\xi^4 + 2\zeta^2 (\lambda - \beta_0\xi^2 + \sqrt{6}\eta\chi) \right) \right), \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{d\zeta}{d\tau} = \frac{\zeta}{2} \left( \left( \sqrt{3}\eta (2\chi^2 + \xi^2) \right) + (\chi^2 + \xi^2) \left( \sqrt{2} (\lambda - \beta_0\xi^2) \chi \right) - \zeta^2 \left( \sqrt{2} (\lambda + a\xi^2) \right) \right), \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{d\xi}{d\tau} = \frac{\xi}{2} \left( \sqrt{2}\eta\chi (\beta_0\xi^4 - 2\zeta^2 (\lambda - \beta_0\xi^2) + \beta_0 (\chi^4 - \xi^4)) + \sqrt{3} (\chi^2 - \zeta^2) \right), \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{d\eta}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{3} (1 - (\chi^2 - \zeta^2) + \xi^2\eta^2) + 2\sqrt{2}\eta\chi (\zeta^2 (\lambda + \beta_0\xi^2) + \beta_0\xi^2 (\chi^2 + \xi^2)) \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{d\lambda}{d\tau} = \sqrt{2}\lambda\chi (\Gamma(\lambda) - 1), \quad \Gamma(\lambda) = \frac{V_{,\phi\phi}V}{(V_{,\phi})^2}. \quad (19)$$

In terms of the new variables, the deceleration parameter reads

$$q(\chi, \zeta, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2\eta^2} (\chi^2 + \zeta^2). \quad (20)$$

From the latter expression it follows that  $q(\chi, \zeta, \eta) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

Using the constraint equations (13) and (14), and considering an exponential scalar field potential where  $\Gamma(\lambda) = 1$ , the five-dimensional dynamical system is reduced to a two-dimensional compactified dynamical system.

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\tau} = \frac{\zeta^2}{4} \left( 4(\lambda - \beta_0)(1 - 2\chi^2) - 2\chi\sqrt{6(1 - 2\chi^2)} - (1 - \chi^2) \left( \chi \left( 4\beta_0 + \sqrt{(1 - 2\chi^2)} \right) \right) - 2\beta_0 \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{d\zeta}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( 2\chi \left( (\lambda - 2\beta_0 + 2(\beta_0 - \lambda)\zeta^2) \chi + 2\beta_0\chi^2 \right) + \sqrt{6} (1 - \zeta^2 + \chi^2) \sqrt{1 - 2\chi^2} \right). \quad (22)$$

in which we have replaced

$$\xi = \sqrt{1 - \chi^2 - \zeta^2}, \quad (23)$$

$$\eta = \sqrt{1 - 2\chi^2}, \quad (24)$$

we have decided to work at the branch where  $H > 0$ . We observe that the system is well defined for  $\chi^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Furthermore the field equations (21), (22) are invariant on the change of variables  $\zeta \rightarrow -\zeta$  and  $\xi \rightarrow -\xi$ . Without loss of generality, in the following, we consider the region  $\zeta \geq 0$ ,  $\xi \geq 0$ .

We proceed with the presentation of the stationary points  $A = (\chi(A), \zeta(A))$  of the two-dimensional dynamical system (21), (22). The admitted stationary points are

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm 1, 0), \\ A_2^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm 1, 1), \\ A_3 &= \left( \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}(3 + \lambda^2)}, \sqrt{\frac{6 + \lambda^2}{6 + 2\lambda^2}} \right) \\ A_4^\pm &= \frac{\sqrt{2}\beta_0}{\sqrt{3 + 4\beta_0^2}} (\pm 1, 0), \\ A_5 &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{3 + 2(\alpha - \lambda)^2}} \left( 1, \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha(\alpha - \lambda) - 3}{3}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The stationary points  $A_1^\pm$  and  $A_2^\pm$  are defined at the extreme limits of the variables  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$ . For the physical parameters  $\xi$  and  $q$ , we calculate the asymptotic solutions at these points as  $(\xi, q)_{A_1^\pm} = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\infty \right)$  and  $(\xi, q)_{A_2^\pm} = (0, -\infty)$ .

From these results, we infer that at the asymptotic solutions, corresponding to  $A_2^\pm$ , only the phantom scalar field contributes to the cosmic fluid and these solutions describe Big Rip singularities.

Analysis of the linearized system near these points reveals that the asymptotic solutions are always unstable. Specifically, for  $\beta_0 > \lambda$ , the points  $A_1^+$  and  $A_2^-$  are saddle points, while  $A_1^-$  and  $A_2^+$  act as sources. For  $\beta_0 < \lambda$ , the roles reverse:  $A_1^+$  and  $A_2^-$  become sources, while  $A_1^-$  and  $A_2^+$  are saddle points.




FIG. 1: Interaction A: Region plots in the space of variables  $\{\beta_0, \lambda\}$  where  $A_3$  is an attractor.

The stationary point  $A_3$  is well defined for any real value of parameter  $\lambda$ . The physical parameters are derived

$$(\xi, q)_{A_3} = \left(0, -1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\right).$$

Thus the solution at point  $A_3$  describes always cosmic acceleration, driven by the phantom scalar field. The de Sitter universe is recovered when  $\lambda = 0$ . The analysis of the linearized system near the stationary points give that the asymptotic solution is a stable solution and  $A_3$  is an attractor for  $\left\{\beta_0 \leq -2\sqrt{3} : \left(\lambda - \frac{\beta_0}{2}\right)^2 > \beta_0^2 - 12\right\}$ ,  $\{\beta_0^2 < 12\}$  or  $\left\{\beta_0 > 2\sqrt{3} : \left(\lambda - \frac{\beta_0}{2}\right)^2 < \beta_0^2 - 12\right\}$ . In Fig. 1 we present the region in the space of variables  $\{\beta_0, \lambda\}$ , in which point  $A_3$  is an attractor.




FIG. 2: Interaction A: Region plots in the space of variables  $\{\beta_0, \lambda\}$  where  $A_4^+$  is attractor (Left Fig.) and  $A_5^-$  is attractor (Righ Fig.)

The set of point  $A_4^\pm$  are well defined for real values of parameter  $\beta_0$ . We calculate

$$\{\xi, q\}_{A_4^\pm} = \left( \sqrt{\frac{3 + 2\beta_0^2}{3 + 4\beta_0^2}}, \frac{1}{2} - \beta_0^2 \right).$$

The asymptotic solution describes a universe with nonzero interacting terms, in which the two fluids contribute to cosmic evolution. The corresponding scale factor is given by a scaling function  $\beta_0^2 \neq \frac{1}{2}$ , and from an exponential function, that is, it describes the de Sitter solution for  $\beta_0^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ . Last but not least, acceleration is occurred for  $\beta_0^2 > \frac{1}{2}$ . The eigenvalues of the linearized system gives that point  $A_4^+$  is an attractor for  $\left\{ \beta_0 > 0 : \lambda > \frac{2\beta_0^2 - 3}{2\beta_0}, \lambda < \frac{2\beta_0^2 - 3}{2\beta_0} \right\}$ , while  $A_4^-$  is an attractor for  $\beta_0^2 < \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{105} - 9)}$  and  $\frac{9 + 30\beta_0^2 + 8\beta_0^4}{(3 + 4\beta_0)} < 2\beta_0\lambda$ . The regions are presented in Fig. 2.

The stationary point  $A_5$  is well defined for  $\{\lambda < 0 : \alpha > 0\}$ , or

$\left\{ 0 < \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{6} : \alpha \leq \frac{\lambda^2 - 3}{\lambda}, \lambda < \alpha \leq \frac{\lambda^2 + 3}{\lambda} \right\}$  or  $\left\{ \lambda > 2\sqrt{6} : \alpha \leq \frac{\lambda - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 24}}{2}, \frac{\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 24}}{2} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\lambda^2 - 3}{\lambda}, \lambda < \alpha \leq \frac{\lambda^2 + 3}{\lambda} \right\}$ . The stationary points describe interaction in the dark sector with

$$\{\xi, q\}_{A_5^\pm} = \left( \sqrt{1 - \chi^2(A_5) - \zeta^2(A_5)}, \frac{18\text{sign}(\alpha - \lambda) - 15 - 2(\alpha - \lambda)(2\alpha + \lambda)}{2(3 + 2(\alpha - \lambda)^2)} \right).$$



TABLE I: Interaction A: Stationary points and physical properties

Point	$\xi \neq 0$	Interaction?	Acceleration?	Attractor?
$A_1^\pm$	False	False	Big Rip	False
$A_2^\pm$	False	False	Big Rip	False
$A_3$	False	False	Always	Fig. 1
$A_4^\pm$	True	True	$\beta_0^2 > \frac{1}{2}$	Fig. 2
$A$	True	True	Fig. 3	Fig. 2

Acceleration is occurred for values of the free parameters  $\lambda, \beta_0$  as they are presented in Fig. 3. Furthermore, the region space where  $A_5$  is an attractor is given in Fig. 3




FIG. 3: Interaction A: Region plots in the space of variables  $\{\beta_0, \lambda\}$  where  $A_5$  describes cosmic acceleration (Left Fig.) and  $A_5$  is an attractor (Right Fig.).

The above results are summarized in Table I. Moreover, in Fig. 4 we present phase-space portraits for the dynamical system (21), (22) for different values of the free parameters. Finally, in Fig. 5 we present phase-space portraits in the plane  $\{\chi, q\}$ .




FIG. 4: Interaction A: Phase-space portraits for the dynamical system (21), (22) for different values of the free parameters. With red are marked the stationary points. We present the case where there not any interaction,  $\alpha = 0$ , and the potential function is constant,  $\lambda = 0$ .

### 3.2. Interacting Model $Q_B$

For the second interacting model  $Q_B$ , the gravitational field equations for the exponential potential  $V(\phi) = V_0 e^{\lambda\phi}$ , after the use of the constraint equations (13), (14) become

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 2(\beta_0 + \lambda)\zeta^2(1 - 2\chi^2) - \chi \left( (1 - \chi^2 + \zeta^2) \sqrt{6(1 - 2\chi^2)} + 2\beta_0\chi(1 - 2\chi^2) \right) \right), \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{d\zeta}{d\tau} = \frac{\zeta}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( 2(\lambda - \beta_0(\beta_0 + \lambda)\zeta^2)\chi + 4\beta_0\chi^3 + (1 + \chi^2 - \zeta^2) \sqrt{6(1 - 2\chi^2)} \right). \quad (26)$$

Similar to before, the dynamical variables are constraints as  $\chi^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ , with  $\chi^2 + \zeta^2 \leq 1$ .

We proceed with the presentation of the stationary points  $B = (\chi(B), \zeta(B))$  for the dynamical system (25), (26). Due to the algebraic difficulty of the equations, we present the analysis for the case of  $\lambda = 0$ , that is, the potential functions are constant.




FIG. 5: Interaction A: Phase-space portraits for the dynamical system (21), (22) for different values of the free parameters where we have substitute  $\zeta$  from expression (20) such that the vertical axis to describe the deceleration parameter  $q$ . Color red marks the stationary points at the finite regime. We present the case where there is not any interaction,  $\alpha = 0$ , and the potential function is constant,  $\lambda = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm 1, 0), \\
B_2^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm 1, 1), \\
B_3 &= (0, 0), \\
B_4 &= \left( -\sqrt{\frac{3}{\beta_0^2 + 3 + \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)}}}, 0 \right), \\
B_5 &= \left( -\sqrt{\frac{\beta_0^2 + 3 + \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)}}{3 + 4\beta_0^2}}, 0 \right), \\
B_6 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( -\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}}, \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}} \right), \\
B_7 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{3}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Stationary points  $B_1^\pm$  and  $B_2^\pm$  have the same physical properties with the points  $A_1^\pm$  and  $A_2^\pm$  respectively. Furthermore, the stability properties are the same. Indeed, for  $\beta_0 > 0$ ,  $B_1^+$ ,  $B_2^-$  are saddle points, and points  $B_1^-$ ,  $B_2^+$  are sources; while for  $\beta_0 < 0$ , points  $B_1^+$ ,  $B_2^-$  are sources, and  $B_1^-$ ,  $B_2^+$  are saddle points.

Point  $B_3$  describes the matter-dominated epoch, where only the dark matter contributes to the universe, that is,  $(\xi, q)_{B_3} = (1, \frac{1}{2})$ . The eigenvalues of the linearized system are calculated  $-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, +\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ , from where we infer that the  $B_3$  is always a saddle point.

Moreover, points  $B_4$  and  $B_5$  describe universes where the kinetic term of the phantom field interacts with the dark matter. The points are well defined for  $\beta_0^2 \geq 6$ , and the physical parameters are

$$(\xi, q)_{B_4} = \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{\beta_0^2 + 3 + \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)}}}, \frac{1}{2} \left( 4 - \beta_0^2 + \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)} \right) \right),$$

and

$$(\xi, q)_{B_5} = \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{\beta_0^2 + 3 + \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)}}}, \frac{1}{2} \left( 4 - \beta_0^2 - \sqrt{\beta_0^2 (\beta_0^2 - 6)} \right) \right).$$

Thus, point  $q(B_4) < 0$ , for  $6 \leq a^2 < 8$ , while  $q(B_5) < 0$  for  $\beta_0^2 \geq 6$ . Finally, the analysis of the eigenvalues near these two stationary points give that  $B_4$  describe always an unstable solution, while  $B_5$  is an attractor for  $\beta_0 > \sqrt{6}$ .

The stationary points  $B_6$  and  $B_7$  describe de Sitter solutions in which the dark matter interacts with all the components of the scalar field. Point  $B_6$  is well defined for  $\beta_0^2 \geq 6$ . The physical parameters are calculates

$$(\xi, q)_{B_6} = \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}}, -1 \right),$$

and

$$(\xi, q)_{B_7} = \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\beta_0^2}}}, -1 \right),$$

As far as the stability is concerned, point  $B_6$  always unstable, while  $B_7$  is an attractor for the range of parameter  $\beta_0$  as given in Fig. 6.




FIG. 6: Interaction B: Real components for the two eigenvalues for the linearized dynamical system (25), (26) near point  $B_7$ .

The above results are summarized in Table II. In Fig. 7, we present phase-space portraits of the dynamical system (25) and (26) for various values of the free parameters. Additionally, in Fig. 8, we display phase-space portraits in the  $(\chi, q)$  plane.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

We have considered a spatially flat FLRW geometry where the dark sector of the universe consists of dark matter, described by a dust fluid source, and dark energy, modeled by a phantom scalar field. The introduction of the phantom field allows the equation of state




FIG. 7: Interaction B: Phase-space portraits for the dynamical system (25), (26) for different values of the free parameters. With red are marked the stationary points. The plots are for  $\lambda = 0$ .




FIG. 8: Interaction B: Phase-space portraits for the dynamical system (21), (22) for different values of the free parameters where we have substitute  $\zeta$  from expression (20) such that the vertical axis to describe the deceleration parameter  $q$ . With red are marked the stationary points at the finite regime. The plots are for  $\lambda = 0$ .

parameter to cross the phantom divide line and take values smaller than  $-1$ . We introduced energy transfer between the components of the dark sector and revised the phase-space analysis by introducing a novel set of compactified dimensionless variables.

We considered a normalization using the components that constitute the dark sector of the universe, as defined by expressions (11) and (12). It is easy to see that this normalization is equivalent to the Hubble normalization in the case of quintessence but differs in the case of

TABLE II: Interaction B: Stationary points and physical properties

<b>Point</b>	$\xi \neq 0$	<b>Interaction?</b>	<b>Acceleration?</b>	<b>Attractor?</b>
$B_1^\pm$	False	False	Big Rip	False
$B_2^\pm$	False	False	Big Rip	False
$B_3$	True	False	False	False
$B_4$	True	True	$6 \leq a^2 < 8$	False
$B_5$	True	True	True	$\beta_0 > \sqrt{6}$
$B_6$	True	True	True	False
$B_7$	True	True	True	Fig. 6

a phantom field. Because the dimensionless variables are compactified, this approach allows us to formally investigate the phase space and understand the evolution of the cosmological parameters. As demonstrated, this analysis provides new insights into the phase-space dynamics. For the cosmological interacting models, we introduced two cases: model  $A$ , with  $Q_A \simeq \dot{\phi}\rho_m$ , and model  $B$ , with  $Q_B \simeq \dot{\phi}\rho_\phi$ . In the first model, the interaction depends on the energy density of dark matter, while in the second the interaction depends on the energy density of dark energy. We assumed that the interactions are proportional to the scalar  $\dot{\phi}$ , which is necessary to avoid the appearance of singularities, as discussed recently in [64].

For the first model, we identified five families of asymptotic solutions, while for the second model, we determined seven families. Big Rip singularities appear in both models, but they are described by source or saddle points, indicating that, due to the cosmic interaction, future singularities are avoided even when a phantom scalar field is introduced. For both models, the future attractors are scaling solutions. These results agree with those obtained using Hubble normalization, but are derived here in a more formal framework.

It is important to mention that for the first model, we assumed the scalar field potential to be described by an exponential function, while for the second model, we considered a constant potential. For more general potentials, the physical properties of the asymptotic solutions change slightly, as discussed in detail in [64]. For this reason, we omit the presentation of the analysis for other nonlinear scalar field potentials.

In future work, we plan to extend this normalization approach to other gravitational models, particularly multiscalar field theories.

### Acknowledgments

AP & GL thanks the support of VRIDT through Resolución VRIDT No. 096/2022 and Resolución VRIDT No. 098/2022. This study was supported by FONDECYT 1240514, Etapa 2024.

- 
- [1] M. Tegmark et al., *Astrophys. J.* 606, 702 (2004)
  - [2] M. Kowalski et al., *Astrophys. J.* 686, 749 (2008)
  - [3] E. Komatsu et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.* 180, 330 (2009)
  - [4] N. Suzuki et. al., *Astrophys. J.* 746, 85 (2012)
  - [5] A. Arbey and F. Mahmoudi, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* 119, 103865 (2021)
  - [6] M. Li, X.-D. Li, S. Wang and Y. Wang, *Frontiers of Physics*, 8, 828 (2013)
  - [7] T. Clifton, P.G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Phys. Rept.* 513, 1 (2012)
  - [8] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astronomy Reviews* 95, 101659 (2022)
  - [9] B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* 37, 3406 (1988)
  - [10] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 75, 559 (2003)
  - [11] N. Roy, S. Goswami and S. Das, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 36, 10137 (2022)
  - [12] C. Armendariz-Picon, V.F. Mukhanov and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. D* 63, 103510 (2001)
  - [13] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, *Phys. Rev. D* 79, 064036 (2009)
  - [14] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, *Phys. Rev. D* 79, 084003 (2009)
  - [15] N. Dimakis, A. Paliathanasis, P.A. Terzis and T. Christodoulakis, 79, 618 (2019)
  - [16] G.W. Horndeski, *Int. J. Ther. Phys.* 10, 363 (1974)
  - [17] A.A. Coley and R.J. van den Hoogen, *Phys. Rev. D* 023517 (2000)
  - [18] A.Yu. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, G. Venturi, S.Yu. Vernov, *Phys. Rev. D* 87, 063503 (2013)
  - [19] L. Järv, M. Rünkla, M. Saal and O. Vilson, *Phys. Rev. D* 97, 124025 (2018)
  - [20] M. Tsamparlis and A. Paliathanasis, *Symmetry* 10, 233 (2018)
  - [21] S. Basilakos, M. Tsamparlis and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Rev. D* 83, 103512 (2011)
  - [22] T. Christodoulakis, N. Dimakis and P.A. Terzis, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 47, 095202 (2014)
  - [23] T. Christodoulakis, N. Dimakis, P.A. Terzis, B. Vakili and E. Melas, *Phys. Rev. D* 89, 044031 (2014)



- [24] Y. Kukulakca, A.R. Akbrarieh and M. Amiri, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 84, 523 (2024)
- [25] D. Laya, R. Bhaumik and S. Chakraborty, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 83, 701 (2023)
- [26] M. Cariglia, A. Galajinsky, G.W. Gibbons and P.A. Horvathy, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 78, 314 (2018)
- [27] A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 44, 101466 (2024)
- [28] A. Paliathanasis, *J. Geom. Phys.* 206, 105338 (2024)
- [29] E.J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* 57, 4686 (1998)
- [30] N. Roy and N. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. D* 95, 064048 (2017)
- [31] O. Hrycyna and M. Szydlowski, *JCAP* 12, 016 (2013)
- [32] N. Mahata and S. Chakraborty, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* 46, 1721 (2014)
- [33] R. De Arcia, T. Gonzales, F.A. Horta-Rangel, G. Leon and U. Nucamendi, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 14, 145001 (2018)
- [34] R. Lazkoz, G. Leon and I. Quiros, *Phys. Lett. B* 649, 103 (2007)
- [35] R. Lazkoz and G. Leon, *Phys. Lett. B.* 638, 303 (2006)
- [36] G. Leon, A. Paliathanasis and J.L. Morales-Martinez, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 78, 753 (2018)
- [37] A. Paliathanasis, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 8., 756 (2023)
- [38] A. Paliathanasis and G. Leon, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* 137, 165 (2022)
- [39] M. Bruni and S. Matarrese, *Astrophys. J.* 445, 958 (1997)
- [40] A. Coley and S. Hervik, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 22, 579 (2005)
- [41] A. Ganguly, R. Gannouji, R. Goswami and S. Ray, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 32, 105006 (2015)
- [42] R.A. Sussman and G. Izquierdo, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 28, 045006 (2011)
- [43] A.D. Millano, K. Dialektopoulos, N. Dimakis, A. Giacomini and H. Shababi, *Phys. Rev. D* 109, 124044 (2024)
- [44] L. Amendola, R. Gannouji, D. Polarski and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* 57, 083504 (2007)
- [45] A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 41, 101255 (2023)
- [46] M.-J. Guzman, L. Jarv and L. Pati, *Phys. Rev. D* 110, 124013 (2024)
- [47] L. Amendola, *Phys. Rev. D* 62, 043511 (2000)
- [48] L. P. Chimento, *Phys. Rev. D* 81, 043525 (2010)
- [49] F. Arevalo, A. P. R. Bacalhau and W. Zimdahl, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 29, 235001 (2012)
- [50] W. Yang, S. Pan and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. D* 97, no. 4, 043529 (2018)
- [51] L. Amendola, G.C. Campos and R. Rosenfeld, *Phys. Rev. D* 75, 083506 (2007)
- [52] L.-Y. Gao, S.-S. Xue and X. Zhang, *Chinese Phys. C* 48, 051001 (2024)

- [53] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela and D. Pavon, Reports Prog. Phys. 87, 036901 (2024)
- [54] W. Giare, Phys. Rev. D 109, 123545 (2024)
- [55] S. Pan and W. Yang, On the Interacting Dark Energy Scenarios—The Case for Hubble Constant Tension. In: Di Valentino, E., Brout, D. (eds) The Hubble Constant Tension. Springer Series in Astrophysics and Cosmology. Springer, Singapore (2024)
- [56] V. Faraoni, Phantom cosmology with general potentials, Class. Quantum Grav. 22, 3235 (2005)
- [57] T. Gonzalez, G. Leon and I. Quiros, Class. Quantum Grav. 23, 3165 (2006)
- [58] A. Paliathanasis, S. Pan and W. Yang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 12, 1950161 (2019)
- [59] S. Chatzidakis, A. Giacomini, P.G.L. Leach, G. Leon and A. Paliathanasis, J. High Energ. Astroph. 36, 141 (2022)
- [60] R. De Arcia, I. Quiros, U. Nucamendi and T. Gonzales, Phys. Dark Univ. 40, 101183 (2023)
- [61] A. Paliathanasis, K. Duffy, A. Halder and A. Abebe, Phys. Dark Univ. 47, 101750 (2025)
- [62] R. Curbelo, T. Gonzalez, G. Leon and I. Quiros, Class. Quantum Grav. 23, 1585 (2006)
- [63] S. Halder, S.D. Odintsov, S. Pan, T. Saha and E.N. Saridakis, Interacting phantom dark energy: new accelerating scaling attractors (2024) [arXiv:2411.18300]
- [64] A. Paliathanasis, A. Halder and G. Leon, Revise the Dark Matter-Phantom Scalar Field Interaction (2024) [arXiv:2412.06501]
- [65] L. Amendola, G. Camargo Campos and R. Rosenfeld, Phys. Rev. D 75, 083506 (2007)
- [66] D. Pavón and B. Wang, Gen. Rel. Grav. 41, 1 (2009)
- [67] J.M. Salim and S.L. Sautu, Class. Quantum Grav. 13, 353 (1996)
- [68] J.M.Salim and S.Sautu, Class. Quantum Grav. 15, 203 (1998)
- [69] J. Khoury and A. Wetlman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 171104 (2004)
- [70] J. Khoury and A. Wetlman, Phys. Rev. D 69, 044026 (2004)
- [71] G. Leon, A. Coley, A. Paliathanasis, J. Tot and B. Yildirim, Phys. Dark Univ. 45, 101503 (2024)