

Avoiding Big Rip Singularities in Phantom Scalar Field theory with Gauss-Bonnet term

Giannis Papagiannopoulos,¹ Genly Leon,^{2,3} and Andronikos Paliathanasis^{3,4,2,5,*}

¹*Department of Physics, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens,
Zografou Campus GR 157 73, Athens, Greece*

²*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Católica del Norte,
Avda. Angamos 0610, Casilla 1280 Antofagasta, Chile*

³*Institute of Systems Science & Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Applied Sciences,
Durban University of Technology, Durban 4000, South Africa*

⁴*Centre for Space Research, North-West University, Potchefstroom 2520, South Africa*

⁵*School of Technology, Woxsen University, Hyderabad 502345, Telangana, India*

We consider a phantom scalar field coupled to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar within a spatially flat FLRW geometry. Moreover, we assume a nonzero interaction between the scalar field and the matter term. We perform a detailed phase space analysis using two sets of dimensionless variables. Specifically, we introduce dimensionless variables based on the Hubble normalization approach and a new set based on the matter-scalar field normalization. These two sets of variables allow for a comprehensive phase space analysis. This model supports inflationary solutions without the Big Rip or Big Crunch singularities appearing as asymptotic solutions. This outcome is attributed to the presence of the Gauss-Bonnet scalar. The result remains valid even in the absence of the interaction term.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.35.+d, 95.36.+x

1. INTRODUCTION

The introduction of the Gauss-Bonnet scalar within the gravitational action integral leads to a gravitational theory known as Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet theory [1, 2], which belongs to

*Electronic address: anpaliat@phys.uoa.gr

the family of Lovelock's theories of gravity [3]. Lovelock's theory is a natural extension of General Relativity in higher-dimensional manifolds. It results in second-order gravitational field equations free from Ostrogradsky instabilities [4]. Lovelock's theory reduces to General Relativity in four-dimensional spacetime.

The Gauss-Bonnet scalar is a topological invariant in a four-dimensional manifold, contributing a boundary term to the gravitational action integral. Consequently, the variation principle in Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet theory yields the same field equations as in General Relativity. However, in five- or higher-dimensional manifolds, the Gauss-Bonnet scalar introduces new geometrodynamical terms in the field equations, leading to novel phenomena, as discussed in [5–12] and references therein.

To incorporate the effects of the Gauss-Bonnet scalar in a four-dimensional manifold, a scalar field with a nonzero coupling function can be introduced to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar field [13–15]. In this case, the Gauss-Bonnet term multiplied by the coupling function, the Gauss-Bonnet term ceases to be a topological invariant. This introduces extra geometrodynamical degrees of freedom into the field equations while preserving the second-order nature of gravitational theory. This model has been extensively studied in the context of cosmic inflation [16–20]. In this framework, cosmic acceleration is attributed to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar [16]. Other cosmological applications are presented in [21–28].

In the case of a Quintessence scalar field, the presence of the Gauss-Bonnet term affects the dynamics so that the equation-of-state parameter can cross the phantom divide line without resulting in future Big Rip singularities [13]. In this work, we consider an Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet scalar field model with a scalar field possessing negative kinetic energy, i.e., a phantom field [31–34]. Furthermore, we assume a coupling between the scalar field and the matter source to enable a chameleon mechanism [29, 30]. Due to this interaction, the mass of the scalar field depends on the energy density of the matter source. The interaction between the phantom field and dark matter allows the equation of state parameter to cross the phantom divide line without leading to future attractors that describe Big Rip singularities [35, 36]. This behavior does not occur for a true phantom field in the absence of the interaction term [37]. In the following, we investigate the effects of the Gauss-Bonnet term on the evolution of physical parameters when the scalar field is modeled as a phantom field. We generalize the analysis presented in [13] and extend the recent study [38], where the chameleon term was introduced in the Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet theory. The structure of the

article is as follows.

In Section 2, we introduce the gravitational model under consideration, which is Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet scalar field cosmology. We consider the scalar field a phantom field with negative kinetic energy. The scalar field is also coupled to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar and the matter source, enabling the chameleon mechanism. The gravitational model depends on three free functions: the scalar field potential $V(\phi)$, the scalar field coupling to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar $f(\phi)$ and the coupling function $g(\phi)$ which defines the interaction with the matter source. In Section 3, we consider the spatially flat Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker geometry, and we derive the cosmological field equations. The evolution of the physical variables is expressed in terms of a system of nonlinear second-order ordinary differential equations.

The asymptotic analysis is presented in Sections 4 and 5. Specifically, for the three functions in the gravitational model, we assume $f(\phi)$ to be linear function, $f(\phi) = f_0\phi$, $g(\phi)$ to be exponential function $g(\phi) = e^{2\beta\phi}$, as described by the chameleon mechanism, and for the scalar field potential, we consider the exponential, i.e., $V(\phi) = V_0e^{\lambda\phi}$. For this gravitational model, in Section 4 introduces a new set of dimensionless variables based on the Hubble normalization approach. The field equations are reformulated as nonlinear first-order algebraic differential equations. Each stationary point of this system represents an asymptotic solution of the original system [39–42]. By analyzing the stability of these stationary points, we reconstruct the cosmological history and evolution.

Due to the system’s non-linearity, the Hubble normalization does not yield a set of compactified variables. Therefore, in Section 5, we introduce a new set of dimensionless variables within the matter-scalar field normalization framework. Using these variables, we determine the phase-space behavior in the infinite regime. We find that, due to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar, no stationary points correspond to Big Rip or Big Crunch singularities, regardless of the presence of the chameleon term. Finally, we present our conclusions in Section 6.

2. GRAVITATIONAL THEORY

The gravitational theory of our consideration is that of the Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet scalar field theory described by the action integral [16]

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(R - f(\phi) G + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\kappa} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\kappa \phi - V(\phi) - g(\phi) L_m(x^\nu) \right). \quad (1)$$

R is the Ricci scalar for the four-dimensional $g_{\mu\nu}$, G is the Gauss-Bonnet scalar defined as [2]

$$G = R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}R^{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}. \quad (2)$$

which is a topological invariant since $g_{\mu\nu}$ has dimension four.

Function $L_m(x^\nu)$ represents the Lagrangian function for the matter source, and ϕ is a scalar field coupled to the Gauss-Bonnet scalar G as well as to the matter source $L_m(x^\nu)$. The function $g(\phi)$ facilitates energy transfer between the scalar field ϕ and the matter source L_m .

$f(\phi)$ also characterizes the coupling between the scalar field and the Gauss-Bonnet scalar. When $f(\phi)$ is constant, the gravitational model (1) reduces to General Relativity. The function $f(\phi)$ is critical for ensuring a contribution from the Gauss-Bonnet term in the gravitational model.

For the scalar field ϕ , it is assumed to be a phantom field, meaning it can have a negative kinetic term. This implies that it may violate the weak energy condition, allowing the energy density to become negative. The gravitational field equations are [16]

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}^G + T_{\mu\nu}^\phi + f(\phi) T_{\mu\nu}^m, \quad (3)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}^m$ is the energy-momentum tensor for the matter source, $T_{\mu\nu}^m = \frac{\delta L_m}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}}$, $T_{\mu\nu}^\phi$ is the energy-momentum tensor for the phantom scalar field

$$T_{\mu\nu}^\phi = -\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - g^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\kappa} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\kappa \phi + V(\phi) \right), \quad (4)$$

and $T_{\mu\nu}^G$ is the effective energy-momentum tensor which attributes the geometrodynamical degrees of freedom given by the Gauss-Bonnet scalar that is [16]

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^G = & -4(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu f(\phi)) R + 8(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\rho f(\phi)) R_\nu^\rho + 8(\nabla_\nu \nabla_\rho f(\phi)) R_\mu^\rho \\ & - 8(g^{\kappa\rho} \nabla_\kappa \nabla_\rho f(\phi)) (4R_{\mu\nu} - 2Rg_{\mu\nu}) - 8(\nabla_\kappa \nabla_\rho f(\phi)) (R^{\rho\kappa} g_{\mu\nu} - R_\mu{}^\rho{}_\nu{}^\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We observe that when $f(\phi)$ is a constant, $T_{\mu\nu}^G = 0$, and when $f(\phi)$ is a linear function $f = f_0\phi$, it follows

$$T_{\mu\nu}^G(f(\phi) \rightarrow f_0\phi) = -4(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi) R + 8(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\rho \phi) R_\nu^\rho + 8(\nabla_\nu \nabla_\rho \phi) R_\mu^\rho - 8(g^{\kappa\rho} \nabla_\kappa \nabla_\rho \phi) (4R_{\mu\nu} - 2Rg_{\mu\nu}) - 8(\nabla_\kappa \nabla_\rho \phi) (R^{\rho\kappa} g_{\mu\nu} - R_{\mu}{}^\rho{}_\nu{}^\sigma). \quad (6)$$

The Bianchi identity leads to the conservation equation [16]

$$g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi + V(\phi) + f_{,\phi} G + \nabla_\mu (f(\phi) \rho_m) u^\mu + g(\phi) (\rho_m + p_m) \nabla_\mu u^\mu = 0, \quad (7)$$

Without loss of generality, the latter equation can be read as follows [16]

$$g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi + V_{,\phi} + g_{,\phi} G + 2\rho_m \nabla_\mu f(\phi) u^\mu = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\nabla_\mu (\rho_m) u^\mu + (\rho_m + p_m) \nabla_\mu u^\mu - \rho_m \nabla_\mu \ln(f(\phi)) u^\mu = 0. \quad (9)$$

$\rho_m \nabla_\mu \ln(f(\phi)) u^\mu$ defines the interaction which gives the energy transfer between the scalar field and matter. This term introduces the Chameleon mechanism for the scalar field.

Equation (8) is the modified Klein-Gordon equation for the phantom scalar field. We observe that the mass of the scalar field depends on the potential function $V(\phi)$, the energy density ρ_m of the matter, and the Gauss-Bonnet scalar G . The theory depends on three unknown functions: the scalar field potential $V(\phi)$, the Gauss-Bonnet coupling function $f(\phi)$, and the Chameleon mechanism $g(\phi)$.

To assess the cosmological viability of the above model and investigate its potential to unify the early-time and late-time acceleration phases of the universe, we performed a detailed phase-space analysis of the field equations for an isotropic and spatially flat FLRW background geometry.

3. FLRW UNIVERSE

On very large scales, the Universe is considered to be described by the isotropic and homogeneous spatially flat FLRW geometry with line element

$$ds^2 = -N^2(t) dt^2 + a^2(t) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (10)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor and describes the radius of the universe, $N(t)$ is a lapse function. For the comoving observer $u^\mu = \delta_t^\mu$, the expansion rate is calculated $\theta = 3H$, where $H = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ is the Hubble function, and $\dot{a} = \frac{da}{dt}$.

For the matter source, we consider it to be described by an isotropic, pressure-less fluid source, which corresponds to the dark matter of the Universe. In this case, the Lagrangian function is given by $L_m = \rho_{m0} a^{-3}$.

Thus, from the gravitational Action Integral (1) For the latter line element, we define the point-like Lagrangian [25]

$$L(N, a, \dot{a}, \phi, \dot{\phi}) = -\frac{1}{N} \left(3a\dot{a}^2 + \frac{1}{2}a^3\dot{\phi}^2 \right) - N \left(a^3 V(\phi) + g(\phi) \rho_{m0} \right) + \frac{8}{N^3} f_{,\phi} \dot{a}^3 \dot{\phi}, \quad (11)$$

The cosmological field equations are derived from the variation of the Lagrangian with respect to the dynamical variables N , a , and ϕ .

The variation with respect to the scale factor a and the scalar field ϕ results in second-order ordinary differential equations, while the variation with respect to the lapse function N provides the constraint equation.

Without loss of generality, we assume $N(t) = 1$, and the cosmological field equations take the form [25]

$$0 = 3H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) + g(\phi) \rho_{m0} a^{-3} - 24 f_{,\phi} H \dot{\phi}, \quad (12)$$

$$0 = 2\dot{H} + 3H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) - 16 \left(H^2 + \dot{H} \right) H f_{,\phi} \dot{\phi} - 8H \left(\dot{\phi}^2 f_{,\phi\phi} + f_{,\phi} \ddot{\phi} \right), \quad (13)$$

$$0 = \ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} - V_{,\phi} - 24H f_{,\phi} \left(H^2 + \dot{H} \right) - g_{,\phi} \rho_{m0} a^{-3}. \quad (14)$$

The field equations can be written in the equivalent form

$$3H^2 = \rho_{eff}, \quad (15)$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -p_{eff}, \quad (16)$$

in which

$$\rho_{eff} = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) - g(\phi) \rho_{m0} a^{-3} + 24 f_{,\phi} H \dot{\phi}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$p_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + 16 \left(H^2 + \dot{H} \right) H f_{,\phi} \dot{\phi} + 8H \left(\dot{\phi}^2 f_{,\phi\phi} + f_{,\phi} \ddot{\phi} \right). \quad (18)$$

In the following for the scalar field potential, we assume that $V(\phi) = V_0 e^{\lambda\phi}$, where in the case $\lambda = 0$, $V(\phi)$ describes the cosmological constant.

We employ dimensionless variables to rewrite the field equations in the equivalent form of an algebraic-differential system of first-order differential equations. To understand the evolution of the physical variables and reconstruct the cosmological history provided by this

gravitational model, we investigate the existence of asymptotic solutions within the phase space.

Specifically, we calculate the stationary points of the field equations and analyze their stability properties. Each stationary point corresponds to a distinct epoch in cosmic evolution.

Now, consider the cosmological scenario where $f(\phi)$ is a linear function, $f(\phi) = f_0\phi$, and $g(\phi) = e^{2\beta\phi}$, an exponential function as described by the Chameleon mechanism or equivalently by the Weyl-integrable spacetime.

In this case, the components of the effective cosmological fluid are expressed as [25]

$$\rho_{eff} = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V_0e^{\lambda\phi} - \rho_{m0}e^{2\beta}a^{-3} + 24f_0H\dot{\phi}, \quad (19)$$

$$p_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V_0e^{\lambda\phi} + 16f_0\left(H^2 + \dot{H}\right)H\dot{\phi} + 8Hf_0\ddot{\phi}. \quad (20)$$

and the equation of motion for the scalar field (14) becomes

$$0 = \ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} - \lambda V_0e^{\lambda\phi} - 24Hf_0\left(H^2 + \dot{H}\right) - 2\beta e^{2\beta_0\phi}\rho_{m0}a^{-3}. \quad (21)$$

4. DYNAMICAL SYSTEM ANALYSIS IN THE HUBBLE NORMALIZATION

We shall now consider the following dimensionless variables within the Hubble normalization approach [43, 44]

$$\eta^2 = \frac{H^2}{1+H^2}, \quad y^2 = \frac{V(\phi)}{(1+H^2)}, \quad x = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\sqrt{(1+H^2)}}, \quad \Omega_m = \frac{\rho_{m0}a^{-3}e^{2\beta\phi}}{1+H^2} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\lambda = \frac{V'(\phi)}{V(\phi)}, \quad \Gamma(\lambda) = \frac{V(\phi)V''(\phi)}{(V'(\phi))^2} \quad (23)$$

Using them and combining with equation (12) we obtain our constraint equation, namely:

$$\Omega_m = \frac{x^2}{2} - y^2 + 3\eta^2 - 24f_0\frac{x\eta^3}{1-\eta^2} \quad (24)$$

For the exponential potential of the form $V = V_0e^{\lambda\phi}$, we have that $\Gamma = 1$ and $\lambda = const.$ Thus, we end with the three-dimensional autonomous system that describes the dynamics of this model, which is the following

$$\frac{dx}{d \ln a} = \frac{1}{4(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2))} \times$$

$$\left(-2y^2(-1 + \eta^2) \left(-2\lambda + 2(-12f_0 + \lambda)\eta^2 + x\eta(1 + 16f_0\lambda + (-1 + 8f_0\lambda)\eta^2) \right) \right.$$

$$+ \eta \left(-48f_0\eta^3(-1 + \eta^2) + x^3(-1 + \eta^2)^2 + 8f_0x^2\eta(-15 + 13\eta^2 + 2\eta^4) \right.$$

$$+ 6x(2 - 5\eta^2 + 4\eta^4 + (-1 + 64f_0^2)\eta^6) \left. \right)$$

$$- 8\beta(-1 + \eta^2)(-1 + \eta^2 + 4f_0x\eta(2 + \eta^2))\Omega_m \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{dy}{d \ln a} = \frac{1}{2}y \left(\lambda x + \left(\eta \left(16f_0x\eta^3(-1 + \eta^2) + x^2(-1 + \eta^2)^2 - 2y^2(-1 + \eta^2)(1 + (-1 + 8f_0\lambda)\eta^2) \right) \right. \right.$$

$$+ 2\eta^2 \left(-3 + 6\eta^2 + 3(-1 + 64f_0^2)\eta^4 - 16f_0\beta(-1 + \eta^2)\Omega_m \right) \left. \right)$$

$$\left/ \left(2 \left(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2) \right) \right) \right) \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{d\eta}{d \ln a} = \frac{(-1 + \eta^2) \left(+2\eta^2 \left(-3 + 6\eta^2 + 3(-1 + 64f_0^2)\eta^4 - 16f_0\beta(-1 + \eta^2)\Omega_m \right) \right)}{4 \left(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2) \right)}$$

$$+ \frac{-2y^2(-1 + \eta^2)(1 + (-1 + 8f_0\lambda)\eta^2) + 16f_0x\eta^3(-1 + \eta^2) + x^2(-1 + \eta^2)^2}{4 \left(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2) \right)} \quad (27)$$

While the expression for the equation of state parameter can be written as

$$w_{eff} = \frac{64f_0x\eta^3(-1 + \eta^2) + x^2(-1 + \eta^2)^2 - 32f_0\eta^2(6f_0\eta^4 + \beta(-1 + \eta^2)\Omega_m)}{6\eta^2 \left(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2) \right)}$$

$$- \frac{-2y^2(-1 + \eta^2)(1 + (-1 + 8f_0\lambda)\eta^2)}{6\eta^2 \left(-1 + 2\eta^2 + (-1 + 96f_0^2)\eta^4 - 8f_0x\eta(-1 + \eta^2) \right)} \quad (28)$$

Proceeding with the dynamical analysis, we obtain the system's critical points corresponding to different cosmic eras. The results are presented in Table I. In the following lines, we discuss the physical properties of asymptotic solutions at stationary points.

TABLE I: Stationary points in the Hubble normalization.

Point	$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \eta)$	Existence	w_{eff}	Acceleration	Attractor
P_0	$(0, 0, 0)$	Always	Undefined	False	False
P_1^-	$(0, 0, -1)$	Always	$-\frac{1}{3}$	False	True
P_1^+	$(0, 0, 1)$	Always	$-\frac{1}{3}$	False	False
P_2^-	$\left(-\frac{1}{6\beta}, 0, -1\right)$	$\beta \neq 0$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	True	False
P_2^+	$\left(\frac{1}{6\beta}, 0, 1\right)$	$\beta \neq 0$	$-\frac{5}{9}$	True	False
P_3^+	$\left(3\sqrt{\frac{2}{15-20\sqrt{30}f_0}}, 0, -\sqrt{\frac{3}{3-4\sqrt{30}f_0}}\right)$	$f_0 < \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}/4$	-1	de Sitter	False
P_3^-	$\left(-3\sqrt{\frac{2}{15-20\sqrt{30}f_0}}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{3-4\sqrt{30}f_0}}\right)$	$f_0 < \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}/4$	-1	de Sitter	True in regions
P_4^-	$\left(-3\sqrt{\frac{2}{15+20\sqrt{30}f_0}}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{3+4\sqrt{30}f_0}}\right)$	$f_0 > -\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}/4$	-1	de Sitter	False
P_4^+	$\left(-3\sqrt{\frac{2}{15+20\sqrt{30}f_0}}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{3+4\sqrt{30}f_0}}\right)$	$f_0 > -\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}/4$	-1	de Sitter	True in regions
P_5^-	$\left(-\frac{3\sqrt{-3+8\beta^2}}{2\beta\sqrt{-3+8\beta(8f_0+\beta)}}, 0, -\frac{\sqrt{-3+8\beta^2}}{\sqrt{-3+8\beta(8f_0+\beta)}}\right)$	some regions	-1	de Sitter	False
P_5^+	$\left(\frac{3\sqrt{-3+8\beta^2}}{2\beta\sqrt{-3+8\beta(8f_0+\beta)}}, 0, \frac{\sqrt{-3+8\beta^2}}{\sqrt{-3+8\beta(8f_0+\beta)}}\right)$	some regions	-1	de Sitter	True in regions
P_6^-	$\left(0, \sqrt{\frac{3\lambda}{-8f_0+\lambda}}, -\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{-8f_0+\lambda}}\right)$	some regions	-1	de Sitter	False
P_6^+	$\left(0, \sqrt{\frac{3\lambda}{-8f_0+\lambda}}, \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{-8f_0+\lambda}}\right)$	some regions	-1	de Sitter	True in regions

The point P_0 corresponds to an empty universe, the Minkowski space, and the point describes an unstable solution.

P_1^- describes a universe that is dominated by the Gauss-Bonnet scalar, the asymptotic solution is a stable scaling solution with $w_{eff} = -\frac{1}{3}$ and eigenvalues $(-2, -1, -1)$.

On the other hand, point P_1^+ with $w_{eff} = -\frac{1}{3}$ describes the same physical solution as P_1^- , but the point is unstable since its eigenvalues are $(1, 1, 2)$.

Stationary point P_2^- describes a universe where interaction exists, the effective equation of state parameter is $w_{eff} = -\frac{5}{9}$ which describes an accelerating universe and its eigenvalues are $\left(-\frac{4}{3}, 1, -\frac{8\beta+\lambda}{12\beta}\right)$ from where we infer that the point is always saddle.

Similarly, point P_2^+ has the same physical properties with P_2^- , the eigenvalues are $\left(\frac{8}{3}, 3, \frac{16\beta-\lambda}{12\beta}\right)$, from where infer that P_2^+ is a source for $\frac{16\beta-\lambda}{12\beta} > 0$, otherwise is a saddle point.

The existence condition for point P_3^+ , is $f_0 < \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}$, the asymptotic solution de-

scribes the de Sitter universe, that is, $w_{eff} = -1$. The eigenvalues are calculated to be $(\frac{3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}(B-C)}}{5f_0A}, \frac{3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}(B+C)}}{5f_0A}, \frac{3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}\lambda}}{\sqrt{10}})$, where $A = -3 + 4\sqrt{30}f_0$, $B = -15\sqrt{3}f_0 + 60\sqrt{10}f_0^2 - 3\sqrt{10}f_0\beta + 40\sqrt{3}f_0^2\beta$, $C = \sqrt{90f_0^2\beta^2 - 240\sqrt{30}f_0^3\beta^2 + 4800f_0^4\beta^2}$. Hence, the stationary point is an attractor for $B - C > 0$, $B + C > 0$ and $\lambda < 0$. It follows that P_3^+ is a source for $\left\{\beta > -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{15}{2}}, \lambda > 0 : f_0 < \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}, f_0 \neq 0\right\}$, otherwise it is a saddle point.

Furthermore, point P_3^- has the same existence condition and effective equation of state parameter with point P_3^+ ; however, the eigenvalues are $(\frac{-3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}(B+C)}}{5f_0A}, \frac{3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}(-B+C)}}{5f_0A}, -\frac{3\sqrt{-\frac{1}{A}\lambda}}{\sqrt{10}})$ from where we infer that the point is an attractor for $B - C < 0$, $B + C < 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, that is, P_3^- is an attractor for the region where P_3^+ is a source.

Point P_4^+ it is real for $f_0 > -\frac{\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}}{4}$, and describes a de Sitter universe, that is, $w_{eff} = -1$, the stability condition gives that the point is stable for $\left\{\beta < \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{15}{2}}, \lambda < 0 : |f_0| < \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}, f_0 \neq 0\right\}$.

On the other hand, the stationary point P_4^- always describes an unstable de Sitter solution.

The stationary points P_5^+ and P_5^- describes de Sitter solutions with nonzero interacting term. The points are real when the free parameters are constrained as follows $\left(f_0 < \frac{3-8\beta^2}{64\beta}, \beta < -\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}, : 0 < \beta < \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}\right)$ or $\left(f_0 > \frac{3-8\beta^2}{64\beta}, -\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} < \beta < 0, : \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} < \beta\right)$. Stationary point P_5^- describes always an unstable solution, while P_5^+ is an attractor when

$$\left(f_0 < 0, \lambda > 0 : -\beta_1 < \beta < -\sqrt{\frac{15}{8}}, -\beta_2 < \beta < -\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}\right),$$

$$\left(0 < f_0 < \frac{3-8\beta^2}{64\beta}, \lambda > 0 : -\beta_1 < \beta < -\sqrt{\frac{15}{8}}, -\beta_2 < \beta < -\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}\right),$$

$$\left(f_0 > 0, \lambda < 0 : \sqrt{\frac{15}{8}} < \beta < \beta_1, \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} < \beta < \beta_2\right),$$

where $\beta_1 = \frac{\sqrt{42(43+4\sqrt{74})}}{28}$ and $\beta_2 = \frac{\sqrt{42(43-4\sqrt{74})}}{28}$.

Finally, the two stationary points P_6^+ and P_6^- are real, when $\lambda f_0 < 0$. These stationary points describe de Sitter solutions. The eigenvalue analysis reveals that P_6^+ is an attractor for $f_0 < 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \sqrt{\frac{6}{17}}$, while under the same conditions, point P_6^- acts as a source. Otherwise, these stationary points behave as saddle points.

In the Hubble normalization approach, the dynamical variables are not compactified, meaning that they can also take values in the infinite regime. The analysis we presented




FIG. 1: "x", "y" Phase-space on the surface $\eta = -1$, assuming $f_0 \rightarrow 10, \beta \rightarrow \frac{1}{5}, \lambda \rightarrow 1$




FIG. 2: "x", " η " Phase-space on the surface $y = 0$, assuming $f_0 \rightarrow -10, \beta \rightarrow \frac{1}{5}, \lambda \rightarrow 1$

considers only the finite regime of the dynamical variables. It is necessary to employ compactified variables to understand the evolution and behavior of the solutions at infinity. Instead of introducing compactified variables within the Hubble normalization approach, we continue our study by defining new dimensionless variables that are compactified.

5. DYNAMICAL SYSTEM ANALYSIS IN MATTER-SCALAR FIELD NORMALIZATION

We consider a new set of dimensionless variables which were introduced recently in [45], for analyzing phantom-scalar field dynamics.

Specifically, we introduce the dimensionless variables:

$$\chi = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{D}, \quad \zeta^2 = \frac{V(\phi)}{D^2}, \quad \omega_m = \frac{\rho_m e^{2\beta\phi}}{D^2}, \quad r = \frac{H}{D}, \quad \Phi = \frac{f_0}{D^2} \quad (29)$$

where function D is defined as

$$D = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + \rho_m e^{2\beta\phi}}. \quad (30)$$

In terms of these variables, the constraint equation reads

$$\omega_m = 3r^2(1 - 8rx\Phi) + \frac{1}{2}\chi^2 - \zeta^2. \quad (31)$$

Variables χ and ζ are compactified and constrained by $-\sqrt{2} \leq \chi \leq \sqrt{2}$, and $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$.

Moreover, from the definition of the dimensionless variables, the constraint equation follows

$$\frac{1}{2}\chi^2 + \zeta^2 + \omega_m = 1. \quad (32)$$

By definition, $D \neq 0$, meaning there will always be a matter contribution in the solution. Consequently, this normalization does not recover solutions without contribution from the matter term in the cosmological fluid. On the other hand, it enables the determination of stationary points that describe scaling solutions, where the kinetic term of the scalar field contributes to the cosmological fluid.

We introduce the new independent variable $dt = Dd\sigma$, and the field equations reads

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\sigma} = \chi \frac{d}{d\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{D} \right) + \frac{-\lambda\zeta^2 + 12r^4\Phi - 6r^2(5\chi^2 + 2\zeta^2)\Phi - 2\beta\omega_m + r\chi(3 + 8\Phi(\lambda\zeta^2 + 2\beta\omega_m))}{8r\Phi(\chi + 12r^3\Phi) - 1}, \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{d\zeta}{d\sigma} = \zeta \frac{d}{d\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{D} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\chi\zeta, \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{dr}{d\sigma} = r \frac{d}{d\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{D} \right) - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\chi^2 + 2\zeta^2 + 2r^2(8\Phi(\lambda\zeta^2 - \chi r + 24r^4\Phi + 2\beta\omega_m) - 3)}{8r\Phi(\chi + 12r^3\Phi) - 1}, \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{d\Phi}{d\sigma} = -2\Phi \frac{d}{d\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{D} \right), \quad (36)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{D} \frac{dD}{d\sigma} = & \lambda\chi\zeta^2 - (3r - 2\beta\chi)\omega_m \\ & + \frac{\chi(-\lambda\zeta^2 + 12r^4\Phi - 6r^2(5\chi^2 + 2\zeta^2)\Phi - 2\beta\omega_m + r\chi(3 + 8\Phi(\lambda\zeta^2 + 2\beta\omega_m)))}{8r\Phi(\chi + 12r^3\Phi) - 1} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Moreover, the equation of state parameter reads

$$w_{eff} = \frac{\chi^2 + 2\zeta^2 - 64r^3\chi\Phi + 16r^2\Phi(\lambda\zeta^2 - 12r^4\Phi + 2\beta\omega_m)}{6r^2(8r\Phi(\chi + 12r^3\Phi) - 1)}.$$

The stationary points of the latter dynamical system are presented in Table

We observe that all the stationary points correspond to de Sitter asymptotic solutions. Stationary points Q_1^\pm and Q_2^\pm are analogous to points P_3^\pm and P_4^\pm in the Hubble normalization approach. Similarly, points Q_4^\pm , where only the scalar field potential contributes to the cosmic fluid, correspond to points P_6^\pm . Furthermore, points Q_3^\pm , characterized by non-zero interaction, describe asymptotic solutions with the same physical properties as points P_5^\pm . Due to this analogy, we omit the detailed presentation of the stability properties for these points.

The most significant result of this normalization is that the stationary points at the finite regime, that is, points where $\chi^2 \rightarrow \sqrt{2}$, Q_1^\pm and Q_2^\pm and points with $\zeta \rightarrow 1$, Q_4^\pm describe de Sitter solutions. There are no Big Rip or Big Crunch singularities. In other words, there are no stationary points with $w_{eff} = \pm\infty$. We conclude that the inclusion of the Gauss-Bonnet term in the gravitational field equations prevents the occurrence of future or past singularities. This conclusion also holds without interaction between the scalar field and the matter source, i.e., for $\beta = 0$.

This result contrasts with General Relativity, where in the absence of interaction, Big Rip singularities serve as future attractors for the phantom field [37]. When the scalar field is present, Big Rip singularities remain as stationary points but describe unstable solutions [36].

6. CONCLUSIONS

Within the four-dimensional Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet scalar field, spatially flat FLRW cosmology, we consider a phantom scalar field with a negative kinetic energy and a dust fluid

TABLE II: Stationary points in the matter scalar -field normalization.

Point	$(\omega_m, \chi, \zeta, \mathbf{r}, \Phi)$	Existence	w_{eff}	Acceleration
Q_1^-	$(0, \sqrt{2}, 0, -\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}, -\frac{3}{20}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_1^+	$(0, \sqrt{2}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}, -\frac{3}{20}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_2^-	$(0, -\sqrt{2}, 0, -\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}, \frac{3}{20}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_2^+	$(0, -\sqrt{2}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}, \frac{3}{20}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_3^-	$(1 + \frac{6}{8\beta^2-21}, -\frac{2}{3\sqrt{8\beta^2-21}}, 0, -\frac{4\beta}{\sqrt{3(8\beta^2-21)}}, -\frac{3(63+64\beta^2(\beta^2-3))}{1024\beta^2})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_3^+	$(1 + \frac{6}{8\beta^2-21}, \frac{2}{3\sqrt{8\beta^2-21}}, 0, \frac{4\beta}{\sqrt{3(8\beta^2-21)}}, -\frac{3(63+64\beta^2(\beta^2-3))}{1024\beta^2})$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_4^-	$(0, 0, 1, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, -\frac{3}{8}\lambda)$	Always	-1	de Sitter
Q_4^+	$(0, 0, 1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, -\frac{3}{8}\lambda)$	Always	-1	de Sitter

that exhibits nonzero energy transfer with the scalar field. To understand how the Gauss-Bonnet scalar modifies the behavior and evolution of the physical parameters, we perform a detailed phase-space analysis using two different sets of dimensionless variables. The introduction of these two sets of variables is essential for conducting a comprehensive phase-space analysis and to explore the existence of stationary points in the extreme limits.

The first normalization belongs to the family of Hubble normalizations. Within these variables, the stationary points of the cosmological field equations describe the vacuum Minkowski solution, scaling solutions where the Gauss-Bonnet term contributes to the cosmological dynamics, and de Sitter solutions that can act as future attractors. Conversely, the second set of dimensionless variables is based on a matter-scalar field normalization. This set has been introduced to investigate the evolution of the physical properties in the extreme limits of the scalar field components. The stationary points in this normalization include those with nonzero contributions from both matter and the scalar field. Consequently, in the extreme limit, only de Sitter solutions are possible, indicating the absence of asymptotic solutions describing Big Rip or Big Crunch singularities.

Although we consider a nonzero interaction between the scalar field and the dust fluid, the main conclusions of this work remain valid, even in the absence of the interaction term. Specifically, in the limit where the parameter $\beta \rightarrow 0$, only the stationary points P_2^\pm cease to exist. Moreover, for the three free functions of the gravitational model, we consider specific

forms that reduce the dimensionality of the field equations. However, our main conclusions hold for other functional forms of the free functions, namely the two coupling functions $f(\phi)$, $g(\phi)$, and the scalar field potential $V(\phi)$.

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. AP thanks the School of Sciences of Woxsen University for the hospitality provided while part of this study was carried out.

-
- [1] T. Padmanabhan and D. Kothawala, Lanczos-Lovelock models of gravity, *Phys. Reports* 531, 115 (2013)
 - [2] P.G.S. Fernandes, P. Carrilho, T. Clifton and D.J. Mulryne, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 39, 063001 (2022)
 - [3] D. Lovelock, *J. Math. Phys.* 12, 498 (1971)
 - [4] M. Crisostomi, R. Klein, and D. Roest, *J. High Energy Phys.* 06, 124 (2017)
 - [5] D. Chirkov, S. A. Pavluchenko and A. Toporensky, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 46, 1799 (2014)
 - [6] C. Charmousis, J.-F. Dufaux, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 19, 4671 (2002)
 - [7] J. Novak, M. Ozkan, Y. Pang, G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 119, 111602 (2017)
 - [8] E.O. Pozdeeva, M.A. Skugoreva, A.V. Toporensky and S. Yu Vernov, *JCAP* 09, 050 (2024)
 - [9] G. Dotti, J. Oliva and R. Troncoso, *Phys. Rev. D* 76, 064038 (2007)
 - [10] A. Giacomini, J. Oliva and A. Vera, *Phys. Rev. D* 91, 104033 (2015)
 - [11] S. Hansraj, N. Mkhize, *Phys. Rev. D* 102, 084028 (2020)
 - [12] G. Kofinas, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 22, L47 (2005)
 - [13] S. Tsujikawa and M. Sami, *JCAP* 0701, 006 (2007)
 - [14] T. Koivisto and D.F. Mota, *Phys. Lett. B* 644, 104 (2007)
 - [15] M. Sami, A. Toporensky, P. V. Tretjakov and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Lett. B* 619, 193 (2005)
 - [16] I.V. Fomin, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* 49, 525 (2018)
 - [17] I.V. Fomin and S.V. Chernov, *Grav. Cosmo.* 23, 367 (2017)

- [18] S.D. Odintsov and V.K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* 98, 044039 (2018)
- [19] I. Supriyadi and G. Hikmawan, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* 2243, 012095 (2022)
- [20] S. Chakraborty, T. Paul and S. SenGupta, *Phys. Rev. D* 98, 083539 (2018)
- [21] M. Motaharfar and H.R. Sepangi, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 76, 646 (2016)
- [22] N. Rashidi and K. Nozari, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 890, 58 (2020)
- [23] S.D. Odintsov, V.K. Oikonomou and F.P. Fronimos, *Annals of Physics* 420, 168250 (2020)
- [24] A.D. Milano, G. Leon and A. Paliathanasis, *Mathematics* 11, 1408 (2023)
- [25] A.D. Milano, G. Leon and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Rev. D* 108, 023519 (2023)
- [26] V.K. Oikonomou, P. Tsyba and O. Razina, *Annals Phys.* 462, 169597 (2024)
- [27] M.M. Gohain, K. Bhuyan, *Phys. Scr.* 99, 075306 (2024)
- [28] B. Micolta-Riascos, A.D. Milano, G. Leon, B. Droguett, E. Gonzalez and J. Magana, *Fractal Fract.* 8, 626 (2024)
- [29] J. Khoury and A. Wetlman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93, 171104 (2004)
- [30] J. Khoury and A. Wetlman, *Phys. Rev. D* 69, 044026 (2004)
- [31] R.C. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N.N. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 071301 (2003)
- [32] L.P. Chimento and R. Lazkoz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 211301 (2003)
- [33] L.A. Ureña-López, *JCAP* 09, 013 (2005)
- [34] N. Roy, S. Goswami and S. Das, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 36, 101037 (2022)
- [35] R. Curbelo, T. Gonzalez, G. Leon and I. Quiros, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 23, 1585 (2006)
- [36] A. Paliathanasis, A. Halder and G. Leon, *arXiv:2412.06501* (2024)
- [37] V. Faraoni, Phantom cosmology with general potentials, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 22, 3235 (2005)
- [38] A. Paliathanasis, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 56, 84 (2024)
- [39] A.A. Coley, *Dynamical Systems in Cosmology* (1999) [gr-qc/9910074]
- [40] G. Leon, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 26, 035008 (2009)
- [41] S. Chatzidakis, A. Giacomini, P.G.L. Leach, G. Leon and A. Paliathanasis, *J. High Energ. Astroph.* 36, 141 (2022)
- [42] R. De Arcia, I. Quiros, U. Nucamendi and T. Gonzales, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 40, 101183 (2023)
- [43] E.J. Copeland, A.R. Liddle and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* 57, 4686 (1998)
- [44] T. Gonzalez, G. Leon and I. Quiros, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 23, 3165 (2006)
- [45] G. Leon, D. Shankar, A. Halder and A. Paliathanasis, *arXiv:2501.09177* (2025)