

Interacting holographic dark energy

Winfried Zimdahl^{*1,2} and Diego Pavón^{†3}

¹*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität zu Köln, D-50937, Köln, Germany*

²*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo,
CEP29060-900 Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brazil*

³*Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias,
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona,
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*

(Dated: December 2, 2024)

Abstract

A generic interaction between pressureless dark matter and holographic dark energy, whose infrared cutoff scale is set by the Hubble length, induces a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion and alleviates the coincidence problem. Likewise, a non-vanishing spatial curvature adds an interesting dynamics to this transition.

^{*} E-mail: zimdahl@thp.uni-koeln.de

[†] E-mail address: diego.pavon@uab.es

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays an overwhelming, direct and indirect, observational evidence supports the idea that the Universe is currently undergoing a phase of accelerated expansion. The most recent and precise confirmation of this rather unexpected feature (see, however [1, 2]) was provided by the 3rd year data of the WMAP mission [3]. Likewise, data from high-redshift supernovae type Ia [4], the cosmic microwave background radiation [5], the large scale structure [6], the integrated Sachs–Wolfe effect [7], and weak lensing [8], endorse it to the point that the discussion has now shifted to when the acceleration began and which might be the agent behind it. For recent reviews see [9].

According to our understanding on the basis of Einstein’s gravity, more than 70% of the cosmic substratum, dubbed dark energy, must be endowed with a high negative pressure. Less than 30% is found to be pressureless matter. Most of the latter is in the form of cold dark matter; only about 5% corresponds to “normal” baryonic matter. Currently, we neither know what the dark matter is made of nor do we understand the nature of dark energy.

Lacking a fundamental theory, most investigations in the field are phenomenological and rely on the assumption that these two unknown substances evolve independently, i.e., their energies are assumed to obey separate conservation laws. In particular, this implies that the dark matter energy density varies as a^{-3} , where a is the scale factor of the Robertson–Walker metric. The behavior of the density of the dark energy is then entirely governed by its equation of state, the determination of which is a major subject of current observational cosmology. One should realize, however, that any coupling in the dark sector will change this situation. A coupling will modify the evolution history of the Universe. As one of the consequences, the energy density of the (interacting) dark matter will no longer evolve as a^{-3} . Ignoring a potentially existing interaction between dark matter and dark energy from the start, may result in a misled interpretation of the data concerning the dark energy equation of state. Das *et al.* [10] and Amendola *et al.* [11] have shown that a measured phantom equation of state may be mimicked by an interaction, while the bare equation of state may well be of a non-phantom type. Further, models showing interaction fare well when contrasted with data from the cosmic microwave background [12] and matter distribution at large scales [13]. It can therefore be argued that the possibility of dark energy to be in interaction with dark matter must be taken seriously. Moreover, we shall demonstrate

in this paper, that there are models in which such an interaction is crucial to obtain an accelerated expansion at all.

The data also suggest a nearly spatially flat universe [3], [14]. In many studies the present smallness of the spatial curvature term has been invoked to neglect it altogether and focus solely on the spatially flat case, thereby taking for granted that the spatial curvature term necessarily leads to trifling corrections. Several of the not so many works that retain that term, for the sake of generality, even seem to justify that it is of minor importance. On the other hand, thanks to the increasing observational precision also higher order corrections may become within reach in the not too distant future. The authors of [15] have demonstrated that the spatial curvature enters the luminosity distance of SNIa supernovae in third order in redshift (see also [16]). It is also known that there are degeneracies between the curvature and the dark energy equation of state in the corresponding parameter space [17]. The possible relevance of spatial curvature for the lowest multipoles in the cosmic microwave background radiation was discussed in [18]. These examples indicate that apart from general theoretical grounds, the observational situation will require the inclusion of spatial curvature, even if its contribution is small, at some level of precision. Therefore, the additional dynamics provided by the curvature, should certainly not be dismissed too quickly since it contains information which is needed to further restrict the cosmological parameter space.

In this paper we consider pressureless dark matter in interaction with an unknown component which is supposed to describe dark energy. We neither specify the dark energy equation of state nor the interaction rate from the beginning. These two (generally time dependent) parameters will influence the ratio of the energy densities of dark matter and dark energy. The behavior of this ratio is crucial for the “coincidence problem”, namely: “why are the matter and dark energy densities of precisely the same order today”. In principle, matter and dark energy redshift at different rates. We show, that there exists a preferred class of dark energy models for which the dynamics of the energy density ratio is entirely determined by the spatial curvature. For vanishing curvature the energy density ratio remains constant. These models are singled out by a dependence $\rho_X \propto H^2$, where ρ_X is the dark energy density and $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. Exactly this dependence is characteristic for a certain type of dark energy models, inspired by the holographic principle [19, 20].

Holographic dark energy models must specify an infrared cutoff length scale [21]. The choice of this scale is presently a matter of debate. The most obvious choice, the Hubble

length, seemed to be incompatible with an accelerated expansion of the Universe [22] (see, however, [23, 24]). This is why, starting with the work of Li [25], many researchers have adopted the future event horizon as the cutoff scale as this choice allows for a sufficiently negative equation of state parameter and hence an accelerated expansion -see, e.g. [26].

In a previous paper [27], we showed that a cutoff set by the Hubble length may well be compatible with an accelerated expansion provided that the dark energy and dark matter do not evolve separately but interact, also non-gravitationally, with each other. In this setting, a negative equation of state parameter that gives rise to accelerated expansion arises as a direct consequence of the interaction. The purpose of the present paper is to put this feature in a broader context and to demonstrate that a constant or slowly varying (as the consequence of a non-vanishing spatial curvature) energy density ratio is compatible with a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion under the condition of a growing interaction parameter.

The outline of this paper is as follows. Section II provides the general formalism for an interacting two-component fluid, where one of the fluids is pressureless. Then it focuses on the case for which the ratio of the energy densities of both fluids is constant or slowly varying. This will single out models for which the energy density of the second component is proportional to the square of the Hubble parameter. A realization of this dependence is provided by certain holographic dark energy models. The basic properties of these models are recalled in Section III. Section IV discusses in detail matter in interaction with holographic dark energy. It provides the conditions under which an interaction driven transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion is feasible. It also comments on the possibility of a weak time dependence of the saturation parameter of the holographic bound, which is usually assumed constant. Section V introduces a simple interacting model and compares it with the Λ CDM model. Finally, section VI summarizes our findings.

II. INTERACTING COSMOLOGICAL FLUIDS

The field equations for a spatially homogeneous and isotropic universe are the Friedmann equation

$$3 H^2 = 8 \pi G \rho - 3 \frac{k}{a^2}, \quad (1)$$

and

$$\dot{H} = -4\pi G (\rho + p) + \frac{k}{a^2} . \quad (2)$$

A combination of both equations yields

$$2\frac{\dot{H}}{H} = -3H \left(1 + \frac{p}{\rho}\right) - \frac{k}{a^2 H} \left(1 + 3\frac{p}{\rho}\right) , \quad (3)$$

a relation that will be useful later on. The deceleration parameter, $q = -\ddot{a}/(aH^2)$, can be written as

$$q = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2}\right) \left(1 + 3\frac{p}{\rho}\right) . \quad (4)$$

The total energy density ρ is supposed to split into $\rho = \rho_M + \rho_X$, where ρ_M is the energy density of pressureless dark matter. Under this assumption the total pressure equals the dark energy pressure, $p = p_X$. We further assume that both components do not conserve separately but interact with each other in such a manner that the balance equations take the form

$$\dot{\rho}_M + 3H\rho_M = \Gamma\rho_X \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\rho}_X + 3H(1+w)\rho_X = -\Gamma\rho_X , \quad (5)$$

where $w \equiv p_X/\rho_X$ is the equation of state parameter of the dark energy, and the function $\Gamma > 0$ measures the strength of the interaction. Models featuring an interaction matter–dark energy were introduced by Wetterich [28] and first used alongside the holographic dark energy by Horvat [23]. Nowadays there is a growing body of literature on the subject -see, e.g. [29] and references therein. Although the assumption of a coupling between both components implies the introduction of an additional phenomenological function Γ , a description that admits interactions is certainly more general than otherwise. Further, there is no known symmetry that would suppress such interaction and arguments in favor of interacting models have been put forward recently [30].

The quantity of interest for analyzing the coincidence problem is the ratio $r \equiv \rho_M/\rho_X$, which, upon using Eqs. (5), can be written as

$$\dot{r} = (1+r) \left[3Hw \frac{r}{1+r} + \Gamma \right] . \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, combining the balance equation for ρ_X in (5) with Eq. (3), we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{\rho}_X}{\rho_X} - 2 \frac{\dot{H}}{H} = - \left[3Hw \frac{r}{1+r} + \Gamma \right] + \frac{k}{a^2 H} \left(1 + 3 \frac{w}{1+r} \right) . \quad (7)$$

Comparing now Eqs. (7) and (6), it follows that the dynamics of the aforesaid ratio is governed by

$$\dot{r} = - (1+r) \left[\frac{\dot{\rho}_X}{\rho_X} - 2 \frac{\dot{H}}{H} - \frac{k}{a^2 H} \left(1 + 3 \frac{w}{1+r} \right) \right] . \quad (8)$$

It is this formula which deserves attention with regard to the coincidence problem. Clearly, the lower $|\dot{r}|$, the less acute becomes this problem. Inspection of Eq. (8) shows that the case $\rho_X \propto H^2$ is singled out for it leads to

$$\dot{r} = (1+r) \frac{k}{a^2 H} \left(1 + 3 \frac{w}{1+r} \right) . \quad (9)$$

At this point, it is expedient to introduce the dimensionless quantities

$$\Omega_M = \frac{8\pi G \rho_M}{3 H^2}, \quad \Omega_X = \frac{8\pi G \rho_X}{3 H^2} . \quad (10)$$

Thus, the Friedmann equation (1) can be cast as

$$\Omega_M + \Omega_X = 1 + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} . \quad (11)$$

By using it together with Eq. (4), the expression (9) takes the form

$$\dot{r} = 2H \frac{k}{a^2 H^2 \Omega_X} q . \quad (12)$$

Via the curvature the evolution of r is directly linked to the deceleration parameter. For $k = +1$ and $q > 0$ (decelerated expansion) r augments, and for $q < 0$ (accelerated expansion) r diminishes. For $k = -1$ the behavior is just the opposite. In any case only small variations of r are possible nowadays, since $1/(a^2 H^2) \ll 1$ at present [3, 14]. While a slow time dependence of the energy density ratio is desirable from the point of view of the coincidence problem, it remains to be clarified whether dark energy models with $\rho_X \propto H^2$ are able to account for a present phase of accelerated expansion as well as for a transition to the latter from an earlier matter dominated phase.

A survey of the, by now, rather ample body of literature on dark energy candidates reveals that models of this type have indeed been introduced previously, namely, in the context of ideas which are rooted in the holographic principle. In the following section we briefly recall, how a dependence $\rho_X \propto H^2$ emerges in these holographic dark energy models.

III. HOLOGRAPHIC DARK ENERGY

The basic ideas of the holographic principle were introduced by 't Hooft [19] and Susskind [20]. The development of interest for our purpose was put forward by Cohen *et al.* [21], followed by Hsu [22] and Li [25], who considered specific holographic dark energy models.

The essential point in establishing the holographic idea is the way of counting the degrees of freedom of a physical system. Consider a three-dimensional lattice of spin-like degrees of freedom and assume that the distance between every two neighboring sites is some small length ℓ which is of the order of the Planck length, ℓ_{Pl} . Each spin can be in one of two states. In a region of volume L^3 the number of quantum states N will be $N = 2^n$, with $n = (L/\ell)^3$ the number of sites in the volume, whence the entropy, given by the logarithm of N , will be $S \propto (L/\ell)^3 \ln 2$. Identifying (in Planck units) ℓ^{-1} with the ultraviolet cutoff Λ (the corresponding energy is $L^3 \Lambda^4$), the maximum entropy varies as $S \sim L^3 \Lambda^3$, i.e., proportional to the volume of the system. Based on considerations on black hole thermodynamics (bear in mind that the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy is $S_{BH} = A/(4\ell_{Pl}^2)$, where A is the area of the black hole horizon), Bekenstein [31] argued that the maximum entropy for a box of volume L^3 should be proportional to its surface rather than to its volume. In keeping with this, 't Hooft conjectured that all phenomena within a volume L^3 should be described by a set of

degrees of freedom located at the surface which bounds this volume with approximately one binary degree of freedom per Planck's area.

Inspired by these ideas, Cohen *et al.* [21] demonstrated that an effective field theory that saturates the inequality (the Bekenstein bound)

$$L^3 \Lambda^3 \leq S_{BH} \simeq L^2 M_{Pl}^2 \quad (M_{Pl}^2 = (8\pi G)^{-1}), \quad (13)$$

necessarily includes states for which the Schwarzschild radius R_s is larger than the box size, i.e., $R_s > L$. Namely, for sufficiently high temperatures (in Planck units $T \gg L^{-1}$ but $T \leq \Lambda$) the thermal energy of the system is $E \simeq L^3 T^4$ while its entropy is $S \simeq L^3 T^3$. When Eq. (13) is saturated (by setting $T = \Lambda$ in there) it follows that $T \simeq (M_{Pl}^2/L)^{1/3}$. Now, the Schwarzschild radius R_s is related to the energy by $R_s \simeq E/M_{Pl}^2$ (recall that an object with Schwarzschild radius R_s corresponds to a (Newtonian) mass $R_s/(2G)$). Consequently, $R_s \gg L$, i.e., the Schwarzschild radius is indeed larger than the system size.

A stronger constraint which excludes states for which the Schwarzschild radius exceeds the size L is

$$L^3 \Lambda^4 \leq M_{Pl}^2 L. \quad (14)$$

The expression on the right-hand side of Eq. (14) corresponds to the energy of a black hole of size L . So, this constraint ensures that the energy $L^3 \Lambda^4$ in a box of the size L does not exceed the energy of a black hole of the same size [25].

While the Bekenstein bound (13) implies a scaling $L \propto \Lambda^{-3}$, the inequality (14) corresponds to a behavior $L \propto \Lambda^{-2}$. Furthermore, since saturation of (14) means $\Lambda^3 \simeq (M_{Pl}^2/L^2)^{3/4}$, one finds that $S = L^3 \Lambda^3 = (M_{Pl}^2 L^2)^{3/4} = S_{BH}^{3/4}$.

By saturating the inequality (14) and identifying Λ^4 with the holographic energy density ρ_X it follows [21, 25]

$$\rho_{HDE} = \frac{3c^2}{8\pi G L^2}, \quad (15)$$

where the factor 3 was introduced for convenience and c^2 is a dimensionless quantity which

is usually assumed constant. It is obvious, that for a choice $L = H^{-1}$, i.e., for a cutoff set by the Hubble radius, the energy density (15) is characterized by exactly that dependence $\propto H^2$ which was singled out by Eqs. (8) and (9). In the following we shall identify (15) with the energy density ρ_X appearing in Eq. (5).

IV. HOLOGRAPHIC DARK ENERGY IN INTERACTION WITH MATTER

For holographic dark energy models with a cutoff scale H^{-1} the time dependence of the energy density ratio is determined by Eq. (9). For a spatially flat universe the ratio r remains constant. Possible changes of r due to a non-vanishing spatial curvature term are necessarily small. At first glance, models with a constant (or almost constant) energy density ratio seem unable to account for a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion. And indeed, holographic dark energy models with the Hubble scale as cutoff length were considered to be ruled out since their equation of state parameter does not seem to allow negative values which are required for an accelerated expansion [22, 25]. However, as shown previously, the presence of an interaction between dark energy and dark matter may change this situation [27]. This becomes obvious if Eq. (3) with $p = w\rho_X$ is solved for the equation of state parameter w . The result is

$$w = -\frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X} \left[\frac{\Gamma}{3H} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} \right]. \quad (16)$$

Owing to the fact that the curvature in the bracket on the right hand side of Eq. (16) is small, the interaction rate Γ essentially determines the equation of state parameter as soon as the ratio Γ/H becomes of order one. For negligible interaction, $|\Gamma|/H \ll 1$, one has $|w| \ll 1$.

The main point of interest now is the behavior of the deceleration parameter, i.e., whether this kind of models admits a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion.

The condition for accelerated expansion ($q < 0$)

$$w + \frac{\Gamma}{3H} < -\frac{1}{3}, \quad (17)$$

readily follows from the above equations. Introduction of the expression (16) for w into the

latter leads to

$$\frac{\Gamma}{H} > \frac{1 - \Omega_X}{\Omega_X} + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2 \Omega_X} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\Gamma}{H} > r , \quad (18)$$

where we have used Friedmann's equation (11). On the other hand, since holographic energy is not compatible with phantom fields [32], one must impose $w \geq -1$ to be consistent with the holographic idea. From Eq. (16) we find that this condition amounts to

$$\frac{\Gamma}{H} \leq 3 (1 - \Omega_X) + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} . \quad (19)$$

Therefore, the consistency condition simply reads,

$$3\Omega_X > 1 + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} . \quad (20)$$

The inequality (19) says that the ratio on its left hand side is smaller than a quantity of order one. Clearly, this is compatible with an initial condition $|\Gamma|/(3H) \ll 1$. The latter implies that w must be close to zero deep in the matter dominated era (cf. Eq. (16)). An initial condition $|\Gamma| \ll H$ is equivalent to an initially negligible interaction. This means that at high redshifts (but well after matter–radiation equality), the dark energy component is almost non–interacting and its equation of state is close to that of pressureless matter. On the other hand, the condition (18) for accelerated expansion entails that $|\Gamma|/H$ must be larger than a lower bound of order one, as well. Both inequalities are consistent with condition (20). This supports our suggestion that, depending on the interaction rate, a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion is indeed feasible.

Starting from Eq. (8), the dynamics of the energy density ratio may alternatively be written as

$$\dot{r} = -H \frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X} \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} \left[\frac{\Gamma}{H} - r \right] . \quad (21)$$

For $k = 0$ we recover the stationary case $r = \text{constant}$, irrespective of the value of Γ/H . If additionally $\Gamma/H = \text{constant}$, it follows from Eq. (16) that w is also a constant. In such

a case, there is no transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion [27]. However, if Γ/H is allowed to grow, then the transition may well occur, even though the ratio r remains constant or almost constant (see Eq. (24) below).

The spatially curved cases generate an interesting additional dynamics. The transition condition $\Gamma/H = r$ (cf. Eq. (18)) coincides with the condition for $\dot{r} = 0$ for $k = \pm 1$ in (21). Since at early times one has $\Gamma/H \ll r$, the ratio r in (21) increases for $k = +1$, while it decreases for $k = -1$. It reaches a maximum (minimum) for $k = 1$ ($k = -1$) at $\Gamma/H = r$ and may go down (up) afterward.

The obvious requirement for a sufficient growth of the interaction parameter Γ/H is that $(\Gamma/Hr)' > 0$ in the phase of decelerated expansion or, by (21), that

$$\frac{(\Gamma/H)'}{\Gamma/H} > \frac{H}{1 - \Omega_X} \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\Gamma}{H} \right]. \quad (22)$$

But according to Eq. (19) the ratio Γ/H is bounded from above. For a growth of Γ/H from a very small value to a value of order one, a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion is feasible. We mention again, that any change of r arises solely as a curvature effect.

A different way to understand the dynamics of the ratio r , which also may be seen as a consistency check, is to start from Eq. (11) and to realize that $\Omega_X = \text{constant}$. Then (recall that $r = \Omega_M/\Omega_X$),

$$r = \frac{1 - \Omega_X}{\Omega_X} + \frac{k}{a^2 H^2 \Omega_X}. \quad (23)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (23) is constant. It is just the curvature term that makes r vary. Since in accelerating universes the absolute value of the curvature term decreases, r will approach a constant value in the long time limit. The ratio r grows if the curvature term enlarges the right hand side ($k = 1$ and $q > 0$, or $k = -1$ and $q < 0$) and it goes down if the curvature term diminishes the right hand side ($k = 1$ and $q < 0$, or $k = -1$ and $q > 0$). This is essentially the behavior discussed beneath Eq. (12). Clearly, differentiation of Eq. (23) alongside the introduction of the deceleration parameter q consistently reproduces Eq. (12).

Combining Eqs. (12) and (21) we get

$$\frac{\Gamma}{H} - r = -2 \frac{1 - \Omega_X}{\Omega_X} q . \quad (24)$$

This equation covers all the cases $k = 0, \pm 1$ and explicitly shows that the cosmological dynamics crucially depends on the difference of two ratios: the ratio Γ/H and the ratio r of the energy densities. The difference of these two ratios is directly proportional to the (negative) deceleration parameter. Accelerated expansion requires $\Gamma/H > r$, decelerated expansion demands $\Gamma/H < r$. It is obvious, that even a constant or a slowly varying ratio r may be compatible with a sign change of q provided Γ/H evolves accordingly.

The circumstance that r is constant or only slowly varying means, that the coincidence problem gets significantly alleviated. The change in the effective equation of state parameter is entirely due to the interaction. Even with a constant r a present accelerated expansion is compatible with an earlier matter dominated period with decelerated expansion. The point is that for negligible interaction (at sufficiently high redshifts) the dark energy component behaves as non-relativistic matter. In this phase r is not really an important parameter since it describes the ratio of two components with the same equation of state. It was this property that apparently ruled out a (non-interacting) holographic dark energy model with an infrared cutoff set by the Hubble scale [22, 25]. Here, this unwanted (in the non-interacting model) feature is advantageous since, thanks to it, a matter dominated phase during which structure formation can occur is naturally recovered. It is only because of the gradually increased interaction that the equations of state begin to differ from each other. Then r becomes important. As mentioned above, the negative equation of state parameter is a pure interaction phenomenon.

By starting from the expression (15) with $L = H^{-1}$ for the dark energy we have assumed the parameter c^2 to be constant throughout our considerations. However, there does not seem to exist any compelling reason for the inequality (14) to be saturated or for the degree of saturation to be a constant once and for all. In principle, a weak time dependence ($0 < (c^2)' / c^2 \ll H$) of c^2 should be admitted here. Such an additional degree of freedom will modify the dynamics discussed so far. In particular, instead of described by Eq. (21), the ratio r will evolve according to

$$\dot{r} = -H r \frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X} \left\{ \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{\Gamma}{H} - 1 \right] + \frac{(\dot{c}^2)}{H c^2} \right\}, \quad (25)$$

and the equation of state parameter changes from (16) to

$$w = -\frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X} \left[\frac{\Gamma}{3H} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} + \frac{1}{3H} \frac{(\dot{c}^2)}{c^2} \right]. \quad (26)$$

As a consequence, in the conditions (17) and (18) and in all relations after them, the rate Γ is to be replaced by $\Gamma + \frac{(\dot{c}^2)}{c^2}$. A varying c^2 will induce small variations in r , additionally to those which are due to the spatial curvature and can support the transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion [27] (see also [33]). Thus, at this transition, we have

$$\dot{r}(q=0) = -\frac{r}{1 - \Omega_X} \frac{(\dot{c}^2)}{c^2} \left[1 - \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} \frac{1}{r} \right], \quad (27)$$

which reduces to the previous result $\dot{r}(q=0) = 0$ for $c^2 = \text{constant}$.

Before closing this section, it is noteworthy that a negative equation of state parameter w can be obtained from a negative curvature term ($k = -1$) alone (cf. Eq. (16)), i.e., even for $\Gamma = 0$,

$$w = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{a^2 H^2} \frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X}. \quad (28)$$

However, the condition (18) for accelerated expansion, in this case $1/(aH)^2 > 1 - \Omega_X$, can never be satisfied as it contradicts the constraint equation (11). Consequently, only models with a non-vanishing interaction between dark energy and dark matter can be potential candidates for a satisfactory cosmological dynamics based on the holographic idea with the infrared cutoff set by the Hubble function.

V. A SIMPLE MODEL

In this section we build a simple model that explicitly exhibits the general features discussed so far.

With the help of the equation of state parameter (16) the balances expressions (5) may be written as

$$\frac{\dot{\rho}_X}{\rho_X} = -3H \left[1 + \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 - \Omega_X} \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} - \frac{\Gamma}{3H} \frac{\Omega_X}{1 - \Omega_X} \right], \quad \frac{\dot{\rho}_M}{\rho_M} = -3H \left[1 - \frac{\Gamma}{3H} \frac{\Omega_X}{\Omega_M} \right]. \quad (29)$$

For $k = 0$, we have $1 - \Omega_X = \Omega_M$ and both rates coincide. Moreover, in this case r stays constant. Integration of (29.2) under this condition from some initial period (subscript “ i ”) onward, results in

$$\frac{\rho_M}{\rho_{Mi}} = \left(\frac{a_i}{a} \right)^3 \exp \left[\frac{1}{r} \int \frac{da}{a} \frac{\Gamma}{H} \right]. \quad (30)$$

For the special case of a constant Γ/H , it reduces to

$$\frac{\rho_M}{\rho_{Mi}} = \left(\frac{a_i}{a} \right)^{3 - \Gamma/(rH)}. \quad (31)$$

Consequently, the Hubble parameter depends on the scale factor as $H \propto a^{-\frac{1}{2}[3 - \Gamma/(rH)]}$. Hence,

$$a \propto t^{\frac{2}{3 - \Gamma/(rH)}}. \quad (32)$$

The exponent on the right hand side of the last expression is larger than unity for $\Gamma/(rH) > 1$ which reproduces the previous condition (18) for accelerated expansion. The limiting case $\Gamma/(rH) = 3$ corresponds to a constant energy density, i.e., to an exponential growth of the scale factor.

As mentioned above, a constant ratio Γ/H can describe either a phase of decelerated expansion ($\Gamma/(rH) < 1$), or a phase of accelerated expansion ($\Gamma/(rH) > 1$), but never a transition between the two. To stage a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion $\Gamma/(rH)$ must increase which, for a constant ratio r , means that Γ/H must increase.

In the following we assume a growth according to

$$\frac{\Gamma}{rH} = 3\beta \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^\alpha, \quad a \leq a_0, \quad \beta \lesssim 1, \quad (33)$$

with constant, positive-definite parameters α and β . The condition on β ensures, that the phantom divide cannot be crossed. Furthermore, we restrict our considerations to the past evolution of the universe. The ansatz (33) implies a continuous growth of the ratio $\Gamma/(rH)$ with a maximum value at the present time. We do not speculate about a possible influence of the interaction on the future dynamics of the Universe. But it is obvious that if, in the future, the interaction becomes less effective, an evolution back to a fresh phase of decelerated expansion is feasible.

Inserting the ansatz (33) into Eq. (30) we get

$$\frac{\rho_M}{\rho_{Mi}} = \left(\frac{a_i}{a}\right)^3 \exp \left[\frac{3\beta}{\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^\alpha - \left(\frac{a_i}{a_0}\right)^\alpha \right) \right]. \quad (34)$$

The exponential factor diminishes the decreases of the energy density with cosmic expansion. Replacing the initial quantities by the corresponding present day values (subscript “0”) provides us with

$$\rho_M = \rho_{M0} \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 \exp \left[\frac{3\beta}{\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^\alpha - 1 \right) \right]. \quad (35)$$

For $k = 0$ and $c^2 = \text{constant}$, the energy density of de dark energy component shows exactly the same dependence on the scale factor,

$$\rho_X = \rho_{X0} \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 \exp \left[\frac{3\beta}{\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^\alpha - 1 \right) \right]. \quad (36)$$

Thus, the Hubble rate is given by

$$h \equiv \frac{H}{H_0} = \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^{3/2} \exp \left[\frac{3\beta}{2\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^\alpha - 1 \right) \right]. \quad (37)$$

Comparing Eq. (33) with (24) for the spatially flat case, the deceleration parameter is found to be

$$q = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \beta \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^\alpha. \quad (38)$$

It is expedient, to compare the dimensionless Hubble rate, h , given by Eq. (37), with the corresponding quantity of the Λ CDM model,

$$\frac{H_{\Lambda CDM}}{H_0} = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_\Lambda}{\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{M0}}} \left[1 + \frac{\rho_{M0}}{\rho_\Lambda} \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^3 \right]^{1/2}. \quad (39)$$

Introducing the redshift parameter z by $a_0/a = 1 + z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_{\Lambda CDM}}{H_0} &= \sqrt{\frac{\rho_\Lambda}{\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{M0}}} \left[1 + \frac{\rho_{M0}}{\rho_\Lambda} (1 + z)^3 \right]^{1/2} \\ &= 1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\rho_{M0}}{\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{M0}} z + \mathcal{O}(z^2), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where for reasons explained below we have retained only the linear term in z in the second line of last equation. From (37) it follows that




FIG. 1: Graphs of the dimensionless ratio h vs redshift. Except for the middle graph -which corresponds to the Λ CDM model-, from top to bottom the α values are: 2.0, 1.5, 1.2, and 1.0. Here, we have taken $\beta = 3/4$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{H}{H_0} &= (1+z)^{3/2} \exp \left[\frac{3\beta}{2\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{1}{1+z} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right) \right] \\
&= 1 + \frac{3}{2} (1-\beta) z + \mathcal{O}(z^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

for our interacting model. It is remarkable that to linear order in z , the expression (41) does not depend on α .

We may now require that our model (41) coincides with the Lambda-cold dark matter (Λ CDM) model (40) up to linear order in z . This allows us to fix the parameter β in terms of the observationally well established ratio of the parameters ρ_{M0} and ρ_Λ of the Λ CDM model. The result is

$$\beta = \frac{\rho_\Lambda}{\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{M0}}. \tag{42}$$

For the observed $\rho_{M0}/\rho_\Lambda \approx 1/3$ we have $\beta \approx 3/4$. Under this condition, the present value of the deceleration parameter (38), $q_0 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\beta$, coincides with the corresponding value $q_{\Lambda\text{CDM}0} = 1/2 - [3\rho_\Lambda/2(\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{M0})] \approx -0.6$ of the Λ CDM model as well. However, the evolution of q towards this value depends on α which gives rise to differences in any order beyond the linear one. For the value of the transition redshift z_{acc} , that follows from $q = 0$ in (38), we obtain $z_{acc} = (3\beta)^{1/\alpha} - 1$.

With the identification (42) and $\rho_{M0}/\rho_\Lambda \approx 1/3$ we find $z_{acc} \approx 1.2$ for $\alpha = 1$ and $z_{acc} \approx 0.5$ for $\alpha = 2$. The corresponding z -value for the Λ CDM model is approximately 0.8.

Figure 1 contrasts the Hubble parameter prediction of our interaction model for different values of α with the Λ CDM model. Clearly, the free parameter α , obviously of the order of one, can be used to adjust $h(z)$ according to the observational situation.

Figure 2 presents the best fit of our model and the best fit of the Λ CDM model to the Gold SNIa data set of Riess *et al.* (fourth reference in [4]), and the SNLS data set of Astier *et al.* (sixth reference in [4]). In plotting the graphs the distance modulus, $\mu = 5 \log d_L + 25$, was employed. In this expression $d_L = (1+z) \int_0^z H^{-1}(z') dz'$ is the luminosity distance in megaparsecs. As can be seen, both best fits largely overlap one another. In all, current SNIa data are unable to discriminate between the popular Λ CDM and our interaction model.




FIG. 2: Distance modulus vs redshift for the best fit toy model, $\Omega_X = 0.75$, $H_0 = 67.35 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, $\alpha = 1.5$ (solid line), and the ΛCDM model, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.71$, and $H_0 = 67.35 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ (dashed line).

VI. DISCUSSION

Models in which dark matter and dark energy interact with each other, are characterized by dynamical features that are missing in models in which both the components of the dark sector evolve independently. An interaction may be relevant for describing the transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion as well as for alleviating the coincidence problem. In this paper we have shown that there exists a dark energy model, holographic dark energy with an infrared cutoff scale set by the Hubble parameter, for which the ratio of the densities of dark matter and dark energy remains constant or varies very slowly. At first sight, the fact that r was never large may seem at variance with the conventional scenario of cosmic structure formation as one may think that at early times the amount of dark matter may have been insufficient to produce gravitational potential wells deep enough to lead to the condensation of the galaxies. However, this is not so; an earlier matter dominated phase is naturally recovered since for negligible interaction at high redshifts the equation of state of the dark energy is similar to that of non-relativistic matter.

As we have seen, the interaction can drive the transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion. We have also shown that taking into account the spatial curvature term gives rise to additional interesting dynamical features. For the coincidence problem to be solved in full one should demonstrate that r is necessarily of order one today, something that lies beyond the scope of the present work. For the time being, its present value must be considered as an input. This is also true for other key cosmic quantities such as the current value of the background radiation temperature, the Hubble constant, or the ratio between the number of baryons and photons.

To further clarify the properties of interacting holographic dark energy we have worked out a model based on the assumption that the ratio $\Gamma/(rH)$ obeys a power law in the scale factor (Eq. (33)). It is seen that it fits the SNIa data not less well than the Λ CDM model. We also discussed to what extent a slowly varying saturation parameter, c^2 , of the holographic bound may modify the cosmological dynamics. Besides, our model can cope with a later transition to a new decelerated phase of expansion [34]-something incompatible with holographic models whose infrared cutoff is set by the radius of the future event horizon.

Acknowledgments

W.Z. was supported by a Grant from the “Programa de Movilidad de Profesores Visitantes 2006” of the “Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona”. This work was partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science under Grant FIS 2006-12296-C02-01, the “Direcció General de Recerca de Catalunya” under Grant 2005 SGR 000 87.

-
- [1] M. S. Turner, in *Generation of Cosmological Large-Scale Structure*, (edited by D. N. Schramm and P. Galeotti, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1997), p. 153, astro-ph/9704062.
 - [2] W. Priester *et al.*, in *Friedmann-Lemaitre Model Derived from the Lyman Alpha Forest in Quasar Spectra*, Proceedings of the Third Alexander Friedmann International Seminar on Gravitation and Cosmology, edited by Y.N. Gnedin, A.A. Grib and V.M. Mostepanenko (Friedmann Laboratory Publishing, 1995), pp 52-67.
 - [3] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, astro-ph/0603449.

- [4] A.G. Riess *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999); J.L. Tonry *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **594**, 1 (2003); A.G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004); M.V. John, *Astrophys. J.* **614**, 1 (2004); P. Astier *et al.*, *J. Astron. Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006); A.G. Riess *et al.*, astro-ph/0611572.
- [5] S. Hanany *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **545**, L5 2000; C.B. Netterfield *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **571**, 604 (2002); D.N. Spergel *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003).
- [6] M. Colless *et al.*, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **328**, 1039 (2001); M. Tegmark *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004); S. Cole *et al.*, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **362**, 505 (2005); V. Springel, C.S. Frenk, and S.M.D. White, *Nature (London)* **440**, 1137 (2006).
- [7] S. Boughn and R. Chritenden, *Nature (London)* **427**, 45 (2004); P. Vielva, E. Martínez-González, and M. Tucci, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **365**, 891 (2006).
- [8] C.R. Contaldi, H. Hoekstra, and A. Lewis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 221303 (2003).
- [9] L. Perivolaropoulos, astro-ph/0601014; E.J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikama, hep-th/0603057.
- [10] S. Das, P.S. Corasaniti, and J. Khoury, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 083509 (2006).
- [11] L. Amendola *et al.*, astro-ph/0610574.
- [12] G. Olivares, F. Atrio and D. Pavón, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063523 (2005).
- [13] G. Olivares, F. Atrio and D. Pavón, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 043521 (2006).
- [14] U. Sejak, A. Slosar and P. McDonald, *JCAP* 10(2006)014.
- [15] R.R. Caldwell and M. Kamionkowski, *JCAP* 09(2004)009.
- [16] Bin Wang, Yungui-Gong and Ru-Keng Su, *Phys. Lett. B* **605**, 9 (2005).
- [17] J.L. Crooks, J.O. Dunn, P.H. Frampton, H.R. Norton and T. Takahashi, *Astropart. Phys.* **20**, 361 (2003), astro-ph/0305495; D. Polarski and A. Ranquet, *Phys. Lett. B* **627**, 1 (2005); E. Linder, *Astropart. Phys.* **24**, 391 (2005); K. Ichikawa and T. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** 083526 (2006); Zhuo-Yi Huang, Bin Wang and Ru-Keng Su, astro-ph/0605392; K. Ichikawa, M. Kawasaki, T. Sekiguchi and T. Takahashi, astro-ph/0605481.
- [18] Yungui Gong, Bin Wang, and Yuan-Zhong Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 043510 (2005); Qing-Guo Huang and Miao Li, *JCAP* 08(2004)013; Zhuo-Yi Huang, Bin Wang, E. Abdalla, and Ru-Keng Su, *JCAP* 05(2006)013.
- [19] G. 't Hooft, gr-qc/9310026.
- [20] L. Susskind, *J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.)* **36**, 6377 (1995).

- [21] A. G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4971 (1999).
- [22] S. D. H. Hsu, Phys. Lett. B **594**, 13 (2004).
- [23] R. Horvat, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 087301 (2004).
- [24] B. Gubiner, R. Horvat and H. Nikolić, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 125011 (2005).
- [25] M. Li, Phys. Lett. B **603**, 1 (2004).
- [26] Yungui Gong, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 064029 (2004); Qin-Guo Huang and Yungui Gong, JCAP 08(2004)006; Bin Wang, Yungui Gong and E. Abdalla, Phys. Lett. B **624**, 141 (2005); Xin Zhang, Int. J. Mod.Phys. D **14**, 1597 (2005); Qing-Guo Huang and Miao Li, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys. 03(2005)001; Bo Hu and Yi Ling, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 123510 (2006); S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, hep-th/0506212; E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov and Peng Wang, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 103504 (2005); Xin Zhang, astro-ph/0604484.
- [27] D. Pavón and W. Zimdahl, Phys. Lett. B **628**, 206 (2005).
- [28] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **302**, 668 (1988); *ibid.*, Astron. Astrophys. **301**, 321 (1995).
- [29] L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043511 (2000); W. Zimdahl, D. Pavón and L.P. Chimento, Phys. Lett. B **521**, 133 (2001); L.P. Chimento, A.S. Jakubi, D. Pavón, and W. Zimdahl, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 083513 (2003); L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 103524 (2004); Rong-Gen Cai and Anzhong Wang JCAP 03(2005)002; Zong-Kuan Guo, Rong-Gen Cai and Yan-Zhong Zhang, JCAP 05(2005)002; W. Zimdahl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **14**, 2319 (2005); L.P. Chimento and D. Pavón, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 063511 (2006); M.S. Berger and H. Shojaei, astro-ph/0606408.
- [30] G.R. Farrar and P.J.E. Peebles, Astrophys. J. **604**, 1 (2004).
- [31] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 1912 (1994).
- [32] D. Bak and S-J. Rey, Class. Quantum Grav. **17**, L83 (2000); E.E. Flanagan, D. Marolf and R.M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 084035 (2000).
- [33] B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Nikolic, astro-ph/0611299.
- [34] F.C. Carvalho, J.S. Alcaniz, J.A.S. Lima, and R. Silva Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 081301 (2006).