Primordial Neutrinos, Cosmological Perturbations in Interacting Dark-Energy Model: CMB and LSS

Kiyotomo Ichiki[1,2,3] *, Yong-Yeon Keum[3,4] †

[1] *National Astronomical Observatory, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan*

[2] *Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, IL 60637, USA*

[3] *Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan 10672, ROC and*

[4] *Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics, Pohang, Korea*

arXiv:0705.2134v2 [astro-ph] 13 Mar 2008

Abstract

We present cosmological perturbation theory in neutrinos probe interacting dark-energy models, and calculate cosmic microwave background anisotropies and matter power spectrum. In these models, the evolution of the mass of neutrinos is determined by the quintessence scalar field, which is responsible for the cosmic acceleration today. We consider several types of scalar field potentials and put constraints on the coupling parameter between neutrinos and dark energy. Assuming the flatness of the universe, the constraint we can derive from the current observation is $\sum m_\nu < 0.87eV$ at the 95 % confidence level for the sum over three species of neutrinos. We also discuss on the stability issue of the our model and on the impact of the scattering term in Boltzmann equation from the mass-varying neutrinos.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k,98.80.Jk,98.80.Cq

* Email address: ichiki@resceu.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

† Email address: yykeum@phys.ntu.edu.tw

I. INTRODUCTION

After SNIa[1] and WMAP[2] observations during last decade, the discovery of the accelerated expansion of the universe is a major challenge of particle physics and cosmology. There are currently three candidates for the *Dark-Energy* which derives this accelerated expansion:

- a non-zero cosmological constant[3],
- a dynamical cosmological constant (Quintessence scalar field)[4],
- modifications of Einstein Theory of Gravity[5]

The scalar field model like quintessence is a simple model with time dependent w, which is generally larger than -1. Because the different w leads to a different expansion history of the universe, the geometrical measurements of cosmic expansion through observations of SNIa, CMB, and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) can give us tight constraints on w. One of the interesting way to study the scalar field dark energy models is to investigate the coupling between the dark energy and the other matter fields. In fact, a number of models which realize the interaction between dark energy and dark matter, or even visible matters, have been proposed so far [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Observations of the effects of these interactions will offer an unique opportunity to detect a cosmological scalar field [6, 11].

In this paper, after reviewing shortly the main idea of the three possible candidates of dark energy and their cosmological phenomena in section II, we discuss the interacting dark energy model, paying particular attention to the interacting mechanism between dark-energy with a hot dark-matter (neutrinos) in section III. In this so-called Mass-Varying Neutinos (MaVaNs) model [12], we calculate explicitly Cosmic Microwave Background(CMB) radiation and Large Scale Structure(LSS) within cosmological perturbation theory. The evolution of the mass of neutrinos is determined by the quintessence scalar filed, which is responsible for the cosmic acceleration today. Recently, perturbation equations for this class of models are nicely presented by Brookfield et al. [13], (see also [14]) which are necessary to compute CMB and LSS spectra. A main difference here from their works is that we correctly take into account the scattering term in the geodesic equation of neutrinos, which was omitted there (see, however, [15]). We will show that this leads significant differences in the resultant spectra and hence the different observational constraints. In section IV, we discuss three different types of quintessence potential, namely, an inverse power law potential, a supergravity potential, and

an exponential type potential. By computing CMB and LSS spectra with these quintessential potentials and comparing them to the latest observations, the constraints on the present mass of neutrinos and coupling parameters are derived. In conclusion we discuss two important points of this work on the impact of the scattering term of the Boltzmann equation and on the stability issue in the interacting dark-energy model. In appendix A, the explicit calculation for the consistency check of our calculations in section III is shown. Since we were asked to show explicit derivation of geodesic equation after our first draft was released, we show them in appendix B.

II. THREE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR ACCELERATING UNIVERSE:

Recent observations with Supernova Ia type (SNIa) and CMB radiation have provided strong evidence that we live now in an accelerating and almost flat universe. In general, one believes that the dominance of a dark-energy component with negative pressure in the present era is responsible for the universe's accelerated expansion. However there are three possible solutions to explain the accelerating universe. The Einstein Equation in General Relativity is given by the following form:

$$G_{\mu\nu} \;=\; R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R\, g_{\mu\nu} \;=\; 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu} \;+\; \Lambda\, g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{1}$$

Here, $G_{\mu\nu}$ term contains the information of geometrical structure, the energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ keeps the information of matter distributions, and the last term is so called the cosmological constant which contain the information of non-zero vacuum energy. After solve the Einstein equation, one can drive a simple relation:

$$\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho + 3p) + \frac{\Lambda}{3}. \tag{2}$$

In order to get the accelerating expansion, either cosmological constant Λ ($\omega_\Lambda = P/\rho = -1$) becomes positive or a new concept of dark-energy with the negative pressure ($\omega_\phi < -1/3$) needs to be introduced. Another solution can be given by the modification of geometrical structure which can provide a repulsive source of gravitational force. In this case, the attractive gravitational force term is dominant in early stage of universe, however at later time near the present era, repulsive term become important and drives universe to be expanded with an acceleration. Also we can consider extra-energy density contributions from bulk space in

Brane-World scenario models, which can modify the Friedmann equation as $H^2 \propto \rho + \rho^{'}$. In summary, we have three different solutions for the accelerating expansion of our universe as mentioned in the introduction. Probing for the origin of accelerating universe is the most important and challenged problem in high energy physics and cosmology now. The detail explanation and many references are in a useful review on dark energy[16].

In this paper, we concentrate on the second solution using the quintessence field. In present epoch, the potential term becomes important than kinetic term, which can easily explain the negative pressure with $\omega_{\phi}^{0} \simeq -1$. However there are many different versions of quintessence field: K-essence[17, 18], phantom[19], quintom[20], ...etc., and to justify the origin of dark-energy from experimental observations is really a difficult job. Present updated value of the equation of states(EoS) are $\omega = -1.02 \pm 0.12$ without any supernova data[21].

III. INTERACTING DARK-ENERGY WITH NEUTRINOS:

As explained in previous section, it is really difficult to probe the origin of dark-energy when the dark-energy doesn't interact with other matters at all. Here we investigate the cosmological implication of an idea of the dark-energy interacting with neutrinos [12, 22]. For simplicity, we consider the case that dark-energy and neutrinos are coupled such that the mass of the neutrinos is a function of the scalar field which drives the late time accelerated expansion of the universe. In previous works by Fardon et al.[22] and R. Peccei[12], kinetic energy term was ignored and potential term was treated as a dynamical cosmology constant, which can be applicable for the dynamics near present epoch. However the kinetic contributions become important to descreibe cosmological perturbations in early stage of universe, which is fully considered in our analysis.

A. Cosmological perturbations: background Equations

Equations for quintessence scalar field are given by

$$\ddot{\phi} + 2\mathcal{H}\dot{\phi} + a^2 \frac{dV_{\rm eff}(\phi)}{d\phi} = 0 \ , \tag{3}$$

$$V_{\rm eff}(\phi) = V(\phi) + V_{\rm I}(\phi) \ , \tag{4}$$

$$V_{\rm I}(\phi) = a^{-4} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{q^2 + a^2 m_\nu^2(\phi)} f(q) \ , \tag{5}$$

$$m_\nu(\phi) = \bar{m}_i e^{\beta \frac{\phi}{M_{\rm pl}}} \text{ (as an example)}, \tag{6}$$

where $V(\phi)$ is the potential of quintessence scalar field, $V_{\rm I}(\phi)$ is additional potential due to the coupling to neutrino particles [22, 23], and $m_\nu(\phi)$ is the mass of neutrino coupled to the scalar field. $\mathcal{H}$ is $\frac{\dot{a}}{a}$, where the dot represents the derivative with respect to the conformal time τ.

Energy densities of mass varying neutrino (MVN) and quintessence scalar field are described as

$$\rho_\nu = a^{-4} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{q^2 + a^2 m_\nu^2} f_0(q) \ , \tag{7}$$

$$3P_\nu = a^{-4} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{q^2}{\sqrt{q^2 + a^2 m_\nu^2}} f_0(q) \ , \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2a^2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \ , \tag{9}$$

$$P_\phi = \frac{1}{2a^2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) \ . \tag{10}$$

From equations (7) and (8), the equation of motion for the background energy density of neutrinos is given by

$$\dot{\rho}_\nu + 3\mathcal{H}(\rho_\nu + P_\nu) = \frac{\partial \ln m_\nu}{\partial \phi} \dot{\phi} (\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu) \ . \tag{11}$$

B. Perturbation equations

1. *perturbations in the metric*

We work in the synchronous gauge and line element is

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) \left[-d\tau^2 + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij}) dx^i dx^j \right] \ , \tag{12}$$

In this metric the Chirstoffel symbols which have non-zero values are

$$\Gamma^0_{00} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} , \tag{13}$$

$$\Gamma^0_{ij} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\delta_{ij} + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}h_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}\dot{h}_{ij} , \tag{14}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{0j} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\delta^i_j + \frac{1}{2}\dot{h}_{ij} , \tag{15}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\delta^{ia}(h_{ka,j} + h_{aj,k} - h_{jk,a}) , \tag{16}$$

where dot denotes conformal time derivative. For CMB anistropies we mainly consider the scalar type perturbations. We introduce two scalar fields, $h(\boldsymbol{k},\tau)$ and $\eta(\boldsymbol{k},\tau)$, in k-space and write the scalar mode of h_{ij} as a Fourier integral [30]

$$h_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x},\tau) = \int d^3k e^{i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}} \left[\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}_i\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}_j h(\boldsymbol{k},\tau) + (\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}_i\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})6\eta(\boldsymbol{k},\tau)\right] , \tag{17}$$

where $\boldsymbol{k} = k\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}$ with $\hat{k}^i\hat{k}_i = 1$.

2. *perturbations in quintessence*

The equation of quintessence scalar field is given by

$$\Box\phi - V_{\rm eff}(\phi) = 0 . \tag{18}$$

Let us write the scalar field as a sum of background value and perturbations around it, $\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\tau) = \phi(\tau) + \delta\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\tau)$. The perturbation equation is then described as

$$\frac{1}{a^2}\ddot{\delta\phi} + \frac{2}{a^2}\mathcal{H}\dot{\delta\phi} - \frac{1}{a^2}\nabla^2(\delta\phi) + \frac{1}{2a^2}\dot{h}\dot{\phi} + \frac{d^2V}{d\phi^2}\delta\phi + \delta\left(\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi}\right) = 0 , \tag{19}$$

where

$$\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi} = a^{-4}\int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial\epsilon(q,\phi)}{\partial\phi}f(q) , \tag{20}$$

$$\epsilon(q,\phi) = \sqrt{q^2 + a^2m_\nu^2(\phi)} , \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{\partial\epsilon(q,\phi)}{\partial\phi} = \frac{a^2m_\nu^2(\phi)}{\epsilon(q,\phi)}\frac{\partial\ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi} . \tag{22}$$

To describe $\delta\left(\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi}\right)$, we shall write the distribution function of neutrinos with background distribution and perturbation around it as

$$f(x^i,\tau,q,n_j) = f_0(\tau,q)(1 + \Psi(x^i,\tau,q,n_j)) . \tag{23}$$

Then we can write

$$\delta\left(\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi}\right) = a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial\phi^2}\delta\phi f_0 + a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}f_0\Psi\ , \tag{24}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial\phi^2} &= \frac{a^2}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\partial m_\nu}{\partial\phi}\right)^2 + \frac{a^2 m_\nu}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\partial^2 m_\nu}{\partial\phi^2}\right)\\ &- \frac{a^2 m_\nu}{\epsilon^2}\left(\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\right)\left(\frac{\partial m_\nu}{\partial\phi}\right)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

For numerical purpose it is useful to rewrite the equations (20) and (24) as

$$\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi} = \frac{\partial\ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi}(\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu)\ , \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\left(\frac{dV_{\rm I}}{d\phi}\right) &= \frac{\partial^2\ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi^2}\delta\phi(\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu)\\ &+\frac{\partial\ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi}(\delta\rho_\nu - 3\delta P_\nu)\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Note that perturbation fluid variables in mass varying neutrinos are given by

$$\delta\rho_\nu = a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\epsilon f_0(q)\Psi + a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\delta\phi f_0\ , \tag{28}$$

$$3\delta P_\nu = a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{q^2}{\epsilon}f_0(q)\Psi - a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{q^2}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\delta\phi f_0\ . \tag{29}$$

The energy momentum tensor of quintessence is given by

$$T^\mu_\nu = g^{\mu\alpha}\phi_{,\alpha}\phi_{,\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\phi^{,\alpha}\phi_{,\alpha} + 2V(\phi)\right)\delta^\mu_\nu\ , \tag{30}$$

and its perturbation is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta T^\mu_\nu &= g^{\mu\alpha}_{(0)}\delta\phi_{,\alpha}\phi_{,\nu} + g^{\mu\alpha}_{(0)}\phi_{,\alpha}\delta\phi_{,\nu} + \delta g^{\mu\alpha}\phi_{,\alpha}\phi_{,\nu}\\ &- \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta\phi^{,\alpha}\phi_{,\alpha} + \phi^{,\alpha}\delta\phi_{,\alpha} + 2\frac{dV}{d\phi}\delta\phi\right)\delta^\mu_\nu\ .\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

This gives perturbations of quintessence in fulid variables as

$$\delta\rho_\phi = -\delta T^0_0 = \frac{1}{a^2}\dot\phi\dot{\delta\phi} + \frac{dV}{d\phi}\delta\phi\ , \tag{32}$$

$$\delta P_\phi = -\delta T^0_0/3 = \frac{1}{a^2}\dot\phi\dot{\delta\phi} - \frac{dV}{d\phi}\delta\phi\ , \tag{33}$$

$$(\rho_\phi + P_\phi)\theta_\phi = ik^i\delta T^0_i = \frac{k^2}{a^2}\dot\phi\delta\phi\ , \tag{34}$$

$$\Sigma^i_j = T^i_j - \delta^i_j T^k_k/3 = 0\ . \tag{35}$$

C. Boltzmann Equation for Mass Varying Neutrino

We have to consider Boltzmann equation to solve the evolution of VMN. A distribution function is written in terms of time (τ), positions (x^i) and their conjugate momentum (P_i). The conjugete momentum is defined as spatial parts of the 4-momentum with lower indices, i.e., $P_i = mU_i$, where $U_i = dx_i/(-ds^2)^{1/2}$. We also introduce locally orthonormal coordinate $X^\mu = (t, r^i)$, and we write the energy and the momentum in this coordinate as (E, p^i), where $E = \sqrt{p^2 + m_\nu^2}$. The relations of these variables in synchronous gauge are given by [30],

$$P_0 = -aE \ , \tag{36}$$

$$P_i = a(\delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}h_{ij})p^j \ . \tag{37}$$

Next we define comoving energy and momentum (ϵ, q_i) as

$$\epsilon = aE = \sqrt{q^2 + a^2 m_\nu^2} \ , \tag{38}$$

$$q_i = ap_i \ . \tag{39}$$

Hereafter, we shall use (x^i, q, n_j, τ) as phase space variables, replacing $f(x^i, P_j, \tau)$ by $f(x^i, q, n_j, \tau)$. Here we have splitted the comoving momentum q_j into its magnitude and direction: $q_j = qn_j$, where $n^i n_i = 1$. The Boltzmann equation is

$$\frac{Df}{D\tau} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} + \frac{dx^i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + \frac{dq}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} + \frac{dn_i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial n_i} = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\right)_C \ . \tag{40}$$

in terms of these variables. From the time component of geodesic equation [25],

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(P^0\right)^2 = -\Gamma^0_{\alpha\beta}P^\alpha P^\beta - mg^{0\nu}m_{,\nu} \ , \tag{41}$$

and the relation $P^0 = a^{-2}\epsilon = a^{-2}\sqrt{q^2 + a^2 m_\nu^2}$, we have

$$\frac{dq}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{h}_{ij}qn^i n^j - a^2\frac{m}{q}\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^i}\frac{dx^i}{d\tau} \ . \tag{42}$$

Our analytic formulas in eqs.(41-42) are different from those of [13] and [14], since they have omitted the contribution of the varying neutrino mass term. We shall show later this term also give an important contribution in the first order perturbation of the Boltzman equation.

We will write down each term up to $\mathcal{O}(h)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} &= \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial \tau} + f_0 \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial \tau}\Psi \\
\frac{dx^i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} &= \frac{q}{\epsilon} n^i \times f_0 \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x^i} \ , \\
\frac{dq}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} &= \left(-a^2 \frac{m_\nu}{q}\frac{\partial m_\nu}{\partial x^i}\frac{dx^i}{d\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\dot{h_{ij}} q n^i n^j \right) \times \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial q} \\
\frac{dn_i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial n_i} &= \mathcal{O}(h^2) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

We note that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}$ and $\frac{dq}{d\tau}$ are $\mathcal{O}(h)$.

1. *Background equations*

From the equations above, the zeroth-order Boltzmann equation is

$$\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial \tau} = 0 \ . \tag{44}$$

The Fermi-Dirac distribution

$$f_0 = f_0(\epsilon) = \frac{g_s}{h_{\rm P}^3} \frac{1}{e^{\epsilon/k_{\rm B}T_0} + 1} \ , \tag{45}$$

can be a solution. Here g_s is the number of spin degrees of freedom, $h_{\rm P}$ and $k_{\rm B}$ are the Planck and the Boltzmann constants.

2. *perturbation equations*

The first-order Boltzmann equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} &+ i\frac{q}{\epsilon}(\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\cdot\boldsymbol{k})\Psi + \left(\dot{\eta} - (\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{n}})^2 \frac{\dot{h}+6\dot{\eta}}{2} \right) \frac{\partial \ln f_0}{\partial \ln q} \\
&- i\frac{q}{\epsilon}(\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\cdot\boldsymbol{k}) k\delta\phi \frac{a^2 m^2}{q^2} \frac{\partial \ln m}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial \ln f_0}{\partial \ln q} = 0 \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Following previous studies, we shall assume that the initial momentum dependence is axially symmetric so that Ψ depends on $\boldsymbol{q} = q\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ only through q and $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$. With this assumption, we expand the perturbation of distribution function, Ψ, in a Legendre series,

$$\Psi(\boldsymbol{k}, \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}, q, \tau) = \sum (-i)^\ell (2\ell+1) \Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{k}, q, \tau) P_\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}) \ . \tag{47}$$

Then we obtain the hierarchy for MVN

$$\dot{\Psi}_0 = -\frac{q}{\epsilon}k\Psi_1 + \frac{\dot{h}}{6}\frac{\partial \ln f_0}{\partial \ln q} , \tag{48}$$

$$\dot{\Psi}_1 = \frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\epsilon}k\left(\Psi_0 - 2\Psi_2\right) + \kappa , \tag{49}$$

$$\dot{\Psi}_2 = \frac{1}{5}\frac{q}{\epsilon}k(2\Psi_1 - 3\Psi_3) - \left(\frac{1}{15}\dot{h} + \frac{2}{5}\dot{\eta}\right)\frac{\partial \ln f_0}{\partial \ln q} , \tag{50}$$

$$\dot{\Psi}_\ell = \frac{q}{\epsilon}k\left(\frac{\ell}{2\ell+1}\Psi_{\ell-1} - \frac{\ell+1}{2\ell+1}\Psi_{\ell+1}\right) . \tag{51}$$

where

$$\kappa = -\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\epsilon}k\frac{a^2m^2}{q^2}\delta\phi\frac{\partial \ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi}\frac{\partial \ln f_0}{\partial \ln q} . \tag{52}$$

Here we used the recursion relation

$$(\ell+1)P_{\ell+1}(\mu) = (2\ell+1)\mu P_\ell(\mu) - \ell P_{\ell-1}(\mu) . \tag{53}$$

We have to solve these equations with a q-grid for every wavenumber k.

IV. QUINTESSENCE POTENTIALS

To determine the evolution of scalar field which couples to neutrinos, we should specify the potential of the scalar field. A variety of quintessence effective potentials can be found in the literature. In the present paper we examine three type of quintessential potentials. First we analyze what is a frequently invoked form for the effective potential of the tracker field, i.e., an inverse power law such as originally analyzed by Ratra and Peebles [38],

$$V(\phi) = M^{4+\alpha}\phi^{-\alpha} \quad \text{(Model I)} , \tag{54}$$

where M and α are parameters.

We will also consider a modified form of $V(\phi)$ as proposed by [39] based on the condition that the quintessence fields be part of supergravity models. The potential now becomes

$$V(\phi) = M^{4+\alpha}\phi^{-\alpha}e^{3\phi^2/2m_{\rm pl}^2} \quad \text{(Model II)} , \tag{55}$$

where the exponential correction becomes important near the present time as $\phi \to m_{\rm pl}$. The fact that this potential has a minimum for $\phi = \sqrt{\alpha/3}m_{\rm pl}$ changes the dynamics. It causes the present value of w to evolve to a cosmological constant much quicker than for the bare




FIG. 1: Examples of the evolution of energy density in quintessence and the background fields as indicated. Model parameters taken to plot this figure are $\alpha = 10,\ 10,\ 1$ for model I, II, III, respectively. The other parameters for the dark energy are fixed so that the energy densities in three types of dark energy should be the same at present.

power-law potential [40]. In these models the parameter M is fixed by the condition that $\Omega_Q \approx 0.7$ at present.

We will also analyze another class of tracking potential, namely, the potential of exponential type [41]:

$$V(\phi) = M^4 e^{-\alpha\phi} \quad \text{(Model III)}\ , \tag{56}$$

This type of potential can lead to accelerating expansion provided that $\alpha < \sqrt{2}$. In figure (1), we present examples of evolution of energy densities with these three types of potentials with vanishing coupling strength to neutrinos.

A. Time evolution of neutrino mass and energy density in scalar field

For an illustration we also plot examples of evolution of energy densities for interacting case with inverse power law potential (Model I) in Fig. (2). In interacting dark energy cases, the evolution of the scalar field is determined both by its own potential and interacting term from neutrinos. When neutrinos are highly relativistic, the interaction term can be expressed




FIG. 2: Examples of the evolution of energy density in quintessence and the background fields in coupled cases with inverse power law potential (Model I). Model parameters taken to plot this figure are $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 1$, 3 as indicated. The other parameters for the dark energy are fixed so that the energy densities in three types of dark energy should be the same at present.

as

$$\frac{\partial m_\nu}{\partial \phi}(\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu) \approx \frac{10}{7\pi^2}(am_\nu)^2 \rho_{\nu_{\rm massless}} \ , \tag{57}$$

where $\rho_{\nu_{\rm massless}}$ denotes the energy density of neutrinos with no mass. The term roughly scales as $\propto a^{-2}$, and therefore, it dominates deep in the radiation dominated era. However, because the motion of the scalar field driven by this interaction term is almost suppressed by the friction term, $-2\mathcal{H}\dot{\phi}$. The scalar field satisfies the slow roll condition similar to the inflation models, $-2\mathcal{H}\dot{\phi} \approx a^2 \frac{\partial m_\nu}{\partial \phi}(\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu)$. Thus, the energy density in scalar field and the mass of neutrinos is frozen there. These behaviors are clearly seen in Figs. (2) and (3).

B. Constrains on the MaVaNs parameters

As was shown in the previous sections, the coupling between cosmological neutrinos and dark energy quintessence could modify the CMB and matter power spectra significantly. It is therefore possible and also important to put constraints on coupling parameters from current observations. For this purpose, we use the WMAP3 [34, 35] and 2dF [36] data sets.

The flux power spectrum of the Lyman-α forest can be used to measure the matter




FIG. 3: Examples of the time evolution of neutrino mass in power law potential models (Model I) with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$ (black solid line), $\beta = 1$ (red dashed line), $\beta = 2$ (blue dash-dotted line), $\beta = 3$ (dash-dot-dotted line). The larger coupling parameter leads to the larger mass in the early universe.




FIG. 4: The CMB angular power spectra for Model I. The solid line is the best fit for the model ($(\alpha, \beta) = (2.97, 0.170)$), the other lines are models with different parameter value of α and β as indicated. The points are WMAP three year data.




FIG. 5: The CMB angular power spectra for Model III. The solid line is the best fit for the model ($(\alpha, \beta) = (0.78, 0.28)$), the other lines are models with different parameter value of α and β as indicated. The points are 2dF data.

power spectrum at small scales around $z \lesssim 3$ [42, 43]. It has been shown, however, that the resultant constraint on neutrino mass can vary significantly from $\sum m_\nu < 0.2$eV to 0.4eV depending on the specific Lyman-α analysis used [44]. The complication arises because the result suffers from the systematic uncertainty regarding to the model for the intergalactic physical effects, i.e., damping wings, ionizing radiation fluctuations, galactic winds, and so on [45]. Therefore, we conservatively omit the Lyman-α forest data from our analysis.

Because there are many other cosmological parameters than the MaVaNu parameters, we follow the Markov Chain Monte Carlo(MCMC) global fit approach [37] to explore the likelihood space and marginalize over the nuisance parameters to obtain the constraint on parameter(s) we are interested in. Our parameter space consists of

$$\vec{P} \equiv (\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, H, \tau, A_s, n_s, m_i, \alpha, \beta) \ , \tag{58}$$

where $\omega_b h^2$ and $\Omega_c h^2$ are the baryon and CDM densities in units of critical density, H is the hubble parameter, τ is the optical depth of Compton scattering to the last scattering surface, A_s and n_s are the amplitude and spectral index of primordial density fluctuations, and (m_i, α, β) are the parameters of MaVaNs defined in section III. We have put priors on MaVaNs parameters as $\alpha > 0$, and $\beta > 0$ for simplicity and saving the computational time.

Our results are shown in Figs.(6) - (8). In these figures we do not observe the strong




FIG. 6: Contours of constant relative probabilities in two dimensional parameter planes for inverse power law models. Lines correspond to 68% and 95.4% confidence limits.




FIG. 7: Same as Fig.(6), but for SUGRA type models.

degeneracy between the introduced parameters. This is why one can put tight constraints on MaVaNs parameters from observations. For both models we consider, larger α leads larger w at present. Therefore large α is not allowed due to the same reason that larger w is not allowed from the current observations.




FIG. 8: Same as Fig.(6), but for exponential type models.

On the other hand, larger β will generally lead larger m_ν in the early universe. This means that the effect of neutrinos on the density fluctuation of matter becomes larger leading to the larger damping of the power at small scales. A complication arise because the mass of neutrinos at the transition from the ultra-relativistic regime to the non-relativistic one is not a monotonic function of β as shown in Fig.(3). Even so, the coupled neutrinos give larger decrement of small scale power, and therefore one can limit the coupling parameter from the large scale structure data.

One may wonder why we can get such a tight constraint on β, because it is naively expected that large β value should be allowed if $\Omega_\nu h^2 \sim 0$. In fact, a goodness of fit is still satisfactory with large β value when $\Omega_\nu h^2 \sim 0$. However, the parameters which give us the best goodness of fit does not mean the most likely parameters in general. In our parametrization, the accepted total volume by MCMC in the parameter space where $\Omega_\nu h^2 \sim 0$ and $\beta \gtrsim 1$ was small, meaning that the probability of such a parameter set is low.

We find no observational signature which favors the coupling between MaVaNs and quintessence scalar field, and obtain the upper limit on the coupling parameter as

$$\beta < 1.11,\ 1.36,\ 1.53\ , \tag{59}$$

and the present mass of neutrinos is also limited to

$$\Omega_\nu h^2_{\rm today} < 0.0095,\ 0.0090,\ 0.0084\ , \tag{60}$$

for models I, II and III, respectively. When we apply the relation between the total sum of the neutrino masses M_ν and their contributions to the energy density of the universe: $\Omega_\nu h^2 = M_\nu/(93.14eV)$, we obtain the constraint on the total neutrino mass: $M_\nu < 0.87eV(95\%C.L.)$ in the neutrino probe dark-energy model. The total neutrino mass contributions in the power spectrum is shown in Fig 9, where we can see the significant deviation from observation data in the case of large neutrino masses.

TABLE I: Global analysis data within 1σ deviation for different types of the quintessence potential.

Quantites	Model I	Model II	Model III	WMAP-3 data (ΛCDM)
$\Omega_B\, h^2[10^2]$	2.21 ± 0.07	2.22 ± 0.07	2.21 ± 0.07	2.23 ± 0.07
$\Omega_{CDM}\, h^2[10^2]$	11.10 ± 0.62	11.10 ± 0.65	11.10 ± 0.63	12.8 ± 0.8
H_0	65.97 ± 3.61	65.37 ± 3.41	65.61 ± 3.26	72 ± 8
Z_{re}	10.87 ± 2.58	10.89 ± 2.62	11.07 ± 2.44	—
α	< 2.63	< 7.78	< 0.92	—
β	< 0.46	< 0.47	< 0.58	—
n_s	0.95 ± 0.02	0.95 ± 0.02	0.95 ± 0.02	0.958 ± 0.016
$A_s[10^{10}]$	20.66 ± 1.31	20.69 ± 1.32	20.72 ± 1.24	—-
$\Omega_Q[10^2]$	68.54 ± 4.81	67.90 ± 4.47	68.22 ± 4.17	71.6 ± 5.5
$Age/Gyrs$	13.95 ± 0.20	13.97 ± 0.19	13.69 ± 0.19	13.73 ± 0.16
$\Omega_{MVN}\, h^2[10^2]$	< 0.44	< 0.48	< 0.48	$< 1.97(95\%C.L.)$
τ	0.08 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.03	0.09 ± 0.03	0.089 ± 0.030

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Before concluding the paper we should comment two important points of this paper: the impact of the scattering term of the Boltzmann Equation in Sec.III and on the stability issue in the present models.




FIG. 9: Examples of the total neutrino mass contributions in power spectrum with $M_\nu = 0.9\,eV$(Left panel) and with $M_\nu = 0.3\,eV$(Right panel). Here the variable λ is equal to α.

Recently, perturbation equations for the MaVaNs models were nicely presented by Brookfield et al. [13], (see also [14]) which are necessary to compute CMB and LSS spectra. A main difference here from their works is that we correctly take into account the scattering term in the geodesic equation of neutrinos, which was omitted there (see, however, [15]). Because the term is proportional to $\frac{\partial m}{\partial x}$ and first order quantity in perturbation, our results and those of earlier works [13, 14] remain the same in the background evolutions. However, as will be shown in the appendix, neglecting this term violates the energy momentum conservation law at linear level leading to the anomalously large ISW effect. Because the term becomes important when neutrinos become massive, the late time ISW is mainly affected through the interaction between dark energy and neutrinos. Consequently, the differences show up at large angular scales. In Fig. (10), the differences are shown with and without the scattering term. The early ISW can also be affected by this term to some extent in some massive neutrino models and the height of the first acoustic peak could be changed. However, the position of the peaks stays almost unchanged because the background expansion histories are the same.

As shown in [46, 47], some class of models with mass varying neutrinos suffers from the adiabatic instability at the first order perturbation level. This is caused by an additional force on neutrinos mediated by the quintessence scalar field and occurs when its effective mass is




FIG. 10: Differences between the CMB power spectra with and without the scattering term in the geodesic equation of neutrinos with the same cosmological parameters.

much larger than the hubble horizon scale, where the effective mass is defined by $m_{\rm eff}^2 = \frac{d^2 V_{\rm eff}}{d\phi^2}$. To remedy this situation one should consider an appropriate quintessential potential which has a mass comparable the horizon scale at present, and the models considered in this paper are the case [13]. Interestingly, some authors have found that one can construct viable MaVaNs models by choosing certain couplings and/or quintessential potentials [48, 49, 50]. Some of these models even realises $m_{\rm eff} \gg H$. In Fig.(11), masses of the scalar field relative to the horizon scale $m_{\rm eff}/H$ are plotted. We find that $m_{\rm eff} < H$ for almost all period and the models are stable. We also dipict in Fig.(11) the sound speed of neutrinos defined by $c_s^2 = \delta P_\nu / \delta \rho_\nu$ with a wavenumber $k = 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$ Mpc^{-1}.

In summary, we investigate dynamics of dark energy in mass-varying neutrinos. We show and discuss many interesting aspects of the interacting dark-energy with neutrinos scenario: (1) To explain the present cosmological observation data, we don't need to tune the coupling parameters between neutrinos and quintessence field, (2) Even with a inverse power law potential or exponential type potential which seem to be ruled out from the observation of ω value, we can receive that the apparent value of the equation of states can pushed down lesser than -1, (3) As a consequence of global fit, the cosmological neutrino mass bound beyond ΛCDM model was first obtained with the value $\sum m_\nu < 0.87\, eV (95\% CL)$. More detail discussions and theoretical predictions on the equation of state and on the absolute




FIG. 11: (Left panel): Typical evolution of the effective mass of the quintessence scalar field relative to theHubble scale, for all models considered in this paper. (Right panel): Typical evolution of the sound speed of neutrinos $c^s = \delta P_\nu/\delta\rho_\nu$ with the wavenumber $k = 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$ Mpc^{-1}, for models as indicated. The values stay positive stating from 1/3 (relativistic) and neutrinos are stable against the density fluctuation.

mass bound of neutrinos from beta decays and cosmological constrains will appear in the separated paper [51].

APPENDIX A: CONSISTENCY CHECK

The form of κ can be also obtained by demanding conservations of energy and momentum, i.e., demanding that $\nabla_\mu \overset{(\phi)}{\delta T^\mu_\nu} + \nabla_\mu \overset{(\nu)}{\delta T^\mu_\nu} = 0$. Let us begin by considering the divergence of the perturbed stress-energy tensor for the scalar field,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\mu \overset{(\phi)}{\delta T^\mu_\nu} = & -a^{-2}\left(\ddot{\phi} + 2\mathcal{H}\dot{\phi} + a^2\frac{dV}{d\phi}\right)\partial_\nu\delta\phi \\ & -a^{-2}\left(\dot{\delta\phi} + 2\mathcal{H}\delta\dot{\phi} + k^2\delta\phi + a^2\frac{d^2V}{d\phi^2}\right)\partial_\nu\phi \\ = & \ \delta\left(\frac{dV_I}{d\phi}\right)\partial_\nu\phi + \frac{dV_I}{d\phi}\partial_\nu\delta\phi \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where in the last line we used eqs.(3) and (19). The divergence of the perturbed stress-energy tensor for the neutrinos is given by,

$$\nabla_\mu \overset{(\nu)}{\delta T^\mu_0} = -\dot{\delta\rho} - (\rho + P)\partial_i v_i - 3\mathcal{H}(\delta\rho + \delta P) - \frac{1}{2}\dot{h}(\rho + P) \tag{A2}$$

for the time component and

$$\nabla_\mu \overset{(\nu)}{\delta T^\mu_i} = (\rho + P)\dot{v}_i + (\dot{\rho} + \dot{P})v_i + 4\mathcal{H}(\rho + P)v_i + \partial_i P + \partial_j \Sigma^j_i \tag{A3}$$

for the spatial component. Let us check the energy flux conservation for example, starting with the energy flux in neutrinos (in k-space):

$$(\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\theta_\nu = 4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0(q) \Psi_1 \tag{A4}$$

where $\theta_\nu = ik^i v_{\nu\ i}$. Differentiate with respect to τ, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\dot{\theta}_\nu + (\dot{\rho}_\nu + \dot{P}_\nu)\theta_\nu \ &= \ 4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0 \dot{\Psi}_1 \\ &\quad -4\mathcal{H}(\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\theta_\nu \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

Let us consider the first term in the right hand side of the above equation. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}&4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0 \dot{\Psi}_1 \\ &= 4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0 \left[\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\epsilon} k(\Psi_0 - 2\Psi_2) + \kappa\right] \\ &= k^2 \delta P_\nu - k^2(\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\sigma_\nu + \frac{1}{3} 4\pi k^2 a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \frac{q^2}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \phi}\delta\phi f_0 \\ &\quad + 4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0 \kappa\end{aligned}$$

where σ is defined as $(\rho + P)\sigma = -(k_i k_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\Sigma^i_j$ and expressed by the distribution function as

$$(\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\sigma_\nu = \frac{8\pi}{3} a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \frac{q^2}{\epsilon} f_0(q) \Psi_2 \tag{A6}$$

Comparing eq. (A5) with eq.(A3), we find that the divergence of the perturbed stress-energy tensor in spatial part for the neutrinos leads to

$$\partial^i \nabla_\mu \overset{(\nu)}{\delta T^\mu_i} = \frac{1}{3} 4\pi k^2 a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \frac{q^2}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \phi}\delta\phi f_0 + 4\pi k a^{-4} \int q^2 dq q f_0 \kappa \tag{A7}$$

On the other hand, the divergence of the perturbed stress-energy tensor in spatial part for scalar field is, from eq.(A1),

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^i \nabla_\mu \overset{(\phi)}{\delta T^\mu_i} \ &= \ -k^2 \delta\phi \left(\frac{\partial \ln m_\nu}{\partial \phi}\right)(\rho_\nu - 3P_\nu) \\ &= \ -4\pi k^2 \delta\phi a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \phi} f_0 \ .\end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

These two equations imply that κ shold take the form as eq. (52).

Next let us check the energy conservation. Density perturbation in neutrino is, (see eq.(28))

$$\delta\rho_\nu = a^{-4} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \epsilon f_0(q) \Psi_0 + a^{-4} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \phi} \delta\phi f_0 \ , \tag{A9}$$

By differenciate with respect to τ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\dot{\rho}_\nu &= -4\mathcal{H}\delta\rho_\nu + a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\dot{\epsilon}f_0\Psi_0 + a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\epsilon f_0\dot{\Psi}_0 \\ &+a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\left(\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\right)\delta\phi f_0 \\ &+a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\dot{\delta\phi}f_0 \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\epsilon} &= (\mathcal{H}a^2m^2 + a^2m^2\frac{\partial\ln m_\nu}{\partial\phi}\dot{\phi})/\epsilon\ , \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\left(\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\right) &= -\mathcal{H}\frac{a^2m^2}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi} + 2\mathcal{H}\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi} + \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial\phi^2}\dot{\phi}\end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

Inserting eq.(48) for $\dot{\Psi}_0$ in the above equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\dot{\rho}_\nu &= -3\mathcal{H}(\delta\rho_\nu + \delta P_\nu) - (\rho_\nu + P_\nu)\theta_\nu - \frac{1}{2}\dot{h}(\rho_\nu + P_\nu) \\ &+a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}f_0\left(\frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial\phi^2}\delta\phi + \Psi_0\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\right)\dot{\phi} \\ &+a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}f_0\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\dot{\delta\phi}\end{aligned} \tag{A12}$$

Comparing with eq.(A2), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\mu\ \overset{(\nu)}{\delta T^\mu_0} = &-a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}f_0\left(\frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial\phi^2}\delta\phi + \Psi_0\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\right)\dot{\phi} \\ &-a^{-4}\int\frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3}f_0\frac{\partial\epsilon}{\partial\phi}\dot{\delta\phi}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{A13}$$

which is found to be equal to $-\nabla_\mu\ \overset{(\phi)}{\delta T^\mu_0} = -\delta\left(\frac{dV_I}{d\phi}\right)\dot{\phi} - \frac{dV_I}{d\phi}\dot{\delta\phi}$.

APPENDIX B: BOLTZMAN EQUATIONS IN INTERACTING DARK ENERGY-NEUTRINOS SCENARIO

From the lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = m(\phi)\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x_\mu}\dot{x_\nu}}$, the Euler-Lagrange equation is given by

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{x}^\mu}\right) = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial x^\mu} \tag{B1}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{x}^\mu} = P_\mu = -m(x^\mu)\frac{\dot{x}^\mu}{\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}}, \tag{B2}$$

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial x^\mu} = \frac{\partial m}{\partial x^\mu}\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta} - m(x^\mu)\frac{g_{\alpha\beta,\mu}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}{2\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}} \tag{B3}$$

Therefore eq(B1) becomes

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}}\frac{d}{d\lambda}\left(-m(x^\mu)\,\frac{\dot{x}^\mu}{\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}}\right)-\frac{m(x^\mu)}{2}\frac{g_{\alpha\beta,\mu}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}{g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}=\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^\mu} \tag{B4}$$

By using the relation $ds=-\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\mu\dot{x}^\nu}d\lambda$, we obtain

$$P^\mu=-m(x^\mu)\frac{\dot{x}^\mu}{\sqrt{-g_{\alpha\beta}\dot{x}^\alpha\dot{x}^\beta}}=m(x^\mu)\frac{dx^\mu}{ds} \tag{B5}$$

and eq.(B4) becomes

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(-m(x^\mu)g_{\mu\beta}\frac{dx^\beta}{ds}\right)+\frac{m(x^\mu)}{2}g_{\alpha\beta,\mu}\frac{dx^\alpha}{ds}\frac{dx^\beta}{ds}\;=\;\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^\mu}, \tag{B6}$$

$$\frac{d}{ds}(g_{\mu\beta}P^\beta)-\frac{1}{2}g_{\alpha\beta,\mu}P^\alpha\frac{dx^\beta}{ds}\;=\;-\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^\mu} \tag{B7}$$

With simple calculation, finally we obtain the relations:

$$\frac{dP^\nu}{ds}+\Gamma^\nu_{\alpha\beta}\,P^\alpha\frac{dx^\beta}{ds}\;=\;-g^{\nu\mu}\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^\mu} \tag{B8}$$

$$P^0\frac{dP^\nu}{d\tau}+\Gamma^\nu_{\alpha\beta}\,P^\alpha P^\beta\;=\;-mg^{\nu\mu}m_{,\nu}. \tag{B9}$$

For $\mu=0$ component, eq.(B9) can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}(P^0)^2+\Gamma^0_{\alpha\beta}=-mg^{0\mu}m_{,\nu}. \tag{B10}$$

Since $P^0=g^{00}P_0=a_2\epsilon$, each terms of the eq.(B10) are given by:

$$\text{First term}\;=\;-2a^{-4}Hq^2+a^{-4}q\frac{dq}{d\tau}-a^{-2}Hm^2+a^{-2}m\frac{dm}{d\tau} \tag{B11}$$

$$\text{Second term}\;=\;2a^{-4}Hq^2+a^{-2}Hm^2+a^{-4}\frac{1}{2}\dot{h}_{ij}q^iq^j \tag{B12}$$

$$\text{Third term}\;=\;a^{-2}m\frac{\partial m}{\partial\tau} \tag{B13}$$

Since the first term includes the total derivative w.r.t. comoving time, we obtain finally the eq.(42) in Section III-C:

$$\frac{dq}{d\tau}=-\frac{1}{2}\dot{h}_{ij}\,q\,n^in^j-a^2\frac{m}{q}\frac{\partial m}{\partial x^i}\,\frac{dx^i}{d\tau}. \tag{B14}$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank L. Amendola, O. Seto, S. Carroll, and L. Schrempp for useful comments and discussion. K.I. thanks C. van de Bruck for useful communications. K.I. thanks also to KICP and National Taiwan university for kind hospitalities where most part of this work have been done. K.I.'s work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows. Y.Y.K's work is partially supported by Grants-in-Aid for NSC in Taiwan, Center for High Energy Physics(CHEP)/KNU and APCTP in Korea.

---

[1] Perlmtter et al.,Nature **391** (1998) 51[arXiv:astro-ph/7912212]; Riess et al., Astrophys. J. **116** (1998) 1009[arXiv:astro-ph/980520]; Perlmtter et al., ApJ **517** (1999) 565[arXiv:astro-ph/9812133].

[2] C. L. Bennett et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **148** (2003) 1; J. L. Tonry et al.,Astrophys. J. **594** (2003) 1; M. Tegmark et al., Astrophys. J. **606** (2004) 702.

[3] L. M. Krauss and M. S. Turner, Gen. Rel. Grav. **27** (1995) 1137 ; P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol**75** (2003) 559.

[4] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B**302** (1988) 645; P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Astrophys. J. Lett. **325** (1988) 17.

[5] S. M. Carroll, M. Trodden and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D**70**: 043528 (2004).

[6] S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3067 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9806099].

[7] R. Bean and J. Magueijo, Phys. Lett. B **517**, 177 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0007199].

[8] G. R. Farrar and P. J. E. Peebles, Astrophys. J. **604**, 1 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0307316].

[9] S. Das, P. S. Corasaniti and J. Khoury, Phys. Rev. **D 73**, 083509 (2006).

[10] S. Lee, G. C. Liu and K. W. Ng, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 083516 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601333].

[11] G. C. Liu, S. Lee and K. W. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 161303 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0606248].

[12] D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**:091801, (2004); R. D. Peccei, Phys. Rev. **D71**:023527 (2005).

[13] A. W. Brookfield, C. van de Bruck, D. F. Mota, and D. Tocchini-Valentini, Phys. Rev. Lett , **96**: 061301,2006; Phys. Rev. **D73**:083515,2006.

[14] G. B. Zhao, J. Q. Xia and X. M. Zhang, arXiv:astro-ph/0611227.

[15] A. W. Brookfield, C. van de Bruck, D. F. Mota and D. Tocchini-Valentini, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 049901 (2007)

[16] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys., **D15**: 1753 (2006).

[17] T. Chiba, T. Okabe, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D62**: 023511, 2000.

[18] C. A. Picon, V. F.Mukhanov, P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. **D63**: 103510, 2001

[19] R. R. Caildwell, Phys. Lett. **B 545**: 23, (2002).

[20] Z. K. Guo,Y.-S. Piao, X.-M. Zhang and Y.-Z Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B 608**, 177 (2005).

[21] U. Seljak, A. Slosar and P. McDonald, JCAP 0610:014 (2006).

[22] R. Fardon, A. E. Nelson and N. Weiner, JCAP 0410:005, 2004; [arXiv:astro-ph/0309800].

[23] X. J. Bi, P. h. Gu, X. l. Wang and X. M. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D69**:113007 (2004); [arXiv:hep-ph/0311022].

[24] J. P. Ostriker and P. Steinhardt, Science, **300**, 1909 (2003).

[25] G. W. Anderson and S. M. Carroll, arXiv:astro-ph/9711288.

[26] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl., **148**, 175 (2003).

[27] G. Hinshaw *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl., **148**, 135 (2003).

[28] A. Kogut *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl., **148**, 161 (2003).

[29] L. Verde *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl., **148**, 195 (2003).

[30] C. P. Ma and E. Bertschinger, Astrophys. J. **455**, 7 (1995).

[31] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, and A. Lasenby, Astrophys. J., **538**, 473 (2000).

[32] U. Seljak and M. Zaldarriago, Astrophys. J., **469**, 437 (1996).

[33] W. Hu, D. Scott, N. Sugiyama, and M. White, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5498 (1995).

[34] G. Hinshaw *et al.*(WMAP collaboration), arXiv:astro-ph/0603451.

[35] L. Page *et al.*(WMAP collaboration), arXiv:astro-ph/0603450.

[36] S. Cole *et al.* [The 2dFGRS Collaboration], Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **362**, 505 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0501174].

[37] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 103511 (2002).

[38] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 3406 (1988).

[39] P. Brax and J. Martin, Phys. Lett. B **468**, 40 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9905040].

[40] P. Brax, J. Martin and A. Riazuelo, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 103505 (2000) [arXiv:astro-ph/0005428].

[41] E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 4686 (1998) [arXiv:gr-qc/9711068].

[42] P. McDonald, J. Miralda-Escude, M. Rauch, W. L. W. Sargent, T. A. Barlow, R. Cen and J. P. Ostriker, Astrophys. J. **543**, 1 (2000) [arXiv:astro-ph/9911196].

[43] R. A. C. Croft *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **581**, 20 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0012324].

[44] A. Goobar, S. Hannestad, E. Mortsell and H. Tu, JCAP **0606**, 019 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0602155].

[45] P. McDonald, U. Seljak, R. Cen, P. Bode and J. P. Ostriker, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **360**, 1471 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0407378].

[46] N. Afshordi, M. Zaldarriaga and K. Kohri, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 065024 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0506663].

[47] R. Bean, E. E. Flanagan and M. Trodden, arXiv:0709.1128 [astro-ph].

[48] M. Kaplinghat and A. Rajaraman, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 103504 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601517].

[49] O. E. Bjaelde, A. W. Brookfield, C. van de Bruck, S. Hannestad, D. F. Mota, L. Schrempp and D. Tocchini-Valentini, arXiv:0705.2018 [astro-ph].

[50] R. Takahashi and M. Tanimoto, JHEP **0605**, 021 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601119].

[51] K. Ichiki and Y.-Y. Keum, "Neutrino Mass, Cosmology in the Interacting Neutrino Dark-Energy Model"[arXiv:astro-ph/0803xxx].