

# Growing Matter

Luca Amendola,<sup>1</sup> Marco Baldi,<sup>2</sup> and Christof Wetterich<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*INAF/Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Via Frascati 33, 00040 Monte Porzio Catone, Roma, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Strasse 1, 85740 Garching bei München, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Philosophenweg 16, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*

(Dated: February 8, 2022)

We investigate quintessence cosmologies with a matter component consisting of particles with an increasing mass. While negligible in early cosmology, the appearance of a growing matter component has stopped the evolution of the cosmon field at a redshift around six. In turn, this has triggered the accelerated expansion of the Universe. We propose to associate growing matter with neutrinos. Then the presently observed dark energy density and its equation of state are determined by the neutrino mass.

Growing observational evidence indicates a homogeneous, at most slowly evolving dark energy density that drives an accelerated expansion of the universe since about six billion years [1, 2]. The origin of dark energy is unknown, be it a cosmological constant [3], a dynamical dark energy due to a scalar field (quintessence) [4, 5], a modification of gravity [6], or something still unexpected. A pressing question arises: why has the cosmological acceleration set in only in the rather recent cosmological past? Within quintessence models we need to explain a transition from the matter dominated Universe to a scalar field dominated Universe at a redshift  $z \simeq 0.5$ .

A similar crossover has happened earlier in the cosmological history, namely the transition from radiation domination to matter domination. This crossover is bound to happen at some time since the dilution of the energy density with increasing scale factor  $a$  obeys  $\rho_r \propto a^{-4}$  for radiation and  $\rho_c \propto a^{-3}$  for cold dark matter. At some moment matter must win. We suggest in this Letter that the presently observed crossover to a dark energy dominated Universe is of a similar type.

We propose "Growing Matter", an unusual form of matter whose energy density decreases slower than the one of the usual cold dark matter, or even increases:

$$\rho_g \propto a^{3(\gamma-2)}, \quad \gamma > 1. \quad (1)$$

This may be realized by particles whose mass increases with time. In presence of both cold dark matter and growing matter a crossover to a new epoch is then necessary at some moment. In our model this transition is witnessed now. Similar as for the radiation-matter transition the time for the crossover is set by the mass and abundance of the growing matter particles. We also speculate that growing matter consists of neutrinos. In this case the abundance is computable and the crossover time is determined by the value of the average neutrino mass  $m_\nu$ . Moreover, the relation between the laboratory value  $m_\nu(t_0)$  (for our present cosmological time  $t_0$ ) and the cold dark matter density  $\rho_c$  at the time of the crossover only depends on dimensionless couplings of our model.

The appearance of a substantial growing matter component strongly influences the dynamical behaviour of

the scalar field responsible for quintessence, the cosmon. Indeed, the possibility of a time evolution of the mass requires a time evolution of this cosmological scalar field. In our model the mass of the particles of the growing component obeys:

$$m_g(\phi) = \bar{m}_g e^{-\beta \frac{\phi}{M}} \quad (2)$$

with  $M \equiv 1/\sqrt{8\pi G_N}$  the reduced Planck mass and  $\bar{m}_g$  a constant. For  $\beta < 0$  an increase in  $\phi$  will induce an increasing mass.

In turn, the growing matter energy density  $\rho_g$  influences the evolution of the cosmon. Our approach is a model of "Coupled Quintessence" [7, 8]. For a homogeneous cosmon field the field equation [9]:

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} + \frac{\beta}{M}\rho_g \quad (3)$$

contains a "force"  $\propto \rho_g$  that will counteract an increase of  $\phi$  once  $\beta\rho_g$  is comparable to  $\partial V/\partial \phi$ . In our model, this effect will eventually dramatically slow down further evolution of the cosmon. For an almost static  $\phi(t)$  the cosmon potential  $V(\phi)$  will then act similar to a cosmological constant. The expansion of the Universe therefore accelerates soon after  $\phi$  stops to move. The coupling between the growing matter and the scalar field ties the time of onset of the accelerated expansion to the crossover time when  $\beta\rho_g$  becomes important. The solution of the "why now" problem is thus linked to the properties of growing matter. The mechanism we propose is similar to the one presented in ref. [10]; here however we suggest to identify the coupled matter component with the neutrinos and we discuss the key role played by the growing matter mass.

Let us specify our model. Besides gravity and the cosmon field, for which we assume an exponential potential:

$$V(\phi) = M^4 e^{-\alpha \frac{\phi}{M}}, \quad (4)$$

cosmology is determined by cold dark matter with a standard equation of state  $p = 0$ , growing matter, baryons and radiation. We denote the fraction of homogeneous

dark energy by  $\Omega_h$ , and similarly for cold dark matter and growing matter by  $\Omega_c$  and  $\Omega_g$ . The cosmologically relevant parameters of our model are the dimensionless couplings  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (eqs. 2,4), as well as the energy density of growing matter at some initial time, e.g.  $\rho_g(t_{eq})$  (the initial density of cold dark matter,  $\rho_c(t_{eq})$ , can be translated to the present value of the Hubble parameter  $H_0$ ). We assume a flat Universe. The cosmological equations are the standard ones, except for the modified energy-momentum conservation for growing matter [9]:

$$\dot{\rho}_g + 3H\rho_g + \frac{\beta}{M}\rho_g\dot{\phi} = 0 \quad (5)$$

which accounts for the exchange of energy between growing matter and the cosmon [7, 9]. In case of neutrino growing matter, eqs. (3) and (5) are modified by pressure terms in early cosmology.

For the radiation and the matter dominated epochs in early cosmology the cosmon field follows a "tracker solution" or "cosmic attractor" with a constant fraction of early dark energy [4]:

$$\Omega_{h,e} = \frac{n}{\alpha^2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $n = 3$  (4) for matter (radiation). This intermediate attractor guarantees that the initial conditions for the scalar field are not fine-tuned. Observations require that  $\alpha$  is large, typically  $\alpha \geq 10$  [11]. In this "scaling regime" one has

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \phi_0 + \frac{2M}{\alpha} \ln\left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right), \\ V &\sim \dot{\phi}^2 \sim \rho_c \sim t^{-2}, \\ m_g &\sim \Omega_g \sim t^{2(\gamma-1)}, \quad \rho_g \sim t^{2(\gamma-2)}, \\ \gamma &= 1 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The growing matter plays no role yet. Its relative weight  $\Omega_g$  grows, however, for  $\gamma > 1$  or  $\beta < 0$  such that growing matter corresponds to an unstable direction. The scaling regime ends once  $\gamma\Omega_g$  has reached a value of order one.

The future of our Universe is described by a different attractor [7, 8], where the scalar field and the growing matter dominate, while baryons and cold dark matter become negligible. The energy-momentum tensor for combined quintessence and growing matter is conserved and we define the equation of state (EOS) in the non-relativistic regime:

$$w = \frac{p_h}{\rho_h + \rho_g}. \quad (8)$$

Notice that this is indeed the dark energy EOS measured by eg. supernovae experiments since the two coupled fluids behave at the background level as a single conserved component.

For this future attractor the expansion of the Universe accelerates according to ( $\gamma > 3/2$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \frac{2\gamma}{3}t^{-1}, \\ w &= -1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}, \\ \Omega_h &= 1 - \Omega_g = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{3}{\alpha^2\gamma^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For large  $\gamma$  the total matter content of the Universe,  $\Omega_M = \Omega_c + \Omega_b + \Omega_g$ , will be quite small in the future,  $\Omega_M \approx \Omega_g \approx 1/\gamma$ . The presently observed value  $\Omega_M \approx 0.25$  indicates then that we are now in the middle of the transition from matter domination ( $\Omega_M \approx 1 - 3/\alpha^2$ ) to a scalar field dominated cosmology ( $\Omega_M \approx 1/\gamma$ ).

The limiting case  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  admits a particularly simple description. In this case we encounter a sudden transition between the two cosmic attractors at the time  $t_c$  when the two terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (3) have equal size, namely for  $\alpha V = -\beta\rho_g$  or:

$$\Omega_g = \Omega_h/\gamma. \quad (10)$$

While the cosmon was evolving before this time, it suddenly stops at a value  $\phi_c \equiv \phi(t)$  at  $t_c$ . Thus, for  $t \geq t_c$  and large  $\gamma$  the cosmology is almost the same as for a Cosmological Constant with value  $V(\phi_c)$ . On the other hand, before  $t_c$  standard CDM cosmology is only mildly modified by the presence of an early dark energy component (6). For large enough  $\alpha$  this ensures compatibility with observations of CMB anisotropies and structure formation. The redshift of the transition  $z_c$  may be estimated by equating the potential  $V$  at the end of the scaling solution (7) to its present value. In terms of the present dark energy fraction  $\Omega_{h,0} \approx 0.75$  it is given by:

$$\frac{H^2(z_c)}{H_0^2} = \frac{2\Omega_{h,0}\alpha^2}{3} \quad (11)$$

whose solution can be approximated as  $1 + z_c \approx [2\Omega_{h,0}\alpha^2/(3 - 3\Omega_{h,0})]^{1/3}$ . In the numerical examples below we will assume  $\alpha = 10$  and either  $\gamma = 5.2$  or  $\gamma = 40$ . Then we obtain numerically  $z_c \approx 6(5)$  for  $\gamma = 5.2(40)$ . Thus  $z_c$  is large enough not to affect the present supernovae observations. The large- $\gamma$ -limit is therefore compatible with all present observations provided that  $\alpha$  is large enough. We plot the time evolution of the different cosmic components and the effective equation of state for the combined cosmon and growing matter components in Fig. 1. For not too large  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  our model differs from  $\Lambda$ CDM, and we will come back below to the interesting possibilities of observing these deviations.

So far we have made no assumptions about the constituents of the growing matter component. It could be a heavy or superheavy massive particle, say with a mass 1TeV or  $10^{16}$ TeV. Then growing matter is non-relativistic

at all epochs where it plays a role in cosmology. In this case the initial value  $\rho_g(t_{eq})$  has to be chosen such that the crossover occurs in the present cosmological epoch. Even more interesting, growing matter could be associated with neutrinos. In this case our model shares certain aspects with the "Mass Varying Neutrinos" scenario [12], although being much closer to "standard" Coupled Quintessence [8]. Neutrino growing matter offers the interesting perspective that no new particles (besides the cosmon and cold dark matter) need to be introduced. Furthermore, the present value of  $\rho_g$  can be computed from the relic neutrino abundance and the present (averaged) neutrino mass  $m_\nu(t_0)$  (assuming  $h = 0.72$ ):

$$\Omega_g(t_0) = \frac{m_\nu(t_0)}{16eV}. \quad (12)$$

For large  $|\beta|$  the neutrino mass becomes rapidly very small in the past such that neutrinos cannot affect the early structure formation. The standard cosmological bounds on the neutrino mass [2] do not apply.

For a given neutrino mass  $m_\nu(t_0)$  our model has only two parameters,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (or  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ ). They will determine the present matter density  $\Omega_M(t_0)$ . Replacing  $\gamma$  by  $\Omega_M(t_0)$ , our model has then only one more parameter,  $\alpha$ , as compared to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model. For an analytical estimate of the relation between  $\Omega_M(t_0) = 1 - \Omega_h(t_0)$  and  $m_\nu(t_0)$  we use the observation that the ratio  $\Omega_g/\Omega_h$  (averaged) has already reached today its asymptotic value (9,10) :

$$\Omega_h(t_0) = \left[ \frac{\gamma}{1 - \frac{3}{\alpha^2\gamma}} - 1 \right] \frac{m_\nu(t_0)}{30.8h^2eV} \approx \frac{\gamma m_\nu(t_0)}{16eV}. \quad (13)$$

This important relation determines the present dark energy density by the neutrino mass and  $\gamma$ :

$$[\rho_h(t_0)]^{1/4} = 1.07 \left( \frac{\gamma m_\nu(t_0)}{eV} \right)^{1/4} 10^{-3} eV. \quad (14)$$

This value will change very slowly in the future since the value  $\gamma = 5.22(800)$  for the maximal (minimal) neutrino mass (no sterile neutrinos)  $m_\nu(t_0) = 2.3eV(0.015eV)$  must indeed be large and  $w$  is therefore close to  $-1$ , cf. Fig. 1. The late dark energy density is essentially determined as the neutrino energy density times  $\gamma$ . Its actual value is given by the value of the scalar potential at the crossing time  $t_c$ , i.e.  $9M^2H^2(t_c)/2\alpha^2$ . Since the equation of state (8) is today already near the asymptotic value (9), cf. Fig. 1, we can relate it to the neutrino mass ( $\Omega_{h,0} \approx 3/4$ ) by eqs. (9,13)

$$w = -1 + \frac{m_\nu(t_0)}{12eV}. \quad (15)$$

This remarkable expression yields  $m_\nu(t_0) < 2.4eV$  for  $w < -0.8$ .

How can our model based on growing matter be tested and constrained? First of all, the presence of early dark energy manifests itself by the detailed peak location of the CMB anisotropies [13], the change in the linear growth of cosmic structures [14, 15], and the abundance and properties of nonlinear structures [16].

Second, for not too large  $\gamma$  there would be a sizable fraction of growing matter today (for neutrino growing matter this would require rather large neutrino masses). Then the present matter density  $\rho_M = \rho_c + \rho_b + \rho_g$  differs from the (rescaled) matter density in the early Universe  $\rho_c + \rho_b$ . This may affect the matching of the present values of  $\Omega_M$  and  $\Omega_b/\Omega_M$  obtained from supernovae, baryon acoustic oscillations and clusters, with determinations from the CMB at high redshift, through the value of  $t_{eq}$  and the baryon content of the Universe at last scattering. This effect is small for large values of  $\gamma$  (small neutrino mass).

Third, growing matter can affect the formation of structures in the late stages. For very massive particles, growing matter would consist of relatively few particles which have presumably fallen into the cold dark matter structures formed in early cosmology. For scales smaller than the range of the cosmon interaction these particles feel a strong mutual attraction, enhanced by a factor  $(2\beta^2 + 1)$  as compared to gravity. This force is mediated by the cosmon [7, 17]. Thus, once a sufficient  $\Omega_g$  is reached, the growing matter structures  $\delta\rho_g$  grow rapidly. They will influence, in turn, the structures in baryons and cold dark matter once the gravitational potential of the growing matter structures becomes comparable to the one of the cold dark matter structures. This happens rather late, especially for large  $\gamma$  since growing matter constitutes only a small fraction of the present matter density in this case.

The condition for the onset of an enhanced growth of  $\delta\rho_g$  requires that the average cosmon force  $\sim 2\beta^2\Omega_g$  is comparable to the average gravitational force  $\sim \Omega_M$ . This happens first at a redshift  $z_{eg}$  somewhat larger than the crossover  $z_c$  (eq. 11). At this time the scaling solution is still valid, with  $\Omega_M \approx 1 - 3/\alpha^2$  and  $\Omega_g(z) = [(1 + z_c)/(1 + z)]^{3(\gamma-1)} \Omega_g(z_c)$ ,  $\Omega_g(z_c) \approx \gamma\Omega_V(z_c) \approx 3\gamma/(2\alpha^2)$ , resulting in:

$$\frac{1 + z_{eg}}{1 + z_c} = \{3\gamma(\gamma - 1)^2\}^{\frac{1}{3(\gamma-1)}}. \quad (16)$$

For large  $\gamma$  one finds  $z_{eg}$  quite close to  $z_c$  such that the enhanced growth concerns only the very last growth epoch before the accelerated expansion reduces further linear growth in the dark matter component. For heavy growing matter this results in an enhancement of  $\sigma_8$  as compared to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, which may be compensated by a slower growth rate before  $z_c$  due to early dark energy [14, 15].

We notice that the fluctuation growth rate  $f \equiv \frac{d \log \delta}{d \log a}$  of the dominant form of matter can be estimated ana-

lytically during both the scaling phase and the future attractor. During the first phase the matter fluctuations grow as [14]

$$f_1 = \frac{1}{4}(-1 + \sqrt{24\Omega_M + 1}) \quad (17)$$

and are therefore slowed down with respect to the standard matter dominated rate; for large  $\alpha$  the modification is small,  $f_1 \approx 1 - 9\alpha^{-2}/5$ . When the growing component becomes dominant, its growth rate can be evaluated as a function of  $\alpha, \gamma$  that for  $\alpha \gg 1$  and  $\gamma \gg 1$  reduces to  $f_2 \approx 1.04\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}$  [8, 15]. Since in our model we are not yet on the final attractor the present growth rate of the dark matter component will be quite smaller than  $f_2$ . It is interesting to remark that in principle an estimate of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  would completely fix both parameters  $\alpha, \gamma$ .

An enhanced growth of  $\delta\rho_g$  concerns only structures with size smaller than the range  $l_\phi$  of the cosmon-mediated interaction. In a cosmological situation we have to solve, in principle, the coupled system of linear fluctuation equations in  $\phi, \rho_g, \rho_c$ , etc... For a rough estimate of the (density dependent) cosmon mass we consider a fixed  $\rho_g$ ,

$$m_\phi^2 = l_\phi^{-2} = \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2} = \frac{\alpha^2 V}{M^2}. \quad (18)$$

During the scaling solution (7) the cosmon range is given by [7]:

$$l_\phi(t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} H^{-1}(t). \quad (19)$$

After  $t_c$  the evolution of  $\phi$  essentially stops, resulting in a constant range  $\hat{l}_\phi = \sqrt{2}/(3H(t_c))$ .

A different regime of growth applies for  $l > l_\phi$ . A “window of adiabatic fluctuations” opens up in the range  $l_\phi < l < H^{-1}$  where the fluctuations of the coupled cosmon fluid and growing matter can be approximated as a single fluid. In this regime the enhanced growth is weakened by the small range of the cosmon interaction.

Neutrino growing matter was relativistic in earlier time, so that free streaming prevents clustering. For  $\beta < 0$  neutrinos have actually remained relativistic much longer than neutrinos with constant mass. In the limit of large  $\gamma$  one can estimate that the neutrinos are relativistic at  $a < a_R$  where

$$a_R \approx (m_\nu(t_0)/T_{\nu,0})^{-1/4} = 0.11 \left( \frac{m_\nu(t_0)}{1\text{eV}} \right)^{-1/4} \quad (20)$$

which corresponds to  $z_R \in (2-10)$  for  $m_{\nu,0} \in (0.015-2.3)$  (we use  $m_\nu(a_R) = T_\nu(a_R)$ , and approximate  $\rho_g \sim \text{const}$ , so that  $m_\nu \sim Va^3$ ,  $V \sim \text{const}$ ,  $T_\nu = T_{\nu,0}/a$  where  $T_{\nu,0}$  is the present neutrino temperature for massless neutrinos). The growth of neutrino structures only starts for  $z < z_R$ . Even then, neutrinos cannot cluster on scales smaller




Figure 1: Cosmological evolution for neutrino growing matter for  $\alpha = 10, \beta = -52$  and  $m_{\nu,0} = 2.3\text{eV}$ . Panel a): density fractions  $\Omega_{rad}$  (black, dots),  $\Omega_c$  (dark green, dot-dashes),  $\Omega_b$  (blue, short dashes),  $\Omega_h$  (red, long dashes),  $\Omega_g$  (light green, solid). Panel b): blow out of panel a) near the present time. Panel c): total equation of state  $w_{\text{eff}} \equiv p_{\text{tot}}/\rho_{\text{tot}}$  (red, long dashes); combined EOS of cosmon and neutrinos (blue, short dashes); and EOS of cosmon alone (green, solid). Panels a) – c) remains almost identical for heavy growing matter. Panel d): neutrino energy density (red, long dashes), neutrino mass (green, solid) normalized to unity today. The dotted curve represents the energy density of always non-relativistic heavy growing matter.

than their "free streaming scale"  $l_{fs}$ . This scale is given by the time when the neutrinos become non-relativistic, eq. (20), close to  $H^{-1}(a_R) \approx 200 (m_\nu/1\text{eV})^{3/8} h^{-1}\text{Mpc} \in (100 - 1000) h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ .

On the other hand, the range  $l_\phi$  of the effective cosmon interaction increases, eq. (19) until it reaches  $\hat{l}_\phi$ . For scales within the window  $l_{fs} < l < l_\phi$  the neutrino clustering is strongly enhanced (for  $z < z_{eg}$ ) due to the additional attractive force mediated by cosmon exchange. This enhanced clustering starts first for scales close to  $l_{fs}$ . One may thus investigate the possible formation of lumps with a characteristic scale around  $l_{fs}$ . For the range  $l_\phi < l < H^{-1}$  one expects again an adiabatic growth of the coupled neutrinos and cosmon fluctuations, approximated by a single fluid. In summary, on large scales  $l > l_{fs}$  the neutrino fluctuations grow similar to the heavy growing matter fluctuations. The growth starts, however, only very late for  $z > z_R$  and only from a low level given by the tiny fluctuations in a relativistic fluid at  $z_R$ . Furthermore, neutrino fluctuations with a scale  $l < l_{fs}$  are suppressed by free streaming.

In this context one may ask to what extent the local variations of the cosmon field  $\phi$  affect the local values of the neutrino mass and therefore the relation of cosmology to the possible outcome of laboratory experiments. Such variations in  $\phi$  are induced by local neutrino concentrations. For neutrino lumps the perturbations of  $\phi$  are of the order of  $\beta$  times the Newtonian potential  $\Phi$ . Thus one expects local variations of the growing matter mass of the order of  $\Delta m_g/m_g \approx \beta^2 \Phi$ . In all observable (non compact) astrophysical objects one has  $\Phi \leq 10^{-4}$  and therefore it turns out that for  $\beta < 100$  the spatial variations of  $m_g$  should not be very large. In particular, we can safely identify the cosmological value of the neutrino mass  $m_\nu(t_0)$  with the one measured on Earth.

A close look at Fig. 1 shows oscillations of  $\Omega_g$ , starting around  $z_c$  and being damped subsequently. Both the oscillation period and the damping time can be understood in terms of the eigenvalues of the stability matrix for small fluctuations around the future attractor solution [7, 8]. We note, however, that the oscillations concern only the relative distribution between  $\Omega_g$  and  $\Omega_h$ , while the sum  $\Omega_h + \Omega_g = 1 - \Omega_M$  remains quite smooth. A detection of the oscillations by investigations of the background evolution, like supernovae, seems extremely hard - the luminosity distance is a very smooth function of  $z$ . For neutrino growing matter the oscillations of  $m_\nu(t)$  around its average value induce an uncertainty in the estimate of the relation between  $\Omega_g(t_0)$  and  $m_\nu(t_0)$  (13) ranging from 25% for  $\gamma = 5.2$  ( $m_\nu(t_0) = 2.3\text{eV}$ ) to 100% for  $\gamma = 40$  ( $m_\nu(t_0) = 0.3\text{eV}$ ). The relations (13-15) all involve the averaged neutrino mass.

While for large enough  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  the cosmology seems rather realistic, one may ask if our proposal for a resolution of the "why now" problem has not introduced other unnaturally small parameters. Indeed, extrapolat-

ing the masses of the growing matter particles back to the Planck time may result in extremely small masses if  $|\beta|$  is large, given typical values  $\phi(t_{Pl}) \approx 0$ ,  $\alpha\phi(t_0)/M \approx 276$  (from eq. 7). However, we have explored here only the simplest possibility of constant  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . It is well conceivable (and quite likely) that in a fundamental theory  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are functions of  $\phi$ . Slow changes will not affect our phenomenological discussion which only concerns a rather small range of  $\phi/M$ . In contrast, extrapolations back to the Planck epoch or Inflation could look completely different. Our scenario does not need a huge overall change of the mass of the growing matter particles. For neutrinos a growth of the mass by a factor  $10^7$ , corresponding in the seesaw mechanism to a decrease of the right handed neutrino mass from  $M$  to  $10^{11}\text{GeV}$ , would largely be sufficient, provided a fast change happens during recent cosmology. We also have assumed here that cold dark matter has a negligible coupling to the cosmon. While the cosmon coupling to baryons must be very small in order to remain compatible with the tests of General Relativity, the coupling between cold dark matter and the cosmon is only restricted by cosmology [8] and needs exploration in our context.

The most crucial observational issues can be understood by concentrating on constant parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  (and possibly a constant cosmon-cold dark matter coupling). It will be a challenge to measure them or to falsify the growing matter scenario. For neutrino growing matter a determination of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  would fix the neutrino mass, allowing for an independent test of this hypothesis by comparing with laboratory experiments.

- 
- [1] P. Astier et al, *Astron. Astrophys.* **447** 31 (2006); T. M. Davis et al., *astro-ph/0701510*
  - [2] D.N. Spergel et al. (WMAP collaboration) *ApJS*, **170**, 377 (2007) *arXiv:astro-ph/0603449*
  - [3] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989) 1.
  - [4] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302** (1988) 668.
  - [5] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. J.* **325** (1988) L17.
  - [6] G.R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett. B* **484**, 112 (2000)
  - [7] C. Wetterich, *Astron. Astrophys.* **301** (1995) 321 [*arXiv:hep-th/9408025*].
  - [8] L. Amendola, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 043511 [*astro-ph/9908023*], L. Amendola, D. Tocchini-Valentini, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 043528 [*astro-ph/0111535*].
  - [9] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302** (1988) 645.
  - [10] G. Huey & B. Wandelt, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 023519
  - [11] M. Doran, G. Robbers and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 023003 [*arXiv:astro-ph/0609814*].
  - [12] P. Gu, X. Wang and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 087301 (2003); R. Fardon, A.E. Nelson and N. Weiner, *JCAP* **0410** (2004) 005; A. W. Brookfield et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** (2006) 061301; N. Afshordi, M. Zaldarriaga & K. Kohri *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 065024; O. E. Bjaelde et al.

- arXiv:0705.2018; K. Ichiki & Y. Keum, arXiv:0705.2134.
- [13] M. Doran, M. J. Lilley, J. Schwindt and C. Wetterich, *Astrophys. J.* **559** (2001) 501 [arXiv:astro-ph/0012139].
  - [14] P. G. Ferreira and M. Joyce, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 4740 [arXiv:astro-ph/9707286].
  - [15] M. Doran, J. M. Schwindt and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 123520 [arXiv:astro-ph/0107525].
  - [16] M. Bartelmann, M. Doran and C. Wetterich, *Astron. & Astrophys.* 454 (2006) 27 [arXiv:astro-ph/0507257].
  - [17] C. Wetterich *JCAP* 0310 (2003) 002 [arXiv:hep-ph/0203266]