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Abstract

In this work we explore some aspects of two holographic models for dark energy within the interacting scenario for the dark sector with the inclusion of spatial curvature. A statistical analysis for each holographic model is performed together with their corresponding extensions given by the consideration of massive neutrinos. The first holographic approach considers the usual formula proposed by Li for the dark energy density with a constant parameter $c$ and for the second model we have a function $c(z)$ instead a constant parameter, this latter model is inspired in the apparent horizon. By considering the best fit values of the cosmological parameters we show that the interaction term for each holographic model, $Q$, keeps positive along the cosmic evolution and exhibits a future singularity for a finite value of the redshift, this is inherited from the Hubble parameter. The temperatures for the components of the dark sector are computed and have a growing behavior in both models. The cosmic evolution in this context it is not adiabatic and the second law it is fulfilled only under certain well-established conditions for the temperatures of the cosmic components and the interacting $Q$-term.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary cosmology dark matter and dark energy are two unclear concepts from which we depend to construct the current picture of the observable Universe given their dominant presence. This has been a source of motivation to explore some extensions of General Relativity; the cosmic effects of dark energy can be obtained in a minimal modification of Einstein’s theory which is usually known as, $\Lambda$CDM model, and consists on the inclusion of a constant term at the gravitational action. However, some issues have been revealed on the grounds of this theoretical framework, suggesting that a dynamical behavior for dark energy seems to be more appropriate to describe the late times behavior of the Universe, see for instance Ref. [1]. Besides, with the advent of more precise cosmological observations some discrepancies appear with different data sets in the fundamental constant that characterizes the expansion rate of the Universe when the $\Lambda$CDM model is considered to describe the dynamics, this is known as the $H_0$ tension, see Ref. [2] for a general perspective on the different values of the expansion rate coming from different data sets. An example of a modified gravity model considered to solve the aforementioned tension can be found at [3]. Other proposal can be found in Ref. [4], a non vanishing spin tensor for dark matter seems to provide an alleviation for the aforementioned $H_0$ tension. A complete review on viable models that could solve the $H_0$ tension is given in [5]. On the other hand, since the nature of the dark matter and dark energy is still unsolved, it is possible to consider that both components are allowed to interact to each other, or in other words, an interchange of energy could exist between such components. In general, this interchange of energy is mediated by the existence of a $Q$ interaction term that is introduced in the continuity equations of the energy densities of both cosmic components. It is worthy to mention that the interaction scheme has been studied widely in the literature and it is not ruled out by the recent cosmological observations, an interesting review on the topic can be found in Ref. [6]. In fact, a reduction of the $H_0$ tension to $2.5\sigma$ was reported recently within the interacting scenario [7], this is an improvement on the tensions reported in [2], which variate between $3.1$ and $5.8\sigma$. See also Ref. [8], where the interaction of WIMP dark matter with dark energy is considered.

From the consideration of some heuristic arguments used in particle physics emerges an
interesting proposal to deal with the dark energy problem known as holographic principle, the description of a physical system within a volume can be performed using only the degrees of freedom residing on the boundary. Using this scenario, it was possible to establish an upper bound for the entropy, $S$, in a region of size $L$, $S \leq M^2 P L^2$, where $M_P$ is the Planck mass, as can be seen at large scales such quantum field theory breaks down.

Therefore the energy contained in a region of volume $L^3$ should not exceed the energy of a black hole of the same size, i.e, $L^3 \lambda_{UV}^3 \leq S_{BH} = M^2 P L^2$, where $\lambda_{UV}$ is identified as the ultraviolet cut-off (vacuum energy) and $L$ acts as the infrared cut-off (scale of the Universe or characteristic length) which scales as $\lambda_{UV}^{-3}$, both quantities are related. In order to avoid the saturation of the aforementioned expression for the energy we can consider that $L$ scales as $\lambda_{UV}^{-2}$, leading to $L^3 \lambda_{UV}^4 \leq M^2 P L$. At cosmological level, the idea behind this approach is to have a theoretical model that reproduces the amount of dark energy in the Universe, as obtained from cosmological observations. This was developed by Li in Ref. [10] by identifying $\lambda_{UV}^4$ as the holographic dark energy and $L$ as the Hubble scale $H^{-1}$, the Li model was tested with observations in Ref. [11]. Of course, the election of the characteristic length is not unique, see for instance Refs. [12–22], where some different forms of $L$ can be found. In Ref. [23] the holographic dark energy was studied in the context of the interacting dark sector. An interesting scenario for holographic dark energy is explored in Ref. [24], where the matter production effects are taken into account, such effects contribute on the cosmic expansion since are characterized by a negative effective pressure. It is worthy to mention that the holographic principle can also be applied to describe the physics of the early Universe, in Ref. [25] an inflationary model based on the holographic approach is studied and in Ref. [26] the inflation process can be understood naturally by considering some holographic arguments.

Without question we live in an Universe for which a plethora of cosmological models could be adapted. However, we must pay attention to the hints revealed by the astrophysical observations, some of the tensions found in modern cosmology allow small deviations from a flat configuration [27], then the precise determination of the curvature parameter is crucial to understand the cosmic evolution we observe. From other point of view, the discrepancies on the measurements of the cosmic expansion rate and the matter fluctuations $\sigma_8$ can have a viable explanation if a key piece is added to the puzzle: massive neutrinos contribution,
in Ref. [28] this contribution is explored and the $H_0$ and $\sigma_8$ tensions are alleviated, but the number of extra relativistic degrees of freedom is increased. This opens a door to a new room for particle physics. Finally, if some of the proposals for indirect detection of dark matter could materialize, we would have a more solid understanding regarding the nature of this component, in Ref. [29] it is established that exoplanets can serve as dark matter detectors since their temperatures could be affected by a heat flux generated by the dark matter surrounding them. If some information it is extracted from exoplanets, we could have a new paradigm on the role of dark matter in scenarios as the one considered in this work.

This work is organized as follows: in Section II is provided a brief description of the background dynamics for the interacting scheme plus spatial curvature. The basic dynamical equations are established and a general expression for the dark energy parameter state is given in terms of some relevant cosmological quantities. Section IIA is devoted to construct the interacting scenario when a holographic approach is considered for the dark energy component. We consider two different holographic models and we label them as Model I and Model II, being the latter a generalization of the usual holographic formula, we replace the holographic constant parameter $c$ by a function $c(z)$, which origin is inspired in the apparent horizon, as we will see below, both holographic models exhibit a future singularity. We implement a statistical analysis for both models with the use of recent cosmological data and we also discuss the inclusion of an extra component given by massive neutrinos, the statistical analysis is also performed with the neutrino contribution in this interacting scenario. The general behavior of the interaction term in both models is also shown using the best fit values obtained from the statistical analysis. Section III is oriented to the thermodynamics discussion of these holographic scenarios. By means of the effective temperature method we compute the temperatures of the cosmic components, using the constrained values for the cosmological parameters we show that such temperatures are well defined in both cases studied and the second law will be fulfilled in the future evolution of the cosmic expansion. In Section IV we give the final comments of our work. In this work we will consider $8\pi G = c = k_B = 1$ units.
II. BACKGROUND DYNAMICS FOR THE INTERACTING DARK SECTOR PLUS CURVATURE

We provide highlights of some results previously discussed by part of the authors in Ref. [30] for the interacting scheme when spatial curvature it is included. If we consider the contribution from dark matter ($m$), dark energy ($de$) plus curvature ($k$), then the Friedmann constraint can be written in terms of the cosmological redshift, $z$, yielding

$$E^2(z) = \frac{1}{3H_0^2}(\rho_m(z) + \rho_{de}(z)) + \Omega_k(z), \quad (1)$$

where we have written the normalized Hubble parameter instead the Hubble parameter, both quantities are related by $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$, being $H_0$ the value of the Hubble parameter at present time ($z = 0$); and we have considered the standard definition $\Omega_i,0 = \rho_i,0 / 3H_0^2$; in this case we have defined $\Omega_k(z) := \Omega_{k,0}(1+z)^2$ with $\Omega_{k,0} = -k/a_0^2H_0^2$ being $k$ the parameter that characterizes the spatial curvature of the spacetime, $k = +1, -1, 0$ for closed, open and flat Universe. If the interaction between dark matter and dark energy is allowed, both energy densities must satisfy

$$\rho'_m - 3 \left( \frac{\rho_m}{1+z} \right) = -\frac{Q}{H_0 E(z)(1+z)}, \quad (2)$$

$$\rho'_{de} - 3 \left[ \frac{\rho_{de}(1 + \omega_{de})}{1+z} \right] = \frac{Q}{H_0 E(z)(1+z)}, \quad (3)$$

where we have considered a barotropic equation of state, i.e., $p_i = \omega_i \rho_i$; note that we focus on the case of cold dark matter, $\omega_m = 0$. From now on, the prime will denote derivative with respect to the cosmological redshift. As can be seen in the r.h.s. of the previous expressions, a $Q$-term appears, this term determines the nature of the interaction between the components of the dark sector. From the above equations, we can determine the behavior of the parameter state for dark energy, using (1), (2) and (3) we can compute

$$1 + \frac{\omega_{de}(z)}{1 + r(z)} = \frac{2}{3} \left[ \frac{1}{2}(1+z)(\ln E^2(z))' - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \right] \left[ 1 - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \right]^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

note that the in the latter equation we have introduced the coincidence parameter, $r(z)$, defined as $r(z) := \rho_m(z)/\rho_{de}(z)$, the dependence on the coincidence parameter by some cosmological quantities is typical of the interacting dark matter - dark energy models. Besides, we can see that the present time value of the parameter state for dark energy will depend only on the constant values $r(0)$ and $\Omega_k(0)$; thus, the value of the spatial curvature plays an important role on the behavior of the dark energy under this construction.
A. Holographic approach

In this section we adopt the holographic description for dark energy, in other words, its corresponding energy density is written in terms of a characteristic length, usually termed as $L$. We will restrict ourselves to following cases discussed below.

1. Model I

As first model we will consider a characteristic length given by the usual Hubble scale, this was also considered in Ref. [30], we have

$$\rho_{de}(z) = 3c^2H_0^2E^2(z),$$

(5)

where $L = 1/H$ and $c$ is a constant parameter. The equation (5) corresponds to a very common formula for holographic dark energy, in order to describe an expanding universe we must have $0 < c^2 < 1$, this kind of holographic model was initially proposed by Li in Ref. [10] and it is interesting since reproduces the amount of dark energy in the Universe, as mentioned before. An advantage of this description is that by inserting the Eq. (5) in (1) we can construct the energy density associated to dark matter, which results as

$$\rho_m(z) = 3H_0^2E^2(z)[1-c^2-\Omega_k(0)((1+z)/E(z))^2]$$

thus for the holographic dark energy (5) we can obtain the following coincidence parameter

$$r(z) = (1-c^2)/c^2-(\Omega_k(0)/c^2)((1+z)/E(z))^2$$

and by evaluating at present time one gets $r(0) = (1-c^2-\Omega_k(0))/c^2$. Note that the present time value of the coincidence parameter depends on the value of the spatial curvature. Therefore, from the continuity equation (3) and the first derivative with respect to the redshift of the Friedmann constraint (1) we can construct the $Q$-term for this interaction, we do not depend on the Ansatz philosophy for the interaction term, one gets

$$\frac{Q(z)}{9(1-c^2)H_0^2E^3(z)} = 1-\Omega_k(0)\left(\frac{1+z}{E(z)}\right)^2 - \left(1 + \frac{\omega_{de}(z)}{1 + r(z)}\right)\left(1 - \Omega_k(0)\left(\frac{1+z}{E(z)}\right)^2\right).$$

(6)

From the previous expression we can observe that the interaction term and the coincidence parameter are related, we will comment below about this relation. It is worthy to mention some properties of the interaction term written above, if we consider its previous expression
together with Eq. (4), we can write

\[
\frac{Q(z)}{9(1-c^2)H_0^3E^3(z)} = 1 - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{3-2c^2}{3(1-c^2)} \right] - \frac{2}{3} \left[ 1 + q(z) - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \right],
\]

(7)

where \( q(z) \) is the deceleration parameter defined as, \( 1+q(z) := \frac{1}{2}(1+z)(\ln E^2(z))' \). Therefore, we can express the deceleration parameter as a function of the \( Q \)-term and the curvature parameter, \( \Omega_k(0) \); both quantities could play a relevant role on the cosmic expansion for this kind of Universe. However, given that our interest relies on an Ansatz independent \( Q \)-term formulation, we do not consider this option. We can also proceed in the inverse order, by providing a parametrization for the deceleration parameter we could obtain an explicit expression for the interaction term, which also will depend on the curvature parameter. But as we will see below, we opt to choose a parametrization for the coincidence parameter. By performing a straightforward calculation it is possible to find the normalized Hubble parameter as a function of the coincidence parameter, this can be done by inserting (5) in (1) and obtaining \( \rho_m \) to evaluate the quotient between both densities; we can write

\[
E^2(z) = -\frac{\Omega_k(0)(1+z)^2}{c^2(r(z) - r_c)}, \quad \text{where} \quad r_c := \frac{1-c^2}{c^2},
\]

(8)

note that the normalized Hubble parameter diverges at \( r(z_s) = r_c \), i.e., for a future value \( z_s \) of the cosmological redshift; this singularity was discussed in [30], the model admits a phantom scenario. From the evaluation at present time of the coincidence parameter it is also possible to establish the following relation between \( r(0) \) and \( r_c \): \( r_c = (r(0) + \Omega_k(0))/(1 - \Omega_k(0)) \). In order to obtain some solutions, in Ref. [30] was considered a Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) like parametrization for the coincidence parameter given as

\[
r(z) = r(0) + \epsilon_0 \frac{z}{1+z},
\]

(9)

therefore, using the previous equation we can solve for the value \( z_s \) at which (8) becomes singular, we obtain

\[
z_s = -\frac{r(0) - r_c}{\epsilon_0 \left[ 1 + \frac{r(0) - r_c}{\epsilon_0} \right]}.
\]

(10)

Now, if we consider again (9) and (10) the normalized Hubble parameter (8) takes the form

\[
E^2(z) = -\Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{z - z_s} \right)^3 \eta, \quad \text{where} \quad \eta := \frac{1 + z_s}{c^2\epsilon_0}, \quad \text{is a constant.}
\]

(11)
By defining the function $\theta(z) := (1 + z)/(z - z_s)$ and using the quantities written previously, the interaction term acquires the form

$$\frac{Q(z)}{3H_0^3} = -\Omega_k(0)\sqrt{-\Omega_k(0)\eta\theta(z)(1 + z)^3[1 + \eta\theta^2(z)(1 - c^2)]}, \quad (12)$$

note that the singular behavior of the phantom cosmology is induced in the interaction term through the $\theta(z)$ function. This last form of the interaction term was also studied in Ref. [31]; an interesting feature of this $Q$-term is the fact that can be written as the product of the dark matter and dark energy densities, then the set of Eqs. (2) and (3) can be considered as a Lotka-Volterra like system, which describes a cyclic interchange of energy between the components of the dark sector. Using the Eq. (11) we can implement a test with observations considering five free parameters: $h, c^2, \epsilon_0, \Omega_k(0)$ and $z_s$, where $h$ is defined as usual $h := H_0/100$. In order to perform this analysis we will use type Ia supernova (SNIa) measurements known as Pantheon sample consisting on a total of 1048 data points ranging from $0.01 < z < 2.3$ [32] and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) compiled from [33]. In general, the luminosity peak of the supernovas type Ia can be used as a distance indicator from the relation between redshift and distance, relative distance measurements can be performed using the luminosity distance which is written as follows

$$d_L = \sqrt{\frac{L}{4\pi S}}, \quad (13)$$

where $L$ is the luminosity and $S$ is the radiation flux density. An important quantity for the observation of supernovas is the modular distance or distance modulus

$$\mu = m_B - M_B + \alpha X - \beta C, \quad (14)$$

where $m_B$ is the maximum apparent magnitude in the blue band (B), $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $M_B$ are parameters that depend on host galaxy properties. $X$ is related to the widening of the light curve and $C$ is a correction for the supernova color. The distance modulus and the luminosity are related through the following expression

$$\mu = 5 \log_{10} \left( \frac{d_L}{10 \text{ pc}} \right). \quad (15)$$

BAO is a statistical property coming from our primitive Universe. A viable description for the early Universe is given by the existence of a plasma formed of photons and matter, the interaction between its components lead to the formation of spherical waves. Once the
Universe cooled down, the photons decoupled from baryons and the final configuration of such process is a overdensity of matter at the center of the spherical wave and a shell of baryons of fixed radius usually known as sound horizon, $r_s$. The BAO scale is estimated by the ratio
\[
\frac{D_M(z)}{r_s},
\]
where $D_M(z)$ is the comoving angular diameter distance. For the transverse direction one can write in the line of sight
\[
\frac{D_M(z)}{r_s} = \frac{P}{(1+z)\sqrt{-\Omega_k}} \sin \left[ \sqrt{-\Omega_k} \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{E(z')} \right],
\]
where $P := c/(r_s H_0)$, the Hubble parameter can be constrained by considering an analogous expression
\[
\frac{D_H(z)}{r_s} = \frac{P}{E(z)}.
\]
In the case of weak redshift-space distortions an isotropic analysis measures an effective combination of Eqs. (17) and (18) and the volume averaged distance $D_V(z)/r_s$, with
\[
D_V(z) = \frac{z(1+z)^2 D_M^2(z) D_H(z)}{[z(1+z)^2 D_M^2(z) D_H(z)]^{1/3}}.
\]
The statistical analysis is carried out by implementing a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) code called SimpleMC\(^1\), which is entirely written in Python, this code solves the cosmological equations for the background parameters in the same way as CLASS or CAMB and it contains the statistical parameter inference from CosmoMC or MontePython \[^34\]. We adopt the Gelman-Rubin convergence criteria for our chains. Assuming all five parameters free, and without using external priors, we get the results shown in Table (I). The summary of the posterior probabilities are shown in Fig. (1). In Fig. (2) we show the behavior of the interaction $Q$-term given in Eq. (12) using the best fit values for the cosmological parameters. As can be seen, the interaction term exhibits a future divergence and keeps positive along the cosmic evolution.

\(^1\) More details about SimpleMC can be found at: https://github.com/slosar/april
2. Model II

The second holographic cut for the dark energy density will be given by the following expression

$$\rho_{de}(z) = 3[\beta_1 - \beta_2 \Omega_k(0)(1 + z)^2]H_0^2E^2(z),$$

(20)

this holographic model was proposed in [13] for non interacting fluids and resembles the expression of the apparent horizon; $\beta_{1,2}$ are constant parameters. By comparing (5) with (20) we can observe that the second holographic model can be written in the form of the usual formula for the holographic dark energy but in this case, $c^2 \rightarrow c^2(z) := \beta_1 - \beta_2 \Omega_k(0)(1 + z)^2$, i.e., now we have a function of the cosmological redshift instead a constant. In Ref. [35] was proposed that a more realistic description of the Universe from the holographic perspective could be obtained if one generalizes the holographic formula from a constant parameter $c^2$ to a varying function of the cosmological redshift (or time); as discussed in [13] the energy density (20) can be written in terms of only one free parameter, in this case $\beta_1$. If we evaluate at present time one gets $c^2(0) = \beta_1 - \beta_2 \Omega_k(0)$. Therefore, (20) is re-expressed as

$$\rho_{de}(z) = 3[\beta_1 + (c^2(0) - \beta_1)(1 + z)^2]H_0^2E^2(z),$$

(21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pantheon</th>
<th>BAO</th>
<th>Pantheon+BAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$0.6536^{+0.1694}_{-0.1503}$</td>
<td>$0.6975^{+0.1307}_{-0.1434}$</td>
<td>$0.7156^{+0.0843}_{-0.1203}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^2$</td>
<td>$0.5403^{+0.2992}_{-0.3372}$</td>
<td>$0.4732^{+0.3243}_{-0.2994}$</td>
<td>$0.5033^{+0.3053}_{-0.3054}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_0$</td>
<td>$0.4893^{+0.3213}_{-0.3015}$</td>
<td>$0.5306^{+0.3005}_{-0.3233}$</td>
<td>$0.5667^{+0.2846}_{-0.3404}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_s$</td>
<td>$-0.5029^{+0.0385}_{-0.0431}$</td>
<td>$-0.4504^{+0.3037}_{-0.3330}$</td>
<td>$-0.4882^{+0.0432}_{-0.0462}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Omega_k(0)$</td>
<td>$-0.0055^{+0.0015}_{-0.0018}$</td>
<td>$-0.0066^{+0.0057}_{-0.0049}$</td>
<td>$-0.0028^{+0.0016}_{-0.0021}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: Best fit values for the cosmological parameters using the Pantheon and BAO samples and their combination.
for simplicity in the notation from now on we will write \( c^2 \) instead \( c^2(0) \). By implementing a similar method as the discussed for Model I, we can write the interaction \( Q \)-term as follows

\[
\frac{Q(z)}{9(1 - c^2(z))H_0^3E^3(z)} = 1 - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1 + z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \left( \frac{3 - 2c^2(z)}{3(1 - c^2(z))} \right) - \left( 1 + \frac{\omega_{de}(z)}{1 + r(z)} \right) \times \\
\times \left[ 1 - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1 + z}{E(z)} \right)^2 \right] + c^2(z) \left( \frac{1 + z}{3(1 - c^2(z))} \right) \frac{d \ln c^2(z)}{dz}, \tag{22}
\]

in this case the normalized Hubble parameter is a generalization of the one obtained for Model I given in Eq. \( (8) \)

\[
E^2(z) = -\frac{\Omega_k(0)(1 + z)^2}{c^2(z)(r(z) - r_c(z))}, \quad \text{being} \quad r_c(z) := \frac{1 - c^2(z)}{c^2(z)}, \tag{23}
\]
for a finite value of the redshift, $z_s$, we have again a divergent behavior for $E(z)$, i.e., $r(z_s) = r_c(z_s)$, from the condition, $r(z_s) - r_c(z_s) = 0$, and the CPL parametrization \cite{9} for $r(z)$, we can obtain a cubic equation for $z_s$; then we can expect one real solution for the redshift value $z_s$, which results to be $z_s = -0.569795$. Finally, as expected, the interaction $Q$-term is also divergent since depends on the normalized Hubble parameter, similarly as done for Model I with the use of Friedmann constraint and the continuity equations for the energy densities, the Eq. \cite{22} can be re-written as follows after some lengthy but straightforward manipulations

$$Q(z) = 3H_0^2E^3(z) \left[ 1 - c^2(z) + 2(1 - \beta_1) - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 - (1 + z)(1 - c^2(z)) \left( \ln E^2(z) \right)' \right],$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

for simplicity in the notation we do not write explicitly the derivative of the normalized Hubble parameter appearing in the above equation. Note that as in Model I, the interaction term can be written as a function of the deceleration parameter

$$Q(z) = 3H_0^2E^3(z) \left[ 1 - c^2(z) + 2(1 - \beta_1) - \Omega_k(0) \left( \frac{1+z}{E(z)} \right)^2 - 2(1 + q(z))(1 - c^2(z)) \right],$$ \hspace{1cm} (25)

therefore the consideration of the interacting scheme for the dark sector could lead to an appropriated description of the observable Universe under the convenient election of the cosmological parameters values. For the Model II case we use Eq. \cite{23} to test it
against observations. Using the same samples of data we obtain the best fit values of the cosmological parameters as shown in Table II. The summary of the posterior probabilities are shown in Fig. (3).

In Fig. (4) the interaction $Q$-term for Model II is shown. Note that as in the Model I, this interaction term is positive. Using the best fit values for the cosmological parameters it is found that Model II exhibits a future divergence at $z = -0.569795$. It is worthy to mention that for both holographic models the interaction terms are positive, this means that no phase transitions are expected for this kind of interacting model, in general, changes in the sign of the $Q$-term induce variations in the value of heat capacities of the cosmic components, see for instance [36]. It is worthy to mention that according to the results obtained from the statistical analysis for both holographic models, we can observe that a negative curvature density parameter, $\Omega_{k,0}$, is favored by the observations used in this study. Given the definition of $\Omega_{k,0}$ this implies a positive parameter $k$, which corresponds to a closed Universe, in Ref. [37] it was found that a closed Universe could provide a physical explanation for the presence of an enhanced lensing amplitude in the CMB power spectra in the latest Planck results. Other relevant work is given in Ref. [38], where with an independent data analysis was obtained that a closed Universe seems favored over open one.

We end this section with some comments about the coincidence parameter for both holographic models. From the Eq. (10) we can write for Model I

$$r(0) = r_c - \frac{z_s\epsilon_0}{1+z_s},$$

(26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pantheon</th>
<th>BAO</th>
<th>Pantheon+BAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.5832$^{+0.1955}_{-0.1290}$</td>
<td>0.7798$^{+0.0828}_{-0.1888}$</td>
<td>0.6720$^{+0.0100}_{-0.0120}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^2$</td>
<td>0.5065$^{+0.0071}_{-0.0044}$</td>
<td>0.7384$^{+0.1565}_{-0.1486}$</td>
<td>0.5027$^{+0.0006}_{-0.0027}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_0$</td>
<td>0.2044$^{+0.1462}_{-0.1168}$</td>
<td>0.4904$^{+0.3358}_{-0.3276}$</td>
<td>0.1910$^{+0.0690}_{-0.0690}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>0.4938$^{+0.0042}_{-0.0066}$</td>
<td>0.2516$^{+0.1620}_{-0.1606}$</td>
<td>0.4973$^{+0.0027}_{-0.0005}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Omega_{k,0}$</td>
<td>$-0.2404^{+0.0772}_{-0.0298}$</td>
<td>$-0.0705^{+0.0275}_{-0.0461}$</td>
<td>$-0.1360^{+0.0210}_{-0.0210}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Adjusted values for the cosmological parameters of Model II.
then, from the definition given in (8) for $r_c$ and the best fit values for each parameter of the model given in Table (I) for the combination Pantheon and BAO we can obtain, $r(0) \approx 1.5$. For Model II we can also obtain the value for the coincidence parameter at present time but now from Eq. (23), yielding

$$r(0) = -1 + \frac{1 - \Omega_k(0)}{c^2}. \quad (27)$$

If we again consider the best fit values obtained from the joint data Pantheon-BAO, we obtain, $r(0) \approx 1.2$, note that this estimation is closer to the unity than the one obtained for Model I. As stated in Ref. [39], for the current stage of the Universe observations reveal that we live in very special conditions since the energy densities for dark matter and dark energy
FIG. 4: Interaction term obtained from the holographic Model II with a generalized parameter $c(z)$.

are almost of the same order despite the cosmic evolution can be divided into different epochs with different components domination. Several proposals to solve this cosmological problem can be found in the literature. For instance, the consideration of dynamical dark energy [40] and other modifications for the ΛCDM model [41]. In Ref. [42] it is established that for any interacting holographic dark energy model, a variable behavior for the coincidence parameter is obtained only by the consideration of a generalized holographic description, i.e., instead a constant we can consider a function of time or redshift for the parameter, $c$, appearing in the holographic formula. As can be seen from the results for Models I and II, this interacting scenario could alleviate the cosmological coincidence problem but does not solve it completely.

B. Massive neutrinos

The neutrino flavour oscillations provide strong evidence of non-null masses for these particles, this fact is also considered as one of the proofs for physics beyond the standard model of particles. However, despite their very small masses they have a non-negligible contribution to the total cosmological density at low redshifts playing a relevant role on the formation of large scale structures [43]. The avoidance of clustering of matter inhomogeneities could also
be due to the neutrino presence. As can be found in the literature, if the sum of the neutrino masses could exceed some well established bounds, then their imprints could be detected in some cosmological observables [44]. In this section we explore the inclusion of massive neutrinos in the interacting scenario with spatial curvature, massive neutrinos are excellent candidates for contributing to the dark matter density. If we consider the holographic Model I, the cosmological parameters of the model can be restricted as performed in the previous sections with the use of data. In table [III] we summarize the results obtained for Model I, the summary of the posterior probabilities are shown in Fig. [5].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pantheon</th>
<th>BAO</th>
<th>Pantheon+BAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.6645±0.1572</td>
<td>0.6584±0.1535</td>
<td>0.6683±0.1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^2$</td>
<td>0.5115±0.3070</td>
<td>0.4816±0.3330</td>
<td>0.4731±0.3176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_0$</td>
<td>0.5045±0.3084</td>
<td>0.4847±0.3327</td>
<td>0.4760±0.3138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_s$</td>
<td>-0.5069±0.0498</td>
<td>-0.4552±0.2958</td>
<td>-0.5161±0.0599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Omega_k(0)$</td>
<td>-0.0769±0.0183</td>
<td>-0.0824±0.0069</td>
<td>-0.0718±0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum m_\nu$ [eV]</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1974</td>
<td>&lt; 0.8559</td>
<td>&lt; 0.3993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: Best fit values for the cosmological parameters of Model I considering massive neutrinos.

For Model II the best fit values obtained are shown in table [IV] and the probabilities in Fig. [6]. As can be seen for both models, the use of Pantheon and BAO data sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Pantheon</th>
<th>BAO</th>
<th>Pantheon+BAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.7121±0.1230</td>
<td>0.7208±0.1314</td>
<td>0.6953±0.0451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^2$</td>
<td>0.5048±0.0034</td>
<td>0.7344±0.1677</td>
<td>0.5060±0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_0$</td>
<td>0.1370±0.0827</td>
<td>0.4760±0.3221</td>
<td>0.1841±0.1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>0.4953±0.0033</td>
<td>0.2768±0.1423</td>
<td>0.4943±0.0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Omega_k(0)$</td>
<td>-0.1788±0.0320</td>
<td>-0.1433±0.0285</td>
<td>-0.2381±0.0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum m_\nu$ [eV]</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5525</td>
<td>&lt; 0.3871</td>
<td>&lt; 0.8150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV: Best fit values for the cosmological parameters of Model II including massive neutrinos.
and their combination lead to bounds on the sum of neutrino masses that do not show clearly a preference for a given mass hierarchy. For normal masses ordering it is found that $\sum m_\nu \geq 0.06$ eV and for the inverted order we must have $\sum m_\nu \geq 0.1$ eV. The results obtained for the sum of neutrino masses with this holographic approach are consistent with the bounds found with the consideration of the $\Lambda$CDM model using Planck (CMB) data where $\sum m_\nu < 0.72$ (0.59) eV or $\sum m_\nu < 0.8$ eV coming from the combination of the Lyman-$\alpha$ power spectrum, the XQ-100 quasars and high-resolution HIRES/MIKE spectrographs, in Refs. [45, 46] can be found a complete panorama on the bounds found for the sum of

FIG. 5: Confidence contours for $1\sigma$, $2\sigma$ and $3\sigma$ for Model I and massive neutrinos (characterized by $\Omega_n$) in parameter space using all data.
neutrino masses coming from cosmology. Some of the values obtained for \( \sum m_\nu \) are close to the values reported in Ref. [28]. We must also comment the impact of the inclusion of neutrinos on the value of \( h \), if we compare the values obtained for \( h \) in this section with the results of the previous section for Model I and Model II, we can observe variations of this value. This latter result is also consistent, variations on the neutrino masses values affects the cosmic expansion rate, see for instance [47].

**FIG. 6:** Confidence contours for 1\( \sigma \), 2\( \sigma \) and 3\( \sigma \) for Model II and massive neutrinos (characterized by \( \Omega_n \)) in parameter space using Pantheon plus BAO data.
III. THERMODYNAMICS OF THE INTERACTING SCENARIO

In this section we show some thermodynamics results for both holographic models within the interacting scenario. In standard cosmology, for a perfect fluid we have the following temperature evolution equation

\[ \frac{\dot{T}}{T} = -3H \left( \frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho} \right)_n. \]  

(28)

The previous equation is valid always that the Gibbs integrability condition holds together with the number \( n \) and energy conservation. However, as can be seen the constant temperature approach of standard thermodynamics is no longer available, i.e., the global equilibrium condition, \( \dot{T} = 0 \), is not satisfied [48]. If we consider a barotropic equation of state in the temperature evolution (28) we can write

\[ \int d \ln T = 3 \int \frac{\omega(z)}{1+z} \, dz \Rightarrow T(z) = T(0) \exp \left( 3 \int \frac{\omega(z)}{1+z} \, dz \right), \]  

(29)

where \( T(0) \) is an integration constant. Following the line of reasoning of Ref. [49], we adopt the effective temperatures method; the expressions (2) and (3) can be written conveniently as follows

\[ \rho_m' - 3 \left( \frac{1 + \omega_{\text{eff},m}}{1 + z} \right) \rho_m = 0, \]  

(30)

\[ \rho_{\text{de}}' - 3 \left( \frac{1 + \omega_{\text{eff},\text{de}}}{1 + z} \right) \rho_{\text{de}} = 0, \]  

(31)

where the effective parameters are given as

\[ \omega_{\text{eff},m} = -\frac{Q}{3 \rho_m H_0 E(z)}, \]  

(32)

\[ \omega_{\text{eff},\text{de}} = \omega_{\text{de}} + \frac{Q}{3 \rho_{\text{de}} H_0 E(z)}. \]  

(33)

Therefore, using the Eq. (29) we can calculate the temperature for the dark energy and dark matter components, yielding

\[ T_m(z) = T_m(0) \exp \left[ \int_0^z \frac{Q}{\rho_m H_0 E(x)} \frac{dx}{1+x} \right], \]  

(34)

\[ T_{\text{de}}(z) = T_{\text{de}}(0) \exp \left[ 3 \int_0^z \left( \omega_{\text{de}} + \frac{Q}{3 \rho_{\text{de}} H_0 E(x)} \right) \frac{dx}{1+x} \right]. \]  

(35)

As can be seen from equation (4), the parameter state depends on the cosmological redshift, for the Model I we can obtain the explicit expression for this parameter state by means of
the Eqs. (4), (11) and the definition given above for the $\theta(z)$ function, yielding

$$\omega_{de}(z) = (1 + r(z)) \left\{ -1 + \frac{2 - \eta \theta(z)(\theta(z) - 3)}{3[1 + \eta \theta(z)]} \right\}. \tag{36}$$

Notice that for the Model I some cosmological quantities such as the parameter state for dark energy and the interaction term can be written in terms of the $\theta(z)$ function, therefore it is convenient to change the variable of integration, $z \rightarrow \theta(z)$, in Eqs. (34) and (35), then

$$T_m(z) = T_m(0) \exp \left[ \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta(z)} \left( - \frac{Q}{\rho_m H_0 E(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{\theta(1 - \theta)} \right) \right], \tag{37}$$

$$T_{de}(z) = T_{de}(0) \exp \left[ 3 \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta(z)} \left( \omega_{de}(\theta) + \frac{Q}{3\rho_{de} H_0 E(\theta)} \right) \frac{d\theta}{\theta(1 - \theta)} \right], \tag{38}$$

where $\theta_0$ means evaluation at present time, i.e., $\theta_0 := \theta(z = 0)$. Using the Eqs. (11), (12) and (36) in the expressions (37) and (38), one gets

$$T_m(z) = T_m(0) \left( \frac{\theta_0}{\theta(z)} \right) \left\{ \frac{1 - \theta(z)}{1 - \theta_0} \left[ 1 + \eta(1 - c^2)\theta(z) \right] \right\}, \tag{39}$$

$$T_{de}(z) = T_{de}(0) \left( \frac{1 - \theta(z)}{1 - \theta_0} \right). \tag{40}$$

In Fig. (7) we show the behavior of the quotient $T_i(z)/T_i(0)$ for each component given in Eqs. (39) and (40) by considering the constrained values for the parameters of the model from the data combination Pantheon + BAO. As shown in the plots, both temperatures are positive and exhibit a growing behavior. Given the singular nature of the cosmological model both temperatures diverge at $z_s$. However, at the past the dark matter temperature is slightly higher than dark energy temperature but for a future evolution before the singularity takes place (not shown in the plots) the situation is inverted, the dark energy temperature is higher than dark matter temperature; having a higher temperature for dark energy component than dark matter one becomes relevant if we demand the fulfillment of the second law of thermodynamics, i.e, a positive growth of the entropy, $S$, we will discuss this below briefly. As far as we know, this thermodynamics requirement is also guaranteed for the Universe at large scales [50]. It is worthy to mention that the behavior exhibited by the temperatures could change in dependence of the choice for their initial values; we must have in mind the following conditions, $T_m(0) = T_{de}(0)$, we can also consider, $T_m(0) > T_{de}(0)$ and $T_m(0) < T_{de}(0)$, since at this moment no definite results coming from cosmological observations with respect to these initial temperatures can be found. For the Model II we
can also implement the previous procedure but in this case we do not use the change of variable $z \rightarrow \theta(z)$ in Eqs. (34) and (35). By constructing the parameter state for dark energy from Eq. (4) and using (24) together with the energy densities for the dark sector we can obtain

$$T_m(z) = T_m(0) \left[ \alpha_1^2 + \frac{(1 + z)^2}{\alpha_1^2 + 1} \right] \frac{\alpha_1^2 \alpha_2 (1 - \beta_1)}{\beta_1 r_0(\alpha_2^2 + \alpha_2^2 - 1)^2} \left( \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2 + z} \right) \frac{2 \alpha_1^2 \alpha_2 (1 - \beta_1)}{\beta_1 r_0(\alpha_2^2 + \alpha_2^2 - 1)^2} \times \exp \left\{ \int_0^z \frac{E^2(x)}{E^2(x) - f(x)} \frac{d \ln E^2(x)}{dx} dx - 2 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 (\alpha_2 - 1)(1 - \beta_1) \frac{\beta_1 r_0(\alpha_2^2 + \alpha_2^2 - 1)^2}{\Theta(z)} \right\},$$

(41)

$$T_{de}(z) = \frac{T_{de}(0)(1 + z)^3}{c^2} \left( \frac{c(z)}{c} \right)^2 E^2(z),$$

(42)

where we have defined the following quantities for simplicity, $\alpha_1^2 = \frac{\beta_1}{c^2 - \beta_1}$ and $\alpha_2 = \frac{r(0)}{r(0) + \epsilon_0}$, and the functions

$$f(z) := \frac{\Omega_k(z)}{1 - c^2(z)},$$

(43)

$$\Theta(z) := \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1 + z}{\alpha_1} \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \right).$$

(44)

The behavior obtained for the temperatures (41) and (42) is shown in Fig. (8), the positivity of both temperatures is kept along the cosmic expansion. Similarly to Model I, at the past the value for dark matter temperature is higher than the dark energy one, but again, for a future evolution of the cosmic expansion the dark energy temperature becomes
higher than dark matter one, notice that in this case the temperatures for dark matter and dark energy are almost indistinguishable. In agreement with the singular nature exhibited by the interaction $Q$-term [24], both temperatures diverge around $z \approx -0.56$, we do not show their singular nature in the plot.

![Graph showing the temperatures for dark matter and dark energy obtained from Model II. The solid line represents $T_m(z)/T_m(0)$ and the dot-dashed line $T_{de}(z)/T_{de}(0)$.

FIG. 8: Temperatures for dark matter and dark energy obtained from Model II. The solid line represents $T_m(z)/T_m(0)$ and the dot-dashed line $T_{de}(z)/T_{de}(0)$.

In terms of the redshift, the condition $dS/dt > 0$ takes the form $dS/dz < 0$. Then, as discussed in Ref. [49], from the second law we have

$$TdS = d(\rho V) + pdV,$$

being $V$ the Hubble volume defined as $V(z) = V_0(a/a_0)^3 = V_0(1 + z)^{-3}$, in this case the quantity $\rho V$ denotes the internal energy. By means of a barotropic equation of state and Eqs. (2), (3) in the above equation, we can write for each component of the dark sector

$$- \frac{T_m}{V} \frac{dS_m}{dz} = \frac{Q}{H_0 E(z)(1 + z)} = \frac{T_{de}}{V} \frac{dS_{de}}{dz},$$

then the entropy associated to each component is not constant, the adiabatic ($S = \text{constant}$) cosmic evolution is recovered for null interaction, $Q = 0$. From Eq. (46) one gets the following condition

$$T_m dS_m + T_{de} dS_{de} = 0,$$
which leads to
\[
\frac{d}{dz}(S_m + S_{de}) = -\left(-1 + \frac{T_{de}}{T_m}\right) \frac{dS_{de}}{dz}.
\] (48)

Thus, Eq. (46) indicates that \(dS_{de}/dz > 0\) always that \(Q > 0\), this latter condition for the interaction term is satisfied by both holographic models as can be seen in Figs. (2) and (4), in consequence the second law is satisfied by the total entropy only if \(T_{de} > T_m\); we also have that \(S_m + S_{de} \neq \text{constant}\). From the thermodynamics point of view, this scenario seems to be more consistent than the ΛCDM model, where the cosmic evolution is described by an adiabatic process, i.e., constant entropy (reversible thermodynamics). We can also observe that the second law of thermodynamics is not guaranteed at the past in this framework for both holographic models but its validity is fulfilled at the future cosmic evolution. To end this section we comment some possible differences between the single fluid description and these interacting scenarios. For a dark energy fluid with constant parameter state, \(\omega\), we have

\[
\rho_{de}(z) = \rho(0)(1 + z)^{3(1+\omega)},
\] (49)

then, from Eq. (29) we can obtain its temperature straightforwardly as follows

\[
T(z) = T(0)(1 + z)^{3\omega}.
\] (50)

The quotient between the energy density for dark energy and its temperature takes the form

\[
\frac{\rho_{de}(z)}{T(z)} = \frac{\rho(0)}{T(0)}(1 + z)^3,
\] (51)

which is independent of the parameter state, \(\omega\). At present time the above quotient is simply a constant value, \(\rho(0)/T(0)\) and at the far future, \(z \to -1\), this quotient tends to zero. If we consider the holographic cut (5) of Model I for dark energy and the temperature (40), we can observe that in this scenario the quotient between the energy density and temperature tends to zero as \(z \to -1\) and takes the constant value at present time. On the other hand, if we construct the corresponding quotient to Model II by means of Eqs. (21) and (42), we have, \((3c^2H_0^2/T_{de}(0))(1 + z)^3\). Therefore, for this specific quotient, both holographic models coincide with the single fluid description.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work we explored some cosmological implications coming from two holographic descriptions for dark energy within the interacting scenario for the dark sector with the
inclusion of spatial curvature. We focused on two models for the characteristic length: (1) the usual holographic formula proposed by Li with a constant parameter penned as \( c \) and (2) an holographic cut inspired in the apparent horizon which was proposed earlier by some of the authors in the context of non interacting fluids. This latter holographic model can be thought as a generalization of the Li model by considering a function \( c(z) \) instead a constant parameter \( c \). An interesting feature of both models is that no Ansatz is needed in order to write explicitly the interaction \( Q \)-term as is usually done in the literature, this term can be constructed in both cases due to the presence of the spatial curvature and by the consideration of the CPL parametrization for the coincidence parameter; the flat Universe case can not be considered in this description. Other relevant feature of this setup is the presence of a future singularity in both models, leading to an over accelerated cosmic expansion. As revealed from the background dynamics, the interaction term has a direct incidence on the cosmic evolution for this kind of Universe since it is related to the deceleration parameter, \( q(z) \); for null interaction the deceleration parameter takes its usual form.

We performed an statistical analysis for both holographic models using recent cosmological data sets and we also considered their combination. Without exception, in all cases a closed Universe is favored by the observations, this is in agreement with other reported results. We also considered the inclusion of massive neutrinos in the model in order to establish some bounds on the sum of their masses. From our results it is not possible to distinguish if there is a preference for normal/inverted mass ordering. However, the bounds obtained in our analysis are close to other results coming from cosmology. The hierarchy of masses for the neutrino is one of the pending issues of the standard model of particles. As found in the literature, we expect that improved future cosmological observations could shed some light on this subject. A relevant consequence obtained from the inclusion of massive neutrinos in this description is the alteration of the expansion rate in both holographic models. It is worthy to mention that in general the values obtained in this work for the expansion rate lie within the Planck and SH0ES collaborations results. As discussed in Ref. [51], the holographic dark energy approach could provide a good scenario to alleviate the \( H_0 \) tension, however this implies abandoning the idea of a constant value for \( H_0 \). This is due to the presence of a turning point in the normalized Hubble parameter, i.e.,
at the past we can observe a decreasing behavior as the \( \Lambda \)CDM model but at some value of the redshift we observe that starts to increase, this characteristic of the \( E(z) \) function can induce changes in the value of \( H_0 \). In fact, the value for \( H_0 \) could also change if the turning point exists at the past or in the future evolution, being more consistent a holographic model with a turning point at the past. We must mention that in this interacting approach for holographic dark energy given by models I and II, such turning point exists in \( E(z) \) for each case. Therefore, as stated in [51], in order to give a final response about the \( H_0 \) tension in the holographic approach, we depend on better quality data for higher redshifts coming from future experiments.

At thermodynamics level, the temperatures for the fluids of the dark sector were computed by means of the effective method. Using the best fit values for the cosmological parameters of Models I and II, it was found that temperatures are well defined and exhibit a growing behavior from the past to the future. Some comments are in order: for Model I the temperatures for dark matter and dark energy can be distinguished easily and at the past the dark matter temperature is higher than dark energy one. For future cosmic evolution the dark energy temperature becomes higher than dark matter one. On the other hand, for Model II the value of the temperatures for the dark sector are almost the same, being again the dark energy temperature greater than dark matter one only in the future evolution. Given that in both scenarios the temperatures are of the same order of magnitude, we have a consistent description from the thermodynamics point of view since we could consider such temperatures very small with respect to the CMB temperature, making them hard to detect. Finally, given that we are in the context of interacting fluids, the cosmic expansion it is not adiabatic, i.e., the entropy has a varying behavior. We explored the condition for which the second law is fulfilled, as discussed previously the second law is achieved if \( T_{\text{de}}(z) > T_{\text{m}}(z) \) and \( Q(z) > 0 \), as shown in the text, both holographic models obey the latter condition for the interaction term.

Finally we would like to comment that this interacting scenario could alleviate the cosmological coincidence problem in both holographic models but does not solve it if we take into account the best fit values for the cosmological parameters obtained from the statistical analysis. The consideration of other holographic cuts could provide a physical explanation
for this problem. We leave this as an open subject for future exploration.
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