

# A Unified Cosmological Dark Sector from a Bose-Einstein Condensate

Saurya Das\*

*Theoretical Physics Group and Quantum Alberta, Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
University of Lethbridge, 4401 University Drive, Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4, Canada*

Sourav Sur†

*Department of Physics and Astrophysics  
University of Delhi, New Delhi - 110007, India*

## Abstract

We examine the viability of cosmological solution(s) describing a unified picture of the dark side of the universe from a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) of light bosons. The energy density of the BEC, together with its quantum potential, can indeed account for such a unification, in the sense that the (dust-like) cold dark matter and the dark energy components emerge from the same source. In particular, the bulk of the dark energy can be attributed to the quantum potential, in the quantum corrected Raychaudhuri-Friedmann equation, when the ‘macroscopic’ BEC wave-function is taken to be such that the corresponding probability density is construed as the energy density of the dusty fluid. However, there arises a purely quantum mechanical back-reaction effect, of even the visible baryons, on the effective dark energy and dark matter contents, which crucially determines the mass of the BEC. We determine the constraint on such a back-reaction, and hence on the BEC mass, from physical considerations, as well as estimate the same using recent observational data.

*Keywords:* Bose-Einstein condensate, dark energy, cold dark matter, cosmology of theories beyond the SM, quantum Raychaudhuri equation.

---

\*email: saurya.das@uleth.ca ; saurya.das@gmail.com

†email: sourav@physics.du.ac.in ; sourav.sur@gmail.com

# 1 Introduction

Despite numerous proposals and constructive efforts, a general consensus on the origin and structure of the cosmic *dark energy* (DE) and the *dark matter* (DM) remains elusive till date [1–6]. While a certain degree of skepticism persists on the adequacy of General Relativity (GR) in this respect, wide attention is being drawn by the cosmological scenarios emerging not only from the classical formulations of alternative or modified gravity theories [7–13], but also from inherently quantum or semi-classical perspectives [14–24]. Of course, the quantum effects on the standard cosmological picture are usually expected to have significance only in the very early universe, or in the spectrum of the density perturbations. However, certain approaches do point to their direct influence on the background (or homogeneous) level cosmic evolution even at the late-time or low red-shift regimes ( $z \lesssim 2$ ) [25–28].

While, observationally, the DE is strongly favoured to be closely akin to a cosmological constant  $\Lambda$ , it is also indicated that the corresponding energy density is comparable to that of a mostly cold and non-relativistic DM, at (and near) the present epoch. As such, there arises the perplexing issue of *cosmic coincidence* with the ensuing idealized model,  $\Lambda$ CDM, since the DE density (or  $\Lambda$ ) remains subdued, in comparison to the cold dark matter (CDM) density, for almost over the entire expansion history of the universe. Even the identification of  $\Lambda$ CDM as being just a limiting case of a *dynamical* DE model, involving say, the scalar field(s) such as quintessence or k-essence [29–37], is not enough to alleviate this problem, unless the DE and CDM components happen to be mutually interacting [38–40]. However, given the general characteristic difference of these components, it is often difficult to find clear physical justifications of such interactions, unless they arise naturally, for e.g., via conformal transformations in certain scalar-tensor equivalent modified gravity formulations [41–50].

A rather attractive proposition is of a *unified* cosmic dark sector, i.e. of the same fundamental origin of the DE, the CDM, and possible interaction(s) thereof. The redundancy of the coincidence problem is then obvious, however, with the DE and the CDM being reduced to mere structural artefacts of a *dark fluid*, within the standard paradigm of Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) cosmology. To be more precise, the unified dark sector may be thought of as being described by the dark fluid, composed of a pressure-free (*dust*-like) part, considered as the effective CDM, and a left-over, considered as the effective DE. If we assume, for simplicity, the energy-momentum conservation for the visible matter content of the universe, then so would be for the dark fluid, although the effective CDM and DE components of this fluid may be interacting. While such a system is shown to have a plausible realization from certain classical gravitational standpoints [51–58], our objective in this paper is to see the implications of its inherently quantum (or semi-classical) description sought from the point of view of considering it to be due entirely

to a *Bose-Einstein condensate* (BEC) of light bosons extending across cosmological length scales. Specifically, we intend to have a closer insight into the dark fluid picture that emerges from the BEC cosmological formalism developed in a series of earlier papers [25–28], by obtaining a solution of the corresponding evolution equations as general as possible, in an attempt to constrain the BEC mass parameter  $m$ , directly and robustly, using the observational data.

The BEC cosmological formalism, under consideration, essentially deals with a quantum correction to the Raychaudhuri-Friedmann equation, due to the bosons in the BEC being treated as quantum particles [59], which follow the Bohmian (quantal) trajectories, as a consequence of getting associated with a *quantum potential*  $U_Q$  [60–62]. Such a potential is derived from the amplitude of a generic wave-function  $\Psi$ , which may conveniently be chosen in a well-motivated Gaussian form (with a time-varying multiplicative factor), as in the earlier works [25–28]. A large enough spread of the Gaussian (close to  $H_0^{-1}$ , where  $H_0$  is the Hubble constant) then implies that  $\Psi$  is a ‘macroscopic’ wave-function describing the BEC, which extends over such a large length scale. Together with the corresponding probability density  $|\Psi|^2$ , perceived as the BEC energy density  $\rho^{(B)}$  in a semi-classical approach, the quantum potential  $U_Q$  consequently describes the evolution of the dark fluid.

Note that there is *a priori* no reason to assume the energy density and pressure of the dark fluid to be due entirely to  $\rho^{(B)}$  and  $U_Q$  respectively. In fact, the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  cannot account for the total effective CDM density, as the entire bulk of physical constituents of the universe (including even the visible baryons) back-reacts on the metric structure of space-time, by virtue of the quantum corrected Raychaudhuri-Friedmann equation. We have demonstrated this in a preceding work [28], by referring specifically to  $\Lambda$ CDM, which is shown to be an exact solution of the BEC cosmological equations. It has also been argued therein, from certain physical considerations, that such a *quantum back-reaction* (QB) is very *mild*, and more interestingly, its magnitude (measured by some parameter  $\varepsilon$ ) is roughly proportional to the inverse of the BEC mass  $m$ . Therefore, the lower the value of  $\varepsilon$ , the more is the enhancement of  $m$  from the corresponding Hubble value  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV. However,  $\varepsilon$  cannot vanish altogether, because then  $m$  would blow up. Thus, no matter how mild the QB is, it can always be regarded as an effect of significance from the point of view of obtaining a lower bound on the mass ratio  $m/m_H$ . For instance, considering  $\rho_0^{(B)} < \rho_0^{(m)}$ , i.e. the BEC density is less than the total effective matter density at the present epoch  $t = t_0$ , it has been shown in ref. [28] that  $\varepsilon < 0.136$ , using the Planck 2018 best fit cosmological parametric estimations for  $\Lambda$ CDM [63]. This in turn implies  $m > 2.182 m_H$ , if one uses the corresponding best fit value of the DE density parameter at the present epoch, viz.  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} = 0.6889$ .

Nevertheless, such a bound seems too loose to imply anything conclusively. For instance, it is loose enough compared to the typical observational mass limit  $m \gtrsim 10^{-24}$  eV predicted for suppressing small scale structures of commonly known ultralight bosonic DM candidates, such as

*axions* [64–71]. Now,  $m \gtrsim 10^{-24}$  eV corresponds to  $\varepsilon \lesssim 10^{-8}$ , meaning that the QB is negligible enough to leave the BEC density accounting for the effective CDM density in entirety. However, such a comparison (of the bounds) may not be quite justified here, since the scenario being still a unified one (regardless of the value of  $\varepsilon$ ), the BEC cannot be responsible for only the CDM, unlike what considered mostly in the literature [72–93] (see also [94, 95]). Besides, one cannot infer with any conviction that an enormously weak QB, or (and) the  $\Lambda$ CDM solution is (are) the only one(s) plausible in this formalism. After all, note that the bound  $\varepsilon < 0.136$ , obtained from just a physical consideration, and using merely the Planck 2018 best fit parametric estimates for  $\Lambda$ CDM, is so loose that it even allows a BEC mass as low as  $10^{-31}$  eV or so, which typically corresponds to that of a scalar field DE candidate. It is therefore imperative to look for a more robust and tighter bound on  $\varepsilon$ , by estimating this parameter directly from the observational results, and that too for a solution of the BEC cosmological equations as general as possible.

At least, a solution more general than  $\Lambda$ CDM is required, in order that the corresponding expression for the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$  explicitly involves the parameter  $\varepsilon$ , thereby enabling one to make a statistical estimation of the latter, using the commonly considered Pantheon Supernovae type-Ia (SN-Ia) and the observational Hubble data. [96–101]. The determination of such a solution is nonetheless a hard proposition, given the highly complicated form of the quantum potential  $U_\varrho$  thus encountered. However, the strong observational concordance on  $\Lambda$ CDM makes one expect that any deviation from it, which implies a dynamical evolution of the effective DE component, is mild enough (in the sense that the cosmological parametric estimates do not breach the corresponding error margins for  $\Lambda$ CDM up to  $1\sigma$  or  $2\sigma$  at most). It therefore suffices to attempt for a solution which may an approximated one, but generalizes the exact  $\Lambda$ CDM solution of the BEC cosmological equations to a certain extent. In fact, one may exploit the smallness of  $\varepsilon$  to obtain an approximated solution more general than  $\Lambda$ CDM, by resorting to a rather simplified expression for  $U_\varrho$  that retains terms up to say, linear in  $\varepsilon$ . Such a solution would, by construction, imply  $H(z)$  explicitly involving  $\varepsilon$ , and hence the latter can be constrained directly from the Pantheon and the Hubble observations.

Let us briefly outline the organization of this paper. We begin the section 2 contemplating on a general cosmological formulation with a BEC of ultralight bosons in the standard spatially flat FRW framework. Supposing the BEC to extend over the cosmological length scale, we look for a plausible semi-classical picture in subsection 2.1, with a prior objective of examining the natural emergence of a unified cosmic dark sector. While the latter can conveniently be described by an evolving dark fluid, mentioned above, we endeavour to pinpoint the criteria and assertions that are essential for its realization, in subsection 2.2. As we are primarily interested in studying the late-time cosmic evolution in this paper, we assume (for brevity) the visible matter content of the universe to be entirely in the form of a *dust* (of baryons). Accordingly, our course in section 3 is

set as follows:

- (a) working out the corresponding evolution equations in subsection 3.1,
- (b) discussing the general aspects of the exact  $\Lambda$ CDM solution of these equations in subsection 3.2,
- (c) realizing the quantum back-reaction (QB) and its significance in subsection 3.3, and
- (d) deriving a rather general solution analytically in subsection 3.4, by approximating the quantum potential  $U_Q$  associated with the BEC, up to the leading order in the QB parameter  $\varepsilon$ .

While such a solution makes it suitable for us to carry out the statistical parametric estimation using the SN-Ia and the observational  $H(z)$  data, we have the objective of figuring out, in section 4, the extent to which the scenario deviates from  $\Lambda$ CDM and the BEC mass  $m$  gets enhanced from its Hubble value  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV, up to  $1\sigma$ . This leaves us with making the concluding remarks in section 5, in addition to pointing out some open issues and possible directions of future work.

*Conventions and notations:* Everywhere, we use metric signature  $(-, +, +, +)$ , natural units (with the speed of light  $c = 1$ ), and denote the metric determinant by  $g$ , the gravitational coupling factor by  $\kappa = \sqrt{8\pi G}$  (where  $G$  is the Newton's constant), and the values of all the parameters and functions at the present epoch by affixing a subscript 0.

## 2 Cosmology with a BEC: the General Formalism

Let us resort to the formal aspects of the standard (homogeneous and isotropic) FRW cosmology, by first referring to the usual perfect fluid description, in terms of the fluid velocity  $u^\alpha$ , the energy density  $\rho$  and pressure  $p$ . In principle, this may be realized by a collection of perfect fluids as well, in which case their individual energy densities and pressures would sum up to give  $\rho$  and  $p$  respectively. The classical general relativistic principles imply that the cosmic evolution is governed by the Friedmann equations, which, under the assumption of spatial flatness, read as

$$H^2(t) = \frac{\kappa^2}{3} \rho(t) , \tag{2.1}$$

$$\dot{H}(t) + H^2(t) = -\frac{\kappa^2}{6} [\rho(t) + 3p(t)] , \tag{2.2}$$

where  $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$ , and  $H(t) = \dot{a}(t)/a(t)$  is the Hubble parameter, with  $a(t)$  being the FRW scale factor, and the overhead dot  $\{\cdot\}$  denoting derivative with respect to the cosmic time  $t$ .

Nevertheless, what would happen when a constituent fluid is inherently quantum in nature, say for e.g. a condensate of bosonic particles (i.e. a BEC) of rest mass  $m$ ? The answer to this could be revealed from the explicit computation of the quantum corrections to the Raychaudhuri equation

carried out by one of us (SD) in an earlier work [59], by considering the Bohmian (quantal) particle trajectories [60–62], which are relevant in this case, in lieu of classical geodesics, as the bosons in the BEC are themselves quantum particles. In particular, taking the ‘quantum’ fluid (or the BEC) wave-function in the generic form

$$\Psi(\vec{x}, t) = \mathcal{R}(\vec{x}, t) e^{iS(\vec{x}, t)}, \quad \text{with } \mathcal{R}, S \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

the modified (or, quantum corrected) Raychaudhuri equation, describing the flow of the quantal trajectories parametrized by an affine parameter  $\lambda$ , is shown to be

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\lambda} = -\frac{\theta^2}{3} - R_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu + \frac{\hbar^2}{m^2} h^{\mu\nu} \left( \frac{\square\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{R}} \right)_{;\mu;\nu}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $R_{\mu\nu}$  is the Ricci tensor,  $\square\mathcal{R} \equiv \mathcal{R}^{\alpha}_{;\alpha}$ , and  $\theta = h^{\mu\nu}u_{\mu;\nu}$  is the expansion scalar, with  $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + u_\mu u_\nu$  denoting the induced metric (or the projection tensor onto the hyperplanes orthogonal to  $u^\mu$ ). Of course, the shear and vorticity terms are ignored here, as they have no relevance to the homogeneous-isotropic cosmology. Hence, with the usual identifications

$$\theta = 3H \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = \frac{\kappa^2}{6}(\rho + p), \quad (2.5)$$

the above equation (2.4) reduces to

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} \equiv \dot{H} + H^2 = -\frac{\kappa^2}{6}(\rho + 3p) + \frac{1}{3}U_Q, \quad (2.6)$$

where the quantity  $U_Q$  given by

$$U_Q = \frac{\hbar^2}{m^2} h^{\mu\nu} \left( \frac{\square\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{R}} \right)_{;\mu;\nu}, \quad (2.7)$$

is interpreted as a *quantum potential* [59–62].

## 2.1 The semi-classical dark fluid description

It is natural to identify Eq.(2.6) as the semi-classical version of the second order Friedmann equation (2.2), simply under the replacement  $p \rightarrow p + \frac{1}{3}U_Q$ . However, one needs to be cautious in making physical interpretations out of such a replacement. In fact, marking the term  $\frac{1}{3}U_Q$  solely as the effective pressure of the quantum fluid is not quite tenable, because there is in principle nothing that can prevent the potential  $U_Q$  to make a contribution to the system’s total energy density  $\rho$  as well. After all, even in a semi-classical approach, the compatibility of the Raychaudhuri equation with the Einstein’s equations implies that the conservation relation

$$\dot{\rho} = -3H(\rho + p), \quad (2.8)$$

is not independent of the cosmic evolution equations, which must therefore be the Friedmann equations (2.1) and (2.2). In other words, one may reckon the semi-classical cosmic evolution to be described by Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2), despite the following:

- The total energy density  $\rho$  is not simply given by that of the classical fluid matter content (in the form of say, the visible baryonic dust, background radiation, etc.) plus that of the BEC (to be perceived as the corresponding probability density  $|\Psi|^2 = |\mathcal{R}|^2$ ).
- The total pressure  $p$  is not simply the sum of the classical fluid pressure (if any) and  $\frac{1}{3}U_Q$ .

As such, a *unified* cosmic dark sector can emerge naturally, since by all means, the (quantum) fluid description of the BEC and the associated quantum potential  $U_Q$  may be regarded as those which determine the evolution profile of a *dark fluid*, that would encode the effective DE and DM components of the universe, and possibly the interaction(s) thereof. To be more precise, the dark fluid could be thought of as the one with energy density given by  $\rho$  minus the classical fluid density, and pressure given by  $p$  minus the classical fluid pressure (if any). Therefore, if the classical fluid obeys the energy-momentum conservation law, so would the dark fluid, regardless of whether its constituents — the effective DE and DM — are conserved.

## 2.2 Criteria and assertions for a consistent picture

Let us enlist the essential criteria, and the assertions to be made consequently, for a concrete BEC cosmological formulation, particularly from the point of view of the dark fluid description:

- The foremost, of course, is the criterion of the large scale isotropy of the universe, which requires the embedded BEC wave-function to be spherically symmetric, i.e.  $\Psi(\vec{x}, t) \equiv \Psi(r, t)$ , where the variable  $r = \sqrt{h_{ij}x^i x^j}$  denotes the proper radial coordinate distance (which is implicitly time-dependent<sup>1</sup>). Accordingly, the BEC density would in general be given by  $|\mathcal{R}(r, t)|^2$ , where  $\mathcal{R}(r, t)$  is the radial part of  $\Psi(r, t)$ . Nevertheless, in limiting one's attention to the background (homogeneous) cosmological level in this paper, it suffices to resort to the purely time-dependent parts of the generic ( $x, t$ -dependent) BEC density and the associated quantum potential, referring to them respectively as  $\rho^{(B)}(t)$  and  $U_Q(t)$  henceforth.
- Next comes the question of suggesting the form of  $\Psi(r, t)$ . For this, it is worth drawing an analogy with a Newtonian picture, which could be reasoned from the point of view that the bosons inside the condensate are slow enough to be treated as non-relativistic. Any such boson, of mass  $m$ , on the surface of a homogeneous sphere of radius  $r$  and density  $\rho$  equal

---

<sup>1</sup>Since  $h_{ij} = h_{ij}(t) = a^2(t)\delta_{ij}$ , we have  $r = r(t) = x a(t)$ , where  $x = \sqrt{\delta_{ij}x^i x^j}$  is the comoving radial coordinate.

to the critical density of universe, satisfies the Newtonian gravitational equation

$$m \ddot{r}(t) = - \frac{G m}{r^2(t)} \left[ \frac{4\pi}{3} r^3(t) \rho(t) \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

This can be recast as

$$\ddot{r}(t) + \omega^2(t) r(t) = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\omega(t) = \frac{4\pi G}{3} \rho(t). \quad (2.11)$$

As  $r(t) \propto a(t)$ , the scale factor also satisfies an equation of the form (2.10), which is nothing but a harmonic oscillator equation with a time-varying frequency  $\omega(t)$ , in general. However, well within the Hubble radius  $H_0^{-1}$ , where  $H_0 \equiv H(t_0)$  is the Hubble constant, one may consider the density  $\rho$ , and as such the frequency  $\omega$ , to be nearly uniform in time. A straightforward quantization, along with the presumption of having all the bosons in the BEC in their ground state (of energy  $E_0$ ), would then suggest the corresponding wave-function to be that with a temporally modulated Gaussian amplitude and a purely time-dependent phase, given by [25–28] (see also [102, 103])

$$\Psi(r, t) = R(t) e^{-r^2/\sigma^2} e^{-iE_0 t/\hbar}, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\sigma$  is a real, positive constant, denoting the spread of the Gaussian<sup>2</sup>.

- Now, the criterion of normalizability of the BEC wave-function over the FRW time-slices determines the modulating factor to be<sup>3</sup>

$$R(t) = R_0 a^{-3/2}(t), \quad \text{where } R_0 \equiv R(t_0) : \text{constant}. \quad (2.13)$$

This implies that at the background (homogeneous) cosmological level the BEC density evolves precisely as that of a dust-like fluid, just as the cold dark matter (CDM):

$$\rho^{(B)}(t) = |R(t)|^2 = \rho_0^{(B)} a^{-3}(t), \quad \text{where } \rho_0^{(B)} \equiv \rho^{(B)}(t_0) = R_0^2. \quad (2.14)$$

<sup>2</sup>In fact, even when one relaxes the assumption of the near time-uniformity of  $\rho$ , the wave-function  $\Psi(r, t)$  can rigorously be shown to be very nearly of the form (2.12), albeit with a different (time-dependent) phase factor [104, 105], which however would neither affect the probability density nor change the quantum potential  $U_Q$ .

<sup>3</sup>Note that the normalization here implies the condition

$$1 = \int d^3x \sqrt{h(\vec{x}, t)} |\Psi(r, t)|^2 = 4\pi a^3(t) R^2(t) \int_0^\infty dr r^2 e^{-2r^2/\sigma^2},$$

where the integration, for the above form of the wave-function (2.12), is being carried out over the induced metric space, with the metric determinant  $h(\vec{x}, t)$  given by that for the FRW time-slices (or spatial hypersurfaces).



- Consequently, it becomes necessary to assert whether the BEC can really account for the CDM, i.e. whether such a proposition is at all conducive to a cosmic evolution consistent with that predicted by observations. Indeed, as shown in ref. [25], the BEC formation in the very early universe is plausible for an ideal gas of neutral bosons, provided they are ultralight. The precise mass bound is  $m \lesssim 6 \text{ eV}$ , which is obtained by demanding that the critical temperature  $T_c$  (below which the BEC is formed) must exceed the ambient temperature of the universe,  $T = 2.7a^{-1}$  (in  $K$ ), at all epochs (see also ref. [26] and the references therein). Specifically,  $T_c$  is inversely proportional to the product  $m^{1/3}a$ , for the above assumption that all the bosons in the BEC are in their ground state [25]. It therefore follows that, after formation, the BEC would persist forever, since  $T/T_c$  diminishes rapidly with decreasing values of  $m$ , irrespective of the phase of evolution of the universe. Moreover, the ratio of the number of bosons within the BEC to the total number in a certain volume being given by  $1 - (T/T_c)^3$ , one infers that for small boson masses, the BEC would subsume most of the available bosons in the universe, and can eventually account for the observed CDM content at the present epoch, at least to the correct order of magnitude [25–27]. Note that, in the strict sense, the entire CDM density cannot anyhow be identified with the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$ , because of a quantum *back-reaction* [28], whose significance would be discussed in due course.
- Finally, it remains to be sorted out the conditions for the viability of the emerging scenario, which makes it imperative to obtain not only a suitable solution of the cosmic evolution equations, but also the estimates or bounds on the relevant parameters, such as the BEC mass  $m$ , using the observational data or results. This is the main purpose of this work, and it is here the quantum back-reaction (mentioned above) plays the utmost crucial role, demonstrated in what follows.

### 3 Effective Scenarios with a Unified Cosmic Dark Sector

Since our interest in this paper is in the late-time cosmological evolution in the standard FRW framework, we resort to a scenario in which the universe is assumed to be constituted only by the BEC, which emulates a dust-like fluid of energy density given by Eq. (2.14), and the visible matter, which is also in the form of a dust (of baryons) of energy density

$$\rho^{(b)}(t) = \rho_0^{(b)} a^{-3}(t) , \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\rho_0^{(b)}$  denotes the corresponding value at the present epoch ( $t = t_0$ , whence  $a = 1$ ).

### 3.1 BEC cosmological equations

Eqs. (2.14) and (3.1) imply that the Raychaudhuri equation (2.6) can be written in the form

$$\frac{\ddot{a}(t)}{a(t)} = -\frac{\kappa^2[\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}]}{6a^3(t)} + \frac{1}{3}U_Q(t). \quad (3.2)$$

While this is identified as the Friedmann equation (2.2) in the semi-classical picture, we have the total energy density of the universe expressed as

$$\rho(t) = \frac{\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}}{a^3(t)} - \frac{2}{\kappa^2}U_Q(t) - 3p(t). \quad (3.3)$$

Note that  $U_Q(t)$  is the background (or homogeneous) level quantum potential, mentioned above, i.e. the homogeneous part of the expression (2.7). For the BEC wave-function of the form (2.12), with the wave amplitude  $R(t)$  given by Eq. (2.13), this turns out to be

$$U_Q(t) = \frac{24\hbar^2}{m^2\sigma^4} \left[ 1 + \frac{\kappa^2\sigma^2}{12} \left\{ \left[ 1 + \frac{3\kappa^2\sigma^2}{8} a(t)p'(t) \right] \rho(t) - 3p(t) \right\} \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where the prime  $\{'\}$  denotes  $d/da$  (see ref. [28] for the detailed steps in the computation). In fact, rather conveniently, one may resort to the following form of the quantum potential, obtained as a function of the scale factor  $a$ , by substituting Eq. (3.3) in Eq. (3.4) and re-arranging the terms:

$$U_Q(a) = \frac{6\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2\sigma^2 f(a)} \left[ 1 + \frac{\kappa^2\sigma^2}{12} \left\{ \frac{[\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}]f(a)}{a^3} - 3[1 + f(a)]p(a) \right\} \right], \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{2\hbar}{m\sigma^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$f(a) := 1 + \frac{3\kappa^2\sigma^2 a p'(a)}{8}, \quad (3.7)$$

are, respectively, a constant of the dimension of  $\kappa^{-1}$ , and a dimensionless function of  $a(t)$ .

On the other hand, substituting Eq. (3.3) in the conservation relation (2.8) one derives the equation

$$\frac{2}{a} \left[ a^3 U_Q(a) \right]' + 3\kappa^2 \left[ a^2 p(a) \right]' = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

which requires to be solved simultaneously with Eq. (3.5) in order to determine the Hubble rate  $H(a)$ , and hence the cosmic expansion history. This is though a very difficult proposition in general, since the potential  $U_Q(a)$  in Eq. (3.5) is given in terms of both  $p(a)$  and  $p'(a)$ , as is evident from the definition (3.7) of the function  $f(a)$ . Substituting for  $U_Q(a)$  in the first order differential equation (3.8), one therefore finds a high degree of non-linearity of the resulting higher order differential equation for  $p(a)$ .

### 3.2 Exact solution describing an effective $\Lambda$ CDM evolution

Quite remarkably, however, an exact solution can be obtained simply by resorting to the ansatz

$$p = -\Lambda, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a (hitherto unspecified) constant [26–28]. Such a solution can easily be verified to be that describing an effective  $\Lambda$ CDM evolution, since the total energy density of the universe, given by Eq. (3.3), gets decomposed as

$$\rho(a) = \rho^{(m)}(a) + \Lambda, \quad (3.10)$$

where one can treat

$$\rho^{(m)}(a) = \rho_0^{(m)} a^{-3}, \quad (3.11)$$

as the total dust-like matter density (with value  $\rho_0^{(m)}$  at the present epoch), and  $\Lambda$  as the effective DE density in the form of a cosmological constant. It is then natural to identify the total effective CDM density  $\rho^{(c)}$  as  $\rho^{(m)}$  minus the visible (baryonic) matter density  $\rho^{(b)} = \rho_0^{(b)} a^{-3}$ . However, quite interestingly, neither  $\rho^{(c)}$  is equal to the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)} = \rho_0^{(B)} a^{-3}$ , nor the cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  equals the quantum potential  $U_Q$  (up to an appropriate dimensional scaling).

To be more specific, the constancy of pressure (3.9) implies  $f = 1$ , from Eq. (3.7). The Eqs. (3.5) and (3.8) are then solved simultaneously to yield  $U_Q$  as the sum of a constant and a term proportional to  $a^{-3}$ . While the latter contributes to the total dust-like matter density of the universe,  $\rho^{(m)}$ , the former (i.e. the constant part of  $U_Q$ ) is equal to  $\kappa^2 \Lambda$ , under the stipulation

$$\Lambda = \frac{6 \kappa^{-2} \alpha^2}{1 - 2\alpha^2 \sigma^2}. \quad (3.12)$$

Explicit computations consequently reveal that  $\rho_0^{(m)}$  is not equal to  $\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}$ , i.e. the sum of the (visible) baryon and BEC densities at the present epoch. Instead, one can express it as [28]

$$\rho_0^{(m)} = (1 - \varepsilon) [\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}], \quad (3.13)$$

upon defining a dimensionless and positive definite constant parameter

$$\varepsilon := \frac{\alpha^2 \sigma^2}{1 + \alpha^2 \sigma^2} = \frac{H_0^2 \sigma^2 \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}}{2 + 3H_0^2 \sigma^2 \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}}, \quad (3.14)$$

where  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  is the value of the  $\Lambda$ -density parameter  $\Omega^{(\Lambda)} = \Lambda/\rho$  at the present epoch<sup>4</sup>.

The BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  is thus not accountable for the effective CDM density  $\rho^{(c)}$  in entirety. In fact, it follows from Eq. (3.13) that  $\rho^{(c)} < \rho^{(B)}$ , with the value at the present epoch being determined as

$$\rho_0^{(c)} \equiv \rho_0^{(m)} - \rho_0^{(b)} = (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_0^{(B)} - \varepsilon \rho_0^{(b)}. \quad (3.15)$$

<sup>4</sup>Note that the last equality in Eq. (3.14) is obtained by first eliminating the parameter  $\alpha$  using Eq. (3.12), and then using the definition  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} = \Lambda/\rho_0$ , where  $\rho_0^2 = 3H_0^2/\kappa^2$  is the critical density at the present epoch.

### 3.3 Quantum back-reaction and the BEC mass bound

The net reduction in  $\rho_0^{(c)}$  from  $\rho_0^{(B)}$  is certainly a quantum effect, in the sense that it can be interpreted as the *quantum back-reaction* (QB) of the entire bulk of physical constituents of the universe (i.e. the BEC and the visible baryons) on the metric structure of space-time, by virtue of the quantum correction to the Raychaudhuri-Friedmann equation. The parameter  $\varepsilon$  (defined above) is therefore dubbed as the QB parameter in ref. [28]. An estimation of this parameter, or at least the assertion of the feasible range of its values, is crucial for constraining the BEC mass parameter which can be expressed as

$$m = \frac{m_H}{2\varepsilon} \sqrt{(1 - \varepsilon)(1 - 3\varepsilon)\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}}, \quad (3.16)$$

by recalling that  $\alpha = 2\hbar/(m\sigma^2)$  and using Eq.(3.14). Here,  $m_H = 2\sqrt{2}\hbar H_0$  is regarded as the ‘Hubble value’ of the BEC mass, which one obtains in a Newtonian cosmological formulation, and under the consideration that all the bosons in the BEC are ultralight and neutral (for e.g. gravitons), with the Gaussian spread of the corresponding wave-function taken as  $\sigma \simeq H_0^{-1}$ . As the Hubble constant  $H_0 \simeq 10^{-42}$  GeV, in the units  $c = 1 = \hbar$ , one gets  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV [26–28].

Now, the parameter  $\varepsilon$  being positive definite, its feasible domain can be determined from certain physical considerations right away:

- Firstly, the positive definiteness of  $\rho_0^{(m)}$ , and that of  $\rho^{(b)}$  and  $\rho^{(B)}$ , implies  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , as is evident from Eq. (3.13).
- Secondly, the real-valuedness of  $m$ , given by Eq.(3.16), restricts the domain further to  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ .
- Finally, an even tighter upper bound on  $\varepsilon$  can be obtained from the legitimate demand that the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  must not exceed the total matter density  $\rho^{(m)}$  at any phase of evolution of the universe. This amounts to imposing the condition  $\rho_0^{(B)} < \rho_0^{(m)}$  at the present epoch  $t = t_0$ . Hence by Eq. (3.13),

$$\varepsilon < \frac{\Omega_0^{(b)}}{1 - \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} + \Omega_0^{(b)}}, \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\Omega_0^{(b)}$  is the value of the baryon density parameter  $\Omega^{(b)} = \rho^{(b)}/\rho$  at  $t = t_0$ . Using therefore the best-fit  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  and  $\Omega_0^{(b)}$  estimations from, say, the combined analysis of Planck 2018 (TT,TE,EE+lowE), Lensing and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) data [63], for the base  $\Lambda$ CDM model, one finds  $\varepsilon \leq 0.136$  [28].

Note that we have excluded the possibility  $\varepsilon = 0$  right from the onset, as otherwise by Eq. (3.16) the mass parameter  $m$  would blow up. On the other hand, the small upper limit of  $\varepsilon$  ( $= 0.136$ ,

found above) implies that  $m$  is higher than the Hubble value  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV by at least a numerical factor of 2.18 or so. However, this bound is too loose to be considered as a useful constraint when it comes to realize whether the BEC behaves primarily as a self-consistent (and dominating) DM component of the universe, or it is so ultralight to be comparable only to a scalar field DE candidate.

Let us point out here that a dominant DM species is desired to have a mass higher than  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV by a few orders of magnitude, in order to be free from the inconsistencies with observations at smaller (galactic) scales of the order  $\lesssim 10$  Kpc (see for e.g. [106–109] and the references therein). By this, we refer in particular to the mass bounds for which the small scale structure (DM halo or sub-halo) formation gets suppressed, or at least not invoke any significant effect at larger scales. One may reckon the *fuzzy* DM hypothesis pertaining to ultralight bosonic particles of masses  $\lesssim 10^{-22}$  eV, but with large de Broglie wavelengths that give the effective Jeans scale, below which the stability of the DM halo is ensured according to the uncertainty principle [72]. However, the viability of the models with ultralight bosonic dark matter (UBDM) candidates, such as *axions*, depend on severe constraints on the corresponding mass value imposed, for instance, by the cosmic microwave background (CMB), pulsar timing array (PTA), black hole super-radiance, as well as the Lyman- $\alpha$  forest power flux observations of distant quasars (see e.g. [64–66] for recent reviews). In fact, the viable mass of a dominating axionic ULDM species is inferred to be no less than  $m \simeq 10^{-24}$  eV, i.e. about 1/100-th of the fuzzy DM benchmark ( $10^{-22}$  eV) quoted above [67–71]. On the other hand, the mass of an axion-like DE candidate is argued to be within the proximity of  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV, or at most deviate from it by one to two orders of magnitude [64–66].

Nevertheless, these mass bounds, which are generally obtained under the presumption of independently evolving DM and DE, may not be amenable in an interacting or unified scenario, such as the one emerging from the BEC cosmological formulation in this paper. One may still be inclined to argue that the small scale crisis for the CDM can be ameliorated by the BEC if its mass  $m$  is as high as  $10^{-24}$  eV or so. By Eq. (3.16), this corresponds to  $\varepsilon \simeq 10^{-8}$ , which is of course well within the bound  $\varepsilon \lesssim 0.136$  obtained for the  $\Lambda$ CDM solution of the BEC cosmological equations. However, this bound is too loose to allow even a value of  $m$  within the close proximity of  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV, which may thereby imply that the BEC acts predominantly as a DE, rather than a DM candidate. Also, there is no concreteness in the above argument, since after all, a negligible quantum back-reaction ( $\varepsilon \simeq 10^{-8}$ ) does not imply the interaction of the effective CDM and DE components to be so. It is therefore imperative to estimate directly (and robustly) the parameter  $\varepsilon$ , and hence the mass ratio  $m/m_H$ , using the observational data, rather than looking for a crude bound merely from a physical consideration. However, such an estimation, in an analysis with the commonly used SN-Ia and Hubble data, is untenable for the  $\Lambda$ CDM solution, as the

corresponding expression for reduced Hubble parameter  $H(a)/H_0$  does not involve the parameter  $\varepsilon$  explicitly. Hence there is a need to look for a more general solution of the BEC cosmological equations, which may yield  $\Lambda$ CDM in a limit. Despite the high degree of analytical difficulty, as pointed out earlier, we work out a way of obtaining such a solution, by making the key utilization of the smallness of  $\varepsilon$ , as described in the next subsection.

### 3.4 A unified scenario of dark matter and a dynamical dark energy

Let us recall the expression (3.5) for the quantum potential  $U_Q$ , and re-write it in the following form, in terms of the parameters  $\Lambda$  and  $\varepsilon$  defined by Eqs. (3.12) and (3.14) respectively:

$$U_Q(a) = \frac{(1 - 3\varepsilon)\kappa^2}{1 - \varepsilon[1 - f(a)]} \left[ \Lambda + \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - 3\varepsilon)} \left\{ \frac{[\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}]f(a)}{a^3} - 3[1 + f(a)]p(a) \right\} \right], \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$f(a) = 1 + \frac{9\varepsilon a p'(a)}{4(1 - 3\varepsilon)\Lambda}, \quad (3.19)$$

is the function, given by Eq. (3.7), re-expressed accordingly.

Plugging Eq. (3.18) in the differential equation (3.8), we can in principle solve for the pressure  $p(a)$ , and thereby determine the expansion history of the universe ( $\rho(a)$  or  $H(a)$ ) using Eq. (3.3). However, given the complicated form of Eq. (3.18), it is very difficult to get the general solution analytically. Numerical techniques, on the other hand, require certain fiducial parametric range specifications, i.e. suitable priors on some of the parameters in the set  $(\rho_0^{(b)}, \rho_0^{(B)}, \Lambda, \varepsilon)$ , apart from the appropriate usage of the initial conditions. Such priors are bound to have some arbitrariness in their selection, and the numerical solution would be far from being a general solution under the given circumstances. Nevertheless, deciding on the extent of the generality is our prerogative, in the sense that we forbid any large deviation from  $\Lambda$ CDM, in view of the general observational concordance on the latter. To be more specific, the general solution, or any particular solution more general than  $\Lambda$ CDM, essentially implies a dynamical evolution of the effective DE component. However, we demand the dynamics to be *mild* enough, so that the cosmic parametric estimates do not breach the corresponding  $\Lambda$ CDM margins very significantly. Now, with such a demand, we may still reckon the effectiveness of the quantum back-reaction we have had for the  $\Lambda$ CDM case in the previous subsection, and the smallness of the respective parameter  $\varepsilon$  therein. It then suffices to look for a solution of the cosmological equations, which may be regarded as the general solution, but only up to, say, the leading order in the powers of  $\varepsilon$ . This is the very reason why we have recast  $U_Q$  explicitly in terms of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\Lambda$  in Eq. (3.18). The following is the power series expansion for the same:

$$U_Q(a) = \kappa^2 \left[ \Lambda + \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}}{2a^3} - 3[p(a) + \Lambda] \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \right]. \quad (3.20)$$

This is certainly a lot simpler to handle, compared to the full expression (3.18).

Keeping terms up to  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  in  $U_Q$ , we solve the differential equation (3.8) to get

$$p(a) \approx p_0 a^{-2s} - \Lambda \left(1 - a^{-2s}\right), \quad (3.21)$$

where  $p_0 = p|_{t=t_0}$  is the pressure at the present epoch, and

$$s = \frac{1 - 3\varepsilon}{1 - 2\varepsilon} \approx 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (3.22)$$

Substituting Eq. (3.21) back in Eq. (3.20), we have the approximated quantum potential expressed as

$$U_Q(a) \approx \kappa^2 \left[ \Lambda + \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}}{2a^3} - \frac{3(p_0 + \Lambda)}{a^{2s}} \right\} \right], \quad (3.23)$$

and substituting this and Eq. (3.21) in Eq. (3.3), we get the approximated total energy density

$$\rho(a) \approx \frac{\rho_0^{(m)}}{a^3} + \Lambda - \frac{3(1 - 2\varepsilon)(p_0 + \Lambda)}{a^{2s}}, \quad (3.24)$$

where the constant  $\rho_0^{(m)}$ , given by Eq. (3.13), is the total dust-like matter density of the universe at the present epoch<sup>5</sup>.

Note that  $p_0$  is in general a free parameter here. However, we are interested in the scenario in which  $|p_0 + \Lambda|$  is quite small, ideally, not exceeding  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  by a significant margin, because otherwise there would be too much drift from  $\Lambda$ CDM, invalidating the approximation. Therefore, identifying the total energy density minus the total (dust-like) matter density as the effective DE density of the universe

$$\rho_X(a) = \rho(a) - \frac{\rho_0^{(m)}}{a^3} \approx \Lambda - \frac{3(p_0 + \Lambda)}{a^{2s}}, \quad (3.25)$$

we have the corresponding (DE) equation of state (EoS) parameter expressed as

$$w_X(a) := \frac{p(a)}{\rho_X(a)} \approx -1 + \frac{2(p_0 + \Lambda)}{3p_0 - \Lambda(a^{2s} - 3)}. \quad (3.26)$$

The overall cosmological evolution is thus quintessence-like, as long as  $p_0 > -\Lambda$ .

<sup>5</sup>It is worth mentioning here that a full perturbative approach, i.e. the consideration of the series expansion not only of  $U_Q(a)$ , but also of  $p(a)$  and  $\rho(a)$ , in powers of  $\varepsilon$ , would have yielded

$$U_Q(a) \approx \kappa^2 \left[ \Lambda + \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{\rho_0^{(b)} + \rho_0^{(B)}}{2a^3} - \frac{3(p_0 + \Lambda)}{a^2} \right\} \right],$$

$$p(a) \approx -\Lambda + \frac{(p_0 + \Lambda)(1 + 2\varepsilon N)}{a^2}, \quad \rho(a) \approx \frac{\rho_0^{(m)}}{a^3} + \Lambda - \frac{3(p_0 + \Lambda)[1 + 2\varepsilon(N - 1)]}{a^2},$$

where  $N = \ln a$ . However, up to  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ , the solution set (3.21)–(3.24) is more general.

Moreover, from the Friedmann equation (2.1) and Eq. (3.24) it follows that

$$\left[\frac{H(a)}{H_0}\right]^2 \approx \frac{\Omega_0^{(m)}}{a^3} + \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} - \frac{3[\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} + \mathbf{w}_0]}{a^{2s}}, \quad (3.27)$$

where  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$  and  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  are, respectively, the matter density parameter and the  $\Lambda$ -density parameter at the present epoch, and  $\mathbf{w}_0 = [p/\rho]_{a=1}$  is the value of the total EoS parameter of the system at the present epoch. It is in fact more convenient to re-express Eq. (3.27) in terms of the redshift  $z = a^{-1} - 1$  as

$$\left[\frac{H(z)}{H_0}\right]^2 \approx \Omega_0^{(m)}(1+z)^3 + \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} + [1 - \Omega_0^{(m)} - \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}](1+z)^{2s}, \quad (3.28)$$

upon using the relationship

$$\mathbf{w}_0 = -\frac{1 - \Omega_0^{(m)} + 2\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}}{3}, \quad (3.29)$$

which follows from the constraint that the total density parameter of the universe is unity (or equivalently,  $H = H_0$  at the present epoch  $a = 1$  or  $z = 0$ ).

Apart from the QB parameter  $\varepsilon$  (which is related to the parameter  $s$  by Eq. (3.22)), the density parameters  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$  and  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  are the ones required to be estimated using the available data, by resorting to the standard chi-squared minimization of the observable quantities, such as the  $H(z)/H_0$  or the distance modulus  $\mu(z)$  (see the next section). Note however that in the present context,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  is a free parameter, and not to be confused with the DE density parameter at the present epoch,  $\Omega_0^{(x)} := [\rho_x/\rho]_{z=0}$ , which is by definition equal to  $1 - \Omega_0^{(m)}$ .

## 4 Estimation of Cosmological Parameters and BEC Mass

Let us proceed to carry out the statistical estimation of the parameters  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$ ,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$ ,  $\varepsilon$  and also the reduced Hubble constant  $h = H_0/[100 \text{ Km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}]$  (wherever relevant) using the well-known Metropolis-Hastings algorithm for the Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) random probabilistic exploration. We consider the following (reasonably wide) pre-assigned domain (or prior range) of such parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0^{(m)} &\in [0.05, 0.5], & \Omega_0^{(\Lambda)} &\in [0.45, 0.95], \\ \varepsilon &\in [0, 0.25], & h &\in [0.55, 0.85], \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

and prefer to use the SN-Ia Pantheon (binned) data-set [96, 97] and its combination with observational Hubble ( $H(z)$ ) data-set [98–100]. While the former refers to a list of 40 data-points showing the redshift  $z$  versus the distance modulus  $\mu(z)$  for well-observed supernovae Ia, the latter contains



30 data-points listing  $z$  versus  $H(z)$  direct measurements using cosmic chronometry detailed in ref. [101].

The standard technique involves the minimization of

$$\chi^2 := \sum_{i,j} \Delta V_i \cdot C_{ij}^{-1} \cdot \Delta V_j, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\Delta V_i = V_{obs}(z_i) - V(z_i)$  denotes the difference between the observed and the theoretically predicted values of the observable  $V$  under consideration (i.e.  $\mu$  or  $H$ ) at a given redshift  $z_i$ , and  $C_{ij}$  is the covariance matrix for the data-points. In principle, one may carry out the minimization of  $\chi^2$  with respect to each of the parameters involved. However, for perspicuity in the approach, while using the Pantheon data-set, we prefer to follow the two-step procedure that is usually adopted — integrating out or marginalizing first the two superfluous parameters that call into play, viz. the absolute magnitude  $M$  and the Hubble constant  $H_0$  (or  $h$ ), and then minimizing the resulting  $\chi^2$  with respect to the three parameters of significance, viz.  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$ ,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  and  $\varepsilon$ . For the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data-set though, one has  $h$  also as a parameter of significance, and no longer a superfluous (or nuisance) parameter.


Table 1 quotes the best fit values and  $1\sigma$  confidence limits of such parameters, estimated using the Pantheon and the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data, as well as the corresponding minimized  $\chi^2$  values (denoted by  $\chi_{\min}^2$ ). Figs. 1 (a) and (b), on the other hand, show the respective two-dimensional

Table 1: Best fit values and(or)  $1\sigma$  confidence limits of parameters  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$ ,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$ ,  $h$  and  $\varepsilon$ , along with the minimized  $\chi^2$  obtained from the MCMC chain, using the Pantheon and Pantheon+ $H(z)$  datasets.


Observational datasets	Parametric estimations (Best fit & $1\sigma$ limits)				$\chi_{\min}^2$
	$\Omega_0^{(m)}$	$\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$	$h$	$\varepsilon$	
Pantheon	$0.2886^{+0.0353}_{-0.0426}$	$0.7018^{+0.0656}_{-0.0531}$	–	$< 0.0693$	48.4279
Pantheon+ $H(z)$	$0.2873^{+0.0312}_{-0.0364}$	$0.6916^{+0.0478}_{-0.0446}$	$0.6839^{+0.0239}_{-0.0273}$	$< 0.0675$	63.4063

posterior distribution or the error contour levels, up to  $3\sigma$ .

Quite understandably, with a larger number of data-points, the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data-set constrains the parameters  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$ ,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$  and  $\varepsilon$  more tightly than the Pantheon data-set. It is also worth noting that the best fit value of  $\varepsilon$  turns out to be quite insignificant (about three orders of magnitude below unity), which is why we have quoted only its  $1\sigma$  margin in the Table 1. On the whole, however, there is not much deviation from the effective  $\Lambda$ CDM scenario we have had in subsection




(a) Two-dimensional posterior distribution using the Pantheon data-set.




(b) Two-dimensional posterior distribution using the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data-set.

Figure 1: The  $1\sigma$ - $3\sigma$  parametric contour levels obtained using (a) the SN-Ia Pantheon (binned) data-set, and (b) its combination with the Hubble data-set. The plot densities of the regions bounded by the contours are shown with the data point scatter, whereas the central solid dots indicate the median best-fits of the parameters.




(a)  $w_x(z)$  estimated from the Pantheon data.




(b)  $w_x(z)$  estimated from the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data.

Figure 2: Effective dark energy EoS parameter  $w_x(z)$  (solid line) and its  $1\sigma$  error limits (broken lines bounding the shaded regions) for (a) the Pantheon data-set, and (b) its combination with the Hubble data-set.

3.2, as the corresponding parametric values turn out to be well within the respective  $1\sigma$  domains obtained here, for the more general cosmological evolution described by Eq. (3.28). One may see this from the  $1\sigma$  domains of the effective DE equation of state parameter  $w_x$ , derived using the parametric estimates in the Table 1 and shown in Figs. 2 (a) and (b), for the two data-sets. The  $\Lambda$ CDM value  $w_x = -1$  is well within such domains. However, the derived  $1\sigma$  domains of the total matter density parameter  $\Omega^{(m)}$  stretch beyond unity at higher redshifts ( $z \gtrsim 2$ ), as shown in Figs. 3 (a) and (b), for the respective data-sets. This is not unexpected though, from the point of



(a)  $\Omega^{(m)}(z)$  estimated from the Pantheon data.



(b)  $\Omega^{(m)}(z)$  estimated from the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data.

Figure 3: Effective total matter density parameter  $\Omega^{(m)}(z)$  (solid line) and its  $1\sigma$  error limits (broken lines bounding the shaded regions) for (a) the Pantheon data-set, and (b) its combination with the Hubble data-set.

view of our perception of the total matter density being that of the net effective dust-like matter content of the universe. In other words, whilst the visible matter being considered to be entirely pressure-less here, not all of the CDM (which is also pressure-less) is due to the BEC. The quantum back-reaction that calls into play, can effectively let  $\Omega^{(m)}$  exceed unity at high  $z$ . Moreover, the very extrapolation of the  $\Omega^{(m)}$  plots to high  $z$  ( $\gtrsim 2$ ) may not be quite reliable, given that the SN-Ia data are available only up to  $z \lesssim 2$ . In any case,  $\Omega^{(m)} > 1$  at the  $1\sigma$  level is nothing new in a unified picture, because what are being interpreted here as the effective CDM and DE components, are nonetheless interacting.

Figs. 4 (a) and (b) show the estimated  $1\sigma$  margins of the rationalized BEC mass  $m/m_H$ , for the two data-sets, obtained using Eq. (3.16) and the cosmological parametric values quoted in Table 1. Due to the (almost) inverse proportionality with  $\varepsilon$ , the  $m/m_H$  increases steeply with




Figure 4: Up to  $1\sigma$  variation of the rationalized BEC mass  $m/m_H$  with the  $\Lambda$ -density parameter at the present epoch,  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$ , derived from the parametric estimation using (a) the Pantheon data-set, and (b) the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data-set. The solid lines and the broken vertical lines denote the respective best fits of  $m/m_H$  and  $\Omega_0^{(\Lambda)}$ .

decreasing  $\varepsilon$ , as shown in Figs. 5 (a) and (b). Up to  $1\sigma$ , the mass enhancement is about three orders of magnitude over  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV, which is still fairly in the range expected for a scalar field DE candidate (rather than that for an axion-like DM).

## 5 Conclusion

We have thus explored the possible ways of realizing a semi-classical picture of a *unified* cosmic dark sector, from a BEC of ultralight bosons stretching across a very large length scale, close to the Hubble scale. While this implies a *quantum* ‘dark fluid’ description of the universe being




Figure 5: Up to  $1\sigma$  variation of the rationalized BEC mass  $m/m_H$  with the quantum back-reaction parameter  $\varepsilon$ , derived from the parametric estimation using (a) the Pantheon data-set, and (b) the Pantheon+ $H(z)$  data-set. The solid lines and the broken vertical lines denote the respective best fits of  $m/m_H$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

sought from the BEC, our primary objective in this paper has been a self-consistent theoretical formulation, from the foundations laid in some of our earlier works [25–28]. In particular, we have pondered on the essential criteria for realistic scenarios in the standard paradigm of FRW cosmology, such as the conditions for the formation of the BEC in the early universe and the spherical symmetry of the corresponding wave-function  $\Psi$ , apart from suggesting the functional form of the latter, so that the BEC may be reckoned as a plausible source of the CDM content of the universe, albeit having interactions with the effective DE component in a unified picture.

The key role in such a unification is shown to be played by the associated quantum potential  $U_Q$ , derived from the amplitude of  $\Psi$ , as the bosons in the BEC being (supposedly) quantum particles, follow the (Bohmian) quantal trajectories [60–62]. In fact, it is this quantum potential  $U_Q$  which leads to a quantum correction to the Raychaudhuri-Friedmann equation [59], and thereby makes an effective DE component perceptible in the formalism. While this has been pointed out in the earlier papers [25–28], quite in contrast with a variety of BEC-DM models in the literature [72–93], what we have demonstrated in this work is the natural emergence of the unified cosmic dark sector, from the perception of the probability density  $|\Psi|^2$  as the energy density  $\rho^{(B)}$  of a dust-like fluid component of the universe, semi-classically. Note that the approach is semi-classical also in the sense that the density  $\rho^{(b)}$  of the visible matter content of the universe, which complements the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  and the quantum potential  $U_Q$ , is taken to be of the form of that of the standard non-relativistic fluid, viz. the baryonic dust. Moreover, the entire formalism here concerns the cosmological evolution at the background (or homogeneous) level,

with no allusion to the perturbative spectrum whatsoever. Nor we have looked into the detailed aspects of the BEC, i.e. about the types of its constituent bosons, and whether there are any specific interactions between them.

Now, to physically realize the dark universe picture, i.e. to examine the viability of the same, one requires to work out in the first place, the suitable solution(s) of the BEC cosmological evolution equations. While this is seemingly a formidable task, since  $U_Q$  turns out to be a highly non-linear function of the energy density and pressure of the system,  $\rho$  and  $p$  (and derivatives thereof), a simple ansatz of the constancy of  $p$  at once leads to a solution describing an effective  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmic evolution. However, neither the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  accounts for the effective CDM density in entirety, nor the quantum potential  $U_Q$  is solely responsible for the the effective cosmological constant  $\Lambda$ . Instead, the entire bulk of physical constituents of the universe (including even the visible baryons) back-reacts on the metric structure of space-time. Such a *quantum back-reaction* (QB) effect is quite intriguing and significant in the sense that the positive-definite and dimensionless parameter  $\varepsilon$ , which determines its strength, roughly varies as the inverse of the BEC mass  $m$ . Hence, a lower bound on  $\varepsilon$  would determine the extent to which  $m$  exceeds its Hubble value  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV.

Progressively tighter constraints on  $\varepsilon$  can actually be placed from purely physical considerations, viz. the positive-definiteness of the total matter density of the universe at the present epoch,  $\rho_0^{(m)}$ , the positive-definiteness of the BEC mass squared, and the legitimate demand  $\rho_0^{(m)} \geq \rho_0^{(B)}$ , where  $\rho_0^{(B)}$  is the value of the BEC density  $\rho^{(B)}$  at the present epoch. However, even the tightest constraint thus found, which implies  $\varepsilon$  is  $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$  or less, is loose enough for the corresponding mass ratio  $m/m_H$ . Specifically, one cannot conclusively say anything when it comes to comparing this constraint with the stringent observational mass limits (typically  $\gtrsim 10^{-24}$  eV) obtained under the demand of suppressing small scale structures of commonly known ultralight bosonic dark matter candidates, such as *axions* [64–71]. This makes it imperative to estimate  $\varepsilon$  directly and robustly using the observational data, and that too for a solution of the BEC cosmological equations as general as possible. At least, a solution more general than  $\Lambda$ CDM needs to be worked out, which should explicitly have  $\varepsilon$  appearing in the expression for the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$ , in order that a statistical estimation of  $\varepsilon$  could be done by using the commonly considered SN-Ia Pantheon data and the observational Hubble data. [96–101].

While looking for such a general solution, one is nonetheless compelled to confront with the formidability posed by complicated form of the quantum potential  $U_Q$ . However, we have had at least the smallness of  $\varepsilon$  to some avail. Therefore, expanding  $U_Q$  in powers of  $\varepsilon$ , and retaining terms up to the linear order, we have obtained a solution more general than  $\Lambda$ CDM and with the corresponding expression for  $H(z)$  inevitably involving  $\varepsilon$ . The observational constraints on  $\varepsilon$  and other relevant parameters, such as the total matter density parameter at the present epoch,  $\Omega_0^{(m)}$ ,

and the Hubble constant  $H_0$ , are consequently worked out following the standard  $\chi^2$  minimization technique, and using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm for MCMC. Apart from a marginal deviation from  $\Lambda$ CDM, the estimates showed a BEC mass enhancement (from the Hubble value  $m_H \simeq 10^{-32}$  eV) by about three orders of magnitude, up to  $1\sigma$ . So, the BEC mass is comparable to that of a scalar field DE candidate, rather than to that of an axion-like DM candidate.

On the whole, there remains a number of open issues though. For instance, what if we drop the assumption of the spatial flatness of the universe? What are the types of the constituent bosons in the BEC? Is the Gaussian wave-function for the BEC fully justified, or one needs to resort to something else? Can we say something on the growth of matter perturbations in this context? Explorations on these are certainly worthy, and some of them are currently underway, which we hope to report soon.

## Acknowledgment

This work has been supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## References

- [1] E.J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, *Dynamics of dark energy*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 15** (2006) 1753, arXiv:hep-th/0603057.
- [2] J.A. Frieman, M.S. Turner and D. Huterer, *Dark energy and the accelerating universe*, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **46** (2008) 385, arXiv:0803.0982[astro-ph].
- [3] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom (2010).
- [4] G. Wolschin (Ed:), *Lectures on Cosmology: Accelerated expansion of the Universe*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2010).
- [5] S. Matarrese, M. Colpi, V. Gorini and U. Moschella (Eds:), *Dark Matter and Dark Energy: A Challenge for Modern Cosmology*, Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands (2011).
- [6] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Dark energy cosmology: the equivalent description via different theoretical models and cosmography tests*, Astrophys. Space Sci. **342** (2012) 155.

- [7] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy*, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **04** (2007) 115, arXiv: hep-th/0601213.
- [8] S. Tsujikawa, *Modified gravity models of dark energy*, Lect. Notes Phys. **800** (2010) 99, arXiv: 1101.0191[gr-qc].
- [9] T. Clifton, P.G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Modified Gravity and Cosmology*, Phys. Rept. **513** (2012) 1, arXiv: 1106.2476[astro-ph.CO].
- [10] J.H. He, B. Wang, and E. Abdalla, *Deep connection between  $f(R)$  gravity and the interacting dark sector model.*, Phys. Rev. **D 84 (12)** (2011) 123521, arXiv: 1109.1730[gr-qc].
- [11] E. Papantonopoulos (Ed:), *Modifications of Einstein's Theory of Gravity at Large Distances*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer, Switzerland (2015).
- [12] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Modified Gravity Theories on a Nutshell: Inflation, Bounce and Late-time Evolution*, Phys. Rept. **692** (2017) 1, arXiv: 1705.11098[gr-qc].
- [13] M. Ishak, *Testing General Relativity in Cosmology*, Liv. Rev. Rel. **22** (2019) 1, arXiv: 1806.10122[astro-ph.CO].
- [14] L. Susskind, *The world as a hologram*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995) 6377.
- [15] S.D.H. Hsu, *Entropy bounds and dark energy*, Phys. Lett. **B 594(1-2)** (2004) 13.
- [16] M. Li, *A model of holographic dark energy*, Phys. Lett. **B 603(1-2)** (2004) 13.
- [17] S. Chen, B. Wang and J. Jing, *Dynamics of interacting dark energy model in Einstein and Loop Quantum Cosmology*, Phys. Rev. **D 78** (2008) 123503, arXiv: 0808.3482[gr-qc].
- [18] M. Sharif and A. Jawad, *Analysis of pilgrim dark energy models*, Eur. Phys. J. **C 73** (2013) 2382.
- [19] M. Sharif and A. Jawad, *Pilgrim dark energy with apparent and event horizons in non-flat universe*, Eur. Phys. J. **C 73** (2013) 2600.
- [20] X. Calmet and B. Latosh, *Dark Matter in Quantum Gravity*, Eur. Phys. J. **C 78(6)** (2018) 520, arXiv: 1805.08552 [hep-th].
- [21] P. Berglund, T. Hubsch and D. Minic, *On Dark Energy and Quantum Gravity*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 28(14)** (2019) 1902003, arXiv: 1905.09463[gr-qc].



- [22] T. P. Singh, *Dark energy as a large scale quantum gravitational phenomenon*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 35(23)** (2020) 2050195.
- [23] S. Alexander, L. Jenks and E. McDonough, *Higher Spin Dark Matter*, Phys. Lett **B 819** (2021) 136436, arXiv: 2010.15125[hep-ph].
- [24] X. Calmet and F. Kuipers, *Implications of quantum gravity for dark matter*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 30(14)** (2021) 2142004, arXiv: 2107.13529[hep-ph].
- [25] S. Das, R.K. Bhaduri, *Dark matter and dark energy from a Bose–Einstein condensate*, Class. Quant. Grav. **32** (2015) 105003, arXiv: 1411.0753[gr-qc].
- [26] S. Das, R.K. Bhaduri, *Bose-Einstein condensate in cosmology*, Phys. News **40** (2019) 81, arXiv: 1808.10505[gr-qc].
- [27] S. Das, R.K. Bhaduri, *On the quantum origin of a small positive cosmological constant*, arXiv: 1812.07647[gr-qc].
- [28] S. Das, M. K. Sharma and S. Sur, *On the quantum origin of a dark universe*, Phys. Sci. Forum **2(1)** (2021) 55, arXiv: 2103.03032[gr-qc].
- [29] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, *Cosmological imprint of an energy component with general equation of state*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 1582, arXiv: astro-ph/9708069.
- [30] E.J. Copeland, A.R. Liddle and D. Wands, *Exponential potentials and cosmological scaling solutions*, Phys. Rev. **D 57** (1998) 4686, arXiv: gr-qc/9711068.
- [31] S. Tsujikawa, *Quintessence: A Review*, Class. Quant. Grav. **30** (2013) 214003, arXiv: 1304.1961[gr-qc].
- [32] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov and P.J. Steinhardt, *A Dynamical Solution to the Problem of a Small Cosmological Constant and Late-time Cosmic Acceleration*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 4438, arXiv: astro-ph/0004134.
- [33] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov and P.J. Steinhardt, *Essentials of k-essence*, Phys. Rev. **D 63** (2001) 103510, arXiv: astro-ph/0006373.
- [34] M. Malquarti, E.J. Copeland, A.R. Liddle and M. Trodden, *A New view of k-essence*, Phys. Rev. **D 67** (2003) 123503, arXiv: astro-ph/0302279.
- [35] R.J. Scherrer, *Purely kinetic k-essence as unified dark matter*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 011301, arXiv: astro-ph/0402316.

- [36] S. Sur and S. Das, *Multiple kinetic k-essence, phantom barrier crossing and stability*, JCAP **0901** (2009) 007, arXiv:0806.4368[astro-ph].
- [37] S. Sur, *Crossing the cosmological constant barrier with kinetically interacting double quintessence*, arXiv:0902.1186[astro-ph.CO].
- [38] L. Amendola, *Coupled quintessence*, Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 043511, arXiv:astro-ph/9908023.
- [39] D. Comelli, M. Pietroni, and A. Riotto, *Dark energy and dark matter*, Phys. Lett. **B 571** (2003) 115, arXiv:hep-ph/0302080.
- [40] G.R. Farrar and P.J.E. Peebles, *Interacting dark matter and dark energy*, Astrophys. J. **604** (2004) 1, arXiv:astro-ph/0307316.
- [41] L. Amendola *et. al.*, *Cosmology and fundamental physics with the Euclid satellite*, Liv. Rev. Rel. **21(1)** (2018) 2, arXiv:1606.00180[astro-ph.CO].
- [42] Y. Fujii and K. Maeda, *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom (2003).
- [43] V. Faraoni, *Cosmology in Scalar-Tensor Gravity*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (2004).
- [44] B. Boisseau, G. Esposito-Farese, D. Polarski and A.A. Starobinsky, *Reconstruction of a scalar tensor theory of gravity in an accelerating universe*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 2236, arXiv:gr-qc/0001066.
- [45] S. Tsujikawa, K. Uddin, S. Mizuno, R. Tavakol and J.I. Yokoyama, *Constraints on scalar-tensor models of dark energy from observational and local gravity tests*, Phys. Rev. **D 77** (2008) 103009, arXiv:0803.1106[astro-ph].
- [46] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, *Weak cosmic growth in coupled dark energy with a Lagrangian formulation*, Phys. Lett. **B** (2020), 135400, arXiv:1911.02179[gr-qc].
- [47] S. Sur and A.S. Bhatia, *Weakly dynamic dark energy via metric-scalar couplings with torsion*, JCAP **07** (2017) 039, arXiv:1611.00654[gr-qc].
- [48] A.S. Bhatia and S. Sur, *Dynamical system analysis of dark energy models in scalar coupled metric-torsion theories*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 26** (2017) 1750149, arXiv:1702.01267[gr-qc].
- [49] M.K. Sharma and S. Sur, *Growth of Matter Perturbations in an Interacting Dark Energy scenario emerging from Metric-Scalar-Torsion couplings*, Phys. Sci. Forum **2(1)** (2021) 51, arXiv:2102.01525[gr-qc].

- [50] M.K. Sharma and S. Sur, *Imprints of interacting dark energy on cosmological perturbations*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 31(3)** (2022) 2250017, arXiv: 2112.08477[astro-ph.CO].
- [51] D. Bertacca, N. Bartolo and S. Mataresse, *Unified Dark Matter Scalar Field Models*, Adv. Astron. **2010** (2010) 904379, arXiv: 1008.0614[astro-ph.CO].
- [52] D. Bertacca, M. Bruni, O.F. Piattella and D. Pietrobon, *Unified Dark Matter scalar field models with fast transition*, JCAP **1102** (2011) 018, arXiv: 1011.6669[astro-ph.CO].
- [53] E. Guendelman, E. Nissimov and S. Pacheva, *Unified Dark Energy and Dust Dark Matter Dual to Quadratic Purely Kinetic K-Essence*, Eur. Phys. J. **C 76** (2016) 90, arXiv: 1511.07071[gr-qc].
- [54] E.G.M. Ferreira, G. Franzmann, J. Khoury and R. Brandenberger, *Unified Superfluid Dark Sector*, JCAP **08** (2019) 027, arXiv: 1810.09474[astro-ph.CO].
- [55] A.H. Chamseddine, V. Mukhanov and A. Vikman, *Cosmology with Mimetic Matter*, JCAP **1406** (2014) 017, arXiv: 1403.3961[astro-ph.CO].
- [56] L. Sebastiani, S. Vagnozzi and R. Myrzakulov, *Mimetic gravity: a review of recent developments and applications to cosmology and astrophysics*, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2017** (2017) 3156915, arXiv: 1612.08661[gr-qc].
- [57] H.R. Chothe, A. Dutta and S. Sur, *Cosmological Dark sector from a Mimetic-Metric-Torsion perspective*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D 28(15)** (2019) 1950174, arXiv: 1907.12429[gr-qc].
- [58] S. Sur, A. Dutta and H.R. Chothe, *Mimetic-Metric-Torsion with induced Axial mode and Phantom barrier crossing*, Eur. Phys. J. **C 81(4)** (2021), arXiv: 2007.04906[gr-qc].
- [59] S. Das, *Quantum Raychaudhuri equation*, Phys. Rev. **D 89** (2014) 084068, arXiv: 1311.6539[gr-qc].
- [60] D. Bohm, *A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of "Hidden" Variables I*, Phys. Rev. **85(2)** (1952) 166.
- [61] D. Bohm, *A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of "Hidden" Variables II*, Phys. Rev. **85(2)** (1952) 180.
- [62] D. Bohm, B.J. Hiley and P.N. Kaloyerou, *An ontological basis for the quantum theory*, Phys. Rept. **144(6)** (1987) 321.
- [63] N. Aghanim *et. al.*, *Planck 2018 results, VI. Cosmological parameters*, Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020) A6, arXiv: 1807.06209[astro-ph.CO].

- [64] D.J.E. Marsh and S. Hoof, *Astrophysical Searches and Constraints on Ultralight Bosonic Dark Matter*, arXiv: 2106.08797[hep-ph].
- [65] E.G.M. Ferreira, *Ultra-light dark matter*, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29(1)** (2021) 7, arXiv: 2005.03254[astro-ph.CO].
- [66] D.J.E. Marsh, *Axion Cosmology*, *Phys. Rept.* **643** (2016) 1, arXiv: 1510.07633[astro-ph.CO].
- [67] D.J.E. Marsh and J.C. Niemeyer, *Strong Constraints on Fuzzy Dark Matter from Ultrafaint Dwarf Galaxy Eridanus II*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123(5)** (2019) 051103, arXiv: 1810.08543[astro-ph.CO].
- [68] E. Armengaud, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, C. Yéche, D.J.E. Marsh and J. Baur, *Constraining the mass of light bosonic dark matter using SDSS Lyman- $\alpha$  forest*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **471(4)** (2017) 4606, arXiv: 1703.09126[astro-ph.CO].
- [69] P.S. Corasaniti, S. Agarwal, D.J.E. Marsh and S. Das, *Constraints on dark matter scenarios from measurements of the galaxy luminosity function at high redshifts*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95(8)** (2017) 083512, arXiv: 1611.05892[astro-ph.CO].
- [70] L. Hui, J.P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine and E. Witten, *Ultralight scalars as cosmological dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95(4)** (2017) 043541, arXiv: 1610.08297[astro-ph.CO].
- [71] R. Hlozek, D. Grin, D.J.E. Marsh and P.G. Ferreira, *A search for ultralight axions using precision cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **91(10)** (2015) 103512, arXiv: 1410.2896[astro-ph.CO].
- [72] W. Hu, R. Barkana and A. Gruzinov, *Fuzzy Cold Dark Matter: The Wave Properties of Ultralight Particles*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 1158, arXiv: astro-ph/0003365.
- [73] X.Z. Wang, *Cold Bose stars: Self-gravitating Bose-Einstein condensates*, *Phys. Rev D* **64** (2001) 124009.
- [74] T. Fukuyama and M. Morikawa, *Relativistic Gross-Pitaevskii equation and the cosmological Bose Einstein condensation: Quantum structure in universe*, *Prog. Theo. Phys.* **115(6)** (2006) 1047, arXiv: astro-ph/0509789.
- [75] T. Fukuyama, M. Morikawa and T. Tatekawa, *Cosmic structures via Bose Einstein condensation and its collapse*, *JCAP* **06** (2008) 033, arXiv: 0705.3091[astro-ph].
- [76] C.G. Boehmer and T. Harko, *Can dark matter be a Bose-Einstein condensate?*, *JCAP* **0706** (2007) 025, arXiv: 0705.4158[astro-ph].

- [77] L.A. Urena-Lopez, *Bose-Einstein condensation of relativistic Scalar Field Dark Matter*, JCAP **01** (2009) 14, arXiv:0806.3093[gr-qc].
- [78] P. Sikivie, *Dark matter axions*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 25** (2010) 554, arXiv:0909.0949[hep-ph].
- [79] P.-H. Chavanis, *Growth of perturbations in an expanding universe with Bose-Einstein condensate dark matter*, Astron. & Astrophys. **537** (2012) A127, arXiv:1103.2698[astro-ph.CO].
- [80] T. Harko, *Bose-Einstein condensation of dark matter solves the core/cusp problem*, JCAP **05** (2011) 022, arXiv:1105.2996[astro-ph.CO].
- [81] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, *Black Hole's Quantum N-Portrait*, Fortsch. Phys. **61** (2013) 742, arXiv:1112.3359[hep-th].
- [82] B. Kain and H. Y. Ling, *Cosmological Inhomogeneities with Bose-Einstein Condensate Dark Matter*, Phys. Rev. **D 85** (2012) 023527, arXiv:1112.4169[hep-ph].
- [83] T. Harko and G. Mocanu, *Cosmological evolution of finite temperature Bose-Einstein Condensate dark matter*, Phys. Rev. **D 85** (2012) 084012, arXiv:1203.2984[gr-qc].
- [84] A. Suárez, V. Robles and T. Matos, *A Review on the Scalar Field/ Bose-Einstein Condensate Dark Matter Model*, Astrophys. Space Sci. Proc. **38** (2013) 107, arXiv:1302.0903[astro-ph.CO].
- [85] D. Bettoni, M. Colombo and S. Liberati, *Dark matter as a Bose-Einstein Condensate: the relativistic non-minimally coupled case*, JCAP **02** (2014) 004, arXiv:1310.3753[astro-ph.CO].
- [86] B. Li, T. Rindler-Daller and P.R. Shapiro, *Cosmological Constraints on Bose-Einstein-Condensed Scalar Field Dark Matter*, Phys. Rev. **D 89** (2014) 083536, arXiv:1310.6061[astro-ph.CO].
- [87] B. Li, *Cosmology with Bose-Einstein-Condensed Scalar Field Dark Matter*, Master of Arts Thesis, University of Texas at Austin, TX, USA, 2013.
- [88] Z. Ebadi, B. Mirza and H. Mohammadzadeh, *Infinite Statistics Condensate as a Model of Dark Matter*, JCAP **11** (2013) 057, arXiv:1312.0176[hep-th].
- [89] M. Dworkin, Z. Keresztes and L.A. Gergely, *Rotation curves in Bose-Einstein Condensate Dark Matter Halos*, Recent Development in Dark Matter Research, Eds. N. Kinjo and A. Nakajima, Nova Science Publishers (2014) 195, arXiv:1312.3715[gr-qc].
- [90] S. Gielen, *Quantum cosmology of (loop) quantum gravity condensates: An example*, Class. Quant. Grav. **31** (2014) 155009, arXiv:1404.2944[gr-qc].

- [91] S. Davidson, *Axions: Bose Einstein Condensate or Classical Field?*, *Astropart. Phys.* **65** (2015) 101, arXiv:1405.1139[hep-ph].
- [92] M. Dworknik, Z. Keresztes, E. Kun and L.A. Gergely, *Bose-Einstein Condensate Dark Matter Halos confronted with galactic rotation curves*, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2017** (2017) 4025386, arXiv:1406.0388[astro-ph.GA].
- [93] H. Schive, T. Chiueh and T. Broadhurst, *Cosmic Structure as the Quantum Interference of a Coherent Dark Wave*, *Nature Phys.* **10** (2014) 496, arXiv:1406.6586[astro-ph.GA].
- [94] M. Cadoni, R. Casadio, A. Giusti, W. Mück and M. Tuveri, *Effective Fluid Description of the Dark Universe*, *Phys. Lett. B* **776** (2018) 242, arXiv:1707.09945[gr-qc].
- [95] M. Cadoni, R. Casadio, A. Giusti and M. Tuveri, *Emergence of a Dark Force in Corpuscular Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 044047, arXiv:1801.10374[gr-qc].
- [96] D. M. Scolnic et. al., *The Complete Light-curve Sample of Spectroscopically Confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and Cosmological Constraints from the Combined Pantheon Sample*, *Astrophys. J.* **859** (2) (2018) 101, arXiv:1710.00845[astro-ph.CO].
- [97] The Pantheon plugin for CosmoMC is available at <https://github.com/dscolnic/Pantheon>.
- [98] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez and C. Maraston, *A 6% measurement of the Hubble parameter at  $z \sim 0.45$ : direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration*, *JCAP* **05** (2016) 014, arXiv:1601.01701[astro-ph.CO].
- [99] H. Yu, B. Ratra and F.-Y. Wang, *Hubble Parameter and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurement Constraints on the Hubble Constant, the Deviation from the Spatially Flat  $\Lambda$ CDM Model, the Deceleration–Acceleration Transition Redshift, and Spatial Curvature*, *Astrophys. J.* **856** (1) (2018) 3, arXiv:1711.03437[astro-ph.CO].
- [100] J. Ryan, S. Doshi and B. Ratra, *Constraints on dark energy dynamics and spatial curvature from Hubble parameter and baryon acoustic oscillation data*, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **480** (2018) 759, arXiv:1805.06408[astro-ph.CO].
- [101] M. Moresco et. al., *Improved constraints on the expansion rate of the Universe up to  $z \sim 1.1$  from the spectroscopic evolution of cosmic chronometers*, *JCAP* **08** (2012) 006, arXiv:1201.3609[astro-ph.CO].
- [102] S. Das and S. Sur, *Emergent gravity and the quantum*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **30**(14) (2021) 2142030, arXiv:2105.07150[gr-qc].

- [103] S. Das and S. Sur, *On the quantum origin of potentials*, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **137(1)** (2022) 75, arXiv:2112.08461[quant-ph].
- [104] C.M.A. Dantas, I.A. Pedrosa and B. Baseia, *Harmonic oscillator with time-dependent mass and frequency and a perturbative potential*, Phys. Rev. **A 45(3)** (1992) 1320.
- [105] T. Padmanabhan, *Demystifying the constancy of the Ermakov–Lewis invariant for a time-dependent oscillator*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 33(07,08)** (2018) 1830005, arXiv:1712.07328 [physics.class-ph].
- [106] L.G. van den Aarssen, T. Bringmann and C. Pfrommer, *Is dark matter with long-range interactions a solution to all small-scale problems of Lambda CDM cosmology?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 231301, arXiv:1205.5809[astro-ph.CO].
- [107] M.S. Pawlowski, B. Famaey, D. Merritt and P. Kroupa, *On the persistence of two small-scale problems in  $\Lambda$ CDM*, Astrophys. J. **815(1)** (2015) 19, arXiv:1510.08060[astro-ph.GA].
- [108] A.D. Popolo and M.L. Delliou, *Small scale problems of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model: a short review*, Galaxies **5(1)** (2017) 17, arXiv:1606.07790[astro-ph.CO].
- [109] J.S. Bullock and M. Boylan-Kolchin, *Small-Scale Challenges to the  $\Lambda$ CDM Paradigm*, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **55** (2017) 343, arXiv:1707.04256 [astro-ph.CO].