

# Cosmic Acceleration and Geodesic Deviation in Chameleon Scalar Field Model

Raziyeh Zaregonbadi,<sup>1,\*</sup> Nasim Saba,<sup>2,†</sup> and Mehrdad Farhoudi<sup>2,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Malayer University, Malayer, Iran*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, Evin, Tehran, 19839, Iran*

(Dated: 7 July 2022)

While considering the chameleon scalar field model with the spatially flat FLRW background, we investigate the late-time acceleration phase of the universe, wherein we apply the typical potential usually used in this model. Through setting some constraints on the free parameters of the model, we indicate that the non-minimal coupling between the matter and the scalar field in such a model should be strongly coupled in order to have an accelerated expansion of the universe at the late-time. We also investigate the relative acceleration of the parallel geodesics by obtaining the geodesic deviation equation in the context of chameleon model. Then, through the null deviation vector fields, we obtain the observer area-distance as a measurable quantity to compare the model with other relevant models.

PACS numbers: 04.50.Kd; 95.36.+x; 04.20.Cv; 95.35.+d

Keywords: Chameleon Scalar Field Model; Late-Time Acceleration Phase; Geodesic Deviation Equation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, cosmology is facing with the most challenging problems regarding accelerated expansion of the universe or dark energy as well as dark matter. The mysterious acceleration of the universe has been supported by the various cosmological observational data [1]-[9]. As these observations are not consistent with the predictions of the Einstein gravity, this theory has generally been amended/modified/generalized, in particular to explain dark energy and dark matter (see, e.g., Refs. [10]-[35] and references therein). For dark energy, numerous attempts have been performed, which explain that the acceleration of the universe could have arisen either from a dark energy component or being due to departure of gravity from general relativity on cosmological scales. In the former approach, dark energy models can be classified in two main categories. The  $\Lambda$ CDM model (in which the universe contains a constant energy density, cold dark matter and ordinary matter) and the scalar field models with a dynamical equation of state, see, e.g., Refs. [36]-[41]. The first category models have some difficulties, such as the cosmological constant problem and the coincidence problem [42]-[48]. Some believe that the scalar field models are perhaps better alternatives to the Einstein gravitational theory [49]-[51]. In particular, quintessence is a more general dynamical model in which the energy source of the universe, unlike the cosmological constant, varies in space and time [52]-[56]. However, if one considers the scalar field coupled to the matter in such theories, then a fifth force and also large violation of the equivalence principle (EP) will arise, whereas these results have not been detected in the solar system tests of

gravity. To solve such a problem, the chameleon model and its generalization have been proposed [57]-[61].

In the chameleon model, as a scalar-tensor theory model for dark energy, the scalar field couples minimally with geometry and non-minimally with the matter field. It also uses an environment-dependent screening mechanism that, although allows it to deviate from general relativity at large scales, keeps it consistent with the results of that at small scales. Indeed, the scalar field couples to matter with a gravitational strength to acquire a mass-dependent on the background matter density of the environment, which leads its interaction to be effectively short-ranged. Due to such a screening mechanism, the model remains consistent with the tests of gravity on the terrestrial and the solar system scales. The strength of force depends on the amount of matter in the environment [57]-[59][62]-[64]. In dense environments, such as on the earth, the force gets weaker whose effects are barely detectable, and hence the theory will be consistent with the experimental and observational tests in the case of EP-violation and fifth force. On the other hand, as the amount of matter decreases, the force becomes stronger. Hence, at empty spaces, the force extends to a powerful range and one expects detecting a fifth force and also the EP-violation. However, despite some controversy, it is believed that the chameleon field may play the role of dark energy causing the cosmic late-time acceleration, see, e.g., Ref. [65] and references therein. In addition, the chameleon model during inflation has also been investigated, see, e.g., Refs. [65]-[69].

In the present work, we consider such a model and investigate the late-time accelerated expansion of the universe. By applying the typical potential usually used in the context of the chameleon theory in the literature, we set some constraints on the free parameters of the model such as the chameleon coupling constant and the slope of the potential. Moreover, we generalize the geodesic deviation equation (GDE) of the presented chameleon model to probe the acceleration of the universe more instructive

\*Electronic address: r.zaregonbadi@malayeru.ac.ir

†Electronic address: n.saba@sbu.ac.ir

‡Electronic address: m-farhoudi@sbu.ac.ir

and hopefully getting a better view of the cosmic acceleration phase. Practically, the GDE offers a subtle understanding of the structure of spacetime and characterizes the nature of gravitational forces in an invariant procedure. The equation of timelike geodesics in the Einstein frame receives a correction, which is interpreted as the effects of a fifth force and the violation of weak EP [50]. A physical definition of geodesic is expressed as a trajectory of a body that is solely under the influence of gravity, and mathematically, it is defined as a curve that parallel transports its tangent vector. Actually, the existence of a fifth force leads to modifications of the GDE. Indeed, the GDE is one of the most significant equation in gravitation that represents the effects of the curvature in the spacetime and relates the Riemann curvature tensor to the relative acceleration of two adjacent geodesics [70]–[75]. It has also been studied in the contest of modified theories of gravitation, see, e.g., Refs. [30, 76]–[78] and references therein.

The work is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce the chameleon model and obtain the field equations of motion by taking the variation of the action. The cosmological equations of the chameleon scalar field model are investigated in Sec. III, where matter-dominated phase and cosmic accelerated phase are studied. In Sec. IV, we investigate the GDE of this model for the timelike and null geodesics within the spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) background and then, attain the corresponding Raychaudhuri equation and the observer area-distance as a measurable physical quantity. At last, we conclude the work in Sec. V with the summary of the results.

## II. CHAMELEON SCALAR FIELD MODEL

We start with the action of the chameleon scalar field model in four dimensions as

$$S = S_{\text{EH}} + S_{\phi} + S_{\phi-m}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $S_{\text{EH}}$  is the Einstein-Hilbert action,  $S_{\phi}$  is the part of minimally coupled scalar field action and  $S_{\phi-m}$  is the action representing coupling between the matter field and the scalar field. More specifically, the action is

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 R}{2} \right) - \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} \phi \partial^{\mu} \phi + V(\phi) \right] + \sum_i \int d^4x \sqrt{-\tilde{g}^{(i)}} L_m^{(i)} \left( \psi_m^{(i)}, \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $g$  is the determinant of the metric,  $R$  is the Ricci scalar,  $M_{\text{Pl}} \equiv (8\pi G)^{-1/2} \approx 10^{27} \text{eV}$  is the reduced Planck mass (in the natural units,  $\hbar = 1 = c$ ) and the lower case Greek indices run from zero to three. Also,  $V(\phi)$  is a self-interacting potential,  $\psi^{(i)}$ s are various matter fields,  $L_m^{(i)}$ s are Lagrangians of matter fields,  $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ s are the matter field metrics that are conformally related to the Einstein

frame metric as

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} = e^{2\frac{\beta_i \phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\beta_i$ s are dimensionless constants, which represent different non-minimal couplings between the scalar field  $\phi$  and each matter species. However in this work, we just consider a single matter component, and hence we omit the index  $i$ . The scalar potential commonly used for the chameleon model in the literature is the well-known run-away potential

$$V(\phi) = \frac{M^{4+n}}{\phi^n}, \quad (2.4)$$

with  $M$  as some mass scale and  $n$  as a positive or negative integer constant.

The variation of action (2.2) with respect to the metric tensor  $g_{\mu\nu}$  gives the field equations

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} \right) = \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)} + e^{2\frac{\beta \phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} \right), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)}$  is the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field, namely

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\phi)} = -\frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \partial^{\alpha} \phi \partial_{\alpha} \phi - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi) + \partial_{\mu} \phi \partial_{\nu} \phi, \quad (2.6)$$

and  $\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}$  is the energy-momentum tensor of matter in the Jordan frame that is conserved within this frame, i.e.  $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mu} \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} = 0$ , and is defined as

$$\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-\tilde{g}}} \left( \frac{\delta \sqrt{-\tilde{g}} L_m}{\delta \tilde{g}^{\mu\nu}} \right). \quad (2.7)$$

In addition, the variation of action (2.2) with respect to the scalar field gives

$$\square \phi = \frac{dV(\phi)}{d\phi} - \frac{\beta}{M_{\text{Pl}}} e^{4\frac{\beta \phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \tilde{g}^{\mu\nu} \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}, \quad (2.8)$$

where  $\square \equiv \nabla^{\alpha} \nabla_{\alpha}$  with respect to the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . Also, we assume the matter field as a perfect fluid with the same state parameter  $w^{(m)}$  in the both frames. Hence, the trace of the energy-momentum tensor of matter is

$$\tilde{T}^{(m)} = \tilde{g}^{\mu\nu} \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} = -\left(1 - 3w^{(m)}\right) \tilde{\rho}^{(m)}, \quad (2.9)$$

and the relation of the matter density in the Einstein frame with the one in the Jordan frame is

$$\rho^{(m)} = e^{4\frac{\beta \phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \tilde{\rho}^{(m)}. \quad (2.10)$$

Note that  $(1 - 3w^{(m)}) \rho^{(m)} = -g^{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}$ , where  $T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}$  is the energy-momentum tensor of matter in the Einstein frame that is not covariantly conserved, i.e.  $\nabla^{\mu} T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} \neq 0$ . Moreover, for more mathematical facilities, we can define a matter density as a quantity independent of the

chameleon scalar field  $\phi$ , which is not a physical matter density but is a conserved quantity within the Einstein frame as [65]

$$\rho(t) \equiv e^{3(1+w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \tilde{\rho}^{(m)}, \quad (2.11)$$

and in turn obtain  $\rho^{(m)} = \rho e^{(1-3w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}}$ . Furthermore, substituting relation (2.11) into Eq. (2.8) indicates that the scalar field is dynamically governed by an effective potential, i.e.

$$\square\phi = \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}(\phi)}{d\phi}, \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) \equiv V(\phi) + \rho e^{(1-3w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} = V(\phi) + \rho^{(m)} \quad (2.13)$$

that depends on the background matter density  $\rho^{(m)}$  of the environment.

### III. COSMOLOGICAL EQUATIONS

In this section, we investigate the cosmological equations of the chameleon scalar field model by considering the spatially flat FLRW metric in the Einstein frame as

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $t$  is the cosmic time,  $a(t)$  is the scale factor describing the cosmological expansion, and in turn  $\tilde{a}(t) = a(t) \exp(\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}})$  is the corresponding one within the Jordan frame. Also, by accepting the homogeneity and isotropy, and the scalar field being just a function of the cosmic time, then by metric (3.1), the field equation (2.12) reads

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}(\phi)}{d\phi} = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $H(t) \equiv \dot{a}/a$  is the Hubble parameter and dot denotes the derivative with respect to  $t$ . Moreover, by inserting metric (3.1) into Eq. (2.5), it yields the Friedmann-like equation as

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + \rho e^{(1-3w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \right] \quad (3.3)$$

and the generalized Raychaudhuri equation as

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) + \left( \frac{1+3w^{(m)}}{2} \right) \rho e^{(1-3w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, from relation (2.6), one obtains the energy density and the pressure density of the chameleon scalar field as

$$\rho^{(\phi)} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$p^{(\phi)} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi). \quad (3.6)$$

Then, using Eqs. (3.5) and (3.6), Eqs. (3.3) and (3.4) read as

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} (\rho^{(\phi)} + \rho^{(m)}) = \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \rho^{(\text{tot})} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= -\frac{1}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \rho^{(\phi)} + \rho^{(m)} + 3(p^{(\phi)} + p^{(m)}) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2} (\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\rho^{(\text{tot})} \equiv \rho^{(\phi)} + \rho^{(m)}$  and  $p^{(\text{tot})} \equiv p^{(\phi)} + p^{(m)}$  are considered as the total energy density and total pressure density, respectively. Also, by employing Eqs. (3.2), (3.5) and (3.6), we obtain

$$\dot{\rho}^{(\phi)} + 3H(\rho^{(\phi)} + p^{(\phi)}) = -X, \quad (3.9)$$

and by the continuity equation for  $\rho(t)$  in the Einstein frame, i.e.  $\dot{\rho} + 3H(1+w^{(m)})\rho = 0$ , we get

$$\dot{\rho}^{(m)} + 3H(\rho^{(m)} + p^{(m)}) = X, \quad (3.10)$$

and in turn

$$\dot{\rho}^{(\text{tot})} + 3H(\rho^{(\text{tot})} + p^{(\text{tot})}) = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$X \equiv (1-3w^{(m)}) \frac{\beta\dot{\phi}}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \rho e^{(1-3w^{(m)})\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}}. \quad (3.12)$$

The  $X$  term acts as an interacting term among the scalar and matter fields, which manifests itself as a deviation term into the geodesic equation and is interpreted as some kind of internal force among those. That is, due to the coupling between the scalar and matter fields, the energy-momentum tensor of each one is not conserved. Nevertheless, the above relations indicate that, although the energy density is not separately conserved (and conservation equations of the internal parts are not independent), its total is conserved as expected.

In the analysis of this work, we investigate the chameleon scalar field during late-time of the universe. To proceed, we assume that the evaluation of the chameleon scalar field with respect to time being as the corresponding one considered in Ref. [67], namely<sup>1</sup>

$$\dot{\phi} = \frac{3(1+w^{(m)})M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta(1-3w^{(m)})} H. \quad (3.13)$$

<sup>1</sup> In Ref. [67], with their used scenario and the specified function of the scalar field, the effects of inflaton and chameleon have been described via one single scalar field during the inflation and late-time.

Also, we plausibly assume that the matter density is a non-relativistic perfect fluid, i.e. dust matter with  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , and hence, relation (3.13) reads

$$\dot{\phi} = \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta} H. \quad (3.14)$$

Furthermore, we prefer to obtain the behavior of the chameleon scalar field with respect to the redshift instead of time. For this purpose, with the relation<sup>2</sup>  $1+z = a_0/a$ , we use the simple differential operator

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{da}{dt} \frac{dz}{da} \frac{d}{dz} = -(1+z) H \frac{d}{dz}. \quad (3.15)$$

Thus, while employing relation (3.15), relation (3.14) gives

$$\phi(z) = \phi_0 - \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta} \ln(1+z), \quad (3.16)$$

where  $\phi_0$  is an integration constant that is equal to  $\phi(z)$  for  $z = 0$ .

Now, to obtain the total (or, the effective) state parameter of this chameleon model, we start by the dimensionless density parameters defined as

$$\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} \equiv \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}}, \quad \Omega_V \equiv \frac{V(\phi)}{\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_m \equiv \frac{\rho^{(m)}}{\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}}, \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\rho_0^{(\text{crit})} \equiv 3H_0^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2$  is the critical density of the universe at the present time. Hence, in general case, Eq. (3.7) can be rewritten as

$$H^2 = H_0^2 \left( \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V + \Omega_m \right), \quad (3.18)$$

and the total state parameter of this model is

$$w^{(\text{tot})} \equiv \frac{p^{(\text{tot})}}{\rho^{(\text{tot})}} = \frac{\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V}{\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V + \Omega_m}, \quad (3.19)$$

and equivalently

$$w^{(\text{tot})} = \frac{H_0^2}{H^2} \left( \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V \right). \quad (3.20)$$

Substituting relation (3.14), for the case of  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , into the first definition (3.17) leads to

$$\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} = \frac{3H^2}{2\beta^2 H_0^2} \quad (3.21)$$

and then, inserting it into relation (3.20) yields

$$w^{(\text{tot})} = \frac{3}{2\beta^2} - \frac{H_0^2}{H^2} \Omega_V. \quad (3.22)$$

At this stage, we manage to get  $\Omega_V$  and  $H^2$  in terms of  $z$ . For this purpose, inserting function (3.16) into (2.4) gives

$$\Omega_V = \Omega_{(0)V} \left( \frac{\phi_0}{\phi} \right)^n = \Omega_{(0)V} \left[ 1 - \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta\phi_0} \ln(1+z) \right]^{-n}, \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$\Omega_{(0)V} = \frac{V(\phi_0)}{\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}} = \frac{1}{\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}} \left( \frac{M^{4+n}}{\phi_0^n} \right). \quad (3.24)$$

Also, for the conserved matter within the Jordan frame<sup>3</sup> with  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , we have  $\tilde{\rho}^{(m)} = \tilde{\rho}_0^{(m)}(1+z)^3$ , hence within the Einstein frame, considering function (3.16) while using (2.10), we obtain

$$\Omega_m = \tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m} e^{4\frac{\beta\phi_0}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} (1+z)^{-9}, \quad (3.25)$$

where  $\tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m} \equiv \tilde{\rho}_0^{(m)}/\rho_0^{(\text{crit})}$ . Then, using relations (3.21), (3.23) and (3.25), Eq. (3.18) reads

$$H^2 = \frac{H_0^2}{1 - \frac{3}{2\beta^2}} \left\{ \Omega_{(0)V} \left[ 1 - \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta\phi_0} \ln(1+z) \right]^{-n} + \tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m} e^{4\frac{\beta\phi_0}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} (1+z)^{-9} \right\}, \quad (3.26)$$

for when  $\beta \neq \pm\sqrt{3/2}$ . Finally, substituting relation (3.23) and Eq. (3.26) into relation (3.22) gives the total state parameter for non-relativistic perfect fluids, in the case of dust matters, in terms of the redshift as

$$w^{(\text{tot})} = \frac{3}{2\beta^2} - \left( 1 - \frac{3}{2\beta^2} \right) \left\{ 1 + \frac{\tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m} e^{4\beta\phi_0/M_{\text{Pl}}}}{\Omega_{(0)V} (1+z)^9} \times \left[ 1 - \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta\phi_0} \ln(1+z) \right]^n \right\}^{-1}. \quad (3.27)$$

Meanwhile, let us also employ the deceleration parameter, which is a dimensionless measure of the cosmic acceleration of the expansion of the universe, defined as  $q \equiv -\ddot{a}a/\dot{a}^2 = -\ddot{a}/(aH^2)$ . In this regard, inserting Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8) into the definition of  $q$  and using the definition of the total state parameter, leads to

$$q = \frac{1 + 3w^{(\text{tot})}}{2}. \quad (3.28)$$

Obviously, if  $q > 0$ , then the expansion of the universe will be a decelerated one, and if  $q < 0$ , then it will be an accelerated one. The transition point from the deceleration to the acceleration phase is

<sup>2</sup> The zero index indicates the present time.

<sup>3</sup> Its related continuity equation is  $\dot{\tilde{\rho}}^{(m)} + 3\tilde{H}(\tilde{\rho}^{(m)} + \tilde{p}^{(m)}) = 0$ , where  $\tilde{H} = H + 3\beta\dot{\phi}/M_{\text{Pl}}$ .

when  $q = 0$ , and in this case, relation (3.28) shows that it corresponds to  $w_{\text{trans}}^{(\text{tot})} = -1/3$ , as expected. Hence, in general case, using relation (3.20), it obviously gives  $\left[\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V = -H^2/(3H_0^2)\right]_{\text{trans.}}$ , and in turn,  $\left[p^{(\phi)} = -H^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2\right]_{\text{trans.}}$ . Also, for the case of dust matters with  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , using relation (3.22), it yields  $\left[V = H^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2(9 + 2\beta^2)/(2\beta^2)\right]_{\text{trans.}}$ . We pursue this issue to discuss about the transition redshift in the next section.

We have plotted relation (3.27) in Figure 1 to obtain the allowed values of the  $n$  parameter in this model for  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$  and  $\beta = 1$  with initial value  $\phi_0 = \beta^{-1}$  (regardless of units) as assumptions. Note that, the value  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$  is an upper bound on this parameter in the chameleon model that is consistent with the experimental constrain obtained in Ref. [79]. The top diagram




Figure 1: The plot of the total state parameter with assumptions  $\bar{\Omega}_{(0)m}/\Omega_{(0)V} \simeq 3/7$ ,  $M_{\text{Pl}} = 1$  and, regardless of units,  $\phi_0 = \beta^{-1}$ . Besides, the top and bottom diagrams have been plotted with  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$  and  $\beta = 1$ , respectively.

in Figure 1 indicates that, for the case  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$  with  $n > 0$ , the total state parameter in the present time, i.e.

at  $z = 0$ , starts to increase from the value less than  $-1/3$  with increasing redshift, which is a suitable model for the evolution of the universe. In addition, the presence of constraint  $n > 0$  is consistent with the inverse power-law potentials first considered in the original suggestion for the chameleon model [57]. Whereas, the bottom diagram in this figure, for  $-10 < n < 10$  and  $0 < z < 10$ , shows unacceptable results for the case  $\beta = 1$  because, at the present time, one expects the total state parameter to be less than  $-1/3$ . However, with  $n < 0$ , the top diagram in Figure 1 also illustrates not a true model because by increasing redshift from  $z = 0$  up to  $z = 10$ , the total state parameter does not increase.

### A. Matter-Dominated Phase

In the matter-dominated phase of the universe, i.e. under assumption  $\rho^{(m)} \gg \rho^{(\phi)}$  that corresponds to  $\Omega_m \gg \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V$ , Eq. (3.18) leads to

$$H^2 \simeq H_0^2 \Omega_m \quad (3.29)$$

and in turn, the state parameter from relation (3.20) gives

$$w^{(\text{tot})} \simeq \frac{\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V}{\Omega_m}. \quad (3.30)$$

In situations that still<sup>4</sup>  $\Omega_m \gg \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V$ , then  $w^{(\text{tot})} \simeq 0$ , which is consistent with the expected value in the matter-dominated epoch of the universe.

### B. Cosmic Accelerated Phase

Since the dust matter density decreases over the time, one can plausibly assume the chameleon scalar field-dominated phase, i.e.  $\rho^{(\phi)} \gg \rho^{(m)}$ , at the late-time universe. Under such an assumption, Eq. (3.18) leads to

$$H^2 \simeq H_0^2 (\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V). \quad (3.31)$$

Then, inserting Eq. (3.31) into relation (3.22) gives the state parameter at the late-time accelerating phase to be

$$w^{(\text{tot})} \simeq \frac{3}{2\beta^2} - \frac{\Omega_V}{\Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V}. \quad (3.32)$$

In this phase of the universe, if we consider  $\beta = 1$  while inserting Eq. (3.31) into relation (3.21) that yields

<sup>4</sup> From (3.16), while regardless of units assuming  $\phi_0 = \beta^{-1}$ , when the scalar  $\phi$  has positive values, from (2.4) will also be the potential  $V$ . Hence, from  $\Omega_m \gg \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} + \Omega_V$ , one obviously has  $\Omega_m \gg \Omega_{\dot{\phi}} - \Omega_V$ .

$\Omega_\phi = -3\Omega_V$ , then relation (3.32) will give  $w^{(\text{tot})} = 2$  that is inconsistent with the observations at the late-time universe. Whereas with the value  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$ , relation (3.21), while inserting Eq. (3.31) into it, renders  $\Omega_\phi \simeq 10^{-5} \Omega_V$ , and in turn in this case for dust matters, relation (3.32) gives

$$w^{(\text{tot})} \simeq \frac{3}{2\beta^2} - 1 \simeq 10^{-5} - 1 \simeq -1. \quad (3.33)$$

Accordingly, the analysis shows that in order to have a viable chameleon model with  $w^{(m)} = 0$  during the acceleration phase of the universe at the late-time universe, the coupling constant between the matter and scalar fields should be much greater than unity. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that, although Weltman and Khoury, in their original suggestion for the chameleon model, considered the possibility of coupling the scalar field to the matter field with the gravitational strength of the order of unity, Mota and Shaw showed that the scalar field theories with strongly coupling are viable due to the non-linearity effects of the theory [80, 81].

#### IV. GEODESIC DEVIATION EQUATION

The Einstein field equations specify how the curvature depends on the matter sources, where one can obtain the consequences of the spacetime curvature through the GDE. Formulating the cosmological equation in the GDE form would be a model independent way. Hence, in this section, in order to probe the acceleration of the universe at the late-time more instructive, we derive the GDE in the presented chameleon model. For this purpose, we start from the general expression for the GDE [82, 83]

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{D\nu^2} = R^\mu{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} V^\nu V^\alpha \eta^\beta - \frac{\beta}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \eta^\alpha \nabla_\alpha (\partial^\mu \phi), \quad (4.1)$$

with the parametric  $x^\mu(s, \nu)$ , where  $s$  labels distinct geodesics, the parameter  $\nu$  is an affine parameter along the geodesic and  $\eta^\mu = \partial x^\mu / \partial s$  is the orthogonal deviation vector of two adjacent geodesics. Also,  $D/D\nu$  is the covariant derivative along the curve and the normalized vector field  $V^\mu = \partial x^\mu / \partial \nu$  is tangent to the geodesics. The second term, which appears in the right side of this equation, illustrates that, in general, there is a fifth force mediated by  $\phi$ , which acts on any massive test particle. However, as we have assumed that the universe is isotropic and homogeneous, only the time derivatives of the scalar field do not vanish, and also in the comoving frame, one has  $\eta^0 = 0$ , hence in this case, Eq. (4.1) reads [73, 78]

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{D\nu^2} = R^\mu{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} V^\nu V^\alpha \eta^\beta. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, to attain the relation between the geometrical properties of the spacetime with the field equations governed

from the chameleon model, we use the expression of the Riemann tensor in 4-dimensions, namely

$$R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = C_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} (g_{\mu\alpha} R_{\nu\beta} - g_{\mu\beta} R_{\nu\alpha} + g_{\nu\beta} R_{\mu\alpha} - g_{\nu\alpha} R_{\mu\beta}) - \frac{1}{6} R (g_{\mu\alpha} g_{\nu\beta} - g_{\mu\beta} g_{\nu\alpha}), \quad (4.3)$$

and note that, in the case of the FLRW metric, the corresponding Weyl tensor  $C_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$  is zero. In addition, for  $w^{(m)} = 0$  with  $T_{\mu\nu}^{(m)} = \rho^{(m)} u_\mu u_\nu = (\rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}}) u_\mu u_\nu$ , where  $u^\mu$  is the comoving unit velocity vector to the matter flow, one easily obtains the Ricci tensor from Eq. (2.5) as

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \dot{\phi}^2 - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi) + \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} u_\mu u_\nu \right] + \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R, \quad (4.4)$$

and in turn with  $u_\mu u^\mu = -1$ , the Ricci scalar as

$$R = \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ -\dot{\phi}^2 + 4V(\phi) + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} \right]. \quad (4.5)$$

Inserting these relations into relation (4.3) gives

$$R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( g_{\mu\alpha} \partial_\nu \phi \partial_\beta \phi - g_{\mu\beta} \partial_\nu \phi \partial_\alpha \phi + g_{\nu\beta} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\alpha \phi - g_{\nu\alpha} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\beta \phi \right) + \frac{\rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}}}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( g_{\mu\alpha} u_\nu u_\beta - g_{\mu\beta} u_\nu u_\alpha + g_{\nu\beta} u_\mu u_\alpha - g_{\nu\alpha} u_\mu u_\beta \right) + \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} \right] \times (g_{\mu\alpha} g_{\nu\beta} - g_{\mu\beta} g_{\nu\alpha}), \quad (4.6)$$

and then, under conditions  $\eta^0 = 0$  in the comoving frame and  $\eta_\mu u^\mu = 0 = \eta_\mu V^\mu$ , we obtain

$$R^\mu{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} V^\nu V^\alpha \eta^\beta = -\frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ (V^\nu \partial_\nu \phi)^2 + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} (u_\nu V^\nu)^2 \right] \eta^\mu - \frac{1}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} \right] V^\nu V_\nu \eta^\mu. \quad (4.7)$$

Accordingly, by employing the total energy  $E = -u^\mu V_\mu$ ,  $\varepsilon \equiv V^\mu V_\mu$ , relation (4.5) and the definitions  $\rho^{(\text{tot})}$  and  $p^{(\text{tot})}$  for  $w^{(m)} = 0$  into relation (4.7), Eq. (4.2) reads

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{D\nu^2} + \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ (\dot{\phi} V^0)^2 + \rho^{(m)} E^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} (\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})} + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 R) \right] \eta^\mu = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

The four-velocity of FLRW comoving observers is  $u^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ , hence  $E = V^0$ , and finally the GDE for the presented chameleon model for dust matters with  $w^{(m)} = 0$  is

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{D\nu^2} + \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left[ E^2 (\rho^{(\text{tot})} + p^{(\text{tot})}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} (\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})} + M_{\text{Pl}}^2 R) \right] \eta^\mu = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

### A. GDE for Timelike Vector Fields

For timelike vector fields corresponded to the comoving observers within the FLRW background, the affine parameter  $\nu$  is actually the proper time  $t$ . Hence in this case,  $\varepsilon = -1$ ,  $E = 1$  and GDE (4.9) reads

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{Dt^2} + \frac{1}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( 2\rho^{(\text{tot})} - M_{\text{Pl}}^2 R \right) \eta^\mu = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

which in turn, by substituting  $\rho^{(\text{tot})}$  and relation (4.5), in the case of dust matters, we obtain

$$\frac{D^2 \eta^\mu}{Dt^2} + \frac{1}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( 2\dot{\phi}^2 - 2V(\phi) + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} \right) \eta^\mu = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

On the other hand, with respect to the comoving tetrad frame, the deviation vector can be rewritten as  $\eta^\mu = a(t) e^\mu$ , and in addition, due to the isotropy of the spacetime, one has

$$\frac{De^\mu}{Dt} = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Therefore, Eq. (4.11) becomes

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( 2\dot{\phi}^2 - 2V(\phi) + \rho e^{\beta\phi/M_{\text{Pl}}} \right), \quad (4.13)$$

which is a particular case of the Raychaudhuri dynamical Eq. (3.4) for  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , as expected to be true even for any value of it. Clearly, Eq. (4.11) illustrates that in order to have an accelerated expansion of the universe, two adjacent geodesics should recede from each other, i.e.  $D^2 \eta^\mu / Dt^2 > 0$ , that corresponds to  $\ddot{a} > 0$  in Eq. (4.13).

In the following, we proceed to obtain the value of the transition redshift from the deceleration to the acceleration phase of the universe in the chameleon model for dust matters (i.e.,  $w^{(m)} = 0$ ) with a strong coupling. For this purpose, as the transition point is when  $\ddot{a} = 0$ , thus according to Eq. (4.13), it occurs when

$$\left[ \Omega_\phi = \frac{\Omega_V}{2} - \frac{\Omega_m}{4} \right]_{\text{trans.}}. \quad (4.14)$$

By inserting relation (4.14) into Eq. (3.18), it gives

$$\left[ H^2 = \frac{3}{2} H_0^2 \left( \Omega_V + \frac{\Omega_m}{2} \right) \right]_{\text{trans.}}, \quad (4.15)$$

and in turn, relation (3.22) reads

$$\left[ w^{(\text{tot})} = \frac{3}{2\beta^2} - \frac{4}{6 + 3\Omega_m/\Omega_V} \right]_{\text{trans.}}. \quad (4.16)$$

On the other hand, as at the transition point  $w_{\text{trans.}}^{(\text{tot})} = -1/3$ , hence with the strong coupling  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$ , one

approximately obtains<sup>5</sup>  $[\Omega_m/\Omega_V]_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 2$ . By substituting relations (3.23) and (3.25) into this result, we achieve the constraint

$$\frac{\tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m} e^{4\beta\phi_0/M_{\text{Pl}}}}{\Omega_{(0)V} (1 + z_{\text{trans.}})^9} \left[ 1 - \frac{3M_{\text{Pl}}}{\beta\phi_0} \ln(1 + z_{\text{trans.}}) \right]^n \simeq 2. \quad (4.17)$$

Now, with assumptions  $\beta = 3.7 \times 10^2$ ,  $\tilde{\Omega}_{(0)m}/\Omega_{(0)V} \simeq 3/7$ ,  $M_{\text{Pl}} = 1$  and (regardless of units)  $\phi_0 = \beta^{-1}$ , we can attain the transition redshift in the chameleon model. Indeed, Eq. (4.17) gives the value of the transition redshift<sup>6</sup> to be  $z_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 0.202$  with  $n = 1$ ,  $z_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 0.157$  with  $n = 2$ ,  $z_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 0.097$  with  $n = 5$ , and  $z_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 0.060$  with  $n = 10$ . These obtained values are less than the corresponding value of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model<sup>7</sup>. Also, in Ref. [30], the corresponding value obtained in the  $f(R, T)$  gravity model is  $z_{\text{trans.}} = 0.11$ . Hence, the obtained results indicate that the coupling between the matter field and the scalar field in the chameleon model (and also between the matter field and geometry in the  $f(R, T)$  gravity model) leads to have the matter-dominated phase ending later than a model without considering such coupling.

It is worth noting that the chameleon theory, due to the non-minimal coupling between the matter and scalar field, has led to an additional force. Indeed, the equation of timelike geodesics shows such a fifth force by receiving an amendment in the Einstein frame. In other words, the GDE shows that, although a freely falling particle appears to be at rest in a comoving frame falling with the particle, a pair of nearby freely falling particles indicates a relative motion that can reveal the presence of a gravitational field to an observer that falls with those.

### B. GDE for Null Vector Fields

In this subsection, we investigate the past-directed null vector fields. With the FLRW metric, for null vector fields, one has  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Also, by considering  $\eta^\mu = \eta e^\mu$  and using a parallelly propagated and aligned coordinate basis, we have  $De^\mu/D\nu = V^\alpha \nabla_\alpha e^\mu = 0$ , and hence GDE (4.9) (for dust matters) reduces to

$$\frac{d^2 \eta}{d\nu^2} + \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( \rho^{(\text{tot})} + p^{(\text{tot})} \right) E^2 \eta = 0, \quad (4.18)$$

<sup>5</sup> Indeed, its value is less than 2, i.e.  $2 - \epsilon$ , which in turn by relation (4.14) gives  $[\dot{\phi}^2 = \epsilon V/2]_{\text{trans.}}$ , where  $V$  at the transition point is a positive value as given under relation (3.28).

<sup>6</sup> For negative values of the  $n$  parameter, the value of the transition redshift is an imaginary number.

<sup>7</sup> In the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the calculation of the transition redshift yields  $z_{\text{trans.}} \simeq 0.67$ .

and actually, using definitions  $\rho^{(\text{tot})}$  and  $p^{(\text{tot})}$  for  $w^{(m)} = 0$ , it reads

$$\frac{d^2\eta}{d\nu^2} + \frac{1}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left( \dot{\phi}^2 + \rho e^{\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} \right) E^2 \eta = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Regarding the focusing condition mentioned in Refs. [74, 75], all the past-directed null geodesics from Eq. (4.18) will experience focusing if the condition  $\rho^{(\text{tot})} + p^{(\text{tot})} > 0$  is met. For the chameleon model in this case, this condition is actually

$$\dot{\phi}^2 + \rho e^{\frac{\beta\phi}{M_{\text{Pl}}}} > 0, \quad (4.20)$$

which, as the density of matter is always positive, is confirmed.

In continuation, it is more suitable to write the GDE for null vector fields as a function of the redshift to obtain the observer area-distance in the chameleon model. To perform this task, we start from the differential operator

$$\frac{d}{d\nu} = \frac{dz}{d\nu} \frac{d}{dz} \quad (4.21)$$

that obviously yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{d\nu^2} &= \left( \frac{dz}{d\nu} \right)^2 \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \frac{d^2 z}{d\nu^2} \frac{d}{dz} \\ &= \left( \frac{d\nu}{dz} \right)^{-2} \left[ \frac{d^2}{dz^2} - \left( \frac{d\nu}{dz} \right)^{-1} \frac{d^2 \nu}{dz^2} \frac{d}{dz} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Then, using the relation  $(1+z) = a_0/a = E/E_0$  with assumption  $a_0 = 1$  for the present-time, one obtains [75]

$$dz = -(1+z) \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \frac{dt}{d\nu} d\nu = -(1+z) H E d\nu, \quad (4.23)$$

that can be rearranged into

$$\frac{d\nu}{dz} = -\frac{1}{E_0 H (1+z)^2}, \quad (4.24)$$

and in turn, get

$$\frac{d^2 \nu}{dz^2} = \frac{1}{E_0 H (1+z)^3} \left[ 2 + \frac{(1+z)}{H} \left( \frac{dH}{dz} \right) \right]. \quad (4.25)$$

By inserting the relation

$$\frac{dH}{dz} = \frac{d\nu}{dz} \frac{dt}{d\nu} \frac{dH}{dt} = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H(1+z)} \quad (4.26)$$

into relation (4.25), it reads

$$\frac{d^2 \nu}{dz^2} = \frac{1}{E_0 H (1+z)^3} \left( 2 - \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \right). \quad (4.27)$$

By substituting  $\dot{H} = \ddot{a}/a - H^2$  into relation (4.27) while using Eq. (3.8), one obtains

$$\frac{d^2 \nu}{dz^2} = \frac{1}{E_0 H (1+z)^3} \left( 3 + \frac{\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})}}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H^2} \right), \quad (4.28)$$

and in turn, by substituting Eq. (4.28) and relation (4.24) into relation (4.22), we get

$$\frac{d^2 \eta}{d\nu^2} = E_0^2 H^2 (1+z)^4 \left[ \frac{d^2 \eta}{dz^2} + \frac{1}{(1+z)} \times \left( 3 + \frac{\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})}}{6M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H^2} \right) \frac{d\eta}{dz} \right]. \quad (4.29)$$

Finally, by inserting Eq. (4.18) into Eq. (4.29), the null GDE corresponding to the chameleon scalar field model for dust matters is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \eta}{dz^2} + \frac{3}{1+z} \left( 1 + \frac{\rho^{(\text{tot})} + 3p^{(\text{tot})}}{18M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H^2} \right) \frac{d\eta}{dz} \\ + \frac{(\rho^{(\text{tot})} + p^{(\text{tot})})}{2(1+z)^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H^2} \eta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

However, using relations (3.7) and (3.19), Eq. (4.30) reads

$$\frac{d^2 \eta}{dz^2} + \frac{(7 + 3w^{(\text{tot})})}{2(1+z)} \frac{d\eta}{dz} + \frac{3(1 + w^{(\text{tot})})}{2(1+z)^2} \eta = 0. \quad (4.31)$$

An analytical solution of Eq. (4.31), as a linear homogeneous second-order ordinary differential equation, is

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(z) = & C_1 (1+z)^{\frac{1}{4}(-5-3w^{(\text{tot})}-|1+3w^{(\text{tot})}|)} \\ & + C_2 (1+z)^{\frac{1}{4}(-5-3w^{(\text{tot})}+|1+3w^{(\text{tot})}|)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are integration constants. Relation (4.32) is the obtained result for the null vector fields in the chameleon model that corresponds to the related one obtained in the Brans-Dicke theory [78]. With appropriate initial conditions  $\eta(0) = 0$  and  $d\eta/dz|_{z=0} = 1$ , solution (4.32) gives

$$C_1 = -C_2 = \frac{-2}{|1 + 3w^{(\text{tot})}|}, \quad (4.33)$$

where the derivative of the state parameter with respect to the redshift has been assumed to be zero at the present time. We have plotted the behavior of the deviation vector with respect to the redshift for some range of allowed values of the total state parameter in the top diagram of Figure 2.

Furthermore, we can indicate the observer area-distance  $r_0(z)$  that is given by

$$r_0(z) := \sqrt{\left| \frac{dA_0(z)}{d\Omega_0} \right|} = \left| \frac{\eta(z')|_{z'=z}}{d\eta(z')/dl|_{z'=0}} \right|, \quad (4.34)$$

where  $A_0$  is the area of the object and  $\Omega_0$  is the solid angle [74, 75]. In this respect, using the relation  $|d/dl| = E_0^{-1}(1+z)^{-1}d/d\nu = H(1+z)d/dz$ , wherein  $dl = a(t)dr$ , while assuming that the deviation vector to be zero at  $z = 0$ , relation (4.34) yields

$$r_0(z) = \left| \frac{\eta(z)}{H_0 d\eta(z')/dz'|_{z'=0}} \right|. \quad (4.35)$$






Figure 2: The behavior of the deviation vector (the top diagram) and the observer area-distance (the bottom diagram) are depicted with respect to the redshift for null vector fields with the initial conditions  $\eta(z)|_{z=0} = 0$ ,  $d\eta(z)/dz|_{z=0} = 1$  and the parametric values  $H_0 \simeq 67.6$  (km/s)/Mpc.

This relation represents the observed area-distance as a function of the redshift in units of the present-day Hubble radius [75]. By inserting solution (4.32) into relation (4.35), we attain the observed area-distance for the chameleon model with dust matters, which has been depicted in the bottom diagram of Figure 2. The comparison of the diagrams in Figure 2 with the corresponding ones in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model [75], the  $f(R)$  theory [84], the Hu-Sawicki models [85], the  $f(R, T)$  theory [30], the Brans-Dicke theory [78] and the space-time-matter theory [33] indicates that the general behavior of the null geodesic deviation and the observer area-distance in the

chameleon model are similar to these models. The similarity of our results to the corresponding ones in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model reveals that the chameleon model remains phenomenologically viable and can be tested with the observational data [75].

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have considered the chameleon model as one of the scalar-tensor theories, in which the chameleon scalar field non-minimally interact with the baryonic matter field, within the homogeneous and isotropic spatially flat FLRW background. The scalar field in such theories (which usually plays the role of dark energy) have been introduced in the Einstein gravitational theory to explain the accelerated expansion of the universe. However, such a scalar field in the chameleon model (as a chameleon field) was introduced to remedy the problem of the EP-violation as well. On the other hand, it would be interesting to be able to describe the evolution of the universe with just one single scalar field from inflation till late-time. In this regard, we had investigated the chameleon model during inflation [65, 67], wherein it has been shown that, at the beginning of the inflation, the cosmological constant drives the inflation and then the chameleon scalar field plays the role of inflation [67]. Now, in this work, the role of the chameleon scalar field as dark energy has been studied.

It has been indicated that the chameleon model for dust matters with the strong coupling and positive values of the  $n$  parameter can explain the late-time accelerated expansion of the universe. Hence, such a model justifies dark energy with stronger confirmation. The results not only reveal that the strongly coupling chameleon scalar field is viable at the late-time, but also set some constraints on the potential of the model. Also, in this work, we have obtained the total state parameter and shown that the case of matter-dominated epoch causes a decelerated evolution, and the case of the chameleon scalar field-dominated epoch corresponds to an accelerated phase. Moreover, the analysis shows that the inverse power-law potential remains a model-consistent with the explanation of the universe at the late-time.

On the other side, in order to make the investigations more instructive, we have calculated the GDE in the chameleonic scalar field model for the timelike and null vector fields to study the relative acceleration of these geodesics as an effect of the curvature of the spacetime. The case of the timelike vector fields gives the generalized Raychaudhuri equation. The presence of the fifth force in the chameleon model leads to the appearance of some new terms in the GDE and the Raychaudhuri equation, which are a direct consequence of the coupling between the chameleon scalar field and matter field. Furthermore, we have obtained the value of the transition redshift from the matter-dominated phase to the late-time accelerated phase of the universe for the chameleon model. The ob-

tained values indicate that the transition redshift in the chameleon model with dust matters is less than the corresponding value of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model but is similar to the  $f(R, T)$  gravity model. Hence, we conclude that the coupling of the matter field with the scalar field or with the geometry leads to a longer matter-dominated epoch in the evolution of the universe.

Also, we have specified the observed area-distance of the model through the GDE of the null vector fields. Moreover, the results show that the general behaviors of the null deviation vector fields and the observer area-distance in the chameleon model for dust matters have an evolution almost similar to the other corresponding modified gravity models. In fact, the behavior of almost all models, for the deviation evolution, is similar to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model for small values of  $z$ , as expected. That is, their results remain like a cosmological constant with

small corrections to GR.

The relations of the area-distance (4.34) and (4.35) can be used for the angular size-redshift relation derived from the Sunyaev-Zel'dovich effect x-ray technique [86, 87], and also to compact the radio sources as cosmic rulers [88, 89]. Moreover, by considering the relation between the area- and the luminosity-distances (see, e.g. Ref. [90]), it is also possible to extend the investigations in the chameleon model with the data obtained from the observations of type Ia supernovae [91, 92]. In addition to the observed area-distance, the geodesic deviation equation can be used to study the effect of the generalized tidal forces, which could lead to the possibility of observationally testing the model through the observational effects of tides due to an extended mass distribution, for more details see Refs. [93, 94].

- 
- [1] A. Riess *et al.*, “Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant”, *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998).
  - [2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [The Supernovae Cosmology Project], “Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high-redshift supernovae”, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999).
  - [3] A.G. Riess *et al.*, “BV RI light curves for 22 type Ia supernovae”, *Astron. J.* **117**, 707 (1999).
  - [4] A.G. Riess *et al.*, “Type Ia supernova discoveries at  $z > 1$  from the Hubble space telescope: Evidence for past deceleration and constraints on dark energy evolution”, *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004).
  - [5] M. Tegmark *et al.*, “Cosmological parameters from SDSS and WMAP”, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004).
  - [6] D.N. Spergel *et al.*, “Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (WMAP) three year observations: Implications for cosmology”, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **170**, 377 (2007).
  - [7] N. Benitez *et al.*, “Measuring baryon acoustic oscillations along the line of sight with photometric redshifts: The PAU survey”, *Astrophys. J.* **691**, 241 (2009).
  - [8] J. Dunkley *et al.*, “Five-year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe observations: Bayesian estimation of CMB polarization maps”, *Astrophys. J.* **701**, 1804 (2009).
  - [9] D. Parkinson *et al.*, “Optimizing baryon acoustic oscillation surveys II. Curvature, redshifts and external data sets”, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **401**, 2169 (2010).
  - [10] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, “Modified gravity with negative and positive powers of the curvature: Unification of the inflation and of the cosmic acceleration”, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 123512 (2003).
  - [11] S.M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden, and M.S. Turner, “Is cosmic speed-up due to new gravitational physics?”, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2004).
  - [12] M.C.B. Abdalla, S. Nojiri, and S.D. Odintsov, “Consistent modified gravity: Dark energy, acceleration and the absence of cosmic doomsday”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, L35 (2005).
  - [13] S.M. Carroll *et al.*, “The cosmology of generalized modified gravity models”, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063513 (2005).
  - [14] S. Capozziello, V.F. Cardone and A. Troisi, “Dark energy and dark matter as curvature effects”, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **0608**, 001 (2006).
  - [15] M. Farhoudi, “On higher order gravities, their analogy to GR, and dimensional dependent version of Duff’s trace anomaly relation”, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **38**, 1261 (2006).
  - [16] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, “Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **04**, 115 (2007).
  - [17] K. Atazadeh, M. Farhoudi and H.R. Sepangi, “Accelerating universe in  $f(R)$  brane gravity”, *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 275 (2008).
  - [18] T. Harko, “Modified gravity with arbitrary coupling between matter and geometry”, *Phys. Lett. B* **669**, 376 (2008).
  - [19] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
  - [20] T.P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, “ $f(R)$  theories of gravity”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 451 (2010).
  - [21] S. Capozziello and V. Faraoni, *Beyond Einstein Gravity: A Survey of Gravitational Theories for Cosmology and Astrophysics*, (Springer, London, 2011).
  - [22] T. Harko, F.S.N. Lobo, S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, “ $f(R, T)$  gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 024020 (2011).
  - [23] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, “Extended theories of gravity”, *Phys. Rep.* **509**, 167 (2011).
  - [24] T. Clifton, P.G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, “Modified gravity and cosmology”, *Phys. Rep.* **513**, 1 (2012).
  - [25] H. Farajollahi, M. Farhoudi, A. Salehi and H. Shojai, “Chameleonic generalized Brans-Dicke model and late-time acceleration”, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **337**, 415 (2012).
  - [26] A.F. Bahrehbakhsh, M. Farhoudi and H. Vakili, “Dark energy from fifth dimensional Brans-Dicke theory”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **22**, 1350070 (2013).
  - [27] H. Shabani and M. Farhoudi, “Cosmological and solar system consequences of  $f(R, T)$  gravity models”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 044031 (2014).
  - [28] Z. Haghani, T. Harko, H.R. Sepangi and S. Shahidi, “Matter may matter”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23**, 1442016 (2014).

- [29] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden, “Beyond the cosmological standard model”, *Phys. Rept.* **568**, 1 (2015).
- [30] R. Zaregonbadi and M. Farhoudi, “Cosmic acceleration from matter-curvature coupling”, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **48**, 142 (2016).
- [31] R. Zaregonbadi, M. Farhoudi and N. Riazi, “Dark matter from  $f(R, T)$  gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 084052 (2016).
- [32] A.F. Bahrehbakhsh, “Interacting induced dark energy model”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **57**, 2881 (2018).
- [33] R. Zaregonbadi, “Cosmic acceleration via space-time-matter theory”, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **34**, 1950296 (2019).
- [34] Y. Xu, G. Li, T. Harko and S.-D. Liang, “ $f(Q, T)$  gravity”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 708 (2019).
- [35] S. Bhattacharjee, J.R.L. Santos, P.H.R.S. Moraes and P.K. Sahoo, “Inflation in  $f(R, T)$  gravity”, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **135**, 576 (2020).
- [36] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, “The cosmological constant and dark energy”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 559 (2003).
- [37] T. Padmanabhan, “Cosmological constant-the weight of the vacuum”, *Phys. Rep.* **380**, 235 (2003).
- [38] D. Polarski, “Dark energy: Current issues”, *Ann. Phys. (Berlin)* **15**, 342 (2006).
- [39] E.J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, “Dynamics of dark energy”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753 (2006).
- [40] R. Durrer and R. Maartens, “Dark energy and dark gravity: Theory overview”, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **40**, 301 (2008).
- [41] 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**, 155 (2012).
- [42] S.M. Carroll, “The cosmological constant”, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4**, 1 (2001).
- [43] V. Sahni, “The cosmological constant problem and quintessence”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 3435 (2002).
- [44] S.M. Carroll, “Why is the universe accelerating?”, *Car. Observ. Astrophys. Ser.* **2**, (2004).
- [45] S. Nobbenhuis, “Categorizing different approaches to the cosmological constant problem”, *Found. Phys.* **36**, 613 (2006).
- [46] H. Padmanabhan and T. Padmanabhan, “CosMIn: The solution to the cosmological constant problem”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **22**, 1342001 (2013).
- [47] D. Bernard and A. LeClair, “Scrutinizing the cosmological constant problem and a possible resolution”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 063010 (2013).
- [48] P. Bull *et al.*, “Beyond  $\Lambda$ CDM: Problems, solutions, and the road ahead”, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **12**, 56 (2016).
- [49] B. Bertotti, L. Iess, P. Tortora, “A test of general relativity using radio links with the Cassini spacecraft”, *Nature* **425**, 374 (2003).
- [50] Y. Fujii and K. Maeda, *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
- [51] V. Faraoni, “Scalar field mass in generalized gravity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 145014 (2009).
- [52] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, “Cosmological imprint of an energy component with general equation of state”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998).
- [53] I. Zlatev, L. Wang and P.J. Steinhardt, “Quintessence, cosmic coincidence and the cosmological constant”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896 (1999).
- [54] P.J. Steinhardt, L. Wang and I. Zlatev, “Cosmological tracking solutions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 123504 (1999).
- [55] J.P. Ostriker and P.J. Steinhardt, “The quintessential universe”, *Sci. Am.* **284**, 46 (2001).
- [56] P.J. Steinhardt, “A quintessential introduction to dark energy”, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **361**, 2497 (2003).
- [57] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, “Chameleon cosmology”, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 046024 (2004).
- [58] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, “Chameleon fields: Awaiting surprises for tests of gravity in space”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 171104 (2004).
- [59] J. Khoury, “Chameleon field theories”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 214004 (2013).
- [60] P. Brax, A.-C. Davis and J. Sakstein, “Dynamics of supersymmetric chameleons”, *JCAP* **1310**, 007 (2013).
- [61] I. Quiros, R. García-Salcedo, T. Gonzalez, and F.A. Horta-Rangel, “The chameleon effect in the Jordan frame of the Brans-Dicke theory”, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 044055 (2015).
- [62] P. Brax, C. Van de Bruck, A.C. Davis, J. Khoury and A. Weltman, “Detecting dark energy in orbit: The cosmological chameleon”, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 123518 (2004).
- [63] S. Gubser and J. Khoury, “Scalar self-interactions loosen constraints from fifth force searches”, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 104001 (2004).
- [64] C. Burrage and J. Sakstein, “Tests of chameleon gravity”, *Living Rev. Rel.* **21**, 1 (2018).
- [65] N. Saba and M. Farhoudi, “Chameleon field dynamics during inflation”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **27**, 1850041 (2018).
- [66] S.M.M. Rasouli, N. Saba, M. Farhoudi, J. Marto and P.V. Moniz, “Inflationary universe in deformed phase space scenario”, *Ann. Phys.* **393**, 288 (2018).
- [67] N. Saba and M. Farhoudi, “Noncommutative universe and chameleon field dynamics”, *Ann. Phys.* **395**, 1 (2018).
- [68] H. Bernardo, R. Costa, H. Nastase and A. Weltman, “Conformal inflation with chameleon coupling”, *JCAP* **1904**, 027 (2019).
- [69] H. Sheikahmadi *et al.*, “Constraining chameleon field driven warm inflation with Planck 2018 data”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 1038 (2019).
- [70] J.L. Synge, “On the deviation of geodesics and null-geodesics, particularly in relation to the properties of spaces of constant curvature and indefinite line-element”, *Ann. Math.* **35**, 705 (1934); Republished in: *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **41**, 1205 (2009).
- [71] F.A.E. Pirani, “On the physical significance of the Riemann tensor”, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **15**, 389 (1956); Republished in: *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **41**, 1215 (2009).
- [72] P. Szekeres, “The gravitational compass”, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1387 (1965).
- [73] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984).
- [74] P. Schneider, J. Ehlers and E.E. Falco, *Gravitational Lenses*, (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992).
- [75] G.F.R. Ellis and H. Van Elst, “Deviation of geodesics in FLRW spacetime geometries”, arXiv:gr-qc/9709060.
- [76] F. Shojai and A. Shojai, “Geodesic consequences in the Palatini  $f(R)$  theory”, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 104011 (2008).
- [77] S.M.M. Rasouli, A.F. Bahrehbakhsh, S. Jalalzadeh and M. Farhoudi, “Quantum mechanics and geodesic deviation in the brane world”, *Europhys. Lett.* **87**, 40006 (2009).
- [78] S.M.M. Rasouli and F. Shojai, “Geodesic deviation equa-

- tion in Brans-Dicke theory in arbitrary dimensions”, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **32**, 100781 (2021).
- [79] M. Jaffe *et al.*, “Testing sub-gravitational forces on atoms from a miniature in-vacuum source mass”, *Nature* **13**, 938 (2017).
- [80] D.F. Mota and D.J. Shaw, “Strongly coupled chameleon fields: New horizons in scalar field theory”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 151102, (2006).
- [81] D.F. Mota and D.J. Shaw, “Evading equivalence principle violations, cosmological and other experimental constraint in scalar field theories with a strong coupling to matter”, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 063501 (2007).
- [82] S. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973).
- [83] V. Faraoni, *Cosmology in Scalar-Tensor Gravity*, (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1988).
- [84] A. Guarnizo, L. Castaneda and J.M. Tejeiro, “Geodesic deviation equation in  $f(R)$  gravity”, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **43**, 2713 (2011).
- [85] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P.K.S. Dunsby, V.C. Busti and S. Kandhai, “Tidal forces in  $f(R)$  theories of gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 064029 (2014).
- [86] M. Bonamente, M.K. Joy, S.J. LaRoque, J.E. Carlstrom, E.D. Reese and K.S. Dawson, “Determination of the cosmic distance scale from Sunyaev-Zel’dovich effect and Chandra X-ray measurements of high-redshift galaxy clusters”, *Astrophys. J.* **647**, 25 (2006).
- [87] Y. Chen and B. Ratra, “Galaxy cluster angular-size data constraints on dark energy”, *Astron. Astrophys.* **543**, A104 (2012).
- [88] J.A.S. Lima and J.S. Alcaniz, “Dark energy and the angular size-redshift diagram for milliarcsecond radio sources”, *Astrophys. J.* **566**, 15 (2002).
- [89] J.C. Jackson, “Is there a standard measuring rod in the Universe?”, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **390**, L1 (2008).
- [90] D.R. Matavers and A.M. Aziz, “A note on the observer area-distance formula”, *Mon. Not. Astron. Soc. Southern Africa* **47**, 124 (1988).
- [91] N. Suzuki *et al.*, “The Hubble space telescope cluster supernova survey. V. Improving the dark-energy constraints above  $z > 1$  and building an early-type-hosted supernova sample”, *Astrophys. J.* **746**, 85 (2012).
- [92] H. Campbell *et al.*, “Cosmology with photometrically classified type Ia supernovae from the SDSS-II supernova survey”, *Astrophys. J.* **763**, 88 (2013).
- [93] C. Porciani, A. Dekel and Y. Hoffman, “Testing tidal-torque theory – I. Spin amplitude and direction”, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **332**, 325 (2002).
- [94] T. Harko and F.S.N. Lobo, “Geodesic deviation, Raychaudhuri equation, and tidal forces in modified gravity with an arbitrary curvature-matter coupling”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 124034 (2012).