Confronting pNGB quintessence with data

Koushik Dutta and Lorenzo Sorbo^y Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003 (Dated: April 11, 2024)

W e analyze the observational constraints on the m odel where a pseudo-N am bu-G oldstone boson (pNGB) plays the role of dark energy. The constraints are derived by using the latest G old set of 182 type Ia supernovae and the CMB shift parameter. W e allow for both the initial value of the scalar eld and the present value of the energy density in the pNGB to vary. We nd that { com pared to previous analyses { the allow ed portion of parameter space has shrunk around the region where the pNGB does not evolve signi cantly.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Since the type Ia supernova observations of [1, 2, 3], an intense activity has been devoted to the search of an explanation of the accelerated expansion of the Universe. If gravity is described by E instein's G eneral Relativity and the e ects of inhom ogeneities can be neglected, then acceleration must be due to a dark energy component that represents roughly 70% of the matter content of the Universe. Current data tell that the equation of state parameter w = p= of dark energy has to obey w < 0:7 [4].

The simplest explanation of cosm ic acceleration is a cosm ological constant, the energy of vacuum, with m agnitude

$$' (2 \ 10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4$$
 (1)

and equation of state parameter w = 1. This solution is attractive in many respects, both for its simplicity (a single parameter is needed to describe it) and for its excellent agreement with data. It is how ever hard to justify from a theoretical standpoint. Quantum uctuations of matter, indeed, give contributions to the vacuum energy, and very precise cancellations are needed to keep this energy at small values. Unfortunately the Standard M odel does not display any of these cancellations at least up to the scales that have been probed in collider experiments, about 60 orders of magnitude beyond the value of (1).

For this reason, soon after the release of [1, 2, 3], people have started to look for alternative scenarios, and a wide interest in quintessence models has emerged [5] (for a recent review, see [6]). The philosophy behind quintessence is the following. First, it is assumed that som emechanism is able to x the energy of the ground state of the Universe to zero¹. Then the existence of a new degree of freedom (quintessence) is postulated: quintessence is supposed not to have yet relaxed to its vacuum, so that its energy density is responsible for cosm ic acceleration. Quintessence has w ϵ 1 as a distinctive prediction, and is usually described by som e scalar degree of freedom endowed with som e potential V (). V () has to be very at, if we want w to be su ciently negative.

It is possible to write down a virtually in nite number of quintessence potentials V (). However, only for few of them the atness of the potential is not spoiled by radiative corrections and the exchange of quanta of do not give rise to an (unobserved) flh force [7]. Those few potentials are more motivated from a theoretical point of view than the others. This is especially true for the pseudo-N am bu-G oldstone boson (pNGB) potential of [8] that has all the good qualities of radiative stability that anybody who believes in quantum mechanics might require.

In the present paper we analyze the parameter space of pNGB quintessence [8] in the light of the most recent observations, in particular those from supernovae. Our approach is orthogonal to the \m odel independent" approach recently taken on the subject by m any investigators (see for instance [9]), and is admittedly based on a theoretical prejudice in favor of radiatively stable potentials. To our know ledge, the most recent com plete analyses of this model date back to about ve years ago [10, 11, 12]. Given the recent developments of the observational situation, we believe that it is important

koushik@physics.umass.edu

^ysorbo@physics.umass.edu

¹ It is often stated that nding a mechanism that xes to cosm ological constant to zero should be easier than nding a mechanism that xes it to some very small nonvanishing value. Let us note here that this is not what usually occurs in Q uantum Field Theory: if it is possible to nd a symmetry that xes some quantity to zero, it is typically straightforward to break such a symmetry so that this quantity can be kept small in a controlled way.

to perform an analysis of the model in which the latest data are taken into account.

In the next section we brie y describe the properties of the model of pNGB quintessence. Then in section III we present the observational constraints from supernovae and from the CMB shift parameter. In section IV we discuss our results before concluding in section V.

II. THE PNGB POTENTIAL

The use of pNBGs has been rst proposed in order to realize a technically natural model of in ation in [13] and has been subsequently considered for dark energy in [8]. The model is characterized by a pseudoscalar eld with a potential that can be well approximated by

$$V() = {4 \left[\cos(=f) + 1\right]};$$
 (2)

where we have neglected the contributions by higher harm onics (this is supposed to be a good approxim ation as long as f is su ciently smaller than the Planck m ass [14]). The potential is generated by the breaking of a shift symmetry ! + constant, and for this reason it is radiatively stable.

The cosm obgical evolution of this model is in general determined by four parameters: the quantities and f and the initial conditions in and \neg_{ln} . Due to the high expansion rate of the Early Universe, we assume $\neg_{ln} = 0$. One more free parameter is eliminated if we insist that

(the current ratio of the am ount of dark energy over critical energy) is equal to 0:7. As a consequence, if we = 0.7, the model is described by only two assum e param eters that can be taken to be f and in . A detailed analysis of the dynam ics of the pNGB zero mode can be found in [11]. Due to periodicity of the potential in takes values between 0 and 2 f. In addition, if we take into account the indication from String Theory [14] that f cannot be larger than M $_{\rm P}$ ' 2:4 10¹⁸ G eV, then the param eter space of the potential turns out to be com pact. This implies that, at least in principle, all of it can be excluded by observation, and that pNGB quintessence in its simplest version can be ruled out. For this reason we nd this model even more attractive (although there are ways to evade the constraint $f < M_P$ [15]), and we believe this is an additionalm otivation for studying it in detail. A lso, for this reason we will restrict our study to the region $f < M_P$.

III. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

W e consider the quintessence eld with potential (2) in a at Friedmann-Robertson-Walker Universe. The equations of motion are given by

$$H^{2} = \frac{1}{3M_{p}^{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{2} + V() + m \right);$$

+ 3H -+ $\frac{dV}{d} = 0;$ (3)

where $H = \underline{a}=a$ is the Hubble constant, m is the energy density of nonrelativistic matter and, since we will be dealing only with the dynam ics of the late Universe, we neglect contributions by radiation. We solve these equations num erically to nd the evolution of the scale factor as a function of time.

A. Type Ia supernovae

First, we investigate constraints from the observation of type Ia supernova from the data set [16], which is a compilation of old data [3] by HZS team, rst year SuperN ova Legacy Survey data [17] and recent observations of 21 new supernovae [4]. For our analysis we will consider only the 182 \high con dence" Gold SN data with z > 0.0233. A lthough m ost of the SN e have z < 1, there are 16 SN e with z > 1. This is the most up to date supernova data set available in the literature. This data set has been recently used in [18, 19] to study the observational constraints on di erent param etrizations of dark energy.

For a particular cosm ologicalm odel with parameters s the predicted distance m oduli are given by

$$_{0}(z;s) = m \quad M = 5 \log_{10} \frac{d_{L}(s)}{M pc} + 25;$$
 (4)

where m and M are the apparent and absolute magnitude of distant supernovae. $d_{\rm L}$ is the lum inosity distance given by

$$d_{L}(z) = (1 + z) \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{dz^{\circ}}{H(z^{\circ})}$$
(5)

and depends only on the expansion history of the Universe from redshift z to today. A ssum ing that all the distance m oduli are independent and norm ally distributed the likelihood function can be calculated from the chi-square statistics L / exp($^{2}=2$), where

² (_{in}; -_{in}; f; ;H₀) =
$$\frac{\dot{X}^{82}}{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{(obs \ th \ 0i})^2}{2 \ 0i}$$
: (6)

Here $_{0i}^{obs}$ and $_{0i}$ are the measured value of the distance modulus and the corresponding uncertainty for the i th supernova. $_{0i}^{obs}$ and $_{0i}$, as well as the redshift z_i are found from the data set [16]. $_{0}^{th}$ is calculated by using eq. (5), where H (z) is obtained by numerically solving the background evolution equation (3). We marginalize the likelihood over the nuisance parameter H $_0$ [2].

As we have noted earlier, the model has four param eters: f; ; in and \neg_n . We assume $\neg_n = 0$ and allow the system to evolve until = 0.7 today. This leaves us with two parameters and we choose them to be f and in. We plot the resulting condence contour in gure 1. The upper left portion of the plot corresponds to the part of parameter space where does not reach the value 0:7. In this part of the parameter space, the scalar eld rolls quickly to the minimum and oscillates around it, behaving like matter.



FIG.1: The shaded areas at the bottom right of the gure denote the 1 and 2 con dence level regions for = 0.7. The upper left part of the plot corresponds to parameters for which never reaches 0:7. The white dashed line corresponds to the value of the parameters for which $w_0 = 0.965$.

The dark areas at the bottom right part of the plot give the 68.3% (1) and the 95.4% (2) condence level regions. The 3 contour runs between the 2 contour and the boundary of the forbidden region (we do not show it in the plot for clarity). As we go closer to the boundary of the forbidden region, the value of ² increases sharply. Even if the 95.4% condence level area seems to cover alm ost all of the allowed region, this is actually not the case. Indeed, there is a part of the parameter space, below the boundary of the forbidden region, where goes across 0:7 several times, as an elect of the oscillations of . This means that points with the same values of in, f and can correspond to di erent histories, depending on the num ber of times has gone across the value 0:7. We have computed the value of 2 in the case where has crossed = 0:7 m ore than once and we have found that this part of the parameter space is excluded at m ore than the 3 level.

0 nce = 0.7 is xed, the constraints on the param - eters in and f can be converted into constraints on the plane (f;). We plot the 1; 2; and 3 contours in g-ure 2.



FIG.2:1;2, and 3 constraints on the plane (f;) for = 0:7. The lower part of the plot corresponds to values of the parameters for which cannot reach the value 0:7.

The thick white dashed line in the bottom right part of gure 1 corresponds the part of parameter space that gives $w_0 = 0.965$ (where w_0 is the current value of the equation of state parameter). A coording to [20], w < 0.965 is the most optimistic constraint (at the 95.4% level) that we might obtain from future observations, should they converge to the regime where dark energy shows no evolution. Therefore the dashed line in gure 1 gives the most stringent 2 constraint that we can expect to put on the parameters of pNGB quintessence.

 ${\tt W}$ e have also considered the case where the value of

is allowed to vary. In this case we have xed $f = M_p$ while keeping in variable. In the left panel of gure 3 we show the 1; 2; and 3 contours related to supernova observations on the (; in) plane. The shaded upper right part of the plot is excluded since the corresponding value of cannot be reached. The contours are essentially vertical and centered around '0:67. How ever, at larger values of in (cor-

responding to some evolution in the quintessence eld) are allowed. The best t is at = 0.67, in = 0 (so that the pNGB sits at the top of its potential and behaves as a cosm ological constant) with $^2 = 159.6$ for 180 degrees of freedom ². For sm aller values of f (gure not shown), the contours have the same shape, although they shrink along the in direction.



FIG. 3: Constraints on the pNGB parameter space for $f = M_P$. Left panel: 1; 2 and 3 con dence level contours from supernovae only (dashed lines) and from the CMB shift parameter (7) only (solid lines). Right panel: 1; 2 and 3 contours from the pint analysis.

B. CMB shift parameter

In addition to the SN data, we use Cosm ic M icrowave Background (CMB) data to constrain the model. In particular we derive constraints from the CMB shift param – eter R, that m easures the shift in the angular size of the acoustic peaks of CMB when parameters of the theory are varied. R is independent on the present value of the Hubble constant, and is given by

$$R = {p - \frac{1}{m} H_0} {dz - \frac{1}{m} \frac{dz}{H_0} \frac{dz}{H_0}};$$
(7)

where $z_{cm b}$ is the redshift of recombination. By using W MAP 3rd year data the value of the shift parameter has been extracted as $R = 1.70 \quad 0.03$ for $z_{cm b} = 1089$ [21]. In

the left panel of gure 3 we plot the resulting con dence contour arising from this constraint. Note that the CM B contours favor a value of that is slightly larger than that favored by the SN data.

Once the SN and the CMB constraints are combined, we obtain the plot shown on the right panel of gure 3. Since we are assuming a at Universe, imposing the shift parameter constraint does not reduce signi cantly the area of the allowed region, and indeed the SN and CMB constraints are not orthogonal. However, the CMB constraint helps elim inate the part of parameter space at large and large in that is available at the 2 and 3 level if only SN constraints are taken into account. M oreover, once the CMB constraint is added, the best t point is not any more at $_{in} = 0$, but at the point = 0.71 where $^{2} = 161.6$. This should $_{\rm in} = 1.25 \, {\rm M}_{\rm P}$; be compared to $^2 = 162:9$ found at = 0:71 when the constraint in = 0 is imposed. Since in 6 0 implies that is rolling, the combination of CMB and SN data seems to hint at some evolution in dark energy. However, this hint should be taken with a grain of salt, since it emerges when we join two data sets that are not exactly compatible, as shown by the increase of 2 units in 2 when we add the single CM B point to the SN data set (as stated above, the best t point for SN data only has $^2 = 159:6$).

IV. DISCUSSION

The data presented above indicate that, if we use supernova constraints only, the parameters that yield the best t to data are those where the eld sits at the top of the cosine potential, thus m in icking a cosm ological constant. If we use also the constraint from the CM B shift parameter, a slow ly rolling pNGB is slightly preferred to a constant one.

In order to see how the new data of [4] in prove the constraints on the model, we can compare our results with those of previous analyses. In [10], W aga and Frieman have studied the constraints from the 1998 supernova data of R isss et al. [1], together with the statistics of gravitationally lensed quasars. C on parison of our results with those of [10] is complicated by di erent assumptions on the param etrization of the model. Indeed, in [10] the value of in is xed to 1.5 f, so that is not a free param eter, but is function of f and . N evertheless, some comparison is possible: in the param eter space of [10] there is still room at 2 for a small region where the scale factor of the U niverse is currently decelerating. In our analysis (see gure 4) this is not possible any more

 $^{^2}$ The best-t 2 for the older dataset [3] was of 2 = 178:1 for 155 degrees of freedom . The lower value of 2 for the current data set can be largely attributed to more conservative assumptions on the dispersions $_{\rm 0i}$.

at the 2 level, even if it is still allowed at 3 .

In [11], a wider portion of the parameter space is analyzed (and a di erent data set [2] is used), that shows that a part of parameter space where has performed half oscillation is allowed at the 2 level. As we have stressed in the section III, the current data do not allow for this possibility any more.

In [12], a detailed study of the parameter space of the model has been performed by taking into account the constraints from CMB observations of BOOMERanG [22] and MAXIMA [23]. Constraints on this quintessence model were derived from its e ects on integrated Sachs-W olfe e ect as well as from its e ects on the location of the rst peak. In gure 2 we show the 1; 2; and 3 constraints in the (f;) plane obtained by our analysis. C om parison with gure 5 of [12], show s that the more recent data in prove by a factor of three or so the constraints on .

Let us also note that a quintessence eld that is clim bing up the potential could m in ic w < 1 [24, 25] and possibly o er a better t to data (see how ever [26]). In our case this is possible only if has already gone through a m axim um. A s we have m entioned above, this case appears to be not realized at the 3 con dence level for a cosine potential. Indeed, a m ore asym m etric potential (such as that pictured in gure 1 of [25]) is needed to im part a su ciently large velocity to the eld and im prove the t to data.



FIG.4:1;2; and 3 contours in the plane ($_{DE}$; w_0) for the pNGB model with $f = M_P$ (dashed, thicker lines) and for dark energy with constant equation of state (solid lines).

F inally, it is instructive to discuss the current value of the equation of state parameter w_0 as obtained in the pNGB m odel and to compare it with the value of w_0 obtained by assuming that it is constant throughout the evolution of the Universe. In gure 4 we show the plots of the 1; 2 and 3 con dence level contours in the plane $(; w_0)$ both for the case of pNGB quintessence with $f = M_P$ and for a model with constant w_0 (only supernova data are used to compute the contours in gure 4). In the case of constant w_0 the contours are quite tilted, allowing for a value of w_0 significantly different from 1 only if DE gets very close to unity. Indeed, if dark energy has a constant equation of state param eter di erent from 1, then a larger amount of dark energy is needed to get the same averaged value of w. In the case of a pNGB, how ever, the value of w₀ can be signi cantly different from 1 even if w was close to 1 in the past. As a consequence, one can obtain the required averaged value of w even without requiring that is extrem ely close to unity.

V. CONCLUSIONS

W e have analyzed the portion of parameter space available for the model of pNGB quintessence. Our work extends the previous studies on the subject by allowing both for variations in the initial value of the zero mode of the pNGB and for variations in the current value of

. U sing the most up-to-date supernova data, we have shown that the parameter space of the pNBG potential is signi cantly constrained around the region where quintessence is sitting on the top of the cosine potential or slowly evolving along it. At the 95.4% level, previous analyses on the subject [10, 11] were still allowing the current value of w to be larger than 1=3 or even the possibility that quintessence had already perform ed a half oscillation about its minimum. Current data do not allow this any more.

W e have also observed that, when CMB and SN constraints are joined, an evolving pNGB provides a slightly better t to data than a pNGB stuck at the top of its potential.

Let us nally discuss future perspectives. A lready now, data tell that f cannot be smaller than about a third of P lanck mass (unless we ne tune $_{\rm in}$ to be very close to the top of the potential). As shown in gure 1, future data m ight constrain f $^{>}$ M $_{\rm P}$ =2, leading to some tension with the requirement f $^{<}$ M $_{\rm P}$ from String Theory [14]. O ne m ight wonder if this will be enough to consider the model \setminus nely tuned", and to start to consider alternative options [15] as more natural. But one can also take a more optim istic approach: m aybe future data will show that cosm ic acceleration is sourced by an evolving, radiatively stable pseudo-N am bu-G oldstone boson.

W e thank Subinoy D as and John D onoghue for useful discussions.

- [1] A. G. Riess et al., Astron. J. 116 (1998) 1009.
 [astro-ph/9805201].
- [2] S. Perlmutter et al., A strophys. J. 517 (1999) 565 [astro-ph/9812133]; J.L. Tonry et al., A strophys. J. 594 (2003) 1 [arX iv astro-ph/0305008]; R.A. K nop et al. [Supernova C osm ology P roject C ollaboration], A strophys. J. 598, 102 (2003) [arX iv astro-ph/0309368].
- [3] A. G. Riess et al. [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], Astrophys. J. 607, 665 (2004) [arXivastro-ph/0402512].
- [4] A.G.Riess et al, arX iv astro-ph/0611572.
- [5] C. W etterich, Nucl. Phys. B 302, 668 (1988). B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. D 37, 3406 (1988).
 R.R.Caldwell, R.D ave and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1582 (1998) [arX iv astro-ph/9708069].
- [6] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:hep-th/0603057.
- [7] S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 3067
 [arX iv astro-ph/9806099]; C. F. Kolda and D. H. Lyth, Phys. Lett. B 458 (1999) 197 [arX iv hep-ph/9811375]; T. Chiba, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999) 083508
 [arX iv gr-qc/9903094]; P. Brax and J. Martin, Phys. Lett. B 468, 40 (1999) [arX iv astro-ph/9905040].
- [8] J.A.Friem an, C.T.Hill, A.Stebbins and I.W aga, Phys. Rev.Lett. 75 (1995) 2077 [arX iv astro-ph/9505060].
- [9] J. Weller and A. Albrecht, Phys. Rev. D 65, 103512 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0106079]; V. Sahni, T.D. Saini, A.A. Starobinsky and U.Alam, JETP Lett. 77, 201 (2003) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 77, 249 (2003)] [arX iv astro-ph/0201498]; U. A lam, V. Sahni, T. D. Saini and A. A. Starobinsky, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 344, 1057 (2003) [arX iv astro-ph/0303009]; U.A lam, V.Sahni, T.D.Saini and A.A. Starobinsky, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. 344, 1057 (2003) [arX iv astro-ph/0303009]; Z.K.Guo, N. Ohta and Y.Z. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 72, 023504 (2005) [arX iv astro-ph/0505253]. R. R. Caldwell and E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 141301 (2005) [arXivastro-ph/0505494]; Z.K.Guo, N.Ohta and Y. Z. Zhang, arXivastro-ph/0603109; V. Sahni and A.Starobinsky, arX iv astro-ph/0610026; D.Huterer and H.V.Peiris, arX iv astro-ph/0610427; C.Li, D.E.Holz and A. Cooray, arX iv astro-ph/0611093.
- [10] I.W aga and J.A.Friem an, Phys.Rev.D 62, 043521

(2000) [arX iv astro-ph/0001354].

- [11] S.C.C.Ng and D.L.W iltshire, Phys.Rev.D 63, 023503 (2001) [arX iv astro-ph/0004138].
- [12] M. Kawasaki, T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D 64, 083009 (2001)
- [13] K. Freese, J. A. Friem an and A. V. O linto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 3233; F.C. A dam s, J.R. Bond, K. Freese, J. A. Friem an and A. V. O linto, Phys. Rev. D 47, 426 (1993) [arX iv hep-ph/9207245].
- [14] M. Dine, arXiv hep-th/0107259; T. Banks, M. Dine, P. J. Fox and E. Gorbatov, JCAP 0306, 001 (2003) [arXiv hep-th/0303252].
- [15] J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. B 553, 1 (2003) [arX iv hep-ph/0210402]; N. ArkaniHamed, H. C. Cheng, P. Crem inelli and L. Randall, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 221302; [arX iv hep-th/0301218]; JCAP 0307 (2003) 003, [arX iv hep-th/0302034]; L.Pilo, D. A. Rayner and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D 68 (2003) 043503. [arX iv hep-ph/0302087]; J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles and M. Peloso, JCAP 0501, 005 (2005) [arX iv hep-ph/0409138]; S. Dim opoulos, S. Kachru, J. M cG reevy and J. G. Wacker, arX iv hep-th/0507205; N. Kaloper and L. Sorbo, JCAP 0604, 007 (2006) [arX iv astro-ph/0511543].
- [16] http://braebum.pha.hu.edu/ ariess/R06/sn_sam.ple
- [17] P. A stier et al, A stron. A strophys. 447, 31 (2006) [arX iv astro-ph/0510447].
- [18] V. Barger, Y. Gao and D. Marfatia, arX iv astro-ph/0611775.
- [19] Y.G.Gong and A.z.W ang, arX iv astro-ph/0612196.
- [20] A. Albrecht et al., arX iv astro-ph/0609591.
- [21] Y.W ang and P.M ukherjee, A strophys. J. 650, 1 (2006) [arX iv astro-ph/0604051].
- [22] P. de Bernardis et al. Boom erang Collaboration], Nature 404, 955 (2000) [arXiv astro-ph/0004404].
- [23] S. Hanany et al., Astrophys. J. 545, L5 (2000) [arXiv:astro-ph/0005123].
- [24] M. Sahlen, A. R. Liddle and D. Parkinson, Phys. Rev. D 72, 083511 (2005) [arX iv astro-ph/0506696].
- [25] C. Csaki, N. K aloper and J. Teming, JCAP 0606, 022 (2006) [arX iv astro-ph/0507148];
- [26] M. Sahlen, A. R. Liddle and D. Parkinson, arXivastro-ph/0610812.