

Mimetic Tensor-Vector-Scalar Cosmology: Unified Dark Energy, Dark Matter and Stiff Matter

David Benisty,^{1,2,3,*} Masud Chaichian,^{4,†} and Markku Oksanen^{4,‡}

¹*DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of*

Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom

²*Physics Department, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel*

³*Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies (FIAS), Ruth-Moufang-Strasse 1, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

⁴*Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 64, FI-00014 Helsinki, Finland*

Phenomenological implications of the Mimetic Tensor-Vector-Scalar theory (MiTeVeS) are studied. The theory is an extension of the vector field model of mimetic dark matter, where a scalar field is also incorporated, and it is known to be free from ghost instability. In the absence of interactions between the scalar field and the vector field, the obtained cosmological solution corresponds to the General theory of Relativity (GR) with a minimally-coupled scalar field. However, including an interaction term between the scalar field and the vector field yields interesting dynamics. There is a shift symmetry for the scalar field with a flat potential, and the conserved Noether current, which is associated with the symmetry, behaves as a dark matter component. Consequently, the solution contains a cosmological constant, dark matter and a stiff matter fluid. Breaking the shift symmetry with a non-flat potential gives a natural interaction between dark energy and dark matter.

I. INTRODUCTION

The dark universe view, astonishingly confirmed by a variety of experiments and surveys in the past years [1–3], paints an intriguing picture of the universe we live in. In particular, observations indicate that around 25% of the energy budget of the universe corresponds to the dark matter sector, while around 70% constitute the dark energy [5], with both sectors being relatively unknown for the moment. Concerning dark matter, there have been numerous attempts to attribute it to specific candidates [6], such as a weakly interacting massive particle [7], while several theories instead posit the existence of additional particles and forces beyond those of the Standard Model [8, 9, 11].

The description of dark energy is more uncertain, since if it does not correspond to the simplest choice of a cosmological constant (which nonetheless is problematic from a theoretical point of view [14, 15]), then there are essentially two ways to explain it. Firstly, assuming that General Relativity (GR) correctly describes gravity on both galactic and cosmological scales, one can attribute dark energy to various fields or exotic matter and energy components (for reviews see [16, 17]). The second intriguing possibility is that GR might not be the correct theory of gravity on all scales, thus paving the road for the wide plethora of modified gravity theories [19, 20, 22]. Modified theories of gravity are theoretically and observationally appealing, and ever-increasingly sensitive and precise upcoming surveys provide the exciting possibility of robustly testing these theories against observational data. One interesting approach is to test the strong equivalence principle [23], which is satisfied only by GR.

One interesting class of modified theories of gravity are theories where a scalar field mimics dark matter [24] with a Lagrange multiplier [25, 26]. In its original formulation the mimetic theory of gravity can be obtained starting from GR, by isolating the conformal degree of freedom of gravity in a covariant fashion through a reparametrization of the physical metric in terms of an auxiliary metric and a scalar field [27]. It is then shown that the resulting gravitational field equations feature an additional term sourced by the mimetic field, which can be interpreted as the contribution of a pressure-less perfect fluid. It is furthermore shown that, on a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRWM) background, this fluid behaves precisely as a dust component. Thus, the mimetic field can mimic cold dark matter on cosmological scales, a feature that gave the theory its name.

Dark matter has an essential role in the dynamics of galaxies. Modified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND) [28, 29] is an alternative successful explanation for the flat rotation curves of galaxies. By violating Newton's second law at low accelerations, the Tully-Fisher relation is recovered, without introducing additional dark matter [23, 31, 32]. The Tensor Vector Scalar theory (TeVeS) is a covariant theory, which produces MOND in the low energy limit [33]. TeVeS is a stable and free from ghosts [34]. A new relativistic theory for MOND has been proposed [35] in order to reproduce the key cosmological observables, while still reproducing all the galactic and lensing phenomenology in the same way as TeVeS.

Cosmology with vector fields has been considered widely in the literature [37, 39–43]. General consideration of scalar-vector-tensor theories and their cosmological solutions is given in [47]. A vector field model of mimetic matter was proposed in [27]. The consistency of those theories with respect to the absence of ghost instability was studied in [48], including a proposal of a new Tensor-Vector-Scalar gravity (MiTeVeS), which generalizes the previous models with additional desirable fea-

* benidav@post.bgu.ac.il

† masud.chaichian@helsinki.fi

‡ markku.oksanen@helsinki.fi

ture. In this paper we discover the homogeneous solution for this theory considering couple of possible interactions.

II. THE THEORY

The Mimetic TeVeS Lagrangian density reads:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi^2\mathcal{R} + 3\Phi^{\cdot\alpha}\Phi_{\cdot\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\Phi^2 + f(\phi)u^\mu u_\mu) - \frac{\Phi^2}{2}\phi_{\cdot\mu}\phi^{\cdot\mu} - \Phi^4V(\phi) - \frac{\mu^2}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{m,int}}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{R} is the Ricci scalar, the kinetic term of the vector field u_μ is defined as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu u_\nu - \partial_\nu u_\mu, \quad (2)$$

and the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\text{m,int}}(\Phi^2g_{\mu\nu}, \chi, \partial\chi, u_\mu, \phi, \phi_{\cdot\mu})$ represents matter fields (denoted collectively as χ) and all interactions among the gravitational fields and the matter fields. Matter couples universally to the physical metric $\Phi^2g_{\mu\nu}$.

The concept of scale invariance is an attractive possibility for a fundamental symmetry of nature. Dimensionless coupling constants for example appear to be related to good renormalizability properties. In its most naive realizations, scale invariance is not a viable symmetry, since nature seems to have chosen some typical scales. The scale invariance can nevertheless be incorporated into realistic generally covariant field theories. Scale invariance has to be discussed in a more general framework than that of standard generally relativistic theories. In the MiTeVeS theory, the action incorporates the scale invariance under the transformation

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow L^2g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \Phi \rightarrow L^{-1}\Phi, \quad \lambda \rightarrow L^{-2}\lambda, \quad (3)$$

where $L = L(\vec{x}, t)$ is an arbitrary function of space and time. The fields ϕ and u_μ are the invariant of the theory:

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi, \quad u_\mu \rightarrow u_\mu. \quad (4)$$

This indicates that the theory is capable to have inflationary solutions naturally.

We can simplify the derivation of the field equations by fixing the conformal symmetry of the theory. We shall choose the gauge condition as $\Phi = 1$, which gives the theory in the Einstein frame form [48]. This is equivalent to performing the following conformal transformation in (1):

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Phi^{-2}g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \Phi^2\lambda. \quad (5)$$

In this frame the Lagrangian is obtained without the auxiliary field Φ as

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}(g_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda(1 + f(\phi)u^\mu u_\mu) - \frac{1}{2}\phi_{\cdot\mu}\phi^{\cdot\mu} - V(\phi) - \frac{\mu^2}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{m,int}}, \quad (6)$$

where $g_{\mu\nu}$ is now the physical metric that couples to matter universally. This frame is equivalent for the setting

$$\Phi^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi G} = 1 \quad (7)$$

where G is the Newtonian Constant.

For simplicity we shall assume in the cosmological analysis that the gravitational vector and scalar fields do not couple directly to matter fields:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{m,int}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{m}}(g_{\mu\nu}, \chi, \partial\chi) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(g_{\mu\nu}, u_\mu, \phi, \phi_{\cdot\mu}). \quad (8)$$

Consider the two simplest interactions (up to the second power in u_μ and at most linear in $\phi_{\cdot\mu}$):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = -\frac{1}{2}h_1(\phi)u_\mu u^\mu - \frac{1}{2}h_2(\phi)u^\mu \phi_{\cdot\mu}. \quad (9)$$

Interactions that involve higher powers of $\phi_{\cdot\mu}$ could enable richer dynamics. However, they would bring to the instability of the theory. Also notice that these terms are not coupled to the scalar λ .

III. FIELD EQUATIONS

A. Metric Variations

Varying the Lagrangian (6) minimally coupled to the interaction term (9) with respect to $g^{\mu\nu}$, λ , ϕ and u_μ gives the field equations as

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \lambda f(\phi)u_\mu u_\nu + T_{\mu\nu}^\phi + T_{\mu\nu}^u + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int},1} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int},2} + T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (10a)$$

$$f(\phi)u^\mu u_\mu = -1, \quad (10b)$$

$$\square\phi + \frac{1}{2}h_2(\phi)\nabla_\mu u^\mu = V'(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda f'(\phi) + h_1'(\phi))u^\mu u_\mu, \quad (10c)$$

$$\mu^2\nabla_\nu F^{\nu\mu} = [\lambda f(\phi) + h_1(\phi)]u^\mu + \frac{1}{2}h_2(\phi)\phi^{\cdot\mu}, \quad (10d)$$

where in the modified Einstein equation (10a) we have defined the energy-momentum tensors as:

$$T_{\mu\nu}^\phi = \phi_{\cdot\mu}\phi_{\cdot\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{1}{2}\phi_{\cdot\alpha}\phi^{\cdot\alpha} + V(\phi)\right), \quad (11)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^u = \mu^2\left(F_{\mu\rho}F_\nu{}^\rho - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}F^{\rho\sigma}\right), \quad (12)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_{\text{m}}(g_{\mu\nu}, \chi, \partial\chi), \quad (13)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int},1} = h_1(\phi)\left(u_\mu u_\nu - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}(u^\alpha u_\alpha)\right), \quad (14)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{int},2} = h_2(\phi) \left(u_{(\mu}\phi_{,\nu)} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}(u^\alpha\phi_{,\alpha}) \right), \quad (15)$$

where the parentheses around indices denote symmetrization:

$$u_{(\mu}\phi_{,\nu)} = \frac{1}{2}(u_\mu\phi_{,\nu} + u_\nu\phi_{,\mu}), \quad (16)$$

which ensures the symmetric form of the energy momentum tensor. The contributions of the interactions between the scalar field and the vector field to the energy-momentum tensor are given in (14) and (15).

B. Homogeneous Solution

In order to find the behavior of the theory for our universe, we consider a flat FLRW metric:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (17)$$

and a time-dependent homogeneous ansatz for the scalar field

$$\phi = \phi(t). \quad (18)$$

For the vector field we also consider a time-dependent homogeneous ansatz:

$$u_\mu = (A(t), 0, 0, 0). \quad (19)$$

The energy-momentum tensor (13) contains the contribution of a matter fluid or fluids as:

$$T^{m\mu}_\nu = \text{diag}(-\rho_m, p_m, p_m, p_m). \quad (20)$$

The constraint (10b) reduces to

$$f(\phi)A^2 = 1. \quad (21)$$

Since we assume a homogeneous solution, the kinetic term of the vector field that contains an anti-symmetric part, vanishes $F_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Eq. (10d) with the cosmological background gives:

$$\lambda f(\phi)A + h_1(\phi)A + \frac{1}{2}h_2(\phi)\dot{\phi} = 0, \quad (22)$$

The variation with respect the scalar field ϕ , Eq. (10c), with a cosmological background, yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2}A^2(\lambda f'(\phi) + h'_1(\phi)) + \frac{1}{2}\dot{A}h_2(\phi) \\ & + \frac{3}{2}HAh_2(\phi) + V'(\phi) + 3H\dot{\phi} + \ddot{\phi} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The Einstein tensor with the energy-momentum tensor terms (10a) gives:

$$3H^2 = \lambda + \frac{1}{2}A^2h_1(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}Ah_2(\phi)\dot{\phi} + V(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + \rho_m \quad (24a)$$

and

$$-3H^2 - 2\dot{H} = \frac{1}{2}A^2h_1(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}Ah_2(\phi)\dot{\phi} - V(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + p_m. \quad (24b)$$

We solve A and λ in terms of ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$ from (21) and (22) as

$$A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(\phi)}}, \quad \lambda = -\frac{h_1(\phi)}{f(\phi)} - \frac{h_2(\phi)\dot{\phi}}{2\sqrt{f(\phi)}}, \quad (25)$$

where we assume that A and $f(\phi)$ are positive, and obtain \dot{A} by differentiating (21):

$$f'(\phi)\dot{\phi}A^2 + 2f(\phi)A\dot{A} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \dot{A} = -\frac{f'(\phi)\dot{\phi}}{2f(\phi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (26)$$

Then we insert (25) and (26) into (23), (24a) and (24b), which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{f'(\phi)h_1(\phi)}{2f(\phi)^2} - \frac{h'_1(\phi)}{2f(\phi)} + V'(\phi) \\ & + \frac{3Hh_2(\phi)}{2\sqrt{f(\phi)}} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \ddot{\phi} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (27a)$$

$$3H^2 = -\frac{h_1(\phi)}{2f(\phi)} + V(\phi) + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + \rho_m, \quad (27b)$$

$$-3H^2 - 2\dot{H} = \frac{h_1(\phi)}{2f(\phi)} - V(\phi) + \frac{h_2(\phi)\dot{\phi}}{2\sqrt{f(\phi)}} + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + p_m. \quad (27c)$$

These equations summarize the homogeneous evolution of the universe considering only the scalar field ϕ as an external degree of freedom besides the scale parameter of the universe. One can check the consistency of the equations using the covariant conservation of the Universe by the term:

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0. \quad (28)$$

For the density and the pressure from equations (27b) and (27c) we get directly (27a), when the other matter fields are conserved as well:

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m + p_m) = 0. \quad (29)$$

So we end up with only one simple and consistent set of equations that depends on ϕ and H . Notice that we can simplify the equations using the redefinition

$$\tilde{V}(\phi) = V(\phi) + \frac{h_1(\phi)}{2f(\phi)}, \quad \tilde{h}(\phi) = \frac{h_2(\phi)}{2\sqrt{f(\phi)}}, \quad (30)$$

which simplifies the set into:

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} \left(1 + \tilde{h}(\phi) \right) + \tilde{V}'(\phi) = 0, \quad (31a)$$

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + \tilde{V}(\phi) + \rho_m, \quad (31b)$$

$$-3H^2 - 2\dot{H} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - \tilde{V}(\phi) + \dot{\phi}\tilde{h}(\phi) + p_m. \quad (31c)$$

If $h_2(\phi) = 0$, the set reduces to the canonical equations for a scalar field coupled minimally to gravity: the quintessence model [49–51]. However, the non-trivial $\tilde{h}(\phi)$ term that only presents in the pressure equation, compensate energy density with the other components. Therefore, choosing the function yields the exact solution for the system.

IV. DARK ENERGY, DARK MATTER AND STIFF MATTER

In this section we test the impact of the second interaction in (9) with the function $h_2(\phi)$. The interaction couples the derivative of the scalar field ϕ into the vector field u_μ . We consider constant functions:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &= V, & f(\phi) &= f, \\ h_1(\phi) &= h_1, & h_2(\phi) &= h_2. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The exact solution of Eq. (27a) for the scalar field is

$$\dot{\phi} = -\frac{C_0}{a^3} - \frac{h_2}{2\sqrt{f}}, \quad (33)$$

where $C_0 > 0$ is a constant of integration. Inserting the relation (33) into the Friedmann equations (27b) and (27c) yields:

$$3H^2 = \frac{C_0^2}{2a^6} + \frac{C_0 h_2}{2\sqrt{f}a^3} + V + \frac{h_2^2 - 4h_1}{8f} + \rho_m, \quad (34a)$$

$$-3H^2 - 2\dot{H} = \frac{C_0^2}{2a^6} - V - \frac{h_2^2 - 4h_1}{8f} + p_m. \quad (34b)$$

There are three fluid components: dark matter ($w = 0$),

$$\rho_{DM} = \frac{C_0 h_2}{2\sqrt{f}a^3}, \quad p_{DM} = 0, \quad (35)$$

dark energy ($w = -1$),

$$\rho_{DE} = V + \frac{h_2^2 - 4h_1}{8f}, \quad p_{DE} = -\rho_{DE}, \quad (36)$$

and stiff matter with equation of state parameter $w = 1$,

$$\rho_s = p_s = \frac{C_0^2}{2a^6}. \quad (37)$$

The stiff equation of state in cosmology is discussed in [63, 66, 67]. Since the density and pressure of the stiff matter component evolves as a^{-6} , which is a smaller

power than the radiation solution $\sim a^{-4}$, we expect that this part would exist before radiation domination and decays rapidly in our universe. Moreover, some theories of the reheating mechanism require the kination domination era. Therefore, this unified picture of dark energy, dark matter and stiff matter will predict different scenarios with different potentials.

The coincidence problem rises the question why observable values of dark energy and dark matter densities in the late universe are of the same order of magnitude. The dark matter and the dark energy part in this model are connected one each other via the parameters C_0 and h_2 . This connection may explain the coincidence problem.

There is a correlation between the shift symmetry and an interaction between the components in the Universe. For constant functions the action has a hidden shift symmetry, that produces a Noether Symmetry:

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi + \text{Const.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad j^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^\mu - \frac{1}{2}h_2(\phi)u^\mu, \quad (38)$$

which is covariantly conserved $\nabla_\mu j^\mu = 0$. When we introduce a nonconstant potential $V(\phi)$ or the function $\tilde{h}(\phi)$, the current is no longer conserved and an interaction between the components emerges. This correspondence was introduced in [68] for a unified dark energy and dark matter models with modified measures. But the principle applies here and also for the Mimetic DM models.

V. COSMOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS

In order to constraint the additional equation of state we use **standard candles (SCs)**, Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) the **Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)** distant prior. Radiation is included in order to constraint the components also in the early universe. The normalized Hubble function reads:

$$\left(\frac{H(z)}{H_0}\right)^2 = \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_m(1+z)^3 + \Omega_r(1+z)^4 + \Omega_\phi(1+z)^6. \quad (39)$$

where H_0 is the current value of the Hubble parameter, and the other constants related to the MiTeVS model are

$$\Omega_\phi = \frac{C_0^2}{6H_0^2}, \quad \Omega_m = \frac{C_0 h_2}{3\sqrt{f}H_0^2}, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = \frac{V}{3H_0^2} + \frac{h_2^2 - 4h_1}{24fH_0^2}, \quad (40)$$

which are the stiff, matter and the dark energy density ratios. The Ω_r is the radiation part.

In order to constrain our model, we use a few data sets. First we impose the average bound on the possible variation of the **Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN)** speed-up factor, defined as the ratio of the expansion rate predicted in a given model versus that of the Λ CDM model at the BBN epoch ($z_{BBN} \sim 10^9$). This amounts to the limit [?] with $(\Delta H/H_{\Lambda CDM})^2 < 0.01$, where




FIG. 1. The posterior distribution for the simplest case of the MiTeVeS with constant functions (red curve) and for Λ CDM model (blue curve). The ratios of the matter density Ω_m , dark energy Ω_Λ , radiation density Ω_r and the stiff part Ω_ϕ summarize to one. The final results for cosmological parameters for the MiTeVeS and the Λ CDM models are summarized in the table. In order to compare the models we calculate the Bayes factor.

$H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ is the Hubble rate for the Λ CDM model and the ΔH is the difference between the MiTeVeS Hubble rate and the Λ CDM Hubble rate, $\Delta H = H - H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$.

Imposing the relation (39) gives a bound on Ω_ϕ :

$$\Omega_\phi(\text{Max}) = \frac{\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_m(1 + z_{\text{BBN}})^3 + \Omega_r(1 + z_{\text{BBN}})^4}{100(1 + z_{\text{BBN}})^6}, \quad (41)$$




FIG. 2. The posterior distribution for the simplest case of the MiTeVeS with constant functions (red curve) and for Λ CDM model (blue curve), with H_0 vs. Ω_m .

which gives a range of 10^{-22} – 10^{-30} for the Planck values of Ω_m and Ω_Λ . Therefore we set the prior on Ω_ϕ to be between zero and $\Omega_\phi(Max)$.

The **Cosmic Chronometers (CC)** exploit the evolution of differential ages of passive galaxies at different redshifts to directly constrain the Hubble parameter [70]. We use uncorrelated 30 CC measurements of $H(z)$ discussed in [71–74].

For **Standard Candles (SC)** we use measurements of the Pantheon Type Ia supernova dataset [75] from different binnings. The parameters of the model are fitted by comparing the observed value μ_i^{obs} to the theoretical value μ_i^{th} of the distance moduli, which is given by:

$$\mu = m - M = 5 \log_{10}(D_L) + \mu_0, \quad (42)$$

where m and M are the apparent and absolute magnitudes and $\mu_0 = 5 \log(H_0^{-1}/Mpc) + 25$ is the nuisance parameter that has been marginalized. The distance moduli is given for different redshifts $\mu_i = \mu(z_i)$. The luminosity distance is defined by

$$D_L(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz^*}{E(z^*)}. \quad (43)$$

Here, we assume that $\Omega_k = 0$ (flat space-time). We use uncorrelated data points from different **Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO)** [76–87]. Studies of the BAO feature in the transverse direction provide a measurement of $D_H(z)/r_d = c/H(z)r_d$, where r_d is the sound horizon at the drag epoch and it is taken as an independent parameter and with the comoving angular diameter

distance being:

$$D_M = \int_0^z \frac{c dz'}{H(z')}. \quad (44)$$

In our database we also use the angular diameter distance $D_A = D_M/(1+z)$ and $D_V(z)/r_d$, which is a combination of the BAO peak coordinates above, namely

$$D_V(z) \equiv [z D_H(z) D_M^2(z)]^{1/3}. \quad (45)$$

The BAO data represent the absolute distance measurements in the Universe. From the measurements of correlation function or power spectrum of large scale structure, we can use the BAO signal to estimate the distance scales at different redshifts. In practice, the BAO data are analyzed based on a fiducial cosmology and the sound horizon at drag epoch. We calculate the redshift of the drag epoch as:

$$z_d = \frac{1291 \omega_m^{0.251}}{1 + 0.659 \omega_m^{0.828}} [1 + b_1 \omega_b^{b_2}], \quad (46)$$

where

$$b_1 = 0.313 \omega_m^{-0.419} [1 + 0.607 \omega_m^{0.674}], \quad (47)$$

$$b_2 = 0.238 \omega_m^{0.223}. \quad (48)$$

We use the CMB data from the latest and final Planck data release [5]. Its contribution in the likelihood analysis is expressed in terms of the compressed form with CMB shift parameters:

$$R \equiv \sqrt{\Omega_m H_0^2} r(z_*)/c, \quad (49)$$

$$l_a \equiv \pi r(z_*)/r_s(z_*), \quad (50)$$

where $r_s(z)$ is the comoving sound horizon at redshift z , and z_* is the redshift to the photon-decoupling surface. These two CMB shift parameters together with $\omega_b = \Omega_b h^2$ and spectral index of the primordial power spectrum n_s can give an efficient summary of CMB data for the dark energy constraints.

The comoving sound horizon is given by

$$r_s(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_0^a \frac{da'}{\sqrt{3(1 + \bar{R}_b a') a'^4 E^2(z')}}. \quad (51)$$

The radiation term in the expression of $E(z)$ for the CMB data analysis should not be ignored. It can be determined by the matter-radiation equality relation $\Omega_r = \Omega_m / (1 + z_{\text{eq}})$, and $z_{\text{eq}} = 2.5 \times 10^4 \omega_m (T_{\text{CMB}}/2.7\text{K})^{-4}$, where $\omega_m = \Omega_m h^2$. The sound speed is $c_s = 1/\sqrt{3(1 + \bar{R}_b a)}$, with $\bar{R}_b a = 3\rho_b/(4\rho_r)$, and $\bar{R}_b = 31500\omega_b (T_{\text{CMB}}/2.7\text{K})^{-4}$. We assume the CMB temperature $T_{\text{CMB}} = 2.7255\text{K}$. The redshift z_* can be calculated by the fitting formula:

$$z_* = 1048[1 + 0.00124\omega_b^{-0.738}][1 + g_1\omega_m^{g_2}], \quad (52)$$

where

$$g_1 = \frac{0.0783\omega_b^{-0.238}}{1 + 39.5\omega_b^{0.763}}, \quad g_2 = \frac{0.560}{1 + 21.1\omega_b^{1.81}}. \quad (53)$$

The Planck data we use for the analysis includes temperature and polarization data, as well as CMB lensing. The final result is expressed in terms of a data vector $\mathbf{v} = (R, l_a, \omega_b)^t$ and their covariance matrix. This compression of CMB called distance priors [91].

Regarding the problem of likelihood maximization, we use an affine-invariant Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampler, as it is implemented within the open-source package **Polychord** [92] with the **GetDist** package [93] to present the results. The prior we choose is with a uniform distribution, where $\Omega_m \in [0.; 1.]$, $\Omega_\Lambda \in [0.; 1 - \Omega_m]$, $\Omega_\phi \in [0.; 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda]$, $\Omega_\phi \in [0.; 1 - \Omega_\phi(\text{Max})]$, $\Omega_r \in [0.; 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda - \Omega_\phi]$, $H_0 \in [50; 100]\text{Km/sec/Mpc}$. For the baryonic matter we use the value reported by Planck 2018.

The posterior distribution is presented in Fig. 1. The differences between the parameters of MiTeVes and ΛCDM are rather small. For the MiTeVes the Hubble parameter is $66.52 \pm 0.53 \text{km/sec/Mpc}$ and for the ΛCDM model $66.58 \pm 0.47 \text{km/sec/Mpc}$. The matter density is 0.31 ± 0.021 for MiTeVes and 0.311 ± 0.016 for ΛCDM . The dark energy density is 0.698 ± 0.019 for MiTeVes and 0.698 ± 0.01 for the ΛCDM model. Because of the error bars of all of these parameters, one cannot distinguish the difference from the current cosmological measurements. However, according to current measurements, the stiff matter may exist in our Universe, but its density portion is constrained to be of order 10^{-25} or smaller. To be more precise, the MCMC gives:

$$\Omega_\phi = (4.258 \pm 2.877) \cdot 10^{-25}. \quad (54)$$

In order to test the preference of the models, we use the Bayesian Evidence that is calculated from the Polychord

directly [94]. The difference between the Bayesian Evidence yields 0.24, which is an **indistinguishable** preference for the ΛCDM model.

VI. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In this paper we uncovered some cosmological implications of the MiTeVes theory. The particular formulation of the theory includes both a scalar field and a vector field, which is stable and free from ghosts. The two simplest interactions between the scalar field and the vector field were considered. For constant functions (32), a conserved Noether current emerges. From the scalar field dynamics, we obtained a unification of dark energy, dark matter and stiff matter. When the shift symmetry is broken, the current is not covariantly conserved. Consequently, possible interactions between these three components emerge.

We use the latest observations of the Big Bang Nucleosynthesis, Cosmic Chronometers, Type Ia Supernova, Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Cosmic Microwave Background distant prior to constrain the additional stiff matter contribution, which is not present in the standard ΛCDM model. It is clear that the dynamics of the Universe does not change significantly as long as the energy density of the stiff matter part is around 10^{-25} or smaller.

There are few direction to continue the research. It is possible to explore different potentials and functions that approach constant functions asymptotically. Such functions produce interaction between the stiff matter, the dark matter and the dark energy parts, and may resolve the cosmic tensions regarding H_0 and others. Moreover, it is important to track the perturbation solutions for this theory in order to compare with further data sets and to validate the formulation in different systems.

The third interesting option is to explore the effect of the scalar Φ in this theory. This scalar is suggested in the theory and gives the behavior of dynamical $G \sim \Phi^{-2}$. Many versions of MOND and other modified theories of gravity suggest this effect that naturally emerges in this formulation. So the full theory gives additional effect of emerging gravity that should be studied in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Eduardo I. Guendelman for helping us to conclude the solution with the constant functions case. D.B. thanks the Rothschild and the Blavatnik Fellowships for generous supports. This work was done in a Short Term Scientific Missions (STSM) in Finland funded by the COST Action CA15117 ‘‘Cosmology and Astrophysics Network for Theoretical Advances and Training Action’’ (CANTATA) of the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST) and the CA18108. M.O. gratefully acknowledges funding from the Oskar Öfunds Stiftelse.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201](#).
- [2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133](#).
- [3] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043526 (2018), [arXiv:1708.01530 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [4] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A13 (2016), [arXiv:1502.01589 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [5] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, *Phys. Rept.* **405**, 279 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0404175](#).
- [7] L. Roszkowski, E. M. Sessolo, and S. Trojanowski, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 066201 (2018), [arXiv:1707.06277 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [8] N. Arkani-Hamed, D. P. Finkbeiner, T. R. Slatyer, and N. Weiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 015014 (2009), [arXiv:0810.0713 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [9] F.-Y. Cyr-Racine and K. Sigurdson, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 103515 (2013), [arXiv:1209.5752 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [10] K. Petraki, L. Pearce, and A. Kusenko, *JCAP* **07**, 039 (2014), [arXiv:1403.1077 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] R. Foot and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 023512 (2015), [arXiv:1409.7174 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] R. Foot and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Lett. B* **748**, 61 (2015), [arXiv:1412.0762 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [13] R. Foot and S. Vagnozzi, *JCAP* **07**, 013 (2016), [arXiv:1602.02467 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [14] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
- [15] V. Sahni, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 3435 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0202076](#).
- [16] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0603057](#).
- [17] Y.-F. Cai, E. N. Saridakis, M. R. Setare, and J.-Q. Xia, *Phys. Rept.* **493**, 1 (2010), [arXiv:0909.2776 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rept.* **505**, 59 (2011), [arXiv:1011.0544 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [19] S. Tsujikawa, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **800**, 99 (2010), [arXiv:1101.0191 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [20] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Phys. Rept.* **509**, 167 (2011), [arXiv:1108.6266 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [21] Y.-F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, and E. N. Saridakis, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 106901 (2016), [arXiv:1511.07586 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [22] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rept.* **692**, 1 (2017), [arXiv:1705.11098 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [23] K.-H. Chae, F. Lelli, H. Desmond, S. S. McGaugh, P. Li, and J. M. Schombert, *Astrophys. J.* **904**, 51 (2020), [Erratum: *Astrophys. J.* 910, 81 (2021)], [arXiv:2009.11525 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [24] A. H. Chamseddine and V. Mukhanov, *JHEP* **11**, 135 (2013), [arXiv:1308.5410 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [25] A. Golovnev, *Phys. Lett. B* **728**, 39 (2014), [arXiv:1310.2790 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [26] A. H. Chamseddine, V. Mukhanov, and A. Vikman, *JCAP* **06**, 017 (2014), [arXiv:1403.3961 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [27] A. O. Barvinsky, *JCAP* **01**, 014 (2014), [arXiv:1311.3111 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] M. Milgrom, *Astrophys. J.* **270**, 365 (1983).
- [29] J. Bekenstein and M. Milgrom, *Astrophys. J.* **286**, 7 (1984).
- [30] R. H. Sanders and S. S. McGaugh, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **40**, 263 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0204521](#).
- [31] R. B. Tully and J. R. Fisher, *Astron. Astrophys.* **54**, 661 (1977).
- [32] S. S. McGaugh, J. M. Schombert, G. D. Bothun, and W. J. G. de Blok, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **533**, L99 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/0003001](#).
- [33] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 083509 (2004), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* 71, 069901 (2005)], [arXiv:astro-ph/0403694](#).
- [34] M. Chaichian, J. Klusoň, M. Oksanen, and A. Tureanu, *Phys. Lett. B* **735**, 322 (2014), [arXiv:1402.4696 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] C. Skordis and T. Zlosnik, (2020), [arXiv:2007.00082 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] L. Heisenberg, *JCAP* **10**, 054 (2018), [arXiv:1801.01523 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [37] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, *JCAP* **11**, 024 (2018), [arXiv:1805.11919 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] L. Heisenberg, R. Kase, and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 123504 (2018), [arXiv:1807.07202 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [39] L. Heisenberg, H. Ramírez, and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 023505 (2019), [arXiv:1812.03340 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [40] A. Oliveros and M. A. Jaraba, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28**, 1950064 (2019), [arXiv:1903.06005 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [41] A. Gallego Cadavid and Y. Rodríguez, *Phys. Lett. B* **798**, 134958 (2019), [arXiv:1905.10664 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] A. Kushwaha and S. Shankaranarayanan, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 065008 (2020), [arXiv:1912.01393 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] D. Benisty and E. I. Guendelman, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 023506 (2018), [arXiv:1802.07981 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [44] D. Benisty and E. I. Guendelman, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043522 (2018), [arXiv:1805.09314 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] D. Benisty, E. Guendelman, and Z. Haba, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 123521 (2019), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* 101, 049901 (2020)], [arXiv:1812.06151 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [46] F. K. Anagnostopoulos, D. Benisty, S. Basilakos, and E. I. Guendelman, *JCAP* **06**, 003 (2019), [arXiv:1904.05762 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] L. Heisenberg, R. Kase, and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 024038 (2018), [arXiv:1805.01066 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [48] M. Chaichian, J. Kluson, M. Oksanen, and A. Tureanu, *JHEP* **12**, 102 (2014), [arXiv:1404.4008 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [49] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988).
- [50] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave, and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9708069](#).
- [51] I. Zlatev, L.-M. Wang, and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9807002](#).
- [52] T. Chiba, T. Okabe, and M. Yamaguchi, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 023511 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9912463](#).
- [53] T. Barreiro, E. J. Copeland, and N. J. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 127301 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9910214](#).
- [54] M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami, and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043507 (2002), [arXiv:gr-qc/0202064](#).
- [55] R. de Putter and E. V. Linder, *Astropart. Phys.* **28**, 263 (2007), [arXiv:0705.0400 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [56] S. Tsujikawa, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 214003 (2013), [arXiv:1304.1961 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [57] E. Babichev, S. Ramazanov, and A. Vikman, *JCAP* **11**, 023 (2018), [arXiv:1807.10281 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [58] J. Kehayias and R. J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023525 (2019), arXiv:1905.05628 [gr-qc].
- [59] V. K. Oikonomou and N. Chatzarakis, *Nucl. Phys. B* **956**, 115023 (2020), arXiv:1905.01904 [gr-qc].
- [60] A. Chakraborty, A. Ghosh, and N. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 103513 (2019), arXiv:1904.10149 [gr-qc].
- [61] S. Chervon, I. Fomin, V. Yurov, and A. Yurov, *Scalar Field Cosmology*, Series on the Foundations of Natural Science and Technology, Vol. 13 (WSP, Singapur, 2019).
- [62] This part was discovered with Eduardo I. Guendelman.
- [63] Y. B. Zel'dovich, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **41**, 1609 (1961).
- [64] C. G. Wynn-Williams, E. E. Becklin, and G. Neugebauer, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **160**, 1 (1972).
- [65] G. Oliveira-Neto, G. A. Monerat, E. V. Correa Silva, C. Neves, and L. G. Ferreira Filho, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **03**, 254 (2011), arXiv:1106.3963 [gr-qc].
- [66] P.-H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 103004 (2015), arXiv:1412.0743 [gr-qc].
- [67] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 104059 (2017), arXiv:1711.04571 [gr-qc].
- [68] E. Guendelman, E. Nissimov, and S. Pacheva, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 472 (2015), arXiv:1508.02008 [gr-qc].
- [69] D. Benisty, E. I. Guendelman, E. Nissimov, and S. Pacheva, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26**, 2050104 (2020), arXiv:2003.13146 [astro-ph.CO].
- [70] R. Jimenez and A. Loeb, *Astrophys. J.* **573**, 37 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0106145.
- [71] M. Moresco, L. Verde, L. Pozzetti, R. Jimenez, and A. Cimatti, *JCAP* **07**, 053 (2012), arXiv:1201.6658 [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] M. Moresco *et al.*, *JCAP* **08**, 006 (2012), arXiv:1201.3609 [astro-ph.CO].
- [73] M. Moresco, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, L16 (2015), arXiv:1503.01116 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, *JCAP* **05**, 014 (2016), arXiv:1601.01701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] D. M. Scolnic *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), arXiv:1710.00845 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] W. J. Percival *et al.* (SDSS), *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **401**, 2148 (2010), arXiv:0907.1660 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416**, 3017 (2011), arXiv:1106.3366 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] N. G. Busca *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **552**, A96 (2013), arXiv:1211.2616 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] L. Anderson *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **427**, 3435 (2013), arXiv:1203.6594 [astro-ph.CO].
- [80] H.-J. Seo *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **761**, 13 (2012), arXiv:1201.2172 [astro-ph.CO].
- [81] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449**, 835 (2015), arXiv:1409.3242 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] R. Tojeiro *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **440**, 2222 (2014), arXiv:1401.1768 [astro-ph.CO].
- [83] J. E. Bautista *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **863**, 110 (2018), arXiv:1712.08064 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] E. de Carvalho, A. Bernui, G. C. Carvalho, C. P. Novaes, and H. S. Xavier, *JCAP* **04**, 064 (2018), arXiv:1709.00113 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] M. Ata *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **473**, 4773 (2018), arXiv:1705.06373 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **483**, 4866 (2019), arXiv:1712.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [87] Z. Molavi and A. Khodam-Mohammadi, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **134**, 254 (2019), arXiv:1906.05668 [gr-qc].
- [88] D. Benisty and D. Staicova, *Astron. Astrophys.* **647**, A38 (2021), arXiv:2009.10701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [89] N. B. Hogg, M. Martinelli, and S. Nesseris, *JCAP* **12**, 019 (2020), arXiv:2007.14335 [astro-ph.CO].
- [90] M. Martinelli *et al.* (EUCLID), *Astron. Astrophys.* **644**, A80 (2020), arXiv:2007.16153 [astro-ph.CO].
- [91] L. Chen, Q.-G. Huang, and K. Wang, *JCAP* **02**, 028 (2019), arXiv:1808.05724 [astro-ph.CO].
- [92] W. J. Handley, M. P. Hobson, and A. N. Lasenby, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, L61 (2015), arXiv:1502.01856 [astro-ph.CO].
- [93] A. Lewis, (2019), arXiv:1910.13970 [astro-ph.IM].
- [94] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90**, 773 (1995).