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Abstract: The ultimate fate of the Universe or the possible occurrence of future singularity to interpret the cosmic accelerating expansion phenomena has been discussed in this paper. The gravitational theory comprising of Ricci scalar $R$ and Gauss-Bonnet invariant $G$, known as $f(R, G)$ gravity has been considered in the quadratic form. Three models with the Hubble parameter that represents finite and infinite future time are presented. The physical and geometrical parameters of the models are analysed. Also, the properties of modified gravitational theory have been examined. The fate of the Universe evolution in this study confronts with neither little or pseudo rip nor the future singularity. The perturbed evolution equations are formulated in the scalar perturbation approach and the stability of the models are shown.
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I. INTRODUCTION

It is well–known that modified theories of gravity have been accepted to address the recent acceleration expansion of the Universe. The changing fraction of the mass energy budget of the Universe and the presence of dark energy attributed to this late time acceleration. This behaviour of the Universe has been conformed by the cosmological observations studies [1–4]. The anti-gravity effect that leads to the negative pressure resulted in the violation of strong energy condition, and hence the role of General Relativity (GR) has been restricted. In addition to some early Universe issues like: initial singularity, flatness, cosmic horizon and at present the issue of late time cosmic acceleration, where GR has certain limitations to address. Therefore, the modification of geometry or matter component in GR has become necessitated. Geometrically extended gravity models are used to add more variables to the geometrical elements of the model. The $f(R, G)$ gravity is such a modified theory of gravity, where $R$ and $G$ respectively denote the Ricci scalar and Gauss-Bonnet invariant [5, 6]. We shall discuss some of the important result on the cosmological and astrophysical aspects done in this theory. The late time acceleration behaviour [7–10], the energy conditions [11–13], Gravastar [14, 15], dynamics of inflation and dark energy[16–18], bouncing [19, 20] and so on. Most recently, Martino et al. [21] have traced the cosmic history and demonstrated that it might lead gravity from the ultraviolet to the infra-red scales. Also, the ghost free issue has been resolved in $f(R, G)$ gravity as in Ref. [22].

The Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) observations indicated that Universe is dominated by phantom energy and in presence of phantom energy, there would be some fascinating physical events, such as the Big Rip (BR) scenario [23]. Also the mass of black holes reducing due to phantom energy accretion [24] and the emergence of a new type of wormhole. This phenomenon can be explained if dark energy exists with a negative pressure, which can be described using a barotropic fluid with equation of state $\omega = \frac{p}{\rho}$ with $\omega = -1.10 \pm 0.14$ [25]. The equation $p = \omega \rho$ with $\omega < -1$ shows that a Universe with dark energy leads to a classic future singularity known as a BR singularity [23, 26]. In this type of singularity the size of the Universe, its expansion and acceleration all diverge [27]. Also because of the phantom or quintessence dark energy, the evolution of the Universe often results in a finite-time future singularity with a parameter $\omega \approx -1$. Recently, an elegant solution to this problem was given by [28], known
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as Little Rip (LR) singularity. Another type of singularity is the Pseudo Rip (PR) singularity, as an example of the intermediate case between LR and the cosmological constant. The structure disintegration in the pseudo-rip depends on the model parameters [29].

In modified theories of gravity, several rip cosmological scenarios are given in the literature. We have discussed here some of the important findings on the rip cosmology. Sami [30] discussed the nature of future evolution of the Universe or the ultimate fate of the Universe and commented that, the evolution depends upon the steepness of the phantom potential. Brevik and Elizalde [31] have explained that viscous fluid is able to produce the LR scenario in early Universe, the $\Lambda$CDM model, LR and PR scenarios of the Universe. Among the BR, LR and PR scenarios, PR models can generate inertial forces that do not rise monotonically [29], however it will diminish at some point after reaching a high value in future. Due to the intensity of the expansion, Saez-Gomez [33] has demonstrated the likelihood of LR and PR singularities. In modified $f(R, G)$ gravity, Makarenko et al. [34] have shown that, the effective phantom type model does not lead to future singularity. Saez-Gomez [33] have discussed that $f(R)$ gravity theory provides useful information for the occurrence of cosmological evolution, future singularities, LR and PR in viable $f(R)$ theories. Brevik et al. [35] have described the phenomena of LR and PR phenomena in coupled dark energy cosmological models. Mishra and Tripathy [36] have presented the LR model in an anistropic background. Ray et al. [37] have shown the non-occurrence of BR or PR singularity in $f(R, T)$ theory of gravity. Pati et al. [38] have shown the cosmological models with LR, BR and PR scenarios in the non-metricity gravity.

In this paper, we shall investigate the possible occurrence of future singularity scenario in the context of modified theory of gravity that includes the Gauss-Bonnet invariant. The paper is organised as: a brief description of $f(R, G)$ gravity and its field equations have been presented in Section II. Three singularity free models based on the LR, BR, and PR scale factors along with its dynamical parameters and energy conditions are discussed in Section III. The stability analysis under linear homogeneous and isotropic perturbations of the models are shown in Section IV and finally the results and conclusion are given in Section V.

II. $f(R,G)$ GRAVITY FIELD EQUATIONS AND DYNAMICAL PARAMETERS

Another modified gravity theory that contains both the Ricci scalar $R$ and Gauss-Bonnet invariant $G$ is the $f(R, G)$ gravity [6, 39, 40]. This gravitational theory has been evolved to justify the evolution of Universe in the context of the dark energy and initial singularity. The action for $f(R, G)$ gravity is,

$$S = \int\sqrt{-g}\frac{1}{2}\kappa f(R, G)\,dt^{4} + \int\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_{m}\,dt^{4}, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G = c = 1$ with $G$ and $\mathcal{L}_{m}$ respectively denote the Newtonian gravitational constant and matter Lagrangian. The Gauss-Bonnet invariant can be expressed as, $G \equiv R^{2} - 4R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$. Now, varying the action Eq. (1) with respect to the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, the field equations of $f(R, G)$ gravity can be described as,

$$f_{R}G_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}[f(R,G) - f_{R}] + \nabla_{\mu}f_{R} - g_{\mu\nu}\Box f_{R}$$

$$+ 2(\nabla_{\mu}\nabla_{\nu}f_{G})R - 2g_{\mu\nu}(\Box f_{G})R + 4(\Box f_{G})R_{\mu\nu} - 4(\nabla_{k}\nabla_{\mu}f_{G})R_{\mu}^{k}$$

$$+ f_{G}(2R_{R_{\mu\nu}} - 4R_{\mu\kappa}R_{\nu}^{\kappa} - 2R_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}R_{\kappa\lambda} + 4g_{k\mu}g_{\nu\kappa}

R^{k\mu

\nu\kappa \lambda \nu \kappa \lambda}) - 4(\nabla_{k}\nabla_{\nu}f_{G})R_{\mu}^{k} + 4g_{\mu\nu}(\nabla_{k}\nabla_{\kappa}f_{G})R^{k\mu

\nu \kappa} - 4(\nabla_{\nu}f_{G})g_{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}R_{\kappa\lambda}, \quad (2)$$

The subscript $R$ and $G$ respectively denote the partial derivative with respect to the Ricci scalar and Gauss-Bonnet invariant. $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the conventional Einstein tensor, $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\nabla_{\mu}$ respectively represent the gravitational metric potential and covariant derivative operator associate with $g_{\mu\nu}$. Also $\Box \equiv g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_{\mu}\nabla_{\nu}$ is the covariant d’Alembert operator, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the energy momentum tensor of the matter field. Here we consider, $T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)u_{\mu}u^{\nu} + pg_{\mu\nu}$, with $\rho$ and $p$ respectively represents the matter energy density and matter pressure. $u^{\mu}$ is the time-like four-velocity vector of the cosmic fluid satisfying $u_{\mu}u^{\mu} = -1$. Now, we shall derive the field equations in an isotropic and homogeneous Friedmann-Robertson-Lemaître-Walker (FLRW) space-time as,

$$ds^{2} = -dt^{2} + a^{2}(t)(dx^{2} + dy^{2} + dz^{2}), \quad (3)$$
where the scale factor $a(t)$ measures the expansion rate of the Universe and as it appears in FLRW space-time, the expansion is uniform in all spatial directions. Using Eq. (3), the Ricci scalar $R$ and Gauss-Bonnet term $G$ can be expressed in Hubble term ($H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$) as, $R = 6(\dot{H} + 2H^2)$ and $G = 24H^2(\dot{H} + H^2)$. With this background, the $f(R,G)$ gravity field equations [Eq. (2)] can be reduced to,

\begin{align}
3H^2f_R &= k\rho + \frac{1}{2}[Rf_R + Gf_G - f(R,G)] - 12H^3f_G - 3Hf_R, \\
2\dot{H}f_R + 3H^2f_R &= -k\rho + \frac{1}{2}[Rf_R + Gf_G - f(R,G)] - 8\dot{H}f_G - 2Hf_R - \ddot{f}_R - 8H^3f_G - 4H^2f_G.
\end{align}

An over dot represents ordinary derivative with respect to cosmic time $t$. The energy density and matter pressure can be obtained if the functional, $f(R,G)$ has some explicit form. So, here we consider a linear form for $R$ and quadratic form for $G$ for the functional $f(R,G)$ such that,

$$f(R,G) = aR + \beta G^2,$$

where the pairing constants $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are used. The energy density and pressure in terms of Hubble parameter by substituting Eq. (6) in Eqs. (4) and (5) can be obtained as,

\begin{align}
\rho &= 3H^2 \left[ \alpha - 96\beta H^6 + 96\beta H^2(2H\dot{H} + 6HH^2 + 3H^2) \right], \\
p &= 288\beta H^8 - 3\alpha H^2 - 2 \left[ 2160\beta H^4\dot{H}^2 + 576\beta H^2\dot{H}^3 + 96\beta H^4(\ddot{H} + 6H\dot{H}) + H(\alpha + 480\beta H^6 + 768\beta H^3\dot{H}) \right].
\end{align}

Model parameters influence the evolution of pressure and energy density of the model. However, we may modify the value to examine the behavior of dynamical parameter. On the other hand, the EoS parameter $\omega = \frac{p}{\rho}$, which will allow us to analyze the late time acceleration issue, may be determined by using Eqs. (7) and (8),

$$\omega = -\frac{4320\beta H^4\dot{H}^2 + 1152\beta H^2\dot{H}^3 + 3H^2 \left[ \alpha - 96\beta H^6 + 64\beta H^2 \left( \ddot{H} + 6H\dot{H} \right) \right] + 2H \left( \alpha + 480\beta H^6 + 768\beta H^3\dot{H} \right)}{3H^2 \left[ \alpha - 96\beta H^6 + 96\beta H^2(2H\dot{H} + 6HH^2 + 3H^2) \right]}.$$

Now, the dynamical and EoS parameters are expressed in Hubble terms and to study its behaviour the Hubble parameter to be expressed in cosmic time. We are intending to study the possible occurrence of future singularity at finite or infinite future, therefore, we have considered some similar form of the Hubble parameter to find the future evolutionary behaviour of the Universe.

### III. SINGULARITY-FREE MODELS

In this section, we shall discuss the three future singularities scenario such as, LR, BR and PR as three cosmological models. For the better clarity, we shall discuss the physical behaviours of the parameters in term of redshift, which can be related to the scale factor as, $z + 1 = \frac{1}{a}$.

#### A. Model I (Little Rip)

The LR scale factor can be represented as, $a(t) = e^{\frac{\lambda}{\nu}}(e^{\nu t} - e^{\nu t_0})$, where $\lambda, \nu$ and $t_0$ is the scale factor parameter and can be constrained from observational and physical basis. The equivalent Hubble parameter, which measures the rate of expansion of the Universe, and the deceleration parameter, which determines whether the Universe accelerates or decelerates, can be written respectively as,

$$H = \Lambda e^{\nu t}; \quad q = -\frac{\lambda + \nu e^{-\nu t}}{\lambda}.$$
From Eq. (10), we analyse that for the positive values of $\lambda$ and $\nu$, the deceleration parameter remains negative throughout the evolution. It rises from a lower negative value to a value of $-1$ at late time of the evolution. Because $e^{-\nu t}$ is positive, the deceleration parameter is always negative for positive values of $\nu$. As a result, a negative value can be deemed to experience a decelerating Universe. However, the sign of the scale factor parameter determines whether the Universe is accelerating or decelerating. The present value of $H$ and $q$ are given in TABLE - I.

The Hubble parameter of the cosmological models constructed through the assumed form of scale factor may lead to the divergence of comoving Hubble radius, $r_h = 1/aH$ as the Hubble parameter vanishes e.g. at the bouncing scenario. At the same time, the accelerating or decelerating behaviour of the Universe can also be assessed through the asymptotic behaviour of the comoving Hubble radius. Whenever the Hubble radius reduces monotonically, before asymptotically shrinking to zero, leads to the accelerating behaviour of the Universe. To note, in the bouncing scenario, the Hubble horizon becomes infinite size near the bouncing point. At late time, the Hubble horizon shrinks to zero. The graphical behaviour of Hubble horizon shows that it reduces asymptotically over time and at late time shrinking to zero [FIG. 1 (left panel)]. This situation is arising for the non-zero Hubble parameter value at the present time, unlike in the case of bouncing scenario. The Gauss-Bonnet invariant which is Hubble parameter dependent, increases gradually and infinitely large at late time [FIG. 1 (right panel)].

![FIG. 1: Hubble Radius (left panel) and Gauss-Bonnet invariant (right panel) versus redshift. The parameter scheme: $\nu = 0.3122, \lambda = 25.11, t_0 = 3.42$.](image)

Using the LR scale factor in Eqns. (7)- (9), we can obtain the expressions for the energy density, pressure, and EoS parameter as,

$$\rho = 3\lambda e^{2\nu t} \left[ \alpha - 96\beta\lambda^4 e^{4\nu t}(-5\nu^2 + \lambda^2 e^{2\nu t} - 6\nu e^{\nu t}) \right], \quad (11)$$

$$p = \lambda e^{\nu t} \left[ -2\alpha - 3\alpha \lambda e^{\nu t} + 288\beta\lambda^7 e^{7\nu t} - 960\beta^3 \lambda^6 v e^{6\nu t} - 5472\beta^2 \lambda^5 \nu^2 e^{5\nu t} - 2880\beta^3 \lambda^4 e^{4\nu t} \right], \quad (12)$$

$$\omega = -1 + \frac{2\nu \left[ \alpha - 96\beta\lambda^4 e^{4\nu t}(-15\nu^2 + 4\lambda^2 e^{2\nu t} - 21\nu e^{\nu t}) \right]}{288\beta^3 \lambda^7 e^{5\nu t} (-5\nu^2 + \lambda^2 e^{2\nu t} - 6\nu e^{\nu t}) - 3\alpha \lambda e^{\nu t}}. \quad (13)$$

To keep the Hubble and deceleration parameter in the range as suggested by the cosmological observations, we constrained the LR scale factor parameter $\nu = 0.39$. Next we have appropriately adjusted the model parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$, so that the energy density remains positive throughout and the EoS parameter exhibits an accelerating behaviour. We have assumed three representative values of the other scale factor parameter $\lambda$. The energy density remains positive and increases over time and at sufficient late time it becomes very high [FIG. 2 (left panel)]. The EoS parameter remains negative throughout and at present time ($z \approx 0$), it remains at the phantom phase. At $z = 0$, $\omega_0$ observed to be $-1.0110, -1.0114, -1.01137$ respectively for $\lambda = 25.11, 25.18, 25.25$. In the literature, it has been mentioned that there are three significant classes of scalar field dark energy models available to investigate the theoretical aspects of dark energy models. These are the phantom phase $\omega < -1$ \cite{41}, quintessence phase...
$-\frac{1}{3} < \omega < -1$ \cite{42}, and the quintom $\omega$ cross $-1$, move from the phantom to the quintessence region, perform the quintom scenario. Here all the curve remain in the phantom phase at present time.
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\[ \text{FIG. 2: Energy density (left panel) and EoS parameter (right panel) versus redshift. The parameter scheme: } \alpha = 0.39, \beta = -1.1, \nu = 0.3122, t_0 = 3.42. \]

\[ \text{B. Model II (Big Rip)} \]

In this case, we consider the scale factor for the BR singularity as, $a(t) = a_0(t) + \frac{1}{(t_s - t)^\gamma}$, where $a_0(t) = c$ is integrating constant. The scale factor $a(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to t_s$ and when $t \to \infty$, $a(t) \to a_0(t)$. Also, $t_s$ is the time that BR occurs, and the cosmic derivative and Hubble rate blow up at $t = t_s$. As a consequence, the curvature is ill-defined at $t = t_s$. The physical properties of the model depends on the free parameter $t_s$ and $\gamma$, and hence must be defined using some physical basis. The Hubble and deceleration parameter are respectively, $H = \frac{7}{t_s - t}$ and $q = -\frac{\gamma + 1}{7}$ when the integrating constant $a_0(t)$ vanishes. We can observe that, to keep $q$ negative, the scale factor parameter $\gamma > -1$, whereas for $\gamma < -1$ provides positive $q$ leads to the decelerating behaviour. The present value of Hubble and deceleration parameter of the model are provided in TABLE - I. The Hubble radius asymptotically reduces to zero from a higher positive value [FIG. 3 (left panel)] and the Gauss-Bonnet invariant increases gradually and at late time approaches to a high positive value [FIG. 3 (right panel)].

\[ \gamma = 74.4, c = 0.015 \]

\[ \text{FIG. 3: Hubble radius (left panel) and Gauss-Bonnet invariant versus redshift (right panel). The parameter scheme: } \gamma = 74.4, c = 0.015 \]

The energy density, pressure and EoS parameter for the BR case can be obtained as,

\[ \rho = \frac{3\gamma^2 (c(t_s - t)^6 - 96\beta\gamma^4(\gamma - 7)(\gamma + 1))}{(t_s - t)^8}, \]

\[ (14) \]
\begin{align}
p &= \frac{\gamma \left(288\beta \gamma^7 - 960\beta \gamma^6 - 6624\beta \gamma^5 - 5376\beta \gamma^4 - 3\lambda \gamma (t_s - t)^6 - 2\alpha (t_s - t)^6\right)}{(t_s - t)^6}, \\
\omega &= \frac{-288\beta \gamma^7 + 960\beta \gamma^6 + 6624\beta \gamma^5 + 5376\beta \gamma^4 + 3\lambda \gamma (t_s - t)^6 + 2\alpha (t_s - t)^6}{288\beta \gamma^6(\gamma - 7)(\gamma + 1) - 3\lambda \gamma (t_s - t)^6}. \tag{16}
\end{align}

The graphical behaviour of energy density indicates that for the chosen value, it remains entirely positive and at late time attained very large value [FIG. 4 (left panel)]. The EoS parameter curve evolves in the phantom phase at the beginning of the epoch, progressively increases, and then remains in the same region. At the late time it approaches near to the \(\Lambda CDM\) line. The BR model records the values pf EoS parameter at the current cosmic epoch, \(\omega_0 = -1.10, -1.18, -1.27\) respectively for \(\gamma = 74.1, 74, 74.7\). This result is in good agreement with the range \(\omega(t_0) = -1.10 \pm 0.14\) as determined by a recent observation [25]. Though the EoS curves evolves from sufficiently different phases initially, but at late time all merge together. So, the changed in evolutionary behaviour of the parameter can be observed for the representative values of \(\gamma\) at early and present time only [FIG. 4 (right panel)]. In the context of this, it is worth noting that Nojiri et al. [43] explored the fate of phantom-driven Universes and discussed the structures of future singularities, including BR, within finite time (\(t_s\)). Nojiri et al. [43] found that the EoS parameter needs to be doubled in value to have a continuous transition from quintessence to phantom phase after evaluating the BR model of evolution based on the EoS parameter.

![Graph](image)

**FIG. 4:** Energy density (left panel) and EoS parameter (right panel) versus redshift. The parameter scheme: \(\alpha = 5, \beta = -0.47, \epsilon = 0.015\)

### C. Model III (Pseudo Rip)

The Hubble parametrization suggests another phantom behavior without singularity at a finite time, \(H = \chi_0 - \chi_1 e^{-\lambda t}\), where \(\lambda, \chi_0\) and \(\chi_1\) are positive constants and \(\chi_0 > \chi_1\). The Hubble parameter, \(H \to \chi_0\) as the limit \(t \to \infty\). Asymptotically, this model leads to a de Sitter Universe [35]. The deceleration parameter \(q\) becomes, \(q = -1 - \frac{\lambda \chi_1 e^{-\lambda t}}{(\chi_1 - \chi_0 e^{\lambda t})^2}\). With the passing of time, the Hubble parameter grows in value, and the current value \(\approx 73.29\) (km/sec)/Mpc. As \(t \to 0\), \(q = -1 - \frac{\lambda \chi_1}{(\chi_1 - \chi_0)^2}\) and when \(t \to \infty\), \(q\) approaches to \(-1\). The parameters \(\chi_1 > 0\) and \(\lambda > 0\) were constrained to keep the current value of the deceleration parameter \(q_0 = -1.00006\), which is within the preferred range of recent observations \((q_0 = -1.08 \pm 0.29)\) [44]. The present value of Hubble parameter and deceleration parameter of this model are given in TABLE 1. The Hubble radius is decreasing up to the present time asymptotically, however at late time it decreases rapidly and approaches to zero [Fig. 5 (left panel)]. The behaviour of Gauss-Bonnet invariant remains same as in the LR and BR cases [Fig. 5 (right panel)].
Fig. 5: Hubble radius (left panel) and Gauss-Bonnet invariant (right panel) versus redshift. The parameter scheme: $\chi_0 = 74.31, \chi_1 = 1, \lambda = 0.3011$

We shall simplify the energy density and EoS parameter of PR model by substituting the Hubble parameter in Eqns. (7)-(9) as,

$$\rho = 3\chi^2 \left[ 96\beta \chi^2 \left( \chi_1 \lambda e^{-3\lambda M} \left( \chi_1 (5\lambda - 12\chi_0) e^{2\lambda t} + 2\chi_0 (3\chi_0 - \lambda) e^{2\lambda t} + 6\chi_1^2 \right) - \chi^4 \right) + a \right], \quad (17)$$

$$p = -2\chi_1 \lambda \left[ 96\beta \lambda \chi^2 e^{-3\lambda M} \left( \chi^2 (\lambda - 6\chi_0) e^{2\lambda t} + 6\chi_1^2 \lambda - 8\chi_1 \lambda e^{\lambda t} \right) + 2736\chi_1 \beta \lambda \chi^4 e^{-2\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda t} (a + 480\beta \chi^6) \right]$$

$$- 3a\chi^2 + 288\beta \chi^8, \quad (18)$$

$$\omega = \frac{-2\chi_1 \lambda \left[ 96\beta \lambda \chi^2 e^{-3\lambda M} \left( \chi^2 (\lambda - 6\chi_0) e^{2\lambda t} + 6\chi_1^2 \lambda - 8\chi_1 \lambda e^{\lambda t} \right) + 2736\chi_1 \beta \lambda \chi^4 e^{-2\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda t} (a + 480\beta \chi^6) \right]}{3\chi^2 \left[ 96\beta \chi^2 \left( \chi_1 \lambda e^{-5\lambda M} e^{2\lambda t} \left( \chi_1 (5\lambda - 12\chi_0) e^{\lambda t} + 2\chi_0 (3\chi_0 - \lambda) e^{2\lambda t} + 6\chi_1^2 \right) - \chi^4 \right) + a \right]}$$

$$- \frac{3a\chi^2 - 288\beta \chi^8}{3\chi^2 \left[ 96\beta \chi^2 \left( \chi_1 \lambda e^{-5\lambda M} e^{2\lambda t} \left( \chi_1 (5\lambda - 12\chi_0) e^{\lambda t} + 2\chi_0 (3\chi_0 - \lambda) e^{2\lambda t} + 6\chi_1^2 \right) - \chi^4 \right) + a \right]}. \quad (19)$$

where $\chi = (\chi_0 - \chi_1 e^{-\lambda t})$. Throughout the evolution, the energy density becomes positive and increases from early time to late time [FIG. 6 (left panel)]. Because the current value of the EoS parameter is so near to $-1$, the model aligns with the concordant $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ model [FIG. 6 (right panel)]. Because the finite time frame future singularity is observable, it avoids the PR singularity. As a result, the action alteration of geometry allows the model to avoid any PR singularity.
\[ \lambda = 0.3011 \]
\[ \lambda = 0.3021 \]
\[ \lambda = 0.3031 \]

To summarize, in TABLE - I, we have listed the present values of the Hubble parameter, deceleration parameter and the EoS parameter for all the three rip models discussed above. Also the cosmological observations results are also mentioned against the parameters.

**TABLE I: Estimated results for the EoS parameter and cosmological parameters for the current era**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>LR ((\lambda = 25.11))</th>
<th>BR ((\eta = 74.1))</th>
<th>PR ((\lambda = 0.3011))</th>
<th>Present Observational Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H(\text{Km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}))</td>
<td>73.03</td>
<td>73.26</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>75.35 (\pm) 1.68 [44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>(-1.004)</td>
<td>(-1.028)</td>
<td>(-1.00006)</td>
<td>(-1.08 \pm 0.29) [44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\omega)</td>
<td>(-1.011)</td>
<td>(-1.1008)</td>
<td>(-1.00015)</td>
<td>(-1.006 \pm 0.045) [3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** \(H_0 = 75.35 \pm 1.68 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}\) is the most recent Pantheon sample, with a 2.2% uncertainty, close to the 1.9% error found by the SHoES Collaboration. Deceleration parameter was demonstrated in [45] that a competitive limit on the Hubble constant might be obtained using the broad (truncated) Gaussian prior \(q_0 = 0.5 \pm 1\). Without high-redshift Type Ia supernovae, the limit on a constant dark energy equation of state parameter from WMAP + BAO + \(H_0\) is \(\omega = -1.10 \pm 0.14\) (68 % CL) [25]. Several data sources were used which suggest the limit for \(\omega\) as, (i) Planck collaboration, \(-1.03 \pm 0.03\) [4], (ii) Supernovae cosmology project, \(-1.035^{+0.055}_{-0.059}\) [46] and (iii) WMAP+SN Ia, \(-1.084 \pm 0.063\) [47]. The limit of \(\omega\) obtained here is in the prescribed limit from different observations sources.

The study is to know the possible occurrence of rip in the evolution process of the Universe because of the late time cosmic expansion and this expansion issue can be addressed by the modified theories of gravity. Some of the properties of the modified theories of gravity need to be verified, prominent among them is the behaviour of energy conditions. The underlying causal and geodesic structure of space-time is assigned by the energy conditions. So, the modified theory of gravity, here the \(f(R, G)\) gravity, must confront the energy conditions. Basically, the energy conditions are the boundary conditions to maintain positive energy density [48, 49]. But the effect of dark energy, additional limits on cosmic models are imposed by energy conditions [50]. For example, the violation of strong energy conditions in the dark energy models. The energy conditions are: Null Energy Condition (NEC), \(\rho + p \geq 0\); Weak Energy Condition (WEC), \(\rho \geq 0\) and \(\rho + p \geq 0\); Strong Energy Condition (SEC), \(\rho + 3p \geq 0\) and \(\rho + p \geq 0\); and Dominant Energy Condition (DEC), \(\rho \geq 0\) and \(\rho + p \geq 0\). Because the violation of the strong energy requirement has become so crucial in modified gravity theories, its survival is now in jeopardy. For this \(f(R, G)\) gravity model, the energy conditions NEC, WEC, SEC, and DEC can now be shown as follows:
Because all models evolve in the phantom phase, except the DEC, all other energy conditions are predicted to be violated. The behaviour of energy conditions for the Model I, Model II and Model III are respectively represented in Fig. 7, Fig. 8 and Fig. 9. In all the models, the DEC is satisfied in the suitable range, however as expected both NEC and SEC are violated. For better visibility to show the violation of NEC, it is embedded in the figures. The NEC decreases and kept falling to a negative value in the negative cosmic time domain. Hence, the models validate the behaviour in $f(R, G)$ gravity. The behaviour of energy conditions summarized in TABLE II.
**IV. COSMOLOGICAL PERTURBATIONS**

Under linear homogeneous and isotropic perturbations, we shall investigate the stability of the rip cosmological models obtained in $f(R, G)$ gravity [51]. We shall use the pressureless dust FLRW background with a general explanation of $H(t) = H_0(t)$. The matter fluid is in the form of perfect fluid with constant EoS such that $p_m = \omega \rho_m$ and the matter-energy density $\rho_m$, obeys the standard continuity equation:

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(1 + \omega)\rho_m = 0,$$  
(20)

Solving the continuity Eq. (20), the evolution of the matter energy density can be described in terms of this specific solution,

$$\rho_{m0}(t) = \rho_0 e^{-3(1+\omega_m)\int H_0(t)dt},$$  
(21)

The isotropic deviation of the baseline Hubble parameter and the matter over density are represented by $\delta(t)$ and $\delta_m(t)$ respectively. Now we define the perturbation for Hubble parameter and energy density as follows

$$H(t) = H_0(t) (1 + \delta(t)) \quad \rho_m(t) = \rho_{m0} (1 + \delta_m(t)).$$  
(22)

We consider the Hubble parameter and the energy density around the arbitrary solutions $H_0(t)$ as perturbations [51]. We shall perform the perturbation analysis on the solution $H(t) = H_0(t)$, so that the function $f(R, G)$ may be represented in $R$ and $G$ powers as,

$$f(R, G) = f_0 + f_{R0}(R - R_0) + f_{G0}(G - G_0) + O^2,$$  
(23)

where the subscript 0 means the values of $f(R, G)$ and its derivatives $f_R$ and $f_G$ are evaluated at $R = R_0$ and $G = G_0$. Although only the linear terms of the induced perturbations are examined, the $O^2$ term contains all terms proportional to $R$ and square of $G$ or higher powers that will be included in the equatio and is ignored. Thus, by substituting Eqs. (22) and (23) in the FLRW background Eq. (4) and the continuity Eq. (20), we obtain the perturbation equations in terms of $\delta(t)$ and $\delta_m(t)$ in the form of the following differential equations,

$$c_2 \ddot{\delta}(t) + c_1 \dot{\delta}(t) + c_0 \delta(t) = c_m \delta_m(t),$$  
(24)

The coefficients $c_0, c_1, c_2$ and $c_m$ are explicitly dependent on the background of $f(R, G)$ solution and its derivatives. In addition, once the matter continuity Eq. (20) is disturbed by expressions, a second perturbed equation is formed from Eq. (22). Thus,

$$\dot{\delta}_m(t) + 3H_0(t)\delta(t) = 0.$$  
(25)

We have framed the model based on the functional $f(R, G) = \alpha R + \beta G^2$. If we assume that GR will be retrieved from the current model at some point, we may have to ignore the contributions from the higher derivatives of the functional $f(R, G)$. So, using the perturbative approach in the equivalent FLRW equation, we obtain

$$6H_0^2 \delta(t) = -c_m \delta_m(t).$$  
(26)
This is an algebraic relationship between geometrical and matter perturbations. As a result, matter perturbations ultimately dictate the whole perturbation surrounding a cosmological solution in GR. Now, we shall carry out the stability analysis for the three models discussed as presented in Section III.

For Model I, that represents with the LR scale factor, \( \delta(t) \) and \( \delta_m(t) \) can be derived by using Eq. (25) and (26) as,

\[
\delta(t) = c \exp \left( \frac{3\lambda e^{\nu t}(7\alpha - 96\beta \lambda^6 e^{\nu t})}{14\alpha \nu} \right)
\]

\[
\delta_m(t) = \frac{2\alpha c}{\alpha - 96\beta \lambda^6 e^{\nu t}} \exp \left( \frac{3\lambda e^{\nu t}(7\alpha - 96\beta \lambda^6 e^{\nu t})}{14\alpha \nu} \right)
\]

Where \( c \) is an integration constant that may be found by evaluating \( \delta(t) \) at current time. The visual assessment of the stability of model is shown in FIG. 10. For the chosen values of the parameters, the linear perturbations in the Hubble parameter and the energy density decrease as time passes, hence the stability of the model has been ensured.
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FIG. 10: \( \delta(t) \) (left panel) and \( \delta_m(t) \) (right panel) versus cosmic time for Model I. The parameter scheme: \( \alpha = 0.897, \beta = 0, \nu = 0.031, \lambda = -1, c = 0.02. \)

To show the stability analysis of the Model II based on the BR scale factor, the expressions for \( \delta(t) \) and \( \delta_m(t) \) are retrieved as,

\[
\delta(t) = c(t_s - t)^{-\frac{3\gamma}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{24\beta \gamma^7}{\alpha(t_s - t)^6} \right),
\]

\[
\delta_m(t) = \frac{2\alpha c(t_s - t)^{6-\frac{3\gamma}{2}}}{\alpha(t_s - t)^6 - 96\beta \gamma^6} \exp \left( -\frac{24\beta \gamma^7}{\alpha(t_s - t)^6} \right).
\]
\[ \delta(t) = c \exp \left( \frac{1}{70a\lambda} \left[ \sum \chi_{1} e^{6\lambda t} \left( \alpha - 672\beta\chi_{0}^{6} \right) + 35\lambda\chi_{0} e^{7\lambda t} \left( \alpha - 96\beta\chi_{0}^{6} \right) + 3520\beta\lambda\chi_{1} e^{5\lambda t} \right] \right) \] 

\[ \delta_{m}(t) = \frac{2\alpha c}{\alpha - 96\beta \left( \chi_{0} - \chi_{1} e^{-\lambda t} \right)} \exp \left( \frac{1}{70a\lambda} \left[ \sum \chi_{1} e^{6\lambda t} \left( \alpha - 672\beta\chi_{0}^{6} \right) + 35\lambda\chi_{0} e^{7\lambda t} \left( \alpha - 96\beta\chi_{0}^{6} \right) \right. \right. \] 

\[ + 3520\beta\lambda\chi_{1} e^{5\lambda t} - 3920\beta\lambda\chi_{1} e^{2\lambda t} + 29400\beta\lambda\chi_{1} e^{4\lambda t} - 14112\beta\lambda\chi_{1} e^{2\lambda t} + 3920\beta\chi_{0}\chi_{1} e^{4\lambda t} - 480\beta\chi_{1}^{7} \right) \] 

FIG. 11: \( \delta(t) \) (left panel) and \( \delta_{m}(t) \) (right panel) versus cosmic time for Model II. The parameter scheme: \( \alpha = 0.897, \beta = 0, \gamma = -4.82, t_{s} = 0.950, c = 0.2 \)

FIG. 12: \( \delta(t) \) (left panel) and \( \delta_{m}(t) \) (right panel) versus cosmic time for Model III. The parameter scheme: \( \alpha = 0.897, \beta = 0, \chi_{0} = 0.011, \chi_{1} = 1, \lambda = 0.3011, c = 0.01 \)

In this model also both \( \delta(t) \) and \( \delta_{m}(t) \) decreases over time and vanishes at late times, confirms the stability of the model. The stability of \( f(R, \mathcal{G}) \) gravity was examined. The expressions of \( \delta(t) \) and \( \delta_{m}(t) \) are the perturbed field equations that have been developed and solved analytically. We have illustrated the linear homogeneous perturbations behaviour for the three rip models. The dynamical stability of the model has been exemplified by the perturbation’s progressive decrease behavior with the increase in time.
V. CONCLUSION

Modified gravity theories have emerged as promising options for addressing the challenges of accelerating cosmic expansion and predicting the ultimate fate of the universe. The $f(R, G)$ is a generic modified gravity based on curvature matter coupling that gives an alternate explanation for present cosmic acceleration without introducing either an additional spatial dimension or an exotic component of dark energy. Because of the expansion of the Universe, the possible occurrence of singularity at finite and infinite future has been examined through three different rip scale factor such as LR, BR and PR. For all the models, we first calculated the behaviour and present value of the geometrical parameters $H$ and $q$ as in TABLE I. The behaviours and present value are in accordance with the cosmological observations results. All the models show the accelerating behaviour and based on the behaviours of the EoS parameter, they remain in the phantom phase at present time ($z = 0$). At late times, though the EoS parameter in the LR model exhibits phantom-like behavior, it remains exceptionally near to the $\Lambda CDM$ line, whereas in the BR model, it remains precisely just below the $\Lambda CDM$ line. Simultaneously, in the PR model, it exhibits identical behaviour to that of the LR model, except that it remains in a smaller range in the PR model. The violation of NEC, SEC and satisfaction of DEC in all the three models are obtained as summarized in TABLE II. This results as expected in the context of the behaviour of EoS parameter and modified theories of gravity. Further the NEC appears immediately below the zero line, which is intriguing. It shows that in these models, the contribution of NEC is essentially non-existent.

Implementing the Hubble parameter and energy density perturbation produced the linearized perturbed equations. We investigated the stability of LR, BR, and PR solutions, discovering that the LR model is stable with specific model parameter limitations, although the BR and PR model solutions are likewise stable for expanding universe behavior. Finally we conclude here that in the context of $f(R, G)$, no future singularity possible either in finite or infinite time.
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