

Cosmological implications of an interacting model of dark matter & dark energy

Keshav Ram Mishra,^{*} Shibesh Kumar Jas Pacif^{id,†}, Rajesh Kumar^{id,‡} and Kazuharu Bamba^{id,§}
(Dated: March 23, 2023)

In this paper, we have studied an interacting dark energy model. We have assumed the gravitational interaction between the matter fields i.e. barotropic fluid and the dark energy. The dark energy evolution is within the framework of spatially homogeneous and isotropic Friedmann-Robertson-Walker space-time. Therefore, we examine the cosmic evolution from the perspective of interacting scenario by selecting a suitable ansatz for the scale factor resulting from a parametrization of Hubble parameter. The evolution of the cosmological parameters are discussed in some details in the considered interacting scenario by calculating parameters and quantities such as deceleration parameter, energy density, pressure, equation of state (EoS) etc. Also, we have performed some cosmological tests and analysis in support of our obtained interacting model. Finally, we reconstruct the potential of the scalar field and refute the refined swampland conjecture using the equation of state of dark energy and the relationship between energy density and pressure with the scalar field and potential, and then thoroughly describe the findings.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major issues in theoretical physics and more generally, in cosmology, over the past decades is to determine the enigmatic nature of the two dominant components in the universe namely, dark energy and dark matter. This greatest open challenge in cosmology nowadays is the physical reason underpinning the late-time cosmic speed-up. The physical mechanism has been revealed by explicate the various statistical observational data sets [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. Many models of dark energy postulate the existence of an extra, unknown field that is responsible for the rapid expansion of the Universe named dark energy, but some viable hypotheses include infra-red modification to the theory of general relativity (for some reviews, see [11], [12], [13]). Dark energy accounts for around 68% of the overall energy density of the Universe, and hence consequently controls the evolution of the current cosmos.

The cosmological constant Λ is the most straightforward dark energy possibility, with equation of state (EoS) parameter $\omega_\Lambda = \frac{p_\Lambda}{\rho_\Lambda} = -1$. The Λ CDM model sides well with the current cosmological observations [14], and its parameters have been well-established with impressive precision using latest observational data. On the other hand, Λ CDM model has always been beset by obvious theoretical objections such as fine-tuning and cosmic-coincidence issues [15], [16]. As a result, various expansions to the underlying Λ CDM cosmology have received a lot of attention, including the possibility of vacuum energy interacting with Λ CDM [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26]. Due to the significant difference between the theoretical and observational predictions on the value of Λ and to alleviate the tension between the Λ CDM and the observational data [27] advised to modify the gravity and move toward the alternating theories of gravity with an enhancement in the goodness of fit [28], [29], [30]. As a replacement for Λ CDM model, the rolling scalar field has been intensively introduced into the literature [31], [32], [33]. Resultantly, the significance of seeing the scalar field as a DE candidate in understanding the unification of cosmic acceleration (early and late time) has earned high acceptance [11].

In addition to the shortcomings of the standard model of cosmology, certain observational results are still puzzling. For instance, in some studies, Λ CDM model has been modified by connecting a dynamical dark energy model with $H_{2,34}$ data. Work in [34], [35] reveals how to evaluate a range of models that allow for the evolution of dark energy models based on BAO, CMB, and SN data, as well as how to match dynamical DE models with $H_{2,34}$

* krmgkp1995@gmail.com

† shibesh.math@gmail.com

‡ rkmath09@gmail.com

§ bamba@sss.fukushima-u.ac.jp

data. In some observations of BOSS data [36], the observed value of Hubble parameter H at redshift $z = 2.34$ is $222 \pm 7 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ which falls below the Λ CDM model's prediction. [37], [38] have some additional similar work. The goal of this study is to create a cosmological model in a manner that incorporates new phenomenological types of interaction between dark energy and dark matter. Here, we study the cosmic acceleration in an interacting scenario between dark matter and dark energy. In this sense, some theories come up with DM and DE interaction, disclosing new properties of both components.

Due to a lack of understanding of the nature of the dark sector, numerous ways have been developed to divulge the physical features of DM and DE. Searching for models that could provide an alternate means of investigating the nature of the dark sector and, ideally, allowing for differentiation between the many theoretical models is still on. In this sense, some theories propose that dark matter and dark energy interact, revealing new properties of both (for a recent review see [39]). Indeed, numerous interactions have been proposed, including non-minimally coupled theories [40, 41], where the complete Lagrangian contains a specific interaction term.

Dark matter and dark energy interaction is a potential mechanism that states that in particle physics or more theoretical ground, any two matter fields can interact with each other. This particular phenomenological theory has piqued the cosmology community's curiosity due to various conceivable outcomes. Interacting models of DM and DE are an equivalent description of the dark sector of the Universe that has been extensively researched and are motivated by a viable explanation to the so called coincidence and cosmological constant concerns as in the interaction model dark energy decay into dark matter [42], [43], [44], [45], [46]. Some studies make fair assumptions about a DM-DE relationship to help ease or overcome the conundrum of the coincidence problem. Because the nature of DE and DM is unknown to us, and interaction is allowed in field theory [47]. The energy densities of DE and DM are allied in this way, and both become dynamical, allowing them to be comparable and reducing the coincidence. Numerous work [48], [47], [49], [50], [51], [52], [53] have already been presented in this regard that highlight the relation between DE and DM interaction. Recently, few interacting models have been explored in the contexts of resolving some cosmological tensions [54], [55], [56], [57], [58], [59], [60], [61], [62], [63], [64], [65], [66], [67], [68], [69]. For a more comprehensive list of references on interaction evidence discovered so far and the discussion of theoretical and cosmological features, see [70]. It has been identified that allowing for interaction can shift the dark energy EoS from quintessence to phantom, implying that the dark energy EoS parameter is imposed with an effective quintom type of nature. In phantom scalar field models, phantom crossing line causes instabilities with negative kinetic correction term. In addition to this, the interaction theory has been found to be particularly effective in addressing the Hubble constant H_0 gap between global and local measurements.

Since there is no such overarching rule for recruiting interaction functions, therefore, a variety of linear and non-linear functions are presented in the literature and one can select some new functions apparently. Generally, it is tedious to discuss the dynamics of the interacting model using a non-linear interaction function, hence these models are quite uncommon in literature [44], [71], [72]. Nonetheless, non-linear interacting models are always fascinating to explore the dynamics of the Universe to see if we can glean any further information from it. As a result of the motivation by the interacting scenarios, we examine an interacting model in this paper by adopting a model-independent approach.

The work of this paper has been organized as follows: Sect. I provides a brief introduction to general relativity and current status of the some hot cosmological problems addressed. In Sect. II, we consider the spacetime metric and formulated the Einstein. In Sect. III, solution of the field equations are obtained using a parametrization scheme. In Sect. IV, we have discussed the energy conditions for our model. We have discussed the stability of the model through velocity of sound in Sect. V. In Sect. VI, we have discussed the swampland conjecture and finally we have concluded our results in Sect. VII.

II. FIELD EQUATIONS IN AN INTERACTING SCENARIO

We start our analysis will go over the metric given in the form of homogeneous, isotropic, and spherically symmetric spatially Robertson-Walker geometry of the form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - \kappa r^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here, $a(t)$ denote the scale factor of the Universe: a function of cosmic time t and $c = 1$. The curvature constant, denoted by the term κ , assumes the values $0, -1, 1$ showing flat, open, or closed geometry respectively.

Let us introduce the Einstein field equations (EFEs) for the Friedmann Robertson-Walker metric in general theory of relativity as

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

where LHS of the above equation denotes the geometry of the Universe and RHS represents the energy momentum tensors of the various components in the Universe i.e. radiation, baryons, dark matter, and dark energy. The independent field equations will be,

$$3M_{pl}^2 \left[H^2 + \kappa a^{-2} \right] = \rho_r + \rho_b + \rho_m + \rho_d = \rho_{total}, \quad (3)$$

$$-M_{pl}^2 \left[2\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + H^2 + \kappa a^{-2} \right] = p_r + p_b + p_m + p_d = p_{total}. \quad (4)$$

Here, an overhead dot represents the time derivative and $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ is the Hubble parameter. $\rho_r, \rho_b, \rho_m, \rho_d, p_r, p_b, p_m,$ and p_d denote the energy densities and corresponding pressures of various components of the Universe. According to the Bianchi identity, $G_{ij}^j = 0$ leads to $T_{ij}^j = 0$, which gives us the following continuity equation.

$$\dot{\rho}_{total} + 3H(\rho_{total} + p_{total}) = 0. \quad (5)$$

As a result of the discussion of motivation in the introduction, let us consider the interacting scenario in this article. We consider the gravitational interaction is between two major dominating components i.e. dark matter and dark energy, which yields the equations:

$$\dot{\rho}_r + 3H(\rho_r + p_r) = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_b + 3H(\rho_b + p_b) = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m + p_m) = Q(t), \quad (8)$$

and

$$\dot{\rho}_d + 3H(\rho_d + p_d) = -Q(t), \quad (9)$$

where $Q(t)$ represents the energy exchange rate between the two dark sectors in these equations, with $Q(t) > 0$ implying a transfer of energy from the dark matter to the dark energy sector, and $Q(t) < 0$ implying the opposite. The energy transfer rate between dark and light sector is determined by the interaction term Q . However, the exact nature of it is still unknown to us. To investigate the topic of dark sector interaction, certain probable forms of Q should be assumed. In this paper, we look at the the form

$$Q = 3\gamma H\rho_m, \quad (10)$$

where γ is a coupling constant. The interaction term is exactly proportional to Hubble parameter H to make the preceding equations (8), (9) to hold the continuity law, since it is needed that the interaction term be proportional to the inverse unit of time. Therefore, We have chosen the form of $Q = 3\gamma H\rho_m$ to reflect this feature.

Let us define the equation of state parameter ω for various components of the Universe as $\omega_i = \frac{p_i}{\rho_i}$. Then, from the field equations (6), (7), (8) and (9) together (10) yield the solution,

$$\rho_r = C_1 a^{-4}, \quad (11)$$

$$\rho_b = C_2 a^{-3}, \quad (12)$$

$$\rho_m = C_3 a^{3\gamma-3}, \quad (13)$$

and

$$\dot{\rho}_{de} + 3H(1 + \omega_{de})\rho_{de} = -3C_3\gamma H a^{3\gamma-3}, \quad (14)$$

where C_1, C_2 and C_3 are integrating constants. Let us now define the redshift $z = \frac{a_0}{a} - 1$. We use the standard lore and normalize scale factor $a_0 = 1$, henceforth. Equations (11), (12) and (13) can now be written as,

$$\rho_r = C_1 (1+z)^4, \rho_b = C_2 (1+z)^3, \rho_m = C_3 (1+z)^{3-3\gamma}, \quad (15)$$

and the expressions of ρ_{de} and p_{de} can be derived in terms of geometrical parameters as,

$$p_d = M_{pl}^2 \left[(2q-1)H^2 - k(1+z)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{3}C_1(1+z)^4, \quad (16)$$

$$\rho_d = 3M_{pl}^2 \left[H^2 + k(1+z)^2 \right] - \left[C_1(1+z)^4 + C_2(1+z)^3 + C_3(1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right]. \quad (17)$$

Let us now define the density parameter (Ω) as $\Omega_i = \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_c}$, where $\rho_c = 3M_{pl}^2 H^2$ stands for the critical density and the suffix $i = r, b, m$ (radiation, baryon and dark matter). Then, we have

$$\Omega_r = \Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 \left(\frac{H_0}{H} \right)^2, \Omega_b = \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 \left(\frac{H_0}{H} \right)^2, \Omega_m = \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \left(\frac{H_0}{H} \right)^2. \quad (18)$$

Here, the suffix 0 stands for the values of the cosmological parameters at present time ($t = t_0$ or $z = 0$). The friedmann equation (3) can be expressed in terms of density parameter as

$$\Omega_d = (1 + \Omega_k) - \left(\frac{H_0}{H} \right)^2 \left[\Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right], \quad (19)$$

with the understanding of $\frac{k(1+z)^2}{H^2} = \frac{k}{a^2 H^2} = \Omega_k$. Finally, we have

$$p_d = M_{pl}^2 \left[(2q-1)H^2 - k(1+z)^2 \right] - H_0^2 \Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4, \quad (20)$$

$$\rho_{de} = 3M_{pl}^2 \left[H^2 + k(1+z)^2 \right] - H_0^2 \left[\Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right], \quad (21)$$

and

$$\omega_d = \frac{1}{3} \frac{(2q-1)H^2 - k(1+z)^2 - H_0^2 \Omega_{r0}(1+z)^4}{H^2 + k(1+z)^2 - H_0^2 [\Omega_{r0}(1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0}(1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^{3-3\gamma}]} \quad (22)$$

From the calculations above, it is now clear that we can have a fully deterministic solution of the field equations for any known $H(z)$ form and then we can explain the characteristics of the model. In order to close the above system of equations, we need one more equation. In literature, there are several phenomenological arguments to choose this extra constrain equation. One of the simplest way is the model-independent way approach that considers a functional form of any physical or geometrical parameter involving a few unknown constants (or model parameters). The model-independent way is also called the parametrization scheme that do not violate the background physics and provide a simple method to find a general solution to the system of equations. There is a huge list of various parametrization schemes summarized in a paper [73] those are used to solve the system of equations in general relativity or in modified theories of gravity. In the studies of cosmological modelling, this cosmological parametrization scheme serves as a natural way to discuss the cosmological dynamics of the model or reconstructing the cosmic evolution. With this motivation, here we proceed our study of interacting model of dark matter - dark energy by considering a well-motivated parameterization of Hubble parameter (H) that already considered in several research papers in different contexts works by Singh [74], Banerjee et al. [75], Nagpal et al. [76], Pacif et al. [77], and Mandal et al. [78]:

$$H(a) = \alpha(1 + a^{-n}), \quad (23)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and $n > 1$ are constants (call them as model parameters), which is to be constrained through some observational datasets. In the next section, we shall discuss the dynamics of the model with the considered cosmological parametrization.

III. THE MODEL

The form of Hubble parameter considered in equation (23) provides a smooth dynamics of expansion of the Universe from a decelerating phase to an accelerating one [76]. Equation (23) readily yields, the explicit form of scale factor as,

$$a(t) = (e^{n\alpha t} - 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} + c. \quad (24)$$

Using the initial big bang condition (at $t = 0$, $a = 0$), which make the constant of integration c , zero. We can establish the $t - z$ relationship as $t(z) = \frac{1}{n\alpha} \log(1 + (1+z)^{-n})$ and we can write,

$$H(z) = \alpha(1 + (1+z)^n), \quad (25)$$

or

$$H(z) = \frac{H_0}{2}(1 + (1+z)^n). \quad (26)$$

The constant α is of the order of H_0 and $\alpha = \frac{H_0}{2}$. The deceleration parameter $q(z)$ comes out to be

$$q(z) = \frac{(n-1)(1+z)^n - 1}{1 + (1+z)^n} \quad (27)$$

The detailed dynamical behavior of these geometrical parameters are discussed in Nagpal et al. [76], Pacif et al. [77], and Mandal et al. [78] in different scenarios in classical and in a modified theory. Here, in this paper, we are trying to discuss the physical dynamics of an interacting model of dark energy with this parametrization. We can observe from equations (26) and (27) that the expressions contain only one model parameter n . A suitable value

of the n would provide the evolution of different cosmological parameters in our model, which can be obtained by constraining it with any cosmological datasets. In the references [76] and [78], the authors have found the constrained values of $n = 1.43$, to which we are going to use here for our further analysis. Together with equations (26) and (27), we obtain the physical parameters as follows:

$$\Omega_r = \Omega_{r0} \frac{4(1+z)^4}{(1+(1+z)^n)^2}, \quad (28)$$

$$\Omega_b = \Omega_{b0} \frac{4(1+z)^3}{(1+(1+z)^n)^2}, \quad (29)$$

$$\Omega_m = \Omega_{m0} \frac{4(1+z)^{-3(\gamma-1)}}{(1+(1+z)^n)^2}, \quad (30)$$

$$\Omega_d = (1 + \Omega_k) - \frac{4 \left[\Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right]}{(1+(1+z)^n)^2}. \quad (31)$$

Equation (31) is verified with $\Omega_{d0} = 1 + \Omega_k - (\Omega_{r0} + \Omega_{b0} + \Omega_{m0})$. Equations (20), (21) and (22) can be written with the help of equations (26) and (27) as,

$$\frac{p_d}{M_{pl}^2 H_0^2} = \left[\frac{\{(2n-3)(1+z)^n - 3\} \{1+(1+z)^n\}}{4} - \frac{\Omega_k \{1+(1+z)^n\}^2}{4} - \Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 \right], \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{\rho_d}{3M_{pl}^2 H_0^2} = \left[\frac{\{1+(1+z)^n\}^2}{4} + \frac{\Omega_k \{1+(1+z)^n\}^2}{4} - \left\{ \Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right\} \right], \quad (33)$$

and

$$\omega_d = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\{(2n-3)(1+z)^n - 3\} \{1+(1+z)^n\} - \Omega_k \{1+(1+z)^n\}^2 - 4\Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4}{\{1+(1+z)^n\}^2 + \Omega_k \{1+(1+z)^n\}^2 - 4 \left\{ \Omega_{r0} (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{b0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{m0} (1+z)^{3-3\gamma} \right\}} \quad (34)$$

IV. ENERGY CONDITIONS

There are several prevalent energy conditions (ECs) in general relativity that set restrictions to prevent some regions having negative energy density. In other words, ECs are considered a valid generalization of the energy momentum tensor to the whole Universe, where energy density can never be negative. The plausibility of numerous significant singularity problems involving black holes, and wormholes, and many others are extensively examined using ECs. The energy conditions can mainly be defined in two ways: (i) geometrically, where ECs are well expressed in terms of Ricci tensor or Weyl tensor, and (ii) physically, where ECs are expressed as a function of the physical world. The ECs are defined as follows.

- Weak energy condition (WEC) $\Leftrightarrow \rho_{total} \geq 0, \rho_{total} + p_{total} \geq 0,$
- Null energy condition (NEC) $\Leftrightarrow \rho_{total} + p_{total} \geq 0,$
- Strong energy condition (SEC) $\Leftrightarrow \rho_{total} + 3p_{total} \geq 0,$
- Dominant energy condition (DEC) $\Leftrightarrow \rho_{total} \geq 0, \rho_{total} \geq |p_{total}|.$




FIG. 1. The plots of energy densities ρ_m , ρ_b and ρ_r for the model. The plots clearly indicate the faster decrease of the radiation than the baryonic matter and faster than the dark matter.




FIG. 2. The plots of ρ_d , p_d and ω_d for the model.

Additionally, the energy density (ρ) and isotropic pressure (p) of the model can be expressed in terms of potential energy ($V(\phi)$) and scalar field ϕ respectively. Thus the point-wise ECs in GR are defined as:

- WEC $\Leftrightarrow V(\phi) \geq \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2}$,
- NEC: $\forall V(\phi)$,
- SEC $\Leftrightarrow V(\phi) \leq \dot{\phi}^2$,
- DEC $\Leftrightarrow V(\phi) \geq 0$.

The examination of various energy conditions to determine whether weak, null, strong and dominant ECs are satisfied in the given scenarios is another crucial topic covered here. We plot some statistics for interacting scenarios and explore various energy conditions for our model (see Fig.3).




FIG. 3. The plots of *Null Energy Condition (NEC)*, *Strong Energy Condition (SEC)* and *Dominant Energy Condition (DEC)* for the model with suitable units of energy density (ρ) and pressure (p) as defined (H_0^2).




FIG. 4. The plots of C_s^2 for the model.

V. VELOCITY OF SOUND

As it is widely known that, the stability of linear perturbations is a significant test for the sustainability of a cosmological model. The need that the speed of sound (C_s^2) be sufficiently less than 1 to prevent unintended oscillations in the matter power spectrum imposes a strict limitation, nevertheless. We, here, plot the graph of velocity of sound (C_s^2) for our obtained models using suitable choice of the appropriate parameters, as illustrated in the following figure:

VI. SWAMPLAND CONJECTURE

In the present era, there is a growing interest in linking modern cosmological models with quantum gravity theory, which can easily distinguish between the effective field models to the nominal string theory. In order to choose field potentials properly, Swampland criteria have just been established. Therefore, in this section, we shall shed light on how the refined swampland programme conjecture and dark energy are related. The swampland conjecture, as we are aware, questions a number of structures, including the physics of black holes, inflation, and other cosmological ideas. The connection of practical cosmological models with gravity's quantum theory, which can distinguish between the effective field models associated to the nominal string landscape, has recently attracted considerable interest. Swampland criteria were recently established to help with field potential selection. Excitement was specifically sparked by the fact that precise de Sitter solutions with positive cosmological constants do not match with the string landscape, making it impossible to link high energy arrangements to fundamental theories.

The swampland criteria of the string theory bound with the quintessence model of DE were recently derived [79], [80]. Numerous works followed the work in [79], [80] approaching the Swampland criterion in the connection of DE's quintessence models, for instance [81] - [92]. The validity of the f(R) theory was recently studied by the researcher in relation to the Swampland conjecture [81], [93]. When a field theory contradicts quantum gravity, the Swampland requirements constrain and regulate it [94]. Although these hypotheses are still in their infancy and address some issues, they are rapidly evolving and changing in some situations like warm inflation [95]. We therefore choose to make a connection between these hypotheses and dark energy. In subsequent works, we'll endeavour to develop this concept and make a more substantial connection between the swampland programme, dark energy, dark matter, and in action. Researchers take into account several models for dark energy, and studied their cosmological applications, but the nature of the concept is still unclear.

Here, we investigate the cosmological restrictions put forth by two string Swampland criteria. These criteria include a lower restriction on $\frac{|\nabla_\phi V|}{V}$ when $V > 0$ and an upper bound on the range that scalar fields can travel. The major disadvantage of these two criteria seems that they generally in conflict with inflationary theories. We discover that certain quintessence models can meet these restrictions at the same time when we apply the same criterion to dark energy in the current epoch. We contend that the universe will experience a phase change within a few Hubble times if the two Swampland requirements are true. These conditions intensify the drive for upcoming dark energy equation of state ω measurements and equivalence principle tests for dark matter. With this motivation, we propose, the refined swampland conjecture in the below form.

Conjecture 1. $\frac{|V'|}{V} > C_1 M_{pl}$

Conjecture 2. $\frac{|V''|}{V} < -C_2 M_{pl}^2$

As we have already noted that the notion to forecast the acceleration in the Universe is to fill it with an exotic type of matter that satisfies the inequality $1 + 3\omega < 0$. The energy that causes the acceleration, according to the measurements, satisfies $\omega \simeq -1$. The development of the EoS parameter ω for our model was already covered in earlier sections, thus to get an appropriate matter field that produces unusual behavior and is capable of exhibiting repulsive effects whose cause is given by dark energy (scalar field) we will consider the following equations,

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad (35)$$

$$p = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi). \quad (36)$$

where the terms $\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2$ and $V(\phi)$ refer to the kinetic energy (KE) and potential energy (PE) of the scalar field. So the term $\omega = \omega(t)$ i.e. can no more be treated as a constant. The quintessence or phantom model is consistent with the observations provided $\omega \simeq -1$. Thus, we need $\dot{\phi}^2 \ll V(\phi)$ i.e. the KE of ϕ is insignificant in comparison to the PE. In this study, we consider that ϕ is the only source of DE with $V(\phi)$, so one can consider energy density and pressure of scalar field as ρ_ϕ and p_ϕ respectively for flat FLRW space-time under Barrow's scheme [96] using Eqs. (35) and (36) as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) = \rho_\phi, \quad (37)$$




FIG. 5. The plots of scalar field ϕ , potential $V(\phi)$ w.r.t. z and scalar field correspondence $V(\phi)$ vs ϕ for the model.

$$p = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) = p_{\phi}. \quad (38)$$

The KE and PE can be obtained by solving the Eqs. (37) and (38). Fig. 4 demonstrates the potential energy $V(\phi)$ plots *w.r.t.* scalar field ϕ for the same considered values of model parameters as we have taken in Fig. 1, 2. From Fig. 4, we notice that the potential $V(\phi)$ is present in the interval $-1 < \phi < 0$ and $V(\phi) \simeq 0$ at $\phi \simeq 0$. Therefore, we can predict that the scalar field ϕ is the only source of DE with potential $V(\phi)$. Thus we conclude that our model is an accelerating dark energy model.

To understand the nature of dark energy, we have considered its only source of energy as scalar field ϕ , which plays the role of quintessence model, therefore in this regard we have analyzed our model in the connection with Swampland conjecture. Conjecture 1 of this criteria is linked with scalar field ϕ , whereas conjecture 2 is connected with scalar potential V . We have composed the behavior of scalar field with respect to redshift for our interacting model in the figure Fig. 5.

The below figure Fig. 6 illustrates the behavior of refined swampland conjecture's components plotted for two distinct potentials connected to an interacting scenario for various parameters of the universe. We are aware that each of the swampland conjectures in the literature has positive values of unit order and the component C_2 , is smaller than component C_1 . The interacting model demonstrates satisfaction of both conjectures, as shown in figure. The Swampland criterion, which has been proposed for a consistent theory of gravity in this regard and which satisfies the requirement $\frac{|V'|}{V} > C_1 \approx O(1)$, demonstrates that this dark energy model accords better with the Swampland criteria.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have examined an interacting dark energy cosmological model in the classical theory of gravity. The interacting scenario discussed here provides an insight into the evolution of cosmological parameters. In order to find a consistent solution, we have considered a parametrization of Hubble parameter, which provide a smooth transition from early deceleration to present acceleration and discuss the late evolution of the Universe. In order to discuss the Universe's evolution in particular the late-time behavior, all the concerned cosmological parameters were written in terms of redshift z after establishing the $(t - z)$ relationship. All the cosmological parameters concerned with one model parameter n only that could be constrained from any cosmological datasets but we have used the constrained value of $n = 1.43$ as found in our earlier works [76], [78] for our analysis here. The evolutionary profiles of energy densities of radiation, baryonic & dark matter, dark energy, pressure and equation of state parameter are




FIG. 6. The plots of swampland conjecture 1 and 2 for the model.

shown in figures 1 and 2. We can observe the faster decrease of the radiation energy than the baryonic matter, which is faster than the dark matter. Panel 2(b) highlights the profile of pressure of dark energy which is more negative in the past, increases in a concave upward way and finally tends to zero in the future. The negative pressure of dark energy in due course of evolution favours the standard lore. Figure 2(c) shows the redshift evolution of equation of state parameter, which is approaching to -1 in the far future assuming the negative values in the expected ranges around $z = 0$. We have discussed different energy conditions for interacting models and shown them with graphical representations and also we have discussed the velocity of sound for our obtained model using suitable choice of appropriate parameters and is shown in Figure 4. Further we reconstructed the potential of the scalar field and challenged the refined swampland conjecture. The imprints on the growth of matter as well as dark energy fluctuations in interacting models of dark matter - dark energy have been studied in several papers [97], [98], [99] at perturbative level. For example, in [97], the perturbation equations are numerically solved, and it is discovered that at the early stages of development, visible imprints on the fluctuations in dark energy density are seen for larger rates of interaction strength for the coupling component. The evolution of cosmological perturbations is investigated in a model with dynamical dark energy in [100], which interacts with dark matter non-gravitationally. The influence of the strength of the additional interaction between the dark components on the evolution of density and velocity perturbations in them is analyzed for quintessence and phantom types of dark energy. We may expect the similar kinds of result with as the similar coupling term considered here and the detailed study is deferred to our future investigation.

Acknowledgement

SKJP thank IUCAA, Pune for hospitality, where a large part of this paper was written. The work of KB was supported in part by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21K03547.

Data Availability Statement: No Data associated in the manuscript

-
- [1] A. G. Riess, et al., *Astron. J.* **116** 1009 (1998)
 - [2] S. Perlmutter et al., *Astrophys. J.* **517** 565 (1999)
 - [3] M. Tegmark et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 103501 (2004)
 - [4] G. Hinshaw et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208** 19 (2013)
 - [5] B. M. Rose et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, **896(1)** L4 (2020); and the references therein.
 - [6] A. H. Jaffe et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 3475 (2001)
 - [7] D. N. Spergel et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **170** 377 (2007)
 - [8] Y. Wang and P. Mukherjee, *Astrophys. J.* **650** 1 (2006)
 - [9] U. Seljak et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 103515 (2005)

- [10] J. K. Adelman-McCarthy et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **162** 38 (2006)
- [11] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15** 1753 (2006)
- [12] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **342** 155 (2012)
- [13] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rept.* **505** 59 (2011)
- [14] P. A. R. Ade et al. Planck Collaboration, Planck 2015 results, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** A13 (2016)
- [15] V. Sahni and A. A. Starobinsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **9** 373 (2000)
- [16] R. Bean, S. M. Carroll and M. Trodden, [astro-ph/0510059](#)
- [17] L. Amendola, Coupled quintessence, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 043511 (2000)
- [18] L. Amendola and D. Tocchini-Valentini, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 043528 (2002)
- [19] R. G. Cai and A. Wang, *J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys.* **0503** 002 (2005)
- [20] X. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **611** 1 (2005)
- [21] M. Sasaki, J. Valiviita and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** 103003 (2006)
- [22] Y. H. Li and X. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** 1700 (2011)
- [23] L. Feng and X. Zhang, *J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys.* **1608** (08) 072 (2016)
- [24] R. Murgia, S. Gariazzo and N. Fornengo, *J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys.* **1604** (04) 014 (2016)
- [25] X. Zhang, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **60** (5) 050431 (2017)
- [26] A. Pourtsidou and T. Tram, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (4) 043518 (2016)
- [27] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** 1 (1989)
- [28] P. A. R. Ade et. al., *Astron. and Astrophys.* **594** A14 (2016)
- [29] T. M. C. Abbott et. al., *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 043526
- [30] N. Aghanim et. al., *Astron. & Astrophys.* **641** A6 (2020)
- [31] P. J. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** 559 (2003)
- [32] E. V. Linder, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** 329 (2008)
- [33] M. Li, X.-D. Li, S. Wang and Y. Wang, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **56** 525 (2011)
- [34] E. Aubourg, S. Bailey and J. E. Bautista et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **92** 123516 (2015)
- [35] G. B. Zhao, M. Raveri and L. Pogosian et al., *Nature Astronomy* **1** 627 (2017)
- [36] T. Delubac, J. E. Bautista and N. G. Busca et al., *Astron. Astrophys.* **574** A59 (2015)
- [37] A. G. Valent, J. Sola and S. Basilakos, *J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys.* **01** 004 (2015)
- [38] R. Y. Guo and X. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** 163 (2016)
- [39] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavon, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79** 096901 (2016)
- [40] T. Koivisto, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043516 (2005)
- [41] L. Amendola, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 043501 (1999)
- [42] W. Zimdahl and D. Pavon, *Phys. Lett. B* **521** 1 (2001)
- [43] C. G. Boehmer, G. Caldera-Cabral, R. Lazkoz, and R. Maartens, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** 023505 (2008)
- [44] L. P. Chimento and M. G. Richarte, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** 127301 (2012)
- [45] F. E. M. Costa, J. S. Alcaniz and D. Jain, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** 107302 (2012)
- [46] F. Arevalo, A. Cid and J. Moya, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (8) 565 (2017)
- [47] S. Micheletti, E. Abdalla and B. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** 123506 (2009)
- [48] B. Wang et al., *Nucl. Phys. B* **778** 69 (2007)
- [49] E. Abdalla, L. R. W. Abramo, L. Sodre Jr. and B. Wang, *Phys. Lett. B* **673** 107 (2009)
- [50] E. Abdalla, L. R. W. Abramo and J. C. C. de Souza, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** 023508 (2010)
- [51] V. Salvatelli, N. Said, M. Bruni, A. Melchiorri and D. Wands, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **113**(18) 181301 (2014)
- [52] S. Vagnozzi et al., *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493** 1139 (2020)
- [53] F. Ferlito et al., *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **512** 1885 (2022)
- [54] Weiqiang eta al., *J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys.* 1809 019 (2018)
- [55] E. D. Valentino et al., *Phys. Dark Univ.* 30 100666 (2020)
- [56] E. D. Valentino et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 101 063502 (2020)
- [57] W. Yang et al., *J. Cosm. Astrop. Phys.*, 1809 019 (2018)
- [58] W. Yang et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 98 123527 (2018)
- [59] S. Pan et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 100 103520 (2019)
- [60] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* 102 023518 (2020)
- [61] S. Pan et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 101 10 (2020)
- [62] E. D. Valentino et al., *J. Cosm. Astrop. Phys.* 2007 045 (2020)
- [63] E. D. Valentino et al., *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* 502 (1) L23 (2021)
- [64] W. Yang et al., *J. Cosm. Astrop. Phys.* 10 008 (2021)
- [65] S. Vagnozzi et al., *J. High Energy Astrophys.* 36 27 (2022)
- [66] R. C. Nunes, E. D. Valentino, *Phys. Rev. D* 104 063529 (2021)

- [67] S. Gariazzo et al., Phys. Rev. D **106** 023530 (2022)
- [68] R. C. Nunes et al., Phys. Rev. D **105** 123506 (2022)
- [69] A. Bernui et al., [arXiv:2301.06097](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.06097) [astro-ph.CO] (2023)
- [70] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela and D. Pavon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **79**(9) 096901 (2016)
- [71] F. Arevalo, A. P. R. Bacalhau and W. Zimdahl, Class. Quant. Grav. **29** 235001 (2012)
- [72] W. Yang, S. Pan and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **97**(4) 043529 (2018)
- [73] S. K. J. Pacif, Eur. Phys. J. Plus, **135** 792 (2020)
- [74] J. P. Singh, Astrophys. Space Sci. **318** 103 (2008)
- [75] N. Banerjee, S. Das, Gen. Rel. Grav. **37** 1695 (2005)
- [76] R. Nagpal, S. K. J. Pacif, J. K. Singh, K. Bamba and A. Beesham, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**(11) 946 (2018)
- [77] S. K. J. Pacif, M. S. Khan, L. K. Paikroy and S. Singh, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **35**(05) 2050011 (2019)
- [78] S. Mandal, S. Bhattacharjee, S. K. J. Pacif and P. K. Sahoo, Phys. Dark Univ. **28** 100551 (2020)
- [79] C. Vafa, [hep-th/0509212](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0509212) (2005).
- [80] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **766** 21 (2007)
- [81] M. Benetti, S. Capozziello and L. L. Graef, Phys. Rev. D **100**(8) 084013 (2019)
- [82] Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko and C. Vafa, [arXiv:1806.08362](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.08362) (2018)
- [83] P. Agrawal, G. Obied, P. J. Steinhardt and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **784** 271 (2018)
- [84] L. Heisenberg, M. Bartelmann, R. Brandenberger and A. Refregier, Phys. Rev. D **98**(12) 123502 (2018)
- [85] M. Raveri, W. Hu and S. Sethi, Phys. Rev. D **99**(8) 083518 (2019)
- [86] Y. Olguin-Trejo, S. L. Parameswaran, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, J. Cosm. Astropart. Phys. **1901**(031) (2019)
- [87] C. Han, S. Pi and M. Sasaki, Phys. Lett. B **791** 314 (2019)
- [88] S. Brahma and M. W. Hossain, J. High Energ. Phys. **1906** 070 (2019)
- [89] M. P. Hertzberg, M. Sandora and M. Trodden, Phys. Lett. B **797** 134878 (2019)
- [90] Y. Akrami, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and V. Vardanyan, Fortsch. Phys. **67**(1), 1800075 (2019)
- [91] H. Murayama, M. Yamazaki and T. T. Yanagida, J. High Energ. Phys. **1812** 032 (2018)
- [92] M. C. David Marsh, Phys. Lett. B **789** 639 (2019)
- [93] V. K. Oikonomou, Phys. Rev. D **103**(12) 124028 (2021)
- [94] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, Euro. Phys. Lett. **126**(2) 20002 (2019)
- [95] Nikodem J. Poplawski, arXiv preprint [gr-qc/0608031](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0608031) (2006)
- [96] J. D. Barrow, Nucl. Phys. B **310** 743 (1988)
- [97] S. Sinha, M. Banerjee, S. Das, arXiv preprint 2204.05174 [gr-qc] (2022)
- [98] S. Sinha, N. Banerjee, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **135** 779 (2020)
- [99] M. Eingorn, C. Kiefer, J. Cosm. Astrop. Phys. **07** 036 (2015)
- [100] R. Neomenko, B. Novosyadlyj, J. Phys. Studies, **24** (2) 2902 (2020)