Gauged Quintessence

1

Hye-Sung Lee (KAIST)

based on JCAP 02 (2023) 005 & work in progress with Kunio Kaneta, Jiheon Lee, Jaeok Yi

KIAS Seminar (May 4, 2023)

The universe is an enormous direct product of representations of symmetry groups.

- Steven Weinberg -



. Well-understood

Ordinary Matter SU(3)xSU(2)xU(1)

Dark Matter A lot of studies

.. Global competition

Dark Energy

What about here?

Least understood

. Well-understood

Ordinary Matter SU(3)xSU(2)xU(1)

Dark Matter A lot of studies

Global competition

Dark Energy

Quintessence [Ratra, Peebles (1988)] : first dark energy field model with a singlet scalar

Gauged Quintessence [Kaneta, LEE, Lee, Yi (2023)] : first gauge symmetry model in the quintessence scalar field understood

New particles/fields were often followed by a new gauge symmetry.

(i) Neutrino (to explain energy spectrum in beta decay) [Pauli 1930] \rightarrow weak interaction [Fermi 1934] (later identified as the SU(2)).

(ii) Quark (to explain plethora of hadrons) [Gell-Mann, Zweig 1964] \rightarrow SU(3) gauge strong interaction [Han & Nambu 1965]

(iii) Dark matter (to explain galaxy rotation curve) [Rubin 1970's]
→ Dark matter symmetry? [Numerous studies]

(iii) Dark energy field (to explain accelerated expansion) [Ratra & Peebles 1988]
→ Dark energy symmetry?

A new gauge symmetry may help understanding the new particles/fields.

Outline of this talk

- 1. Quintessence at a glance
- 2. Gauged quintessence
- 3. Coherent dark gauge boson
- 4. Evolution of the universe
- 5. Remarks on the Hubble tension
- 6. Summary and Outlooks

Quintessence at a glance

Quintessence



Quintessence

- Proposed by Ratra and Peebles (1988).
- Dynamic dark energy model with a scalar field (ϕ).
- A scalar rolls down a potential slowly in the present universe.
- Its potential energy is identified as the dark energy.
- Tracking behavior: The ϕ initial value does not really matter. Only the potential determines the the present time value of ϕ and its equation of state (addressing the cosmological coincidence problem) [Steinhardt, Wang, Zlatev (1999)].

Quintessence

$$S = \int d^4x \,\sqrt{-g} \Big[\frac{1}{2} m_{Pl}^2 R - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 - V(\phi) \Big] \qquad g_{\mu\nu} = \text{Diag}\{-1, a(t)^2, a(t)^2, a(t)^2\}$$

 $m_{\phi}^2 = rac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2}$ (*m_{\phi}* decreases for a Ratra-Peebles potential.)

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} = 0$$
 (equation of motion) $H \equiv \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ (Hubble parameter)

$$w \equiv \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V}{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V} \qquad \text{(equation of state)} \qquad \rho \propto a^{-3(1+w)}$$
$$= -1 + \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{V} + \cdots \qquad \text{for } \dot{\phi}^2 \ll V(\phi) \qquad \text{(slow-roll)} \qquad \qquad \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(1+3w)\rho$$

(w < -1/3 for the accelerated expansion. w = -1 for Λ)

Quintessence



Conditions for the quintessence dark energy $V \sim 10^{-123} M_{Pl}^4 \sim 3 \times 10^{-47} \,\text{GeV}^4$ (present dark energy density) $m_\phi \lesssim H_0 \sim 10^{-42} \,\text{GeV}$ (slow-roll)

Quintessence dynamics (without a gauge symmetry)



Balancing between the potential slope and Hubble friction results in the common tracking solution for the quintessence. The present values are not sensitive to its initial values (quintessence tracking behavior).

Gauged quintessence

Gauged Quintessence

We introduce a dark U(1) gauge symmetry to the quintessence scalar.

- $\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \phi \, e^{i \eta} \quad : \text{complex scalar under the U(1)}_{\text{dark}} \text{ gauge symmetry}$
- $(\phi: \text{ quintessence scalar})$
- $(\eta : \text{ longitudinal component of the dark gauge boson } X)$

$$\begin{split} S &= \int d^4 x \ \sqrt{-g} \Big[\frac{1}{2} m_{Pl}^2 R - |D_{\mu} \Phi|^2 - V_0(\Phi) - \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{X}_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{X}^{\mu\nu} \Big] \quad \begin{array}{l} D_{\mu} \equiv \partial_{\mu} + ig_X \mathbb{X}_{\mu} \\ &= \int d^4 x \ \sqrt{-g} \Big[\frac{1}{2} m_{Pl}^2 R - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} \phi)^2 - V_0(\phi) - \frac{1}{4} X_{\mu\nu} X^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_X^2 \phi^2 X_{\mu} X^{\mu} \Big] \\ &\text{(in unitary gauge : } \eta = 0, \quad X_{\mu} = \mathbb{X}_{\mu} + \frac{1}{g_X} \partial_{\mu} \eta) & V_{\text{gauge}} \end{split}$$

$$m_{\phi}^2|_0 = \frac{\partial^2 V_0}{\partial \phi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial \phi^2} , \quad m_X^2|_0 = g_X^2 \phi^2$$
 (tree-level masses)

Masses vary over cosmic evolution



As the quintessence ϕ rolls down the potential, both m_{ϕ} and m_X change over cosmic evolution.

$$m_{\phi}^2|_0 = \frac{\partial^2 V_0}{\partial \phi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial \phi^2} , \quad m_X^2|_0 = g_X^2 \phi^2$$

Gauged Quintessence

Equations of motion for ϕ and X (coupled via V_{gauge})

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial V_0}{\partial \phi} + g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu \phi = 0$$
$$\partial_\mu X^{\mu\nu} + 3H X^{0\nu} - g_X^2 \phi^2 X^\nu = 0$$

$$V_{\text{gauge}} = \frac{1}{2} g_X^2 \phi^2 X_\mu X^\mu$$

Energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_{\mu}\phi)(\partial_{\nu}\phi) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}(\partial_{\alpha}\phi)(\partial^{\alpha}\phi) - g_{\mu\nu}V_{0}(\phi)$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}g_{X}^{2}\phi^{2}X_{\alpha}X^{\alpha} + g_{X}^{2}\phi^{2}X_{\mu}X_{\nu} + X_{\mu\alpha}X_{\nu}^{\alpha} - \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{4}X_{\alpha\beta}X^{\alpha\beta}$$

Boltzmann equations for mass varying ϕ and X

$$\dot{\rho}_{\phi} + 3H(\rho_{\phi} + p_{\phi}) = -\frac{\dot{m}_X}{m_X}(\rho_X - 3p_X)$$
$$\dot{\rho}_X + 3H(\rho_X + p_X) = \frac{\dot{m}_X}{m_X}(\rho_X - 3p_X)$$

The energy flow between the quintessence scalar and the dark gauge boson is proportional to the \dot{m}_X .

 $\dot{m}_X > 0$: Energy flows from ϕ to X $\dot{m}_X < 0$: Energy flows from X to ϕ

Potential modified by the gauge symmetry



 $V = V_0 + \frac{1}{2}g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu \phi^2$

Quantum corrections in the gauged quintessence

1-loop effective potential in the gauged quintessence model

$$V_{\text{eff}} = V_0 + \frac{1}{2}g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu \phi^2 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2} V_0^{\prime\prime} + \frac{(V_0^{\prime\prime})^2}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{V_0^{\prime\prime}}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + \frac{3(m_X^2|_0)^2}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{m_X^2|_0}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{5}{6} \right)$$

1-loop correction of the quintessence

Additional 1-loop correction due to the X-boson



Quantum corrections in the gauged quintessence

1-loop effective potential in the gauged quintessence model

$$\begin{split} V_{\text{eff}} &= V_0 + \frac{1}{2} g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu \phi^2 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2} V_0'' + \frac{(V_0'')^2}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{V_0''}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + \frac{3(m_X^2|_0)^2}{64\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{m_X^2|_0}{\Lambda^2} - \frac{5}{6} \right) \\ m_\phi^2 &= \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \phi^2} = V_0'' + g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu + \frac{\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2} V_0'''' + \frac{V_0'' V_0'''}{32\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{V_0''}{\Lambda^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{9g_X^2 m_X^2|_0}{16\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{m_X^2|_0}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{1}{3} \right) \\ m_X^2 &= g_X^2 \left(\phi^2 + \frac{V_0''}{32\pi^2} \ln \frac{V_0''}{\Lambda^2} \right) & \text{independent of potential } V_0 \\ \text{Conditions for the quintessence dark energy} \\ V &\sim 10^{-123} M_{Pl}^4 \sim 3 \times 10^{-47} \text{ GeV}^4 & \text{(present dark energy density)} \\ m_\phi &\lesssim H_0 \sim 10^{-42} \text{ GeV} & \text{(slow-roll)} \end{split}$$

Potential-independent constraints (at present universe)



(Blue band: Ratra-Peebles potential case with the tracking behavior.)

Coherent dark gauge boson

Misalignment mechanism for coherent scalar oscillation

[Preskill, Wise, Wilczek (1983)] [Abbott, Sikivie (1983)] [Dine, Fischler (1983)]

Misalignment mechanism is a popular production mechanism of a coherent scalar field (such as QCD axion DM).

$$\ddot{\varphi} + 3H\dot{\varphi} + m_{\varphi}^2\varphi = 0 \qquad \rho_{\varphi} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\varphi}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_{\varphi}^2\varphi^2$$



- (i) Inflation makes φ spatially homogeneous: $\varphi(t, \vec{x}) = \varphi(t)$.
- (ii) Initially, Hubble friction is large ($H > m_{\varphi}$), which makes φ frozen and ρ_{φ} constant.
- (iii) When Hubble friction decreases sufficiently ($H \leq m_{\varphi}$), a coherent φ oscillation begins around the potential minimum.
- (iv) The oscillator has $p_{\varphi} = 0$, behaving as non-relativistic matter ($\rho_{\phi} \propto a^{-3}$); φ is a CDM despite of lightness. (QCD axion DM: $m_a \sim 10^{-6} 10^{-2}$ eV)

Misalignment mechanism for coherent vector boson oscillation





vector fields in random direction (before the inflation)

vector fields in one direction in visible universe (during/after inflation)

 $\partial_{\mu}X^{\mu\nu} + 3HX^{0\nu} - m_X^2 X^{\nu} = 0$ zero mode (spatially homogeneous): $X_{\mu}(t, \vec{x}) = X_{\mu}(t) = (X_0(t), \vec{X}(t))$

$$X_0 = 0 \qquad \ddot{X} + H\dot{X} + m_X^2 X = 0 \qquad \rho_X = \frac{1}{2a^2} \left(\dot{X}^2 + m_X^2 X^2 \right)$$

Unlike the scalar case, the ρ_X is highly suppressed by the scale factor, and it is hard to retain the ρ_X through the inflation. (Typical inflation e-folding is 60.)

-1

Naive misalignment does not really work for a sizable vector boson production.

Vector misalignment in the gauged quintessence model



As ϕ may increase by many orders of magnitude, m_X may increase by many orders of magnitude overcoming the suppression by the scale factor.

Misalignment mechanism with a mass-varying vector boson may work to produce a sizable vector boson energy density.

Preliminary

Vector misalignment in the gauged quintessence model



Misalignment mechanism with a mass-varying vector boson may work to produce a sizable vector boson energy density.

Evolution of the universe



X may have a sizable relic density, but we assume it is a subdominant DM (less than 10% relic density of the dominant CDM).

The dynamics of ϕ and X change drastically when the hierarchy between m_{ϕ} , m_X and H change over time.

(i) $H > m_{\phi}, m_X$ (ii) $m_{\phi} > H > m_X$ (iii) $m_X, m_{\phi} > H$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial V_0}{\partial \phi} + g_X^2 X_\mu X^\mu \phi = 0$$
$$\partial_\mu X^{\mu\nu} + 3H X^{0\nu} - g_X^2 \phi^2 X^\nu = 0$$

Benchmark parameters: $\alpha = 1$, $M = 2.2 \times 10^{-6}$ GeV, $g_X = 10^{-39}$ $\dot{X} = 0$, $\dot{\phi} = 0$ (at $a = 10^{-12}$)









(*i*) $H > m_{\phi}$, m_X : Both ϕ and X are frozen by Hubble friction. (*ii*) $m_{\phi} > H > m_X$: X is frozen, but ϕ rolls down potential. (*iii*) m_X , $m_{\phi} > H$: X is in coherent oscillations (DM), ϕ rolls.

When $V_{\text{gauge}} \sim \rho_X$ becomes sizable, it affects the quintessence dynamics. ϕ oscillates around the minimum of the potential until V_{gauge} becomes subdominant. ϕ gets back to the tracking solution.







(*i*) $H > m_{\phi}$, m_X : Both ϕ and X are frozen by Hubble friction. (*ii*) $m_{\phi} > H > m_X$: X is frozen, but ϕ rolls down potential. (*iii*) m_X , $m_{\phi} > H$: X is in coherent oscillations (DM), ϕ rolls.

The oscillation in the ϕ equation of state reflects the ϕ oscillation around the minimum of the potential. After V_{gauge} becomes subdominant, it restores tracking solution.

Hubble tension

Modern measurements of the Hubble constant



(early Universe)

(i) By fitting CMB data to the Λ -CDM model



(late Universe)

(ii) With the observation of the expansion (standard candles: Cepheid variables + Supernovae)



80

75

CMB with Planck

Balkenhol et al. (2021), Planck 2018+SPT+ACT : 67.49 ± 0.53 Pogosian et al. (2020), eBOSS+Planck $\Omega_m H^2$: 69.6 ± 1.8 Aghanim et al. (2020), Planck 2018: 67.27 ± 0.60 Aghanim et al. (2020), Planck 2018+CMB lensing: 67.36 ± 0.54 Ade et al. (2016), Planck 2015, $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.66$

CMB without Planck

Dutcher et al. (2021), SPT: 68.8 ± 1.5 Aiola et al. (2020), ACT: 67.9 ± 1.5 Aiola et al. (2020), WMAP9+ACT: 67.6 ± 1.1 Zhang, Huang (2019), WMAP9+BAO: 68.36^{+0.53} Hinshaw et al. (2013), WMAP9: 70.0 ± 2.2

No CMB, with BBN

D'Amico et al. (2020), BOSS DR12+BBN: 68.5 ± 2.2 Colas et al. (2020), BOSS DR12+BBN: 68.7 ± 1.5 Philcox et al. (2020), P_l+BAO+BBN: 68.6 ± 1.1 Ivanov et al. (2020), BOSS+BBN: 67.9 ± 1.1 Alam et al. (2020), BOSS+eBOSS+BBN: 67.35 ± 0.97

P_I(k) + CMB lensing

Philcox et al. (2020), $P_1(k)$ +CMB lensing: 70.6 ± 3.7

Cepheids – SNIa

Riess et al. (2020), R20: 73.2 ± 1.3 Breuval et al. (2020): 72.8 ± 2.7 Riess et al. (2019), R19: 74.0 ± 1.4 Camarena, Marra (2019): 75.4 ± 1.7 Burns et al. (2018): 73.2 ± 2.3 Dhawan, Jha, Leibundgut (2017), NIR: 72.8 ± 3.1 Follin, Knox (2017): 73.3 ± 1.7 Feeney, Mortlock, Dalmasso (2017): 73.2 ± 1.8 Riess et al. (2016), R16: 73.2 ± 1.7 Cardona, Kunz, Pettorino (2016), HPs: 73.8 ± 2.1 Freedman et al. (2012): 74.3 ± 2.1

TRGB – SNIa

Soltis, Casertano, Riess (2020): 72.1 ± 2.0 Freedman et al. (2020): 69.6 ± 1.9 Reid, Pesce, Riess (2019), SH0ES: 71.1 ± 1.9 Freedman et al. (2019): 69.8 ± 1.9 Yuan et al. (2019): 72.4 ± 2.0 Jang, Lee (2017): 71.2 ± 2.5

Miras – SNIa

Huang et al. (2019): 73.3 ± 4.0

Masers Pesce et al. (2020): 73.9 ± 3.0

Tully – Fisher Relation (TFR) Kourkchi et al. (2020): 76.0 ± 2.6

Schombert, McGaugh, Lelli (2020): 75.1 ± 2.8

Surface Brightness Fluctuations Blakeslee et al. (2021) IR-SBF w/ HST: 73.3 ± 2.5

Khetan et al. (2020) w/ LMC DEB: 71.1 ± 4.1

SNII

de Jaeger et al. (2020): 75.8^{+5.2}

HII galaxies Fernández Arenas et al. (2018): 71.0 ± 3.5

Lensing related, mass model – dependent

Denzel et al. (2021): 71.8-3.9 Birrer et al. (2020), TDCOSMO+SLACS: $67.4^{+1.7}_{-3.2}$, TDCOSMO: $74.5^{+5.6}_{-3.2}$ Yang, Birrer, Hu (2020), $H_0 = 73.65^{+3.9}_{-1.95}$ Millon et al. (2020), TDCOSMO: 74.2 ± 1.0 Baxter et al. (2020): 73.5 ± 5.3 Qi et al. (2020): 73.6^{+1.6} Liao et al. (2020): 72.8+ Liao et al. (2019): 72.2 ± 2.1 Shajib et al. (2019), STRIDES: 74.2-2 Wong et al. (2019), H0LiCOW 2019: 73.3⁺¹/₁ Birrer et al. (2018), H0LiCOW 2018: 72.5+ Bonvin et al. (2016), H0LiCOW 2016: 71.9⁻²

Optimistic average Di Valentino (2021): 72.94 ± 0.75

Ultra - conservative, no Cepheids, no lensing Di Valentino (2021): 72.7 ± 1.1

GW related

65

70

Gayathri et al. (2020), GW190521+GW170817: 73.4+6 Mukherjee et al. (2020), GW190521+GW170817: 73.4 $^{-1}_{10.7}$ Mukherjee et al. (2020), GW170817+ZTF: 67.6 $^{+4.3}_{-4.6}$ Mukherjee et al. (2019), GW170817+VLBI: 68.3 $^{+4.6}_{-8.0}$ Abbott et al. (2017), GW170817: 70.0 $^{+12.7}_{-8.0}$



(early Universe). $H_0 \sim 67$

(late Universe). $H_0 \sim 73$

Hubble tension:

about 5σ difference in H₀ between the

early and late Universe values.

(Potential hint of the new cosmology.)

Sound horizon in CMB



Baryon Acoustic Oscillations



(late universe)

DE becomes dominant only in the late universe.

Assuming no change in the sound horizon (early universe physics), the comoving distance to the last scattering (D) should remain intact with a new DE model.



$$D(z_s) = \int_0^{z_s} dz \, \frac{C}{H(z)} \qquad \qquad H^2 = \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = H_0^2 \left(\Omega_{\rm DE} + \Omega_{\rm matter}\right) \\ \rho \propto a^{-3(1+w)}$$

To keep D unchanged, a larger H_0 (resolving Hubble tension) should be compensated by a smaller H in the recent past

: It demands w(DE) < -1 (Λ -CDM value).

In the uncoupled quintessence model, w(DE) > -1 (worsening Hubble tension).

If an interacting DE model can provide effective w < -1, it may alleviate Hubble tension.

[Valentino, Melchiorri, Mina (2017)] [Lee, Lee, Colgain, Sheikh-Jabbari, Thakur (2022)]

(quintessence)
$$w \equiv \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V}{\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V}$$
$$= -1 + \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{V} + \cdot$$

Effective DE density

$$w_{\text{eff}}(\widetilde{DE}) = -1 + \frac{1}{\rho_{\widetilde{DE}}} \left((1+w_0)\rho_\phi + \left(\frac{m_X}{m_X^0} - 1\right)\frac{\rho_X^0}{a^3}\right)_{\dot{\rho} + 3H(1+w)\rho = 0}$$

: effective *w* for the effective DE density in the gauged quintessence

Developed in the DE-DM interaction model. [Das, Corasaniti, Khoury (2006)]

Take the effective DM density ($\rho_{\widetilde{CDM}}$) for the constant mass with a^{-3} scaling part. The remaining mass-varying part is absorbed in the effective DE density ($\rho_{\widetilde{DE}}$).

$$\rho_{\text{CDM}} + \rho_X + \rho_\phi = \rho_{\text{CDM}}^0 a^{-3} + \frac{m_X}{m_X^0} \rho_X^0 a^{-3} + \rho_\phi \qquad \qquad \frac{a^3 \rho_X}{m_X} = \frac{\rho_X^0}{m_X^0}$$
$$= \left[\left(\rho_{\text{CDM}}^0 + \rho_X^0 \right) a^{-3} \right] + \left[\left(\frac{m_X}{m_X^0} - 1 \right) \rho_X^0 a^{-3} + \rho_\phi \right]$$
$$= \rho_{\widetilde{CDM}} + \rho_{\widetilde{DE}} \qquad \qquad \rho_{\widetilde{DE}}$$



For $\dot{m}_X > 0$, $w_{\text{eff}}(DE)$ is lower than the uncoupled quintessence. It can be even lower than the **A**-CDM (w=-1).

Possibility of alleviating the Hubble tension. (It requires numerical fitting study.)

Concluding remarks

Summary

- 1. We introduced the first gauge symmetry model for a popular quintessence dark energy scalar field.
- 3. The interaction between the quintessence and the gauge boson $(V_{\text{gauge}} = \frac{1}{2}g_X^2\phi^2 X_\mu X^\mu)$ brings many interesting features to the universe evolution.
- 4. The mass-varying effect of the X gauge boson may overcome the problem of the vector boson misalignment mechanism (scaling factor suppression). [Preliminary result]
- 6. Hubble tension may be alleviated. (Need quantitative study.)
- 8. Our study serves as a proof of concept that the dark energy sector can be studied using a gauge symmetry. (Gauge interaction with the dark energy!)

. Well-understood

Ordinary Matter SU(3)xSU(2)xU(1)

Dark Matter A lot of studies

.. Global competition

Dark Energy

It is about time to investigate the governing symmetry in the dark energy sector!

Least understood

. Well-understood

Ordinary Matter SU(3)xSU(2)xU(1)

Dark Matter A lot of studies

.. Global competition

Dark Energy It is about time to investigate the governing symmetry in the dark energy sector!

Least understood

The universe is an enormous direct product of representations of symmetry groups.

- Steven Weinberg -

Thank you