Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Observational Constraints and Future of the Universe with Dynamic Dark Energy

Florian Neukart *

Posted Date: 3 January 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202401.0137.v1

Keywords: Hubble tension; Cosmic Microwave Background; Large-scale structures; Dark energy constraints; Future cosmological observations doi:10.20944/preprints202401.0137.v1

Article

Observational Constraints and Future of the Universe with Dynamic Dark Energy

Florian Neukart [1,2,*]

[1] Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands; f.neukart@gmail.com
[2] Terra Quantum AG, St. Gallen, Switzerland

Abstract: This paper is dedicated to examining dynamic dark energy models in the context of observational constraints and their implications for the universe's future. By integrating theoretical models with various observational data, we aim to provide a comprehensive view of how dynamic dark energy influences cosmic evolution and the universe's fate. This study tests these models against the latest observational evidence, including the Cosmic Microwave Background, supernovae, and large-scale structure surveys, to refine our understanding of the universe's accelerating expansion and the mysterious nature of dark energy.

Key words: Hubble tension; Cosmic Microwave Background; Large-scale structures; Dark energy constraints; Future cosmological observations

1. Introduction

The accelerated expansion of the universe, attributed to dark energy, has been a central focus of cosmological research since its discovery [1,2]. While the Lambda Cold Dark Matter (Lambda-CDM) model with a cosmological constant (Λ) provides a good fit for many observations [3,4], the precise nature of dark energy remains one of the most compelling mysteries in physics [5,6]. Dynamic dark energy models, which propose a time-varying component to dark energy, present a promising avenue for exploring this mystery [7,8].

1.1. The Role of Observational Constraints

Observational constraints play a pivotal role in testing and refining models of dynamic dark energy [9,10]. The reliability and validity of these models depend heavily on their consistency with a wide range of cosmological observations [11,12]. This paper will discuss how different observational techniques and data sets, from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) to supernovae and galaxy clustering, provide stringent tests for these models [3,13].

1.2. Current Observational Techniques and Data

We live in an era rich in cosmological data, with a variety of observational techniques offering insights into the nature of dark energy:

- *Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)*: Observations of the CMB provide a snapshot of the early universe, offering constraints on the composition and evolution of the cosmos, including the effects of dark energy [3,14]. These observations are particularly critical for understanding the initial conditions for structure formation and the subsequent influence of dark energy on the universe's evolution.
- *Type Ia Supernovae*: As standard candles, supernovae are crucial for measuring cosmic distances and the universe's expansion rate, directly impacting our understanding of dark energy [1,2]. The luminosity-redshift relation derived from these observations provides essential evidence for the universe's accelerated expansion.
- *Large-Scale Structure*: Surveys of galaxies and the universe's large-scale structure help in understanding the growth of cosmic structures under the influence of dark energy [12,15]. The distribution of galaxies and galaxy clusters and the characteristics of baryon acoustic oscillations are key observables that inform the dynamics of dark energy and its interaction with matter.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 January 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202401.0137.v1

2. Testing Dynamic Dark Energy Models

Integrating theoretical models with diverse observational data is crucial in the quest to understand the nature of dark energy. This section explores the methodologies for combining dynamic dark energy models with key datasets and analyzes the constraints these data place on the models [16,17].

2.1. Methodology for Data Integration

Dynamic dark energy models can be tested and constrained by integrating them with observational data [11,12]. This integration involves comparing theoretical predictions with observed data, using statistical techniques to assess model viability [18,19].

2.1.1. Supernova Data

Type Ia supernovae serve as standard candles for measuring cosmic distances. By comparing the luminosity-distance relationship predicted by dynamic dark energy models with observed supernova data, we can test these models' consistency with the observed acceleration of the universe [1,2]:

$$\mu(z) = 5\log_{10}\left[\frac{d_L(z)}{1\ \mathrm{Mpc}}\right] + 25 \quad (1)$$

where $\mu(z)$ is the distance modulus, and $d_L(z)$ is the luminosity distance as a function of redshift z, predicted by the model [20,21].

2.1.2. Cosmic Microwave Background

The CMB provides a wealth of information about the early universe [22,23]. Dynamic dark energy models can be tested by their impact on the CMB power spectrum, mainly through their influence on the acoustic peaks and the late-time Integrated Sachs-Wolfe effect [24,25].

2.1.3. Large-Scale Structure

Observations of the large-scale structure, including galaxy surveys and measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations, offer another avenue for testing dynamic dark energy models [12,15]. These observations provide insights into the growth rate of structure in the universe, which is sensitive to the nature of dark energy [26,27].

2.2. Constraints and Viability of Models

Each observational dataset provides unique constraints on dynamic dark energy models:

- *Constraints from Supernovae*: Supernova data primarily constrain the universe's expansion history, offering insights into the evolution of dark energy density over time [28,29].
- *CMB Constraints*: The CMB constrains the total density of dark energy, its equation of state, and potential interactions with other cosmic components [14,30].
- *Large-Scale Structure Constraints*: Data from large-scale structures constrain the growth of cosmic structures under the influence of dark energy, providing a window into the interplay between dark energy and gravity [31,32].

By synthesizing constraints from these diverse datasets, we can assess the viability of dynamic dark energy models [33,34]. This involves statistical analysis and model comparison to determine which models best fit the data while remaining theoretically sound.

2.3. Conclusions

The rigorous testing of dynamic dark energy models against observational data is essential for advancing our understanding of the universe's expansion [10,35]. As we collect more precise and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202401.0137.v1

diverse data, our ability to constrain these models improves, bringing us closer to unveiling the true nature of dark energy and its role in cosmic evolution [5,36].

3. Implications for the Cosmic Fate

The properties of dynamic dark energy not only influence the universe's current state but also have profound implications for its future. This section explores the different scenarios for the universe's future that emerge from various dynamic dark energy models [37,38].

3.1. Scenarios Based on Dark Energy Properties

The future behavior of the universe is intricately linked to the nature of dark energy. Based on the properties of dynamic dark energy, several scenarios are possible:

3.1.1. Continued Acceleration

If the energy density of dynamic dark energy remains dominant and constant or increases over time, the universe could continue to accelerate indefinitely [39,40]. This scenario, often called the 'Big Freeze,' leads to a cold, dilute, and dark universe in the far future [41,42].

3.1.2. Dark Energy Decay

In models where the energy density of dark energy decreases over time, the universe's expansion could slow down, halt, or potentially reverse [43,44]. This scenario could lead to a 'Big Crunch,' where the universe eventually collapses back on itself [45,46].

3.1.3. Phantom Energy and the Big Rip

A more exotic scenario arises in models with 'phantom energy,' where the equation of state parameter w is less than -1 [47,48]. In this case, the universe could end in a 'Big Rip,' where the growing dark energy density tears apart galaxies, stars, planets, and the fabric of space-time itself [37,49].

3.2. Cosmic Expansion and Potential End-States

The potential end-states of the universe are closely tied to the evolution of dark energy:

- *Future Observations*: Predictions about the long-term state of the universe can be tested by observing the evolution of cosmic structures, the rate of cosmic expansion, and the behavior of dark energy over time [12,50].
- *Theoretical Implications*: Theoretical models of dark energy, especially those that predict unusual end-states like the Big Rip, challenge our understanding of fundamental physics and require new physics beyond the standard cosmological model [6,51].

3.3. Conclusions

The exploration of dynamic dark energy models provides not only insights into the current state of the universe but also visions of its ultimate fate [5,52]. The properties of dark energy, as revealed by both observational data and theoretical models, are key to understanding the cosmos' long-term evolution and potential end-states [53,54]. As our observational capabilities and theoretical frameworks continue to advance, we will gain a deeper understanding of cosmic fate and the role of dark energy in shaping it [55,56].

4. Conclusions

This paper has focused on the critical role of observational data in constraining dynamic dark energy models and the implications of these models for the fate of the universe. Integrating theoretical

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 January 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202401.0137.v1

models with various observational data provides a unique window into understanding the nature of dark energy and its impact on cosmic evolution.

4.1. Summary of Observational Constraints

Observational data, ranging from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and Type Ia supernovae to large-scale structure surveys, plays a pivotal role in testing and refining dynamic dark energy models:

- *CMB Observations*: These have provided constraints on the equation of state of dark energy and its density, shaping our understanding of the early universe's dynamics.
- *Supernovae Data*: This has been instrumental in revealing the universe's accelerating expansion and continues to refine our understanding of dark energy's role in this acceleration.
- *Large-Scale Structure Surveys*: These surveys offer insights into the growth rate of cosmic structures under the influence of dark energy, providing a complementary perspective to CMB and supernovae data.

4.2. Prospects for Future Observations

The future of cosmological research holds great promise for further elucidating the nature of dark energy:

- *Next-Generation Telescopes and Surveys*: Upcoming missions like the James Webb Space Telescope, Euclid, and the Vera C. Rubin Observatory will provide more detailed observations of the universe, from the CMB to distant galaxies, offering finer constraints on dynamic dark energy models.
- *Advancements in Data Analysis*: Enhanced data analysis techniques, including machine learning and statistical methods, will play a crucial role in extracting meaningful insights from the wealth of incoming data.

4.3. Theoretical Developments

In parallel with observational advances, theoretical developments are essential for deepening our understanding of dark energy:

- *Refinement of Dynamic Dark Energy Models*: Continued theoretical work is needed to refine models of dynamic dark energy, particularly in light of new observational data.
- *Interdisciplinary Approaches*: Collaborations across different fields of physics may yield new insights into the fundamental nature of dark energy and its role in the broader framework of physics.

4.4. Final Thoughts

In conclusion, studying dynamic dark energy is fascinating, with the interplay of theory and observation offering a pathway to answer some of the most profound questions about the universe. As we move forward, the synergy between increasingly sophisticated observations and innovative theoretical models will continue to shape our understanding of the cosmos, its evolution, and its ultimate fate.

References

1. et al., A.G.R. Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant. *The Astronomical Journal* **1998**, *116*, 1009–1038. doi:10.1086/300499.
2. S. Perlmutter, e.a. Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae. *The Astrophysical Journal* **1999**, *517*, 565–586.

3. Collaboration, P. Planck 2018 Results. VI. Cosmological Parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2020**, *641*, A6. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.
4. Dan Scolnic, e.a. The Complete Light-curve Sample of Spectroscopically Confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and Cosmological Constraints from the Combined Pantheon Sample. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2018**, *859*, 101.
5. Joshua A. Frieman, M.S.T.; Huterer, D. Dark Energy and the Accelerating Universe. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics* **2008**, *46*, 385–432.
6. Weinberg, S. The Cosmological Constant Problem. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **1989**, *61*, 1–23.
7. R. R. Caldwell, R.D.; Steinhardt, P.J. Cosmological Imprint of an Energy Component with General Equation of State. *Physical Review Letters* **1998**, *80*, 1582–1585.
8. Wetterich, C. Cosmology and the Fate of Dilatation Symmetry. *Nuclear Physics B* **1988**, *302*, 668–696.
9. Huterer, D.; Shafer, D.L. Dark Energy Two Decades after: Observables, Probes, Consistency Tests. *Reports on Progress in Physics* **2017**, *81*, 016901.
10. Austin Joyce, L.L.; Schmidt, F. Dark Energy Versus Modified Gravity. *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **2016**, *66*, 95–122.
11. M. Betoule, e.a. Improved Cosmological Constraints from a Joint Analysis of the SDSS-II and SNLS Supernova Samples. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2014**, *568*, A22.
12. Daniel J. Eisenstein, e.a. Detection of the Baryon Acoustic Peak in the Large-Scale Correlation Function of SDSS Luminous Red Galaxies. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2005**, *633*, 560–574.
13. Adam G. Riess, e.a. Large Magellanic Cloud Cepheid Standards Provide a 1% Foundation for the Determination of the Hubble Constant and Stronger Evidence for Physics Beyond ΛCDM. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2019**, *876*, 85.
14. G. Hinshaw, e.a. Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **2013**, *208*, 19.
15. John A. Peacock, e.a. A Measurement of the Cosmological Mass Density from Clustering in the 2dF Galaxy Redshift Survey. *Nature* **2001**, *410*, 169–173.
16. Andreas Albrecht, e.a. Report of the Dark Energy Task Force. *arXiv* **2006**, [astro-ph/0609591].
17. D. N. Spergel, e.a. Three-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Implications for Cosmology. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **2007**, *170*, 377–408.
18. Trotta, R. Bayes in the Sky: Bayesian Inference and Model Selection in Cosmology. *Contemporary Physics* **2008**, *49*, 71–104.
19. Verde, L. Statistical Methods in Cosmology. *Lecture Notes in Physics* **2010**, *800*, 147–177.
20. Phillips, M.M. The Absolute Magnitudes of Type IA Supernovae. *The Astrophysical Journal* **1993**, *413*, L105–L108.
21. Julien Guy, e.a. SALT2: Using Distant Supernovae to Improve the Use of Type Ia Supernovae as Distance Indicators. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2007**, *466*, 11–21.
22. Collaboration, P. Planck 2018 Results. VI. Cosmological Parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2020**, *641*, A6.
23. D. N. Spergel, e.a. First-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Determination of Cosmological Parameters. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **2003**, *148*, 175–194.
24. Hu, W.; Sugiyama, N. Small-Scale Cosmological Perturbations: An Analytic Approach. *The Astrophysical Journal* **1997**, *471*, 542–570.
25. Seljak, U.; Zaldarriaga, M. A Line-of-Sight Integration Approach to Cosmic Microwave Background Anisotropies. *The Astrophysical Journal* **1996**, *469*, 437–444.
26. Max Tegmark, e.a. The Three-Dimensional Power Spectrum of Galaxies from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2004**, *606*, 702–740.
27. Luigi Guzzo, e.a. A Test of the Nature of Cosmic Acceleration Using Galaxy Redshift Distortions. *Nature* **2008**, *451*, 541–544.
28. Pierre Astier, e.a. The Supernova Legacy Survey: Measurement of Ω_M, Ω_Λ and w from the First Year Data Set. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2006**, *447*, 31–48.
29. N. Suzuki, e.a. The Hubble Space Telescope Cluster Supernova Survey: V. Improving the Dark Energy Constraints Above $z > 1$ and Building an Early-Type-Hosted Supernova Sample. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2012**, *746*, 85.

30. Eiichiro Komatsu, e.a. Seven-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Interpretation. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **2011**, *192*, 18.
31. Beth A. Reid, e.a. Cosmological Constraints from the Clustering of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey DR7 Luminous Red Galaxies. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **2010**, *404*, 60–85.
32. Chris Blake, e.a. The WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey: Mapping the Distance-Redshift Relation with Baryon Acoustic Oscillations. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **2011**, *418*, 1707–1724.
33. Liddle, A.R. Information Criteria for Astrophysical Model Selection. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* **2007**, *377*, L74–L78.
34. Bassett, B.A.; Hlozek, R. Baryon Acoustic Oscillations. *arXiv* **2010**, [1004.2553].
35. David H. Weinberg, e.a. Observational Probes of Cosmic Acceleration. *Physics Reports* **2013**, *530*, 87–255.
36. Luca Amendola, e.a. Cosmology and Fundamental Physics with the Euclid Satellite. *Living Reviews in Relativity* **2013**, *16*, 6.
37. Robert R. Caldwell, M.K.; Weinberg, N.N. Phantom Energy and Cosmic Doomsday. *Physical Review Letters* **2003**, *91*, 071301.
38. Steinhardt, P.J.; Turok, N. Cosmic Evolution in a Cyclic Universe. *Physical Review D* **2002**, *65*, 126003.
39. Adam G. Riess, e.a. Type Ia Supernova Discoveries at $z > 1$ from the Hubble Space Telescope: Evidence for Past Deceleration and Constraints on Dark Energy Evolution. *The Astrophysical Journal* **2004**, *607*, 665–687.
40. Linder, E.V. The Dynamics of Quintessence, the Quintessence of Dynamics. *General Relativity and Gravitation* **2008**, *40*, 329–356.
41. Loeb, A. Cosmology with Hypervelocity Stars. *Physical Review Letters* **2011**, *107*, 071103.
42. N. G. Busca, e.a. Baryon Acoustic Oscillations in the Lyα Forest of BOSS Quasars. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **2013**, *552*, A96.
43. Ivaylo Zlatev, L.W.; Steinhardt, P.J. Quintessence, Cosmic Coincidence, and the Cosmological Constant. *Physical Review Letters* **1999**, *82*, 896–899.
44. Paul J. Steinhardt, L.W.; Zlatev, I. Cosmological Tracking Solutions. *Physical Review D* **1999**, *59*, 123504.
45. Paul H. Frampton, K.J.L.; Scherrer, R.J. The Little Rip. *Physical Review D* **2011**, *84*, 063003.
46. Miao Li, e.a. Dark Energy. *Communications in Theoretical Physics* **2011**, *56*, 525–604.
47. Caldwell, R.R. A Phantom Menace? Cosmological Consequences of a Dark Energy Component with Super-Negative Equation of State. *Physics Letters B* **2002**, *545*, 23–29.
48. Nojiri, S.; Odintsov, S.D. Quantum DeSitter Cosmology and Phantom Matter. *Physics Letters B* **2003**, *562*, 147–152.
49. Nesseris, S.; Perivolaropoulos, L. The Fate of Bound Systems in Phantom and Quintessence Cosmologies. *Physical Review D* **2004**, *70*, 123529.
50. Peebles, P.J.E.; Ratra, B. The Cosmological Constant and Dark Energy. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **2003**, *75*, 559–606.
51. Ratra, B.; Peebles, P.J.E. Cosmological Consequences of a Rolling Homogeneous Scalar Field. *Physical Review D* **1988**, *37*, 3406.
52. Edmund J. Copeland, M.S.; Tsujikawa, S. Dynamics of Dark Energy. *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **2006**, *15*, 1753–1936.
53. Amendola, L.; Tsujikawa, S. Dark Energy: Theory and Observations. *Cambridge University Press* **2010**.
54. Kazuharu Bamba, e.a. Dark Energy Cosmology: The Equivalent Description via Different Theoretical Models and Cosmography Tests. *Astrophysics and Space Science* **2012**, *342*, 155–228.
55. Kamionkowski, M. How to Deconstruct Dark Matter. *Science* **2007**, *316*, 980–982.
56. Wang, Y. Dark Energy. *Wiley-VCH* **2007**.