

# Galileons on Trial

Stephen Appleby<sup>1</sup> & Eric V. Linder<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for the Early Universe WCU, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea*

<sup>2</sup>*Berkeley Center for Cosmological Physics & Berkeley Lab,  
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

(Dated: March 4, 2019)

Galileon gravity offers a robust theoretical alternative to general relativity with a cosmological constant for explaining cosmic acceleration, protected by a shift symmetry and having second order field equations. The predictions for the combination of cosmic expansion and growth history are distinct from  $\Lambda$ CDM, and we demonstrate that approaching  $\Lambda$ CDM in one causes deviations in the other. This tension allows us to severely disfavor the entire class of minimally coupled standard Galileon gravity through current observational constraints.

## I. INTRODUCTION

General relativity is an excellent description of gravitation on all scales at which it has been tested, from the solar system to compact objects to cosmology. However within cosmology, general relativity requires a cosmological constant or some form of strongly negative pressure to explain observations of late time cosmic acceleration [1–5]. No compelling explanation exists for the magnitude of the cosmological constant (or scalar field potential), and in general such a contribution to the gravitational action should receive corrections from high energy physics.

These fine tuning and naturalness issues motivate exploration of further physics that can explain the observed acceleration and cosmic gravity, while being protected against high energy physics disruptions. One of the most successful such theories is Galileon gravity [6–8]. In the standard, cosmological constant free case this involves four terms in a Lagrangian that leads to well behaved, second order equations of motion. The Galileon field acts like a shift symmetric scalar field but arises as a geometric object in higher dimensions, offering protection against radiative corrections.

In [9] we investigated in detail the cosmic expansion history and growth history (especially the time varying effective Newton’s constant  $G_{\text{eff}}$ ) behaviors of the standard Galileon model (and others), finding interesting properties including evolution from a high redshift matter dominated attractor to current acceleration and a future de Sitter attractor (the existence of an asymptotic de Sitter state was first found in [10]). Numerous other studies [11–17] have examined various properties of Galileon gravity. Here we confront both the Galileon expansion and growth behavior with current observational constraints.

Section II summarizes the general dependencies of the effective dark energy equation of state and gravitational strength on the Galileon parameters. In Sec. III we exhibit the tension between expansion and growth and present the results of a Markov Chain Monte Carlo scan through the Galileon parameter space comparing to the latest cosmological data sets. We discuss the conclusions in Sec. IV.

## II. COSMOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF GALILEONS

The Galileon action comprises the sum of four terms involving nonlinear products of first and second derivatives of the scalar field  $\pi$  and the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ , with a coefficient  $c_n$  for the term where  $\pi$  appears  $n$  times, with  $n = 2-5$  (we neglect the  $n = 1$  tadpole to avoid an explicit cosmological constant). The exact form is determined by the requirement that it lead to second order field equations, and is given explicitly in [7] or see Eqs. 2–4 of [9]. Generalization of the coefficients to be functions of the field and its canonical kinetic term is possible [25, 26], but we consider the standard Galileon case where the coefficients are constants.

The set of parameters determining the cosmological expansion and growth histories, and hence the observables, includes the four coefficients  $c_n$  and the initial conditions  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  and  $x_i = d(\pi/M_{pl})/d\ln a$ , where  $M_{pl}$  is the Planck mass and  $a = 1/(1+z)$  is the expansion factor, with  $z$  the redshift. However, for initial conditions at high redshift where the Hubble parameter  $H_i$  is determined by the background (non-Galileon) energy density, the quantity  $x_i$  is determined through  $\rho_{\pi,i}(c_n, H_i, x_i)$ . Furthermore, since the evolution  $x(a)$  is fixed by the equations of motion, similarly today a relation exists of  $\rho_{\pi,0}(c_n, H_0, x_0)$ . This allows us to replace one of the  $c_n$  by the present dark energy density  $\Omega_{de,0}$  as a parameter (or equivalently, the present matter density  $\Omega_{m,0}$ ). Together with the reduced Hubble constant today,  $h = H_0/(100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1})$ , the parameter space can be thought of as  $\{c_3, c_4, c_5, \rho_{\pi,i}, \Omega_{m,0}, h\}$ . Throughout this work we adopt a theory or inflationary prior of a spatially flat universe.

First, let us explore the broad effects of the Galileon parameters. At high redshift, the effective dark energy equation of state  $w(z)$  follows tracker trajectories given by the background equation of state, i.e. radiation or matter domination, and so is independent of the parameters. The strength of the gravitational coupling  $G_{\text{eff}}$ , however, deviates from Newton’s constant  $G_N$  by an amount proportional to the dark energy density at the time,  $\Omega_{de}$ . Thus a key early parameter is the initial dark

energy density  $\rho_{\pi,i}$ .

Increasing  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  increases the gravitational strength early. Since at high redshift the  $c_5$  term typically dominates over the others, by factors of  $H^2 x \gg 1$ , then increasing  $c_5$  has a similar effect. For larger initial densities (and larger  $c_5$ ), it takes longer for the other  $c_n$  terms to become comparable. Since the moderate redshift ( $z \approx 10$ ) peak in the gravitational strength  $G_{\text{eff}}$  occurs due to interplay and partial cancellation between the terms, then higher values of  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  shift the peak to later times. Once the cancellation passes, the peak in the gravitational strength often gives way to a period around  $z \approx 3$  where  $G_{\text{eff}} \approx G_N$  is restored. Finally, the growth of the dark energy density fraction  $\Omega_{de}$  moves  $G_{\text{eff}}$  instead toward its late time de Sitter attractor behavior, which is independent of  $\rho_{\pi,i}$ . In summary, increasing  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  tends to amplify the deviation from Einstein gravity, particularly at  $z \approx 3 - 10$ .

A substantial increase in the gravitational strength would enhance the growth of structure, even at later times, enough to make it discrepant with observations. So we expect that growth constraints would favor low values of  $\rho_{\pi,i}$ , keeping  $G_{\text{eff}} \approx G_N$  for the matter dominated era.

The opposite is true, however, for the expansion constraints. If we start with a low  $\rho_{\pi,i}$ , then due to the approximate tracking behaviour of  $\rho_\pi$  during matter domination and the fact that we need to arrive today at  $\Omega_{de,0} \approx 0.7$ , the model requires a more extreme behavior in  $w(z)$  near the present. Low  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  leads to strong spikes in  $w(z)$ , with highly negative values at  $0 \lesssim z \lesssim 2$ . This tends to shift the distance-redshift relation from the observed, near- $\Lambda$ CDM behavior, both at low redshift and for the integrated distance to the CMB last scattering surface. Increasing  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  ameliorates this problem, allowing a smoother transition between the matter dominated attractor and de Sitter attractor for  $w(z)$ ; then through covariance with background cosmology parameters this can reasonably satisfy observations.

Figure 1 illustrates these behaviors of a strong tendency toward tension between the growth history and expansion history behaviors in Galileon cosmology. In the next section we quantify this and compare to current observations, obtaining tight constraints on the Galileon model.

### III. COSMOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS

While we have phrased the above arguments in terms of  $\rho_{\pi,i}$ , the variations of the  $c_n$  parameters have related effects. Because the degree of deviation in gravitational strength and  $w$  involve interplay and cancellation between terms, it is somewhat more complicated. Therefore to take into account properly the covariances between parameters we must scan over the full parameter space.

The first issue to keep in mind is that by using only distance data constraints, for example those arising from




FIG. 1. Gravitational coupling deviation  $G_{\text{eff}}/G_N$  and effective equation of state  $w$  are shown for examples with high redshift initial conditions  $\rho_{\pi,i} = 10^{-6} \rho_{m,i}$  (dashed) and  $\rho_{\pi,i} = 3 \times 10^{-5} \rho_{m,i}$  (solid). Note that adjusting  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  to lessen deviations in gravity increases the deviations in equation of state, and vice versa.

the cosmic microwave background (CMB), baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) and supernovae, we can find an acceptable fit, with a maximum likelihood comparable to  $\Lambda$ CDM (cf. [11]). Similarly, by using only growth data one can also find a viable parameter region (cf. the low initial density curve in Fig. 1). However, these two regions may be disjoint and the tension within the combined data constraints forces even the best fit to have a poor joint likelihood.

The second issue is that certain parts of parameter space are restricted theoretically due to ghosts or instabilities, as discussed in [9]. Indeed the best fit regions seem to tend to lie close to these because the best fits take advantage of the near cancellations between terms that can also lead to pathologies. We only apply the theoretical criteria to the past behavior of the field, that is for  $z > 0$ , since we have no reason to rule out models based on their future (observationally untested) behavior. Imposing the restrictions at all times, including the future de Sitter state, would further constrain the allowed

region, increasing the tension further.

To quantify fully the tension between expansion and growth in Galileon cosmology and account for the parameter interactions we carry out Markov Chain Monte Carlo analysis of the full likelihood surface using CosmoMC [18] as a generic sampler. The likelihood is given by the sum

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{CMB}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{SN}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{BAO}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{growth}} . \quad (1)$$

We use the latest observational data to constrain the model. CMB data from WMAP7 is applied in the form of the covariance matrix for the shift parameter, acoustic peak multipole, and redshift of decoupling [3]. Since the Galileon model acts like the standard cosmology in the early universe these quantities basically measure the distance to last scattering and the matter density. Distances from Type Ia supernovae in the Union2.1 data compilation [19] constrain the expansion history at  $z \approx 0 - 1.4$ . Distances from the baryon acoustic oscillation feature in the galaxy distribution, measured to 6 redshifts at  $z = 0.1 - 0.7$  [20], probe a somewhat different cosmological parameter combination. For growth constraints we use measurements of the growth rate from the WiggleZ survey at four redshifts  $z = 0.2 - 0.8$  [21] and from the BOSS survey at  $z = 0.57$  [22], plus the  $E_G$  growth probe [23, 24]. Note that the main conditions needed to apply these growth data analyses to constrain a modified gravity model – that the standard  $z \gtrsim 1000$  matter transfer function and initial conditions are preserved, and that growth is scale independent over the relevant length scales – are satisfied by the Galileon case.

Our MCMC results indicate the Galileon model is severely disfavored. The best fit yields a minimum  $\Delta\chi^2 = 31$  with respect to the best fit  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  model, despite the Galileon case having 4 extra fit parameters. We conclude that the entire parameter space of the standard Galileon theory is strongly disfavored. The CMB distance to last scattering deviates by  $\sim 3\sigma$  from the best fit  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  case, and the individual lower redshift distances and growth predictions are similarly in moderate disagreement with  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ . The highest impact individual constraint arises from the BOSS measurements at  $z = 0.57$ . This leverage bodes well for the impact of future redshift surveys on testing gravity on cosmic scales. The combination of all the data leads in aggregate to a poor fit.

Figure 2 shows the  $\chi^2$  surface relative to the best fit  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  result in the plane of the CMB shift parameter  $R$  and growth rate  $f\sigma_8(z = 0.57)$ . These quantities serve as examples of cosmic expansion and growth, respectively. The  $\Delta\chi^2$  is large ( $\chi_{\text{gali}}^2 = 587.2$  to  $\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2 = 556.5$  for the best fits) and the Galileon values are shifted considerably in attempting to fit the expansion and growth simultaneously.

The key tension between expansion and growth will be more fully realized with more accurate data. If we merely change the SN data implementation to employ the Union2.1 statistics only error matrix, rather than the




FIG. 2.  $\Delta\chi^2$  relative to the best fit  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  model (purple square) is shown for the Galileon model as a function of the CMB shift parameter  $R$  (an example of expansion) and growth rate  $f\sigma_8(z = 0.57)$  (an example of growth, measured by BOSS [22]). Blue stars are points derived from the MCMC chains, outlining the rough paraboloid of the  $\chi^2$  surface, with the yellow triangle the best fit. No values of the Galileon parameters provide a fit with  $\Delta\chi^2 < 30.7$  (horizontal grid).

full systematics matrix, the improved distance measurements exhibit the tension much more clearly, leading to a minimum  $\Delta\chi^2 = 53$ . This demonstrates how upcoming supernova surveys will also deliver substantial cosmological leverage.

The maximum likelihood values are highly stable with respect to variations in the prior ranges. The parameters  $\Omega_{m,0}$ ,  $h$ , and  $\rho_{\pi,i}$  are well constrained (with best fits for the Galileon cosmology at 0.302, 0.714, and  $\ln(\rho_{\pi,i}/\rho_{m,i}) = -11.09$ , respectively), but the coefficients  $c_3$ ,  $c_4$ ,  $c_5$  have strong covariance. The best fit to observational data minimizes the deviations in growth and expansion relative to  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ , requiring a delicate balance among those Galileon coefficients. While the nominal best fits are respectively  $-2.10$ ,  $-1.71$ ,  $-1.77$ , there is a long, narrow region of degeneracy with nearly the same likelihood. This is moot, however, since the maximum likelihood is so poor. Figure 3 exhibits the degeneracy surface of the parameters  $c_3$ – $c_4$ – $c_5$ .

No point in the Galileon parameter space gives a reasonable fit to current data. Moreover, the best fit, poor though it is, is achieved by balancing on the edge of a precipice: the gravitational strength diverges in the very near future. To suppress deviations in growth and expansion simultaneously the Galileon terms are forced into a highly delicate, and temporary, cancellation. Figure 4 exhibits the gravitation strength and effective dark energy equation of state as a function of redshift for the best fit Galileon model. (Note the divergence of  $G_{\text{eff}}$  may be ameliorated by effects beyond sub-horizon, linear perturbation theory.) Since we only applied our instability criterion to the past, where there is data, we do not rule out this model on theoretical grounds despite its Laplace




FIG. 3. The narrow locus of points shows the 3D degeneracy in  $c_3$ - $c_4$ - $c_5$  having nearly the same  $\chi^2$  (here within 0.5 of the minimum), with the best fit point marked with a light yellow diamond.

instability (negative sound speed squared,  $c_s^2 < 0$ , for the dark energy perturbations) in the future.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

General relativity has passed all tests to date but lacks a clear explanation of the magnitude of the cosmological constant, or origin of dark energy, needed to account for cosmic acceleration. Galileon scalar fields, which have strong ties to higher dimensional gravity theories, can give rise to late time cosmic acceleration and possess well behaved, second order field equations with symmetries protecting against high energy physics modifications.

We have identified a tension, however, between Galileon predictions for the cosmic expansion history and growth history that severely disfavors Galileon cosmology. Confronting the entire class of standard, uncoupled Galileon theory with current observations demonstrates that the predictions are a worse fit than general relativity with a cosmological constant by  $\Delta\chi^2 > 30$ . If one wanted to abandon the theory prior of spatial flatness, [11] found that adding a free parameter for curvature improved the best fit  $\chi^2$  by little more than one, and so would not have a significant effect on our conclusions.

It is striking that already with current data we can rule out an entire, theoretically viable class of extended grav-

ity, one with several attractive features. We also established that forthcoming data will be able to strengthen these limits to  $\Delta\chi^2 > 50$ . More generally, the next generation of cosmological measurements will shed strong light on the distinction between modified gravity vs general relativity plus a physical dark energy.




FIG. 4. Gravitational strength  $G_{\text{eff}}(z)$  and effective dark energy equation of state  $w(z)$  are plotted for the Galileon model that best fits the current data. Different  $G_{\text{eff}}$  superscripts correspond to the different modified Poisson equations in [9].

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by World Class University grant R32-2009-000-10130-0 through the National Research Foundation, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology of Korea and the Director, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

[1] S. Perlmutter et al, ApJ 517, 565 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133]  
 [2] A.G. Riess et al, Astron. J. 116, 1009 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201]

[3] E. Komatsu et al, ApJ Suppl. 192, 18 (2011) [arXiv:1001.4538]  
 [4] J.A. Frieman, M.S. Turner, D. Huterer, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 46, 385 (2008) [arXiv:0803.0982]

- [5] R.R. Caldwell & M. Kamionkowski, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **59**, 397 (2009) [[arXiv:0903.0866](#)]
- [6] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, E. Trincherini, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 064036 (2009) [[arXiv:0811.2197](#)]
- [7] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese, A. Vikman, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 084003 (2009) [[arXiv:0901.1314](#)]
- [8] C. Deffayet, S. Deser, G. Esposito-Farese, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 064015 (2009) [[arXiv:0906.1967](#)]
- [9] S.A. Appleby & E.V. Linder, *JCAP* **1203**, 043 (2012) [[arXiv:1112.1981](#)]
- [10] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 111301 [[arXiv:1007.2700](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [11] S. Nesseris, A. De Felice, S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 124054 (2010) [[arXiv:1010.0407](#)]
- [12] A. Ali, R. Gannouji and M. Sami, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 103015 [[arXiv:1008.1588](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *JCAP* **1203** (2012) 025 [[arXiv:1112.1774](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] E. Babichev, C. Deffayet and G. Esposito-Farese, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 251102 [[arXiv:1107.1569](#) [gr-qc]].
- [15] A. De Felice, R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 043515 [[arXiv:1011.6132](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] D. F. Mota, M. Sandstad and T. Zlosnik, *JHEP* **1012** (2010) 051 [[arXiv:1009.6151](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] P. Brax, C. Burrage and A. C. Davis, *JCAP* **1109** (2011) 020 [[arXiv:1106.1573](#) [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. Lewis & S. Bridle, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 103511 (2002) [[arXiv:astro-ph/0205436](#)]  
<http://cosmologist.info/cosmomc>
- [19] N. Suzuki et al, *ApJ* **746**, 85 (2012) [[arXiv:1105.3470](#)]
- [20] C. Blake et al, *MNRAS* **418**, 1707 (2011) [[arXiv:1108.2635](#)]
- [21] C. Blake et al, *MNRAS* **415**, 2876 (2011) [[arXiv:1104.2948](#)]
- [22] B.A. Reid et al, [arXiv:1203.6641](#)
- [23] P. Zhang, M. Liguori, R. Bean, S. Dodelson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 141302 (2007) [[arXiv:0704.1932](#)]
- [24] R. Reyes, R. Mandelbaum, U. Seljak, T. Baldauf, J.E. Gunn, L. Lombriser, R.E. Smith, *Nature* **464**, 256 (2010) [[arXiv:1003.2185](#)]
- [25] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki, A. Vikman, *JCAP* **1010**, 026 (2010) [[arXiv:1008.0048](#)]
- [26] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D.A. Steer, G. Zahariade, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 064039 (2011) [[arXiv:1103.3260](#)]