

Cosmology after Phantom Crossing by Horndeski Gravity

Eric V. Linder

*Berkeley Center for Cosmological Physics & Berkeley Lab,
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

(Dated: December 4, 2025)

One possible way to explain the observed effective dark energy equation of state crossing $w = -1$ (the phantom divide) is through modified gravity. A key point is to not view the expansion history in isolation but to take into account the other gravitational impacts on growth of large scale structure, lensing, etc. Within shift symmetric Horndeski gravity this implies three main paths for the late time cosmic expansion. All require unusual kinetic structure and we analyze their various implications for how w should behave after phantom crossing.

I. INTRODUCTION

Current cosmic data points toward a “beautifully bizarre” revolutionary picture of dark energy that is not only dynamic but evolves across the phantom divide, from effective equation of state ratio $w < -1$ at high redshift to $w > -1$ at late times [1–3]. Conventional (noninteracting, canonical, general relativistic) dark energy cannot achieve this [4–7].

Both interacting and modified gravity models designed to enable this behavior of the cosmic expansion tend to run afoul of cosmic growth (see [8] and references therein). That is, if they couple in some way to matter (either through direct interactions, e.g. [9, 10], or “phake phantoms” [7, 11, 12]) they will significantly alter the growth of large scale structure [8]. On the other hand if they couple nonminimally to gravity, modifying general relativity (e.g. [8, 13]), they again impact cosmic growth, and possibly also light propagation (lensing).

Here we consider modified gravity but seek to temper the impact on growth and lensing, as well as focusing on how the dark energy behaves at late times. That is, does the rapid rise of w after crossing -1 continue, level off, or return to $w = -1$?

In Section II we highlight the key aspect of considering cosmic expansion and gravitational effects, e.g. on growth of large scale structure and on lensing, simultaneously. Section III looks at the implications if gravitational braiding effects are large, and how dark energy then must cede its dominance. For the observed condition of dark energy dominance, Section IV explores the future behavior of the dark energy equation of state under “natural” conditions, while following sections consider deviations from naturalness (Section V: kinetic structure; Section VI: field evolution; Section VII: field coasting; Section VIII: vanishing kinetic term). We conclude in Section IX.

II. CONNECTING COSMIC EXPANSION AND GROWTH

Horndeski gravity provides an excellent framework for exploring modified gravity, being highly general and well

behaved. Observations have constrained some of the generality, in particular removing the G_5 term in the action and restricting the G_4 term to being a function of the scalar field ϕ but not its derivative $X \equiv \dot{\phi}^2/2$ (in the most straightforward interpretation of gravitational waves propagating at the speed of light). Thus one has a Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = G_4(\phi) R + K(\phi, X) - G_3(\phi, X) \square \phi, \quad (1)$$

where K is the kinetic term.

Theory motivates restriction to shift symmetry in order to rein in quantum corrections. If one adopts this then one is left with

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}R + K(X) - G_3(X) \square \phi, \quad (2)$$

normalizing the Planck mass to $M_{\text{Pl}}^2 = 1$. Note that since $G_4(\phi)$ is what led to issues with cosmic growth as seen in [8, 13], the shift symmetry has an added benefit of easing the fit to observations.

From this action the equations of motion yield the modified Friedmann equations

$$3H^2 = \rho_m + \rho_{\text{de,eff}}, \quad (3)$$

$$-2\dot{H} = \rho_m + P_m + \rho_{\text{de,eff}} + P_{\text{de,eff}}, \quad (4)$$

$$0 = \ddot{\phi} \left[K_X + 2XK_{XX} + 6H\dot{\phi}g_X \right] + 3H\dot{\phi}K_X + 6g \left(\dot{H} + 3H^2 \right). \quad (5)$$

Hereafter we will simply write dark energy rather than effective dark energy and suppress the eff subscript. We take the matter component to be pressureless, $P_m = 0$, and it follows the usual continuity equation, avoiding a “phake phantom” as well as various impacts on large scale structure growth.

The third equation in the set is the scalar field equation of motion. Here $g \equiv XK_{3X}$ and a subscript X denotes a derivative with respect to X . We can readily see that the equation reduces to the usual Klein-Gordon equation in general relativity, i.e. $K = X$, $g = 0$.

The explicit forms of the dark energy density and pressure are

$$\rho_{\text{de}} = -K + 2XK_X + 6H\dot{\phi}g, \quad (6)$$

$$P_{\text{de}} = K - 2g\ddot{\phi}. \quad (7)$$

The dark energy equation of state is $w \equiv P_{\text{de}}/\rho_{\text{de}}$. We can see that there is considerable freedom in allowing w to cross -1 due to the free functions $K(X)$, $G_3(X)$ or $g(X)$, and the scalar field evolution $\phi(t)$.

For the modified gravity strengths, i.e. the effective couplings in the equivalent of the Poisson equations for matter perturbations and for light propagation, we have

$$G_{\text{eff}} = G_{\text{matter}} = G_{\text{light}} . \quad (8)$$

That is, such a shift symmetric theory has no gravitational slip, so the two metric potentials Φ and Ψ are equal and $G_{\text{matter}} = G_{\text{light}}$, as in general relativity (GR). However, note this does not mean they are equal to the GR gravitational strength, Newton's constant (here normalized to one). It is convenient to write G_{eff} in terms of the dimensionless braiding function [14]

$$\alpha_B = \frac{2\dot{\phi}g}{H} , \quad (9)$$

leading to

$$G_{\text{eff}} = 1 + \frac{\alpha_B^2}{\alpha_B(2 - \alpha_B) + 2\alpha'_B} , \quad (10)$$

where a prime denotes $d/d \ln a$.

Now let us rewrite the the dark energy density and pressure to identify key ratios, and highlight the close interconnection between the modified gravity effects and the cosmic expansion. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{de}} &= -K \left[1 - \frac{2XK_X}{K} - \alpha_B \frac{3H^2}{K} \right] \\ &= -K \left[1 - \frac{2XK_X}{K} - \alpha_B \frac{3H^2}{\rho_{\text{de}}} \frac{\rho_{\text{de}}}{K} \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{de}} &= K \left[1 - \frac{2g\ddot{\phi}}{K} \right] \\ &= K \left[1 - \alpha_B \frac{\ddot{\phi}}{3H\dot{\phi}} \frac{3H^2}{\rho_{\text{de}}} \frac{\rho_{\text{de}}}{K} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We can see that the key ratios are $\rho_{\text{de}}/(3H^2) = \Omega_{\text{de}}$, ρ_{de}/K , XK_X/K , and $\ddot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi})$. Different cases will arise depending on whether they are much smaller, larger, or comparable to unity. (Note that in Section VIII we show that taking $K = 0$ will not lead to a viable theory.) Connecting the dark energy equation of state, in terms of the ratio of its pressure to energy density, to the modified gravity braiding α_B is important for a synoptic picture of viable cosmology. To preserve $G_{\text{eff}} \approx 1$, i.e. no large deviations in gravity from GR – as seen by cosmic growth and lensing data – we require $\alpha_B \ll 1$. (Also see [15].)

III. DARK ENERGY NON-DOMINATION

Let's begin by looking at the α_B term in ρ_{de} , Eq. (11). Suppose that it dominates the other terms. This gives

$\rho_{\text{de}} = \alpha_B (3H^2)$, i.e. $\Omega_{\text{de}} = \alpha_B$. Since $\alpha_B \ll 1$ it is impossible for dark energy to dominate. Thus over the main redshift range constrained by data, $z \approx [0, 1]$, the α_B term cannot dominate in ρ_{de} .

However we are also interested in the late time expansion, to explore how dark energy behaves in the future, well after its phantom crossing. If w evolves so far as to cross 0 in the future, then the dark energy density will eventually decline relative to the matter density. If the α_B term in P_{de} also is the dominant term then

$$w \rightarrow \frac{-\ddot{\phi}}{3H\dot{\phi}} . \quad (13)$$

The field would need to decelerate, i.e. $\ddot{\phi}$ and $\dot{\phi}$ having opposite signs, to give $w > 0$.

While if P_{de} is dominated by the first term, K , then

$$w \rightarrow \frac{K/\rho_{\text{de}}}{\alpha_B/\Omega_{\text{de}}} \rightarrow \frac{K}{\rho_{\text{de}}} . \quad (14)$$

Recall from the first paragraph of this section that when ρ_{de} is dominated by the α_B term then $\alpha_B/\Omega_{\text{de}} = 1$. Since ρ_{de} is not dominated by its K term then the equation of state must be close to zero in this case¹.

IV. DARK ENERGY DOMINATION NATURALLY

Now we turn to the case of dark energy domination, $\rho_{\text{de}}/(3H^2) \approx 1$. We start with the “natural” case where the other key ratios are also of order one. In this case the α_B terms in both ρ_{de} and P_{de} are not significant, and

$$w \approx \frac{-1}{1 - 2XK_X/K} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_B) . \quad (15)$$

Defining $n \equiv XK_X/K$, for dark energy to dominate we require $w < 0$ and hence $n < 1/2$. (Thus the canonical $K = X$, i.e. $n = 1$, is not allowed.)

We then see that $\rho_{\text{de}} \approx K(2n - 1)$ requires $K < 0$ for positive dark energy density (and negative dark energy pressure). This class can also cross $w = -1$ when n changes sign, e.g. moving from $w < -1$ to $w > -1$ as it goes from $n > 0$ to $n < 0$. (Although dark energy doesn't fully dominate when data suggest the crossing occurs, $z \approx 0.5$, one still has $\rho_{\text{de}}/(3H^2) \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ then.)

One might be concerned that without α_B , and hence g , appearing, this seems to be simply a k-essence model. Recall that pure k-essence alone cannot cross the phantom divide and will have a ghost when the kinetic

¹ There is one exception. Since ρ_{de} actually involves $-K + 2XK_X$ then it is possible for the α_B term to be greater than this quantity, but not greater than K alone. This requires $K \sim X^{1/2}$. It is thus possible that K/ρ_{de} , and hence w , could be of order one, or even greater than one.

term is negative. This does not automatically hold here. The g term also enters in the no ghost condition, $\alpha_K + (3/2)\alpha_B^2 \geq 0$, in both α_B and the kineticity α_K [14]. Moreover, g and α_B also enter in G_{eff} , so even in the limit where the density and pressure are dominated by the kinetic term the theory and its observational implications lie outside k-essence.

V. DEVIATING THE KINETIC STRUCTURE

Moving away from the natural case where all ratios are of order one, suppose XK_X/K is not of order one. If it is very small, this is of no concern since then simply $\rho_{\text{de}} \approx -K$ and $w \approx -1$. However large XK_X/K requires special attention. This is because while it enters in ρ_{de} , only K enters in P_{de} . If ρ_{de}/K becomes large enough, then the α_B term in the pressure could dominate over the first term.

Consider a Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI) kinetic term (see e.g. [16, 17]). Then

$$K(X) = -\sqrt{1-X} \quad (16)$$

$$n \equiv \frac{XK_X}{K} = \frac{-1}{2(1-X)}, \quad (17)$$

and $n \rightarrow \infty$ as $X \rightarrow 1^-$. As seen by Eq. (15) this would drive $w \rightarrow 0^-$, or at least to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_B)$. Thus an interesting scenario for the future of dark energy is that it could end up scaling as matter.

VI. DEVIATING THE FIELD EVOLUTION

Changing $\ddot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi})$ from order one also has interesting consequences. Consider $\ddot{\phi} \gg 3H\dot{\phi}$. If the cosmic expansion rate H is the only timescale then this cannot be achieved, so such a condition requires introduction of a new time scale.

Recall that in the standard Klein-Gordon equation one has the acceleration term $\ddot{\phi}$, the friction term $3H\dot{\phi}$, and the driving term from the steepness of the potential, $-dV/d\phi$. As clearly illustrated in [18] for the quintessence case, none of these terms dominate over the others (unlike in slow roll inflation). Here we have no potential, but the driving term arises from $-6g(\dot{H} + 3H^2)$.

One needs an extra ingredient entering the driving term, an additional, shorter, time scale than the expansion time scale H^{-1} . One example is a mass scale M , e.g.

$$g(X) = \gamma(X) + M. \quad (18)$$

However this appears problematic as a large $\ddot{\phi}$, increasing at faster than the Hubble rate, will eventually lead to a similarly large $\dot{\phi}$ and hence a large $\alpha_B \sim \phi g/H$. That will cause large deviations from GR, with G_{eff} possibly diverging and instability from likely negative sound

speed of scalar perturbations, $c_s^2 < 0$ (see [15]). So this case appears problematic.

VII. DEVIATING BY SLOW ROLL

We can take the opposite limit of field evolution: $\ddot{\phi} = 0$, known as slow roll in inflation. Recall that we absolutely cannot do this for generic quintessence when the dark energy does not fully dominate [18], i.e. as in our present or past universe where there is matter. Taking $\ddot{\phi} = 0$ would imply $\dot{\phi} \sim t$, i.e. the only clock is the field, hence the field must dominate the cosmic expansion.

Suppose the $\ddot{\phi} = 0$ condition holds, at some time at least. The field equation (5) then has the interesting property that it determines the action function g in terms of K (though only in this limit),

$$g = \frac{-\dot{\phi}K_X}{3H(1-w_{\text{dom}})}, \quad (19)$$

where we have used $\dot{H} = (-3/2)(1+w_{\text{dom}})H^2$, and w_{dom} indicates the equation of state of the dominant energy density component².

Keeping $\alpha_B \ll 1$ will imply $w \rightarrow -1$ when dark energy dominates, as

$$\alpha_B \equiv \frac{2\dot{\phi}g}{H} = \frac{-4XK_X}{3H^2(1-w)} \approx \frac{4n}{(1-2n)(1-w)}. \quad (20)$$

Thus $\alpha_B \ll 1$ requires $|n| \ll 1$, and hence by Eq. (15) that $w \rightarrow -1$. This implies that after dark energy crosses the phantom divide to $w > -1$, in this specific $\ddot{\phi} = 0$ future it must turn around and go back to a de Sitter limit.

VIII. NO KINETIC TERM

We know that the g (i.e. G_3) term must exist, otherwise we are left with k-essence, which cannot cross the phantom divide by itself. Let us consider whether we can do without the K term, having only the G_3 term in the action.

When $K = 0$, the field equation gains an interesting structure,

$$0 = \ddot{\phi} 6H\dot{\phi}g_X + 6g(\dot{H} + 3H^2) \quad (21)$$

$$= 6a^{-3}[(a^3H)\dot{g} + g(a^3H)'] , \quad (22)$$

since $\dot{g} = g_X\dot{X} = g_X\dot{\phi}\ddot{\phi}$. The solution is

$$g \sim (a^3H)^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

² This solution is quite similar to the Branch A solution of [19] that can well temper, i.e. cancel, a high energy cosmological constant, when we have a de Sitter state, with $w_{\text{dom}} = -1$, $H \rightarrow h = \text{const.}$ However canceling Λ only at late times is not so useful.

Once one specifies a $g(X)$ then one can derive $X(a)$.

However, we see that $\rho_{\text{de}} = 6H\dot{\phi}g = \alpha_B 3H^2$, and so that dark energy cannot dominate without giving a large gravitational deviation. The equation of state is $w = -\dot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi})$, and must be positive. Thus the combination of expansion information (phantom crossing) and gravity information (no large deviation from GR) requires that both K and G_3 terms must enter the action.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

The beautifully bizarre behavior of dark energy in rapidly rising in energy density, crossing the phantom divide, and evolving to a less negative equation of state than $w = -1$ may require a beautifully bizarre theory. A major class of physics that can enable this behavior is modified gravity.

By combining observational and theoretical motivations, leading to consideration of shift symmetric, cubic Horndeski gravity, and using the key strategy of simultaneously incorporating both cosmic expansion and cosmic structure data indications – phantom crossing, dark energy domination, and small deviations from GR – we have analyzed the restrictions and outcomes of this class of modified gravity.

We have demonstrated solutions where dark energy continues to evolve away from $w = -1$, and indeed can have $w > 0$ so the dark energy fades away faster than matter, where it turns around and restores to $w = -1$ at late times, or where dark energy will end up at some value $-1 < w < 0$ (for example, the “natural” case with $K \sim X^{-1}$, i.e. $n = -1$, goes to $w = -1/3$), or scaling as matter, $w \approx 0$. The natural case can also provide the phantom crossing when n evolves from negative to

positive. Table I summarizes many of the results.

Note that the existence of phantom crossing and the nonexistence of large deviations from GR work together to ensure that both K and G_3 terms must appear in the action. Such shift symmetric, cubic Horndeski theories are in the class of No Run Gravity [15], and have some interesting properties. To avoid Laplace instability in the scalar perturbations, the sound speed squared must be nonnegative, $c_s^2 \geq 0$, and this implies $\alpha_B \geq 0$ (see the Appendix in [20]). We see that in many cases here $\alpha_B > 0$ is also required for positive energy density.

Note that $\alpha_B \geq 0$ has the implication that $G_{\text{eff}} \geq 1$, as seen from Eq. (10) and [15]; indeed, using the stability condition that [15] derived,

$$0 \leq G_{\text{eff}}(a) - 1 \leq \frac{\alpha_B(a)}{3\Omega_m(a)}. \quad (24)$$

Thus, in the range best covered by observations, and in particular around the phantom crossing time, $G_{\text{eff}} - 1 \ll 1$ so $\alpha_B \ll 1$ is required.

It is interesting that this class of theories strengthens gravity, giving a clear prediction for large scale structure surveys. Together with its requirement of no gravitational slip, i.e. the behaviors of clustering and of lensing are closely tied together, $G_{\text{matter}} = G_{\text{light}}$, this offers clear tests for shift symmetric, cubic Horndeski gravity as the physics behind the phantom crossing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Bob Scherrer for coining the term “phake phantoms”.

-
- [1] DESI Collaboration, DESI DR2 Results II: Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Cosmological Constraints, Phys. Rev. D 112, 083515 (2025) [arXiv:2503.14738]
 - [2] DESI Collaboration, DESI DR2 Results I: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations from the Lyman Alpha Forest, Phys. Rev. D 112, 083514 (2025) [arXiv:2503.14739]
 - [3] K. Lodha et al., Extended Dark Energy analysis using DESI DR2 BAO measurements, Phys. Rev. D 112, 083511 (2025) [arXiv:2503.14743]
 - [4] A. Vikman, Can dark energy evolve to the Phantom?, Phys. Rev. D 72, 043527 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0407107]
 - [5] R.R. Caldwell, M. Doran, Dark-Energy Evolution Across the Cosmological-Constant Boundary, Phys. Rev. D 72, 043527 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0501104]
 - [6] A.A. Sen, Reconstructing K-essence, JCAP 0603, 010 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0512406]
 - [7] R.R. Caldwell, E.V. Linder, Null Impact of the Null Energy Condition in Current Cosmology, arXiv:2511.07526
 - [8] E.V. Linder, Uplifting, Depressing, and Tilting Dark Energy, arXiv:2506.02122
 - [9] J. Khoury, M-X. Lin, M. Trodden, Apparent $w < -1$ and a Lower S_8 from Dark Axion and Dark Baryons Interactions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 135, 181001 (2025) [arXiv:2503.16415]
 - [10] R. Chen, J.M. Cline, V. Muralidharan, B. Salewicz, Quintessential dark energy crossing the phantom divide, arXiv:2508.19101
 - [11] S. Dutta, R.J. Scherrer, Decaying dark matter mimicking time-varying dark energy, Phys. Rev. D 82, 043526 (2010) [arXiv:1004.3295]
 - [12] R. Liu, Y. Zhu, W. Hu, V. Miranda, Phantom Mirage from Axion Dark Energy, arXiv:2510.14957
 - [13] W.J. Wolf, C. García-García, T. Anton, P.G. Ferreira, Cosmological Evidence for Non-Minimal Coupling, Phys. Rev. Lett. 135, 081001 (2025) [arXiv:2504.07679]
 - [14] E. Bellini, I. Sawicki, Maximal freedom at minimum cost: linear large-scale structure in general modifications of gravity, JCAP 1407, 050 (2014) [arXiv:1404.3711]
 - [15] E.V. Linder, No Run Gravity, JCAP 1907, 034 (2019) [arXiv:1903.02010]

Case	Eq.	w	Notes
NonDom1	(13)	$-\ddot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi}) > 0$	Late time DE no dominate
NonDom2	(14)	$\approx 0^+$	Late time DE no dominate
NonDom3	¹	$K/\rho_{\text{de}} > 0$	Late time DE no dominate; $K \sim X^{1/2}$
Natural	(15)	$-1/(1-2n)$	DE dominate; $n < 1/2$; $K < 0$
DBI	(17)	$\approx 0^-$	DE dominate; $n \rightarrow -\infty$
MassAdd	(18)	?	$ \ddot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi}) \gg 1$; diverging, unstable?
Coast	(19)	-1	$\ddot{\phi} = 0$; $n \approx 0$
No K	(23)	$-\ddot{\phi}/(3H\dot{\phi}) > 0$	$K = 0$, $g \sim (a^3 H)^{-1}$; unviable

TABLE I. Different cases enabled by the shift symmetric Horndeski gravity. The value of w listed is the late time, future value. The quantity $n \equiv X K_X / K$. The most promising case is the natural case of Section IV, enabling both a phantom crossing and a diversity of late time asymptotes for w .

- [16] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov and P.J. Steinhardt, Essentials of k-essence, Phys.Rev.D, 63, 103510 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0006373]
- [17] M. Bento, O. Bertolami, and A. Sen, Generalized Chaplygin Gas, Accelerated Expansion and Dark Energy-Matter Unification, Phys. Rev. D 66, 043507 (2002)
- [18] E.V. Linder, The Paths of Quintessence, Phys. Rev. D 73, 063010 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601052]
- [19] E.V. Linder, S. Appleby, An Expansion of Well Tempered Gravity, JCAP 2103, 074 (2021) [arXiv:2012.03965]
- [20] E.V. Linder, No Slip Gravity, JCAP 1803, 005 (2018) [arXiv:1801.01503]