

Bayesian analysis of running holographic Ricci dark energy

Paxy George and Titus K Mathew

Department of Physics,

Cochin University of Science and Technology, Kochi-22, India.

Abstract

Running vacuum models is an excellent description of slowly varying dark energy, where the density is varying with the even powers of Hubble parameter. Holographic Ricci dark energy evolving through its interaction with dark matter is a natural choice in this regard. We have analyzed the relative significance of two versions of this model in the light of SNIa, CMB, BAO and Hubble data sets using the method Bayesian inferences. The first one is, running holographic Ricci dark energy (rhrde) having a constant additive term in its density form and the second is one having no additive constant, instead the interaction of rhrde with dark matter is accounted through a phenomenological coupling term. The Bayes factor of these models in comparison with the standard Λ CDM have been obtained by calculating the likelihood of each model for five different data combinations, Hubble parameter data, SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO, SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data, SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO and SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data. The priors for the model parameters, in order to get the likelihood of the model, are obtained by getting the width of the Gaussian distribution of the parameters with respect to the corresponding observational data combination. Our analysis have shown that, the model 1 is not worth more than a bare mention compared to Λ CDM model, as its Bayes factor is between one and three for all the data combinations. While the evidence for model 2, is definite even though not so strong against the standard model for the full data set SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble, since the corresponding Bayes factor is greater than three. For other data combinations model 2 is similar in status as model 1 in comparison with Λ CDM model. At the outset our analysis supporting a slowly varying dark energy instead of a strict cosmological constant.

1 Introduction

The idea that the cosmological term Λ could be varying (at least slowly) as the universe expand is gaining much attention in the light of the recent cosmological data[1]. A continuously varying vacuum energy which adopts its time dependence from the Hubble parameter $H(t)$ is suggested by quantum field theory in curved space-time[2] and is turn out to be good choice for dynamical cosmological term [3, 4, 5, 6]. Such a running vacuum energy (RVE) model has been proposed to alleviate the drawbacks of the standard Λ CDM[12, 11], the coincidence problem and the cosmological constant problem, proposed to explain the recent acceleration in the expansion of the universe[7, 8, 9, 10]. The issue, cosmological constant problem, is due to the incredibly small magnitude of the observed value of the cosmological constant compared to it's theoretical prediction from quantum field theory [13], while the coincidence of present energy densities of both cosmological constant and dark matter is refers to coincidence problem. RVE model [14] proposes a cosmological parameter, $\Lambda(H)$, which is decaying as the universe expands and can hopefully solve the previously mentioned issues. Authors in reference [15] have found strong evidence for a slowly varying 'cosmological constant' using the latest combined observational data, SNIa+BAO+H(z)+LSS+BBN+CMB.

Another interesting attempt to explain the decaying dark energy is by applying holographic principle[16, 17], which culminated into an alternative model, the holographic Ricci dark energy(hrde). The hrde has a resemblance in form with the conventional RVE. Energy densities of both the models are combinations of \dot{H} and H^2 , where over-dot represents a derivative with respect to time. The hrde was initially proposed as a varying dark energy with time dependent equation of state[18]. Due to its similarity in density, it has been considered as an alternative to RVE[19, 20, 21], for convenience let us call it as rhrde (running holographic Ricci dark energy). In rhrde model an additive constant in the energy density is essential to ensure the transition from a prior decelerated to a late accelerated epoch[19, 20]. In reference [21] we have shown that such an additive constant in the density is not needed for causing a transition into the late accelerating epoch if one accounts for the interaction between the rhrde and the dark matter[22, 23, 24]. The evolution of the various cosmological parameters in such a model were studied in the light of supernovae, SDSS and recent Planck data [21]. Taking account of the reasonable performance of rhrde in predicting the back ground evolution of the universe, it is worth to contrast it with the standard Λ CDM model in order to assess it's relative importance. In the present work we make this comparison using the method Bayesian analysis[57, 26, 27, 28].

The Bayesian theory of statistics was developed by great mathematicians such as Gauss, Bayes, Laplace, Bernoulli etc. It is possible to assign a probability for a random variable based on repeated measurements. But in cosmological scenario such kind of repeated observations are practically impossible or only rarely possible. Often one have a hypothesis or a theory in cosmology instead of a random variable, the probability of which is to be fixed. Bayesian theory help us in this regard to fix the probability of such hypothesis by using the available data[31, 32, 33, 40]. Following this, it is possible to compare different cosmological models by computing what is known as Bayes factor, which is proportional to the ratio of the probabilities of the models which are to be compared. This method have been used in many works for model comparison[25, 29, 30, 35]. Here we first compare the rhrde having an additive constant in the density with the standard Λ CDM model then compare the hrde devoid of the additive constant, but its interaction with cold dark matter is accounted phenomenologically.

2 The method of Bayesian analysis

In this section we present the basic method of the Bayesian comparison following reference[35, 36]. The method is based on the famous Bayes theorem, which allow one to evaluate the posterior probability of a given model. Let $p(M_{rhrde}|D, I)$ be the posterior probability of M_{rhrde} , the rhrde model with Ricci dark energy and dark matter as the cosmic components, such that D , the given set of observational data and I , the back ground information regarding the expansion of the universe are true. According to Bayes theorem it then follows,

$$p(M_{rhrde}|D, I) = \frac{p(M_{rhrde}|I)p(D|M_{rhrde}, I)}{p(D|I)}. \quad (1)$$

Here $p(M_{rhrde}|I)$ is the prior probability assigned to the model before analyzing the data, given that the back ground information I is true. The prior is a fundamental ingredient of Bayesian statistics. It could be considered as problematic, since the theory does not give prescription about how the prior should be selected. It may be natural that different scientists might have different priors as a result of their past experiences. But once a prior has been chosen then repeated application of Bayes theorem, equation (1) will

lead to a convergence to a common posterior. The term $p(D|M_{rhrde}, I)$ is the probability for obtaining the data provided the model and the background information are true and is called the likelihood of the model, $\mathcal{L}(M_{rhrde})$ for a given set of observational data. This term encodes how the degree of plausibility of the hypothesis or model changes when we acquire new data. The term $p(D|I)$ is the probability for obtaining the data if the background information is true, which is a normalization factor. In a similar way the posterior probability of $M_{\Lambda CDM}$, the standard ΛCDM model can be obtained by replacing M_{rhrde} with $M_{\Lambda CDM}$ in the above equation. For comparing the models in the Bayesian way we define what is called as the odds ratio, the ratio of the posterior probabilities of the two models as,

$$O_{ij} \equiv \frac{p(M_{rhrde}|D, I)}{p(M_{\Lambda CDM}|D, I)} = \frac{p(M_{rhrde}|I)p(D|M_{rhrde}, I)}{p(M_{\Lambda CDM}|I)p(D|M_{\Lambda CDM}, I)}, \quad (2)$$

where suffix ' i ' represents M_{rhrde} and ' j ' represents $M_{\Lambda CDM}$ and we have assumed that the normalization factor $P(D|I)$ is the same in the case of both models. The prior probability of either the given model or the standard model is fixed before considering the data and is depending only on the prior information. The prior information is an attempt to quantify the collective wisdom of a researcher in the given area. If this collective information does not prefer one model over the other, the prior probabilities get canceled out in the above odds ratio, hence we have

$$O_{ij} = \frac{p(D|M_{rhrde}, I)}{p(D|M_{\Lambda CDM}, I)} \equiv B_{ij}, \quad (3)$$

where B_{ij} is now called as the Bayes factor. The $p(D|M_{rhrde}, I)$, the likelihood of the model M_{rhrde} can be conveniently denoted as $\mathcal{L}(M_i)$ (where $M_i = M_{rhrde}$). If α and β are the model parameters then the likelihood can be expressed as[35],

$$\mathcal{L}(M_i) = \int d\alpha p(\alpha|M_i) \left(\int d\beta p(\beta|M_i) \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \beta) \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \beta)$ is the likelihood of the combination of the model parameters (α, β) . Assuming the measurement errors are Gaussian, the likelihood function can be taken as[37],

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \beta) = e^{-\frac{\chi^2(\alpha, \beta)}{2}}, \quad (5)$$

where,

$$\chi^2(\alpha, \beta) = \sum \left[\frac{A_k - A_k(\alpha, \beta)}{\sigma_k} \right]^2. \quad (6)$$

Here A_k is the observed value, $A_k(\alpha, \beta)$ is the corresponding theoretical value and σ_k is the uncertainties in the measurement of the observable. We assume no prior information regarding the parameters except that they are lying in the range $[\alpha, \alpha + \Delta\alpha]$ and $[\beta, \beta + \Delta\beta]$ respectively, then the prior probability of parameters can be taken as $p(\alpha|M_i) = \frac{1}{\Delta\alpha}$ and $p(\beta|M_i) = \frac{1}{\Delta\beta}$ and are the simplest choice for them. Hence the above equation become

$$\mathcal{L}(M_i) = \frac{1}{\Delta\alpha} \frac{1}{\Delta\beta} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+\Delta\alpha} d\alpha \int_{\beta}^{\beta+\Delta\beta} d\beta \exp[-\chi^2(\alpha, \beta)/2]. \quad (7)$$

The range over which the parameters vary can be obtained as follows. The values of the model parameters are to be obtained by constraining the model with the observation data using the process of χ^2 minimization.

The probable value of them is the one corresponding to the minimum of χ^2 , i.e. χ_{min}^2 . A plot of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \beta)$ with one of the parameters, keeping the other constant, is Gaussian in shape. For instance, β can be fixed equal to its value corresponding to the χ_{min}^2 and parameter α can be varied about its equilibrium value corresponding to χ_{min}^2 . The width of the resulting Gaussian curve can be taken as $\Delta\alpha$ and the inverse of which is taken to be as the flat prior $p(\alpha|M_i)$. Similar procedure can be adopted to find $\Delta\beta$ and the corresponding prior. Having the prior probabilities for the parameters, the marginal likelihood for a parameter, say α can be written as,

$$\mathcal{L}_i(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\Delta\beta} \int_{\beta}^{\beta+\Delta\beta} d\beta \exp[-\chi^2(\alpha, \beta)/2]. \quad (8)$$

Similarly marginal likelihood for β can also be defined.

Knowing the likelihood of the models M_i and M_j , the comparison between them can be performed by estimating Bayes factor B_{ij} , which is the ratio of likelihood of the two models,

$$B_{ij} = \frac{\mathcal{L}(M_i)}{\mathcal{L}(M_j)}. \quad (9)$$

Following the conventional Jeffrey's scale of reference in Bayesian analysis[38], If the Bayes factor, $B_{ij} < 1$, then the model M_i is not significant as compared to M_j . If $1 < B_{ij} < 3$, there is evidence against M_j when compared with M_i but it is not worth more than a bare mention. For $3 < B_{ij} < 20$, the evidence of M_i against M_j is not strong but definite. If $20 < B_{ij} < 150$, the evidence is strong and on the other hand if $B_{ij} > 150$, evidence against M_j is very strong[58, 59, 64].

3 Model Comparison

In this section we employ the method of Bayesian comparison to contrast the significance of rhrde over the standard Λ CDM model. We consider two versions of rhrde model. The first one characterized by a dark energy density with an additive constant, which causes the transition into the late acceleration. While the second one, doesn't have that additive constant in the dark energy density, instead the late acceleration is now caused by the non-gravitational interaction between the dark sectors, which is accounted in a phenomenological way. We briefly describe both these two models before entering the Bayesian analysis[39, 40, 41].

3.1 rhrde Models

Model 1 - Ricci dark energy with a bare cosmological constant, is characterized by the energy density with a bare cosmological constant, Λ_0 , of the form [19],

$$\rho_{\Lambda}(H, \dot{H}) = 3\beta M_p^2(\dot{H} + 2H^2) + M_p^2\Lambda_0, \quad (10)$$

where $M_p^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi G}$ is the reduced Planck mass, β is the model parameter, H is the Hubble parameter and \dot{H} is its derivative with cosmic time. This is running in the sense that, its equations of state is fixed, $\omega = -1$

while the density is varying as the universe evolves. The conservation law followed by the major cosmic components is,

$$\dot{\rho}_m + \dot{\rho}_r + \dot{\rho}_\Lambda + 3H(\rho_m + \frac{4}{3}\rho_r) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where ρ_m, ρ_r are the matter and radiation densities respectively and the over dot represents their derivatives with respect to cosmic time. From the Friedmann equation the Hubble parameter, $h = H/H_0$ takes the form[20],

$$h^2 = \frac{\Omega_{m0}}{\xi_m} e^{-3\xi_m x} + \Omega_{r0} e^{-4x} + \frac{\Lambda_0}{3(1-2\beta)H_0^2}, \quad (12)$$

where $\Omega_{m0} = \frac{\rho_{m0}}{3M_p^2 H_0^2}$, $\Omega_{r0} = \frac{\rho_{r0}}{3M_p^2 H_0^2}$, H_0 is the present value of the Hubble parameter and $\xi_m = \frac{(1-2\beta)}{(1-\frac{3}{2}\beta)}$. The variable $x = \ln a$. The first term in Eqn (12) is corresponds to matter density, second term represent the energy density of radiation and the third term corresponds to the bare cosmological constant. This equation implies an upper limit on the model parameter, $\beta < 1/2$. In the limit $a \rightarrow \infty$ the Hubble parameter becomes, $h^2 \rightarrow \frac{\Lambda_0}{3(1-2\beta)H_0^2}$, a constant which corresponds to an accelerating universe dominated by the bare cosmological constant.

Model 2 - Interacting Ricci dark energy, the dark energy density is of the same form as in the previous case, but devoid of the last additive constant. In addition, the interaction between the dark sectors is taken care off by a phenomenological term, $Q = 3bH\rho_m$, where b is the coupling constant and ρ_m is density of dark matter[48, 49, 50, 51]. The conservation equations then follows as,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{hrde} + 3H(\rho_{hrde} + P_{hrde}) &= -Q, \\ \dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m + P_m) &= Q. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In a previous work we have analyzed the background evolution of the universe in this model[21] by solving the the Friedmann equation,

$$3H^2 = \rho_m + \rho_{hrde}, \quad (14)$$

for the Hubble parameter as,

$$h^2 = \frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-b} e^{-3(1-b)x} - \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{2\Omega_{hrde0}}{\beta} + 3\Omega_{m0} - 4 \right) e^{-3x} + \left(\frac{2\Omega_{hrde0}}{3\beta} - \frac{b}{1-b}\Omega_{m0} - \frac{1}{3} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $h = H/H_0$, $\Omega_{m0} = \frac{\rho_{m0}}{3H_0^2}$, $\Omega_{hrde0} = \frac{\rho_{hrde0}}{3H_0^2}$, with ρ_{m0} and ρ_{hrde0} as the present value of the dark matter and dark energy densities respectively and H_0 is present value of the Hubble parameter. The variable, $x = \ln a$, where a is the scale factor of expansion. The Hubble parameter have the expected asymptotic properties. As $x \rightarrow -\infty$ (equivalently $a \rightarrow 0$) the first two terms in equation(15) dominates which implies a prior deceleration phase. As $x \rightarrow +\infty$ (equivalently $a \rightarrow \infty$) Hubble parameter tends to a constant which corresponds to the end de Sitter phase.

3.2 Data analysis for model parameters

The model parameters β of model 1 and β & b of model 2 are evaluated using the χ^2 minimization technique. For the computation we have used supernova 580 data from the SCP "Union2.1" SN Ia compilation[43],

$H(z)$ data[44], CMBR data from Planck2013[54, 55] and BAO (Baryon Acoustic Oscillation) data from Sloan Digital Sky Survey(SDSS)[52, 53]. We repeat the computation by replacing 580 supernovae data set with the 307 data from Union compilation[42]. The 580 data set consists of more data points from the low redshift observations. It has been noted that interference with the background in obtaining the low redshift data is relatively high [46] and also Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis[47] have shown that 307 data set have relatively larger, i.e. 85% probability of being originated from a common distribution. The theoretical distance modulus for a redshift z_i is,

$$\mu_t(\beta, b, H_0, z_i) = 5 \log_{10} \left[\frac{d_L(\beta, b, H_0, z_i)}{Mpc} \right] + 25, \quad (16)$$

where d_L is its luminosity distance. The μ_t calculated for a given redshift is to be compared with the observational data for the same redshift for obtaining χ^2 using equation(6) by replacing A_k with the distance modulus μ .

We have used Hubble parameter data [44], contains 38 samples in the red shift range $0.07 \leq z \leq 2.36$. The χ^2 has been obtained using equation (6), in which we replace A_k with H . In using Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) data[45], the shift parameter \mathcal{R} , is taken as the observable instead of A_k in equation(6), defined as,

$$\mathcal{R} = \sqrt{\Omega_m} \int_0^{z_2} \frac{dz}{h(z)}. \quad (17)$$

Here z_2 is the red shift at the last scattering surface. From Planck 2013 data, $z_2 = 1090.41$ and $\mathcal{R} = 1.7499 \pm 0.0080$ [54, 55]. For Baryon Acoustic Oscillation(BAO) data, the observable used in equation(6) is the acoustic parameter \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_m}}{h(z_1)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \left(\frac{1}{z_1} \int_0^{z_1} \frac{dz}{h(z)} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (18)$$

Here $z_1 = 0.35$ is the redshift where the signature of the peak acoustic oscillations has been measured[53]. According to the SDSS data the observational value of the acoustic parameter for flat universe corresponding to the same redshift is, $\mathcal{A} = 0.484 \pm 0.016$ [56].

We first done the χ^2 minimization with Hubble parameter data alone for both the models to extract the parameters. We obtained the parameters for the data combinations SNIa(307)+BAO+CMB, SNIa(307)+BAO+CMB+Hubble data, SNIa(580)+BAO+CMB and SNIa(580)+BAO+CMB+Hubble data. For instance the total χ^2 corresponding to Model 2 for the full data set is $\chi^2(\beta, b) = \chi^2(\beta, b)_{SNIa} + \chi^2(\beta, b)_{CMB} + \chi^2(\beta, b)_{BAO} + \chi^2(\beta, b)_{Hubble\ data}$. By minimizing χ^2 function, the parameters for both models are extracted and are summarized in table1 for model 1 and in table2 for model 2. For both models we have fixed the value of the present Hubble parameter at $H_0 = 69 km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}$ as per the Planck data[54]. The parameters β and b of model 2 are estimated with 1σ level of correction and are shown in table2.

For model 1, the value of the parameter β is found to be almost the same for all the combinations of the data set. The same is the case for model 2 regarding parameter β . In the case of interaction parameter b of model 2, it is around 0.0470 with Hubble parameter data but ten times smaller with combinations of data (see table2). Yet another point to be noted is the strength of the parameter β , which around 0.01 for model 1 but in the case of model 2, where interaction is being taken care explicitly, this parameter has gone up approximately by ten times and is around 0.46. This implies, with the phenomenological interaction the strength of dark energy has enhanced substantially.




Figure 1: The plot gives the prior range of the parameter β in model 1 using SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO.

4 Bayesian analysis for model 1

We will now calculate the likelihood of the model. One of the basic input for this is the prior probability for the parameter β . For obtaining that, we plotted $\exp(\frac{-\chi^2(\beta)}{2})$ with β and is of Gaussian shape as shown in figure(1). The width of the variation is taken as $\Delta\beta$, called the prior range of the parameter. The range corresponding to different data sets are found to be: $-0.0665 < \beta < 0.0763$ for Hubble data, $-0.007 < \beta < 0.0342$ for SNIa(307)+BAO+CMB, $0.0038 < \beta < 0.0435$ for SNIa(307)+BAO+CMB+Hubble data, $0.0018 < \beta < 0.03155$ for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO, $0.00053 < \beta < 0.0295$ for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data sets. The likelihood for the model 1 can then be evaluated by using equation (7) as,

$$\mathcal{L}(M_i) = \frac{1}{\Delta\beta} \int_{\beta}^{\beta+\Delta\beta} d\beta \mathcal{L}_i(\beta). \quad (19)$$

For obtaining the Bayes factor of the model, we have to obtain the likelihood of the standard Λ CDM for the same data set. The standard model is two component one with dark matter ($\Omega_m = \frac{\rho_m}{3H^2}$) and cosmological constant Λ ($\Omega_\Lambda = \frac{\rho_\Lambda}{3H^2}$) as the constituents. First we obtain the prior ranges of the parameters Ω_m and Ω_Λ using the relation (5) by replacing α and β with Ω_m and Ω_Λ respectively and are found to be $0.2437 < \Omega_m < 0.3056$ & $0.6363 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0.8712$ for Hubble data, $0.255 < \Omega_m < 0.31$ & $0.695 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0.7802$ for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO, $0.2538 < \Omega_m < 0.2935$ & $0.7057 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0.7953$ for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble, $0.2639 < \Omega_m < 0.3038$ & $0.6669 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0.7225$ for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO and $0.2556 < \Omega_m < 0.2883$ & $0.6602 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0.7161$ for the last combination SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble of the data sets. Using corresponding prior probabilities we obtained $\mathcal{L}(M_j)$, the likelihood of the standard Λ CDM model using the relation (7) by replacing α and β with Ω_m and Ω_Λ respectively for each data sets. The Bayes factor for the model 1 in comparison to the standard Λ CDM model can then be evaluated using the expression (9) and are summarized in the last row of table(1).




Figure 2: The plot gives prior range for the model parameter β using SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO.

Table 1: Parameter value, prior range and Bayes factor for different data sets for model 1.

<i>Parameters</i>	<i>Hubbledata</i>	<i>SNIa(307)+ CMB + BAO</i>	<i>SNIa(307)+ CMB + BAO + Hubbledata</i>	<i>SNIa(580)+ CMB + BAO</i>	<i>SNIa(580)+ CMB + BAO + Hubbledata</i>
β	0.0125	0.0145	0.013	0.0172	0.015
$\Delta\beta$	0.14	0.0412	0.0397	0.0287	0.0289
<i>Bayesfactor</i>	1.09	1.45	1.88	1.80	2.6

From table it is seen that the Bayes factor for all the data combinations are in the range $1 < B_{ij} < 3$. According to Jeffrey's scale this indicate that the model 1 have evidence against the standard model but it is not worth more than a bare mention.

5 Bayesian analysis for model 2

Now we will go for the Bayesian analysis of the model 2, where the interaction between the dark sectors is accounted with a phenomenological term. In contrast to the previous model the late acceleration is caused by this interaction term instead of the constant additive term in the dark energy density. Here also we have used the five data set combinations for the analysis as in the previous case. We have to first obtained the prior probability of the model parameters β and b . For instance with SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO, we obtain the $\chi^2(\beta, b)$ distribution as function of the parameters by contrasting the model with the data. By fixing the value of b the function $\exp(-\frac{\chi^2(\beta)}{2})$ has been plotted with β for a given H_0 ($H_0 = 69 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$). The width of the resulting Gaussian, as shown in figure(2), is taken as $\Delta\beta$ and is found to be $\Delta\beta = 0.0200$. The inverse of this will give the prior probability of β . The marginal likelihood for the interaction term b can then be obtained by performing the integral over β as in relation(8) by replacing α with b . The resulting




Figure 4: The plot gives prior range for the model parameter b for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO.

function is then plotted against b gives a Gaussian shape, see figure(3), which in turn implies a range for b as $-0.01 < b < 0.03$ which is the actual range over which the parameter b varies.




Figure 3: The plot shows the marginal likelihood of the interaction term b for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO data set.

A similar procedure is adopted for finding the prior probability of b and the contributing range of the parameter β . The prior probability of b is obtained from the plot of $\exp(\frac{-\chi^2(b)}{2})$ with b (figure(4)), implies $\Delta b = 0.0303$, which is then used to integrate out b . The marginal likelihood for the parameter β thus evaluated and is found that it contribute in the range $0.44 < \beta < 0.48$, see figure(5). In short we have obtained the likelihood of the model parameters by starting with some flat probability.




Figure 5: The plot shows the marginal likelihood of the model parameter β for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO data sets.

After completing the above process of computation for all the data combinations, we have proceeded to obtain the likelihood of the model. The likelihood of the present model $\mathcal{L}(M_i)$ can be obtained by using equation(7), using b instead of α . The prior ranges for integration corresponding to different data combinations are $0.4534 < \beta < 0.487$ & $-0.01993 < b < 0.1191$ for Hubble data, $0.455 < \beta < 0.475$ & $-0.0083 < b < 0.022$ for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO, $0.4554 < \beta < 0.4726$ & $-0.00915 < b < 0.02363$ for SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data set, $0.4525 < \beta < 0.4727$ & $-0.01296 < b < 0.0204$ for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO data sets and $0.4548 < \beta < 0.4726$ & $-0.00887 < b < 0.02339$ for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data sets respectively. The Bayes factor for the model 2 corresponding to each data sets was evaluated using the relation(9) and the results are summarized in Table(2)

Table 2: Parameter value, prior and Bayes factor for different data sets of model 2.

<i>Parameters</i>	<i>Hubbledata</i>	<i>SNIa(307)+ CMB + BAO</i>	<i>SNIa(580)+ CMB + BAO</i>	<i>SNIa(307)+ CMB + BAO + Hubbledata</i>	<i>SNIa(580)+ CMB + BAO + Hubbledata</i>
β	$0.4694^{+0.007}_{-0.006}$	$0.4645^{+0.005}_{-0.004}$	$0.4642^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.4634^{+0.004}_{-0.003}$	$0.4632^{+0.004}_{-0.003}$
b	$0.0470^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$	$0.0075^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.0076^{+0.006}_{-0.006}$	$0.0078^{+0.006}_{-0.002}$	$0.0077^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$
$\Delta\beta$	0.0336	0.02	0.0176	0.0172	0.0178
Δb	0.139	0.0303	0.0341	0.0327	0.0322
<i>Bayes factor</i>	1.9	1.6	1.72	2.9	3.2

The Bayes factor of model 2 corresponding to the Hubble parameter data, SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO data, SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO data and SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data are all lie in the range $1 < B_{ij} < 3$. According to Jeffrey's scale this indicate that, the model is not worth more than a bare mention than the standard Λ CDM model with reference to the said data combinations. But for the final data

set SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble the Bayes factor is above three. According to Jeffreys standard, this implies that, model 2 is significant but not so strong, in the light of the full data set. The difference in the Bayes factors corresponding the data sets SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble and (580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble is not too large, but for the former data set it below three and for later set it is above three. If one rely on 580 SNIa, which consists of more number of data in the low redshift region, along with other data's, then it seems that model 2 is slightly superior over Λ CDM model. But as noted by some, if one take account of the relatively large background interference in obtaining the low redshift data, then 307 SNIa is comparatively reliable, which leads to the fact that the model 2 is not so worth against the standard model. However our analysis pointing towards the equal competency, may be slightly superior, of the decaying dark energy as compared to the conventional cosmological constant.

We have also made a comparison between model 1 and model 2 by comparing the likelihood that we have calculated previously. The resulting Byes factor of model 2 relative to model 1 is found to be $B_{ij} = 1.25$, for the complete set SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble. This shows the slight edge of model 2 over model 1. So including the interaction via non-gravitational phenomenological term could increase the acceptance of the model.

6 Conclusion

The huge discrepancy between the observed value of the cosmological constant and its value predicted by quantum field theory is one of the prominent issues in theoretical physics. A feasible solution to this is that the vacuum energy can be considered as varying as the universe expand, in particular it depending on the Hubble parameter, its derivative and also to the even powers of it and is then called the running dark energy[60, 61, 62]. It was noticed that the holographic Ricci dark energy has the same density form as that of the standard running vacuum models[62], except the difference in the nature of the model parameters. In the present work we have tested the significance of the interacting holographic dark energy as an alternative running vacuum and is called rhrde. The interaction between the dark sectors is accounted through a non-gravitational phenomenological coupling term, $Q = 3bH\rho_m$.

We have used the Bayesian analysis[63, 68, 69], an effective tool for selecting the most appropriate model based on the current observational data, to compare the rhrde with the standard Λ CDM. The observational data on supernovae, Hubble parameter, BAO and CMB data sets are used in different combinations to extract the statistical evidence of two versions of running holographic Ricci dark energy model: (1) rhrde with an additive constant in the energy density and (2) rhrde without additive constant in the energy density and its interaction with dark matter is accounted by a phenomenological term. The data combinations, we have used are; Hubble parameter data, SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO, SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data, SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO, SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data.

We have obtained the likelihood of model 1, model 2 and also the Λ CDM model using the different data combinations mentioned above. The ingredients for the likelihood, the prior range and hence the prior probability of the model parameters, has been obtained by plotting $e^{-\chi^2/2}$ with the concerned parameter, the width of the resulting Gaussian profile gives the prior range and inverse of the width gives the prior probability of the respective parameter. For example the prior of the model parameters say β is obtained

by plotting the $e^{-\chi^2/2}$ with β by fixing the other parameters equal to their value corresponding to the χ^2 minimum. Through out the calculation for model 1 and 2 we have assumed the prior of present dark mass density parameter in the range $0.25 < \Omega_{m0} < 0.3$ subjected to the condition $\Omega_{m0} + \Omega_{\Lambda0} = 1$ and present Hubble parameter as $69 < H_0 < 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. However for the Λ CDM model we have deduced the range of both Ω_{m0} and $\Omega_{\Lambda0}$ by finding the Gaussian distribution of the exponential of χ^2 as a function of these parameters. The ratio of the likelihood of any two models gives the Bayes inference factor.

Our analysis shows that the Bayes factor for model 1 is between one and three for all the data combinations, however it is least for the Hubble parameter data alone and highest for the full data combination SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data. This shows that there is a progressive evidence for the model against Λ CDM as one take more and more data into consideration. In spit of this, in an over all sense, the range of the Bayes factor values implies that, model 1 is not worth more than a bare mention against the standard Λ CDM model, even though the background evolution of the universe of this model is almost comparable with that of the Λ CDM model[20].

Model 2, is different from model 1 in such a way that the interaction of dark energy with dark matter is accounted with a phenomenological term, which in fact causes the late acceleration without the aid of a constant additive term in the dark energy density [21]. The model is a two parameter one, in which β characterizing the dark energy and b , the interaction. Parameter β is almost the same for all the data combinations, while b is smaller for the data combinations compared to Hubble expansion data for which it is approximately ten times larger. We have obtained the likelihood of these parameters and following which the Bayes factor have been calculated. The results of the Bayesian analysis is summarized in table 2. For Hubble parameter data alone the Bayes factor of the model is found to be 1.9 which is arguably larger compared to the case of Model 1. However as the inference is considered, in standards of Jeffreys, this model is not so worth with Hubble data alone. For the combinations data set SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO and SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO are between one and two, implying the model is not so worth corresponding to these data combinations also. But when add Hubble parameter data to both these, the Bayes factor corresponding to SNIa(307)+CMB+BAO+Hubble become near to three, while for SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble data is become above three, i.e. 3.2. This shows that for the full data set SNIa(580)+CMB+BAO+Hubble, the evidence of Model 2 against Λ CDM is definite but at the same time not so strong. This otherwise supporting the earlier conclusions[15, 65, 1, 66, 67] that the dark energy could be a running one, varying slowly as the universe expands. We also check the Bayes factor for model 2 with respect to model 1 and is found to be $B_{ij} = 1.25$. This indicates that model 2 is significant compared to model 1, which supports the non-gravitational nature of the interaction between rhrde and dark matter. In summary the present analysis is a clear evidence that the rhrde is equally competent as the conventional running vacuum models in supporting the idea of decaying ‘cosmological constant’.

References

- [1] J. Sola, *Int J Mod Phys A.*, **31** (2016) 1630035.
- [2] J. Sola, H. Stefancic, *Phys. Lett. A* **21** (2006) 479.

- [3] J. Sola, A. Gomez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Perez, *Ap. J* **811** (2015) L14.
- [4] J. Sola, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **453** (2013) 012015.
- [5] J. Sola and A. Gomez-Valent, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24** (2015) 1541003.
- [6] J. Sola, A. Gomez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Perez, *Ap. J* **836** (2017) 43.
- [7] A. G. Riess et al., *Ap. J.* **116** (1998) 1009.
- [8] S. Perlmutter et al., *Ap. J.* **517** (1999) 565 .
- [9] D. N. Spergel et al.,*Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.* **148** (2003) 175.
- [10] M. Tegmark et al.,*Ap. J.* **606** (2004) 702.
- [11] N. A. Bahcall, J. P. Ostriker, S. Perlmutter and P.J. Steinhardt, *Science* **284** (1999) 1481-1488.
- [12] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.D* **15** (2006) 1753-1936,
- [13] L. Amendola, and S. Tsujikawa, *Cambridge University Press* (2010).
- [14] I. L. Shapiro, J. Sola, *Phys. Lett. B* **475** (2000) 236; I. L. Shapiro, J. Sola, *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Supp.* **127** (2004) 71.
- [15] J. Sola, A. Gomez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Perez,*Ap. J.* **836** (2017) 43, arXiv:1602.02103v4
- [16] R. Bousso, *Rev. Mod. Phys* **74** (2002) 825.
- [17] G. t Hooft,*Gerard Conf.Proc. C* **930308** (1993) 284-296, arXiv:gr-qc/9310026; L. Susskind, *J. Math. Phys.* **36** (1995) 6377
- [18] P. Praseetha and T. K. Mathew, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23** 1450024 (2014).
- [19] M.B. Lopez and Y.Tavakoli, *Phys.Rev.D* **87** (2013) 023515.
- [20] G. Paxy,T. K. Mathew, *Mod. Phys.Lett. A* **31**(2016) 1650075
- [21] G. Paxy, V. M. Shereef, T. K.Mathew, *Ind. Nat. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28** (2019) 1950060.
- [22] S. H. Pereira and J. F. Jesus, *Phys.Rev. D* **79** (2009) 043517.
- [23] S. Som, A. Sil, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **352** (2014) 867.
- [24] H. Jian-Hua, B. Wang, *JCAP* **0806** (2008) 010.
- [25] B. Santos, N. C. Devi, and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 123514.
- [26] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, E. Sellentin, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon, and A. Mootooyaloo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 101301.
- [27] S. Santos da Costa, M. Benetti, and J. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **1803** (2018) no.03 004.
- [28] U. Andrade, C. A. P. Bengaly, J. S. Alcaniz, and B. Santos, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 083518.

- [29] J.F. Jesus, R. Valentim and F. Andrade-Oliveira, *JCAP* **09** (2017) 030.
- [30] P. Serra, A. Heavens and A. Melchior, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **379** (2007) 169175.
- [31] A. Kurek and M. Szydykowski, *Astrophys. J.* **75** (2008)1.
- [32] A. Cid, B. Santos, et al, *JCAP* **1903** (2019) no.03, 030.
- [33] A.C.C. Guimaraes, J.V. Cunha and J.A.S. Lima, *JCAP* **10** (2009) 010.
- [34] I. Debono, *MNRAS* **437** (2014) 887897.
- [35] M. V. John and J. V. Narlikar, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**(2002) 043506.
- [36] M. V. John, *Ap. J* **630** (2005) 667-674.
- [37] Miao Li, Xiao-Dong Li, Shuang Wang, Xin Zhang, *JCAP* **0906**(2009)036
- [38] H. Jefferys, *Theory of probability(3 ed.) Oxford UK. Oxford university press* (1961).
- [39] S. Hee, W. Handley et al, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **455** (2016) 2461-2473.
- [40] I. Debono, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **437** (2014) 887-897.
- [41] T. D. Saini, J. Weller and S. L. Bridle, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **348** (2004) 603-608.
- [42] M. Kowalski *et al.*, *Ap.J.* **686** (2008) 749.
- [43] N. Suzuki et al, *Ap. J* **746** (2012) 85.
- [44] O. Farooq, F. Madiyar, S. Crandall, B. Ratra, *Ap. J* **835** (2017) 26.
- [45] J.R. Bond, G. Efstathiou and M. Tegmark, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **291** (1997) L33.
- [46] B. Schwarzschild, *Phys. Today* **57(6)** (2004) 19.
- [47] F. B. Bianco et al., *Ap. J.* **741** (2011) 20.
- [48] C. Rong-Gen, Q. Su, *Phys.Rev.D* **81** (2010) 103514.
- [49] H. Jian-Hua, B. Wang and E. Abdalla, *Phys.Rev.D* **83** (2011) 063515.
- [50] S. Chen, B. Wang, J. Jing, *Phys.Rev.D* **78** (2008) 123503.
- [51] W. Zimdahl , D. Pavon b, Luis P. Chimento, *Physics Letters B* **521** (2001) 133138.
- [52] D. J. Eisenstein, *et al.*, [SDSS Collaboration] *Astrophys. J.* **633** (2005) 560 .
- [53] M. Tegmark *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 123507.
- [54] P.A.R. Ade *et al.*, [Planck collaboration] *Astron. Astrophys.* **571** (2014) A16.
- [55] D.L. Shafer and D. Huterer, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 063510.
- [56] C. Blake, E. Kazin, F. Beutler, T. Davis, D. Parkinson et al., *Mon. Not.Roy. Astron. Soc.* **418** (2011) 1707

- [57] R.E. Kass and A.E. Raftery, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **90** (1995) 773.
- [58] R. Trotta., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **378** (2007) 72.
- [59] P. S. Drell, T. J. Loredo, and I. Wasserman, *Ap. J.* **530** (2000) 593.
- [60] I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, *Phys.Lett.B* **682** (2009) 105-113.
- [61] E. L. D. Perico, J. A. S. Lima, Spyros Basilakos, Joan Sola, *Phys. Rev. D.* **88** (2013) 063531.
- [62] J. Sola and A. Gomez-Valent, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24** (2015) 1541003-1541039.
- [63] R. Colistete Jr., J. C. Fabris, S. V. B. Goncalves and P. E. DE Souza, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **13** No. 4 (2004) 669-693.
- [64] A. Sasidharan, N.D.J. Mohan, M.V. John et al., *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 628.
- [65] J. Sola, *The Fourteenth Marcel Grossmann Meeting* (2017) 2363-2370; arXiv:1601.01668 [gr-qc]
- [66] J. Sola, A. Gomez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Perez, arXiv:1606.00450.
- [67] Sola, J. de Cruz Perez and A. Gomez-Valent, *EPL* **121** (2018) 39001.
- [68] A. N. Taylor and T. D. Kitching, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **408** (2010) 865-875.
- [69] G. Efstathiou, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **388** (2008) 1314-1320.