

Testing $f(R)$ gravity models with quasar X-ray and UV fluxes

Matías Leizerovich,^{1,2,*} Lucila Kraiselburd,^{2,3} Susana Landau,^{1,4} and Claudia G. Scóccola^{2,3}

¹*Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Av. Intendente Cantilo S/N 1428 Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

²*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET),
Godoy Cruz 2290, 1425, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

³*Facultad de Ciencias Astronómicas y Geofísicas,
Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Observatorio Astronómico, Paseo del Bosque,
B1900FWA La Plata, Argentina*

⁴*IFIBA - CONICET - UBA
Av. Intendente Cantilo S/N 1428 Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

(Dated: June 2021)

Recently, Active Galactic Nuclei (AGNs) have been proposed as *standardizable candles*, thanks to an observed non-linear relation between their X-ray and optical-ultraviolet (UV) luminosities, which provides an independent measurement of their distances. In this paper, we use these observables for the first time to estimate the parameters of $f(R)$ gravity models (specifically the Hu-Sawicki and the exponential models) together with the cosmological parameters. The importance of this type of modified gravity theories lies in the fact that they can explain the late time accelerated expansion of the universe without the inclusion of a dark energy component. We have also included other observable data to the analyses such as estimates of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ from Cosmic Chronometers, the Pantheon Type Ia supernovae compilation, and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations measurements. Our results show that the allowed space parameter is restricted when both AGN and BAO data are added to CC and SNIa data, being the BAO data set the most restrictive one. We can also conclude that even though our results are consistent with the ones from the Λ CDM model, small deviations from General Relativity, than can be successfully described by the $f(R)$ models studied in this paper, are also allowed by the considered data sets.

I. INTRODUCTION

The late time accelerated expansion of the universe is still one of the most intriguing conundrums that any successful cosmological model has to explain. In 1998, two international teams (Riess et al. [1, 2] and Perlmutter et al. [3]) showed independently observational evidence of this phenomena. Since then, great efforts have been made in order to explain the physical mechanism responsible for it. In the standard cosmological model (Λ CDM), a cosmological constant Λ is added to the Einstein equations of General Relativity:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{R}{2}g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G$ (for $c = 1$), $R_{\mu\nu}$ is the Riemann tensor, R is the Ricci scalar and $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor. However, this proposal has several problems that have been discussed in the literature. For instance, the observational value of the cosmological constant Λ does not match the value that is expected from theoretical estimations by 60 to 120 orders of magnitude [4–7]). Another example is the tension on the value of the Hubble expansion rate today, H_0 . Specifically, the value that has been obtained using CMB data and assuming a standard

cosmological model [8] is not in agreement with the one using model-independent observations, such as the luminosity from Supernovae Ia [9]¹. In this context, alternative cosmological models have been considered to provide an explanation for the dynamics of the universe's expansion. These models can be classified into two families [12]: those which incorporate scalar fields with minimal coupling to gravity and matter (for example, quintessence or k-essence fields [13, 14]) and those which are based in alternative gravity theories. In the last group we find theories like Gauss-Bonnet, Horndeski and the so-called $f(R)$ theories [12, 15–18], among many others. $f(R)$ theories [18], despite originally proposed by Starobinsky [19] in the '80 to describe the inflation mechanism, have recently become relevant for explaining the late time accelerated expansion of the universe. In these models, the Ricci scalar R on the Einstein-Hilbert action is replaced by a scalar function of R . Although many $f(R)$ were proposed in the past, the vast majority of them have been ruled out by theoretical reasons such as antigravity regimes [20] or by experimental and observational constraints such as local gravity tests [18, 21, 22] and solar system tests [23–27]. Two models that are still considered viable are the Hu-Sawicki [28] and the exponential ones [29–31].

¹ There is also no agreement within the scientific community of the amount of this tension. While some authors claim that there is a $4 - \sigma$ tension [9], others claim lower amounts or even no disagreements [10, 11].

*Electronic address: mleize@df.uba.ar

Recently, Desmond & Ferreira [32], by using morphological indicators in galaxies to constrain the strength and range of the fifth force, have claimed that Hu-Sawicki $f(R)$ model can be ruled out. In their methodology, they use GR-based mock catalogues to which the effects of the $f(R)$ model are added. However, the results obtained superimposing analytical expressions for the $f(R)$ effects to a Λ CDM cosmology are different from those obtained from a modified gravity based simulation, such as those presented in [33].

In Nunes et al. [34] different $f(R)$ models (including the Hu-Sawicki and the exponential models) have been tested using Cosmic Chronometers (CC), Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO), JLA samples from Supernovae Ia (SnIa) and astrophysical estimates of H_0 . Also, Farugia et al. [35] have analyzed the same $f(R)$ models using several of the observational data mentioned above (but updated) plus Redshift Space Distorsions (RSD) data set and model-dependent CMB data. In D'Agostino et al. [36, 37], the Hu-Sawicki model has been tested with newer data sets such as gravitational waves and lensed quasars from the HOLICOW Collaboration. In Odintsov et al. [30] a change of variables to express Friedmann equations for the exponential model has been proposed while in Ref. [38] a comparison between their numerical solution and the latest updates of the aforementioned observational data has been made. In the present work, we constrain the Hu-Sawicki and the exponential models using a large set of cosmological observations, including, for the first time for these models, a recently released data set of Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) compiled from Lusso et al. [39] and taking the astrophysical parameters β , γ and δ from Li et al. [40]. This data set together with SnIa and BAO data has recently been considered by Bargiachi et al [41] to constrain the Λ CDM model as well as extensions of the latter and to discuss implications for non-flat cosmological models.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II we briefly describe the main aspects of the $f(R)$ models in the cosmological context. We also recall the modified Friedmann equations to be solved in each case. In Sec. III, we describe the observational data that are used to test the predictions of the theoretical models. We also explain the statistical treatment that we have chosen for the AGN data which is based in the one proposed in Ref. [40]. In Sec. IV, we present the results of the statistical analyses. Comparison with similar works is discussed in Sec. V while the conclusions are presented in Sec. VI.

II. THEORETICAL MODELS

The $f(R)$ theories refer to a set of gravitational theories whose Lagrangian is given by a function of the Ricci scalar R , where each $f(R)$ defines a different model. Therefore, the Einstein-Hilbert action for these theories

is

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} f(R) + S_m + S_r, \quad (2)$$

where S_m and S_r represent the matter and radiation actions, respectively. The field equations are obtained by varying the action S with respect to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ such that

$$R_{\mu\nu} f_R - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} f(R) + (g_{\mu\nu} \square - \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu) f_R = \kappa T_{\mu\nu} \quad (3)$$

being $f_R = \frac{df}{dR}$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ the energy-momentum tensor.

In this work we assume a spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmology so the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \left(dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right), \quad (4)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor of the universe and $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter (the dot represents the derivatives with respect to the cosmic time). Then, the Ricci scalar can be written as

$$R = 6 \left(2H^2 + \dot{H} \right). \quad (5)$$

Considering the energy-momentum tensor of a perfect fluid $T_\nu^\mu = \text{diag}(-\rho, P, P, P)$ (being $\rho = \rho_m + \rho_r$ and $P = P_m + P_r$), the field equations (3), become

$$-3H^2 = -\frac{1}{f_R} \left[\kappa \rho + \frac{R f_R - f}{2} - 3H \dot{R} f_{RR} \right] \quad (6a)$$

$$-2\dot{H} = \frac{1}{f_R} \left[\kappa (\rho + P) + f_{RRR} \dot{R}^2 + \left(\ddot{R} - H \dot{R} \right) f_{RR} \right]. \quad (6b)$$

It has been shown that the latter equations can be expressed as a set of first order equations, which results in a more stable system from the numerical point of view [30, 42]. There are numerous proposals in this regard. In this article we assume the change of variables proposed in Ref. [30] for the exponential model and the one used by De la Cruz-Dombriz et al. [42] for the Hu-Sawicki model. Both settings are described in the next subsections.

The continuity equations of matter and radiation for a flat FLRW metric can be expressed as

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + P) = 0. \quad (7)$$

At redshifts between $0 \leq z \leq 10^4$, considering pressureless (non-relativistic) matter and radiation (relativistic particles), the solution is $\rho = \rho_m^0 a^{-3} + \rho_r^0 a^{-4}$.

Viable $f(R)$ models must fulfil some theoretical constraints such as having a positive gravitational constant, stable cosmological perturbations, and avoiding ghost states, among many others [28, 34, 43]. Therefore, to

elude instabilities when curvature becomes too large at high densities², it is necessary that

$$f_R > 0 \text{ and } f_{RR} > 0, \text{ for } R \geq R_0, \quad (8)$$

where R_0 is the current value of the Ricci scalar. Moreover, as discussed previously, a successful cosmological model must provide an explanation for the late accelerated expansion of the universe. For this, it is required that $f(R) \rightarrow R - 2\Lambda$ when $R \geq R_0$, being Λ an effective cosmological constant. On the other hand, bounds from local tests of gravity such as solar system and equivalence principle tests require that a viable $f(R)$ model shows a ‘‘chameleon-like’’ mechanism [44–46]. Lastly, the stability of a late-time de Sitter solution must be guaranteed. Consequently, the following condition has to be fulfilled

$$0 < \frac{Rf_{RR}}{f_R}(r) < 1 \text{ at } r = -\frac{Rf_R}{f} = -2 \quad (9)$$

Accounting for all these restrictions, the viable models can be expressed as follows,

$$f(R) = R - 2\Lambda y(R, b), \quad (10)$$

with $y(R, b)$ a function that quantifies the deviation from GR and b the distortion parameter that quantifies the effect of that deviation.

As a consequence of the restrictions described above, the behaviour of these $f(R)$ models tends asymptotically to the one of the Λ CDM at large redshifts ($z \geq 10^4$), when the curvature R also becomes large [28, 30, 43, 47]. However, the late time evolution of these theories differs from Λ CDM. Hence, if $\Omega_i^0 = \kappa \rho_i^0 / 3H_0^2$ is the current critical density, where H_0 and ρ_i^0 refer to the current values of the Hubble parameter and density ρ_i , these quantities (Ω_i^0 and H_0) defined in $f(R)$ models, will be different from the same quantities defined in the Λ CDM model. Still, all these quantities are related through the physical matter density [28],

$$\Omega_m^0 H_0^2 = \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} (H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}})^2 = \frac{\kappa}{3} \rho_m^0. \quad (11)$$

Besides, for the Λ CDM model it holds that

$$\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 1 \quad (12)$$

being $\Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = \Lambda/3 (H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}})^2$. It should be noted that the systems of differential equations that we use in this paper are written in terms of $\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ and $H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ while the results of the statistical analyses will be reported in terms of the corresponding parameters defined in $f(R)$ models. Eqs. (11) and (12) will be useful to establish the initial conditions of the Friedmann equations. For

this, the main assumption is that at high redshift the behaviour of $H(z)$ in the Λ CDM and $f(R)$ models is the same. Since the observational data used in this work are at redshifts $z < 8$, the radiation terms can be neglected.

In the next subsections we will present the $f(R)$ models analyzed in this paper and the system of equations that must be solved in each case. Also, it will be useful to write the expressions for $f(R)$ in the form of Eq. (10).

A. The exponential model

The exponential $f(R)$ model was proposed by Cognola et al [29] and further discussed in [30, 31, 48], among many others. In this model, the proposed $f(R)$ function can be expressed as:

$$f(R) = R - 2\Lambda(1 - e^{-\frac{R}{\Lambda b}}) \quad (13)$$

where b and Λ are the free parameters of the model. Besides, the Friedmann equations can be expressed in terms of other independent variables such as redshift as follows [30]:

$$\frac{dH}{dx} = \frac{R}{6H} - 2H \quad (14a)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dx} = \frac{1}{f_{RR}} \left(\frac{\kappa\rho}{3H^2} - f_R + \frac{Rf_R - f}{6H^2} \right) \quad (14b)$$

$$\frac{d\rho}{dx} = -3(\rho + P). \quad (14c)$$

Here $x = \log a = -\log(z + 1)$ is the number of e-folds, with $a(t_0) = 1$ at the present time t_0 . Using the following dimensionless change of variables,

$$E = \frac{H}{H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}, \quad \mathcal{R} = \frac{R}{2\Lambda}, \quad (15)$$

the field equations are expressed in terms of the parameters $\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, $\Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ y $H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$:

$$\frac{dE}{dx} = \Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{E} - 2E, \quad (16a)$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{R}}{dx} = \frac{2\Lambda}{f_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}}} \left[\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} \frac{a^{-3} + X^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} a^{-4}}{E^2} - \frac{f_{\mathcal{R}}}{2\Lambda} + \frac{\mathcal{R}f_{\mathcal{R}} - f}{6(H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}})^2 E^2} \right], \quad (16b)$$

where $X^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = \Omega_r^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} / \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. This system of equations is solved numerically by establishing appropriate initial conditions. As mentioned above, the main assumption for this is that the $f(R)$ models resemble the Λ CDM model at high z .

It has been already discussed that there are two situations for which the behaviour of the model tends asymptotically to the Λ CDM solution: i) high redshifts (large curvature) and ii) $b \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, to perform the numerical integration we can assume initial conditions that match the Λ CDM model at a redshift z_i

² Other requirements that are usually asked to ensure stability in scenarios with large curvatures are $\lim_{R \rightarrow 0} f(R) - R = 0$ and $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} f(R) - R = cte$.

($x_i = -\log(z_i + 1)$), i.e.

$$E^2(x_i) = \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} (e^{-3x_i} + X^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} e^{-4x_i}) + \Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} \quad (17a)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(x_i) = 2 + \frac{\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}{2\Omega_\Lambda^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}} e^{-3x_i} \quad (17b)$$

Moreover, to determine z_i , we also assume that $f(R(z_i)) \simeq R - 2\Lambda$ which can be expressed by the following condition [30]:

$$e^{-\frac{R(z_i)}{\Lambda b}} = \epsilon \ll 10^{-10} \quad (18)$$

In turn, this implies:

$$z_i = \left[\frac{\Omega_\Lambda b}{\Omega_m} \left(\ln \epsilon^{-1} - \frac{4}{b} \right) \right]^{1/3} - 1 \quad (19)$$

Thus, when $z > z_i$ we consider the solution of the exponential model as the Λ CDM one and when $z < z_i$ the prediction of the model is calculated from the numerical integration of equations (16a) and (16b).

B. Hu-Sawicki model

This model was developed by W. Hu and I. Sawicki in 2007 [28] and the proposed $f(R)$ function can be expressed as:

$$f(R) = R - \frac{c_1 R_{HS} (R/R_{HS})^n}{c_2 (R/R_{HS})^n + 1} \quad (20)$$

being c_1 , c_2 , R_{HS} and n the free parameters of the model. For this model, the numerical integration of $H(z)$ performed with the change of variables proposed in [30] is much more computationally expensive than the one accomplished with the proposal of de la Cruz-Dombriz et al [42]³. Consequently, we implement the latter such that,

$$x = \frac{\dot{R} f_{RR}}{H f_R} \quad (21a)$$

$$y = \frac{c^2 f}{6H^2 f_R} \quad (21b)$$

$$v = \frac{c^2 R}{6H^2} \quad (21c)$$

$$\Omega = \frac{8\pi G \rho_m}{3H^2 f_R} \quad (21d)$$

$$\Gamma = \frac{f_R}{R f_{RR}} \quad (21e)$$

$$r = R/R^*, \quad (21f)$$

where the constant R^* has the same units as the Ricci scalar R (in this case, $R^* = R_{HS}$). From this change of variables, the FLRW equations (6) and (7) become

$$\frac{dH}{dz} = \frac{H}{z+1} (2-v) \quad (22a)$$

$$\frac{dx}{dz} = \frac{1}{z+1} [-\Omega - 2v + x + 4y + xv + x^2] \quad (22b)$$

$$\frac{dy}{dz} = \frac{-1}{z+1} [vx\Gamma - xy + 4y - 2yv] \quad (22c)$$

$$\frac{dv}{dz} = \frac{-v}{z+1} (x\Gamma + 4 - 2v) \quad (22d)$$

$$\frac{d\Omega}{dz} = \frac{\Omega}{z+1} (-1 + 2v + x) \quad (22e)$$

$$\frac{dr}{dz} = -\frac{x\Gamma r}{z+1}. \quad (22f)$$

The latter system of equations is also solved numerically by defining the proper initial conditions.

On the other hand, it is possible to describe this $f(R)$ as proposed in Eq. (10),

$$f(R) = R - 2\Lambda \left[1 - \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{R}{\Lambda b}\right)^n} \right] \quad (23)$$

with $\Lambda = c_1 R_{HS} / 2c_2$ and $b = 2c_2^{1-1/n} / c_1$. It is easy to see that when $b \rightarrow 0$, the model reduces to a Λ CDM cosmology; $f(R) \rightarrow R - 2\Lambda$. In this work, we will restrict ourselves to analyze only the case when $n = 1$.

When b tends to zero, the numerical integration of equations (22) is particularly computationally expensive, becoming unstable for certain combinations of the parameters b and Ω_m^0 . This occurs because when the models $f(R)$ resemble Λ CDM, f_{RR} tends to zero.

To avoid this problem, Basilakos et al [49] proposed a method to obtain a series expansion of $H(z)$ around $b = 0$ (the Λ CDM model solution). In this way, there is no need to perform the numerical integration in those regions of the parameter space that require large computational times. This approach was also used in many works such as [34, 36, 37]. The general idea of this procedure is as follows; letting $N = -\log(1+z)$ be the number of efoldings at redshift z , then the Hubble parameter of the Λ CDM model can be written as,

$$H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2(N) = (H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}})^2 \left[\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} e^{-3N} + (1 - \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}) \right], \quad (24)$$

and an expansion around it will be given by,

$$H^2(N) = H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2(N) + \sum_{i=1}^M b^i \delta H_i^2(N), \quad (25)$$

where M is the number of terms that are used for the expansion. It has been studied that, for the Hu-Sawicki model with $n = 1$, the error in assuming expression (25)

³ Besides, the system of equations proposed in [42] is also not the most appropriate for the exponential model.

just keeping the first two nonzero terms of the expansion (instead of the numerical integration) is of order of 0.001% for all redshifts and $b \leq 0.5$ (for details see [49]). Unfortunately, this method cannot be applied to the exponential $f(R)$ model since it cannot be expanded in series around $b = 0$.

In a nutshell, for $b \leq 0.15$ we use Eq. (25) up to order 2 in b while for other values of b we solve equations (22) numerically. For this last case, as we did for the exponential model, the initial conditions of the system of Eqs. (22) are established so that the behaviour of the $f(R)$ model matches the one of the Λ CDM model.

$$x_0 = 0 \quad (26a)$$

$$y_0 = \frac{c^2(R_{\Lambda\text{CDM}} - 2\Lambda)}{6H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2} \quad (26b)$$

$$v_0 = \frac{c^2 R_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}{6H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2} \quad (26c)$$

$$\Omega_0 = 1 - v_0 + x_0 + y_0 \quad (26d)$$

$$r_0 = R_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}/R^*, \quad (26e)$$

In this paper the initial redshift is set at $z_i = 10$.

III. OBSERVATIONAL DATA

In this section, we present the data sets that we use to determine the values of the $f(R)$ parameters that best fit the different cosmological observations.

A. Cosmic Chronometers

The Cosmic Chronometer (CC) is a method developed by Simon et al. [50] that allows to determine the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ from the study of the differential age evolution of old elliptical passive-evolving⁴ galaxies that formed at the same time but are separated by a small redshift interval. The method relies on computing the Hubble factor $H(z)$ from the following expression

$$H(z) = \frac{-1}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt}, \quad (27)$$

where dz/dt can be calculated from the ratio $\Delta z/\Delta t$ and Δ refers to the difference between the two galaxies whose properties have been described above.

The galaxies chosen for this method were formed early in the universe, at high redshift ($z > 2 - 3$), with large mass ($\mathcal{M}_{\text{stars}} > 10^{11} \mathcal{M}_{\odot}$), and their stellar production has been inactive since then. Hence, by observing the same type of galaxies at late cosmic time, stellar age evolution can be used as a clock synchronized with cosmic

⁴ Passive-evolving means that there is no star formation or interaction with other galaxies.

z	$H(z)$ (km s ⁻¹ Mpc ⁻¹)	Reference
0.09	69 ± 12	[50]
0.17	83 ± 8	
0.27	77 ± 14	
0.4	95 ± 17	
0.9	117 ± 23	
1.3	168 ± 17	
1.43	177 ± 18	
1.53	140 ± 14	
1.75	202 ± 40	
0.48	97 ± 62	[51]
0.88	90 ± 40	
0.1791	75 ± 4	[52]
0.1993	75 ± 5	
0.3519	83 ± 14	
0.5929	104 ± 13	
0.6797	92 ± 8	
0.7812	105 ± 12	
0.8754	125 ± 17	
1.037	154 ± 20	
0.07	69 ± 19.6	
0.12	68.6 ± 26.2	
0.2	72.9 ± 29.6	
0.28	88.8 ± 36.6	
1.363	160 ± 33.6	[54]
1.965	186.5 ± 50.4	
0.3802	83 ± 13.5	[55]
0.4004	77 ± 10.2	
0.4247	87.1 ± 11.2	
0.4497	92.8 ± 12.9	
0.4783	80.9 ± 9	

TABLE I: $H(z)$ estimates from the Cosmic Chronometers. Each column stands for the redshift of the measurement, the $H(z)$ mean value (and its standard deviation) and reference, respectively.

time evolution. On the other hand, dz is determined by spectroscopic surveys with high precision. The goodness of this method lies in the fact that the measurement of relative ages dt eliminates the systematic effects present in the determination of absolute ages. Furthermore, dt is independent of the cosmological model since it only depends on atomic physics and not on the integrated distance along the line of sight (redshift).

For this work, we use the most precise available estimates of $H(z)$, which are summarized in Table I.

B. Supernovae Type Ia

Type Ia supernovae are one of the most luminous events in the universe, and are considered as standard candles due to the homogeneity of both its spectra and light curves. As we will explain below, the distance mod-

ulus μ can be determined from the SnIa data, and alternatively, it can also be described as,

$$\mu = 25 + 5 \log_{10}(d_L(z)), \quad (28)$$

being d_L the luminosity distance,

$$d_L(z) = (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}. \quad (29)$$

Since the previous expression shows how this last magnitude depends on both the redshift z and the cosmological model (via $H(z)$), it is possible to compare the distance modulus predicted by the theories with the estimates from observations.

In this case, we are considering 1,048 SnIa at redshifts between $0.01 < z < 2.3$ from the Pantheon compilation [56]. For this compilation, the observed distance modulus estimator is expressed as,

$$\mu = m_B - M + \alpha x_1 + \beta c + \Delta_M + \Delta_B, \quad (30)$$

with m_B being an overall flux normalization, x_1 the deviation from the average light-curve shape, and c the mean SnIa BV color⁵. Meanwhile, M refers to the absolute B-band magnitude of a fiducial SnIa with $x_1 = 0$ and $c = 0$, and Δ_B refers to a distance correction based on predicted biases from simulations. Coefficients α and β define the relations between luminosity and stretch and between luminosity and color, respectively.

On the other hand, Δ_M represent a distance correction based on the mass of the SnIa's host-galaxy. For this SnIa compilation, it is obtained from:

$$\Delta_M = \gamma \times [1 + e^{-(m-m_{\text{step}})/\tau}]^{-1} \quad (31)$$

where m_{step} is a mass step for the split; γ , a relative offset in luminosity; and m , the mass of the host-galaxy. Parameter τ symbolize an exponential transition term in a Fermi function that defines the relative probability of masses to be on one side or the other of the split. Both, m_{step} and τ are derived from different host galaxies samples (for details see [56]). Finally, coefficients α , β , M and γ are the so-called nuisance parameters of the SnIa.

These parameters are usually determined through a statistical analysis with supernovae data where a Λ CDM model is assumed. In particular Scolnic et al. obtain for the Pantheon sample [56] the following values $\alpha = 0.0154 \pm 0.006$, $\beta = 3.02 \pm 0.06$ and $\gamma = 0.053 \pm 0.009$. To verify these values, we have assumed the Hu-Sawicki model and performed a statistical analysis with the same

data set allowing both the nuisance and the model parameters to vary⁶. Our estimated nuisance parameters are consistent with those computed by the Pantheon compilation within 1σ . This agreement has been also obtained in a similar analysis carried out assuming another alternative theory of gravity [58], and in [56] where extensions of the Λ CDM models were assumed. All those mentioned analyses confirm that the value of the nuisance parameters are independent of the cosmological model. Therefore, in all statistical analyses reported in Section IV we fix the nuisance parameters to the values published by the Pantheon compilation.

C. Baryon Acoustic Oscillations

Before the recombination epoch, photons and electrons were coupled through Thomson scattering, generating sound waves in the primordial plasma. Once the temperature of the universe has dropped sufficiently as for neutral hydrogen to form, matter and radiation decouples, and the acoustic oscillations are frozen, leaving an imprint both in the Cosmic Microwave Background and in the distribution of matter at large scales. The maximum distance that the acoustic wave could travel in the plasma before decoupling defines a characteristic scale, named the sound horizon at the drag epoch r_d . Hence, Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) provide a standard ruler to measure cosmological distances. Several tracers of the underlying matter density field provide different probes to measure distances at different redshifts.

The BAO signal along the line of sight directly constrains the Hubble constant $H(z)$ at different redshifts. When measured in a redshift shell, it constrains the angular diameter distance $D_A(z)$,

$$D_A(z) = \frac{c}{(1+z)} \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}. \quad (32)$$

To separate $D_A(z)$ and $H(z)$, BAO should be measured in the anisotropic 2D correlation function, for which extremely large volumes are necessary. If this is not the case, a combination of both quantities can be measured as

$$D_V(z) = \left[(1+z)^2 D_A^2(z) \frac{cz}{H(z)} \right]^{1/3}. \quad (33)$$

Currently, there are many precise measurements of BAO obtained using different observational probes. In general, a fiducial cosmology is needed in order to measure the BAO scale from the clustering of galaxies, or any

⁵ Parameters m_B , x_1 and c are determined from a fit between a model of the spectral sequence SnIa and the photometric data (for details [56]).

⁶ Given the strong degeneracies between the parameters when only SnIa data are used, we have considered a fixed value for H_0 (we have analysed two cases: one with $H_0 = 67.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [8] and another one with $H_0 = 73.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [57].)

z_{eff}	Value	Observable	Reference
0.15	4.473 ± 0.159	D_V/r_d	[59]
0.44	11.548 ± 0.559	D_V/r_d	[60]
0.6	14.946 ± 0.680	D_V/r_d	
0.73	16.931 ± 0.579	D_V/r_d	
1.52	26.005 ± 0.995	D_V/r_d	[61]
0.81	10.75 ± 0.43	D_A/r_d	[62]
0.38	$10.272 \pm 0.135 \pm 0.074$	D_M/r_d	[63]
0.51	$13.378 \pm 0.156 \pm 0.095$	D_M/r_d	
0.61	$15.449 \pm 0.189 \pm 0.108$	D_M/r_d	
0.698	17.65 ± 0.3	D_M/r_d	[64]
1.48	30.21 ± 0.79	D_M/r_d	[65]
2.3	37.77 ± 2.13	D_M/r_d	[66]
2.4	36.6 ± 1.2	D_M/r_d	[67]
0.698	19.77 ± 0.47	D_H/r_d	[64]
1.48	13.23 ± 0.47	D_H/r_d	[65]
2.3	9.07 ± 0.31	D_H/r_d	[66]
2.4	8.94 ± 0.22	D_H/r_d	[67]
0.38	$12044.07 \pm 251.226 \pm 133.002$	Hr_d [km/s]	[63]
0.51	$13374.09 \pm 251.226 \pm 147.78$	Hr_d [km/s]	
0.61	$14378.994 \pm 266.004 \pm 162.558$	Hr_d [km/s]	

TABLE II: Distance constraints from BAO measurements of different observational probes. The table shows the redshift of the measurement, the mean value and standard deviation of the observable, the observable that is measured in each case and the corresponding reference.

other tracer of the matter density field. The distance constraints presented in Table II include information about r_d^{fid} , which is the sound horizon at the drag epoch computed for the fiducial cosmology.

Here we describe the observations used in this work. In Ross et al. [59], the main spectroscopic sample of SDSS-DR7 galaxies is used to compute the large-scale correlation function at $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.15$. The non-linearities at the BAO scale are alleviated using a reconstruction method. The first year data release of the Dark Energy Survey [62] measured the angular diameter distance D_A/r_d at $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.81$, from the projected two point correlation function of a sample of 1.3 million galaxies with photometric redshifts, in an area of 1336 deg^2 . The final galaxy clustering data release of the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey [63], provides measurements of the comoving angular diameter distance D_M/r_d (related with the physical angular diameter distance by $D_M(z) = (1+z)D_A(z)$) and Hubble parameter Hr_d from the BAO method after applying a reconstruction method,

for three partially overlapping redshift slices centred at effective redshifts 0.38, 0.51, and 0.61. Measurements of D_V/r_d at effective redshifts of 0.44, 0.6, and 0.73 are provided by the WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey [60]. With a sample of 147000 quasars from the extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey [61] distributed over 2044 square degrees with redshifts $0.8 < z < 2.2$, a measurement of D_V/r_d at $z_{\text{eff}} = 1.52$ is provided. The BAO can be also determined from the flux-transmission correlations in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ forests in the spectra of 157,783 quasars in the redshift range $2.1 < z < 3.5$ from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) data release 12 (DR12) [66]. Measurements of D_M/r_d and the Hubble distance D_H/r_d (defined as $D_H = c/H(z)$) at $z_{\text{eff}} = 2.33$ are provided. From the cross-correlation of quasars with the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ -forest flux transmission of the final data release of the SDSS-III [67], a measurement of D_M/r_d and D_H/r_d at $z_{\text{eff}} = 2.4$ can be obtained. From the anisotropic power spectrum of the final quasar sample of the SDSS-IV eBOSS survey [65], measurements for D_M/r_d and D_H/r_d at $z_{\text{eff}} = 1.48$ are obtained. The analysis in the configuration-space of the anisotropic clustering of the final sample of luminous red galaxies (LRGs) from SDSS-IV eBOSS survey [64] gives constraints on D_M/r_d and D_H/r_d at $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.698$.

D. Quasar X-ray and UV fluxes

Quasars are among the most luminous sources in the universe. Besides, they are observable at very high redshift and therefore they are regarded as promising cosmological probes. In the last years, the observed relation between the ultraviolet and X-ray emission in quasars has been used to develop a new method to convert quasars into "standardizable candles" [39, 68, 69]. In this work, we will use the recent compilation provided by Risaliti et al [39] of X-ray and UV flux measurements of 2,421 quasars (QSOs/AGNs) which span the redshift range $0.009 \leq z \leq 7.5413$ to test the cosmological models based in alternative theories of gravity described in section II. The relation between the quasar UV and X-ray luminosities can be described by the following equation:

$$\log L_X = \gamma \log L_{\text{UV}} + \beta_1 \quad (34)$$

where L_X and L_{UV} refer to the rest-frame monochromatic luminosities at 2 keV and 2500 Å respectively. The constants γ and β_1 are determined with observational data and should be independent of redshift in order to assure the robustness of the method [39, 68, 69]. It was pointed out in [39] that there is a strong correlation between the parameters involved in the quasar luminosity relation and cosmological distances and therefore in order to test cosmological models, luminosity distances obtained from quasar fluxes should be cross-calibrated previously using, for example, data from type Ia supernovae. In this work, we use the calibration method proposed by Li et al [40] which uses a Gaussian Process regression to reconstruct the expansion history of the universe from

the latest type Ia supernova observations⁷. Next, we will briefly describe how this method, which is almost model-independent, is implemented. Eq. (34) can be expressed in terms of the UV and X-ray fluxes as follows:

$$\log F_X = \gamma \log F_{UV} + 2(\gamma - 1) \log(d_L H_0) + \beta \quad (35)$$

where d_L refers to the luminosity distance and $\beta = \beta_1 + (\gamma - 1) \log 4\pi - 2(\gamma - 1) \log H_0$ ⁸. From Eq. (35), the quantity $\log F_X^{\text{SN}}$ can be defined and computed, using quasar measurements of F_{UV} , while the quantity $d_L H_0$ is obtained from a Gaussian Process regression method with the latest Sne Ia data [40]. Furthermore, the following likelihood is assumed:

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \left(\frac{\log(F_X(\gamma, \beta))_i^{\text{SN}} - \log(F_X)_i^{\text{QSO}}}{s_i^2} \right)^2 + \ln s_i^2 \quad (36)$$

where $s_i^2 = \sigma_{\log F_X}^2 + \gamma^2 \sigma_{\log F_{UV}}^2 + \delta^2$ and δ is an intrinsic dispersion that is introduced to alleviate the Eddington bias [39, 69]. In such way, considering the X ray fluxes from quasar data ($\log F_X^{\text{QSO}}$), Li et al [40] obtained γ, β and δ in a model-independent way. Their results are consistent within 1σ with the ones obtained in [39] using Eq. (35). Moreover, the independence of the $F_X - F_{UV}$ relation with redshift has been analyzed in previous works [39, 68, 69]. In such way, we will test the cosmological models defined in section II, using the following likelihood and assuming the values of γ and β obtained in [40] ($\gamma = 0.648 \pm 0.007$, $\beta = 7.730 \pm 0.244$)⁹:

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \frac{\left[\log(d_L H_0(\theta))_i^{\text{TH}} - \log(d_L H_0)_i^{\text{QSO}} \right]^2}{\sigma_{\log(d_L H_0)}^2} \quad (37)$$

where $\theta = (\Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, b)$, $\log(d_L H_0(\theta))^{\text{TH}}$ refers to the theoretical prediction of the luminosity distance, $\log(d_L H_0)_i^{\text{QSO}}$ is calculated from Eq. (35) and

⁷ Within the Gaussian Process, a theoretical model is assumed but it has been discussed in [40] that the results are independent from this choice.

⁸ It should be stressed that the parameter β defined here is different from the respective in Refs [39, 69].

⁹ It should be noted that the considered value of γ is in agreement with the one obtained in Ref. [41] (G. Bargiacchi private communication) where also the AGN, SnIa and BAO data sets are used and extensions of the ΛCDM cosmological models are considered. However, in the statistical analyses of Ref. [41] γ is free to vary together with the cosmological parameters. Regarding the parameter β , there is not fair comparison to be made since the parameter β in Ref [41] refers to the parameter β_1 in Eq. (34) and it is necessary to fix the value of H_0 to relate both parameters.

$$\sigma_{\log(d_L H_0)}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{F_X}^2 + \gamma^2 \sigma_{F_{UV}}^2 + \sigma_\beta^2}{[2(\gamma - 1)]^2} + \frac{(\beta + \log F_{UV} - \log F_X) \sigma_\gamma^2}{[2(\gamma - 1)]^2} \quad (38)$$

On the other hand, it has been argued recently, that some of the subsamples of the data set provided in [39] are not standardizable and have model and/or redshift dependence [70, 71]. First of all, the analysis used to reach such a conclusion does not include any previous cross-calibration with supernovae data. It should also be noted that the most important differences in the values of γ and β obtained in these works are for models with different geometries, i.e, flat and non-flat models. Moreover, the present work is restricted to flat $f(R)$ models. Furthermore, these analysis intend to constrain Ω_m and H_0 at the same time and it is well-known that this can not be done when using only data with information about the luminosity distances.

IV. RESULTS

In this section we present the results of our statistical analysis for both models; Hu-Sawicki with $n = 1$ (HS) and the exponential $f(R)$ (EM). As we have described in Section II the free parameters of these models are: the distortion parameter b , the mass density Ω_m , and the Hubble parameter H_0 . To do the statistical analysis, we use a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method and the observational data described in Section III. In cases where the SnIa observational data are used, M_{abs} is also set as a free parameter. The priors used in this work are $H_0 \in [60, 80]$, $\Omega_m \in [0.01, 0.4]$, $M_{abs} \in [-22, -18]$, and $b \in [0, 5]$ for EM while for HS $b \in [0, 2]$.

From Table III, where we also include the results for the ΛCDM model for comparison, and Figure 1, it can be seen that for both models, when we add the AGN or BAO data to the CC+SnIa analysis, the allowed parameter space is considerably reduced. Note that the BAO data set is much more restrictive than AGN. Nevertheless, the constraining power of AGN is clearly seen. Besides, the AGN data shift the fitted value of Ω_m to larger values (this fact has been already mentioned in [40] for the ΛCDM model), and the estimated H_0 to lower values. We notice that the shift on Ω_m (to larger values) and H_0 (to lower values) is much more pronounced for AGN than for BAO. We also remark that the correlation between Ω_m and H_0 changes sign when BAO data is used, independently of whether the AGN data is used or not. Regarding the relation between b and H_0 , we mention that BAO data constrain the parameter space in such a way that there is a negative correlation between them for the HS model, while this relation is not as clear for the exponential model. With regards to Ω_m , BAO also constrains the parameter space, and makes the correlation

between Ω_m and b to reduce considerably. We note that the allowed region of Ω_m is strongly reduced thanks to BAO data, for both models.

Lastly, for the exponential $f(R)$ model, we obtain larger intervals for the distortion parameter b in comparison with the ones from the Hu-Sawicki model. This effect is expected since it is necessary a bigger change on b (in EM) to notice a difference with the Λ CDM model predictions.

In all the analyses that we have been carrying out for the Hu-Sawicki model, the b values presented are consistent with 0 (Λ CDM prediction) within 1σ , except for the case where CC, SnIa and BAO data were used together, in which the concordance is given at 2σ . The rest of the estimated free parameters are in agreement with those obtained for Λ CDM model for all statistical analyses carried out in this paper. Furthermore, the parameter spaces obtained for the Hu-Sawicki and the exponential $f(R)$ models are compatible at 1σ in all the studied cases. On the other hand, for this last model (EM), the estimated b parameters are consistent at 2σ with the Λ CDM model ($b = 0$), except for the cases where the CC+SnIa+AGN and CC+SnIa data were used such that the consistency is within 1σ . Also, it follows from Fig. 1 that for the Hu-Sawicki model Ω_m and b show degeneracies when CC and SnIa are considered and also where the AGN data are added to the latter.

Finally, from all the statistical analyses that have been performed in this paper, it is noted that for the models studied here, the estimated H_0 parameters are consistent with the latest result reported by the Planck collaboration [8] within 1σ but not with the ones published by Riess et al ([57] and [9]).

V. DISCUSSION

Here we compare our results shown in the previous section with others that have already been published by other authors for the same $f(R)$ models using the same and/or similar data sets ([35, 37, 72] for HS, and [35, 38] for EM).

Our parameter estimates for the Hu-Sawicki model using CC+SnIa data are 1σ consistent with the ones published in [37] for the same data compilations. The b values reported in there are slightly smaller at 1σ and smaller at 2σ than ours. These differences are due to the fact that in that work, the authors only use the series expansion proposed by Basilakos et al [49] to obtain an expression for $H(z)^{10}$, while we use the combination of methods explained in Section II B. That series expansion only allows them to explore a small range of b values ($b < 1$) which does not deviate much from the Λ CDM prediction;

this does not happen in our analysis where the parameter space to be examined is much larger. Furthermore, in that article another statistical analysis is performed incorporating data from six systems of strongly lensed quasars analyzed by the HOLICOW Collaboration [72] to the data mentioned before (CC+SnIa). Comparing the results of this analysis with our own, it is noticed that i) the ranges of H_0 are in agreement within 2σ except for our study of CC + SnIa + BAO; ii) the Ω_m intervals are consistent at 1σ except for our CC + SnIa + AGN analysis, where they are consistent at 2σ ; and iii) all the b ranges are compatible at 1σ . Another interesting result to compare with is the one published by Farugia et al [35]. Although their results are in agreement with ours with 1σ , their estimated range of b values is very small (of the order 10^{-4}). They use the same data compilations as we do for CC and SnIa but our BAO data set is different, plus they add data from Redshift Space Distortions (RSD) and CMB. It should be noted that the CMB data used in [35] refers to the acoustic scale l_A , the shift parameter R and the current baryon density $\omega_b = \Omega_b h^2$. However, these observables are obtained through a statistical analysis where a Λ CDM model is assumed. Therefore, in our opinion, it is not correct to use these data to constrain alternative cosmological models.

On the other hand, the estimates we have obtained for the parameters of the exponential $f(R)$ model using CC and SnIa data are consistent at 1σ with the values of Ω_m and H_0 reported on [38] for the same data set. However, in that paper the b interval is not reported, but it is for an associate quantity $\beta = 2/b$. In order to compare it with our predictions, we tried to construct the posterior distribution for β based on our distribution for b . Since the results are located near $b = 0$, the distribution for β tends to infinity on the ranges of interest (as it is noticed in that article) so, it cannot be sampled correctly. These authors also perform statistical tests using data from H_{BAO} (a BAO data set different than ours) and CMB, which both further restrict the parameter space. Their estimates using CC+SnIa+ H_{BAO} are compatible with ours (for CC+SnIa+BAO data set) at 1σ , while their predictions using CC+SnIa+ H_{BAO} +CMB are consistent with ours (using CC+SnIa+BAO+AGN) within 1σ only for the b and H_0 intervals, since the CMB data greatly reduce the Ω_m interval. Finally, in article [35] a statistical analysis is also performed for the exponential model using the CC+SnIa+BAO₂+RSD+CMB data (BAO₂ is a BAO data set different than ours) whose results are consistent within 1σ with ours (using CC+SnIa+BAO+AGN) but their parameter intervals are narrower than ours. It should not be overlooked that the CMB data used in both papers [35] and [38], are biased as explained above.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have analyzed two $f(R)$ models (HS and EM) in a cosmological context. For this, we have

¹⁰ Private communication with R. C. Nunes.

		M_{abs}	Ω_m	b	H_0
ΛCDM	CC+SnIa	$-19.386^{+0.048(0.096)}_{-0.048(0.097)}$	$0.301^{+0.019(0.040)}_{-0.022(0.040)}$	–	$68.810^{+1.708(3.259)}_{-1.637(3.302)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN	$-19.407^{+0.050(0.095)}_{-0.050(0.104)}$	$0.327^{+0.018(0.035)}_{-0.018(0.035)}$	–	$67.809^{+1.674(3.187)}_{-1.631(3.343)}$
	CC+SnIa+BAO	$-19.396^{+0.024(0.050)}_{-0.025(0.048)}$	$0.297^{+0.010(0.021)}_{-0.011(0.020)}$	–	$68.558^{+0.690(1.364)}_{-0.706(1.421)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN+BAO	$-19.386^{+0.023(0.047)}_{-0.026(0.048)}$	$0.305^{+0.010(0.020)}_{-0.010(0.020)}$	–	$68.743^{+0.677(1.364)}_{-0.729(1.389)}$
HS	CC+SnIa	$-19.377^{+0.050(0.096)}_{-0.049(0.100)}$	$0.270^{+0.033(0.054)}_{-0.029(0.061)}$	$< 0.587(1.255)$	$68.899^{+1.802(3.313)}_{-1.603(3.406)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN	$-19.409^{+0.052(0.099)}_{-0.047(0.098)}$	$0.322^{+0.017(0.035)}_{-0.020(0.037)}$	$< 0.145(0.372)$	$67.620^{+1.702(3.230)}_{-1.578(3.304)}$
	CC+SnIa+BAO	$-19.435^{+0.036(0.067)}_{-0.033(0.067)}$	$0.293^{+0.011(0.022)}_{-0.012(0.022)}$	$0.299^{+0.083(0.394)}_{-0.275(0.299)}$	$66.976^{+1.337(2.215)}_{-1.102(2.404)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN+BAO	$-19.414^{+0.032(0.059)}_{-0.029(0.063)}$	$0.305^{+0.010(0.021)}_{-0.011(0.020)}$	$< 0.278(0.579)$	$67.550^{+1.148(2.042)}_{-1.004(2.140)}$
EXP	CC+SnIa	$-19.380^{+0.049(0.100)}_{-0.051(0.099)}$	$0.294^{+0.026(0.048)}_{-0.021(0.051)}$	$< 1.099(1.991)$	$68.861^{+1.637(3.417)}_{-1.767(3.356)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN	$-19.403^{+0.049(0.097)}_{-0.049(0.096)}$	$0.324^{+0.019(0.039)}_{-0.020(0.037)}$	$< 0.768(1.279)$	$67.876^{+1.538(3.138)}_{-1.698(3.229)}$
	CC+SnIa+BAO	$-19.407^{+0.030(0.054)}_{-0.026(0.057)}$	$0.298^{+0.011(0.021)}_{-0.011(0.021)}$	$0.934^{+0.338(1.001)}_{-0.877(0.934)}$	$67.946^{+1.156(1.839)}_{-0.787(2.079)}$
	CC+SnIa+AGN+BAO	$-19.393^{+0.028(0.052)}_{-0.025(0.053)}$	$0.305^{+0.010(0.021)}_{-0.011(0.020)}$	$0.786^{+0.468(0.738)}_{-0.524(0.786)}$	$68.345^{+0.905(1.634)}_{-0.783(1.730)}$

TABLE III: Results from statistical analysis using data from Cosmic Chronometers (CC), luminosity distances reported by *Pantheon* collaboration (SnIa), Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) UV and X-ray luminosities, and several data sets from cosmological distances of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO). For each parameter, we present the mean value, and the 68% (95%) confidence levels, or the upper limits obtained.

solved the corresponding Friedmann equations and we have performed statistical analyses considering recent data sets from SnIa, BAO, AGN and CC in order to constrain the free parameters of the models. The originality of this work lies in the use of AGN (not previously used for these particular theories) as standard candles to put bounds to the proposed models, and the inclusion of the latest BAO data from the eBOSS collaboration (2020). Furthermore, we have previously verified the consistency between the SnIa nuisance parameters published by the Pantheon collaboration assuming a Λ CDM cosmological model and those estimated from the $f(R)$ models studied here.

Our results show that, although AGNs narrow down the parameter space of cosmological models more than the SnIa and CC data, the Baryon Acoustic Oscillation data continue to be the most restrictive ones. On the other hand, all our estimates for the different combinations of data sets are in accordance within 2σ with the values reported by other authors for the same cosmological models but with different data sets. Moreover, we have found that the H_0 estimates are consistent with the value reported by Planck collaboration.

In summary, we have analysed the Hu-Sawicki and the exponential $f(R)$ predictions with different and new data sets. Moreover, although most of the b estimates are in agreement with the Λ CDM prediction at 1σ (except in cases where BAO data is included, in which case the compatibility is given within 2σ), the allowed region of the parameter space leads us to conclude that both HS and exponential $f(R)$ models are not yet ruled out by current data to explain the late time accelerated expansion of the universe.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank G.S. Sharov, R. Nunes, G. Bargiacchi, X. Li, S. Kandhai and L. Perivolaropoulos for their helpful comments.

The authors are supported by the National Agency for the Promotion of Science and Technology (ANPCYT) of Argentina grant PICT-2016-0081; CONICET grant PIP 11220200100729CO and grants G140, G157 and G175 from UNLP.

[1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, et al., *The Astronomical*

Journal **116**, 1009 (1998), URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/300499>.

[2] B. P. Schmidt, N. B. Suntzeff, M. M. Phillips, R. A.




FIG. 1: Cornerplots for the posterior distributions of the free parameters M_{abs} , Ω_m , b and H_0 , for the Hu-Sawicki model (left) and the Exponential model (right). The darker and brighter regions correspond to 1σ and 2σ confidence level, respectively.

- Schommer, A. Clocchiatti, R. P. Kirshner, P. Garnavich, P. Challis, B. Leibundgut, J. Spyromilio, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **507**, 46 (1998), astro-ph/9805200, URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/306308>.
- [3] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, et al., *The Astrophysical Journal* **517**, 565 (1999), URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/307221>.
- [4] S. Weinberg, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, 1 (1989), URL <https://doi.org/10.1103/revmodphys.61.1>.
- [5] R. Bousso, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **40**, 607 (2007), URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-007-0557-5>.
- [6] S. M. Carroll, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **4** (2001), URL <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2001-1>.
- [7] V. Sahni and A. Starobinsky, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **9**, 373 (2000), astro-ph/9904398.
- [8] Planck Collaboration, N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, et al., *Astron. & Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), 1807.06209.
- [9] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, and D. Scolnic, *The Astrophysical Journal* **876**, 85 (2019).
- [10] E. Mortsell, A. Goobar, J. Johansson, and S. Dhawan, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2105.11461 (2021), 2105.11461.
- [11] W. L. Freedman, *Astrophys. J.* **919**, 16 (2021), 2106.15656.
- [12] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, *Physics Reports* **513**, 1 (2012).
- [13] A. Joyce, L. Lombriser, and F. Schmidt, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **66**, 95 (2016), 1601.06133.
- [14] S. Tsujikawa, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **30**, 214003 (2013), 1304.1961.
- [15] B. Li, J. D. Barrow, and D. F. Mota, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 044027 (2007), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.76.044027>.
- [16] G. W. Horndeski, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **10**, 363 (1974).
- [17] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **126**, 511 (2011), 1105.5723.
- [18] A. D. Felice and S. Tsujikawa, **13** (2010), URL <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2010-3>.
- [19] A. Starobinsky, *Physics Letters B* **91**, 99 (1980), ISSN 0370-2693, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037026938090670X>.
- [20] K. Bamba, S. Nojiri, O. S. D., and D. Sáez-Gómez, *Physics Letters B* **730**, 136 (2014), ISSN 0370-2693, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370269314000677>.
- [21] G. Tino, L. Cacciapuoti, S. Capozziello, G. Lambiase, and F. Sorrentino, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **112**, 103772 (2020).
- [22] V. K. Oikonomou and N. Karagiannakis, *Astrophys. and Space Science* **354**, 583 (2014).
- [23] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 451 (2010), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.82.451>.
- [24] T. Faulkner, M. Tegmark, E. F. Bunn, and Y. Mao, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 063505 (2007), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.76.063505>.
- [25] S. Capozziello and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 107501 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.107501>.
- [26] J.-Q. Guo, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **23**, 1450036 (2014), URL <https://doi.org/10.1142/>

- s0218271814500369.
- [27] T. Chiba, T. L. Smith, and A. L. Erickcek, *Physical Review D* **75** (2007), URL <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.75.124014>.
- [28] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 064004 (2007).
- [29] G. Cognola, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, L. Sebastiani, and S. Zerbini, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 046009 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.046009>.
- [30] S. D. Odintsov, D. Sáez-Chillón Gómez, and G. S. Sharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 862 (2017).
- [31] Y. Chen, C.-Q. Geng, C.-C. Lee, L.-W. Luo, and Z.-H. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 044019 (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.044019>.
- [32] H. Desmond and P. G. Ferreira, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 104060 (2020).
- [33] A. P. Naik, E. Puchwein, A.-C. Davis, and C. Arnold, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **480**, 5211 (2018).
- [34] R. C. Nunes, S. Pan, E. N. Saridakis, and E. M. C. Abreu, *JCAP* **2017**, 005 (2017).
- [35] C. R. Farrugia, J. Sultana, and J. Mifsud, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2106.04657 (2021), 2106.04657.
- [36] R. D'Agostino and R. C. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 044041 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.044041>.
- [37] R. D'Agostino and R. C. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 103505 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.103505>.
- [38] S. D. Odintsov, D. Sáez-Chillón Gómez, and G. S. Sharov, *Nuclear Physics B* **966**, 115377 (2021), ISSN 0550-3213, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0550321321000742>.
- [39] E. Lusso, G. Risaliti, E. Nardini, G. Bargiacchi, M. Benetti, S. Bisogni, S. Capozziello, F. Civano, L. Eggleston, M. Elvis, et al., *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **642**, A150 (2020), 2008.08586.
- [40] X. Li, R. E. Keeley, A. Shafieloo, X. Zheng, S. Cao, M. Biesiada, and Z.-H. Zhu, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **507**, 919 (2021), ISSN 0035-8711, <https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/507/1/919/39805710/stab2154.pdf>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2154>.
- [41] G. Bargiacchi, M. Benetti, S. Capozziello, E. Lusso, G. Risaliti, and M. Signorini, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2111.02420 (2021), 2111.02420.
- [42] Á. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P. K. S. Dunsby, S. Kandhai, and D. Sáez-Gómez, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 084016 (2016), 1511.00102.
- [43] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **13**, 3 (2010).
- [44] P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A.-C. Davis, and D. J. Shaw, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 104021 (2008), 0806.3415.
- [45] L. Hui, A. Nicolis, and C. W. Stubbs, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 104002 (2009), 0905.2966.
- [46] C. Negrelli, L. Kraiselburd, S. J. Landau, and M. Salgado, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 064005 (2020), 2002.12073.
- [47] A. A. Starobinsky, *JETP Letters* **86**, 157 (2007).
- [48] E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 123528 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.123528>.
- [49] S. Basilakos, S. Nesseris, and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 123529 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.123529>.
- [50] J. Simon, L. Verde, and R. Jimenez, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123001 (2005), astro-ph/0412269.
- [51] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, and S. A. Stanford, *JCAP* **2**, 008 (2010), 0907.3149.
- [52] M. Moresco, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, L. Pozzetti, G. Zamorani, M. Bolzonella, J. Dunlop, F. Lamareille, M. Mignoli, H. Pearce, et al., *JCAP* **8**, 006 (2012), 1201.3609.
- [53] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, S. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, and Y.-C. Sun, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* **14**, 1221-1233 (2014), 1207.4541.
- [54] M. Moresco, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **450**, L16 (2015), 1503.01116.
- [55] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, *JCAP* **5**, 014 (2016), 1601.01701.
- [56] D. M. Scolnic, D. O. Jones, A. Rest, Y. C. Pan, R. Chornock, R. J. Foley, M. E. Huber, R. Kessler, G. Narayan, A. G. Riess, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), 1710.00845.
- [57] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. Macri, J. Anderson, J. W. MacKenty, J. B. Bowers, K. I. Clubb, A. V. Filippenko, D. O. Jones, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **855**, 136 (2018), 1801.01120.
- [58] C. Negrelli, L. Kraiselburd, S. Landau, and C. G. Scóccola, *JCAP* **2020**, 015 (2020), 2004.13648.
- [59] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **449**, 835–847 (2015), ISSN 0035-8711, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv154>.
- [60] E. A. Kazin, J. Koda, C. Blake, N. Padmanabhan, S. Brough, M. Colless, C. Contreras, W. Couch, S. Croom, D. J. Croton, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **441**, 3524–3542 (2014), ISSN 0035-8711, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu778>.
- [61] M. Ata, F. Baumgarten, J. Bautista, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. Brinkmann, J. R. Brownstein, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **473**, 4773–4794 (2017), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2630>.
- [62] T. M. C. Abbott, F. B. Abdalla, A. Alarcon, S. Allam, F. Andrade-Oliveira, J. Annis, S. Avila, M. Banerji, N. Banik, K. Bechtol, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **483**, 4866–4883 (2018), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty3351>.
- [63] S. Alam, M. Ata, S. Bailey, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. R. Brownstein, A. Burden, C.-H. Chuang, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **470**, 2617–2652 (2017), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx721>.
- [64] J. E. Bautista, R. Paviot, M. Vargas Magaña, S. de la Torre, S. Fromenteau, H. Gil-Marín, A. J. Ross, E. Burtin, K. S. Dawson, J. Hou, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **500**, 736–762 (2020), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa2800>.
- [65] R. Neveux, E. Burtin, A. de Mattia, A. Smith, A. J. Ross, J. Hou, J. Bautista, J. Brinkmann, C.-H. Chuang, K. S. Dawson, et al., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **499**, 210 (2020), 2007.08999.
- [66] J. E. Bautista, N. G. Busca, J. Guy, J. Rich,

- M. Blomqvist, H. du Mas des Bourboux, M. M. Pieri, A. Font-Ribera, S. Bailey, T. Delubac, et al., *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **603**, A12 (2017), ISSN 1432-0746, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201730533>.
- [67] H. du Mas des Bourboux, J.-M. Le Goff, M. Blomqvist, N. G. Busca, J. Guy, J. Rich, C. Yèche, J. E. Bautista, E. Burtin, K. S. Dawson, et al., *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **608**, A130 (2017), ISSN 1432-0746, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201731731>.
- [68] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Astrophys. J.* **815**, 33 (2015), 1505.07118.
- [69] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Nature Astronomy* **3**, 272 (2019), 1811.02590.
- [70] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **502**, 6140 (2021), 2012.09291.
- [71] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2107.07600 (2021), 2107.07600.
- [72] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C.-F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger, M. W. Auger, et al., *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **498**, 1420 (2019), ISSN 0035-8711.