

An exponential equation of state of dark energy in the light of 2018 CMB Planck data

Mónica N. Castillo-Santos^{1,*}, A. Hernández-Almada^{1,†}, Miguel A. García-Aspeitia^{2,‡} and Juan Magaña^{3§}

¹ *Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro,
Centro Universitario Cerro de las Campanas, 76010, Santiago de Querétaro, México*

² *Depto. de Física y Matemáticas, Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, Prolongación Paseo
de la Reforma 880, México D. F. 01219, México and*

³ *Escuela de Ingeniería, Universidad Central de Chile,
Avenida Francisco de Aguirre 0405, 171-0164 La Serena, Coquimbo, Chile*

The dynamics of the Universe is analyzed using an exponential function for the dark energy equation of state, known as Gong-Zhang parameterization. The phase space of the free parameters presented in the model is constrained using Cosmic Microwave Background radiation, Cosmic Chronometers, modulus distance from Hydrogen II Galaxies, Type Ia Supernovae and measurements from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, together with a stronger bound from a Joint analysis. The cosmological model is confronted with Λ CDM, observing there is a strong evidence for Λ CDM in the Joint analysis although the exponential model is preferred when the data are separated. Based on the Joint analysis, a value of $\omega_0 = -1.202^{+0.027}_{-0.026}$ is found for the characteristic parameter presented in the equation of state. Additionally, the cosmographic parameters at current times are reported, having $q_0 = -0.789^{+0.034}_{-0.036}$, $j_0 = 1.779^{+0.130}_{-0.119}$, and a transition deceleration-acceleration redshift $z_T = 0.644^{+0.011}_{-0.012}$. Furthermore, the age of the Universe is estimated as $t_U = 13.788^{+0.019}_{-0.019}$ Gyrs. Finally, under the $\mathbb{H}0(z)$ diagnostic, we discuss this model could alleviate the H_0 tension.

PACS numbers: Dark energy, equation of state, cosmology

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of the accelerated expansion of the Universe at current times through Ia Type Supernovae (SNIa) in 1998 [1, 2], its nature is one of the most elusive open question in cosmology. This phenomenon, associated to the called Dark Energy (DE), was later confirmed through the radiation coming from early times of the Universe, the well-known Cosmic Microwave Background radiation (CMB) [3]. There is no doubt the simplest way to model the DE is with a cosmological constant (Λ) introduced into Einstein field equations as a new field. By adding a matter component (baryons and Dark Matter (DM)) and a relativistic component (photons and neutrinos), has been constructed the standard cosmological model known as Λ -Cold Dark Matter (Λ CDM). Until now, this paradigm has been tested at different scales and data and it is successful to fit and be consistent with them. However Λ CDM is not free of problems, apart from the coincidence and fine-tuning problems [4–6] related to Λ , recent studies [7] indicate that the DE Equation of State (EoS) could be dynamical instead of a constant.

Furthermore, a recent problem in Cosmology is related to the Hubble constant (H_0) measurements. There is

a deviation about 4σ between the local measurements of H_0 using SNIa [8] corresponding at late times of the Universe and those performed using CMB radiation at early times [3]. This problem is also known as the H_0 tension in which Λ CDM does not give an answer. A review of cosmological models that could resolve the H_0 tension is presented in [9].

In general, the efforts to search for alternatives to understand the DE comes from two perspectives. One approach considers that the cosmic acceleration comes from a modified gravity theory such as $f(R)$ theories, Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity and extra dimensions [10]. Another considers there is an extra component (fluid or field) that drives the accelerated expansion of the Universe and some of them are Chaplygin gas [11, 12], viscous fluids [13, 14] and emergent fluids [15, 16], among others. In general, these dark energy fluids have an evolving EoS that can be parametrized as a function of redshift. A well-studied parametrization able to solve the Λ problems is a linear function of the scale factor (Chevallier-Polarski and Linder (CPL) parametrization [17, 18]), however it present divergences at the future [19]. Although some EoS parameterizations as function of the redshift or scale factor have been proposed, some of them present problems. For instance, an EoS represented by a linear function of the redshift [20, 21] diverges at high redshift (in the past) and is in disagreement with CMB [22] and Big Bang Nucleosynthesis constraints [23]. Although, there are proposals to solve these conflicts, most of them involve two or more parameters in the EoS [19, 24–34] that need to be determined by the observa-

* mncastillo99@gmail.com

† ahalmada@uaq.mx

‡ angel.garcia@ibero.mx

§ juan.magana@uccentral.cl

tions.

In this work we explore a parameterization proposed by Gong and Zhang (GZ) for DE EoS [35], which is formulated to avoid the divergences at the future or at the early stages of the Universe and, moreover, only add one extra parameter to the standard cosmology. In this sense, we confront the GZ cosmology with several cosmological datasets to establish strong bounds on this characteristic parameter, in both background and perturbation levels. We analyze the behavior of the deceleration and jerk parameters and compare with the standard paradigm. Furthermore, we analyze if this model could alleviate the H_0 tension through the $\mathbb{H}0(z)$ diagnostic.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Sec. II we present the mathematical formalism for the Gong-Zhang parameterization in where it is presented the background and perturbed cosmology. In Sec. III we show the data sets and constraints obtained through CMB, Cosmic Chronometers, Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, Hydrogen II Galaxies and SNIa observations. Sec. IV presents our constraints and finally in V we summarize our results and present a discussion about the model and its consequences. We henceforth use units in which $c = \hbar = k_B = 1$, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

II. GONG-ZHANG PARAMETERIZATION COSMOLOGY

A. Background cosmology

Under a flat Friedmann-Leamitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) spacetime, we consider a cosmological model composes by DM and baryon fluid with an EoS $\omega_m = 0$, a radiation fluid with $\omega_r = 1/3$, and a dynamical DE fluid whose EoS is parameterised [35], as

$$\omega_{GZ}(z) = \frac{w_0}{1+z} e^{z/(1+z)}, \quad (1)$$

where z is the redshift and w_0 is a free parameter which represents the ω_{GZ} value at $z = 0$. Notice that $w_{GZ} \rightarrow 0$ when $z \rightarrow \infty$ and when $z \rightarrow -1$. Notice that this model only adds one extra parameter over Λ CDM. Figure 1 displays the evolution of $\omega_{GZ}(z)$ for several values of ω_0 .

At the background level, the cosmological system can be expressed as

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_r + \rho_{de}), \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_m = -3H\rho_m, \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_r = -4H\rho_r, \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{de} = -3H(1 + \omega_{GZ})\rho_{de}, \quad (5)$$

where the dot symbol ($\dot{\cdot}$) represents derivative with respect to cosmic time, ρ_m, ρ_r and ρ_{de} refer to matter, radiation and dark energy densities respectively, $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter, a is the scale factor related with




FIG. 1. Evolution of the GZ EoS for several values of ω_0 , all of these EoS under the general relativity constraint of Universe acceleration $w_0 < -1/3$.

redshift through $a = (1+z)^{-1}$, $\kappa^2 \equiv 8\pi G$, and G is the Newton gravitational constant.

By integrating (3)-(5) and substituting into (2), the dimensionless Hubble parameter defined as $E(z) \equiv H(z)/H_0$ is given by

$$E^2(z) = \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + \Omega_{r0}(1+z)^4 + \Omega_{de}(z), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\Omega_{de}(z) = \Omega_{de0}(1+z)^3 \exp[3w_0(e^{\frac{z}{1+z}} - 1)], \quad (7)$$

and $\Omega_i = \kappa^2 \rho_{i0}/3H_0^2$ with $i = m, r$ and $\Omega_{de0} = 1 - \Omega_{m0} - \Omega_{r0}$. For radiation density parameter we use $\Omega_{r0} = 2.469 \times 10^{-5} h^{-2} (1 + 0.2271g_*)$, where $g_* = 3.04$ is the effective number of relativistic species [36]. Notice that the expression (6), satisfies the flatness condition $E(0) = 1$. Additionally, we can observe that DE component in (7) behaves as an effective DM density. In the future as $\Omega_{de} \sim \Omega_{de0} e^{-3\omega_0(1+z)^3}$, in the past as $\Omega_{de} \sim \Omega_{de0} e^{-3\omega_0(1-e)}(1+z)^3$, and at present as $\Omega_{de} \sim \Omega_{de0}$.

On the other hand, the deceleration parameter $q(z)$ is estimated as

$$q(z) = -1 + \frac{1}{E^2(z)} \left[\frac{3}{2} \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + 2\Omega_{r0}(1+z)^4 + \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + \omega_0 - \omega_0 \frac{z}{1+z} \right) \Omega_{de}(z) \right], \quad (8)$$

and the jerk parameter is obtained through the expression

$$j(z) = q(2q+1) + (1+z) \frac{dq}{dz}. \quad (9)$$

It is worth to mention that the jerk parameter for Λ CDM tends to $j(z) = 1$ when $z \rightarrow 0$.

B. Perturbed cosmology

Within the EoS parameterization (1), the DE is dynamical and it plays an important role in the perturbation analysis. In this sense, by perturbing the FLRW metric under the conformal Newtonian gauge as

$$ds^2 = a^2(\eta)[-(1 + 2\psi)d\eta^2 + (1 - 2\phi)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j], \quad (10)$$

where η is the conformal time, $\psi(\eta, \vec{r})$ and $\phi(\eta, \vec{r})$ are scalar potentials. Thus the perturbed equations for the DE density and velocity are [37–39]

$$\delta' = -(1 + \omega_{GZ})(\theta - 3\phi') - 3\mathcal{H}(c_s^2 - \omega_{GZ})\delta, \quad (11)$$

$$\theta' = -\mathcal{H}(1 - 3\omega_{GZ}) - \frac{\omega'_{GZ}}{1 + \omega_{GZ}}\theta + \frac{c_s^2}{1 + \omega_{GZ}}k^2\delta + k^2\psi, \quad (12)$$

respectively. In this notation, $\delta = \delta\rho/\rho = (\rho - \bar{\rho})/\bar{\rho}$ is the density contrast between the density field ρ and the spatial average density $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta = \nabla_i v^i$ is the velocity divergence and k^2 is the wave vector. The prime (') denotes the derivatives with respect to η , the conformal Hubble parameter is $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$ and the square sound speed is defined in the form $c_s^2 = \delta p/\delta\rho$.

III. DATASETS AND CONSTRAINTS

The parameter phase-space of the GZ model is given by $\Theta = \{h, \Omega_{b0}, \Omega_{m0}, \omega_0, \log(10^{10}A_s), n_s, \tau_{reio}\}$ where h is the dimensionless Hubble constant, A_s is the amplitude of the initial power spectrum, n_s is the scalar spectral index, τ_{reio} is the optical depth to re-ionization, $\Omega_{b0} = \kappa^2 \rho_{b0}/3H_0^2$ with ρ_{b0} is the current baryon density, and Ω_{m0} and ω_0 were defined in the previous section. The aim is to bound them using CMB, CC, BAO, HIIG and SNIa datasets and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) tools. Furthermore, a stronger bound on the phase-space is established by a joint analysis. Thus, a modified CLASS version [40] is used to implement the GZ parametrization and also a likelihood for HIIG sample is added to Montepython [41, 42] to perform the mentioned analysis. The convergence of the chains is verified through the Gelman-Rubin criterion.

Additionally, the configuration for the priors are Uniform distributions except for h which is a Gaussian distribution as shown in Table I. Hence the figure-of-merit for the joint analysis is built through the a Gaussian log-likelihood given as $-2\ln(\mathcal{L}_{\text{data}}) \propto \chi_{\text{data}}^2$ and

$$\chi_{\text{data}}^2 = \chi_{\text{CMB}}^2 + \chi_{\text{CC}}^2 + \chi_{\text{BAO}}^2 + \chi_{\text{HIIG}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SNIa}}^2, \quad (13)$$

where each terms refer to the χ^2 -function for every single dataset. Now, a description of all data is given in the rest of the section.

Parameter	Prior
h	Gauss(0.7324,0.0174) [43]
Ω_{b0}	[0.001, 0.15]
Ω_{m0}	[0, 1]
ω_0	[-2, 0]
$\log(10^{10}A_s)$	[1.7, 5.0]
n_s	[0.7, 1.3]
τ_{reio}	[0.004, 0.08]

TABLE I. Priors considered over free parameters at background and perturbative level.

A. Cosmic Microwave Background

The latest CMB anisotropy data is provided by Planck 2018 legacy dataset release [3]. We use likelihoods of the high- ℓ for Temperature power spectrum (TT mode) covering a multipole interval $30 \leq \ell < 2508$, and for high TE multipole and polarization spectra EE modes in the range $30 \leq \ell \leq 1996$. Additionally, we consider the low- ℓ TT-only likelihood which covers the multipole range $2 \leq \ell \leq 29$.

B. Cosmic Chronometers

Cosmic chronometers consist of 31 Hubble parameter measurements which are considered as cosmological model independent because are obtained using differential age tools [44]. Furthermore, due these points are considered uncorrelated the χ^2 -function can be written as

$$\chi_{\text{CC}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{31} \left(\frac{H_{th}(z_i, \Theta) - H_{obs}(z_i)}{\sigma_{obs}^i} \right)^2, \quad (14)$$

where the sum runs over the whole sample, and $H_{th} - H_{obs}$ is the difference between the theoretical and observational Hubble parameter at the redshift z_i and σ_{obs} is the uncertainty of H_{obs} .

C. Baryon Acoustic Oscillations

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations give an standard ruler evolving through the Universe since recombination epoch produced from the interactions between baryons and photons. As BAO is a powerful tool for constraining cosmological models, we use several measurements of the BAO data coming from different tracers as galaxies, $\text{Ly}\alpha \times \text{Ly}\alpha$ and $\text{Ly}\alpha \times \text{QSO}$. Table II summaries the BAO dataset used. BAO measurements in the transverse direction give an estimate of $D_M(z)/r_d$ and the BAO feature through

the line of sight gives $D_H(z)/r_d = c/H(z)r_d$. Here,

$$D_M(z) = c \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}, \quad (15)$$

is the comoving angular diameter for a flat cosmology at the redshift z , $r_d = r_s(z_d)$ is the size of the sound horizon at the drag epoch redshift z_d , and c is the speed of light. The datasets 6dFGS and SDSS DR7 report the measurement $D_V(z)r_d$ where the distance scale D_V is defined as

$$D_V(z) = [z D_H(z) D_M^2(z)]^{1/3}. \quad (16)$$

The redshift z_d is given by [45]

$$z_d = \frac{1291(\Omega_{m0}h^2)^{0.251}}{1 + 0.659(\Omega_{m0}h^2)^{0.828}} [1 + b_1(\Omega_{b0}h^2)^{b_2}], \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= 0.313(\Omega_{m0}h^2)^{-0.419} [1 + 0.607(\Omega_{m0}h^2)^{0.674}], \\ b_2 &= 0.238(\Omega_{m0}h^2)^{0.223}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus the χ^2 -function is built as

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\text{BAO}}^2 &= \chi_{\text{6dFGS}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SDSSDR7}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SDSSDR12}}^2 \\ &\quad + \chi_{\text{SDSSDR14}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Due the 6dFGS [46], SDSS DR7 [47], SDSS DR14 [48] datasets give uncorrelated points, each χ^2 corresponds to the square of the difference between the observable measurement and the theoretical estimate divided by the uncertainty of the measurement. SDSS DR12 [49] dataset reports correlated measurements of the D_M and H , thus the χ^2 function is built using the covariance matrix, as $\chi^2 = \vec{X}^T C_{DR12}^{-1} \vec{X}$.

D. Hydrogen II Galaxies

Hydrogen II galaxies are compact low mass galaxies which their luminosity is almost dominated by a young massive burst of star formation and are useful to constrain cosmological parameters [51] because there is a correlation between the measured luminosity, L , and the inferred velocity dispersion, σ , of the ionized gas. The largest sample reported by [52, 53] consists of a full sample of 181 HIIG measurements in the redshift range $0.01 < z < 2.6$. The χ^2 -function is written as

$$\chi_{\text{HIIG}}^2 = \sum_i^{181} \frac{[\mu_{th}(z_i, \Theta) - \mu_{obs}(z_i)]^2}{\epsilon_i^2}, \quad (21)$$

where μ_{obs} is the observational distance modulus given by

$$\mu_{obs} = 2.5(\alpha + \beta \log \sigma - \log f - 40.08), \quad (22)$$

where α and β correspond to the intercept and slope of the L - σ relation and f is the measured flux. The quantity ϵ_i is the uncertainty of μ_{obs} at z_i . It is worth to mention that [53] reports measurements and uncertainties of $\log \alpha$, $\log \beta$ and $\log f$, hence it is necessary to propagate such errors to estimate ϵ_i (for more details see [53]).

The theoretical counterpart is given as

$$\mu_{th}(z, \Theta) = 5 \log_{10} \left[\frac{d_L(z, \Theta)}{1 \text{ Mpc}} \right] + 25, \quad (23)$$

where d_L is the luminosity distance measured in Mpc expressed as

$$d_L(z, \Theta) = (1 + z)D_M(z), \quad (24)$$

being $D_M(z)$ defined by Eq. (15).

E. Type Ia Supernovae

The largest sample is the Pantheon sample [54] which contain 1048 luminosity modulus measurements coming from Supernovae Ia. With this sample a redshift region $0.01 < z < 2.3$ is covered. In this case the measurements are correlated which is appropriate to use a χ^2 -function as

$$\chi_{\text{SNIa}}^2 = \vec{X}^T C_P^{-1} \vec{X}, \quad (25)$$

where \vec{X} is the vector of residuals between the theoretical distance modulus and the observed one and the upper index T represents the transpose of the vector, C_P is the covariance matrix formed by adding the systematic and statistic uncertainties, $C_P = C_{P,sys} + C_{P,stat}$.

The theoretical distance modulus is estimated by

$$m_{th} = \mathcal{M} + 5 \log_{10} \left[\frac{d_L(z)}{10 \text{ pc}} \right], \quad (26)$$

where \mathcal{M} is a nuisance parameter and $d_L(z)$ is luminosity distance defined in Eq. (24).

IV. RESULTS

After confronting the cosmological model with CMB, CMB+CC, CMB+BAO, CMB+HIIG, CMB+SNIa data and CMB+CC+BAO+HIIG+SNIa (we will refer as Joint to this data combination), the main values of the parameter space are summarized in the Table III. Additionally, the 2D probability spaces at 68% (1σ) and 95% (2σ) and 1D posterior distributions are displayed in Figure 2. Furthermore, we also estimate the cosmological parameter σ_8 , defined as the r.m.s. density variation when smoothed with a tophat-filter of radius of $8h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ [55]. Regarding this parameter, we find consistent results as those found using ΛCDM . For the Joint analysis we find our results in agreement within 2σ with those values

BAO measurement Dataset	Tracer	Parameter	z_{eff}	Reference
6dFGS	6dFGS galaxies	$r_d/D_V(z_{\text{eff}})$	0.106	[46]
SDSS MGS	SDSS DR7 galaxies	$D_V(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d$	0.15	[47]
BOSS Gal	SDSS DR12 galaxies	$D_M(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d, D_H(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d$	0.38, 0.51, 0.61	[49]
eBOSS Ly α \times Ly α	SDSS DR14 Ly α \times Ly α	$D_M(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d, D_H(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d$	2.34	[48]
eBOSS Ly α \times QSO	SDSS DR14 Ly α \times QSO	$D_M(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d, D_H(z_{\text{eff}})/r_d$	2.35	[50]

TABLE II. BAO measurements used in the cosmological parameter estimation.

reported in [56] (using Planck 2015+CC+BAO+JLA), and is deviated 1.2σ from the values reported in [35] (using WMAP+SNIa+SDSS) for the GZ cosmology; in particular, our yield $\omega_0 = -1.202_{-0.026}^{+0.027}$ is within 1σ but about 50% less of uncertainty. Based on this ω_0 value, the DE behaves as phantom today and is deviated about 7.5σ of the quintessence behaviour instead of about 4σ reported in [56]. On the other hand, to compare statistically both GZ and Λ CDM models, we estimate their Bayesian evidences. In this test, a model M_1 is compared with respect to a model M_2 through the ratio of their posterior probabilities as

$$\frac{P(M_1|D)}{P(M_2|D)} = B_{12} \frac{P(M_1)}{P(M_2)}, \quad (27)$$

where the factor B_{12} is known as the Bayes' factor defined as the ratio of the evidence of the models, $B_{12} = P(D|M_1)/P(D|M_2)$. In the Jeffreys' scale [57], the strength of evidence is as follow. When $|\log B_{12}| < 1$ there is a weak or inconclusive evidence, it is definite or positive evidence for $1 \leq |\log B_{12}| < 3$, a strong evidence for $3 \leq |\log B_{12}| < 5$, and a very strong evidence or decisive for $|\log B_{12}| > 5$. Table IV shows the difference of the $\log B_{12} = \log B_{\text{GZ}} - \log B_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ when GZ model is confronted with Λ CDM for the different samples used by using the publicly package MCEvidence [58, 59]. A negative (positive) value of $\log B_{ij}$ indicates a preference of the data over Λ CDM (GZ cosmology). We find an inconclusive evidence for CMB+CC and CMB+HIIG, a strong evidence of GZ model for CMB, CMB+BAO and CMB+SNIa, and a strong evidence of Λ CDM for the Joint analysis.

Figure 3 displays the C_ℓ^{TT} CMB Temperature power spectrum for both GZ and Λ CDM cosmologies at the top panel and the relative error of GZ with respect to Λ CDM at the bottom panel. We find agreement between both models less than 5%. As it is expected, the largest contribution of cosmological models with variable EoS is at low ℓ as shown in the bottom panel [29].

Figure 4 shows the reconstruction of the Hubble (left panel), the deceleration (middle panel) and jerk (right panel) parameters for the GZ model as function of redshift. The blue shadow regions show the 3σ error for the joint constraints. For comparison, the Λ CDM prediction is also shown. Although the $H(z)$ reconstruction for GZ model is consistent with Λ CDM as shown

in Fig. 4, the cosmographic parameters present different behaviours. Firstly, an interesting feature is the slowing down of the cosmic acceleration observed in the $q(z)$ reconstruction at $z_{sd} \approx -0.3$ as shown in Fig. 4, where z_{sd} is the slowing down redshift, being the accelerated epoch only a transitory effect ($-0.7 \lesssim z \lesssim 0.7$), ending the evolution of the Universe similar as the matter dominated epoch. The slowing down of cosmic acceleration is also found in some dynamical dark energy models with parametric EoS [60, 61].

For instance, [30] found this phenomenon for five parametrization using different SNIa data sets. [31] found this trend in an extended analysis adding more cosmological data and one more parametrization. [62] investigated different cosmological parameters using Gaussian process with different cosmological data and found that there is no a strong support for the slowing down of the cosmic acceleration. Moreover, they provided a physical condition for the feature in any DE EoS parametrization. Nevertheless, the slowing down of cosmic acceleration at late times is not completely discarded as is shown in recent studies ([32, 63, 64]). As mentioned before, in the GZ the slowing down of cosmic acceleration is a transitory effect and the $q(z)$ behaviour could be oscillatory. On the other hand, the $j(z)$ presents also an oscillatory behaviour in the range $-1 < z \lesssim 1$ and goes to $j \rightarrow 1$ for $z \gg 1$ instead of a constant as jerk for Λ CDM.

Additionally, an estimated value of $q_0 = -0.789_{-0.036}^{+0.034}$ is found which is deviated more than 3σ from the Λ CDM value but the value of the deceleration-acceleration transition redshift of $z_T = 0.644_{-0.012}^{+0.011}$ obtained is consistent within 1σ from the Λ CDM value. Additionally, a current value of the jerk parameter of $j_0 = 1.779_{-0.119}^{+0.130}$ is reported and is deviated more than 5σ from the Λ CDM value. The values of q_0 and j_0 are also in agreement with the regions $-1.4 < q_0 < -0.3$ and $-0.1 < j_0 < 6.4$ reported in [65] and discussed by [66].

On the other hand, we estimate the age of the Universe as $13.743_{-0.030}^{+0.030}$ Gyrs (CMB), $13.747_{-0.027}^{+0.028}$ Gyrs (CMB+CC), $13.754_{-0.025}^{+0.025}$ Gyrs (CMB+HIIG), $13.767_{-0.023}^{+0.024}$ Gyrs (CMB+BAO), $13.834_{-0.023}^{+0.024}$ Gyrs (CMB+SNIa) $13.788_{-0.019}^{+0.019}$ Gyrs (Joint). These values are consistent within 1σ with the value reported by Planck [3]. Additionally they are in agreement within 2σ with the cosmological model-independent value of the age of the Universe and deviated from the age of the old-

Sample	χ^2_{\min}	h	Ω_{m0}	ω_0	$\log 10^{10} A_s$	n_s	τ_{reio}	σ_8
GZ cosmology								
CMB	2841	$0.742^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$	$0.262^{+0.012}_{-0.014}$	$-1.333^{+0.057}_{-0.054}$	$3.048^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.965^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.055^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.867^{+0.020}_{-0.020}$
CMB+CC	2856	$0.739^{+0.016}_{-0.016}$	$0.264^{+0.011}_{-0.013}$	$-1.324^{+0.054}_{-0.053}$	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.965^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.055^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.865^{+0.019}_{-0.019}$
CMB+BAO	2861	$0.725^{+0.011}_{-0.012}$	$0.274^{+0.008}_{-0.009}$	$-1.275^{+0.045}_{-0.042}$	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.966^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.056^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.848^{+0.017}_{-0.018}$
CMB+HIIG	3278	$0.733^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$	$0.268^{+0.009}_{-0.010}$	$-1.309^{+0.047}_{-0.044}$	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.965^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.055^{+0.008}_{-0.008}$	$0.860^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$
CMB+SNIa	3883	$0.690^{+0.009}_{-0.009}$	$0.303^{+0.009}_{-0.009}$	$-1.168^{+0.032}_{-0.031}$	$3.050^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.965^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.056^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.815^{+0.014}_{-0.014}$
JOINT	4367	$0.709^{+0.007}_{-0.007}$	$0.284^{+0.006}_{-0.006}$	$-1.202^{+0.027}_{-0.026}$	$3.051^{+0.015}_{-0.017}$	$0.968^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.058^{+0.007}_{-0.009}$	$0.821^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$
Λ CDM								
CMB	2849	$0.680^{+0.006}_{-0.006}$	$0.307^{+0.008}_{-0.008}$	—	$3.048^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.969^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.057^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.808^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$
CMB+CC	2864	$0.680^{+0.006}_{-0.006}$	$0.306^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	—	$3.048^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.969^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.057^{+0.007}_{-0.009}$	$0.808^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$
CMB+BAO	2860	$0.681^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.305^{+0.006}_{-0.006}$	—	$3.048^{+0.014}_{-0.016}$	$0.970^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.057^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$	$0.808^{+0.007}_{-0.007}$
CMB+HIIG	3289	$0.684^{+0.006}_{-0.005}$	$0.302^{+0.007}_{-0.007}$	—	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.971^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.058^{+0.007}_{-0.009}$	$0.806^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$
CMB+SNIa	3893	$0.688^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	$0.296^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	—	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.017}$	$0.973^{+0.003}_{-0.004}$	$0.059^{+0.008}_{-0.009}$	$0.803^{+0.007}_{-0.008}$
JOINT	4358	$0.688^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.296^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	—	$3.049^{+0.015}_{-0.017}$	$0.973^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.059^{+0.008}_{-0.009}$	$0.804^{+0.007}_{-0.007}$

TABLE III. First column is the data sample, second column is the minimum value of the χ^2 , and the rest of the columns are the bestfit values of the free parameters and their 1σ CL uncertainties for both GZ and Λ CDM cosmologies.




FIG. 2. 2D contours at 1σ (inner region) and 2σ (outermost region) CL for the GZ cosmology.

est globular clusters ($t_{GC} = 13.32 \pm 0.1(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.5(\text{sys.})$) in 3σ [67].

Figure 5 shows the reconstruction of the $\mathbb{H}0(z)$ diagnostic [68] for the GZ cosmology and its error band at 1σ CL. Horizontal square points represents the CMB Planck value of H_0 for Λ CDM [3] and horizontal band is its un-

certainty at 1σ . It is interesting to observe that in the past (high redshift), $\mathbb{H}0(z)$ goes to Planck value and it presents a trend to go to our prior value of H_0 obtained by SH0ES collaboration [8] at late times. This result is supported by the Bayesian evidence for CMB data in which the GZ model presents a strong evidence when a

Sample	$\log B_{12}$
CMB	18.99
CMB+CC	-0.29
CMB+BAO	7.95
CMB+HIIG	-1.69
CMB+SNIa	6.20
JOINT	-10.15

TABLE IV. Bayes factor difference, $\log B_{12} = \log B_{\text{GZ}} - \log B_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$.




FIG. 3. C_l^{TT} CMB Temperature reconstruction for both GZ and ΛCDM cosmologies at top panel. Relative difference between both models, $\varepsilon = C_l^{TT}(\text{GZ})/C_l^{TT}(\Lambda\text{CDM}) - 1$, at bottom panel.

value of $h = 0.742_{-0.017}^{+0.017}$ is obtained for CMB.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

We analyzed a model of the Universe which include a DE component characterized with an exponential EoS added to DM, baryons and radiation, namely GZ cosmology.

This model was confronted with several cosmological datasets as CMB, CC, BAO, HIIG and SNIa, and also a joint analysis. Our results are consistent within 2σ with those reported in [35, 56]. Furthermore, the Bayes factor is estimated to compare statistically both GZ model and ΛCDM and shows that the latter was preferred by the Joint analysis but GZ cosmology is preferred when the data is separated. Based on the Joint constraint results, we reconstruct the deceleration and jerk parameters as shown in Fig. 4 and we obtain current values $q_0 = -0.789_{-0.036}^{+0.034}$ and $j_0 = 1.779_{-0.119}^{+0.130}$ respectively. Although both quantities are deviated more than 3σ from the ΛCDM values, the deceleration acceleration transition redshift is in agreement within 1σ . Additionally, the cosmographic parameters $q(z)$ and $j(z)$ for GZ model present oscillations as shown in Fig. 4 as happens in other models with parametric EoS presented in the literature [30]. In contrast to these models, GZ cosmology presents only an accelerated phase around $-0.7 \lesssim z \lesssim 0.7$, going to a state similar to matter dominated era as $z \rightarrow -1$.

On the other hand, we report the age of the Universe as $t_U = 13.788_{-0.019}^{+0.019}$ Gyrs which is consistent with the standard cosmology within 2σ and is 3σ greater than the age of the oldest globular clusters [67]. Finally based on the $H_0(z)$ diagnostic results and Bayesian statistical test for CMB data, we find GZ cosmology is an interesting candidate to alleviate the H_0 tension between early and late time estimation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A.H.A. thank to the support from Luis Aguilar, Alejandro de León, Carlos Flores, and Jair García of the Laboratorio Nacional de Visualización Científica Avanzada. M.A.G.-A. acknowledges support from cátedra Marcos Moshinsky (MM), Universidad Iberoamericana for support with the SNI grant and the numerical analysis was also carried out by *Numerical Integration for Cosmological Theory and Experiments in High-energy Astrophysics* (Nicté Ha) cluster at IBERO University, acquired through cátedra MM support. J.M. acknowledges the support from ANID REDES 190147.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, *et al.*, The Astronomical Journal **116**, 1009 (1998).
 - [2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, others, and T. S. C. Project, The Astrophysical Journal **517**, 565 (1999).
 - [3] N. Aghanim and et. al., A&A **641**, A6 (2020).
 - [4] S. M. Carroll, Living Rev. Rel. **4**, 1 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0004075 [astro-ph].
 - [5] Y. B. Zeldovich, Soviet Physics Uspekhi **11** (1968).
 - [6] S. Weinberg, Reviews of Modern Physics **61** (1989).
 - [7] G.-B. Zhao *et al.*, Nature Astron. **1**, 627 (2017), arXiv:1701.08165 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [8] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, and D. Scolnic, Astrophys. J. **876**, 85 (2019), arXiv:1903.07603 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [9] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, Class. Quant. Grav. **38**, 153001 (2021), arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [10] M. A. Garcia-Aspeitia, A. Hernandez-Almada, J. Magaña, M. H. Amante, V. Motta, and C. Martínez-Robles, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 101301 (2018), arXiv:1804.05085 [gr-qc].




FIG. 4. Left to right: reconstruction of the $H(z)$, $q(z)$ and $j(z)$ in GZ cosmology and Λ CDM for each dataset. The bands correspond to 3σ uncertainty for GZ model.




FIG. 5. $H_0(z)$ diagnostic for GZ cosmology in terms of the redshift z .

- [11] S. A. Chaplygin, *Sci. Mem. Moscow Univ. Math. Phys.* **21** (1904).
- [12] A. Hernández-Almada, J. Magana, M. A. García-Aspeitia, and V. Motta, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 12 (2019), arXiv:1805.07895 [astro-ph.CO].
- [13] A. Hernández-Almada, M. A. García-Aspeitia, J. Magaña, and V. Motta, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063516 (2020).
- [14] L. Herrera-Zamorano, A. Hernández-Almada, and M. García-Aspeitia, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 637 (2020), arXiv:2007.04507.
- [15] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, *The Astrophysical Journal* **883**, L3 (2019).
- [16] A. Hernández-Almada, G. Leon, J. Magaña, M. A. García-Aspeitia, and V. Motta, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 1590 (2020), arXiv:2002.12881 [astro-ph.CO].
- [17] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **10**, 213 (2001).
- [18] E. V. Linder, *Physical Review Letters* **90** (2003), 10.1103/physrevlett.90.091301.
- [19] J.-Z. Ma and X. Zhang, *Physics Letters B* **699**, 233 (2011).
- [20] D. Huterer and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123527 (2001).
- [21] J. Weller and A. Albrecht, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 103512 (2002).
- [22] R. R. Caldwell and M. Doran, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103517 (2004).
- [23] V. B. Johri, *Pramana - J Phys* **59**, L553 (2002).
- [24] A. Upadhye, M. Ishak, and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 063501 (2005).
- [25] H. K. Jassal, J. S. Bagla, and T. Padmanabhan, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* **356**, L11 (2005), <https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/356/1/L11/6278031/356-1-L11.pdf>.
- [26] D.-J. Liu, X.-Z. Li, J. Hao, and X.-H. Jin, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **388**, 275 (2008), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.13380.x>.
- [27] E. Barboza and J. Alcaniz, *Physics Letters B* **666**, 415 (2008).
- [28] H. Li and X. Zhang, *Physics Letters B* **703**, 119 (2011).
- [29] C.-J. Feng, X.-Y. Shen, P. Li, and X.-Z. Li, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2012**, 023 (2012).
- [30] J. Magaña, V. H. Cárdenas, and V. Motta, *JCAP* **10**, 017 (2014), arXiv:1407.1632 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] Y. Hu, M. Li, N. Li, and S. Wang, *Astrophys. J.* **821**, 60 (2016), arXiv:1509.03461 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] J. Roman-Garza, T. Verdugo, J. Magana, and V. Motta, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 890 (2019), arXiv:1806.03538 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] J. K. Singh and R. Nagpal, *Eur. Phys. J. C Part. Fields* **80** (2020).
- [34] D. Perković and H. Štefančić, *Eur. Phys. J. C Part. Fields* **80** (2020).
- [35] Y. Gong and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043518 (2005).
- [36] E. Komatsu, K. M. Smith, J. Dunkley, C. L. Bennett, B. Gold, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, D. Larson, M. R. Nolte, L. Page, D. N. Spergel, M. Halpern, R. S. Hill, A. Kogut, M. Limon, S. S. Meyer, N. Odegard, G. S. Tucker, J. L. Weiland, E. Wollack, and E. L. Wright, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **192**, 18 (2011).
- [37] J. M. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1882 (1980).
- [38] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **78**, 1 (1984), <https://academic.oup.com/ptps/article-pdf/doi/10.1143/PTPS.78.1/5321391/78-1.pdf>.
- [39] C.-P. Ma and E. Bertschinger, *The Astrophysical Journal* **455**, 7 (1995).
- [40] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and T. Tram, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2011**, 034 (2011).
- [41] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, (2018),

- arXiv:1804.07261 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, and S. Prunet, *JCAP* **1302**, 001 (2013), arXiv:1210.7183 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] A. G. Riess, L. M. Macri, S. L. Hoffmann, D. Scolnic, S. Casertano, A. V. Filippenko, B. E. Tucker, M. J. Reid, D. O. Jones, J. M. Silverman, R. Chornock, P. Challis, W. Yuan, P. J. Brown, and R. J. Foley, *The Astrophysical Journal* **826**, 56 (2016).
- [44] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, *JCAP* **1605**, 014 (2016), arXiv:1601.01701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] D. J. Eisenstein and W. Hu, *The Astrophysical Journal* **496**, 605 (1998).
- [46] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **416**, 3017 (2011).
- [47] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **449**, 835 (2015).
- [48] V. de Sainte Agathe, C. Balland, H. du Mas des Bourboux, N. G. Busca, M. Blomqvist, J. Guy, J. Rich, A. Font-Ribera, M. M. Pieri, J. E. Bautista, K. Dawson, J.-M. L. Goff, A. de la Macorra, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, W. J. Percival, I. Pérez-Ràfols, D. P. Schneider, A. Slosar, and C. Yèche, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **629**, A85 (2019).
- [49] S. Alam, M. Ata, S. Bailey, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. R. Brownstein, A. Burden, C.-H. Chuang, J. Comparat, A. J. Cuesta, K. S. Dawson, D. J. Eisenstein, S. Escoffier, H. Gil-Marín, J. N. Grieb, N. Hand, S. Ho, K. Kinemuchi, D. Kirkby, F. Kitaura, E. Malanushenko, V. Malanushenko, C. Maraston, C. K. McBride, R. C. Nichol, M. D. Olmstead, D. Oravetz, N. Padmanabhan, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, K. Pan, M. Pellejero-Ibanez, W. J. Percival, P. Petitjean, F. Prada, A. M. Price-Whelan, B. A. Reid, S. A. Rodríguez-Torres, N. A. Roe, A. J. Ross, N. P. Ross, G. Rossi, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, S. Saito, S. Salazar-Albornoz, L. Samushia, A. G. Sánchez, S. Satpathy, D. J. Schlegel, D. P. Schneider, C. G. Scóccola, H.-J. Seo, E. S. Sheldon, A. Simmons, A. Slosar, M. A. Strauss, M. E. C. Swanson, D. Thomas, J. L. Tinker, R. Tojeiro, M. V. Magaña, J. A. Vazquez, L. Verde, D. A. Wake, Y. Wang, D. H. Weinberg, M. White, W. M. Wood-Vasey, C. Yèche, I. Zehavi, Z. Zhai, and G.-B. Zhao, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **470**, 2617 (2017).
- [50] M. Blomqvist, H. du Mas des Bourboux, N. G. Busca, V. de Sainte Agathe, J. Rich, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, K. Dawson, A. Font-Ribera, J. Guy, J.-M. L. Goff, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, W. J. Percival, I. Pérez-Ràfols, M. M. Pieri, D. P. Schneider, A. Slosar, and C. Yèche, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **629**, A86 (2019).
- [51] R. Chávez, R. Terlevich, E. Terlevich, F. Bresolin, J. Melnick, M. Plionis, and S. Basilakos, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **442**, 3565 (2014), arXiv:1405.4010 [astro-ph.GA].
- [52] A. L. González-Morán, R. Chávez, R. Terlevich, E. Terlevich, F. Bresolin, D. Fernández-Arenas, M. Plionis, S. Basilakos, J. Melnick, and E. Telles, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **487**, 4669 (2019), arXiv:1906.02195 [astro-ph.GA].
- [53] A. L. González-Morán, R. Chávez, E. Terlevich, R. Terlevich, D. Fernández-Arenas, F. Bresolin, M. Plionis, J. Melnick, S. Basilakos, and E. Telles, *MNRAS* **505**, 1441 (2021), arXiv:2105.04025 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] D. M. Scolnic *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), arXiv:1710.00845 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] J. A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- [56] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 043543 (2019).
- [57] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90**, 773 (1995).
- [58] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, E. Sellentin, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon, and A. Mootoovaloo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 101301 (2017).
- [59] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, A. Mootoovaloo, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon, and E. Sellentin, “Marginal likelihoods from monte carlo markov chains,” (2017).
- [60] V. H. Cardenas and M. Rivera, *Phys. Lett. B* **710**, 251 (2012), arXiv:1203.0984 [astro-ph.CO].
- [61] V. H. Cardenas, C. Bernal, and A. Bonilla, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **433**, 3534 (2013), arXiv:1306.0779 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] M.-J. Zhang and J.-Q. Xia, *Nucl. Phys. B* **929**, 438 (2018), arXiv:1701.04973 [astro-ph.CO].
- [63] J. Magana, V. Motta, V. H. Cardenas, and G. Foex, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **469**, 47 (2017), arXiv:1703.08521 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] Y. L. Bolotin, V. A. Cherkaskiy, M. I. Konchatnyi, S. Pan, and W. Yang, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31**, 2250036 (2022), arXiv:2008.09602 [gr-qc].
- [65] A. G. Riess, L.-G. Strolger, J. Tonry, S. Casertano, H. C. Ferguson, B. Mobasher, P. Challis, A. V. Filippenko, S. Jha, W. Li, R. Chornock, R. P. Kirshner, B. Leibundgut, M. Dickinson, M. Livio, M. Giavalisco, C. C. Steidel, T. Benitez, and Z. Tsvetanov, *The Astrophysical Journal* **607**, 665 (2004).
- [66] M. Visser, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **21**, 2603 (2004).
- [67] D. Valcin, J. L. Bernal, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, and B. D. Wandelt, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2020**, 002 (2020).
- [68] C. Krishnan, E. Ó Colgáin, M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), 10.1103/physrevd.103.103509.