

# The Pantheon Sample analysis of cosmological constraints under new models

Peifeng Peng

L3 Computing Project, Lab Group: C2, Lab Day: Thursday

Submitted: March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Supervisor: Dr. Nigel Metcalfe

In this project, the cosmological parameters are determined by applying six cosmological models to fit the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample consisting of 1048 Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) in the range of  $0.01 < z < 2.26$ . Apart from the well-known flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model as well as other models that have been broadly studied, this project includes two new models, which are the  $ow$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, to fully evaluate the correlations between the cosmological parameters by performing the MCMC algorithm and to explore the geometry and mass content of the Universe. Combining the measurements of the baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) and the cosmic microwave background (CMB) with the SNe Ia constraints, the matter density parameter  $\Omega_M = 0.328^{+0.018}_{-0.026}$ , the curvature of space parameter  $\Omega_k = 0.0045^{+0.0666}_{-0.0741}$ , and the dark energy equation of state parameter  $w = -1.120^{+0.143}_{-0.185}$  are measured for the  $ow$ CDM model. When it comes to the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, if the parameter  $w$  is allowed to evolve with the redshift as  $w = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$ , the cosmological parameters are found to be  $\Omega_M = 0.344^{+0.018}_{-0.027}$ ,  $\Omega_k = 0.0027^{+0.0665}_{-0.0716}$ ,  $w_0 = -0.739^{+0.336}_{-0.378}$ , and  $w_a = -0.812^{+0.750}_{-0.678}$ . The parameters of the  $ow$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model are consistent with the literature results, although the parameter  $w$  is not well constrained in both models. The large uncertainties of the parameter  $w$  can be reduced by running more steps for the MCMC algorithm to better constrain the parameters and estimate their uncertainties. All cosmological models applied are reasonable to fit the Pantheon Sample, except for the less reasonable flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model when fitting high-redshift SNe Ia data.

## 1. Introduction

Since Edwin Hubble discovered the first observational evidence of the expanding Universe and derived his renowned Hubble's Law (Hubble 1929), our understanding of the Universe has been completely reshaped. Hubble's Law formed the basis of modern observational cosmology, which supported the Big Bang model for the origin of our Universe and led to the research of large-scale structures, distant galaxy clusters, and supernovae (Bahcall 2015). Among all these candidates, Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) arouse the interest of cosmologists the most because they share consistent peak luminosity, meaning that they can be used as standard candles to accurately measure their distances to us and hence determine the cosmological constraints (Baade 1938; Riess et al. 1998).

The Supernova Cosmology Project was started about 35 years ago, with the first significant work observed and collected 60 SNe Ia data at that time to study their magnitude-redshift relation (Perlmutter et al. 1999). From the deviation of linearity for the high-redshift SNe Ia data in the Hubble diagram, the cosmologists surprisingly found that the expansion rate of our Universe was currently accelerating due to the existence of dark energy which accounted for  $\sim 70\%$  of the total energy in the Universe (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999; Jones et al. 2018). Under a flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the cosmological parameters were determined as  $\Omega_M = 0.28$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.72$ .

In recent years, as more SNe Ia were measured by the Pan-STARRS1 (PS1) Medium Deep Survey (Rest et al. 2014), the reasonability of the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model to fit the latest SNe Ia data needs to be reviewed. Nowadays, modern cosmological probes have suggested that the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model cannot fully describe our Universe (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016). Under the assumption of other cosmological models, this project aims at reanalyzing and better constraining the cosmological parameters to fit the magnitude-redshift relation of SNe Ia data more reasonably.

The supernovae dataset used in this project is based on the Pantheon Sample (Scolnic et al. 2018), which is a full set of 1048 SNe Ia data in the range of  $0.01 < z < 2.26$  combined from different surveys, including PS1 (Rest et al. 2014), the Supernova Legacy Survey (SNLS, Conley et al. 2011), the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS, Kessler et al. 2009), and the Hubble Space Telescope Survey (HST, Riess et al. 2007). The SNe Ia data of the Pantheon Sample have all been calibrated and standardized (Scolnic et al. 2018) with the systematic uncertainties evaluated, such as the photometric calibration, the Milky Way extinction, the mass estimates for the host galaxies of SNe Ia, etc. The full list of 1048 corrected SNe Ia table can be viewed at DOI: 10.17909/T95Q4X.

In this project, the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model is first applied in Section 3 of this paper to fit the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample, which will prove less reasonable for the high-redshift SNe Ia data in Fig. 2. Hence, other cosmological models, including two new models called the  $ow$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, will all be applied in Section 3 to better fit the Pantheon Sample by performing the MCMC algorithm so that the correlations between the cosmological parameters can be fully analyzed with their uncertainties estimated. More details about the derivation and physical interpretation of the cosmological models and the MCMC algorithm are explained in Section 2 of this paper, and the results of the cosmological parameters under different cosmological models are shown in Table 1. The  $ow_0w_a$ CDM fitting model and its MCMC corner plot are illustrated in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, while the  $ow$ CDM fitting model and its MCMC corner plot are illustrated in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 in Appendix A. Finally, there will be a short conclusion given in Section 4 of this paper.

## 2. Methods

Firstly, the Friedmann equation is expressed below, which governs the evolution of a homogeneous isotropic Universe under general relativity by relating the expansion rate to the

energy density (Friedmann 1999; Nemiroff & Patla 2008):

$$H^2 = \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3c^2}(\rho_{\text{mass}}c^2 + \rho_{\text{DE}}c^2) - \frac{kc^2}{a^2}, \quad (1)$$

Where  $H$  is the Hubble parameter,  $a$  is the scale factor,  $G$  is the gravitational constant,  $c$  is the speed of light,  $\rho_{\text{mass}}c^2$  is the energy density of matter,  $\rho_{\text{DE}}c^2$  is the energy density of dark energy, and  $k$  is the curvature of space. Due to the conservation law of matter in the Universe, the density of matter follows as  $\rho_{\text{mass}} = \rho_0 a^{-3}$ , where  $\rho_0$  is the present-day density of matter. Meanwhile, the density of dark energy can be derived by  $\rho_{\text{DE}} = \rho_{\Lambda,0} a^{-3(1+w)}$ , where  $\rho_{\Lambda,0}$  is the present-day density of dark energy,  $w = P_{\text{DE}}/\rho_{\text{DE}}c^2$  is the dark energy equation of state parameter defined from the fluid equation by assuming our Universe as an expanding fluid. Thus, let  $\Omega_{M,0} = 8\pi G\rho_0/3H_0^2$  and  $\Omega_{\Lambda,0} = 8\pi G\rho_{\Lambda,0}/3H_0^2$ , the original Friedmann equation can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{H^2}{H_0^2} = \frac{\Omega_{M,0}}{a^3} + \frac{\Omega_{\Lambda,0}}{a^{3(1+w)}} + \frac{\Omega_{k,0}}{a^2}, \quad (2)$$

Where  $\Omega_{M,0}$  is the present-day matter density parameter,  $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$  is the present-day dark energy density parameter,  $\Omega_{k,0} = -kc^2/H_0^2$  is the present-day curvature of space parameter, and  $H_0$  is the Hubble constant. Note that the Hubble constant cannot be directly estimated from the PS1 Survey alone because it requires more distance indicators, such as the Cepheid variables and the CMB and BAO experiments based on the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP), to constrain  $H_0$  by combining multiple surveys (Bennett et al. 2013; Planck Collaboration et al. 2016; Brout et al. 2022). Therefore, the prior value of the Hubble constant is taken to be  $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  in this project after considering the ‘‘Hubble tension’’ between local expansion rate ( $H_0$ ) measurements and the early Universe predictions (Riess et al. 2016; Brout et al. 2022).

Under the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the density of dark energy  $\rho_{\text{DE}}$  is invariant to the scale factor  $a$ , implying that  $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$  is a constant value, which is also known as the cosmological constant. Furthermore, since the Universe is currently in the  $\Lambda$ -dominated era under the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, two conditions  $\Omega_{k,0} = 0$  and  $w = -1$  must be satisfied, and the present-day radiation density parameter  $\Omega_{R,0}$  can be safely ignored. As a result, the simple relation  $\Omega_{M,0} + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} = 1$  for the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model can then be obtained from equation (2) by assuming  $H = H_0$  and  $a = 1$  for the present-day values.

To calculate the effective magnitude of each SNe Ia data in the Pantheon Sample, one need to find the best-fit peak luminosity  $L_{\text{peak}}$  first, which is related to the corresponding peak flux  $f$  by the following equation:


$$f = \frac{L_{\text{peak}}}{4\pi(S_k(\eta))^2(1+z)^2}, \quad (3)$$

Where  $z$  is the redshift of each SNe Ia data in the Pantheon Sample with heliocentric and peculiar velocity corrections performed (Carr et al. 2022),  $\eta$  is the comoving distance, and  $S_k(\eta)$  is the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric. The peak flux  $f$  can be further converted to the effective magnitude  $m$  using:

$$m = m_B - 2.5 \log_{10} f, \quad (4)$$

Where  $m_B = -20.48$  is the rest-frame  $B$  band peak

magnitude (Marchesini et al. 2007). For the low-redshift SNe Ia data ( $z < 0.1$ ), the approximation  $S_k(\eta) = \eta = cz/H_0$  is valid by assuming a flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model. Then, the best-fit peak luminosity  $L_{\text{peak}}$  can be determined via a chi-squared minimization analysis and a looping process implemented by the Python self-written codes. The outcome is shown in Fig. 1, where the best-fit  $L_{\text{peak}}H_0^2$  at local minimum is equivalent to  $L_{\text{peak}} = (4.43_{-0.05}^{+0.04}) \times 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ . The uncertainties of the best-fit  $L_{\text{peak}}$  are estimated within  $\pm 1\sigma$  (68.3%) confidence interval, which yields  $\Delta\chi^2 = \pm 1$  for one degree of freedom (Hughes & Hase 2010).



**Fig. 1.** The variation of chi-squared and reduced chi-squared with  $L_{\text{peak}}H_0^2$  after performing the chi-squared minimization analysis. The local minimum corresponds to the best-fit  $L_{\text{peak}}$ , which is determined by looping over  $L_{\text{peak}}H_0^2$  from 0 to 5 in 1000 steps.

After obtaining the best-fit  $L_{\text{peak}}$ , the comoving distance  $\eta$  can be accurately computed by solving the following integral using the *scipy.integrate* package in Python:

$$\eta = \frac{c}{H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_k}} S_k \left[ \sqrt{\Omega_k} \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{E(z')} \right], \quad (5)$$


Where  $E(z')$  is given by (Scolnic et al. 2018):

$$E(z') = \left[ \Omega_M(1+z')^3 + \Omega_\Lambda(1+z')^{3(1+w)} + \Omega_k(1+z')^2 \right]^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$


Note that for simplicity, the parameter  $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_\Lambda$ , and  $\Omega_k$  in equation (6) all represent the present-day values mentioned in the previous section, while the function  $S_k(x)$  in equation (5) is equal to  $\sin(x)$  when  $\Omega_k < 0$ ,  $S_k(x) = x$  when  $\Omega_k = 0$ , and  $S_k(x) = \sinh(x)$  when  $\Omega_k > 0$ . Similarly, the FRW metric  $S_k(\eta)$  in equation (3) is defined by the expressions below:

$$S_k(\eta) = \begin{cases} \sin(\sqrt{k}\eta)/\sqrt{k}, & k > 0 \\ \eta, & k = 0 \\ \sinh(\sqrt{-k}\eta)/\sqrt{-k}, & k < 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

To solve the integral in equation (5), one could still use the chi-squared minimization analysis to find the best-fit cosmological parameters for the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model. However, when it comes to other more complicated models (such as the  $ow$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model), it is extremely time-consuming to minimize chi-squared in a higher dimensional parameter space. Thus, a computational algorithm called the affine invariant Markov Chain Monte




**Fig. 2.** The magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample fitted by the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model when  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.703 \pm 0.016$  and  $\Omega_M = 0.281 \pm 0.011$ . The best-fit values and the uncertainties of  $\Omega_{\Lambda}$  and  $\Omega_M$  are constrained by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. The normalized residual plot and the frequency plot are included underneath to help visualize the reasonability of the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model.



**Fig. 3.** The magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample fitted by the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model when  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.644^{+0.033}_{-0.051}$  and  $\Omega_M = 0.341$ . The best-fit values and the uncertainties of  $\Omega_{\Lambda}$  and  $\Omega_M$  are constrained by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. The normalized residual plot and the frequency plot are included underneath to help visualize the reasonability of the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model.

Carlo (MCMC) is performed in this project to efficiently calculate multiple best-fit cosmological parameters and estimate their uncertainties at the same time by fully evaluating the correlations in the parameter space. Built from the *emcee* and *corner* package in Python, the MCMC algorithm can automatically draw samples from the

posterior probability distribution of parameters where the advance of each step in the Markov Chain is only dependent on the location of its previous step (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). Constrained by the prior function and the likelihood function, the sampled parameters describe the highest likelihood model. The likelihood function  $P(X|\theta)$



**Fig. 4.** The MCMC corner plot for the  $\phi w_0 w_a$ CDM model. The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_k$ ,  $w$ ,  $w_0$ ,  $w_a$ ) and their uncertainties are determined by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. It is obviously seen that two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  are poorly constrained in this corner plot, indicating that the MCMC algorithm must be improved in the future.

is determined by a chi-squared test, which only keeps the parameters in the MCMC algorithm that pass this test:

$$P(X|\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum \left( \frac{Y_{\text{data}} - Y_{\text{model}}}{Y_{\text{error}}} \right)^2, \quad (8)$$

Where  $X$  and  $Y$  are the independent variable and observation (dependent variable) in the model function,  $\theta$  is the parameter vector which defines the model function. The highest likelihood model is generated by the advances of the parameter vector which follow the likelihood function  $P(X|\theta)$  within the prior function  $P(\theta)$ . Specifically speaking, the range of each parameter in the prior function  $P(\theta)$  is set to be broader enough to fully take into account the correlations in the parameter space. The posterior probability distribution of parameters  $P(\theta|X)$  is therefore derived to be proportional to the product of  $P(X|\theta)$  and  $P(\theta)$

in accordance with Bayes' Theorem (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013):

$$P(\theta|X) \propto P(X|\theta)P(\theta), \quad (9)$$


The number of MCMC steps in this project is selected to be 2000 for a 1-hour sampling process. After performing the MCMC algorithm, the best-fit cosmological parameters under different cosmological models can be obtained to fit the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample. Another outcome of the MCMC algorithm is the MCMC corner plots, which can also be illustrated to evaluate the correlations between the best-fit parameters and estimate their uncertainties. At last, a chi-squared hypothesis test containing the reduced chi-squared ( $\chi^2_{\nu}$ ) and the P-value is performed to point out the reasonability of different cosmological models when fitting the Pantheon Sample.

**Table 1.** The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_k$ ,  $w_0$ ,  $w_a$ ) and their uncertainties for six models obtained by combining different measurements after running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. The “/” sign represents that the parameter is not defined in that model.

Model	Measurements	$\Omega_M$	$\Omega_k$	$w_0$	$w_a$
$\Lambda$ CDM	PS1	$0.281 \pm 0.011$	/	/	/
$\Lambda$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.296 \pm 0.006$	/	/	/
$\phi$ CDM	PS1	$0.308 \pm 0.019$	$-0.119 \pm 0.068$	/	/
$\phi$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.309 \pm 0.010$	$-0.059 \pm 0.034$	/	/
$w$ CDM	PS1	$0.350^{+0.033}_{-0.039}$	/	$-1.235^{+0.138}_{-0.143}$	/
$w$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.329^{+0.017}_{-0.020}$	/	$-1.122^{+0.072}_{-0.074}$	/
$ow$ CDM	PS1	$0.343^{+0.035}_{-0.051}$	$0.0079^{+0.1332}_{-0.1481}$	$-1.246^{+0.281}_{-0.366}$	/
$ow$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.328^{+0.018}_{-0.026}$	$0.0045^{+0.0666}_{-0.0741}$	$-1.120^{+0.143}_{-0.185}$	/
$w_0w_a$ CDM	PS1	$0.351^{+0.033}_{-0.037}$	/	$-0.947^{+0.649}_{-0.715}$	$0.010^{+1.368}_{-1.349}$
$w_0w_a$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.349^{+0.019}_{-0.021}$	/	$-0.751^{+0.336}_{-0.368}$	$-0.645^{+0.728}_{-0.719}$
$ow_0w_a$ CDM	PS1	$0.341^{+0.033}_{-0.051}$	$0.0073^{+0.1329}_{-0.1433}$	$-0.942^{+0.652}_{-0.737}$	$-0.153^{+1.412}_{-1.259}$
$ow_0w_a$ CDM	PS1+CMB+BAO	$0.344^{+0.018}_{-0.027}$	$0.0027^{+0.0665}_{-0.0716}$	$-0.739^{+0.336}_{-0.378}$	$-0.812^{+0.750}_{-0.678}$

### 3. Results and Discussion

In this paper, six cosmological models are explored: the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k = 0$ ,  $w = -1$ ), the  $\phi$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k$  varies,  $w = -1$ ), the flat  $w$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k = 0$ ,  $w$  varies), the  $ow$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k$  varies,  $w$  varies but not evolves with  $a$ ,  $w_a = 0$ ), the flat  $w_0w_a$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k = 0$ ,  $w$  varies and evolves with  $a$  under the relation  $w = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$ ,  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  vary), and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model ( $\Omega_k$  varies,  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  vary). All models are performed by the MCMC algorithm to determine the best-fit parameters and estimate their uncertainties, while only the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, and the  $ow$ CDM model are plotted in Fig. 2, Fig. 3, and Fig. 6 to fit the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample with the normalized residual plot and the frequency plot included underneath. The MCMC corner plots are then illustrated in Fig. 4, Fig. 5, and Fig. 7 for the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, and the  $ow$ CDM model to show how the parameters are correlated with each other through the contour plots.

**Fig. 5.** The MCMC corner plot for flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model. The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ) and their uncertainties are determined by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. Both parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ) are well constrained in this corner plot.

In combination with the CMB (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016) and BAO measurements, the results of all best-fit cosmological parameters under different models are presented in Table 1. The BAO measurements are taken from the SDSS Data Release 7 (DR7) main galaxy sample (Ross et al. 2015), SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) DR 10, 11, and 12 (Dawson et al. 2013; Anderson et al. 2014; Alam et al. 2017). To validate the reliability of the best-fit cosmological parameters under the  $\phi$ CDM model, the flat  $w$ CDM model, and the flat  $w_0w_a$ CDM model, their corresponding MCMC corner plots are also illustrated in two panels in Fig. 8 and one panel in Fig. 9 in Appendix B.

**Table 2.** The reduced chi-squared and the P-value of six models.

Model	$\chi^2_\nu$	P-value
$\Lambda$ CDM	0.989	0.592
$\phi$ CDM	0.988	0.602
$w$ CDM	0.986	0.620
$ow$ CDM	0.991	0.575
$w_0w_a$ CDM	0.986	0.620
$ow_0w_a$ CDM	0.988	0.600

Based on the results of the chi-squared hypothesis test demonstrated in Table 2, all cosmological models applied in this paper are reasonable to fit the Pantheon Sample since all the values of the reduced chi-squared ( $\chi^2_\nu$ ) tend to be 1 and the P-values tend to be 0.5 (Hughes & Hase 2010). However, from the normalized residual plot in Fig. 2, the high-redshift SNe Ia data points when  $z > 0.5$  are slightly deflected from the central horizontal line, revealing that the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model becomes less reasonable to fit distant SNe Ia data and hence cannot fully describe the geometry and mass content of our Universe in the past. This high-redshift small deflection can also be observed in the frequency plot in Fig. 2, where more SNe Ia data points are distributed on one side compared to the more evenly distributed frequency plot in Fig. 3.

Regarding the results listed in Table 1, all the best-fit cosmological parameters are consistent with the previous literature results (Scolnic et al. 2018; Jones et al. 2018) because they all agree with a Universe which contains  $\sim 30\%$

baryonic and non-baryonic matter and  $\sim 70\%$  dark energy (Bahcall 2015), although the parameter  $\Omega_M$  is slightly overestimated for the models apart from the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model and the  $o$ CDM model. Besides, the uncertainties of two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  for the flat  $w_0w_a$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model are extremely large compared to other parameters, causing them to be poorly constrained by the MCMC algorithm and hence less reliable. These poor constraints are also reflected in the MCMC corner plot in Fig. 4, where two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  fail to construct valid contour plots. To further constrain the cosmological parameters and reduce their uncertainties, one could either run the MCMC algorithm for more steps or perform other MCMC algorithms that converge faster, such as the one built from the *pymcstat* package in Python (Miles 2019).

Even though the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model has been proved to be less reasonable when fitting the high-redshift SNe Ia data, the general best-fit parameters presented in Table 1 indicate that the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model is still convincing because the discrepancy between the parameter  $\Omega_k$  and 0 is very small, inferring that our Universe is almost spatially flat at present. Meanwhile, since the best-fit parameter  $w$  in Table 1 is different from  $-1$ , it also suggests that the parameter  $w$  is likely to evolve with time as  $w = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$ , which sheds light on the importance of investigating the best-fit results of two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  under new cosmological models (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016).

#### 4. Conclusion

In this project, the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample consisting of 1048 SNe Ia data is fitted by six cosmological models, including two new models called the  $ow$ CDM model and the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model, to remeasure the cosmological parameters. After performing the MCMC algorithm and illustrating the MCMC corner plots, the correlations in the parameter space can be evaluated through the contour plots to determine the best-fit cosmological parameters and estimate their uncertainties. When determining the best-fit parameters, the CMB and BAO measurements are combined with the SNe Ia data to improve the accuracy of the cosmological constraints, giving the results of the matter density parameter  $\Omega_M = 0.328^{+0.018}_{-0.026}$ , the curvature of space parameter  $\Omega_k = 0.0045^{+0.0666}_{-0.0741}$ , and the dark energy equation of state parameter  $w = -1.120^{+0.143}_{-0.185}$  for the  $ow$ CDM model. Similarly, the results for the  $ow_0w_a$ CDM model yield as  $\Omega_M = 0.344^{+0.018}_{-0.027}$ ,  $\Omega_k = 0.0027^{+0.0665}_{-0.0716}$ ,  $w_0 = -0.739^{+0.336}_{-0.378}$ , and  $w_a = -0.812^{+0.750}_{-0.678}$ .

The best-fit parameters of all models applied in this project are compatible with the literature results, except that the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model cannot fit the high-redshift SNe Ia data reasonably well. Despite very small discrepancies in the parameter  $\Omega_k$  under different models, our Universe is very close to be spatially flat. Considering that the results of the parameter  $w$  under different models in Table 1 are not determined to be exactly equal to  $-1$ , future studies of the “phantom” dark energy ( $w < -1$ ) and the “quintessence” dark energy ( $w > -1$ ) are necessarily required to explore the perturbations of dark energy beyond the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model


(Amendola et al. 2013). Also, since two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  are poorly constrained by the MCMC algorithm, future investigations must be conducted to reduce the parameter uncertainties, which can be realized by incorporating local expansion rate ( $H_0$ ) measurements and more recent SNe Ia constraints (Riess et al. 2016; Brout et al. 2022), running more steps for the MCMC algorithm, and performing other MCMC algorithms with faster convergence.

*Acknowledgements.* First of all, I would like to sincerely appreciate my project supervisor, Dr. Nigel Metcalfe, for his professional comments and guidance provided on my project during our fortnightly tutorial sessions throughout the Michaelmas term and the Epiphany term. I wish to acknowledge Dr. Nigel Metcalfe and many other global scholars for their contributions to the Pan-STARRS1 Survey, the Pantheon Sample research, and the public PSICOSMO datasets, which form the basis of my project and make my project possible to conduct. I would also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Baojiu Li, who offered technical help in building my MCMC algorithm and explained many physical interpretations in cosmology. Thank you to Durham University’s Department of Physics for granting Level 3 students the opportunity to practice their independent research skills by completing this project.


#### References

- Alam, S., Ata, M., Bailey, S., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 470, 2617
- Amendola, L., Appleby, S., Bacon, D., et al. 2013, LRR, 16, 6
- Anderson, L., Aubourg, É., Bailey, S., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 441, 24
- Baade, W. 1938, ApJ, 88, 285
- Bahcall, N. A. 2015, PNAS, 112, 3173
- Bennett, C. L., Larson, D., Weiland, J. L., et al. 2013, ApJS, 208, 20
- Brout, D., Scolnic, D., Popovic, B., et al. 2022, ApJ, 938, 110
- Carr, A., Davis, T. M., Scolnic, D., et al. 2022, PASA, 39, E046
- Conley, A., Guy, J., Sullivan, M., et al. 2011, ApJS, 192, 1
- Dawson, K. S., Schlegel, D. J., Ahn, C. P., et al. 2013, AJ, 145, 10
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, PASP, 125, 306
- Friedmann, A. 1999, GRG, 31, 1991
- Hubble, E. 1929, PNAS, 15, 168
- Hughes, I. G., & Hase, T. P. A. 2010, Measurements and their Uncertainties (New York: Oxford University Press)
- Jones, D. O., Scolnic, D. M., Riess, A. G., et al. 2018, ApJ, 857, 51
- Kessler, R., Becker, A. C., Cinabro, D., et al. 2009, ApJS, 185, 32
- Marchesini, D., van Dokkum, P., Quadri, R., et al. 2007, ApJ, 656, 42
- Miles, P. R. 2019, JOSS, 4, 1417
- Nemiroff, R. J., & Patla, B. 2008, Am. J. Phys., 76, 265
- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2016, A&A, 594, A13
- Rest, A., Scolnic, D., Foley, R. J., et al. 2014, ApJ, 795, 44
- Riess, A. G., Filippenko, A. V., Challis, P., et al. 1998, AJ, 116, 1009
- Riess, A. G., Macri, L. M., Hoffmann, S. L., et al. 2016, ApJ, 826, 56
- Riess, A. G., Strolger, L.-G., Casertano, S., et al. 2007, ApJ, 659, 98
- Ross, A. J., Samushia, L., Howlett, C., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 449, 835
- Scolnic, D. M., Jones, D. O., Rest, A., et al. 2018, ApJ, 859, 101

## Appendix


A. The magnitude-redshift relation and the MCMC corner plot for the  $\phi w$ CDM model

**Fig. 6.** The magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon Sample fitted by the  $\phi w$ CDM model when  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.639^{+0.196}_{-0.140}$  and  $0.343^{+0.035}_{-0.051}$ . The best-fit values and the uncertainties of  $\Omega_\Lambda$  and  $\Omega_M$  are constrained by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. The normalized residual plot and the frequency plot are included underneath to help visualize the reasonability of the  $\phi w$ CDM model.




**Fig. 7.** The MCMC corner plot for the  $\phi w$ CDM model. The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_k$ ,  $w$ ) and their uncertainties are determined by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. Although all parameters are able to construct their valid contour plots, it is still obviously seen that the parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_k$ ,  $w$ ) are not well-constrained in this corner plot due to their large uncertainties.

## B. The MCMC corner plots for the remaining three cosmological models



**Fig. 8.** The MCMC corner plots for two models, where panel (a) is for the  $\Lambda$ CDM model and panel (b) is for the flat  $w$ CDM model. The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_k$ ,  $w$ ) and their uncertainties in two corner plots are determined by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. All parameters in panel (a) and panel (b) are able to construct valid and well-constrained contour plots, although the best-fit parameters in two corner plots, except for the parameter  $\Omega_M$  in panel (a), are not well consistent with the literature results.



**Fig. 9.** The MCMC corner plot for the flat  $w_0w_a$ CDM model. The best-fit cosmological parameters ( $\Omega_\Lambda$ ,  $\Omega_M$ ,  $w$ ,  $w_0$ ,  $w_a$ ) and their uncertainties are determined by running the MCMC algorithm for 2000 steps. It is obviously seen that two parameters  $w_0$  and  $w_a$  are still poorly constrained in this corner plot, which indicates again that future improvements to the MCMC algorithm are necessarily required.



### **Lay Summary for a General Audience**

Over 100 years of modern cosmology research since Albert Einstein first introduced the parameter  $\Lambda$  to his equations of General Relativity (GR) in 1917, the consensus has been reached that the parameter  $\Lambda$ , which is known as the cosmological constant denoting the energy density of vacuum (or dark energy) nowadays, can be applied in the simplest  $\Lambda$ CDM model to explain the accelerating expansion of our Universe based on recent studies of the observational SNe Ia data. Even though cosmologists have made constructive breakthroughs in accurately constraining the value of the cosmological constant to  $\sim 0.7$ , little is known about the nature of the enigmatic dark energy which is still one of the fundamental questions in modern cosmology. The  $\Lambda$ CDM model favours the interpretation of dark energy to be some undetected fields or forces, while some researchers prefer other explanations by modifying GR. In this paper, the  $\Lambda$ CDM model is still assumed to govern the nature of dark energy. By constraining the cosmological constant better and better, we can extrapolate how our Universe evolved after the Big Bang and what the fate of our Universe will be in the far future, which is important to understand the structure of our Universe and even broaden our knowledge of fundamental physics theories.