

# Measuring the speed of light with updated Hubble diagram of high-redshift standard candles

YUTING LIU,<sup>1,2,3</sup> SHUO CAO,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> MAREK BIESIADA,<sup>4</sup> YUJIE LIAN,<sup>1,2</sup> XIAOLIN LIU,<sup>1,2</sup> AND YILONG ZHANG<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Frontiers in Astronomy and Astrophysics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 102206, China;*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China;*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan;*

<sup>4</sup>*National Centre for Nuclear Research, Pasteura 7, Warsaw, 02-093, Poland*

## ABSTRACT

The possible time variation of the fundamental constants of nature has been an active subject of research in modern physics. In this paper, we propose a new method to investigate such possible time variation of the speed of light  $c$  using the updated Hubble diagram of high-redshift standard candles including Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) and high-redshift quasars (based on UV-X relation). Our findings show that the SNe Ia Pantheon sample, combined with currently available sample of cosmic chronometers, would produce robust constraints on the speed of light at the level of  $c/c_0 = 1.03 \pm 0.03$ . For the Hubble diagram of UV+X ray quasars acting as a new type of standard candles, we obtain  $c/c_0 = 1.19 \pm 0.07$ . Therefore, our results confirm that there is no strong evidence for the deviation from the constant speed of light up to  $z \sim 2$ . Moreover, we discuss how our technique might be improved at much higher redshifts ( $z \sim 5$ ), focusing on future measurements of the acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  with gravitational waves (GWs) from binary neutron star mergers. In particular, in the framework of the second-generation space-based GW detector, DECi-hertz Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory (DECIGO), the speed of light is expected to be constrained with the precision of  $\Delta c/c = 10^{-3}$ .

**Keywords:** Cosmological parameters(339); Type Ia supernovae(1728); Quasars(1319); Gravitational waves(678)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As a test of fundamental physics, probing the space-time variation of fundamental constants of Nature (the fine-structure constant  $\alpha$ , the speed of light  $c$ , the proportionality constant  $G$ , the Planck constant  $\hbar$ ) has been undertaken in the past decades, following the pioneering work of Dirac (1934). In particular, experiments on Earth and solar system have been designed and carried out for centuries to measure the speed of light  $c$ , with extreme precision in their measurements. However, the assumption that the speed of light  $c$  is constant across all universe at every time and distance scale is a far reaching extrapolation of our knowledge, grounded on a fairly limited space-time region. Even Einstein himself had already considered the theory of the dynamic speed of light (Einstein 1907). The speed of light may, in principle change over time during the evolution of the universe. Such an idea is referred to as the variable speed of light (VSL) theory (Albrecht & Magueijo 1999; Barrow & Magueijo 1999), which has attracted considerable

attention some time ago because it can provide a new way of solution of classical cosmological problems such as the initial singularity, horizon and flatness problems, without relying on inflationary scenarios (Albrecht & Magueijo 1999; Barrow 1999; Barrow & Magueijo 1999; Bassett et al. 2000). Similar ideas were independently formulated and strongly supported by Moffat (2002). Later studies revealed that variable  $c$  theories are able to explain the scale-invariant spectrum of Gaussian fluctuations in cosmic microwave background (CMB) data (Magueijo 2003). On the other hand, some authors claimed that dimensional constants like  $c$  are merely human constructions, contrary to their dimensionless combinations like the fine structure constant  $\alpha$  (Duff 2002). Hence, their temporal changes have no operational significance. Yet, the variability of the speed of light is still a controversial issue.

At present, the measurements of the speed of light on the Earth have reached a very high accuracy and support its being a fundamental constant. Still, cosmological tests of  $c$  variations are much more scarce and less precise. Fortunately, a variety of high-quality observational data obtained from extra-galactic surveys

\* caoshuo@bnu.edu.cn

are becoming available to test the basic laws in the more distant universe (Salzano et al. 2016; Balcerzak et al. 2017; Salzano & Dabrowski 2017; Salzano 2017a,b). Based on a flat FLRW universe, a simple relationship  $c(z_M) = D_A(z_M)H(z_M)$  between the speed of light  $c$ , the angular diameter distance  $D_A(z)$  and the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$  was proposed (Salzano et al. 2015), at the redshift  $z_M$  corresponding to the maximum of  $D_A(z)$  function. Cai et al. (2016) developed a new and more general approach to test the speed of light in the larger redshift range, using the luminosity distance  $D_L(z)$  from type Ia supernovae sample. Subsequently, Cao et al. (2017) obtained the measurement of the speed light using the maximum redshift  $z_M = 1.70$  obtained from the intermediate-luminosity compact radio quasars acting as standard rulers. The result was absolutely consistent with the value of  $c_0$  measured on Earth. Salzano (2017b) also investigated the invariance of the speed of light at different redshifts not only at the specific redshift  $z_M$ . More recently, Cao et al. (2020); Liu et al. (2021) studied the possibility of using strong gravitational lensing to test the invariance of the speed of light. Some other observational tests on the invariance of the speed of light in cosmology have also been performed in Qi et al. (2014); Cao et al. (2018); Wang (2019). Of course, we still need to develop other methods to measure the speed of light in the distant universe, which is an almost unexplored domain.

In this context of the discussion presented above, we will focus our attention on an original model-independent technique, which delivers estimates of the speed of light at different redshifts in the distant universe, combining current observations of the standard candles (type Ia supernovae, the X-UV relation of quasars) and standard clock data (Hubble parameters  $H(z)$  inferred from cosmic chronometers). Since the cosmic chronometers data are currently available up to the redshift  $z \sim 2$ , we study another possibility, which is to use the future space gravitational wave detector DECIGO allowing to determine the so called acceleration parameter  $X(z)$ , related to  $H(z)$  up to the redshift  $z = 5$ . In this way one might be able to measure the speed of light with considerable accuracy up to the higher redshifts and enrich the estimates of the speed of light in unexplored domain. We would like to emphasize that our technique is completely independent of the details of the cosmological model, and the only assumption we made is the flat FLRW metric. This paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we introduce the methodology and observational data used in this work. Simulations are presented in Sect. 3. Furthermore, our

results and general conclusions are summarized in Sect. 4.

## 2. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

It is well known that under the assumption of homogeneity and isotropy in the large scale, the geometry of the universe can be described by the FLRW metric

$$ds^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + a^2(t) \left[ \frac{dr^2}{1 - Kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $t$  is the cosmic time and  $(r, \theta, \phi)$  are the comoving spatial coordinates. By virtue of the Einstein equations, the scale factor  $a(t)$  as the only gravitational degree of freedom can be determined by the matter and energy content of the Universe. The curvature parameter  $\Omega_k$  is related to the dimensionless curvature  $K$  as  $\Omega_k = -cK/(a_0 H_0)^2$ , where  $H_0$  denotes the Hubble constant and  $K = -1, 0, +1$  corresponds to open, flat and closed Universe, respectively. Considering a flat universe in such metric, the luminosity distance  $D_L(z)$  can be expressed as

$$D_L(z) = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}, \quad (2)$$

where  $H(z)$  denotes the expansion rate of the Universe at redshift  $z$ .

Generally, one can introduce the time variable  $c$  in the metric or in the Friedmann equations, and assume the speed of light is a function of cosmic time or redshift  $z$  in a homogenous and isotropic universe (Qi et al. 2014). In this paper, we use  $c$  to quantify the speed of light related to the baseline from redshift  $z$  to the Earth (at redshift  $z = 0$ ). Any evidence in favour of violating the constancy of  $c$  at different redshifts will have a profound impact on our understanding of nature. Differentiating Eq.(2) with respect to the redshift  $z$ , one can obtain

$$D'_L(z) = c \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')} + c(1+z) \frac{1}{H(z)}, \quad (3)$$

From this equation one is able to express the speed of light  $c$  in terms of the the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$ , luminosity distance  $D_L(z)$  and its derivative  $D'_L(z) = dD_L(z)/dz$ :

$$c = \frac{D'_L(z)H(z)}{1+z} - \frac{D_L(z)H(z)}{(1+z)^2}. \quad (4)$$

Thus, we would be able to determine the speed of light at any single redshift, provided we have all aforementioned ingredients. More importantly, one does not need to assume any particular cosmological model besides flat FLRW metric. In this paper, we focused on an empirical

fit to the luminosity distance measurements, based on a third-order logarithmic polynomial of (Risaliti & Lusso 2018; Liu et al. 2020; Zheng et al. 2021a)

$$D_L(z) = \ln(10) \frac{c_0}{H_0} (x + ax^2 + bx^3), \quad (5)$$

where  $c_0 = 299792458 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  denotes the laboratory value of the speed of light,  $x = \log(1 + z)$ , and  $a$  and  $b$  are the free parameters. The logarithmic parameterization has the advantage of faster convergence at high redshifts ( $z > 1$ ). Combining Eq.(4) and Eq.(5), one can derive


$$\eta \equiv \frac{c}{c_0} = \frac{y}{(1+z)^2} [1 + (2a-1)x + (3b-a)x^2 - bx^3], \quad (6)$$

where  $y = \ln(10)H(z)/H_0$ . The constancy of the speed of light means  $\eta = 1$ . Any deviation of  $\eta$  from 1, at some redshift  $z^*$  will indicate that  $c(z^*)$  is different from  $c_0$ . Therefore, we can test the invariance of the speed of light at any redshift based on Eq.(6).

In this paper we determine the parameters  $a$  and  $b$ , as best fits to the data regarding standard candles: SNe Ia and quasars with a calibrated UV-X relation, as will be presented below. We use for this purpose the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method implemented in the Python module <sup>1</sup> `emcee` introduced by Foreman-Mackey (2013). The next ingredient we need is the expansion rate  $H(z)$  at redshift  $z$  and it will be extracted from cosmic chronometers. We will also consider the utility of the  $H(z)$  related expansion parameter, which can be obtained with the future GW space-borne detector DECIGO. Throughout this work, we take the prior on the Hubble constant  $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$  from the latest *Planck* CMB observations (Aghanim et al. 2020).

### 2.1. The Pantheon Sample of Type Ia Supernovae

Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) regarded as the standard candles for their standardizable luminosity have been used to discover the accelerating expansion of the Universe (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999) and are widely used as cosmological probes. Many supernovae surveys have been focused on detecting supernovae within a considerable range of redshifts over the past two decades, including low-redshift ( $0.01 < z < 0.1$ ) surveys, e.g. CfA1-CfA4, CSP and LOSS (Riess et al. 1999; Jha et al. 2006; Stritzinger et al. 2011) and four main surveys probing the  $z > 0.1$  redshift range like ESSENCE, SNLS, SDSS and PS1 (Miknaitis 2007;



**Figure 1.** Scatter plot of the type Ia supernovae from the Pantheon sample. The red points denote the apparent B-band magnitude of the type Ia supernovae, with its  $1\sigma$  confidence level (yellow bars).

Conley et al. 2011; Frieman 2008; Scolnic et al. 2014). Moreover, SCP, GOODS and CANDELS/CLASH surveys released the high- $z$  ( $z > 1.0$ ) data (Suzuki et al. 2012; Riess et al. 2004, 2007; Rodney et al. 2014). These surveys extended the Hubble diagram to  $z = 2.26$ .

More recently, Scolnic D. M., et al. (2018) combined the subset of 279 Pan-STARRS1(PS1) ( $0.03 < z < 0.68$ ) supernovae (Rest et al. 2014; Scolnic et al. 2014) with the data from SDSS, SNLS, various low- $z$  and HST samples to form the largest combined sample of SNe Ia consisting of a total of 1048 SNe Ia ranging from  $0.01 < z < 2.3$ , which is known as the “Pantheon Sample”. Systematic uncertainties in the Pantheon sample have been reduced by the improvements of the PS1 SNe photometry, astrometry and calibration. Generally speaking, the light curve of Type Ia SN is characterized by 3 or 4 nuisance parameters, and its use involves their optimization together with the unknown parameters of the cosmological model. Fortunately, Kessler & Scolnic (2017) proposed a new method (i.e., BEAMS with Bias Corrections (BBC)) to retrieve the nuisance parameters in the Tripp formula (Tripp 1998)

$$\mu = m_B - M + \alpha x_1 - \beta^* C + \Delta M + \Delta B, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mu$  is the distance modulus,  $m_B$  is the apparent B-band magnitude,  $C$  is the color,  $x_1$  is the light-curve shape parameter,  $\Delta M$  is a distance correction based on the host-galaxy mass of the SNe and  $\Delta B$  is a distance correction based on predicted biases from simulations. Furthermore,  $\alpha$  is the coefficient of the relation between luminosity and stretch,  $\beta^*$  is the coefficient of the relation between luminosity and color and  $M$  is the absolute B-band magnitude of a fiducial SN Ia with  $x_1 = 0$  and

<sup>1</sup> <https://pypi.python.org/pypi/emcee>

$C = 0$ . The Pantheon Sample is relatively clean and the obvious advantage of using it is its richness and depth in redshift as compared with the previous data sets such as Union2.1 or JLA (Betoule et al. 2014). We show the scatter plot of the 1048 Pantheon Sample in Figure 1.

As already mentioned, we aim to employ Eq.(6) for the assessment of the invariance of the speed of light. For this purpose we need to use the high-redshift Pantheon Sample to fit the free parameters  $a$  and  $b$  in the phenomenological representation of the luminosity distance, by minimizing the  $\chi^2$  objective function

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{1048} \frac{[D_{L,SNe}(z_i) - D_L(z_i; a, b)]^2}{\sigma_{D_{L,SNe}}(z_i)^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $D_{L,SNe}$  (in  $Mpc$ ) is calculated from distance modulus using a well-known relation:

$$D_{L,SNe} = 10^{0.2(m-M)-5}, \quad (9)$$

and the uncertainty of luminosity distance from SNe is given by


$$\sigma_{D_{L,SNe}} = (\ln 10 / 5) D_{L,SNe} \sigma_{*i}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\sigma_{*i}$  is total uncertainty of the apparent magnitude. We treat absolute magnitude  $M$  as a free parameter fitted together with the free parameter  $(a, b)$  characterizing the luminosity distance. Such methodology, which generated the best fitted values with 68% C.L of  $a = 3.15 \pm 0.12$ ,  $b = 3.27 \pm 0.41$ , and  $M = -19.45 \pm 0.01$ .

## 2.2. The Hubble diagram of High-redshift Quasar

Quasars as the brightest sources in the Universe that can be observed up to redshift  $z \sim 8.0$ , have long been attempted to be used as potential standard candle candidates for extending the distance range as compared with supernovae (Mortsell & Onsson 2011; Banados et al. 2018). The standard candle suitable for cosmological research has to have two basic properties: one – it has to have a standard (or standardizable) intrinsic luminosity; second – it should be easy to observe in a wide redshift range. Quasars are one of the best candidates satisfying the latter, but they do not clearly display the former property. Luminosity of the quasars emission regions spans several orders of magnitude, hence at the first glance they appear to have little chance of becoming the standard candle. However, with a large enough sample of quasars one may attempt to discover correlations between luminosities at different spectral bands, try to select a sample with not too large dispersion and use it as a cosmological tool.

Along this line of reasoning, the non-linear relationship between the quasars ultraviolet and X-ray luminosity ( $L_{UV} - L_X$ ) has been proposed as such a tool.



**Figure 2.** Scatter plot of the UV+X ray quasar sample. The pink points denote the logarithm of the flux in X-ray and UV. The gray bars represent  $F_X$   $1\sigma$  uncertainty level. The uncertainty of  $F_{UV}$  measurements are negligible.

According to the unified picture of active galactic nuclei (AGN), quasars in particular, it is generally believed that ultraviolet photons are emitted from the accretion disk, while X-rays originate from inverse Compton scattering of UV photons passing through the hot corona. Therefore one is encouraged to seek for the non-linear relation between the X-ray and UV luminosities of quasars, parameterized as a linear one in logarithmic variables:

$$\log_{10}(L_X) = \gamma \log_{10}(L_{UV}) + \beta, \quad (11)$$

where  $L_X$  and  $L_{UV}$  correspond to the rest-frame monochromatic luminosity at  $2 \text{ keV}$  and  $2500 \text{ \AA}$ , the slope  $\gamma$  and the intercept  $\beta$  are free parameters which can be calibrated with other cosmological probes. On the other hand, the observable quantity is flux, not luminosity, hence the non-linear relation between the X-ray and UV fluxes can be written as

$$\log_{10}(F_X) = \gamma \log_{10}(F_{UV}) + 2(\gamma - 1) \log_{10}(D_L) + \beta', \quad (12)$$

where  $F_X$  and  $F_{UV}$  correspond to the X-ray flux and UV flux, respectively  $\beta' = (\gamma - 1) \log_{10}(4\pi) + \beta$  is the intercept of this new relation and  $D_L$  is luminosity distance. Therefore, the correlation between the observed UV and X radiation fluxes can be used to obtain the luminosity distance.

Risaliti & Lusso (2015) collected a sample of 1138 quasars from large surveys such as COSMOS, SDSS, XMM and for the first time used the nonlinear relationship between the UV and X-ray radiation flux to estimate cosmological distances in the high redshift range. However, the high dispersion (0.35 – 0.40 dex) revealed in the quasar data was a major obstacle for cosmological



applications. In the subsequent series of studies (Lusso & Risaliti 2016; Bisogni et al. 2017), the dispersion in quasars data set has been significantly reduced.

Recently, Risaliti & Lusso (2018) have taken a key step in the study of the non-linear  $L_{UV} - L_X$  relationship in quasars to construct the Hubble diagram, covering the redshift range from  $z = 0.04$  to  $z = 5.1$ . The final sample of 1,598 sources they used to build the Hubble diagram has been obtained from a parent sample of 7,237 quasars. Selection criteria used to derive the final sample included consideration of X-ray absorption, interstellar reddening effects, pollution of UV observations, Eddington deviation, etc. The final sample is built by merging the following groups of quasars: 791 sources from the SDSS-DR7 sample, 612 from the SDSS-DR12, 102 from XMM-COSMOS, 18 from the low-redshift sample (Swift), 19 from Chandra-Champ, 38 from the high- $z$  ( $z > 4$ ) sample, and 18 quasars from the new  $z \sim 3$  sample (XMM-Newton Very Large Program). After this selection, the intrinsic dispersion was reduced to 0.23 dex. Many international project teams have been using this updated Hubble diagram of high-redshift standard candles in cosmological research (Liao 2019; Melia 2019; Liu et al 2020; Yang et al. 2020; Geng et al. 2020; Zheng et al. 2021a; Borislavov Vasilev et al. 2021; Lian et al. 2021; Zhao & Xia 2021; Li et al. 2021). We show the scatter plot of the 1598 quasar sources in Figure 2.

As previously, in the case of Pantheon SN Ia sample, we use the updated UV-X quasar data to fit the parameters  $a$  and  $b$  characterizing the phenomenological form of the luminosity distance. They are obtained by minimizing the following objective function

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{1598} \frac{[D_{L,QSO}(z_i) - D_L(z_i; a, b)]^2}{\sigma_{D_{L,QSO}}(z_i)^2}, \quad (13)$$

where  $D_{L,QSO}(z)$  obtained from Eq.(12) can be expressed as

$$D_{L,QSO} = 10^{\frac{1}{2-2\gamma}[\gamma \log(F_{UV}) - \log(F_X) + \beta]} \quad (14)$$

The uncertainty of the luminosity distance obtained from QSOs is given in terms of the  $(F_X)_i$  measurement uncertainty  $\sigma_i$  and the global intrinsic dispersion  $\delta$ :

$$\sigma_{D_{L,QSO}} = \frac{\ln(10) D_{L,QSO}}{2 - 2\gamma} \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \delta^2} \quad (15)$$

The uncertainty of  $F_{UV}$  is negligible comparing to  $\sigma_i$  and  $\delta$ , and is therefore ignored in this paper (Risaliti & Lusso 2015). During the fit we also treat  $(\gamma, \beta, \delta)$  as free parameters fitted together with the parameters  $(a, b)$  characterizing the luminosity distance. In this case, we obtain the best fitted values of free parameters with  $1\sigma$  error, respectively,  $a = 5.33^{+1.75}_{-1.38}$ ,  $b = -0.16^{+1.30}_{-1.50}$ ,  $\gamma = 0.62 \pm 0.01$ ,  $\beta = 7.83 \pm 0.29$  and  $\delta = 0.23 \pm 0.003$ .

### 2.3. Cosmic Chronometers $H(z)$


The Hubble parameter  $H(z) = \dot{a}/a$  characterizes the expansion rate of the universe at given redshift and has recently been widely used in cosmological research. A model-independent procedure of measuring the expansion rate of the universe has been proposed by Jimenez et al. (2002), using the differential age of passively evolving galaxies. This is known as cosmic chronometer approach and is based on the relation

$$H(z) = -\frac{1}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt}. \quad (16)$$

From the measurements of the age difference  $\Delta t$  between two passively evolving galaxies separated by a small redshift interval  $\Delta z$ , one can approximate the derivative  $dz/dt$  by the ratio  $\Delta z/\Delta t$ . In order to accurately calculate the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$ , the average age of stars in each galaxy should be much larger than the age difference between the galaxies. Galaxy pairs selected as cosmic chronometers, besides being close in redshift, should meet the following two conditions: similar metal abundance and low star formation rate. Therefore, it is necessary to select those passively evolved galaxies with reddish spectra dominated by the old population.

Currently popular approach is to determine the age of passively evolving galaxies from the spectral feature known as 4000 Å break. Denoted as  $D4000$ , the feature is defined as the ratio between the continuum flux densities in a red band and a blue band around 4000 Å. It originates from a series of metal absorption features, and is known to correlate with the stellar metallicity and age of the stellar population Moresco et al. (2016). Historically, in short, Simon et al. (2005) analyzed Gemini Deep Survey (GDDS) and archival data to obtain 8  $H(z)$  data points, which they used to constrain the dark energy. Stern et al. (2010) improved previous expansion history measurements of Simon et al. (2005) by the high-quality spectra with the Keck-LRIS spectrograph of red-envelope galaxies in 24 galaxy clusters in the redshift range  $0.2 < z < 1.0$  from the SPICES and VVDS surveys. Chuang & Wang (2012) measured the  $H(z)$  at  $z = 0.35$  based on the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 data. Moresco et al. (2012) obtained 8 new  $H(z)$  data points in the redshift range  $0 < z < 1.75$  and expanded the sample size to 20.

Then, Zhang et al. (2014) obtained 4 new observational  $H(z)$  data from 17,832 luminous red galaxies covering redshift  $0 < z < 0.4$  in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey DR7. More recently, 2 new measurements of the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$  were presented by Moresco (2015) using the cosmic chronometer method up to  $z \sim 2$ . Moresco et al. (2016) exploited the un-



**Figure 3.** Scatter plot of the 31 cosmic chronometers sample. Bars denote the Hubble parameters  $H(z)$ , with their  $1\sigma$  uncertainties.

precedented statistics provided by the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) Data Release 9 to provide new data regarding the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$ . From the sample of more than 130,000 massive and passively evolving galaxies, 5 new cosmology-independent  $H(z)$  measurements have been obtained in the redshift range  $0.3 < z < 0.5$ , with an accuracy of  $\sim 11\%$  to  $\sim 16\%$  incorporating both statistical and systematic uncertainties. These new data were crucial to provide the first cosmology-independent determination of the transition redshift  $z_t = 0.4 \pm 0.1$  between dark energy and dark matter dominated expansion. This result significantly disfavored the null hypothesis of no transition between decelerated and accelerated expansion at 99.9% confidence level. This analysis highlighted the potential of cosmic chronometers to constrain the expansion history of the universe in a way competitive with standard probes. The latest measurements of 31 Hubble parameters  $H(z)$  from the galaxy differential age method, covering the redshift range  $0.070 < z < 1.965$  are shown in Fig.3. Actually, there is another approach to obtain the  $H(z)$  data based on the radial baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) features from galaxy clustering (Gaztanaga et al. 2009; Blake et al. 2012; Samushia et al. 2013; Font-Ribera et al. 2014; Delubac et al. 2015). However, the expansion rates obtained employing this method are dependent on an assumed fiducial cosmological model and the prior for the distance to the last scattering surface from CMB observations (Li et al. 2016c), which is not quite suitable for our model-independent analysis. Consequently, we use only the latest 31 CC  $H(z)$  measurements shown in Figure 3. Let us remind that  $H(z)$  besides the  $D_L(z)$  function, is the second ingredient necessary to implement Eq.(6).

### 3. GRAVITATIONAL WAVES FROM DECIGO AS ALTERNATIVE TO COSMIC CHRONOMETERS

Considering the redshift range of currently available cosmic chronometers data, it is tempting to seek for other complementary tools reaching higher redshifts. On the other hand, the era of gravitational wave (GW) astronomy just begun with the first detection of GW150914 signal and the total number of events registered so far  $\sim 90$ . Planned future detectors like the Einstein Telescope (ET)<sup>2</sup>, and satellite missions like LISA will provide orders of magnitude richer statistics of events probing the redshift range far deeper than optical surveys (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2017). In particular, Kawamura et al. (2011); Seto et al. (2011) proposed a future space gravitational wave detector called as DECi-hertz Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory (DECIGO). Its deci-Hertz frequency range fills the gap between LISA and Earth based interferometric detectors allowing to discover inspiralling binary system (BH-BH, BH-NS, NS-NS) up to a few years before they enter the frequency band of LIGO-Virgo-Kagra (or future ET) detectors (Cao et al. 2022a,b).

DECIGO can become a unique tool to probe the cosmic expansion (Schutz 1986; Nishizawa et al. 2011) due to the following advantages compared with ground-based GW detectors: (i) lower-frequency band, (ii) larger number of GW cycles registered in a pre-merger phase, (iii) longer observation time for each binary, and (iv) larger number of NS-NS binaries that can be detected up to  $z \sim 5$  (Kawamura et al. 2019). The accelerated expansion of the universe produce an additional phase shift in gravitational waveforms, which is analogous to the redshift drift in the electromagnetic domain (Seto et al. 2001). Focusing on the GWsignals from the binary system with component masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , the observed GW (time-domain) waveform can be written as  $h(\Delta t)$  and the Fourier transform of this waveform can be expressed as

$$\tilde{h}(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt e^{2\pi i f t} h(\Delta t) \quad (17)$$

where  $\Delta t \equiv t_c - t$  means the time to coalescence measured in the observer frame with  $t_c$  representing the coalescence time. If one relates the observed time interval  $\Delta t$  with the respective time at the emitter frame  $\Delta t_e$  taking into account both the time dilation in an expanding universe and the acceleration, the result is:

$$\Delta t = \Delta T + X(z_c) \Delta T^2, \quad (18)$$

<sup>2</sup> The Einstein Telescope Project, <https://www.et-gw.eu/et/>.

where  $\Delta T = (1 + z_c)\Delta t_e$ ,  $z_c$  is the redshift of the source (coalescing binary) and the acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  is related to the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$  as follows

$$X(z) = \frac{1}{2(1+z)} [H_0(1+z) - H(z)]. \quad (19)$$

Then,  $h(\Delta t)$  can be re-expressed as a function of  $\Delta T(\Delta t)$  with  $h(\Delta T)$  meaning the GW waveform without cosmic acceleration. Substituting this to the Eq.(17) one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(f) = & e^{2\pi i f t_c} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta T' e^{-2\pi i f \Delta T'} h(\Delta T') \\ & \times e^{-2\pi i f X(z_c)\Delta T'^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Considering the stationary phase approximation (Cutler & Flanagan 1994), Eq.(20) can be re-expressed as

$$\tilde{h}(f) = e^{i\Psi_{acc}(f)} \tilde{h}(f)|_{noaccel}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{acc}(f) & \equiv -2\pi f X(z_c) \Delta T(f)^2 \\ & = -\Psi_N(f) \frac{25}{768} X(z_c) M_z (\pi M_z f)^{-8/3}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $M_z \equiv (1 + z_c) \frac{(m_1 m_2)^{3/5}}{(m_1 + m_2)^{1/5}}$  is the redshifted chirp mass, and  $\Psi_N(f) \equiv \frac{3}{128} (\pi M_z f)^{-5/3}$ . Moreover,


$$\tilde{h}(f)|_{noaccel} = e^{2\pi i f t_c} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\Delta T' e^{-2\pi i f \Delta T'} h(\Delta T'), \quad (23)$$

corresponds to the gravitational waveform in the Fourier domain without cosmic acceleration – more details can be found in Yagi, Nishizawa, & Yoo (2012).

We need to take the accuracies of binary parameters  $\theta^i = (\ln M_z, \ln \hat{\eta}, \hat{\beta}, t_c, \phi_c, \theta_s, \phi_s, \theta_l, \phi_l, D_L, X)$  into consideration, where  $\hat{\eta} = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)^2$ ,  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\phi_c$  are related to the spin-orbit coupling and the coalescence phase. The direction of the sources are represented by  $\theta_s$  and  $\phi_s$ . And the direction of the orbital angular momentum can be described by  $\theta_l$  and  $\phi_l$ . In order to estimate the uncertainty of  $\theta^i$ , we employ Fisher analysis with inner product

$$\Gamma_{ij} = 4Re \int_{f_{min}}^{f_{max}} df \frac{\partial_i \tilde{h}^*(f) \partial_j \tilde{h}(f)}{S_n(f)}, \quad (24)$$

where the noise spectrum  $S_n(f)$  of the DECIGO can be found in Kawamura et al. (2006). Following this procedure, the accuracies can be estimated as  $\Delta\theta^i = \sqrt{\Gamma_{ii}^{-1}}$ . By marginalizing the other parameters, the accuracy of the acceleration parameter  $X$  can be defined as  $\sigma_X = \sqrt{8\Gamma_{jj}^{-1}}$ . We show more details in Zhang et al. (2022).




**Figure 4.** Scatter plot of the 10,000 simulated acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  based on the future space-based GW detector DECIGO. The gray point denotes acceleration parameter  $X(z)$ , with its  $1\sigma$  uncertainty (blue bar).

The classical redshift distribution of the GW sources observed on Earth will be used in our work (Sathyaprakash et al. 2010) and the NSs coalescence rate can be approximated as Schneider et al. (2001); Cutler & Holz (2009). In our simulation, we assume equal mass NSs binary system with  $1.4M_\odot$  based on the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM ( $\Omega_m=0.315$  and  $H_0=67.4\text{km/s/Mpc}$ ). Recent analysis of (Kawamura et al. 2019) suggests that the space-based GW detector DECIGO can detect up to 10,000 GW events up to redshift  $z \sim 5$  in one year of operation. Thus, we simulate a mock data of 10,000 GW events to be used for the invariance of the speed of light analysis. The 10,000 simulated acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  are shown in Figure 4.

We also show the redshift distribution of different measurements in Figure 5. Blue broken line means the redshift distribution of Hubble parameter  $H(z)$  from the cosmic chronometers, it has a smaller redshift range and number than supernovae and quasars. Fortunately, future gravitational wave detector DECIGO can provide us with much higher redshifts and lots of measurements of acceleration parameters  $X(z)$  (related to  $H(z)$ ), which can help us study the invariance of the speed of light in more earlier Universe.

#### 4. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Applying methodology described above to determine the  $\eta$  parameter measuring the constancy of  $c$  from the combination of the Pantheon sample of Ia supernovae reconstruction and 31 cosmic chronometers  $H(z)$  measurements, we get the results shown in Figure 6. The uncertainties have been calculated from the uncertainty propagation rule. We summarize the individual values of  $\eta$  as the weighted mean with the inverse variance weight-



**Figure 5.** Redshift distribution of different measurements used in this work. Blue, green, red, and orange lines correspond to redshift distributions of cosmic chronometers, GW sources used in simulating the acceleration parameters, UV-X QSO data and Pantheon SN Ia, respectively.


ing (Bevington 1993):

$$\eta = \frac{\sum_i (\eta_i / \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)}{\sum_i (1 / \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)}, \quad \sigma_{\eta}^2 = \frac{1}{\sum_i (1 / \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\eta$  stands for the weighted mean and  $\sigma_{\eta}$  is its corresponding uncertainty. Following this most straightforward and popular way of summarizing multiple measurements, the result is  $\text{Mean}(\eta) = 1.03 \pm 0.03$  with 31 measurements, which shows that SN Ia and  $H(z)$  data do not indicate the deviation of  $\eta$  from 1, i.e. there is no signal suggesting the different value of  $c$  across the redshift range up to  $z \sim 2$ . In addition, we also summarized our findings with a robust non-parametric statistics by calculating the median and the corresponding median absolute deviation (Zheng et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2023). Considering that the probability that  $n$ -th observation is higher than the median follows the binomial distribution (Feigelson & Babu 2012):

$$P = 2^{-N} N! / [n!(N-n)!] \quad (26)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of multiple measurements, one can also define the 68.3% confidence interval with median statistics. Our assessment is  $\text{Mean}(\eta) = 1.04 \pm 0.05$  with the median value and the absolute deviation. It should be noted that the above estimates are based on the prior of the Hubble constant  $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$  km/s/Mpc from the latest *Planck* CMB observations (Aghanim et al. 2020). Considering the redshifts of the Pantheon sample of Ia supernovae are  $z \sim 2$  which correspond to the late universe, it is necessary to discuss the performance of the speed of light under different priors of Hubble constant. Therefore, we also use




**Figure 6.** Reconstruction of  $\eta \equiv c/c_0$  parameter measuring the invariance of the speed of light from the Pantheon sample of Ia supernovae and cosmic chronometers  $H(z)$ . Red dots represent 31 measurements of  $\eta$  and their  $1\sigma$  uncertainties, and the black line shows the value indicating the constancy of the speed of light.

$H_0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42$  km/s/Mpc from the SH0ES collaboration (Riess et al. 2019) to estimate the invariance of the speed of light. In this case, we obtain  $\text{Mean}(\eta) = 0.93 \pm 0.02$  and  $\text{Median}(\eta) = 0.94 \pm 0.05$  in the framework of weighted mean and median statistics, which produces a possible deviation from the constant speed of light up to  $z \sim 2$ . However, our results are still marginally consistent with  $\eta = 1$  within  $2\sigma$  confidence level, which is in full agreement with other recent tests involving cosmological data.

The use of UV-X relation in high-redshift quasars instead of SN Ia was motivated by reaching farther in redshift with the assessment of  $\eta$ . In fact, because both  $D_L(z)$  and  $H(z)$  data are needed, we are able to infer  $\eta$  parameter also up to  $z \sim 2$ . However, comparison between Pantheon +  $H(z)$  vs. UV-X QSO +  $H(z)$  allows to address the utility of UV-X QSO in the future. As one can see in Figure 7, almost all of the reconstructed  $\eta$  is consistent with the constancy of the speed of light within the  $1\sigma$  confidence level. As for the summary statistics, the weighted mean value and corresponding uncertainty is  $\text{Mean}(\eta) = 1.19 \pm 0.07$ , while the median statistics turns out to be  $\text{Median}(\eta) = 1.22^{+0.05}_{-0.13}$ . We summarize our findings from *QSO* +  $H(z)$  and *Pantheon* +  $H(z)$  in Table 1. Compared with what is obtained from the Ia supernovae, some  $\eta$  measurements have demonstrated mild deviation from the standard case ( $\eta = 1$ ) within the observational uncertainty, especially in the low-redshift range ( $z < 0.5$ ). Such possible tension between UV-X QSO and standard cosmological scenario has been recently traced and extensively discussed in Lian et al. (2021); Zheng et al. (2022). Moreover, there is no obvi-






**Figure 7.** Reconstruction of  $\eta \equiv c/c_0$  parameter measuring the invariance of the speed of light from the UV-X relation in high-redshift quasars and cosmic chronometers  $H(z)$ . Pink dots represent 31 measurements of  $\eta$  and their  $1\sigma$  uncertainties, and the black line shows the value indicating the constancy of the speed of light.

**Table 1.** The weighted mean and median values of  $\eta$  parameter measuring the invariance of the speed of light from the *QSO* +  $H(z)$  and *Pantheon* +  $H(z)$  samples. The associated dispersion measures are: weighted standard deviation and median absolute deviation.

	Mean( $\eta$ )	Median( $\eta$ )
<i>Pantheon</i> + $H(z)$	$1.03 \pm 0.03$	$1.04 \pm 0.05$
<i>QSO</i> + $H(z)$	$1.19 \pm 0.07$	$1.22^{+0.05}_{-0.13}$

ous improvement in the precision when the UV-X QSO data are used. Most likely it is due to still significant intrinsic dispersion in the UV-X QSO data. However, the uncertainty bars of individual assessments of  $\eta$  parameter support the future potential of UV-X QSO data in similar projects. The advantage of higher redshift coverage could not be taken, for the reasons already discussed. This possibility will be tested on the simulated data on acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  from DECIGO. Before we go to this point, let us compare our findings with the earlier studies done using alternative probes. The precision of our inference regarding  $\eta$  parameter is comparable to that attained in the study of the invariance of the speed of light from the recently compiled set of strong gravitational lensing (SGL) systems (Liu et al. 2021). Our conclusions that there is no clear evidence for the different value of the speed of light in earlier epochs is also consistent with the analysis of Cai et al. (2016); Cao et al. (2017).

Contemplating alternative measures of the expansion rate  $H(z)$  covering higher redshifts, we turned to the future space-borne GW detector DECIGO. Using the sim-



**Figure 8.** Reconstruction of the invariance of the speed of light  $\eta \equiv c/c_0$  from the Hubble diagram of type Ia supernovae (upper), high-redshift (lower) quasars and the simulated acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  based on the standard siren of GW space-based detector DECIGO. The gray dots with blue bars represent 10,000 measurements of  $\eta$  and their  $1\sigma$  confidence level.

ulated data of 10,000 the acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  measurements from DECIGO, combined with the UV-X QSO Hubble diagram, we obtained  $\eta = 1.016 \pm 0.002$ . Considering instead, the Pantheon sample, the  $\eta$  parameter measuring the invariance of the speed of light can be constrained as  $\eta = 1.002 \pm 0.001$ . We summarize our results in Table 2. They are also illustrated in Fig. 8. The expected precision is promising and is comparable to the forecasts of Cao et al. (2020), who predicted that multiple measurements of galactic-scale strong gravitational lensing systems with Type Ia supernovae acting as background sources from the future Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) would be able to constrain  $\Delta c/c$  at the level of  $10^{-3}$ . One should also note that this last approach we discussed was an attempt to measure the speed of light by combining the GW data with electromagnetic ones, which would also have a potential for testing general relativity.

In conclusion, we proposed an original technique to test the invariance of the speed of light with the Hubble

**Table 2.**  $\eta$  parameter measuring the invariance of the speed of light from the  $QSO + X(z)$  and  $Pantheon + X(z)$  samples and its precision.

	$\eta$	$\Delta\eta$
$Pantheon + X(z)$	$1.002 \pm 0.001$	$10^{-3}$
$QSO + X(z)$	$1.016 \pm 0.002$	$10^{-3}$

diagrams of standard candles (SN Ia up to  $z \sim 2.4$  and UV-X QSO relation up to  $z \sim 5.1$ ) combined with Hubble parameters  $H(z)$  inferred from cosmic chronometers. Moreover, this method does not rely on the details of the cosmological model: only flat FLRW metric is assumed. Generalization to non-flat FLRW metric is straightforward. Moreover, precise and accurate measurements of  $H_0$  and curvature parameter, which would be the input to our method are anyway more than welcome in any cosmological studies. Our findings confirm that there is no clear evidence for the deviation of  $\eta$  from 1 at the current observational data level. This result supports the claim that the speed of light is a fundamental constant of nature. It should be noted that due to the restricted redshift range and small number of cosmic chronometers,

we were not able to take the full advantage of the high redshift reach of standard candles (UV-X QSO in particular). However, the results obtained with simulated acceleration parameter  $X(z)$  expected from the future DECIGO mission are encouraging: the attainable precision of testing the invariance of the speed of light is at the level of  $10^{-3}$ . The combination of measurements obtained from GW and electromagnetic windows additionally opens a possibility to test the general relativity in a broader sense.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants Nos. 12021003, 11690023, and 11920101003; the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Grant No. XDB23000000; and the Interdisciplinary Research Funds of Beijing Normal University. Y.T. Liu was supported by the Interdisciplinary Research Funds of Beijing Normal University (Grant No. BNUXKJC2017) and China Scholarship Council (Grant No. 202106040084). M. Biesiada was supported by Foreign Talent Introducing Project and Special Fund Support of Foreign Knowledge Introducing Project in China (No. G2021111001L).

## REFERENCES

- Aghanim, N., et al. (Planck Collaboration), 2020, A&A, 641, A6
- Albrecht, A., & Magueijo, J. 1999, PRD, 59, 043516
- Amaro-Seoane P., Audley H., Babak S., et al. 2017, arXiv:1702.00786
- Barrow, J. D. 1999, PRD, 59, 043515
- Barrow, J. D., & Magueijo, J. 1999, PLB, 447, 246
- Balcerzak, A., DÄbrowski, M. P., & Salzano, V. 2017, AnP, 529, 1600409
- Banados, E., et al. 2018, Nature, 553, 473
- Bassett, B. A., Liberati, S., Molina-Paris, C., et al. 2000, PRD, 62, 103518
- Betoule, M., et al. 2014, A&A, 568, 22
- Bevington, P. R., et al. 1993, Computers in Physics, 7, 415.
- Bisogni, S., Risaliti, G., & Lusso, E. 2017, FrASS, 4, 68
- Blake, C., Brough, S., Colless, M., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 425, 405
- Borislavov Vasilev, T., Bouhmadi-López, M., & Martín-Moruno, P. 2021, PRD, 103, 124049
- Cai, R. G., Guo, Z. K., & Yang, T. 2016, JCAP, 08, 016
- Cao, S., Biesiada, M., Jackson, J., et al. 2017, JCAP, 02, 012
- Cao, S., Qi, J., Biesiada, M., et al. 2018, ApJ, 867, 50
- Cao, S., Qi, J., Biesiada, M., et al. 2020, ApJL, 888, L25
- Cao, S., Liu, T., Biesiada, M., et al. 2022a, ApJ, 926, 214
- Cao, S., Qi, J., Cao, Z., et al. 2022b, A&A Letters, 659, L5
- Chuang, C. H., & Wang, Y. 2012, MNRAS, 426, 226
- Conley, A., Guy, J., Sullivan, M., et al. 2011, ApJS, 192, 1
- Cutler, C. & Flanagan, E. E., 1994, PRD, 49, 2658
- Cutler, C. , Holz, D. E. 2009, PRD, 80, 104009
- Delubac, T., Bautista, J. E., et al. 2015, A&A, 574, A59
- Dirac, P. A. M. 1934, PCPS, 30, 150
- Duff, M.J., 2002 [arXiv:hep-th/0208093]
- Dvali, G. R., Gabadadze, G. & Porrati, M. 2000, PLB, 485, 208
- Einstein, A., 1907, Jahrbuch der Radioaktivitat und Elektronik, 4, 411
- Feigelson, E. & Babu, G. J., Modern Statistical Methods for Astronomy: With R Applications, 2012, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Font-Ribera, A., Kirkby, D., Busca, N., et al. 2014, JCAP, 5, 027
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., et al. 2013, PASP, 125, 306
- Frieman, J. A., Bassett, B., Becker, A., et al. 2008, AJ, 135, 33

- Fujii, Y. & Maeda, K., *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2007).
- Gaztanaga, E., Cabré, A., & Hui, L., 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, 1663
- Geng, S., Cao S., Liu T., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 905, 54
- Jha, S., Kirshner, R. P., Challis, P., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 131, 527
- Jimenez, R., & Loeb, A. 2002, *ApJ*, 573, 37
- Jimenez, R., Verde, L., Treu, T. et al. 2003, *ApJ*, 593, 622
- Kawamura, S., et al. 2006, *CQG*, 23, 125
- Kawamura, S., et al. 2011, *CGQ*, 28, 094011
- Kawamura S., et al. 2019, *IJMPD*, 28, 1845001
- Kessler, R., & Scolnic, D. 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 56
- Li X., Keeley R. E., Shafieloo A., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 507, 919
- Li, Z.-X., Wang, G.-J., Liao, K., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 833, 240
- Lian Y., Cao S., Biesiada M., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 505, 2111
- Liao, K. 2019, *PRD*, 99, 083514
- Liu, T. H., Cao S., Zhang J., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 496, 708
- Liu, Y., Cao, S., Liu, T., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 901, 129
- Liu, T. H., Cao, S., Biesiada, M., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 506, 2181
- Liu, T. H., Cao, S., Liu, Y., et al. 2023, *PLB*, 838, 137687
- Lusso, E., & Risaliti, G. 2016, *ApJ*, 819, 154
- Magueijo, J. 2003, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* 66, 2025
- Melia, F., 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 517
- Miknaitis, G., Pignata, G., Rest, A., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 666, 674
- Moffat, J. W. 2002 [arXiv:hep-th/0208109]
- Moresco, M., Verde, L., Pozzetti, L., et al. 2012, *JCAP*, 7, 053
- Moresco, M. 2015, *MNRAS*, 450, L16
- Moresco, M., Pozzetti, L., Cimatti, A., et al. 2016, *JCAP*, 5, 014
- Mortsell, E., & Onsson, J. 2011, arXiv:1102.4485
- Nicolis, A. & Rattazzi, R., 2004, *JHEP*, 06, 059
- Nishizawa, A., Taruya, A. & Saito, S., 2011, *PRD*, 83, 084045
- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 565
- Qi, J., Zhang, M., & Liu, W., 2014, *PRD*, 90, 063526
- 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., Kirshner, R. P., Schmidt, B. P., et al. 1999, *AJ*, 117, 707
- Riess, A. G., Strolger, L. G., Tonry, J., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 607, 665
- Riess, A. G., Strolger, L. G., Casertano, S., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 659, 98
- Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 876, 85
- Risaliti, G., & Lusso, E. 2015, *ApJ*, 815, 33
- Risaliti, G., & Lusso, E. 2019, *NatAs*, 3, 272
- Rodney, S. A., Riess, A. G., Strolger, L. G., et al. 2014, *AJ*, 148, 13
- Salzano, V., DÄbrowski M. P., & Lazkoz, R., 2015, *PRL*, 114, 101304
- Salzano, V., DÄbrowski, M. P., & Lazkoz, R., 2016, *PRD*, 93, 063521
- Salzano, V., & DÄbrowski, M. P., 2017, *ApJ*, 851, 97
- Salzano, V., 2017, *Universe*, 3, 35
- Salzano, V., 2017, *PRD*, 95, 084035
- Samushia, L., Reid, B. A., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 429, 1514
- Sathyaprakash, B. et al. 2010, *CQG*, 27, 215006
- Schneider, R., et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 324, 797
- Schutz, B. F. 1986, *Nature*, 323, 310
- Scolnic, D., Rest, A., Riess, A., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 45
- Scolnic D. M., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 859, 101
- Seto, N., Kawamura, S. & Nakamura, T. 2001, *PRL*, 87, 221103
- Seto, N., et al. 2001, *PRL*, 87, 221103
- Simon, J., Verde, L., & Jimenez, R. 2005, *PRD*, 71, 123001
- Stern, D., Jimenez, R., Verde, L., et al. 2010, *JCAP*, 2, 008
- Stritzinger, M. D., Phillips, M. M., Boldt, L. N., et al. 2011, *AJ*, 142, 156
- Suzuki, N., Rubin, D., Lidman, C., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 746, 85
- Tripp, R. 1998, *A&A*, 331, 815
- Wang, D. D., Zhang, H. Y., Zheng, J. L., et al. 2019, arXiv:1904.04041
- Yagi, K., Nishizawa, A., & Yoo, C. M. 2012, *JCAP*, 2012, 031
- Yang T., Banerjee A., & Ó Colgáin E., 2020, *PRD*, 102, 123532
- Zhang, C., Zhang, H., Yuan, S., et al. 2014, *RAA*, 14, 1221
- Zhang, Y., Cao S., Liu X., Liu T., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 931, 119
- Zhao, D., & Xia, J.-Q., 2021, *EPJC*, 81, 694
- Zheng, X. G., Ding, X. H., Biesiada, M., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, 17
- Zheng, X., Cao, S., Liu, Y., et al. 2021, *EPJC*, 81, 14
- Zheng, X., Cao, S., Biesiada, M., et al. 2021, *SCPMA*, 64, 259511
- Zheng, J., Cao, S., Lian, Y., et al. 2022, *EPJC*, 82, 582