

Early Dark Energy with Power-law $F(R)$ Gravity

Sergei D. Odintsov,^{1,2,*} V.K. Oikonomou,^{3,†} and German S. Sharov^{4,5,‡}

¹*Institut de Ciències de l'Espai, ICE/CSIC-IEEC, Campus UAB,
Carrer de Can Magrans s/n, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*

²*Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA),
Passeig Luis Companys, 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

³*Department of Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece*

⁴*Tver state university, Sadovyy per. 35, 170002 Tver, Russia*

⁵*International Laboratory for Theoretical Cosmology,
Tomsk State University of Control Systems and Radioelectronics (TUSUR), 634050 Tomsk, Russia*

We study a power-law $F(R)$ gravity with an early dark energy term, that can describe both the early-time and the late-time acceleration of the Universe. We confront this scenario with recent observational data including the Pantheon Type Ia supernovae, measurements of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ (Cosmic Chronometers), data from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and standard rulers data from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation. The model demonstrates some achievements in confronting with these observations and can be compared with the Λ -Cold-Dark-Matter model. In particular, in both models we obtain very close estimates for the Hubble constant H_0 , but it is not true for Ω_m^0 . The early dark energy term supports viability of the considered $F(R)$ gravity model.

PACS numbers: 04.50.Kd, 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x

I. INTRODUCTION

We live in an era in which the way to precision cosmology is paved in rapid steps, aimed by the plethora of cosmological and astrophysical observational data. There are a lot of facts and challenges of standard benchmark models used currently in order to describe the observable Universe. To be precise, the Λ -Cold-Dark-Matter (Λ CDM) assisted with a nearly scale invariant power spectrum observed in the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), see to provide a generally acceptable description of the current Universe at large scales. But there are shortcomings, for example we do not even know if inflation indeed was the source of the observed nearly scale invariant power spectrum, if the inflationary era is controlled by a scalar field, which has to be coupled to all the Standard Model particles in order to reheat these, issues related to the inflationary era solely. Regarding the Λ CDM, the possible existence of large scale matter structure at large redshifts, will put further into question the Λ CDM, which is a rather simple model, not the actual model that describes the late-time Universe. To our opinion, the Λ CDM is just a starting point, not the end. There are many new issues to be addressed and much more new physics to be employed from the primordial era, followed by the reheating, matter, the CMB era and the late-time acceleration eras. We have some hints about these eras, but we are still at the start and in the next decades these model we have at hands, we will be into test and the observations will reveal to us the correct way to proceed in modelling the Universe. Modified gravity, for example $f(R)$ gravity, is an alternative to dark energy which can mimic the Λ CDM model and produce viable late-time acceleration, in a geometric way. In some cases it can also mimic dark matter, although there is strong motivation to expect that dark matter is of particle nature, if not a massive interacting particle, then some elusive light scalar field, like the axion. Also modified gravity can model inflation in a geometric way without the need for a scalar field to drive the dynamics. The question is whether inflation ever existed at all. In the next 15 years it will be scrutinized by stage 4 CMB experiments and by gravitational waves experiments, so we will have a concrete answer on whether it occurred or not. It should be noted that the Universe's acceleration follows a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker cosmology, but the latter remains after all, an idealized solution of general relativity, which disregards other interactions. Dark energy is not a straight consequence of measuring results, but it follows from one possible interpretation, among others. The real result of the measurements is the detection of non-linear dependence of the registered energy current density of SNe Ia with respect to redshift. Also the dark Universe is currently not explained by the Standard-Model

*Electronic address: odintsov@ice.csic.es

†Electronic address: voikonomou@gapps.auth.gr; v.k.oikonomou1979@gmail.com

‡Electronic address: sharov.gs@tversu.ru

of elementary particles which constitutes an embarrassing 96% of the Universe. Thus the challenges for theorists are apparently many, but this is exactly the core of the physics science, from the date it was firstly quantified by Newton. Physics is always challenged and we believe this is the correct way, physics always in crisis, this is what keeps theorists active and busy. Each generation will have another challenge, and the great wall of understanding the Universe is built by each generation by putting a simple brick in the wall. So expressions like physics in crisis are redundant, physics was always in crisis and will be. For some recent mainstream articles in the above research lines, see for example [1–7]. The Hubble tension problem is not a new problem, but it is a 30 years old problem, now very well constrained and verified at 5σ C.L. and there exist various ways to remedy or alleviate this problem [8–11]. The tension between local low redshift [12] and CMB measurements [13] of the Hubble rate is nowadays confirmed at 5σ , thus it is a realistic problem of post recombination physics. To date it is still a mystery, although many phenomenological solutions have been proposed that can remedy or even alleviate the tension [14–32], including the early dark energy (EDE) perspective [33–40], see also [41] for a recent review and several proposals for abrupt physics changes before $70 - 150$ Myrs [42–47]. The Λ CDM model although being a benchmark model fitting very well the CMB polarization anisotropies, it has its shortcomings. However, the Λ CDM model is not the only one which can describe in a consistent way the late-time acceleration era. Modified gravity in its various forms [48–51] can also consistently describe the late-time era, mimicking the Λ CDM model and offering a solid theoretical background for model building. In addition, modified gravity offers a theoretical framework which a geometric fluid actually realizes dark energy but the same fluid can also generate an inflationary era and also intermediate eras, like an early dark energy era. Scenarios with an EDE are also motivated by the H_0 tension problem. This form of dark energy can be produced from scalar fields, axions or other forms of matter, see for example a recent work on this [52], but also from modified gravity. The EDE component can play a role of dark energy or an effective cosmological constant at intermediate times between the matter-radiation equality $z \simeq 3000$ and recombination $z \simeq 1000$ and then decays faster than radiation. In a previous work [53] we considered an EDE generating $F(R)$ gravity term as a possible tool for solving or alleviating the H_0 tension problem. This model and the EDE term did not affect significantly the values of H_0 . In the present paper, we explore a power-law $F(R)$ gravity model with a late-time dominating term of the form $\sim \gamma R^\delta$ studied previously in the papers [36, 54] and with an additional EDE term firstly introduced in Ref. [53]. We confront the model with the following observational data: the Type Ia supernovae data (SNe Ia) from the Pantheon sample survey, the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ measurements from differential ages of galaxies or cosmic chronometers (CC), data connected with cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB) and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO). We shall adopt the approach developed in some previous papers [55–57] and we obtain the best fit parameters which in the end we shall compare with predictions of the Λ CDM model. This paper is organized as follows: In section II, we introduce the $F(R)$ model under consideration, further, we consider its early-time evolution in section III and the late-time dynamics of the model are analyzed in section IV. Section V is devoted to SNe Ia, $H(z)$, CMB and BAO observational data. The results of our analysis are presented in section VI and the conclusions follow at the end of the article.

II. AN $F(R)$ GRAVITY MODEL QUANTIFYING INFLATION, DE AND EDE ERAS

We shall extend the $F(R)$ gravity model of Ref. [53], with the general gravitational action being,

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

where $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$, R is the Ricci scalar and S^{matter} is the matter action. In the present paper, we analyze the power-law $F(R)$ model of Ref. [53] with an additional EDE term [53] so the $F(R)$ gravity function has the form,

$$F(R) = R - 2\Lambda\gamma \left(\frac{R}{2\Lambda}\right)^\delta + F_{\text{EDE}} + \frac{R^2}{M^2}. \quad (2)$$

The last term $F_{\text{inf}} = R^2/M^2$ is responsible for the early-time acceleration, [36, 54] and dominates during the inflationary era, described below in Sect. III. However, the constant M should be large enough in order for F_{inf} to become negligible at late times $z < 3000$ related with our observational data.

The EDE term, F_{EDE} , that mimics an effective cosmological constant at intermediate times between the matter-radiation equality and recombination was considered as [53]

$$F_{\text{EDE}} = -\alpha \cdot 2\Lambda R_0^\ell \frac{R^{m-n}(R - R_0)^n}{R_0^{\ell+m} + R^{\ell+m}},$$

where α, ℓ, m, n, R_0 are constants. The scale R_0 corresponds to the Ricci scalar value for the intermediate epoch $1000 \leq z \leq 3000$. This EDE term F_{EDE} was examined in Ref. [53] and as it was shown it leads to a regular evolution without singularities only if the numbers ℓ, m, n are $\ell = n = 0, m = 1$ (if α is not negligible). So the viable form of the EDE term is,

$$F_{\text{EDE}} = -2\Lambda\alpha \frac{R}{R_0 + R}. \quad (3)$$

The EDE term (3) is aimed to shift the effective cosmological constant before and near the time of recombination, which might affect the CMB parameter measurements at that epoch. At early times, where $R \gg R_0$, the EDE term turns to be a constant $F_{\text{EDE}} \simeq -2\alpha\Lambda$ and becomes irrelevant at the very early Universe. At late times $R \ll R_0$, the EDE term becomes small because of the factor R/R_0 .

Moreover, the EDE term (3) with sufficiently large α can effectively suppress oscillations arising in this model during the mentioned intermediate epoch and beyond [53].

The field equations for $F(R)$ gravity with the action (1) are obtained by varying it with respect to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$:

$$F_R R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{F}{2} g_{\mu\nu} + (g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\alpha \nabla_\beta - \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu) F_R = \kappa^2 T_{\mu\nu}.$$

Here $R_{\mu\nu}$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ are the Ricci and energy-momentum tensors respectively. In a spatially-flat Friedman-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) spacetime with line element,

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) d\mathbf{x}^2$$

where the scale factor is denoted as $a(t)$, these equations are reduced to the system for the Hubble parameter $H = \dot{a}/a$, while the Ricci scalar R and the matter density ρ are,

$$\frac{dH}{d \log a} = \frac{R}{6H} - 2H, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dR}{d \log a} = \frac{1}{F_{RR}} \left(\frac{\kappa^2 \rho}{3H^2} - F_R + \frac{R F_R - F}{6H^2} \right), \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{d\rho}{d \log a} = -3(\rho + p). \quad (6)$$

The matter density ρ includes contributions of dust matter ρ_m (baryonic and dark matter) and radiation ρ_r . For $\rho = \rho_m + \rho_r$ the continuity equation (6) can be easily solved,

$$\rho = \rho_m^0 a^{-3} + \rho_r^0 a^{-4} = \rho_m^0 (a^{-3} + X_r a^{-4}). \quad (7)$$

Here ρ_m^0, ρ_r^0 and $a = 1$ are the present time values of the matter densities and the scale factor, while we assume the estimation for the ratio of matter densities as provided by Planck [13]:

$$X_r = \frac{\rho_r^0}{\rho_m^0} = 2.9656 \cdot 10^{-4}. \quad (8)$$

III. INFLATIONARY EVOLUTION OF THE $F(R)$ GRAVITY MODEL

In this section we briefly review the early time evolution of the scenario (2) that may be interpreted as the inflationary era. For $F(R)$ models of the type (2), in other words, for models with the power-law ($\sim R^\delta$) and the inflationary term $F_{\text{inf}} = R^2/M^2$ slow-roll inflation scenarios were considered in many papers [58]. These scenarios reproduce the inflationary era when the Ricci scalar R is very large, hence in the expression $F(R)$ (2) we can neglect the terms,

$$F_{\text{DE}} = -2\Lambda\gamma \left(\frac{R}{2\Lambda} \right)^\delta, \quad F_{\text{EDE}} = -2\Lambda\alpha \frac{R}{R_0 + R} \simeq -2\alpha\Lambda, \quad R \gg R_0. \quad (9)$$

The constant M in F_{inf} may be evaluated as $M = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-5} (50/N) M_P$, where N is the number of e -foldings during inflation, and $M_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{4\pi G}} = 2.435 \cdot 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$ is the reduced Planck mass. Hence M should be of order 10^{13} GeV

that is close to approximate values of the Hubble parameter $H(z) \simeq H_I \sim 10^{13}$ GeV during the inflationary era in the mentioned scenarios [36, 54].

The considered inflationary scenario, is a slow-roll scenario, assuming the approximation,

$$|\ddot{H}| \ll H|\dot{H}|, \quad |\dot{H}| \ll H^2. \quad (10)$$

The relation,

$$R = 6\dot{H} + 12H^2, \quad (11)$$

equivalent to Eq. (4), in the slow-roll case (10) is reduced to $R \simeq 12H^2$, hence the curvature scalar during inflation is approximately $R \simeq R_I = \mathcal{O}(10^{27})$ GeV². Consequently, we can evaluate the quadratic term $F_{\text{inf}} = R^2/M^2 \simeq R_I^2/M^2 = \mathcal{O}(10^{28})$ GeV² during inflation (it is of order or exceeds $R \simeq R_I$) and compare it with the terms (9). We estimate the constant

$$\Lambda = 3\Omega_\Lambda H_0^2 \simeq 4.2 \cdot 10^{-66} \text{ eV}^2 \quad (12)$$

using the Planck 2018 fits [13] for Ω_Λ and H_0 . The term F_{DE} during this era (for $R \simeq R_I$) is of order $|F_{\text{DE}}| \simeq 8.4 \cdot 10^{-84} \gamma \cdot 10^{110\delta}$ GeV² and under natural limitations (see Sect. VI) $\gamma \leq 10$, $\delta \leq 0.06$ it does not exceed $|F_{\text{DE}}| \simeq 3.4 \cdot 10^{-76}$ GeV².

Taking into account the EDE term $|F_{\text{EDE}}| \simeq 8.4 \cdot 10^{-84} \alpha$ GeV², we obtain the relations of the terms (9) to F_{inf} near the inflationary epoch,

$$\frac{|F_{\text{DE}}|}{F_{\text{inf}}} < 5 \cdot 10^{-104}, \quad \frac{|F_{\text{EDE}}|}{F_{\text{inf}}} < 10^{-106}, \quad (13)$$

if $\gamma \leq 10$, $\delta \leq 0.06$, $\alpha \leq 10^5$. Derivatives of F_{DE} and F_{EDE} are relatively smaller.

We may conclude that the terms (9) are negligible during the inflationary era, when $F(R)$ is reduced to the form,

$$F(R) \simeq R + \frac{R^2}{M^2}. \quad (14)$$

If we use the relation (11), we can exclude R and rewrite the equation (5) for the case (14) neglecting matter:

$$\ddot{H} + 3H\dot{H} - \frac{\dot{H}^2}{2H} + \frac{M^2}{12}H = 0. \quad (15)$$

Under the slow-roll conditions (10) this equation is simplified to $\dot{H} \simeq -M^2/36$, that yields a quasi-de Sitter evolution

$$H(t) = H_I - \frac{M^2}{36}t \quad (16)$$

and the slow-roll parameter ϵ_1 reads [58],

$$\epsilon_1 = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{M^2}{36(H_I - \frac{M^2}{36}t)^2}. \quad (17)$$

We can find the time t_f , when inflation ends, from the equality $\epsilon_1(t_f) = 1$, that yields $t_f = 6(6H_I - M)/M^2$. The horizon crossing time instance t_i for inflation we can express via the e -folding number N [58]

$$N = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} H(t) dt = H_I(t_f - t_i) - \frac{M^2}{72}(t_f - t_i)^2 \quad (18)$$

and obtain $t_i = \frac{36}{M^2}H_I - \frac{6}{M}\sqrt{2N+1}$. If we evaluate the slow-roll index ϵ_1 (17) at the time instance t_i , we get the result [58]

$$\epsilon_1(t_i) = \frac{1}{2N+1}. \quad (19)$$

The other relevant slow-roll parameters have the form [58],

$$\epsilon_3 = \frac{\dot{F}_R}{2HF_R}, \quad \epsilon_4 = \frac{\ddot{F}_R}{2HF_R},$$

can also be calculated for the evolution (16) at $t = t_i$:

$$\epsilon_3(t_i) = -\frac{1}{2N+2}, \quad \epsilon_4(t_i) = -\frac{1}{2N+1} \quad (20)$$

in concordance with the estimations [58] $\epsilon_4 \simeq -\epsilon_1(1 + 24H^2 \frac{F_{RRR}}{F_{RR}})$, $\epsilon_3 = -\epsilon_1/(1 - \epsilon_4)$. Here for all ϵ_i we have $|\epsilon_i| \ll 1$. If we calculate the spectral index of primordial curvature perturbations n_s and the tensor-to-scalar ratio r [58]

$$n_s = 1 - \frac{4\epsilon_1 - 2\epsilon_3 + 2\epsilon_4}{1 - \epsilon_1}, \quad r = 48 \frac{\epsilon_3^2}{(1 + \epsilon_3)^2},$$

for the expressions (19), (20), we get the estimates

$$n_s = 1 - \frac{2}{N} + \frac{1}{2N(N+1)}, \quad r = \frac{48}{(2N+1)^2}. \quad (21)$$

They are close to the well-known results $n_s \simeq 1 - 4\epsilon_1 \simeq 1 - 2/N$, $r \simeq 12/N^2$ for the spectral index and the tensor-to-scalar ratio. One may conclude that the inflationary behavior of the model (2) is viable and compatible with the Planck 2018 data [13].

IV. LATE-TIME EVOLUTION OF THE $F(R)$ GRAVITY MODEL

During the late-time evolution, in other words, at redshifts $z \leq 3000$, the EDE term F_{EDE} (3) and matter play an important role, and we shall see below that the inflationary term F_{inf} becomes negligible.

It was shown in the paper [53] that the model (2), (3) under certain initial conditions mimics the Λ CDM model at large redshifts $z > 1000$ with the following asymptotic behavior of H and R :

$$\frac{H^2}{(H_0^*)^2} = \Omega_m^*(a^{-3} + X_r a^{-4}) + \Omega_\Lambda^*, \quad \frac{R}{2\Lambda} = 2 + \frac{\Omega_m^*}{2\Omega_\Lambda^*} a^{-3}, \quad a \rightarrow 0. \quad (22)$$

Here the matter density $\rho = \rho_m + \rho_r$ behaves as (7), (8); the index $*$ refers to parameters related to the Λ CDM model, in particular, H_0^* is the Hubble constant in the Λ CDM scenario. However, under these initial conditions the late-time evolution for the $F(R)$ model deviates from the Λ CDM evolution, such that the parameters $H_0 = H(t_0)$, $\Omega_m^0 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3H_0^2} \rho_m(t_0)$ measured today (at t_0) for our models will be different:

$$H_0 \neq H_0^*, \quad \Omega_m^0 \neq \Omega_m^*.$$

However, these parameters are connected:

$$\Omega_m^0 H_0^2 = \Omega_m^* (H_0^*)^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3} \rho_m(t_0), \quad \Omega_\Lambda H_0^2 = \Omega_\Lambda^* (H_0^*)^2 = \frac{\Lambda}{3}. \quad (23)$$

Using the relations (22) and (12) we can estimate the Ricci scalar and the inflationary term for $z \sim 3000$:

$$\frac{R}{2\Lambda} \sim 3 \cdot 10^{10}, \quad R \sim 10^{-73} \text{ GeV}^2, \quad F_{\text{inf}} = \frac{R^2}{M^2} \sim 10^{-172} \text{ GeV}^2.$$

One can see that F_{inf} is many orders smaller than R and the terms (9) $|F_{\text{DE}}| > \gamma \cdot 10^{-83} \text{ GeV}^2$, $|F_{\text{EDE}}| \sim \alpha \cdot 10^{-83} \text{ GeV}^2$. Later, during further evolution, F_{inf} diminishes faster than other terms.

Following Refs. [53] we redefine the Hubble parameter and the Ricci scalar as dimensionless functions,

$$E = \frac{H}{H_0^*}, \quad \mathcal{R} = \frac{R}{2\Lambda}. \quad (24)$$

If we neglect the inflationary term F_{inf} , the dynamical equations (5) for the model (2), (3) with the dimensionless variables (24) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE}{d \log a} &= \Omega_\Lambda^* \frac{\mathcal{R}}{E} - 2E, \\ \frac{d\mathcal{R}}{d \log a} &= \frac{1}{R F_{RR}} \left[\frac{\Omega_m^* (a^{-3} + X_r a^{-4}) + \Omega_\Lambda^* [\gamma(1 - \delta)\mathcal{R}^\delta + \alpha \frac{\mathcal{R}^2}{(\mathcal{R}_0 + \mathcal{R})^2}]}{E^2} - 1 + \gamma\delta\mathcal{R}^{\delta-1} + \alpha \frac{\mathcal{R}_0}{(\mathcal{R}_0 + \mathcal{R})^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Here $RF_{RR} = \gamma\delta(1-\delta)\mathcal{R}^{\delta-1} + 2\alpha\mathcal{R}_0\mathcal{R}/(\mathcal{R}_0+\mathcal{R})^3$, $\mathcal{R}_0 = R_0/(2\Lambda)$. As mentioned above, the model (2), (3) mimics the Λ CDM asymptotic behavior (22) at large redshifts or at the range $10 \leq \mathcal{R} \leq 10^{10}$ of the normalized Ricci scalar [53]. We can numerically solve the system of equations (25) by integrating over the folding number $x = \log a = -\log(z+1)$ and assuming the initial conditions (22) at an initial point x_i related to redshift z_i in the range $1000 \leq z \leq 3000$. This redshift range should also contain z_0 corresponding to the value R_0 of the EDE term (3): $R(z_0) = R_0$. At this time, just before recombination and at its vicinity (where $R \sim R_0$), the EDE term becomes important. In our calculations we chose $\mathcal{R}_0 = 10^8$ and the initial point x_i before $x_0 = -\log(z_0 + 1)$. In this case the results appeared to be weakly depending on x_i .

In the paper [53] we studied solutions of the system (25) without the EDE term ($\alpha = 0$) and had seen their undesirable oscillatory behavior at large R (see also Refs. [36, 54]). These oscillations become inevitable in the most interesting case $\delta \ll 1$. However, the EDE term (3) with sufficiently large α makes it possible to suppress these oscillations in the framework of the considered model.

Thus, we can obtain non-oscillating and non-diverging solutions of the model (2), (3), and, further, confront them with the observational data (Sect. V) by fitting the free parameters. If we fix the ratio X_r (8) and the values \mathcal{R}_0 and x_i , we will work with the following set of the parameters:

$$\gamma, \delta, \alpha, \Omega_m^*, \Omega_\Lambda^*, H_0^*. \quad (26)$$

The last 3 parameters should be transformed into the more convenient $\Omega_m^0, \Omega_\Lambda, H_0$ via the relations (23) and $H_0 = H_0^*E(z=0)$. Here we keep in mind that the calculated normalized value $E(z)$ yields the Hubble parameter as $H(z) = H_0^*E(z)$.

V. OBSERVATIONAL DATA

We confront the model (2), (3) and its predictions with the observational data in order to obtain the best fit for the free parameters (26) and estimate viability of the model. In this paper our analysis involves the following observational data: (a) Pantheon sample of Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) data [59]; (b) measurements of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ from cosmic chronometers, data from (c) cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB) and (d) baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO). Unlike Ref. [55] here we include the renewed BAO data and exclude $H(z)$ estimations extracted from BAO.

The Pantheon sample database [59] for SNe Ia contains $N_{\text{SN}} = 1048$ datapoints of distance moduli μ_i^{obs} at redshifts z_i . We calculate the χ^2 function,

$$\chi_{\text{SN}}^2(\theta_1, \dots) = \min_{H_0} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_{\text{SN}}} \Delta\mu_i (C_{\text{SN}}^{-1})_{ij} \Delta\mu_j, \quad \Delta\mu_i = \mu^{\text{th}}(z_i, \theta_1, \dots) - \mu_i^{\text{obs}}, \quad (27)$$

where θ_j are free model parameters, C_{SN} is the covariance matrix [59] and the theoretical values of distance moduli are given by the relations,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\text{th}}(z) &= 5 \log_{10} \frac{D_L(z)}{10\text{pc}}, \quad D_L(z) = (1+z) D_M(z), \\ D_M(z) &= c \int_0^z \frac{d\tilde{z}}{H(\tilde{z})}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the χ^2 function (27) for SNe Ia data we consider the Hubble constant H_0 or the ‘‘asymptotical’’ constant H_0^* (22), (23) as a nuisance parameter following Refs. [53, 55]. For the Hubble parameter data $H(z)$ here we use the cosmic chronometers (CC), i.e. measured different ages Δt of galaxies with close redshifts Δz and consequently, extracted values $H(z) = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \simeq -\frac{1}{1+z} \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t}$.

In this paper, we also consider $N_H = 32$ CC $H(z)$ data points, 31 of them are given in Refs. [60] and were used previously in the papers [53, 55]. Here we add the value $H = 98.8 \pm 33.6$ at $z = 0.75$ from Ref. [61]. Unlike Ref. [53] we do not include here $H(z)$ values, extracted from BAO data along the line-of-sight direction to avoid correlations with BAO data described below. We calculate the χ^2 function for CC $H(z)$ data as follows:

$$\chi_H^2(\theta_1, \dots) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_H} \left[\frac{H(z_j, \theta_1, \dots) - H^{\text{obs}}(z_j)}{\sigma_j} \right]^2 \quad (29)$$

We use observational manifestations from the CMB radiation that are extracted from Planck 2018 data [?] as the following parameters [62]:

$$\mathbf{x} = (R, \ell_A, \omega_b), \quad R = \sqrt{\Omega_m^0} \frac{H_0 D_M(z_*)}{c}, \quad \ell_A = \frac{\pi D_M(z_*)}{r_s(z_*)}, \quad \omega_b = \Omega_b^0 h^2. \quad (30)$$

Here, z_* is the photon-decoupling redshift, D_M is the comoving distance (28), $h = H_0/[100 \text{ kms}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}]$, the comoving sound horizon $r_s(z)$ is calculated as,

$$r_s(z) = \int_z^\infty \frac{c_s(\tilde{z})}{H(\tilde{z})} d\tilde{z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \int_0^{1/(1+z)} \frac{da}{a^2 H(a) \sqrt{1 + [3\Omega_b^0/(4\Omega_\gamma^0)]a}}. \quad (31)$$

We estimate the ratio of baryons and photons Ω_b^0/Ω_γ using the relation (8), $\rho_\nu = N_{\text{eff}}(7/8)(4/11)^{4/3}\rho_\gamma$ with $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$, as given by Planck 2018 data [?]. We use the estimation of z_* given in Refs. [62, 63]. The current baryon fraction Ω_b^0 here is considered as the nuisance parameter in the corresponding χ^2 function,

$$\chi_{\text{CMB}}^2 = \min_{\omega_b} \Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot C_{\text{CMB}}^{-1}(\Delta \mathbf{x})^T, \quad \Delta \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{Pl}. \quad (32)$$

The estimates [62],

$$\mathbf{x}^{Pl} = (R^{Pl}, \ell_A^{Pl}, \omega_b^{Pl}) = (1.7428 \pm 0.0053, 301.406 \pm 0.090, 0.02259 \pm 0.00017), \quad (33)$$

are extracted from Planck collaboration 2018 data [?] with free amplitude for the lensing power spectrum. The covariance matrix $C_{\text{CMB}} = \|\tilde{C}_{ij}\sigma_i\sigma_j\|$ is described in Ref. [62].

For the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) data we consider the magnitudes,

$$d_z(z) = \frac{r_s(z_d)}{D_V(z)}, \quad A(z) = \frac{H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_m^0}}{cz} D_V(z), \quad (34)$$

where $D_V(z) = [czD_M^2(z)/H(z)]^{1/3}$, $r_s(z_d)$ is the integral (31) and z_d being the redshift at the end of the baryon drag era. Here we work with 21 BAO data points for $d_z(z)$ and 7 data points for $A(z)$ as given in Table I from Refs. [64–77]. This table contains some new data points with respect to BAO data from Refs. [55]. However we excluded from Table I estimates of d_z , extracted from repeating or overlapping galaxy catalogues. The χ^2 function

z	$d_z(z)$	σ_d	$A(z)$	σ_A	Survey	Refs.
0.106	0.336	0.015	0.526	0.028	6dFGS	[66]
0.15	0.2237	0.0084	-	-	SDSS DR7	[70]
0.20	0.1905	0.0061	0.488	0.016	SDSS DR7	[64]
0.278	0.1394	0.0049	-	-	SDSS LRG	[65]
0.314	0.1239	0.0033	-	-	SDSS LRG	[67]
0.32	0.1181	0.0026	-	-	DR10,11	[69]
0.32	0.1165	0.0024	-	-	BOSS DR12	[72]
0.35	0.1097	0.0036	0.484	0.016	SDSS DR7	[64]
0.38	0.1011	0.0011	-	-	BOSS DR12	[71]
0.44	0.0916	0.0071	0.474	0.034	WiggleZ	[67]
0.57	0.0739	0.0043	0.436	0.017	BOSS DR9	[68]
0.57	0.0726	0.0014	-	-	DR10,11	[69]
0.59	0.0701	0.0008	-	-	BOSS DR12	[72]
0.60	0.0726	0.0034	0.442	0.020	WiggleZ	[67]
0.61	0.0696	0.0007	-	-	BOSS DR12	[71]
0.73	0.0592	0.0032	0.424	0.021	WiggleZ	[67]
0.85	0.0538	0.0041	-	-	DR16 ELG	[77]
1.48	0.0380	0.0013	-	-	eBOSS DR16	[76]
2.0	0.0339	0.0025	-	-	eBOSS DR14	[74]
2.35	0.0327	0.0016	-	-	DR14 Ly α	[75]
2.4	0.0331	0.0016	-	-	DR12 Ly α	[73]

TABLE I: BAO data $d_z(z) = r_s(z_d)/D_V(z)$ and $A(z)$ (34).

yields:

$$\chi_{\text{BAO}}^2(\Omega_m^0, \theta_1, \dots) = \Delta d \cdot C_d^{-1}(\Delta d)^T + \Delta A \cdot C_A^{-1}(\Delta A)^T. \quad (35)$$

Here, C_d and C_A are the covariance matrices for the correlated BAO data [64, 67] and the corresponding vectors are:

$$\Delta d_i = d_z^{\text{obs}}(z_i) - d_z^{\text{th}}(z_i, \dots), \quad \Delta A_i = A^{\text{obs}}(z_i) - A^{\text{th}}(z_i, \dots).$$

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our $F(R)$ model (2), (3) will fit the observational data from the previous section, if we minimize the χ^2 function, including SNe Ia (27), CC $H(z)$ data (29), CMB (32) and BAO (35) contributions:

$$\chi_{\text{tot}}^2 = \chi_{\text{SN}}^2 + \chi_H^2 + \chi_{\text{CMB}}^2 + \chi_{\text{BAO}}^2. \quad (36)$$

This function is calculated in the space of free model parameters (26) with flat priors within their natural limitations (positive values for all of them). The corresponding contour plots and likelihoods for γ , δ , α , Ω_m^0 are shown in Fig. 1. The contour plots are depicted as 1σ (68.27%) and 2σ (95.45%) confidence level domains for two-parameter distributions $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\theta_i, \theta_j)$, assuming minimization over all remaining free model parameters with the mentioned natural limitations. For example, in the bottom-left panel in Fig. 1 in $\Omega_m^0 - \delta$ plane we present 1σ and 2σ CL contours for $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\Omega_m^0, \delta) = \min_{\gamma, \alpha, \Omega_\Lambda^*, H_0} \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$. In other panels in Fig. 1 we use the similar approach with $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\theta_i, \theta_j)$, these functions reach their absolute minima at the points marked by stars.

Note that we use the “true” parameter $\Omega_m^0 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3H_0^2} \rho_m(t_0)$ in the left panels of Fig. 1 and in the top-right panel, where the one-parameter distribution $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\Omega_m^0)$ is shown, in comparison with its analog for the Λ CDM model. Here one-parameter distributions are also minimized over all remaining model parameters. The value Ω_m^0 should be differed from the “asymptotic” parameter Ω_m^* (22) keeping in mind their connection (23). For $\gamma - \delta$ or $\log \alpha - \gamma$ planes the values Ω_m^* , Ω_Λ^* , H_0^* are more convenient, when we minimize χ_{tot}^2 over these parameters.

We see in Fig. 1 that the best fitted value $\Omega_m^0 = 0.294_{-0.0036}^{+0.0048}$ for the $F(R)$ model is larger and has more wide 1σ error box than this value in the Λ CDM model. This is connected, in particular, with large number $N_p = 6$ of its model parameters (26) in comparison with $N_p = 2$ in the Λ CDM model.

For Ω_m^0 , γ , δ , α the likelihood functions are depicted in Fig. 1. They are connected with the corresponding one-parameter distributions, in particular, $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_m^0) \sim \exp(-\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\Omega_m^0)/2)$.

The best fit 1σ estimates for other parameters and values $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$ are tabulated in Table II. They are determined from the one-parameter distributions or likelihoods $\mathcal{L}(\theta_j)$. We see that the $F(R)$ model (2), (3) has the small advantage over the Λ CDM model in $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$, but this advantage disappears if we take into account numbers $N_p = 6$ and $N_p = 2$ of free model parameters and consider the Akaike information criterion [78] $\text{AIC} = \min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2 + 2N_p$. In Fig. 1 we use

Model	$\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2 / d.o.f$	AIC	Ω_m^0	H_0	δ	γ	$\log \alpha$
$F(R)$ +EDE	1089.80 / 1106	1101.80	$0.294_{-0.0036}^{+0.0048}$	$68.93_{-1.57}^{+1.61}$	$0.010_{-0.010}^{+0.017}$	$1.85_{-1.51}^{+6.3}$	$7.64_{-2.62}^{+4.45}$
Λ CDM	1090.35 / 1110	1094.35	$0.2908_{-0.0012}^{+0.0013}$	$68.98_{-1.60}^{+1.58}$	-	-	-

TABLE II: The best fit values for parameters and $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$ for the $F(R)$ model (2), (3) in comparison with the Λ CDM model.

the more convenient parameter $\log \alpha$ instead of the EDE factor α , because the 1σ error box includes rather large values $\alpha \in [1.5 \cdot 10^2, 1.78 \cdot 10^5]$, whereas the best fit is $\alpha \simeq 2.1 \cdot 10^3$. If the EDE factor α is lower than a certain permissible value, oscillations appear during the middle-time evolution in the considered model (2), (3). An example of these oscillations for the Ricci scalar $R = R(a)$ is presented in Fig. 2. Here other model parameters are close to best fit values from Table II. We see that for $\alpha = 100$ the value $R(a)$ begins to oscillate near the middle-time epoch $z \sim 100$ ($a \sim 10^{-2}$), that is later than the recombination and the initial point z_i , where we start integration of the system (25). For $\alpha = 10^4$ and the same other parameters these oscillations appear to be suppressed.

If we take values α lower than 100 for the considered in Fig. 2 system, or put $\alpha = 0$ (that is exclude the EDE term), we will obtain oscillations with extremely growing amplitudes. In other words, smooth solutions of the system (25) exist only if the factor α is large enough. These limits on α depend on δ , γ and other parameters. During calculations with results, depicted in Fig. 1, we excluded the mentioned oscillations by considering only solutions with limited value of $|dR/d \log a|$. These calculations show that the EDE term (3) with rather large α is the necessary condition for viability of this model.

As mentioned above, regarding R_0 , we fix the value $R_0/(2\Lambda) = 10^8$ corresponding to the epoch before or near the recombination, and work with the remaining 6 parameters (26). Here Ω_Λ^* or Ω_Λ can be considered as conditionally free parameters [53], in particular, in the planes with Ω_m^0 we vary Ω_Λ^* trying to reach the equality $E(z=0) = 1$, that is equivalent $\Omega_m^* = \Omega_m^0$ and $H_0^* = H_0$. We will use this approach below, for the contour plots in the $\Omega_m^0 - H_0$ plane as shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3 1σ and 2σ contour plots and likelihood functions are presented in the $\Omega_m^0 - H_0$ plane. These parameters are common for our $F(R)$ gravity scenario and the Λ CDM model so we can compare the corresponding contours. The Λ CDM 1σ and 2σ CL domains are essentially more compact and a bit shifted along the Ω_m^0 axis, however the observed H_0 dependence is very close for both models. It may be seen in the right panels in Fig. 3 where two likelihoods practically coincide and the one-parameter distributions $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(H_0)$ are similar and differ only because of the lowest minimum $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$ of the $F(R)$ gravity model.

One can see in the figures and Table II, that the power-law $F(R)$ gravity model can describe the observational data including SNe Ia, CC $H(z)$, CMB and BAO data with the absolute minimum $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$ better than the Λ CDM model. However, the Λ CDM model with $N_p = 2$ free parameters demonstrates the best AIC.

The best fit values of the Hubble constant H_0 and the likelihoods $\mathcal{L}(H_0)$ are very close for both models (see Fig 3 and Table II). This result confirms the conclusion in Ref. [53] about weak effectiveness of the $F(R)$ gravity model (2) in alleviating the H_0 tension. We see that the EDE term in the form (3) with suitable parameters α , R_0 does not




FIG. 1: Contour plots of χ_{tot}^2 with 1σ , 2σ CL and likelihood functions $\mathcal{L}(\theta_i)$ for the $F(R)$ model (2), (3) in comparison with the Λ CDM model in one-parameter distributions $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\Omega_m^0)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_m^0)$.

change essentially the resulting best fit of H_0 . However this EDE term should not be excluded from this model: it is necessary for suppressing the above mentioned oscillations, which inevitably appear during the epoch $10^2 < z < 10^3$, if α is not large enough.

The best fit values of the parameter $\delta \simeq 0.01^{+0.017}_{-0.01}$ satisfy the condition $\delta \ll 1$ that is necessary for asymptotic behavior (22) of this γR^δ model. At $\delta > 0.04$ this model does not describe effectively the observational data. For γ and the EDE factor α we observe rather wide ranges of admissible values in Table II.

Hence, the $F(R)$ gravity scenario (2) with the EDE term (3) gives interesting possibilities and viability in confronting with SNe Ia, CC, BAO and CMB observational data.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have explored the power-law $F(R)$ gravity model (2) with an additional EDE term (3). Its cosmological evolution was studied by solving dynamical equations and model predictions were confronted with observational data including Pantheon SNe Ia, estimations of CC $H(z)$, CMB and BAO observed manifestations.

The results are presented in Figs. 1, 3 and Table II. The best fit value of the Hubble constant H_0 for the $F(R)$ gravity model is very close the Λ CDM model prediction. One may conclude that the EDE term (3) does not shift essentially the effective value of H_0 . But we can not exclude the EDE term $-\alpha R/(R_0 + R)$ because of oscillatory behavior of this model with $\alpha = 0$ or small $\alpha = 0$. These oscillations, shown in Fig. 1, can be suppressed only if α is sufficiently large. If α is too small or $\alpha = 0$ these oscillations grow to extremely large amplitudes, and we obtain discontinuous solutions of the system (25). We may conclude that the EDE term (3) with sufficiently large α is necessary for viability of the model (2).

The other free parameters of the model with the best fit values given in Table II, satisfy the conditions leading to the Λ CDM asymptotic behavior (22) before or near the recombination epoch. In particular, for δ the condition $\delta \ll 1$ is fulfilled. At $\delta > 0.04$ this model does not describe effectively the observational data. For γ and the EDE factor α , we observe rather wide ranges of admissible values in Table II. The estimate $\Omega_m^0 = 0.294^{+0.0048}_{-0.0036}$ of the $F(R)$ model is slightly shifted and has larger width in comparison with the Λ CDM prediction.

We see in Figs. 1, 3 and Table II that the power-law $F(R)$ gravity model can successfully describe the mentioned observations: its absolute minimum $\min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2$ is better in comparison with the Λ CDM model. However, the Λ CDM model is more optimal from the point of view of the Akaike information criterion [78] and gives the smallest $\text{AIC} = \min \chi_{\text{tot}}^2 + 2N_p$ because of the least number $N_p = 2$ of its free model parameters.




FIG. 2: Oscillations in the model (2) and their suppression at high α .




FIG. 3: Contour plots of χ^2_{tot} in $\Omega_m^0 - H_0$ plane with 1σ , 2σ CL and one-parameter distributions $\chi^2_{\text{tot}}(H_0)$ likelihood functions \mathcal{L} for the $F(R)$ model in comparison with the ΛCDM model.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by MICINN (Spain), project PID2019-104397GB-I00 and by the program Unidad de Excelencia Maria de Maeztu CEX2020-001058-M, Spain (SDO).

-
- [1] A. D. A. M. Spallicci, J. A. Helay el-Neto, M. L pez-Corredoira and S. Capozziello, Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.1, 4 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08703-3 [arXiv:2011.12608 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [2] A. D. A. M. Spallicci, G. Sarracino and S. Capozziello, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **137** (2022), 253 doi:10.1140/epjp/s13360-022-02450-y [arXiv:2202.02731 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [3] G. Sarracino, A. D. A. M. Spallicci and S. Capozziello, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **137** (2022) no.12, 1386 doi:10.1140/epjp/s13360-022-03595-6 [arXiv:2211.11438 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [4] C. Csaki, N. Kaloper and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002), 161302 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.161302 [arXiv:hep-ph/0111311 [hep-ph]].
 - [5] C. Csaki, N. Kaloper and J. Terning, Phys. Lett. B **535** (2002), 33-36 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)01765-3 [arXiv:hep-ph/0112212 [hep-ph]].
 - [6] J. Colin, R. Mohayaee, M. Rameez and S. Sarkar, Astron. Astrophys. **631** (2019), L13 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936373 [arXiv:1808.04597 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [7] L. H. Dam, A. Heinesen and D. L. Wiltshire, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **472** (2017) no.1, 835-851 doi:10.1093/mnras/stx1858 [arXiv:1706.07236 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [8] S. Capozziello, M. Benetti and A. D. A. M. Spallicci, Found. Phys. **50** (2020) no.9, 893-899 doi:10.1007/s10701-020-00356-2 [arXiv:2007.00462 [gr-qc]].
 - [9] A. D. A. M. Spallicci, M. Benetti and S. Capozziello, Found. Phys. **52** (2022) no.1, 23 doi:10.1007/s10701-021-00531-z [arXiv:2112.07359 [physics.gen-ph]].
 - [10] S. Capozziello, G. Sarracino and A. D. A. M. Spallicci, Phys. Dark Univ. **40** (2023), 101201 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2023.101201 [arXiv:2302.13671 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [11] M. Lopez-Corredoira, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **517** (2022) no.4, 5805-5809 doi:10.1093/mnras/stac2567 [arXiv:2210.07078 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [12] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934** (2022) 1, L7, arXiv:2112.04510.
- [13] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A6 [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652** (2021), C4] doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] W. M. Dai, Y. Z. Ma and H. J. He, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), 121302 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.121302 [arXiv:2003.03602 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] H. J. He, Y. Z. Ma and J. Zheng, *JCAP* **11** (2020), 003 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/11/003 [arXiv:2003.12057 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Y. Nakai, M. Suzuki, F. Takahashi and M. Yamada, *Phys. Lett. B* **816** (2021), 136238 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136238 [arXiv:2009.09754 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] E. Di Valentino, A. Mukherjee and A. A. Sen, *Entropy* **23** (2021) no.4, 404 doi:10.3390/e23040404 [arXiv:2005.12587 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] P. Agrawal, G. Obied and C. Vafa, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.4, 043523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.043523 [arXiv:1906.08261 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [19] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **09** (2018), 019 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/09/019 [arXiv:1805.08252 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.8, 083507 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083507 [arXiv:2001.02451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [21] S. Vagnozzi, F. Pacucci and A. Loeb, *JHEAp* **36** (2022), 27-35 doi:10.1016/j.jheap.2022.07.004 [arXiv:2105.10421 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [22] H. Desmond, B. Jain and J. Sakstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.4, 043537 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.6, 069904; erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.12, 129901] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.043537 [arXiv:1907.03778 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] E. Ó Colgáin, M. H. P. M. van Putten and H. Yavartanoo, *Phys. Lett. B* **793** (2019), 126-129 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.04.032 [arXiv:1807.07451 [hep-th]].
- [24] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.2, 023518 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023518 [arXiv:1907.07569 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] C. Krishnan, E. Ó. Colgáin, Ruchika, A. A. Sen, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.10, 103525 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103525 [arXiv:2002.06044 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] E. Ó. Colgáin and H. Yavartanoo, *Phys. Lett. B* **797** (2019), 134907 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.134907 [arXiv:1905.02555 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.6, 063524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063524 [arXiv:2105.10425 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] B. H. Lee, W. Lee, E. Ó. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and S. Thakur, *JCAP* **04** (2022) no.04, 004 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2022/04/004 [arXiv:2202.03906 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [29] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, D. Saez-Chillon Gomez and G. S. Sharov, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **32** (2021), 100837 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2021.100837 [arXiv:2103.05304 [gr-qc]].
- [30] C. Krishnan, R. Mohayaee, E. Ó. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and L. Yin, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.18, 184001 doi:10.1088/1361-6382/ac1a81 [arXiv:2105.09790 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] G. Ye, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **839** (2023), 137770 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137770 [arXiv:2107.13391 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [32] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.4, 043536 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.043536 [arXiv:2202.10055 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [33] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.6, 063527 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.063527 [arXiv:2006.06686 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [34] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) no.22, 221301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301 [arXiv:1811.04083 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [35] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) no.10, 103523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.103523 [arXiv:1608.01309 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [36] V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.4, 044036 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.044036 [arXiv:2012.00586 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [37] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **29** (2020), 100602 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2020.100602 [arXiv:1912.13128 [gr-qc]].
- [38] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) no.10, 103523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.103523 [arXiv:1608.01309 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] E. Mörtzell and S. Dhawan, *JCAP* **09** (2018), 025 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/09/025 [arXiv:1801.07260 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) no.22, 221301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301 [arXiv:1811.04083 [astro-ph.CO]].;
- J. Sakstein and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** (2020) no.16, 161301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.161301 [arXiv:1911.11760 [astro-ph.CO]].;
- F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.6, 063527 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.063527 [arXiv:2006.06686 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, [arXiv:2211.04492 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95** (2022), 101659 doi:10.1016/j.newar.2022.101659 [arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123511 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123511

- [arXiv:2109.04406 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [44] L. Perivolaropoulos, *Universe* **8** (2022) no.5, 263 doi:10.3390/universe8050263 [arXiv:2201.08997 [astro-ph.EP]].
- [45] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *EPL* **137** (2022) no.3, 39001 doi:10.1209/0295-5075/ac52dc [arXiv:2201.07647 [gr-qc]].
- [46] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *EPL* **139** (2022) no.5, 59003 doi:10.1209/0295-5075/ac8a13 [arXiv:2208.07972 [gr-qc]].
- [47] V. K. Oikonomou, P. Tsyba and O. Razina, *Universe* **8** (2022) no.9, 484 doi:10.3390/universe8090484 [arXiv:2209.04669 [gr-qc]].
- [48] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rept.* **692** (2017) 1 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2017.06.001 [arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc]].
- [49] S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, *Phys. Rept.* **509**, 167 (2011);
- [50] V. Faraoni and S. Capozziello, *Fundam. Theor. Phys.* **170** (2010). doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0165-6
- [51] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rept.* **505**, 59 (2011);
- [52] V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) no.6, 064071 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.064071 [arXiv:2303.05889 [hep-ph]].
- [53] S. D. Odintsov, D. Sáez-Chillón Gómez and G. S. Sharov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **966** (2021), 115377 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2021.115377 [arXiv:2011.03957 [gr-qc]].
- [54] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.4, 044009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.044009 [arXiv:2001.06830 [gr-qc]].
- [55] S. D. Odintsov, D. Saez-Chillon Gomez and G. S. Sharov, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.4, 044010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.044010 [arXiv:2001.07945 [gr-qc]].
- [56] G. S. Sharov, *JCAP* **06** (2016), 023 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/06/023 [arXiv:1506.05246 [gr-qc]].
- [57] S. Pan and G. S. Sharov, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **472** (2017) no.4, 4736-4749 doi:10.1093/mnras/stx2278 [arXiv:1609.02287 [gr-qc]].
- [58] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Lett. B* **807** (2020), 135576 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135576 [arXiv:2005.12804 [gr-qc]].
- [59] D. M. Scolnic *et al.* [Pan-STARRS1], *Astrophys. J.* **859** (2018) no.2, 101 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aab9bb [arXiv:1710.00845 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] A. L. Ratsimbazafy, S. I. Loubser, S. M. Crawford, C. M. Cress, B. A. Bassett, R. C. Nichol and P. Väisänen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **467** (2017) no.3, 3239-3254 doi:10.1093/mnras/stx301 [arXiv:1702.00418 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [61] N. Borghi, M. Moresco and A. Cimatti, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **928** (2022) no.1, L4 doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac3fb2 [arXiv:2110.04304 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] L. Chen, Q. G. Huang and K. Wang, *JCAP* **02** (2019), 028 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/02/028 [arXiv:1808.05724 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] W. Hu and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. J.* **471** (1996), 542-570 doi:10.1086/177989 [arXiv:astro-ph/9510117 [astro-ph]].
- [64] W. J. Percival, B. A. Reid, D. J. Eisenstein, N. A. Bahcall, T. Budavari, *et al.* [SDSS], *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **401** (2010), 2148, [arXiv:0907.1660].
- [65] E. A. Kazin, M. R. Blanton, R. Scoccimarro, C. K. McBride, A. A. Berlind, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **710** (2010), 1444, [arXiv:0908.2598].
- [66] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders and F. Watson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416** (2011), 3017. -3032 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x [arXiv:1106.3366].
- [67] C. Blake, E. Kazin, F. Beutler, T. Davis, D. Parkinson, S. Brough, M. Colless, C. Contreras, W. Couch and S. Croom, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **418** (2011), 1707, [arXiv:1108.2635].
- [68] C. H. Chuang, F. Prada, A. J. Cuesta, D. J. Eisenstein, E. Kazin, N. Padmanabhan, A. G. Sanchez, X. Xu, F. Beutler and M. Manera, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **433** (2013), 3559, [arXiv:1303.4486].
- [69] L. Anderson *et al.* [BOSS], *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **441** (2014) no.1, 24, [arXiv:1312.4877].
- [70] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden and M. Manera, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449** (2015) no.1, 835, [arXiv:1409.3242].
- [71] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders and F. Watson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **464** (2017) 3, 3409, [arXiv:1607.03149].
- [72] C. H. Chuang, H.-J. Seo, A. J. Ross, P. McDonald, S. Saito, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **471** (2017) 2, 2370, [arXiv:1607.03151].
- [73] H. du Mas des Bourboux, J.-M. Le Goff, M. Blomqvist, N. G. Busca, J. Guy, J. Rich, *et al.* *Astron. Astrophys.* **608** (2017) A130, [arXiv:1708.02225].
- [74] F. Zhu, N. Padmanabhan, A. J. Ross, M. White, W. J. Percival, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **480** (2018) 1, 1096, [arXiv:1801.03038].
- [75] M. Blomqvist, H. du Mas des Bourboux, N. G. Busca, V. de Sainte Agathe, J. Rich, *Astron. Astrophys.* **629** (2019) A86, [arXiv:1904.03430].
- [76] J. Hou, A. G. Sanchez, A. J. Ross, A. Smith, R. Neveux, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **500** (2020) 1, 1201, [arXiv:2007.08998].
- [77] A. Tamone, A. Raichoor, C. Zhao, A. de Mattia, C. Gorgoni, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **499** (2020) 4, 5527, [arXiv:2007.09009].
- [78] H. Akaike, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, **19** (1974) 716.