

Is the background evolution of Λ CDM model consistent with observations?

YANG LIU,¹ BAO WANG,^{1,2,3} HONGWEI YU,^{1,4} AND PUXUN WU^{1,4}

¹*Department of Physics and Synergistic Innovation Center for Quantum Effects and Applications, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, China*

²*Purple Mountain Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing 210023, China*

³*School of Astronomy and Space Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

⁴*Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, China*

(Received; Revised; Accepted)

Submitted to

ABSTRACT

We establish a new and cosmological-model-independent method to explore the cosmic background dynamics in this work. Utilizing the latest Pantheon+ type Ia supernova sample and the Hubble parameter measurements, we obtain the values of the Hubble parameter and the deceleration parameter at five different redshift points ranging from 0.2 to 0.6, and find that they can deviate from the predictions of the Λ CDM model at more than 2σ . We further probe the equation of state of dark energy and obtain that a slightly oscillating equation of state of dark energy around the -1 line is favored.

1. INTRODUCTION

The cosmological constant Λ plus cold dark matter (Λ CDM) is the simplest and most favored cosmological model to describe the cosmic evolution. The Λ CDM model, although fits observational data very well, still faces some challenges. Among them, the Hubble constant (H_0) tension is the most notable one and it has been considered as the most serious crisis in modern cosmology (Riess 2020; Perivolaropoulos & Skara 2022). The H_0 tension refers to the discrepancy (more than 5σ) between the measurements of H_0 using the near type Ia supernova (SN Ia) calibrated by Cepheids (Riess et al. 2022) and that from the high-redshift cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation observation within the framework of the Λ CDM model (Planck Collaboration 2020), and it indicates that the assumed Λ CDM model used to determine the Hubble constant may be inconsistent with our present Universe or there may be potentially unknown systematic errors in the observational data. It is worth noting, however, that any systematics, which could explain the H_0 tension, have not been found (Efstathiou 2014; Feeney et al. 2018; Riess et al. 2016; Cardona et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2017; Follin & Knox 2018; Riess et al. 2018a,b). Thus, it is necessary to investigate whether the Λ CDM model can correctly describe our Universe.

Since the cosmological constant as dark energy has a constant equation of state (EoS) parameter w_{DE} equal to -1 , where w_{DE} is defined as $w_{\text{DE}} \equiv \frac{P_{\text{DE}}}{\rho_{\text{DE}}}$ with P_{DE} and ρ_{DE} being the pressure and energy density of dark energy, respectively. Generalizing the EoS of dark energy from -1 to an arbitrary constant w_{DE} or a parametrized form as a function of redshift z , e.g., the CPL parametrization (Chevallier & Polarski 2001; Linder 2003), and constraining w_{DE} or the coefficients in the parameterization from observational data, we can judge the viability of the cosmological constant as dark energy by analyzing whether $w_{\text{DE}} = -1$ is allowed by the observations. Although the Λ CDM model has been found to be supported by the observations, the result will be unreliable if the EoS of dark energy is not a constant or the parametrized form of EoS is inappropriate.

yangl@hunnu.edu.cn

hwyu@hunnu.edu.cn

pxwu@hunnu.edu.cn

Reconstructing the cosmic background evolution directly from the observations is a reliable method to understand the expanding history of our Universe. The usual methods include the nonparametric Bayesian reconstruction (Zhao et al. 2012, 2017) and the Gaussian process (Holsclaw et al. 2010; Seikel et al. 2012; Shafieloo et al. 2012). Using the observational data, e.g., SN Ia, one can reconstruct the Hubble parameter ($H(z)$) or luminosity distance ($d_L(z)$) with their derivatives, and then compare them with the predictions from the Λ CDM model to determine whether the Λ CDM model can correctly describe the cosmic evolution. However, since all observational data are used together to reconstruct the cosmic evolution, the low (high) redshift data will affect the reconstructed result of the high (low) redshift regions.

In this work, we establish a new method to obtain the cosmic background dynamics in different redshift regions from observational data. Our method does not assume the EoS of dark energy and any cosmological model. Using the Pantheon+ SN Ia and the Hubble parameter measurements, we obtain the values of the Hubble parameter and the deceleration parameter at different redshifts, and find that may be incompatible with the predictions of the Λ CDM model at more than 2σ .

2. METHOD

For a homogeneous and isotropic Universe described by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker metric, the Hubble parameter H , which gives the cosmic expanding velocity, is defined as

$$H \equiv \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt}, \quad (1)$$

where a is the cosmic scale factor and t the cosmic time. In the Λ CDM model, the Hubble parameter has the form: $H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1 - \Omega_{m0})}$ with Ω_{m0} being the present dimensionless matter density parameter. Using the Hubble parameter, one can obtain the luminosity distance $d_L(z)$:

$$d_L(z) = (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{1}{H(z)} dz. \quad (2)$$

Comparing the theoretical value and the observational one of the luminosity distance can yield constraints on the cosmological parameters, i.e. Ω_{m0} , after choosing a concrete cosmological model. To cosmological-model-independently understand the cosmic dynamics, we perform the Taylor expansion of the Hubble parameter and the luminosity distance at a given redshift z_i and then obtain:

$$H(z) = H_i \left(1 + (z - z_i) \frac{1 + q_i}{1 + z_i} \right) + \mathcal{O}((z - z_i)^2), \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_L(z) = & d_{L,i} + (z - z_i) \left(\frac{1 + z_i}{H_i} + \frac{d_{L,i}}{1 + z_i} \right) \\ & + (z - z_i)^2 \left(\frac{1}{H_i} - \frac{1 + q_i}{2H_i} \right) + \mathcal{O}((z - z_i)^3), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $H_i = H(z_i)$, $d_{L,i} = d_L(z_i)$, and $q_i = q(z_i)$ with $q \equiv -\frac{1}{aH^2} \frac{d^2a}{dt^2}$ being the cosmic deceleration parameter. Clearly, $d_{L,i}$, H_i and q_i are constants. If we can determine their values from the observational data, the cosmic dynamics will be known. Since the convergence region of the Taylor series of the luminosity distance and the Hubble parameter is the near region around $z = z_i$, we only consider the observational data in the redshift region $|z - z_i| \leq \Delta z$ to constrain $d_{L,i}$, H_i and q_i , where Δz represents the convergence radius. When $z_i = 0$, our method reduces to the usual cosmographic one, which has been widely used to study the cosmic expanding history (Visser 2005; Luongo 2011; Aviles et al. 2012; Dunsby & Luongo 2016; Capozziello et al. 2019, 2020).

Once the constraints on H_i and q_i at a given redshift are obtained, we can calculate the EoS parameter of dark energy $w_{DE,i}$ at that redshift

$$w_{DE,i} = \frac{H_i^2(1 - 2q_i)}{3[H_0^2\Omega_{m0}(1 + z_i)^3 - H_i^2]} \quad (5)$$

after assuming that the energy component of the Universe consists of pressureless matter and dark energy and the Universe is spatially flat.

Table 1. Number of data in each redshift range

z_i	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
Redshift range	$0.01 < z \leq 0.4$	$0.1 < z \leq 0.5$	$0.2 < z \leq 0.6$	$0.3 < z \leq 0.7$	$0.4 < z \leq 0.8$
N_{SN}	1282	750	624	419	278
$N_{H(z)}$	12	16	12	11	10
N_{total}	1294	766	636	430	288

NOTE— Number of data in each redshift range. The N_{SN} , $N_{H(z)}$, and N_{total} represent the number of SN Ia data, $H(z)$ data, and the total data in each redshift range, respectively. The SN Ia data with redshift less than 0.01 are excluded here.

3. SAMPLES AND RESULTS

The latest Pantheon+ SN Ia sample (Scolnic et al. 2022) will be used firstly to constrain H_i and q_i . We choose $\Delta z = 0.2$, which is small enough to avoid the convergence problem in the Taylor series, and consider five redshift points (z_i) in redshift from 0.2 to 0.6 with an increment of 0.1. The number of SN Ia data in each redshift region is summarized in Table 1. Due to that the nearby SN Ia sample is strongly impacted by their peculiar velocities (Brout et al. 2022), we exclude those data whose redshift are less than 0.01 in our analysis. The redshift points at $z > 0.6$ are not considered since the data number in the $(z - \Delta z, z + \Delta z]$ range are less than two hundred, which will not give tight constraints on the cosmological parameters.

To estimate the best-fit values of the cosmological parameters and their uncertainties from SN Ia, we utilize the minimizing χ^2 method:

$$\chi_{\text{SN}}^2 = [\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\text{obs}}(z) - m_{\text{th}}(z)]^\dagger C^{-1} [\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\text{obs}}(z) - m_{\text{th}}(z)]. \quad (6)$$

Here the subscript ‘obs’ and ‘th’ refer to the observed and theoretical values, respectively, C is the covariance matrix, which is a submatrix of the full SN Ia sample since only data within the range $(z_i - 0.2, z_i + 0.2]$ are used, and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{\text{obs}}$ is a 1D array consisting of the SN Ia apparent magnitudes. The theoretical value of the apparent magnitude can be derived from the luminosity distance $d_L(z)$ and the absolute magnitude M :

$$m_{\text{th}}(z) = M + 25 + 5 \log(d_L(z)). \quad (7)$$

Since the Hubble parameter H is highly correlated with the absolute magnitude M , we need to fix M , which is set to satisfy a Gaussian prior: -19.253 ± 0.027 mag (Riess et al. 2022), when only the SN Ia data are used.

In Figure 1, we show the constraints on H_i (Figure 1(a)) and q_i (Figure 1(b)). The solid lines represent the evolutionary curves of $H(z)$ and $q(z)$ in the Λ CDM model with $H_0 = 73.2$ km/s/Mpc and $\Omega_{\text{m}0} = 0.33$, which are obtained from the SN Ia sample with $M = -19.253 \pm 0.027$ mag. To show the difference between H_i and q_i , and the predictions in the Λ CDM model clearly, we also plot $\Delta H = H_i - H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ and $\Delta q = q_i - q_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. The corresponding numerical results are summarized in Table 2. It is easy to see that the values of H_i at $z_i = 0.2, 0.3$ and 0.5 are consistent with the Λ CDM model. But they deviate from the Λ CDM model when $z_i = 0.4$ and 0.6 , and the deviation can reach about 1.4σ . For the deceleration parameter, the values at $z_i = 0.2, 0.4$, and 0.5 are different from the prediction of the Λ CDM model, the largest deviation, which occurs at $z_i = 0.2$, is about 2.8σ . Furthermore, we find that at $z_i = 0.4$ the SN Ia data support a decelerating expansion at more than 1σ . Using Eq. (5), we can derive the EoS parameter of dark energy at different redshifts ($w_{\text{DE},i}$) by considering the constraints on H_i and q_i . Setting H_0 and $\Omega_{\text{m}0}$ to be 73.2 ± 0.94 km/s/Mpc and 0.33 ± 0.018 , respectively, we obtain five values of w_{DE} , which are shown in Figure 2. We find that w_{DE} shows a slightly oscillating behavior around the -1 line. The values of w_{DE} at $z_i = 0.2, 0.4$, and 0.5 exhibit discrepancy from -1 , and the maximum statistical deviation is about 2.1σ , which occurs at $z_i = 0.2$.

A prior fixed M may introduce some unknown bias in the results. To avoid this issue, we add the Hubble parameter measurements (Simon et al. 2005; Stern et al. 2010; Moresco et al. 2012; Cong et al. 2014; Moresco 2015; Moresco et al. 2016; Ratsimbazafy et al. 2017; Borghi et al. 2022) into our analysis. Thus, M can be treated as a free parameter. The number of $H(z)$ data in different redshift ranges is listed in Table 1. The results from SN Ia+ $H(z)$ are shown




Figure 1. The constraints on H_i and q_i at different redshift points by using the SN Ia dataset. The solid lines represent the predictions of the ΛCDM model with $H_0 = 73.2 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33$. The symbol Δ denotes the differences between the results of H_i and q_i , and the predictions of the ΛCDM model.




Figure 2. The values of $w_{\text{DE},i}$ derived from Eq. (5) with $H_0 = 73.2 \pm 0.94 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33 \pm 0.018$ by using H_i and q_i constrained from the SN Ia data.

in Table 3 and Figure 3. While Figure 3(a) and 3(b), respectively, represent H_i , q_i and the predicted $H(z)$ and $q(z)$ from the ΛCDM model with $H_0 = 67.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33$, which are determined from the SN Ia + $H(z)$ data. Figure 3(a) indicates that the values of H_i are consistent with the ΛCDM model at 1σ CL, which is different from the results from the SN Ia data only. While, the values of q_i at $z_i = 0.2, 0.4$ and 0.5 deviate from the prediction of the ΛCDM model and the largest deviation is about 2.8σ . At $z_i = 0.4$, SN Ia + $H(z)$ favor a decelerating expansion since $q_i > 0$ is supported at more than 1σ . These results are almost the same as what are obtained from the SN Ia data only. Figure 4 shows the values of M_i , from which, we find that M_i decreases almost linearly with the increase of redshift. To illustrate clearly this trend, we use a simple linear function: $M(z) = M_0 + \alpha z$ to fit the evolution of M_i between $z = 0.2$ and 0.6 , and obtain $M_0 = -19.26 \pm 0.12 \text{ mag}$ and $\alpha = -0.65 \pm 0.33 \text{ mag}$. Apparently, M_0 is well consistent with that obtained from the Cepheid host ($-19.253 \pm 0.027 \text{ mag}$) (Riess et al. 2022). The slope α deviates from zero at about 2σ , which indicates the observations seem to favor a non-constant absolute magnitude of SN Ia.




Figure 3. The constraints on H_i and q_i by using the SN Ia + $H(z)$ data. The solid lines are the predictions of the ΛCDM model with $H_0 = 67.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33$. The symbol Δ denotes the differences between the results of H_i and q_i , and the predictions of the ΛCDM model.




Figure 4. The constraints on M_i by using the SN Ia + $H(z)$ data. The solid line represents the linear fitting with the shadow region being the 1σ CL.

Figure 5 shows the values of $w_{\text{DE},i}$ after setting $H_0 = 67.5 \pm 1.7 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33 \pm 0.017$. One can see that $w_{\text{DE},i}$ oscillates slightly around the -1 line and the maximum deviation from -1 of $w_{\text{DE},i}$ occurs at $z_i = 0.4$ and is at about 1.6σ , which is similar to the results from the SN Ia data only.

4. CONCLUSIONS

To determine whether the cosmic evolution is consistent with the predictions of the ΛCDM model, we establish a new and cosmological-model-independent method to explore the cosmic dynamics from observational data. Using the Pantheon+ SN Ia data, we obtain the values of H and q at five different redshift points. We find that the deviation from the prediction of the ΛCDM model is apparent and the largest deviation reaches 2.8σ . Further considering the Hubble parameter measurements, we discover that the values of q_i can deviate from the predictions of the ΛCDM model at about 2.8σ although H_i become consistent with the ΛCDM model, and a linearly decreasing absolute magnitude




Figure 5. The values of $w_{DE,i}$ derived from Eq. (5) with $H_0 = 67.5 \pm 1.7$ km/s/Mpc and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33 \pm 0.017$ by using H_i and q_i constrained from the SN Ia+ $H(z)$ data.

Table 2. Constraints on parameters from SN Ia dataset

z_i	H_i	q_i	$w_{DE,i}$
0.2	81.58 ± 1.13	-0.48 ± 0.06	-1.21 ± 0.10
0.3	86.66 ± 1.41	-0.30 ± 0.16	-1.11 ± 0.23
0.4	95.43 ± 2.03	0.33 ± 0.28	-0.24 ± 0.39
0.5	100.54 ± 2.95	-0.70 ± 0.47	-1.95 ± 0.80
0.6	109.78 ± 4.41	-0.41 ± 0.82	-1.53 ± 1.39
z_i	ΔH_i	Δq_i	$\Delta w_{DE,i}$
0.2	0.06 ± 1.60	-0.17 ± 0.06	-0.21 ± 0.10
0.3	0.20 ± 1.91	-0.08 ± 0.16	-0.11 ± 0.23
0.4	3.55 ± 2.52	0.47 ± 0.28	0.76 ± 0.39
0.5	2.77 ± 3.42	-0.63 ± 0.47	-0.95 ± 0.80
0.6	5.70 ± 4.83	-0.42 ± 0.82	-0.53 ± 1.39

NOTE— The marginalized mean value and the 1σ uncertainty of parameters from the SN Ia data. The M is set to be -19.253 ± 0.027 mag. Δ denotes the difference between the constraint results and the Λ CDM model with $H_0 = 73.2 \pm 0.94$ km/s/Mpc and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33 \pm 0.018$.

of SN Ia with the increase of redshift is favored. Furthermore, a slightly oscillating EoS of dark energy around -1 is found. We think that this property of dark energy may alleviate the H_0 tension, and this issue is under current investigation.

¹ This work was supported in part by the NSFC under Grant Nos. 12275080 and 12075084.

REFERENCES

- Aviles, A., Gruber, C., Luongo, O., & Quevedo, H. [2012](#), [PhRvD](#), **86**, 123516
- Brout, D., Scolnic, D., Popovic, B., et al. [2022](#), [ApJ](#), **938**, 110
- Borghi, N., Moresco, M., & Cimatti, A. [2022](#), [ApJL](#), **928**, L4
- Capozziello, S., D’Agostino, R., & Luongo, O. [2019](#), [IJMPD](#), **28**, 1930016
- Capozziello, S., D’Agostino, R., & Luongo, O. [2020](#), [MNRAS](#), **494**, 2576

Table 3. Constraints on parameters from SN + $H(z)$ dataset

z_i	H_i	q_i	$w_{\text{DE},i}$	M
0.2	76.64 ± 2.38	-0.48 ± 0.06	-1.17 ± 0.11	-19.39 ± 0.07
0.3	80.09 ± 2.42	-0.32 ± 0.15	-1.13 ± 0.23	-19.42 ± 0.07
0.4	82.92 ± 3.88	0.32 ± 0.26	-0.31 ± 0.44	-19.56 ± 0.11
0.5	87.59 ± 3.75	-0.57 ± 0.36	-2.10 ± 0.84	-19.56 ± 0.10
0.6	91.83 ± 4.07	-0.20 ± 0.42	-1.73 ± 1.18	-19.65 ± 0.11
z_i	ΔH_i	Δq_i	$\Delta w_{\text{DE},i}$...
0.2	1.47 ± 3.07	-0.17 ± 0.06	-0.17 ± 0.11	...
0.3	0.36 ± 3.20	-0.10 ± 0.15	-0.13 ± 0.23	...
0.4	-1.81 ± 4.49	0.45 ± 0.26	0.69 ± 0.44	...
0.5	-2.56 ± 4.50	-0.51 ± 0.36	-1.10 ± 0.84	...
0.6	-4.15 ± 4.90	-0.20 ± 0.42	-0.73 ± 1.18	...

NOTE— The marginalized mean value and the 1σ uncertainty of parameters from SN + $H(z)$ data. Δ denotes the difference between the constraint results and the Λ CDM model with $H_0 = 67.5 \pm 1.7$ km/s/Mpc and $\Omega_{\text{m}0} = 0.33 \pm 0.017$.

- Cardona, W., Kunz, M., & Pettorino, V. 2017, *JCAP*, 03, 056
- Chevallier, M., & Polarski, D. 2001, *IJMPD*, 10, 213
- Cong, Z., Han, Z., Shuo, Y., et al. 2014, *RAA*, 14, 1221
- Dunsby, P. K. S., & Luongo, O. 2016, *IJGMM*, 13, 1630002
- Efstathiou, G. 2014, *MNRAS*, 400, 1138
- Feeney, S. M., Mortlock, D. J., & Dalmaso, N. 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 3861
- Follin, B., & Knox, L. 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, 4534
- Holsclaw, T., Alam, U., Sansó, B., et al. 2010, *PhRvL*, 105, 241302
- Linder, E. V. 2003, *PhRvL*, 90, 091301
- Luongo, O. 2011, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 26, 1459
- Moresco, M., Cimatti, A., Jimenez, R., et al. 2012, *JCAP*, 08, 006
- Moresco, M. 2015, *MNRAS Lett.*, 450, L16
- Moresco, M., Pozzetti, L., Cimatti, A., et al. 2016, *JCAP*, 05, 014
- Perivolaropoulos, L., & Skara, F. 2022, *NewAR*, 95, 101659
- Planck Collaboration. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A6
- Ratsimbazafy, A. L., Loubser, S. I., Crawford, S. M., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 467, 3239
- Riess, A. G., Macri, L. M., Hoffmann, S. L., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 826, 56
- Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., et al. 2018a, *ApJ*, 855, 136
- Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 861, 126
- Riess, A. G. 2020, *NatRP*, 2, 10
- Riess, A. G., Yuan, W., Macri, L. M., et al. 2022, *ApJL*, 934, L7
- Scolnic, D., Brout, D., Carr, A., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 938, 113
- Seikel, M., Clarkson, C., & Smith, M. 2012, *JCAP*, 06, 036
- Shafieloo, A., Kim, A. G., Linder, E. V. 2012, *PhRvD*, 85, 123530
- Simon, J., Verde, L., & Jimenez, R. 2005, *PhRvD*, 71, 123001
- Stern, D., Jimenez, R., Verde, L., Kamionkowski, M., & Stanford, S. A. 2010, *JCAP*, 02, 008
- Visser, M. 2005, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.*, 37, 1541
- Zhang, B. R., Childress, M. J., Davis, T. M., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 471, 2254
- Zhao, G. B., Crittenden, R. G., Pogosian, L., & Zhang, X. 2012, *PhRvL*, 109, 171301
- Zhao, G. B., Raveri, M., Pogosian, L., et al. 2017, *Nat. Astron.*, 1, 627