

Testing the standardizability of, and deriving cosmological constraints from, a new Amati-correlated gamma-ray burst data compilation

Shulei Cao^{1,2,*} and Bharat Ratra^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics, Kansas State University, 116 Cardwell Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA*

²*Department of Physics, Boise State University, 1910 University Drive, Boise, ID 83725, USA*

(Dated: April 16, 2024)

By using gamma-ray burst (GRB) data to simultaneously constrain Amati correlation parameters and cosmological parameters in six spatially-flat and nonflat dark energy cosmological models, we show that an updated 220 GRB version of the Jia et al. [Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 516, 2575 (2022)] GRB data compilation are standardizable through the Amati correlation and so can be used for cosmological analyses. However, the resulting GRB data constraints on the current value of the nonrelativistic matter density parameter, Ω_{m0} , are in $> 2\sigma$ tension with those from a joint analysis of better-established Hubble parameter $H(z)$ and baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) data for most of the cosmological models we consider, indicating that these GRB data cannot be jointly used with better-established $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data to constrain cosmological parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

A number of independent observations indicate that the Universe is currently undergoing accelerated cosmological expansion. The prevailing explanation for this phenomenon is dark energy, a hypothetical substance characterized by negative pressure. Among dark energy cosmological models, the most popular spatially-flat Λ CDM model, [1], assumes dark energy is a cosmological constant, Λ , contributing approximately 70% of the total energy budget of the current Universe. However, some recent observations hint at potential deviations from this model (see e.g. Ref. [2–5]), prompting exploration of alternate cosmological models accommodating non-zero spatial curvature and dynamical dark energy. In our analysis here we use some of these alternate models to check the standardizability of gamma-ray burst (GRB) data.

At present, better-established cosmological observations predominantly explore either the lower-redshift Universe, at $z < 2.3$, [6], or the Universe at $z \sim 1100$, [7]. In the intermediate redshift range GRB data extending up to $z \sim 8.2$ serve as potential cosmological probes, through correlations the GRBs obey that allow some of them to be standardizable [8–24]. We have analyzed GRB data by simultaneously constraining correlation parameters and cosmological parameters across various cosmological models. This approach is crucial to circumvent the circularity problem and to ascertain whether the correlation is independent of cosmological model, thus potentially rendering it standardizable [9, 25].

Our analysis reveals that a subset of 118 Amati-correlated (A118) GRBs, characterized by lower intrinsic dispersion, is indeed independent of the assumed cosmological model, making these data standardizable and

suitable for cosmological investigations [10, 26–29]. Cosmological constraints from the A118 GRB dataset are consistent with, but weaker than, those from better-established data, so A118 data can be jointly used with these better-established data to constrain cosmological parameters, with the resulting cosmological constraints being slightly more restrictive when A118 GRB data are included in the mix. However, the A118 dataset is small and it would be good to have a bigger standardizable GRB dataset, both to presently more restrictively constrain cosmological parameters as well as to help better understand such GRB data in preparation for large, better-quality, GRB compilations that should soon become available.¹

Recently Ref. [32] have collected a larger sample of 221 Amati-correlated GRBs, nearly twice as large as the A118 GRB sample. Here we study an updated version of the Ref. [32] sample, to determine whether it is standardizable and also study whether these GRB data cosmological constraints are consistent with those from better established data, such as baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) observations and expansion rate or Hubble parameter $H(z)$ measurements.

Other similar emerging cosmological probes include reverberation-measured Mg II and C IV quasar (QSO) measurements reaching to $z \sim 3.4$, [33–40], which our technique, [9, 25], shows are standardizable. Bright H II starburst galaxy (H II G) data reaching to $z \sim 2.5$, [41–51] might eventually become a standardizable probe. However, our technique, [9, 25], shows that in the most recent H II G compilation, [46], both low- z and high- z H II starburst galaxy compilations can individually be standardized, but they obey distinctly different correlations and so cannot be jointly standardized, challenging assumptions made in previous analyses of these data, [52]. QSO X-

* shuleicao@boisestate.edu

† ratra@phys.ksu.edu

¹ The SVOM space mission [30] is scheduled to be launched later this year and THESEUS [31] is an example of a possible future GRB space mission.

ray and UV flux observations, reaching to $z \sim 7.5$, have been explored as a potential cosmological probe utilizing a similar correlation [53–63]. However, it has been found that these QSOs lack standardizability, as the correlation is neither independent of cosmological model nor redshift independent, [59, 60], in the latest QSO flux compilation, [58]. Therefore, these QSO data cannot be utilized for cosmological purposes, [59, 60, 64–67].

As discussed below, we update the 221 GRB dataset of Ref. [32] by discarding one of the GRBs and updating measurements for eight other GRBs. We show, for the first time, that the updated 220 GRB dataset is standardizable through the Amati correlation. However, the constraints on the present value of the nonrelativistic matter density parameter Ω_{m0} are mostly in $> 2\sigma$ tension compared with those from better-established $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data in four of the six cosmological models we study. This suggests that the updated 220 GRB dataset of Ref. [32] cannot be used to constrain cosmological parameters, hence the A118 GRB dataset [10, 26–29] still is the largest GRB compilation suitable for cosmological purposes.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section II we provide a brief overview of the cosmological models employed in our analyses. Section III introduces the datasets used while Section IV outlines our methodology. Our main findings are presented in Section V, followed by concluding remarks in Section VI.

II. COSMOLOGICAL MODELS

Some previous investigations (see Refs. [10, 26–29] and references therein) have used GRB data that obey the Amati or $E_p - E_{\text{iso}}$ correlation, [68], between the GRB’s peak photon energy in the cosmological rest frame and the isotropic energy related to the measured GRB bolometric flux, see discussion in Section III below. Our aim here is to study the GRB dataset of Ref. [32]. We undertake this analysis within the framework of six relativistic dark energy cosmological models, encompassing both spatially-flat and nonflat scenarios.² Our objective is to examine, by simultaneously constraining cosmological model parameters and $E_p - E_{\text{iso}}$ correlation parameters, whether these GRB data conform to the $E_p - E_{\text{iso}}$ correlation in a manner independent of cosmological model and so are potentially standardizable. We are also interested in deriving cosmological parameter constraints using these GRB data to determine whether or not the GRB data alone cosmological constraints are consistent with those derived using better-established data. For these purposes we need $H(z)$ in each cosmological model. $H(z)$ depends on redshift z and the cosmological parameters of the model under study. It is defined by the first

Friedmann equation, derived within the framework of general relativity in the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker metric.

We consider models with one massive and two massless neutrino species. With an effective number of relativistic neutrino species $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$ and a total neutrino mass $\sum m_\nu = 0.06$ eV, the present value of the nonrelativistic neutrino physical energy density parameter is computed as $\Omega_\nu h^2 = \sum m_\nu / (93.14 \text{ eV})$, where h is the Hubble constant (H_0) scaled by $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Accordingly, $\Omega_{m0} = (\Omega_\nu h^2 + \Omega_b h^2 + \Omega_c h^2) / h^2$, where $\Omega_b h^2$ and $\Omega_c h^2$ denote the present values of the baryonic and cold dark matter physical energy density parameters, respectively. Given our focus on late-time measurements, we ignore the very small contribution from photons to the late-time cosmological energy budget.

We investigate both ΛCDM models and XCDM parametrizations, which extend the ΛCDM framework by allowing temporal (but not spatial) variability in the (fluid) dark energy density but with constant dark energy equation of state parameter $w_{\text{DE}} = p_{\text{DE}} / \rho_{\text{DE}}$, where p_{DE} and ρ_{DE} are the dark energy fluid pressure and energy density, respectively. While ΛCDM models correspond to $w_{\text{DE}} = -1$, XCDM parametrizations allow other values of w_{DE} . In these models the governing Friedmann equation takes the form

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{k0} (1+z)^2 + \Omega_{\text{DE}0} (1+z)^{1+w_{\text{DE}}}}. \quad (1)$$

Here Ω_{k0} represents the current value of the spatial curvature energy density parameter and $\Omega_{\text{DE}0} = 1 - \Omega_{m0} - \Omega_{k0}$ is the current value of the dark energy density parameter. In the ΛCDM model dark energy is the cosmological constant Λ , i.e., $\Omega_{\text{DE}0} = \Omega_\Lambda$. In the XCDM parameterization dark energy is an X-fluid with a dynamical dark energy equation of state parameter, resulting in $\Omega_{\text{DE}0} = \Omega_{\text{X}0}$. Since GRB data cannot constrain H_0 and Ω_b , we fix $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_b = 0.05$ in the GRB analyses. $\{\Omega_{m0}, \Omega_{k0}\}$ for ΛCDM and $\{\Omega_{m0}, w_{\text{X}}, \Omega_{k0}\}$ for XCDM are the free parameters we constrain with GRB data. As for $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data, $\{H_0, \Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, \Omega_{k0}\}$ for ΛCDM and $\{H_0, \Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, w_{\text{X}}, \Omega_{k0}\}$ for XCDM are the free parameters constrained. In spatially-flat models $\Omega_{k0} = 0$.

We also explore ϕCDM models (see e.g. Ref. [84–86]),³ where a dynamical scalar field ϕ is the dark energy. The Friedmann equation for this model is

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0} (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{k0} (1+z)^2 + \Omega_\phi(z, \alpha)}. \quad (2)$$

Here the scalar field dynamical dark energy density parameter $\Omega_\phi(z, \alpha)$ is computed numerically by simultaneously solving the Friedmann equation (2) and the equa-

² For recent studies on spatial curvature constraints, refer to Refs. [69–83], among others.

³ For recent cosmological constraints on the ϕCDM models, see Refs. [87–101] and references therein.

tion of motion of the scalar field

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $V(\phi)$ is the potential energy density

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}\kappa m_p^2 \phi^{-\alpha}. \quad (4)$$

In these equations, m_p is the Planck mass and α is a positive constant to be constrained; note that when $\alpha = 0$ the ϕ CDM model is the Λ CDM model. The constant coefficient κ can be determined by the shooting method in the cosmic linear anisotropy solving system (CLASS) code, [102]. In the ϕ CDM model, for GRB data $\{\Omega_{m0}, \alpha, \Omega_{k0}\}$ are to be constrained, while for $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data $\{H_0, \Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, \alpha, \Omega_{k0}\}$ are to be constrained. In the flat ϕ CDM model $\Omega_{k0} = 0$.

III. DATA

In this paper we test whether the updated GRB A220 data set of Ref. [32]⁴ is standardizable through the Amati ($E_p - E_{\text{iso}}$) correlation, by using these data to simultaneously constrain the Amati correlation parameters and cosmological parameters in half a dozen cosmological models. These GRB data, as well as $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data used for comparison purposes, are summarized below.

A220 GRB sample. The A220 sample, which is mostly taken from table 1 of Ref. [32], consists of 220 long GRBs and spans a wide redshift range, from 0.034 to 8.2. Note, however, that our A220 sample differs from the 221 GRBs of Ref. [32] by removing GRB 020127 (which has an unreliable redshift, [10]) and by updating 8 GRBs (080916C, 090323, 090328, 090424, 090902B, 091020, 091127, 130427A) from Ref. [8] (to the GRB A118 data set values in [10]). We also reverted the rest-frame isotropic radiated energy E_{iso} , reported in table 1 of Ref. [32], back to the bolometric fluence S_{bolo} , where $E_{\text{iso}} = 4\pi D_L^2 S_{\text{bolo}} / (1+z)$ and S_{bolo} is computed in the standard rest-frame energy band $1 - 10^4$ keV. Here $D_L(z)$ is the luminosity distance

$$D_L(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{c(1+z)}{H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{k0}}} \sinh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_{k0}} H_0}{c} D_C(z) \right] & \text{if } \Omega_{k0} > 0, \\ (1+z) D_C(z) & \text{if } \Omega_{k0} = 0, \\ \frac{c(1+z)}{H_0 \sqrt{|\Omega_{k0}|}} \sin \left[\frac{H_0 \sqrt{|\Omega_{k0}|}}{c} D_C(z) \right] & \text{if } \Omega_{k0} < 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

with $D_C(z)$ being the comoving distance

$$D_C(z) = c \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}, \quad (6)$$

and c is the speed of light.

The Amati correlation [68, 103, 104], is given by $\log E_{\text{iso}} = \beta + \gamma \log E_p$, where γ and β are the slope and intercept parameters and the rest-frame peak energy E_p of a GRB source is related to the observed peak energy $E_{p,\text{obs}}$ by $E_p = (1+z)E_{p,\text{obs}}$. By simultaneously determining both Amati correlation and cosmological parameters from A220 GRB data one can verify that A220 GRB data are potentially standardizable through the Amati correlation if the resulting Amati correlation parameter values are independent of cosmological model.

H(z) + BAO data. Here we use 32 $H(z)$ and 12 BAO measurements listed in tables 1 and 2 of Ref. [6], spanning the redshift ranges $0.07 \leq z \leq 1.965$ and $0.122 \leq z \leq 2.334$, respectively.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The natural log of the GRB data likelihood function is

$$\ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{GRB}} = -\frac{1}{2} \left[\chi_{\text{GRB}}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ln (2\pi \sigma_{\text{tot},i}^2) \right], \quad (7)$$

where

$$\chi_{\text{GRB}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{(\log E_{\text{iso},i} - \beta - \gamma \log E_{p,i})^2}{\sigma_{\text{tot},i}^2} \right] \quad (8)$$

with total uncertainty $\sigma_{\text{tot},i}$ given by

$$\sigma_{\text{tot},i}^2 = \sigma_{\text{int}}^2 + \sigma_{\log E_{\text{iso},i}}^2 + \gamma^2 \sigma_{\log E_{p,i}}^2, \quad (9)$$

where σ_{int} is the intrinsic scatter parameter for GRB data, which also accounts for unknown systematic uncertainties, [105].

The likelihood functions for $H(z)$ and BAO data are described in Ref. [6], which also provides the $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data results shown here.

The parameters we constrain obey flat (uniform) priors, non-zero in the closed intervals listed in Table I. We utilize the MontePython Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) code, [106, 107], for conducting likelihood analysis of both cosmological and Amati correlation parameters. Subsequent statistical analysis and visualization are facilitated by employing the GetDist PYTHON package, [108]. For definitions of the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), and Deviance Information Criterion (DIC), see Sec. IV of Ref. [6]. To evaluate model performance, we utilize ΔIC , which is the difference between the dark energy model IC value and the flat Λ CDM model baseline IC value. A positive (or negative) ΔIC value indicates how much worse (or better) the alternate model fits the dataset in comparison to the baseline flat Λ CDM model fit. We categorize the strength of evidence against the models based

⁴ Note that the updated A220 GRB dataset of Ref. [32] and our paper differs from the GRB A220 dataset of Ref. [10].

TABLE I. Flat (uniform) priors of the constrained parameters.

Parameter	Prior
Cosmological Parameters	
H_0 ^a	[None, None]
$\Omega_b h^2$ ^b	[0, 1]
$\Omega_c h^2$ ^b	[0, 1]
Ω_{k0}	[-2, 2]
α	[0, 10]
w_X	[-5, 0.33]
Ω_{m0} ^c	[0.051314766115, 1]
Amati Correlation Parameters	
β	[0, 300]
γ	[0, 5]
σ_{int}	[0, 5]

^a km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹. In the GRB cases, $H_0 = 70$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹.

^b $H(z) + \text{BAO}$. In the GRB cases $\Omega_b = 0.05$.

^c GRB cases only, to ensure that Ω_c remains positive.

on ΔIC values relative to the model with the minimum IC as follows: weak (0, 2], positive (2, 6], strong (6, 10], and very strong > 10 .

V. RESULTS

The values of the unmarginalized best-fitting parameters, maximum likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$, AIC, BIC, DIC, ΔAIC , ΔBIC , and ΔDIC for all models and datasets are presented in Table II. Additionally, the one-dimensional marginalized posterior mean parameter values and their uncertainties ($\pm 1\sigma$ error bars or 1 or 2σ limits) for all models and datasets can be found in Table III. Figures 1 and 2 show the posterior distributions and contours of all parameters and of just cosmological parameters, respectively, for the six cosmological models under study, where the A220 and $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ results are shown in blue and red, respectively.

We have found that only for the XCDM parameterizations are the constraints on cosmological parameters from A220 data consistent with those from $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data. Specifically, for flat XCDM the Ω_{m0} and w_X constraints are $\Omega_{m0} > 0.289$ [= 0.285 ± 0.019] and $w_X < 0.086$ [= $-0.776^{+0.130}_{-0.103}$] for A220 [$H(z) + \text{BAO}$] data, respectively; and for nonflat XCDM the Ω_{m0} , w_X , and Ω_{k0} constraints are $\Omega_{m0} > 0.296$ [= 0.292 ± 0.024], $w_X = -0.054 \pm 0.103$ [= $-1.883^{+2.033}_{-0.824}$], and $\Omega_{k0} = -0.757^{+0.135}_{-0.093}$ [= $0.254^{+0.591}_{-0.758}$] for A220 [$H(z) + \text{BAO}$] data, respectively. However, for other models the constraints on Ω_{m0} exhibit tensions exceeding 2σ , while the A220 and $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data constraints on Ω_{k0} and α are consistent within 2σ .

Given that, more so than not, the A220 constraints on Ω_{m0} are not consistent with those from better-established $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data, these A220 GRB data cannot be jointly used with better-established data for the purpose

of constraining cosmological parameters.

It is noteworthy that the A220 and $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data constraints on Ω_{k0} for all three nonflat models are consistent within 1σ . Furthermore, all A220 cases favor closed hypersurfaces, however only the nonflat ΛCDM model exhibits a slight bias (just 1.003σ) away from flat geometry.

The constraints on the Amati correlation slope parameter γ range from a low of 1.381 ± 0.068 (nonflat ϕCDM) to a high of 1.408 ± 0.068 (nonflat ΛCDM), with maximum difference of 0.28σ . The constraints on the Amati correlation intercept parameter β range from a low of 49.12 ± 0.19 (nonflat ΛCDM) to a high of 49.19 ± 0.18 (flat XCDM), with maximum difference of 0.27σ . Therefore we conclude that A220 GRB data are standardizable through the Amati correlation.

The constraints on the intrinsic scatter parameter σ_{int} range from a low of $0.390^{+0.020}_{-0.024}$ (flat ϕCDM) to a high of $0.391^{+0.021}_{-0.024}$ (nonflat XCDM), with maximum difference of 0.03σ .

For A220 data, based on AIC (BIC), flat ΛCDM is the most favored model, the evidence against nonflat XCDM and nonflat ϕCDM is positive (very strong), and the evidence against the rest is weak (positive). Based on the more reliable DIC, nonflat ϕCDM is the most favored model, the evidence against nonflat XCDM is positive, and the evidence against the rest is weak.

VI. CONCLUSION

We use updated A220 GRB data based on the compilation of Ref. [32] to simultaneously constrain Amati correlation parameters and cosmological parameters in six spatially-flat and nonflat dark energy cosmological models. We have found that these updated 220 GRBs are standardizable through the Amati correlation, because their constraints on both Amati correlation parameters are independent of cosmological model. However, we have also found that their constraints on Ω_{m0} are in $> 2\sigma$ tension with those from better-established $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data for the four flat and nonflat ΛCDM and ϕCDM models and so these A220 GRB data cannot be used to constrain cosmological parameters. This means that currently the A118 GRB dataset [10, 26–29] is the largest GRB compilation suitable for cosmological purposes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The computations for this project were performed on the Beocat Research Cluster at Kansas State University, which is funded in part by NSF grants CNS-1006860, EPS-1006860, EPS-0919443, ACI-1440548, CHE-1726332, and NIH P20GM113109.

TABLE II. Unmarginalized best-fitting parameter values for all models from H II G data.

Model	Data set	$\Omega_b h^2$	$\Omega_c h^2$	Ω_{m0}	Ω_{k0}	w_X/α^a	H_0^b	γ	β	σ_{int}	$-2 \ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$	AIC	BIC	DIC	ΔAIC	ΔBIC	ΔDIC
Flat ΛCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0254	0.1200	0.297	...	...	70.12	...	...	...	30.56	36.56	41.91	37.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nonflat ΛCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0269	0.1128	0.289	0.041	...	69.61	...	...	...	30.34	38.34	45.48	38.80	1.78	3.56	1.48
Flat XCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0318	0.0938	0.283	...	-0.734	66.67	...	...	...	26.58	34.58	41.71	34.83	-1.98	-0.20	-2.49
Nonflat XCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0305	0.0998	0.293	-0.084	-0.703	66.79	...	...	...	26.00	36.00	44.92	36.11	-0.56	3.01	-1.21
Flat ϕCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0336	0.0866	0.271	...	1.157	66.80	...	...	...	26.50	34.50	41.64	34.15	-2.05	-0.27	-3.17
Nonflat ϕCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0337	0.0894	0.275	-0.074	1.393	67.16	...	...	...	25.92	35.92	44.84	35.29	-0.64	2.93	-2.03
		...	...	0.990	-0.356	9.498	...	1.363	49.16	0.385	232.21	242.21	259.17	241.62	3.63	10.42	-0.59

^a w_X corresponds to flat/nonflat XCDM and α corresponds to flat/nonflat ϕCDM .^b $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.^c $\Omega_b = 0.05$ and $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

TABLE III. One-dimensional marginalized posterior mean values and uncertainties ($\pm 1\sigma$ error bars or 2σ limits) of the parameters for all models from various combinations of data.

Model	Data set	$\Omega_b h^2$	$\Omega_c h^2$	Ω_{m0}	Ω_{k0}	w_X/α^a	H_0^b	γ	β	σ_{int}
Flat Λ CDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	0.0260 ± 0.0040 ...	$0.1212^{+0.0091}_{-0.0101}$...	$0.297^{+0.015}_{-0.017}$ > 0.542	...	...	70.49 ± 2.74 ...	...	...	...
Nonflat Λ CDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0275^{+0.0046}_{-0.0051}$...	$0.1131^{+0.0180}_{-0.0181}$...	0.289 ± 0.023 > 0.569	$0.047^{+0.082}_{-0.089}$ $-0.612^{+0.610}_{-0.871}$	...	69.81 ± 2.80 ...	...	...	...
Flat XCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0308^{+0.0053}_{-0.0046}$...	$0.0978^{+0.0184}_{-0.0164}$...	0.285 ± 0.019 > 0.289	...	$-0.776^{+0.130}_{-0.103}$ < 0.086	67.18 ± 3.18 ...	...	...	...
Nonflat XCDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0303^{+0.0054}_{-0.0048}$...	0.1021 ± 0.0193 ...	0.292 ± 0.024 > 0.296	-0.054 ± 0.103 $-1.883^{+2.033}_{-0.824}$	$-0.757^{+0.135}_{-0.093}$ $0.254^{+0.591}_{-0.758}$	67.33 ± 2.96 ...	...	...	...
Flat ϕ CDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0326^{+0.0061}_{-0.0030}$...	$0.0866^{+0.0197}_{-0.0180}$...	$0.272^{+0.024}_{-0.022}$ > 0.377	...	$1.271^{+0.507}_{-0.836}$ > 4.007 ^d	$66.19^{+2.89}_{-2.88}$...	...	...	...
Nonflat ϕ CDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0325^{+0.0064}_{-0.0029}$...	$0.0881^{+0.0199}_{-0.0201}$...	0.275 ± 0.025 > 0.412	$-0.052^{+0.093}_{-0.087}$ $-0.269^{+0.305}_{-0.275}$	$1.427^{+0.572}_{-0.830}$ > 0.462 ^d	66.24 ± 2.88 ...	...	...	...
Nonflat ϕ CDM	$H(z) + \text{BAO}$ A220 ^c	$0.0325^{+0.0064}_{-0.0029}$...	$0.0881^{+0.0199}_{-0.0201}$...	0.275 ± 0.025 > 0.412	$-0.052^{+0.093}_{-0.087}$ $-0.269^{+0.305}_{-0.275}$	$1.427^{+0.572}_{-0.830}$ > 0.462 ^d	66.24 ± 2.88 ...	...	...	...

^a w_X corresponds to flat/nonflat XCDM and α corresponds to flat/nonflat ϕ CDM.

^b $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

^c $\Omega_b = 0.05$ and $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

^d This is the 1σ limit. The 2σ limit is set by the prior and not shown here.




FIG. 1. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ two-dimensional likelihood confidence contours from GRB A220 (blue) and $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ (red) data for six different models, with ΛCDM , $X\text{CDM}$, and ϕCDM in the top, middle, and bottom rows, and flat (nonflat) models in the left (right) column. The black dashed zero-acceleration lines, computed for the third cosmological parameter set to the $H(z) + \text{BAO}$ data best-fitting values listed in Table II in panels (d) and (f), divide the parameter space into regions associated with currently-accelerating (below or below left) and currently-decelerating (above or above right) cosmological expansion. The crimson dash-dot lines represent flat hypersurfaces, with closed spatial hypersurfaces either below or to the left. The magenta lines represent $w_X = -1$, i.e. flat or nonflat ΛCDM models. The $\alpha = 0$ axes correspond to flat and nonflat ΛCDM models in panels (e) and (f), respectively.




FIG. 2. Same as Fig. 1, but for cosmological parameters only.

-
- [1] P. J. E. Peebles, *Astrophys. J.* **284**, 439 (1984).
 - [2] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astronomy Reviews* **95**, 101659 (2022), [arXiv:2105.05208 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [3] M. Moresco, L. Amati, L. Amendola, S. Birrer, J. P. Blakeslee, M. Cantiello, A. Cimatti, J. Darling, M. Della Valle, M. Fishbach, *et al.*, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **25**, 6 (2022), [arXiv:2201.07241 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [4] E. Abdalla, G. F. Abellán, A. Aboubrahim, A. Agnello, Ö. Akarsu, Y. Akrami, G. Alestas, D. Aloni, L. Amendola, L. A. Anchordoqui, *et al.*, *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics* **34**, 49 (2022), [arXiv:2203.06142 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [5] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, *Universe* **9**, 94 (2023), [arXiv:2302.05709 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [6] S. Cao and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 103521 (2023), [arXiv:2302.14203 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [7] Planck Collaboration, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [8] F. Fana Dirirsa, S. Razzaque, F. Piron, M. Arimoto, M. Axelsson, D. Kocevski, F. Longo, M. Ohno, and S. Zhu, *Astrophys. J.* **887**, 13 (2019), [arXiv:1910.07009 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
 - [9] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **499**, 391 (2020), [arXiv:2007.13907 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [10] N. Khadka, O. Luongo, M. Muccino, and B. Ratra, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2021** (9), 042, [arXiv:2105.12692 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [11] D. Zhao and J.-Q. Xia, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **511**, 5661 (2022).
 - [12] S. Cao, M. Dainotti, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **516**, 1386 (2022), [arXiv:2204.08710 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [13] M. G. Dainotti, V. Nielson, G. Sarracino, E. Rinaldi, S. Nagataki, S. Capozziello, O. Y. Gnedin, and G. Bargiacchi, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **514**, 1828 (2022), [arXiv:2203.15538 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [14] Y. Liu, N. Liang, X. Xie, Z. Yuan, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Astrophys. J.* **935**, 7 (2022), [arXiv:2207.00455 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [15] G. Govindaraj and S. Desai, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2022**, 069 (2022), [arXiv:2208.00895 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
 - [16] N. Liang, Z. Li, X. Xie, and P. Wu, *Astrophys. J.* **941**, 84 (2022), [arXiv:2211.02473 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [17] M. Singh, D. Singh, K. Lal Pandey, D. Verma, and S. Gupta, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* **24**, 015015 (2024), [arXiv:2211.11667 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [18] D. Kumar, N. Rani, D. Jain, S. Mahajan, and A. Mukherjee, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2023**, 021 (2023), [arXiv:2212.05731 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [19] Z. Li, B. Zhang, and N. Liang, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **521**, 4406 (2023), [arXiv:2212.14291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [20] Y. Mu, B. Chang, and L. Xu, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2023**, 041 (2023), [arXiv:2302.02559 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [21] J.-L. Li, Y.-P. Yang, S.-X. Yi, J.-P. Hu, F.-Y. Wang, and Y.-K. Qu, *Astrophys. J.* **953**, 58 (2023), [arXiv:2306.12840 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
 - [22] H. Xie, X. Nong, B. Zhang, H. Wang, Z. Li, and N. Liang, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2307.16467 \(2023\)](#), [arXiv:2307.16467 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [23] B. Zhang, X. Xie, X. Nong, G. Wang, Z. Xiong, P. Wu, and N. Liang, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2312.09440 \(2023\)](#), [arXiv:2312.09440 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [24] A. Favale, M. G. Dainotti, A. Gómez-Valent, and M. Migliaccio, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2402.13115 \(2024\)](#), [arXiv:2402.13115 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [25] S. Cao, J. Ryan, N. Khadka, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **501**, 1520 (2021), [arXiv:2009.12953 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [26] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, *Galaxies* **9**, 77 (2021), [arXiv:2110.14408 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
 - [27] S. Cao, N. Khadka, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **510**, 2928 (2022), [arXiv:2110.14840 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [28] S. Cao, M. Dainotti, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **512**, 439 (2022), [arXiv:2201.05245 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [29] Y. Liu, F. Chen, N. Liang, Z. Yuan, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Astrophys. J.* **931**, 50 (2022), [arXiv:2203.03178 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [30] SVOM Collaboration, J. L. Atteia, B. Cordier, and J. Wei, in *The Sixteenth Marcel Grossmann Meeting. On Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics, and Relativistic Field Theories*, edited by R. Ruffino and G. Vereshchagin (2023) pp. 104–132.
 - [31] L. Amati, P. T. O'Brien, D. Götz, E. Bozzo, A. Santangelo, N. Tanvir, F. Frontera, S. Mereghetti, J. P. Osborne, A. Blain, S. Basa, M. Branchesi, L. Burderi, M. Caballero-García, A. J. Castro-Tirado, L. Christensen, R. Ciolfi, A. De Rosa, V. Doroshenko, A. Ferrara, G. Ghirlanda, L. Hanlon, P. Heddermann, I. Hutchinson, C. Labanti, E. Le Floch, H. Lerman, S. Paltani, V. Reglero, L. Rezzolla, P. Rosati, R. Salvaterra, G. Stratta, C. Tenzer, and Theseus Consortium, *Experimental Astronomy* **52**, 183 (2021), [arXiv:2104.09531 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
 - [32] X. D. Jia, J. P. Hu, J. Yang, B. B. Zhang, and F. Y. Wang, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **516**, 2575 (2022), [arXiv:2208.09272 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
 - [33] B. Czerny, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, G. Wojtkowska, M. Zajaček, P. Marziani, D. Dultzin, M. H. Naddaf, S. Panda, R. Prince, R. Przyłuski, M. Ralowski, and M. Śniegowska, *Acta Physica Polonica A* **139**, 389 (2021), [arXiv:2011.12375 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [34] M. Zajaček, B. Czerny, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, M. Ralowski, A. Olejak, R. Przyłuski, S. Panda, K. Hryniewicz, M. Śniegowska, M.-H. Naddaf, *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **912**, 10 (2021), [arXiv:2012.12409 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
 - [35] N. Khadka, Z. Yu, M. Zajaček, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, B. Czerny, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **508**, 4722 (2021), [arXiv:2106.11136 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [36] N. Khadka, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, M. Zajaček, B. Czerny, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **513**, 1985 (2022), [arXiv:2112.00052 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [37] N. Khadka, M. Zajaček, S. Panda, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **515**, 3729 (2022), [arXiv:2205.05813 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [38] S. Cao, M. Zajaček, S. Panda, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, B. Czerny, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **516**, 1721 (2022), [arXiv:2205.15552 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [39] B. Czerny *et al.*, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **368**, 8 (2023), [arXiv:2209.06563 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [40] S. Cao, M. Zajaček, B. Czerny, S. Panda, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **528**, 6444 (2024), [arXiv:2309.16516 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [41] E. R. Siegel, R. Guzmán, J. P. Gallego, M. Orduña López, and P. Rodríguez Hidalgo, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **356**, 1117 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0410612 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [42] D. Mania and B. Ratra, *Physics Letters B* **715**, 9 (2012), [arXiv:1110.5626 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [43] R. Chávez, R. Terlevich, E. Terlevich, F. Bresolin, J. Melnick, M. Plionis, and S. Basilakos, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **442**, 3565 (2014), [arXiv:1405.4010 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [44] R. Chávez, M. Plionis, S. Basilakos, R. Terlevich, E. Terlevich, J. Melnick, F. Bresolin, and A. L. González-Morán, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **462**, 2431 (2016), [arXiv:1607.06458 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [45] A. L. González-Morán, R. Chávez, R. Terlevich, E. Terlevich, F. Bresolin, D. Fernández-Arenas, M. Plionis, S. Basilakos, J. Melnick, and E. Telles, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **487**, 4669 (2019), [arXiv:1906.02195 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [46] A. L. González-Morán, R. Chávez, E. Terlevich, R. Terlevich, D. Fernández-Arenas, F. Bresolin, M. Plionis, J. Melnick, S. Basilakos, and E. Telles, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **505**, 1441 (2021), [arXiv:2105.04025 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] S. Cao, J. Ryan, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 3191 (2020), [arXiv:2005.12617 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [48] S. Cao, J. Ryan, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **504**, 300 (2021), [arXiv:2101.08817 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] S. Cao, J. Ryan, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **509**, 4745 (2022), [arXiv:2109.01987 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [50] J. P. Johnson, A. Sangwan, and S. Shankaranarayanan, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2022** (1), 024, [arXiv:2102.12367 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [51] S. Cao and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **513**, 5686 (2022), [arXiv:2203.10825 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] S. Cao and B. Ratra, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2310.15812 \(2023\)](#), [arXiv:2310.15812 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Astrophys. J.* **815**, 33 (2015), [arXiv:1505.07118 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Nat. Astron.* **3**, 272 (2019), [arXiv:1811.02590 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [55] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **492**, 4456 (2020), [arXiv:1909.01400 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] T. Yang, A. Banerjee, and E. Ó Colgáin, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 123532 (2020), [arXiv:1911.01681 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 263 (2020), [arXiv:2004.09979 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [58] E. Lusso, G. Risaliti, E. Nardini, G. Bargiacchi, M. Benetti, S. Bisogni, S. Capozziello, F. Civano, L. Eggleston, M. Elvis, *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **642**, A150 (2020), [arXiv:2008.08586 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [59] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **502**, 6140 (2021), [arXiv:2012.09291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [60] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **510**, 2753 (2022), [arXiv:2107.07600 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] M. Rezaei, J. Solà Peracaula, and M. Malekjani, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **509**, 2593 (2022), [arXiv:2108.06255 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] O. Luongo, M. Muccino, E. Ó. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and L. Yin, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103510 (2022), [arXiv:2108.13228 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] M. G. Dainotti, G. Bargiacchi, A. Ł. Lenart, S. Capozziello, E. Ó Colgáin, R. Solomon, D. Stojkovic, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Astrophys. J.* **931**, 106 (2022), [arXiv:2203.12914 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [64] V. Petrosian, J. Singal, and S. Mutchnick, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **935**, L19 (2022), [arXiv:2205.07981 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [65] N. Khadka, M. Zajaček, R. Prince, S. Panda, B. Czerny, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, V. K. Jaiswal, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **522**, 1247 (2023), [arXiv:2212.10483 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] M. Zajaček, B. Czerny, N. Khadka, M. L. Martínez-Aldama, R. Prince, S. Panda, and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. J.* **961**, 229 (2024), [arXiv:2305.08179 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [67] B. Wang, Y. Liu, H. Yu, and P. Wu, *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 103 (2024), [arXiv:2401.01540 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [68] L. Amati, F. Frontera, M. Tavani, J. J. M. in't Zand, A. Antonelli, E. Costa, M. Feroci, C. Guidorzi, J. Heise, N. Masetti, E. Montanari, L. Nicastro, E. Palazzi, E. Pian, L. Piro, and P. Soffitta, *Astron. Astrophys.* **390**, 81 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0205230 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [69] J. Ooba, B. Ratra, and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. J.* **869**, 34 (2018), [arXiv:1710.03271 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **364**, 82 (2019), [arXiv:1803.05522 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [71] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **908**, L9 (2021), [arXiv:2003.04935 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [72] R. Arjona and S. Nesseris, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 103539 (2021), [arXiv:2103.06789 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [73] S. Dhawan, J. Alsing, and S. Vagnozzi, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. Lett.* **506**, L1 (2021), [arXiv:2104.02485 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [74] F. Renzi, N. B. Hogg, and W. Giarè, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **513**, 4004 (2022), [arXiv:2112.05701 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [75] C.-Q. Geng, Y.-T. Hsu, and J.-R. Lu, *Astrophys. J.* **926**, 74 (2022), [arXiv:2112.10041 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [76] P. Mukherjee and N. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063516 (2022), [arXiv:2202.07886 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] A. Glanville, C. Howlett, and T. Davis, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **517**, 3087 (2022), [arXiv:2205.05892 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [78] P.-J. Wu, J.-Z. Qi, and X. Zhang, *Chinese Physics C* **47**, 055106 (2023), [arXiv:2209.08502 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [79] J. de Cruz Pérez, C.-G. Park, and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063522 (2023), [arXiv:2211.04268 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [80] D. Dahiya and D. Jain, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* **23**, 095001 (2023), [arXiv:2212.04751 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [81] J. Stevens, H. Khoraminezhad, and S. Saito, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2023**, 046 (2023), [arXiv:2212.09804 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [82] A. Favale, A. Gómez-Valent, and M. Migliaccio, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **523**, 3406 (2023), [arXiv:2301.09591 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [83] J.-Z. Qi, P. Meng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 063522 (2023), [arXiv:2302.08889 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [84] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **325**, L17 (1988).
- [85] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988).

- [86] A. Pavlov, S. Westmoreland, K. Saaïdi, and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 123513 (2013), [arXiv:1307.7399 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [87] J. Ooba, B. Ratra, and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. J.* **866**, 68 (2018), [arXiv:1712.08617 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [88] J. Ooba, B. Ratra, and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **364**, 176 (2019), [arXiv:1802.05571 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [89] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. J.* **868**, 83 (2018), [arXiv:1807.07421](#).
- [90] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **364**, 134 (2019), [arXiv:1809.03598 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [91] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083508 (2020), [arXiv:1908.08477 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [92] A. Singh, A. Sangwan, and H. K. Jassal, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2019** (4), 047, [arXiv:1811.07513 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [93] L. A. Ureña-López and N. Roy, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063510 (2020), [arXiv:2007.08873 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [94] S. Sinha and N. Banerjee, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2021** (4), 060, [arXiv:2010.02651 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [95] J. de Cruz Perez, J. Sola Peracaula, A. Gomez-Valent, and C. Moreno-Pulido, [arXiv:2110.07569 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#) (2021).
- [96] T. Xu, Y. Chen, L. Xu, and S. Cao, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **36**, 101023 (2022), [arXiv:2109.02453 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [97] J. F. Jesus, R. Valentim, A. A. Escobal, S. H. Pereira, and D. Benndorf, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2022** (11), 037, [arXiv:2112.09722 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [98] A. Adil, A. Albrecht, and L. Knox, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063521 (2023), [arXiv:2207.10235 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [99] F. Dong, C. Park, S. E. Hong, J. Kim, H. S. Hwang, H. Park, and S. Appleby, *Astrophys. J.* **953**, 98 (2023), [arXiv:2305.00206 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [100] M. Van Raamsdonk and C. Waddell, [arXiv:2305.04946 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#) (2023).
- [101] O. Avsajanishvili, G. Y. Chitov, T. Kahniashvili, S. Mandal, and L. Samushia, *Universe* **10**, 122 (2024), [arXiv:2310.16911 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [102] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and T. Tram, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2011** (7), 034, [arXiv:1104.2933 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [103] L. Amati, C. Guidorzi, F. Frontera, M. Della Valle, F. Finelli, R. Landi, and E. Montanari, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **391**, 577 (2008), [arXiv:0805.0377 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [104] L. Amati, F. Frontera, and C. Guidorzi, *Astron. Astrophys.* **508**, 173 (2009), [arXiv:0907.0384 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [105] G. D'Agostini, [arXiv e-prints](#), physics/0511182 (2005), [arXiv:physics/0511182 \[physics.data-an\]](#).
- [106] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, and S. Prunet, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2013** (2), 001, [arXiv:1210.7183 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [107] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **24**, 100260 (2019), [arXiv:1804.07261 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [108] A. Lewis, [arXiv:1910.13970 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#) (2019).