Generalized Chaplygin Gas Models tested with SN Ia

M arek Biesiada D epartment of A strophysics and Cosmology, University of Silesia Universitedka 4,40-007 K atowice, Poland mb@imp.sosnowiec.pl W lodzimierz G odlowski A stronomical O bservatory Jagiellonian University O rla171, K rakow, Poland godlows@oa.ujedu.pl M arek Szydlowski A stronomical O bservatory Jagiellonian University O rla171, K rakow, Poland szydlo@oa.ujedu.pl

ABSTRACT

The Generalized Chaplygin G as (GCG) with the equation of state $p = \frac{A}{2}$ was recently proposed as a candidate for dark energy in the Universe. In this paper we confront the GCG with SN Ia data using avaliable samples. Speci cally we have tested the GCG cosm ology in three di erent classes of models with (1) $_{\rm m}$ = 0:3, $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0:7; (2) $_{\rm m}$ = 0:05, $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0:95 and (3) $_{\rm m}$ = 0, $_{\rm Ch}$ = 1, as well as a model without prior assumptions on m. The best thed models are obtained by m in in a lizing the 2^{2} function. We supplement our analysis with con dence intervals in the $(A_0;)$ plane by marginalizing the probability density functions over remaining parameters assuming uniform priors. We have also derived one-dimensional probability distribution functions for _{Ch} obtained from joint marginalization over A_0 . The maximum value of such PDF provides the most probable value of $_{Ch}$ within the full class of GCG models. The general conclusion is that SN Ia data give support to the Chaplygin gas (with = 1). However noticeable preference of A_0 values close to 1 m eans that the dependence becom es insigni cant. It is relected on one dimensional PDFs for which turned out to be at meaning that the power of present supernovae data to discriminate between various GCG models (diering by) is weak. Extending our analysis by relaxing the prior assumption of the atness of the Universe leads to

the result that even though the best tted values of $_k$ are form ally non-zero, still they are close to the at case. Our results show clearly that in GCG cosmology distant (i.e. z > 1) supernovae should be brighter than in CDM model. Therefore one can expect that future supernova experiments (e.g., SNAP) having access to higher redshifts will eventually resolve the issue whether the dark energy content of the Universe could be described as a the Chaplygin gas. Moreover, it would be possible to dimensiate between models with various value of parameter and/or discriminated between GCG, Cardassian and CDM models. This discriminative power of the forthcoming mission has been demonstrated on simulated SNAP data.

Subject headings: cosm ology theory | distance scale | supernovae: G eneralized C haplygin G as

1. Introduction

For a couple of years two independent observational programs the high redshift supernovae surveys (Perlm utter et al. 1999) and CM BR sm allscale anisotropy m easurem ents (de Bernardis et al. 2000, Benoit et al. 2003, Hinshaw et al. 2003) have brought a new picture of the Universe in the large. While interpreted ithin the FRW models results of these programs suggest that our Universe is at (as inferred from the location of acoustic peaks in CMBR power spectrum) and presently accelerates its expansion (as inferred from the SN Ia Hubble diagram). C om bined with the independent know ledge about the am ount of baryons and CDM estimated to be m = 0.3 (Turner 2002) it follows that about x = 0.7fraction of critical density $_{\rm cr} = \frac{3c^2 {\rm H}_0^2}{8 {\rm G}}$ should be contained in a mysterious component called \dark energy". The most obvious candidate for this smooth component permeating the Universe is the cosm ological constant representing the energy of the vacuum. Well known ne tuning problems led many people to seek beyond the fram ework, and the concept of the quintessence had been conceived. U sually the quintessence is described in a phenom enological manner, as a scalar eld with an appropriate potential (Ratra & Peebles 1988, Caldwell, Dave & Steinhardt 1995, Friem an, Stebbins & Waga 1995). It turns out, however, that quintessence program also su ers from its own netuning problem s (K olda & Lyth 1999).

In 1904 Russian physicist Chaplygin introduced the exotic equation of state $p = \frac{A}{2}$ to discribe an adiabatic aerodynamic process (Chaplygin 2004). The attractiveness of this equation of state in the context dark energy models comes mainly from the fact that it gives the unication of both dark energy (postulated in cosm ology to explain current aceleration

of the Universe) and clustered dark matter which is postulated in astrophysics to explain the at rotation curves of spiral galaxies. It is interesting that the Chaplygin gas can be derived from the quintessence Lagrangian for the scalar eld with some potential and also from the Bom-Infeld form of the Lagrangian (K am enshchik, M oschella & Pasquier 2001). The Chaplygin equation of state has some interesting connections with string theory and it admits the interpretation in the fram ework of brane cosm ologies (Jackiw 2000).

Recently the so called Chaplygin gas (K am enshchik, M oschella & Pasquier 2001, Fabris, G on calves & de Souza 2002, Szydlow ski & C za ja 2004) | a hypothetical component with the equation of state $p = \frac{A}{2}$ | was proposed as a challenge to the above mentioned candidates for dark energy. This, also purely phenom enological, entity has interesting connections with string theory (O gaw a 2000). Currently its generalizations adm itting the equation of state $p = \frac{A}{2}$ where 0 1 have been proposed (Bento, Bertolami & Sen 2002, Carturan & Finelli 2002a).

In this paper we confront the Generalized Chaplygin Gas with the SN Ia data. At this point our choice of Generalized Chaplygin Gas cosm ologies deserves a sort of justi cation. There are two approaches in the literature. First one is phenom enological, namely having no preferred theory of dark energy responsible for acceleration of the Universe one characterizes it as a cosm ic uid with an equation of state $p_X = w_X$ where w 1 (see e.g. (Chiba 1998, Turner & W hite 1997) and an immense literature that appeared thereafter). Because, as already m entioned above, a strain of ideas about dark energy is associated with an evolving scalar there are good reasons to expect that cosm ic equation of state could be time dependent ie. w = w (t) = w (z) (e.g. W eller & A lorecht 2001, M aor et al. 2001 and m any others thereafter). This approach seems attractive from the perspective of analyzing observational data such like supernovae surveys and indeed this approach was taken while rst analyzing the data (Perlm utter et al. 1999, K nop et al. 2003 or R iess et al. 2004). How ever even though such analysis places constrains on any potential theory that might explain the dark energy phenom enon, ultim ately one always ends up at testing a speci c theory. A long this line there appeared attempts to reconstruct the scalar potential, if the scalar eld was responsible for dark energy (e.g. A lam et al. 2003 and references therein). Our approach goes along this philosophy but instead is devoted to the Generalized Chaplygin Gas which is being recently considered as candidate to uni ed dark matter energy com ponent (i.e. responsible for both clustering and accelerated expansion (Makler, de Oliveira & Waga 2003).

The cosm ological models with the Generalized Chaplygin G as have also many special features which make them attractive. In standard cosm ological model one can clearly distinguish the epochs of radiation dom ination followed by (ordinary) matter dom ination (with decelerated expansion). As mentioned above supernova data suggest that the epoch of de-

celerated expansion ended and switched to accelerated epoch | dom inated by dark energy. The G eneralized Chaplygin G as models describe smoothly the transition from the decelerated to accelerated epochs. They represent the simplest deformation of concordance CDM (G oriniet al. 2004). And moreover, they propose a new unied macroscopic (phenomenological) description of both dark energy and dark matter. This places them in a distinguished position from the point of view of 0 ccam's razor principle. It should be also noted that the G enaralized Chaplygin G as model allowed us to explain presently observed acceleration of the Universe without the cosm ological constant and/orm odi cation of E instein's equations.

If one takes seriously given dark energy scenario (necessary to explain cosm ic acceleration) one should also consider the behaviour of perturbations in such a universe. In the fram ework of quintessence models with the barotropic equation of state (i.e. p = w and w = const) one faces the problem of instabilities in short scales. This appears because the speed of sound squared (equal here to w) is negative (and constant). Calculation of the sound speed in G eneralized Chaplygin G as model (see below) reveal its non-barotropic nature. The perturbations in GCG models are stable in short scales even in an accelerating phase (Carturan & Finelli 2002a). Moreover, they behave like dust perturbations when Chaplygin G as is in dust regime.

A nother motivation for studying G eneralized Chaplygin G as models goes from theoretical physics | speci cally from attempts to describe the dark energy in terms of the Lagrangian for a tachyonic eld (G arousi 2000, Sen 2002). Of course it would be nice to have a description of dark energy in terms of the non quintessence Lagrangian as it describes the nature of dark energy while the cosm ological constant is only phenom elogical and effective description. One should also note that the G eneralized C haplygin G as equation of state arises in modern physics in the context of brane models (B ordem ann & H oppe 1993, K am enshchik, M oschella & Pasquier 2001, R andall & Sundrum 1999) where the G eneralized C haplygin G as manifests itself as an elect of immersion of our U niverse in multidimensional bulk space.

G eneralized C haplygin gas models have been intensively studied in the literature and in particular they have been tested against supernovae data (M akler, de O liveira & W aga 2003, A velino et al. 2003, C ollistete et al. 2003), lensing statistics (D ev, A leaniz & Jain 2003), CM BR m easurements (B ento, B ertolam i & Sen 2003a, 20003b, C arturan & F inelli 2003b, A m endola et al. 2003), age-redshift relation (A leaniz, Jain & D ev 2003), x-ray lum inosities of galaxy clusters (C unha, L in a & A leaniz 2003) or from the large scale structure considerations (B ean & D ore 2003, M ultam aki, M anera & G aztanaga 2003, B ilic et al. 2003). P erspectives to distinguish between G eneralized C haplygin G as, brane-world scenarios and quintessence in forthcom ing gravity wave experiments has been discussed in (B iesiada 2003). A lihough the results are in general mutually consistent there was no strong convergence to unique values of A_0 , parameters characterizing Chaplygin gas equation of state.

Makler, de O liveira & W aga (2003) have considered the FRW model lled completely with Generalized Chaplygin G as and concluded that whole class of such models is consistent with current SN Ia data although the value of = 0.4 is favoured. This result has been con m ed by our analysis (class (3) models). However, when the existing know ledge about baryonic matter content of the Universe was incorporated into the study our results were di erent from Makler, de O liveira & W aga (2003) who found that = 0.15 was preferred (assuming $_{\rm m} = 0.04$ which is very close to our assumption for class (2) models).

A s noticed by Bean & D ore (2003) G eneralized C haplygin G as models have an inherent degeneracy with cosm ological constant models as far as background evolution is concerned, and therefore they have a good t with SN Ia data. These degeneracies disappear at the level of evolution of perturbations and hence confrontation with CM BR spectrum would be decisive. U sing available data on the position of CM BR peaks measured by BOOM ERANG (de Bernardis et al. 2000) and A rcheops (Benoit et al. 2003, H inshaw et al. 2003, Bento, Bertolam i & Sen (2002) obtained the following constraints: 0.81 A₀ 0.85 and 0.2 0.6 at 68% CL in the model representative of our class (2) (i.e. with $_{\rm m} = 0.05$ assumed). A nother estimation of the parameter was done by Am endola et al. (2003) with W M AP D ata. The obtained the 0 < 0.2 at 95% con dence level.

Using the angular size statistics for extragalactic sources combined with SN Ia data it was found in (A lcaniz & Lim a 2003) that in the the $_{\rm m}$ = 0.3 and $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0.7 scenario best tted values of model parameters are $A_0 = 0.83$ and = 1: respectively. Recent paper by Bertolamiet al. (2004) in which Generalized Chaplygin G as models have been analyzed against Tonry et al. (2003) supernovae data relaxing the prior assumption on atness suggests, surprisingly as the authors admit, the preference of > 1.

Table 1. Results of statistical analysis of G eneralized Chaplygin G as model (with marginalization over M) performed on analyzed samples of SN IA (A, C, K 6, K 3, T B I, T B II, Silver, G old) as a minimum ² best-t (denoted BF) and with the maximum likelihood method (denoted L). First two rows for each sample refer to no prior on $_{\rm m}$. The same analysis was repeated with xed priors $_{\rm m} = 0.0$, $_{\rm m} = 0.05$ and $_{\rm m} = 0.3$.

sam ple	m	C h	Α ₀		М	2	m ethod
A	0.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	-3.39	95.4	BF
	0.17	0.83	0.83	0.00	-3.36		L
	0.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	-3.39	95.4	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.73	1.00	-3.38		L
	0.05	0.95	0.80	1.00	-3.39	95.4	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.76	1.00	-3.38		L
	0.30	0.70	0.96	1.00	-3.39	95.8	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.96	0.00	-3.38		L
С	0.00	1.00	0.80	1.00	-3.44	52.9	ΒF
	0.15	0.85	0.86	0.00	-3.41		L
	0.00	1.00	0.80	1.00	-3.44	52.9	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.76	0.49	-3.43		L
	0.05	0.95	0.83	1.00	-3.44	53.0	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.79	0.11	-3.43		L
	0.30	0.70	0.99	1.00	-3.42	53.3	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.99	0.00	-3.39		L
К б	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	-3.52	55.3	ΒF
	0.10	0.90	0.88	0.00	-3.51		L
	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	-3.52	55.3	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.78	0.71	-3.52		L
	0.05	0.95	0.84	1.00	-3.52	55.4	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.81	0.06	-3.52		L
	0.30	0.70	1.00	1.00	-3.51	55.9	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	1.00	0.00	-3.49		L
К З	0.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	-3.48	60.4	ΒF
	0.11	0.89	0.88	0.00	-3.45		L
	0.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	-3.48	60.4	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.80	0.30	-3.47		L
	0.05	0.95	0.87	1.00	-3.47	60.4	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.84	0.00	-3.47		L
	0.30	0.70	1.00	1.00	-3.44	61.4	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	1.00	0.00	-3.42		L
ΤΒΙ	0.00	1.00	0.79	1.00	15.895	273.9	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	15.905		L
	0.00	1.00	0.79	1.00	15.895	273.8	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	15.905		L
	0.05	0.95	0.82	1.00	15.895	274.0	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.78	1.00	15.915		L
	0.30	0.70	0.97	1.00	15.915	275.8	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.96	0.00	15.915		L
ΤΒΙΙ	0.00	1.00	0.78	1.00	15.915	186.5	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	15.925		L
	0.00	1.00	0.78	1.00	15.915	186.5	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	15.915		L
	0.05	0.95	0.81	1.00	15.915	186.6	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.78	1.00	15.925		L
	0.30	0.70	0.97	1.00	15.925	188.4	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.96	0.00	15.935		L
Silver	0 00	1 00	0.82	1 00	15.945	2294	BF

2. Cosm ological m odel

E instein equations for the Friedman-Robertson-Walker model with hydrodynamical energy-momentum tensor T = (+p)uu pg read:

$$\frac{a}{a}^{2} = \frac{8 G}{3} \frac{k}{a^{2}(t)}$$
 (1)

$$\frac{a(t)}{a} = \frac{4 G}{3} (+ 3p)$$
 (2)

Let us assume that matter content of the Universe consists of pressure-less gas with energy density $_{\rm m}$ representing baryonic plus cold dark matter (CDM) and the Generalized Chaplygin G as with the equation of state

$$p_{Ch} = \frac{A}{Ch}$$
(3)

representing the dark energy responsible for the acceleration of the Universe. If one further makes an assumption that these two components do not interact, then the energy conservation equation

$$_+ 3H (p +) = 0$$
 (4)

where $H = \underline{a}=a$ is the Hubble function, can be integrated separately form atter and Chaplygin gas leading to well known result $_{m} = _{m;0}a^{-3}$ and (see also Bento, Bertolami & Sen 2002 or Carturan & Finelli 2002)

$$_{Ch} = A + \frac{B}{a^{3(1+)}} \stackrel{\frac{1}{1+}}{(5)}$$

The physical interpretation of, so far arbitrary, constants A and B is the following. A dopting usual convention that current value of the scale factor a_0 is equal to 1, one can see that $_{Ch;0} = (A + B)^{\frac{1}{1+}}$ represents the current energy density of the Chaplygin gas. Calculating the adiabatic speed of sound squared for the Chaplygin gas

$$c_{s}^{2} = \frac{@p_{C h}}{@_{C h}} = \frac{A}{1^{+}} = \frac{A}{A + \frac{B}{a^{3(1+-)}}}$$

it is easy to con in that the current value of c_s^2 is equal to $c_{s,0}^2 = \frac{A}{A+B}$. Hence the constants A and B can be expressed as combinations of quantities having well de ned physical meaning.

Our further task will be to confront the Chaplygin gas model with SN Ia data and for this purpose we have to calculate the lum inosity distance in our model

$$d_{L}(z) = (1 + z) \frac{c}{H_{0}} \frac{1}{p + \frac{1}{j_{k}j}} F + H_{0} \frac{p}{j_{k}j_{0}} \frac{z}{dz^{0}} \frac{dz^{0}}{H(z^{0})}$$
(6)

sam ple	m	C h	Α ₀		М	2	m ethod
	0.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	15.945		L
	0.00	1.00	0.82	1.00	15.945	229.4	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.79	1.00	15.955		L
	0.05	0.95	0.85	1.00	15.945	229.6	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.81	1.00	15.955		L
	0.30	0.70	0.99	1.00	15.965	232.3	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.99	0.00	15.965		L
Gold	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	15.945	173.7	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	15.955		L
	0.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	15.945	173.7	ΒF
	0.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	15.955		L
	0.05	0.95	0.84	1.00	15.945	173.8	ΒF
	0.05	0.95	0.80	1.00	15.955		L
	0.30	0.70	0.99	1.00	15.965	175.6	ΒF
	0.30	0.70	0.99	0.00	15.965		L

Table 1 | Continued

Table 2: Generalized Chaplygin G as model parameter values obtained from the marginal probability density functions calculated on Perlmutter, K nop, Tonry/Barris and R iess sam – ples with $_{\rm m}$ prior relaxed.

sam ple	m	C h	A 0	
A	0:17 ^{+ 0:08} 0:17	0:83 ^{+ 0:17}	0:83 ^{+ 0:14}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:67}
С	0:15 ^{+ 0:08}	0 : 85 ^{+ 0:15}	0:86 ^{+ 0:13}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:66}
К б	0:10 ^{+ 0:11}	0:90 ^{+ 0:10}	0:88 ^{+ 0:12}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:66}
К З	$0:11^{+0:07}_{0:11}$	0 : 89 ^{+ 0:11} 0:07	0:88 ^{+ 0:11}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:66}
TBI	0:00+ 0:21	1:00 0:21	0:81 ^{+ 0:12}	1:0 _{0:60}
ТВП	0:00+ 0:21	1:00 0:21	0:81 ^{+ 0:12}	1:0 _{0:62}
Silver	0:00+ 0:18	1:00 0:18	0:84 ^{+ 0:09}	1:0 _{0:59}
Gold	0:00+ 0:20	1:00 0:20	0 : 83 ^{+ 0:11} 0:07	1:0 _{0:64}

Table 3: Generalized Chaplygin G as model parameter values obtained from the marginal probability density functions calculated on Perlmutter, K nop, Tonry/Barris and R iess sam – <u>ples. The analysis was done with xed m</u> = 0.0, m = 0.05 and m = 0.3.

sample	m	Ch	A 0	
A	00:00	1:00	0:73 ^{+ 0:08}	1:0 _{0:63}
	0:05	0 : 95	0:76 ^{+ 0:08}	1:0 _{0:66}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 96 ^{+ 0:04}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:65}
С	00:00	1:00	0:76 ^{+ 0:08}	0 : 49 ^{+ 0:36}
	0:05	0 : 95	0:79 ^{+ 0:08}	0:41 ^{+ 0:27}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 99 ^{+ 0:01} 0:11	0:0+0:64
К б	00:00	1:00	0:78 ^{+ 0:07}	0:71 ^{+ 0:29}
	0:05	0 : 95	0 : 81 ^{+ 0:08}	0:06 ^{+ 0:61}
	0:30	0 : 70	1:00 0:10	0:0+0:64
К З	00:00	1:00	0 : 80 ^{+ 0:06}	0:30 ^{+ 0:39}
	0:05	0 : 95	0 : 84 ^{+ 0:05}	0:0+0:67
	0:30	0 : 70	1:00 0:06	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:63}
TBI	0:00	1:00	0:75 ^{+ 0:04}	1:0 _{0:54}
	0:05	0 : 95	0:78 ^{+ 0:04} 0:06	1:0 _{0:55}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 96 ^{+ 0:04}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:67}
ТΒП	0:00	1:00	0:75 ^{+ 0:04}	1:0 _{0:54}
	0:05	0 : 95	0:78 ^{+ 0:04}	1:0 _{0:54}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 96 ^{+ 0:04}	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:67}
Silver	0:00	1:00	0:79 ^{+ 0:03}	1:0 0:52
	0:05	0 : 95	0 : 81 ^{+ 0:04}	1:0 _{0:54}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 99 ^{+ 0:01} 0:03	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:64}
Gold	0:00	1:00	0:77 ^{+ 0:04} 0:05	1:0 _{0:58}
	0:05	0 : 95	0 : 80 ^{+ 0:04} 0:05	1:0 _{0:59}
	0:30	0 : 70	0 : 99 ^{+ 0:01} 0:04	0 : 0 ^{+ 0:64}

Table 4: Results of statistical analysis of G eneralized C haplygin G as models with at prior relaxed and with marginalization over M performed on K nop Samples K 3 as a minimum ² best-t (denoted BF) and with the maximum likelihood method (denoted L). First two rows refer to no prior on $_{\rm m}$. The same analysis was repeated with xed $_{\rm m} = 0.0$, $_{\rm m} = 0.05$ and $_{\rm m} = 0.3$.

sam ple	k	m	C h	A ₀		М	2	m ethod
К З	-0.19	0.00	1.19	0.82	1.00	-3.48	60.3	BF
	-0.60	0.00	1,26	0.89	0.00	-3.46		L
	-0.25	0.00	1.25	0.82	1.00	-3.49	60.3	BF
	0.10	0.00	0.90	0.76	0.00	-3.46		L
	-0.28	0.05	1,23	0.84	1.00	-3.49	60.3	BF
	0.05	0.05	0.90	0.78	0.00	-3.47		L
	-0.48	0.30	1.18	0.93	0.97	-3.49	60.3	BF
	-0.35	0.30	1.05	0.88	0.00	-3.47		\mathbb{L}
Gold	-0.12	0.00	1.12	0.80	0.99	15.945	173.4	BF
	-0.32	0.00	1.06	0.82	0.00	15.945		L
	-0.13	0.00	1.13	0.81	1.00	15.935	173.4	BF
	-0.19	0.00	1.19	0.76	0.85	15.945		L
	-0.17	0.05	1.12	0.83	1.00	15.935	173.4	BF
	-0.20	0.05	1.15	0.78	0.54	15.945		L
	-0.31	0.30	1.01	0.94	1.00	15.955	173.6	BF
	-0.30	0.30	1.00	0.91	0.00	15.945		L

Table 5: Results of statistical analysis of G eneralized C haplygin G as models with at prior relaxed and with m arginalization over M perform ed on K nop Samples K 3. M odel parameter values are obtained from the marginal probability density functions. First row refer to no prior on m. The same analysis was repeated with xed m = 0.0, m = 0.05 and m = 0.3.

sam ple	k	m	C h	A 0	
К З	0 : 60 ^{+ 0:38}	0:00+0:29	$126^{+0.25}_{-0.39}$	0 : 89 ^{+ 0:11}	0:0+0:64
	0:10 ^{+ 0:37}	0:00	0:90 ^{+ 0:59}	0:76 ^{+ 0:10}	0:0+0:66
	0:05 ^{+ 0:31}	0:05	0 : 90 ^{+ 0:58}	0:78 ^{+ 0:10}	0:0+0:66
	0:35 ^{+ 0:17}	0:30	1:05 ^{+ 0:41}	0 : 88 ^{+ 0:09}	0:0+0:63
Gold	0:32 ^{+ 0:25}	0:00+ 0:28	1:06 ^{+ 0:24}	0:82 ^{+ 0:13}	0:0+0:64
	$0:19^{+0:29}_{0:28}$	0:00	$1:19^{+0:28}_{0:29}$	0:76 ^{+ 0:03}	0 : 85 ^{+ 0:15}
	020^{+028}_{-029}	0:05	$1:15^{+0:29}_{-0:28}$	0:78 ^{+ 0:05}	0:54 ^{+ 0:36}
	0:30 ^{+ 0:21}	0:30	1:00 ^{+0:23}	0 : 91 ^{+ 0:04} 0:05	0:00+ 0:60



Fig. 1. Residuals (in m ag) between the Einstein-de Sitter m odel (zero line), the CDM m odel (upper curve) and the best-tted Generalized Chaplygin G as m odel with $_{m} = 0.3$; $_{Ch} = 0.7$ (m iddle curve), sample K 3.



Fig. 2. Levels of constant 2 on the plane (A₀;) for G eneralized Chaplygin G as model with $_m = 0.3$; $_{Ch} = 0.7$, sample K 3, marginalized over M . The gure shows preferred values of A₀ and .



Fig. 3. Condence levels on the plane (A₀;) for Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodelwith $_{m} = 0.3; _{Ch} = 0.7$, sample K3, marginalized over M. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A₀ and .



Fig. 4. Residuals (in mag) between the Einstein-de Sitter model (zero line), the at CDM model (upper curve) and the best-tted Generalized Chaplygin G as model with $_{\rm m} = 0.05$; $_{\rm Ch} = 0.95$ (middle curve), sample K3.



Fig. 5. Levels of constant 2 on the plane (A₀;) for G eneralized C haplygin G as model with $_m = 0.05$; $_{Ch} = 0.95$, sample K 3, m arginalized over M. The gure shows preferred values of A₀ and .



Fig. 6. Con dence levels on the plane (A₀;) for Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodelwith $_{m} = 0.05$; _{Ch} = 0.95, sample K3, marginalized over M . The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A₀ and .



Fig. 7. Residuals (in mag) between the Einstein-de Sitter model (zero line), the at CDM model (upper curve) and the best-tted Generalized Chaplygin Gas model with $_{m} = 0$; $_{Ch} = 1$ (middle curve), sample K3.



Fig. 8. Levels of constant 2 on the plane (A $_0$;) for G eneralized C haplygin G as model with $_m$ = 0; $_{\rm C\,h}$ = 1, sample K 3, m arginalized over M . The gure shows preferred values of A $_0$ and $_{\rm .}$



Fig. 9. Con dence levels on the plane (A $_0$;) for Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodelwith $_m = 0$; $_{Ch} = 1$, sample K3, marginalized over M. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A $_0$ and .



Fig. 10. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for $_{Ch}$ obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit $_{Ch} > 0.70$ at the condence level 95:4%.

where $_{k} = \frac{k}{H_{0}^{2}}$ and

$$F(x) = \sinh(x)$$
 for $k < 0$ (7)

$$F(x) = x$$
 for $k = 0$ (8)

$$F(x) = \sin(x)$$
 for $k > 0$ (9)

The Friedman equation (1) can be rearranged to the form giving explicitly the Hubble function H (z) = $\underline{a}=a$

$$H (z)^{2} = H_{0}^{2} m (1 + z)^{3} + C_{h} A_{0} + (1 - A_{0}) (1 + z)^{3(1 + 1)} \frac{1}{1 + 1} + k (1 + z)^{2}$$
(10)

where the quantities $_{i}$, i = m; Ch; k represent fractions of critical density currently contained in energy densities of respective components and $_{m} + _{Ch} + _{k} = 1$. For the transparency of further form ulae we have also denoted $A_{0} = A = (A + B)$.

F inally the lum inosity distance reads:

$$d_{L}(z) = (1 + z) \frac{c}{H_{0}} \frac{p}{j_{k}j} \frac{1}{j_{k}j}$$

$$F = \frac{p}{j_{k}j} \frac{z}{q} \frac{dz^{0}}{(1 + z)^{3} + c_{h}(A_{0} + (1 - A_{0})(1 + z)^{3(1 + 1)})^{\frac{1}{1 + 1}} + k(1 + z)^{2}}$$
(11)

The formula (11) is the most general one in the fram ework of Friedman-Robertson-W alker cosm ology with Generalized Chaplygin Gas. Please note, that this model propose a uni ed m acroscopic (phenom enological) description of both dark energy and dark matter.

Further in this paper we will mostly use its version restricted to at model k = 0 (the exception will be when we relax at prior) since the evidence for this case is very strong in the light of current CM BR data. Therefore while talking about model testing we actually mean the estimation of and A_0 parameters for the best tted at FRW cosm ologicalm odel led with G eneralized Chaplygin G as.

To proceeded with thing the SN Ia data we need the magnitude-redshift relation

$$m (z;M ; _{m}; _{Ch};A_{0};) = M + 5 \log_{10} D_{L} (z; _{m}; _{Ch};A_{0};)$$
(12)

where:

$$D_{L}(z; m; C_{h};A_{0};) = H_{0}d_{L}(z;H_{0}; m; C_{h};A_{0};)$$

is the lum inosity distance with H₀ factored out so that marginalization over the intercept

$$M = M \qquad 5 \log_{10} H_0 + 25 \tag{13}$$

leads actually to joint marginalization over H $_{\rm 0}$ and M $\,$ (M $\,$ being the absolute magnitude of SN Ia).

Then we can obtain the best tted model minimalizing the 2 function

$${}^{2} = \sum_{i}^{X} \frac{(m_{i}^{Ch} m_{i}^{obs})^{2}}{\sum_{i}^{2}}$$

where the sum is over the SN Ia sample and $_{i}$ denote the (full) statistical error of magnitude determ ination. This is illustrated by gures (Fig.1 - Fig.9) of residuals (with respect to E instein-de Sitter model) and ² levels in the (A₀;) plane. One of the advantages of residual plots is that the intercept of the m z curve gets cancelled. The assumption that the intercept is the same for di erent cosm ological models is legitimate since M is actually determined from the low-redshift part of the Hubble diagram which should be linear in all realistic cosm ologies. From the full Perlmutter's sample (see below) we have obtained M = 3:39 which is in a very good agreement with the values reported in the literature (Perlmutter et al. 1999, Riess et al. 1999). For other samples see discussion below.

The best-t values alone are not relevant if not supplemented with the condence levels for the parameters. Therefore, we performed the estimation of model parameters using the minimization procedure, based on the likelihood function. We assumed that supernovae measurements came with uncorrelated G aussian errors and in this case the likelihood function L could be determined from chi-square statistic L / exp (2 =2) (Perlmutter et al. 1999, R iess et al. 1999).

Therefore we supplement our analysis with condence intervals in the (A $_0$;) plane by calculating the marginal probability density functions

$$P(A_0;) / exp(^2(m; C_h; A_0; ;M) = 2)dM$$

with $_{m}$; $_{Ch}$ xed ($_{m}$ = 0.0, 0.05, 0.3) and $_{Z}$

$$P(A_0;) / exp({}^2(m; C_h; A_0; ;M) = 2)d_m$$

with M xed (M = 3:39) respectively (proportionality sign means equal up to the normalization constant). In order to complete the picture we have also derived one-dimensional probability distribution functions for $_{Ch}$ obtained from joint marginalization over and A_0 . The maximum value of such PDF informs us about the most probable value of $_{Ch}$ (supported by supernovae data) within the full class of G eneralized C haplygin G as models.



Fig. 11. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for A_0 obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit $A_0 > 0.74$ at the condence level 95:4%.



Fig. 12. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit < 0.94 at the condence level 95:4%.



Fig. 13. Residuals (in mag) between the Einstein-de Sitter model (zero line), the at CDM model (upper curve) and the best-tted Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodel (without any prior assumptions on $_{m}$) (middle curve), sample K3.



Fig. 14. Levels of constant $\ ^2$ on the plane (A $_0$;) for G eneralized C haplygin G as m odel, sam ple K 3, m arginalized over M , and $\ _m$. The gure shows preferred values of A $_0$ and $\ .$



Fig. 15. Con dence levels on the plane (A $_0$;) for Generalized Chaplygin Gas model, sample K3, marginalized over M , and $_m$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A $_0$ and a.



Fig. 16. Levels of constant 2 on the plane ($_{\rm m}$;) for G eneralized C haplygin G as model, sample K 3, m arginalized over M , and A_0. The gure shows preferred values of $_{\rm m}$; and .



Fig. 17. Con dence levels on the plane ($_m$;) for Generalized Chaplygin G as model, sample K 3, marginalized over M , and A $_0$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of $_m$, and .



Fig. 18. Residuals (in m ag) between the Einstein-de Sitter m odel (zero line), at CDM m odel (two upper curves: for SN IA w ith z < 1 | curve located higher and for all supernovae Ia belonging to the sam ple | curve located lower) and the best-tted G eneralized C haplygin G as m odel (w ithout any prior assumptions on $_{m}$) (m iddle curve), GOLD sam ple.



Fig. 19. Levels of constant 2 on the plane (A $_0$;) for G eneralized C haplygin G as model, G old sample, marginalized over M , and $_{\rm m}$. The gure shows preferred values of A $_0$ and ~.



Fig. 20. Condence levels on the plane (A $_0$;) for Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodel, Gold sample, marginalized over M , and $_{\rm m}$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A $_0$ and $_{\rm o}$.

{ 33 {

3. Fits to A_0 and parameters

3.1. Sam ples used

Supernovae surveys (published data) have already ve years long history. Beginning with rst published sam ples other data sets have been produced either by correcting original sam ples for system atics or by supplem enting them with new supernovae (or both). It is not our intention here to suggest a distinguished role to any one of these data sets. Therefore, in our analysis we decided to use a collection of sam ples from all existing supernovae data.

Latest data was compiled by Riess et al. (2004). However, for comparision and ilustration we analyse three other main samples of supernovae. Such investigation seems to be useful because it is pointed out in the literature that result of the analysis with di erent SN Ia sample give often di erent results (see for example G odlow ski Szydlow ski & K raw iec 2003, C houdhury & Padm anabhan 2004).

Samples from the original Perlm utter et al. (1999) data chosen for the analysis comprise the full sample reported by Perlm utter (sample A) and a sub-sample after excluding two outliers di ering the most from the average lightcurve and two outliers claim ed to be likely reddened (sample C). A lthough the outliers often suggest statistical inhom ogeneity of the data (and some hints suggesting the necessity of rem oving them from sample A exist) there is always a danger that rem oval of outliers is to some extent subjective. Therefore we retained the full sample A in our analysis. The Perlm utter data were gathered some years ago, hence one should also refer to more recent supernovae data as well.

Recently K nop et al. (2003) have reexam ined the Perm utter's data with host-galaxy extinction correctly assessed. From the Perlm utter's sam ple they chose only these supernovae which were spectroscopically safely identi ed as type Ia and had reasonable color measurements. They also included eleven new high redshift supernovae and a well known sam ple with low redshift supernovae. In K nop et al. (2003) a few subsam ples have been distinguished. W e considered two of them. The rst is a subset of 58 supernovae with corrected extinction (K nop subsam ple 6; hereafter K 6) and the second is that of 54 low extinction supernovae (K nop subsam ple 3; hereafter K 3). Sam ples C and K 3 are sim ilarly constructed as containing only low extinction supernovae. The advantage of the K nop sam ple is that K nop's discussion of extinction correction was very careful and as a result his sam ple has extinction correctly applied.

A nother sample was recently presented by Tonry et al. (2003) who collected a large number of supernovae data published by di erent authors and added eight new high redshift SN Ia. This sample of 230 SN Ia was re-calibrated with a consistent zero point. W herever possible the extinction estimates and distance thing were recalculated. Unfortunately, one was not able to do so for the full sample (for details see Table 8 in Tonry et al. (2003)). This sample was further improved by Barris et al. (2003) who added 23 high redshift supernovae including 15 at z 0:7 thus doubling the published record of objects at these redshifts. Despite of the above mentioned problems, the analysis of our model using this sample of supernovae could be interesting. Hence for comparison, we decided to repeat our analysis with the Tonry/Barris sample.

We decided to analyze two Tonry/Bariss subsamples. First, we considered the full Tonry/Barris sample of 253 SN e Ia (hereafter sample TBI). The sample contains 218 SN e Ia with low extinction. Because Tonry's sample has a lot of outliers especially at low redshifts, we decided to analyze the sample where all low redshift (z < 0.01) supernovae were excluded. In the sample of 193 supernovae all SN Ia with low redshift and high extinction were rem oved (hereafter sample TBI).

Tonry et al. (2003) and Barris et al. (2003) presented the data of redshifts and lum inosity distances for their supernovae sample. Therefore, Eqs. (12) and (13) should be modi ed appropriately (W illiam s et al. 2003):

$$m \quad M = 5 \log_{10} (D_{\rm L})_{\rm Tonry} \quad 5 \log_{10} 65 + 25 \tag{14}$$

and

$$M = 5 \log_{10} H_0 + 25:$$
(15)

For the Hubble constant H₀ = 65 km s¹ M pc¹ one gets M = 15.935.

Recently Riess et al. (2004) signi cantly improved the former Riess sample. They discovered 16 new type Ia Supernovae. It should be noted that 6 of these objects have z > 1.25 (out of total number of 7 object with so high redshifts). Moreover, they compiled a set of previously observed SN Ia relying on large, published samples, whenever possible, to reduce systematic errors from di erences in calibrations. With this enriched sample it became possible to test our prediction that distant supernovae in GCG cosm ology should be brighter than in CDM model (see discussion below). This is the reason why we repeated our analysis with new Riess sample.

The full R iess sample contains 186 SN Ia (\Silver" sample). On the base of quality of the spectroscopic and photom etric record for individual Supernovae, they also selected m ore restricted \G old" sample of 157 Supernovae. We have separately analyzed CDM m odel for supernovae with z < 1 and for all SN Ia belonging to the G old sample.

{ 35 {

3.2. Cosm ological models tested

On these samples we have tested G eneralized C haplygin gas $\cos m$ ology in three di erent classes of models with (1) $_{m} = 0.3$, $_{Ch} = 0.7$; (2) $_{m} = 0.05$, $_{Ch} = 0.95$ and (3) $_{m} = 0$, $_{Ch} = 1.$ We started with a xed value of M = 3.39 m odifying this assumption accordingly while analyzing di erent samples.

The rst class was chosen as representative of the standard know ledge of $_{m}$ (baryonic plus dark matter in galactic halos (Peebles & Ratra 2003)) with Chaplygin gas responsible for the missing part of closure density (the dark energy).

In the second class we have incorporated (at the level of $_{\rm m}$) the prior know ledge about baryonic content of the U niverse (as inferred from the BBN considerations). Hence this class is representative of the m odels in which C haplygin gas is allowed to clum p and is responsible both for dark m atter in halos as well as its di use part (dark energy).

The third class is a kind of toy model { the FRW Universe led completely with Chaplygin gas. We have considered it mainly in order to see how sensitive the SN Ia test is with respect to parameters identifying the cosm ological model.

F inally, we analyzed the data without any prior assumption about m .

3.3. Results

In the rst class of models best t (with xed value of M = 3:39) from the sample A is (= 1; A₀ = 0:96) at the ² = 95:8. Sample C gives the best t of (= 0:95; A₀ = 0:95) at the ² = 53:6.

In the second class Sample A gives the best t of (= 1; A₀ = 0:80) at the ² = 95:4 whereas the sample C gives the best t (= 0:51; A₀ = 0:73) at the ² = 53:7.

Finally, in the third class the sample A again gives the best t of (= 1; A_0 = 0:77) at the ² = 95:4 whereas the sample C gives the best t (= 0:42; A_0 = 0:69) at the ² = 53:7.

It should be noted, however that the tting procedure for sample C prefers M = 3.44 instead of M = 3.39 as for sample A. If one takes this value the results for sample C will change respectively and then for the rst class $A_0 = 1$ (at $^2 = 53.5$) what means (see equation (10)) that can be arbitrary and the problem is electively equivalent to the model with cosm ological constant. A nalogously, for the second class $A_0 = 0.83 = 1$ (at $^2 = 52.9$), while for third class $A_0 = 0.80 = 1$ (at $^2 = 52.9$). This indicates clearly that model parameters, especially strongly depend on the choice of M.

Separately we analyzed the data without any prior assumption about $_{\rm m}$. For the sample A we obtain as a best t (minimizing 2) $_{\rm m}$ = 0;, (= 1;A₀ = 0:77) at the 2 = 95:4. For sample C assuming M = 3:39 we obtain $_{\rm m}$ = 0:27, (= 1;A₀ = 0:93) with 2 = 53:6 while for M = 3:44 the best t gives $_{\rm m}$ = 0;, (= 1;A₀ = 0:80) with 2 = 52:9.

Using minimization procedure, based on likelihood function, joint marginalization over A_0 and gives the following results. For the sample A we obtain $_{Ch} = 0.82$ (hence $_{m} = 0.18$), with the limit $_{Ch}$ 0:76 at the condence level 68:3% and $_{Ch}$ 0:69 at the condence level 95:4%. For the sample C we obtain (for M = 3:39) $_{Ch} = 0.76$ (hence $_{m} = 0.24$), with the limit $_{Ch}$ (0:69;0:94) on the condence level 68:3% and $_{Ch}$ 0:62 at the condence level 95:4%. For M = 3:44 we obtain: $_{Ch} = 0.84$ (hence $_{m} = 0.16$), with the limit $_{Ch}$ (0:79;0:98) on the condence level 68:3% and $_{Ch}$ 0:69 at the condence level 95:4%.

O ne could see that results are di erent for di erent values of the intercept M in each sample. Therefore we additionally analyzed our samples marginalized over M. The results are displayed in Table 1. First rows for each sample correspond to no prior on $_{\rm m}$ assumed. Two tting procedures were used: ² tting (denoted as BF) and maximum likelihood method (denoted L).

Table 2 contains the results of joint marginalization over $_{m}$, A_{0} and . For sample A we obtain $_{Ch} = 0.83$ (hence $_{m} = 0.17$), while for sample C we obtain $_{Ch} = 0.85$ (hence $_{m} = 0.15$). For A_{0} and we obtain values ($= 0; A_{0} = 0.83$) for sample A, while ($= 0; A_{0} = 0.86$) for sample C. W ith the marginalization procedure we can also obtain one dimensional probability distribution function (PDF) for A_{0} and for particular class models with xed $_{m}$ (Table 3).

From the above mentioned analysis we concluded that $_{m}$ and A_{0} parameters derived from samples A and C are similar. For $_{m}$ xed A_{0} increases with increasing $_{m}$. The estimates of parameter are dimensioned for each of two above mentioned samples, but unfortunately errors are big. D iscrepancy between the best thing procedure and minimization procedure (based on likelihood function) increases with the number of parameters thed. The minimization procedure seems to be more appropriate in the context of our problem.

O ne can see from the Table 1 that using the K nop's sam ples had not in uenced conclusions in a signi cant way. However, the errors of parameter estimation decreased noticeably (see Tables 2 and 3). M inimization procedure prefers (especially for sam ple K 3) close to zero. The exception is the model with $_{m} = 0$ where = 0.3 and = 0.71 are obtained for the sam ples K 3 and K 6 respectively.

The above mentioned results for the K nop sample K 3 are illustrated on gures Fig. 1 – 17. In Fig.1 we present residual plots of redshift-m agnitude relations between the E instein-de Sitterm odel (represented by zero line) the best- tted G eneralized Chaplygin G as model with $_{\rm m} = 0.3$; $_{\rm Ch} = 0.7$) (middle curve) and the at CDM model with = 0.75 and $_{\rm m} = 0.25$ (K nop et al. 2003)) { upper curve. One can observe that system atic deviation between CDM model and G eneralized Chaplygin G as model predict that high redshift supernovae should be brighter than that predicted with CDM model.

Levels of constant ² on the (A₀;) plane for G eneralized Chaplygin G as model with $_{\rm m}$ = 0:3; $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0:7), marginalized over M are presented in Figure 2. The gure shows preferred values of A₀ and . Figure 3 displays condence levels on the (A₀;) plane for G eneralized Chaplygin G as model with $_{\rm m}$ = 0:3; $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0:7), marginalized over M. This gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of (A₀ and). Similar results for the models with $_{\rm m}$ = 0:05; $_{\rm Ch}$ = 0:95 and $_{\rm m}$ = 0; $_{\rm Ch}$ = 1 are presented in the gures 4 - 9 respectively.

Separately we repeated our analysis without prior assumptions on $_{m}$. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for model parameters obtained by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model are presented in Figures 10-12.

Residuals (in m ag) between the Einstein-de Sitter m odel (zero line), at CDM m odel { upper curve { and the best-tted Generalized Chaplygin G as m odel (w ithout prior assumptions on $_{\rm m}$) { m iddle curve { are presented on F igure 13, while levels of constant 2 and con dence levels on the (A $_0$;) plane (m arginalized over M) are presented on F igs. 14 and 15.

O ne should notice that as a best twe obtain $_{m} = 0$; $_{Ch} = 1$; $A_{0} = 0$:85; = 1 i.e. results are the same as for a toy model with Chaplygin gas only ($_{Ch} = 1$). Formally, we could have analyzed models with > 1. However, due to large error in estimation of the parameter, it does not seem reasonable to analyze such a possibility with current supernovae data.

Levels of constant ² on the ($_{m}$;) plane for Generalized Chaplygin G as model, marginalized over M and A₀ are presented on Figure 16, while con dence levels on the ($_{m}$;) plane (marginalized over M, and A₀) are presented on Figure 17. This gure shows that all three model with $_{Ch} = 1$, $_{Ch} = 0.95$, and $_{Ch} = 0.7$, are statistically admissible by current Supernovae data.

The results of sim ilar analysis obtained with Tonry/Barris sample are sim ilar to those obtained with previous samples. For example TBII sample gives the best t: $_{m} = 0$; $_{Ch} = 1$; $A_{0} = 0.78$; = 1 i.e. nearly the same as in the case of K 3 sample.

Joint marginalization over parameters gives the following results: $_{Ch} = 1.00$ (hence $_{m} = 0.0$), with the limit $_{Ch} = 0.79$ at the condence level of 68.3% and $_{Ch} = 0.67$ at the condence level of 95.4%. (= $1.0; A_0 = 0.81$) with the limit 2 (0.40;1:) and $A_0 = 2$ (0.74;0.93) at the condence level of 68.3% and 2 (0.06;1:) and $A_0 = 2$ (0.70;1.00) at the condence level of 95.4%.

However with minimization procedure we not important difference beetween results obtained with Tonry/Barris sample and those obtained with Perlmutter and Knop sam – ples. Minimization procedure (only except the model with free m = 0.3) performed on Tonry/Barris data gives = 1. It is significantly different from the result obtained for C Perlmutter's and Knop's samples where minimization procedure prefered small values of parameter. Also the Tonry /Barris sample prefered value of m = 0 while Perlmutter and Knop samples suggested m is close to zero, what indicates that barionic component is small and in agreement with BBN.

The new Riess sample leads to the results which are similar to these obtained with Tonry/Bariss sample. However the errors in estimation of the parameters are lower. For the Gold sample, joint marginalization over parameters gives the following results: $_{Ch} = 1.00$ (hence $_{m} = 0.0$), with the limit $_{Ch} = 0.80$ at the condence level of 68:3% and $_{Ch} = 0.69$ at the condence level of 95:4%. ($= 1.0; A_0 = 0.83$) with the limit 2 (0:36;1:) and $A_0 2$ (0:76;0:94) at the condence level of 68:3% and 2 (0:05;1:) and $A_0 2$ (0:72;1:00) at the condence level of 95:4%.

As one can see from the Figure 18 the di erences between the results obtained in both cases are small (how ever the result obtained with the full sample leads to the prediction of brighter distant supernovae than in the case with z < 1 SN Ia.) Residuals (in mag) between the Einstein-de Sitter model (zero line), at CDM model (two upper curves: for SN IA with z < 1 -higher curve - and for all supernovae Ia belonging to the sample - lower curve) and the best-tted G eneralized Chaplygin G as model (without prior assumptions on __m) (middle curve) are presented on Figure 18. Figure 18 shows that most distant supernovae are actually brighter than predicted in CDM model. This is in agreement with prediction of the G eneralized Chaplygin G as cosmology.

The levels of constant ² and con dence levels on the $(A_0;)$ plane (m arginalized over M) are presented on Figs. 19 and 20. Fig.20 shows that con dence levels on the $(A_0;)$ (for G old Sam ple) plane are comparable at the the 95:4% con dence level with the results obtained on the K nop's sam ple. How ever the preferred values of are di erent.

3.4. Flat prior relaxed

We extended our analysis by adding a curvature term to the original GCG model. Then in equation (11) we must take into account the $_k$ term. For statistical analysis we restricted the values of the $_m$ parameter to the interval [0;1], $_{Ch}$ to the interval [0;2] and $_k$ was obtained from the constraint $_m + _{ch} + _k = 1$. However, the cases $_k < 1$ were excluded from the analysis. The results are presented in Table IV and V.

In the model without prior assumptions on $_{m}$ we obtain with Knop's sample $_{k} = 0:19$ as a best t, while with maximum likelihood method prefers $_{k} = 0:60$. However, the model with priors on $_{m}$ or $_{Ch}$ the maximum likelihood method prefers the universe much \closer" to the atone. Speci cally, for the "toy" model with Chaplygin G as only one gets $_{k} = 0:10$ and $_{k} = 0:05$ for the model with baryonic content only i.e. $_{m} = 0:05$. One should emphasize that even though we allowed $_{k} \in 0$ the preferred model of the universe is nearly a at one, which is in agreement with CM BR data. It is an advantage of our GCG model as compared with CDM model where in Perlmutter et al. (1999) high negative value of $_{k}$ was obtained as a best t, although zero value of $_{k}$ was statistically admissible. In order to nd the curvature of the Universe they additionally used the data from CM BR and extragalactic astronom y.

Density distribution functions (one dimensional PDF) for model parameters obtained by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model are presented in Figures 21– 25. For $_{\rm k}$ we obtain the limit $_{\rm k}$ 2 (0:98; 0:22) at the condence level 68:3% and $_{\rm k}$ 2 (1;0:23) at the condence level 95:4%. For and A₀ parameters we obtain the following results: = 0: and A₀ = 0:89 with the limit 2 (0;0:64) and A₀ 2 (0:82;1) at the condence level 68:3% and 2 (0:;0:95) and A₀ 2 (0:73;1:) at the condence level 95:4%. For the density parameter $_{\rm Ch}$ we obtain the limit $_{\rm Ch}$ 2 (0:87;1:51) at the condence level 68:3% and $_{\rm Ch}$ 2 (0:61;1:79) at the condence level 95:4%. For the density parameter $_{\rm m}$ we obtain the limit $_{\rm m}$ < 0:29 at the condence level 68:3% and $_{\rm m}$ < 0:53 at the condence level 95:4%.

Our main result is that the preference of the nearly at universe is con med with the new Riess sample. In the model without a prior assumption on m we obtain k = 0.12 as a best t, with the Gold sample while maximum likelihood method prefers k = 0.32 i.e the Gold sample gives even "more at" universe than K nop's sample. The models with priors on m give also very similar results when we analyse K nop and Riess samples. One can see that estimation of other models parameters give similar result for both samples only with exception for parameter . Speci cally, for the \toy" and \baryonic" models the maximum likelihood method prefers the universe. One can see that, with at prior relaxed, when we analyse the Gold sample, the errors in

estimation of the model parameter signicantly decrase with comparision to the case of the Knop sample.

4. Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodel in perspective of SNAP data

In the near future the SNAP m ission is expected to observe about 2000 SN Ia supernovae each year, over a period of three years¹. Therefore it could be possible to discriminate between various cosm ological models since errors in the estimation of model parameters would decrease signi cantly. We tested how a large number of new data would in uence the errors in estimation of model parameters. We assumed that the Universe is at and tested three classes of $\cos m$ obgical models. In the rst CDM model we assumed that m = 0.25, = 0:75 and M = 3:39 (K nop et al. 2003). Second class was representative of the and so called C ardassian m odels (Freese & Lew is 2002) with parameters m = 0.42, card = 0.520:77 as obtained in (Godlowski, Szydlowski & Krawiec 2004). Let us note, that and n = technically i.e. at the level of tests like the Hubble diagram C ardassian m odels are equivalent to quintessence m odels. The di erence is in the underlying philosophy: quintessence assumes exotic dark energy component with hydrodynam ical equation of state in ordinary FRW model while the Cardassian Universe assumes modi cation of the Friedman equation (which can be either due to exotic matter component or due to modi cation of gravity law). The last m odel is Generalized Chaplygin G as M odel with parameters obtained in the present paper as best ts for the K3 sample ($_{m} = 0, A_{0} = 0.85, = 1$). These values are in agreement with results of the analysis perform ed on Tonry/Barris and Riess sam ples. A Iternatively, we also test the Generalized Chaplygin G as M odel with sm all value of parameter suggested by analysis of the Perlm mutter and K nop samples ($_{m} = 0, A_{0} = 0.76, = 0.40$). For three above m entioned m odels we generated a sam ple of 1915 supernovae (Sam ples X 1, X 2, X 3a, X 3b respectively) in the redshift range z [0:01;1:7] distributed according to predicted SNAP data (see Tab I of A lam et al. (2003)). We assumed G aussian distribution of uncertainties in the measurement of m and z. The errors in redshifts z are of order 1 = 0.002 while uncertainty in the measurement of magnitude m is assumed 1 = 0.15. The systematic uncertainty is $_{sys} = 0.02 \text{ mag}$ at z = 1.5 (A lam et al. 2003). Hence one can assume that sys(z) = (0.02=1.5)z in rst approximation. For such generated sample we repeated our analysis. The result of our analysis is presented on gures Fig 26-29. On these gures we present con dence levels on the plane $(A_0;)$ for sample of simulated SNAP data. The gures show the ellipses of preferred values of A_0 and A_0 . It is easy to see that with the forthcoming SNAP data it will be possible to discriminate between predictions of CDM

¹ http://www-supernova.lblgov, http://snfactory.lblgov

and GCG models. W ith Cardasian Model the situation is not so clear, however (see Fig 27 and 28). Note that if ' 0:4 as suggested by analysis of Perlmutter sample C, (see also: Makler, de O liveira & Waga 2003, A velino et al. 2003, Fabris, Gonn calves & de Souza 2002, Collistete et al. 2003) then it will be possible to discrim inate between model with Chaplygin gas and Cardassian model (see Fig 27 and 29). Moreover, it is clear that with the future SNAP data it would be possible to discriminate between models with various value of

parameter. This is especially valuable since all analyses performed so far have had weak sensitivity with respect to $\ .$

5. Conclusions

It is apparent that Generalized Chaplygin G as models have brighter supernovae at redshifts z > 1. Indeed one can see on respective gures (Figs 1, 4, 7, 13) that system atic deviation from the baseline Einstein de Sitter model gets larger at higher redshifts. This prediction seems to be independent of analysed sample.

We obtained that the estimated value of A_0 is close to 0.8 in all considered models with exepction the model class (1) ($_m = 0.3$) when $A_0 > 0.95$. Extending our analysis by relaxing the at prior lead to the result that even though the best tted values of $_k$ are form ally non-zero, yet they are close to the at case. It should be viewed as an advantage of the GCG model since in similar analysis of CDM model in Perlmutter et al. (1999) high negative value of $_k$ were found to be best tted to the data and independent inspiration from CMBR and extragalactic astronomy has been invoked to x the curvature problem. A nother advantage of GCG model is that in a natural way we obtained the conclusion that matter (baryonic) component should be small what is in agreement with prediction from BBN (Big Bang Nucleosynthesis). Both estimations of A_0 , $_k$ and $_m$ are independent of the sample used in our analysis.

O ur results suggest that SN Ia data support the Chaplygin gas (i.e. = 1) scenario when the ² best tting procedure is used. Them in in ization procedure perform ed on Tonry/Barris and Riess data gives also = 1 (only except the model with xed $_{\rm m}$ = 0:3). However, the maximum likelihood tting with K nop et al.'s sample prefers, quite unexpectedly, a small value of or even = 0, i.e. the CDM scenario. Please note that small value of is in agreement with the results obtained from CMBR (de Bernardis et al. 2000 Benoit et al. 2003, H inshaw et al. 2003, Bento, Bertolam i & Sen 2002, Am endola et al. 2003) and with the recent analysis of Zhu (2004) who, using combined data of X-ray gas mass fraction of the galaxy cluster, FR IIB radiogalaxies and combined sample Perlmutter et al. (1998) and Riess et al. (1998, 2001), sugested that could be even less than 0. The results are dependent both on the sample chosen and on the prior know ledge of M in which the Hubble constant and intrinsic lum inosity of SN Ia are entangled. Moreover the observed preference of A_0 values close to 1 m eans that the dependence becomes insignicant (see equation (10)). It is rejected on one dimensional PDFs for which turned out to be at meaning that the power of the present supernovae data to discriminate between various G eneralized Chaplygin G as models (dimensional power) is weak.

However, we argue that with future SNAP data it would be possible to di erentiate between models with various value of parameter. Residual plots indicate the di erences between CDM and Generalized Chaplygin G as cosm ologies at high redshifts. Therefore one can expect that future supernova experiments (e.g. SNAP) having access to higher redshifts will eventually resolve the issue whether the dark energy content of the Universe could be described as a Chaplygin gas. The discriminative power of forthcoming SNAP data has been illustrated on respective gures (Fig 26-29) obtained from the analysis on simulated SNAP data.

6. A cknow ledgem ents

W e thank dr Barris and dr R iess for explanation of details of their SN Ia sam ples. M S was supported by KBN grant no 2P03D00326

REFERENCES

- A lam U.et al, M on Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 344, 1057, 2003
- A lcaniz J.S., Jain D., Dev A., Phys. Rev. D 67, 043514, 2003
- A lcaniz J.S., and Lim a J.A.S., astro-ph/0308465, 2003
- Amendola L., Finelli F., Burigana C., Carturan D., JCAP 0307, 5, 2003
- Avelino P.P., Beca L.M. G., de Carvalho J.P.M., Martins C.J.A.P., Pinto P., Phys. Rev. D 67, 023511, 2003
- Barris B. J. et al. 2003 astro-ph/0310843
- Bean R., Dore O., Phys. Rev. D 68, 023515, 2003
- Benoit A., et al., A stron A strophys. 399, L25-L30, 2003



Fig. 21. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for $_{Ch}$ obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit $_{Ch}$ (0:61;1:79) at the condence level 95:4%. (Non-at GCG model.)



Fig. 22. | The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for A_0 obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the lim it A_0 (0:73;1) at the condence level 95:4%. (Non-at GCG model.)



Fig. 23. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit < 0.95 at the condence level 95:4%. (Non-at GCG model.)



Fig. 24. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for $_{\rm k}$ obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit $_{\rm k}$ (1;0:23) at the condence level 95:4%. (Non-at GCG model.)



Fig. 25. The density distribution (one dimensional PDF) for $_{\rm m}$ obtained from sample K3 by marginalization over remaining parameters of the model. We obtain the limit $_{\rm m}$ (0;0:53) at the condence level 95:4%. (Non-at GCG model.)



Fig. 26. Con dence levels on the plane (A $_0$;) for sample X1 (CDM model) of simulated SNAP data, marginalized over $_m$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A $_0$ and .



Fig. 27. Con dence levels on the plane $(A_0;)$ for sample X2 (Cardassian model) of simulated SNAP data, marginalized over $_m$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A_0 and .



Fig. 28. Con dence levels on the plane $(A_0;)$ for sample X 3a (Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodel) of simulated SNAP data ($_m = 0, A_0 = 0.85$, = 1:), marginalized over $_m$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A_0 and .



Fig. 29. Con dence levels on the plane $(A_0;)$ for sample X 3b (Generalized Chaplygin Gasmodel) of simulated SNAP data ($_m = 0, A_0 = 0.76$, = 0.49), marginalized over $_m$. The gure shows the ellipses of preferred values of A_0 and .

- Bento M C., BertolamiO., Sen A A., PhysRev.D 66, 043507, 2002
- Bento M C., BertolamiO., Sen A A., PhysRev.D 67, 063003, 2003
- Bento M C., Bertolam iO., Sen A A., PhysLett. B 575, 172{180, 2003
- Bertolam iO , Sen A A , Sen S , Silva P T , astro-ph/0402387
- deBemardis P. et al., Nature 404, 955, 2000
- Biesiada M., Acta Phys. Polon B 34,5423 (5432, 2003
- Bilic N., Lindenbaum R.J., Tupper G.B., Viollier R.D., astro-ph/0307214
- Bordem ann M., Hoppe J., Phys. Lett. B 317, 315, 1993
- Caldwell R R., Dave R., Steinhardt P.J., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2077, 1995
- Carturan D., Finelli F., 2002 astro-ph/0211626v1
- Carturan D., Finelli F., PhysRev. D 68, 103501, 2003
- S.Chaplygin, Sci.Mem.Moscow Univ.Math 21, 1, 1904
- Chiba T., Sugiyam a N., Nakam ura T., M. N. R. A. S. 301, 72, 1998
- Choudhury T.R., Padm anabhan T.AA accepted 2004 astro-ph/0311622
- Collistete Jr. R., Fabris J.C., Goncalves S.V. B., de Souza P.E., astro-ph/0303338
- Cunha J.V., Lim a J.A.S., A lcaniz J.S., astro-ph/0306319
- Dev A., Alcaniz J.S., Jain D., Phys. Rev. D 67, 023515, 2003
- Fabris J.C., Goncalves S.V.B., de Souza P.E., Gen Relat. Grav. 34, 53, 2002
- Freese K., Lew is M., Phys. Lett. B 540, p1 2002
- Friem an J., HillC., Stebbins A., W aga I., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2077, 1995
- GarousiM R., Nucl. Phys. B 584, 284, 2000
- GodlowskiW , SzydlowskiM , Krawiec A , Astrophys J 605, 599, 2004, astro-ph/0309569
- GoriniV., Kamenshchik A., Moschella V., Pasquier V., gr-qc/0403062, 2004
- Hinshaw G. et al. [MMAP collaboration], 2003, ApJ submitted; astro-ph/0302217

- R Jackiw A particle eld theorist's lecture on supersymmetric, non abelian dynamics and D-branes"; report M II CPT 3000 physics/0010042
- Kamenshchik A., Moschella V., Pasquier V., PhysLett. B 511, 265 2001
- Kolda C., Lyth D., PhysLett. B 458, 197, 1999
- Knop R.A. et al., A strophys J 598, 102, 2003; astro-ph/0309368
- Makler M., de Oliveira S.Q., Waga I., PhysLett. B 555, 1, 2003
- M aor I., Brustein R., Steinhardt P.J., PhysRevLett. 86, 6-9 (2001)
- MultamakiT, Manera M, Gaztanaga E, astro-ph/0307533
- Ogawa N., Phys.Rev.D 62, 085023, 2000
- Peebles P.J.E., Ratra B., Rev. M od. Phys. 75, 559 2003
- Perlmutter S., Aldering G., Goldhaber G., et al., Astrophys. J 517, 565, 1999
- RandallL, Peebles PJE, PhysRevLett 83, 4690, 1999
- Ratra B., Peebles P.J.E., PhysRev D 37, 3406, 1988
- Riess A., Filipenko A.V., Challis P., et al., Astron J 116, 1009, 1998
- Riess A., Nugent P.E., Gilliland R.L., et al., ApJ 560, 49, 2001
- Riess A.G. et al. 2004 astro-ph/0402512
- Sen A., JHEP 0204, 048, 2002
- Silva P.T., Bertolam iO., astro-ph/0303353
- SzydlowskiM "Czaja W .PhysRev.D 69,023506,2004
- Tonry JL., et al., A strophys. J 594, 1, 2003
- Tumer M S., W hite M , PhysRev D 56, 4439 (1997)
- Tumer M ., A strophys J 576, L101-L104, 2002
- Weller J., Albrecht A., PhysRevLett. 86, 1939–1942 (2001)
- W illiam s B.F. et al. 2003 astro-ph/0310432

Zhu Z.H., Astron Astrophys. 423, 421, 2004

This preprint was prepared with the AAS ${\rm IAT}_E X$ m acros v5.0.