

On phenomenological parametrizations for the luminosity distance of gravitational waves

Andrés Lizardo, Javier Chagoya, C. Ortiz

Unidad Académica de Física, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Calzada Solidaridad esquina con Paseo a la Bufa S/N C.P. 98060, Zacatecas, México.

E-mail: andres.lizardo@fisica.uaz.edu.mx

Abstract. The propagation of gravitational waves offers new possibilities for testing the theory of gravity. Amongst these possibilities there is the luminosity distance of gravitational waves, d_{gw} . It has been proposed to study this property by means of phenomenological parametrizations, which in this work we confront to the predictions of Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet gravity, finding that the simplest parametrization performs better. We propose a novel parametrization that covers a wider range of models, in particular, within degenerate higher order scalar-tensor theories of gravity. Also, regarding model selection from best-fit parameters, we find that even quantities derived from d_{gw} can lead to inconsistent model selection if they are treated independently. This highlights that it is essential to perform simultaneous analysis and include other types of data. We expect our findings to be relevant for future constraints on modified gravity based on the properties of standard sirens.

Keywords: Gravitational waves, Dark Energy, Modified gravity.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Luminosity distance of gravitational waves	2
2.1	Phenomenological Parametrizations	3
2.2	Theoretical predictions of Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet gravity	4
2.2.1	Modified friction term in EsGB gravity	6
3	Confronting theory and parametrizations	7
4	A novel parametrization	10
5	Discussion	12

1 Introduction

The direct detection of gravitational waves (GW) [1, 2] opened up new avenues for testing the theory of gravity. For instance, a difference between the propagation of gravitational and electromagnetic waves over cosmological distances can be traced back to a modification of General Relativity (GR). Indeed, important constraints on Modified Gravity (MG) theories have been derived from a measurement of this difference for the electromagnetic and gravitational waves produced by a binary neutron star inspiral, GW170817 [2–8]. Testing the theory of gravity with GW at cosmological scales is particularly relevant since it is precisely at these scales where many theories of MG purposely deviate from GR in order to alleviate the cosmological constant problem [9, 10]. By doing so, these theories introduce new dynamics that can also affect the behaviour of tensor perturbations (e.g. [11]). Therefore, MG theories are subject to GW constraints even if they are endowed with screening mechanisms [12, 13] that allow them to recover GR predictions at Solar System scales.

Interest in MG has been continuously sourced mainly by theoretical arguments since the first few years after the introduction of GR (e.g. [14, 15] for reviews). This has led to a plethora of models that address issues such as the nature of dark energy and dark matter or the fate of GR at high energy scales. Although the motivations for these models might emerge from diverse scenarios, it turns out that some of their predictions for physical observables can be characterized by a few parameters. This feature is exploited, for instance, in the study of post-Newtonian solutions [16], cosmological evolution [17–19], and inflationary mechanisms [20]. These parametrized approaches provide a useful tool for testing generic features of theories of MG. In particular, some parametrizations have been proposed for the study of modifications to the friction term in the gravitational wave equation [21, 22]. However, the range of applicability of these parametrizations is still under study.

In this work, we study gravitational wave propagation in Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet (EsGB) gravity, a theory that modifies GR by the addition of a quadratic curvature term – the Gauss-Bonnet invariant – directly coupled to a scalar field. In four dimensions, the Gauss-Bonnet term is proportional to the Euler topological term. Thus, by itself, it does not modify the classical equations of motion of GR. However, once it is coupled to a scalar field it becomes dynamical. In the late 80s it was found that this type of coupling appears as

a second order curvature correction in heterotic string theory [23–25], therefore motivating investigations on the physical significance of a scalar-Gauss-Bonnet theory. Along these lines, in [26–28] it was shown that the theory admits singularity-free solutions for a spatially-flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric, prompting a sustained interest in the study of inflationary, late-time, and astrophysical solutions to EsGB and related models [29–37]. Another relevant property of EsGB is that it is free of Ostrogradsky instabilities, unlike generic higher order curvature theories which introduce derivatives of order higher than two in the equations of motion (see [38] for a review of Ostrogradsky theorem). Being a ghost-free scalar-tensor theory, EsGB is included in Horndeski’s theory – the most general scalar-tensor theory in 4 dimensions with second order equations of motion [39, 40]. The identification is not trivial and is performed in [11] by studying the equations of motion. This raises the issue of a possible incompatibility between the theory and observational constraints on the speed of gravitational waves [2]. In [35, 36] it was found that compatibility can be achieved by imposing a differential equation on the scalar coupling function. Finally, recent investigations on astrophysical solutions have found that future observations of waveforms of the inspiral phase of binary black hole systems have the potential to constrain EsGB gravity [37], while black hole shadows could constrain the theory if the uncertainty in ring diameter measurements decreases from a relative error of 6% to about 1% [41]. In view of the above, it is interesting to continue the investigation of phenomenological signatures of EsGB. In this work we explore these signatures in the context of gravitational wave propagation and we analyse how well the parametrizations proposed in [21, 22] can fit the predictions of EsGB gravity.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we describe the equation that governs gravitational wave propagation, the modifications it gets in MG models, and the parametrizations that attempt to capture these modifications. Also, we introduce EsGB theory and the solutions that we use as a background to test modified gravitational wave propagation. In Sec. 3 we analyse the results of such tests. In Sec. 4 we propose a novel parametrization that is valid for a wider range of models. Sec. 5 is devoted to discussion and concluding remarks.

2 Luminosity distance of gravitational waves

In GR, linearized tensor perturbations on a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker background are described by the equation

$$\tilde{h}_A'' + 2\mathcal{H}\tilde{h}_A' + k^2\tilde{h}_A = \Pi_A, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\tilde{h}_A(\eta, \mathbf{k}) = (\tilde{h}_+, \tilde{h}_\times)$ are the Fourier modes of the GW amplitude, k is the wavenumber, η stands for conformal time, primes denote derivatives with respect to η , \mathbf{k} is the wave vector, $a(\eta)$ the scale factor, $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$ is the Hubble parameter, and Π_A is a source term. The first derivative in eq. (2.1) corresponds to a friction term that depends on the change of the scale factor, while the third term comes from spatial derivatives and is related to the propagation speed of GW, c_{gw} . Recent observations place bounds on this quantity at the level $|c_{gw} - c|/c < 10^{-15}$ [42], where c is the speed of light, which we set to one in every other equation in this text.

Generic modifications of gravity affect each term in eq. (2.1). From now on we focus on theories where the source term Π_A is not present. We also drop modifications to the third term, i.e., to the speed of propagation of GW. This is completely valid in theories that predict $c_{gw} = 1$, such as a reduced set of (beyond) Horndeski theories that includes quintessence, Brans-Dicke, $f(R)$ and other popular models [3]. Theories that do not generically predict

$c_{gw} = 1$ are disfavoured, however, even within such theories, it is possible to construct models that are compatible with $c_{gw} \approx 1$ under some circumstances [8, 36]. Thus, we consider only modified wave equations of the form

$$h_A'' + 2\mathcal{H}[1 - \delta(\eta)]h_A' + k^2 h_A = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where δ represents the modifications to the friction term arising from MG. This modification affects the amplitude of GW, i.e., the amount by which the amplitude of a wave decreases from the time of emission to the time of observation depends not only on the scale factor but also on the function $\delta(\eta)$. This leads to the notion of *gravitational wave luminosity distance*, d_L^{gw} [21]. The distance d_L^{gw} is related to the usual electromagnetic luminosity distance d_L^{em} , by

$$d_L^{gw}(z) = d_L^{em}(z) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{1+z'} \delta(z') \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

where all functions are expressed in terms of redshift (z) instead of time, and the normalization $a(z=0) = 1$ is chosen without loss of generality. Unless otherwise specified, from now on we always take δ as a function of z ($\delta(z)$). The difference between d_L^{gw} and d_L^{em} implies that measurements of luminosity distance performed with coalescing compact binaries – standard sirens – are different from measurements with electromagnetic probes, thus providing a possible test for deviations of GR, as explored in [21, 22, 43–45].

2.1 Phenomenological Parametrizations

Since an observation of $d_L^{gw}/d_L^{em} \neq 1$ does not necessarily point to a specific model of modified gravity, it is convenient to think of $\delta(z)$ in terms of parametrizations that incorporate features expected in generic theories of MG. For instance, if MG is designed to solve the cosmological constant problem it would be ideal for it to affect only late time cosmology, this implies that contribution of $\delta(z)$ to linearized perturbations should vanish at high redshifts. On the other hand, at small redshifts the function

$$\Xi(z) \equiv \frac{d_L^{gw}(z)}{d_L^{em}(z)}, \quad (2.4)$$

is expected to behave as $\Xi(z \ll 1) = 1$, since at those values of z the effects of modified GW propagation do not have enough time to accumulate into an observable quantity. Notice that the relation between $\Xi(z)$ and $\delta(z)$ can be written as

$$\delta(z) = - \frac{d \ln \Xi(z)}{d \ln(1+z)}, \quad (2.5)$$

thus $\Xi(z)$ approaches a constant value for large z . With the considerations above in mind, Ref. [21] proposes a parametrization for $\delta(z)$ that interpolates between the expected behaviours at large and small z ,

$$\delta_I(z) = \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{1 - \Xi_0 + \Xi_0(1+z)^n}, \quad (2.6)$$

where n and Ξ_0 are free parameters, both assumed positive. It is straightforward to verify that $\delta_I(z \gg 1) = 0$ and $\delta_I(z \ll 1) = n(1 - \Xi_0)$. The quantity $\delta(z)$ is of interest since it represents the modification to the GW equation due to MG; however, since the observables are d_L^{gw} and

d_L^{em} , it is also convenient to express the parametrization in terms of $\Xi(z)$. Corresponding to eq. (2.6) we have

$$\Xi_I(z) = \Xi_0 + \frac{1 - \Xi_0}{(1+z)^n}. \quad (2.7)$$

with $\Xi_I(z \gg 1) = \Xi_0$ and $\Xi_I(z \ll 1) = 1$. Indeed, at small z , $\Xi_I(z)$ deviates from unity by terms of order z . Since $\Xi(z)$ involves an integration over z , it is less sensitive than $\delta(z)$ to details of GW propagation – for instance, a peak in $\delta(z)$ might not be reflected in $\Xi(z)$. In the spirit of parametrizing generic deviation from GR, this is a positive aspect. In principle, either eq. (2.6) or eq. (2.7) is to be fitted against observational data. However, first it has to be checked that these parametrizations do indeed describe effects induced on GW propagation by generic MG models. Some steps in this direction have been taken, for instance, in [22], where a set of parametrizations including eqs. (2.6), (2.7) were fitted to the explicit predictions of some well motivated MG models, finding that, while in most cases eqs. (2.6), (2.7) provide a good fit, exploring alternative parametrizations is important in order to account for more complicated, but still well motivated, physical predictions of MG. Specifically, the following alternative parametrizations for $\delta(z)$ are explored in [22],

$$\delta_{II}(z) = \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{1 - \Xi_0 + \Xi_0(1+z)^n} + \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^n} - \frac{2n(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^{2n}}, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\delta_{III}(z) = \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)(1+z)z^{n-1}}{1 + \Xi_0(e^{z^n} - 1)}. \quad (2.9)$$

Equivalently, the parametrizations for $\Xi(z)$ are

$$\Xi_{II}(z) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{(1 - \Xi_0)[1 - (1+z)^n]}{(1+z)^{2n}} \right\} [\Xi_0 + (1 - \Xi_0)(1+z)^{-n}], \quad (2.10)$$

$$\Xi_{III}(z) = \Xi_0 + (1 - \Xi_0)e^{-z^n}. \quad (2.11)$$

In Sec. (3) we evaluate the validity of the parametrizations described above for a MG model known as Einstein-Scalar-Gauss-Bonnet gravity, which we describe below.

2.2 Theoretical predictions of Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet gravity

Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet (EsGB) gravity is a MG theory that adds higher order curvature terms to GR. Unlike other higher order curvature corrections, EsGB is free of Ostrogradsky instabilities (see [38] for a review of Ostrogradsky theorem). Indeed, in four dimensions EsGB is the only ghost-free theory with quadratic curvature terms. Although we shall focus on this theory, it is worth mentioning that further generalizations where the Gauss-Bonnet \mathcal{G} term is replaced by a function $f(\mathcal{G})$ have been studied in [46], and it has been shown that their ghosts can be removed at the level of the equations of motion by the addition of constraints via Lagrange multipliers. In this work we consider an action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{M_{Pl}^2}{2} R - X - V(\phi) - \xi(\phi)\mathcal{G} \right], \quad (2.12)$$

where the Gauss-Bonnet term is given in terms of the curvature tensor $R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ and its contractions as $\mathcal{G} = R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$, $\xi(\phi)$ is the coupling between the scalar field ϕ and \mathcal{G} , $X = \partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi/2$, $V(\xi)$ is the scalar field potential, and M_{Pl} is the Planck mass. It is worth mentioning that EsGB, eq. (2.12), is part of Horndeski gravity [11]. The potential $V(\phi)$ does

not affect the friction term of the gravitational wave equation, thus it will be neglected when analysing the gravitational wave luminosity distance (for a complete description of how each term in Horndeski gravity affects the GW equation see, e.g., [47]); however, together with the coupling $\xi(\phi)$, it is relevant in determining the background metric on which we study GW propagation. Different choices for the coupling and potential functions have been explored in the literature, e.g., [26, 28, 31, 32, 35, 48], initially motivated by the existence of non-singular cosmological solutions, but then it was realized that the theory has applications to the inflationary and late time acceleration eras. Furthermore, it has been shown that there is a sector of the theory that predicts gravitational waves that propagate at the speed of light. As a sample of the possible cosmological solutions to EsGB gravity, we work with the following models:

Model A This model describes de Sitter expansion and is based on the solution reported in [32], with an exponential coupling function $\xi(\phi) \sim e^\phi$ and a scalar field that depends logarithmically on the scale factor, $\phi \sim \ln a(t)$, with a certain relation between the proportionality constants appearing in these functions. Rather than using the precise form of the solutions derived in [32], and in the spirit of testing the validity of the δ -parametrizations as opposed to testing the validity of the model, we assume

$$\xi(\phi) = M_{Pl}^2 \kappa_1 e^{\kappa_2 \phi}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\phi = \phi_0 \ln a^3(t), \quad (2.14)$$

where κ_1, κ_2 and ϕ_0 are constants to be fixed with the only condition that the expected asymptotic form of the function $\delta(z)$ is obtained. Similar considerations are made in the other three models. Also, we assume that the solution for the metric resembles the observed accelerated expansion, thus we take a constant Hubble factor, $H = H_0$.

Model B Based on the results of [31], where a de Sitter solution in a model with quadratic coupling is presented. This solution is found in the study of early universe dynamics; however, if the theory is to be compatible with observations, then at late times we can expect the scale factor to evolve as in a dark energy dominated universe, i.e., as a de Sitter solution. This motivates us to take the background solution

$$\xi(\phi) = M_{Pl}^2 \kappa_1 \phi^2, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\phi = \phi_0 \exp\left(-\frac{5}{2} H_0 t\right), \quad (2.16)$$

with a constant Hubble parameter H_0 .

Model C A combination of the results of [26, 49] for inflationary and cosmological scenarios, both with a power law scale factor, $a \sim t^x$ for some real exponent x , but with different forms of the potential and coupling function. Drawing from their results, we assume

$$\xi(\phi) = M_{Pl}^2 \kappa_1 \phi^2, \quad \phi = \phi_0 + \phi_1 t^2, \quad a(t) = a_0 t^x. \quad (2.17)$$

Model D Based on the results of [49] for cosmological scenarios, we assume a power-law expansion,

$$\xi(\phi) = M_{Pl}^2 \kappa_1 e^{\kappa_2 \phi}, \quad \phi = \phi_0 + \phi_1 \ln t, \quad a(t) = a_0 t^x. \quad (2.18)$$

In all the equations above, $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \phi_0, \phi_1$ and a_0 are constants and are specific for each model, i.e., a choice of their values for Model A has no implication on their values for other models. Models *A*, *B*, *C* and *D* are used as cosmological backgrounds where gravitational waves propagate. To simplify the notation hereafter we set $M_{Pl}^2 = 1$.

2.2.1 Modified friction term in EsGB gravity

We take the variation of eq. (2.12) with respect to the metric $g^{\mu\nu}$ in order to obtain the field equations of motion for EsGB gravity. Then we fix $\xi(\phi)$ as either a quadratic or exponential coupling, depending on the model we are considering, and we take first order tensor perturbations, $g_{\mu\nu} = \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}(x^\alpha) + h_{\mu\nu}(x^\alpha)$ with $|h_{\mu\nu}| \ll 1$ around a background metric $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ that we choose as a flat FRW metric,

$$d\bar{s}^2 = \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = a^2(\eta)(-d\eta^2 + d\Sigma^3), \quad (2.19)$$

where $d\Sigma^2$ is the line element of a flat, spacelike metric, and η represents conformal time. Performing the perturbation of the equations of motion in traceless transverse gauge, neglecting corrections to the speed of light by the same arguments that lead to eq. (2.2), and comparing with that same equation, we find that the δ -modifications to the friction term for any ϕ -dependent coupling are given by

$$\delta = \frac{4(\mathcal{H}\phi'^2\xi_{\phi\phi} + \xi_\phi(\mathcal{H}' - 2\mathcal{H}^2)\phi' + \xi_\phi\mathcal{H}\phi'')}{\mathcal{H}(a^2 - 8\mathcal{H}\phi'\xi_\phi)}, \quad (2.20)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$, primes denote derivatives with respect to conformal time, ξ is the coupling function and $\xi_\phi, \xi_{\phi\phi}$ are its first and second derivatives with respect to the scalar field. For the exponential (models *A* and *D*) and quadratic (models *B* and *C*) coupling functions, $\delta(z)$ takes the form

$$\delta_{A,D} = \frac{4\kappa_1\kappa_2 e^{\kappa_2\phi} [(\mathcal{H}' - 2\mathcal{H}^2)\phi' + \mathcal{H}\kappa_2\phi'^2 + \mathcal{H}\phi'']}{\mathcal{H}[a^2 - 8e^{\kappa_2\phi}\mathcal{H}\kappa_1\kappa_2\phi']}, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\delta_{B,C} = \frac{8\kappa_1 [(\mathcal{H}' - 2\mathcal{H}^2)\phi\phi' + \mathcal{H}\phi'^2 + \mathcal{H}\phi'']}{\mathcal{H}[a^2 - 16\phi\mathcal{H}\kappa_1\phi']}. \quad (2.22)$$

After converting to cosmological time, using the background solution of each model, and expressing the results in terms of redshift, each $\delta(z)$ becomes

$$\delta_A(z) = \frac{36\phi_0^2 H_0^2 \kappa_1 \kappa_2^2}{(1+z)^{3\phi_0\kappa_2} - 24\phi_0 H_0^2 \kappa_1 \kappa_2}, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\delta_B(z) = \frac{100\phi_0^2 H_0^2 \kappa_1}{40\phi_0^2 H_0^2 \kappa_1 + (1+z)^{-5}}, \quad (2.24)$$

$$\delta_C(z) = -\frac{32\kappa_1\phi_1^2(1+z)^{-2/x}}{32\kappa_1 x\phi_1(\phi_1(1+z)^{-2/x} + \phi_0) - 1}. \quad (2.25)$$

$$\delta_D(z) = \frac{4\kappa_1\kappa_2\phi_1 e^{\kappa_2\phi_0}(\kappa_2\phi_1 - 2)(1+z)^{-\kappa_2\phi_1/x}}{(1+z)^{-2/x} - 8\kappa_1\kappa_2 x\phi_1 e^{\kappa_2\phi_0}(1+z)^{-\kappa_2\phi_1/x}} \quad (2.26)$$

In order for these functions to decay asymptotically, one must choose appropriate values for the constants involved. The values we have used are reported in Table 1. For model B it is impossible to get an asymptotically vanishing δ , instead, it always approaches $\delta \rightarrow 5/2$. Thus,

model B modifies gravity at every redshift and it should be ruled out by various observational tests. Furthermore, the parametrizations given by eq. (2.6), (2.8) and (2.9) are specifically designed to give $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Nevertheless, we have decided to trivially modify these parametrizations by adding a constant term, so that we can retain model B and gather more information on the ability of $\delta_I, \delta_{II}, \delta_{III}$ to reproduce the dynamical part of $\delta(z)$.

In principle one can use eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) to write down the expression for the function $\Xi(z)$ corresponding to $\delta(z)$ for any coupling function. However, the integral involved in such an expression is not always analytically solvable, and model D provides an example of this. Therefore, for this case the fit is performed between the parametrizations and a numerical profile. For the other three models, $\Xi(z)$ is computed analytically. The results are the following,

$$\Xi_A(z) = \frac{(1+z)^{\frac{3\phi_0\kappa_2}{2}} \sqrt{1 - 24\phi_0 H_0^2 \kappa_1 \kappa_2}}{\sqrt{(1+z)^{3\phi_0\kappa_2} - 24\phi_0 H_0^2 \kappa_1 \kappa_2}}, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\Xi_B(z) = \frac{\sqrt{40\phi_0^2 H_0^2 \kappa_1 + 1}}{\sqrt{40\phi_0^2 H_0^2 \kappa_1 (1+z)^5 + 1}}, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\Xi_C(z) = \frac{\sqrt{32\kappa_1 x \phi_1 (\phi_0 + \phi_1) - 1}}{\sqrt{32\kappa_1 x \phi_1 (\phi_1 (1+z)^{-2/x} + \phi_0) - 1}}, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\Xi_D(z) = \exp\left(-\int_0^z \frac{\delta_D(z')}{z'+1} dz'\right). \quad (2.30)$$

In the next section we present the results of fitting models *A-D* with the parametrizations for $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$ given in eqs. (2.6) to (2.11).

3 Confronting theory and parametrizations

Overall, the simple parametrizations δ_I (eq. (2.6)) and Ξ_I (eq. (2.7)) provide a better fit to all the ESGB models described above and, as anticipated, the fits for $\Xi(z)$ are better than the fits for $\delta(z)$, as we describe in more detail below.

In Fig. 1 we show the theoretical profiles for $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$ for models A-D with the constants reported in Table 1, as well as the parametrizations $\delta_I, \delta_{II}, \delta_{III}$ (left panels) and $\Xi_I, \Xi_{II}, \Xi_{III}$ (right panels). By design $\delta_{II}(0) = 0$, this is required in models where the cosmological solution evolves towards a de Sitter fixed point. Similarly, $\delta_{III}(0) = 0$ for $n > 1$. This restriction makes δ_{II} and δ_{III} unable to reproduce the theoretical $\delta(z)$ in the models we are studying when $z \rightarrow 0$. Since $\Xi(z)$ is a cumulative effect, it is highly sensitive to the behaviour of $\delta(z)$ near $z \rightarrow 0$. Thus, if $\delta(z \sim 0)$ is not well fitted neither is $\Xi(z)$, unless we allow $\Xi(z)$ to select its best fit parameters independently of those of $\delta(z)$. In this case, the parameters extracted from the fit to $\Xi(z)$ do not necessarily agree with those extracted from the fit to $\delta(z)$. It is important to keep this in mind when fitting actual data: a good fit to $\Xi(z)$ does not imply that the same parameters provide a good fit for $\delta(z)$, therefore, fitting one quantity is not enough to conclude that the parametrizations favour a certain model.

In Table 2 we report the best fit parameters obtained from independent fits for $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$ with the three parametrizations described in Sec. 2. Both from Fig. 1 and from the errors reported in Table 2 we conclude that the parametrization Ξ_I performs better than the others. A few remarks about these figures are in order.

Model	κ_1	κ_2	ϕ_0	ϕ_1	x
<i>A</i>	0.1	0.3	1.0	-	-
<i>B</i>	-0.05	-	1.0	-	-
<i>C</i>	0.1	-	-1.0	1.0	0.5
<i>D</i>	0.1	-1.0	1.0	1.0	-1.0

Table 1. Parameters for the models *A-D* presented in Sec. 2.2. These parameters are chosen such that $\delta(z)$ vanishes asymptotically, except for model *B* where this is not possible and we only require that δ' is asymptotically vanishing.

	A	B	C	D
δ_I				
n_0	2.067 ± 0.024	33.68 ± 0.335	8.43 ± 0.09	3.79 ± 0.016
Ξ_0	0.561 ± 0.003	0.411 ± 0.005	0.65 ± 0.003	0.843 ± 0.001
Ξ_I				
n_0	2.006 ± 0.011	3.37 ± 0.017	6.135 ± 0.036	3.5 ± 0.0075
Ξ_0	0.56 ± 0.0006	1.4 ± 0.001	0.62 ± 0.0002	0.84 ± 0.00005
δ_{II}				
n_0	2.908 ± 0.099	14.63 ± 3.2	9.69 ± 0.7	6.16 ± 0.268
Ξ_0	0.626 ± 0.01	0.514 ± 0.06	0.7 ± 0.017	0.87 ± 0.005
Ξ_{II}				
n_0	3.07 ± 0.038	2.42 ± 0.012	9.04 ± 0.12	5.36 ± 0.055
Ξ_0	0.58 ± 0.0012	0.008 ± 0.0011	0.624 ± 0.0005	0.84 ± 0.0002
δ_{III}				
n_0	0.695 ± 0.007	0.0 ± 7.662	0.001 ± 1.9	0.001 ± 12.8
Ξ_0	0.568 ± 0.004	-0.58 ± 63.26	-0.58 ± 11.6	-0.56 ± 365.2
Ξ_{III}				
n_0	0.5 ± 0.0063	0.62 ± 0.008	0.158 ± 0.006	0.26 ± 0.008
Ξ_0	0.512 ± 0.0012	1.57 ± 0.004	0.46 ± 0.0021	0.79 ± 0.001

Table 2. Parameters (n_0, Ξ_0) determined by a least squares fit between the parametrizations I-III and the models *A – B* specified in Table (1). The fits to δ and Ξ are performed independently, therefore the values of n_0 and Ξ_0 obtained by each fit are not necessarily self-consistent.

- Model B (second row in Fig. 1) modifies gravity at all redshifts. Asymptotically, its $\delta(z)$ approaches a constant value of $2/5$ which is not compatible with the parametrizations given by eq. (2.6), (2.8) and (2.9). Thus, only in this case we minimally modified these parametrizations by the addition of a constant term. At this point, one could either fix this constant term to the known asymptotic value of $\delta(z)$ or leave it as another free parameter to be fixed by the least squares methods. We took the former approach. In addition, for this model we modified $\Xi_I, \Xi_{II}, \Xi_{III}$ in order to take into account the constant asymptotic value of $\delta(z)$.
- Model B also exemplifies that $\Xi(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ is as an indication that GR is being modified at all redshifts. If the integral in (2.3) grows for large z , which happens for instance if $\delta(z)$ is constant, then $\Xi(z)$ goes to zero.
- The best fit parameters obtained with δ_{III} display large uncertainties. These uncer-




Figure 1. Comparison between the functions δ and Ξ for models A - D and the parametrizations given by eqs. (2.6)-(2.11) with the values for the parameters reported in Table 2.

tainties can be reduced by removing from the analysis points that are too close to the origin, i.e., by changing the range of z used in the numerical fits. However, in order to report parameters obtained under the same search criteria, we did not do this modification here.

The results above show that δ_I and Ξ_I provide good fits to well motivated quadratic models of gravity, in particular to models A and D that are motivated by late time cosmological solutions. Nevertheless, it is known that these parametrizations are not appropriated for certain types of modifications of gravity, in particular DHOST gravity. Thus, we would like to generalize the parametrizations studied above so that we can fit a wider range of models.

4 A novel parametrization

In this section a more general parametrization is presented. The proposal mimics models that evolve towards a de Sitter fixed point as well as models that do not. The construction is motivated by the pattern observed in the parametrizations δ_I and δ_{II} (eqs. (2.6), (2.8)). Specifically, we see that δ_{II} modifies δ_I by the addition of two terms that suggest a power series in $1/(1+z)$. As explained in [22], δ_{II} is designed to fit models that approach a de Sitter fixed point as $z \rightarrow 0$, while δ_I does not follow this requirement. Since Ξ_0 is assumed to be positive, we notice that δ_{II} is driven to zero near $z = 0$ only by its last term. Therefore, we generalize δ_{II} by replacing its second and third terms with two power series, each weighted by an independent parameter, such that the first series adds up to the magnitude of the first term (i.e. to δ_I) and the second one can reduce this magnitude if necessary. We propose a parametrization δ_X given by

$$\delta_X(z) = \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{1 - \Xi_0 + \Xi_0(1+z)^n} + \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^n} - \frac{2r(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^{2r}} + \frac{3n(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^{3n}} - \dots \quad (4.1)$$

Assuming an infinite number of terms, this parametrization can be rewritten as

$$\delta_X(z) = \delta_I(z) + \frac{n(1 - \Xi_0)}{(1+z)^n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2i-1}{((1+z)^{2n})^{i-1}} \right] - (1 - \Xi_0) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2ir}{(1+z)^{2ir}} \right], \quad (4.2)$$

The sum in the first square bracket is further separated into two sums, one with coefficient $2i$ and the other with coefficient -1 . The latter is immediately recognized as a geometric series, while the former is the derivative of the geometric series. Similarly, the sum in the second square bracket is also the derivative of a geometric series. For $z > 0$ these geometric series are convergent, and after a few simplifications $\delta(z)$ can be rewritten as follows,

$$\delta_X(z) = (1 - \Xi_0) \left(\frac{n(1+z)^n(1+(1+z)^{2n})}{(-1+(1+z)^{2n})^2} - \frac{2r(1+z)^{2r}}{(-1+(1+z)^{2r})^2} + \frac{n}{1+\Xi_0(-1+(1+z)^n)} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Now let us derive the form of $\Xi_X(z)$ for this new parametrization. Since $\delta_X(z)$ is not well behaved at $z = 0$, the integration required for computing Ξ_X contains a divergence. To circumvent this issue we regularize by removing the divergent terms, thus obtaining

$$\Xi_X(z) = \Xi_I \exp \left[(\Xi_0 - 1) \left(\frac{z+2}{4nz} - \frac{z+2}{4rz} - \frac{(z+1)^n}{(z+1)^{2n}-1} + \frac{1}{(z+1)^{2r}-1} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (4.4)$$




Figure 2. Parametrizations δ_X and Ξ_X applied to models *A* (de Sitter expansion, top panels) and *D* (power law expansion, bottom panels). The best fit parameters are reported in Table 4.

This Ξ_X satisfies $\Xi_X(z=0) = 1$, and near this region it differs from unit by terms of order z . On the other hand, for large redshifts, $\Xi_X(z \gg 1) = \Xi_{X0}$, where the constant Ξ_{X0} is determined by Ξ_0, n and r . It is worth noticing that the large z behaviour of $\Xi_X(z)$ is determined by the powers n and r , while at low z the behaviours is linear. This characteristic is shared with Ξ_I, Ξ_{II} and Ξ_{III} , and contributes to the generality of the parametrizations.

In the top panels of Fig. 2 we show the results of a least squares fit between δ_X, Ξ_X and the predictions of model *A*. The best fit parameters are reported in the first column of Table 4. We see that the fit is similar to the one obtained with δ_I, Ξ_I . This is confirmed by the values of χ^2 reported in Table 3. The same analysis is performed for model *D*, and the results are displayed in the bottom panels of Fig. 2 and in Table 3. From the results of the previous section, we also conclude that δ_X and Ξ_X perform better than the parametrizations labeled *II* and *III*.

	Model A				Model D			
	δ_I	δ_X	Ξ_I	Ξ_X	δ_I	δ_X	Ξ_I	Ξ_X
χ^2	11.42	4.33	0.442	0.472	0.112	0.075	0.009	0.017

Table 3. χ^2 test for the fits to Models *A* and *D* with the parametrizations $\delta_I, \delta_X, \Xi_I, \Xi_X$. The fit for $\delta(z)$ in model *A* presents a significant improvement when using δ_X , while in all the other cases the goodness of fit is similar.

In Fig. 3 we confirm that δ_X and Ξ_X are also able to reproduce the type of modifications




Figure 3. Parametrizations δ_X and Ξ_X applied to a $\delta_{II}(z)$ that is appropriated for some models of DHOST gravity with a de Sitter fixed point. Best fit parameters are reported in Table 4.

to the friction term and to the luminosity distance that appear in DHOST theories with a fixed de Sitter point and a tracker cosmological solution. This wider range of applicability is the main advantage of δ_X, Ξ_X over the parametrizations studied in previous sections. For simplicity, in this test we compared our proposed parametrizations to profiles for δ_{II}, Ξ_{II} that reproduce a DHOST-like behaviour [22] rather than to a specific DHOST solution. By further analyzing δ_X , it is found that the peak shown in Fig. 3 can be shifted around by changing the parameters (n, r, Ξ_0) , however the magnitude of its slope always gets larger as z gets smaller, i.e., the peak is asymmetric. This is a limitation of δ_X . One possible way around is to weight δ_X by a factor of the form $\exp[-(z+c)^{-2}]$, with $c > 0$, this introduces a z -dependent damping that smooths out the asymmetry of the peak while also allowing it to be less extended, thus making it more similar to the predictions for DHOST gravity reported in [22]. The same argument can be made about δ_{II} and Ξ_{II} , then, one could keep 3 parameters, (n, c, Ξ_0) and get a better fit specifically for DHOST-like gravity. The preceding discussion highlights the fact that there is still work to do on parametrizations that are general enough without introducing a large number of parameters. On the other hand, $\Xi(z)$ – which is more directly related to observations – presents a simpler form. As the right panel of Fig. 3 shows its theoretical profile is similar to the ones obtained in models without a de Sitter fixed point, and the parametrization Ξ_X is appropriate for this type of profiles, as one can conclude from Figs. 2 and 3.

5 Discussion

In this work we analyzed three existing parametrizations for the propagation of gravitational waves. In particular, we studied how these parametrizations fit the predictions of different cosmological models in EsGB gravity, including models that have been proposed in the context of late time acceleration of the universe and that are able to fulfill the stringent constraint on the speed of gravitational waves imposed by the observation of GW170817. We found that the simplest of these parametrizations gives good agreement with the the predictions of EsGB. The other two parametrizations, labeled *II* and *III*, are designed for models where $\delta(z)$ goes to zero at late times, for instance due to the presence of a de Sitter fixed point and a tracker cosmological solution. This characteristic is absent in the models that we studied, therefore their predictions for $\delta(z)$ are not well fitted by these parametrizations. However, it is interesting to highlight that even for these models the parametrization Ξ_{II} gives a good

	A	D	DHOST
δ_X			
Ξ_0	0.69 ± 0.0014	0.9 ± 0.0003	1.02 ± 0.0001
n	1.687 ± 0.013	3.637 ± 0.013	2.823 ± 0.017
r	1.743 ± 0.013	3.831 ± 0.11	2.612 ± 0.012
Ξ_X			
Ξ_0	0.66 ± 0.0006	0.89 ± 0.0001	1.017 ± 0.0001
n	2.084 ± 0.012	3.887 ± 0.012	2.247 ± 0.024
r	2.085 ± 0.012	3.888 ± 0.012	2.247 ± 0.024

Table 4. The first two columns show the parameters (Ξ_0, n, r) determined by least squares fits between the parametrizations δ_X , Ξ_X and the models A and D specified in Table 1. The third column shows the parameters obtained by fitting δ_X, Ξ_X to a choice of δ_{II}, Ξ_{II} reported in [21] as a good fit for GW propagation in DHOST gravity. The fits to δ and Ξ are performed independently, therefore the values of n and Ξ_0 obtained by each fit are not necessarily self-consistent.

approximation to the predicted values of $\Xi(z)$. This emphasizes the robustness of $\Xi(z)$; since it is an integrated effect it is less sensitive to the local modifications to the friction term in the gravitational wave equation. From these results we conclude that both Ξ_I and Ξ_{II} are viable parametrizations for quadratic gravity.

Although the motivations for the parametrizations II and III are physically relevant, their ability to fit different models is highly restricted, especially in the case of $\delta(z)$. Since in this work our focus is on the generality of the parametrization, we propose a new, more general profile, δ_X , that contains an additional parameter that allows the fit to select between models that behave like δ_I and models that behave like δ_{II} . In the cases we studied, the distinction between these types of models is reflected in the signs of $\Xi_0 - 1$ and $n - r$, i.e., the factors that control $\delta(z)$ near $z = 0$.

Once the parameters are determined by comparing to actual data, one should try to identify a physical model that is well described by these parameters. Along these lines, our results show that the best fit parameters obtained independently from $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$ do not necessarily agree, therefore model identification based only on one of those functions might be inconsistent. It is natural to expect that this is alleviated either by incorporating other sets of data in addition to gravitational waves or by performing a simultaneous optimization of $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$.

Finally, concerning EsGB, we can conclude that the cosmological solutions to this model do lead to profiles for $\delta(z)$ and $\Xi(z)$ that are consistent with the expectations for late time modifications of gravity.

Acknowledgments

CO and JC acknowledge the support provided by UAZ-2018-37554. AL is supported by CONACyT graduate grant No. 855158.

References

- [1] LIGO SCIENTIFIC, VIRGO collaboration, B. P. Abbott et al., *Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 061102, [1602.03837].

- [2] LIGO SCIENTIFIC, VIRGO collaboration, B. P. Abbott et al., *GW170817: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Neutron Star Inspiral*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 161101, [[1710.05832](#)].
- [3] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacárregui, *Dark Energy After GW170817: Dead Ends and the Road Ahead*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 251304, [[1710.05901](#)].
- [4] P. Creminelli and F. Vernizzi, *Dark Energy after GW170817 and GRB170817A*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 251302, [[1710.05877](#)].
- [5] T. Baker, E. Bellini, P. G. Ferreira, M. Lagos, J. Noller and I. Sawicki, *Strong constraints on cosmological gravity from GW170817 and GRB 170817A*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 251301, [[1710.06394](#)].
- [6] E. J. Copeland, M. Kopp, A. Padilla, P. M. Saffin and C. Skordis, *Dark energy after GW170817 revisited*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 061301, [[1810.08239](#)].
- [7] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark energy in Horndeski theories after GW170817: A review*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28** (2019) 1942005, [[1809.08735](#)].
- [8] L. Bordin, E. J. Copeland and A. Padilla, *Dark energy loopholes some time after GW170817*, *JCAP* **11** (2020) 063, [[2006.06652](#)].
- [9] S. Weinberg, *The Cosmological Constant Problem*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989) 1–23.
- [10] A. Padilla, *Lectures on the Cosmological Constant Problem*, [1502.05296](#).
- [11] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. Yokoyama, *Generalized G-inflation: Inflation with the most general second-order field equations*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126** (2011) 511–529, [[1105.5723](#)].
- [12] P. Brax, *Screening mechanisms in modified gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013) 214005.
- [13] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden, *Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model*, *Phys. Rept.* **568** (2015) 1–98, [[1407.0059](#)].
- [14] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Modified Gravity and Cosmology*, *Phys. Rept.* **513** (2012) 1–189, [[1106.2476](#)].
- [15] K. Koyama, *Cosmological Tests of Modified Gravity*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79** (2016) 046902, [[1504.04623](#)].
- [16] C. M. Will, *The Confrontation between General Relativity and Experiment*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17** (2014) 4, [[1403.7377](#)].
- [17] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, *Theory of cosmological perturbations. Part 1. Classical perturbations. Part 2. Quantum theory of perturbations. Part 3. Extensions*, *Phys. Rept.* **215** (1992) 203–333.
- [18] T. Baker, P. G. Ferreira and C. Skordis, *The Parameterized Post-Friedmann framework for theories of modified gravity: concepts, formalism and examples*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 024015, [[1209.2117](#)].
- [19] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, *Essential Building Blocks of Dark Energy*, *JCAP* **08** (2013) 025, [[1304.4840](#)].
- [20] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan and L. Senatore, *The Effective Field Theory of Inflation*, *JHEP* **03** (2008) 014, [[0709.0293](#)].
- [21] E. Belgacem, Y. Dirian, S. Foffa and M. Maggiore, *Modified gravitational-wave propagation and standard sirens*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 023510, [[1805.08731](#)].
- [22] LISA COSMOLOGY WORKING GROUP collaboration, E. Belgacem et al., *Testing modified gravity at cosmological distances with LISA standard sirens*, *JCAP* **07** (2019) 024, [[1906.01593](#)].

- [23] C. G. Callan, Jr., E. J. Martinec, M. J. Perry and D. Friedan, *Strings in Background Fields*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **262** (1985) 593–609.
- [24] D. J. Gross and J. H. Sloan, *The Quartic Effective Action for the Heterotic String*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **291** (1987) 41–89.
- [25] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, *Order alpha-prime (Two Loop) Equivalence of the String Equations of Motion and the Sigma Model Weyl Invariance Conditions: Dependence on the Dilaton and the Antisymmetric Tensor*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **293** (1987) 385–419.
- [26] J. Rizos and K. Tamvakis, *On the existence of singularity free solutions in quadratic gravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **326** (1994) 57–61, [[gr-qc/9401023](#)].
- [27] I. Antoniadis, J. Rizos and K. Tamvakis, *Singularity - free cosmological solutions of the superstring effective action*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **415** (1994) 497–514, [[hep-th/9305025](#)].
- [28] P. Kanti, J. Rizos and K. Tamvakis, *Singularity free cosmological solutions in quadratic gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 083512, [[gr-qc/9806085](#)].
- [29] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, *Gauss-Bonnet Quintessence: Background Evolution, Large Scale Structure and Cosmological Constraints*, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 023518, [[hep-th/0609155](#)].
- [30] A. K. Sanyal, *If Gauss-Bonnet interaction plays the role of dark energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **645** (2007) 1–5, [[astro-ph/0608104](#)].
- [31] P. Kanti, R. Gannouji and N. Dadhich, *Gauss-Bonnet Inflation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 041302, [[1503.01579](#)].
- [32] M. Heydari-Fard, H. Razmi and M. Yousefi, *Scalar-Gauss-Bonnet gravity and cosmic acceleration: Comparison with quintessence dark energy*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26** (2016) 1750008.
- [33] L. Sberna and P. Pani, *Nonsingular solutions and instabilities in Einstein-scalar-Gauss-Bonnet cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 124022, [[1708.06371](#)].
- [34] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Viable Inflation in Scalar-Gauss-Bonnet Gravity and Reconstruction from Observational Indices*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 044039, [[1808.05045](#)].
- [35] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Inflationary Phenomenology of Einstein Gauss-Bonnet Gravity Compatible with GW170817*, *Phys. Lett. B* **797** (2019) 134874, [[1908.07555](#)].
- [36] S. D. Odintsov, V. K. Oikonomou and F. P. Fronimos, *Rectifying Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet Inflation in View of GW170817*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **958** (2020) 115135, [[2003.13724](#)].
- [37] Z. Carson and K. Yagi, *Probing Einstein-dilaton Gauss-Bonnet Gravity with the inspiral and ringdown of gravitational waves*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 104030, [[2003.00286](#)].
- [38] R. P. Woodard, *Avoiding dark energy with $1/r$ modifications of gravity*, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **720** (2007) 403–433, [[astro-ph/0601672](#)].
- [39] G. W. Horndeski, *Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10** (1974) 363–384.
- [40] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, *Covariant Galileon*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 084003, [[0901.1314](#)].
- [41] P. V. P. Cunha, C. A. R. Herdeiro, B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz and E. Radu, *Shadows of Einstein-dilaton-Gauss-Bonnet black holes*, *Phys. Lett. B* **768** (2017) 373–379, [[1701.00079](#)].
- [42] LIGO SCIENTIFIC, VIRGO, FERMI-GBM, INTEGRAL collaboration, B. P. Abbott et al., *Gravitational Waves and Gamma-rays from a Binary Neutron Star Merger: GW170817 and GRB 170817A*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848** (2017) L13, [[1710.05834](#)].
- [43] C. Escamilla-Rivera and A. Nájera, *Dynamical dark energy models in the light of Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalogues*, **2103.02097**.

- [44] G. Calcagni, S. Kuroyanagi, S. Marsat, M. Sakellariadou, N. Tamanini and G. Tasinato, *Gravitational-wave luminosity distance in quantum gravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **798** (2019) 135000, [[1904.00384](#)].
- [45] G. Fanizza, G. Franchini, M. Gasperini and L. Tedesco, *Comparing the luminosity distance for gravitational waves and electromagnetic signals in a simple model of quadratic gravity*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52** (2020) 111, [[2010.06569](#)].
- [46] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Ghost-free Gauss-Bonnet Theories of Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 044050, [[1811.07790](#)].
- [47] S. Arai and A. Nishizawa, *Generalized framework for testing gravity with gravitational-wave propagation. II. Constraints on Horndeski theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 104038, [[1711.03776](#)].
- [48] J. Soda, M.-a. Sakagami and S. Kawai, *Novel instability in superstring cosmology*, in *International Seminar on Mathematical Cosmology (ISMIC 98)*, pp. 302–309, 3, 1998. [[gr-qc/9807056](#)].
- [49] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and M. Sasaki, *Gauss-Bonnet dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 123509, [[hep-th/0504052](#)].