

Observational $H(z)$ Data as a complementarity to other cosmological probes

Hui Lin¹, Cheng Hao², Xiao Wang¹, Qiang Yuan³, Ze-Long Yi⁴, Tong-Jie Zhang^{4,5,*} and Bao-Quan Wang⁶

¹*Department of Statistics, School of Mathematical Sciences,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, P.R.China*

²*Department of Applied Mathematics, School of Mathematical Sciences,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, P.R.China*

³*Key Laboratory of Particle Astrophysics, Institute of High Energy Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O.Box 918-3, Beijing 100049, P.R.China*

⁴*Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, P.R.China*

⁵*Kavli Institute for theoretical Physics China, Institute of Theoretical Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences(KITPC/ITP-CAS),P.O.Box 2735,Beijing 100875,P.R. China and*

⁶*Department of Physics, Dezhou University, Dezhou, 253023, P. R. China*

In this paper, we use a set of observational $H(z)$ data (OHD) to constrain the Λ CDM cosmology. This data set can be derived from the differential ages of the passively evolving galaxies. Meanwhile, the \mathcal{A} -parameter, which describes the Baryonic Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) peak, and the newly measured value of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) shift parameter \mathcal{R} are used to present combinational constraints on the same cosmology. The combinational constraints favor an accelerating flat universe while the flat Λ CDM cosmology is also analyzed in the same way. We obtain a result compatible with that by many other independent cosmological observations. We find that the observational $H(z)$ data set is a complementarity to other cosmological probes.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq; 98.80.Es; 04.50.+h; 95.36.+x

I. INTRODUCTION

Several observations, such as the type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) [1, 2], Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) [3] and Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [4, 5] support an accelerating expanding universe. Many cosmological models such as the Quintessence [6], the Braneworld cosmology[7], the Chaplygin Gas [8] and the holographic dark energy models [9, 10] are extensively explored to explain the acceleration of the universe. One of the most common candidates is composed of cold dark matter with the equation of state $\omega = p/\rho = 0$ and a cosmological constant Λ with $\omega = -1$. It is usually called the Λ CDM cosmology [11], which is characterized by

$$H^2(z) = H_0^2[\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_k(1+z)^2], \quad (1)$$

where Ω_m , Ω_Λ and Ω_k are proportion of the matter density, the cosmological constant and the curvature term respectively, and $H_0 = 100h$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ is the current value of the Hubble parameter. We can get the relation $\Omega_k = 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ from Eq.(1) by setting $z = 0$, and $\Omega_k > 0$, $\Omega_k = 0$ and $\Omega_k < 0$ correspond to an open, flat and closed universe respectively.

One important task is to constrain the cosmological parameters of various cosmological models. Using the luminosity distance measurements to a particular class of objects such as SNe Ia and Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs) is the most frequently used method [12, 13]. X-ray gas mass fraction of galaxy clusters is also very popular [14, 15]. A different method based on the lookback time measurements and the age of the universe has been used to test the cosmological models [16, 17]. In addition, the size of the Baryonic Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) peak detected in the large-scale correlation function of luminous red galaxies from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [18], the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) data obtained from the three-year WMAP estimate [19, 20] and the SNe Ia data which are newly released as the first-year result of the planned five-year Supernova Legacy Survey (SNLS) are widely used to constrain cosmological models. Recently, one method based on the observational $H(z)$ data (OHD for simplicity hereafter), which are related to the differential ages of the oldest galaxies, has been used to test cosmological models [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33].

In this paper, we first examine the non-flat Λ CDM cosmology using the observational $H(z)$ data, which can be derived from the derivative of redshift z with respect to the cosmic time t (i.e., dz/dt) [34]. Meanwhile, we do

*Electronic address: tjzhang@bnu.edu.cn

the combinational analyses using observations of BAO and CMB. We obtain a compatible result with many other independent cosmological probes. We find that the observational $H(z)$ data are effective for cosmological constraints.

We organize this paper as follows: In Sec.2, we briefly overview the observational $H(z)$ data, the BAO data and the CMB data. In Sec.3, we present the constraints on the Λ CDM model. In Sec.4, the conclusions and more discussions are given.

II. OHD, BAO AND CMB AS COMBINATIONAL TESTS

A. The Observational $H(z)$ Data

The Hubble parameter $H(z)$ depends on the differential ages of the universe in this form

$$H(z) = -\frac{1}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt}, \quad (2)$$

which provides a direct measurement for $H(z)$ through a determination of dz/dt . In the work of Jimenez et al. [35], they demonstrated the feasibility of the method by applying it to a $z \sim 0$ sample. In particular, SDSS was used to determine H_0 and it was showed that its value was in good agreement with other independent methods. With the availability of new galaxy surveys, it becomes possible to determine $H(z)$ at $z > 0$. By using the differential ages of passively evolving galaxies determined from the Gemini Deep Deep Survey (GDDS) [36] and archival data [37, 38, 39, 40], Simon et al. (2005) [41] derived a set of observational $H(z)$ data.

The data set was derived from the absolute ages of 32 passively evolving galaxies with high-quality spectroscopy. Synthetic stellar population models were used to constrain the ages of the oldest stars in the galaxy (after marginalising over the metallicity and star formation history), similar to the work of Jimenez et al. [35]. In order to estimate the differential ages, these galaxies were further divided into three subsamples. The first subsample was composed of 10 field early-type galaxies, after discarding galaxies for which the spectral fit indicated an extended star formation. The ages of this sample were derived using the SPEED models [42]. The second subsample was composed of 20 old passive galaxies from GDDS. They calculated the absolute ages using the SPEED models too, obtaining harmonious results with the GDDS collaboration which estimated the ages using different models. The third subsample consisted of two red radio galaxies 53W091 and 53W069 [40, 43, 44]. After grouping together all the galaxies within $\Delta z = 0.03$ and excluding unperfect ones, they computed differential ages only for those bins within $0.1 \leq \Delta z \leq 0.15$. The interval $\Delta z = 0.03$ is set small in order to avoid incorporating galaxies that have already evolved in age, but large enough for the sparse sample to have more than one galaxy in most of the bins. The lower limit is imposed so that the age evolution between the two bins is larger than the error in the age determination. This provides a robust determination of dz/dt . The differential ages are less sensitive to systematics errors than absolute ages [42]. Then a set of differential ages dz/dt , equivalently $H(z)$, was obtained. As z has a relatively wide range, $0.1 < z < 1.8$, these data are expected to provide a more full-scale description of the dynamical evolution of our universe. But what a pity, the data amount is not sufficient enough and the corresponding errors are quite large [22, 23].

These observational $H(z)$ data have been used to constrain the dark energy potential and its redshift dependence by Simon et al. [41]. Using this data set, one can constrain various cosmological models too. Yi & Zhang [21] first used them to analyze the holography-inspired dark energy models in which the parameter c plays a key role. The cases with $c = 0.6, 1.0, 1.4$ and setting c free are discussed in detail. The results are consistent with some other independent cosmological tests. Samushia & Ratra [22] used the data set to constrain the parameters of Λ CDM, XCDM and ϕ CDM models. Wei & Zhang [23] compared a series of other cosmological models with interaction between dark matter and dark energy. And they find that the best models have an oscillating feature for both the Hubble parameter and the equation of state.

B. The BAO Data

The acoustic peaks in the CMB anisotropy power spectrum has been found efficient to constrain cosmological parameters [3]. As the acoustic oscillations in the relativistic plasma of the early universe will also be imprinted on to the late-time power spectrum of the non-relativistic matter [45], the acoustic signatures in the large-scale clustering of galaxies yield additional tests for cosmology.

Using a large spectroscopic sample of 46748 luminous red galaxies covering 3816 square degrees out to $z = 0.47$ from the SDSS, Eisenstein et al. [18] successfully found the peaks, described by the model-independent \mathcal{A} -parameter

which is independent on H_0 ,

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_m}}{z_1} \left[\frac{z_1}{E(z_1)} \frac{1}{|\Omega_k|} \text{sinn}^2(\sqrt{|\Omega_k|} \mathcal{F}(z_1)) \right]^{1/3}, \quad (3)$$

where $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$, $z_1 = 0.35$ is the redshift at which the acoustic scale has been measured, the function $\text{sinn}(x)$ is defined as

$$\text{sinn}(x) \equiv \begin{cases} \sinh(x) & \text{if } \Omega_k > 0; \\ x & \text{if } \Omega_k = 0; \\ \sin(x) & \text{if } \Omega_k < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

and the function $\mathcal{F}(z)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{dz}{E(z)}. \quad (5)$$

Eisenstein et al. [18] suggested the measured value of the \mathcal{A} -parameter as $\mathcal{A} = 0.469 \pm 0.017$.

C. The CMB Data

The shift parameter \mathcal{R} is perhaps the most model-independent parameter which can be derived from CMB data and it does not depend on H_0 . It is defined as [46, 47]

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_m}}{\sqrt{|\Omega_k|}} \text{sinn}[\sqrt{|\Omega_k|} \mathcal{F}(z_r)], \quad (6)$$

where $z_r = 1089$ is the redshift of recombination. From the three-year result of WMAP [20], Wang & Mukherjee [19] estimated the CMB shift parameter \mathcal{R} and showed that its measured value is mostly independent on assumptions about dark energy. The observational result is suggested as $\mathcal{R} = 1.70 \pm 0.03$ [19].

BAO and CMB have been widely used to do combinational constraints on the cosmological parameters. In the work of Guo et al. [48], BAO was used to constrain the Dvali-Gabadadze-Porrati (DGP) braneworld cosmology and a closed universe is strongly favored. Wu & Yu [49] combined BAO with CMB to determine parameters of a dark energy model with $\omega = \omega_0/[1 + b \ln(1+z)]^2$. They suggested that a varying dark energy model and a crossing with $\omega = -1$ are favored and the current value of ω is very likely less than -1. Pires et al. [50] combined BAO and the lookback time data to make a joint statistic analysis for the DGP braneworld cosmology and they suggested a closed universe. Wang & Mukherjee [19] used the \mathcal{R} parameter, combing several other cosmological probes including BAO, to derive model-independent constraints on the dark energy density and the Hubble parameter.

III. CONSTRAINTS ON THE Λ CDM COSMOLOGY

In this paper, we combine the observational $H(z)$ data with BAO and CMB to make a constraint on the Λ CDM cosmology. The best-fit parameters can be determined through the χ^2 minimization method. For the non-flat Λ CDM cosmology, we assume a prior of $h = 0.72 \pm 0.08$ suggested by the Hubble Space Telescope (HST) Key Project [51]. Thus we have only two free parameters, i.e., Ω_m and Ω_Λ . We get the fitting results $\Omega_m = 0.19 \pm 0.34$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.52 \pm 0.57$, with the χ^2 -value per degree of freedom $\chi_{\text{min}}^2/d.o.f = 8.94/7$. The best-fit results suggest $\Omega_k = 0.29$. We plot the confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane in Fig.1. It seems that this constraint is quite weak and requires deeper discussions such as combinational analysis with other cosmological probes.

In order to further explore the role of the observational $H(z)$ data, we study the combinational constraints from the other cosmological probes. If we combine OHD and BAO, we get $\Omega_m = 0.28 \pm 0.02$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.66 \pm 0.09$, with $\chi_{\text{min}}^2/d.o.f = 9.01/8$. The best-fit results correspond to a universe with $\Omega_k = -0.04$. We also plot the confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane in Fig.1. It is clear that the constraint from OHD+BAO is much more restrict than using only OHD. We also find that Ω_m is constrained more effectively than Ω_Λ .

By combing OHD and CMB, we get $\Omega_m = 0.31 \pm 0.04$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.71 \pm 0.03$, with $\chi_{\text{min}}^2/d.o.f = 9.06/8$. The best-fit values correspond to a universe with $\Omega_k = -0.02$. The fitting results are not too far from the result for combining OHD+BAO, but they suggest a universe closer to being flat. We plot the confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane in Fig.1 too, and the parameters are constrained more strictly than that using OHD and OHD+BAO, especially Ω_Λ .




FIG. 1: Confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane for a non-flat Λ CDM universe, for different observational data sets as labeled in the figure. The shaded regions from inner to outer stand for confidence levels at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% respectively. For a comparison, confidence regions for considering only the observational $H(z)$ data are plotted with solid lines. And the solid lines from inner to outer correspond to confidence levels at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% respectively. The dash-dot straight line represents a flat universe which satisfies $\Omega_k = 0$, i.e., $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$. The dashed straight line is the critical line for an accelerating and a decelerating universe.

TABLE I: Fitting results for a non-flat universe

Test	Ω_m	Ω_Λ	Ω_k	$\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$
OHD	0.19 ± 0.34	0.52 ± 0.57	0.29	8.94/7
OHD+BAO	0.28 ± 0.02	0.66 ± 0.09	-0.04	9.01/8
OHD+CMB	0.31 ± 0.04	0.71 ± 0.03	-0.02	9.06/8
OHD+BAO+CMB	0.28 ± 0.02	0.73 ± 0.02	-0.01	9.74/9

And the tendency of the confidence regions keeps along with the dash-dot straight line which corresponds to a flat universe. Note Fig.4 in the work of Su et al. [52] for more comparisons with results from GRBs.

If we combine OHD, BAO and CMB, we get $\Omega_m = 0.28 \pm 0.02$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73 \pm 0.02$, with $\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f = 9.74/9$. This case corresponds to a universe with $\Omega_k \simeq -0.01$, which is a flat universe at a confidence level of 68.3%. Confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane are plotted in Fig.1. Both Ω_m and Ω_Λ are constrained more strictly. Clearly, all points within the confidence region at 99.7% confidence level are near the dash-dot straight line which stands for a flat universe. And our confidence regions are very similar to those from BAO+CMB+GRBs [52]. All the fitting results discussed above are listed in Table I.

For a comparison, we present a constraint on the flat cosmology. Thus only one free parameter needs to be fitted if the prior of h is taken too. All the fitting results are listed in Table II. All the tests suggest $\Omega_m \simeq 0.28$ which is consistent with WMAP which suggested $\Omega_m = 0.27 \pm 0.04$ [3]. In addition, we discuss the flat Λ CDM cosmology if h is set free. All the fitting results are listed in Table III. The information on Ω_m is consistent with that of WMAP [3] and the value of h is roughly concordant with the prior we have taken in the above discussions. We plot the confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - h$ plane in Fig.2.

IV. THE ROLES OF OHD AND SNE IA DATA IN COSMOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS

The purpose of this section is to examine the role of OHD and SNe Ia data in the constraints on cosmological parameters. Thus we just consider the Λ CDM cosmological model with a curvature term. The likelihood for the cosmological parameters can be determined from a $\chi^2(h, \Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda)$ statistic. We marginalize the likelihood functions

TABLE II: Fitting results for a flat universe with a prior of h

Test	Ω_m	Ω_Λ	$\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$
OHD	0.30 ± 0.04	0.70	9.04/8
OHD+BAO	0.28 ± 0.02	0.72	9.47/9
OHD+CMB	0.27 ± 0.03	0.73	10.97/9
OHD+BAO+CMB	0.27 ± 0.02	0.73	10.97/10

TABLE III: Fitting results for a flat universe, setting h free

Test	h	Ω_m	Ω_Λ	$\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$
OHD	0.71 ± 0.07	0.31 ± 0.09	0.69	9.02/7
OHD+BAO	0.74 ± 0.03	0.28 ± 0.02	0.72	9.23/8
OHD+CMB	0.76 ± 0.04	0.25 ± 0.04	0.75	10.03/8
OHD+BAO+CMB	0.75 ± 0.03	0.27 ± 0.02	0.73	10.39/9

over h by integrating the probability density $P \propto e^{-\chi^2/2}$ to obtain the fitting results and the confidence regions in the Ω_M - Ω_Λ plane.

We further do the joint constraint using several data sets including BAO and CMB. In order to avoid double-counting the constraints from CMB observation, we do not employ the prior of h . In Fig.3, we show the combination results of OHD+BAO+CMB (solid lines) and SNe Ia+BAO+CMB (dotted lines) respectively. For the combined constraint, we get $\Omega_M = 0.275$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.74$ for OHD+BAO+CMB and $\Omega_M = 0.28$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.74$ for SNe Ia+BAO+CMB respectively. The best-fit results for OHD+BAO+CMB are almost identical to those for SNe Ia+BAO+CMB combination, and are consistent with that from WMAP five year's results [53]. From Fig.3, it is shown that there are slight differences between the confidence regions at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% levels for OHD+BAO+CMB and SNe Ia+BAO+CMB. The one-dimensional probability distribution functions (PDF) p for selections of parameters Ω_M and Ω_Λ for the combination data analysis are shown in Fig.4. It is also shown that there are only slight discrepancies between OHD+BAO+CMB and SNe Ia+BAO+CMB combination data on both PDF of Ω_M and Ω_Λ . Therefore, we find that the OHD play an almost same role as SNe Ia for the joint constraints. In the recent work by Carvalho et al.[54], the




FIG. 2: Confidence regions in the $\Omega_m - h$ plane for a flat Λ CDM universe. The most outer regions correspond to OHD, from inner to outer for confidence levels at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% respectively. Regions for different observational data sets are labeled in the figure, from inner to outer for confidence levels at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% respectively. The dashed straight line is the critical line for an accelerating and a decelerating universe.




FIG. 3: Confidence regions at 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% levels from inner to outer respectively in the $\Omega_M - \Omega_\Lambda$ plane for a non-flat Λ CDM universe. The dotted lines correspond to the results using SNe Ia+BAO+CMB, while solid lines for OHD+BAO+CMB. The crosses in the center of confidence regions indicate the best-fit values respectively. The dash straight line represents a flat universe with $\Omega_k = 0$.

very similar conclusions are also drawn in the test of $f(R)$ cosmology with the same data as our work.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Recent observations have provided many robust tools to analyze the dynamical behavior of the universe. Most of them are based on distance measurements, such as SNe Ia. It is also important to use other different probes to set bounds on the cosmological parameters. In this paper, we have followed this direction and used the observational $H(z)$ data from the differential ages of the passively evolving galaxies to constrain the Λ CDM cosmology, combining BAO and CMB. For the non-flat case, the value of $\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$ from OHD+BAO+CMB is the smallest while that from OHD is the largest. In other words, OHD fails to provide a more restrict constraint on this model. It is mainly due to its lackness in quality and big observational errors which can be seen in Fig.1 of Yi and Zhang [21]. However, most of the combinational results suggest a universe with small absolute values of Ω_k , i.e., close to being flat, which can be easily found in Fig.1. This is consistent with most observations that support a flat universe [3].

For a flat universe with a prior, the value of $\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$ from OHD+BAO is the smallest while that from OHD+CMB is the largest. If we set h free, the value of $\chi^2_{\min}/d.o.f$ from OHD+CMB is the smallest while that from OHD+BAO is the largest. From Fig.2, we can see clearly that most of the confidence regions are overlapped, in agreement with each other very well. Meanwhile, most of the fitting results suggest an accelerating expanding universe at 99.7% confidence level.

From the above comparison and previous works [21, 22], we find that our results from the observational $H(z)$ data are believable and the observational $H(z)$ data can be seen as a complementarity to other cosmological probes.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are very grateful to the anonymous referee for his valuable comments that greatly improve this paper. Ze-Long Yi would like to thank Yuan Qiang and Jie Zhou for their valuable suggestions. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grants No.10473002, 10533010), 2009CB24901 and the Scientific Research




FIG. 4: The one-dimensional probability distribution function (PDF) p for selections of parameters Ω_M (*Top panel*) and Ω_Λ (*Bottom panel*) for the combination analysis OHD+BAO+CMB (solid) and SNe Ia+BAO+CMB (dotted) respectively.

Foundation for the Returned Overseas Chinese Scholars, State Education Ministry.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiattia, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, K. R. Kirshner, B. Leibundgut, M. M. Phillips, D. Reiss, B. P. Schmidt, R. A. Schommer, R. C. Smith, J. Spyromilio, C. Stubbs, N. B. Suntzeff & J. Tonry. *ApJ*. **116**, 1009 (1998).
 - [2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, I. M. Hook, A. G. Kim, M. Y. Kim, J. C. Lee, N. J. Nunes, R. Pain, C. R. Pennypacker, R. Quimby, C. Lidman, R. S. Ellis, M. Irwin, R. G. McMahon, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, N. Walton, B. Schaefer, B. J. Boyle, A. V. Filippenko, T. Matheson, A. S. Fruchter, N. Panagia, H. J. M. Newberg & W. J. Couch. *ApJ*. **517**, 565 (1999).
 - [3] D. N. Spergel, L. Verde, H. V. Peiris, E. Komatsu, M. R. Nolta, C. L. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, A. Kogut, M. Limon, S. S. Meyer, L. Page, G. S. Tucker, J. L. Weiland, E. Wollack & E. L. Wright. *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003)
 - [4] M. Tegmark, M. Blanton, M. Strauss, F. Hoyle, D. Schlegel, R. Scoccimarro, M. Vogeley, D. Weinberg, I. Zehavi, A. Berlind, T. Budavari, A. Connolly, D. Eisenstein, D. Finkbeiner, J. Frieman, J. Gunn, A. Hamilton, L. Hui, B. Jain, D.

- Johnston, S. Kent, H. Lin, R. Nakajima, R. Nichol, J. Ostriker, A. Pope, R. Scranton, U. Seljak, R. Sheth, A. Stebbins, A. Szalay, I. Szapudi, L. Verde & Y. Xu. *ApJ*. **606**, 702 (2004a)
- [5] M. Tegmark, M. Strauss, M. Blanton, K. Abazajian, S. Dodelson, H. Sandvik, X. Wang, D. Weinberg, I. Zehavi, N. Bahcall, F. Hoyle, D. Schlegel, R. Scoccimarro, M. Vogele, A. Berlind, T. Budavari, A. Connolly, D. Eisenstein, D. Finkbeiner, J. Frieman, J. Gunn, L. Hui, B. Jain, D. Johnston, S. Kent, H. Lin, R. Nakajima, R. Nichol, J. Ostriker, A. Pope, R. Scranton, U. Seljak, R. Sheth, A. Stebbins, A. Szalay, I. Szapudi & Y. Xu. *Phys. Rev. D*. **69**, 103501 (2004b)
- [6] U. Alam, V. Sahni, T. D. Saini & A. A. Starobinsky. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **344**, 1057 (2003)
- [7] G. Davali, G. Gabadadze, M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett. B*. **485** (2000) 208
- [8] J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain & A. Dev. *Phys. Rev. D*. **67**, 043514 (2003)
- [9] K. Ke & M. Li. *Phys. Lett. B*. **606**, 173 (2005)
- [10] Y. G. Gong. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 2121 (2005)
- [11] S. M. Carroll, E. Farhi & A. H. Guth. *hep-th/9207037*
- [12] S. Nesseris & L. Perivolaropoulos. *Phys. Rev. D*. **70**, 043531 (2004)
- [13] Z. G. Dai, E. W. Liang & D. Xu. *ApJL*. **612**, L101(2004)
- [14] Z. H. Zhu, M. K. Fujimoto & X. T. He. *Astron. Astrophys.* **417**, 833 (2004)
- [15] Z. Chang, F. Q. Wu & X. Zhang. *Phys. Lett. B*. **633**, 14 (2006)
- [16] S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, M. Funaro & S. Andreon. *Phys. Rev. D*. **70**, 123501 (2004)
- [17] M. A. Dantas, J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain & A. Dev. *astro-ph/0607060*
- [18] D. J. Eisenstein, I. Zehavi, D. W. Hogg, R. Scoccimarro, M. R. Blanton, R. C. Nichol, R. Scranton, H. Seo, M. Tegmark, Z. Zheng, S. Anderson, J. Annis, N. Bahcall, J. Brinkmann, S. Burles, F. J. Castander, A. Connolly, I. Csabai, M. Doi, M. Fukugita, J. A. Frieman, K. Glazebrook, J. E. Gunn, J. S. Hendry, G. Hennessy, Z. Ivezić, S. Kent, G. R. Knapp, H. Lin, Y. Loh, R. H. Lupton, B. Margon, T. McKay, A. Meiksin, J. A. Munn, A. Pope, M. Richmond, D. Schlegel, D. Schneider, K. Shimasaku, C. Stoughton, M. Strauss, M. SubbaRao, A. S. Szalay, I. Szapudi, D. Tucker, B. Yanny & D. York. *ApJ*. **633**, 560 (2005)
- [19] Y. Wang & P. Mukherjee. *ApJ*. **650**, 1 (2006)
- [20] D. N. Spergel, R. Bean, O. Dore, M. R. Nolta, C. L. Bennett, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, E. Komatsu, L. Page, H. V. Peiris, L. Verde, C. Barnes, M. Halpern, R. S. Hill, A. Kogut, M. Limon, S. S. Meyer, N. Odegard, G. S. Tucker, J. L. Weiland, E. Wollack & E. L. Wright. *astro-ph/0603449*
- [21] Z. L. Yi & T. J. Zhang. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*. **22**, 41 (2007)
- [22] L. Samushia & B. Ratra. *ApJL*. **650**, L5 (2006)
- [23] H. Wei & S. N. Zhang. *Phys. Lett. B*. in press, *astro-ph/0609597*
- [24] J.F. Zhang, X. Zhang & H.Y. Liu. *The European Physical Journal C*, **52**, 693(2007)
- [25] P.X. Wu & H. W. JCAP. **14** (2007).
- [26] H. Wei & S. N. Zhang. *Phys. Rev. D*. **76**, 063003
- [27] X. Zhang & F. Q. Wu. *Phys. Rev. D*. **76**, 023502 (2007)
- [28] M. A. Dantas, J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain, & A. Dev. *Astron. Astrophys.* **467**, 421 (2007).
- [29] H. S. Zhang & Z. H. Zhu. *astro-ph/0703245*
- [30] H. Wei, N. N. Tang & S. N. Zhang. *Phys. Rev. D*. **75**, 043009
- [31] P. X. Wu & H. W. Yu. *Phys. Lett. B*. **644**, 16. (2007)
- [32] H. Wei & N. S. Zhang. *Phys. Lett. B*. **644**, 7. (2007)
- [33] L. Samushia & B. Ratra. *ApJ*. **650**, 5. (2006)
- [34] R. Jimenez & A. Loeb. *ApJ*. **573**, 37 (2002)
- [35] R. Jimenez, L. Verde, T. Treu & D. Stern. *ApJ*. **593**, 622 (2003)
- [36] R. G. Abraham, K. Glazebrook, P. J. McCarthy, D. Crampton, R. Murowinski, I. Jorgensen, K. Roth, I. M. Hook, S. Savaglio, H. W. Chen, R. O. Marzke & R. G. Carlberg. *ApJ*. **127**, 2455 (2004)
- [37] T. Treu, M. Stiavelli, P. Møller, S. Casertano & G. Bertin. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **326**, 221 (2001)
- [38] T. Treu, P. Møller, M. Stiavelli, S. Casertano & G. Bertin. *ApJL*. **564**, L13 (2002)
- [39] L. A. Nolan, J. S. Dunlop, R. Jimenez & A. F. Heavens. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **341**, 464 (2003a)
- [40] P. L. Nolan, W. F. Tompkins, I. A. Grenier & P. F. Michelson. *ApJ*. **597**, 615 (2003b)
- [41] J. Simon, L. Verde & R. Jimenez. *Phys. Rev. D*. **71**, 123001 (2005)
- [42] R. Jimenez, J. MacDonald, J. Dunlop, P. Padoan & J. Peacock. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **349**, 240 (2004)
- [43] J. Dunlop et al. *Nature*. **381**, 581 (1996)
- [44] H. Spinrad, A. Dey, D. Stern, J. Dunlop, J. Peacock, R. Jimenez & R. Windhorst. *ApJ*. **484**, 581 (1997)
- [45] D. J. Eisenstein & W. Hu. *ApJ*. **496**, 605 (1998)
- [46] J. R. Bond, G. Efstathiou & M. Tegmark. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **291**, L33 (1997)
- [47] C. J. Odman, A. Melchiorri, M. P. Hobson & A. N. Lasenby. *Phys. Rev. D*. **67**, 083511 (2003)
- [48] Z. K. Guo, Z. H. Zhu, J. S. Alcaniz & Y. Z. Zhang. *ApJ*. **646**, 1 (2006)
- [49] P. X. Wu & H. W. Yu. *astro-ph/0611507*
- [50] N. Pires, Z. H. Zhu & J. S. Alcaniz. *Phys. Rev. D*. **73**, 123530 (2006)
- [51] W. L. Freedmann, B. F. Madore, B. K. Gibson, L. Ferrarese, D. D. Kelson, S. Sakai, J. R. Mould, R. C. Kennicutt, Jr., H. C. Ford, J. A. Graham, J. P. Huchra, S. M. G. Hughes, G. D. Illingworth, L. M. Macri, & P. B. Stetson. *ApJ*. **553**, 47 (2001)
- [52] M. Su, H. Li, Z. H. Fan & B. Liu. *astro-ph/0611155*
- [53] G. Hinshaw et al. *arXiv:astro-ph/0803.0732*

[54] F. C. Carvalho et al., arXiv:astro-ph/0804.2878