

## What is parameterized $Om(z)$ diagnostics telling us in light of recent observations?

Jing-Zhao Qi<sup>1</sup>, Shuo Cao<sup>1</sup>, Marek Biesiada<sup>1,2</sup>, Tengpeng Xu<sup>1</sup>, Yan Wu<sup>1</sup>, Sixuan Zhang<sup>1</sup> and Zong-Hong Zhu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China; [caoshuo@bnu.edu.cn](mailto:caoshuo@bnu.edu.cn)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Astrophysics and Cosmology, Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007, Katowice, Poland

Received XX; accepted XX

**Abstract** In this paper, we propose a new parametrization of  $Om(z)$  diagnostics and show how the most recent and significantly improved observations concerning the  $H(z)$  and SN Ia measurements can be used to probe the consistency or tension between  $\Lambda$ CDM model and observations. Our results demonstrates that  $H_0$  plays a very important role in the consistency test of  $\Lambda$ CDM with the  $H(z)$  data. Adopting the Hubble constant priors from *Planck* 2013 and Riess (2016), one finds a considerable tension between the current  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM model and confirms the conclusions obtained previously by the others. However, with the Hubble constant prior taken from WMAP9, the discrepancy between  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM disappears, i.e., the current  $H(z)$  observations still support the cosmological constant scenario. This conclusion is also supported by the results derived from the JLA SNe Ia sample. The best-fit Hubble constant from the combination of  $H(z)$ +JLA ( $H_0 = 68.81^{+1.50}_{-1.49}$  km/s/Mpc) is well consistent with the results derived both by Planck 2013 and WMAP9, which is significantly different from the recent local measurement by Riess (2016).

**Key words:** parameterized  $Om(z)$  diagnostics — null testing  $\Lambda$ CDM — Hubble constant


### 1 INTRODUCTION

The fact that our universe is undergoing an accelerated expansion at the present stage has become one of the most important issues of the modern cosmology ever since the indication of it came from observations of type Ia supernovae (SN Ia) (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999), which was also supported by other independent astrophysical observations including large scale structure (Tegmark et al. 2004), baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) peaks (Eisenstein et al. 2005) and cosmic microwave background (CMB) (Spergel et al. 2003). This phenomenon poses a great mystery concerning what component of our universe could produce


substance with negative pressure, dubbed as dark energy, was proposed to explain this acceleration. Due to still unknown nature of dark energy, the investigation of its equation of state (EoS),  $w = p/\rho$ , a critical parameter to characterize the dynamical property of dark energy, has also become a significant research theme in modern cosmology. Many cosmologists suspect that dark energy is just the cosmological constant with  $w = -1$ , due to its simplicity and a remarkable consistency with almost all observational data. However, the notable fine-tuning problem (Weinberg 1989) and coincidence problem (Zlatev et al. 1999) still question why  $\Lambda$ CDM is declared to be the concordance cosmological model to describe the overall evolution of the Universe. Thereupon, the possibility that cosmic EoS is a variable depending with time has been explored in a number of dynamical dark energy models, such as quintessence (Caldwell & Linder 2005; Zlatev et al. 1999), K-essence (Chiba et al. 2000; Armendariz-Picon et al. 2000), phantom (Kahya & Onemli 2007; Onemli & Woodard 2004; Singh et al. 2003), etc. In the face of so many competing dark energy candidates, it is important to find an effective way to decide whether the EoS of dark energy is time varying, which is significant for us to understand the nature of dark energy.

Following this way, an effective diagnostic named  $Om(z)$ , which is sensitive to the EoS of dark energy and thus provides a null test of  $\Lambda$ CDM model, was initially introduced by (Sahni et al. (2008)) and extensively studied in many subsequent works (Sahni et al. 2014; Ding et al. 2015; Zheng et al. 2016). If the value of  $Om(z)$  is a constant at any redshift, dark energy is exactly in the form of the cosmological constant, whereas the evolving  $Om(z)$  corresponds to other dynamical dark energy models. On the other hand, the slope of  $Om(z)$  could distinguish two different types of dark energy models, i.e., a positive slope indicates a phase of phantom ( $w < -1$ ) while a negative slope represents quintessence ( $w > -1$ ) (Sahni et al. 2008). Based on the above results, many previous works have performed consistency tests of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, by using reconstructed  $Om(z)$  with the combination of Gaussian processes and observations including SN Ia and Hubble parameter data (Seikel et al. 2012; Qi et al. 2016; Yahya et al. 2014). It was found that  $\Lambda$ CDM is compatible with Union2.1 SN Ia and smaller sample of  $H(z)$  measurements. More recently, Shafieloo et al. (2012) developed an improved version of the two-point diagnostics  $Om h^2(z_1, z_2)$ , which was also extensively used to test  $\Lambda$ CDM with different samples of  $H(z)$  data (Sahni et al. 2014; Ding et al. 2015; Zheng et al. 2016). The general conclusion, which revealed the tension between  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM in the framework of Planck data (Ade et al. 2014), implies that the  $\Lambda$ CDM model may not be the best scenario of our universe, or dark energy does not exist in the form of the cosmological constant. Considering the significance of this result to understand the nature of dark energy, it is still important to seek its confirmation with alternative techniques.

In this paper, we propose a parametrization of  $Om(z)$  to provide a null test of  $\Lambda$ CDM, which successfully alleviates the disadvantages of the traditional  $Om(z)$  associated with its strong dependence on the smoothing data methodology (Seikel et al. 2012; Qi et al. 2016; Yahya et al. 2014) and the statistical approach used (Sahni et al. 2014; Ding et al. 2015; Zheng et al. 2016). With this new parametrization of  $Om(z)$ , the purpose of this work is to show how the combination of the most recent and significantly improved observations regarding the  $H(z)$  and SN Ia can be used to probe the consistency or reveal the tension between the  $\Lambda$ CDM model and observations. This paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we briefly in-



**Fig. 1** The evolution of  $Om(z)$  versus the redshift  $z$  (black dashed lines) for the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  with  $n = -0.1, -0.05, 0.05, 0.15$ . Three different cosmologies ( $\Lambda$ CDM, quintessence and phantom) denoted by solid lines are also added for comparison. The light blue shadow area represents the  $1\sigma$  confidence region of  $Om(z)$  reconstructed by GP-processed  $H(z)$  data.



**Fig. 2** The evolution of  $E(z)$  versus the redshift  $z$  for the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  with  $n = -0.2, 0.1$ . The light blue shadow area represents the  $1\sigma$  confidence region of  $E(z)$  reconstructed by GP-processed  $H(z)$  data.

constrain the  $Om(z)$  parameters and make comparison with the results obtained from Planck, WMAP9 (Hinshaw et al. 2013), and a local determination of  $H_0$  from Riess et al. (2016). Consistency test of  $\Lambda$ CDM with JLA SN Ia sample is also shown in section 4. Finally, the conclusions are summarized in section 5.

## 2 METHODOLOGY AND DATA

Considering the flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker spacetime, the general Friedmann equation for

now dynamically negligible radiation) can be written as

$$E^2(z) \equiv \frac{H^2(z)}{H_0^2} = \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1 - \Omega_{m0}) \times \exp\left(3 \int_0^z \frac{1+w(z')}{1+z'} dz'\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\Omega_{m0}$  is the present matter density of the Universe. Inspired by the form of this equation in the  $\Lambda$ CDM case, the  $Om(z)$  diagnostic has been defined as (Sahni et al. 2008)

$$Om(z) \equiv \frac{E^2(z) - 1}{(1+z)^3 - 1}. \quad (2)$$

It is obvious that in the flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the  $Om(z)$  evaluated at any redshift is always equal to the present mass density parameter  $\Omega_{m0}$ .

Therefore, from the observations of the expansion rates at different redshifts, we would be able to differentiate between  $\Lambda$ CDM and other dark energy models including evolving dark energy. For instance, for the simplest phenomenology of dark energy with constant equation of state parameter  $w = const$ , a positive slope of  $Om(z)$  relates to a phase phantom ( $w < -1$ ) and a negative slope represents the quintessence model ( $w > -1$ ) (Sahni et al. 2008), which is shown in Fig. 1. Motivated by the physical indication of  $Om(z)$  slope and the well-known Chevalier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) model concerning reconstruction of evolving dark energy EoS, we propose the following theoretical parametrization for  $Om(z)$ :

$$Om(z) = \alpha \left( \frac{z}{1+z} \right)^n, \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $n$  are the two constant parameters. From the above expression, it is straightforward to show that  $\Lambda$ CDM is fully recovered when  $\alpha = \Omega_{m0}$  and  $n = 0$ . Moreover, from a simple comparison illustrated in Fig. 1, one may easily find a positive slope  $n > 0$  indicates a phase of phantom, while a negative slope represents quintessence-like models. Compared with the direct study on the equation of state of dark energy in the previous works (Cao & Zhu 2014), the introduction of the new parameter  $n$  provides a new cosmological-model-independent method to differentiate a wider range of cosmological solutions with effective equation of state, which focus on gravitational modifications (i.e.,  $f(R)$  and  $f(T)$  gravity) to account for the cosmic acceleration without the inclusion of exotic dark energy (Chiba 2003; Wu & Yu 2011; Qi et al. 2017). We remark that one disadvantage of this  $Om(z)$  parameterization is that it would be divergent at  $z = 0$  when  $n < 0$ . However, as is shown in Fig. 1, the  $Om(z)$  reconstructed by  $H(z)$  data (see Table 1) with Gaussian processes (GP), which is consistent with this parametrization within  $1\sigma$  confidence level, exhibits the similar divergence feature at  $z \sim 0$ . Another disadvantage of this parameterization in this analysis lies in the strong assumption that the slope parameter  $n$  is a constant, which only proposes a special candidate to test the possible crossing of the cosmological constant boundary with different value of  $n$ . In order to make a comparison with other cosmological models including quintom cosmology (Cai et al. 2010) and other modified gravity models (Chiba 2003; Wu & Yu 2011; Qi et al. 2017), a possible solution is to generalize the slope parameter  $n$  as a function of redshift  $z$ , which will be considered in our future work concentrating on more cosmological applications. Now, the dimensionless Hubble parameter can be rewritten as

$$E^2(z) = Om(z) [(1+z)^3 - 1] + 1 = \alpha \left( \frac{z}{1+z} \right)^n [(1+z)^3 - 1] + 1 \quad (4)$$

and further used to estimate the values of  $\alpha$  and  $n$  from various observational data by minimizing the respective  $\chi^2$ -function. It is noteworthy that we do not aim to pinpoint the right dark energy candidate among many competing models, but our goal is to propose an effective and sensitive probe for testing the validity of the concordance  $\Lambda$ CDM model. One possible controversy here is, whether  $E(z = 0) = 1$  is still valid for the case of  $n < 0$ , due to the divergence of the  $Om(z)$  parametrization proposed above. In fact, because the term of  $[(1+z)^3 - 1]$  in Eq. 4 approaches zero at  $z = 0$ , the convergent result of  $E(z = 0) = 1$  in this case will be naturally recovered, which can be clearly seen from the enlarged subplot in Fig. 2. More importantly, the  $Om(z)$  parametrization with different slope parameters also agrees very well with the evolution of  $E(z)$  reconstructed by  $H(z)$  data with GP.

In this paper we use the latest  $H(z)$  data set including 41 data points to place constrain on the  $Om(z)$  parametrization proposed above. In general, the measurement of  $H(z)$  could be obtained by two different techniques: galaxy differential age, also known as cosmic chronometer (hereafter CC  $H(z)$ ) and radial BAO size methods (hereafter BAO  $H(z)$ ) (Zhang et al. 2011). The latest 41  $H(z)$  data set including 31 CC  $H(z)$  data and 10 BAO  $H(z)$  data is compiled in Table 1. Moreover, the Hubble function  $H(z)$  should be normalized to the dimensionless Hubble parameter  $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$ , whose uncertainty could be obtained through

$$\sigma_E^2 = \frac{\sigma_H^2}{H_0^2} + \frac{H^2}{H_0^4} \sigma_{H_0}^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma_H$  and  $\sigma_{H_0}$  are the uncertainty of  $H(z)$  and  $H_0$ , respectively. In this work estimate the parameters by minimizing the  $\chi^2$ -function defined as

$$\chi_H^2(z, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i=1}^{41} \frac{[E_{th}(z_i, \mathbf{p}) - E_{obs}(z_i)]^2}{\sigma_E(z_i)^2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{p}$  denotes the  $Om(z)$  parameters,  $E_{th}$  and  $E_{obs}$  respectively stand for the theoretical and observed value of the dimensionless Hubble parameter.

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We remark here that, as the benchmark of whole  $H(z)$  data set, that the influence of the Hubble constant value on the test of the  $Om(z)$  parameter should be taken into account. Therefore, three recent measurements of  $H_0 = 67.3 \pm 1.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  with 1.8% uncertainty (Ade et al. 2014),  $H_0 = 70.0 \pm 2.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  with 3.1% uncertainty (Hinshaw et al. 2013) and  $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  with 2.4% uncertainty (Riess et al. 2016) are respectively used in our analysis. The best-fit parameters (with  $1\sigma$  uncertainties) for these three priors are presented in Table 2.

#### 3.1 Comparison with *Planck* 2013 results


To start with, we determine the best-fit  $Om(z)$  parameters by applying the Markov Chain Monte Carlo method to find the maximum likelihood based on the  $\chi^2$ -function. Then we compare the results with cosmological parameters (Ade et al. 2014) obtained by *Planck* 2013. Adopting the Hubble constant prior  $H_0 = 67.3 \pm 1.2 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$  to the  $H(z)$  data, we obtain the best-fit value of the parameters  $\alpha = 0.268_{-0.02}^{+0.02}$  and  $n = -0.172_{-0.114}^{+0.12}$  at 68:3% confidence level. The value of the slope parameter  $n$  is obviously smaller

$z$	$H(z)$ ( $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ )	Method	Ref.
0.09	$69 \pm 12$	I	<a href="#">Jimenez et al. 2003</a>
0.17	$83 \pm 8$	I	
0.27	$77 \pm 14$	I	
0.4	$95 \pm 17$	I	
0.9	$117 \pm 23$	I	<a href="#">Simon et al. 2005</a>
1.3	$168 \pm 17$	I	
1.43	$177 \pm 18$	I	
1.53	$140 \pm 14$	I	
1.75	$202 \pm 40$	I	
0.48	$97 \pm 62$	I	<a href="#">Stern et al. 2010</a>
0.88	$90 \pm 40$	I	
0.35	$82.1 \pm 4.9$	I	<a href="#">Chuang &amp; Wang 2012</a>
0.179	$75 \pm 4$	I	
0.199	$75 \pm 5$	I	
0.352	$83 \pm 14$	I	
0.593	$104 \pm 13$	I	<a href="#">Moresco et al. 2012</a>
0.68	$92 \pm 8$	I	
0.781	$105 \pm 12$	I	
0.875	$125 \pm 17$	I	
1.037	$154 \pm 20$	I	
0.07	$69 \pm 19.6$	I	
0.12	$68.6 \pm 26.2$	I	<a href="#">Zhang et al. 2014</a>
0.2	$72.9 \pm 29.6$	I	
0.28	$88.8 \pm 36.6$	I	
1.363	$160 \pm 33.6$	I	<a href="#">Moresco 2015</a>
1.965	$186.5 \pm 50.4$	I	
0.3802	$83 \pm 13.5$	I	
0.4004	$77 \pm 10.2$	I	
0.4247	$87.1 \pm 11.2$	I	<a href="#">Moresco et al. 2016</a>
0.4497	$92.8 \pm 12.9$	I	
0.4783	$80.9 \pm 9$	I	
0.24	$79.69 \pm 2.65$	II	<a href="#">Gaztanaga et al. 2009</a>
0.43	$86.45 \pm 3.68$	II	
0.44	$82.6 \pm 7.8$	II	
0.6	$87.9 \pm 6.1$	II	<a href="#">Blake et al. 2012</a>
0.73	$97.3 \pm 7$	II	
0.35	$84.4 \pm 7$	II	<a href="#">Xu et al. 2013</a>
0.57	$92.4 \pm 4.5$	II	<a href="#">Samushia et al. 2013</a>
2.3	$224 \pm 8$	II	<a href="#">Delubac et al. 2013</a>
2.34	$222 \pm 7$	II	<a href="#">Delubac et al. 2015</a>
2.36	$226 \pm 8$	II	<a href="#">Font-Ribera et al. 2014</a>

**Table 1** The latest  $H(z)$  measurements including 31 data points from the galaxy differential age method (I) and 10 data points from the radial BAO size method (II)

$H_0$ priors	$\alpha$	$n$	$\Lambda$ CDM ( $\alpha, n$ )
Planck 2013	$\alpha = 0.268^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$n = -0.172^{+0.12}_{-0.114}$	(0.315, 0)
WMAP9	$\alpha = 0.268^{+0.026}_{-0.024}$	$n = -0.021^{+0.151}_{-0.142}$	(0.279, 0)
Riess (2016)	$\alpha = 0.196^{+0.034}_{-0.032}$	$n = 0.162^{+0.163}_{-0.147}$	(-, 0)

**Table 2** The best-fit values of the  $Om(z)$  parameters derived from the  $H(z)$  data with different  $H_0$  priors. The corresponding values for  $\Lambda$ CDM are also presented for comparison.




**Fig. 3** The 68.3% and 95.4% confidence regions in the  $\alpha - n$  parameter space for the  $Om(z)$  parameterization constrained from  $H(z)$  data (with the prior of  $H_0 = 67.3 \pm 1.2$  km/s/Mpc from Planck). The red point represents the  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $n = 0.0$ ,  $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315$ ).


energy as suggested by the  $Om(z)$  parametrization. The marginalized 2D confidence contours of  $\alpha - n$  are shown in Fig. 2, in which the  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $n = 0.0$  and  $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315$ ) characterized by *Planck* 2013 data is also added for comparison. The deviation from  $\Lambda$ CDM at  $2\sigma$  confidence region strongly indicates a tension between the current  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM, which confirms the conclusion obtained in the previous works (Sahni et al. 2014; Ding et al. 2015; Zheng et al. 2016).

### 3.2 Comparison with WMAP9 results

In the second case, we adopt the prior of  $H_0 = 70.0 \pm 2.2$  km/s/Mpc from WMAP9 results (Hinshaw et al. 2013) to constrain the parametrization of  $Om(z)$ . By minimizing the  $\chi^2$ , the parameter  $n$  implied by our statistical analysis gives  $n = -0.021^{+0.151}_{-0.142}$ , which indicates that there is no deviation from the  $\Lambda$ CDM scenario. Moreover, the best fit obtained for the dark energy parameter is  $\alpha = 0.268^{+0.026}_{-0.024}$  (68.3% confidence level), which is in perfect agreement with the matter density  $\Omega_{m0} = 0.279$  given by WMAP9. As can be seen from Fig. 4, the discrepancy between  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM determined by *Planck* 2013 data has gone, i.e., the observations of Hubble parameter still support the existence of cosmological constant



**Fig. 4** The 68.3% and 95.4% confidence regions in the  $\alpha - n$  parameter space for the  $Om(z)$  parameterization of  $Om(z)$  constrained from  $H(z)$  data (with the prior of  $H_0 = 70.0 \pm 2.2$  km/s/Mpc from WMAP9). The red point represents  $\Lambda$ CDM ( $n = 0.0, \Omega_{m0} = 0.279$ ).



**Fig. 5** The 68.3% and 95.4% confidence regions in the  $\alpha - n$  parameter space for the  $Om(z)$  parameterization of  $Om(z)$  constrained from  $H(z)$  data (with the prior of  $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$  km/s/Mpc from [Riess et al. \(2016\)](#)). The horizontal black line denotes  $\Lambda$ CDM ( $n = 0.0$ ).

Obviously, the same  $H(z)$  data set corresponding to different values of  $H_0$  and  $\Omega_{m0}$  from Planck 2013 and WMAP9 gives very different conclusions. Concerning the previous works ([Sahni et al. 2014](#); [Ding et al. 2015](#); [Zheng et al. 2016](#)), their estimates of  $Om h^2$  are compared with  $\Omega_{m0} h^2$ , the combination of  $\Omega_{m0}$  and  $H_0$  ( $h = H_0/100$  km/s/Mpc) determined by *Planck* observations. Therefore, it is hard to tell the source



	$H_0$	$\alpha$	$n$
JLA	$67.63^{+4.06}_{-2.18}$	$0.292^{+0.097}_{-0.075}$	$-0.014^{+0.240}_{-0.250}$
$H(z)$	$67.799^{+5.67}_{-13.29}$	$0.276^{+0.070}_{-0.026}$	$-0.164^{+0.434}_{-0.545}$
$H(z)$ +JLA	$68.81^{+1.50}_{-1.49}$	$0.262^{+0.020}_{-0.018}$	$-0.096^{+0.105}_{-0.098}$

**Table 3** The best-fit values (with the  $1\sigma$  uncertainties) of the Hubble constant and the  $Om(z)$  parameters with different data combinations ( $H(z)$ , JLA and  $H(z)$ +JLA).

final conclusion could be separately discussed. From the above analysis, we may conclude that the value of  $H_0$  is the most influential factor in performing consistency test of the  $\Lambda$ CDM with  $H(z)$  data. For instance, in the case of  $H_0 = 67.3 \pm 1.2$  km/s/Mpc from *Planck* 2013 data,  $\Lambda$ CDM with any value of  $\Omega_{m0}$  is ruled out at 68.3% confidence level. However, with the prior of  $H_0 = 70.0 \pm 2.2$  km/s/Mpc from WMAP9, the  $H(z)$  data exhibits very good consistency with the concordance cosmological constant model.

### 3.3 Comparison with Riess (2016) results

Considering the significant influence of  $H_0$ , in the final case a local determination of  $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$  km/s/Mpc with 2.4% uncertainty from Riess et al. (2016) can be taken to perform consistency test. We show the contours constrained from the statistical analysis in Fig. 5 and the best fit is  $\alpha = 0.196^{+0.034}_{-0.032}$  and  $n = 0.162^{+0.163}_{-0.147}$ . (68.3% confidence level). Different from the first case based on *Planck* measurements, a positive value for the slope parameter, which corresponds to a phantom cosmology is favored in the framework of this  $Om(z)$  parametrization. Moreover, because this measurement of  $H_0$  is a local determination obtained in a cosmology-independent method, we may comment on the value of matter density in the framework of  $\Lambda$ CDM, i.e., at the 95.4% confidence level the range of  $\Omega_{m0}$  is restricted to (0.2118, 0.2504) with the current  $H(z)$  data, which is generally lower than the value given by most of other types of cosmological observations. Therefore, the measurement of  $H_0$  from Riess et al. (2016) will significantly affect our understanding of  $\Lambda$ CDM and thus the components in the Universe.

## 4 CONSTRAINTS FROM JLA SN IA SAMPLE

As mentioned above, the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  proposed in this paper makes it possible to perform consistency test of the  $\Lambda$ CDM with other astronomical observations. More importantly, previous literature have examined the role of  $H(z)$  and SN Ia data in cosmological constraints, and found that they could play a similar role in constraining the cosmological parameters (Cao et al. 2010; Cao & Liang 2011; Cao et al. 2014). Therefore, we turn to the joint light-curve analysis (JLA) sample of 740 SNe Ia data (Betoule et al. 2014). For the JLA data, the observed distance modulus is given by

$$\mu_{\text{SN}} = m_B^* + \alpha \cdot x_1 - \beta \cdot c - M_B \quad (7)$$

where  $m_B^*$  is the rest frame  $B$ -band peak magnitude,  $x_1$  and  $c$  are the time stretching of light-curve and the supernova color at maximum brightness respectively, which are the three parameters of light curve fitted by SALT2 (Guy et al. 2007). Moreover, the parameter  $M_B$  describes the absolute  $B$ -band magnitude, whose

2014)

$$M_B = \begin{cases} M_B^1 & \text{for } M_{\text{stellar}} < 10^{10} M_{\odot}, \\ M_B^1 + \Delta_M & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Therefore, there are four nuisance parameters ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $M_B^1$  and  $\Delta_M$ ) to be fitted along with the  $Om(z)$  parameters.

On the other hand, the theoretical distance modulus  $\mu_{\text{th}}$  is expressed as  $\mu_{\text{th}} \equiv 5 \log(D_L(z)/\text{Mpc}) + 25$ , where  $D_L(z)$  is the luminosity distance. Thus, the  $\chi^2$  for the JLA sample is constructed as

$$\chi_{\text{JLA}}^2 = \Delta\mu^T \cdot \mathbf{Cov}^{-1} \cdot \Delta\mu, \quad (9)$$

where  $\Delta\mu = \mu_{\text{SN}}(\alpha, \beta, M_B^1, \Delta_M; z) - \mu_{\text{th}}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{Cov}$  is the total covariance matrix defined as

$$\mathbf{Cov} = \mathbf{D}_{\text{stat}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{stat}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{sys}}. \quad (10)$$

Here  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{stat}}$  corresponds to the diagonal part of the statistical uncertainty, while  $\mathbf{C}_{\text{stat}}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{\text{sys}}$  denote the statistical and systematic covariance matrices, respectively. The details of the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{Cov}$  including its construction can be found in [Betoule et al. \(2014\)](#). Considering the significance of Hubble constant in testing  $\Lambda$ CDM, in this section we will treat  $H_0$  as a free parameter in the  $\chi^2$ -minimization procedure. Thus there are four nuisance parameters plus tree parameters ( $H_0$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $n$ ) referring to the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  that we are interested in.


In order to break the strong degeneracy between parameters, we also perform a joint statistical analysis with use the JLA data and the Hubble parameter measurements to constrain the parametrization of  $Om(z)$ . The total  $\chi^2$  with the combined data set of JLA and  $H(z)$  can be given by

$$\chi_{\text{tot}}^2 = \chi_{\text{H}}^2 + \chi_{\text{JLA}}^2. \quad (11)$$

The best-fit parameters (with  $1\sigma$  uncertainties) for different data sets are presented in [Table 3](#). The marginalized 2D confidence contours of parameters ( $\alpha$  and  $n$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $H_0$ , and  $n$  and  $H_0$ ) are shown in [Fig. 6](#). It is apparent that the principal axes of confidence regions obtained with  $H(z)$  data and JLA data intersect, which implies that the joint analysis with  $H(z)$  and JLA could effectively break the strong degeneracy between parameters and thus provide a more stringent constraint on the three parameters. On the one hand, although the best-fit  $Om(z)$  slope parameter is slightly smaller than zero, which suggests that the current observational data tend to support a quintessence cosmology, the  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $n = 0$ ) is still included within  $1\sigma$  confidence region. On the other hand, the best-fit Hubble constant from the combination of  $H(z)$ +JLA ( $H_0 = 68.81_{-1.49}^{+1.50}$  km/s/Mpc) is consistent with the results derived by both *Planck* 2013 and WMAP9, which is significantly different from the recent local measurement by [Riess et al. \(2016\)](#).

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

An important issue in modern cosmology is whether the EoS of dark energy is a constant or varying with time. Based on an effective diagnostic  $Om(z)$  and its improved version  $Om(z_1, z_2)$  and  $Om h^2(z_1, z_2)$ , many recent works have performed a null test of  $\Lambda$ CDM determined by *Planck* observations, which implies that the  $\Lambda$ CDM model may not be the best scenario of our universe, or dark energy does not exist in the form



**Fig. 6** The 68.3% and 95.4% confidence regions in the  $H_0 - \alpha - n$  parameter space derived from JLA,  $H(z)$  and  $H(z)$ +JLA.

the validity of  $\Lambda$ CDM, which successfully clarify the impact of  $H_0$  and  $\Omega_{m0}$  on the final conclusion. With three different priors of the Hubble constant  $H_0$ , the latest  $H(z)$  data is used to set constraint on the  $Om(z)$  parameters of interest. Our results showed that the value of  $H_0$  plays a very important role in the consistency test of  $\Lambda$ CDM. Here we summarize our main conclusions in more detail:

- Adopting the Hubble constant prior  $H_0 = 67.3 \pm 1.2$  km/s/Mpc (Ade et al. 2014) to the  $H(z)$  data, we find the value of the slope parameter  $n$  smaller than zero at 68% confidence level, which implies that quintessence may be a good candidate of dark energy according to this  $Om(z)$  parametrization. The deviation from  $\Lambda$ CDM at  $2\sigma$  confidence region strongly indicates a tension between the current  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM, which confirms the conclusion obtained in the previous works.
- With the prior of  $H_0 = 70.0 \pm 2.2$  km/s/Mpc from WMAP9 results, the discrepancy between  $H(z)$  data and  $\Lambda$ CDM disappeared, i.e., the data analyzed in the framework of this  $Om(z)$  parametrization still support the cosmological constant scenario.
- In the third case with the local determination of  $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$  km/s/Mpc from Riess et al. (2016), a positive value for the slope parameter, which corresponds to a phantom cosmology is strongly favored by the current  $H(z)$  data. Moreover, at the 95.4% confidence level the range of matter density is restricted to  $\Omega_{m0} = (0.2118, 0.2504)$ , which is generally lower than the value given by most of other types of cosmological observations.

Moreover, the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  makes it possible to perform consistency test of the  $\Lambda$ CDM

data (Betoule et al. 2014) and its combination with the Hubble parameter measurements on the parametrization of  $Om(z)$ . Here we summarize our main conclusions in more detail:

- Although the best-fit  $Om(z)$  slope parameter is slightly smaller than zero, which suggests that the current observational data tend to support a quintessence cosmology, the  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $n = 0$ ) is still included within  $1\sigma$  confidence region.
- The best-fit Hubble constant from the combination of  $H(z)$ +JLA ( $H_0 = 68.81^{+1.50}_{-1.49}$  km/s/Mpc) is well consistent with the results derived both by *Planck* 2013 and WMAP9, which is significantly different from the recent local measurement by Riess et al. (2016).

As a final remark, the parametrization of  $Om(z)$  proposed in this paper has opened a robust window for testing the validity of the concordance  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmology and suggesting the other possible dynamical dark energy models. However, more precise model selection still remains a difficult task with the current accuracy of the data and the important role played by the Hubble constant. We hope that future data concerning strong gravitational lensing observations (Cao et al. 2011b; Cao & Zhu 2011; Cao et al. 2011a, 2012, 2015), high-redshift SN Ia from SDSS-II and SNLS collaborations (Betoule et al. 2014), ultra-compact structure in high-redshift radio quasars (Cao et al. 2017), and weak lensing surveys combined with CMB measurements (Ade et al. 2016) will lead to a substantial progress in this respect.

**Acknowledgements** This work was supported by National Key R&D Program of China No. 2017YFA0402600, the National Basic Science Program (Project 973) of China under (Grant No. 2014CB845800), the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants Nos. 11503001, 11690023, 11373014, and 11633001, the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Grant No. XDB23000000, the Interdiscipline Research Funds of Beijing Normal University, and the Opening Project of Key Laboratory of Computational Astrophysics, National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences. J.-Z. Qi was supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation under Grant No. 2017M620661. This research was also partly supported by the Poland-China Scientific & Technological Cooperation Committee Project No. 35-4. M.B. was supported by Foreign Talent Introducing Project and Special Fund Support of Foreign Knowledge Introducing Project in China.

## References

- Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., Arnaud, M., et al. 2016, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 594 12
- Ade, P., Aghanim, N., Armitage-Caplan, C., et al. 2014, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 571, A16 2, 5, 11
- Armendariz-Picon, C., Mukhanov, V., & Steinhardt, P. J. 2000, *Physical Review Letters*, 85, 4438 2
- Betoule, M., Kessler, R., Guy, J., et al. 2014, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 568, A22 9, 10, 12
- Blake, C., Brough, S., Colless, M., et al. 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 425, 405 6
- Cai, Y.-F., Saridakis, E. N., Setare, M. R., & Xia, J.-Q. 2010, *Phys. Rept.*, 493, 1 4
- Caldwell, R., & Linder, E. V. 2005, *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 95, 141301 2
- Cao, S., Biesiada, M., Gavazzi, R., Piorkowska, A., & Zhu, Z. 2015, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 806, 185

- Cao, S., Biesiada, M., Jackson, J., et al. 2017, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2017, 012 [12](#)
- Cao, S., Chen, Y., Zhang, J., & Ma, Y. 2014, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 54, 1492 [9](#)
- Cao, S., Covone, G., & Zhu, Z. 2012, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 755, 31 [12](#)
- Cao, S., & Liang, N. 2011, *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 22, 1350082 [9](#)
- Cao, S., Liang, N., & Zhu, Z. 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 416, 1099 [9](#)
- Cao, S., Pan, Y., Biesiada, M., Godlowski, W., & Zhu, Z. 2011a, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2012, 016 [12](#)
- Cao, S., & Zhu, Z. 2011, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 538 [12](#)
- Cao, S., & Zhu, Z.-H. 2014, *Physical Review D*, 90, 083006 [4](#)
- Cao, S., Zhu, Z., & Zhao, R. 2011b, *Physical Review D*, 84 [12](#)
- Chiba, T. 2003, *Physics Letters B*, 575, 1 [4](#)
- Chiba, T., Okabe, T., & Yamaguchi, M. 2000, *Physical Review D*, 62, 023511 [2](#)
- Chuang, C.-H., & Wang, Y. 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 426, 226 [6](#)
- Delubac, T., Rich, J., Bailey, S., et al. 2013, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 552, A96 [6](#)
- Delubac, T., Bautista, J. E., Rich, J., et al. 2015, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 574, A59 [6](#)
- Ding, X., Biesiada, M., Cao, S., Li, Z., & Zhu, Z.-H. 2015, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 803, L22 [2](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- Eisenstein, D. J., Zehavi, I., Hogg, D. W., et al. 2005, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 633, 560 [1](#)
- Font-Ribera, A., Kirkby, D., Miralda-Escudé, J., et al. 2014, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2014, 027 [6](#)
- Gaztanaga, E., Cabré, A., & Hui, L. 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 399, 1663 [6](#)
- Guy, J., Astier, P., Baumont, S., et al. 2007, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 466, 11 [9](#)
- Hinshaw, G., Larson, D., Komatsu, E., et al. 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 208, 19 [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- Jimenez, R., Verde, L., Treu, T., & Stern, D. 2003, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 593, 622 [6](#)
- Kahya, E. O., & Onemli, V. K. 2007, *Physical Review D*, 76, 043512 [2](#)
- Moresco, M. 2015, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, 450, L16 [6](#)
- Moresco, M., Verde, L., Pozzetti, L., Jimenez, R., & Cimatti, A. 2012, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2012, 053 [6](#)
- Moresco, M., Pozzetti, L., Cimatti, A., et al. 2016, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2016, 014 [6](#)
- Onemli, V., & Woodard, R. 2004, *Physical Review D*, 70, 107301 [2](#)
- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1999, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 517, 565 [1](#)
- Qi, J.-Z., Cao, S., Biesiada, M., Zheng, X., & Zhu, H. 2017, *Eur. Phys. J.*, C77, 502 [4](#)
- Qi, J.-Z., Zhang, M.-J., & Liu, W.-B. 2016, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00168 [2](#)
- Riess, A. G., Macri, L. M., Hoffmann, S. L., et al. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 826, 56 [3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#)

- Riess, A., et al. 1998, *Astron. J.*, 116, 1009 [1](#)
- Sahni, V., Shafieloo, A., & Starobinsky, A. A. 2008, *Physical Review D*, 78, 103502 [2](#), [4](#)
- Sahni, V., Shafieloo, A., & Starobinsky, A. A. 2014, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 793, L40 [2](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- Samushia, L., Reid, B. A., White, M., et al. 2013, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 429, 1514 [6](#)
- Seikel, M., Yahya, S., Maartens, R., & Clarkson, C. 2012, *Physical Review D*, 86, 083001 [2](#)
- Shafieloo, A., Sahni, V., & Starobinsky, A. A. 2012, *Physical Review D*, 86, 103527 [2](#)
- Simon, J., Verde, L., & Jimenez, R. 2005, *PRD*, 71, 123001 [6](#)
- Singh, P., Sami, M., & Dadhich, N. 2003, *Physical Review D*, 68, 023522 [2](#)
- Spergel, D., et al. 2003, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 148, 170 [1](#)
- Stern, D., Jimenez, R., Verde, L., Kamionkowski, M., & Stanford, S. A. 2010, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2010, 008 [6](#)
- Tegmark, M., Strauss, M., Blanton, M., et al. 2004, *Physical Review D*, 69, 103501 [1](#)
- Weinberg, S. 1989, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 61 [2](#)
- Wu, P., & Yu, H. 2011, *The European Physical Journal C*, 71, 1 [4](#)
- Xu, X., Cuesta, A. J., Padmanabhan, N., Eisenstein, D. J., & McBride, C. K. 2013, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, stt379 [6](#)
- Yahya, S., Seikel, M., Clarkson, C., Maartens, R., & Smith, M. 2014, *Physical Review D*, 89, 023503 [2](#)
- Zhang, C., Zhang, H., Yuan, S., et al. 2014, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 14, 1221 [6](#)
- Zhang, T.-J., Ma, C., & Lan, T. 2011, *Advances in Astronomy*, 2010 [5](#)
- Zheng, X., Ding, X., Biesiada, M., Cao, S., & Zhu, Z.-H. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 825, 17 [2](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- Zlatev, I., Wang, L.-M., & Steinhardt, P. J. 1999, *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 82, 896 [2](#)
- Zlatev, I., Wang, L., & Steinhardt, P. J. 1999, *Physical Review Letters*, 82, 896 [2](#)