

A Distance-Deviation Consistency and Model-Independent Method to Test the Cosmic Distance-Duality Relation

CHICHUN ZHOU,¹ JIAN HU ,¹ MAOCAI LI,¹ XI ZHANG,¹ AND GUANWEN FANG²

¹*School of Engineering, Dali University, Dali 671003, China*

²*School of Mathematics and Physics, Anqing Normal University, Anqing 246011, China*

(Accepted for publication in *The Astrophysical Journal*)

ABSTRACT

A distance-deviation consistency and model-independent method to test the cosmic distance duality relation (CDDR) is provided. The method is worth attention on two aspects: firstly, a distance-deviation consistency method is used to pair subsamples: instead of pairing subsamples with redshift deviation smaller than a value, say $|\Delta z| < 0.005$. The redshift deviation between subsamples decreases with the redshift to ensure the distance deviation stays the same. The method selects more subsamples at high redshift, up to $z = 2.16$, and provides 120 subsample pairs. Secondly, the model-independent method involves the latest data set of 1048 type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) and 205 strong gravitational lensing systems (SGLS), which are used to obtain the luminosity distances D_L and the ratio of angular diameter distance D_A respectively. With the model-independent method, parameters of the CDDR, the SNe Ia light-curve, and the SGLS are fitted simultaneously. The result shows that $\eta = 0.047^{+0.190}_{-0.151}$ and CDDR is validated at 1σ confidence level for the form $\frac{D_L}{D_A}(1+z)^{-2} = 1 + \eta z$.

Keywords: Cosmology, cosmic distance duality, SGL

1. INTRODUCTION

The cosmic distance duality relation (CDDR), also called Etherington's reciprocity relation (Etherington 1933), plays an important role in modern cosmology, especially in galaxy observations (Cunha, Marassi & Shevchuk 2007; Mantz et al. 2010), cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation observations (Komatsu et al. 2011), and the gravitational lensing (Ellis 2007). The CDDR reads

$$\frac{D_L}{D_A}(1+z)^{-2} = 1, \quad (1)$$

where D_L is the luminosity distance, D_A is the angular diameter distance, and z is the redshift. The CDDR is valid for all cosmological models based on Riemannian geometry. The basis of this relation is that the number of photons is conservative and photons travel along the null geodesic in a Riemannian space-time (Ellis 2007).

The validity of the CDDR is explored widely for the past decades, because any deviation of CDDR may trigger new physics. Uzan et al. (2004) investigates the possible deviation from the CDDR by analysing the measurements of SZE and X-ray emission data of galaxy clusters and reports that the parameter $\eta = 0.89^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$ and is at 1σ confidence level. Holanda, Lima & Ribeiro (2011) takes more parametrized

forms of η and found no departure from the CDDR. Nair et al. (2011); Basset & Kunz (2004); Holanda et al. (2010); Holanda, Lima & Ribeiro (2011); Cao & Liang (2011); Meng et al. (2012) used D_L directly from type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) to test the CDDR. Hu, & Wang (2018) and Melia (2018) used the D_L from SNe Ia with the $R_h = ct$ cosmology model to test the CDDR and compared the model with the Λ CDM model. Basset & Kunz (2004) found a 2σ violation of the CDDR using the luminosity distances D_L from SNe Ia and the angular diameter distance D_A from FRIIb radio galaxies. Räsänen et al. (2016) used CMB anisotropy to test the CDDR. The CDDR is also important in studying cosmic opacity (Lv & Xia 2016; Hu et al. 2017).

To test the CDDR, many D_L and D_A pairs at the same redshift z need to be provided simultaneously. In principle, the two distances should neither be correlated nor based on any cosmology models. That is, a model-independent method and a quality and quantity collection of sample pairs are important. Conventionally, in determining D_L , the method of Standard Candles (e.g. SNe Ia, GRB (Wang & Dai 2006; Wang et al. 2007; Wang & Dai 2008; Wang et al. 2009; Wang & Dai 2006; Wang et al. 2015; Tu & Wang 2018; Wang & Wang 2019)) plays a prominent part. However, the method of Standard Candles is model-dependent, i.e., a special cosmology model is used in calibrating the light-curve parameters. For example, Suzuki et al. (2012) used the cold dark matter (CDM), w CDM, and ow CDM models to fit the parameters of Union2.1 SNe Ia and to constrain the cosmology parameters. In determining D_A , the method of using

the Sunyaev–Zel’dovich effect (SZE) and X-ray observations (Cavaliere & Fusco-Fermiano 1978; Sunyaev & Zel’dovich 1972; Bonamente et al. 2006) is important in finding D_A from galaxy clusters. D_A can also be obtained from ultra-compact radio sources (Li & Lin 2018) and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAOs) (Wu et al. 2015).

There are model-independent methods. Liao et al. (2016) introduced a new method to test the CDDR based on strong gravitational lensing systems and SNe Ia. In their work, they constrain η , the parameter of the SNe Ia light-curve, and the parameter of the SGLS simultaneously. Räsänen et al. (2016) uses the temperature-redshift relation of CMB to test the CDDR, in their work, a flat FRW universe is assumed. Ruan et al. (2018) use a similar model-independent method with the SGLS, the SNe Ia, and the HII galaxy Hubble diagram to test the CDDR. To avoid the effect of the cosmic opacity, Liao (2019) uses the D_L from the gravitational wave signals and the ratio of D_A from the SGLS (for details see below) with a model-independent method, which is proposed in (Liao et al. 2016). These model independent methods show that the CDDR is valid in the given redshift range, say, $z < 1.0$.

In this paper, we provide a distance-deviation consistency and model-independent method to test the CDDR. The distance-deviation consistency method pairs subsamples with redshift deviation decrease with the redshift to ensure the distance deviation stays the same. It is because the distance grows nonlinearly with the redshift, the larger the redshift is, the smaller the redshift deviation is between two sources with the same distance deviation. The latest data set of SNe Ia with 1048 samples and strong gravitational lensing system (SGLS) with 205 samples are involved and the distance-deviation consistency method enables us to take full advantage of the data: the method selects more subsamples at high redshift, up to $z = 2.16$, and provide 121 subsample pairs. With the model-independent method, parameters of the CDDR, the SNe Ia light-curve, and the SGLS are fitted simultaneously.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec.2, we introduce the latest data set of the SNe Ia with 1048 samples and the SGLS with 205 samples. In Sec.3, we explain a distance-deviation consistency method to pair subsamples and describe the method of statistical analysis. The numerical results are shown. Conclusions and discussions are given in Sec.4.

2. DATA

In this section, we describe two sets of data suitable for testing the CDDR, one based on the redshift and the light-curve of the SNe Ia, from which we can obtain $D_L(z)$, the other base on the observational velocity dispersion of the lens galaxy, redshifts of the strong gravitational lensing system (SGLS), from which we can obtain the ratio of $D_A(z)$.

2.1. The Pantheon SNe Ia Sample

In this section, we introduce the contents of the Pantheon sample (Scolnic et al. 2018). The Pantheon sample consisting

of a total of 1048 SNe Ia in the range of $0.01 < z < 2.3$ is constructed by a subset include 279 SNe Ia ($0.03 < z < 0.68$) from the Pan-STARRS1 (PS1) Medium Deep Survey, the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS), the SNLS, the various low- z , and Hubble Space Telescope (HST) samples.

On one hand, the luminosity distances $D_L(z)$ can be determined accurately by multiple light-curve fitters (e.g., (Jha et al. 2007; Guy et al. 2010; Burns et al. 2011; Mandel et al. 2011)). From the phenomenological point of view, the distance modulus, μ , of an SNe Ia can be extracted from its light curve. In a modified version of the Tripp formula (Tripp et al. 1998), the SALT2 light-curve fit parameters are transformed into distances:

$$\mu = m_B - M + \alpha x_1 - \beta c + \Delta_M + \Delta_B, \quad (2)$$

where m_B is the apparent magnitude, M is the absolute B-band magnitude of a fiducial SNe Ia with $x_1 = 0$ and $c = 0$, Δ_M and Δ_B are distance corrections based on the mass of the host galaxy of the SNe Ia and predicted biases from simulations respectively. α and β are light-curve parameters of relations between the luminosity and the stretch and between the luminosity and the color respectively. Moreover, Δ_M in the equation (2) can be written in the form Scolnic et al. (2018)

$$\Delta_M = \gamma [1 + e^{-(m - m_{step})/\tau}]^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

where γ , m_{step} , and τ are coefficients to be determined (Scolnic et al. 2018). On the other hand, one assumes that the SNe Ia with identical color, shape, and galactic environment have on average the same intrinsic luminosity for all redshifts (Betoule et al. 2014). According to the definition of the distance modulus, it can be written as

$$\mu = 5 \log\left(\frac{D_L}{\text{Mpc}}\right) + 25. \quad (4)$$

By using equations (2) and (4), we can obtain the luminosity distances $D_L(z)$ for the Pantheon SNe Ia Sample.

2.2. The strong gravitational lensing system Sample

For the new SGLS sample, we used from Amante et al. (2019), which contains 205 SGLS. This sample constituted from some survey projects, (e.g. the SLACS, the CASTLES survey, the BELLS, the LSD ...). In an SGLS, the light is bent by massive bodies (e.g., galaxy, galaxy cluster) which is predicted by the general theory of relativity. The SGLS is a powerful astrophysical tool to explore the universe and galaxy and has been rapidly developed in recent years, especially like dark energy (Biesiada 2006; Biesiada et al. 2010; Cao et al. 2012; Cao et al. 2015; Jullo et al. 2010; Magaña et al. 2015, 2018), the CDDR (Liao et al. 2016; Liao 2019), the cosmic acceleration (Tu et al. 2019), calibrating the standard candles (Wen et al. 2019), and cosmological models’ comparison (Melia et al. 2015; Leaf & Melia 2018; Tu et al. 2019). In an SGLS, a single galaxy acting as the lens, the Einstein radius depends on three parameters: depends on the angular distance to the source and between the lens and the

source, and the mass distribution within the lensing galaxy. A singular isothermal sphere (SIS) model (Ratnatunga et al 1999) is used to describe the lens galaxy's mass distribution. The ratio of the angular diameter distances between lens and source and between observer and source can be obtained from a special physical model (e.g. SIS model). Because these distances depend on the cosmological metric, the ratio can be used to constrain cosmological parameters.

In an SIS model of the SGLS, the distance ratio $R^A(z_l, z_s)$ (D_l^A/D_s^A) is related to observables in the following way (Biesiada et al. 2010),

$$R^A(z_l, z_s) = \frac{c^2 \theta_E}{4\pi \sigma_{SIS}^2}, \quad (5)$$

where c is the speed of light, θ_E is the Einstein radius, and σ_{SIS} is the velocity dispersion of the stellar in the periphery of the lens galaxy due to the lens mass distribution in the SIS model. In general, σ_{SIS} not equals to the observed stellar velocity dispersion σ_0 (White & Davis 1996). To express the difference, researchers use a phenomenological free parameter f_e defined by the relation $\sigma_{SIS} = f_e \sigma_0$ (Kochanek 1992; Ofek et al 2003; Cao et al. 2012), where $(0.8)^{1/2} < f_e < (1.2)^{1/2}$. In this case, the systematic error is caused by σ_0 as σ_{SIS} , the deviation of the SIS model, the effects of secondary lenses (nearby galaxies), the line of sight contamination (Ofek et al 2003), etc. The uncertainty of equation (5) can be written by (Liao et al. 2016)

$$\sigma_{R^A}(z_l, z_s) = R^A(z_l, z_s) \sqrt{(4\delta_{\sigma_{sis}})^2 + (\delta_{\theta_E})^2}. \quad (6)$$

In equation(6), $\delta_{\sigma_{sis}}$ and δ_{θ_E} are the fractional uncertainty of the σ_{sis} and θ_E , respectively. To test the CDDR, the left term of equation (ref5), $R^A(z_l, z_s)$, should be expressed as the ratio of luminosity distance, D_{ls}^A/D_s^A . We transform $R^A(z_l, z_s)$ into the ratio of Comoving distance(D_C) or dimensionless distance $H_0 D_C/c$. In a flat space, the dimensionless distance satisfies

$$d(z_l, z_s) = d(z_s) - d(z_l). \quad (7)$$

By using the equation,

$$D_A(z) = \frac{D_C(z)}{1+z} = \frac{H_0 d(z)}{c(1+z)}, \quad (8)$$

$R^A(z_l, z_s)$ can be written as

$$R^A(z_l, z_s) = 1 - \frac{(1+z_l)D_A(z_l)}{(1+z_s)D_A(z_s)}. \quad (9)$$

In a non-flat space, the expression of $R^A(z_l, z_s)$ is more complicated, one can refer to Räsänen et al. (2015). Fortunately, most cosmological tests today support a flat cosmic (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016), in this work, we test the CDD relation in the case where we assume that space-time is flat.

To test the CDDR, equation (1) is rewritten by the parametrization of the deviation:

$$\frac{D_L}{D_A}(1+z)^{-2} = 1 + \eta z. \quad (10)$$

Combining equations (9) and (10), $R^A(z_l, z_s)$ can be written as

$$R_0^A(z_l, z_s) = 1 - \frac{(1+\eta z_s)(1+z_s)d_L(z_l)}{(1+\eta z_l)(1+z_l)d_L(z_s)}. \quad (11)$$

By using equation (4), the part $\frac{d_L(z_l)}{d_L(z_s)}$ of equation (11) can be rewritten as

$$\lg\left[\frac{d_L(z_l)}{d_L(z_s)}\right] = 0.2\{m_B(z_l) - m_B(z_s) + \alpha[x(z_l) - x(z_s)] - \beta[c(z_l) - c(z_s)] + \Delta_M(z_l) - \Delta_M(z_s)\}, \quad (12)$$

where, the absolute magnitude of SNe Ia subsample is offset, z_l is the redshift of the lens, and z_s is the redshift of the sources.

3. METHOD AND RESULTS

In this section, we introduce a distance-deviation consistency method of data selection and show the result.

3.1. Method of data selection: a distance-deviation consistency method

To test the CDDR, D_L and D_A at the same redshift z need to be provided simultaneously. However, redshifts of subsamples from the SGLS and the SNe Ia are different. To take full advantage of the data, one needs to pair the subsamples efficiently. In this section, we provide a distance-deviation consistency method to pair subsamples, which outperforms the conventional method.

The redshift-difference of subsample-pairs in this work is not fixed, and it decreases with the redshifts to ensure the distance deviation of the sources stays the same. The relation between Δz and coordinate distance with a cosmology model reads

$$\Delta d_c^{model}(z) = d_c^{model}(z + \Delta z^{model}) - d_c^{model}(z), \quad (13)$$

where $R_h = ct$ and flat Λ CDM model with $\Omega_m = 0.31$ (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016) are used. By setting $\Delta d_c/d_c$ equals 5% and combining equation(13), $\Delta z(z)$ can be calculated:

$$\Delta z(z) = \min\{\Delta z^{\Lambda CDM}(z), \Delta z^{R_h=ct}(z)\}, \quad (14)$$

where the distance formulas of the two cosmology model, Λ CDM and $R_h = ct$ are used. The $R_h = ct$ cosmological model was proposed in Melia (2007). In the $R_h = ct$ universe, the luminosity distance D_L can be written by:

$$D_L^{R_h=ct}(z) = \frac{c}{H_0}(1+z) \ln(1+z) \quad (15)$$

This model is a Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) cosmological model, which is obeying the cosmological principle and Weyl’s postulate (Melia 2007; Melia & Shevchuk 2012). In $R_h = ct$ universe that space expands at a constant rate, rather than an accelerating rate. Theoretically, there are some controversies with this model, which focus on the zero active mass condition $\rho + 3p = 0$ (for more details see Melia (2016); Kim, Lasenbyet & Hobson (2016); Melia (2017)). In terms of the fitting of observational data, the model performs relatively well. The originator of this model himself and his collaborators have done extensive work comparing it with the standard model using many different types of observations, and they have found that the $R_h = ct$ model is better than the Standard Model (e.g. Melia (2013); Melia & Manoj (2018); Fatuzzo & Melia (2017b); Melia (2014); Wei et al. (2015); Melia (2019)). Additional work by others also illustrates this point (Yu & Wang 2014; Yuan & Wang 2015). There is also a lot of work against this model (e.g. Tutusaus et al. (2016); Shafer (2015)) Thus, despite the theoretical controversy, this model has gained some support for the data, and we can use this model jointly with the standard model to select the data.

For a given SGLS subsample, the redshift-dimensionless distance relation, equation (14), is used to acquire a suitable redshift deviation interval. Then, the subsamples of the SNe Ia with redshifts within the interval are selected as the candidate. Finally, the subsample with the smallest redshift-deviation is selected.

Our method outperforms the conventional method in two aspects: (1) information of subsamples at high-redshifts is conserved. To pair subsamples with a slight difference of redshift is a simple and commonly used method. For example, $\Delta z = 0.005$ (Holanda et al. 2010, 2012; Holanda, Busti, & Alcaniz 2016; Li et al 2011; Nair et al. 2011), $\Delta z = 0.006$ (Goncalves, Holanda & Alcaniz 2012), and $\Delta z = 0.003$ (Liao 2019). Gaussian Process (GP) reconstruction is also a usable method (Zhang 2014; Ruan et al. 2018). The linear interpolation method is also taken by some researchers (Liang et al. 2013; Hu, & Wang 2018). These methods reduce the systematic error to an extent but do not consider the distance-deviation consistency. The relation between the distance and the redshift is non-linear: the same redshift deviation at the higher redshift has a smaller distance deviation. For example, some researchers set the $\Delta z = 0.005$, the uncertainty of dimensionless distance is 5% at $z \sim 0.1$, the minimum redshift of the subsample we select, but small than 1% at $z \sim 1$ for selecting data with a general cosmology model, so the selecting uncertainty is not the consistency of distance-deviation. The selecting uncertainty of their methods are all ignoring, and if they were taking them into account in their fitting, they had to introduce a cosmological model so that their methods were no longer model-independent. In our approach, although two cosmological models are introduced, they are used to jointly pick the data, breaking the dependence on a single cosmological model when picking the data, and are not introduced into the χ^2 function, in other words, the final parameter fit results are independent of the cosmological model. Cao et al. (2017) used a similar method for se-




Figure 1. The relation between the $\Delta d/d$ and z , the red line and the blue line indicate the relationship between the relative error of d and the redshift in $R_h = ct$ model and Λ CDM model, respectively. The black line indicates the scheme we used.




Figure 2. The relation between the Δz and z

lecting the data with a Λ CDM model to fitting the parameters of the ultra-compact radio quasars. At high redshift, in general, subsamples are sparse and matching pairs of subsamples is difficult if a fixed Δz is used. The distance deviation consistency method selects more subsamples at high-redshifts.

(2) More subsample pairs are selected. For example, in the work of Liao et al. (2016), they gain only 60 pairs of samples to testing the CDDR. According to figure (1), at $z=0.11$, the most previously used $\Delta z = 0.005$ and the curve of $\Delta d/d$ in this method are intersecting. So, the $\Delta d/d = 5\%$ is the maximum allowable uncertainty of dimensionless distance. In other words, if the error of selecting exceeds 5%, the statistical error of our results must be higher than that of previous work. If the error is significantly lower than 5%, the number of data pairs we choose will not be significantly improved. With the method of fixed $\Delta d/d = 5\%$, the number of the pairs can reach 68. The data utilization increases by 13.3%. In this work, we have obtained 120 pairs of samples that redshift from 0.11 to 2.16.

A comparison between our method with a fixed $\Delta d/d$ and the conventional method with a fixed Δz are shown in figures (1) and (2). In figure (1), the deviation, $\Delta d/d$, falls rapidly with the increase of redshift with Δz fixed. The main advantage of a fixed $\Delta d/d$ is shown in figure (2). To conclude, on the one hand, our method maintains more information about subsamples at high-redshifts. On the other hand, our method selects more subsample-pairs thus reduces the systematic error.

3.2. Method of statistical analysis

To determine the parameters, we minimize χ^2 function. By using equations (5) and (11), χ^2 function can be written as

$$\chi^2 = \sum_1^{120} \left(\frac{(R^A(z_l, z_s) - R_0^A(z_l, z_s))^2}{\sigma_{R^A(z_l, z_s)}^2 + \sigma_{R_0^A(z_l, z_s)}^2 + \sigma_{sel}^2} \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\sigma_{R^A(z_l, z_s)}$ is the uncertainty of the SGLS with SIS model, $\sigma_{R_0^A(z_l, z_s)}$ is the error caused by the uncertainty of the distance modulus of SNe Ia, which is related to the uncertainty of observed data (e.g. m_B), and σ_{sel} is the uncertainty of data selection, which is related to artificial selection. By using equation(11), the uncertainty of data selection can be written as

$$\sigma_{sel} = \frac{(1 + \eta z_s)(1 + z_s)d_L(z_l)}{(1 + \eta z_l)(1 + z_l)d_L(z_s)} * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta d_l}{d_l}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta d_s}{d_s}\right)^2}, \quad (17)$$

where $\frac{\Delta d_l}{d_l} = \frac{\Delta d_s}{d_s} = \frac{\Delta d}{d} = 5\%$.

We use the Markov chainMonte Carlo (MCMC) method to constrain the parameters in equation(17). EMCEE (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013) python package is used. In order to execute the MCMC process, we need to provide the prior values first. In Scolnic et al. (2018), the best value and the 1σ confidence level of the parameters are shown. But in our work, we take an SIS model of SGLS to calibrating these parameters, which will different. So, we take the prior interval that completely covering the value range of the value from Scolnic et al. (2018). The prior probability for parameters $P(\alpha, \beta, f_e, \eta, \gamma, m_{step}, \tau)$ is the product of prior probability of each parameter. The prior probability is assumed to be uniform distributions: $P(\alpha) = U[-0.2, 0.2]$, $P(\beta) = U[2, 6]$, $P(f_e) = U[0.5, 1.5]$, $P(\eta) = U[-0.5, 1.5]$, $P(\gamma) = U[0, 0.3]$, $P(m_{step}) = U[5, 15]$, $P(\tau) = U[0.001, 1]$. In Pantheon samples, the errors include both statistic and systematic deviation. The systematic error relatives to all data point and appears as a huge covariance matrix. In this work, part of SNe Ia are selected, only the statistic error is considered.

3.3. Results

The result is shown in figure (3) and table (1). Triangle contours are plotted by using the open-source python package ‘‘Getdist’’. One can see from figure (3) that the best-fitted center value is $\eta = 0.047_{-0.151}^{+0.190}$, which is at 1σ confidence level. The result indicates that the CDDR is in agreement with the observations and there are no signs of violation in light of SN Ia and SL data.

4. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The validation of the CDDR is a crucial topic in cosmology. Any violation of the CDDR may generate a new theory of physics. In recent years, to compare the D_L derived from SNe Ia and the D_A measured using galaxy clusters is the common method to test the CDDR. To use this method, a specific cosmology model with some parameters (e.g. the **Table 1**. Constraints on the coefficients of light-curve parameters and η at the 1σ confidence levels.

parameters	value
α	$0.001_{-0.061}^{+0.061}$
β	$5.283_{-0.464}^{+0.417}$
f_e	$1.046_{-0.019}^{+0.020}$
η	$0.047_{-0.151}^{+0.190}$
γ	$0.141_{-0.070}^{+0.080}$
m_{step}	$10.055_{-0.148}^{+0.177}$
τ	$0.134_{-0.073}^{+0.048}$
χ^2	117.430
$\chi^2/d.o.f$	117.430/113

matter density parameter Ω_m , the cosmic equation of state, and the Hubble constant) must be assumed. Such results are hardly convincing.

In testing the CDDR, using a model-independent method is necessary. Moreover, to obtain a data sample contains a large number of D_L and D_A pairs are also important. However, the number of useful subsample pairs is limited by the observed data, and pair subsamples with redshift-deviation smaller than a constant will lose the subsamples at high redshift which leads to systematic errors.

In this paper, we provide a distance-deviation consistency and a model-independent method to test the CDDR. By applying the distance-deviation consistency method on the latest data set of SNe Ia with 1048 samples and strong gravitational lensing system (SGLS) with 205 samples, we obtain the collection of subsample pairs not only contains more subsamples but also maintains the information of subsamples at high redshift, up to $z = 2.16$. By applying a model-independent method: the SGLS model is used to replace the cosmology model in SNe Ia light-curve fitting, the result shows that $\eta = 0.047_{-0.151}^{+0.190}$ and CDDR is validated at 1σ confidence level for the form $\frac{D_L}{D_A}(1+z)^{-2} = 1 + \eta z$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the anonymous referee for constructive comments. This work is supported by the Research Foundation for Advanced Talents(NO KY1916102940, KY1916102740), Dali university and the Special Foundation for Basic Research Plan (grants KY2013113740 and KY2013114440)

REFERENCES




Figure 3. The 2D regions and 1D marginalized distributions with 1σ and 2σ contours for the parameters α , β , f_e , γ , m_{step} , τ and η using Pantheon sample and SGLS sample.

Betoule, M., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 568, A22

Biesiada, M., 2006, *PRD*, 73, 023006

Biesiada, M., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 406, 1055

Bonamente, M., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 647, 25

Burns, C. R., Stritzinger, M., Phillips, M. M., et al. 2011, *AJ*, 141, 19

Cao, S., et al., 2012, *JCAP*, 03, 016

Cao, S., Biesiada, M., Gavazzi, R., Piorkowska, A., Zhu, Z. U., 2015, *ApJ*, 806, 185

Cao, S., et al. 2017, *JCAP*, 02, 012

Cao, S., Liang, N., 2011, *RAA*, 11, 10

Cavaliere, A., Fusco-Fermiano, R., 1978, *A&A.*, 667, 70

Cunha, J. V., Marassi, L., Lima, J. A. S., 2007, *MNRAS*, 379, L1

Ellis, G. F. R., 2007, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit*, 39, 1047

Etherington, I. M. H., 1933, *Philos. Mag*, 15, 761

Fatuzzo, M., & Melia F. 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 2

Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., Goodman, J., 2013, *PASP*, 125, 306

Goncalves, R. S., Holanda, R. F. L., Alcaniz, J. S., 2012, *MNRAS*, 420, L43

Guy, J., Sullivan, M., Conley, A., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 523, A7

Holanda, R. F. L., Busti, V. C., Alcaniz, J. S., 2016, *JCAP*, 02, 054

Holanda, R. F. L., Lima, J. A. S., Ribeiro, M. B., 2010, *ApJL*, 722, L233

Holanda, R. F. L., Lima, J. A. S., Ribeiro, M. B., 2011, *A&A*, 528, L14

Holanda, R. F. L., Lima, J. A. S., Ribeiro, M. B., 2012, *A&A*, 538, A131

Hu, J., Yu, H., Wang, F. Y., 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 1

Hu, J., Wang, F. Y., 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, 5064

Jha, S., Riess, A. G., Kirshner, R. P., 2007, *ApJ*, 659, 122

Jullo, E., Natarajan, P., Kneib, J.-P., et al. 2010, *Sci*, 329, 924

Kim, D. Y., Lasenby, A. N., Hobson, M. P., 2016, *MNRAS*, 460, L119

Kochanek, C. S., 1992, *ApJ*, 384, 1

Komatsu, E., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 192, 2

- Leaf, K., Melia, F., 2018, MNRAS, 478, 5104
- Li, Xin, & Lin, H. N., 2018, MNRAS, 474, 313
- Li, Z. X., Wu, P. X., Yu, H. W. 2011, ApJL, 729, L14
- Liang, N., Li, Z. X., Wu, P. X., Cao, S., Liao, K., Zhu, Z. H. 2013, MNRAS, 436, 1017
- Liao, K., et al. 2016, ApJ, 822, 2
- Liao, K. 2019, arXiv:1906.09588
- Lv, M. Z., Xia J. Q. 2016, PDU, 13, 139
- Magaña, J. Motta, V., Cárdenas, V. H., Verdugo, T., Jullo E. 2015, ApJ, 813, 69
- Magaña, J., et al. 2018, ApJ, 865, 122
- Mandel, K. S., Narayan, G., & Kirshner, R. P. 2011, ApJ, 731, 120
- Mantz, A. et al. 2010, MNRAS, 406, 1759
- Melia, F. 2007, MNRAS, 382, 1917
- Melia, F., Shevchuk, A. S. H. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 2579
- Melia, F. 2013, ApJ, 764, 6
- Melia, F. 2014, ApJ, 149, 72
- Melia, F., Wei, J.J., Wu, X. F. 2015, ApJ, 149, 2
- Melia, F. 2016a, FP, 11, 119801
- Melia, F. 2017, FP, 12, 129802
- Melia, F. 2018, MNRAS, 481, 4855
- Melia, F., & Yennapureddy, Manoj K, 2018, MNRAS, 480, 2
- Melia, F. 2019, MNRAS, 489, 517
- Meng, X. L., Zhang, T. J., Zhan, H., Wang, X. 2012, ApJ, 745, 98
- Nair, R., Jhingan, S., Jain D. 2011, JCAP, 05, 023
- Ofek, E. O., Rix, H.-W., & Maoz, D. 2003, MNRAS, 343, 639
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R. et al. 2016, A&A, 594, A13
- Räsänen, S., Bolejko, K., & Finoguenov, A. 2015, PRL, 115, 101301
- Räsänen, S., Valiviita J., Kosonen, V. 2016, JCAP, 04, 050
- Ratnatunga, K., U., et al. 1999, AJ, 117, 2010
- Ringermacher, H. I., Mead, L. R. 2016, arXiv:1611.00999
- Ruan, C. Z., Melia, F., Zhang, T. J. 2018, ApJ, 866, 31
- Scolnic, et al. 2018, ApJ, 859, 101
- Shafer, D. L. 2015, PRD, 91, 103516
- Sunyaev, R. A., Zel'dovich Y. B. 1972, Comments Astrophys. Space Phys., 4, 173
- Suzuki, N., et al. 2012, ApJ, 746, 58
- Tripp, R. 1998, A&A, 331, 815
- Tu, Z. L., Wang, F. Y. 2018, ApJ, 869, 2
- Tu, Z. L., Hu J., Wang, F. Y. 2019, MNRAS, 484, 4337
- Tutusaus, I., et al. 2016, PRD, 94, 103511
- Uzan, J. P., Aghanim, N., Mellier, Y. 2004, PRD, 70, 083533
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 371
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G., Zhu, Z. H. 2007, ApJ, 667, 1
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 371
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G., Qi, S. 2009, A&A, 507, 1
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G. 2009, MNRAS, 400, 1
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G., Liang, E. W. 2015, New Astronomy Reviews, 67, 1
- Wang, Y. Y., Wang F. Y. 2019, ApJ, 873, 1
- Wei, J. J., Wu, X. F., Melia, F. 2015, MNRAS, 463, 1114
- Wen, X. D., Liao, K., 2019, arXiv:1907.02693
- White, R. E., Davis, D. S. 1996, BAAS, 28, 1323
- Wu, P., Li, Z., Liu, X., & Yu, H. 2015, PRD, 92, 023520
- Yu, H., Wang, F. Y. 2014, EPJC, 74, 3090
- Yuan, C. C., Wang, F. Y. 2015, MNRAS, 452, 2423
- Zhang, Y. 2019, arXiv:1408.3897