Constraints on quintessence scalar field models using cosmological observations

Weiqiang Yang,^{1,*} M. Shahalam,^{2,†} Barun Pal,^{3,‡} Supriya Pan,^{4,§} and Anzhong Wang^{2,5,¶}

¹Department of Physics, Liaoning Normal University, Dalian, 116029, P. R. China

²Institute for Theoretical Physics & Cosmology, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310023, P. R. China

³Department of Mathematics, Netaji Nagar College for Women, Kolkata 700092, West Bengal, India

⁴Department of Mathematics, Presidency University, 86/1 College Street, Kolkata 700073, India

⁵GCAP-CASPER, Department of Physics, Baylor University, Waco, TX, 76798-7316, USA

We consider a varieties of quintessence scalar field models in a homogeneous and isotropic geometry of the universe with zero spatial curvature aiming to provide stringent constraints using a series of cosmological data sets, namely, the cosmic microwave background observations (CMB), baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), joint light curve analysis (JLA) from supernovae type Ia, redshift space distortions (RSD), and the cosmic chronometers (CC). From the qualitative evolution of the models, we find all of them are able to execute a fine transition from the past decelerating phase to the presently accelerating expansion where in addition, the equation of state of the scalar field (also the effective equation of state) might be close to that of the ACDM cosmology depending on its free parameters. From the observational analyses, we find that the scalar field parameters are unconstrained irrespective of all the observational datasets. In fact, we find that the quintessence scalar field models are pretty much determined by the CMB observations since any of the external datasets such as BAO, JLA, RSD, CC does not add any constraining power to CMB. Additionally, we observe a strong negative correlation between the parameters H_0 (present value of the Hubble parameter), Ω_{m0} (density parameter for the matter sector, i.e., cold dark matter plus baryons) exists, while no correlation between H_0 , and σ_8 (amplitude of the matter fluctuation) are not correlated. We also comment that the present models are unable to reconcile the tension on H_0 . Finally, we conclude our work with the Bayesian analyses which report that the non-interacting Λ CDM model is preferred over all the quintessence scalar field models.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Es.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the detection of accelerating universe by measuring the luminosity distances of type Ia Supernovae [1, 2] - anew era of modern cosmology has began. Subsequent investigations by different groups [3, 4] conveyed that current acceleration of our universe could be an effect of some hypothetical fluid with large negative pressure known as dark energy [5], which is completely unknown by its character and origin. Usually there are two distinct approaches to describe such accelerating expansion – one route is through the modifications of the matter sector in the context of Einstein gravity [5, 6, 7], and the other way around is to modify the Einstein's gravitational theories [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] which leads to some extra geometrical terms (alternatively known as geometrical dark energy fluids in order to make a difference between the accelerating effects coming from the matter modifications or geometry modifications). Apart from above two approaches there is another alternative to describe this accelerating universe – the gravitational particle production mechanism, see [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26] and references therein. However, overall, the actual dynamics of these mysterious components are unknown, but thanks to the recent observational evidences, we have an estimate of such dark fluids. According to the observational predictions, such dark energy fluids contribute nearly 68% of the total energy density of our universe [4]. Additionally, another bulk content of the matter sector, about 28% of the total energy density of our universe, is occupied by some non-luminous dark matter component. Thus, overall, almost 96% of the total energy content of our universe has been filled up by these dark fluids, namely, dark energy and dark matter and probing their nature, evolution and the origin is one of the most intriguing facts of modern cosmology.

In the present work we confine ourselves to Einstein gravity and thus incorporate dark energy fluid through matter

^{*}Electronic address: d11102004@163.com

[†]Electronic address: shahalam@zjut.edu.cn

 $^{^{\}ddagger} Electronic address: terminatorbarun@gmail.com$

[§]Electronic address: supriya.maths@presiuniv.ac.in

[¶]Electronic address: Anzhong[•]Wang@baylor.edu

sector in the field equations. The dark energy fluids may appear in many forms – from the simplest cosmological constant to more complicated ones. Although the cosmological constant characterized by the constant equation of state $w_{\Lambda} = -1$, is consistent with present observations, however, a time varying dark energy equation of state has been found to be efficient in relieving the tensions between several cosmological parameters, see [27]. The release of tensions between cosmological parameters in presence of a constant dark energy equation of state is not usually possible until some extra degrees of freedom in terms of the non-gravitational interaction, for instance, is allowed into the picture. Moreover, the problem related to the magnitude of the cosmological constant (see [28, 29]) further motivated to consider some dark energy fluids evolving with cosmic time.

The scalar field models, arising in the context of particle physics theory, is a very natural choice for the dynamical dark energy models. Usually there is a division in the scalar field models, one is the canonical scalar field models and the other one is the non-canonical scalar field models. We consider a specific type of canonical scalar field model, namely the quintessence which is a single minimally coupled scalar field with a canonical kinetic term having positive sign. In case of phantom scalar field models, which is also a canonical scalar field model, the sign of its kinetic term is negative contrary to the quintessence scalar field model. We note that the canonical scalar field models are more informative compared to the non-canonical scalar field models. The physics of canonical scalar field models, which is mostly contained in the potential, $V(\phi(t))$ where $\phi(t)$ is the underlying field, have gained a considerable interest in the cosmological community due to explaining various stages of the universe evolution, see [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57] (also see [58, 59, 60, 61, 62]). The selection of quintessence scalar field models should not be much arbitrary, according to recently introduced swampland [63, 64] and refined swampland [65] criteria. In particular, these criteria imply that the quintessence potential should not be steeper than order unity in Planck units [66]. The swapland criteria has recently got massive attention in the cosmological community, see for an incomplete list [66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74]. However, apart from the canonical scalar field models, non-canonical scalar field models have also been investigated widely in the literature. A class of non-canonical scalar field models include the k-essence, tachyon, ghost condensates and the dilatonic scalar field models, see [5, 6] for more details on them. However, in the present work we shall consider some specific potentials for quintessence scalar field models aiming to impose stringent cosmological constraints using the latest cosmological sources, namely, the cosmic microwave background temperature and polarization data [75, 76], baryon acoustic oscillations distance measurements [77, 78, 79], redshift space distortion [80], Supernovae Type Ia [81], and finally the Hubble parameter measurements from the cosmic chronometers [82]. The underlying geometry has been chosen to be the spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric where the matter fields of the universe is minimally coupled to the gravity – described by the usual Einstein gravity.

The work has been organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the evolution equations for any quintessence scalar field model at the level of background and perturbations in a spatially flat FLRW universe. The section 3 introduces a class of quintessence models and their qualitative behavior that we wish to study in this work. In section 4, we introduce the observational data, the statistical technique and the results of the models. In particular, the subsection 4.1 contains the observational constraints on the models; the subsection 4.2 includes a geometrical probe, namely, the Om diagnostic; the subsection 4.3 provides with the Bayesian model comparison and in subsection 4.4 we present an overall comparison between all the quintessence scalar field models. Finally, with section 5 we close the present work summarizing the main findings.

2. BASIC FRAMEWORK

As usual we consider a homogeneous and isotropic space-time of the universe characterized by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker line element

$$ds^{2} = -dt^{2} + a^{2}(t) \left[\frac{dr^{2}}{1 - Kr^{2}} + r^{2} \left(d\theta^{2} + \sin^{2} \theta \ d\phi^{2} \right) \right],$$
(1)

where a(t) is the expansion scale factor of the universe and K is the curvature scalar which for 0, +1, -1, respectively represent the spatially flat, closed and open universe. In agreement with the observational evidences [4] we consider the spatial flatness of this universe, that means, we shall consider K = 0 throughout the analysis of the present work. Let us now consider the action in such a universe where the matter fields minimally coupled to gravity as follows

$$\mathcal{A} = \int \sqrt{-g} d^4 x \left[\frac{R}{2\kappa} - g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - 2V(\phi) \right] + S_m + S_r \tag{2}$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G$ is the Einstein's gravitational constant (G is the Newton's gravitational constant); S_m , S_r are respectively the actions representing the matter and radiation sectors; $V(\phi)$ is the potential of the scalar field ϕ . The corresponding field equations for flat FLRW universe are given by

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho_{\text{eff}},\tag{3}$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -8\pi G \, p_{\rm eff},\tag{4}$$

where an overhead dot represents the cosmic time differentiation; $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$, is the Hubble parameter; $\rho_{\text{eff}} = \rho_r + \rho_b + \rho_c + \rho_{\phi}$ is the total energy density of the universe. Here, ρ_i $(i = r, b, c, \phi)$ represents the energy density of the *i*-th fluid where the symbol r, b, c, ϕ corresponds to the radiation, baryons, cold dark matter and the scalar field sector, respectively. ¹ Similarly, one can define the total pressure by adding the pressure of each fluid, i.e., $p_{\text{eff}} = p_r + p_b + p_c + p_{\phi}$ in which p_i stands for the pressure term for the *i*-th fluid $(i = r, b, c, \phi)$. For the flat FLRW universe, the energy density and the pressure of the scalar field model, respectively are, $\rho_{\phi} = \dot{\phi}^2/2 + V(\phi)$, $p_{\phi} = \dot{\phi}^2/2 - V(\phi)$. Additionally, we assume that each fluid follows the barotropic equation of state $p_i = w_i \rho_i$, $i = r, b, c, \phi$ (w_i being the barotropic index for the *i*-th fluid) where $w_r = 1/3$, $w_b = 0$, $w_c = 0$, and $w_{\phi} = p_{\phi}/\rho_{\phi} = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2 - 2V(\phi)}{\dot{\phi}^2 + 2V(\phi)}$. Since there is no such interaction between any two fluids, hence, each fluid satisfies their own conservation equation, i.e., $\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(p_i + \rho_i) = 0$. Following this conservation equation, one can see the evolution of the component fluids as follows: $\rho_r \propto a^{-4}$, $\rho_b \propto a^{-3}$, $\rho_c \propto a^{-3}$.

$$\ddot{\phi} = -3H\dot{\phi} - \frac{dV}{d\phi} \tag{5}$$

which can also be obtained from equations (3) and (4). However, one can clearly understand that the dynamics of the scalar field can only be determined once the potential $V(\phi)$ is prescribed and there is no such specific rule to select the potential. In this work, we shall consider a few phenomenological forms for the potential and render stringent constraints from the latest observational data coming from different cosmological sources.

Let us define some important cosmological parameters exhibiting the qualitative evolution of the scalar field model. The effective equation of state for the total fluid characterized by ρ_{eff} , p_{eff} as

$$w_{\text{eff}} = \frac{p_{\text{eff}}}{\rho_{\text{eff}}} = -1 - \frac{2\dot{H}}{3H^2} \tag{6}$$

and the deceleration parameter q that quantifies the accelerating or decelerating phase of the universe, is given by

$$q = -1 - \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}.\tag{7}$$

One may also recall the usual definitions of the density parameters for the fluids as follows: $\Omega_i = \rho_i/\rho_c$, where $\rho_c = 3H_0^2/8\pi G$, is the critical density of the universe.

Having the above set of equations in hand, in principle one can determine the evolution of the quintessence scalar field model at the background level but not at the level of perturbations. Since the observed structure formation of the universe is related to the evolution at the level of perturbations, thus, we now proceed to the investigations of the perturbation equations. In order to do so, we consider the perturbed FLRW metric in the conformal Newtonian gauge. The perturbed FLRW metric in this gauge takes the following form

$$ds^{2} = a^{2}(\tau) \left[-(1+2\Psi)d\tau^{2} + (1+2\Phi)\delta_{ij}dx^{i}dx^{j} \right]$$
(8)

where τ is the conformal time; Ψ , Φ are the perturbation quantities. For the above perturbed FLRW metric (8), one may write down the Einstein's field equations in the conformal Newtonian gauge as [91]:

$$\delta'_{A} + 3aH\left(c_{s,A}^{2} - w_{A}\right)\delta_{A} = -(1 + w_{A})(\theta_{A} + 3\Phi'),\tag{9}$$

$$\theta'_{A} + \left(aH(1 - 3w_{A}) + \frac{w'_{A}}{1 + w_{A}}\right)\theta_{A} = k^{2} \left(\frac{c_{s,A}^{2}}{1 + w_{A}}\delta_{A} + \Psi + \sigma_{A}\right),\tag{10}$$

$$k^2 \Phi = 4\pi G a^2 \rho_A \left(\delta_A + 3a H (1 + w_A) \frac{\theta_A}{k^2} \right), \tag{11}$$

¹ We fix the total neutrino mass to $M_{\nu} = 0.06 \text{ eV}$, the minimal mass allowed within the normal ordering, as in the *Planck* baseline analyses. This is justified by the current very tight limits on neutrino masses [83, 84, 85, 86, 87], which favour the normal ordering [88, 89] (see also [90]).

and $\Psi = -\Phi$. Here, we recognize $\delta_A = \delta \rho_A / \rho_A$, as the density perturbation for the fluid A; $\theta_A = i \vec{k} \cdot \vec{v}_A$, as the divergence of the peculiar velocity v_A of the component A. The prime attached to any quantity denotes the differentiation with respect to the conformal time τ . The quantity $c_{s,A}^2 = \delta p_A / \delta \rho_A$, is the sound speed of the fluid A which we consider to be non-negative in order to avoid any kind of instabilities. Finally, we note that the above perturbations equations could also be written using the synchronous gauge. So, we have presented the equations in Appendix B for completeness.

3. SCALAR FIELD MODELS

The scalar field models play an essential role to describe the different dynamical phases of our universe. It is widely known that both early and late accelerating phases of the universe, are almost satisfactorily described by the scalar field models. However, in this section we shall introduce some scalar field models belonging to the quintessence class and investigate their qualitative behavior. The quintessence scalar field models are usually classified into two distinct groups, namely the thawing (slow-roll) and freezing (fast-roll) scalar field models. The models belonging to the thawing class are very sensitive to the initial conditions, while on the other hand, freezing models are independent for a wide range of the initial conditions. Concerning the freezing models, they are again subdivided into two classes based on the nature of the models — whether they have scaling and tracking behaviour. The tracker models could produce late-time cosmic acceleration but for scaling models late time acceleration is not possible, see Refs. [92, 93, 94] for more discussions in this direction. In the present work we shall focus on both kind of scalar field models, that means thawing and freezing scalar field models. Since the present literature includes a large number of potentials, therefore, the main aim of this work is to introduce some 'generalized' potentials that could recover some well known models that have been already studied.

3.1. Model 1

Let us first consider the following scalar field model characterized by the potential

$$V(\phi) = V_0 \cosh\left[\beta \left(\frac{\phi}{M_p}\right)^u\right] \tag{12}$$

where V_0 , u and β are real constants in which β , u are dimensionless while V_0 is dimensionful; M_p represents the reduced Planck mass. The parameter β in (12) quantifies the deviation of the model from the constant potential $V(\phi) = V_0$. One can clearly notice that the potential (12) is the sum of two exponential potentials:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{V_0}{2} \left(e^{\beta(\phi/M_p)^u} + e^{-\beta(\phi/M_p)^u} \right),$$

and it is the generalized version of the potential $V = V_0 \cosh(\beta \phi/M_p)$ [95] which is obtained by setting u = 1 in (12). The original cosh potential (u = 1) has the following asymptotic form

$$V(\phi) \simeq \frac{V_0}{2} \exp\left(\frac{\beta\phi}{M_p}\right), \text{ for } \frac{\beta|\phi|}{M_p} \gg 1$$
 (13)

$$V(\phi) \simeq V_0 \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\beta \phi}{M_p} \right)^2 \right], \text{ for } \frac{\beta |\phi|}{M_p} \ll 1$$
 (14)

Now, in order to study the qualitative behavior of this potential, we choose a specific value of u, the simplest one namely, u = 1, and solve the conservation equation (5) numerically. One may wonder why we fix u = 1 since other values of u are equally favorable. Thus, we performed similar calculations for other values of u in a wide range of $u \in \mathbf{R}$, namely, u = 2, 3, but we did not find any significant qualitative changes in the cosmological parameters sketching the evolution of the universe. So, in this work we consider u = 1 for this potential and proceed to its further analysis ². So, essentially, we are interested in the original potential $V = V_0 \cosh(\beta \phi/M_p)$ of [95] although we keep

² However, concerning the observational constraints on this potential, keeping u as a free parameter is certainly appealing,



FIG. 1: This figure corresponds to the potential (12). We show different cosmological parameters for u = 1 taking various values of β as $\beta = 6$ (red), 8 (green), 10 (blue). This potential belongs to tracker class which is independent for a wide range of initial conditions. For large field values, the potential has an exponential asymptotic form where as for small field values (near minimum of potential) it is associated with quadratic term of field. Therefore, energy density of scalar field scales with background energy density around the present epoch, and exits it at late time, and correspondingly $w_{\phi} \simeq -1$ will be oscillatory. We note that during the analysis we have taken a specific value of V_0 as $V_0=2.2 M_p^4$.

the original u-dependent model (12) in this work for a far reaching purpose just mentioned above. The original cosh potential belongs to tracker class which is independent for a wide range of initial conditions. The qualitative evolution of this potential is presented in Fig. 1 in terms of various cosmological parameters. In the upper left plot of Fig. 1 we show the evolution of this potential which shows that the potential has an extremum and the parameter β plays the role of a scaling character. The extreme right plot of the upper panel of Fig. 1 presents the evolution of the scalar field itself. The middle plot of the upper panel of Fig. 1 depicts the evolution of the deceleration parameter from which a smooth transition from the past deceleration to present acceleration is clearly displayed and the transition occurs around z = 0. Moreover, from the evolution of the deceleration parameter, one can also notice that it is similar to that of the Λ CDM cosmology, however, for this case, the transition occurs after the transition for Λ CDM. The lower panel of Fig. 1 also displays various parameters, namely, the energy density of the fluids (lower left plot of Fig. 1), equation of state of the scalar field w_{ϕ} and the effective equation of state of the total fluid, w_{eff} (lower middle plot of Fig. 1); and the density parameters for the fluids (lower right plot of Fig. 1). From the evolution of the energy density, one can see that initially, the energy density of the scalar field is sub-dominant, and freezes due to large Hubble damping. Around the present epoch, it scales with the background, and at present epoch it exits from the background and gives rise to late time acceleration. The equation of state for the scalar field as well as the effective equation of state of the total fluid, for large field values potential, behave almost in an exponential way while for small field values since it is associated with ϕ^2 term, hence, it suggests that at late time the scalar field behaves like a cosmological constant $w_{\phi} \simeq -1$ together with an oscillatory behavior.

but this on the other hand increases the degeneracy between other parameters of the model. So, fixing u to some preassigned value may reduce the degeneracy between the parameters. In this context, one can also see how the cosmological constraints change for different positive or negative values of u leading to a class of quintessence potentials, such as $V = V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^2), V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^3), ...V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^{-1}), V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^{-2}), ...V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^{1/2}), V_0 \cosh(\beta(\phi/M_p)^{1/3}), \text{ etc.}$ This might be an interesting investigation in future.



FIG. 2: This figure corresponds to the potential (15) with $\epsilon = +1$. We choose the model parameters as $V_0 = 1.1M_p^4$, $\alpha = 1$ (red), 2.5 (green) and 3.5 (blue). From the plots one can realize that α works as a scaling parameter while the qualitative evolution of the model seems to be independent of α .

3.2. Model 2

We now consider the model characterized by the following potential

$$V(\phi) = V_0 \Big[1 + \epsilon \operatorname{sech}(\alpha \phi/M_p) \Big]$$
(15)

where $\epsilon = \pm 1$, V_0 is a constant and α is the only free parameter of this model that quantifies the deviation of this potential from the constant potential $V = V_0$. The potential (15) is closely related to the previous potential in (12) since one is the inverse of the other. Originally the model was introduced in [96] (and subsequently in [97, 98]) to study cosmic inflation motivated by the models of inflation in the framework of supergravity. Though it is a phenomenological model without having any field theoretic origin, the model has few distinctive features in the context of inflation. Firstly, the spectral index r as predicted by this model is nearly constant with slight negative tilt. Depending on the model parameter this model renders two types of inflationary solutions: one corresponds to small inflaton excursion during observable inflation which predicts negligible amount of gravity waves ($r \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$) and the other describes large field inflation which is capable of large amount of gravity waves ($r \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-1})$). This inspired us to analyze the performance of this model in the context of late time acceleration. However, the authors of [96] discussed its cosmological features for $\epsilon = -1$. However, concerning the cosmological importance of this model, we do not find any strong reason to exclude the model with $\epsilon = +1$. Thus, we are intended to investigate this potential for both the values of ϵ in the context of late-time acceleration of the universe. For convenience, the model with $\epsilon = 1$ is denoted by Model 2a while the model with $\epsilon = -1$ is named as Model 2b. In the following we shall show that the sign of ϵ plays an interesting role in the evolution of the universe.

In order to understand the nature of the potential and its impact on the evolution of the universe, in Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = 1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$), we have displayed the variations of $V(\phi)$ as well as the energy densities of different matter sources of the universe for different values of the free parameter α . In the top panels of Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, we have showed the evolution of the potential (15) for $\epsilon = +1$ (top left of Fig. 2) and for $\epsilon = -1$ (top left of Fig. 3). One can clearly notice that here α does not play any significant role except that its scaling character. The evolution of the potentials are reversed due to $\epsilon = +1, -1$. But, both the potentials allow extremum values during its evolution. For this potential, we have numerically solved the conservation equation (5) and displayed the evolution of the scalar field in the top right plots of both Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = +1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$). The energy density for this potential has



FIG. 3: This figure represents the potential (15) with $\epsilon = -1$. We show different cosmological parameters, namely the deceleration parameter q, equation-of-state, w_{ϕ} and w_{eff} for different values of the characteristic parameter α such as $\alpha = 0.9$ (red), 1 (green), 1.1 (blue) and $V_0=3$ M_p^4 whereas the evolution of the density parameter (right) corresponds to $\alpha = 1$. By looking the evolution of w_{ϕ} , one may conclude that the w_{ϕ} exhibits thawing behavior at present epoch, and oscillations in the future.

been shown in the bottom left plot of Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = +1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$). Here, we have some characteristic changes between these potentials as reflected from the bottom left plots of Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. For $\epsilon = +1$, from the evolution of the energy densities, one can see that at late time, the energy density of the scalar field, is actually constant which corresponds to the cosmological constant, and this seems to be independent of α . While on the other hand, a sharp fall of the scalar field energy density is observed which is also independent of α .

We have also presented the evolution of the deceleration parameter, q (top middle plots of both Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = +1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$)), equation of state for scalar field (also the effective equation of state) in the bottom middle plots of both Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = +1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$)), and the evolution of the density parameters (bottom right plots of both Fig. 2 (for $\epsilon = +1$) and Fig. 3 (for $\epsilon = -1$)). We find that for both the models, a clear transition for the past decelerating phase to the current accelerating phase is suggested and α , the quantifying parameter of the model does not play any significant role in this picture. The evolution of the deceleration parameter is found to be very close to its evolution for the Λ CDM model. Since α does not play any crucial role for the evolution of the scalar field model, thus, pick up $\alpha = 1$ and displays the evolution of the density parameters for the matter fluids in the top right (for $\epsilon = +1$) and bottom right (for $\epsilon = -1$) panels. However, we observe some different behavior when the equation of state of the scalar field model (w_{ϕ}) and the effective equation of state of the models, w_{eff} .

For the potential with $\epsilon = +1$, we display the evolution of w_{ϕ} and w_{eff} in the middle plot of the top panel of Fig. 2. The evolution shows that at late time, the scalar field behaves like a cosmological constant and moreover, one can further notice that the effective equation of state also mimics a cosmological constant fluid. For $\epsilon = -1$, similar quantities are displayed in the middle plot of the bottom panel of Fig. 3. We find that although at present (that corresponds to z = 0), the equation of state for the scalar field, w_{ϕ} and the effective equation of state, w_{eff} are very close to the cosmological constant boundary, however, slight different characteristics in both w_{ϕ} and w_{eff} are observed for z < 0, corresponding to the evolution in the future. We find that for z < 0, oscillating features of both w_{ϕ} and w_{eff} are allowed. From the analyses of the models, in particular, from the evolution of the energy density and the scalar field equation of state, w_{ϕ} , we observe that both the models, namely, Model 2a and Model 2b exhibit thawing behavior around the present epoch ($z \simeq 0$). However, Model 2b has an additional feature compared to Model 2a as follows: It shows oscillating nature through the equation of state, w_{ϕ} . Thus, in summary, we see that although Model 2a exhibits only the thawing nature while Model 2b has both thawing and oscillating behavior.



FIG. 4: The figure displays the evolution of various cosmological parameters associated for the potential (16) with $\delta = +1$. We have analyzed the model for different values of p = 1 (red curves), 2 (green curves), 3 (blue curves). Let us note that for the trajectories of w (middle plot of the lower panel) and the energy density for the scalar field (left plot of the lower panel), the blue curve is completely overlapped with the green curve. Let us further mention that throughout the analysis we have fixed $V_0=2.2 M_p^4$.

3.3. Model 3

Finally, we consider the last model in this series:

$$V(\phi) = V_0 \left[1 + \delta \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P} \right)^p \right]^2, \tag{16}$$

that can be found in [99]. Here, in δ , p, V_0 are the real constants and $M_P = (8\pi G)^{-1/2}$. Let us note that the parameter $\delta \in \mathbf{R}$ quantifies the deviation of the model from the constant potential $V = V_0$. Here, we classify Model 3 in the following manner. We denote Model 3 with $\delta \geq 0$ as Model 3a while by Model 3b we mean Model 3 with $\delta \leq 0$. Although the potential (16) is one of the representatives of the collection of a large number of phenomenological potentials in the literature, however, it has a special interest in the context of cosmological observations. For $\delta = -1$, the potential (16) represents hilltop inflation which is favoured by recent CMB observations. Moreover, one can further notice that for $\phi/M_p \ll 1$, the model (16) actually recovers the constant potential independently of the sign of δ . Now, following similar trend, we have numerically solved the conservation equation (5) for this potential and discuss various quantities graphically in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. Let us describe the qualitative behaviour of Model 3a and Model 3b.

The Fig. 4 completely describes the qualitative evolution of Model 3a. The Fig. 4 has two panels, namely, the upper and lower panels where each panel contains three different plots. In the upper panel of Fig. 4, we show the evolution of the potential with respect to the scalar field ϕ (upper left panel of Fig. 4), the deceleration parameter as a function of the redshift (upper middle panel of Fig. 4) and the scalar field itself with respect to $\ln(1+z)$ (upper right panel of Fig. 4). In all three plots, we have used three different values of p, namely, p = 1 (red curves), p = 2 (green curves) and p = 3 (blue curves). From the evolution of the potential we find that that model allows an extremum during the evolution of the universe. From the upper middle panel (Fig. 4), a clear transition of the deceleration parameter from its past decelerating phase to the present accelerating phase of the universe is clearly seen and this evolution is quite similar to that of the Λ CDM cosmology. The scalar field appears to be sharply decrease (upper



FIG. 5: The figure displays the evolution of various cosmological parameters associated for the potential (16) with $\delta = -1$. We have analyzed the model for different values of p = 1 (red curves), 2 (green curves), 3 (blue curves). We note that throughout the analysis we have fixed $V_0=2.2 M_p^4$. Similarly, in the plot for the deceleration parameter, q (middle panel of the upper plot) the blue and green curves are almost indistinguishable from one another.

right panel of Fig. 4) with the evolution of the universe. The lower panel of Fig. 4 has three different plots, namely, the evolution of the energy densities of the component fluids (lower left panel of Fig. 4), the equation of state of the scalar field model and the effective equation of state (lower middle panel of Fig. 4), the evolution of the density parameters of the component fluids (lower left panel of Fig. 4). From the evolution of different energy densities, we see that at late time, ρ_{ϕ} does not seem to evolve with the cosmic time, so effectively, ρ_{ϕ} behaves like a cosmological constant fluid. From the equation of state of both scalar field as well as the effective fluid, we see that at late time, both of them has a converging nature to '-1'.

For Model 3b, we have described various cosmological parameters in Fig. 5. Similarly, we have made two panels – the upper panel containing three distinct plots, namely, the evolution of the potential (upper left panel of Fig. 5), deceleration parameter (upper middle panel of Fig. 5), evolution of the scalar field (upper right panel of Fig. 5) – and one the lower panel containing another three distinct plots, namely, the evolution of the energy densities of different fluids (lower left panel of Fig. 5), equation of state for the scalar field as well as for the effective fluid (lower middle panel of Fig. 5) and the density parameters of the fluids (lower right panel of Fig. 5). The evolution of this model (i.e., Model 3b) has similarities to Model 3a.

4. OBSERVATIONAL DATA, FITTING METHODOLOGY AND THE RESULTS

In order to constrain the model, we use several cosmological data with latest origin. In the following we describe the observational data and then we describe the analysis of the model.

• Cosmic Microwave Background: The data from cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation are very effective for the analyses with dark energy models. In this work we make use of the CMB temperature and polarization anisotropies, as well as their cross-correlations, from the Planck [75]. To be precise, our measurements include the combination of high- and low- ℓ TT likelihoods in the overall multipole range $2 \le \ell \le 2508$, and the combination of high- and low- ℓ polarization likelihoods [76]. To constrain the present quintessence models, we use the freely available Planck likelihood [76], which marginalizes over several nuisance parameters describing the uncertainties related to the calibration, residual foreground contamination, residual beam-leakage, and several

Parameter	Prior (Model 1)	Prior (Model 2a)	Prior (Model 2b)	Prior (Model 3a)	Prior (Model 3b)
$\Omega_b h^2$	[0.005, 0.1]	[0.005, 0.1]	[0.005, 0.1]	[0.005, 0.1]	[0.005, 0.1]
$\Omega_c h^2$	[0.01, 0.99]	[0.01, 0.99]	[0.01, 0.99]	[0.01, 0.99]	[0.01, 0.99]
au	[0.01, 0.8]	[0.01, 0.8]	[0.01, 0.8]	[0.01, 0.8]	[0.01, 0.8]
n_s	[0.5, 1.5]	[0.5, 1.5]	[0.5, 1.5]	[0.5, 1.5]	[0.5, 1.5]
$\log[10^{10}A_s]$	[2.4, 4]	[2.4, 4]	[2.4, 4]	[2.4, 4]	[2.4, 4]
$100\theta_{MC}$	[0.5, 10]	[0.5, 10]	[0.5, 10]	[0.5, 10]	[0.5, 10]
β	[0, 10]	—	—	—	_
α	—	[0, 10]	[0, 10]	—	_
δ	_	_	_	[0, 10]	[-10, 0]
δ	-			[0, 10]	[-10, 0]

TABLE I: The table summarizes the flat priors on various free parameters for all the quintessence scalar field models.

more.

- Baryon Acoustic Oscillations: We have used four particular measurements of the Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) distance measurements, namely, the data from the 6dF Galaxy Survey (6dFGS) ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.106$) [77], the Main Galaxy Sample of Data Release 7 of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS-MGS) ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.15$) [78], the CMASS sample of Data Release 12 (DR12) of the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.57$) [79] and finally the LOWZ sample ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.32$) from the same BOSS data release (DR12) [79].
- Redshift Space Distortion: We also consider the Redshift Space Distortion (RSD) data in our analysis. In particular, we consider RSD data from the CMASS sample ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.57$) [80] and the LOWZ sample ($z_{\text{eff}} = 0.32$) [80]. Let us note that when we use these two RSD data in the analysis, the BOSS DR12 results are not used in order to avoid double-counting of data.
- Supernovae Type Ia: The Supernovae Type Ia (SNIa) data are the first observational indicators for an accelerating universe, that means, for the existence of dark energy in the universe sector. In this work we have used the joint light curve analysis (JLA) sample [81], an updated list of SNIa data, distributed over the redshift range $z \in [0.01, 1.30]$ with 740 number of data points. The χ^2 function for this data is given by
- Cosmic chronometers: Finally, our analyses also include the Hubble parameter measurements from the most old and passively evolving galaxies, known as cosmic chronometers (CC). The measurements from the cosmic chronometers are believed to be the most potential and model independent measurements and hence, they could able to provide the most important information about the expansion history of the universe. The total number of data points spanned in 0 < z < 2 are 30 (see Table 4 of Ref. [82]), see the details of the data and more discussions in [82].

In order to constrain the cosmological parameters, we use the markov chain monte carlo package cosmomc [100], an efficient sampling method. The convergence of the MCMC chains are assessed through the Gelman-Rubin statistics R-1 [101]. In addition to that we also include the Bayesian model comparison which provides a goodness of fit of the model under consideration compared to some reference model, usually taken to be the Λ CDM cosmological model. Now, for the statistical analysis, we consider the following parameter space

$$P \equiv \{\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, \Theta_S, \tau, n_s, \log[10^{10} A_S], \mu\},\$$

where the above symbols have the following meanings: $\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$ are respectively the density of baryons and the dark matter; $\Theta_S = 100\theta_{MC}$ is the ratio of sound horizon to the angular diameter distance; τ is the optical depth; n_s is the scalar spectral index; A_s is the amplitude of the initial power spectrum. Here, μ is the free parameter coming from the scalar field models under consideration. That means when we consider Model 1, $\mu = \beta$, when Model 2 is considered, $\mu = \alpha$ and for Model 3, $\mu = \delta$. So, overall, during the statistical analyses, we consider a seven dimensional parameter space. Finally, in Table I we enlist the priors on the model parameters for our analysis.

4.1. Observational Constraints

Here we present the observational constraints of the scalar field models using the following cosmological data.

- CMB (Planck TTTEEE+lowTEB)
- \bullet CMB+BAO
- CMB+BAO+JLA
- CMB+RSD+JLA
- CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC

For each of the above scalar field models, we sample the posterior distribution of the parameters by running MCMC chains with **cosmomc**, using various observational datasets. We determine the convergence of the chains by computing the Gelman-Rubin statistic R-1, and requiring R-1 < 0.1. In particular, all continued the running of all the chains until $R-1 \leq 0.03$ was achieved. In what follows, we separately describe the observational constraints imposed on the scalar field models.

4.1.1. Model 1

As mentioned earlier, for this model we focus on a specific value of u, namely, u = 1 and proceed towards its observational constraints using a number of cosmological datasets mentioned in section 4. The observational summary for this model has been shown in Table II where we present the constraints on the model parameters at 68% and 95% CL. In Fig. 6, we display the 1D marginalized posterior distributions for some selected parameters of the model as well as 2D joint contours considering several combinations of the model parameters.

From the constraints on H_0 by all the observational datasets, we see that it takes almost similar mean values to the Λ CDM based Planck's estimation [4], but the 68% error bars on H_0 for this scalar field model (considering all the datasets) are slightly lower compared to its error bars from Planck [4]. Precisely, the estimations of H_0 for this scalar field model considering the employed observational datasets are many standard deviations apart from the local estimation of H_0 by Riess et al. [102], thus, the tension on H_0 is not released for this quintessence scalar field model. However, this is not a new result and it is quite expected in this context because the alleviation of H_0 needs a phantom dark energy equation of state in the universe sector as already discussed in [126, 127]. Actually the presence of phantom dark energy makes the expansion of the universe faster at late times, and hence decreases the distance to last scattering. In fact, in [127], the authors have argued that the dark energy models with equation of state $w \geq -1$ cannot alleviate the H_0 tension. Thus, naturally quintessence scalar field models are included in this class and hence they are unable to release the H_0 tension. Furthermore, the constraints on Ω_{m0} , are similar to the Planck's Λ CDM based estimation [4] while the estimated values of σ_8 are slightly higher (although mildly) compared to the Planck's Λ CDM based estimation [4].

Concerning the free key parameter β of this scalar field model, our analyses actually show that it is unconstrained for CMB data alone and also by other observational datasets, such as CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA and CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC. This is clear if one looks at the 1D marginalized distributions of β as well as the joint contours (see Fig. 6). Thus, one thing is clear from this context that the sensitivity of CMB is not strong enough to test the parameter, β , and hence this parameter remains unconstrained. When the external datasets, such as BAO, JLA, RSD, CC, are added to CMB, the nature of the parameter, β , does not alter. That means, none of the above external datasets (BAO, JLA, RSD, CC), add much to the CMB data in order to constrain β . In fact, this could be a general statement for this work if we closely look at the constraints and their error bars. From Table II. one could clearly see the error bars on almost all the parameters (except β since this is unconstrained) remain same for all the observational datasets. That means the addition of any external dataset to CMB alone does not actually improve the error bars on the parameters. For instance one could study the error bars on H_0 , Ω_{m0} and even σ_8 for all the datasets. This again means that these external datasets (BAO, JLA, RSD, CC) do not add much to CMB alone, and it likely means that in quintessence models H_0 as well as other parameters are pretty much determined by the CMB data alone. Perhaps it is worth noting that the unconstrained nature of β is independent on its prior considered during the statistical analysis. Even if we increase the upper limit of the prior on β which for this case we set to be [0, 10] (see Table I), the result on β does not alter. That means β remains unconstrained independent of the observational datasets.

Finally, we conclude this section with the presence and absence of correlations between the model parameters. Looking at Fig. 6, one can see that a strong negative correlation between Ω_{m0} and H_0 exists which is a consequence of the geometric degeneracy, while the remaining parameters shown in Fig. 6 do not have any correlation amongst them. In particular, the parameters H_0 and σ_8 are not correlated. This is one of the interesting observations in this work. A possible explanation towards such uncorrelated feature is as follows. The important thing to notice is that H_0 and σ_8 are respectively more background and perturbation quantities. Even though, σ_8 is a derived parameter and is related to A_s (namely $\sigma_8 \propto A_s^2$). So, they govern different physics, even in the simplest Λ CDM model. The Hubble constant at present, H_0 , governs the distance to last-scattering and thus Θ_s (= $100\theta_{MC}$). Changing H_0 changes the position of all the peaks in the CMB spectrum, especially the first one. Whereas changing σ_8 alters the amplitude of the CMB peaks. The effects are distinct and thus can be well distinguished between each other. So, in principle we don't expect a strong correlation between H_0 and σ_8 to begin with. The only effect is an 'indirect' correlation between H_0 and Ω_{m0} .



FIG. 6: 1D marginalized posterior distributions for $(\beta, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8, H_0)$ and 2D contour plots of several combinations of the above model parameters have been presented for Model 1: $V(\phi) = V_0 \cosh(\beta \phi^u)$ with u = 1, using various astronomical datasets CMB, CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA, CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

Parameters	CMB	CMB CB		CRJ	CBJRC
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.12^{+0.0014+0.0027}_{-0.0014-0.0027}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0020\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0019\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0020\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12^{+0.0014+0.0028}_{-0.0014-0.0028}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	$0.022\substack{+0.00015+0.00031\\-0.00015-0.00031}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00027}_{-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00027}_{-0.00014-0.00028}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00028}_{-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022^{+0.00015+0.00030}_{-0.00016-0.00030}$
$100\theta_{MC}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00033+0.00063\\-0.00032-0.00065}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00061\\-0.00030-0.00057}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00060\\-0.00030-0.00059}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00058\\-0.00030-0.00057}$	$1.041^{+0.00032+0.00063}_{-0.00033-0.00064}$
au	$0.081\substack{+0.017+0.034\\-0.017-0.033}$	$0.085^{+0.017+0.033}_{-0.017-0.032}$	$0.085^{+0.016+0.031}_{-0.016-0.034}$	$0.072^{+0.016+0.031}_{-0.016-0.031}$	$0.079^{+0.017+0.033}_{-0.017-0.032}$
n_s	$0.97^{+0.0045+0.0092}_{-0.0045-0.0088}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0076\\-0.0038-0.0076}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0076\\-0.0038-0.0076}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0037+0.0076\\-0.0037-0.0072}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0045+0.0092\\-0.0047-0.0092}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.095\substack{+0.034+0.065\\-0.034-0.065}$	$3.101\substack{+0.033+0.066\\-0.034-0.065}$	$3.101\substack{+0.032+0.061\\-0.032-0.066}$	$3.076^{+0.031+0.062}_{-0.031-0.063}$	$3.092\substack{+0.032+0.065\\-0.033-0.064}$
β	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained
Ω_{m0}	$0.31^{+0.009+0.017}_{-0.009-0.016}$	$0.31\substack{+0.006+0.012\\-0.006-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.006+0.012\\-0.006-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.006+0.012\\-0.006-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.009+0.018\\-0.009-0.017}$
σ_8	$0.83\substack{+0.014+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.014+0.027\\-0.014-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.82\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.012-0.025}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.025}$
H_0	$67.48^{+0.63+1.22}_{-0.63-1.21}$	$67.91_{-0.46-0.89}^{+0.46+0.89}$	$67.94_{-0.44-0.90}^{+0.46+0.90}$	$67.76_{-0.47-0.90}^{+0.47+0.93}$	$67.47_{-0.63-1.26}^{+0.64+1.28}$

TABLE II: Summary of 68% and 95% CL constraints on various model parameters of the scalar field model for Model 1: $V(\phi) = V_0 \cosh(\beta \phi^u)$ with u = 1 using different observational datasets. We note that Ω_{m0} is the present value of $\Omega_m = \Omega_c + \Omega_b$ and H_0 is in the units of km/s/Mpc. Here, we have shortened the notations as follows: CB = CMB+BAO, CBJ = CMB+BAO+JLA, CRJ = CMB+RSD+JLA, and CBJRC = CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

4.1.2. Model 2

In order to extract the cosmological constraints of the scalar field model (15), we have separately analyzed two cases, one with $\epsilon = 1$ (Model 2a) and the other with $\epsilon = -1$ (Model 2b).

Let us now summarize the observational constraints for Model 2a, that means for the scalar field model: $V(\phi) =$ $V_0[1 + sech(\alpha\phi)]$. In Table III we have summarized the observational constraints on free and derived parameters of this model for different cosmological datasets at 68% CL and 95% CL. Additionally, in Fig. 7, we present the 1D marginalized posterior distributions for some selected model parameters and 2D joint contours at 68% and 95% CL considering various combinations of the model parameters. We first concentrate on the constraints on some derived parameters, such as, H_0 , Ω_{m0} and σ_8 . From the analyses, we find that the estimated values of the Hubble parameter for different observational datasets are almost similar to the Λ CDM based Planck's estimation, see [4] with mildly lower error bars. So, it means the tension on H_0 is not released by this scalar field model which actually supports the previous results [126, 127]. On the other hand, the estimated values of Ω_{m0} are mildly larger with slightly larger error bars compared to Planck [4]. This is expected because as one can see from Fig. 7 that there is a negative correlation between H_0 and Ω_{m0} . About the σ_8 parameter we have similar conclusion as we already have found with Model 1, that means the values of σ_8 for different combinations are slightly larger compared to Planck [4]. The important point that we like to note here that, when we add any external dataset to CMB, we see that the error bars on the parameters, do not actually improve. So, the addition of any other external dataset does not actually add anything to the constraints obtained from CMB alone dataset. Thus, similar to what we have observed in Model 1, here too, one can safely conclude that the constraints on this model are pretty much determined by the CMB data alone. This observation is also supported if we now focus on the observational constraints on the free parameter α . Our analyses show that the parameter α is unconstrained. It is much clear if one looks at the 1D posterior distributions for α (see Fig. 7). Perhaps it should mentioned that the observational nature of this free parameter does not change even if we increase the upper limit of the prior imposed on it (see Table I). So, similar to the previous model (i.e. Model 1), here too, we can comment that the CMB sensitivity is not enough to constrain this parameter. And when any one of the external datasets, such as BAO, JLA, RSD and CC, are added to CMB, the results do not change at all. That means the unconstrained nature of this parameter does not actually change. Finally, we again see that similar to Model 1, the parameter σ_8 is not correlated to H_0 . Now, this is becoming an interesting issue since such a relation remains same irrespective of the change of the potential. The absence of such correlation between these two parameters follows similar explanation as already given in section 4.1.1.

We now discuss the observational constraints of Model 2b: $V(\phi) = V_0[1 - \operatorname{sech}(\alpha\phi)]$. The observational summary for this model has been displayed in Table IV where we have shown 68% and 95% CL constraints on the model parameters. And in Fig. 8, we show the 1D marginalized posterior distributions for some selected model parameters and 2D joint contours at 68% and 95% CL considering various combinations of the model parameters. From the analysis summarized in Table IV, we notice that this model returns almost similar fit to Model 2a, and in a similar fashion, the parameter α is again found to be unconstrained. Similar to the previous case (i.e., the potential (15) with $\epsilon = +1$), here too, we observe that the estimated values of the Hubble constant for all the combinations are very close to the Λ CDM based Planck's estimation [4]. So, both the models, as one can see, cannot solve the H_0 -tension. This agrees with two earlier conclusions, namely for Model 1 and Model 2a and supports the arguments of [126, 127]. And moreover we also comment that only CMB alone data are enough to test this model since the addition of any other external datasets do not add anything to the constraints obtained from CMB alone. However, the analyses with other external datasets to CMB are important in order to verify whether this model returns similar conclusion or not. Concerning the absence of the correlation between H_0 and σ_8 , we follow similar arguments as already given in section 4.1.1 and in the upper half of this section.

4.1.3. Model 3

We now present the observational constraints for the last scalar field model in this series, namely, the model of eqn. (16). We have analyzed the potential (16) for two different regions of the parameter δ , namely for $\delta \ge 0$ (identified as Model 3a) and for $\delta \le 0$ (identified as Model 3b) using exactly similar observational datasets that we have already used to study the previous models. In both the cases, we have analyzed the model for a fixed value of p, namely p = 1. In what follows we describe the observational constraints for each model separately.



FIG. 7: 1D marginalized posterior distributions for $(\alpha, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8, H_0)$ and 2D contour plots of several combinations of the above model parameters have been presented for Model 2a: $V(\phi) = V_0 [1 + \operatorname{sech}(\alpha \phi)] (\alpha \ge 0)$, using various **cosmological** datasets CMB, CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA, CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

Parameters	CMB	CB	CBJ	CRJ	CBJRC
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.12^{+0.0014+0.0028}_{-0.0014-0.0027}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0020\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0019}_{-0.0010-0.0019}$	$0.12^{+0.0011+0.0021}_{-0.0010-0.0021}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0020\\-0.0010-0.0020}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	$0.022\substack{+0.00016+0.00031\\-0.00016-0.00030}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00015-0.00026}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00028\\-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00014-0.00027}$
$100\theta_{MC}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00032+0.00065\\-0.00033-0.00065}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00031+0.00058\\-0.00030-0.00060}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00059\\-0.00030-0.00059}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00058\\-0.00030-0.00060}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00031+0.00059\\-0.00031-0.00061}$
n_s	$0.97\substack{+0.0046+0.0089\\-0.0046-0.0089}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0039+0.0080\\-0.0040-0.0077}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0076\\-0.0041-0.0074}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0074\\-0.0039-0.0077}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0037+0.0074\\-0.0037-0.0073}$
au	$0.079\substack{+0.017+0.034\\-0.017-0.033}$	$0.084\substack{+0.016+0.031\\-0.016-0.032}$	$0.086\substack{+0.018+0.032\\-0.016-0.033}$	$0.073\substack{+0.015+0.030\\-0.015-0.030}$	$0.072\substack{+0.015+0.029\\-0.015-0.030}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.092^{+0.034+0.065}_{-0.033-0.064}$	$3.099_{-0.032-0.064}^{+0.032+0.061}$	$3.10^{+0.036+0.063}_{-0.032-0.065}$	$3.077^{+0.031+0.059}_{-0.030-0.060}$	$3.076^{+0.030+0.058}_{-0.030-0.060}$
α	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained
Ω_{m0}	$0.31\substack{+0.0087+0.017\\-0.0088-0.016}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0062+0.012\\-0.0061-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0059+0.011\\-0.0060-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0065+0.013\\-0.0063-0.013}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0061+0.012\\-0.0062-0.012}$
σ_8	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.014+0.026\\-0.014-0.026}$	$0.82\substack{+0.012+0.025\\-0.012-0.024}$	$0.82\substack{+0.012+0.024\\-0.012-0.024}$
H_0	$67.46_{-0.64-1.22}^{+0.65+1.23}$	$67.89_{-0.47-0.91}^{+0.46+0.92}$	$67.97_{-0.49-0.86}^{+0.44+0.90}$	$67.81_{-0.48-0.93}^{+0.48+0.94}$	$67.76_{-0.46-0.90}^{+0.46+0.92}$

TABLE III: Summary of 68% and 95% CL constraints on various model parameters of Model 2a: $V(\phi) = V_0 [1 + sech(\alpha \phi)]$ ($\alpha \ge 0$) using different observational datasets. We note that Ω_{m0} is the present value of $\Omega_m = \Omega_c + \Omega_b$ and H_0 is in the units of km/s/Mpc. Here, we have shortened the notations as follows: CB = CMB+BAO, CBJ = CMB+BAO+JLA, CRJ = CMB+RSD+JLA, and CBJRC = CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

Table V summarizes the observational constraints for Model 3a (i.e. when $\delta \geq 0$ in eqn. (16)) at 68% and 95% CL using different observational datasets. Similarly, in Fig. 9 we display the 1D marginalized posterior distributions for some selected parameters of this model plus the 2D joint contour plots at 68% and 95% CL considering various combinations of the model parameters. We first focus on some specific derived parameters and their constraints. Concerning the constraints on the Hubble constant H_0 from different data, we again come up with the same conclusion as found in previous scalar field models. That means, for this model too, the estimated values of H_0 are almost similar to what the Planck (Λ CDM based experiments) [4] reports but the error bars on H_0 derived for this scalar field model are mildly higher than Planck [4]. So, naturally, the tension in H_0 still exists in this model and strongly agrees the previous works [126, 127]. This now seems to be a generic feature where H_0 tension still alives in quintessence scalar

Parameters	CMB	CB	B CBJ CRJ		CBJRC
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.12^{+0.0013+0.0026}_{-0.0014-0.0027}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0019\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0020}_{-0.0010-0.0019}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0011+0.0021\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0020}_{-0.0011-0.0020}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	$0.022\substack{+0.00015+0.00031\\-0.00015-0.00030}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00014-0.00028}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00028\\-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00028\\-0.00015-0.00028}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00027}_{-0.00014-0.00028}$
$100\theta_{MC}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00031+0.00063\\-0.00032-0.00063}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00059\\-0.00030-0.00059}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00057\\-0.00030-0.00060}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00029+0.00058\\-0.00029-0.00060}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00060\\-0.00030-0.00059}$
n_s	$0.97^{+0.0044+0.0087}_{-0.0044-0.0088}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0037+0.0074\\-0.0037-0.0075}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0040+0.0075\\-0.0038-0.0076}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0076\\-0.0039-0.0074}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0074\\-0.0037-0.0074}$
au	$0.080\substack{+0.017+0.032\\-0.017-0.032}$	$0.085\substack{+0.016+0.031\\-0.016-0.032}$	$0.085\substack{+0.017+0.032\\-0.017-0.032}$	$0.074\substack{+0.015+0.031\\-0.016-0.030}$	$0.073\substack{+0.016+0.031\\-0.016-0.031}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.092\substack{+0.032+0.063\\-0.033-0.063}$	$3.10^{+0.032+0.062}_{-0.032-0.065}$	$3.10^{+0.032+0.064}_{-0.032-0.065}$	$3.077\substack{+0.030+0.060\\-0.030-0.059}$	$3.076^{+0.031+0.062}_{-0.031-0.062}$
α	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained
Ω_{m0}	$0.31^{+0.0081+0.017}_{-0.0083-0.016}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0060+0.012\\-0.0060-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0061+0.012\\-0.0060-0.011}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0063+0.013\\-0.0063-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0063+0.012\\-0.0063-0.012}$
σ_8	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.82\substack{+0.012+0.024\\-0.012-0.024}$	$0.82\substack{+0.012+0.025\\-0.013-0.025}$
H_0	$67.46^{+0.60+1.21}_{-0.59-1.21}$	$67.91_{-0.45-0.86}^{+0.45+0.91}$	$67.93_{-0.45-0.91}^{+0.45+0.89}$	$67.86_{-0.48-0.94}^{+0.48+0.94}$	$67.77_{-0.48-0.89}^{+0.47+0.94}$

TABLE IV: Summary of 68% and 95% CL constraints on various model parameters of the scalar field model with potential $V(\phi) = V_0 [1 - sech(\alpha \phi)]$ ($\alpha \ge 0$) using different observational datasets. We note that Ω_{m0} is the present value of $\Omega_m = \Omega_c + \Omega_b$ and H_0 is in the units of km/s/Mpc. Here, we have shortened the notations as follows: CB = CMB+BAO, CBJ = CMB+BAO+JLA, CRJ = CMB+RSD+JLA, and CBJRC = CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.



FIG. 8: 1D marginalized posterior distributions for $(\alpha, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8, H_0)$ and 2D contour plots of several combinations of the above model parameters have been presented for Model 2b using various cosmological datasets CMB, CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA, CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

field models. Focusing on the next two important parameters, Ω_{m0} and σ_8 , we have exactly similar observation to the previous cases. That means the error bars on Ω_{m0} are slightly higher to what we see in Planck [4] and the estimated values of σ_8 are also slightly higher (mildly although) compared to Planck [4]. But, the interesting observation that we have already seen in other two quintessence scalar field models, is that, the addition of other external dataset such as BAO, JLA, RSD or CC, does not actually play any crucial role in constraining the parameters. Precisely, as we have already noticed from the error bars on different parameters, that, these external datasets do not add any constraining power to CMB dataset because after the inclusion of these external datasets to CMB dataset, there is basically no such improvements in their error bars. So, for this model we again found that CMB data alone pretty much determine the constraints. This statement is further strengthened when one considers the free parameters δ



FIG. 9: 1D marginalized posterior distributions for $(\delta, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8, H_0)$ and 2D contour plots of several combinations of the above model parameters have been presented for Model 3a using various cosmological datasets CMB, CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA, CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

and its constraining nature. From the analyses (precisely we refer to the 1D plots of δ shown in Fig. 9), it is clear that the free parameter, δ , of this model remains unconstrained for CMB alone and maintains the same feature after the addition of the external datasets, such as BAO, JLA, RSD, CC. To be more conclusive we tested this parameter taking its prior in the closed interval [0, 10], but we have seen that its constraining nature does not depend on the choice of the prior. That means if we set the prior in the closed interval [0, 30] or even increase the upper limit of this interval this does not work out. One final remark is as follows. The absence of correlation between H_0 and σ_8 , similar to other quintessence models, is again confirmed for this model. Therefore, in summary we see that H_0 tension is not reconciled for this model too, the parameter δ remains unconstrained, no correlation is present between H_0 and σ_8 similar to what we have observed with other quintessence scalar field models, and more importantly, CMB data alone can determine the constraints for this model.

We perform similar analyses for Model 3b (i.e., when $\delta \leq 0$ in eqn. (16)) and summarize the results in Table VI. Also, in Fig. 10 we show the 1D marginalized posterior distributions for some selected parameters as well as the 2D contour plots for some combinations of the model parameters. From the analyses, we again find that, δ is again unconstrained for all the observational datasets, irrespective of its prior (see the 1D posterior distribution of δ shown in Fig. 10). Additionally, other parameters, namely, H_0 , Ω_{m0} and σ_8 follow exactly similar pattern (concerning their constraining behaviour) as observed in case of Model 3a and other models in this work. So, H_0 tension remains alive for this model; σ_8 and H_0 also remains uncorrelated; and CMB data alone are sufficient to study this model since the external datasets do not add any constraining power to CMB.



FIG. 10: 1D marginalized posterior distributions for $(\delta, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8, H_0)$ and 2D contour plots of several combinations of the above model parameters have been presented for Model 3b using various cosmological datasets CMB, CMB+BAO, CMB+BAO+JLA, CMB+RSD+JLA, CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

Parameters	CMB	CB	CBJ	CRJ	CBJRC
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.12^{+0.0014+0.0028}_{-0.0014-0.0028}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0020}_{-0.0010-0.0019}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0020\\-0.0010-0.0020}$	$0.12\substack{+0.0010+0.0021\\-0.0011-0.0021}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0020}_{-0.0010-0.0020}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	$0.022\substack{+0.00015+0.00030\\-0.00016-0.00030}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00014+0.00027\\-0.00015-0.00026}$	$0.022\substack{+0.00013+0.00027\\-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022^{+0.00013+0.00027}_{-0.00013-0.00027}$
$100\theta_{MC}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00032+0.00063\\-0.00033-0.00064}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00031+0.00058\\-0.00030-0.00059}$	$1.041\substack{+0.00030+0.00058\\-0.00030-0.00061}$	$1.041^{+0.00031+0.00060}_{-0.00031-0.00059}$	$1.041^{+0.00031+0.00058}_{-0.00030-0.00059}$
au	$0.079\substack{+0.017+0.033\\-0.017-0.032}$	$0.085\substack{+0.017+0.031\\-0.016-0.033}$	$0.085\substack{+0.017+0.032\\-0.016-0.032}$	$0.073\substack{+0.015+0.030\\-0.015-0.031}$	$0.073\substack{+0.016+0.030\\-0.016-0.031}$
n_s	$0.97\substack{+0.0045+0.0092\\-0.0047-0.0092}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0073\\-0.0038-0.0075}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0039+0.0076\\-0.0039-0.0079}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0040+0.0075\\-0.0039-0.0075}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0037+0.0074\\-0.0038-0.0073}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.092^{+0.032+0.065}_{-0.033-0.064}$	$3.10^{+0.034+0.061}_{-0.031-0.064}$	$3.10^{+0.032+0.063}_{-0.032-0.065}$	$3.077^{+0.030}_{-0.030-0.061}$	$3.077^{+0.032+0.061}_{-0.031-0.062}$
δ	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained
Ω_{m0}	$0.31\substack{+0.0086+0.018\\-0.0087-0.017}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0058+0.012\\-0.0064-0.011}$	$0.31^{+0.0061+0.012}_{-0.0060-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0062+0.013\\-0.0064-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0061+0.012\\-0.0060-0.012}$
σ_8	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.025}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.013-0.025}$	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.013-0.027}$	$0.82\substack{+0.012+0.024\\-0.012-0.024}$	$0.82\substack{+0.013+0.025\\-0.013-0.025}$
H_0	$67.47_{-0.63-1.26}^{+0.64+1.28}$	$67.91\substack{+0.45+0.87\\-0.46-0.87}$	$67.94_{-0.46-0.88}^{+0.46+0.91}$	$67.83_{-0.47-0.94}^{+0.48+0.96}$	$67.78_{-0.46-0.87}^{+0.45+0.88}$

TABLE V: Summary of 68% and 95% CL constraints on various model parameters of Model 3a: $V(\phi) = V_0 \left[1 + \delta \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^p\right]^2$ (where $\delta \ge 0$) with p = 1, using different observational datasets. We note that Ω_{m0} is the present value of $\Omega_m = \Omega_r + \Omega_b$ and H_0 is in the units of km/s/Mpc. Here, we have shortened the notations as follows: CB = CMB+BAO, CBJ = CMB+BAO+JLA, CRJ = CMB+RSD+JLA, and CBJRC = CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

4.2. Geometrical test: The Om diagnostic

According to the current literature, a large number of cosmological models are introduced to understand the latetime accelerated phase of the universe. Amongst them, sometimes from the statistical ground, finding the differences between the cosmological models becomes very difficult and not sound. Thus, a geometrical way that enables us to distinguish the cosmological models is welcome and very appealing. One of such geometrical tests that we are interested in this work is the Om diagnostic [103, 104]. This diagnostic is also considered to be the simplest one in compared to the statefinder and cosmographic parameters since the only geometrical parameter involved in this

Parameters	CMB	CB	CBJ	CRJ	CBJRC
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.12^{+0.0014+0.0026}_{-0.0013-0.0027}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0021}_{-0.0010-0.0021}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0019}_{-0.0010-0.0019}$	$0.12^{+0.0011+0.0021}_{-0.0011-0.0021}$	$0.12^{+0.0010+0.0020}_{-0.0010-0.0019}$
$\Omega_b h^2$	$0.022\substack{+0.00015+0.00030\\-0.00016-0.00030}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00028}_{-0.00014-0.00027}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00027}_{-0.00014-0.00028}$	$0.022^{+0.00014+0.00028}_{-0.00014-0.00028}$	$0.022^{+0.00013+0.00026}_{-0.00013-0.00026}$
$100\theta_{MC}$	$1.041^{+0.00033+0.00066}_{-0.00033-0.00066}$	$1.041^{+0.00031+0.00060}_{-0.00030-0.00061}$	$1.041^{+0.00030+0.00060}_{-0.00030-0.00060}$	$1.041^{+0.00031+0.00060}_{-0.00030-0.00060}$	$1.041^{+0.00030+0.00058}_{-0.00030-0.00059}$
au	$0.080^{+0.017+0.033}_{-0.017-0.033}$	$0.085\substack{+0.017+0.033\\-0.017-0.034}$	$0.085^{+0.017+0.031}_{-0.016-0.032}$	$0.073^{+0.015+0.031}_{-0.015-0.030}$	$0.072^{+0.015+0.030}_{-0.016-0.029}$
n_s	$0.97\substack{+0.0045+0.0088\\-0.0045-0.0087}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0039+0.0077\\-0.0039-0.0074}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0039+0.0076\\-0.0039-0.0074}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0039+0.0076\\-0.0039-0.0074}$	$0.97\substack{+0.0038+0.0073\\-0.0038-0.0074}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.092\substack{+0.034+0.065\\-0.034-0.066}$	$3.101\substack{+0.034+0.065\\-0.034-0.067}$	$3.101\substack{+0.035+0.060\\-0.032-0.063}$	$3.077^{+0.030+0.060}_{-0.030-0.058}$	$3.076^{+0.030+0.059}_{-0.029-0.057}$
δ	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained	unconstrained
Ω_{m0}	$0.31\substack{+0.0084+0.017\\-0.0084-0.016}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0063+0.013\\-0.0062-0.012}$	$0.31^{+0.0059+0.012}_{-0.0060-0.011}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0064+0.013\\-0.0063-0.012}$	$0.31\substack{+0.0060+0.012\\-0.0060-0.012}$
σ_8	$0.83\substack{+0.013+0.026\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.83\substack{+0.014+0.027\\-0.014-0.027}$	$0.83\substack{+0.014+0.025\\-0.013-0.026}$	$0.82^{+0.012+0.024}_{-0.013-0.023}$	$0.82^{+0.012+0.024}_{-0.013-0.023}$
H_0	$67.47^{+0.61+1.23}_{-0.62-1.20}$	$67.92^{+0.47+0.94}_{-0.47-0.92}$	$67.92^{+0.45+0.89}_{-0.46-0.89}$	$67.85^{+0.48+0.96}_{-0.48-0.95}$	$67.76_{-0.45-0.88}^{+0.45+0.89}$

TABLE VI: Summary of 68% and 95% CL constraints on various model parameters of Model 3b: $V(\phi) = V_0 \left[1 + \delta \left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right)^p\right]^2$ (where $\delta \leq 0$) with p = 1, using different observational datasets. We note that Ω_{m0} is the present value of $\Omega_m = \Omega_r + \Omega_b$ and H_0 is in the units of km/s/Mpc. Here, we have shortened the notations as follows: CB = CMB+BAO, CBJ = CMB+BAO+JLA, CRJ = CMB+RSD+JLA, and CBJRC = CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC.

method is the Hubble parameter, in other words, only the first order derivative of the cosmic time appears, while the cosmographic constructions involve the higher order derivatives of the cosmic time. We refer to some works on cosmographic parameters used to distinguish the dark energy models in the literature [105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110]. We begin our analysis with the definition of Om as follows [103, 104]

$$Om(z) = \frac{E(z)^2 - 1}{(1+z)^3 - 1}$$
(17)

where $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$. Looking at eqn. (17), One can easily see that in a spatially flat Λ CDM driven universe, where $E(z)^2 = \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_{m0})$, the definition for Om(z) returns, $Om(z) = \Omega_{m0}$, that means, for the Λ CDM universe, Om(z) is time independent. Conversely, if for any cosmological model, we are given that, $Om(z) = \Omega_{m0}$, during the evolution of the universe, then using equation (17), one may conclude that, the model is basically Λ CDM where the background is described by the usual flat FLRW universe, so mathematically, one can say that, $Om(z) = \Omega_{m0}$, *iff* the model is the Λ CDM. This statement actually works to distinguish the cosmological models from the Λ CDM and it has been used extensively in the literature. Thus, for any cosmological model, any deviation of Om(z) from Ω_{m0} actually signals the difference of the toy model from the base Λ CDM cosmological model. In addition to that, the Om diagnostic also offers a characterization of the dark energy models whether they belong to the quintessence class or the phantom class [111, 112, 113, 114]. Now, in order to understand the evolutions of Om(z) for the scalar field models, we have numerically solved the Hubble function for each scalar field model and present the variations of Om(z) in Fig. 11. From Fig. 11, one can easily find that the models actually are very close to each other and at large redshifts, the evolution of Om(z) for the scalar field models is same to that of the Λ CDM model (represented by the solid horizontal line), while for $z \leq 2$, the deviation of Om(z) for each scalar field model compared to the Λ CDM are clearly pronounced.

4.3. Bayesian Evidence: A statistical tool for model comparison

In this section we present a statistical comparison of the scalar field models using the Bayesian analysis, an analysis that quantifies the support of the cosmological model with the observational data. The analysis needs a reference model with respect to which the comparison should be made, and without any doubt, Λ CDM model will be the best choice based on its performance with the observational evidences. Let us first describe how the Bayesian evidence is calculated. In the Bayesian analysis we need the posterior probability of the model parameters (denoted by the symbol θ) of any preassigned model M, given a particular data set x which is employed to analyze the model, and any prior information. Now, recalling the Bayes theorem, one may easily write:

$$p(\theta|x, M) = \frac{p(x|\theta, M) \pi(\theta|M)}{p(x|M)}$$
(18)

where $p(x|\theta, M)$ is the likelihood function that entirely depends on the model parameters (θ) with the fixed data set (x); and $\pi(\theta|M)$ is the prior information that is supplied during the analysis. The quantity p(x|M) placed in the



FIG. 11: Qualitative evolution of the Om(z) function for the scalar field models (12), (15) and (16). The different trajectories of Om(z) correspond to Model 1 with $\beta = 2$ and u = 1 (red curve), Model 2 with $\alpha = 2$ (green curve for $\epsilon = +1$ and cyan curve for $\epsilon = -1$), and Model 3 with p = 2 (magenta curve for $\delta = +1$ and blue curve for $\delta = -1$). We note that the curves (red, green, cyan, magenta, and blue) describing the Om(z) function for different scalar field models are very close to each other and hence it is very hard to distinguish from one another. The horizontal solid black line depicts the Om(z) function (which is constant as shown in the text) for the spatially flat Λ CDM model. The remaining black lines exhibit the evolution of Om(z) for the dark energy models with constant equation of state w = -0.9, -1 and -1.1, respectively from the top to bottom. The dark energy models having w > -1 (quintessence) show negative curvature whereas the model with w < -1 (phantom) designates positive curvature which are generic features of quintessence and phantom models, respectively.

denominator in the right hand side of eqn. (18) is the Bayesian evidence for the model comparison and this is nothing but the integral over the unnormalised posterior $\tilde{p}(\theta|x, M) \equiv p(x|\theta, M) \pi(\theta|M)$ taking the following expression

$$E \equiv p(x|M) = \int d\theta \, p(x|\theta, M) \, \pi(\theta|M), \tag{19}$$

which is also referred to as the marginal likelihood. Now, for any particular model M_i and the reference model M_j (this is the Λ CDM model under consideration), the posterior probability is given by

$$\frac{p(M_i|x)}{p(M_j|x)} = \frac{\pi(M_i)}{\pi(M_j)} \frac{p(x|M_i)}{p(x|M_j)} = \frac{\pi(M_i)}{\pi(M_j)} B_{ij}.$$
(20)

where the quantity $B_{ij} = \frac{p(x|M_i)}{p(x|M_j)}$, is the Bayes factor of the model M_i relative to the reference model M_j (here it is Λ CDM). This factor essentially tells us how the observational data support the cosmological model under consideration. For $B_{ij} > 1$, we say that the observational data support the model M_i more strongly than the model M_j . For different values of B_{ij} (or alternatively, $\ln B_{ij}$) we quantify the models. The quantification is generally adopts the widely accepted revised Jeffreys scales [115] (see Table VII for the details). If B_{ij} (or $\ln B_{ij}$) assumes negative values, the result is reversed, that means, the negative values of $\ln B_{ij}$ indicate that the model M_j is preferred over the model M_i .

$\ln B_{ij}$	Strength of evidence for model M_i
$0 \le \ln B_{ij} < 1$	Weak
$1 \le \ln B_{ij} < 3$	Definite/Positive
$3 \le \ln B_{ij} < 5$	Strong
$\ln B_{ij} \ge 5$	Very strong

TABLE VII: Revised Jeffreys scale used to quantify the observational support of any model M_i with respect to one another model (reference model) M_j .

Dataset	Model	$\ln B_{ij}$	Strength of evidence for model $\Lambda {\rm CDM}$
CMB	${\rm Model}\ 1$	-1.9	Definite/Positive
CB	${\rm Model}\ 1$	-5.9	Very Strong
CBJ	${\rm Model}\ 1$	-6.2	Very Strong
CJR	${\rm Model}\ 1$	-3.2	Strong
CBJRC	${\rm Model}\ 1$	-2.7	Definite/Positive
CMB	Model 2a	-3.1	Strong
CB	Model 2a	-5.1	Very Strong
CBJ	${\rm Model}\ 2{\rm a}$	-4.9	Strong
CJR	${\rm Model}\ 2{\rm a}$	-1.6	Definite/Positive
CBJRC	Model 2a	-1.1	Definite/Positive
CMB	Model 2b	-2.6	Definite/Positive
CB	Model 2b	-7.0	Very Strong
CBJ	Model 2b	-6.1	Very Strong
CJR	Model 2b	-1.8	Definite/Positive
CBJRC	Model 2b	-1.9	Definite/Positive
CMB	Model 3a	-3.3	Strong
CB	Model 3a	-4.0	Strong
CBJ	Model 3a	-5.2	Very Strong
CJR	Model 3a	-3.1	Strong
CBJRC	Model 3a	-2.3	Strong
CMB	Model 3b	-2.5	Definite/Positive
CB	Model 3b	-3.9	Strong
CBJ	Model 3b	-5.4	Very Strong
CJR	Model 3b	-1.7	Definite/Positive
CBJRC	Model 3b	-1.5	Definite/Positive

TABLE VIII: The values of $\ln B_{ij}$, the logarithm of the Bayes factor for different scalar field models in this work with respect to the base Λ CDM model for different observational data sets as well as the corresponding strength of evidence for Λ CDM quantified based on the modified Jeffreys scale (see Tab. VII). From the Bayesian point of view, the negative values of $\ln B_{ij}$ indicate that the Λ CDM model is certainly preferred in respect to the scalar field models.

The computation of the Bayesian evidence is now easy since one can directly use the MCMC chains that are already found to extract the parameters space for different observational data sets. For a detailed explanation and implementation of the Bayesian evidence for any cosmological model we refer to the original works [116, 117]. Here we use the code MCEvidence³ for the computation of the Bayesian evidence of the models. In Table VIII, we present the $\ln B_{ij}$ values calculated for all the scalar field models with respect to the base cosmological model Λ CDM obtained for different observational data sets employed in this work. The negative values of $\ln B_{ij}$ for any scalar field model obtained for any observational data set actually indicate that the Λ CDM model is preferred over the scalar field models. From Table VIII one can see that Λ CDM model is clearly favored over all the scalar field models. In

³ This code is freely available at github.com/yabebalFantaye/MCEvidence.



FIG. 12: MCMC samples in the (\tilde{x}, Ω_{m0}) plane where $\tilde{x} = \beta$ (for Model 1), α (for Model 2a and Model 2b) and δ (for Model 3a and Model 3b) colored by the values of H_0 for the combined analysis CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC. The upper panel stands for Model 1; the middle panels correspond to Model 2 (Model 2a in the left side and Model 2b in the right side); the lower panels are for Model 3 (Model 3a in the left side and Model 3b in the right side).

particular, for Model 3a, this becomes much clear while one may note that, depending on different data sets, a slight changes appear in the conclusion, but however, overall the Λ CDM model is favored with a preference ranging from definite/positive to very strong.



22



FIG. 13: The left panel shows a strong negative correlation between the parameters (Ω_{m0}, H_0) for the scalar field models and the right panel shows that the parameters (σ_8, H_0) for all the scalar field models are uncorrelated. We have shown both the results for the combined analysis CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC, however, this result is valid for the remaining datasets.

4.4. A comparative study of the quintessence scalar field models

In the previous subsections, we have presented the observational constraints on the scalar field models and also performed their Bayesian evidences from which it has been found that ACDM is always preferred over the present scalar field models, at least according to the observational data employed in this work. In this section, we aim to offer an overall comparison between the present scalar field models (12), (15) and (16) focusing on some generic properties of the models independent of the observational datasets. In all scalar field models, we find that the parameter which quantifies the model from the constant potential, that means, β for Model 1 of eqn. (12), α for Model 2 of eqn. (15) and Model 3 of eqn. (16) are very weakly constrained and within 68% CL, the models allow the constant potential $V(\phi) = V_0$. This is not a new result in the scalar field theory. One might recall similar investigations with Peebles-Ratra potential $V(\phi) \propto \phi^{-\alpha}$ ($\alpha \ge 0$) [32, 33] where the parameter α quantifying the deviation of the model from the constant potential cannot be constrained well even with the latest cosmological datasets, see the results in [118]. For the exponential potential [112], a similar conclusion finding that the constant potential is allowed by the data was achieved but again the quantifying parameter was weakly constrained. Some of the models studied in this work are closely related to the exponential potential since the first two models, Model 1, Model 2 can be expressed in terms of the exponential potential and Model 3 has similar structure to the power law type potential (although it looks similar to the power law potential [118] for negative values of p, but strictly not). However, to understand this scenario much better, in Fig. 12, we have shown the 2D contour plots between the parameters (\tilde{x}, Ω_{m0}) where $\tilde{x} = \beta$ (for Model 1), α (for Model 2a and Model 2b) and δ (for Model 3a and Model 3b) colored by the H_0 values. The points in all the sub plots are the samples from the chains of the markov chain monte carlo (mcmc) analysis using the combined dataset CMB+BAO+JLA+RSD+CC (we only show the final analysis because the others give similar conclusions). From this figure (Fig. 12), one can now clearly see that for higher or lower values of H_0 (used different color to distinguish), the parameter $\tilde{x} (= \beta, \alpha, \delta)$ mentioned above, does not offer any specific changes with different (higher/lower) values of Ω_{m0} . Apart from that, the scalar field models are very similar predicting a smooth transition from the past decelerating era to the present accelerating phase. Also, the equation of state w_{ϕ} , of the scalar field model and the effective equation of state w_{eff} in eqn. (6) of the cosmological model are close to '-1', the cosmological constant limit. Concerning the statistical analysis, we find that there is a strong negative correlation between the parameters Ω_{m0} and H_0 (see the left panel of Fig. 13) while there is no such correlation found for the parameters (σ_8, H_0). Both the results are independent of all the datasets considered. One may recall that the correlation between Ω_{m0} and H_0 exists for some other well known potentials [112, 118] and this is just a consequence of the geometric degeneracy. While the absence of correlation between σ_8 and H_0 for all three quintessence scalar field models is certainly an interesting issue since the correlations between these two parameters are often present in other cosmological models explored recently [119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125]. As already explained in detail, H_0 and σ_8 are respectively more background and perturbation quantities while σ_8 is a derived parameter which is related to A_s as $\sigma_8 \propto A_s^2$. Thus, based on their individual character, it is expected that they should govern different physics irrespective of the simplicity of the model. The parameter H_0 governs the distance to last-scattering and thus Θ_s . So, changing H_0 changes the position of all the peaks in the CMB spectrum, especially the first one. On the other hand, changing σ_8 changes the amplitude of the CMB peaks. So, in principle we do not expect a strong correlation between H_0 and σ_8 , rather the only effect is an indirect correlation between H_0 and Ω_{m0} . Since the absence of the correlation between H_0 and σ_8 is valid for all three different quintessence scalar field models, thus, we certainly believe that the investigations toward this direction should be continued in order to get a more transparent picture of the quintessence scalar field models. In fact, it is important to check whether the presence or absence of the correlations between the above three parameters are independent of the quintessence scalar field potentials or not.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Scalar field models are well known due to their diversities in explaining various phases of the universe's evolution. They have been found to explain both early- and late-accelerating phases of the universe in a satisfactory way, see [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39]. The scalar field models are also very appealing to provide with a unified picture connecting the early- and late accelerating phases, known as quintessential inflationary models, see for instance [37, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52]. So, without any further doubt, the scalar field models might be thought to furnish a viable description for the universe evolution, and as a consequence, this triggered the investigations in this direction with an output of numerous scalar field models [5]. In the present work we focus on a specific scalar field model, namely, the quintessence scalar field model. Since the potential plays the key role in determining the nature of the model, thus, it is natural to ask the observational viabilities of the models. Thus, remembering this issue, in the present work we consider a varieties of quintessence scalar field models in order to test their observational viabilities and to provide stringent constraints using the latest **cosmological** data from various sources, namely, the observations from cosmic microwave background (CMB), baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), redshift space distortions (RSD), joint light curve analysis (JLA) from Supernovae Type Ia and the Hubble parameter measurements from the cosmic chronometers (CC). The analyses of the scalar field models have been performed using markov chain monte carlo package cosmomc [100], a fast converging algorithm equipped with a convergence criteria by Gelman-Rubin [101]. The analyses of the results for different scalar field models, and using several observational datasets, have been presented in Table II (Model 1), Table III (Model 2a), Table IV (Model 2b) Table V (Model 3a), Table VI (Model 3b) with the corresponding 1D marginalized posterior distributions of some key parameters of the models as well as the 2D contour plots between several combinations of the model parameters in Fig. 6 (Model 1), Fig. 7 (Model 2a), Fig. 8 (Model 2b), Fig. 9 (Model 3a) and Fig. 10 (Model 3b).

Our analyses show that the free parameters, β , α and δ of the scalar field potentials, quantifying the deviations of the models from the constant potential remain unconstrained for all the observational datasets we have used in this work. We further find that the constraints on various model parameters obtained from CMB alone dataset and from CMB+ext datasets (where 'ext' means the external dataset such as BAO, JLA, RSD, CC) are almost similar. This means that the quintessence scalar field models are pretty much determined by the CMB alone dataset. It is interesting to note that in all scalar field models, a strong negative correlation between the parameters (H_0 , Ω_{m0}) exists (the consequence of the geometric degeneracy), whilst on the other hand, the parameters (H_0 , σ_8) are not correlated. The absence of correlation between H_0 and σ_8 is expected. The parameter, H_0 , governs the distance to last-scattering and hence Θ_s (= $100\theta_{MC}$). So, changing H_0 changes the position of all the peaks in the CMB spectrum, especially the first one. Whereas changing σ_8 alters the amplitude of the CMB peaks. The effects are distinct and thus can be well distinguished between each other. So, usually we do not expect any correlation between H_0 and σ_8 for the scalar field models.

However, in spite of that, perhaps it will be important to continue further the investigations along the similar lines in order to see whether the presence of correlations between (H_0, Ω_{m0}) and the absence of correlations between (H_0, σ_8) in the scalar field models are generic or not. The generic nature of any parameter is very important to understand the nature of the models. Finally, the models have been further analyzed using the Bayesian analysis with respect to the base Λ CDM model for all the cosmological data sets employed in the work. We compute the observational support of the scalar field models with respect to the the Λ CDM model (summarized in Table VIII). The Bayesian evidence analyses report that overall the Λ CDM model is favored with a preference ranging from definite/positive to very strong.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the referee for some essential comments that certainly improved the quality of the manuscript. W. Yang is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11705079, No. 11647153. S. Pan acknowledges the support through the Faculty Research and Professional Development Fund

(FRPDF) Scheme of Presidency University, Kolkata. A. Wang acknowledges the financial support provided by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11675145. The authors also thank S. Vagnozzi, R. C. Nunes and E. Di Valentino for several fruitful discussions.

Appendix A

We use following dimensionless variables [128]

$$Y_1 = \frac{\phi}{M_p}, \quad Y_2 = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{M_p H_0}, \quad \mathcal{V} = \frac{V(Y_1)}{M_p^2 H_0^2}.$$
 (21)

where dot (.) denotes the derivative with respect to cosmic time and H_0 is the Hubble parameter at present epoch. We can cast Hubble and Klein-Gordon Eqs. as a system of the first-order equations

$$Y_1' = \frac{Y_2}{h(Y_1, Y_2)} \tag{22}$$

$$Y_2' = -3Y_2 - \frac{1}{h(Y_1, Y_2)} \left[\frac{d\mathcal{V}(Y_1)}{dY_1} \right]$$
(23)

The prime (') represents the derivative with respect to $\ln(a)$, and the function $h(Y_1, Y_2) = H/H_0$ is given by,

$$h(Y_1, Y_2) = \sqrt{\left[\frac{Y_2^2}{6} + \frac{\mathcal{V}(Y_1)}{3} + \Omega_{m0}e^{-3a} + \Omega_{r0}e^{-4a}\right]}$$
(24)

Here, Ω_{r0} and Ω_{m0} are the energy density parameters of radiation and matter, respectively at the present epoch. We solve the evolution equations (22) and (23) numerically, and the results are shown in Figures 1 – 5 for different potentials.

Above Eqs. are first order differential equations, and to solve them we need two initial conditions of Y_1 and Y_2 . We choose initial values of Y_1 and Y_2 such that at the present epoch $\Omega_{m0} \simeq 0.3$, $\Omega_{r0} \simeq 10^{-4}$, $\Omega_{\phi_0} \simeq 0.7$ and $h(z) = \frac{H(z)}{H_0}|_{z=0} = 1$, where H_0 is the Hubble constant at present epoch and z is redshift.

Appendix B

In this section we present the first order perturbations equations in the synchronous gauge. We consider the perturbed metric in the above gauge that takes the form [129, 130, 131]

$$ds^{2} = a^{2}(\eta) \left[-d\eta^{2} + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij}) dx^{i} dx^{j} \right],$$
(25)

in which η refers to the conformal time; δ_{ij} , h_{ij} are the unperturbed and the perturbed metric tensors, respectively. Now, the conservation equations of the energy and momentum for the *i*-th component of the fluid for a mode with wavenumber k are recasted into:

$$\delta_i' = -(1+w_i) \left(\theta_i + \frac{h'}{2}\right) - 3\mathcal{H}\left(\frac{\delta p_i}{\delta \rho_i} - w_i\right) \delta_i - 9\mathcal{H}^2\left(\frac{\delta p_i}{\delta \rho_i} - c_{a,i}^2\right) (1+w_i)\frac{\theta_i}{k^2},\tag{26}$$

$$\theta_i' = -\mathcal{H}\left(1 - 3\frac{\delta p_i}{\delta \rho_i}\right)\theta_i + \frac{\delta p_i/\delta \rho_i}{1 + w_i}k^2\,\delta_i - k^2\sigma_i,\tag{27}$$

where the symbols used in the above equations have the following meanings: (i) The prime associated to each quantity refers the derivative with respect to conformal time, (ii) $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$ is the conformal Hubble parameter, (iii) the quantity $\delta_i = \delta \rho_i / \rho_i$ refers to the density perturbation of the *i*-th fluid, (iv) $\theta_i \equiv ik^j v_j$ is the divergence of the *i*-th fluid velocity, (v) $h = h_j^j$ is the trace of the metric perturbations h_{ij} , (vi) σ_i denotes the anisotropic stress associated with the *i*-th fluid, (vii) w_i is the equation of state of the *i*-th fluid, so for scalar field model, $w_{\phi} = p_{\phi} / \rho_{\phi}$. Finally, $c_{a,i}^2 = \dot{p}_i / \dot{\rho}_i$,

is the adiabatic speed of sound of the *i*-th fluid with $c_{a,i}^2 = w_i - \frac{w'_i}{3\mathcal{H}(1+w_i)}$. The quantity $c_{a,i}^2$ should be taken to be non-negative in order to avoid any kind of instabilities.

- A. G. Riess et al., Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant, Astron. J. 116, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].
- [2] S. Perlmutter et al., Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high redshift supernovae, Astrophys. J. 517, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].
- [3] G. Hinshaw et al., Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results, Astrophys. J. Suppl. 208, 19 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] P. A. R. Ade et al., Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters, Astron. Astrophys. 594, A13 (2016) [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [5] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, Dynamics of dark energy, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 15, 1753 (2006) [hep-th/0603057].
- [6] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, Dark Energy: Theory and Observations, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., (2010).
- [7] L. Visinelli and S. Vagnozzi, Cosmological window onto the string axiverse and the supersymmetry breaking scale, Phys. Rev. D 99 (2019) no.6, 063517 [arXiv:1809.06382 [hep-ph]].
- [8] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, f(R) theories, Living Rev. Rel. 13, 3 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4928 [gr-qc]].
- [9] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, f(R) Theories Of Gravity, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 451 (2010) [arXiv:0805.1726 [gr-qc]].
- [10] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Extended Theories of Gravity*, Phys. Rept. 509, 167 (2011).
- [11] R. Myrzakulov, L. Sebastiani and S. Vagnozzi, Inflation in $f(R, \phi)$ -theories and mimetic gravity scenario, Eur. Phys. J. C **75** (2015) 444 [arXiv:1504.07984 [gr-qc]].
- [12] Y. F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis and E. N. Saridakis, f(T) Teleparallel Gravity and Cosmology, Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, no. 10, 106901 (2016).
- [13] L. Sebastiani, S. Vagnozzi and R. Myrzakulov, Mimetic gravity: a review of recent developments and applications to cosmology and astrophysics, Adv. High Energy Phys. 2017, 3156915 (2017) [arXiv:1612.08661 [gr-qc]].
- [14] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, Modified Gravity Theories on a Nutshell: Inflation, Bounce and Late-time Evolution, Phys. Rept. 692, 1 (2017) [arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc]].
- [15] J. Dutta, W. Khyllep, E. N. Saridakis, N. Tamanini and S. Vagnozzi, Cosmological dynamics of mimetic gravity, JCAP 1802 (2018) 041 [arXiv:1711.07290 [gr-qc]].
- [16] A. Casalino, M. Rinaldi, L. Sebastiani and S. Vagnozzi, Mimicking dark matter and dark energy in a mimetic model compatible with GW170817, Phys. Dark Univ. 22 (2018) 108 [arXiv:1803.02620 [gr-qc]].
- [17] S. Chakraborty, S. Pan and S. Saha, A third alternative to explain recent observations: Future deceleration, Phys. Lett. B 738, 424 (2014) [arXiv:1411.0941 [gr-qc]].
- [18] R. C. Nunes and D. Pavón, Phantom behavior via cosmological creation of particles, Phys. Rev. D 91, 063526 (2015) [arXiv:1503.04113 [gr-qc]].
- [19] J. de Haro and S. Pan, Gravitationally induced adiabatic particle production: From Big Bang to de Sitter, Class. Quant. Grav. 33, no. 16, 165007 (2016) [arXiv:1512.03100 [gr-qc]].
- [20] S. Pan, J. de Haro, A. Paliathanasis and R. J. Slagter, Evolution and Dynamics of a Matter creation model, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 460, no. 2, 1445 (2016) [arXiv:1601.03955 [gr-qc]].
- [21] R. C. Nunes and S. Pan, Cosmological consequences of an adiabatic matter creation process, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 459, no. 1, 673 (2016) [arXiv:1603.02573 [gr-qc]].
- [22] R. C. Nunes, Connecting inflation with late cosmic acceleration by particle production, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 25, no. 06, 1650067 (2016) [arXiv:1603.05302 [gr-qc]].
- [23] R. C. Nunes, Gravitationally induced particle production and its impact on structure formation, Gen. Rel. Grav. 48, no. 8, 107 (2016) [arXiv:1607.03441 [gr-qc]].
- [24] L. Aresté Saló and J. de Haro, Cosmological solutions in spatially curved universes with adiabatic particle production, Class. Quant. Grav. 34, no. 6, 065001 (2017) [arXiv:1612.01272 [gr-qc]].
- [25] A. Paliathanasis, J. D. Barrow and S. Pan, Cosmological solutions with gravitational particle production and nonzero curvature, Phys. Rev. D 95, no. 10, 103516 (2017) [arXiv:1610.02893 [gr-qc]].
- [26] S. Pan, B. Kumar Pal and S. Pramanik, Gravitationally influenced particle creation models and late-time cosmic acceleration, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 15, no. 03, 1850042 (2018) [arXiv:1606.04097 [gr-qc]].
- [27] G. B. Zhao et al., Dynamical dark energy in light of the latest observations, Nat. Astron. 1, no. 9, 627 (2017) [arXiv:1701.08165 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] S. Weinberg, The cosmological constant problem, Rev. Mod. Phys. 61, 1 (1989).
- [29] S. M. Carroll, The cosmological constant problem, Liv. Rev. Rel. 4, 1 (2001) [astro-ph/0004075].
- [30] A. H. Guth, The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems, Phys. Rev. D 23, 347 (1981).
- [31] A. D. Linde, A New Inflationary Universe Scenario: A Possible Solution of the Horizon, Flatness, Homogeneity, Isotropy and Primordial Monopole Problems, Phys. Lett. 108B, 389 (1982).

- [32] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Cosmology with a Time Variable Cosmological Constant, Astrophys. J. 325, L17 (1988).
- [33] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Cosmological Consequences of a Rolling Homogeneous Scalar Field, Phys. Rev. D 37, 3406 (1988).
- [34] J. D. Barrow and P. Saich, Scalar field cosmologies, Class. Quant. Grav. 10, 279 (1993).
- [35] J. D. Barrow, New types of inflationary universe, Phys. Rev. D 48, 1585 (1993).
- [36] A. R. Liddle and R. J. Scherrer, A Classification of scalar field potentials with cosmological scaling solutions, Phys. Rev. D 59, 023509 (1999) [astro-ph/9809272].
- [37] P. J. E. Peebles and A. Vilenkin, *Quintessential inflation*, Phys. Rev. D 59, 063505 (1999) [astro-ph/9810509].
- [38] V. Sahni and L. M. Wang, A New cosmological model of quintessence and dark matter, Phys. Rev. D 62, 103517 (2000) [astro-ph/9910097].
- [39] C. Rubano and J. D. Barrow, Scaling solutions and reconstruction of scalar field potentials, Phys. Rev. D 64, 127301 (2001) [gr-qc/0105037].
- [40] S. Basilakos, M. Tsamparlis and A. Paliathanasis, Using the Noether symmetry approach to probe the nature of dark energy, Phys. Rev. D 83, 103512 (2011) [arXiv:1104.2980 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] M. Tsamparlis and A. Paliathanasis, Three fluid cosmological model using Lie and Noether symmetries, Class. Quant. Grav. 29, 015006 (2012) [arXiv:1111.5567 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] A. Paliathanasis, M. Tsamparlis and S. Basilakos, Dynamical symmetries and observational constraints in scalar field cosmology, Phys. Rev. D 90, no. 10, 103524 (2014) [arXiv:1410.4930 [gr-qc]].
- [43] A. Paliathanasis, M. Tsamparlis, S. Basilakos and J. D. Barrow, Dynamical analysis in scalar field cosmology, Phys. Rev. D 91, no. 12, 123535 (2015) [arXiv:1503.05750 [gr-qc]].
- [44] R. Myrzakulov, L. Sebastiani, S. Vagnozzi and S. Zerbini, *Mimetic covariant renormalizable gravity*, Fund. J. Mod. Phys. 8 (2015) 119 [arXiv:1505.03115 [gr-qc]].
- [45] R. Myrzakulov, L. Sebastiani, S. Vagnozzi and S. Zerbini, Static spherically symmetric solutions in mimetic gravity: rotation curves and wormholes, Class. Quant. Grav. 33 (2016) no.12, 125005 [arXiv:1510.02284 [gr-qc]].
- [46] G. Cognola, R. Myrzakulov, L. Sebastiani, S. Vagnozzi and S. Zerbini, Covariant Hořava-like and mimetic Horndeski gravity: cosmological solutions and perturbations, Class. Quant. Grav. 33 (2016) no.22, 225014 [arXiv:1601.00102 [gr-qc]].
- [47] J. de Haro, J. Amorós and S. Pan, Simple inflationary quintessential model, Phys. Rev. D 93, no. 8, 084018 (2016) [arXiv:1601.08175 [gr-qc]].
- [48] J. de Haro and E. Elizalde, Inflation and late-time acceleration from a double-well potential with cosmological constant, Gen. Rel. Grav. 48, no. 6, 77 (2016) [arXiv:1602.03433 [gr-qc]].
- [49] J. de Haro, J. Amorós and S. Pan, Simple inflationary quintessential model II: Power law potentials, Phys. Rev. D 94, no. 6, 064060 (2016) [arXiv:1607.06726 [gr-qc]].
- [50] J. de Haro, On the viability of quintessential inflation models from observational data, Gen. Rel. Grav. 49, no. 1, 6 (2017) [arXiv:1602.07138 [gr-qc]].
- [51] J. de Haro and L. Aresté Saló, Reheating constraints in quintessential inflation, Phys. Rev. D 95, no. 12, 123501 (2017) [arXiv:1702.04212 [gr-qc]].
- [52] J. Haro, Different reheating mechanisms in quintessence inflation, arXiv:1807.07367 [gr-qc].
- [53] N. Dimakis, A. Karagiorgos, A. Zampeli, A. Paliathanasis, T. Christodoulakis and P. A. Terzis, General Analytic Solutions of Scalar Field Cosmology with Arbitrary Potential, Phys. Rev. D 93, no. 12, 123518 (2016) [arXiv:1604.05168 [gr-qc]].
- [54] A. Paliathanasis, S. Pan and S. Pramanik, Scalar field cosmology modified by the Generalized Uncertainty Principle, Class. Quant. Grav. 32, no. 24, 245006 (2015) [arXiv:1508.06543 [gr-qc]].
- [55] S. Vagnozzi, Recovering a MOND-like acceleration law in mimetic gravity, Class. Quant. Grav. 34 (2017) no.18, 185006 [arXiv:1708.00603 [gr-qc]].
- [56] Y. Akrami, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and V. Vardanyan, The landscape, the swampland and the era of precision cosmology, arXiv:1808.09440 [hep-th].
- [57] A. Casalino, M. Rinaldi, L. Sebastiani and S. Vagnozzi, Alive and well: mimetic gravity and a higher-order extension in light of GW170817, Class. Quant. Grav. 36 (2019) no.1, 017001 [arXiv:1811.06830 [gr-qc]].
- [58] A. Paliathanasis and M. Tsamparlis, Two scalar field cosmology: Conservation laws and exact solutions, Phys. Rev. D 90, no. 4, 043529 (2014) [arXiv:1408.1798 [gr-qc]].
- [59] N. Dimakis, A. Giacomini and A. Paliathanasis, Integrability from Point Symmetries in a family of Cosmological Horndeski Lagrangians, Eur. Phys. J. C 77, no. 7, 458 (2017) [arXiv:1701.07554 [gr-qc]].
- [60] A. Giacomini, S. Jamal, G. Leon, A. Paliathanasis and J. Saavedra, Dynamical Analysis of an Integrable Cubic Galileon Cosmological Model, Phys. Rev. D 95, no. 12, 124060 (2017) [arXiv:1703.05860 [gr-qc]].
- [61] G. Papagiannopoulos, S. Basilakos, A. Paliathanasis, S. Savvidou and P. C. Stavrinos, *FinslerRanders cosmology: dynamical analysis and growth of matter perturbations*, Class. Quant. Grav. 34, no. 22, 225008 (2017) [arXiv:1709.03748 [gr-qc]].
- [62] J. D. Barrow and A. Paliathanasis, Szekeres Universes with Homogeneous Scalar Fields, Eur. Phys. J. C 78, no. 9, 767 (2018) [arXiv:1808.00173 [gr-qc]].
- [63] G. Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko and C. Vafa, De Sitter Space and the Swampland, arXiv:1806.08362 [hep-th].
- [64] P. Agrawal, G. Obied, P. J. Steinhardt and C. Vafa, On the Cosmological Implications of the String Swampland, Phys. Lett. B 784, 271 (2018) [arXiv:1806.09718 [hep-th]].
- [65] H. Ooguri, E. Palti, G. Shiu and C. Vafa, Distance and de Sitter Conjectures on the Swampland, Phys. Lett. B 788, 180 (2019) [arXiv:1810.05506 [hep-th]].
- [66] W. H. Kinney, S. Vagnozzi and L. Visinelli, The zoo plot meets the swampland: mutual (in)consistency of single-field

inflation, string conjectures, and cosmological data, arXiv:1808.06424 [astro-ph.CO].

- [67] L. Heisenberg, M. Bartelmann, R. Brandenberger and A. Refregier, Dark Energy in the Swampland, Phys. Rev. D 98, no. 12, 123502 (2018) [arXiv:1808.02877 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] M. C. David Marsh, The Swampland, Quintessence and the Vacuum Energy, Phys. Lett. B 789, 639 (2019) [arXiv:1809.00726 [hep-th]].
- [69] W. H. Kinney, Eternal Inflation and the Refined Swampland Conjecture, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, no. 8, 081302 (2019) [arXiv:1811.11698 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [70] R. I. Thompson, Beta function quintessence cosmological parameters and fundamental constants II. Exponential and logarithmic dark energy potentials, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 482, no. 4, 5448 (2019) [arXiv:1811.03164 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [71] F. Tosone, B. S. Haridasu, V. V. Lukovi and N. Vittorio, Constraints on field flows of quintessence dark energy, Phys. Rev. D 99, no. 4, 043503 (2019) [arXiv:1811.05434 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [72] M. Raveri, W. Hu and S. Sethi, Swampland Conjectures and Late-Time Cosmology, arXiv:1812.10448 [hep-th].
- [73] E. Palti, The Swampland: Introduction and Review, arXiv:1903.06239 [hep-th].
- [74] C. van de Bruck and C. C. Thomas, Dark Energy, the Swampland and the Equivalence Principle, arXiv:1904.07082 [hep-th].
- [75] R. Adam et al. [Planck Collaboration], Planck 2015 results. I. Overview of products and scientific results, Astron. Astrophys. 594, A1 (2016) [arXiv:1502.01582 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [76] N. Aghanim et al. [Planck Collaboration], Planck 2015 results. XI. CMB power spectra, likelihoods, and robustness of parameters, Astron. Astrophys. 594, A11 (2016) [arXiv:1507.02704 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [77] F. Beutler et al., The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 416, 3017 (2011) [arXiv:1106.3366 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [78] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden and M. Manera, *The clustering of the SDSS DR7 main Galaxy sample I. A 4 per cent distance measure at z = 0.15*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 449, no. 1, 835 (2015) [arXiv:1409.3242 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [79] H. Gil-Marín et al., The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: BAO measurement from the LOS-dependent power spectrum of DR12 BOSS galaxies, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 460, no. 4, 4210 (2016) [arXiv:1509.06373 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [80] H. Gil-Marín et al., The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: RSD measurement from the power spectrum and bispectrum of the DR12 BOSS galaxies, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 465, no.2, 1757 (2017) [arXiv:1606.00439 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] M. Betoule et al. [SDSS Collaboration], Improved cosmological constraints from a joint analysis of the SDSS-II and SNLS supernova samples, Astron. Astrophys. 568, A22 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4064 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [82] M. Moresco et al., A 6% measurement of the Hubble parameter at $z \sim 0.45$: direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration, JCAP 1605, 014 (2016) [arXiv:1601.01701 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [83] N. Palanque-Delabrouille et al., Neutrino masses and cosmology with Lyman-alpha forest power spectrum, JCAP 1511 (2015) no.11, 011 [arXiv:1506.05976 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [84] E. Giusarma, M. Gerbino, O. Mena, S. Vagnozzi, S. Ho and K. Freese, Improvement of cosmological neutrino mass bounds, Phys. Rev. D 94 (2016) no.8, 083522 [arXiv:1605.04320 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [85] S. Vagnozzi, E. Giusarma, O. Mena, K. Freese, M. Gerbino, S. Ho and M. Lattanzi, Unveiling ν secrets with cosmological data: neutrino masses and mass hierarchy, Phys. Rev. D 96 (2017) no.12, 123503 [arXiv:1701.08172 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [86] E. Giusarma, S. Vagnozzi, S. Ho, S. Ferraro, K. Freese, R. Kamen-Rubio and K. B. Luk, Scale-dependent galaxy bias, CMB lensing-galaxy cross-correlation, and neutrino masses, Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) no.12, 123526 [arXiv:1802.08694 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [87] N. Aghanim et al. [Planck Collaboration], Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, arXiv:1807.06209 [astroph.CO].
- [88] F. Simpson, R. Jimenez, C. Pena-Garay and L. Verde, Strong Bayesian Evidence for the Normal Neutrino Hierarchy, JCAP 1706 (2017) no.06, 029 [arXiv:1703.03425 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [89] T. Schwetz, K. Freese, M. Gerbino, E. Giusarma, S. Hannestad, M. Lattanzi, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, Comment on "Strong Evidence for the Normal Neutrino Hierarchy", arXiv:1703.04585 [astro-ph.CO].
- [90] M. Gerbino, K. Freese, S. Vagnozzi, M. Lattanzi, O. Mena, E. Giusarma and S. Ho, Impact of neutrino properties on the estimation of inflationary parameters from current and future observations, Phys. Rev. D 95 (2017) no.4, 043512 [arXiv:1610.08830 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [91] Y. Chen and L. Xu, Galaxy clustering, CMB and supernova data constraints on \u03c6CDM model with massive neutrinos, Phys. Lett. B 752, 66 (2016) [arXiv:1507.02008 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [92] E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle, and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* 57, 4686 (1998).
- [93] T. Chiba, A. D. Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* 87, 083505 (2013).
- [94] Paul J. Steinhardt, Limin Wang and Ivaylo Zlatev, Phys. Rev. D 59, 123504 (1999).
- [95] S. Lee, K. A. Olive and M. Pospelov, Quintessence models and the cosmological evolution of alpha, Phys. Rev. D 70, 083503 (2004) [astro-ph/0406039].
- [96] B. K. Pal, S. Pal and B. Basu, Mutated Hilltop Inflation: A Natural Choice for Early Universe, JCAP 1001, 029 (2010) [arXiv:0908.2302 [hep-th]].
- [97] B. K. Pal, S. Pal and B. Basu, A semi-analytical approach to perturbations in mutated hilltop inflation, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 21, 1250017 (2012) [arXiv:1010.5924 [hep-th]].
- [98] B. K. Pal, Mutated hilltop inflation revisited, Eur. Phys. J. C 78, 358 (2018) [arXiv:1711.00833 [hep-th]].

- [99] S. Antusch, F. Cefala and S. Orani, Gravitational waves from oscillons after inflation, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, no. 1, 011303 (2017); Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, no. 21, 219901 (2018)] [arXiv:1607.01314 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [100] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach, Phys. Rev. D 66, 103511 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0205436].
- [101] A. Gelman and D. Rubin, Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences, Statistical Science 7, 457 (1992).
- [102] A. G. Riess et al., A 2.4% Determination of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant, Astrophys. J. 826, no. 1, 56 (2016) [arXiv:1604.01424 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [103] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and A. A. Starobinsky, Two new diagnostics of dark energy, Phys. Rev. D 78, 103502 (2008) [arXiv:0807.3548 [astro-ph]].
- [104] C. Zunckel, C. Clarkson, Consistency Tests for the Cosmological Constant, Phys. Rev. Lett 101, 181301 (2008) [arXiv:0807.4304 [astro-ph]].
- [105] V. Sahni, T. D. Saini, A. A. Starobinsky and U. Alam, Statefinder: A New geometrical diagnostic of dark energy, JETP Lett. 77, 201 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0201498].
- [106] M. Visser, Cosmography: Cosmology without the Einstein equations, Gen. Rel. Grav. 37, 1541 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0411131].
- [107] S. Pan and S. Chakraborty, A cosmographic analysis of holographic dark energy models, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 23, no. 11, 1450092 (2014) [arXiv:1410.8281 [gr-qc]].
- [108] M. Sami, M. Shahalam, M. Skugoreva, A. Toporensky, Cosmological dynamics of non-minimally coupled scalar field system and its late time cosmic relevance, Phys. Rev. D 86, 103532 (2012) [arXiv:1207.6691 [hep-th]].
- [109] R. Myrzakulov, M. Shahalam, Statefinder hierarchy of bimetric and galileon models for concordance cosmology, JCAP 10, 047 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0194 [gr-qc]].
- [110] Sarita Rani, A. Altaibayeva, M. Shahalam, J. K. Singh, R. Myrzakulov, Constraints on cosmological parameters in power-law cosmology, JCAP 03, 031 (2015) [arXiv:1404.6522 [gr-qc]].
- [111] M. Shahalam, S. Sami, A. Agarwal, Om diagnostic applied to scalar field models and slowing down of cosmic acceleration, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 448, 2948 (2015) [arXiv:1501.04047 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [112] M. Shahalam, W. Yang, R. Myrzakulov, A. Wang, Late-time acceleration with steep exponential potentials, Eur. Phys. J. C 77, 894 (2017) [arXiv:1802.00326].
- [113] A. Agarwal, R. Myrzakulov, S.K.J. Pacif, M. Shahalam, Cosmic acceleration from coupling of known components of matter: Analysis and diagnostics, [arXiv:1711.06321 [gr-qc]].
- [114] R. Myrzakulov, M. Shahalam, Light mass galileon and late time acceleration of the Universe, Gen. Rel. Grav. 47, 81 (2015) [arXiv:1407.7798 [gr-qc]].
- [115] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *Bayes Factors*, J. Am. Statist. Assoc. **90**, no.430, 773 (1995).
- [116] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, A. Mootoovaloo, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon and E. Sellentin, Marginal Likelihoods from Monte Carlo Markov Chains, [arXiv:1704.03472 [stat.CO]].
- [117] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, E. Sellentin, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon and A. Mootoovaloo, No evidence for extensions to the standard cosmological model, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, no. 10, 101301 (2017) [arXiv:1704.03467 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [118] Y. Chen, S. Kumar and B. Ratra, Determining the Hubble constant from Hubble parameter measurements, Astrophys. J. 835, no. 1, 86 (2017) [arXiv:1606.07316 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [119] W. Yang, S. Pan and A. Paliathanasis, Latest astronomical constraints on some non-linear parametric dark energy models, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 475, no. 2, 2605 (2018) [arXiv:1708.01717 [gr-qc]].
- [120] S. Pan, E. N. Saridakis and W. Yang, Observational Constraints on Oscillating Dark-Energy Parametrizations, Phys. Rev. D 98, no. 6, 063510 (2018) [arXiv:1712.05746 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [121] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi and D. F. Mota, Tale of stable interacting dark energy, observational signatures, and the H₀ tension, JCAP 1809, no. 09, 019 (2018) [arXiv:1805.08252 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [122] W. Yang, S. Pan, R. Herrera and S. Chakraborty, Large-scale (in) stability analysis of an exactly solved coupled dark-energy model, Phys. Rev. D 98, no. 4, 043517 (2018) [arXiv:1808.01669 [gr-qc]].
- [123] W. Yang, A. Mukherjee, E. Di Valentino and S. Pan, Interacting dark energy with time varying equation of state and the H₀ tension, arXiv:1809.06883 [astro-ph.CO].
- [124] W. Yang, S. Vagnozzi, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Pan and D. F. Mota, "Listening to the sound of dark sector interactions with gravitational wave standard sirens," arXiv:1905.08286 [astro-ph.CO].
- [125] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis and S. Chakraborty, Observational constraints on one-parameter dynamical dark-energy parametrizations and the H₀ tension, arXiv:1810.05141 [astro-ph.CO].
- [126] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri and J. Silk, *Reconciling Planck with the local value of* H_0 *in extended parameter space*, Phys. Lett. B **761**, 242 (2016) [arXiv:1606.00634 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [127] S. Vagnozzi, S. Dhawan, M. Gerbino, K. Freese, A. Goobar and O. Mena, Constraints on the sum of the neutrino masses in dynamical dark energy models with $w(z) \ge -1$ are tighter than those obtained in ΛCDM , Phys. Rev. D 98, no. 8, 083501 (2018) [arXiv:1801.08553 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [128] M. Shahalam, R. Myrzakulov, S. Myrzakul, A. Wang Observational constraints on the generalized α attractor model, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 27, 1850058 (2018) [arXiv:1611.06315].
- [129] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, Theory of cosmological perturbations, Phys. Rept. 215, 203 (1992).
- [130] C. P. Ma and E. Bertschinger, Cosmological perturbation theory in the synchronous and conformal Newtonian gauges, Astrophys. J. 455, 7 (1995).
- [131] K. A. Malik and D. Wands, Cosmological perturbations, Phys. Rept. 475, 1 (2009).