

Evolution of Hubble parameter from Pantheon+ data and comparison of cosmological models using cosmic chronometers

Ardra Edathandel Sasi¹ and Moncy Vilavinal John^{1*}

¹*School of Pure and Applied Physics, Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam, India*

20 December 2024

ABSTRACT

The evolution of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ with redshift z is estimated from the Pantheon+ data of Type Ia supernovae, for the Λ CDM model and the three special cases of the eternal coasting (EC) cosmological model with three different spatial geometries. The scatter associated with $H(z)$ is seen to grow markedly with redshift. This behaviour, which is deduced directly from the SNe Hubble diagram, raises the question of whether the universe is undergoing a stochastic expansion, which scenario can offer an explanation for the Hubble tension in cosmology. From the estimated $H(z)$ values, the present value of the Hubble parameter H_0 is evaluated for each of these models through regression, and the scatter using the Monte Carlo method. Bayesian comparison between these models is carried out using the data of 35 cosmic chronometers (CC). The comparative study favours the Λ CDM model, with some strong evidence. However, exclusion of four outlier CC data points with small errorbars leads to large reduction in the Bayes factor value. The unusually large value of Bayes factor obtained while using the full set of CC data raises some concerns about its tension with other data, such as that of the SNe Ia. While using the remaining 31 CC data points, it is observed that the resulting Bayes factor still favours the Λ CDM model, but with a much smaller value of the Bayes factor. When EC models are compared among themselves, the $\Omega = 2$ model has strong evidence than the $\Omega = 1$ (also known as $R_h = ct$) and the $\Omega = 0$ (Milne-type) models.

Key words: cosmology: observations – cosmology: theory – cosmological parameters.

1 INTRODUCTION

Though cosmology as a modern science has its history lasting only for roughly one century, it could provide us with a fairly accurate picture of the evolution of our universe, from its hot very early phase to the present state, that took place during the past 13.8 billion years or more. An almost complete and satisfactory theoretical account of this evolution is given by the Λ CDM model (Peebles 1984, 1993). This model conceives the universe as containing ordinary matter (~ 5 per cent), a larger amount of unseen dark matter (~ 25 per cent) and a much larger amount of still mysterious dark energy (~ 70 per cent). A host of observational data, such as those related to the relative abundance of light elements in the universe (big bang nucleosynthesis), the temperature fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation (the CMB power spectrum), formation of large scale structures such as clusters and superclusters of galaxies, voids, etc., univocally provide strong support to this model. While the Λ CDM model is largely successful on several such fronts, there lingers even today some problems and tensions in this model, such as the Hubble tension, σ_8 tension, coincidence problem, etc. (Di Valentino 2022).

An alternative to this model, named the eternal coast-

ing (EC) cosmological model (John & Joseph 1996, 1997, 2000; Melia & Shevchuk 2012) where the scale factor of the universe varies linearly with time ($a \propto t$), has gained increased attention in recent years. [For a review, see (Casado 2020).] The most characteristic feature of the model in (John & Joseph 1996, 1997, 2000) is that it has all components, such as the ordinary and dark matter, dark energy, etc., varying as a^{-2} . To maintain this, there will be continuous creation of matter/dark matter at the expense of dark energy, leading to a constant ratio between matter density and dark energy density. Hence it is devoid of any coincidence problem. The earliest work in (John & Joseph 1996, 1997), which is specifically a bouncing and coasting model, has closed spatial geometry ($k = +1$) and contains an additional negative energy density varying as a^{-4} , though it disappears very early. But the model in (John & Joseph 2000) is more general and considers all the three possible 3-geometries. It was explicitly shown that these models will have none of the cosmological problems which plagued the FLRW models. The evolution of temperature in this ‘early-dark energy’ model was shown (John & Joseph 1997) to be almost the same as that in the standard model. A special case ($k = 0$) of this model is studied extensively under the title ‘ $R_h = ct$ model’, where it was shown capable of explaining several observational data related to the expansion of the universe (Melia & Shevchuk 2012). However, in the $R_h = ct$ version, there is no defi-

* moncyjohn@yahoo.co.uk

nite inventory of matter/energy components for the cosmic fluid or there is no clear-cut prescription for the variation of density parameters of such components (John 2019), as in (John & Joseph 2000).

In 1998, with the release of the apparent magnitude-redshift (m - z) data of Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999), it was found that the expansion of the present universe is in marked deviation from the decelerating Friedmann solutions that reigned till then. SNe Ia are ideal standard candles with which the distances to the universe up to redshifts $z \sim 2 - 3$ are reliably estimated and these are still considered to be the primary source of information in our understanding of the universe. The strong claim made by the Λ CDM model that the present universe is accelerating was, however, not undisputed. In a first ever Bayesian comparison of cosmological models (John & Narlikar 2002), the Λ CDM model was compared with the EC model using the m - z data of SNe Ia and the angular size-redshift data of galaxies. The results showed that there is only some marginal advantage for the Λ CDM model over the EC model in accounting for these data. Later, some model-independent analyses using SNe Ia data (John 2005, 2010) showed that there is significant probability for the deceleration parameter q_0 to be zero, thus providing credence to the linear coasting model.

Recently, in view of the looming Hubble tension in cosmology (Di Valentino et al. 2021), several novel cosmological probes are developed to investigate the history of cosmic evolution. (For a review, see (Moresco et al. 2010).) A prominent observation that belongs to this category is that of the cosmic chronometers (CC) that help to evaluate the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ in a model-independent manner. Astrophysical objects that can serve as CC are passively evolving galaxies whose redshift determination can be done with extreme accuracy. Such objects allow us to trace the differential age evolution of the universe across a wide range of cosmic times. Notable applications of cosmic chronometers are in the estimation of the present value of the Hubble parameter H_0 , estimation of other cosmological parameters, comparison with other probes, comparison of different cosmological models, etc.

In this work, we first make use of the fact that in a particular cosmological model, each SN Ia with redshift z gives a value of $H(z)$. If there is no error in the measurement of m and z , we get a definite value of $H(z)$. When there is a nonzero error, one can find a probability distribution for $H(z)$ at z . Though these results are model-dependent, the values of expansion rates of the universe at various cosmic times, extracted from SNe Ia would be valuable information in the context of the Hubble tension. We perform this computation for the Λ CDM and EC models and in both cases, the $H(z) \pm \sigma_H$ versus z plots were made. We notice the growth in the scatter in $H(z)$ with z while doing Gaussian process regression (GPR). This again is relevant information, when Hubble tension is concerned. It raises the question whether there is some inherent fluctuation in the expansion rate of the universe (Berera and Fang 1994; Sivakumar et al. 2001; John et al. 2003), which subsides with the passage of cosmic time. This can also be a potential explanation to the disparity between the predicted and local measurements of H_0 , as in Hubble tension. In the second part of the work, we use Monte Carlo simulations to randomly sample noisy data and evalu-

ate the uncertainty in the parameter H_0 , after estimating it through regression. In each of these models we get different values of $H_0 \pm \sigma_{H_0}$. Such theoretical predictions of all these four models are then subjected to Bayesian model comparison using the data of 35 cosmic chronometers (Moresco 2024), with appropriate prior probabilities obtained from the above evaluation of H_0 . The significance of the resulting Bayes factors are discussed. We extend this study to see whether the same results follow if we eliminate a few outlier data points with small errorbars. By eliminating four such points from the CC data, a huge difference in the Bayes factors is observed, which we argue as indicating a possible inconsistency between the SNe Ia data and the CC data when the latter is taken in full. We also find that a Bayesian comparison of these models, as performed in (Melia & Maier 2013; Melia & Yennapureddy 2018), has certain flaw in choosing the prior probabilities.

The plan of the paper is as follows: In the next section, we outline the evaluation of the Hubble parameter for the Λ CDM model and the EC models, using the SNe data and then the evaluation of H_0 in each of these cases, from the resulting $H(z)$ diagram. Here we also present our results for the scatter in the $H(z)$ diagram. Section 3 deals with the Bayesian model comparison of the four cosmological models, with the full and modified sets of CC data. The last section comprises our conclusion.

2 $H(Z)$ IN THE Λ CDM AND THE EC MODELS FROM SNE IA DATA

The Λ CDM model has flat spatial geometry ($k = 0$). The density parameter corresponding to matter (including dark matter) is Ω_m and that corresponding to dark energy is Ω_Λ , such that $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$. The model grants expression for luminosity distance as

$$D_L = \frac{c}{H(z)}(1+z)I(z), \quad (1)$$

where

$$I(z) = \int_0^z [(1+z)^2(1+\Omega_m z) - z(2+z)\Omega_\Lambda]^{\frac{1}{2}} dz, \quad (2)$$

Using SN Ia data, one may estimate the value of the Hubble parameter $H(z_j) \equiv H_j$ for each of the supernova at z_j , using the expression for D_L . When there is nonzero error in measurements, one can evaluate $H_j \pm \sigma_{H_j}$ versus z_j , corresponding to each of the supernova and plot the H versus z diagram. For this, we may use the Chi-squared statistic, which uses

$$\chi_j^2 = \frac{(m_{p,j} - m_{o,j})^2}{\sigma_j^2}. \quad (3)$$

Here $m_{p,j}$ and $m_{o,j}$ are respectively the predicted and observed values of the apparent magnitude of supernova, each corresponding to z_j , with H_j as one of the free parameters. The χ_j^2 computed for the j^{th} SNe Ia can be used to obtain

$$P(H_j|D, M_1) = \frac{\exp(-\chi_j^2/2)}{\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(-\chi_j^2/2) dH_j}. \quad (4)$$




Figure 1. Hubble parameter evolution in the Λ CDM model, red line giving the theoretical prediction of the model as in equation (5). The regression and Monte Carlo methods give a value of Hubble constant $H_0 = 72.391 \pm 0.053 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

This gives a probability distribution function for H_j , given the data D and the validity of the model M_1 , provided we give fixed values to the parameters other than H_j . From this pdf, its mean values \bar{H}_j and the standard deviation σ_{H_j} can be evaluated. These mean values will depend on the free parameters of the model. In the Λ CDM model, since we have flat geometry, the model has a fixed value $\Omega = 1$, but the matter density parameter Ω_m , the Hubble parameter H_j and the absolute magnitude M of an SN Ia are free parameters in this model. In our calculations, we have fixed $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$ (Lahav & Liddle 2024) and $M = -19.3$ as fiducial values and varied only H_j . A plot showing the mean and standard deviation of the Hubble parameter corresponding to each of the supernovae in the Λ CDM model is given in Fig. 1.

In the Λ CDM model, one has an expression for the variation of the Hubble parameter, given by

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_m (1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda} \quad (5)$$

We estimate the parameter H_0 in this expression (again fixing $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$) by regression and evaluate the uncertainty in the parameter H_0 using Monte Carlo method. This is with the aid of the H - z diagram we constructed out of the Pantheon+ data. The resulting value is $H_0 = 72.391 \pm 0.053 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and the curve thus obtained is overplotted in Fig. 1.

On the otherhand, for the the EC model, the time evolution of scale factor can be given for all the three space geometries ($k = 0, \pm 1$) as

$$a = \alpha ct, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{k}{\Omega - 1}}. \quad (7)$$

This $a(t)$ is the solution of the Friedmann equations when all energy densities vary as a^{-2} , which was the modified Chen-Wu ansatz proposed in (John & Joseph 2000). (This in turn implies zero gravitational charge $\rho c^2 + 3p = 0$.) It may be

noted that here one can take $\alpha = 1$ for each of $\Omega = -1, 0$ and $+1$. The luminosity distance in these cases is

$$D_L = \frac{\alpha c}{H(z)} (1+z)^2 \sin n \left[\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln(1+z) \right], \quad (8)$$

where $\sin n(x) = \sin(x)$ for $k = +1$, $\sin n(x) = x$ for $k = 0$ and $\sin n(x) = \sinh(x)$ for $k = -1$. Note that the above procedure we adopted in the Λ CDM model can be used to obtain the mean values H_j and the standard deviation σ_{H_j} also in this model.

In the EC model, Ω is a free parameter, along with H_j and M . We consider three different values of the total density parameter; $\Omega = 0, 1$ and 2 , belonging to the three spatial geometries. In each of these cases, we have the parameter α in equation (6) equal to unity. The set of points \bar{H}_j and σ_{H_j} for all these cases are plotted against their redshift z_j in Fig. 2. In the EC model, we have the equation for the evolution of $H(z)$ as

$$H(z) = H_0(1+z). \quad (9)$$

As in the previous case of Λ CDM model, we use the regression and Monte Carlo methods to find out the best value of H_0 . We have overplotted the straight line in the above equation with this value of H_0 .

2.1 Scatter in the $H(z)$ diagram

After the epoch-making release of SNe Ia data in 1998, very stringent attempts were made to reduce the observational errors in the m - z data of these objects. However, it now appears that these errors cannot be reduced any further. This raises the question whether the scatter in the Hubble diagram is truly due to systematic or random errors, or whether it is due to any inherent property of the cosmic evolution, as that of a fluctuating expansion for the universe.

In this work, we have also made an attempt towards exploring the nature of the scatter in the Hubble diagram, as provided by the Pantheon+ data. The above analysis of latest Pantheon+ dataset shows that the scatter σ_H associated with the Hubble parameter increases with increasing redshifts. This was explicitly seen in our analysis of the $H(z)$ diagram discussed above, while using Gaussian process regression (GPR). Such an evolution is exhibited by all the models considered – the Λ CDM and the three cases of EC. The fluctuating behaviour of $H(z)$ points to some non-deterministic expansion of the universe, especially in the early epochs. This indicates that the H - z diagram we constructed from the Pantheon+ data can be a potential observational tool in searching for any fluctuating stochastic evolution of the early universe. Here we recall that such a possibility is discussed in (Berera and Fang 1994; Sivakumar et al. 2001; John et al. 2003). The results we obtained in the present work is depicted using the GPR method, in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, where the former gives the evolution of scatter in the Λ CDM model and the latter gives the same for the case of the $\Omega = 1$ EC model. The expansion rate characterised by the $H(z)$ values approach a deterministic character in the late epochs with low redshifts, but they show considerable fluctuation and uncertainty in the early epochs.




Figure 2. $H(z)$ in the three cases of EC model. The green lines give the theoretical prediction of the model as in equation (9). The Hubble constant value estimated from regression and MC methods is (a) $\Omega = 2$ case, $H_0 = 68.844 \pm 0.051 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. (b) $\Omega = 1$ case, $H_0 = 69.599 \pm 0.050 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. (c) $\Omega = 0$ case, $H_0 = 70.294 \pm 0.054 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

3 COSMIC CHRONOMETERS AND COMPARISON OF COSMOLOGICAL MODELS

The differential age method itself is a very promising tool to explore the cosmic expansion history, in a model-independent way. In this approach, one rewrites the Friedmann equation to obtain




Figure 3. Evolution of scatter σ_H in the Λ CDM model from the GPR method.




Figure 4. Evolution of scatter σ_H in the $\Omega = 1$ case of EC model using the GPR method.

$$H(z) = -\frac{1}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt} \quad (10)$$

The set of data called cosmic chronometers helps to evaluate the differential age dt/dz of the universe at different redshifts, and hence to compute the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ at various cosmic times, using this equation. In any given cosmological model, where a solution $a(t)$ is available, one has a prediction for $H(z)$ and a comparison of this with values estimated from the cosmic chronometer data can be done to test the model. In the Λ CDM model, the expression for $H(z)$ is as given in equation (5) and in the EC model, the corresponding equation for $H(z)$ is as given in equation (9). In this section, we make an attempt for a Bayesian model comparison of the four models considered here, among themselves, using the cosmic chronometer data in (Moresco 2024).

3.1 Bayesian model comparison

The use of Bayes theorem, without a proper account of the use of prior probability in it, may lead to erroneous conclusions. Bayes theorem helps to evaluate the posterior probability $P(M_1|D, I)$ for a model M_1 (that is, the probability for a model M_1 to be true, given the data D and the truth of some background information I) and can be stated as

$$P(M_1|D, I) = \frac{P(M_1|I)P(D|M_1, I)}{P(D|I)} \quad (11)$$

Here $P(M_1|I)$ is the prior probability, which we assume before considering the data, $P(D|M_1, I)$ is the probability to get the data D if the model M_1 and the background information I are true, and $P(D|I)$ is a normalisation constant, which is the probability for the data D , whatever be the model. The prior probability is an educated guess of the probability for the model, given only the background information I . $P(D|M_1, I)$ is sometimes called the likelihood for the model M_1 and is denoted as $\mathcal{L}(M_1)$. One can see that $P(D|I)$, the normalisation constant, is the sum of posteriors of all possible models such as M_1 . When M_i are models or hypotheses, it is often impossible to evaluate it, but this will not be a major impediment in Bayesian model comparison. When we compare two models M_1 and M_2 , this quantity cancels out on taking the ratio and one gets the Bayesian odds

$$O_{12} \equiv \frac{P(M_1|D, I)}{P(M_2|D, I)} = \frac{P(M_1|I)P(D|M_1, I)}{P(M_2|I)P(D|M_2, I)} \quad (12)$$

If the background information I does not give any preference to one model over the other, the two priors are equal and the above ratio simply becomes the Bayes factor B_{12}

$$B_{12} \equiv \frac{P(D|M_1, I)}{P(D|M_2, I)} = \frac{\mathcal{L}(M_1)}{\mathcal{L}(M_2)}, \quad (13)$$

which is the ratio of the two likelihoods. The problem of the estimation of the likelihood $P(D|M_1, I) \equiv \mathcal{L}(M_1)$ is solved by using the Bayes theorem once again. The posterior probability for a parameter in M_1 to have a value θ , given the data D and also given the truth of both the model M_1 and the background information I , can be written using Bayes theorem as

$$P(\theta|D, M_1, I) = \frac{P(\theta|M_1, I)P(D|\theta, M_1, I)}{P(D|M_1, I)} \quad (14)$$

Here, the denominator, which is a normalisation constant, can be evaluated as an integral of $P(\theta|D, M_1, I)$ over all the possible values of θ in this model. This is the probability for the data D , given the model M_1 and the information I , which is the desired likelihood $\mathcal{L}(M_1)$ for the model. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(M_1) &\equiv P(D|M_1, I) \\ &= \int P(\theta|D, M_1, I)d\theta \\ &= \int P(\theta|M_1, I)P(D|\theta, M_1, I)d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$P(D|\theta, M_1, I)$, the likelihood for the parameter θ , given D , M_1 and I are true, is usually in the form of the χ^2 statistic, as in equation (3).

The first factor in the integrand on the right hand side of equation (15) is the prior probability for the parameter θ in model M_1 . Before we start to analyse the data, i.e., when we have only the background information I , there may exist some consensus on the range of values of the parameter θ , or even a PDF for θ , in the model. Often this is the result of a previous analysis. While estimating the Bayesian probability, the prior is intended as the posterior obtained from a previous analysis of data, in a specific model. When this can be approximated as a Gaussian distribution with mean μ and




Figure 5. The full set of 35 cosmic chronometer data points with errorbars. The best-fitting $H(z)$ curves corresponding to the Λ CDM model and the three EC models are plotted.

standard deviation σ , one can write the prior probability for the parameter θ in the form

$$P(\theta|M_1, I) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (16)$$

The above discussion points to the importance of including the background information I in Bayes theorem, while evaluating the posterior probability for a model. The background information, which is commonly shared by all before the analysis of the data, has an equal contribution in deciding the prior probability as that information one has deduced directly from the model in a previous analysis. This effectively means that the prior probability distribution one assigns for a parameter in a model should lie within the commonly accepted range of values of that parameter. This discussion also underscores the fact that it is not appropriate to decide on prior probabilities on the basis of the same data under analysis.

3.2 Model comparison with the full set of CC data

We shall now perform Bayesian model comparison of the Λ CDM model with each of the three coasting models (with $\Omega = 0, 1$ and 2) and also among the three EC models, using the CC data. The latest compilation of CC data, which we shall use here is from (Moresco 2024).

Now onwards, model M_1 refers to Λ CDM model, M_2 to the $\Omega = 2$ case, M_3 to the $\Omega = 1$ case and M_4 to the $\Omega = 0$ case of EC model. The likelihood for each model is evaluated after setting the prior probabilities for the parameters in them as discussed in the above subsection. The prior probabilities for H_0 shall be Gaussian functions in the respective models, with mean and standard deviation as evaluated from the Pantheon+ data, discussed in the previous section. In the case of parameter Ω_m appearing in the Λ CDM model, we adopted a Gaussian function with $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$ (Lahav & Liddle 2024) as prior. Bayes factors between different models, which we have evaluated, are given in Table 1.

The large value of Bayes factor B_{12} between Λ CDM model and the $\Omega = 2$ case of EC model indicates very strong evi-

Bayes factor	
B_{12}	10466.98
B_{24}	264.70
B_{23}	15.96
B_{34}	16.59

Table 1. Bayes factors estimated from the comparative study between models using 35 CC data points.

dence in favour of the former over the latter. Bayes factors B_{23} , B_{24} , B_{34} are the results of Bayesian comparison among EC models themselves. Comparatively larger values of these factors can be interpreted as favouring the $\Omega = 2$ model over the $\Omega = 1$ ($R_h = ct$) and $\Omega = 0$ [Milne-type (Milne 1935, 1948)] models.

The method adopted in (Melia & Maier 2013; Melia & Yennapureddy 2018) of using the prior around $63.2 \pm 1.6 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ for the $R_h = ct$ model is unacceptable, since no other observations in the present universe help us to motivate a prior of this kind. A straight line as in equation (9) is fitted to the CC data and they obtained a value of H_0 from the best-fitting line as $H_0 = 63.2 \pm 1.6 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ which is in sharp tension with other estimations of H_0 , such as that obtained from the SNe Ia data, in the same model. Moreover, a prior cannot be chosen from the same data we want to analyse, as done in their analysis. In view of the discussion in Subsec. 3.1, we can conclude that the analysis in (Melia & Maier 2013; Melia & Yennapureddy 2018) is not a truly Bayesian one. Additionally, fitting a straight line as in the above case will give only one value of H_0 for the EC model, and it would then be irrespective of the value of Ω in the model. In other words, it is not clear to which value of Ω such H_0 belongs.

3.3 Model comparison with a reduced dataset

Any dataset may contain outliers. It is described by National Institute of Standards and Technology (.gov) thus:

‘An outlier is an observation that lies (at) an abnormal distance from other values in a random sample from a population. In a sense, this definition leaves it up to the analyst (or a consensus process) to decide what will be considered abnormal.’ (<https://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/prc/section1/prc16.htm>)

Let us choose any point in the dataset which lie far away from the theoretical curves under study as an outlier. Outliers in data are usually culpable in the context of statistical tests, regression and parameter estimation. In this subsection, we investigate the result of excluding some such outlier points from the CC data, based on a standard criterion and see whether that affects our above conclusions drastically.

Here we treat those CC data points, which lie at more than 1σ away from any of the theoretical curves compared in this study, as outliers. Accepting this criterion, we identify four data points from (Moresco et al. 2012, 2016; Simon & Jimenez 2005). These points, given in Table 2, are eliminated from the original CC data of 35 data points in (Moresco 2024). The Bayesian model comparison using the remaining 31 CC data points gives Bayes factors, which are

z	$H(z)$	References
0.179	75 ± 4	(Moresco et al. 2012)
0.199	75 ± 5	(Moresco et al. 2012)
0.4783	80.9 ± 9	(Moresco et al. 2016)
1.53	140 ± 14	(Simon & Jimenez 2005)

Table 2. The four outlier points excluded from the full CC dataset. $H(z)$ in the unit of $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

Bayes factor	
B_{12}	50.20
B_{24}	19.78
B_{23}	4.26
B_{34}	4.64

Table 3. Bayes factors from the comparative study of models using 31 CC data points.

given in Table 3. The results show drastic decrease in the Bayes factors than that in Table 1.

We argue that this considerable reduction in the Bayes factor values B_{12} , B_{24} , B_{23} , B_{34} indicates an incompatibility existing between the SNe Ia data and CC data. This is particularly for the reason that none of the other Bayesian model comparisons performed so far (John & Narlikar 2002; John 2010; Melia & Yennapureddy 2018) between the Λ CDM and EC models using SNe Ia have given values of Bayes factor as large as that in Table 1.

4 CONCLUSION

The Λ CDM model, albeit being a successful one on several fronts, faces challenges such as the Hubble tension (Di Valentino 2022). The studies we perform in this work are particularly important in the context of the Hubble tension.

Well-known model-independent estimations of the cosmic evolution are based on observations of the CC and gravitational waves (GW) (Raffai et al. 2024). The GW waves emitted by merging black holes and neutron stars, which are termed standard sirens, were recently used to constrain cosmological parameters and to compare different cosmological models, including the EC models. In the first test of coasting models using GW sirens (Raffai et al. 2024), constraints were put on H_0 , the present value of the Hubble parameter, for three fixed values of the total density parameter $\Omega_0 = 0, 1$ and 2 (corresponding to $k = -1, 0$ and $+1$, respectively). In a Bayesian model comparison, it was found that the coasting models and the Λ CDM models fit equally well to the applied set of GW detections. Moreover, they have found that the maximum posterior probability for the $k = +1$ EC model is the closest to the H_0 measured by the differential age method of the CC data.

The evolution of the Hubble parameter that we estimated in this work, for the Λ CDM model and the three special cases of EC model using the SNe Ia data, offers a new perspective to look into the expansion history of universe. The growth of scatter as we go to the early epochs in both models is strong evidence for suspecting some stochastic nature of the Hubble parameter. The present value of the Hubble parameter

inferred from our study, in units of $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$, are $H_0 = 72.391 \pm 0.053$ for the ΛCDM model and $H_0 = 68.844 \pm 0.051$, $H_0 = 69.599 \pm 0.050$ and $H_0 = 70.294 \pm 0.054$, for the $\Omega = 2$, $\Omega = 1$ and $\Omega = 0$ cases of EC model, respectively. The fact that CC data is model-independent makes it ideal for comparative study between cosmological models. The results of Bayesian model comparison strongly supports the ΛCDM model over other EC models, while using the full dataset of 35 CC. Among the EC models, $\Omega = 2$ case, which corresponds to closed spatial geometry ($k = +1$), is favoured over $\Omega = 1$ ($R_h = ct$) and $\Omega = 0$ (Milne-type) models, in both of our comparative studies. However, large reduction happened in the Bayes factor between all these models from the exclusion of mere four outlier points. In the context of having only marginal support for ΛCDM model over the EC models in several previous analyses of SNe and GW data, we conclude that the large values of Bayes factor obtained while using the full set of 35 CC data points indicate an incompatibility between SNe Ia data and the CC data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Juan Casado for a critical reading of the manuscript and for valuable comments.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The Pantheon+ dataset used in this study can be found at <https://github.com/PantheonPlusSH0ES/DataRelease> and the cosmic chronometer data are from (Moresco 2024).

REFERENCES

- Benoit-Lévy A., Chardin G., 2012, *A&A*, 537, A78
Berera A., Fang L. Z., 1994, *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 72, 458
Casado J., 2020, *Ap&SS*, 365, 16
Di Valentino E., 2022, *Universe*, 8, 399
Di Valentino E., et al., 2021, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 38, 153001
John M. V., 2005, *ApJ*, 630, 667
John M. V., 2010, *Ap&SS*, 330, 7
John M. V., 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, L35
John M. V., Joseph K. B., 1996, *Phys. Lett. B*, 387, 466
John M. V., Joseph K. B., 1997, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 14, 1115
John M. V., Joseph K. B., 2000, *Phys. Rev. D*, 61, 087304
John M. V., Narlikar J. V., 2002, *Phys. Rev. D*, 65, 043506
John M. V., Sivakumar C., Joseph K. B., 2003, *Pramana - J. Phys.*, 60, 1
Lahav O., Liddle A. R., 2024, *arXiv:2403.15526*
Melia F., Maier R. S., 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 2669
Melia F., Shevchuk A., 2012, *MNRAS*, 419, 2579
Melia F., Yennapureddy M. K., 2018, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 034
Milne E. A., 1935, *Relativity, Gravitation and World Structure*, Oxford
Milne E. A., 1948, *Kinematic Relativity*, Oxford
Moresco M., 2024, in *The Hubble Constant Tension*, Di Valentino E., Brout D. (Eds.), Springer Nature Singapore, 377
Moresco M., et al., 2010, *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 25, 6
Moresco M., et al., 2012, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2012, 006
Moresco M., et al., 2016, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2016, 014
Peebles, P. J. E. 1984, *ApJ*, 284, 439

- Peebles P. J. E., 1993, *Principles of Physical Cosmology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton
Perlmutter S., et al., 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 565
Raffai P., Pálfi M., Dály G., Gray R., 2024, *ApJ*, 961, 17
Riess A. G., et al., 1998, *AJ*, 116, 1009
Simon J., Verde L., Jimenez R., 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 123001
Sivakumar C., John M. V., Joseph K. B., 2001, *Pramana - J. Physics*, 56, 477