

Parametrization Framework for the Deceleration Parameter in Scalar Field Dark Energy Model

A. Beesham¹

Faculty of Applied and Health Sciences, Mangosuthu University of Technology,
Jacobs 4026, South Africa

Abstract: We propose a Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker cosmological model with a scalar field that represents dark energy. A new parametrization of the deceleration parameter is introduced of the form $q = -1 + \eta/(1 + \mu a^\eta)$ where η and μ are model parameters. and the compatibility of the model is constrained by recent observational datasets, including cosmic chronometers, Pantheon+ and Baryon Acoustic Observations. By considering a variable deceleration parameter, we address the expansion history of the universe, providing a viable description of the transition from deceleration to acceleration. Using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo method, the parameters of the model are constrained and we examine the cosmological parameters. A comparison is then made with the Λ CDM model using the latest observations. We examine the history of the main cosmological parameters, such as the deceleration parameter, jerk parameter, snap parameter, density parameter, and equation-of-state parameter, by constraining and interpreting them to reveal insights into what has been dubbed “dynamical dark energy” under the assumptions made above. Our method provides a framework that is independent of the model to explore dark energy, leading to a deeper and more subtle understanding of the mechanisms driving late-time cosmic acceleration.

Keywords: Cosmological model; Dark energy; Current acceleration of universe; Variable deceleration parameter; Observational constraints

MSC code: 83F05; 85A40

PACS: 98.80.Jk; 95.30.Sf

1 Introduction:

The accelerated expansion of the universe, first observed in the late 1990s through distant supernovae surveys, has revolutionized our understanding of the cosmos [1, 2]. For an explanation of this, there are two schools of thought by the researchers in the field. The first one is the introduction of a mysterious form of exotic matter called Dark Energy (DE) [3, 4, 5], which is characterized by significant pressure that is negative, and causes the current acceleration. The second approach explores modified gravity theories by changing the gravitational action of general relativity [6]. Some modified gravity theories which have been used to interpret the acceleration of the expanding universe include $f(R)$ gravity [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12], $f(T)$ gravity [13, 14, 15, 16, 17], and $f(Q)$ gravity, where functions of the Ricci scalar R , torsion T , and the non-metricity

¹Email: abeesham@yahoo.com

scalar Q are involved in modifying the gravitational action [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. These models can provide alternative explanations for the accelerated expansion of the universe due to changes in the expansion dynamics without invoking the need for exotic matter or dark energy. Besides these, there have been many Dark Energy (DE) models, such as quintessence [24], involving a dynamic scalar field; k-essence [25], which generalizes quintessence by considering more complex kinetic terms; phantom energy [26, 27, 28], characterized by an equation of state parameter less than -1; and scalar-tensor theories, which couple a scalar field with gravity. Each of these models introduces different theoretical frameworks and predictions, which are very helpful in gaining varying insights into the evolution of the universe, and its likely solutions to cosmological puzzles such as the coincidence problem and the nature of dark energy.

The Λ CDM model is extremely successful in describing a large variety of observational data, but has several theoretical challenges [29, 30, 31]. One of the significant challenges is problem of fine tuning, arising from the cosmological constant (Λ). It raises the question of fine tuning of Λ [32]. The other major problem is problem of cosmic coincidence, which describes the peculiar fact that the dark energy (DE) and matter densities are aligned presently [33, 34, 35, 36]. Additionally, new observations indicate that the Λ CDM model does not accurately describe the latest low-redshift cosmological data. Although the Λ CDM is consistent with many observations, some data suggest that the DE density evolves over time, whereas it is constant in the standard model. These models are believed to fit observations better,

It is important to carefully consider and test all proposed models with the help of cosmological observations. This is because the mechanisms that drive late-time acceleration are complex and observational data is becoming increasingly precise. For such analyses, proper parametrizations need to be used that permit a description that is independent of the model for explaining the present [37, 38, 39, 40].

In this paper, we discuss a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker model with a scalar field dark energy and investigate its compatibility with recent observational datasets, including cosmic chronometers (CC), SNIa (Pantheon), and BAO. By considering a variable deceleration parameter (VDP), we address the expansion history of the universe, providing a viable description of the transition from deceleration to acceleration. Using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, we constrain the model parameters and examine the cosmological quantities. In section 2, we provide the basics of the model, and relevant quantities. Then section 3 entails the determination of the model parameters using the MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) technique. In section 4, we discuss our results, and finally, in section 5 is the conclusion.

2 Cosmological model

For the $k = 0$ Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) universe, the metric is:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) [dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)], \quad (1)$$

where the symbols have their usual meanings. We take the model to be populated by two fluids that are perfect. One is matter m , with negligible pressure (dark and baryonic matter), and the other is a scalar field ϕ . The latter, a scalar

field, is believed to cause the present acceleration, and may be regarded as Dark Energy (DE). In this scenario, Einstein's field equations and the Klein-Gordon equation for the scalar field can be written as follows (assuming $8\pi G = c = 1$):

$$3H^2 = \rho_m + \rho_\phi = \rho_m + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad (2)$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -p_\phi = -\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)\right), \quad (3)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{dV}{d\phi} = 0. \quad (4)$$

Here, $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ is the Hubble parameter, representing expansion or contraction. The parameters p_ϕ , ρ_ϕ , and ρ_m , are the pressure and of the scalar field, and energy density of matter, respectively. The solution of the above equations with relevant initial conditions provides information about the evolution of the model. The evolution of ϕ with m is given by:

$$\rho_m = \rho_{m0}a^{-3} = \rho_{m0}(1+z)^3, \quad (5)$$

where the subscript 0 denotes the present time and since the redshift is $z = -1 + 1/a(t)$.

ρ_ϕ can be written as the familiar equation: $\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)$, whereas p_ϕ is: $p_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi)$. As usual, the potential function is $V(\phi)$. From equations (4), (3) and (2), We can get the evolution of the the Hubble parameter H , and $V(\phi)$ in terms of H :

$$2\dot{H} = -\frac{\rho_{m0}}{a^3} - \dot{\phi}^2, \quad (6)$$

and

$$V(\phi) = +3H^2 + \dot{H} - \frac{\rho_{m0}}{2a^3}. \quad (7)$$

From equation (6) we : $a \frac{d}{da}(H^2) + \frac{\rho_{m0}}{a^3} = -\dot{\phi}^2$. In addition, we can express $\dot{\phi}$ as $\dot{\phi} = aH \left(\frac{d\phi}{da}\right)$. The evolution of ϕ in terms of z is:

$$\frac{d\phi}{dz} = \left[(2E \frac{dE}{dz} - 3\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^2) \frac{1}{E^2(1+z)} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (8)$$

where represents the dimensionless $E(z) = \frac{H(z)}{H_0}$ is the Hubble parameter without dimension, and $\Omega_{m0} = \frac{\rho_{m0}}{3H_0^2}$ is the current density of matter. Similarly, $V(z)$ is given by:

$$\frac{V(z)}{3H_0^2} = -(1+z)^3 E \frac{dE}{dz} + E^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3. \quad (9)$$

The definition of the deceleration parameter is:

$$q(z) = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} - 1 = \frac{dE}{dz} \frac{(1+z)}{E} - 1. \quad (10)$$

Deceleration is indicated by $q > 0$, acceleration by $q < 0$ and a constant expansion by $q = 0$. For $q = -1$, we get de Sitter expansion (exponential expansion), and finally, $q < -1$ denotes expansion that is super-exponential.

Ω_m and Ω_ϕ in terms of the redshift z are given by:

$$\Omega_m(z) = \frac{\rho_m}{3H^2} = \frac{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3}{E^2}, \quad (11)$$

$$\Omega_\phi(z) = 1 - \Omega_m(z) = 1 - \frac{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3}{E^2}. \quad (12)$$

Another parameter useful in the study of dark energy is the equation of state parameter (eos) denoted by $\omega_\phi(z)$, defined by:

$$\omega_\phi(z) = \frac{p_\phi}{\rho_\phi} = \frac{-1 - \frac{2\dot{H}}{3H^2}}{\Omega_\phi}. \quad (13)$$

Thus, we get:

$$\omega_\phi(z) = \frac{\frac{2}{3}(1+z)E\frac{dE}{dz} - E^2}{E^2 - \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3}. \quad (14)$$

3 Kinematical Parameters

We now choose q as :

$$q = -1 + \frac{\eta}{1 + \mu a^\eta}. \quad (15)$$

for which

$$H = \kappa(\mu + a^{-\eta}), \quad (16)$$

The motivation for this form of q comes from a recent study by Pawde et al [41] who considered $q = -1 + \eta/(1 + a^\eta)$. As no observational constraints were provided via an MCMC analysis, we made this study [42], and found that that form for q did not fit the observations. Hence, in this investigation, we consider form (15). Another obvious motivation for the condition (15) is as follows: For large scale factor a , we have $q \rightarrow -1$, as is the case for the Λ CDM model. Hence the assumption of this condition ensures that the model will approach the Λ CDM model in future.

Additional motivation for our choice of deceleration parameter q as in Eq. (15) is as follows.

- The study of cosmological models within the climate of late time acceleration is expressed in terms of kinematic parameters such as q .
- Expressing q as $q = -(\ddot{a}/a)/(H^2)$, we see that it is essentially the acceleration divided by the expansion. In the past, the universe was decelerating, so $q > 0$, or $q = \text{const} > 0$. However, now we are experiencing acceleration, so $q < 0$. Hence, for continuity, we need a dynamic q as a function of time (or redshift), that changes sign from positive to negative.
- Hence, many form of q have been adopted to try to explain this transition [43, 44] (and references therein).
- Since $a = 1/(1+z)$, for our choice of q , we can make some qualitative remarks about how q varies with redshift.

- Both parameters η and μ relate to q_0 , i.e., $q_0 = -1 + \eta/(\mu + 1)$. Presently, the state of the model depends upon the value of these parameters. $\mu = \eta - 1 \implies q_0 = 0$, and the universe is undergoing constant expansion. $\mu > \eta - 1 \implies q_0 > 0$, and we have decelerated expansion. Finally, if $\mu < \eta - 1$, then $q_0 < 0$, and we have accelerated expansion.
- In the distant past, $z \gg 1$, and $q(z) \rightarrow -1 + \eta$. For $\eta > 1$, we have $q > 0 \implies$ deceleration, i.e., the radiation and matter dominated eras.
- In the far future, from the form of $q(a)$ as in Eq. (15), and the discussion following that equation, we have seen that $q \rightarrow -1$, the asymptotic form for q for the Λ CDM model. Hence this model will asymptotically approach the Λ CDM model in future.

We can write in terms of redshifts

$$H = \frac{H_0}{1 + \mu} [\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]. \quad (17)$$

Consider the special form (15) of the deceleration parameter; Equations (14), (12), (11) and (10), and can be written as:

$$q = -1 + \frac{\eta(1 + z)^\eta}{\mu + (1 + z)^\eta}, \quad (18)$$

$$\Omega_m(z) = \frac{\Omega_{m0}(1 + \mu)^2(1 + z)^3}{[\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]^2}, \quad (19)$$

$$\Omega_\phi(z) = 1 - \frac{\Omega_{m0}(1 + \mu)^2(1 + z)^3}{[\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]^2}, \quad (20)$$

$$\omega_\phi(z) = \frac{\frac{2\eta}{3}(1 + z)^\eta[\mu + (1 + z)^\eta] - [\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]^2}{[\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]^2 - \Omega_{m0}(1 + \mu)^2(1 + z)^3}. \quad (21)$$

The jerk and snap parameters of cosmology give additional higher derivatives of the scale factor for the universe as opposed to the traditional two parameters (Hubble and deceleration). These higher order derivatives describe the cosmological expansion in further and finer detail.

$$j = \frac{1}{a} \frac{d^3 a}{d\tau^3} \left(\frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{d\tau} \right)^{-3} = q(2q + 1) + (1 + z) \frac{dq}{dz}, \quad (22)$$

$$j(z) = \left(-1 + \frac{\eta(1 + z)^\eta}{\mu + (1 + z)^\eta} \right) \left(1 + \frac{2\eta(1 + z)^\eta}{\mu + (1 + z)^\eta} \right) + \frac{\eta^2 \mu (1 + z)^\eta}{[\mu + (1 + z)^\eta]^2}, \quad (23)$$

$$s = \frac{j - 1}{3(q - \frac{1}{2})},$$

$$s = \frac{\left(-1 + \frac{\eta(1+z)^\eta}{\mu+(1+z)^\eta} \right) \left(1 + \frac{2\eta(1+z)^\eta}{\mu+(1+z)^\eta} \right) + \frac{\eta^2 \mu (1+z)^\eta}{[\mu+(1+z)^\eta]^2} - 1}{3 \left(-\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\eta(1+z)^\eta}{\mu+(1+z)^\eta} \right)}.$$

4 Determination of Model Parameters Using MCMC Technique

In cosmology, Bayesian methods are commonly used to estimate parameters by computing the posterior distribution of the parameters θ based on observed data D :

$$P(\theta | D) = \frac{L(D | \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}, \quad (24)$$

with $P(\theta)$ being the prior distribution, $P(D)$ the marginal likelihood and $L(D | \theta)$ the likelihood function. Bayesian parameter estimation involves exploring the parameter space θ , often with algorithms like Metropolis-Hastings [45], which helps guide a random walker through the space, preferring regions with higher likelihoods. The mean and uncertainty of each parameter are usually found by analyzing where the walker spends most of its time and how far it deviates within the parameter space. In situations where we have a nearly Gaussian posterior distribution, information criteria offers a simpler approach to model selection [46]. In this work, we investigate the form (18) for the deceleration parameter. A Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis with the emcee package [47] is used to properly cover the parameter space in order to get reliable estimates. The GetDist package [48] is employed to visualize and plot the posterior distributions. This enables the proper determination of constraints for the parameters.

4.1 Cosmic chronometers (CC)

CC are strong probes of cosmic expansion, and offer a model-independent way to estimate the Hubble parameter $H(z)$. We can calculate $H(z)$ at a given redshift z from the metallicity and age of passive nearby galaxies. This approximation comes from the formula: $H(z) \approx -(\Delta z / \Delta t) / (1 + z)$. CC data is obtained from a number of sources [49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54], over the redshift range $0.07 \lesssim z \lesssim 1.97$ [46]. This data provides the constraints on $H(z)$. To determine how well theoretical models fit in with CC data at any given redshift, we calculate the chi-squared statistic χ^2 :

$$\chi_{\text{CC}}^2(\theta) = \Delta H^T(z) C^{-1} \Delta H(z), \quad (25)$$

where $\Delta H(z)$ is the difference between the predicted expansion rate of the model, $H_{\text{M}}(z)$, and that of cosmic chronometer data, $H_{\text{D}}(z)$, at a given redshift z , and C the covariance matrix.

4.2 Type Ia supernova (SNIa)

The Pantheon+ dataset consists of light curves for 1701 Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) from 1550 unique events with redshifts in the range $0 \leq z \leq 2.3$ [55]. The apparent magnitude of such a star is:

$$m(z) = 5 \log_{10} \left(\frac{d_L(z)}{\text{Mpc}} \right) + \mathcal{M} + 25, \quad (26)$$

where \mathcal{M} is the absolute magnitude of the star and $d_L(z)$ its luminosity distance given by:

$$d_L(z) = (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')H_0}, \quad (27)$$

For the SNe Ia data,

$$\chi_S^2 = \Delta D^T C_t^{-1} \Delta D, \quad (28)$$

where the total covariance matrix $C_t = C_{\text{sys}} + C_{\text{stat}}$ is the sum of the systematic and statistical covariance matrices, respectively. The deviation of the distance modulus of a star is given by:

$$\Delta D = \mu(z_i) - \mu_{\text{model}}(z_i, \theta), \quad (29)$$

where $\mu(z_i) = m(z_i) - \mathcal{M}$ is the observed distance modulus. We project \mathcal{M} up to a normalization constant in the likelihood function $L \propto e^{-\chi^2/2}$ [56].

4.3 Baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO)

The sound horizon, r_d , defined at the epoch of baryon decoupling ($z_d \approx 1060$), is given by:

$$r_d = \frac{1}{H_0} \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z)}{E(z)} dz, \quad (30)$$

where $c_s(z)$ is the sound speed, a function of the baryon-to-photon density ratio, and $E(z) \equiv H(z)/H_0$ is the dimensionless Hubble parameter. Now, in cosmology, measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) depend on r_d . In this work, we take r_d as a free parameter [57, 58, 59, 60], rather than as a prior based on CMB Planck data.

Data from the completed Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS-IV) [61] and the BAO catalogs from the first-year observations of the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI Y1) [62] are utilised in the analysis. The distance measures that are used are the Hubble distance $D_H(z) = c/H(z)$, the comoving angular diameter distance $D_M(z)/r_d$:

$$D_M(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_0^z \frac{dx'}{E(x')}. \quad (31)$$

and the volume-averaged distance $D_V(z)/r_d$, which encodes the position of the BAO peak:

$$D_V(z) = [z D_M^2(z) D_H(z)]^{1/3}. \quad (32)$$

The χ^2 statistic for the distance measurements scaled by the sound horizon, D_X/r_d , is:

$$\chi_{D_X/r_d}^2 = \Delta D_X^T C_{D_X}^{-1} \Delta D_X, \quad (33)$$

where $\Delta D_X = D_{X,\text{Model}}/r_d - D_{X,\text{Data}}/r_d$ for $X = H, M, V$, and $C_{D_X}^{-1}$ is the inverse covariance matrix for each X . In Figure 1, we have plotted the confidence contours for each parameter of our choice of the varying deceleration parameter (18). Table I contains the best-fit values for the parameters of our model.

Additionally, Fig. 2 compares the Hubble parameter curve predicted by the model with the Λ CDM model, demonstrating consistency with the observational data, and Fig. 3 gives a comparison of the distance modulus curve with the Λ CDM model.




Figure 1: Posterior distributions of parameters for cubic varying deceleration parameter

MCMC Results			
Model	Parameters	Prior	Joint
VDP model	H_0	[50,100]	69.1 ± 1.1
	μ	[3,4]	$3.038^{+0.011}_{-0.038} \pm 0.031$
	η	[1,2]	$1.996^{+0.013}_{-0.015}$
	\mathcal{M}	[-20,-18]	-19.385 ± 0.036
	$r_d(Mpc)$	[100,200]	146.4 ± 2.5

Table 1: The calculated best-fit values for model using CC+SNIa+BAO datasets.




Figure 2: Comparison of the Hubble parameter curve with the Λ CDM model.




Figure 3: Comparison of the distance modulus curve with the Λ CDM model.




Figure 4: $q(z)$ vs z with 1σ error bounds.

5 Results and discussion

We have already obtained the best fit values of the parameters H_0 , η and μ in section 4. Next, we discuss the cosmological evolution of the model variables as constrained by the observations. Our primary focus was on the combined data sets: $\mathcal{CC} + \mathcal{SNT} + \mathcal{BAO}$. Based on the best-fit values for H_0 , η and μ from Table 1, we continue our evaluation in this section. q was reconstructed, and this is illustrated in Fig. 4, together with the 1σ error bounds. The figure illustrates that at a best-fit transition redshift of $z_{tr} = 0.748_{-0.4}^{+0.4}$, $q(z)$ change sign from positive to negative. This means a transition from deceleration (required for structure formation, etc) to acceleration. The current value of $q(z)$ is $q_0 = -0.57_{-0.46}^{+0.46}$. z_{tr} and q_0 are within observational constraints. [63, 64].

The jerk parameter [65] is significant in cosmology, as it is essentially the the third order term in the Taylor series expansion of $a(t)$. It is a unique characterization of cosmic dynamics. It contains useful information related to the evolution of the cosmos and distinguishes between various dark energy models. It acts as an indispensable bridge between dark energy and normal cosmological models. The different values of j establish a relationship between several theories of dark energy and the Λ CDM model; for instance, $j = 1$ refers to the Λ CDM model. A grasp of the jerk parameter is fundamental to study the dynamics in cosmic expansion and the transitions between different eras of acceleration. The jerk parameter for our model is sketched in Fig. 5, and it may be seen, surprisingly, that j is constant, with $j = 1$. This result has been obtained by starting with a form of the deceleration parameter that was motivated by by Pawde et al [41].

The snap parameter [65], which is represented by s , is a cosmological parameter that gives the fourth time derivative of the scale factor and hence provides




Figure 5: Jerk parameter $j(z)$ vs redshift z with 1σ error bounds.

insight into how the curvature and expansion dynamics of the universe are set. It plays an important role in the Taylor series expansion that describes the growth of the Universe. $j = 1$ for the Λ CDM model, and so we get $s = -(2 + 3q)$. The snap parameter for our model is plotted in Fig. 6, from which it can be seen that it is constant, $s = 0$. Figs. 7 and Fig. 8 are the plots of the density parameters for m and ϕ , respectively. During early times, m dominates, while ϕ is negligible. With time, the influence of m decreases, whilst that of ϕ increases. matter density parameter decreases due to expansion. However, in the course of time, the scalar field density parameter becomes dominant and overshoots that of matter. This leads to acceleration of the expansion of the universe, which is the critical point in cosmic evolution. Furthermore, the density parameters at present time have been determined to be $\Omega_{m0} = 0.33$, $\Omega_{\phi0} = 0.7$ for the $\mathcal{CC} + \mathcal{SN}I + \mathcal{BAO}$ datasets. In the Λ CDM model, $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315 \pm 0.007$ [66, 67, 68], and the values for our model is in agreement with those of the Λ CDM model. Fig. 9 shows ω_{ϕ} versus z . It starts from the quintessence region, moves into the phantom phase for $0.35 < z < 1.45$, and then back into the quintessence region ($\omega_{\phi} > -1$). Furthermore, $\omega_{\phi0} = -0.99$, in excellent agreement with observations. [69, 70].

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated a scalar field dark energy model with a specific form (15) of the deceleration parameter. The motivation for this form was a simpler form studied by Pawde et al [41] who considered $q = -1 + \eta/(1 + a^n)$. This was without the parameter μ as compared to our choice. We found that that choice by Pawde et al was not compatible with observations [42]. We began




Figure 6: $s(z)$ versus z




Figure 7: Ω_m vs z .




Figure 8: Ω_{ϕ} versus z .




Figure 9: ω_{ϕ} vs z .

by giving a background to the dark energy cosmological, together with all the relevant equations. We considered baryonic and dark matter together with a scalar field which represents dark energy. Then we motivated for our choice of deceleration parameter, and gave all the kinematic parameters in terms of z , such as the Hubble, jerk and snap parameters. In addition, we gave the energy parameters for the matter and scalar field.

Then in section 3, we subjected our model to observational constraints to determine the parameters of our model. Using a combination of cosmic chronometers, Pantheon and baryon acoustic oscillation datasets, we found the following parameters: the present value of the Hubble parameter H_0 , the constants μ and ν in our form (15) of the deceleration parameter, along with their corresponding 1- σ and 2- σ confidence regions, which are given in Table 1 and Fig. 1, respectively. The absolute magnitude M and the sound horizon r_d were also constrained by observations. We then compared our Hubble parameter $H(z)$ and distance modulus curve with that of the Λ CDM model, finding a good fit.

We then plotted the cosmographic parameters $q(z)$, $j(z)$ and $s(z)$. The current value $q_0 = -0.57$ of the deceleration parameter, and transition redshift $z_{tr} = 0.748$ are well within observational constraints, and the jerk and snap parameters, surprisingly, are the same as that of the Λ CDM model. Thus our model is viable, and provides an alternative to the standard Λ CDM model. In view of the importance of scalar fields, we feel that this model has the potential to contribute to the knowledge of dark energy, and towards a better understanding of the current acceleration of the universe.

References

- [1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, et al., Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant, *The astronomical journal* 116 (3) (1998) 1009.
- [2] S. Perlmutter, B. P. Schmidt, Measuring cosmology with supernovae, *Supernovae and Gamma-Ray Bursters* (2003) 195?217.
- [3] P. J. E. Peebles, B. Ratra, The cosmological constant and dark energy, *Reviews of modern physics* 75 (2) (2003) 559.
- [4] T. Padmanabhan, *Cosmological constant: The weight of the vacuum* (2003).
- [5] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, Kazuharu bamba, salvatore capozziello, *Astrophys Space Sci* 342 (2012) 155?228.
- [6] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, C. Skordis, Modified gravity and cosmology, *Physics reports* 513 (1-3) (2012) 1?189.
- [7] H. K. Nguyen, Buchdahl-inspired spacetimes and wormholes: Unearthing hans buchdahl's other?hidden?treasure trove, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08163* (2023).
- [8] H. Kleinert, H.-J. Schmidt, Cosmology with curvature-saturated gravitational lagrangian R, *General Relativity and Gravitation* 34 (8) (2002) 1295?1318.

- [9] S. Odintsov, V. Oikonomou, Autonomous dynamical system approach for $f(R)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* 96 (10) (2017) 104049.
- [10] S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, The role of energy conditions in $f(R)$ cosmology, *Physics Letters B* 781 (2018) 99?106.
- [11] S. D. Odintsov, V. K. Oikonomou, Running of the spectral index and inflationary dynamics of $f(R)$ gravity, *Physics Letters B* 833 (2022) 137353.
- [12] G. Abbas, H. Nazar, S. Qaisar, E. Gudekli, Anisotropic stellar compact spheres in $f(R)$ gravity via karmarkar approach, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* 18 (09) (2021) 2150133.
- [13] S. Capozziello, V. Cardone, H. Farajollahi, A. Ravanpak, Cosmography in $f(T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D?Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology* 84 (4) (2011) 043527.
- [14] D. Liu, M. Reboucas, Energy conditions bounds on $f(T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D?Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology* 86 (8) (2012) 083515.
- [15] K. Bamba, S. Nojiri, S. Odintsov, J., The future of the universe in modified gravitational theories: approaching a finite-time future singularity, *Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* 10 (2008) 045.
- [16] K. Bamba, S. D. Odintsov, E. N. Saridakis, Inflationary cosmology in unimodular $f(T)$ gravity, *Modern Physics Letters A* 32 (21) (2017) 1750114.
- [17] M. Zubair, A. Ditta, E. Gudekli, P. Bhar, H. Azmat, Anisotropic compact star models in $f(T)$ gravity with tolman?kuchowicz spacetime, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* 18 (04) (2021) 2150060.
- [18] J. B. Jimenez, L. Heisenberg, T. Koivisto, Coincident general relativity, *Physical Review D* 98 (4) (2018) 044048.
- [19] J. B. Jimenez, L. Heisenberg, T. Koivisto, S. Pekar, Cosmology in $f(Q)$ geometry, *Physical Review D* 101 (10) (2020) 103507.
- [20] M. Koussour, A. De, Observational constraints on two cosmological models of $f(Q)$ theory, *The European Physical Journal C* 83 (5) (2023) 400.
- [21] A. Mussatayeva, N. Myrzakulov, M. Koussour, Cosmological constraints on dark energy in $f(Q)$ gravity: A parametrized perspective, *Physics of the Dark Universe* 42 (2023) 101276.
- [22] N. Myrzakulov, M. Koussour, D. J. Gogoi, A new $f(Q)$ cosmological model with $H(z)$ quadratic expansion, *Physics of the Dark Universe* 42 (2023) 101268.
- [23] G. Chakraborty, S. Chattopadhyay, E. Gudekli, Viscous holographic $f(Q)$ cosmology with some versions of holographic dark energy with generalized cut-offs, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 21 (12) (2021) 317.
- [24] S. Capozziello, Dark energy models toward observational tests and data, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* 4 (01) (2007) 53?78.

- [25] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. Mukhanov, P. J. Steinhardt, Essentials of k-essence, *Physical Review D* 63 (10) (2001) 103510.
- [26] U. Alam, V. Sahni, A. A. Starobinsky, Can dark energy be decaying?, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2003 (04) (2003) 002.
- [27] R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski, N. N. Weinberg, Phantom energy: dark energy with $w = -1$ causes a cosmic doomsday, *Physical review letters* 91 (7) (2003) 071301.
- [28] R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski, N. N. Weinberg, Phantom energy: dark energy with $w = -1$ causes a cosmic doomsday, *Physical review letters* 91 (7) (2003) 071301.
- [29] S. Weinberg, Theories of the cosmological constant, *Critical dialogues in cosmology* (1997) 195-203.
- [30] M. Setare, M. Houndjo, Finite-time future singularity models in $f(T)$ gravity and the effects of viscosity, *Canadian Journal of Physics* 91 (3) (2013) 260-267.
- [31] P. K. Dunsby, E. Elizalde, R. Goswami, S. Odintsov, D. Saez-Gomez, A Λ CDM universe in $f(R)$ gravity, *Physical Review D: Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology* 82 (2) (2010) 023519.
- [32] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, S. Tsujikawa, Dynamics of dark energy, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* 15 (11) (2006) 1753-1935.
- [33] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo, A. A. Starobinsky, Model-independent evidence for dark energy evolution from baryon acoustic oscillations, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 793 (2) (2014) L40.
- [34] T. Delubac, J. Rich, S. Bailey, A. Font-Ribera, D. Kirkby, J.-M. Le Goff, M. M. Pieri, A. Slosar, E. Aubourg, J. E. Bautista, et al., Baryon acoustic oscillations in the Ly α forest of BOSS quasars, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 552 (2013) A96.
- [35] A. G. Riess, L. M. Macri, S. L. Hoffmann, D. Scolnic, S. Casertano, A. V. Filippenko, B. E. Tucker, M. J. Reid, D. O. Jones, J. M. Silverman, et al., A 2.4% determination of the local value of the Hubble constant, *The Astrophysical Journal* 826 (1) (2016) 56.
- [36] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, S. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, Y.-C. Sun, Four new observational $H(z)$ data from luminous red galaxies in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey data release seven, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 14 (10) (2014) 1221-1233.
- [37] A. Shafieloo, A. G. Kim, E. V. Linder, Model independent tests of cosmic growth versus expansion, *Physical Review D: Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology* 87 (2) (2013) 023520.
- [38] A. Shafieloo, A. G. Kim, E. V. Linder, Gaussian process cosmography, *Physical Review D: Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology* 85 (12) (2012) 123530.

- [39] B. R. Dinda, Model independent parametrization of the late time cosmic acceleration: constraints on the parameters from recent observations, *Physical Review D* 100 (4) (2019) 043528.
- [40] P. S. Corasaniti, E. Copeland, Model independent approach to the dark energy equation of state, *Physical Review D* 67 (6) (2003) 063521.
- [41] J. Pawde, R. Mapari, V. Patil, D. pawar, Anisotropic behavior of universe in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity with varying deceleration parameter, *Euro- pean Physical Journal C* (2024).
- [42] A. Beesham, Observational constraints on model with specific q (2024). arXiv:2412.18665. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.18665>
- [43] M. Koussour, N. Myrzakulov, A. H. Alfedeel, F. Awad, M. Bennai, Modeling cosmic acceleration with a generalized varying deceleration parameter, *Physics of the Dark Universe* 42 (2023) 101339.
- [44] S. K. J. Pacif, R. Myrzakulov, S. Myrzakul, Reconstruction of cosmic history from a simple parametrization of H, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* 14 (07) (2017) 1750111.
- [45] J. Akeret, S. Seehars, A. Amara, A. Refregier, A. Csillaghy, Cosmo- hammer: Cosmological parameter estimation with the mcmc hammer, *Astronomy and Computing* 2 (2013) 27?39.
- [46] R. C. Bernardo, D. Grand'on, J. L. Said, V. H. C'ardenas, Parametric and nonparametric methods hint dark energy evolution, *Physics of the Dark Universe* 36 (2022) 101017.
- [47] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, J. Goodman, emcee: the mcmc hammer, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* 125 (925) (2013) 306.
- [48] A. Lewis, Getdist: a python package for analysing monte carlo samples, arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13970 (2019).
- [49] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, S. A. Stanford, Cosmic chronometers: constraining the equation of state of dark energy. i: H (z) measurements, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2010 (02) (2010) 008.
- [50] M. Moresco, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, L. Pozzetti, G. Zamorani, M. Bolzonella, J. Dunlop, F. Lamareille, M. Mignoli, H. Pearce, et al., Improved constraints on the expansion rate of the universe up to z 1.1 from the spectroscopic evolution of cosmic chronometers, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2012 (08) (2012) 006.
- [51] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, S. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, Y.-C. Sun, Four new observational H (z) data from luminous red galaxies in the sloan digital sky survey data release seven, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 14 (10) (2014) 1221.

- [52] M. Moresco, Raising the bar: new constraints on the hubble parameter with cosmic chronometers at $z > 2$, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* 450 (1) (2015) L16?L20.
- [53] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, D. Wilkinson, A 6of the hubble parameter at $z < 0.45$: direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2016 (05) (2016) 014.
- [54] A. Ratsimbazafy, S. Loubser, S. Crawford, C. Cress, B. Bassett, R. Nichol, P. Vaisanen, Age-dating luminous red galaxies observed with the southern african large telescope, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 467 (3) (2017) 3239?3254.
- [55] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, A. Carr, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton, D. Jones, et al., The pantheon+ analysis: cosmological constraints, *The Astrophysical Journal* 938 (2) (2022) 110.
- [56] A. Escobal, J. Jesus, S. Pereira, Cosmological constraints on scalar field dark matter, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* 30 (15) (2021) 2150108.
- [57] K. Jedamzik, L. Pogosian, G.-B. Zhao, Why reducing the cosmic sound horizon alone can not fully resolve the hubble tension, *Communications Physics* 4 (1) (2021) 123.
- [58] L. Pogosian, G.-B. Zhao, K. Jedamzik, A consistency test of the cosmological model at the epoch of recombination using desi bao and planck measurements, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20306* (2024).
- [59] W. Lin, X. Chen, K. J. Mack, Early universe physics insensitive and uncalibrated cosmic standards: constraints on ω and implications for the hubble tension, *The Astrophysical Journal* 920 (2) (2021) 159.
- [60] S. Vagnozzi, Seven hints that early-time new physics alone is not sufficient to solve the hubble tension, *Universe* 9 (9) (2023) 393.
- [61] S. Alam, M. Aubert, S. Avila, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, M. A. Bershadsky, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, A. S. Bolton, J. Bovy, et al., Completed sdss-iv extended baryon oscillation spectroscopic survey: Cosmological implications from two decades of spectroscopic surveys at the apache point observatory, *Physical Review D* 103 (8) (2021) 083533.
- [62] A. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, D. Alexander, M. Alvarez, O. Alves, A. Anand, U. Andrade, E. Armengaud, et al., Desi 2024 vi: Cosmological constraints from the measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03002* (2024).
- [63] A. Hernandez-Almada, M. Mendoza-Martinez, M. A. Garcia-Aspeitia, V. Motta, Phenomenological emergent dark energy in the light of desi-data release 1, *Physics of the Dark Universe* 46 (2024) 101668.
- [64] O. Luongo, M. Muccino, Model-independent cosmographic constraints from desi 2024, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* 690 (2024) A40.

- [65] V. Sahni, T. D. Saini, A. A. Starobinsky, U. Alam, Statefinder? a new geometrical diagnostic of dark energy, *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters* 77 (2003) 201?206.
- [66] J. R. Mould, J. P. Huchra, W. L. Freedman, R. C. Kennicutt Jr, L. Ferrarese, H. C. Ford, B. K. Gibson, J. A. Graham, S. M. Hughes, G. D. Illingworth, et al., The hubble space telescope key project on the extra- galactic distance scale. xxviii. combining the constraints on the hubble constant, *The Astrophysical Journal* 529 (2) (2000) 786.
- [67] D. N. Spergel, L. Verde, H. V. Peiris, E. Komatsu, M. Nolta, C. L. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, A. Kogut, et al., First-year wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (wmap)* observations: determi- nation of cosmological parameters, *The Astrophysical Journal Supple- ment Series* 148 (1) (2003) 175.
- [68] E. Komatsu, J. Dunkley, M. Nolta, C. Bennett, B. Gold, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, D. Larson, M. Limon, L. Page, et al., Five-year wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe observations: cosmological interpretation, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 180 (2) (2009) 330.
- [69] J. Roman-Garza, T. Verdugo, J. Magana, V. Motta, Constraints on barotropic dark energy models by a new phenomenological $q(z)$ parameterization, *The European Physical Journal C* 79 (11) (2019) 890.
- [70] D. Camarena, V. Marra, Local determination of the hubble constant and the deceleration parameter, *Physical Review Research* 2 (1) (2020) 013028.