

Constraints on Cardassian Expansion from Distant type Ia Supernovae

Zong-Hong Zhu and Masa-Katsu Fujimoto

National Astronomical Observatory, 2-21-1, Osawa, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan
zong-hong.zhu@nao.ac.jp, fujimoto.masa-katsu@nao.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

The distant type Ia supernovae data compiled by Perlmutter et al. (1999) are used to analyze the Cardassian expansion scenario, which was recently proposed by Freese and Lewis (2002) as an alternative to a cosmological constant (or more generally a dark energy component) in explaining the currently accelerating universe. We show that the allowed intervals for n and z_{eq} , the two parameters of the Cardassian model, will give rise to a universe with a very low matter density, which can hardly be reconciled with the current value derived from the measurements of the cosmic microwave background anisotropy and galaxy clusters (cluster baryon fraction). As a result, this Cardassian expansion proposal does not seem to survive the magnitude-redshift test for the present type Ia supernovae data, unless the universe contains primarily baryonic matter.

Subject headings: cosmology: theory — distance scale — supernovae: type Ia supernovae

1. Introduction

A major development in modern cosmology is the discovery of the acceleration of the universe through observations of distant type Ia supernovae (Perlmutter et al. 1998, 1999; Riess et al. 1998, 2001; Leibundgut 2001). It is well known that all known types of matter with positive pressure generate attractive forces and decelerate the expansion of the universe – conventionally, a deceleration factor is always used to describe the status of the universe’s expansion (Sandage 1988). Given this, the discovery from the high-redshift type Ia supernovae indicates the existence of a new component with fairly negative pressure, which is now generally called dark energy, such as a cosmological constant (Weinberg 1989; Carroll et al. 1992;

Krauss and Turner 1995; Ostriker and Steinhardt 1995) or an evolving scalar field (referred to by some as quintessence) (Ratra and Peebles 1988; Wetterich 1988; Frieman et al. 1995; Coble et al. 1997; Caldwell et al. 1998; Gong 2002). While current measurements of the cosmic microwave background anisotropies favor a spatially flat universe with cold dark matter (de Bernardis et al. 2000; Lange et al. 2001), both the deuterium abundance measured in four high-redshift hydrogen clouds seen in absorption against distant quasars (Burles and Tytler 1998a,b) (combined with the baryon fraction in galaxy clusters from X-ray data – see White et al. 1993 for the method) and the large-scale structure in the distribution of galaxies (Bahcall 2000; Peacock et al. 2001) have made a strong case for a low density universe (for a recent summary, see Turner 2002a). It seems that all these observations can be concordantly explained by the hypothesis that there exists, in addition to cold dark matter, a dark energy component with negative pressure in our universe (Turner 2002b). The existence of this component has also been independently indicated by other observations such as the angular size-redshift relations for compact radio sources (Guivits et al. 1999; Vishwakarma 2001; Lima and Alcaniz 2002; Chen and Ratra 2003) and FRIIb radio galaxies (Guerra et al. 2000; Daly and Guerra 2002; Podariu et al. 2003), the age estimates of old high-redshift galaxies (Dunlop et al. 1996; Krauss 1997; Alcaniz and Lima 1999) and gravitational lensing (Kochanek 1996; Chiba and Yoshii 1999; Futamase and Hamana 1999; Jain et al. 2001; Dev et al. 2001; Ohyaama et al. 2002; Sereno 2002).

Neither a cosmological constant nor a quintessence, the present candidates for the universe acceleration mechanism, however avoid the cosmic coincidence problem – why the densities of dark energy and dark matter are comparable today (another related but distinct difficulty is the fine-tuning problem, see Carroll et al. 1992 for a discussion of this point). Although the tracking field model (Zlatev et al. 1999) provides a possible resolution to this problem, a convincing dark energy model with a solid basis in particle physics is still far off. Therefore it is desirable to explore alternative possibilities, such as higher dimensions (Deffayet et al. 2002; Gu and Hwang 2002) or an altered theory of gravitation (Behnke et al. 2002). Very recently, Freese and Lewis (2002) proposed the “Cardassian Expansion Scenario” in which the standard Friedman-Robertson-Walker (FRW) equation is modified as follows,

$$H^2 = A\rho + B\rho^n \tag{1}$$

where $H \equiv \dot{R}/R$ is the Hubble parameter as a function of cosmic time, R is the scale factor of the universe and ρ is the energy density of matter and radiation. In the usual FRW equation $B = 0$. To be consistent with the usual FRW result, one should take $A = 8\pi G/3$. It is convenient to use the redshift z_{eq} , at which the two terms of eq.(1) are equal, as the second parameter of the Cardassian model. In this parameterization of (n, z_{eq}) , it can be shown that (Freese and Lewis 2002), $B = H_0^2(1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)}\rho_0^{-n}[1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)}]^{-1}$, where ρ_0 is the

matter density of the universe at the present time and $H_0 = 100h \text{ kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ is the Hubble constant. This particular proposal is very intriguing because the expansion of the universe will be accelerated automatically later without any dark energy component – the second term, which may arise as a consequence of brane world cosmologies, dominates at a late epoch and drives the acceleration of the universe. It is valuable to explore the agreement of the Cardassian expansion model with the currently available cosmological observation data, as suggested by Freese and Lewis, who proposed this scenario. In a previous paper, the authors have used the recent measurements of the angular size of high-redshift compact radio sources made by Gurvits et al. (1999) to test the Cardassian model (Zhu and Fujimoto 2002). It was shown that the allowed intervals for the two model parameters, n and z_{eq} , are heavily dependent on the value of the mean projected linear size l (see Table 1 of Zhu and Fujimoto 2002). For example, at $l = 16h^{-1}\text{pc}$, the best fit occurs for $n = 0.76$ and $z_{eq} = 1.78$, which gives a reasonable matter density of $\Omega_m \sim 0.32$. However, this analysis shows that, if one minimizes χ^2 for the parameters l , n and z_{eq} simultaneously, the best fit to the current angular size data prefers the conventional flat ΛCDM model to the Cardassian expansion proposal. In this work, we analyze this scenario with the distant type Ia supernovae sample compiled by Perlmutter et al. (1999). It is shown that the allowed intervals for n and z_{eq} would give rise to a universe with an unreasonably low matter density ($\Omega_m < 0.1$). As a result, the Cardassian expansion scenario does not seem to survive the magnitude-redshift test from the present type Ia supernovae data, unless the universe contains no dark matter. After providing a brief description of the data analysis method (section 2), we present our numerical results in section 3. Finally we summarize our conclusions and present discussion(section 4).

2. Outline of the data analysis method

The apparent bolometric magnitude $m(z)$ of a standard candle with absolute bolometric magnitude M is related to the luminosity distance d_L by $m = M + 5 \log d_L + 25$. Following Perlmutter et al. (1997), we write the B-band magnitude-redshift relation as

$$m_B = \mathcal{M}_B + 5 \log \mathcal{D}_L, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_L \equiv H_0 d_L$ is the ‘‘Hubble-constant-free’’ luminosity distance and $\mathcal{M}_B \equiv M_B - 5 \log H_0 + 25$ is the ‘‘Hubble-constant-free’’ B -band absolute magnitude at maximum of a type Ia supernova.

In a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) universe, the luminosity distance d_L can be calculated from the redshift-dependent Hubble parameter, $H(z) = H_0 E(z)$, by the integral

$d_L(z) = (c/H_0)(1+z) \int_0^z dz'/E(z)$. For the ansatz of eq.(1) and a flat universe with only matter, Freese and Lewis (2002) get

$$E^2(z; n, z_{eq}) = (1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)})^{-1} \times (1+z)^3 + (1 - (1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)})^{-1}) \times (1+z)^{3n} \quad (3)$$

where n and z_{eq} are the two parameters of the Cardassian model.

We use the Perlmutter et al. (1999) data to place observational constraint on the Cardassian model parameters n and z_{eq} . This data set, plotted in Fig. 1, consists of 42 high-redshift Type Ia supernovae from the Supernova Cosmology Project¹, and 18 low-redshift Type Ia supernovae from the Calán/Tololo Supernova Survey (Hamuy et al. 1996). Both sets include corrections for the lightcurve width-luminosity relation. The error bars, which include both the measurement errors and the intrinsic luminosity dispersion, have also been shown in Fig. 1. We determine the model parameters n and z_{eq} through a χ^2 minimization method. The range of n spans the interval $[-3, 2]$ in steps of 0.01, while the range of z_{eq} spans the interval $[0, 4]$ also in steps of 0.01.

$$\chi^2(\mathcal{M}_B; n, z_{eq}) = \sum_i \frac{[m_B(z_i; \mathcal{M}_B; n, z_{eq}) - m_{Bi}^{\text{eff}}]^2}{\sigma_{m_{Bi}}^2}, \quad (4)$$

where $m_B(z_i; \mathcal{M}_B; n, z_{eq})$ refers to the theoretical prediction from eq.(2), m_{Bi}^{eff} is the observed effective magnitude, and $\sigma_{m_{Bi}}$ is the total uncertainty (i refers to the i th supernova of the sample). The summation is over all of the observational data points.

Evaluating the ansatz of eq.(1) at the present time, we have (Freese and Lewis 2002)

$$H_0^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho_0 [1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)}]. \quad (5)$$

Because in the Cardassian model the universe is flat and contains only matter, the matter density at present, ρ_0 , should be equal to the ‘critical density’ of this scenario. From eq.(5), we have

$$\rho_0 = \rho_{c,\text{cardassian}} = \rho_c \times F(n), \quad F(n) = [1 + (1 + z_{eq})^{3(1-n)}]^{-1} \quad (6)$$

where $\rho_c = 3H_0^2/8\pi G$ is the critical density of the standard FRW model. Therefore the new critical density $\rho_{c,\text{cardassian}}$ depends on the two parameters, n and z_{eq} , while $F(n, z_{eq}) \equiv \Omega_m$ gives the matter density in units of the critical density of standard FRW model (Freese and Lewis 2002). Instead of specifying Ω_m (or F), we consider both n and z_{eq} as independent parameters, while $\Omega_m(F)$ is treated as the output of the fitting result. The magnitude “zero point” \mathcal{M}_B can be determined from the 18 low-redshift supernovae that are

¹Supernova Cosmology Project: <http://www-supernova.lbl.gov>

carefully chosen from a sample of 29 supernovae from the Calan/Tololo survey. After appropriate correction, they give $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.32 \pm 0.05$ (Perlmutter et al. 1997). We will use $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.27, -3.32, -3.37$ respectively as typical values of the zero point to fit the data, as well as a range of $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.00 - -3.60$ (Mészáros 2002) to check the robustness of our results. In order to make the analysis independent of the choice of \mathcal{M}_B , we also minimize eq.(4) for \mathcal{M}_B , n and z_{eq} simultaneously, which we refer as the “best fit”.

3. Numerical results

Table 1 summarizes our fitting results to the Cardassian expansion model. Following Perlmutter et al. (1999), we analyze the 60 supernovae as three different sample groupings. Sample A is the entire data set. Sample B excludes four outliers – the two of them with lower redshifts, SN1992bo and SN1992bp, are the most significant outliers from the average light-curve width, while the other two with higher redshifts, SN1994H and SN1997O, are the largest residuals from χ^2 fitting. Sample C further excludes two very likely reddened supernovae, SN1996cg and SN1996cn. (For details of all these outliers, see Perlmutter et al. 1999.) As shown in Table 1, the fitting results for samples A and B are very similar except for their goodness-of-fits. The larger χ^2 per degree of freedom (d.o.f) for sample A, $\chi^2_\nu = 1.78$, indicate that the outlier supernovae included in this sample are probably not part of a Gaussian distribution and thus will not be appropriately weighted in a χ^2 fit (Perlmutter et al. 1999). The χ^2 per d.o.f for sample B, $\chi^2_\nu = 1.20$, is reduced significantly and indicates that no large statistical errors remain unaccounted for. The fit for sample C is a more robust one, because the two very likely reddened supernovae, SN1996cg and SN1996cn, have been further removed (Perlmutter et al. 1999). All three best-fits result in the same value of the zero-point magnitude $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.42$, which is higher than $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.32$, the conclusion of Perlmutter et al. (1997,1999), but a little bit lower than $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.45$, the value of Efstathiou (1999) which is obtained from the best-fit to the combined data for type Ia supernovae and the cosmic microwave background anisotropies. The best fit to sample C, with $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.42$, $n = -1.33$, $z_{eq} = 0.43$ and the lowest χ^2 per d.o.f. of 1.11, is depicted in Fig. 1 as a solid line. For comparison, three other curves with model parameters n and z_{eq} taken from the Table 1 of Freese and Lewis (2002) are also shown. The ability of these curves to fit the data is surprisingly distinct (and can even be seen by eye), while the former solid curve matches the data points very well, none of the later three curves does.

In Fig. 2, we show the confidence regions (68.3% and 95.4% C.L.) of the fitting results in the plane (n, z_{eq}) . The three left panels show the results for sample A, B and C using the value of $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.32$ which was initiated by Perlmutter et al. (1997, 1999), while the

three right panels show their corresponding best fits (i.e., the case of $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.42$). In order to evaluate how reasonable the resulting parameters, n and z_{eq} are, two areas which give a currently optimistic matter density, $\Omega_m(F) = 0.330 \pm 0.035$, (see Turner 2002a for the argument) and a wider range of $\Omega_m(F) = 0.2-0.4$, respectively are also shown in every panel. As it is distinctly shown that there is no overlap between the resulting parameter range and the reasonable area for the matter density, we have a 95.4% confidence level (C.L.) in saying that the Cardassian expansion is not compatible with a cold dark matter dominated universe with $\Omega_m(F) = 0.2-0.4$ (the C.L. goes up to 99% if the matter density of the universe is, $\Omega_m(F) = 0.330 \pm 0.035$). As a matter of fact, all of our fitting results for n and z_{eq} , point to a universe with $\Omega_m(F)$ less than 0.1, which is unreasonable in light of the currently available cosmological observations (Bahcall 2000; Peacock et al. 2001; Turner 2002a).

One could use the observational constraints on the deceleration factor q to cross-check the robustness of the fitting results and the difficulty of the Cardassian model with a reasonable matter density (e.g., $\Omega_m \sim 0.33$) in explaining the type Ia supernovae data. For the Cardassian expansion scenario parameterized by n and z_{eq} , we get the deceleration parameter as a function of redshift

$$q(z) \equiv -\frac{\ddot{R}R}{\dot{R}^2} = -1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d \ln E^2(z; n, z_{eq})}{d \ln(1+z)} \quad (7)$$

where the function $E^2(z; n, z_{eq})$ is given by eq.(3), in which the $(1+z)^3$ -dependent term dominates at high redshifts, causing the deceleration of the expansion of the universe. An acceleration will only occur when it becomes negative, i.e. $q < 0$, at a late epoch. We plot the redshift dependent deceleration parameter in Fig. 3 for the Cardassian models with the parameters of n and z_{eq} taken from the Table 1 of Freese and Lewis (2002) and from our best fits. The shaded area in Fig. 3 corresponds to the present observational constraints on the deceleration parameter, i.e., the universe switched from deceleration to acceleration at a redshift interval $0.6 < z_{q=0} < 1.7$ at the 1σ level (Perlmutter et al. 1999; Riess et al. 1998,2001; Avelino et al. 2001; Avelino and Martins 2002). The problem now is apparent: while the best fits of this work predict the turnaround redshift well within the observation constraints, all Cardassian models with a reasonable matter density ($\Omega_m \sim 0.33$) (parameters taken from the Table 1 of Freese and Lewis 2002) predict the turnaround redshift less than ~ 0.6 , which is only marginally compatible to the present observations. We are thrown into a dilemma: an unrealistically low matter density is needed so that the acceleration starts early enough to be realistic (See Avelino and Martins 2002 for the same discussion for another brane world cosmology). Therefore our fitting results are robust in explaining the type Ia supernovae data of Perlmutter et al. (1999): all of them predict a universe with very low matter density ($\Omega_m < 0.1$).

4. Conclusions and Discussion

We have analyzed the Cardassian expansion recently proposed by Freese and Lewis (2002) using distant type Ia supernovae data compiled by perlmutter et al. (1999). Although this particular proposal is an intriguing mechanism for the acceleration of the universe because it postulates the universe is flat, matter dominated and accelerating, but contains no vacuum contribution, it is strongly disfavored by the present high-redshift type Ia supernovae data and the constraint of $\Omega_m \sim 0.3$. The main point is that all fitting results of this scenario to the supernovae sample lead to a universe with unreasonably low matter density, leaving no space for the huge amount of dark matter whose existence has been widely accepted among the astronomical community (see, e.g., Primack 2002, Turner 2002b). Even if one can say that this Cardassian model can marginally pass the cosmological test from the updated angular size data (Zhu and Fujimoto 2002), it can hardly survive the magnitude-redshift test for the present type Ia supernovae data unless the universe contains primarily baryonic matter. There seems to be a tendency: a model that excludes the dark energy component dispels dark matter also (see Avelino and Martins 2002 for another analysis). However, it is worth keeping in mind that a universe with low matter density $\Omega_m \sim 0.1$ can also fit the data of Perlmutter et al. (1999) surprisingly well (Mészáros 2002).

One of the major uncertainties in the present analysis comes from the errors of the magnitude “zero point” \mathcal{M}_B . There are several ways to overcome this problem. First of all, one can analyze the data over a large enough range of \mathcal{M}_B to include almost all of the possibilities, and then calculate the probability distribution for the model parameters by integrating over it (Perlmutter et al. 1997, 1999). However this is not needed for our purpose, because all our fits with the values of \mathcal{M}_B from -3.00 to -3.60 lead to a universe with very low matter density. Second, one could pin down the value of \mathcal{M}_B through a larger sample low-redshift supernovae. Databases of nearby SNeIa are becoming unprecedentedly abundant (see, e.g., Li et al. 2001). In particular, the Nearby SN Factory² will accumulate a sample of 300 low-redshift supernovae and determine \mathcal{M}_B to a precision of $\pm(0.01-0.02)$. Finally, from eq. (2), the model parameters n and z_{eq} can be determined by measuring differences of magnitudes at different redshifts, which are independent of \mathcal{M}_B (Frieman et al. 2002).

Other uncertainties of cosmological parameter extraction from high-redshift type Ia supernovae sample caused by progenitor and metallicity evolution, extinction, sample selection bias, local perturbations in the expansion rate, gravitational lensing and sample contamination have been carefully studied by Riess et al. (1998) and Perlmutter et al. (1999). It was found that none of these effects can seriously change the result. Considering our results show

²Nearby SN Factory: <http://snfactory.lbl.gov>

that the matter density predicted by the Cardassian scenario is less than 0.1, it is impossible for any of these effects to change the case. In short, the present Cardassian expansion model is strongly disfavoured by the current distant SNeIa data and the constraint of $\Omega_m \sim 0.3$. We hope that other convincing mechanisms for the acceleration of the universe will appear in the near future.

We would like to thank A. G. Riess and W. Li for their help on parameter extraction with high-redshift type Ia supernovae data, Y. Tsunesada and S. Sato for their assistance on using the computer cluster ATAMA, and P. Beyersdorf for polishing up the English. Z.-H. Zhu is also grateful to all TAMA300 member and the staffs of NAOJ for their hospitality and help during his stay. Finally, our thanks go to the anonymous referee for valuable comments and useful suggestions, which improved this work very much. This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas (No.14047219) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

REFERENCES

- Alcaniz, J. S. and Lima, J. A. S. 1999, *ApJ*, 520, 87
- Avelino, P. P., de Carvalho, J. P. M. and Martins, C. J. A. P. 2001, *Phys. Rev. D*, 64, 063505
- Avelino, P. P. and Martins, C. J. A. P. 2002, *ApJ*, 565, 661
- Bahcall, N. A. 2000, *Phys.Rep.*, 333, 233
- Behnke, D., Blaschke, D., Pervushin, V. N. and Proskurin, D. 2002, *Phys.Lett. B*, 530, 20
- Burles, S., and Tytler, D. 1998a, *ApJ*, 499, 699
- Burles, S., and Tytler, D. 1998b, *ApJ*, 507, 732
- Caldwell, R., Dave, R., and Steinhardt, P. J. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80, 1582
- Carroll, S., Press, W. H. and Turner, E. L. 1992, *ARA&A*, 30, 499
- Chen, G., and Ratra, B. 2003, *ApJ*, 582, 586
- Chiba, M. and Yoshii, Y. 1999, *ApJ*, 510, 42
- Coble, K., Dodelson, S., and Frieman, J. A. 1997, *Phys. Rev. D*, 55, 1851
- Daly, R. A., and Guerra, E. J. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 1831

- de Bernardis, P. et al. 2000, *Nature*, 404, 955
- Deffayet, C., Dvali, G. and Gabadadze, G. 2002, *Phys.Rev.D*, 65, 044023
- Dev, A., Jain, D., Panchapakesan, N., Mahajan, S., and Bhatia, V. B. 2001, *astro-ph/0104076*
- Dunlop, J. S., Peacock, J., Spinrad, H., Dey, A., Jimenez, R., Stern, D., and Windhorst, R. 1996 *Nature*, 381, 581
- Efstathiou, G. 1999, *MNRAS*, 310, 842
- Freese, K. and Lewis, M. 2002, *Phys.Lett. B*540, 1
- Frieman, J. A., Hill, C. T., Stebbins, A., and Waga, I. 1995, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75, 2077
- Frieman, J. A., Huterer, D., Eric V. Linder, E. V. and Turner, M. S. 2002, *Phys.Rev.D*, submitted (*astro-ph/0208100*)
- Futamase, T. and Hamana, T. 1999, *Prog.Theor.Phys.*, 102, 1037
- Gong, Y. 2002, *Class.Quan.Grav.* 19, 4537
- Gu, J.-A. and Hwang, W-Y. P. 2002, *Phys. Rev. D*, 66, 024003
- Guerra, E. J., Daly, R. A., and Wan, L. 2000, *ApJ*, 544, 659
- Gurvits, L. I., Kellermann, K. I., and Frey, S. 1999, *A&A*, 342, 378
- Hamuy, M. et al. 1996, *AJ*, 112, 2391
- Jain, D., Dev, A., Panchapakesan, N., Mahajan, S. and Bhatia, V. B. 2001, *astro-ph/0105551*.
- Kochanek, C. S. 1996, *ApJ*, 466, 638
- Krauss, L. M. 1997, *ApJ*, 480, 466
- Krauss, L. M. and Turner, M. S. 1995, *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 27, 1137
- Lange, A. E. et al. 2001, *Phys. Rev. D*, 63, 042001
- Leibundgut, B. 2001, *ARA&A*, 39, 67
- Li, W. et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 546, 734
- Lima, J. A. S. and Alcaniz, J. S. 2002, *ApJ*, 566, 15

- Mészáros, A. 2002, ApJ, accepted (astro-ph/0207558)
- Ohyama, Y., Hamana, T., Kashikawa, N., Chiba, M., Futamase, T., Iye, M., Kawabata, K.S., Aoki, K., Sasaki, T., Kosugi, G., and Takata, T. 2002, AJ, 123, 2903
- Ostriker, J. P. and Steinhardt, P. J. 1995, Nature, 377, 600
- Peacock, J.A. et al. 2001, Nature, 410, 169
- Perlmutter, S. et al. 1997, ApJ, 483, 565
- Perlmutter, S. et al. 1998, Nature, 391, 51
- Perlmutter, S. et al. 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
- Podariu, S., Daly, R. A., Mory, M. P. and Ratra, B. 2003, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0207096)
- Primack, J. R. 2002, astro-ph/0205391
- Ratra, B. and P.J.E. Peebles, P. J. E. 1988, Phys. Rev. D, 37, 3406
- Riess, A. G. et al. 1998, AJ, 116, 1009
- Riess, A. G. et al. 2001, ApJ, 560, 49
- Sandage, A. 1988, ARA&A, 26, 561
- Sereno, M. 2002, A&A, 393, 757
- Turner, M. S. 2002a, ApJ, 576, L101
- Turner, M. S. 2002b, astro-ph/0207297
- Vishwakarma, R. G. 2001, Class.Quan.Grav. 18, 1159
- Weinberg, S. 1989, Rev. Mod. Phys. 61, 1
- Wetterich, C. 1988, Nucl.Phys. B302, 645
- White, S. D. W., Navarro, J. F., Evrard, A. E., and Frenk, C. S. 1993, Nature, 366, 429
- Zhu, Z. -H. and Fujimoto, M. -K. 2002, ApJ, 581, 1
- Zlatev, I., Wang, L. and Steinhardt, P. J. 1999, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, 896




Fig. 1.— Hubble diagram for 42 high-redshift SNeIa from the Supernova Cosmology Project and 18 low-redshift SNeIa from the Calan/Tololo Supernova Survey. The empty squares mark the four outliers which are excluded in sample B, while the empty diamonds mark the another two further excluded in sample C. The solid curve corresponds to our best fit to sample C, with $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.42$, $n = -1.33$, $z_{eq} = 0.43$. The values of (n, z_{eq}) for the other three curves are taken from the Table 1 of Freese and Lewis (2002).




Fig. 2.— Confidence regions of fitting results of sample A (a,b), B (c,d) and C (e,f), and the area constrained by observed matter density of the universe in the $n-z_{eq}$ plane. The faint(dark)-shaded areas show the parameter regions with a confidence level of 68.3% (95.4%). The positively slanted hatchings and the cross-hatched regions correspond to the parameter areas that give the matter density of the universe $\Omega_m(F) = 0.2-0.4$ and $\Omega_m(F) = 0.330 \pm 0.035$ respectively. The left three panels are for the fitting results with the assumption of $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.32$, while the right three panels show the case of $\mathcal{M}_B = -3.42$.




Fig. 3.— Diagram of the deceleration parameter q versus redshift for the Cardassian expansion models. The model parameters are taken from Table 1 of Freese and Lewis (2002) and from our best fits respectively. The shaded area shows the observational constraint on q from the literatures. As it shows, our best-fits are much more compatible with the observational constraints on the turnaround redshifts than the Cardassian models with $\Omega_m(F) = 0.33$ are.

Table 1. Fitting results for the Cardassian model from distant type Ia supernovae data compiled by Perlmutter et al. (1999).

Sample	N	\mathcal{M}_B	n	z_{eq}	$\Omega_m(F)$	χ^2
A	60	-3.27	-0.81	0.82	0.037	108.0
A	60	-3.32	-0.99	0.62	0.053	104.3
A	60	-3.37	-1.19	0.49	0.068	102.1
A	60	Best fit: -3.42	-1.43	0.39	0.083	101.3
B	56	-3.27	-0.80	0.83	0.037	69.7
B	56	-3.32	-0.99	0.61	0.055	66.4
B	56	-3.37	-1.21	0.47	0.072	64.5
B	56	Best fit: -3.42	-1.45	0.38	0.086	63.9
C	54	-3.27	-0.71	1.08	0.023	65.4
C	54	-3.32	-0.90	0.72	0.043	62.4
C	54	-3.37	-1.12	0.53	0.063	60.7
C	54	Best fit: -3.42	-1.33	0.43	0.076	60.2

Note. — Sample A: all supernovae; Sample B: excludes four outliers, SN1992bo, SN1992bp, SN1994H and SN1997O; Sample C: further excludes SN1996cg and SN1996cn.