

$f(Q, L_m)$ gravity, and its cosmological implications

Ayush Hazarika^{1,*}, Simran Arora^{2,†}, P.K. Sahoo^{3,‡} and Tiberiu Harko^{4,5,§}

¹Department of Physics, Tezpur University, Napaam, Tezpur, 784028, Assam, India

²Department of Mathematics, CDOE, Chandigarh University, Punjab, 140413, India.

³Department of Mathematics, Birla Institute of Technology and Science-Pilani, Hyderabad Campus, Hyderabad-500078, India.

⁴Department of Physics, Babes-Bolyai University, 1 Kogalniceanu Street, 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

⁵Astronomical Observatory, 19 Ciresilor Street, 400487, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

(Dated: July 2, 2024)

In the present work, we extend the $f(Q)$ symmetric teleparallel gravity by introducing an arbitrary coupling between the non-metricity Q and matter Lagrangian L_m in the Lagrangian density f of the theory, which thus leads to the $f(Q, L_m)$ theory. This generalisation encompasses Coincident General Relativity (CGR), and the Symmetric Teleparallel Equivalent to GR (STTEGR). Using the metric formalism, we derive the field equation of the theory, which generalizes the field equations of $f(Q)$ gravity. From the study of the covariant divergence of the field equations, it follows that the presence of the geometry-matter coupling leads to the non-conservation of the matter energy-momentum tensor. The cosmological implications of the theory are investigated in the case of a flat, homogeneous, and isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker geometry. As a first step in this direction, we obtain the modified Friedmann equations for the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity in a general form. Specific cosmological models are investigated for several choices of $f(Q, L_m)$, including $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$, and $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + (2L_m)^2 + \beta$, respectively. Comparative analyses with the standard Λ CDM paradigm are carried out, and the observational implications of the models are investigated in detail.

Keywords: $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity, cosmology, observational constraints, dark energy

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1	2. Cosmological evolution: Model A	11
II. Field equations of $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity	5	C. Model B: $f = -\alpha Q + (2L_m)^2 + \beta$ with $L_m = p$	12
A. Geometric Preliminaries	5	1. Statistical analysis	13
B. The variational principle and the field equation	5	2. Cosmological evolution: Model B	13
C. Energy-momentum tensor balance equations	6	D. Model comparisons, and correlation results	14
III. Cosmological evolution of FLRW universe in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity	7	1. Correlation results	14
A. The Friedmann equations	8	V. Conclusions	15
B. The de Sitter solution	9	Appendices	17
IV. Cosmological models	9	A. Derivation of the Friedmann equations	17
A. Data and methodology of MCMC analyses	9	Data Availability	17
1. Data sets	9	Acknowledgments	18
2. Statistical analysis	10	References	18
B. Model A: $f = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$ with $L_m = p$	10		
1. Statistical analysis of Model A	11		

I. INTRODUCTION

The theory of General Relativity (GR) [1–3] revolutionized our understanding of gravity by conceptualizing it not as a conventional force but as an inherent property of spacetime, rooted in Riemannian geometry [4]. Thus, General Relativity developed Contrary

* ayush.hazarika4work@gmail.com

† dawrasimran27@gmail.com

‡ pksahoo@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in

§ tiberiu.harko@aira.astro.ro

to Einstein’s initial intent of not “geometrizing gravity” [5]. In GR, the metric and matter interact minimally, as defined by the Einstein-Hilbert action (S_{EH}), given as $S_{EH} = (1/2\kappa) \int \sqrt{-g}R d^4x + S_m$, where κ denotes the gravitational coupling constant term. g is the determinant of the metric tensor, and R represents the Ricci scalar. By S_m , we have denoted the matter action. This linearity in R gives a second-order field equation $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - (1/2)R g_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}$, which governs the dynamics of matter in the curved spacetime and relates geometry, described by the Einstein tensor $G_{\mu\nu}$ to the matter energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$.

A large number of observations have established GR as a very successful theory of gravity by confirming many of its predictions, such as the deflection of light by the Sun’s gravitational field [6], the perihelion motion of Mercury [7], the existence of gravitational waves [8], gravitational redshift [9], orbital decay of the Hulse-Taylor binary pulsar [10], and the radar echo delay [11, 12], respectively. An in-depth analysis of all the experimental and observational tests of GR can be found in [13, 14].

Despite its remarkable success, which spanned almost one hundred years, the theory of General Relativity currently faces numerous challenges. At a quantum level, it cannot explain the quantum properties of the gravitational interaction. Also, gravitational collapse can result in geodesic incompleteness under specific assumptions regarding the energy-momentum tensor. This implies that certain types of geodesics are constrained by an upper limit on an affine parameter, indicating a singular structure in spacetime. One notable consequence of this phenomenon is the appearance of cosmological singularities during the Big Bang and the existence of the black holes.

A significant challenge for GR did appear when it was faced with the problem of explaining the late-time cosmic accelerated expansion. Evidence from observations of type Ia supernovae [15–17], large-scale structure observations, and measurements of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies from the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) [18], and of the Planck satellite [?] highlighted a limitation in GR’s ability to fully describe and comprehend the dynamics of the Universe at cosmic scales during its later stages. This failure of GR prompted the exploration of alternative theories of gravity and the consideration of additional factors or components in the gravitational field equations, such as dark energy or the addition of a cosmological constant (Λ) in action (S_{EH}), to reconcile observations with theoretical predictions [4]. Hence, a more general gravitational framework is required to explain

the gravitational dynamics across various scales, ranging from the Solar System to galaxies and the large scale Universe.

In pursuit of a more comprehensive understanding of gravity that aligns with the observational evidence, a plethora of modified gravity theories have been proposed, such as Scalar-tensor theories [19–24], Tensor-Vector-Scalar (TeVeS) [25], Dvali-Gabadadze-Porrati (DGP) gravity [26], Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity [27], brane-world gravity [28], Einstein-Aether theory [29], Eddington-inspired Born-Infeld (EiBI) gravity [30, 31] etc.

A class of gravitational theories, known as $f(R)$ gravity, arises through a straightforward extension of the Einstein-Hilbert action S_{EH} by replacing R with an arbitrary functions of the Ricci scalar R [32]. The geometrical structures of the $f(R)$ gravity were able to explain the accelerated cosmic expansion [33], and also the flat rotation curves of galaxies, without introducing dark matter [34]. Even though it failed when subjected to Solar-System tests [35–37], $f(R)$ gravity could still be a valuable approach to the foundational framework for a “parameterized post-Friedmann” description of linear phenomena and could draw parallels with the parameterized post-Newtonian framework for small-scale tests of gravity.

An alternative method for extending the Einstein-Hilbert action involves postulating the presence of a non-minimal coupling between geometry and matter, and it leads to the $f(R, L_m)$ gravity [38]. For the various astrophysical and cosmological implications of this theory see [39–48]. Another similar approach is based on the inclusion of a non-minimal coupling between geometry, described by the Ricci scalar R , and the trace of the energy-momentum tensor T , giving rise to $f(R, T)$ gravity [49]. A more comprehensive exploration of this theory is available in the detailed investigations presented in [50–59]. In all these extended theories, the gravitational dynamics is described by more general functions of the curvature scalar, matter Lagrangian, and the trace of momentum-energy tensor, respectively, which allows for obtaining a broader range of gravitational behaviours going beyond the predictions of GR. For a detailed review of modified gravity and its implications see [32, 60–70].

GR is based solely on the metric and on the Riemannian curvature tensor to define gravity. However, within the broader context of metric-affine geometry, gravity is not limited to curvature alone; it can also be mediated by two additional geometric quantities, torsion and non-metricity, respectively.

In the context of the Riemannian geometry, the torsion

tensor faces a severe limitation. Specifically, due to the symmetry of the Christoffel symbols, the torsion tensor is restricted to zero, that is, $T_{\rho\lambda}^{\mu} = 0$. In an interesting extension of Riemann geometry, in the Weitzenböck space [71], the torsion tensor is non-zero ($T_{\rho\lambda}^{\mu} \neq 0$), and the Riemann curvature tensor is zero, leading to a spacetime characterized by flat geometry, endowed with a significant property known as absolute parallelism, or teleparallelism. The applications of Weitzenböck-type spacetimes in physics were pioneered by Einstein to introduce a unified teleparallel theory, unifying electromagnetism and gravity [72]. In the teleparallel approach, the fundamental characteristic is the replacement of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, which serves as the primary physical variable that describes gravitational properties, with a set of tetrad vectors e_{μ}^i . Torsion, originating from the tetrad fields, can be employed as a comprehensive descriptor of the gravitational effects, thus replacing curvature with torsion. This leads to the theory known as the teleparallel equivalent of general relativity (TEGR) [73–75], which was extended to the $f(T)$ gravity theory.

In teleparallel or $f(T)$ type gravity theories, torsion exactly compensates curvature, resulting in a flat spacetime. A notable advantage of $f(T)$ gravity theory lies in its second-order field equations, which differentiates it from the $f(R)$ gravity, which, within the metric approach, is described by fourth-order field equations. [76]. The applications of $f(T)$ gravity theories have been extensively explored in the study of astrophysical processes, and in cosmology. Significantly, these theories are extensively used to provide an alternative explanation for large-scale structure, the late-time accelerating expansion of the Universe, thus eliminating the need to introduce dark energy [77–98].

The third geometric formulation of gravitational theories is based on the non-metricity Q of the metric [99]. Geometrically, this quantity captures the variation in the length of a vector during parallel transport. Moreover, it offers the advantage of covariantizing conventional coordinate calculations in general relativity. In the framework of symmetric teleparallel gravity, the associated energy-momentum density is fundamentally the Einstein pseudotensor, transformed into a true tensor. In the context of gravitational actions containing non-metricity, the action $S_{STEGR} = (-1/2k) \int \sqrt{-g} Q d^4x + S_m$, which substitutes the curvature scalar with the non-metricity, is at the basic of a theory called the Symmetric Teleparallel Equivalent of General Relativity (STEGR) [100]. The extension of the symmetric teleparallel gravity led to the formulation of the $f(Q)$ gravity theory, also known as Coincident General Relativity [101] or non-metric gravity. In this theory, the connection is flat and

torsionless. These conditions lead to a connection that is purely inertial, differing from the Levi-Civita connection through a general linear gauge transformation. Furthermore, the torsionless condition simplifies the connection to $Y^{\alpha}_{\mu\beta} = (\partial x^{\alpha} / \partial \zeta^{\lambda}) \partial_{\mu} \partial_{\beta} \zeta^{\lambda}$ for some arbitrary ζ^{λ} . This crucial outcome indicates that the connection can be entirely removed through a diffeomorphism. Consequently, the ζ^{λ} fields emerge as Stückelberg fields, restoring this gauge symmetry [101].

In exploring extensions of symmetric teleparallel gravity, recent studies have considered the characteristics of gravitational wave propagation. An analysis particularly of the speed and polarization of gravitational waves [102] has remarkably extended the results obtained in general relativity, unveiling consistent speeds and polarizations.

In another line of research, in [103], a derivation of the exact propagator for the most general infinite-derivative, even-parity, and generally covariant theory within symmetric teleparallel spacetimes was presented. This approach involves decomposing the action, containing the non-metricity tensor and its contractions, into terms involving the metric and a gauge vector field.

Further insights emerged from the study of new general relativistic type solutions in symmetric teleparallel gravity theories [104]. The investigation of the gravitational wave propagation in a Minkowski spacetime revealed that all gravitational waves propagate with the speed of light. The Noether symmetry approach played a key role in classifying possible quadratic, first-order derivative terms of the non-metricity tensor in the framework of symmetric teleparallel geometry [105]. The cosmology of the $f(Q)$ theory and its observational constraints were considered in [106] and [107], where it was shown that the accelerating expansion is an intrinsic property of the Universe's geometry, thus eliminating the need for exotic dark energy or additional fields. and also used a dynamical system approach. For more work, check the Refs. [108–111]

Investigation of cosmological perturbations in $f(Q)$ gravity [112] revealed intriguing findings, such as the re-scaling of the Newton constant in tensor perturbations and the absence of vector contributions without vector sources being present. Notably, the scalar sector introduced two additional propagating modes, suggesting that $f(Q)$ theories add at least two extra degrees of freedom. Moreover, extending non-metric gravity by incorporating the trace of the matter-energy-momentum tensor T into a general function $f(Q, T)$ has been investigated in [113, 114]. These $f(Q, T)$ gravity models have been observationally constrained as noted in [115], and some models have successfully described the accel-

erated expansion of the Universe [116]. Additionally, a spherically symmetric stellar system in $f(Q, T)$ gravity has been shown to satisfy all the physical conditions [117]. For more works in $f(Q, T)$ gravity, see Refs. [118–124]. Over the past two decades, numerous studies have been devoted to the geometrical and physical aspects of symmetric teleparallel gravity, with a surge in interest in recent years [102–107, 112, 125–137].

Riemannian geometry represents a specific case within the broader framework of metric-affine geometry, offering a restricted perspective on gravitational dynamics. However, there exist no definitive physical principles that exclusively favor Riemannian geometry as the sole representation of gravity. Instead, metric-affine geometry presents three distinct yet physically equivalent avenues for describing gravitational phenomena. These approaches attribute the gravitational effects to the presence of non-zero curvature, non-zero torsion, or non-zero non-metricity within a given geometric framework. Together, these descriptions constitute the geometric trinity of General Relativity [137, 138]. It is essential to investigate all three approaches equally to gain a comprehensive understanding of gravity.

The coupling between the gravitational field and matter fields defines the dynamics in spacetime. In GR, the minimal coupling principle dictates that matter theories formulated in flat Minkowski space are seamlessly extended to incorporate gravitational interactions by replacing the flat metric and partial derivatives with the curved metric and covariant derivatives. This principle holds as long as the matter fields are coupled solely to the metric and its determinant without involving derivatives of the metric. In teleparallel gravity, for the electromagnetic potential, the presence of torsion introduces additional terms in the Maxwell action, violating the expected equivalence with GR [139]. Similarly, fermionic fields are affected by torsion, further challenging the minimal coupling principle. However, in symmetric teleparallel gravity, the scenario shifts. The minimal coupling principle remains intact even in the presence of non-metricity [139]. For electromagnetic fields and fermions alike, non-metricity does not interfere with the standard coupling prescriptions, ensuring compatibility with GR. In essence, while the symmetric teleparallel theory maintains equivalence with GR in the presence of matter fields, teleparallel theories diverge from this equivalence, underscoring the nuanced interplay between gravity and matter within these distinct frameworks.

The flat Λ CDM model generally aligns well with observations, but recent data indicate possible discrepan-

cies. These include variations in the measured values of the Hubble constant H_0 , and the amplitude of matter fluctuations σ_8 , when different methods are used. Additionally, some anomalies arise when comparing the model’s theoretical predictions, based on the best-fit cosmological parameters, with actual observations. These potential inconsistencies encourage the investigation of extensions of the Λ CDM model. The well-known discrepancy between H_0 , measured by the SH0ES collaboration using local distance ladder measurements from Type Ia supernovae ($H_0 = 73 \pm 1$ km/s/Mpc) [140, 141], and the value inferred by the Planck collaboration from observations of temperature and polarization anisotropies in the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation, assuming a Λ CDM cosmology ($H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ km/s/Mpc) [142], has reached a statistical significance exceeding 5σ . Unless this discrepancy is due to systematic errors, an intriguing possibility is that the Hubble tension could indicate new physics beyond the standard Λ CDM model of cosmology.

The main objective of our study is to generalize symmetric teleparallel gravity by incorporating the matter Lagrangian in the Lagrangian density of the $f(Q)$ theory, thus obtaining the $f(Q, L_m)$ theory. The corresponding action could describe minimal and non-minimal couplings between geometry and matter. After introducing the basic action of the model, we obtain the general system of field equations by varying the action with respect to the metric. We also investigate the conservation problem of the matter energy-momentum tensor and show that, in the present theory, it is not conserved. Furthermore, we investigate the cosmic evolution for the case of a flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker metric by first obtaining the generalized Friedmann equations. Furthermore, we consider two particular gravitational models corresponding to two distinct forms of the function $f(Q, L_m)$. The predictions of the two gravitational models are compared with two distinct observational datasets. Our results unravel the intricate dynamics of the Universe within this extended gravitational framework.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II A provides the geometrical background for building the general theory, which is followed by the derivation of the field equation using the metric formalism (Section II B). Furthermore, in Section II C, we obtain the energy-momentum tensor balance equation. In Section III, the cosmic evolution of the Universe governed by $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity is investigated. Two specific expressions for the arbitrary function $f(Q, L_m)$ are considered in Section IV B and Section IV C, respectively. The model parameters are constrained using MCMC in Section IV D. A

concise summary of the work is presented in Section V. The detailed calculations for obtaining the Friedmann equations are provided in Appendix V.

II. FIELD EQUATIONS OF $f(Q, L_m)$ GRAVITY

This section first provides a concise overview of the geometric foundations underlying gravitational theories, which are based on the existence of a general line element in spacetime. Then we introduce the action of the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravitational theory, and, with the help of the variational principle, we obtain the corresponding gravitational field equation, offering new insights into the understanding of gravitational phenomena within this geometric framework. Furthermore, we explore the non-conservation of the matter-energy momentum tensor, highlighting the impact of the coupling between matter Lagrangian and geometry.

A. Geometric Preliminaries

Once the definition of a metric is provided, the geometric interpretation of gravity is given by the Riemann tensor

$$R^\alpha{}_{\beta\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu Y^\alpha{}_{\nu\beta} - \partial_\nu Y^\alpha{}_{\mu\beta} + Y^\alpha{}_{\mu\lambda} Y^\lambda{}_{\nu\beta} - Y^\alpha{}_{\nu\lambda} Y^\lambda{}_{\mu\beta}, \quad (1)$$

and of its contractions. The Riemann tensor is constructed with the help of an affine connection. The general form of the affine connection $Y^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ consists of three parts: a symmetric part known as the Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$, a contortion tensor $K^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ describing the anti-symmetric part, and the disformation tensor $L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$, accounting for the presence of non-metricity,

$$Y^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = \Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} + K^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} + L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (2)$$

The torsion-free Levi-Civita connection $\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ is equivalent to the 2nd order Christoffel symbol in terms of the metric; it preserves the inner product of the various tangent vectors when a vector is parallelly transported, and it is defined according to

$$\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\lambda} (\partial_\mu g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\lambda\mu} - \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu}). \quad (3)$$

The contortion tensor $K^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ is represented in terms of torsion tensor $T^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$K^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} (T^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} + T_\mu{}^\alpha{}_\nu + T_\nu{}^\alpha{}_\mu). \quad (4)$$

The torsion tensor characterizes the deviation of a connection from symmetry, which indicates that parallel

transport around a closed loop does not necessarily bring a vector back to its original position.

The disformation tensor $L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$ describes the overall expansion or contraction of spacetime. When a vector is parallelly transported, its magnitude changes along its path. The variation of the length is measured by the non-metricity tensor,

$$L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} (Q^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} - Q_\mu{}^\alpha{}_\nu - Q_\nu{}^\alpha{}_\mu). \quad (5)$$

The non-metricity tensor $Q_{\alpha\mu\nu}$ is defined according to

$$Q_{\alpha\mu\nu} = \nabla_\alpha g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\alpha g_{\mu\nu} - Y^\beta{}_{\alpha\mu} g_{\beta\nu} - Y^\beta{}_{\alpha\nu} g_{\mu\beta}. \quad (6)$$

To construct a boundary term in the action of the metric-affine gravity theories, we need a non-metricity conjugate, known as the superpotential $P^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}$, defined as [113]

$$P^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} L^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} (Q^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{Q}^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu}) g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \delta^\alpha{}_{(\mu} Q_{\nu)}. \quad (7)$$

Here, $Q^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = Q^\alpha{}_{\mu}{}^\mu$ and $\tilde{Q}^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} = Q_\mu{}^\alpha{}_\mu$ are the non-metricity vectors. The non-metricity scalar can be obtained by contracting the superpotential tensor with the non-metricity tensor,

$$Q = -Q_{\lambda\mu\nu} P^{\lambda\mu\nu}. \quad (8)$$

The non-metricity scalar Q describes the deviation of the manifold geometry from isotropy and can be thought of as a measure of how much the volume of a parallelly transported object changes as it moves through spacetime.

B. The variational principle and the field equation

The dynamics of a physical system are studied by using the action principle. The action for the $f(Q, L_m)$ modified gravity takes the following form

$$S = \int f(Q, L_m) \sqrt{-g} d^4x, \quad (9)$$

where $\sqrt{-g}$ is the determinant of the metric, and $f(Q, L_m)$ is an arbitrary function of non-metricity scalar Q and of the matter Lagrangian L_m .

By varying the action with respect to the metric tensor, we obtain the gravitational field equation, which describes how spacetime geometry responds to the presence of matter and energy. Hence, we first obtain

$$\delta S = \int [(f_Q \delta Q + f_{L_m} \delta L_m) \sqrt{-g} + f \delta \sqrt{-g}] d^4x. \quad (10)$$

Here, $f_Q = \partial f(Q, L_m)/\partial Q$ and $f_{L_m} = \partial f(Q, L_m)/\partial L_m$. The variation of Q is given by [113]

$$\delta Q = 2P_{\alpha\nu\rho} \nabla^\alpha \delta g^{\nu\rho} - (P_{\mu\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_\mu^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta\nu}) \delta g^{\mu\nu}. \quad (11)$$

The energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ of the matter is defined as [9]

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta(\sqrt{-g} L_m)}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} = g_{\mu\nu} L_m - 2 \frac{\partial L_m}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}}, \quad (12)$$

The variation of the determinant of the metric tensor is

$$\delta \sqrt{-g} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-g} g_{\mu\nu} \delta g^{\mu\nu}. \quad (13)$$

From Eqs. (11), (12), and (13) it follows that Eq. (10) can be written as

$$\delta S = \int \left[\left(f_Q (2P_{\alpha\nu\rho} \nabla^\alpha \delta g^{\nu\rho} - (P_{\mu\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_\mu^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta\nu}) \delta g^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (g_{\mu\nu} L_m - T_{\mu\nu}) \delta g^{\mu\nu} \right) - \frac{1}{2} f g_{\mu\nu} \delta g^{\mu\nu} \right] \sqrt{-g} d^4 x. \quad (14)$$

After applying the boundary conditions and integrating the first term in Eq. (14) becomes $-2\nabla^\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P_{\alpha\mu\nu}) \delta g^{\mu\nu}$. Equating the metric variation of the action to zero, we obtain the field equation of the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P_{\alpha\mu\nu}^\alpha) + f_Q (P_{\mu\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_\mu^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta\nu}) + \frac{1}{2} f g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (g_{\mu\nu} L_m - T_{\mu\nu}). \quad (15)$$

For $f(Q, L_m) = f(Q) + 2L_m$, it reduces to the field equation of $f(Q)$ gravity (as seen in [143])

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha (\sqrt{-g} f_Q P_{\alpha\mu\nu}^\alpha) + f_Q q_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} f(Q) g_{\mu\nu} = -T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (16)$$

where $q_{\mu\nu} = P_{\mu\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_\mu^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta\nu}$. Furthermore, the field equation (15) can also be reduced to the STEGR.

In the mixed tensor representation, the field equation (15) is given by

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P^{\alpha\mu}_\nu) + f_Q P^\mu_{\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \delta^\mu_\nu f = \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (\delta^\mu_\nu L_m - T^\mu_\nu). \quad (17)$$

Using the Lagrange multiplier method with constraints $T^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = 0$ and $R^\alpha_{\beta\mu\nu} = 0$, the action (9) reads as

$$S = \int \left[f(Q, L_m) \sqrt{-g} + \lambda_\alpha^{\beta\gamma} T^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} + \zeta_\alpha^{\beta\mu\nu} R^\alpha_{\beta\mu\nu} \right] d^4 x. \quad (18)$$

The variation of the Lagrange multipliers is given as

$$\delta(\lambda_\alpha^{\beta\gamma} T^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}) = 2\lambda_\alpha^{\beta\gamma} \delta Y^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}, \quad (19)$$

$$\delta(\zeta_\alpha^{\beta\mu\nu} R^\alpha_{\beta\mu\nu}) = \zeta_\alpha^{\beta\mu\nu} \left[\nabla_\mu (\delta Y^\alpha_{\nu\beta}) - \nabla_\nu (\delta Y^\alpha_{\mu\beta}) \right] \quad (20)$$

$$= 2\zeta_\alpha^{\nu\beta\mu} \nabla_\beta (\delta Y^\alpha_{\mu\nu}) \simeq 2(\nabla_\beta \zeta_\alpha^{\nu\beta\mu}) \delta Y^\alpha_{\mu\nu}. \quad (21)$$

Varying now the action (18) with respect to the connection gives

$$\delta S = \int \left(4\sqrt{-g} f_Q P^{\mu\nu}_\alpha + H_\alpha^{\mu\nu} + 2\nabla_\beta \zeta_\alpha^{\nu\beta\mu} + 2\lambda_\alpha^{\mu\nu} \right) d^4 x \delta Y^\alpha_{\mu\nu}. \quad (22)$$

Here $H_\alpha^{\mu\nu}$ is the hypermomentum density defined as

$$H_\alpha^{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{-g} f_{L_m} \frac{\delta L_m}{\delta Y^\alpha_{\mu\nu}}. \quad (23)$$

In the action variation, we introduce two covariant derivatives $\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu$ to eliminate the Lagrange multiplier coefficients with the anti-symmetry property of μ and ν . Then, the field equation becomes

$$\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \left(4\sqrt{-g} f_Q P^{\mu\nu}_\alpha + H_\alpha^{\mu\nu} \right) = 0. \quad (24)$$

C. Energy-momentum tensor balance equations

The covariant derivative of ω^μ_ν is given by

$$\nabla_\mu \omega^\mu_\nu = D_\mu \omega^\mu_\nu - \frac{1}{2} Q_\rho \omega^\rho_\nu - L^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \omega^\mu_\lambda, \quad (25)$$

where D_μ is the covariant derivative with respect to the Levi-Civita connection. The covariant derivative of the field equation (17) is

$$D_\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (\delta^\mu_\nu L_m - T^\mu_\nu) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\nu f + D_\mu (f_Q P^\mu_{\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta}) + D_\mu \left[\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P^{\alpha\mu}_\nu) \right], \quad (26)$$

From Eq. (25) D_μ can be expressed as $D_\mu = \nabla_\mu + \frac{1}{2} Q_\mu + L^\rho_{\mu\nu}$. Thus, Eq. (26) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha \nabla_\mu H_\nu^{\alpha\mu} - \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} D_\mu T^\mu_\nu = \frac{1}{2} f_Q \partial_\nu Q + \\ & \nabla_\mu (f_Q P^\mu_{\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta}) + \frac{1}{2} Q_\mu (f_Q P^\mu_{\alpha\beta} Q_\nu^{\alpha\beta}) + \\ & L^\rho_{\mu\nu} (f_Q P^\mu_{\alpha\beta} Q_\rho^{\alpha\beta}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} L^\rho_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\alpha (\sqrt{-g} f_Q P^{\alpha\mu}_\rho) \\ & + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} Q_\mu \nabla_\alpha (\sqrt{-g} f_Q P^{\alpha\mu}_\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The detailed calculations are shown in [113], and they lead to

$$D_\mu T^\mu_\nu = \frac{1}{f_{L_m} \sqrt{-g}} \left[\nabla_\alpha \nabla_\mu H_\nu^{\alpha\mu} - 2 Q_\mu \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P^{\alpha\mu}_\nu) \right]. \quad (28)$$

To simplify the above equation, we introduce the tensor A^μ_α and define Eq. (24) such that

$$\nabla_\mu \left(4 \sqrt{-g} f_Q P^{\mu\nu}_\alpha + H_\alpha^{\mu\nu} \right) = \sqrt{-g} A^\nu_\alpha. \quad (29)$$

Then the covariant derivative of the RHS of Eq. (29) is

$$\nabla_\nu (\sqrt{-g} A^\nu_\alpha) = \sqrt{-g} \nabla_\nu A^\nu_\alpha + \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2} Q_\nu A^\nu_\alpha = 0. \quad (30)$$

Eq. (28) simplifies by the combination of Eqs. (29) and (30) as

$$D_\mu T^\mu_\nu = \frac{1}{f_{L_m}} \left[\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha \nabla_\mu H_\nu^{\alpha\mu} + \nabla_\mu A^\mu_\nu - \nabla_\mu \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \nabla_\alpha H_\nu^{\alpha\mu} \right) \right] = B_\nu \neq 0. \quad (31)$$

From Eq. (31), it follows that the matter energy-momentum tensor is not conserved in the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory. The non-conservation tensor B_ν is a function of dynamical variables like Q , L_m , and the thermodynamic parameters.

In a broader context, dissipative processes pose significant challenges when reconciling cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR) and large-scale structure (LSS). In [54], the cosmological and solar system consequences of a class of models with geometry-matter coupling were investigated. The findings of this work suggest that these models often exhibit inconsistent behaviour as compared to observational data. This inconsistency may potentially manifest and amplify when extended to cosmological scales at both galactic and extragalactic levels. In particular, incompatibility with CMBR or LSS appears to be a model-dependent phenomenon. However, the study in [54] reveals that some or all of these inconsistencies can be mitigated through meticulous fine-tuning of model parameters.

At larger scales, specifically galactic and extra-galactic levels, the non-minimal matter coupling with geometry introduces intriguing implications. The observed flattening of galaxy rotation curves considered a dynamically generated effect, is attributed to the non-minimal coupling [144, 145]. The non-conservation of the energy-momentum tensor leads to a deviation from geodesic motion, explaining the observed deviation between measured rotation velocity and classical predic-

tions. Moreover, a specific type of non-minimal matter coupling with geometry is shown to mimic the presence of dark matter in galaxy clusters. In [146], they explore this phenomenon in the context of the Abell cluster A586, demonstrating its potential extension to a larger sample of galaxy clusters. Adding to the complexity of the physical behaviour, dissipative processes play a distinctive role in the evolution of radio galaxies, as discussed in [147].

If we consider matter as a perfect fluid described by its pressure p and energy density ρ , the energy-momentum tensor can be defined as

$$T^\mu_\nu = (\rho + p) u_\nu u^\mu + p \delta^\mu_\nu, \quad (32)$$

where u^μ denotes the four-velocity of the fluid. Following [135] we have

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = B_\mu u^\mu. \quad (33)$$

The continuity equation presented above deviates noticeably from the standard form, incorporating additional terms on the right-hand side (RHS) that account for the deviations from the geodesic motion. In this context, the source term, denoted by $B_\mu u^\mu$, is associated with the generation or dissipation of energy. When $B_\mu u^\mu = 0$, the system obeys the energy conservation law of standard gravity. On the contrary, if $B_\mu u^\mu$ takes nonzero values, the energy transfer processes become dominant.

The momentum conservation equation, which describes the movement of massive particles [113, 135], is expressed as

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{ds^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta} u^\alpha u^\beta = \frac{h^{\mu\nu}}{\rho + p} (B_\nu - D_\nu p) = F^\mu, \quad (34)$$

where $h^{\mu\nu}$ represents the projection operator, defined as $h^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu} + u^\mu u^\nu$. The equation of motion exhibits a notable departure from the geodesic motion of the massive particles. An additional force, F^μ , emerges as a consequence of the coupling between Q and L_m . This coupling introduces a non-gravitational influence, leading to deviations from the trajectories determined by the standard geodesic motion of general relativity thus influencing the dynamical evolution of massive particles.

III. COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF FLRW UNIVERSE IN $f(Q, L_m)$ GRAVITY

In the present Section, we will investigate, in a general framework, the cosmological implications of the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory. By considering a flat

Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker geometry, the generalized Friedmann equations are derived. The cosmological evolution equations do contain some extra-terms, coming from the presence of the nonmetricity and geometry matter coupling, which generate an effective density of pressure, which can be interpreted as representing geometric dark energy. The general form of the energy balance equation is also obtained. The de Sitter limiting behaviour of the cosmological models is also investigated.

A. The Friedmann equations

To study the cosmological evolution in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity, we assume that the Universe is described by a flat Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) geometry, with the spacetime interval of the form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (35)$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor¹. We define the rate of expansion of the universe as $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$. Let us also assume that the Universe is filled with a perfect fluid. We adopt the expressions $L_m = -\rho$, or $L_m = p$ for the Lagrangian density of the cosmic matter. Hence, in the comoving frame, the non-zero components of the energy-momentum tensor are given by $T_\nu^\mu = (-\rho, p, p, p)$.

Using the FLRW metric, the field equations Eq. (15) give the two generalized Friedmann equations (the detailed calculations are presented in the Appendix A)

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f - f_{L_m}(\rho + L_m)], \quad (36)$$

$$\dot{H} + 3H^2 + \frac{\dot{f}_Q}{f_Q} H = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f + f_{L_m}(p - L_m)]. \quad (37)$$

For $f(Q, L_m) = f(Q) + 2L_m$ the Friedmann equations reduces to $f(Q)$ [148, 149], it can further be simplified to STEGR. By subtracting Eqs. (36) and (37) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}(f_Q H) = \frac{f_{L_m}}{4} (p + \rho). \quad (38)$$

The generalized expression of the deceleration parameter is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} q &= -1 - \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4f_Q H^2} (2Qf_Q + 4\dot{f}_Q H - f - f_{L_m}(p - L_m)) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

With the help of Eq. (36) and Eq. (37) can be rewritten as

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f + f_{L_m}(\rho + 2p - L_m)] - 2\frac{\dot{f}_Q}{f_Q} H. \quad (40)$$

Thus, we can reformulate the generalized Friedmann equations of the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory in the form

$$3H^2 = \rho_{eff}, \quad 2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -p_{eff}, \quad (41)$$

where we have introduced the effective energy density and pressure, defined as

$$\rho_{eff} = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f - f_{L_m}(\rho + L_m)], \quad (42)$$

and

$$p_{eff} = 2\frac{\dot{f}_Q}{f_Q} H - \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f + f_{L_m}(\rho + 2p - L_m)], \quad (43)$$

respectively. Eq. (41) allow to formulate the generalized effective conservation equation of the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory as

$$\dot{\rho}_{eff} + 3H(\rho_{eff} + p_{eff}) = 0. \quad (44)$$

By introducing the notations

$$\Delta = \frac{f_{L_m}}{f_Q}, \quad \delta = \frac{f}{f_{L_m}}, \quad (45)$$

we can represent the effective energy density and pressure as

$$\rho_{eff} = \frac{1}{4}\Delta [\delta - (\rho + L_m)], \quad (46)$$

and

$$p_{eff} = 2\frac{\dot{f}_Q}{f_Q} H - \frac{1}{4}\Delta [\delta + (\rho + 2p - L_m)], \quad (47)$$

respectively. Then the conservation equation (44) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) &= \frac{1}{\Delta} \frac{d}{dt} [\Delta(\delta - L_m)] \\ &+ 3H \left\{ 8\frac{\dot{f}_Q}{f_Q} \frac{H}{\Delta} - \left[\left(1 + \frac{\dot{\Delta}}{\Delta} \right) \rho + p \right] \right\} = \Gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The function Γ describes the non-conservation level of the present modified gravity theory. If $\Gamma > 0$, the energy of the particles increases due to the energy transfer of matter to the gravitational field. The case $\Gamma < 0$ can be interpreted as describing particle decay due to the matter-geometry coupling.

¹ Here, we assume the Lapse function as $N(t) = 1$.

From Eqs. (41) we also obtain the expression of the deceleration parameter as

$$q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3 p_{eff}}{2 \rho_{eff}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} + 6 \frac{2 \dot{f}_Q H - (1/4) [f + f_{L_m} (\rho + 2p - L_m)]}{f - f_{L_m} (\rho + L_m)}. \quad (49)$$

The Universe enters into an accelerating phase when $q < 0$, or $p_{eff} < -\rho_{eff}/3$. This gives the condition that must be satisfied by the function f and its derivatives to describe an accelerated expansion

$$12 \dot{H} f_Q + f - f_{L_m} (\rho + L_m) > 0. \quad (50)$$

To compare the theoretical results with the cosmological observations, we introduce an independent variable redshift z instead of the usual time variable t , defined as $a = \frac{1}{1+z}$, where we have used a normalization of the scale factor by imposing $a(0) = 1$. Thus, we can replace the derivatives with respect to the time with the derivatives with respect to the redshift using the relation

$$\frac{d}{dt} = -(1+z)H(z) \frac{d}{dz}. \quad (51)$$

Moreover, the redshift dependence of the deceleration parameter is given by

$$q(z) = -1 + (1+z) \frac{H'(z)}{H(z)}. \quad (52)$$

B. The de Sitter solution

As a first step in considering explicit theoretical models, we consider the problem of the existence of a de Sitter-type vacuum solution of the cosmological field equations. The de Sitter solution corresponds to $p = 0$, $\rho = 0$ and $H = H_0 = \text{constant}$, respectively. For a vacuum de Sitter type Universe, Eq. (38) gives $\dot{f}_Q = 0$, and further results in $f_Q = F_0$, where F_0 is a constant.

The condition $f_Q = F_0$ is satisfied for any Q , when we have [113, 135]

$$f(Q) = F_0 Q + 2\Lambda, \quad (53)$$

where Λ is an integration constant. In the vacuum de Sitter phase, the first field equation (36) reduces to the form

$$3H_0^2 = \frac{6F_0 H_0^2 + 2\Lambda}{4F_0}. \quad (54)$$

One can also write the above equation as

$$H_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{3F_0}}. \quad (55)$$

Hence, the $f(Q, L_m)$ theory admits the de Sitter type evolution in the limiting case of a vacuum Universe. As can be easily calculated, for the de-Sitter solution, we have $q = -1$ and $\omega = -1$, respectively.

IV. COSMOLOGICAL MODELS

In this Section, we will explore various cosmological models based on the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory. The models are determined by specific choices for the functional form of $f(Q, L_m)$. To keep our analysis as general as possible, we will assume that the matter in the Universe obeys an equation of state given by $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$ where p is the pressure and ρ is the energy density, $1 \leq \gamma \leq 2$. For $\gamma = 4/3$, this linear relationship between pressure and energy density describes the behaviour of the radiation in the early Universe, characterized by high density, as well as, for $\gamma = 1$, in the present Universe, when the matter density is low. However, we will begin our presentation by describing the data sets and the statistical methods used to compare the models with observations.

A. Data and methodology of MCMC analyses

The present Section presents the observational datasets that constrain the $f(Q, L_m)$ modified gravity theory with the MCMC methodology. We perform a Bayesian statistical analysis based on MCMC tools, using the Emcee module under the Python environment, to establish bounds over the model parameters. To find the maximum of the likelihood function for each data set, we use the following priors: $H_0 : [60, 80]$, $\alpha : [0, 0.5]$, $\beta : [-3000, -2000]$, and $\gamma : [1, 2]$. We also perform our analysis by combining the samples $OHD + SN + BAO$.

1. Data sets

- Hubble parameter: The values of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ are usually derived from the so-called differential age of galaxies (DAH) methodology. As the Hubble parameter can be estimated at a redshift z from $H(z) = \frac{-1}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt}$, dz/dt can be obtained from measurements of massive and very slowly evolving galaxies, dubbed Cosmic Chronometers (CC). We use 31 points compiled in [150], where we take them as uncorrelated with each other.
- Type Ia supernovae (SN): We use measurements of the most recent Pantheon+ dataset [151, 152],

TABLE I: Confidence-level constraints on the investigated models; we have considered SN and OHD + SN + BAO.

Model	Data	H_0	α	β	γ	q_0	z_t
A	SN	72.454 ± 0.093	0.1231 ± 0.0042	-2484.96 ± 0.10	$1.0313^{+0.0085}_{-0.031}$	$-0.44^{+0.040}_{-0.053}$	$0.46^{+0.11}_{-0.05}$
	OHD+SN+BAO	72.527 ± 0.095	0.1191 ± 0.0024	-2484.952 ± 0.097	$1.0046^{+0.0013}_{-0.0045}$	$-0.48^{+0.022}_{-0.025}$	$0.56^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$
B	SN	72.456 ± 0.094	$0.1228^{+0.0036}_{-0.0032}$	-2457.873 ± 0.094	$1.046^{+0.011}_{-0.047}$	$-0.44^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$0.47^{+0.08}_{-0.04}$
	OHD+SN+BAO	72.546 ± 0.093	0.1167 ± 0.0024	-2457.858 ± 0.099	$1.0188^{+0.046}_{-0.018}$	$-0.49^{+0.03}_{-0.02}$	$0.56^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$

consisting of 1701 light curves from 1550 Type Ia supernovae. This is an improvement from the previous Pantheon data set, where, in particular, there is an increase in the low redshift range. This data set includes measurements of Cepheid hosts from the SH0ES collaboration, composed of 77 points. The theoretical estimate for the distance modulus $\mu(z) = m_b - M_B$ is

$$\mu_{th} = 5 \log_{10} D_L(z)/\text{Mpc} + 25, \quad (56)$$

with $D_L(z)$ being the luminosity distance.

- Baryonic Acoustic Oscillations (BAO): Finally, we constrain our model using BAO [153–155]. To obtain the BAO constraints, we use the acoustic scale $l_A = \pi \frac{d_A(z_d)}{r_s(z_*)}$, where $d_A(z) = \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}$ is the angular diameter distance in the comoving coordi-

nates and r_s is the sound horizon determined as $r_s(z_d) = \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z')}{H(z')}$ at the drag epoch z_d with sound speed $c_s(z)$. Here, $D_V(z_{BAO})$ is the dilation scale $D_V(z) = \left[\frac{d_A(z)^2 c_z}{H(z)} \right]^{1/3}$. Finally, we obtain the BAO constraints $\frac{d_A(z_d)}{D_V(z_{BAO})}$.

2. Statistical analysis

To perform the MCMC sampling, we consider the chi-squared functions χ_{SN}^2 and $\chi_{OHD}^2 + \chi_{SN}^2 + \chi_{BAO}^2$ obtained by minimizing the corresponding log-likelihood function $\mathcal{L} = \exp(-\chi^2/2)$. The best-fit values and their uncertainties at 68% confidence level (CL) for the datasets are reported in Table I.

It is useful to estimate how preferred the proposed models are in comparison with the standard Λ CDM one. We then incorporate statistical criteria, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), defined as [156]

$$\text{AIC} = \chi_{\min}^2 + 2d, \quad \text{BIC} = \chi_{\min}^2 + d \ln N, \quad (57)$$

where d is the number of free parameters, and N is the total size of the data.

In this criterion, if the difference in AIC value between a given model and the best one (ΔAIC) is less than 4, both models are equally supported by the data. For ΔAIC values in the interval $4 < \Delta\text{AIC} < 10$, the data still support the given model but less than the preferred one. For $\Delta\text{AIC} > 10$, the observations do not support the given model.

Similarly, BIC discriminates between models as follows: For $\Delta\text{BIC} < 2$, there is no appreciable evidence

against the model. If $2 < \Delta\text{BIC} < 6$, there is modest evidence against the considered model. For the interval $6 < \Delta\text{BIC} < 10$, the evidence against the candidate model is strong, and even stronger evidence against it exists in the data when $\Delta\text{BIC} > 10$.

B. Model A: $f = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$ with $L_m = p$

As a first example of a cosmological model, we consider the functional form of f as represented by $f = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$ with $L_m = p$, where α and β are constants. Hence, for this particular $f(Q, L_m)$ model with $L_m = p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, the Friedmann equations reduces to

$$3H^2 = -\frac{\beta}{2\alpha} + \frac{\rho}{\alpha}, \quad (58)$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -3H^2(\gamma - 1) - \frac{\beta\gamma}{2\alpha}. \quad (59)$$

The system of Eqs. (63) and (59) does admit a de Sitter type solution for a vacuum Universe, with $H = H_0 = \text{constant}$, corresponding to $3H_0^2 = -\beta/2\alpha$, which requires that either α or β are negative. The effective densities and pressures are given by

$$\rho_{eff} = \frac{\rho}{\alpha} - \frac{\beta}{2\alpha}, \quad p_{eff} = 3H^2(\gamma - 1) + \frac{\beta\gamma}{2\alpha}, \quad (60)$$

leading to the energy balance equation

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0, \quad (61)$$

Hence, in this model, the energy-momentum tensor of the matter is conserved.

Further, using the relation $\frac{1}{H} \frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d \ln a}$, the above equations have an exact solution for H , which takes the form

$$H(z) = \left[\frac{(6H_0^2\alpha + \beta)(1+z)^{3\gamma} - \beta}{6\alpha} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (62)$$

where $H(0) = H_0$ is the present Hubble parameter. It should be noted that the positivity condition on $H(z)$ in Eq. (62) gives us the constraints on model parameters for the priors to be set in MCMC analysis.

1. Statistical analysis of Model A

The 1D posterior distributions and 2D confidence level contours at 1σ CL and 2σ CL are presented in Model A in Figs. 1.

According to our results, we obtain the χ^2 for SN and OHD + SN + BAO in the case of model A. We have $\Delta AIC = 2.13$ & 3.4 , $\Delta BIC = 1.57$ and 8.87 for SN and OHD + SN + BAO. We find that our model A is well supported by the observational data SN and, on average, supported by the combined set OHD + SN + BAO.

2. Cosmological evolution: Model A

The variations as a function of the redshift of the energy density, deceleration parameter, and the effective equation of state for Model A of $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity are represented in Figs. 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The deceleration parameter $q(z)$ shows a significant dependence on the numerical values of the model parameters. In the redshift range $z \in (-1, 0.6)$, the model can reproduce well the results of the standard Λ CDM model. The deceleration parameter for model A at higher redshifts takes much larger positive values than for the Λ CDM case, indicating a decelerating evolution followed by a




FIG. 1: The corner plot for the parameter space $(H_0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ with their 1σ and 2σ confidence levels for model A in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity.

quicker transition to the accelerating phase. However, the model we consider enters the accelerating phase with $q < 0$ at the redshift 0.46 and 0.56 for the SN and OHD + SN + BAO [157–159]. The comparison of the deceleration parameter variation of Model A with the Λ CDM paradigm shows a qualitative similarity between the two models. Cosmological phases with a de Sitter-type expansion with $q = -1$ can also be obtained at late times.

In addition, the energy density is an increasing function of redshift z . The increase is almost linear for small redshifts, and it is almost independent of the numerical values of model parameters. However, a significant dependence on the model parameter can be seen at higher redshifts. The $f(Q, L_m)$ Model A can provide a viable alternative explanation for matter dynamics, as the plot shows.

The plots in Fig. 4 depict the behaviour of the effective EoS parameter versus the redshift z of Model A for different sets of observational data. According to the observations, $\gamma = 4/3$ represents the radiation phase, and $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the matter-dominated (non-relativistic) phase. The first model here depicts the quintessence era of the universe at present, $-1 < \omega < 0$ and approaches towards Λ CDM, i.e. $\omega = -1$ at late times. However, the current function $f(Q, L_m)$ cannot




FIG. 2: The behaviour of the energy density $\bar{\rho} = \rho/3H_0^2$ as a function of redshift using the best-fit values of model parameters for model A with 1σ levels.




FIG. 3: The behaviour of the deceleration parameter as a function of redshift using the best-fit values of model parameters for model A with 1σ levels. The dashed black curve represents the evolution of the q in the standard Λ CDM cosmological model with $\Omega_m = 0.3089$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.6911$, obtained from the Planck data.

fully mimic the standard cosmic evolution in a quantitative manner. However, it produces identical qualitative results.

C. Model B: $f = -\alpha Q + (2L_m)^2 + \beta$ with $L_m = p$

As a second cosmological model, we consider the functional form as $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + (2L_m)^2 + \beta$ with $L_m = p$, where $\alpha > 0$ and β are constants. For the specific functional form, the Friedmann equations are reduced to

$$3H^2 = -\frac{2}{\alpha}(1 - \gamma^2)\rho^2 - \frac{\beta}{2\alpha}, \quad (63)$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -\frac{\beta}{2\alpha} - \frac{(\gamma - 1)(\beta + 6\alpha H^2)}{2\alpha(\gamma + 1)}. \quad (64)$$




FIG. 4: The behaviour of the effective equation of state parameter using the best-fit values of model parameters for model A with 1σ levels.

Hence, for this model, the effective energy density and pressure can be defined as

$$\rho_{eff} = -\frac{2}{\alpha}(1 - \gamma^2)\rho^2 - \frac{\beta}{2\alpha}, \quad (65)$$

and

$$p_{eff} = \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} + \frac{(\gamma - 1)(\beta + 6\alpha H^2)}{2\alpha(\gamma + 1)}. \quad (66)$$

For the energy balance equation, we obtain

$$\dot{\rho} + \frac{3\gamma}{\gamma + 1}H\rho = 0, \quad (67)$$

which can be integrated to give the density-scale factor dependence in the form

$$\rho(a) = \rho_0 a^{-3\gamma/(\gamma+1)}, \quad (68)$$

where ρ_0 is an arbitrary integration constant. Eq. (67) can be reformulated as

$$\dot{\rho} + 3\gamma H\rho = \frac{3\gamma^2}{\gamma + 1}H\rho = \Gamma, \quad (69)$$

which shows that Γ , the matter non-conservation rate, is proportional to the factor $H\rho$. In the present model $\Gamma > 0$, and thus it describes energy transfer from the gravitational field to matter. Still, in the limit of very low densities matter creation processes can be safely ignored.

The expression of the function $H(z)$ for this model is obtained as

$$H(z) = \left[\frac{(6H_0^2\alpha + \beta)(1+z)^{\frac{6\gamma}{1+\gamma}} - \beta}{6\alpha} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (70)$$




FIG. 5: The corner plot for the parameter space $(H_0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ with their 1σ and 2σ confidence levels for Model B in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity.

1. Statistical analysis

The 2D confidence level contours at 1σ CL and 2σ CL for Model B are presented in Fig. 5.

Similarly, we obtain the following results for Model B: $\chi^2 = 1609.95$, and $\chi^2 = 1632.15$. Hence, using the above information, we obtain $\Delta AIC = 2.05$ & 2.9 , $\Delta BIC = 1.49$ & 8.4 for *SN* and *OHD + SN + BAO*. Consequently, Model B is also similarly supported by the observational data.

2. Cosmological evolution: Model B

The energy density in Fig. 6 is a monotonically increasing function of the redshift for all adopted numerical values of the model parameters. The increase is almost linear for small redshifts. However, a dependence on the model parameter can be seen at higher redshifts. This particular $f(Q, L_m)$ model predicts a lower energy density at high and low redshifts compared to the previous model.

In this model, the deceleration parameter provides a good qualitative concordance with the predictions of the

standard cosmology. Moreover, the behaviour of q overlaps at 1σ level for *SN* and *OHD + SN + BAO* sets. Up




FIG. 6: The behaviour of the energy density $\bar{\rho} = \rho/3H_0^2$ as a function of redshift using the best-fit values of model parameters for model B with 1σ levels.




FIG. 7: The behaviour of the deceleration parameter as a function of redshift using the best-fit values of model parameters for model B with 1σ levels. The dashed black curve represents the evolution of the q in the standard Λ CDM cosmological model with $\Omega_m = 0.3089$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.6911$, obtained from the Planck data.

to redshifts of around $z \sim 1$, the deceleration parameter is roughly a constant in the range $q \in (0.2, 0.5)$, and the Universe is decelerating. Furthermore, the Universe began to accelerate, and after a short cosmological time interval, it entered an accelerating phase at the redshift 0.47 and 0.56 for *SN* and *OHD + SN + BAO*, for the considered $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity model. The second model in Fig. 8 depicts the quintessence era of the universe at present, $-1 < \omega < 0$ and approaches towards Λ CDM, i.e. $\omega = -1$ at late times. Thus, in the present mode, we get the overlapping and tighter constraints for both datasets, *SN* and *OHD + SN + BAO*.

TABLE II: The corresponding χ^2 of the models for each sample and the information criteria AIC and BIC for the examined cosmological models.

Model	Data	χ^2	AIC	ΔAIC	BIC	ΔBIC
Λ CDM	SN	1609.9	1615.90	0	1638.21	0
	OHD+SN+BAO	1631.217	1637.217	0	1653.59	0
A	SN	1610.03	1618.03	2.13	1639.78	1.57
	OHD+SN+BAO	1632.62	1640.62	3.4	1662.46	8.87
B	SN	1609.95	1617.95	2.05	1639.70	1.49
	OHD+SN+BAO	1632.15	1640.15	2.9	1661.99	8.4




FIG. 8: The behavior of the effective equation of state parameter using the best-fit values of model parameters for model B with 1σ levels.




FIG. 9: The behavior of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ as a function of the redshift for model A and B in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity.

D. Model comparisons, and correlation results

Here, Fig. 9 illustrates the redshift evolution of the Hubble parameter, providing a clear comparison of the fit for both models and the Λ CDM at both low and high redshifts. The black line depicts the Λ CDM model. The error-bar plot of the distance modulus $\mu(z)$ and $\mu(z) - \mu_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ for the Pantheon+ data is shown in Fig. 10, with the standard Λ CDM model represented by a black solid line. Notably, both models correspond closely with the Λ CDM at low redshifts, but they start to diverge slightly after $z \approx 1$.

1. Correlation results

We further investigate the correlations among key physical parameters within the datasets. From the results presented in Fig. 11, we infer the following conclusions:

- Fig. 11(a) shows that the Hubble parameter H_0 exhibits a strong positive linear relationship with redshift z , as indicated by the correlation coefficient of 0.95. The standard deviation σ shows a moderate positive correlation with both H_0 (0.37) and z (0.39).
- Fig. 11(b) illustrates that z_{BAO} has a strong negative relation with σ and $D (= d_A/D_V)$, as indicated by the correlation coefficient of -0.75 and -0.87. The standard deviation σ shows a strong positive correlation with D (0.93).
- Fig. 11(c) shows that μ has strong positive correlation with z_{CMB} (0.83) and moderate negative correlation with σ_μ (-0.31). The correlation coefficient




FIG. 10: The behavior of $\mu(z)$ and $\mu(z) - \mu_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(z)$ as a function of the redshift for Models A (blue dashed line) and B (red dotted line) in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity.

of -0.011 indicates a very weak negative linear relationship between σ_μ and z_{CMB} .

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have investigated the theoretical aspects of the third geometric description of gravity, known as the symmetric teleparallel gravity, or the $f(Q)$ gravity. From a geometric and mathematical perspective, $f(Q)$ gravity uses the Weylian extension of Riemann geometry, where the fundamental metricity condition no longer holds. The violation of the metricity condition thus becomes the source of gravitational phenomena, with the non-metricity scalar Q playing a similar role to that of the Ricci scalar in general relativity.

In the present study we have introduced a novel class of theories, representing an extension of the $f(Q)$ gravity, where the non-metricity Q is coupled non-minimally with the matter Lagrangian L_m . Mathematically, our

analysis was conducted within the framework of the metric-affine formalism. Our theory is constructed similarly to the $f(Q, T)$ theory, but with the trace of the matter energy-momentum tensor replaced by the matter Lagrangian. Similarly to the energy-momentum tensor trace-curvature couplings, in $f(Q, L_m)$ theory, the coupling between Q and L_m leads to the non-conservation of the matter energy-momentum tensor.

By applying a variational principle, we have derived the gravitational field equations for the $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity theory. For particular choices of $f(Q, L_m)$, it reduces to both $f(Q)$ and STEGR. This theory provides the freedom to explore different sets of coupling between Q and L_m , and thus, the theory sheds light on the coupling mechanisms between the third, non-metric geometric description of gravity and matter, representing new avenues for further theoretical exploration. Consequently, the fundamental equations describing the cosmological evolution in $f(Q, L_m)$ gravity are expressed in terms of an effective energy density and pressure of a purely geometric origin. But they also depend on the ordinary matter-energy and pressure components of the energy-momentum tensor, as well as on the functions $f(Q, L_m)$, $f_Q(Q, L_m)$, and $f_{L_m}(Q, L_m)$.

Additionally, we have obtained the general relationship describing the non-conservation of the matter-energy-momentum tensor. The equation of motion of the particles reveals a notable departure from the geodesic motion for massive particles, specific to standard general relativity. An additional force emerges as a consequence of the coupling between Q and L_m . This coupling introduces a non-gravitational effect, leading to deviations from the paths followed in the standard geodesic motion and influencing the dynamical evolution of massive particles. The investigations presented may also contribute to a better understanding of the geometrical formulation of gravity theories, particularly regarding the aspects related to the geometry-matter coupling.

For the description of the dynamics of the Universe, we have adopted the homogeneous and isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker type metric, describing the cosmological evolution in a flat geometry. In this study, we have examined two specific classes of cosmological models by adopting some simple functional forms of $f(Q, L_m)$. For the first case, we have assumed the simple additive Lagrangian, $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$. For this model, we have obtained a wide range of cosmological scenarios and evolution corresponding to the specific numerical values of the model parameters. These scenarios may include cosmological evolution describing both the de-




FIG. 11: Correlation matrix heatmap for (a) Observed Hubble Data (OHD), (b) Baryonic Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and (c) SN (Pantheon+SHOES)

celerating and the accelerating expansion phases of the Universe and de Sitter-type dynamics at late times. The model $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + 2L_m + \beta$ can provide an effective description of cosmological data up to redshifts of around $z \approx 1$. Specifically, in this model, the Universe undergoes a rapid transition from a decelerating phase, characterized by a positive value of q , to an accelerating state where $q < 0$. This transition can result, in its final stages, in a de Sitter-type expansion. The second model with $f(Q, L_m) = -\alpha Q + (2L_m)^2 + \beta$ also evolves from a decelerating to an accelerating state. The nature of the cosmological evolution is heavily influenced by the numerical values of the model parameters and the specific functional form of f . Our fundamental finding

for the specific models and for the range of the cosmological parameters we have examined indicates that the Universe initially underwent a decelerating phase in its recent evolution, followed by an accelerating phase with $q < 0$, in which the Universe entered at $z = z_{crit}$, and which continued for $0 < z < z_{crit}$. In the future, the Universe enters into an accelerating de Sitter-type phase, with $q = -1$. From our analysis, it follows that H_0 in the second model has higher values as compared to the first model, while the values of other model parameters decrease under the same scenario. Additionally, we find consistent DE EoS behavior with the assumption of quintessence dynamics within 1σ .

We have also compared the theoretical predictions of the $f(Q, L_m)$ theory with the corresponding results in the standard Λ CDM cosmology. Both our considered $f(Q, L_m)$ models align well with Λ CDM at lower redshifts. However, at higher redshifts, significant differences emerge in the behavior of the $\mu(z)$ function and the deceleration parameter, as compared to the Λ CDM model. Henceforth, in the presence of matter, the models give an acceptable description of the observational data, as well as of the Λ CDM model, but without reproducing it exactly at the present time.

Another potential application of the $f(Q, L_m)$ theory would be to consider inflation in the presence of scalar fields, which might offer a completely new perspective on the geometrical, gravitational, and cosmological processes that significantly influenced the early dynamics of the Universe. Consequently, the predictions of the present model could lead to major differences compared to those of standard general relativity or its extensions that ignore the role of matter. These differences could impact several current areas of interest, such as cosmology, gravitational collapse, and the generation of gravitational waves. To conclude, in the present investigation, we have introduced a new version of the symmetric teleparallel theory, and we have demonstrated its theoretical consistency. This approach also motivates and encourages the exploration of further extensions within the $f(Q, L_m)$ family of theories.

Appendix A: Derivation of the Friedmann equations

The metric tensor components are given by $g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, a^2, a^2, a^2)$, $g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, a^{-2}, a^{-2}, a^{-2})$, and its determinant $\sqrt{-g} = a^3$. For the nonmetricity tensor, have the following non-zero terms,

$$Q_{011} = Q_{022} = Q_{033} = 2a\dot{a}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$Q_0^{11} = Q_0^{22} = Q_0^{33} = \frac{2\dot{a}}{a^3}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$Q_{11}^{01} = Q_{22}^{02} = Q_{33}^{03} = -\frac{2\dot{a}}{a}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$L_{11}^0 = L_{22}^0 = L_{33}^0 = -a\dot{a}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$L_{01}^1 = L_{10}^1 = L_{02}^2 = L_{20}^2 = L_{03}^3 = L_{30}^3 = -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$P_{11}^0 = P_{22}^0 = P_{33}^0 = -a\dot{a}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$P^{011} = P^{022} = P^{033} = -\frac{\dot{a}}{a^3}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$P_{011} = P_{022} = P_{033} = a\dot{a}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$P_{01}^1 = P_{10}^1 = P_{02}^2 = P_{20}^2 = P_{03}^3 = P_{30}^3 = -\frac{\dot{a}}{4a}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$P_{110} = P_{101} = P_{220} = P_{202} = P_{330} = P_{303} = -\frac{a\dot{a}}{4}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$P^{110} = P^{101} = P^{220} = P^{202} = P^{330} = P^{303} = -\frac{\dot{a}}{4a^3}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The non-metricity scalar Q is calculated using Eq.(8) as

$$Q = -(Q_{011}P^{011} + Q_{022}P^{022} + Q_{033}P^{033}). \quad (\text{A12})$$

We obtain thus $Q = 6H^2$, where $H = \dot{a}/a$. The energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ for a perfect fluid has the components $T_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(\rho, pa^2, pa^2, pa^2)$. Evaluating the field equation (15) for the tt-component

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{a^3} \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P_{00}^\alpha) + f_Q (P_{0\alpha\beta} Q_0^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_0^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta 0}) \\ + \frac{1}{2} f g_{00} = \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (g_{00} L_m - T_{00}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_Q (P_{011} Q_0^{11} + P_{022} Q_0^{22} + P_{033} Q_0^{33}) - \frac{1}{2} f \\ = -\frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (\rho + L_m). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

gives the first generalized Friedmann equation

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f - f_{L_m} (\rho + L_m)]. \quad (\text{A15})$$

By evaluating the field equation (15) for the xx-component

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{a^3} \nabla_\alpha (f_Q \sqrt{-g} P_{11}^\alpha) + f_Q (P_{1\alpha\beta} Q_1^{\alpha\beta} - 2Q_1^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta 1}) \\ + \frac{1}{2} f g_{11} = \frac{1}{2} f_{L_m} (g_{11} L_m - T_{11}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{a^3} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (f_Q a^3 (-a\dot{a})) - 2f_Q \left(\frac{2\dot{a}}{a}\right) (a\dot{a}) + \frac{a^2}{2} f \\ = \frac{a^2}{2} f_{L_m} (L_m - p). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

leads to the second generalized Friedmann equation

$$\dot{H} + 3H^2 + \frac{f_Q}{f} H = \frac{1}{4f_Q} [f + f_{L_m} (p - L_m)]. \quad (\text{A18})$$

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AH thanks Mr. Sayantan Ghosh (BITS-Pilani, Hyderabad) for fruitful discussion on modified gravity. PKS

acknowledges Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, Government of India for financial support to carry out Research project No.: CRG/2022/001847 and IUCAA, Pune, India, for providing support through the visiting Associateship program.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, Die feldgleichungen der gravitation, Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften , 844 (1915).
- [2] D. Hilbert, Die grundlagen der physik.(erste mitteilung.), Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse **1915**, 395 (1915).
- [3] A. Einstein *et al.*, The foundation of the general theory of relativity, *Annalen Phys* **49**, 769 (1916).
- [4] R. M. Wald, *General relativity* (University of Chicago press, 2010).
- [5] D. Lehmkuhl, Why einstein did not believe that general relativity geometrizes gravity, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **46**, 316 (2014).
- [6] F. W. Dyson, A. S. Eddington, and C. Davidson, Ix. a determination of the deflection of light by the sun's gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of may 29, 1919, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character* **220**, 291 (1920).
- [7] M. Janssen and J. Renn, Einstein and the Perihelion Motion of Mercury, *arXiv e-prints* (2021).
- [8] B. Abbott, S. Jawahar, N. Lockerbie, and K. Tokmakov, Ligo scientific collaboration and virgo collaboration (2016) directly comparing gw150914 with numerical solutions of einstein's equations for binary black hole coalescence. *physical review d*, 94 (6). issn 1550-2368, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.94.064035>, *PHYSICAL REVIEW D Phys Rev D* **94**, 064035 (2016).
- [9] L. D. Landau, *The classical theory of fields*, Vol. 2 (Elsevier, 2013).
- [10] J. H. Taylor and J. M. Weisberg, A new test of general relativity-gravitational radiation and the binary pulsar psr 1913+ 16, *Astrophysical Journal, Part 1*, vol. 253, Feb. 15, 1982, p. 908-920. NSF-supported research. **253**, 908 (1982).
- [11] I. I. Shapiro, W. B. Smith, M. E. Ash, and S. Herrick, General relativity and the orbit of icarus, *Astronomical Journal*, Vol. 76, p. 588 (1971) **76**, 588 (1971).
- [12] I. I. Shapiro, C. C. Counselman III, and R. W. King, Verification of the principle of equivalence for massive bodies, *Physical Review Letters* **36**, 555 (1976).
- [13] C. M. Will, *Living rev, Relativity* **9** (2006).
- [14] M. Ishak, Testing general relativity in cosmology, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **22**, 1 (2019).
- [15] 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**, 1009 (1998).
- [16] S. Perlmutter and B. P. Schmidt, Measuring cosmology with supernovae, in *Supernovae and Gamma-Ray Bursters*, edited by K. W. Weiler (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003) pp. 195–217.
- [17] J. L. Tonry, B. P. Schmidt, B. Barris, P. Candia, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. L. Coil, A. V. Filippenko, P. Garnavich, C. Hogan, *et al.*, Cosmological results from high-z supernovae, *The Astrophysical Journal* **594**, 1 (2003).
- [18] D. N. Spergel, R. Bean, O. Doré, M. Nolta, C. Bennett, J. Dunkley, G. Hinshaw, N. e. Jarosik, E. Komatsu, L. Page, *et al.*, Three-year wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (wmap) observations: implications for cosmology, *The astrophysical journal supplement series* **170**, 377 (2007).
- [19] V. Faraoni and V. Faraoni, *Scalar-Tensor Gravity* (Springer, 2004).
- [20] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Mach's principle and a relativistic theory of gravitation, *Physical review* **124**, 925 (1961).
- [21] R. H. Dicke, Mach's principle and invariance under transformation of units, *Physical review* **125**, 2163 (1962).
- [22] P. G. Bergmann, Comments on the scalar-tensor theory, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **1**, 25 (1968).
- [23] K. Nordtvedt Jr, Post-newtonian metric for a general class of scalar-tensor gravitational theories and observational consequences., *Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 161, p. 1059 **161**, 1059 (1970).
- [24] R. V. Wagoner, Scalar-tensor theory and gravitational waves, *Physical Review D* **1**, 3209 (1970).
- [25] J. D. Bekenstein, Relativistic gravitation theory for the modified newtonian dynamics paradigm, *Physical Review D* **70**, 083509 (2004).
- [26] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, and M. Porrati, 4d gravity on a brane in 5d minkowski space, *Physics Letters B* **485**, 208 (2000).
- [27] D. Glavan and C. Lin, Einstein-gauss-bonnet gravity in four-dimensional spacetime, *Physical review letters* **124**, 081301 (2020).
- [28] R. Maartens and K. Koyama, Brane-world gravity, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **13**, 1 (2010).

- [29] T. Jacobson and D. Mattingly, Gravity with a dynamical preferred frame, *Physical Review D* **64**, 024028 (2001).
- [30] M. Banados and P. G. Ferreira, Eddington's theory of gravity and its progeny, *Physical review letters* **105**, 011101 (2010).
- [31] J. B. Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, G. J. Olmo, and D. Rubiera-García, Born–infeld inspired modifications of gravity, *Physics Reports* **727**, 1 (2018).
- [32] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, $f(r)$ theories of gravity, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **82**, 451 (2010).
- [33] Y.-S. Song, W. Hu, and I. Sawicki, Large scale structure of $f(R)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **75**, 044004 (2007).
- [34] C. G. Böhm, T. Harko, and F. S. Lobo, Dark matter as a geometric effect in $f(R)$ gravity, *Astroparticle Physics* **29**, 386 (2008).
- [35] C. P. Berry and J. R. Gair, Linearized $f(R)$ gravity: gravitational radiation and solar system tests, *Physical Review D* **83**, 104022 (2011).
- [36] T. Chiba, T. L. Smith, and A. L. Erickcek, Solar System constraints to general $f(R)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **75**, 124014 (2007).
- [37] J.-Q. Guo, Solar system tests of $f(R)$ gravity, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **23**, 1450036 (2014).
- [38] T. Harko and F. S. Lobo, $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **70**, 373 (2010).
- [39] J. Wang and K. Liao, Energy conditions in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **29**, 215016 (2012).
- [40] L. V. Jaybhaye, R. Solanki, S. Mandal, and P. Sahoo, Cosmology in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *Physics Letters B* **831**, 137148 (2022).
- [41] L. V. Jaybhaye, S. Mandal, and P. Sahoo, Constraints on Energy Conditions in $f(R, L_m)$ Gravity, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* **19**, 2250050 (2022).
- [42] L. V. Jaybhaye, S. Bhattacharjee, and P. Sahoo, Baryogenesis in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **40**, 101223 (2023).
- [43] N. Kavya, V. Venkatesha, G. Mustafa, P. Sahoo, and S. D. Rashmi, Static traversable wormhole solutions in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *Chinese Journal of Physics* **84**, 1 (2023).
- [44] D. C. Maurya, Constrained Λ CDM dark energy models in higher derivative $f(R, L_m)$ -gravity theory, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **42**, 101373 (2023).
- [45] R. Solanki, Z. Hassan, and P. Sahoo, Wormhole solutions in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (2023).
- [46] J. Singh, R. Myrzakulov, H. Balhara, *et al.*, A constrained cosmological model in $f(R, L_m)$ gravity, *New Astronomy*, 102070 (2023).
- [47] T. Harko, F. S. Lobo, and O. Minazzoli, Extended $f(R, L_m)$ gravity with generalized scalar field and kinetic term dependences, *Physical Review D* **87**, 047501 (2013).
- [48] D. C. Maurya, Accelerating scenarios of massive universe in $f(R, L_m)$ -gravity, *New Astronomy* **100**, 101974 (2023).
- [49] T. Harko, F. S. Lobo, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, $f(R, T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **84**, 024020 (2011).
- [50] R. Myrzakulov, FRW cosmology in $f(R, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **72**, 2203 (2012).
- [51] F. G. Alvarenga, M. J. S. Houndjo, A. V. Monwanou, and J. B. C. Orou, Testing some $f(R, T)$ gravity models from energy conditions, arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.4678 (2012).
- [52] R. Zaregonbadi, M. Farhoudi, and N. Riazi, Dark matter from $f(R, T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **94**, 084052 (2016).
- [53] S. B. Fisher and E. D. Carlson, Reexamining $f(R, T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **100**, 064059 (2019).
- [54] H. Shabani and M. Farhoudi, Cosmological and solar system consequences of $f(R, T)$ gravity models, *Physical Review D* **90**, 044031 (2014).
- [55] F. Alvarenga, A. De La Cruz-Dombriz, M. Houndjo, M. Rodrigues, and D. Sáez-Gómez, Dynamics of scalar perturbations in $f(R, T)$ gravity, *Physical review D* **87**, 103526 (2013).
- [56] P. Moraes and P. Sahoo, Modeling wormholes in $f(R, T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **96**, 044038 (2017).
- [57] H. Shabani and A. H. Ziaie, Stability of the Einstein static universe in $f(R, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **77**, 1 (2017).
- [58] S. Bhattacharjee, J. Santos, P. Moraes, and P. Sahoo, Inflation in $f(R, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal Plus* **135**, 576 (2020).
- [59] P. Mahapatra and P. K. Das, Neutron Stars in modified $f(R, T)$ gravity framework with $\mathcal{O}(T, T^2)$ terms, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01321 (2024).
- [60] S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden, and M. S. Turner, Is cosmic speed-up due to new gravitational physics?, *Physical Review D* **70**, 043528 (2004).
- [61] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* **4**, 115 (2007).
- [62] F. S. Lobo, The dark side of gravity: Modified theories of gravity, arXiv preprint arXiv:0807.1640 (2008).
- [63] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, $f(R)$ theories, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **13**, 1 (2010).
- [64] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, Extended theories of gravity, *Physics Reports* **509**, 167 (2011).
- [65] G. J. Olmo, Palatini approach to modified gravity: $f(R)$ theories and beyond, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **20**, 413 (2011).
- [66] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Unified cosmic history in modified gravity: from $f(R)$ theory to Lorentz non-invariant models, *Physics Reports* **505**, 59 (2011).
- [67] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, Dark energy cosmology: the equivalent description via different theoretical models and cosmography tests, *Astrophysics and Space Science* **342**, 155 (2012).
- [68] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, Modified gravity and cosmology, *Physics reports* **513**, 1 (2012).
- [69] S. Nojiri, S. Odintsov, and V. Oikonomou, Modified gravity theories on a nutshell: Inflation, bounce and late-

- time evolution, *Physics Reports* **692**, 1 (2017).
- [70] T. Harko and F. S. Lobo, *Extensions of $f(R)$ Gravity: Curvature-Matter Couplings and Hybrid Metric-Palatini Theory*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [71] R. Weitzenböck, *Invariantentheorie* (Noordhoff, Groningen, 1923).
- [72] A. Einstein, Riemann-geometrie mit aufrechterhaltung des begriffes des fernparallelismus, preussische akademie der wissenschaften, phys.-math, Klasse, Sitzungsberichte **217** (1928).
- [73] C. Möller, Conservation laws and absolute parallelism in general relativity, *Nordita Publ.* **64**, 50 (1961).
- [74] C. Pellegrini and J. Plebanski, Tetrad fields and gravitational fields, *Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab, Mat. Fys. Skrifter* **2** (1963).
- [75] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, New general relativity, *Physical Review D* **19**, 3524 (1979).
- [76] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Teleparallel gravity: an introduction*, Vol. 173 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
- [77] B. Li, T. P. Sotiriou, and J. D. Barrow, Large-scale structure in $f(T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **83**, 104017 (2011).
- [78] R. Myrzakulov, Accelerating universe from $F(T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **71**, 1752 (2011).
- [79] Y.-F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, and E. N. Saridakis, $f(T)$ teleparallel gravity and cosmology, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **79**, 106901 (2016).
- [80] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, Modified teleparallel gravity: Inflation without an inflaton, *Physical Review D* **75**, 084031 (2007).
- [81] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, Born-infeld gravity in weitzenböck spacetime, *Physical Review D* **78**, 124019 (2008).
- [82] G. R. Bengochea and R. Ferraro, Dark torsion as the cosmic speed-up, *Physical Review D* **79**, 124019 (2009).
- [83] E. V. Linder, Einstein's other gravity and the acceleration of the universe, *Physical Review D* **81**, 127301 (2010).
- [84] C. G. Boehmer, T. Harko, and F. S. Lobo, Wormhole geometries in modified teleparallel gravity and the energy conditions, *Physical Review D* **85**, 044033 (2012).
- [85] T. Harko, F. S. Lobo, G. Otalora, and E. N. Saridakis, Nonminimal torsion-matter coupling extension of $f(T)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **89**, 124036 (2014).
- [86] T. Harko, F. S. Lobo, G. Otalora, and E. N. Saridakis, $f(T, \tau)$ gravity and cosmology, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2014** (12), 021.
- [87] S. Bahamonde, C. G. Böhrmer, and M. Krššák, New classes of modified teleparallel gravity models, *Physics Letters B* **775**, 37 (2017).
- [88] S. Capozziello, G. Lambiase, and E. Saridakis, Constraining $f(T)$ teleparallel gravity by big bang nucleosynthesis: $f(T)$ cosmology and BBN, *The European Physical Journal C* **77**, 1 (2017).
- [89] G. Farrugia, J. L. Said, V. Gakis, and E. N. Saridakis, Gravitational waves in modified teleparallel theories, *Physical Review D* **97**, 124064 (2018).
- [90] A. Awad, W. El Hanafy, G. Nashed, S. Odintsov, and V. Oikonomou, Constant-roll inflation in $f(T)$ teleparallel gravity, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018** (07), 026.
- [91] J. B. Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, and T. S. Koivisto, Teleparallel palatini theories, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018** (08), 039.
- [92] A. Golovnev and T. Koivisto, Cosmological perturbations in modified teleparallel gravity models, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2018** (11), 012.
- [93] R. D'Agostino and O. Luongo, Growth of matter perturbations in nonminimal teleparallel dark energy, *Physical Review D* **98**, 124013 (2018).
- [94] M. Fontanini, E. Huguet, and M. Le Delliou, Teleparallel gravity equivalent of general relativity as a gauge theory: Translation or cartan connection?, *Physical Review D* **99**, 064006 (2019).
- [95] T. Koivisto and G. Tsimperis, The spectrum of teleparallel gravity, *Universe* **5**, 80 (2019).
- [96] J. G. Pereira and Y. N. Obukhov, Gauge structure of teleparallel gravity, *Universe* **5**, 139 (2019).
- [97] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann, and C. Pfeifer, On the gauge fixing in the hamiltonian analysis of general teleparallel theories, *Universe* **5**, 143 (2019).
- [98] S. Arora, A. Bhat, and P. Sahoo, Squared torsion $f(t, T)$ gravity and its cosmological implications, *Fortschritte der Physik* **71**, 2200162 (2023).
- [99] J. M. Nester and H.-J. Yo, Symmetric teleparallel general relativity, arXiv preprint gr-qc/9809049 (1998).
- [100] L. Heisenberg, Review on $f(Q)$ gravity, *Physics Reports* **1066**, 1 (2024).
- [101] J. B. Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, and T. Koivisto, Coincident general relativity, *Physical Review D* **98**, 044048 (2018).
- [102] I. Soudi, G. Farrugia, J. L. Said, V. Gakis, and E. N. Saridakis, Polarization of gravitational waves in symmetric teleparallel theories of gravity and their modifications, *Physical Review D* **100**, 044008 (2019).
- [103] A. Conroy and T. Koivisto, The spectrum of symmetric teleparallel gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **78**, 1 (2018).
- [104] M. Hohmann, C. Pfeifer, U. Ualikhanova, and J. L. Said, Propagation of gravitational waves in symmetric teleparallel gravity theories, *Physical Review D* **99**, 024009 (2019).
- [105] K. F. Dialektopoulos, T. S. Koivisto, and S. Capozziello, Noether symmetries in symmetric teleparallel cosmology, *The European Physical Journal C* **79**, 1 (2019).
- [106] J. Lu, X. Zhao, and G. Chee, Cosmology in symmetric teleparallel gravity and its dynamical system, *The European Physical Journal C* **79**, 1 (2019).
- [107] R. Lazkoz, F. S. Lobo, M. Ortiz-Baños, and V. Salzano, Observational constraints of $f(Q)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **100**, 104027 (2019).
- [108] F. D'Ambrosio, S. D. Fell, L. Heisenberg, and S. Kuhn, Black holes in $f(Q)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **105**, 024042 (2022).

- [109] L. Atayde and N. Frusciante, Can $f(q)$ gravity challenge λ cdm?, *Physical Review D* **104**, 064052 (2021).
- [110] O. Sokoliuk, S. Arora, S. Praharaj, A. Baransky, and P. K. Sahoo, On the impact of $f(q)$ gravity on the large scale structure, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **522**, 252 (2023).
- [111] S. Arora and P. K. Sahoo, Crossing Phantom Divide in $f(Q)$ Gravity, *Annalen Phys.* **534**, 2200233 (2022).
- [112] J. B. Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, T. Koivisto, and S. Pekar, Cosmology in $f(Q)$ geometry, *Physical Review D* **101**, 103507 (2020).
- [113] Y. Xu, G. Li, T. Harko, and S.-D. Liang, $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **79**, 1 (2019).
- [114] Y. Xu, T. Harko, S. Shahidi, and S.-D. Liang, Weyl type $f(Q, T)$ gravity, and its cosmological implications, *The European Physical Journal C* **80**, 1 (2020).
- [115] S. Arora, S. Pacif, S. Bhattacharjee, and P. Sahoo, $f(Q, T)$ gravity models with observational constraints, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **30**, 100664 (2020).
- [116] S. Arora, J. Santos, and P. Sahoo, Constraining $f(Q, T)$ gravity from energy conditions, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **31**, 100790 (2021).
- [117] K. P. Das and U. Debnath, Spherically symmetric anisotropic charged neutron stars in $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **84**, 513 (2024).
- [118] A. Nájera and A. Fajardo, Cosmological perturbation theory in $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2022** (03), 020.
- [119] A. Nájera and A. Fajardo, Fitting $f(Q, T)$ gravity models with a Λ CDM limit using H (z) and Pantheon data, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **34**, 100889 (2021).
- [120] J.-Z. Yang, S. Shahidi, T. Harko, and S.-D. Liang, Geodesic deviation, Raychaudhuri equation, Newtonian limit, and tidal forces in Weyl-type $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **81**, 1 (2021).
- [121] S. Bhattacharjee and P. Sahoo, Baryogenesis in $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal C* **80**, 289 (2020).
- [122] G. Gadbail, S. Arora, and P. Sahoo, Power-law cosmology in Weyl-type $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *The European Physical Journal Plus* **136**, 1040 (2021).
- [123] S. Arora, A. Parida, and P. K. Sahoo, Constraining effective equation of state in $f(Q, T)$ gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 555 (2021).
- [124] G. N. Gadbail, S. Arora, and P. K. Sahoo, Reconstruction of $f(Q, T)$ Lagrangian for various cosmological scenario, *Phys. Lett. B* **838**, 137710 (2023).
- [125] M. Adak, M. Kalay, and Ö. Sert, Lagrange formulation of the symmetric teleparallel gravity, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **15**, 619 (2006).
- [126] M. Adak, The symmetric teleparallel gravity, *Turkish Journal of Physics* **30**, 379 (2006).
- [127] C. Pala and M. Adak, A novel approach to autoparallels for the theories of symmetric teleparallel gravity, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (IOP Publishing, 2022).
- [128] M. Adak, Ö. Sert, M. Kalay, and M. Sari, Symmetric teleparallel gravity: some exact solutions and spinor couplings, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **28**, 1350167 (2013).
- [129] J. B. Jiménez and T. S. Koivisto, Spacetimes with vector distortion: Inflation from generalised weyl geometry, *Physics Letters B* **756**, 400 (2016).
- [130] A. Golovnev, T. Koivisto, and M. Sandstad, On the covariance of teleparallel gravity theories, *Classical and quantum gravity* **34**, 145013 (2017).
- [131] I. Mol, The non-metricity formulation of general relativity, *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras* **27**, 2607 (2017).
- [132] M. Adak, Gauge approach to the symmetric teleparallel gravity, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* **15**, 1850198 (2018).
- [133] L. Järv, M. Rünkla, M. Saal, and O. Wilson, Nonmetricity formulation of general relativity and its scalar-tensor extension, *Physical Review D* **97**, 124025 (2018).
- [134] A. Delhom-Latorre, G. J. Olmo, and M. Ronco, Observable traces of non-metricity: new constraints on metric-affine gravity, *Physics Letters B* **780**, 294 (2018).
- [135] T. Harko, T. S. Koivisto, F. S. Lobo, G. J. Olmo, and D. Rubiera-Garcia, Coupling matter in modified q gravity, *Physical Review D* **98**, 084043 (2018).
- [136] F. S. Lobo, T. Harko, T. S. Koivisto, G. J. Olmo, and D. Rubiera-Garcia, Novel couplings between nonmetricity and matter, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00805* (2019).
- [137] J. Beltrán Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, and T. S. Koivisto, The geometrical trinity of gravity, *Universe* **5**, 173 (2019).
- [138] L. Heisenberg, A systematic approach to generalisations of general relativity and their cosmological implications, *Physics Reports* **796**, 1 (2019).
- [139] J. B. Jiménez, L. Heisenberg, and T. Koivisto, The coupling of matter and spacetime geometry, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **37**, 195013 (2020).
- [140] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, G. S. Anand, L. Breuval, *et al.*, A comprehensive measurement of the local value of the hubble constant with 1 km s⁻¹ mpc⁻¹ uncertainty from the hubble space telescope and the sh0es team, *The Astrophysical journal letters* **934**, L7 (2022).
- [141] Y. S. Murakami, A. G. Riess, B. E. Stahl, W. Kenworthy, D.-M. A. Pluck, A. Macoreta, D. Brout, D. O. Jones, D. M. Scolnic, and A. V. Filippenko, Leveraging SN Ia spectroscopic similarity to improve the measurement of H_0 , *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2023** (11), 046.
- [142] N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, *et al.*, Planck 2018 results-vi. cosmological parameters, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A6 (2020).
- [143] W. Wang, H. Chen, and T. Katsuragawa, Static and spherically symmetric solutions in $f(q)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **105**, 024060 (2022).
- [144] O. Bertolami and J. Páramos, Dark matter as a dynamic effect due to a non-minimal gravitational coupling with matter (i): Analytical results, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 222 (IOP Publishing, 2010) p. 012010.

- [145] J. Páramos and O. Bertolami, Dark matter as a dynamic effect due to a non-minimal gravitational coupling with matter (ii): Numerical results, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 222 (IOP Publishing, 2010) p. 012011.
- [146] O. Bertolami, P. Frazão, and J. Páramos, Mimicking dark matter in galaxy clusters through a nonminimal gravitational coupling with matter, *Physical Review D* **86**, 044034 (2012).
- [147] M. Perucho, Dissipative processes and their role in the evolution of radio galaxies, *Galaxies* **7**, 70 (2019).
- [148] R. Solanki, S. Pacif, A. Parida, and P. Sahoo, Cosmic acceleration with bulk viscosity in modified $f(R)$ gravity, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **32**, 100820 (2021).
- [149] S. Mandal, D. Wang, and P. Sahoo, Cosmography in $f(R)$ gravity, *Physical Review D* **102**, 124029 (2020).
- [150] H. Yu, B. Ratra, and F.-Y. Wang, Hubble Parameter and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurement Constraints on the Hubble Constant, the Deviation from the Spatially Flat Λ CDM Model, the Deceleration-Acceleration Transition Redshift, and Spatial Curvature, *The Astrophysical Journal* **856**, 3 (2018).
- [151] D. B. et al., The pantheon+ analysis: Cosmological constraints, *The Astrophysical Journal* **938**, 110 (2022).
- [152] Y. S. Murakami, A. G. Riess, B. E. Stahl, W. D. Kenworthy, D.-M. A. Pluck, A. Macoreta, D. Brout, D. O. Jones, D. M. Scolnic, and A. V. Filippenko, Leveraging sn ia spectroscopic similarity to improve the measurement of h_0 , *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2023** (11), 046.
- [153] D. J. Eisenstein, I. Zehavi, D. W. Hogg, R. Scoccimarro, M. R. Blanton, R. C. Nichol, R. Scranton, H.-J. Seo, M. Tegmark, Z. Zheng, *et al.*, Detection of the baryon acoustic peak in the large-scale correlation function of sdss luminous red galaxies, *The Astrophysical Journal* **633**, 560 (2005).
- [154] C. Blake, E. A. Kazin, F. Beutler, T. M. Davis, D. Parkinson, S. Brough, M. Colless, C. Contreras, W. Couch, S. Croom, *et al.*, The wigglez dark energy survey: mapping the distance–redshift relation with baryon acoustic oscillations, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **418**, 1707 (2011).
- [155] S. Capozziello, P. K. Dunsby, and O. Luongo, Model-independent reconstruction of cosmological accelerated–decelerated phase, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **509**, 5399 (2022).
- [156] H. Akaike, A new look at the statistical model identification, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19**, 716 (1974).
- [157] P. Mukherjee and N. Banerjee, Non-parametric reconstruction of the cosmological jerk parameter, *The European Physical Journal C* **81**, 36 (2021).
- [158] A. Al Mamon and K. Bamba, Observational constraints on the jerk parameter with the data of the hubble parameter, *The European Physical Journal C* **78**, 862 (2018).
- [159] D. Camarena and V. Marra, Local determination of the hubble constant and the deceleration parameter, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 013028 (2020).