

Testing dark energy after pre-recombination early dark energy

Hao Wang^{1,2*} and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2,3,4 †}

¹ *School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China*

² *School of Physics Sciences, University of Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

³ *International Center for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific, Beijing/Hangzhou, China and*

⁴ *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China*

Abstract

In the studies on pre-recombination early dark energy (EDE), the evolution of Universe after recombination is usually regarded as Λ CDM-like, which corresponds that the equation of state of dark energy responsible for current accelerated expansion is $w = -1$. However, in realistic models, w might be evolving. We consider the parametrizations of w with respect to the redshift z in Axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE models, respectively. We performed the Monte Carlo Markov chain analysis with recent cosmological data, and found that the bestfit $w(z)$ is compatible with $w_0 = -1, w_a = 0$ (the cosmological constant) and the evolution of w is only marginally favored, which so has little effect on lifting the bestfit value of H_0 .

PACS numbers:

* wanghao187@mailsucas.ac.cn

† yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, local measurements of Hubble constant H_0 have showed $H_0 \sim 73\text{km/s/Mpc}$ [1–5], which has $\gtrsim 4\sigma$ discrepancy to $H_0 \sim 67\text{km/s/Mpc}$ suggested from the fit of cosmic microwave background (CMB) data [6] based on the ΛCDM model, which is so-called Hubble tension [7, 8], see also the most recent [9]. Currently, it is difficult to explain this conflict by systematic errors.

It has been widely thought that the Hubble tension might be a hint of new physics beyond ΛCDM , e.g.[10–14]. In early dark energy (EDE) scenario [15], see also [16–31], since the scalar field energy has a non-negligible fraction before recombination, the sound horizon

$$r_s^* = \int_{z_*}^{\infty} \frac{c_s}{H(z)} dz \quad (1)$$

is suppressed, where z_* is the redshift at recombination, which naturally brings a higher H_0 (noting that CMB and BAO have fixed the angular scales

$$\theta_s^* = \frac{r_s^*}{D_A^*} \sim r_s^* H_0, \quad (2)$$

where D_A^* is the angular diameter to last scattering surface), without spoiling fit to CMB and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) data, see also [32–35] for combined Planck+SPT dataset and [36, 37] for Planck+ACT dataset. In particular, an Anti-de Sitter (AdS) phase around recombination can allow $H_0 \simeq 73\text{km/s/Mpc}$, so the corresponding AdS-EDE model [20, 21] can be 1σ consistent with local H_0 measurements. In Ref.[38], it has been found that the pre-recombination solutions of the Hubble tension implies a scale-invariant Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum of primordial scalar perturbation, i.e. $n_s = 1$ for $H_0 \sim 73\text{km/s/Mpc}$.

The beyond- ΛCDM modifications after recombination have also been proposed e.g.[39–50], see also [51, 52] for recent reviews. The current accelerated expansion of our Universe suggests the existence of dark energy at present, with the equation of state (EOS) $w = p/\rho \simeq -1$. In the studies on pre-recombination EDE, the evolution of Universe after recombination is usually regarded as ΛCDM -like, which corresponds to $w = -1$. However, in realistic models, w might be evolving, see e.g.[51] for a review, so having a consistency check for the ΛCDM model after recombination is significant.

In this paper, we will consider different parametrization of w in Axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE models, respectively, and perform the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis

with PlanckCMB, BAO, Pantheon and H_0 dataset. This paper is organised as follows. In sect-II, we outline the parametrizations of w of current dark energy. In sect-III, we perform the MCMC analysis and present our results. We conclude in sect-IV.

II. PARAMETRIZATIONS OF DARK ENERGY

In Λ CDM model, the dark energy activates as a cosmological constant with $w = -1$. However, in scalar field models of dark energy, e.g.[53–59], w may be evolving or oscillating. Here, it is convenient to work with the parametrizations of $w(z)$.

The simplest parametrization is $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z$, which is linear but diverge at high redshift, see also [61–63]. Thus the CPL parametrization [64, 65]

$$w(z) = w_0 + w_a \left(\frac{z}{1+z} \right), \quad (3)$$

and the oscillating parametrization $w(z) = w_0 + w_a \{1 - \cos [\ln(1+z)]\}$ [66], see also [67, 69], have been widely applied. Both are well behaved at high z . The parametrizations degrading into linear at low z also include logarithmic[70], etc [71–75], see also [76] for relevant comments.

III. MCMC RESULTS FOR EDE MODELS

In this section we will confront the Axion EDE and AdS-EDE models (with CPL and oscillating parametrizations, respectively) with recent cosmological data. We modified the Montepython-3.3 [77, 78] and CLASS [79, 80] codes to perform the MCMC analysis.

Here, we will set the SH0ES result [1] as the Gaussian prior. The datasets consist of Planck2018 high-l and low-l TTTEEE as well as Planck lensing likelihoods[81], the BOSS DR12 [82] with its full covariant matrix for BAO as well as the 6dFGS [83] and MGS of SDSS [84] for low- z BAO, the Pantheon data [85]. We consider chains to be converged when the Gelman-Rubin statistic[68] satisfies $R - 1 < 0.05$.

A. Axion-like EDE model ¹

In Axion-like EDE model [15], an oscillating axion field with the potential $V(\phi) \propto (1 - \cos[\phi/f])^n$, naturally arising in the string theory, is responsible for EDE. At the critical redshift, EDE starts to oscillate and dilutes away like a fluid with $w = (n - 1)/(n + 1)$. It is noted that $n = 3$ is better for a higher best-fit H_0 [15, 22].

We perform the MCMC analysis on the parameters set $\{\omega_b, \omega_{cdm}, H_0, \ln(10^{10} A_s), n_s, \tau_{reio}, \log_{10} a_c, f_{ede}, \phi_i, w_0, w_a\}$, where ϕ_i is the initial value of EDE field, a_c is when the field starts rolling and f_{ede} is the energy fraction of EDE at a_c . We also set $n = 3$ [15, 22]. In Table-I, we present the MCMC results for the CPL and oscillating parametrizations of $w(z)$, respectively. In Fig.1, we show the 1σ and 2σ marginalized posterior distributions of model parameters.

Parameters	Λ CDM	Axi+CPL	Axi+OSC
$100\omega_b$	$2.247(2.224)^{+0.015}_{-0.014}$	$2.247(2.289)^{+0.0188}_{-0.0280}$	$2.256(2.277)^{+0.0256}_{-0.0267}$
ω_{cdm}	$0.1182(0.1183)^{+0.0008}_{-0.0013}$	$0.1243(0.1305)^{+0.00239}_{-0.00520}$	$0.1261(0.1307)^{0.00327}_{-0.00480}$
H_0	$68.16(68.23)^{+0.56}_{-0.4}$	$70.06(72.05)^{+0.859}_{-1.346}$	$70.09(71.90)^{+1.182}_{-0.941}$
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	$3.049(3.054)^{+0.013}_{-0.016}$	$3.044(3.050)^{+0.0172}_{-0.0148}$	$3.044(3.031)^{+0.0154}_{-0.0153}$
n_s	$0.9688(0.9696)^{+0.0039}_{-0.0042}$	$0.9717(0.9853)^{+0.00069}_{-0.00104}$	$0.9749(0.9850)^{+0.00815}_{-0.01103}$
τ_{reio}	$0.0604(0.0636)^{+0.0066}_{-0.0075}$	$0.0525(0.0505)^{+0.00807}_{-0.00815}$	$0.0516(0.0448)^{+0.00721}_{-0.00706}$
f_{ede}	-	$0.045(0.052)^{+0.0713}_{-0.0370}$	$0.047(0.054)^{+0.0794}_{-0.0229}$
$\log_{10} a_c$	-	$-3.652(-3.839)^{+0.2439}_{-0.2057}$	$-3.664(-3.864)^{+0.2386}_{-0.2112}$
$100\theta_s$	$1.0422(1.0421)^{+0.0005}_{-0.0004}$	$1.0416(1.0415)^{+0.000342}_{-0.000327}$	$1.0415(1.0415)^{+0.000338}_{-0.000379}$
σ_8	$0.8078(0.81)^{+0.0054}_{-0.0066}$	$0.8472(0.8597)^{+0.0105}_{-0.0132}$	$0.8506(0.8538)^{+0.0115}_{-0.0119}$
w_0	-1	$-1.021(-0.970)^{+0.0755}_{-0.0883}$	$-1.008(-1.007)^{+0.0458}_{-0.0449}$
w_a	0	$-0.130(-0.293)^{+0.347}_{-0.280}$	$-0.469(-0.444)^{+0.567}_{-0.322}$

TABLE I: Mean values (best-fits) of parameters in Axion-like EDE model for CPL and oscillating parameterizations, respectively, fitted to Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon+ H_0 dataset.

In Fig.1, we see that the evolving w has little effect on H_0 and n_s , compared with the model with $w = -1$ in Ref.[15]. However, the EDE parameters are constrained more tightly

¹ We follow the name in Ref.[37].




FIG. 1: Marginalized 1σ and 2σ posterior distributions of $\{H_0, n_s, f_{ede}, w_0, w_a\}$ in Axion-like EDE model. The red lines are the results for the CPL parameterization and the blue ones are for the oscillating parameterization. The shadow regions of H_0 represent 1σ and 2σ values of local measurement [1]. The intersection point of dash lines in w_0 - w_a plot corresponds to the Λ CDM model, with the shadow region corresponding to the Quintessence dark energy in the whole history.

by the oscillating parametrization. The result on $w(z)$ is compatible with the cosmological constant ($w_0 = -1, w_a = 0$), and only marginally favors the evolution of w . Here and in AdS-EDE model (see Table-II), the amplitude σ_8 of matter density fluctuation at low redshift is larger than local measurements [86, 87], which, however, may be pulled lower by new physics beyond cold dark matter [88–90]².

We also follow the Ref.[18] and plot the difference $\Delta C_l = C_{l,model} - C_{l,ref}$ in units of the cosmic variance per multipole

$$\sigma_{CV} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2/(2l+1)} C_l^{TT}, & TT \\ \sqrt{1/(2l+1)} \sqrt{C_l^{TT} C_l^{EE} + (C_l^{TE})^2}, & TE \\ \sqrt{2/(2l+1)} C_l^{EE}, & EE \end{cases}$$

for both parametrizations in CMB TT, EE and TE spectrum in Fig.2, where $C_{l,ref}$ is that for the Λ CDM model. Compared with the results in Ref.[15], the residual oscillations caused by

² Here, we will not involve it.

EDE at small scales are slightly amplified under both the CPL and oscillating parametrizations. The residuals of TT, EE and TE spectrum are within the cosmological variance at observable scales ($l \lesssim 2000$).




FIG. 2: $\Delta C_l/\sigma_{CV}$ for both parametrizations in Axion-like EDE model fitted to Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon+ H_0 datasets. The reference model is the Λ CDM model. The left panel is that for the TT spectrum, the right one is for the EE and the bottom one is for the TE spectrum.

B. AdS-EDE model

In AdS-EDE model [20], we consider the potential as $V(\phi) = V_0(\frac{\phi}{M_p})^4 - V_{ads}$, which is glued to $V(\phi) = 0$ at $\phi = (\frac{V_{ads}}{V_0})^{1/4}M_p$ by interpolation, where V_{ads} is the depth of AdS well. The existence of AdS phase enables the density ρ_{ede} of field dilutes away faster, and so allows a larger EDE fraction but without spoiling fit to CMB and BAO data, which makes

AdS-EDE possible have a higher H_0 .

We perform the MCMC analysis on the parameters set $\{\omega_b, \omega_{cdm}, H_0, \ln(10^{10} A_s), n_s, \tau_{reio}, \ln(1 + z_c), f_{ede}, \alpha_{ads}, w_0, w_a\}$, where z_c is the redshift when the field starts rolling, f_{ede} is the energy fraction of EDE at z_c , and α_{ads} corresponds to V_{ads} by $V_{ads} = \alpha_{ads} (\rho_m(z_c) + \rho_r(z_c))$, which will be fixed to 3.79×10^{-4} , see [20]. In Table-II, we present the MCMC results of AdS-EDE model for the CPL and oscillating parameterizations of $w(z)$, respectively. In Fig.3, we show the 1σ and 2σ marginalized posterior distributions of model parameters.

Parameters	Λ CDM	AdS+CPL	AdS+OSC
$100\omega_b$	$2.247(2.224)_{-0.014}^{+0.015}$	$2.327(2.320)_{-0.0179}^{+0.0197}$	$2.326(2.324)_{-0.0192}^{+0.0184}$
ω_{cdm}	$0.1182(0.1183)_{-0.0013}^{+0.0008}$	$0.1353(0.1338)_{-0.00210}^{+0.00184}$	$0.1354(0.1354)_{-0.00203}^{+0.00185}$
H_0	$68.16(68.23)_{-0.4}^{+0.56}$	$72.77(72.30)_{-0.805}^{+0.695}$	$72.73(72.51)_{-0.774}^{+0.778}$
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	$3.049(3.054)_{-0.016}^{+0.013}$	$3.071(3.067)_{-0.0151}^{+0.0158}$	$3.069(3.068)_{-0.0144}^{+0.0152}$
n_s	$0.9688(0.9696)_{-0.0042}^{+0.0039}$	$0.9938(0.9951)_{-0.00468}^{+0.00488}$	$0.9934(0.9898)_{-0.00489}^{+0.00431}$
τ_{reio}	$0.0604(0.0636)_{-0.0075}^{+0.0066}$	$0.0530(0.0537)_{-0.00815}^{+0.00807}$	$0.0521(0.0523)_{-0.00753}^{+0.00772}$
f_{ede}	-	$0.1137(0.1081)_{-0.00883}^{+0.00415}$	$0.1135(0.1094)_{-0.00753}^{+0.00772}$
$\ln(1 + z_c)$	-	$8.168(8.169)_{-0.0848}^{+0.0647}$	$8.177(8.087)_{-0.0821}^{+0.0759}$
$100\theta_s$	$1.0422(1.0421)_{-0.0004}^{+0.0005}$	$1.0410(1.0410)_{-0.000308}^{+0.000304}$	$1.0410(1.0411)_{-0.000308}^{+0.000302}$
σ_8	$0.8078(0.81)_{-0.0066}^{+0.0054}$	$0.8633(0.8636)_{-0.0106}^{+0.0112}$	$0.8651(0.8577)_{-0.0118}^{+0.0112}$
w_0	-1	$-0.987(-0.989)_{-0.0753}^{+0.0734}$	$-0.983(-0.960)_{-0.0477}^{+0.0463}$
w_a	0	$-0.122(-0.154)_{-0.248}^{+0.299}$	$-0.427(-0.562)_{-0.344}^{+0.567}$

TABLE II: Mean values (best-fits) of parameters in AdS-EDE model for CPL and oscillating parameterizations, respectively, fitted to Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon+ H_0 dataset. Actually, we can have the bestfit $H_0 \gtrsim 72\text{km/s/Mpc}$ for AdS-EDE model without H_0 prior, see Appendix for the MCMC results based on Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon dataset.

In Table-II and Fig.3, we see again that the evolving w has little effect on H_0 and n_s , compared with AdS-EDE model with $w = -1$ in Ref.[20]. It is also clear that the parameterizations of dark energy hardly affect the EDE parameters. The result on $w(z)$ is still compatible with the cosmological constant ($w_0 = -1, w_a = 0$), and only marginally favors the evolution of w . The difference $\Delta C_l/\sigma_{CV}$ is plotted in Fig.4. Compared with the

results in Ref.[20], the parameterizations of dark energy not only maintain the character of oscillating in both TT and EE spectrum, but also strengthen the going-upwards of amplitude with l in TT spectrum and the bump at $l \sim 200$ in EE spectrum. The residuals of the TT spectrum are within the cosmological variance for large scales ($l \lesssim 1500$) and become comparable to the σ_{CV} as l grows. However, the residuals of the EE and TE spectrum are larger than the σ_{CV} in the $l \gtrsim 1300$ multipoles for CPL and $l \gtrsim 850$ for oscillating one, which may be detected.




FIG. 3: Marginalized 1σ and 2σ posterior distributions of $\{H_0, n_s, f_{ede}, w_0, w_a\}$ in AdS-EDE model. The red lines are the results for the CPL parameterization and the blue ones are for the oscillating parameterization. The shadow regions are the same as in Fig.2.

C. Discussion

We present the $H_0-r_s^*$ contours for the CPL and oscillating parameterizations, respectively, with colored scatters as w_0 in Fig.5. We see that w_0 at 1σ contour is closed to -1, which is consistent with the cosmological constant. As expected, we have $H_0 \simeq 73$ and $w_0 \simeq -1$ for AdS-EDE model.

We list the χ^2 of all datasets for different models in Table-III, respectively. We find that all best-fit models are improved over the best-fit Λ CDM model by $\Delta\chi^2 \sim -20$. We




FIG. 4: $\Delta C_l/\sigma_{CV}$ for both parametrizations in AdS-EDE model fitted to Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon+ H_0 datasets. The reference model is the Λ CDM model. The left panel is that for the TT spectrum, the right one is for the EE and the bottom one is for the TE spectrum.

see that both parameterizations reduce the χ^2 of Axion EDE model markedly, but slightly reduce that of the AdS-EDE model. This suggests that with the evolving w of current dark energy, Axion model seems to be favored over the AdS model. However, here since the AdS parameter α_{ads} (relevant with the depth of AdS well) is fixed as 3.79×10^{-4} , releasing α_{ads} might give better fit for the AdS-EDE model. It is also noted that although the χ^2_{CMB} in Axion EDE model is reduced, its fit to BAO dataset is worsened seriously.

To test whether the smoothing effect of lensing to the CMB power spectrum is consistent with that measured by the lensing reconstruction, the lensing potential is often scaled by a consistency parameter A_L , theoretically $A_L = 1$ [91]. It has been pointed out that Planck data seems favor a closed universe [92], while flat universe suggests $A_L = 1.180 \pm 0.065$




FIG. 5: $H_0 - r_s^*$ contours for the CPL and oscillating parametrizations with colored scatters by w_0 . The red contour is that for Axion EDE model and the blue one is for AdS-EDE model. The shadow region corresponds to 1σ value of local H_0 measurement.

Dataset	Λ CDM	AdS+CPL	AdS+OSC	Axi+CPL	Axi+OSC
Planck high-l TT,TE,EE	2347.5	2346.52	2344.81	2338.89	2336.30
Planck low-l EE	398.2	396.04	395.77	395.73	396.29
Planck low-l TT	23.9	20.63	20.81	20.94	20.78
Planck lensing	9.1	10.07	10.81	10.33	9.36
BAO BOSS DR12	1.8	3.51	3.51	4.61	5.08
BAO smallz 2014	2.2	1.61	2.00	2.88	3.38
Pantheon	1026.9	1028.24	1027.49	1027.12	1027.52
HST	15.4	0.21	0.29	0.89	0.95
Total	3825	3806.83	3805.50	3803.40	3799.67

TABLE III: χ^2 of all datasets for different models.

(Planck TT,TE,EE+lowE) [6], which is called the lensing anomaly. The oscillating parametrization of dark energy might help to explain this problem.

We set A_L as a MCMC parameter, and show the posterior distribution of parameters set $\{H_0, n_s, w_0, w_a, A_L\}$ in Axion-like EDE model with the oscillating parametrization in Fig.6. We see that the bestfit of H_0 is consistent with that in sect-III.A, and $A_L = 1.0421^{+0.036}_{-0.050}$,

but with a slightly smaller Ω_m , see Fig.7. Thus it is possible to seek for certain oscillating parametrizations to alleviate the lensing anomaly.




FIG. 6: Marginalized 1σ and 2σ posterior distributions of $\{H_0, n_s, w_0, w_a, A_L\}$ in Axion-like EDE model with the oscillating parametrization. It is obvious that A_L is very closed to 1, which alleviates the lensing anomaly.




FIG. 7: A_L - Ω_m contour in Axion-like EDE model with the oscillating parametrization. The dash line corresponds to $A_L=1$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the studies on pre-recombination EDE, the evolution of Universe after recombination is usually regarded as Λ CDM-like, which corresponds to $w = -1$. However, in realistic models, w might be evolving or oscillating. Here, we investigate the effects of different parametrization of w in Axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE models, respectively.

We performed the MCMC analysis with recent cosmological data, and found that bestfit $w(z)$ is compatible with $w_0 = -1, w_a = 0$ (the cosmological constant), and the evolution of w is only marginally favored. Particularly, our study confirmed again that AdS-EDE model (here the bestfit $H_0 \simeq 72.7\text{km/s/Mpc}$) is more efficient in solving the Hubble tension. The parametrizations of w i.e.the evolution of current dark energy, in EDE models has little effect on the bestfit values of H_0 and n_s , thus the shift of primordial scalar spectral index scales still as $\delta n_s \simeq 0.4 \frac{\delta H_0}{H_0}$ [38], which suggests a scale-invariant Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum ($n_s = 1$) for $H_0 \sim 73\text{km/s/Mpc}$, see also Table-I,II.

We also show $\Delta C_l/\sigma_{CV}$ for both parametrizations in CMB TT, EE and TE spectrum, and found that compared with the results in Refs.[15, 20], the parameterization of $w(z)$ basically maintains the shape of spectrum, but slightly amplifies the residual oscillations caused by EDE at small scale, which might be detectable. In addition, we also found that the oscillating parametrization could alleviate the lensing anomaly. Thus it is interesting to test other parametrizations of current dark energy in EDE cosmologies.

Acknowledgments

We thank Gen Ye, Jun-Qian Jiang for helpful discussions. This work is supported by the NSFC, Nos.12075246, 11690021, the KRPCAS, No.XDPB15, and also UCAS Undergraduate Innovative Practice Project. We acknowledge the use of publicly available codes AxiCLASS (<https://github.com/PoulinV/AxiCLASS>) and classmultiscf (https://github.com/genye00/class_multiscf.git).

Appendix A: MCMC results in AdS-EDE model without H_0 prior

We show the MCMC results of AdS-EDE model for the CPL parametrization, based on Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon dataset without H_0 prior.

Parameters	AdS+CPL
$100\omega_b$	$2.331(2.328)^{+0.0194}_{-0.0210}$
ω_{cdm}	$0.1345(0.1340)^{+0.00186}_{-0.00227}$
H_0	$72.44(72.36)^{+0.704}_{-0.925}$
$\ln(10^{10}A_s)$	$3.070(3.075)^{+0.0156}_{-0.0167}$
n_s	$0.9955(0.9935)^{+0.00462}_{-0.00488}$
τ_{reio}	$0.0537(0.0553)^{+0.00838}_{-0.00876}$
f_{ede}	$0.1122(0.1059)^{+0.00446}_{-0.00909}$
$\ln(1 + z_c)$	$8.1943(8.2317)^{+0.0844}_{-0.0943}$
$100\theta_s$	$1.0411(1.0410)^{+0.000328}_{-0.000349}$
σ_8	$0.8584(0.8649)^{+0.0119}_{-0.0123}$
w_0	$-0.969(-0.979)^{+0.056}_{-0.040}$
w_a	$-0.173(-0.146)^{+0.108}_{-0.174}$

TABLE IV: Mean values (best-fits) of parameters in AdS-EDE model for the CPL parameterizations, fitted to Planck2018+BAO+Pantheon dataset.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri and D. Scolnic, *Astrophys. J.* **876**, no.1, 85 (2019) doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422 [arXiv:1903.07603 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [2] G. C. F. Chen, C. D. Fassnacht, S. H. Suyu, C. E. Rusu, J. H. H. Chan, K. C. Wong, M. W. Auger, S. Hilbert, V. Bonvin and S. Birrer, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **490**, no.2, 1743-1773 (2019) doi:10.1093/mnras/stz2547 [arXiv:1907.02533 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [3] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger and M. W. Auger, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **498**, no.1, 1420-1439 (2020) doi:10.1093/mnras/stz3094 [arXiv:1907.04869 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [4] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, D. Hatt, T. J. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. L. Beaton, C. R. Burns, M. G. Lee, A. J. Monson and J. R. Neeley, *et al.* doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab2f73 [arXiv:1907.05922 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [5] C. D. Huang, A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, N. L. Zakamska, S. Casertano, P. A. Whitelock, S. L. Hoffmann, A. V. Filippenko and D. Scolnic, doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab5dbd [arXiv:1908.10883 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [6] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020) [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652**, C4 (2021)] doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] A. G. Riess, *Nature Rev. Phys.* **2** (2019) no.1, 10-12 doi:10.1038/s42254-019-0137-0 [arXiv:2001.03624 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [8] L. Verde, T. Treu and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astron.* **3**, 891 doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0902-0 [arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [9] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, L. Breuval and T. G. Brink, *et al.* [arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [10] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.4, 043533 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.043533 [arXiv:1908.03663 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [11] R. G. Cai, Z. K. Guo, S. J. Wang, W. W. Yu and Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.2, L021301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.L021301 [arXiv:2107.13286 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [12] M. Z. Lyu, B. S. Haridasu, M. Viel and J. Q. Xia, *Astrophys. J.* **900** (2020) no.2, 160 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aba756 [arXiv:2001.08713 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] B. S. Haridasu, M. Viel and N. Vittorio, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.6, 063539 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.063539 [arXiv:2012.10324 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.6, 063524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063524 [arXiv:2105.10425 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, no.22, 221301 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301 [arXiv:1811.04083 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] P. Agrawal, F. Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner and L. Randall, [arXiv:1904.01016 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] S. Alexander and E. McDonough, *Phys. Lett. B* **797**, 134830 (2019) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.134830 [arXiv:1904.08912 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] M. X. Lin, G. Benevento, W. Hu and M. Raveri, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.6, 063542 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.063542 [arXiv:1905.12618 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [19] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, Phys. Rev. D **103**, no.4, L041303 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.L041303 [arXiv:1910.10739 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.8, 083507 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083507 [arXiv:2001.02451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [21] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.8, 083523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.083523 [arXiv:2008.10832 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [22] T. L. Smith, V. Poulin and M. A. Amin, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.6, 063523 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063523 [arXiv:1908.06995 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] J. Sakstein and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, no.16, 161301 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.161301 [arXiv:1911.11760 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [24] T. Karwal, M. Raveri, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden, [arXiv:2106.13290 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] M. Braglia, W. T. Emond, F. Finelli, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu and K. Koyama, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.8, 083513 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.083513 [arXiv:2005.14053 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] M. X. Lin, W. Hu and M. Raveri, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020), 123523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.123523 [arXiv:2009.08974 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, D. Saez-Chillon Gomez and G. S. Sharov, Phys. Dark Univ. **32** (2021), 100837 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2021.100837 [arXiv:2103.05304 [gr-qc]].
- [28] V. I. Sabla and R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.10, 103506 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.103506 [arXiv:2103.04999 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [29] A. Moss, E. Copeland, S. Bamford and T. Clarke, [arXiv:2109.14848 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [30] E. McDonough, M. X. Lin, J. C. Hill, W. Hu and S. Zhou, [arXiv:2112.09128 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] A. Gómez-Valent, Z. Zheng, L. Amendola, V. Pettorino and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.8, 083536 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.083536 [arXiv:2107.11065 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [32] A. La Posta, T. Louis, X. Garrido and J. C. Hill, [arXiv:2112.10754 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [33] A. Chudaykin, D. Gorbunov and N. Nedelko, JCAP **08** (2020), 013 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/08/013 [arXiv:2004.13046 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [34] A. Chudaykin, D. Gorbunov and N. Nedelko, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.4, 043529 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.043529 [arXiv:2011.04682 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [35] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.10, 103524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.103524 [arXiv:2107.07128 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [36] J. C. Hill, E. Calabrese, S. Aiola, N. Battaglia, B. Bolliet, S. K. Choi, M. J. Devlin, A. J. Duiv-

- envoorden, J. Dunkley and S. Ferraro, *et al.* [arXiv:2109.04451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [37] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith and A. Bartlett, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123550 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123550 [arXiv:2109.06229 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [38] G. Ye, B. Hu and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.6, 063510 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063510 [arXiv:2103.09729 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, E. V. Linder and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.2, 023523 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.023523 [arXiv:1704.00762 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.2, 023518 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023518 [arXiv:1907.07569 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi and U. Danielsson, *Symmetry* **11**, no.8, 1035 (2019) doi:10.3390/sym11081035 [arXiv:1907.07953 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100666 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.dark.2020.100666 [arXiv:1908.04281 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] Ö. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, L. A. Escamilla and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.6, 063528 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063528 [arXiv:1912.08751 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [44] Ö. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özülker and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123512 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123512 [arXiv:2108.09239 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [45] W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan, Y. Wu and J. Lu, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **501** (2021) no.4, 5845-5858 doi:10.1093/mnras/staa3914 [arXiv:2101.02168 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan and O. Mena, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **31** (2021), 100762 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2020.100762 [arXiv:2007.02927 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [47] W. Liu, L. A. Anchordoqui, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan, Y. Wu and W. Yang, [arXiv:2108.04188 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [48] G. Alestas, D. Camarena, E. Di Valentino, L. Kazantzidis, V. Marra, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, [arXiv:2110.04336 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [49] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123511 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123511 [arXiv:2109.04406 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [50] S. Bag, V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and Y. Shtanov, *Astrophys. J.* **923** (2021) no.2, 212 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac307e [arXiv:2107.03271 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.15, 153001 doi:10.1088/1361-6382/ac086d

- [arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [52] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, [arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [53] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37** (1988), 3406 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.37.3406
- [54] I. Zlatev, L. M. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999), 896-899
- [55] R. R. Caldwell, *Phys. Lett. B* **545** (2002), 23-29 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)02589-3 [arXiv:astro-ph/9908168 [astro-ph]].
- [56] B. Feng, X. L. Wang and X. M. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **607** (2005), 35-41 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2004.12.071 [arXiv:astro-ph/0404224 [astro-ph]].
- [57] Z. K. Guo, Y. S. Piao, X. M. Zhang and Y. Z. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **608** (2005), 177-182 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.01.017 [arXiv:astro-ph/0410654 [astro-ph]].
- [58] H. Wei, R. G. Cai and D. F. Zeng, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005), 3189-3202 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/22/16/005 [arXiv:hep-th/0501160 [hep-th]].
- [59] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005), 123507 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.72.123507 [arXiv:astro-ph/0509328 [astro-ph]]. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.896 [arXiv:astro-ph/9807002 [astro-ph]].
- [60] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493**, no.3, 3255-3263 (2020) doi:10.1093/mnras/staa412 [arXiv:1912.03986 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [61] A. R. Cooray and D. Huterer, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **513**, L95-L98 (1999) doi:10.1086/311927 [arXiv:astro-ph/9901097 [astro-ph]].
- [62] P. Astier, *Phys. Lett. B* **500**, 8-15 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)00072-7 [arXiv:astro-ph/0008306 [astro-ph]].
- [63] J. Weller and A. Albrecht, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 103512 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.103512 [arXiv:astro-ph/0106079 [astro-ph]].
- [64] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213-224 (2001) doi:10.1142/S0218271801000822 [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008 [gr-qc]].
- [65] E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.091301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512 [astro-ph]].
- [66] B. Feng, M. Li, Y. S. Piao and X. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **634**, 101-105 (2006) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2006.01.066 [arXiv:astro-ph/0407432 [astro-ph]].
- [67] R. Lazkoz, V. Salzano and I. Sendra, *Phys. Lett. B* **694**, 198-208 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.10.002 [arXiv:1003.6084 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [68] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin, *Statist. Sci.* **7**, 457-472 (1992) doi:10.1214/ss/1177011136
- [69] S. Pan, E. N. Saridakis and W. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.6, 063510 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.063510 [arXiv:1712.05746 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [70] G. Efstathiou, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **310**, 842-850 (1999) doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02997.x [arXiv:astro-ph/9904356 [astro-ph]].
- [71] E. M. Barboza, Jr. and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys. Lett. B* **666**, 415-419 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.08.012 [arXiv:0805.1713 [astro-ph]].
- [72] J. Z. Ma and X. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **699**, 233-238 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.04.013 [arXiv:1102.2671 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [73] C. J. Feng, X. Y. Shen, P. Li and X. Z. Li, *JCAP* **09**, 023 (2012) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2012/09/023 [arXiv:1206.0063 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [74] G. Pantazis, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no.10, 103503 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.103503 [arXiv:1603.02164 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [75] W. Yang, S. Pan and A. Paliathanasis, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **475**, no.2, 2605-2613 (2018) doi:10.1093/mnras/sty019 [arXiv:1708.01717 [gr-qc]].
- [76] E. Ó. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and L. Yin, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.2, 023510 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.023510 [arXiv:2104.01930 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [77] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed and S. Prunet, *JCAP* **02**, 001 (2013) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/02/001 [arXiv:1210.7183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [78] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **24**, 100260 (2019) doi:10.1016/j.dark.2018.100260 [arXiv:1804.07261 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [79] J. Lesgourgues, [arXiv:1104.2932 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [80] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues and T. Tram, *JCAP* **07**, 034 (2011) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2011/07/034 [arXiv:1104.2933 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936386 [arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [82] S. Alam *et al.* [BOSS], *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470** (2017) no.3, 2617-2652 doi:10.1093/mnras/stx721 [arXiv:1607.03155 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [83] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders and F. Watson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416**, 3017-3032 (2011) doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x [arXiv:1106.3366 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [84] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden and M. Manera, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449**, no.1, 835-847 (2015) doi:10.1093/mnras/stv154 [arXiv:1409.3242 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [85] D. M. Scolnic *et al.* [Pan-STARRS1], *Astrophys. J.* **859**, no.2, 101 (2018) doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aab9bb [arXiv:1710.00845 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [86] H. Hildebrandt, F. Köhlinger, J. L. van den Busch, B. Joachimi, C. Heymans, A. Kannawadi, A. H. Wright, M. Asgari, C. Blake and H. Hoekstra, *et al.* *Astron. Astrophys.* **633** (2020), A69 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201834878 [arXiv:1812.06076 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [87] C. Heymans, T. Tröster, M. Asgari, C. Blake, H. Hildebrandt, B. Joachimi, K. Kuijken, C. A. Lin, A. G. Sánchez and J. L. van den Busch, *et al.* *Astron. Astrophys.* **646** (2021), A140 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/202039063 [arXiv:2007.15632 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [88] I. J. Allali, M. P. Hertzberg and F. Rompineve, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.8, L081303 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.L081303 [arXiv:2104.12798 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [89] G. Ye, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2107.13391 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [90] S. J. Clark, K. Vattis, J. Fan and S. M. Koushiappas, [arXiv:2110.09562 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [91] E. Calabrese, A. Slosar, A. Melchiorri, G. F. Smoot and O. Zahn, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 123531 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.123531 [arXiv:0803.2309 [astro-ph]].
- [92] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri and J. Silk, *Nature Astron.* **4**, no.2, 196-203 (2019) doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0906-9 [arXiv:1911.02087 [astro-ph.CO]].