

Improved Planck constraints on axion-like early dark energy as a resolution of the Hubble tension

George Efstathiou,^{1,*} Erik Rosenberg,^{2,1,†} and Vivian Poulin^{3,‡}

¹*Kavli Institute for Cosmology & Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB2 0HA, UK.*

²*Jodrell Bank Centre for Astrophysics, School of Physics & Astronomy,
University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK.*

³*Laboratoire Univers & Particules de Montpellier,
CNRS & Université de Montpellier (UMR-5299), 34095 Montpellier, France.*

(Dated: November 2, 2023)

Axion-like early dark energy (EDE) as an extension to Λ CDM has been proposed as a possible solution to the ‘Hubble tension’. We revisit this model using a new cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature and polarization likelihood constructed from the *Planck* NPIPE^a data release. In a Bayesian analysis, we find that the maximum fractional contribution of EDE to the total energy density is $f_{\text{EDE}} < 0.061$ (without SH0ES) over the redshift range $z \in [10^3, 10^4]$ and that the Hubble constant is constrained to lie within the range $66.9 < H_0 < 69.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ (both at 95 % C.L.). The data therefore favour a model close to Λ CDM, leaving a residual tension of 3.7σ with the SH0ES Cepheid-based measurement of H_0 . A comparison with the likelihood profile shows that our conclusions are robust to prior-volume effects. Our new CMB likelihood provides no evidence in favour of a significant EDE component.

Recent improvements in the determination of the Hubble constant H_0 have led to a potential crisis in cosmology. Assuming the standard six-parameter Λ CDM model, CMB data from *Planck* predicts¹ $H_0 = 67.5 \pm 0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ [2]. However, direct measurement of H_0 via Cepheid-calibrated Type Ia supernovae (SN1a) by the SH0ES collaboration yields $H_0 = 73 \pm 1 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, in apparent 5σ tension with the Λ CDM prediction [3]. Although not all measurements of the Hubble constant are in strong tension with the *Planck* Λ CDM prediction [4, 5], increasingly stringent tests of the Cepheid-based distance scale have failed to reveal evidence of systematics in the SH0ES data [3, 6–8]. It is therefore important to carefully consider the possibility that the ‘Hubble tension’ is caused by physics beyond Λ CDM.

Among many models proposed to resolve the Hubble tension [5, 9, 10], Early Dark Energy (EDE) has emerged as one of the most plausible [11–14], since it is able to reduce the Hubble tension to about the 2σ level while maintaining a good fit to 2018 *Planck* CMB power spectra, Baryonic Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and SN1a data. An EDE solution to the Hubble tension would also have important implications for our understanding of inflationary cosmology, since acceptable fits to the CMB power spectra require a nearly scale-invariant spectrum of curvature perturbations. Thus EDE affects the interpretation of the dynamics of inflation and of gravitational

wave upper limits from observations of CMB polarization on large angular scales [15, 16].

A consensus on the observational constraints on EDE has yet to emerge. Bayesian analyses of the *Planck* data tend to disfavor EDE when the SH0ES measurements are excluded [17]. Nevertheless, it has been argued that these Bayesian analyses are affected by prior volume effects [18, 19]. Profile likelihood analyses based on the *Planck* *Plik* temperature-polarization likelihood [20] lead to weaker constraints and may even favor a non-zero EDE component with a larger H_0 at about 2σ , mainly driven by the polarization spectra [21, 22]. The recent ACT DR4 data have hinted at a 3σ preference for EDE over Λ CDM [23–25], though this result is not supported by the recent 2018 SPT3G data [26] or by *Planck* temperature measurements.

Since the 2018 *Planck* likelihood release [20], it has become possible to construct more powerful CMB likelihoods by using more sky area at high frequencies [27, 28]. In addition, the recent NPIPE maps [1] incorporate a number of improvements in the processing of time ordered data, leading to a significant reduction in the small scale noise compared to previous *Planck* data releases. In this *letter*, we use an updated *Planck* likelihood based on the work of Ref. [28] to investigate the viability of EDE as a solution to the Hubble tension and to assess the potential hints for EDE reported in some earlier analyses of *Planck* and ACT DR4 data.

We analyze the popular axion-like EDE model, specified by the modified axion potential [11, 29, 30]

$$V(\theta) = m^2 f^2 [1 - \cos(\theta)]^3, \quad (1)$$

where m represents the axion mass, f the axion decay constant, and $\theta \equiv \phi/f$ is a re-normalized field variable defined such that $-\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi$. This potential provides a EDE model with flexible phenomenology, and can be em-

* gpe@ast.cam.ac.uk

† erik.rosenberg@manchester.ac.uk

‡ vivian.poulin@umontpellier.fr

^a National Research Scientific Computing Center *pipeline*, described in [1] and available from the Planck Legacy Archive, <https://pla.esac.int>.

¹ Unless otherwise stated, in this paper two-sided constraints are quoted at 1σ , while one-sided constraints are quoted at 2σ .




FIG. 1. Residuals of the TT, TE and EE spectra relative to the best fit Λ CDM model to the NPIPE TTTEEE. Residuals for NPIPE spectra used in this *letter* are shown in the left hand panels. Residuals for the *Planck* spectra, as used in the baseline 2018 *Planck* TTTEEE likelihood, relative to the same cosmology are shown in the right hand panels. The lines show the residuals of the best fit EDE model, summarized in Table 1, fitted to NPIPE+SHOES (black) and *Planck*+SHOES (orange). Note that the EE spectrum at $\ell > 2000$ is not used in the NPIPE likelihood.

bedded in a string-theory framework [31, 32]. For other EDE parametrizations, we refer to Refs. [31, 33–61].

The 2018 *Planck* data release (hereafter PR3) used the *Planck* temperature-polarization power spectrum likelihood as the baseline for cosmological parameter analysis [2]. The *Planck* collaboration papers also reported results using an alternative likelihood, *CamSpec* (which was used as the baseline in the first *Planck* data release [62]). These two likelihoods are almost identical in temperature and differ primarily in polarization. As described in [2], they give very similar results for most cosmological models. Following PR3, Ref. [27] presented an extension of *CamSpec* which, via cleaning of the 143 and 217 GHz temperature maps using 545 GHz maps as a template of Galactic dust emission, allowed the use of 80% of sky. The *TE* and *EE* spectra used in *CamSpec* are cleaned from polarized dust emission using 353 GHz maps. Extensive tests of these cleaning procedures including tests as a function of frequency, detector combination and sky coverage are presented in Ref. [27].

Ref. [28] applied the *CamSpec* methodology to the 2020 *Planck* data release (PR4) NPIPE maps. The NPIPE maps are produced for each of two detector groupings, *A* and *B*, which are processed independently. The NPIPE

likelihood produced in Ref. [28] used only $A \times B$ cross spectra, but in this paper we include $A \times A$ and $B \times B$ cross spectra for different frequencies since we have found no evidence for correlated noise in these spectra. This leads to an improvement in the signal-to-noise of the coadded TT and EE spectra. The other aspects of the likelihood, frequencies, multipole ranges, foreground treatment in temperature, and calibration parameters are as described in Ref. [28] except for extending TE to $\ell = 2500$. The best-fit six parameter Λ CDM model determined from this likelihood is almost identical to the best-fit model presented in Ref. [28]. Residuals of the NPIPE coadded *TT*, *TE* and *EE* spectra² with respect to this best-fit model are plotted in Fig. 1. The residuals of the 2018 *Planck* spectra used in the publicly available *Planck* likelihood are plotted in the right hand panels of Fig. 1. As can be seen, the NPIPE spectra have substantially smaller residuals compared to *Planck*. Significantly (emphasised in Ref. [27]), as the statistical power

² The *TT* spectra are corrected for the best-fit foreground model. In *CamSpec* there are no foregrounds in the dust-corrected *TE* and *EE* spectra.




FIG. 2. Posterior distributions of H_0 and the EDE fraction $f_{\text{EDE}}(z_c)$ computed from analyses using the new NPIPE CMB likelihood compared to the 2018 *Planck* likelihood. We report results with and without the SH0ES M_b prior. All MCMC runs include *Planck* CMB lensing, BAO/ $f\sigma_8$ and Pantheon+ data as described in the text.

of the *Planck* temperature and polarization spectra have improved, they have all come into even closer agreement with the predictions of the base six parameter Λ CDM cosmology, with no evidence for any significant anomalies. As a consequence, we anticipate that the NPIPE *Planck* spectra are likely to disfavor EDE as a solution to the Hubble tension.

In addition to our new *Planck* likelihood, the baseline analysis in this paper includes the TT and EE likelihoods in the multipole range $2 \leq \ell < 30$ from *Planck* 2018 [20] together with the ‘conservative’ *Planck* lensing likelihood [63], measurements of the BAO and redshift space distortions from the CMASS and LOWZ galaxy samples of BOSS DR12 at $z = 0.38, 0.51, \text{ and } 0.61$ [64], BAO measurements from 6dFGS at $z = 0.106$ and SDSS DR7 at $z = 0.15$ [65, 66] and the Pantheon+ catalog of over 1600 SN1a which constrains the luminosity distance over the redshift range $0.01 < z < 2.3$ [67]. The SH0ES Cepheid calibration of the peak SN1a absolute magnitude is modelled as a Gaussian, $M_b = -19.253 \pm 0.027$ [3]. Consistency with SH0ES is assessed via the statistic [68]

$$Q_{\text{DMAP}} = \frac{\sqrt{\Delta\chi^2}}{\sqrt{\chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\text{with SH0ES}) - \chi_{\text{tot}}^2(\text{without SH0ES})}}, \quad (2)$$

where the two values of χ^2 are computed at the maximum a posteriori points with and without including the SH0ES

M_b prior³.

We run Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) using the Metropolis-Hasting algorithm implemented in MontePython-v3⁴ [69, 70] interfaced with a modified version of CLASS⁵ [71, 72]. We use large flat priors on H_0 , the baryon and cold dark matter energy density, ω_b and ω_{cdm} respectively, the amplitude and tilt of the scalar perturbations A_s and n_s respectively, and the reionization optical depth τ_{reio} . For the EDE sector, we follow the approach in Ref. [30] and vary the critical redshift $z_c \in [10^3, 10^4]$ after which the scalar-field starts rolling, the fractional contribution of EDE at that redshift $f_{\text{EDE}}(z_c) \in [0, 0.3]$ and the initial field value $\theta_i \in [0, \pi]$. We model free-streaming neutrinos as two massless and one massive neutrino with $m_\nu = 0.06$ eV. We use Halofit to estimate the non-linear matter clustering [73]. We consider chains to be converged using the conventional Gelman-Rubin criterion $|R - 1| \lesssim 0.05$ [74]. To analyze the chains and produce our figures we use the GetDist package [75], and we obtain the minimum χ^2 values using the simulated annealing method described in the appendix of Ref. [9]. In addition to MCMC, and to mitigate prior-volume effects that have been shown to affect posterior distributions [14, 21, 22], we present likelihood profiles of H_0 and f_{EDE} , that are obtained using a methodology which will be presented in a forthcoming paper [76].

Our main results are shown in Fig. 2 and reported in Table I. With the new NPIPE likelihood we find $f_{\text{EDE}}(z_c) < 0.061$, with $h < 0.696$ at 2σ (where h is the Hubble constant in units of $100\text{km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$). The addition of the SH0ES prior raises the contribution of EDE to the 10% level, with $h \simeq 0.712 \pm 0.008$, but this comes at the expense of a substantially worse fit to the NPIPE TT-TEEE likelihood ($\Delta\chi^2 = +6.3$) (see Table III). The solid black line in Fig. 1 shows the residuals of the best fit EDE model fitted to NPIPE and SH0ES. This fit gives a χ^2 of 4.4 for the SH0ES prior, and as a consequence of the poor fits to both the CMB and SH0ES data the Q_{DMAP} tension metric indicates a 3.7σ discrepancy between SH0ES and our baseline datasets (p -value of 0.000239). These results are significantly stronger than the $\sim 2.6\sigma$ tension⁶ estimated with the 2018 *Planck* likelihood (entries under the heading ‘*Planck*’ in Table III). The residuals with respect to the *Planck*+SH0ES solution are shown by the orange lines in Fig. 1. One can see that this solution is pulled by a small excess in power at $\ell \gtrsim 1300$ in the *Planck* TT and by an excess at $\ell \sim 800 - 1000$ in the *Planck* TE spectrum (see

³ Q_{DMAP} gives an indication of the inconsistency between the SH0ES prior and our baseline likelihoods in terms of an effective ‘number of σ ’. Alternatively, one can compute a p -value from $\Delta\chi^2$ assuming a χ^2 distribution with 1 degree of freedom.

⁴ https://github.com/brinckmann/montepython_public

⁵ https://lesgourg.github.io/class_public/class.html

⁶ The use of the updated Pantheon+ SN sample that raises Ω_m by $\sim 1\sigma$ and the tighter M_b determination by SH0ES increases the tension by $\sim 0.5\sigma$ compared to previous results [77].




FIG. 3. Likelihood profile of H_0 and f_{EDE} reconstructed from our analyses using the new NPIPE likelihood compared to the 2018 *Planck* likelihood. All runs include supplementary data as described in the text.

[25] for discussion). Neither of these features are strongly statistically significant and neither are seen in the higher signal-to-noise NPIPE spectra.

As reviewed in Ref. [14], in EDE models there has always been some residual tension between the CMB and the SH0ES distance scale. However, if EDE were the correct explanation of the Hubble tension, we would expect to see a pull towards EDE as we increase the signal-to-noise of the CMB spectra from *Planck* to NPIPE. In fact, it is evident from Fig. 1, that the NPIPE spectra move even closer to Λ CDM without a hint of EDE.

Our conclusions on EDE models are supported further by the profile likelihoods of f_{EDE} and H_0 shown in Fig. 3 and reported in Table. II. For *Planck*, the profile likelihood allows for significantly larger values of f_{EDE} and H_0 than the posterior distribution extracted from the MCMC analysis, with a $\sim 2\sigma$ level preference for non-zero f_{EDE} [21, 22]. The constraints derived from the NPIPE profile likelihood, although weaker than those determined from the posterior distribution, lead to the limits $f_{\text{EDE}} < 0.094$ and $H_0 < 70.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ at 2σ . This indicates that for NPIPE, the prior volume effects are minor and that there is no evidence for EDE from the CMB temperature and polarization spectra.

In conclusion, we have shown in this *letter* that a high signal-to-noise likelihood constructed from the *Planck* NPIPE maps precludes axion-like EDE from fully alleviating the Hubble tension, leaving a residual tension with the SH0ES distance scale of about 3.7σ . A comparison with the likelihood profile shows that our results are robust to prior-volume effects. Given the large parametric freedom of the axion-like model studied in this paper, it seems unlikely that the Hubble tension can be solved by invoking an alternative EDE model (see Ref. [14] for a review), though we regard this possibility as a subject for future work.

We note that Ref. [78] used low values of the spectral

index n_s inferred from observations of quasar Ly α absorption lines to exclude the EDE models allowed by the *Planck* likelihood. However, it is not clear whether the matter power spectrum inferred from Ly α data is compatible with *Planck* [79] unless one also invokes a running of the spectral index (which would weaken the constraints on EDE). Various authors have derived tight constraints on EDE models by including constraints on the shape of the matter power spectrum derived from galaxy surveys [e.g 17, 80, 81]. However, such constraints are sensitive to model assumptions and choices of priors [19, 21, 82]. The strong constraints on EDE reported in this paper are driven primarily by the linear CMB anisotropies and are therefore more robust than these analyses.

Our results exclude the $\sim 3\sigma$ preference for EDE reported by the ACT collaboration (with a preferred fraction $f_{\text{EDE}} \sim 15\%$). The ACT DR4 best fit solution leads to a CMB temperature spectrum that is strongly excluded by both *Planck* and NPIPE. In fact, we have checked that one would need to discard the NPIPE temperature spectrum at $\ell > 1000$ to allow an EDE fraction as large as that favored by ACT DR4. There is no good reason to ignore these data. We therefore conclude that the ACT DR4 result is caused either by a systematic error in the temperature data, or a statistical fluke (see also [26]).

The absence of hint for physics beyond Λ CDM in the CMB anisotropies seems to argue against modifications of pre-recombination physics as a solution of the Hubble tension. Furthermore, it is well known that late-time explanations are excluded by the combination of SN1a and *Planck* calibrated BAO measurements [see e.g. 83, for a recent discussion]. In the absence of evidence in favour of EDE, and if evidence for the Hubble tension persists as calibrations of the distance scale improve, new physics at both early- and late-times may be required to explain the discrepancy [84]. Evidently, a theoretical explanation of the Hubble tension remains elusive at the present time.

	NPIPE		<i>Plik</i>	
SH0ES prior?	no	yes	no	yes
h	0.6811(0.684) $^{+0.0047}_{-0.0082}$	0.7124(0.7167) \pm 0.0077	0.6842(0.6946) $^{+0.0052}_{-0.011}$	0.7186(0.7212) \pm 0.0078
$f_{\text{EDE}}(z_c)$	< 0.061(0.035)	0.107(0.121) \pm 0.023	< 0.083(0.064)	0.128(0.135) $^{+0.023}_{-0.021}$
$\log_{10}(z_c)$	3.53(3.85) $^{+0.27}_{-0.22}$	3.585(3.565) $^{+0.049}_{-0.15}$	3.57(3.56) $^{+0.25}_{-0.21}$	3.604(3.568) $^{+0.014}_{-0.075}$
θ_i	1.91(3.01) $^{+1.2}_{-0.62}$	2.53(2.82) $^{+0.46}_{+0.079}$	1.93(2.76) $^{+1.1}_{-0.72}$	2.73(2.76) $^{+0.11}_{-0.090}$
ω_{cdm}	0.1216(0.1226) $^{+0.0011}_{-0.0026}$	0.1300(0.1315) \pm 0.0029	0.1229(0.1262) $^{+0.0013}_{-0.0034}$	0.1329(0.134) \pm 0.0032
$10^2\omega_b$	2.226(2.233) \pm 0.016	2.258(2.242) \pm 0.020	2.253(2.253) $^{+0.017}_{-0.022}$	2.282(2.274) \pm 0.022
$10^9 A_s$	2.102(2.100) \pm 0.030	2.140(2.140) \pm 0.031	2.113(2.125) $^{+0.029}_{-0.032}$	2.152(2.155) \pm 0.031
n_s	0.9691(0.9736) $^{+0.0043}_{-0.0060}$	0.9868(0.9877) \pm 0.0059	0.9713(0.9769) $^{+0.0045}_{-0.0074}$	0.9902(0.9915) \pm 0.0059
τ_{reio}	0.0543(0.0534) \pm 0.0070	0.0561(0.0549) $^{+0.0068}_{-0.0076}$	0.0549(0.0546) \pm 0.0070	0.0561(0.0552) \pm 0.0073
S_8	0.830(0.831) \pm 0.011	0.838(0.839) \pm 0.012	0.835(0.841) \pm 0.011	0.847(0.85) \pm 0.012
Ω_m	0.3116(0.3111) \pm 0.0050	0.3019(0.3009) \pm 0.0050	0.3120(0.3096) \pm 0.0056	0.3029(0.3027) \pm 0.0049

TABLE I. Credible interval and best fit values (in parentheses) in the EDE model reconstructed from analyses of the new NPIPE likelihood compared to the 2018 *Plik* likelihood. We report results with and without the SH0ES prior on M_b . For parameters with two-sided constraints, we report the mean and 1σ errors. For parameters with one-sided constraints, we report the 2σ limits. All of the MCMC chains include supplementary data as described in the text.

	NPIPE		<i>Plik</i>	
	MCMC	Profile likelihood	MCMC	profile likelihood
h	0.6811 $^{+0.0047}_{-0.0082}$	0.6837 \pm 0.0075	0.6842 $^{+0.0052}_{-0.011}$	0.6944 \pm 0.0119
$f_{\text{EDE}}(z_c)$	< 0.061	0.035 \pm 0.025 (< 0.094)	< 0.083	0.064 \pm 0.036 (< 0.135)

TABLE II. (Bayesian) confidence intervals and (Frequentist) credible intervals extracted from the MCMC posterior distribution and the likelihood profile respectively. Two-sided intervals are provided at 1σ , while one-sided limits are provided at 2σ .

	NPIPE		<i>Plik</i>	
<i>Planck</i> high- ℓ TTTEEE	11237.4	11243.7	2343.3	2346.1
<i>Planck</i> low- ℓ TT	22.0	21.2	22.1	21.0
<i>Planck</i> low- ℓ EE	395.9	396.1	396.1	396.1
<i>Planck</i> lensing	9.5	10.1	9.4	10.1
BOSS BAO low- z	1.2	1.9	1.3	1.7
BOSS BAO/ $f\sigma_8$ DR12	6.6	6.8	6.8	7.0
Pantheon+	1411.3	1413.1	1411.5	1412.8
SH0ES	–	4.4	–	2.5
total χ^2_{min}	13083.9	13097.4	4190.4	4197.3
$\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}}$ (EDE – Λ CDM)	-2.1	-28.0	-3.0	-35.3
Q_{DMAP}	3.7 σ		2.6 σ	

TABLE III. Best-fit χ^2 per experiment (and total) for EDE when fit to the our baseline datasets, with either the Planck NPIPE or *Plik* likelihood. We compare the fits with and without the SH0ES prior on M_b . We report the $\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}} \equiv \chi^2_{\text{min}}(\text{EDE}) - \chi^2_{\text{min}}(\Lambda\text{CDM})$ and the tension metric Q_{DMAP} defined in Eq. 2. Note that *Planck* high- ℓ includes 10415 data points for NPIPE and 2289 bins for *Plik*; the other data sets are the same in each column.

[1] Y. Akrami *et al.*, “*Planck* intermediate results. LVII. Joint *Planck* LFI and HFI data processing,” *Astron. As-*

trophys., vol. 643, p. A42, 2020.
[2] P. Collaboration, “*Planck* 2018 results. VI. Cosmological

- parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 641, p. A6, Sept. 2020.
- [3] A. G. Riess *et al.*, “A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km/s/Mpc Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team,” 12 2021.
 - [4] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, T. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. Beaton, M. G. Lee, A. Monson, J. Neeley, and J. Rich, “Calibration of the Tip of the Red Giant Branch,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 891, p. 57, Mar. 2020.
 - [5] E. Abdalla *et al.*, “Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies,” *JHEAp*, vol. 34, pp. 49–211, 2022.
 - [6] W. Yuan, A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, and L. M. Macri, “A First Look at Cepheids in a Type Ia Supernova Host with JWST,” *ApJL*, vol. 940, p. L17, Nov. 2022.
 - [7] A. G. Riess, L. Breuval, W. Yuan, S. Casertano, L. M. Macri, J. B. Bowers, D. Scolnic, T. Cantat-Gaudin, R. I. Anderson, and M. Cruz Reyes, “Cluster Cepheids with High Precision Gaia Parallaxes, Low Zero-point Uncertainties, and Hubble Space Telescope Photometry,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 938, p. 36, Oct. 2022.
 - [8] A. G. Riess, G. S. Anand, W. Yuan, S. Casertano, A. Dolphin, L. M. Macri, L. Breuval, D. Scolnic, M. Perrin, and R. I. Anderson, “Crowded No More: The Accuracy of the Hubble Constant Tested with High Resolution Observations of Cepheids by JWST,” *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2307.15806, July 2023.
 - [9] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, “The H_0 Olympics: A fair ranking of proposed models,” 7 2021.
 - [10] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, “In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 38, no. 15, p. 153001, 2021.
 - [11] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, “Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 122, no. 22, p. 221301, 2019.
 - [12] L. Knox and M. Millea, “Hubble constant hunter’s guide,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 4, p. 043533, 2020.
 - [13] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, “The Hubble Tension and Early Dark Energy,” 11 2022.
 - [14] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, and T. Karwal, “The Ups and Downs of Early Dark Energy solutions to the Hubble tension: a review of models, hints and constraints circa 2023,” 2 2023.
 - [15] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, “BICEP/Keck and cosmological attractors,” *JCAP*, vol. 2021, p. 008, Dec. 2021.
 - [16] P. A. R. Ade, Z. Ahmed, M. Amiri, D. Barkats, R. B. Thakur, C. A. Bischoff, D. Beck, J. J. Bock, H. Boenish, E. Bullock, V. Buza, J. R. Cheshire, J. Connors, J. Cornelison, M. Crumrine, A. Cukierman, E. V. Denison, M. Dierickx, L. Duband, M. Eiben, S. Fatigoni, J. P. Filippini, S. Fliescher, N. Goeckner-Wald, D. C. Goldfinger, J. Grayson, P. Grimes, G. Hall, G. Halal, M. Halpern, E. Hand, S. Harrison, S. Henderson, S. R. Hildebrandt, G. C. Hilton, J. Hubmayr, H. Hui, K. D. Irwin, J. Kang, K. S. Karkare, E. Karpel, S. Kefeli, S. A. Kernasovskiy, J. M. Kovac, C. L. Kuo, K. Lau, E. M. Leitch, A. Lennox, K. G. Megerian, L. Minutolo, L. Moncelsi, Y. Nakato, T. Namikawa, H. T. Nguyen, R. O’Brien, R. W. Ogburn, S. Palladino, T. Prouve, C. Pryke, B. Racine, C. D. Reintsema, S. Richter, A. Schillaci, R. Schwarz, B. L. Schmitt, C. D. Sheehy, A. Soliman, T. S. Germaine, B. Steinbach, R. V. Sudiwala, G. P. Teply, K. L. Thompson, J. E. Tolan, C. Tucker, A. D. Turner, C. Umiltà, C. Vergès, A. G. Vieregg, A. Wandui, A. C. Weber, D. V. Wiebe, J. Willmert, C. L. Wong, W. L. K. Wu, H. Yang, K. W. Yoon, E. Young, C. Yu, L. Zeng, C. Zhang, S. Zhang, and Bicep/Keck Collaboration, “Improved Constraints on Primordial Gravitational Waves using Planck, WMAP, and BICEP/Keck Observations through the 2018 Observing Season,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, p. 151301, Oct. 2021.
 - [17] J. C. Hill, E. McDonough, M. W. Toomey, and S. Alexander, “Early dark energy does not restore cosmological concordance,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 4, p. 043507, 2020.
 - [18] R. Murgia, G. F. Abellán, and V. Poulin, “Early dark energy resolution to the Hubble tension in light of weak lensing surveys and lensing anomalies,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 6, p. 063502, 2021.
 - [19] T. L. Smith, V. Poulin, J. L. Bernal, K. K. Boddy, M. Kamionkowski, and R. Murgia, “Early dark energy is not excluded by current large-scale structure data,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 12, p. 123542, 2021.
 - [20] N. Aghanim *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 641, p. A5, 2020.
 - [21] L. Herold, E. G. M. Ferreira, and E. Komatsu, “New constraint on Early Dark Energy from Planck and BOSS data using the profile likelihood,” 12 2021.
 - [22] L. Herold and E. G. M. Ferreira, “Resolving the Hubble tension with Early Dark Energy,” 10 2022.
 - [23] J. C. Hill *et al.*, “The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: Constraints on Pre-Recombination Early Dark Energy,” 9 2021.
 - [24] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, and A. Bartlett, “Dark energy at early times and ACT data: A larger Hubble constant without late-time priors,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 12, p. 123550, 2021.
 - [25] T. L. Smith, M. Lucca, V. Poulin, G. F. Abellan, L. Balkenhol, K. Benabed, S. Galli, and R. Murgia, “Hints of Early Dark Energy in Planck, SPT, and ACT data: new physics or systematics?,” 2 2022.
 - [26] T. L. Smith and V. Poulin, “Current small-scale CMB constraints to axion-like early dark energy,” 9 2023.
 - [27] G. Efstathiou and S. Gratton, “A Detailed Description of the CAMSPEC Likelihood Pipeline and a Reanalysis of the Planck High Frequency Maps,” *The Open Journal of Astrophysics*, vol. 4, p. 8, Aug. 2021.
 - [28] E. Rosenberg, S. Gratton, and G. Efstathiou, “CMB power spectra and cosmological parameters from Planck PR4 with CamSpec,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 517, no. 3, pp. 4620–4636, 2022.
 - [29] M. Kamionkowski, J. Pradler, and D. G. E. Walker, “Dark energy from the string axiverse,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 113, no. 25, p. 251302, 2014.
 - [30] T. L. Smith, V. Poulin, and M. A. Amin, “Oscillating scalar fields and the Hubble tension: a resolution with novel signatures,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 6, p. 063523, 2020.
 - [31] E. McDonough and M. Scalisi, “Towards Early Dark Energy in String Theory,” 8 2022.
 - [32] M. Cicoli, M. Licheri, R. Mahanta, E. McDonough, F. G. Pedro, and M. Scalisi, “Early Dark Energy in Type IIB

- String Theory,” 3 2023.
- [33] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, “Rock ‘n’ Roll Solutions to the Hubble Tension,” 2019.
- [34] M.-X. Lin, G. Benevento, W. Hu, and M. Raveri, “Acoustic Dark Energy: Potential Conversion of the Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 6, p. 063542, 2019.
- [35] S. Alexander and E. McDonough, “Axion-Dilaton Destabilization and the Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 797, p. 134830, 2019.
- [36] J. Sakstein and M. Trodden, “Early Dark Energy from Massive Neutrinos as a Natural Resolution of the Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 124, no. 16, p. 161301, 2020.
- [37] A. Gogoi, R. Kumar Sharma, P. Chanda, and S. Das, “Early Mass-varying Neutrino Dark Energy: Nugget Formation and Hubble Anomaly,” *Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 915, p. 132, July 2021.
- [38] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, “New early dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 4, p. L041303, 2021.
- [39] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, “Resolving the Hubble tension with new early dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 6, p. 063527, 2020.
- [40] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, “Hot new early dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 105, no. 6, p. 063509, 2022.
- [41] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, “Is the Hubble tension a hint of AdS phase around recombination?,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 8, p. 083507, 2020.
- [42] K. V. Berghaus and T. Karwal, “Thermal Friction as a Solution to the Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 8, p. 083537, 2020.
- [43] K. Freese and M. W. Winkler, “Chain early dark energy: A Proposal for solving the Hubble tension and explaining today’s dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 8, p. 083533, 2021.
- [44] M. Braglia, W. T. Emond, F. Finelli, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, and K. Koyama, “Unified framework for early dark energy from α -attractors,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 8, p. 083513, 2020.
- [45] V. I. Sabla and R. R. Caldwell, “No H_0 assistance from assisted quintessence,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 10, p. 103506, 2021.
- [46] V. I. Sabla and R. R. Caldwell, “Microphysics of early dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 106, no. 6, p. 063526, 2022.
- [47] A. Gómez-Valent, Z. Zheng, L. Amendola, V. Pettorino, and C. Wetterich, “Early dark energy in the pre- and postrecombination epochs,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 8, p. 083536, 2021.
- [48] A. Moss, E. Copeland, S. Bamford, and T. Clarke, “A model-independent reconstruction of dark energy to very high redshift,” 9 2021.
- [49] E. Guendelman, R. Herrera, and D. Benisty, “Unifying inflation with early and late dark energy with multiple fields: Spontaneously broken scale invariant two measures theory,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 105, no. 12, p. 124035, 2022.
- [50] T. Karwal, M. Raveri, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, “Chameleon Early Dark Energy and the Hubble Tension,” *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2106.13290, June 2021.
- [51] E. McDonough, M.-X. Lin, J. C. Hill, W. Hu, and S. Zhou, “The Early Dark Sector, the Hubble Tension, and the Swampland,” 12 2021.
- [52] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, “A fraction of dark matter faded with early dark energy ?,” 9 2022.
- [53] S. Alexander, H. Bernardo, and M. W. Toomey, “Addressing the Hubble and S_8 Tensions with a Kinetically Mixed Dark Sector,” 7 2022.
- [54] S. Nakagawa, F. Takahashi, and W. Yin, “Early dark energy by dark Higgs, and axion-induced non-thermal trapping,” 9 2022.
- [55] A. Gómez-Valent, Z. Zheng, L. Amendola, C. Wetterich, and V. Pettorino, “Coupled and uncoupled early dark energy, massive neutrinos and the cosmological tensions,” 7 2022.
- [56] H. Mohseni Sadjadi and V. Anari, “Early dark energy and the screening mechanism,” 5 2022.
- [57] K. Kojima and Y. Okubo, “Early dark energy from a higher-dimensional gauge theory,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 106, no. 6, p. 063540, 2022.
- [58] T. Rudelius, “Constraints on Early Dark Energy from the Axion Weak Gravity Conjecture,” 3 2022.
- [59] V. K. Oikonomou, “Unifying inflation with early and late dark energy epochs in axion $F(R)$ gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 4, p. 044036, 2021.
- [60] S. X. Tian and Z.-H. Zhu, “Early dark energy in k -essence,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 4, p. 043518, 2021.
- [61] M. Maziashvili, “Inflaton-driven early dark energy,” *Astropart. Phys.*, vol. 145, p. 102792, 2023.
- [62] Planck Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, C. Armitage-Caplan, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, F. Atrio-Barandela, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, J. G. Bartlett, E. Battaner, K. Benabed, A. Benoit, A. Benoit-Lévy, J. P. Bernard, M. Bersanelli, P. Bielewicz, J. Bobin, J. J. Bock, A. Bonaldi, J. R. Bond, J. Borrill, F. R. Bouchet, M. Bridges, M. Bucher, C. Burigana, R. C. Butler, E. Calabrese, B. Cappellini, J. F. Cardoso, A. Catalano, A. Challinor, A. Chamballu, R. R. Chary, X. Chen, H. C. Chiang, L. Y. Chiang, P. R. Christensen, S. Church, D. L. Clements, S. Colombi, L. P. L. Colombo, F. Couchot, A. Coulais, B. P. Crill, A. Curto, F. Cuttaia, L. Danese, R. D. Davies, R. J. Davis, P. de Bernardis, A. de Rosa, G. de Zotti, J. Delabrouille, J. M. Delouis, F. X. Désert, C. Dickinson, J. M. Diego, K. Dolag, H. Dole, S. Donzelli, O. Doré, M. Douspis, J. Dunkley, X. Dupac, G. Efstathiou, F. Elsner, T. A. Enßlin, H. K. Eriksen, F. Finelli, O. Forni, M. Frailis, A. A. Fraisse, E. Franceschi, T. C. Gaier, S. Galeotta, S. Galli, K. Ganga, M. Giard, G. Giardino, Y. Giraud-Héraud, E. Gjerløw, J. González-Nuevo, K. M. Górski, S. Gratton, A. Gregorio, A. Gruppuso, J. E. Gudmundsson, J. Haissinski, J. Hamann, F. K. Hansen, D. Hanson, D. Harrison, S. Henrot-Versillé, C. Hernández-Monteagudo, D. Herranz, S. R. Hildebrandt, E. Hivon, M. Hobson, W. A. Holmes, A. Hornstrup, Z. Hou, W. Hovest, K. M. Huffenberger, A. H. Jaffe, T. R. Jaffe, J. Jewell, W. C. Jones, M. Juvela, E. Keihänen, R. Keskitalo, T. S. Kisner, R. Kneissl, J. Knoche, L. Knox, M. Kunz, H. Kurki-Suonio, G. Lagache, A. Lähteenmäki, J. M. Lamarre, A. Lasenby, M. Lattanzi, R. J. Laureijs, C. R. Lawrence, S. Leach, J. P. Leahy, R. Leonardi, J. León-Tavares, J. Lesgourgues, A. Lewis, M. Liguori, P. B. Lilje, M. Linden-Vørnle, M. López-Cañiego, P. M. Lubin, J. F. Macías-Pérez, B. Maffei, D. Maino, N. Mandolesi, M. Maris, D. J. Marshall, P. G. Martin, E. Martínez-González, S. Masi, M. Massardi, S. Matarrese, F. Matthai, P. Mazzotta, P. R. Meinhold, A. Melchiorri, J. B. Melin, L. Mendes,

- E. Menegoni, A. Mennella, M. Migliaccio, M. Millea, S. Mitra, M. A. Miville-Deschênes, A. Moneti, L. Montier, G. Morgante, D. Mortlock, A. Moss, D. Munshi, J. A. Murphy, P. Naselsky, F. Nati, P. Natoli, C. B. Netterfield, H. U. Nørgaard-Nielsen, F. Novello, D. Novikov, I. Novikov, I. J. O’Dwyer, S. Osborne, C. A. Oxborrow, F. Paci, L. Pagano, F. Pajot, R. Paladini, D. Paoletti, B. Partridge, F. Pasian, G. Patanchon, D. Pearson, T. J. Pearson, H. V. Peiris, O. Perdereau, L. Perotto, F. Perrotta, V. Pettorino, F. Piacentini, M. Piat, E. Pierpaoli, D. Pietrobon, S. Plaszczynski, P. Platania, E. Pointecouteau, G. Polenta, N. Ponthieu, L. Popa, T. Poutanen, G. W. Pratt, G. Prêzeau, S. Prunet, J. L. Puget, J. P. Rachen, W. T. Reach, R. Rebolo, M. Reinecke, M. Remazeilles, C. Renault, S. Ricciardi, T. Riller, I. Ristortcelli, G. Rocha, C. Rosset, G. Roudier, M. Rowan-Robinson, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, B. Rusholme, M. Sandri, D. Santos, M. Savelainen, G. Savini, D. Scott, M. D. Seiffert, E. P. S. Shellard, L. D. Spencer, J. L. Starck, V. Stolyarov, R. Stompor, R. Sudiwala, R. Sunyaev, F. Sureau, D. Sutton, A. S. Suur-Uski, J. F. Sygnet, J. A. Tauber, D. Tavagnacco, L. Terenzi, L. Tofolatti, M. Tomasi, M. Tristram, M. Tucci, J. Tuovinen, M. Türlér, G. Umama, L. Valenziano, J. Valiviita, B. Van Tent, P. Vielva, F. Villa, N. Vittorio, L. A. Wade, B. D. Wandelt, I. K. Wehus, M. White, S. D. M. White, A. Wilkinson, D. Yvon, A. Zacchei, and A. Zonca, “Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 571, p. A16, Nov. 2014.
- [63] N. Aghanim *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 641, p. A6, 2020. [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [64] S. Alam *et al.*, “The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 470, no. 3, pp. 2617–2652, 2017.
- [65] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, “The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 416, pp. 3017–3032, 2011.
- [66] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, “The clustering of the SDSS DR7 main Galaxy sample – I. A 4 per cent distance measure at $z = 0.15$,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 449, no. 1, pp. 835–847, 2015.
- [67] D. Brout *et al.*, “The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 938, no. 2, p. 110, 2022.
- [68] M. Raveri and W. Hu, “Concordance and discordance in cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 99, p. 043506, Feb. 2019.
- [69] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, and S. Prunet, “Conservative Constraints on Early Cosmology: an illustration of the Monte Python cosmological parameter inference code,” *JCAP*, vol. 02, p. 001, 2013.
- [70] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, “MontePython 3: boosted MCMC sampler and other features,” 2018.
- [71] J. Lesgourgues, “The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) I: Overview,” 2011.
- [72] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and T. Tram, “The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) II: Approximation schemes,” *JCAP*, vol. 1107, p. 034, 2011.
- [73] R. E. Smith, J. A. Peacock, A. Jenkins, S. D. M. White, C. S. Frenk, F. R. Pearce, P. A. Thomas, G. Efstathiou, and H. M. P. Couchmann, “Stable clustering, the halo model and nonlinear cosmological power spectra,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 341, p. 1311, 2003.
- [74] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin, “Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences,” *Statist. Sci.*, vol. 7, pp. 457–472, 1992.
- [75] A. Lewis, “GetDist: a Python package for analysing Monte Carlo samples,” 10 2019.
- [76] T. Karwal, A. Bartlett, Y. Patel, T. L. Smith, and V. Poulin, “A profile likelihood tool for cosmological analysis,” *in prep.*
- [77] T. Simon, “Can acoustic early dark energy still resolve the Hubble tension?,” 10 2023.
- [78] S. Goldstein, J. C. Hill, V. Iršič, and B. D. Sherwin, “Canonical Hubble-Tension-Resolving Early Dark Energy Cosmologies are Inconsistent with the Lyman- α Forest,” 3 2023.
- [79] N. Palanque-Delabrouille, C. Yèche, N. Schöneberg, J. Lesgourgues, M. Walther, S. Chabanier, and E. Armengaud, “Hints, neutrino bounds, and WDM constraints from SDSS DR14 Lyman- α and Planck full-survey data,” *JCAP*, vol. 2020, p. 038, Apr. 2020.
- [80] G. D’Amico, L. Senatore, P. Zhang, and H. Zheng, “The Hubble Tension in Light of the Full-Shape Analysis of Large-Scale Structure Data,” *JCAP*, vol. 05, p. 072, 2021.
- [81] O. H. E. Philcox, G. S. Farren, B. D. Sherwin, E. J. Baxter, and D. J. Brout, “Determining the Hubble constant without the sound horizon: A 3.6% constraint on H_0 from galaxy surveys, CMB lensing, and supernovae,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 106, no. 6, p. 063530, 2022.
- [82] T. Simon, P. Zhang, V. Poulin, and T. L. Smith, “Updated constraints from the effective field theory analysis of BOSS power spectrum on Early Dark Energy,” *Phys. Rev. D.*, vol. In press, 8 2022.
- [83] S. Brieden, H. Gil-Marín, and L. Verde, “A tale of two (or more) h ’s,” *JCAP*, vol. 2023, p. 023, Apr. 2023.
- [84] S. Vagnozzi, “Seven hints that early-time new physics alone is not sufficient to solve the Hubble tension,” *Universe*, vol. 9, p. 393, 2023.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Tanvi Karwal and Yashvi Patel for sharing their profile likelihood tool, Steven Gratton for his contributions to preparing NPIPE likelihoods and Marc Kamionkowski, Adam Riess, and Tristan L. Smith for valuable comments on the draft. GPE thanks the Leverhulme Trust for the award of an Emeritus Fellowship. VP is supported by funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s HORIZON-ERC-2022 (Grant agreement No. 101076865). The authors acknowledge the use of computational resources from the Excellence Initiative of Aix-Marseille University (A*MIDEX) of the Investissements d’Avenir program. We acknowledge the use of LUPM’s cloud computing infrastructure founded by Ocevu labex and France-Grilles. This project has received support from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 860881-HIDDeN.