

Negative cosmological constant in the dark energy sector: tests from JWST photometric and spectroscopic observations of high-redshift galaxies

Nicola Menci^a Shahnawaz A. Adil,^b Upala Mukhopadhyay,^c
Anjan A. Sen,^c and Sunny Vagnozzi^{d,e}

^aIstituto Nazionale di Astrofisica (INAF), Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Via Frascati 33, 00078 Monte Porzio Catone (RM), Italy

^bDepartment of Physics, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi-110025, India

^cCentre for Theoretical Physics, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi-110025, India

^dDepartment of Physics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive 14, 38122 Povo (TN), Italy

^eIstituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Trento Institute for Fundamental Physics and Applications (TIFPA), Via Sommarive 14, 38122 Povo (TN), Italy

E-mail: nicola.menci@inaf.it, shahnawaz188483@st.jmi.ac.in,
rs.umukhopadhyay@jmi.ac.in, aasen@jmi.ac.in, sunny.vagnozzi@unitn.it,
sunny.vagnozzi@unitn.it

Abstract. Early observations with the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) have revealed the existence of an unexpectedly large abundance of extremely massive galaxies at redshifts $z \gtrsim 5$: these are in tension with the predictions not only of the standard Λ CDM cosmology, but also with those of a wide class of dynamical dark energy (DE) models, and are generally in better agreement with models characterized by a phantom behaviour. Here we consider a model, inspired by string theory and the ubiquity of anti-de Sitter vacua therein, featuring an evolving DE component with positive energy density on top of a negative cosmological constant, argued in an earlier exploratory analysis to potentially be able to explain the JWST observations. We perform a robust comparison of this model against JWST data, considering both photometric observations from the CEERS program, and spectroscopic observations from the FRESCO survey. We show that the model is able to accommodate the JWST observations, with a consistency probability of up to 98%, even in the presence of an evolving component with a quintessence-like behaviour (easier to accommodate theoretically compared to phantom DE), while remaining consistent with standard low-redshift probes. Our results showcase the potential of measurements of high-redshift galaxy abundances in tests of fundamental physics, and their complementarity with standard cosmological probes.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Dark Energy models	5
3	Methods	7
4	Results	10
5	Conclusions	15

1 Introduction

The concordance Λ CDM cosmological model constitutes at present one of the simplest frameworks to describe the evolution of our Universe, and owes its success to its ability to describe a wide range of cosmological and astrophysical observations. One of the cornerstones of current cosmology is dark energy (DE) [1–3], a component with negative pressure and positive energy density driving the late-time acceleration of the Universe, whose discovery in 1998 led to one of the biggest paradigm shifts in physics [4, 5]: within Λ CDM, DE takes the form of a *positive* cosmological constant (CC) Λ [6]. Over the past two and a half decades, the nature of DE has to a large extent been investigated by means of three classes of cosmological observations: low-redshift ($z \lesssim 2$) probes based on Type Ia Supernovae (SNeIa) and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO), the latter observed in the clustering of various tracers of the large-scale structure, such as galaxies; and high-redshift ($z \sim 1100$) probes based on the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB): see Ref. [7] for a recent review on observational probes of DE. ¹ By virtue of the significant efforts devoted to the study of observations, underlying theory, and systematics associated to these probes, CMB, BAO, and SNeIa are generally referred to as standard cosmological probes and enjoy a (rightly deserved) privileged status for what concerns cosmological tests of the expansion of the Universe and of fundamental physics, with particular regard to the nature of DE. However, a series of growing cosmological tensions which appear to challenge the Λ CDM model [9], and the fact that some of these probes are close to being systematics-limited, are making it imperative to start looking for new independent probes, whose complementarity and synergy with the standard CMB+BAO+SNeIa can greatly enrich the landscape of methods to study the Universe: in this sense, a number of so-called “emerging” cosmological probes are rapidly gaining momentum, as beautifully summarized in the recent review of Ref. [10]. ²

In this context, the long-awaited recent observations of massive, distant galaxies delivered by the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) [27] have opened a remarkable window

¹Nevertheless, it is worth emphasizing that the sensitivity of the CMB to (late-time) DE is indirectly mostly a low-redshift (geometrical) one, through the effect of DE on the distance to the CMB itself (see e.g. the recent discussion in Ref. [8]), whereas the sensitivity of the CMB to DE perturbations and the dynamics thereof is quite limited, except possibly in the case of models which deviate substantially from the positive CC Λ , which are however ruled out by observations.

²Of course tests of DE are not limited to cosmological scales. Various tests of DE on astrophysical, astronomical, and even local scales, have been considered over the past decades, see Refs. [11–26] for examples in this sense.

not only onto astrophysics and the process of galaxy formation, but also onto novel cosmological tests of the contents of our Universe and more generally fundamental physics [28–30]. This is possible because the abundance of galactic haloes of dark matter (DM) mass M at redshifts $z \approx 5 - 10$ is predicted to be exponentially sensitive to the growth factor of perturbations $D(z)$, while also being a strongly decreasing function of redshift, and one which depends crucially on the (model-dependent) time-redshift relation [31].³ On the other hand, if we denote by Ω_b and Ω_m the cosmic density parameters for baryons and the total matter component respectively (and with $f_b \equiv \Omega_b/\Omega_m$), the stellar mass of a galaxy M_\star cannot exceed the maximal allowed baryonic content of the host halo $f_b M$. This implies that comparing the theoretically *predicted* cumulative comoving stellar number density of massive ($M_\star \approx 10^{10} - 10^{11} M_\odot$) galaxies, $n(> M_\star, z)$, with the *observed* abundance of galaxies of given stellar mass at redshifts $z \approx 5 - 10$, can potentially provide strong constraints on the expansion history and growth of cosmological perturbations, and therefore also on the nature of DE, in a way which is completely independent of the complex baryonic physics involved in the formation of galaxies. Needless to say, such constraints would be extremely valuable in light of their high complementarity to state-of-the-art determinations from CMB, BAO, and SNeIa, both in terms of range of redshifts/cosmic times probed, as well as potential systematics involved.

As hinted to earlier, the possibility of testing the expansion history of the Universe at such intermediate redshifts is particularly valuable in view of the tension between local and high-redshift determinations of the Hubble constant H_0 (see e.g. Refs. [39–48] for recent reviews). At a significance of $\gtrsim 5\sigma$, the Hubble tension poses what is probably one of the most serious observational challenges to Λ CDM, and can potentially lead us to completely rethink the nature of DE.⁴ Thus, probing the expansion history of the Universe at intermediate redshifts $z \approx 6 - 10$ constitutes a key opportunity to study the validity of Λ CDM model in an independent manner, and in an epoch which is otherwise extremely difficult to access (see also Refs. [86, 87] for recent work which highlighted the relevance of intermediate-redshift DE dynamics in the context of the Hubble tension).

Among the various aspects of fundamental physics which can be put to test through measurements of the abundance of massive galaxies at very high redshift, of particular interest to the present work are the properties of DE. In particular, as explicitly demonstrated by one of us in Ref. [88] using data from the CANDELS survey, the abundances of massive, high-redshift galaxies can provide key constraints on the DE equation of state (EoS) w . The reason is that w controls the large-scale behaviour of DE at both background and perturbation level, thereby dramatically affecting the growth of density perturbations and the formation of cosmic structures. In this context, a number of recent works (see e.g. Refs. [89–93]) have demonstrated how initial JWST imaging data from NIRCcam observations of the Cosmic Evolution Early Release Science (CEERS) program, which uncovered evidence of a surprisingly abundant population of very massive galaxies at extremely high redshifts $7 \lesssim z \lesssim 10$, could severely challenge the Λ CDM scenario. Specializing to the implications for DE, it was argued by one of us in Ref. [94] that these observations in fact exclude a significant portion

³Distant galaxies are also useful as a test of cosmological models through their ages, which of course cannot exceed the age of the Universe: see for instance Refs. [32–38] for recent works exploring the importance of stellar and galactic ages as a test of cosmological models.

⁴With no claims as to completeness, see Refs. [49–75] for examples of works exploring the implications of the Hubble tension for the nature of DE. The possibility of a more speculative “early dark energy” component, operative at very high redshift, is also a particularly interesting possibility in this context (see e.g. Refs. [76–85]).

of dynamical DE parameter space (including the point corresponding to Λ CDM), and favor models whose equation of state takes values $w < -1$ at some point after recombination, i.e. *phantom* models [95], see also Ref. [96] for further discussions.⁵ Although such results are still affected by uncertainties related to the assumed initial mass function (IMF) of the stellar populations (see e.g. Ref. [126]) and to the broadband selection criteria (especially for double-break sources, see for example, see Ref. [127]), it is worth highlighting that recent spectroscopic observations in the redshift range $5 \lesssim z \lesssim 6$ and $8 \lesssim z \lesssim 10$ [29, 30] from the JWST First Reionization Epoch Spectroscopically Complete Observations (FRESCO) and CEERS surveys corroborate the above conclusions, while also placing them on a much stronger footing.

The implications of the early JWST results for phantom DE are particularly interesting in view of the Hubble tension. It is now well understood that consistency with measurements of the acoustic angular scale at low redshifts from BAO requires that the sound horizon be lowered in the presence of a higher Hubble constant [128–137]. This implies that phantom DE, an inherently late-time component which does not affect the sound horizon, cannot on its own completely solve the Hubble tension. Nevertheless, within the limits imposed by low-redshift data, phantom DE can at least partially alleviate the Hubble tension, in light of its ability to accommodate a higher Hubble constant while keeping the distance to the CMB, and thereby the acoustic angular scale observed in the CMB θ_s , fixed (given that the sound horizon is unaffected, see Ref. [138] for a recent explicit discussion of parameter degeneracies in the presence of phantom DE). For this and other reasons, the possibility of phantom DE playing some role in the context of the Hubble tension is one which has been given serious consideration in the literature (see e.g. Refs. [139–153] for recent discussions on the subject).

Our discussions so far have been data-driven. However, theory considerations have a lot to offer to the discussion on viable DE models. Firstly, the tiny value of the positive CC Λ required to explain observations is at severe odds with the value expected from theory considerations, when interpreted in terms of zero-point vacuum energy density of quantum fields: this is the well-known CC problem [154, 155]. Moving on to the simplest “quintessence” models for DE, based on a single, minimally coupled scalar field in the absence of higher derivative operators, and with canonical kinetic term [156–160], it is well known that these predict $w > -1$, and cannot therefore give rise to phantom DE, which instead requires a violation of the null energy condition [161–165]. It is also worth noting that, in the absence of additional ingredients, these “vanilla” quintessence models also worsen the Hubble tension, and one could therefore argue that they are observationally disfavored if the Hubble tension is to be taken seriously [166–170].

Although most quintessence scalar field models feature a ground state with positive energy density, corresponding to a de Sitter (dS) vacuum, such a scenario has proven extremely difficult to construct in a controlled setting within string theory. In fact, it has been conjectured that string theory may be unable to accommodate dS vacua [171], as advocated by the swampland program [172–174], whose cosmological implications, particularly for inflation and DE, are far-reaching to say the least (see e.g. Refs. [175–184]).⁶ On the other hand,

⁵For examples of other works showcasing the enormous potential of the early JWST observations in constraining various aspects of fundamental physics, see Refs. [91, 96–119]. Taking a step aside from new fundamental physics, a very important possibility of course is that the JWST results may call for a better understanding of galaxy formation, as discussed in a number of recent works [120–125].

⁶Two possible counterexamples to these conjectures are the KKLT [185] and Large Volume Compactification [186] scenarios, although there is still no complete consensus on whether the resulting uplifted (meta)stable dS vacua are sufficiently long-lived to be able to agree with observations.

anti-dS (AdS) vacua, which correspond to a negative CC (nCC), appear ubiquitously within string theory, and are among the best understood quantum gravity backgrounds by virtue of the AdS/CFT correspondence [187]. Of course, a nCC $\Lambda < 0$ with energy density $\rho_\Lambda < 0$ is unable, on its own, to give rise to cosmic acceleration. However, an evolving DE component with positive energy density $\rho_x > 0$ on top of a nCC can be consistent with the observed late-time acceleration, provided $\rho_x + \rho_\Lambda$ is positive around the present time, and amounts to about 70% of the total energy budget. Such a scenario, which could be interpreted in terms of a quintessence field whose potential features a negative minimum (AdS vacuum), is of great theoretical interest in light of the previous string-driven considerations. In fact, a number of recent works have explored similar scenarios in light of standard CMB, BAO, and SNeIa observations (see e.g. Refs. [188–197]), finding that these models perform equally well as Λ CDM, or are even potentially statistically preferred.⁷ The strong theoretical motivation behind such models, as well as their consistency with standard cosmological probes, strongly motivates further studies thereof, and in particular a comparison against other available observations, potentially in different redshift ranges, where the deviations from Λ CDM can be substantially more pronounced.

In Ref. [209], it was shown by some of us that a DE sector featuring an evolving component on top of a nCC can, within regions of parameter space consistent with standard cosmological observations, drastically alter the growth of structure at high redshifts with respect to Λ CDM to the point of *potentially* restoring concordance with the (photometric) JWST CEERS observations. We stress the word “potentially” as this earlier analysis was merely an exploratory one: in fact, besides only having explored a few benchmark points in parameter space, a careful treatment of corrections required for an accurate comparison to the JWST observations was lacking, as well as a more complete assessment of the complementarity with standard cosmological probes (the last two points were, in fact, both explicitly mentioned as motivation for a more detailed follow-up work in the closing paragraph of Ref. [209]). Given the enormous promise shown by a model featuring an evolving DE component on top of a nCC, it is our goal in the present work to revisit the model and go beyond the exploratory analysis of Ref. [209], by providing a full comparison of such a model against the JWST CEERS observations, while also including information from standard cosmological probes. To place our results on a much more solid footing from the observational point of view, we also consider spectroscopic data from the JWST FRESCO survey [29]. Overall, our work confirms and reinforces the extremely promising conclusions reached earlier in Ref. [209], and provides further motivation for exploring dark sectors featuring components with negative energy densities, while also highlighting once more the enormous potential held by observations of the abundance of massive galaxies at very high redshift in testing fundamental physics.

The rest of this paper is then organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we briefly review the DE models considered in the rest of the work. Our analysis methods, including the adopted datasets, are discussed in Sec. 3. The results of our analysis, and in particular the resulting limits in dynamical DE parameter space, are presented in Sec. 4. Finally, in Sec. 5 we draw concluding remarks and outline a number of potentially interesting avenues for follow-up work.

⁷Another related very interesting possibility which has been explored in the literature involves an AdS phase around recombination, as in the case of so-called AdS-early dark energy models [198–208].

2 Dark Energy models

Following the earlier work of Ref. [209], we consider a DE sector consisting of a cosmological constant $\Lambda \gtrless 0$ which in principle can take either sign (with positive or negative signs corresponding to a dS or AdS vacuum respectively), and with associated energy density $\rho_\Lambda = \Lambda/8\pi G$ of the same sign. On top of this dS or AdS vacuum we place an evolving DE component with strictly positive energy density $\rho_x(z) > 0$. Rather than committing to a specific microphysical model for the evolving DE component, we assume that this is described by a time-evolving EoS $w_x(z)$ of the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) form [210, 211]:

$$w_x(z) = w_0 + w_a \frac{z}{1+z}. \quad (2.1)$$

There are various reasons why we adopt the widely used CPL parametrization, ranging from its highly manageable 2-dimensional nature, to its direct connection to several physical DE models (including several quintessence DE models, see e.g. Refs. [211–215]) and, last but not least, for ease of comparison to the earlier work of Ref. [209].⁸ We refer to the evolving component being quintessence-like (phantom) at a given epoch if, at the redshift in question, $w(z) > -1$ (< -1). While w_0 controls the current (quintessence-like or phantom) nature of DE, whether or not this can change in the past is determined by the value of w_a , given that at asymptotically early times ($z \rightarrow \infty$) the DE EoS tends to the value $w_0 + w_a$. Finally, we note that models crossing which can cross between the two regimes are typically referred to as “quintom” models, and have been widely studied in the literature [228–237], see Ref. [238] for a review.

If we denote by $\rho_{\text{crit}}^{(0)}$ the current critical energy density, by $\rho_x^{(0)}$ the current energy density of the evolving DE component, and by $\Omega_x \equiv \rho_x^{(0)}/\rho_{\text{crit}}^{(0)}$ its density parameter, the energy density of the evolving DE component as a function of redshift is given by the following:

$$\rho_x(z) = \Omega_x \rho_{\text{crit}}^{(0)} (1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} \exp\left(-3w_a \frac{z}{1+z}\right). \quad (2.2)$$

We work under the assumption of a spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker Universe filled, besides the evolving DE component described previously, by the cosmological constant $\Lambda \gtrless 0$, alongside the usual matter and radiation fluids (with density parameters Ω_m and Ω_r respectively).⁹ Under these assumptions, and defining the density parameter of the cosmological constant $\Omega_\Lambda \equiv \Lambda/3$, the evolution of the Hubble rate is governed by the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H^2(z)}{H_0^2} &= \Omega_r (1+z)^4 + \Omega_m (1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda \\ &+ \Omega_x (1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} \exp\left(-3w_a \frac{z}{1+z}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

⁸See Ref. [216] for a recent discussion on potential shortcomings of the CPL parametrization. For completeness, we note that a number of other parametrizations for the EoS of dynamical DE components have been proposed in the literature, see e.g. Refs. [217–226], see also Ref. [227] for discussions on the theoretical viability of these parametrizations.

⁹We neglect neutrinos for simplicity, given their very limited impact at the cosmological epochs of interest.

where the density parameters satisfy $\Omega_r + \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_x = 1$. Finally, as noted in Ref. [209], it is natural to identify the combination of the evolving CPL component and the cosmological constant Λ as comprising the combined DE sector, whose total density parameter is $\Omega_{\text{DE}} \equiv \Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda$. The important thing to note is that, although Λ itself and therefore Ω_Λ can be negative, the *total* DE density and therefore Ω_{DE} have to be positive in order to be able to drive cosmic acceleration and maintain agreement with cosmological observations. Roughly speaking, such a DE sector can in principle be compatible with cosmological observations provided $\Omega_{\text{DE}} \approx 0.7$, which of course is possible even if $\Omega_\Lambda < 0$, as noted in several recent works [190, 191, 195, 239, 240]. We note that, in order to agree with observations, a more negative Ω_Λ needs to be compensated by more negative values of w_x , moving towards the phantom regime. These considerations lead to comparatively weak, order unity upper limits on $|\Omega_\Lambda|$, as discussed for instance in Refs. [191, 195], whereas different combinations of w_x , Ω_x , and Ω_Λ (the latter two summing to the same value of Ω_{DE}) can lead to a very rich phenomenology, discussed in detail in Ref. [194] (see also Ref. [241] for discussions on the expected sensitivity to a nCC from future 21-cm observations).

From a theoretical standpoint, such a phenomenological model has been argued to loosely carry string motivation in the case where $\Lambda < 0$ [191, 195, 209]. While AdS vacua appear ubiquitously in string theory, the evolving DE component on top can, broadly speaking, be justified on the grounds that string compactifications typically predict the existence of a plethora of ultralight (pseudo)scalar particles. This usually goes under the name of “string axiverse” (see for example Refs. [242–246]), with the axion-like particles arising from Kaluza-Klein reduction of higher-dimensional form fields on the topological cycles of the compactification space. The topology of the compactification manifold fixes the number of particles, typically of order hundreds or more, and with masses spread over a huge number of decades, with the rough expectation that the distribution of the logarithms of the masses should be approximately uniform [247–249], see also Ref. [192, 250] for related studies. The important thing to note is that the effective EoS of multiple interacting scalar fields can be phantom [161, 162, 251–253]: this motivates the possibility of a component with positive energy density, but with EoS $w_x(z)$ potentially crossing -1 [as in Eq. (2.1) for suitable choices of w_0, w_a], sitting on top of a nCC.

Concerning the AdS vacuum itself, the exploratory results of Ref. [209] which our work seeks to confirm show that the relevant region of parameter space is one where $|\Omega_\Lambda| \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, i.e. where the nCC is of the same order of the dS vacuum energy in Λ CDM (see also Refs. [190, 191, 195]). Therefore, the magnitude of the nCC is expected to be $\lesssim 10^{-123}$ in Planck units, and one could legitimately worry that this would introduce a (negative) cosmological constant problem. Intriguingly, recent work in string theory [254, 255] has led to the explicit construction of supersymmetric AdS₄ vacua of the right magnitude. This has been achieved within the context of type IIB string theory in compactifications on orientifolds of Calabi-Yau threefold hypersurfaces, with the resulting solution preserving $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry, and with the key point of the construction being the perfect cancellation of all perturbative terms in the superpotential. Such a construction explicitly shows that it is possible to obtain an exponentially small nCC within string compactifications, thereby providing further string motivation for the region of parameter space we shall explore in this work.

Before moving on we note that, once the combination of evolving CPL component and Λ is identified as making up the combined DE sector, a natural quantity characterizing the latter is the effective equation of state $w_{\text{eff}}(z)$, which can be determined through the twice

contracted Bianchi identity, and is given by (see Ref. [209] for the full calculation):

$$w_{\text{eff}}(z) = \frac{\Omega_x(1+z)^{2+3w_0+3w_a} [w_0 + (w_0 + w_a)z] \exp\left(-3w_a \frac{z}{1+z}\right) - \Omega_\Lambda}{\Omega_x(1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} \exp\left(-3w_a \frac{z}{1+z}\right) + \Omega_\Lambda},$$

for which in general $w_{\text{eff}}(z=0) \neq w_0$ unless $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$. It is also worth noting that if the values of Ω_x , Ω_Λ , w_0 , and w_a are such that the total DE energy density goes through zero and therefore switches sign at a certain redshift, the associated effective EoS given by Eq. (2.4) necessarily goes through a pole at the same redshift. This has been discussed in detail in Refs. [209, 256], and does not in itself signal a pathology given that $w_{\text{eff}}(z)$ is not associated to the dynamics of a single microscopical degree of freedom – however, this does highlight the importance of focusing on the total DE energy density rather than the effective EoS.

3 Methods

For what concerns the properties of high-redshift galaxies, and more generally the formation of structures, the predictions of our model are controlled by seven parameters: the matter density parameter Ω_m , the baryon density parameter Ω_b (as it controls the maximal baryonic, and therefore stellar, content of a given host DM halo), the density parameter of the (positive or negative) cosmological constant Ω_Λ , the Hubble constant H_0 , the present-day linear theory amplitude of matter fluctuations averaged in spheres of radius $8 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$ σ_8 , and finally the parameters characterizing the evolving DE component with positive energy density, w_0 and w_a . We note that the radiation density parameter Ω_r is essentially fixed by extremely high-precision measurements of the CMB temperature monopole (and is in any case negligible), from which it follows that the density parameter of the evolving DE component $\Omega_x > 0$ is fixed by the closure relation $\Omega_r + \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_x = 1$ (which basically reduces to $\Omega_{\text{DE}} = \Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda \approx 1 - \Omega_m$), and cannot therefore be treated as a free parameter.

For each set of cosmological parameters discussed above, following Ref. [257] and as reported in Refs. [88, 94, 209], we compute the evolution of the matter density contrast δ , from which we obtain the linear growth factor of density perturbations $D(z)$. We note that the evolution of $D(z)$ can differ significantly from that within ΛCDM . The reason is that the equation for the evolution of δ (see e.g. Ref. [209]) depends on both the normalized expansion rate $E(z) \equiv H(z)/H_0$ and its first derivative: a different background expansion therefore directly impacts the growth of structure, which within the model at hand can be either suppressed or enhanced depending on the choice of cosmological parameters, with the value of Ω_Λ playing an important role (see Ref. [209] for more detailed discussions on this point).

The next step is to compute the predicted maximal abundance of galaxies with stellar mass M_\star . More precisely, the relevant quantities are the comoving cumulative number or mass (stellar mass or DM halo mass) densities, which quantify the number or mass density of halos above a given threshold, or the number or stellar mass density of stars contained in galaxies more massive than a given threshold. Here we proceed as in Refs. [88, 94] and just recall the basic steps to compute these quantities, while encouraging the reader to consult the above papers for further details (see also Eqs. (3.7–3.10) of Ref. [209] for explicit expressions of the four quantities discussed above). For a given set of the seven cosmological parameters we compute the DM halo mass function $dn(M, z)/dM$, which quantifies the number of DM

haloes of mass M per unit mass per unit comoving volume in the mass range $[M; M + dM]$ at a given redshift. We do so following the prescription of Ref. [258], itself an extension of the Press-Schechter formalism [259] accounting for ellipsoidal collapse.

From the DM halo mass function we can obtain the *maximal* comoving number density of galaxies with stellar mass in the range $[M_\star; M_\star + dM_\star]$, $dn_\star(M_\star, z)/dM_\star$. This is given by $dn_\star(M_\star, z)/dM_\star = f_b dn(M, z)/dM$, where $f_b \equiv \Omega_b/\Omega_m$ is the cosmic baryon fraction. We stress that this is the *maximal* density because it is computed under the extremely optimistic assumption that the entire available baryonic reservoir ends up being converted into stars. This assumption is of course unrealistic, as in reality the efficiency of converting gas into stars, typically denoted by ϵ , is of order $\epsilon \lesssim 0.2$ or less, with a moderate redshift dependence [260–262]. However, this assumption is extremely conservative for the purposes of our study: given that galaxies cannot outnumber their DM haloes, one can exclude those cosmological models for which *even when* $\epsilon = 1$ the predicted number density of galaxies of given stellar mass at a certain redshift falls short of the observed abundance of galaxies within the same range of redshift and stellar mass. To put it differently, a galaxy of stellar mass M_\star can only form if a DM halo of mass $M_\star/\epsilon f_b$ has formed first. Finally, we can compute the corresponding cumulative comoving maximal number and stellar mass densities of galaxies with stellar masses larger than a given observational threshold \overline{M}_\star . These are obtained by integrating $dn(M, z)/dM$ and $f_b M dn(M, z)/dM$ respectively, where the lower limit of the integration range is given by the threshold DM halo mass \overline{M}_\star/f_b ,¹⁰ and averaging over the cosmic volume $V(z_1, z_2)$ enclosed between the redshift range $z_{\min} - z_{\max}$ covered by the observations (the average is performed within the integral, again see Eqs. (3.7–3.10) of Ref. [209] for explicit expressions of these quantities). Two further corrections are required before the computed cumulative comoving stellar mass density of galaxies, $\rho_\star(> \overline{M}_\star, z)$, can be compared against the JWST observations, as we will discuss shortly.

Our goal is now to compute $\rho_\star(> \overline{M}_\star, z)$ as a function of various choices of cosmological parameters, while ensuring that the latter are in agreement with standard cosmological probes. This will allow us to discuss the complementarity between the latter, and the observed abundance of high-redshift galaxies from JWST. Operationally, we therefore proceed as follows. The cosmological datasets we consider are given below:¹¹

- *CMB data*: measurements of CMB temperature anisotropy and polarization power spectra, their cross-spectra, and CMB lensing power spectrum reconstructed from the temperature 4-point correlation function, from the *Planck* 2018 legacy release. This combination is usually referred to as **TTTEEE+lowl+lowE+lensing**, and we analyse it making use of the official *Planck* likelihood [265–267].
- *BAO data*: isotropic and anisotropic distance and expansion rate measurements from the SDSS-MGS, 6dFGS, and BOSS DR12 collaborations [268–270].

¹⁰The upper limit of the integration range is formally ∞ , although the integrand drops exponentially quickly for sufficiently large DM halo mass.

¹¹While more recent datasets are available for some of the measurements below (especially for what concerns BAO and SNeIa data), the reason why we chose these datasets was for consistency with the work of Ref. [195], in order to make use of the chains which were produced therein. Nevertheless, we expect very minimal quantitative changes were we to use the most up-to-date eBOSS BAO data [263] and *PantheonPlus* SNeIa data [264], and no qualitative changes, given that our conclusions are almost entirely driven by the JWST observations. We therefore expect them to be robust against the use of slightly more update BAO and SNeIa data.

- *SNeIa data*: distance moduli measurements from the *Pantheon* SNeIa sample within the redshift range $0.01 < z < 2.3$ [271].
- *SH0ES prior*: a prior on the Hubble constant $H_0 = (73.30 \pm 1.04)$ km/s/Mpc, as determined by the SH0ES team [272].

Considering the combination of the above datasets, we derive constraints on our set of cosmological parameters by making use of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, with predictions for the cosmological observables in question derived using the publicly available Boltzmann solver CLASS [273, 274]. We make use of the publicly available cosmological MCMC sampler MontePython 3.3 [275, 276]. We monitor the convergence of the generated MCMC chains through the Gelman-Rubin parameter $R-1$ [277], requiring $R-1 < 0.02$ for our chains to be considered converged, and analyze them using the GetDist package [278]. For a full discussion of the methodology and the resulting constraints, we refer the reader to Ref. [195].

In the next stage of the analysis, we introduce the JWST observations, in particular the inferred/observed comoving cumulative stellar mass density $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$. More specifically, we consider the value of $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ inferred from two different classes of observations:

- the six most massive, intrinsically red galaxies in the redshift range $9 \lesssim z \lesssim 11$, identified in the first NIRCcam observations of the JWST CEERS program, as reported in Ref. [28], and which we treat as a measurement of $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ at $z_{\text{eff}} = 10$;
- the three most massive, optically dark (dust-obscured) galaxies with robust spectroscopic redshifts, in the redshift range $5 \lesssim z \lesssim 6$, identified within the JWST FRESCO NIRCcam/grism survey, as reported in Ref. [29], and which we treat as a measurement of $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ at $z_{\text{eff}} = 5.5$.

From the two above observations the inferred stellar mass density is of the order of $\gtrsim 10^6 M_\odot \text{Mpc}^{-3}$ and $\gtrsim 10^5 M_\odot \text{Mpc}^{-3}$ respectively.

From the MCMC chains described above, we then select only those points which are consistent within 2σ with the standard cosmological probes discussed earlier. We stress that in our MCMC analysis we have allowed for $\Omega_\Lambda \geq 0$, i.e. either a dS or AdS vacuum energy component. Each of the models consistent within 2σ with the standard cosmological observations is then compared against the inferred values of $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ from the JWST CEERS and FRESCO observations described above. However, in order to properly carry out this comparison, we need to account (and correct) for the fact that both the values of $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ reported by Ref. [28] and Ref. [29] have been obtained assuming a certain fiducial cosmology, in this case Λ CDM with a given choice of parameters. Let us refer to the vector of fiducial cosmology parameters as \mathbf{f} , whereas we denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ the vector of cosmological parameters for each point in our MCMC chain. As discussed in detail in Ref. [94], one then needs to apply two different corrections:

- the inferred $\rho_{\text{obs}}(> \overline{M}_\star)$ has to be corrected by a “volume factor” $f_{\text{vol}} \equiv V_{\mathbf{f}}/V_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ to appropriately rescale the volume density, where V is the cosmic volume computed for the specific model and choice of cosmological parameters in question, at the effective redshift z_{eff} ;
- similarly, the measured masses have to be corrected by a “luminosity factor” $f_{\text{lum}} \equiv d_{L,\mathbf{f}}/d_{L,\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ to account for the fact that the stellar masses have been inferred from the observed luminosities within the assumption of the given fiducial cosmology, where d_L

is the luminosity distance computed for the specific model and choice of cosmological parameters in question, once more at the effective redshift z_{eff} .

The cosmology-corrected maximal comoving cumulative stellar mass densities can then be directly compared to the JWST observations described above.

We consider a given cosmological model (which, we recall, is already ensured to be consistent within 2σ with the standard cosmological probes) to be excluded if the maximal predicted stellar mass density of galaxies at the given effective redshift is lower than the value inferred from JWST CEERS or FRESCO observations. From this we can then compute the exclusion probability P for a given model, or conversely the probability of consistency with the JWST observations Q (obviously $P + Q = 1$). This is performed using the procedure described in Ref. [94], through a Monte Carlo procedure which also accounts for uncertainties in the observational estimates of masses – in particular potential systematics related to the spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting procedure – and statistical errors in the observational number densities.

More in detail, for each set of cosmological parameters which are consistent with the standard cosmological probes after running our MCMC, we simulate the dispersion of the observed number density $n(M_*)$ due to both systematics affecting M_* and statistical errors affecting $n(M_*)$. For the former, we conservatively assign an uncertainty of 0.5 dex to the stellar masses M_* reported by CEERS. This uncertainty budget accounts rather generously for systematic uncertainties related to the SED fitting procedure (see e.g. Refs. [94, 279]), particularly for what concerns the ages of stellar populations, dust extinction, metallicity, and assumed shapes of the star formation histories. When simulating the uncertainties associated to the CEERS values of M_* in our Monte Carlo procedure, the limit stellar mass \overline{M}_* is extracted from such an interval following an uniform distribution to simulate systematic uncertainties. For what concerns the spectroscopic FRESCO observations, the uncertainties in the estimated stellar masses are simulated in our Monte Carlo procedure by extracting an uncertainty ΔM_* following a Gaussian distribution with variance given by the uncertainties reported in Ref. [29]. The observed number densities of galaxies associated to stellar masses M_* extracted as described above are compared to the theoretical expectations for the number density of DM haloes with mass $M = M_*/f_b$, and we estimate upper and lower Poisson confidence limits using the statistical method presented in Ref. [280], which presents improved numerical approximations to assess the statistical significance (Poissonian confidence limits) of an observed small number of events, which is precisely the case at play here. This allows us to derive a confidence level P for the probability that the observed number densities are below the theoretical predictions. Notice that the value f_b is not taken to be a free parameter, but is computed from the ratio $f_b \equiv \Omega_b/\Omega_m$ where Ω_b and Ω_m are taken from the chains of cosmological parameters discussed above.

4 Results

We begin by comparing our theoretical predictions against the stellar mass density inferred from the most massive objects identified by NIRCcam observations of the JWST CEERS program, as reported in Ref. [28]. In particular, these observations refer to the redshift range $z_{\text{min}} = 9 \lesssim z \lesssim z_{\text{max}} = 11$, which we treat at an effective redshift $z_{\text{eff}} = 10$, focusing on the most massive bin considered in Ref. [28], corresponding to $M_* \geq \overline{M}_* = 10^{10.5} M_\odot$. As discussed in Sec. 3, from the MCMC chains we extract cosmological parameter vectors consistent within 2σ with the standard CMB, BAO, and SNeIa cosmological probes, predict the

corresponding maximal comoving cumulative stellar mass density, which we then correct for the assumed fiducial cosmology, and then compare this against the JWST CEERS observations. For each model, we derive the exclusion probability P , or conversely the probability of consistency with the JWST observations, $Q = 1 - P$.

The results of our analysis are reported in terms of consistency probability contour plots as a function of the evolving DE parameters w_0 and w_a in Fig. 1, where each of the four quadrants refers to different regimes for the vacuum energy density parameter Ω_Λ : dS vacuum $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$ (lower right quadrant), AdS vacuum with $-1 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0$ (lower left quadrant), AdS vacuum with even more negative $\Omega_\Lambda < -1$ (upper right panel), and finally any value of Ω_Λ (upper left quadrant). Superimposed on the same plots are 2σ and 3σ joint confidence intervals in the w_0 - w_a plane obtained from a combination of CMB, BAO, and SNeIa measurements (black contours, as reported in Ref. [281]), as well as from the combined Hubble diagram of SNeIa and quasars (QSOs, blue contours, as reported in Ref. [282]), reaching up to redshift $z \sim 5.5$.

The first noteworthy result is that the existence of a region of w_0 - w_a parameter space featuring a DE component with an AdS vacuum which is consistent with all the standard cosmological probes *and* the abundance of high-redshift galaxies inferred from JWST. This can be contrasted to the earlier results of Ref. [94] which only considered a dS vacuum, finding that a major portion of the w_0 - w_a parameter space favored by the standard cosmological probes is excluded at significance $> 2\sigma$ by the JWST observations. This result on its own, therefore, represents a solid quantitative confirmation of the earlier exploratory results of Ref. [209], and confirms that the presence of a nCC in the DE sector can help accelerate structure formation, thereby aiding the formation of very massive objects at very high redshift beyond what is possible within Λ CDM (for more detailed explanations of why this occurs, we refer the reader to Ref. [209]).

It is also interesting to note that the favored region in w_0 - w_a parameter space is not far from $(w_0, w_a) = (-1, 0)$, while lying slightly within the phantom regime, in qualitative agreement with Ref. [209]. Within this region, we are able to achieve a consistency probability with the JWST measurements of up to 47%. Moreover, this same region is also consistent within $\approx 2\sigma$ with the region favored by SNeIa+QSOs. As Ω_Λ is increased, and we therefore move from the upper right quadrant to the two lower quadrants, we see a gradual shift in the required properties of the evolving DE component: this progressively shifts from being characterized by mostly quintessence-like behaviour (potentially crossing the phantom divide in the past, in agreement with the results of Ref. [209]), to a quintessence-like behaviour at present but a phantom behaviour in the past, i.e. moving towards the lower right part of the w_0 - w_a plane. The latter point is in excellent agreement with the earlier findings of Ref. [94], which indeed focused precisely on this regime, and showed that therein most of the $w_a > 0$ region is excluded, unless w_0 is deep in the phantom regime. Either way, it is clear that as Ω_Λ is increased, the point $(w_0, w_a) = (-1, 0)$ is progressively disfavored, with a probability of consistency of $< 10\%$ in the $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$ case (lower right quadrant), in agreement with Ref. [94]. In the latter case, one should pay attention to the fact that Fig. 2 in Ref. [94] plots the *exclusion* probability, whereas here we are plotting the probability for *consistency*: when one accounts for this, it is easy to see that the results are consistent with those of Ref. [94]. On the other hand, an AdS vacuum plus evolving DE component scenario displays a good consistency with the JWST measurements (see especially the upper right quadrant): the reason is that the presence of the nCC helps accelerate structure formation, thereby reducing the need for phantom DE, which also happens to be theoretically much harder to

accommodate with respect to a quintessence-like component.

While the above conclusions are robust on the theoretical side, critical issues may affect the measurements of Ref. [28] we are comparing against. In first place, potential uncertainties may affect the calibration of the JWST photometric data used therein. A second issue may concern the Chabrier IMF adopted by Ref. [28] to derive stellar masses. While we do not expect that assuming other universal forms for the IMF based on low-redshift conditions would change (or even strengthen) the constraints we have derived, the star formation process can be significantly different at redshifts as high as the ones we are concerned with (see e.g. Ref. [283]).




Figure 1. Contours in the w_0 - w_a plane colored by the probability of consistency with the stellar mass density inferred from the six most massive galaxies identified in the first NIRCcam observations of the JWST CEERS program, in the redshift range $9 \lesssim z \lesssim 11$, as reported in Ref. [28]. The contours are reported considering the dynamical DE model discussed in Sec. 2, featuring an evolving DE component with positive energy density, sitting on top of a vacuum energy component with density parameter $\Omega_\Lambda \gtrsim 0$. The four different quadrants correspond to different regimes for the value of Ω_Λ : all values $\Omega_\Lambda \gtrsim 0$ (upper left quadrant), $\Omega_\Lambda < -1$ (upper right quadrant), $-1 < \Omega_\Lambda < 0$ (lower left quadrant), and $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$ (lower right quadrant). As discussed in Sec. 3, we only consider combinations of cosmological parameters consistent within 2σ with the standard CMB+BAO+SNeIa cosmological probes. Our contours are compared to the 2σ and 3σ contours allowed by the latest CMB+BAO+SNeIa measurements (black contours) as reported in Ref. [281], and the combined Hubble diagram of SNeIa and quasars (QSOs, blue contours) reported in Ref. [282]. The green dot corresponds to the Λ CDM case ($w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$).

For such reasons, it is important to perform an independent test against spectroscopic

data in a different redshift range. With this in mind, we then proceed to carry out a comparison against the stellar mass density inferred from the three most massive, optically dark (dust-obscured) galaxies with robust spectroscopic redshifts from the JWST FRESCO survey [29]. Note that here as well the stellar masses have been conservatively inferred using a Chabrier IMF. We expect that assuming other universal forms for the IMF (e.g. Salpeter, Kennicutt) would yield similar or even larger values of M_* , and therefore our results can be interpreted as being conservative in this sense. As in our previous comparison, we conservatively consider for the measured value M_* the one corresponding to the lower tip of the uncertainty provided by Ref. [29]. As for the uncertainties in the number density, the confidence levels thereon are derived using the statistical method presented in Ref. [280], as discussed in Ref. [94].

The results of such a comparison are shown in Fig. 2, with the same quadrant structure as in Fig. 1. We see that the results are completely consistent, and very similar, to those obtained comparing against the photometric sample at higher redshift of Ref. [28]. The only quantitative difference is that overall we are able to achieve higher levels of consistency with the JWST FRESCO data, as high as 98%. Moreover, just as observed earlier, we see that the fraction of evolving DE models with phantom behaviour increases with increasing values of Ω_Λ , confirming the trend seen with the photometric sample: in other words, introducing a nCC helps accelerate structure formation and reduce the need for a phantom DE component, a welcome reduction from the theory point of view.

We stress that the CEERS and FRESCO datasets adopted are not the only JWST-based measurements of the abundance of high-redshift galaxies. The reason why we have adopted these and not others, however, is that at present they constitute the most constraining datasets, and are therefore best suited for the scope of the present work. For instance, NIRCcam observations of the GLASS-ERS 1324 program reported in Ref. [284] involve galaxies at comparable redshifts but with much lower stellar masses ($\log M_*/M_\odot \lesssim 9.5$), and are therefore not expected to significantly tighten existing cosmological constraints. On the other hand, JWST observations of the Hubble Ultra Deep Field (HUDF) and UKIDSS Ultra Deep Survey field reported in Ref. [285] extend to lower redshifts ($z \lesssim 8$) compared to ones we considered. Indeed, the measurements reported in Ref. [285] yield number densities which are comparable to, or even lower than, those reported in Ref. [286] for the CANDELS/UDS, GOODS-South, and HUDF fields. The cosmological implications of the measurements reported in Ref. [286] were analyzed by one of us in Ref. [88], finding much weaker constraints on dynamical DE compared to the ones obtained in Ref. [94] based on JWST CEERS data, and in the present work. Therefore, we do not expect that the measurements presented in Refs. [284, 285] would add much constraining power to constraints on dark energy from standard cosmological probes, although a study thereof could be interesting for follow-up works. The CEERS and FRESCO measurements we consider in the present work provide at present an unprecedented combination of high redshifts, large masses, and large abundances which make them uniquely suited for our study.

For completeness, in Fig. 3 we display the associated contours in the h - $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8 \sqrt{\Omega_m/0.3}$ parameter space, where $h \equiv H_0/(100 \text{ km/s/Mpc})$ is the reduced Hubble constant, and S_8 controls the overall strength of matter clustering in the late Universe. While the contours we obtain are, by construction, consistent with the standard cosmological observables we considered, they display some tension with weak lensing (and, to some extent, galaxy clustering) measurements, which favour lower values of S_8 (see e.g. Refs. [287–289]). This is of course not unexpected.




Figure 2. Same as in Fig. 1, but considering the three most massive, optically dark (dust-obscured) galaxies with robust spectroscopic redshifts identified within the JWST FRESCO survey, in the redshift range $5 \lesssim z \lesssim 6$, as reported in Ref. [29].

Before closing, a comment is in order regarding our treatment of the cosmic baryon fraction f_b . As explained earlier, we have not treated f_b as a free parameter, but as a derived parameter which is self-consistently computed from the values of ω_b , Ω_m , and H_0 at each point in the MCMC chains. This approach differs from a number of other studies on the cosmological implications of the JWST measurements, where f_b is either fixed to the best-fit value inferred within Λ CDM from the *Planck* 2018 measurements, or freely varied within some prior range. We believe our approach is somewhat more robust as it ensures that f_b is self-consistently constrained by the other probes at play, varying consistently with the same parameters which control our predictions for the growth of structure and thereby the stellar mass density. Of course, it is worth noting that the inferred values of f_b are model-dependent, and can be affected by the choice of both pre- and post-recombination models. Indeed, it is known that the assumed pre-recombination model can affect the inferred value of $\Omega_m h^2$, a fact which has been appreciated in the context of the Hubble tension [290], whereas $\Omega_b h^2$ is essentially fixed by considerations on Big Bang Nucleosynthesis and the relative height of the odd versus even acoustic peaks in the CMB. We note that higher (lower) values of f_b would lead to proportionally higher (lower) values of the cumulative comoving number and stellar mass densities of galaxies (as both scale linearly with f_b), thereby slightly weakening (strengthening) our existing constraints. Nevertheless, within the range of allowed model-




Figure 3. Contours of probability of consistency with the same observations considered in Fig. 2, and with the same color coding, in the plane of the reduced Hubble constant $h \equiv H_0/(100 \text{ km/s/Mpc})$ and the clustering parameter $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8 \sqrt{\Omega_m/0.3}$.

dependent values of f_b , the effect is expected to be small, and changes to the growth history associated to a different dark energy model are expected to be much larger.

5 Conclusions

The puzzling abundance of extremely massive galaxies at very high redshift unveiled by the early JWST observations has the potential to upturn the current concordance Λ CDM model, itself already plagued by other observational tensions. At the same time, the JWST observations can be used to test alternative cosmological models, and can potentially rule out those models which do not allow for a sufficiently fast growth of structure required to explain the formation of the galaxies observed by JWST. As argued by various earlier works [88, 94, 209], observations of the abundance of high-redshift galaxies can place strong constraints on dynamical DE models, in a way which is highly complementary to standard CMB, BAO, and SNeIa cosmological probes at low redshifts. In the earlier exploratory work of Ref. [209] some of us argued that a DE sector featuring a negative cosmological constant (AdS vacuum) with an evolving DE component on top, which carries strong motivation from string theory given the ubiquity of AdS vacua therein, can lead to a more efficient growth of structure at early times, potentially explaining the JWST observations. Our goal in this work has been that of

going beyond this exploratory analysis, by *a*) performing a more careful comparison of such a model against JWST data, while also *b*) better assessing the complementarity with standard cosmological probes, and *c*) considering also spectroscopic data from the JWST FRESCO survey [29] in order to place the results on a more solid footing.

Our results, which qualitatively confirm the exploratory findings of Ref. [209], can be summarized as follows:

- a DE sector featuring an evolving component with positive energy density on top of a negative cosmological constant with density parameter $\Omega_\Lambda < 0$ can indeed improve consistency with photometric JWST observations at redshifts $9 \lesssim z \lesssim 11$ (in agreement with the findings of Ref. [209]), with consistency of up to 47%;
- as Ω_Λ is increased, the behaviour evolving DE component progressively shifts towards a more phantom behaviour – to put it differently, introducing a negative cosmological constant allows for better agreement with the JWST observations with a decreased need for phantom behaviour, which is more problematic compared to a quintessence-like behaviour from a theoretical point of view;
- for $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$, the JWST observations favor dynamical DE models which cross the phantom divide, in agreement with the findings of Ref. [94];
- these findings remain intact when considering spectroscopic observations from the JWST FRESCO survey at $5 \lesssim z \lesssim 6$, placing all the earlier conclusions on a much more robust footing from the observational point of view;
- the JWST observations, and more generally observations of the abundance of high-redshift galaxies, are highly complementary to standard cosmological probes from CMB, BAO, and SNeIa, as well as observations of high-redshift QSOs.

In short, we have shown that DE sectors featuring a negative cosmological constant are extremely interesting from the perspective of the high-redshift galaxies observed by JWST. Moreover, this class of models, and more generally models featuring negative energy densities in the DE sector, also have the potential to partially (albeit not completely) alleviate the Hubble tension (see e.g. Refs. [191, 193, 195, 197, 291–296]). This therefore confirms that such models are interesting from all three the observational, phenomenological, and also theoretical perspective, in the latter case in light of their strong motivation from string theory.

Overall, our results further strengthen the case for illuminating the nature of DE, and more generally testing new fundamental physics, using observations of high-redshift galaxies, in a redshift range which cannot be reached by standard cosmological probes. We believe such observations have the potential to become an important “emergent probe” (see e.g. Refs. [10]) in coming years, especially with the achievable higher spatial resolution and improved sensitivity from future ALMA/NOEMA and deep JWST spectroscopic observations, whose complementarity with upcoming CMB measurements [297, 298] it would be interesting to explore. From the theory side, it could be interesting to extend our analysis to one implementing a fundamental string scenario from first principles, along the lines of Refs. [192, 299, 300]). The early JWST observations have the potential to shake modern cosmology and shed new light onto the nature of the dark sector components. Our work represents a small step in the latter direction, and we cannot wait to see what lies in store for cosmology as our long-awaited space telescope keeps gathering data.

Acknowledgments

N.M. acknowledges support from Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca (MUR, Italian Ministry for Universities and Research) through the Progetti di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale (PRIN) project “Black Hole winds and the Baryon Life Cycle of Galaxies: the stone-guest at the galaxy evolution supper” (grant agreement no. 2017-PH3WAT), and INAF Theory Grant “AGN-driven outflows in cosmological models of galaxy formation”. A.A.S. and U.M. acknowledge support from the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB) of the Government of India through research grant no. CRG/2020/004347. S.A.A., U.M., and A.A.S. acknowledge the use of the High Performance Computing facility Pegasus at IUCAA, Pune, India. S.V. acknowledges support from the University of Trento and the Provincia Autonoma di Trento (PAT, Autonomous Province of Trento) through the UniTrento Internal Call for Research 2023 grant “Searching for Dark Energy off the beaten track” (DARKTRACK, grant agreement no. E63C22000500003), and from the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) through the Commissione Scientifica Nazionale 4 (CSN4) Iniziativa Specifica “Quantum Fields in Gravity, Cosmology and Black Holes” (FLAG). This publication is based upon work from the COST Action CA21136 “Addressing observational tensions in cosmology with systematics and fundamental physics” (CosmoVerse), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

References

- [1] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *The Cosmological Constant and Dark Energy*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** (2003) 559 [[astro-ph/0207347](#)].
- [2] J. Frieman, M. Turner and D. Huterer, *Dark Energy and the Accelerating Universe*, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **46** (2008) 385 [[0803.0982](#)].
- [3] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov and V.K. Oikonomou, *Modified Gravity Theories on a Nutshell: Inflation, Bounce and Late-time Evolution*, *Phys. Rept.* **692** (2017) 1 [[1705.11098](#)].
- [4] SUPERNOVA SEARCH TEAM collaboration, *Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant*, *Astron. J.* **116** (1998) 1009 [[astro-ph/9805201](#)].
- [5] SUPERNOVA COSMOLOGY PROJECT collaboration, *Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high redshift supernovae*, *Astrophys. J.* **517** (1999) 565 [[astro-ph/9812133](#)].
- [6] S.M. Carroll, *The Cosmological constant*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4** (2001) 1 [[astro-ph/0004075](#)].
- [7] D. Huterer and D.L. Shafer, *Dark energy two decades after: Observables, probes, consistency tests*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81** (2018) 016901 [[1709.01091](#)].
- [8] L.A. Escamilla, W. Giarè, E. Di Valentino, R.C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *The state of the dark energy equation of state circa 2023*, [2307.14802](#).
- [9] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Challenges for Λ CDM: An update*, *New Astron. Rev.* **95** (2022) 101659 [[2105.05208](#)].
- [10] M. Moresco et al., *Unveiling the Universe with emerging cosmological probes*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **25** (2022) 6 [[2201.07241](#)].
- [11] P. Hamilton, M. Jaffe, P. Haslinger, Q. Simmons, H. Müller and J. Khoury, *Atom-interferometry constraints on dark energy*, *Science* **349** (2015) 849 [[1502.03888](#)].
- [12] C. Burrage and J. Sakstein, *A Compendium of Chameleon Constraints*, *JCAP* **11** (2016) 045 [[1609.01192](#)].

- [13] C. Burrage and J. Sakstein, *Tests of Chameleon Gravity*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **21** (2018) 1 [1709.09071].
- [14] S. Vagnozzi, L. Visinelli, P. Brax, A.-C. Davis and J. Sakstein, *Direct detection of dark energy: The XENON1T excess and future prospects*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 063023 [2103.15834].
- [15] Z. Zhang, *Geometrization of light bending and its application to SdS_w spacetime*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **39** (2022) 015003 [2112.04149].
- [16] F. Ferlito, S. Vagnozzi, D.F. Mota and M. Baldi, *Cosmological direct detection of dark energy: Non-linear structure formation signatures of dark energy scattering with visible matter*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **512** (2022) 1885 [2201.04528].
- [17] P. Brax, A.-C. Davis and B. Elder, *Screened scalar fields in hydrogen and muonium*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 044008 [2207.11633].
- [18] D. Benisty and S. Capozziello, *Tracking the Local Group dynamics by extended gravity*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39** (2023) 101175 [2301.06614].
- [19] R. Zhang and Z. Zhang, *Dark energy on astrophysical scales and its detection in the Milky Way*, *JCAP* **06** (2023) 031 [2303.14047].
- [20] D. Benisty, J. Mifsud, J. Levi Said and D. Staicova, *Strengthening extended gravity constraints with combined systems: $f(R)$ bounds from cosmology and the galactic center*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42** (2023) 101344 [2303.15040].
- [21] D. Benisty, P. Brax and A.-C. Davis, *Multiscale constraints on scalar-field couplings to matter: The geodesic and frame-dragging effects*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 063031 [2305.19977].
- [22] D. Benisty, A.-C. Davis and N.W. Evans, *Constraining Dark Energy from the Local Group Dynamics*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **953** (2023) L2 [2306.14963].
- [23] E.A. Paraskevas and L. Perivolaropoulos, *The density of virialized clusters as a probe of dark energy*, 2308.07046.
- [24] D. Benisty, J. Wagner and D. Staicova, *Dark Energy as a Critical Period in Binary Motion: Bounds from Multi-scale Binaries*, 2310.11488.
- [25] K. Kaneta, H.-S. Lee, J. Lee and J. Yi, *Non-gravitational signals of dark energy under a gauge symmetry*, 2312.09717.
- [26] T. O’Shea, A.-C. Davis, M. Giannotti, S. Vagnozzi, L. Visinelli and J.K. Vogel, *Solar chameleons: novel channels (I)*, 2406.01691.
- [27] J.P. Gardner et al., *The James Webb Space Telescope*, *Space Sci. Rev.* **123** (2006) 485 [astro-ph/0606175].
- [28] I. Labbé et al., *A population of red candidate massive galaxies ~ 600 Myr after the Big Bang*, *Nature* **616** (2023) 266 [2207.12446].
- [29] M. Xiao et al., *Massive Optically Dark Galaxies Unveiled by JWST Challenge Galaxy Formation Models*, 2309.02492.
- [30] P. Arrabal Haro, M. Dickinson, S.L. Finkelstein, S. Fujimoto, V. Fernández, J.S. Kartaltepe et al., *Spectroscopic Confirmation of CEERS NIRC*am*-selected Galaxies at $z \simeq 8 - 10$* , *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951** (2023) L22 [2304.05378].
- [31] A. Del Popolo and I.S. Yesilurt, *The cosmological mass function*, *Astron. Rep.* **51** (2007) 709 [astro-ph/0609166].
- [32] R. Jimenez, A. Cimatti, L. Verde, M. Moresco and B. Wandelt, *The local and distant Universe: stellar ages and H_0* , *JCAP* **03** (2019) 043 [1902.07081].
- [33] D. Valcin, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, J.L. Bernal and B.D. Wandelt, *The age of the Universe with globular clusters: reducing systematic uncertainties*, *JCAP* **08** (2021) 017 [2102.04486].

- [34] J.L. Bernal, L. Verde, R. Jimenez, M. Kamionkowski, D. Valcin and B.D. Wandelt, *The trouble beyond H_0 and the new cosmic triangles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 103533 [2102.05066].
- [35] S. Vagnozzi, F. Pacucci and A. Loeb, *Implications for the Hubble tension from the ages of the oldest astrophysical objects*, *JHEAp* **36** (2022) 27 [2105.10421].
- [36] J.-J. Wei and F. Melia, *Exploring the Hubble Tension and Spatial Curvature from the Ages of Old Astrophysical Objects*, *Astrophys. J.* **928** (2022) 165 [2202.07865].
- [37] A. Cimatti and M. Moresco, *Revisiting the Oldest Stars as Cosmological Probes: New Constraints on the Hubble Constant*, *Astrophys. J.* **953** (2023) 149 [2302.07899].
- [38] A.A. Costa, Z. Ren and Z. Yin, *A bias using the ages of the oldest astrophysical objects to address the Hubble tension*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 875 [2306.01234].
- [39] L. Verde, T. Treu and A.G. Riess, *Tensions between the Early and the Late Universe*, *Nature Astron.* **3** (2019) 891 [1907.10625].
- [40] E. Di Valentino et al., *Snowmass2021 - Letter of interest cosmology intertwined II: The hubble constant tension*, *Astropart. Phys.* **131** (2021) 102605 [2008.11284].
- [41] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri et al., *In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) 153001 [2103.01183].
- [42] E. Abdalla et al., *Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies*, *JHEAp* **34** (2022) 49 [2203.06142].
- [43] 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*, *Phys. Rept.* **984** (2022) 1 [2107.10291].
- [44] P. Shah, P. Lemos and O. Lahav, *A buyer’s guide to the Hubble constant*, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29** (2021) 9 [2109.01161].
- [45] M. Kamionkowski and A.G. Riess, *The Hubble Tension and Early Dark Energy*, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **73** (2023) 153 [2211.04492].
- [46] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, *Hubble Tension: The Evidence of New Physics*, *Universe* **9** (2023) 94 [2302.05709].
- [47] S. Vagnozzi, *Seven hints that early-time new physics alone is not sufficient to solve the Hubble tension*, *Universe* **9** (2023) 393 [2308.16628].
- [48] L. Verde, N. Schöneberg and H. Gil-Marín, *A tale of many H_0* , [2311.13305](#).
- [49] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R.C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi and D.F. Mota, *Tale of stable interacting dark energy, observational signatures, and the H_0 tension*, *JCAP* **09** (2018) 019 [1805.08252].
- [50] R.-Y. Guo, J.-F. Zhang and X. Zhang, *Can the H_0 tension be resolved in extensions to Λ CDM cosmology?*, *JCAP* **02** (2019) 054 [1809.02340].
- [51] J. Sola Peracaula, A. Gomez-Valent and J. de Cruz Pérez, *Signs of Dynamical Dark Energy in Current Observations*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **25** (2019) 100311 [1811.03505].
- [52] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, *Interacting dark energy in the early 2020s: A promising solution to the H_0 and cosmic shear tensions*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30** (2020) 100666 [1908.04281].
- [53] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, *Nonminimal dark sector physics and cosmological tensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 063502 [1910.09853].

- [54] M. Zumalacarregui, *Gravity in the Era of Equality: Towards solutions to the Hubble problem without fine-tuned initial conditions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 023523 [2003.06396].
- [55] A. Gómez-Valent, V. Pettorino and L. Amendola, *Update on coupled dark energy and the H_0 tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 123513 [2004.00610].
- [56] E. Di Valentino, S. Gariazzo, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, *Soundness of Dark Energy properties*, *JCAP* **07** (2020) 045 [2005.02062].
- [57] C. Moreno-Pulido and J. Sola, *Running vacuum in quantum field theory in curved spacetime: renormalizing ρ_{vac} without $\sim m^4$ terms*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 692 [2005.03164].
- [58] L.-Y. Gao, Z.-W. Zhao, S.-S. Xue and X. Zhang, *Relieving the H_0 tension with a new interacting dark energy model*, *JCAP* **07** (2021) 005 [2101.10714].
- [59] J. Solà Peracaula, A. Gómez-Valent, J. de Cruz Perez and C. Moreno-Pulido, *Running vacuum against the H_0 and σ_8 tensions*, *EPL* **134** (2021) 19001 [2102.12758].
- [60] M. Petronikolou, S. Basilakos and E.N. Saridakis, *Alleviating H_0 tension in Horndeski gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 124051 [2110.01338].
- [61] G. Alestas, D. Camarena, E. Di Valentino, L. Kazantzidis, V. Marra, S. Nesseris et al., *Late-transition versus smooth $H(z)$ -deformation models for the resolution of the Hubble crisis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 063538 [2110.04336].
- [62] C. Moreno-Pulido and J. Sola Peracaula, *Renormalizing the vacuum energy in cosmological spacetime: implications for the cosmological constant problem*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 551 [2201.05827].
- [63] N. Roy, S. Goswami and S. Das, *Quintessence or phantom: Study of scalar field dark energy models through a general parametrization of the Hubble parameter*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **36** (2022) 101037 [2201.09306].
- [64] R.K. Sharma, K.L. Pandey and S. Das, *Implications of an Extended Dark Energy Model with Massive Neutrinos*, *Astrophys. J.* **934** (2022) 113 [2202.01749].
- [65] J. Sola Peracaula, *The cosmological constant problem and running vacuum in the expanding universe*, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **380** (2022) 20210182 [2203.13757].
- [66] H. Moshafi, H. Firouzjahi and A. Talebian, *Multiple Transitions in Vacuum Dark Energy and H_0 Tension*, *Astrophys. J.* **940** (2022) 121 [2208.05583].
- [67] T. Schiavone, G. Montani and F. Bombacigno, *$f(R)$ gravity in the Jordan frame as a paradigm for the Hubble tension*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **522** (2023) L72 [2211.16737].
- [68] L.-Y. Gao, S.-S. Xue and X. Zhang, *Dark energy and matter interacting scenario to relieve H_0 and S_8 tensions**, *Chin. Phys. C* **48** (2024) 051001 [2212.13146].
- [69] A. Bernui, E. Di Valentino, W. Giarè, S. Kumar and R.C. Nunes, *Exploring the H_0 tension and the evidence for dark sector interactions from 2D BAO measurements*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 103531 [2301.06097].
- [70] I. Ben-Dayana and U. Kumar, *Emergent Unparticles Dark Energy can restore cosmological concordance*, *JCAP* **12** (2023) 047 [2302.00067].
- [71] J. de Cruz Perez and J. Sola Peracaula, *Running vacuum in Brans & Dicke theory: A possible cure for the σ_8 and H_0 tensions*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **43** (2024) 101406 [2302.04807].
- [72] Y. Zhai, W. Giarè, C. van de Bruck, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena and R.C. Nunes, *A consistent view of interacting dark energy from multiple CMB probes*, *JCAP* **07** (2023) 032 [2303.08201].
- [73] J. Sola Peracaula, A. Gomez-Valent, J. de Cruz Perez and C. Moreno-Pulido, *Running Vacuum in the Universe: Phenomenological Status in Light of the Latest Observations, and Its Impact on the σ_8 and H_0 Tensions*, *Universe* **9** (2023) 262 [2304.11157].

- [74] S. Basilakos, A. Lymperis, M. Petronikolou and E.N. Saridakis, *Alleviating both H_0 and σ_8 tensions in Tsallis cosmology*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 297 [2308.01200].
- [75] M. Petronikolou and E.N. Saridakis, *Alleviating the H_0 Tension in Scalar–Tensor and Bi-Scalar–Tensor Theories*, *Universe* **9** (2023) 397 [2308.16044].
- [76] V. Poulin, T.L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 221301 [1811.04083].
- [77] F. Niedermann and M.S. Sloth, *New early dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) L041303 [1910.10739].
- [78] 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* **102** (2020) 083513 [2005.14053].
- [79] V.K. Oikonomou, *Unifying inflation with early and late dark energy epochs in axion $F(R)$ gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 044036 [2012.00586].
- [80] S. Vagnozzi, *Consistency tests of Λ CDM from the early integrated Sachs-Wolfe effect: Implications for early-time new physics and the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 063524 [2105.10425].
- [81] T. Karwal, M. Raveri, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden, *Chameleon early dark energy and the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 063535 [2106.13290].
- [82] G. Benevento, J.A. Kable, G.E. Addison and C.L. Bennett, *An Exploration of an Early Gravity Transition in Light of Cosmological Tensions*, *Astrophys. J.* **935** (2022) 156 [2202.09356].
- [83] A. Reeves, L. Herold, S. Vagnozzi, B.D. Sherwin and E.G.M. Ferreira, *Restoring cosmological concordance with early dark energy and massive neutrinos?*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520** (2023) 3688 [2207.01501].
- [84] 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*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42** (2023) 101348 [2302.09032].
- [85] S.D. Odintsov, V.K. Oikonomou and G.S. Sharov, *Early dark energy with power-law $F(R)$ gravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **843** (2023) 137988 [2305.17513].
- [86] A. Gómez-Valent, A. Favale, M. Migliaccio and A.A. Sen, *Late-time phenomenology required to solve the H_0 tension in view of the cosmic ladders and the anisotropic and angular BAO datasets*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 023525 [2309.07795].
- [87] I. Tutusaus, M. Kunz and L. Favre, *Solving the Hubble tension at intermediate redshifts with dynamical dark energy*, [2311.16862](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16862).
- [88] N. Menci et al., *Constraints on Dynamical Dark Energy Models from the Abundance of Massive Galaxies at High Redshifts*, *Astrophys. J.* **900** (2020) 108 [2007.12453].
- [89] C.C. Lovell, I. Harrison, Y. Harikane, S. Tacchella and S.M. Wilkins, *Extreme value statistics of the halo and stellar mass distributions at high redshift: are JWST results in tension with Λ CDM?*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518** (2022) 2511 [2208.10479].
- [90] M. Boylan-Kolchin, *Stress testing Λ CDM with high-redshift galaxy candidates*, *Nature Astron.* **7** (2023) 731 [2208.01611].
- [91] M. Forconi, Ruchika, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and N. Menci, *Do the early galaxies observed by JWST disagree with Planck’s CMB polarization measurements?*, *JCAP* **10** (2023) 012 [2306.07781].
- [92] D. Wang and Y. Liu, *JWST high redshift galaxy observations have a strong tension with Planck CMB measurements*, [2301.00347](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00347).

- [93] M. Forconi, W. Giarè, O. Mena, Ruchika, E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri et al., *A double take on early and interacting dark energy from JWST*, [2312.11074](#).
- [94] N. Menci, M. Castellano, P. Santini, E. Merlin, A. Fontana and F. Shankar, *High-redshift Galaxies from Early JWST Observations: Constraints on Dark Energy Models*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **938** (2022) L5 [[2208.11471](#)].
- [95] R.R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N.N. Weinberg, *Phantom energy and cosmic doomsday*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 071301 [[astro-ph/0302506](#)].
- [96] P. Wang, B.-Y. Su, L. Zu, Y. Yang and L. Feng, *Exploring the Dark Energy Equation of State with JWST*, [2307.11374](#).
- [97] M. Biagetti, G. Franciolini and A. Riotto, *High-redshift JWST Observations and Primordial Non-Gaussianity*, *Astrophys. J.* **944** (2023) 113 [[2210.04812](#)].
- [98] M. Haslbauer, P. Kroupa, A.H. Zonoozi and H. Haghi, *Has JWST Already Falsified Dark-matter-driven Galaxy Formation?*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **939** (2022) L31 [[2210.14915](#)].
- [99] G. Hütsi, M. Raidal, J. Urrutia, V. Vaskonen and H. Veermäe, *Did JWST observe imprints of axion miniclusters or primordial black holes?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 043502 [[2211.02651](#)].
- [100] G. Gandolfi, A. Lapi, T. Ronconi and L. Danese, *Astroparticle Constraints from the Cosmic Star Formation Rate Density at High Redshift: Current Status and Forecasts for JWST*, *Universe* **8** (2022) 589 [[2211.02840](#)].
- [101] U. Maio and M. Viel, *JWST high-redshift galaxy constraints on warm and cold dark matter models*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **672** (2023) A71 [[2211.03620](#)].
- [102] G.-W. Yuan, L. Lei, Y.-Z. Wang, B. Wang, Y.-Y. Wang, C. Chen et al., *Rapidly growing primordial black holes as seeds of the massive high-redshift JWST Galaxies*, [2303.09391](#).
- [103] P. Dayal and S.K. Giri, *Warm dark matter constraints from the JWST*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **528** (2024) 2784 [[2303.14239](#)].
- [104] C. Ilie, J. Paulin and K. Freese, *Supermassive Dark Star candidates seen by JWST*, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **120** (2023) e2305762120 [[2304.01173](#)].
- [105] H. Jiao, R. Brandenberger and A. Refregier, *Early structure formation from cosmic string loops in light of early JWST observations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 043510 [[2304.06429](#)].
- [106] P. Parashari and R. Laha, *Primordial power spectrum in light of JWST observations of high redshift galaxies*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **526** (2023) L63 [[2305.00999](#)].
- [107] S. Hassan et al., *JWST Constraints on the UV Luminosity Density at Cosmic Dawn: Implications for 21 cm Cosmology*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **958** (2023) L3 [[2305.02703](#)].
- [108] L. Lei et al., *Black holes as the source of dark energy: A stringent test with high-redshift JWST AGNs*, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **67** (2024) 229811 [[2305.03408](#)].
- [109] S. Yoshiura, T. Minoda and T. Takahashi, *EDGES and JWST with 21cm global signal emulator*, [2305.11441](#).
- [110] H. Padmanabhan and A. Loeb, *Alleviating the Need for Exponential Evolution of JWST Galaxies in $10^{10} M_{\odot}$ Haloes at $z > 10$ by a Modified Λ CDM Power Spectrum*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **953** (2023) L4 [[2306.04684](#)].
- [111] H. Lin, Y. Gong, B. Yue and X. Chen, *Implications of the Stellar Mass Density of High- z Massive Galaxies from JWST on Warm Dark Matter*, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **24** (2024) 015009 [[2306.05648](#)].
- [112] B.-Y. Su, N. Li and L. Feng, *An inflation model for massive primordial black holes to interpret the JWST observations*, [2306.05364](#).

- [113] Y. Gouttenoire, S. Trifinopoulos, G. Valogiannis and M. Vanvlasselaer, *Scrutinizing the primordial black hole interpretation of PTA gravitational waves and JWST early galaxies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 123002 [2307.01457].
- [114] S.-Y. Guo, M. Khlopov, X. Liu, L. Wu, Y. Wu and B. Zhu, *Footprints of Axion-Like Particle in Pulsar Timing Array Data and JWST Observations*, **2306.17022**.
- [115] H.-L. Huang, Y. Cai, J.-Q. Jiang, J. Zhang and Y.-S. Piao, *Supermassive primordial black holes in multiverse: for nano-Hertz gravitational wave and high-redshift JWST galaxies*, **2306.17577**.
- [116] S. Bird, C.-F. Chang, Y. Cui and D. Yang, *Enhanced Early Galaxy Formation in JWST from Axion Dark Matter?*, **2307.10302**.
- [117] S. Libanore, J. Flitter, E.D. Kovetz, Z. Li and A. Dekel, *Effects of feedback-free starburst galaxies on the 21-cm signal and reionization history*, **2310.03021**.
- [118] J. Wang, Z. Huang, L. Huang and J. Liu, *Quantifying the Tension between Cosmological Models and JWST Red Candidate Massive Galaxies*, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **24** (2024) 045001 [2311.02866].
- [119] M.H.P.M. van Putten, *The Fast and Furious in JWST high- z galaxies*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **43** (2024) 101417 [2312.16692].
- [120] A. Ferrara, A. Pallottini and P. Dayal, *On the stunning abundance of super-early, luminous galaxies revealed by JWST*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **522** (2023) 3986 [2208.00720].
- [121] Y. Qin, S. Balu and J.S.B. Wyithe, *Implications of $z \gtrsim 12$ JWST galaxies for galaxy formation at high redshift*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **526** (2023) 1324 [2305.17959].
- [122] A. Pallottini and A. Ferrara, *Stochastic star formation in early galaxies: Implications for the James Webb Space Telescope*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **677** (2023) L4 [2307.03219].
- [123] Y.-Y. Wang, L. Lei, G.-W. Yuan and Y.-Z. Fan, *Modeling the JWST High-redshift Galaxies with a General Formation Scenario and the Consistency with the Λ CDM Model*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **954** (2023) L48 [2307.12487].
- [124] F. Pacucci, B. Nguyen, S. Carniani, R. Maiolino and X. Fan, *JWST CEERS and JADES Active Galaxies at $z = 4-7$ Violate the Local $M_{\bullet}-M_{*}$: Implications for Low-mass Black Holes and Seeding Models*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **957** (2023) L3 [2308.12331].
- [125] F. Iocco and L. Visinelli, *Compatibility of JWST results with exotic halos*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **44** (2024) 101496 [2403.13068].
- [126] C.L. Steinhardt, V. Kokorev, V. Rusakov, E. Garcia and A. Sneppen, *Templates for Fitting Photometry of Ultra-high-redshift Galaxies*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951** (2023) L40 [2208.07879].
- [127] G. Desprez et al., *Λ CDM not dead yet: massive high- z Balmer break galaxies are less common than previously reported*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **530** (2024) 2935 [2310.03063].
- [128] J.L. Bernal, L. Verde and A.G. Riess, *The trouble with H_0* , *JCAP* **10** (2016) 019 [1607.05617].
- [129] G.E. Addison, D.J. Watts, C.L. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw and J.L. Weiland, *Elucidating Λ CDM: Impact of Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurements on the Hubble Constant Discrepancy*, *Astrophys. J.* **853** (2018) 119 [1707.06547].
- [130] P. Lemos, E. Lee, G. Efstathiou and S. Gratton, *Model independent $H(z)$ reconstruction using the cosmic inverse distance ladder*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **483** (2019) 4803 [1806.06781].
- [131] K. Aylor, M. Joy, L. Knox, M. Millea, S. Raghunathan and W.L.K. Wu, *Sounds Discordant: Classical Distance Ladder & Λ CDM -based Determinations of the Cosmological Sound Horizon*, *Astrophys. J.* **874** (2019) 4 [1811.00537].

- [132] N. Schöneberg, J. Lesgourgues and D.C. Hooper, *The BAO+BBN take on the Hubble tension*, *JCAP* **10** (2019) 029 [[1907.11594](#)].
- [133] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Hubble constant hunter’s guide*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 043533 [[1908.03663](#)].
- [134] N. Arendse et al., *Cosmic dissonance: are new physics or systematics behind a short sound horizon?*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **639** (2020) A57 [[1909.07986](#)].
- [135] G. Efstathiou, *To H_0 or not to H_0 ?*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505** (2021) 3866 [[2103.08723](#)].
- [136] R.-G. Cai, Z.-K. Guo, S.-J. Wang, W.-W. Yu and Y. Zhou, *No-go guide for the Hubble tension: Late-time solutions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) L021301 [[2107.13286](#)].
- [137] R.E. Keeley and A. Shafieloo, *Ruling Out New Physics at Low Redshift as a Solution to the H_0 Tension*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) 111002 [[2206.08440](#)].
- [138] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis and L. Perivolaropoulos, *H_0 tension, phantom dark energy, and cosmological parameter degeneracies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 123516 [[2004.08363](#)].
- [139] G.-B. Zhao et al., *Dynamical dark energy in light of the latest observations*, *Nature Astron.* **1** (2017) 627 [[1701.08165](#)].
- [140] E. Mörtzell and S. Dhawan, *Does the Hubble constant tension call for new physics?*, *JCAP* **09** (2018) 025 [[1801.07260](#)].
- [141] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, *A Simple Phenomenological Emergent Dark Energy Model can Resolve the Hubble Tension*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **883** (2019) L3 [[1906.08275](#)].
- [142] S. Vagnozzi, *New physics in light of the H_0 tension: An alternative view*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 023518 [[1907.07569](#)].
- [143] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis and L. Perivolaropoulos, *$w - M$ phantom transition at $z_t < 0.1$ as a resolution of the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 083517 [[2012.13932](#)].
- [144] W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan, Y. Wu and J. Lu, *Dynamical dark energy after Planck CMB final release and H_0 tension*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **501** (2021) 5845 [[2101.02168](#)].
- [145] S. Kumar, *Remedy of some cosmological tensions via effective phantom-like behavior of interacting vacuum energy*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **33** (2021) 100862 [[2102.12902](#)].
- [146] Y.-P. Teng, W. Lee and K.-W. Ng, *Constraining the dark-energy equation of state with cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 083519 [[2105.02667](#)].
- [147] L. Heisenberg, H. Villarrubia-Rojo and J. Zosso, *Simultaneously solving the H_0 and σ_8 tensions with late dark energy*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39** (2023) 101163 [[2201.11623](#)].
- [148] A. Chudaykin, D. Gorbunov and N. Nedelko, *Exploring Λ CDM extensions with SPT-3G and Planck data: 4σ evidence for neutrino masses and implications of extended dark energy models for cosmological tensions*, [2203.03666](#).
- [149] M.K. Sharma, S.K.J. Pacif, G. Yergaliyeva and K. Yesmakhanova, *The oscillatory universe, phantom crossing and the Hubble tension*, *Annals Phys.* **454** (2023) 169345 [[2205.13514](#)].
- [150] M. Ballardini, A.G. Ferrari and F. Finelli, *Phantom scalar-tensor models and cosmological tensions*, *JCAP* **04** (2023) 029 [[2302.05291](#)].
- [151] S. Dahmani, A. Bouali, I. El Bojaddaini, A. Errahmani and T. Ouali, *Smoothing the H_0 tension with a phantom dynamical dark energy model*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42** (2023) 101266.
- [152] G. Montani, M. De Angelis, F. Bombacigno and N. Carlevaro, *Metric $f(R)$ gravity with dynamical dark energy as a scenario for the Hubble tension*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **527** (2024) L156 [[2306.11101](#)].

- [153] S.S. da Costa, D.R. da Silva, A.S. de Jesus, N. Pinto-Neto and F.S. Queiroz, *The H_0 trouble: confronting non-thermal dark matter and phantom cosmology with the CMB, BAO, and Type Ia supernovae data*, *JCAP* **04** (2024) 035 [[2311.07420](#)].
- [154] S. Weinberg, *The Cosmological Constant Problem*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989) 1.
- [155] T. Padmanabhan, *Cosmological constant: The Weight of the vacuum*, *Phys. Rept.* **380** (2003) 235 [[hep-th/0212290](#)].
- [156] C. Wetterich, *Cosmology and the Fate of Dilatation Symmetry*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302** (1988) 668 [[1711.03844](#)].
- [157] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Cosmology with a Time Variable Cosmological Constant*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **325** (1988) L17.
- [158] B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, *Cosmological Consequences of a Rolling Homogeneous Scalar Field*, *Phys. Rev. D* **37** (1988) 3406.
- [159] C. Wetterich, *The Cosmon model for an asymptotically vanishing time dependent cosmological 'constant'*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **301** (1995) 321 [[hep-th/9408025](#)].
- [160] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, *Cosmological imprint of an energy component with general equation of state*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 1582 [[astro-ph/9708069](#)].
- [161] A. Vikman, *Can dark energy evolve to the phantom?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 023515 [[astro-ph/0407107](#)].
- [162] S.M. Carroll, A. De Felice and M. Trodden, *Can we be tricked into thinking that w is less than -1 ?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 023525 [[astro-ph/0408081](#)].
- [163] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov and S. Tsujikawa, *Properties of singularities in (phantom) dark energy universe*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 063004 [[hep-th/0501025](#)].
- [164] V.K. Oikonomou and I. Giannakoudi, *A panorama of viable $F(R)$ gravity dark energy models*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31** (2022) 2250075 [[2205.08599](#)].
- [165] O. Trivedi, *Recent advances in cosmological singularities*, [2309.08954](#).
- [166] S. Vagnozzi, S. Dhawan, M. Gerbino, K. Freese, A. Goobar and O. Mena, *Constraints on the sum of the neutrino masses in dynamical dark energy models with $w(z) \geq -1$ are tighter than those obtained in Λ CDM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 083501 [[1801.08553](#)].
- [167] E. Ó Colgáin, M.H.P.M. van Putten and H. Yavartanoo, *de Sitter Swampland, H_0 tension | \mathcal{E} observation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **793** (2019) 126 [[1807.07451](#)].
- [168] E. Ó Colgáin and H. Yavartanoo, *Testing the Swampland: H_0 tension*, *Phys. Lett. B* **797** (2019) 134907 [[1905.02555](#)].
- [169] A. Banerjee, H. Cai, L. Heisenberg, E.O. Colgáin, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari and T. Yang, *Hubble sinks in the low-redshift swampland*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) L081305 [[2006.00244](#)].
- [170] B.-H. Lee, W. Lee, E.O. Colgáin, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari and S. Thakur, *Is local H_0 at odds with dark energy EFT?*, *JCAP* **04** (2022) 004 [[2202.03906](#)].
- [171] U.H. Danielsson and T. Van Riet, *What if string theory has no de Sitter vacua?*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **27** (2018) 1830007 [[1804.01120](#)].
- [172] C. Vafa, *The String landscape and the swampland*, [hep-th/0509212](#).
- [173] E. Palti, *The Swampland: Introduction and Review*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **67** (2019) 1900037 [[1903.06239](#)].
- [174] M. Graña and A. Herráez, *The Swampland Conjectures: A Bridge from Quantum Gravity to Particle Physics*, *Universe* **7** (2021) 273 [[2107.00087](#)].

- [175] G. Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko and C. Vafa, *De Sitter Space and the Swampland*, [1806.08362](#).
- [176] P. Agrawal, G. Obied, P.J. Steinhardt and C. Vafa, *On the Cosmological Implications of the String Swampland*, *Phys. Lett. B* **784** (2018) 271 [[1806.09718](#)].
- [177] A. Achúcarro and G.A. Palma, *The string swampland constraints require multi-field inflation*, *JCAP* **02** (2019) 041 [[1807.04390](#)].
- [178] S.K. Garg and C. Krishnan, *Bounds on Slow Roll and the de Sitter Swampland*, *JHEP* **11** (2019) 075 [[1807.05193](#)].
- [179] A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, *A note on Inflation and the Swampland*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **66** (2018) 1800052 [[1807.05445](#)].
- [180] W.H. Kinney, S. Vagnozzi and L. Visinelli, *The zoo plot meets the swampland: mutual (in)consistency of single-field inflation, string conjectures, and cosmological data*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) 117001 [[1808.06424](#)].
- [181] H. Ooguri, E. Palti, G. Shiu and C. Vafa, *Distance and de Sitter Conjectures on the Swampland*, *Phys. Lett. B* **788** (2019) 180 [[1810.05506](#)].
- [182] S.D. Odintsov and V.K. Oikonomou, *Swampland implications of GW170817-compatible Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **805** (2020) 135437 [[2004.00479](#)].
- [183] V.K. Oikonomou, *Rescaled Einstein-Hilbert Gravity from $f(R)$ Gravity: Inflation, Dark Energy and the Swampland Criteria*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 124028 [[2012.01312](#)].
- [184] M. Cicoli, F. Cunillera, A. Padilla and F.G. Pedro, *Quintessence and the Swampland: The Numerically Controlled Regime of Moduli Space*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **70** (2022) 2200008 [[2112.10783](#)].
- [185] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A.D. Linde and S.P. Trivedi, *De Sitter vacua in string theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 046005 [[hep-th/0301240](#)].
- [186] V. Balasubramanian, P. Berglund, J.P. Conlon and F. Quevedo, *Systematics of moduli stabilisation in Calabi-Yau flux compactifications*, *JHEP* **03** (2005) 007 [[hep-th/0502058](#)].
- [187] J.M. Maldacena, *The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231 [[hep-th/9711200](#)].
- [188] R. Cardenas, T. Gonzalez, Y. Leiva, O. Martin and I. Quiros, *A model of the universe including dark energy accounted for by both a quintessence field and a (negative) cosmological constant*, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 083501 [[astro-ph/0206315](#)].
- [189] V. Poulin, K.K. Boddy, S. Bird and M. Kamionkowski, *Implications of an extended dark energy cosmology with massive neutrinos for cosmological tensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 123504 [[1803.02474](#)].
- [190] K. Dutta, Ruchika, A. Roy, A.A. Sen and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Beyond Λ CDM with low and high redshift data: implications for dark energy*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52** (2020) 15 [[1808.06623](#)].
- [191] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi and U. Danielsson, *Revisiting a negative cosmological constant from low-redshift data*, *Symmetry* **11** (2019) 1035 [[1907.07953](#)].
- [192] Ruchika, S.A. Adil, K. Dutta, A. Mukherjee and A.A. Sen, *Observational constraints on axion(s) dark energy with a cosmological constant*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40** (2023) 101199 [[2005.08813](#)].
- [193] E. Di Valentino, A. Mukherjee and A.A. Sen, *Dark Energy with Phantom Crossing and the H_0 Tension*, *Entropy* **23** (2021) 404 [[2005.12587](#)].
- [194] R. Calderón, R. Gannouji, B. L’Huillier and D. Polarski, *Negative cosmological constant in the dark sector?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 023526 [[2008.10237](#)].

- [195] A.A. Sen, S.A. Adil and S. Sen, *Do cosmological observations allow a negative Λ ?*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518** (2022) 1098 [2112.10641].
- [196] M. Malekjani, R.M. Conville, E.O. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *On redshift evolution and negative dark energy density in Pantheon + Supernovae*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 317 [2301.12725].
- [197] S.A. Adil, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, R.C. Nunes, E. Özlüker, A.A. Sen et al., *Omnipotent dark energy: A phenomenological answer to the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 023527 [2306.08046].
- [198] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Is the Hubble tension a hint of AdS phase around recombination?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 083507 [2001.02451].
- [199] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *T_0 censorship of early dark energy and AdS vacua*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 083523 [2008.10832].
- [200] G. Ye, B. Hu and Y.-S. Piao, *Implication of the Hubble tension for the primordial Universe in light of recent cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 063510 [2103.09729].
- [201] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Testing AdS early dark energy with Planck, SPTpol, and LSS data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 103524 [2107.07128].
- [202] G. Ye, J. Zhang and Y.-S. Piao, *Alleviating both H_0 and S_8 tensions: Early dark energy lifts the CMB-lockdown on ultralight axion*, *Phys. Lett. B* **839** (2023) 137770 [2107.13391].
- [203] J.-Q. Jiang, G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Return of Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum in light of recent cosmological tensions*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **527** (2024) L54 [2210.06125].
- [204] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Toward early dark energy and $n_s=1$ with Planck, ACT, and SPT observations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 103514 [2202.13379].
- [205] J.-Q. Jiang, G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Impact of the Hubble tension on the $r-n_s$ contour*, *Phys. Lett. B* **851** (2024) 138588 [2303.12345].
- [206] G. Ye, J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Shape of CMB lensing in the early dark energy cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 063512 [2305.18873].
- [207] Z.-Y. Peng and Y.-S. Piao, *Testing the n_s - H_0 scaling relation with Planck-independent CMB data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 023519 [2308.01012].
- [208] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, *Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension*, [2404.18579](#).
- [209] S.A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A.A. Sen and S. Vagnozzi, *Dark energy in light of the early JWST observations: case for a negative cosmological constant?*, *JCAP* **10** (2023) 072 [2307.12763].
- [210] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Accelerating universes with scaling dark matter*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10** (2001) 213 [gr-qc/0009008].
- [211] E.V. Linder, *Exploring the expansion history of the universe*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 091301 [astro-ph/0208512].
- [212] E.V. Linder, *The paths of quintessence*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 063010 [astro-ph/0601052].
- [213] E.V. Linder, *The Dynamics of Quintessence, The Quintessence of Dynamics*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** (2008) 329 [0704.2064].
- [214] E.V. Linder, *Mapping the Cosmological Expansion*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **71** (2008) 056901 [0801.2968].
- [215] R.J. Scherrer, *Mapping the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder parametrization onto Physical Dark Energy Models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 043001 [1505.05781].

- [216] E.O. Colgáin, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari and L. Yin, *Can dark energy be dynamical?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 023510 [[2104.01930](#)].
- [217] G. Efstathiou, *Constraining the equation of state of the universe from distant type Ia supernovae and cosmic microwave background anisotropies*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **310** (1999) 842 [[astro-ph/9904356](#)].
- [218] H.K. Jassal, J.S. Bagla and T. Padmanabhan, *WMAP constraints on low redshift evolution of dark energy*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **356** (2005) L11 [[astro-ph/0404378](#)].
- [219] Y.-g. Gong and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Probing the curvature and dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 043518 [[astro-ph/0502262](#)].
- [220] E.M. Barboza, Jr. and J.S. Alcaniz, *A parametric model for dark energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **666** (2008) 415 [[0805.1713](#)].
- [221] J.-Z. Ma and X. Zhang, *Probing the dynamics of dark energy with novel parametrizations*, *Phys. Lett. B* **699** (2011) 233 [[1102.2671](#)].
- [222] G. Pantazis, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Comparison of thawing and freezing dark energy parametrizations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 103503 [[1603.02164](#)].
- [223] W. Yang, S. Pan and A. Paliathanasis, *Latest astronomical constraints on some non-linear parametric dark energy models*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **475** (2018) 2605 [[1708.01717](#)].
- [224] S. Pan, E.N. Saridakis and W. Yang, *Observational Constraints on Oscillating Dark-Energy Parametrizations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 063510 [[1712.05746](#)].
- [225] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, E.N. Saridakis and S. Chakraborty, *Observational constraints on one-parameter dynamical dark-energy parametrizations and the H_0 tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 043543 [[1810.05141](#)].
- [226] J.K. Singh, P. Singh, E.N. Saridakis, S. Myrzakul and H. Balhara, *New parametrization of the dark-energy equation of state with a single parameter*, *Universe* **10** (2024) 246 [[2304.03783](#)].
- [227] D. Perkovic and H. Stefancic, *Barotropic fluid compatible parametrizations of dark energy*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 629 [[2004.05342](#)].
- [228] B. Feng, M. Li, Y.-S. Piao and X. Zhang, *Oscillating quintom and the recurrent universe*, *Phys. Lett. B* **634** (2006) 101 [[astro-ph/0407432](#)].
- [229] Z.-K. Guo, Y.-S. Piao, X.-M. Zhang and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Cosmological evolution of a quintom model of dark energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **608** (2005) 177 [[astro-ph/0410654](#)].
- [230] Y.-f. Cai, M.-z. Li, J.-X. Lu, Y.-S. Piao, T.-t. Qiu and X.-m. Zhang, *A String-Inspired Quintom Model Of Dark Energy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **651** (2007) 1 [[hep-th/0701016](#)].
- [231] Y.-F. Cai, T. Qiu, Y.-S. Piao, M. Li and X. Zhang, *Bouncing universe with quintom matter*, *JHEP* **10** (2007) 071 [[0704.1090](#)].
- [232] X. Zhang, *Holographic Ricci dark energy: Current observational constraints, quintom feature, and the reconstruction of scalar-field dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 103509 [[0901.2262](#)].
- [233] E.N. Saridakis, *Quintom evolution in power-law potentials*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **830** (2010) 374 [[0903.3840](#)].
- [234] Y.-F. Cai, M. Li and X. Zhang, *Emergent Universe Scenario via Quintom Matter*, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2012) 248 [[1209.3437](#)].
- [235] S. Bahamonde, M. Marciu and P. Rudra, *Generalised teleparallel quintom dark energy non-minimally coupled with the scalar torsion and a boundary term*, *JCAP* **04** (2018) 056 [[1802.09155](#)].
- [236] G. Leon, A. Paliathanasis and J.L. Morales-Martínez, *The past and future dynamics of quintom dark energy models*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 753 [[1808.05634](#)].

- [237] S. Panpanich, P. Burikham, S. Ponglertsakul and L. Tannukij, *Resolving Hubble Tension with Quintom Dark Energy Model*, *Chin. Phys. C* **45** (2021) 015108 [[1908.03324](#)].
- [238] Y.-F. Cai, E.N. Saridakis, M.R. Setare and J.-Q. Xia, *Quintom Cosmology: Theoretical implications and observations*, *Phys. Rept.* **493** (2010) 1 [[0909.2776](#)].
- [239] E.O. Colgáin, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari and L. Yin, *Do high redshift QSOs and GRBs corroborate JWST?*, [2405.19953](#).
- [240] A. Favale, A. Gómez-Valent and M. Migliaccio, *2D vs. 3D BAO: quantification of their tension and test of the Etherington relation*, [2405.12142](#).
- [241] C.B.V. Dash, T. Guha Sarkar and A.A. Sen, *Post-reionization H I 21-cm signal: a probe of negative cosmological constant*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **527** (2024) 11694 [[2309.01623](#)].
- [242] P. Svrcek and E. Witten, *Axions In String Theory*, *JHEP* **06** (2006) 051 [[hep-th/0605206](#)].
- [243] A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos, S. Dubovsky, N. Kaloper and J. March-Russell, *String Axiverse*, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 123530 [[0905.4720](#)].
- [244] M. Cicoli, M. Goodsell and A. Ringwald, *The type IIB string axiverse and its low-energy phenomenology*, *JHEP* **10** (2012) 146 [[1206.0819](#)].
- [245] L. Visinelli and S. Vagnozzi, *Cosmological window onto the string axiverse and the supersymmetry breaking scale*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 063517 [[1809.06382](#)].
- [246] M. Cicoli, J.P. Conlon, A. Maharana, S. Parameswaran, F. Quevedo and I. Zavala, *String cosmology: From the early universe to today*, *Phys. Rept.* **1059** (2024) 1 [[2303.04819](#)].
- [247] M. Kamionkowski, J. Pradler and D.G.E. Walker, *Dark energy from the string axiverse*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 251302 [[1409.0549](#)].
- [248] R. Emami, D. Grin, J. Pradler, A. Raccanelli and M. Kamionkowski, *Cosmological tests of an axiverse-inspired quintessence field*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 123005 [[1603.04851](#)].
- [249] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Dark energy at early times, the Hubble parameter, and the string axiverse*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 103523 [[1608.01309](#)].
- [250] D.J.E. Marsh, *The Axiverse Extended: Vacuum Destabilisation, Early Dark Energy and Cosmological Collapse*, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 123526 [[1102.4851](#)].
- [251] S.M. Carroll, M. Hoffman and M. Trodden, *Can the dark energy equation-of-state parameter w be less than -1 ?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 023509 [[astro-ph/0301273](#)].
- [252] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, *Imperfect Dark Energy from Kinetic Gravity Braiding*, *JCAP* **10** (2010) 026 [[1008.0048](#)].
- [253] I. Sawicki and A. Vikman, *Hidden Negative Energies in Strongly Accelerated Universes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 067301 [[1209.2961](#)].
- [254] M. Demirtas, M. Kim, L. McAllister, J. Moritz and A. Rios-Tascon, *Small cosmological constants in string theory*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 136 [[2107.09064](#)].
- [255] M. Demirtas, M. Kim, L. McAllister, J. Moritz and A. Rios-Tascon, *Exponentially Small Cosmological Constant in String Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) 011602 [[2107.09065](#)].
- [256] E. Ozulker, *Is the dark energy equation of state parameter singular?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 063509 [[2203.04167](#)].
- [257] E.V. Linder, *Cosmic growth history and expansion history*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 043529 [[astro-ph/0507263](#)].
- [258] R.K. Sheth and G. Tormen, *Large scale bias and the peak background split*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **308** (1999) 119 [[astro-ph/9901122](#)].

- [259] W.H. Press and P. Schechter, *Formation of galaxies and clusters of galaxies by selfsimilar gravitational condensation*, *Astrophys. J.* **187** (1974) 425.
- [260] A.K. Leroy, F. Walter, E. Brinks, F. Bigiel, W.J.G. de Blok, B. Madore et al., *The Star Formation Efficiency in Nearby Galaxies: Measuring Where Gas Forms Stars Effectively*, *Astron. J.* **136** (2008) 2782 [0810.2556].
- [261] F. Combes, S. Garcia-Burillo, J. Braine, E. Schinnerer, F. Walter and L. Colina, *Galaxy Evolution and Star Formation Efficiency at $0.2 < z < 0.6$* , *Astron. Astrophys.* **528** (2011) A124 [1009.2040].
- [262] S. Tacchella, S. Bose, C. Conroy, D.J. Eisenstein and B.D. Johnson, *A Redshift-independent Efficiency Model: Star Formation and Stellar Masses in Dark Matter Halos at $z \gtrsim 4$* , *Astrophys. J.* **868** (2018) 92 [1806.03299].
- [263] EBOSS collaboration, *Completed SDSS-IV extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Cosmological implications from two decades of spectroscopic surveys at the Apache Point Observatory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 083533 [2007.08991].
- [264] D. Scolnic et al., *The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release*, *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) 113 [2112.03863].
- [265] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6 [1807.06209].
- [266] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VIII. Gravitational lensing*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A8 [1807.06210].
- [267] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A5 [1907.12875].
- [268] 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.* **449** (2015) 835 [1409.3242].
- [269] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D.H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell et al., *The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416** (2011) 3017 [1106.3366].
- [270] BOSS collaboration, *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.* **470** (2017) 2617 [1607.03155].
- [271] PAN-STARRS1 collaboration, *The Complete Light-curve Sample of Spectroscopically Confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and Cosmological Constraints from the Combined Pantheon Sample*, *Astrophys. J.* **859** (2018) 101 [1710.00845].
- [272] A.G. Riess et al., *A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with $1 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934** (2022) L7 [2112.04510].
- [273] J. Lesgourgues, *The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) I: Overview*, **1104.2932**.
- [274] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues and T. Tram, *The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) II: Approximation schemes*, *JCAP* **07** (2011) 034 [1104.2933].
- [275] 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* **02** (2013) 001 [1210.7183].
- [276] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, *MontePython 3: boosted MCMC sampler and other features*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **24** (2019) 100260 [1804.07261].

- [277] A. Gelman and D.B. Rubin, *Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences*, *Statist. Sci.* **7** (1992) 457.
- [278] A. Lewis, *GetDist: a Python package for analysing Monte Carlo samples*, [1910.13970](#).
- [279] P. Santini, H.C. Ferguson, A. Fontana, B. Mobasher, G. Barro, M. Castellano et al., *Stellar Masses from the CANDELS Survey: The GOODS-South and UDS Fields*, *Astrophys. J.* **801** (2015) 97 [[1412.5180](#)].
- [280] H. Ebeling, *Improved approximations of poissonian errors for high confidence levels*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **349** (2004) 768 [[astro-ph/0301285](#)].
- [281] D. Brout et al., *The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints*, *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) 110 [[2202.04077](#)].
- [282] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Cosmological constraints from the Hubble diagram of quasars at high redshifts*, *Nature Astron.* **3** (2019) 272 [[1811.02590](#)].
- [283] C.L. Steinhardt, V. Rusakov, T.H. Clark, A. Diaconu, J. Forbes, C. McPartland et al., *The Earliest Stage of Galactic Star Formation*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **949** (2023) L38 [[2301.01774](#)].
- [284] P. Santini et al., *Early Results from GLASS-JWST. XI. Stellar Masses and Mass-to-light Ratio of $z > 7$ Galaxies*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **942** (2023) L27 [[2207.11379](#)].
- [285] R. Navarro-Carrera, P. Rinaldi, K.I. Caputi, E. Iani, V. Kokorev and S.E. van Mierlo, *Constraints on the Faint End of the Galaxy Stellar Mass Function at $z \simeq 4-8$ from Deep JWST Data*, *Astrophys. J.* **961** (2024) 207 [[2305.16141](#)].
- [286] A. Grazian, A. Fontana, P. Santini, J.S. Dunlop, H.C. Ferguson, M. Castellano et al., *The galaxy stellar mass function at $3.5 \leq z \leq 7.5$ in the CANDELS/UDS, GOODS-South, and HUDF fields*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **575** (2015) A96 [[1412.0532](#)].
- [287] E. Di Valentino and S. Bridle, *Exploring the Tension between Current Cosmic Microwave Background and Cosmic Shear Data*, *Symmetry* **10** (2018) 585.
- [288] E. Di Valentino et al., *Cosmology Intertwined III: $f\sigma_8$ and S_8* , *Astropart. Phys.* **131** (2021) 102604 [[2008.11285](#)].
- [289] R.C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *Arbitrating the S_8 discrepancy with growth rate measurements from redshift-space distortions*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505** (2021) 5427 [[2106.01208](#)].
- [290] K. Jedamzik, L. Pogosian and G.-B. Zhao, *Why reducing the cosmic sound horizon alone can not fully resolve the Hubble tension*, *Commun. in Phys.* **4** (2021) 123 [[2010.04158](#)].
- [291] O. Akarsu, J.D. Barrow, L.A. Escamilla and J.A. Vazquez, *Graduated dark energy: Observational hints of a spontaneous sign switch in the cosmological constant*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 063528 [[1912.08751](#)].
- [292] G. Acquaviva, O. Akarsu, N. Katirci and J.A. Vazquez, *Simple-graduated dark energy and spatial curvature*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 023505 [[2104.02623](#)].
- [293] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker and J.A. Vazquez, *Relaxing cosmological tensions with a sign switching cosmological constant*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 123512 [[2108.09239](#)].
- [294] O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, M. Ozyigit and S. Sharma, *Testing spatial curvature and anisotropic expansion on top of the Λ CDM model*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39** (2023) 101162 [[2112.07807](#)].
- [295] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker, J.A. Vazquez and A. Yadav, *Relaxing cosmological tensions with a sign switching cosmological constant: Improved results with Planck, BAO, and Pantheon data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 023513 [[2211.05742](#)].
- [296] O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R.C. Nunes, J.A. Vazquez and A. Yadav, *Λ_s CDM model: A promising scenario for alleviation of cosmological tensions*, [2307.10899](#).

- [297] SIMONS OBSERVATORY collaboration, *The Simons Observatory: Science goals and forecasts*, *JCAP* **02** (2019) 056 [[1808.07445](#)].
- [298] SIMONS OBSERVATORY collaboration, *The Simons Observatory: Astro2020 Decadal Project Whitepaper*, *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.* **51** (2019) 147 [[1907.08284](#)].
- [299] M. Cicoli, S. De Alwis, A. Maharana, F. Muia and F. Quevedo, *De Sitter vs Quintessence in String Theory*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **67** (2019) 1800079 [[1808.08967](#)].
- [300] V.K. Oikonomou, F.P. Fronimos, P. Tsyba and O. Razina, *Kinetic axion dark matter in string corrected $f(R)$ gravity*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40** (2023) 101186 [[2302.07147](#)].