

Dynamical dark energy in the light of DESI 2024 data

Nandan Roy*

*NAS, Centre for Theoretical Physics & Natural Philosophy, Mahidol University,
Nakhonsawan Campus, Phayuha Khiri, Nakhonsawan 60130, Thailand*

The recent result from the DESI (Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument) data release 1 (DR1) combined with the cosmic microwave background and supernova data shows a preference for the dynamical dark energy over the cosmological constant [1]. For this analysis, the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parameterization of the dark energy equation of state has been used. Though CPL parametrization is the most popular parametrization of dark energy equation of state (EoS) recent studies have questioned its choice of prior and degeneracy. In this work, we propose a new parametrization of the dark energy equation of state motivated by its ability to cross the phantom barrier crossing. At a high redshift limit, this parametrization takes the form of CPL parametrization. We have used the Bayesian model selection criteria in which this parametrization shows a moderate positive preference over the Λ CDM model. Contrary to the DESI2024 results our model suggests the current value of the dark energy equation of state to be phantom today with two phantom barrier crossings one at $z \simeq 0.4$ from deep phantom to quintessence which matches with the finding from the DESI2024 result and another phantom barrier crossing very recently at $z \simeq 0.1$ from quintessence to phantom. The proposed model also weakens the Hubble tension significantly to $\approx 2\sigma$ while comparing with the result from [2] and to $\approx 1.4\sigma$ while comparing with [3].

I. INTRODUCTION

A wide variety of cosmological observations [4–8] has indicated that currently our universe is undergoing a mysterious accelerated expansion phase. Any known form of matter can not explain this accelerated expansion. Though current observations are consistent with the Cosmological constant [9] as the candidate behind this accelerated expansion, over the years it has faced major theoretical challenges like the cosmological constant problem, coincidence problem, and a growing number of challenges from the observational side.

Recently, as our precision in the measurement of the cosmological parameters has improved significantly estimation of different cosmological parameters from different cosmological observations shows discrepancy between their estimation. The most significant one is the Hubble tension. A statistically significant discrepancy of the order of $\approx 5.3\sigma$ [10] has been reported from the early universe measurements and late time distance ladder measurement of the current value of the Hubble parameter (H_0). The early universe measurements like CMB from Planck collaboration [11], BAO [12–16], and BBN [17] data estimated the current value of the Hubble constant to be $H_0 \sim (67.0 - 68.5)$ km/s/Mpc by considering the cosmological constant (Λ) as the candidate for the dark energy. The measurement of the H_0 using the distance ladder measurements like [18] and

H0LiCOW [19] collaborations reported the value of it to be $H_0 = (74.03 \pm 1.42)$ km/s/Mpc.

Consideration of dark energy to be dynamical is one of the ways to alleviate the problems faced by cosmological constant [20, 21]. The simplest dynamical dark energy model is the fluid description of the dark energy in which the dark energy equation of state is parameterized phenomenologically and the most popular parametrization of the dark energy EOS is the CPL parametrization or w_0w_a CDM model in which the EOS is parameterized as $w(a) = w_0 + w_a(1 - \frac{a}{a_0})$. The recent DESI 2024 Data Release 1 (DR1) [1] has constrained the CPL model and found the preference of more than 2σ for the dynamical dark energy over the Λ CDM. A piece of similar evidence for the CPL model has been reported by the studies [22, 23]. On the other hand [24] reported that the best model to fit the data is not CPL while comparing a wide number of dynamical dark energy models. In [25, 26] the authors have shown concern about the choice of prior and degeneracy which may affect the result reported in [1]. DESI 2024 data has been also used to constrain other cosmological models [27–34] showing preference for the dynamical dark energy.

In this study, we propose a new parametrization of the dark energy equation of state which is inspired by the dynamics of the quintom scalar field model [35] in which the dark energy sector has a contribution from a quintessence and a phantom scalar field. One of the interesting properties of this pro-

* nandan.roy@mahidol.ac.th (Corresponding Author)

posed parametrization is at the high redshift, this EOS takes the form of the CPL parametrization. We used the Pantheon Plus data with SH0ES prior, and DESI BAO 2024 data together with a compressed Planck likelihood to constrain this model. We have compared our result with the Λ CDM model and used the Bayesian model selection criteria to find out the preference for the model. We have also reported the status of the Hubble tension in this model.

The current work is presented in the following way: In Section II, we provide an overview of the mathematical formulation and discuss about the proposed model. Section III discusses the observational data used in this work together with the constraints obtained on the cosmological parameters and the model comparison. Finally, we conclude our results and findings in Section IV.

II. MATHEMATICAL SETUP AND THE MODEL

In a spatially flat homogeneous and isotropic universe filled with the barotropic fluids the Friedmann equations can be written as,

$$\frac{H^2(z)}{H_0^2} = \Omega_{m,0}(1+z)^3 + \Omega_{r,0}(1+z)^4 + (1 - \Omega_{m,0} - \Omega_{r,0}) f_{DE}(z), \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega_{m,0}$ and $\Omega_{r,0}$ are the current matter and radiation density respectively and $f_{DE}(z) \equiv \rho_{DE}(z)/\rho_{DE,0}$ is normalized dark energy density given by the following expression,

$$f_{DE}(z) \equiv \frac{\rho_{DE}(z)}{\rho_{DE,0}} = \exp\left(3 \int_0^z [1 + w(\tilde{z})] d \ln(1 + \tilde{z})\right). \quad (2)$$

While considering any candidate for dark energy the expansion of the universe is affected by the evolution of this normalized dark energy density $f_{DE}(z)$. A popular and simple way of investigating the dynamics of dark energy is to consider a parametrization of the dark energy equation of state.

Here we propose a new parametrization of the dark energy equation of state in the following form,

$$w(a) = w_a \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) \text{Cos} \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) - w_b \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) \text{Cosh} \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) - w_c \quad (3)$$

The reason behind introducing the trigonometric and hyperbolic function in the equation of state is inspired by the equation of state of the scalar field dark energy models. In [36–38] it has been shown the equation of state of a quintessence field can be written as a *cosine* function whereas in [39] it has been shown the equation of state of a phantom scalar field can be written as the function of the *cosh* and for the quintom model it to be a function of the both *cosine and cosh* [35]. From the above motivation we propose the current parametrization of the EoS of the dark energy in which there are two dedicated parts one corresponds to quintessence and the other to the phantom nature of the EoS. For the sake of generality, we have introduced another parameter w_c . In case $w_b = 0$ and $w_c = 0$ this equation can show quintessence like behaviour since $-1 \leq \text{Cos} \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) \leq 1$. On the other hand, it can show phantom-like behaviour when $w_a = 0$ and $w_c = 0$ since $\text{Cosh} \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right) \geq 1$. Existence of both these terms in EoS expected to give rise to quintom-like behaviour with a possibility of phantom barrier crossing.

Another interesting nature of this proposed EoS is at $\frac{a}{a_0} \ll 1$ this parametrization reduces to CPL parametrization as follows,

$$w(a) = \tilde{w}_0 + \tilde{w}_a \left(1 - \frac{a}{a_0}\right), \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{w}_0 = (w_a - w_b - w_c)$ and $\tilde{w}_a = w_b - w_a$. Due to this reason, we can expect more reacher behaviour of the dark energy at the late time than the CPL model.

We have implemented this proposed parametrization to publicly available CLASS Boltzmann code[40, 41] to numerically understand its behaviour and to constrain the model parameters against different cosmological observations we have used the cosmological MCMC code MontePython [42].

III. OBSERVATIONAL DATA

To constraint the cosmological parameters we have used the following data sets;

1. Pantheon Plus SH0ES

Type Ia supernovae are widely used as standard candles because of their relatively uniform absolute luminosity[4, 43]. In this analysis have used the Pantheon Plus SH0ES compilation sample of SN-Ia data

based on [44] and [2]. This data set calibrates the SN1a magnitude using additional cepheid distances as a calibrator.

2. DESI BAO

In the density of visible baryonic matter recurring and periodic fluctuations occur which are known as Baryon acoustic oscillations. These oscillations serve as crucial standard rulers for accurately measuring distances in the field of cosmology. In this work, we have considered the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) 2024 BAO observations data from [1]. This survey encompasses a redshift range of $z \in [0.1, 4.2]$ and dividing it into seven redshift bins. Similar to the approach in [45] we have consider only two types of DESI-BAO data ratios,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d_H(z)}{r_d} &= \frac{cr_d^{-1}}{H(z)} \\ \frac{d_V(z)}{r_d} &= \left[\frac{czr_d^{-3}d_L^2(z)}{H(z)(1+z)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here the luminosity distance is represented by $d_L(z)$. This data contains five different samples, the Bright Galaxy Sample(BGS), Luminous Red Galaxy samples (LRG), Emission Line Galaxy sample (ELG), Quasar Sample (QSO), and the Lyman- α Forest Sample (Ly α). The effective redshift and the corresponding d_H/r_d and d_V/r_d ratios from [1] are given in the TABLE.I.

Samples	z_{eff}	d_H/r_d	d_V/r_d
BGS	0.30	-	7.93 ± 0.15
LRG	0.51	20.98 ± 0.61	-
LRG	0.71	20.08 ± 0.60	-
LRG+ELG	0.93	17.88 ± 0.35	-
ELG	1.32	13.82 ± 0.42	-
QSO	1.49	-	26.07 ± 0.67
Ly α QSO	2.33	8.52 ± 0.17	-

TABLE I: DESI-BAO samples with effective redshift and corresponding d_H/r_d and d_V/r_d ratios.

3. Compressed Planck likelihood

In this analysis, we have utilized the Planck compressed likelihood following the approach in [46]. This compressed likelihood is useful to obtain the same constraining accuracy as full Planck while having limited computational resources and it is used to

estimate the baryon physical density $\omega_b = \Omega_b h^2$ and the two shift parameters,

$$\theta_* = r_s(z_{\text{dec}})/D_A(z_{\text{dec}}), \quad \mathcal{R} = \sqrt{\Omega_M H_0^2 D_A(z_{\text{dec}})},$$

where, decoupling redshift is z_{dec} , and D_A is the comoving angular diameter distance. We chose the mean values of the above parameters to be $100\omega_b = 2.237$, $100\theta_s = 1.0411$, and $\mathcal{R} = 1.74998$, and the correlation matrix Σ [46] to be

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.34 & 0.63 \\ 0.34 & 1.00 & 0.46 \\ 0.63 & 0.46 & 1.00 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For more details about this likelihood, we refer to the Appendix. A of [46].

A. Observational Constraints

We have considered flat priors on the cosmological parameters, $100\omega_b : [0, 4.6]$, $\omega_{\text{cdm}} : [0.095, 0.145]$. For the model parameters, we have considered the prior to be $w_a : [-5, 15]$, $w_b : [-5, 5]$ and $w_c : [0, 10]$. The positive prior on the w_c is preferred by keeping in mind the performance and stability of the CLASS code. The mean value and the corresponding 68%CL constraint obtained on the cosmological parameters from our analysis are given in Table.II. The result is shown for the combined data sets of SN-Ia Pantheon Plus compilation[47], BAO DESI2024 [1], together with the compressed Planck likelihood[46]. For comparison, the constraint on the Λ CDM model, the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder model denoted as *CPL* and the proposed model as *wCDM* are given together.

The 2D and 1D triangular plots of the cosmological parameters $100w_b$, w_{cdm} , H_0 , Ω_{DE} , Ω_m are shown in FIG.1. The posteriors for the the Λ CDM(in blue) and *CPL* (in green) model for the same set of data has been shown for comparison. It can be seen the proposed model suggests a higher value of H_0 and Ω_{DE} compared to the Λ CDM(in blue) and *CPL* (in green) models. To quantify the status of Hubble tension in the proposed model we have used the estimator proposed in[48],

$$T_{H0} = \frac{|H_0 - H_0^{\text{loc}}|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{H0}^2 + \sigma_{\text{loc}}^2}},$$

where T_{H0} denotes the estimation of the amount of tension, H_0 and H_0^{loc} is the mean value of the Hubble parameter obtained from the current analysis

and local universe observations respectively, whereas the σ^2 represents the corresponding variance of the posteriors.

By comparing our results with the result obtain in [2] ($H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$), from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES data, the status of the tension to be $T_{H_0} \simeq 2.01\sigma$. On the other hand while comparing it with the reported value of ($H_0 = 73.22 \pm 2.06 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) from the standardized TRGB and Type Ia supernova data sets in [3], it reduces to $T_{H_0} \simeq 1.4\sigma$. If we consider the classification of tension from Table IV in [48] for both the comparisons the tension is weak.

Figure 2 shows the contour plot of posterior distributions of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c and the current value of the dark energy EOS w_{DE} . The current value of the EOS is $w_{DE} = -1.113_{-0.21}^{+0.22}$ which is phantom in nature. To understand the evolution of the EOS of the dark energy in FIG.3 we have plotted the w_{DE} against the redshift z for the mean value of the parameters w_a, w_b and w_c reported in TABLE.II. It can be seen though the current value of the EOS is in the phantom region but in the recent past, it has two phantom barrier crossing. Around $z \approx 0.4$ from phantom to quintessence and around $z \approx 0.1$ quintessence to phantom. The first phenomenon of the first barrier crossing matches with the findings in [1, 49].

In FIG.5 the evolution of the energy densities for the current model has been shown together with the Λ CDM model. The evolution of the $H(z)/1+z$ is shown in the FIG.4 together with the observational data points obtained from the Sh0ES survey [50] and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) surveys [51–54]. It can be seen from both plots the cosmological parameters show expected behaviour for the proposed model.

The temperature anisotropies and the matter power spectrum (MPS) for the w CDM model considered here are shown in Fig 6 and Fig 7 correspondingly. To make comparison with observed data, the values from different observations have been plotted together with the Λ CDM case for reference. In the Fig 6 for temperature anisotropies (TT) the binned TT power spectrum data from Planck 18 [55] has been shown. For the MPS in FIG.7 following are the data sets which have been used: Planck2018 CMB data [55], SDSS galaxy clustering [56], SDSS Ly α forest [57] and DES cosmic shear data [58] (for details on full data collection, please see [59]).

At the bottom pan of Fig 6 and Fig 7 we have shown the relative differences in $\Delta D_l = (D_l - D_l^{\Lambda CDM})/D_l^{\Lambda CDM}$ and $\Delta P(k) =$

$(P(k) - P(k)^{\Lambda CDM})/P(k)^{\Lambda CDM}$ to compare with the Λ CDM model. For both cases of D_l , the proposed model shows a small deviation from Λ CDM at higher multipoles and for $P(k)$ it can be seen at the higher scale. The PPF (Parameterized Post-Friedmann) approximation [60] has been used to calculate the D_l and $P(k)$. PPF approximation is useful for the perturbations to cross the phantom divider smoothly. This approximation has already been implemented in the CLASS code by default. Both the plots Fig 6 and Fig 7 suggest the consistency of the proposed model not only at the background level but also at the perturbation level.

B. Comparison with Λ CDM

We use the concept of the Bayes factor to be certain about the preference of this model over the Λ CDM model. Bayes factor is calculated as $\ln B_{w\Lambda} = \ln \mathcal{Z}_w - \ln \mathcal{Z}_\Lambda$, where \mathcal{Z} represents the Bayesian evidence and the suffixes w and Λ represent the current w CDM and Λ CDM models, respectively.

In general, Jeffrey's scale is used to find the preference of one model over another model. According to this scale, a negative preference will be considered if $|\ln B_{w\Lambda}| < 1$, on the other hand positive, moderate, and strong preferences will be considered if $|\ln B_{I\Lambda}| > 1$, $|\ln B_{I\Lambda}| > 2.5$, and $|\ln B_{I\Lambda}| > 5.0$, respectively [61]. We have used publicly available code MCEVIDENCE [62] to directly calculate the Bayes factor from the MCMC chains. From Table.II it can be seen the evidence for our model is 2.89 indicating moderate evidence for the current model over the Λ CDM model.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Recent DESI2024 data [1] has shown indication for dark energy to be dynamical and a phantom barrier crossing from phantom to quintessence by considering the CPL parametrization of the EOS of the dark energy. In this work, we have proposed a new parametrization of the EOS of the dark energy inspired by the EOS of the quintom scalar field model. Interestingly, this proposed parametrization reduces to the form of the CPL parametrization at the high redshift. It consists of *trigonometric cosine* and *hyperbolic cosine* as they can represent dedicatedly the EOS of the quintessence and phantom scalar field respectively.




FIG. 1: A triangular plot illustrates the constraints on cosmological parameters for the proposed model w CDM (in red), with the Λ CDM model (in blue) and CPL model (in green) for comparison.

Parameter	Λ CDM	w CDM	CPL
$10^{-2}\omega_b$	$2.237^{+0.014}_{-0.016}$	$2.239^{+0.015}_{-0.015}$	$2.239^{+0.015}_{-0.015}$
ω_{cdm}	$0.1186^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$	$0.1196^{+0.0011}_{-0.0012}$	$0.1193^{+0.0011}_{-0.0011}$
H_0	$67.79^{+0.48}_{-0.48}$	$69.91^{+1.1}_{-1.2}$	69.1^{+1}_{-1}
Ω_{DE}	$0.6917^{+0.0065}_{-0.0062}$	$0.7078^{+0.011}_{-0.0091}$	$0.7017^{+0.0095}_{-0.009}$
Ω_m	$0.3083^{+0.0062}_{-0.0065}$	$0.2921^{+0.0091}_{-0.011}$	$0.2983^{+0.009}_{-0.0095}$
w_0	-	-	$-0.8966^{+0.097}_{-0.1}$
w_a (CPL)	-	-	$-0.06699^{+0.34}_{-0.36}$
w_a (w CDM)	-	$5.203^{+3.5}_{-5.1}$	-
w_b	-	$-0.06699^{+0.34}_{-0.36}$	-
w_a	-	≥ -1.45	-
w_b	-	$0.188^{+0.47}_{-0.47}$	-
w_c	-	$3.634^{+1.5}_{-2.4}$	-
w_{fld}	-1	$-1.113^{+0.22}_{-0.21}$	-0.8966
$\delta\chi^2_{min}$	0	-1.62	-1.38
$ \ln B_{w\Lambda} $	-	2.89	2.88

TABLE II: The constraint (68%CL) obtained on cosmological parameters from the combining data sets of Pantheon supernova survey [47], DESI2024 data[1] together with the compressed Planck likelihood.




FIG. 2: A triangular posterior plot showing the constraint obtained on the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c and the dark energy EOS (w_{DE}).

We have used the currently released BAO data from [1], Pantheon plus supernova data and a compressed Planck likelihood to constrain the cosmological parameters. Our finding suggests the current EOS of the dark energy to be phantom whereas DESI2024[1] data indicates it to be quintessence. Though our findings differ in this case from the DESI2024 analysis we also obtain a phantom barrier




FIG. 3: Evolution of the dark energy EOS with respect to the redshift z in yellow dashed line for the mean value of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c listed in the TABLE:II.




FIG. 4: A plot of $H(z)/(1+z)$ vs z for the current model in yellow, using the mean value of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c is shown. The evolution of $H(z)/(1+z)$ for Λ CDM model (in blue) is also presented along with observational values from the Sh0ES survey [50] and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) surveys [51–54] for comparison.

crossing at the $z \simeq 0.4$ from phantom to quintessence which is in agreement with the finding from the DESI result [49]. Apart from this phantom barrier crossing another crossing is indicated from our model which happened very recently at $z \simeq 0.1$ from quintessence to phantom and currently, it is in the phantom domain. For this model, we have also obtained the current value of the Hubble parameter to be higher than both the CPL and Λ CDM model. The status of the Hubble tension weakens significantly for the proposed model.




FIG. 5: A plot of the evolution of Ω_m (in solid line) and Ω_{DE} (in dashed lines) vs z for the $wCDM$ model (in yellow) using the mean value of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c and ΛCDM model (in blue).




FIG. 6: Plot of the CMB anisotropies for the $wCDM$ model (in yellow) using the mean value of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c together with the ΛCDM model (in blue). The bottom panel shows the relative difference between the models $\Delta D_l = (D_l - D_l^{\Lambda CDM}) / D_l^{\Lambda CDM}$.

To find the behaviour of the linear perturbation we have plotted the temperature anisotropies and the matter power spectrum (MPS) and compared them with the ΛCDM counterpart. A slight deviation from the ΛCDM model has been found at the high multipoles and high scales indicating the consistency of the model even at the perturbation level. We have also calculated the Bayes factor to find the preference of this model on the ΛCDM and a moderate preference for this model compared to the ΛCDM has been obtained. This suggests the very late time evolution of dark energy may be richer than the one described by the simple CPL model.




FIG. 7: The Plot of the matter power spectrum for the $wCDM$ model (in yellow) using the mean value of the model parameters w_a, w_b, w_c together with the ΛCDM model (in blue). The bottom panel shows the relative difference between the models $\Delta P(k) = (P(k) - P(k)^{\Lambda CDM}) / P(k)^{\Lambda CDM}$. Observations data points have been also shown for comparison.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author acknowledges the use of the Chalawan High Performance Computing cluster, operated and maintained by the National Astronomical Research Institute of Thailand (NARIT).

- [1] AG Adame, J Aguilar, S Ahlen, S Alam, DM Alexander, M Alvarez, O Alves, A Anand, U Andrade, E Armengaud, et al. Desi 2024 vi: Cosmological constraints from the measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03002*, 2024.
- [2] Adam 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(1):L7, 2022. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b.
- [3] D Scolnic, AG Riess, J Wu, S Li, GS Anand, R Beaton, S Casertano, RI Anderson, S Dhawan, and X Ke. Cats: The hubble constant from standardized trgb and type ia supernova measurements. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 954(1): L31, 2023.
- [4] Adam G. Riess et al. Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant. *Astron. J.*, 116:1009–1038, 1998. doi: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1086/300499>.
- [5] S. Perlmutter et al. Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high redshift supernovae. *Astrophys. J.*, 517:565–586, 1999. doi:10.1086/307221.
- [6] Attila Meszaros. On the Reality of the accelerating universe. *Astrophys. J.*, 580:12–15, 2002. doi: 10.1086/343071.
- [7] M. Arnaud et al. Planck intermediate results. XXXI. Microwave survey of Galactic supernova remnants. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 586:A134, 2016. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201425022.
- [8] Christopher P Ahn, Rachael Alexandroff, Carlos Allende Prieto, Scott F Anderson, Timothy Anderton, Brett H Andrews, Éric Aubourg, Stephen Bailey, Eduardo Balbinot, Rory Barnes, et al. The ninth data release of the sloan digital sky survey: first spectroscopic data from the sdss-iii baryon oscillation spectroscopic survey. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 203(2):21, 2012.
- [9] T Padmanabhan. Dark energy: mystery of the millennium. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 861, pages 179–196. American Institute of Physics, 2006.
- [10] Adam G. Riess, Louise Breuval, Wenlong Yuan, Stefano Casertano, Lucas M. Macri, J. Bradley Bowers, Dan Scolnic, Tristan Cantat-Gaudin, Richard I. Anderson, and Mauricio Cruz Reyes. Cluster cepheids with high precision gaia parallaxes, low zero-point uncertainties, and hubble space telescope photometry. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 938(1):36, oct 2022. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8f24. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/2F1538-4357/2Fac8f24>.
- [11] N. Aghanim et al. Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 641:A6, 2020. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910. [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [12] Shadab Alam, Metin Ata, Stephen Bailey, Florian Beutler, Dmitry Bizyaev, Jonathan A. Blazek, Adam S. Bolton, Joel R. Brownstein, Angela Burden, Chia-Hsun Chuang, and et al. The clustering of galaxies in the completed sdss-iii baryon oscillation spectroscopic survey: cosmological analysis of the dr12 galaxy sample. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 470(3):2617–2652, Mar 2017. ISSN 1365-2966. doi:10.1093/mnras/stx721. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx721>.
- [13] Florian Beutler, Chris Blake, Matthew Colless, D. Heath Jones, Lister Staveley-Smith, Lachlan Campbell, Quentin Parker, Will Saunders, and Fred Watson. The 6df galaxy survey: baryon acoustic oscillations and the local hubble constant. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 416(4):3017–3032, Jul 2011. ISSN 0035-8711. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x>.
- [14] T. M. C. Abbott et al. Dark Energy Survey year 1 results: Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering and weak lensing. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(4):043526, 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.043526.
- [15] E. Macaulay et al. First Cosmological Results using Type Ia Supernovae from the Dark Energy Survey: Measurement of the Hubble Constant. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 486(2):2184–2196, 2019. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stz978.
- [16] E. Krause et al. Dark Energy Survey Year 1 Results: Multi-Probe Methodology and Simulated Likelihood Analyses. 6 2017.
- [17] Shadab Alam, Marie Aubert, Santiago Avila, Christophe Balland, Julian E. Bautista, Matthew A. Bershad, Dmitry Bizyaev, Michael R. Blanton, Adam S. Bolton, Jo Bovy, and et al. Completed sdss-iv extended baryon oscillation spectroscopic survey: Cosmological implications from two decades of spectroscopic surveys at the apache point observatory. *Physical Review D*, 103(8), Apr 2021. ISSN 2470-0029. doi:10.1103/physrevd.103.083533. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.083533>.
- [18] Adam G. Riess, Stefano Casertano, Wenlong Yuan, Lucas M. Macri, and Dan Scolnic. Large magellanic cloud cepheid standards provide a 1% foundation for the determination of the hubble constant and stronger evidence for physics beyond Λ cdm. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 876(1):85, May 2019. ISSN 1538-4357. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422>.
- [19] Kenneth C. Wong et al. H0LiCOW – XIII. A 2.4 percent measurement of H0 from lensed quasars: 5.3 σ tension between early- and late-Universe probes. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 498(1):1420–1439, 2020. doi:10.1093/mnras/stz3094.
- [20] Luca Amendola and Shinji Tsujikawa. *Dark energy: theory and observations*. Cambridge University

- Press, 2010.
- [21] Kazuharu Bamba, Salvatore Capozziello, Shin'ichi Nojiri, and Sergei D. Odintsov. Dark energy cosmology: the equivalent description via different theoretical models and cosmography tests. *Astrophys. Space Sci.*, 342:155–228, 2012. doi:10.1007/s10509-012-1181-8.
- [22] Deng Wang. The self-consistency of desi analysis and comment on” does desi 2024 confirm λ cdm?”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13833*, 2024.
- [23] Chan-Gyung Park, Javier de Cruz Perez, and Bharat Ratra. Using non-desi data to confirm and strengthen the desi 2024 spatially-flat w_0w_a cdm cosmological parameterization result. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00502*, 2024.
- [24] Youri Carloni, Orlando Luongo, and Marco Muccino. Does dark energy really revive using DESI 2024 data? 4 2024.
- [25] Marina Cortès and Andrew R Liddle. Interpreting desi’s evidence for evolving dark energy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08056*, 2024.
- [26] David Shlivko and Paul Steinhardt. Assessing observational constraints on dark energy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03933*, 2024.
- [27] K. Lodha et al. DESI 2024: Constraints on Physics-Focused Aspects of Dark Energy using DESI DR1 BAO Data. 5 2024.
- [28] Dimitrios Bousis and Leandros Perivolaropoulos. Hubble tension tomography: BAO vs SnIa distance tension. 5 2024.
- [29] R. Calderon et al. DESI 2024: Reconstructing Dark Energy using Crossing Statistics with DESI DR1 BAO data. 5 2024.
- [30] Yuhang Yang, Xin Ren, Qingqing Wang, Zhiyu Lu, Dongdong Zhang, Yi-Fu Cai, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis. Quintom cosmology and modified gravity after DESI 2024. 4 2024.
- [31] Hao Wang and Yun-Song Piao. Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension. 4 2024.
- [32] William Giarè, Miguel A. Sabogal, Rafael C. Nunes, and Eleonora Di Valentino. Interacting Dark Energy after DESI Baryon Acoustic Oscillation measurements. 4 2024.
- [33] Kim V. Berghaus, Joshua A. Kable, and Vivian Miranda. Quantifying Scalar Field Dynamics with DESI 2024 Y1 BAO measurements. 4 2024.
- [34] Eoin Ó. Colgáin, Maria Giovanna Dainotti, Salvatore Capozziello, Saeed Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and Dejan Stojkovic. Does DESI 2024 Confirm Λ CDM? 4 2024.
- [35] Nandan Roy and L. Arturo Ureña López. Tracker behaviour of quintom dark energy and the Hubble tension. 12 2023.
- [36] Nandan Roy, Alma X. Gonzalez-Morales, and L. Arturo Urena-Lopez. New general parametrization of quintessence fields and its observational constraints. *Phys. Rev.*, D98(6):063530, 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.063530.
- [37] L. Arturo Ureña-López and Nandan Roy. Generalized tracker quintessence models for dark energy. *Physical Review D*, 102(6), Sep 2020. ISSN 2470-0029. doi:10.1103/physrevd.102.063510. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.063510>.
- [38] Nandan Roy and Kazuharu Bamba. Arbitrariness of potentials in interacting quintessence models. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(12):123520, 2019. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.123520.
- [39] Francisco X. Linares Cedeño, Nandan Roy, and L. Arturo Ureña López. Tracker phantom field and a cosmological constant: Dynamics of a composite dark energy model. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(12):123502, 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123502.
- [40] Julien Lesgourgues. The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) III: Comparison with CAMB for LambdaCDM. 2011.
- [41] Julien Lesgourgues and Thomas Tram. The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS) IV: efficient implementation of non-cold relics. *JCAP*, 1109:032, 2011. doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2011/09/032.
- [42] Thejs Brinckmann and Julien Lesgourgues. MontePython 3: boosted MCMC sampler and other features. 2018.
- [43] AG Reiss et al. Supernova serach team. *Astron. J.*, 116:1009, 1998.
- [44] Dillon Brout et al. The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints. *Astrophys. J.*, 938(2):110, 2022. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8e04.
- [45] Youri Carloni, Orlando Luongo, and Marco Muccino. Does dark energy really revive using desi 2024 data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12068*, 2024.
- [46] Nikki Arendse, Radosław J. Wojtak, Adriano Agnello, Geoff C.-F. Chen, Christopher D. Fassnacht, Dominique Sluse, Stefan Hilbert, Martin Millon, Vivien Bonvin, Kenneth C. Wong, and et al. Cosmic dissonance: are new physics or systematics behind a short sound horizon? *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 639:A57, Jul 2020. ISSN 1432-0746. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936720. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201936720>.
- [47] D. M. Scolnic et al. The Complete Light-curve Sample of Spectroscopically Confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and Cosmological Constraints from the Combined Pantheon Sample. *Astrophys. J.*, 859(2):101, 2018. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aab9bb.
- [48] David Camarena and Valerio Marra. Impact of the cosmic variance on H_0 on cosmological analyses. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(2):023537, 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.023537.
- [49] R Calderon, K Lodha, A Shafieloo, E Linder, W Sohn, A de Mattia, JL Cervantes-Cota, R Crittenden, TM Davis, M Ishak, et al. Desi 2024: Reconstructing dark energy using crossing statistics with desi dr1 bao data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04216*, 2024.
- [50] Adam G. Riess, Stefano Casertano, Wenlong Yuan, Lucas M. Macri, and Dan Scolnic. Large Magellanic Cloud Cepheid Standards Provide a 1% Foundation for the Determination of the Hubble Constant and Stronger Evidence for Physics beyond Λ CDM. *Astrophys. J.*, 876(1):85, 2019. doi:10.3847/1538-

- 4357/ab1422.
- [51] Shadab Alam et al. The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 470(3):2617–2652, 2017. doi:10.1093/mnras/stx721.
- [52] Pauline Zarrouk et al. The clustering of the SDSS-IV extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey DR14 quasar sample: measurement of the growth rate of structure from the anisotropic correlation function between redshift 0.8 and 2.2. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 477(2):1639–1663, 2018. doi:10.1093/mnras/sty506.
- [53] Michael Blomqvist et al. Baryon acoustic oscillations from the cross-correlation of Ly α absorption and quasars in eBOSS DR14. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 629:A86, 2019. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201935641.
- [54] Victoria de Sainte Agathe et al. Baryon acoustic oscillations at $z = 2.34$ from the correlations of Ly α absorption in eBOSS DR14. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 629:A85, 2019. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201935638.
- [55] N. Aghanim et al. Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 641:A5, 2020. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936386.
- [56] Beth A. Reid et al. Cosmological Constraints from the Clustering of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey DR7 Luminous Red Galaxies. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 404:60–85, 2010. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.16276.x.
- [57] Bela Abolfathi et al. The Fourteenth Data Release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey: First Spectroscopic Data from the Extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey and from the Second Phase of the Apache Point Observatory Galactic Evolution Experiment. *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 235(2):42, 2018. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/aa9e8a.
- [58] M. A. Troxel et al. Dark Energy Survey Year 1 results: Cosmological constraints from cosmic shear. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(4):043528, 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.043528.
- [59] Solène Chabanier, Marius Millea, and Nathalie Palanque-Delabrouille. Matter power spectrum: from Ly α forest to CMB scales. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 489(2):2247–2253, 2019. doi:10.1093/mnras/stz2310.
- [60] Wenjuan Fang, Wayne Hu, and Antony Lewis. Crossing the Phantom Divide with Parameterized Post-Friedmann Dark Energy. *Phys. Rev. D*, 78:087303, 2008. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.087303.
- [61] Roberto Trotta. Applications of Bayesian model selection to cosmological parameters. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 378:72–82, 2007. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11738.x.
- [62] Alan Heavens, Yabebal Fantaye, Araykrisna Mootoovaloo, Hans Eggers, Zafiirah Hosenie, Steve Kroon, and Elena Sellentin. Marginal Likelihoods from Monte Carlo Markov Chains. 4 2017.