

Can recent DESI BAO measurements accommodate a negative cosmological constant?

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

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

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

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

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

Abstract

Anti-de Sitter vacuum, which correspond to a negative cosmological constant (CC), is theoretically important and well-motivated. It is interesting to see whether current data can allow the existence of a negative CC not. In this paper, we perform the MCMC analysis for the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+\text{CC}$ model using recent DESI BAO measurements combined with Planck CMB and Pantheon Plus dataset. The results reveal that the bestfit energy density of CC is $\Omega_\Lambda \sim -0.3$ and the fitting to DESI is slightly improved, while $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ is also 1σ consistent.

PACS numbers:

* wanghao187@mailsucas.ac.cn
† pengzeyu@mail.ustc.edu.cn
‡ yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past decades, identifying the nature of dark energy (DE) has been still an important challenge, see e.g.[1–4] for reviews. It is usually thought that DE is a positive cosmological constant (CC), e.g.[5, 6]. However, recently DESI collaboration [7–9] has showed $w_0 = -0.45 \pm 0.27$ and $w_a = -1.79 \pm 0.79$ for the equation of state of DE [10, 11]

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

while when Pantheon data is considered, the constraints on w_0 and w_a becomes tighter, $w_0 = 0.827 \pm 0.063$ and $w_a = -0.75 \pm 0.27$. The CC ($w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$) has been not preferred at $> 2\sigma$ C.L. see also [12, 13]. The relevant issues have been also intensively investigated recently, e.g.[14–30].

It is well-known that anti-de Sitter (AdS) vacuum, which correspond to a negative CC, is theoretically important and well-motivated. Though it is possible that dS vacua exist [31, 32], the construction of such vacua in string landscape is not straightforward, notably e.g. recent swampland conjecture [33, 34], see [35, 36] for recent reviews and also [37]. However, AdS vacua are ubiquitous, which might have an unexpected impact on our observable universe. The resolution of Hubble tension might be related to the AdS vacuum around the recombination [38–42], or the switch-sign CC [43–47], see also [48]. The inflation in AdS landscape and implication for primordial perturbations have been explored in e.g.[49–53]. Recently, the AdS effect at low redshift have been investigated in light of CMB and pre-DESI BAO dataset [54–59], as well as the JWST observation [60, 61]. Thus it is significant to ask if recent DESI BAO data can accommodate a negative CC.

In this paper, with recent BAO data we will search for the possibility of the existence of a negative CC. In corresponding model, the state equation $w_x(z)$ of one component of DE follows (1), while the other component is CC. They are related by $\Omega_m + \Omega_r + \Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$, where the density parameters of matter Ω_m , radiation Ω_r , one component of DE Ω_x and CC Ω_Λ . We will discuss the implications of our results.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

To confront the w_0w_a CDM+CC model with recent observations, we adopt the following observational datasets:

- **CMB** Planck 2018 low- l and high- l TT, TE, EE spectra, and reconstructed CMB lensing spectrum [62–64].
- **DESI BAO** The measurements of DESI for the comoving distance $D_M(z)/r_d$ and $D_H(z)/r_d$ [7–9],

$$D_M(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{cdz'}{H(z')}, \quad D_H(z) \equiv \frac{c}{H(z)}, \quad (2)$$

where $r_d = \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z)}{H(z)}$ is the sound horizon, $z_d \simeq 1060$ is the redshift at the baryon drag epoch and c_s is the speed of sound, as well as the angle-averaged quantity D_V/r_d where $D_V(z) \equiv (zD_M(z)^2D_H(z))^{1/3}$.

tracer	z_{eff}	D_M/r_d	D_H/r_d	D_V/r_d
BGS	0.30	-	-	7.93 ± 0.15
LRG	0.51	13.62 ± 0.25	20.98 ± 0.61	-
LRG	0.71	16.85 ± 0.32	20.08 ± 0.60	-
LRG+ELG	0.93	21.71 ± 0.28	17.88 ± 0.35	-
ELG	1.32	27.79 ± 0.69	13.82 ± 0.42	-
QSO	1.49	-	-	26.07 ± 0.67
Lya QSO	2.33	39.71 ± 0.94	8.52 ± 0.17	-

TABLE I: Statistics for the DESI samples of the DESI DR1 BAO measurements used in this paper [9].

- **Pantheon+** We use Pantheon+ consisting of 1701 light curves of 1550 spectroscopically confirmed type Ia SN coming from 18 different surveys [65].

The parameter space of the w_0w_a CDM+CC model adapted is $\{100\omega_b, \omega_{cdm}, H_0, n_s, \ln 10^{10}A_s, \tau_{reio}, w_0, w_a, \Omega_x\}$. There is only an additional parameter Ω_x , compared with the w_0w_a CDM model, while that of the CC component is related to Ω_x by $\Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_r - \Omega_x$. We modified the MontePython-3.6 sampler [66, 67] and CLASS codes [68, 69] to perform our MCMC analysis. In Table II we list the flat priors used. We adopt a Gelman-Rubin convergence criterion with a threshold $R - 1 < 0.03$.

Parameter	Prior
$100\omega_b$	[None, None]
ω_{cdm}	[None, None]
H_0	[65, 80]
$\ln 10^{10} A_s$	[None, None]
n_s	[None, None]
τ_{reio}	[0.004, None]
w_0	[-2, 0.34]
w_a	[-3, 2]
Ω_x	[0, 10]

TABLE II: The priors of parameters we adapt in MCMC analysis.

III. RESULTS

In Table.III and IV, we present our MCMC results and the corresponding χ^2 . In Fig.1, we show the 1σ and 2σ marginalized posterior distributions of concerned parameters. As in the w_0w_a CDM model, for the w_0w_a component of DE, $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$ is not still preferred by $\gtrsim 2\sigma$ C.L.. A negative CC (the bestfit $\Omega_\Lambda \sim -0.3$) is slightly preferred by data about $\Delta\chi^2 \sim -0.8$, while a small positive CC $\Omega_\Lambda \lesssim 0.6$ is also 1σ consistent.

In Fig.2, we find that compare to the w_0w_a CDM model, the 2σ contour of $w_0 - w_a$ in the w_0w_a CDM+CC models seems to shift up as a whole, and can be closer to $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$. In our case, the low-redshift evolution of background is controlled by an evolving DE component Ω_x with the state equation w_x and CC Ω_Λ , it is interesting to consider an effective state equation [60]¹

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

instead of w_x . Analogous to the parameterization (1), we have

$$w_{0,\text{eff}} \equiv w_{\text{eff}}(z)|_{z=0} = \frac{\Omega_x w_0 - \Omega_\Lambda}{\Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda}, \quad (4)$$

¹ As discussed in Ref.[60, 70], for initially $w_x(z) < -1$ and negative Ω_Λ , $w_{\text{eff}}(z)$ will diverge at certain high redshift. Thus here (3) only serves as an effective description of state equation at low redshift.

Parameters	w_0w_a CDM	w_0w_a CDM
		+CC
$100\omega_b$	2.219(2.207) \pm 0.014	2.236(2.232) \pm 0.015
ω_{cdm}	0.119(0.120) \pm 0.001	0.120(0.120) \pm 0.001
H_0	67.86(67.99) \pm 0.73	68.27(67.87) \pm 1.00
$\ln 10^{10} A_s$	3.036(3.026) \pm 0.014	3.037(3.026) \pm 0.019
n_s	0.964(0.961) \pm 0.004	0.965(0.967) \pm 0.004
τ_{reio}	0.052(0.048) \pm 0.007	0.053(0.051) \pm 0.008
w_0	-0.844(-0.886) \pm 0.071	-0.820(-0.839) \pm 0.082
w_a	-0.670(-0.546) \pm 0.306	-0.763(-0.591) \pm 0.326
Ω_x	$\simeq 0.7$	0.993(0.972) \pm 0.938
Ω_m	0.3087(0.3077) \pm 0.0069	0.3024(0.3090) \pm 0.0098
S_8	0.833(0.832) \pm 0.012	0.832(0.829) \pm 0.013
Ω_Λ	0	-0.296(-0.281) \pm 0.941

TABLE III: Mean (bestfit) values and 1σ regions of the parameters of w_0w_a CDM+CC model fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets.

Datasets	w_0w_a CDM	w_0w_a CDM
		+CC
Planck high-l TTTEEE	2341.65	2341.43
Planck low-l EE	396.10	395.86
Planck low-l TT	22.55	22.52
Planck lensing	8.77	8.79
DESI	14.93	14.45
Pantheon+	1409.66	1409.77
Total χ^2	4193.76	4192.96

TABLE IV: χ^2 of w_0w_a CDM and w_0w_a CDM+CC model fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets.




FIG. 1: 2D contours at 68% and 95% CL for the parameters of $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+\text{CC}$ model fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets.

and

$$w_{a,\text{eff}} \equiv \left. \frac{dw_{\text{eff}}(z)}{dz} \right|_{z=0} = \frac{\Omega_x[w_a\Omega_x + 3(w_0 + 1)^2\Omega_\Lambda]}{(\Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda)^2}. \quad (5)$$

It can be observed that for $\Omega_\Lambda < 0$, we will have $w_{0,\text{eff}} > w_0$ and $w_{a,\text{eff}} < w_a$ (noting $\Omega_x + \Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_r \sim 0.7$). Thus if $w_{0,\text{eff}} > -1$ and $w_{a,\text{eff}} < 0$ supported by observations, w_0 and w_a must be closer to $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$.

The effect caused by negative CC could be also further investigated by $w_{0,\text{eff}}$ and $w_{a,\text{eff}}$, as plotted in Fig. 3. It looks like that a smaller negative CC is accompanied by more negative $w_{a,\text{eff}}$ and larger $w_{0,\text{eff}}$ for fixed w_0 and w_a . In certain sense, a smaller negative CC ($|\Omega_\Lambda| < 1$) can allow a larger deviation from $w_{a,\text{eff}} = 0$ and larger $w_{0,\text{eff}} = -1$ (although the fitting is bad for $\Omega_\Lambda \lesssim -2$). The reason that an moderate negative CC $\Omega_\Lambda \sim -0.3$ is preferred by Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus dataset is that it suggests $w_{0,\text{eff}} \sim -0.8$ and $w_{a,\text{eff}} \sim -0.7$




FIG. 2: 1σ and 2σ contours of $w_0 - w_a$ for $w_0 w_a$ CDM and $w_0 w_a$ CDM+CC models, respectively, and scattered plot for $w_0 w_a$ CDM+CC with respect to Ω_Λ fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets. The blue dashed line corresponds to $w_0 + w_a = -1$.

at low redshift. The negative CC component with $|\Omega_\Lambda| \sim O(1)$ has been also considered in e.g. Refs.[54, 55, 58, 60].

In Fig.4, we show the evolutions of $D_H(z)/r_d$ and $D_M(z)/r_d$ for our bestfit values, in which $\Omega_\Lambda = -0.281$. It is found that a negative CC could slightly suppress $D_H(z)/r_d$ and $D_M(z)/r_d$ at low redshift, notably, we can have a slightly better fitting at the effective redshift $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.51$ (see e.g.the comments in Refs.[16, 20, 22, 23] on DESI data at $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.51$) and $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.71$, which might be responsible to the improvement of $\Delta\chi_{\text{DESI}}^2 \sim -0.5$, see Table.IV. This result can be explained as follows. According to the parameterization (1), for a negative Ω_Λ , we have

$$\frac{H^2(z)}{H_0^2} = \left[\Omega_m(1+z)^3 - |\Omega_\Lambda| + (1 - \Omega_m + |\Omega_\Lambda|)(1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} e^{\frac{-3w_a z}{1+z}} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Thus $\rho_x(z) = \rho_0(1 - \Omega_m + |\Omega_\Lambda|)(1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} e^{\frac{-3w_a z}{1+z}}$ (so $H(z)$) must be larger than that in the $w_0 w_a$ CDM model without negative CC, or else $\rho_x(z) + \rho_\Lambda$ after $w_x > -1$ will lower




FIG. 3: Scattered plot for $w_{0,eff}-w_{a,eff}$ of w_0w_a CDM+CC model for Ω_Λ fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets.

too fast to fit the observation. In certain sense the concavities of $D_H(z)/r_d$ and $D_M(z)/r_d$ at low redshift might be an observable imprint of negative CC or AdS vacuum, next surveys would rule out it.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we investigate whether recent DESI BAO data allow the existence of a negative CC not. We confront the w_0w_a CDM+CC model with recent observations, and find that while a small positive CC closed to $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ is still 1σ consistent, a negative CC, $\Omega_\Lambda \sim -0.3$, could slightly improve the fitting to DESI.

It is worthwhile to comment the implications of our result. Though in the w_0w_a CDM+CC model, for the w_0w_a component of DE, $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$ is not still preferred by $\gtrsim 2\sigma$ C.L., the inclusion of a negative CC will make w_0 and w_a closer to $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$, in particular, $w_0 + w_a \geq -1$ can be 1.8σ consistent ($w_0 + w_a \geq -1$ is ruled out at $\gtrsim 2\sigma$ C.L. in DESI paper [9]). This effect of negative CC might be worth further studying. The test for negative CC with the JWST observations of high-redshift galaxies has been investigated




FIG. 4: Residuals of $D_H(z)/r_d$, $D_M(z)/r_d$ and $D_V(z)/r_d$ for the bestfit values (blue curves) of w_0w_a CDM+CC model with respect to w_0w_a CDM model fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon Plus datasets. The blue shadows are 1σ regions of $D_H(z)/r_d$, $D_M(z)/r_d$ and $D_V(z)/r_d$, respectively. The DESI data points and error bars are as listed in Table.I.

in Refs.[60, 61]. It is interesting to consider how to combine the JWST observation into Planck+DESI+Pantheon Plus dataset to search for negative CC. In recent e.g.Refs.[15, 29], the impact of DESI data on the state equation w of DE has been inspected in the Hubble-tension-free early dark energy cosmologies, thus it is interesting and might be also necessary to again access the corresponding results [71].

In our phenomenological study, we simply incorporate a negative CC into the parameterized w_0w_a CDM model, however, in realistic scalar field model it might be that the

corresponding DE has an AdS vacuum, thus at low redshift it will roll towards the AdS vacuum, and eventually our Universe will collapse at certain redshift $z < 0$. However, relevant scalar field phenomenology seems not so simple and is worth further investigating. It is possible that if initially $w_0 + w_a < -1$, $\rho_x + \rho_\Lambda \sim -\rho_0|\Omega_\Lambda|$ is in a AdS vacuum, how to climb out of it is also an interesting issue.

In the forthcoming years, the full DESI dataset combined with CMB and SN dataset will help to unveil the nature of DE better, so tell us whether AdS vacua exist not.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by NSFC, No.12075246, National Key Research and Development Program of China, No. 2021YFC2203004, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

-
- [1] J. Frieman, M. Turner and D. Huterer, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **46** (2008), 385-432 doi:10.1146/annurev.astro.46.060407.145243 [arXiv:0803.0982 [astro-ph]].
 - [2] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rept.* **692** (2017), 1-104 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2017.06.001 [arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc]].
 - [3] S. M. Carroll, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4** (2001), 1 doi:10.12942/lrr-2001-1 [arXiv:astro-ph/0004075 [astro-ph]].
 - [4] D. Huterer and D. L. Shafer, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81** (2018) no.1, 016901 doi:10.1088/1361-6633/aa997e [arXiv:1709.01091 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [5] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989), 1-23 doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.61.1
 - [6] T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rept.* **380** (2003), 235-320 doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(03)00120-0 [arXiv:hep-th/0212290 [hep-th]].
 - [7] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03000 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [8] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03001 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [9] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03002 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [10] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10** (2001), 213-224 doi:10.1142/S0218271801000822 [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008 [gr-qc]].

- [11] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003), 091301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.091301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512 [astro-ph]].
- [12] R. Calderon *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2405.04216 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] K. Lodha *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2405.13588 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] Y. Yang, X. Ren, Q. Wang, Z. Lu, D. Zhang, Y. F. Cai and E. N. Saridakis, [arXiv:2404.19437 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2404.18579 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] Z. Wang, S. Lin, Z. Ding and B. Hu, [arXiv:2405.02168 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] W. Yin, [arXiv:2404.06444 [hep-ph]].
- [18] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.07070 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [19] M. Cortês and A. R. Liddle, [arXiv:2404.08056 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] Y. Carloni, O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.12068 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [21] D. Wang, [arXiv:2404.06796 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [22] D. Wang, [arXiv:2404.13833 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] E. Ó. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and D. Stojkovic, [arXiv:2404.08633 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [24] W. Giarè, M. A. Sabogal, R. C. Nunes and E. Di Valentino, [arXiv:2404.15232 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] C. Escamilla-Rivera and R. Sandoval-Orozco, JHEAp **42** (2024), 217-221 doi:10.1016/j.jheap.2024.05.005 [arXiv:2405.00608 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] C. G. Park, J. de Cruz Perez and B. Ratra, [arXiv:2405.00502 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] D. Shlivko and P. Steinhardt, [arXiv:2405.03933 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] B. R. Dinda, [arXiv:2405.06618 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [29] O. Seto and Y. Toda, [arXiv:2405.11869 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [30] S. Bhattacharya, G. Borghetto, A. Malhotra, S. Parameswaran, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, [arXiv:2405.17396 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 046005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.046005 [arXiv:hep-th/0301240 [hep-th]].
- [32] R. Kallosh and A. D. Linde, JHEP **12** (2004), 004 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/12/004 [arXiv:hep-th/0411011 [hep-th]].
- [33] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **766** (2007), 21-33 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2006.10.033 [arXiv:hep-th/0605264 [hep-th]].

- [34] G. Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko and C. Vafa, [arXiv:1806.08362 [hep-th]].
- [35] E. Palti, Fortsch. Phys. **67** (2019) no.6, 1900037 doi:10.1002/prop.201900037 [arXiv:1903.06239 [hep-th]].
- [36] M. Graña and A. Herráez, Universe **7** (2021) no.8, 273 doi:10.3390/universe7080273 [arXiv:2107.00087 [hep-th]].
- [37] R. Kallosh, A. Linde, E. McDonough and M. Scalisi, JHEP **03** (2019), 134 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2019)134 [arXiv:1901.02022 [hep-th]].
- [38] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.8, 083507 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083507 [arXiv:2001.02451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.8, 083523 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.083523 [arXiv:2008.10832 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.10, 103524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.103524 [arXiv:2107.07128 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] G. Ye, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Lett. B **839** (2023), 137770 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137770 [arXiv:2107.13391 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Lett. B **832** (2022), 137244 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137244 [arXiv:2201.07079 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] Ö. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, L. A. Escamilla and J. A. Vazquez, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.6, 063528 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063528 [arXiv:1912.08751 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [44] Ö. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker and J. A. Vazquez, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.12, 123512 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123512 [arXiv:2108.09239 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [45] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker, J. A. Vazquez and A. Yadav, Phys. Rev. D **108** (2023) no.2, 023513 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.023513 [arXiv:2211.05742 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, J. A. Vazquez and A. Yadav, [arXiv:2307.10899 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [47] E. A. Paraskevas, A. Cam, L. Perivolaropoulos and O. Akarsu, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.10, 103522 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.103522 [arXiv:2402.05908 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [48] L. A. Anchordoqui, I. Antoniadis and D. Lust, [arXiv:2312.12352 [hep-th]].
- [49] H. H. Li, G. Ye, Y. Cai and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.6, 063527 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063527 [arXiv:1911.06148 [gr-qc]].
- [50] G. Ye, J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.10, 103528

- doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.103528 [arXiv:2205.02478 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] P. X. Lin, H. L. Huang, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, to be published in Phys.Lett.B [arXiv:2211.05265 [gr-qc]].
- [52] Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005), 087301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.087301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0502343 [astro-ph]].
- [53] Y. Cai, Y. T. Wang, J. Y. Zhao and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.10, 103535 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.103535 [arXiv:1709.07464 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] K. Dutta, Ruchika, A. Roy, A. A. Sen and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Gen. Rel. Grav. **52** (2020) no.2, 15 doi:10.1007/s10714-020-2665-4 [arXiv:1808.06623 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [55] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi and U. Danielsson, Symmetry **11** (2019) no.8, 1035 doi:10.3390/sym11081035 [arXiv:1907.07953 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [56] Ruchika, S. A. Adil, K. Dutta, A. Mukherjee and A. A. Sen, Phys. Dark Univ. **40** (2023), 101199 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2023.101199 [arXiv:2005.08813 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [57] R. Calderón, R. Gannouji, B. L’Huillier and D. Polarski, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.2, 023526 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.023526 [arXiv:2008.10237 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [58] A. A. Sen, S. A. Adil and S. Sen, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **518** (2022) no.1, 1098-1105 doi:10.1093/mnras/stac2796 [arXiv:2112.10641 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [59] M. Malekjani, R. M. Conville, E. Ó. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Eur. Phys. J. C **84** (2024) no.3, 317 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12667-z [arXiv:2301.12725 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen and S. Vagnozzi, JCAP **10** (2023), 072 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2023/10/072 [arXiv:2307.12763 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [61] N. Menci, S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen and S. Vagnozzi, [arXiv:2401.12659 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], Astron. Astrophys. **641**, A6 (2020) [erratum: Astron. Astrophys. **652**, C4 (2021)] doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020), A5 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936386 [arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [64] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020), A8 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833886 [arXiv:1807.06210 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [65] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, A. G. Riess, T. M. Davis, A. Dwomoh, D. O. Jones,

- N. Ali, P. Charvu and R. Chen, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 113 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8b7a [arXiv:2112.03863 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [66] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed and S. Prunet, *JCAP* **02** (2013), 001 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/02/001 [arXiv:1210.7183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [67] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **24** (2019), 100260 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2018.100260 [arXiv:1804.07261 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] J. Lesgourgues, [arXiv:1104.2932 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [69] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues and T. Tram, *JCAP* **07** (2011), 034 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2011/07/034 [arXiv:1104.2933 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [70] E. Ozulker, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.6, 063509 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.063509 [arXiv:2203.04167 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [71] H. Wang, Z. Y. Peng and Y. S. Piao, *in preparation*.