

Matching current observational constraints with non-minimally coupled dark energy

William J. Wolf,^{1,*} Pedro G. Ferreira,^{1,†} and Carlos García-García^{1,‡}

¹*Astrophysics, University of Oxford, DWB, Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom*

We show that a universe with a non-minimally coupled scalar field can fit current measurements of the expansion rate of the Universe better than the standard Λ -Cold Dark Matter model or other minimally coupled dark energy models. While we find a clear improvement in the goodness of fit for this dark energy model with respect to others that have been considered in the recent literature, using various information theoretic criteria, we show that the evidence for it is still inconclusive.

Introduction.—The latest DESI measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) [1], alongside data from supernovae (SNe) [2–4] and the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) [5–8], seem to be hinting at deviations from the Λ -Cold Dark Matter (Λ CDM) paradigm and provide evidence for time-evolving dark energy. There has, understandably, been a tremendous amount of work exploring this evidence (see e.g. [9–39]). A particular thread of the literature concerns whether or not the current data, assuming that the recent DESI results hold up to further scrutiny and more data, implies a phantom crossing in the dark energy evolution.

The discussion around dynamically evolving dark energy has largely centered around the well-known Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parameterization [40, 41]:

$$w(a) \simeq w_0 + w_a(1 - a), \quad (1)$$

where, $w = P_{\text{DE}}/\rho_{\text{DE}}$ is the equation of state of dark energy, with energy density, ρ_{DE} , pressure, P_{DE} , and a is the scale factor of the Universe. The right-hand side of Eq. (1) is an approximation to the left-hand side where w_0 gives the value of w today and w_a characterizes its temporal evolution. Current constraints on these parameters seem to place dark energy firmly in the phantom regime, where $w(a) < -1$. But, as has been discussed in [9, 13, 14, 42], w_0 and w_a are in fact fitting parameters and it can be misleading to extrapolate the parametrised $w(a)$ across the entirety of cosmic history. Indeed, there are non-phantom quintessence models which appear to be phantom when described in terms of CPL parameterization simply because the resulting parametrised $w(a)$ crosses -1 even though the dark energy model itself never dips below -1 . Nevertheless, if one restricts oneself to thawing models of quintessence (which never have $w(a) < -1$), Wolf *et al.* [9] shows that there is inconclusive evidence for them from the current data.

There have been a few attempts at assessing the evidence for the phantom regime from current data. On the one hand, a model agnostic approach from Lodha *et al.* [15] indicated that there is no evidence for phantom crossing. On the other hand, Ye *et al.* [10] have also

used model agnostic methods to argue that there is evidence for phantom crossing. In light of their results, Ye *et al.* [10] have proposed a non-minimally coupled model of dark energy – dubbed *Thawing Gravity* (TG) – as a proof of concept to illustrate that non-minimally coupled models with a stable phantom crossing can offer an improvement in terms of fitting the data over Λ CDM and minimally coupled quintessence. In this letter, we will show that this model, when compared with the minimally coupled thawing quintessence in Wolf *et al.* [9] and Wolf and Ferreira [42], is similar in terms of its consistency with the data. We will show; however, that by building on the insights of Wolf and Ferreira [42], Wolf *et al.* [9], and Ye *et al.* [10], it is possible to construct a viable, non-minimally coupled dark energy model that does cover the type of evolution of $w(a)$ being uncovered by current data. Nevertheless we will argue that, using current constraints on the redshift dependence of the expansion rate, such a model is not statistically preferable over Λ CDM.

Dark energy models.— Our starting point will be the following action:

$$S_{HTG} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} (M_{\text{P}}^2 - \xi \varphi^2) R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial^\mu \varphi - \left(V_1 - V_0 e^{-\lambda \varphi / M_{\text{P}}} \right) + \mathcal{L}_M(g_{\alpha\beta}, \psi_M) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is the metric, g its determinant and R its Ricci tensor, φ is the quintessence field (the source of dark energy), ξ is the non-minimal coupling parameter, $\mathcal{L}_M(\dots)$ is the matter action, and ψ_M is a schematic representation of all the matter fields apart from the quintessence field. This model has a large region of parameter space which is safe from ghost and gradient instabilities, which are known to frequently plague theories of modified gravity [43–47].

There are two crucial ingredients to this model: the non-minimal coupling and the particular form of the potential. The non-minimal coupling allows for phantom crossing behavior [48], which seems to be implied by the data (notwithstanding the earlier mentioned caveats). The potential proposed in Eq. (2) allows for a $d^2V/d\varphi^2 < 0$, i.e., a potential with hilltop or plateau-like features. More generally, potentials with this feature have been widely explored in the context of inflation (e.g. [49–52]), and to a somewhat lesser extent dark

* william.wolf@stx.ox.ac.uk

† pedro.ferreira@physics.ox.ac.uk

‡ carlos.garcia-garcia@physics.ox.ac.uk

energy [9, 11, 13, 42, 53–55]. This particular form of the potential with a negative exponential resembles some that have previously been studied in various contexts in modeling early Universe physics [56–59]. Contra the most common scalar field potentials like the standard quadratic or exponential models, these potentials are concave down and once the field begins rolling down the potential, the evolution of φ can be very rapid. This can translate into sharp, non-linear evolution in $w(a)$ which would suggest that such models lie in the steeper (w_0, w_a) regions favoured by current constraints [9, 13, 42]. Thus, we will refer to this model as *Hilltop Thawing Gravity* (HTG).

In order to solve the cosmological equations of motion, we have implemented this model in `hi_class` [60–62]. We set $\varphi_{ini} = 0$ and $\dot{\varphi}_{ini} \neq 0$ (in practice this means setting it to a small, but non-zero value so that the field can roll down the potential). We tune V_1 to satisfy the equations of motion, while varying the parameters λ , V_0 , and ξ . Similar to [10], we find that $V_1 \simeq 3H_0\Omega_\varphi$ provides a robust starting point for the numerical solvers. Through this letter, $M_P = 1$, V_0 will be in units of $M_P^2(H_0/h)^2$, and both ξ and λ are dimensionless.

Additionally, as we shall soon see, it will be instructive to compare the HTG model explored here with the TG explored in Ye *et al.* [10] and the *Thawing Quintessence* (TQ) model explored in Wolf and Ferreira [42] and Wolf *et al.* [9], which as mentioned earlier, share some features. For reference, we reproduce the actions of these models here. TG is given by:

$$S_{TG} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} (M_P^2 - \xi\varphi^2) R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial^\mu \varphi - V_0 e^{-\lambda\varphi/M_P} + \mathcal{L}_M(g_{\alpha\beta}, \psi_M) \right], \quad (3)$$

where we have kept the non-minimal coupling prescription which enables recent phantom crossing and we have a similar exponential form, but $d^2V/d\varphi^2 > 0$ in this model because $V_0 > 0$ here, which does restrict us to a more limited range of dynamical behavior. Additionally, one can easily see from this expression that we can recover the TG model from the HTG action by choosing $V_1 = 0$ and $V_0 < 0$ in Eq. (2). TQ is given by:

$$S_{TQ} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} M_P^2 R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial^\mu \varphi - \left(V_0 + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 \right) + \mathcal{L}_M(g_{\alpha\beta}, \psi_M) \right], \quad (4)$$

where the non-minimal coupling has been dropped, meaning that this model can not venture into the phantom regime of dark energy. However, this model can have either $d^2V/d\varphi^2 > 0$ or $d^2V/d\varphi^2 < 0$ depending on the sign of m^2 . As detailed in [9, 42], this allows it to have considerable dynamical freedom.

Results. — The CPL parameters (w_0, w_a) are fitting parameters, a form of data compression. Often in the literature, one takes the approach of directly fitting $w(a)$ to

a selection of data over a recent range of redshifts to best approximate the evolution of $w(a)$ in terms of the CPL parameters. In practice though, we cannot measure $w(a)$ directly; (w_0, w_a) are inferred from data that effectively probe $H(z) \equiv \dot{a}/a(z)$ (where overdot is a derivative with cosmic time) at different redshifts, $1+z = 1/a$. Assuming Eq. (1), H becomes:

$$H^2(a) = H_0^2 \left[\Omega_m a^{-3} + (1 - \Omega_m) e^{3w_a(a-1)} a^{-3(1+w_0+w_a)} \right], \quad (5)$$

where Ω_m is the fractional energy density in non-relativistic matter today and H_0 is the Hubble rate today. One then finds the best fit (and associated uncertainties) of Eq. (5) to an appropriate selection of data.

If one wishes to compare a particular model to the data, represented in terms of (w_0, w_a) , one needs to undertake the exact same procedure; one must find the corresponding $H(z)$ for that model, determine the corresponding observables at the same redshifts as the data has been collected, and find the best fit values of (w_0, w_a) . In [9], an efficient approach to this was proposed, specifically targeting BAO, SNe, and CMB probes used in the DESI analysis [1]. We briefly recap the method. The BAO data is given in terms of angular diameter distances; the SNe data can be compressed into measurements of $E(z) \equiv H(z)/H_0$ at different redshifts [63]; the CMB data can be compressed into an acoustic scale ℓ_A and shift parameter $R(z_*)$ at the photon decoupling redshift z_* [64–66]. Using this combination of variables, one can reproduce the latest results from [1] to an excellent approximation; thus, we can be sure that using this procedure will allow us to compare like for like when determining a dark energy model’s representation in the (w_0, w_a) plane (see [9, Appendix A] for more details). In other words, this procedure is essentially determining the prior distribution of this class of theories in the CPL parameter plane. This then allows us to compare the theory directly to the likelihood for (w_0, w_a) derived from the data and determine the extent of the overlap.

Given these observables, we then find the best-fit CPL parameters by minimizing

$$\chi^2 = (\mathcal{O}^{\text{CPL}} - \mathcal{O}^\varphi)^T \left(\frac{\mathcal{O}^{\text{d}}}{\mathcal{O}^\varphi} \right)^T \text{Cov}^{-1} \frac{\mathcal{O}^{\text{d}}}{\mathcal{O}^\varphi} (\mathcal{O}^{\text{CPL}} - \mathcal{O}^\varphi), \quad (6)$$

which gives the distance between (ξ, λ, V_0, V_1) and (w_0, w_a) . Here, $\mathcal{O}_i^{\text{CPL}}$ and \mathcal{O}_i^φ are the observables computed with the CPL parameterization or the dark energy model respectively, the factors $\mathcal{O}^{\text{d}}/\mathcal{O}^\varphi$ ensure that we fit the observables using the data measurements’ relative errors, and “Cov” represents the associated covariance. Here, we work with the combined data and minimize $\chi_{\text{tot}}^2 = \chi_{\text{DESI}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SNe}}^2 + \chi_{\text{CMB}}^2$.

It is useful to illustrate this for a few representative models as can be seen in Fig. 1. Consider the $w(a)$ that arise from the theory given by Eq. (2) for particular choices of (ξ, λ, V_0, V_1) and for a cosmology with $\Omega_m = .31$ and $H_0 = 69 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Then,




FIG. 1: Top: equation of state, $w(a)$, for a representative modified gravity models from Eq. (2) alongside the corresponding best fit CPL models when fitting directly to the BAO, SNe, and CMB data (Eq. 6). Bottom: projection of these (w_0, w_a) fits onto latest data constraints [1].

for each value of these parameters, we use Eq. (5) to find the corresponding values of (w_0, w_a) . The blue line is given by $(\xi, \lambda, V_0, V_1) = (2.30, 0.75, 5.00, 5.30)$ and $(w_0, w_a) = (-0.82, -0.79)$, the yellow line is given $(1.50, 0.82, 1.75, 2.68)$ and $(-0.92, -0.23)$, and the green line is given by $(2.10, 1.42, 1.61, 2.24)$ and $(-0.93, -0.42)$. As can be seen from examining Fig. 1, these models cross the phantom divide quite recently ($z < 1$), but they differ quite substantially in terms of how far they delve into the phantom regime, as well as how rapidly they subsequently thaw. It is precisely this dynamical flexibility that allows these representative models to map a large region of the (w_0, w_a) plane.

To see how extensively we can cover the (w_0, w_a) plane we sample $\simeq 100,000$ models from the HTG model given in Eq. (2) in latin hypercube in the ranges $\xi \in [0.0, 3.5]$,

$\lambda \in [0.0, 3.5]$, and $V_0 \in [0.0, 15.0]$, and for the cosmological parameters $\Omega_m \in [0.28, 0.34]$ and $h \in [0.66, 0.72]$. Additionally, as the data strongly favors models for which $w_0 > -1$ (the fitted value of the equation of state today), we will restrict ourselves to models which have successfully crossed the phantom divide and have $w_0 > -1$. As both the model proposed here and the thawing gravity model of [10] are similar in that they allow for a recent phantom crossing, it will be instructive to compare them. In order to compare the above model with the thawing gravity model of Ye *et al.* [10], we also repeat the sampling procedure $\xi \in [0.0, 3.5]$ and $\lambda \in [0.0, 3.5]$ for the model in Ye *et al.* [10] (recall that it has one less parameter). To complete the comparison, we also can perform an analogous scan across the *minimally coupled* thawing quintessence model; in this case the model essentially maps onto the parametrized model explored in detail in Wolf *et al.* [9].

As depicted in Fig. 2, the model in Eq. (2) saturates the posterior distribution of the combined BAO+SNe+CMB data and can be mapped across the (w_0, w_a) plane when directly fitting the data (c.f. [9, Fig. 3] whereas the minimally coupled thawing quintessence models asymptote to a particular region of the (w_0, w_a) plane and share only a small overlap with the posteriors constraints). We also find, similarly to [10], that the model given by [10] occupies a small slice of viable parameter space. However, the fitting procedure used here pushes these models further away from the posterior constraints. This is because, when determining the (w_0, w_a) representation for their models, [10] directly fit the equation of state $w(a)$ over a range of recent redshifts ($z < 1$). The fitting procedure here uses the precise redshifts and uncertainties from current BAO and SNe constraints and, crucially, also includes CMB data from $z \simeq 1100$. As can be seen from looking at the posteriors for various combinations of data sets in [1], including the CMB will naturally pull the best fit CPL parameters into the upper right region of the (w_0, w_a) plane.

Thus, even given that this fitting procedure takes account for all the data across these epochs, the model given by Eq. (2) has dynamics that enables it to occupy the lower left regions of the posterior constraints. This comes from the fact that the model given by Eq. (2), when compared to its cousin in [10], can move further into the phantom region and evolve more rapidly, which means that the corresponding, derived, (w_0, w_a) values can occupy the lower left region favored by the data.

Does this mean current data is favouring the HTG model? To answer this question, we turn to a direct comparison of the observables generated by the model to the data, bypassing the step of estimating the CPL parameters; we use the likelihoods as implemented in Cobaya [67, 68] for the DESI [15], Pantheon+ [3], and Planck+ACT lensing [5–8] data. While we can undertake a full Bayesian analysis of this model, placing constraints on (ξ, λ, V_0, V_1) , these will depend on the priors we assume on this set of parameters and are not the goal




FIG. 2: 68% and 95% C.L. posterior distribution of the CPL parameters (dashed line) from the combined BAO+CMB+SNe data, where we use the data sets coming from DESI data [15], Pantheon+ [3], and Planck+ACT lensing [5–8]. Overlaid are the CPL parameters, obtained fitting Eq. (6), for thawing quintessence, thawing gravity, and hilltop thawing gravity.

of this letter. We will focus on whether non-minimal thawing quintessence is, in any way favoured relative to minimally couple quintessence or even Λ CDM. To do so, we just need to find the model, given by Eq. (2) that maximizes the likelihood, \mathcal{L} (or, alternatively, minimizes $\chi^2 = -2 \ln \hat{\mathcal{L}}$)¹ for this data-set.

For the HTG model in Eq. (2), we find $\chi^2_{\text{HTG}} \simeq 2424$, whereas for the thawing gravity model [10] we find $\chi^2_{\text{TG}} \simeq 2432.7$, leading to a substantial $\Delta\chi^2 \simeq 8.7$ between the two models. Thawing quintessence has $\chi^2_{\text{TQ}} \simeq 2434$ and Λ CDM has $\chi^2_{\Lambda\text{CDM}} \simeq 2436.8$. Thus the thawing gravity of [10] and thawing quintessence of [9, 42] perform similarly in terms of their ability to fit the data, with a $\Delta\chi^2 \simeq 1.3$.

With a $\Delta\chi^2 \simeq 12.8$, the HTG model seems to be strongly preferred over Λ CDM. Yet, it is useful to refine this comparison by looking at more nuanced information criteria that account for the number of parameters. We consider the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [69–71]. The AIC is given by $\text{AIC} = 2k + \chi^2$, where k is the number of parameters in the model. The BIC is given by $\text{BIC} = k \ln(n) + \chi^2$, where $n \simeq 2400$ is the number of data points. Regarding the AIC, Λ CDM has one free parameter given by $\{\Lambda\}$, whereas non-minimal thawing quintessence has five free parameters given by $\{V_1, V_0, \xi, \lambda, \dot{\varphi}_{\text{ini}}\}$. Thus, $\Delta k \equiv k^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} - k^{\text{HTG}} = -4$ and $\Delta\text{AIC} \simeq 4.4$, which still solidly favors the HTG model over the Λ CDM model even when accounting for introducing more parameters. For the BIC, we have $\Delta\text{BIC} \simeq -18.3$, which strongly favors Λ CDM.

Discussion.— In this letter, we have shown that it is

possible to construct a model of dark energy (extending the proposal of [10]) that can span a large area of the (w_0, w_a) plane, easily covering the region constrained by current observations. A crucial ingredient is that the scalar field is non-minimally coupled to gravity and one might interpret what we found as evidence for new physics. We show that is not the case. While the new model does substantially improve the goodness of fit (or the $\chi^2 = -2 \ln \hat{\mathcal{L}}$) relative to Λ CDM, if one takes into account the number of free parameters required to do so, one finds that, as in the discussion of thawing quintessence in [9], that the evidence is inconclusive.

While the evidence for this model is inconclusive, it is, nevertheless, interesting that a non-minimal coupling plays such an important role. What would it take to strengthen the evidence? A first step would be to reduce the number of free parameters in the model. We now have five free parameters and the bare minimum we can have, for a scalar field model, is three (one for the non-minimal coupling, one for a monomial potential and one for the initial conditions); even in that case, for the same value of the χ^2 the evidence would be marginal. The only way the evidence might be strengthened is with future, more constraining data, reinforcing what has been found with the current data, but at higher significance. An interesting consequence of having a non-minimal coupling is that it might lead to other effects related to structure formation [72–78], gravitational waves [79–85] and, most significantly, fifth force tests [86–88]. We leave for future work the study of the impact of the non-minimal coupling at small scales and whether the effects can be screened to satisfy the local tests of Gravity. However, it is important to remind ourselves that such signatures will impose very tight, independent, constraints on these types of models.

Acknowledgements.— We are very grateful to Gen Ye and Alessandra Silvestri for helpful discussions.

¹ We use the *lite* version of Planck likelihood in the minimization.

We acknowledge the `hi_class` developers, Emilio Bellini, Miguel Zumalacárregui and Ignacy Sawicki, for sharing a private version of the code. WJW is supported by St. Cross College, University of Oxford. CGG is supported by the Beecroft Trust. PGF is supported by STFC and the Beecroft Trust. For the purposes of open

access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Software: We made extensive use of `hi_class` [60–62], `Cobaya` [67, 68] and the `numpy` [89, 90], `scipy` [91], and `matplotlib` [92] python packages.

-
- [1] A. G. Adame *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024 VI: Cosmological Constraints from the Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, (2024), [arXiv:2404.03002 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [2] D. Rubin *et al.*, Union Through UNITY: Cosmology with 2,000 SNe Using a Unified Bayesian Framework, (2023), [arXiv:2311.12098 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [3] D. Scolnic *et al.*, The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 113 (2022), [arXiv:2112.03863 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [4] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), The Dark Energy Survey: Cosmology Results With ~ 1500 New High-redshift Type Ia Supernovae Using The Full 5-year Dataset, (2024), [arXiv:2401.02929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [5] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [7] F. J. Qu *et al.* (ACT), The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: A Measurement of the DR6 CMB Lensing Power Spectrum and Its Implications for Structure Growth, *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 112 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05202 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [8] M. S. Madhavacheril *et al.* (ACT), The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: DR6 Gravitational Lensing Map and Cosmological Parameters, *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 113 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05203 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [9] W. J. Wolf, C. García-García, D. J. Bartlett, and P. G. Ferreira, Scant evidence for thawing quintessence, (2024), [arXiv:2408.17318 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [10] G. Ye, M. Martinelli, B. Hu, and A. Silvestri, Non-minimally coupled gravity as a physically viable fit to DESI 2024 BAO, (2024), [arXiv:2407.15832 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [11] Y. Tada and T. Terada, Quintessential interpretation of the evolving dark energy in light of DESI observations, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L121305 (2024), [arXiv:2404.05722 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [12] C.-G. Park, J. de Cruz Perez, and B. Ratra, Using non-DESI data to confirm and strengthen the DESI 2024 spatially-flat w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization result, (2024), [arXiv:2405.00502 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [13] D. Shlivko and P. J. Steinhardt, Assessing observational constraints on dark energy, *Phys. Lett. B* **855**, 138826 (2024), [arXiv:2405.03933 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [14] M. Cortès and A. R. Liddle, Interpreting DESI’s evidence for evolving dark energy, (2024), [arXiv:2404.08056 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [15] K. Lodha *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024: Constraints on Physics-Focused Aspects of Dark Energy using DESI DR1 BAO Data, (2024), [arXiv:2405.13588 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [16] B. R. Dinda, A new diagnostic for the null test of dynamical dark energy in light of DESI 2024 and other BAO data, (2024), [arXiv:2405.06618 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [17] Y. Carloni, O. Luongo, and M. Muccino, Does dark energy really revive using DESI 2024 data?, (2024), [arXiv:2404.12068 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [18] D. Wang, The Self-Consistency of DESI Analysis and Comment on “Does DESI 2024 Confirm Λ CDM?”, (2024), [arXiv:2404.13833 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [19] K. S. Croker, G. Tarlé, S. P. Ahlen, B. G. Cartwright, D. Farrah, N. Fernandez, and R. A. Windhorst, DESI Dark Energy Time Evolution is Recovered by Cosmologically Coupled Black Holes, (2024), [arXiv:2405.12282 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [20] P. Mukherjee and A. A. Sen, Model-independent cosmological inference post DESI DR1 BAO measurements, (2024), [arXiv:2405.19178 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [21] N. Roy, Dynamical dark energy in the light of DESI 2024 data, (2024), [arXiv:2406.00634 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [22] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension, (2024), [arXiv:2404.18579 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [23] I. D. Gialamas, G. Hütsi, K. Kannike, A. Racioppi, M. Raidal, M. Vasar, and H. Veermäe, Interpreting DESI 2024 BAO: late-time dynamical dark energy or a local effect?, (2024), [arXiv:2406.07533 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [24] A. Notari, M. Redi, and A. Tesi, Consistent Theories for the DESI dark energy fit, (2024), [arXiv:2406.08459 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [25] H. Wang, G. Ye, and Y.-S. Piao, Impact of evolving dark energy on the search for primordial gravitational waves, (2024), [arXiv:2407.11263 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [26] H. Wang, Z.-Y. Peng, and Y.-S. Piao, Can recent DESI BAO measurements accommodate a negative cosmological constant?, (2024), [arXiv:2406.03395 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [27] W. Giarè, M. Najafi, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, and J. T. Firouzjaee, Robust Preference for Dynamical Dark Energy in DESI BAO and SN Measurements, (2024), [arXiv:2407.16689 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [28] B. R. Dinda and R. Maartens, Model-agnostic assessment of dark energy after DESI DR1 BAO, (2024), [arXiv:2407.17252 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [29] J.-Q. Jiang, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, Non-parametric late-time expansion history reconstruction and implications for the Hubble tension in light of DESI, (2024), [arXiv:2408.02365 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [30] B. Ghosh and C. Bengaly, Consistency tests between SDSS and DESI BAO measurements, (2024), [arXiv:2408.04432 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [31] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, Model independent cosmographic constraints from DESI 2024, (2024), [arXiv:2404.07070 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [32] A. C. Alfano, O. Luongo, and M. Muccino, Cosmological constraints from calibrated $E_p - E_{iso}$ gamma-ray burst correlation by using DESI 2024 data release, (2024), [arXiv:2408.02536 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [33] J. a. Rebouças, D. H. F. de Souza, K. Zhong, V. Miranda, and R. Rosenfeld, Investigating Late-Time Dark Energy and Massive Neutrinos in Light of DESI Y1 BAO, (2024), [arXiv:2408.14628 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [34] Y.-H. Pang, X. Zhang, and Q.-G. Huang, Constraints on Redshift-Binned Dark Energy using DESI BAO Data, (2024), [arXiv:2408.14787 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [35] J. J. Heckman, O. F. Ramadan, and J. Sakstein, First Constraints on a Pixelated Universe in Light of DESI, (2024), [arXiv:2406.04408 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] G. Efstathiou, Evolving dark energy or supernovae systematics? (2024), [arXiv:2408.07175 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [37] S. Bhattacharya, G. Borghetto, A. Malhotra, S. Parameswaran, G. Tasinato, and I. Zavala, Cosmological constraints on curved quintessence, (2024), [arXiv:2405.17396 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [38] S. Roy Choudhury and T. Okumura, Updated cosmological constraints in extended parameter space with Planck PR4, DESI BAO, and SN: dynamical dark energy, neutrino masses, lensing anomaly, and the Hubble tension, (2024), [arXiv:2409.13022 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [39] R. Arjona and S. Nesseris, A swampland conjecture DESIderátum?, (2024), [arXiv:2409.14990 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [40] E. V. Linder, Exploring the expansion history of the universe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512](#).
- [41] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, Accelerating universes with scaling dark matter, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213 (2001), [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008](#).
- [42] W. J. Wolf and P. G. Ferreira, Underdetermination of dark energy, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103519 (2023), [arXiv:2310.07482 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [43] V. A. Rubakov, The Null Energy Condition and its violation, *Phys. Usp.* **57**, 128 (2014), [arXiv:1401.4024 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [44] W. J. Wolf and M. Lagos, Cosmological Instabilities and the Role of Matter Interactions in Dynamical Dark Energy Models, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 084035 (2019), [arXiv:1908.03212 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] F. Sbisà, Classical and quantum ghosts, *Eur. J. Phys.* **36**, 015009 (2015), [arXiv:1406.4550 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [46] E. Bellini and I. Sawicki, Maximal freedom at minimum cost: linear large-scale structure in general modifications of gravity, *JCAP* **07**, 050, [arXiv:1404.3713 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] V. Errasti Díez, J. Gaset Rifà, and G. Staudt, Foundations of ghost stability, (2024), [arXiv:2408.16832 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [48] S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, Crossing the Phantom Divide: Theoretical Implications and Observational Status, *JCAP* **01**, 018, [arXiv:astro-ph/0610092](#).
- [49] L. Boubekur and D. H. Lyth, Hilltop inflation, *JCAP* **07**, 010, [arXiv:hep-ph/0502047](#).
- [50] K. Kohri, C.-M. Lin, and D. H. Lyth, More hilltop inflation models, *JCAP* **12**, 004, [arXiv:0707.3826 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] W. J. Wolf, Minimizing the tensor-to-scalar ratio in single-field inflation models, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 043521 (2024), [arXiv:2407.00358 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, On hilltop and brane inflation after Planck, *JCAP* **09**, 030, [arXiv:1906.02156 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [53] S. Dutta and R. J. Scherrer, Hilltop Quintessence, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 123525 (2008), [arXiv:0809.4441 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [54] T. Chiba, Slow-Roll Thawing Quintessence, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 083517 (2009), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 80, 109902 (2009)], [arXiv:0902.4037 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [55] S. Tsujikawa, Quintessence: A Review, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 214003 (2013), [arXiv:1304.1961 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [56] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, and V. Vennin, Encyclopædia Inflationaris, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **5-6**, 75 (2014), [arXiv:1303.3787 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, A Cyclic model of the universe, *Science* **296**, 1436 (2002), [arXiv:hep-th/0111030](#).
- [58] M. Cicoli, C. P. Burgess, and F. Quevedo, Fibre Inflation: Observable Gravity Waves from IIB String Compactifications, *JCAP* **03**, 013, [arXiv:0808.0691 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [59] A. Ijjas and P. J. Steinhardt, A new kind of cyclic universe, *Phys. Lett. B* **795**, 666 (2019), [arXiv:1904.08022 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [60] M. Zumalacárregui, E. Bellini, I. Sawicki, J. Lesgourgues, and P. G. Ferreira, hi_class: Horndeski in the Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2017**, 019 (2017), [arXiv:1605.06102 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] E. Bellini, I. Sawicki, and M. Zumalacárregui, hi_class background evolution, initial conditions and approximation schemes, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2020**, 008 (2020), [arXiv:1909.01828 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and T. Tram, The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS). Part II: Approximation schemes, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2011**, 034 (2011), [arXiv:1104.2933 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] A. G. Riess *et al.*, Type Ia Supernova Distances at Redshift > 1.5 from the Hubble Space Telescope Multi-cycle Treasury Programs: The Early Expansion Rate, *Astrophys. J.* **853**, 126 (2018), [arXiv:1710.00844 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] E. Komatsu, J. Dunkley, M. R. Nolta, C. L. Bennett, B. Gold, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, D. Larson, M. Limon, L. Page, D. N. Spergel, M. Halpern, R. S. Hill, A. Kogut, S. S. Meyer, G. S. Tucker, J. L. Weiland, E. Wollack, and E. L. Wright, Five-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe Observations: Cosmological Interpretation, *ApJS* **180**, 330 (2009), [arXiv:0803.0547 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [65] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2015 results. XIV. Dark energy and modified gravity, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A14 (2016), [arXiv:1502.01590 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] L. Chen, Q.-G. Huang, and K. Wang, Distance Priors from Planck Final Release, *JCAP* **02**, 028, [arXiv:1808.05724 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [67] J. Torrado and A. Lewis, Cobaya: code for Bayesian analysis of hierarchical physical models, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2021**, 057 (2021), [arXiv:2005.05290 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [68] J. Torrado and A. Lewis, Cobaya: Bayesian analysis in cosmology, *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, record ascl:1910.019 (2019).
- [69] A. R. Liddle, Information criteria for astrophysical model selection, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **377**, L74 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0701113](#).
- [70] H. Akaike, A New Look at the Statistical Model Identification, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19**, 716 (1974).
- [71] G. Schwarz, Estimating the Dimension of a Model, *Annals of Statistics* **6**, 461 (1978).
- [72] P. G. Ferreira, Cosmological Tests of Gravity, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **57**, 335 (2019), [arXiv:1902.10503 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [73] E. J. Ruiz and D. Huterer, Testing the dark energy consistency with geometry and growth, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 063009 (2015), arXiv:1410.5832 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] D. Alonso, E. Bellini, P. G. Ferreira, and M. Zumalacárregui, Observational future of cosmological scalar-tensor theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 063502 (2017), arXiv:1610.09290 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] Y. Wen, N.-M. Nguyen, and D. Huterer, Sweeping Horndeski canvas: new growth-rate parameterization for modified-gravity theories, *JCAP* **09**, 028, arXiv:2304.07281 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] M. K. Sharma and S. Sur, Imprints of interacting dark energy on cosmological perturbations, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31**, 2250017 (2022), arXiv:2112.08477 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] J. Ruiz-Zapatero, D. Alonso, P. G. Ferreira, and C. Garcia-Garcia, Impact of the Universe's expansion rate on constraints on modified growth of structure, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 083523 (2022), arXiv:2207.09896 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] T. Baker, P. G. Ferreira, and C. Skordis, A Fast Route to Modified Gravitational Growth, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 024026 (2014), arXiv:1310.1086 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] T. Baker, E. Bellini, P. G. Ferreira, M. Lagos, J. Noller, and I. Sawicki, Strong constraints on cosmological gravity from GW170817 and GRB 170817A, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251301 (2017), arXiv:1710.06394 [astro-ph.CO].
- [80] E. Barausse *et al.*, Prospects for Fundamental Physics with LISA, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52**, 81 (2020), arXiv:2001.09793 [gr-qc].
- [81] E. Belgacem *et al.* (LISA Cosmology Working Group), Testing modified gravity at cosmological distances with LISA standard sirens, *JCAP* **07**, 024, arXiv:1906.01593 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacárregui, Dark Energy in light of Multi-Messenger Gravitational-Wave astronomy, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* **5**, 44 (2018), arXiv:1807.09241 [astro-ph.CO].
- [83] C. Dalang, P. Fleury, and L. Lombriser, Horndeski gravity and standard sirens, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 044036 (2020), arXiv:1912.06117 [gr-qc].
- [84] W. J. Wolf and M. Lagos, Standard Sirens as a Novel Probe of Dark Energy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 061101 (2020), arXiv:1910.10580 [gr-qc].
- [85] J. M. Ezquiaga and M. Zumalacárregui, Dark Energy After GW170817: Dead Ends and the Road Ahead, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 251304 (2017), arXiv:1710.05901 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] C. Burrage and J. Sakstein, Tests of Chameleon Gravity, *Living Rev. Rel.* **21**, 1 (2018), arXiv:1709.09071 [astro-ph.CO].
- [87] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model, *Phys. Rept.* **568**, 1 (2015), arXiv:1407.0059 [astro-ph.CO].
- [88] C. M. Will, The Confrontation between General Relativity and Experiment, *Living Rev. Rel.* **17**, 4 (2014), arXiv:1403.7377 [gr-qc].
- [89] T. E. Oliphant, *A guide to NumPy*, Vol. 1 (Trelgol Publishing USA, 2006).
- [90] S. Van Der Walt, S. C. Colbert, and G. Varoquaux, The numpy array: a structure for efficient numerical computation, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **13**, 22 (2011).
- [91] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. Carey, Í. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. Vand erPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and S. . . Contributors, SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python, *Nature Methods* **17**, 261 (2020).
- [92] J. D. Hunter, Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9**, 90 (2007).