

Can decaying vacuum solve the H_0 Tension?

L. S. Brito^{1,*}, J. F. Jesus^{1,2,†}, A. A. Escobal^{1,3,4,‡} and S. H. Pereira^{2§}

¹*Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP),*

Faculdade de Engenharia e Ciências,

Departamento de Física - Av. Dr. Ariberto Pereira da Cunha 333,

12516-410, Guaratinguetá, SP, Brazil

²*Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP),*

Instituto de Ciências e Engenharia,

Departamento de Ciências e Tecnologia - R. Geraldo Alckmin,

519, 18409-010, Itapeva, SP, Brazil

³*Department of Astronomy, School of Physical Sciences,*

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

⁴*IAG, Universidade de São Paulo, 05508-900 São Paulo, SP, Brazil.*

Abstract

In the present work we analyze two different models of interaction between dark energy and dark matter, also known as vacuum decay models or $\Lambda(t)$ CDM models. In both models, when the H_0 parameter is constrained by the Planck distance priors, its value is compatible with a higher value of H_0 , in agreement with SH0ES data, while simultaneously reducing the values of Ω_m and Ω_b . In both models, we find $H_0 = 73.1 \pm 0.86$ at 68% c.l. by combining Planck+SH0ES data. We also find the decay parameter to be $\varepsilon = 0.0197^{+0.0032}_{-0.0027}$ for one model and $\varepsilon = 0.0203 \pm 0.0034$ for the other one. From these analyses, a noninteracting model is excluded at least at 6σ c.l.! This shows that these types of models are promising in solving or at least alleviating the H_0 tension problem. Our analysis also shows a preference for the decay of vacuum into dark matter, in agreement to thermodynamic analyses.

PACS numbers:

Keywords:

*Electronic address: lucas.s.brito@unesp.br

†Electronic address: jf.jesus@unesp.br

[‡]Electronic address: anderson.aescobal@gmail.com

[§]Electronic address: s.pereira@unesp.br

I. INTRODUCTION

The Λ CDM model (formed by a Cold Dark Matter component plus a cosmological constant Λ) is currently the most widely accepted cosmological model to describe the evolution of the Universe, due to its ability to accurately describe key observational data, such as the cosmic microwave background (CMB) power spectrum and the accelerated expansion of the Universe. However, despite its success, the Λ CDM model faces several challenges, both theoretical and observational. Among these are the cosmological constant problem or Dark Energy (DE) problem, the nature of Dark Matter (DM), the coincidence problem and more recently the Hubble tension.

The cosmological constant problem arises from the discrepancy between theoretical predictions of vacuum energy from quantum field theory and the observed value of the vacuum energy density. Quantum Field Theory in curved spacetime predicts a vacuum energy density that is approximately 120 orders of magnitude larger than what is inferred from astronomical observations. This vast difference between the theoretical prediction and the observationally inferred value remains one of the greatest unsolved problems in modern Cosmology [1, 2]. Another profound mystery in modern Cosmology is the nature of DM. Although it constitutes approximately 27% of the total mass-energy content of the Universe, dark matter does not interact with electromagnetic radiation, making it invisible to current detection methods. Its presence is inferred primarily through its gravitational effects, such as the rotation curves of galaxies and gravitational lensing. Despite extensive efforts to directly detect dark matter particles, their exact nature remains elusive. The coincidence problem, on the other hand, refers to the seemingly peculiar fact that the current densities associated with the DE or vacuum energy and DM are of the same order of magnitude, despite having evolved very differently throughout the history of the Universe. In the early Universe, the density of matter was vastly greater than that of dark energy. As the Universe expanded, dark matter density diluted, while dark energy remained constant. The challenge is to explain why, out of all possible epochs, we observe the Universe at a time when these densities appear so closely aligned [3].

In this work, however, we focus on another significant cosmological issue: the Hubble tension [4]. Early estimates of the Hubble constant (H_0), which describes the current expansion rate of the Universe, varied considerably. During the 1960s and 1970s, measurements

ranged from 50 km/s/Mpc to 100 km/s/Mpc, mainly due to the limitations in observational techniques at that time. In the 1990s, the Hubble Space Telescope provided more precise estimates of H_0 , leading to a period of significant improvement in measurements. The SH0ES (Supernovae, H_0 for the Dark Energy Equation of State) Program further refined the value of the H_0 through detailed analyses of parallax measurements, Cepheid variable stars, gravitational lensing, and Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia). The SH0ES team determined H_0 to be 74.2 ± 3.6 km/s/Mpc [5], with subsequent studies improving the precision to 73.17 ± 0.86 km/s/Mpc [6]. This value will be referred to as the SH0ES H_0 . In contrast, the Planck satellite mission, operated by the European Space Agency (ESA), used a different approach to measure the expansion rate of the Universe. By analyzing data from the CMB in combination with baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) data, the Planck team derived a lower value of $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ km/s/Mpc [7], which we refer to as the Planck H_0 .

The discrepancy between the SH0ES and Planck measurements of H_0 has sparked a significant debate within the cosmology community, as both values are derived from highly robust and independent datasets. The SH0ES estimate is based on local or low-redshift observations, while the Planck value stems from early or high-redshift Universe data, under the assumption of the Λ CDM model. This discrepancy has now reached a 5.8σ significance level, posing a serious challenge to the Λ CDM framework. Since systematic errors have not been able to account for this tension, various theoretical models have been proposed to resolve the issue. These include modifications such as models with additional degrees of freedom in the dark energy sector, and other alternative cosmological proposals [8].

In the present paper we are interested to investigate the Hubble tension in a special class of DE models, namely models with a time-varying Λ , also known as vacuum-decay models [9–19]. In such models, some *ad hoc* time dependence for $\Lambda(t)$ is assumed or can also be derived from Quantum Mechanical arguments or by geometrical motivations.

The paper is organized as follows. We describe the Friedmann equations with a time-dependent $\Lambda(t)$ -term in Section II, where we also obtain analytical solutions for $H(z)$ in different classes of models. In Section III, we constrain the parameters of the models using CMB and H_0 from SH0ES. In the analysis, we consider separately the constraints on H_0 from Planck and SH0ES. Finally, we present our conclusions and final remarks in Section IV.

II. COSMOLOGICAL EQUATIONS FOR A VARYING Λ TERM

From the cosmological principle, which assures that the spatial distribution of matter in the Universe is uniformly homogeneous and isotropic when viewed on large scale, the Einstein field equations leads to the so-called Friedmann equations, given by:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G\rho_T}{3} - \frac{k}{a^2}, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho_T + 3p_T), \quad (2)$$

where ρ_T is the total energy density of the Universe, p_T is the total pressure and k is the spatial curvature, which we assume to be zero from now on. Taking into account different contributions to ρ_T and p_T , they are given by:

$$\rho_T = \rho_M + \rho_\Lambda + \rho_r, \quad (3)$$

$$p_T = p_\Lambda + p_r = -\rho_\Lambda + \frac{1}{3}\rho_r \quad (4)$$

where $\rho_M = \rho_d + \rho_b$ corresponds to the sum of dark matter energy density (ρ_d) plus baryons energy density (ρ_b), which are both pressureless ($p_M = 0$), ρ_Λ corresponds to the time-varying $\Lambda(t)$ -term, (with $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda$) and ρ_r corresponds to radiation, (with $p_r = \frac{1}{3}\rho_r$). The continuity equations may be written as:

$$\dot{\rho}_b + 3H\rho_b = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_r + 4H\rho_r = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_d + 3H\rho_d = Q, \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_\Lambda = -Q, \quad (8)$$

where Q is the interaction term between pressureless matter and vacuum. Eqs. (5) and (6) promptly yield the standard result $\rho_b = \rho_{b0}a^{-3}$ and $\rho_r = \rho_{r0}a^{-4}$. In order to solve for ρ_d and ρ_Λ , however, we need the explicit form of the interaction term Q . Since we know that baryons and dark matter share the same equation of state (EOS), one might also write:

$$\dot{\rho}_M + 3H\rho_M = Q \quad (9)$$

for the total pressureless matter.

In the present work we will study two possible interaction terms, namely $Q = 3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda$ (Model I) and $Q = 3\varepsilon aH\rho_\Lambda$ (Model II). Thus, one could summarize both interaction terms in one equation:

$$Q = 3\varepsilon a^n H\rho_\Lambda \quad (10)$$

where $n = 0$ or $n = 1$ for the Models I and II, respectively. Model I is interesting for dimensional reasons, as the interaction term has dimensions $\propto H\rho$. Model II is interesting because it corresponds to an exponential decay of Λ with respect to the scale factor, as we shall see below. In the following subsections, we study each of these cases separately.

A. Model I: $Q = 3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda$ class of models

This model has already been studied by [20–22], in the context of a dark energy with a constant equation of state. In this case, by replacing $n = 0$ in Eq. (10), Eq. (8) can be written as:

$$\dot{\rho}_\Lambda = -3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda \quad (11)$$

By changing to scale factor derivatives by using the relation $\frac{d}{dt} = \dot{a}\frac{d}{da} = aH\frac{d}{da}$, it can be written as:

$$\rho'_\Lambda(a) = -\frac{3\varepsilon\rho_\Lambda(a)}{a} \quad (12)$$

where $'$ means $\frac{d}{da}$. This equation can easily be solved to:

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{\Lambda 0} a^{-3\varepsilon} \quad (13)$$

where $\rho_{\Lambda 0}$ is the current value of Λ density. This coincides with the so-called Generalized Chen-Wu model, where $\Lambda \propto a^{-n}$ [23, 24]. By replacing Eq. (13) in Eq. (9), and changing to scale factor derivatives, we find:

$$\rho'_M(a) = -\frac{3\rho_M}{a} + 3\varepsilon\rho_{\Lambda 0}a^{-1-3\varepsilon}. \quad (14)$$

This equation can be solved to:

$$\rho_M(a) = \left(\rho_{M0} - \frac{\varepsilon\rho_{\Lambda 0}}{1-\varepsilon}\right)a^{-3} + \frac{\varepsilon\rho_{\Lambda 0}}{1-\varepsilon}a^{-3\varepsilon}. \quad (15)$$

By replacing (13) and (15) in Friedmann equation (1) and changing to redshift z , we find

$$H^2 = H_0^2 \left[\left(\Omega_M - \frac{\varepsilon\Omega_\Lambda}{1-\varepsilon} \right) (1+z)^3 + \frac{\Omega_\Lambda(1+z)^{3\varepsilon}}{1-\varepsilon} + \Omega_r(1+z)^4 \right] \quad (16)$$

where $\Omega_i \equiv \frac{8\pi G \rho_{i0}}{3H_0^2}$ are the current density parameters and the normalization condition reads:

$$\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_r = 1. \quad (17)$$

B. Model II: $Q = 3\varepsilon a H \rho_\Lambda$ class of models

In this case, $n = 1$ in Eq. (10) and Eq. (8) can be solved to:

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{\Lambda*} e^{-3\varepsilon a} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\rho_{\Lambda*} \equiv \rho_{\Lambda 0} e^{3\varepsilon} \quad (19)$$

As one may see, Eq. (18) corresponds to an exponential decay of Λ with respect to the scale factor. This model has already been proposed by Rajeev [25]. Although being proposed decades ago, it has never been tested against observations, as we shall test below.

Replacing (18) and (19) into Eq. (9) and solving, we find:

$$\rho_M = \frac{\rho_{M0}}{a^3} + \frac{\rho_{\Lambda 0}}{9\varepsilon^3 a^3} [P(\varepsilon) - P(\varepsilon a) e^{3\varepsilon(1-a)}], \quad (20)$$

where the cubic polynomial $P(x)$ is defined as:

$$P(x) \equiv 9x^3 + 9x^2 + 6x + 2. \quad (21)$$

By replacing (18) and (20) together with radiation term into Friedmann equation (2) we find:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \left\{ \frac{\rho_{M0}}{a^3} + \frac{\rho_{\Lambda 0}}{9\varepsilon^3 a^3} [P(\varepsilon) - P(\varepsilon a) e^{3\varepsilon(1-a)}] + \rho_{\Lambda 0} e^{3\varepsilon(1-a)} + \rho_{r0} a^{-4} \right\} \quad (22)$$

or:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \left\{ \frac{\rho_{M0}}{a^3} + \frac{\rho_{\Lambda 0}}{9\varepsilon^3 a^3} [P(\varepsilon) - Q(\varepsilon a) e^{3\varepsilon(1-a)}] + \rho_{r0} a^{-4} \right\}, \quad (23)$$

where $Q(x)$ is the quadratic polynomial:

$$Q(x) \equiv P(x) - 9x^3 = 9x^2 + 6x + 2. \quad (24)$$

Dividing (23) by H_0^2 , we find:

$$E^2 \equiv \frac{H^2}{H_0^2} = \frac{\Omega_M}{a^3} + \frac{\Omega_\Lambda}{9\varepsilon^3 a^3} [P(\varepsilon) - Q(\varepsilon a) e^{3\varepsilon(1-a)}] + \Omega_r a^{-4}, \quad (25)$$

where $\Omega_i \equiv \frac{8\pi G\rho_{i0}}{3H_0^2}$ are the current density parameters and the normalization condition reads:

$$\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_r = 1. \quad (26)$$

In terms of z , we have:

$$E(z)^2 = \Omega_M(1+z)^3 + \frac{\Omega_\Lambda(1+z)^3}{9\varepsilon^3} \left[P(\varepsilon) - Q\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1+z}\right) e^{\frac{3\varepsilon z}{1+z}} \right] + \Omega_r(1+z)^4. \quad (27)$$

III. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In order to keep the analysis as simple as possible, we chose to work only with a prior over H_0 from SH0ES and the distance priors from Planck 2018.

In Ref. [6], the SH0ES collaboration were able to improve the cosmic distance ladder by calibrating the period-luminosity relation with photometric measurements of 88 Cepheid variables in the core of the Small Magellanic Cloud. With this analysis, they were able to increase the foundation of the cosmic distance ladder from three to four calibrating galaxies, thereby obtaining a combined result of $H_0 = 73.17 \pm 0.86$ km/s/Mpc. With this result, as explained by [6], the local measurement of H_0 based on Cepheids and Type Ia Supernovae shows a 5.8σ tension with the value inferred from CMB in the context of a Λ CDM cosmology, $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ km/s/Mpc [7].

Here, instead of working with the full CMB power spectrum, we work simply with the so-called distance priors from Planck [26], which consist on three cosmological quantities obtained from the Planck 2018 Monte Carlo chains and, as shown by [26], result in approximately the same constraints from the full spectrum, in the context of flat Λ CDM, $\text{O}\Lambda$ CDM and flat XCDM.

In all analyses we have assumed a flat prior over the free parameters: $\Omega_m \in [0, 1]$, $H_0 \in [10, 100]$ km/s/Mpc, $\Omega_b \in [0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. It is important to mention that we have also allowed for a negative range for ε . However, as we shall see below, this range will not be favoured when combining the prior distance constraints with the SH0ES H_0 prior.

In Fig. 1 it is showed the results for Model I ($Q = 3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda$). As one can see from this Figure, concerning the CMB constraints, there are strong degeneracies in the $H_0 - \Omega_m$, $H_0 - \Omega_b$ and $\Omega_m - \Omega_b$ planes. These degeneracies vanish when the constraint over H_0 from SH0ES is included. When one looks into the ε CMB constraints, one may see that ε has negative correlations with Ω_m and Ω_b and a positive correlation with H_0 . When the SH0ES




FIG. 1: Triangular plot of parameters, with data from Planck 2018 distance priors and SH0ES H_0 , for Model I (with $Q = 3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda$). The contours correspond to 68% and 95% c.l.

H_0 constraint is included, we may see that a positive value for ε is favoured. Given the correlations mentioned before, it indicates that lower values of Ω_m and Ω_b are favoured, while a higher value of H_0 is favoured, thus solving the H_0 tension. Finally, looking to the ε posterior distributions, one may see that alone, CMB does not yield a lower limit to ε , while it is quite constrained when the SH0ES prior is included.

In Fig. 2, we have the constraints for Model II ($Q = 3\varepsilon aH\rho_\Lambda$). As one can see from this Figure, the constraints over the free parameters are quite similar to Model I. We may see strong degeneracies in the CMB constraints in the $H_0 - \Omega_m$, $H_0 - \Omega_b$ and $\Omega_m - \Omega_b$ planes,




FIG. 2: Triangular plot of parameters, with data from Planck 2018 distance priors and SH0ES H_0 . For $Q = 3\epsilon a H \rho_\Lambda$ The contours correspond to 68% and 95% c.l.

which vanish when the SH0ES constraint is included. ϵ has negative correlations with Ω_m and Ω_b and positive correlation with H_0 . The inclusion of the SH0ES constraint favours $\epsilon > 0$, therefore, due to these correlations, it also favours lower values for Ω_m and Ω_b and a higher value for H_0 , also solving the H_0 tension. Again, the CMB constraint over ϵ does not yield an inferior limit to this parameter, while ϵ is quite constrained when including the H_0 from SH0ES.

In Tab. I, we quantify the results for both models, showing the mean values and corresponding uncertainties for each free parameter. As one may see, all parameters were

Parameter	$Q = 3\varepsilon H\rho_\Lambda$	$Q = 3\varepsilon aH\rho_\Lambda$
Ω_m	$0.254 \pm 0.0082^{+0.017}_{-0.016}$	$0.258 \pm 0.0078^{+0.016}_{-0.015}$
Ω_b	$0.0419 \pm 0.0010^{+0.0021}_{-0.0020}$	$0.0419 \pm 0.0010^{+0.0021}_{-0.0020}$
H_0	$73.1 \pm 0.86 \pm 1.7$	$73.1 \pm 0.86 \pm 1.7$
ε	$0.0197^{+0.0032+0.0055}_{-0.0027-0.0063}$	$0.0203 \pm 0.0034^{+0.0066}_{-0.0069}$

TABLE I: Mean values of the free parameters from the CMB+SH0ES analysis, together with the 1σ and 2σ c.l. intervals, for the $\Lambda(t)$ CDM models with the different interaction terms Q studied here.

quite constrained with this simple analysis. If we compare with the results from Planck, $\Omega_m = 0.3153 \pm 0.0073$, $\Omega_b = 0.04930 \pm 0.00086$ and $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54$ km/s/Mpc, we see that Ω_m and Ω_b are lower than the value expected from Λ CDM model, while H_0 is higher, in agreement with the correlations discussions that we have made above. This happens for both Models I and II. In fact, both models have exactly the same results for Ω_b and H_0 and have similar results for the other parameters.

It is interesting to mention that the value for $\varepsilon = 0.0197^{+0.0032}_{-0.0027}$ for Model I excludes a noninteracting model with $\sim 7.3\sigma$ c.l. The situation for a noninteracting model is slightly alleviated when compared to Model II: $\varepsilon = 0.0203 \pm 0.0034$ excludes a noninteracting model at $\sim 6\sigma$.

There are some analyses available in the literature concerning Model I. Bernui *et al.* [27] analyse a model similar to Model I, as they assume a dark energy with EOS $w = -0.9999$. By comparing the model with Planck data only, they find $\varepsilon = -0.43^{+0.281}_{-0.21}$ and $H_0 = 71.7^{+2.3}_{-2.7}$ km/s/Mpc at 68% c.l. By comparing the model with Planck+transversal BAO+ H_0 , they find $\varepsilon = -0.58 \pm 0.11$ and $H_0 = 73.99 \pm 0.88$ km/s/Mpc at 68% c.l. The H_0 values obtained from [27] are compatible with our analysis. The value they have obtained, however, for the ε parameter are incompatible with our analysis and also indicates a decay of DM into DE, differently of what we obtained here, that is, a decay of Λ into DM. The possible reasons for this difference is the fact that they have made an analysis with DE perturbation, which does not make sense for our model, as Λ is expected to be smooth. They also have used different data from the current analysis, that is, the full Planck CMB power spectrum and

¹ Their parameter ξ corresponds to ε from our analysis.

transversal BAO data.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have analysed the Hubble tension within the context of dark energy models with a time-varying cosmological constant, specifically vacuum decay models. The results obtained in this work show that vacuum decay models $\Lambda(t)$ CDM, with interaction between dark matter and the cosmological parameter, are promising in addressing the Hubble H_0 tension. Our results show that vacuum decay models, where the cosmological term Λ varies over time, can reconcile the H_0 estimates, providing higher values in alignment with the SH0ES data. In both models, the H_0 parameter is not well constrained by CMB alone. However, when the constraint over H_0 from SH0ES is added, H_0 is quite limited to a higher value, at the same time that the parameter ε , which describes the interaction between matter and vacuum, is constrained to a positive value, which indicates a decay from the latter to the former. From a thermodynamic point of view it is well known that this is the preferred direction of decay, as it does not demand a non-vanishing chemical potential in the dark sector [20]. This suggests that the energy flow from vacuum to matter is compatible with a higher H_0 , while simultaneously reducing Ω_m and Ω_b . Thus, we see that within the context of interacting models as presented here, a solution to the H_0 tension is possible, once that the H_0 values estimated by SH0ES and Planck priors are now compatible.

Acknowledgments

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001. JFJ acknowledges financial support from Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) (No. 314028/2023-4). SHP acknowledges financial support from Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) (No. 308469/2021).

[1] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, New Astron. Rev. **95** (2022), 101659 [arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [2] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989), 1-23
- [3] H. E. S. Velten, R. F. vom Marttens and W. Zimdahl, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) no.11, 3160 [arXiv:1410.2509 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.15, 153001 [arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [5] A. G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, M. Sosey, H. Lampeitl, H. C. Ferguson, A. V. Filippenko, S. W. Jha, W. Li and R. Chornock, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **699** (2009), 539-563 [arXiv:0905.0695 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [6] L. Breuval, A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, M. Romaniello, Y. S. Murakami, D. Scolnic, G. S. Anand and I. Soszyński, *Astrophys. J.* **973** (2024) no.1, 30 [arXiv:2404.08038 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A6 [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652** (2021), C4] [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [8] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.15, 153001 [arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [9] A. M. Öztaş, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **481** (2018) no.2, 2228-2234
- [10] R. G. Vishwakarma, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001), 1159-1172 [arXiv:astro-ph/0012492 [astro-ph]].
- [11] J. M. Overduin and F. I. Cooperstock, *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998), 043506 [arXiv:astro-ph/9805260 [astro-ph]].
- [12] H. Azri and A. Bounames, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26** (2017) no.7, 1750060 [arXiv:1412.7567 [gr-qc]].
- [13] H. Azri and A. Bounames, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **44** (2012), 2547-2561 [arXiv:1007.1948 [gr-qc]].
- [14] M. Szydlowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) no.12, 123538 [arXiv:1502.04737 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] M. Bruni, R. Maier and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.6, 063532 [arXiv:2111.01765 [gr-qc]].
- [16] G. Papagiannopoulos, P. Tsiapi, S. Basilakos and A. Paliathanasis, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) no.1, 55 [arXiv:1911.12431 [gr-qc]].
- [17] M. Benetti, W. Miranda, H. A. Borges, C. Pigozzo, S. Carneiro and J. S. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **12** (2019), 023 [arXiv:1908.07213 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] M. Benetti, H. Borges, C. Pigozzo, S. Carneiro and J. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **08** (2021), 014

- [arXiv:2102.10123 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [19] H. A. P. Macedo, L. S. Brito, J. F. Jesus and M. E. S. Alves, Eur. Phys. J. C **83** (2023) no.12, 1144 [arXiv:2305.18591 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [20] S. H. Pereira and J. F. Jesus, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009), 043517 [arXiv:0811.0099 [astro-ph]].
 - [21] D. Pavon and W. Zimdahl, Phys. Lett. B **628** (2005), 206-210 [arXiv:gr-qc/0505020 [gr-qc]].
 - [22] D. Pavon and B. Wang, Gen. Rel. Grav. **41** (2009), 1-5 [arXiv:0712.0565 [gr-qc]].
 - [23] W. Chen and Y. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **41** (1990), 695-698 [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992), 4728].
 - [24] M. V. John and K. B. Joseph, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000), 087304 [arXiv:gr-qc/9912069 [gr-qc]].
 - [25] S. G. Rajeev, Phys. Lett. B **125** (1983), 144-146
 - [26] L. Chen, Q. G. Huang and K. Wang, JCAP **02** (2019), 028 [arXiv:1808.05724 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [27] A. Bernui, E. Di Valentino, W. Giarè, S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) no.10, 103531 [arXiv:2301.06097 [astro-ph.CO]].