

# Running Einstein Constant and the Vacuum Energy Problem

Giovanni Montani<sup>\*1,2</sup>, Giulia Maniccia<sup>†2</sup>, Elisa Fazzari<sup>‡2,3,4</sup>, and Alessandro Melchiorri<sup>§2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*ENEA, Nuclear Department, C.R. Frascati, Via E. Fermi 45, 00044 Frascati, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Physics Department, Sapienza University of Rome, P.le A. Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy*

<sup>3</sup>*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Sezione di Roma, P.le A. Moro 5, I-00185, Roma, Italy*

<sup>4</sup>*Physics Department, Tor Vergata University of Rome, Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy*

December 20, 2024

## Abstract

We propose a revised formulation of General Relativity for cosmological contexts, in which the Einstein constant varies with the energy density of the Universe. We demonstrate that this modification has no direct phenomenological impact on the Universe’s dynamics or on particle motion within the expanding cosmos. Assuming a state close to vacuum, here defined by the vanishing product of the Einstein coupling constant and the Universe’s energy density, we perform a Taylor expansion of the theory. In this framework, the vacuum energy problem is addressed, and an additional constant pressure term, which induces a Chaplygin-like contribution to the dark energy equation of state, arises in the late-time dynamics. The correction to the late-time Hubble parameter is investigated by comparing theoretical predictions with the late Universe observational data. Our findings indicate that the current value of the vacuum energy is consistent with zero. Alternatively, the expansion used in our formulation would no longer be valid if the current state significantly deviates from the assumed near-vacuum condition. Implications of the modified  $\Lambda$ CDM model with respect to the Hubble tension are also discussed.

## 1 Introduction

A characteristic feature of General Relativity (GR) is the sensitivity of the gravitational field, i.e. the space-time curvature, to the energy-momentum of any physical field. It is commonly said that gravity is an *environmental* interaction [1, 2]. As a consequence, the gravitational field responds to any non-zero energy density, making the most natural definition of “vacuum”

---

\*giovanni.montani@enea.it

†giulia.maniccia@uniroma1.it

‡elisa.fazzari@uniroma1.it

§alessandro.melchiorri@uniroma1.it

in GR the one associated to a vanishing energy-momentum tensor for all local or cosmological “matter” components.

In a Minkowski space-time, the diverging energy density of a free field is renormalized to zero by prescribing that the annihilation operators appear on the right-hand side of any expression [3, 4]. This renormalization process is partially preserved in Quantum Field Theory (QFT) on curved (or curvilinear) space-time [5], where ad hoc renormalization schemes are developed for specific cases [6, 7]. However, as one approaches Planck-scale physics – i.e., exploring spatial scales of the order of the Planck length  $l_P$  – the renormalization process becomes inapplicable due to the emergence of quantum gravity effects (for discussions on possible quantum gravity corrections to QFT, see [8–21]).

An estimate of the vacuum energy density of a free field can be calculated by assuming a cut-off value for the particle momentum of the order  $1/l_P$  (in  $c = \hbar = 1$  units), see [22]. A straightforward calculation yields a vacuum energy density of the Planck order  $\propto l_P^{-4}$ . This contribution would correspond to a massive effective cosmological constant  $\Lambda$ , approximately  $10^{120}$  times greater than the currently estimated value [23]. For discussions on the possible evolving nature of the present cosmological constant, see [24–28].

Over the past 25 years, many studies have appeared in the literature [29–34], aiming to explain the reduction of the immense vacuum energy to the presently observed value, approximately 70% of the Universe’s critical density. However, within the framework of GR and the Standard Model of particle physics, this issue remains an unresolved and challenging question.

The situation changes significantly when modified gravity theories are considered, particularly the unimodular formulation (see [35–37] for early developments and comments). This framework addresses the possibility of a gravitational field that is insensitive to constant energy densities. In this approach,  $\Lambda$  is allowed to vary off-shell, and the emerging conjugate variable – a four-volume – is interpreted as cosmological time. The concept of varying constants can be traced back to an initial proposal in [38]. Over time, this idea has been applied at various levels in cosmological contexts, including attempts to address the cosmological constant problem [39] and the Hubble tension [40–48]. A comparison of unimodular gravity with standard GR at the one-loop level can be found in [49]. Recent developments within this paradigm include the works [50–52], where “variability” is introduced in the coupling constants, and the resulting conjugate variables are identified as effective cosmological clocks.

In this work, we consider a theory where the Einstein constant (*de facto* the Newton constant) depends on time in a cosmological context. Specifically, we reformulate this time dependence as a dependence of the Einstein constant on the Universe’s energy density, without loss of generality. We analyze the implications of the Bianchi identities within this revised scenario, exploring how the new physics affects both the Friedmann equations and geodesic particle motion. An important outcome of this study is that the standard cosmological picture remains phenomenologically consistent: both the 00-component of the field equations and the 00-component of the geodesic equations remain unchanged in form compared to their ordinary counterparts.

To explore the potential phenomenological implications of our proposal, we introduce a new definition of the *macroscopic vacuum* state of the Universe: it corresponds to the vanishing product of the Einstein coupling constant (which depends on the energy density) and the Universe’s energy density. Assuming that the current Universe is sufficiently close to this vacuum state, we then perform a Taylor expansion of this product, leading to a specific form for the Einstein coupling. An immediate significant phenomenological consequence arises in this limit: a constant additional pressure term appears in the present Universe’s dynamics. When interpreted as a modification of the dark energy equation of state, this term alters the Friedmann equation; as a result, an additional contribution to the Hubble parameter appears in the form of a logarithmic term. To quantify this effect, we employ datasets from the late Universe and use a Bayesian inference procedure to estimate the amplitude of the logarithmic term, which corresponds to twice the ratio of the vacuum energy density of the Universe to its present critical density.

The manuscript is structured as follows: In Section 2, we present the basic equations for perfect fluids in a curved spacetime with the varying Einstein constant. The associated Friedmann equations and Hubble parameter are derived in Section 3. Section 4 introduces the vacuum definition and discusses the related energy problem. In Section 5, we analyze the late Universe dynamics within this framework, and compare it with observational data in Section 6. Finally, we discuss the results and provide concluding remarks in Section 7.

## 2 Basic formulation

We now elucidate the fundamental paradigm underlying our proposed solution to the Hubble tension.

We consider modified Einstein equations in the presence of a space-time dependent coupling constant between gravity and matter [38], i.e.:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \chi(x^\alpha)T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where  $G_{\mu\nu}$  is the usual Einstein tensor, constructed with the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  (here we adopt the signature  $(+, -, -, -)$ ),  $T_{\mu\nu}$  denotes the matter energy-momentum tensor, and  $\chi$  represents the Einstein ‘‘constant’’, here promoted to a function that depends on the event  $x^\alpha$  ( $\mu, \nu, \alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ).

The validity of the Bianchi identity for  $G_{\mu\nu}$  implies the following modified conservation law for the energy-momentum tensor:

$$\nabla_\nu T_\mu^\nu = -T_\mu^\nu \partial_\nu \ln \chi, \quad (2)$$

where  $\nabla$  denotes the metric covariant derivative, and  $\chi$  appears as a necessarily scalar function.

In view of the cosmological implementation of our theory, we focus on the form that Eq. (2) takes when matter is described by the energy-momentum tensor of a perfect fluid, which is given by [1, 53]

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p) u_\mu u_\nu - p g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho$  is the energy density,  $p$  is the pressure, and  $u_\mu$  is the four-velocity field associated with matter.

Substituting Eq. (3) into Eq. (2), and performing straightforward algebra, we obtain:

$$u_\mu \nabla_\nu [(\rho + p) u^\nu] + (\rho + p) u^\nu \nabla_\nu u_\mu = \partial_\mu p - u_\mu (\rho + p) u^\nu \partial_\nu \chi + p \partial_\nu \chi. \quad (4)$$

Multiplying both sides of the equation by  $u^\mu$  (with  $u^\mu u_\mu = 1$ ), we arrive at the scalar equation

$$\nabla_\nu [(\rho + p) u^\nu] = u^\nu \partial_\nu p - \rho u^\nu \partial_\nu \ln \chi, \quad (5)$$

which, when substituted back into Eq. (4), gives the equation for the fluid trajectories:

$$(\rho + p) u^\nu \nabla_\nu u_\mu = \partial_\mu p - u_\mu u^\nu \partial_\nu p + p (\partial_\mu \ln \chi - u_\mu u^\nu \partial_\nu \ln \chi). \quad (6)$$

Equations (1), (5) and (6) provide the basic dynamical ingredients for the cosmological analysis developed below.

## 3 Cosmological Dynamics

According to the Planck Satellite data [54, 55] we consider an isotropic flat Universe (for a different indication see [56]), with line element

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (7)$$

where  $t$  denotes the synchronous time (we choose  $c = 1$  units),  $a(t)$  is the cosmic scale factor which accounts for the expansion of the Universe, and  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Euclidean three-metric tensor.

Since the Universe is spatially homogeneous, the three quantities  $\chi$ ,  $\rho$  and  $p$  are function of time only. We also assume the standard equation of state for the perfect fluid  $p = w\rho$ , where  $w$  is a constant. Thus, the Friedmann and acceleration equations take the form, according to Eq. (1):

$$H^2 \equiv \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{\chi(t)}{3} \sum_w \rho_w(t) \quad (8)$$

and

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{\chi(t)}{6} \sum_w (1 + 3w) \rho_w(t), \quad (9)$$

respectively. In these equations, the dot denotes the derivative with respect to  $t$ , and we allow for the presence of a generic set of energy density contributions, each characterized by a different  $w$ .

Now Eq. (5) easily provides

$$\sum_w \left[ \dot{\rho}_w + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a} (1 + w) \rho_w \right] = -\dot{\ln} \chi(t) \sum_w \rho_w, \quad (10)$$

which admits the solution

$$\chi(t) \sum_w \rho_w(t) = \chi_E \sum_w \frac{\rho_w^0}{a^{3(1+w)}}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\chi_E$  is the ordinary Einstein constant and  $\rho_w^0$  is the present-day value of the corresponding energy density  $\rho_w$  (with the convention that today  $a(t = t_0) = 1$ ).

Thus, the Friedmann equation (8) for a  $\Lambda$ CDM-scenario (i.e. in the presence of cold dark matter and baryonic matter  $\rho_m = \rho_m^0/a^3$  and a constant dark energy density  $\rho_\Lambda$ ) can be written in the following standard form:

$$H^2(z) = H_0^2 (\Omega_m^0 (1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda), \quad (12)$$

where  $H_0 \equiv H(z = 0)$ ,  $\Omega_m^0 \equiv \chi_E \rho_m^0 / 3H_0^2$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda \equiv \chi_E \rho_\Lambda / 3H_0^2$ .

As a fundamental result, we see that the variation of the Einstein coupling “constant” with time does not affect the Universe’s  $\Lambda$ CDM dynamics, and therefore the interpretation of all observations that directly depend on the Hubble parameter seems to remain unchanged. Additionally, the acceleration equation retains its standard form in the present context, so it can be easily verified that the deceleration parameter coincides with its  $\Lambda$ CDM value.

The same conclusion holds for the dynamics of photons and particles: indeed, according to Eq. (6), the motion of a dust (having  $p \equiv 0$ ) is still governed by the standard geodesic equation.

## 4 Solution of the vacuum energy problem

A long standing question in GR and Cosmology [57, 58] concerns the possibility of defining an absolute zero for the energy density of a quantum matter field, since the Einstein equations are sensitive to any physical source including constant terms. The present value of the cosmological constant, associated with the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, is extremely smaller (by about 120 orders of magnitude) than the Planckian cut-off, which is considered the natural value for a quantum field’s vacuum energy. No clear mechanisms are known, even in very general formulations [59], to explain such a drastic suppression. The idea of a possible renormalization process [3, 5] is considered ambiguously applicable because, at the Planckian scale, quantum gravity effects are expected to be relevant [60].

In the present scenario, the vacuum energy process can be reformulated in a more physical manner. Without loss of generality, we can choose in cosmology  $\chi = \chi(\rho)$ , i.e. fixing the scaling of the gravitational interaction in terms of the Universe's energy density. Hence, it is natural to define the vacuum state of the Universe as that one for which the following condition holds:

$$\chi(\rho_{vac})\rho_{vac} = 0, \quad (13)$$

which states that the vacuum energy density  $\rho_{vac}$  does not induce any gravitational effect on the Universe.

Clearly, the validity of the condition (13) has a precise physical meaning if the value of the vacuum energy density is a minimum one for the Universe evolution (see below Eq. (16)). In this sense, we are not including in our proposal the possibility of a Planckian vacuum energy density, to be removed from the dynamics. We are still in the framework of a possible "renormalization" of the vacuum contribution, but we simply state that its presence should not influence the Universe evolution.

Any further development of our model would require the knowledge of the explicit expression of the function  $\chi(\rho)$ . This information is not contained in the model itself, but, in what follow, we will study the relevant case in which we are close to the vacuum energy density, i.e. its value is a bit smaller than the Universe critical density. This situation has to be naturally reached by the Universe, unless the dark energy equation is exactly  $p_{de} = -\rho_{de}$  (with self-explanatory notation). Thus, we are simply stating that our Universe is approaching the vacuum energy density today and, hence, we can Taylor expand the Einstein coupling constant near this vacuum state. As a consequence, we will be able to provide explicit expressions for all the quantities involved in the problem. In the end, we want to stress that the present formulation is motivated by the idea that dark energy is not a cosmological constant term, due to the quantum field vacuum in cosmology, but an evolutionary physical ingredient, as recently inferred by the DESI Collaboration [24], see also [26].

Now, a natural expansion for the late Universe dependence of  $\chi(\rho)$  is given by

$$\chi(\rho) = \chi_E \left( 1 - \frac{\rho^*}{\rho} + \dots \right), \quad (14)$$

where  $\rho^*$  denotes a characteristic constant energy density. This formulation ensures a constant trend for  $\chi$  when  $\rho \gg \rho^*$ , if this behavior were extrapolated at higher energy densities too. Substituting the expression (14) into the condition (13) we get at first order:

$$\chi_E \left( 1 - \frac{\rho^*}{\rho_{vac}} \right) \rho_{vac} = 0 \rightarrow \rho_{vac} \simeq \rho^*. \quad (15)$$

As a consequence, we see that the presence of a vacuum energy does not affect the Friedmannian dynamics of the Universe, since Eq. (11) now implies the basic relation:

$$\sum_w \rho_w = \rho^* + \sum_w \rho_w^s, \quad \rho_w^s \equiv \frac{\rho_w^0}{a^{3(1+w)}}, \quad (16)$$

where the label  $s$  indicates the standard expression for the energy density with equation of state parameter  $w$ . We observe that, unlike in GR, a vacuum energy density here would never contribute to the Universe's expansion. Therefore,  $\rho_{vac} \simeq \rho^*$  cannot be identified with the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmological term, whose presence induces a distinct phenomenology.

## 5 Implications for the late Universe dynamics

Let us now investigate the possible implication of our scenario when the late Universe dynamics is concerned.

While the fundamental evolution of the Universe, described by the Friedmann equations and particle trajectories of Sec. 3, is not significantly altered by the varying Einstein coupling constant, we still observe an additional effect due to the vacuum energy density. Indeed, if the present-day Universe is close to the vacuum energy value, as assumed in the Taylor expansion (14), for each matter component there is an associated extra constant pressure term given by  $p_w^* = w\rho^*$ , see Eq. (16).

The energy density of the present-day Universe consists of three main contributions: matter ( $w = 0$ ), radiation ( $w = 1/3$ ), and dark energy ( $w = -1$ ). The extra terms result in a net negative constant pressure

$$p^* = -\frac{2}{3}\rho^*, \quad (17)$$

which modifies the equation of state for dark energy. To capture this effect, we redefine the dark energy pressure as

$$p_{de} = -\rho_{de} + p^* \equiv w_{de}(\rho_{de})\rho_{de}, \quad (18)$$

with a new effective parameter for dark energy

$$w_{de}(\rho_{de}) \equiv -1 - \frac{2\rho^*}{3\rho_{de}}. \quad (19)$$

This interpretation is justified by the fact that we can think about dark energy as the extra component relevant today in addition to the dark matter. This leads to a modified cosmological dynamics with Friedmann equation

$$H^2 = \frac{\chi_E}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_{de}), \quad (20)$$

where  $\rho_m$  denotes the standard matter, and to continuity equations for the matter and dark energy components respectively:

$$\frac{d\rho_m}{dz} = \frac{3}{1+z}\rho_m, \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{d\rho_{de}}{dz} = \frac{3}{1+z}(1+w_{de})\rho_{de} = -\frac{2}{1+z}\rho^*. \quad (22)$$

The dynamical expressions for the energy densities can be directly derived as solutions:

$$\rho_m(z) = \rho_m^0(1+z)^3, \quad (23)$$

$$\rho_{de}(z) = \rho_\Lambda - 2\rho^* \ln(1+z), \quad (24)$$

where  $\rho_m^0$  is the present-day matter density and  $\rho_\Lambda \equiv \rho_{de}(z=0)$  is the cosmological constant which corresponds to the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model. Notably, Eq. (24) exhibits a logarithmic correction to the dark energy density, see also [61].

The Hubble parameter is also modified relative to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model. By introducing the standard normalization, its expression reads:

$$H^2(z) = H_0^2(\Omega_m^0(1+z)^3 + 1 - \Omega_m^0 - \Omega^* \ln(1+z)), \quad (25)$$

where the density parameters for matter  $\Omega_m^0$ , cosmological constant  $\Omega_\Lambda$ , and vacuum energy  $\Omega^*$  are defined as

$$\Omega_m^0 \equiv \frac{\chi_E \rho_m^0}{3H_0^2}, \quad (26)$$

$$\Omega_\Lambda \equiv \frac{\chi_E \rho_\Lambda}{3H_0^2} = 1 - \Omega_m^0, \quad (27)$$

$$\Omega^* \equiv \frac{2\chi_E \rho^*}{3H_0^2}. \quad (28)$$

We recall that  $H_0 \equiv H(z = 0)$  is the Hubble parameter at redshift  $z = 0$ . Notably, the new parameter  $\Omega^*$  is exactly twice the ratio of the vacuum energy density  $\rho^*$  to the present-day critical density of the Universe. We proceed to confront this prediction with late Universe observables in the next Section.

## 6 Model testing in the late Universe

We investigate here the possibility to constraint the three free parameters of the proposed model above, i.e.  $H_0$ ,  $\Omega_m^0$  and  $\Omega^*$ . In particular, we want to clarify if this latter parameter takes, from the data analysis, a value different from zero in one  $\sigma$ , which could validate the conjecture we discussed.

### 6.1 Statistical analyses

We performed a parameter inference procedure on our model by using the publicly available sampler Cobaya [62] to implement Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analyses. We assess the convergence of our MCMC chains using the Gelman-Rubin  $R-1$  parameter [63], and consider our chains converged when  $R - 1 < 0.01$ .

For the prior ranges, we adopted values for  $H_0$  (in  $\text{km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ ) within  $[30, 100]$  and for  $\Omega_m^0$  within  $[0, 1]$ . For the parameter  $\Omega^*$ , we performed two analyses: initially setting the range to  $[10^{-3}, 1]$ , as this parameter is expected to be positive based on its physical interpretation, and then extending the range to  $[-1, 1]$  to account for the considerations discussed below.

### 6.2 Datasets

We used as observational datasets the main cosmological data at the background level, since we are investigating a late Universe modification of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, that are:

- *Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO)* – BAO measurements consist of the transverse comoving distance ( $D_M/r_d$ ), the Hubble horizon ( $D_H/r_d$ ), and the angle-averaged distance ( $D_V/r_d$ ), all normalized to the comoving sound horizon at the drag epoch  $r_d$  [64–67]. We use the DESI BAO measurements from the first-year data release, based on observations of the clustering of the Bright Galaxy Sample (BGS), the Luminous Red Galaxy Sample (LRG), the Emission Line Galaxy (ELG) Sample and the combined LRG+ELG sample, quasars, and the Lyman- $\alpha$  forest as summarized in Table I of Ref. [24]. The data span the redshift range  $0.1 < z < 4.16$ , and we account for the correlation between measurements of  $D_M/r_d$  and  $D_H/r_d$ . The sound horizon is calibrated using Planck data, assuming a Gaussian prior of  $r_d = (147.09 \pm 0.26)$  Mpc, as reported in Table 2 of Ref. [54]. We refer to this dataset as "DESI".
- *Cosmic Chronometers* – measurements of the expansion rate  $H(z)$  from so-called cosmic chronometers (CC), i.e. the differential ages of massive, early-time, passively-evolving galaxies [68, 69]. For our analysis, we use 15 data points reported in Refs. [70–72] in the range  $0.1791 < z < 1.965$ . While more than 30 CC measurements are technically available, we focus our analysis on a subset where full estimates of the covariance matrix's non-diagonal terms and systematic contributions, as outlined in Refs. [73, 74], are accessible. Additionally, we exclude some earlier measurements due to concerns expressed in Ref. [75], which do not apply to our selected data. We note that including the other CC measurements is unlikely to significantly impact our results, as our chosen sample already includes some of the most precise and reliable measurements. We refer to this set of 15 measurements as "CC", and the corresponding data is publicly available in the repository [76].

- *Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia)* – distance moduli measurements [77, 78] used in two different compilations:
  - PantheonPlus sample [79, 80] that consist of 1701 light curves for 1550 uncalibrated SNe Ia spanning a redshift range of 0.01 to 2.26. This dataset is referred to as "SN".
  - PantheonPlus with the SH0ES Cepheid host distances used to calibrate the SN Ia sample [81]. We denote the SH0ES calibrated sample as "SH0ES".

For both cases the likelihood has been taken from the public repository [82].

### 6.3 Results

Here we discuss the results for the parameter inference procedure. In Tab. 1, we present the datasets used and the inferred parameter values for both the  $\Lambda$ CDM model and our model. For the first and most natural choice of prior range, i.e. that one with  $\Omega^*$  positive, we present in Figure 1 the one-dimensional posterior probability distributions and two-dimensional 68% and 95% CL contours for the free parameters of the model. From the results, we observe that for both dataset combinations, the mean value of  $\Omega^*$  is compatible with zero within  $1\sigma$ . Notably, the best-fit value for  $\Omega^*$  is positive and the pick of its posterior distribution is significantly different from the lower-limit of the prior range. The two datasets are consistent in their best-fit value of  $\Omega^*$ .

We observed that the posterior distribution of  $\Omega^*$  reached the boundaries of the prior range, suggesting that the parameter could potentially extend beyond the initially chosen limits. To address this, we expanded the prior range to include negative values of  $\Omega^*$ . The results for this extended range are presented still in Table 1 and Figure 2. With this new range, the best-fit values for  $\Omega^*$  are negative and when combining the results with the SH0ES dataset,  $\Omega^*$  remains compatible with zero within  $1\sigma$ , while for the PantheonPlus dataset alone, it is not the case. In both scenarios, we observe that the uncertainties associated with  $\Omega^*$  are relatively large, highlighting the challenges in tightly constraining this parameter.

Fig. 3 shows the Hubble parameter profile for the  $\Lambda$ CDM model and the modified model with positive  $\Omega^*$  prior using the best-fit values of the parameters obtained from the dataset combination DESI+SH0ES+CC:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} &= 70.25, \quad \Omega_m^0, \Lambda\text{CDM} = 0.286 \\
 H_0 &= 71.02, \quad \Omega_m^0 = 0.276, \quad \Omega^* = 0.025.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{29}$$

We observe that our model provide a slightly higher value of  $H_0$  compared to the  $\Lambda$ CDM value, and then the two curves overlap at  $z \sim 1$ .

Focusing on the values of  $H_0$  and  $\Omega_m^0$ , we observe that adopting the SH0ES calibration results in higher  $H_0$  values, accompanied simultaneously by lower  $\Omega_m^0$  values. This effect is also reported in [79]. Furthermore, the combinations for  $\Omega_m^0 h^2$  (where  $h = \frac{H_0}{100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}}$ ) are consistent with each other within  $1\sigma$  and agree with the Planck value reported in [54]. Additionally, the posteriors on  $r_d$  in both cases align well with the Planck constraint provided as gaussian prior to calibrate the sound horizon for BAO measurements.



Model	Dataset	$H_0$ [km/s/Mpc]	$\Omega_m^0$	$\Omega^*$
$\Lambda$ CDM	DESI+SN+CC	$68.36 \pm 0.69$	$0.312 \pm 0.012$	–
	DESI+SH0ES+CC	$70.30 \pm 0.58$	$0.285 \pm 0.009$	–
Our model (positive $\Omega^*$ prior)	DESI+SN+CC	$68.41 \pm 0.72$	$0.313 \pm 0.012$	$0.015^{+0.011}_{-0.025}$
	DESI+SH0ES+CC	$71.00 \pm 0.52$	$0.278 \pm 0.009$	$0.022^{+0.012}_{-0.037}$
Our model (extended $\Omega^*$ prior)	DESI+SN+CC	$67.90 \pm 0.75$	$0.300 \pm 0.014$	$-0.18 \pm 0.11$
	DESI+SH0ES+CC	$70.07 \pm 0.64$	$0.280 \pm 0.012$	$-0.088 \pm 0.099$

Table 1: Mean values and associated uncertainties for the inferred parameters from the MCMC analysis for the three models ( $\Lambda$ CDM, our model with positive prior for  $\Omega^*$ , and our model with extended prior for  $\Omega^*$ ). The results are presented for different dataset combinations.

## 7 Concluding remarks

We have proposed a reformulation of GR applied to the Universe dynamics based on a running of the gravitational coupling constant with the density. We examined the consequences of the Bianchi identities on the conservation law for the matter content of the Universe, as a superposition of perfect fluids in the standard framework. In this revised scenario, both the Friedmann equation and the free particle motion remain phenomenologically unaffected by the revised dynamics. Furthermore, we assumed that the current state of the Universe is near the vacuum energy density – which clearly differs from the present-day value of the cosmological constant – and performed a Taylor expansion of the theory up to the first order.

In this regime, the model provided both an explicit expression for the Einstein coupling constant as a function of the Universe’s energy density and the corresponding energy density for the superposition of perfect fluids. This result offers a novel perspective on the vacuum energy density problem: while the vacuum energy contributes to the total energy density (and, in the absence of a standard cosmological constant, represents its asymptotic future value), it does not influence the Universe’s dynamics or the free particle motion. This is because the vacuum energy is absent from the Friedmann equation and particles continue to follow geodesics within the expanding Universe.

Nonetheless, the analysis reveals an additional constant pressure term in the dynamics; this “anomalous” contribution can be interpreted as a modified equation of state for dark energy, resembling a Chaplygin-like gas behavior [83, 84]. This effect introduces a negative logarithmic term into the Hubble parameter, whose magnitude is equal to twice the ratio of the vacuum energy density to the critical density of the present-day Universe, see Eq. (28).

The revised late Universe dynamics was then tested against observational data from sources detected at redshifts less than a few units, i.e. SNe Ia, CC and BAO distances. By constraining the coefficient of the logarithmic term to be positive (implying a positive vacuum energy density), a Bayesian inference procedure using an MCMC method revealed that its value is compatible with zero in  $1\sigma$ . This conclusion is further supported when allowing  $\Omega^*$  to take on negative values. Indeed the most probable value of  $\Omega^*$  is negative in both scenarios considered, with only one case being compatible with zero within  $1\sigma$ . In other words, no significant evidence emerges of a positive  $\Omega^*$ .

Based on the theoretical and numerical analysis conducted, we conclude that either the vacuum energy density is exactly zero (so that GR is fully recovered), or that our Taylor-expanded theory lacks predictive power. Specifically, if the coefficient of the logarithmic term is small but not vanishing, the present-day Universe’s critical density would significantly exceed the vacuum energy density, rendering the expansion invalid.




Figure 1: One-dimensional posterior probability distributions and two-dimensional 68% and 95% CL contours for the free parameters of the model  $H_0$ ,  $\Omega_m^0$ ,  $\Omega^*$  with the positive prior range, as inferred by the two dataset combination listed in the legend.




Figure 2: One-dimensional posterior probability distributions and two-dimensional 68% and 95% CL contours for the model's free parameters  $H_0$ ,  $\Omega_m^0$ ,  $\Omega^*$ , using the extended prior range for  $\Omega^*$ . The dataset combinations are indicated in the legend.




Figure 3: Evolution of the normalized Hubble parameter  $H(z)/(1+z)^{1.5}$  for the modified model with positive  $\Omega^*$  prior (blue line) and the  $\Lambda$ CDM model (red line), using the best-fit parameter values in Eq. (29) obtained from the DESI+SH0ES+CC dataset combination.

We conclude by observing that the contribution of the logarithmic term to a possible attenuation of the Hubble tension [85–93] is rather weak. Only in one case (when we consider DESI+SH0ES+CC with the positive prior range for  $\Omega^*$ ), the model analyzed reduces the tension with the SH0ES result in [81] at  $1.75\sigma$ , alleviating the tension with respect to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model in the same dataset combination of  $0.55\sigma$ . Therefore further analysis and possibly higher data resolution are needed to draw insights on the predictivity of such proposal.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank very much E. Di Valentino and W. Giarè for the excellent advice on the model testing setup. In particular, E.F. is grateful to W. Giarè for his technical support for code running. G. Maniccia would like to thank the Institute for Quantum Gravity, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg for hospitality and Sapienza University of Rome for funding. E. F. acknowledges the IT Services at The University of Sheffield for providing High Performance Computing resources.

This article is based upon work from COST Action CA21136 – “Addressing observational tensions in cosmology with systematics and fundamental physics (CosmoVerse)”, supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology). Authors E.F. and A.M. are supported by "Theoretical Astroparticle Physics" (TAsP), iniziativa specifica INFN. The work of E.F. and A.M. was partially supported by the research grant number 2022E2J4RK “PAN-THEON: Perspectives in Astroparticle and Neutrino THEory with Old and New messengers” under the program PRIN 2022 funded by the Italian Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca (MUR).

## References

- [1] G. Montani et al. *Primordial cosmology*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2009. DOI: 10.1142/7235.
- [2] Charles W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1973. ISBN: 978-0-7167-0344-0.
- [3] F. Mandl and G. Shaw. *Quantum Field Theory*. A Wiley-Interscience publication. Wiley, 2010. ISBN: 9780471496830.

- [4] Steven Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [5] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies. *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 1982. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511622632.
- [6] Robert M. Wald. *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime*. 1995. arXiv: gr-qc/9509057 [gr-qc].
- [7] R. M. Wald. *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time and Black Hole Thermodynamics*. Chicago Lectures in Physics. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995. ISBN: 978-0-226-87027-4.
- [8] C. Kiefer and T. P. Singh. “Quantum gravitational corrections to the functional Schrödinger equation”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 44 (4 Aug. 1991), pp. 1067–1076. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.44.1067.
- [9] C. Bertoni, F. Finelli, and G. Venturi. “The Born-Oppenheimer approach to the matter-gravity system and unitarity”. In: *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 13.9 (Sept. 1996), pp. 2375–2383. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/13/9/005.
- [10] Roberto Casadio. “Gravitational Renormalization of Quantum Field Theory”. In: *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 27 (2008), p. 1250186.
- [11] A. Y. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, and G. Venturi. “Inflation and quantum gravity in a Born–Oppenheimer context”. In: *Physics Letters B* 726.1 (2013), pp. 518–522. ISSN: 0370-2693. DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.067.
- [12] D. Bini et al. “On the modification of the cosmic microwave background anisotropy spectrum from canonical quantum gravity”. In: *Physical Review D* 87.10 (May 2013). DOI: 10.1103/physrevd.87.104008.
- [13] A. Y. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, and G. Venturi. “Signatures of quantum gravity in a Born–Oppenheimer context”. In: *Physics Letters B* 734 (2014), pp. 72–78. ISSN: 0370-2693. DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.028.
- [14] D. Brizuela, C. Kiefer, and M. Krämer. “Quantum-gravitational effects on gauge-invariant scalar and tensor perturbations during inflation: The de Sitter case”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 93 (10 May 2016), p. 104035. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.93.104035.
- [15] D. Brizuela, C. Kiefer, and M. Krämer. “Quantum-gravitational effects on gauge-invariant scalar and tensor perturbations during inflation: The slow-roll approximation”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 94 (12 Dec. 2016), p. 123527. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.94.123527.
- [16] F. Di Gioia et al. “Nonunitarity problem in quantum gravity corrections to quantum field theory with Born-Oppenheimer approximation”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 103 (10 May 2021), p. 103511. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.103.103511.
- [17] L. Chataignier and M. Krämer. “Unitarity of quantum-gravitational corrections to primordial fluctuations in the Born-Oppenheimer approach”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 103.6 (Mar. 2021). DOI: 10.1103/physrevd.103.066005.
- [18] G. Maniccia and G. Montani. “Quantum gravity corrections to the matter dynamics in the presence of a reference fluid”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 105.8 (8 Apr. 2022), p. 086014. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.105.086014.
- [19] G. Maniccia, G. Montani, and L. Torcellini. “Study of the Inflationary Spectrum in the Presence of Quantum Gravity Corrections”. In: *Universe* 9.4 (Mar. 2023), p. 169. DOI: 10.3390/universe9040169.
- [20] G. Maniccia, G. Montani, and S. Antonini. “QFT in curved spacetime from quantum gravity: Proper WKB decomposition of the gravitational component”. In: *Physical Review D* 107.6 (Mar. 2023). DOI: 10.1103/physrevd.107.1061901.

- [21] Giulia Maniccia, Giovanni Montani, and Marco Tosoni. “Analyzing the influence of graviton fluctuations on the inflationary spectrum with a Kuchar-Torre clock”. In: *Physical Review D* 110.8 (Oct. 2024). DOI: 10.1103/physrevd.110.086012.
- [22] Francesco Cianfrani et al. *Canonical Quantum Gravity: Fundamentals and Recent Developments*. July 2014. ISBN: 978-981-4556-64-4. DOI: 10.1142/8957.
- [23] S. Weinberg. *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity*. Wiley, 1972. ISBN: 9780471925675.
- [24] AG Adame et al. “Desi 2024 VI: Cosmological constraints from the measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03002* (2024).
- [25] William Giarè. *Dynamical Dark Energy Beyond Planck? Constraints from multiple CMB probes, DESI BAO and Type-Ia Supernovae*. 2024. arXiv: 2409.17074 [astro-ph.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.17074>.
- [26] William Giarè et al. “Robust preference for Dynamical Dark Energy in DESI BAO and SN measurements”. In: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2024.10 (Oct. 2024), p. 035. ISSN: 1475-7516. DOI: 10.1088/1475-7516/2024/10/035. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2024/10/035>.
- [27] Giovanni Montani, Nakia Carlevaro, and Maria G. Dainotti. *Running Hubble constant: evolutionary Dark Energy*. 2024. arXiv: 2411.07060 [gr-qc]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07060>.
- [28] Joan Solà Peracaula et al. “Running vacuum against the  $H_0$  and  $\sigma_8$  tensions”. In: *Europhysics Letters* 134.1 (Apr. 2021), p. 19001. ISSN: 1286-4854. DOI: 10.1209/0295-5075/134/19001. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/134/19001>.
- [29] Steven Weinberg. *The Cosmological Constant Problems (Talk given at Dark Matter 2000, February, 2000)*. 2000. arXiv: astro-ph/0005265 [astro-ph].
- [30] Ivaylo Zlatev, Li-Min Wang, and Paul J. Steinhardt. “Quintessence, cosmic coincidence, and the cosmological constant”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82 (1999), pp. 896–899. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.896.
- [31] C. Armendariz-Picon, Viatcheslav F. Mukhanov, and Paul J. Steinhardt. “A Dynamical solution to the problem of a small cosmological constant and late time cosmic acceleration”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 (2000), pp. 4438–4441. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.4438.
- [32] T. Padmanabhan. “Cosmological constant: The Weight of the vacuum”. In: *Phys. Rept.* 380 (2003), pp. 235–320. DOI: 10.1016/S0370-1573(03)00120-0.
- [33] P. J. E. Peebles and Bharat Ratra. “The Cosmological Constant and Dark Energy”. In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 75 (2003). Ed. by Jong-Ping Hsu and D. Fine, pp. 559–606. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.75.559.
- [34] Shin’ichi Nojiri and Sergei D. Odintsov. “Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy”. In: *eConf C0602061* (2006). Ed. by Andrzej Borowiec, p. 06. DOI: 10.1142/S0219887807001928.
- [35] Marc Henneaux and Claudio Teitelboim. “The cosmological constant and general covariance”. In: *Physics Letters B* 222.2 (1989), pp. 195–199. ISSN: 0370-2693. DOI: 10.1016/0370-2693(89)91251-3.
- [36] W. G. Unruh. “Unimodular theory of canonical quantum gravity”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 40 (4 Aug. 1989), pp. 1048–1052. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.40.1048.
- [37] Karel V. Kuchar. “Does an unspecified cosmological constant solve the problem of time in quantum gravity?” In: *Phys. Rev. D* 43 (10 May 1991), pp. 3332–3344. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.43.3332.

- [38] Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac. “A new basis for cosmology”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 165.921 (1938), pp. 199–208. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1938.0053.
- [39] Lee Smolin. “Quantization of unimodular gravity and the cosmological constant problems”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 80 (8 Oct. 2009), p. 084003. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.80.084003.
- [40] Eleonora Di Valentino et al. “In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions”. In: *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 38.15 (July 2021), p. 153001. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6382/ac086d.
- [41] Luke Hart and Jens Chluba. “Varying fundamental constants principal component analysis: additional hints about the Hubble tension”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 510.2 (Oct. 2021), pp. 2206–2227. DOI: 10.1093/mnras/stab2777.
- [42] Joan S. Peracaula. *Composite running vacuum in the Universe: implications on the cosmological tensions*. 2024. arXiv: 2410.20382 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] Tilek Zhumabek et al. *Running gravitational constant induced dark energy as a solution to  $\sigma_8$  tension*. 2024. arXiv: 2411.05965 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] Giovanni Montani et al. “Metric  $f(R)$  gravity with dynamical dark energy as a scenario for the Hubble tension”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* 527.1 (Oct. 2023), pp. L156–L161. ISSN: 1745-3933. DOI: 10.1093/mnrasl/slad159. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slad159>.
- [45] Tiziano Schiavone, Giovanni Montani, and Flavio Bombacigno. “ $f(R)$  gravity in the Jordan frame as a paradigm for the Hubble tension”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* 522.1 (Mar. 2023), pp. L72–L77. ISSN: 1745-3933. DOI: 10.1093/mnrasl/slad041. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slad041>.
- [46] Tiziano Schiavone et al. *Running Hubble constant from the SNe Ia Pantheon sample?* 2022. arXiv: 2205.07033 [astro-ph.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.07033>.
- [47] M. G. Dainotti et al. “On the Hubble Constant Tension in the SNe Ia Pantheon Sample”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 912.2 (May 2021), p. 150. ISSN: 1538-4357. DOI: 10.3847/1538-4357/abeb73. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abeb73>.
- [48] Maria Dainotti et al. *The Hubble constant tension: current status and future perspectives through new cosmological probes*. 2023. arXiv: 2301.10572 [astro-ph.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.10572>.
- [49] R. Percacci. “Unimodular quantum gravity and the cosmological constant”. In: *Foundations of Physics* 48.10 (June 2018), pp. 1364–1379. DOI: 10.1007/s10701-018-0189-5.
- [50] João Magueijo. “Cosmological time and the constants of nature”. In: *Physics Letters B* 820 (2021), p. 136487. ISSN: 0370-2693. DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136487.
- [51] João Magueijo. “Connection between cosmological time and the constants of nature”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 106 (8 Oct. 2022), p. 084021. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.106.084021.
- [52] João Magueijo. “Evolving laws and cosmological energy”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 108 (10 Nov. 2023), p. 103514. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.108.103514.
- [53] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz. *Fluid Mechanics: Volume 6*. v. 6. Butterworth-Heinemann, 1987. ISBN: 9780080570730.
- [54] Nabila Aghanim et al. “Planck 2018 results-VI. Cosmological parameters”. In: *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641 (2020), A6.
- [55] George Efstathiou and Steven Gratton. “The evidence for a spatially flat Universe”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* 496.1 (2020), pp. L91–L95.

- [56] Eleonora Di Valentino, Alessandro Melchiorri, and Joseph Silk. “Planck evidence for a closed Universe and a possible crisis for cosmology”. In: *Nature Astronomy* 4.2 (2020), pp. 196–203.
- [57] Steven Weinberg. “The cosmological constant problem”. In: *Reviews of modern physics* 61.1 (1989), p. 1.
- [58] Thanu Padmanabhan. “Cosmological constant—the weight of the vacuum”. In: *Physics reports* 380.5-6 (2003), pp. 235–320.
- [59] Norisuke Sakai and Ikuo Senda. “Vacuum energies of string compactified on torus”. In: *Progress of Theoretical Physics* 75.3 (1986), pp. 692–705.
- [60] Carlo Rovelli. *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2004. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511755804.
- [61] Pablo Lemos et al. “Model independent  $H(z)$  reconstruction using the cosmic inverse distance ladder”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 483.4 (2019), pp. 4803–4810.
- [62] Jesus Torrado and Antony Lewis. “Cobaya: Code for Bayesian Analysis of hierarchical physical models”. In: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2021.05 (2021), p. 057.
- [63] Andrew Gelman and Donald B Rubin. “Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences”. In: *Statistical science* 7.4 (1992), pp. 457–472.
- [64] Éric Aubourg et al. “Cosmological implications of baryon acoustic oscillation measurements”. In: *Physical Review D* 92.12 (2015), p. 123516.
- [65] Pier Stefano Corasaniti and Alessandro Melchiorri. “Testing cosmology with cosmic sound waves”. In: *Physical Review D* 77.10 (May 2008). ISSN: 1550-2368. DOI: 10.1103/physrevd.77.103507. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.103507>.
- [66] Gianpiero Mangano et al. “Present bounds on the relativistic energy density in the Universe from cosmological observables”. In: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2007.03 (Mar. 2007), pp. 006–006. ISSN: 1475-7516. DOI: 10.1088/1475-7516/2007/03/006. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2007/03/006>.
- [67] Armando Bernui et al. “Exploring the  $H_0$  tension and the evidence for dark sector interactions from 2D BAO measurements”. In: *Physical Review D* 107.10 (2023), p. 103531.
- [68] Raul Jimenez and Abraham Loeb. “Constraining Cosmological Parameters Based on Relative Galaxy Ages”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 573.1 (July 2002), pp. 37–42. DOI: 10.1086/340549.
- [69] Nicola Borghi, Michele Moresco, and Andrea Cimatti. “Toward a better understanding of cosmic chronometers: a new measurement of  $H(z)$  at  $z \sim 0.7$ ”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 928.1 (2022), p. L4.
- [70] Michele Moresco et al. “A 6% measurement of the Hubble parameter at  $z \simeq 0.45$ : direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration”. In: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2016.05 (May 2016), pp. 014–014. DOI: 10.1088/1475-7516/2016/05/014.
- [71] Michele Moresco et al. “New constraints on cosmological parameters and neutrino properties using the expansion rate of the Universe to  $z \simeq 1.75$ ”. In: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2012.07 (2012), p. 053.
- [72] Michele Moresco. “Raising the bar: new constraints on the Hubble parameter with cosmic chronometers at  $z \simeq 2$ ”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters* 450.1 (Apr. 2015), pp. L16–L20. DOI: 10.1093/mnrasl/slv037.

- [73] Michele Moresco et al. “Setting the Stage for Cosmic Chronometers. I. Assessing the Impact of Young Stellar Populations on Hubble Parameter Measurements”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 868.2 (Nov. 2018), p. 84. DOI: 10.3847/1538-4357/aae829.
- [74] Michele Moresco et al. “Setting the Stage for Cosmic Chronometers. II. Impact of Stellar Population Synthesis Models Systematics and Full Covariance Matrix”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 898.1 (July 2020), p. 82. DOI: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab9eb0.
- [75] Anders Ahlström Kjerrgren and Edvard Mörtzell. “On the use of galaxies as clocks and the universal expansion”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 518.1 (July 2022), pp. 585–591. DOI: 10.1093/mnras/stac1978.
- [76] [https://gitlab.com/mmoresco/CCcovariance/-/blob/master/data/HzTable\\_MM\\_BC03.dat?ref\\_type=heads](https://gitlab.com/mmoresco/CCcovariance/-/blob/master/data/HzTable_MM_BC03.dat?ref_type=heads).
- [77] Adam G Riess et al. “A 2.4% determination of the local value of the Hubble constant”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 826.1 (2016), p. 56.
- [78] Daniel Moshe Scolnic et al. “The complete light-curve sample of spectroscopically confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and cosmological constraints from the combined pantheon sample”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 859.2 (2018), p. 101.
- [79] Dan Scolnic et al. “The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 938.2 (Oct. 2022), p. 113. DOI: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac8b7a.
- [80] Dillon Brout et al. “The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints”. In: *The Astrophysical Journal* 938.2 (Oct. 2022), p. 110. DOI: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac8e04.
- [81] Adam G Riess et al. “A comprehensive measurement of the local value of the Hubble constant with 1 km s<sup>-1</sup> Mpc<sup>-1</sup> uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES team”. In: *The Astrophysical journal letters* 934.1 (2022), p. L7. DOI: 10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b.
- [82] <https://github.com/PantheonPlusSH0ES/DataRelease.git>.
- [83] Vittorio Gorini, Alexander Kamenshchik, and Ugo Moschella. “Can the Chaplygin gas be a plausible model for dark energy?” In: *Physical Review D* 67.6 (2003), p. 063509.
- [84] Abha Dev, JS Alcaniz, and Deepak Jain. “Cosmological consequences of a Chaplygin gas dark energy”. In: *Physical Review D* 67.2 (2003), p. 023515.
- [85] Luis A. Escamilla et al. *Exploring the Hubble tension with a late time Modified Gravity scenario*. 2024. arXiv: 2408.04354 [astro-ph.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.04354>.
- [86] Tiziano Schiavone and Giovanni Montani. *Evolution of an effective Hubble constant in f(R) modified gravity*. 2024. arXiv: 2408.01410 [gr-qc]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.01410>.
- [87] Giovanni Montani, Nakia Carlevaro, and Mariaveronica De Angelis. “Modified Gravity in the Presence of Matter Creation: Scenario for the Late Universe”. In: *Entropy* 26.8 (Aug. 2024), p. 662. ISSN: 1099-4300. DOI: 10.3390/e26080662. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/e26080662>.
- [88] Giovanni Montani et al. *Kinetic Model for Dark Energy – Dark Matter Interaction: Scenario for the Hubble Tension*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.15977 [gr-qc]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.15977>.
- [89] Maria Giovanna Dainotti et al. *Shedding new light on the Hubble constant tension through Supernovae Ia*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.15188 [astro-ph.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.15188>.



- [90] Giovanni Montani, Nakia Carlevaro, and Maria Giovanna Dainotti. “Slow-rolling scalar dynamics as solution for the Hubble tension”. In: *Physics of the Dark Universe* 44 (May 2024), p. 101486. ISSN: 2212-6864. DOI: 10.1016/j.dark.2024.101486. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2024.101486>.
- [91] Maria Giovanna Dainotti et al. “A new binning method to choose a standard set of Quasars”. In: *Physics of the Dark Universe* 44 (2024), p. 101428.
- [92] Eleonora Di Valentino, Eric V Linder, and Alessandro Melchiorri. “Vacuum phase transition solves the H 0 tension”. In: *Physical Review D* 97.4 (2018), p. 043528.
- [93] William Giarè et al. “Interacting dark energy after DESI baryon acoustic oscillation measurements”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15232* (2024).