

Effect of Peak Absolute Magnitude of Type Ia Supernovae and Sound Horizon Values on Hubble Tension using DESI results

Shubham Barua^{1,*} and Shantanu Desai^{1,†}

¹ Department of Physics, IIT Hyderabad Kandi, Telangana 502284, India

We apply data-motivated priors on the peak absolute magnitude of Type Ia supernovae (M), and on the sound horizon at the drag epoch (r_d), to study their impact on the Hubble tension, when compared to the Planck estimated value of the Hubble constant. We use the data from Pantheon+, cosmic chronometers, and the latest DESI BAO results for this purpose. We reaffirm the fact that there is a degeneracy between M and r_d , and modifying the r_d values to reconcile the Hubble tension also requires a change in the peak absolute magnitude M . For certain M and r_d priors, the tension is found to reduce to as low as (1.2-2) σ .

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hubble constant H_0 , defined as $H(z=0)$, is one of the most important cosmological parameters in the current concordance Λ CDM model [1]. Considerable efforts have been made to determine its value since Hubble [2] proposed his famous velocity-distance relation [3–5]. After more than half a century of efforts, measurements of the Hubble constant covered to (72 ± 8) km s⁻¹Mpc⁻¹, obtained from the Hubble Space Telescope (HST) Key Project [6].

With the advent of precision cosmology, the Hubble constant value came under intense scrutiny. The Planck collaboration obtained $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54$ km s⁻¹Mpc⁻¹ inferred from CMB measurements in the framework of the spatially-flat standard Λ CDM model [7]. On the other hand, the value of H_0 determined from the *Supernovae and H_0 for the Equation of State of dark energy* (SH0ES) project, which uses Cepheid-calibrated SNe Ia data is 73.04 ± 1.04 km s⁻¹Mpc⁻¹ [8]. This difference between the high redshift and low redshift H_0 values is known as the Hubble tension [9–11]. Various solutions to this tension have been proposed [12] such as early dark energy [13–19] and dark energy-dark matter interactions [20] for early universe modifications, while late-time modifications are also viable solutions [21, 22]. It has also been argued that the breakdown in Λ CDM model implied by the Hubble tension is a signature of redshift-dependent cosmological parameters [23] (and references therein). The relation between Hubble tension and other other tensions and anomalies in the current concordance model of Cosmology can be found in recent reviews [24–27].

One of the proposed solutions to fix the Hubble tension conundrum is to modify the value of the sound horizon at the drag epoch r_d [28], which can increase the Hubble expansion rate. The sound horizon is the scale at which the baryons decoupled from the photons during the drag epoch [29, 30]. This serves as a standard ruler in Cosmology known as baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) [31, 32]. By studying the clustering of galaxies and other cosmic structures, efforts have been made to measure this scale. However, the value of r_d measured from CMB observations is model dependent and is equal to 147 ± 0.3 Mpc [7]. In the determination of H_0 , the calibration of r_d becomes important since BAO observations give rise to a strong degeneracy between H_0 and r_d in the form of the factor $\frac{c}{r_d H_0}$. Hence, it is evident that model-dependent calibrations can bias the H_0 value.

The discovery of late-time cosmic acceleration was based on Type Ia supernovae observations [33–36]. The peak absolute magnitude M of SNe Ia plays an important role in constraining cosmological parameters. It appears in the expression of the cosmic luminosity distance and has a degenerate relation with the Hubble constant H_0 . To determine the value of H_0 from SNe Ia observations, calibration of M becomes important. This is exactly what was done by the SH0ES team where using SNe Ia Cepheid hosts, they found a value of $M = -19.253 \pm 0.027$ [8]. There have been some arguments in the literature that instead of the Hubble tension, one should pay attention to the value of M as it is more fundamental when we think of the distance ladder approach to determine the H_0 value [37, 38]. This now raises the question of the constancy of M (see, [39–45]). While considering BAO observations with Type Ia SNe measurements, a tension then arises in the $M - r_d$ plane.

This work tries to shed further light on this issue by focussing on using the latest DESI BAO measurements [46] along with the Pantheon+ and the Cosmic Chronometer datasets to determine the impact of the values of r_d and M on the Hubble tension with respect to the Planck value of the Hubble constant. The outline of this manuscript is as follows. In Section II, we briefly mention the relevant cosmological relations. Section III

*Email:ph24resch01006@iith.ac.in

†Email:shntn05@gmail.com

mentions the datasets and values used in this work, while Section IV describes the approach used. Finally, we present our results and conclusions in Sections V and VI, respectively.

II. COSMOLOGICAL RELATIONS

In this work, we consider the spatially-flat Λ CDM model of the homogeneous and isotropic Universe defined by the FLRW metric [47] $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 dR^2$. In this model, the evolution of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ is given by:

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_m (1+z)^3 + (1 - \Omega_m)}, \quad (1)$$

where H_0 is the Hubble constant and Ω_m is the dimensionless matter density parameter. For our assumptions, the luminosity distance (D_L) is given by

$$D_L(z) = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}. \quad (2)$$

For Type Ia supernovae, the relation between its luminosity distance, the apparent magnitude and the peak absolute magnitude is given by [35]

$$m(z) = 5 \log_{10} \left[\frac{d_L(z)}{Mpc} \right] + 25 + M, \quad (3)$$

where M is the peak absolute magnitude and $m(z)$ is the apparent magnitude.

The DESI DR1 lists the values of D_M/r_d , D_H/r_d , and D_V/r_d [46]. By measuring the redshift interval Δz along the line-of-sight, we can get an estimate of the Hubble distance at redshift z by

$$D_H(z) = \frac{c}{H(z)}. \quad (4)$$

The comoving angular diameter distance [48] can be found by measuring the angle $\Delta\theta$ subtended by the BAO feature at a redshift z , along the transverse direction and given by:

$$D_M(z) = (1+z)D_A(z), \quad (5)$$

where, $D_A(z)$ is the angular diameter distance [49] and is related to D_L using the cosmic distance-duality relation [50] as follows:

$$D_A(z) = \frac{D_L(z)}{(1+z)^2}. \quad (6)$$

Finally, the BAO measurements also provide an estimation of the spherically averaged distance (D_V) given by [51]:

$$D_V(z) = [zD_M(z)^2 D_H(z)]^{1/3}. \quad (7)$$

III. DESCRIPTION OF DATA

We describe the datasets used for our analysis as follows:

- For Type Ia supernovae, we use 1590 distinct samples from the Pantheon+ compilation [52] in the redshift range 0.001 to 2.26¹. All the uncertainties have been incorporated in the covariance matrix provided along with the dataset.
- The cosmic chronometer [53] dataset has been obtained from [54–61] in the redshift range $0.07 \leq z \leq 1.965$. We use the covariance matrix for computations as described in [62]. We tabulate the $H(z)$ values used for the analysis in Table I, which can also be found in Table (1.1) of [63]. The last 15 $H(z)$ measurements of Table I are correlated².

¹ The data release can be found at <https://github.com/PantheonPlusSH0ES/DataRelease>

² <https://gitlab.com/mmoresco/CCcovariance>

- DESI DR1 listed in Table 1 of [46]. We consider both isotropic and anisotropic BAO data that include the observables-BGS, LRG, ELG and QSOs. We also incorporated the correlation coefficients (r) listed in the table. The redshift range of this sample is between 0.1 and 4.16.

To fix the absolute value of the peak magnitude and the sound horizon, we use four data-motivated priors obtained from literature as follows:

- $M = -19.253 \pm 0.027$ obtained by the Cepheid calibration of Type Ia SNe based on SH0ES observations [8].
- $M = -19.362_{-0.067}^{+0.078}$ considering a model-independent method [64] using SNe Ia observations along with BAO and CC data.
- $M = -19.396 \pm 0.015$. This value has been obtained using Gaussian Process Regression [65] for a model-independent and non-parametric approach, similar to the analysis in [66].
- $M = -19.401 \pm 0.027$ obtained by using a model-independent binning technique, which combined type Ia SNe observations with anisotropic BAO observations [67].
- $M = -19.420 \pm 0.014$ where Λ CDM model was used to calibrate the Type Ia SNe with Planck CMB data [68].

For the sound horizon values we used the following priors from the literature:

- $r_d = 137 \pm 4.5$ Mpc using the angular diameter distances to three time-delay lenses from the H0LiCOW collaboration in a model-independent approach [69].
- $r_d = 139.7_{-4.5}^{+5.2}$ Mpc obtained by using BAO observations and gravitationally time-delay lensed quasars from H0LiCOW observations using a model-independent approach [70].
- $r_d = 147.05 \pm 0.3$ Mpc which is the value obtained by the Planck collaboration [7].
- $r_d = 148 \pm 3.6$ Mpc using the model-independent polynomial expansions approach [71].

For our analysis, when we use all of the above datasets together, care is taken to consider only the common redshift range among the datasets. So, we work with the redshift range from 0.1 - 1.965, the lower limit coming from the redshift range in the DESI data, while the upper limit corresponds to the highest value in the CC dataset.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The parameters $\{H_0, \Omega_m, r_d, M\}$ are constrained using Bayesian inference. For this purpose, the posteriors are sampled using Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampler `emcee` [72], while the marginalized posteriors were generated using `getdist`[73].

First, using Pantheon+, DESI BAO, and CC unbinned data points in the common redshift range 0.1 - 1.965, we constrain H_0, Ω_m, M , and r_d values using uniform priors for the parameters. Subsequently, we apply a Gaussian prior on either M or r_d using one of the values described in Section III and assign a uniform prior on the other. Finally, we apply Gaussian priors on both M and r_d . As noted in [74], one DESI LRG datum at $z_{\text{eff}} = 0.51$ has been identified as a potential outlier. To account for this anomalous data point, we conducted our analysis, both including and excluding this data point. However, we find no significant differences between the two results. Therefore, all the results shown in this work include this data point. Finally, we compare the H_0 values obtained from our analyses to the Planck cosmological analyses (obtained from TT,TE,EE+low E+lensing), which has the value $67.36 \pm 0.54 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [7] and quantify the significance of the tension. It has been known for a while that cosmological parameters inferred through Bayesian analysis could be prior dependent [75]. Additionally, as has been pointed out in [76] the choice of priors on the peak absolute magnitude plays a pivotal role in the analysis of the Pantheon+ dataset. Therefore, we further sub-divide our analysis into two parts, wherein we use both Gaussian and uniform priors on r_d and M . For Gaussian priors, we use the values mentioned in Section III, while for uniform priors, we use $r_d \in \mathcal{U}(50, 200)$ and $M \in \mathcal{U}(-21, -18)$. Additionally, uniform priors have been used for H_0 and Ω_m as given by:

$$H_0 \in \mathcal{U}(10, 200) \text{ and } \Omega_m \in \mathcal{U}(0, 1).$$

For this analysis, the total likelihood is given by:

$$L(\theta) \propto e^{-\chi^2/2}, \quad (8)$$

TABLE I: 32 $H(z)$ data

z	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	Reference
0.07	69.0 ± 19.6	[61]
0.09	69.0 ± 12.0	[60]
0.12	68.6 ± 26.2	[61]
0.17	83.0 ± 8.0	[60]
0.2	72.9 ± 29.6	[61]
0.27	77.0 ± 14.0	[60]
0.28	88.8 ± 36.6	[61]
0.4	95.0 ± 17.0	[60]
0.47	89.0 ± 50.0	[57]
0.48	97.0 ± 62.0	[58]
0.75	98.8 ± 33.6	[59]
0.88	90.0 ± 40.0	[58]
0.9	117.0 ± 23.0	[60]
1.3	168.0 ± 17.0	[60]
1.43	177.0 ± 18.0	[60]
1.53	140.0 ± 14.0	[60]
1.75	202.0 ± 40.0	[60]
0.1791	74.91	[62]
0.1993	74.96	[62]
0.3519	82.78	[62]
0.3802	83.0	[62]
0.4004	76.97	[62]
0.4247	87.08	[62]
0.4497	92.78	[62]
0.4783	80.91	[62]
0.5929	103.8	[62]
0.6797	91.6	[62]
0.7812	104.5	[62]
0.8754	125.1	[62]
1.037	153.7	[62]
1.363	160.0	[62]
1.965	186.5	[62]

where θ represents the parameter vector (or subset depending on which parameters are fixed) $\{H_0, \Omega_m, r_d, M\}$ and

$$\chi_{\text{tot}}^2 = \chi_{\text{SNe}}^2 + \chi_{\text{BAO}}^2 + \chi_{\text{CC}}^2. \quad (9)$$

We now present our results for our analyses in the next Section.

V. RESULTS

Our results with all the aforementioned analyses can be found in Tables II, III, IV and Figure 1.

1. Uniform priors on r_d and M : (Figure 1)

- We see that the Pantheon+, DESI and CC datasets favor $H_0 = 69.7 \pm 2.5$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ for $M = -19.377 \pm 0.077$ and a value of $r_d = 145.2 \pm 5.1$ Mpc for uniform priors on both r_d and M . This value of H_0 is consistent with the Planck value within 0.9σ , and is also in agreement (within 1σ) with that obtained from a joint analysis of CC + BAO + Pantheon+ quasar angular size + Mg II and CIV quasar measurements + GRB data, viz. $H_0 = 69.8 \pm 1.3$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ [77].

2. Uniform priors on r_d and Gaussian priors on M : (Table II)




FIG. 1: Pantheon Plus, DESI and CC dataset with H_0 , Ω_m , r_d and M_B as parameters (Uniform Priors). The contours represent marginalized 68% and 99% credible intervals.

- When applying Gaussian priors to M , the mean values of r_d increase as M decreases. This reduces the tension to as much as 1.2σ for $M \in \mathcal{N}(-19.42, 0.014)$ and $r_d = 147.7 \pm 1.6$ Mpc.
3. Uniform priors on M and Gaussian priors on r_d (Table III)
 - This follows a similar trend as the previous case, where M decreases with increasing values of r_d .
 - We find that the H_0 is correlated with M and decreasing the M values also reduces the estimate of H_0 , with the Hubble tension ranging from $(0.97\text{-}2.42)\sigma$.
 4. Gaussian priors on both r_d and M (Table IV). Here, we considered twenty different use-cases. Our conclusions are as follows:
 - For SH0ES prior on M , the tension with the Planck value remains high ($\sim 5\sigma$), independent of the change in the value of r_d .
 - For priors on M other than the SH0ES value, the tension reduces considerably to 2σ , and it keeps on decreasing as the value of M decreases and r_d increases. For $M \in \mathcal{N}(-19.42, 0.014)$ and $r_d \in \mathcal{N}(148, 3.6)$ Mpc, the discrepancy becomes only 1.2σ .
 - For a fixed value of r_d , the tension decreases as M decreases. However, note the very gradual decrease in the mean Hubble constant value from $69.44 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ to $68.88 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ for $M \in \mathcal{N}(-19.401, 0.027)$, when r_d is increased. There is a similar trend for other M priors as well.

The H_0 values which we get for all priors on M except -19.253 ± 0.027 , are consistent with the H_0 value of $69.03 \pm 1.75 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, obtained using TRGB and JAGB methods with JWST data [78] to within $\sim 1\sigma$ maximum. It is interesting to note that this consistency occurs when we consider low values of M . Further, our H_0 values determined for M other than the SH0ES prior are very much in agreement with [79], which circumvented calibrations related to the sound horizon at the baryon drag epoch or M of Type Ia SNe and so is a purely data-driven method.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have investigated the effect of certain data-motivated priors (on the sound horizon r_d as well as the peak absolute magnitude M) on the tension between the value of Hubble constant obtained by the Planck collaboration, compared to the same obtained using the combination of Pantheon+, CC, and the latest DESI BAO observations.

TABLE II: Hubble tension with Planck Cosmology [7] for a Gaussian prior on M and a Uniform prior on $r_d \in (50, 200)$.

M	r_d (Mpc)	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	Ω_m	Tension (in σ)
-19.253 ± 0.027	138.3 ± 1.9	73.32 ± 0.91	0.301 ± 0.012	5.63
-19.362 ± 0.072	144.6 ± 3.5	70.0 ± 1.7	0.305 ± 0.013	1.48
-19.396 ± 0.015	146.3 ± 1.6	69.06 ± 0.54	0.306 ± 0.013	2.23
-19.401 ± 0.027	146.5 ± 2.1	68.99 ± 0.87	0.306 ± 0.012	1.6
-19.420 ± 0.014	147.7 ± 1.6	68.30 ± 0.52	0.307 ± 0.012	1.25

TABLE III: Hubble tension with Planck Cosmology [7] for a Gaussian prior on r_d and Uniform prior on $M \in (-21, -18)$.

r_d (Mpc)	M	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	Ω_m	Tension (in σ)
137.00 ± 4.5	-19.307 ± 0.053	71.9 ± 1.8	0.305 ± 0.013	2.42
139.70 ± 4.85	-19.331 ± 0.055	71.2 ± 1.9	0.304 ± 0.013	1.94
147.05 ± 0.3	-19.403 ± 0.02	68.80 ± 0.74	0.305 ± 0.012	1.57
148.00 ± 3.6	-19.398 ± 0.048	69.0 ± 1.6	0.305 ± 0.0143	0.97

TABLE IV: Hubble tension with Planck Cosmology [7] for a Gaussian prior on r_d and M .

M prior	r_d (Mpc)	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	Ω_m	Tension (in σ)
-19.253 ± 0.027	137 ± 4.5	73.39 ± 0.88	0.301 ± 0.012	5.84
	139.7 ± 4.85	73.29 ± 0.88	0.300 ± 0.012	5.74
	147.05 ± 0.3	70.71 ± 0.63	0.280 ± 0.010	4.03
	148 ± 3.6	72.57 ± 0.87	0.295 ± 0.012	5.08
-19.362 ± 0.072	137 ± 4.5	71.3 ± 1.4	0.306 ± 0.013	2.62
	139.7 ± 4.85	70.8 ± 1.5	0.305 ± 0.012	2.15
	147.05 ± 0.3	68.85 ± 0.72	0.304 ± 0.013	1.65
	148 ± 3.6	69.3 ± 1.3	0.304 ± 0.012	1.38
-19.396 ± 0.015	137 ± 4.5	69.21 ± 0.54	0.311 ± 0.012	2.42
	139.7 ± 4.85	69.16 ± 0.56	0.308 ± 0.012	2.31
	147.05 ± 0.3	68.95 ± 0.51	0.303 ± 0.010	2.15
	148 ± 3.6	69.02 ± 0.55	0.304 ± 0.012	2.15
-19.401 ± 0.027	137 ± 4.5	69.44 ± 0.83	0.310 ± 0.013	2.1
	139.7 ± 4.85	69.31 ± 0.85	0.308 ± 0.012	1.93
	147.05 ± 0.3	68.80 ± 0.64	0.305 ± 0.011	1.72
	148 ± 3.6	68.88 ± 0.81	0.305 ± 0.012	1.56
-19.420 ± 0.014	137 ± 4.5	68.46 ± 0.52	0.313 ± 0.012	1.47
	139.7 ± 4.85	68.41 ± 0.54	0.310 ± 0.012	1.38
	147.05 ± 0.3	68.39 ± 0.48	0.311 ± 0.098	1.43
	148 ± 3.6	68.31 ± 0.52	0.306 ± 0.012	1.27

We emphasize that this work is heavily motivated by Chen et al. [76]. However, the aim of this work is to study the effect of degeneracy between M and r_d on the Hubble tension by applying data motivated Gaussian and uniform priors on the two parameters. In addition, [76] considered the Pantheon+ dataset only and M is the only additional parameter other than H_0 and Ω_m . In our analyses, we considered both M , r_d , and DESI BAO and CC datasets. We do wish to point out that the value of Ω_m had a very high value in [76], while we get considerably lower values in comparison. Further, note that our Ω_m values are similar for all our different prior choices within 1σ , irrespective of the values of M or r_d . This was also noted in [76], and occurs in our work because we consider only a particular redshift range (0.1 - 1.965).

A summary of our key results can be found in Tables II, III, and IV. We find that increasing the value of the sound horizon at the drag epoch does seem to reduce the tension between the two values to somewhere around 1.2σ , but the value of M also decreases to about -19.4. This confirms the fact that there is some degeneracy between M and r_d , which needs to be further studied. Additionally, we note that when applying uniform priors on either r_d or M , the Hubble constant decreases for smaller values of M and larger values of r_d . This is similar to the fact that Gaussian priors on both r_d or M decrease the value of M and increase r_d . But note that M plays a crucial role in decreasing H_0 , as a higher M and larger r_d results in a tension of about 5σ , while smaller

M and smaller r_d give a tension of around 1.5σ (cf. Table IV).

Therefore, to summarize, we have reaffirmed the degeneracy present in the $M - r_d$ plane in light of the latest DESI results, and is in accord with some recent related works in literature [44, 66, 80].

Acknowledgments

SB would like to extend his gratitude to the University Grants Commission (UGC), Govt. of India for their continuous support through the Junior Research Fellowship, which has played a crucial role in the successful completion of our research. We are also grateful to Bharat Ratra for useful comments on the manuscript.

-
- [1] W. L. Freedman and B. F. Madore, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **48**, 673 (2010), 1004.1856.
 - [2] E. Hubble, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **15**, 168 (1929).
 - [3] G. Chen and B. Ratra, *Pub. Astro. Soc. Pac.* **123**, 1127 (2011), 1105.5206.
 - [4] S. Bethapudi and S. Desai, *European Physical Journal Plus* **132**, 78 (2017), 1701.01789.
 - [5] J. L. Cervantes-Cota, S. Galindo-Uribarri, and G. F. Smoot, *Universe* **9**, 501 (2023), 2311.07552.
 - [6] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, B. K. Gibson, L. Ferrarese, D. D. Kelson, S. Sakai, J. R. Mould, R. C. Kennicutt, Jr., H. C. Ford, J. A. Graham, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **553**, 47 (2001), astro-ph/0012376.
 - [7] Planck Collaboration, N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, et al., *Astron. & Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), 1807.06209.
 - [8] A. G. Riess et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), 2112.04510.
 - [9] E. Abdalla, G. F. Abellán, A. Aboubrahim, A. Agnello, Ö. Akarsu, Y. Akrami, G. Alestas, D. Aloni, L. Amendola, L. A. Anchordoqui, et al., *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics* **34**, 49 (2022), 2203.06142.
 - [10] L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astronomy* **3**, 891 (2019), 1907.10625.
 - [11] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **38**, 153001 (2021), 2103.01183.
 - [12] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 043533 (2020), 1908.03663.
 - [13] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, and T. Karwal, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **42**, 101348 (2023), 2302.09032.
 - [14] T. Karwal, M. Raveri, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063535 (2022), 2106.13290.
 - [15] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 221301 (2019), 1811.04083.
 - [16] K. V. Berghaus and T. Karwal, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083537 (2020), 1911.06281.
 - [17] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **73**, 153 (2023), 2211.04492.
 - [18] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **42**, 101347 (2023), 1904.01016.
 - [19] S. Vagnozzi, *Universe* **9**, 393 (2023), 2308.16628.
 - [20] G. Montani, N. Carlevaro, L. A. Escamilla, and E. Di Valentino, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2404.15977* (2024), 2404.15977.
 - [21] M. Raveri, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083524 (2020), 1902.01366.
 - [22] R. E. Keeley, S. Joudaki, M. Kaplinghat, and D. Kirkby, *JCAP* **2019**, 035 (2019), 1905.10198.
 - [23] E. Ó. Colgáin and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2412.12905* (2024), 2412.12905.
 - [24] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astronomy Reviews* **95**, 101659 (2022), 2105.05208.
 - [25] E. Abdalla, G. F. Abellán, A. Aboubrahim, A. Agnello, Ö. Akarsu, Y. Akrami, G. Alestas, D. Aloni, L. Amendola, L. A. Anchordoqui, et al., *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics* **34**, 49 (2022), 2203.06142.
 - [26] P. J. E. Peebles, *Annals of Physics* **447**, 169159 (2022), 2208.05018.
 - [27] I. Banik and H. Zhao, *Symmetry* **14**, 1331 (2022), 2110.06936.
 - [28] D. J. Eisenstein and W. Hu, *Astrophys. J.* **496**, 605 (1998), astro-ph/9709112.
 - [29] R. A. Sunyaev and Y. B. Zeldovich, *Comments on Astrophysics and Space Physics* **4**, 173 (1972).
 - [30] P. J. E. Peebles and J. T. Yu, *Astrophys. J.* **162**, 815 (1970).
 - [31] D. J. Eisenstein, H.-J. Seo, E. Sirko, and D. N. Spergel, *Astrophys. J.* **664**, 675 (2007), astro-ph/0604362.
 - [32] W. Sutherland, *MNRAS* **426**, 1280 (2012), 1205.0715.
 - [33] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, et al., *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), astro-ph/9805201.
 - [34] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), astro-ph/9812133.
 - [35] D. Huterer and D. L. Shafer, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 016901 (2018), 1709.01091.
 - [36] D. H. Weinberg, M. J. Mortonson, D. J. Eisenstein, C. Hirata, A. G. Riess, and E. Rozo, *Physics Reports* **530**, 87 (2013), 1201.2434.
 - [37] G. Efstathiou, *MNRAS* **505**, 3866 (2021), 2103.08723.
 - [38] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *MNRAS* **504**, 5164 (2021), 2101.08641.
 - [39] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Universe* **8**, 502 (2022), 2208.11169.
 - [40] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *MNRAS* **520**, 5110 (2023), 2301.01024.
 - [41] C. Ashall, P. Mazzali, M. Sasdelli, and S. J. Prentice, *MNRAS* **460**, 3529 (2016), 1605.05507.
 - [42] J. Evslin, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **14**, 57 (2016), 1605.00486.

- [43] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083517 (2021), 2012.13932.
- [44] D. Staicova, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2404.07182 (2024), 2404.07182.
- [45] P. Mukherjee, K. F. Dialektopoulos, J. L. Said, and J. Mifsud, *JCAP* **2024**, 060 (2024), 2402.10502.
- [46] DESI Collaboration, A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, D. M. Alexander, M. Alvarez, O. Alves, A. Anand, U. Andrade, et al., arXiv e-prints arXiv:2404.03002 (2024), 2404.03002.
- [47] Particle Data Group, P. A. Zyla, R. M. Barnett, J. Beringer, O. Dahl, D. A. Dwyer, D. E. Groom, C. J. Lin, K. S. Lugovsky, E. Pianori, et al., *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
- [48] É. Aubourg, S. Bailey, J. E. Bautista, F. Beutler, V. Bhardwaj, D. Bizyaev, M. Blanton, M. Blomqvist, A. S. Bolton, J. Bovy, et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 123516 (2015), 1411.1074.
- [49] H.-J. Seo and D. J. Eisenstein, *Astrophys. J.* **598**, 720 (2003), astro-ph/0307460.
- [50] K. Bora and S. Desai, *JCAP* **2021**, 052 (2021), 2104.00974.
- [51] D. J. Eisenstein, I. Zehavi, D. W. Hogg, R. Scoccimarro, M. R. Blanton, R. C. Nichol, R. Scranton, H.-J. Seo, M. Tegmark, Z. Zheng, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **633**, 560 (2005), astro-ph/0501171.
- [52] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, A. G. Riess, T. M. Davis, A. Dwomoh, D. O. Jones, N. Ali, P. Charvu, R. Chen, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 113 (2022), 2112.03863.
- [53] R. Jimenez and A. Loeb, *Astrophys. J.* **573**, 37 (2002), astro-ph/0106145.
- [54] M. Moresco, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, L. Pozzetti, G. Zamorani, M. Bolzonella, J. Dunlop, F. Lamareille, M. Mignoli, H. Pearce, et al., *JCAP* **2012**, 006 (2012), 1201.3609.
- [55] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, *JCAP* **2016**, 014 (2016), 1601.01701.
- [56] M. Moresco, *MNRAS* **450**, L16 (2015), 1503.01116.
- [57] A. L. Ratsimbazafy, S. I. Loubser, S. M. Crawford, C. M. Cress, B. A. Bassett, R. C. Nichol, and P. Väisänen, *MNRAS* **467**, 3239 (2017), 1702.00418.
- [58] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, and S. A. Stanford, *JCAP* **2010**, 008 (2010), 0907.3149.
- [59] N. Borghi, M. Moresco, and A. Cimatti, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **928**, L4 (2022), 2110.04304.
- [60] J. Simon, L. Verde, and R. Jimenez, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123001 (2005), astro-ph/0412269.
- [61] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, S. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, and Y.-C. Sun, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* **14**, 1221-1233 (2014), 1207.4541.
- [62] M. Moresco, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, A. Cimatti, and L. Pozzetti, *Astrophys. J.* **898**, 82 (2020), 2003.07362.
- [63] M. Moresco (2023), 2307.09501.
- [64] A. Gómez-Valent, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 043528 (2022), 2111.15450.
- [65] M. Seikel, C. Clarkson, and M. Smith, *JCAP* **2012**, 036 (2012), 1204.2832.
- [66] B. R. Dinda and N. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063513 (2023), 2208.14740.
- [67] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *MNRAS* **495**, 2630 (2020), 1910.14125.
- [68] K. L. Greene and F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, *JCAP* **2022**, 002 (2022), 2112.11567.
- [69] R. Wojtak and A. Agnello, *MNRAS* **486**, 5046 (2019), 1908.02401.
- [70] T. Liu, S. Cao, and J. Wang, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2406.18298 (2024), 2406.18298.
- [71] X. Zhang and Q.-G. Huang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 043513 (2021), 2006.16692.
- [72] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *Pub. Astro. Soc. Pac.* **125**, 306 (2013), 1202.3665.
- [73] A. Lewis, arXiv e-prints arXiv:1910.13970 (2019), 1910.13970.
- [74] E. Ó. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and D. Stojkovic, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2404.08633 (2024), 2404.08633.
- [75] V. Patel, A. Chakraborty, and L. Amendola, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2407.06586 (2024), 2407.06586.
- [76] Y. Chen, S. Kumar, B. Ratra, and T. Xu, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **964**, L4 (2024), 2401.13187.
- [77] S. Cao and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 103521 (2023), 2302.14203.
- [78] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, I. S. Jang, T. J. Hoyt, A. J. Lee, and K. A. Owens (2024), 2408.06153.
- [79] A. Hernández-Almada, M. L. Mendoza-Martínez, M. A. García-Aspeitia, and V. Motta, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **46**, 101668 (2024), 2412.13045.
- [80] D. Benisty, J. Mifsud, J. Levi Said, and D. Staicova, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **39**, 101160 (2023), 2202.04677.