

Cosmological search for sterile neutrinos after DESI 2024

Guo-Hong Du,¹ Tian-Nuo Li,¹ Peng-Ju Wu,² Lu Feng,^{3,1} Sheng-Han Zhou,¹ Jing-Fei Zhang,¹ and Xin Zhang^{1,4,5,*}

¹*Liaoning Key Laboratory of Cosmology and Astrophysics,
College of Sciences, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China*

²*School of Physics, Ningxia University, Yinchuan 750021, China*

³*College of Physical Science and Technology, Shenyang Normal University, Shenyang 110034, China*

⁴*MOE Key Laboratory of Data Analytics and Optimization for Smart Industry,
Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China*

⁵*National Frontiers Science Center for Industrial Intelligence and Systems Optimization,
Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China*

The question of whether the massive sterile neutrinos exist remains a crucial unresolved issue in both particle physics and cosmology. We explore the cosmological constraints on the massive sterile neutrinos using the latest observational data, including the baryon acoustic oscillations data from DESI, the cosmic microwave background data from Planck satellite and ACT, and the 5-year Type Ia supernova data and the 3-year weak-lensing data from DES. We search for the massive sterile neutrinos within the Λ CDM, w CDM, and w_0w_a CDM models. Our analysis shows that when considering massive sterile neutrinos within the w_0w_a CDM model, the combined datasets allow us to infer a non-zero sterile neutrino mass at approximately 2σ confidence level. Specifically, in the w_0w_a CDM+Sterile model, the effective mass of sterile neutrinos and the effective number of relativistic species are constrained to be $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} = 0.50_{-0.27}^{+0.33}$ eV and $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.076_{-0.017}^{+0.011}$, respectively. However, the Λ CDM+Sterile and w CDM+Sterile models could not provide evidence supporting the existence of massive sterile neutrinos.

I. INTRODUCTION

The neutrino oscillation phenomena observed in neutrino experiments are well explained by oscillations among the three active neutrino flavors with nonvanishing masses and mixings [1–6]. However, some anomalies and discrepancies observed in neutrino experiments suggest that the existence of light sterile neutrinos as an additional flavor of neutrino remains an open question in neutrino physics. Short-baseline experiments, such as LSND [7] and MiniBooNE [8], have reported anomalies that cannot be explained by three active neutrinos, pointing to the existence of sterile neutrinos with mass-squared differences around the eV^2 scale. Although the results from neutrino experiments such as Daya Bay [9] and IceCube [10] are consistent with the absence of sterile neutrinos, the IceCube data still yield a best-fit value of $\Delta m_{41}^2 \simeq 4.5 \text{ eV}^2$ [11]. Furthermore, mild discrepancies in measurements of Δm_{21}^2 between Super-Kamiokande [12] and KamLAND [13] persist. Consequently, sterile neutrinos are still regarded as a viable phenomenological motivation (see, e.g., Refs. [14–17]), even though being challenged by other neutrino experiments.

Cosmology can provide independent constraints for eV-scale sterile neutrinos. These constraints primarily come from the cosmic microwave background (CMB), big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN), and large-scale structure observations, which are influenced by sterile neutrino free-streaming effects and the increase in the effective number of neutrino relativistic species, N_{eff} . The Planck collaboration reported $N_{\text{eff}} < 3.29$ and the effec-

tive mass of sterile neutrinos $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.65 \text{ eV}$ in the standard Λ cold dark matter (Λ CDM) model, utilizing the Planck CMB data combined with the baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) measurements from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 12 (DR12) [18]. However, introducing sterile neutrinos alone seems not favored by cosmological observations and leads to poorer data fits. The Planck 2018 results show a strong contradiction between the presence of light thermalized sterile neutrinos and CMB data [18], and the resulting large N_{eff} is incompatible with BBN observations [19–21]. Therefore, additional components, such as dynamical dark energy, could be introduced to dominate over or counteract the effects of sterile neutrinos. Considering dynamical dark energy or modified gravity theory can also relax the constraints on free-streaming, potentially allowing for the existence of massive sterile neutrinos [22, 23]. The impact of dark energy on constraints for sterile neutrinos has also been widely discussed in previous studies [24–33].

Recently, the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) collaboration released its BAO data obtained in galaxy, quasar, and Lyman- α ($\text{Ly}\alpha$) forest observations, and the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration published a new Type Ia supernova (SN) compilation, DESY5, as a component of the 5-year data release. The combination of the BAO data from DESI, SN data from DESY5, and CMB measurements from Planck satellite and the Atacama Cosmology Telescope (ACT) suggests the possibility of dynamical evolution in dark energy, with the statistical confidence reaching to 3.9σ [34–36]. This latest result on dark energy research has garnered widespread attention and discussions (see, e.g., Refs. [37–67]). The high-confidence result from DESI enables us to further investigate the cosmological bounds on sterile

* Corresponding author; zhangxin@mail.neu.edu.cn

neutrinos within the framework of a time-evolving dark-energy equation of state (EoS). Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the impact of introducing the dynamically evolving dark energy on constraints on sterile neutrinos after the latest DESI BAO data release.

Moreover, previous studies have shown that incorporating weak-lensing data from the DES 1-year (DESY1) observation can enhance the possibility of sterile neutrino existence with non-zero mass, reaching a confidence level of 2σ [32]. This is due to the weak-lensing data predict a lower level of matter clustering, consistent with the suppression of small-scale structures caused by the free-streaming effects of sterile neutrinos. Therefore, the amplitude of matter density fluctuations at the $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc scale, characterized by σ_8 , is inversely correlated with the mass and effective number of sterile neutrinos. A lower value of σ_8 allows for the presence of more massive sterile neutrinos. DES collaboration has released its 3-year (DESY3) weak-lensing data, which consists of three two-point correlation functions: cosmic shear, galaxy clustering, and the cross-correlation between source galaxy shear and lens galaxy positions [68, 69]. The DESY3 analysis is based on observations of approximately 100 million source galaxies across a 4143 deg² footprint, which is around three times larger compared to DESY1. Consequently, incorporating DESY3 data into the analysis is expected to impose further influence on searching sterile neutrinos.

In this paper, we aim to explore cosmological bounds on the massive sterile neutrinos with the impact of the dynamically evolving dark energy utilizing the latest DESI BAO and DESY5 SN data, as well as the CMB data, and the DESY1 and DESY3 weak-lensing measurements. Furthermore, we compare different models by calculating the Bayes factor. Our results demonstrate the potential of latest cosmological observations in the search for massive sterile neutrinos.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Sec. II, we describe the methods and data utilized in this work. In Sec. III, we report the results and provide a detailed discussion. In Sec. IV, we present the conclusions of this work.

II. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

In this section, we first describe the cosmological models analyzed in this study, followed by a brief overview of the cosmological datasets utilized. Finally, we present the methods used to infer cosmological parameters and calculate Bayes factors.

A. Models

In this analysis, we consider three cosmological models, with their respective parameters detailed in Table I.

- Λ CDM+Sterile. The baseline model is the standard Λ CDM model. This model contains six base parameters, including the logarithm of the amplitude of the primordial scalar power spectrum $\ln(10^{10}A_s)$, the spectral index of the primordial scalar perturbations n_s , the angular scale of the sound horizon at decoupling $100\theta_{MC}$, the baryon density parameter $\Omega_b h^2$, the cold dark matter density parameter $\Omega_c h^2$, and the reionization optical depth τ_{reio} . Dark energy in this model is described by the cosmological constant Λ , with the dark-energy EoS parameter $w = -1$. To incorporate the effects of sterile neutrinos, as described in Ref. [70], we extend the Λ CDM model by introducing N_{eff} and the effective mass of sterile neutrinos, $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, given by

$$m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} \equiv (\Delta N_{\text{eff}})^{3/4} m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{thermal}}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \equiv N_{\text{eff}} - N_{\text{SM}}$, where $N_{\text{SM}} = 3.044$ is the effective number of active neutrinos in the Standard Model (SM) framework [71–73]. $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{thermal}}$ represents the physical mass of thermally produced sterile neutrinos. In our analysis, we set a prior $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{thermal}} < 10 \text{ eV}$ as is restricted in Ref. [18].

- w CDM+Sterile. Building on Λ CDM+Sterile model, we further consider a scenario where w is treated as a free-to-vary constant.
- $w_0 w_a$ CDM+Sterile. Extending Λ CDM+Sterile further, we consider that w evolves with the scale factor a following the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parametrization [74, 75], expressed as

$$w(a) = w_0 + w_a(1 - a). \quad (2)$$

Here, w_0 represents the present value of w , and w_a indicates the evolution of w with a .

B. Cosmological datasets

In our analysis, we use the following cosmological datasets.

- CMB. This analysis utilizes comprehensive measurements of the CMB anisotropies and lensing, incorporating multiple likelihood components. Specifically, the CMB dataset used in this work include: (i) high- ℓ power spectra of temperature and polarization anisotropies, C_ℓ^{TT} , C_ℓ^{TE} , and C_ℓ^{EE} ($\ell > 30$), derived from the NPIPE PR4 Planck CamSpec likelihood [18, 76, 77]; (ii) low- ℓ ($2 \leq \ell \leq 30$) temperature anisotropy power spectrum, C_ℓ^{TT} , reconstructed using the Planck Commander likelihood [78, 79]; (iii) low- ℓ ($2 \leq \ell \leq 30$) large-scale E-mode polarization power spectrum, C_ℓ^{EE} , derived from the Planck SimA11 likelihood [18, 79]; (iv) the

TABLE I. Cosmological models and parameters used in this work.

Model	Parameter #	Parameters
Λ CDM+Sterile	8	$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$, n_s , $100\theta_{\text{MC}}$, $\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$, τ_{reio} , N_{eff} , $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$
w CDM+Sterile	9	$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$, n_s , $100\theta_{\text{MC}}$, $\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$, τ_{reio} , N_{eff} , $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, w
$w_0 w_a$ CDM+Sterile	10	$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$, n_s , $100\theta_{\text{MC}}$, $\Omega_b h^2$, $\Omega_c h^2$, τ_{reio} , N_{eff} , $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, w_0 , w_a

lensing potential power spectrum, derived from the NPIPE PR4 Planck lensing reconstruction data¹ [80, 81] and complemented by the ACT Data Release 6 lensing likelihood² [82, 83].

- DESI. The tracers in the DESI Data Release 1³ include the bright galaxy sample (BGS) ($0.1 \leq z \leq 0.5$), luminous red galaxy (LRG) ($0.4 \leq z \leq 1.0$), emission line galaxy (ELG) ($0.8 \leq z \leq 1.6$), quasar (QSO) ($0.8 \leq z \leq 2.1$), and Ly α forest ($2.1 \leq z \leq 4.2$). We utilize 12 BAO measurements obtained from above tracers [34–36]. The dataset characterizes the large-scale structure of the universe through key distance measurements: the transverse comoving distance, D_M/r_d , the angle-averaged distance, D_V/r_d , and the Hubble horizon, D_H/r_d , where r_d is the comoving sound horizon at the drag epoch.
- DESY5. We incorporate 1829 supernovae (SNe) data⁴ from the 5-year data release of DES, covering the redshift range $0.025 < z < 1.3$ [84]. This dataset comprises 1635 photometrically classified SN Ia homogeneously selected within $0.1 < z < 1.3$, complemented by 194 low-redshift SNe ($0.025 < z < 0.1$) that overlap with the Pantheon+ sample [85].
- DESY3. We incorporate the DES 3-year release data, which combines angular galaxy clustering and weak gravitational lensing into the “3 \times 2pt” datavector, consisting of three two-point correlation functions: galaxy-galaxy, galaxy-shear, and shear-shear [68, 69]. For the fiducial MagLim sample, the DESY3 analysis is based on observations of about 100 million source galaxies and 10 million lens galaxies over a 4143 deg² footprint. Source galaxies are divided into four tomographic bins ($0 < z < 2.0$), while lens galaxies are split into six redshift bins ($0.20 < z < 1.05$), with the two highest redshift lens samples excluded from the fiducial

analysis. Galaxy angular clustering is derived from lens galaxy positions, cosmic shear from the shear of source galaxies, and galaxy-shear correlations from the cross-correlation of source galaxy shear and lens galaxy positions. The dataset also includes the shear-ratio at small scales. The DESY3 analysis mitigates scale-dependent bias, baryon feedback, and nonlinearities through scale cuts and halofit-based theoretical modeling, marginalizing over astrophysical nuisance parameters [86, 87].

- DESY1. For comparative analysis, we also employ the DES 1-year data, which is based on the analysis for 26 million source galaxies and 6.5 million lens galaxies over a 1321 deg² footprint [88, 89].

Note that we denote the combined datasets of CMB, DESI BAO, and DESY5 SN as “CBS” in our analysis.

C. Bayes analysis

We perform Bayesian inference to constrain cosmological parameters listed in Table I. It is worth noting that in addition to these parameters, we also focus on the derived parameters $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8(\Omega_m/0.3)^{0.5}$, as weak-lensing data are included in our analysis. Theoretical calculations for cosmological observables are performed using the Boltzmann solver CAMB⁵ [90, 91], which computes model predictions based on input parameters. Bayesian inference is implemented with the cosmological analysis framework Cobaya⁶ [92], incorporating likelihoods from DESY5 and DESI BAO data, as well as publicly available CMB likelihoods integrated into or compatible with Cobaya. For cases involving the combination of Planck and ACT lensing likelihoods, we adopt higher precision settings recommended by ACT. Additionally, for DESY3 data, we utilize the likelihood from the publicly CosmoLike pipeline [93], integrated into Cobaya through the Cocoa package⁷ [94]. The consistency of this likelihood with the commonly used pipeline Cosmology⁸ [95] has been thoroughly validated [94]. Sampling is conducted using the

¹The lensing likelihood is publicly available at https://github.com/carronj/planck_PR4_lensing.

²Accessible at https://github.com/ACTCollaboration/act_dr6_lenslike.

³Details at <https://data.desi.lbl.gov/doc/releases/>.

⁴Data provided in <https://github.com/des-science/DES-SN5YR>.

⁵<https://github.com/cmbant/CAMB>

⁶<https://github.com/CobayaSampler/cobaya>

⁷<https://github.com/CosmoLike/cocoa>

⁸<https://github.com/joezuntz/cosmosis>

TABLE II. The 1σ or 2σ confidence ranges of cosmological parameters obtained by using the CBS, CBS+DESY1, and CBS+DESY3 data combinations, for the Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile models. For the parameters N_{eff} and $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, when central values cannot be determined, we provide their 2σ upper limits. For other parameters, the 1σ confidence intervals are reported.

Parameter	H_0 [km s $^{-1}$ Mpc $^{-1}$]	Ω_m	S_8	w or w_0	w_a	$m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$ [eV]	N_{eff}
ΛCDM + Sterile							
CBS	$68.10^{+0.50}_{-0.93}$	0.3110 ± 0.0054	$0.821^{+0.012}_{-0.008}$	—	—	< 0.217	< 3.42
CBS+DESY1	$68.03^{+0.32}_{-0.67}$	0.3087 ± 0.0052	$0.806^{+0.014}_{-0.010}$	—	—	< 0.436	$3.121^{+0.004}_{-0.074}$
CBS+DESY3	$67.87^{+0.27}_{-0.48}$	0.3093 ± 0.0046	$0.796^{+0.021}_{-0.015}$	—	—	< 0.801	$3.099^{+0.009}_{-0.047}$
wCDM + Sterile							
CBS	$67.57^{+0.85}_{-1.00}$	0.3163 ± 0.0066	$0.823^{+0.011}_{-0.008}$	-0.965 ± 0.024	—	< 0.160	< 3.50
CBS+DESY1	$67.45^{+0.67}_{-0.97}$	0.3138 ± 0.0065	$0.809^{+0.013}_{-0.010}$	-0.965 ± 0.024	—	< 0.445	$3.153^{+0.035}_{-0.108}$
CBS+DESY3	$67.03^{+0.62}_{-0.78}$	0.3160 ± 0.0062	$0.797^{+0.023}_{-0.015}$	-0.962 ± 0.023	—	< 0.806	$3.106^{+0.015}_{-0.056}$
w_0w_aCDM + Sterile							
CBS	$67.57^{+0.71}_{-0.85}$	0.3172 ± 0.0067	$0.825^{+0.013}_{-0.010}$	-0.718 ± 0.070	$-1.12^{+0.36}_{-0.29}$	< 0.35	< 3.37
CBS+DESY1	$67.64^{+0.68}_{-0.76}$	0.3154 ± 0.0067	$0.812^{+0.013}_{-0.011}$	-0.703 ± 0.069	$-1.20^{+0.35}_{-0.30}$	$0.19^{+0.06}_{-0.17}$	$3.142^{+0.023}_{-0.090}$
CBS+DESY3	67.11 ± 0.65	0.3161 ± 0.0064	$0.793^{+0.019}_{-0.021}$	-0.735 ± 0.066	$-0.98^{+0.31}_{-0.27}$	$0.50^{+0.33}_{-0.27}$	$3.076^{+0.011}_{-0.017}$

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method based on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [96–98]. Convergence is determined using the Gelman-Rubin criterion, and we consider chains to have converged when $R - 1 < 0.01$. Finally, we analyze the MCMC results and derive parameter constraints using `Getdist`⁹ [99].

Furthermore, to facilitate a quantitative comparison for various models, the Bayesian evidence Z is introduced as a measure of model likelihood, given by

$$Z \equiv P(D|M) = \int_{\Omega} P(D|\boldsymbol{\theta}, M)P(\boldsymbol{\theta}|M)P(M) d\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (3)$$

where $P(D|M)$ denotes the probability of the observed data D given model M , $P(D|\boldsymbol{\theta}, M)$ is the likelihood of D given parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and model M , $P(\boldsymbol{\theta}|M)$ is the prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ conditioned on M , and $P(M)$ represents the prior of model M . Using the evidence Z , the Bayes factor in logarithmic space, $\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}$, is calculated directly as $\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij} = \ln Z_i - \ln Z_j$, where Z_i and Z_j are the Bayesian evidence values for models i and j .

The Jeffreys’ scale [100, 101] provides a generally used criterion for evaluating the relative strength of evidence between two models. According to this scale, the evidence is deemed inconclusive if $|\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}| < 1$. For $1 \leq |\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}| < 2.5$, the support is considered weak, while $2.5 \leq |\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}| < 5$ indicates moderate evidence. A strong

preference corresponds to $5 \leq |\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}| < 10$, and decisive evidence is indicated by $|\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}| \geq 10$.

The parameter space Ω involved in this work can have up to 40 dimensions, posing a significant challenge for calculating the Bayes factor. To address this, we employ a normalization flow method based on harmonic mean estimation using posterior samples, implemented with the `harmonic`¹⁰ package [102, 103]. This approach has been validated in the DESY1 analysis, demonstrating consistency with traditional nested sampling methods as well as robust performance and generalizability [104].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present and analyze the constraints on cosmological parameters. We analyze three dark-energy models with sterile neutrinos: Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile. The analysis utilizes the CBS, CBS+DESY1, and CBS+DESY3 datasets. Table II summarizes the marginalized 1σ or 2σ (for the parameters N_{eff} and $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$ when central values cannot be determined) constraints for the parameters of three models. Figs. 1 and 2 show the posterior distribution contours for selected parameters of the Λ CDM+Sterile and w CDM+Sterile models, respectively. We also present the triangular plots of the marginalized

⁹<https://github.com/cmbant/getdist>

¹⁰<https://github.com/astro-informatics/harmonic>




FIG. 1. The 1σ and 2σ credible-interval contours of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, H_0 , S_8 , and N_{eff} in the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model, using the CBS, CBS+DES Y1, and CBS+DES Y3 data combinations, respectively.




FIG. 2. The 1σ and 2σ credible-interval contours of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, H_0 , w , and N_{eff} in the $w\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model, using the CBS, CBS+DES Y1, and CBS+DES Y3 data combinations, respectively.

posterior distributions of the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model in Fig. 3. Finally, we compare the models using the Bayes factors, as shown in Fig. 4.

In Fig. 1, we show the two-dimensional (2D) contour plots of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, H_0 , S_8 , and N_{eff} for the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model. The 2σ upper limits on the effective mass of sterile neutrinos are $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.217$ eV, $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.406$ eV, and $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.801$ eV using the CBS, CBS+DES Y1, and CBS+DES Y3 datasets, respectively. The inclusion of DES Y3 significantly expands the allowed mass range for sterile neutrinos compared to CBS alone. As shown in Fig. 1, this is due to the anti-correlation of S_8 and $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, where CBS+DES Y3 yields a lower value of $S_8 = 0.796^{+0.021}_{-0.015}$. Meanwhile, considering the free-streaming effects of sterile neutrinos could weaken the matter clustering, the S_8 value

is lower than that in the ΛCDM model when using the same dataset. Additionally, the constraints on N_{eff} are $N_{\text{eff}} < 3.42$, $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.121^{+0.004}_{-0.074}$, and $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.099^{+0.009}_{-0.047}$ using CBS, CBS+DES Y1, and CBS+DES Y3, respectively. This suggests that the inclusion of DES Y1 and DES Y3 allows for certain effective degrees of freedom for sterile neutrinos, although the results remain conservative overall.

In Fig. 2, we present the 2D contours of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$, H_0 , w , and N_{eff} for the $w\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model. It can be seen that the best-fit values of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$ and N_{eff} in the $w\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model are generally consistent with those in the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\text{Sterile}$ model when using the same datasets, as shown in right panels of Figs. 1 and 2. This indicates that the introduction of a constant dark-energy EoS has little impact on the properties of sterile neutrinos. Moreover, CBS, CBS+DES Y1, and CBS+DES Y3




FIG. 3. The triangular plots of the marginalized posterior distributions for cosmological parameters in the $w_0 w_a$ CDM+Sterile model, using the CBS, CBS+DESY1, and CBS+DESY3 data combinations, respectively.

yield generally consistent constraints on the dark-energy EoS parameter, with $w = -0.962 \pm 0.023$. The result $w > -1$ leads to a lower value of H_0 compared to the Λ CDM+Sterile model.

We present the triangular plot of the parameters in the $w_0 w_a$ CDM+Sterile model in Fig. 3. For the effective mass of sterile neutrinos, CBS alone provides only an upper limit of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.35$ eV, while CBS+DESY1 gives $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} = 0.19^{+0.06}_{-0.17}$ eV, indicating a non-zero sterile neutrino mass at approximately 1σ level. In

comparison with Ref. [32], which reports $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} = 0.40^{+0.16}_{-0.20}$ eV using Planck CMB+DR12 BAO+Pantheon SN+DESY1 datasets, the latest CBS data lower the sterile neutrino mass by approximately 50%. A notable result is that CBS+DESY3 yields $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} = 0.50^{+0.33}_{-0.27}$ eV, inferring a non-zero sterile neutrino mass at approximately 2σ confidence level. The best-fit value for the sterile neutrino mass is also higher than the one reported in Ref. [32]. On one hand, this outcome can be attributed to the lower value of $S_8 = 0.793^{+0.019}_{-0.021}$

given by CBS+DESY3, which allows for a higher sterile neutrino mass. On the other hand, it reflects the consideration of a time-varying dark-energy EoS, which dominates over or counteracts the impact of a non-zero sterile neutrino mass, as discussed in Sec. I. Moreover, using CBS+DESY3, we obtain $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.076^{+0.011}_{-0.017}$ and $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = 0.032^{+0.011}_{-0.017}$, which implies $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} > 0$ at the 2σ confidence level. Due to the prior $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{thermal}} < 10$ eV imposed on the thermalized sterile neutrino mass, N_{eff} value derived from CBS+DESY3 is significantly lower than those from CBS+DESY1 and CBS. Regarding the dark-energy EoS parameters, CBS alone gives $w_0 = -0.718 \pm 0.070$ and $w_a = -1.12^{+0.36}_{-0.29}$, while CBS+DESY1 yields $w_0 = -0.703 \pm 0.069$ and $w_a = -1.20^{+0.35}_{-0.30}$. CBS+DESY3, in contrast, provides $w_0 = -0.735 \pm 0.066$ and $w_a = -0.98^{+0.31}_{-0.27}$. Incorporating DESY1 leads to a higher w_0 and a smaller w_a compared to CBS alone, while combining CBS with DESY3 shows the opposite trend. This indicates that a larger non-zero sterile neutrino mass tends to weaken the evolution of the dark-energy EoS.




FIG. 4. The Bayes factors of the Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile models, relative to the Λ CDM model, calculated using the CBS+DESY3 data (marked in magenta, orange, and blue, respectively). The shades of gray from light to dark represent inconclusive, weak, moderate, and strong evidence based on Jeffreys' scale. The negative values of $\ln B_{ij}$ indicate that the Λ CDM model is preferred.

Finally, we employ Bayesian evidence to compare different models. Fig. 4 illustrates the Bayes factors for the Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile models relative to the Λ CDM model, based on the CBS+DESY3 dataset. The Bayes factors for the Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile models are -6.660 , -9.606 , and -0.824 , respectively. This result indicates that introducing massive sterile neutrinos in the Λ CDM model alone is disfavored by the latest data, consistent with the findings of Planck [18]. Similarly, the w CDM+Sterile model is disfavored with almost decisive evidence, in line with the previous study [53].

However, if we further consider a time-evolving dark-energy EoS, the preference of the w_0w_a CDM+Sterile model becomes comparable to that of the Λ CDM model based on latest data. This highlights the significant impact of dark-energy nature on the search for massive sterile neutrinos.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate the constraints on sterile neutrinos by considering three cosmological models, including the Λ CDM+Sterile, w CDM+Sterile, and w_0w_a CDM+Sterile models. Our primary aim is to search for massive sterile neutrinos with particular focus on the w_0w_a CDM+Sterile model, using the latest DESI BAO, DESY5 SN, and DESY1 and DESY3 weak-lensing data.

The results from Λ CDM+Sterile and w CDM+Sterile models consistently reveal that incorporating the DES weak-lensing datasets increases the upper limits of sterile neutrino mass, especially combining with DESY3 due to the anti-correlation between S_8 and $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}}$. For instance, the Λ CDM+Sterile model provides an upper limit on the sterile neutrino mass of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} < 0.801$ eV using CBS+DESY3 dataset. Moreover, the introduction of a constant dark-energy EoS parameter w has essentially no impact on the constraints on sterile neutrinos compared to $w = -1$.

For the w_0w_a CDM+Sterile model, CBS+DESY3 dataset provides approximately 2σ confidence for the existence of sterile neutrinos due to the consideration of a time-varying dark-energy EoS. Specifically, CBS+DESY3 infers the sterile neutrino effective mass of $m_{\nu, \text{sterile}}^{\text{eff}} = 0.50^{+0.33}_{-0.27}$ eV, achieving approximately 2σ detection confidence. Meanwhile, we also obtain $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.076^{+0.011}_{-0.017}$ and $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} > 0$ at the 2σ level, suggesting the thermalization of sterile neutrinos. Additionally, the constraints on the dark-energy EoS parameters, $w_0 = -0.735 \pm 0.066$ and $w_a = -0.98^{+0.31}_{-0.27}$, indicate a shift toward less dynamical dark-energy behavior when DESY3 is included. Although incorporating massive sterile neutrinos alone within the Λ CDM model is not favored by current data, the Bayesian evidence analysis further demonstrates comparable favor for the w_0w_a CDM+Sterile model to the Λ CDM model with the CBS+DESY3 dataset.

These findings underscore the significance of combining CMB and large-scale structure datasets to search for massive sterile neutrinos within the framework of various dark-energy models. Future surveys with improved precision are expected to provide stronger evidence for these phenomena.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Jun-Da Pan for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the National SKA

Program of China (Grants Nos. 2022SKA0110200 and 2022SKA0110203), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants Nos. 12473001, 11975072, 11875102, 11835009, and 12305069), the National 111

Project (Grant No. B16009), the China Manned Space Project (Grant No. CMS-CSST-2021-B01), and the Program of the Education Department of Liaoning Province (Grant No. JYTMS20231695).

-
- [1] Y. Fukuda *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 1562 (1998), arXiv:hep-ex/9807003.
- [2] S. Fukuda *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), *Physical Review Letters* **85**, 3999 (2000), arXiv:hep-ex/0009001.
- [3] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* (SNO), *Physical Review Letters* **89**, 011301 (2002), arXiv:nucl-ex/0204008.
- [4] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* (SNO), *Physical Review Letters* **87**, 071301 (2001), arXiv:nucl-ex/0106015.
- [5] K. Olive, *Chinese Physics C* **38**, 090001 (2014).
- [6] F. P. An *et al.* (Daya Bay), *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 161802 (2023), arXiv:2211.14988 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. Aguilar *et al.* (LSND), *Physical Review D* **64**, 112007 (2001), arXiv:hep-ex/0104049.
- [8] A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.* (MiniBooNE), *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 221801 (2018), arXiv:1805.12028 [hep-ex].
- [9] P. Adamson *et al.* (Daya Bay, MINOS), *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 151801 (2016), [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 117, 209901 (2016)], arXiv:1607.01177 [hep-ex].
- [10] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* (IceCube), *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 071801 (2016), arXiv:1605.01990 [hep-ex].
- [11] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* (IceCube), *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 141801 (2020), arXiv:2005.12942 [hep-ex].
- [12] K. Abe *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), *Physical Review D* **94**, 052010 (2016), arXiv:1606.07538 [hep-ex].
- [13] A. Gando *et al.* (KamLAND), *Physical Review D* **88**, 033001 (2013), arXiv:1303.4667 [hep-ex].
- [14] S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, and M. Laveder, *JHEP* **11**, 211 (2013), arXiv:1309.3192 [hep-ph].
- [15] S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, and M. Laveder, *JCAP* **04**, 023 (2015), arXiv:1412.7405 [astro-ph.CO].
- [16] S. Hagstotz, P. F. de Salas, S. Gariazzo, M. Gerbino, M. Lattanzi, S. Vagnozzi, K. Freese, and S. Pastor, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123524 (2021), arXiv:2003.02289 [astro-ph.CO].
- [17] M. Archidiacono, S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, S. Hannestad, and T. Tram, *JCAP* **12**, 029 (2020), arXiv:2006.12885 [astro-ph.CO].
- [18] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A6 (2020), arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [19] P. Di Bari, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 043509 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0108182.
- [20] V. Barger, J. P. Kneller, H.-S. Lee, D. Marfatia, and G. Steigman, *Phys. Lett. B* **566**, 8 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0305075.
- [21] A. D. Dolgov and F. L. Villante, *Nucl. Phys. B* **679**, 261 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0308083.
- [22] J. R. Kristiansen and O. Elgaroy, *Astron. Astrophys.* **532**, A67 (2011), arXiv:1104.0704 [astro-ph.CO].
- [23] H. Motohashi, A. A. Starobinsky, and J. Yokoyama, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **124**, 541 (2010), arXiv:1005.1171 [astro-ph.CO].
- [24] J. Hamann, S. Hannestad, G. G. Raffelt, and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *JCAP* **09**, 034 (2011), arXiv:1108.4136 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] Y.-H. Li, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **744**, 213 (2015), arXiv:1502.01136 [astro-ph.CO].
- [26] L. Feng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **23**, 100261 (2019), arXiv:1712.03148 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] L. Feng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 418 (2017), arXiv:1703.04884 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] M.-M. Zhao, D.-Z. He, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 043520 (2017), arXiv:1703.08456 [astro-ph.CO].
- [29] L. Feng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **61**, 050411 (2018), arXiv:1706.06913 [astro-ph.CO].
- [30] L. Feng, R.-Y. Guo, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Lett. B* **827**, 136940 (2022), arXiv:2109.06111 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] E. Di Valentino, S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, O. Mena, S. Pan, and W. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103511 (2022), arXiv:2110.03990 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] S. Pan, O. Seto, T. Takahashi, and Y. Toda, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 083524 (2024), arXiv:2312.15435 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] L. Feng, T. Han, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, (2024), arXiv:2409.04453 [astro-ph.HE].
- [34] A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, *et al.* (DESI), (2024), arXiv:2404.03000 [astro-ph.CO].
- [35] A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, *et al.* (DESI), (2024), arXiv:2404.03001 [astro-ph.CO].
- [36] A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, *et al.* (DESI), (2024), arXiv:2404.03002 [astro-ph.CO].
- [37] R. Calderon *et al.* (DESI), *JCAP* **10**, 048 (2024), arXiv:2405.04216 [astro-ph.CO].
- [38] Z. Wang, S. Lin, Z. Ding, and B. Hu, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **534**, 3869 (2024), arXiv:2405.02168 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] C. Escamilla-Rivera and R. Sandoval-Orozco, *JHEAp* **42**, 217 (2024), arXiv:2405.00608 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] E. Di Valentino, S. Gariazzo, and O. Mena, (2024), arXiv:2404.19322 [astro-ph.CO].
- [41] Y. Yang, X. Ren, Q. Wang, Z. Lu, D. Zhang, Y.-F. Cai, and E. N. Saridakis, *Sci. Bull.* **69**, 2698 (2024), arXiv:2404.19437 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, (2024), arXiv:2404.18579 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] A. Gomez-Valent and J. Solà Peracaula, *Astrophys. J.* **975**, 64 (2024), arXiv:2404.18845 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] I. J. Allali, D. Aloni, and N. Schöneberg, *JCAP* **09**, 019 (2024), arXiv:2404.16822 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] F. J. Qu, K. M. Surrao, B. Bolliet, J. C. Hill, B. D. Sherwin, and H. T. Jense, (2024), arXiv:2404.16805 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] E. O. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and D. Stojkovic, (2024), arXiv:2404.08633 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] M. Cortés and A. R. Liddle, *JCAP* **12**, 007 (2024), arXiv:2404.08056 [astro-ph.CO].

- [48] D. Wang, (2024), [arXiv:2404.06796 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] S.-F. Ge and L. Tan, (2024), [arXiv:2409.11115 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] D. Pedrotti, J.-Q. Jiang, L. A. Escamilla, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 023506 (2025), [arXiv:2408.04530 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [51] J.-Q. Jiang, W. Giarè, S. Gariazzo, M. G. Dainotti, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, (2024), [arXiv:2407.18047 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] W. Giarè, M. Najafi, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, and J. T. Firouzjaee, *JCAP* **10**, 035 (2024), [arXiv:2407.16689 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] G.-H. Du, P.-J. Wu, T.-N. Li, and X. Zhang, (2024), [arXiv:2407.15640 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] Y. Toda, W. Giarè, E. Özlüker, E. Di Valentino, and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **46**, 101676 (2024), [arXiv:2407.01173 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [55] Y.-H. Pang, X. Zhang, and Q.-G. Huang, (2024), [arXiv:2408.14787 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] J. a. Rebouças, D. H. F. de Souza, K. Zhong, V. Miranda, and R. Rosenfeld, (2024), [arXiv:2408.14628 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] L. A. Escamilla, E. Özlüker, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, and J. A. Vázquez, (2024), [arXiv:2408.12516 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [58] T.-N. Li, P.-J. Wu, G.-H. Du, S.-J. Jin, H.-L. Li, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Astrophys. J.* **976**, 1 (2024), [arXiv:2407.14934 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [59] E. Specogna, W. Giarè, and E. Di Valentino, (2024), [arXiv:2411.03896 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [60] C.-G. Park, J. de Cruz Pérez, and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 123533 (2024), [arXiv:2405.00502 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] G. Alestas, M. Caldarola, S. Kuroyanagi, and S. Nesseris, (2024), [arXiv:2410.00827 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] H. Wang, G. Ye, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, (2024), [arXiv:2409.17879 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] P.-J. Wu and X. Zhang, (2024), [arXiv:2411.06356 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] T.-N. Li, Y.-H. Li, G.-H. Du, P.-J. Wu, L. Feng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, (2024), [arXiv:2411.08639 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [65] G. Ye, M. Martinelli, B. Hu, and A. Silvestri, (2024), [arXiv:2407.15832 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] U. K. Tyagi, S. Haridasu, and S. Basak, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 063503 (2024), [arXiv:2406.07446 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [67] T.-N. Li, G.-H. Du, Y.-H. Li, P.-J. Wu, S.-J. Jin, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, (2025), [arXiv:2501.07361 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [68] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 023520 (2022), [arXiv:2105.13549 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [69] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 083504 (2023), [arXiv:2207.05766 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A16 (2014), [arXiv:1303.5076 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [71] K. Akita and M. Yamaguchi, *JCAP* **08**, 012 (2020), [arXiv:2005.07047 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [72] J. Froustey, C. Pitrou, and M. C. Volpe, *JCAP* **12**, 015 (2020), [arXiv:2008.01074 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] J. J. Bennett, G. Buldgen, P. F. De Salas, M. Drewes, S. Gariazzo, S. Pastor, and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *JCAP* **04**, 073 (2021), [arXiv:2012.02726 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [74] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213 (2001), [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008](#).
- [75] E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512](#).
- [76] G. Efstathiou and S. Gratton, (2019), 10.21105/astro.1910.00483, [arXiv:1910.00483 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] E. Rosenberg, S. Gratton, and G. Efstathiou, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **517**, 4620 (2022), [arXiv:2205.10869 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [78] L. Pagano, J. M. Delouis, S. Mottet, J. L. Puget, and L. Vibert, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **635**, A99 (2020), [arXiv:1908.09856 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [79] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [80] J. Carron, M. Mirmelstein, and A. Lewis, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **09**, 039 (2022), [arXiv:2206.07773 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [81] J. Carron, A. Lewis, and G. Fabbian, *Physical Review D* **106**, 103507 (2022), [arXiv:2209.07395 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [82] M. S. Madhavacheril *et al.* (ACT), *The Astrophysical Journal* **962**, 113 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05203 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [83] F. J. Qu *et al.* (ACT), *The Astrophysical Journal* **962**, 112 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05202 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [84] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **973**, L14 (2024), [arXiv:2401.02929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [85] D. Brout *et al.*, *The Astrophysical Journal* **938**, 110 (2022), [arXiv:2202.04077 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [86] R. E. Smith, J. A. Peacock, A. Jenkins, S. D. M. White, C. S. Frenk, F. R. Pearce, P. A. Thomas, G. Efstathiou, and H. M. P. Couchmann (VIRGO Consortium), *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **341**, 1311 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0207664](#).
- [87] R. Takahashi, M. Sato, T. Nishimichi, A. Taruya, and M. Oguri, *Astrophys. J.* **761**, 152 (2012), [arXiv:1208.2701 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [88] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043526 (2018), [arXiv:1708.01530 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [89] E. J. Baxter *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 023508 (2019), [arXiv:1802.05257 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [90] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, and A. Lasenby, *The Astrophysical Journal* **538**, 473 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9911177 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [91] C. Howlett, A. Lewis, A. Hall, and A. Challinor, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **1204**, 027 (2012), [arXiv:1201.3654 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [92] J. Torrado and A. Lewis, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2021**, 057 (2021), [arXiv:2005.05290 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [93] E. Krause and T. Eifler, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470**, 2100 (2017), [arXiv:1601.05779 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [94] V. Miranda, P. Rogozenski, and E. Krause, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **509**, 5218 (2021), [arXiv:2009.14241 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [95] J. Zuntz, M. Paterno, E. Jennings, D. Rudd, A. Manzotti, S. Dodelson, S. Bridle, S. Sehrish, and J. Kowalkowski, *Astron. Comput.* **12**, 45 (2015), [arXiv:1409.3409 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [96] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, *Physical Review D* **66**, 103511 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0205436 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [97] R. M. Neal, (2005), [arXiv:math/0502099 \[math.ST\]](#).
- [98] A. Lewis, *Physical Review D* **87**, 103529 (2013), [arXiv:1304.4473 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [99] A. Lewis, (2019), [arXiv:1910.13970 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [100] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *Journal of the American*

- Statistical Association **90**, 773 (1995).
- [101] R. Trotta, *Contemporary Physics* **49**, 71–104 (2008), [arXiv:0803.4089 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [102] J. D. McEwen *et al.*, (2023), [arXiv:2111.12720](#)
- [103] A. Spurio Mancini *et al.*, *RAS Techniques and Instruments* **2**, 710 (2023), [arXiv:2207.04037 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [104] A. Polanska, M. A. Price, D. Piras, *et al.*, (2024), [arXiv:2405.05969 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).