

Linear matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model: Examining growth dynamics and addressing the S_8 tension

Özgür Akarsu,^{1,*} Arman Çam,^{1,†} Evangelos A. Paraskevas,^{2,‡} and Leandros Perivolaropoulos^{2,§}

¹*Department of Physics, Istanbul Technical University, Maslak 34469 Istanbul, Turkey*

²*Department of Physics, University of Ioannina, GR-45110, Ioannina, Greece*

We investigate linear matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM scenario, in which the Λ is replaced by one that undergoes a late-time ($z \sim 2$) mirror AdS-dS transition, resulting in distinct growth dynamics that shape cosmic structure evolution. We begin our analysis by developing a systematic method to track perturbation growth using two complementary approaches: (i) determining the initial density contrast and its evolution rate for a given collapse scale factor, and (ii) computing the collapse scale factor for a specified initial density contrast and evolution rate. We derive analytical solutions for the growth rate $f = \Omega_m^{\gamma}$ and growth index γ in both models, reinforcing the theoretical foundation of our approach. Our analysis indicates that prior to the transition, during the AdS-like phase—the AdS-like Λ in Λ_s CDM reduces cosmic friction, causing linear matter density perturbations to grow more rapidly than in Λ CDM; this effect is most pronounced just before the transition, with a growth rate approximately 15% higher than that of Λ CDM around $z \sim 2$. After the transition, Λ_s CDM behaves similarly to Λ CDM but features a larger cosmological constant, leading to higher $H(z)$ and greater cosmic friction that more effectively suppresses growth. Before the transition, the growth index γ remains below both the Λ CDM and Einstein-de Sitter values ($\gamma \approx 6/11$); during the transition, it increases rapidly and then grows gradually, paralleling Λ CDM while remaining slightly higher in the post-transition era—though overall, it stays near $\gamma \sim 0.55$, as in the Λ CDM model. Using the Planck best-fit values, namely $\Omega_{m0} = 0.28$ for Λ_s CDM and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.32$ for Λ CDM, we find that the corresponding growth rates at $z = 0$ are $f = 0.49$ and $f = 0.53$, respectively. Notably, Λ_s CDM predicts a value closer to $f = 0.48$, recently obtained from LSS data when γ is treated as a free parameter in Λ CDM. This suggests that Λ_s CDM may naturally resolve the structure growth anomaly, without deviating from $\gamma \sim 0.55$. The analysis of linear matter perturbations underscores Λ_s CDM's potential to resolve multiple cosmological tensions within a unified framework, motivating further exploration of its implications for nonlinear structure formation and observational tests.

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the accelerated expansion of the universe in 1998 marked a pivotal moment in cosmology, firmly establishing the Λ CDM model as the dominant framework for describing cosmic evolution [1–3]. Defined by six fundamental parameters, Λ CDM is both simple and remarkably effective, providing a successful description of cosmic expansion and structure formation that has remained widely accepted for decades. However, advances in observational cosmology have revealed persistent tensions within the Λ CDM framework [4–12]. These discrepancies challenge the completeness of the standard model and drive the search for alternative cosmological scenarios.

The most prominent cosmological tensions involve the Hubble constant, H_0 , and the weighted amplitude of matter fluctuations, $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0}/0.3}$. The H_0 tension [5, 6, 13–27] remains a major challenge, with a striking 5σ discrepancy between the Planck- Λ CDM estimate, $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [28], and the local SH0ES measurement, $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [29]. The persistent divergence between early- and late-universe

determinations¹ of H_0 underscores the need to investigate potential systematic uncertainties or explore new physics beyond the standard Λ CDM model. Beyond the well-known H_0 tension, another major cosmological discrepancy is the S_8 tension, which is closely tied to the formation and evolution of cosmic structures. This tension may signal deviations in our understanding of structure growth across cosmic history. Unlike the H_0 tension, which arises from direct observational discrepancies, the S_8 tension is inherently model-dependent. Specifically, early-universe constraints from Planck assuming Λ CDM yield $S_8 = 0.834 \pm 0.016$ [28]. However, late-time measurements based on galaxy clustering and weak lensing consistently return lower values under the Λ CDM framework. The Dark Energy Survey Year 3 (DES-Y3) reports $S_8 = 0.759^{+0.025}_{-0.023}$, a 2.3σ tension [30]; Redshift Space Distortions (RSD) data give $S_8 = 0.762^{+0.030}_{-0.025}$, a 2.2σ tension [31]; and the Kilo-Degree Survey (KiDS-1000) finds $S_8 = 0.766^{+0.020}_{-0.014}$, a 3.1σ discrepancy with Planck- Λ CDM [32]. The persistence of this tension across independent datasets makes it increasingly unlikely that it arises solely from observational systematics. Instead, it may indicate a missing component in the underlying assumptions of the Λ CDM model, suggesting that it does

* akarsuo@itu.edu.tr

† cam21@itu.edu.tr

‡ e.paraskevas@uoi.gr

§ leandros@uoi.gr

¹ We refer readers to Table I in Ref. [5] for a comprehensive compilation of H_0 measurements.

not fully capture the complexity of cosmic structure formation [5, 6, 31, 33–48].

As mounting evidence from diverse experiments continues to reinforce the persistent tensions, they are increasingly interpreted as potential indications of new physics rather than mere artifacts of systematic errors or statistical fluctuations. Consequently, various cosmological models have been proposed to address these discrepancies, which can be broadly categorized as:

- *Early time models* ($z \gtrsim 1100$): These introduce new physics before recombination, aiming to reduce the sound horizon and increase H_0 . Examples include: Early Dark Energy (EDE) [49–54], New EDE [55–57], AdS–EDE [58–60], and modified gravity models [61–67]. These models often struggle to simultaneously resolve both the H_0 and S_8 tensions.
- *Intermediate/Late time models* ($0.1 \lesssim z \lesssim 3.0$): These modify cosmic evolution at intermediate to late times, adjusting the expansion rate history $H(z)$. Examples include: Λ_s CDM [68–77], Phantom Crossing Dark Energy [78–84], and Interacting Dark Energy [85–99]. These models often show promise in addressing both H_0 and S_8 tensions, even though they appear to have a problem in simultaneously fitting BAO and SNe Ia data [100].
- *Ultra late time models* ($z \lesssim 0.01$): These propose changes to fundamental or stellar physics in the recent universe [26, 80, 101–103]. These models focus on addressing tensions through modifications of our understanding of local astrophysics.

The simultaneous presence of the H_0 and S_8 tensions presents a significant challenge for cosmological model-building. Models attempting to resolve the H_0 tension often struggle to address the S_8 tension, and vice versa [18, 104]. The Λ_s CDM model, which is the focus of this paper, falls into the category of *intermediate/late time models* and shows particular promise in addressing both tensions within a single framework.

The Λ_s CDM model [68–71] offers a promising alternative to Λ CDM, by addressing major cosmological tensions. It introduces a transition in the sign of the cosmological constant (from negative to positive), which can be described by sigmoid or sigmoid-like functions. In the simplest case, the transition can be modeled using a hyperbolic tangent function, such as:

$$\rho_{\Lambda_s}(a) = \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \frac{\tanh\left[\eta\left(1 - \frac{a}{a_\dagger}\right)\right]}{\tanh\left[\eta\left(1 - a_\dagger\right)\right]}, \quad (1)$$

where a represents the scale factor, a_\dagger is the transition scale factor, $\rho_{\Lambda_s 0}$ is the present-day energy density of Λ_s , and η determines the rapidity of the transition. As $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, the smooth transition becomes abrupt and the sign switch can be described by the signum (sgn) function [69–71]:

$$\rho_{\Lambda_s}(a) = \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \text{sgn}(a - a_\dagger). \quad (2)$$

This idealized model, known as the abrupt Λ_s CDM model, serves as an approximate representation of rapid AdS–dS

transitions while introducing only one additional parameter to the standard Λ CDM model. Given Eq. (2), Friedmann equations for a universe containing only dust and Λ_s can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} &= \frac{8\pi G}{3} [\rho_{m0} a^{-3} + \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \text{sgn}(a - a_\dagger)], \\ \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= -\frac{4\pi G}{3} [\rho_{m0} a^{-3} - 2\rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \text{sgn}(a - a_\dagger) \\ &\quad - 2\rho_{\Lambda_s 0} a \delta_D(a - a_\dagger)], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where δ_D represents the Dirac delta function and dot denotes the derivative with respect to the cosmic time, i.e., $\dot{} := d/dt$.

The feasibility of late-Universe rapid anti-de Sitter (AdS) to de Sitter (dS) transition in the CC, as proposed by the Λ_s CDM framework, was initially regarded as challenging to reconcile with established physical principles. However, the remarkable phenomenological success of this framework—despite its simplicity—has motivated further theoretical investigation. Recent studies have demonstrated that even well-established theories, when re-examined, reveal previously unexplored solution spaces that naturally accommodate such transitions. This necessitates a reassessment of conventional theoretical paradigms. A notable example is the Λ_s CDM⁺ model, which extends the Λ_s CDM framework within the context of string theory. Although the AdS swampland conjecture suggests that an AdS-to-dS transition in the late Universe is unlikely—due to the large separation of vacua in moduli space—it has been shown in [105–108] that such a transition can be achieved through the action of Casimir forces in the bulk. Extending this framework, Λ_s VCDM is a complete, predictive cosmological model encompassing the AdS-to-dS transition. In the VCDM framework, this mirror transition is realized via a Lagrangian that incorporates an auxiliary scalar field with a smoothly joined two-segment linear potential [76, 77, 109, 110]. Similarly, [75] demonstrated that teleparallel $f(T)$ gravity, studying its exponential infrared form [111], which has also shown promise in resolving the Hubble constant (H_0) tension [112, 113], admits previously overlooked solution spaces with significant implications. By relaxing the conventional assumption of a strictly positive effective DE density—while remaining consistent with CMB spectra—the model accommodates not only the well-known phantom behavior, but also an alternative scenario where DE transitions smoothly from negative to positive at redshift $z_\dagger \sim 1.5$. Building on these insights, $f(T)$ - Λ_s CDM maps the background dynamics of Λ_s CDM into the $f(T)$ gravity framework [114], further establishing a theoretical framework for AdS-to-dS-like transitions in the late universe. The recently proposed Ph- Λ_s CDM model [115] investigates smooth transition dynamics driven by scalar fields, particularly phantom fields with negative kinetic terms. By modeling dark energy as a minimally coupled scalar field with a hyperbolic tangent potential, this framework naturally induces a stable AdS–dS transition. While Λ_s CDM models share identical background dynamics,

their linear perturbations differ. GR-based [69–71, 115], Λ_s VCDM [76, 77], and $f(T)$ - Λ_s CDM exhibit distinct behaviors, while string-inspired Λ_s CDM⁺ [105–107] predicts $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = 0.25$. These differences provide key observational signatures for distinguishing between models.

While the aforementioned models most directly realize the dynamical features of the Λ_s CDM framework, they do not exhaust all possibilities. Other theoretical approaches exhibiting similar behavior, including: brane-world models [116–118], energy-momentum log gravity [119], bimetric gravity [120], Horndeski gravity [121], holographic dark energy (DE) [122], Granda–Oliveros holographic DE [123], composite DE (w XCDM) [124, 125], omnipotent DE [78, 83], and models incorporating a variation in the gravitational constant between super- and sub-horizon scales, as motivated by the Hořava–Lifshitz proposal or the Einstein-aether framework [126, 127]. Additionally, [128] demonstrated that in certain formulations of GR, a sign-switching CC can naturally emerge through an overall sign change in the spacetime metric.

A key feature of the Λ_s CDM model is its ability to address multiple cosmological challenges simultaneously. The model amplifies structure growth at high redshifts due to the negative cosmological constant, which enhances gravitational attraction [70, 71]. This feature aligns well with recent observations from JWST [129], suggesting more intense early structure formation than predicted by the Λ CDM [130–132]. Conversely, the model weakens structure growth at late times due to the lower matter density parameter it requires for resolving the Hubble tension [71, 72]. This dual effect on structure formation makes the Λ_s CDM model particularly interesting in the context of the S_8 tension.

These results are also supported by a recent analysis conducted by Akarsu et al. [71]. When considering only the Planck dataset, the analysis predicts a higher Hubble constant— $H_0 = 70.77^{+0.79}_{-2.70} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ compared to the standard Λ CDM value of $H_0 = 67.39 \pm 0.55 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ —bringing it closer to local measurements from the SH0ES collaboration and reducing the tension from 4.8σ to 1.4σ . Simultaneously, it yields a lower clustering amplitude ($S_8 = 0.801^{+0.026}_{-0.016}$) than that of Λ CDM ($S_8 = 0.832 \pm 0.013$), reducing the tension from 3.1σ to 1.7σ and making it an compelling alternative to the standard cosmological model.

Recent studies have provided observational support for models incorporating negative cosmological constants at high redshifts, aligning with the Λ_s CDM framework. Wang et al. [133] found that DESI BAO measurements are compatible with a negative cosmological constant. Colgáin et al. [134] and Malekjani et al. [135] reported evidence for $\Omega_{m0} > 1$, when using data from relatively higher redshifts $z \gtrsim 1.5$, implying negative dark energy densities at high redshifts². Analysis of the DES 5-year supernova dataset [134] and DESI dark energy fit [180]

further support modifications to the standard Λ CDM model consistent with Λ_s CDM predictions. Additionally, Bousis and Perivolaropoulos demonstrated that models with negative cosmological constants could have advantages for the resolution of the Hubble tension compared to smooth $H(z)$ deformation models [100]. These findings collectively suggest a growing body of observational evidence favoring negative dark energy densities at high redshifts.

A crucial question addressed in this paper is the prediction of the Λ_s CDM model for the value of γ and how it compares with observational expectations. The unique features of Λ_s CDM, particularly its sign-switching cosmological constant, may lead to distinct predictions for γ that could potentially reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the standard model and observations. By examining the evolution of γ in the Λ_s CDM framework, we can assess whether this model provides a more consistent description of structure growth across cosmic time, potentially addressing both early and late time cosmological tensions simultaneously. Recently, Paraskevas et al. [73] has provided a comprehensive analysis of the model’s implications for bound cosmic structures. Their study shows that the Λ_s CDM model can lead to earlier formation of dense structures at high redshifts while also potentially alleviating tensions in structure growth measurements at lower redshifts. The growth of cosmic structure is commonly characterized by the growth index γ , defined through the relation $f \equiv \Omega_m^\gamma$, where f is the growth rate and Ω_m is the matter density parameter [181–183]. In the standard Λ CDM model within GR, $\gamma \approx 0.55$. Using this value along with the Planck- Λ CDM matter density parameter $\Omega_{m0} \simeq 0.315$, the corresponding growth rate is given by $f \simeq 0.53$. However, a recent analysis performed by Nguyen et al. [184]—which extends the Λ CDM model by treating γ as a free parameter constrained by observational data—finds $\gamma \simeq 0.63$, suggesting a suppression of structure growth at low redshifts. Suggesting a growth rate of $f \simeq 0.48$. Since Λ_s CDM is identical to Λ CDM in the post-transition era (i.e., $z \lesssim 2$, covering the redshift

model-independent and non-parametric reconstructions—on dark energy (DE) models permitting negative energy densities ($z \gtrsim 1.5$ – 2), often linked to an AdS-like cosmological constant and addressing major cosmological tensions, we refer readers to Refs. [58, 59, 72, 75–78, 83, 100, 105–107, 110, 114, 116–126, 128, 130, 132–174]. Phantom DE models have been explored as a resolution to the H_0 tension. Among them, the phantom crossing model (DMS20) [78, 83] stands out, with recent analysis confirming its success while highlighting that its ability to assume negative densities at $z \gtrsim 2$ is key to its effectiveness. Interacting DE (IDE) models [85–98] offer another approach, though model-independent reconstructions [175] do not rule out negative DE densities at $z \gtrsim 2$. Recent DESI BAO data—analyzed using the CPL parametrization—provided more than 3σ evidence for dynamical DE [176]. However, the non-parametric reconstructions of the DE density from DESI BAO data also indicate the possibility of vanishing or negative DE densities for $z \gtrsim 1.5$ – 2 [177, 178], a trend similarly observed in pre-DESI BAO data, viz., from SDSS [178, 179].

² For further theoretical and observational studies—including

range probed by late-time structure formation data), it is reasonable to assume that, within the framework of GR, Λ_s CDM would also yield $\gamma \simeq 0.55$. Considering observational analyses which predicts a lower present-day matter density parameter for Λ_s CDM—specifically, the Planck– Λ_s CDM yields $\Omega_{m0} \simeq 0.28$ —results in a growth rate of $f \simeq 0.49$, which closely matches the findings of Nguyen et al. [184]. This agreement suggests that the Λ_s CDM model can potentially account for the observed suppression of structure growth without conflicting with the assumption $\gamma \sim 0.55$. However, it remains crucial to rigorously demonstrate, within a theoretically robust framework, that Λ_s CDM indeed yields $\gamma \approx 0.55$ when gravitational phenomena are governed by GR.

Given these developments, investigating linear matter density perturbations within the Λ_s CDM framework is of significant importance. This analysis will allow the calculation of the crucial growth parameters and elucidate the impact of the type II singularity on linear matter density perturbations. Building upon previous investigations of non-linear matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model [144, 185], this study focuses on linear perturbations. Also, unlike our previous study [185], we adopt a fixed transition time of $z_{\dagger} = 1.7$, consistent with recent analyses [70, 71].

Linear matter density perturbation equations are governed by second-order differential equations, with particular solutions depending on the initial and boundary conditions. One of them is the δ_{∞} parameter, which represents the numerical value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse. While it is possible to set a constant δ_{∞} value (see Refs. [186–188]), we closely follow the approach of Herrera et al. [189]. By leveraging Einstein-de Sitter (EdS) model’s property of constant linear density contrast at collapse [190–192], we determine δ_{∞} as a function of collapse scale factor³. This method allows us to determine the initial conditions of an overdensity for a given collapse scale factor, or to compute the collapse scale factor for given initial conditions, without assuming δ_{∞} *a priori*.

The following sections outline the structure of this paper: Section II provides a comprehensive theoretical framework for linear and non-linear matter density perturbations in EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models. In Section III, we expand upon the methodology introduced by Herrera et al. [189] to develop a robust numerical approach for calculating the δ_{∞} parameter. Section IV presents a detailed analysis for the evolution of the linear matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model. This investigation is conducted from two different perspectives: First, by considering identical collapse scale factors (resulting in different initial conditions), and sec-

ond, by employing the same initial conditions (leading to different collapse scale factors). This dual approach provides a comprehensive understanding of perturbation dynamics in the Λ_s CDM framework. In Section V, we focus on calculating the growth rate and growth index for the Λ_s CDM model. Additionally, we perform an analysis based on the $f\sigma_8$ data to constrain the σ_8 and Ω_{m0} parameters, following methodologies similar to those employed in recent cosmological studies [5, 193]. This structured approach allows for a systematic exploration of matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model, providing insights into its behavior relative to standard cosmological models and its potential to address current cosmological tensions.

II. MATTER DENSITY PERTURBATIONS

A. Spherical Collapse Model

Initially, assume a slightly overdense homogeneous spherical region with uniform density $\rho \equiv \rho(t)$ and comoving radius R . To an observer within the perturbation conducting local measurements, this region of higher density (relative to the background) can be effectively described by a FRW metric. The mass enclosed within spherical overdensity is given by $M(R) = 4\pi\rho R^3/3$, which remains constant, as no matter escapes or falls in.

The evolution of a spherical overdensity can be derived by using Newtonian mechanics:

$$\ddot{r} = -\frac{GM}{r^2}, \quad (4)$$

where r represents the physical radius of the spherical overdensity and it is proportional to the local scale factor within the overdensity. At early times, the spherical overdensity follows the cosmic background expansion, such that $r(t_{\text{ini}}) = a(t_{\text{ini}})R$, where a represents the background scale factor. The solution of Eq. (4) can be expressed in a parametric form as a function of θ [194, 195]:

$$\begin{aligned} r(\theta) &= \frac{r_{\text{ta}}}{2}(1 - \cos \theta), \\ t(\theta) &= \frac{t_{\text{ta}}}{\pi}(\theta - \sin \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $t(\theta)$ represents the cosmic time. Additionally we define $r_{\text{ta}} := r(\theta = \pi)$ and $t_{\text{ta}} := t(\theta = \pi)$ to simplify the notation. Given Eq. (5), density contrast in linear and non-linear regimes can be written as [186, 194–198]:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{lin,EdS}}(t) &= \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{3\pi}{4} \frac{t}{t_{\text{ta}}} \right)^{2/3}, \\ \delta_{\text{non-lin,EdS}}(\theta) &= \frac{9}{2} \frac{(\theta - \sin \theta)^2}{(1 - \cos \theta)^3} - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

At turnaround, linear and non-linear density contrasts become:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{lin,EdS}}(t = t_{\text{ta}}) &\approx 1.06241, \\ \delta_{\text{non-lin,EdS}}(\theta = \pi) &\approx 4.55165. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

³ In reality, δ_{∞} also depends on the chosen initial scale factor which marks the starting point of the evolution of the density perturbations. However, since we will fix its value throughout the study, δ_{∞} will depend solely on the collapse scale factor.

Meanwhile, at collapse, the density contrasts reach [199]:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{lin,EdS}}(t = t_{\text{col}}) &\approx 1.68647, \\ \delta_{\text{non-lin,EdS}}(\theta = 2\pi) &\rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In summary, the spherical collapse model describes the evolution of an overdensity through the following stages:

- (1) *Linear regime*: In the initial phase, the overdensity grows linearly with the expansion of the universe [196].
- (2) *Turnaround*: The overdensity has already decoupled from the Hubble flow of the background universe, expanded gradually at a decreasing rate, and eventually reached its maximum turnaround radius [196, 197, 200].
- (3) *Collapse*: After the turnaround, the spherical overdensity begins to contract (resembling an EdS universe) and collapses toward the center, reaching $r = 0$ at $t = t_{\text{col}} = 2t_{\text{ta}}$, resulting in a curvature singularity where the density becomes infinite.

Evidently, this singular state is unphysical. In more realistic scenarios, the spherical collapse is valid only up to the point of shell crossing. At this stage, the dust assumption is expected to break down, non-radial fluctuations emerge, and the collisionless dark matter component undergoes violent relaxation [194]. Consequently, the shells are expected to collapse in a non-spherical manner, and the time-averaged gravitational energy exchange among these shells leads to a virialized state [197, 200–204].

Despite these limitations, the spherical collapse model remains a valuable tool for determining the linear density contrast at collapse, δ_c , which serves as a criterion for identifying regions in an initial linear density field that are likely to collapse and form halos. But still, the non-linear density contrast diverges to infinity at collapse, as shown in Eq. (8), creating significant challenges in determining the initial conditions of an overdensity. To address this issue, we will identify a numerical representation of it by following an existing approach presented by Herrera et al. [189]. This will be further discussed in Section III.

B. Evolution of the Matter Density Perturbations in Linear and Non-Linear Regimes

We consider a spherical region of radius r , containing matter (m) and dark energy (DE) with energy densities ρ_{c_j} for $j = \{\text{m, DE}\}$. Similarly, the background universe is modeled as a perfect fluid with energy densities ρ_j . To simplify the calculations, we will assume the equation of state (EoS) parameter for matter and dark energy in the spherical overdensity and in the background are the same, i.e., $w_{c_j} \equiv w_j$ [205]. Under these assumptions, Friedmann equations describing the evolution of a background

universe are written as:

$$\begin{aligned} 3H^2 &= 8\pi G \sum_k \rho_k, \\ \dot{H} &= -4\pi G \sum_k \rho_k (1 + w_k), \\ \dot{\rho}_j &= -3H\rho_j(1 + w_j), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter of the background universe. Similarly, the evolution of a spherical overdensity is described by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 3h^2 &= 8\pi G \sum_k \rho_{c_k}, \\ \dot{h} &= -4\pi G \sum_k \rho_{c_k} (1 + w_k), \\ \dot{\rho}_{c_j} &= -3h\rho_{c_j} (1 + w_j), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $h \equiv \dot{r}/r$ is the local expansion rate of the overdensity. Subsequently, we can define the density contrast of cosmic fluid j via:

$$\delta_j := \frac{\rho_{c_j}}{\rho_j} - 1, \quad (11)$$

which measures the relative overdensity compared to the background. By differentiating Eq. (11) with respect to cosmic time, we obtain [205–207]:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\delta}_j &= 3(1 + \delta_j)(H - h)(1 + w_j), \\ \ddot{\delta}_j &= 3(1 + \delta_j)(\dot{H} - \dot{h})(1 + w_j) + \frac{\dot{\delta}_j^2}{1 + \delta_j} + \frac{\dot{\delta}_j \dot{w}_j}{(1 + w_j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By using the second Friedmann equation for the spherical overdensity:

$$\frac{\ddot{r}}{r} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} \sum_k \rho_{c_k} (1 + 3w_k), \quad (13)$$

and combining equations (9) through (12), we obtain the non-linear density perturbation equation [186, 187, 204, 205]:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\delta}_j + \left(2H - \frac{\dot{w}_j}{1 + w_j} \right) \dot{\delta}_j - \left[\frac{4 + 3w_j}{3(1 + w_j)} \right] \frac{\dot{\delta}_j^2}{1 + \delta_j} \\ - 4\pi G(1 + w_j)(1 + \delta_j) \sum_k \rho_k \delta_k (1 + 3w_k) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In this study, we will ignore the dark energy density perturbations, i.e., $\delta_{\text{DE}} = 0$. Thus, for matter perturbations, Eq. (14) simplifies to:

$$\ddot{\delta}_m + 2H\dot{\delta}_m - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\dot{\delta}_m^2}{1 + \delta_m} - 4\pi G\rho_m \delta_m (1 + \delta_m) = 0. \quad (15)$$

Changing the independent variable from cosmic time to the scale factor by using $\partial_t = aH(a)\partial_a$, Eq. (15) takes

the following form:

$$\delta_m'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} + \frac{E'}{E} \right) \delta_m' - \frac{4}{3} \frac{(\delta_m')^2}{1 + \delta_m} - \frac{3}{2a^2} \Omega_m \delta_m (1 + \delta_m) = 0, \quad (16)$$

where prime denotes the derivative with respect to the scale factor, i.e., $' := d/da$ and we define the matter density parameter as $\Omega_m \equiv \Omega_m(a) = \Omega_{m0} a^{-3}/E^2$ with $E \equiv H(a)/H_0$.

By restricting $\delta_m \ll 1$ and ignoring second-order terms, we obtain the linear form of the matter density perturbation equation [186, 187, 204, 205, 208]:

$$\delta_m'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} + \frac{E'}{E} \right) \delta_m' - \frac{3}{2a^2} \Omega_m \delta_m = 0. \quad (17)$$

EdS:

$$\delta_{\text{EdS}}'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \right) \delta_{\text{EdS}}' - \frac{4}{3} \frac{(\delta_{\text{EdS}}')^2}{1 + \delta_{\text{EdS}}} - \frac{3}{2a^2} \delta_{\text{EdS}} (1 + \delta_{\text{EdS}}) = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$\delta_{\text{EdS}}'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \right) \delta_{\text{EdS}}' - \frac{3}{2a^2} \delta_{\text{EdS}} = 0. \quad (21)$$

Λ CDM:

$$\delta_{\Lambda}'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \right) \delta_{\Lambda}' - \frac{4}{3} \frac{(\delta_{\Lambda}')^2}{1 + \delta_{\Lambda}} - \frac{3}{2a^2} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \delta_{\Lambda} (1 + \delta_{\Lambda}) = 0, \quad (22)$$

$$\delta_{\Lambda}'' + \left(\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \right) \delta_{\Lambda}' - \frac{3}{2a^2} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \delta_{\Lambda} = 0. \quad (23)$$

Λ_s CDM:

$$\delta_{\Lambda_s}'' + \left[\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3} \delta_D(a - a_{\dagger}) a^4 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right] \delta_{\Lambda_s}' - \frac{4}{3} \frac{(\delta_{\Lambda_s}')^2}{1 + \delta_{\Lambda_s}} - \frac{3}{2a^2} \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \delta_{\Lambda_s} (1 + \delta_{\Lambda_s}) = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\delta_{\Lambda_s}'' + \left[\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3} \delta_D(a - a_{\dagger}) a^4 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right] \delta_{\Lambda_s}' - \frac{3}{2a^2} \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \delta_{\Lambda_s} = 0. \quad (25)$$

where we have used:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda} &:= \Omega_{\Lambda 0} / (1 - \Omega_{\Lambda 0}), \\ \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} &:= \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} / (1 - \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0}), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for $\Omega_{\Lambda 0}, \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} \geq 0$. Most importantly, one should be careful and not to confuse the matter density perturbation, $\delta := \delta_m$, with the Dirac delta function, δ_D .

Given the matter density parameter:

$$\Omega_m = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{EdS} \\ \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}}, & \Lambda\text{CDM} \\ \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}, & \Lambda_s\text{CDM} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

and:

$$\frac{E'}{E} = \begin{cases} -\frac{2}{3a}, & \text{EdS} \\ -\frac{1}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}}, & \Lambda\text{CDM} \\ -\frac{1}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3} \delta_D(a - a_{\dagger}) a^4 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}, & \Lambda_s\text{CDM} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

evolution of the non-linear and linear matter density perturbations in the EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models can be described as:

III. DETERMINING THE NUMERICAL VALUE OF THE NON-LINEAR DENSITY CONTRAST AT COLLAPSE

While analytical expressions for the evolution of an overdensity can be derived in certain cosmological models, numerical approaches are often preferred. In such cases, it is crucial to use accurate initial and boundary conditions to analyze and compare the evolution of perturbations across different cosmological models.

In the current methodology, we use both linear and non-linear matter density perturbation equations in a complementary manner to describe the evolution of an overdensity (see Refs. [186–188]). In these methods, as shown in Eq. (8), the theoretical value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse approaches infinity, making it impractical for direct use in numerical analyses. Therefore, it is essential to develop a robust method to determine the numerical value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse.

The EdS model is one of the simplest cosmological models, describing a universe with zero spatial curvature that contains only matter. Due to its simplicity, it is possible to analytically determine some of the key parameters related to the evolution of an overdensity (see Eqs. (6)–(8)). Moreover, the linear matter density perturbations for many cosmological models in the literature, including Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM, converge to those of the EdS model in the early-universe (see Fig. 1). These characteristics make the EdS an ideal model for determining δ_∞ , as we will discuss in the following subsections.

A. Initial Scale Factor

The initial scale factor, a_{ini} , marks the point in time, which the perturbations begin to grow with the initial conditions δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini} . To determine the most suitable value of a_{ini} , we can examine the evolution of matter density perturbations across different time periods. Therefore, let us consider the following intervals:

- *Minimal radiation contribution* ($a_{\text{ini}} \gg a_{\text{eq}}$): Since we are neglecting the effect of the radiation in the background universe, its contribution should be minimal during and after the initial scale factor. Therefore, the initial scale factor must be set much after the matter-radiation equality.
- *Equivalent dynamics in linear and non-linear regimes* ($a_{\text{ini}} \ll 1$): The non-linear matter density perturbations initially coincides with the linear matter density perturbations, allowing the initial conditions of the latter to evaluate the former (and conversely). This can be confirmed by analyzing Eqs. (20)–(22)–(24) in the early-universe, and comparing them with Eqs. (21)–(23)–(25), which can be also seen in Fig. 1. Moreover, within this period, the number of unknown initial conditions can be reduced from two to one⁴ by expressing δ'_{ini} in terms of δ_{ini} (i.e., $\delta'_{\text{ini}} \equiv \delta_{\text{ini}}/a_{\text{ini}}$).

⁴ The same approach is also performed in Refs. [187, 204] with only minor difference. The authors assume a power law behavior, $\delta(a) = Ca^n$, which becomes $\delta'_{\text{ini}} = n\delta_{\text{ini}}/a_{\text{ini}}$ at the initial scale factor. Meanwhile, in our study we directly assume $n_{\text{EdS}} = n_\Lambda = n_{\Lambda_s} \equiv 1$, given that in the early-universe both of the models behave as EdS and the deviation from $n = 1$ can be neglected.




FIG. 1. Linear and non-linear evolution of the matter density perturbations in EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models assuming $a_{\text{col}} = 1$. We have used Eqs. (20)–(25) to produce the plot, with the initial conditions obtained from Table I and Table II. Meanwhile, the cosmological parameters are taken from Table VI^a. As $a \rightarrow a_{\text{ini}}$, the effect of the Λ_s and Λ becomes less significant and the dynamics of the density perturbations become similar, in both linear and non-linear regimes. At $a = a_{\text{col}}$, the non-linear density contrasts in all three models reach δ_∞ .

^a We refer readers to Appendix A for the detailed discussion.

- *Synchronized evolution of baryon and CDM perturbations* ($a_{\text{ini}} \gtrsim a_{\text{rec}}$): Since CDM does not interact with radiation, their perturbations can grow during the radiation-dominated era (the Mészáros effect [209]). Thus, at the end of the recombination era, size of the CDM fluctuations will be around $\delta_{\text{CDM}} \propto a^{-3} \simeq 10^{-3}$. However, the baryonic density fluctuations will remain on the order of $\delta_b \sim 10^{-5}$, since baryonic matter and radiation are strongly coupled due to Thomson scattering. Only after the recombination, baryonic perturbations can grow freely and catch up to CDM perturbations, i.e., $\delta_b \rightarrow \delta_{\text{CDM}}$ as $a \gtrsim a_{\text{rec}}$ (see sections 12-13 and figure 13.3.b in Ref. [210]). Thus, selecting $a_{\text{ini}} \gtrsim a_{\text{rec}}$ will allow a synchronized evolution between CDM and baryonic matter density perturbations.

Considering these points, we have decided to set the initial scale factor as $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$. While our aim is to study the evolution of the matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model, it is also important to compare those with the Λ CDM. Therefore, we adopt the same initial scale factor for the density perturbations, to ensure consistency across different cosmological models analyzed in this study.

B. Initial Density Contrast and Initial Rate of Evolution

The differential equation describing the evolution of linear matter density perturbation in the EdS model is

given by Eq. (21), and it has the following (growing) solution:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{EdS}}(a) &= C_{\text{EdS}} a, \\ \delta'_{\text{EdS}}(a) &= C_{\text{EdS}},\end{aligned}\quad (27)$$

where C_{EdS} represents the integration constant. As the perturbation grows, it eventually reaches a point where the linear theory no longer applies and non-linear effects become significant. The non-linear evolution of the perturbation leads to a rapid collapse, resulting in the formation of a bound structure, such as a galaxy or cluster of galaxies.

The linear density contrast at collapse, δ_c , serves as a benchmark for determining when a perturbation will collapse to form such a structure:

$$\delta_c := \delta_{\text{lin}}(a = a_{\text{col}}). \quad (28)$$

As derived from the spherical collapse model, the linear density contrast at collapse in the EdS model is given by [188–192]:

$$\delta_{c,\text{EdS}} = \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{3\pi}{2} \right)^{2/3} \approx 1.68647, \quad (29)$$

which is independent of $\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini,EdS}}$ parameters [189, 195, 196].

In the EdS model, both linear and non-linear matter density perturbations are governed by second order differential equations, with their evolution determined by the specified initial conditions. To determine these initial conditions, the evolution of the density perturbation must be constrained between some initial and collapse scale factor⁵ (i.e., $a_{\text{ini}} \leq a \leq a_{\text{col}}$). Without this constraint, numerical calculations cannot be performed, as the collapse time of the perturbation would remain undetermined due to unknown value of δ_∞ . Thus, the collapse scale factor must be set before the calculations.

By using Eqs. (27)–(29), we can write the linear density contrast at the collapse scale factor as:

$$\delta_{c,\text{EdS}} \equiv \delta_{\text{lin,EdS}}(a = a_{\text{col}}) = C_{\text{EdS}} a_{\text{col}}. \quad (30)$$

For $\delta_{c,\text{EdS}}$ to remain constant for different values of a_{col} , C_{EdS} must vary with respect to the collapse scale factor. Therefore, we can define $C_{\text{EdS}} \equiv C_{\text{EdS}}(a_{\text{col}})$ via:

$$C_{\text{EdS}} \equiv \frac{\delta_{c,\text{EdS}}}{a_{\text{col}}} = \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{3\pi}{2} \right)^{2/3} \frac{1}{a_{\text{col}}}. \quad (31)$$

⁵ Note that bounding the evolution of a density perturbation with respect to cosmic time and scale factor are two different things. Since we are fixing the boundaries with respect to the scale factor (i.e., a_{ini} and a_{col}), the cosmic time that passes for the two models will be different. This implies that, the two perturbations will evolve under different time scales, even though their initial and collapse scale factors are bounded by the same value.

TABLE I. Initial density contrast and numerical value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse, obtained for perturbations that starts their evolution at $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$ and collapses at $a_{\text{col}} = \{1/8, 1/4, 1/2, 1\}$, under the EdS model^a.

Model	a_{ini}	a_{col}	δ_{ini}	δ_∞
EdS	10^{-3}	0.125	1.34918×10^{-2}	2.17548×10^3
EdS	10^{-3}	0.250	6.74588×10^{-3}	8.27789×10^3
EdS	10^{-3}	0.500	3.37294×10^{-3}	3.20866×10^4
EdS	10^{-3}	1.000	1.68647×10^{-3}	1.25832×10^5

^a Due to the rapid increase in the non-linear density contrast as $a \rightarrow a_{\text{col}}$, directly substituting these values into the non-linear or linear matter density perturbation equations, as outlined in Section II, may yield inaccurate results. For the most accurate values, one can look at our public code in [camarman/MDP-Ls](#) repository on GitHub.

Let us consider the density contrast at some initial scale factor, a_{ini} :

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}} &= C_{\text{EdS}} a_{\text{ini}}, \\ \delta'_{\text{ini,EdS}} &= C_{\text{EdS}}.\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

By combining Eq. (31) and Eq. (32), initial density contrast and initial rate of evolution of an overdensity in the EdS model can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}} &= \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{3\pi}{2} \right)^{2/3} \frac{a_{\text{ini}}}{a_{\text{col}}}, \\ \delta'_{\text{ini,EdS}} &\equiv \frac{\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}}{a_{\text{ini}}} = \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{3\pi}{2} \right)^{2/3} \frac{1}{a_{\text{col}}}.\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

C. Condition for Collapse

The collapse process can be visualized by plotting the evolution of a density perturbation over time. In Fig. 1, we show the linear and non-linear evolution of a matter density perturbations in EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models, assuming the spherical overdensity collapses today (i.e., $a_{\text{col}} = 1$).

Theoretically, as $a \rightarrow a_{\text{col}}$, the non-linear density contrast grows rapidly and approaches infinity, representing the collapse of a matter into a single point (i.e., $\delta_{\text{non-lin}}(a = a_{\text{col}}) \rightarrow \infty$). However, in numerical analysis, the value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse will be finite and it will be represented by δ_∞ [186–188]. That is:

$$\delta_\infty := \delta_{\text{num-non-lin}}(a = a_{\text{col}}). \quad (34)$$

Since the evolution of the matter density perturbation is bounded between $[a_{\text{ini}}, a_{\text{col}}]$ we can obtain $\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini,EdS}} \equiv \delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}/a_{\text{ini}}$ from Eq. (33). Subsequently, by evaluating Eq. (20) with the initial conditions obtained




FIG. 2. Evolution of $\delta_\infty \equiv \delta_{\infty, \text{EdS}}$, obtained by propagating Eq. (20) with the initial conditions given in Eq. (33) for $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$ and $a_{\text{col}} = \{0.01, 1\}$. Although δ_∞ also depends on the initial scale factor (as it appears in Eq. (33)), since its value is fixed in this study, δ_∞ depends solely on a_{col} .

from Eq. (33)⁶ we obtain $\delta_{\infty, \text{EdS}}$. The result of this calculation is shown in Table I, and also depicted in Fig. 2 as a function of a_{col} . As expected, $\delta_{\infty, \text{EdS}}$ varies with respect to the collapse scale factor as a result of $\delta_{c, \text{EdS}}$ being an independent parameter from the collapse scale factor.

If an overdensity in an EdS universe collapses at a particular scale factor, its non-linear density contrast formally diverges, approaching infinity (i.e., $\delta_{\text{non-lin, EdS}}(a_{\text{col}}) \rightarrow \infty$). In numerical calculations, this divergence is represented by $\delta_{\infty, \text{EdS}}$, as defined in Eq. (34). Now, consider another overdensity evolving under different set of cosmological dynamics. If we assume this overdensity also collapses at the same scale factor, its non-linear density contrast will likewise theoretically diverge to infinity (i.e., $\delta_{\text{non-lin, X}}(a_{\text{col}}) \rightarrow \infty$).

While the linear density contrast at collapse, δ_c , shows slight variations across different cosmological models (assuming that a linear density field has the initial conditions necessary for collapse) the evolution of a spherically collapsing density perturbation gradually becomes similar to that in an EdS model. Collapse is a physical process in which an overdensity eventually becomes matter-dominated within the collapsing structure. In the final stages of this process, the evolution becomes largely independent of the cosmological model. Therefore, it is a reasonable assumption that all models converge to an identical density contrast at the point of collapse, thus validating the completion of the collapse process (see Ref. [189]):

$$\delta_{\text{non-lin, X}}(a_{\text{col}}) \equiv \delta_{\text{non-lin, EdS}}(a_{\text{col}}). \quad (35)$$

⁶ This is only possible due to the chosen initial scale factor, $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$, where the non-linear matter density perturbations behaves as linear. Thus the initial conditions obtained from linear equations can be used to evaluate non-linear ones (see Ref. [211]).

Numerical equivalence of this condition corresponds to:

$$\delta_\infty \equiv \delta_{\infty, \text{X}} = \delta_{\infty, \text{EdS}}, \quad (36)$$

which can be interpreted as follows: *The collapse only takes places, when the numerical value of the non-linear density contrast in model X, reaches the numerical value of the non-linear density contrast at collapse in the EdS model.* This ensures that the conditions for collapse are consistent across different cosmological models, enabling a meaningful comparison of the evolution of matter density perturbations.

IV. LINEAR MATTER DENSITY PERTURBATIONS IN THE Λ_s CDM MODEL

At the start of the analysis, we can approach the study of the dynamics of an overdensity by asking two different questions, each leading to a distinct line of investigation. The first question is: “*What are the initial conditions of an overdensity, that result in its collapse at a given scale factor?*” The second question is: “*What is the collapse scale factor, given that the overdensity begins from specific initial conditions?*”.

Regardless of the chosen approach, there is a crucial criteria that must be satisfied at the collapse scale factor: As previously outlined in Section III, the numerical value of the non-linear density contrast must reach δ_∞ at the time of collapse, in order to align with the theoretical predictions.

Under these assumptions, we will study the linear matter density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model using two different approaches: First, by constraining the evolution between an initial and a collapse scale factor (Section IV A), and later on by fixing the initial density contrast and the initial rate of evolution (Section IV B).

A. Evolution of the Linear Matter Density Perturbations for a Fixed Collapse Scale Factor

In this part of the analysis, we aim to determine the initial conditions of an overdensity by predefining the time of collapse. Since the transition scale factor is set to $a_\dagger \approx 1/3$, we have decided to examine the evolution of the linear matter density perturbations at four different collapse scale factors: $a_{\text{col}} = \{1/8, 1/4, 1/2, 1\}$. Setting the collapse scale factors before and after the AdS-dS transition will allow us to observe the effect of the type II singularity⁷ on the linear matter density perturbations.

In the early-universe, behavior of linear and non-linear matter density perturbations in the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models become similar as in EdS (see Fig. 1) [190–192] and their evolution can be represented by Eq. (27). As

⁷ We refer readers to Appendix B, for the detailed discussion.




FIG. 3. *Top panel:* Evolution of δ_{ini} with respect to a_{col} for EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models. As $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow a_{\text{ini}}$, initial density contrast and initial rate of evolution increases independent from the model, since the overdensity have to collapse in the early-universe and therefore it should start with a larger density contrast. Meanwhile, as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow 1$, δ_{ini} decreases, indicating that a_{col} and δ_{ini} is inversely proportional. *Bottom panel:* The relative deviation in the $\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s}$ and $\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}$ with respect to $\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}$. Before the transition (and even up to $a_{\text{col}} \lesssim 0.5$) we observe $\Delta\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} < 0 < \Delta\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}$, which is an indication of faster structure growth compared to EdS and Λ CDM. After the transition, we observe $\Delta\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda} > \Delta\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} > 0$, which still implies faster structure growth compared to Λ CDM but less then EdS.

a result, we can parameterize initial conditions of an overdensity in Λ CDM:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda} &= C_{\Lambda} a_{\text{ini}}, \\ \delta'_{\text{ini,}\Lambda} &= C_{\Lambda} = \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda} / a_{\text{ini}}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and in Λ_s CDM:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} &= C_{\Lambda_s} a_{\text{ini}}, \\ \delta'_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} &= C_{\Lambda_s} = \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} / a_{\text{ini}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Writing δ'_{ini} as a function of δ_{ini} and a_{ini} reduces the number of unknown initial conditions from two to one. Additionally, by using Eq. (36), we can write the following relation:

$$\delta_{\infty} \equiv \delta_{\infty,\text{EdS}} = \delta_{\infty,\Lambda} = \delta_{\infty,\Lambda_s}, \quad (39)$$

which will allow us to determine the initial conditions for each overdensity.

At this stage, we can employ a root finding algorithm (by using non-linear matter density perturbation equation) which searches δ_{ini} within the interval of $\delta_{\text{ini}} \in [6.14 \times 10^{-6}, 1.00]$, satisfying the following conditions: The overdensity starts its evolution at a_{ini} , collapses at a_{col} with non-linear density contrast equal to δ_{∞} ⁸.

After finding the initial conditions, we can use the linear matter density perturbation equation to evaluate δ_c . We have presented our results in Table II and Figs. 3, 4, and 5.

Fig. 3 illustrates that bounding the evolution (i.e., fixing the a_{col}) leads to different initial conditions, as a result of different dark energy dynamics. In the *top panel*, we have shown the initial conditions as a function of the collapse scale factor. Meanwhile, in the *bottom panel*, we have plotted the relative deviation in the initial density contrast for the Λ_s CDM and Λ CDM models with respect to EdS:

$$\Delta\delta_{\text{ini},i}[\%] := 100 \left(\frac{\delta_{\text{ini},i}}{\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}} - 1 \right) \quad \text{for } i = \Lambda, \Lambda_s. \quad (40)$$

We observe that, as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow a_{\text{ini}}$, the effect of the dark energy becomes negligible on the evolution of an overdensity, and the initial conditions converges to the EdS value, i.e., $\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}, \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} \rightarrow \delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}$.

If the collapse occurs before the AdS–dS transition ($a_{\text{col}} < a_{\dagger}$), we can write the relation between the initial conditions as:

$$\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} < \delta_{\text{ini,EdS}} < \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}. \quad (41)$$

This is expected, considering that the negative cosmological constant enhances the structure growth. Thus, for two overdensities that begin their evolution at the same a_{ini} and collapse at the same a_{col} , with the same δ_{∞} , the initial density contrast of one should be lower than that of the perturbation evolving under a positive or zero cosmological constant (see Table II and Fig. 3).

Meanwhile, if the collapse occurs after the transition ($a_{\text{col}} > a_{\dagger}$), especially for $a_{\text{col}} \gtrsim 0.5$, we can write the following relation between the initial conditions:

$$\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}} < \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} < \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}. \quad (42)$$

After the AdS–dS transition, $\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s}$ begins to increase and eventually exceeds $\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}$. This suggests that, an overdensity in the Λ_s CDM model must start with a higher initial density contrast compared to the EdS, in order to compensate for the suppression caused by the positive cosmological constant. Finally, we observe that $\delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda_s} < \delta_{\text{ini,}\Lambda}$ holds true at all a_{col} . Consequently, we can claim the

⁸ We refer readers to Appendix C, for the detailed discussion of the usage of the Dirac delta function in numerical analysis.




FIG. 4. *Left panels:* Ratio of the density contrasts as a function of the scale factor. *Right panels:* The rate of change of the density contrasts as a function of the scale factor. From top to bottom the collapse scale factors are given as $a_{\text{col}} = \{1/8, 1/4, 1/2, 1\}$. Initial conditions and cosmological parameters are taken from Table II and Table VI respectively. The vertical grey line represents the moment of transition, meanwhile the dotted line represents the time of collapse.




FIG. 5. The linear density contrast at collapse in the EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models. Notice that, in the early-universe, δ_{c,Λ_s} and $\delta_{c,\Lambda}$ are almost the same as $\delta_{c,\text{EdS}}$ (i.e., $\delta_{c,\Lambda_s} \simeq \delta_{c,\Lambda} \simeq \delta_{c,\text{EdS}}$ for $a_{\text{col}} \ll 1$).

TABLE II. For $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$, $a_{\text{col}} = \{1/8, 1/4, 1/2, 1\}$ and with the assumption of Eq. (39), we have calculated δ_{ini} and δ_c of an overdensity in the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models. The cosmological parameters used in the analysis are taken from Table VI.

Model	a_{ini}	a_{col}	δ_{∞}	δ_{ini}	δ_c
Λ CDM	10^{-3}	0.125	2.17548×10^3	1.35020×10^{-2}	1.68646
Λ_s CDM				1.34793×10^{-2}	1.68649
Λ CDM	10^{-3}	0.250	8.27789×10^3	6.78604×10^{-3}	1.68627
Λ_s CDM				6.69609×10^{-3}	1.68672
Λ CDM	10^{-3}	0.500	3.20866×10^4	3.52333×10^{-3}	1.68474
Λ_s CDM				3.38297×10^{-3}	1.68714
Λ CDM	10^{-3}	1.000	1.25832×10^5	2.12598×10^{-3}	1.67699
Λ_s CDM				2.08448×10^{-3}	1.67828

following: For a given a_{col} , the Λ_s CDM model requires a smaller initial overdensity than the Λ CDM model to attain the specified δ_{∞} at the corresponding a_{col} .

To better understand the evolution of the linear density perturbations, we have used Table II values as initial conditions⁹ to plot $\delta_{\Lambda_s}/\delta_{\Lambda}$ and $\delta'_{\Lambda_s}/\delta'_{\Lambda}$ as a function of the scale factor.

In the *left panels* of Fig. 4, we see that while initially the density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model starts from smaller values (see Eqs. (41) and (42)), they grow faster compared to the Λ CDM model and catch up. The reason as follows: Since, we have fixed the boundaries of the evolution of the overdensity between some initial and

collapse scale factor, i.e., $[a_{\text{ini}}, a_{\text{col}}]$, faster evolving density perturbation must start from a lower density contrast so that it can collapse at the same scale factor and with the same δ_{∞} . In the right panels of the same figure, we see that the δ'_{Λ_s} also starts from lower value, however later on, it increases and passes δ'_{Λ} .

If the collapse occurs after the transition, we can see the effect of the type II (sudden) singularity on the linear matter density perturbations. The discontinuity in the δ'_{Λ_s} suggest that, the rate of evolution in the Λ_s CDM model suddenly decreases and becomes similar to the Λ CDM (i.e., $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon) \simeq \delta'_{\Lambda}(a_{\dagger})$). After the transition, the overdensity encounters more friction due to $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} > \Omega_{\Lambda 0}$. Thus, $\delta'_{\Lambda_s}/\delta'_{\Lambda}$ ratios decreases even further and falls below one.

Most of the information related to the growth of structures (e.g., the comoving number density of collapsed halos, cumulative stellar mass density) depends on the halo mass function, which requires the calculation of the δ_c parameter. For this reason, we have calculated $\delta_{c,\text{EdS}}$, $\delta_{c,\Lambda}$, and δ_{c,Λ_s} as a function of the collapse scale factor, as shown in Fig. 5.

In Fig. 5, we observe that $\delta_{c,\text{EdS}}$ remains constant independent from the collapse scale factor (see Eq. (29)), whereas $\delta_{c,\Lambda}$ decreases as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow 1$. Before the transition, the negative cosmological supports the structure growth, causing δ_{c,Λ_s} to increase; however, after the transition, due to positive cosmological constant, it starts to decrease. Finally, $\delta_{c,\Lambda}$ and δ_{c,Λ_s} approach $\delta_{c,\text{EdS}} = 1.68647$ as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow a_{\text{ini}}$.

B. Evolution of the Linear Matter Density Perturbations for a Fixed Initial Density Contrast and Initial Rate of Evolution

Since the CMB power spectrum is well defined [28], and considering that the pre-recombination era of the Λ_s CDM is the same as the Λ CDM, its natural to start the overdensities with the same δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini} . Since our aim is to compare the two models, we have decided to use the Λ CDM values obtained from Table II as the initial conditions of both density perturbations. This will allow for an easier comparison of the evolution between the Λ_s CDM and Λ CDM models (see Table III).

Similar to the previous case, dynamics of the both linear and non-linear matter density perturbations in the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models become similar as in EdS (see Fig. 1) and we can parameterize initial conditions of an overdensity in Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models given as in Eq (37) and Eq. (38) respectively.

Following this, the time of collapse can be determined by evolving the nonlinear density perturbation equation until its value reaches δ_{∞} . The result of this calculation is given in Table III.

In Fig. 6, we have plotted $\delta_{\Lambda_s}/\delta_{\Lambda}$ and $\delta'_{\Lambda_s}/\delta'_{\Lambda}$ as a function of the scale factor. In the *left panels* we have plotted ratio of the density perturbations as a function

⁹ Due to the rapid increase in the non-linear density contrast as $a \rightarrow a_{\text{col}}$, directly substituting these values into the non-linear or linear matter density perturbation equations, as outlined in Section II, may yield inaccurate results. For the most accurate values, one can look at our public code in [camarman/MDP-Ls](#) repository on GitHub.




FIG. 6. *Left panels:* Evolution of the ratio of the density contrasts as a function of the scale factor. *Right panels:* The rate of change of the density contrasts as a function of the scale factor. Initial conditions and cosmological parameters are taken from Table III and Table VI respectively. Since we have started the perturbations from the same initial conditions (δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini}), the density perturbations in the Λ_s CDM model grows faster and thus, collapses earlier (see Table III). The vertical grey line represents the moment of transition, meanwhile the dotted line represents the time of collapse. Since the collapse occurs earlier in the Λ_s CDM, we have plotted the ratio until the collapse occurs for an overdensity in the Λ_s CDM model (i.e., a_{col,Λ_s}).

TABLE III. We have used the same a_{ini} , δ_{ini} , and δ'_{ini} to compute the evolution of an overdensity in ΛCDM and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ models. (i.e., $\delta_{\text{ini},\Lambda_s} \equiv \delta_{\text{ini},\Lambda}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini},\Lambda_s} \equiv \delta'_{\text{ini},\Lambda}$). Under this assumption, we observe that the overdensity in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model collapses earlier, which is a result of the faster structure formation compared to ΛCDM . Note that δ_∞ is different in the two models, as a result of the different a_{col} values (see also Fig. 2).

Model	a_{ini}	δ_{ini}	δ_∞	a_{col}	δ_c
ΛCDM	10^{-3}	1.35020×10^{-2}	2.17548×10^3	0.1250	1.68646
$\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$			2.16623×10^3	0.1248	1.68647
ΛCDM	10^{-3}	6.78604×10^{-3}	8.27789×10^3	0.2500	1.68627
$\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$			8.00898×10^3	0.2468	1.68665
ΛCDM	10^{-3}	3.52333×10^{-3}	3.20866×10^4	0.5000	1.68474
$\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$			2.90892×10^4	0.4772	1.68734
ΛCDM	10^{-3}	2.12598×10^{-3}	1.25832×10^5	1.0000	1.67699
$\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$			1.16466×10^5	0.9624	1.67910

of the scale factor. Even though the linear evolution of the density perturbations are the same for $a \lesssim 0.1$, there occurs a increase in the size of the perturbations at $a \approx a_\dagger$ about $\approx 5\%$.

Meanwhile, in the *right panels*, we have shown the ratio of the rate of evolution of the density perturbations as a function of the scale factor. Since the perturbations in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model grow faster, the ratio of $\delta_{\Lambda_s}/\delta_\Lambda$ exceeds 1. Only some time after the transition, the ratio drops below 1 due to the increased friction compared to ΛCDM , which is a result of the $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} > \Omega_{\Lambda 0}$.

Most importantly, we observe that the collapse occurs earlier in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model independent from the chosen initial conditions. The reason as follows: Since the negative cosmological constant supports the growth of structures, matter density perturbations in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model will grow faster and reach δ_∞ before the ΛCDM . *This implies for same δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini} , the perturbations in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model will collapse earlier, independent from the value of δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini} .*

We observe that the evolution of linear matter density perturbations becomes similar as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow a_{\text{ini}}$. This is reasonable considering that in the early-universe the effect of dark energy is negligible, and we expect the models to behave similarly. Over time, density perturbations under the influence of a negative cosmological constant grow faster compared to those under a positive cosmological constant. However, as $a_{\text{col}} \rightarrow a_\dagger$, the effect of the negative cosmological constant becomes more important, and the ratio of $\delta_{\Lambda_s}/\delta_\Lambda$ increases up to $\approx 5\%$. Meanwhile, after the AdS–dS transition, due to $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} > \Omega_{\Lambda 0}$, the overdensity encounters more friction and positive cosmological constant slows down the structure formation. As a result the ratio starts to drop.

C. Overall Perspective

To understand the effect of the negative cosmological constant on the structure formation, we can also directly look at Eq. (17). Let us define the Hubble friction as H_f , and the gravitational potential as Φ , such that:

$$H_f := \frac{3}{a} + \frac{E'}{E}, \quad (43)$$

$$\Phi := -\frac{3}{2a^2} \Omega_m.$$

In Fig. 7, we have shown the relative deviation in H_f and Φ in the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model compared to ΛCDM [212]:

$$\Delta H_f[\%] := 100 \left(\frac{H_{f,\Lambda_s}}{H_{f,\Lambda}} - 1 \right), \quad (44)$$

$$\Delta \Phi[\%] := 100 \left(\frac{\Phi_{\Lambda_s}}{\Phi_\Lambda} - 1 \right).$$

Before the transition, the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model has a higher gravitational potential and a lower friction, supporting the structure growth. In this region, the negative cosmological constant behaves as expected: It reduces the Hubble friction and also increases the gravitational potential. This trend continuous until the transition where the Hubble friction increases suddenly. After the transition, the Hubble friction becomes larger for the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model and similarly the potential becomes smaller. Thus, increased friction and reduced potential suppresses structure formation.

Let us summarize the process described from Section III to Section IV for an overdensity in a generic model, \mathbf{X} , whose dynamics resemble EdS in the early-universe. As discussed in Section III A, one can set the initial scale factor within the $a_{\text{rec}} \lesssim a_{\text{ini}} \ll 1$ interval. In this study, we have decided to set $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$. Under these assumptions, evolution of linear matter density perturbations can be studied from two different perspectives:

Method I: Finding $\delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$ by specifying a_{col}

1. Set the collapse scale factor; a_{col} .
2. For a given a_{ini} and a_{col} , calculate the initial conditions of an overdensity in the EdS model, via Eq. (33).
3. Calculate δ_∞ by evolving the non-linear matter density perturbation for EdS (see Eq. (20)) with the initial conditions found in step (b), until the scale factor reaches the time of collapse (i.e., $a \rightarrow a_{\text{col}}$). The resultant density contrast will be the value of δ_∞ .
4. Following Eq. (36), we can set, $\delta_\infty \equiv \delta_{\infty,\text{EdS}} = \delta_{\infty,\mathbf{X}}$, which will serve as a boundary condition and allow us to determine the corresponding initial conditions.
5. Parameterize the initial conditions as $\{\delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}, \delta'_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}} \equiv \delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}/a_{\text{ini}}\}$ and use a root finding algorithm (for the non-linear matter density




FIG. 7. *Top panel:* Relative deviation in the Hubble friction with respect to the scale factor. *Bottom panel:* Relative deviation in the gravitational potential with respect to the scale factor. Until the transition, due to the negative cosmological constant, the Λ_s CDM model supports the growth of structures more than the Λ CDM. However, after the transition, increased Hubble friction slows down structure formation compared to the Λ CDM. The behaviour presented here is a result of the different Ω_{m0} best-fit parameters, as obtained from the analysis described in Appendix A.

perturbation equation), which searches $\delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$, satisfying the following conditions: The overdensity starts its evolution at a_{ini} and collapses at a_{col} with non-linear density contrast equal to δ_{∞} .

6. Once $\delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$ are determined, the linear matter density perturbation equation can be solved to compute $\delta_{c,\mathbf{X}}$ and growth parameters.

Method II: Finding a_{col} by specifying $\delta_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$ and $\delta'_{\text{ini},\mathbf{X}}$:

1. Evolve the non-linear matter density perturbation equation for model \mathbf{X} , and at each step, store the value of the non-linear density contrast and the collapse scale factor.
2. Terminate the calculations, if the non-linear density contrast reaches δ_{∞} . The scale factor corresponding to this value will be the collapse scale factor.
3. Since a_{col} is determined in step (b), $\delta_{c,\mathbf{X}}$ and growth parameters can be evaluated accordingly.




FIG. 8. Numerical evolution of the growth rate for the EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models, obtained by using two independent approaches: (i) By directly solving Eq. (50) and Eq. (51) with the initial conditions given in Eq. (52) and Eq. (53) (shown by the solid lines) and (ii) By using the methods described in Section III and Section IV A (shown by the dashed lines). We see that the two methods match almost perfectly.

V. GROWTH RATE AND GROWTH INDEX OF THE COSMOLOGICAL PERTURBATIONS

A. Growth Rate

The growth rate of cosmological perturbations is a key parameter in understanding the evolution of cosmic structures. It is defined as the logarithmic derivative of the linear growth factor with respect to the scale factor [47, 182, 213–221]:

$$f \equiv \frac{d \ln D}{d \ln a} = a \frac{\delta'(a)}{\delta(a)}. \quad (45)$$

1. Numerical solution

In the numerical calculations of the growth rate, we will follow two independent approaches. First, we will use previously discussed methods, which is described in Sections III and IV A, and calculate the growth rate by using Eq. (45), by selecting the appropriate δ_{ini} and δ'_{ini} parameters. In the second approach, we will numerically evaluate the differential equations, describing the evolution of the growth rate.

In the first approach, we will define the growth factor as $D(a) = \delta(a)/\delta(a=1)$. In order to calculate the denominator, $\delta(a) = 1$, one has to assume that the overdensity collapsed today. In this regard, we will use the following values; $\{\delta_{\text{ini,EdS}}, \delta_{\text{ini},\Lambda}, \delta_{\text{ini},\Lambda_s}\} = \{1.68647 \times 10^{-3}, 2.12598 \times 10^{-3}, 2.08448 \times 10^{-3}\}$, which are taken from Table I and Table II for $a_{\text{col}} = 1$. Given these initial conditions, we can directly use the linear matter density perturbation equations (see Eqs. (21), (23),

and (25)) to numerically evaluate Eq. (45). The solution of this numerical calculation is given in Fig. 8, and it is shown by the dashed lines.

Meanwhile, to perform the second approach, let us begin by expressing the growth rate and its derivative in terms of the density contrast:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= a \frac{\delta'}{\delta}, \\ f' &= a \frac{\delta''}{\delta} + \frac{\delta'}{\delta} - a \frac{\delta'^2}{\delta^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

which implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta'}{\delta} &= \frac{f}{a}, \\ \frac{\delta''}{\delta} &= \frac{1}{a} \left(f' - \frac{f}{a} + \frac{f^2}{a} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

At this point, by using Eq. (47) we can re-write Eq. (17) as [31, 216–218, 220]:

$$f' + \frac{f^2}{a} + \left(\frac{2}{a} + \frac{E'}{E} \right) f - \frac{3}{2a} \Omega_m = 0, \quad (48)$$

which represents the general evolution of the growth rate. Given Eq. (18) and Eq. (19), we can write the evolution of the growth rate in EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models as follows:

EdS:

$$f'_{\text{EdS}} + \frac{f_{\text{EdS}}^2}{a} + \left(\frac{2}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \right) f_{\text{EdS}} - \frac{3}{2a} = 0. \quad (49)$$

Λ CDM:

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\Lambda} + \frac{f_{\Lambda}^2}{a} + \left(\frac{2}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1+a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \right) f_{\Lambda} \\ - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1+a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Λ_s CDM:

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}^2}{a} + \left[\frac{2}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3}\delta_D(a-a_{\dagger})a^4\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a-a_{\dagger})a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right] f_{\Lambda_s} \\ - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(a-a_{\dagger})a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Since the evolution of the growth is described via first order differential equations, we can numerically solve them by only providing a single initial condition. In the early-universe ($a \ll 1$), dynamics of the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models becomes similar to the EdS, (see Fig. 1), and given $f_{\text{EdS}}(a) = 1$, we obtain the following initial conditions:

$$f_{\Lambda}(a_{\text{ini}}; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}) = 1, \quad (52)$$

$$f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\text{ini}}; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) = 1. \quad (53)$$

Thus, Eq. (52) and Eq. (53) can be directly used in Eqs. (50) and (51) to obtain the evolution of the f_{Λ} and f_{Λ_s} .

2. Analytical solution

The analytical solution of Eq. (50) is a type of Riccati ordinary differential equation [222] and the solution can be obtained via Mathematica¹⁰ [223]:

$$f_{\Lambda}(a; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}) = \frac{10a^{5/2} - 15C_1\sqrt{1+a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} - 6a^{5/2}\sqrt{1+a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} {}_2F_1(-a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})}{2(1+a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})^{3/2} [5C_1 + 2a^{5/2} {}_2F_1(-a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})]}, \quad (54)$$

$$C_1 = \frac{2}{5} a_{\text{ini}}^{5/2} \left[\frac{5}{\sqrt{1+a_{\text{ini}}^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}}(5+2a_{\text{ini}}^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})} - {}_2F_1(-a_{\text{ini}}^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}) \right], \quad (55)$$

where C_1 is the integration constant and we simplified the notation of the hypergeometric function as ${}_2F_1(-a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}) \equiv {}_2F_1\left(\frac{5}{6}, \frac{3}{2}; \frac{11}{6}; -a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}\right)$ [222]. By using the initial condition given in Eq. (52) we can find C_1 ,

which is given in Eq. (55).

Meanwhile, since $\delta_D(a-a_{\dagger}) = 0$ for $a \neq a_{\dagger}$ in the Λ_s CDM model, we can separate Eq. (51) into two regions:

¹⁰ We refer readers to our public code in [camarman/MDP-Ls](https://github.com/camarman/MDP-Ls) repository on GitHub, for the solution.

$$0 = \begin{cases} f'_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}^2}{a} + \left(\frac{1 - 4a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{2 - 2a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 - a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} & a < a_{\dagger} \\ f'_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}^2}{a} + \left(\frac{1 + 4a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{2 + 2a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} & a > a_{\dagger} \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

with the AdS part corresponding to $a < a_{\dagger}$ and dS part corresponding to $a > a_{\dagger}$. Equation (56) is a type of Riccati ordinary differential equation [222] and the solution can be obtained via Mathematica [223]:

$$f_{\Lambda_s}(a; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) = \begin{cases} \frac{10a^{5/2} - 15C_2 \sqrt{1 - a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} - 6a^{5/2} \sqrt{1 - a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} {}_2F_1(a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})}{2(1 - a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})^{3/2} [5C_2 + 2a^{5/2} {}_2F_1(a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})]} & a < a_{\dagger} \\ \frac{10a^{5/2} - 15C_3 \sqrt{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} - 6a^{5/2} \sqrt{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} {}_2F_1(-a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})}{2(1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})^{3/2} [5C_3 + 2a^{5/2} {}_2F_1(-a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})]} & a > a_{\dagger} \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

$$C_2 = \frac{2}{5} a_{\text{ini}}^{5/2} \left[\frac{5}{\sqrt{1 - a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} (5 - 2a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} - {}_2F_1(a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) \right], \quad (58)$$

$$C_3 = \frac{2}{5} a_{\text{ini}}^{5/2} \left[\frac{5}{\sqrt{1 + a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} (5 + 2a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} - {}_2F_1(-a_{\text{ini}}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) \right], \quad (59)$$




FIG. 9. The analytical solution of the growth rate for the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models. The dashed line represents the general solution of the Λ_s CDM model, given by Eq. (63). Meanwhile, the dashed-dotted solution represents the Λ CDM solution, given by Eq. (62). As defined in Eq. (61), in order to find the general solution for the f_{Λ_s} , we have assumed that just after the transition, the growth rate of the Λ_s CDM follows the dynamics of the Λ CDM but with the Λ_s CDM parameters. In a similar sense, the AdS part of the solution represents the Λ CDM but with the negative cosmological constant.

where C_2, C_3 are integration constants and we simplified the notation of the hypergeometric function as ${}_2F_1(\pm a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) \equiv {}_2F_1\left(\frac{5}{6}, \frac{3}{2}; \frac{11}{6}; \pm a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}\right)$ [222]. In order to determine integration constants, C_2 and C_3 , we need an initial and a boundary condition.

In order to determine C_2 , we can use the AdS part of the solution in Eq. (57) and combine it with Eq. (53), which is given in Eq. (58). Meanwhile, as a direct consequence of the jump discontinuity in ΔH , the boundary condition

can be obtained by integrating Eq. (51) over the interval $(a_{\dagger} - \epsilon, a_{\dagger} + \epsilon)$ and applying Eq. (3)¹¹, which is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta f_{\Lambda_s} &:= f_{\Lambda_s,+}(\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) - f_{\Lambda_s,-}(\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) \\ &= -a_{\dagger}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where we define $f_{\Lambda_s,+} := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f(a_{\dagger} + \epsilon)$ and $f_{\Lambda_s,-} := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f(a_{\dagger} - \epsilon)$.

Eq. (60) alone does not determine Δf , as the value of $f(a_{\dagger})$ remains unspecified. At first glance, one might assume $f(a_{\dagger}) = 1$, but this is not necessarily the case. Instead, $f(a_{\dagger})$ must be determined by a physical process of the model. In the Λ_s CDM model, this process is uniquely determined by the magnitude of Δf .

To address this issue, we define the growth rate of the Λ_s CDM model, as the one whose right-hand limit at the transition a_{\dagger} matches the growth rate of a Λ CDM model with parameter \mathcal{R}_{Λ_s} at the same a_{\dagger} . Specifically, we set:

$$f_{\Lambda_s,+}(\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) = f_{\Lambda}(a_{\dagger}; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}). \quad (61)$$

This ensures that for $a > a_{\dagger}$, the growth rate f_{Λ_s} of the Λ_s CDM model is identical in functional form to the growth rate of the corresponding Λ CDM model. However, the parameters of that Λ CDM model are replaced by those of the Λ_s CDM model, i.e., $\Omega_{m0} = 1 - \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0}$. Notice that the left hand side of the equation corresponds to the dS part of the solution. Meanwhile, the right hand side can be obtained from Eqs. (54) and (55). By using Eq. (61) we find C_3 , which is given in Eq. (59). Furthermore, by

¹¹ We refer readers to Appendix D for the detailed discussion.




FIG. 10. Analytical and numerical solutions of the growth rate for the EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models. Before the transition, negative cosmological constant supports the structure formation, which results in a higher growth rate. Meanwhile, after the transition due to $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} > \Omega_{\Lambda 0}$, structure formation is suppressed with respect to the Λ CDM model and the growth rate falls below Λ CDM value [224].

using Eq. (61), we can determine the appropriate value¹² of $f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger})$ to satisfy our definition in Eq. (60)¹³.

Thus the complete analytical solutions of growth rate in Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models (see Eq. (54) and Eq. (57)) can be written in a simpler form, considering obtain $|C_1| = |C_2| = |C_3| \simeq 10^{-18} \approx 0$ for $a_{\text{ini}} = 10^{-3}$.

Thus, for the Λ CDM model we can write Eq. (54) as:

$$f_{\Lambda}(a; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}) = -\frac{3}{2}\Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(-a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})} \Omega_m^{3/2}, \quad (62)$$

Meanwhile, for the Λ_s CDM model, Eq. (57) becomes:

$$f_{\Lambda_s}(a; \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}) = \begin{cases} -\frac{3}{2}\Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} \Omega_m^{3/2} & a < a_{\dagger} \\ -\frac{3}{2}\Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(-a^3\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} \Omega_m^{3/2} & a > a_{\dagger} \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

In Fig. 9, we present both numerical and analytical solutions of the growth rate as a function of scale factor for the EdS, Λ CDM, and Λ_s CDM models. Before the AdS–dS transition, the negative cosmological constant in the Λ_s CDM model supports structure formation, resulting in a higher growth rate. Meanwhile at the transition, a

¹² The value of $f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger})$ holds no intrinsic physical significance; the sole physically relevant quantity is Δf_{Λ_s} . For this reason, the jump in Δf_{Λ_s} must be established as a physical process, ensuring it remains invariant while allowing $f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger})$ to vary.

¹³ If we intend to solve Eq. (25) analytically, we proceed by integrating over the interval $(a_{\dagger} - \epsilon, a_{\dagger} + \epsilon)$ and applying Eq. (3). The jump for the linear overdensity is uniquely defined, as the boundary condition is now given in Eq. (60). This allows us to specify $\delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}) = a_{\dagger}^{-1} \delta_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}) f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger})$ and further obtain $\Delta \delta'_{\Lambda_s} \equiv \delta'_{\Lambda_s,+} - \delta'_{\Lambda_s,-} = -a_{\dagger}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} \delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger})$.

discontinuity in the growth rate occurs due to the type II singularity. After the transition, since the Hubble rate of the Λ_s CDM model is higher than the Λ CDM, the growth rate of the Λ_s CDM model falls below the Λ CDM curve.

Overall, we observe that the analytical solution for the growth rate aligns perfectly with the numerical results for the EdS and Λ CDM models, and nearly matches with the Λ_s CDM. The slight discrepancy in the Λ_s CDM model arises from the Dirac delta function approximation¹⁴. The consistency between analytical and numerical approach also supports our findings.

B. Growth Index

For many cosmological models, the growth rate f is approximately related to the matter energy density function Ω_m and the growth index γ via:

$$f \equiv \Omega_m^{\gamma}, \quad (64)$$

where it depends on the underlying cosmology, such that for Λ CDM, $\gamma \approx 0.55$ [182, 201].

1. Approximation

In 1998 paper of Wang and Steinhardt [182] showed that evolution of γ can be described by:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 3w_{\text{DE}}(1 - \Omega_m)\Omega_m \ln \Omega_m \frac{d\gamma}{d\Omega_m} \\ &\quad - 3w_{\text{DE}} \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{2} \right) \Omega_m + \Omega_m^{\gamma} \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2} \Omega_m^{1-\gamma} + 3w_{\text{DE}}\gamma - \frac{3}{2}w_{\text{DE}} + \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where w_{DE} represents the EoS parameter of the dark energy. For a slowly varying EoS parameter, (i.e., $|dw_{\text{DE}}/d\Omega_m| \ll 1/(1 - \Omega_m)$), γ can be approximated as [182]:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \frac{3}{5 - \frac{w_{\text{DE}}}{1 - w_{\text{DE}}}} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{125} \frac{(1 - w_{\text{DE}}) \left(1 - \frac{3w_{\text{DE}}}{2}\right)}{\left(1 - \frac{6w_{\text{DE}}}{5}\right)^3} (1 - \Omega_m) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}[(1 - \Omega_m)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

In the case of Λ CDM, Eq. (66) reduces to:

$$\gamma_{\Lambda}^{(\text{approx})}(a) = \frac{6}{11} + \frac{15}{1331} \left(\frac{a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}} \right). \quad (67)$$

¹⁴ We refer readers to Appendix C for a detailed discussion.

Meanwhile, in the Λ_s CDM model we can write:

$$\gamma_{\Lambda_s}^{(\text{approx})}(a) = \begin{cases} \frac{6}{11} - \frac{15}{1331} \left(\frac{a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 - a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) & a < a_{\dagger} \\ \frac{6}{11} + \frac{15}{1331} \left(\frac{a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) & a > a_{\dagger} \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

Given $\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda} = \Omega_{\Lambda 0}/(1 - \Omega_{\Lambda 0}) = 2.158$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} = \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0}/(1 - \Omega_{\Lambda_s 0}) = 2.618$ (where we have used Table VI values for $\Omega_{\Lambda 0}$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0}$), we obtain $\gamma_{\Lambda}^{(\text{approx})}(a = 1) = 0.553$ and $\gamma_{\Lambda_s}^{(\text{approx})}(a = 1) = 0.554$, respectively. We can also see the approximate solution as a function of the redshift in Fig. 11.

2. Analytical solution

For Λ CDM, using Eq. (62) is sufficient to calculate the evolution of the $\gamma_{\Lambda}(a)$:

$$\gamma_{\Lambda}(a) = \frac{\ln \left[-\frac{3}{2} \Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(-a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda})} \Omega_m^{3/2} \right]}{\ln \Omega_m}. \quad (69)$$

Since we have derived an analytical solution for the growth rate in the Λ_s CDM model, we can obtain the analytical expression for the growth index, $\gamma_{\Lambda_s}(a)$:

$$\gamma_{\Lambda_s}(a) = \begin{cases} \frac{\ln \left[-\frac{3}{2} \Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} \Omega_m^{3/2} \right]}{\ln \Omega_m} & a < a_{\dagger} \\ \frac{\ln \left[-\frac{3}{2} \Omega_m + \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(-a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s})} \Omega_m^{3/2} \right]}{\ln \Omega_m} & a > a_{\dagger} \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

Note that at the precise moment when $a = a_{\dagger}$, and considering the definition of the Hubble parameter in Eq. (3), we obtain $\Omega_m(a_{\dagger}) = 1$ while $f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}) \neq 1$, making the growth index undefined at this point. This may not always be the case and depends on the specific definition of the Hubble parameter¹⁵.

In Fig. 11, γ_{Λ} and γ_{Λ_s} are plotted as a function of scale factor, for both analytical and approximate cases. First we notice that the approximation given by Eq. (66) works reasonably well for both Λ_s CDM and Λ CDM models. This is no surprise given that the effect of the negative (positive) cosmological constant is mostly negligible for $a \lesssim 0.1$ and after the transition the Λ_s CDM dynamics are the same as Λ CDM. We observe that in the early-universe ($a \ll 1$), both γ_{Λ} and γ_{Λ_s} approaches to the same value; $\gamma \approx 6/11$. Furthermore, until the moment of




FIG. 11. Plot of $\gamma(a)$ for the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models obtained from the analytical and approximate solutions. The observed discontinuity at $a = a_{\dagger}$ is a result of the type II singularity. Meanwhile, the light gray solid line represents the Einstein-de Sitter, dust only universe, $\gamma_{\text{EdS}} \approx 6/11$.

transition, γ_{Λ} increases, meanwhile γ_{Λ_s} decreases. This is expected considering that the negative cosmological constant supports the structure formation and higher growth rate (see Fig. 9) implies lower growth index. At the AdS-dS transition, there occurs a discontinuity in the γ_{Λ_s} parameter due to the type II singularity, which occurs only in the case of a rapid AdS-dS transition, where the sign-switch in the Λ_s is described by the signum function.

Combined constraints on the Λ CDM model from [224], which include Planck CMB data and large-scale structure observations (weak lensing, galaxy clustering, and cosmic velocities) while treating γ as a free parameter, predict $\gamma = 0.633^{+0.025}_{-0.024}$. This result excludes the flat Λ CDM model in GR at 3.7σ significance. This finding suggests a suppression of the growth rate during the dark-energy dominated epoch and indicates a possible internal inconsistency within the Λ CDM framework.

For the Λ_s CDM model, our theoretical solution suggests $\gamma_{\Lambda_s}(a = 1) = 0.555$, and given the matter density parameter $\Omega_{m0} = 0.276$, we obtain $f \simeq 0.489$, which is consistent with the findings of the Nguyen et al. [184].

C. Observational Constraints From $f\sigma_8$ Measurements

In the context of observational cosmology, the quantity $f\sigma_8$ is often used, where σ_8 is the root-mean-square fluctuation of the matter density field on scales of $8h^{-1}$ Mpc and it is given by:

$$f\sigma_8 \equiv \left(a \frac{\delta'}{\delta} \right) \left[\sigma_8 \frac{\delta}{\delta(a=1)} \right] = a\sigma_8 \frac{\delta'}{\delta(a=1)}. \quad (71)$$

The $f\sigma_8$ data provides a powerful tool for testing different cosmological models and constraining parameters like the growth index γ . Recent studies have indicated a tension between the growth rate data and the predictions from the

¹⁵ In this study, the Hubble parameter at a_{\dagger} is defined by $H(a_{\dagger}) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0} a_{\dagger}^{-3}}$. The regions preceding and following the transition (along with $\Delta\gamma$) are of physical significance. In our definition, where we set $\text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) = 0$ at a_{\dagger} , we obtain $\Omega_m(a_{\dagger}) = 1$ and $f_{\Lambda_s} \neq 1$, which leads to an undefined $\gamma(a_{\dagger})$.




FIG. 12. *Top panel:* $f\sigma_8$ vs z . Data points are obtained from Table IV. *Bottom panel:* The data used for the χ^2 -analysis is the growth dataset, with additional support from WiggleZ and SDSS data [193, 225, 226]. The left panel displays contours up to 2σ for the Λ CDM model, while the right panel illustrates the Λ_s CDM model with $z_{\dagger} = 1.7$ (the gray dashed contour in the right panel corresponds to the Λ CDM model from the left panel). The larger (red) dots indicate the best-fit values from Planck data for the Λ CDM model $\{\Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8\} = \{0.3163, 0.8136\}$ and Λ_s CDM model $\{\Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8\} = \{0.2796, 0.8191\}$ [71].

Planck Λ CDM model, which could suggest a weakening of gravity at low redshifts [193, 227–235].

In the top panel of Fig. 12, we fit the $f\sigma_8$ function to selected data from the growth datasets presented in [193, 225, 250], which are summarized in Table IV. Let $\{x_i\}$ denote a set of measurements, where \mathbf{x}_{obs} represents the observed data vector, and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{\text{theory}} - \mathbf{x}_{\text{obs}}$ is the difference between the theoretical and observed data vectors. The χ^2 distribution defined as¹⁶:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2(\theta) &= \mathbf{x}^T [C_{kl}]^{-1} \mathbf{x} \\ &= [x_{\text{th},i}(\theta) - x_{\text{obs},i}] ([C_{kl}]^{-1})_{ij} [x_{\text{th},j}(\theta) - x_{\text{obs},j}], \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where $([C_{kl}])_{ij} \equiv C(x_i, x_j)$ represents the covariance matrix and θ denotes the unknown parameter. For the assumed uncorrelated data points listed in Table IV, the

TABLE IV. Summary of the $f\sigma_8$ measurements from various astronomical surveys.

ID	z_{eff}	$f\sigma_8$	Survey	Reference
1	0.02	0.398 ± 0.065	SnIa IRAS	[236]
2	0.02	0.314 ± 0.048	2MRS	[236]
3	0.02	0.428 ± 0.0465	6dFGS+SnIa	[237]
4	0.1	0.37 ± 0.13	SDSS-veloc	[238]
5	0.15	0.490 ± 0.145	SDSS-MGS	[239]
6	0.17	0.51 ± 0.06	2dFGRS	[240]
7	0.18	0.36 ± 0.09	GAMA	[241]
8	0.25	0.3512 ± 0.0583	SDSS-LRG-200	[242]
9	0.25	0.471 ± 0.024	BOSS LOWZ	[243]
10	0.37	0.4602 ± 0.0378	SDSS-LRG-200	[242]
11	0.38	0.44 ± 0.06	GAMA	[241]
12	0.44	0.413 ± 0.08	WiggleZ	[244]
13	0.59	0.488 ± 0.06	SDSS-CMASS	[245]
14	0.6	0.39 ± 0.063	WiggleZ	[244]
15	0.6	0.550 ± 0.120	Vipers PDR-2	[246]
16	0.73	0.437 ± 0.072	WiggleZ	[244]
17	0.86	0.48 ± 0.1	Vipers PDR-2	[246]
18	0.978	0.379 ± 0.176	SDSS-IV eBOSS	[247]
19	1.230	0.3850 ± 0.0990	SDSS-IV eBOSS	[247]
20	1.4	0.482 ± 0.116	FastSound	[248]
21	1.526	0.342 ± 0.07	SDSS-IV eBOSS	[247]
22	1.944	0.364 ± 0.106	SDSS-IV eBOSS	[247]

χ^2 distribution is given by

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{[f\sigma_8(z_i, \Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8) - f\sigma_8^{\text{obs}}]^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \quad (73)$$

where we assume a diagonal covariance matrix for all data points except those from the WiggleZ [244] and SDSS-IV eBOSS surveys. For the WiggleZ data set, a published covariance matrix is available (see also Ref. [193]).

$$[C_{ij}^{\text{WiggleZ}}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0.00640 & 0.002570 & 0.000000 \\ 0.00257 & 0.003969 & 0.002540 \\ 0.00000 & 0.002540 & 0.005184 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (74)$$

The data vector is derived from the points numbered ID-12, ID-14, and ID-16 in Table IV, with the corresponding covariance matrix provided in Eq. (74). We also include the correlated SDSS IV eBOSS data points from Table IV, with their corresponding covariance matrix given by [225, 247, 252]:

$$[C_{ij}^{\text{SDSS}}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0310 & 0.0089 & 0.0033 & -0.0002 \\ 0.0089 & 0.0098 & 0.0044 & 0.0008 \\ 0.0033 & 0.0044 & 0.0049 & 0.0035 \\ -0.0002 & 0.0008 & 0.0035 & 0.0112 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

¹⁶ We refer readers to Refs. [226, 251] for detailed discussion.

TABLE V. We present observational constraints on the parameters Ω_{m0} , σ_8 , and S_8 obtained from $f\sigma_8$ measurements (see Table IV). The marginalized mean values with 68% confidence level (best-fit) parameters are provided for both the Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models (assuming $z_t = 1.7$). The value of the $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0}/0.3}$ is calculated via error propagation, taking into account the correlation between Ω_{m0} and σ_8 parameters^a. Additionally, we have included the best-fit parameters derived from the Planck dataset (see Ref. [71]), which were used to compute the χ^2 -difference for each model: $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2| \equiv |\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM},\text{min}}^2 - \chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2(\Omega_{m0}^{\text{Planck}}, \sigma_8^{\text{Planck}})| \simeq 6.6$ and $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda_s\text{CDM}}^2| = 2.2$ (calculated using the same reasoning as in the Λ CDM case).

Dataset	$f\sigma_8$ (This Work)		Planck [71]	
	Λ_s CDM	Λ CDM	Λ_s CDM	Λ CDM
Ω_{m0}	0.249 ± 0.050	0.246 ± 0.050	$0.2860_{-0.0099}^{+0.0230}$ (0.2796)	0.3151 ± 0.0075 (0.3163)
σ_8	0.809 ± 0.060	0.816 ± 0.070	$0.8210_{-0.0110}^{+0.0064}$ (0.8191)	$0.8121_{-0.0061}^{+0.0055}$ (0.8136)
S_8	0.738 ± 0.089	0.739 ± 0.095	$0.8010_{-0.0160}^{+0.0260}$ (0.7910)	0.8320 ± 0.0130 (0.8350)
χ_{min}^2	12.04	12.36	2778.06	2780.52

^a Its necessary to take into account the covariance, $\sigma_{uv}^2 = \langle (u - \bar{u})(v - \bar{v}) \rangle$. Given that $S_8 \equiv S_8(\Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8)$ we have $\sigma_{S_8}^2 = \sigma_{\Omega_{m0}}^2 (\partial S_8 / \partial \Omega_{m0})^2 + \sigma_{\sigma_8}^2 (\partial S_8 / \partial \sigma_8)^2 + 2\sigma_{\Omega_{m0}\sigma_8}^2 (\partial S_8 / \partial \Omega_{m0})(\partial S_8 / \partial \sigma_8)$ [249].

Similarly, for the correlated SDSS data, the data vector is derived from the SDSS data points numbered ID-18, ID-19, ID-21, and ID-22 from Table IV, with the corresponding covariance matrix given in Eq. (75). The total χ^2 is then computed as:

$$\chi^2 = \chi_{\text{WiggleZ}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SDSS}}^2 + \chi_{\text{diag}}^2. \quad (76)$$

The parameters that minimize the χ^2 expression in Eq. (76) are the most probable values, referred to as the best fit parameters. The confidence regions are obtained using the relation $\Delta\chi_{n\sigma}^2 = 2Q^{-1}[m/2, 1 - \text{Erf}(n/\sqrt{2})]$, where Q^{-1} denotes the inverse of the regularized gamma function $\Gamma(a, z)/\Gamma(a)$, with $\Gamma(a, z)$ and $\Gamma(a)$ being the incomplete gamma and gamma functions, respectively [253]. Here, Erf represents the error function, m denotes the dimension of the parameter space, and $n = 1, 2, 3$ corresponds to the σ level of each contour. Note that in a two-parameter space, the 1σ region corresponds to $\Delta\chi_{1\sigma}^2 \simeq 2.2$, while the 2σ region corresponds to $\Delta\chi_{2\sigma}^2 \simeq 6.2$. The contours up to 2σ for Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM are shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 12.

Furthermore, we use the likelihood function, denoted as \mathcal{L} , to estimate the most probable values of the unknown parameter θ , which correspond to its maximum. In this context, minimizing the χ^2 function is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood function. The likelihood function \mathcal{L} is viewed as a function of an unknown parameter θ for an n -dimensional random variable $\{X_i\}$ and it is defined as $\mathcal{L}(\{x_i\}|\theta) = f(\{x_i\}; \theta)$, where $f(\{x_i\}; \theta)$ is the probability density function of the observed data $\{x_i\}$. In this case, the likelihood function is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(\{x_i\}|\theta) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2(\theta)}. \quad (77)$$

Finally, the uncertainties in each best-fit parameter value are quantified using a Fisher forecast. When the components of the Fisher matrix are large in certain directions, the likelihood changes rapidly, indicating that the data are highly constraining, and thus the uncertainties in the

corresponding parameters are small. The Fisher matrix defined as [226, 251]:

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} \equiv - \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \ln \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right\rangle. \quad (78)$$

We use it to estimate the expected errors on Ω_{m0} and σ_8 for each model.

As shown in Table V, we obtain the best-fit parameters and the corresponding expected errors for $\{\Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8\}$ in each model. For Λ CDM: $\{0.246 \pm 0.050, 0.816 \pm 0.070\}$, and for Λ_s CDM: $\{0.249 \pm 0.050, 0.809 \pm 0.060\}$. The χ^2 -difference between the central point of each contour and the corresponding best-fit value from the Planck data is $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2| \equiv |\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM},\text{min}}^2 - \chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2(\Omega_{m0}^{\text{Planck}}, \sigma_8^{\text{Planck}})| \simeq 6.6$, which exceeds $\Delta\chi_{2\sigma}^2$. In contrast, $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda_s\text{CDM}}^2| \simeq 2.2$ (calculated using the same reasoning as in the Λ CDM case), which is approximately equal to $\Delta\chi_{1\sigma}^2$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have presented a comprehensive analysis of linear matter density perturbations within the Λ_s CDM framework, deriving key analytical solutions and comparing growth dynamics with Λ CDM.

We first carried out a thorough analysis of matter density perturbations, deriving the key Λ_s CDM equations. As these perturbations obey second-order differential equations, their solutions are sensitive to initial and boundary conditions. Building on the work of Herrera et al. [189], we present a systematic numerical approach to evaluate both linear and nonlinear matter density perturbations, along with their respective growth parameters. Within this framework, one can determine the linear density contrast at collapse, δ_c , to identify which regions in an initial linear density field are likely to form halos. Furthermore, the proposed numerical methods provide a robust and adaptable approach, suitable for a wide range of cosmological models.

We have conducted a detailed examination of the evolution of the linear matter density perturbations from two complementary approaches: (i) determining the initial density contrast and the initial rate of evolution for a given collapse scale factor, and (ii) computing the collapse scale factor based on a specified initial density contrast and rate of evolution. From these viewpoints, we explored the evolution of linear matter density perturbations, with particular emphasis on the effects of the AdS-to-dS transition and its implications. Notably, when the collapse scale factor is held fixed and the same in both models, the required initial overdensity is lower in the Λ_s CDM model than in Λ CDM, indicating more efficient structure formation in the former. Furthermore, if both models share the same initial density contrast and rate of evolution, the collapse occurs earlier under Λ_s CDM, implying a more rapid progression of structure formation compared to Λ CDM.

These results are also supported in the growth rate calculations as find distinct differences in perturbation growth between Λ_s CDM and Λ CDM models. In the pre-transition epoch ($a < a_+$), we observe enhanced structure growth in Λ_s CDM due to negative cosmological constant, with f_{Λ_s} exceeding f_{Λ} by up to $\approx 15\%$ around $a \lesssim 1/3$ [224]. In the post-transition epoch ($a > a_+$), we find more efficient suppression of structure growth compared to Λ CDM, due to $\Omega_{\Lambda_s 0} > \Omega_{\Lambda 0}$ [71]. This aligns with theoretical expectations that a negative cosmological constant reduces Hubble friction and increases gravitational potential, thus promoting structure growth. However, post-transition, increased Hubble friction in the Λ_s CDM model slows down the growth of perturbations more than the Λ CDM model. This dual behavior is crucial as it addresses the S_8 tension by suppressing growth more effectively after the sign-switch.

In the standard Λ CDM model, the growth index is typically around $\gamma \approx 0.55$, and when combined with the Planck-derived matter density $\Omega_{m0} \simeq 0.315$, this yields a growth rate at $z = 0$ of approximately $f \simeq 0.53$. In contrast, a recent study by Nguyen et al. [184] extended the Λ CDM framework by allowing γ to vary according to observational constraints and finds $\gamma \simeq 0.63$, implying a suppressed structure growth at low redshifts ($f(z=0) \simeq 0.48$). Our analytical results show that the Λ_s CDM model produces $\gamma \approx 0.55$, in line with theoretical expectations. Furthermore, when using the Planck- Λ_s CDM value of $\Omega_{m0} \simeq 0.28$, the resulting growth rate at $z = 0$ is $f \simeq 0.49$. The close agreement with Nguyen et al.'s findings suggests that the Λ_s CDM model can naturally account for the observed suppression in structure growth without deviating from the assumption that $\gamma \sim 0.55$. Our $f\sigma_8$ analysis provides best-fit values for $\{\Omega_{m0}, \sigma_8\}$ under each model: $\{0.246 \pm 0.050, 0.816 \pm 0.070\}$ for Λ CDM and $\{0.249 \pm 0.050, 0.809 \pm 0.060\}$ for Λ_s CDM. Comparing each best-fit point with Planck's, we find $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}^2| \simeq 6.6$, which exceeds $\Delta\chi_{2\sigma}^2$, whereas $|\Delta\chi_{\Lambda_s\text{CDM}}^2| \simeq 2.2$, lying near $\Delta\chi_{1\sigma}^2$. Consequently, the Λ_s CDM model more effectively reduces the S_8 tension. Indeed, our $f\sigma_8$ analysis

yields $S_8 = 0.738 \pm 0.089$, closer to the Planck result of $S_8 = 0.801 \pm 0.026$ than in the Λ CDM scenario, where $S_8 = 0.739 \pm 0.095$ falls further from the Planck result of 0.832 ± 0.013 .

Several promising directions arise from this work. A detailed study of halo mass functions within the Λ_s CDM framework [205–207] and an investigation of galaxy formation under scenarios of enhanced early growth [254] could yield valuable insights. Examining void statistics and the cosmic web [255–257] further refines our understanding of large-scale structure. Meanwhile, integrating our methods into N -body simulations [73] could illuminate key non-linear effects. These approaches can also be generalized to other transition-based cosmological models. Moreover, exploring smooth transitions with varying rapidity parameters and multiple or more intricate transitions [258], along with assessing how transition timing influences structure formation [71], remains a compelling avenue of inquiry. On the theoretical side, integrating this framework with modified gravity theories or dynamical dark energy models may yield a more comprehensive gravitational paradigm [75–77, 114, 115]. Moreover, exploring potential ties to fundamental physics mechanisms could shed additional light on the processes driving cosmic evolution [105, 106].

In conclusion, while the Λ_s CDM model shows significant promise in addressing key cosmological tensions, particularly regarding structure formation and growth, substantial work remains in exploring its full implications. The analytical framework developed here provides a foundation for future investigations into both theoretical aspects and observational consequences of the model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Cihad Kıbrıs for valuable discussions. Ö.A. acknowledges the support by the Turkish Academy of Sciences in scheme of the Outstanding Young Scientist Award (TÜBA-GEBİP). This research was supported by COST Action CA21136 - Addressing observational tensions in cosmology with systematics and fundamental physics (CosmoVerse), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

CODE AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All calculations that go into the figures in this paper will be made publicly available in [camarman/MDP-Ls](https://github.com/camarman/MDP-Ls) repository on GitHub under the MIT license. In the analysis we have used the following Python packages: Matplotlib [259], Numpy [260], SciencePlots [261], and SciPy [262].

Appendix A DETERMINING MODEL PARAMETERS

The locations of peaks in the CMB power spectrum, l_A , is a well-measured quantity and it is defined as:

$$l_A \equiv \pi \frac{d_A^*}{r_s^*} = \frac{\pi}{\theta_*}, \quad (79)$$

where we define:

$$r_s^* := r_s(z_*) = \int_{z_*}^{\infty} dz \frac{c_s(z)}{H(z)}, \quad (80)$$

$$d_A^* := d_A(z_*) = \int_0^{z_*} dz \frac{c}{H(z)}. \quad (81)$$

Here θ_* , r_s^* , and d_A^* represents the angular size of the sound horizon, comoving size of the sound horizon, and comoving angular diameter distance to the last scattering surface respectively. The sound speed of the photon-baryon fluid is given by:

$$c_s(z) = c \left[3 \left(1 + \frac{3\omega_b}{4\omega_\gamma(1+z)} \right) \right]^{-1/2}, \quad (82)$$

Since the value of the θ_* parameter is fixed by the Planck observations almost model-independently, we can constrain the Hubble constant for the Λ CDM model ($h_{0,\Lambda} \equiv H_{0,\Lambda}/100$) via:

$$\theta_* \equiv \frac{r_{s,\Lambda}^*}{d_{A,\Lambda}^*} = \frac{r_{s,\Lambda}^*}{\int_0^{z_*} dz \frac{c}{h_\Lambda(z)}}, \quad (83)$$

for:

$$h_\Lambda^2(z) = \omega_{m,\Lambda}(1+z)^3 + \omega_{r,\Lambda}(1+z)^4 + (h_{0,\Lambda}^2 - \omega_{m,\Lambda} - \omega_{r,\Lambda}). \quad (84)$$

Since the dynamics of the both Λ CDM and Λ_s CDM models are the same in the pre-recombination era, we can write:

$$\omega_{b,\Lambda_s} \simeq \omega_{b,\Lambda}, \quad \omega_{r,\Lambda_s} \simeq \omega_{r,\Lambda}, \quad \omega_{m,\Lambda_s} \simeq \omega_{m,\Lambda}, \quad (85)$$

which implies $z_{*,\Lambda} \simeq z_{*,\Lambda_s}$, $c_{s,\Lambda}(z) \simeq c_{s,\Lambda_s}(z)$ and consequently $r_{s,\Lambda_s}^* \simeq r_{s,\Lambda}^*$. Thus, we can use Λ CDM `plik` best-fit values for the Λ_s CDM to constrain $h_{0,\Lambda_s} \equiv H_{0,\Lambda_s}/100$:

$$\theta_* \equiv \frac{r_{s,\Lambda_s}^*}{d_{A,\Lambda_s}^*} = \frac{r_{s,\Lambda}^*}{\int_0^{z_*} dz \frac{c}{h_{\Lambda_s}(z)}}, \quad (86)$$

for:

$$h_{\Lambda_s}^2(z) = \omega_{m,\Lambda}(1+z)^3 + \omega_{r,\Lambda}(1+z)^4 + (h_{0,\Lambda_s}^2 - \omega_{m,\Lambda} - \omega_{r,\Lambda}) \text{sgn}(z_\dagger - z). \quad (87)$$

TABLE VI. Overview of the cosmological parameters used in this study. Upper part of the table represents the Baseline high- l Planck power spectra (`plik`) best-fit values [TT,TE,EE+lowl+lowE+lensing] taken from the Planck (2018) dataset [28], which we take the same for both models (see Eq. (85)). We have defined the physical radiation density parameter as the sum of the physical photon and neutrino density parameters; $\omega_r \equiv \omega_\gamma + \omega_n = 2.473 \times 10^{-5} \left[1 + \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{4}{11} \right)^{4/3} N_{\text{eff}} \right]$ with $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$ for standard model of particle physics [263–265].

	Λ CDM	Λ_s CDM($z_\dagger = 1.7$)
$100\theta_*$		1.041085
ω_b		0.022383
ω_m		0.143140
ω_r		4.184×10^{-5}
z_*		1089.914
r_s^* [Mpc]		144.394
Ω_{b0}	0.04953	0.04323
Ω_{m0}	0.31673	0.27645
h_0	0.67225	0.71957

Appendix B DEMONSTRATION OF TYPE II (SUDDEN) SINGULARITY

Sign change in the energy density of Λ_s can be described by using sigmoid-like functions such as:

$$\rho_{\Lambda_s}(a) = \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \frac{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - \frac{a_\dagger}{a} \right) \right]}{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - a_\dagger \right) \right]}, \quad (88)$$

where $\eta > 0$ determines the rapidity of the transition and $\rho_{\Lambda_s 0} > 0$ is the physical energy density of the Λ_s today. Note that in the parametrization of Eq. (88), the denominator acts as a normalization factor for a smooth transition, i.e., for finite η .

As a result, total energy density and total pressure of the universe, can be expressed via:

$$\rho_{\text{tot}}(a) = \rho_{m0} a^{-3} + \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \frac{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - \frac{a_\dagger}{a} \right) \right]}{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - a_\dagger \right) \right]}, \quad (89)$$

$$P_{\text{tot}}(a) = - \frac{\rho_{\Lambda_s 0} c^2}{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - a_\dagger \right) \right]} \left[\frac{\eta a_\dagger}{3a} \text{sech}^2 \left[\eta \left(1 - \frac{a_\dagger}{a} \right) \right] + \tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - \frac{a_\dagger}{a} \right) \right] \right]. \quad (90)$$

where we have used the continuity equation to write:

$$w_{\Lambda_s}(a) = - \frac{1}{3} \frac{a}{\rho_{\Lambda_s}} \frac{d\rho_{\Lambda_s}}{da} - 1, \quad (91)$$

for:

$$\frac{d\rho_{\Lambda_s}}{da} = \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \frac{\eta a_{\dagger}}{a^2} \frac{\operatorname{sech}^2 \left[\eta \left(1 - \frac{a_{\dagger}}{a} \right) \right]}{\tanh \left[\eta \left(1 - a_{\dagger} \right) \right]}. \quad (92)$$

Upon examining the characteristics of $\rho_{\text{tot}}(a)$ and $P_{\text{tot}}(a)$ at $a = a_{\dagger}$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) &= \rho_{m0} a_{\dagger}^{-3}, \\ P_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) &= -\rho_{\Lambda_s 0} c^2 \frac{\eta}{3} \coth \left[\eta \left(1 - a_{\dagger} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Notice that $\rho_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger})$ does not depend on η and $P_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger})$ is negative but finite for finite values of η . The smooth AdS–dS transition, reduces to an abrupt AdS \rightarrow dS transition, by taking $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, which we have studied in the current paper:

$$\rho_{\Lambda_s}(a) = \rho_{\Lambda_s 0} \operatorname{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) \quad \text{for } \eta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (94)$$

Only in this case, we observe that the absolute value of the total pressure diverges to infinity, while the total energy density remains positive and finite [73]:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \left| P_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) \right| &\rightarrow \infty, \\ \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

This behavior, which occurs at the limit of $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, is characterized by a type II (sudden) cosmological singularity. Type II (sudden) singularity at $t = t_{\dagger}$, can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} t &= t_{\dagger}, \\ a_{\dagger} &:= a(t = t_{\dagger}) < \infty, \\ \rho_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) &< \infty, \\ \left| P_{\text{tot}}(a_{\dagger}) \right| &\rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

with the following characteristics: the scale factor is continuous and non-zero; the first derivative of the scale factor is discontinuous; and its second derivative diverges [266] (We refer readers to Refs. [266–268] for the definition and discussion about the type II singularity, Ref. [258] for the cosmological models with jump discontinuities, Ref. [269] for quantum corrections, and Ref. [270] for geodesic behavior).

Appendix C DEALING WITH THE DIRAC DELTA FUNCTION: NUMERICAL APPROACHES

In numerical methods, approximating the Dirac delta function and its related functions is crucial for accurate computation, particularly in cases involving discontinuities or sudden transitions. One such function is the signum function, which can be smoothly approximated as:

$$\operatorname{sgn}(a) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{a}{\varepsilon} \right), \quad (97)$$

where ε is a real parameter that controls the rapidity of the transition. As ε approaches zero, the function closely approximates the standard signum function. Given that the Heaviside step function $\mathcal{H}(a)$ can be expressed in terms of the signum function:

$$\mathcal{H}(a) = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a)], \quad (98)$$

and we can derive an approximation for the Dirac delta function as follows:

$$\delta_{\text{D}}(a) \equiv \frac{d\mathcal{H}(a)}{da} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\operatorname{sgn}(a)}{da} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\varepsilon}{a^2 + \varepsilon^2}. \quad (99)$$

This approximation also satisfies the normalization condition, namely:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta_{\text{D}}(a) da = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{a^2 + \varepsilon^2} da = 1. \quad (100)$$

We have tested this approximation for various ε values by performing numerical integration for functions involving the Dirac delta function, such as $\int g(x) \delta_{\text{D}}(x) dx$. Our analysis suggests that $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ is the optimal value for performing numerical integration.

Appendix D EFFECT OF THE TYPE II (SUDDEN) SINGULARITY: DISCONTINUITIES IN GROWTH PARAMETERS

In our study, we investigate the effect of the rapid sign-switching cosmological constant on the linear matter density perturbations, where a type II (sudden) singularity occurs at the moment of transition. As a result, certain parameters exhibit discontinuities at the moment of transition. In this section, we analyze and calculate several key parameters affected by this behavior. Most importantly, obtained relations can be used as a boundary condition to find the integration constants.

A Rate of Evolution

To calculate the discontinuity in δ'_{Λ_s} , we can start by writing the linear matter density perturbation equation for the Λ_s CDM model, and taking the integral over the range $(a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon, a_{\dagger} - \varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{a_{\dagger} - \varepsilon}^{a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon} \left(\delta''_{\Lambda_s} + \left(\frac{3}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{\text{D}}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^4 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) \delta'_{\Lambda_s} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \frac{3}{2a^2} \frac{1}{1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \delta_{\Lambda_s} \right) da \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

we are left with:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{a_{\dagger} - \varepsilon}^{a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon} \left(\delta'_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{\delta_{\text{D}}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \operatorname{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \delta'_{\Lambda_s} \right) da \right] = 0, \quad (102)$$

which reduces to:

$$\Delta\delta'_{\Lambda_s} := \delta'_{\Lambda_s,+} - \delta'_{\Lambda_s,-} = -a_{\dagger}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} \delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}). \quad (103)$$

where we have denoted $\delta'_{\Lambda_s,+} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon)$ and $\delta'_{\Lambda_s,-} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta'_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger} - \varepsilon)$.

B Growth Rate

To calculate the discontinuity in f_{Λ_s} , we can again start by writing the differential equation for the growth rate in the Λ_s CDM model:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{a_{\dagger}-\varepsilon}^{a_{\dagger}+\varepsilon} \left(f'_{\Lambda_s} + \left[\frac{2}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1 - \frac{2}{3} \delta_D(a - a_{\dagger}) a^4 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right] f_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{f_{\Lambda_s}^2}{a} - \frac{3}{2a} \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} \right) da \right] = 0. \quad (104)$$

we are left with:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{a_{\dagger}-\varepsilon}^{a_{\dagger}+\varepsilon} \left(f'_{\Lambda_s} + \frac{\delta_D(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}}{1 + \text{sgn}(a - a_{\dagger}) a^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s}} f_{\Lambda_s} \right) da \right] = 0, \quad (105)$$

which reduces to:

$$\Delta f_{\Lambda_s} := f_{\Lambda_s,+} - f_{\Lambda_s,-} = -a_{\dagger}^3 \mathcal{R}_{\Lambda_s} f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger}). \quad (106)$$

where we have denoted $f_{\Lambda_s,+} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger} + \varepsilon)$ and $f_{\Lambda_s,-} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_{\Lambda_s}(a_{\dagger} - \varepsilon)$.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant, *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201](#).
 - [2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High Redshift Supernovae, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133](#).
 - [3] S. M. Carroll, The Cosmological constant, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4**, 1 (2001), [arXiv:astro-ph/0004075](#).
 - [4] L. Perivolaropoulos, Six Puzzles for Λ CDM Cosmology, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:0811.4684](#) (2008), [arXiv:0811.4684 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [5] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, Challenges for Λ CDM: An update, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022), [arXiv:2105.05208 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [6] E. Abdalla *et al.*, Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies, *JHEAp* **34**, 49 (2022), [arXiv:2203.06142 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [7] G. Efstathiou, Challenges to the Lambda CDM Cosmology (2024) [arXiv:2406.12106 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [8] P. J. E. Peebles, Status of the LambdaCDM theory: supporting evidence and anomalies (2024) [arXiv:2405.18307 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [9] P. J. E. Peebles, Anomalies in physical cosmology, *Annals Phys.* **447**, 169159 (2022), [arXiv:2208.05018 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [10] P. Bull *et al.*, Beyond Λ CDM: Problems, solutions, and the road ahead, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **12**, 56 (2016), [arXiv:1512.05356 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [11] J. S. Bullock and M. Boylan-Kolchin, Small-Scale Challenges to the Λ CDM Paradigm, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **55**, 343 (2017), [arXiv:1707.04256 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [12] E. Di Valentino, Crack in the cosmological paradigm, *Nature Astron.* **1**, 569 (2017), [arXiv:1709.04046 \[physics.pop-ph\]](#).
 - [13] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 153001 (2021), [arXiv:2103.01183 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [14] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, Hubble Tension: The Evidence of New Physics, *Universe* **9**, 94 (2023), [arXiv:2302.05709 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [15] W. L. Freedman, Cosmology at a Crossroads, *Nature Astron.* **1**, 0121 (2017), [arXiv:1706.02739 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [16] E. Di Valentino *et al.*, Snowmass2021 - Letter of interest cosmology intertwined II: The hubble constant tension, *Astropart. Phys.* **131**, 102605 (2021), [arXiv:2008.11284 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [17] L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, Tensions between the Early and the Late Universe, *Nature Astron.* **3**, 891 (2019), [arXiv:1907.10625 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [18] P. Shah, P. Lemos, and O. Lahav, A buyer's guide to the Hubble constant, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29**, 9 (2021), [arXiv:2109.01161 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [19] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, The H0 Olympics: A fair ranking of proposed models, *Phys. Rept.* **984**, 1 (2022), [arXiv:2107.10291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [20] L. Perivolaropoulos, Hubble tension or distance ladder crisis?, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 123518 (2024), [arXiv:2408.11031 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [21] Ruchika, L. Perivolaropoulos, and A. Melchiorri, Effects of a local physics change on the SH0ES determination of H_0 , (2024), [arXiv:2408.03875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [22] L. Perivolaropoulos, Isotropy properties of the absolute luminosity magnitudes of SNIa in the Pantheon+ and SH0ES samples, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 063509 (2023), [arXiv:2305.12819 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [23] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, On the homogeneity of SNIa absolute magnitude in the Pantheon+ sample, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520**, 5110 (2023),

- arXiv:2301.01024 [astro-ph.CO].
- [24] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, A Reanalysis of the Latest SH0ES Data for H_0 : Effects of New Degrees of Freedom on the Hubble Tension, *Universe* **8**, 502 (2022), arXiv:2208.11169 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] L. Perivolaropoulos, Is the Hubble Crisis Connected with the Extinction of Dinosaurs?, *Universe* **8**, 263 (2022), arXiv:2201.08997 [astro-ph.EP].
- [26] G. Alestas, D. Camarena, E. Di Valentino, L. Kazantzidis, V. Marra, S. Nesseris, and L. Perivolaropoulos, Late-transition versus smooth $H(z)$ -deformation models for the resolution of the Hubble crisis, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063538 (2022), arXiv:2110.04336 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] L. Verde, N. Schöneberg, and H. Gil-Marín, A Tale of Many H_0 , *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **62**, 287 (2024), arXiv:2311.13305 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [29] A. G. Riess *et al.*, A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km/s/Mpc Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team, (2021), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO].
- [30] A. Amon, D. Gruen, M. A. Troxel, N. MacCrann, S. Dodelson, A. Choi, C. Doux, L. F. Secco, S. Samuroff, E. Krause, J. Cordero, J. Myles, J. DeRose, R. H. Wechsler, M. Gatti, A. Navarro-Alsina, G. M. Bernstein, B. Jain, J. Blazek, A. Alarcon, A. Ferté, P. Lemos, M. Raveri, A. Campos, J. Prat, C. Sánchez, M. Jarvis, O. Alves, F. Andrade-Oliveira, E. Baxter, K. Bechtol, M. R. Becker, S. L. Bridle, H. Camacho, A. Carnero Rosell, M. Carrasco Kind, R. Cawthon, C. Chang, R. Chen, P. Chintalapati, M. Crocce, C. Davis, H. T. Diehl, A. Drlica-Wagner, K. Eckert, T. F. Eifler, J. Elvin-Poole, S. Everett, X. Fang, P. Fosalba, O. Friedrich, E. Gaztanaga, G. Giannini, R. A. Gruendl, I. Harrison, W. G. Hartley, K. Herner, H. Huang, E. M. Huff, D. Huterer, N. Kuropatkin, P. Leget, A. R. Liddle, J. McCullough, J. Muir, S. Pandey, Y. Park, A. Porredon, A. Refregier, R. P. Rollins, A. Roodman, R. Rosenfeld, A. J. Ross, E. S. Rykoff, J. Sanchez, I. Sevilla-Noarbe, E. Sheldon, T. Shin, A. Troja, I. Tutusaus, I. Tutusaus, T. N. Varga, N. Weaverdyck, B. Yanny, B. Yin, Y. Zhang, J. Zuntz, M. Aguena, S. Allam, J. Annis, D. Bacon, E. Bertin, S. Bhargava, D. Brooks, E. Buckley-Geer, D. L. Burke, J. Carretero, M. Costanzi, L. N. da Costa, M. E. S. Pereira, J. De Vicente, S. Desai, J. P. Dietrich, P. Doel, I. Ferrero, B. Flaugher, J. Frieman, J. García-Bellido, E. Gaztanaga, D. W. Gerdes, T. Giannantonio, J. Gschwend, G. Gutierrez, S. R. Hinton, D. L. Hollowood, K. Honscheid, B. Hoyle, D. J. James, R. Kron, K. Kuehn, O. Lahav, M. Lima, H. Lin, M. A. G. Maia, J. L. Marshall, P. Martini, P. Melchior, F. Menanteau, R. Miquel, J. J. Mohr, R. Morgan, R. L. C. Ogando, A. Palmese, F. Paz-Chinchón, D. Petravick, A. Pieres, A. K. Romer, E. Sanchez, V. Scarpine, M. Schubnell, S. Serrano, M. Smith, M. Soares-Santos, G. Tarle, D. Thomas, C. To, and J. Weller (DES Collaboration), Dark energy survey year 3 results: Cosmology from cosmic shear and robustness to data calibration, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 023514 (2022).
- [31] R. C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, Arbitrating the S8 discrepancy with growth rate measurements from redshift-space distortions, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505**, 5427 (2021), arXiv:2106.01208 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] T. Tröster *et al.* (KiDS), KiDS-1000 Cosmology: Constraints beyond flat Λ CDM, *Astron. Astrophys.* **649**, A88 (2021), arXiv:2010.16416 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), Dark Energy Survey Year 3 results: Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering and weak lensing, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 023520 (2022), arXiv:2105.13549 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] C. Heymans *et al.*, KiDS-1000 Cosmology: Multi-probe weak gravitational lensing and spectroscopic galaxy clustering constraints, *Astron. Astrophys.* **646**, A140 (2021), arXiv:2007.15632 [astro-ph.CO].
- [35] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (Kilo-Degree Survey, DES), DES Y3 + KiDS-1000: Consistent cosmology combining cosmic shear surveys, *Open J. Astrophys.* **6**, 2305.17173 (2023), arXiv:2305.17173 [astro-ph.CO].
- [36] R. Dalal *et al.*, Hyper Suprime-Cam Year 3 results: Cosmology from cosmic shear power spectra, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 123519 (2023), arXiv:2304.00701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [37] S. Chen *et al.*, Analysis of DESI \times DES using the Lagrangian effective theory of LSS, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 103518 (2024), arXiv:2407.04795 [astro-ph.CO].
- [38] J. Kim *et al.*, The Atacama Cosmology Telescope DR6 and DESI: structure formation over cosmic time with a measurement of the cross-correlation of CMB lensing and luminous red galaxies, *JCAP* **12**, 022, arXiv:2407.04606 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] L. Faga *et al.* (DES), Dark Energy Survey Year 3 Results: Cosmology from galaxy clustering and galaxy-galaxy lensing in harmonic space, (2024), arXiv:2406.12675 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] J. Harnois-Deraps *et al.*, KiDS-1000 and DES-Y1 combined: cosmology from peak count statistics, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **534**, 3305 (2024), arXiv:2405.10312 [astro-ph.CO].
- [41] F. J. Qu *et al.*, The Atacama Cosmology Telescope DR6 and DESI: Structure growth measurements from the cross-correlation of DESI Legacy Imaging galaxies and CMB lensing from ACT DR6 and Planck PR4, (2024), arXiv:2410.10808 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] T. Tröster *et al.*, Cosmology from large-scale structure: Constraining Λ CDM with BOSS, *Astron. Astrophys.* **633**, L10 (2020), arXiv:1909.11006 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] E. Di Valentino *et al.*, Cosmology Intertwined III: $f\sigma_8$ and S_8 , *Astropart. Phys.* **131**, 102604 (2021), arXiv:2008.11285 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] O. Akarsu, E. O. Colgáin, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Λ CDM Tensions: Localising Missing Physics through Consistency Checks, *Universe* **10**, 305 (2024), arXiv:2402.04767 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] S. A. Adil, O. Akarsu, M. Malekjani, E. O. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, S_8 increases with effective redshift in Λ CDM cosmology, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **528**, L20 (2023), arXiv:2303.06928 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] O. Akarsu, E. O. Colgáin, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Further support for S_8 increasing with effective redshift, (2024), arXiv:2410.23134 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] D. Huterer *et al.*, Growth of Cosmic Structure: Probing Dark Energy Beyond Expansion, *Astropart. Phys.* **63**, 23 (2015), arXiv:1309.5385 [astro-ph.CO].

- [48] S. G. Choudhury, P. Mukherjee, and A. A. Sen, Towards a Composite Framework for Simultaneous Exploration of New Physics in Background and Perturbed Universes, (2025), [arXiv:2502.18457 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, Dark energy at early times, the Hubble parameter, and the string axiverse, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103523 (2016), [arXiv:1608.01309 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [50] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 221301 (2019), [arXiv:1811.04083 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [51] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, D. Grin, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, Cosmological implications of ultralight axionlike fields, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083525 (2018), [arXiv:1806.10608 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, Rock 'n' Roll Solutions to the Hubble Tension (2019) [arXiv:1904.01016 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, The Hubble Tension and Early Dark Energy (2022) [arXiv:2211.04492 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] S. D. Odintsov, V. K. Oikonomou, and G. S. Sharov, Early dark energy with power-law $F(R)$ gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* **843**, 137988 (2023), [arXiv:2305.17513 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [55] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, New early dark energy, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L041303 (2021), [arXiv:1910.10739 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] J. S. Cruz, F. Niedermann, and M. S. Sloth, Cold New Early Dark Energy pulls the trigger on the H_0 and S_8 tensions: a simultaneous solution to both tensions without new ingredients (2023) [arXiv:2305.08895 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, New Early Dark Energy as a solution to the H_0 and S_8 tensions (2023) [arXiv:2307.03481 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, Is the Hubble tension a hint of AdS phase around recombination?, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083507 (2020), [arXiv:2001.02451 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [59] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, T_0 censorship of early dark energy and AdS vacua, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 083523 (2020), [arXiv:2008.10832 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [60] G. Ye, J. Zhang, and Y.-S. Piao, Alleviating both H_0 and S_8 tensions: Early dark energy lifts the CMB-lockdown on ultralight axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **839**, 137770 (2023), [arXiv:2107.13391 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] M. Rossi, M. Ballardini, M. Braglia, F. Finelli, D. Paoletti, A. A. Starobinsky, and C. Umiltà, Cosmological constraints on post-Newtonian parameters in effectively massless scalar-tensor theories of gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 103524 (2019), [arXiv:1906.10218 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] M. Braglia, M. Ballardini, W. T. Emond, F. Finelli, A. E. Gumrukuoglu, K. Koyama, and D. Paoletti, Larger value for H_0 by an evolving gravitational constant, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 023529 (2020), [arXiv:2004.11161 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] T. Adi and E. D. Kovetz, Can conformally coupled modified gravity solve the Hubble tension?, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023530 (2021), [arXiv:2011.13853 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] M. Braglia, M. Ballardini, F. Finelli, and K. Koyama, Early modified gravity in light of the H_0 tension and LSS data, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 043528 (2021), [arXiv:2011.12934 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [65] M. Ballardini, M. Braglia, F. Finelli, D. Paoletti, A. A. Starobinsky, and C. Umiltà, Scalar-tensor theories of gravity, neutrino physics, and the H_0 tension, *JCAP* **10**, 044, [arXiv:2004.14349 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] G. Franco Abellán, M. Braglia, M. Ballardini, F. Finelli, and V. Poulin, Probing Early Modification of Gravity with Planck, ACT and SPT (2023) [arXiv:2308.12345 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [67] M. Petronikolou and E. N. Saridakis, Alleviating the H_0 Tension in Scalar-Tensor and Bi-Scalar-Tensor Theories, *Universe* **9**, 397 (2023), [arXiv:2308.16044 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [68] O. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, L. A. Escamilla, and J. A. Vazquez, Graduated dark energy: Observational hints of a spontaneous sign switch in the cosmological constant, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063528 (2020), [arXiv:1912.08751 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [69] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker, and J. A. Vazquez, Relaxing cosmological tensions with a sign switching cosmological constant, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123512 (2021), [arXiv:2108.09239 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, Relaxing cosmological tensions with a sign switching cosmological constant: Improved results with Planck, BAO, and Pantheon data, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023513 (2023), [arXiv:2211.05742 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [71] O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, Λ_s CDM model: A promising scenario for alleviation of cosmological tensions, (2023), [arXiv:2307.10899 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [72] A. Yadav, S. Kumar, C. Kibris, and O. Akarsu, Λ_s CDM cosmology: Alleviating major cosmological tensions by predicting standard neutrino properties, (2024), [arXiv:2406.18496 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [73] E. A. Paraskevas, A. Cam, L. Perivolaropoulos, and O. Akarsu, Transition dynamics in the Λ_s CDM model: Implications for bound cosmic structures, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103522 (2024), [arXiv:2402.05908 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [74] M. S. Souza, A. M. Barcelos, R. C. Nunes, O. Akarsu, and S. Kumar, Mapping the λ_s cdm scenario to $f(t)$ modified gravity: Effects on structure growth rate, *Universe* **11**, 10.3390/universe11010002 (2025).
- [75] O. Akarsu, B. Bulduk, A. De Felice, N. Katırcı, and N. M. Uzun, Unexplored regions in teleparallel $f(T)$ gravity: Sign-changing dark energy density, (2024), [arXiv:2410.23068 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [76] O. Akarsu, A. De Felice, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, E. Ozulker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, Λ_s CDM cosmology from a type-II minimally modified gravity, (2024), [arXiv:2402.07716 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] O. Akarsu, A. De Felice, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, E. Özüiker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, Cosmological constraints on Λ_s CDM scenario in a type II minimally modified gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 103527 (2024), [arXiv:2406.07526 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [78] E. Di Valentino, A. Mukherjee, and A. A. Sen, Dark Energy with Phantom Crossing and the H_0 Tension, *Entropy* **23**, 404 (2021), [arXiv:2005.12587 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [79] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, H_0 tension, phantom dark energy, and cosmological parameter degeneracies, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123516 (2020), [arXiv:2004.08363 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [80] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, $w - M$ phantom transition at $z_t < 0.1$ as a resolution of the Hubble tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083517 (2021),

- arXiv:2012.13932 [astro-ph.CO].
- [81] M. R. Gangopadhyay, S. K. J. Pacif, M. Sami, and M. K. Sharma, Generic Modification of Gravity, Late Time Acceleration and Hubble Tension, *Universe* **9**, 83 (2023), arXiv:2211.12041 [gr-qc].
- [82] S. Basilakos, A. Lymperis, M. Petronikolou, and E. N. Saridakis, Alleviating both H_0 and σ_8 tensions in Tsallis cosmology (2023) arXiv:2308.01200 [gr-qc].
- [83] S. A. Adil, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, E. Özüllker, A. A. Sen, and E. Specogna, Omnipotent dark energy: A phenomenological answer to the Hubble tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023527 (2024), arXiv:2306.08046 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] M. R. Gangopadhyay, M. Sami, and M. K. Sharma, Phantom dark energy as a natural selection of evolutionary processes a genetic algorithm and cosmological tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103526 (2023), arXiv:2303.07301 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, Echo of interactions in the dark sector, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 103511 (2017), arXiv:1702.02143 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and O. Mena, Can interacting dark energy solve the H_0 tension?, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 043503 (2017), arXiv:1704.08342 [astro-ph.CO].
- [87] W. Yang, A. Mukherjee, E. Di Valentino, and S. Pan, Interacting dark energy with time varying equation of state and the H_0 tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 123527 (2018), arXiv:1809.06883 [astro-ph.CO].
- [88] S. Pan, W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Chakraborty, Interacting scenarios with dynamical dark energy: Observational constraints and alleviation of the H_0 tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 103520 (2019), arXiv:1907.07540 [astro-ph.CO].
- [89] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, and S. K. Yadav, Dark sector interaction: a remedy of the tensions between CMB and LSS data, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 576 (2019), arXiv:1903.04865 [astro-ph.CO].
- [90] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, and S. Vagnozzi, Nonminimal dark sector physics and cosmological tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063502 (2020), arXiv:1910.09853 [astro-ph.CO].
- [91] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, and S. Vagnozzi, Interacting dark energy in the early 2020s: A promising solution to the H_0 and cosmic shear tensions, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100666 (2020), arXiv:1908.04281 [astro-ph.CO].
- [92] M. Lucca and D. C. Hooper, Shedding light on dark matter-dark energy interactions, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 123502 (2020), arXiv:2002.06127 [astro-ph.CO].
- [93] A. Gómez-Valent, V. Pettorino, and L. Amendola, Update on coupled dark energy and the H_0 tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123513 (2020), arXiv:2004.00610 [astro-ph.CO].
- [94] S. Kumar, Remedy of some cosmological tensions via effective phantom-like behavior of interacting vacuum energy, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **33**, 100862 (2021), arXiv:2102.12902 [astro-ph.CO].
- [95] R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi, S. Kumar, E. Di Valentino, and O. Mena, New tests of dark sector interactions from the full-shape galaxy power spectrum, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 123506 (2022), arXiv:2203.08093 [astro-ph.CO].
- [96] A. Bernui, E. Di Valentino, W. Giarè, S. Kumar, and R. C. Nunes, Exploring the H_0 tension and the evidence for dark sector interactions from 2D BAO measurements, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 103531 (2023), arXiv:2301.06097 [astro-ph.CO].
- [97] W. Giarè, M. A. Sabogal, R. C. Nunes, and E. Di Valentino, Interacting Dark Energy after DESI Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 251003 (2024), arXiv:2404.15232 [astro-ph.CO].
- [98] M. A. Sabogal, E. Silva, R. C. Nunes, S. Kumar, and E. Di Valentino, Sign switching in dark sector coupling interactions as a candidate for resolving cosmological tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 043531 (2025), arXiv:2501.10323 [astro-ph.CO].
- [99] M. A. Sabogal, E. Silva, R. C. Nunes, S. Kumar, E. Di Valentino, and W. Giarè, Quantifying S_8 tension and evidence for interacting dark energy from redshift-space distortion measurements, arXiv:2408.12403 [astro-ph.CO] (2024).
- [100] D. Bousis and L. Perivolaropoulos, Hubble tension tomography: BAO vs SN Ia distance tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 103546 (2024), arXiv:2405.07039 [astro-ph.CO].
- [101] V. Marra and L. Perivolaropoulos, Rapid transition of G_{eff} at $z \simeq 0.01$ as a possible solution of the Hubble and growth tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, L021303 (2021), arXiv:2102.06012 [astro-ph.CO].
- [102] G. Alestas, I. Antoniou, and L. Perivolaropoulos, Hints for a Gravitational Transition in Tully–Fisher Data, *Universe* **7**, 366 (2021), arXiv:2104.14481 [astro-ph.CO].
- [103] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, Hubble tension or a transition of the Cepheid SNIa calibrator parameters?, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123511 (2021), arXiv:2109.04406 [astro-ph.CO].
- [104] L. Knox and M. Millea, Hubble constant hunter’s guide, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 043533 (2020), arXiv:1908.03663 [astro-ph.CO].
- [105] L. A. Anchordoqui, I. Antoniadis, and D. Lust, Anti-de Sitter \rightarrow de Sitter transition driven by Casimir forces and mitigating tensions in cosmological parameters, *Phys. Lett. B* **855**, 138775 (2024), arXiv:2312.12352 [hep-th].
- [106] L. A. Anchordoqui, I. Antoniadis, D. Lust, N. T. Noble, and J. F. Soriano, From infinite to infinitesimal: Using the universe as a dataset to probe Casimir corrections to the vacuum energy from fields inhabiting the dark dimension, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **46**, 101715 (2024), arXiv:2404.17334 [astro-ph.CO].
- [107] L. A. Anchordoqui, I. Antoniadis, D. Bielli, A. Chattrabhati, and H. Isono, Thin-wall vacuum decay in the presence of a compact dimension meets the H_0 and S_8 tensions, (2024), arXiv:2410.18649 [hep-th].
- [108] J. F. Soriano, S. Wohlberg, and L. A. Anchordoqui, New insights on a sign-switching Λ , (2025), arXiv:2502.19239 [astro-ph.CO].
- [109] A. De Felice, A. Doll, and S. Mukohyama, A theory of type-II minimally modified gravity, *JCAP* **09**, 034, arXiv:2004.12549 [gr-qc].
- [110] A. De Felice, S. Mukohyama, and M. C. Pookkillath, Addressing H_0 tension by means of Λ CDM, *Phys. Lett. B* **816**, 136201 (2021), [Erratum: Phys.Lett.B 818, 136364 (2021)], arXiv:2009.08718 [astro-ph.CO].
- [111] A. Awad, W. El Hanafy, G. G. L. Nashed, and E. N. Saridakis, Phase Portraits of general $f(T)$ Cosmology, *JCAP* **02**, 052, arXiv:1710.10194 [gr-qc].
- [112] M. Hashim, W. El Hanafy, A. Golovnev, and A. A. El-Zant, Toward a concordance teleparallel cosmology. Part I. Background dynamics, *JCAP* **07**, 052,

- arXiv:2010.14964 [astro-ph.CO].
- [113] M. Hashim, A. A. El-Zant, W. El Hanafy, and A. Golovnev, Toward a concordance teleparallel cosmology. Part II. Linear perturbation, *JCAP* **07**, 053, arXiv:2104.08311 [astro-ph.CO].
- [114] M. S. Souza, A. M. Barcelos, R. C. Nunes, O. Akarsu, and S. Kumar, Mapping the Λ_s CDM Scenario to $f(T)$ Modified Gravity: Effects on Structure Growth Rate, *Universe* **11**, 2 (2025), arXiv:2501.18031 [astro-ph.CO].
- [115] O. Akarsu, L. Perivolaropoulos, A. Tsikoundoura, A. E. Yükselci, and A. Zhuk, Dynamical dark energy with AdS-to-dS and dS-to-dS transitions: Implications for the H_0 tension, (2025), arXiv:2502.14667 [astro-ph.CO].
- [116] V. Sahni and Y. Shtanov, Brane world models of dark energy, *JCAP* **11**, 014, arXiv:astro-ph/0202346.
- [117] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo, and A. A. Starobinsky, Model independent evidence for dark energy evolution from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **793**, L40 (2014), arXiv:1406.2209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [118] S. Bag, V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo, and Y. Shtanov, Phantom Braneworld and the Hubble Tension, *Astrophys. J.* **923**, 212 (2021), arXiv:2107.03271 [astro-ph.CO].
- [119] O. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, C. V. R. Board, N. M. Uzun, and J. A. Vazquez, Screening Λ in a new modified gravity model, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 846 (2019), arXiv:1903.11519 [gr-qc].
- [120] S. Dwivedi and M. Höggås, 2D BAO vs. 3D BAO: Solving the Hubble Tension with Bimetric Cosmology, *Universe* **10**, 406 (2024), arXiv:2407.04322 [astro-ph.CO].
- [121] Y. Tiwari, B. Ghosh, and R. K. Jain, Towards a possible solution to the Hubble tension with Horndeski gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 220 (2024), arXiv:2301.09382 [astro-ph.CO].
- [122] U. K. Tyagi, S. Haridasu, and S. Basak, Holographic and gravity-thermodynamic approaches in entropic cosmology: Bayesian assessment using late-time data, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 063503 (2024), arXiv:2406.07446 [astro-ph.CO].
- [123] M. T. Manoharan, Insights on Granda–Oliveros holographic dark energy: possibility of negative dark energy at $z \gtrsim 2$, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 552 (2024).
- [124] A. Gomez-Valent and J. Solà Peracaula, Phantom Matter: A Challenging Solution to the Cosmological Tensions, *Astrophys. J.* **975**, 64 (2024), arXiv:2404.18845 [astro-ph.CO].
- [125] A. Gómez-Valent and J. Solà Peracaula, Composite Dark Energy and the Cosmological Tensions, (2024), arXiv:2412.15124 [astro-ph.CO].
- [126] R. Y. Wen, L. T. Hergt, N. Afshordi, and D. Scott, A cosmic glitch in gravity, *JCAP* **03**, 045, arXiv:2311.03028 [astro-ph.CO].
- [127] R. Y. Wen, L. T. Hergt, N. Afshordi, and D. Scott, A glitch in gravity: cosmic Lorentz-violation from fiery Big Bang to glacial heat death (2024) arXiv:2412.09568 [astro-ph.CO].
- [128] B. Alexandre, S. Gielen, and J. a. Magueijo, Overall signature of the metric and the cosmological constant, *JCAP* **02**, 036, arXiv:2306.11502 [hep-th].
- [129] I. Labbe *et al.*, A population of red candidate massive galaxies ~ 600 Myr after the Big Bang, *Nature* **616**, 266 (2023), arXiv:2207.12446 [astro-ph.GA].
- [130] N. Menci, S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen, and S. Vagnozzi, Negative cosmological constant in the dark energy sector: tests from JWST photometric and spectroscopic observations of high-redshift galaxies, *JCAP* **07**, 072, arXiv:2401.12659 [astro-ph.CO].
- [131] N. Menci, A. A. Sen, and M. Castellano, The Excess of JWST Bright Galaxies: a Possible Origin in the Ground State of Dynamical Dark Energy in the light of DESI 2024 Data, (2024), arXiv:2410.22940 [astro-ph.CO].
- [132] S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen, and S. Vagnozzi, Dark energy in light of the early JWST observations: case for a negative cosmological constant?, *JCAP* **10**, 072, arXiv:2307.12763 [astro-ph.CO].
- [133] H. Wang, Z.-Y. Peng, and Y.-S. Piao, Can recent DESI BAO measurements accommodate a negative cosmological constant?, (2024), arXiv:2406.03395 [astro-ph.CO].
- [134] E. O. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Implications of DES 5YR SNe Dataset for Λ CDM, (2024), arXiv:2406.06389 [astro-ph.CO].
- [135] M. Malekjani, R. M. Conville, E. O. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, On redshift evolution and negative dark energy density in Pantheon + Supernovae, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 317 (2024), arXiv:2301.12725 [astro-ph.CO].
- [136] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi, and U. Danielsson, Revisiting a negative cosmological constant from low-redshift data, *Symmetry* **11**, 1035 (2019), arXiv:1907.07953 [astro-ph.CO].
- [137] Ruchika, S. A. Adil, K. Dutta, A. Mukherjee, and A. A. Sen, Observational constraints on axion(s) dark energy with a cosmological constant, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40**, 101199 (2023), arXiv:2005.08813 [astro-ph.CO].
- [138] A. A. Sen, S. A. Adil, and S. Sen, Do cosmological observations allow a negative Λ ?, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518**, 1098 (2022), arXiv:2112.10641 [astro-ph.CO].
- [139] S. Di Gennaro and Y. C. Ong, Sign Switching Dark Energy from a Running Barrow Entropy, *Universe* **8**, 541 (2022), arXiv:2205.09311 [gr-qc].
- [140] H. Moshafi, H. Firouzjahi, and A. Talebian, Multiple Transitions in Vacuum Dark Energy and H_0 Tension, *Astrophys. J.* **940**, 121 (2022), arXiv:2208.05583 [astro-ph.CO].
- [141] A. van de Venn, D. Vasak, J. Kirsch, and J. Struckmeier, Torsional dark energy in quadratic gauge gravity, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 288 (2023), arXiv:2211.11868 [gr-qc].
- [142] Y. C. Ong, An Effective Sign Switching Dark Energy: Lotka–Volterra Model of Two Interacting Fluids, *Universe* **9**, 437 (2023), arXiv:2212.04429 [gr-qc].
- [143] J. A. Vázquez, D. Tamayo, G. Garcia-Arroyo, I. Gómez-Vargas, I. Quiros, and A. A. Sen, Coupled multiscalar field dark energy, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023511 (2024).
- [144] E. A. Paraskevas and L. Perivolaropoulos, The density of virialized clusters as a probe of dark energy, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **531**, 1021 (2024), arXiv:2308.07046 [astro-ph.CO].
- [145] A. De Felice, S. Kumar, S. Mukohyama, and R. C. Nunes, Observational bounds on extended minimal theories of massive gravity: new limits on the graviton mass, *JCAP* **04**, 013, arXiv:2311.10530 [astro-ph.CO].
- [146] E. Ozulker, Is the dark energy equation of state parameter singular?, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063509 (2022), arXiv:2203.04167 [astro-ph.CO].
- [147] J. A. Vazquez, S. Hee, M. P. Hobson, A. N. Lasenby, M. Ibison, and M. Bridges, Observational constraints on conformal time symmetry, missing matter and double dark energy, *JCAP* **07**, 062, arXiv:1208.2542 [astro-ph.CO].

- [148] T. Delubac *et al.* (BOSS), Baryon acoustic oscillations in the Ly α forest of BOSS DR11 quasars, *Astron. Astrophys.* **574**, A59 (2015), [arXiv:1404.1801 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [149] E. Aubourg *et al.* (BOSS), Cosmological implications of baryon acoustic oscillation measurements, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 123516 (2015), [arXiv:1411.1074 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [150] E. Di Valentino, E. V. Linder, and A. Melchiorri, Vacuum phase transition solves the H_0 tension, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 043528 (2018), [arXiv:1710.02153 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [151] E. Mörtsell and S. Dhawan, Does the Hubble constant tension call for new physics?, *JCAP* **09**, 025, [arXiv:1801.07260 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [152] V. Poulin, K. K. Boddy, S. Bird, and M. Kamionkowski, Implications of an extended dark energy cosmology with massive neutrinos for cosmological tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 123504 (2018), [arXiv:1803.02474 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [153] S. Capozziello, Ruchika, and A. A. Sen, Model independent constraints on dark energy evolution from low-redshift observations, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **484**, 4484 (2019), [arXiv:1806.03943 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [154] Y. Wang, L. Pogosian, G.-B. Zhao, and A. Zucca, Evolution of dark energy reconstructed from the latest observations, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **869**, L8 (2018), [arXiv:1807.03772 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [155] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi, and A. H. Shirazi, Phase transition in the dark sector as a proposal to lessen cosmological tensions, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123521 (2020), [arXiv:1808.02472 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [156] K. Dutta, Ruchika, A. Roy, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Beyond Λ CDM with low and high redshift data: implications for dark energy, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52**, 15 (2020), [arXiv:1808.06623 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [157] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi, and A. H. Shirazi, Ginzburg-Landau Theory of Dark Energy: A Framework to Study Both Temporal and Spatial Cosmological Tensions Simultaneously, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 083509 (2019), [arXiv:1810.11007 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [158] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, A Simple Phenomenological Emergent Dark Energy Model can Resolve the Hubble Tension, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **883**, L3 (2019), [arXiv:1906.08275 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [159] A. Perez, D. Sudarsky, and E. Wilson-Ewing, Resolving the H_0 tension with diffusion, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **53**, 7 (2021), [arXiv:2001.07536 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [160] O. Akarsu, N. Katirci, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, B. Öztürk, and S. Sharma, Rastall gravity extension of the standard Λ CDM model: theoretical features and observational constraints, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 1050 (2020), [arXiv:2004.04074 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [161] R. Calderón, R. Gannouji, B. L'Huillier, and D. Polarski, Negative cosmological constant in the dark sector?, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023526 (2021), [arXiv:2008.10237 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [162] A. Paliathanasis and G. Leon, Dynamics of a two scalar field cosmological model with phantom terms, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 075013 (2021), [arXiv:2009.12874 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [163] A. Bonilla, S. Kumar, and R. C. Nunes, Measurements of H_0 and reconstruction of the dark energy properties from a model-independent joint analysis, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 127 (2021), [arXiv:2011.07140 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [164] G. Acquaviva, O. Akarsu, N. Katirci, and J. A. Vazquez, Simple-graduated dark energy and spatial curvature, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 023505 (2021), [arXiv:2104.02623 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [165] R. C. Bernardo, D. Grandón, J. Said Levi, and V. H. Cárdenas, Parametric and nonparametric methods hint dark energy evolution, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **36**, 101017 (2022), [arXiv:2111.08289 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [166] L. A. Escamilla and J. A. Vazquez, Model selection applied to reconstructions of the Dark Energy, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 251 (2023), [arXiv:2111.10457 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [167] O. Akarsu, E. O. Colgain, E. Özulker, S. Thakur, and L. Yin, Inevitable manifestation of wiggles in the expansion of the late Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 123526 (2023), [arXiv:2207.10609 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [168] R. C. Bernardo, D. Grandón, J. Levi Said, and V. H. Cárdenas, Dark energy by natural evolution: Constraining dark energy using Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40**, 101213 (2023), [arXiv:2211.05482 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [169] A. Gómez-Valent, A. Favale, M. Migliaccio, and A. A. Sen, Late-time phenomenology required to solve the H_0 tension in view of the cosmic ladders and the anisotropic and angular BAO datasets, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023525 (2024), [arXiv:2309.07795 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [170] R. Medel-Esquivel, I. Gómez-Vargas, A. A. M. Sánchez, R. García-Salcedo, and J. Alberto Vázquez, Cosmological Parameter Estimation with Genetic Algorithms, *Universe* **10**, 11 (2024), [arXiv:2311.05699 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [171] Y. Toda, W. Giarè, E. Özulker, E. Di Valentino, and S. Vagnozzi, Combining pre- and post-recombination new physics to address cosmological tensions: case study with varying electron mass and a sign-switching cosmological constant, (2024), [arXiv:2407.01173 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [172] P. Mukherjee, D. Kumar, and A. A. Sen, Quintessential Implications of the presence of AdS in the Dark Energy sector, (2025), [arXiv:2501.18335 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [173] W. Giarè, T. Mahassen, E. Di Valentino, and S. Pan, An overview of what current data can (and cannot yet) say about evolving dark energy, (2025), [arXiv:2502.10264 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [174] R. E. Keeley, K. N. Abazajian, M. Kaplinghat, and A. Shafieloo, The Preference for Evolving Dark Energy from Cosmological Distance Measurements and Possible Signatures in the Growth Rate of Perturbations, (2025), [arXiv:2502.12667 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [175] L. A. Escamilla, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, and J. A. Vazquez, Model-independent reconstruction of the interacting dark energy kernel: Binned and Gaussian process, *JCAP* **11**, 051, [arXiv:2305.16290 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [176] A. G. Adame *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024 VI: cosmological constraints from the measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations, *JCAP* **02**, 021, [arXiv:2404.03002 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [177] R. Calderon *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024: reconstructing dark energy using crossing statistics with DESI DR1 BAO data, *JCAP* **10**, 048, [arXiv:2405.04216 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [178] L. A. Escamilla, E. Özulker, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, and J. A. Vázquez, Do we need wavelets in the late Universe?, (2024), [arXiv:2408.12516 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [179] M. A. Sabogal, O. Akarsu, A. Bonilla, E. Di Valentino, and R. C. Nunes, Exploring new physics in the late Universe's expansion through non-parametric inference, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 703 (2024), [arXiv:2407.04223 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [180] A. Notari, M. Redi, and A. Tesi, Consistent Theories for the DESI dark energy fit, (2024), [arXiv:2406.08459 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [181] J. N. Fry, DYNAMICAL MEASURES OF DENSITY IN EXOTIC COSMOLOGIES, *Phys. Lett. B* **158**, 211 (1985).
- [182] L. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, Cluster abundance constraints on quintessence models, *Astrophys. J.* **508**, 483 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9804015 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [183] E. V. Linder, Cosmic growth history and expansion history, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043529 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0507263](#).
- [184] N.-M. Nguyen, D. Huterer, and Y. Wen, Evidence for suppression of structure growth in the concordance cosmological model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 111001 (2023), [arXiv:2302.01331 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [185] E. A. Paraskevas, A. Çam, L. Perivolaropoulos, and O. Akarsu, Transition dynamics in the Λ_s CDM model: Implications for bound cosmic structures, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103522 (2024).
- [186] F. Pace, J. C. Waizmann, and M. Bartelmann, Spherical collapse model in dark-energy cosmologies, *mnras* **406**, 1865 (2010), [arXiv:1005.0233 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [187] F. Pace, C. Fedeli, L. Moscardini, and M. Bartelmann, Structure formation in cosmologies with oscillating dark energy, *mnras* **422**, 1186 (2012), [arXiv:1111.1556 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [188] F. Pace, S. Meyer, and M. Bartelmann, On the implementation of the spherical collapse model for dark energy models, *JCAP* **10**, 040, [arXiv:1708.02477 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [189] D. Herrera, I. Waga, and S. E. Jorás, Calculation of the critical overdensity in the spherical-collapse approximation, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 064029 (2017), [arXiv:1703.05824 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [190] P. J. E. Peebles, *The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe* (Princeton University Press, 1980).
- [191] T. Padmanabhan, *Structure Formation in the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- [192] J. E. Gunn and I. Gott, J. Richard, On the Infall of Matter into Clusters of Galaxies and Some Effects on Their Evolution, *Astrophys. J.* **176**, 1 (1972).
- [193] L. Kazantzidis and L. Perivolaropoulos, Evolution of the $f\sigma_8$ tension with the Planck15/ Λ CDM determination and implications for modified gravity theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 103503 (2018), [arXiv:1803.01337 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [194] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- [195] S. Dodelson and F. Schmidt, *Modern Cosmology* (2020).
- [196] C. Knobel, An Introduction into the Theory of Cosmological Structure Formation, [arXiv e-prints](#), [arXiv:1208.5931](#) (2012), [arXiv:1208.5931 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [197] J. A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics* (1999).
- [198] S. Engineer, N. Kanekar, and T. Padmanabhan, Nonlinear density evolution from an improved spherical collapse model, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **314**, 279 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9812452](#).
- [199] R. C. Batista, On the virialization threshold for halo mass functions, (2024), [arXiv:2409.03895 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [200] D. F. Mota and C. van de Bruck, On the Spherical collapse model in dark energy cosmologies, *Astron. Astrophys.* **421**, 71 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0401504](#).
- [201] O. Lahav, P. B. Lilje, J. R. Primack, and M. J. Rees, Dynamical effects of the cosmological constant, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **251**, 128 (1991).
- [202] V. Pavlidou and B. D. Fields, Double distribution of dark matter halos with respect to mass and local overdensity, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 043510 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0410338](#).
- [203] S. Basilakos, J. C. Bueno Sanchez, and L. Perivolaropoulos, The spherical collapse model and cluster formation beyond the Λ cosmology: Indications for a clustered dark energy?, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 043530 (2009), [arXiv:0908.1333 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [204] A. Del Popolo, F. Pace, and J. A. S. Lima, Spherical collapse model with shear and angular momentum in dark energy cosmologies, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **430**, 628 (2013), [arXiv:1212.5092 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [205] L. R. Abramo, R. C. Batista, L. Liberato, and R. Rosenfeld, Structure formation in the presence of dark energy perturbations, *JCAP* **11**, 012, [arXiv:0707.2882 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [206] B. Farsi and A. Sheykhi, Structure formation in mimetic gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024053 (2022), [arXiv:2202.04118 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [207] B. Farsi, A. Sheykhi, and M. Khodadi, Evolution of spherical overdensities in energy-momentum-squared gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023524 (2023), [arXiv:2304.01571 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [208] G. Alestas and L. Perivolaropoulos, Late-time approaches to the Hubble tension deforming $H(z)$, worsen the growth tension, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **504**, 3956 (2021), [arXiv:2103.04045 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [209] P. Meszaros, The behaviour of point masses in an expanding cosmological substratum, *Astron. Astrophys.* **37**, 225 (1974).
- [210] M. S. Longair, *Galaxy Formation*, Astronomy and Astrophysics Library (Springer, Heidelberg, Germany, 2008).
- [211] O. Sokoliuk, Explaining JWST star formation history at $z \sim 17$ by modifying Λ CDM, (2025), [arXiv:2501.11103 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [212] N. N. Pooya, Growth of matter perturbations in the interacting dark energy-dark matter scenarios, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 043510 (2024), [arXiv:2407.03766 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [213] E. V. Linder, Cosmic growth history and expansion history, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043529 (2005).
- [214] E. V. Linder and R. N. Cahn, Parameterized Beyond-Einstein Growth, *Astropart. Phys.* **28**, 481 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0701317](#).
- [215] S. Haude, S. Salehi, S. Vidal, M. Maturi, and M. Bartelmann, Model-Independent Determination of the Cosmic Growth Factor, (2019), [arXiv:1912.04560 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [216] R. Calderon, D. Felbacq, R. Gannouji, D. Polarski, and A. A. Starobinsky, Global properties of the growth index: mathematical aspects and physical relevance, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 103501 (2020), [arXiv:1912.06958 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [217] F. Avila, A. Bernui, A. Bonilla, and R. C. Nunes, Inferring $S_8(z)$ and $\gamma(z)$ with cosmic growth rate measurements using machine learning, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 594 (2022), [arXiv:2201.07829 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [218] F. Oliveira, F. Avila, A. Bernui, A. Bonilla, and R. C. Nunes, Reconstructing the growth index γ with Gaussian processes, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 636 (2024), [arXiv:2311.14216 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [219] D. Wang and O. Mena, Robust analysis of the growth of structure, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 083539 (2024), [arXiv:2311.14423 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [220] G. Panotopoulos, G. Barnert, and L. E. Campusano, Correlation of structure growth index with current cos-

- mic acceleration: Constraints on dark energy models, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **32**, 2350036 (2023), arXiv:2303.09492 [gr-qc].
- [221] E. Specogna, E. Di Valentino, J. Levi Said, and N.-M. Nguyen, Exploring the growth index γ_L : Insights from different CMB dataset combinations and approaches, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 043528 (2024), arXiv:2305.16865 [astro-ph.CO].
- [222] G. Arfken, G. Arfken, H. Weber, and F. Harris, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists: A Comprehensive Guide* (Elsevier Science, 2013).
- [223] W. R. Inc., *Mathematica, Version 13.3*, champaign, IL, 2023.
- [224] N.-M. Nguyen, D. Huterer, and Y. Wen, Evidence for Suppression of Structure Growth in the Concordance Cosmological Model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 111001 (2023), arXiv:2302.01331 [astro-ph.CO].
- [225] B. Sagredo, S. Nesseris, and D. Sapone, Internal Robustness of Growth Rate data, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083543 (2018), arXiv:1806.10822 [astro-ph.CO].
- [226] A. Theodoropoulos and L. Perivolaropoulos, The Hubble Tension, the M Crisis of Late Time $H(z)$ Deformation Models and the Reconstruction of Quintessence Lagrangians, *Universe* **7**, 300 (2021), arXiv:2109.06256 [astro-ph.CO].
- [227] E. Macaulay, I. K. Wehus, and H. K. Eriksen, Lower Growth Rate from Recent Redshift Space Distortion Measurements than Expected from Planck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 161301 (2013), arXiv:1303.6583 [astro-ph.CO].
- [228] S. Nesseris, G. Pantazis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, Tension and constraints on modified gravity parametrizations of $G_{\text{eff}}(z)$ from growth rate and Planck data, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 023542 (2017), arXiv:1703.10538 [astro-ph.CO].
- [229] R. Gannouji, L. Kazantzidis, L. Perivolaropoulos, and D. Polarski, Consistency of modified gravity with a decreasing $G_{\text{eff}}(z)$ in a Λ CDM background, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 104044 (2018), arXiv:1809.07034 [gr-qc].
- [230] L. Kazantzidis, L. Perivolaropoulos, and F. Skara, Constraining power of cosmological observables: blind redshift spots and optimal ranges, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 063537 (2019), arXiv:1812.05356 [astro-ph.CO].
- [231] L. Perivolaropoulos and L. Kazantzidis, Hints of modified gravity in cosmos and in the lab?, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **28**, 1942001 (2019), arXiv:1904.09462 [gr-qc].
- [232] L. Kazantzidis and L. Perivolaropoulos, σ_8 Tension. Is Gravity Getting Weaker at Low z ? Observational Evidence and Theoretical Implications, in *Modified Gravity and Cosmology; An Update by the CANTATA Network*, edited by E. N. Saridakis, R. Lazkoz, V. Salzano, P. V. Moniz, S. Capozziello, J. Beltrán Jiménez, M. De Laurentis, and G. J. Olmo (2021) pp. 507–537.
- [233] F. Skara and L. Perivolaropoulos, Tension of the E_G statistic and redshift space distortion data with the Planck - Λ CDM model and implications for weakening gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063521 (2020), arXiv:1911.10609 [astro-ph.CO].
- [234] L. Kazantzidis and L. Perivolaropoulos, Hints of a Local Matter Underdensity or Modified Gravity in the Low z Pantheon data, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 023520 (2020), arXiv:2004.02155 [astro-ph.CO].
- [235] R. Gannouji, L. Perivolaropoulos, D. Polarski, and F. Skara, Weak gravity on a Λ CDM background, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 063509 (2021), arXiv:2011.01517 [gr-qc].
- [236] M. J. Hudson and S. J. Turnbull, The growth rate of cosmic structure from peculiar velocities at low and high redshifts, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **751**, L30 (2013), arXiv:1203.4814 [astro-ph.CO].
- [237] D. Huterer, D. Shafer, D. Scolnic, and F. Schmidt, Testing Λ CDM at the lowest redshifts with SN Ia and galaxy velocities, *JCAP* **05**, 015, arXiv:1611.09862 [astro-ph.CO].
- [238] M. Feix, A. Nusser, and E. Branchini, Growth Rate of Cosmological Perturbations at $z \sim 0.1$ from a New Observational Test, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 011301 (2015), arXiv:1503.05945 [astro-ph.CO].
- [239] S. Alam *et al.* (BOSS), The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470**, 2617 (2017), arXiv:1607.03155 [astro-ph.CO].
- [240] Y.-S. Song and W. J. Percival, Reconstructing the history of structure formation using Redshift Distortions, *JCAP* **10**, 004, arXiv:0807.0810 [astro-ph].
- [241] C. Blake *et al.*, Galaxy And Mass Assembly (GAMA): improved cosmic growth measurements using multiple tracers of large-scale structure, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **436**, 3089 (2013), arXiv:1309.5556 [astro-ph.CO].
- [242] L. Samushia, W. J. Percival, and A. Raccanelli, Interpreting large-scale redshift-space distortion measurements, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **420**, 2102 (2012), arXiv:1102.1014 [astro-ph.CO].
- [243] J. U. Lange, A. P. Hearin, A. Leauthaud, F. C. van den Bosch, H. Guo, and J. DeRose, Five per cent measurements of the growth rate from simulation-based modelling of redshift-space clustering in BOSS LOWZ, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **509**, 1779 (2021), arXiv:2101.12261 [astro-ph.CO].
- [244] C. Blake, S. Brough, M. Colless, C. Contreras, W. Couch, S. Croom, D. Croton, T. M. Davis, M. J. Drinkwater, K. Forster, D. Gilbank, M. Gladders, K. Glazebrook, B. Jelliffe, R. J. Jurek, I. h. Li, B. Madore, D. C. Martin, K. Pimblet, G. B. Poole, M. Pracy, R. Sharp, E. Wisnioski, D. Woods, T. K. Wyder, and H. K. C. Yee, The WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey: joint measurements of the expansion and growth history at $z < 1$, *mnras* **425**, 405 (2012), arXiv:1204.3674 [astro-ph.CO].
- [245] C.-H. Chuang *et al.* (BOSS), The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: single-probe measurements from CMASS anisotropic galaxy clustering, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **461**, 3781 (2016), arXiv:1312.4889 [astro-ph.CO].
- [246] A. Pezzotta *et al.*, The VIMOS Public Extragalactic Redshift Survey (VIPERS): The growth of structure at $0.5 < z < 1.2$ from redshift-space distortions in the clustering of the PDR-2 final sample, *Astron. Astrophys.* **604**, A33 (2017), arXiv:1612.05645 [astro-ph.CO].
- [247] G.-B. Zhao *et al.* (eBOSS), The clustering of the SDSS-IV extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey DR14 quasar sample: a tomographic measurement of cosmic structure growth and expansion rate based on optimal redshift weights, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **482**, 3497 (2019), arXiv:1801.03043 [astro-ph.CO].
- [248] T. Okumura *et al.*, The Subaru FMOS galaxy redshift survey (FastSound). IV. New constraint on gravity theory from redshift space distortions at $z \sim 1.4$, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Jap.* **68**, 38 (2016), arXiv:1511.08083 [astro-ph.CO].

- [249] P. R. Bevington and D. K. Robinson, *Data reduction and error analysis for the physical sciences* (2003).
- [250] D. Benisty, Quantifying the S_8 tension with the Redshift Space Distortion data set, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **31**, 100766 (2021), [arXiv:2005.03751 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [251] L. Verde, Statistical methods in cosmology, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **800**, 147 (2010), [arXiv:0911.3105 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [252] W. J. C. da Silva and R. Silva, Growth of matter perturbations in the extended viscous dark energy models, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 403 (2021), [arXiv:2011.09516 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [253] R. Lazkoz, S. Nesseris, and L. Perivolaropoulos, Exploring Cosmological Expansion Parametrizations with the Gold SnIa Dataset, *JCAP* **11**, 010, [arXiv:astro-ph/0503230](#).
- [254] K. Chworowsky, S. L. Finkelstein, M. Boylan-Kolchin, E. J. McGrath, K. G. Iyer, C. Papovich, M. Dickinson, A. J. Taylor, L. Y. A. Yung, P. Arrabal Haro, M. B. Bagley, B. E. Backhaus, R. Bhatawdekar, Y. Cheng, N. J. Cleri, J. W. Cole, M. C. Cooper, L. Costantin, A. Dekel, M. Franco, S. Fujimoto, C. C. Hayward, B. W. Holwerda, M. Huertas-Company, M. Hirschmann, T. A. Hutchison, A. M. Koekemoer, R. L. Larson, Z. Li, A. S. Long, R. A. Lucas, N. Pirzkal, G. Rodighiero, R. S. Somerville, B. N. Vanderhoof, A. de la Vega, S. M. Wilkins, G. Yang, and J. A. Zavala, Evidence for a Shallow Evolution in the Volume Densities of Massive Galaxies at $z = 4-8$ from CEERS, *aj* **168**, 113 (2024), [arXiv:2311.14804 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [255] C. Horellou and J. Berge, Dark energy and the evolution of spherical overdensities, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **360**, 1393 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0504465](#).
- [256] N. J. Nunes, A. C. da Silva, and N. Aghanim, Number counts in homogeneous and inhomogeneous dark energy models, *Astron. Astrophys.* **450**, 899 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0506043](#).
- [257] L. Liberato and R. Rosenfeld, Dark energy parameterizations and their effect on dark halos, *JCAP* **07**, 009, [arXiv:astro-ph/0604071](#).
- [258] A. V. Yurov, A. V. Astashenok, and V. A. Yurov, The Cosmological Models with Jump Discontinuities, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 542 (2018), [arXiv:1710.05796 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [259] J. D. Hunter, Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9**, 90 (2007).
- [260] C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant, Array programming with NumPy, *Nature* **585**, 357 (2020).
- [261] J. D. Garrett, [garrettj403/SciencePlots 10.5281/zenodo.4106649](#) (2021).
- [262] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, Í. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors, SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python, *Nature Methods* **17**, 261 (2020).
- [263] D. J. Fixsen, The temperature of the cosmic microwave background, *The Astrophysical Journal* **707**, 916 (2009).
- [264] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A16 (2014), [arXiv:1303.5076 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [265] N. Arendse *et al.*, Cosmic dissonance: are new physics or systematics behind a short sound horizon?, *Astron. Astrophys.* **639**, A57 (2020), [arXiv:1909.07986 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [266] J. D. Barrow, Sudden future singularities, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, L79 (2004), [arXiv:gr-qc/0403084](#).
- [267] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and S. Tsujikawa, Properties of singularities in (phantom) dark energy universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063004 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0501025](#).
- [268] O. Trivedi, Recent Advances in Cosmological Singularities, *Symmetry* **16**, 298 (2024), [arXiv:2309.08954 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [269] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Quantum escape of sudden future singularity, *Phys. Lett. B* **595**, 1 (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0405078](#).
- [270] L. Fernandez-Jambrina and R. Lazkoz, Geodesic behaviour of sudden future singularities, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 121503 (2004), [arXiv:gr-qc/0410124](#).