# Yano-Schrödinger Hyperfluid: Cosmological Implications

Himanshu Chaudhary<sup>1,\*</sup> and Saddam Hussain<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Babes-Bolyai University, Kogalniceanu Street, Cluj-Napoca 400084, Romania, <sup>2</sup>Institute for Theoretical Physics and Cosmology, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China

Perfect cosmological hyperfluids generalize the concept of a perfect fluid within the framework of metric affine gravity. These hyperfluids encode the microstructure of matter including shear, dilation, and spin via the hypermomentum tensor. In this paper, we focus on the observational constraints of the recently introduced Yano-Schrödinger hyperfluid, which sources a special type of nonmetricity, that preserves the lengths of vectors under autoparallel transport. We propose a model in which the effective nonmetricity contributions to pressure and matter density are related linearly as  $p_{eff} = \omega \rho_{eff}$ . This assumption allows for a straightforward parameterization of deviations from standard cosmological behavior while maintaining analytical tractability. To constrain the effective equation of state parameter  $\omega$ , we perform a Markov Chain Monte Carlo analysis using Baryon Acoustic Oscillation measurements from the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument Year 1 and the Dark Energy Survey Year 6, along with Type Ia supernova and Cosmic Chronometer data. In our analysis, we treat  $r_d$ as a free parameter, enabling late-time data to extract posterior distributions for the Hubble constant  $(H_0)$  and the sound horizon  $(r_d)$ , along with the corresponding model parameters. Our results yield  $H_0 = 66.9 \pm 1.6 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  and  $r_d = 147.7 \pm 3.5 \text{ Mpc}$ , with  $\omega = -0.476$ . Finally, we employ various statistical metrics to compare different Yano-Schrödinger models against the ACDM model. We find that the LESC model provides a better fit to the data, suggesting that modifications to metricaffine gravity could offer viable alternatives to the standard cosmological paradigm.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The ACDM model has been highly successful in explaining many aspects of modern cosmology. It describes the Universe as being mainly composed of cold dark matter (CDM) and a cosmological constant ( $\Lambda$ ), which drives cosmic acceleration. Precise observations have allowed scientists to measure key parameters of this model with great accuracy, particularly the Hubble constant  $(H_0)$ , which represents the Universe's expansion rate. However, different methods of measuring  $H_0$  have led to a significant discrepancy known as the Hubble Tension. Estimates based on early Universe observations, such as cosmic microwave background (CMB) data from the Planck satellite, suggest  $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$  km/s/Mpc [1]. In contrast, local Universe measurements using the cosmic distance ladder calibrated with Cepheid variables and Type Ia supernovae yield a higher value, such as  $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$  [2]. This inconsistency, at a statistical significance of about  $4\sigma$  to 5.7 $\sigma$ , suggests a fundamental issue that cannot be easily explained by measurement errors alone.

This debate raises questions about the validity of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model. Potential explanations encompass

systematic observational errors, calibration uncertainties, or the possibility of physics beyond the Standard Model. To explore this, alternative cosmological frameworks have been proposed [3–16]. Additionally, independent techniques such as gravitational wave events [17–19], fast radio bursts (FRBs) [20, 21], Megamaser [22–24], Quasar Lensing [25, 26], the red giant branch tip method (TRGs) [27-29], and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAOs) [30] provide alternative ways to estimate  $H_0$ . For example, LIGO/Virgo's analysis of GW190412 combined with optical data from the Dark Energy Survey estimated  $H_0 = 77.96^{+23.0}_{-5.03}$ km/s/Mpc [31], while data from the DELVE survey and LIGO/Virgo's first three runs suggest  $H_0 = 68.84^{+15.51}_{-7.74}$ km/s/Mpc [32]. Another effective method for studying cosmic expansion is the analysis of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAOs). These oscillations originated as sound waves traveling through the hot plasma of the early Universe and became imprinted in the large-scale distribution of galaxies after recombination. BAO measurements from surveys such as the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument and the Dark Energy Survey are crucial for cosmological analysis. BAO observations provide key measurements, including  $D_A(z)/r_d$ ,  $D_V(z)/r_d$ ,  $D_M(z)/r_d$ ,  $D_H/r_d$ , and  $H(z) \cdot r_d$ , where  $r_d$ represents the comoving sound horizon at the baryon decoupling redshift  $z_d$ . The Hubble constant  $H_0$  and the sound horizon  $r_d$  are strongly linked, connecting early and late Universe measurements. The value of  $r_d$ 

<sup>\*</sup> himanshuch1729@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup> mdsaddamh6@gmail.com

is determined by early Universe physics and has been precisely constrained using Planck data [1]. An alternative approach to calibrating  $r_d$  involves using BAO data in combination with low-redshift observations while treating  $r_d$  as a free parameter. This model-independent technique avoids assumptions about early Universe conditions and the physics of recombination, offering an independent method to estimate cosmic expansion parameters [33–38].

In parallel, alternative gravity theories have been explored to address unresolved issues in Einstein's General Relativity (GR) and to explain cosmic phenomena that GR struggles with. The most relevant theoretical challenges in the concordance  $\Lambda$ CDM model involve the nature of dark energy and dark matter. These components are essential for accurately describing observational data in GR, yet their fundamental nature remains unknown. Furthermore, even with the inclusion of dark matter and dark energy, the ACDM model faces significant challenges, particularly in reconciling early-time and late-time predictions of cosmic expansion. To address these issues, theorists have proposed that while Einstein's theory is highly successful on Solar System scales, it may require modifications at cosmological scales. Many alternative gravity theories exist, which can broadly be categorized into three main classes:

- 1. Theories that extend the gravitational action, such as *f*(*R*), *f*(*R*, *T*), *f*(*R*, *L*<sub>m</sub>) gravity [39–41].
- Theories that modify the underlying geometry, such as metric-affine gravity (MAG) [42].
- 3. Theories that alter both the action and the geometry, such as  $f(Q), f(Q, T), f(\mathbb{T}), f(\mathbb{T}, T)$  gravity [43–46].

The second class is particularly interesting, as it is deeply rooted in gauge-theoretic principles [47]. These have proven to be successfull for the description of elementary particle physics: the standard model is a  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge theory. In metric-affine gravity, instead of taking the aforementioned group, one considers the Affine group,  $GA(4, \mathbb{R}) = T(4) \times GL(4, \mathbb{R})$  as the gauge group. In this approach, the metric and the connection are treated as independent variables: their dynamics are governed by the field equations obtained from variational principles. As such, torsion and nonmetricity are a consequence of the geometry-matter coupling, induced by the hypermomentum [48, 49]. Geometric modifications with torsion date back to the early work of Cartan [50–53], who was the first to introduce this concept into differential geometry. In geometries with torsion, the Ricci scalar loses its symmetry [54], necessitating a distinct form of matter on the right-hand side of the Einstein equations to source the antisymmetric component. In Einstein-Cartan theory, this is achieved by linking these antisymmetric terms to the spin of matter, such as through a Weysenhoff fluid [55]. Torsion's incorporation into cosmology was later explored by Kranas et al. [56], demonstrating that it may act as either the cosmological constant or spatial curvature, significantly affecting the Universe's dynamics. In [57], the Friedmann equations, adjusted only by variable rescaling, are derived from a semi-symmetric (often termed vectorial) torsion framework [58]. In [59], the simplest torsion-based models are compared with observational data.

In contrast, theories incorporating nonmetricity within the metric-affine framework have received less attention. The earliest formulation stems from Weyl [60], who aimed to unify electromagnetic and gravitational interactions. We believe Einstein's objection to the nonpreservation of lengths under parallel transport likely contributed to the theory's prolonged neglect. Recently, however, this geometry has been reexamined from new perspectives [61–64] and applied to semimetals [65]. Schrödinger introduced a connection [66] that resolves Einstein's critique of Weyl's geometry by preserving lengths under autoparallel transport. This geometry has gained traction in recent works by Ravera et al. [67], Ming et al. [68], and Csillag et al. [69, 70]. The preservation of lengths under autoparallel transport enables a natural generalization of the Raychaudhuri and Sachs equations within this framework [69], a task complicated by the Weyl connection or other nonmetric connections [71, 72]. This difficulty arises because nonmetricity may alter the causal structure of timelike or null congruences, potentially transforming a null vector into a timelike one or a timelike vector into a null one. In Schrödinger's geometry, however, timelike and null autoparallels maintain their causal nature [69]. In [57], it is demonstrated that symmetrizing a semi-symmetric torsion over the appropriate indices naturally yields a Schrödinger connection. Similarities between torsion and nonmetricity in the metric-affine framework are explored in [73], where Weyl-type nonmetricity is shown to be equivalent to vectorial (or semi-symmetric) torsion under projective invariance.

As previously noted, perfect fluid models, such as

the Weysenhoff fluid, have been explored within the metric-affine framework. A comprehensive generalization was proposed by Iosifidis [74, 75], introducing the *perfect cosmological hyperfluid*. This model extends the conventional perfect fluid of GR by incorporating microscopic properties of matter—such as shear, spin, and dilation—which source spacetime geometry through the connection field equations. Despite growing interest in hyperfluid models [76–80], their compatibility with observational data remains underexplored in the literature. These models have primarily been examined theoretically. This gap motivates the present study, which investigates the compatibility of the recently developed Yano-Schrödinger hyperfluid [69] with cosmological observational data.

The paper is structured as follows: in section II, we briefly review the theoretical and geometrical preliminaries to present the Yano-Schrödinger hyperfluid. Having the theoretical background at hand, in section III, we present a cosmological model, which relates the effective quantities in a linear manner:  $p_{eff} = \omega \rho_{eff}$ . In section IV, we constrain the parameters of the considered model, and study its compatibility with the data. In section VIII, we conclude by discussing the results and explores avenues for further research.

## II. THE YANO-SCHRÖDINGER HYPERFLUID

The Yano-Schrödinger hyperfluid model is a special case of the general theory of perfect hyperfluids. More precisely, the hypermomentum part of the gravitational action is designed such that the solutions of the connection field equations yield precisely the Yano-Schrödinger connection. Before we present the mathematical details, let us briefly review the Yano-Schrödinger geometry, which is a special case of nonmetric geometry.

# A. Yano-Schrödinger geometry

The most general connection in metric-affine geometry, which is described by torsion and nonmetricity takes the form

$$\Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} = \gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\mu}(-Q_{\lambda\nu\rho} + Q_{\rho\lambda\nu} + Q_{\nu\rho\lambda}) - \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\mu}(T_{\rho\nu\lambda} + T_{\nu\rho\lambda} - T_{\lambda\rho\nu}),$$
(1)

where  $\gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho}$  denotes the Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection, the nonmetricity tensor  $Q_{\lambda\nu\rho}$ 

measures the failure of preservation of lengths under parallel transport, and the torsion tensor  $T_{\lambda\nu\rho}$  is the antisymmetric part of the connection coefficient functions.

The Yano-Schrödinger geometry is a special case of the above formulation, where torsion is set to zero and the nonmetricity is vectorial, and given by

$${}^{YS}_{Q_{\lambda\nu\rho}} = -w_{\lambda}g_{\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{2}w_{\rho}g_{\lambda\nu} + \frac{1}{2}w_{\nu}g_{\rho\lambda}, \qquad (2)$$

where  $w_{\mu}$  is a one-form. Note that this is very similar to Weyl geometry, where nonmetricity takes the following form

$$\overset{W}{Q}_{\lambda\nu\rho} = -w_{\lambda}g_{\nu\rho}.$$
(3)

The difference between the two nonmetricities is completely determined by the Weyl one-form w, and is given by

$$\overset{W}{Q}_{\lambda\nu\rho} - \overset{YS}{Q}_{\lambda\nu\rho} = -\frac{1}{2}w_{\rho}g_{\lambda\nu} + \frac{1}{2}w_{\nu}g_{\rho\lambda}.$$
 (4)

This minor difference leads to a very physically desirable property, namely to the existence of fixed-length vectors. For a more detailed description, we refer the reader to [69]. By substituting the form of the Yano-Schrödinger nonmetricity in equation (1), we obtain

$$\Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\nu\rho} = \gamma^{\mu}{}_{\nu\rho} + w^{\mu}g_{\nu\rho} - \frac{1}{2}w_{\rho}\delta^{\mu}_{\nu} - \frac{1}{2}w_{\nu}\delta^{\mu}_{\rho}.$$
 (5)

In [69] the curvature tensors of this connection have been computed. The Ricci tensor reads

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \overset{\circ}{R}_{\mu\nu} + g_{\mu\nu} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\alpha} w^{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\mu} w_{\nu} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\nu} w_{\mu} \\ - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} w^{\alpha} w_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{4} w_{\mu} w_{\nu}, \tag{6}$$

while for the Ricci scalar, one has

$$R = \overset{\circ}{R} + \frac{9}{2} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\mu} w^{\mu} - \frac{9}{4} w_{\mu} w^{\mu}.$$
 (7)

# B. The gravitational field equations

The gravitational field equations of the proposed theory are derived using the Palatini formalism. Here, torsion is explicitly assumed to vanish from the outset. The general class of theories under consideration is defined by the action

$$S = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \sqrt{-g} R(\Gamma) + S_M(g, \Phi, \Gamma).$$
(8)

The variation with respect to the metric and connection yield the field equations

$$R_{(\mu\nu)}(\Gamma) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R(\Gamma) = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}, \ P_{\lambda}^{\ (\mu\nu)} = \kappa \Delta_{\lambda}^{\ (\mu\nu)}, \ (9)$$

where we have the energy-momentum and hypermomentum sources

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta \left(\sqrt{-g} \mathcal{L}_M\right)}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}, \ \Delta_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta \left(\sqrt{-g} \mathcal{L}_M\right)}{\delta \Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}},$$
(10)

and the Palatini tensor

Ē

$$P_{\lambda}^{\ (\mu\nu)} = \frac{1}{2} Q_{\lambda} g^{\mu\nu} - Q_{\lambda}^{\ \mu\nu} + \left(q^{(\mu} - \frac{1}{2} Q^{(\mu)}\right) \delta_{\lambda}^{\ \nu)}, \quad (11)$$

with  $Q_{\lambda} := Q_{\lambda\mu\nu}g^{\mu\nu}$  and  $q_{\nu} := Q_{\lambda\mu\nu}g^{\lambda\mu}$ . For matter, we now take a hyperfluid  $S_M = S_{hyp}$ , whose action is described by

$$S_{hyp} = \int d^4x \left[ J^{\mu} \left( \varphi_{,\mu} + s \theta_{,\mu} + \beta_k \alpha_{,\mu}^k \right) - \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2} \left( 2\rho(n,s,D) - \frac{5}{2} Q_{\mu} D^{\mu} + q_{\mu} D^{\mu} \right) \right],$$
(12)

where

$$D^{\mu} = \frac{D}{2\kappa} u^{\mu}$$
, for some smooth function *D*, (13)

and  $J^{\mu}$ , representing the particle flux density, depends on the fluid variables—number density *n* and comoving velocity  $u^{\mu}$ —via:

$$J^{\mu} = \sqrt{-g} n u^{\mu}, \quad |J| = \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu} J^{\nu}}, \quad n = \frac{|J|}{\sqrt{-g}},$$
$$u^{\mu} u_{\mu} = -1. \quad (14)$$

In the Lagrangian, the variables  $(\varphi, \theta, \alpha^k, \beta^k)^1$  serve as Lagrange multipliers, while *s*, the entropy per particle, was introduced by Brown [81] and later incorporated into actions for perfect fluids in various studies [82–84]. Upon varying the aforementioned action gives the hypermomentum tensor

$$\Delta_{\lambda\mu\nu} = \frac{D}{2\kappa} \left[ h_{\mu\nu} u_{\lambda} - 4h_{\lambda(\nu} u_{\mu)} + 3u_{\mu} u_{\nu} u_{\lambda} \right], \qquad (15)$$

which precisely sources the Palatini tensor of the Yano-Schrödinger geometry [69].

It is also interesting to mention that the hypermomentum tensor of a generic torsion-free cosmological hyperfluid takes the form

$$\Delta_{\lambda\mu\nu} = \omega u_{\lambda} u_{\mu} u_{\nu} + \psi u_{\lambda} h_{\mu\nu} + \phi u_{\nu} h_{\lambda\mu} + \chi u_{\mu} h_{\lambda\nu}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\omega$ ,  $\psi$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\chi$  are smooth functions of time. For the Yano-Schrödinger hyperfluid, these are all described by a single function D(t), but differ by multiplicative constants

$$\phi(t) = \chi(t) = -\frac{D(t)}{\kappa}, \ \psi(t) = -\frac{D(t)}{2\kappa}, \ \omega(t) = \frac{3D(t)}{2\kappa}.$$
(17)

The metric variation leads to the field equations [69]

$$\overset{\circ}{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \overset{\circ}{R} - \frac{5}{4} g_{\mu\nu} \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\alpha} w^{\alpha} + \frac{1}{4} \left( \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\mu} w_{\nu} + \overset{\circ}{\nabla}_{\nu} w_{\mu} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{5}{8} g_{\mu\nu} w^{\alpha} w_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{4} w_{\nu} w_{\mu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}.$$

$$(18)$$

Note that since the connection field equation is algebraic, this variational principle does not describe dynamics for the vector field w. This will be obtained later, by imposing an equation of state in a cosmological setting [69].

# III. YANO-SCHRÖDINGER HYPERFLUID COSMOLOGY

In this section, we review the cosmological evolution of a Yano-Schrödinger (YS) hyperfluid, and obtain a novel cosmological model, by imposing a linear effective equation of state. We work in the spatially flat FLRW metric

$$ds^{2} = -dt^{2} + a^{2}(t)\delta_{ij}dx^{i}dx^{j},$$
(19)

where a(t) denotes the scale factor. The matter source is taken as a standard perfect fluid, described by the energy momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \rho u_{\mu} u_{\nu} + p(u_{\mu} u_{\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}).$$
 (20)

In a comoving frame with  $u_{\mu} = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ , the nonmetricity vector is characterized by a smooth function

$$w_{\nu} = (\psi(t), 0, 0, 0),$$
 (21)

in accordance with the cosmological principle. In these notations, the Friedmann equations read [69]

$$3H^2 = 8\pi\rho + \frac{3}{2}\dot{\psi} + \frac{15}{2}H\psi - \frac{9}{8}\psi^2 = 8\pi(\rho + \rho_{eff}),$$
(22)

$$3H^2 + 2\dot{H} = -8\pi p + \frac{5}{2}\dot{\psi} + 4H\psi - \frac{3}{8}\psi^2 = -8\pi(p + p_{eff})$$
(23)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> where the index k ranges from 1 to 3.

where the Hubble parameter is

$$H = \frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)}.$$
 (24)

Additionally, we define dimensionless variables  $(h, \tau, \Psi, r, P)$ , as follows:

$$H = H_0 h, \tau = H_0 t, \psi = H_0 \Psi, \rho = \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi} r, p = \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi} P.$$
(25)

enabling the reformulation of the preceding equations into the form presented below:

$$3h^2 = 3r + \frac{3}{2}u + \frac{15}{2}h\Psi - \frac{9}{8}\Psi^2,$$
 (26)

$$2\frac{dh}{d\tau} + 3h^2 = \frac{5}{2}u + 4h\Psi - \frac{3}{8}\Psi^2.$$
 (27)

The Friedmann equations of a YS hyperfluid in redshift space become:

$$h^{2}(z) = r(z) + \frac{1}{2}u(z) + \frac{5}{2}h(z)\Psi(z) - \frac{3}{8}\Psi(z)^{2}$$
, (28)

$$3h^{2}(z) - 2(1+z)h(z)\frac{dh(z)}{dz} = -3P(z) + \frac{5}{2}u(z) + 4h(z)\Psi(z) - \frac{3}{8}\Psi^{2}.$$
 (29)

We will consider the case of dust matter by setting P = 0 in Eqs (22) and (23). Then, by imposing the condition  $p_{eff} = w\rho_{eff}$  and using the dimensional parameters defined in Eq (25), one can get the Hubble function as a system of differential equations:

$$\frac{d\Psi(z)}{dz} = \frac{2(8+15\omega)h(z)\Psi(z) + \frac{13(-1+3\omega)}{4}\Psi^2(z)}{(5+3\omega)(1+z)h(z)}, \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{dh(z)}{dz} = \frac{1}{2(1+z)h(z)} \left( (1+z)h\frac{5}{2}\frac{d\Psi(z)}{dz} - 4h(z)\Psi(z) + \frac{3}{8}\Psi^2(z) + 3h^2(z) \right).$$
(31)

These equations have to be solved with the initial conditions h(0) = 1 and  $\Psi(0) := \Psi_0$ .

# IV. METHODOLOGY AND DATA DESCRIPTION

To constrain the parameters of the LESC model in hyperfluid framework, we adopt a Bayesian statistical approach. The model is governed by a system of coupled differential equations describing the evolution of the Hubble parameter H(z) as a function of redshift z. These equations, derived from theoretical considerations, are solved numerically using the solve\_ivp function from the scipy library [85]. For numerical integration, we employ the Radau method, which is wellsuited for stiff differential equations, over the redshift range  $0 \le z \le 3$ . To ensure accuracy, we set relative and absolute tolerances to  $10^{-3}$  and  $10^{-6}$ , respectively. Once the numerical solutions are obtained, we construct a likelihood function to evaluate how well the model aligns with observational data. This function incorporates key datasets, including measurements from Cosmic Chronometers, the Pantheon<sup>+</sup> dataset (excluding SHOES calibration), and recent Baryon Acoustic Oscillation data from the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument Year 1 and Dark Energy Survey Year 6. To enforce physical constraints and prior knowledge, we define uniform prior distributions for the model parameters. The posterior distribution is sampled using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, implemented via the emcee library [86]. This approach enables efficient exploration of the parameter space by generating a sequence of samples converging to the posterior distribution. To enhance computational efficiency, we parallelize the sampling process using the multiprocessing library, leveraging multiple CPU cores [87]. After running the MCMC chains, we discard an initial burn-in period to remove dependence on the starting conditions and thin the chains to reduce autocorrelation, ensuring robust results. Finally, we visualize the posterior distributions using triangular plots created with the getdist library [88]. These plots intuitively represent the pairwise correlations and marginal distributions of the parameters, offering valuable insights into the constraints on the model. To determine the posterior distribution of the LESC model, we construct a likelihood function for each dataset. Below, we describe each dataset and the corresponding formulation of its likelihood function.

• **Cosmic Chronometers:** In our analysis, we use a subset of 15 Hubble measurements from a total of 31 data points, spanning the redshift range  $0.1791 \le z \le 1.965$  [89], obtained using the differential age technique [90]. This method, based on passively evolving massive galaxies formed at  $z \sim$  2 – 3, enables direct, model-independent estimation of the Hubble parameter via  $\Delta z/\Delta t$ , minimizing astrophysical assumptions [91, 92]. To infer parameter distributions, we apply the likelihood function defined as:  $\mathcal{L}_{CC} = e^{\frac{-1}{2}(\Delta H^T(z)\mathbf{C}^{-1}\Delta H(z))}$ , where  $\Delta H(z) = \mathbf{H}_{model}(\theta) - \mathbf{H}_{obs}$  represents the difference between theoretical and observed Hubble values. Following by [93], the full covariance matrix **C**, which incorporates both statistical and systematic uncertainties, has been considered. Its inverse,  $\mathbf{C}^{-1}$ , ensures a comprehensive treatment of these uncertainties.

- **Type Ia supernova:** We also use the Pantheon<sup>+</sup> without SHOES calibration, which comprises light curves for 1701 Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia) across a redshift range of  $0 \le z \le 2.3$  [94], we utilize the likelihood function defined in [95, 96]. This approach incorporates both statistical and systematic uncertainties through a covariance matrix [97]. The likelihood function is defined as follows:  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SNe Ia}} = e^{\frac{-1}{2}(\Delta \mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{C}_{\text{total}}^{-1} \Delta \mathbf{D})}$ , where  $\Delta \mathbf{D}$  represents the vector of residuals between the observed distance moduli  $\mu(z_i)$  and the model-predicted distance moduli  $\mu_{\text{model}}(z_i, \theta)$ . Each residual,  $\Delta D_i$ , is computed as:  $\Delta D_i = \mu(z_i) - \mu_{\text{model}}(z_i, \theta)$ . The total covariance matrix,  $C_{total}$ , combines both statistical ( $C_{stat}$ ) and systematic ( $C_{sys}$ ) uncertainties. Its inverse,  $C_{total}^{-1}$  is used to account for these uncertainties in the analysis. The model-predicted distance moduli are given by:  $\mu_{model}(z_i) =$  $5\log_{10}\left(\frac{d_L(z)}{\text{Mpc}}\right) + \mathcal{M} + 25$ , where the luminosity distance  $d_L(z)$  in a flat FLRW Universe is defined as:  $d_L(z) = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}$ . Here, *c* is the speed of light, and H(z) denotes the Hubble parameter. This method reveals a degeneracy between the parameters  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $H_0$ . Consequently, external datasets are incorporated to resolve this degeneracy.
- **Baryon Acoustic Oscillation:** We incorporate the latest Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) data from Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument Year 1 (DESI-Y1) and Dark Energy Survey Year 6 (DES-Y6) [98, 99]. The BAO scale is determined by the sound horizon at the drag epoch  $z_d \approx 1060$ , marking the decoupling of photons and baryons. The sound horizon  $r_d$  is given by:  $r_d = \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z)}{E(z)} dz$ , where  $c_s(z) \approx c \left(3 + \frac{9\rho_b(z)}{4\rho_\gamma(z)}\right)^{-0.5}$  is the speed of sound in the baryon-photon fluid, with  $\rho_b(z)$  and  $\rho_\gamma(z)$  as the baryon and photon densities, re-

6

spectively. The function  $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$  incorporates cosmological model parameters. In a flat ACDM cosmology, the sound horizon at drag is estimated as  $r_d = 147.09 \pm 0.26 \,\mathrm{Mpc}$ [1]. In this analysis, we treat  $r_d$  as a free parameter, allowing late-time data to constrain the value of sound horizon [33-37]. For the BAO datasets, we compute the Hubble distance  $D_H(z)$ comoving angular diameter distance  $D_M(z)$ , and volume-average distance  $D_V(z)$ , which are define as follows:-  $D_H(z) = \frac{c}{H(z)}, D_M(z) = c \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')},$ and  $D_V(z) = \left[z D_M^2(z) D_H(z)\right]^{1/3}$ . Here, c represents the speed of light in a vacuum. To analyze the distribution of parameters, the following ratios are considered:  $\frac{D_M(z)}{r_d}$ ,  $\frac{D_H(z)}{r_d}$ , and  $\frac{D_V(z)}{r_d}$ . The likelihood function for the BAO dataset is given by:  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{BAO}} = e^{\frac{-1}{2}(\Delta D_Y^T \cdot \mathbf{C}_{D_Y}^{-1} \cdot \Delta D_Y)}$ , where  $\Delta D_Y =$  $D_{Y/r_d,Model} - D_{Y/r_d,Data}$  for Y = H, M, V, and  $\mathbf{C}_{D_V}^{-1}$ is the inverse of the covariance matrix. The covariance matrix  $C_{D_{Y}}$  is typically diagonal, with elements  $\sigma_{D_{Y}}^2$  representing observational uncertainties, i.e.,  $C_{D_Y} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{D_Y}^2)$ . Its inverse is obtained as  $\mathbf{C}_{D_Y}^{-1} = (\operatorname{diag}(\sigma_{D_Y}^2))^{-1}$ . The total likelihood function is given by:  $\mathcal{L}_{BAO} = \mathcal{L}_{D_H/r_d} \times \mathcal{L}_{D_V/r_d} \times$  $\mathcal{L}_{D_M/r_d}$ .

The parameter distributions of the LESC model within the YS Hyperfluid framework are obtained by maximizing the likelihood function,  $\mathcal{L}$ . The total likelihood function, denoted as  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Tot}}$ , is expressed as:  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Tot}} = e^{\frac{-\chi^2_{\text{Tot}}}{2}}$ , where

$$\chi^2_{\rm Tot} = \chi^2_{\rm CC} + \chi^2_{\rm SNeIa} + \chi^2_{\rm BAO}$$
 (32)

#### A. Comparative analysis with the $\Lambda$ CDM model

After determining the mean values of the free parameters in the LESC model, it is essential to assess the model's predictions in comparison to well-established  $\Lambda$ CDM model, which serves as a benchmark. A key aspect of this analysis involves studying the evolution of the Hubble parameter H(z). For the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM framework, the Hubble parameter is given by:  $H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_{m0})}$ . Here, we adopt  $H_0 = 67.8 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$  and  $\Omega_{m0} = 0.328$ . The behavior of H(z) as a function of redshift is then examined for both the LESC model in the YS hyperfluid framework and the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, and the results are compared with the CC dataset. Additionally, we calculate



FIG. 1: The posterior distributions of LESC model parameters in the YS hyperfluid framework at 68% (1 $\sigma$ ) and 95% (2 $\sigma$ ) credible intervals.

Models	Parameter	Prior	Mean Values		
	$H_0$	[50.,90.]	67.8±1.6		
$\Lambda \texttt{CDM} Model$	$\Omega_{m0}$	[0, 1.]	$0.328 {\pm} 0.013$		
	$\mathcal{M}$	[-20, -18]	$-19.423{\pm}0.052$		
	r <sub>d</sub>	[100,300]	$147.3 \pm 3.5$		
	$H_0$	[50.,90.]	66.9±1.6		
	$\Psi_0$	[0., 1.]	$0.396 {\pm} 0.011$		
LESC Model	ω	[-1., 0.]	$-0.476{\pm}0.014$		
	$\mathcal{M}$	[-20, -18]	$-19.400{\pm}0.051$		
	r <sub>d</sub>	[100., 300.]	$147.7 \pm 3.5$		

TABLE I: Best-fit parameter values with 68% (1 $\sigma$ ) credible intervals, including prior ranges, for the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model compared with the LESC model within the YS hyperfluid framework.

the distance modulus  $\mu(z)$  to further evaluate the LESC model's predictions. The distance modulus is defined as:  $\mu(z) = 5\log_{10}(D_L(z)) + 25$ , where  $D_L(z)$  is the luminosity distance. The luminosity distance itself is expressed as  $D_L(z) = (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{c}{H(z')} dz'$ . Here, *c* represents the speed of light in a vacuum, and H(z') denotes the Hubble parameter at redshift z'. Using the best fit values obtained from the MCMC analysis, we compute the distance modulus for the LESC model, denoted as  $\mu_{\text{LESC}}(z)$ , and compare it with the  $\Lambda$ CDM model,  $\mu_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(z)$ . Finally, these theoretical predictions are plotted alongside observational data from 1701 Type Ia su-

# V. COSMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the expansion history of the universe using the deceleration parameter q(z)and the jerk parameter j(z), which provide insights into cosmic evolution [100, 101]. The deceleration parameter determines whether the expansion is accelerating or decelerating, while the jerk parameter characterizes variations in acceleration. A key feature of the standard ACDM model is that the jerk parameter remains constant at j(z) = 1 [101]. Using Planck 2018 parameters, the present-day deceleration parameter is approximately  $q(0) \approx -0.526$ , indicating that the Universe is currently undergoing accelerated expansion. Our approach involves comparing different cosmological models, specifically the LESC model, against  $\Lambda$ CDM. By analyzing the behavior of q(z) and j(z) across models, we aim to evaluate how well the LESC framework aligns with observational data and whether it provides a viable alternative in describing the Universe's expansion [95, 102].

#### **VI.** Om(z) **DIAGNOSTIC**

To compare LESC model in YS hyperfluid framework with standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model, we'll also utilize the Om(z) diagnostic [103, 104], which is a crucial tool for differentiating alternative cosmological models. The Om(z) function is defined as:

$$Om(z) = \frac{H^2(z)/H_0^2 - 1}{(1+z)^3 - 1} = \frac{h^2(z) - 1}{(1+z)^3 - 1}.$$
 (33)

In the case of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, Om(z) is a constant equal to the present-day matter density, denoted as r(0) = 0.3166. However, in other theories of gravity that deviate from the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, changes in the value of Om(z) over time indicate different types of cosmic evolution. Specifically, if Om(z) increases (positive slope), it suggests a phantom-like evolution. Conversely, if Om(z) decreases (negative slope), it points to quintessence-like dynamics.



FIG. 2: The evolution of the Hubble parameter and Distance Modulus as functions of redshift (z) for the  $\Lambda$ CDM and LESC model in the YS hyperfluid framework.



FIG. 3: The evolution of deceleration and jerk parameters with redshift (z) for the  $\Lambda$ CDM and LESC model in the YS hyperfluid framework.

# VII. MATTER DENSITY r(z) AND NONMETRICITY $\Psi(z)$

In this section, we will examine the behavior of two important quantities: matter density r(z), which describes the evolution of matter energy density with redshift z, and nonmetricity  $\Psi(z)$  in the YS hyperfluid framework, which quantifies deviations from Levi-Civita connections and affects gravitational dynamics.

# VIII. STATISTICAL METRICS

To distinguish the LESC model from the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model, we employ several statistical metrics to assess the quality of the fit tabulated in Table II.

One key approach is maximum likelihood estimation, which allows us to compute the minimum chi-squared value,  $\chi^2_{min'}$  using the relation:  $\mathcal{L}_{tot} = e^{-\frac{\chi^2_{tot}}{2}}$ . After obtaining  $\chi^2_{min'}$  we compute the reduced chi-squared statistic [105] to assess the goodness of the fit, defined as:  $\chi^2_{red} = \frac{\chi^2_{min}}{DOF}$ , where DOF (degrees of freedom) is the difference between the number of data points and the number of model parameters. A  $\chi^2_{red}$  value close to 1 indicates a good fit, while a significantly lower value may suggest overfitting, and a much higher value implies a poor fit. In addition to chi-squared analysis, we also compute the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [106–110]. These criteria help compare different models by balancing the goodness of fit with model complex-



FIG. 4: The evolution of the Om(z) diagnostic profile for the  $\Lambda$ CDM and LESC model in YS hyperfluid framework.



FIG. 5: The evolution of the dimensionless matter density r(z) profile for the LESC model in YS hyperfluid framework.



FIG. 6: The evolution of the dimensionless nonmetricity  $\Psi(z)$  profile for the LESC model in YS hyperfluid framework.

ity. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is given by: AIC =  $\chi^2_{\min} + 2k_{tot}$ , where  $k_{tot}$  represents the total number of free parameters, which is 5 in our case. Similarly, the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) is calculated as: BIC =  $\chi^2_{\min} + k_{tot} \ln(\mathcal{N}_{tot})$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_{tot}$  is the total number of observational data points, which is 1729 in our case. To compare LESC model, we compute the differences in AIC and BIC relative to the  $\Lambda CDM$ model:  $\Delta AIC = AIC_{LESC Model} - AIC_{\Lambda CDM}$ ,  $\Delta BIC =$  $BIC_{LESC Model} - BIC_{\Lambda CDM}$ . According to Jeffreys' scales [111], we interpret these differences as follows: If  $|\Delta AIC|$ is between 0 and 2, the models are statistically similar,  $|\Delta AIC| \ge 4$ , the model with the higher AIC is less favorable. For BIC, a  $\triangle$ BIC between 0 and 2 suggests weak evidence against the model, between 2 and 6 indicates strong evidence against it, and greater than 6 means very strong evidence against it. A negative  $\Delta AIC$ or  $\triangle$ BIC suggests that the LESC model provides a better statistical fit than ACDM. Furthermore, the statistical significance of the model fit was assessed using the p-value, calculated as:  $p = 1 - F_{\chi^2_{\min}}(\chi \mid \nu)$ , where  $F_{\chi^2_{\min}}(\chi \mid \nu)$  represents the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the chi-squared distribution, and  $\nu$  denotes the degrees of freedom. A p-value below 0.05 (p < 0.05) is generally considered statistically significant, providing strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis [112].

#### IX. RESULTS

Fig. 1, shows the corner plot illustrating the parameter constraints for the LESC model within the YS hyperfluid framework. The plot features 1D marginalized distributions along the diagonal and 2D contour plots in the off-diagonal terms, highlighting the correlations between different parameter pairs. Table I, presents the mean values along with the 68% (1 $\sigma$ ) credible intervals and prior ranges for both the ACDM model and the LESC model within the YS hyperfluid framework. We observe that the extracted value of  $H_0$  and  $r_d$  in the ACDM and LESC models is very close to the value predicted by the Planck estimation. On the other hand, the predicted values of  $\Omega_{m0}$  and  $\Omega_{\Lambda 0}$  are close to the values predicted by the Planck collaboration ( $\Omega_m$  =  $0.315 \pm 0.007$ ,  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.685 \pm 0.007$ ). Fig. 2, shows the evolution of the Hubble parameter H(z) and the distance modulus  $\mu(z)$  for the  $\Lambda$ CDM and LESC models, compared against CC and SNe Ia measurements as a function of redshift. As shown in Fig. 2a, the LESC model closely agrees with the standard ACDM model at low redshifts (z < 1.5). However, at higher redshifts, the

Model	$\chi^2_{\mathrm{tot},min}$	$\chi^2_{\rm red}$	AIC	ΔΑΙΟ	BIC	ΔBIC	p-Value
ΛCDM Model	1787.85	1.036	1795.85	0	1817.67	0	0.142
LESC Model	1781.16	1.033	1781.16	-4.68	1818.43	0.765	0.164

TABLE II: Summary of  $\chi^2_{tot}^{min}$ , AIC,  $\Delta$ AIC, BIC,  $\Delta$ BIC, and p-Value for the  $\Lambda$ CDM Model and ECC and LESC models in YS hyperfluid framework.

LESC model begins to deviate from ACDM. A similar trend can be observed in Fig. 2b, where the LESC model again exhibits close agreement with  $\Lambda$ CDM. However, in this case, the deviation is not easily visible to the naked eye. To highlight this difference, we include an inset subplot within the  $\mu(z)$  plot to better show the deviation between the ACDM and LESC models. Fig. 3, shows the evolution of cosmographic parameters as a function of redshift. In Fig. 3a, the evolution of the deceleration parameter is presented. We observe that the LESC model exhibits a different evolution from the standard ACDM model at high redshifts. However, at low redshifts, both models show similar behavior. A similar trend can be seen in Fig. 3b, which shows the evolution of the jerk parameter as a function of redshift. At high redshifts, the LESC model deviates from the ACDM model, but as the redshift decreases, both models converge, showing similar behavior at j(0). Fig. 4, shows the evolution of the Om(z) profile for the  $\Lambda CDM$ model and the LESC model within the YS hyperfluid framework. The LESC model displays a monotonic decrease with increasing redshift, a behavior characteristic of quintessence-like evolution. Fig. 5, illustrates the evolution of the matter density profile, where the matter density in the LESC model deviates significantly from the  $(1+z)^3$  scaling with increasing redshift expected in the concordance model. However, in the lower redshift, both models predict nearly identical result. The evolution of non-metricity, shown in Fig. 6, remains positive across cosmic history. In the recent Universe (up to z = 0.5), it is monotonically decreasing, while in the early Universe, it was an increasing function. Table II presents a comparative statistical analysis of the ACDM model and the LESC model in the YS hyperfluid framework. The ACDM model has a total chi-squared value of 1787.85 and a reduced chi-squared of 1.036, indicating a reasonable fit to the data. The AIC for the  $\Lambda$ CDM model is 1795.85, and the BIC is 1817.67, both serving as measures of the model's goodness of fit while penalizing for complexity. The p-value for the  $\Lambda$ CDM model is 0.142, which is above the 0.05 threshold, indicating no significant deviation from the data. The LESC model has a lower total chi-squared value of 1781.16 and a reduced

chi-squared of 1.033, suggesting a slightly improved fit compared to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model. The AIC for the LESC model is also 1781.16, with a  $\triangle$ AIC value of -4.68, indicating a better fit relative to the ACDM model based on this criterion. The BIC for the LESC model is 1818.43, with a  $\Delta$ BIC of 0.765, suggesting a slightly less favorable comparison when accounting for model complexity. The *p*-value for the LESC model is 0.164, which, while marginally higher than that of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, remains above the statistical significance threshold, confirming that both models provide acceptable fits to the data. Overall, the negative  $\Delta$ AIC value suggests that the LESC model provides a better statistical fit compared to the ACDM model. However, the small differences in AIC and BIC indicate that neither model is overwhelmingly favored. Both models demonstrate good compatibility with the data, with similar *p* values, but the LESC model's slightly lower AIC implies a modest advantage in terms of balancing goodness of fit and model complexity.

#### X. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have investigated the FLRW cosmology of the Yano Schrödinger, which is a natural extension of the perfect fluid utilized in GR. Unlike standard cosmological models like ACDM, which focus on spacetime curvature through the Einstein-Hilbert action, the YS hyperfluid incorporates nonmetricity, sourced through a specific type of hypermomentum. Nonmetricity adds new geometric features that affect the behaviour of energy and matter. By including these elements, the cosmic dynamics is modified, which could offer new insights into dark energy and cosmic expansion. The effects of nonmetricity, often neglected in simpler frameworks, help reveal underlying mechanisms that govern cosmic expansion. The YS framework provides a self consistent way to incorporate these effects while maintaining stability and causality in the field equations. Ultimately, it offers a richer framework for exploring the connection between nonmetricity and dark energy, contributing to our understanding of the

accelerated expansion of the Universe. From an observational perspective, we propose the LESC model, where effective nonmetricity contributions to pressure and matter density are linearly related as  $p_{\rm eff} = \omega \rho_{\rm eff}$ and provide the comparative analysis with the ACDM model. The comparative analysis between the  $\Lambda CDM$ model and the LESC model in the YS hyperfluid framework suggests that both models provide a statistically viable fit to the observational data. The parameter constraints of the LESC model predict values of  $H_0$  and  $r_d$  that are in close agreement with Planck predictions. However, the evolution of key cosmological parameters such as H(z),  $\mu(z)$ , the deceleration parameter, the jerk parameter, and the Om(z) profile reveals subtle deviations of the LESC model at higher redshifts, particularly in the behaviour of nonmetricity. From a statistical perspective, the LESC model exhibits a slightly better fit to the data, as indicated by its lower  $\chi^2$ , AIC, and BIC values. While the improvement is not drastic enough to decisively favor the LESC model over ACDM, the results suggest that the LESC model offers a promising alternative framework that is capable of capturing subtle devi-

- P. Collaboration, N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. Banday, R. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, *et al.*, "Planck 2018 results. vi. cosmological parameters," 2020.
- [2] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, G. S. Anand, L. Breuval, *et al.*, "A comprehensive measurement of the local value of the hubble constant with 1 km s- 1 mpc-1 uncertainty from the hubble space telescope and the sh0es team," *The Astrophysical journal letters*, vol. 934, no. 1, p. L7, 2022.
- [3] H. Miao and Z. Huang, "The h<sub>0</sub> tension in non-flat qcdm cosmology," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 868, no. 1, p. 20, 2018.
- [4] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, "Investigating cosmic discordance," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, vol. 908, no. 1, p. L9, 2021.
- [5] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, "A simple phenomenological emergent dark energy model can resolve the hubble tension," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, vol. 883, no. 1, p. L3, 2019.
- [6] G.-B. Zhao, M. Raveri, L. Pogosian, Y. Wang, R. G. Crittenden, W. J. Handley, W. J. Percival, F. Beutler, J. Brinkmann, C.-H. Chuang, et al., "Dynamical dark energy in light of the latest observations," *Nature Astronomy*, vol. 1, no. 9, pp. 627–632, 2017.
- [7] J. Ryan, Y. Chen, and B. Ratra, "Baryon acoustic oscillation, hubble parameter, and angular size measurement constraints on the hubble constant, dark energy dynam-

ations from standard cosmology while maintaining consistency with observational constraints. The ultimate motivation for this study is to explore whether the modifications introduced by nonmetricity and hypermomentum can deepen our understanding of cosmic evolution. The LESC model in the YS hyperfluid provides a competitive fit to observational data, suggesting it is a viable framework for understanding the universe. Future investigations, particularly with more precise data from upcoming surveys like the James Webb Space Telescope, Euclid, or the Vera C. Rubin Observatory, will further test the YS cosmology predictions. These observations could clarify whether the deviations in the LESC model reflect new physical phenomena or fall within statistical uncertainties. Thus, studying FLRW cosmology of the Yano Schrödinger represents a step towards a more nuanced understanding of the universe's evolution, integrating additional geometric structures into cosmological models. This could help resolve key puzzles, such as the nature of dark energy and tensions in current cosmological measurements, making it an exciting avenue for future research in metric affine gravity and cosmology.

ics, and spatial curvature," Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, vol. 488, no. 3, pp. 3844–3856, 2019.

- [8] Q. Ding, T. Nakama, and Y. Wang, "A gigaparsec-scale local void and the hubble tension," *Science China Physics*, *Mechanics & Astronomy*, vol. 63, pp. 1–9, 2020.
- [9] M. Liu, Z. Huang, X. Luo, H. Miao, N. K. Singh, and L. Huang, "Can non-standard recombination resolve the hubble tension?," *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy*, vol. 63, pp. 1–5, 2020.
- [10] S. Vagnozzi, "New physics in light of the h<sub>0</sub> tension: An alternative view," *Physical Review D*, vol. 102, no. 2, p. 023518, 2020.
- [11] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, "Early dark energy can resolve the hubble tension," *Physical review letters*, vol. 122, no. 22, p. 221301, 2019.
- [12] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Chakraborty, "Observational constraints on oneparameter dynamical dark-energy parametrizations and the *h*<sub>0</sub> tension," *Physical Review D*, vol. 99, no. 4, p. 043543, 2019.
- [13] L. Xu and Q.-G. Huang, "Detecting the neutrinos mass hierarchy from cosmological data," *Science China Physics*, *Mechanics & Astronomy*, vol. 61, pp. 1–4, 2018.
- [14] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, "Reconciling planck with the local value of h<sub>0</sub> in extended parameter space," *Physics Letters B*, vol. 761, pp. 242–246, 2016.
- [15] Q.-G. Huang and K. Wang, "How the dark energy can reconcile planck with local determination of the hubble constant," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 76, pp. 1–

5,2016.

- [16] S. Hussain, "Non-adiabatic particle production scenario in algebraically coupled quintessence field with dark matter fluid," 3 2024.
- [17] K. Mooley, A. Deller, O. Gottlieb, E. Nakar, G. Hallinan, S. Bourke, D. Frail, A. Horesh, A. Corsi, and K. Hotokezaka, "Superluminal motion of a relativistic jet in the neutron-star merger gw170817," *Nature*, vol. 561, no. 7723, pp. 355–359, 2018.
- [18] D. C. H. J. K. V. R. D. T. L. S. D. V. S. Y. S. ...
  245 and L. C. O. C. A. I. .. H. G. .. H. D. A. .. M. C. ..
  P. D. V. S. . 247, "A gravitational-wave standard siren measurement of the hubble constant," *Nature*, vol. 551, no. 7678, pp. 85–88, 2017.
- [19] K. Hotokezaka, E. Nakar, O. Gottlieb, S. Nissanke, K. Masuda, G. Hallinan, K. P. Mooley, and A. T. Deller, "A hubble constant measurement from superluminal motion of the jet in gw170817," *Nature Astronomy*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 940–944, 2019.
- [20] Q. Wu, G.-Q. Zhang, and F.-Y. Wang, "An 8 per cent determination of the hubble constant from localized fast radio bursts," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, vol. 515, no. 1, pp. L1–L5, 2022.
- [21] C. James, E. Ghosh, J. Prochaska, K. Bannister, S. Bhandari, C. Day, A. Deller, M. Glowacki, A. Gordon, K. Heintz, et al., "A measurement of hubble's constant using fast radio bursts," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, vol. 516, no. 4, pp. 4862–4881, 2022.
- [22] D. Pesce, J. Braatz, M. Reid, A. Riess, D. Scolnic, J. Condon, F. Gao, C. Henkel, C. Impellizzeri, C. Kuo, *et al.*, "The megamaser cosmology project. xiii. combined hubble constant constraints," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, vol. 891, no. 1, p. L1, 2020.
- [23] M. Reid, D. W. Pesce, and A. Riess, "An improved distance to ngc 4258 and its implications for the hubble constant," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, vol. 886, no. 2, p. L27, 2019.
- [24] C. Kuo, J. Braatz, K. Lo, M. Reid, S. Suyu, D. Pesce, J. Condon, C. Henkel, and C. Impellizzeri, "The megamaser cosmology project. vi. observations of ngc 6323," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 800, no. 1, p. 26, 2015.
- [25] M. Millon, A. Galan, F. Courbin, T. Treu, S. Suyu, X. Ding, S. Birrer, G.-F. Chen, A. Shajib, D. Sluse, *et al.*, "An exploration of systematic uncertainties in the inference of h<sub>0</sub> from time-delay cosmography," *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, vol. 639, p. A101, 2020.
- [26] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger, M. W. Auger, *et al.*, "H0licow–xiii. a 2.4 per cent measurement of h<sub>0</sub> from lensed quasars: 5.3 σ tension between early-and late-universe probes," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, vol. 498, no. 1, pp. 1420–1439, 2020.
- [27] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, D. Hatt, T. J. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. L. Beaton, C. R. Burns, M. G. Lee, A. J. Monson, J. R. Neeley, *et al.*, "The carnegie-chicago hubble program. viii. an independent determination of the hub-

ble constant based on the tip of the red giant branch," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 882, no. 1, p. 34, 2019.

- [28] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, T. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. Beaton, M. G. Lee, A. Monson, J. Neeley, and J. Rich, "Calibration of the tip of the red giant branch," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 891, no. 1, p. 57, 2020.
- [29] W. L. Freedman, "Measurements of the hubble constant: tensions in perspective," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 919, no. 1, p. 16, 2021.
- [30] G. Addison, D. Watts, C. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw, and J. Weiland, "Elucidating λcdm: impact of baryon acoustic oscillation measurements on the hubble constant discrepancy," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 853, no. 2, p. 119, 2018.
- [31] W. Ballard, A. Palmese, I. M. Hernandez, S. BenZvi, J. Moon, A. Ross, G. Rossi, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, R. Blum, *et al.*, "A dark siren measurement of the hubble constant with the ligo/virgo gravitational wave event gw190412 and desi galaxies," *Research Notes of the AAS*, vol. 7, no. 11, p. 250, 2023.
- [32] V. Alfradique, C. R. Bom, A. Palmese, G. Teixeira, L. Santana-Silva, A. Drlica-Wagner, A. Riley, C. E. Martínez-Vázquez, D. Sand, G. S. Stringfellow, et al., "A dark siren measurement of the hubble constant using gravitational wave events from the first three ligo/virgo observing runs and delve," Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, vol. 528, no. 2, pp. 3249–3259, 2024.
- [33] L. Pogosian, G.-B. Zhao, and K. Jedamzik, "Recombination-independent determination of the sound horizon and the hubble constant from bao," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, vol. 904, no. 2, p. L17, 2020.
- [34] K. Jedamzik, L. Pogosian, and G.-B. Zhao, "Why reducing the cosmic sound horizon alone can not fully resolve the hubble tension," *Communications Physics*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 123, 2021.
- [35] L. Pogosian, G.-B. Zhao, and K. Jedamzik, "A consistency test of the cosmological model at the epoch of recombination using desi bao and planck measurements," *arXiv preprint arXiv*:2405.20306, 2024.
- [36] W. Lin, X. Chen, and K. J. Mack, "Early-universe-physics insensitive and uncalibrated cosmic standards: Constraints on  $\omega_m$  and implications for the hubble tension," *arXiv preprint arXiv*:2102.05701, 2021.
- [37] S. Vagnozzi, "Seven hints that early-time new physics alone is not sufficient to solve the hubble tension," *Universe*, vol. 9, no. 9, p. 393, 2023.
- [38] S. Hussain, S. Nelleri, and K. Bhattacharya, "Comprehensive study of k-essence model: dynamical system analysis and observational constraints from latest Type Ia supernova and BAO observations," *JCAP*, vol. 03, p. 025, 2025.
- [39] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, "f(r) theories of gravity," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 82, pp. 451–497, Mar 2010.
- [40] T. Harko, F. S. N. Lobo, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov,
   "f(r,t) gravity," Phys. Rev. D, vol. 84, p. 024020, Jul 2011.
- [41] T. Harko and F. S. N. Lobo, "f(r, l\_m) gravity," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 70, pp. 373–379, 2010.

- [42] F. W. Hehl, J. McCrea, E. W. Mielke, and Y. Ne'eman, "Metric-affine gauge theory of gravity: field equations, noether identities, world spinors, and breaking of dilation invariance," *Physics Reports*, vol. 258, no. 1, pp. 1– 171, 1995.
- [43] L. Heisenberg, "Review on f(q) gravity," *Physics Reports*, vol. 1066, pp. 1–78, 2024. Review on f(Q) gravity.
- [44] Y. Xu, G. Li, T. Harko, and S.-D. Liang, "f(q, t) gravity," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 79, Aug. 2019.
- [45] Y.-F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, and E. N. Saridakis, "f(t) teleparallel gravity and cosmology," *Reports* on Progress in Physics, vol. 79, p. 106901, Sept. 2016.
- [46] T. Harko, F. S. Lobo, G. Otalora, and E. N. Saridakis, "f(t,t) gravity and cosmology," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2014, p. 021–021, Dec. 2014.
- [47] M. Blagojević and F. W. Hehl, "Gauge theories of gravitation," 2022.
- [48] F. W. Hehl, G. D. Kerlick, and P. von der Heyde, "On hypermomentum in general relativity i. the notion of hypermomentum," *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung A*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 111–114, 1976.
- [49] D. Iosifidis, "Non-riemannian cosmology: The role of shear hypermomentum," *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, vol. 18, p. 2150129, May 2021.
- [50] E. Cartan Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences (Paris), vol. 174, p. 593, 1922.
- [51] E. Cartan Annales de l Ecole Normale Superieure, vol. 40, p. 325, 1923.
- [52] E. Cartan Annales de l Ecole Normale Superieure, vol. 41, p. 1, 1924.
- [53] E. Cartan Annales de l Ecole Normale Superieure, vol. 42, p. 17, 1925.
- [54] J. Schouten, Ricci Calculus, An Introduction to Tensor Analysis and Geometrical Applications. Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1954.
- [55] Y. N. Obukhov and V. A. Korotky, "The weyssenhoff fluid in einstein-cartan theory," *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 4, p. 1633, nov 1987.
- [56] D. Kranas, C. G. Tsagas, J. D. Barrow, and D. Iosifidis, "Friedmann-like universes with torsion," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 79, Apr. 2019.
- [57] L. Csillag and T. Harko, "Semi-symmetric metric gravity: From the friedmann-schouten geometry with torsion to dynamical dark energy models," *Physics of the Dark Universe*, vol. 46, p. 101596, 2024.
- [58] A. Friedmann and J. Schouten, "Über die geometrie der halbsymmetrischen Übertragung," *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 21, pp. 211–223, 1924.
- [59] H. Chaudhary, L. Csillag, and T. Harko, "Semisymmetric metric gravity: A brief overview," *Universe*, vol. 10, no. 11, p. 419, 2024.
- [60] H. Weyl Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, p. 465, 1918.
- [61] D. M. Ghilencea, "Gauging scale symmetry and inflation: Weyl versus palatini gravity," *European Physical Journal C*, vol. 81, p. 510, 2021.

- [62] D. M. Ghilencea, "Standard model in weyl conformal geometry," European Physical Journal C, vol. 82, p. 23, 2022.
- [63] P. Burikham, T. Harko, K. Pimsamarn, and S. Shahidi, "Dark matter as a weyl geometric effect," *Physical Review* D, vol. 107, p. 064008, 2023.
- [64] J.-Z. Yang, S. Shahidi, and T. Harko, "Black hole solutions in the quadratic weyl conformal geometric theory of gravity," *European Physical Journal C*, vol. 82, p. 1171, 2022.
- [65] G. Palumbo, "Weyl geometry in weyl semimetals," 2024.
- [66] E. Schrödinger, Space-time Structure. Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- [67] S. Klemm and L. Ravera *Physics Letters B*, vol. 817, p. 136291, 2021.
- [68] L. Ming, S.-D. Liang, H.-H. Zhang, and T. Harko *Physical Review D*, vol. 109, p. 024003, 2024.
- [69] L. Csillag, A. Agashe, and D. Iosifidis, "Schrödinger connections: from mathematical foundations towards yano-schrödinger cosmology," *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 41, p. 235005, oct 2024.
- [70] L. Csillag, R. Hama, M. Józsa, T. Harko, and S. V. Sabău, "Length-preserving biconnection gravity and its cosmological implications," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2024, p. 034, dec 2024.
- [71] A. Agashe, "Kinematics in metric-affine geometry," *Phys. Scripta*, vol. 98, no. 10, p. 105210, 2023.
- [72] A. Agashe, "Lagrangian formulation of the raychaudhuri equation in non-riemannian geometry," *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, Jan. 2024.
- [73] D. Iosifidis, A. C. Petkou, and C. G. Tsagas, "Torsion/nonmetricity duality in f(r) gravity," *General Relativity and Gravitation*, vol. 51, May 2019.
- [74] D. Iosifidis, "Cosmological hyperfluids, torsion and non-metricity," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 80, Nov. 2020.
- [75] D. Iosifidis, "The perfect hyperfluid of metric-affine gravity: the foundation," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2021, p. 072, Apr. 2021.
- [76] Y. N. Obukhov and F. W. Hehl, "Hyperfluid model revisited," *Physical Review D*, vol. 108, Nov. 2023.
- [77] D. Iosifidis, "Metric-affine cosmologies: kinematics of perfect (ideal) cosmological hyperfluids and first integrals," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2023, p. 045, sep 2023.
- [78] D. Iosifidis, E. Jensko, and T. S. Koivisto, "Relativistic interacting fluids in cosmology," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2024, p. 043, nov 2024.
- [79] I. Andrei, D. Iosifidis, L. Järv, and M. Saal, "Friedmann cosmology with hyperfluids," 2024.
- [80] D. Iosifidis and T. S. Koivisto, "Hyperhydrodynamics: relativistic viscous fluids from hypermomentum," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2024, p. 001, may 2024.
- [81] J. D. Brown, "Action functionals for relativistic perfect fluids," Class. Quant. Grav., vol. 10, pp. 1579–1606, 1993.

- [82] C. G. Boehmer, N. Tamanini, and M. Wright, "Interacting quintessence from a variational approach Part I: algebraic couplings," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 91, no. 12, p. 123002, 2015.
- [83] A. Chatterjee, S. Hussain, and K. Bhattacharya, "Dynamical stability of the k-essence field interacting nonminimally with a perfect fluid," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 10, p. 103505, 2021.
- [84] S. Hussain, A. Chatterjee, and K. Bhattacharya, "Dynamical stability in models where dark matter and dark energy are nonminimally coupled to curvature," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 108, no. 10, p. 103502, 2023.
- [85] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, *et al.*, "Scipy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in python," *Nature methods*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 261–272, 2020.
- [86] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, "emcee: the mcmc hammer," *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, vol. 125, no. 925, p. 306, 2013.
- [87] G. van Rossum, "The python language reference: Release 2.6. 4," *Python Software Foundation*, 2009.
- [88] A. Lewis, "Getdist: a python package for analysing monte carlo samples," arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13970, 2019.
- [89] S. Vagnozzi, A. Loeb, and M. Moresco, "Eppur è piatto? the cosmic chronometers take on spatial curvature and cosmic concordance," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 908, no. 1, p. 84, 2021.
- [90] R. Jimenez and A. Loeb, "Constraining cosmological parameters based on relative galaxy ages," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 573, no. 1, p. 37, 2002.
- [91] M. Moresco, "Raising the bar: new constraints on the hubble parameter with cosmic chronometers at z 2," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, vol. 450, no. 1, pp. L16–L20, 2015.
- [92] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, "A 6% measurement of the hubble parameter at z 0.45: direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration," *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 2016, no. 05, p. 014, 2016.
- [93] M. Moresco, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, A. Cimatti, and L. Pozzetti, "Setting the stage for cosmic chronometers. ii. impact of stellar population synthesis models systematics and full covariance matrix," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 898, no. 1, p. 82, 2020.
- [94] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, A. Carr, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton, D. Jones, *et al.*, "The pantheon+ analysis: cosmological constraints," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 938, no. 2, p. 110, 2022.
- [95] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, *et al.*, "Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant," *The astronomical journal*, vol. 116, no. 3,

p. 1009, 1998.

- [96] P. Astier, J. Guy, N. Regnault, R. Pain, E. Aubourg, D. Balam, S. Basa, R. Carlberg, S. Fabbro, D. Fouchez, *et al.*, "The supernova legacy survey: measurement of, and w from the first year data set," *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, vol. 447, no. 1, pp. 31–48, 2006.
- [97] A. Conley, J. Guy, M. Sullivan, N. Regnault, P. Astier, C. Balland, S. Basa, R. Carlberg, D. Fouchez, D. Hardin, *et al.*, "Supernova constraints and systematic uncertainties from the first three years of the supernova legacy survey," *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, vol. 192, no. 1, p. 1, 2010.
- [98] A. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, D. Alexander, M. Alvarez, O. Alves, A. Anand, U. Andrade, E. Armengaud, et al., "Desi 2024 vi: Cosmological constraints from the measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations," arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03002, 2024.
- [99] T. Abbott, M. Adamow, M. Aguena, S. Allam, O. Alves, A. Amon, F. Andrade-Oliveira, J. Asorey, S. Avila, D. Bacon, *et al.*, "Dark energy survey: A 2.1% measurement of the angular baryonic acoustic oscillation scale at redshift z eff= 0.85 from the final dataset," *Physical Review D*, vol. 110, no. 6, p. 063515, 2024.
- [100] N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, et al., "Planck 2018 resultsvi. cosmological parameters," Astronomy & Astrophysics, vol. 641, p. A6, 2020.
- [101] M. Visser, "Jerk, snap and the cosmological equation of state," *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 21, no. 11, p. 2603, 2004.
- [102] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, *et al.*, "Measurements of  $\omega$  and  $\lambda$  from 42 high-redshift supernovae," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 517, no. 2, p. 565, 1999.
- [103] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo, and A. A. Starobinsky, "Two new diagnostics of dark energy," *Physical Review D*, vol. 78, p. 103502, 2008.
- [104] M. Shahalam, S. Pathak, M. Verma, M. Y. Khlopov, and R. Myrzakulov, "Dynamics of interacting quintessence," *The European Physical Journal C*, vol. 75, pp. 1–9, 2015.
- [105] R. Andrae, T. Schulze-Hartung, and P. Melchior, "Dos and don'ts of reduced chi-squared," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.3754*, 2010.
- [106] J. Kuha, "Aic and bic: Comparisons of assumptions and performance," *Sociological methods & research*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 188–229, 2004.
- [107] A. R. Liddle, "Information criteria for astrophysical model selection," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomi*cal Society: Letters, vol. 377, no. 1, pp. L74–L78, 2007.
- [108] H. Akaike, "A new look at the statistical model identification," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 716–723, 1974.
- [109] K. P. Burnham and D. R. Anderson, "Multimodel inference: understanding aic and bic in model selection," Sociological methods & research, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 261–304,

2004.

- [110] G. Schwarz, "Estimating the dimension of a model," *The annals of statistics*, pp. 461–464, 1978.
- [111] H. Jeffreys, *The theory of probability*. OuP Oxford, 1998.
- [112] R. L. Wasserstein and N. A. Lazar, "The asa statement on p-values: context, process, and purpose," 2016.