

Hint of $r \simeq 0.01$ after DESI DR2 ?

Hao Wang^{1,2*} and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2,4,5 †}

¹ *School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China*

² *School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

³ *International Center for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific, Beijing/Hangzhou, China and*

⁴ *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China*

Abstract

In the report by BICEP and Keck collaborations, the tensor-to-scalar ratio is $r_{0.05} < 0.036$ (95% C.L.) and $< 1.3\sigma$ non-zero (with pre-DESI BAO data). However, recent datasets have significantly shifted the bestfit values of relevant Λ CDM cosmological parameters, and thus possibly alter the amplitude of lensing B-mode spectrum, which would affect the search for r . Here, the joint analysis of Planck and BICEP/Keck data with DESI DR2 reveals that the lower bound of $r_{0.05}$ is 2.0σ and 2.1σ non-zero for PantheonPlus and DES-Y5, respectively, and the bestfit r is $r_{0.05} \simeq 0.01$. The results are consistent with those with DESI DR1, but slightly strengthened. There might be still systematic uncertainties in B-mode measurements due to the foreground contamination, however, our work is to not say what about the value of r , but emphasize that the detection for r is model-dependent and depends potentially on our insight into the dark universe, highlighting the important role of cosmological surveys in comprehending our very early universe.

PACS numbers:

* wanghao187@mailsucas.ac.cn

† yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

The current paradigm of very early universe, inflation [1–4], predicts a nearly scale-invariant scalar perturbation consistent with recent observations, as well as the primordial gravitational waves (GWs).

It is well known that the ultra-low-frequency primordial GWs at $f \sim 10^{-18} - 10^{-16}$ Hz, which can source the B-mode polarization in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [5–7], is the “smoking gun” of inflation. Based on the standard Λ CDM model, using Planck18 CMB, pre-DESI baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) and BICEP/Keck18 CMB B-mode dataset the BICEP/Keck collaboration has reported the upper bound on the tensor-to-scalar ratio, $r_{0.05} < 0.036$ (95% C.L.) [8], see also [9], and $r_{0.05}$ is non-zero at 1.3σ significance level¹. This upper bound will be tighter, $r_{0.05} < 0.028$ (95% C.L.), when the pre-recombination resolutions of the Hubble tension were considered [10, 11].

Though the standard Λ CDM model is thought to be the most successful model explaining most of cosmological observations, recently using their first year data the DESI collaboration [12–14] has found that DE is evolving at $\gtrsim 3\sigma$ significance level. This result will inevitably bring the shifts of the bestfit values of relevant Λ CDM cosmological parameters (possibly alter the amplitude of lensing B-mode spectrum), so that $r \simeq 0.01$ can emerge and is about 2σ non-zero [15, 16]. Though the scientific community still have doubts about systematic errors of DESI DR1, recent DESI DR2 [17] are consistent with DESI DR1, and further strengthened the results with DESI DR1 [18]², Thus it is significant to investigate the underlying impact of DESI DR2 on the search for r .

Here, we present the search for primordial GWs, and find

$$r_{0.05} = 0.0155_{-0.0136-0.0155}^{+0.0051+0.0145} \quad (68\% \text{ and } 95\% \text{ CL},) \quad (1)$$

$$r_{0.05} = 0.0143_{-0.0116-0.0139}^{+0.0079+0.0210} \quad (68\% \text{ and } 95\% \text{ CL}) \quad (2)$$

for the datasets with PantheonPlus and DES-Y5 SN data, respectively, and both upper bounds are consistent with that reported by the BICEP/Keck collaboration [8], but the lower bounds are 2.0σ and 2.1σ non-zero. The bestfit r is $r_{0.05} \sim 0.01$, see also Figs.1 and 2. However, regardless of ultimately whether $r \simeq 0.01$ or not, our result implies that the

¹ This significance level can be read out from the BICEP/Keck chain used in [8].

² The relevant issues have been also intensively investigated since DESI DR1 and DR2, e.g.[19–79]




FIG. 1: The $r - n_s$ contours for the $w_0 w_a$ CDM model, where n_s is the spectral index of primordial scalar perturbation. The dataset is Planck18+BK18+DESI+Pantheon Plus.

detection for r depends potentially on our insight into the nature of DE, highlighting the important role of cosmological surveys in comprehending our very early universe.

II. DATASETS AND METHOD

Recent **DESI DR2** consists of bright galaxies, LRGs, ELGs, quasars and Ly α Forest samples at the redshift region $0.1 < z < 4.2$ [17], which is consistent with SDSS and DESI DR1 [12]. Here, we use their measurements for the comoving distances $D_M(z)/r_d$ and $D_H(z)/r_d$ as listed in Table I, where

$$D_M(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{cdz'}{H(z')}, \quad D_H(z) \equiv \frac{c}{H(z)}, \quad (3)$$

and $r_d = \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z)}{H(z)}$ is the sound horizon with $z_d \simeq 1060$ at the baryon drag epoch and c_s the speed of sound, as well as the angle-averaged quantity D_V/r_d , where $D_V(z) \equiv (zD_M(z)^2 D_H(z))^{1/3}$.

To perform the search for r , we use **Planck 2018 CMB** dataset (low-l and high-l TT, TE, EE spectra, and reconstructed CMB lensing spectrum [80–82]), and the CMB B-mode




FIG. 2: The $r - n_s$ contours for the $w_0 w_a$ CDM model, where n_s is the spectral index of primordial scalar perturbation. The dataset is Planck18+BK18+DESI+DESY5.

BK18 data [8]. In addition, we also use the supernova dataset: **PantheonPlus** (consisting of 1701 light curves of 1550 spectroscopically confirmed Type Ia SN coming from 18 different surveys [83]) and **DES-Y5** (Dark Energy Survey, as part of their Year 5 data, recently published results based on a new, homogeneously selected sample of 1635 photometrically classified SN Ia with redshifts $0.1 < z < 1.3$, which is complemented by 194 low-redshift SN Ia in common with the Pantheon+ sample spanning $0.025 < z < 0.1$ [84]).

Tracer	z_{eff}	D_M/r_d	D_H/r_d	D_V/r_d	$r_{M,H}$
BGS	0.295	-	-	7.944 ± 0.075	-
LRG1	0.510	13.587 ± 0.169	21.863 ± 0.427	12.720 ± 0.098	-0.475
LRG2	0.706	17.347 ± 0.180	19.458 ± 0.332	16.048 ± 0.110	-0.423
LRG3+ELG1	0.934	21.574 ± 0.153	17.641 ± 0.193	19.720 ± 0.091	-0.425
ELG2	1.321	27.605 ± 0.320	14.178 ± 0.217	24.256 ± 0.174	-0.437
QSO	1.484	30.519 ± 0.758	12.816 ± 0.513	26.059 ± 0.400	-0.489
Lya QSO	2.330	38.988 ± 0.531	8.632 ± 0.101	31.267 ± 0.256	-0.431

TABLE I: Statistics for the DESI samples of the DESI DR2 BAO measurements used in this paper.

In our analysis, we consider the w_0w_a CDM model (well-known CPL parameterisation) where the state equation of DE is [85, 86]

$$w_{\text{DE}} = w_0 + w_a \frac{z}{1+z}. \quad (4)$$

Here, our MCMC analysis is performed by modifying the MontePython-3.6 sampler [88, 89] and CLASS codes [87, 90]. The threshold of Gelman-Rubin convergence criterion is $R-1 < 0.01$. The corresponding priors of MCMC parameters are listed in Table II, and the pivot scale of r is set to $0.05(\text{Mpc})^{-1}$.

Parameters	Prior
$100\omega_b$	[None, None]
ω_{cdm}	[None, None]
H_0	[65, 80]
$\ln 10^{10} A_s$	[None, None]
n_s	[None, None]
τ_{reio}	[0.004, None]
w_0	[-2, 0.34]
w_a	[-3, 2]
r	[0, 0.5]

TABLE II: The priors of parameters we adopt in MCMC analysis.

III. RESULTS

In Table III, we present our MCMC results. In w_0w_a CDM model (with PantheonPlus SN data), an evolving DE is preferred with $w_0 = -0.847 \pm 0.055$ and $w_a = -0.516 \pm 0.206$, see also Fig. 1, consistent with those of DESI collaboration [17]. The result of tensor-to-scalar ratio r is $r_{0.05} = 0.0155^{+0.0051}_{-0.0136}$ at the 1σ (68%) CL. and its lower bound is 2.0σ non-zero. The best fit value is $r_{0.05} = 0.0142$. The constraint on r is slightly tighter than that with DESI DR1 [15], as illustrated in Fig. 1.

However, when **SH0ES** Cepheid-calibrated SN1a magnitude (equivalently SH0ES prior [91]) is considered, the tensor-to-scalar ratio r is slightly suppressed to a best fit $r_{0.05} = 0.010$

Parameters	Planck18+BK18+DESI		
	+PantheonPlus	+PantheonPlus+SH0ES	+DESY5
$100\omega_b$	2.233(2.222) \pm 0.014	2.237(2.237) \pm 0.014	2.233(2.223) \pm 0.012
ω_{cdm}	0.119(0.120) \pm 0.001	0.120(0.120) \pm 0.001	0.119(0.120) \pm 0.001
H_0	67.53(67.53) \pm 0.59	69.18(69.06) \pm 0.54	66.87(66.72) \pm 0.53
$\ln 10^{10}A_s$	3.036(3.033) \pm 0.014	3.036(3.040) \pm 0.014	3.038(3.027) \pm 0.012
n_s	0.965(0.967) \pm 0.004	0.966(0.960) \pm 0.004	0.968(0.965) \pm 0.004
τ_{reio}	0.053(0.051) \pm 0.007	0.052(0.054) \pm 0.007	0.053(0.048) \pm 0.006
w_0	-0.847(-0.835) \pm 0.055	-0.911(-0.893) \pm 0.056	-0.782(-0.792) \pm 0.043
w_a	-0.516(-0.586) \pm 0.206	-0.485(-0.548) \pm 0.215	-0.664(-0.654) \pm 0.155
r	0.0155(0.0142) $^{+0.0051}_{-0.0136}$	0.0153(0.0101) $^{+0.0049}_{-0.0136}$	0.0143(0.009) $^{+0.0079}_{-0.0116}$
Ω_m	0.311(0.311) \pm 0.006	0.297(0.298) \pm 0.005	0.317(0.319) \pm 0.005
S_8	0.833(0.836) \pm 0.010	0.828(0.832) \pm 0.010	0.834(0.837) \pm 0.009

TABLE III: Mean (bestfit) values and 1σ regions of the parameters of the w_0w_a CDM model. The datasets are Planck+BK18+DESI+PantheonPlus(+SH0ES) and Planck18+BK18+DESI+DESY5, respectively.

with a slightly smaller significance for non-zero $r_{0.05}$ at 1.9σ , while S_8 seems to also be slightly suppressed with a larger H_0 and a smaller Ω_m .

It has been pointed out in Ref.[15] that the evolving DE has a significant impact on the bestfit values of relevant Λ CDM cosmological parameters, such as A_s , Ω_m , and thus the lensing B-mode $C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB}$. The larger $C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB}$ leads to a less significant r , since the total power spectrum of B-mode $C_{l,\text{total}}^{BB} = C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB} + C_{l,\text{tensor}}^{BB}$ is set by BK18 dataset, where $C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB}$ and $C_{l,\text{tensor}}^{BB}$ are the contributions from the lensing and tensor B-modes respectively. As a clarification, the bestfit $C_{l,\text{total}}^{BB}$, $C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB}$ and $C_{l,\text{tensor}}^{BB}$ in our w_0w_a CDM model with or without SH0ES prior are plotted in Fig.3.

In w_0w_a CDM model (with DESY5 SN data), see also Fig. 2, $r = 0.0143_{-0.0116}^{+0.0079}$, which has a tighter lower bound than that with PantheonPlus, and r is 2.1σ non-zero. It is noteworthy that this $> 2\sigma$ significance level for non-zero r has never observed by Planck+BK18+pre-DESI data, which can be attributed to the impact of Planck18+DESI+DESY5 dataset on relevant Λ CDM cosmological parameters. However, replacing PantheonPlus with DESY5




FIG. 3: **The total power spectrum of B-mode $C_{l,\text{total}}^{BB}$, the power spectra of lensing B-mode $C_{l,\text{lensing}}^{BB}$ and tensor B-mode $C_{l,\text{tensor}}^{BB}$ for the bestfit values in the $w_0 w_a$ CDM model.** Points with error bars are binned BK18 [8], SPT [92] and ACT [93] data points.

slightly exacerbates the fit to CMB while improving that of DESI DR2, and the discrepancy between CMB, DESI and SN data remains to be further investigated.

IV. DISCUSSION

In the concordant Λ CDM model, the simplest possibility of DE is the cosmological constant. However, recently DESI DR2 combined with Planck CMB and supernova data has showed that DE is evolving at $\gtrsim 3\sigma$ significance level. This result will inevitably bring the shifts of the bestfit values of relevant Λ CDM cosmological parameters. In corresponding $w_0 w_a$ CDM model, we find that the bestfit r is $r_{0.05} \simeq 0.01$, and the lower bound of $r_{0.05}$ is 2.0σ and 2.1σ non-zero for PantheonPlus and DESY5 SN data respectively. The result with DR1 [15] is further strengthened (r is 1.9σ non-zero with DR1).

It is possible that relevant datasets have still some unknown systematics, such as systematic uncertainties in B-mode measurements due to the foreground contamination, systematic errors in DESI DR2. It is also interesting check how the result on r changes under differ-

ent assumptions about the DE models (different parameterisations or scalar fields models, e.g. recent [72]), reionization history, neutrino masses, or alternative priors. Currently, it is still too early to say what about r , however, our work is to not just search for the primordial GWs, but highlight how its detection is depending potentially on our insight into the dark universe in new era of cosmological surveys (DESI, Euclid[94], LSST [95]).

It should be also mentioned that the concordant Λ CDM model suffered from the Hubble tension, see e.g.[96–99]. In pre-recombination early dark energy (EDE) solution [100–102] to the Hubble tension, in particular AdS-EDE solution [103–106], the upper bound on r can be further tightened [10]³. However, such a pre-recombination EDE would also suppress the shifts of w_0 and w_a towards the evolving DE [24], see also [78], thus it is significant to investigate the underlying impact of the Hubble tension on the search for r , e.g.[16].

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2021YFC2203004), NSFC (Grant No.12075246), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

-
- [1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981), 347-356 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.23.347
 - [2] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108** (1982), 389-393 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(82)91219-9
 - [3] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982), 1220-1223 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.48.1220
 - [4] A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. B **91** (1980), 99-102 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90670-X
 - [5] U. Seljak, Astrophys. J. **482** (1997), 6 doi:10.1086/304123 [arXiv:astro-ph/9608131 [astro-ph]].
 - [6] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky and A. Stebbins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997), 2058-2061 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.2058 [arXiv:astro-ph/9609132 [astro-ph]].
 - [7] U. Seljak and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997), 2054-2057 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.2054 [arXiv:astro-ph/9609169 [astro-ph]].

³ In corresponding models, $n_s = 1$ since n_s scales as $\delta n_s \simeq 0.4 \frac{\delta H_0}{H_0}$ [107–109].

- [8] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [BICEP and Keck], Phys. Rev. Lett. **127** (2021) no.15, 151301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.151301 [arXiv:2110.00483 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [9] M. Tristram, A. J. Banday, K. M. Górski, R. Keskitalo, C. R. Lawrence, K. J. Andersen, R. B. Barreiro, J. Borrill, L. P. L. Colombo and H. K. Eriksen, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.8, 083524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.083524 [arXiv:2112.07961 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [10] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.4, 043536 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.043536 [arXiv:2202.10055 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [11] J. Q. Jiang, G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, Phys. Lett. B **851** (2024), 138588 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2024.138588 [arXiv:2303.12345 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [12] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03002 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] R. Calderon *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2405.04216 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] K. Lodha *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2405.13588 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] H. Wang, G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2407.11263 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] H. Wang, G. Ye, J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2409.17879 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] M. Abdul Karim *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2503.14738 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] K. Lodha, R. Calderon, W. L. Matthewson, A. Shafieloo, M. Ishak, J. Pan, C. Garcia-Quintero, D. Huterer, G. Valogiannis and L. A. Ureña-López, *et al.* [arXiv:2503.14743 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [19] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.07070 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] M. Cortês and A. R. Liddle, [arXiv:2404.08056 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [21] Y. Carloni, O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.12068 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [22] E. Ó. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and D. Stojkovic, [arXiv:2404.08633 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] W. Giarè, M. A. Sabogal, R. C. Nunes and E. Di Valentino, [arXiv:2404.15232 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [24] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2404.18579 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] C. G. Park, J. de Cruz Perez and B. Ratra, [arXiv:2405.00502 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] Z. Wang, S. Lin, Z. Ding and B. Hu, [arXiv:2405.02168 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] D. Shlivko and P. Steinhardt, [arXiv:2405.03933 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] B. R. Dinda, [arXiv:2405.06618 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [29] O. Seto and Y. Toda, [arXiv:2405.11869 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [30] S. Bhattacharya, G. Borghetto, A. Malhotra, S. Parameswaran, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala,

- [arXiv:2405.17396 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] N. Roy, [arXiv:2406.00634 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [32] H. Wang, Z. Y. Peng and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2406.03395 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [33] A. Notari, M. Redi and A. Tesi, [arXiv:2406.08459 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [34] J. J. Heckman, O. F. Ramadan and J. Sakstein, [arXiv:2406.04408 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [35] I. D. Gialamas, G. Hütsi, K. Kannike, A. Racioppi, M. Raidal, M. Vasar and H. Veermäe, [arXiv:2406.07533 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [36] L. Orchard and V. H. Cárdenas, [arXiv:2407.05579 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [37] E. Ó. Colgáin, S. Pourojaghi and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, [arXiv:2406.06389 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [38] T. N. Li, P. J. Wu, G. H. Du, S. J. Jin, H. L. Li, J. F. Zhang and X. Zhang, [arXiv:2407.14934 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] G. Ye, M. Martinelli, B. Hu and A. Silvestri, [arXiv:2407.15832 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] W. Giarè, M. Najafi, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino and J. T. Firouzjaee, [arXiv:2407.16689 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] B. R. Dinda and R. Maartens, [arXiv:2407.17252 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] J. Q. Jiang, W. Giarè, S. Gariazzo, M. G. Dainotti, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa and S. Vagnozzi, [arXiv:2407.18047 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] A. C. Alfano, O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2408.02536 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [44] J. Q. Jiang, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa and S. Vagnozzi, [arXiv:2408.02365 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [45] M. K. Sharma and M. Sami, [arXiv:2408.04204 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] B. Ghosh and C. Bengaly, [arXiv:2408.04432 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [47] J. Rebouças, D. H. F. de Souza, K. Zhong, V. Miranda and R. Rosenfeld, [arXiv:2408.14628 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [48] Y. H. Pang, X. Zhang and Q. G. Huang, [arXiv:2408.14787 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [49] W. J. Wolf, C. García-García, D. J. Bartlett and P. G. Ferreira, [arXiv:2408.17318 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [50] S. Roy Choudhury and T. Okumura, [arXiv:2409.13022 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] R. Arjona and S. Nesseris, [arXiv:2409.14990 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [52] W. J. Wolf, P. G. Ferreira and C. García-García, [arXiv:2409.17019 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [53] W. Giarè, [arXiv:2409.17074 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] G. Alestas, M. Caldarola, S. Kuroyanagi and S. Nesseris, [arXiv:2410.00827 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [55] Y. Carloni and O. Luongo, [arXiv:2410.10935 [gr-qc]].
- [56] S. Bhattacharya, G. Borghetto, A. Malhotra, S. Parameswaran, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, [arXiv:2410.21243 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [57] E. Specogna, W. Giarè and E. Di Valentino, [arXiv:2411.03896 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [58] T. N. Li, Y. H. Li, G. H. Du, P. J. Wu, L. Feng, J. F. Zhang and X. Zhang, [arXiv:2411.08639 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [59] G. Ye, [arXiv:2411.11743 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] Y. H. Pang, X. Zhang and Q. G. Huang, [arXiv:2411.14189 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [61] S. Akthar and M. W. Hossain, [arXiv:2411.15892 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] E. Ó. Colgáin and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, [arXiv:2412.12905 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] S. S. da Costa, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **47** (2025), 101791 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2024.101791 [arXiv:2412.14290 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [64] C. G. Park and B. Ratra, [arXiv:2501.03480 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [65] M. A. Sabogal, E. Silva, R. C. Nunes, S. Kumar and E. Di Valentino, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025) no.4, 043531 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.111.043531 [arXiv:2501.10323 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [66] G. H. Du, T. N. Li, P. J. Wu, L. Feng, S. H. Zhou, J. F. Zhang and X. Zhang, [arXiv:2501.10785 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [67] A. G. Ferrari, M. Ballardini, F. Finelli and D. Paoletti, [arXiv:2501.15298 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2501.16883 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [69] Z. Y. Peng and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2502.04641 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [70] J. Q. Jiang, [arXiv:2502.15541 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [71] W. J. Wolf, C. García-García and P. G. Ferreira, [arXiv:2502.04929 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [72] W. Giarè, T. Mahassen, E. Di Valentino and S. Pan, [arXiv:2502.10264 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [73] M. W. Hossain and A. Maqsood, [arXiv:2502.19274 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [74] L. Feng, T. N. Li, G. H. Du, J. F. Zhang and X. Zhang, [arXiv:2503.10423 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [75] A. Chakraborty, P. K. Chanda, S. Das and K. Dutta, [arXiv:2503.10806 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [76] G. Borghetto, A. Malhotra, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, [arXiv:2503.11628 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [77] J. Pan and G. Ye, [arXiv:2503.19898 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [78] Y. H. Pang, X. Zhang and Q. G. Huang, [arXiv:2503.21600 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [79] W. J. Wolf and P. G. Ferreira, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) no.10, 103519 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.103519 [arXiv:2310.07482 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [80] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A5 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936386 [arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A8 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833886 [arXiv:1807.06210 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [82] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020) [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652**, C4 (2021)] doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [83] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, A. G. Riess, T. M. Davis, A. Dwomoh, D. O. Jones, N. Ali, P. Charvu and R. Chen, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 113 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8b7a [arXiv:2112.03863 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [84] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* [DES], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **973**, no.1, L14 (2024) doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ad6f9f [arXiv:2401.02929 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [85] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10** (2001), 213-224 doi:10.1142/S0218271801000822 [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008 [gr-qc]].
- [86] E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003), 091301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.091301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512 [astro-ph]].
- [87] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues and T. Tram, *JCAP* **07** (2011), 034 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2011/07/034 [arXiv:1104.2933 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [88] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed and S. Prunet, *JCAP* **02** (2013), 001 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/02/001 [arXiv:1210.7183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [89] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **24** (2019), 100260 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2018.100260 [arXiv:1804.07261 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [90] J. Lesgourgues, [arXiv:1104.2932 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [91] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, L. Breuval and T. G. Brink, *et al.* *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, no.1, L7 (2022) doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b [arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [92] J. T. Sayre *et al.* [SPT], *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.12, 122003 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.122003 [arXiv:1910.05748 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [93] S. K. Choi *et al.* [ACT], *JCAP* **12**, 045 (2020) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/12/045 [arXiv:2007.07289 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [94] Y. Mellier *et al.* [Euclid], [arXiv:2405.13491 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [95] R. Mandelbaum *et al.* [LSST Dark Energy Science], [arXiv:1809.01669 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [96] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.4, 043533 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.043533 [arXiv:1908.03663 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [97] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, no.15, 153001 (2021) doi:10.1088/1361-6382/ac086d [arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [98] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.newar.2022.101659 [arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [99] S. Vagnozzi, *Universe* **9** (2023) no.9, 393 doi:10.3390/universe9090393 [arXiv:2308.16628 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [100] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.10, 103523 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.103523 [arXiv:1608.01309 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [101] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, no.22, 221301 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301 [arXiv:1811.04083 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [102] T. L. Smith, V. Poulin and M. A. Amin, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.6, 063523 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063523 [arXiv:1908.06995 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [103] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.8, 083507 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083507 [arXiv:2001.02451 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [104] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.8, 083523 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.083523 [arXiv:2008.10832 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [105] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.10, 103524 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.103524 [arXiv:2107.07128 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [106] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **832** (2022), 137244 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137244 [arXiv:2201.07079 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [107] G. Ye, B. Hu and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.6, 063510 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063510 [arXiv:2103.09729 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [108] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.10, 103514 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.103514 [arXiv:2202.13379 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [109] G. Ye, J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.10, 103528 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.103528 [arXiv:2205.02478 [astro-ph.CO]].