

Statistical Analysis of Cosmologies in $f(R)$ Theories with DESI DR2 2025 Data

Francisco Plaza^{1,2,*} and Lucila Kraiselburd^{1,2}

¹*Facultad de Ciencias Astronómicas y Geofísicas,
Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Observatorio Astronómico, Paseo del Bosque,
B1900FWA La Plata, Argentina*

²*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET),
Godoy Cruz 2290, 1425, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

(Dated: April 2025)

Motivated by the recent results published by the DESI DR2 Collaboration and its compelling results in obtaining statistical preference for dynamical dark energy models over the standard Λ CDM model, this study presents an MCMC fit for all currently viable $f(R)$ models using this dataset, along with a corresponding Bayesian analysis. The findings reveal very strong evidence in favor of $f(R)$ models compared to Λ CDM model. The analysis also includes data from cosmic chronometers and the latest Pantheon Plus + SH0ES supernova compilation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Models based on $f(R)$ gravity represent a viable alternative today as a possible explanation for the accelerated expansion of the universe, an issue that remains unexplained within the standard model framework.

The Λ CDM standard model incorporates the cosmological constant Λ into the Einstein-Hilbert action, since this inclusion guarantees that it dominates the universe's dynamics at late times, predicting an accelerated expansion rate in the present cosmic epoch. This modification was primarily motivated by the observational discovery of cosmic acceleration [1, 2]. Despite being the most basic and straightforward extension of General Relativity, Λ CDM model has successfully explained the aforementioned observations and has remained statistically indistinguishable from (or even preferable to) alternative gravity models due to its simplicity and minimal number of free parameters. In the standard context, it remains unclear whether the cosmological constant Λ should be placed on the left-hand side of Einstein's field equations as part of the geometric structure of spacetime or on the right-hand side as an exotic form of matter. This ambiguity has led to the emergence of numerous proposed models collectively referred to as "dark energy," wherein the cosmological constant is interpreted as part of the energy-momentum tensor. However, if exotic matter were responsible for this phenomenon (for example, w_0w_a CDM models, quintessence or k-essence fields [3–6]), it would constitute approximately 70% of the universe.

Despite the success of the Λ CDM model, compelling evidence has emerged in favor of alternative models, driven by the increasing precision of cosmological observations that now allow for the discrimination between competing scenarios and the resolution of statistical ambiguities in Bayesian comparisons. The recent article

from the DESI collaboration [7] presents the latest compilation of Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) measurements and performs a Bayesian comparison between the standard model and simple alternative models, more specifically, w_0w_a CDM models that allow for a dynamical dark energy component, or in other words, permit the variation of the equation of state of the presumed dark energy. That study finds statistical preference for such alternative models over Λ CDM, motivating the present work, where we similarly conduct Bayesian comparisons for cosmological models based on $f(R)$ gravity in contrast with the standard one. While the interpretations of these models differ—with the w_0w_a CDM model attributing the expansion to exotic matter, and $f(R)$ theories, under our interpretation, ascribing it to unknown gravitational effects—the $f(R)$ theories introduce additional degrees of freedom in the formulation and modeling of the expansion, which may also statistically favor the accurate explanation of these new data.

To date, numerous analyses of this kind have been reported [8–17], revealing that the earliest fits indicated that the distortion parameter b , which, as we will see in the theoretical formalism of $f(R)$ gravity, quantifies the deviation of the theory from General Relativity, was often found to be very small. This suggested minimal differences between the theories, as can be seen in [12–14]. It was only in 2024 that the inclusion of the Pantheon Plus compilation of Type Ia supernovae in the fits drastically altered the results, yielding higher values for b and revealing inconsistencies at the 1- to 2-sigma level between the $f(R)$ model and Λ CDM [18–20]. However, despite these discrepancies, the Bayesian analysis still indicated a statistical preference for the standard model [18, 19] or a very slight preference for certain $f(R)$ models.

The present work, which could be considered a sequel (or update) to [18], reports for the first time, an analysis of this kind incorporating data from the DESI DR2 release. From this, a very strong statistical preference for the $f(R)$ model over the standard model emerges, as we will see in the final section. All the theoretical formalism, methodology, employed approximations, and the methods used to solve the systems of differential equa-

*Electronic address: Fran22@fcaglp.unlp.edu.ar

tions are exactly the same as in that article. Therefore, many of the technical details are not reiterated here and can be consulted in the previous publication. We emphasize that the only difference between the present study and the previous one lies in the replacement of the BAO dataset. In Section II we briefly describe the dynamics of the equations to be solved together with the $f(R)$ models to be analyzed. A synthesis of the observational data used is presented in Section III. Then, in Section IV we present our estimates and their analysis and comparisons with other results. Finally, Section V exposes the conclusions.

II. THEORETICAL FORMALISM

$f(R)$ theories are alternatives to General Relativity that introduce corrective terms to the Einstein-Hilbert action, inspired by developments in theoretical physics. These modifications are proposed to account for quantum gravitational effects or yet-unknown aspects of spacetime that become significant at very large scales or in regions of extreme curvature, manifested in this context as part of an effective theory representing the low-energy limit of a more fundamental quantum theory of gravitation, or a unified theory of all fundamental interactions.[21–23]. As such, they offer a potential fundamental explanation for the accelerated expansion of the universe, which may stem from unknown gravitational interactions. Furthermore, these theories are of particular interest due to their potential to unify the explanations of both late-time cosmic acceleration and the inflationary expansion of the early universe [21, 24–27], which is not possible in the standard context employing the cosmological constant. By introducing different corrective terms in the action, some variants of $f(R)$ gravity can lead to the prediction of late-time acceleration, while others can drive early-time expansion, as required by inflationary theory to resolve issues such as the flatness and horizon problems.

Formally, a generalized action is proposed in terms of a function of the Ricci scalar:

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} f(R) + S_m(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi) \quad (1)$$

From this, using metric formalism, the modified field equations are obtained:

$$f_R(R)R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}f(R)g_{\mu\nu} - (\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} \square)f_R(R) = \kappa^2 T_{\mu\nu} \quad (2)$$

where $f_R = \frac{df}{dR}$, \square is the d'Alembertian operator and ∇_μ is the covariant derivative.

In this context, all terms depend on the Ricci scalar, with the accelerated expansion of the universe attributed exclusively to the geometric aspects of spacetime. Even when assuming a vacuum state and $R = \text{constant} = R_0$, the dynamics correspond to a universe undergoing accelerated expansion [28], characterized by an effective cosmological constant given by:

$$\Lambda_{ef} = \frac{f(R_0)}{(f_R(R_0))^2} \quad (3)$$

We will employ the FLRW cosmological solution, which satisfies the field equations 2, and assume a spatially flat universe.

$$ds^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + a^2(t) \left(\frac{dr^2}{1 - Kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right) \quad (4)$$

The modified Friedmann equations are obtained:

$$-3H^2 = -\frac{1}{f_R} \left(\frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \rho_i + c^2 \frac{Rf_R - f}{2} - 3H\dot{R}f_{RR} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$-2\dot{H} = \frac{1}{f_R} \left[\frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \left(\rho_i + \frac{P_i}{c^2} \right) + f_{RRR}\dot{R}^2 + (\ddot{R} - H\dot{R}) f_{RR} \right] \quad (6)$$

where $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ and $i = m, r$; being m the total matter component, including both dark and baryonic matter, and r referring to radiation. These equations are solved numerically (details in [18]).

A. $f(R)$ theories

Over the years, various $f(R)$ functions introduced in the gravitational action have been studied to determine which can satisfactorily describe the accelerated expansion of the universe while simultaneously providing accurate predictions in the solar system context [27]. Additionally, these functions must meet essential theoretical requirements, such as being ghost-free, avoiding small-scale antigravitational effects, and maintaining stability under perturbations, among other criteria [18, 29, 30].

The $f(R)$ theories that fulfill all these requirements to date are those tested in the cosmological context in this work, and they are as follows:

i. *Hu-Sawicki*

The Hu-Sawicki theory, introduced in [31]

$$f_{\text{HS}}(R) = R - 2\Lambda \left\{ 1 - \left[1 + \left(\frac{R}{b\Lambda} \right)^{n_{\text{HS}}} \right]^{-1} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Here, Λ represents the cosmological constant, while b quantifies deviations from the Λ CDM paradigm. Viability conditions require $f_R > 0$ and $f_{RR} > 0$ for $R \geq R_0$, implying $b > 0$ when n_{HS} is odd. In this work, we assume $n_{\text{HS}} = 1$

ii. Starobinsky

Starobinsky's approach [21] modifies $f(R)$ as:

$$f_{\text{ST}}(R) = R - 2\Lambda \left\{ 1 - \left[1 + \left(\frac{R}{b\Lambda} \right)^2 \right]^{-n_S} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

For $n_S = 1$, the Starobinsky theory aligns with the Hu-Sawicki theory at $n_{\text{HS}} = 2$. Unlike the Hu-Sawicki theory, the Starobinsky formulation does not necessitate $b > 0$. Nonetheless, we assume $b > 0$ for simplicity in investigating deviations from Λ CDM assuming $n_S = 1$.

iii. Exponential

The exponential theory [32] introduces a distinct parameterization:

$$f_{\text{E}}(R) = R - 2\Lambda \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{R}{b\Lambda}\right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

In the limit $R \gg b\Lambda$, the theory asymptotically approaches $f(R) \sim R - 2\Lambda$, reproducing Λ CDM at high curvatures.

iv. Hyperbolic Tangent

Tsujikawa proposed an alternative [33]:

$$f_{\text{T}}(R) = R - 2\Lambda \tanh\left(\frac{R}{b\Lambda}\right). \quad (10)$$

This expression clearly demonstrates that as $b \rightarrow 0$, the model asymptotically approaches the Λ CDM model

III. OBSERVATIONAL DATA

The data we use in this work and briefly describe below belong to three groups: cosmic chronometers, supernovae and acoustic baryon oscillations.

A. Cosmic chronometers

These estimates of $H(z)$ at different redshifts are obtained from the analysis of the differential development of the age of old passively evolving elliptical galaxies, formed at the same time but separated by a small redshift interval. [34]. The chosen data points are the same as that used in [18] from [34–40]

B. Supernovae type Ia

Type Ia supernovae are currently one of the most widely used distance estimators for estimating cosmological parameters. In this case, we used the Pantheon Plus + SH0ES data compilation (PPS) [41–43](PPS), which allows these data to be used without incorporating a marginalization based on the absolute magnitude.

C. Baryon acoustic oscillations

Other useful cosmological distance estimators are baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO). These were generated before the decoupling of matter and radiation, because perturbations in the density of baryonic matter propagate as an oscillating pressure wave in the photon-baryon fluid produced by the presence of gravitational potentials, which clump the baryonic matter together, and collisions between it and radiation, which scatter it. As mentioned above, we use data from DESI DR2 release [7]. In this new version, the accuracy of the measurements has been improved thanks to a larger dataset of galaxies and quasars compared to the first version (DR1) [44]. Furthermore, separate measurements of the transverse comoving distance $D_M(z)$ and the Hubble distance $D_H(z)$ can now be obtained thanks to the improved signal-to-noise ratio of the new quasar set, which is a major advance, since only the value of the volume-averaged distance $D_V(z)$ was reported in DR1.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, we present and analyze the results obtained in the estimation of the confidence intervals for the free parameters of the $f(R)$ and Λ CDM models (Figures 1 and 2, and Table I), and compare them primarily with the results reported in our previous article [18], where the BAO datasets used come from DESI DR1 [44] and SDSS [45–51] releases. We also examine the significant change observed in the present work regarding the statistical comparisons employing the ΔAIC and ΔBIC criteria (Table II), in contrast with our previous report.

A. The Hu-Sawicki model

According to what has been published in [18], for the case of Hu Sawicki in the statistical analysis CC+PPS+BAO₂ (using DESI DR1 BAO measurements [44]), there is a consistency at 2σ level with respect to the Λ CDM model, based on the distortion parameter analysis. With the new fit presented in this work applying DESI_{DR2} data, although smaller values for b are obtained, the inconsistency at the 1σ level with the standard model remains. Besides, the results of Ω_m and M_{abs} parameters are compatible at 1σ with those obtained for

Λ CDM, while H_0 is compatible at 2σ . Regarding the Bayesian comparison with the standard model, our previous paper [18] shows a preference for the standard model, classified as weak or positive according to the ΔAIC index and strong according to the ΔBIC index. In the present study, a strong preference for the standard model is obtained according to both indices.

B. The Starobinsky model

Concerning the Starobinsky model, the previous results indicated consistency at the 2σ level with the standard model, based on its distortion parameter [18]. This fact contrasts with the results reported in here, where the model is inconsistent at more than the 2σ level with the standard model. Regarding the rest of the fitted cosmological parameters, the reported values of H_0 and M_{abs} are now compatible at 2σ with those for Λ CDM, while Ω_m is at 1σ . On the other hand, in the past the statistical preference criteria favored the Λ CDM model, indicating weak preference according to the ΔAIC index and strong preference according to the ΔBIC index. In the present work, a very strong preference for the $f(R)$ model is found according to both the ΔBIC and ΔAIC indices. This result is remarkable, as despite having an additional free parameter, which is primarily penalized by the BIC index, it remains statistically preferred.

C. The Exponential model

For this model, in our previous paper we found inconsistency at the 2σ level of the parameter b with $b = 0(\Lambda$ CDM). The incorporation of DESI_{DR2} data further increases that inconsistency, while the reported values for Ω_m and M_{abs} are compatible at 1σ and H_0 is compatible at 2σ . Performing the Bayesian comparison with the standard model, [18] reported slightly positive evidence in favor of the $f(R)$ model according to the ΔAIC index and slightly positive evidence in favor of the standard model according to the ΔBIC index. In contrast, in this new analysis, we obtain very strong evidence in favor of the Exponential $f(R)$ model according to both the ΔAIC and ΔBIC indices.

D. The Hyperbolic Tangent model

Finally, the conclusions obtained for the hyperbolic tangent $f(R)$ model are similar to those for the Exponential case. The estimated confidence interval for the distortion parameter b is smaller than in our previous publication [18], where we found inconsistency with Λ CDM even at the 2σ level, with a high value for b of approximately $b = 3$. In the present work, a lower value of approximately $b = 1.75$ is obtained, with its interval also inconsistent at more than the 2σ level with Λ CDM. The re-




FIG. 1: Results for the matter density parameter Ω_{m0} , the Hubble parameter H_0 and the absolute magnitude M_{abs} for the Λ CDM model, obtained using combinations of the Cosmic Chronometers, Type Ia Supernovae data from the Pantheon⁺+SH0ES collaborations, and the new DESI_{DR2} BAO data. The plots show the 68% and 95% confidence regions.

sults obtained for the rest of the cosmological parameters are compatible at 1σ with those reported for Λ CDM. Regarding statistical preference, the previous study shows positive evidence in favor of the $f(R)$ model according to the ΔAIC index, while conversely, weak evidence in favor of the standard model was found according to the ΔBIC index, which is reasonable since this criterion penalizes additional free parameters. Notably, in the present analysis, we also obtain very strong evidence in favor of the hyperbolic tangent $f(R)$ model in comparison with the Λ CDM model.

Model	Data	b	H_0	Ω_{m0}	M_{abs}
Λ_{CDM}	CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	–	$70.474^{+0.340(0.770)}_{-0.285(0.716)}$	$0.301^{+0.007(0.015)}_{-0.006(0.015)}$	$-19.338^{+0.012(0.027)}_{-0.010(0.025)}$
Starobinsky	CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	$0.827^{+0.086(0.218)}_{-0.119(0.291)}$	$68.824^{+0.368(0.939)}_{-0.309(0.746)}$	$0.308^{+0.006(0.015)}_{-0.008(0.016)}$	$-19.376^{+0.012(0.029)}_{-0.011(0.025)}$
Hu-Sawicki	CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	$0.000066^{+0.111(0.317)}_{-0.000050(0.000066)}$	$70.091^{+0.061(0.424)}_{-0.948(2.036)}$	$0.301^{+0.009(0.018)}_{-0.004(0.012)}$	$-19.349^{+0.003(0.017)}_{-0.026(0.054)}$
Exponential	CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	$1.020^{+0.083(0.193)}_{-0.067(0.183)}$	$69.801^{+0.321(0.754)}_{-0.270(0.654)}$	$0.306^{+0.007(0.017)}_{-0.006(0.015)}$	$-19.351^{+0.011(0.027)}_{-0.011(0.024)}$
Hyperbolic tangent	CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	$1.750^{+0.103(0.281)}_{-0.123(0.299)}$	$70.126^{+0.276(0.701)}_{-0.302(0.698)}$	$0.306^{+0.006(0.016)}_{-0.006(0.016)}$	$-19.343^{+0.010(0.024)}_{-0.011(0.025)}$

TABLE I: Confidence intervals (68% and 95% levels) for the $f(R)$ models (Starobinsky, Hu-Sawicki, Exponential and Hyperbolic Tangent) obtained using the different groups of observables selected to perform the statistical analyses. (Cosmic Chronometers (CC), Snela Pantheon⁺+SH0ES (PPS) Collaboration and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) data from the DESI Data Release 2 (DESI_{DR2})).

Data	Model	χ^2_{min}	χ^2_{ν}	AIC	BIC	ΔAIC	ΔBIC
CC+PPS+DESI _{DR2}	Λ_{CDM}	1585.536	0.9272	1591.536	1607.874	-	-
	Starobinsky	1563.613	0.9149	1571.613	1593.397	-19.922	-14.476
	Hu-Sawicki	1588.178	0.9293	1596.178	1617.962	4.642	10.088
	Exponential	1556.196	0.9106	1564.196	1585.980	-27.340	-21.894
	Hyperbolic Tangent	1557.191	0.9112	1565.191	1586.975	-26.345	-20.899

TABLE II: Results of standard statistical tools commonly used to assess model fitting: the chi-square and the reduced chi-square statistics (χ^2_{min} , χ^2_{ν}), the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) for each model.




FIG. 2: Results for the distortion parameter b , the Hubble parameter H_0 , the matter density parameter Ω_{m0} and the absolute magnitude M_{abs} for all the $f(R)$ models studied in this work obtained using combinations of the Cosmic Chronometers, Type Ia Supernovae data from the Pantheon⁺+SH0ES collaborations, and the new DESI_{DR2} BAO data. The plots show the 68% and 95% confidence regions.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we have analyzed four of the most widely studied $f(R)$ models—Starobinsky, Hu-Sawicki, Exponential, and Hyperbolic Tangent—within a cosmological framework using the latest compilation of BAO measurements, the DESI DR2 release [7]. To achieve this, we solved the modified Friedmann equations and performed statistical analyses using also datasets from SNIa [41, 42] (Pantheon plus+SH0ES) and cosmic chronometers to constrain the free parameters of these models.

It is observed that all models, except for Hu-Sawicki, are incompatible with the Λ_{CDM} model at more than 2σ level in the confidence intervals for the distortion parameter b . In this regard, we find that the models exhibiting significant differences from the standard model are precisely those that show statistical preference over Λ_{CDM} . This is reasonable, as the Hu-Sawicki model is the one that allows the least deviation of its parameter b from zero, as we previously demonstrated in our earlier publication, where we found that for larger n_{HS} , the distortion parameter b exhibits greater freedom [18]. Therefore, if a model does not significantly deviate from the standard one and possesses an additional free parameter, it is reasonable that it does not show statistical preference, especially when analyzing ΔBIC , which penalizes extra free parameters.

In the cases of the Starobinsky, Exponential, and Hyperbolic Tangent models, very strong evidence is found in their favor over the standard Λ CDM model. This is an unprecedented result and is attributed to the precision of the new data released by DESI DR2 [7], which, for the first time, demonstrates that both the alternative models studied in that paper and those analyzed in this work are statistically preferred in describing the observational data. This finding may be highly relevant for future research into new physics related to gravitational interactions.

Regarding the Hubble parameter, H_0 , it is observed that all the $f(R)$ models studied yield values below those of the standard model. Concerning the H_0 tension, although these models are statistically preferred, they do not appear to alleviate this discrepancy [8, 16, 43, 52]. Nevertheless, in this context, future prospects include the implementation of alternative calibration methods for Type Ia supernovae [53, 54], which could help alleviate the tension by modifying the model-independent estimated value. However, this is not something that can be asserted at present.

With respect to the total matter density parameter, all models are mutually compatible and consistent with the

standard model.

As a final conclusion, we highlight the significant change in the conclusions of the Bayesian comparison analyses, exclusively driven by the remarkable constraining power of this new dataset, which allows for greater differentiation between models and enables their comparison with higher rigor and precision. Therefore, we conclude that $f(R)$ theory models continue to represent a promising approach to explaining the accelerated expansion of the universe, with the novel addition of statistical preference for these models over the Λ CDM model in light of the new observational data.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank D. Brout, M. Leizerovich, A. Ballatore and S. J. Landau for their helpful comments.

The authors are supported by CONICET Grant No. PIP 11220200100729CO, and Grant No.G175 from UNLP.

-
- [1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, et al., *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), astro-ph/9805201.
- [2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), astro-ph/9812133.
- [3] A. Joyce, L. Lombriser, and F. Schmidt, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **66**, 95 (2016), 1601.06133.
- [4] S. Tsujikawa, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **30**, 214003 (2013), 1304.1961.
- [5] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **15**, 1753 (2006), hep-th/0603057.
- [6] R. R. Caldwell and E. V. Linder, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 141301 (2005), astro-ph/0505494.
- [7] DESI Collaboration, M. Abdul Karim, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, L. Allen, C. Allende Prieto, O. Alves, A. Anand, U. Andrade, et al., arXiv e-prints arXiv:2503.14738 (2025), 2503.14738.
- [8] B. Hu, M. Raveri, M. Rizzato, and A. Silvestri, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **459**, 3880 (2016), 1601.07536.
- [9] . Nunes et al., *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2017**, 005 (2017), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088%2F1475-7516%2F2017%2F01%2F005>.
- [10] S. D. Odintsov, D. Sáez-Chillón Gómez, and G. S. Sharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 862 (2017).
- [11] Á. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P. K. S. Dunsby, S. Kandhai, and D. Sáez-Gómez, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 084016 (2016), 1511.00102.
- [12] M. Leizerovich, L. Kraiselburd, S. Landau, and C. G. Scóccola, *Physical Review D* **105**, 103526 (2022), 2112.01492.
- [13] S. D. Odintsov, D. Sáez-Chillón Gómez, and G. S. Sharov, *Nuclear Physics B* **966**, 115377 (2021), ISSN 0550-3213, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0550321321000742>.
- [14] C. R. Farrugia, J. Sultana, and J. Mifsud, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123503 (2021), 2106.04657.
- [15] K. Ravi, A. Chatterjee, B. Jana, and A. Bandyopadhyay, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **527**, 7626 (2024), 2306.12585.
- [16] R. Kou, C. Murray, and J. G. Bartlett, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **686**, A193 (2024), 2311.09936.
- [17] S. Li, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, S. Casertano, and G. S. Anand, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2502.05259 (2025), 2502.05259.
- [18] F. Plaza and L. Kraiselburd, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2503.16132 (2025), 2503.16132.
- [19] K. Ravi, A. Chatterjee, B. Jana, and A. Bandyopadhyay, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **527**, 7626 (2024), 2306.12585.
- [20] A. T. Chantada, S. J. Landau, P. Protopapas, C. G. Scóccola, and C. Garraffo, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 123514 (2024), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.109.123514>.
- [21] A. A. Starobinsky, *Physics Letters B* **91**, 99 (1980), ISSN 03702693.
- [22] T. Asaka, S. Iso, H. Kawai, K. Kohri, T. Noumi, and T. Terada, *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* **2016**, 123E01 (2016), ISSN 2050-3911, <https://academic.oup.com/ptep/article-pdf/2016/12/123E01/10436310/ptw161.pdf>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptw161>.
- [23] A. Cisterna, N. Grandi, and J. Oliva, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**,

- 084043 (2024), 2406.10037.
- [24] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, TSPU Bulletin **N8(110)**, 7 (2011), 0807.0685.
- [25] M. Artymowski and Z. Lalak, JCAP **09**, 036 (2014), 1405.7818.
- [26] S. W. Hawking, T. Hertog, and H. S. Reall, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 083504 (2001), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.63.083504>.
- [27] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Reviews in Relativity **13**, 3 (2010), 1002.4928.
- [28] . D.Perez, et al., *New Phenomena and New States of Matter in the Universe* (2023).
- [29] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations* (2010).
- [30] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Reviews in Relativity **13**, 3 (2010), 1002.4928.
- [31] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 064004 (2007), 0705.1158.
- [32] G. Cognola, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, L. Sebastiani, and S. Zerbini, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 046009 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.046009>.
- [33] S. Tsujikawa, Physical Review D **77** (2008), ISSN 1550-2368, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.023507>.
- [34] J. Simon, L. Verde, and R. Jimenez, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 123001 (2005), astro-ph/0412269.
- [35] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, and S. A. Stanford, JCAP **2**, 008 (2010), 0907.3149.
- [36] M. Moresco, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, L. Pozzetti, G. Zamorani, M. Bolzonella, J. Dunlop, F. Lamareille, M. Mignoli, H. Pearce, et al., JCAP **8**, 006 (2012), 1201.3609.
- [37] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, S. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, and Y.-C. Sun, Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics **14**, 1221-1233 (2014), 1207.4541.
- [38] M. Moresco, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **450**, L16 (2015), 1503.01116.
- [39] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, JCAP **5**, 014 (2016), 1601.01701.
- [40] N. Borghi, M. Moresco, and A. Cimatti, The Astrophysical Journal Letters **928**, L4 (2022), URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac3fb2>.
- [41] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, and et al., The Astrophys. Journal **938**, 110 (2022), 2202.04077.
- [42] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, and et al., The Astrophys. Journal **938**, 113 (2022), 2112.03863.
- [43] 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., Astrophys. J. Lett. **934**, L7 (2022), 2112.04510.
- [44] A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, D. M. Alexander, M. Alvarez, O. Alves, A. Anand, U. Andrade, E. Armengaud, et al., JCAP **2025**, 021 (2025), 2404.03002.
- [45] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **449**, 835–847 (2015), ISSN 0035-8711, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv154>.
- [46] J. E. Bautista, N. G. Busca, J. Guy, J. Rich, M. Blomqvist, H. du Mas des Bourboux, M. M. Pieri, A. Font-Ribera, S. Bailey, T. Delubac, et al., Astronomy and Astrophysics **603**, A12 (2017), ISSN 1432-0746, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201730533>.
- [47] J. E. Bautista, R. Paviot, M. Vargas Magaña, S. de la Torre, S. Fromenteau, H. Gil-Marín, A. J. Ross, E. Burtin, K. S. Dawson, J. Hou, et al., Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **500**, 736–762 (2020), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa2800>.
- [48] R. Neveux, E. Burtin, A. de Mattia, A. Smith, A. J. Ross, J. Hou, J. Bautista, J. Brinkmann, C.-H. Chuang, K. S. Dawson, et al., Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **499**, 210 (2020), 2007.08999.
- [49] M. Ata, F. Baumgarten, J. Bautista, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. Brinkmann, J. R. Brownstein, et al., Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **473**, 4773–4794 (2017), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2630>.
- [50] S. Alam, M. Ata, S. Bailey, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. R. Brownstein, A. Burden, C.-H. Chuang, et al., Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **470**, 2617–2652 (2017), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx721>.
- [51] H. du Mas des Bourboux, J.-M. Le Goff, M. Blomqvist, N. G. Busca, J. Guy, J. Rich, C. Yèche, J. E. Bautista, E. Burtin, K. S. Dawson, et al., Astronomy and Astrophysics **608**, A130 (2017), ISSN 1432-0746, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201731731>.
- [52] . Planck Collaboration, A&A **641**, A6 (2020), URL <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910>.
- [53] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, I. S. Jang, T. J. Hoyt, A. J. Lee, and K. A. Owens, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2408.06153 (2024), 2408.06153.
- [54] L. Perivolaropoulos, Phys. Rev. D **110**, 123518 (2024), 2408.11031.