

Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension

Hao Wang^{1,2*} and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2,3,4} †

¹ School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,

Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China

² School of Physics 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

It might be necessary to access the impact of recent released Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) data on the state equation of dark energy in the Hubble-tension-free cosmologies. In this paper, we report the MCMC analysis for the $w_0 w_a$ CDM model with pre-recombination early dark energy (EDE) using Planck+DESI+Pantheon+SH0ES dataset. The results reveal that $H_0 = 72.43 \pm 0.75$, $w_0 = -0.971 \pm 0.035$, $w_a = -0.347 \pm 0.120$ for axion-like EDE, while $H_0 = 73.32 \pm 0.64$, $w_0 = -0.923 \pm 0.054$, $w_a = -0.435 \pm 0.132$ for AdS-EDE, and also not surprisingly the spectral index of primordial scalar perturbation moves towards $n_s = 1$. It looks like that in corresponding models the bestfit H_0 are higher than those with pre-DESI BAO data, but without the further exacerbation of S_8 tension.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the local measurement by the SH0ES collaboration using Cepheid-calibrated Type Ia supernovae has reported the Hubble constant $H_0 \sim 73$ km/s/Mpc [2], while the standard Λ CDM model predicts a value for $H_0 \sim 67$ km/s/Mpc based on observations of CMB [1]. This is the well-known Hubble tension [3, 4], see also [5–8].

It is usually thought that early dark energy (EDE) [9–11] is one of the most competitive resolutions to the Hubble tension. In corresponding model, EDE field is not negligible just before recombination, which results in a lower sound horizon and consequently a higher H_0 . In particular an anti-de Sitter phase around recombination can efficiently enhance the EDE contribution (AdS-EDE) [12, 13], and thus leads the bestfit $H_0 \sim 73$ km/s/Mpc, 1σ consistent with the local measurement. Though the rise of H_0 is accompanied with the exacerbation of S_8 tension [14–18], it might be alleviated by mechanisms independent of EDE [19–29].

Recent DESI dataset is based on samples of bright galaxies, LRGs, ELGs, quasars and Ly α forest tracers in the redshift range $0.1 < z < 4.2$ [30–32]. The measurement of the state equation w of dark energy is one of significant results of DESI. The combination of DESI and CMB shows $w_0 = -0.45 \pm 0.27$ and $w_a = -1.79 \pm 0.79$ for the equation of state [47, 48]

$$w(z) = w_0 + w_a \frac{z}{1+z}, \quad (1)$$

while the constraints on w_0 and w_a becomes tighter when Pantheon data is concerned, which results $w_0 = 0.827 \pm$

0.063 and $w_a = -0.75 \pm 0.27$. The relevant issues have been intensively investigated e.g.[33–38].

However, in view of the Hubble tension that Λ CDM model is suffering from, it might be necessary and also significant to access the results of DESI on the state equation of dark energy in the Hubble-tension-free cosmologies. In this paper, we report our MCMC results for the $w_0 w_a$ CDM+EDE model with Planck2018 full data, DESI BAO, Pantheon+ and the SH0ES H_0 prior, compared with our earlier work [39] with pre-DESI data. We discuss whether the impact of DESI on w would persist with EDE, and the corresponding implications.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

To study the cosmological results with DESI BAO, we adopt the following observational datasets:

- **CMB** Planck 2018 low-l and high-l TT, TE, EE spectra, and reconstructed CMB lensing spectrum [1, 40, 41].
- **DESI BAO** The BGS sample in the redshift range $0.1 < z < 0.4$, LRG samples in $0.4 < z < 0.6$ and $0.6 < z < 0.8$, combined LRG and ELG sample in $0.8 < z < 1.1$, ELG sample in $1.1 < z < 1.6$, quasar sample in $0.8 < z < 2.1$ and the Lyman- α Forest Sample in $1.77 < z < 4.16$ [30–32]. We use their measurements of the comoving distance $D_M(z)/r_d$ and $D_H(z)/r_d$ ($r_d = \int_{z_d}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z)}{H(z)} dz$ is the sound horizon)

$$D_M(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{c_s dz'}{H(z')}, \quad D_H(z) \equiv \frac{c_s}{H(z)}, \quad (2)$$

where $z_d \simeq 1060$ is at the baryon drag epoch and c_s is the speed of sound, as well as the angle-averaged quantity D_V/r_d for BGS and QSO measurements

*wanghao187@mails.ucas.ac.cn

†yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

with low signal-to-noise ratio where

$$D_V(z) \equiv (z D_M(z)^2 D_H(z))^{1/3}. \quad (3)$$

tracer	z_{eff}	D_M/r_d	D_H/r_d	D_V/r_d
BGS	0.30	-	-	7.93 ± 0.15
LRG	0.51	13.62 ± 0.25	20.98 ± 0.61	-
LRG	0.71	16.85 ± 0.32	20.08 ± 0.60	-
LRG+ELG	0.93	21.71 ± 0.28	17.88 ± 0.35	-
ELG	1.32	27.79 ± 0.69	13.82 ± 0.42	-
QSO	1.49	-	-	26.07 ± 0.67
Lya QSO	2.33	39.71 ± 0.94	8.52 ± 0.17	-

TABLE I: Statistics for the DESI samples of the DESI DR1 BAO measurements used in this paper.

- **Pantheon+** We use Pantheon+ consisting of 1701 light curves of 1550 spectroscopically confirmed type Ia SN coming from 18 different surveys [42].
- **SH0ES** We take $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04$ km/s/Mpc reported by the SH0ES as a Gaussian prior, which is similar to adding a Gaussian prior on the peak SN1a absolute magnitude M_b [43], see also [44, 45].

Here, for pre-recombination EDE we consider axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE models. In original EDE model [10], an axion-like field with $V(\phi) \sim (1 - \cos[\phi/f])^3$ is responsible for EDE, which starts to oscillate at the redshift $z_c \sim 3000$ and dilutes away like a fluid with $w = 1/2$. In AdS-EDE model [12, 13, 46], we have $V(\phi) = V_0(\phi/M_P)^4 - V_{ads}$, which is glued to a cosmological constant $V(\phi) = \Lambda$ by interpolation ($V_{ads} > 0$ is the AdS depth), and the scalar field starts to roll at the redshift z_c , and then rolls over an AdS minimum like a fluid with $w > 1$ and climbs up to the $\Lambda > 0$ region.

In our MCMC, the parameter sets are $\{\omega_b, \omega_{cdm}, H_0, \ln 10^{10} A_s, n_s, \tau_{reio}, w_0, w_a, \log_{10} a_c, f_{EDE}, \theta_i\}$ for axion-like EDE where $\theta_i \equiv \phi_i/f$, and $\{\omega_b, \omega_{cdm}, H_0, \ln 10^{10} A_s, n_s, \tau_{reio}, w_0, w_a, \ln(1+z_c), f_{EDE}\}$ for AdS-EDE ¹, respectively, where f_{EDE} is the energy fraction of EDE at z_c .

We modified the MontePython-3.6 sampler [49, 50] and CLASS codes [51, 52] to perform our MCMC analysis. In Table.II we list the flat priors used. We adopt a Gelman-Rubin convergence criterion with a threshold $R-1 < 0.1$.

III. RESULTS

In Table.III, we present our MCMC results. In Fig.1, we show the 1σ and 2σ marginalized posterior distributions of parameters. It looks like that DESI prefers a

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]
f_{EDE}	$[10^{-4}, 0.3]$
w_0	$[-2, 0.34]$
w_a	$[-3, 2]$

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

Parameters	w_0w_a CDM axion-like EDE	w_0w_a CDM AdS-EDE
$100\omega_b$	$2.256(2.272) \pm 0.018$	$2.337(2.336) \pm 0.013$
ω_{cdm}	$0.128(0.129) \pm 0.003$	$0.134(0.134) \pm 0.002$
H_0	$72.43(72.66) \pm 0.75$	$73.32(73.35) \pm 0.64$
$\ln 10^{10} A_s$	$3.052(3.068) \pm 0.014$	$3.072(3.079) \pm 0.015$
n_s	$0.979(0.992) \pm 0.007$	$0.995(0.995) \pm 0.004$
τ_{reio}	$0.054(0.060) \pm 0.006$	$0.055(0.059) \pm 0.007$
w_0	$-0.971(-0.951) \pm 0.035$	$-0.923(-0.885) \pm 0.054$
w_a	$-0.347(-0.236) \pm 0.120$	$-0.435(-0.553) \pm 0.132$
Ω_m	$0.287(0.287) \pm 0.006$	$0.294(0.294) \pm 0.005$
S_8	$0.842(0.836) \pm 0.013$	$0.863(0.864) \pm 0.010$

TABLE III: Mean (bestfit) values and 1σ regions of the parameters of w_0w_a CDM model with axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE, respectively, fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon+SH0ES dataset.

higher H_0 , In both w_0w_a CDM+EDE models, the bestfit are $H_0 \sim 72.4$ and 73.3 km/s/Mpc, both are higher than those with pre-DESI data, see e.g.[39]. In Ref.[53], for the Λ CDM+EDE model, the bestfit H_0 is ~ 71 km/s/Mpc. however, in w_0w_a CDM+EDE model it seems that the slight preference to $w_0 > -1$ and $w_a < 0$ caused by DESI possibly further increases H_0 by $\sim 1\sigma$.

In w_0w_a CDM+(axion-like)EDE model, S_8 is smaller than that with pre-DESI data. Actually DESI itself tends to a lower S_8 , e.g.see [53]. However, in w_0w_a CDM+(AdS-)EDE model the exacerbation of S_8 caused by a larger H_0 offsets the effect of DESI, with a S_8 similar to that with pre-DESI data. Here, $\Omega_m \sim 0.29$, which is consistent with the result of DESI for Λ CDM, $\Omega_m = 0.295 \pm 0.015$ [32], but slightly smaller. It might be that most D_M/r_d and D_H/r_d posteriors of DESI imply a smaller Ω_m , which causes the shift towards a higher H_0 .

It is significant to comment the results on dark energy. In w_0w_a CDM+EDE model, $w_0 > -1$ and $w_a < 0$ are preferred, closer to $w_0 = -1$ but there is still $1 - 2\sigma$ deviation from those with pre-DESI data in Ref.[39]. The constraint on w_a becomes tighter. This could be partly explained by a higher H_0 in light of the $H(z)$. According

¹ In AdS-EDE we fixed $\alpha_{ads} = 3.79 \times 10^{-4}$ where α_{ads} is set by $V_{ads} = \alpha_{ads}(\rho_m(z_c) + \rho_r(z_c))$, as in Ref.[12].




FIG. 1: 2D contours at 68% and 95% CL for the parameters of w_0w_a CDM model with axion-like EDE and AdS-EDE, respectively, fitting to Planck18+DESI+Pantheon+SH0ES dataset.

to the parameterization (1), we have

$$\frac{H(z)}{H_0} = \left[\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)(1+z)^{3(1+w_0+w_a)} e^{\frac{-3w_a z}{1+z}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

In certain sense D_M/r_d (also D_H/r_d) is set by both H_0 and $w_0(w_a)$, and thus a high H_0 in w_0w_a CDM+EDE models suppresses the requirement for $w_0 > -1$ when $D_M/r_d(D_H/r_d)$ is fixed, so w_0 is closer to -1 .

It is well-known that inflation is the current paradigm of early universe, which predicts (nearly) scale-invariant scalar perturbation. Though based on Λ CDM model the Planck collaboration showed $n_s \approx 0.965$ [54], $n_s = 1$ ($n_s - 1 \sim \mathcal{O}(0.001)$) is favored [12, 55–59] in light of the EDE resolution of Hubble tension (see also [68, 69]), see recent Refs.[60–67] for its implication for inflation mod-

els. Here, with DESI data we find that the shift towards $n_s = 1$ persists.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the use of publicly available codes AxiCLASS (<https://github.com/PoulinV/AxiCLASS>) and classmultiscf (https://github.com/genye00/class_multiscf.git). We thank Bin Hu for valuable discussion. YSP is supported by NSFC, No.12075246, National Key Research and Development Program of China, No. 2021YFC2203004, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

-
- [1] 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]].
- [2] L. Breuval, A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan,

- L. M. Macri, M. Romaniello, Y. S. Murakami, D. Scolnic, G. S. Anand and I. Soszyński, [arXiv:2404.08038 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [3] A. G. Riess, Nature Rev. Phys. **2**, no.1, 10–12 (2019) doi:10.1038/s42254-019-0137-0 [arXiv:2001.03624 [astro-

- ph.CO]].
- [4] L. Verde, T. Treu and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astron.* **3**, 891 doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0902-0 [arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [5] 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]].
 - [6] 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]].
 - [7] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.newar.2022.101659 [arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [8] S. Vagnozzi, *Universe* **9** (2023) no.9, 393 doi:10.3390/universe9090393 [arXiv:2308.16628 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [9] 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]].
 - [10] 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]].
 - [11] 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]].
 - [12] 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]].
 - [13] 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]].
 - [14] G. D'Amico, L. Senatore, P. Zhang and H. Zheng, *JCAP* **05**, 072 (2021) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/05/072 [arXiv:2006.12420 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [15] C. Krishnan, E. Ó. Colgáin, Ruchika, A. A. Sen, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.10, 103525 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103525 [arXiv:2002.06044 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [16] R. C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505**, no.4, 5427-5437 (2021) doi:10.1093/mnras/stab1613 [arXiv:2106.01208 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [17] J. C. Hill, E. McDonough, M. W. Toomey and S. Alexander, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.4, 043507 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.043507 [arXiv:2003.07355 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [18] M. M. Ivanov, E. McDonough, J. C. Hill, M. Simonović, M. W. Toomey, S. Alexander and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.10, 103502 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103502 [arXiv:2006.11235 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [19] V. Poulin, J. L. Bernal, E. Kovetz and M. Kamionkowski, [arXiv:2209.06217 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [20] I. J. Allali, M. P. Hertzberg and F. Rompinene, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.8, L081303 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.L081303 [arXiv:2104.12798 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [21] G. Ye, J. Zhang and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2107.13391 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [22] S. Alexander, H. Bernardo and M. W. Toomey, [arXiv:2207.13086 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [23] G. Franco Abellán, R. Murgia and V. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.12, 12 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.123533 [arXiv:2102.12498 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [24] S. J. Clark, K. Vattis, J. Fan and S. M. Koushiappas, [arXiv:2110.09562 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [25] T. Simon, G. Franco Abellán, P. Du, V. Poulin and Y. Tsai, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, no.2, 023516 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.023516 [arXiv:2203.07440 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [26] A. Reeves, L. Herold, S. Vagnozzi, B. D. Sherwin and E. G. M. Ferreira, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520**, no.3, 3688-3695 (2023) doi:10.1093/mnras/stad317 [arXiv:2207.01501 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [27] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) no.8, 8 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.083516 [arXiv:2209.09685 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [28] Z. Chacko, Y. Cui, S. Hong, T. Okui and Y. Tsai, *JHEP* **12**, 108 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)108 [arXiv:1609.03569 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [29] M. A. Buen-Abad, Z. Chacko, C. Kilic, G. Marques-Tavares and T. Youn, [arXiv:2208.05984 [hep-ph]].
 - [30] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03002 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [31] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03000 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [32] A. G. Adame *et al.* [DESI], [arXiv:2404.03001 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [33] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.07070 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [34] M. Cortés and A. R. Liddle, [arXiv:2404.08056 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [35] Y. Carloni, O. Luongo and M. Muccino, [arXiv:2404.12068 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [36] D. Wang, [arXiv:2404.13833 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [37] E. Ó. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and D. Stojkovic, [arXiv:2404.08633 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [38] W. Giarè, M. A. Sabogal, R. C. Nunes and E. Di Valentino, [arXiv:2404.15232 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [39] 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]].
 - [40] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A5 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201936386 [arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [41] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A8 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833886 [arXiv:1807.06210 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [42] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, A. G. Riess, T. M. Davis, A. Dwomoh, D. O. Jones, N. Ali, P. Charvú and R. Chen, *et al. Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 113 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8b7a [arXiv:2112.03863 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [43] 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]].
 - [44] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **504** (2021), 5164-5171 doi:10.1093/mnras/stab1200 [arXiv:2101.08641 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [45] G. Efstathiou, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **505** (2021) no.3, 3866-3872 doi:10.1093/mnras/stab1588 [arXiv:2103.08723 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] 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]].
- [47] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **10** (2001), 213-224 doi:10.1142/S0218271801000822 [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008 [gr-qc]].
- [48] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003), 091301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.091301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512 [astro-ph]].
- [49] 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]].
- [50] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, Phys. Dark Univ. **24** (2019), 100260 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2018.100260 [arXiv:1804.07261 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] J. Lesgourgues, [arXiv:1104.2932 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [52] 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]].
- [53] F. J. Qu, K. M. Surrao, B. Bolliet, J. C. Hill, B. D. Sherwin and H. T. Jense, [arXiv:2404.16805 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] Y. Akrami *et al.* [Planck], Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020), A10 doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833887 [arXiv:1807.06211 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [55] 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]].
- [56] 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]].
- [57] J. Q. Jiang, G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2210.06125 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [58] T. L. Smith, M. Lucca, V. Poulin, G. F. Abel-
lan, L. Balkenhol, K. Benabed, S. Galli and R. Murgia, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.4, 043526 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.043526 [arXiv:2202.09379 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [59] Z. Y. Peng and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2308.01012 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.2, 023522 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.023522 [arXiv:2204.02425 [hep-th]].
- [61] 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]].
- [62] J. Q. Jiang, G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, [arXiv:2303.12345 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] G. D'Amico, N. Kaloper and A. Westphal, Phys. Rev. D **105**, no.10, 103527 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.103527 [arXiv:2112.13861 [hep-th]].
- [64] F. Takahashi and W. Yin, Phys. Lett. B **830**, 137143 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137143 [arXiv:2112.06710 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [65] W. Giarè, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, W. Yang, J. de Haro and A. Melchiorri, JCAP **09** (2023), 019 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2023/09/019 [arXiv:2305.15378 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [66] C. Fu and S. J. Wang, [arXiv:2310.12932 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [67] W. Giarè, [arXiv:2404.12779 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, Y. Fantaye and A. Heavens, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.6, 063508 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.063508 [arXiv:1808.09201 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [69] W. Giarè, F. Renzi, O. Mena, E. Di Valentino and A. Melchiorri, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **521** (2023) no.2, 2911-2918 doi:10.1093/mnras/stad724 [arXiv:2210.09018 [astro-ph.CO]].