

Combining pre- and post-recombination new physics to address cosmological tensions: case study with varying electron mass and sign-switching cosmological constant

Yo Toda,^{1, α} William Giarè,^{2, β} Emre Özülker,^{3, γ} Eleonora Di Valentino,^{2, δ} and Sunny Vagnozzi^{4, 5, ϵ}

¹*Department of Physics, Hokkaido University, Kita 10, Nishi 8, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

²*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sheffield, Hounsfield Road, Sheffield S3 7RH, United Kingdom*

³*Department of Physics, Istanbul Technical University, 34469 Maslak, Istanbul, Turkey*

⁴*Department of Physics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive 14, 38123 Povo (TN), Italy*

⁵*Trento Institute for Fundamental Physics and Applications (TIFPA)-INFN, Via Sommarive 14, 38123 Povo (TN), Italy*

(Dated: September 24, 2024)

It has recently been argued that the Hubble tension may call for a combination of both pre- and post-recombination new physics. Motivated by these considerations, we provide one of the first concrete case studies aimed at constructing such a viable combination. We consider models that have individually worked best on either end of recombination so far: a spatially uniform time-varying electron mass leading to earlier recombination (also adding non-zero spatial curvature), and a sign-switching cosmological constant inducing an AdS-to-dS transition within the Λ_s CDM model. When confronted against Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, and Type Ia Supernovae data, we show that no combination of these ingredients can successfully solve the Hubble tension. We find that the matter density parameter Ω_m plays a critical role, driving important physical scales in opposite directions: the AdS-to-dS transition requires a larger Ω_m to maintain the CMB acoustic scale fixed, whereas the varying electron mass requires a smaller Ω_m to maintain the redshift of matter-radiation equality fixed. Despite the overall failure, we use our results to draw general model-building lessons, highlighting the importance of assessing tension-solving directions in the parameter space of new physics parameters and how these correlate with shifts in other standard parameters, while underscoring the crucial role of Ω_m in this sense.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Λ CDM model has proven to be extremely successful in accounting for a wide range of cosmological and astrophysical observations [1–5]. As the precision of our instruments improves, so does that of the inferred cosmological parameters, potentially leading to mismatches between Λ CDM-based model predictions for such parameters and direct measurements thereof: the most prominent mismatch concerns the Hubble constant H_0 . The latest observations of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature, polarization, and lensing from the *Planck* satellite, when analyzed assuming the Λ CDM model, yield $H_0 = (67.36 \pm 0.54)$ km/s/Mpc [2]. On the other hand, the local distance ladder measurement of H_0 via Cepheid-calibrated Type Ia Supernovae (SNeIa) from the SHOES team in Ref. [6] yields $H_0 = (73.04 \pm 1.04)$ km/s/Mpc, while a number of other local observations (see for example Refs. [7–29]) are also consistent with higher values of H_0 , albeit not at the same level of tension with *Planck* as the SHOES measurement. The resulting $\gtrsim 5\sigma$ Hubble tension is leading to a potential cosmological crisis, but at the same time constitutes one of the most exciting and fast-moving open problems in the field – see e.g. Refs. [30–39] for reviews.

With the continuous improvement in precision of cosmological measurements, the Hubble tension has not only persisted but increased in significance, while a number of other milder tensions have appeared (e.g. the discrepancy in S_8 , measuring the amplitude of clustering in the late Universe [40–44]). The steady growth of the Hubble tension and the increasing difficulty in attributing it to systematics [45–54] has motivated within the community over a decade of attempts to build new physics models aimed at addressing this and potentially other observational tensions:¹ with no claims as to completeness, see e.g. Refs. [56–106] for examples of these models. However, to better appreciate at what epochs new physics may be required to resolve the H_0 tension, it is useful to inspect the role of the comoving size of the sound horizon at the epoch of recombination, r_s . Datasets calibrated with early-time (pre-recombination) information appear to be consistent with the low value of H_0 inferred from *Planck*: a key example in this sense are Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) measurements calibrated by using a Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) prior on the physical baryon density ω_b to determine r_s . Further combining BBN and BAO measurements with uncalibrated (Hubble flow) SNeIa allows one to build an *inverse distance ladder*, from which a low value of H_0 consistent with the *Planck* Λ CDM one, yet *completely independent of any*

^{α} y-toda@particle.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

^{β} w.giare@sheffield.ac.uk

^{γ} ozulker17@itu.edu.tr

^{δ} e.divalentino@sheffield.ac.uk

^{ϵ} sunny.vagnozzi@unitn.it

¹ To the best of our knowledge one of the earliest works recognizing the problem, explicitly referring to it as a tension, and attempting solutions in terms of new physics was Ref. [55], which dates back to the first half of 2013.

CMB data, is inferred. These results are in stark disagreement with the higher values of H_0 obtained via local distance measurements which calibrate SNeIa (or, more generally, other distance indicators) by inferring their absolute magnitude, M_B , utilizing nearby astrophysical objects. The tension between local and inverse distance ladder inferences of H_0 indicates that, at its heart, the Hubble tension is actually a tension between calibrators, which can be cleanly recast in terms of the SNeIa absolute magnitude M_B , and the sound horizon r_s [107].

Since BAO data on their own are sensitive to the combination $H_0 r_s$,² it is clear that (assuming M_B is left untouched) the only way to get local and inverse distance ladder measurements of H_0 to agree is to lower r_s – given that the integral determining r_s runs from the earliest times up to recombination, this necessarily requires introducing new physics prior to recombination [108–117]. One interesting possibility in this sense is that of increasing the pre-recombination expansion rate, for instance through an early dark energy (EDE) component [118–120]. Another interesting class of proposals invokes new physics which makes recombination occur earlier, for instance via a time-varying electron mass m_e [121, 122], as we will discuss in significantly more detail later.

The above considerations make it clear that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to resolve the Hubble tension by invoking exclusively late-time, post-recombination physics [108–117]. Because they are on their own unable to alter the sound horizon, late-time modifications to Λ CDM in the presence of a higher value of H_0 are bound to worsen the fit to BAO and uncalibrated SNeIa data, which control respectively the normalization and shape of the $z \lesssim 2$ expansion rate.³ Nevertheless, some amount of late-time new physics which can partially (but not completely) alleviate the Hubble tension is allowed by BAO and SNeIa data, and various proposals in this direction have been explored in the literature, mostly in relation to new dynamics in the dark energy (DE) sector (see e.g. Refs. [138–187]).

² BAO measurements are actually sensitive to the sound horizon evaluated at the baryon drag epoch, typically denoted by r_d , whereas the scale governing the physics behind the acoustic peaks in the CMB is the sound horizon evaluated at recombination, typically denoted by r_* . The two epochs are separated in redshift by $\Delta z = z_d - z_* \sim 30$, so the difference between the two sound horizons is very small, but nevertheless important. In order not to overburden the notation, here we shall simply refer to the “sound horizon” denoted by r_s , and it will be clear from the context of the discussion which of the two sound horizons we are actually referring to.

³ This argument does not necessarily hold, or is at the very least weakened, if one considers 2D BAO data, which have been argued to carry less cosmological model-dependence compared to their widely used 3D counterparts (see e.g. Refs. [123–137] for examples of discussions on 2D BAO data and their use in obtaining cosmological constraints). Nevertheless, in order to be as conservative as possible, we will not use this less conventional approach in the present work. In what follows, BAO will thus always refer to 3D BAO measurements.

Despite a plethora of attempts, it is fair to say that no compelling model of early-time new physics which is *i*) able to fully solve the Hubble tension while *ii*) maintaining a good fit to all available cosmological data *iii*) without worsening other milder observational discrepancies, has yet been constructed. Empirically speaking, it is the case that even the most successful models appear, at best, to bring the value of H_0 inferred from CMB, BAO, and Hubble flow SNeIa data (therefore without an inclusion of SH0ES H_0 prior) up to $H_0 \sim 70$ km/s/Mpc. Could it perhaps be that models of early-time new physics, on their own, may not be enough to fully solve the Hubble tension? This conclusion was recently put forward by one of us in Ref. [188], on the basis of seven assorted hints [189–204]: in particular, it was argued that solving the Hubble tension will ultimately require a combination of early- and late-time new physics, and potentially local new physics.⁴ However, besides a few general considerations, Ref. [188] did not propose any concrete combination of potentially interesting early-plus-late-time new physics models, delegating the quest of finding one such combination as an exercise to the reader.

The goal of the present work is precisely that of embracing the above challenge, thereby providing one of the first concrete case studies aimed at combining early- and late-time new physics in an attempt to address the Hubble tension (see also Refs. [225–235] for earlier studies which in part show a similar spirit, featuring combinations of modifications and/or ingredients at early and late times). The choice of which specific models to combine is guided by considerations on which models have *individually* shown the most promise so far. In this first work, our (admittedly naïve) zeroth-order criterion to judge promise, therefore, is simply assessing whether the value of H_0 inferred within the models in question from CMB+BAO+SNeIa data (without a SH0ES H_0 prior) is sufficiently high. More specifically, on the early-time side we consider the Λ CDM+ m_e model, featuring a spatially uniform time-varying electron mass m_e [121, 122], and introducing an extra parameter, i.e. the fractional variation in m_e between recombination and today: a higher value of m_e leads to recombination occurring earlier, thereby reducing r_s . Once the curvature parameter Ω_K is also allowed to vary (Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model), as required to provide a good fit to late-time data [122], the resulting model emerges as one of the most promising early-time modifications, as explicitly quantified by means of the metrics introduced in Ref. [34]. On the late-time side, we instead consider the so-called Λ_s CDM model [236], which introduces a rapid sign switch in the cosmological constant (from $-\Lambda$ to Λ) at redshifts $z_\dagger \sim 2$. While on its own the model cannot completely solve the Hubble tension, it can nonetheless alleviate it to an interesting extent while also addressing a number of other discrepan-

⁴ For studies on the impact of local or very late-time physics on the Hubble tension, see e.g. Refs. [205–224].

cies. In the spirit of the proposal of Ref. [188], we therefore consider various combinations of time-varying electron mass, non-zero spatial curvature, and sign-switching cosmological constant: in short, our goal is to assess whether the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, i.e. whether the combination of these ingredients performs better than the individual ingredients themselves in addressing the Hubble tension. While we do not find this to be the case, at least for the specific combination of ingredients considered, our analysis teaches us a number of valuable lessons and considerations (especially regarding the matter density parameter Ω_m) for future attempts at solving the Hubble tension by combining early- and late-time new physics, a quest which turns out to be much more difficult than expected (partly due to reasons anticipated in Ref. [188]).

The rest of this paper is then organized as follows. In Sec. II we review in more detail the two early- and late-time new physics models we combine: $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$ ($+\Omega_K$) and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$. In Sec. III we discuss the datasets and methodology we make use of. The results of our analysis can be found in Sec. IV. Finally, in Sec. V we draw a number of concluding remarks and summarize the lessons learned from our case study.

II. MODELS

In what follows, we discuss in more detail the two models of early- and late-time new physics we combine: a spatially uniform time-varying electron mass (potentially in a non-spatially flat Universe) and a sign-switching cosmological constant.

A. Varying electron mass in a non-flat Universe

For what concerns early-time new physics, we consider a model where the value of the electron mass in the early Universe m_e differs from its present value $m_{e,0} \simeq 511$ keV; we refer to this model as $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$. Indeed, a variation in the fundamental properties of Hydrogen and Helium is one of the most effective ways of shifting the epoch of recombination, and thereby the sound horizon at recombination which, as argued in Sec. I, plays a key role in the Hubble tension discussion. The cosmological implications of a varying electron mass have been discussed in a number of earlier works, including Refs. [237–241]. In particular, varying m_e alters a number of relevant quantities, including most importantly the energy levels of Hydrogen and Helium, as well as the Thomson scattering cross section, two-photon decay rate of the second shell, effective recombination and photoionization rates, effective temperature at which the former are evaluated, effective dipole transition rate for the Lyman- α resonance, K-factors, Einstein A coefficients, and so on. We refer the reader to Refs. [237, 239] for recent more detailed discussions on these and other effects.

For our purposes, it is the effects of a change in m_e on the Hydrogen atom energy levels and Thomson scattering cross section which are most relevant in terms of cosmological implications. In particular, the energy levels scale as $E_i \propto m_e$, whereas the Thomson scattering cross-section scales as $\sigma_T \propto m_e^{-2}$ (the latter is nothing other than a consequence of the behavior of the electron propagator in the non-relativistic regime, where $p^2 \ll m_e^2$). Focusing on the effects on E_i , this implies that an increase in the electron mass at recombination raises the binding energy of neutral Hydrogen. As a consequence, recombination becomes energetically favorable at higher energies and thereby occurs earlier, reducing the redshift range over which the integral determining the sound horizon is evaluated, and therefore reducing the sound horizon r_s itself. As discussed in Sec. I, this is a key feature in order for a cosmological model to accommodate a higher H_0 without ruining the fit to BAO data.

However, the scaling of σ_T with m_e is also crucial for the model to succeed in leading to higher values of H_0 . A key challenge faced by many models of early-time new physics, particularly those increasing the pre-recombination expansion rate $H(z)$, is that they alter the ratio θ_d/θ_s , which is exquisitely constrained from CMB measurements: this is the ratio between the angular sizes on the last-scattering surface of the diffusion length at last scattering r_d (basically the ‘‘Silk damping scale,’’ not to be confused with the sound horizon at the drag epoch, r_d) and the sound horizon at last scattering r_s . The reason behind this has been discussed in detail in Ref. [113] and can be understood as follows: early-time new physics leads to a fractional reduction in the sound horizon $\delta r_s/r_s$, while also leading to an identical fractional reduction in the angular diameter distance to last-scattering d_A , $\delta d_A/d_A \approx \delta r_s/r_s$, in order to keep θ_s fixed. However, for a large class of early-time new physics models (the prototype being an increase in the effective number of relativistic species, N_{eff}), the fractional change in the diffusion length is $\delta r_d/r_d \approx 1/2\delta r_s/r_s$,⁵ which implies that θ_d necessarily changes if θ_s is kept fixed, thereby altering θ_d/θ_s : this is undesirable and limits the extent to which CMB data allows for such early-time new physics. However, the scaling $\sigma_T \propto m_e^{-2}$ improves the situation, since the integrand of the integral determining r_d scales as $1/\sqrt{\sigma_T}$. This allows for additional contributions to $\delta r_d/r_d$, which help in maintaining θ_d/θ_s fixed, thereby improving agreement with CMB observations on small scales. The crucial role played by the $\sigma_T \propto m_e^{-2}$ scaling was explicitly noted by Refs. [121, 239], where it

⁵ The factor of 1/2 is ultimately tied to the random walk nature of diffusion damping, which results in the expression for r_d having a similar functional form to that for r_s , but with a square root in front. This can also be understood by looking at Fig. 2 of Ref. [113], where it is clear that the kernel describing the fractional linear response of r_d to a fractional change in $H(z)$ is centered over a much narrower redshift range compared to the analogous quantity for r_s .

was shown that properly including this scaling and its effects on the Thomson visibility function opens up a large geometrical degeneracy between m_e and H_0 , allowing for significantly larger values of H_0 compared to the case where the Thomson scattering cross section is not properly scaled when m_e is varied.

From the above considerations, it is now clear why a model where m_e was a few percent larger at recombination compared to its present-day value, $m_{e,0}$, can provide a potential solution to the Hubble tension, as studied in a number of recent works (see e.g., Refs. [34, 121, 242–245]). However, as explicitly noted in Ref. [122], a model in which only m_e is varied while assuming a spatially flat Λ CDM background at late times cannot accommodate an adequately large transition in the electron mass so as to shrink the sound horizon to small enough values. The reason is that CMB data imposes strong correlations between the baryonic and dark matter densities and the time of recombination (which is modified by the altered electron mass) – these correlations cause the baryonic and dark matter density parameters to deviate from their usual Λ CDM values by a far margin when the sound horizon is significantly reduced. These induced parameter shifts spoil the good fit of the late-time Λ CDM cosmology to BAO and SNeIa distance measurements. Nevertheless, it has been shown that allowing for non-zero spatial curvature allows one to overcome this problem and thereby accommodate a higher H_0 while increasing m_e , while simultaneously delivering a good fit to CMB, BAO, and SNeIa data. As shown in Ref. [122], this requires a negative spatial curvature parameter $\Omega_K < 0$, which corresponds to a spatially closed Universe.⁶

In light of the above considerations, we envisage a class of models featuring a spatially uniform variation of m_e . In particular, as done in earlier works [34, 121, 122], $m_e(z)$ is approximated as being redshift-independent over the narrow redshift range of recombination, whereas its full functional form after recombination is irrelevant to cosmological observables as long as the present-day value $m_{e,0}$ is reached at a reasonably high redshift. Therefore, this amounts to introducing the extra parameter $m_e/m_{e,0}$, where by m_e we denote the value of the electron mass at recombination. With the above discussions in mind, we consider different cosmological models where either or both $m_e/m_{e,0}$ and Ω_K are varied. Note that, because of the necessity of varying Ω_K to successfully fit all available data within the varying electron mass model, the combined model, Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K , is strictly speaking not a purely early-time new physics model. Never-

theless, for simplicity, we place it within this category, as usually done in the literature. Finally, we note that from the model-building point of view, models with varying fundamental constants (such as the electron mass) can be embedded within theories featuring direct couplings of the matter fields to additional scalar fields, such as a dilaton or the dark energy field [235, 268–270].

B. Sign-switching cosmological constant: the Λ_s CDM model

The Λ_s CDM model [236] is an extension of the baseline Λ CDM model that replaces the usual cosmological constant with a sign-switching one, Λ_s , which at the transition redshift $z = z_\dagger$ abruptly shifts its value from $\Lambda_{\text{AdS}} < 0$ to $\Lambda_{\text{dS}} = -\Lambda_{\text{AdS}}$, with the latter then driving the late-time acceleration of the Universe. Therefore, the model is a phenomenological implementation of an abrupt anti-de Sitter (AdS) to de Sitter (dS) vacuum transition. The cosmological and astrophysical implications of this model was investigated in Refs. [236, 271–276]. The precursor of the Λ_s CDM model, from which the latter took inspiration, is the so-called graduated DE model. First studied in Ref. [277], this model dynamically modifies the functional form of the null inertial mass density of the vacuum energy, while also promoting its value (equal to zero in the standard case) to a negative constant. The resulting model, when constrained against cosmological data, was shown to effectively lead to a very rapid sign-switch in the cosmological constant, while at the same time partially relaxing (but not completely solving) the H_0 tension [277].

Inspired by the above findings, Ref. [236] proposed the Λ_s CDM model, where the gradual transition within the graduated DE model is replaced by a phenomenological, abrupt AdS-to-dS vacuum transition at $z_\dagger \sim 2$:

$$\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_s \equiv \Lambda_{s0} \operatorname{sgn}[z_\dagger - z], \quad (1)$$

where Λ_{s0} is the present-day value of the positive cosmological constant, and the signum function is given by:

$$\operatorname{sgn}[x] = \begin{cases} -1 & (x < 0), \\ 0 & (x = 0), \\ +1 & (x > 0). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

This model is typically categorized as a late-time modification to Λ CDM even though, strictly speaking, the AdS phase persists even at earlier times, including before recombination. However, just as the positive cosmological constant of Λ CDM is completely negligible during and prior to recombination, the same is true for the negative cosmological constant of Λ_s CDM, given that the two have the same absolute value. In fact, the negative cosmological constant leads to a fractional contribution of $\lesssim 10^{-9}$ to the energy budget of the Universe at recombination, and has therefore virtually no effect on quantities related to early-Universe physics (including, most importantly,

⁶ This is of particular interest in light of recent discussions on the possibility that *Planck* data may favor a spatially closed Universe [246, 247]. Without seeking to take sides in this discussion, we refer the reader for instance to Refs. [248–267] for recent studies on various aspects of this issue, and possible ways to arbitrate it. We note that the question is far from being settled, and exploring the role spatial curvature may play in the Hubble tension is therefore still of interest.

the sound horizon r_s). Note that the Λ CDM model is recovered only in the limit where $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$.

Initially introduced as a phenomenological model for cosmology, recent investigations have looked into potential microphysical origins for the Λ_s CDM model, which include but are not limited to sign switch from Casimir forces [278] and type-II minimally modified theories of gravity [274, 279].⁷ It is worth noting that the possibility of cosmologies with negative energy densities is not a far-fetched one, but on the contrary has been the subject of a number of studies in recent years, not limited to the Λ_s CDM model (see for example Refs. [280–301] in the context of late-time DE, Refs. [302–311] in the context of EDE, and Refs. [312–316] in the context of effective negative neutrino masses). Indeed, the possibility of negative energy densities enjoys strong motivation from string theory, wherein stable dS vacua have proven extremely difficult to construct, but AdS vacua are ubiquitous: it has in fact been conjectured that string theory may be unable to harbor dS vacua, as advocated by the swampland program [317–319], with important cosmological consequences, particularly for the accelerated phases of the cosmological expansion [320–329].

If the abrupt jump is taken at face value, it corresponds to a non-differentiable scale factor $a(t)$, alongside a discontinuous $\dot{a}(t)$, and a singular $\ddot{a}(t)$, implying a type II (sudden) singularity [330–332]. Nevertheless, this idealized instantaneous transition captures the essence of Λ_s CDM very well and is convenient for numerical studies thanks to its simplicity. However, should one wish to work with a more realistic parametrization of a smooth Λ term incorporating a more gradual transition, other functions such as sigmoids can be utilized, e.g. $\Lambda_s(z) = \Lambda_{s0} \tanh[\eta(z_{\dagger} - z)] / \tanh[\eta z_{\dagger}]$ as proposed in Refs. [271, 279]. Throughout this work, unless otherwise specified, we shall work with the instantaneous transition described by Eq. (1). Some astrophysical consequences of such an abrupt transition, particularly for bound cosmic structures (e.g. virialized galaxy clusters), have been recently studied in Refs. [273, 275]: these findings show that the abrupt transition does not result in the dissociation of bound systems, but rather exerts relatively weak effects thereon, further reinforcing the viability of the sudden transition parametrization.

The Λ_s CDM model has demonstrated particular promise in alleviating (albeit not completely solving, for reasons which are now well understood and discussed in

Sec. I) the Hubble tension, and a number of other less statistically significant cosmological discrepancies, including the S_8 tension, the BAO Lyman- α discrepancy, the cosmic age issue, and so on [236, 271, 272, 274]. The reason why the Λ_s CDM model is able to partially alleviate the Hubble tension is because its lower energy density compared to Λ CDM during the AdS phase ($z > z_{\dagger}$) would increase the distance to the last scattering surface, thereby reducing θ_s since the sound horizon is not affected; as the inferred θ_s from CMB measurement is extremely robust, such a change is not allowed and needs to be compensated by increasing H_0 . The mechanism is similar to that by which phantom DE models (with DE equation of state $w < -1$) lead to higher values of H_0 , the common feature being a DE density that decreases towards the past, reducing the total energy density compared to the Λ CDM model – yet, compared to these models, Λ_s CDM performs better for two reasons. Firstly, its DE density takes negative values, requiring a larger H_0 value to compensate the shift in θ_s . Phantom DE models cannot transition to negative values trivially, as the sign change of the energy density of a minimally coupled source requires a singular equation of state parameter [290]. However, this can be achieved by combining phantom DE models with an AdS vacuum as was done in Refs. [282, 294, 296]. Secondly, the Λ_s CDM model is able to offer a better fit to BAO and SNeIa data since the shape of the expansion history is simply that of Λ CDM for $z < z_{\dagger}$ as preferred by these late-time data, albeit with eventually different values of the common cosmological parameters. On the other hand, phantom DE models lead to a different shape of the expansion history at all redshifts, which is tightly constrained by late-time observations. In light of the above interesting features, we decide to consider the Λ_s CDM model as our “representative” model for late-time new physics, alongside the non-zero spatial curvature parameter already discussed earlier in Sec. II A and required for a working early-time new physics model based on a varying electron mass.

III. DATASETS AND METHODOLOGY

We recall that our goal in this work is to provide a case study of pre-plus-post-recombination new physics as a route towards solving the Hubble tension, in the spirit of Ref. [188]. With this in mind, and driven by the considerations made in Sec. II, we consider various combinations of time-varying m_e , non-zero spatial curvature, and sign-switching cosmological constant. Specifically, the cosmological models we consider are the following:

- the 6-parameter Λ CDM model, where the 6 parameters varied are the acoustic angular scale θ_s , the physical baryon and cold dark matter densities ω_b and ω_c , the amplitude and tilt of the primordial spectrum of scalar perturbations A_s and n_s , and the optical depth to reionization τ – this is our baseline model;

⁷ It is worth mentioning that the Λ_s CDM model embedded in these type-II minimally modified theories of gravity appears slightly more promising than the fully phenomenological model as the embedding provides a theoretical basis for the sign-switch, and its explicit treatment of the perturbations during the transition period (in contrast with the phenomenological model where the transition is assumed to be instantaneous with no effect on the perturbations) appears to lead to the model parameters being better constrained with CMB-only data, while also yielding slightly higher inferred values for H_0 [274].

Model	# parameters	Free parameters
Λ CDM	6	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau$
Λ CDM+ m_e	7	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, \frac{m_e}{m_{e,0}}$
Λ CDM+ Ω_K	7	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, \Omega_K$
Λ CDM+ $m_e + \Omega_K$	8	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, \frac{m_e}{m_{e,0}}, \Omega_K$
Λ_s CDM	7	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, z_{\dagger}$
Λ_s CDM+ m_e	8	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, z_{\dagger}, \frac{m_e}{m_{e,0}}$
Λ_s CDM+ Ω_K	8	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, z_{\dagger}, \Omega_K$
Λ_s CDM+ $m_e + \Omega_K$	9	$\omega_b, \omega_c, \theta_s, A_s, n_s, \tau, z_{\dagger}, \frac{m_e}{m_{e,0}}, \Omega_K$

TABLE I. Summary of the 8 cosmological models considered in this work.

- the 7-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary $m_e/m_{e,0}$, the ratio of the electron mass at recombination to its current value – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1$;
- the 8-parameter Λ CDM+ $m_e + \Omega_K$ model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary $m_e/m_{e,0}$ and the spatial curvature parameter Ω_K – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1$ and $\Omega_K = 0$;
- the 7-parameter Λ_s CDM model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary z_{\dagger} , the redshift at which the AdS-to-dS transition (sign-switch in the cosmological constant) takes place – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$;
- the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary z_{\dagger} and $m_e/m_{e,0}$ – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$ and $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1$;
- the 9-parameter Λ_s CDM+ $m_e + \Omega_K$ model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary z_{\dagger} , $m_e/m_{e,0}$, and Ω_K – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$, $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1$, and $\Omega_K = 0$;

For completeness, we also consider the following 2 cosmological models:

- the 7-parameter Λ CDM+ Ω_K model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary Ω_K – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $\Omega_K = 0$;
- the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ Ω_K model, where in addition to the 6 Λ CDM parameters we vary z_{\dagger} and Ω_K – this model therefore reduces to Λ CDM in the limit where $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\Omega_K = 0$;

For the convenience of the reader, the properties of these 8 models are summarized in Tab. I. We set wide, flat priors on all the cosmological parameters listed above, verifying a posteriori that our posteriors are not affected by the choice of lower and upper prior boundaries. The only exception is z_{\dagger} , for which we set a prior $z_{\dagger} \in [1; 3.5]$. However, our results are not expected to be sensitive to the upper edge of this prior, as we discuss later in Sec. IV.

To constrain the parameter space of the models, we consider various combinations of the following datasets:

- measurements of CMB temperature anisotropy and polarization power spectra, their cross-spectra, and lensing potential power spectrum reconstructed from the temperature 4-point function, as obtained from the *Planck* 2018 legacy data release [333, 334];
- BAO measurements from the 6dFGS, SDSS-MGS, and BOSS DR12 surveys [335–337] – note that we only use distance/expansion rate measurements, whereas we do not include growth rate measurements from redshift-space distortions;
- uncalibrated SNeIa measurements from the *Pantheon* sample [338];
- BAO measurements from the eBOSS Lyman- α ($Ly\alpha$) auto-correlation and $Ly\alpha$ -quasar cross-correlation [339], which we refer to as $Ly\alpha$;
- a Gaussian prior on the Hubble constant $H_0 = (73.04 \pm 1.04)$ km/s/Mpc as measured by the SH0ES team using a distance ladder approach via Cepheid-calibrated SNeIa in Ref. [6], and referred to as $R21$.

The combination of the first three datasets (CMB, BAO without $Ly\alpha$ measurements, and SNeIa) is deemed to be the most robust one and therefore constitutes our baseline dataset combination, which we collectively refer to as \mathcal{B} . The combination of \mathcal{B} and the $Ly\alpha$ BAO measurements is instead referred to as \mathcal{D} . Overall, the dataset combinations we consider are \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{D} , and $\mathcal{D}+R21$.

An important clarification is in order for what concerns the adopted datasets. The reader will in fact notice that these are not the latest available ones, neither on the BAO side (where the more recent eBOSS measurements are available [4] and, even more recently, the DESI ones [340]), nor on the SNeIa side (where the more recent *PantheonPlus* measurements are available [22]) whereas, for what concerns the local H_0 prior, we are not using the latest SH0ES measurement, although this choice is somewhat arbitrary given the deluge of available local measurements which mostly cluster between 71 and 74 km/s/Mpc. Nevertheless, given that ours is just a proof-of-principle case study (which, furthermore, does not claim a solution to the Hubble tension), we believe this choice of datasets is not problematic, and that upgrading to the latest datasets would not alter our overall conclusions. More importantly, the adopted datasets also allow for a more fair comparison to earlier results on varying electron mass models [34, 122].

We obtain theoretical predictions for cosmological observables within the above models using a modified version of the Boltzmann solver **CAMB** [341]. In particular, the effects of a varying electron mass are implemented by modifying the **Recfast** module called by **CAMB** [342].⁸ To sample the posterior distributions for the parameters of the models in question, we make use of Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) methods, via the cosmological sampler **CosmoMC** [343]. The convergence of the generated MCMC chains is assessed via the Gelman-Rubin parameter $R - 1$ [344], and we require $R - 1 < 0.03$ for our chains to be considered converged. Plots of the parameter posterior distributions are produced by making use of the **GetDist** package [345]. Finally, to conduct model comparison, we calculate the Bayesian evidence for each model and estimate the corresponding relative Bayes factors, normalized to a baseline Λ CDM scenario. We use the **MCEvidence** package, which is publicly available [346, 347]⁹. We adopt the convention that a negative Bayes factor indicates a preference for the given model over Λ CDM. To interpret the results, we refer to the revised Jeffrey's scale by Trotta [348, 349], classifying evidence as inconclusive if $0 \leq |\ln B_{ij}| < 1$, weak if $1 \leq |\ln B_{ij}| < 2.5$, moderate if $2.5 \leq |\ln B_{ij}| < 5$, strong if $5 \leq |\ln B_{ij}| < 10$, and very strong if $|\ln B_{ij}| \geq 10$.

⁸ Our set-up is very similar to that of the latest *Planck* analyses [2]. The recombination code difference between **Recfast++**, which is the modified version of **Recfast**, and **CosmoRec** is discussed in Ref. [239] and is completely negligible at the current level of precision of observational measurements. We also note that papers using the **CLASS** Boltzmann solver obtain results which are consistent with the two previous works [34, 240].

⁹ The **MCEvidence** package can be accessed at <https://github.com/yabebalFantaye/MCEvidence>.




FIG. 1. Triangular plot showing 2D joint and 1D marginalized posterior probability distributions for a selection of parameters within the 8-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model: the Hubble constant H_0 (in km/s/Mpc), the matter density parameter Ω_m , the clustering parameter S_8 , the ratio of the electron mass at recombination to its value today $m_e/m_{e,0}$, and the curvature parameter Ω_K . These distributions have been obtained in light of three different dataset combinations: the baseline combination \mathcal{B} (red curves), the combination \mathcal{D} (blue curves) which also includes Lyman- α BAO measurements, and the combination of \mathcal{D} and $R21$ (green curves).

IV. RESULTS

We now study the cosmological models in question in light of the dataset combinations discussed previously. Visual summaries of our results are shown in Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. On the other hand, we report 68% confidence level (C.L.) intervals for selected cosmological parameters in Tabs. II, III, and IV for the \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{D} , and $\mathcal{D} + R21$ dataset combinations respectively. For cases where only upper/lower limits are reported in the Tables, we report both 68% C.L. and 95% C.L. upper/lower limits (the latter in brackets).

We begin by checking our results for the 8-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model, studied previously in Ref. [122]. When considering the \mathcal{B} dataset combination, we infer $H_0 = (69.7 \pm 1.7)$ km/s/Mpc, whereas we obtain $H_0 = (70.2 \pm 1.7)$ km/s/Mpc when considering the \mathcal{D} dataset combination – both are significantly lower than the $H_0 = 72.3^{+2.7}_{-2.8}$ km/s/Mpc obtained in Ref. [122], considerably reducing the ability of the model to alleviate the Hubble tension. We believe the origin of this discrepancy is to be sought in the adopted data: the \mathcal{B} dataset combination we have used also includes the CMB lensing power spectrum, which to the best of our understanding has not

Model \ Parameter	Λ CDM	Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_k	Λ_s CDM+ m_e
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02244 ± 0.00013	$0.02288^{+0.00045}_{-0.00050}$	$0.02209^{+0.00037}_{-0.00020}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.11918 ± 0.00094	0.1216 ± 0.0022	$0.1177^{+0.0029}_{-0.0023}$
Ω_K	-	-0.0041 ± 0.0049	-
z_{\dagger}	-	-	$2.32^{+0.60}_{-0.83}$
m_e/m_{e0}	-	1.019 ± 0.018	$0.986^{+0.017}_{-0.009}$
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	67.74 ± 0.42	69.7 ± 1.7	$67.1^{+1.5}_{-1.3}$
Ω_m	0.3101 ± 0.0056	0.299 ± 0.011	$0.3117^{+0.0084}_{-0.0094}$
σ_8	$0.8099^{+0.0057}_{-0.0065}$	0.825 ± 0.014	0.803 ± 0.013
r_d [Mpc]	147.14 ± 0.25	144.45 ± 2.53	149.33 ± 2.33

TABLE II. 68% C.L. intervals on selected cosmological parameters indicated in the first column, as inferred within the cosmological models indicated in the first row, in light of the \mathcal{B} dataset combination which does not include $Ly\alpha$ BAO measurements. The first set of parameters in bold are explicitly varied, whereas the final set of parameters not in bold are derived.




FIG. 2. As in Fig. 2, but focusing on the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e model, and reporting constraints on the AdS-to-dS transition redshift z_{\dagger} instead of the curvature parameter Ω_K .

been adopted in Ref. [122]. CMB lensing data is known to remove the preference for $\Omega_K < 0$ present when using *Planck* primary CMB data alone (see the earlier footnote 6), and indeed we find $\Omega_K = -0.0041 \pm 0.0049$, consistent with a spatially flat Universe within better than 1σ . Given the crucial role played by $\Omega_K < 0$ in the tension-solving ability of the Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model, it




FIG. 3. Triangular plot comparing 2D joint and 1D marginalized posterior probability distributions for a selection of parameters across 4 spatially flat models discussed in this paper: the 6-parameter Λ CDM model (red curves), the 7-parameter Λ_s CDM model (green curves), the 7-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e model (blue curves), and the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e model (grey curves). As in Fig. 2, we report constraints on H_0 (in km/s/Mpc), Ω_m , S_8 , $m_e/m_{e,0}$ (obviously only for the Λ CDM+ m_e and Λ_s CDM+ m_e models), and z_{\dagger} (obviously only for the Λ_s CDM and Λ_s CDM+ m_e models). These distributions have been obtained in light of the \mathcal{D} dataset combination which also includes Lyman- α BAO measurements.

Model \ Parameter	Λ CDM	Λ_s CDM	Λ CDM+ m_e	Λ_s CDM+ m_e
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02244 ± 0.00014	0.02236 ± 0.00014	0.02253 ± 0.00016	$0.02207^{+0.00034}_{-0.00024}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.11908 ± 0.00093	0.1201 ± 0.0010	0.1206 ± 0.0019	$0.1175^{+0.0027}_{-0.0023}$
m_e/m_{e0}	-	-	1.0061 ± 0.0065	$0.985^{+0.015}_{-0.010}$
z_{\dagger}	-	> 2.60 (> 2.16)	-	$2.19^{+0.34}_{-0.79}$
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	67.78 ± 0.42	$68.64^{+0.50}_{-0.61}$	68.8 ± 1.1	$67.1^{+1.5}_{-1.3}$
Ω_m	0.3095 ± 0.0056	0.3038 ± 0.0060	0.3042 ± 0.0079	0.3114 ± 0.0090
σ_8	0.8100 ± 0.0061	0.8151 ± 0.0064	0.818 ± 0.010	0.802 ± 0.013
r_d [Mpc]	147.26 ± 0.23	147.08 ± 0.24	146.23 ± 1.13	149.53 ± 2.22
$\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}$	-	0.33	2.60	2.42

Model \ Parameter	Λ CDM+ Ω_k	Λ_s CDM+ Ω_k	Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_k	Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_k
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02242 ± 0.00015	0.02244 ± 0.00015	0.02300 ± 0.00046	0.02236 ± 0.00062
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.1194 ± 0.0014	0.1190 ± 0.0013	0.1219 ± 0.0022	$0.1185^{+0.0032}_{-0.0028}$
Ω_K	0.0006 ± 0.0019	$-0.0028^{+0.0026}_{-0.0022}$	-0.0050 ± 0.0046	-0.0022 ± 0.0053
z_{\dagger}	-	$2.50^{+0.42}_{-0.65}$	-	2.41 ± 0.61
m_e/m_{e0}	-	-	1.023 ± 0.017	$0.996^{+0.026}_{-0.023}$
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	67.92 ± 0.63	68.29 ± 0.67	70.2 ± 1.7	68.0 ± 2.1
Ω_m	0.3089 ± 0.0060	0.3049 ± 0.0062	0.296 ± 0.011	0.307 ± 0.013
σ_8	0.8113 ± 0.0072	0.8119 ± 0.0071	0.829 ± 0.014	0.809 ± 0.018
r_d [Mpc]	147.20 ± 0.30	147.27 ± 0.29	143.88 ± 2.39	147.92 ± 3.65
$\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}$	3.66	0.25	5.12	5.08

TABLE III. As in Tab. II, but for the \mathcal{D} dataset combination which includes $Ly\alpha$ BAO measurements. We note that the lower limits reported on z_{\dagger} for the Λ_s CDM model are at 68% C.L. and 95% C.L., with the latter being the ones in brackets. The Bayes factors $\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij} = \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\Lambda\text{CDM}} - \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}$ are calculated as the difference between the evidence for Λ CDM and the specific model \mathcal{M} (for the same dataset \mathcal{D}). A negative value indicates a preference for the model \mathcal{M} over the Λ CDM scenario.

is clear that pushing Ω_K towards less negative values (i.e. closer to $\Omega_K = 0$) will reduce H_0 , while also reducing $m_e/m_{e,0}$ – in fact, we find $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1.019 \pm 0.018$, consistent with the standard value at $\approx 1\sigma$, and smaller than the $\gtrsim 5\%$ increase one would need to fully solve the Hubble tension [122].

We note that the analysis of Ref. [34] made use of a similar dataset to ours (using CMB lensing, and without using $Ly\alpha$) to infer $H_0 = (69.3 \pm 2.1)$ km/s/Mpc, in very good agreement with our findings. This comparison reinforces our interpretation that it is the CMB lensing dataset that is the main driver of the differences with respect to the earlier results of Ref. [122]. On the other hand, we do not believe the choice of recombination code (Recfast versus HyRec) or sampling algorithm (Metropolis-Hastings versus nested sampling) plays a

major role, in the latter case because of the high level of convergence of our chains coupled with the unimodal nature of the posteriors. 2D joint and 1D marginalized posterior probability distributions for selected parameters within the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model, for all three dataset combinations \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{D} , and $\mathcal{D}+R21$, are shown in Fig. 1.

For the 7-parameter Λ_s CDM model, we essentially reproduce the earlier results of Ref. [271], even if we use a wider prior on $z_{\dagger} \in [1; 3.5]$ compared to Ref. [271], and a slightly different combination of BAO data. The reason why widening the z_{\dagger} prior leads to negligible shifts in other cosmological parameters, especially in H_0 which is the main parameter of interest, is that the extent to which the model approaches Λ CDM in the $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$ limit is actually non-linear, and this can easily be appreciated from the H_0 - z_{\dagger} relation shown in Fig. 8 of Ref. [236].

Model \ Parameter	Λ CDM	Λ_s CDM	Λ CDM+ m_e	Λ_s CDM+ m_e
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02260 ± 0.00013	0.02242 ± 0.00014	0.02280 ± 0.00014	$0.02262^{+0.00017}_{-0.00015}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.11753 ± 0.00085	0.1198 ± 0.0011	0.1233 ± 0.0017	0.1221 ± 0.0017
m_e/m_{e0}	-	-	1.0196 ± 0.0047	$1.0118^{+0.0062}_{-0.0051}$
z_{\dagger}	-	$2.24^{+0.14}_{-0.36}$	-	> 2.78 (> 2.18)
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	68.53 ± 0.39	69.93 ± 0.58	71.32 ± 0.79	70.96 ± 0.80
Ω_m	0.2998 ± 0.0050	0.2922 ± 0.0054	0.2884 ± 0.0055	0.2888 ± 0.0054
σ_8	0.8082 ± 0.0061	0.8181 ± 0.0068	0.8343 ± 0.0087	0.8289 ± 0.0091
r_d [Mpc]	147.49 ± 0.22	147.10 ± 0.25	144.04 ± 0.84	145.21 ± 1.00
$\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}$	-	-3.94	-5.01	-2.85

Model \ Parameter	Λ CDM+ Ω_K	Λ_s CDM+ Ω_K	Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K	Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_K
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.02240 ± 0.00015	0.02245 ± 0.00015	0.02354 ± 0.00030	$0.02339^{+0.00033}_{-0.00029}$
$\Omega_c h^2$	0.1201 ± 0.0014	0.1194 ± 0.0013	0.1243 ± 0.0017	0.1232 ± 0.0018
Ω_K	0.0042 ± 0.0018	$-0.0011^{+0.0028}_{-0.0024}$	-0.0095 ± 0.0033	$-0.0100^{+0.0030}_{-0.0036}$
m_e/m_{e0}	-	-	1.045 ± 0.010	$1.037^{+0.012}_{-0.010}$
z_{\dagger}	-	$2.19^{+0.18}_{-0.52}$	-	> 2.72 (2.07)
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	69.50 ± 0.58	69.84 ± 0.61	72.46 ± 0.87	72.16 ± 0.91
Ω_m	0.2963 ± 0.0051	0.2922 ± 0.0055	0.2830 ± 0.0055	0.2828 ± 0.0056
σ_8	0.8173 ± 0.0073	0.8173 ± 0.0072	0.8448 ± 0.0093	0.8393 ± 0.0097
r_d [Mpc]	147.04 ± 0.29	147.16 ± 0.29	140.86 ± 1.37	141.91 ± 1.54
$\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij}$	1.08	-1.25	-5.33	-3.74

TABLE IV. As in Tab. II, but for the $\mathcal{D}+R21$ dataset combination. We note that the lower limits reported on z_{\dagger} for the Λ_s CDM+ m_e and Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_K models are at 68% C.L. and 95% C.L., with the latter being the ones in brackets. As usual, the Bayes factors $\ln \mathcal{B}_{ij} = \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\Lambda\text{CDM}} - \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{M}}$ are calculated as the difference between the evidence for Λ CDM and the specific model \mathcal{M} (for the same dataset $\mathcal{D}+R21$). A negative value indicates a preference for the model \mathcal{M} over the Λ CDM scenario.

Stated differently, if $z_{\dagger} \gtrsim 3$, the transition happens at such a high redshift that the cosmological constant is already completely subdominant with respect to the matter component, so the model is already basically Λ CDM (i.e. $z_{\dagger} \gtrsim 3$ is already a good approximation to $z_{\dagger} \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore, for what concerns cosmological parameter estimation, a prior range $z_{\dagger} \in [1; 3.5]$ is sufficiently large to basically encompass the Λ CDM limit.

We now move on to examining the impact of combining one or more of the ingredients discussed previously, focusing first on spatially flat models. We begin by considering the simplest combination of all the models presented previously, namely the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e model. We show 2D joint and 1D marginalized posterior probability distributions for selected parameters within this model in Fig. 2, again for all three dataset combi-

nations: \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{D} , and $\mathcal{D}+R21$. A comparison between the Λ CDM (red curves), Λ_s CDM (green curves), Λ CDM+ m_e (blue curves), and Λ_s CDM (grey curves) models is instead shown in Fig. 3 for the \mathcal{D} dataset combination, and similarly in Fig. 4 for the $\mathcal{D}+R21$ dataset combination.

The result of this first case study is somewhat surprising. Despite both the Λ_s CDM and Λ CDM+ m_e models faring better than the Λ CDM model in terms of alleviating the Hubble tension, reducing it to 3.9σ and 2.8σ respectively (when using the \mathcal{D} dataset combination), the combined Λ_s CDM+ m_e model actually fares worse than both of them in terms of the inferred central value of H_0 . In fact, within Λ_s CDM+ m_e we infer $H_0 = 67.1^{+1.5}_{-1.3}$ km/s/Mpc from both the \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{D} dataset combinations, bringing the tension to the 3.3σ level. We observe that the central value of H_0 has actually moved




FIG. 4. As in Fig. 3, but considering the combination of the \mathcal{D} and $R21$ datasets.




FIG. 5. As in Fig. 3, but considering 4 models with varying spatial curvature: the 7-parameter $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ model (red curves), the 8-parameter $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ model (green curves), the 8-parameter $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model (blue curves), and the 9-parameter $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model (grey curves). In addition, we also report constraints on the curvature parameter Ω_K .

below the value inferred within ΛCDM , and the Hubble tension is only formally alleviated by virtue of the substantially larger uncertainties, which are a factor of




FIG. 6. As in Fig. 5, but considering the combination of the \mathcal{D} and $R21$ datasets.

$\sim 3 - 4$ larger with respect to those within ΛCDM (this prevents us from considering such a model a truly satisfactory resolution). Similar considerations hold when considering the $\mathcal{D}+R21$ dataset combination, see Fig. 4.

The above is clearly not a satisfactory situation: to put it plainly, we are finding that the whole is less/worse than the sum of its parts with regards to the ability to solve the Hubble tension (which, just to be clear, is on its own not a good metric for model performance [350]). Part of the reason behind this has to do with the inferred value of $m_e/m_{e,0}$. Recall, as per our discussion in Sec. II A, that $m_e/m_{e,0} > 1$ is required in order for the Hubble tension to be alleviated, since the geometrical degeneracy results in a positive correlation between $m_e/m_{e,0}$ and H_0 . Physically, this is because raising $m_e/m_{e,0}$ moves recombination to an earlier time, therefore reducing the sound horizon and requiring a higher value of H_0 to maintain the acoustic angular scale fixed. With these considerations in mind, within the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$ model we find $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1.019 \pm 0.018$ and $m_e/m_{e,0} = 1.0061 \pm 0.0065$ from the \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{D} datasets respectively. Both values are too small to fully solve the Hubble tension (which would require $m_e/m_{e,0} \gtrsim 1.05$), although they move in the right direction. On the other hand, within the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e$ model we infer $m_e/m_{e,0} = 0.986^{+0.017}_{-0.009}$ and $m_e/m_{e,0} = 0.985^{+0.015}_{-0.010}$, both of which actually move in the wrong direction to help with the Hubble tension: this explains why, in spite of the larger uncertainties (formally alleviating the Hubble tension), the central value of H_0 has actually shifted to lower values relative to ΛCDM .

From Fig. 2, Fig. 3, and Fig. 4 we observe that the shift of $m_e/m_{e,0}$ towards $m_e/m_{e,0} < 1$ appears to be driven, at least in part, by the strong $m_e-\Omega_m$ nega-

tive correlation, which is further exacerbated within the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e$ model (compare e.g. grey versus blue curves in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). There are several reasons underlying this degeneracy. Firstly, as already explained earlier, m_e and H_0 are positively correlated due to the geometrical degeneracy, and thereby the necessity to keep θ_s fixed. However, viable early-time solutions typically cannot lead to substantial variations in the redshift of matter-radiation equality, implying that $\Omega_m h^2$ should be roughly constant. Therefore, one expects a negative correlation between Ω_m and H_0 , roughly (but not exactly) along the $\Omega_m \propto h^{-2}$ direction of parameter space. It is easy to see that this degeneracy direction well approximates the one spanned by the joint Ω_m - H_0 posteriors. It is also worth noting that a completely identical behavior has been observed in Ref. [351], which carried out a data-driven, non-parametric, Fisher-bias reconstruction of modifications to recombination required to solve the Hubble tension, focusing also on $m_e(z)$: see in particular Fig. 2 of the paper. The combination of the positive m_e - H_0 correlation due to the geometrical degeneracy and the negative Ω_m - H_0 correlation driven by the redshift of matter-radiation equality leads to m_e inheriting a negative correlation with Ω_m as observed in our analyses both within the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$ and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e$ models. Obviously BAO, SNeIa, and CMB lensing (once combined with primary CMB observations) do not tolerate too low values of Ω_m , and this substantially limits the ability of these models to solve the Hubble tension.

As we already noted earlier, the m_e - Ω_m correlation is exacerbated when the DE sector moves from the positive cosmological constant ($\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$) to the sign-switching one ($\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e$). This point is worthy of further exploration. Let us begin by examining Fig. 3, and in particular the green contours for the Λ_s model. Here we observe a negative correlation between z_\dagger and H_0 , and correspondingly a positive correlation between z_\dagger and Ω_m . Both have been reported in previous literature [236, 271, 272], and can easily be understood by noting that the later the AdS-to-dS transition takes place (i.e. the lower z_\dagger), the higher H_0 and the lower Ω_m need to be in order to keep the distance to the CMB fixed, ensuring that the acoustic angular scale θ_s is fixed (since the sound horizon is not modified).

Remaining still on Fig. 3, let us see what happens when moving from the green to the grey contours, i.e. from the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model to the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e$ one. In this case, the “pull” of the $m_e/m_{e,0}$ parameter partially overwhelms the effects of $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$. More specifically, the negative m_e - Ω_m correlation extensively discussed earlier is strong enough to revert the (weaker) correlations observed within $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$. This is quite clear comparing the green and grey contours in the bottom row of Fig. 3: we see that once $m_e/m_{e,0}$ is allowed to vary, the negative z_\dagger - H_0 correlation becomes a weak positive one, and likewise the positive z_\dagger - Ω_m correlation becomes a weak negative one. Nevertheless, the fact that the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ model prefers a higher value of Ω_m to begin with is still

apparent even when $m_e/m_{e,0}$ is varied, and can be appreciated by comparing the blue versus grey contours in the m_e - Ω_m plane. There, we see that the effect of the AdS-to-dS transition is to increase the “pull” towards larger values of Ω_m . Because of the negative m_e - Ω_m correlation discussed earlier, this pushes towards values of $m_e < m_{e,0}$, going in the wrong direction compared to what is required to solve the Hubble tension, and undoing the tension-solving work associated with m_e . Finally, the considerations we have drawn above hold for the \mathcal{D} dataset combination. However, our arguments hold even when considering the addition of the $R21$ prior, as shown in Fig. 4, with the results being qualitatively very similar – the only difference is that the $R21$ prior obviously pulls towards larger values of H_0 , and correspondingly shifts the beyond- ΛCDM parameters in response to the main degeneracies at play (i.e. lower z_\dagger , higher m_e).

It is therefore clear that Ω_m , and in particular its correlations with the beyond- ΛCDM parameters in question, plays a key role in driving the (in)success of the model combining $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ and a varying electron mass: the important role of Ω_m in the context of the Hubble tension had in fact already been emphasized earlier [199, 200, 235, 352–355]. Let us, however, return to the original motivation and philosophy of this work, motivated by the earlier Ref. [188], namely that of providing a case study aimed at combining early- and late-time new physics in an attempt to address the Hubble tension. This specific case study highlights one of the potential issues raised in Ref. [188], but otherwise not backed up by concrete examples (see discussion in Sec. III thereof). Namely, that the early-time and late-time models in question may not combine “in phase”/“constructively”, and may not be able to “decouple” their tension-solving effects. To put it differently, parameter shifts and/or parameter degeneracies induced by one of the two models may limit the tension-solving ability of the other model, and the other way around. This is precisely what we observe here. In particular, the beyond- ΛCDM parameters for the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ and $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e$ models, z_\dagger and $m_e/m_{e,0}$ respectively, are both positively correlated with Ω_m . However, the tension-solving routes in Ω_m parameter space point in opposite directions: larger Ω_m for $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$, and smaller Ω_m for m_e . The end product is that each of the two models limits the tension-solving abilities of the other rather than combining “constructively”, resulting in the final value of H_0 being even lower compared to ΛCDM , and the tension only being formally alleviated due to the substantially larger error bars.

Motivated by the important role of spatial curvature in ensuring that a model with varying electron mass can fit CMB, BAO, and SNeIa data with a high H_0 , we now take a step forward and combine all the ingredients studied so far, namely an AdS-to-dS transition, a varying electron mass, and a non-zero spatial curvature. Constraints on the resulting 9-parameter $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model are given by the grey contours in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 for the \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{D}+R21$ dataset combinations respectively (other

than considering $\Omega_K \neq 0$, these Figures are analogous to the earlier Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). For completeness, we also report constraints on the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$, $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$, and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ models in the Figures, although the latter two are not discussed in the text.

When varying the spatial curvature parameter, the only important quantitative difference is that the value of H_0 inferred within models where $m_e/m_{e,0}$ is varied is higher by $\Delta H_0 \sim (1.0 - 1.5)$ km/s/Mpc compared to the corresponding models where $\Omega_K = 0$ (such an enhancement is instead not observed for the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ models related to the ΛCDM and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ ones). However, we overall qualitatively recover the same (unsuccessful) features observed earlier. Namely, combining the three ingredients does not lead to an overall higher value of H_0 , while correspondingly shifting the beyond- ΛCDM parameters in response to the main degeneracies at play, as can clearly be appreciated by comparing Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. The reasons behind these unsuccessful conclusions remain precisely the ones outlined earlier, in relation to the tension-solving routes in Ω_m parameter space pointing in opposite directions, leading to the AdS-to-dS transition limiting the tension-solving ability of the combined varying electron mass and non-flat Universe model, and vice versa. The inclusion of Ω_K somewhat tames these differences, but is unable to remove them, and therefore does not lead to a successful combination of early- and late-time new physics.

To be concrete, from the \mathcal{D} dataset combination we find $H_0 = (70.2 \pm 1.7)$ km/s/Mpc within the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model, which decreases to $H_0 = (68.0 \pm 2.1)$ km/s/Mpc within the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ model, formally reducing the Hubble tension down to 2.1σ mostly by virtue of the huge uncertainties. For comparison, within the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ model and with the same dataset combination, we find $H_0 = (67.9 \pm 0.6)$ km/s/Mpc which, apart from the uncertainty smaller by a factor of almost 4, features a central value that is virtually identical to the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+m_e+\Omega_K$ one. Qualitatively similar conclusions, albeit with higher values of H_0 , are reached when considering the $\mathcal{D}+R21$ dataset combination. Finally, as already stressed earlier, the inclusion of the CMB lensing dataset plays an important role in driving the (in)success of these combinations when non-zero spatial curvature is considered, as it removes any possible preference for $\Omega_K < 0$, which is part of the required ingredients for a model featuring a varying electron mass to accommodate a high H_0 . There is, however, reason to be cautious about the inclusion of CMB lensing measurements because of the $\approx 2.5\sigma$ disagreement with primary temperature anisotropy measurements [2]. Nevertheless, we have chosen to include these measurements to be as conservative as possible in assessing the tension-solving abilities of the combined models we are considering.

For what concerns model comparison considerations, we observe that $\ln\mathcal{B}_{ij}$ is always positive, and hence ΛCDM is always preferred, when the $R21$ prior is not included (see the final rows of Tab. IV). The addition

of the $R21$ prior essentially always leads to a preference for the extended models (except in the $\Lambda\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ case, see the final rows of Tab. III), however this preference is clearly artificial and driven by the $R21$ prior itself. We therefore choose to focus our discussion on the more conservative \mathcal{D} dataset combination, from which we conclude that from a Bayesian evidence perspective ΛCDM is always preferred. The models which are least disfavored with respect to ΛCDM one in light of this dataset combination are the $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}$ and $\Lambda_s\text{CDM}+\Omega_K$ ones, with $\ln\mathcal{B}_{ij} = 0.33$ and 0.25 respectively, in both cases indicating only an inconclusive preference for ΛCDM .

To sum up, the combination of pre- and post-recombination new physics in the form of a spatially uniform time-varying electron mass leading to earlier recombination, and a sign-switching cosmological constant leading to an AdS-to-dS transition, does not appear to show promise in the context of solving the Hubble tension. This remains true even when the spatial curvature parameter, which plays a key role in ensuring the viability of the varying electron mass piece of the model, is allowed to vary. While the case study at hand fails to realize the type of combination envisaged in Ref. [188], our results have nevertheless taught us several valuable lessons. First of all, recalling that our case study combined two among the most successful (or rather, least unsuccessful) models on the pre- and post-recombination sides, our results clearly indicate that a successful combination thereof is clearly no easy task. Moreover, in providing an explicit example of a potential pitfall already outlined in Ref. [188] and discussed earlier, we have highlighted the particularly important role played by Ω_m , and its degeneracies with the beyond- ΛCDM parameters of the models being combined. In this sense, one of the key issues we identified is that the degeneracy-induced tension-solving routes in Ω_m parameter space point in opposite directions for the varying electron mass and AdS-to-dS transition ingredients. This aspect, coupled to the fact that Ω_m is tightly constrained via late-time datasets (even when these are not explicitly calibrated, see for instance Refs. [199, 200]), leads to (with some abuse of language) “destructive interference” between the models being combined. As a result, each model limits the tension-solving abilities of the other, with the final value of H_0 being even lower than the ΛCDM value. Such a potential issue was already discussed in Ref. [188], and our work provides an explicit realization thereof.

Although this work considers a specific example, we can still hope to draw some valuable general lessons to guide future cosmological model-building and/or tension-solving activities. In an attempt to construct a successful combination of pre- and post-recombination new physics, an important preliminary step should involve an assessment of the tension-solving directions in the parameter space of the beyond- ΛCDM parameters and how, given the directions of the parameter degeneracies involved, these project onto the other standard (fundamental or derived) parameters. We expect that a necessary but

not sufficient prerequisite for a successful combination of models is that the tension-solving routes in the space spanned by parameters (directly or indirectly) well constrained by observations point in the same directions, i.e. precisely the opposite of what we observed in our work for the case of the matter density parameter Ω_m . In this sense, parameters one should pay particular attention to are Ω_m (as stressed throughout this work), ω_c , as well as potentially A_s , n_s , and τ . In our case, n_s plays no significant role due to the fact that we have explicitly accounted for the scaling of the Thomson scattering cross-section with m_e , which helps maintain θ_d/θ_s fixed, thereby eliminating the need for shifts in n_s which would otherwise be required to push this ratio back to its standard value. However, this (obviously positive) feature is one which is somewhat peculiar to the varying m_e model, and not shared by other models of pre-recombination new physics, which instead typically necessitate much higher values of n_s — potentially as large as ~ 1 — to maintain a good fit to CMB data [118, 120, 302, 304, 305, 307–309, 311, 356]: we therefore expect that for these models, assessing how tension-solving directions project in n_s parameter space may play as important a role as that of analogous considerations for Ω_m in our case. For what concerns ω_b , we do not expect similar considerations thereon to play an important role, given how tightly it is constrained from the relative height of the acoustic peaks in the CMB, as well as from BBN considerations: there is hence very little wiggle room for variations in ω_b to play a significant role in similar discussions (see e.g. Refs. [357–359] for discussions on ω_b in the context of the CMB, BBN, and the Hubble tension).

Two comments and a caveat are in order before closing. Our study, and thereby our discussion, have been centered upon the combination of a varying electron mass and a sign-switching cosmological constant leading to an AdS-to-dS transition. While we have tried to extract general lessons from our work, we caution the reader that some of these are inevitably specific to our model: complete and nuanced assessments on the viability (or not) of combinations of pre- and post-recombination new physics models will inevitably have to be done on a model-by-model basis, and different model combinations may flag other aspects, not apparent in our work, which may prevent such a combination from functioning. In addition, our discussion has been centered around the Hubble tension. Nevertheless, we have also checked that the combination of models we have studied has little impact on the S_8 discrepancy, which therefore remains unsolved. Finally, as already stressed in Sec. III, we have not used the latest available cosmological datasets on the late-time data side. Nevertheless, we expect that updating the adopted datasets to the latest available ones will not qualitatively change our results, and neither should lead to major quantitative changes. That is, adopting these datasets should slightly tighten some of our constraints and may slightly change some degeneracy directions, but would not alter neither the overall (lack of) success of

the specific combination of models considered, nor our general discussions on parameter degeneracies.

V. CONCLUSIONS

At the time of writing, despite being one of the hottest open problems in cosmology, the Hubble tension remains unsolved after over a decade of attempts. Among the efforts in this direction based on models of new fundamental physics, the vast majority have focused on introducing new physical ingredients either before or after recombination, with the former class identified as being the least unsuccessful one due to constraints imposed from late-time observations. However, motivated by a number of independent indications, recent work by one of us has raised the possibility that solving the Hubble tension might ultimately require a combination of pre- and post-recombination new physics [188], without however proposing any concrete combination in this sense. Driven by this possibility, in the present work we provide one of the first concrete case studies aimed at combining pre- and post-recombination new physics in an attempt to address the Hubble tension (see also Refs. [225–234] for earlier attempts in the same direction). In what is perhaps – especially in hindsight – somewhat of a naïve attempt, we combine two models which, from each of the two sides, have *individually* shown particular promise in alleviating the Hubble tension: a spatially uniform time-varying electron mass leading to earlier recombination (and eventually adding non-zero spatial curvature, given its important role in the context of this model), and a sign-switching cosmological constant (i.e., an AdS-to-dS transition, within the so-called Λ_s CDM model).

Our study shows that no combination of the aforementioned ingredients leads to a model that successfully solves the Hubble tension. Our results are visually summarized in the whisker plot of Fig. 7, where we see that within the Λ_s CDM+ m_e and Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_K models, the Hubble tension is only reduced to the 3.3σ and 2.2σ levels respectively. These figures (especially the latter) are, however, artifacts of very large uncertainties, which are in the latter case a factor of ~ 3 -4 larger compared to the uncertainty on H_0 within Λ CDM (itself a consequence of the three additional parameters). It is worth noting that the mean value within the Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model is actually even *lower* than the Λ CDM value. We have found that this can be ascribed to a potential problem already pointed out (albeit without an explicit example) in Ref. [188], i.e. that degeneracies within each of the two models being combined limit the tension-solving abilities of the other, leading to a combination where the whole is less than the sum of its parts (in terms of the value of H_0). We have highlighted the particularly important role of Ω_m in these considerations. In fact, for the two models being combined, the tension-solving routes in Ω_m parameter space point in opposite directions—the AdS-to-dS transition wants a larger Ω_m to maintain the




FIG. 7. Whisker summary plot displaying 68% C.L. intervals on the Hubble constant H_0 (on the abscissa axis, in units of km/s/Mpc) and residual level of the Hubble tension (on the ordinate axis, in units of equivalent Gaussian σ) within the 8 different models considered. The left panel focuses on the 4 spatially flat models studied – the 6-parameter Λ CDM model (black), the 7-parameter Λ_s CDM model (red), the 7-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e model (blue), and the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e model (green) – and conversely the right panel focuses on the 4 models with varying spatial curvature studied – the 7-parameter Λ CDM+ Ω_K model (black), the 8-parameter Λ_s CDM+ Ω_K model (red), the 8-parameter Λ CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model (blue), and the 9-parameter Λ_s CDM+ m_e + Ω_K model (green). These constraints have been obtained using the \mathcal{D} dataset combination, including Lyman- α BAO measurements.

distance to the CMB fixed, whereas the varying electron mass wants a smaller Ω_m to keep the redshift of matter-radiation equality fixed. These results highlight once more the extremely important role of Ω_m in arbitrating viable solutions to the Hubble tension. Finally, we have verified that none of the model combinations considered has a significant impact on the S_8 discrepancy.

Despite the overall failure to obtain a solution to the Hubble tension, we have learned some valuable lessons for future tension-solving activities attempting to construct a successful combination of pre- and post-recombination new physics, in the spirit of Ref. [188]. We have argued that for such a combination to be successful, it is important that the tension-solving routes in the space spanned by parameters well constrained by observations point in the same directions, with Ω_m playing a particularly important role in this sense. Of course, other considerations may prevent such combinations from working, but we believe the one highlighted above represents a particularly important point, which can already be preliminarily assessed even before carrying out a complete analysis within a specific combination of models. Our work opens up various interesting follow-up directions, with the most obvious one being to carry out other attempts at constructing viable combinations of pre- and post-recombination new physics, guided by the lessons we have just learned. Besides a time-varying electron mass,

a particularly interesting candidate on the early-time side is, of course, early dark energy, for which we already know that degeneracies involving ω_c , n_s , and to some extent Ω_m play a particularly important role. In terms of better controlling Ω_m , interacting dark energy models at late times might offer a route of potential interest, given that they achieve a higher value of H_0 (albeit not fully solving the tension) while lowering Ω_m (see e.g., Refs. [360–362]). Moreover, it could be worth considering dark scattering models [363–369], whose role in potentially helping with the S_8 discrepancy was pointed out in Ref. [188]. Finally, a number of more recent cosmological datasets are now available [340]; these could help strengthen our conclusions or shed further light on the ingredients required for a successful pre-plus-post-recombination new physics combination, while at the same time it may be of interest to assess the feasibility of testing such models in future cosmological data [370–372]. We defer studies on these and related aspects to future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Vivian Poulin and Nils Schöneberg for many helpful discussions, and to Osamu Seto for collaboration throughout various stages of the project. Y.T. acknowledges support from the Japan Science and Tech-

nology Agency (JST) through the SPRING (Support for Pioneering Research Initiated by the Next Generation) grant no. JPMJSP2119. E.Ö. acknowledges support from the Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu (TÜBİTAK, Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) through the 2214/A National Graduate Scholarship Program. W.G. is supported by the Lancaster–Sheffield Consortium for Fundamental Physics under STFC grant ST/X000621/1. E.D.V. acknowledges support from the Royal Society through a Royal Society Dorothy Hodgkin Research Fellowship. S.V. acknowledges support from the University of Trento and

the Provincia Autonoma di Trento (PAT, Autonomous Province of Trento) through the UniTrento Internal Call for Research 2023 grant “Searching for Dark Energy off the beaten track” (DARKTRACK, grant agreement no. E63C22000500003), and from the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) through the Commissione Scientifica Nazionale 4 (CSN4) Iniziativa Specifica “Quantum Fields in Gravity, Cosmology and Black Holes” (FLAG). This publication is based upon work from the COST Action CA21136 “Addressing observational tensions in cosmology with systematics and fundamental physics” (CosmoVerse), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

-
- [1] M. A. Troxel *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043528 (2018), [arXiv:1708.01538 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [2] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [3] S. Aiola *et al.* (ACT), *JCAP* **12**, 047 (2020), [arXiv:2007.07288 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [4] S. Alam *et al.* (eBOSS), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083533 (2021), [arXiv:2007.08991 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [5] D. Brout *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 110 (2022), [arXiv:2202.04077 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] A. G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), [arXiv:2112.04510 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [7] S. Dhawan, S. W. Jha, and B. Leibundgut, *Astron. Astrophys.* **609**, A72 (2018), [arXiv:1707.00715 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [8] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, 1M2H, Dark Energy Camera GW-E, DES, DLT40, Las Cumbres Observatory, VINROUGE, MASTER), *Nature* **551**, 85 (2017), [arXiv:1710.05835 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [9] W. L. Freedman *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **882**, 34 (2019), [arXiv:1907.05922 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [10] C. D. Huang, A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, N. L. Zakamska, S. Casertano, P. A. Whitelock, S. L. Hoffmann, A. V. Filippenko, and D. Scolnic, *Astrophys. J.* **889**, 5 (2020), [arXiv:1908.10883 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [11] D. W. Pesce *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **891**, L1 (2020), [arXiv:2001.09213 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [12] T. de Jaeger, B. E. Stahl, W. Zheng, A. V. Filippenko, A. G. Riess, and L. Galbany, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **496**, 3402 (2020), [arXiv:2006.03412 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [13] J. Schombert, S. McGaugh, and F. Lelli, *Astron. J.* **160**, 71 (2020), [arXiv:2006.08615 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [14] J. P. Blakeslee, J. B. Jensen, C.-P. Ma, P. A. Milne, and J. E. Greene, *Astrophys. J.* **911**, 65 (2021), [arXiv:2101.02221 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [15] S. Dhawan *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **934**, 185 (2022), [arXiv:2203.04241 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [16] S. M. Ward *et al.* (Young Supernova Experiment), *Astrophys. J.* **956**, 111 (2023), [arXiv:2209.10558 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [17] R. B. Tully *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **944**, 94 (2023), [arXiv:2209.11238 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [18] A. L. Lenart, G. Bargiacchi, M. G. Dainotti, S. Nagataki, and S. Capozziello, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **264**, 46 (2023), [arXiv:2211.10785 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [19] A. J. Shajib *et al.* (TDCOSMO), *Astron. Astrophys.* **673**, A9 (2023), [arXiv:2301.02656 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [20] M. G. Dainotti, G. Bargiacchi, M. Bogdan, S. Capozziello, and S. Nagataki, *JHEAp* **41**, 30 (2024), [arXiv:2303.06974 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [21] G. Bargiacchi, M. G. Dainotti, S. Nagataki, and S. Capozziello, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **521**, 3909 (2023), [arXiv:2303.07076 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [22] D. Scolnic, A. G. Riess, J. Wu, S. Li, G. S. Anand, R. Beaton, S. Casertano, R. I. Anderson, S. Dhawan, and X. Ke, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **954**, L31 (2023), [arXiv:2304.06693 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [23] S. A. Uddin *et al.*, (2023), [arXiv:2308.01875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [24] G. Dhungana *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 60 (2024), [arXiv:2308.00916 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [25] R. B. Tully, C. Howlett, and D. Pomarede, *Astrophys. J.* **954**, 169 (2023), [arXiv:2309.00677 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [26] W. Ballard *et al.* (DESI), *Res. Notes AAS* **7**, 250 (2023), [arXiv:2311.13062 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [27] C. D. Huang *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **963**, 83 (2024), [arXiv:2312.08423 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [28] S. Li, A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, G. S. Anand, D. M. Scolnic, W. Yuan, L. Breuval, and C. D. Huang, *Astrophys. J.* **966**, 20 (2024), [arXiv:2401.04777 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [29] M. Pascale *et al.*, (2024), [arXiv:2403.18902 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [30] L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astron.* **3**, 891 (2019), [arXiv:1907.10625 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [31] E. Di Valentino *et al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **131**, 102605 (2021), [arXiv:2008.11284 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [32] 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**, 153001 (2021), [arXiv:2103.01183 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [33] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022), [arXiv:2105.05208 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [34] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Rept.* **984**, 1 (2022), [arXiv:2107.10291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [35] P. Shah, P. Lemos, and O. Lahav, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29**, 9 (2021), [arXiv:2109.01161 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] E. Abdalla *et al.*, *JHEAp* **34**, 49 (2022),

- arXiv:2203.06142 [astro-ph.CO].
- [37] E. Di Valentino, *Universe* **8**, 399 (2022).
- [38] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, *Universe* **9**, 94 (2023), arXiv:2302.05709 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] L. Verde, N. Schöneberg, and H. Gil-Marín, (2023), arXiv:2311.13305 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] E. Di Valentino and S. Bridle, *Symmetry* **10**, 585 (2018).
- [41] E. Di Valentino *et al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **131**, 102604 (2021), arXiv:2008.11285 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] R. C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505**, 5427 (2021), arXiv:2106.01208 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] R. de Sá, M. Benetti, and L. L. Graef, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **137**, 1129 (2022), arXiv:2209.11476 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] I. d. O. C. Pedreira, M. Benetti, E. G. M. Ferreira, L. L. Graef, and L. Herold, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103525 (2024), arXiv:2311.04977 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] E. Mortsell, A. Goobar, J. Johansson, and S. Dhawan, *Astrophys. J.* **933**, 212 (2022), arXiv:2105.11461 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] E. Mortsell, A. Goobar, J. Johansson, and S. Dhawan, *Astrophys. J.* **935**, 58 (2022), arXiv:2106.09400 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] W. L. Freedman, *Astrophys. J.* **919**, 16 (2021), arXiv:2106.15656 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] W. D. Kenworthy, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, W. Yuan, J. L. Bernal, D. Brout, S. Cassertano, D. O. Jones, L. Macri, and E. R. Peterson, *Astrophys. J.* **935**, 83 (2022), arXiv:2204.10866 [astro-ph.CO].
- [49] R. Wojtak and J. Hjorth, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **515**, 2790 (2022), arXiv:2206.08160 [astro-ph.CO].
- [50] A. G. Riess, L. Breuval, W. Yuan, S. Casertano, L. M. Macri, J. B. Bowers, D. Scolnic, T. Cantat-Gaudin, R. I. Anderson, and M. C. Reyes, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 36 (2022), arXiv:2208.01045 [astro-ph.CO].
- [51] Y. S. Murakami, A. G. Riess, B. E. Stahl, W. D. Kenworthy, D.-M. A. Pluck, A. Macoretta, D. Brout, D. O. Jones, D. M. Scolnic, and A. V. Filippenko, *JCAP* **11**, 046 (2023), arXiv:2306.00070 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] A. G. Riess, G. S. Anand, W. Yuan, S. Casertano, A. Dolphin, L. M. Macri, L. Breuval, D. Scolnic, M. Perrin, and R. I. Anderson, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **956**, L18 (2023), arXiv:2307.15806 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] A. G. Riess, G. S. Anand, W. Yuan, S. Casertano, A. Dolphin, L. M. Macri, L. Breuval, D. Scolnic, M. Perrin, and R. I. Anderson, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **962**, L17 (2024), arXiv:2401.04773 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] 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, (2024), arXiv:2404.08038 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] L. Verde, P. Protopapas, and R. Jimenez, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **2**, 166 (2013), arXiv:1306.6766 [astro-ph.CO].
- [56] L. A. Anchordoqui, V. Barger, H. Goldberg, X. Huang, D. Marfatia, L. H. M. da Silva, and T. J. Weiler, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 061301 (2015), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 069901 (2016)], arXiv:1506.08788 [hep-ph].
- [57] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103523 (2016), arXiv:1608.01309 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] M. Benetti, L. L. Graef, and J. S. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **07**, 066 (2018), arXiv:1712.00677 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] E. Mortsell and S. Dhawan, *JCAP* **09**, 025 (2018), arXiv:1801.07260 [astro-ph.CO].
- [60] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, and S. K. Yadav, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043521 (2018), arXiv:1803.10229 [astro-ph.CO].
- [61] R.-Y. Guo, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **02**, 054 (2019), arXiv:1809.02340 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] L. L. Graef, M. Benetti, and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 043519 (2019), arXiv:1809.04501 [astro-ph.CO].
- [63] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101347 (2023), arXiv:1904.01016 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] M. Escudero and S. J. Witte, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 294 (2020), arXiv:1909.04044 [astro-ph.CO].
- [65] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L041303 (2021), arXiv:1910.10739 [astro-ph.CO].
- [66] J. Sakstein and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 161301 (2020), arXiv:1911.11760 [astro-ph.CO].
- [67] G. Ballesteros, A. Notari, and F. Rompineve, *JCAP* **11**, 024 (2020), arXiv:2004.05049 [astro-ph.CO].
- [68] K. Jedamzik and L. Pogosian, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 181302 (2020), arXiv:2004.09487 [astro-ph.CO].
- [69] M. Ballardini, M. Braglia, F. Finelli, D. Paoletti, A. A. Starobinsky, and C. Umiltà, *JCAP* **10**, 044 (2020), arXiv:2004.14349 [astro-ph.CO].
- [70] E. Di Valentino, S. Gariazzo, O. Mena, and S. Vagnozzi, *JCAP* **07**, 045 (2020), arXiv:2005.02062 [astro-ph.CO].
- [71] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063527 (2020), arXiv:2006.06686 [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] M. Gonzalez, M. P. Hertzberg, and F. Rompineve, *JCAP* **10**, 028 (2020), arXiv:2006.13959 [astro-ph.CO].
- [73] M. Braglia, M. Ballardini, F. Finelli, and K. Koyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 043528 (2021), arXiv:2011.12934 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] S. Roy Choudhury, S. Hannestad, and T. Tram, *JCAP* **03**, 084 (2021), arXiv:2012.07519 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] T. Brinckmann, J. H. Chang, and M. LoVerde, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 063523 (2021), arXiv:2012.11830 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] T. Karwal, M. Raveri, B. Jain, J. Khoury, and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063535 (2022), arXiv:2106.13290 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] A. Gómez-Valent, Z. Zheng, L. Amendola, V. Pettorino, and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 083536 (2021), arXiv:2107.11065 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, F. Ge, and L. Knox, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 201301 (2022), arXiv:2107.13000 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] F. Niedermann and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Lett. B* **835**, 137555 (2022), arXiv:2112.00759 [hep-ph].
- [80] E. N. Saridakis, W. Yang, S. Pan, F. K. Anagnostopoulos, and S. Basilakos, *Nucl. Phys. B* **986**, 116042 (2023), arXiv:2112.08330 [astro-ph.CO].
- [81] L. Herold, E. G. M. Ferreira, and E. Komatsu, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **929**, L16 (2022), arXiv:2112.12140 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *EPL* **137**, 39001 (2022), arXiv:2201.07647 [gr-qc].
- [83] A. Aboubrahim, M. Klasen, and P. Nath, *JCAP* **04**, 042 (2022), arXiv:2202.04453 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] X. Ren, S.-F. Yan, Y. Zhao, Y.-F. Cai, and E. N. Saridakis, *Astrophys. J.* **932**, 2 (2022), arXiv:2203.01926 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] S. Adhikari, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **36**, 101005 (2022), arXiv:2203.04835 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and V. K. Oikonomou, *Nucl. Phys. B* **980**, 115850 (2022), arXiv:2205.11681 [gr-qc].
- [87] N. Schöneberg and G. Franco Abellán, *JCAP* **12**, 001 (2022), arXiv:2206.11276 [astro-ph.CO].
- [88] M. Joseph, D. Aloni, M. Schmaltz, E. N. Sivarajan,

- and N. Weiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023520 (2023), [arXiv:2207.03500 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [89] A. Gómez-Valent, Z. Zheng, L. Amendola, C. Wetterich, and V. Pettorino, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103522 (2022), [arXiv:2207.14487 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [90] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *EPL* **139**, 59003 (2022), [arXiv:2208.07972 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [91] F. Ge, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, and L. Knox, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 023517 (2023), [arXiv:2210.16335 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [92] T. Schiavone, G. Montani, and F. Bombacigno, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **522**, L72 (2023), [arXiv:2211.16737 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [93] T. Brinckmann, J. H. Chang, P. Du, and M. LoVerde, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 123517 (2023), [arXiv:2212.13264 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [94] M. Khodadi and M. Schreck, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39**, 101170 (2023), [arXiv:2301.03883 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [95] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, S. Pan, and P. Yadav, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101281 (2023), [arXiv:2301.07897 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [96] I. Ben-Dayan and U. Kumar, *JCAP* **12**, 047 (2023), [arXiv:2302.00067 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [97] Ruchika, H. Rathore, S. Roy Choudhury, and V. Rentala, *JCAP* **06**, 056 (2024), [arXiv:2306.05450 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [98] V. Yadav, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101365 (2023), [arXiv:2306.16135 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [99] R. K. Sharma, S. Das, and V. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 043530 (2024), [arXiv:2309.00401 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [100] O. F. Ramadan, T. Karwal, and J. Sakstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 063525 (2024), [arXiv:2309.08082 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [101] C. Fu and S.-J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L041304 (2024), [arXiv:2310.12932 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [102] G. Efstathiou, E. Rosenberg, and V. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 221002 (2024), [arXiv:2311.00524 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [103] G. Montani, N. Carlevaro, and M. G. Dainotti, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **44**, 101486 (2024), [arXiv:2311.04822 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [104] C. Stahl, B. Famaey, R. Ibata, O. Hahn, N. Martinet, and T. Montandon, (2024), [arXiv:2404.03244 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [105] M. Garny, F. Niedermann, H. Rubira, and M. S. Sloth, (2024), [arXiv:2404.07256 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [106] R. T. Co, N. Fernandez, A. Ghalsasi, K. Harigaya, and J. Shelton, (2024), [arXiv:2405.12268 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [107] D. Bousis and L. Perivolaropoulos, (2024), [arXiv:2405.07039 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [108] J. L. Bernal, L. Verde, and A. G. Riess, *JCAP* **10**, 019 (2016), [arXiv:1607.05617 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [109] G. E. Addison, D. J. Watts, C. L. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw, and J. L. Weiland, *Astrophys. J.* **853**, 119 (2018), [arXiv:1707.06547 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [110] P. Lemos, E. Lee, G. Efstathiou, and S. Gratton, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **483**, 4803 (2019), [arXiv:1806.06781 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [111] K. Aylor, M. Joy, L. Knox, M. Millea, S. Raghunathan, and W. L. K. Wu, *Astrophys. J.* **874**, 4 (2019), [arXiv:1811.00537 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [112] N. Schöneberg, J. Lesgourgues, and D. C. Hooper, *JCAP* **10**, 029 (2019), [arXiv:1907.11594 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [113] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 043533 (2020), [arXiv:1908.03663 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [114] N. Arendse *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **639**, A57 (2020), [arXiv:1909.07986 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [115] G. Efstathiou, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505**, 3866 (2021), [arXiv:2103.08723 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [116] R.-G. Cai, Z.-K. Guo, S.-J. Wang, W.-W. Yu, and Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, L021301 (2022), [arXiv:2107.13286 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [117] R. E. Keeley and A. Shafieloo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 111002 (2023), [arXiv:2206.08440 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [118] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 221301 (2019), [arXiv:1811.04083 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [119] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **73**, 153 (2023), [arXiv:2211.04492 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [120] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, and T. Karwal, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101348 (2023), [arXiv:2302.09032 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [121] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493**, 3255 (2020), [arXiv:1912.03986 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [122] T. Sekiguchi and T. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083507 (2021), [arXiv:2007.03381 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [123] G. C. Carvalho, A. Bernui, M. Benetti, J. C. Carvalho, and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 023530 (2016), [arXiv:1507.08972 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [124] E. de Carvalho, A. Bernui, G. C. Carvalho, C. P. Novaes, and H. S. Xavier, *JCAP* **04**, 064 (2018), [arXiv:1709.00113 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [125] G. C. Carvalho, A. Bernui, M. Benetti, J. C. Carvalho, E. de Carvalho, and J. S. Alcaniz, *Astropart. Phys.* **119**, 102432 (2020), [arXiv:1709.00271 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [126] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **495**, 2630 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14125 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [127] R. C. Nunes, S. K. Yadav, J. F. Jesus, and A. Bernui, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 2133 (2020), [arXiv:2002.09293 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [128] R. C. Nunes and A. Bernui, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 1025 (2020), [arXiv:2008.03259 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [129] E. de Carvalho, A. Bernui, F. Avila, C. P. Novaes, and J. P. Nogueira-Cavalcante, *Astron. Astrophys.* **649**, A20 (2021), [arXiv:2103.14121 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [130] D. Staicova and D. Benisty, *Astron. Astrophys.* **668**, A135 (2022), [arXiv:2107.14129 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [131] R. Menote and V. Marra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **513**, 1600 (2022), [arXiv:2112.10000 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [132] D. Benisty, J. Mifsud, J. Levi Said, and D. Staicova, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39**, 101160 (2023), [arXiv:2202.04677 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [133] A. Bernui, E. Di Valentino, W. Giarè, S. Kumar, and R. C. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 103531 (2023), [arXiv:2301.06097 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [134] R. Shah, S. Saha, P. Mukherjee, U. Garain, and S. Pal, (2024), [arXiv:2401.17029 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [135] A. Favale, A. Gómez-Valent, and M. Migliaccio, (2024), [arXiv:2405.12142 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [136] Ruchika, (2024), [arXiv:2406.05453 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [137] W. Giarè, J. Betts, C. van de Bruck, and E. Di Valentino, (2024), [arXiv:2406.07493 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [138] M.-M. Zhao, D.-Z. He, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 043520 (2017), [arXiv:1703.08456 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [139] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and O. Mena, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 043503 (2017), [arXiv:1704.08342 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [140] S. Vagnozzi, S. Dhawan, M. Gerbino, K. Freese, A. Goo-

- bar, and O. Mena, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083501 (2018), [arXiv:1801.08553 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [141] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi, and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **09**, 019 (2018), [arXiv:1805.08252 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [142] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi, and A. H. Shirazi, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123521 (2020), [arXiv:1808.02472 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [143] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi, and A. H. Shirazi, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 083509 (2019), [arXiv:1810.11007 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [144] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **883**, L3 (2019), [arXiv:1906.08275 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [145] W. Yang, S. Pan, S. Vagnozzi, E. Di Valentino, D. F. Mota, and S. Capozziello, *JCAP* **11**, 044 (2019), [arXiv:1907.05344 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [146] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 023518 (2020), [arXiv:1907.07569 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [147] N. B. Hogg, M. Bruni, R. Crittenden, M. Martinelli, and S. Peirone, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **29**, 100583 (2020), [arXiv:2002.10449 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [148] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123516 (2020), [arXiv:2004.08363 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [149] A. Banerjee, H. Cai, L. Heisenberg, E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L081305 (2021), [arXiv:2006.00244 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [150] E. Di Valentino, E. V. Linder, and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100733 (2020), [arXiv:2006.16291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [151] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi, and A. Shafieloo, *JCAP* **06**, 003 (2021), [arXiv:2012.01407 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [152] G. Alestas, L. Kazantzidis, and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083517 (2021), [arXiv:2012.13932 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [153] L.-Y. Gao, Z.-W. Zhao, S.-S. Xue, and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **07**, 005 (2021), [arXiv:2101.10714 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [154] G. Alestas and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **504**, 3956 (2021), [arXiv:2103.04045 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [155] L. Heisenberg, H. Villarrubia-Rojo, and J. Zosso, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39**, 101163 (2023), [arXiv:2201.11623 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [156] L. Heisenberg, H. Villarrubia-Rojo, and J. Zosso, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 043503 (2022), [arXiv:2202.01202 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [157] R. K. Sharma, K. L. Pandey, and S. Das, *Astrophys. J.* **934**, 113 (2022), [arXiv:2202.01749 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [158] R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi, S. Kumar, E. Di Valentino, and O. Mena, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 123506 (2022), [arXiv:2203.08093 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [159] M. K. Sharma, S. K. J. Pacif, G. Yergaliyeva, and K. Yesmakhanova, *Annals Phys.* **454**, 169345 (2023), [arXiv:2205.13514 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [160] H. Moshafi, H. Firouzjahi, and A. Talebian, *Astrophys. J.* **940**, 121 (2022), [arXiv:2208.05583 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [161] S. Banerjee, M. Petronikolou, and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 024012 (2023), [arXiv:2209.02426 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [162] P. D. Alvarez, B. Koch, C. Laporte, and A. Rincon, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **45**, 101531 (2024), [arXiv:2210.11853 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [163] M. R. Gangopadhyay, S. K. J. Pacif, M. Sami, and M. K. Sharma, *Universe* **9**, 83 (2023), [arXiv:2211.12041 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [164] L.-Y. Gao, S.-S. Xue, and X. Zhang, *Chin. Phys. C* **48**, 051001 (2024), [arXiv:2212.13146 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [165] S. Dahmani, A. Bouali, I. El Bojaddaini, A. Errahmani, and T. Ouali, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101266 (2023), [arXiv:2301.04200 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [166] J. de Cruz Perez and J. Sola Peracaula, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **43**, 101406 (2024), [arXiv:2302.04807 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [167] M. Ballardini, A. G. Ferrari, and F. Finelli, *JCAP* **04**, 029 (2023), [arXiv:2302.05291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [168] Y.-H. Yao, J.-C. Wang, and X.-H. Meng, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 063502 (2024), [arXiv:2303.00961 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [169] M. R. Gangopadhyay, M. Sami, and M. K. Sharma, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103526 (2023), [arXiv:2303.07301 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [170] Y. Zhai, W. Giarè, C. van de Bruck, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, and R. C. Nunes, *JCAP* **07**, 032 (2023), [arXiv:2303.08201 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [171] J. Sola Peracaula, A. Gomez-Valent, J. de Cruz Perez, and C. Moreno-Pulido, *Universe* **9**, 262 (2023), [arXiv:2304.11157 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [172] A. Gómez-Valent, N. E. Mavromatos, and J. Solà Peracaula, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **41**, 015026 (2024), [arXiv:2305.15774 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [173] E. Frion, D. Camarena, L. Giani, T. Miranda, D. Bertacca, V. Marra, and O. F. Piattella, *Open J. Astrophys.* (2024), [10.21105/astro.2307.06320](#), [arXiv:2307.06320 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [174] L. A. Escamilla, W. Giarè, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, and S. Vagnozzi, *JCAP* **05**, 091 (2024), [arXiv:2307.14802 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [175] G. A. Hoerning, R. G. Landim, L. O. Ponte, R. P. Rolim, F. B. Abdalla, and E. Abdalla, (2023), [arXiv:2308.05807 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [176] M. Petronikolou and E. N. Saridakis, *Universe* **9**, 397 (2023), [arXiv:2308.16044 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [177] I. Ben-Dayan and U. Kumar, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 167 (2024), [arXiv:2310.03092 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [178] R. Lazkoz, V. Salzano, L. Fernandez-Jambrina, and M. Bouhmadi-López, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **45**, 101511 (2024), [arXiv:2311.10526 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [179] M. Forconi, W. Giarè, O. Mena, Ruchika, E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and R. C. Nunes, *JCAP* **05**, 097 (2024), [arXiv:2312.11074 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [180] M. Sebastianutti, N. B. Hogg, and M. Bruni, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **46**, 101546 (2024), [arXiv:2312.14123 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [181] D. Benisty, S. Pan, D. Staicova, E. Di Valentino, and R. C. Nunes, (2024), [arXiv:2403.00056 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [182] W. Giarè, Y. Zhai, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, and C. van de Bruck, (2024), [arXiv:2404.02110 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [183] R. Shah, P. Mukherjee, and S. Pal, (2024), [arXiv:2404.06396 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [184] W. Giarè, M. A. Sabogal, R. C. Nunes, and E. Di Valentino, (2024), [arXiv:2404.15232 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [185] G. Montani and N. Carlevaro, (2024), [arXiv:2404.15977 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [186] X. D. Jia, J. P. Hu, and F. Y. Wang, (2024), [arXiv:2406.02019 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [187] A. Aboubrahim and P. Nath, (2024), [arXiv:2406.19284 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [188] S. Vagnozzi, *Universe* **9**, 393 (2023), arXiv:2308.16628 [astro-ph.CO].
- [189] S. Vagnozzi, F. Pacucci, and A. Loeb, *JHEAp* **36**, 27 (2022), arXiv:2105.10421 [astro-ph.CO].
- [190] K. Jedamzik, L. Pogosian, and G.-B. Zhao, *Commun. in Phys.* **4**, 123 (2021), arXiv:2010.04158 [astro-ph.CO].
- [191] K. C. Wong *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **498**, 1420 (2020), arXiv:1907.04869 [astro-ph.CO].
- [192] C. Krishnan, E. O. Colgáin, Ruchika, A. A. Sen, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 103525 (2020), arXiv:2002.06044 [astro-ph.CO].
- [193] C. Krishnan, E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 103509 (2021), arXiv:2011.02858 [astro-ph.CO].
- [194] M. G. Dainotti, B. De Simone, T. Schiavone, G. Montani, E. Rinaldi, and G. Lambiase, *Astrophys. J.* **912**, 150 (2021), arXiv:2103.02117 [astro-ph.CO].
- [195] M. G. Dainotti, B. De Simone, T. Schiavone, G. Montani, E. Rinaldi, G. Lambiase, M. Bogdan, and S. Ugale, *Galaxies* **10**, 24 (2022), arXiv:2201.09848 [astro-ph.CO].
- [196] E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and R. Solomon, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40**, 101216 (2023), arXiv:2211.02129 [astro-ph.CO].
- [197] X. D. Jia, J. P. Hu, and F. Y. Wang, *Astron. Astrophys.* **674**, A45 (2023), arXiv:2212.00238 [astro-ph.CO].
- [198] S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 063524 (2021), arXiv:2105.10425 [astro-ph.CO].
- [199] W. Lin, K. J. Mack, and L. Hou, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **904**, L22 (2020), arXiv:1910.02978 [astro-ph.CO].
- [200] W. Lin, X. Chen, and K. J. Mack, *Astrophys. J.* **920**, 159 (2021), arXiv:2102.05701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [201] E. J. Baxter and B. D. Sherwin, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **501**, 1823 (2021), arXiv:2007.04007 [astro-ph.CO].
- [202] O. H. E. Philcox, B. D. Sherwin, G. S. Farren, and E. J. Baxter, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023538 (2021), arXiv:2008.08084 [astro-ph.CO].
- [203] O. H. E. Philcox, G. S. Farren, B. D. Sherwin, E. J. Baxter, and D. J. Brout, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063530 (2022), arXiv:2204.02984 [astro-ph.CO].
- [204] O. Akarsu, E. O. Colgáin, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, (2024), arXiv:2402.04767 [astro-ph.CO].
- [205] W. D. Kenworthy, D. Scolnic, and A. Riess, *Astrophys. J.* **875**, 145 (2019), arXiv:1901.08681 [astro-ph.CO].
- [206] H. Desmond, B. Jain, and J. Sakstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 043537 (2019), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 101, 069904 (2020), Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 101, 129901 (2020)], arXiv:1907.03778 [astro-ph.CO].
- [207] Q. Ding, T. Nakama, and Y. Wang, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **63**, 290403 (2020), arXiv:1912.12600 [astro-ph.CO].
- [208] G. Benevento, W. Hu, and M. Raveri, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 103517 (2020), arXiv:2002.11707 [astro-ph.CO].
- [209] H. Desmond and J. Sakstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 023007 (2020), arXiv:2003.12876 [astro-ph.CO].
- [210] R.-G. Cai, J.-F. Ding, Z.-K. Guo, S.-J. Wang, and W.-W. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 123539 (2021), arXiv:2012.08292 [astro-ph.CO].
- [211] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **504**, 5164 (2021), arXiv:2101.08641 [astro-ph.CO].
- [212] R.-G. Cai, Z.-K. Guo, L. Li, S.-J. Wang, and W.-W. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 121302 (2021), arXiv:2102.02020 [astro-ph.CO].
- [213] V. Marra and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, L021303 (2021), arXiv:2102.06012 [astro-ph.CO].
- [214] C. Krishnan, R. Mohayaee, E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and L. Yin, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 184001 (2021), arXiv:2105.09790 [astro-ph.CO].
- [215] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123511 (2021), arXiv:2109.04406 [astro-ph.CO].
- [216] S. Castello, M. Högås, and E. Mörtzell, *JCAP* **07**, 003 (2022), [Erratum: *JCAP* 09, E01 (2022)], arXiv:2110.04226 [astro-ph.CO].
- [217] D. Camarena, V. Marra, Z. Sakr, and C. Clarkson, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **39**, 184001 (2022), arXiv:2205.05422 [astro-ph.CO].
- [218] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Universe* **8**, 502 (2022), arXiv:2208.11169 [astro-ph.CO].
- [219] V. K. Oikonomou, P. Tsyba, and O. Razina, *Universe* **8**, 484 (2022), arXiv:2209.04669 [gr-qc].
- [220] M. Högås and E. Mörtzell, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 024007 (2023), arXiv:2303.12827 [astro-ph.CO].
- [221] M. Högås and E. Mörtzell, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 124050 (2023), arXiv:2309.01744 [astro-ph.CO].
- [222] L. Giani, C. Howlett, K. Said, T. Davis, and S. Vagnozzi, *JCAP* **01**, 071 (2024), arXiv:2311.00215 [astro-ph.CO].
- [223] S. Mazurenko, I. Banik, P. Kroupa, and M. Haslbauer, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **527**, 4388 (2024), arXiv:2311.17988 [astro-ph.CO].
- [224] L. Huang, S.-J. Wang, and W.-W. Yu, (2024), arXiv:2401.14170 [astro-ph.CO].
- [225] I. J. Allali, M. P. Hertzberg, and F. Rompineve, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, L081303 (2021), arXiv:2104.12798 [astro-ph.CO].
- [226] L. A. Anchordoqui, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan, and W. Yang, *JHEAp* **32**, 28 (2021), arXiv:2107.13932 [astro-ph.CO].
- [227] N. Khosravi and M. Farhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063505 (2022), arXiv:2109.10725 [astro-ph.CO].
- [228] S. J. Clark, K. Vattis, J. Fan, and S. M. Koushiappas, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 083527 (2023), arXiv:2110.09562 [astro-ph.CO].
- [229] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **832**, 137244 (2022), arXiv:2201.07079 [astro-ph.CO].
- [230] L. A. Anchordoqui, V. Barger, D. Marfatia, and J. F. Soriano, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103512 (2022), arXiv:2203.04818 [astro-ph.CO].
- [231] A. Reeves, L. Herold, S. Vagnozzi, B. D. Sherwin, and E. G. M. Ferreira, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520**, 3688 (2023), arXiv:2207.01501 [astro-ph.CO].
- [232] Y.-H. Yao and X.-H. Meng, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **76**, 075401 (2024), arXiv:2312.04007 [astro-ph.CO].
- [233] S. S. da Costa, D. R. da Silva, A. S. de Jesus, N. Pinto-Neto, and F. S. Queiroz, *JCAP* **04**, 035 (2024), arXiv:2311.07420 [astro-ph.CO].
- [234] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, (2024), arXiv:2404.18579 [astro-ph.CO].
- [235] M. Baryakhtar, O. Simon, and Z. J. Weiner, (2024), arXiv:2405.10358 [astro-ph.CO].
- [236] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özüiker, and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 123512 (2021), arXiv:2108.09239 [astro-ph.CO].
- [237] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **580**, A22 (2015), arXiv:1406.7482 [astro-ph.CO].
- [238] J. Chluba and Y. Ali-Haimoud, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **456**, 3494 (2016), arXiv:1510.03877 [astro-ph.CO].

- [239] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **474**, 1850 (2018), arXiv:1705.03925 [astro-ph.CO].
- [240] A. R. Khalife, M. B. Zanjani, S. Galli, S. Günther, J. Lesgourgues, and K. Benabed, *JCAP* **04**, 059 (2024), arXiv:2312.09814 [astro-ph.CO].
- [241] J. Chluba and L. Hart, (2023), arXiv:2309.12083 [astro-ph.CO].
- [242] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 083512 (2023), arXiv:2206.13209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [243] K. Hoshiya and Y. Toda, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 043505 (2023), arXiv:2202.07714 [astro-ph.CO].
- [244] R. Solomon, G. Agarwal, and D. Stojkovic, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103536 (2022), arXiv:2201.03127 [hep-ph].
- [245] O. Seto and Y. Toda, (2024), arXiv:2405.11869 [astro-ph.CO].
- [246] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Nature Astron.* **4**, 196 (2019), arXiv:1911.02087 [astro-ph.CO].
- [247] W. Handley, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L041301 (2021), arXiv:1908.09139 [astro-ph.CO].
- [248] G. Efstathiou and S. Gratton, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **496**, L91 (2020), arXiv:2002.06892 [astro-ph.CO].
- [249] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **908**, L9 (2021), arXiv:2003.04935 [astro-ph.CO].
- [250] D. Benisty and D. Staicova, *Astron. Astrophys.* **647**, A38 (2021), arXiv:2009.10701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [251] S. Vagnozzi, E. Di Valentino, S. Gariazzo, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, and J. Silk, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **33**, 100851 (2021), arXiv:2010.02230 [astro-ph.CO].
- [252] S. Vagnozzi, A. Loeb, and M. Moresco, *Astrophys. J.* **908**, 84 (2021), arXiv:2011.11645 [astro-ph.CO].
- [253] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, S. Pan, and W. Yang, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **502**, L23 (2021), arXiv:2011.00283 [astro-ph.CO].
- [254] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, and A. Melchiorri, *JCAP* **10**, 008 (2021), arXiv:2101.03129 [astro-ph.CO].
- [255] S. Cao, J. Ryan, and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **504**, 300 (2021), arXiv:2101.08817 [astro-ph.CO].
- [256] S. Dhawan, J. Alsing, and S. Vagnozzi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **506**, L1 (2021), arXiv:2104.02485 [astro-ph.CO].
- [257] J. E. Gonzalez, M. Benetti, R. von Martens, and J. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **11**, 060 (2021), arXiv:2104.13455 [astro-ph.CO].
- [258] B. R. Dinda, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063524 (2022), arXiv:2106.02963 [astro-ph.CO].
- [259] E. Zuckerman and L. A. Anchordoqui, *JHEAp* **33**, 10 (2022), arXiv:2110.05346 [astro-ph.CO].
- [260] G. Bargiacchi, M. Benetti, S. Capozziello, E. Lusso, G. Risaliti, and M. Signorini, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **515**, 1795 (2022), arXiv:2111.02420 [astro-ph.CO].
- [261] A. Glanville, C. Howlett, and T. M. Davis, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **517**, 3087 (2022), arXiv:2205.05892 [astro-ph.CO].
- [262] J. Bel, J. Larena, R. Maartens, C. Marinoni, and L. Perenon, *JCAP* **09**, 076 (2022), arXiv:2206.03059 [astro-ph.CO].
- [263] W. Yang, W. Giarè, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063509 (2023), arXiv:2210.09865 [astro-ph.CO].
- [264] J. Stevens, H. Khoraminezhad, and S. Saito, *JCAP* **07**, 046 (2023), arXiv:2212.09804 [astro-ph.CO].
- [265] A. Favale, A. Gómez-Valent, and M. Migliaccio, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **523**, 3406 (2023), arXiv:2301.09591 [astro-ph.CO].
- [266] J.-Z. Qi, P. Meng, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 063522 (2023), arXiv:2302.08889 [astro-ph.CO].
- [267] W. Giarè, E. Di Valentino, and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103519 (2024), arXiv:2312.06482 [astro-ph.CO].
- [268] S. M. Carroll, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3067 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9806099.
- [269] P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A. C. Davis, and C. S. Rhodes, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 023512 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0209158.
- [270] T. Chiba, T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 043516 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0610027.
- [271] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özülker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023513 (2023), arXiv:2211.05742 [astro-ph.CO].
- [272] O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, (2023), arXiv:2307.10899 [astro-ph.CO].
- [273] E. A. Paraskevas and L. Perivolaropoulos, (2023), arXiv:2308.07046 [astro-ph.CO].
- [274] O. Akarsu, A. De Felice, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, E. Özülker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, (2024), arXiv:2406.07526 [astro-ph.CO].
- [275] E. A. Paraskevas, A. Cam, L. Perivolaropoulos, and O. Akarsu, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 103522 (2024), arXiv:2402.05908 [astro-ph.CO].
- [276] A. Yadav, S. Kumar, C. Kibris, and O. Akarsu, (2024), arXiv:2406.18496 [astro-ph.CO].
- [277] O. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, L. A. Escamilla, and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063528 (2020), arXiv:1912.08751 [astro-ph.CO].
- [278] L. A. Anchordoqui, I. Antoniadis, and D. Lust, (2023), arXiv:2312.12352 [hep-th].
- [279] O. Akarsu, A. De Felice, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, E. Özülker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, (2024), arXiv:2402.07716 [astro-ph.CO].
- [280] V. Poulin, K. K. Boddy, S. Bird, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 123504 (2018), arXiv:1803.02474 [astro-ph.CO].
- [281] K. Dutta, Ruchika, A. Roy, A. A. Sen, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52**, 15 (2020), arXiv:1808.06623 [astro-ph.CO].
- [282] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi, and U. Danielsson, *Symmetry* **11**, 1035 (2019), arXiv:1907.07953 [astro-ph.CO].
- [283] B. S. Haridasu, S. L. Cherkas, and V. L. Kalashnikov, *Fortsch. Phys.* **68**, 2000047 (2020), arXiv:1912.09224 [physics.gen-ph].
- [284] Ruchika, S. A. Adil, K. Dutta, A. Mukherjee, and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40**, 101199 (2023), arXiv:2005.08813 [astro-ph.CO].
- [285] E. Di Valentino, A. Mukherjee, and A. A. Sen, *Entropy* **23**, 404 (2021), arXiv:2005.12587 [astro-ph.CO].
- [286] R. Calderón, R. Gannouji, B. L'Huilier, and D. Polarski, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023526 (2021), arXiv:2008.10237 [astro-ph.CO].
- [287] M. Högås and E. Mörtzell, *JCAP* **05**, 001 (2021), arXiv:2101.08794 [gr-qc].
- [288] A. A. Sen, S. A. Adil, and S. Sen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518**, 1098 (2022), arXiv:2112.10641 [astro-ph.CO].

- ph.CO].
- [289] Y. C. Ong, *Universe* **9**, 437 (2023), [arXiv:2212.04429 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [290] E. Özüilker, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063509 (2022), [arXiv:2203.04167 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [291] M. Malekjani, R. M. Conville, E. O. Colgáin, S. Pourajaghi, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 317 (2024), [arXiv:2301.12725 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [292] M. Van Raamsdonk and C. Waddell, *JCAP* **06**, 047 (2024), [arXiv:2305.04946 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [293] S. A. Adil, O. Akarsu, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, E. Özüilker, A. A. Sen, and E. Specogna, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023527 (2024), [arXiv:2306.08046 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [294] S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen, and S. Vagnozzi, *JCAP* **10**, 072 (2023), [arXiv:2307.12763 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [295] A. Gómez-Valent, A. Favale, M. Migliaccio, and A. A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023525 (2024), [arXiv:2309.07795 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [296] N. Menci, S. A. Adil, U. Mukhopadhyay, A. A. Sen, and S. Vagnozzi, (2024), [arXiv:2401.12659 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [297] A. Gomez-Valent and J. Sola Peracaula, (2024), [arXiv:2404.18845 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [298] R. Calderon *et al.* (DESI), (2024), [arXiv:2405.04216 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [299] E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and L. Yin, (2024), [arXiv:2405.19953 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [300] M. Van Raamsdonk and C. Waddell, (2024), [arXiv:2406.02688 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [301] H. Wang, Z.-Y. Peng, and Y.-S. Piao, (2024), [arXiv:2406.03395 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [302] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083507 (2020), [arXiv:2001.02451 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [303] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 083523 (2020), [arXiv:2008.10832 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [304] G. Ye, B. Hu, and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 063510 (2021), [arXiv:2103.09729 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [305] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 103524 (2021), [arXiv:2107.07128 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [306] G. Ye, J. Zhang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **839**, 137770 (2023), [arXiv:2107.13391 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [307] J.-Q. Jiang, G. Ye, and Y.-S. Piao, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **527**, L54 (2023), [arXiv:2210.06125 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [308] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103514 (2022), [arXiv:2202.13379 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [309] J.-Q. Jiang, G. Ye, and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **851**, 138588 (2024), [arXiv:2303.12345 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [310] G. Ye, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 063512 (2023), [arXiv:2305.18873 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [311] Z.-Y. Peng and Y.-S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023519 (2024), [arXiv:2308.01012 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [312] N. Craig, D. Green, J. Meyers, and S. Rajendran, (2024), [arXiv:2405.00836 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [313] H. E. Noriega and A. Aviles, (2024), [arXiv:2407.06117 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [314] D. Green and J. Meyers, (2024), [arXiv:2407.07878 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [315] W. Elbers, C. S. Frenk, A. Jenkins, B. Li, and S. Pascoli, (2024), [arXiv:2407.10965 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [316] D. Naredo-Tuero, M. Escudero, E. Fernández-Martínez, X. Marcano, and V. Poulin, (2024), [arXiv:2407.13831 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [317] C. Vafa, (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0509212](#).
- [318] U. H. Danielsson and T. Van Riet, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **27**, 1830007 (2018), [arXiv:1804.01120 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [319] E. Palti, *Fortsch. Phys.* **67**, 1900037 (2019), [arXiv:1903.06239 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [320] G. Obied, H. Ooguri, L. Spodyneiko, and C. Vafa, (2018), [arXiv:1806.08362 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [321] P. Agrawal, G. Obied, P. J. Steinhardt, and C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett. B* **784**, 271 (2018), [arXiv:1806.09718 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [322] A. Achúcarro and G. A. Palma, *JCAP* **02**, 041 (2019), [arXiv:1807.04390 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [323] S. K. Garg and C. Krishnan, *JHEP* **11**, 075 (2019), [arXiv:1807.05193 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [324] A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, *Fortsch. Phys.* **66**, 1800052 (2018), [arXiv:1807.05445 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [325] W. H. Kinney, S. Vagnozzi, and L. Visinelli, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 117001 (2019), [arXiv:1808.06424 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [326] H. Ooguri, E. Palti, G. Shiu, and C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett. B* **788**, 180 (2019), [arXiv:1810.05506 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [327] S. D. Odintsov and V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Lett. B* **805**, 135437 (2020), [arXiv:2004.00479 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [328] V. K. Oikonomou, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 124028 (2021), [arXiv:2012.01312 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [329] M. Cicoli, F. Cunillera, A. Padilla, and F. G. Pedro, *Fortsch. Phys.* **70**, 2200008 (2022), [arXiv:2112.10783 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [330] J. D. Barrow, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, L79 (2004), [arXiv:gr-qc/0403084](#).
- [331] J. de Haro, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, V. K. Oikonomou, and S. Pan, *Phys. Rept.* **1034**, 1 (2023), [arXiv:2309.07465 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [332] O. Trivedi, *Symmetry* **16**, 298 (2024), [arXiv:2309.08954 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [333] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A8 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06210 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [334] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [335] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416**, 3017 (2011), [arXiv:1106.3366 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [336] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449**, 835 (2015), [arXiv:1409.3242 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [337] S. Alam *et al.* (BOSS), *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470**, 2617 (2017), [arXiv:1607.03155 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [338] D. M. Scolnic *et al.* (Pan-STARRS1), *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), [arXiv:1710.00845 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [339] M. Blomqvist *et al.* (eBOSS), *Astron. Astrophys.* **629**, A86 (2019), [arXiv:1904.03430 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [340] A. G. Adame *et al.* (DESI), (2024), [arXiv:2404.03002 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [341] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, and A. Lasenby, *Astrophys. J.* **538**, 473 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9911177](#).
- [342] S. Seager, D. D. Sasselov, and D. Scott, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **523**, L1 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9909275](#).
- [343] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 103511 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0205436](#).
- [344] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin, *Statist. Sci.* **7**, 457 (1992).
- [345] A. Lewis, (2019), [arXiv:1910.13970 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [346] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, E. Sellentin, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon, and A. Mootoovaloo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*

- 119**, 101301 (2017), [arXiv:1704.03467 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [347] A. Heavens, Y. Fantaye, A. Mootoovaloo, H. Eggers, Z. Hosenie, S. Kroon, and E. Sellentin, (2017), [arXiv:1704.03472 \[stat.CO\]](#).
- [348] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* **90**, 773 (1995).
- [349] R. Trotta, *Contemp. Phys.* **49**, 71 (2008), [arXiv:0803.4089 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [350] M. Cortés and A. R. Liddle, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **531**, L52 (2024), [arXiv:2309.03286 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [351] N. Lee, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, N. Schöneberg, and V. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 161003 (2023), [arXiv:2212.04494 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [352] Z. Sakr, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 083519 (2023), [arXiv:2305.02846 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [353] N. Schöneberg and L. Vacher, (2024), [arXiv:2407.16845 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [354] D. Pedrotti, J.-Q. Jiang, L. A. Escamilla, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, (2024), [arXiv:2408.04530 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [355] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, R. Calderón, and T. Simon, (2024), [arXiv:2407.18292 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [356] W. Giarè, (2024), [arXiv:2404.12779 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [357] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 123501 (2021), [arXiv:2101.03740 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [358] N. Schöneberg, L. Verde, H. Gil-Marín, and S. Brieden, *JCAP* **11**, 039 (2022), [arXiv:2209.14330 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [359] T. Takahashi and Y. Toda, *JCAP* **11**, 101 (2023), [arXiv:2306.00454 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [360] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100666 (2020), [arXiv:1908.04281 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [361] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, and S. Vagnozzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063502 (2020), [arXiv:1910.09853 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [362] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavón, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **87**, 036901 (2024), [arXiv:2402.00819 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [363] F. Simpson, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 083505 (2010), [arXiv:1007.1034 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [364] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 734 (2017), [arXiv:1709.02384 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [365] S. Vagnozzi, L. Visinelli, O. Mena, and D. F. Mota, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493**, 1139 (2020), [arXiv:1911.12374 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [366] J. Beltrán Jiménez, D. Bettoni, D. Figueruelo, and F. A. Teppa Pannia, *JCAP* **08**, 020 (2020), [arXiv:2004.14661 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [367] J. Beltrán Jiménez, D. Bettoni, D. Figueruelo, F. A. Teppa Pannia, and S. Tsujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 103503 (2021), [arXiv:2106.11222 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [368] F. Ferlito, S. Vagnozzi, D. F. Mota, and M. Baldi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **512**, 1885 (2022), [arXiv:2201.04528 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [369] V. Poulin, J. L. Bernal, E. D. Kovetz, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 123538 (2023), [arXiv:2209.06217 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [370] K. N. Abazajian *et al.* (CMB-S4), (2016), [arXiv:1610.02743 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [371] P. Ade *et al.* (Simons Observatory), *JCAP* **02**, 056 (2019), [arXiv:1808.07445 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [372] M. H. Abitbol *et al.* (Simons Observatory), *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.* **51**, 147 (2019), [arXiv:1907.08284 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).