

An overview of what current data can (and cannot yet) say about evolving dark energy

William Giarè,^{1,*} Tariq Mahassen,^{1,†} Eleonora Di Valentino,^{1,‡} and Supriya Pan^{2,3,§}

¹*School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Sheffield,
Hounsfield Road, Sheffield S3 7RH, United Kingdom*

²*Department of Mathematics, Presidency University, 86/1 College Street, Kolkata 700073, India*

³*Institute of Systems Science, Durban University of Technology,
PO Box 1334, Durban 4000, Republic of South Africa*

(Dated: February 17, 2025)

Recent measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and distance moduli from Type Ia supernovae suggest a preference for Dynamical Dark Energy (DDE) scenarios characterized by a time-varying equation of state (EoS). This focused review assesses its robustness across independent measurements and surveys. Using the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parameterization to describe the evolution of the DE EoS, we analyze over 35 dataset combinations, incorporating Planck Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) anisotropies, three independent Type Ia supernova (SN) catalogs (PantheonPlus, Union3, DESY5), BAO measurements from DESI and SDSS, and expansion rate measurements $H(z)$ inferred from the relative ages of massive, passively evolving galaxies at early cosmic times known as Cosmic Chronometers (CC). This review has two main objectives: first, to evaluate the statistical significance of the DDE preference across different dataset combinations, which incorporate varying sources of information. Specifically, we consider cases where only low-redshift probes are used in different combinations, others where individual low-redshift probes are analyzed together with CMB data, and finally, scenarios where high- and low-redshift probes are included in all possible independent combinations. Second, we provide a reader-friendly synthesis of what the latest cosmological and astrophysical probes can (and cannot yet) reveal about DDE. Overall, our findings highlight that combinations that *simultaneously* include PantheonPlus SN and SDSS BAO significantly weaken the preference for DDE. However, intriguing hints supporting DDE emerge in combinations that do not include DESI-BAO measurements: SDSS-BAO combined with SN from Union3 and DESY5 (with and without CMB) support the preference for DDE.

I. INTRODUCTION

As first established in 1998 through observations of distant Type Ia Supernovae [1, 2] and subsequently corroborated by numerous other probes [3–9], our Universe is experiencing a phase of accelerated expansion. This groundbreaking discovery has significantly impacted our understanding of the Universe’s ultimate fate, with profound implications for fundamental physics.

Explaining cosmic acceleration within the standard model of fundamental physics is highly challenging, as all known forces and components are expected to decelerate the expansion of the Universe. This enigma has inspired extensive theoretical exploration since the early 2000s, with cosmologists and particle physicists proposing diverse models and hypotheses. These range from vacuum energy density and new dynamical (pseudo-scalar) fields and interacting fluids to modified gravity theories extending General Relativity (GR) [10–29] (also see [30–103]).

Despite these efforts, the physical nature of the late-time accelerated expansion remains largely unknown. In the standard Λ CDM model, this phase of acceleration is

attributed to a positive cosmological constant term (Λ) in Einstein’s field equations. Nevertheless, unresolved issues with the cosmological constant [104, 105] have necessitated consideration of alternative frameworks, including a dynamical fluid akin to Λ , known as dark energy (DE). The simplest DE model assumes a constant equation of state (EoS), w_0 , which has been constrained using various observations, including the CMB from Planck and complementary experiments such as Atacama Cosmology Telescope (ACT) and South Pole Telescope (SPT) [6, 106–110].¹ However, there is no compelling reason (other than simplicity) to limit this model to a constant EoS. Relaxing the assumption of a constant EoS leads naturally to considering a time-dependent EoS, $w(a)$, varying with the Universe’s expansion [110, 112–174].

Recently, BAO measurements from the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) [175, 176], in combination with Planck 2018 CMB [6] and supernova type Ia datasets, have suggested evidence for dynamical DE transitioning from a past phantom-like to a present quintessence-like behavior. This analysis, based on the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parameterization,

* w.giare@sheffield.ac.uk

† tmahassen1@sheffield.ac.uk

‡ e.divalentino@sheffield.ac.uk

§ supriya.maths@presiumiv.ac.in

¹ It is worth noting that Planck data show a mild preference for a phantom EoS ($w_0 < -1$) [6, 110, 111], which is not confirmed by ACT or SPT [106–109].

$w(a) = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$ [114, 115] – where w_0 corresponds to the present-day DE EoS and w_a describes the dynamical evolution of DE – indicates $w_0 > -1$ and $w_a < 0$ at a significance of 2.5σ to 3.9σ , depending on the specific supernova type Ia dataset used [177]. Given the importance of the result, its robustness has been extensively tested in the literature [178–183], including different combinations of datasets [174, 184, 185] or different parametrizations for Dynamical DE including various EoS of DE or different DE models [173, 174, 176, 186–206].

Undoubtedly, the hints of a dynamical evolution of dark energy reported by DESI represent one of the most intriguing indications of new physics beyond Λ CDM, as they challenge the cosmological constant interpretation of DE. The implications extend from fundamental physics to the ongoing tensions between Planck results within the Λ CDM paradigm [6] and local measurements, such as SH0ES [207], potentially marking the beginning of a new era in cosmology.

Given the significance of this result, a systematic analysis is essential before drawing firm conclusions. Motivated by this crucial issue, we investigate whether different independent datasets, considered in various combinations, consistently support a preference for dynamical DE. In this focused review, following the approach adopted by DESI, we assume a CPL parameterization to describe the evolution of $w(a)$ and explore the full range of available measurements from diverse astronomical probes in constraining the DE EoS. We systematically analyze combinations of surveys, including Planck Cosmic Microwave Background anisotropies, three independent Type Ia supernova catalogs (PantheonPlus, Union3, DESY5), BAO measurements from DESI and SDSS, and Cosmic Chronometers.

We have here two main objectives:

- We evaluate the constraining power of each individual probe to determine whether, and to what extent, they support the preference for DDE both independently and in combination with other high- and low-redshift surveys. Specifically, we compute the statistical significance of the DDE preference across different dataset combinations, incorporating varying sources of information. We first analyze cases where only low-redshift probes are used in different combinations, then examine scenarios where individual low-redshift probes are combined with CMB data, and finally, explore configurations where high- and low-redshift probes are included in all possible independent combinations.
- We provide the community with a clear, accessible, and reader-friendly synthesis of what the latest cosmological and astrophysical probes can (and cannot yet) reveal about DDE. This includes assessing whether and to what extent the preference for DDE should be regarded as a robust feature emerging from multiple independent datasets or whether

it primarily arises from specific dataset combinations.

This review is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present the basic framework of a generalized DE model and introduce the main model under study. Sec. III details the observational datasets and analysis methodology. Results are discussed in Sec. IV, and conclusions are provided in Sec. V.

II. DYNAMICAL DARK ENERGY

We consider that our universe is homogeneous and isotropic in the large scale. This geometrical set-up of the universe is well described by the spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) line element characterized by $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2)$, where $a(t)$ (t denotes the cosmic time) is the expansion scale factor of the universe and (x, y, z) are the spatial coordinates. Next, we assume that the gravitational sector of the universe is described by GR and the matter sector inside it is minimally coupled to gravity, i.e. GR and there is no interaction between any two fluids. With these prescriptions, using the Einstein’s gravitational equations, one can determine the evolution of the universe.

Assuming that the matter sector of the universe comprises of radiation, pressure-less matter (baryons and cold dark matter), neutrinos and a DE fluid, the Hubble’s equation can be written as:

$$H^2(a) = \frac{\kappa^2}{3}(\rho_r + \rho_m + \rho_\nu + \rho_{\text{DE}}), \quad (1)$$

where ρ_r , ρ_m , ρ_ν , ρ_{DE} are respectively the energy density of radiation, matter, neutrinos,² and DE. Now, since the individual fluid obeys its own conservation equation $\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(1 + w_i)\rho_i = 0$, in which $w_i = p_i/\rho_i$ (ρ_i and p_i are denoting the energy density and pressure of the i -th fluid, respectively) is the barotropic equation of state of the i -th fluid. Therefore, solving the conservation equation for radiation ($w_r = 1/3$), pressure-less matter ($w_m = 0$), one would respectively obtain, $\rho_r = \rho_{r,0}(a/a_0)^{-4}$, $\rho_m = \rho_{m,0}(a/a_0)^{-3}$, where a_0 refers to the present day value of the scale factor;³ $\rho_{r,0}$, $\rho_{m,0}$ are respectively the present day value of ρ_r and ρ_m . On the DE side, using its conservation equation, the evolution of its energy density can be expressed as

$$\rho_{\text{DE}} = \rho_{\text{DE},0}a^{-3} \exp\left(-3 \int_1^a \frac{w(a')}{a'} da'\right), \quad (2)$$

² We note that here we fix the sum of neutrino mass to $\sum m_\nu = 0.06$ eV, while the number of neutrino species is fixed to $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.044$ in agreement with the prediction from the standard model of particle physics.

³ Without any loss of generality, one can set $a_0 = 1$ and we have also set the same in this article.

where $w(a)$ is the barotropic equation of state of DE which could be either constant or time-varying. For $w = -1$ which corresponds to the cosmological constant, using the above equation one gets back $\rho_{\text{DE}} = \rho_{\text{DE},0}$, i.e. a constant component that represents the present-day value of the DE density.

Depending on the nature of the EoS of DE, one can solve the evolution equation for the DE density (2) either analytically or numerically, and then using the Hubble equation (1), one can solve for the scale factor of the universe, that means the expansion of the universe can be determined at the background level. However, the background evolution alone does not reveal the full picture. A complete description of a cosmological model also requires an understanding of its evolution at the perturbation level. A time varying DE EoS can influence the perturbative evolution of the universe, directly by affecting the formation of structure of the universe. It is therefore essential to understand how a time varying DE EoS influences the universe's structure formation. This however needs a specific functional form for w_{DE} .

In order to understand the overall picture at the level of perturbations, we consider the following line element written in the synchronous gauge [208]

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) [-d\tau^2 + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij})dx^i dx^j], \quad (3)$$

where τ denotes the conformal time; δ_{ij} and h_{ij} are respectively the unperturbed and perturbed spatial part of the metric tensors. For the above metric, we can write the perturbation equations for all fluids present in the Hubble equation (1). Denoting $\delta_i = \delta\rho_i/\rho_i$ as the dimensionless density perturbations for the fluid component i and $\theta_i = i\kappa^j v_j$ being the divergence of the i -th fluid velocity, their evolution equations in the Fourier space can be described as [208]:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta'_i &= -(1+w_i) \left(\theta_i + \frac{h'}{2} \right) - 3\mathcal{H} \left(\frac{\delta P_i}{\delta\rho_i} - w_i \right) \delta_i \\ &\quad - 9\mathcal{H}^2 \left(\frac{\delta P_i}{\delta\rho_i} - c_{a,i}^2 \right) (1+w_i) \frac{\theta_i}{\kappa^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\theta'_i = -\mathcal{H} \left(1 - 3 \frac{\delta P_i}{\delta\rho_i} \right) \theta_i + \frac{\delta P_i / \delta\rho_i}{1+w_i} \kappa^2 \delta_i - \kappa^2 \sigma_i, \quad (5)$$

where prime denotes the derivative with respect to the conformal time τ ; $\mathcal{H}(a) = a'/a$ is the conformal Hubble parameter; h is the usual synchronous gauge metric perturbation; κ refers to the wavenumber in the Fourier space; σ_i is the anisotropic stress of the i -th fluid,⁴ $\frac{\delta P_{\text{DE}}}{\delta\rho_{\text{DE}}} = c_{\text{s,DE}}^2$ is the square of the sound speed of the DE component in the rest frame, $c_{a,i}^2 = w_i - w'_i / (3\mathcal{H}(1+w_i))$ is the adiabatic sound speed of the i -th fluid. In this article $c_{\text{s,DE}}^2$ has been set to be unity similar to the minimally coupled scalar field models.

⁴ We note that here anisotropic stress is neglected, i.e., $\sigma_i = 0$ has been set in the perturbation equations.

Using the evolution equations for background and perturbations, the complete evolution of the universe in the presence of a DDE fluid, characterized by its EoS $w(a)$, can be determined.

In this review, we consider the well-known Chevallier-Polarski-Linder (CPL) parametrization [114, 115], also employed by the DESI collaboration [177], which is given by:

$$w(a) = w_0 + w_a \times (1 - a), \quad (6)$$

where $w_0 = w(a_0)$ is the present-day value of $w(a)$, and $w_a = -dw(a)/da$ evaluated at $a_0 = 1$ determines the dynamical nature of the DE equation of state (EoS). For $w_a = 0$, the DE EoS reduces to a non-dynamical constant. From a theoretical standpoint, there is ongoing debate regarding the choice of this parametrization since Eq. (6) is merely a Taylor expansion of $w(a)$ around the present epoch, i.e., $a = 1$. Consequently, numerous alternative models have been proposed to describe a dynamical DE more accurately, often involving more complex but theoretically motivated functional forms for $w(a)$ (see, e.g., Refs. [110, 112, 113, 116, 117, 119–134, 139, 141–143, 147, 149–151, 153–155, 157, 158, 166, 167, 170, 173, 205]). However, as evidenced in the literature, no widely accepted theoretical framework has yet emerged that can consistently align with all observational data. Therefore, given the ongoing complexities and the enigmatic nature of DE even after more than two decades since the discovery of cosmic acceleration, we avoid introducing additional theoretical complexity through convoluted forms of $w(a)$. Instead, we adopt this linear choice, i.e., Eq. (6), as a straightforward approach to investigate whether current observational data provide genuine evidence for a dynamical dark energy component. We close this section providing the evolution of the DE density for the CPL parametrization:

$$\rho_{\text{DE}}/\rho_{\text{DE},0} = a^{-3(1+w_0+w_a)} \times \exp[-3w_a(1-a)], \quad (7)$$

from which one can sketch the qualitative feature of the DE evolution for different values of the DE parameters.

III. OBSERVATIONAL DATASETS AND METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present the observational datasets and the underlying methodology that we have used to constrain the proposed DE parametrizations. In what follows, we describe each dataset.

- **CMB:** Planck 2018 (PR3) temperature and polarization (TT, TE, EE) power spectra [6, 209, 210], in combination with the Planck 2018 reconstructed lensing [211] and ACT-DR6 lensing [212, 213] likelihoods have been used.

- **SDSS:** Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and Redshift Space Distortions (RSD) measurements from the completed SDSS-IV eBOSS survey. These include isotropic and anisotropic distance and expansion rate measurements, as well as measurements of $f\sigma_8$ [9].
- **DESI:** Measurements of BAO in galaxy, quasar, and Lyman- α forest tracers from the first year of observations using DESI. This dataset also includes robust measurements of the Hubble rate and transverse comoving distance [175, 177, 214].
- **PantheonPlus (PP):** We use the 1701 light curves of 1550 distinct Type Ia supernovae (SNIa), including those with $z < 0.01$, to allow for a joint measurement of the DE EoS parameter and the Hubble constant H_0 [215, 216].
- **DESY5:** We have also considered the distance modulus measurements of 1635 Type Ia SN distributed in $0.10 < z < 1.13$ by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) Supernova Program during five years [217–219], together with 194 low-redshift SNIa in $0.025 < z < 0.1$ that overlap with the PantheonPlus sample [215, 216].
- **Union3 (U3):** We use the compilation of 2087 Type Ia SN, of which 1363 SNIa in common with the PantheonPlus sample, as presented in Ref. [220], that includes improvements in the model selection effects, standardization, and systematic uncertainties.
- **Cosmic Chronometers (CC):** The expansion rate $H(z)$ is determined from the relative ages of massive, passively evolving galaxies at early cosmic times, known as Cosmic Chronometers [221]. For our analysis, we adopt a conservative approach, utilizing a dataset of 15 CC measurements within the redshift range $z \sim 0.179$ to $z \sim 1.965$ [4, 222, 223], incorporating all non-diagonal elements of the covariance matrix and accounting for systematic uncertainties.

For the statistical analyses, we have used the publicly available cosmological package **CAMB** [224–226] and the sampler **Cobaya** [227] to perform the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analyses. The convergence of the produced MCMC chains was assessed using the Gelman-Rubin statistic, $R - 1$ [228]. The MCMC chains were run until $R - 1 < 0.02$. In Table I, we list the flat priors applied to the free parameters in the current model. The descriptions of the free parameters are as follows: $\Omega_b h^2$ is the physical baryon energy density, $\Omega_c h^2$ is the physical cold dark matter energy density, A_s denotes the amplitude of the primordial scalar spectrum, n_s is the spectral index of the primordial scalar spectrum, τ corresponds to the optical depth to reionization, θ_{MC} is the angular size of the sound horizon, and there are two additional

Parameter	Prior
$\Omega_b h^2$	[0.005, 0.1]
$\Omega_c h^2$	[0.01, 0.99]
$\log(10^{10} A_s)$	[1.61, 3.91]
n_s	[0.8, 1.2]
τ	[0.01, 0.8]
$100\theta_{MC}$	[0.5, 10]
w_0	[-2, 0]
w_a	[-2, 2]

Table I. Flat priors on the cosmological parameters sampled in this work.

free parameters, w_0 and w_a , originating from the CPL parametrization.

We assess the preference for an evolving DE equation of state by computing the difference in the minimum χ^2 obtained assuming a CPL parameterization for DE and a standard Λ CDM cosmology. In particular, assuming both models are analyzed with the same dataset, the difference $\Delta\chi^2 = \min(\chi_{CPL}^2) - \min(\chi_{\Lambda CDM}^2)$ follows approximately a χ^2 distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in the number of free parameters between the models, $\Delta k = k_{CPL} - k_{\Lambda CDM} = 2$. The probability of obtaining a $\Delta\chi^2$ as extreme as the observed value, under the null hypothesis that the models provide an equally good fit to the data, is given by the p -value:

$$p = 1 - F_{\chi^2}(|\Delta\chi^2|, \Delta k), \quad (8)$$

where $F_{\chi^2}(x, k)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the χ^2 distribution with k degrees of freedom:

$$F_{\chi^2}(x, k) = \frac{1}{2^{k/2}\Gamma(k/2)} \int_0^x t^{k/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt. \quad (9)$$

Ultimately, we convert the p -value into a tension in units of standard deviations ($\#\sigma$)

$$\sigma = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p/2), \quad (10)$$

by using the (inverse of the) cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution, Φ defined as:

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-t^2/2} dt. \quad (11)$$

IV. RESULTS

We present the constraints on the CPL parametrization by considering several cosmological probes. We perform two separate analyses with this model. First, we use only the low-redshift datasets (SN, BAO, CC). Then,

Dataset	w_0	w_a	H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	Ω_m	# σ
CMB	$-1.36^{+0.24}_{-0.53}$ (< -0.619)	< -0.197 (< 0.967)	84^{+20}_{-5} (> 66.5)	$0.209^{+0.017}_{-0.066}$ ($0.209^{+0.12}_{-0.070}$)	1.9
CMB+CC	$-1.03^{+0.48}_{-0.37}$ ($-1.03^{+0.70}_{-0.80}$)	$-0.47^{+0.54}_{-1.4}$ (< 1.13)	$72.3^{+5.7}_{-7.7}$ (72^{+10}_{-10})	$0.280^{+0.045}_{-0.059}$ ($0.280^{+0.10}_{-0.097}$)	0.1
CMB+DESI	$-0.63^{+0.26}_{-0.14}$ ($-0.63^{+0.35}_{-0.43}$)	< -1.05 (< -0.238)	$66.3^{+1.9}_{-2.8}$ ($66.3^{+5.1}_{-4.5}$)	$0.326^{+0.026}_{-0.021}$ ($0.326^{+0.045}_{-0.048}$)	2.3
CMB+DESI+CC	$-0.65^{+0.26}_{-0.14}$ ($-0.65^{+0.35}_{-0.42}$)	< -0.991 (< -0.226)	$66.3^{+1.8}_{-2.8}$ ($66.3^{+4.9}_{-4.4}$)	$0.326^{+0.026}_{-0.021}$ ($0.326^{+0.044}_{-0.047}$)	2.6
CMB+DESI+DESY5	-0.735 ± 0.067 ($-0.73^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$)	$-0.999^{+0.31}_{-0.28}$ ($-0.999^{+0.56}_{-0.62}$)	67.27 ± 0.66 ($67.3^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$)	0.3156 ± 0.0065 ($0.316^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$)	3.9
CMB+DESI+DESY5+CC	-0.737 ± 0.065 ($-0.74^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$)	$-0.99^{+0.30}_{-0.27}$ ($-0.99^{+0.54}_{-0.62}$)	67.23 ± 0.65 ($67.2^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$)	0.3161 ± 0.0064 ($0.316^{+0.013}_{-0.012}$)	3.8
CMB+DESI+PP	-0.824 ± 0.064 ($-0.82^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.74^{+0.29}_{-0.25}$ ($-0.74^{+0.50}_{-0.58}$)	67.99 ± 0.71 ($68.0^{+1.4}_{-1.4}$)	0.3089 ± 0.0067 ($0.309^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$)	2.5
CMB+DESI+PP+CC	-0.827 ± 0.061 ($-0.83^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$)	$-0.72^{+0.28}_{-0.24}$ ($-0.72^{+0.49}_{-0.55}$)	67.96 ± 0.71 ($68.0^{+1.4}_{-1.4}$)	0.3091 ± 0.0068 ($0.309^{+0.014}_{-0.013}$)	2.5
CMB+DESI+U3	-0.661 ± 0.095 ($-0.66^{+0.18}_{-0.19}$)	-1.20 ± 0.34 ($-1.20^{+0.63}_{-0.71}$)	66.58 ± 0.94 ($66.6^{+1.8}_{-1.8}$)	0.3225 ± 0.0094 ($0.322^{+0.019}_{-0.018}$)	3.5
CMB+DESI+U3+CC	-0.669 ± 0.093 ($-0.67^{+0.18}_{-0.19}$)	$-1.16^{+0.36}_{-0.33}$ ($-1.16^{+0.64}_{-0.64}$)	66.57 ± 0.95 ($66.6^{+1.9}_{-1.8}$)	0.3224 ± 0.0095 ($0.322^{+0.019}_{-0.018}$)	3.3
CMB+DESY5	$-0.737^{+0.10}_{-0.089}$ ($-0.74^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$)	-1.02 ± 0.46 ($-1.02^{+0.83}_{-0.90}$)	67.37 ± 0.98 ($67.4^{+1.9}_{-2.0}$)	$0.3150^{+0.0094}_{-0.011}$ ($0.315^{+0.021}_{-0.019}$)	2.6
CMB+PP	$-0.860^{+0.12}_{-0.093}$ ($-0.86^{+0.20}_{-0.22}$)	$-0.61^{+0.51}_{-0.60}$ ($-0.6^{+1.0}_{-1.0}$)	67.9 ± 1.3 ($67.9^{+2.4}_{-2.5}$)	$0.310^{+0.013}_{-0.015}$ ($0.310^{+0.026}_{-0.024}$)	0.1
CMB+SDSS	-0.80 ± 0.19 ($-0.80^{+0.37}_{-0.37}$)	$-0.68^{+0.58}_{-0.51}$ ($-0.68^{+0.99}_{-1.1}$)	$66.8^{+1.8}_{-2.1}$ ($66.8^{+3.9}_{-3.6}$)	0.322 ± 0.019 ($0.322^{+0.037}_{-0.036}$)	0.3
CMB+SDSS+CC	-0.83 ± 0.19 ($-0.83^{+0.36}_{-0.36}$)	$-0.59^{+0.56}_{-0.49}$ ($-0.59^{+0.96}_{-1.1}$)	$67.0^{+1.7}_{-2.0}$ ($67.0^{+3.9}_{-3.5}$)	0.320 ± 0.018 ($0.320^{+0.036}_{-0.035}$)	0.3
CMB+SDSS+DESY5	-0.800 ± 0.064 ($-0.80^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.69^{+0.28}_{-0.24}$ ($-0.69^{+0.49}_{-0.55}$)	66.75 ± 0.62 ($66.8^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$)	0.3215 ± 0.0064 ($0.322^{+0.013}_{-0.012}$)	2.6
CMB+SDSS+DESY5+CC	-0.804 ± 0.063 ($-0.80^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.67^{+0.28}_{-0.23}$ ($-0.67^{+0.48}_{-0.54}$)	66.71 ± 0.62 ($66.7^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$)	0.3219 ± 0.0065 ($0.322^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$)	2.3
CMB+SDSS+PP	-0.879 ± 0.060 ($-0.88^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.46^{+0.25}_{-0.22}$ ($-0.46^{+0.45}_{-0.50}$)	67.37 ± 0.68 ($67.4^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$)	0.3154 ± 0.0068 ($0.315^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$)	1.6
CMB+SDSS+PP+CC	-0.885 ± 0.061 ($-0.89^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.43^{+0.25}_{-0.22}$ ($-0.43^{+0.44}_{-0.49}$)	67.33 ± 0.66 ($67.3^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$)	0.3158 ± 0.0066 ($0.316^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$)	1.0
CMB+SDSS+U3	-0.751 ± 0.093 ($-0.75^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$)	$-0.82^{+0.35}_{-0.31}$ ($-0.82^{+0.62}_{-0.67}$)	66.26 ± 0.87 ($66.3^{+1.7}_{-1.7}$)	0.3264 ± 0.0089 ($0.326^{+0.018}_{-0.017}$)	1.9
CMB+SDSS+U3+CC	-0.761 ± 0.094 ($-0.76^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$)	$-0.78^{+0.35}_{-0.31}$ ($-0.78^{+0.61}_{-0.67}$)	66.30 ± 0.87 ($66.3^{+1.7}_{-1.7}$)	0.3260 ± 0.0089 ($0.326^{+0.018}_{-0.018}$)	1.8
CMB+U3	$-0.677^{+0.13}_{-0.096}$ ($-0.68^{+0.20}_{-0.23}$)	$-1.19^{+0.33}_{-0.69}$ (< -0.302)	66.9 ± 1.3 ($66.9^{+2.5}_{-2.5}$)	0.319 ± 0.013 ($0.319^{+0.027}_{-0.024}$)	1.7
DESI+CC	$-0.80^{+0.30}_{-0.23}$ ($-0.80^{+0.47}_{-0.50}$)	< -0.197 (< 0.947)	$67.8^{+4.2}_{-4.9}$ (68^{+9}_{-9})	$0.313^{+0.048}_{-0.028}$ ($0.313^{+0.065}_{-0.081}$)	0.9
DESI+DESY5	-0.755 ± 0.079 ($-0.75^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$)	$-1.00^{+0.43}_{-0.74}$ (< 0.0676)	> 78.9 (> 62.5)	$0.323^{+0.022}_{-0.013}$ ($0.323^{+0.040}_{-0.041}$)	2.9
DESI+DESY5+CC	-0.763 ± 0.077 ($-0.76^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$)	$-0.98^{+0.49}_{-0.67}$ (< -0.0347)	67.2 ± 3.7 ($67.2^{+7.1}_{-7.0}$)	$0.325^{+0.019}_{-0.015}$ ($0.325^{+0.034}_{-0.036}$)	2.8
DESI+PP	$-0.870^{+0.065}_{-0.073}$ ($-0.87^{+0.14}_{-0.13}$)	$-0.31^{+0.72}_{-0.65}$ ($-0.3^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$)	> 74.8 (> 56.3)	$0.299^{+0.036}_{-0.013}$ ($0.299^{+0.049}_{-0.072}$)	1.5
DESI+PP+CC	$-0.871^{+0.066}_{-0.078}$ ($-0.87^{+0.15}_{-0.14}$)	$-0.43^{+0.66}_{-0.54}$ ($-0.4^{+1.1}_{-1.1}$)	68.2 ± 3.7 ($68.2^{+7.4}_{-7.2}$)	$0.307^{+0.025}_{-0.016}$ ($0.307^{+0.042}_{-0.048}$)	0.0
DESI+U3	$-0.701^{+0.11}_{-0.092}$ ($-0.70^{+0.18}_{-0.21}$)	$-1.09^{+0.28}_{-0.85}$ (< 0.0391)	> 78.8 (> 63.0)	$0.327^{+0.023}_{-0.014}$ ($0.327^{+0.041}_{-0.045}$)	2.5
DESI+U3+CC	$-0.70^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$ ($-0.70^{+0.20}_{-0.21}$)	< -0.906 (< -0.107)	66.9 ± 3.7 ($66.9^{+7.2}_{-6.9}$)	$0.330^{+0.021}_{-0.015}$ ($0.330^{+0.035}_{-0.040}$)	2.4
SDSS+CC	-0.90 ± 0.24 ($-0.90^{+0.47}_{-0.45}$)	$-0.09^{+0.92}_{-0.59}$ ($-0.1^{+1.3}_{-1.5}$)	68.3 ± 4.9 (68^{+10}_{-9})	$0.297^{+0.028}_{-0.035}$ ($0.297^{+0.061}_{-0.057}$)	0.7
SDSS+DESY5	$-0.805^{+0.065}_{-0.084}$ ($-0.80^{+0.16}_{-0.14}$)	$-0.46^{+0.70}_{-0.46}$ ($-0.5^{+1.0}_{-1.2}$)	> 80.0 (> 61.6)	$0.307^{+0.027}_{-0.022}$ ($0.307^{+0.042}_{-0.047}$)	2.5
SDSS+DESY5+CC	$-0.811^{+0.066}_{-0.079}$ ($-0.81^{+0.15}_{-0.13}$)	$-0.45^{+0.66}_{-0.38}$ ($-0.45^{+0.90}_{-1.1}$)	67.3 ± 3.8 (67^{+8}_{-7})	0.309 ± 0.020 ($0.309^{+0.040}_{-0.038}$)	2.5
SDSS+PP	-0.897 ± 0.062 ($-0.90^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$)	$0.01^{+0.54}_{-0.29}$ ($0.01^{+0.78}_{-0.97}$)	> 81.3 (> 64.4)	$0.291^{+0.022}_{-0.024}$ ($0.291^{+0.043}_{-0.042}$)	1.6
SDSS+PP+CC	-0.901 ± 0.062 ($-0.90^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$)	$-0.03^{+0.47}_{-0.26}$ ($-0.03^{+0.69}_{-0.84}$)	68.4 ± 3.9 ($68.4^{+7.5}_{-7.5}$)	$0.295^{+0.017}_{-0.021}$ ($0.295^{+0.037}_{-0.035}$)	1.6
SDSS+U3	$-0.763^{+0.091}_{-0.11}$ ($-0.76^{+0.21}_{-0.19}$)	$-0.49^{+0.75}_{-0.45}$ ($-0.49^{+0.99}_{-1.2}$)	> 79.1 (> 61.3)	0.309 ± 0.024 ($0.309^{+0.046}_{-0.048}$)	2.2
SDSS+U3+CC	$-0.777^{+0.097}_{-0.11}$ ($-0.78^{+0.20}_{-0.19}$)	$-0.51^{+0.72}_{-0.45}$ ($-0.51^{+0.98}_{-1.2}$)	66.8 ± 4.2 (67^{+8}_{-8})	0.312 ± 0.022 ($0.312^{+0.043}_{-0.041}$)	2.1

Table II. Summary of the constraints on key parameters (i.e., the dark energy parameters, w_0 and w_a , the Hubble constant H_0 , and the present matter density parameter Ω_m) at 68% CL (95% CL) for various dataset combinations. For cases where parameters are unconstrained, we report their upper or lower limits. The upper half of the table presents constraints based on high-redshift CMB data, both alone and in combination with BAO measurements (from either DESI or SDSS), SN distance moduli (from PP, DESY5, and U3), and CC. The lower half shows constraints obtained exclusively from low-redshift probes. In the last column, we quantify the preference for DDE in terms of the standard deviation σ , computed as described in Sec. III.




Figure 1. The w_0 - w_a plane for the CPL parametrization at 68% and 95% CL for all datasets analyzed in this article.




Figure 2. Whisker plots with the 68% CL constraints on the DE parameters, w_0 (left plot) and w_a (right plot) for a wide variety of combined cosmological probes. The inclusion of CC does not significantly affect the constraints on w_0 and w_a , therefore we do not consider additional cases incorporating CC.

we incorporate CMB data from Planck 2018 [6] alongside all the low-redshift cosmological probes. This distinction allows us to explore the differences in the constraints derived from the low redshift probes and CMB. In Table II, we summarize the constraints on the key parameters of interest, namely the dark energy parameters, w_0 and w_a , the Hubble constant H_0 , and the present matter density parameter Ω_m . The first half of Table II presents the constraints on these model parameters for CMB alone and when CMB is included with the low redshift probes, while the second half focuses on results derived solely from the low-redshift cosmological probes. The graphical summary representing this model are shown in Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. In the following, we systematically discuss the results obtained from all these dataset combinations, while postponing a summary and key highlights of the main findings to the conclusions.

A. Constraints from the low-redshift probes

Here, we present the constraints on the key parameters of the model obtained from various combinations of low-redshift datasets, specifically BAO from two distinct surveys, namely, DESI, SDSS; CC measurements, and three distinct samples of SN, namely, DESY5, PP, and

U3.⁵

1. BAO+CC

We include CC with two versions of the BAO data, and specifically perform the analyses with DESI+CC and SDSS+CC. According to the results, we note that only for the SDSS+CC dataset, w_a is constrained, while DESI+CC fails to constrain it within the considered flat prior, i.e., $w_a \in [-2, 2]$. In both cases, no significant evidence for a non-zero w_a is found. Furthermore, while the mean value of w_0 remains in the quintessential regime, within 1σ , the value $w_0 = -1$ is still consistent with the data. Consequently, neither dataset has enough constraining power to provide positive evidence for a dynamical evolution of $w(a)$.

On the other hand, the mean values of H_0 and Ω_m for DESI+CC are almost identical to the Planck 2018

⁵ According to [229, 230], the DESY5 sample might have some systematics that could affect the evidence for DDE. Although such possibility may not be excluded, in this work we present the results combining DESY5 with other datasets as well without entering into this debate.




Figure 3. Evolution of the CPL EoS $w(z)$ considering various combined astronomical probes. The blue dashed lines correspond to the mean values of $w(z)$ and the solid lines are denoting its 1σ and 2σ uncertainties.

estimations (assuming the Λ CDM model in the background) [6], though they exhibit significantly larger error bars. This can be visualized by comparing DESI+CC constraints ($\Omega_m = 0.313^{+0.048}_{-0.028}$ at 68% CL, $H_0 = 67.8^{+4.2}_{-4.9}$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL) with those from Planck 2018 TT,TE,EE+lowE+lensing [6] ($\Omega_m = 0.3153 \pm 0.0073$ at 68% CL, $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL). However, the SDSS+CC combination leads to a slightly higher mean value of H_0 ($H_0 = 68.3 \pm 4.9$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL) compared to both DESI+CC and Planck 2018 results. Consequently, this results in a mildly lower value of Ω_m . Nonetheless, the error bars on both H_0 and Ω_m are similarly large as those observed for DESI+CC. Overall, neither DESI+CC nor SDSS+CC suggests any significant deviation from the standard Λ CDM model, as statistically, the CPL model remains within 1σ (0.9σ and 0.7σ for DESI+CC and SDSS+CC, respectively; see the last column of Table II).

2. BAO+SN

We consider six distinct combinations of data, involving two different versions of BAO (DESI and SDSS) and three different samples of SN (DESY5, PP, U3). Additionally, the same cases have been tested with the inclusion of CC data.

From the plots in Fig. 1, in the first two columns, it is evident that the cosmological constant is ruled out at more than 95% CL for all the cases where U3 or DESY5 is included. Conversely, the indication is reduced to 68% CL when PP is considered. A quantification of the deviation from Λ CDM can be found in the last column of Table II, where it is confirmed that in the cases involving U3 or DESY5, the sole combination of BAO+SN is sufficient to provide evidence for a DDE at more than 2σ , which can be visualized in the bottom of the radar plot in Fig. 5.

Focusing separately on the results for w_0 and w_a from Fig. 2, the non-null nature of w_a is detected for




Figure 4. Whisker plot showing the 68% CL constraints on the present-day matter density parameter, Ω_m , for various combinations of cosmological probes. The inclusion of CC does not significantly impact the results on Ω_m ; therefore, we do not consider additional cases incorporating CC.

DESI+DESY5 and DESI+U3 at more than 1σ , while for the other cases, it remains consistent with zero. On the other hand, a quintessential nature of $w(a)$ at the present time, with $w_0 > -1$, is identified for all dataset combinations at least at 68% CL, reaching more than 2σ when U3 or DESY5 is included (see also Fig. 3 for the evolution of $w(a)$). It might be interesting to note that Fig. 3 (see the first two rows) clearly depicts the transition (except for SDSS+PP where this transition is not present within this redshift region)⁶ of $w(a)$ from its past phantom-like nature ($w(a) < -1$) to the quintessential nature at current times. The matter density parameter remains stable and almost consistent with the Λ CDM expectations,⁷ as shown in Fig. 4, while the value of the Hubble constant is consistent with the local measurements obtained by SH0ES, primarily due to the large error bars.

We also examine possible improvements resulting from the inclusion of CC. Focusing first on the DESI+SN+CC datasets, and referring to the second column of Fig. 1,

the cosmological constant is excluded at more than 2σ when DESY5 or U3 is included, while this evidence is reduced to approximately 1σ when PP is part of the combined dataset. This clearly indicates that the inclusion of CC does not significantly alter the evidence for DDE, as previously observed in the DESI+SN datasets. In particular, the nature of w_0 remains unchanged with the addition of CC, with $w_0 > -1$ at more than 2σ when DESY5 or U3 is included, while for PP, the evidence weakens to between 1σ and 2σ . Regarding w_a , no significant changes arise after the inclusion of CC for DESY5 (w_a remains non-null within 1σ) or PP (where $w_a = 0$ is allowed within 1σ). However, the indication for $w_a \neq 0$ at more than 1σ observed for DESI+U3 disappears when CC is included, i.e., for DESI+U3+CC. On the other hand, the inclusion of CC shifts the estimation of H_0 closer to the Planck 2018 results [6], though with larger error bars. This behavior is a direct effect introduced by the CC data. Specifically, the mean value of H_0 for DESI+DESY5+CC is quite close to Planck’s mean value (Planck 2018 TT,TE,EE+lowE+lensing) [6], but it increases slightly for DESI+PP+CC and decreases for DESI+U3+CC. Since Ω_m and H_0 are anti-correlated, Ω_m adjusts proportionally to variations in H_0 . For instance, the lowest estimated value of H_0 ($H_0 = 66.9 \pm 3.7$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL) for DESI+U3+CC corresponds to a higher matter density $\Omega_m = 0.330^{+0.021}_{-0.015}$ at 68% CL. Conversely, the highest estimation of H_0 ($H_0 = 68.2 \pm 3.7$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL) obtained for DESI+PP+CC leads to a lower value of $\Omega_m = 0.307^{+0.025}_{-0.016}$ at 68% CL. Nevertheless, considering the overall deviation of the model from Λ CDM for this dataset, the inclusion of CC with DESI+PP makes no statistical difference, as the deviation is $\sigma = 0$ (see the last column of Table II).

Moving to the remaining datasets involving SDSS BAO (i.e., SDSS+SN+CC combinations), we once again find that the cosmological constant is disfavored at approximately 2σ when DESY5 or U3 is included in the combined dataset. However, in the presence of PP, this shift weakens, reducing to approximately 1σ . The constraints on w_0 remain almost unchanged after the inclusion of CC, as do those on w_a . Similarly, the constraints on H_0 and Ω_m follow the same trend as observed in the DESI+SN and DESI+SN+CC datasets, with H_0 values slightly shifting towards lower values while Ω_m adjusts proportionally due to their anti-correlation. Overall, considering the deviation from the Λ CDM paradigm as summarized in the last column of Table II, the inclusion of CC does not introduce any statistically significant changes.

B. Constraints including the CMB data

Here, we present the constraints on the key parameters of the model obtained from all the combinations of CMB and low-redshift datasets. Specifically, we have explored the constraints using CMB alone, and its combination with other datasets, such as CMB+CC,

⁶ However, as we will discuss later, when CMB is added to SDSS+PP, the transition becomes then clear.

⁷ Although, upon a critical examination of the predicted mean values of the matter density parameter, one can conclude that the DESI+DESY5 and DESI+U3 datasets favor a slightly higher value of Ω_m compared to Planck 2018 TT,TE,EE+lowE+lensing [6], while DESI+PP predicts a lower value. On the contrary, the SDSS+SN datasets tend to prefer lower mean values of Ω_m across all cases.

CMB+BAO (DESI and SDSS), CMB+SN (DESY5, PP, and U3), and CMB+BAO+CC, CMB+BAO+SN, and CMB+BAO+SN+CC, resulting in a total of 21 cases.

1. CMB and CMB+CC

In the first row of Table II, we present the constraints obtained from the CMB alone dataset. The results for CMB alone are not new, as they have already been presented in several works (see, for example, Refs. [6, 110, 111]). In this case, w_0 lies in the phantom regime at slightly more than 68% CL ($w_0 = -1.36^{+0.24}_{-0.53}$ at 68% CL), but it is only weakly constrained with an upper limit at 95% CL. The parameter w_a , which quantifies the dynamical nature of $w(a)$, also has only an upper limit for this dataset.

Due to the phantom nature of w_0 , the Hubble constant H_0 takes a very high value with large error bars ($H_0 = 84^{+20}_{-5}$ km/s/Mpc at 68% CL). This high value of H_0 leads to a lower matter density parameter of $\Omega_m = 0.208^{+0.023}_{-0.063}$ at 68% CL, since H_0 and Ω_m are anti-correlated. Overall, this dataset exhibits a deviation from the standard Λ CDM model at the 1.9σ level (see also Fig. 5).

The inclusion of CC data significantly affects these constraints. As seen in the second row of Table II, w_0 shifts towards -1 , with a constraint of $w_0 = -1.03^{+0.48}_{-0.37}$ at 68% CL for the CMB+CC combination. Meanwhile, w_a is constrained at $w_a = -0.47^{+0.54}_{-1.4}$ at 68% CL, though it remains unconstrained from below at 95% CL. Therefore, within 68% CL, CMB+CC allows $(w_0, w_a) = (-1, 0)$, which is statistically very close to the standard Λ CDM model with a deviation of only 0.1σ (see also Fig. 1).

2. CMB+SN

CMB in combination with any of the three SN samples (e.g., DESY5, PP, U3) influences the parameter space quite significantly. In all three cases, as shown in Table II, w_0 is consistently found in the quintessence regime, while w_a is non-null.⁸ The strength of the evidence depends on the specific dataset: w_0 remains in the quintessence regime at more than 2σ for CMB+DESY5 and CMB+U3, while for CMB+PP, it stays in the same regime but only slightly above 1σ . On the other hand, w_a is non-null (i.e., $w_a \neq 0$, indicating a dynamical $w(a)$) at more than 2σ for CMB+DESY5 and CMB+U3, but only at approximately 1σ for CMB+PP. These results jointly support the evidence for dynamical dark energy with a present-day quintessential nature of $w(a)$.

In the second panel from the top of Fig. 2, we present the whisker plots for w_0 (left) and w_a (right) for these

datasets, offering a clear visualization of the DE equation of state and the strength of the dynamical DE evidence. Similar to the BAO+SN analysis discussed earlier, the evidence for DDE for CMB+SN is more pronounced when DESY5 and U3 are included, while it weakens significantly with PP, as also illustrated in Fig. 1.

To quantify the statistical preference for the CPL model over Λ CDM, we calculate the deviation and find that CPL deviates from the standard Λ CDM model at 2.6σ , 1.7σ , and 0.1σ for CMB+DESY5, CMB+U3, and CMB+PP, respectively. This confirms that the maximum deviation is observed for CMB+DESY5 (see also Fig. 5).

Finally, focusing on H_0 , our analysis reveals that for all three combined datasets, the estimated values of H_0 remain consistent with the predictions from Planck 2018 within the Λ CDM model [6], though with slightly larger error bars. Similarly, the estimates for the matter density parameter Ω_{m0} , as shown in Fig. 4, are also consistent with Planck 2018 results within Λ CDM [6].

3. CMB+BAO

When CMB is combined with BAO, significant changes in the constraints on the parameters are observed. We have explored two versions of the BAO data, specifically DESI and SDSS. Notably, CMB+DESI fails to constrain w_a within the considered range $[-2, 2]$, providing only an upper limit, while CMB+SDSS does constrain w_a —a distinguishing feature between these BAO datasets, as shown in Table II and the third panel (from top to bottom) of Fig. 2. Focusing on w_0 , we observe that for CMB+DESI, it remains in the quintessence regime at slightly more than 2σ , whereas for CMB+SDSS, $w_0 > -1$ is only weakly indicated at slightly more than 1σ . This suggests that DESI combined with CMB enhances the evidence for a quintessential dark energy component more significantly than SDSS combined with CMB. Overall, we find a deviation from Λ CDM of 2.3σ for CMB+DESI and 0.3σ for CMB+SDSS, as also illustrated in Fig. 5. This indicates that DESI, when paired with CMB, shows a stronger preference for a DDE than SDSS, as can also be seen in Fig. 1.

Regarding the Hubble constant, our results show consistency with the value obtained under Λ CDM, but on the lower side, while the matter density remains in agreement with all previously discussed cases, supported by larger error bars, as shown in Fig. 4.

The inclusion of CC data with both CMB+DESI and CMB+SDSS datasets does not significantly alter the constraints. For example, w_a continues to have only an upper limit for CMB+DESI+CC, indicating that the additional constraining power from CC is insufficient to improve the constraints in this case. Similarly, the constraints on w_0 and other cosmological parameters remain almost unchanged with the inclusion of CC for both datasets. Specifically, CPL remains 0.3σ away from

⁸ For the combination CMB+U3, w_a is constrained at 68% CL but remains unconstrained from below at 95% CL.

Λ CDM for both CMB+SDSS and CMB+SDSS+CC. However, for CMB+DESI+CC, the deviation increases to 2.6σ , compared to 2.3σ for CMB+DESI alone (see also Fig. 5).

4. CMB+BAO+SN

In this case, we consider six different combined analyses involving two BAO datasets (DESI and SDSS) and three SN samples (DESY5, PP, U3). We can immediately observe that the indication for DDE seen in the BAO+SN and CMB+SN combinations is further strengthened when considering the full combination CMB+BAO+SN. The 2D contour plots shown in Fig. 1 reveal a striking deviation from the cosmological constant, consistent with findings already reported in the literature.

Focusing first on the constraints from CMB+DESI+SN datasets, we find that w_0 remains in the quintessence regime at more than 2σ for all three combined analyses. Notably, for CMB+DESI+U3, w_0 is significantly different from -1 ($w_0 = -0.661 \pm 0.095$ at 68% CL) compared to the results obtained with the other two SN samples. On the other hand, w_a is constrained in all cases, unlike the scenario without SN data (see Fig. 2 and Table II). Moreover, w_a is also found to be non-null at more than 2σ , providing strong evidence for a dynamical evolution of $w(a)$ as described by the CPL parameterization, as further illustrated in Fig. 3.

When comparing with the Λ CDM model, a deviation of 3.9σ is observed for CMB+DESI+DESY5 and 3.5σ for CMB+DESI+U3, both of which are significantly larger than the 2.5σ deviation seen for CMB+DESI+PP. These cases represent the largest deviations explored in this study, as visualized in Fig. 5.

The Hubble constant H_0 is extremely well constrained in these cases and remains in agreement with the Λ CDM model, while the matter density Ω_m is slightly higher but still consistent with the standard value, as shown in Fig. 4.

Upon including CC data in all three combined datasets, the constraints on w_0 , w_a , and other cosmological parameters remain nearly unchanged due to the limited constraining power of CC data. Consequently, the statistical deviation of the model from Λ CDM remains almost identical to the cases without CC.

The replacement of DESI by SDSS in the CMB+BAO+SN combination significantly affects the constraints, though it still mildly favors a DDE in all cases, as shown in Fig. 1. For all three SN datasets, w_a remains non-null at more than 2σ , though the strength of evidence is more pronounced in the presence of DESI, as illustrated in the whisker plot of Fig. 2 and the evolution of the dark energy equation of state $w(a)$ in Fig. 3. Regarding w_0 , it is found to be in the quintessence regime at more than 2σ




Figure 5. Radar plot quantifying the preference for the CPL evolving DE component over Λ CDM, measured by the standard deviation, σ , calculated for each observational dataset summarized in Table II, following the methodology described in Sec. III.

when DESY5 and U3 are considered, while for PP, the evidence is reduced to approximately 1σ . A notable trend is the shift of w_0 towards -1 compared to the constraints derived from CMB+DESI+SN (see also Table II). Statistically, the evidence for dynamical DE is weaker in the presence of SDSS compared to DESI. Specifically, the evidence for dynamical DE is reduced from 3.9σ (CMB+DESI+DESY5) to 2.6σ (CMB+SDSS+DESY5). Similarly, the evidence for CMB+SDSS+PP drops to 1.6σ , compared to 2.5σ with DESI. For CMB+SDSS+U3, the deviation is reduced to 1.9σ from 3.5σ with DESI (see the radar plot in Fig. 5).

Analogously to the case with DESI, both the Hubble constant H_0 and the matter density parameter Ω_m are extremely well constrained for CMB+SDSS+SN and remain consistent with the Λ CDM model (see Fig. 4).

When CC is included in the CMB+SDSS+SN combinations, the evidence for dynamical DE is mildly reduced across all cases. The most significant reduction occurs for CMB+SDSS+PP and CMB+SDSS+PP+CC, where the inclusion of CC lowers the evidence for dynamical DE from 1.6σ to 1σ (see also Fig. 5).

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

After the BAO measurements from the DESI collaboration [175, 177], intriguing features of the DE sector emerged. Assuming a dynamical DE equation of

state described by the CPL parametrization: $w(a) = w_0 + w_a(1 - a)$, it was reported that the combination of CMB+DESI-BAO indicates a preference for a dynamical DE component at approximately 2.6σ . When various SN datasets are added to CMB+DESI-BAO, the preference for dynamical DE strengthens, reaching 3.9σ for the CMB+DESI-BAO+DESY5 combination.

This result challenges the cosmological constant interpretation of the present-day accelerated expansion of the Universe, pointing to a dynamical DE component characterized by present-day quintessence-like behavior ($w_0 > -1$) that transitioned into the phantom-like regime in the past ($w_a < 0$).

Motivated by these findings, we presented a concise review of the current constraints on dynamical dark energy. Adopting the Chevallier-Polarski-Linder parametrization to describe the evolution of the equation of state, we systematically analyzed multiple cosmological probes, considering over 35 different combinations of data involving two BAO datasets (DESI and SDSS), three SN datasets (DESY5, PP, and U3), Hubble parameter measurements from cosmic chronometers, and Planck CMB temperature and polarization anisotropies. Our goals were to provide the community with a reader-friendly synthesis of what the latest cosmological and astrophysical probes can (and cannot yet) reveal about dynamical dark energy, clarify the constraining power of each individual probe, and determine whether, and to what extent, the preference for dynamical dark energy was supported across different combinations of datasets, accounting for varying sources of information from high and low redshift surveys.

We summarized the numerical constraints on key parameters in Table II, while the key results were visually presented in Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, using two-dimensional joint contours, several whisker plots, and a radar plot.

The most relevant findings from this comprehensive study are outlined as follows:

- Our analysis of low-redshift probes revealed that an indication for dynamical dark energy is already present in the BAO+SN dataset combination. Notably, this preference is not solely driven by the DESI data, as a shift toward dynamical dark energy is also observed when considering SDSS BAO in combination with SN. However, the strength of this preference is reduced when SDSS replaces DESI in the same dataset combination. Importantly, among the BAO+SN analyses, the choice of the SN catalog plays the most significant role in determining the strength of the preference. In particular, the PantheonPlus dataset combined with SDSS BAO is the only case that does not yield a significant indication for dynamical dark energy (see also the top-left panel in Figure 3 and the 2D contours in Figure 1).
- When considering the CMB+DESI-BAO combination, the cosmological constant value falls out-

side the 95% confidence level marginalized probability contours, whereas for CMB+SDSS-BAO, it remains within the probability contours (see Figure 1). That said, even for SDSS-BAO, the favored region of parameter space is consistent with that preferred by CMB+DESI. Projecting the constraints on w_0 and w_a in one dimension, we still observe a shift toward a present-day quintessence-like equation of state, dynamically evolving into a phantom-like behavior in the past (see Figure 3).

- When considering different combinations of CMB and SN surveys, the preference for dynamical dark energy persists, reinforcing the crucial role of SN measurements in driving this trend. However, the inclusion of the PantheonPlus SN catalog weakens this indication compared to the DESY5 and Union3 datasets.
- The full combination of CMB+BAO+SN typically strengthens the evidence for DDE, reaching a maximal significance of 3.9σ for CMB+DESY5+DESI. As usual, this preference is reduced in combinations involving PantheonPlus SN data or SDSS BAO measurements, compared to the DESY5/U3 SN catalogs and DESI BAO, respectively. However, the preference for DDE remains robust across most dataset combinations. In fact, the only scenario where this preference is significantly weakened is when SDSS BAO and PantheonPlus SN are considered simultaneously.
- The addition of Cosmic Chronometers to combinations involving only low-redshift probes generally has a modest impact. One notable exception is the DESI+PantheonPlus combination, which favors the CPL model over Λ CDM at $\sim 1.5\sigma$. However, when Cosmic Chronometers are included, no statistically significant deviation between from a Λ CDM cosmology is found. When high-redshift CMB data are incorporated, the constraining power of the combined CMB+BAO+SN datasets is sufficient to render the addition of Cosmic Chronometers largely irrelevant in terms of constraints.
- Across all independent correlations (each showing hints of deviation from a cosmological constant at varying statistical significance) we consistently observe shifts in parameter space in the same direction. These shifts point toward a quintessence-like equation of state in the present epoch that transitions into a phantom-like regime in the past. This trend is clearly visible in Figure 1, where the 2D contours in the w_0 - w_a plane illustrate the correlation, in Figure 2, which presents the 1D marginalized constraints on w_0 (left panel) and w_a (right panel), and in Figure 3, which reconstructs the redshift evolution of the dark energy equation of state.

Based on these results, one could take an optimistic perspective, arguing that the hints for DDE should be regarded positively, as they emerge from multiple independent probes that exhibit similar trends in the evolution of the dark energy equation of state—consistently favoring a phantom-like behavior in the past and a quintessence-like behavior today. However, on the other hand, the strength of this preference remains contingent on specific dataset choices, see also Figure 5. Further cross-checks using future surveys and new data releases will be necessary before these findings can be considered robust across all datasets.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

W.G. acknowledges support from the Lancaster–Sheffield Consortium for Fundamental Physics

through the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) grant ST/X000621/1. E.D.V. acknowledges support from the Royal Society through a Royal Society Dorothy Hodgkin Research Fellowship. S.P. acknowledges the financial support from the Department of Science and Technology (DST), Govt. of India under the Scheme “Fund for Improvement of S&T Infrastructure (FIST)” (File No. SR/FST/MS-I/2019/41). This article 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). We acknowledge IT Services at The University of Sheffield for the provision of services for High Performance Computing.

-
- [1] Adam G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), “Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant,” *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009–1038 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201](#).
- [2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), “Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High Redshift Supernovae,” *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565–586 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133](#).
- [3] Blake D. Sherwin *et al.*, “Evidence for dark energy from the cosmic microwave background alone using the Atacama Cosmology Telescope lensing measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 021302 (2011), [arXiv:1105.0419 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [4] Michele Moresco, Lucia Pozzetti, Andrea Cimatti, Raul Jimenez, Claudia Maraston, Licia Verde, Daniel Thomas, Annalisa Citro, Rita Tojeiro, and David Wilkinson, “A 6% measurement of the Hubble parameter at $z \sim 0.45$: direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration,” *JCAP* **05**, 014 (2016), [arXiv:1601.01701 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [5] David Rubin and Brian Hayden, “Is the expansion of the universe accelerating? All signs point to yes,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **833**, L30 (2016), [arXiv:1610.08972 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [7] Seshadri Nadathur, Will J. Percival, Florian Beutler, and Hans Winther, “Testing Low-Redshift Cosmic Acceleration with Large-Scale Structure,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 221301 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11044 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [8] B. M. Rose, D. Rubin, A. Cikota, S. E. Deustua, S. Dixon, A. Fruchter, D. O. Jones, A. G. Riess, and D. M. Scolnic, “Evidence for Cosmic Acceleration is Robust to Observed Correlations Between Type Ia Supernova Luminosity and Stellar Age,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **896**, L4 (2020), [arXiv:2002.12382 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [9] Shadab Alam *et al.* (eBOSS), “Completed SDSS-IV extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Cosmological implications from two decades of spectroscopic surveys at the Apache Point Observatory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083533 (2021), [arXiv:2007.08991 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [10] P. J. E. Peebles and Bharat Ratra, “The Cosmological Constant and Dark Energy,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 559–606 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0207347](#).
- [11] Shin’ichi Nojiri and Sergei D. Odintsov, “Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy,” *eConf C0602061*, 06 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0601213](#).
- [12] Edmund J. Copeland, M. Sami, and Shinji Tsujikawa, “Dynamics of dark energy,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753–1936 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0603057](#).
- [13] Ruth Durrer and Roy Maartens, “Dark Energy and Dark Gravity,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 301–328 (2008), [arXiv:0711.0077 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [14] T. Padmanabhan, “Dark energy and gravity,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 529–564 (2008), [arXiv:0705.2533 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [15] Gabriel R. Bengochea and Rafael Ferraro, “Dark torsion as the cosmic speed-up,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 124019 (2009), [arXiv:0812.1205 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [16] Joshua Frieman, Michael Turner, and Dragan Huterer, “Dark Energy and the Accelerating Universe,” *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **46**, 385–432 (2008), [arXiv:0803.0982 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [17] Thomas P. Sotiriou and Valerio Faraoni, “f(R) Theories Of Gravity,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 451–497 (2010), [arXiv:0805.1726 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [18] Antonio De Felice and Shinji Tsujikawa, “f(R) theories,” *Living Rev. Rel.* **13**, 3 (2010), [arXiv:1002.4928 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [19] Timothy Clifton, Pedro G. Ferreira, Antonio Padilla, and Constantinos Skordis, “Modified Gravity and Cosmology,” *Phys. Rept.* **513**, 1–189 (2012), [arXiv:1106.2476 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [20] Miao Li, Xiao-Dong Li, Shuang Wang, and Yi Wang, “Dark Energy,” *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **56**, 525–604 (2011), [arXiv:1103.5870 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [21] Kazuharu Bamba, Salvatore Capozziello, Shin’ichi Nojiri, and Sergei D. Odintsov, “Dark energy cosmology:

- the equivalent description via different theoretical models and cosmography tests,” *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **342**, 155–228 (2012), arXiv:1205.3421 [gr-qc].
- [22] Kazuya Koyama, “Cosmological Tests of Modified Gravity,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 046902 (2016), arXiv:1504.04623 [astro-ph.CO].
- [23] Emanuele Berti et al., “Testing General Relativity with Present and Future Astrophysical Observations,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 243001 (2015), arXiv:1501.07274 [gr-qc].
- [24] Austin Joyce, Lucas Lombriser, and Fabian Schmidt, “Dark Energy Versus Modified Gravity,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **66**, 95–122 (2016), arXiv:1601.06133 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavon, “Dark Matter and Dark Energy Interactions: Theoretical Challenges, Cosmological Implications and Observational Signatures,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 096901 (2016), arXiv:1603.08299 [astro-ph.CO].
- [26] Shuang Wang, Yi Wang, and Miao Li, “Holographic Dark Energy,” *Phys. Rept.* **696**, 1–57 (2017), arXiv:1612.00345 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, and V. K. Oikonomou, “Modified Gravity Theories on a Nutshell: Inflation, Bounce and Late-time Evolution,” *Phys. Rept.* **692**, 1–104 (2017), arXiv:1705.11098 [gr-qc].
- [28] Sebastian Bahamonde, Christian G. Böhmer, Sante Carloni, Edmund J. Copeland, Wei Fang, and Nicola Tamanini, “Dynamical systems applied to cosmology: dark energy and modified gravity,” *Phys. Rept.* **775–777**, 1–122 (2018), arXiv:1712.03107 [gr-qc].
- [29] Sebastian Bahamonde, Konstantinos F. Dialektopoulos, Celia Escamilla-Rivera, Gabriel Farrugia, Viktor Gakis, Martin Hendry, Manuel Hohmann, Jackson Levi Said, Jurgen Mifsud, and Eleonora Di Valentino, “Teleparallel gravity: from theory to cosmology,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **86**, 026901 (2023), arXiv:2106.13793 [gr-qc].
- [30] Luca Amendola, “Coupled quintessence,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 043511 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9908023.
- [31] Dragan Huterer and Michael S. Turner, “Probing the dark energy: Methods and strategies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123527 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0012510.
- [32] Latham A. Boyle, Robert R. Caldwell, and Marc Kamionkowski, “Spintessence! New models for dark matter and dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 17–22 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0105318.
- [33] Vittorio Gorini, Alexander Kamenshchik, and Ugo Moschella, “Can the Chaplygin gas be a plausible model for dark energy?” *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 063509 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0209395.
- [34] J. S. Bagla, Harvinder Kaur Jassal, and T. Padmanabhan, “Cosmology with tachyon field as dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 063504 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0212198.
- [35] Sean M. Carroll, Mark Hoffman, and Mark Trodden, “Can the dark energy equation-of-state parameter w be less than -1 ?” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023509 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0301273.
- [36] Sean M. Carroll, Vikram Duvvuri, Mark Trodden, and Michael S. Turner, “Is cosmic speed - up due to new gravitational physics?” *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0306438.
- [37] Shin’ichi Nojiri and Sergei D. Odintsov, “Modified gravity with negative and positive powers of the curvature: Unification of the inflation and of the cosmic acceleration,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 123512 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0307288.
- [38] Varun Sahni and Yuri Shtanov, “Brane world models of dark energy,” *JCAP* **11**, 014 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0202346.
- [39] Zong-Kuan Guo, Yun-Song Piao, Xin-Min Zhang, and Yuan-Zhong Zhang, “Cosmological evolution of a quintom model of dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **608**, 177–182 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0410654.
- [40] Joan Simon, Licia Verde, and Raul Jimenez, “Constraints on the redshift dependence of the dark energy potential,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123001 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412269.
- [41] Miao Li, “A Model of holographic dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **603**, 1 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0403127.
- [42] Ujjaini Alam, Varun Sahni, and A. A. Starobinsky, “The Case for dynamical dark energy revisited,” *JCAP* **06**, 008 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0403687.
- [43] Shin’ichi Nojiri and Sergei D. Odintsov, “Gravity assisted dark energy dominance and cosmic acceleration,” *Phys. Lett. B* **599**, 137–142 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0403622.
- [44] Edmund J. Copeland, Mohammad R. Garousi, M. Sami, and Shinji Tsujikawa, “What is needed of a tachyon if it is to be the dark energy?” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 043003 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0411192.
- [45] Rong-Gen Cai and Anzhong Wang, “Cosmology with interaction between phantom dark energy and dark matter and the coincidence problem,” *JCAP* **03**, 002 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0411025.
- [46] Hao Wei, Rong-Gen Cai, and Ding-Fang Zeng, “Hessence: A New view of quintom dark energy,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 3189–3202 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0501160.
- [47] Shin’ichi Nojiri, Sergei D. Odintsov, and Misao Sasaki, “Gauss-Bonnet dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123509 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0504052.
- [48] Salvatore Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, “Observational constraints on dark energy with generalized equations of state,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 043512 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0508350.
- [49] Robert J. Scherrer, “Dark energy models in the w - w' plane,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 043502 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0509890.
- [50] John D. Barrow and T. Clifton, “Cosmologies with energy exchange,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 103520 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0604063.
- [51] Shin’ichi Nojiri and Sergei D. Odintsov, “Modified $f(R)$ gravity consistent with realistic cosmology: From matter dominated epoch to dark energy universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 086005 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0608008.
- [52] Luca Amendola, Radouane Gannouji, David Polarski, and Shinji Tsujikawa, “Conditions for the cosmological viability of $f(R)$ dark energy models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 083504 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0612180.
- [53] S. Fay, S. Nesseris, and L. Perivolaropoulos, “Can $f(R)$ Modified Gravity Theories Mimic a Λ CDM Cosmology?” *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 063504 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0703006.
- [54] Shinji Tsujikawa, “Observational signatures of $f(R)$ dark energy models that satisfy cosmological and local gravity constraints,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 023507 (2008),

- arXiv:0709.1391 [astro-ph].
- [55] Hao Wei and Rong-Gen Cai, “A New Model of Agegraphic Dark Energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 113–117 (2008), arXiv:0708.0884 [astro-ph].
- [56] Antonio De Felice and Shinji Tsujikawa, “Construction of cosmologically viable $f(G)$ dark energy models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **675**, 1–8 (2009), arXiv:0810.5712 [hep-th].
- [57] Shuang-Yong Zhou, Edmund J. Copeland, and Paul M. Saffin, “Cosmological Constraints on $f(G)$ Dark Energy Models,” *JCAP* **07**, 009 (2009), arXiv:0903.4610 [gr-qc].
- [58] Philippe Brax, Carsten van de Bruck, Anne-Christine Davis, and Douglas Shaw, “The Dilaton and Modified Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 063519 (2010), arXiv:1005.3735 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] Tiberiu Harko, Francisco S. N. Lobo, Shin’ichi Nojiri, and Sergei D. Odintsov, “ $f(R, T)$ gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 024020 (2011), arXiv:1104.2669 [gr-qc].
- [60] Chao-Qiang Geng, Chung-Chi Lee, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Yi-Peng Wu, ““Teleparallel” dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **704**, 384–387 (2011), arXiv:1109.1092 [hep-th].
- [61] Houri Ziaeeepour, “Discrimination between Lambda-CDM, quintessence, and modified gravity models using wide area surveys,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 043503 (2012), arXiv:1112.6025 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] Hermano Velten and Dominik Schwarz, “Dissipation of dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 083501 (2012), arXiv:1206.0986 [astro-ph.CO].
- [63] Jolyon K. Bloomfield, Éanna É. Flanagan, Minjoon Park, and Scott Watson, “Dark energy or modified gravity? An effective field theory approach,” *JCAP* **08**, 010 (2013), arXiv:1211.7054 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] J. A. S. Lima, S. Basilakos, and F. E. M. Costa, “New Cosmic Accelerating Scenario without Dark Energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 103534 (2012), arXiv:1205.0868 [astro-ph.CO].
- [65] A. Yu. Kamenshchik, A. Tronconi, G. Venturi, and S. Yu. Vernov, “Reconstruction of Scalar Potentials in Modified Gravity Models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 063503 (2013), arXiv:1211.6272 [gr-qc].
- [66] E. L. D. Perico, J. A. S. Lima, Spyros Basilakos, and Joan Sola, “Complete Cosmic History with a dynamical $\Lambda = \Lambda(H)$ term,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 063531 (2013), arXiv:1306.0591 [astro-ph.CO].
- [67] Stefano Foffa, Michele Maggiore, and Ermis Mitsou, “Cosmological dynamics and dark energy from nonlocal infrared modifications of gravity,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **29**, 1450116 (2014), arXiv:1311.3435 [hep-th].
- [68] Weiqiang Yang and Lixin Xu, “Coupled dark energy with perturbed Hubble expansion rate,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 083532 (2014), arXiv:1409.5533 [astro-ph.CO].
- [69] Eric V. Linder, Gizem Sengör, and Scott Watson, “Is the Effective Field Theory of Dark Energy Effective?” *JCAP* **05**, 053 (2016), arXiv:1512.06180 [astro-ph.CO].
- [70] Supriya Pan, Subhra Bhattacharya, and Subenoy Chakraborty, “An analytic model for interacting dark energy and its observational constraints,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **452**, 3038–3046 (2015), arXiv:1210.0396 [gr-qc].
- [71] Mario Ballardini, Fabio Finelli, Caterina Umiltà, and Daniela Paoletti, “Cosmological constraints on induced gravity dark energy models,” *JCAP* **05**, 067 (2016), arXiv:1601.03387 [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] Iver Brevik, Øyvind Grøn, Jaume de Haro, Sergei D. Odintsov, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis, “Viscous Cosmology for Early- and Late-Time Universe,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26**, 1730024 (2017), arXiv:1706.02543 [gr-qc].
- [73] Mehdi Rezaei, Mohammad Malekjani, Spyros Basilakos, Ahmad Mehrabi, and David F. Mota, “Constraints to Dark Energy Using PADE Parameterizations,” *Astrophys. J.* **843**, 65 (2017), arXiv:1706.02537 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] Eleonora Di Valentino, Eric V. Linder, and Alessandro Melchiorri, “Vacuum phase transition solves the H_0 tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 043528 (2018), arXiv:1710.02153 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] Emmanuel N. Saridakis, “Ricci-Gauss-Bonnet holographic dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 064035 (2018), arXiv:1707.09331 [gr-qc].
- [76] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, and David F. Mota, “Novel approach toward the large-scale stable interacting dark-energy models and their astronomical bounds,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 123508 (2017), arXiv:1709.00006 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] Carsten Van De Bruck and Jurgen Mifsud, “Searching for dark matter - dark energy interactions: going beyond the conformal case,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 023506 (2018), arXiv:1709.04882 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] David Langlois, Ryo Saito, Daisuke Yamauchi, and Karim Noui, “Scalar-tensor theories and modified gravity in the wake of GW170817,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 061501 (2018), arXiv:1711.07403 [gr-qc].
- [79] Mehdi Rezaei, Mohammad Malekjani, and Joan Sola, “Can dark energy be expressed as a power series of the Hubble parameter?” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023539 (2019), arXiv:1905.00100 [gr-qc].
- [80] Xiaolei Li, Arman Shafieloo, Varun Sahni, and Alexei A. Starobinsky, “Revisiting Metastable Dark Energy and Tensions in the Estimation of Cosmological Parameters,” *Astrophys. J.* **887**, 153 (2019), arXiv:1904.03790 [astro-ph.CO].
- [81] Fotios K. Anagnostopoulos, Spyros Basilakos, Georgios Kofinas, and Vasilios Zarikas, “Constraining the Asymptotically Safe Cosmology: cosmic acceleration without dark energy,” *JCAP* **02**, 053 (2019), arXiv:1806.10580 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] Jose Beltrán Jiménez, Lavinia Heisenberg, Tomi Sebastian Koivisto, and Simon Pekar, “Cosmology in $f(Q)$ geometry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 103507 (2020), arXiv:1906.10027 [gr-qc].
- [83] Francisco X. Linares Cedeño, Ariadna Montiel, Juan Carlos Hidalgo, and Gabriel Germán, “Bayesian evidence for α -attractor dark energy models,” *JCAP* **08**, 002 (2019), arXiv:1905.00834 [gr-qc].
- [84] Weiqiang Yang, M. Shahalam, Barun Pal, Supriya Pan, and Anzhong Wang, “Constraints on quintessence scalar field models using cosmological observations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023522 (2019), arXiv:1810.08586 [gr-qc].
- [85] Supriya Pan, Weiqiang Yang, Eleonora Di Valentino, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Subenoy Chakraborty, “Interacting scenarios with dynamical dark energy: Observational constraints and alleviation of the H_0 tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 103520 (2019), arXiv:1907.07540 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] Micol Benetti, Welber Miranda, Humberto A. Borges, Cassio Pigozzo, Saulo Carneiro, and Jailson S. Alcaniz, “Looking for interactions in the cosmological dark

- sector,” *JCAP* **12**, 023 (2019), [arXiv:1908.07213 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [87] Özgür Akarsu, John D. Barrow, Luis A. Escamilla, and J. Alberto Vazquez, “Graduated dark energy: Observational hints of a spontaneous sign switch in the cosmological constant,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 063528 (2020), [arXiv:1912.08751 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [88] Eleonora Di Valentino, Alessandro Melchiorri, Olga Mena, and Sunny Vagnozzi, “Interacting dark energy in the early 2020s: A promising solution to the H_0 and cosmic shear tensions,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100666 (2020), [arXiv:1908.04281 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [89] Weiqiang Yang, Eleonora Di Valentino, Supriya Pan, Spyros Basilakos, and Andronikos Paliathanasis, “Metastable dark energy models in light of *Planck* 2018 data: Alleviating the H_0 tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063503 (2020), [arXiv:2001.04307 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [90] L. N. Granda, “Modified gravity with disappearing cosmological constant,” *JHEP* **12**, 205 (2021), [arXiv:2007.13956 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [91] Rong-Gen Cai, Zong-Kuan Guo, Li Li, Shao-Jiang Wang, and Wang-Wei Yu, “Chameleon dark energy can resolve the Hubble tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 121302 (2021), [arXiv:2102.02020 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [92] Verónica Motta, Miguel A. García-Aspeitia, Alberto Hernández-Almada, Juan Magaña, and Tomás Verdugo, “Taxonomy of Dark Energy Models,” *Universe* **7**, 163 (2021), [arXiv:2104.04642 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [93] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, Celia Escamilla-Rivera, and Andronikos Paliathanasis, “Exploring bulk viscous unified scenarios with gravitational waves standard sirens,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520**, 1146–1154 (2023), [arXiv:2301.03969 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [94] Sudip Halder, Jaume de Haro, Tapan Saha, and Supriya Pan, “Phase space analysis of sign-shifting interacting dark energy models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 083522 (2024), [arXiv:2403.01397 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [95] William Giarè, Miguel A. Sabogal, Rafael C. Nunes, and Eleonora Di Valentino, “Interacting Dark Energy after DESI Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 251003 (2024), [arXiv:2404.15232 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [96] Varun Muralidharan and James M. Cline, “Can Baby Universe Absorption Explain Dark Energy?” (2024), [arXiv:2408.13306 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [97] William Giarè, Yuejia Zhai, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, Rafael C. Nunes, and Carsten van de Bruck, “Tightening the reins on non-minimal dark sector physics: Interacting Dark Energy with dynamical and non-dynamical equation of state,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.02110 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [98] Pietro Ghedini, Rasmi Hajjar, and Olga Mena, “Redshift-space distortions corner interacting dark energy,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **46**, 101671 (2024), [arXiv:2409.02700 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [99] Ozgur Akarsu, Bilal Bulduk, Antonio De Felice, Nihan Katırcı, and N. Merve Uzun, “Unexplored regions in teleparallel $f(T)$ gravity: Sign-changing dark energy density,” (2024), [arXiv:2410.23068 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [100] M. Koussour, S. Bekov, A. Syzdykova, S. Muminov, I. Ibragimov, and J. Rayimbaev, “Observational constraints on a generalized equation of state model,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **47**, 101799 (2025), [arXiv:2412.20073 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [101] Sergei D. Odintsov, Diego Sáez-Chillón Gómez, and German S. Sharov, “Modified gravity/Dynamical Dark Energy vs Λ CDM: is the game over?” (2024), [arXiv:2412.09409 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [102] Sudip Halder, S. D. Odintsov, Supriya Pan, Tapan Saha, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis, “Interacting phantom dark energy: new accelerating scaling attractors,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.18300 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [103] Sudip Halder, Jaume de Haro, Supriya Pan, Tapan Saha, and Subenoy Chakraborty, “Phase space analysis of CCDM cosmologies,” (2025), [arXiv:2502.03256 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [104] Steven Weinberg, “The Cosmological Constant Problem,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1–23 (1989).
- [105] Ivaylo Zlatev, Li-Min Wang, and Paul J. Steinhardt, “Quintessence, cosmic coincidence, and the cosmological constant,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896–899 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9807002](#).
- [106] Simone Aiola et al. (ACT), “The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: DR4 Maps and Cosmological Parameters,” *JCAP* **12**, 047 (2020), [arXiv:2007.07288 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [107] D. Dutcher et al. (SPT-3G), “Measurements of the E-mode polarization and temperature-E-mode correlation of the CMB from SPT-3G 2018 data,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 022003 (2021), [arXiv:2101.01684 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [108] L. Balkenhol et al. (SPT-3G), “Measurement of the CMB temperature power spectrum and constraints on cosmology from the SPT-3G 2018 TT, TE, and EE dataset,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023510 (2023), [arXiv:2212.05642 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [109] William Giarè, “CMB Anomalies and the Hubble Tension,” (2023), [arXiv:2305.16919 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [110] Luis A. Escamilla, William Giarè, Eleonora Di Valentino, Rafael C. Nunes, and Sunny Vagnozzi, “The state of the dark energy equation of state circa 2023,” *JCAP* **05**, 091 (2024), [arXiv:2307.14802 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [111] Weiqiang Yang, Eleonora Di Valentino, Supriya Pan, Yabo Wu, and Jianbo Lu, “Dynamical dark energy after Planck CMB final release and H_0 tension,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **501**, 5845–5858 (2021), [arXiv:2101.02168 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [112] Asantha R. Cooray and Dragan Huterer, “Gravitational lensing as a probe of quintessence,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **513**, L95–L98 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9901097](#).
- [113] G. Efstathiou, “Constraining the equation of state of the universe from distant type Ia supernovae and cosmic microwave background anisotropies,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **310**, 842–850 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9904356](#).
- [114] Michel Chevallier and David Polarski, “Accelerating universes with scaling dark matter,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213–224 (2001), [arXiv:gr-qc/0009008](#).
- [115] Eric V. Linder, “Exploring the expansion history of the universe,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0208512](#).
- [116] Christof Wetterich, “Phenomenological parameterization of quintessence,” *Phys. Lett. B* **594**, 17–22 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0403289](#).
- [117] Bo Feng, Mingzhe Li, Yun-Song Piao, and Xinmin Zhang, “Oscillating quintom and the recurrent universe,” *Phys. Lett. B* **634**, 101–105 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0407432](#).

- [118] Steen Hannestad and Edvard Mortsell, “Cosmological constraints on the dark energy equation of state and its evolution,” *JCAP* **09**, 001 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0407259](#).
- [119] Jun-Qing Xia, Bo Feng, and Xin-Min Zhang, “Constraints on oscillating quintom from supernova, microwave background and galaxy clustering,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **20**, 2409–2416 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0411501](#).
- [120] Yun-gui Gong and Yuan-Zhong Zhang, “Probing the curvature and dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043518 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0502262](#).
- [121] Harvinder Kaur Jassal, J. S. Bagla, and T. Padmanabhan, “Observational constraints on low redshift evolution of dark energy: How consistent are different observations?” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 103503 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0506748](#).
- [122] S. Nesseris and Leandros Perivolaropoulos, “Comparison of the legacy and gold snia dataset constraints on dark energy models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 123519 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0511040](#).
- [123] Dao-Jun Liu, Xin-Zhou Li, Jiangang Hao, and Xing-Hua Jin, “Revisiting the parametrization of Equation of State of Dark Energy via SNIa Data,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **388**, 275 (2008), [arXiv:0804.3829 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [124] E. M. Barboza, Jr. and J. S. Alcaniz, “A parametric model for dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **666**, 415–419 (2008), [arXiv:0805.1713 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [125] E. M. Barboza, J. S. Alcaniz, Z. H. Zhu, and R. Silva, “A generalized equation of state for dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 043521 (2009), [arXiv:0905.4052 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [126] Jing-Zhe Ma and Xin Zhang, “Probing the dynamics of dark energy with novel parametrizations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **699**, 233–238 (2011), [arXiv:1102.2671 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [127] Irene Sendra and Ruth Lazkoz, “SN and BAO constraints on (new) polynomial dark energy parametrizations: current results and forecasts,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **422**, 776–793 (2012), [arXiv:1105.4943 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [128] Lei Feng and Tan Lu, “A new equation of state for dark energy model,” *JCAP* **11**, 034 (2011), [arXiv:1203.1784 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [129] E. M. Barboza, Jr. and J. S. Alcaniz, “Probing the time dependence of dark energy,” *JCAP* **02**, 042 (2012), [arXiv:1103.0257 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [130] Antonio De Felice, Savvas Nesseris, and Shinji Tsujikawa, “Observational constraints on dark energy with a fast varying equation of state,” *JCAP* **05**, 029 (2012), [arXiv:1203.6760 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [131] Chao-Jun Feng, Xian-Yong Shen, Ping Li, and Xin-Zhou Li, “A New Class of Parametrization for Dark Energy without Divergence,” *JCAP* **09**, 023 (2012), [arXiv:1206.0063 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [132] Hao Wei, Xiao-Peng Yan, and Ya-Nan Zhou, “Cosmological Applications of Padé Approximant,” *JCAP* **01**, 045 (2014), [arXiv:1312.1117 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [133] Juan Magaña, Victor H. Cárdenas, and V. Motta, “Cosmic slowing down of acceleration for several dark energy parametrizations,” *JCAP* **10**, 017 (2014), [arXiv:1407.1632 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [134] Özgür Akarsu, Tekin Dereli, and J. Alberto Vazquez, “A divergence-free parametrization for dynamical dark energy,” *JCAP* **06**, 049 (2015), [arXiv:1501.07598 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [135] Supriya Pan, Jaume de Haro, Andronikos Paliathanasis, and Reinoud Jan Slagter, “Evolution and Dynamics of a Matter creation model,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **460**, 1445–1456 (2016), [arXiv:1601.03955 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [136] Eleonora Di Valentino, Alessandro Melchiorri, and Joseph Silk, “Reconciling Planck with the local value of H_0 in extended parameter space,” *Phys. Lett. B* **761**, 242–246 (2016), [arXiv:1606.00634 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [137] Rafael C. Nunes, Alexander Bonilla, Supriya Pan, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis, “Observational Constraints on $f(T)$ gravity from varying fundamental constants,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 230 (2017), [arXiv:1608.01960 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [138] Rafael C. Nunes, Supriya Pan, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Everton M. C. Abreu, “New observational constraints on $f(R)$ gravity from cosmic chronometers,” *JCAP* **01**, 005 (2017), [arXiv:1610.07518 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [139] Juan Magana, V. Motta, Victor H. Cardenas, and G. Foex, “Testing cosmic acceleration for $w(z)$ parameterizations using f_{gas} measurements in galaxy clusters,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **469**, 47–61 (2017), [arXiv:1703.08521 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [140] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, and Andronikos Paliathanasis, “Latest astronomical constraints on some non-linear parametric dark energy models,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **475**, 2605–2613 (2018), [arXiv:1708.01717 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [141] Supriya Pan, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Weiqiang Yang, “Observational Constraints on Oscillating Dark-Energy Parametrizations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 063510 (2018), [arXiv:1712.05746 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [142] Grigoris Panotopoulos and Ángel Rincón, “Growth index and statefinder diagnostic of Oscillating Dark Energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 103509 (2018), [arXiv:1804.11208 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [143] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Subenoy Chakraborty, “Observational constraints on one-parameter dynamical dark-energy parametrizations and the H_0 tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 043543 (2019), [arXiv:1810.05141 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [144] Luisa G. Jaime, Mariana Jaber, and Celia Escamilla-Rivera, “New parametrized equation of state for dark energy surveys,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083530 (2018), [arXiv:1804.04284 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [145] Anadijiban Das, Asit Banerjee, Subenoy Chakraborty, and Supriya Pan, “Perfect Fluid Cosmological Universes: One equation of state and the most general solution,” *Pramana* **90**, 19 (2018), [arXiv:1706.08145 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [146] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis, “Observational constraints on dynamical dark energy with pivoting redshift,” *Universe* **5**, 219 (2019), [arXiv:1811.06932 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [147] Xiaolei Li and Arman Shafieloo, “A Simple Phenomenological Emergent Dark Energy Model can Resolve the Hubble Tension,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **883**, L3 (2019), [arXiv:1906.08275 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [148] Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, Andronikos Paliathanasis, Subir Ghosh, and Yabo Wu, “Observational constraints of a new unified dark fluid and the H_0 tension,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **490**, 2071–2085 (2019), [arXiv:1904.10436 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [149] Supriya Pan, Weiqiang Yang, Eleonora Di Valentino, Arman Shafieloo, and Subenoy Chakraborty, “Recon-

- ciling H_0 tension in a six parameter space?” *JCAP* **06**, 062 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12551 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [150] David Tamayo and J. Alberto Vazquez, “Fourier-series expansion of the dark-energy equation of state,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **487**, 729–736 (2019), [arXiv:1901.08679 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [151] Supriya Pan, Weiqiang Yang, and Andronikos Paliathanasis, “Imprints of an extended Chevalier–Polarski–Linder parametrization on the large scale of our universe,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 274 (2020), [arXiv:1902.07108 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [152] Eleonora Di Valentino, Ankan Mukherjee, and Anjan A. Sen, “Dark Energy with Phantom Crossing and the H_0 Tension,” *Entropy* **23**, 404 (2021), [arXiv:2005.12587 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [153] M. Rezaei, T. Naderi, M. Malekjani, and A. Mehrabi, “A Bayesian comparison between Λ CDM and phenomenologically emergent dark energy models,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 374 (2020), [arXiv:2004.08168 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [154] Dalibor Perkovic and Hrvoje Stefancic, “Barotropic fluid compatible parametrizations of dark energy,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 629 (2020), [arXiv:2004.05342 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [155] Abdolali Banihashemi, Nima Khosravi, and Arman Shafieloo, “Dark energy as a critical phenomenon: a hint from Hubble tension,” *JCAP* **06**, 003 (2021), [arXiv:2012.01407 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [156] Mariana Jaber-Bravo, Erick Almaraz, and Axel de la Macorra, “Imprint of a Steep Equation of State in the growth of structure,” *Astropart. Phys.* **115**, 102388 (2020), [arXiv:1906.09522 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [157] H. B. Benaoum, Weiqiang Yang, Supriya Pan, and Eleonora Di Valentino, “Modified emergent dark energy and its astronomical constraints,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31**, 2250015 (2022), [arXiv:2008.09098 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [158] Weiqiang Yang, Eleonora Di Valentino, Supriya Pan, Arman Shafieloo, and Xiaolei Li, “Generalized emergent dark energy model and the Hubble constant tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 063521 (2021), [arXiv:2103.03815 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [159] Mariana Jaber, Gustavo Arciniega, Luisa G. Jaime, and Omar Abel Rodríguez-López, “A single parameterization for dark energy and modified gravity models,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **37**, 101069 (2022), [arXiv:2102.08561 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [160] George Alestas, David Camarena, Eleonora Di Valentino, Lavrentios Kazantzidis, Valerio Marra, Savvas Nesseris, and Leandros Perivolaropoulos, “Late-transition versus smooth $H(z)$ -deformation models for the resolution of the Hubble crisis,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063538 (2022), [arXiv:2110.04336 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [161] Jing Yang, Xin-Yan Fan, Chao-Jun Feng, and Xiang-Hua Zhai, “Latest Data Constraint of Some Parameterized Dark Energy Models,” *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **40**, 019801 (2023), [arXiv:2211.15881 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [162] Helena García Escudero, Jui-Lin Kuo, Ryan E. Keeley, and Kevork N. Abazajian, “Early or phantom dark energy, self-interacting, extra, or massive neutrinos, primordial magnetic fields, or a curved universe: An exploration of possible solutions to the H_0 and σ_8 problems,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103517 (2022), [arXiv:2208.14435 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [163] Mónica N. Castillo-Santos, A. Hernández-Almada, Miguel A. García-Aspeitia, and Juan Magaña, “An exponential equation of state of dark energy in the light of 2018 CMB Planck data,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40**, 101225 (2023), [arXiv:2212.01974 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [164] Weiqiang Yang, William Giarè, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, Alessandro Melchiorri, and Joseph Silk, “Revealing the effects of curvature on the cosmological models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063509 (2023), [arXiv:2210.09865 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [165] Safae Dahmani, Amine Bouali, Imad El Bojaddaini, Ahmed Errahmani, and Taoufik Ouali, “Smoothing the H_0 tension with a phantom dynamical dark energy model,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101266 (2023), [arXiv:2301.04200 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [166] Mehdi Rezaei, Supriya Pan, Weiqiang Yang, and David F. Mota, “Evidence of dynamical dark energy in a non-flat universe: current and future observations,” *JCAP* **01**, 052 (2024), [arXiv:2305.18544 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [167] Shah Nawaz A. Adil, Özgür Akarsu, Eleonora Di Valentino, Rafael C. Nunes, Emre Özlüker, Anjan A. Sen, and Enrico Specogna, “Omnipotent dark energy: A phenomenological answer to the Hubble tension,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023527 (2024), [arXiv:2306.08046 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [168] Jose Agustin Lozano Torres, “Generalized emergent dark energy in the late-time Universe,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **533**, 1865–1873 (2024).
- [169] Jainendra Kumar Singh, Preeti Singh, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, Shynaray Myrzakul, and Harshna Balhara, “New Parametrization of the Dark-Energy Equation of State with a Single Parameter,” *Universe* **10**, 246 (2024), [arXiv:2304.03783 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [170] Mehdi Rezaei, “Oscillating Dark Energy in Light of the Latest Observations and Its Impact on the Hubble Tension,” *Astrophys. J.* **967**, 2 (2024), [arXiv:2403.18968 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [171] Masoume Reyhani, Mahdi Najafi, Javad T. Firouzjaee, and Eleonora Di Valentino, “Structure formation in various dynamical dark energy scenarios,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **44**, 101477 (2024), [arXiv:2403.15202 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [172] Mahdi Najafi, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, and Javad T. Firouzjaee, “Dynamical dark energy confronted with multiple CMB missions,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **45**, 101539 (2024).
- [173] William Giarè, Mahdi Najafi, Supriya Pan, Eleonora Di Valentino, and Javad T. Firouzjaee, “Robust preference for Dynamical Dark Energy in DESI BAO and SN measurements,” *JCAP* **10**, 035 (2024), [arXiv:2407.16689 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [174] William Giarè, “Dynamical Dark Energy Beyond Planck? Constraints from multiple CMB probes, DESI BAO and Type-Ia Supernovae,” (2024), [arXiv:2409.17074 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [175] A. G. Adame et al. (DESI), “DESI 2024 III: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations from Galaxies and Quasars,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.03000 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [176] K. Lodha et al. (DESI), “DESI 2024: Constraints on Physics-Focused Aspects of Dark Energy using DESI DR1 BAO Data,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.13588 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [177] A. G. Adame et al. (DESI), “DESI 2024 VI: Cosmological Constraints from the Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.03002 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [178] Marina Cortês and Andrew R. Liddle, “Interpreting DESI’s evidence for evolving dark energy,” *JCAP* **12**, 007 (2024), [arXiv:2404.08056 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [179] David Shlivko and Paul J. Steinhardt, “Assessing observational constraints on dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **855**, 138826 (2024), [arXiv:2405.03933 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [180] Orlando Luongo and Marco Muccino, “Model independent cosmographic constraints from DESI 2024,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.07070 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [181] Wen Yin, “Cosmic clues: DESI, dark energy, and the cosmological constant problem,” *JHEP* **05**, 327 (2024), [arXiv:2404.06444 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [182] Ioannis D. Gialamas, Gert Hütsi, Kristjan Kannike, Antonio Racioppi, Martti Raidal, Martin Vasar, and Hardi Veermäe, “Interpreting DESI 2024 BAO: late-time dynamical dark energy or a local effect?” (2024), [arXiv:2406.07533 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [183] Bikash R. Dinda, “A new diagnostic for the null test of dynamical dark energy in light of DESI 2024 and other BAO data,” *JCAP* **09**, 062 (2024), [arXiv:2405.06618 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [184] Hao Wang and Yun-Song Piao, “Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.18579 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [185] Chan-Gyung Park, Javier de Cruz Pérez, and Bharat Ratra, “Using non-DESI data to confirm and strengthen the DESI 2024 spatially-flat w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization result,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.00502 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [186] Yuichiro Tada and Takahiro Terada, “Quintessential interpretation of the evolving dark energy in light of DESI observations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L121305 (2024), [arXiv:2404.05722 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [187] Youri Carloni, Orlando Luongo, and Marco Muccino, “Does dark energy really revive using DESI 2024 data?” (2024), [arXiv:2404.12068 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [188] Chan-Gyung Park, Javier de Cruz Pérez, and Bharat Ratra, “Using non-DESI data to confirm and strengthen the DESI 2024 spatially flat w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization result,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 123533 (2024), [arXiv:2405.00502 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [189] Omar F. Ramadan, Jeremy Sakstein, and David Rubin, “DESI Constraints on Exponential Quintessence,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.18747 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [190] Alessio Notari, Michele Redi, and Andrea Tesi, “Consistent Theories for the DESI dark energy fit,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.08459 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [191] Lili Orchard and Víctor H. Cárdenas, “Probing Dark Energy Evolution Post-DESI 2024,” (2024), [arXiv:2407.05579 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [192] A. Hernández-Almada, M. L. Mendoza-Martínez, Miguel A. García-Aspeitia, and V. Motta, “Phenomenological emergent dark energy in the light of DESI Data Release 1,” (2024), [arXiv:2407.09430 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [193] S. Pourojaghi, M. Malekjani, and Z. Davari, “Cosmological constraints on dark energy parametrizations after DESI 2024: Persistent deviation from standard Λ CDM cosmology,” (2024), [arXiv:2407.09767 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [194] João Rebouças, Diogo H. F. de Souza, Kunhao Zhong, Vivian Miranda, and Rogerio Rosenfeld, “Investigating Late-Time Dark Energy and Massive Neutrinos in Light of DESI Y1 BAO,” (2024), [arXiv:2408.14628 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [195] Chan-Gyung Park, Javier de Cruz Perez, and Bharat Ratra, “Is the w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization evidence for dark energy dynamics partially caused by the excess smoothing of Planck CMB anisotropy data?” (2024), [arXiv:2410.13627 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [196] Nicola Menci, Anjan Ananda Sen, and Marco Castellano, “The Excess of JWST Bright Galaxies: A Possible Origin in the Ground State of Dynamical Dark Energy in the Light of DESI 2024 Data,” *Astrophys. J.* **976**, 227 (2024), [arXiv:2410.22940 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [197] Tian-Nuo Li, Yun-He Li, Guo-Hong Du, Peng-Ju Wu, Lu Feng, Jing-Fei Zhang, and Xin Zhang, “Revisiting holographic dark energy after DESI 2024,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.08639 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [198] Jun-Xian Li and Shuang Wang, “A comprehensive numerical study on four categories of holographic dark energy models,” (2024), [arXiv:2412.09064 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [199] Alessio Notari, Michele Redi, and Andrea Tesi, “BAO vs. SN evidence for evolving dark energy,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.11685 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [200] Qing Gao, Zhiqian Peng, Shengqing Gao, and Yungui Gong, “On the evidence of dynamical dark energy,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.16046 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [201] Ramy Fikri, Esraa ElKhateeb, El Sayed Lashin, and Waleed El Hanafy, “A preference for dynamical phantom dark energy using one-parameter model with Planck, DESI DR1 BAO and SN data,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.19362 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [202] Jie Zheng, Da-Chun Qiang, and Zhi-Qiang You, “Cosmological constraints on dark energy models using DESI BAO 2024,” (2024), [arXiv:2412.04830 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [203] Adria Gómez-Valent and Joan Solà Peracaula, “Composite Dark Energy and the Cosmological Tensions,” (2024), [arXiv:2412.15124 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [204] Antony Lewis and Ewan Chamberlain, “Understanding acoustic scale observations: the one-sided fight against Λ ,” (2024), [arXiv:2412.13894 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [205] William J. Wolf, Carlos García-García, and Pedro G. Ferreira, “Robustness of Dark Energy Phenomenology Across Different Parameterizations,” (2025), [arXiv:2502.04929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [206] Anowar J. Shajib and Joshua A. Frieman, “Evolving dark energy models: Current and forecast constraints,” (2025), [arXiv:2502.06929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [207] Adam G. Riess et al., “A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), [arXiv:2112.04510 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [208] Chung-Pei Ma and Edmund Bertschinger, “Cosmological perturbation theory in the synchronous and conformal Newtonian gauges,” *Astrophys. J.* **455**, 7–25 (1995), [arXiv:astro-ph/9506072](#).
- [209] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), “Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12875 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [210] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), “Planck 2018 results. I. Overview and the cosmological legacy of Planck,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A1 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06205 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [211] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), “Planck 2018 results. VIII. Gravitational lensing,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A8 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06210 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [212] Mathew S. Madhavacheril *et al.* (ACT), “The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: DR6 Gravitational Lensing Map and Cosmological Parameters,” *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 113 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05203 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [213] Frank J. Qu *et al.* (ACT), “The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: A Measurement of the DR6 CMB Lensing Power Spectrum and Its Implications for Structure Growth,” *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 112 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05202 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [214] A. G. Adame *et al.* (DESI), “DESI 2024 IV: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations from the Lyman Alpha Forest,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.03001 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [215] Dan Scolnic *et al.*, “The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release,” *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 113 (2022), [arXiv:2112.03863 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [216] Dillon Brout *et al.*, “The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints,” *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 110 (2022), [arXiv:2202.04077 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [217] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), “The Dark Energy Survey: Cosmology Results With ~ 1500 New High-redshift Type Ia Supernovae Using The Full 5-year Dataset,” (2024), [arXiv:2401.02929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [218] B. O. Sánchez *et al.* (DES), “The Dark Energy Survey Supernova Program: Light curves and 5-Year data release,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.05046 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [219] M. Vincenzi *et al.* (DES), “The Dark Energy Survey Supernova Program: Cosmological Analysis and Systematic Uncertainties,” (2024), [arXiv:2401.02945 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [220] David Rubin *et al.*, “Union Through UNITY: Cosmology with 2,000 SNe Using a Unified Bayesian Framework,” (2023), [arXiv:2311.12098 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [221] Raul Jimenez and Abraham Loeb, “Constraining cosmological parameters based on relative galaxy ages,” *Astrophys. J.* **573**, 37–42 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0106145](#).
- [222] M. Moresco *et al.*, “Improved constraints on the expansion rate of the Universe up to $z \sim 1.1$ from the spectroscopic evolution of cosmic chronometers,” *JCAP* **08**, 006 (2012), [arXiv:1201.3609 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [223] Michele Moresco, “Raising the bar: new constraints on the Hubble parameter with cosmic chronometers at $z \sim 2$,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, L16–L20 (2015), [arXiv:1503.01116 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [224] Antony Lewis, Anthony Challinor, and Anthony Lasenby, “Efficient computation of CMB anisotropies in closed FRW models,” *Astrophys. J.* **538**, 473–476 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9911177](#).
- [225] Antony Lewis and Sarah Bridle, “Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 103511 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0205436](#).
- [226] Cullan Howlett, Antony Lewis, Alex Hall, and Anthony Challinor, “CMB power spectrum parameter degeneracies in the era of precision cosmology,” *JCAP* **04**, 027 (2012), [arXiv:1201.3654 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [227] Antony Lewis, “Efficient sampling of fast and slow cosmological parameters,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 103529 (2013), [arXiv:1304.4473 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [228] Andrew Gelman and Donald B. Rubin, “Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences,” *Statist. Sci.* **7**, 457–472 (1992).
- [229] George Efstathiou, “Evolving Dark Energy or Supernovae Systematics?” (2024), [arXiv:2408.07175 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [230] Lu Huang, Rong-Gen Cai, and Shao-Jiang Wang, “The DESI 2024 hint for dynamical dark energy is biased by low-redshift supernovae,” (2025), [arXiv:2502.04212 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).