Prepared for submission to JCAP

Testing the violation of the equivalence principle in the electromagnetic sector and its consequences in $f(T)$ gravity

Jackson Levi Said,[a,b] **Jurgen Mifsud,**[a,c] **David Parkinson,**[c] **Emmanuel N. Saridakis,**[d,e,f] **Joseph Sultana,**[g] **and Kristian Zarb Adami**[a,b,h]

[a]Institute of Space Sciences and Astronomy, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta
[b]Department of Physics, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta
[c]Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, 776 Daedeokdae–ro, Yuseong–gu, Daejeon 34055, Republic of Korea
[d]Department of Physics, National Technical University of Athens, Zografou Campus GR 157 73, Athens, Greece
[e]National Observatory of Athens, Lofos Nymfon, 11852 Athens, Greece
[f]Department of Astronomy, School of Physical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, P.R. China
[g]Department of Mathematics, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta
[h]Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Denys Wilkinson Building, Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3RH, UK

E-mail: jackson.said@um.edu.mt, jurgen.mifsud@um.edu.mt, jurgenmifsud@kasi.re.kr, davidparkinson@kasi.re.kr, msaridak@phys.uoa.gr, joseph.sultana@um.edu.mt, kristian.zarb-adami@um.edu.mt

Abstract. A violation of the distance–duality relation is directly linked with a temporal variation of the electromagnetic fine–structure constant. We consider a number of well–studied $f(T)$ gravity models and we revise the theoretical prediction of their corresponding induced violation of the distance–duality relationship. We further extract constraints on the involved model parameters through fine–structure constant variation data, alongside with supernovae data, and Hubble parameter measurements. Moreover, we constrain the evolution of the effective $f(T)$ gravitational constant. Finally, we compare with revised constraints on the phenomenological parametrisations of the violation of the equivalence principle in the electromagnetic sector.

arXiv:2005.05368v1 [astro-ph.CO] 11 May 2020

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 $f(T)$ gravity and the fine–structure constant **4**
2.1 Teleparallel Gravity 4
2.2 $f(T)$ cosmology 6
2.3 The fine–structure constant in Teleparallel Gravity 7

3 Probing $f(T)$ gravity by its induced variation in α **9**
3.1 Current constraints 9
3.1.1 The $f_1(T)$ model 11
3.1.2 The $f_2(T)$ model 11
3.1.3 The $f_3(T)$ model 12
3.1.4 The $f_4(T)$ model 14
3.1.5 The $f_5(T)$ model 16
3.2 Implications for an effective Newton's constant 16

4 Conclusions **19**

A Phenomenological violation of the cosmic distance–duality relation **20**
A.1 Induced variation of the fine–structure constant 21
A.2 Data sets and methodology 22
A.3 Current constraints 24

1 Introduction

It is well-known that the ΛCDM cosmological model is evidenced by overwhelming successes in describing the Universe at all scales where observations can be made [1, 2]. This is achieved by considering an extra cold dark matter sector which can produce stable galaxies and clusters thereof [3, 4], while the late–time cosmic acceleration can be described through the cosmological constant. However, despite extraordinary efforts, the model still retains numerous questions that still appear insurmountable in this regard [5].

On the other hand, the efficiency of the ΛCDM paradigm in explaining precision cosmology observations has been called into question in recent years. In this respect, the core criticism of the ΛCDM model appears primarily through the so-called H_0 tension problem which quantifies the inconsistency between the ΛCDM predicted value of H_0 from the measurements of the anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) and its reported value from local observations. The problem first appeared through measurements by the *Planck* Collaboration [6, 7], but has since been confirmed to a greater degree by the strong lensing measurements from the H0LiCOW collaboration [8]. In the interim period, measurements on the tip of the red giant branch (TRGB, Carnegie-Chicago Hubble Program) have yielded a lower H_0 tension [9]. The problem may be further illuminated by future observations from gravitational wave astronomy such as through the LISA mission [10, 11] similar to the work carried out in Refs. [12, 13].

There have been a plethora of theories in recent years that attempt to describe the disparate phenomena that make up observational cosmology [2, 14]. Collectively, these theories are primarily extensions of General Relativity (GR) in that they consider gravity through the prism of curvature by means of the Levi-Civita connection. The most popular of these theories is standard $f(\mathring{R})$ gravity [14–16] (over-circles are used throughout to refer to quantities that are calculated using the Levi-Civita connection) which is a fourth-order theory that directly generalises the Einstein-Hilbert action.

In this work, we consider the possibility of gravity being a manifestation of torsion through the Weitzenböck connection [17]. Teleparallel gravity (TG) is the body of theories that are based on the Weitzenböck connection [18, 19]. While the Levi-Civita connection is torsion-less, the Weitzenböck connection is curvature-less, and both satisfy the metricity condition. The Einstein-Hilbert action relies on a Lagrangian that is simply constructed by the standard Ricci scalar, $\mathring{R}$, while TG can produce identical dynamical equations for a Lagrangian that consists only of the torsion scalar, T. This is the so-called *Teleparallel equivalent of General Relativity* (TEGR), and differs from GR only at the level of Lagrangian by a total divergence quantity, B (boundary term). The boundary term embodies the fourth-order corrections which arise to have a covariant theory (due to the second-order derivatives in the Einstein-Hilbert action). The importance of this property is that extensions to TEGR will differ from their Levi-Civita connection counterparts. Moreover, TG has a number of interesting properties such as its similarity to Yang–Mills theory [20] giving it an added particle physics dimension, its potential to define a gravitational energy-momentum tensor [21, 22], and that it is more regular than GR in that it does not require the introduction of a Gibbons–Hawking–York boundary term in order to produce a well-defined Hamiltonian formulation [18]. As an aside, the theory can be constructed even without the weak equivalence principle (but definitely it can satisfy it if needed) unlike GR [23].

Following the same reasoning as $f(\mathring{R})$ gravity [14–16], the TEGR Lagrangian can be arbitrarily generalised to produce $f(T)$ theory [24–28] which is a generally second-order theory of gravity. This last point is a result of a weaken Lovelock theorem in TG [29–31] which emerges due to the absence of the boundary term. A number of $f(T)$ gravity models have shown promising results in the cosmological regime [18, 32, 33], as well as in galactic [34] and solar system [35–39] scale physics. The boundary term can also be included in this generalisation to produce $f(T, B)$ gravity [40–45, 45, 46]. In this latter case, the model produces a general framework in which $f(\mathring{R})$ gravity forms one subclass of possible models.

Another important aspect of any potential proposal for a modified theory of gravity is its Einstein frame features. In many cases, the Einstein frame is obtained through a conformal transformation which leaves the electromagnetic action invariant (due to the conformal invariance of that action) [47]. However, $f(T)$ gravity cannot be written in the Einstein frame by taking conformal transformations. In fact, conformal transformations produce an extra term in which the conformal scalar field and the torsional contribution are coupled [46]. Conformal transformations lead to the Einstein frame only in $f(T, B)$ gravity in the limit in which $f(\mathring{R})$ gravity is reproduced. It is also the case that disformal transformations cannot either lead to the Einstein frame in $f(T)$ gravity [48, 49], which implies that if an Einstein frame exists then it may produce a non-vanishing coupling to the electromagnetic sector.

The series of works in Refs. [50–52] consider the possibility of a violation of the Einstein equivalence principle (EEP), a cornerstone of GR, through the appearance of a coupling parameter between the scalar field that transforms the gravitational action to its Einstein frame, and the matter fields. On the other hand, in Refs. [53, 54] the violation of the EEP

is considered through the presence of quantum effects such as the coupling of heavy fermions to photons. This may be the source of the potential violation of the EEP in TG.

It is well–known that a nonminimal multiplicative coupling between a scalar field and matter fields would break the EEP, and would further lead to the variation of fundamental constants of Nature [51]. For instance, a scalar field coupling with the electromagnetic Lagrangian would lead to a variation of the fine–structure constant, or Sommerfeld's constant, which characterises the strength of the electromagnetic field and appears as a coupling constant in the electromagnetic action. A variation in the fundamental constants of Nature [55], which could be conservatively defined as those theoretical free parameters that could not be calculated with our present knowledge of physics, has been a long–established intriguing question [56, 57] with pertinent consequences for fundamental physics and cosmology (see, for instance, Refs. [58–60]). Interestingly, when Dirac's numerological principle [56, 57] was encapsulated in a field–theoretical framework, this led to the birth of the Jordan–Fierz–Brans–Dicke scalar–tensor theory of gravitation [61–63]. Moreover, in theories with additional space–time dimensions, fundamental constants of Nature are only effective quantities and are related to the true constants via characteristic sizes of extra dimensions [64]. Such paradigms include, for instance, Kaluza–Klein models [64, 65], superstring theories [64, 66] and brane world models [67].

A number of theoretical models have been proposed in order to explore the possibility of a dynamical fine–structure constant $\alpha \equiv e^2/\hbar c$. These models have been primarily formulated as Lagrangian theories with explicit variation of the velocity of light c [68, 69], or of the charge on the electron e [70, 71]. The former class of models are also known as varying speed of light theories [68, 72, 73], and have also been studied in the context of inflationary cosmology [68, 74, 75]. The latter models are commonly referred to as varying electric charge theories, which have been first formulated by Bekenstein from a generalisation of Maxwell's equations in Ref. [70], that led to the construction of the cosmological varying–e Bekenstein–Sandvik–Barrow–Magueijo theory of varying α [76–81]. Although, at first glance, the varying–c and varying–e theories seem to be interchangeable, each theory is characterised by its distinct cosmological imprints [82]. Other frameworks include, for instance, a runaway dilaton [83, 84], supersymmetric generalisation of Bekenstein's model [85] and a disformally coupled electromagnetic sector [86].

Several probes have been used for the search of any space–time dependence of the fine–structure constant, including primarily astronomical and local methods. The latter ones consist of geophysical analyses of samples from the natural nuclear reactor in Oklo [87, 88], meteorites [89], and laboratory atomic clocks [90–92]. Stringent constraints on the variation of the fine–structure constant have been inferred from the analysis of spectra from high–redshift quasar absorption systems [60, 93–103]. Other constraints have been derived with the thermal Sunyaev–Zeldovich effect and X–ray measurements of galaxy clusters [104, 105], strong gravitational lensing [106, 107], and from primordial abundances of light nuclei produced during the era of Big Bang nucleosynthesis [108]. Furthermore, upcoming gravitational wave observations [109–111] are also expected to be competitive with the currently available probes of the variation of the fine–structure constant. Moreover, the space–time dependence of fundamental constants has also been linked with the currently reported Hubble tension via the inferred effects in the ionisation history and profile of CMB anisotropies. Indeed, Ref. [112] reported that a variation in fundamental constants, particularly in the effective electron mass, could play an important role in the alleviation of the low versus high-redshift Hubble tension.

In this work, we consider the potential variation of the fine–structure parameter due to modified TG effects. These constraints are then used to limit the coupling parameters of literature models of $f(T)$ gravity. This is done using several data sets in conjunction with several literature approaches to parametrising the violation of the distance–duality relation which is a natural consequence of the violation of the EEP. This work builds on the foundations laid in Ref. [113] where the potential violation of the fine–structure constant was first studied in the context of TG. However, since the conformal transformations that were performed in Ref. [114] were elaborated more thoroughly in Ref. [46], in the present work we revisit the analysis of Ref. [113] and we expand its breadth with updated data and a deeper analysis of the potential implications.

Throughout the manuscript, Latin indices are used to refer to tangent space coordinates, while Greek indices refer to general manifold coordinates. The outline of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we review TG and its extension to $f(T)$ gravity in the context of its cosmology as well as its potential predictions on the variation of the fine–structure constant. A number of $f(T)$ gravity models are constrained in section 3, in which we also discuss the cosmological implications of the inferred parameter constraints. Finally, the main results of our analyses and prospective lines of research are discussed in section 4. In appendix A, we also probe the general case of the phenomenology of a non–vanishing coupling constant in the electromagnetic Lagrangian which produces a violation of the distance–duality relation. Using literature parametrisations of this violation, we revisit and update the constraints on this potential violation.

2 $f(T)$ gravity and the fine–structure constant

2.1 Teleparallel Gravity

Teleparallel gravity (TG) represents a paradigm shift in the way that gravity is expressed not through the torsion-less connection of GR, but with the curvature-less one called the Weitzenböck connection, $\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu}$ [115]. In GR, curvature is calculated through the Levi-Civita connection $\mathring{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu}$ [116, 117] (recall that we use over-circles to denote quantities determined by the Levi-Civita connection). The Riemann tensor can then be used to determine a meaningful measure of curvature on a manifold, which is used in various modifications to standard gravity. Given that the Levi-Civita connection is replaced with the Weitzenböck connection in TG, it follows that irrespective of the space–time under consideration, the Riemann tensor will always vanish due to the connection being curvatureless. It is for this reason that TG necessitates different measures to construct realistic models of gravity.

The dynamical objects in TG are the tetrads $e^{a}{}_{\mu}$, which act as a soldering agent between tangent spaces (Latin indices) and the general manifold (Greek indices) [20]. In this way, tetrads (and their inverses $e_{a}{}^{\mu}$) can be used to transform to (and from) the Minkowski metric through

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^{a}{}_{\mu} e^{b}{}_{\nu} \eta_{ab} \,, \qquad \eta_{ab} = e_{a}{}^{\mu} e_{b}{}^{\nu} g_{\mu\nu} \,. \tag{2.1}$$

The tetrads satisfy the orthogonality conditions

$$e^{a}{}_{\mu} e_{b}{}^{\mu} = \delta^{a}_{b} \,, \qquad e^{a}{}_{\mu} e_{a}{}^{\nu} = \delta^{\nu}_{\mu} \,, \tag{2.2}$$

for internal consistency. The Weitzenböck connection can then be defined as [17]

$$\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu} := e_{a}{}^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} e^{a}{}_{\nu} + e_{a}{}^{\sigma} \omega^{a}{}_{b\mu} e^{b}{}_{\nu} \,, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\omega^{a}{}_{b\mu}$ represents the spin connection. This is the most general linear affine connection that is both curvatureless and satisfies the metricity condition [20]. Here, the spin connection appears to preserve the covariance of the resulting equations of motion [118]. To do this, it incorporates the Local Lorentz Transformation (LLT) invariance of the theory, which implies that it can be set to zero for a particular choice of Lorentz frame [19].

Spin connections also appear in GR, but they are mainly hidden into the internal structure of the theory [1]. Considering the full breadth of LLTs (Lorentz boosts and rotations), $\Lambda^{a}{}_{b}$, the spin connection can be represented completely as $\omega^{a}{}_{b\mu} = \Lambda^{a}{}_{c}\partial_{\mu}\Lambda_{b}{}^{c}$ [20]. For any particular metric tensor, there exist an infinite number of tetrads that satisfy Eq.(2.1) due to LLT invariance. Thus, it is the combination of a tetrad choice and its associated spin connection that retain the covariance of TG.

In the framework of TG the torsion tensor is defined as [18]

$$T^{\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu} := 2\Gamma^{\sigma}_{[\mu\nu]}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where the square brackets denote the anti-symmetric operator, and where this represents the field strength of gravitation. The torsion tensor transforms covariantly under both diffeomorphisms and LLTs. TG also relies on a couple of other tensorial quantities that help render a concise representation of the ensuing gravitational models. Firstly, the contorsion tensor turns out to be a useful quantity and is defined as the difference between the Weitzenböck and Levi-Civita connections, i.e.

$$K^{\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu} := \Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu} - \mathring{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\left(T_{\mu}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\nu} + T_{\nu}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\mu} - T^{\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}\right)\,, \tag{2.5}$$

which plays an important role in relating TG with Levi-Civita based theories. The second central ingredient to TG is the so-called superpotential

$$S_{a}{}^{\mu\nu} := \frac{1}{2}\left(K^{\mu\nu}{}_{a} - e_{a}{}^{\nu}T^{\alpha\mu}{}_{\alpha} + e_{a}{}^{\mu}T^{\alpha\nu}{}_{\alpha}\right)\,, \tag{2.6}$$

which has been linked to the gauge current representation of the gravitational energy-momentum tensor in TG [119, 120]. By contracting the torsion tensor with its superpotential produces the torsion scalar

$$T := S_{a}{}^{\mu\nu}T^{a}{}_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{2.7}$$

which is determined entirely by the Weitzenböck connection in the same way that the Ricci scalar depends only on the Levi-Civita connection. By constructing the torsion scalar in this way, it turns out that the Ricci and torsion scalars are related by a total divergence term [33, 40]

$$R = \mathring{R} + T - \frac{2}{e}\partial_{\mu}\left(eT^{\sigma}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\mu}\right) = 0\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where R is the Ricci scalar in terms of the Weitzenböck connection, which is zero, and $\mathring{R}$ is the regular Ricci scalar from GR. This implies that the Ricci and torsion scalars are equal up to a boundary term

$$\mathring{R} = -T + \frac{2}{e}\partial_{\mu}\left(eT^{\sigma}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\mu}\right) := -T + B\,, \tag{2.9}$$

where $e = \det\left(e^{a}{}_{\mu}\right) = \sqrt{-g}$. This fact alone guarantees that the Ricci scalar and the torsion scalar produce the same dynamical equations. That is, we can define the TEGR action as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rm TEGR} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa^{2}}\int \mathrm{d}^{4}x\; eT + \int \mathrm{d}^{4}x\; e\mathcal{L}_{\rm m}\,, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\rm m}$ is the matter Lagrangian. While both actions lead to the same dynamical equations, they differ in terms of their Lagrangian in that the TG formulation decouples the second-order derivative contributions to the field equations, and the fourth-order derivative contribution which appears as a boundary quantity. This is not relevant for comparing GR and TEGR, but becomes an active agent when modifications to gravity are considered.

Using the same reasoning that led to $f(\mathring{R})$ gravity [14, 15], the Lagrangian of TEGR can be generalised to $f(T)$ gravity [24–28], giving

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rm TEGR} = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int \mathrm{d}^4x\, e f(T) + \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, e\mathcal{L}_{\rm m}\,. \tag{2.11}$$

This produces second-order equations, which is only possible since the Lovelock theorem is much weaker in TG [29–31]. Note that TG and thus GR, are reproduced if $f(T) = -T + \Lambda$. $f(T)$ gravity also shares a number of properties with GR such as the same gravitational wave polarisation structure [44, 121–123], and being Gauss-Ostrogradsky ghost free (since it remains second-order) [19, 117]. Finally, by performing variation of the $f(T)$ action with respect to the tetrads, we arrive at the following field equations

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-1}\partial_\nu\left(e e_a{}^\rho S_\rho{}^{\mu\nu}\right) f_T - e_a{}^\lambda T^\rho{}_{\nu\lambda} S_\rho{}^{\nu\mu} f_T + \frac{1}{4} e_a{}^\mu f(T) \\ &\quad + e_a{}^\rho S_\rho{}^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu\left(T\right) f_{TT} + e_b{}^\lambda \omega^b{}_{a\nu} S_\lambda{}^{\nu\mu} f_T = \kappa^2 e_a{}^\rho \Theta_\rho{}^\mu\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where subscripts denote derivatives, and $\Theta_\rho{}^\nu$ is the regular energy-momentum tensor.

2.2 $f(T)$ cosmology

We investigate the cosmology of $f(T)$ gravity through a flat homogeneous and isotropic metric. We consider a tetrad choice of the form

$$e^a{}_\mu = \mathrm{diag}\left(1,\, a(t),\, a(t),\, a(t)\right)\,, \tag{2.13}$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor, and which allows us to set the spin connection to zero, i.e. $\omega^a{}_{b\mu} = 0$ [118, 124]. Through Eq. (2.1), the flat FLRW metric is reproduced

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\mathrm{d}t^2 + a^2(t)\left(\mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}y^2 + \mathrm{d}z^2\right)\,. \tag{2.14}$$

Straightforwardly, we can calculate the torsion scalar to be

$$T = 6H^2\,, \tag{2.15}$$

and the boundary term to be $B = 6\left(3H^2 + \dot{H}\right)$, which reproduces the well-known Ricci scalar for this metric, i.e. $\mathring{R} = -T + B = 6\left(\dot{H} + 2H^2\right)$ (note that we use the standard convention for the metric signature [125], instead of the one used in Refs. [18, 26, 27], which leads to a sign difference in T). By evaluating the field equations in Eq. (2.12), the resulting Friedmann equations are

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3}\left(\rho + \rho_{\rm eff}\right)\,, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\left(\rho + \rho_{\rm eff} + p + p_{\rm eff}\right)\,, \tag{2.17}$$

where ρ and p represent the energy density and pressure of the matter content respectively, while $f(T)$ gives rise to an effective fluid with components

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} := \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\left(T - f + 2T f_T\right) , \tag{2.18}$$

$$p_{\text{eff}} := -\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\left[4\dot{H}\left(1 + f_T + 2T f_{TT}\right)\right] - \rho_{\text{eff}} , \tag{2.19}$$

which also satisfies the conservation equation

$$\dot{\rho}_{\text{eff}} + 3H\left(\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}\right) = 0 . \tag{2.20}$$

In this way, we can define an equation of state (EoS) of the effective fluid as [33]

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\text{eff}} &:= \frac{p_{\text{eff}}}{\rho_{\text{eff}}} \\ &= -1 + \frac{4\dot{H}\left(1 + f_T + 2T f_{TT}\right)}{T - f + 2T f_T} \\ &= -1 + \left(1 + \omega_m\right)\frac{\left(f - 2T f_T\right)\left(1 + f_T + 2T f_{TT}\right)}{\left(f_T + 2T f_{TT}\right)\left(T - f + 2T f_T\right)} ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where the last line is a result of the Friedmann equations in Eqs. (2.16,2.17), and ω_m is the EoS of matter. Notice that we recover the ΛCDM scenario ($\omega_{\text{eff}} = -1$) for $f(T) = -T + \Lambda$. Finally, by considering scalar perturbations on the flat FLRW of Eq. (2.14) together with matter perturbations, an effective Newton's constant can be defined as in Refs. [126–128] such that $G_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_N}{|f_T|}$, where G_N is Newton's constant.

2.3 The fine–structure constant in Teleparallel Gravity

The fine–structure constant and the luminosity distance are derived from the electromagnetic action [51, 129] which is conformally invariant [130]. Conformal transformations are important because for many theories of modified gravity, they can be used to transform between the Jordan and Einstein frames [14, 131, 132], where the extra degrees of freedom of a theory may appear as scalar fields. There exists a number of theories of gravity in which conformal transformations do not lead to the Einstein frame. This implies that the Einstein frame would be a result of another type of transformation which may produce a coupling with the electromagnetic Lagrangian [84, 86, 133–137]. This also occurs when the low-energy limit of quantum gravity theories are considered [51, 51, 83, 129, 138], which may appear as heavy fermions for instance. In either case, the result is the introduction of a new degree of freedom, ϕ, that arises from the transformation

$$e^a{}_\mu \to \tilde{e}^a{}_\mu , \tag{2.22}$$

where $\tilde{e}^a{}_\mu$ represents the Einstein frame tetrad. This then induces an electromagnetic coupling which takes on the form

$$S_{\text{EM}} = -\frac{1}{4}\int \mathrm{d}^4x\, eB_F\left(\phi\right) F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} , \tag{2.23}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = A_{\nu,\mu} - A_{\mu,\nu}$ is the standard Faraday tensor, and $B_F\left(\phi\right)$ represents the non-vanishing $\phi-$coupling. The consequence of this induced coupling is that the fine–structure

constant and the luminosity distance will be altered comparing to GR [1, 129]. As in Refs. [53, 85, 137, 139], this can be expanded about $\phi(t = t_0)$, which is suitably small, to give

$$B_F(\phi) \simeq 1 + \beta_F \frac{\phi}{M_{\rm pl}}\,, \tag{2.24}$$

where $\beta_F = \mathcal{O}(1)$ is a constant, and $M_{\rm pl} = 1/\kappa^2$ is the Planck mass ($\beta_F \phi << M_{\rm pl}$).

Given an initially uncoupled Jordan–frame electromagnetic action, the fine–structure constant turns out to be given by [85]

$$\alpha_E(\phi) = \frac{\alpha_J(\phi)}{B_F(\phi)}\,, \tag{2.25}$$

where α_E and α_J are the fine–structure constants in the Einstein and Jordan frames respectively. To relate a change in the fine–structure constant between these frames with the electromagnetic coupling term in Eq. (2.23), consider the fractional change [51, 139]

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} := \frac{\alpha_E - \alpha_J}{\alpha_J} = \frac{1}{B_F(\phi)} - 1\,, \tag{2.26}$$

which depends on redshift (or cosmic time). Since $B_F(z = 0) := B_{F_0} \neq 1$, we need to rescale this relation so that $\Delta\alpha = 0$ at present time ($z = 0$). This can be conveniently done by taking $B_F(\phi) \to B_F(\phi)/B_{F_0}$ which is a result of the Maxwell tensor transformation $F_{\mu\nu} \to \sqrt{B_{F_0}} F_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, the fractional change in the fine–structure constant now emerges as

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{B_{F_0}}{B_F(\phi)} - 1\,. \tag{2.27}$$

In $f(T)$ gravity, the form of this fine–structure constant dependence can be obtained by a conformal transformation of the tetrad where

$$\tilde{e}^a{}_\mu = \Omega\, e^a{}_\mu\,, \qquad\qquad \tilde{e}_a{}^\mu = \Omega^{-1}\, e_a{}^\mu\,, \tag{2.28}$$

which results in the regular conformal transformation $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, as expanded upon in Ref. [46], where $\Omega^2 = -f_T = |f_T|$ (note that since in our conventions $T > 0$ and $f_T < 0$, we have replaced $-f_T$ by $|f_T|$). It is well-known that $f(T)$ gravity cannot be written in the Einstein frame through conformal transformations, which implies that it will induce a dependence in its associated fine–structure constant characterised by Eq. (2.24) [53]. In fact, this produces an extra $2\Omega^{-6}\tilde{\partial}^\mu\left(\Omega^2\right)\tilde{T}^\nu{}_{\nu\mu}$ term which cannot be removed. The remainder of the scalar field becomes a phantom field with the choice of $\phi = \sqrt{3}\ln f_T$ [46], which is partially favored by recent *Planck* data [6] (this form of the scalar field is a correction to the one used in Ref. [139] due to a typo in Ref. [114]).

Recent constraints on observationally viable models of $f(T)$ gravity [32, 35, 113, 128, 140–142] suggest that the model Lagrangian would take the form of TEGR plus small corrections. Given that $\Omega^2 = |f_T|$, this would imply that the $\tilde{\partial}^\mu\left(\Omega^2\right)$ would be very small rendering the additional term negligible. We will revisit this reasoning against the results of the analysis. With this approximation to the Einstein frame, the variation of the fine–structure constant takes the form

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{M_{\rm pl} + \sqrt{3}\beta_F[\ln|f_T(T_0)|]}{M_{\rm pl} + \sqrt{3}\beta_F[\ln|f_T|]} - 1\,, \tag{2.29}$$

which vanishes for the ΛCDM case of $f(T) = -T + \Lambda$, as expected. Eq. (2.29) embodies the redshift dependence of the fine–structure constant in TG, since the torsion scalar depends on redshift in accordance with Eq. (2.15). Another consequence of a nonvanishing scalar field coupling to the electromagnetic action is that the luminosity distance will be altered [51]. By considering the standard derivation of luminosity distance [1] with this new action, Ref. [129] shows that this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} d_L &= c\,(1+z)\sqrt{\frac{B_{F_0}}{B_F}}\int_0^z \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{H(z)} \\ &= c\,(1+z)\sqrt{\frac{M_{\rm pl}+\sqrt{3}\beta_F[\ln|f_T(T_0)|]}{M_{\rm pl}+\sqrt{3}\beta_F[\ln|f_T|]}}\int_0^z \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{H(z)}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

as the luminosity distance for $f(T)$ gravity, which limits to the GR formula for $B_F = 1$.

3 Probing $f(T)$ gravity by its induced variation in α

In this section we present the inferred constraints on five distinct $f(T)$ gravitational models by adopting a Bayesian approach for each model under consideration. This was implemented in the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) Ensemble sampler `emcee` [143]. We then analysed our chains by the publicly available package `ChainConsumer` [144].

We consider flat priors for all the varied $f(T)$ model parameters $\Theta = \{\chi,\, \Omega_0^{\rm m},\, H_0,\, \beta_F\}$, where χ is the specific model parameter characterising each particular model which will be discussed in the next section, $\Omega_0^{\rm m}$ is the dimensionless energy density of pressureless matter today, H_0 denotes the Hubble's constant, and β_F is the electromagnetic coupling constant defined in Eq. (2.24).

We have independently and jointly considered the measurements of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ from the archival astrophysical data measurements from quasar absorption lines observed at the Keck (K) observatory [94] and with the VLT (V) [95], along with a set of 21 dedicated new measurements (N) [60, 96–103], and the constraint from the Oklo (O) natural nuclear reactor at an effective redshift of $z = 0.14$ [88]. We remark that the measurements contained in the N data set were reported from the ESO Ultraviolet and Visual Echelle Spectrograph (UVES) Large Program which was specifically developed for such measurements. In what follows, we denote the joint data sets of: N + O by NO, K + V by KV, K + V + N by KVN, and K + V + N + O by KVNO.

Additionally, we will be making use of the Supernovae Type Ia (SN) Pantheon Sample [145], and a cosmic chronometers (CC) data set [146–151] composed of Hubble parameter measurements which are determined from the differential age of old and passive evolving galaxies [152]. We further adopt a prior likelihood (H_0^R) on the Hubble constant of $H_0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$ [153], in order to check for any model parameter dependencies on the value of the Hubble constant.

3.1 Current constraints

We will be considering five distinct $f(T)$ models, which have been extensively studied in the literature and found to be cosmologically viable (see, for instance, Ref. [32]). The inferred mean values and 68% limits are reported in Table 1, and the obtained results are discussed in the below sections.

$f_1(T)$ Model			
Parameter	SN + CC + H_0^R	SN + CC + KVNO	SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R
b	$-0.16^{+0.24}_{-0.49}$	$0.003^{+0.053}_{-0.059}$	$-0.001^{+0.050}_{-0.048}$
$\Omega_0^{\rm m}$	$0.281^{+0.036}_{-0.035}$	$0.300^{+0.026}_{-0.024}$	$0.283^{+0.023}_{-0.021}$
H_0	$72.8^{+1.4}_{-1.3}$	$68.9^{+2.0}_{-1.9}$	$72.2^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$
β_F	$0.28^{+0.32}_{-0.32}$	$-0.003^{+0.063}_{-0.056}$	$-0.003^{+0.074}_{-0.067}$
$f_2(T)$ Model			
Parameter	SN + CC + H_0^R	SN + CC + KVNO	SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R
$1/p$	$0.093^{+0.171}_{-0.079}$	$\left(10.8^{+35.9}_{-4.9}\right) \times 10^{-3}$	$\left(41.7^{+9.3}_{-30.8}\right) \times 10^{-3}$
$\Omega_0^{\rm m}$	$0.279^{+0.025}_{-0.031}$	$0.300^{+0.021}_{-0.020}$	$0.283^{+0.020}_{-0.019}$
$H_0/\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$	$72.2^{+1.3}_{-1.2}$	$69.0^{+1.8}_{-1.9}$	$72.2^{+1.3}_{-1.2}$
β_F	$-0.10^{+0.49}_{-0.56}$	$-0.01^{+0.45}_{-0.75}$	$-0.07^{+0.58}_{-0.55}$
$f_3(T)$ Model			
Parameter	SN + CC + H_0^R	SN + CC + KVNO	SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R
$1/q$	$0.065^{+0.088}_{-0.045}$	$\left(15.7^{+28.7}_{-9.5}\right) \times 10^{-3}$	$0.029^{+0.018}_{-0.020}$
$\Omega_0^{\rm m}$	$0.279^{+0.021}_{-0.020}$	$0.302^{+0.022}_{-0.023}$	$0.283^{+0.019}_{-0.019}$
$H_0/\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$	$72.2^{+1.3}_{-1.2}$	$69.0^{+2.0}_{-1.9}$	$72.2^{+1.2}_{-1.3}$
β_F	$-0.22^{+0.76}_{-0.40}$	$-0.05^{+0.61}_{-0.53}$	$0.00^{+0.61}_{-0.52}$
$f_4(T)$ Model			
Parameter	SN + CC + H_0^R	SN + CC + KVNO	SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R
m	$1.07^{+6.04}_{-0.50}$	$1.16^{+5.51}_{-0.67}$	$1.16^{+5.53}_{-0.65}$
$\Omega_0^{\rm m}$	$0.264^{+0.029}_{-0.033}$	$0.301^{+0.020}_{-0.021}$	$0.282^{+0.019}_{-0.017}$
$H_0/\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$	$72.5^{+1.4}_{-1.1}$	$69.0^{+1.9}_{-1.8}$	$72.2^{+1.1}_{-1.2}$
β_F	$-0.25^{+0.37}_{-0.32}$	$\left(-1.6^{+2.6}_{-2.3}\right) \times 10^{-6}$	$\left(-1.5^{+2.5}_{-2.4}\right) \times 10^{-6}$
$f_5(T)$ Model			
Parameter	SN + CC + H_0^R	SN + CC + KVNO	SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R
n	$1.49^{+0.25}_{-0.15}$	$1.934^{+0.055}_{-0.331}$	$1.941^{+0.047}_{-0.306}$
$\Omega_0^{\rm m}$	$0.298^{+0.076}_{-0.091}$	$0.291^{+0.051}_{-0.155}$	$0.147^{+0.156}_{-0.028}$
$H_0/\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}}$	$72.8^{+1.4}_{-1.4}$	$68.5^{+2.2}_{-1.9}$	$72.2^{+1.2}_{-1.3}$
β_F	$0.039^{+0.043}_{-0.037}$	$\left(-6.8^{+0.1}_{-7.4}\right) \times 10^{-4}$	$\left(3.8^{+10.5}_{-9.1}\right) \times 10^{-7}$

Table 1. The mean value and the corresponding 68% limits of the model parameters of the five $f_i(T)$ models ($i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$), as described in section 3.1.

3.1.1 The $f_1(T)$ model

We consider the power–law model [26] as the first $f(T)$ model, specified by

$$f_1(T) = -T + \alpha_1 T^b \,, \tag{3.1}$$

where α_1 and b are constant model parameters, such that

$$\alpha_1 = \left(6H_0^2\right)^{1-b} \frac{1-\Omega_0^{\rm m}}{2b-1} \,, \tag{3.2}$$

which follows from Eq. (2.16). Clearly, we recover the ΛCDM model when $b = 0$, while this $f(T)$ model can mimic the Dvali–Gabadadze–Porrati (DGP) model [154] when $b = 1/2$.

The inferred model parameter constraints are reported in the top panel of Table 1, and in Fig. 1 we illustrate the marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints. We should remark that even without the varying fine–structure constant observational probes, we were still able to impose a robust constraint on β_F via the SN likelihood. As expected, the constraints on β_F improve significantly when we further make use of the KVNO data set, from which we find that β_F is compatible with zero. Consequently, there is a negligible deviation from the $f(T)$ distance–duality relation in this model.

The derived constraint on $b = -0.16^{+0.24}_{-0.49}$ from the SN + CC + H_0^R joint data set is consistent with the findings in previous studies [32, 155–157], which however did not consider a varying β_F. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the SN + CC + KVNO and SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R joint data sets also improve the constraints on the model parameter b, which we find to be consistent with zero. Consequently, our constraints are tighter than the ones reported in a similar analysis of Ref. [139]. Indeed, all results show that the $f_1(T)$ model is in agreement with the ΛCDM model at the 1σ level, in line with Refs. [32, 139, 155–157], and different from Ref. [113].

3.1.2 The $f_2(T)$ model

The second $f(T)$ model is the square–root–exponential model [27] given by

$$f_2(T) = -T + \alpha_2 T_0 \left(1 - e^{-p\sqrt{T/T_0}}\right) \,, \tag{3.3}$$

with model parameters α_2 and p, and we recall that $T_0 = T(z=0) = 6H_0^2$ denotes the current torsion scalar. From the Friedmann Eq. (2.16) we find that

$$\alpha_2 = -\frac{1-\Omega_0^{\rm m}}{1-(1+p)e^{-p}} \,. \tag{3.4}$$

Thus, for $p \to +\infty$, the $f_2(T)$ model reduces to the concordance ΛCDM model. In our analysis we therefore vary the parameter $1/p$, for which we recover the ΛCDM model when $1/p \to 0^+$.

The inferred constraints on $1/p$ from the joint data sets of SN + CC + H_0^R and SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R are consistent with zero at around 1σ, while the $f_2(T)$ model is found to be in agreement with the ΛCDM model at around 2σ when the SN + CC + KVNO data set is adopted. This observation is in line with other studies, such as Refs. [32, 113, 139, 155–157]. We depict the marginalised confidence contours in Fig. 2 and we list all the derived constraints in the second panel of Table 1.




Figure 1. Marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints on the parameters of the $f_1(T)$ model of Eq. (3.1).

This $f(T)$ model is also found to be consistent with the distance–duality relation, although the KVNO data set did not significantly improve the constraints on β_F, which were always found to be in agreement with zero. However, the variation of the fine–structure constant relationship of Eq. (2.29) led to tighter constraints on $1/p$ than those reported in Ref. [139].

3.1.3 The $f_3(T)$ model

A similar model to the $f_2(T)$ model is the exponential model [27], which is also motivated by $f(R)$ gravity [158], and is given by

$$f_3(T) = -T + \alpha_3 T_0 \left(1 - e^{-qT/T_0}\right) , \tag{3.5}$$

with

$$\alpha_3 = \frac{1 - \Omega_0^{\rm m}}{-1 + (1+2q)e^{-q}} , \tag{3.6}$$




Figure 2. Marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints on the parameters of the $f_2(T)$ model specified in Eq. (3.3).

and q is the remaining model parameter. Again, we observe that the ΛCDM model is recovered when $q \to +\infty$, or equivalently $1/q \to 0^+$. For convenience, we will be considering $1/q$ as our free parameter.

We report the derived parameter constraints in the third panel of Table 1 and we depict the marginalised confidence contours in Fig. 3. Similar to the previous exponential $f(T)$ model, the model parameter $1/q$ is found to be consistent with the ΛCDM limit at around 1σ. This is compatible with the results of Refs. [32, 113, 156, 157], although in these studies the possible variation of the fine–structure constant has not been taken into account.

Moreover, this exponential $f(T)$ model is characterised by a null variation in the fine–structure constant, since β_F is always found to be consistent with zero. However, we note that the KVNO data set did not significantly ameliorate the constraints inferred by the SN + CC + H_0^R joint data set.




Figure 3. Marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints on the parameters of the $f_3(T)$ model of Eq. (3.5).

3.1.4 The $f_4(T)$ model

The next model which will be considered in our analysis is the logarithmic model [159], given by

$$f_4(T) = -T + \alpha_4\, T_0 \sqrt{\frac{T}{mT_0}} \ln\left(\frac{mT_0}{T}\right) , \tag{3.7}$$

such that

$$\alpha_4 = -\frac{(1-\Omega_0^{\rm m})\sqrt{m}}{2} , \tag{3.8}$$

and m is the model parameter which will be varied in our MCMC analysis. We should remark that unlike the previously considered $f(T)$ models, this model cannot reduce to the concordance model of cosmology for any chosen value of m.

Interestingly enough, the background evolution of this model coincides with that of the spatially flat self–accelerating branch of the DGP braneworld model [154, 160]. However,




Figure 4. Marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints on the parameters of the $f_4(T)$ model specified by Eq. (3.7).

the evolution of cosmological perturbations differ from one model to another. For instance, the functional forms of $G_{\rm eff}/G_N$ are not identical. Obviously, the well–known significant inconsistencies of the spatially flat self–accelerating DGP model with cosmological data (see e.g. Refs. [161–163] and references therein) will be inherited by the $f_4(T)$ model, and we therefore expect that this model will not be viable.

Moreover, the resulting Friedmann equation is independent from the model parameters α_4 and m, in contrast with all the other $f(T)$ models considered in this section. Consequently, no constraints can be placed on the free parameter m with cosmological data sets which solely probe the background evolution of this model. Indeed, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first analysis which reports a constraint on the model parameter m. We were able to place some limits on m, since this parameter appears in the variation of the fine–structure constant $f(T)$ relationship defined by Eq. (2.29).

We report the model parameter constraints in the penultimate panel of Table 1, and

the marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints are depicted in Fig. 4. With the considered data sets, we were able to place a lower bound on $m \gtrsim 0.57\,(m \gtrsim 0.5)$ with the SN + CC + H_0^R (SN + CC + KVNO/ SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R) joint data set.

In order for this model to satisfy the adopted tight limits on the variation of the fine–structure constant, β_F was robustly constrained to $\sim 10^{-6}$. Thus, the β_F constraints imposed by the KVNO data set were found to be of a similar order to the inferred constraints on the theoretical phenomenological parametrisations of section A.3. Furthermore, this model seems to favor slightly low values of $\Omega_0^{\rm m}$, particularly when high H_0 values are obtained. Consequently, this model will be disfavored in light of the H_0 tension, as already highlighted in Refs. [32, 156, 157].

3.1.5 The $f_5(T)$ model

Our last model is the hyperbolic–tangent model [164] which is specified as follows

$$f_5(T) = -T + \alpha_5\, T^n \tanh\left(\frac{T_0}{T}\right)\,, \tag{3.9}$$

with model parameters α_5 and n. From Eq. (2.16), we find that

$$\alpha_5 = \frac{\left(6H_0^2\right)^{1-n}\left(1-\Omega_0^{\rm m}\right)}{(2n-1)\tanh(1) - 2\,\mathrm{sech}^2(1)}\,, \tag{3.10}$$

and therefore n will be the varying model parameter. Similar to the previous $f_4(T)$ model, the ΛCDM cosmology cannot be recovered as a limiting case of the $f_5(T)$ model for any arbitrary value of n. Therefore, the parameter n does not characterise the deviation from the concordance model of cosmology.

The derived constraints are listed in the last panel of Table 1, and the corresponding marginalised confidence contours are illustrated in Fig. 5. From the SN + CC + H_0^R data set, we obtain a smaller value of n when compared with the inferred mean value of this parameter from the other data sets which include the KVNO measurements. Given that small values of $n \lesssim 1.69$ [164] naturally give rise to the crossing of the phantom divide line, the KVNO data set restricts this possibility as higher values of n are preferred. We note that our inferred constraints on n agree with the reported results in Refs. [155–157, 165], although in these analyses β_F was neglected. We further observe that the higher the value of n, the smaller the value of $\Omega_0^{\rm m}$, which is consistent with Ref. [156, 157]. This will however make this model inconsistent with the CMB data.

Moreover, the β_F electromagnetic coupling parameter is loosely constrained with the SN + CC + H_0^R joint data set, however the inclusion of the KVNO measurements lead to very stringent constraints on this parameter. Indeed, the inferred constraints on β_F with the SN + CC + KVNO and SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R joint data sets are found to be similar to the derived constraints in the phenomenological parametrisations of section A.3 and in the case of the above $f_4(T)$ model. Consequently, the $f_5(T)$ hyperbolic–tangent model is also found to be in agreement with the distance–duality relation.

3.2 Implications for an effective Newton's constant

As already mentioned in section 2.2, $f(T)$ gravity gives rise to an effective gravitational constant, in similarity with the majority of modified gravitational frameworks. This variation is generically given by [32, 126, 157] $G_{\rm eff} = \frac{G_N}{|f_T|}$, with G_N being Newton's gravitational




Figure 5. Marginalised two–dimensional likelihood constraints on the $f_5(T)$ model parameters specified in Eq. (3.9).

constant. Hence, the effective gravitational constant in the considered $f(T)$ models will coincide with G_N at earlier times, and we expect some deviation at late–times.

In the panels of Fig. 6, we reconstruct the variation of the effective gravitational constant, specified by the quantity $G_{\rm eff}/G_N - 1$, at the 1σ confidence level. For the power–law $f_1(T)$ model, the square–root–exponential $f_2(T)$ model and the exponential $f_3(T)$ model, we can clearly observe that $G_{\rm eff} \simeq G_N$, particularly when we make use of the SN + CC + KVNO + H_0^R data set. Indeed, we observe that in these models, the KVNO measurements significantly restrict the deviation of $G_{\rm eff}$ from G_N, in agreement with current independent bounds on the time variation of the gravitational constant (see, for instance, Refs. [166–170] and references therein). Moreover, a much tighter 1σ deviation of $G_{\rm eff}$ from G_N is obtained at around $z \simeq 1$, although this redshift is model dependent.

On the other hand, we observe a significant deviation of $G_{\rm eff}/G_N$ from unity at low redshifts in the logarithmic $f_4(T)$ and hyperbolic–tangent $f_5(T)$ scenarios. Such deviations




Figure 6. Reconstruction of $G_{\rm eff}/G_{\rm N} - 1$ and its 1σ uncertainty as a function of redshift, for the five $f(T)$ models considered in this work, namely $f_1(T)$ (top left), $f_2(T)$ (top right), $f_3(T)$ (middle left), $f_4(T)$ (middle right) and $f_5(T)$ (bottom) models.

are unequivocally forbidden by current constraints on the variation of Newton's gravitational constant [166–170], and therefore we consider these models as cosmologically non-viable models, consistent with Refs. [32, 156, 157]. Indeed, only the $f(T)$ models which posses the ΛCDM model as a limiting case are in agreement with the condition of $G_{\rm eff}/G_N \simeq 1$, which could therefore be considered as viable cosmological models.

4 Conclusions

In this work, we focused our attention on the $f(T)$ gravitational framework in section 2. After our concise discussion on TG and $f(T)$ cosmology, we focused on the induced variation of the fine–structure constant in the $f(T)$ gravitational scenario. Indeed, we have revisited and updated the theoretical $f(T)$ relationship of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ in Eq. (2.29), and the modification of the luminosity distance in Eq. (2.30).

In section 3 we proceeded to the confrontation of five $f(T)$ models with the Supernovae Type Ia Pantheon Sample, Hubble parameter measurements and measurements of the variation of the fine–structure constant. We have considered three models ($f_1(T)$, $f_2(T)$, $f_3(T)$) which posses the ΛCDM model as a limiting case. From our inferred results of Table 1, we observe that the $f_1(T)$, $f_2(T)$, and $f_3(T)$ models do not exclude the ΛCDM paradigm. It was also found that these are cosmologically viable models, since the reconstructed deviation of their effective gravitational constant from G_N is negligible and in an excellent agreement with current experimental bounds.

On the other hand, the remaining $f(T)$ models do not contain the ΛCDM scenario as a particular limit. The logarithmic $f_4(T)$ model is identical to the spatially flat self–accelerating branch of the DGP model at the background level, and therefore we expected that this model will not be cosmologically viable. Indeed, the reconstructed evolution of $G_{\rm eff}/G_N$ significantly deviated from unity at late–times, which clearly is not consistent with current bounds on $G_{\rm eff}/G_N$. The remaining hyperbolic–tangent model is characterised by the crossing of the phantom divide line, although our inferred constraints did not favor this possibility due to a preference to relatively large values of the $f_5(T)$ model parameter n. Moreover, the reconstructed evolution of $G_{\rm eff}/G_N$ was not found to be in agreement with the respective experimental bounds.

Also in appendix A, we explore a number of widely known theoretical parametrisations of the violation of the distance–duality relation, on which we imposed very stringent constraints ($\mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$) by adopting several measurements of the variation of the fine–structure constant. From this analysis, we clearly illustrated that current data sets are in an excellent agreement with the distance–duality relation irrespective of the adopted phenomenological parametrisation.

A common feature of all $f(T)$ models is that they are all in an excellent agreement with the distance–duality relation. Thus, with current measurements of the variation of the fine–structure constant, we have been able to confirm the validity of EEP in $f(T)$ gravity. We expect that the relevant constraints will significantly improve in the era of the new generation of high–resolution ultra–stable spectrographs, such as ESPRESSO [171] and ELT–HIRES [172], which will lead to improvements in local atomic clock tests and complimentary cosmological observations.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge funding support Cosmology@MALTA which is supported by the University of Malta. The authors would like to acknowledge networking support by the COST Action CA18108. The authors would also like to acknowledge networking support by the COST Action GWverse CA16104. JM would like to acknowledge"IPAS - 2018-011: TeleGravity" project for travel funds which was funded by *The Malta Council for Science and Technology (MCST).*

A Phenomenological violation of the cosmic distance–duality relation

The EEP could be easily broken by introducing a phenomenological nonminimal multiplicative coupling between a scalar field ϕ and matter fields. For instance, in the electromagnetic sector, the action formalism would be given by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rm EM} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\sqrt{-g}\, B_{_F}(\phi)\, \mathcal{L}_{\rm EM} \,, \tag{A.1}$$

where the electromagnetic Lagrangian is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{\rm EM}$, g is the determinant of the space–time metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, and the scalar field dependent electromagnetic coupling is denoted by $B_{_F}(\phi)$. We remark that the dynamical evolution of the scalar field and the metric tensor are not relevant at this point, and such dynamics are encoded in the scalar–gravitational field Lagrangian.

After the variation of the above action with respect to the electromagnetic four–potential A^μ, we arrive at the homogeneous modified Maxwell equations

$$\mathring{\nabla}_\nu \left(B_{_F}(\phi)\, F^{\mu\nu}\right) = 0 \,, \tag{A.2}$$

with $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ being the standard antisymmetric Faraday tensor, and $\mathring{\nabla}_\nu$ being the regular covariant derivative calculated with the Levi-Civita connection. From Eq. (A.2) we know that photons propagate on null geodesics, and therefore the reciprocity relation still holds [173]. However, the number of photons is no longer conserved, which consequently leads to a violation of Etherington's relation [174]. Thence, one could parametrise the violation of the distance–duality relation by

$$\eta(z) = \frac{D_{_L}(z)}{D_{_A}(z)\,(1+z)^2} \,, \tag{A.3}$$

where $D_{_L}(z)$ and $D_{_A}(z)$ are the luminosity distance and angular diameter distance at redshift z, respectively. Clearly, the distance–duality relation is recovered when $\eta(z) = 1$.

In our analyses, we will be adopting the following commonly used phenomenological parametrisations

$$\eta(z) = \eta_0 \,, \tag{A.4}$$

$$\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_1 z \,, \tag{A.5}$$

$$\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_2 \frac{z}{1+z} \,, \tag{A.6}$$

$$\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_3 \ln(1+z) \,, \tag{A.7}$$

$$\eta(z) = (1+z)^\epsilon \,. \tag{A.8}$$

The parametrisation of Eq. (A.4) is simply considering a time–independent constant parameter which is not necessarily equal to unity [175, 176], whereas the second theoretical parametrisation [177] is depicting a Taylor expansion at low redshifts which is ill behaved at high redshifts. The divergence problem in Eq. (A.5) is fixed in the parametrisation of Eq. (A.6) [177], while the fourth parametrisation appears in dilaton–type models [60, 83, 84]. The last theoretical parametrisation of Eq. (A.8) was studied in the context of deviations from

Data set	$(\eta_0 - 1)$ $[\times 10^{-7}]$	η_1 $[\times 10^{-7}]$	η_2 $[\times 10^{-7}]$	η_3 $[\times 10^{-7}]$	ϵ $[\times 10^{-7}]$
K	$-28.6^{+5.8}_{-5.7}$	$-18.6^{+3.9}_{-3.9}$	$-52.2^{+10.6}_{-9.9}$	$-33.5^{+6.8}_{-6.6}$	$-33.4^{+6.8}_{-6.7}$
V	$10.5^{+6.2}_{-6.3}$	$8.4^{+3.5}_{-3.6}$	$20.0^{+10.0}_{-10.0}$	$13.9^{+6.3}_{-6.4}$	$13.8^{+6.3}_{-6.4}$
N	$-3.0^{+3.5}_{-3.3}$	$-1.5^{+2.4}_{-2.5}$	$-4.5^{+5.8}_{-6.1}$	$-2.8^{+3.9}_{-4.0}$	$-2.8^{+3.9}_{-4.0}$
KV	$-10.8^{+4.2}_{-4.3}$	$-3.7^{+2.6}_{-2.6}$	$-15.6^{+7.3}_{-7.3}$	$-8.5^{+4.6}_{-4.8}$	$-8.4^{+4.5}_{-4.7}$
NO	$0.00^{+0.30}_{-0.31}$	$-0.6^{+1.6}_{-1.7}$	$-0.5^{+2.3}_{-2.3}$	$-0.5^{+2.0}_{-2.0}$	$-0.6^{+2.0}_{-2.0}$
KVN	$-6.0^{+2.6}_{-2.6}$	$-2.5^{+1.8}_{-1.8}$	$-9.2^{+4.7}_{-4.5}$	$-5.2^{+2.9}_{-3.1}$	$-5.3^{+3.0}_{-3.0}$
NO + lab + H_0^R	$0.00^{+0.31}_{-0.30}$	$0.3^{+1.1}_{-1.1}$	$0.6^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$	$0.5^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$	$0.5^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$
KVNO + lab + H_0^R	$-0.06^{+0.31}_{-0.30}$	$-0.3^{+1.0}_{-1.0}$	$0.1^{+1.3}_{-1.2}$	$-0.1^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$	$-0.1^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$

Table 2. We report the mean value and the 68% limits for each $\eta(z)$ parametrisation, as described in Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8). The data sets are discussed in section A.2.

cosmic transparency [178, 179], which could arise from astrophysical attenuation processes as well as from exotic physics including photon–axion mixing [180–182].

Several studies have constrained the theoretical parametrisations presented in Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8), in which different kinds of cosmological and local probes have been adopted (see, for instance, Refs. [51, 175–177, 183–200] and references therein), and no significant deviation from the distance–duality relation has not been reported yet. Consequently, the likelihoods of $\eta_0 - 1$, η_1, η_2, η_3, and ϵ are expected to peak at zero in order to satisfy the distance–duality relation.

A.1 Induced variation of the fine–structure constant

A number of well–known cosmological consequences arising from the violation of the distance–duality relationship have been widely explored in the literature. We will be particularly interested in the induced variation of the electromagnetic fine–structure constant, which is explicitly related with the nonminimal electromagnetic coupling via $\alpha \propto B_F^{-1}(\phi)$ [83, 84, 201, 202]. Indeed, the unequivocal relationship of the redshift evolution of $\alpha(z)$, with the nonminimal electromagnetic coupling and Etherington's parameter $\eta(z)$, can be expressed as follows

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha(z)}{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\alpha(z) - \alpha_0}{\alpha_0} = \frac{B_F\left(\phi_0\right)}{B_F(\phi)} - 1 = \eta^2(z) - 1 \,, \tag{A.9}$$

where a 0–subscript indicates the current epoch values at $z = 0$. Thus, constraints on $\Delta\alpha(z)/\alpha$ can be interchanged to constraints on $\eta(z)$, and vice versa. Furthermore, the current temporal variation of $\alpha(z)$, simplifies to the following equation

$$\left.\frac{\dot{\alpha}}{\alpha}\right|_0 = -2H_0 \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}\eta}{\mathrm{d}z}\right|_0 \,, \tag{A.10}$$

where the Hubble constant is denoted by $H_0 = a^{-1}\mathrm{d}a/\mathrm{d}t|_0 = a^{-1}\dot{a}|_0$, with t being the cosmic time and $a(t)$ is the cosmic scale factor of a spatially–flat Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) metric with $a_0 = 1$.




Figure 7. Marginalised posterior distributions of the parameters characterising the phenomenological $\eta(z)$ theoretical parametrisations of Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8).

A.2 Data sets and methodology

We will be implementing the methodology outlined in section 3 and apply it for each phenomenological parametrisation of Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8). We thus make use of the MCMC Ensemble sampler `emcee` [143], and analyse our chains by the publicly available package




Figure 8. Best–fit $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ evolution along with the 1σ posterior spread for the η_0 (top left), η_1 (top right), η_2 (middle left), η_3 (middle right), and ϵ (bottom) parametrisations of Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8). The illustrated data points from Keck, VLT, New and Oklo data set measurements are described in section A.2.

`ChainConsumer` [144].

In our constraint analyses we made use of the currently available measurements of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ and $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha|_0$. We remark that the constraints on the parameters $(\eta_{0,1,2,3}, \epsilon)$ defining the $\eta(z)$ phenomenological functions (A.4) – (A.8), were transposed from the constraints on the

variation in $\alpha(z)$ by using the direct relation given in Eq. (A.9). We refer to section 3 for a description on the several $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ constraints, while the adopted atomic clocks laboratory (lab) constraint is specified by $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha|_0 = (-1.6 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-17}\,\mathrm{year}^{-1}$ [92]. When we include the latter constraint on the temporal variation of the fine–structure constant, we make use of a Hubble constant prior likelihood H_0^R [153], since we then marginalise over H_0 to infer the constraints on the $\eta(z)$ parameters.

A.3 Current constraints

The inferred constraints on the model parameters of the theoretical functions defined in Eqs. (A.4) – (A.8) are reported in Table 2, in which a number of data sets have been adopted as indicated in the first column of this table. Although the derived constraints on $\eta_{0,1,2,3}$ and ϵ are all of the order of 10^{-7}, the NO data set along with the laboratory measurement of the current temporal variation in α, significantly tighten the constraints that are obtained from the Keck and VLT data sets. Moreover, the Keck and VLT data sets are characterised by the largest deviation from the distance–duality relation (due to a preference for non–null theoretical model parameter values) irrespective from the adopted parametrisation, as clearly illustrated by their joint posterior distribution in Fig. 7. Additionally, the inferred constraints from the Keck and VLT data sets lead to incompatible theoretical evolution of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$. This is shown in Fig. 8, in which we depict the best–fit redshift evolution of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$, along with the 68% uncertainty region.

From the NO, NO + lab + H_0^R and KVNO + lab + H_0^R joint data sets, we obtain a minute deviation from the distance–duality relation ($\eta(z) \simeq 1$), and such result is independent from the adopted theoretical parametrisation. It is worth mentioning that our derived constraints are orders of magnitude more restrictive than the ones obtained from cosmological observations, such as in Refs. [191, 195–199]. We remark that, as expected, the obtained results are in agreement with Ref. [200], in which the parametrisation independence has been further shown with the expected data from upcoming experiments. Moreover, we observe that the laboratory measurement is complementary to the NO data set, and the inclusion of the laboratory measurement did not alter the inferred constraints from the NO data set. Thence, in the analyses of section 3.1, we exclude the laboratory measurement from our data sets, however we have verified that the final results do not change.

References

[1] C. W. Misner, K. Thorne and J. Wheeler, *Gravitation*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973.

[2] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Modified Gravity and Cosmology*, *Phys. Rept.* **513** (2012) 1 [1106.2476].

[3] L. Baudis, *Dark matter detection*, *J. Phys.* **G43** (2016) 044001.

[4] G. Bertone, D. Hooper and J. Silk, *Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints*, *Phys. Rept.* **405** (2005) 279 [hep-ph/0404175].

[5] S. Weinberg, *The cosmological constant problem*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989) 1.

[6] Planck collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, 1807.06209.

[7] Planck collaboration, *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13 [1502.01589].

[8] K. C. Wong et al., *H0LiCOW XIII. A 2.4% measurement of H_0 from lensed quasars: 5.3σ tension between early and late-Universe probes*, 1907.04869.

[9] W. L. Freedman et al., *The Carnegie-Chicago Hubble Program. VIII. An Independent Determination of the Hubble Constant Based on the Tip of the Red Giant Branch*, 1907.05922.

[10] J. Baker et al., *The Laser Interferometer Space Antenna: Unveiling the Millihertz Gravitational Wave Sky*, 1907.06482.

[11] P. Amaro-Seoane et al., *Laser Interferometer Space Antenna*, 1702.00786.

[12] L. L. Graef, M. Benetti and J. S. Alcaniz, *Primordial gravitational waves and the H0-tension problem*, *Phys.Rev.D* **99** (2019) 043519 [1809.04501].

[13] LIGO Scientific, Virgo, 1M2H, Dark Energy Camera GW-E, DES, DLT40, Las Cumbres Observatory, VINROUGE, MASTER collaboration, *A gravitational-wave standard siren measurement of the hubble constant*, *Nature* **551** (2017) 85 [1710.05835].

[14] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Extended theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rept.* **509** (2011) 167 [1108.6266].

[15] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *f(R) theories*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **13** (2010) 3 [1002.4928].

[16] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Unified cosmic history in modified gravity: from $F(R)$ theory to Lorentz non-invariant models*, *Phys. Rept.* **505** (2011) 59 [1011.0544].

[17] R. Weitzenböock, *'Invariantentheorie'*. Noordhoff, Gronningen, 1923.

[18] Y.-F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis and E. N. Saridakis, *f(T) teleparallel gravity and cosmology*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79** (2016) 106901 [1511.07586].

[19] M. Krššák, R. J. van den Hoogen, J. G. Pereira, C. G. Bhmer and A. A. Coley, *Teleparallel theories of gravity: illuminating a fully invariant approach*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) 183001 [1810.12932].

[20] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Teleparallel Gravity*, vol. 173. Springer, Dordrecht, 2013, 10.1007/978-94-007-5143-9.

[21] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann and C. Pfeifer, *Hamiltonian and primary constraints of new general relativity*, *Phys.Rev.D* **99** (2019) 084025 [1811.11137].

[22] D. Blixt, M. Hohmann and C. Pfeifer, *On the gauge fixing in the Hamiltonian analysis of general teleparallel theories*, *Universe* **5** (2019) 143 [1905.01048].

[23] R. Aldrovandi, J. G. Pereira and K. H. Vu, *Doing without the equivalence principle*, in *On recent developments in theoretical and experimental general relativity, gravitation, and relativistic field theories. Proceedings, 10th Marcel Grossmann Meeting, MG10, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 20-26, 2003. Pt. A-C*, pp. 1505–1512, 2004, gr-qc/0410042, DOI.

[24] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *Modified teleparallel gravity: Inflation without inflaton*, *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 084031 [gr-qc/0610067].

[25] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *On Born-Infeld Gravity in Weitzenbock spacetime*, *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 124019 [0812.1981].

[26] G. R. Bengochea and R. Ferraro, *Dark torsion as the cosmic speed-up*, *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 124019 [0812.1205].

[27] E. V. Linder, *Einstein's other gravity and the acceleration of the Universe*, *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 127301 [1005.3039].

[28] S.-H. Chen, J. B. Dent, S. Dutta and E. N. Saridakis, *Cosmological perturbations in f(T) gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 023508 [1008.1250].

[29] D. Lovelock, *The Einstein tensor and its generalizations*, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 498.

[30] P. A. Gonzalez and Y. Vasquez, *Teleparallel equivalent of Lovelock Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 124023 [1508.01174].

[31] S. Bahamonde, K. F. Dialektopoulos and J. Levi Said, *Can Horndeski Theory be recast using Teleparallel Gravity?*, *Phys. Rev.* **D100** (2019) 064018 [1904.10791].

[32] S. Nesseris, S. Basilakos, E. N. Saridakis and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Viable $f(T)$ models are practically indistinguishable from ΛCDM*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013) 103010 [1308.6142].

[33] G. Farrugia and J. L. Said, *Stability of the flat FLRW metric in $f(T)$ gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 124054 [1701.00134].

[34] A. Finch and J. L. Said, *Galactic rotation dynamics in $f(T)$ gravity*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **78** (2018) 560 [1806.09677].

[35] G. Farrugia, J. L. Said and M. L. Ruggiero, *Solar System tests in $f(T)$ gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016) 104034 [1605.07614].

[36] L. Iorio and E. N. Saridakis, *Solar system constraints on f(T) gravity*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **427** (2012) 1555 [1203.5781].

[37] M. L. Ruggiero and N. Radicella, *Weak-field spherically symmetric solutions in $f(T)$ gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 104014 [1501.02198].

[38] L. Iorio, M. L. Ruggiero, N. Radicella and E. N. Saridakis, *Constraining the Schwarzschild-de Sitter solution in models of modified gravity*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **13** (2016) 111 [1603.02052].

[39] X.-M. Deng, *Probing f(t) gravity with gravitational time advancement*, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **35** (2018) 175013.

[40] S. Bahamonde, C. G. Bhmer and M. Wright, *Modified teleparallel theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 104042 [1508.05120].

[41] S. Capozziello, M. Capriolo and M. Transirico, *The gravitational energy-momentum pseudotensor: the cases of $f(R)$ and $f(T)$ gravity*, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* (2018) [1804.08530].

[42] S. Bahamonde and S. Capozziello, *Noether Symmetry approach in $f(T, B)$ teleparallel cosmology*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C77** (2017) 107 [1612.01299].

[43] A. Paliathanasis, *de Sitter and Scaling solutions in a higher-order modified teleparallel theory*, *JCAP* **1708** (2017) 027 [1706.02662].

[44] G. Farrugia, J. Levi Said, V. Gakis and E. N. Saridakis, *Gravitational waves in modified teleparallel theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018) 124064 [1804.07365].

[45] S. Bahamonde, M. Zubair and G. Abbas, *Thermodynamics and cosmological reconstruction in $f(T, B)$ gravity*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **19** (2018) 78 [1609.08373].

[46] M. Wright, *Conformal transformations in modified teleparallel theories of gravity revisited*, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016) 103002 [1602.05764].

[47] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Introduction to modified gravity and gravitational alternative for dark energy*, *eConf* **C0602061** (2006) 06 [hep-th/0601213].

[48] M. Hohmann, *Disformal transformations in scalar-torsion gravity*, *Universe* **5** (2019) 167 [1905.00451].

[49] A. Golovnev and M. J. Guzman, *Disformal transformations in modified teleparallel gravity*, *Symmetry* **12** (2020) 152 [1912.04604].

[50] O. Minazzoli, *Conservation laws in theories with universal gravity/matter coupling*, *Phys.Rev.D* **88** (2013) 027506 [1307.1590].

[51] A. Hees, O. Minazzoli and J. Larena, *Breaking of the equivalence principle in the electromagnetic sector and its cosmological signatures*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 124064 [1406.6187].

[52] O. Minazzoli and A. Hees, *Late-time cosmology of a scalar-tensor theory with a universal multiplicative coupling between the scalar field and the matter Lagrangian*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 023017 [1404.4266].

[53] P. Brax, A.-C. Davis, B. Li and H. A. Winther, *A unified description of screened modified gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 044015 [1203.4812].

[54] O. Minazzoli and A. Hees, *Dilatons with intrinsic decouplings*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 064038 [1512.05232].

[55] J. L. Flowers and B. W. Petley, *Progress in our knowledge of the fundamental constants of physics*, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **64** (2001) 1191.

[56] P. A. M. Dirac, *The cosmological constants*, *Nature* **139** (1937) 323.

[57] P. A. Dirac, *New basis for cosmology*, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **A165** (1938) 199.

[58] J.-P. Uzan, *The fundamental constants and their variation: observational status and theoretical motivations*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** (2003) 403 [hep-ph/0205340].

[59] J.-P. Uzan, *Varying constants, gravitation and cosmology*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **14** (2011) 2 [1009.5514].

[60] C. J. A. P. Martins, *The status of varying constants: a review of the physics, searches and implications*, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80** (2017) 126902 [1709.02923].

[61] P. Jordan, *Die physikalischen weltkonstanten*, *Naturwissenschaften* **25** (1937) 513.

[62] M. Fierz, *On the physical interpretation of P.Jordan's extended theory of gravitation*, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **29** (1956) 128.

[63] C. Brans and R. Dicke, *Mach's principle and a relativistic theory of gravitation*, *Phys. Rev.* **124** (1961) 925.

[64] J. D. Barrow, *Observational limits on the time evolution of extra spatial dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **35** (1987) 1805.

[65] A. Chodos and S. L. Detweiler, *Where has the fifth-dimension gone?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **21** (1980) 2167.

[66] Y.-S. Wu and Z. Wang, *The time variation of Newton's gravitational constant in Superstring theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 1978.

[67] E. Kiritsis, *Supergravity, D-brane probes and thermal superYang-Mills: A Comparison*, *JHEP* **10** (1999) 010 [hep-th/9906206].

[68] J. D. Barrow, *Cosmologies with varying light speed*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 043515.

[69] J. W. Moffat, *A model of varying fine structure constant and varying speed of light*, astro-ph/0109350.

[70] J. Bekenstein, *Fine structure constant: Is it really a constant?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **25** (1982) 1527.

[71] M. Livio and M. Stiavelli, *Does the fine structure constant really vary in time?*, *Astrophys. J.* **507** (1998) L13 [astro-ph/9808291].

[72] J. Moffat, *Superluminary universe: A possible solution to the initial value problem in cosmology*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **2** (1993) 351 [gr-qc/9211020].

[73] J. Magueijo, *New varying speed of light theories*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **66** (2003) 2025 [astro-ph/0305457].

[74] A. Albrecht and J. Magueijo, *A time varying speed of light as a solution to cosmological puzzles*, *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 043516 [astro-ph/9811018].

[75] M. A. Clayton and J. W. Moffat, *Dynamical mechanism for varying light velocity as a solution to cosmological problems*, *Phys. Lett.* **B460** (1999) 263 [astro-ph/9812481].

[76] H. B. Sandvik, J. D. Barrow and J. Magueijo, *A simple cosmology with a varying fine structure constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 031302 [astro-ph/0107512].

[77] J. D. Barrow, H. B. Sandvik and J. Magueijo, *The behavior of varying alpha cosmologies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 063504 [astro-ph/0109414].

[78] J. D. Barrow, J. Magueijo and H. B. Sandvik, *Variations of alpha in space and time*, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 043515 [astro-ph/0202129].

[79] J. D. Barrow and D. F. Mota, *Qualitative analysis of universes with varying alpha*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 6197 [gr-qc/0207012].

[80] J. D. Barrow and S. Z. Lip, *A generalized theory of varying alpha*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 023514 [1110.3120].

[81] J. D. Barrow and A. A. H. Graham, *General dynamics of varying-alpha Universes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 103513 [1307.6816].

[82] J. Magueijo, J. D. Barrow and H. B. Sandvik, *Is it e or is it c? Experimental tests of varying alpha*, *Phys. Lett.* **B549** (2002) 284 [astro-ph/0202374].

[83] T. Damour, F. Piazza and G. Veneziano, *Runaway dilaton and equivalence principle violations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 081601 [gr-qc/0204094].

[84] T. Damour, F. Piazza and G. Veneziano, *Violations of the equivalence principle in a dilaton runaway scenario*, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 046007 [hep-th/0205111].

[85] K. A. Olive and M. Pospelov, *Evolution of the fine structure constant driven by dark matter and the cosmological constant*, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 085044 [hep-ph/0110377].

[86] C. van de Bruck, J. Mifsud and N. J. Nunes, *The variation of the fine-structure constant from disformal couplings*, *JCAP* **1512** (2015) 018 [1510.00200].

[87] T. Damour and F. Dyson, *The Oklo bound on the time variation of the fine structure constant revisited*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B480** (1996) 37 [hep-ph/9606486].

[88] Yu. V. Petrov, A. I. Nazarov, M. S. Onegin, V. Yu. Petrov and E. G. Sakhnovsky, *Natural nuclear reactor Oklo and variation of fundamental constants. Part 1. Computation of neutronic of fresh core*, *Phys. Rev.* **C74** (2006) 064610 [hep-ph/0506186].

[89] K. A. Olive, M. Pospelov, Y.-Z. Qian, G. Manhes, E. Vangioni-Flam, A. Coc et al., *A re-examination of the Re-187 bound on the variation of fundamental couplings*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 027701 [astro-ph/0309252].

[90] J. D. Prestage, R. L. Tjoelker and L. Maleki, *Atomic clocks and variations of the fine structure constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 3511.

[91] E. Peik, B. Lipphardt, H. Schnatz, T. Schneider, C. Tamm and S. G. Karshenboim, *Limit on the present temporal variation of the fine structure constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 170801 [physics/0402132].

[92] T. Rosenband, D. B. Hume, P. O. Schmidt, C. W. Chou, A. Brusch, L. Lorini et al., *Frequency ratio of al+ and hg+ single-ion optical clocks; metrology at the 17th decimal place*, *Science* **319** (2008) 1808.

[93] J. N. Bahcall, C. L. Steinhardt and D. Schlegel, *Does the fine-structure constant vary with cosmological epoch?*, *Astrophys. J.* **600** (2004) 520 [astro-ph/0301507].

[94] M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, J. K. Webb, V. V. Dzuba, J. X. Prochaska and A. M. Wolfe, *Constraining variations in the fine–structure constant, quark masses and the strong interaction*, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **648** (2004) 131 [astro-ph/0310318].

[95] J. A. King, J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, R. F. Carswell, M. B. Bainbridge et al., *Spatial variation in the fine-structure constant – new results from VLT/UVES*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **422** (2012) 3370 [1202.4758].

[96] I. I. Agafonova, P. Molaro, S. A. Levshakov and J. L. Hou, *First measurement of Mg isotope abundances at high redshifts and accurate estimate of Delta alpha/alpha*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **529** (2011) A28 [1102.2967].

[97] P. Molaro et al., *The UVES Large Program for Testing Fundamental Physics: I Bounds on a change in alpha towards quasar HE 2217-2818*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **555** (2013) A68 [1305.1884].

[98] A. Songaila and L. L. Cowie, *Constraining the variation of the fine structure constant with observations of narrow quasar absorption lines*, *Astrophys. J.* **793** (2014) 103 [1406.3628].

[99] T. M. Evans et al., *The UVES Large Program for testing fundamental physics III. Constraints on the fine-structure constant from three telescopes*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **445** (2014) 128 [1409.1923].

[100] S. M. Kotu, M. T. Murphy and R. F. Carswell, *High-precision limit on variation in the fine-structure constant from a single quasar absorption system*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **464** (2017) 3679 [1609.03860].

[101] M. T. Murphy, A. L. Malec and J. X. Prochaska, *Precise limits on cosmological variability of the fine-structure constant with zinc and chromium quasar absorption lines*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **461** (2016) 2461 [1606.06293].

[102] M. B. Bainbridge and J. K. Webb, *Artificial intelligence applied to the automatic analysis of absorption spectra. Objective measurement of the fine structure constant*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **468** (2017) 1639.

[103] C. S. Alves, A. C. O. Leite, C. J. A. P. Martins, T. A. Silva, S. A. Berge and B. S. A. Silva, *Current and future constraints on extended Bekenstein–type models for a varying fine–structure constant*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018) 023522 [1801.08089].

[104] I. de Martino, C. J. A. P. Martins, H. Ebeling and D. Kocevski, *Constraining spatial variations of the fine structure constant using clusters of galaxies and Planck data*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 083008 [1605.03053].

[105] L. R. Colaço, R. F. L. Holanda, R. Silva and J. S. Alcaniz, *Galaxy clusters and a possible variation of the fine structure constant*, *JCAP* **1903** (2019) 014 [1901.10947].

[106] K. Liao, Z. Li, S. Cao, M. Biesiada, X. Zheng and Z.-H. Zhu, *The distance duality relation from strong gravitational lensing*, *Astrophys. J.* **822** (2016) 74 [1511.01318].

[107] R. F. L. Holanda, V. C. Busti, F. S. Lima and J. S. Alcaniz, *Probing the distance-duality relation with high-z data*, *JCAP* **1709** (2017) 039 [1611.09426].

[108] M. Mosquera and O. Civitarese, *New cosmological constraints on the variation of fundamental constants: the fine structure constant and the Higgs vacuum expectation value*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **551** (2013) A122.

[109] T. Yang, R. F. L. Holanda and B. Hu, *Constraints on the cosmic distance duality relation with simulated data of gravitational waves from the Einstein Telescope*, *Astropart. Phys.* **108** (2019) 57 [1710.10929].

[110] X. Fu, L. Zhou and J. Chen, *Testing the cosmic distance-duality relation from future gravitational wave standard sirens*, *Phys. Rev.* **D99** (2019) 083523 [1903.09913].

[111] J.-Z. Qi, S. Cao, C. Zheng, Y. Pan, Z. Li, J. Li et al., *Testing the Etherington distance duality relation at higher redshifts: Combined radio quasar and gravitational wave data*, *Phys. Rev.* **D99** (2019) 063507 [1902.01988].

[112] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Updated fundamental constant constraints from Planck 2018 data and possible relations to the Hubble tension*, 1912.03986.

[113] R. C. Nunes, S. Pan and E. N. Saridakis, *New observational constraints on $f(T)$ gravity from cosmic chronometers*, *JCAP* **1608** (2016) 011 [1606.04359].

[114] R.-J. Yang, *Conformal transformation in $f(T)$ theories*, *EPL* **93** (2011) 60001 [1010.1376].

[115] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, *New General Relativity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D19** (1979) 3524.

[116] M. Nakahara, *Geometry, topology and physics*. 2003.

[117] T. Ortin, *Gravity and strings*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004, 10.1017/CBO9780511616563.

[118] M. Krššák and E. N. Saridakis, *The covariant formulation of f(T) gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016) 115009 [1510.08432].

[119] R. Aldrovandi, J. G. Pereira and K. H. Vu, *Gravitation without the equivalence principle*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **36** (2004) 101 [gr-qc/0304106].

[120] T. Koivisto, M. Hohmann and L. Marzola, *An axiomatic purification of gravity*, 1909.10415.

[121] Y.-F. Cai, C. Li, E. N. Saridakis and L. Xue, *$f(T)$ gravity after GW170817 and GRB170817A*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018) 103513 [1801.05827].

[122] H. Abedi and S. Capozziello, *Gravitational waves in modified teleparallel theories of gravity*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C78** (2018) 474 [1712.05933].

[123] Z. Chen, W. Luo, Y.-F. Cai and E. N. Saridakis, *New test on General Relativity using galaxy-galaxy lensing with astronomical surveys*, 1907.12225.

[124] N. Tamanini and C. G. Boehmer, *Good and bad tetrads in f(T) gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 044009 [1204.4593].

[125] G. Kofinas and E. N. Saridakis, *Teleparallel equivalent of Gauss-Bonnet gravity and its modifications*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 084044 [1404.2249].

[126] R. Zheng and Q.-G. Huang, *Growth factor in $f(T)$ gravity*, *JCAP* **1103** (2011) 002 [1010.3512].

[127] Y.-P. Wu and C.-Q. Geng, *Matter density perturbations in modified teleparallel theories*, *JHEP* **11** (2012) 142 [1211.1778].

[128] R. C. Nunes, *Structure formation in $f(T)$ gravity and a solution for H_0 tension*, 1802.02281.

[129] O. Minazzoli and A. Hees, *Late-time cosmology of a scalar-tensor theory with a universal multiplicative coupling between the scalar field and the matter lagrangian*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 023017.

[130] P. J. E. Peebles, *Principles of physical cosmology*. Princeton University Press, 1993.

[131] K.-i. Maeda, *Towards the Einstein-Hilbert action via conformal transformation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 3159.

[132] S. Carloni, E. Elizalde and S. Odintsov, *Conformal transformations in cosmology of modified gravity: The covariant approach perspective*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **42** (2010) 1667 [0907.3941].

[133] E. Belgacem, Y. Dirian, S. Foffa and M. Maggiore, *Gravitational-wave luminosity distance in modified gravity theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018) 104066 [1712.08108].

[134] C. Wetterich, *Crossover quintessence and cosmological history of fundamental 'constants'*, *Phys. Lett.* **B561** (2003) 10 [hep-ph/0301261].

[135] A. Hees, O. Minazzoli and J. Larena, *Observables in theories with a varying fine structure constant*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **47** (2015) 9 [1409.7273].

[136] S. Lee, K. A. Olive and M. Pospelov, *Quintessence models and the cosmological evolution of alpha*, *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 083503 [astro-ph/0406039].

[137] E. J. Copeland, N. J. Nunes and M. Pospelov, *Models of quintessence coupled to the electromagnetic field and the cosmological evolution of alpha*, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 023501 [hep-ph/0307299].

[138] P. Brax, C. Burrage, A.-C. Davis, D. Seery and A. Weltman, *Anomalous coupling of scalars to gauge fields*, *Phys. Lett.* **B699** (2011) 5 [1010.4536].

[139] R. C. Nunes, A. Bonilla, S. Pan and E. N. Saridakis, *Observational constraints on $f(T)$ gravity from varying fundamental constants*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C77** (2017) 230 [1608.01960].

[140] L. Iorio, N. Radicella and M. L. Ruggiero, *Constraining f(T) gravity in the Solar System*, *JCAP* **1508** (2015) 021 [1505.06996].

[141] P. Wu and H. W. Yu, *Observational constraints on $f(T)$ theory*, *Phys. Lett.* **B693** (2010) 415 [1006.0674].

[142] S. Capozziello, R. D'Agostino and O. Luongo, *Model-independent reconstruction of $f(T)$ teleparallel cosmology*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **49** (2017) 141 [1706.02962].

[143] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang and J. Goodman, *emcee: The MCMC Hammer*, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **125** (2013) 306 [1202.3665].

[144] S. R. Hinton, *ChainConsumer*, *The Journal of Open Source Software* **1** (2016) 00045.

[145] D. M. Scolnic et al., *The complete light-curve sample of spectroscopically confirmed SNe Ia from Pan-STARRS1 and cosmological constraints from the combined Pantheon Sample*, *Astrophys. J.* **859** (2018) 101 [1710.00845].

[146] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde et al., *A 6% measurement of the Hubble parameter at $z \sim 0.45$: direct evidence of the epoch of cosmic re-acceleration*, *JCAP* **05** (2016) 014 [1601.01701].

[147] 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** (2012) 006 [1201.3609].

[148] J. Simon, L. Verde and R. Jimenez, *Constraints on the redshift dependence of the dark energy potential*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 123001 [astro-ph/0412269].

[149] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski and S. Stanford, *Cosmic chronometers: Constraining the equation of state of dark energy. I: $H(z)$ measurements*, *JCAP* **02** (2010) 008 [0907.3149].

[150] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, T.-J. Zhang and Y.-C. Sun, *Four new observational $H(z)$ data from luminous red galaxies in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey data release seven*, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **14** (2014) 1221 [1207.4541].

[151] M. Moresco, *Raising the bar: new constraints on the Hubble parameter with cosmic chronometers at $z \sim 2$*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450** (2015) L16 [1503.01116].

[152] R. Jimenez and A. Loeb, *Constraining cosmological parameters based on relative galaxy ages*, *Astrophys. J.* **573** (2002) 37 [astro-ph/0106145].

[153] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri and D. Scolnic, *Large Magellanic Cloud Cepheid Standards provide a 1% foundation for the determination of the Hubble constant and stronger evidence for physics beyond ΛCDM*, *Astrophys. J.* **876** (2019) 85 [1903.07603].

[154] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *4-D gravity on a brane in 5-D Minkowski space*, *Phys. Lett. B* **485** (2000) 208 [hep-th/0005016].

[155] J.-Z. Qi, S. Cao, M. Biesiada, X. Zheng and H. Zhu, *New observational constraints on $f(T)$ cosmology from radio quasars*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 502 [1708.08603].

[156] B. Xu, H. Yu and P. Wu, *Testing viable $f(T)$ models with current observations*, *Astrophys. J.* **855** (2018) 89.

[157] F. K. Anagnostopoulos, S. Basilakos and E. N. Saridakis, *Bayesian analysis of $f(T)$ gravity using $f\sigma_8$ data*, *Phys. Rev.* **D100** (2019) 083517 [1907.07533].

[158] E. V. Linder, *Exponential Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 123528 [0905.2962].

[159] K. Bamba, C.-Q. Geng, C.-C. Lee and L.-W. Luo, *Equation of state for dark energy in $f(T)$ gravity*, *JCAP* **1101** (2011) 021 [1011.0508].

[160] C. Deffayet, *Cosmology on a brane in Minkowski bulk*, *Phys. Lett. B* **502** (2001) 199 [hep-th/0010186].

[161] R. Maartens and E. Majerotto, *Observational constraints on self-accelerating cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 023004 [astro-ph/0603353].

[162] Y.-Y. Xu and X. Zhang, *Comparison of dark energy models after Planck 2015*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 588 [1607.06262].

[163] L. Lombriser, W. Hu, W. Fang and U. Seljak, *Cosmological constraints on DGP Braneworld gravity with Brane tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 063536 [0905.1112].

[164] P. Wu and H. W. Yu, *$f(T)$ models with phantom divide line crossing*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C71** (2011) 1552 [1008.3669].

[165] V. F. Cardone, N. Radicella and S. Camera, *Accelerating f(T) gravity models constrained by recent cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 124007 [1204.5294].

[166] E. Garcia-Berro, P. Loren-Aguilar, S. Torres, L. G. Althaus and J. Isern, *An upper limit to the secular variation of the gravitational constant from white dwarf stars*, *JCAP* **05** (2011) 021 [1105.1992].

[167] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev and D. H. Boggs, *Progress in lunar laser ranging tests of relativistic gravity*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 261101 [gr-qc/0411113].

[168] W. Zhu et al., *Tests of gravitational symmetries with pulsar binary J1713+0747*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **482** (2019) 3249 [1802.09206].

[169] W. Zhao, B. S. Wright and B. Li, *Constraining the time variation of Newton's constant G with gravitational-wave standard sirens and supernovae*, *JCAP* **10** (2018) 052 [1804.03066].

[170] J. Alvey, N. Sabti, M. Escudero and M. Fairbairn, *Improved BBN constraints on the variation of the Gravitational constant*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 148 [1910.10730].

[171] F. Pepe et al., *ESPRESSO — An Echelle SPectrograph for Rocky Exoplanets Search and Stable Spectroscopic Observations*, *ESO Messenger* **153** (2019) 6.

[172] A. Marconi, P. D. Marcantonio, V. D'Odorico, S. Cristiani, R. Maiolino, E. Oliva et al., *EELT-HIRES the high-resolution spectrograph for the E-ELT*, in *Ground-based and Airborne Instrumentation for Astronomy VI*, C. J. Evans, L. Simard and H. Takami, eds., vol. 9908, pp. 676 – 687, International Society for Optics and Photonics, SPIE, 2016, DOI.

[173] G. Ellis, *Relativistic cosmology*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **41** (2009) 581.

[174] I. M. H. Etherington, *On the definition of distance in General Relativity.*, *Philosophical Magazine* **15** (1933) 761.

[175] J.-P. Uzan, N. Aghanim and Y. Mellier, *The distance duality relation from x-ray and SZ observations of clusters*, *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 083533 [astro-ph/0405620].

[176] F. De Bernardis, E. Giusarma and A. Melchiorri, *Constraints on dark energy and distance duality from Sunyaev Zel'dovich effect and Chandra X-ray measurements*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15** (2006) 759 [gr-qc/0606029].

[177] R. F. L. Holanda, J. A. S. Lima and M. B. Ribeiro, *Cosmic distance duality relation and the shape of galaxy clusters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **528** (2011) L14 [1003.5906].

[178] A. Avgoustidis, L. Verde and R. Jimenez, *Consistency among distance measurements: transparency, BAO scale and accelerated expansion*, *JCAP* **0906** (2009) 012 [0902.2006].

[179] R. Nair, S. Jhingan and D. Jain, *Cosmic distance duality and cosmic transparency*, *JCAP* **1212** (2012) 028 [1210.2642].

[180] B. A. Bassett and M. Kunz, *Cosmic distance-duality as a probe of exotic physics and acceleration*, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 101305 [astro-ph/0312443].

[181] A. Avgoustidis, C. Burrage, J. Redondo, L. Verde and R. Jimenez, *Constraints on cosmic opacity and beyond the standard model physics from cosmological distance measurements*, *JCAP* **1010** (2010) 024 [1004.2053].

[182] P. Tiwari, *Constraining axionlike particles using the distance-duality relation*, *Phys. Rev.* **D95** (2017) 023005 [1610.06583].

[183] R. Lazkoz, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, *Comparison of standard ruler and standard candle constraints on dark energy models*, *JCAP* **07** (2008) 012 [0712.1232].

[184] R. Holanda, J. Lima and M. Ribeiro, *Probing the cosmic distance duality relation with the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect, X-rays observations and Supernovae Ia*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **538** (2012) A131 [1104.3753].

[185] R. Holanda, J. Lima and M. Ribeiro, *Testing the distance-duality relation with galaxy clusters and Type Ia Supernovae*, *Astrophys. J.* **722** (2010) L233 [1005.4458].

[186] Z. Li, P. Wu and H. W. Yu, *Cosmological-model-independent tests for the distance-duality relation from galaxy clusters and Type Ia Supernova*, *Astrophys. J.* **729** (2011) L14 [1101.5255].

[187] N. Liang, S. Cao and Z.-H. Zhu, *A consistent test of the distance-duality relation with galaxy clusters and Type Ia Supernovae*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **436** (2013) 1017 [1104.2497].

[188] X.-L. Meng, T.-J. Zhang and H. Zhan, *Morphology of galaxy clusters: A cosmological model-independent test of the cosmic distance-duality relation*, *Astrophys. J.* **745** (2012) 98 [1104.2833].

[189] S. Cao and N. Liang, *Testing the distance-duality relation with a combination of cosmological distance observations*, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **11** (2011) 1199 [1104.4942].

[190] V. F. Cardone, S. Spiro, I. Hook and R. Scaramella, *Testing the distance duality relation with present and future data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 123510 [1205.1908].

[191] R. Holanda, R. Gonalves and J. Alcaniz, *A test for cosmic distance duality*, *JCAP* **06** (2012) 022 [1201.2378].

[192] X. Yang, H.-R. Yu, Z.-S. Zhang and T.-J. Zhang, *An improved method to test the Distance–Duality relation*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **777** (2013) L24 [1310.0869].

[193] Z. Li, P. Wu, H. Yu and Z.-H. Zhu, *Cosmic opacity: Cosmological-model-independent tests and their impact on cosmic acceleration*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 103013 [1304.7317].

[194] R. Holanda and V. Busti, *Probing cosmic opacity at high redshifts with gamma-ray bursts*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 103517 [1402.2161].

[195] S. Santos-da Costa, V. C. Busti and R. F. L. Holanda, *Two new tests to the distance duality relation with galaxy clusters*, *JCAP* **1510** (2015) 061 [1506.00145].

[196] M.-Z. Lv and J.-Q. Xia, *Constraints on cosmic distance duality relation from cosmological observations*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **13** (2016) 139 [1606.08102].

[197] C. Ma and P.-S. Corasaniti, *Statistical test of distance-duality relation with Type Ia Supernovae and baryon acoustic oscillations*, *Astrophys. J.* **861** (2018) 124 [1604.04631].

[198] H.-N. Lin, M.-H. Li and X. Li, *New constraints on the distance duality relation from the local data*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **480** (2018) 3117 [1808.01784].

[199] C.-Z. Ruan, F. Melia and T.-J. Zhang, *Model-independent test of the cosmic distance duality relation*, *Astrophys. J.* **866** (2018) 31 [1808.09331].

[200] R. S. Gonçalves, S. Landau, J. S. Alcaniz and R. F. L. Holanda, *Variation in the fine-structure constant, distance-duality relation and the next generation of high-resolution spectrograph*, 1907.02118.

[201] T. Damour and A. M. Polyakov, *The String dilaton and a least coupling principle*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B423** (1994) 532 [hep-th/9401069].

[202] T. Damour and A. M. Polyakov, *String theory and gravity*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **26** (1994) 1171 [gr-qc/9411069].