arXiv:2012.01407v1 [astro-ph.CO] 2 Dec 2020

Dark Energy as a Critical Phenomenon: a Resolution for Hubble Tension

Abdolali Banihashemi,[1,*] Nima Khosravi,[1,†] and Arman Shafieloo[2,‡]

[1]*Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, 1983969411, Tehran, Iran*
[2]*Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, Daejeon 34055, Korea and University of Science and Technology, Daejeon 34113, Korea*

(Dated: January 15, 2022)

We propose a dark energy model based on the physics of critical phenomena which is consistent with both the Planck's CMB and the Riess et al.'s local Hubble measurements. In this model the dark energy density behaves like the magnetization of the Ising model. This means the dark energy is an emergent phenomenon and we named it critically emergent dark energy model, CEDE. In CEDE, dark energy emerges at a transition redshift, z_c, corresponding to the critical temperature in critical phenomena. Combining the Planck CMB data and local measurement of the Hubble constant from Riess et al. (2019) we find statistically significant support for this transition with respect to the case of very early transition that represents effectively the cosmological constant. This is understandable since CEDE model naturally prefers larger values of Hubble constant consistent with local measurements. Since CEDE prefers a non-trivial transition when we consider both high redshift Planck CMB data and local Hubble constant measurements, we conclude that H_0 tension can be a hint for the substructure of the dark energy as a well-studied properties of critical phenomena.

I. INTRODUCTION:

Riess et al. [1–3] have devoted efforts to measure and constrain the present Hubble parameter and their most recent result shows $H_0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42$ km/s/Mpc by the analysis of the Hubble Space Telescope observations using 70 long-period Cepheids in the Large Magellanic Cloud. This observation is in 4.4σ tension with the prediction of CMB observations by Planck satellite [4]. This tension can be due to systematics, as speculated e.g. by [5], but its chance has become less and less thanks to the independent local measurements of H_0 e.g. based on Type II supernovae [6] ($H_0 = 75.8^{+5.2}_{-4.9}$ km/s/Mpc) or based on strong gravitational lensing effects on quasar systems, H0LiCOW, ($H_0 = 73.5^{+1.7}_{-1.8}$ km/s/Mpc) [7–9] or based on a calibration of the Tip of the Red Giant Branch, TRGB, ($H_0 = 69.8 \pm 1.9$ km/s/Mpc) [10] or based on calibration of the SN Ia luminosity using highly-evolved low-mass stars, Miras, ($H_0 = 73.6 \pm 3.9$ km/s/Mpc) [11] or based on calibration of the type Ia supernovae with surface brightness fluctuations, SBF, ($H_0 = 76.5 \pm 4.0$ km/s/Mpc) [12] or by using geometric distance measurements to megamaser-hosting galaxies, MCP, ($H_0 = 74.8 \pm 3.1$ km/s/Mpc) [13]. In addition it is worth to mention that the ΛCDM model suffers from some other (mild) tensions e.g. S_8 [14], low/high ℓ [15] and CMB spatial anomalies [16–18]. Nevertheless, H_0 tension seems the most robust one supported by many observations. In near future the situation will be clear and if this tension be real then it is very important to know if there is any theoretical explanation for it.

There are many different theoretical attempts to address the H_0 tension. Dynamical dark energy models [19–25] and gravity theories in which gravity changes with redshift [26–30] are examples of the late universe modifications. On the other hand, assuming an early dark energy phase before recombination in order to decrease the sound horizon [31–33] or non-standard recombination scenarios [34–37] are the main topics of the early universe solutions. There have been though some serious doubts on how these early dark energy models can practically resolve the Hubble tension [38].

There are also interacting dark energy models [39–54], in which dark matter and dark energy have an extra non-gravitational interaction in hope for alleviating this tension. However, there remains some doubts and questions about the detection of dark energy dark matter interaction [55]. Furthermore, decaying dark matter can be a remedy for this problem [56–58]. In addition, one can have a higher H_0 at the price of extra relativistic degrees of freedom, parameterized by the $N_{\rm eff}$ [59, 60].

We have also proposed a model to address the H_0 tension based on the idea of critical phenomena in [61–63]. In these works we considered that the dark energy experienced a phase transition in its history. This assumption can be natural due to the discrepancy between early and late cosmology. In [61], this phase transition has been modeled phenomenologically by a $\tanh$ function. This behavior for dark energy has been assumed independently in [64–67] as Phenomenological Emergent Dark Energy (PEDE). In this work we would like to generalize our idea in [61] by assigning a more realistic time evolution to dark energy. In the physics of critical phenomena, the Ising model is one of the well-considered models and shares its behavior with many other ones. We will assume that dark energy behaves like an Ising model which results in a very specific time evolution for it.

II. CRITICALLY EMERGENT DARK ENERGY (CEDE)

Adapted from the literature of critical phenomena, we suppose that the dark energy consists of a sort of self interacting micro-structures which carry a local "order parameter". Here, we attribute a scalar field, $\phi(\boldsymbol{r}, z)$, to be representative of this order parameter in each point of space and time (redshift).

*Electronic address: a_banihashemi@sbu.ac.ir
†Electronic address: n-khosravi@sbu.ac.ir
‡Electronic address: shafieloo@kasi.re.kr

In fact, this field corresponds to the concept of the coarse grained local magnetization within the Ising model context. We assume the spatial average of ϕ is responsible for the background density of the dark energy:

$$\Omega_{\rm DE}(z) = \langle \phi(\boldsymbol{r}, z) \rangle \equiv M(z). \tag{1}$$

For now, we assume that our dark energy is somehow in thermal contact[1] with the radiation and has a temperature proportional to the cosmological redshift, $T_{\rm DE} \propto 1+z$. At early times or equivalently high temperatures, the local order parameter changes rapidly and there is no long range correlation in the dark energy field. it is completely disordered and its spatial average vanishes. As the universe cools down, order begins to emerge and the field starts to show a long range correlation. After a critical temperature, T_c, the average of ϕ takes distance from zero and dark energy appears in a continuous phase transition. To formulate this scenario, we use the mathematical description of phase transitions, developed by Ginzburg and Landau [68]. For this goal, we introduce our effective free energy[2]

$$E_F = \int d^3\boldsymbol{r} \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} (\nabla\phi)^2 + m\, t\, \phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\, \phi^4 \right], \tag{2}$$

and demand that the E_F be always stationary with respect to the variations of ϕ. In the above expression, t is the reduced temperature, $t \equiv \frac{T-T_c}{T_c}$, and γ, m and λ are some positive constants that are supposed to be determined from observations. As it is evident in (2), we have supposed $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry for our effective free energy; i.e. there isn't any odd power of ϕ. This symmetry implies that the phase transition is continuous or second order. For the equation of motion of ϕ we obtain:

$$-\gamma\, \nabla^2\phi(\boldsymbol{r}) + 2\, m\, t\, \phi(\boldsymbol{r}) + 2\, \lambda\, \phi^3(\boldsymbol{r}) = 0. \tag{3}$$

At the first approximation, we consider ϕ within the mean field approach: $\phi(\boldsymbol{r}) = \langle \phi(\boldsymbol{r}) \rangle \equiv M$. Hence it should obey the following equation:

$$2\, m\, t\, M + 2\, \lambda\, M^3 = 0, \tag{4}$$

which yields:

$$M = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad M = \pm\sqrt{-\frac{mt}{\lambda}} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{m}{\lambda}\,\frac{z_c - z}{1+z_c}}. \tag{5}$$

The last equality comes from our assumption for the dark energy temperature, $T_{DE} \propto 1+z$. The case $M = 0$ corresponds to $T > T_c$ and the two other cases belong to $T < T_c$; after spontaneous symmetry breaking, M takes one of these two possible temporal functionalities[3]. We choose M to take the positive one, because negative values for the dark energy density are not very pleasing philosophically. It is worth to clarify that we assumed quasi-static case for the DE system. This effectively means the interaction has smaller time scale in comparison to the Hubble time.

In addition, spatially flatness of the universe fixes the coefficient $m/\lambda = (1-\Omega_m-\Omega_r)^2\,(1+z_c)/z_c$ in (5) and we obtain

$$\Omega_{\rm DE}(z) = (1-\Omega_m-\Omega_r)\sqrt{\frac{z_c - z}{z_c}}, \tag{6}$$

where Ω_m and Ω_r are the matter and radiation fractional densities at present time, respectively. So in this step we have the form of the Friedmann equation,

$$H^2 = H_0^2 \left[\Omega_m (1+z)^3 + \Omega_r (1+z)^4 + \Omega_{\rm DE}(z) \right]. \tag{7}$$

We can deduce the dark energy's equation of state from the continuity equation, namely,

$$\rho'_{\rm DE}(z) - \frac{3}{1+z}\,\rho_{\rm DE}(z)\left[1 + w_{\rm DE}(z)\right] = 0, \tag{8}$$

where $'$ denotes the derivative with respect to the redshift. By substituting $\rho_{\rm DE}(z)$ from (6) into (8) we can read $w_{\rm DE}(z)$ as

$$w_{\rm DE}(z) = -1 - \frac{1+z}{6(z_c - z)}. \tag{9}$$

This relation holds for any moment after onset of the phase transition and before that time, since the density of dark energy is zero, $w_{\rm DE}$ is not well-defined. Right at the moment of transition, $w_{\rm DE}$ diverges toward $-\infty$ and afterwards, at far future, approaches -1 (c.f. figure 1). Physically, this means the DE effectively is in a phantom phase and dynamically approaches to the cosmological constant. This is a behavior that we expect from emergent dark energy models [64, 66]. We emphasize that since $w_{\rm DE}$ is not appeared in the physics directly then $w_{\rm DE} = -\infty$ does not give any physically divergences in our model[4]. It is worth to add that we could expect this behaviour since at the critical temperature, it is a very natural behaviour in the physics of critical phenomena to see a discontinuity in some of the parameters.

---

[1] It is important to emphasize that this interaction should be very tiny. Otherwise we expect modification in the behaviour of photons which are very well-constrained. On the other hand, theoretically one can assume that the phase transition in the behaviour of DE is realized by changing of the temperature due to the expansion rate of the universe. In this scenario we could assume $T_{DE} \propto (1+z)^\beta$. The β dependence does not change the general behavior of our model and here we assume $\beta = 1$.

[2] In the literature of critical phenomena it is shown by L. But here we used E_F to not make any confusion with the Lagrangian.

[3] Note that what is observable is m/λ. According to (2), the parameter m encodes the interaction strength between DE and other fields (e.g. photons). This means even by setting m to be very small, we expect we can have the phase transition but ignore the effects on the other fields. In this scenario we can set λ to get an appropriate value for dark energy density.

[4] Note that the physics is given by $\rho(a) = \rho_0 \times exp[-3\int_{a_0}^{a}(1+w(a))d\ln a]$ where an infinite $w_{\rm DE}$ at one point cannot make any divergences.




FIG. 1: The equation of state of dark energy versus redshift for a typical transition redshift, $z_c = 2$. The grey lines are horizontal and vertical asymptotes of this function which lie at $w = -1$ and $z = z_c$, respectively. Note that as we discussed in the draft, $\rho_{\rm DE}(z)$ is the physical quantity and well behaved at z_c even if $w_{\rm DE}(z)$ diverges at the critical redshift. The sub-plot inside, is the same function with linear horizontal axis.




FIG. 2: The $1-2\sigma$ contours for a_c vs H_0 is plotted for CEDE model where Planck **CMB** data is used without and with **R19** data, in red and in blue, respectively. The grey bands show the $1-2\sigma$ values for H_0 as reported by Riess et al. from local measurments. The red contours show that CEDE model has no inconsistency with **R19** which means we can combine **R19** and **CMB** data together to get the joint constraints (blue contour). It is worth to mention that CEDE reduces to ΛCDM when the transition occurs very early (effectively at a_c tends to 0). The red contours show this property very clearly: for very small a_c the H_0 value becomes closer to what Planck reports for ΛCDM.

III. ANALYSIS

The parameter space we want to put constraint on, is

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_c h^2, 100\Theta_{MC}, \tau, n_s, \ln[10^{10} A_s], a_c\}, \quad (10)$$

which shows that our model has six parameters in common with ΛCDM and an extra free parameter a_c which represents the scale factor of transition.

In order to put constraint on these free parameters, we focus on the following two data sets:

- Planck 2018 temperature and polarization angular power spectra, i.e. combination of the **`Commander`**, **`SimALL`** and **`plikTT,TE,EE`** likelihoods.[69]. We refer to this data as **CMB**.
- The latest measurement of H_0 by Riess *et al.* [1]. We refer to this data point as **R19**.

In this work we do not add the other datasets e.g. BAO or Supernovae. The first reason is that we want to see if our model can reconcile between CMB and R19. The second reason is that it is not clear if BAO and SNe datasets are consistent with CMB. We will study this consistency in our future works. We make use of publicly available code `CAMB` [70, 71], to calculate the predictions of CEDE for the observables described above. For sampling the parameter space, we use `CosmoMC` [72, 73]. We use `GetDist` [74] in order to extract the parameter's posteriors from the MCMC chains and to plot likelihood contours.

IV. RESULTS

The first very important step is to see if independent datasets are compatible for a theoretical setup or not. If they are not compatible then we are not allowed to use both of them at the same time (that usually would result to tight constraints for the model parameters). In the framework of ΛCDM, **CMB** and **R19** are more than 4σ incompatible which is the Hubble tension. To check the compatibility between these two datasets we have put constraints on CEDE parameters just with **CMB** dataset. The main result can be seen in figure 2 where the red likelihood shows the $2-d$ likelihood for H_0 and a_c in CEDE. The result is very promising: constraints from **CMB** data has no tension with **R19** data in this model. Obviously, the 1σ likelihood touches **R19**'s 1σ; and 2σ likelihood for H_0 in CEDE reaches to upper 2σ value for **R19**. In figure 4, we have shown the $2-d$ and $1-d$ likelihoods for our free parameters as well as derived H_0 and Ω_Λ. It is obvious from the last row that **R19** does not show any inconsistencies in our free parameters. Consequently, we can add up **CMB** and **R19** datasets. The likelihoods for CEDE has been shown in figures 2 and 4 in blue. The best fit values are reported in table I for ΛCDM and CEDE in the presence of **CMB** with and without **R19**. Note that we have reported the best values for ΛCDM parameters constrained by **CMB** and **R19** but it can not be trusted since these two datasets are incompatible in the framework of ΛCDM.

The main result is that including **R19** needs a non-trivial phase transition in DE by excluding lower values for transition scale factor a_c. This lower value at 2σ is around $a_c \sim 0.2$ which is equivalent to $z_c \sim 4$. To explain it let us emphasize that for very small values of a_c the transition occurs at very high redshifts. This means DE starts to grow from zero to a




FIG. 3: The fractional density of dark energy is plotted versus the redshift. The dashed black line represents this function for the ΛCDM model best fit values. The red line region shows the same for 1σ values of CEDE when it is constrained by only **CMB**. Obviously, for this case, CEDE includes ΛCDM as we discussed in the paper. But including **R19** excludes the ΛCDM as it is shown by 1σ region in blue. While the main plot is logarithmic in redshift, the interior sub-plot is linear up to $z = 4$.

constant Ω_Λ very early. This transition is so fast and occurs far before DE domination. So it has no observational effects. In other words CEDE behaves exactly same as ΛCDM for very high transition redshifts. The results show that in the framework of CEDE, ΛCDM can explain **CMB** as good as CEDE with non-trivial phase transition. But including **R19** breaks this degeneracy in favour of a phase transition in the late time behavior of dark energy. To study this fact more clearly we have plotted the dark energy fractional density (1σ values) as a function of redshift in figure 3. It is obvious from this plot that having ΛCDM is valid in CEDE framework when we use only **CMB** but including **R19** excludes it.

V. DISCUSSIONS

In this work we have shown a specific form of transition in the behaviour of dark energy can be a very promising framework to address the Hubble tension. This specific from of transition is based on the physics of critical phenomena, specifically the Ising model. We named our model "critically emergent dark energy", CEDE. As it is shown figure 2, in CEDE there is no tension between CMB from Planck and local H_0 measurement by Riess et al. Consequently we can add up these datasets without any worries.

Theoretically, in the critical phenomena literature, the phase transition in the behaviour of a system means there is a substructure for that system. So we think the Hubble tension can be a hint for existence of substructure of dark energy. This has a very rich phenomenology observationally: What are the effects of these substructures? e.g. in ISW signal or structure formation? Do they make dark energy to be clustered? Another very interesting question is that what happened at the redshift of transition: according to physics of critical phenomena at the critical point, we expect the correlation length become infinity. This may cause a very specific fingerprint in the cosmological observables at the redshift of transition.

Here, we checked CEDE only against **CMB** and **R19** to show the main properties of this model but we have a plan to check it against the other datasets including BAO and SNe Ia compilations. Another very interesting path to follow is comparing CEDE with PEDE [64] and GEDE [66] phenomenological models of emergent dark energy as they have effectively very similar properties.

Acknowledgments

We thank E. Linder and A. Starobinsky for very useful comments on the draft. AB and NK thank Iran National Science Foundation (INSF) for supporting this work partly under project no. 98022568.

[1] 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**, no.1, 85 (2019) doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422 [arXiv:1903.07603 [astro-ph.CO]].

[2] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. Macri, B. Bucciarelli, M. G. Lattanzi, J. W. MacKenty, J. B. Bowers, W. Zheng and A. V. Filippenko, *et al.* "Milky Way Cepheid Standards for Measuring Cosmic Distances and Application to Gaia DR2: Implications for the Hubble Constant," Astrophys. J. **861**, no.2, 126 (2018) doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aac82e [arXiv:1804.10655 [astro-ph.CO]].

[3] A. G. Riess, L. M. Macri, S. L. Hoffmann, D. Scolnic, S. Casertano, A. V. Filippenko, B. E. Tucker, M. J. Reid, D. O. Jones and J. M. Silverman, *et al.* "A 2.4% Determination of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant," Astrophys. J. **826**, no.1, 56 (2016) doi:10.3847/0004-637X/826/1/56 [arXiv:1604.01424 [astro-ph.CO]].

[4] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters," Astron. Astrophys. **641**, A6 (2020) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910 [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].

[5] G. Efstathiou, "A Lockdown Perspective on the Hubble Tension (with comments from the SH0ES team)," [arXiv:2007.10716 [astro-ph.CO]].

[6] T. de Jaeger, B. E. Stahl, W. Zheng, A. V. Filippenko, A. G. Riess and L. Galbany, "A measurement of the Hubble constant from Type II supernovae," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **496**, no.3, 3402-3411 (2020) doi:10.1093/mnras/staa1801 [arXiv:2006.03412 [astro-ph.CO]].

[7] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger and M. W. Auger, *et al.* "H0LiCOW XIII. A 2.4%

Parameter	Prior	ΛCDM (**CMB**)	ΛCDM (**CMB+R19**)	CEDE (**CMB**)	CEDE (**CMB+R19**)
$\Omega_b h^2$	[0.005 , 0.1]	0.02236 ± 0.00015	0.02254 ± 0.00014	$0.02243^{+0.00013}_{-0.00014}$	0.02243 ± 0.00014
$\Omega_c h^2$	[0.001 , 0.99]	0.1202 ± 0.0014	0.1179 ± 0.0012	0.1199 ± 0.0014	0.1194 ± 0.0013
$100\Theta_{MC}$	[0.5 , 10]	1.04091 ± 0.00032	1.04120 ± 0.00030	1.04093 ± 0.00032	1.04098 ± 0.00032
τ	[0.01 , 0.8]	0.0545 ± 0.0077	0.0579 ± 0.0084	0.0539 ± 0.0080	0.0539 ± 0.0077
n_s	[0.8 , 1.2]	0.9648 ± 0.0043	0.9703 ± 0.0042	0.9656 ± 0.0045	0.9674 ± 0.0043
$\ln[10^{10} A_s]$	[2 , 4]	$3.045^{+0.014}_{-0.016}$	3.047 ± 0.017	3.043 ± 0.017	3.042 ± 0.016
a_c	[0.01 , 1]	-	-	$0.185^{+0.087}_{-0.14}$	$0.325^{+0.052}_{-0.036}$
Ω_Λ	-	0.6837 ± 0.0084	0.6976 ± 0.0072	$0.707^{+0.014}_{-0.023}$	$0.735^{+0.011}_{-0.0097}$
H_0 [km/s/Mpc]	-	67.29 ± 0.60	68.32 ± 0.55	$70.0^{+1.2}_{-2.7}$	73.4 ± 1.4
Total $\chi^2_{\rm min}$	-	2772.3	**2792.9**	2771.7	**2775.0**
$\chi^2_{\rm CMB}$	-	2768.9	2769.6	2769.6	2769.5
$\chi^2_{\rm R19}$	-	-	20.4	-	1.0

TABLE I: The best fit values and 68% CL intervals for ΛCDM and CEDE parameters when two combinations of data are used. When only **CMB** is used, CEDE shows a slightly lower χ^2 with respect to ΛCDM and inclusion of **R19** makes our $\Delta\chi^2$ much more negative and hence preferred.

measurement of H_0 from lensed quasars: 5.3σ tension between early and late-Universe probes," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **498**, no.1, 1420-1439 (2020) doi:10.1093/mnras/stz3094 [arXiv:1907.04869 [astro-ph.CO]].

[8] K. Liao, A. Shafieloo, R. E. Keeley and E. V. Linder, Astrophys. J. Lett. **886** (2019) no.1, L23 doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab5308 [arXiv:1908.04967 [astro-ph.CO]].

[9] K. Liao, A. Shafieloo, R. E. Keeley and E. V. Linder, Astrophys. J. Lett. **895** (2020) no.2, L29 doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab8dbb [arXiv:2002.10605 [astro-ph.CO]].

[10] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, D. Hatt, T. J. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. L. Beaton, C. R. Burns, M. G. Lee, A. J. Monson and J. R. Neeley, *et al.* "The Carnegie-Chicago Hubble Program. VIII. An Independent Determination of the Hubble Constant Based on the Tip of the Red Giant Branch," doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab2f73 [arXiv:1907.05922 [astro-ph.CO]].

[11] C. D. Huang, A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, N. L. Zakamska, S. Casertano, P. A. Whitelock, S. L. Hoffmann, A. V. Filippenko and D. Scolnic, "Hubble Space Telescope Observations of Mira Variables in the Type Ia Supernova Host NGC 1559: An Alternative Candle to Measure the Hubble Constant," doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab5dbd [arXiv:1908.10883 [astro-ph.CO]].

[12] N. Khetan, L. Izzo, M. Branchesi, R. Wojtak, M. Cantiello, C. Murugeshan, A. A. E. Cappellaro, M. Della Valle, C. Gall and J. Hjorth, *et al.* "A new measurement of the Hubble constant using Type Ia supernovae calibrated with surface brightness fluctuations," [arXiv:2008.07754 [astro-ph.CO]].

[13] D. W. Pesce, J. A. Braatz, M. J. Reid, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, J. J. Condon, F. Gao, C. Henkel, C. M. V. Impellizzeri and C. Y. Kuo, *et al.* "The Megamaser Cosmology Project. XIII. Combined Hubble constant constraints," Astrophys. J. Lett. **891**, no.1, L1 (2020) doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab75f0 [arXiv:2001.09213 [astro-ph.CO]].

[14] C. Heymans, T. Tröster, M. Asgari, C. Blake, H. Hildebrandt, B. Joachimi, K. Kuijken, C. A. Lin, A. G. Sánchez and J. L. v. Busch, *et al.* "KiDS-1000 Cosmology: Multi-probe weak gravitational lensing and spectroscopic galaxy clustering constraints," [arXiv:2007.15632 [astro-ph.CO]].

[15] G. E. Addison, Y. Huang, D. J. Watts, C. L. Bennett, M. Halpern, G. Hinshaw and J. L. Weiland, "Quantifying discordance in the 2015 Planck CMB spectrum," Astrophys. J. **818**, no.2, 132 (2016) doi:10.3847/0004-637X/818/2/132 [arXiv:1511.00055 [astro-ph.CO]].

[16] H. K. Eriksen, F. K. Hansen, A. J. Banday, K. M. Gorski and P. B. Lilje, "Asymmetries in the Cosmic Microwave Background anisotropy field," Astrophys. J. **605**, 14 (2004) Erratum: [Astrophys. J. **609**, 1198 (2004)] doi:10.1086/382267 [astro-ph/0307507].

[17] P. Vielva, E. Martinez-Gonzalez, R. B. Barreiro, J. L. Sanz and L. Cayon, "Detection of non-Gaussianity in the WMAP 1 - year data using spherical wavelets," Astrophys. J. **609**, 22 (2004) doi:10.1086/421007 [astro-ph/0310273].

[18] A. de Oliveira-Costa, M. Tegmark, M. Zaldarriaga and A. Hamilton, "The Significance of the largest scale CMB fluctuations in WMAP," Phys. Rev. D **69**, 063516 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.063516 [astro-ph/0307282].

[19] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino and E. N. Saridakis, "Observational constraints on dynamical dark energy with pivoting redshift," Universe **5**, no.11, 219 (2019) doi:10.3390/universe5110219 [arXiv:1811.06932 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] R. E. Keeley, S. Joudaki, M. Kaplinghat and D. Kirkby, "Implications of a transition in the dark energy equation of state for the H_0 and σ_8 tensions," JCAP **12**, 035 (2019) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/12/035 [arXiv:1905.10198 [astro-ph.CO]].

[21] E. Di Valentino, A. Mukherjee and A. A. Sen, "Dark Energy with Phantom Crossing and the H_0 tension," [arXiv:2005.12587 [astro-ph.CO]].

[22] H. B. Benaoum, W. Yang, S. Pan and E. Di Valentino, "Modified Emergent Dark Energy and its Astronomical Constraints," [arXiv:2008.09098 [gr-qc]].

[23] W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, S. Pan and O. Mena, "A complete model of Phenomenologically Emergent Dark Energy,"




FIG. 4: 68%, 95% and 99% parameter constraint contours for CEDE from two sets of data. Note that blue contours are narrower because of inclusion of the **R19**; but still over lapping with the red contours.

[arXiv:2007.02927 [astro-ph.CO]].

[24] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and A. A. Starobinsky, "Model independent evidence for dark energy evolution from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations," Astrophys. J. Lett. **793**, no.2, L40 (2014) doi:10.1088/2041-8205/793/2/L40 [arXiv:1406.2209 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] G. B. Zhao, M. Raveri, L. Pogosian, Y. Wang, R. G. Crittenden, W. J. Handley, W. J. Percival, F. Beutler, J. Brinkmann and C. H. Chuang, *et al.* "Dynamical dark energy in light of the latest observations," Nature Astron. **1**, no.9, 627-632 (2017) doi:10.1038/s41550-017-0216-z [arXiv:1701.08165 [astro-ph.CO]].

[26] N. Khosravi, S. Baghram, N. Afshordi and N. Altamirano, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.10, 103526 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.103526 [arXiv:1710.09366 [astro-ph.CO]].

[27] S. F. Yan, P. Zhang, J. W. Chen, X. Z. Zhang, Y. F. Cai and E. N. Saridakis, "Interpreting cosmological tensions from the effective field theory of torsional gravity," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.12, 121301 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.121301

[arXiv:1909.06388 [astro-ph.CO]].

[28] N. Frusciante, S. Peirone, L. Atayde and A. De Felice, "Phenomenology of the generalized cubic covariant Galileon model and cosmological bounds," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.6, 064001 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064001 [arXiv:1912.07586 [astro-ph.CO]].

[29] M. Braglia, M. Ballardini, W. T. Emond, F. Finelli, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, K. Koyama and D. Paoletti, "Larger value for H_0 by an evolving gravitational constant," Phys. Rev. D **102**, no.2, 023529 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023529 [arXiv:2004.11161 [astro-ph.CO]].

[30] M. Raveri, "Reconstructing Gravity on Cosmological Scales," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.8, 083524 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083524 [arXiv:1902.01366 [astro-ph.CO]].

[31] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, "Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension," Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, no.22, 221301 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.221301 [arXiv:1811.04083 [astro-ph.CO]].

[32] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, "Dark energy at early times, the Hubble parameter, and the string axiverse," Phys. Rev. D **94**, no.10, 103523 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.103523 [arXiv:1608.01309 [astro-ph.CO]].

[33] V. Pettorino, L. Amendola and C. Wetterich, "How early is early dark energy?," Phys. Rev. D **87**, 083009 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.083009 [arXiv:1301.5279 [astro-ph.CO]].

[34] C. T. Chiang and A. Slosar, "Inferences of H_0 in presence of a non-standard recombination," [arXiv:1811.03624 [astro-ph.CO]].

[35] K. Jedamzik and L. Pogosian, "Relieving the Hubble tension with primordial magnetic fields," [arXiv:2004.09487 [astro-ph.CO]].

[36] T. Sekiguchi and T. Takahashi, "Early recombination as a solution to the H_0 tension," [arXiv:2007.03381 [astro-ph.CO]].

[37] B. Bose and L. Lombriser, "Easing cosmic tensions with an open and hotter universe," [arXiv:2006.16149 [astro-ph.CO]].

[38] J. C. Hill, E. McDonough, M. W. Toomey and S. Alexander, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.4, 043507 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.043507 [arXiv:2003.07355 [astro-ph.CO]].

[39] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, "Probing the interaction between dark matter and dark energy in the presence of massive neutrinos," Phys. Rev. D **94**, no.12, 123511 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.123511 [arXiv:1608.02454 [astro-ph.CO]].

[40] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri and O. Mena, "Can interacting dark energy solve the H_0 tension?," Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.4, 043503 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.043503 [arXiv:1704.08342 [astro-ph.CO]].

[41] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, "Echo of interactions in the dark sector," Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.10, 103511 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.103511 [arXiv:1702.02143 [astro-ph.CO]].

[42] A. Gómez-Valent, V. Pettorino and L. Amendola, "Update on coupled dark energy and the H_0 tension," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.12, 123513 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.123513 [arXiv:2004.00610 [astro-ph.CO]].

[43] M. Lucca and D. C. Hooper, "Tensions in the dark: shedding light on Dark Matter-Dark Energy interactions," [arXiv:2002.06127 [astro-ph.CO]].

[44] C. Van De Bruck and J. Mifsud, "Searching for dark matter - dark energy interactions: going beyond the conformal case," Phys. Rev. D **97**, no.2, 023506 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.023506 [arXiv:1709.04882 [astro-ph.CO]].

[45] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Vagnozzi and D. F. Mota, "Tale of stable interacting dark energy, observational signatures, and the H_0 tension," JCAP **09**, 019 (2018) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/09/019 [arXiv:1805.08252 [astro-ph.CO]].

[46] W. Yang, A. Mukherjee, E. Di Valentino and S. Pan, "Interacting dark energy with time varying equation of state and the H_0 tension," Phys. Rev. D **98**, no.12, 123527 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.123527 [arXiv:1809.06883 [astro-ph.CO]].

[47] W. Yang, O. Mena, S. Pan and E. Di Valentino, "Dark sectors with dynamical coupling," Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.8, 083509 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.083509 [arXiv:1906.11697 [astro-ph.CO]].

[48] M. Martinelli, N. B. Hogg, S. Peirone, M. Bruni and D. Wands, "Constraints on the interacting vacuum–geodesic CDM scenario," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **488**, no.3, 3423-3438 (2019) doi:10.1093/mnras/stz1915 [arXiv:1902.10694 [astro-ph.CO]].

[49] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, "Interacting dark energy in the early 2020s: A promising solution to the H_0 and cosmic shear tensions," Phys. Dark Univ. **30**, 100666 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.dark.2020.100666 [arXiv:1908.04281 [astro-ph.CO]].

[50] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Vagnozzi, "Nonminimal dark sector physics and cosmological tensions," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.6, 063502 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063502 [arXiv:1910.09853 [astro-ph.CO]].

[51] V. Pettorino, "Testing modified gravity with Planck: the case of coupled dark energy," Phys. Rev. D **88**, 063519 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.063519 [arXiv:1305.7457 [astro-ph.CO]].

[52] W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan and R. C. Nunes, "All-inclusive interacting dark sector cosmologies," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.8, 083509 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083509 [arXiv:2001.10852 [astro-ph.CO]].

[53] W. Yang, S. Pan, R. C. Nunes and D. F. Mota, "Dark calling Dark: Interaction in the dark sector in presence of neutrino properties after Planck CMB final release," JCAP **04**, 008 (2020) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/04/008 [arXiv:1910.08821 [astro-ph.CO]].

[54] W. Yang, S. Pan, L. Xu and D. F. Mota, "Effects of anisotropic stress in interacting dark matter – dark energy scenarios," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **482**, no.2, 1858-1871 (2019) doi:10.1093/mnras/sty2789 [arXiv:1804.08455 [astro-ph.CO]].

[55] E. Di Valentino and O. Mena, "A fake Interacting Dark Energy detection?," [arXiv:2009.12620 [astro-ph.CO]].

[56] K. Vattis, S. M. Koushiappas and A. Loeb, "Dark matter decaying in the late Universe can relieve the H0 tension," Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.12, 121302 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.121302 [arXiv:1903.06220 [astro-ph.CO]].

[57] L. A. Anchordoqui, V. Barger, H. Goldberg, X. Huang, D. Marfatia, L. H. M. da Silva and T. J. Weiler, "IceCube neutrinos, decaying dark matter, and the Hubble constant," Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.6, 061301 (2015) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **94**, no.6, 069901 (2016)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.069901 [arXiv:1506.08788 [hep-ph]].

[58] Z. Berezhiani, A. D. Dolgov and I. I. Tkachev, "Reconciling Planck results with low redshift astronomical

measurements," Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.6, 061303 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.061303 [arXiv:1505.03644 [astro-ph.CO]].

[59] S. Carneiro, P. C. de Holanda, C. Pigozzo and F. Sobreira, "Is the H_0 tension suggesting a fourth neutrino generation?," Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.2, 023505 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.023505 [arXiv:1812.06064 [astro-ph.CO]].

[60] G. B. Gelmini, A. Kusenko and V. Takhistov, "Possible Hints of Sterile Neutrinos in Recent Measurements of the Hubble Parameter," [arXiv:1906.10136 [astro-ph.CO]].

[61] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi and A. H. Shirazi, "Ginzburg-Landau Theory of Dark Energy: A Framework to Study Both Temporal and Spatial Cosmological Tensions Simultaneously," Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.8, 083509 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.083509 [arXiv:1810.11007 [astro-ph.CO]].

[62] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi and A. H. Shirazi, "Phase transition in the dark sector as a proposal to lessen cosmological tensions," Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.12, 123521 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.123521 [arXiv:1808.02472 [astro-ph.CO]].

[63] M. Farhang and N. Khosravi, "Phenomenological Gravitational Phase Transition: Reconciliation between the Late and Early Universe," [arXiv:2011.08050 [astro-ph.CO]].

[64] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, "A Simple Phenomenological Emergent Dark Energy Model can Resolve the Hubble Tension," Astrophys. J. Lett. **883**, no.1, L3 (2019) doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab3e09 [arXiv:1906.08275 [astro-ph.CO]].

[65] S. Pan, W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, A. Shafieloo and S. Chakraborty, "Reconciling H_0 tension in a six parameter space?," JCAP **06**, no.06, 062 (2020) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/06/062 [arXiv:1907.12551 [astro-ph.CO]].

[66] X. Li and A. Shafieloo, "Evidence for Emergent Dark Energy," Astrophys. J. **902**, no.1, 58 (2020) doi:10.3847/1538-4357/abb3d0 [arXiv:2001.05103 [astro-ph.CO]].

[67] M. Rezaei, T. Naderi, M. Malekjani and A. Mehrabi, "A Bayesian comparison between ΛCDM and phenomenologically emergent dark energy models," Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, no.5, 374 (2020) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7942-6 [arXiv:2004.08168 [astro-ph.CO]].

[68] V. L. Ginzburg and L. D. Landau, "On the Theory of superconductivity," Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **20**, 1064-1082 (1950)

[69] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], "Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods," arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO].

[70] https://camb.info/

[71] A. Lewis, A. Challinor and A. Lasenby, *Efficient computation of CMB anisotropies in closed FRW models,* Astrophys. J. **538**, 473 (2000) [astro-ph/9911177].

[72] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, *Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach,* Phys. Rev. D **66**, 103511 (2002) [astro-ph/0205436].

[73] A. Lewis, "Efficient sampling of fast and slow cosmological parameters," Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 10, 103529 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.103529 [arXiv:1304.4473 [astro-ph.CO]].

[74] A. Lewis, "GetDist: a Python package for analysing Monte Carlo samples," [arXiv:1910.13970 [astro-ph.IM]].