

# Varying- $\alpha$ in scalar-tensor theory: Implications in light of the supernova absolute magnitude tension and forecast from GW standard sirens

L. R. Colaço,<sup>\*</sup> R. F. L. Holanda<sup>1,†</sup> and Rafael C. Nunes<sup>2‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte,  
Departamento de Física Teórica e Experimental,  
59300-000, Natal - RN, Brasil.*

and

<sup>2</sup>*Divisão de Astrofísica,  
Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais,  
Avenida dos Astronautas 1758,  
São José dos Campos, 12227-010, SP, Brazil*

In this work, we constraint a possible time variation of the fine structure constant ( $\alpha$ ) within the context of the so-called runaway dilaton model. The limits are performed by using the pantheon supernova Ia sample and strong gravitational lensing data, and we find that in light of the current tension on the supernova absolute magnitude  $M_B$ , a varying- $\alpha$  can be non-null at  $\sim 2\sigma$  confidence level. Motivated by this aspect, and within the methodology presented here, we perform a forecast analysis based on the generation of some gravitational-wave standard sirens mock data within the perspective of Einstein Telescope and LISA mission. We find that future standard sirens observations can come to play an important role in discrimination such theories.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Es

## I. INTRODUCTION

The possibility that the fundamental constants of nature are actually not constants, but time-evolving quantities following the slow pace of the cosmological evolution, had a long discussion in the literature. This question was probably first discussed by Dirac [1] in his “large numbers hypothesis” and by Milne, [2] introducing a possibility for a time variation of the gravitational coupling  $G$ . Jordan speculated that the fine structure constant  $\alpha$  together with  $G$  could be both space and time-dependent [3, 4] (see also [5, 6] and references therein). Later on, Brans and Dicke also proposed a time variation possibility on  $G$ , driven by a dynamical scalar field coupled to curvature [7], while Gamow also triggered subsequent speculations on the possible variation of the fine structure constant [8]. The possibility that the particle masses and the speed of light could also drift with the cosmic evolution also have been proposed and discussed [9–14]. Several other pioneers theoretical motivations have been introduced that lead to temporal variation of the constants of nature (see [15, 16] for a review related to theoretical and experimental research on the variation of the fundamental constants).

On the other hand, from a more modern perspective, the observational evidence that our Universe is currently in a stage of accelerated expansion lead us to introduce some extra degrees of freedom compared to general rel-

ativity (GR), as dark energy models and modified gravity theories, of which also predict cosmic time variation of the fundamental constants. These include scalar-tensor theories [17–20], modified Teleparallel gravity [21, 22], running vacuum models [23], Bekenstein-Sandvik-Barrow-Magueijo theory [24, 25], extra-dimensions [26], dynamical dark energy models [27–30]. Briefly, in the astronomical context, tight constraints on  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  are obtained from white dwarf observations. For instance, by using white dwarf gravitational potential, the Refs. [31, 32] put limits on  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  at the level  $(2.7 \pm 9.1) \times 10^{-5}$ . Very recently, from observations up to  $z \approx 7.14$  (by the so-called many-multiplet method), new quasars spectral observations show no evidence for a redshift variation of the fine-structure constant [33]. On the other hand, when these new measurements were combined with a large existing sample at lower redshifts, a spatial variation of  $\alpha$  was preferred over a no-variation model at the  $3.7\sigma$  level (see other discussions about possible  $\alpha$  spatial variation in [34–36]). However, it is important to comment that the authors of the Ref. [37] showed to exist a degeneracy between the absorption structure and turbulent models in quasar analyses, each giving different  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  values. Naturally, this fact adds a substantial additional random uncertainty to  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  [33].

Other tests for a possible  $\alpha$  variation have been performed by using distinct astrophysical observable, such as galaxy cluster [38], Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis [39], black hole in a high gravitational potential [40], among others [41, 42]. Variation of  $\alpha$  and  $m_e$  straightly modify the recombination history at  $z \approx 1100$ , changing the temperature and polarization anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background (see Ref. [43]). In this line, tight constraint on  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  was performed by the Planck satel-

<sup>\*</sup>Electronic address: colacolrc@gmail.com

<sup>†</sup>Electronic address: holandarfl@gmail.com

<sup>‡</sup>Electronic address: rafadcnunes@gmail.com

lite data [44, 45],  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha \approx 10^{-3}$ . However, it is worth commenting that such limit is inferred for a specific cosmological model, namely: flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, with purely adiabatic initial conditions and an almost scale-invariant power spectrum, being weakened if the parameter space is allowed to vary in the number of relativistic species or the helium abundance (see Figs. 5 and 6 in [44]). As local methods, atomic clock measurements [46], spectroscopy of radio-frequency transitions [47] and isotope ratio measurements [48] have also been used to obtain the most tight limits on  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ .

From a theoretical point of view, the Ref. [19] showed that the Einstein equivalence principle in the electromagnetic sector is violated in a general class of modified gravity theories that have a non-minimal multiplicative coupling between the usual electromagnetic part of matter fields and a new scalar field. In such a framework the entire electromagnetic sector of the theory is also affected, leading to  $\alpha$  variation. In this line, a particular class of string theory inspired-models that produce a temporal variation of alpha is the so-called runaway dilaton model [49–52] (string theories at low energy predict the existence of dilaton, a scalar partner of Spin-2 graviton). In order to check a possible temporal variation of the fine-structure constant in runaway dilaton scenarios, some methods using astronomical data have been developed in recent years[52–58].

This work is divided into two parts, first, inspired by the Ref.[54], we use geometric measurements of strong gravitational lensing and Type Ia supernovae sample to constraint a possible time evolution of the fine-structure constant induced for the well-known runaway dilaton model. In particular, the role of the tension on the supernova absolute magnitude  $M_B$  in our main results, which can lead to a preference at  $2\sigma$  confidence level (CL) on a varying- $\alpha$  theory, is discussed. In a second moment, as a step forward concerning Ref.[54], we will perform a forecast analysis based on the generation of some standard sirens catalogs within the perspective of two future gravitational waves observatories, namely, Einstein Telescope and LISA. This paper is structured as follows. Next Section we present our methodology. In Sections III and IV, we present our theoretical framework and the data sets used in this work, respectively. In Section V, we discuss the main results of our analysis. In Section VI, we outline our final considerations and perspectives.

## II. METHODOLOGY

In what follows, we describe our methodology. The Strong Gravitational Lensing (SGL) effect is one prediction of GR occurring when the source ( $s$ ), lens ( $l$ ), and the observer ( $o$ ) are at the same line-of-sight to form the Einstein ring, a ring-like structure with angular radius  $\theta_E$  [59]. It is a purely gravitational phenomenon where, in the cosmological scenario, a lens can be a foreground galaxy or galaxy cluster placed between the source and

observer. Under the assumption of the singular isothermal sphere (SIS) model, the lens mass distribution,  $\theta_E$ , is given by [59, 60]:

$$\theta_E = 4\pi \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} \frac{\sigma_{SIS}^2}{c^2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $D_{A_{ls}}$  is the angular diameter distance from the lens to source,  $D_{A_s}$  the angular diameter distance to the source,  $c$  the speed of light (SoL), and  $\sigma_{SIS}$  the velocity dispersion measured under SIS model assumption.

On galaxy scales, such a phenomenon has been largely used to ascertain gravitational and cosmological theories and fundamental physics. Particularly, SGL systems observed and detected by SLACS, LSD, SLS2, and BELLS surveys had significant progress in the last years in order to increase the accuracy of lens-modeling and obtain precise limits on distinct cosmological parameters [61–65]. For instance, [54] provided a robust test based on SGL and type Ia Supernovae observations in order to put new bounds on a possible time variation of the fine-structure constant ( $\alpha$ ). This method is based on Eq. (1) for lenses and the observational quantity  $D$  defined by:

$$D \equiv \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} = \frac{\theta_E c_s^2}{4\pi\sigma_{SIS}^2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $c_s$  is the SoL measured at  $z_s$ . In fact, [54] extended the original method provided by [66] which investigates any deviation of the Cosmic Duality Distance Relation (CDDR) through SGL and SNe Ia observations. According to the definition of the fine-structure constant ( $\alpha_s = e^2/\hbar c_s$ ), the Eq.(2) can be rewritten as:

$$D \equiv \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} = \frac{e^4 \theta_E}{\hbar^2 \alpha_s^2 4\pi \sigma_{SIS}^2}. \quad (3)$$

From another perspective, under a flat Universe assumption with comoving distance between the lens and the observer being  $r_{ls} = r_s - r_l$ , and using the relations  $r_s = (1 + z_s)D_{A_s}$ ,  $r_l = (1 + z_l)D_{A_l}$ ,  $r_{ls} = (1 + z_s)D_{A_{ls}}$ , it is possible to obtain [66]:

$$D = 1 - \frac{(1 + z_l)}{(1 + z_s)} \frac{D_{A_l}}{D_{A_s}}. \quad (4)$$

Considering a possible deviation of CDDR by  $D_{A_i} = D_{L_i}/\eta(z_i)/(1 + z_i)^2$ , we can obtain:

$$D = 1 - \frac{(1 + z_s)D_{L_l} \eta(z_s)}{(1 + z_l)D_{L_s} \eta(z_l)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $D_{L_l}$  and  $D_{L_s}$  are the luminosity distances to lens and source, respectively, and  $\eta(z_i)$  captures any deviation of CDDR.

### III. VARYING- $\alpha$ IN SCALAR-TENSOR GRAVITY

Modified gravity theories related to a non-minimal multiplicative coupling between an extra scalar field and the usual matter Lagrangian lead to violations of the Einstein Equivalence Principle (EEP) in the electromagnetic sector [19, 67]. In this context, the usual matter Lagrangian is given by [19]:

$$S_{\text{mat.}} = \sum_i \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} h_i(\phi) \mathcal{L}_i(g_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_i), \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_i$  are the Lagrangians for the different matter fields ( $\Psi_i$ ), and  $h(\phi)$  is a function of the scalar field. In the electromagnetic sector, the fine-structure constant  $\alpha$  and the CDDR change over cosmological time<sup>1</sup>, and both changes are intimately and unequivocally related by [19]:

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\alpha(z) - \alpha_0}{\alpha_0} = \frac{h(\phi_0)}{h(\phi)} - 1 = \eta^2(z) - 1 \quad (7)$$

In this work we will focus on the so-called Runaway Dilaton Model, a string theory-inspired model capable of delineating a time-variation of  $\alpha$  close to the present day [49–52, 70]. Such a model is a particular case of scalar-tensor theories of gravity inspired by a multiplicative coupling between an extra scalar-field and the usual matter Lagrangian [52]. Basically, the model explores the string-loop modification of the four-dimensional effective low-energy action. Thus, the runaway of dilaton towards strong coupling can lead to time variations of  $\alpha$ , and its variation at low and intermediate is given by [52]:

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \approx -\frac{1}{40} \beta_{\text{had},0} \phi'_0 \ln(1+z) \equiv -\gamma \ln(1+z), \quad (8)$$

where  $\gamma \equiv \frac{1}{40} \beta_{\text{had},0} \phi'_0$ ,  $\beta_{\text{had},0}$  is the current coupling value between dilaton and hadronic matter<sup>2</sup>, and  $\phi'_0 \equiv \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial \ln a}$ . It is important to stress that Eq.(8) can be considered up to redshift  $z \approx 5$  (see Ref.[52]).

Therefore, assuming  $\alpha$  evolves like  $\alpha(z) = \alpha_0 \phi(z)$ , where  $\alpha_0$  is the current value of the fine-structure constant, and  $\phi(z)$  is a scalar field that controls a time-variation of  $\alpha$ , the Eq. (7) gives  $\phi(z) = \eta^2(z)$ . Thus, the equations (3) and (5) might be written, respectively, by:

$$D = \frac{e^4 \theta_E}{4\pi \alpha_0^2 \hbar^2 \sigma_{SIS}^2} \phi^{-2}(z_s) = D_0 \phi^{-2}(z_s) \quad (9)$$

and

$$D = 1 - \frac{(1+z_s) D_{L_l} \phi^{1/2}(z_s)}{(1+z_l) D_{L_s} \phi^{1/2}(z_l)}, \quad (10)$$

where  $D_0 \equiv e^4 \theta_E / 4\pi \alpha_0^2 \hbar^2 \sigma_{SIS}^2$ . If  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha = 0$ , thus  $\phi(z) = 1$  and  $D = D_0$ . Combining Eq.s (9) and (10), it is possible to obtain:

$$D_0 = \phi^2(z_s) \left[ 1 - \frac{(1+z_s) D_{L_l} \phi^{1/2}(z_s)}{(1+z_l) D_{L_s} \phi^{1/2}(z_l)} \right]. \quad (11)$$

This is the equation we shall use to compare the model predictions with SGL, SNe Ia and GW observations.

### IV. DATA SET

In this work, we desire to constrain possible departure from EEP described above using observational data obtained by probes which map the expansion history of the late-time universe (and in particular lying in the region  $z < 3$ ). Our analysis is based on the Type Ia Supernovae distance moduli measurements from the Pantheon sample, strong gravitational lensing systems, and some mock data from gravitational wave standard sirens. In the following subsections, we present the different data sets used in our analysis.

#### A. Type Ia Supernovae

We consider the so-called Pantheon sample [71], the most recent wide refined sample of SNe Ia consisting of 1049 spectroscopically confirmed data points and covering a redshift range of  $0.01 \leq z \leq 2.3$ . We constructed the  $D_L$  sample from its apparent magnitude ( $m_b$ ) catalog and the absolute magnitude  $M_B$  through the relation

$$D_L = 10^{(m_b - M_b - 25)/5} \text{Mpc}. \quad (12)$$

Within our methodology, we must use SNe Ia at the same (or approximately)  $z$  of lens-source for each system. Thus, we make a selection according to the criteria:  $|z_s - z_{SNe}| \leq 0.005$  and  $|z_l - z_{SNe}| \leq 0.005$ . Then, we perform the weighted average for each system as [66]:

$$\bar{D}_L = \frac{\sum_i D_{L_i} / \sigma_{D_{L_i}}^2}{\sum_i 1 / \sigma_{D_{L_i}}^2}, \quad (13)$$

$$\sigma_{\bar{D}_L}^2 = \frac{1}{\sum_i 1 / \sigma_{D_{L_i}}^2}. \quad (14)$$

<sup>1</sup> In this type of theory, a variation of  $\alpha$  can arise from a varying  $\mu_0$  (vacuum permeability) or from a variation of charge of the elementary particles. Both interpretations lead to the same modified expression of  $\alpha$  [68, 69].

<sup>2</sup> The relevant parameter of the model is the coupling between dilaton and hadronic matter. The central hypothesis of the model is that all gauge fields couple to the same gauge coupling function ( $B_F(\phi)$ ) [52].

As discussed in the literature, the distance modulus is modified by the influence of a possible  $\alpha$  variation [72, 73]. However, recent analyses of [74] concluded that the parameters of SNe Ia data (from JLA [74] and Union2.1 [75] compilations) are consistent with a null variation of  $\alpha$ . Thus, we do not take into consideration  $\alpha$  variation from luminosity distances in this paper.

## B. Gravitational Wave Standard Sirens

To impose more robust and accurate constraints on parametric space  $\gamma - \Upsilon$ , let us generate some mock data inspired by the possibility of future observation of standard siren (SS) events. We will create some SS mock catalogs, the GW analog of the astronomical standard candles, which can provide powerful information about the dynamics of the Universe up to high  $z$ .

For a given a GW strain signal,  $h(t) = A(t) \cos[\Phi(t)]$ , one can use the stationary-phase approximation for the orbital phase of inspiraling binary system to obtain its Fourier transform  $\tilde{h}(f)$ . In this case, the waveform of a coalescing binary system will take the form

$$\tilde{h}(f) = Q \mathcal{A} f^{-7/6} e^{i\Phi(f)}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{A} \propto 1/d_L$  is the luminosity distance to the redshift of the merger, and  $\Phi(f)$  is the inspiral phase of the binary system. More details on the post-Newtonian coefficients and waveforms can be found in [76] (see references therein and Appendix A). Once the GW signal is defined, for a high enough signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), we can obtain upper bounds on the free parameters of the GW signal by means of the Fisher information analysis. Estimating  $D_L(z)$  from GW standard sirens mock data is a well-consolidated methodology, and we refer to [76] and the references therein for a detailed description. In what follows, we briefly describe our methodology that is used to generate the SS mock catalog from the perspective of two future observatories, namely Einstein Telescope (ET) and LISA.

The ET is a third-generation ground detector, covering the frequency range  $1 - 10^4$  Hz. The ET is expected to be ten times more sensitive than the current advanced ground-based detectors. See [77] for a presentation of the scientific objectives of the ET observatory. The ET conceptual design study predicts an order of  $10^3 - 10^7$  BNS detection per year. Nevertheless, only a small fraction ( $\sim 10^{-3}$ ) of them is expected to be accompanied by a short  $\gamma$ -ray burst observation. Assuming a detection rate of  $\mathcal{O}(10^5)$ , the events with short  $\gamma$ -ray bursts will be  $\mathcal{O}(10^2)$  per year. In our simulations, we have considered two different samples. i) A catalog with 1000 BNS mock GW SS merger events up to  $z = 2$ . In this case, we perform a random sampling of the masses from a uniform distribution between  $[1-2]M_\odot$ . Let us detonate this sample by ET - mock data 1. ii) Let us consider a mass distribution of the astrophysical objects NS and BH with a random sampling of their masses from uniform

distributions  $[1-2]M_\odot$  and  $[3-10]M_\odot$ , respectively. This catalog also contains 1000 mock GW SS merger events, but with distributed events up to  $z = 5$ . Let us detonate this sample by ET - mock data 2. For each event, we have estimated the measurement error on the luminosity distance by applying the Fisher matrix analysis. We calculated the SNR of each event and confirmed that it is a GW detection if  $\text{SNR} > 8$ . Details of this methodology are well described in previous works [76, 78, 79].

The LISA is a space-borne detector with a sensitivity peak of around 1 millihertz. Among astrophysical sources, LISA can reach include Galactic binaries, stellar-origin black hole binaries, and extreme-mass-ratio inspirals. LISA will also observe massive black hole binaries (MBHBs) from  $10^4$  to  $10^7$  solar masses. See [80] for a review of the scientific details of the LISA mission. The high SNR of the detected signals will allow for more precise parameter estimations. Among the most probable LISA sources with electromagnetic counterparts are MBHBs. In particular, MBHBs are supposed to merge in gas-rich environments and within the LISA frequency band allowing for electromagnetic followups to determine their redshift. The prospect of MBHBs which could have EM counterparts extends up to  $z \sim 7$  providing a unique probe of the universe at high  $z$ . In this work, our catalog is based on the model presented in [81], where a semi-analytic framework allows tracing the galactic baryonic structures and dark matter mergers. Also, this methodology integrates the BH seeding at high  $z$  and the delays between the merger of two galaxies and that of the massive BHs residing in the galaxies. For the purposes of the methodology of this work, we only take the category of population models named Pop III.

## C. Strong Gravitational Lensing Systems

In this section, we present a specific catalog containing 158 confirmed sources of SGL that will be used to perform the corresponding statistical analyses. Such catalog includes 118 SGL systems identical to the compilation of [59] obtained from SLOAN Lens ACS, BOSS Emission-line Lens Survey (BELLS), and Strong Legacy Survey SL2S, plus 40 new systems recently discovered by SLACS and pre-selected by [82] (see Table I in [83]).

However, different studies using SGL systems have shown that the slopes of density profiles for individual galaxies exhibit a non-negligible deviation from SIS model, indicating as an inaccurate representation for the lens mass distribution [84? -89]. Therefore, we assumed the power-law model (PLAW) for the mass distribution of lensing systems. It basically assumes a spherically symmetric mass distribution with a more general power-law index  $\Upsilon$  like  $\rho \propto r^{-\Upsilon}$ , where  $\rho$  is the total mass distribution and  $r$  is the spherical radius from the lensing galaxy center. Assuming that the velocity anisotropy can be ignored and solving the spherical Jeans equation, we can rescale the dynamical mass inside the aperture of size  $\theta_{ap}$




FIG. 1: Left panel: Luminosity distance data obtained from ET mock sample 1 (total of 119 points) together with LISA (total of 2 points). The blue data correspond to the luminosity distances from the observer to the source, and the red ones from observer to lens for each SGL system used in our analyses. Right panel: Same as in left panel, but from ET - mock data sample 2 (total of 82 points) together with LISA (total of 2 points).

projected to the lens plane and obtain

$$\theta_E = \frac{4\pi\sigma_{ap}^2}{c^2} \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} \left( \frac{\theta_E}{\theta_{ap}} \right)^{2-\Upsilon} f(\Upsilon), \quad (16)$$

where  $\sigma_{ap}$  is the stellar velocity dispersion inside the aperture  $\theta_{ap}$ , and

$$f(\Upsilon) \equiv -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{(5-2\Upsilon)(1-\Upsilon)}{3-\Upsilon} \frac{\Gamma(\Upsilon-1)}{\Gamma(\Upsilon-3/2)} \times \left[ \frac{\Gamma(\Upsilon/2-1/2)}{\Gamma(\Upsilon/2)} \right]^2. \quad (17)$$

If  $\Upsilon = 2$ , we have the SIS model. Thus, combining Eq.(s) (9) and (16), we may obtain:

$$D_0 = \frac{e^4\theta_E}{\alpha_0^2 h^2 4\pi\sigma_{ap}^2} \left( \frac{\theta_{ap}}{\theta_E} \right)^{2-\Upsilon} f^{-1}(\Upsilon). \quad (18)$$

In this paper, the factor  $\Upsilon$  and the parameter  $\gamma$  are approached as free parameters. In addition, the full SGL sample (158 data points) is culled to  $N_i$  after the following cuts:  $D_0 \pm \sigma_{D_0} < 1$  (non physical region); the system J0850-0347<sup>3</sup>; and systems that do not have the corresponding pair of  $D_L$ . Thus, we finish with the following samples: SGL + SNe Ia (total of 111 data points); SGL + ET mock data 1 (total of 119 data points); SGL + ET mock data 2 (total of 82 data points). Figure 1 shows the luminosity distances for these samples.

Data-Set	$\gamma$	$\Upsilon$
SGL + Pantheon	$-0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$1.94^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$
SGL + ET mock data 1 + LISA	$-0.08^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$2.01^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$
SGL + ET mock data 2 + LISA	$-0.07^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$1.94^{+0.06}_{-0.05}$

TABLE I: Constraints at 68% CL on the free parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\Upsilon$ .

## V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

We used Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods to estimate the posterior probability distribution functions (PDF) of free parameters supported by `emcee` MCMC sampler [90]. The likelihood is built as follows

$$\mathcal{L}(Data|\vec{\Theta}) = \prod \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_\mu} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2\right), \quad (19)$$

where

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \left[ \frac{(D_{0,i} - \zeta_i)}{\sigma_{T,i}} \right]^2, \quad (20)$$

$$\zeta_i \equiv \phi^2(z_{s,i}) \left[ 1 - \frac{(1+z_{s,i})D_{L_{l,i}} \phi^{1/2}(z_{s,i})}{(1+z_{l,i})D_{L_{s,i}} \phi^{1/2}(z_{l,i})} \right], \quad (21)$$

$$\sigma_{T,i} = (\sigma_{D_{0,i}}^2 + \sigma_{\zeta_i}^2)^{1/2}, \quad (22)$$

$$\sigma_{\zeta_i}^2 = \frac{\phi^5(z_{s,i})}{\phi(z_{l,i})} \left[ \frac{(1+z_{s,i})D_{L_{l,i}}}{(1+z_{l,i})D_{L_{s,i}}} \right]^2 Y_i, \quad (23)$$

<sup>3</sup> It deviates by more than  $5\sigma$  from all the considered models [? ].

$$Y_i \equiv \left\{ \left( \frac{\sigma_{D_{L_i,i}}}{D_{L_i,i}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma_{D_{L_s,i}}}{D_{L_s,i}} \right)^2 \right\}, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\sigma_{D_0} = D_0 \sqrt{4 \left( \frac{\sigma_{\sigma_{ap}}}{\sigma_{ap}} \right)^2 + (1 - \Upsilon)^2 \left( \frac{\sigma_{\theta_E}}{\theta_E} \right)^2}. \quad (25)$$

As mentioned before,  $\phi(z_s) = 1 - \gamma \ln(1 + z_s)$  and  $\phi(z_l) = 1 - \gamma \ln(1 + z_l)$ . The PDF posterior is proportional to the product between the likelihood and the prior, that is,

$$P(\vec{\Theta} | Data) \propto \mathcal{L}(Data | \vec{\Theta}) \times P_0(\vec{\Theta}), \quad (26)$$

where  $\vec{\Theta} = (\gamma, \Upsilon)$ . Nevertheless, we assume flat priors:  $-1 \leq \gamma \leq 1$  and  $1.5 \leq \Upsilon \leq 2.5$ . Following the approach in [91], the Einstein's radius uncertainties follows  $\sigma_E = 0.05\theta_E$  (5% for all systems). In addition, we also follow the procedure of replacing  $\sigma_{ap}$  by  $\sigma_0$  [54, 59, 65, 92]. As we deal with a set of lens located at different  $z$ ,  $\sigma_0$  makes  $D_0$  more homogeneous.

In this work, we consider two different data combinations, namely, Pantheon + SGL and GWs + SGL, applied to the cosmological model under consideration. To derive the constraints on the parameters baseline of this work, we ensure a Gelman - Rubin convergence criterion of  $R - 1 < 10^{-3}$  [93] on our chains.

In order forward in our methodology, we need to assume a value for the supernova absolute magnitude ( $M_B$ ) in Eq.(12) to turn the distance modulus into measurements constrains of the luminosity distance. As well discussed in the literature, the current  $H_0$  tension is actually a tension on the supernova absolute magnitude  $M_B$  (see [94–96]). Assuming the  $\Lambda$ CDM scenario, Planck-CMB data analysis provides  $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$  [97], which is in  $4.4\sigma$  tension with the local measurement  $H_0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$  [98] by the SH0ES team. The SH0ES team measures the absolute peak magnitude,  $M_B$ , assumed to be standard candles, by calibrating the distances of SN host galaxies to local geometric distance anchors via the Cepheid period luminosity relation. The magnitude  $M_B$  is then converted into a value of  $H_0$  via the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon SN sample [99]. Therefore, it has been argued that the  $H_0$  tension is actually a tension on the supernova absolute magnitude  $M_B$  [94, 95], because the SH0ES  $H_0$  measurement comes directly from  $M_B$  estimates. The CMB constraint on the sound horizon to the SN absolute magnitude  $M_B$  using the parametric-free inverse distance ladder predicts  $M_B = -19.401 \pm 0.027 \text{ mag}$  [100], while the the SN measurements from SH0ES corresponds to




FIG. 2: Two-dimensional joint posterior distributions in the  $\gamma$ - $\Upsilon$  plane from Pantheon + SGL, with the corresponding 68% and 95% CL contours, obtained using Gaussian prior on  $M_B$  corresponding to the SN measurements from SH0ES (in red) and inverse distance ladder (in blue). The green vertical and horizontal dashed lines correspond to the limit  $\gamma = 0$  (GR prediction) and  $\Upsilon = 2$ .

$M_B = -19.244 \pm 0.037 \text{ mag}$  [95]. These measurements are at  $3.4\sigma$  tension<sup>4</sup>.

In [54] the joint analysis Pantheon + SGL was performed based on the  $M_B$  value obtained by the SH0ES team. In this present work, we will adapt the value  $M_B = -19.244 \pm 0.037$  for two reasons. First, to maintain consistency with the observations from the CMB and BAO data and then compare with previous results obtained in [54]. Second, to perform the SS forecast analysis we need to assume a fiducial cosmology. Thus, the most natural choice is the Planck-LCDM baseline. Since this tension is still not well resolved and it is still in great debate in the literature. We fix these considerations in our main results. Table 1 summarizes the main results of our statistical analysis.

Fig. 2 shows the 2D joint posterior distributions at 68% CL and 95% CL in the  $\gamma$ - $\Upsilon$  plane for Pantheon + SGL by using the value  $M_B = -19.244 \pm 0.037$  (blue regions). We note  $\gamma = -0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$  and  $\Upsilon = 1.94^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$  at 68% CL. Therefore, we find that  $\gamma$  is non-null at  $\sim 2\sigma$  CL. In the Ref. [54] was obtained  $\gamma = -0.03^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$  at

<sup>4</sup> Very recently, a cosmological model-independent test of variability of Type Ia Supernova luminosity has been discussed in Ref.[101].




FIG. 3: Left panel: Two-dimensional joint posterior distributions in the  $\gamma$ - $\Upsilon$  plane, with the corresponding 68% CL and 95% CL contours, obtained from Pantheon + SGL (in blue) and SGL + GWs joint analysis (in red). Here the GWs joint analysis means ET - mock data 1 combined with LISA. The green vertical and horizontal dashed lines correspond to the limit  $\gamma = 0$  (GR prediction) and  $\Upsilon = 2$ . Right panel: Same as in left panel, but using ET - mock data 2 combined with LISA.

68% CL (red regions), of which is compatible with GR prediction. It is important to mention that this shift of  $2\sigma$  CL may be in view of the  $M_B$  tension. Therefore, there is a correlation between  $M_B$  and  $\gamma$ . That fact emerges as an interesting aspect, in the sense for a possibility that varying- $\alpha$  theory can directly influence in  $M_B$  and bring new perspectives in the context of the  $H_0$  tension. Our aim and methodology employed here do not allow to explore these points in more detail. We hope to fix this point in future communication. On the other hand, the SIS model is allowed ( $\Upsilon = 2$ ) by data within  $2\sigma$  CL.

From the perspective of forecast analysis, i.e., SGL + GWs, GWs from ET mock data 1 + LISA combination (see Fig. 3 on the left panel, red regions), we find  $\gamma = -0.08^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$  and  $\Upsilon = 2.01^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$  at 68% CL. This confirms that future distance luminosity measurements from GWs observation can improve the current constraint at  $\gamma$  (blue regions). Also, note that within the perspective of  $M_B$  value here, we have also  $\sim 2\sigma$  CL deviation of GR. In addition, the right panel in Fig. 3 shows the 2D joint posterior distributions at 68% CL and 95% CL in the  $\gamma$ - $\Upsilon$  plane but from the perspective of the ET mock data 2 + LISA (red regions). In this case, we find  $\gamma = -0.07^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$  and  $\Upsilon = 1.94^{+0.06}_{-0.05}$  at 68% CL. Results very similar to the previous case.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

The space-time variations in fundamental constants are expected to naturally arise from the interactions of new low mass particles appearing, for example, in theories of dark energy and modified gravity. In this work, we have investigated the time variation of the fine structure constant within the runaway dilaton model using late-time universe observation in the range  $z < 3$ . Taking the inverse distance ladder information to fix the absolute peak magnitude  $M_B$ , we show that a varying- $\alpha$  possibility can be non-null at  $2\sigma$  CL using Pantheon + SGL combination (blue regions in Fig.2).

It has been argued that the variation in  $\alpha$  can shift the time of recombination history in the early Universe and alleviate the  $H_0$  tension [102, 103]. In light of the  $M_B$ - $H_0$  tension, our results showed here that at late times evolution there is a correlation between  $M_B$  and  $\gamma$ , in the sense that these variables have a direct influence on each other. Therefore, this result can bring new perspectives and motivation to build and realization of new analysis at the late time evolution of the Universe beyond the  $\Lambda$ CDM model and GR framework to try to solve the  $H_0$  tension.

Finally, a forecast analysis based on the future GWs observations is presented. We have obtained that the method used here along with future measurements of the luminosity distances of gravitational waves sources plus SGL systems will be at least competitive with the cur-

rent analyses by using SNe Ia and SGL data (see Figs. 2 and 3). Therefore, in a near future, our approach will be able to put tighter limits on  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  by using new gravitational wave data and thousands of strong lensing systems that will be discovered by the optical and infrared data from the EUCLID mission, Vera Rubin LSST, and Nancy Grace Roman space telescope. A natural extension of this work will be to consider the role of cosmic curvature in our current results.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

RCN thank the financial support from the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP, São Paulo Research Foundation) under the project No. 2018/18036-5.

- 
- [1] P. Dirac, *Nature* **139** (1937), URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/139323a0#citeas>.
- [2] E. A. Milne, *Relativity, gravitation and world-structure* (1935).
- [3] P. Jordan, *Naturwissenschaften* **25**, 513 (1937).
- [4] P. Jordan, *Zeitschrift fur Physik* **113**, 660 (1939).
- [5] C. Burrage and J. Dombrowski, *JCAP* **2020**, 060 (2020), 2004.14260.
- [6] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, *Physics Reports* **513**, 1 (2012), 1106.2476.
- [7] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 925 (1961), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.124.925>.
- [8] G. Gamow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 759 (1967), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.759>.
- [9] A. Albrecht and J. Magueijo, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 043516 (1999), astro-ph/9811018.
- [10] G. F. R. Ellis and J.-P. Uzan, *American Journal of Physics* **73**, 240 (2005), gr-qc/0305099.
- [11] S. Cao, J. Qi, M. Biesiada, X. Zheng, T. Xu, and Z.-H. Zhu, *Astrophys. J.* **867**, 50 (2018), 1810.01287.
- [12] S. Cao, M. Biesiada, J. Jackson, X. Zheng, Y. Zhao, and Z.-H. Zhu, *JCAP* **2017**, 012 (2017), 1609.08748.
- [13] I. E. C. R. Mendonça, K. Bora, R. F. L. Holanda, S. Desai, and S. H. Pereira, *JCAP* **2021**, 034 (2021), 2109.14512.
- [14] T. Liu, S. Cao, M. Biesiada, Y. Liu, Y. Lian, and Y. Zhang, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **506**, 2181 (2021), 2106.15145.
- [15] J.-P. Uzan, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **14** (2011), ISSN 1433-8351, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2011-2>.
- [16] C. J. A. P. Martins, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80**, 126902 (2017), ISSN 1361-6633, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1361-6633/aa860e>.
- [17] Y. Fujii and K.-I. Maeda, *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation* (2003).
- [18] A. Naruko, D. Yoshida, and S. Mukohyama, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **33**, 09LT01 (2016), 1512.06977.
- [19] A. Hees, O. Minazzoli, and J. Larena, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124064 (2014), 1406.6187.
- [20] C. v. de Bruck, J. Mifsud, and N. J. Nunes, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2015**, 018–018 (2015), ISSN 1475-7516, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2015/12/018>.
- [21] R. C. Nunes, A. Bonilla, S. Pan, and E. N. Saridakis, *The European Physical Journal C* **77** (2017), ISSN 1434-6052, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4798-5>.
- [22] J. L. Said, J. Mifsud, D. Parkinson, E. N. Saridakis, J. Sultana, and K. Z. Adami, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2020**, 047–047 (2020), ISSN 1475-7516, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/11/047>.
- [23] H. Fritzsche, J. Solà, and R. C. Nunes, *The European Physical Journal C* **77** (2017), ISSN 1434-6052, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4714-z>.
- [24] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 1527 (1982).
- [25] J. D. Barrow and S. Z. W. Lip, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 023514 (2012), 1110.3120.
- [26] J. M. Overduin and P. S. Wesson, *Physics Reports* **283**, 303 (1997), gr-qc/9805018.
- [27] C. J. A. P. Martins, A. M. M. Pinho, P. Carreira, A. Gusart, J. López, and C. I. S. A. Rocha, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 023506 (2016), 1601.02950.
- [28] C. J. A. P. Martins and A. M. M. Pinho, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 103501 (2015), 1505.02196.
- [29] M. E. Mosquera and O. Civitarese, *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 045802 (2017).
- [30] Z.-E. Liu, W.-F. Liu, T.-J. Zhang, Z.-X. Zhai, and K. Bora, *Astrophys. J.* **922**, 19 (2021), 2109.00134.
- [31] S. J. Landau, *IAU Symposium* **357**, 45 (2020), 2002.00095.
- [32] M. Bainbridge, M. Barstow, N. Reindl, W. Ü. Tchang-Brillet, T. Ayres, J. Webb, J. Barrow, J. Hu, J. Holberg, S. Preval, et al., *Universe* **3**, 32 (2017), 1702.01757.
- [33] M. R. Wilczynska, J. K. Webb, M. Bainbridge, J. D. Barrow, S. E. I. Bosman, R. F. Carswell, M. P. Dabrowski, V. Dumont, C.-C. Lee, A. C. Leite, et al., *Science Advances* **6**, eaay9672 (2020), 2003.07627.
- [34] J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, M. J. Drinkwater, and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 884 (1999), astro-ph/9803165.
- [35] W. Ubachs, *Space Science Reviews* **214**, 3 (2018), 1709.07704.
- [36] D. Milaković, C.-C. Lee, R. F. Carswell, J. K. Webb, P. Molaro, and L. Pasquini, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **500**, 1 (2021), 2008.10619.
- [37] C.-C. Lee, J. K. Webb, D. Milaković, and R. F. Carswell, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **507**, 27 (2021), 2102.11648.
- [38] S. Galli, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 123516 (2013), 1212.1075.
- [39] M. T. Clara and C. J. A. P. Martins, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **633**, L11 (2020), 2001.01787.
- [40] A. Hees, T. Do, B. M. Roberts, A. M. Ghez, S. Nishiyama, R. O. Bentley, A. K. Gautam, S. Jia, T. Kara, J. R. Lu, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081101 (2020), 2002.11567.
- [41] D. Milaković, C.-C. Lee, R. F. Carswell, J. K. Webb,



- P. Molaro, and L. Pasquini, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **500**, 1 (2021), 2008.10619.
- [42] L. Kraisselburd, F. L. Castillo, M. E. Mosquera, and H. Vucetich, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 043526 (2018), 1801.08594.
- [43] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **493**, 3255 (2020), 1912.03986.
- [44] Planck Collaboration, P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, E. Battaner, et al., *Astron. & Astrophys.* **580**, A22 (2015), 1406.7482.
- [45] L. Hart and J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **474**, 1850 (2018), 1705.03925.
- [46] N. Hinkley, J. A. Sherman, N. B. Phillips, M. Schioppo, N. D. Lemke, K. Beloy, M. Pizzocaro, C. W. Oates, and A. D. Ludlow, *Science* **341**, 1215 (2013), 1305.5869.
- [47] N. Leefer, C. T. M. Weber, A. Cingöz, J. R. Torgerson, and D. Budker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 060801 (2013), 1304.6940.
- [48] E. A. Dijck, Ph.D. thesis, Groningen U. (2020).
- [49] T. Damour, F. Piazza, and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 046007 (2002), hep-th/0205111.
- [50] C. J. A. P. Martins and L. Vacher, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 123514 (2019), 1911.10821.
- [51] M. Martinelli, E. Calabrese, and C. J. A. P. Martins, in *Fourteenth Marcel Grossmann Meeting - MG14*, edited by M. Bianchi, R. T. Jansen, and R. Ruffini (2018), pp. 3664–3669.
- [52] M. Martinelli, E. Calabrese, and C. J. A. P. Martins, *JCAP* **2015**, 030 (2015), 1508.00765.
- [53] K. Bora and S. Desai, *JCAP* **2021**, 012 (2021), 2008.10541.
- [54] L. R. Colaço, R. F. L. Holanda, and R. Silva, *European Physical Journal C* **81**, 822 (2021), 2004.08484.
- [55] L. R. Colaço, R. F. L. Holanda, R. Silva, and J. S. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **2019**, 014 (2019), 1901.10947.
- [56] R. F. L. Holanda, S. J. Landau, J. S. Alcaniz, I. E. Sánchez G., and V. C. Busti, *JCAP* **2016**, 047 (2016), 1510.07240.
- [57] R. F. L. Holanda, V. C. Busti, L. R. Colaço, J. S. Alcaniz, and S. J. Landau, *JCAP* **2016**, 055 (2016), 1605.02578.
- [58] C. J. A. P. Martins, P. E. Vielzeuf, M. Martinelli, E. Calabrese, and S. Pandolfi, *Physics Letters B* **743**, 377 (2015), 1503.05068.
- [59] S. Cao, M. Biesiada, R. Gavazzi, A. Piórkowska, and Z.-H. Zhu, *Astrophys. J.* **806**, 185 (2015), 1509.07649.
- [60] S. Refsdal, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **128**, 307 (1964).
- [61] S. H. Suyu, P. J. Marshall, M. W. Auger, S. Hilbert, R. D. Blandford, L. V. E. Koopmans, C. D. Fassnacht, and T. Treu, *Astrophys. J.* **711**, 201 (2010), 0910.2773.
- [62] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger, M. W. Auger, et al., *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **498**, 1420 (2020), 1907.04869.
- [63] A. J. Shajib, S. Birrer, T. Treu, A. Agnello, E. J. Buckley-Geer, J. H. H. Chan, L. Christensen, C. Lemon, H. Lin, M. Millon, et al., *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **494**, 6072 (2020), 1910.06306.
- [64] S. Birrer, A. J. Shajib, A. Galan, M. Millon, T. Treu, A. Agnello, M. Auger, G. C. F. Chen, L. Christensen, T. Collett, et al., *Astron. & Astrophys.* **643**, A165 (2020), 2007.02941.
- [65] L. R. Colaço, J. E. Gonzalez, and R. F. L. Holanda, *European Physical Journal C* **81**, 533 (2021), 2010.04021.
- [66] R. F. L. Holanda, V. C. Busti, F. S. Lima, and J. S. Alcaniz, *JCAP* **2017**, 039 (2017), 1611.09426.
- [67] O. Minazzoli and A. Hees, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 023017 (2014), 1404.4266.
- [68] J.-P. Uzan, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **14**, 2 (2011), 1009.5514.
- [69] A. Hees, O. Minazzoli, and J. Larena, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **47**, 9 (2015), 1409.7273.
- [70] T. Damour, F. Piazza, and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 081601 (2002), gr-qc/0204094.
- [71] D. M. Scolnic, D. O. Jones, A. Rest, Y. C. Pan, R. Chornock, R. J. Foley, M. E. Huber, R. Kessler, G. Narayan, A. G. Riess, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), 1710.00845.
- [72] T. Chiba and K. Kohri, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **110**, 195 (2003), astro-ph/0306486.
- [73] L. Kraisselburd, S. J. Landau, C. Negrelli, and E. García-Berro, *Astrophys. and Space Science* **357**, 4 (2015), 1412.3418.
- [74] C. Negrelli, L. Kraisselburd, S. Landau, and E. García-Berro, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **27**, 1850099 (2018), 1804.01521.
- [75] N. Suzuki, D. Rubin, C. Lidman, G. Aldering, R. Amanullah, K. Barbary, L. F. Barrientos, J. Botyanszki, M. Brodwin, N. Connolly, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **746**, 85 (2012), 1105.3470.
- [76] R. D’Agostino and R. C. Nunes, *Physical Review D* **100** (2019), ISSN 2470-0029, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.044041>.
- [77] M. Maggiore, C. V. D. Broeck, N. Bartolo, E. Belgacem, D. Bertacca, M. A. Bizouard, M. Branchesi, S. Clesse, S. Foffa, J. García-Bellido, et al., *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2020**, 050–050 (2020), ISSN 1475-7516, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/03/050>.
- [78] W. Zhao, C. Van Den Broeck, D. Baskaran, and T. G. F. Li, *Physical Review D* **83** (2011), ISSN 1550-2368, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.83.023005>.
- [79] R.-G. Cai and T. Yang, *Physical Review D* **95** (2017), ISSN 2470-0029, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.044024>.
- [80] P. A.-S. et al, *Laser interferometer space antenna* (2017), 1702.00786.
- [81] N. Tamanini, C. Caprini, E. Barausse, A. Sesana, A. Klein, and A. Petiteau, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2016**, 002–002 (2016), ISSN 1475-7516, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2016/04/002>.
- [82] Y. Shu, J. R. Brownstein, A. S. Bolton, L. V. E. Koopmans, T. Treu, A. D. Montero-Dorta, M. W. Auger, O. Czoske, R. Gavazzi, P. J. Marshall, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **851**, 48 (2017), 1711.00072.
- [83] K. Leaf and F. Melia, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **478**, 5104 (2018), 1805.08640.
- [84] L. V. E. Koopmans, A. Bolton, T. Treu, O. Czoske, M. W. Auger, M. Barnabè, S. Vegetti, R. Gavazzi, L. A. Moustakas, and S. Burles, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **703**, L51 (2009), 0906.1349.
- [85] M. W. Auger, T. Treu, A. S. Bolton, R. Gavazzi, L. V. E. Koopmans, P. J. Marshall, L. A. Moustakas, and S. Burles, *Astrophys. J.* **724**, 511 (2010), 1007.2880.

- [86] M. Barnabè, O. Czoske, L. V. E. Koopmans, T. Treu, and A. S. Bolton, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **415**, 2215 (2011), 1102.2261.
- [87] A. Sonnenfeld, T. Treu, R. Gavazzi, S. H. Suyu, P. J. Marshall, M. W. Auger, and C. Nipoti, *Astrophys. J.* **777**, 98 (2013), 1307.4759.
- [88] S. Cao, M. Biesiada, M. Yao, and Z.-H. Zhu, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **461**, 2192 (2016), 1604.05625.
- [89] Y. Chen, R. Li, Y. Shu, and X. Cao, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **488**, 3745 (2019), 1809.09845.
- [90] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *PASP* **125**, 306 (2013), 1202.3665.
- [91] C. Grillo, M. Lombardi, and G. Bertin, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **477**, 397 (2008), 0711.0882.
- [92] I. Jorgensen, M. Franx, and P. Kjaergaard, *Mont. Not. Royal. Astron. Soc.* **276**, 1341 (1995).
- [93] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin, *Statistical Science* **7**, 457 (1992), URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1177011136>.
- [94] G. Efstathiou, *To  $h0$  or not to  $h0$ ?* (2021), 2103.08723.
- [95] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **504**, 5164–5171 (2021), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab1200>.
- [96] R. C. Nunes and E. Di Valentino, *Physical Review D* **104** (2021), ISSN 2470-0029, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063529>.
- [97] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), 1807.06209.
- [98] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, and D. Scolnic, *Astrophys. J.* **876**, 85 (2019), 1903.07603.
- [99] D. M. Scolnic et al., *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), 1710.00845.
- [100] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **495**, 2630–2644 (2020), ISSN 1365-2966, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa770>.
- [101] D. Kumar, A. Rana, D. Jain, S. Mahajan, A. Mukherjee, and R. F. L. Holanda, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2107.04784 (2021), 2107.04784.
- [102] N. Schöneberg, G. F. Abellán, A. P. Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues (2021), 2107.10291.
- [103] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **38**, 153001 (2021), ISSN 1361-6382, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/ac086d>.