

ΛCDM IS ALIVE AND WELL

ALAIN BLANCHARD

Université de Toulouse, UPS-OMP, IRAP, CNRS, 14 Avenue Edouard Belin, F-31400 Toulouse, France

JEAN-YVES HÉLORET

Université de Toulouse, UPS-OMP, IRAP, CNRS, 14 Avenue Edouard Belin, F-31400 Toulouse, France

STÉPHANE ILIĆ

Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, IJCLab, 91405 Orsay, France

Centre National d'Études Spatiales, Toulouse, France and
 IRAP, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, CNES, UPS, Toulouse, France

BRAHIM LAMINE

Université de Toulouse, UPS-OMP, IRAP, CNRS, 14 Avenue Edouard Belin, F-31400 Toulouse, France

ISAAC TUTUSAUS

Université de Genève, Département de Physique Théorique and Centre for Astroparticle Physics, 24 quai Ernest-Ansermet, CH-1211
 Genève 4, Switzerland

Institute of Space Sciences (ICE, CSIC), Campus UAB, Carrer de Can Magrans, s/n, 08193 Barcelona, Spain

Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya (IEEC), Carrer Gran Capità 2-4, 08193 Barcelona, Spain and

Université de Toulouse, UPS-OMP, IRAP, CNRS, 14 Avenue Edouard Belin, F-31400 Toulouse, France

(Dated: February 15, 2023)

Version February 15, 2023

ABSTRACT

Despite its successes, the ΛCDM model faces several tensions with recent cosmological data and their increased accuracy. The mismatch between the values of the Hubble constant H_0 obtained from direct distance ladder measurements and from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) is the most statistically significant, but the amplitude of the matter fluctuations is also regarded as a serious concern, leading to the investigation of a plethora of models.

Here, we examine the situation from a different perspective. We first show that the combination of several recent measurements from local probes leads to a tight constraint on the present-day matter density Ω_M as well as on the amplitude of the matter fluctuations, both acceptably consistent with the values inferred from the CMB. Secondly, we address the Hubble tension by assuming that some determinations of the value of H_0 are possibly biased. We treat such a bias as a nuisance parameter within ΛCDM and we examine such “ΛCDM+ H_0 bias” models on the same statistical grounds as alternative cosmological models. We show that the former produces improvements in terms of ΔAIC that supersede existing extended models proposed up to now. In a third step, we show that the value of Ω_M we obtained, combined with SH0ES determination of H_0 , leads to an accurate measurement of the density parameter of the Universe $\omega_M = 0.1753 \pm 0.0069$, thereby providing an additional low-redshift test for cosmological models. From this test, most ΛCDM extensions seem to be confronted with a new tension as many of them cluster around $\omega_M = 0.14$, while there is no tension with a local $H_0 \sim 67$ km/s/Mpc. We conclude that a standard ΛCDM model with an unknown bias in the Cepheids distance calibration represents a model that reaches a remarkable agreement, statistically better than previously proposed extensions without bias for which such a comparison can be performed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concordance model in cosmology, ΛCDM, is extremely successful in accounting for most of the current cosmological observations with great precision (Weinberg *et al.* 2013). Indeed, the accuracy of data has remarkably improved: cosmic microwave background (CMB) measurements with Planck have achieved sub-percent accuracy, reaching a precision of the order of one percent for ΛCDM parameters, providing accurate reference values for the parameters of the standard model (Planck Collaboration *et al.* 2020). After the discovery of the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) peak (Eisenstein *et al.* 2005),

the properties of the 3D matter distribution in the late Universe (roughly at redshifts $z < 3$) have been sampled thanks to larger and larger galaxy (and quasars) surveys. One of the most recent instances has been provided by the final eBOSS survey, the culmination of more than twenty years of efforts (Alam *et al.* 2021a). Moreover, large-area deep photometric surveys are now providing additional direct information on the total matter distribution through weak lensing measurements, such as the latest DES Year 3 (DES Y3) results (Abbott *et al.* 2022). Finally, the Hubble diagram of type Ia supernovae, historically the first evidence for an accelerated expansion

(Riess *et al.* 1998; Perlmutter *et al.* 1999), is reaching high statistical power (Betoule *et al.* 2014; Brout *et al.* 2022).

On the other hand, this model also faces important problems, one of which is its inability to elucidate the mystery of the cosmological constant Λ , which remains an *ad hoc* addition to general relativity, introduced to explain the late-stage accelerated expansion of the Universe. While this constant behaves in the same way as a vacuum energy, its value is many orders of magnitude smaller than the estimations of quantum field theory (Weinberg 1989). Finding a solution with $\Lambda = 0$ would solve one aspect of this problem, since it would be compatible with a renormalization to zero – a more natural value compared to the current estimations of Λ . This has motivated the search for alternatives to a genuine cosmological constant for the origin of cosmic acceleration, either in the form of additional fields contributing to the energy density budget, or modifications of gravity at large scales.

Looking for viable alternatives is comforted by the emergence of so-called tensions between predictions of the standard Λ CDM (normalized from Planck) and several observational quantities. Such tensions already exist – and were noticed – from the CMB data as it prefers models with $w \sim -1.5$ and a non zero-curvature $\Omega_k \sim -0.05$ (Planck Collaboration *et al.* 2020). These tensions have been regarded as a reliable indication for the necessity of alternative models (Di Valentino *et al.* 2021a; Abdalla *et al.* 2022) (a broader discussion on the incompleteness of the Λ CDM can be found in Peebles (2022)). This class of models is dubbed “extensions” of Λ models. However, combining measurements of the BAO scale and CMB data restricts considerably the kind of alternative to the standard model (Blanchard *et al.* 2006) and relatively contrived models are needed.

Additionally, during recent years tensions between several observationally-inferred cosmological parameters have emerged mostly between values inferred from early-physics data (CMB anisotropies, BAO scale) and measurements performed from the local Universe, in particular the distance ladder. From Planck data the present day Hubble constant (within standard Λ CDM) is expected to be $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54$ km/s/Mpc (Planck Collaboration *et al.* 2020). The BAO scales measured from different redshift surveys combined with Big Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) constraints on Ω_b allows us to tightly constrain the Hubble constant (Aubourg *et al.* 2015). Using this method the eBOSS surveys covering the redshift range $0.1 \leq z \leq 2$, lead to $H_0 = 67.35 \pm 0.97$ km/s/Mpc (Alam *et al.* 2021a). This value conflicts with several measurements of the local expansion rate, the most discrepant being the recent values obtained by the SH0ES team (Riess *et al.* 2021) $H_0 = 73.3 \pm 1.04$ km/s/Mpc. Although many disagreements have been noticed between the standard model and astronomical observations (Bull *et al.* 2016), the amplitude of matter fluctuations at low redshift is regarded as the next most serious concern (Di Valentino *et al.* 2021b), even though the solution to it might be found in the standard model itself (Amon and Efstathiou 2022).

In this paper, we present a different view on the treatment of tensions. We want to investigate the possibility of the presence of systematics in some data, and in such

cases quantify the corresponding statistical gain for the Λ CDM model in comparison to physical extensions. We first examine the so-called S_8 tension and then examine the possible existence of a bias affecting distance ladder measurements. Finally, we point out that the reduced matter density parameter of the Universe ω_M provides a well-measured quantity at low redshift allowing for a new test to distinguish between competitive models.

2. THE AMPLITUDE OF MATTER FLUCTUATIONS

The amplitude of matter fluctuations is usually expressed by σ_8 , i.e. in term of the average r.m.s fluctuation in a sphere of $8h^{-1}$ Mpc. However, probes of matter fluctuations such as the abundance of clusters are sensitive to a combination of Ω_M and σ_8 . This has led to the introduction of another parameter:

$$S_8 = \sigma_8 \left(\frac{\Omega_M}{0.3} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (1)$$

which for clusters is much less sensitive to Ω_M . Still S_8 may vary with Ω_M for other probes. Therefore the dependence on Ω_M is to be taken into account for model comparison.

Redshift space distortions (RSD) are used to extract relevant information on the amplitude of matter fluctuations from redshift surveys. The velocity field is sensitive to $f\sigma_8$ where f is the linear growth rate ($= d \ln D / d \ln a$), D being the linear growth function ($\delta(a) = \delta_0 D(a)$). Survey analysis can therefore be used to put constraints in the $f\sigma_8 - \Omega_M$ plane (Percival and White 2009; Benisty 2021). However, existing measurements are not always independent. Some such as the eBOSS measurements were extensively tested against mock samples. Recently, it has been shown that the eBOSS measurements, assuming Planck CMB priors for all cosmological parameters but σ_8 , leads to a high value of S_8 (Blanchard and Ilić 2021). In the following, in order to achieve accurate measurements without using Planck priors, we use a large set of RSD measurements which we selected to be independent, following closely the approach in Avila *et al.* (2022). To achieve this, we regard data from different surveys as being independent from each other when they cover different sky areas for the same tracer, disjointed redshift bins for the same tracer, and overlapping redshift bins but with different tracers. We use the latest measurements when the same survey was analysed several times. We also remove measurements that used a fiducial model for σ_8 .

Our final sample is presented in Table 1. Fitting a Λ CDM model to this dataset leads to $\Omega_M = 0.349^{+0.043}_{-0.054}$ and $S_8 = 0.818^{+0.039}_{-0.036}$. These values and their uncertainties are similar to those obtained by Avila *et al.* (2022). There is a clear degeneracy in the $\Omega_M - f\sigma_8$ plane. It is therefore convenient to combine them with other low-redshift probes in order to restrict the range of Ω_M . We use first the latest Pantheon+ result from which was derived for the Λ CDM model $\Omega_M = 0.338 \pm 0.018$ (Brout *et al.* 2022), and secondly the DES Y3 3×2 pt analysis (Abbott *et al.* 2022). The Pantheon+ measurement is interesting as it provides a tight measurement of the density parameter Ω_M from low-redshift data (in Λ CDM).

Survey	z	$f\sigma_8$	Refs
2MFT	0	$0.505^{+0.089}_{-0.079}$	Howlett <i>et al.</i> (2017)
6dFGS	0.067	0.423 ± 0.055	Beutler <i>et al.</i> (2012)
SDSS DR13	0.1	0.48 ± 0.16	Feix <i>et al.</i> (2017)
2dFGRS	0.17	0.51 ± 0.06	Song and Percival (2009)
GAMA	0.2	0.43 ± 0.05	Alam <i>et al.</i> (2021b)
WiggleZ	0.22	0.42 ± 0.07	Blake <i>et al.</i> (2011)
BOSS LOW Z	0.25	0.471 ± 0.024	Lange <i>et al.</i> (2022)
GAMA	0.38	0.44 ± 0.06	Blake <i>et al.</i> (2013)
BOSS LOW Z	0.4	0.431 ± 0.025	Lange <i>et al.</i> (2022)
WiggleZ	0.41	0.45 ± 0.04	Blake <i>et al.</i> (2011)
CMASS BOSS	0.57	$0.453 \pm 0.022^\dagger$	Nadathur <i>et al.</i> (2019)
WiggleZ	0.6	0.43 ± 0.04	Blake <i>et al.</i> (2011)
VIPERS	0.6	$0.48 \pm 0.12^\ddagger$	de la Torre <i>et al.</i> (2017)
SDSS IV	0.69	0.447 ± 0.039	Nadathur <i>et al.</i> (2020)
SDSS IV	0.77	0.432 ± 0.038	Wang <i>et al.</i> (2020)
WiggleZ	0.78	0.38 ± 0.04	Blake <i>et al.</i> (2011)
SDSS IV	0.85	0.52 ± 0.10	Aubert <i>et al.</i> (2020)
VIPERS	0.86	$0.48 \pm 0.10^\ddagger$	de la Torre <i>et al.</i> (2017)
SDSS IV	0.978	$0.379 \pm 0.176^\dagger$	Zhao <i>et al.</i> (2019)
SDSS IV	1.23	$0.385 \pm 0.1^\dagger$	Zhao <i>et al.</i> (2019)
FastSound	1.4	$0.494^{+0.126}_{-0.120}$	Okumura <i>et al.</i> (2016)
SDSS IV	1.52	0.426 ± 0.077	Zarrouk <i>et al.</i> (2018)
SDSS IV	1.944	$0.364 \pm 0.106^\dagger$	Zhao <i>et al.</i> (2019)

TABLE 1

SELECTED VALUES OF $f\sigma_8(z)$ MEASURED FROM REDSHIFT SPACE DISTORTION USED IN THIS WORK. † : OBTAINED FROM RSD COMBINED WITH ALCOCK-PACZYNSKI. ‡ : FOR VIPERS WE USED THEIR VALUES OF f AND $\sigma_8(z)$.

When combined with our RSD sample, we obtained :

$$\Omega_M = 0.34^{+0.017}_{-0.017} \quad (2)$$

$$S_8 = 0.811^{+0.021}_{-0.021}. \quad (3)$$

The combination with local constraints on Ω_M raised up the final value. We also noticed that replacing the various SDSS measurements by the values summarized in Alam *et al.* (2021a) can lead to a shift in the value of best model from RSD data alone, while we obtained very stable values when combined with Pantheon+ (or other tight constraints on Ω_M). Unsurprisingly, the central value of Ω_M is close to the Pantheon+ value, but the implication for S_8 is interesting: its uncertainties are noticeably reduced and the central value is increased, making it in good agreement with Planck ($S_8 = 0.834 \pm 0.016$, $\Omega_M = 0.315 \pm 0.0084$), in line with Blanchard and Ilić (2021), but now obtained without priors from the early Universe. It should be borne in mind, however, that RSD data are still suspected of being subject to unidentified systematics (Yu *et al.* 2022).

Weak lensing surveys are a major source of direct information on the dark matter distribution. As it is commonly the case for cosmological probes, they provide tight constraints on a combination of σ_8 and Ω_M . They may however be affected by subtle unidentified biases (Schneider *et al.* 2021; Efsthathiou and Lemos 2018). The 3×2 pt analysis of DES Y3 data provides a measurement of $S_8 = 0.776 \pm 0.017$ (Abbott *et al.* 2022), which is claimed to be consistent with Planck. Combining these data with the constraints we derived from RSD, we obtain $\Omega_M = 0.322 \pm 0.016$ and a slightly higher amplitude with smaller uncertainties: $S_8 = 0.788 \pm 0.012$. The three datasets (RSD, Pantheon+, DES Y3) can be assumed to be independent, as they represent different probes over different areas of the sky. This leads to a value of Ω_M




FIG. 1.— Confidence contours (68 and 95%) from RSD and other data combinations. The red lines are for DES Y3 3×2 pt constraints. The tight final contours (green) are obtained from low-redshift data only.

which is tightly constrained:

$$\Omega_M = 0.33 \pm 0.012. \quad (4)$$

We also obtained a value of

$$S_8 = 0.790 \pm 0.012. \quad (5)$$

These numbers are also consistent with the DES Y3 analysis (Abbott *et al.* 2022) (see their Table II).

Those results are summarized in Figure 1. The final constraint on S_8 is in reasonable agreement with Planck CMB, although S_8 differs at a 2.2σ level, a conclusion similar to Nunes and Vagnozzi (2021) based on slightly different RSD data combined with Pantheon and BAO. Such a level of disagreement is not to be regarded as problematic in the context of model comparisons, especially given the possible non-Gaussian distribution of the measured quantities derived from weak lensing (Schöneberg *et al.* 2021). We also combine our values with the recent S_8 obtained from KiDS by Loureiro *et al.* (2021) ($S_8 = 0.754^{+0.027}_{-0.029}$) and found $S_8 = 0.789^{+0.016}_{-0.016}$. The various datasets and combinations used in the present work are all based on low-redshift probes. We conclude from this study that no stringent tension exists on the amplitude of matter fluctuations when comparing estimates from local probes with ones deduced from Planck in the Λ CDM model. For the sake of completeness we combine our constraints with those from Planck and obtain $\Omega = 0.3082 \pm 0.0055$ and $S_8 = 0.813^{+0.010}_{-0.009}$, in agreement with the DES Y3 and KiDS-1000 S_8 (Heymans *et al.* 2021) being slightly below 2.2σ away.

3. THE HUBBLE CONSTANT

3.1. The tension

The tension on the Hubble constant H_0 has been extensively addressed in the recent literature. The SH0ES team recently provided a value that leads to the most stringent disagreement from a single measurement: $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04$ km/s/Mpc (Riess *et al.* 2021). This value yields a $\sim 5\sigma$ disagreement with the Planck value: $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54$ km/s/Mpc. The situation worsens because

on one hand several measurements of the Hubble constant from local probes lead to values consistent with the SH0ES value, while on the other hand the BAO length scale in combination with primordial nucleosynthesis and the SNIa Hubble diagram leads to a value consistent with Planck's one (Aubourg *et al.* 2015). Using this approach, the recent eBOSS analysis concluded to $H_0 = 67.35 \pm 0.97$ km/s/Mpc (Alam *et al.* 2021a). The inconsistency of the values can be measured from the combination of the most illustrative Hubble constant measurements: in the following we used the value derived by the Carnegie–Chicago Hubble Project (CCHP) based on the tip of the red giant branch to calibrate the distance ladder, measuring $H_0 = 69.6 \pm 1.9$ km/s/Mpc (Freedman *et al.* 2020). We also use the value obtained by the Megamaser Cosmology Project (MCP) leading to $H_0 = 73.9 \pm 3.0$ km/s/Mpc (Pesce *et al.* 2020), as well as three other recent measurements: the Tully–Fisher method (TF) leading to $H_0 = 75.1 \pm 3.0$ km/s/Mpc (Kourkchi *et al.* 2020), the surface brightness fluctuation method (SBF) leading to $H_0 = 73.7 \pm 2.4$ (Blakeslee *et al.* 2021) and the method based on Mira variables, combined with additional calibration, leading to $H_0 = 73.3 \pm 4$. Huang *et al.* (2020). Time-delay in gravitational lenses is also often quoted, but their inferred value is known to depend on the mass modelling (Shajib *et al.* 2022), preventing it from being used efficiently for now. Gravitational wave (GW) events are another promising technique, but the most stringent value obtained up to now is $H_0 = 67.6 \pm 4.2$ km/s/Mpc (Mukherjee *et al.* 2020). Quoted uncertainties are often dominated by systematic effects. It is interesting to notice that the TF and SBF methods rely on Cepheids calibration, as does the SH0ES approach. Taking the measurements from Planck, BAO, SH0ES, CCHP, MCP, TF, SBF and Miras the statistical average is $H_0 = 68.8 \pm 0.4$ km/s/Mpc (due to the high weight of the Planck value), but with a $\chi^2 \sim 37$ which is high, indicating the strong inconsistency between the values. This is commonly interpreted as the signature of a tension between values derived from early-physics considerations¹ and present-day values derived from the distance ladder (Verde *et al.* 2019; Abdalla *et al.* 2022), given their concordance. However the situation is not entirely clear: from Cepheids and TRGB-calibrated SNIa, one of the reported determination of H_0 was 63.7 ± 2.3 km/s/Mpc (Tammann and Reindl 2013). This value, as well as the one based on GW is not used in the following. Finally, let us have a look at an other probe: the cosmic chronometers data (CC), based on the differential age of passively evolving galaxies. This can be used to determine the Hubble rate at different redshifts and thereby to estimate cosmological parameters including the Hubble constant (Jimenez and Loeb 2002). This method has been used in the past to infer H_0 (Gómez-Valent and Amendola 2018), but the accuracy of this method is limited by the uncertainties on other cosmological parameters, including the dark energy equation of state. However, here we want to estimate H_0 for a

Λ CDM model restricted to matter density inferred from Pantheon+: $\Omega_M = 0.338 \pm 0.018$ (Brout *et al.* 2022). To do so, we use the latest compilation from (Vagnozzi *et al.* 2021) (Table 1) and we fit the Hubble constant:

$$H(z) = H_0 (\Omega_M(1+z)^3 + 1 - \Omega_M)^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

The narrow range of values of Ω_M from Pantheon+ (Brout *et al.* 2022) is added as a prior and allows us to derive an accurate value of the Hubble constant ($H_0 = 67.4 \pm 1.34$ km/s/Mpc) in good agreement with value inferred from early physics within the Λ CDM model. When added to the above set of Hubble constant determinations, this value does not change any of the previous conclusions: the values of H_0 , ($= 68.6 \pm 0.4$ km/s/Mpc) and of the χ^2 (~ 38) are almost unchanged.

However, because ages are derived from the complex modelling of the star population synthesis and stellar population properties, one may be concerned by the existence of a possible bias. Indeed, estimation of possible astrophysical uncertainties in the modelling leads to wider error bars $H_0 = 66.5 \pm 5.44$ km/s/Mpc (Moresco *et al.* 2022), making this determination of little weight and is therefore not used in the following. Such concern about possible unidentified bias should also be applied to the other Hubble measurements (Freedman 2021). Clearly, the necessity for new physics is required only if one is confident that there is no significant systematic error left over (Abdalla *et al.* 2022). Indeed the possibility of a bias in the H_0 determination is seriously taken in consideration by some authors in the field (Freedman 2021; Freedman *et al.* 2021). For instance, (Mortsell *et al.* 2021) claims that Cepheids calibration systematics may shift down the Hubble constant by 5 km/s/Mpc, which would essentially remove the discrepancy between the SH0ES value and the early physics ones. Recently, it was proposed that a different prior on dust extinction could lead to a shift in the preferred color correction for SN and thereby on the value of the Hubble constant (Wojtak and Hjorth 2022). It is generally argued that the various methods used to derive the Hubble constant provide evidence that the tension is real and cannot be attributed to a possible bias in a single measurement. Hence, a plethora of models have been proposed in order to solve this issue, see for instance the impressive compilation from Di Valentino *et al.* (2021c).

3.2. Methodology

There are many tools proposed to quantify the respective merit of different models when compared to data, in particular in situations where "tensions" exist. A standard way to compare the merit of these models is to compute the amount by which their (best-fit) χ^2 on the data improves compared to the Λ CDM model and/or examine the improvement provided in terms of the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC):

$$\Delta\text{AIC} = \Delta\chi^2 + 2\Delta p. \quad (7)$$

This metric allows us to compare the improvement in χ^2 but penalizes the addition of new parameters (the Δp term). In the present work, we want to perform a statistical approach and comparison taking into account a possible systematic effect in one of the measurements.

¹ The consistency of values derived from early physics has been recently reinforced by (Philcox *et al.* 2022) who derived $H_0 = 64.6 \pm 2.4$ km/s/Mpc from a combination of late-Universe data used to measure the scale associated to the horizon at matter-radiation equality, in a sound horizon-independent way.

For this, we consider the presence of an unknown parameter α that allows one observed measured quantity to shift. We determine this parameter by minimizing the χ^2 :

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(H_0 - \alpha_i \times H_{0,i})^2}{\sigma_i^2} \quad (8)$$

(α_i is set to 1 except for measurements that we regarded as possibly biased, for which $\alpha_i = \alpha$ is our single free parameter. $H_{0,i}$ are the measures used and σ_i their uncertainty) and the improvements in terms of χ^2 and AIC. Treating such a possible bias as an additional parameter of the Λ CDM allows to consider it as an "extension" of the basic model and to make a statistical comparison.

3.3. Results

In our models, named E1 to E5, we respectively assume the presence of an unknown bias in i) the SH0ES data (**E1**), ii) the Cepheids calibration thereby affecting in an identical way SH0ES, TF, and SBF data, (**E2**) iii) H_0 from BAO data (**E3**), iv) H_0 from Planck data (**E4**), and v) H_0 from Planck and BAO data (**E5**). The results are summarized in Table 2. From this table, one can compare improvements against Jeffrey's scale: a value of ΔAIC below -10 is considered to be a very strong evidence (Nesseris and García-Bellido 2013). From our results, it appears that a bias in any single determination of the Hubble constant – except from BAO (model E3) – produces such strong evidence. In other words, the determination of the Hubble constant from the BAO does not change appreciably the level of disagreement among the other determinations. On the contrary, if one assumes that SH0ES is affected by some unknown bias (model E1), the ΔAIC is -17.7, an evidence which is very strong and performing better than any model examined in Schöneberg *et al.* (2021). However, the value of the χ^2 falls to ~ 17.3 which remains not particularly good for seven degrees of freedom. This supports the qualitative impression that removing SH0ES does not bring a particularly good agreement between the remaining determinations. A bias in any other single low-redshift determination of H_0 does not produce any appreciable improvement.

For comparison, we include a model in which it is assumed that the Planck value is biased (model E4). The improvement in AIC is ~ -16 ; few models among the extensions already investigated in the past reach such level of improvement. Model E5 is a model in which we assume that both CMB and BAO are affected by an identical bias. The improvement is then similar to the one obtained in model E2: $\Delta\text{AIC} \sim -30$.

However, as mentioned earlier several methods used to infer the Hubble constant rely on the Cepheids calibration. Therefore a bias in this calibration would affect in a similar way *all* these determinations. Assuming such a bias (model E2) would affect not only SH0ES but also the surface brightness method as well as the Tully-Fisher one. Under this hypothesis, still adding only one parameter to the Λ CDM, we obtain a χ^2 of 6.7 and a ΔAIC of -26.3. Recently several review papers addressed various Λ CDM extensions that may relieve the H_0 tension among which Di Valentino *et al.* (2021c,b). Schöneberg *et al.* (2021) performed a quantitative investigation of

Model	χ^2	ΔAIC
Λ CDM	37.0	–
Λ CDM E1	17.3	-17.7
Λ CDM E2	6.7	-26.3
Λ CDM E3	34.4	-0.6
Λ CDM E4	19.2	-15.76
Λ CDM E5	4.3	-30.7

TABLE 2
QUANTITATIVE SUCCESS OF THE Λ CDM WHEN SOME (UNKNOWN) BIAS IS ASSUMED FOR ONE (TWO FOR E5) H_0 MEASUREMENTS AMONG THE SET USED (PLANCK, BAO, SH0ES, CCHP, MCP, TF, SBF, MIRAS).

the performance of various Λ CDM extensions. In this work, improvements in models were examined through three distinct metrics: the Gaussian Tension (GT), the change in the effective χ^2 , and the improvement in AIC. We can therefore compare directly and quantitatively the improvement from our Table II to the models they investigated².

We conclude from this comparison that the possibility of a bias in the Cepheids calibration leads to an improvement in χ^2 (-30) and in AIC (-26.3) that no extension of the Λ CDM model investigated in Schöneberg *et al.* (2021) has reached. It can be noted that only a model that would escape CMB and BAO constraints (E5) will achieve a comparable improvement. It will interesting to see in the future if any theoretical model can reach such a level of improvement.

4. MORE TENSION THAN H_0 : THE MATTER DENSITY OF THE UNIVERSE

The physical density of the Universe is measured by the parameter ω_M :

$$\omega_M = \Omega_M h^2, \quad (9)$$

which is accurately determined from Planck data:

$$\omega_M = 0.1424 \pm 0.0012, \quad (10)$$

with an accuracy of 0.85%, which is strictly valid only for Λ CDM. The observed CMB angular power spectrum (C_l) is primarily the result of the physical evolution of fluctuations in the early Universe and the distance to the last scattering surface (LSS) (Blanchard 1984). The early physics depends on physical densities of the various fluids, i.e. photons, baryons, and dark matter, and on the expansion rate at that time. With standard physics in the early Universe (before LSS) the density in radiation is well known and consequently the densities of the other fluids are accurately constrained. "Early cosmological parameters", including ω_M , can therefore be constrained without assumptions on the late-time evolution: Vonlanthen *et al.* (2010); Audren *et al.* (2013) found uncertainties two times larger than with the standard model, staying within the 1σ interval of the latter. The other ingredient, the distance to the LSS, is also well constrained but provides a quantity in which the Hubble constant is degenerate to first order. This is illustrated by the behavior of ω_M versus w in w CDM. See for instance Haridasu *et al.* (2021): from their Fig. 2, it is clear that ω_M constraints are nearly independent of w). This degeneracy

² Because our χ^2 is derived directly from H_0 measurements and uncertainties, the GT is less relevant in our case.




FIG. 2.— Histogram of the preferred value of ω_M for a series of Λ CDM extensions, adjusted to CMB data (see (Di Valentino *et al.* 2021c) for the comprehensive list). The black vertical line is our ω_M estimation for Λ CDM models from local data (12), the yellow area corresponds to the 1σ region.

prevents an accurate determination of H_0 from the CMB only. In extended models, it is therefore natural to expect that the matter density of the Universe ω_M remains tightly constrained given the observed $\mathcal{C}_l$, while the Hubble constant may be more sensitive to the details of the model. Extensions of Λ CDM that provide a good fit to the observed $\mathcal{C}_l$ are therefore expected to have a (total) matter density close to the above value. To check this in a more quantitative way, we use the compilation of references from (Di Valentino *et al.* 2021c) to produce the histogram of ω_M values obtained from all models when fitting the Planck $\mathcal{C}_l$ (and using the FIRAS determination of the value of the temperature of the CMB³). This histogram is shown in our Fig. 2. As anticipated, values of ω_M are clustered around the best Λ CDM value: their average and standard deviation are 0.1409 ± 0.011 , similar to the Planck determination (10). This is coherent with the fact that ω_M is robustly constrained from the CMB in a relatively model-independent way (some points lie on the low end of the scale, corresponding to some interacting dark energy models). Furthermore, the recent sound horizon-independent constraints Philcox *et al.* (2022) obtained from large-scale structure data in the late Universe are leading to values in the range

$$\omega_M = 0.1425 \pm 0.007, \quad (11)$$

providing relevant information on cosmological parameters from early physics, complementary to those provided by the CMB. Another recent estimation of cosmological parameters from early-time physics (at matter-radiation equality epoch) from the full transfer function yields $\omega_M \sim 0.14$ with small uncertainties (Brieden *et al.* 2022). These values can be compared to the one we can derive from our estimate (4) of Ω_M , using the SH0ES determination of the Hubble constant $H_0 = 73$ km/s/Mpc:

$$\omega_M = 0.1753 \pm 0.0069. \quad (12)$$

This value is more than 4σ away from Planck pre-

³ Ivanov *et al.* (2020) have investigated the consequences of relaxing the temperature of the CMB from the FIRAS determination, and found a best-fit value of $H_0 \sim 55$ and $\Omega_M \sim 0.75$, i.e. $\omega_M \sim 0.23$. The inclusion of BAO data brings back the density to 0.1394.

ferred value (10). Using $H_0 = 67$ km/s/Mpc yields $\omega_M = 0.1447 \pm 0.0058$, a value higher but fully consistent with the Planck derived value⁴. The Pantheon+ 1σ region is shown as a yellow band in Fig. 2. Clearly, no model sits in the preferred region of Pantheon+SH0ES, and most fall outside of its 3σ range. Because the late-time expansion of these models does not necessarily follow Λ CDM (i.e. as produced by a dark energy fluid with $w = -1$), a fully quantitative comparison cannot be performed. However, the level of disagreement is so strikingly large that one may conclude it will be difficult for this type of models to be in agreement with the value of ω_M obtained with the combined Pantheon+SH0ES data.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In recent years, the Λ CDM model has been regarded as being in tension with the Hubble constant measurements in the local Universe, as well as with the amplitude of matter fluctuations although at a lower statistical level of significance. One convenient way to quantify the merit of alternative models is through two metrics: the improvement in the χ^2 and in the AIC. With the most recent data on the amplitude of matter fluctuations from RSD data, we show that some difference between values inferred from the CMB and values inferred from local probes persists but at a moderate level of disagreement. The tension on the value of the Hubble constant is the most statistically significant one. Ref. Schöneberg *et al.* (2021) provides a comprehensive investigation of the relative merit of extended models using the above-mentioned metrics. It is currently recognised that there is no satisfying physical solution to the Hubble tension (Linder 2023). It remains possible that the tension is due to an incompleteness of the LCDM or to some unidentified systematics (Shah *et al.* 2021).

This clearly calls for considering the option of a possible bias in the values inferred from local data. Treating statistically such potential bias as a nuisance parameter, and using the same metrics than Schöneberg *et al.* (2021), through Eq. 8 and 7, we performed a statistical comparison. This is summarized in our table 2. We found that models with bias in H_0 can lead to a highly significant improvement in χ^2 and in AIC compared to existing proposed Λ CDM extensions. If one assumes that such a bias is on the Cepheids distance scale, affecting several of the Hubble constant measurements, the gain in AIC supersedes all published models. Finally, introducing a new ingredient for model comparison, we showed that most models from a compilation of nearly 200 extensions lead to a value of the reduced density parameter ω_M at odds with the value inferred from Pantheon+SH0ES or Pantheon+SH0ES+RSD+DESY3 (although a direct, fully significant comparison remains to be done). We conclude that the case for the Λ CDM model plus some bias in the Cepheid calibration is statistically preferred over the cases with extended models (from a large class proposed in recent years) plus no Cepheid bias. This indicates that if the cosmological tensions find a solution in an extension of GR, the late

⁴ In other words the Planck central value of ω_M and the Pantheon+ determination of Ω_M point towards $H_0 = 65 \pm 2$ km/s/Mpc in Λ CDM.

expansion of the universe should be different from the one of Λ CDM model. GAIA and JWST are expected to provide many improvements on the calibration issues in the coming years Shah *et al.* (2021), and could therefore shed light on this issue.

We thank G. Efstathiou, J. Lesgourgues, M. Moresco

and A. Riess for valuable comments on the manuscript. SI thanks the Centre national d’études spatiales (CNES) which supports his postdoctoral research contract. IT acknowledges funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 863929; project title “Testing the law of gravity with novel large-scale structure observables”).

REFERENCES

- D. H. Weinberg, M. J. Mortonson, D. J. Eisenstein, C. Hirata, A. G. Riess, and E. Rozo, *Phys. Rep.* **530**, 87 (2013), arXiv:1201.2434 [astro-ph.CO].
- Planck Collaboration, N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, R. Battye, K. Benabed, J. P. Bernard, M. Bersanelli, P. Bielewicz, J. J. Bock, J. R. Bond, J. Borrill, F. R. Bouchet, F. Boulanger, M. Bucher, C. Burigana, R. C. Butler, E. Calabrese, J. F. Cardoso, J. Carron, A. Challinor, H. C. Chiang, J. Chluba, L. P. L. Colombo, C. Combet, D. Contreras, B. P. Crill, F. Cuttaia, P. de Bernardis, G. de Zotti, J. Delabrouille, J. M. Delouis, E. Di Valentino, J. M. Diego, O. Doré, M. Douspis, A. Ducout, X. Dupac, S. Dusini, G. Efstathiou, F. Elsner, T. A. Enßlin, H. K. Eriksen, Y. Fantaye, M. Farhang, J. Fergusson, R. Fernandez-Cobos, F. Finelli, F. Forastieri, M. Frailis, A. A. Fraisse, E. Franceschi, A. Frolov, S. Galeotta, S. Galli, K. Ganga, R. T. Génova-Santos, M. Gerbino, T. Ghosh, J. González-Nuevo, K. M. Górski, S. Gratton, A. Gruppiso, J. E. Gudmundsson, J. Hamann, W. Handley, F. K. Hansen, D. Herranz, S. R. Hildebrandt, E. Hivon, Z. Huang, A. H. Jaffe, W. C. Jones, A. Karakci, E. Keihänen, R. Kesitalo, K. Kiiveri, J. Kim, T. S. Kisner, L. Knox, N. Krachmalnicoff, M. Kunz, H. Kurki-Suonio, G. Lagache, J. M. Lamarre, A. Lasenby, M. Lattanzi, C. R. Lawrence, M. Le Jeune, P. Lemos, J. Lesgourgues, F. Levrier, A. Lewis, M. Liguori, P. B. Lilje, M. Lilley, V. Lindholm, M. López-Caniego, P. M. Lubin, Y. Z. Ma, J. F. Macías-Pérez, G. Maggio, D. Maino, N. Mandolesi, A. Mangilli, A. Marcos-Caballero, M. Maris, P. G. Martin, M. Martinelli, E. Martínez-González, S. Matarrese, N. Mauri, J. D. McEwen, P. R. Meinhold, A. Melchiorri, A. Mennella, M. Migliaccio, M. Millea, S. Mitra, M. A. Miville-Deschênes, D. Molinari, L. Montier, G. Morgante, A. Moss, P. Natoli, H. U. Nørgaard-Nielsen, L. Pagano, D. Paoletti, B. Partridge, G. Patanchon, H. V. Peiris, F. Perrotta, V. Pettorino, F. Piacentini, L. Polastri, G. Polenta, J. L. Puget, J. P. Rachen, M. Reinecke, M. Remazeilles, A. Renzi, G. Rocha, C. Rosset, G. Roudier, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, B. Ruiz-Granados, L. Salvati, M. Sandri, M. Savelainen, D. Scott, E. P. S. Shellard, C. Sirignano, G. Sirri, L. D. Spencer, R. Sunyaev, A. S. Suur-Uski, J. A. Tauber, D. Tavagnacco, M. Tenti, L. Toffolatti, M. Tomasi, T. Trombetti, L. Valenziano, J. Valiviita, B. Van Tent, L. Vibert, P. Vielva, F. Villa, N. Vittorio, B. D. Wandelt, I. K. Wehus, M. White, S. D. M. White, A. Zacchei, and A. Zonca, *A&A* **641**, A6 (2020), arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- D. J. Eisenstein, I. Zehavi, D. W. Hogg, R. Scoccimarro, M. R. Blanton, R. C. Nichol, R. Scranton, H.-J. Seo, M. Tegmark, Z. Zheng, S. F. Anderson, J. Annis, N. Bahcall, J. Brinkmann, S. Burles, F. J. Castander, A. Connolly, I. Csabai, M. Doi, M. Fukugita, J. A. Frieman, K. Glazebrook, J. E. Gunn, J. S. Hendry, G. Hennessy, Z. Ivezić, S. Kent, G. R. Knapp, H. Lin, Y.-S. Loh, R. H. Lupton, B. Margon, T. A. McKay, A. Meiksin, J. A. Munn, A. Pope, M. W. Richmond, D. Schlegel, D. P. Schneider, K. Shimasaku, C. Stoughton, M. A. Strauss, M. SubbaRao, A. S. Szalay, I. Szapudi, D. L. Tucker, B. Yanny, and D. G. York, *ApJ* **633**, 560 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0501171 [astro-ph].
- S. Alam, M. Aubert, S. Avila, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, M. A. Bershad, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, A. S. Bolton, J. Bovy, J. Brinkmann, J. R. Brownstein, E. Burtin, S. Chabanier, M. J. Chapman, P. D. Choi, C.-H. Chuang, J. Comparat, M.-C. Cousinou, A. Cuceu, K. S. Dawson, S. de la Torre, A. de Mattia, V. d. S. Agathe, H. d. M. des Bourbonx, S. Escoffier, T. Etourneau, J. Farr, A. Font-Ribera, P. M. Frinchaboy, S. Fromenteau, H. Gil-Marín, J.-M. Le Goff, A. X. Gonzalez-Morales, V. Gonzalez-Perez, K. Grabowski, J. Guy, A. J. Hawken, J. Hou, H. Kong, J. Parker, M. Klaene, J.-P. Kneib, S. Lin, D. Long, B. W. Lyke, A. de la Macorra, P. Martini, K. Masters, F. G. Mohammad, J. Moon, E.-M. Mueller, A. Muñoz-Gutiérrez, A. D. Myers, S. Nadathur, R. Neveux, J. A. Newman, P. Noterdaeme, A. Oravetz, D. Oravetz, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, K. Pan, R. Paviot, W. J. Percival, I. Pérez-Ràfols, P. Petitjean, M. M. Pieri, A. Prakash, A. Raichoor, C. Ravoux, M. Rezaie, J. Rich, A. J. Ross, G. Rossi, R. Ruggeri, V. Ruhlmann-Kleider, A. G. Sánchez, F. J. Sánchez, J. R. Sánchez-Gallego, C. Sayres, D. P. Schneider, H.-J. Seo, A. Shafieloo, A. Slosar, A. Smith, J. Stermer, A. Tamone, J. L. Tinker, R. Tojeiro, M. Vargas-Magaña, A. Variu, Y. Wang, B. A. Weaver, A.-M. Weijmans, C. Yèche, P. Zarrouk, C. Zhao, G.-B. Zhao, and Z. Zheng, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083533 (2021a), arXiv:2007.08991 [astro-ph.CO].
- T. M. C. Abbott, M. Aguena, A. Alarcon, S. Allam, O. Alves, A. Amon, F. Andrade-Oliveira, J. Annis, S. Avila, D. Bacon, E. Baxter, K. Bechtol, M. R. Becker, G. M. Bernstein, S. Bhargava, S. Birrer, J. Blazek, A. Brandao-Souza, S. L. Bridle, D. Brooks, E. Buckley-Geer, D. L. Burke, H. Camacho, A. Campos, A. Carnero Rosell, M. Carrasco Kind, J. Carrtero, F. J. Castander, R. Cawthon, C. Chang, A. Chen, R. Chen, A. Choi, C. Conselice, J. Cordero, M. Costanzi, M. Crocce, L. N. da Costa, M. E. da Silva Pereira, C. Davis, T. M. Davis, J. De Vicente, J. DeRose, S. Desai, E. Di Valentino, H. T. Diehl, J. P. Dietrich, S. Dodelson, P. Doel, C. Doux, A. Drlica-Wagner, K. Eckert, T. F. Eifler, F. Elsner, J. Elvin-Poole, S. Everett, A. E. Evrard, X. Fang, A. Farahi, E. Fernandez, I. Ferrero, A. Ferté, F. Fosalba, O. Friedrich, J. Frieman, J. García-Bellido, M. Gatti, E. Gaztanaga, D. W. Gerdes, T. Giannantonio, G. Giannini, D. Gruen, R. A. Gruendl, J. Gschwend, G. Gutierrez, I. Harrison, W. G. Hartley, K. Herner, S. R. Hinton, D. L. Hollowood, K. Honscheid, B. Hoyle, E. M. Huff, D. Huterer, B. Jain, D. J. James, M. Jarvis, N. Jeffrey, T. Jeltema, A. Kovacs, E. Krause, R. Kron, K. Kuehn, N. Kuropatkin, O. Lahav, P. F. Leget, P. Lemos, A. R. Liddle, C. Lidman, M. Lima, H. Lin, N. MacCrann, M. A. G. Maia, J. L. Marshall, P. Martini, R. McCullough, P. Melchior, J. Mena-Fernández, F. Menanteau, R. Miquel, J. J. Mohr, R. Morgan, J. Muir, J. Myles, S. Nadathur, A. Navarro-Alsina, R. C. Nichol, R. L. C. Ogando, Y. Omori, A. Palmese, S. Pandey, Y. Park, F. Paz-Chinchón, D. Petravick, A. Pieres, A. A. Plazas Malagón, A. Porredon, J. Prat, M. Raveri, M. Rodríguez-Monroy, R. P. Rollins, A. K. Romer, A. Roodman, R. Rosenfeld, A. J. Ross, E. S. Rykoff, S. Samuroff, C. Sánchez, E. Sanchez, J. Sanchez, D. Sanchez Cid, V. Scarpine, M. Schubnell, D. Scolnic, L. F. Secco, S. Serrano, I. Sevilla-Noarbe, E. Sheldon, T. Shin, M. Smith, M. Soares-Santos, E. Suchyta, M. E. C. Swanson, M. Tabbbutt, G. Tarle, D. Thomas, C. To, A. Troja, M. A. Troxel, D. L. Tucker, I. Tutusaus, T. N. Varga, A. T. Walker, N. Weaverdyck, R. Wechsler, J. Weller, B. Yanny, B. Yin, Y. Zhang, J. Zuntz, and DES Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 023520 (2022), arXiv:2105.13549 [astro-ph.CO].

- A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, B. Leibundgut, M. M. Phillips, D. Reiss, B. P. Schmidt, R. A. Schommer, R. C. Smith, J. Spyromilio, C. Stubbs, N. B. Suntzeff, and J. Tonry, *AJ* **116**, 1009 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9805201 [astro-ph].
- S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, I. M. Hook, A. G. Kim, M. Y. Kim, J. C. Lee, N. J. Nunes, R. Pain, C. R. Pennypacker, R. Quimby, C. Lidman, R. S. Ellis, M. Irwin, R. G. McMahon, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, N. Walton, B. Schaefer, B. J. Boyle, A. V. Filippenko, T. Matheson, A. S. Fruchter, N. Panagia, H. J. M. Newberg, W. J. Couch, and T. S. C. Project, *ApJ* **517**, 565 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9812133 [astro-ph].
- M. Betoule, R. Kessler, J. Guy, J. Mosher, D. Hardin, R. Biswas, P. Astier, P. El-Hage, M. König, S. Kuhlmann, J. Marriner, R. Pain, N. Regnault, C. Balland, B. A. Bassett, P. J. Brown, H. Campbell, R. G. Carlberg, F. Cellier-Holzem, D. Cinabro, A. Conley, C. B. D'Andrea, D. L. DePoy, M. Doi, R. S. Ellis, S. Fabbro, A. V. Filippenko, R. J. Foley, J. A. Frieman, D. Fouchez, L. Galbany, A. Goobar, R. R. Gupta, G. J. Hill, R. Hlozek, C. J. Hogan, I. M. Hook, D. A. Howell, S. W. Jha, L. Le Guillou, G. Leloudas, C. Lidman, J. L. Marshall, A. Möller, A. M. Mourão, J. Neveu, R. Nichol, M. D. Olmstead, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, S. Perlmutter, J. L. Prieto, C. J. Pritchett, M. Richmond, A. G. Riess, V. Ruhlmann-Kleider, M. Sako, K. Schahmanche, D. P. Schneider, M. Smith, J. Sollerman, M. Sullivan, N. A. Walton, and C. J. Wheeler, *A&A* **568**, A22 (2014), arXiv:1401.4064 [astro-ph.CO].
- D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, A. Carr, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton, D. Jones, W. D. Kenworthy, E. R. Peterson, K. Said, G. Taylor, N. Ali, P. Armstrong, P. Charvu, A. Dwomoh, A. Palmese, H. Qu, B. M. Rose, C. W. Stubbs, M. Vincenzi, C. M. Wood, P. J. Brown, R. Chen, K. Chambers, D. A. Coulter, M. Dai, G. Dimitriadis, A. V. Filippenko, R. J. Foley, S. W. Jha, L. Kelsey, R. P. Kirshner, A. Möller, J. Muir, S. Nadathur, Y.-C. Pan, A. Rest, C. Rojas-Bravo, M. Sako, M. R. Siebert, M. Smith, B. E. Stahl, and P. Wiseman, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2202.04077 (2022), arXiv:2202.04077 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Weinberg, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, 1 (1989).
- E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *ApJ* **908**, L9 (2021a), arXiv:2003.04935 [astro-ph.CO].
- E. Abdalla, G. F. Abellán, A. Aboubrahim, A. Agnello, Ö. Akarsu, Y. Akrami, G. Alestas, D. Aloni, L. Amendola, L. A. Anchordoqui, R. I. Anderson, N. Arendse, M. Asgari, M. Ballardini, V. Barger, S. Basilakos, R. C. Batista, E. S. Battistelli, R. Battye, M. Benetti, D. Benisty, A. Berlin, P. de Bernardis, E. Berti, B. Bilenko, S. Birrer, J. P. Blakeslee, K. K. Boddy, C. R. Bom, A. Bonilla, N. Borghi, F. R. Bouchet, M. Braglia, T. Buchert, E. Buckley-Geer, E. Calabrese, R. R. Caldwell, D. Camarena, S. Capozziello, S. Casertano, G. C. F. Chen, J. Chluba, A. Chen, H.-Y. Chen, A. Chudaykin, M. Cicoli, C. J. Copi, F. Courbin, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, B. Czerny, M. Dainotti, G. D'Amico, A.-C. Davis, J. de Cruz Pérez, J. de Haro, J. Delabrouille, P. B. Denton, S. Dhawan, K. R. Dienes, E. Di Valentino, P. Du, D. Eckert, C. Escamilla-Rivera, A. Ferté, F. Finelli, P. Fosalba, W. L. Freedman, N. Frusciante, E. Gaztañaga, W. Giarè, E. Giusarma, A. Gómez-Valent, W. Handley, I. Harrison, L. Hart, D. K. Hazra, A. Heavens, A. Heinen, H. Hildebrandt, J. C. Hill, N. B. Hogg, D. E. Holz, D. C. Hooper, N. Hosseininejad, D. Huterer, M. Ishak, M. M. Ivanov, A. H. Jaffe, I. S. Jang, K. Jedamzik, R. Jimenez, M. Joseph, S. Joudaki, M. Kamionkowski, T. Karwal, L. Kazantzidis, R. E. Keeley, M. Klase, E. Komatsu, L. V. E. Koopmans, S. Kumar, L. Lamagna, R. Lazkoz, C.-C. Lee, J. Lesgourgues, J. Levi Said, T. R. Lewis, B. L'Huillier, M. Lucca, R. Maartens, L. M. Macri, D. Marfatia, V. Marra, C. J. A. P. Martins, S. Masi, S. Matarrese, A. Mazumdar, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, L. Mersini-Houghton, J. Mertens, D. Milaković, Y. Minami, V. Miranda, C. Moreno-Pulido, M. Moresco, D. F. Mota, E. Mottola, S. Mozzon, J. Muir, A. Mukherjee, S. Mukherjee, P. Naselsky, P. Nath, S. Nesseris, F. Niedermann, A. Notari, R. C. Nunes, E. Ó Colgáin, K. A. Owens, E. Özülker, F. Pace, A. Paliathanasis, A. Palmese, S. Pan, D. Paoletti, S. E. Perez Bergliaffa, L. Perivolaropoulos, D. W. Pesce, V. Pettorino, O. H. E. Philcox, L. Pogosian, V. Poulin, G. Poulot, M. Raveri, M. J. Reid, F. Renzi, A. G. Riess, V. I. Sabla, P. Salucci, V. Salzano, E. N. Saridakis, B. S. Sathiyaprakash, M. Schmaltz, N. Schöneberg, D. Scolnic, A. A. Sen, N. Sehgal, A. Shafieloo, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, J. Silk, A. Silvestri, F. Skara, M. S. Sloth, M. Soares-Santos, J. Solà Peracaula, Y.-Y. Songsheng, J. F. Soriano, D. Staicova, G. D. Starkman, I. Szapudi, E. M. Teixeira, B. Thomas, T. Treu, E. Trott, C. van de Bruck, J. A. Vazquez, L. Verde, L. Visinelli, D. Wang, J.-M. Wang, S.-J. Wang, R. Watkins, S. Watson, J. K. Webb, N. Weiner, A. Weltman, S. J. Witte, R. Wojtak, A. K. Yadav, W. Yang, G.-B. Zhao, and M. Zumalacárregui, *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics* **34**, 49 (2022), arXiv:2203.06142 [astro-ph.CO].
- P. J. E. Peebles, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.05018 (2022), arXiv:2208.05018 [astro-ph.CO].
- A. Blanchard, M. Douspis, M. Rowan-Robinson, and S. Sarkar, *A&A* **449**, 925 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0512085 [astro-ph].
- É. Aubourg, S. Bailey, J. E. Bautista, F. Beutler, V. Bhardwaj, D. Bizyaev, M. Blanton, M. Blomqvist, A. S. Bolton, J. Bovy, H. Brewington, J. Brinkmann, J. R. Brownstein, A. Burden, N. G. Busca, W. Carithers, C.-H. Chuang, J. Comparat, R. A. C. Croft, A. J. Cuesta, K. S. Dawson, T. Delubac, D. J. Eisenstein, A. Font-Ribera, J. Ge, J. M. Le Goff, S. G. A. Gontcho, J. R. Gott, J. E. Gunn, H. Guo, J. Guy, J.-C. Hamilton, S. Ho, K. Honscheid, C. Howlett, D. Kirkby, F. S. Kitaura, J.-P. Kneib, K.-G. Lee, D. Long, R. H. Lupton, M. V. Magaña, V. Malanushenko, E. Malanushenko, M. Manera, C. Maraston, D. Margala, C. K. McBride, J. Miralda-Escudé, A. D. Myers, R. C. Nichol, P. Noterdaeme, S. E. Nuza, M. D. Olmstead, D. Oravetz, I. Pâris, N. Padmanabhan, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, K. Pan, M. Pellejero-Ibanez, W. J. Percival, P. Petitjean, M. M. Pieri, F. Prada, B. Reid, J. Rich, N. A. Roe, A. J. Ross, N. P. Ross, G. Rossi, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, A. G. Sánchez, L. Samushia, R. T. Génova-Santos, C. G. Scóccola, D. J. Schlegel, D. P. Schneider, H.-J. Seo, E. Sheldon, A. Simmons, R. A. Skibba, A. Slosar, M. A. Strauss, D. Thomas, J. L. Tinker, R. Tojeiro, J. A. Vazquez, M. Viel, D. A. Wake, B. A. Weaver, D. H. Weinberg, W. M. Wood-Vasey, C. Yèche, I. Zehavi, G.-B. Zhao, and BOSS Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 123516 (2015), arXiv:1411.1074 [astro-ph.CO].

- A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, L. Breuval, T. G. Brink, A. V. Filippenko, S. Hoffmann, S. W. Jha, W. D. Kenworthy, J. Mackenty, B. E. Stahl, and W. Zheng, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2112.04510 (2021), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO].
- P. Bull, Y. Akrami, J. Adamek, T. Baker, E. Bellini, J. Beltrán Jiménez, E. Bentivegna, S. Camera, S. Clesse, J. H. Davis, E. Di Dio, J. Enander, A. Heavens, L. Heisenberg, B. Hu, C. Linares, R. Maartens, E. Mörtzell, S. Nadathur, J. Noller, R. Pasechnik, M. S. Pawlowski, T. S. Pereira, M. Quartin, A. Ricciardone, S. Riemer-Sørensen, M. Rinaldi, J. Sakstein, I. D. Saltas, V. Salzano, I. Sawicki, A. R. Solomon, D. Spolyar, G. D. Starkman, D. Steer, I. Tereno, L. Verde, F. Villaescusa-Navarro, M. von Strauss, and H. A. Winther, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **12**, 56 (2016), arXiv:1512.05356 [astro-ph.CO].
- E. Di Valentino, L. A. Anchordoqui, Ö. Akarsu, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, L. Amendola, N. Arendse, M. Asgari, M. Ballardini, S. Basilakos, E. Battistelli, M. Benetti, S. Birrer, F. R. Bouchet, M. Bruni, E. Calabrese, D. Camarena, S. Capozziello, A. Chen, J. Chluba, A. Chudaykin, E. Ó. Colgáin, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, P. de Bernardis, J. de Cruz Pérez, J. Delabrouille, J. Dunkley, C. Escamilla-Rivera, A. Ferté, F. Finelli, W. Freedman, N. Frusciante, E. Giusarma, A. Gómez-Valent, W. Handley, I. Harrison, L. Hart, A. Heavens, H. Hildebrandt, D. Holz, D. Huterer, M. M. Ivanov, S. Joudaki, M. Kamionkowski, T. Karwal, L. Knox, S. Kumar, L. Lamagna, J. Lesgourgues, M. Lucca, V. Marra, S. Masi, S. Matarrese, A. Mazumdar, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, L. Mersini-Houghton, V. Miranda, C. Moreno-Pulido, D. F. Mota, J. Muir, A. Mukherjee, F. Niedermann, A. Notari, R. C. Nunes, F. Pace, A. Paliathanasis, A. Palmese, S. Pan, D. Paoletti, V. Pettorino, F. Piacentini, V. Poulin, M. Raveri, A. G. Riess, V. Salzano, E. N. Saridakis, A. A. Sen, A. Shafieloo, A. J. Shajib, J. Silk, A. Silvestri, M. S. Sloth, T. L. Smith, J. Solà Peracaula, C. van de Bruck, L. Verde, L. Visinelli, B. D. Wandelt, D. Wang, J.-M. Wang, A. K. Yadav, and W. Yang, *Astroparticle Physics* **131**, 102604 (2021b), arXiv:2008.11285 [astro-ph.CO].
- A. Amon and G. Efstathiou, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2206.11794 (2022), arXiv:2206.11794 [astro-ph.CO].
- W. J. Percival and M. White, *MNRAS* **393**, 297 (2009), arXiv:0808.0003 [astro-ph].
- D. Benisty, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **31**, 100766 (2021), arXiv:2005.03751 [astro-ph.CO].
- A. Blanchard and S. Ilić, *A&A* **656**, A75 (2021), arXiv:2104.00756 [astro-ph.CO].
- F. Avila, A. Bernui, A. Bonilla, and R. C. Nunes, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2201.07829 (2022), arXiv:2201.07829 [astro-ph.CO].
- C. Howlett, L. Staveley-Smith, P. J. Elahi, T. Hong, T. H. Jarrett, D. H. Jones, B. S. Koribalski, L. M. Macri, K. L. Masters, and C. M. Springob, *MNRAS* **471**, 3135 (2017), arXiv:1706.05130 [astro-ph.CO].
- F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, G. B. Poole, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, *MNRAS* **423**, 3430 (2012), arXiv:1204.4725 [astro-ph.CO].
- M. Feix, E. Branchini, and A. Nusser, *MNRAS* **468**, 1420 (2017), arXiv:1612.07809 [astro-ph.CO].
- Y.-S. Song and W. J. Percival, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2009**, 004 (2009), arXiv:0807.0810 [astro-ph].
- S. Alam, J. A. Peacock, D. J. Farrow, J. Loveday, and A. M. Hopkins, *MNRAS* **503**, 59 (2021b), arXiv:2006.05383 [astro-ph.CO].
- C. Blake, S. Brough, M. Colless, C. Contreras, W. Couch, S. Croom, T. Davis, M. J. Drinkwater, K. Forster, D. Gilbank, M. Gladders, K. Glazebrook, B. Jelliffe, R. J. Jurek, I. H. Li, B. Madore, D. C. Martin, K. Pimblett, G. B. Poole, M. Pracy, R. Sharp, E. Wisnioski, D. Woods, T. K. Wyder, and H. K. C. Yee, *MNRAS* **415**, 2876 (2011), arXiv:1104.2948 [astro-ph.CO].
- J. U. Lange, A. P. Hearin, A. Leauthaud, F. C. van den Bosch, H. Guo, and J. DeRose, *MNRAS* **509**, 1779 (2022), arXiv:2101.12261 [astro-ph.CO].
- C. Blake, I. K. Baldry, J. Bland-Hawthorn, L. Christodoulou, M. Colless, C. Conselice, S. P. Driver, A. M. Hopkins, J. Liske, J. Loveday, P. Norberg, J. A. Peacock, G. B. Poole, and A. S. G. Robotham, *MNRAS* **436**, 3089 (2013), arXiv:1309.5556 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Nadathur, P. M. Carter, W. J. Percival, H. A. Winther, and J. E. Bautista, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023504 (2019), arXiv:1904.01030 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. de la Torre, E. Jullo, C. Giocoli, A. Pezzotta, J. Bel, B. R. Granett, L. Guzzo, B. Garilli, M. Scodeggio, M. Bolzonella, U. Abbas, C. Adami, D. Bottini, A. Cappi, O. Cucciati, I. Davidzon, P. Franzetti, A. Fritz, A. Iovino, J. Krywult, V. Le Brun, O. Le Fèvre, D. Maccagni, K. Malek, F. Marulli, M. Polletta, A. Pollo, L. A. M. Tasca, R. Tojeiro, D. Vergani, A. Zanichelli, S. Arnouts, E. Branchini, J. Coupon, G. De Lucia, O. Ilbert, T. Moutard, L. Moscardini, J. A. Peacock, R. B. Metcalf, F. Prada, and G. Yepes, *A&A* **608**, A44 (2017), arXiv:1612.05647 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Nadathur, A. Woodfinden, W. J. Percival, M. Aubert, J. Bautista, K. Dawson, S. Escoffier, S. Fromenteau, H. Gil-Marín, J. Rich, A. J. Ross, G. Rossi, M. V. Magaña, J. R. Brownstein, and D. P. Schneider, *MNRAS* **499**, 4140 (2020), arXiv:2008.06060 [astro-ph.CO].
- Y. Wang, G.-B. Zhao, C. Zhao, O. H. E. Philcox, S. Alam, A. Tamone, A. de Mattia, A. J. Ross, A. Raichoor, E. Burtin, R. Paviot, S. de la Torre, W. J. Percival, K. S. Dawson, H. Gil-Marín, J. E. Bautista, J. Hou, K. Koyama, J. A. Peacock, V. Ruhlmann-Kleider, H. d. M. d. Bourboux, C.-H. Chuang, J. Comparat, S. Escoffier, J.-P. Kneib, E.-M. Mueller, J. A. Newman, G. Rossi, A. Shafieloo, and D. P. Schneider, *MNRAS* **498**, 3470 (2020), arXiv:2007.09010 [astro-ph.CO].
- M. Aubert, M.-C. Cousinou, S. Escoffier, A. J. Hawken, S. Nadathur, S. Alam, J. Bautista, E. Burtin, A. de Mattia, H. Gil-Marín, J. Hou, E. Jullo, R. Neveux, G. Rossi, A. Smith, A. Tamone, and M. Vargas Magaña, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2007.09013 (2020), arXiv:2007.09013 [astro-ph.CO].
- G.-B. Zhao, Y. Wang, S. Saito, H. Gil-Marín, W. J. Percival, D. Wang, C.-H. Chuang, R. Ruggeri, E.-M. Mueller, F. Zhu, A. J. Ross, R. Tojeiro, I. Pâris, A. D. Myers, J. L. Tinker, J. Li, E. Burtin, P. Zarrouk, F. Beutler, F. Baumgarten, J. E. Bautista, J. R. Brownstein, K. S. Dawson, J. Hou, A. de la Macorra, G. Rossi, J. A. Peacock, A. G. Sánchez, A. Shafieloo, D. P. Schneider, and C. Zhao, *MNRAS* **482**, 3497 (2019), arXiv:1801.03043 [astro-ph.CO].
- T. Okumura, C. Hikage, T. Totani, M. Tnegawa, H. Okada, K. Glazebrook, C. Blake, P. G. Ferreira, S. More, A. Taruya, S. Tsujikawa, M. Akiyama, G. Dalton, T. Goto, T. Ishikawa, F. Iwamuro, T. Matsubara, T. Nishimichi, K. Ohta, I. Shimizu, R. Takahashi, N. Takato, N. Tamura, K. Yabe, and N. Yoshida, *PASJ* **68**, 38 (2016), arXiv:1511.08083 [astro-ph.CO].
- P. Zarrouk, E. Burtin, H. Gil-Marín, A. J. Ross, R. Tojeiro, I. Pâris, K. S. Dawson, A. D. Myers, W. J. Percival, C.-H. Chuang, G.-B. Zhao, J. Bautista, J. Comparat, V. González-Pérez, S. Habib, K. Heitmann, J. Hou, P. Laurent, J.-M. Le Goff, F. Prada, S. A. Rodríguez-Torres, G. Rossi, R. Ruggeri, A. G. Sánchez, D. P. Schneider, J. L. Tinker, Y. Wang, C. Yèche, F. Baumgarten, J. R. Brownstein, S. de la Torre, H. du Mas des Bourboux, J.-P. Kneib, V. Mariappan, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, J. Peacock, P. Petitjean, H.-J. Seo, and C. Zhao, *MNRAS* **477**, 1639 (2018), arXiv:1801.03062 [astro-ph.CO].
- B. Yu, U. Seljak, Y. Li, and S. Singh, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2211.16794 (2022), arXiv:2211.16794 [astro-ph.CO].
- P. Schneider, M. Asgari, Y. Najafi Jozani, A. Dvornik, B. Giblin, J. Harnois-Déraps, C. Heymans, H. Hildebrandt, H. Hoekstra, K. Kuijken, H. Shan, T. Tröster, and A. H. Wright, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2110.09774 (2021), arXiv:2110.09774 [astro-ph.CO].
- G. Efstathiou and P. Lemos, *MNRAS* **476**, 151 (2018), arXiv:1707.00483 [astro-ph.CO].
- R. C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *MNRAS* **505**, 5427 (2021), arXiv:2106.01208 [astro-ph.CO].
- N. Schöneberg, G. F. Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2107.10291 (2021), arXiv:2107.10291 [astro-ph.CO].

- A. Loureiro, L. Whittaker, A. Spurio Mancini, B. Joachimi, A. Cuceu, M. Asgari, B. Stözlner, T. Tröster, A. H. Wright, M. Bilicki, A. Dvornik, B. Giblin, C. Heymans, H. Hildebrandt, H. Shan, A. Amara, N. Auricchio, C. Bodendorf, D. Bonino, E. Branchini, M. Brescia, V. Capobianco, C. Carbone, J. Carretero, M. Castellano, S. Cavuoti, A. Cimatti, R. Cledassou, G. Congedo, L. Conversi, Y. Copin, L. Corcione, M. Cropper, A. Da Silva, M. Douspis, F. Dubath, C. A. J. Duncan, X. Dupac, S. Dusini, S. Farrens, S. Ferriol, P. Fosalba, M. Frailis, E. Franceschi, M. Fumana, B. Garilli, B. Gillis, C. Giocoli, A. Grazian, F. Grupp, S. V. H. Haugan, W. Holmes, F. Hormuth, K. Jahnke, S. Kermiche, A. Kiessling, M. Kilbinger, T. Kitching, M. Kümmel, K. Kuijken, M. Kunz, H. Kurki-Suonio, S. Ligori, P. B. Lilje, I. Lloro, O. Mansutti, O. Marggraf, K. Markovic, F. Marulli, R. Massey, M. Meneghetti, G. Meylan, M. Moresco, B. Morin, L. Moscardini, E. Munari, S. M. Niemi, C. Padilla, S. Paltani, F. Pasion, K. Pedersen, V. Pettorino, S. Pires, M. Poncet, L. Popa, F. Raison, J. Rhodes, H. Rix, M. Roncarelli, R. Saglia, P. Schneider, A. Secroun, S. Serrano, C. Sirignano, G. Sirri, L. Stanco, J. L. Starck, P. Tallada-Crespí, A. N. Taylor, I. Tereno, R. Toledo-Moreo, F. Torradeflot, E. A. Valentijn, Y. Wang, N. Welikala, J. Weller, G. Zamorani, J. Zoubian, S. Andreon, M. Baldi, S. Camera, R. Farinelli, G. Polenta, and N. Tessore, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2110.06947 (2021), arXiv:2110.06947 [astro-ph.CO].
- C. Heymans, T. Tröster, M. Asgari, C. Blake, H. Hildebrandt, B. Joachimi, K. Kuijken, C.-A. Lin, A. G. Sánchez, J. L. van den Busch, A. H. Wright, A. Amon, M. Bilicki, J. de Jong, M. Crocce, A. Dvornik, T. Erben, M. C. Fortuna, F. Getman, B. Giblin, K. Glazebrook, H. Hoekstra, S. Joudaki, A. Kannawadi, F. Köhlinger, C. Lidman, L. Miller, N. R. Napolitano, D. Parkinson, P. Schneider, H. Shan, E. A. Valentijn, G. Verdoes Kleijn, and C. Wolf, A&A **646**, A140 (2021), arXiv:2007.15632 [astro-ph.CO].
- W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, T. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. Beaton, M. G. Lee, A. Monson, J. Neeley, and J. Rich, ApJ **891**, 57 (2020), arXiv:2002.01550 [astro-ph.GA].
- 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, C. Y. Kuo, and K. Y. Lo, ApJ **891**, L1 (2020), arXiv:2001.09213 [astro-ph.CO].
- E. Kourkchi, R. B. Tully, S. Eftekhazadeh, J. Llop, H. M. Courtois, D. Guinet, A. Dupuy, J. D. Neill, M. Seibert, M. Andrews, J. Chuang, A. Danesh, R. Gonzalez, A. Holthaus, A. Mokolke, D. Schoen, and C. Urasaki, ApJ **902**, 145 (2020), arXiv:2009.00733 [astro-ph.GA].
- J. P. Blakeslee, J. B. Jensen, C.-P. Ma, P. A. Milne, and J. E. Greene, ApJ **911**, 65 (2021), arXiv:2101.02221 [astro-ph.CO].
- 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, ApJ **889**, 5 (2020), arXiv:1908.10883 [astro-ph.CO].
- A. J. Shajib, K. C. Wong, S. Birrer, S. H. Suyu, T. Treu, E. Buckley-Geer, H. Lin, C. E. Rusu, J. Poh, A. Palmese, A. Agnello, M. W. Auger, A. Galan, S. Schuldt, D. Sluse, F. Courbin, J. Frieman, and M. Millon, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2202.11101 (2022), arXiv:2202.11101 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Mukherjee, A. Ghosh, M. J. Graham, C. Karathanasis, M. M. Kasliwal, I. Magaña Hernandez, S. M. Nissanke, A. Silvestri, and B. D. Wandelt, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2009.14199 (2020), arXiv:2009.14199 [astro-ph.CO].
- O. H. E. Philcox, G. S. Farren, B. D. Sherwin, E. J. Baxter, and D. J. Brout, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2204.02984 (2022), arXiv:2204.02984 [astro-ph.CO].
- L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, Nature Astronomy **3**, 891 (2019), arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph.CO].
- G. A. Tammann and B. Reindl, A&A **549**, A136 (2013), arXiv:1208.5054 [astro-ph.CO].
- R. Jimenez and A. Loeb, ApJ **573**, 37 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0106145 [astro-ph].
- A. Gómez-Valent and L. Amendola, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys. **2018**, 051 (2018), arXiv:1802.01505 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Vagnozzi, A. Loeb, and M. Moresco, ApJ **908**, 84 (2021), arXiv:2011.11645 [astro-ph.CO].
- M. Moresco, L. Amati, L. Amendola, S. Birrer, J. P. Blakeslee, M. Cantiello, A. Cimatti, J. Darling, M. Della Valle, M. Fishbach, C. Grillo, N. Hamaus, D. Holz, L. Izzo, R. Jimenez, E. Lusso, M. Meneghetti, E. Piedipalumbo, A. Pisani, A. Pourtsidou, L. Pozzetti, M. Quartin, G. Risaliti, P. Rosati, and L. Verde, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2201.07241 (2022), arXiv:2201.07241 [astro-ph.CO].
- W. L. Freedman, ApJ **919**, 16 (2021), arXiv:2106.15656 [astro-ph.CO].
- W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, T. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, A. Lee, and K. A. Owens, “Answering the Most Important Problem in Cosmology Today: Is the Tension in the Hubble Constant Real?” JWST Proposal. Cycle 1 (2021).
- E. Mortell, A. Goobar, J. Johansson, and S. Dhawan, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2105.11461 (2021), arXiv:2105.11461 [astro-ph.CO].
- R. Wojtak and J. Hjorth, MNRAS **515**, 2790 (2022), arXiv:2206.08160 [astro-ph.CO].
- 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 (2021c), arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Nesseris and J. García-Bellido, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys. **2013**, 036 (2013), arXiv:1210.7652 [astro-ph.CO].
- A. Blanchard, A&A **132**, 359 (1984).
- M. Vonlanthen, S. Räsänen, and R. Durrer, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys. **2010**, 023 (2010), arXiv:1003.0810 [astro-ph.CO].
- B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, and S. Prunet, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys. **2013**, 001 (2013), arXiv:1210.7183 [astro-ph.CO].
- B. S. Haridasu, M. Viel, and N. Vittorio, Phys. Rev. D **103**, 063539 (2021).
- M. M. Ivanov, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, and J. Lesgourgues, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 063515 (2020), arXiv:2005.10656 [astro-ph.CO].
- S. Brieden, H. Gil-Marín, and L. Verde, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2204.11868 (2022), arXiv:2204.11868 [astro-ph.CO].
- E. V. Linder, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2301.09695 (2023), arXiv:2301.09695 [astro-ph.CO].
- P. Shah, P. Lemos, and O. Lahav, A&A Rev. **29**, 9 (2021), arXiv:2109.01161 [astro-ph.CO].

This paper was built using the Open Journal of Astrophysics L^AT_EX template. The OJA is a journal which

provides fast and easy peer review for new papers in the **astro-ph** section of the arXiv, making the reviewing process simpler for authors and referees alike. Learn more at <http://astro.theoj.org>.