

On the dynamical generation and decay of cosmological anisotropies

Bum-Hoon Lee,^{1,2,*} Hocheol Lee,^{2,†} Wonwoo Lee,^{1,‡} Nils A. Nilsson,^{1,§} and Somyadip Thakur^{1,2,3,¶}

¹*Center for Quantum Spacetime, Sogang University, Seoul 04107, Republic of Korea*

²*Department of Physics, Sogang University, Seoul 04107, Republic of Korea*

³*Department of Physics, Hanyang University, Seoul 04763, South Korea*

We present a simple model which dynamically generates cosmological anisotropies on top of standard FLRW geometry. This is in some sense reminiscent of the mean field approximation, where the mean field cosmological model under consideration would be the standard FLRW, and the dynamical anisotropy is a small perturbative correction on top of it. Using a supergravity-inspired model, we confirm that the stable fixed point of our model corresponds to standard FLRW cosmology. We use a Bianchi VII_h-type model supplemented with an axion-like particle (ALP) and $U(1)$ gauge fields, and we show that the anisotropies of the geometry are dynamically generated by the non-trivial interaction between the gravity sector and the $U(1)$ gauge sector. Studying the attractor flow, we show that the anisotropies are present at early times (high redshift) and decay asymptotically to an FLRW attractor fixed point. With such a mechanism, observations of non-isotropy are not contradictory to FLRW geometry or indeed the Λ CDM model. Such models could in principle shed some insights on the present cosmological tensions.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Gauge-Axion model	2
III. Equations of motion and their solutions	3
A. Perturbative Analysis	4
1. Zeroth order	5
2. First order	5
IV. Numerical solutions	6
V. Anisotropic dark energy	8
VI. Discussion & Conclusions	9
Acknowledgments	10
A. General Formalism of Bianchi Metrics	11
B. Killing Symmetry of the Gauge Fields	11
C. Metric Gauge Choice	12
D. Perturbative Expansions	12
E. Choice of initial conditions	14
References	14

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most successful cosmological models based on General relativity is the base Lambda Cold Dark Matter (Λ CDM) model. This tremendously well established model of cosmology assumes a flat universe, cold dark matter (CDM) and a positive cosmological constant, and is the simplest cosmological model which is fairly in good agreement with current observations. As the current de-facto standard model of cosmology, the spacetime geometry in Λ CDM is that of the homogeneous and isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW), where the only inhomogeneities allowed are those of small perturbations, which are actually the sources of some of the most important cosmological observables. Observations of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) [1], Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) [2], and Large Scale Structure [3] have for a long time been satisfactory proof that the Universe is evolving very closely along the predictions of the Λ CDM model.

Although the standard cosmological model has been a resounding success, there exist several problems which emerge when confronting the model with data. One of the most topical is the *Hubble tension*, the discrepancy between the value of the Hubble constant H_0 when measured in the local Universe versus with CMB observations, a tension which is currently reported at 5σ [4]. This is just one of a slew of “cosmic tensions” persistent within the Λ CDM paradigm, an overview of which can be found in [5]. These cosmic tensions are not the only threats to Λ CDM: different types of anomalous anisotropies have been reported both in the early and late Universe, such as quadrupole-octopole alignment in the CMB [6, 7], anomalous bulk flow [8, 9], radio-galaxy dipoles [7, 10], and possible variations in the fine-structure constant [11]. It seems clear that the Λ CDM model may need to be revised.

Recently, hints of cosmic birefringence, the rotation of the polarization plane of CMB photons, were reported

* bhl@sogang.ac.kr

† insaying@sogang.ac.kr

‡ warrior@sogang.ac.kr

§ nilssonnilsalbin@gmail.com

¶ somyadip@sogang.ac.kr

at over 3σ in the *Planck* EB power spectrum [12–14]. This is in sharp contrast to the Λ CDM prediction (no birefringence) and would have profound implications for fundamental physics if confirmed. A possible theoretical mechanism which could generate cosmic birefringence is a Chern-Simons term of the form

$$\mathcal{L} \supseteq \theta \phi F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$$

, which would generate non-zero odd-parity TB and EB CMB power spectra.¹ This term contains a pseudoscalar axion-like field ϕ coupled to the electromagnetic field-strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ and its dual $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$, and describes a type of axion electrodynamics [16–18]. A generalisation of this type of model to the case of SU(2) gauge fields have received a lot of attention in the context of inflation (referred to as Gauge-fflation or Chromo-natural models) [19–22]. These scenarios extend the standard scalar-field inflationary models, where anisotropies are exponentially damped due to the inflationary expansion of the background. This casts some doubt on the cosmic no-hair theorem, as dubbed by Wald in [23], and it may be possible for significant anisotropies to survive past the inflationary epoch, although it has been shown that non-Abelian gauge fields can be used to construct inflationary models which preserve homogeneity and isotropy [15, 22].

In this paper, we introduce an abelian version of the chromo-natural models discussed in [15, 19, 21, 22]. This type of model has been shown to arise naturally in $N = 4$ supergravity, and has been used to study spacetime-varying couplings as discussed in [18] and others. We start by using the Bianchi VII_h spacetime, and by employing a perturbative scheme, we show that the model contains Λ CDM at the zeroth order, and that FLRW geometry is a stable point in the attractor flow. As such, there is no contradiction between the observed cosmological tensions and anisotropies and the Λ CDM model.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section II we introduce the model and the theoretical details; in Section III we discuss the covariant equations of motion and their perturbative expansions; Section IV contains the numerical solutions, where we also present our main results; in Section V we present the dark energy equation of state generated by the gauge field and anisotropies, and we conclude in Section VI. Appendix A contains a short treatment of the general Bianchi classification; in Appendix B we present the Killing symmetry of 1-form fields and the 2-form fluxes; Appendix C and D contains the metric gauge choice, the relevant Einstein equations and the perturbative expansions respectively. Finally, we outline our procedure for generating initial conditions in Appendix E.

We use $c = \hbar = \kappa = 8\pi G = 1$ and the metric signature $(-+++)$ throughout the paper.

Note added: While we were in the final stages of preparation for the arXiv submission, [24] appeared that

have partial overlap, and of course are compatible with our main results and statements. However the approach adopted in our present work is slightly different from [24], where they have considered a tilted cosmology model based on [25].

II. GAUGE-AXION MODEL

In this section, we focus on the bosonic part of a supergravity-inspired model with the action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{R - 2\Lambda}{2\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\Theta \phi}{4} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{PF}} \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G$ (which we set to unity from now on), R is the Ricci scalar, Λ is the cosmological constant, ϕ is the pseudoscalar axion field, θ is the axion decay constant, and \mathcal{L}_{PF} is the canonical Lagrange density for a perfect fluid. Here, $F_{\mu\nu} = 2\partial_{[\mu} A_{\nu]}$ is the field-strength tensor for the gauge field A_μ and $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}$ is its dual where $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is Levi-Civita tensor. The new field ϕ can be thought of as a candidate for axionic dark matter and/or dark energy. The gauge-axion Lagrangian considered in this work is very general, which can encompass a very general class of Bianchi models; viz, Bianchi type I.

We note here that a stringent supergravity model would not allow us to have any explicit cosmological constant term in the action. However for the present paper where we mostly study an effective cosmological model, such constraints coming from supergravity can be relaxed and we present our action with explicit cosmological constant term.

In the rest of the paper we will mostly focus on the abelian $U(1)$ gauge field A_μ ,² which together with the ansatz chosen makes all contributions from the symmetry-breaking term ($\propto \Theta$) vanish. We note here that for the most general gauge field and metric ansatz, i.e full dependence on the time and the spatial coordinates, the symmetry-breaking term does not vanish and has non-trivial contributions which we defer for future study. The model that we use in the present analysis can also be considered as minimally coupled Quintessence with electromagnetic fields [26–29]. In minimally coupled Quintessence models the Quintessence (scalar) field couples to the Maxwell term,³ which is in contrast to the gauge-axion model where the pseudoscalar axion couples to the CP -violating Θ term.

² This $U(1)$ gauge field may not necessarily be in the physical electromagnetic sector (standard model elementary particle), in principle it can be in the dark sector.

³ For details, see Eq. (2.9) in [26]

¹ For a review, see [15]

It is also worthwhile to note that our analysis can be extended to non-abelian sectors, viz. $SU(2)$ or $SU(3)$ gauge groups [30, 31], which, when coupled to the axion field would encode a QCD axion, which is among one of the most compelling candidates for physics beyond the standard model (BSM). This axion solves the strong CP problem [32, 33] and is potentially a natural candidate for cold dark matter [34, 35]. In string theory, a similar spectrum of particles dubbed axion-like particles (ALPs) can be identified as ultralight dark matter with a broad mass range and interesting cosmological consequences [36–38]. In general, the abundance of axion-like dark matter is determined by the axion mass term and the coupling of the axion to the gauge sector, i.e. the decay constant, which depends on the cosmological epoch when the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) symmetry breaking takes place [39, 40].

The equations of motion derived from Eq. (1) are given below.

The Einstein equations

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{AN}} \quad (2)$$

where we add the stress-energy tensor for a perfect fluid, $\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$. We have simplified Eq. (2) by including the deviation from the base Λ CDM in $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{AN}}$, which we call the anisotropic stress-energy tensor; it takes the form

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{AN}} = \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} \nabla_\alpha \phi \nabla^\alpha \phi - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta} + F_\mu{}^\alpha F_{\nu\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

Equations of motion for ϕ and A_μ

$$0 = \square\phi - V'(\phi) - \frac{\Theta}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\delta\rho}\nabla_\beta A_\alpha \nabla_\rho A_\delta, \quad (4)$$

$$0 = \square A_\mu - \nabla^\alpha \nabla_\mu A_\alpha - \Theta \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\delta\mu} (\nabla^\beta A^\alpha \nabla^\delta \phi + \phi \nabla^\delta \nabla^\beta A^\alpha). \quad (5)$$

We choose as our starting point the Bianchi I metric, which we parametrize as

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)} \left(e^{2\beta_1(t)} dx_1^2 + e^{2\beta_2(t)} dx_2^2 + e^{2\beta_3(t)} dx_3^2 \right), \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta_i(t)$ are the isotropic and anisotropic scale factors, respectively (for details, see Appendix A). The factor two in the exponentials has been introduced so that the isotropic scale factor matches its FLRW equivalent, i.e. $a(t) = \exp(\alpha(t))$, and $\dot{a}/a = \dot{\alpha}$. We also adopt the temporal gauge for the gauge fields and write

$$A_\mu = \begin{cases} 0, & \mu = 0, \\ A_i, & \mu = i. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

In Appendix B we explicitly show that the 1-form gauge field is invariant under the Killing symmetry of the metric

(6), which allows us to expand the 1-form field as follows

$$A_i = e_i \psi_i, \quad (8)$$

where e_i are the spatial triads, which take the following form⁴

$$e_i = e^{(\alpha+\beta_i)} \delta_i. \quad (9)$$

With the Bianchi I metric (6) with \mathbb{R}^3 symmetry, we can write the gauge field as

$$A_i = \text{diag} \left(e^{(\alpha+\beta_1)} \psi_1, e^{(\alpha+\beta_2)} \psi_2, e^{(\alpha+\beta_3)} \psi_3 \right), \quad (10)$$

which allows us to rewrite the 1-form fields in terms of some scalar functions which we call $\psi_i(t)$, $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta_i(t)$. In the following section we proceed by writing the most general coupled differential equations for the metric ansatz (6) and the 1-form fields (7). In the rest of the paper we will focus only on the $U(1)$ 1-form field strength, and it can be shown that the symmetry-breaking term proportional to Θ vanishes identically for the abelian sector. The most general solution for non-abelian 1-form field strength will be discussed in the forthcoming paper [41].

III. EQUATIONS OF MOTION AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

We substitute the metric (6) into the equations of motion (2), (4), and (5), and explicitly write out the results for each index value; after some simplification, we can write the scalar-field equation as

$$0 = \ddot{\phi} + \dot{\phi} \left(3\dot{\alpha} + \sum_k \dot{\beta}_k \right) + V'(\phi). \quad (11)$$

With our gauge choice (temporal gauge), the temporal component of the gauge-field equation vanishes, and we can write the spatial components as

$$0 = \ddot{\psi}_i + \left[\dot{\psi}_i + \psi_i (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta}_i) \right] \left(3\dot{\alpha} + \sum_{n=1}^3 \dot{\beta}_n \right) + \psi_i \left[\ddot{\alpha} + \ddot{\beta}_i - (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta}_i)^2 \right]. \quad (12)$$

We write out all the components of the Einstein equations (2) in a similar manner; these are somewhat lengthy, and we show the first Friedmann equation ($\mu = \nu = 0$ component) here (the rest can be found in Appendix D)

⁴ $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ij} e_\mu^i e_\nu^j$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{00}^{\text{PF}} + \Lambda &= 3\dot{\alpha}^2 + 2\dot{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^3 \dot{\beta}_n + \dot{\beta}_1 \dot{\beta}_2 + \dot{\beta}_2 \dot{\beta}_3 + \dot{\beta}_3 \dot{\beta}_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^3 \left(\psi_n \left(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta}_n \right) + \dot{\psi}_n \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In the rest of this paper we incorporate the contribution from the cosmological constant Λ into the stress-energy tensor for the perfect fluid as follows

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} = \tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} - \Lambda g_{\mu\nu},$$

and we work only with $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$ (without tilde) from now on.

The stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$ for the perfect fluid is given by⁵

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ 0 & g_{ij}p & & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where $\rho = \sum_i \rho_i$ is the energy density, $p = \sum_i w_i \rho_i$ is the pressure, and w is the equation of state parameter, which takes the values $w = -1$ for the cosmological constant, $w = 1/3$ for radiation, $w = 0$ for baryonic matter, and $w = -1/3$ for curvature. Taking the flat (zero spatial curvature) case, the components of $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$ for the homogeneous and isotropic (zeroth order) limit reads as follows

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF},(0)} = \begin{cases} 3H_0^2 (\Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha} + \Omega_m^0 e^{-3\alpha} + \Omega_\Lambda^0), & (\mu = \nu = 0) \\ 3H_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{3} \Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha} - \Omega_\Lambda^0 \right) e^{2\alpha}, & (\mu = \nu = i), \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where we have denoted the zeroth-order part with a superscript (0). The full order can be found in Appendix D.

To simplify the equations of motion, we rewrite the components of the gauge field (10) by introducing two new scalar fields, $\sigma(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ and redefine the ψ_i 's as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1(t) &= \frac{\psi(t)}{\sigma(t)^2 - \gamma(t)^2}, \\ \psi_2(t) &= (\sigma(t) + \gamma(t))\psi(t), \\ \psi_3(t) &= (\sigma(t) - \gamma(t))\psi(t), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

⁵ The stress-energy tensor is given by

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} = (\rho + p)u_\mu u_\nu + pg_{\mu\nu},$$

for a boosted fluid. In this paper we consider a fluid four velocity given by

$$u_\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0),$$

with the normalization $u \cdot u = -1$. Note that the velocity field does not receive any corrections from the non-trivial metric evolution.

which will be useful when reducing the solutions to the homogeneous and isotropic (FLRW) limit.⁶ Given these redefinitions, it is easy to see that the isotropic condition is

$$\dot{\beta}_i(t) = 0, \quad \psi(t) = 0, \quad \sigma(t) = \pm 1, \quad \gamma(t) = 0 \quad (17)$$

The metric as written in Eq. (6) has had its symmetries broken down to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, which is equivalent to the Bianchi I spacetime; in order to restore $SO(2) \times \mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$), we need to choose

$$\beta_2(t) = \beta_3(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(t) = 0,$$

which sets the components of the gauge field to $A_2 = A_3$. This choice brings us to the final metric which we use in the rest of this paper as

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)} \left(e^{2\beta_1(t)} dx_1^2 + e^{2\beta_2(t)} (dx_2^2 + dx_3^2) \right), \quad (18)$$

which is equivalent to Bianchi VII_h and related to Kantowski-Sachs geometry (see for example [42]). The symmetries of this metric encapsulates the idea that the universe has a kind of preferred direction or symmetry axis, along which the cosmic expansion evolves differently.

A. Perturbative Analysis

The equations of motion in Section III have now been reduced to a system of coupled second-order scalar differential equations. In order to obtain numerical solutions, we use a perturbative approach and employ the following scheme:

- Expand all scalar degrees of freedom $\zeta = \{\alpha, \beta_i, \phi, \psi, \sigma\}$ in a perturbative series around their equilibrium fixed points (homogeneous and isotropic fixed point) and retain only the linear order in perturbations

$$\zeta(t) = \zeta^{(0)}(t) + \epsilon \zeta^{(1)}(t), \quad (19)$$

where ϵ is a book-keeping device for perturbative order.

- Find the zeroth-order ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) solutions.
- Plug the zeroth-order solutions back into the equations, where they act as seed solutions for first order.

Following the above scheme we write out the perturbative expansions around the homogeneous and isotropic fixed

⁶ The number of degrees of freedom is the same

points as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(t) &= \alpha^{(0)}(t), \quad \sigma(t) = \pm 1 + \epsilon \sigma^{(1)}(t), \\ \beta_1(t) &= \epsilon \beta_1^{(1)}(t), \quad \beta_2(t) = \epsilon \beta_2^{(1)}(t), \quad \beta_3(t) = \beta_2(t), \\ \psi(t) &= \psi^{(0)}(t) + \epsilon \psi^{(1)}(t), \quad \phi(t) = \phi^{(0)}(t) + \epsilon \phi^{(1)}(t),\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

where we have used the remaining gauge freedom in the metric to set $\alpha^{(1)}(t) = 0$ (For details, see Appendix C).

We have also set $\sigma^{(0)}(t) = \pm 1$ and $\beta_i^{(0)}(t) = 0$,

since this represents the homogeneous and isotropic zeroth-order background; moreover, we set $\gamma(t) = 0$ to restore the planar $SO(2) \times \mathbb{R}$ symmetry.

The perfect fluid evolves according to the continuity equation, which in the Λ CDM case reads $\dot{\rho} + 3H(1 + w)\rho = 0$. This equation changes due to the present non-trivial Bianchi VII_h geometry [43, 44]. The implications and perturbative corrections to the continuity equation and $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$ are presented in Appendix D.

From now on, expressions of order ϵ will always be enclosed in square brackets.

1. Zeroth order

As a first consistency check, we start with the zeroth-order vacuum equations, where we set ($T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}} = 0$) and $\phi^{(0)}(t) = \psi^{(0)}(t) = 0$, leaving us with a system of equations which is the flat-space vacuum. In this case, the system we need to solve is the two Friedmann equations, which read

$$3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 = 0, \quad 3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 2\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} = 0,\tag{21}$$

where the transformation $\alpha^{(0)}(t) = \log a(t)$ gives the physical scale factor, and we obtain the familiar solution for a static Universe.

Adding now a radiation term in the stress-energy tensor, the Friedmann equations read

$$\begin{aligned}(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 &= H_0^2 \Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha^{(0)}}, \\ 2\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 &= -H_0^2 \Omega_r^0 e^{-2\alpha^{(0)}},\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

which solves as

$$\alpha^{(0)}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_r^0} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln t,\tag{23}$$

and the corresponding scale factor reads $a(t) = (2H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_r^0})^{1/2} \sqrt{t}$, which is consistent with standard FLRW evolution.

We now turn our attention to the more general case when $\phi^{(0)}$ and $\psi^{(0)}$ are non-zero. Here, the dynamical variables are $\phi^{(0)}$, $\dot{\phi}^{(0)}$ and $\psi^{(0)}$, and we have the following three equations for the scalar, gauge field, and

Einstein parts, respectively

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \ddot{\phi}^{(0)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\phi}^{(0)} + V'(\phi^{(0)}) \\ 0 &= \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) \\ T_{00}^{\text{PF},(0)} &= 3(\alpha^{(0)})^2 - \frac{3}{2} \left(\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{(0)})^2 - V'(\phi^{(0)}).\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

By examining the full set of equations in Appendix D, we notice that all terms containing $\sigma^{(1)}$ or $\beta_i^{(1)}$, i.e. the *anisotropic* variables, are proportional to $\psi^{(0)}$ or its time derivative. This influences our choice of initial conditions in the numerical solutions: if we simply choose $\psi^{(0)}(0) = \text{const.}$ and $\dot{\psi}^{(0)}(0) = 0$, we obtain a solution proportional to a constant $\psi^{(0)}$, and this can simply be gauged away. In order to obtain a meaningful solution, we therefore have to implement a non-zero $\dot{\psi}^{(0)}$ as our initial condition. A description of our method for choosing consistent initial conditions can be found in Appendix E.

2. First order

The scalar equation (11) reads

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \ddot{\phi}^{(0)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\phi}^{(0)} + V'(\phi^{(0)}) + \epsilon \left[\left(\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right) \dot{\phi}^{(0)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \ddot{\phi}^{(1)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\phi}^{(1)} + \phi^{(1)}V''(\phi^{(0)}) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

where the factor 2 on $\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)}$ comes from $\beta_2 = \beta_3$. The expressions for the gauge field and Einstein equations are rather lengthy, and we will only display the zeroth order in this section, including the full equations in Appendix D.

For the gauge field in Eq. (12), the zeroth-order expressions are identical $\mu = 1, 2, 3$, but the equations differ at first order, and due to the symmetries, the $\mu = 2$ and $\mu = 3$ components are equal. Keeping to our choice of a positive sign for $\sigma^{(0)} = +1$, all the spatial components are identical (at zeroth order), and read

$$0 = \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) \psi^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon).\tag{26}$$

The first Friedmann equation ($\mu = \nu = 0$ component of the Einstein equations) read

$$\begin{aligned}T_{00}^{\text{PF},(0)} + \epsilon T_{00}^{\text{PF},(1)} &= 3(\alpha^{(0)})^2 - \frac{3}{2} \left(\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{(0)})^2 \\ &\quad - V'(\phi^{(0)}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon).\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

The spatial diagonal components ($\mu = \nu = i$) are identi-

cal at zeroth order and read

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11}^{\text{PF},(0)} + \epsilon T_{ii}^{\text{PF},(1)} \\ = -e^{2\alpha^{(0)}} \left[2\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \left(\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\psi^{(0)} \right)^2 \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 - V(\phi^{(0)}) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

We choose a simple ϕ^4 -type potential for $V(\phi)$ as

$$V(\phi) = V_0\phi^4, \quad (29)$$

where V_0 is a constant, and we expand $V(\phi)$ and its derivatives; the potential reads

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &= V_0(\phi^{(0)})^4 + \epsilon \left(4V_0(\phi^{(0)})^3\phi^{(1)} \right), \\ V'(\phi) &= 4V_0(\phi^{(0)})^3 + \epsilon \left(12V_0(\phi^{(0)})^2\phi^{(1)} \right), \\ V''(\phi) &= 12V_0(\phi^{(0)})^2 + \epsilon \left(24V_0\phi^{(0)}\phi^{(1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In our numerical computation we have set the value of the constant, $V_0 = 10^{-3}$.

IV. NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS

We solve the full system of coupled differential equations for scalar, gauge field, and Einstein parts order-by-order and present the relevant solutions here; the full equations can be found in Appendix D. The qualitative behaviour of these solutions indicate that the field content $\phi(t)$ and $A_\mu(t)$ have considerable contribution in the early Universe before decaying exponentially, and eventually flowing to the homogeneous and isotropic attractor fixed point, which exactly corresponds to FLRW. The ini-

Zeroth order		
$\phi^{(0)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$	$\alpha^{(0)}(t_f) = 1.6$	$\psi^{(0)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$
$\dot{\phi}^{(0)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$		
First order		
$\phi^{(1)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$	$\psi^{(1)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$	$\sigma^{(1)}(t_f) = 10^{-3}$
$\dot{\phi}^{(1)}(t_f) = -10^{-6}$	$\dot{\psi}^{(1)}(t_f) = -10^{-6}$	$\dot{\sigma}^{(1)}(t_f) = -10^{-3}$
$\beta_1^{(1)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$	$\beta_2^{(1)}(t_f) = 10^{-6}$	$\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)}(t_f) = -10^{-6}$

TABLE I. Boundary conditions used in the numerical solutions, defined at $t_f = 20$ Gyr.

tial conditions for all the variables are in general coupled, and need to satisfy the equations of motion; therefore, the conditions shown in Table I are the ones we choose as ‘‘primary’’, whilst the rest are derived. In Appendix E we present our method for finding the rest of the boundary conditions from the Einstein equations in a consistent way.

From the zeroth-order equations we can solve the isotropic part of the scale factor $\alpha^{(0)}$ from the zeroth-order Einstein equations. Here we have imposed boundary condition at the isotropic fixed point and solved the evolution of the Einstein equations. The evolution of the zeroth order scalar and the gauge fields, $\phi^{(0)}$ and $\psi^{(0)}$ respectively.

The second order differential equations governing the evolution of the Einstein equations, 1-form gauge fields and the scalars are roughly damped harmonic oscillators, the solutions of which contain both growing and decaying modes; however, to be consistent with observations of the late-time universe, the evolution should settle down to homogeneous and isotropic solutions, viz. FLRW universe. In our numerical solutions we retain the decaying solutions.

Numerical results:

- In Figure 1 we present the solution of the isotropic scale factor. Our result at current epoch, viz. $t_0 = H_0^{-1} = 13.7$ Gyr, in good agreement with the results in [45]. The isotropic scale factor has been plotted against the scale factor of Λ CDM (which has been normalized to unity at the present time). The deviation from the Λ CDM value can be attributed to the scalar and gauge fields in the present model under study.

Next we focus on the deceleration parameter, which for Λ CDM is canonically defined in terms of the scale factor $a(t)$ as

$$q(t) = -\frac{\ddot{a}(t)a(t)}{\dot{a}(t)^2} \quad (31)$$

In Figure 2 we compare the deceleration parameter for the model under consideration with Λ CDM, and we notice that the present model has marginally faster expansion (q more negative), with the difference being most pronounced between $t = 3 - 10$ Gyr. This faster expansion is expected to play a crucial role in alleviating H_0 tension in this model.

- In Figure 3 we present the solution for the scalar fields. The scalar field profile starts with a non-zero divergent nature in the early universe, before rapidly decaying and finally saturating to zero at very late asymptotic times. This axion-like particle can be attributed to the scalar dark sector contributing to either dark energy (and/or dark matter). In the following section V we examine the dark energy equation of state, which confirms our observations here.
- In Figure 4 and 5 we show the behaviour of the fields ψ and σ , both of which take on very small values, even at early times, before flowing to the attractor fixed point asymptotically, which is consistent with our construction. Essentially there will

be no residual gauge fields in the future and only residual gauge-field contributions would survive to the present epoch ~ 13.7 Gyr; this is consistent with present observations.

One crucial point at this juncture is to bear in mind the overall picture: the backreaction from the $U(1)$ gauge fields are dynamically generating the anisotropies in the early Universe, and the anisotropies settle down to their fixed-point values as the gauge field saturates to the attractor fixed points.

- The zeroth-order solutions of the Friedmann equations dictate the isotropic evolution of the universe, which is the base Λ CDM; however, we notice that there is some deviation due to the residual presence of the scalar and gauge-field contributions, where the contribution from the anisotropic parameters appear as perturbative corrections.

The anisotropic contributions to the metric, β_1 and β_2 , are suppressed by order 10^{-6} as compared to the isotropic scale factor, which is in agreement with the observational constraints where the anisotropy in the universe is comparatively very small as compared to the isotropic scale factor. In Figure 6 we show the evolution of the anisotropic scale factors $\exp(\beta_1)$ and $\exp(\beta_2)$, which flow towards the stable fixed point at late times, exactly the isotropic limit (Note that $\beta_1^{(1)}$ and $\beta_2^{(1)}$ should be further suppressed by ϵ), in keeping with observational results.

- In order to quantify the evolution of the anisotropic degrees of freedom, we define the *average* Hubble parameter \bar{H} as follows

$$\bar{H} = \frac{1}{3} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \epsilon\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\epsilon\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right). \quad (32)$$

In Figure 7 and 8 we show the full contribution of the anisotropy to the Hubble parameter compared to base Λ CDM. From these two plots we can see that the average Hubble parameter \bar{H} is slightly smaller than its Λ CDM counterpart at all times, but that this difference is larger at early times. We also see that when compared to the isotropic limit of the present model (Figure 8), the effects of the anisotropies are on the order of $\leq 10^{-7}$ throughout the history of the universe, though divergent as very early times.⁷ The effects of the anisotropic variables on cosmic evolution may be important when studying the H_0 tension and other cosmological puzzles, but a detailed treatment of observational signatures lies beyond the scope of this paper, although we give some brief comments below.

We end this section with some plausible implications of our axion-anisotropic cosmological model on the resolution of the present cosmological tensions. A naive observation from the solution of the average Hubble parameter from Figure 7 indicates that the value of Hubble parameter is lower than in the base Λ CDM model, especially at very early times. A natural question to ask at this juncture is: *Can the Hubble tension be resolved in the presence of some extra degrees of freedom on top of standard FLRW cosmology?*

In [30] the authors showed that a rolling axion coupled to a non-Abelian gauge field has the potential to provide a viable solution to the Hubble tension. The pertinent point made in [30] is that the axion fields coupled to non-abelian gauge fields provides some additional *friction* term (thermal friction) to the gravity system, and thus have a potential solution to stabilize the Hubble tension. A quick comparison with our model shows that the anisotropic expansion parameters $\beta_i^{(1)}$ can in principle provide such a friction, and thus may provide a resolution to the Hubble tension, even though this contribution is small compared to Λ CDM. We leave this question open for future considerations. This can be studied in an effective EFT model on a similar line as presented in [46].




FIG. 1. The isotropic scale factor $a(t) = e^{\alpha^{(0)}(t)}$ compared with the Λ CDM model.




FIG. 2. The deceleration parameter q compared with that of Λ CDM.

⁷ The primordial universe lies beyond the scope of this paper, since we neglect the contribution from the radiation Ω_r^0 , which dominates in that epoch.




FIG. 3. The behaviour of the full scalar field $\phi(t) = \phi^{(0)} + \epsilon\phi^{(1)}$.




FIG. 4. The behaviour of $\psi(t) = \psi^{(0)} + \epsilon\psi^{(1)}$.

V. ANISOTROPIC DARK ENERGY

From our construction it is worthwhile to investigate the anisotropic contribution to the dark energy equation of state. We can write the anisotropic stress-energy tensor (3) in the standard form as

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{AN}} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho^{\text{AN}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ 0 & & g_{ij}p_i^{\text{AN}} & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

In the particular case of homogeneous and isotropic cosmological models, we can assume an equation of state of the form

$$P = \omega\rho, \quad (34)$$

and in the presence of anisotropic matter sources and geometry, the total pressure and the total energy density can similarly be split into isotropic and anisotropic parts

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t &= (\rho^{\text{PF}} + \rho_0^{\text{AN}}) + \epsilon\rho_1^{\text{AN}}, \\ P_t &= (P^{\text{PF}} + P_i^{\text{AN}(0)}) + \epsilon P_i^{\text{AN}(1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

from which we can determine the effective equation of state parameter w_t for the cosmic fluid, as was also noted




FIG. 5. The behaviour of $\sigma(t) = \epsilon\sigma^{(1)}$.




FIG. 6. The anisotropic scale factors $\beta_1^{(1)}$ and $\beta_2^{(1)}$. Note that these should be further suppressed by ϵ .

in [43, 44, 47, 48]. Note that we show in Appendix D that the perfect-fluid part also receives corrections at order ϵ ; these contributions are coupled to the anisotropic degrees of freedom, and we count them as part of ρ_1^{AN} and P_i^{AN} . In Figure 9 we show the evolution of w_t as a function of time, and we observe that it stays negative throughout all of cosmic history, and is close to, but always lower than, the Λ CDM model. From the point of view of the perfect fluid, the negative values of the equation of state parameter are to be expected, since we neglect the radiation term $w_r = 1/3$, and $\omega \leq 0$ for both matter and cosmological constant.

It is also interesting to examine the contribution to w_t from the anisotropic variables. First of all, by examining the anisotropic energy density ρ_1^{AN} in Eq. (35) and comparing it to the perfect fluid, we see that ρ^{PF} dominates, and the anisotropic parts make up on the order of 10^{-5} of the total energy budget of the system. Moreover, when examining the equation of state for the anisotropic contribution (which we may call w_{AN}), we see that up to a few parts in 10^8 , w_{AN} is a constant throughout cosmic history, with a value of

$$w_{\text{AN}} \approx 1.$$

This corresponds to a *stiff matter* fluid, which has been studied in the context of both classical and quantum cos-




FIG. 7. The average Hubble parameter in contrast to the pure Λ CDM case.




FIG. 8. The average scale factor normalized by the isotropic case.

mology in [49] and [50] and others. Specifically, it was found in [49] that a stiff fluid may lead to a bouncing solution of the Wheeler-de-Witt equation.

VI. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we introduce an axion-electrodynamics model for the purpose of dynamical generation of cosmological anisotropies. Working with abelian gauge fields, we choose the components of the gauge field A_μ to be aligned with the Killing vectors of the Bianchi VII_h metric, and we show that the field content satisfies the same isometries as Bianchi VII_h. We solve the resulting equations of motion numerically using a perturbative scheme where the zeroth order is the homogeneous isotropic limit; in this way, we obtain the canonical Λ CDM solutions at zeroth order, with anisotropic contributions appearing at first order. Thanks to the parametrisation of the gauge field, we obtain solutions to the anisotropic scale factors $\beta_i^{(1)}$ which are driven by the evolution of the gauge-field A_μ , and by constructing the average Hubble parameter \bar{H} , we see that the deviation from Λ CDM is largest in the early universe, before relaxing down to the asymptotic Λ CDM fixed point. The magnitude of \bar{H} is

always smaller than $H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, and a negative slope at all times, which may have implications for the Hubble tension. Simultaneously, the isotropic scale factor exhibits approximately standard Λ CDM evolution throughout the history of the Universe, although the amplitude is consistently higher. Our solutions for the anisotropic scale factors $\exp(\beta_1^{(1)})$ and $\exp(\beta_2^{(1)})$ are very similar in amplitude, but not identical; this is a desirable feature, since cosmological anisotropies are expected to be small, and by evaluating $\exp(\beta_1^{(1)})$ and $\exp(\beta_2^{(1)})$ at the present time ($t_0 = 1/H_0$), we find that the anisotropic expansion is on the order of $10^{-7} \sim 10^{-8}$. The scalar field ϕ exhibits steep falloff in the early Universe and settles down to a small constant at late times, and we find similar behaviour in ψ and σ , which parametrize the gauge field.

Taken together, these results indicate that most non-trivial effects will be contained to the early universe. Whilst this does safeguard late-time evolution against large anisotropic effects, this is not necessarily desirable, since early-Universe processes (inflation, BBN, recombination etc) are very sensitive to the field content and initial conditions; however, this lies beyond the scope of the present work.

In Appendix D we find that the perfect-fluid part of the total stress-energy tensor receives anisotropic corrections perturbatively, both in the energy density and in the pressure. The anisotropic part of the energy density has been studied as *anisotropic dark energy*, for example in [47] and [48], although at the background level. There are also interesting connections to the quadrupole anomaly in the CMB [51].

The most important result of this work is the *dynamical generation of cosmological anisotropies*; we have shown that it is possible to find solutions which closely resemble those of Λ CDM at zeroth order, whilst containing a small degree of anisotropic correction at order ϵ . An important note is that we are likely overestimating the magnitude of the dark-energy density Ω_Λ : since the extra field content $\{\phi(t), \psi(t), \sigma(t), \beta_1(t), \beta_2(t)\}$ can be interpreted as dynamical dark energy, the total dark-energy density should read $\Omega_{\text{DE}} = \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_\phi + \dots$, but because of the small scales of the anisotropies and the field $\phi(t)$, this would be a very small correction.⁸

The observational status of cosmological anisotropy is rapidly evolving, with some groups claiming very strong results, such as anisotropic acceleration (anomalous bulk flow) in the direction of the CMB dipole at 3.9σ significance [53] and a 3σ hemispherical power asymmetry in the Hubble constant, also aligned with the CMB dipole⁹ [55]. Together with probes such as fine structure-constant variation and preferred directions in the CMB

⁸ For a discussion of the current observational status of dynamical dark energy, see [52].

⁹ A possible solution to the hemispherical power asymmetry was recently proposed in [54].




FIG. 9. The behaviour of the total equation of state parameter w_t compared to that of Λ CDM

results in compelling evidence that the cosmological standard model needs revision, and we have provided a mechanism through which such preferred directions can arise dynamically from a well-motivated field theory. This is of course not the only model which can generate cosmological anisotropies; in particular, models exhibiting spacetime-symmetry breaking are known to contain preferred directions in the form of timelike vector fields. For example Hořava-Lifshitz gravity [56] Einstein-Aether theory [57], and bumblebee gravity [58], all of which have received significant attention in recent years, contain preferred frames of reference. On the other hand, spacetime-symmetry breaking in gravity has been tightly constrained using the Standard-Model Extension effective field theory, restricting the available parameter space for all spacetime-symmetry breaking models [59]. Our construction has the advantage of keeping these well-tested spacetime symmetries intact, and instead postulating the existence of the fields $\psi(t)$ and $A_\mu(t)$, and in this sense, it can be considered a scalar-vector model.

Natural extensions and applications of this work would be to consider an $SU(2)$ gauge field, as was done in the context of cosmic birefringence in [21], as well as computing imprints of anisotropy on the CMB, by introducing angular dependence of the metric functions. All of these applications are forthcoming [41].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Stephen Appleby, Eoin Ó Colgáin, and Jeong-Hyuck Park for discussions and comments on the draft.

BHL, WL, HL, and NAN were supported by the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (BHL, HL, NAN: 2020R1F1A1075472,

BHL, HL: NRF-2020R1F1A1075472, WL: NRF-2022R1IA1A01067336, NAN: 2020R1A6A1A03047877, HL: 2016R1D1A1B01015196). The work of ST was supported by Mid-career Researcher Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea grant No. NRF-2021R1A2B5B02002603.

Appendix A: General Formalism of Bianchi Metrics

The most general metric of the Bianchi geometries can be written as [60]

$$ds^2 = -N(t)^2 dt^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)} e^{2\beta_{ij}(t)} \omega^i \omega^j, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $N(t)$ is the lapse function, ω^i are 1-forms, $e^{2\alpha(t)}$ is the scale factor of the universe and β_{ij} determines the anisotropic parameters. In this general Bianchi model, the shift vector is not stipulated in the metric, and the lapse function can consequently be a dynamical variable; however, in the flat-space limit this can be gauged away and we can safely set this lapse function to a constant [61]. In Eq. (A1), β_{ij} determines the anisotropic parameters, which can in principle be a general matrix with non-diagonal entries. However we can work in a diagonal basis where $\beta_+(t)$ and $\beta_-(t)$ are given as follows

$$\beta_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_+ + \sqrt{3}\beta_- & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_+ - \sqrt{3}\beta_- & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2\beta_+ \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A2})$$

In this paper we consider the Bianchi metric in such a diagonal basis of β_{ij} , and we identify

$$\beta_+ + \sqrt{3}\beta_- = \beta_1, \quad \beta_+ - \sqrt{3}\beta_- = \beta_2, \quad -2\beta_+ = \beta_3, \quad (\text{A3})$$

from which we obtain the most general Bianchi I metric ansatz in Cartesian coordinates as

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)} \left(e^{2\beta_1(t)} dx_1^2 + e^{2\beta_2(t)} dx_2^2 + e^{2\beta_3(t)} dx_3^2 \right), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta_i(t)$ are the isotropic and anisotropic scale factors, respectively. The factor two has been introduced so that the isotropic scale factor matches its FLRW equivalent, i.e. $a(t) = \exp(\alpha(t))$, and $\dot{a}/a = \dot{\alpha}$.

Appendix B: Killing Symmetry of the Gauge Fields

In this appendix we explicitly show that the $U(1)$ gauge field under consideration has the Killing symmetry of the

Lets us start with the metric in the Bianchi I metric as follows

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)+2\beta_1(t)} dx_1^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)+2\beta_2(t)} dx_2^2 + e^{2\alpha(t)+2\beta_3(t)} dx_3^2, \quad (\text{B1})$$

We have three Killing vectors associated with the (B1),

$$K_i = \partial_i,$$

with $i = x'_i$ s. The Killing vectors satisfies the following condition

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_i} g^{\mu\nu} = 0$$

Here we will use a convenient notation for $\omega_i \wedge \omega_j$ just by $\omega_i \omega_j$ with the property that

$$\omega_i \omega_j = -\omega_j \omega_i.$$

Let us write the 2-form fluxes in the most general form as

$$F = (f_1 dt dx_1 + f_2 dt dx_2 + f_3 dt dx_3) + (g_1 dx_1 dx_2 + g_2 dx_2 dx_3 + g_3 dx_3 dx_1),$$

where the f_i 's and g_i 's can be arbitrary functions of (t, x_i) . The equation of motion of the 2-form fields are given by

$$dF = 0,$$

which gives us the following constraint equations

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_2 f_1 - \partial_1 f_2 + \partial_t g_1) &= 0 \\ (\partial_3 f_1 - \partial_1 f_3 - \partial_t g_3) &= 0 \\ (\partial_3 f_2 - \partial_2 f_3 + \partial_t g_2) &= 0 \\ (\partial_1 g_2 + \partial_2 g_3 + \partial_3 g_1) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

The Killing equation is given by the following equation

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_i} F = d(iK_i F) + iK_i(dF) \quad (\text{B3})$$

Now if the 2-form field has the same Killing symmetry then

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_i} F = 0$$

identically, which after a few trivial algebraic manipulation gives the following constraint equations,

$$\begin{aligned} -(\partial_1 f_1 d_{01} + \partial_1 f_2 d_{02} + \partial_1 f_3 d_{03}) \\ -(\partial_1 g_1 d_{12} + \partial_1 g_3 d_{31} + \partial_1 g_2 d_{23}) &= 0 \\ -(\partial_2 f_1 d_{01} + \partial_2 f_2 d_{02} + \partial_2 f_3 d_{03}) \\ -(\partial_2 g_1 d_{12} + \partial_2 g_3 d_{31} + \partial_2 g_2 d_{23}) &= 0 \\ -(\partial_3 f_1 d_{01} + \partial_3 f_2 d_{02} + \partial_3 f_3 d_{03}) \\ -(\partial_3 g_1 d_{12} + \partial_3 g_3 d_{31} + \partial_3 g_2 d_{23}) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

Where we have defined the volume form as

$$d_{ij} = dx_i dx_j.$$

Simultaneously satisfying (B2) and (B4) gives us the following relations

$$\partial_j f_i = 0, \quad \partial_j g_i = 0, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (\text{B5})$$

which implies that f_i and g_i are functions of only time t .

A similar analysis can be done for the 1-form gauge fields A_i . The 1-form gauge field can be written as

$$A = a_0 dt + b_i dx_i, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where again a_0 and b_i can be arbitrary functions of (t, x_i) . The fluxes can be computed as $F = dA$ and the equation of motion is trivially satisfied,

$$dF = 0.$$

Lets us write the Killing equation for the 1-form A

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_i}(A) = d(iK_i A) + iK_i(dA)$$

and the algebra can be easily worked out

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_j} A = \partial_j a_0 dt + \partial_j b_i dx_i, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Satisfying the Killing equation leads to

$$\partial_j a_0 = 0 \quad \partial_j b_i = 0, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{B8})$$

which implies that a_0 and b_i can at most be a function of the time t only. So far we have worked with the most general Killing symmetry of Bianchi I type; however, we can similarly generalize to the metric ansatz we have implemented in our main text, Bianchi VII_h with $\beta_2 = \beta_3$ in (B1) which will have the following Killing vectors

$$k_i = \partial_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad \text{and} \quad k_4 = x_2 \partial_3 - x_3 \partial_2 \quad (\text{B9})$$

Note here that once we consider more general metric ansatz, which depends on angular direction, we have different sets of Killing vectors, and the 1-form field strengths can depend on these variable. We defer this analysis for our forthcoming work[41].

Appendix C: Metric Gauge Choice

In this section we give some relevant arguments for the gauge choice of the metric ansatz we use in this paper. The isotropic scale factor α can also be expanded in a perturbative expansion as follows

$$\alpha(t) = \alpha^{(0)} + \epsilon \alpha^{(1)} + \dots$$

However the gauge degrees of freedom of the metric allows us to set $\alpha^{(1)} = 0$ and set all the contribution of the anisotropy in the β 's. In such gauge choice with $\alpha^{(1)}(t) \neq 0$, there will be non-vanishing contribution coming at the first order in the isotropic scale factor. In such set up the matter sector will non-trivially back-react on the metric and we will have corrections to the isotropic scale factors. For example if we study Quintessence model with such metric ansatz then the Quintessence (scalar) fields would back-react at the first order in the isotropic scale factors.

Thus such first order correction to the isotropic scale factors would in principle differ significantly from the base Λ CDM Quintessence models. In the present work we mostly focus on the anisotropic scale factors, which are generated at the first order due to the back-reaction of the matter sector on the metric. So one natural choice would be absorb the first order correction to the anisotropic scale factors in the β_i 's or equivalently we can set the $\alpha^{(1)}(t) = 0$.

Appendix D: Perturbative Expansions

In this section, we reintroduce the coupling κ for completeness. The $\mu = 1$ component of the vector equations read

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} + \epsilon \left[\psi^{(1)}\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} - 6\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\sigma}^{(1)} \right. \\ & + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(1)} + 2\psi^{(1)}(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \beta_1^{(1)} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) - 2\sigma^{(1)} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) + \psi^{(0)}\ddot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} - 2\psi^{(0)}\ddot{\sigma}^{(1)} - 4\dot{\sigma}^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \ddot{\psi}^{(1)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

and the $\mu = 2, 3$ component is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} + \epsilon \left[(\psi^{(1)}\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 3\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} + 3\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\sigma}^{(1)} + 3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(1)} \right. \\ & + 2\psi^{(1)}(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \beta_2^{(1)} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) + \sigma^{(1)} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \left(\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right) + \ddot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) \\ & \left. + \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)}\ddot{\beta}_2^{(1)} + 2\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)}\ddot{\sigma}^{(1)} + 2\dot{\sigma}^{(1)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \ddot{\psi}^{(1)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

The $\mu = \nu = 0$ component of the Einstein equations (the first Friedmann equation) read

$$\begin{aligned} 3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \epsilon \left[2\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 4\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right] = & \kappa \frac{1}{2} \left(3 \left(\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right)^2 + 2\rho^{\text{PF}} + 2V(\phi^{(0)}) + (\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 \right) \\ & - \epsilon \kappa \left[- (\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \left(\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right) - \psi^{(0)} \left(3\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \left(\psi^{(1)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(1)} \right) + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \left(\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right) \right) \right. \\ & \left. - 3\psi^{(1)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} - \phi^{(1)}V'(\phi^{(0)}) - 3\dot{\psi}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(1)} - \dot{\phi}^{(0)}\dot{\phi}^{(1)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D3})$$

the $\mu = \nu = 1$ component is

$$\begin{aligned}
2\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 3(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \epsilon \left[4\beta_1^{(1)}\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 6\beta_1^{(1)}(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 6\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} + 2\ddot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right] = & -\kappa \frac{1}{2} \left((\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 2\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2p^{\text{PF}} \right. \\
& - 2V(\phi^{(0)}) + (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 + (\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 \left. \right) - \epsilon \kappa \left[-(\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + \beta_1^{(1)} (\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 2\beta_1^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2(\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right. \\
& + 4(\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} + 4\sigma^{(1)} (\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 8\sigma^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(1)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(1)} + \psi^{(0)} \psi^{(1)} (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \\
& - \psi^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + \beta_1^{(1)} (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 + \beta_1^{(1)} (\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 + 2\psi^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2\beta_1^{(1)} p^{\text{PF}} + 4\psi^{(0)} \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 4\sigma^{(1)} (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 \\
& \left. - \phi^{(1)} V'(\phi^{(0)}) - 2\beta_1^{(1)} V(\phi^{(0)}) + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(1)} + \dot{\phi}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}^{(1)} \right] \tag{D4}
\end{aligned}$$

$\mu = \nu = 2, 3$ are equal and read

$$\begin{aligned}
4\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 6(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + \epsilon \left[8\beta_2^{(1)}\ddot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 6\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 6\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} + 12\beta_2^{(1)}(\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 2\ddot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\ddot{\beta}_2^{(1)} \right] = & -\kappa \left((\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right. \\
& + 2\psi^{(0)}\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}\dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2p^{\text{PF}} - 2V(\phi^{(0)}) + (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 + (\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 \left. \right) - \epsilon \kappa \left[2(\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)} (\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 \right. \\
& + 4\beta_2^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} - 4(\psi^{(0)})^2 \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} - 4\sigma^{(1)} (\psi^{(0)})^2 (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 - 8\sigma^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2\psi^{(1)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(1)} \\
& + 2\psi^{(0)} \psi^{(1)} (\dot{\alpha}^{(0)})^2 + 2\psi^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)} (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 + 2\beta_2^{(1)} (\dot{\phi}^{(0)})^2 + 4\beta_2^{(1)} p^{\text{PF}} - 4\psi^{(0)} \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \\
& \left. - 4\sigma^{(1)} (\dot{\psi}^{(0)})^2 - 2\phi^{(1)} V'(\phi^{(0)}) - 4\beta_2^{(1)} V(\phi^{(0)}) + 2\dot{\psi}^{(0)} \dot{\psi}^{(1)} + 2\dot{\phi}^{(0)} \dot{\phi}^{(1)} \right] \tag{D5}
\end{aligned}$$

For the magnetic components, we obtain for $\mu = 1, \nu = 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right)^2 + \epsilon \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) \left[\beta_1^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \beta_2^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} - \sigma^{(1)} \psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + 2\psi^{(1)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \right. \\
& \left. + \psi^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_1^{(1)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} (\beta_1^{(1)} + \beta_2^{(1)} - \sigma^{(1)}) + \psi^{(0)} \dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} - \psi^{(0)} \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} + 2\dot{\psi}^{(1)} \right], \tag{D6}
\end{aligned}$$

and for $\mu = 2, \nu = 3$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right)^2 + \epsilon \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) \left[\beta_2^{(1)} \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) + \sigma^{(1)} \left(\psi^{(0)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} + \dot{\psi}^{(0)} \right) + \psi^{(1)} \dot{\alpha}^{(0)} \right. \\
& \left. + \psi^{(0)} \left(\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)} + \dot{\sigma}^{(1)} \right) + \dot{\psi}^{(1)} \right]. \tag{D7}
\end{aligned}$$

The electric components are zero, since $\partial_i \phi(t) = 0$.

Expansion of the perfect fluid stress-energy tensor

The continuity equation for the perfect fluid reads

$$\dot{\rho}_i + 3\bar{H}(1 + w_i)\rho_i = 0, \tag{D8}$$

where \bar{H} is the average Hubble parameter (32). The equation solves as

$$\rho_i = \rho_i^0 e^{-(1+w_i) \left[3\alpha^{(0)} + \epsilon(\beta_1^{(1)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)}) \right]}. \tag{D9}$$

From this we see that the perfect fluid stress-energy tensor will have corrections at the perturbative level, and

we can write the components of $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{PF}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{00}^{\text{PF}} = & 3H_0^2 \left(\Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha^{(0)}} + \Omega_m^0 e^{-3\alpha^{(0)}} + \Omega_\Lambda \right) \\
& + \epsilon \left[-H_0^2 \left(\beta_1^{(1)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)} \right) \left(4\Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha^{(0)}} + 3\Omega_m^0 e^{-3\alpha^{(0)}} \right) \right] \tag{D10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{ii}^{\text{PF}} = & 3H_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{3} \Omega_r^0 e^{-2\alpha^{(0)}} - \Omega_\Lambda^0 e^{2\alpha^{(0)}} \right) \\
& + \epsilon \left\{ -\frac{2}{3} H_0^2 \left[2(\beta_1^{(1)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)}) \Omega_r^0 e^{-2\alpha^{(0)}} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - 3\beta_i \left(\Omega_r^0 e^{-2\alpha^{(0)}} - 3\Omega_\Lambda^0 e^{2\alpha^{(0)}} \right) \right] \right\}, \tag{D11}
\end{aligned}$$

to first order in ϵ , where we obtain the zeroth-order (isotropic) form as in Eq. (15). From this, we form the

pressure p_i as

$$p_i = 3H_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{3} \Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha^{(0)}} - \Omega_\Lambda^0 \right) + \epsilon \left[-\frac{4}{3} H_0^2 \left(\beta_1^{(1)} + 2\beta_2^{(1)} \right) \Omega_r^0 e^{-4\alpha^{(0)}} \right], \quad (\text{D12})$$

by multiplying by g^{ii} to first order in ϵ . As such, the perfect fluid received *anisotropic* corrections to the pressure in the presence of a radiation term. Note that we have taken $\Omega_r^0 = 0$ in this paper, and that this term would only be significant at very early times.

Appendix E: Choice of initial conditions

In this appendix we write the constraints coming from the Einstein equations and the other field equations which we implement in the numerical solutions. A priori even though the functions α, β_1, β_2 and their derivatives seems to be independent, however differential equations

sets some constraints on these functions. Below we write out the constraints equations and we write our choice of boundary values in Table I.

1. The first Friedmann equation at the zeroth order sets the constraint on $\alpha(t)$ once we have chosen the initial value of $\alpha(t)$.
2. Similarly, the first order ($\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$) of the first Friedmann equation sets a constraint between the β_i 's: once the initial values of β_1, β_2 and $\dot{\beta}_1$ are fixed the value of $\dot{\beta}_2^{(1)}(t)$ is constrained by the other equations.
3. The zeroth order off-diagonal part of the Einstein equations fixes the initial value of $\dot{\psi}^{(0)}(t)$ once we specify the $\psi^{(0)}(t)$ and $\alpha^{(0)}(t)$:

$$\dot{\psi}^{(0)}(t_f) = -\dot{\alpha}^{(0)}(t_f)\psi^{(0)}(t_f).$$

-
- [1] W. Hu and S. Dodelson, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **40**, 171 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0110414.
- [2] D. H. Weinberg, M. J. Mortonson, D. J. Eisenstein, C. Hirata, A. G. Riess, and E. Rozo, *Phys. Rept.* **530**, 87 (2013), arXiv:1201.2434 [astro-ph.CO].
- [3] F. Bernardeau, S. Colombi, E. Gaztanaga, and R. Scoccimarro, *Phys. Rept.* **367**, 1 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0112551.
- [4] A. G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO].
- [5] E. Abdalla *et al.*, *JHEAp* **34**, 49 (2022), arXiv:2203.06142 [astro-ph.CO].
- [6] A. de Oliveira-Costa, M. Tegmark, M. Zaldarriaga, and A. Hamilton, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 063516 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0307282.
- [7] D. J. Schwarz, G. D. Starkman, D. Huterer, and C. J. Copi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 221301 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0403353.
- [8] C. Howlett, K. Said, J. R. Lucey, M. Colless, F. Qin, Y. Lai, R. B. Tully, and T. M. Davis, (2022), 10.1093/mnras/stac1681, arXiv:2201.03112 [astro-ph.CO].
- [9] K. Migkas, F. Pacaud, G. Schellenberger, J. Erler, N. T. Nguyen-Dang, T. H. Reiprich, M. E. Ramos-Ceja, and L. Lovisari, *Astron. Astrophys.* **649**, A151 (2021), arXiv:2103.13904 [astro-ph.CO].
- [10] A. Dolfi, E. Branchini, M. Bilicki, A. Balaguera-Antolínez, I. Prandoni, and R. Pandit, *Astron. Astrophys.* **623**, A148 (2019), arXiv:1901.08357 [astro-ph.CO].
- [11] J. A. King, J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, R. F. Carswell, M. B. Bainbridge, M. R. Wilczynska, and F. E. Koch, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **422**, 3370 (2012), arXiv:1202.4758 [astro-ph.CO].
- [12] Y. Minami and E. Komatsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 221301 (2020), arXiv:2011.11254 [astro-ph.CO].
- [13] P. Diego-Palazuelos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 091302 (2022), arXiv:2201.07682 [astro-ph.CO].
- [14] J. R. Eskilt, *Astron. Astrophys.* **662**, A10 (2022), arXiv:2201.13347 [astro-ph.CO].
- [15] E. Komatsu, *Nature Rev. Phys.* **4**, 452 (2022), arXiv:2202.13919 [astro-ph.CO].
- [16] W.-T. Ni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 301 (1977).
- [17] F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1799 (1987).
- [18] V. A. Kostelecky, R. Lehnert, and M. J. Perry, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 123511 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0212003.
- [19] A. Maleknejad and E. Erfani, *JCAP* **03**, 016 (2014), arXiv:1311.3361 [hep-th].
- [20] I. Wolfson, A. Maleknejad, and E. Komatsu, *JCAP* **09**, 047 (2020), arXiv:2003.01617 [gr-qc].
- [21] K. Ishiwata, E. Komatsu, and I. Obata, *JCAP* **03**, 010 (2022), arXiv:2111.14429 [hep-ph].
- [22] A. Maleknejad, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and J. Soda, *Phys. Rept.* **528**, 161 (2013), arXiv:1212.2921 [hep-th].
- [23] R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 2118 (1983).
- [24] C. Krishnan, R. Mondol, and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, (2022), arXiv:2209.14918 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] A. R. King and G. F. R. Ellis, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 209 (1973).
- [26] E. J. Copeland, N. J. Nunes, and M. Pospelov, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 023501 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0307299.
- [27] P. Brax and J. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063530 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0502069.
- [28] S. Panda, Y. Sumitomo, and S. P. Trivedi, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 083506 (2011), arXiv:1011.5877 [hep-th].
- [29] M. Ibe, M. Yamazaki, and T. T. Yanagida, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 235020 (2019), arXiv:1811.04664 [hep-th].
- [30] K. V. Berghaus and T. Karwal, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083537 (2020), arXiv:1911.06281 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] K. Choi, S. H. Im, H. J. Kim, and H. Seong, (2022), arXiv:2206.01462 [hep-ph].
- [32] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).

- [33] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223 (1978).
- [34] J. Preskill, M. B. Wise, and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Lett. B* **120**, 127 (1983).
- [35] M. Dine and W. Fischler, *Phys. Lett. B* **120**, 137 (1983).
- [36] P. Svrcek and E. Witten, *JHEP* **06**, 051 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0605206](#).
- [37] A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos, S. Dubovsky, N. Kaloper, and J. March-Russell, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 123530 (2010), [arXiv:0905.4720 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [38] D. Grin, M. A. Amin, V. Gluscevic, R. Hlözec, D. J. E. Marsh, V. Poulin, C. Prescod-Weinstein, and T. L. Smith, (2019), [arXiv:1904.09003 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [39] P. Arias, D. Cadamuro, M. Goodsell, J. Jaeckel, J. Redondo, and A. Ringwald, *JCAP* **06**, 013 (2012), [arXiv:1201.5902 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [40] M. Kawasaki, K. Saikawa, and T. Sekiguchi, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 065014 (2015), [arXiv:1412.0789 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [41] Work in progress, BHL, HL, NAN, ST, .
- [42] J. D. Barrow and M. P. Dabrowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 630 (1997), [arXiv:hep-th/9608136](#).
- [43] S. A. Appleby and E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 023532 (2013), [arXiv:1210.8221 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [44] S. Appleby, R. Battye, and A. Moss, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 081301 (2010), [arXiv:0912.0397 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [45] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, and S. A. Stanford, *JCAP* **02**, 008 (2010), [arXiv:0907.3149 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [46] B.-H. Lee, W. Lee, E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and S. Thakur, *JCAP* **04**, 004 (2022), [arXiv:2202.03906 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 083502 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0512135](#).
- [48] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **06**, 018 (2008), [arXiv:0801.3676 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [49] P.-H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 103004 (2015), [arXiv:1412.0743 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [50] G. Oliveira-Neto, G. A. Monerat, E. V. Correa Silva, C. Neves, and L. G. Ferreira Filho, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **03**, 254 (2011), [arXiv:1106.3963 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [51] D. C. Rodrigues, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 023534 (2008), [arXiv:0708.1168 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [52] J. Sola Peracaula, A. Gomez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Pérez, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **25**, 100311 (2019), [arXiv:1811.03505 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] J. Colin, R. Mohayaee, M. Rameez, and S. Sarkar, *Astron. Astrophys.* **631**, L13 (2019), [arXiv:1808.04597 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] K. S. Kumar and J. a. Marto, (2022), [arXiv:2209.03928 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [55] O. Luongo, M. Muccino, E. O. Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and L. Yin, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103510 (2022), [arXiv:2108.13228 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] P. Horava, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 084008 (2009), [arXiv:0901.3775 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] M. Gasperini, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **4**, 485 (1987).
- [58] R. V. Maluf and J. C. S. Neves, *JCAP* **10**, 038 (2021), [arXiv:2105.08659 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [59] V. A. Kostelecky and N. Russell, (2008), [arXiv:0801.0287 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
- [61] D. Lorenz, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1848 (1980).