

Negative Dark Energy Density from High Redshift Pantheon+ Supernovae

M. Malekjani,¹ R. Mc Conville,² E. Ó Colgáin,^{2,*} S. Pourojaghi,³ and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari³

¹Department of Physics, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan 65178, Iran

²Atlantic Technological University, Ash Lane, Sligo, Ireland

³School of Physics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O.Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran

Given a *model building* assumption on the (effective) equation of state (EoS) of the Universe, the Hubble constant H_0 arises as an integration constant when one solves the Friedmann equations. Therefore, while H_0 is *mathematically* a constant, it need not be a constant *observationally*, unless the EoS or model accurately describes the Universe. Building on earlier results, we show that redshift evolution of flat Λ CDM cosmological parameters (H_0, Ω_m) persists in the most up-to-date Pantheon+ sample. In particular, an increasing Ω_m (decreasing H_0) trend with effective redshift leads to $\Omega_m > 1$ best fits, corresponding to negative dark energy (DE) density, beyond $z = 1$. The redshift range of the Pantheon+ sample is presented as $0 < z \lesssim 2.26$, but this masks redshift evolution of flat Λ CDM fitting parameters across the sample.

INTRODUCTION

The flat Λ CDM cosmological model is an extremely successful minimal model that returns seemingly consistent cosmological parameters across Type Ia supernovae (SN) [1, 2], Cosmic Microwave Background [3] and baryon acoustic oscillations [4]. Despite this success, comparison of early and late Universe cosmological parameters has revealed discrepancies [5–11]. The origin [12, 13] and resolution [14, 15] of these anomalies is a topic of debate. We observe that the flat Λ CDM model describes approximately 13 billion years of evolution of the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ in the late Universe (conservatively redshifts $z \lesssim 30$) with a single fitting parameter, matter density today Ω_m [99]. Objectively, given the prevailing belief that $\Omega_m \sim 0.3$, this marks billions of years of evolution with effectively no free parameters.

As originally pointed out in [16] (see also [17]) within the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) framework, any mismatch between $H(z)$, an unknown function inferred from Nature, and a theoretical assumption on the effective EoS $w_{\text{eff}}(z)$, e. g. the flat Λ CDM model, must mathematically lead to a Hubble constant H_0 that evolves with effective redshift. Simply put, a redshift-dependent H_0 is indicative of a bad model [16]. This prediction can be tested in the late Universe, where the flat Λ CDM model reduces to two fitting parameters:

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{1 - \Omega_m + \Omega_m(1+z)^3}. \quad (1)$$

To date, independent studies have documented decreasing H_0 trends within model (1) across strong lensing time delay (SLTD) [18, 19], Type Ia supernovae (SN) [20–24] and combinations of cosmological data sets [25, 26]. Moreover, quasar (QSO) Hubble diagrams [27–29] show a preference for larger than expected Ω_m values, $\Omega_m \gtrsim 1$ [30–33]. It was then noted that Ω_m increases with effective redshift in QSO samples [23] (see also [34]). Although the trend in any given observable is not overly significant, e. g. $\lesssim 2\sigma$ for SLTD [18, 19], combining probabilities from independent observables using Fisher’s method, the significance increases quickly [24].

Moreover, simple binned mock Λ CDM data analysis [24,

35] suggests that evolution of (H_0, Ω_m) can be expected in any data set that only provides either observational Hubble $H(z)$ or angular diameter $D_A(z)$ or luminosity distance $D_L(z)$ constraints [100]. If true, one can expect to separate any given sample into low and high redshift subsamples and see discrepancies in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane. Here, we highlight the feature in the latest Pantheon+ SN sample [36, 37]. In passing, we note that Pantheon+ is statistically poorer than the Pantheon sample [38] at higher redshifts; 57 higher redshift SNLS [39, 40] SN beyond $z = 0.8$ have been removed due to potential evolution in inferred distances [41].

The main message of this letter is that evolution of (H_0, Ω_m) with effective redshift persists in Pantheon+ SN. Furthermore, an increasing Ω_m trend, evident at higher redshifts, continues beyond $\Omega_m = 1$ giving rise to negative DE densities at $z \gtrsim 1$. In light of concerns highlighted in [42–44], the Pantheon+ sample improves on redshift corrections [45]. Nevertheless, relative to simple analysis presented in [23], the significance of the trend has increased from $\sim 1\sigma$ [101] to $\sim 2\sigma$ with improved data quality, in spite of the fewer high redshift SN.

Hints of negative DE densities are widespread in the literature, so our observations in Pantheon+ may be unsurprising. Starting with studies incorporating Lyman- α BAO [46], one of the first observables discrepant with Planck- Λ CDM [47–49], claims of negative DE densities at higher redshifts, including anti-de Sitter (AdS) vacua at high redshift [50, 51] (however, see [52]) [102] and features in data reconstructions [58–62], have been noticeable [103]. This has led to extensive attempts to model negative DE densities [67–77], most simply as sign switching Λ models [78–82]. Given the sparseness of SN data beyond $z = 1$, claims of negative DE densities are usually attributed to Lyman- α BAO, but here we see the same feature in state of the art Pantheon+ SN. It is plausible that selection effects are at play (see discussion in [20]), but if the arguments in [24, 35] hold up, then evolution is expected.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis starts by following and recovering results in [83] (see also [36]). We set the stage with a preliminary con-

sistency check. In short, we extremise the likelihood,

$$\chi^2 = \vec{Q}^T \cdot (C_{\text{stat+sys}})^{-1} \cdot \vec{Q} \quad (2)$$

where \vec{Q} is a 1701-dimensional vector and $C_{\text{stat+sys}}$ is the covariance matrix of the Pantheon+ sample [36]. The Pantheon+ sample has 1701 SN light curves, 77 of which correspond to galaxies hosting Cepheids in the low redshift range $0.00122 \leq z \leq 0.01682$. In order to break the degeneracy between H_0 and the absolute magnitude M of Type Ia, we define the vector

$$Q_i = \begin{cases} m_i - M - \mu_i, & i \in \text{Cepheid hosts} \\ m_i - M - \mu_{\text{model}}(z_i), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where m_i and $\mu_i \equiv m_i - M$ denote the apparent magnitude and distance modulus of the i^{th} SN, respectively. The cosmological model, which we assume to be the flat Λ CDM model (1), enters through the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\text{model}}(z) &= 5 \log \frac{d_L(z)}{\text{Mpc}} + 25, \\ d_L(z) &= c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus, one is either extremising or marginalising (2) with respect to the two cosmological parameters (H_0, Ω_m) and the nuisance parameter M . Extremising the likelihood, one arrives at the best fit values,

$$H_0 = 73.42 \text{ km/s/Mpc}, \quad \Omega_m = 0.333, \quad M = -19.248, \quad (5)$$

which are in perfect agreement with [83]. It remains to determine the uncertainties, and in contrast to [83], where estimates were obtained from the inverse of a Fisher matrix, here we perform a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) exploration of the likelihood. The result of this exercise is found in Fig. 1, where throughout we use *GetDist* [84] and the central values and 1σ confidence intervals are

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= 73.41_{-1.00}^{+0.97} \text{ km/s/Mpc}, \\ \Omega_m &= 0.333_{-0.017}^{+0.018}, \quad M = -19.248_{-0.030}^{+0.028}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which are once again consistent with the uncertainties in [83].

Splitting Pantheon+

Having confirmed the results quoted in [83], we depart from earlier analysis and crop the Pantheon+ covariance matrix in order to isolate the 77×77 -dimensional covariance matrix C_{Cepheid} corresponding to SN in Cepheid host galaxies and define a new likelihood that is only sensitive to the absolute magnitude M ,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\text{Cepheid}}^2 &= (\vec{Q}')^T \cdot (C_{\text{Cepheid}})^{-1} \cdot \vec{Q}', \\ Q'_i &= m_i - M - \mu_i, \quad i \in \text{Cepheid hosts}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1: Constraints on the parameters from the full Pantheon+ sample arising from the likelihood (2).

The remaining 1624 SN we can now split into low and high redshift samples, which are demarcated through a redshift z_{split} . One can crop the original covariance matrix accordingly to get C_{SN} for either the low or high redshift sample, but for reasons outlined later in the text, we will primarily focus on the high redshift subsample with $z > z_{\text{split}}$. In summary, we study the new likelihood,

$$\chi^2 = \chi_{\text{Cepheid}}^2 + \chi_{\text{SN}}^2, \quad (8)$$

where we have defined,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\text{SN}}^2 &= (\vec{Q})^T \cdot (C_{\text{SN}})^{-1} \cdot \vec{Q}, \\ \vec{Q}_i &= m_i - M - \mu_{\text{model}}(z_i), \quad z_i > z_{\text{split}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The redshift range of the Pantheon+ sample [36] is $0.00122 \leq z \leq 2.26137$, so we take z_{split} in this range. Throughout, we remark that we never recover the original likelihood (2), since once the SN in galaxies with Cepheids are isolated, we have removed off-diagonal terms in the original Pantheon+ covariance matrix $C_{\text{stat+sys}}$.

We now perform the analysis in [23], which generalises analysis performed in the Pantheon+ paper [36]. As demonstrated in [36], if one imposes a high redshift cut-off and focuses exclusively on SN below the cut-off, an anomaly observed in the original Pantheon sample in the range $z \lesssim 0.2$ [85–88] disappears with the inclusion of additional Pantheon+ SN. Nevertheless, there may yet be an anomaly that does not affect cosmological inferences at even lower redshifts, $z \lesssim 0.01$ [83]. That being said, if one focuses on observables at traditional cosmological scales ($d_L \gtrsim 100$ Mpc), then it has been demonstrated that the low redshift portion of the Pantheon+ SN sample is consistent with Λ CDM with $\Omega_m \sim 0.3$

[36]. For this reason, we focus on high redshifts, where it is possible to infer from mock data that evolution in Ω_m is expected when one works with data with $D_A(z) \propto D_L(z)$ constraints [35]. Indeed, this analysis has been initiated in Fig. 16 of [36], but the authors only focus on Ω_m , since the SN are *uncalibrated*. Moreover, the authors restrict attention to the range $z < 0.3$, yet there is an intriguing increase in Ω_m at $z \sim 0.3$ and beyond that warrants investigation here.

z_{split}	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	Ω_m
0.3 (494 SN)	$72.01^{+1.39}_{-1.37}$ (72.09)	$0.390^{+0.044}_{-0.041}$ (0.384)
0.4 (308 SN)	$72.48^{+1.91}_{-1.99}$ (72.64)	$0.374^{+0.064}_{-0.059}$ (0.365)
0.5 (210 SN)	$76.47^{+2.49}_{-2.72}$ (76.84)	$0.264^{+0.070}_{-0.057}$ (0.252)
0.6 (129 SN)	$76.10^{+3.48}_{-4.01}$ (76.98)	$0.272^{+0.110}_{-0.077}$ (0.249)
0.7 (75 SN)	$78.76^{+4.37}_{-4.96}$ (80.23)	$0.221^{+0.113}_{-0.074}$ (0.190)
0.8 (30 SN)	$68.36^{+9.34}_{-11.24}$ (74.20)	$0.397^{+0.411}_{-0.188}$ (0.266)
0.9 (27 SN)	$52.14^{+13.27}_{-10.37}$ (60.86)	$1.047^{+1.036}_{-0.589}$ (0.604)
1 (25 SN)	$44.27^{+11.03}_{-6.10}$ (35.97)	$1.67^{+0.889}_{-0.846}$ (3)

TABLE I: Results of marginalising the likelihood (8) with higher redshift SN ($z_{\text{split}} < z$) with the uniform prior $\Omega_m \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 3)$. Throughout, we find $M = -19.25^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$, which is expected since we use the same 77 SN to calibrate subsamples. In brackets we record the SN count in each subsample and the best fit parameters corresponding to extrema of the likelihood.

Let us emphasise again that in contrast to [36], once we define the likelihood (8) we can work with *calibrated* SN, which allows us to track changes in *both* the cosmological parameters and not just Ω_m . We begin from $z_{\text{split}} = 0.3$, and focus exclusively on SN with redshifts $z_{\text{split}} < z$, since as explained above, anomalies in the range $z < z_{\text{split}}$ are not expected. We increase z_{split} in intervals of $\Delta z = 0.1$ and we document the best fit (H_0, Ω_m) value numerically in Table I and graphically in Fig. 2. Throughout, we employ MCMC analysis and quote best fit and marginalised results with 1σ confidence intervals. We relax the customary uniform prior on $\Omega_m \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ to $\Omega_m \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 3)$ in order to allow the possibility of $\Omega_m > 1$, which corresponds to a negative cosmological constant in the flat Λ CDM model.

Our results are consistent with earlier analysis with the Pantheon sample [23]. In particular, deviations from best fit parameters of the full sample relative to the pink bands in Fig. 2 only start to become evident about $z \sim 0.7$, and beyond $z_{\text{split}} = 0.7$ one sees a decreasing trend in H_0 and increasing trend in Ω_m . One interesting aspect is that we are witnessing variations in H_0 in excess of 2σ , where it is worth stressing again that errors from the calibration have been propagated. More interestingly still, we note that the peak of the distributions stray beyond $\Omega_m = 1$. In Fig. 3 focusing on SN below and above $z = 1$ with a uniform prior on $\Omega_m \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 3)$ we confirm the discrepancy in the cosmological parameters and the preference for negative DE density. One also notes a $\sim 2\sigma$ tension in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane. One can extend the prior on Ω_m to find a very gradual fall off in the PDF towards




FIG. 2: Variations in the constraints on the cosmological parameters (H_0, Ω_m) as one focuses on SN with $z_{\text{split}} < z$. The SN are calibrated through 77 SN in galaxies with Cepheids. The pink bands correspond to the constraints from the full sample (6).

larger Ω_m values. This we show in Fig. 4, where it is evident that the peak in Ω_m is robust, whereas the H_0 peak is not. As one extends the uniform prior on Ω_m the “banana” in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane, stretches further into the top left corner, increasing the tension with $z \leq 1$ SN. This increase in tension in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane is evident in the H_0 peak moving to smaller values, while small (large) values of Ω_m (H_0) are disfavoured. As the priors are relaxed, eventually the 2σ contour intervals no longer overlap. We note in passing that the Pantheon+ covariance matrix appears to be overestimated [89], so tensions may be underestimated throughout.

DISCUSSION

The main take-home message is that a decreasing H_0 and increasing Ω_m trend observed in the Pantheon SN sample [38] at low significance $\sim 1\sigma$ [23] (see [20–22, 25, 26] for the H_0 trend alone) persists in the Pantheon+ sample [36, 37] with significance $\geq 2\sigma$. Moreover, *calibrated* $z > 1$ SN have a preference for $\Omega_m > 1$, thereby signaling negative DE den-




FIG. 3: Differences in the cosmological parameters with $z_{\text{split}} = 1$. We adopt a uniform prior $\Omega_m \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 3)$ and a peak at $\Omega_m > 1$ is evident. The Ω_m - H_0 plot tracks the high redshift degeneracy $\Omega_m H_0^2 \approx \text{constant}$, but low (high) values of Ω_m (H_0) are disfavoured, and the contour cannot stretch in the bottom right corner. Our contours are clearly impacted by the priors in the top left corner.

sities in the flat Λ CDM model. Similar features are evident in the literature, most notably Lyman- α BAO [46] and QSOs standardised through fluxes in UV and X-ray [27–29].

To put these results in context we return to the generic solution of the Friedmann equation [16],

$$H(z) = H_0 \exp\left(-\frac{3}{2} \int_0^z \frac{1 + w_{\text{eff}}(z')}{1 + z'} dz'\right), \quad (10)$$

where $w_{\text{eff}}(z)$ is the effective EoS. We observe that evolution of H_0 (and Ω_m) with effective redshift in the Pantheon+ sample is consistent with a disagreement between the assumed EoS, here the flat Λ CDM model, and $H(z)$ inferred from Nature. These anomalies are not confined to SN and we see related features elsewhere [18, 19, 23, 24]. Moreover, JWST is also reporting anomalies that may be cosmological in origin [90–92]; JWST anomalies prefer a phantom DE EoS [92], which may be a proxy for negative DE densities. If persistent cosmological tensions [5–11] are due to systematics, one expects no evolution in H_0 from (10), but this runs contrary to what we are seeing.

Admittedly, this one result may not be enough to falsify flat Λ CDM, but we are left with bad options if we discount that possibility. For example, clearly the prior $0 < \Omega_m < 1$ precludes an identification of the Ω_m peak in Fig. 3 and 4. Does this make high redshift SN captured through the Hubble Space Telescope (HST) [93–96] inconsistent with Planck- Λ CDM? We can of course relax the $\Omega_m = 1$ prior, thereby allowing negative DE densities, but what then is a good upper bound? As we see in Fig. 4, the H_0 peak is sensitive to the priors on




FIG. 4: Same as Fig. 3 but with different uniform Ω_m priors. The orange and red contours are the same in both plots. Changing priors impacts the H_0 peak but not the Ω_m peak; relaxing priors increases tension in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane.

Ω_m , and relaxing the priors completely, i. e. $0 < \Omega_m < \infty$ simply exacerbates tensions in the (H_0, Ω_m) -plane. In particular, inferences in lower dimensions can be misleading. It should be stressed that all SN are calibrated through SN in Cepheid host galaxies, so we could simply cut the Pantheon+ sample at $z \sim 1$ and throw away high redshift SN. Of course, this may be a drastic resolution.

Going forward, if the next generation of SN data [97] increases the statistical significance of the anomaly then there are interesting implications. First, any increasing trend in Ω_m with effective redshift prevents one separating H_0 and $S_8 \propto \sqrt{\Omega_m}$ tensions. This is obvious. Interestingly, sign switching Λ models, which perform well alleviating H_0/S_8 tensions [80], fit well with our main message here, i.e. negative DE at higher z . Secondly, flat Λ CDM model breakdown allows us to re-evaluate the longstanding observational cosmological constant problem [98]. Thirdly, and most consequentially, it is likely that changes to the DE sector cannot prevent evolution in Ω_m , because DE is traditionally irrelevant at higher redshifts. Moreover, if DE could address evolution in H_0 (at all z), then it is an easy argument from (10) that this reduces H_0/S_8 tensions to systematics. Ultimately, if DE does not or cannot come to the rescue, this brings the assumption of pressureless matter scaling as a^{-3} with scale factor a into question in late Universe FLRW cosmology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Leandros Perivolaropoulos for discussion, and Özgür Akarsu and Anjan Sen for comments on a late

draft. MMSHJ and SP acknowledge SarAmadan grant No. ISEF/M/401332. SP also acknowledges hospitality of Bu-Ali Sina University.

* Electronic address: ecoin.colgáin@atu.ie

- [1] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team], *Astron. J.* **116** (1998), 1009-1038 [[arXiv:astro-ph/9805201](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9805201)] [astro-ph]].
- [2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project], *Astrophys. J.* **517** (1999), 565-586 [[arXiv:astro-ph/9812133](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9812133)] [astro-ph]].
- [3] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A6 [[arXiv:1807.06209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06209)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] D. J. Eisenstein *et al.* [SDSS], *Astrophys. J.* **633** (2005), 560-574 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0501171](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0501171)] [astro-ph]].
- [5] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, L. Breuval and T. G. Brink, *et al.* *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934** (2022) no.1, L7 [[arXiv:2112.04510](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04510)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [6] W. L. Freedman, *Astrophys. J.* **919** (2021) no.1, 16 [[arXiv:2106.15656](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15656)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] D. W. Pesce, J. A. Braatz, M. J. Reid, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, J. J. Condon, F. Gao, C. Henkel, C. M. V. Impellizzeri and C. Y. Kuo, *et al.* *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **891** (2020) no.1, L1 [[arXiv:2001.09213](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.09213)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [8] J. P. Blakeslee, J. B. Jensen, C. P. Ma, P. A. Milne and J. E. Greene, *Astrophys. J.* **911** (2021) no.1, 65 [[arXiv:2101.02221](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.02221)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [9] E. Kourkchi, R. B. Tully, G. S. Anand, H. M. Courtois, A. Dupuy, J. D. Neill, L. Rizzi and M. Seibert, *Astrophys. J.* **896** (2020) no.1, 3 [[arXiv:2004.14499](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.14499)] [astro-ph.GA]].
- [10] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* [DES], [[arXiv:2105.13549](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.13549)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [11] M. Asgari *et al.* [KiDS], *Astron. Astrophys.* **645** (2021), A104 [[arXiv:2007.15633](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.15633)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [12] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95** (2022), 101659 [[arXiv:2105.05208](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05208)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] E. Abdalla, G. Franco Abellán, A. Aboubrahim, A. Agnello, O. Akarsu, Y. Akrami, G. Alestas, D. Aloni, L. Amendola and L. A. Anchordoqui, *et al.* *JHEAp* **34** (2022), 49-211 [[arXiv:2203.06142](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.06142)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.15, 153001 [[arXiv:2103.01183](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.01183)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Rept.* **984** (2022), 1-55 [[arXiv:2107.10291](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.10291)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] C. Krishnan, E. Ó Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.10, 103509 [[arXiv:2011.02858](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.02858)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [17] C. Krishnan and R. Mondol, [[arXiv:2201.13384](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.13384)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [18] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger and M. W. Auger, *et al.* *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **498** (2020) no.1, 1420-1439 [[arXiv:1907.04869](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.04869)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [19] M. Millon, A. Galan, F. Courbin, T. Treu, S. H. Suyu, X. Ding, S. Birrer, G. C. F. Chen, A. J. Shajib and D. Sluse, *et al.* *Astron. Astrophys.* **639** (2020), A101 [[arXiv:1912.08027](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.08027)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [20] M. G. Dainotti, B. De Simone, T. Schiavone, G. Montani, E. Rinaldi and G. Lambiase, *Astrophys. J.* **912** (2021) no.2, 150 [[arXiv:2103.02117](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.02117)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [21] M. G. Dainotti, B. De Simone, T. Schiavone, G. Montani, E. Rinaldi, G. Lambiase, M. Bogdan and S. Ugale, *Galaxies* **10** (2022) no.1, 24 [[arXiv:2201.09848](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.09848)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [22] M. Dainotti, B. De Simone, G. Montani, T. Schiavone and G. Lambiase, [[arXiv:2301.10572](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.10572)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [23] E. Ó Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, R. Solomon, G. Bargiacchi, S. Capozziello, M. G. Dainotti and D. Stojkovic, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.4, L041301 [[arXiv:2203.10558](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.10558)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [24] E. Ó Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, R. Solomon, M. G. Dainotti and D. Stojkovic, [[arXiv:2206.11447](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11447)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] C. Krishnan, E. Ó Colgáin, Ruchika, A. A. Sen, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and T. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.10, 103525 [[arXiv:2002.06044](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.06044)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] X. D. Jia, J. P. Hu and F. Y. Wang, [[arXiv:2212.00238](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.00238)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Astrophys. J.* **815** (2015), 33 [[arXiv:1505.07118](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.07118)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] G. Risaliti and E. Lusso, *Nature Astron.* **3** (2019) no.3, 272-277 [[arXiv:1811.02590](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02590)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [29] E. Lusso, G. Risaliti, E. Nardini, G. Bargiacchi, M. Benetti, S. Bisogni, S. Capozziello, F. Civano, L. Eggleston and M. Elvis, *et al.* *Astron. Astrophys.* **642** (2020), A150 [[arXiv:2008.08586](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08586)] [astro-ph.GA]].
- [30] T. Yang, A. Banerjee and E. Ó Colgáin, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.12, 123532 [[arXiv:1911.01681](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.01681)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **497** (2020) no.1, 263-278 [[arXiv:2004.09979](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.09979)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [32] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **502** (2021) no.4, 6140-6156 [[arXiv:2012.09291](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.09291)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [33] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **510** (2022) no.2, 2753-2772 [[arXiv:2107.07600](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07600)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [34] S. Pourojaghi, N. F. Zabihi and M. Malekjani, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.12, 123523 [[arXiv:2212.04118](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.04118)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [35] E. Ó Colgáin, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and R. Solomon, [[arXiv:2211.02129](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.02129)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [36] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, A. Carr, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton and D. Jones, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 110 [[arXiv:2202.04077](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.04077)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [37] D. Scolnic, D. Brout, A. Carr, A. G. Riess, T. M. Davis, A. Dwomoh, D. O. Jones, N. Ali, P. Charvu and R. Chen, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 113 [[arXiv:2112.03863](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03863)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [38] D. M. Scolnic *et al.* [Pan-STARRS1], *Astrophys. J.* **859** (2018) no.2, 101 [[arXiv:1710.00845](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.00845)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [39] A. Conley *et al.* [SNLS], *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **192** (2011), 1 [[arXiv:1104.1443](https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.1443)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] M. Sullivan *et al.* [SNLS], *Astrophys. J.* **737** (2011), 102 [[arXiv:1104.1444](https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.1444)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [41] D. Brout, G. Taylor, D. Scolnic, C. M. Wood, B. M. Rose, M. Vincenzi, A. Dwomoh, C. Lidman, A. Riess and N. Ali, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **938** (2022) no.2, 111 doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac8bcc [[arXiv:2112.03864](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03864)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [42] T. M. Davis, S. R. Hinton, C. Howlett and J. Calcino, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **490** (2019) no.2, 2948-2957 [[arXiv:1907.12639](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.12639)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] M. Rameez and S. Sarkar, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.15, 154005 [[arXiv:1911.06456](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.06456)] [astro-ph.CO]].
- [44] C. L. Steinhardt, A. Sneppen and B. Sen, *Astrophys. J.* **902** (2020) no.1, 14 [[arXiv:2005.07707](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.07707)] [astro-ph.CO]].

- [45] A. Carr, T. M. Davis, D. Scolnic, D. Scolnic, K. Said, D. Brout, E. R. Peterson and R. Kessler, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral.* **39** (2022), e046 [[arXiv:2112.01471](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [46] É. Aubourg, S. Bailey, J. E. Bautista, F. Beutler, V. Bhardwaj, D. Bizyaev, M. Blanton, M. Blomqvist, A. S. Bolton and J. Bovy, *et al.* *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) no.12, 123516 [[arXiv:1411.1074](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [47] T. Delubac *et al.* [BOSS], *Astron. Astrophys.* **574** (2015), A59 [[arXiv:1404.1801](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [48] A. Font-Ribera *et al.* [BOSS], *JCAP* **05** (2014), 027 [[arXiv:1311.1767](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [49] H. du Mas des Bourboux, J. Rich, A. Font-Ribera, V. de Sainte Agathe, J. Farr, T. Etourneau, J. M. Le Goff, A. Cuceu, C. Balland and J. E. Bautista, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **901** (2020) no.2, 153 [[arXiv:2007.08995](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [50] K. Dutta, Ruchika, A. Roy, A. A. Sen and M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **52** (2020) no.2, 15 [[arXiv:1808.06623](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] A. A. Sen, S. A. Adil and S. Sen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518** (2022) no.1, 1098-1105 [[arXiv:2112.10641](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [52] L. Visinelli, S. Vagnozzi and U. Danielsson, *Symmetry* **11** (2019) no.8, 1035 [[arXiv:1907.07953](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [53] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.8, 083507 [[arXiv:2001.02451](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [54] G. Ye and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.8, 083523 [[arXiv:2008.10832](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [55] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Lett. B* **832** (2022), 137244 [[arXiv:2201.07079](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [56] H. Wang and Y. S. Piao, [[arXiv:2209.09685](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [57] J. Q. Jiang and Y. S. Piao, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.10, 103514
- [58] E. Mörtzell and S. Dhawan, *JCAP* **09** (2018), 025 [[arXiv:1801.07260](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [59] V. Poulin, K. K. Boddy, S. Bird and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.12, 123504 [[arXiv:1803.02474](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [60] Y. Wang, L. Pogosian, G. B. Zhao and A. Zucca, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **869** (2018), L8 [[arXiv:1807.03772](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [61] A. Bonilla, S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) no.2, 127 [[arXiv:2011.07140](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [62] L. A. Escamilla and J. A. Vazquez, [[arXiv:2111.10457](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [63] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and A. A. Starobinsky, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **793** (2014) no.2, L40 [[arXiv:1406.2209](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [64] E. Ozulker, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.6, 063509 [[arXiv:2203.04167](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [65] G. B. Zhao, M. Raveri, L. Pogosian, Y. Wang, R. G. Crittenden, W. J. Handley, W. J. Percival, F. Beutler, J. Brinkmann and C. H. Chuang, *et al.* *Nature Astron.* **1** (2017) no.9, 627-632 [[arXiv:1701.08165](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [66] S. Capozziello, Ruchika and A. A. Sen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **484** (2019), 4484 [[arXiv:1806.03943](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [67] E. Di Valentino, E. V. Linder and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) no.4, 043528 [[arXiv:1710.02153](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [68] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi and A. H. Shirazi, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.12, 123521 [[arXiv:1808.02472](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [69] A. Banihashemi, N. Khosravi and A. H. Shirazi, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) no.8, 083509 [[arXiv:1810.11007](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [70] Ö. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, C. V. R. Board, N. M. Uzun and J. A. Vazquez, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) no.10, 846 [[arXiv:1903.11519](#) [gr-qc]].
- [71] A. Perez, D. Sudarsky and E. Wilson-Ewing, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **53** (2021) no.1, 7 [[arXiv:2001.07536](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [72] Ö. Akarsu, N. Katurci, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, B. Öztürk and S. Sharma, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) no.11, 1050 [[arXiv:2004.04074](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [73] R. Calderón, R. Gannouji, B. L'Huillier and D. Polarski, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) no.2, 023526 [[arXiv:2008.10237](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [74] G. Acquaviva, Ö. Akarsu, N. Katurci and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.2, 023505 [[arXiv:2104.02623](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [75] F. X. Linares Cedeño, N. Roy and L. A. Ureña-López, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123502 [[arXiv:2105.07103](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [76] O. Akarsu, E. Ó Colgáin, E. Özülker, S. Thakur and L. Yin, [[arXiv:2207.10609](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [77] H. Moshafi, H. Firouzjahi and A. Talebian, *Astrophys. J.* **940** (2022) no.2, 121 [[arXiv:2208.05583](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [78] Ö. Akarsu, J. D. Barrow, L. A. Escamilla and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.6, 063528 [[arXiv:1912.08751](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [79] Ö. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özülker and J. A. Vazquez, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.12, 123512 [[arXiv:2108.09239](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [80] O. Akarsu, S. Kumar, E. Özülker, J. A. Vazquez and A. Yadav, [[arXiv:2211.05742](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] S. Di Gennaro and Y. C. Ong, *Universe* **8** (2022) no.10, 541 [[arXiv:2205.09311](#) [gr-qc]].
- [82] Y. C. Ong, [[arXiv:2212.04429](#) [gr-qc]].
- [83] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, [[arXiv:2301.01024](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [84] A. Lewis, [[arXiv:1910.13970](#) [astro-ph.IM]].
- [85] E. Ó Colgáin, *JCAP* **09** (2019), 006 [[arXiv:1903.11743](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [86] D. Camarena and V. Marra, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2** (2020) no.1, 013028 [[arXiv:1906.11814](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [87] Maurice H P M van Putten *MNRAS Volume 491, Issue 1, January 2020, Pages L6-L10*
- [88] L. Kazantzidis, H. Koo, S. Nesseris, L. Perivolaropoulos and A. Shafieloo, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **501** (2021) no.3, 3421-3426 [[arXiv:2010.03491](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [89] R. Keeley, A. Shafieloo and B. L'Huillier, [[arXiv:2212.07917](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [90] M. Boylan-Kolchin, [[arXiv:2208.01611](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [91] C. C. Lovell, I. Harrison, Y. Harikane, S. Tacchella and S. M. Wilkins, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518** (2022) no.2, 2511-2520 [[arXiv:2208.10479](#) [astro-ph.GA]].
- [92] N. Menci, M. Castellano, P. Santini, E. Merlin, A. Fontana and F. Shankar, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **938** (2022) no.1, L5 [[arXiv:2208.11471](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [93] N. Suzuki *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project], *Astrophys. J.* **746** (2012), 85 [[arXiv:1105.3470](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [94] A. G. Riess, S. A. Rodney, D. M. Scolnic, D. L. Shafer, L. G. Strolger, H. C. Ferguson, M. Postman, O. Graur, D. Maoz and S. W. Jha, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **853** (2018) no.2, 126 [[arXiv:1710.00844](#) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [95] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team], *Astrophys. J.* **607** (2004), 665-687 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0402512](#) [astro-ph]].
- [96] A. G. Riess, L. G. Strolger, S. Casertano, H. C. Ferguson, B. Mobasher, B. Gold, P. J. Challis, A. V. Filippenko, S. Jha and W. Li, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.* **659** (2007), 98-121 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0611572](#) [astro-ph]].
- [97] D. Scolnic, S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, D. Brout, T. Davis, A. Filippenko, R. Foley, R. Hložek, R. Hounsell and S. Jha, *et al.* [[arXiv:1903.05128](#) [astro-ph.CO]].

- [98] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989), 1-23
- [99] The Hubble constant H_0 is merely the scale of $H(z)$, so it does not dictate evolution.
- [100] Note that $D_L(z)$ and $D_A(z)$ are not independent, since $D_L(z) = (1+z)^2 D_A(z)$.
- [101] Introducing a Planck prior on $\Omega_m h^2$, where $h \equiv H_0/100$, increases the significance [24].
- [102] AdS vacua pre-recombination resolve Hubble tension without invoking H_0 priors [53–57].
- [103] One cannot get negative DE densities when one works with a barotropic EoS $w_{\text{DE}}(z)$, but one may find null DE densities by sending $w_{\text{DE}}(z) \rightarrow -\infty$ [63, 64]. More generally, one notes a preference for $w_{\text{DE}}(z) < 0$ at higher z [65, 66].