

Observational Constraints on Yukawa Cosmology and Connection with Black Hole Shadows

Esteban Gonzalez^{1,*}, Kimet Jusufi^{2,†}, Genly Leon^{3,4,‡} and Emmanuel N. Saridakis^{3,5,§}

¹*Departamento de Física, Universidad Católica del Norte,
Avenida Angamos 0610, Casilla 1280, Antofagasta, Chile*

²*Physics Department, State University of Tetovo,
Ilinden Street nn, 1200, Tetovo, North Macedonia*

³*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Católica del Norte,
Avda. Angamos 0610, Casilla 1280 Antofagasta, Chile*

⁴*Institute of Systems Science, Durban University of Technology, PO Box 1334, Durban 4000, South Africa*

⁵*National Observatory of Athens, Lofos Nymfon, 11852 Athens, Greece and*

⁶*CAS Key Laboratory for Researches in Galaxies and Cosmology, Department of Astronomy,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R. China*

Abstract

We confront Yukawa modified cosmology, proposed in [Jusufi et al. arXiv:2304.11492], with data from Supernovae Type Ia (SNe Ia) and Hubble parameter (OHD) observations. Yukawa cosmology is obtained from a Yukawa-like gravitational potential, with coupling parameter α and wavelength parameter λ , which gives rise to modified Friedmann equations. We show that the agreement with observations is very efficient, and within 1σ confidence level we find the best-fit parameters $\lambda = (2693^{+1191}_{-1262})$ Mpc, $\alpha = 0.416^{+1.137}_{-0.326}$, and a graviton mass of $m_g = (2.374^{+2.095}_{-0.728}) \times 10^{-42}$ GeV. Additionally, we establish a connection between the effective dark matter and dark energy density parameters and the angular radius of the black hole shadow of the SgrA and M87 black holes in the low-redshift limit, consistent with the Event Horizon Telescope findings.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to modern cosmology, the universe's large-scale structure is homogeneous and isotropic. Additionally, it is believed that cold dark matter, a type of matter that is not visible and only interacts through gravity, exists [1–5]. However, despite numerous efforts, there have not been any direct detection of dark matter particles and their existence is only inferred from its gravitational effects on galaxies and larger structures. On the other hand, dark energy is also introduced to explain the universe accelerated expansion [6], supported by numerous observations [7–9].

The Λ CDM paradigm has proven to be the most successful model in modern cosmology. This scenario can describe cosmological observations with the least number of parameters [10]. However, specific fundamental physics concepts remain to be fully understood, such as the microphysical nature of dark matter and dark energy. Since scalar fields play a significant role in the physical description of the universe in the inflationary scenario [11], a quintessence scalar field is used in a generalization of the Λ CDM model [12–18]. Additionally, multi-scalar field models can describe various epochs of the cosmological history [19–25]. Moreover, a unified description of the matter and dark energy epochs was presented for a class of scalar-torsion theories, providing a Hamilto-

nian description [26]. Nevertheless, there is direction in the literature that deviates from this line of thought and supports the idea that observations can be explained by altering Einstein's equations, leading to modified theories of gravity [27–42].

Concerning dark matter, which is needed to explain the galaxy rotation curves [43], one of the first theories suggesting an explanation for the flatness of rotation curves was the Modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND) proposed by Milgrom [44], which modifies Newton's law [45–51]. Other interesting proposals are the superfluid dark matter [52], the Bose-Einstein condensate [53], etc.

On the other hand, black holes are intriguing astrophysical objects and can potentially test the theories of gravity in strong gravitational fields. One of the most fascinating aspects of black holes is their shadow image. The black hole's silhouette is a dark region that results from the immense gravitational pull of the black hole, which bends the path of light rays near it. Specifically, photons emitted from a bright source close to a black hole can either be drawn into the black hole or scattered away from it and into infinity. Additionally, critical geodesics separate the first two sets, known as unstable spherical orbits. By observing the critical photon geodesic trajectories in the sky, we can obtain the black hole shadow [54–76]. With the recent results, the black hole shadow for the supermassive black holes M87 and Sgr A was confirmed by the Event Horizon Telescope (EHT) collaboration [77–82].

In the present paper, we follow an approach motivated by cosmology and quantum field theories; we aim to study the dark sector by introducing the Yukawa potential [83–87]. We adopt the viewpoint of Verlinde and con-

*Electronic address: esteban.gonzalez@ucn.cl

†Electronic address: kimet.jusufi@unite.edu.mk

‡Electronic address: genly.leon@ucn.cl (corresponding author)

§Electronic address: msaridak@noa.gr

sider gravity as an entropic force caused by the changes in the system's information [88]. Verlinde further argued that dark matter is an apparent effect, i.e., a consequence of the baryonic matter [89]. Furthermore, the corresponding entropic force was used in deriving the corrected Friedmann equations due to the minimal length, as recently studied in [90–93].

In particular, as it was recently shown in [93], dark matter can be explained by the coupling between baryonic matter through a long-range force via the Yukawa gravitational potential. This coupling is characterized by the coupling parameter α , the wavelength parameter λ , and the Planck length l_0 . The modified Friedmann equations are derived using Verlinde's entropic force interpretation of gravity based on the holographic scenario and the equipartition law of energy. An equation connects the dark matter density, dark energy density, and baryonic matter density. It is worth noting that dark matter is not associated with a particle but is an apparent effect. Dark energy is related to graviton mass and α , indicating that the cosmological constant can be viewed as a self-interaction effect between gravitons. The model parameters were estimated as $\lambda \simeq 10^3$ [Mpc] and $\alpha \in (0.0385, 0.0450)$.

In this work, we are interested in performing detailed observational tests of the cosmological scenario based on Yukawa potential. In particular, we wish to constrain the parameters of the model using Supernovae Type Ia (SNe Ia) and Hubble parameter (OHD) observations. Additionally, we are interested in investigating the connection to black hole physics. In particular, at low redshifts, one can use the angular radius of the black hole shadow to constrain the Hubble constant independently. The manuscript is organized as follows. In Sect. II we review the Yukawa cosmological scenario, while in Sect. III we extract observational constraints. In Sect. IV we study the relation between the modified Yukawa cosmology and black hole shadows, and in Sect. V we comment on our findings.

II. YUKAWA MODIFIED COSMOLOGY

In this section, we shall review the model that was recently studied in [93]. The gravitational potential considered is modified via the non-singular Yukawa-type gravitational potential

$$\Phi(r) = -\frac{GMm}{\sqrt{r^2 + l_0^2}} (1 + \alpha e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}}) \Big|_{r=R}, \quad (1)$$

with l_0 being a small quantity of Planck length order, i.e. $l_0 \sim 10^{-34}$ cm and $\alpha > 0$. Note that the wavelength of massive graviton we have $\lambda = \frac{\hbar}{m_g c} > 10^{20}$ m, that leads to $m_g < 10^{-64}$ kg for the graviton mass [94]. If we use the relation $F = -\nabla\Phi(r)|_{r=R}$, and by neglecting the term $\alpha l_0^2/R^2 \rightarrow 0$ we get the modified Newton's law of

gravitation

$$F = -\frac{GMm}{R^2} \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda + \frac{l_0^2}{R}}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] \left[1 + \frac{l_0^2}{R^2} \right]^{-3/2}. \quad (2)$$

We can further elaborate that such a force can be obtained if we modify the expression for the entropy by means of Verlinde's entropic force interpretation. In this theory, when a test particle or excitation moves apart from the holographic screen, the magnitude of the entropic force on this body has the form [88] $F\Delta x = T\Delta S$. Specifically, one can get Newton's law of gravitation via the entropy-area relationship $S = A/4$, however in general, one can modify the total expression for the entropy as $S = A/4 + \mathcal{S}(A)$ [93]. One uses the holographic scenario and the equipartition law of energy to get the expression for force. The entropy of the surface changes by $dS = [1/4 + \partial\mathcal{S}/\partial A] dA$; at the same time, we can relate the area of the surface to the number of bytes according to $A = QN$, where Q is a fundamental constant, and N is the number of bytes. We can now use the equipartition law of energy, we get the total energy on the surface via $E = Nk_B T/2$, and further taking $\Delta N = 1$, and $\Delta A = Q$, we get the modified gravity force

$$F = -\frac{GMm}{R^2} \left(\frac{Q}{2\pi k_B \eta} \right) \left[\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\partial\mathcal{S}}{\partial A} \right]_{A=4\pi R^2}. \quad (3)$$

This means that, by changing the entropy, we end up with a modified law of gravity. Let us define $\eta = 1/8\pi k_B$; we get $Q = 1$,

$$F = -\frac{GMm}{R^2} \left[1 + 4 \frac{\partial\mathcal{S}}{\partial A} \right]_{A=4\pi R^2}. \quad (4)$$

Since for large-scale distances l_0 is unimportant, we can set it to zero, i.e. $l_0 = 0$. We now see that we can get the corrections to the entropy if we compare

$$1 + \left(\frac{1}{2\pi R} \right) \frac{dS}{dR} = \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Solving for entropy, we obtain [93]

$$S = \pi R^2 - 2\pi\alpha (R^2 + 3\lambda R + 3\lambda^2) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}}. \quad (6)$$

We have therefore shown that the Yukawa modified force follows from the modification of the entropy. This method can be viewed as a generic result; if we modify the entropy, we modify Newton's law of gravity. It is worth noting that the correction of the entropy can be viewed as a volume law entanglement to the entropy due to the gravitons. We see from the last equation that α appears only in the second term; hence we can say that α is a result of the entanglement due to the volume law entropy contribution. We proceed by studying the implications of the above-modified law of gravity in cosmology. First, we assume the background spacetime to

be spatially homogeneous and isotropic, described by the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \right], \quad (7)$$

with $R = a(t)r$, $x^0 = t$, $x^1 = r$, and the two dimensional metric $h_{\mu\nu}$, and where k is the spatial curvature ($k = 0, 1, -1$ corresponding to flat, closed, and open universes, respectively). In addition, we have an apparent dynamic horizon, which the following relation can determine $h^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu R)(\partial_\nu R) = 0$. It is easy to show that the apparent horizon radius for the FRW universe reads as

$$R = ar = 1/\sqrt{H^2 + k/a^2}. \quad (8)$$

On the other hand, we have a matter source which can be assumed to be a perfect fluid described by the stress-energy tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)u_\mu u_\nu + pg_{\mu\nu}, \quad (9)$$

along with the continuity equation $\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0$, with $H = \dot{a}/a$ being the Hubble parameter.

Let us consider a compact spatial region V with a compact boundary \mathcal{S} , corresponding to a sphere of radius $R = a(t)r$, where r is a dimensionless quantity. Through Newton's law, we can write the gravitational force on a test particle m near the surface [93] as

$$m\ddot{a}r = -\frac{GMm}{R^2} \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] \left[1 + \frac{l_0^2}{R^2} \right]^{-3/2}. \quad (10)$$

In Newtonian cosmology, we can take $\rho = M/V$ inside the volume $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi a^3 r^3$, hence we can rewritten the above equation as [93]

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} \rho \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] \left[1 + \frac{l_0^2}{R^2} \right]^{-3/2}, \quad (11)$$

which is the dynamical equation for Newtonian cosmology. To obtain the Friedmann equations in general relativity, we must use the active gravitational mass \mathcal{M} rather than the total mass M . By replacing M with \mathcal{M} , we obtain

$$\mathcal{M} = -\ddot{a}a^2 r^3 \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] \left[1 + \frac{l_0^2}{R^2} \right]^{-3/2}, \quad (12)$$

where the active gravitational mass can also be computed via

$$\mathcal{M} = 2 \int_V dV \left(T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} T g_{\mu\nu} \right) u^\mu u^\nu. \quad (13)$$

Using these equations, we obtain the modified acceleration equation for the dynamical evolution of the FRW universe [93]

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} (\rho + 3p) \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] \left[1 - \frac{3l_0^2}{2R^2} \right]. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, we can simplify the work since l_0 is a very small number; we can consider a series expansion around $x = 1/\lambda$ via

$$\left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{R + \lambda}{\lambda} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right] = 1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha R^2}{\lambda^2} + \dots, \quad (15)$$

provided that $\alpha R^2/\lambda^2 \ll 1$. In general, we expect $\alpha < 1$, and λ to be some large number of magnitude comparable to the radius of the observable Universe $R \sim 10^{26}$ m.

In summary, the corresponding Friedmann equation for $\alpha R^2/\lambda^2 \ll 1$ becomes

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} \sum_i (\rho_i + 3p_i) \left[1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha R^2}{\lambda^2} \right] \left[1 - \frac{3l_0^2}{2R^2} \right], \quad (16)$$

where we have included several matter fluids with a constant equation of state parameters ω_i along with the continuity equation $\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(1 + \omega_i)\rho_i = 0$, that yield an expression for densities $\rho_i = \rho_{i0} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)}$. Inserting these into (16) and integrating we obtain [93]

$$d(\dot{a}^2 + k) = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \left[1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha R^2}{\lambda^2} \right] \left[1 - \frac{3l_0^2}{2R^2} \right] \times d \left(\sum_i \rho_{i0} a^{-1-3\omega_i} \right). \quad (17)$$

Using the fact that $R[a] = ra$, we further, get

$$\dot{a}^2 + k = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \int \left[1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha R[a]^2}{\lambda^2} \right] \left[1 - \frac{3l_0^2}{2R[a]^2} \right] \times \frac{d(\sum_i \rho_{i0} a^{-1-3\omega_i})}{da} da, \quad (18)$$

with r nearly a constant. Considering the equations of state, $\omega_i \notin \{-1, 1/3\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + \frac{k}{a^2} &= \frac{8\pi G}{3} \left(\alpha \left(\frac{3l_0^2}{4\lambda^2} + 1 \right) + 1 \right) \sum_i \rho_{i0} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)} \\ &\quad - \frac{4\pi(\alpha + 1)Gl_0^2}{3R^2} \sum_i \frac{3\omega_i + 1}{\omega_i + 1} \rho_{i0} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)} \\ &\quad + \frac{4\pi\alpha GR^2}{3\lambda^2} \sum_i \frac{1 + 3\omega_i}{1 - 3\omega_i} \rho_{i0} a^{-3(1+\omega_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

implying that at leading order terms ($l_0^2/\lambda^2 \rightarrow 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} &= \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3} \sum_i \rho_i - \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_i \Gamma_1(\omega_i) \rho_i \\ &\quad + \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3} R^2 \sum_i \Gamma_2(\omega_i) \rho_i, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the Newton's constant is shifted as $G_{\text{eff}} = G(1 + \alpha)$, along with the definitions [93]

$$\Gamma_1(\omega_i) \equiv \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}} l_0^2}{3} \left(\frac{1 + 3\omega_i}{1 + \omega_i} \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\Gamma_2(\omega_i) \equiv \frac{\alpha(1 + 3\omega_i)}{\lambda^2(1 + \alpha)(1 - 3\omega_i)}. \quad (22)$$

If, for example, we assume only a matter source, at leading order terms we can write

$$H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\rho - \frac{\Gamma_1}{R^2}\rho + \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\rho\Gamma_2 R^2. \quad (23)$$

Focusing on the flat case ($k = 0$), we have $R^2 = 1/H^2$, yielding

$$H^2(1 + \Gamma_1\rho) - \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\frac{\Gamma_2}{H^2}\rho = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\rho. \quad (24)$$

Finally, by expanding around l_0 , making use of $(1 + \Gamma_1\rho)^{-1} \simeq (1 - \Gamma_1\rho)$, and neglecting the terms $\sim \mathcal{O}(l_0\alpha^2/\lambda^2)$, we obtain

$$H^2 - \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\frac{\Gamma_2}{H^2}\rho = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\rho(1 - \Gamma_1\rho). \quad (25)$$

A. Late time universe

Let us now study the modified Friedmann equation's phenomenological aspects. In particular, we are interested in studying the late universe, which implies we can neglect the quantum effects by setting $l_0 \rightarrow 0$ [$\Gamma_1 = 0$]. This gives

$$H^2 - \frac{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\frac{\sum_i \Gamma_2(\omega_i)\rho_i}{H^2} = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\sum_i \rho_i, \quad (26)$$

and using $\rho_{\text{crit}} = \frac{3}{8\pi G}H_0^2$ we acquire two solutions:

$$E^2 = \frac{(1 + \alpha)}{2}\sum_i \Omega_i \pm \frac{\sqrt{(\sum_i \Omega_i)^2(1 + \alpha)^2 + 2\Gamma_2(\omega_i)\Omega_i(1 + \alpha)/H_0^2}}{2}, \quad (27)$$

where $\Omega_i = \Omega_{i0}(1 + z)^{3(1 + \omega_i)}$, $\Omega_{i0} = 8\pi G\rho_{i0}/(3H_0^2)$, with $E = H/H_0$. In addition, we point out that the total quantity Ω^2 in the square root should be viewed as the root-mean-square density energy, i.e $\Omega \equiv \sqrt{\langle \Omega^2 \rangle}$ along with $\langle \Omega^2 \rangle = \langle \Omega_B^2 \rangle + \langle \Omega_\Lambda^2 \rangle$. As explained in [93], the most interesting implication of the last equation relies on the physical interpretation of the term $2\Gamma_2(\omega_i)\Omega_i(1 + \alpha)/H_0^2$. In particular, it was shown that this term precisely mimics the effect of cold dark matter of the Λ CDM model. Taking the term $\Gamma_2\Omega_i$ and set $\omega_i = 0$ we define the quantity (here we shall add the constant term c to make the equation consistent) [93]

$$\frac{\Omega_D^2(1 + \alpha)^2}{(1 + z)^3} \equiv \frac{2\Gamma_2\Omega_i(1 + \alpha)}{H_0^2}. \quad (28)$$

Thus, we can obtain an equation for dark matter as

$$\Omega_D = \frac{c}{\lambda H_0(1 + \alpha)}\sqrt{2\alpha\Omega_B}(1 + z)^3. \quad (29)$$

From this equation, we can deduce that dark matter can be viewed as an effective sector, a manifestation of modified Newton's law, quantified by $\sim \alpha\Omega_B$. Additionally, we define the quantity

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \frac{c^2}{\lambda^2 H_0^2} \frac{\alpha}{(1 + \alpha)^2}. \quad (30)$$

Finally, comparing the last expression with $\rho_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda c^2}{8\pi G}$, we can estimate the effective cosmological constant to be $\Lambda = \frac{3m_g^2 c^2 \alpha}{\hbar^2(1 + \alpha)^2}$. Note that one can combine the above expressions and relate baryonic matter with the effective dark matter and dark energy, acquiring

$$\Omega_D = \sqrt{2\Omega_B\Omega_\Lambda}(1 + z)^3. \quad (31)$$

In summary, Eq. (27) can be re-written as [93]

$$E^2(z) = (1 + \alpha)[\Omega_B(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda]. \quad (32)$$

We can now introduce the split $\Omega_B(1 + z)^3 \rightarrow \Omega_B^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_D^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, hence, to get the Λ CDM-like model, we can write

$$E^2(z) = (1 + \alpha)[\Omega_B^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_D^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_\Lambda], \quad (33)$$

where

$$\Omega_D^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = \frac{c}{\lambda H_0(1 + \alpha)}\sqrt{2\alpha\Omega_B^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}(1 + z)^3. \quad (34)$$

III. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

In the previous section, we presented Yukawa-modified cosmology. Hence, in this section, we can proceed to observational confrontation with Hubble parameter data (OHD) and Type Ia supernovae (SN Ia) data, in order to extract constraints of the free parameters. For this purpose, we compute the best-fit of the free parameters and their corresponding confidence regions at 1σ (68.3%) of confidence level (CL) with the affine-invariant Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method [95], implemented in the pure-Python code *emcee* [96]. In particular, we have considered 100 chains or “walkers”, using the autocorrelation time provided by the *emcee* module as a convergence test. In this sense, we computed at every 50 step the autocorrelation time, τ_{corr} , of the chains. If the current step is larger than $50\tau_{\text{corr}}$ and the values of τ_{corr} changed by less than 1%, then we will consider that the chains are converged, and the constraint is stopped. We discard the first $5\tau_{\text{corr}}$ steps as “burn-in” steps. Finally, we compute the mean acceptance fraction of the chains, which must have a value between 0.2 and 0.5 [96] and can be modified by the stretch move provided by the *emcee* module.

For this Bayesian statistical analysis, we need to construct the following Gaussian likelihoods:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{OHD}} \propto \exp\left(-\frac{\chi_{\text{OHD}}^2}{2}\right), \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{SNe}} \propto \exp\left(-\frac{\chi_{\text{SNe}}^2}{2}\right), \quad (35)$$

where χ_{OHD}^2 and χ_{SNe}^2 are the merit function of the OHD and SNe Ia data, respectively. The Gaussian likelihood for the joint analysis SNe Ia+OHD is constructed as $\mathcal{L}_{\text{joint}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SNe}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{OHD}}$.

In the following subsections, we will briefly describe the construction of the merit function of each data set.

A. Observational Hubble parameter data

For the OHD, we consider the sample compiled by Magaña et al. [97], which consists of 51 data points in the redshift range $0.07 \leq z \leq 2.36$, and for which we construct their merit functions as

$$\chi_{\text{OHD}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{51} \left[\frac{H_i - H_{th}(z_i, \theta)}{\sigma_{H,i}} \right]^2, \quad (36)$$

where H_i is the observational Hubble parameter at redshift z_i with an associated error $\sigma_{H,i}$, all of them provided by the OHD sample, H_{th} is the theoretical Hubble parameter at the same redshift, and θ encompasses the free parameters of the model under study.

The theoretical Hubble parameter is obtained from Eq. (33), which we conveniently rewrite as

$$E^2(z) = (1 + \alpha) \left[\left(\Omega_{B,0} + \sqrt{2\Omega_{B,0}\Omega_{\Lambda,0}} \right) (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} \right], \quad (37)$$

with $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$ given by Eq. (30), while the condition $H(z=0) = H_0$, leads to

$$1 + \alpha = \left[\Omega_{B,0} + \sqrt{2\Omega_{B,0}\Omega_{\Lambda,0}} + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} \right]^{-1}, \quad (38)$$

and the free parameters of the Yukawa-modified cosmology are $\theta = \{H_0; \Omega_{B,0}; \Omega_{\Lambda,0}\}$. Note that one has the relations

$$(1 + \alpha) \Omega_{B,0} \equiv \Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, \quad (39)$$

$$(1 + \alpha) \sqrt{2\Omega_{B,0}\Omega_{\Lambda,0}} \equiv \Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, \quad (40)$$

$$(1 + \alpha) \Omega_{\Lambda,0} \equiv \Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, \quad (41)$$

and Eq. (37) becomes

$$E^2(z) = (\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}) (1+z)^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}, \quad (42)$$

which is related to the Hubble parameter for the standard ΛCDM model through $H(z) = H_0 E(z)$, with $H_0 = H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$.

It is important to mention that the OHD, as well as the SNe Ia data, are not able to independently constraint $\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ and $\Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. Thus, for the ΛCDM scenario, we define $\Omega_{m,0} \equiv \Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, where the condition $H(z=0) = H_0$ leads to $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 1 - \Omega_{m,0}$, and the free parameters of the ΛCDM scenario are $\theta = \{H_0; \Omega_{m,0}\}$. Therefore, we consider the following priors for our MCMC analysis: $H_0 = 100 \frac{\text{km/s}}{\text{Mpc}} h$, with $0.55 < h < 0.85$, $0 < \Omega_{m,0} < 1$, $0 < \Omega_{B,0} < 0.2$, $0 < \Omega_{\Lambda,0} < 1$, and the condition $\alpha > 0$ implies $0 < \Omega_{B,0} + \sqrt{2\Omega_{B,0}\Omega_{\Lambda,0}} + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} < 1$.

B. Type Ia supernovae data

For the SNe Ia data, we consider the Pantheon+ sample [98], which is the successor of the original Pantheon sample [99] and consist of 1701 data points in the redshift range $0.001 \leq z \leq 2.26$. In this case, the merit function can be conveniently constructed in matrix notation (denoted by bold symbols) as

$$\chi_{\text{SNe}}^2 = \mathbf{\Delta D}(z, \theta, M)^\dagger \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta D}(z, \theta, M), \quad (43)$$

where $[\mathbf{\Delta D}(z, \theta, M)]_i = m_{B,i} - M - \mu_{th}(z_i, \theta)$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_{\text{stat}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{sys}}$ is the total uncertainty covariance matrix, where the matrices \mathbf{C}_{stat} and \mathbf{C}_{sys} accounts for the statistical and systematic uncertainties, respectively. In this expression, $\mu_i = m_{B,i} - M$ is the observational distance modulus of Pantheon+ sample, obtained by a modified version of the Trip's formula [100], with three nuisance parameters calibrated to zero with the BBC (BEAMS with Bias Corrections) approach [101]. Therefore, the Pantheon+ sample provides directly the corrected apparent B-band magnitude $m_{B,i}$ of a fiducial SNe Ia at redshift z_i , with M the fiducial magnitude of an SNe Ia, which must be jointly estimated with the free parameters of the model under study.

The theoretical distance modulus for a spatially flat FLRW spacetime is given by

$$\mu_{th}(z_i, \theta) = 5 \log_{10} \left[\frac{d_L(z_i, \theta)}{\text{Mpc}} \right] + 25, \quad (44)$$

with $d_L(z_i, \theta)$ the luminosity distance given by

$$d_L(z_i, \theta) = c(1+z_i) \int_0^{z_i} \frac{dz'}{H_{th}(z', \theta)}, \quad (45)$$

where c is the speed of light given in units of km/s. Note that the luminosity distance depends on the theoretical Hubble parameter, which is given by Eq. (37) for the Yukawa cosmology and Eq. (42) for the ΛCDM model. Therefore, we only add to the free parameters the nuisance parameter M , for which we consider the following prior to our MCMC analysis: $-20 < M < -18$.

Similarly to the Pantheon sample, there is a degeneration between the nuisance parameter M and H_0 . Hence, to constraint the free parameter H_0 using SNe Ia data alone, it is necessary to include the SH0ES (Supernovae and H_0 for the Equation of State of the dark energy program) Cepheid host distance anchors of the form

$$\chi_{\text{Cepheid}}^2 = \mathbf{\Delta D}_{\text{Cepheid}}(M)^\dagger \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta D}_{\text{Cepheid}}(M), \quad (46)$$

where $[\mathbf{\Delta D}_{\text{Cepheid}}(M)]_i = \mu_i(M) - \mu_i^{\text{Cepheid}}$, with μ_i^{Cepheid} the Cepheid calibrated host-galaxy distance obtained by SH0ES [102]. Hence, for the correspondence, we use the Cepheid distances as the “theory” instead of using the model under study to calibrate M , considering that the difference $\mu_i(M) - \mu_i^{\text{Cepheid}}$ is sensitive to

M and H_0 and also is largely insensitive to other parameters like $\Omega_{m,0}$. In this sense, the Pantheon+ sample provides μ_i^{Cepheid} , and the total uncertainty covariance matrix for Cepheid is contained in the total uncertainty covariance matrix \mathbf{C} . Therefore, we can define the merit function for the SNe Ia data as

$$\chi_{\text{SNe}}^2 = \mathbf{\Delta D}'(z, \theta, M)^\dagger \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta D}'(z, \theta, M), \quad (47)$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Delta D}'_i = \begin{cases} m_{B,i} - M - \mu_i^{\text{Cepheid}} & i \in \text{Cepheid host} \\ m_{B,i} - M - \mu_{th}(z_i, \theta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (48)$$

It is essential to mention that from now on, we will omit the free parameter M and we will focus our analysis only on the free parameters of each model. Besides, considering that the best-fit parameters minimize the merit function, we can use the evaluation of the best-fit parameters in the merit function, χ_{min}^2 , as an indicator of the goodness of the fit: the smaller the value of χ_{min}^2 is, the better is the fit.

C. Results and discussions

In Table I, we present the total number of steps, the values used for the stretch move, the mean acceptance fraction, and the autocorrelation time for the free parameters h and $\Omega_{m,0}$ of the Λ CDM model, and h , $\Omega_{B,0}$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$ of the Yukawa modified cosmology. Additionally, in Table II, we present their respective best-fit values at 1σ CL with the corresponding χ_{min}^2 criteria. In Figs. 1 and 2, we depict the posterior 1D distribution and the joint marginalized regions of the free parameters space of the Λ CDM model and the Yukawa-modified cosmology. The admissible joint regions presented correspond to 1σ , 2σ (95.5%), and 3σ (99.7%) CL, respectively. These results were obtained by the MCMC analysis described in Section III for the SNe Ia data, OHD, and their joint analysis.

As we can see from Table II, the values obtained for the χ_{min}^2 criteria show that the Yukawa modified cosmology can fit the observational data of SNe Ia, OHD and SNe Ia+OHD as accurately as the Λ CDM model. Even more, the value of the Hubble constant is the same in both models, which agrees with our previous identification in Eqs. (37) and (42), where $H_0 = H_0^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$. The only difference between these models relies on the rescaling of energy densities due to the contribution of the α parameter. On physical grounds, the main difference between these models are that in Yukawa cosmology, dark matter is effective and precisely mimics the cold dark matter of the Λ CDM scenario.

To establish the last point, we use the results of our MCMC analysis for SNe Ia+OHD to calculate the values of $\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, $\Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ at 1σ CL from their definitions given by Eqs. (39), (40), and (41), obtaining:




FIG. 1: Posterior 1D distribution and joint marginalized regions of the free parameters space of the Λ CDM model, obtained by the MCMC analysis described in Section III. The admissible joint regions correspond to 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ CL, respectively. The best-fit values for each model free parameter are shown in Table II.




FIG. 2: Posterior 1D distribution and joint marginalized regions of the free parameters space of the Yukawa modified cosmology, obtained by the MCMC analysis described in Section III. The admissible joint regions correspond to 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ CL, respectively. The best-fit values for each model free parameter are shown in Table II.

Data	Total Steps	a	MAF	τ_{corr}			
				h	$\Omega_{m,0}$	$\Omega_{B,0}$	$\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$
ΛCDM model							
SNe Ia	1250	5.0	0.35	24.9	23.6
OHD	2100	5.0	0.31	31.9	32.2
SNe Ia+OHD	1250	5.0	0.35	24.0	22.8
Yukawa cosmology							
SNe Ia	2500	3.0	0.38	38.1	...	48.1	49.8
OHD	4150	2.5	0.37	64.1	...	82.2	80.7
SNe Ia+OHD	2300	3.0	0.38	38.5	...	45.8	45.2

TABLE I: The total number of steps, stretch move (a), mean acceptance fraction (MAF), and autocorrelation time (τ_{corr}) for the free parameters space of the Λ CDM model and the Yukawa modified cosmology. The values were obtained when the convergence test described in Section III is fulfilled for an MCMC analysis with 100 chains and the flat priors $h \in F(0.55, 0.85)$, $\Omega_{m,0} \in F(0, 1)$, $\Omega_{B,0} \in F(0, 0.2)$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda,0} \in F(0, 1)$. Additionally, we consider the constraint $0 < \Omega_{B,0} + \sqrt{2\Omega_{B,0}\Omega_{\Lambda,0}} + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} < 1$ for the Yukawa cosmology.

Data	Best-Fit values				χ^2_{\min}
	h	$\Omega_{m,0}$	$\Omega_{B,0}$	$\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$	
Λ CDM model					
SNe Ia	0.734 ± 0.010	0.333 ± 0.018	\cdots	\cdots	1523.0
OHD	0.707 ± 0.012	0.259 ± 0.018	\cdots	\cdots	27.5
SNe Ia+OHD	0.707 ± 0.007	0.272 ± 0.011	\cdots	\cdots	1576.7
Yukawa cosmology					
SNe Ia	0.734 ± 0.010	\cdots	$0.040^{+0.013}_{-0.017}$	$0.468^{+0.141}_{-0.206}$	1523.0
OHD	0.706 ± 0.012	\cdots	$0.024^{+0.008}_{-0.011}$	$0.522^{+0.153}_{-0.233}$	27.5
SNe Ia+OHD	0.707 ± 0.007	\cdots	$0.027^{+0.008}_{-0.012}$	$0.513^{+0.153}_{-0.229}$	1576.7

TABLE II: Best-fit values and χ^2_{min} criteria for the Λ CDM model and the Yukawa cosmology. The values were obtained by the MCMC analysis described in Section III, and the uncertainties presented correspond to 1σ CL.




FIG. 3: Hubble parameter as a function of redshift for the Λ CDM and Yukawa modified cosmologies. The shaded curve represents the confidence region of the Hubble parameter for the Yukawa cosmology at 3σ CL. Additionally, we depict the OHD sample for further comparison. Both curves and the confidence region were obtained with the results of our MCMC analysis described in Section III for the SNe Ia+OHD.




FIG. 4: Matter density parameter as a function of redshift for the Λ CDM and Yukawa modified cosmologies. The shaded curve represents the confidence region of the Matter density parameter for the Yukawa cosmology at 3σ CL. Both curves and the confidence region were obtained with the results of our MCMC analysis described in Section III for the SNe Ia+OHD.

$\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 0.038 \pm 0.003$, $\Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 0.235 \pm 0.008$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 0.727 \pm 0.011$. Note that $\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = 0.273 \pm 0.011$, which match with the value of $\Omega_{m,0}$ obtained in the Λ CDM model. Therefore, Yukawa cosmology

can mimic the late-time Λ CDM model, as we can see from Fig. 3, where we depict the Hubble parameter as a function of redshift z for the Yukawa and Λ CDM cosmologies, given respectively by Eqs. (37) and (42). Furthermore, in Fig. 4 we depict the matter density pa-

parameter Ω_m as a function of redshift for both models, were $\Omega_m = \Omega_{m,0}(1+z)^3/E^2$. Both figures were obtained with the results of our MCMC analysis described in Section III for the joint analysis.

The joint analysis has revealed the best-fit values for Yukawa parameters at 1σ CL. These are $\lambda = 2693_{-1262}^{+1191}$ Mpc, $\alpha = 0.416_{-0.326}^{+1.137}$, and $m_g := \hbar/(c\lambda) = (4.233_{-1.298}^{+3.735}) \times 10^{-69}$ kg $\equiv (2.374_{-0.728}^{+2.095}) \times 10^{-42}$ GeV.

Other studies have estimated the graviton mass differently. For instance, A. S. Goldhaber *et al.* (1974) [103], using data from Galaxy Clusters, obtained $\lambda > 0.324$ and $m_g < 10^{-38}$ GeV. C. Talmadge *et al.* (1998) [104], using data from Solar System measurements, obtained $\lambda > 9.074 \times 10^{-8}$ and $m_g < 7.2 \times 10^{-32}$ GeV. Moreover, S. R. Choudhury *et al.* (2004) [105], using Weak Lensing measurements, obtains $\lambda > 97.22$ and $m_g < 6 \times 10^{-41}$ GeV. E. Berti *et al.* (2011) [106], observed multiple inspiralling black holes to determine the bounds that space-based detectors could place on the graviton Compton wavelength and graviton mass, leading to $\lambda > 9.722 \times 10^{-4}$ and $m_g < 4 \times 10^{-35}$ GeV. Finally, D. Benisty *et al.* (2023) [107] obtain a value of $\alpha < 0.581$ and $m_g < 5.095 \times 10^{-35}$ with Local Group estimations. We have compared our best-fit values for α , λ , and m_g at 1σ CL with previous references in Table III.

Our results are consistent with more stringent Yukawa constraints on m_g [105]. For instance, our findings show that the graviton mass is less than 6×10^{-41} GeV and λ is greater than 97.22 Mpc obtained for Weak Lensing measurements [105], and α is less than the value of 0.581 obtained for the Local Group estimations [107]. Also, we provide Diagram 5 for upper bounds on the graviton mass (m_g) for the Yukawa potential, which we compared with our best-fit values using SNe Ia+OHD. Our research has revealed that the graviton's mass is lower than previously estimated. This discovery significantly contributes to the scientific community and complements other significant findings related to Yukawa constraints from various systems [103–111].

IV. RELATING YUKAWA COSMOLOGY AND BLACK HOLE SHADOWS

In this section, we will present a connection between the dark matter/dark energy densities and the angular radius of the black hole shadow. We will closely follow the approach developed in [74, 75], in which one can employ the standard definition of the luminosity distance for a flat Λ CDM model as [74, 75]

$$d_L(z) = (1+z)cI(z)/H_0, \quad (49)$$

where c is the speed of light, H_0 is the Hubble constant. The quantity $I(z)$ is given in terms of the integral

$$I(z) = \int_0^z (\Omega_{m,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(1+\tilde{z})^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}})^{-1/2} d\tilde{z}, \quad (50)$$

with $\Omega_{m,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} = \Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}} + \Omega_{DM,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, that provides the present values of the critical density parameters for matter and a dark energy component, respectively. On the other hand, one can define the luminosity distance, which is related to the angular diameter distance $d_A(z)$ in terms of the equation [74, 75]:

$$d_L(z) = (1+z)^2 d_A(z). \quad (51)$$

To examine the connection with black holes shadows, let us recall that, by definition, the observed angular diameter of an object (say, a black hole) is given by $\theta = R/d_A$, with R is some proper diameter of the object. Hence, we can extract information about the cosmological parameters, having measured one of these distances at a particular redshift z . Assuming Schwarzschild black holes, as a first approximation, an observer located far away from the black hole can construct the shadow image in the center with an angular radius

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}}(z) = R_{\text{SH}}/d_A(z), \quad (52)$$

where R_{SH} is the shadow radius and M_{BH} is the mass of the supermassive black hole. As it was pointed out in [75], the above equation for the angular radius of the black hole shadow is valid only when the radial coordinate is large enough in comparison with the size of the black hole shadow radius $3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}/c^2$. If we now combine Eqs. (49)–(51), we can obtain Tsupko *et al.* [74], Escamilla-Rivera and Torres Castillejos [75]

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \frac{R_{\text{SH}}}{(1+z)} \frac{c}{H_0} I(z). \quad (53)$$

In the present work, we are interested in the low-redshift limit, hence utilizing Eqs. (50) and (53) we can obtain [74, 75]

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = R_{\text{SH}}H_0/(cz), \quad (54)$$

implying that we can estimate the angular radius of the black hole if we know the Hubble constant, the redshift z of the black hole, along with its mass. Since we have explicit expressions of the dark matter/dark energy parameters in terms of H_0 (see Eqs. (29) and (30)), we can solve for H_0 in Eq. (30) and directly relate the angular radius with the dark energy density parameter as

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \frac{R_{\text{SH}}}{z\lambda(1+\alpha)} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\Omega_{\Lambda,0}}}, \quad (55)$$

or using the notation of (42):

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \frac{R_{\text{SH}}}{z\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}}. \quad (56)$$

Similarly, we can express this relation in terms of the effective dark matter mass as

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \frac{R_{\text{SH}}}{z\lambda(1+\alpha)} \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha\Omega_{B,0}}}{\Omega_{D,0}}, \quad (57)$$

Data	Constraint			Reference
	α	λ [Mpc]	m_g [GeV]	
Galaxy Clusters	...	> 0.324	$< 10^{-38}$	A. S. Goldhaber <i>et al.</i> (1974) [103]
Solar System	...	$> 9.074 \times 10^{-8}$	$< 7.2 \times 10^{-32}$	C. Talmadge <i>et al.</i> (1998) [104]
Weak Lensing	...	> 97.22	$< 6 \times 10^{-41}$	S. R. Choudhury <i>et al.</i> (2004) [105]
BH binaries	...	$> 9.722 \times 10^{-4}$	$< 4 \times 10^{-35}$	E. Berti <i>et al.</i> (2011) [106]
Local Group	< 0.581	...	$(3.265^{+1.830}_{-1.830}) \times 10^{-35}$	D. Benisty <i>et al.</i> (2023) [107]
SNe Ia+OHD	$0.416^{+1.137}_{-0.326}$	2693^{+1191}_{-1262}	$(2.374^{+2.095}_{-0.728}) \times 10^{-42}$	Present paper

TABLE III: Estimations of the coupling constant α , the wavelength parameter (λ), and graviton mass (m_g) for the Yukawa potential, compared with our best-fit values using SNe Ia+OHD.




FIG. 5: Upper bounds on the graviton mass (m_g) for the Yukawa potential, compared with our best-fit values using SNe Ia+OHD. For representation purposes, the x -axis is presented on a logarithmic scale.

or in terms of the notation of (39), (40) and (41), as

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \frac{R_{\text{SH}}}{z\lambda\sqrt{1+\alpha}} \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha\Omega_{B,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}}{\Omega_{D,0}^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}}. \quad (58)$$

In summary, we can obtain the angular radius of black holes using dark matter and dark energy densities. Note that in this modified cosmological scenario, the shadow radius depends on the distance from the black hole to the observer.

A. Black hole solution

Let us see how the spacetime geometry around the black hole is modified in this theory. The general solution in case of a static, spherically symmetric source reads

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2). \quad (59)$$

The energy density of the modified matter can be computed from $\rho(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\Delta\Phi(r)$. In astrophysical scales we can set $l_0/r \rightarrow 0$, in that case using (1) we acquire

$$\rho(r) = -\frac{M\alpha}{4\pi r\lambda^2} e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}}. \quad (60)$$

The negative sign reflects that the energy conditions are violated inside the black hole. On the other hand, we assume that Einstein field equation with a cosmological constant holds in the sense that the effect of effective dark matter is encoded in the total energy-momentum part; namely, $G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$. Then, from the gravitational field equations for the $t-t$ component, we obtain

$$\frac{rf'(r) + f(r) - 1}{r^2} + \Lambda - \frac{2M\alpha}{r\lambda^2} e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}} = 0, \quad (61)$$

yielding the solution

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{2M\alpha(r+\lambda)e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}}}{r\lambda} - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3}. \quad (62)$$

The third term is due to the apparent dark matter effect, while the last term is the contribution due to the cosmological constant. We can perform a series expansion around $x = 1/\lambda$, yielding

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2M(1+\alpha)}{r} + \frac{M\alpha r}{\lambda^2} - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3} + \dots \quad (63)$$

It is, therefore, natural to define the true or the physical mass of the black hole to be $\mathcal{M} = M(1+\alpha)$ and write the solution in terms of the physical mass

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2\mathcal{M}}{r} + \frac{\mathcal{M}\alpha r}{(1+\alpha)\lambda^2} - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3} + \dots \quad (64)$$

At this point, it is interesting to notice that the last equation can be linked to the spherical black hole solutions in de Rham, Gabadadze and Tolley (dRGT) massive gravity [112]

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2\mathcal{M}}{r} - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3} + \gamma r + \zeta, \quad (65)$$

for $\zeta = 0$ and $\gamma = \mathcal{M}\alpha/\lambda^2$. Further, we can neglect the term $\mathcal{O}(\alpha/\lambda^2)$ in (64) and we obtain the Kottler space-time, i.e., Schwarzschild black hole with a cosmological constant

$$f(r) \simeq 1 - \frac{2\mathcal{M}}{r} - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3}. \quad (66)$$

Following [71], it is easy to show that the shadow radius for the metric (64) can be written as

$$R_{\text{SH}} = \frac{r_{\text{ph}}}{\sqrt{f(r_{\text{ph}})}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM_{\text{BH}}}{c^2 r_O} + \frac{GM_{\text{BH}}\alpha r_O}{c^2(1+\alpha)\lambda^2} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r_O^2}, \quad (67)$$

where r_O is the distance to the black hole. Hence, using the best-fit values of the previous section, one can show that $\Lambda \simeq 10^{-52} \text{m}^{-2}$, and we can identify the physical mass of the black hole with $\mathcal{M} = M_{\text{BH}}$. For the Sgr A BH we can take $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{SgrA}} = 4 \times 10^6 M_{\text{Sun}}$ with the distance $r_O = 8.3 \text{ kpc}$. The change in the shadow radius compared to the Schwarzschild black hole is of the order $\delta R_{\text{SH}} \sim 2 \times 10^{-9}$ measured in black hole units. For the M87 black hole, we can take $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{M87}} = 6.6 \times 10^9 M_{\text{Sun}}$, along with the distance $r_O = 16.8 \text{ Mpc}$, which compared to the Schwarzschild black hole changes by $|\delta R_{\text{SH}}| \sim 2 \times 10^{-5}$. In other words, such a change is outside the scope of the present technology. We can approximate the shadow radius in both cases to be $R_{\text{SH}} \simeq 3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}/c^2$.

Now, it is well known that the real part of quasinormal modes $\omega_{\mathbb{R}}$ in the eikonal limit is related to the shadow radius of BHs via $\omega_{\mathbb{R}} = \lim_{l \gg 1} \frac{1}{R_{\text{SH}}} (l + 1/2)$ [113–118] where l is the angular node number. This correspondence is achieved based on the geometric-optics correspondence between the parameters of a quasinormal mode and the conserved quantities along geodesics. This connection allows the testing of gravitational waves with the next-generation Event Horizon Telescope [119, 120]. However,

here we see that the frequency of the quasinormal modes emitted by a perturbed black hole in the eikonal limit will depend on the effect of cosmological constant and apparent dark matter. In particular, we obtain the following relation $\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \lim_{l \gg 1} \frac{(l+1/2)}{\omega_{\mathbb{R}} z \lambda} \sqrt{\alpha/(1+\alpha)\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\text{ACDM}}}$,

and $\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}} = \lim_{l \gg 1} \frac{(l+1/2)}{\omega_{\mathbb{R}} z \lambda \sqrt{1+\alpha}} \sqrt{2\alpha\Omega_{B,0}^{\text{ACDM}}/\Omega_{D,0}^{\text{ACDM}}}$, respectively. These relations are valid in specific conditions, i.e. the eikonal regime and the low-redshift limit. In what follows, we will apply Eq. (57) to compute the angular radius, assuming known black hole mass and Yukawa parameters.

• Case I: Sgr A supermassive BH

Using the best-fit values for λ and α along with the black hole mass for SgrA, we can estimate the angular radius:

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}}^{\text{SgrA}} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}^{\text{SgrA}}}{c^2 z \lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\text{ACDM}}}} \simeq 26.2 \mu\text{as}, \quad (68)$$

where we have used $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{SgrA}} = 4 \times 10^6 M_{\text{Sun}}$, $z = 0.1895 \times 10^{-5}$, $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\text{ACDM}} \sim 0.7$, $\lambda \simeq 2693 \text{ [Mpc]}$ and $\alpha \simeq 0.416$. Since we showed that the change in the shadow radius is $\delta R_{\text{SH}} \sim 2 \times 10^{-9}$, here we have approximated the shadow radius to $R_{\text{SH}} \simeq 3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}^{\text{SgrA}}/c^2$.

• Case II: M87 supermassive BH

For the case of M87, we obtain:

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}}^{\text{M87}} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}^{\text{M87}}}{c^2 z \lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\text{ACDM}}}} \simeq 19.13 \mu\text{as}, \quad (69)$$

where we have used $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{M87}} = 6.6 \times 10^9 M_{\text{Sun}}$, $z = 0.428 \times 10^{-2}$, along with $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}^{\text{ACDM}} \sim 0.7$, $\lambda \simeq 2693 \text{ [Mpc]}$ and $\alpha \simeq 0.416$. Again, the shadow radius is approximated to be $R_{\text{SH}} \simeq 3\sqrt{3}GM_{\text{BH}}^{\text{SgrA}}/c^2$. These values are consistent with those reported by the EHT [77–82].

V. CONCLUSIONS

In the present work, we extracted observational constraints on the Yukawa cosmological model. In this scenario, dark matter appears effectively, and a relation exists between dark matter, dark energy, and baryonic matter. In particular, the effective dark matter is attributed to the long-range force between the baryonic matter particles. Such a Yukawa-like gravitational potential modifies Newton's law of gravity in large-scale structures. It is characterized by the coupling parameter α and has a graviton with non-zero mass (which is inversely related to the wavelength parameter λ). We used SNe Ia and OHD observational data, and we found within 1σ CL the best-fit parameter $\lambda = 2693^{+1191}_{-1262} \text{ Mpc}$ and $\alpha = 0.416^{+1.137}_{-0.326}$, respectively. With these values, we acquire the value $m_g = (4.233^{+3.735}_{-1.298}) \times 10^{-69} \text{ kg}$, or, equivalently, $m_g = (2.374^{+2.095}_{-0.728}) \times 10^{-42} \text{ GeV}$, for the graviton

mass, complementing other significant findings related to Yukawa constraints from different systems [103–111].

Additionally, we found a black hole solution and a relation between the dark matter/dark energy density parameters and the angular radius of black hole shadows. These equations allow us to constrain the graviton mass directly from the EHT results for Sgr A and M87 supermassive black holes. We can further use the following Gaussian likelihoods $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Shadow}} \propto \exp(-\chi_{\text{Shadow}}^2/2)$, where $\chi_{\text{Shadow}}^2 = \sum_{i=1} [\hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}}^{\text{observed}} - \hat{\alpha}_{\text{SH}}^{\text{theory}}/\sigma_{\alpha,i}]^2$, and the modify the Gaussian likelihood for the joint analysis SNe Ia+OHD+Shadow as $\mathcal{L}_{\text{joint}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SNe}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{OHD}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{shadow}}$. We will consider and explore this possibility in a separate project.

Our research combines two systems from varying scales, successfully integrating cosmological constraints on black hole shadows. That establishes a multi-messenger constraint on gravity, modelled explicitly as the Yukawa potential. Our application mainly focuses on constraints related to late-time cosmology. However, constraints from higher redshifts, such as those derived from Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN), could effectively restrict the Yukawa parameters in future research.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Esteban González: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. **Kimet Jusufi:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration. **Genly Leon:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Visualization,

Investigation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Project administration. **Emmanuel N. Saridakis:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

E.G. thanks to Vicerrectoría de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico (VRIDT) at Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN) by the scientific support of Núcleo de Investigación No. 7 UCN-VRIDT 076/2020, Núcleo de Modelación y Simulación Científica (NMSC). G.L. was funded by VRIDT at UCN through Resolución VRIDT No. 040/2022, Resolución VRIDT No. 054/2022, Resolución VRIDT No. 026/2023 and Resolución VRIDT No. 027/2023. E.G. and G.L. thank the support of Núcleo de Investigación Geometría Diferencial y Aplicaciones, Resolución VRIDT No. 096/2022.

Data Availability

The data underlying this article were cited in Section III.

-
- [1] J. R. Primack and G. R. Blumenthal, in *3rd Moriond Astrophysics Meeting: Galaxies and the Early Universe* (1983) pp. 445–464.
 - [2] P. J. E. Peebles, *Astrophys. J.* **277**, 470 (1984).
 - [3] J. R. Bond and G. Efstathiou, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **285**, L45 (1984).
 - [4] V. Trimble, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **25**, 425 (1987).
 - [5] M. S. Turner, in *UCLA International Conference on Trends in Astroparticle Physics* (1991) pp. 3–42.
 - [6] S. M. Carroll, W. H. Press, and E. L. Turner, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **30**, 499 (1992).
 - [7] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), *Nature* **391**, 51 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9712212.
 - [8] A. G. Riess *et al.* (Supernova Search Team), *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9805201.
 - [9] S. Perlmutter *et al.* (Supernova Cosmology Project), *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9812133.
 - [10] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [11] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
 - [12] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988).
 - [13] P. Parsons and J. D. Barrow, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12**, 1715 (1995).
 - [14] C. Rubano and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 127301 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0105037.
 - [15] E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Lett. B* **676**, 7 (2009), arXiv:0811.1333 [hep-th].
 - [16] Y.-F. Cai, E. N. Saridakis, M. R. Setare, and J.-Q. Xia, *Phys. Rept.* **493**, 1 (2010), arXiv:0909.2776 [hep-th].
 - [17] M. Wali Hossain, R. Myrzakulov, M. Sami, and E. N. Saridakis, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24**, 1530014 (2015), arXiv:1410.6100 [gr-qc].
 - [18] J. D. Barrow and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 083518 (2016), arXiv:1609.01126 [gr-qc].
 - [19] E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043539 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0405034.
 - [20] E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, D. Saez-Gomez, and V. Faraoni, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 106005 (2008), arXiv:0803.1311 [hep-th].

- [21] M. A. Skugoreva, E. N. Saridakis, and A. V. Toporensky, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 044023 (2015), arXiv:1412.1502 [gr-qc] .
- [22] E. N. Saridakis and M. Tsoukalas, *JCAP* **04**, 017 (2016), arXiv:1602.06890 [gr-qc] .
- [23] A. Paliathanasis, G. Leon, and S. Pan, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **51**, 106 (2019), arXiv:1811.10038 [gr-qc] .
- [24] S. Banerjee, M. Petronikolou, and E. N. Saridakis, “Alleviating H_0 Tension with New Gravitational Scalar Tensor Theories,” (2022), arXiv:2209.02426 [gr-qc] .
- [25] F. F. Santos, B. Pourhassan, and E. Saridakis, “de Sitter versus anti-de Sitter in Horndeski-like gravity,” (2023), arXiv:2305.05794 [hep-th] .
- [26] G. Leon, A. Paliathanasis, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Basilakos, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024055 (2022), arXiv:2203.14866 [gr-qc] .
- [27] Y. Akrami *et al.* (CANTATA), *Modified Gravity and Cosmology: An Update by the CANTATA Network*, edited by E. N. Saridakis, R. Lazkoz, V. Salzano, P. Vargas Moniz, S. Capozziello, J. Beltrán Jiménez, M. De Laurentis, and G. J. Olmo (Springer, 2021) arXiv:2105.12582 [gr-qc] .
- [28] G. Leon and E. N. Saridakis, *JCAP* **11**, 006 (2009), arXiv:0909.3571 [hep-th] .
- [29] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *Living Rev. Rel.* **13**, 3 (2010), arXiv:1002.4928 [gr-qc] .
- [30] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rept.* **505**, 59 (2011), arXiv:1011.0544 [gr-qc] .
- [31] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, *Phys. Rept.* **513**, 1 (2012), arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [32] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Phys. Rept.* **509**, 167 (2011), arXiv:1108.6266 [gr-qc] .
- [33] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *JCAP* **02**, 007 (2012), arXiv:1110.3878 [gr-qc] .
- [34] C. Xu, E. N. Saridakis, and G. Leon, *JCAP* **07**, 005 (2012), arXiv:1202.3781 [gr-qc] .
- [35] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri, and S. D. Odintsov, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **342**, 155 (2012), arXiv:1205.3421 [gr-qc] .
- [36] G. Leon and E. N. Saridakis, *JCAP* **03**, 025 (2013), arXiv:1211.3088 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [37] G. Kofinas, G. Leon, and E. N. Saridakis, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 175011 (2014), arXiv:1404.7100 [gr-qc] .
- [38] S. Bahamonde, C. G. Böhm, and M. Wright, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 104042 (2015), arXiv:1508.05120 [gr-qc] .
- [39] D. Momeni and R. Myrzakulov, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **360**, 28 (2015), arXiv:1511.01205 [physics.gen-ph] .
- [40] Y.-F. Cai, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, and E. N. Saridakis, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 106901 (2016), arXiv:1511.07586 [gr-qc] .
- [41] M. Krssak, R. J. van den Hoogen, J. G. Pereira, C. G. Böhm, and A. A. Coley, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 183001 (2019), arXiv:1810.12932 [gr-qc] .
- [42] A. Dehghani, B. Pourhassan, S. Zarepour, and E. N. Saridakis, “Thermodynamic schemes of charged BTZ-like black holes in arbitrary dimensions,” (2023), arXiv:2305.08219 [hep-th] .
- [43] P. Salucci, *Found. Phys.* **48**, 1517 (2018), arXiv:1807.08541 [astro-ph.GA] .
- [44] M. Milgrom, *Astrophys. J.* **270**, 365 (1983).
- [45] P. G. Ferreira and G. Starkmann, *Science* **326**, 812 (2009), arXiv:0911.1212 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [46] M. Milgrom and R. H. Sanders, *The Astrophysical Journal* **599**, L25 (2003).
- [47] O. Tiret, F. Combes, G. W. Angus, B. Famaey, and H. Zhao, *Astron. Astrophys.* **476**, L1 (2007), arXiv:0710.4070 [astro-ph] .
- [48] P. Kroupa, B. Famaey, K. S. de Boer, J. Dabringhausen, M. S. Pawlowski, C. M. Boily, H. Jerjen, D. Forbes, G. Hensler, and M. Metz, *Astron. Astrophys.* **523**, A32 (2010), arXiv:1006.1647 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [49] V. F. Cardone, G. Angus, A. Diaferio, C. Tortora, and R. Molinaro, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **412**, 2617 (2011), arXiv:1011.5741 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [50] T. Richtler, R. Salinas, I. Misgeld, M. Hilker, G. K. T. Hau, A. J. Romanowsky, Y. Schuberth, and M. Spolaor, *Astron. Astrophys.* **531**, A119 (2011), arXiv:1103.2053 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [51] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 083509 (2004), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 069901 (2005)], arXiv:astro-ph/0403694 .
- [52] L. Berezhiani and J. Khoury, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 103510 (2015), arXiv:1507.01019 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [53] C. G. Boehmer and T. Harko, *JCAP* **06**, 025 (2007), arXiv:0705.4158 [astro-ph] .
- [54] R. Takahashi, *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **45**, S1808 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0405099 .
- [55] K. Hioki and K.-i. Maeda, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 024042 (2009), arXiv:0904.3575 [astro-ph.HE] .
- [56] R. Brito, V. Cardoso, and P. Pani, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **906**, pp.1 (2015), arXiv:1501.06570 [gr-qc] .
- [57] P. V. P. Cunha, C. A. R. Herdeiro, E. Radu, and H. F. Runarsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 211102 (2015), arXiv:1509.00021 [gr-qc] .
- [58] T. Ohgami and N. Sakai, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 124020 (2015), arXiv:1704.07065 [gr-qc] .
- [59] J. W. Moffat, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 130 (2015), arXiv:1502.01677 [gr-qc] .
- [60] A. Abdujabbarov, M. Amir, B. Ahmedov, and S. G. Ghosh, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 104004 (2016), arXiv:1604.03809 [gr-qc] .
- [61] P. V. P. Cunha and C. A. R. Herdeiro, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **50**, 42 (2018), arXiv:1801.00860 [gr-qc] .
- [62] Y. Mizuno, Z. Younsi, C. M. Fromm, O. Porth, M. De Laurentis, H. Olivares, H. Falcke, M. Kramer, and L. Rezzolla, *Nature Astron.* **2**, 585 (2018), arXiv:1804.05812 [astro-ph.GA] .
- [63] N. Tsukamoto, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 064021 (2018), arXiv:1708.07427 [gr-qc] .
- [64] D. Psaltis, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **51**, 137 (2019), arXiv:1806.09740 [astro-ph.HE] .
- [65] M. Amir, K. Jusufi, A. Banerjee, and S. Hansraj, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36**, 215007 (2019), arXiv:1806.07782 [gr-qc] .
- [66] S. E. Gralla, D. E. Holz, and R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 024018 (2019), arXiv:1906.00873 [astro-ph.HE] .
- [67] C. Bambi, K. Freese, S. Vagnozzi, and L. Visinelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 044057 (2019), arXiv:1904.12983 [gr-qc] .
- [68] P. V. P. Cunha, C. A. R. Herdeiro, and E. Radu, *Universe* **5**, 220 (2019), arXiv:1909.08039 [gr-qc] .
- [69] M. Khodadi, A. Allahyari, S. Vagnozzi, and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **09**, 026 (2020), arXiv:2005.05992 [gr-qc] .
- [70] V. Perlick and O. Y. Tsupko, *Phys. Rept.* **947**, 1 (2022), arXiv:2105.07101 [gr-qc] .
- [71] S. Vagnozzi *et al.*, “Horizon-scale tests of gravity the-

- ories and fundamental physics from the Event Horizon Telescope image of Sagittarius A*,” (2022), arXiv:2205.07787 [gr-qc] .
- [72] K. Saurabh and K. Jusufi, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 490 (2021), arXiv:2009.10599 [gr-qc] .
- [73] K. Jusufi, M. Jamil, and T. Zhu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 354 (2020), arXiv:2005.05299 [gr-qc] .
- [74] O. Y. Tsupko, Z. Fan, and G. S. Bisnovatyi-Kogan, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **37**, 065016 (2020), arXiv:1905.10509 [gr-qc] .
- [75] C. Escamilla-Rivera and R. Torres Castillejos, *Universe* **9**, 14 (2023), arXiv:2301.00490 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [76] K. Jusufi, M. Azreg-Aïnou, M. Jamil, and E. N. Saridakis, *Universe* **8**, 102 (2022), arXiv:2110.07258 [gr-qc] .
- [77] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **875**, L1 (2019), arXiv:1906.11238 [astro-ph.GA] .
- [78] D. Psaltis *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 141104 (2020), arXiv:2010.01055 [gr-qc] .
- [79] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **910**, L13 (2021), arXiv:2105.01173 [astro-ph.HE] .
- [80] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **930**, L12 (2022).
- [81] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **930**, L13 (2022).
- [82] K. Akiyama *et al.* (Event Horizon Telescope), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **930**, L14 (2022).
- [83] M. Garny, M. Sandora, and M. S. Sloth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 101302 (2016), arXiv:1511.03278 [hep-ph] .
- [84] A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos, V. Gorbenko, J. Huang, and K. Van Tilburg, *JHEP* **05**, 071 (2017), arXiv:1609.06320 [hep-ph] .
- [85] H. Desmond, P. G. Ferreira, G. Lavaux, and J. Jasche, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **483**, L64 (2019), arXiv:1802.07206 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [86] H. Desmond, P. G. Ferreira, G. Lavaux, and J. Jasche, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 064015 (2018), arXiv:1807.01482 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [87] Y.-D. Tsai, Y. Wu, S. Vagnozzi, and L. Visinelli, *JCAP* **04**, 031 (2023), arXiv:2107.04038 [hep-ph] .
- [88] E. P. Verlinde, *JHEP* **04**, 029 (2011), arXiv:1001.0785 [hep-th] .
- [89] E. P. Verlinde, *SciPost Phys.* **2**, 016 (2017), arXiv:1611.02269 [hep-th] .
- [90] K. Jusufi and A. Sheykhi, *Phys. Lett. B* **836**, 137621 (2023), arXiv:2210.01584 [gr-qc] .
- [91] A. D. Millano, K. Jusufi, and G. Leon, *Phys. Lett. B* **841**, 137916 (2023), arXiv:2302.00223 [gr-qc] .
- [92] K. Jusufi, A. Sheykhi, and S. Capozziello, “Apparent dark matter as a non-local manifestation of emergent gravity,” (2023), arXiv:2303.14127 [gr-qc] .
- [93] K. Jusufi, G. Leon, and A. D. Millano, “Dark Universe Phenomenology from Yukawa Potential?” (2023), arXiv:2304.11492 [gr-qc] .
- [94] M. Visser, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **30**, 1717 (1998), arXiv:gr-qc/9705051 .
- [95] J. Goodman and J. Weare, *Communications in applied mathematics and computational science* **5**, 65 (2010).
- [96] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **125**, 306 (2013), arXiv:1202.3665 [astro-ph.IM] .
- [97] J. Magana, M. H. Amante, M. A. Garcia-Aspeitia, and V. Motta, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **476**, 1036 (2018), arXiv:1706.09848 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [98] D. Brout *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 110 (2022), arXiv:2202.04077 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [99] D. M. Scolnic *et al.* (Pan-STARRS1), *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 101 (2018), arXiv:1710.00845 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [100] R. Tripp, *Astron. Astrophys.* **331**, 815 (1998).
- [101] R. Kessler and D. Scolnic, *Astrophys. J.* **836**, 56 (2017), arXiv:1610.04677 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [102] A. G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [103] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 1119 (1974).
- [104] C. Talmadge, J. P. Berthias, R. W. Hellings, and E. M. Standish, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1159 (1988).
- [105] S. R. Choudhury, G. C. Joshi, S. Mahajan, and B. H. J. McKellar, *Astropart. Phys.* **21**, 559 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0204161 .
- [106] E. Berti, J. Gair, and A. Sesana, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 101501 (2011), arXiv:1107.3528 [gr-qc] .
- [107] D. Benisty and S. Capozziello, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **39**, 101175 (2023), arXiv:2301.06614 [astro-ph.GA] .
- [108] C. de Rham, J. T. Deskins, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 025004 (2017), arXiv:1606.08462 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [109] L. Shao, N. Wex, and S.-Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 024069 (2020), arXiv:2007.04531 [gr-qc] .
- [110] D. Benisty, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 043001 (2022), arXiv:2207.08235 [gr-qc] .
- [111] D. Benisty, J. Mifsud, J. Levi Said, and D. Staicova, (2023), arXiv:2303.15040 [astro-ph.CO] .
- [112] S. G. Ghosh, L. Tannukij, and P. Wongjun, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 119 (2016), arXiv:1506.07119 [gr-qc] .
- [113] K. Jusufi, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 084055 (2020), arXiv:1912.13320 [gr-qc] .
- [114] K. Jusufi, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 124063 (2020), arXiv:2004.04664 [gr-qc] .
- [115] K. Jusufi, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **53**, 87 (2021), arXiv:2007.16019 [gr-qc] .
- [116] B. Cuadros-Melgar, R. D. B. Fontana, and J. de Oliveira, *Phys. Lett. B* **811**, 135966 (2020), arXiv:2005.09761 [gr-qc] .
- [117] C. Liu, T. Zhu, Q. Wu, K. Jusufi, M. Jamil, M. Azreg-Aïnou, and A. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 084001 (2020), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 089902 (2021)], arXiv:2003.00477 [gr-qc] .
- [118] Y. Zhao, Y. Cai, S. Das, G. Lambiase, E. N. Saridakis, and E. C. Vagenas, “Quasinormal Modes in Noncommutative Schwarzschild black holes,” (2023), arXiv:2301.09147 [gr-qc] .
- [119] H. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 084010 (2021), arXiv:2101.11129 [gr-qc] .
- [120] N. Franchini and S. H. Völkel, “Testing General Relativity with Black Hole Quasi-Normal Modes,” (2023), arXiv:2305.01696 [gr-qc] .