

# Impact of big bang nucleosynthesis on the $H_0$ tension

Tomo Takahashi<sup>1</sup> and Yo Toda<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Saga University, Saga 840-8502, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

## Abstract

We investigate the impact of big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) on the Hubble tension, focusing on how the treatment of the reaction rate and observational data affect the evaluation of the tension. We show that the significance of the tension can vary by  $0.8\sigma$  in some early dark energy model, depending on the treatment of the reaction rate and observational data. This indicates that how we include the BBN data in the analysis can give a significant impact on the Hubble tension, and we need to carefully consider the assumptions of the analysis to evaluate the significance of the tension when the BBN data is used.

EPHOU-23-011

# 1 Introduction

The so-called  $\Lambda$ CDM model has now been recognized as the standard paradigm of cosmology. Indeed almost all observations can be understood in the framework of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, however, there have been several tensions reported, among which the Hubble tension ( $H_0$  tension) is one of the most pronounced one where the values of the Hubble constant  $H_0$  are inconsistent at almost  $5\sigma$  level between the ones obtained from direct measurements such as Cepheid calibrated distance ladder  $H_0 = 73.30 \pm 1.04$  km/s/Mpc [1]<sup>#1</sup> and from indirect observations such as cosmic microwave background (CMB) from Planck  $H_0 = 67.66 \pm 0.42$  km/s/Mpc [2]. Even if different data are used, local direct observations consistently infer a relatively higher value of  $H_0$  compared to the one obtained from Planck, on the other hand, indirect observations, even without Planck data, gives  $H_0$  consistent with that obtained from Planck<sup>#2</sup> (see, e.g., [6, 7] for reviews of the  $H_0$  tension).

A lot of works have been devoted to resolving the  $H_0$  tension by extending the  $\Lambda$ CDM framework (for various models proposed to solve the tension, see, e.g., reviews [6, 8]). In those models, the value of  $H_0$  can become higher than  $\Lambda$ CDM case when they are fitted to CMB in combination with some other data such as baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO), type Ia supernova (SNeIa), and so on. It would be important to notice that there exists the correlation between  $H_0$  and other cosmological parameters in the fit to CMB<sup>#3</sup>. Although such a correlation is somewhat involved in models proposed to resolve the  $H_0$  tension, the increase of the value of  $H_0$  certainly affects other aspects of cosmology. Indeed the baryon energy density generally tends to become larger than that for the case with the  $\Lambda$ CDM in models proposed to resolve the  $H_0$  tension when fitted to CMB in combination with other observations [12–15]<sup>#4</sup>.

The baryon density can also be well determined by big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) and hence we can also include BBN data in the fitting to derive the cosmological parameters. However, as we discuss in this paper, we need to be cautious regarding what observational data we use and what nuclear reaction rates are adopted, depending on which the derived values of the cosmological parameters can change. Therefore when the BBN data is combined with CMB and some other data, it can affect the value of  $H_0$  in models to resolve the  $H_0$  tension through the correlations among the cosmological parameters in the fitting. Since, among the light elements, the baryon density is mainly determined by the primordial deuterium abundance, which we denote  $D_p$  in the following, we mainly investigate the

---

<sup>#1</sup>Here we quote the value based on the analysis including high-redshift supernovae.

<sup>#2</sup>Even without CMB data, the combination of data from baryon acoustic oscillation, type Ia supernovae and big bang nucleosynthesis also gives a relatively low value of  $H_0$  in the framework of  $\Lambda$ CDM and other extended models [3–5].

<sup>#3</sup>One can easily recognize such a correlation from 2D constraints in the plane of  $H_0$  and some other parameters (e.g., [2]). See also, e.g., [9–11] to see how  $H_0$  is correlated with other cosmological parameters in the structure of acoustic peaks in CMB power spectrum.

<sup>#4</sup>It has also been argued that constraints on the neutrino mass [16], the spectral index for primordial power spectrum  $n_s$  [17–20] are also modified in models proposed to resolve the tension such as time-varying electron mass [21] and early dark energy models [22].

impact of the treatment of the primordial deuterium on the  $H_0$  tension<sup>#5</sup>. To this end, we consider several different treatments to include the primordial deuterium abundance in the analysis: For observational data, we use two different data for  $D_p$  from Cooke et al. [29] and the weighted mean of the recent 11 measurements compiled by Particle Data Group [30]. For the theoretical calculations of  $D_p$ , we adopt the nuclear reaction rate for  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$  obtained from the extrapolation of experiments [31, 32] and the theoretically evaluated one via an ab-initio approach [33]. As we argue in this paper, the significance of the  $H_0$  tension can vary up to  $0.8\sigma$  depending on the treatment of how we include  $D_p$  in the analysis and models assumed, which shows that BBN has a significant impact on the  $H_0$  tension.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In the next section, we summarize our analysis method and models assumed in the analysis. Then, in Section 3, we show our results and argue that the treatment of BBN in the analysis can give a significant impact on the  $H_0$  tension depending on what observational data and the reaction rate are adopted. We give the summary of this paper in the final section.

## 2 Models and analysis method

### 2.1 Models

To investigate the impact of the treatment of the primordial deuterium abundance on the  $H_0$  tension, we consider two model frameworks: a flat  $\Lambda$ CDM and early dark energy (EDE) models [22]. In the framework of a flat  $\Lambda$ CDM model, we vary 6 standard cosmological parameters: baryon density  $\Omega_b h^2$ , cold dark matter (CDM) density  $\Omega_c h^2$ , the acoustic scale  $\theta$ , the reionization optical depth  $\tau$ , the amplitude of primordial power spectrum  $A_s$  and its spectral index  $n_s$ . Since we assume a flat Universe, the Hubble constant  $H_0$  is derived once these parameters are given. The amplitude  $A_s$  is defined at the reference scale  $k_{\text{ref}} = 0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ .

EDE model [22, 34–36] has been extensively studied as a possible candidate to resolve the  $H_0$  tension (for recent review on early dark energy, see [37, 38]). There are several variations of EDE model discussed in the literature depending on the potential of a scalar field and/or the actual implementation of the model, here we adopt the one based on an axionlike field [34]<sup>#6</sup> whose potential is assumed as

$$V(\phi) = \Lambda^4 (1 - \cos(\phi/f))^n, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\Lambda$  sets the energy scale of the potential and  $f$  is a parameter which could be related to a breaking scale of the model. To describe the energy fraction of the EDE field at the redshift

---

<sup>#5</sup>The primordial helium abundance  $Y_p$  is also precisely measured [23–26], however  $Y_p$  is not so severely constrained by CMB data (see, e.g., [2, 27, 28]), and hence the inclusion of  $Y_p$  data would not affect  $H_0$  much. Therefore we focus on the treatment of the deuterium abundance in this paper although the  $Y_p$  data of [23] is included in our analysis.

<sup>#6</sup>The cosmic birefringence suggested by the recent analyses of the Planck data [39, 40] also motivates to introduce such an axionlike field  $\phi$  [41, 42].

when  $\phi$  starts to oscillate, denoted as  $z_c$ , one usually introduces the following quantity:

$$f_{\text{de}}(z_c) = \frac{\rho_{\text{de}}(z_c)}{\rho_{\text{total}}(z_c)}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\rho_{\text{de}}$  and  $\rho_{\text{total}}$  are energy densities of the EDE field and the total component, respectively. When  $n = 2$ , the energy density of EDE scales as  $\rho_{\text{de}} \propto a^{-4}$ . When  $n = \infty$ ,  $\rho_{\text{de}}$  decreases as  $\rho_{\text{de}} \propto a^{-6}$ . We use the **camb** [43] where axionlike EDE is already implemented<sup>#7</sup> and perform the MCMC analysis sampling  $f_{\text{de}}(z_c) \in [0.00001, 0.15]$ ,  $z_c \in [1000, 50000]$ , and  $\Theta_i \equiv \phi_{\text{ini}}/f \in [0.01, 3.14]$  (the initial value of  $\phi$ ) in addition to the 6 standard parameters.

## 2.2 Analysis method

To evaluate the impact of the treatment of BBN on the Hubble tension, we perform Markov Chain Monte Carlo analysis by using a modified version of **CosmoMC** [44], which accommodates the EDE model discussed in [34], by using the data from Planck (TT,TE,EE+lowE) [45] and BAO [46–48]. In some cases, we assume a prior on the Hubble constant as  $H_0 = 73.30 \pm 1.04$  [1] (hereinafter, we refer this prior as R21, after the author and the year of the paper). In addition to these, we include the light element data of the primordial helium abundance  $Y_P = 0.2449 \pm 0.0040$  [23] and two different data for the primordial deuterium abundance from Cooke et al.  $D_p = (2.527 \pm 0.030) \times 10^{-5}$  [29] and the weighted mean of the recent 11 measurements compiled by Particle Data Group  $D_p = (2.547 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-5}$  [30].

For the theoretical calculations of light elements, we consider three different nuclear rate for  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$ , which is important in computing the deuterium abundance. The one is from Adelberger et al. [31] which is evaluated from the extrapolation of experimental results. Another reaction rate is from Marcucci et al. [33] which is an ab-initio theoretical calculation of the reaction rate, which shows a larger  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$  rate, more deuterium burning, and less abundance of deuterium  $D_p$ . The other is taken from Pisanti et al. [32] which is the extrapolation of the most recent experimental results and their value is somewhat in between the two rates mentioned above. The value of the theoretical uncertainties are given by  $\sigma_{Y_p, \text{th}} = 0.0003$  [49] for the all analysis,  $\sigma_{D_p, \text{th}} = 0.06 \times 10^{-5}$  [31] for the analysis using Adelberger et al.,  $\sigma_{D_p, \text{th}} = 0.03 \times 10^{-5}$  [33] for the analysis using Marcucci et al., and  $\sigma_{D_p, \text{th}} = 0.06 \times 10^{-5}$  [50] for the analysis using Pisanti et al. In total, we perform 7 different analyses depending on the assumption for the data and the theoretical calculation of  $D_p$ , which is summarized in Table 1. “offset” in Table 1 indicates that we adopt the theoretical bias offset  $-0.091 \times 10^{-5}$  and corrected theoretical error  $\sigma_{D_p, \text{th}} = 0.089 \times 10^{-5}$ . These values are introduced in the standard **CosmoMC** analysis so that the BBN constraints correspond to the prior  $\Omega_b h^2 = 0.0222 \pm 0.005$ <sup>#8</sup>. We note that Case II or III is commonly adopted one in the literature when the BBN data is included in the CMB analysis.

<sup>#7</sup>The fluid approximation as in Eq. (16) in the paper [34] is used for an axionlike field, which is implemented in the background and perturbation equations.

<sup>#8</sup>See Sec. 7.6.1 of the Planck paper [2] for details.

	Reaction rate for $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$	$D_p$ data
Case I	Adelberger et al.	no-data
Case II	Adelberger et al.	Cooke et al. + offset
Case III	Adelberger et al.	Cooke et al.
Case IV	Marcucci et al.	Cooke et al.
Case V	Marcucci et al.	recent 11 weighted mean
Case VI	Pisanti et al.	Cooke et al.
Case VII	Pisanti et al.	recent 11 weighted mean

Table 1: Combinations of the data of  $D_p$  and theoretical treatment of the reaction rate for  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$  used in our analysis.

### 3 Results

Now we present the results of our analysis. In Tables 2, 3 and 4, the derived values of  $H_0$  and  $\Omega_b h^2$ , as well as the Gaussian tension are summarized for the framework models of  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ , EDE ( $n = 2$ ) and EDE ( $n = \infty$ ), respectively. The Gaussian tension is evaluated between the direct measurement of  $H_0$  from Cepheid calibrated supernova distance ladder [1]  $H_0 = 73.30 \pm 1.04$  km/s/Mpc and the one obtained in our analysis using CMB+BAO (with/without BBN and the  $H_0$  prior). For the cases of EDE, we also give the value of  $f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$ . We have performed 10 analyses including Case I - VII in Table 1 and the cases with and without the prior on  $H_0$  (R21) for some cases.

For the case of  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ , depending on the treatment of the observational data and theoretical calculation for  $D_p$ , the significance of the tension varies from  $4.97\sigma$  to  $5.38\sigma$  when R21 is not included. As already mentioned, the setup of Case II or III is commonly adopted when one includes the BBN data in combination with CMB. It is also worth noting that in Case III the Hubble tension is slightly eased with respect to Case I (no-BBN data analysis) and Case II (standard BBN analysis including the offset). In any case, just by changing the assumption on the observational data for  $D_p$  and the reaction rate, the significance is increased by  $0.41\sigma$ . The difference mainly comes from the treatment of the reaction rate. In Figure 1, we show the posterior distributions and two dimensional constraints for  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $H_0$  and  $D_p$ , which shows that the deuterium abundance  $D_p$  decrease in the order of Case III (Adelberger et al.), Case VI (Pisanti et al.), and Case IV (Marcucci et al.) for a given baryon fraction  $\Omega_b h^2$  (all these cases use Cooke et al. [29] for the observational data of  $D_p$ ). In order to be consistent with  $D_p$  observations, it is important to notice that the decrease of  $D_p$  leads to a lower baryon fraction, a larger sound horizon  $r_*$ , and a lower Hubble constant  $H_0$ , which makes the tension worse. The observational data also affects slightly although two data from Cooke et al. [29] and the averaged mean value from 11 recent measurements of  $D_p$  [30] are almost consistent. For example, by comparing Case IV and V in which Cooke et al. and the recent 11 weighted mean value are adopted for the  $D_p$  data with the same reaction rate, the tension in Case V is slightly larger than that in Case IV.

The impact of the treatment of BBN is more significant when we study the issue in the

	$\Omega_b h^2$	$H_0$	Tension
Case I	$0.02242 \pm 0.00014$	$67.67 \pm 0.43$	$5.00\sigma$
Case I +R21	$0.02259 \pm 0.00013$	$68.49 \pm 0.40$	$4.32\sigma$
Case II	$0.02240 \pm 0.00013$	$67.63 \pm 0.43$	$5.04\sigma$
Case III	$0.02246 \pm 0.00013$	$67.73 \pm 0.42$	$4.97\sigma$
Case III+R21	$0.02260 \pm 0.00012$	$68.51 \pm 0.39$	$4.31\sigma$
Case IV	$0.02230 \pm 0.00012$	$67.42 \pm 0.40$	$5.28\sigma$
Case V	$0.02226 \pm 0.00011$	$67.33 \pm 0.39$	$5.38\sigma$
Case V +R21	$0.02238 \pm 0.00011$	$68.09 \pm 0.38$	$4.71\sigma$
Case VI	$0.02242 \pm 0.00013$	$67.66 \pm 0.41$	$5.05\sigma$
Case VII	$0.02240 \pm 0.00013$	$67.62 \pm 0.42$	$5.06\sigma$

Table 2: Derived values of  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $H_0$  and the Gaussian tension for  $\Lambda$ CDM model.




Figure 1: Posterior distributions and two dimensional constraints for  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $H_0$  and  $D_p$  in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model.

	$\Omega_b h^2$	$f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$	$H_0$	Tension
Case I	$0.02252 \pm 0.00016$	$0.0106^{+0.0043}_{-0.0088}$	$68.64^{+0.65}_{-0.86}$	$3.61\sigma$
Case I +R21	$0.02277 \pm 0.00016$	$0.0277^{+0.0071}_{-0.0092}$	$70.64 \pm 0.73$	$2.09\sigma$
Case II	$0.02245 \pm 0.00015$	$0.0098^{+0.0039}_{-0.0082}$	$68.49^{+0.60}_{-0.79}$	$3.83\sigma$
Case III	$0.02254 \pm 0.00014$	$0.0111^{+0.0036}_{-0.010}$	$68.68^{+0.61}_{-0.86}$	$3.61\sigma$
Case III+R21	$0.02276^{+0.00016}_{-0.00014}$	$0.0261^{+0.0073}_{-0.0081}$	$70.54 \pm 0.70$	$2.20\sigma$
Case IV	$0.02235 \pm 0.00012$	$0.0085^{+0.0028}_{-0.0078}$	$68.13^{+0.57}_{-0.68}$	$4.26\sigma$
Case V	$0.02229 \pm 0.00012$	$0.0081^{+0.0021}_{-0.0079}$	$67.96^{+0.50}_{-0.72}$	$4.41\sigma$
Case V +R21	$0.02238 \pm 0.00015$	$0.033^{+0.012}_{-0.015}$	$70.22^{+0.76}_{-0.88}$	$2.32\sigma$
Case VI	$0.02250 \pm 0.00014$	$0.0099^{+0.0034}_{-0.0089}$	$68.53^{+0.58}_{-0.81}$	$3.80\sigma$
Case VII	$0.02247 \pm 0.00014$	$0.0096^{+0.0032}_{-0.0086}$	$68.46^{+0.58}_{-0.80}$	$3.86\sigma$

Table 3: Derived values of  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$ ,  $H_0$  and the Gaussian tension for the EDE model with  $n = 2$ .

EDE model which has been proposed to relax the  $H_0$  tension. In Tables 3 and 4, derived values of  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$ ,  $H_0$  and the Gaussian tension are listed for the cases of  $n = 2$  and  $n = \infty$ . In Figs. 2 and 3, the posterior distribution and two dimensional constraints for  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{DE}}(z_c)$  and  $H_0$  are depicted for the cases of  $n = 2$  and  $n = \infty$ , respectively. We first note that, in the EDE model we adopted here, the significance of the tension is  $3.6\sigma$  for Case I where we do not include the BBN data, which can be compared to  $5.0\sigma$  in the counterpart of the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ . However, when the BBN is included in the analysis for the case of  $n = 2$ , it increases to  $3.83\sigma$  for the standard treatment of Case II and even worse to  $4.41\sigma$  for Case V. It should be noticed that the significance of the tension varies from  $3.61\sigma$  to  $4.41\sigma$  ( $0.8\sigma$  difference) just by changing the assumption on the treatment of  $D_p$ . The tendency of which reaction rate makes the tension larger is the same as that in the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  model, however, the change of the tension is more pronounced in the EDE model. For the case of  $n = \infty$ , the Gaussian tension is increased from  $4.58\sigma$  in Case II to  $5.23\sigma$  in Case V, which is  $0.65\sigma$  increase. Although the change is less significant compared to the case of  $n = 2$ , BBN still have an impact on the  $H_0$  tension.

	$\Omega_b h^2$	$f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$	$H_0$	Tension
Case I	$0.02249^{+0.00014}_{-0.00017}$	$0.0174^{+0.0037}_{-0.017}$	$67.93^{+0.42}_{-0.62}$	$4.60\sigma$
Case I +R21	$0.02302 \pm 0.00021$	$0.079^{+0.021}_{-0.019}$	$70.85 \pm 0.77$	$1.89\sigma$
Case II	$0.02245^{+0.00013}_{-0.00015}$	$0.0165^{+0.0034}_{-0.016}$	$67.82^{+0.42}_{-0.54}$	$4.78\sigma$
Case III	$0.02251^{+0.00013}_{-0.00016}$	$0.0177^{+0.0035}_{-0.018}$	$67.99^{+0.38}_{-0.62}$	$4.58\sigma$
Case III+R21	$0.02293 \pm 0.00019$	$0.075^{+0.022}_{-0.018}$	$70.65 \pm 0.76$	$2.06\sigma$
Case IV	$0.02232 \pm 0.00012$	$0.0131^{+0.00226}_{-0.013}$	$67.52 \pm 0.42$	$5.15\sigma$
Case V	$0.02227 \pm 0.00011$	$0.0135^{+0.0026}_{-0.014}$	$67.44^{+0.38}_{-0.45}$	$5.23\sigma$
Case V +R21	$0.02243 \pm 0.00015$	$0.044^{+0.027}_{-0.020}$	$69.31^{+0.92}_{-0.80}$	$2.95\sigma$
Case VI	$0.02246^{+0.00013}_{-0.00015}$	$0.0174^{+0.0038}_{-0.017}$	$67.87^{+0.40}_{-0.57}$	$4.72\sigma$
Case VII	$0.02243 \pm 0.00014$	$0.0149^{+0.0029}_{-0.015}$	$67.76^{+0.41}_{-0.48}$	$4.90\sigma$

Table 4: Derived values of  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{de}}(z_c)$ ,  $H_0$  and the Gaussian tension for the DE model with  $n = \infty$ .




Figure 2: Posterior distributions and two dimensional constraints for  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{DE}}(z_c)$  and  $H_0$  for the EDE model with  $n = 2$ .






Figure 3: Posterior distributions and two dimensional constraints for  $\Omega_b h^2$ ,  $f_{\text{DE}}(z_c)$  and  $H_0$  for the EDE model with  $n = \infty$ .

## 4 Conclusion and discussion

We have investigated the impact of the BBN on the Hubble tension, focusing on to what extent the evaluation of the tension is affected by how we include the BBN in the analysis. In models proposed to resolve the  $H_0$  tension, not only the derived value of  $H_0$  tends to be increased in the fitting to cosmological data such as CMB, the determination of other cosmological parameters is also affected, among which the baryon density is significantly affected. Indeed the baryon density can also be well determined by the BBN data, in particular the primordial deuterium abundance. We have investigated this issue in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, and the EDE as an example of models which has been proposed to resolve the  $H_0$  tension.

When one includes the BBN data in addition to CMB and BAO in the analysis, there are several ways to take account of it as to which observational data is used and which nuclear reaction rate, especially for  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$  which is particularly relevant to the deuterium abundance, is adopted. We have made the analysis adopting two different observational data for  $D_p$  and three separate treatments for the reaction rate of  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$ . We found that the significance of the  $H_0$  tension between the direct measurement of Cepheid calibrated supernova distance ladder from [1] and indirect ones from Planck+BAO in combination with BBN data varies depending on which observational data and the nuclear reaction rate are used in the analysis.

In  $\Lambda$ CDM model, the tension is  $5.04\sigma$  for Case II where the value of  $D_p$  from Cooke et al. [29] and the reaction rate of Adelberger et al. [31] for  $d(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$  are assumed, which is usually adopted in the literature. However, it increases to  $5.38\sigma$  for Case V where the

weighted average of 11 recent measurements of  $D_p$  [30] and the reaction rate from Marcucci et al. [33] are assumed.

The impact is more significant in the EDE model, which has been extensively studied as a possible solution to the  $H_0$  tension. For the case of the EDE model with  $n = 2$ , the significance is increased from  $3.83\sigma$  (Case II) to  $4.41\sigma$  (Case V), which indicates that the assumption in the treatment of BBN would significantly affect the tension. Our analysis shows that we need to carefully consider which data and the reaction rate are adopted in the BBN analysis to investigate the Hubble tension.

Since the Hubble tension is now one of the most serious problem in cosmology today, one needs to carefully quantify the tension particularly when we analyze models to resolve the  $H_0$  tension. We have various accurate cosmological observations such as CMB, BAO and BBN and the combinations of these data would constrain cosmological models even further. However, we may have some options as to which data and how the theoretical calculation are performed, which can appreciably affect the significance of the  $H_0$  tension. We have explicitly demonstrated this issue for the BBN, which gives some cautions to future research in the  $H_0$  tension.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19K03874 (TT), MEXT KAKENHI Grant Number 23H04515 (TT), and JST SPRING, Grant Number JP-MJSP21119 (YT).

## References

- [1] A. G. Riess et al., *A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with  $1 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934** (2022), no. 1 L7, [[arXiv:2112.04510](#)].
- [2] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim et al., *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6, [[arXiv:1807.06209](#)]. [Erratum: *Astron.Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [3] N. Schöneberg, J. Lesgourgues, and D. C. Hooper, *The BAO+BBN take on the Hubble tension*, *JCAP* **10** (2019) 029, [[arXiv:1907.11594](#)].
- [4] F. Okamatsu, T. Sekiguchi, and T. Takahashi,  *$H_0$  tension without CMB data: Beyond the  $\Lambda$ CDM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021), no. 2 023523, [[arXiv:2105.12312](#)].
- [5] N. Schöneberg, L. Verde, H. Gil-Marín, and S. Brieden, *BAO+BBN revisited – Growing the Hubble tension with a  $0.7 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$  constraint*, [arXiv:2209.14330](#).
- [6] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, *In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021), no. 15 153001, [[arXiv:2103.01183](#)].
- [7] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Challenges for  $\Lambda$ CDM: An update*, *New Astron. Rev.* **95** (2022) 101659, [[arXiv:2105.05208](#)].
- [8] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, *The  $H_0$  Olympics: A fair ranking of proposed models*, *Phys. Rept.* **984** (2022) 1–55, [[arXiv:2107.10291](#)].
- [9] K. Ichikawa, M. Fukugita, and M. Kawasaki, *Constraining neutrino masses by CMB experiments alone*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 043001, [[astro-ph/0409768](#)].
- [10] K. Ichikawa, T. Sekiguchi, and T. Takahashi, *Probing the Effective Number of Neutrino Species with Cosmic Microwave Background*, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 083526, [[arXiv:0803.0889](#)].
- [11] T. Sekiguchi, K. Ichikawa, T. Takahashi, and L. Greenhill, *Neutrino mass from cosmology: Impact of high-accuracy measurement of the Hubble constant*, *JCAP* **03** (2010) 015, [[arXiv:0911.0976](#)].
- [12] T. Takahashi and S. Yamashita, *Big bang nucleosynthesis and early dark energy in light of the EMPRESS  $Y_p$  results and the  $H_0$  tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 10 103520, [[arXiv:2211.04087](#)].

- [13] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Comparing early dark energy and extra radiation solutions to the Hubble tension with BBN*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 12 123501, [[arXiv:2101.03740](#)].
- [14] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Big bang nucleosynthesis constraints on varying electron mass solution to the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 8 083512, [[arXiv:2206.13209](#)].
- [15] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Hubble tension in lepton asymmetric cosmology with an extra radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021), no. 6 063019, [[arXiv:2104.04381](#)].
- [16] T. Sekiguchi and T. Takahashi, *Cosmological bound on neutrino masses in the light of  $H_0$  tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 8 083516, [[arXiv:2011.14481](#)].
- [17] G. Ye, B. Hu, and Y.-S. Piao, *Implication of the Hubble tension for the primordial Universe in light of recent cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021), no. 6 063510, [[arXiv:2103.09729](#)].
- [18] F. Takahashi and W. Yin, *Cosmological implications of  $n_s \approx 1$  in light of the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Lett. B* **830** (2022) 137143, [[arXiv:2112.06710](#)].
- [19] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Toward early dark energy and  $n_s=1$  with Planck, ACT, and SPT observations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 10 103514, [[arXiv:2202.13379](#)].
- [20] G. Ye, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Towards hybrid inflation with  $n_s = 1$  in light of Hubble tension and primordial gravitational waves*, [arXiv:2205.02478](#).
- [21] T. Sekiguchi and T. Takahashi, *Early recombination as a solution to the  $H_0$  tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 8 083507, [[arXiv:2007.03381](#)].
- [22] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019), no. 22 221301, [[arXiv:1811.04083](#)].
- [23] E. Aver, K. A. Olive, and E. D. Skillman, *The effects of He I  $\lambda 10830$  on helium abundance determinations*, *JCAP* **07** (2015) 011, [[arXiv:1503.08146](#)].
- [24] T. Hsyu, R. J. Cooke, J. X. Prochaska, and M. Bolte, *The PHLEK Survey: A New Determination of the Primordial Helium Abundance*, *Astrophys. J.* **896** (2020), no. 1 77, [[arXiv:2005.12290](#)].
- [25] O. A. Kurichin, P. A. Kislitsyn, V. V. Klimenko, S. A. Balashev, and A. V. Ivanchik, *A new determination of the primordial helium abundance using the analyses of H II region spectra from SDSS*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **502** (2021), no. 2 3045–3056, [[arXiv:2101.09127](#)].

- [26] A. Matsumoto et al., *EMPRESS. VIII. A New Determination of Primordial He Abundance with Extremely Metal-poor Galaxies: A Suggestion of the Lepton Asymmetry and Implications for the Hubble Tension*, *Astrophys. J.* **941** (2022), no. 2 167, [[arXiv:2203.09617](#)].
- [27] K. Ichikawa and T. Takahashi, *Revisiting the constraint on the helium abundance from cmb*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 063528, [[astro-ph/0601099](#)].
- [28] K. Ichikawa, T. Sekiguchi, and T. Takahashi, *Primordial Helium Abundance from CMB: a constraint from recent observations and a forecast*, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 043509, [[arXiv:0712.4327](#)].
- [29] R. J. Cooke, M. Pettini, and C. C. Steidel, *One Percent Determination of the Primordial Deuterium Abundance*, *Astrophys. J.* **855** (2018), no. 2 102, [[arXiv:1710.11129](#)].
- [30] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, R. L. Workman et al., *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [31] E. G. Adelberger et al., *Solar fusion cross sections II: the pp chain and CNO cycles*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83** (2011) 195, [[arXiv:1004.2318](#)].
- [32] O. Pisanti, G. Mangano, G. Miele, and P. Mazzella, *Primordial Deuterium after LUNA: concordances and error budget*, *JCAP* **04** (2021) 020, [[arXiv:2011.11537](#)].
- [33] L. E. Marcucci, G. Mangano, A. Kievsky, and M. Viviani, *Implication of the proton-deuteron radiative capture for Big Bang Nucleosynthesis*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016), no. 10 102501, [[arXiv:1510.07877](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 117, 049901 (2016)].
- [34] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, D. Grin, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Cosmological implications of ultralight axionlike fields*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018), no. 8 083525, [[arXiv:1806.10608](#)].
- [35] M. Braglia, W. T. Emond, F. Finelli, A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, and K. Koyama, *Unified framework for early dark energy from  $\alpha$ -attractors*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), no. 8 083513, [[arXiv:2005.14053](#)].
- [36] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, *Rock 'n' Roll Solutions to the Hubble Tension*, [arXiv:1904.01016](#).
- [37] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, *The Hubble Tension and Early Dark Energy*, [arXiv:2211.04492](#).
- [38] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, and T. Karwal, *The Ups and Downs of Early Dark Energy solutions to the Hubble tension: a review of models, hints and constraints circa 2023*, [arXiv:2302.09032](#).

- [39] Y. Minami and E. Komatsu, *New Extraction of the Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck 2018 Polarization Data*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020), no. 22 221301, [[arXiv:2011.11254](#)].
- [40] P. Diego-Palazuelos et al., *Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck Data Release 4*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022), no. 9 091302, [[arXiv:2201.07682](#)].
- [41] L. M. Capparelli, R. R. Caldwell, and A. Melchiorri, *Cosmic birefringence test of the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 12 123529, [[arXiv:1909.04621](#)].
- [42] K. Murai, F. Naokawa, T. Namikawa, and E. Komatsu, *Isotropic cosmic birefringence from early dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 4 L041302, [[arXiv:2209.07804](#)].
- [43] <http://camb.info>.
- [44] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, *Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach*, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 103511, [[astro-ph/0205436](#)].
- [45] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim et al., *Planck 2018 results. V. CMB power spectra and likelihoods*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A5, [[arXiv:1907.12875](#)].
- [46] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, and F. Watson, *The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **416** (2011) 3017–3032, [[arXiv:1106.3366](#)].
- [47] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *The clustering of the SDSS DR7 main Galaxy sample – I. A 4 per cent distance measure at  $z = 0.15$* , *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449** (2015), no. 1 835–847, [[arXiv:1409.3242](#)].
- [48] **BOSS** Collaboration, S. Alam et al., *The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470** (2017), no. 3 2617–2652, [[arXiv:1607.03155](#)].
- [49] R. Consiglio, P. F. de Salas, G. Mangano, G. Miele, S. Pastor, and O. Pisanti, *PARthENoPE reloaded*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **233** (2018) 237–242, [[arXiv:1712.04378](#)].
- [50] S. Gariazzo, P. F. de Salas, O. Pisanti, and R. Consiglio, *PARthENoPE revolutions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **271** (2022) 108205, [[arXiv:2103.05027](#)].