

To H_0 or not to H_0 ?

George Efstathiou

Kavli Institute for Cosmology Cambridge and Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0HA.

6 January 2022

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates whether changes to late time physics can resolve the ‘Hubble tension’. It is argued that many of the claims in the literature favouring such solutions are caused by a misunderstanding of how distance ladder measurements actually work and, in particular, by the inappropriate use of a distance ladder H_0 prior. A dynamics-free inverse distance ladder shows that changes to late time physics are strongly constrained observationally and cannot resolve the discrepancy between the SH0ES data and the base Λ CDM cosmology inferred from *Planck*. We propose a statistically rigorous scheme to replace the use of H_0 priors.

Key words: cosmology; cosmological parameters, distance scale, observations

1 INTRODUCTION

As is well known, a six parameter Λ CDM cosmology¹ has proved to be spectacularly successful in explaining the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB), light element abundances and a wide range of other astronomical data (e.g. [Planck Collaboration et al. 2018](#); [Efstathiou & Gratton 2019](#); [Mossa et al. 2020](#); [eBOSS Collaboration et al. 2020](#)). As noted in [Planck Collaboration et al. \(2018\)](#), the agreement between the base Λ CDM model and observations is so good, that many researchers have begun to focus on possible discrepancies or ‘tensions’, with the hope that the model might break to reveal new truths about our Universe. This is reasonable given that many ingredients of the model, particularly the physics describing the dark sector, remain mysterious at this time.

The discrepancy between early time and late time determinations of the Hubble constant, H_0 , is probably the most serious such tension. This tension became apparent following the first results from the *Planck* satellite ([Planck Collaboration et al. 2014](#)) which revealed a discrepancy between the best fit base Λ CDM value of H_0 and the Cepheid-based distance ladder measurement of H_0 by the SH0ES² collaboration ([Riess et al. 2011](#)). Since then, the ‘Hubble tension’ (as it has become known) has intensified: recent results from the SH0ES collaboration give $H_0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ([Riess et al. 2019](#), hereafter R19) (updating the results of [Riess et al. \(2016\)](#), hereafter R16) which differs by 4.3σ from the base Λ CDM value $H_0 = 67.44 \pm 0.58 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ inferred from the most recent analysis of *Planck* ([Efstathiou & Gratton 2019](#)). To add to the conundrum, the lower value of H_0 inferred from the CMB is in very good agreement

with various applications of an inverse distance ladder, irrespective of whether the sound horizon, r_d , is fixed to a value determined from the CMB or to a value inferred from primordial nucleosynthesis (e.g. [Aubourg et al. 2015](#); [Verde et al. 2017](#); [Addison et al. 2018](#); [Abbott et al. 2018](#); [Macaulay et al. 2019](#)).

Possible modifications to the base Λ CDM model that might resolve this tension have been discussed in the reviews by [Knox & Millea \(2020\)](#), [Beenakker & Venhoek \(2021\)](#) and [Di Valentino et al. \(2021\)](#). In broad brush, the proposed solutions fall into four categories: (i) radical departures from conventional cosmology, including departures from General Relativity³; (ii) changes to the physics of the early Universe (for example adding additional relativistic species, or neutrino interactions); (iii) new physics at matter-radiation equality, or recombination, that alters the value of the sound horizon, (iv) changes to the expansion history at late times. The focus of this paper is on solutions in class (iv).

The issue of whether the tension is real is not yet fully clear (see [Freedman et al. 2019](#); [Yuan et al. 2019](#); [Freedman et al. 2020](#)). Despite the fact that the author is an unashamed Hubble tension skeptic ([Efstathiou 2020](#)), I will take the SH0ES results at face value in this paper and consider whether the Hubble tension can be resolved by modifications to the Λ CDM late time expansion history.

Figure 1 shows various measurements of $H(z)$ from baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) experiments. The normalization of these measurements assumes the *Planck* value of

¹ Which I will refer to as the base Λ CDM model.

² SNe, H_0 , for the Equation of State of dark energy

³ Such models, including those leading to local changes in the properties of Type Ia SN ([Alesta et al. 2021](#)) and/or Cepheids ([Desmond et al. 2019](#)), will not be considered further in this paper.




Figure 1. The evolution of the Hubble parameter with redshift. The red points⁵ show $H(z)$ measurements in three redshift bins inferred from galaxy correlations in the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) Alam et al. (2017). The purple point at $z = 2.35$ shows $H(z)$ from BAO features in the cross-correlations of Ly α absorbers and quasars (Blomqvist et al. 2019). The blue point at $z = 2.34$ shows $H(z)$ from BAO features in the correlations of Ly α absorbers (de Sainte Agathe et al. 2019). The magenta point at $z = 1.48$ shows $H(z)$ from BAO features in the correlations of quasars (Hou et al. 2020). The green line shows $H(z)$ for the best-fit base Λ CDM determined from *Planck* and the grey bands show 1σ and 2σ ranges. The dashed line shows Eq. (2) with parameters chosen to match the SH0ES value of H_0 at $z = 0$.

the sound horizon

$$r_d = 147.31 \pm 0.31 \text{ Mpc}. \quad (1)$$

Throughout this paper we will assume that the base Λ CDM model describes accurately the physics at early times and so r_d is fixed to Eq. (1). The sources for the observational data points are listed in the figure caption. The green line shows $H(z)$ for the best fit base Λ CDM cosmology determined from *Planck* and the grey bands show 1σ and 2σ ranges. The green line approaches the value $H_0^P = 67.44 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ asymptotically as $z \rightarrow 0$. As long as r_d remains fixed, apparently the only way to reconcile the BAO data with the SH0ES value of H_0 is to modify the base Λ CDM curve. For example, the dashed line in Fig. 1 shows the relation

$$H(z) = H_0^f \left[\Omega_m (1+z)^3 + (1 - \Omega_m) \left(1 + \Delta \exp(-z/z_c)^\beta \right) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

with parameters $H_0^f = H_0^P$, $\Omega_m = 0.31$, $\Delta = 0.30$, $z_c = 0.1$ and $\beta = 2$. With this choice of parameters, the value of H_0 matches the SH0ES value whilst matching the BAO $H(z)$ measurements at $z > 0.3$.

If the dashed curve is interpreted as a variation in the

equation of state of the dark energy, then it necessarily requires a phantom equation of state, $w < -1$, at low redshifts. Alternatively, one might imagine that transference of energy between the dark matter and dark energy results in something like the dashed curve. Models of both types have been proposed as ‘solutions’ to the Hubble tension as summarized in Di Valentino et al. (2021). These ‘solutions’ are not viable because the SH0ES team does not directly measure H_0 .

In fact, the SH0ES team measure the absolute peak magnitude, M_B , of Type Ia supernovae (SN), assumed to be standard candles, by calibrating the distances of SN host galaxies to local geometric distance anchors via the Cepheid period luminosity relation. The magnitude M_B is then converted into a value of H_0 via the magnitude-redshift relation of the Pantheon SN sample (Scolnic et al. 2017) of supernovae in the redshift range $0.023 < z < 0.15$. All of the proposed late time ‘solutions’ to the Hubble tension reviewed in Di Valentino et al. (2021) interpret the SH0ES H_0 measurement as a measurement of the value of $H(z)$ as $z \rightarrow 0$ (often imposing a SH0ES ‘ H_0 prior’) without investigating whether the ‘solution’ is consistent with the magnitude-redshift relation of Type Ia SN. It is hardly advancing our understanding if authors propose solutions to the H_0 tension that are inconsistent with the measurements that they are trying to explain.

This point was first made by Lemos et al. (2019) and more recently by Benevento et al. (2020) and by Camarena & Marra (2021), but has been comprehensively ignored in recent literature. The purpose of this paper is to show how theoretical models exploring new physics at late time should be compared with distance ladder measurements, avoiding the use of a SH0ES H_0 prior. I will adopt a ‘dynamics free’ approach to this problem and show that late time modifications of the Λ CDM expansion history cannot resolve the Hubble tension.

2 THE INVERSE DISTANCE LADDER

We will write the metric of space-time as

$$ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 - R^2(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (3)$$

adopting a spatially flat geometry consistent with the very tight experimental constraints on spatial curvature (Efstathiou & Gratton 2020). The Hubble parameter, $H = R^{-1}dR/dt$, then fixes the luminosity distance $D_L(z)$ and comoving angular diameter distance $D_M(z)$ according to

$$D_L(z) = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}, \quad D_M(z) = \frac{D_L(z)}{(1+z)}. \quad (4)$$

Standard candles and standard rulers can therefore be used to constrain $H(z)$ independently of any dynamics (Heavens et al. 2014; Bernal et al. 2016; Lemos et al. 2019; Aylor et al. 2019). As long as the relations of Eq. (4) are satisfied, it does not matter whether modifications to the functional form of $H(z)$ are caused by changes to the equation of state of dark energy or interactions between dark matter and dark energy.

A standard candle with absolute magnitude M at redshift z will have an apparent magnitude

$$m = M + 25 + 5 \log_{10} D_L(z), \quad (5a)$$

$$= -5a + 5 \log_{10} \hat{c} d_L(z) \quad (5b)$$

⁵ The data and covariance matrices are from the file BAO_consensus_covtot_dM_Hz.txt downloaded from http://www.sdss3.org/science/BOSS_publications.php




Figure 2. 68 and 95% constraints on the parameters Δ and z_c (left hand panel) and the SH0ES-like parameter H_0^S of Eq. (10b) and H_0 . (right hand panel). The dashed lines in the right hand panel show the best fit values of H_0^S and H_0 .

with D_L in units of Mpc. In (5b), a is the intercept of the magnitude-redshift relation, $5a = -(M + 25 - 5 \log_{10} H_0)$ and $\hat{d}_L(z) = H_0 D_L(z)/c$. The SH0ES Cepheid data allow one to calibrate the absolute magnitude M_B of Type Ia SN. Combining the geometrical distance estimates of the maser galaxy NGC 4258 (Reid et al. 2019), detached eclipsing binaries in the Large Magellanic Cloud (Pietrzyński et al. 2019) and GAIA early data release 3 (EDR3, Lindgren et al. (2020a,b)) parallax measurements of 75 Milky Way Cepheids with HST photometry as reported in Riess et al. (2021) (hereafter R21), the SH0ES Cepheid photometry and Pantheon SN peak magnitudes give

$$M_B = -19.214 \pm 0.037 \text{ mag.} \quad (6)$$

(see Sect. 3). To estimate H_0 , R16 determine the intercept of the Pantheon SN magnitude-redshift relation by fitting the low redshift expansion to the luminosity distance

$$\hat{d}_l(z) = z \left[1 + (1 - q_0) \frac{z}{2} - \frac{1}{6} (1 - q_0 - 3q_0^2 + j_0) z^2 \right], \quad (7)$$

over the redshift range $z = 0.023$ to $z = 0.15$, with the deceleration and jerk parameters set to $q_0 = -0.55$ and $j_0 = 1$ (close to the values for base Λ CDM, $q_0 = -0.535$, $j_0 = 1$). They find

$$a_B = 0.71273 \pm 0.00176, \quad (8)$$

which, together with Eq. (6), gives

$$H_0 = 74.1 \pm 1.3 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

(see Table 2). This is slightly higher than the value $H_0 = 73.2 \pm 1.3 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ quoted in R21 reflecting differences in the period ranges and photometric samples used in my analysis. These differences are unimportant for this paper. (Note, however, that the global fits to the SH0ES Cepheid data using the GAIA EDR3 parallaxes have puzzling features as discussed in Sect. 3.)

To apply the inverse distance ladder, I follow closely the analysis described in Lemos et al. (2019). $H(z)$ is parameterized by Eq. (2) and the parameters of the model are determined by fitting to Pantheon SN magnitudes and

Table 1. Results of applying the inverse distance ladder. The table lists the mean values of the parameters and their 1σ error. The last column lists the ranges over which a uniform prior is applied to the parameters. The parameters H_0 and H_0^S are derived parameters (see Eqs. 2 and 10b). The units of H_0^f , H_0 and H_0^S are $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

parameter	fit	prior range
H_0^f	68.13 ± 1.00	60 – 80
Ω_m	0.306 ± 0.017	0.25 – 0.35
Δ	0.107 ± 0.162	0.0 – 1.0
z_c	0.167 ± 0.091	0.001 – 0.5
β	2.45 ± 0.86	1.0 – 4.0
M_B	-19.387 ± 0.021	-19.0 – -19.5
H_0	70.5 ± 3.6	–
H_0^S	67.73 ± 0.97	–

the BAO $D_M(z)$ and $H(z)$ measurements from the references given in the caption to Fig. 1, supplemented by the $D_V(z) = (D_M^2(z)cz/H(z))^{1/3}$ measurement at $z = 0.106$ from Beutler et al. (2011). The free parameters of the model are H_0^f , Ω_m , Δ , z_c , β and M_B with uniform priors as listed in Table 1. To compare with the BAO results, I adopt a Gaussian prior on the sound horizon r_d with the parameters of Eq. (1). I use the MULTINEST sampling algorithm (Feroz et al. 2009, 2011) to explore the parameter space.

The constraints on these parameters are summarized in Table 1. The left hand plot in Fig. 2 shows the 1σ and 2σ constraints on the parameters Δ and z_c ⁶. The key point here is that the parameter Δ is well constrained for values of $z_c \gtrsim 0.05$ because at these redshifts the form of $H(z)$ is tightly constrained by the SN magnitude-redshift relation. At lower values of z_c , the parameter Δ becomes poorly constrained by the SN magnitude-redshift relation and solutions with high values of H_0 are allowed. This reinforces the con-

⁶ Evidently, the parameter z_c runs into the upper range of its prior, but this is unimportant.




Figure 3. The left hand panel shows 68 and 95% constraints on the parameters H_0^S and M_B . The dotted lines show the mean values of these parameters listed in Table 1. The middle panel shows the marginalised posterior distributions of the SN peak absolute magnitude M_B determined from the inverse distance ladder discussed in this paper (black line) compared with the posterior distribution of M_B determined from the SH0ES data (red line). The right hand panel shows the equivalent plot, but for the parameter H_0^S instead of M_B .

clusions of [Benevento et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Camarena & Marra \(2021\)](#) that the SN data are insensitive to changes in the dark energy equation of state at very late times⁷.

We can compute a derived quantity H_0^S that is equivalent to the SH0ES estimate of H_0

$$a_B = \left(\sum_{ij} C_{ij}^{-1} (\log_{10} \hat{d}_L(z) - 0.2m_B(i)) \right) / \sum_{ij} C_{ij}^{-1} \quad (10a)$$

$$H_0^S = 10^{0.2(M_B + 5a_B + 25)} \quad (10b)$$

where C is the covariance matrix of the Pantheon SN magnitudes and the sums in Eq. (10a) extend all SN in the Pantheon sample with redshifts in the range 0.023 – 0.15.

The right hand plot in Fig. 2 shows H_0^S plotted against the true value of H_0 . One can see the long tail extending to high values of H_0 . These high values arise in solutions with $z_c \lesssim 0.05$ and high values of Δ corresponding to phantom-like equations of state. However, the SH0ES analysis is oblivious to these high values of H_0 . Instead, a SH0ES type analysis would infer a value close to the estimate H_0^S of Eq. (10b), which is always low. For these models $H_0^S = 67.75 \pm 1.01 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, discrepant with Eq. (9) by 3.9σ despite the ability of the model to mimic extreme phantom-like equations of state. It is also worth noting that the parameters Ω_m and H_0^S are each within about 0.4σ of the base Λ CDM values inferred from *Planck*. There is not even a hint from these data for any phantom-like physics.

The discrepancy between the inverse distance ladder and the SH0ES data is illustrated clearly in Fig. 3. The left hand panel shows the 1σ and 2σ constraints on H_0^S and M_B . The central panel shows the posterior distribution of M_B determined from the inverse distance ladder (black line) compared with the result of Eq. (7) derived from the SH0ES data (red line). The right hand panel shows the posterior distribution of H_0^S compared with Eq. (9). The SH0ES results are clearly discrepant with the inverse distance ladder. As long as the *Planck* value of r_d is correct and the relations of

Eq. (4) apply, *modifications to the expansion history at late times cannot explain the SH0ES data.*

3 SHOULD ONE USE A SH0ES H_0 PRIOR?

The first draft of this paper generated a large number of comments. Many of the negative comments cited the paper by [Dhawan et al. \(2020\)](#) which explored a number of parametric forms for the expansion history (interpreted as modifications to the dark energy equation of state) constrained to fit the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation. [Dhawan et al. \(2020\)](#) concluded that the distance ladder values of H_0 inferred for these expansion histories agreed to within about $0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ (excluding models with a sharp transition in the equation of state at very low redshift, which were not considered by [Dhawan et al. \(2020\)](#)). Critics of my paper have argued that the insensitivity of H_0 to variations in the expansion history found by [Dhawan et al. \(2020\)](#) means that it is safe to use a SH0ES H_0 prior in cosmological parameter analysis *even if the Pantheon sample is excluded from the analysis*. This is incorrect.

The key point is that the Pantheon SN sample is an essential part of the SH0ES distance ladder measurement of H_0 . Summarising the entire SH0ES analysis in terms of one parameter, namely the value of H_0 , represents a huge and lossy compression of the Cepheid+SN data. In particular, all information on the shape of the SN magnitude-redshift relation is lost. If one then imposes a SH0ES H_0 prior but ignores the Pantheon SN data, it is possible to infer evidence for phantom like dark energy as illustrated by the dotted line in Fig. 1. However, such a solution is strongly disfavoured by the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation.

If one wants to investigate consequences of new late-time physics, a rigorous way of compare with the SH0ES results, as noted by [Camarena & Marra \(2021\)](#), is to drop H_0 as a parameter in favour of the SN peak absolute magnitude M_B . In other words, rather than explaining the ‘Hubble tension’ one should instead focus on the ‘supernova absolute magnitude tension’ since this is what the Cepheid calibrations are designed to measure. The goal then is to find a late time solution that brings M_B measured from distant supernovae into agreement with the value inferred from Cepheid measurements. This necessarily involves analysing

⁷ It is worth mentioning that the SN host galaxies of R16 and [Freedman et al. \(2019\)](#) are very nearby, with redshifts $z \lesssim 0.007$. Yet as shown in Fig. 7 of [Freedman et al. \(2019\)](#), their velocity flow corrected distances define a Hubble diagram with very little scatter. There is therefore no evidence for an abrupt change to the equation of state at very low redshifts.




Figure 4. The upper panel shows the magnitude-redshift relation for the Pantheon sample, together with the best fit (solid line) assuming the expansion history of Eq. (12). The vertical dashed line shows the maximum redshift used in the fit. The lower panel shows maximum likelihood band averaged residuals with respect to the best fit, together with 1σ errors.

a uniformly calibrated supernova sample such as Pantheon⁸. The following procedure is statistically rigorous:

[1] If correlations between the host⁹ galaxy SN magnitudes and the magnitudes of more distant supernovae are ignored (as in the the SHOES papers and this paper) the SHOES Cepheid measurements can be summarized by the posterior distribution of the SN peak absolute magnitude M_B^1 . If one wants to take into account correlations between the magnitudes of host and distant SN, the SHOES data must be summarized in terms of a vector of distance moduli μ and an associated covariance matrix as described in Appendix A.

[2] To test a theoretical model, carry as parameters an absolute magnitude M_B^1 for the Cepheid SN host galaxies and an absolute magnitude M_B^2 for the more distant SN in the Pantheon sample (taking into account correlations with the Cepheid SN magnitudes, if necessary). If the posteriors of M_B^1 and M_B^2 overlap, then one has a candidate solution to the ‘supernova absolute magnitude tension’.

[3] If there is substantial overlap between the posteriors of M_B^1 and M_B^2 , one can replace these parameters by a single parameter M_B . The best fit value of M_B for a chosen cosmology is equivalent to a best fit value of H_0 .

In the above procedure, there is no danger of reaching

⁸ Similar remarks apply to the tip of the red giant branch distance ladder [Freedman et al. \(2019\)](#), but with the Carnegie Supernova Project ([Hamuy et al. 2006](#); [Krisciunas et al. 2017](#)) replacing the Pantheon sample.

⁹ We are using the term ‘host’ as shorthand to denote galaxies with Cepheid distance moduli that hosted a Type 1a SN.




Figure 5. 68% and 95% constraints on the NGC 4258 and LMC distance moduli for the three anchor global fit summarized in column 5 of Table 2. The best fit geometrical distance moduli of ([Reid et al. 2019](#)) and ([Pietrzyński et al. 2019](#)) (which are included as priors in the global fit) are shown by the dotted lines.

erroneous conclusions on late time physics through the inappropriate use of an H_0 prior. In addition, the Pantheon data is only used only once in testing a particular theoretical model (c.f. [Camarena & Marra 2021](#)). Furthermore, this approach remains valid for models in which the expansion history changes at $z \lesssim 0.05$.

What procedure should forward distance ladder measurements follow in reporting a value for H_0 ? It is clear that one should fit the expansion history using the Pantheon sample as part of the H_0 analysis rather than adopting fixed values for q_0 and j_0 as in R16. To illustrate this, Table 2 shows results of global fits to the SHOES Cepheid and Pantheon SN magnitude-redshift relation combining three geometrical distance anchors, as described in Sect. 2. The Cepheid period luminosity is fitted to (see e.g. R21)

$$m_j^i = \mu_i + M_H^W + b(\log_{10} P_j - 1) + Z_w \Delta[O/H]_j, \quad (11)$$

where m_j^i is the H-band Weisenheit apparent magnitude of Cepheid j in galaxy i , P_j is the period of Cepheid j in units of days and $\Delta[O/H]_j$ is the metallicity assigned to Cepheid j relative to Solar metallicity. As in R21 I include a constant offset zp to the GAIA EDR3 parallaxes as a free parameter. Column 2 shows results assuming the R16 prior on a_B (Eq. 8) which gives the value of H_0 quoted in Eq. (9). The next two columns show results using the (q_0, j_0) expansion of Eq. (7) which we fit to the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation over the redshift ranges $0.023 - 0.5$ (column 3) and $0.023 - 0.8$ (column 4). The Cepheid period-luminosity parameters, and the parameter M_B are stable across the columns, as expected since these parameters are statistically decoupled from the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation. However, the value of the Hubble constant increases by $\sim 0.7 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ between columns 2 and 4.

To test the sensitivity of these results to the assumed expansion history, column 5 in Table 2 shows results for the flexible parametric form:

$$H(z) = H_0^f [A(1+z)^3 + B + Cz + D \ln(1+z)]^{1/2}, \quad (12)$$

Table 2. Determination of H_0 from three geometrical distance anchors (NGC 4258 maser distance, LMC detached eclipsing binaries and GAIA DR3 parallaxes to Milky Way Cepheids) using different fits to the expansion history. Column 2 gives results assuming a Gaussian prior on a_B of 0.71273 ± 0.00176 as in R16 and subsequent SHOES papers. Columns 3 and 4 give results of fitting the q_0, j_0 expansion history of Eq. (7) to the Pantheon sample for SN in the redshift range 0.023 to z_{\max} . Column 5 shows the results of fitting Eq. (12) to the Pantheon sample over the redshift range 0.023–0.8. The accuracy of the best fit to the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation in this case is illustrated in Fig. 4. The units of the parameter zp is μarcsec and H_0 is in units of $\text{km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

parameter	a_B prior	Eq. (7) ($z_{\max} = 0.50$)	Eq. (7) ($z_{\max} = 0.80$)	Eq. (12) ($z_{\max} = 0.80$)
M_H^W	-5.922 ± 0.017	-5.922 ± 0.017	-5.922 ± 0.017	-5.922 ± 0.017
b	-3.24 ± 0.02	-3.24 ± 0.02	-3.24 ± 0.02	-3.24 ± 0.02
Z_w	-0.22 ± 0.06	-0.22 ± 0.05	-0.22 ± 0.05	-0.22 ± 0.06
zp	-17.1 ± 4.8	-17.2 ± 4.7	-17.1 ± 4.7	-16.8 ± 4.8
M_B	-19.214 ± 0.037	-19.213 ± 0.036	-19.212 ± 0.037	-19.209 ± 0.037
a_B	0.71273 ± 0.00176	0.7174 ± 0.0028	0.7164 ± 0.0026	0.7162 ± 0.0033
H_0	74.1 ± 1.3	75.0 ± 1.3	74.8 ± 1.3	74.9 ± 1.4

with A, B, C and D as free parameters (Lemos et al. 2019). The best fit SN magnitude-redshift relation is shown in Fig. 4. Equation (12) provides a very accurate fit to the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation and is very close to the relation for the best-fit Planck base Λ CDM cosmology (as can be seen from Fig. 13 of Planck Collaboration et al. (2018)). For most purposes, it will be sufficient to quote a value of H_0 based on fits of a flexible fitting function (or a Gaussian process, see e.g. Shafieloo et al. (2012); Joudaki et al. (2018)) to the Pantheon magnitude-redshift relation. However, there remains an uncertainty in this type of forward estimation of H_0 , which is difficult to quantify, if the expansion history deviates from the base Λ CDM cosmology at redshifts $z \lesssim 0.05$ since such models are poorly constrained by the Pantheon sample (cf. Fig. 2).

It is worth mentioning a peculiar aspect of the solutions in Table 2. Efstathiou (2020) pointed out a $\sim 3\sigma$ tension between the NGC 4258 and LMC geometric distance anchors in the global fits using the R16 Cepheids. This tension becomes stronger if we include the GAIA EDR3 Cepheid parallaxes. This is illustrated in Fig. 5, which shows the constraints on the LMC and NGC 4258 distance moduli (μ_{LMC} and μ_{4258}) derived from the fit in column 5 of Table 2. The GAIA EDR3 and LMC anchors pull the solution towards high values of H_0 , while the NGC 4258 maser anchor wants to pull the solution to lower values of H_0 . The three-anchor solutions listed in Table 2 (and in R21) are therefore statistically inconsistent.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The Hubble tension has led to a large literature in the last few years. Authors of proposed late time solutions to the Hubble tension have often imposed a SHOES H_0 prior on the Hubble parameter at $z = 0$, leading to erroneous claims of evidence for phantom dark energy, dark matter-dark energy interactions, or other exotic late-time physics. The review article by Di Valentino et al. (2021) cites many such examples.

If one wants to investigate consequences of new late-time physics, the simplest way to compare with the SHOES results is to drop H_0 as a parameter in favour of the SN peak absolute magnitude M_B , i.e. rather than explaining

the ‘Hubble tension’ one should instead focus on the ‘supernova absolute magnitude tension’. The goal then is to find a late time solution that brings M_B into agreement with the SHOES measurement. This necessarily involves analysing the Pantheon SN sample¹⁰. If one wants to combine the SHOES data with other astrophysical data to constrain late time physics, then one should impose a SHOES prior on the parameter M_B (or Cepheid calibrated distance moduli of SN host galaxies, see Appendix A) and not on the parameter H_0 .

However, using the Pantheon and BAO data, the inverse distance ladder places very strong constraints on new physics at late times. The results of Table 1 show that the data are in excellent agreement with the base Λ CDM cosmology determined from *Planck*. BAO is now a mature field employing analysis techniques that have been tested extensively against simulations. There is no good reason to ignore these measurements. Neither is there a good reason to ignore the Pantheon SN sample, since this is an essential part of the SHOES distance ladder. It is, therefore, unlikely that changes to the late time expansion history can resolve the ‘Hubble tension’. This conclusion is independent of any dynamics, and independent of perturbations insofar as the *Planck* value of r_d is unaltered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Sunny Vagnozzi for his comments on a draft of this paper. I am grateful to the many people who have sent me comments on this paper. In particular, I thank Adam Riess, Dan Scolnic and Pablo Lemos for correspondence on the material discussed in Section 3.

DATA AVAILABILITY

No new data were generated or analysed in support of this research.

¹⁰ Similar remarks apply to the tip of the red giant branch distance ladder Freedman et al. (2019), but with the Carnegie Supernova Project (Hamuy et al. 2006; Krisciunas et al. 2017) replacing the Pantheon sample.

APPENDIX A: INCLUDING CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CEPHEID-CALIBRATED SN MAGNITUDES AND MAGNITUDES OF MORE DISTANT SN

We denote the covariance matrix of the SN magnitudes as \mathbf{M} and the covariance matrix of the host galaxy distance moduli as \mathbf{C} . Let t denote the index of the N_H host SN and q denote the index of the N_P more distant SN in the Pantheon sample that will link the Cepheid measurements to the Hubble flow. The predicted peak SN magnitude in a host galaxy is

$$m_t^P = \mu_t + M_B^1, \quad (\text{A1a})$$

where μ_t is the distance modulus to galaxy t . The predicted peak SN magnitude for a distant SN at redshift z_q is

$$m_q^P = \mu(z_q) + M_B^2, \quad (\text{A1b})$$

where the distance modulus $\mu(z_q)$ is fixed by an assumed cosmology and value of H_0 . We would expect $M_B^1 = M_B^2 = M_B$ if Type 1a supernovae are standard candles. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}^P)$, where \mathbf{m} is the data vector of SN peak magnitudes, and partition the vector \mathbf{x} as (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) where \mathbf{y} describes the hosts and \mathbf{w} describes the more distant SN. Let us partition the covariance matrix \mathbf{M} as follows:

$$\mathbf{M}^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{D} & \mathbf{E} \\ \hline \mathbf{E}^T & \mathbf{F} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{F} have dimensions $N_H \times N_H$, $N_H \times N_P$ and $N_P \times N_P$ respectively.

If correlations between host and distant SN magnitudes are negligible, the Cepheid analysis is decoupled from the analysis of the distant SN in the Pantheon sample. In this case, the Cepheid analysis can be summarized by the posterior distribution of M_B^1 and the likelihood of the distant SN is¹¹

$$-2 \ln \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{F} \mathbf{w}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Given an assumed functional form for $D_L(z)$, Eq. (A3) can be used to determine a probability distribution for H_0 given a distribution for $M_B^1 = M_B^2 = M_B$. This is the approximation adopted by the SH0ES team and in the main body of this paper.

To take into account correlations between host and distant SN magnitudes, a more complex procedure is necessary. In this case, the Cepheid analysis can no longer be summarized by the posterior distribution of M_B^1 . Instead the Cepheid analysis needs to be summarized in terms of the distance moduli for the SN hosts and a covariance matrix. It is a very good approximation to assume a Gaussian probability distribution

$$-2 \ln \mathcal{L} = (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^m)^T \mathbf{C}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^m), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}^m$ are the mean values of the host distance moduli determined from the MCMC chains and \mathbf{C} is their covariance matrix

There is, however, no need to carry the N_H components of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ as parameters, since it is possible to integrate over

¹¹ All likelihoods in this section are defined to within an additive constant.

these variables. After some algebra, one can show that the likelihood can be written as

$$-2 \ln \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{w}]^T (\mathbf{C}^{-1} + \mathbf{D})^{-1} [\mathbf{D}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{w}], \quad (\text{A5})$$

where the μ_t in Eq. (A1a) are replaced by the maximum likelihood values μ_t^m .

In the limit that correlations between host and distant magnitudes can be neglected, the host component of the likelihood becomes

$$-2 \ln \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{D} [\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{C}^{-1} + \mathbf{D})^{-1} \mathbf{D}] \mathbf{y}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Equation (A6) reproduces the results of Table 2 to within the precision of the MCMC chains.

REFERENCES

- Abbott T. M. C., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, **480**, 3879
 Addison G. E., Watts D. J., Bennett C. L., Halpern M., Hinshaw G., Weiland J. L., 2018, *ApJ*, **853**, 119
 Alam S., et al., 2017, *MNRAS*, **470**, 2617
 Alestas G., Kazantzidis L., Perivolaropoulos L., 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, **103**, 083517
 Aubourg É., et al., 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, **92**, 123516
 Aylor K., Joy M., Knox L., Millea M., Raghunathan S., Kimmy Wu W. L., 2019, *ApJ*, **874**, 4
 Beenakker W., Venhoek D., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2101.01372
 Benevento G., Hu W., Raveri M., 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, **101**, 103517
 Bernal J. L., Verde L., Riess A. G., 2016, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, **10**, 019
 Beutler F., et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, **416**, 3017
 Blomqvist M., et al., 2019, *A&A*, **629**, A86
 Camarena D., Marra V., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2101.08641
 Desmond H., Jain B., Sakstein J., 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, **100**, 043537
 Dhawan S., Brout D., Scolnic D., Goobar A., Riess A. G., Miranda V., 2020, *ApJ*, **894**, 54
 Di Valentino E., et al., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2103.01183
 Efstathiou G., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2007.10716
 Efstathiou G., Gratton S., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1910.00483
 Efstathiou G., Gratton S., 2020, *MNRAS*, **496**, L91
 Feroz F., Hobson M. P., Bridges M., 2009, *MNRAS*, **398**, 1601
 Feroz F., Hobson M. P., Bridges M., 2011, MultiNest: Efficient and Robust Bayesian Inference (ascl:1109.006)
 Freedman W. L., et al., 2019, *ApJ*, **882**, 34
 Freedman W. L., et al., 2020, *ApJ*, **891**, 57
 Hamuy M., et al., 2006, *PASP*, **118**, 2
 Heavens A., Jimenez R., Verde L., 2014, *Physical Review Letters*, **113**, 241302
 Hou J., et al., 2020, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **500**, 1201–1221
 Joudaki S., Kaplinghat M., Keeley R., Kirkby D., 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, **97**, 123501
 Knox L., Millea M., 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, **101**, 043533
 Krisciunas K., et al., 2017, *AJ*, **154**, 211
 Lemos P., Lee E., Efstathiou G., Gratton S., 2019, *MNRAS*, **483**, 4803
 Lindegren L., et al., 2020a, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2012.01742
 Lindegren L., et al., 2020b, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2012.03380
 Macaulay E., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, **486**, 2184
 Mossa V., et al., 2020, *Nature*, **587**, 210
 Pietrzyński G., et al., 2019, *Nature*, **567**, 200
 Planck Collaboration et al., 2014, *A&A*, **571**, A16

- Planck Collaboration et al., 2018, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1807.06209](#)
- Reid M. J., Pesce D. W., Riess A. G., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1908.05625](#)
- Riess A. G., et al., 2011, *ApJ*, **730**, 119
- Riess A. G., et al., 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **826**, 56
- Riess A. G., Casertano S., Yuan W., Macri L. M., Scolnic D., 2019, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **876**, 85
- Riess A. G., Casertano S., Yuan W., Bowers J. B., Macri L., Zinn J. C., Scolnic D., 2021, *ApJ*, **908**, L6
- Scolnic D. M., et al., 2017, preprint, ([arXiv:1710.00845](#))
- Shafieloo A., Kim A. G., Linder E. V., 2012, *Phys. Rev. D*, **85**, 123530
- Verde L., Bernal J. L., Heavens A. F., Jimenez R., 2017, *MNRAS*, **467**, 731
- Yuan W., Riess A. G., Macri L. M., Casertano S., Scolnic D. M., 2019, *ApJ*, **886**, 61
- de Sainte Agathe V., et al., 2019, *A&A*, **629**, A85
- eBOSS Collaboration et al., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2007.08991](#)