

Is the w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization evidence for dark energy dynamics partially caused by the excess smoothing of Planck CMB anisotropy data?

Chan-Gyung Park *

*Division of Science Education and Institute of Fusion Science,
Jeonbuk National University, Jeonju 54896, Republic of Korea*

Javier de Cruz Pérez †

*Departamento de Física, Universidad de Córdoba,
Campus Universitario de Rabanales, Ctra. N-IV km, 396, E-14071, Córdoba, Spain*

Bharat Ratra ‡

*Department of Physics, Kansas State University, 116 Cardwell Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA
(Dated: October 18, 2024)*

We study the performance of the spatially-flat dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM parameterization, with redshift-dependent dark energy fluid equation of state parameter $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z/(1+z)$, with and without a varying CMB lensing consistency parameter A_L , against Planck cosmic microwave background (CMB) data (P18 and lensing) and a combination of non-CMB data composed of baryonic acoustic oscillation (BAO) measurements that do not include DESI BAO data, Pantheon+ type Ia supernovae (SNIa) observations, Hubble parameter $[H(z)]$ measurements, and growth factor ($f\sigma_8$) data points. From our most restrictive data set, P18+lensing+non-CMB, for the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization, we obtain $w_0 = -0.879 \pm 0.060$, $w_a = -0.39^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$, the asymptotic limit $w(z \rightarrow \infty) = w_0 + w_a = -1.27^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$, and $A_L = 1.078^{+0.036}_{-0.040}$ (all 1σ errors). This joint analysis of CMB and non-CMB data favors dark energy dynamics over a cosmological constant at $\sim 1\sigma$ and $A_L > 1$ at $\sim 2\sigma$, i.e. more smoothing of the Planck CMB anisotropy data than is predicted by the best-fit model. For the w_0w_a CDM parameterization with $A_L = 1$ the evidence in favor of dark energy dynamics is larger, $\sim 2\sigma$, suggesting that at least part of the evidence for dark energy dynamics comes from the excess smoothing of the Planck CMB anisotropy data. For the w_0w_a CDM parameterization with $A_L = 1$, there is a difference of 2.8σ between P18 and non-CMB cosmological parameter constraints and 2.7σ between P18+lensing and non-CMB constraints. When A_L is allowed to vary these tensions reduced to 1.9σ and 2.1σ respectively. Our P18+lensing+non-CMB data compilation *positively* favors the w_0w_a CDM parameterization without and with a varying A_L parameter over the flat Λ CDM model, and w_0w_a CDM+ A_L is also *positively* favored over w_0w_a CDM.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x

I. INTRODUCTION

At cosmological scales the current best description of gravity is general relativity, which provides the framework for the standard model of cosmology (Λ CDM) [1]. This flat Λ CDM model assumes flat spatial geometry and is characterized by six cosmological parameters. The flat Λ CDM model cosmological energy budget has contributions from photons, neutrinos, ordinary baryonic matter, cold dark matter (CDM), and a cosmological constant Λ that dominates at the present time and so powers the observed accelerated expansion of the universe. This model passes most observational tests but there are some recent measurements that question whether the predictions of the model are correct [2–5].

For instance, the DESI collaboration has recently made public some baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO)

measurements [6] that may be incompatible with the time-independent Λ dark energy component of the flat Λ CDM model. These authors also study a spatially-flat dynamical dark energy fluid cosmological parameterization, w_0w_a CDM, that has a time-evolving dark energy fluid with redshift-dependent equation of state parameter $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z/(1+z)$, [7, 8], characterized by two degrees of freedom, w_0 and w_a . When the DESI+CMB+PantheonPlus data set (see [6] for a more detailed description) is analyzed using the w_0w_a CDM parameterization they find $w_0 = -0.827 \pm 0.063$ and $w_a = -0.75^{+0.29}_{-0.25}$ with a $\sim 2\sigma$ preference for a time-evolving dark energy over a Λ . For other discussions of the DESI 2024 results, see [9–45]. In [18], we showed, by using a different data set that did not include the DESI BAO measurements, that the $\sim 2\sigma$ preference for a dynamical dark energy component over a cosmological constant did not depend on the DESI measurements, and that our data compilation provides slightly more restrictive constraints, giving $w_0 = -0.850 \pm 0.059$ and $w_a = -0.59^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$. In [18] we also showed that the w_0w_a CDM parameterization $\sim 2\sigma$ preference for dark

* park.chan.gyung@gmail.com

† jdecruz@uco.es

‡ ratra@phys.ksu.edu

energy dynamics over a Λ also did not depend on Pantheon+ type Ia supernova (SNIa) data. Earlier discussions about the possibility of having a dynamical dark energy component can be found in [46–59] and references therein.

It is important to bear in mind that these results are not that statistically significant and also that w_0w_a CDM is not a physically consistent cosmological model but just a redshift-dependent parameterization of a dynamical dark energy equation of state. In the simplest physically consistent dynamical dark energy models, the dark energy component is described in terms of an evolving scalar field ϕ with a potential energy density $V(\phi)$, [60, 61]. For recent discussions of scalar field dark energy models in the context of the DESI measurements see [9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 24, 30].

In reference [18], within the context of the w_0w_a CDM parameterization a difference of about 2.7σ was found between cosmological parameter constraints obtained with CMB and non-CMB data. One main aim of this work is to determine whether the addition of the variable lensing consistency parameter A_L [62] to the dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM parameterization can help improve its performance when simultaneously fitting different CMB and non-CMB data sets, as is the case in Λ CDM models, [58]. Another main aim is to determine whether the flat w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization better fits these data than does the flat Λ CDM model and the flat w_0w_a CDM parameterization. We find that both of these are true. More importantly, we also find that when A_L is allowed to vary in the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization, the evidence for dark energy dynamics over a Λ decreases to $\sim 1\sigma$ (compared to the $\sim 2\sigma$ evidence in the w_0w_a CDM parameterization case) and that $A_L > 1$ is favored at $\sim 2\sigma$, i.e., that these data prefer more weak lensing of the CMB than is predicted by the best-fit model. These results suggest that at least part of the support for dark energy dynamics in the w_0w_a CDM parameterization comes from the excess smoothing of the Planck CMB anisotropy data.

A brief description of the structure of the article follows. In Sec. II we provide general details of the different data sets we use to constrain the cosmological parameters and also to test the models under study. A brief summary of the main features of the analysis can be found in Sec. III. In Sec. IV our main results are presented and discussed and finally in Sec. V we deliver our conclusions.

II. DATA

Here we list the data used in our analyses and the corresponding references, but the details are provided in Sec. II of [58]. We note that we account for all known data covariances.

The CMB data sets used in this work are composed of the Planck 2018 TT,TE,EE+lowE (P18) CMB temperature and polarization power spectra [63], which are

analyzed alone or in combination with the Planck lensing potential (lensing) power spectrum [64].

The non-CMB data utilized in the analyses here are the same as those denoted non-CMB (new) data that are used in [58] and comprised of

- 16 BAO data points, spanning $0.122 \leq z \leq 2.334$, listed in Table I of [58]. We do not use DESI 2024 BAO data, [6].
- 1590 SNIa data points, a subset of the Pantheon+ compilation [65], where the SNIa at $z < 0.01$ were not used so as to minimize the model-dependency of the peculiar velocity corrections. The range covered by these data is $0.01016 \leq z \leq 2.26137$.
- 32 Hubble parameter [$H(z)$] measurements, spanning $0.070 \leq z \leq 1.965$, which are listed in Table 1 of [66] and also in Table II of [58].
- 9 growth rate ($f\sigma_8$) data points, not obtained from BAO analyses, covering $0.013 \leq z \leq 1.36$. The complete list is provided in Table III of [58].

We use five individual and combined data sets to constrain the flat Λ CDM model and the flat dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM and w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterizations, namely: P18 data, P18+lensing data, non-CMB data, P18+non-CMB data, and P18+lensing+non-CMB data.

III. METHODS

Here we present a brief summary of the methods used in our study. A fuller discussion can be found in Sec. III of [58].

In order to pin down the values of the cosmological parameters that better describe these observational data we use the CAMB/COSMOMC program (October 2018 version) [67–69]. While CAMB computes the evolution of cosmological model spatial inhomogeneities and makes theoretical predictions, that in turn depend on the cosmological parameters that characterize the different models under study, COSMOMC compares these predictions to observational data using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method to determine the posterior probability distributions of the involved parameters. The MCMC chains are considered to have converged when the Gelman and Rubin R statistic satisfies $R - 1 < 0.01$. Once the converged chains are obtained, we utilize the `GetDist` code [70] to extract the average values, confidence intervals, and likelihood distributions of the cosmological model parameters.

The six flat Λ CDM model primary cosmological parameters we have chosen to use are the current value of the physical baryonic matter density parameter $\Omega_b h^2$ (h is the Hubble constant in units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$),

TABLE I. Mean and 68% (or 95% indicated between parentheses when the value is provided) confidence limits of flat w_0w_a CDM model parameters from non-CMB, P18, P18+lensing, P18+non-CMB, and P18+lensing+non-CMB data. H_0 has units of $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$. We also include the values of χ^2_{min} , DIC, and AIC and the differences with respect to the Λ CDM model, denoted by $\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}}$, ΔDIC , and ΔAIC , respectively.

Parameter	Non-CMB	P18	P18+lensing	P18+non-CMB	P18+lensing+non-CMB
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.0315 ± 0.0043	0.02240 ± 0.00015	0.02243 ± 0.00015	0.02245 ± 0.00014	0.02244 ± 0.00014
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.0990^{+0.0061}_{-0.011}$	0.1199 ± 0.0014	0.1192 ± 0.0012	0.1190 ± 0.0011	0.1191 ± 0.0010
$100\theta_{\text{MC}}$	$1.0218^{+0.0087}_{-0.011}$	1.04094 ± 0.00031	1.04101 ± 0.00031	1.04101 ± 0.00030	1.04100 ± 0.00029
τ	0.0540	0.0540 ± 0.0079	0.0523 ± 0.0074	0.0529 ± 0.0077	0.0534 ± 0.0072
n_s	0.9654	0.9654 ± 0.0043	0.9669 ± 0.0041	0.9672 ± 0.0040	0.9670 ± 0.0039
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	$3.60 \pm 0.24 (> 3.13)$	3.043 ± 0.016	3.038 ± 0.014	3.039 ± 0.016	3.040 ± 0.014
w_0	-0.876 ± 0.055	$-1.25^{+0.43}_{-0.56}$	$-1.24^{+0.44}_{-0.56}$	-0.853 ± 0.061	-0.850 ± 0.059
w_a	$0.10^{+0.32}_{-0.20}$	$-1.3 \pm 1.2 (< 1.13)$	$-1.2 \pm 1.3 (< 1.19)$	$-0.57^{+0.27}_{-0.23}$	$-0.59^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$
$w_0 + w_a$	$-0.78^{+0.28}_{-0.15}$	$-2.50^{+0.74}_{-1.2}$	$-2.40^{+0.80}_{-1.2}$	$-1.42^{+0.21}_{-0.18}$	$-1.44^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$
H_0	69.8 ± 2.4	$84 \pm 11 (> 64.5)$	$84 \pm 11 (> 64.7)$	67.81 ± 0.64	67.80 ± 0.64
Ω_m	$0.2692^{+0.0086}_{-0.015}$	$0.213^{+0.016}_{-0.070}$	$0.213^{+0.017}_{-0.071}$	0.3092 ± 0.0063	0.3094 ± 0.0063
σ_8	$0.823^{+0.031}_{-0.027}$	$0.955^{+0.11}_{-0.050}$	$0.945^{+0.11}_{-0.048}$	0.810 ± 0.011	0.8108 ± 0.0091
χ^2_{min}	1457.16	2761.18	2770.39	4234.18	4243.01
$\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}}$	-12.77	-4.62	-4.32	-6.06	-6.25
DIC	1470.93	2815.45	2824.19	4290.48	4298.75
ΔDIC	-7.18	-2.48	-2.26	-1.85	-2.45
AIC	1469.16	2819.18	2828.39	4292.18	4301.01
ΔAIC	-8.77	-0.62	-0.32	-2.05	-2.25

the current value of the physical cold dark matter density parameter $\Omega_c h^2$, the angular size of the sound horizon evaluated at recombination θ_{MC} , the reionization optical depth τ , the primordial scalar-type perturbation power spectral index n_s , and the power spectrum amplitude A_s . We use flat priors for these parameters, non-zero over: $0.005 \leq \Omega_b h^2 \leq 0.1$, $0.001 \leq \Omega_c h^2 \leq 0.99$, $0.5 \leq 100\theta_{\text{MC}} \leq 10$, $0.01 \leq \tau \leq 0.8$, $0.8 \leq n_s \leq 1.2$, and $1.61 \leq \ln(10^{10} A_s) \leq 3.91$.

In the dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM and w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterizations, dark energy is taken to be a perfect fluid characterized by a time-evolving equation of state parameter $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z / (1 + z)$, [7, 8]. For the lensing consistency parameter A_L we use a flat prior non-zero over $0 \leq A_L \leq 10$. For the additional dark energy equation of state parameters we adopt flat priors non-zero over $-3.0 \leq w_0 \leq 0.2$ and $-3 < w_a < 2$. Due to the inability of non-CMB data to constrain the values of the τ and n_s parameters, in the corresponding analyses we fix their values to those obtained from P18 data and constrain only the other parameters. In addition, we also present constraints on three derived parameters, namely the Hubble constant H_0 , the current value of the non-relativistic matter density parameter Ω_m , and the amplitude of matter fluctuations σ_8 , which are ob-

tained from the values of the primary parameters of the cosmological model. Also, we show the value of the sum of dark energy equation of state parameters $w_0 + w_a$, to which $w(z)$ asymptotes at high z .

The primordial scalar-type energy density perturbation power spectrum considered for the flat Λ CDM model and the flat w_0w_a CDM and w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterizations is

$$P_\delta(k) = A_s \left(\frac{k}{k_0} \right)^{n_s}, \quad (1)$$

where k is wavenumber and n_s and A_s are the spectral index and the amplitude of the spectrum at pivot scale $k_0 = 0.05 \text{Mpc}^{-1}$. This power spectrum is generated by quantum fluctuations during an early epoch of power-law inflation in a spatially-flat inflation model powered by a scalar field inflaton potential energy density that is an exponential function of the inflaton [71–73].

To properly quantify how relatively well each model fits the different combinations of data sets under study, we use the differences in the Akaike information criterion (ΔAIC) and the deviance information criterion (ΔDIC) between the information criterion (IC) values for the flat dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM parameterizations, with and without an A_L -varying parameter, and

TABLE II. Mean and 68% (or 95%) confidence limits of flat w_0w_a CDM+ A_L model parameters from non-CMB, P18, P18+lensing, P18+non-CMB, and P18+lensing+non-CMB data. H_0 has units of $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

Parameter	Non-CMB	P18	P18+lensing	P18+non-CMB	P18+lensing+non-CMB
$\Omega_b h^2$	0.0315 ± 0.0043	0.02259 ± 0.00017	0.02250 ± 0.00017	0.02264 ± 0.00015	0.02256 ± 0.00015
$\Omega_c h^2$	$0.0990^{+0.0061}_{-0.011}$	0.1181 ± 0.0015	0.1185 ± 0.0015	0.1175 ± 0.0012	0.1177 ± 0.0012
$100\theta_{\text{MC}}$	$1.0218^{+0.0087}_{-0.011}$	1.04113 ± 0.00033	1.04108 ± 0.00033	1.04120 ± 0.00031	1.04115 ± 0.00030
τ	0.0540	$0.0497^{+0.0085}_{-0.0074}$	0.0495 ± 0.0085	$0.0485^{+0.0085}_{-0.0073}$	$0.0482^{+0.0086}_{-0.0074}$
n_s	0.9654	0.9706 ± 0.0049	0.9690 ± 0.0049	0.9723 ± 0.0043	0.9711 ± 0.0043
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	$3.60 \pm 0.24 (> 3.13)$	$3.030^{+0.018}_{-0.016}$	$3.030^{+0.018}_{-0.016}$	$3.026^{+0.017}_{-0.015}$	$3.025^{+0.018}_{-0.015}$
A_L	...	$1.161^{+0.063}_{-0.086}$	$1.046^{+0.038}_{-0.057}$	1.191 ± 0.064	$1.078^{+0.036}_{-0.040}$
w_0	-0.876 ± 0.055	$-1.07^{+0.54}_{-0.69}$	$-1.14^{+0.48}_{-0.68}$	-0.880 ± 0.059	-0.879 ± 0.060
w_a	$0.10^{+0.32}_{-0.20}$	$-0.8 \pm 1.3 (< 1.42)$	$-0.9 \pm 1.3 (< 1.44)$	-0.37 ± 0.24	$-0.39^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$
$w_0 + w_a$	$-0.78^{+0.28}_{-0.15}$	$-1.91^{+1.4}_{-0.90}$	$-2.0^{+1.2}_{-1.1}$	$-1.25^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$	$-1.27^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$
H_0	69.8 ± 2.4	$77^{+20}_{-9} (> 55.8)$	$79 \pm 13 (> 57.6)$	67.87 ± 0.64	67.84 ± 0.64
Ω_m	$0.2692^{+0.0086}_{-0.015}$	$0.259^{+0.033}_{-0.12}$	$0.245^{+0.025}_{-0.010}$	0.3058 ± 0.0063	0.3062 ± 0.0064
σ_8	$0.823^{+0.031}_{-0.027}$	$0.875^{+0.16}_{-0.082}$	$0.895^{+0.15}_{-0.070}$	0.793 ± 0.012	0.794 ± 0.012
χ^2_{min}	1457.16	2755.98	2770.22	4222.87	4238.26
$\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}}$	-12.77	-9.82	-4.49	-17.37	-11.00
DIC	1470.93	2812.60	2825.75	4283.17	4296.83
ΔDIC	-7.18	-5.33	-0.70	-9.16	-4.37
AIC	1469.16	2815.98	2830.22	4282.87	4298.26
ΔAIC	-8.77	-3.82	+1.51	-11.37	-5.00

the flat Λ CDM model. For a more detailed description of these statistical estimators, see Sec. III of [58] and references therein. According to Jeffreys' scale, when $-2 \leq \Delta\text{IC} < 0$ there is *weak* evidence in favor of the model under study. For $-6 \leq \Delta\text{IC} < -2$ there is *positive* evidence, for $-10 \leq \Delta\text{IC} < -6$ there is *strong* evidence, and when $\Delta\text{IC} < -10$ we can claim *very strong* evidence in favor of the model under study relative to the tilted flat Λ CDM model. Conversely, if ΔIC values are positive, the Λ CDM model is favored over the model under study.

We are interested in quantitatively comparing how consistent the cosmological parameter constraints are, within a given model, when obtained from two different data sets. To do this, we use two different statistical estimators. The first, $\log_{10} \mathcal{I}$, is based on DIC values (see [74] and Sec. III of [58]). Positive values ($\log_{10} \mathcal{I} > 0$) indicate that the two data sets are consistent, whereas negative values ($\log_{10} \mathcal{I} < 0$) indicate inconsistency. According to Jeffreys' scale, the degree of concordance or discordance between two data sets is classified as *substantial* if $|\log_{10} \mathcal{I}| > 0.5$, *strong* if $|\log_{10} \mathcal{I}| > 1$, and *decisive* if $|\log_{10} \mathcal{I}| > 2$ [74]. The second estimator we consider is the tension probability p and the related Gaussian approximation "sigma value" σ (see [75–77] and also Sec. III

of [58]). Approximately, a value of $p = 0.05$ corresponds to 2σ and $p = 0.003$ corresponds to a 3σ Gaussian standard deviation.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We present the w_0w_a CDM and w_0w_a CDM+ A_L dynamical dark energy parameterization results in Tables I – III and in Figs. 1 – 6. When studying the consistency of cosmological parameter constraints between P18 and non-CMB data and between P18+lensing and non-CMB data, we use two statistical estimators, $\log_{10} \mathcal{I}$ and p values. These results are presented in Table III. The $\Delta\chi^2_{\text{min}}$, ΔAIC , and ΔDIC values are provided in Tables I and II.

Due to the minor role played by dark energy at the redshift of the CMB data, the constraints on w_0 and w_a coming from the analysis of P18 and P18+lensing data are weaker than those obtained with non-CMB data. The same is true for the derived parameters H_0 , Ω_m , and σ_8 .

As discussed in [18], within the context of the w_0w_a CDM parameterization, there exists a tension between P18 and non-CMB data cosmological constraints and also between P18+lensing and non-CMB data cosmological constraints. In this work we investigate




FIG. 1. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of flat w_0w_a CDM model parameters favored by non-CMB, P18, and P18+non-CMB data sets. We do not show τ and n_s , which are fixed in the non-CMB data analysis. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard Λ CDM model.

whether allowing the lensing consistency parameter A_L to vary (see [78] and [58] for a detailed study of the inclusion of this parameter in other cosmological models) can help alleviate these discrepancies. From the values presented in Table III, we see in the P18 vs. non-CMB case that while the w_0w_a CDM model with $A_L = 1$ yields $\log_{10} \mathcal{I} = -0.891$ for the first estimator, the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L model gives $\log_{10} \mathcal{I} = 0.079$. For the second estimator, when $A_L = 1$, we find $\sigma = 2.801$ whereas allowing A_L to vary reduces it to $\sigma = 1.896$. Regardless

of the estimator considered, the results show that when A_L is allowed to vary, particularly when $A_L > 1$, the tension between P18 and non-CMB data cosmological constraints is reduced. This reduction in the differences is milder when CMB lensing data are included in the analysis. In studying the tension between P18+lensing and non-CMB data, we find that for the w_0w_a CDM parameterization with $A_L = 1$, $\log_{10} \mathcal{I} = -0.787$ and $\sigma = 2.653$, whereas for the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization we obtain $\log_{10} \mathcal{I} = -0.030$ and $\sigma = 2.050$. While, as expected,




FIG. 2. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of flat w_0w_a CDM model parameters favored by non-CMB, P18+lensing, P18+lensing+non-CMB data sets. We do not show τ and n_s , which are fixed in the non-CMB data analysis. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard Λ CDM model.

there is a reduction in the level of differences compared to the $A_L = 1$ case, we still find a $\sigma > 2$ (but < 3) tension between the cosmological parameter constraints obtained with P18+lensing data and with non-CMB data. In light of these results, we may conclude that P18, lensing, and non-CMB data can also be jointly analyzed within the context of the dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization, as in the $A_L = 1$ case, [18]. Consequently, we largely focus on results from the analysis of the P18+lensing+non-CMB data, the largest data com-

pilation we study.

From Tables I and II we can compare the results obtained with P18+lensing+non-CMB data for the eight-parameter w_0w_a CDM model and the nine-parameter w_0w_a CDM+ A_L model. For the six primary parameters common to the flat Λ CDM model, the shifts in the values remain below 1σ , in particular: $\Omega_b h^2$ (-0.58σ), $\Omega_c h^2$ ($+0.90\sigma$), $100\theta_{MC}$ (-0.36σ), τ ($+0.46\sigma$), n_s (-0.71σ), and $\ln(10^{10}A_s)$ ($+0.66\sigma$). In regard to the equation of state parameters, while for the w_0w_a CDM parameteriza-




FIG. 3. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of flat $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ model parameters favored by non-CMB, P18, and P18+non-CMB data sets. We do not show τ and n_s , which are fixed in the non-CMB data analysis. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard ΛCDM model.

tion we have $w_0 = -0.850 \pm 0.059$ and $w_a = -0.59^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$ for the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ parameterization we find $w_0 = -0.879 \pm 0.060$ and $w_a = -0.39^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$, with the difference between these pair of values being $+0.34\sigma$ and -0.59σ . Additionally, we provide the value for the combination $w_0 + w_a$. For the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}$ model $w_0 + w_a = -1.44^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$ and for the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ model $w_0 + w_a = -1.27^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$, with a tension of -0.65σ between the two results. As for the derived parameters, H_0 , Ω_m , and σ_8 , the differences

between the values are -0.04σ , $+0.36\sigma$, and 1.12σ , respectively.

We now examine whether the P18+lensing+non-CMB data compilation provides model-independent cosmological parameter constraints. The results for the flat ΛCDM model, obtained after analysing the P18+lensing+non-CMB data, are presented in the right column of the upper half of Table IV in [58], while the corresponding results for the flat $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ parameterization can be found in Table II. For the six common primary pa-




FIG. 4. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of flat $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ model parameters favored by non-CMB, P18+lensing, P18+lensing+non-CMB data sets. We do not show τ and n_s , which are fixed in the non-CMB data analysis. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard ΛCDM model.

rameters, the differences are: -0.35σ for $\Omega_b h^2$, $+0.54\sigma$ for $\Omega_c h^2$, -0.15σ for $100\theta_{MC}$, $+0.78\sigma$ for τ , -0.46σ for n_s , and $+0.92\sigma$ for $\ln(10^{10}A_s)$. Although all the differences remain below 1σ , it is noteworthy that when A_L is allowed to vary in the analysis, the shift in the cosmological parameter values, except for the $100\theta_{MC}$ parameter, are greater than those obtained when comparing the results for the flat $w_0w_a\text{CDM}$ (with $A_L = 1$) model and the flat ΛCDM model, see discussion in Sec. IV of [18]. For the derived parameters H_0 , Ω_m , and σ_8 , the differences

are at $+0.28\sigma$, -0.04σ , and $+1.03\sigma$ respectively.

In order to compare the performance of the flat ΛCDM model with that of the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ dynamical dark energy parameterization, it is important to account for the extra parameters in the latter model, which has three additional degrees of freedom w_0 , w_a and A_L . In this work we use the AIC and DIC to properly penalize the presence of these extra parameters (see Sec. III for details on these statistical estimators). According to the information criteria considered here, both $\Delta\text{DIC} = -4.37$ and

TABLE III. Consistency check parameter $\log_{10} \mathcal{I}$ and tension parameters σ and p for P18 vs. non-CMB data sets and P18+lensing vs. non-CMB data sets in the flat w_0w_a CDM($+A_L$) parameterizations.

Flat w_0w_a CDM parameterization		
Data	P18 vs non-CMB	P18+lensing vs non-CMB
$\log_{10} \mathcal{I}$	-0.891	-0.787
σ	2.801	2.653
p (%)	0.509	0.798
Flat w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization		
Data	P18 vs non-CMB	P18+lensing vs non-CMB
$\log_{10} \mathcal{I}$	0.079	-0.030
σ	1.896	2.050
p (%)	5.800	4.032

$\Delta\text{AIC} = -5.00$ indicate that the w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization is *positively* favored over the standard model. This means that including the A_L parameter in the analysis improves the model's ability to fit these observational data. When performing the same comparison for the w_0w_a CDM model with $A_L = 1$, we find $\Delta\text{DIC} = -2.45$ and $\Delta\text{AIC} = -2.25$, which still indicates that this dynamical dark energy parameterization is also *positively* favored over the Λ CDM model, though the magnitudes of $|\Delta\text{DIC}|$ and $|\Delta\text{AIC}|$ are reduced by about ~ 2 units. Finally, comparing the performance of the w_0w_a CDM model ($A_L = 1$) with that of w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ model, we see that the latter has smaller DIC and AIC than the former by 1.92 and 2.75, respectively, indicating that the model with a varying A_L is on the verge of being *positively* favored.

As previously stated, in light of the results presented in Table III, the variation of the lensing consistency parameter A_L helps reduce the tension between P18 and non-CMB data cosmological constraints and also between P18+lensing and non-CMB data cosmological constraints. This can be seen more visually by comparing the contour plots displayed in Figs. 5 and 6. In the case with $A_L = 1$, the contours in the $w_0 - w_a$ plane, obtained with P18 data and with non-CMB data, do not overlap at $\sim 2\sigma$ level. However, in the parameterization with a varying A_L , an overlap occurs even at the 1σ level. The same is true for the comparison between P18+lensing data and non-CMB data contours.

From the P18+lensing+non-CMB data set in the flat w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization we get $H_0 = 67.84 \pm 0.64 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, which agrees with the median statistics result $H_0 = 68 \pm 2.8 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [79–81], as well as with some local measurements including the flat Λ CDM model value of [66] $H_0 = 69.25 \pm 2.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$

Mpc^{-1} from a joint analysis of $H(z)$, BAO, Pantheon+ SNIa, quasar angular size, reverberation-measured Mg II and C IV quasar, and 118 Amati correlation gamma-ray burst data, and the local $H_0 = 69.03 \pm 1.75 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ from JWST TRGB+JAGB and SNIa data [82], but is in tension with the local $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ measured using Cepheids and SNIa data [83], also see [84]. And the flat w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization P18+lensing+non-CMB data value $\Omega_m = 0.3062 \pm 0.0064$ also agrees well with the flat Λ CDM model value of $\Omega_m = 0.313 \pm 0.012$ of [66] (for the data set listed above used to determine H_0).

Comparing the blue $w_0 - w_a$ likelihood contours of the flat w_0w_a CDM parameterization for the P18+lensing+non-CMB data, shown in the right panel of Fig. 5, to the corresponding flat w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization blue contours in the right panel of Fig. 6, we see that the upper left vertex of the w_0w_a CDM parameterization 2σ blue contour almost touches the flat Λ CDM model point of $w_0 = -1$ and $w_a = 0$, [18], while the flat Λ CDM model point is just outside the 1σ contour in the w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization case. As noted in [18] our w_0w_a CDM parameterization P18+lensing+non-CMB data result is consistent with, but more restrictive than the corresponding DESI+CMB+PantheonPlus result of [6], reflecting the greater constraining power of our data compilation. We also showed in [18] that even when we exclude Pantheon+ SNIa data from our non-CMB data compilation the flat Λ CDM model is still $\sim 2\sigma$ away from the best-fit dynamical dark energy model, so the $\sim 2\sigma$ support we find for dark energy dynamics in this parameterization is neither caused by DESI BAO data (which we have not used), nor caused by Pantheon+ SNIa data.

In our analyses here we find that in the w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization for the P18+lensing+non-CMB data we get $A_L = 1.078_{-0.040}^{+0.036}$ meaning that the option $A_L > 1$ is preferred at 1.95σ . Additionally, this parameterization simultaneously favors the possibility of having a time-evolving dark energy component over a cosmological constant by approximately $\sim 1\sigma$. This can be seen either, as noted above, by looking at the $w_0 - w_a$ sub-panel in the right panel of Fig. 6 or by looking at the asymptotic value of the equation of state parameter at high redshift $w_0 + w_a$, whose value in the standard flat Λ CDM model is $w_0 + w_a = -1$, but instead in the flat w_0w_a CDM $+A_L$ parameterization takes the value $w_0 + w_a = -1.27_{-0.17}^{+0.20}$ representing a deviation from $w_0 + w_a = -1$ of 1.35σ , less than the 2.2σ deviation we find from $w_0 + w_a = -1.44_{-0.17}^{+0.20}$ in the w_0w_a CDM ($A_L = 1$) parameterization.

We showed in [18] for the w_0w_a CDM parameterization that P18 data likelihood contours clearly favor a phantom dark energy equation of state, high values of H_0 , and low values of Ω_m . Including non-CMB data in the mix breaks the degeneracy between parameters, pushing H_0 down, Ω_m up, and decreasing the evidence in favor of phantom dark energy. We find the same is true for




FIG. 5. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of w_0 , w_a , and $w_0 + w_a$ parameters in the flat w_0w_a CDM model favored by (left) non-CMB, P18, and P18+non-CMB data sets, and (right) non-CMB, P18+lensing, and P18+lensing+non-CMB data sets. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard Λ CDM model.

the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization, but now for the P18+lensing+non-CMB data set there is only $\sim 1\sigma$ evidence in favor of dynamical dark energy but $\sim 2\sigma$ evidence in favor of $A_L > 1$, i.e., for more weak CMB lensing than is predicted by the best-fit cosmological model. So while the $\sim 2\sigma$ support we find for dark energy dynamics in the w_0w_a CDM parameterization is neither caused by DESI BAO data nor caused by Pantheon+ SNIa data, our results suggest that the excess weak CMB lensing smoothing seen in Planck PR3 data might be contributing to the evidence for dark energy dynamics seen in the w_0w_a CDM parameterization.

It is important to note that consideration of the new Planck data release (PR4) [85], which is the updated version of the Planck 2018 TT,TE,EE+lowE data (denoted as PR3, for comparison, here) employed in this work, can induce some changes in the values of the cosmological parameters. The authors of [85] find from PR4 data in the flat Λ CDM+ A_L model a lensing consistency parameter $A_L = 1.039 \pm 0.052$ (with 0.75σ evidence in favor of $A_L > 1$), whereas when PR4 data are considered together with updated weak CMB lensing data $A_L = 1.037 \pm 0.037$ (with 1σ evidence in favor of $A_L > 1$). These values are to be compared with $A_L = 1.181 \pm 0.067$, obtained from PR3 and showing a preference for $A_L > 1$ at 2.7σ , and with $A_L = 1.073 \pm 0.041$ obtained from PR3+lensing and 1.78σ away from $A_L = 1$, respectively [78]. According to these results the excess amount of weak gravitational lensing present in the PR4 version of the CMB power spectra is smaller than in the corresponding version of the

PR3 and consequently the evidence in favor of $A_L > 1$ is reduced. Another important point is that, while with PR3 data the joint use of PR3 and lensing data reduces the evidence in favor of $A_L > 1$ with respect to the analysis with PR3 data alone, in the corresponding case with the PR4 versions of the likelihoods it is the other way around.

V. CONCLUSION

We have tested the flat dynamical dark energy w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization, with a varying lensing consistency parameter A_L , that is characterized by a dynamical dark energy fluid equation of state parameter $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z / (1 + z)$, with different data set combinations including CMB and non-CMB data. For the most complete data set, P18+lensing+non-CMB, we find $w_0 = -0.879 \pm 0.060$ and $w_a = -0.39^{+0.26}_{-0.22}$, with the high-redshift asymptotic limit $w_0 + w_a = -1.27^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$, and $A_L = 1.078^{+0.036}_{-0.040}$. Therefore time evolution of the dark energy fluid is favored over a Λ at $\sim 1\sigma$ and a preference for $A_L > 1$ is found with a significance of $\sim 2\sigma$. When its performance is compared with that of the flat Λ CDM model and with that of the flat w_0w_a CDM parameterization with $A_L = 1$, the w_0w_a CDM+ A_L parameterization turns out to be *positively* favored by these data. Moreover, the variation of the phenomenological lensing consistency parameter A_L helps in better reconciling the P18 and non-CMB and the P18+lensing and non-CMB




FIG. 6. One-dimensional likelihoods and 1σ and 2σ likelihood confidence contours of w_0 , w_a , and $w_0 + w_a$ parameters in the flat $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ model favored by (left) non-CMB, P18, and P18+non-CMB data sets, and (right) non-CMB, P18+lensing, and P18+lensing+non-CMB data sets. The horizontal or vertical dotted lines representing $w_0 = -1$, $w_a = 0$, $w_0 + w_a = -1$ correspond to the values in the standard ΛCDM model.

cosmological parameter constraints with respect to the case with $A_L = 1$.

While the evidence for dark energy dynamics in the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}$ parameterization [6, 18] does not depend on DESI BAO data [18], nor on the use of Pantheon+ SNIa data [18], our results here suggest that it at least partially depends on the excess smoothing seen in some of the Planck CMB anisotropy multipoles.

While these results are interesting, they are not that statistically significant. Additionally $w_0w_a\text{CDM}+A_L$ is not a physically consistent dynamical dark energy model but rather just a parameterization. However, as we have shown here, allowing for a varying lensing consistency parameter does alleviate some tensions between cosmological parameter constraints obtained with different data sets that are present when $A_L = 1$, and it also provides a better fit to these data than is provided by the standard

flat ΛCDM model as well as the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}$ parameterization. Our results therefore motivate a more careful analysis, with better and more data, of the $w_0w_a\text{CDM}(+A_L)$ parameterizations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J.d.C.P.'s research was financially supported by the project "Plan Complementario de I+D+i en el área de Astrofísica" funded by the European Union within the framework of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan - NextGenerationEU and by the Regional Government of Andalucía (Reference AST22_00001). C.-G.P. was supported by a National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) No. RS-2023-00246367.

-
- [1] P. J. E. Peebles, Tests of Cosmological Models Constrained by Inflation, *Astrophys. J.* **284**, 439 (1984).
[2] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, Challenges for ΛCDM : An update, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022), arXiv:2105.05208 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] M. Moresco *et al.*, Unveiling the Universe with emerging cosmological probes, *Living Rev. Rel.* **25**, 6 (2022), arXiv:2201.07241 [astro-ph.CO].
[4] E. Abdalla *et al.*, Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies, *JHEAP* **34**, 49 (2022), arXiv:2203.06142 [astro-ph.CO].
[5] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, Hubble Tension: The Evidence of New Physics, *Universe* **9**, 94 (2023), arXiv:2302.05709 [astro-ph.CO].
[6] A. G. Adame *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024 VI: Cosmological Constraints from the Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, (2024), arXiv:2404.03002 [astro-ph.CO].
[7] M. Chevallier and D. Polarski, Accelerating universes with scaling dark matter, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **10**, 213 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0009008.

- [8] E. V. Linder, Exploring the expansion history of the universe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 091301 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0208512.
- [9] Y. Tada and T. Terada, Quintessential interpretation of the evolving dark energy in light of DESI observations, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L121305 (2024), arXiv:2404.05722 [astro-ph.CO].
- [10] W. Yin, Cosmic clues: DESI, dark energy, and the cosmological constant problem, *JHEP* **05**, 327, arXiv:2404.06444 [hep-ph].
- [11] D. Wang, Constraining Cosmological Physics with DESI BAO Observations, (2024), arXiv:2404.06796 [astro-ph.CO].
- [12] O. Luongo and M. Muccino, Model independent cosmographic constraints from DESI 2024, (2024), arXiv:2404.07070 [astro-ph.CO].
- [13] M. Cortés and A. R. Liddle, Interpreting DESI's evidence for evolving dark energy, (2024), arXiv:2404.08056 [astro-ph.CO].
- [14] E. O. Colgáin, M. G. Dainotti, S. Capozziello, S. Pourojaghi, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and D. Stojkovic, Does DESI 2024 Confirm Λ CDM?, (2024), arXiv:2404.08633 [astro-ph.CO].
- [15] D. Wang, The Self-Consistency of DESI Analysis and Comment on "Does DESI 2024 Confirm Λ CDM?", (2024), arXiv:2404.13833 [astro-ph.CO].
- [16] K. V. Berghaus, J. A. Kable, and V. Miranda, Quantifying Scalar Field Dynamics with DESI 2024 Y1 BAO measurements, (2024), arXiv:2404.14341 [astro-ph.CO].
- [17] Y. Yang, X. Ren, Q. Wang, Z. Lu, D. Zhang, Y.-F. Cai, and E. N. Saridakis, Quintom cosmology and modified gravity after DESI 2024, *Sci. Bull.* **69**, 2698 (2024), arXiv:2404.19437 [astro-ph.CO].
- [18] C.-G. Park, J. de Cruz Perez, and B. Ratra, Using non-DESI data to confirm and strengthen the DESI 2024 spatially-flat w_0w_a CDM cosmological parameterization result, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2405.00502 (2024), arXiv:2405.00502 [astro-ph.CO].
- [19] D. Shlivko and P. J. Steinhardt, Assessing observational constraints on dark energy, *Phys. Lett. B* **855**, 138826 (2024), arXiv:2405.03933 [astro-ph.CO].
- [20] Z. Huang *et al.*, MEET-U Project I: The key drivers of the preference for dynamic dark energy, (2024), arXiv:2405.03983 [astro-ph.CO].
- [21] R. Calderon *et al.* (DESI), DESI 2024: Reconstructing Dark Energy using Crossing Statistics with DESI DR1 BAO data, (2024), arXiv:2405.04216 [astro-ph.CO].
- [22] B. R. Dinda, A new diagnostic for the null test of dynamical dark energy in light of DESI 2024 and other BAO data, *JCAP* **09**, 062, arXiv:2405.06618 [astro-ph.CO].
- [23] A. Favale, A. Gómez-Valent, and M. Migliaccio, Quantification of 2D vs 3D BAO tension using SNIa as a redshift interpolator and test of the Etherington relation, *Phys. Lett. B* **858**, 139027 (2024), arXiv:2405.12142 [astro-ph.CO].
- [24] O. F. Ramadan, J. Sakstein, and D. Rubin, DESI constraints on exponential quintessence, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, L041303 (2024), arXiv:2405.18747 [astro-ph.CO].
- [25] P. Mukherjee and A. A. Sen, Model-independent cosmological inference post DESI DR1 BAO measurements, (2024), arXiv:2405.19178 [astro-ph.CO].
- [26] N. Roy, Dynamical dark energy in the light of DESI 2024 data, (2024), arXiv:2406.00634 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] H. Wang, Z.-Y. Peng, and Y.-S. Piao, Can recent DESI BAO measurements accommodate a negative cosmological constant?, (2024), arXiv:2406.03395 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] J. J. Heckman, O. F. Ramadan, and J. Sakstein, First Constraints on a Pixelated Universe in Light of DESI, (2024), arXiv:2406.04408 [astro-ph.CO].
- [29] I. D. Gialamas, G. Hütsi, K. Kannike, A. Racioppi, M. Raidal, M. Vasar, and H. Veermäe, Interpreting DESI 2024 BAO: late-time dynamical dark energy or a local effect?, (2024), arXiv:2406.07533 [astro-ph.CO].
- [30] A. Notari, M. Redi, and A. Tesi, Consistent Theories for the DESI dark energy fit, (2024), arXiv:2406.08459 [astro-ph.CO].
- [31] G. Liu, Y. Wang, and W. Zhao, Impact of LRG1 and LRG2 in DESI 2024 BAO data on dark energy evolution, (2024), arXiv:2407.04385 [astro-ph.CO].
- [32] L. Orchard and V. H. Cárdenas, Probing Dark Energy Evolution Post-DESI 2024, (2024), arXiv:2407.05579 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] V. Patel and L. Amendola, Comments on the prior dependence of the DESI results, (2024), arXiv:2407.06586 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] T.-N. Li, P.-J. Wu, G.-H. Du, S.-J. Jin, H.-L. Li, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, Constraints on interacting dark energy models from the DESI BAO and DES supernovae data, (2024), arXiv:2407.14934 [astro-ph.CO].
- [35] G.-H. Du, P.-J. Wu, T.-N. Li, and X. Zhang, Impacts of dark energy on weighing neutrinos after DESI BAO, (2024), arXiv:2407.15640 [astro-ph.CO].
- [36] W. Giarè, M. Najafi, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, and J. T. Firouzjaee, Robust Preference for Dynamical Dark Energy in DESI BAO and SN Measurements, (2024), arXiv:2407.16689 [astro-ph.CO].
- [37] B. R. Dinda and R. Maartens, Model-agnostic assessment of dark energy after DESI DR1 BAO, (2024), arXiv:2407.17252 [astro-ph.CO].
- [38] J.-Q. Jiang, W. Giarè, S. Gariazzo, M. G. Dainotti, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, Neutrino cosmology after DESI: tightest mass upper limits, preference for the normal ordering, and tension with terrestrial observations, (2024), arXiv:2407.18047 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] J.-Q. Jiang, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, Non-parametric late-time expansion history reconstruction and implications for the Hubble tension in light of DESI, (2024), arXiv:2408.02365 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] A. C. Alfano, O. Luongo, and M. Muccino, Cosmological constraints from calibrated $E_p - E_{iso}$ gamma-ray burst correlation by using DESI 2024 data release, (2024), arXiv:2408.02536 [astro-ph.CO].
- [41] B. Ghosh and C. Bengaly, Consistency tests between SDSS and DESI BAO measurements, (2024), arXiv:2408.04432 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] J. a. Rebouças, D. H. F. de Souza, K. Zhong, V. Miranda, and R. Rosenfeld, Investigating Late-Time Dark Energy and Massive Neutrinos in Light of DESI Y1 BAO, (2024), arXiv:2408.14628 [astro-ph.CO].
- [43] Y.-H. Pang, X. Zhang, and Q.-G. Huang, Constraints on Redshift-Binned Dark Energy using DESI BAO Data, (2024), arXiv:2408.14787 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] W. J. Wolf, C. García-García, D. J. Bartlett, and P. G. Ferreira, Scant evidence for thawing quintessence, (2024), arXiv:2408.17318 [astro-ph.CO].

- [45] S. Roy Choudhury and T. Okumura, Updated cosmological constraints in extended parameter space with Planck PR4, DESI BAO, and SN: dynamical dark energy, neutrino masses, lensing anomaly, and the Hubble tension, (2024), arXiv:2409.13022 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] J. Solà, A. Gómez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Pérez, Dynamical dark energy: scalar fields and running vacuum, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **32**, 1750054 (2017), arXiv:1610.08965 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] J. Ooba, B. Ratra, and N. Sugiyama, Planck 2015 Constraints on the Nonflat ϕ CDM Inflation Model, *Astrophys. J.* **866**, 68 (2018), arXiv:1712.08617 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] J. Ooba, B. Ratra, and N. Sugiyama, Planck 2015 constraints on spatially-flat dynamical dark energy models, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **364**, 176 (2019), arXiv:1802.05571 [astro-ph.CO].
- [49] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, Observational constraints on the tilted spatially-flat and the untilted nonflat ϕ CDM dynamical dark energy inflation models, *Astrophys. J.* **868**, 83 (2018), arXiv:1807.07421 [astro-ph.CO].
- [50] J. Solà Peracaula, A. Gómez-Valent, and J. de Cruz Pérez, Signs of Dynamical Dark Energy in Current Observations, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **25**, 100311 (2019), arXiv:1811.03505 [astro-ph.CO].
- [51] C.-G. Park and B. Ratra, Using SPT polarization, *Planck* 2015, and non-CMB data to constrain tilted spatially-flat and untilted nonflat Λ CDM, XCDM, and ϕ CDM dark energy inflation cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083508 (2020), arXiv:1908.08477 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] S. Cao, J. Ryan, and B. Ratra, Cosmological constraints from H II starburst galaxy apparent magnitude and other cosmological measurements, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 3191 (2020), arXiv:2005.12617 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] N. Khadka and B. Ratra, Constraints on cosmological parameters from gamma-ray burst peak photon energy and bolometric fluence measurements and other data, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **499**, 391 (2020), arXiv:2007.13907 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] S. Cao, M. Dainotti, and B. Ratra, Standardizing Platinum Dainotti-correlated gamma-ray bursts, and using them with standardized Amati-correlated gamma-ray bursts to constrain cosmological model parameters, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **512**, 439 (2022), arXiv:2201.05245 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] S. Cao and B. Ratra, Using lower redshift, non-CMB, data to constrain the Hubble constant and other cosmological parameters, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **513**, 5686 (2022), arXiv:2203.10825 [astro-ph.CO].
- [56] F. Dong, C. Park, S. E. Hong, J. Kim, H. Seong Hwang, H. Park, and S. Appleby, Tomographic Alcock–Paczynski Test with Redshift-space Correlation Function: Evidence for the Dark Energy Equation-of-state Parameter $w > -1$, *Astrophys. J.* **953**, 98 (2023), arXiv:2305.00206 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] M. Van Raamsdonk and C. Waddell, Possible hints of decreasing dark energy from supernova data, arXiv:2305.04946 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] J. de Cruz Pérez, C.-G. Park, and B. Ratra, Updated observational constraints on spatially-flat and non-flat Λ CDM and XCDM cosmological models, (2024), arXiv:2404.19194 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] M. Van Raamsdonk and C. Waddell, Holographic motivations and observational evidence for decreasing dark energy, (2024), arXiv:2406.02688 [hep-th].
- [60] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Cosmology with a Time Variable Cosmological Constant, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **325**, L17 (1988).
- [61] B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Cosmological Consequences of a Rolling Homogeneous Scalar Field, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988).
- [62] E. Calabrese, A. Slosar, A. Melchiorri, G. F. Smoot, and O. Zahn, Cosmic Microwave Weak lensing data as a test for the dark universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 123531 (2008), arXiv:arXiv:0803.2309 [astro-ph].
- [63] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VIII. Gravitational lensing, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A8 (2020), arXiv:1807.06210 [astro-ph.CO].
- [65] D. Brout *et al.*, The Pantheon+ Analysis: Cosmological Constraints, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 110 (2022), arXiv:2202.04077 [astro-ph.CO].
- [66] S. Cao and B. Ratra, $H_0=69.8\pm 1.3$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹, $\Omega_m=0.288\pm 0.017$, and other constraints from lower-redshift, non-CMB, expansion-rate data, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 103521 (2023), arXiv:2302.14203 [astro-ph.CO].
- [67] A. Challinor and A. Lasenby, Cosmic microwave background anisotropies in the CDM model: A Covariant and gauge invariant approach, *Astrophys. J.* **513**, 1 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9804301.
- [68] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, and A. Lasenby, Efficient computation of CMB anisotropies in closed FRW models, *Astrophys. J.* **538**, 473 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9911177.
- [69] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 103511 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0205436.
- [70] A. Lewis, GetDist: a Python package for analysing Monte Carlo samples, arXiv:1910.13970 [astro-ph.IM].
- [71] F. Lucchin and S. Matarrese, Power Law Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **32**, 1316 (1985).
- [72] B. Ratra, Quantum Mechanics of Exponential Potential Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 3939 (1989).
- [73] B. Ratra, Inflation in an Exponential Potential Scalar Field Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 1913 (1992).
- [74] S. Joudaki *et al.*, CFHTLenS revisited: assessing concordance with Planck including astrophysical systematics, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **465**, 2033 (2017), arXiv:1601.05786 [astro-ph.CO].
- [75] W. Handley and P. Lemos, Quantifying dimensionality: Bayesian cosmological model complexities, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023512 (2019), arXiv:1903.06682.
- [76] W. Handley and P. Lemos, Quantifying tensions in cosmological parameters: Interpreting the DES evidence ratio, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 043504 (2019), arXiv:1902.04029.
- [77] W. Handley, Curvature tension: evidence for a closed universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L041301 (2021), arXiv:arXiv:1908.09139 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] J. de Cruz Pérez, C.-G. Park, and B. Ratra, Current data are consistent with flat spatial hypersurfaces in the Λ CDM cosmological model but favor more lensing than the model predicts, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063522 (2023), arXiv:2211.04268 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] G. Chen and B. Ratra, Median statistics and the Hubble constant, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **123**, 1127 (2011), arXiv:1105.5206., arXiv:1105.5206 [astro-ph.CO].

- [80] J. R. Gott, III, M. S. Vogeley, S. Podariu, and B. Ratra, Median statistics, $H(0)$, and the accelerating universe, *Astrophys. J.* **549**, 1 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0006103.
- [81] E. Calabrese, M. Archidiacono, A. Melchiorri, and B. Ratra, The impact of a new median statistics H_0 prior on the evidence for dark radiation, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 043520 (2012), arXiv:arXiv:1205.6753 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, I. S. Jang, T. J. Hoyt, A. J. Lee, and K. A. Owens, Status Report on the Chicago-Carnegie Hubble Program (CCHP): Three Independent Astrophysical Determinations of the Hubble Constant Using the James Webb Space Telescope, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2408.06153 (2024), arXiv:2408.06153 [astro-ph.CO].
- [83] A. G. Riess *et al.*, A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km/s/Mpc Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] Y. Chen, S. Kumar, B. Ratra, and T. Xu, Effects of Type Ia Supernovae Absolute Magnitude Priors on the Hubble Constant Value, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **964**, L4 (2024), arXiv:2401.13187 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] M. Tristram *et al.*, Cosmological parameters derived from the final Planck data release (PR4), *Astron. Astrophys.* **682**, A37 (2024), arXiv:2309.10034 [astro-ph.CO].