

On observational signatures of multi-fractional theory

Mahnaz Asghari^{a,b}, Ahmad Sheykhi^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Physics, College of Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz 71454, Iran

^bBiruni Observatory, College of Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz 71454, Iran

Abstract

We study the multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives, where the multi-fractional measure is considered to be in the time direction. The evolution of power spectra and also the expansion history of the universe are investigated in the q -derivatives theory. According to the matter power spectra diagrams, the structure growth would increase in the multi-fractional model, expressing incompatibility with low redshift measurements of large scale structures. Furthermore, concerning the diagrams of Hubble parameter evolution, there is a reduction in the value of Hubble constant which conflicts with local cosmological constraints. Thus, primary numerical investigations imply that q -derivatives theory has no potential to relieve observational tensions. We also explore the multi-fractional model with current observational data, principally Planck 2018, weak lensing, supernovae, baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), and redshift-space distortions (RSD) measurements. Numerical analysis reveals that the degeneracy between multi-fractional parameters makes them remain unconstrained under observations. Furthermore, observational constraints on H_0 and σ_8 , detect no significant departure from standard model of cosmology.

Keywords: Cosmology, Multi-fractional theory

1. Introduction

In light of considerable astrophysical and cosmological observations, it is certain that Λ CDM model affords the most appropriate explanation of the universe. The concordance Λ CDM model described by dark matter and also the cosmological constant Λ as dark energy, is introduced in the framework of general relativity (GR) after the discovery of accelerated expansion of the universe [1, 2]. The success of standard cosmological model has been also confirmed by the majority of observational measurements including the cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies [3–8], large scale structures [9–11], and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) [12–14]. However, despite such accomplishments, it is known that there are some tensions between the inferred values of cosmological parameters from local and global observational measurements. In detail, results concerning direct determinations of Hubble constant indicate significant discrepancies from CMB data based on Λ CDM model [15–18]. The most recent local measurement performed by Hubble Space Telescope (HST) and the SH0ES¹ collaboration reports $H_0 = 73.30 \pm 1.04 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [19], which is in 5σ difference with Planck 2018 results [8]. Also there is a less significant discrepancy known as σ_8 tension, where the value of structure growth parameter σ_8 predicted from low redshift observations is inconsistent with Planck data [20]. Thus, these observational tensions might imply that there is a possibility for new physics beyond the standard Λ CDM

model. In this direction, one can consider multi-fractional scenarios which are categorized to four independent types of theories, mainly ordinary, weighted, q - and fractional derivatives [21–23]. Formerly, R. A. El-Nabulsi proposed a formalism known as the fractional action-like variational approach to discuss the application of fractional calculus in cosmology [24–26]. More investigations on implications of fractional approach in GR and cosmology are also performed in literature [27–37]. Thereafter, multi-fractional theories in which the geometry is characterized by a fundamental scale, were proposed to improve the physical interpretation of quantum gravity [38–40]. For some related studies on multi-fractional theories refer to [41–47]. In the present study, we are interested in multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives, which describes a more intuitive multi-fractional spacetime [48–53]. We revise the observational tensions in the framework of multi-fractional theory, and also investigate the q -derivatives theory with cosmological probes.

The organization of our paper is as follows. In section 2 we explain modified field equations in multi-fractional spacetime. Section 3 contains numerical results, as well as derived observational constraints on cosmological parameters. We present our conclusions in section 4.

2. Field equations in multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives

The theory with q -derivatives is characterized by replacing the coordinates x^μ by the multi-fractional profile $q^\mu(x^\mu)$ given by [21, 53]

$$q^\mu(x^\mu) = \int dx^{(\mu)} \nu_{(\mu)}(x^\mu), \quad (1)$$

¹Supernovae and H_0 for the Equation of State of dark energy

Email addresses: mahnaz.asghari@shirazu.ac.ir (Mahnaz Asghari), asheykhi@shirazu.ac.ir (Ahmad Sheykhi)

where there is no contraction on index μ in the parenthesis. Correspondingly, by using $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^\mu(x^\mu)} = \frac{1}{v_{(\mu)}(x^\mu)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}$, the metric connection and the Riemann tensor in fractional frame are defined as [21, 53]

$$\begin{aligned} {}^q\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho &= \frac{1}{2} g^{\rho\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{v_{(\mu)}} \partial_{(\mu)} g_{\nu\sigma} + \frac{1}{v_{(\nu)}} \partial_{(\nu)} g_{\mu\sigma} - \frac{1}{v_{(\sigma)}} \partial_{(\sigma)} g_{\mu\nu} \right), \quad (2) \\ {}^qR_{\mu\sigma\nu}^\rho &= \frac{1}{v_{(\sigma)}} \partial_{(\sigma)} {}^q\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\rho - \frac{1}{v_{(\nu)}} \partial_{(\nu)} {}^q\Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^\rho + {}^q\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\tau {}^q\Gamma_{\sigma\tau}^\rho - {}^q\Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^\tau {}^q\Gamma_{\nu\tau}^\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Also, the total action in the fractional frame takes the form [21, 46, 53]

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^4 q(x) \sqrt{-g} ({}^qR - 2\Lambda) + S_m, \quad (4)$$

where the action measure is [46, 49]

$$d^4 q(x) = \Pi_{\mu=0}^3 dq^\mu(x^\mu) = d^4 x \Pi_{\mu=0}^3 v_\mu(x^\mu) = d^4 x v(x), \quad (5)$$

so we have

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^4 x v(x) \sqrt{-g} ({}^qR - 2\Lambda) + S_m. \quad (6)$$

where $v(x) = \Pi_{\mu=0}^3 v_\mu(x^\mu) = v_0(x^0)v_1(x^1)v_2(x^2)v_3(x^3)$ [21, 22].

Action (6) results in the following field equations in multi-fractional cosmology [21]

$${}^qR_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} ({}^qR - 2\Lambda) = 8\pi G {}^qT_{\mu\nu}, \quad (7)$$

where ${}^qR_{\mu\nu} = {}^qR_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ and ${}^qR = g^{\mu\nu} {}^qR_{\mu\nu}$ [53].

It is more convenient to contemplate multi-fractional structure along each direction x^μ as described in the literature [51], however for the sake of simplicity, in this work we consider it only in the time direction where $v(\tau)$ defined as

$$v(\tau) = 1 + \left(\beta \frac{a}{a_0} \right)^\alpha, \quad (8)$$

in which $\alpha > 0$ is the fractional exponent and $\beta \geq 0$ is a dimensionless constant (for more information on the range of the fractional exponent α refer to [53]). According to equation (8) it is evident that multi-fractional effects are more significant in late time, as also illustrated in figure 1 (obtained from the modified version of the CLASS² code [54]).

In the following, we investigate multi-fractional theory in a flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) universe, described by the metric

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) \left(-d\tau^2 + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij}) dx^i dx^j \right) \quad (9)$$

in the synchronous gauge, where

$$h_{ij}(\vec{x}, \tau) = \int d^3 k e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \left(\hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j h(\vec{k}, \tau) + \left(\hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \right) 6\eta(\vec{k}, \tau) \right), \quad (10)$$

with $\vec{k} = k\hat{k}$, in which h and η are scalar perturbations [55]. Likewise, conformal Newtonian gauge is represented by the metric

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) \left(- (1 + 2\Psi) d\tau^2 + (1 - 2\Phi) d\vec{x}^2 \right), \quad (11)$$

with gravitational potentials Ψ and Φ [55].

We also assume the energy content of the universe as a perfect fluid with the energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p) u_\mu u_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} p, \quad (12)$$

which is similar to GR, since of considering multi-fractal only in the time direction. So, field equations in the theory with q -derivatives in background level take the form

$$\frac{1}{v^2} H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \sum_i \bar{\rho}_i, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \left(2 \frac{H}{a} \frac{v'}{v} - 2 \frac{H'}{a} - 3H^2 \right) = 8\pi G \sum_i \bar{p}_i, \quad (14)$$

in which a prime indicates a deviation with respect to the conformal time, and $H = a'/a^2$ is the Hubble parameter. Then, from equation (13), the total density parameter for a universe consists of radiation (R), baryons (B), dark matter (DM) and cosmological constant (Λ) can be written as

$$\Omega_{\text{tot}} = \frac{1}{v^2}. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, it is possible to write modified field equations to linear order of perturbations in synchronous gauge (syn), given by

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \frac{a'}{a} h' - 2k^2 \eta = 8\pi G a^2 \sum_i \delta\rho_{i(\text{syn})}, \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{1}{v} k^2 \eta' = 4\pi G a^2 \sum_i (\bar{\rho}_i + \bar{p}_i) \theta_{i(\text{syn})}, \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} h'' + 3\eta'' + \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{v'}{v} + \frac{a'}{a} \right) (h' + 6\eta') \right) - k^2 \eta = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \left(\left(-\frac{v'}{v} + 2 \frac{a'}{a} \right) h' + h'' \right) - 2k^2 \eta = -24\pi G a^2 \sum_i \delta p_{i(\text{syn})}, \quad (19)$$

while in conformal Newtonian gauge (con) we have

$$\frac{3}{v^2} \left(\frac{a'}{a} \Phi' + \left(\frac{a'}{a} \right)^2 \Psi \right) + k^2 \Phi = -4\pi G a^2 \sum_i \delta\rho_{i(\text{con})}, \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{1}{v} \left(k^2 \Phi' + \frac{a'}{a} k^2 \Psi \right) = 4\pi G a^2 \sum_i (\bar{\rho}_i + \bar{p}_i) \theta_{i(\text{con})}, \quad (21)$$

$$\Phi = \Psi, \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{v^2} \left[\frac{v'}{v} \left(-2\Psi \frac{a'}{a} - \Phi' \right) + \Psi \left(2 \frac{a''}{a} - \left(\frac{a'}{a} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{a'}{a} (\Psi' + 2\Phi') + \Phi'' \right] \\ + \frac{1}{3} k^2 (\Phi - \Psi) = 4\pi G a^2 \sum_i \delta p_{i(\text{con})}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

²Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System




Figure 1: Left panel shows $v(\tau)$ in term of conformal time for different values of β compared to standard model of cosmology, where $\alpha = 1$, and right panel shows analogous diagrams for different values of α , while $\beta = 0.08$.

Furthermore, conservation equations in the theory with q -derivatives

for i th component of the universe in background and perturbation levels are

$$\bar{\rho}'_i + 3\frac{a'}{a}\bar{\rho}_i(1 + w_i) = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\delta'_{i(\text{syn})} = -3\frac{a'}{a}(c_{si}^2 - w_i)\delta_{i(\text{syn})} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + w_i)h' - (1 + w_i)\left[\frac{9}{v}\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2(c_{si}^2 - c_{ai}^2)\frac{1}{k^2} + v\right]\theta_{i(\text{syn})}, \quad (25)$$

$$\theta'_{i(\text{syn})} = \frac{a'}{a}\left[3(w_i + c_{si}^2 - c_{ai}^2) - 1\right]\theta_{i(\text{syn})} + v\frac{k^2 c_{si}^2}{1 + w_i}\delta_{i(\text{syn})}. \quad (26)$$

$$\delta'_{i(\text{con})} = -3\frac{a'}{a}(c_{si}^2 - w_i)\delta_{i(\text{con})} + 3(1 + w_i)\Phi' - (1 + w_i)\left[\frac{9}{v}\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2(c_{si}^2 - c_{ai}^2)\frac{1}{k^2} + v\right]\theta_{i(\text{con})}, \quad (27)$$

$$\theta'_{i(\text{con})} = \frac{a'}{a}\left[3(w_i + c_{si}^2 - c_{ai}^2) - 1\right]\theta_{i(\text{con})} + v\left(\frac{k^2 c_{si}^2}{1 + w_i}\delta_{i(\text{con})} + k^2\Psi\right). \quad (28)$$

Also, it is clear that choosing $v = 1$ (or correspondingly $\beta = 0$) recovers field equations in standard cosmology. It should be mentioned that in the rest of the paper, we will investigate multi-fractional theory in the synchronous gauge.

3. Results

This section is devoted to numerical study of the theory with q -derivatives, by employing a modified version of the CLASS code [54] according to field equations in multi-fractional cosmology. Furthermore, we compare multi-fractional theory with observations by using the MCMC³ package MONTE PYTHON [56, 57].

³Markov Chain Monte Carlo

3.1. Numerical investigations

Here, we are interested to modify the publicly available code CLASS to accommodate the multi-fractional field equations explained in section 2, in pursuance of exploring the theory with q -derivatives, numerically. We consider Planck 2018 data [8] for cosmological parameters, in numerical study.

The CMB temperature anisotropy diagrams in theory with q -derivatives compared to standard cosmological model, are displayed in figure (2). In upper panels we can see the TT component of CMB power spectra for different values of β , while $\alpha = 1$; and correspondingly, lower panels show power spectra for different values of α , where $\beta = 0.08$. According to this figure, it can be understood that there is more deviation from Λ CDM model for larger values of β , or equivalently, smaller values of α , when the other parameter is fixed. This feature is also predictable from modified field equations described in section 2.

In figure (3) we illustrate the matter power spectra diagrams in multi-fractional theory comparing with Λ CDM model. Upper panels depict power spectra for different values of β , in which $\alpha = 1$; while lower panels demonstrate power spectra diagrams considering different values of α , where $\beta = 0.08$. This figure expresses an enhancement in the growth of structure for theory with q -derivatives, considering larger values of β , or correspondingly, smaller values of α (when the other parameter is fixed), which is in contrast with low redshift structure formation [20].

Furthermore, it is exciting to contemplate the expansion history of the universe in multi-fractional theory. Figure (4) depicts the evolution of Hubble parameter in theory with q -derivatives, which represents a suppression in the current value of H compared to standard cosmological model (considering larger values of β , or equivalently, smaller values of α). Thus, we can see that Hubble tension might become more serious in multi-fractional cosmology.

3.2. Observational constraints

Now we turn our attention to confronting the multi-fractional theory with current observations by making use of the public MCMC package MONTE PYTHON. Accordingly, the baseline parameter set we consider in MCMC method includes $\{100 \Omega_{B,0} h^2,$




Figure 2: Upper panels show the CMB power spectra diagrams (left) and their relative ratio with respect to ΛCDM model (right) for different values of β , considering $\alpha = 1$. Lower panels show analogous diagrams for different values of α , regarding $\beta = 0.08$.




Figure 3: Upper panels show the matter power spectra diagrams (left) and their relative ratio with respect to standard cosmological model (right) for different values of β , considering $\alpha = 1$. Lower panels show analogous diagrams for different values of α , where $\beta = 0.08$.

$\Omega_{\text{DM},0}h^2$, $100\theta_s$, $\ln(10^{10}A_s)$, n_s , τ_{reio} , β , α , where $\Omega_{\text{B},0}h^2$ and $\Omega_{\text{DM},0}h^2$ indicate the baryon and cold dark matter densities re-




Figure 4: Left panel shows Hubble parameter in term of conformal time for different values of β compared to Λ CDM model, while $\alpha = 1$. Right panel depicts analogous diagrams for different values of α , where $\beta = 0.08$.

spectively, θ_s is the ratio of the sound horizon to the angular diameter distance at decoupling, A_s represents the amplitude of the primordial scalar perturbation spectrum, n_s indicates the scalar spectral index, τ_{reio} stands for the optical depth to reionization, and multi-fractional parameters β and α measure deviations from standard cosmology. Additionally, there are four derived parameters consist of reionization redshift (z_{reio}), the matter density parameter ($\Omega_{\text{M},0}$), the Hubble constant (H_0), and the root-mean-square mass fluctuations on scales of $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc (σ_8). Also, based on preliminary numerical analysis, we choose the prior range $[0, 0.1]$ for β , and the prior range $[1, 5]$ for fractional exponent α .

In order to put constraints on cosmological parameters, we consider the following likelihoods in MCMC analysis: the Planck likelihood with Planck 2018 data (containing high- l TT,TE,EE, low- l EE, low- l TT, and lensing) [8], the Planck-SZ likelihood for the Sunyaev-Zeldovich (SZ) effect measured by Planck [58, 59], the CFHTLenS likelihood with the weak lensing data [60, 61], the Pantheon likelihood with the supernovae data [62], the BAO likelihood with the baryon acoustic oscillations data [63, 64], and the BAORSRD likelihood for BAO and redshift-space distortions (RSD) measurements [65, 66].

It is worth mentioning that using different likelihoods to investigate cosmological models beyond the standard Λ CDM paradigm, can introduce unknown bias and inconsistency which should be considered and evaluated carefully. So it is important to exercise caution and test the reliability and suitability of these likelihoods in case of studying non-standard cosmological models. It is known that the Planck 2018 data is the most reliable and powerful probe to test cosmological models. Moreover, the BAO and supernovae datasets are appropriate probes to constrain the expansion history of the universe. Thus, it is convenient in the literature to apply the Planck likelihood combined with BAO and/or supernovae datasets to investigate beyond Λ CDM model. For some recent related investigations refer to e.g. [67–70]. On the other hand, the Planck SZ cluster counts data, weak lensing data, and RSD measurements could prove useful in constraining the structure growth parameter σ_8 . The Planck SZ and weak lensing measurements constrain a combination of cosmological parameters $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8(\Omega_{\text{m}}/\Omega_{\text{m, fiducial}})^\alpha$

(where α indicates the degeneracy direction), in which Λ CDM is assumed as the fiducial model. So it is expected that the obtained data to be dependent on the fiducial Λ CDM model. However, the cluster counts and weak lensing measurements usually consider some non-linear effects to constrain S_8 , and since we are interested in linear perturbations in our study, we can assume that there is no need to modify the mass bias in this paper. Furthermore, the RSD measurements constrain the combination $f\sigma_8$, where f is the growth rate. The combination of $f\sigma_8$ is independent of bias [71], so there is no need to consider modifications on bias parameter in using this likelihood. There are also some studies in the literature which have been used the combined Planck, BAO, supernovae, and RSD dataset to explore non-standard cosmological models [72–74]. Overall, while we acknowledge that using different likelihoods to test non-standard cosmological models can introduce bias or inconsistency, we believe that it is convenient to apply a combination of the above mentioned likelihoods in our MCMC analysis, without considering any substantial modifications on bias parameter.

The report on observational constraints imposed by the “Planck + Planck-SZ + CFHTLenS + Pantheon + BAO + BAORSRD” dataset is presented in table 1. The fitting results correspond to selected parameters of multi-fractional model are also shown in figure (5). Concerning numerical results, there is a degeneracy between multi-fractional parameters β and α , which makes them remain unconstrained under observational data. Accordingly, in the direction of obtaining better constraints on these parameters, it is recommended that we fix one of them in MCMC analysis. Thereupon, table 2 presents corresponding results, where we have fixed β to 0.01, and then α to 4, which are close to derived best fit values displayed in table 1. However, MCMC results show that multi-fractional parameters are degenerate with other cosmological parameters, and so still remain unconstrained. The results are more apparent in figure (6) which demonstrates marginalized 1σ and 2σ confidence limit contours. On the other hand, observational constraints on H_0 and σ_8 represent no significant deviation from standard cosmological model.

Table 1: Best fit values of cosmological parameters with the 1σ and 2σ confidence levels from "Planck + Planck-SZ + CFHTLenS + Pantheon + BAO + BAORS" dataset for Λ CDM and the theory with q -derivatives.

parameter	Λ CDM		q -derivatives theory	
	best fit	68% & 95% limits	best fit	68% & 95% limits
$100 \Omega_{B,0} h^2$	2.261	$2.263^{+0.012+0.026}_{-0.013-0.025}$	2.263	$2.264^{+0.014+0.027}_{-0.0080-0.0016}$
$\Omega_{DM,0} h^2$	0.1163	$0.1164^{+0.00078+0.0015}_{-0.00079-0.0015}$	0.1166	$0.1165^{+0.00080+0.0016}_{-0.00080-0.0016}$
$100 \theta_s$	1.042	$1.042^{+0.00029+0.00055}_{-0.00026-0.00053}$	1.042	$1.042^{+0.00030+0.00057}_{-0.00029-0.00059}$
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	3.034	$3.024^{+0.010+0.023}_{-0.014-0.021}$	3.018	$3.024^{+0.0095+0.023}_{-0.013-0.021}$
n_s	0.9712	$0.9719^{+0.0036+0.0072}_{-0.0039-0.0074}$	0.9708	$0.9714^{+0.0038+0.0072}_{-0.0037-0.0072}$
τ_{reio}	0.05358	$0.04963^{+0.0041+0.010}_{-0.0074-0.0096}$	0.04628	$0.04933^{+0.0043+0.010}_{-0.0068-0.0093}$
β	—	—	0.01029	unconstrained
α	—	—	4.524	unconstrained
$\bar{\tau}_{\text{reio}}$	7.502	$7.084^{+0.50+1.0}_{-0.69-1.0}$	6.749	$7.052^{+0.46+1.0}_{-0.69-1.0}$
$\Omega_{M,0}$	0.2871	$0.2876^{+0.0043+0.0086}_{-0.0044-0.0086}$	0.2879	$0.2879^{+0.0044+0.0090}_{-0.0046-0.0091}$
$H_0 \left[\frac{\text{km}}{\text{s Mpc}} \right]$	69.56	$69.54^{+0.37+0.73}_{-0.36-0.71}$	69.54	$69.52^{+0.38+0.77}_{-0.38-0.76}$
σ_8	0.8079	$0.8044^{+0.0045+0.0096}_{-0.0051-0.0091}$	0.8022	$0.8048^{+0.0041+0.0095}_{-0.0049-0.0090}$

Table 2: Best fit values of cosmological parameters with the 1σ and 2σ confidence levels from "Planck + Planck-SZ + CFHTLenS + Pantheon + BAO + BAORS" dataset for the theory with q -derivatives, where β is fixed to 0.01 in one analysis, and α is fixed to 4 in the other study.

parameter	best fit	68% & 95% limits	best fit	68% & 95% limits
$100 \Omega_{B,0} h^2$	2.257	$2.264^{+0.014+0.026}_{-0.013-0.028}$	2.270	$2.264^{+0.014+0.026}_{-0.013-0.026}$
$\Omega_{DM,0} h^2$	0.1166	$0.1164^{+0.00075+0.0014}_{-0.00070-0.0015}$	0.1163	$0.1164^{+0.00082+0.0016}_{-0.00074-0.0016}$
$100 \theta_s$	1.042	$1.042^{+0.00025+0.00056}_{-0.00028-0.00052}$	1.042	$1.042^{+0.00030+0.00060}_{-0.00029-0.00059}$
$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	3.022	$3.025^{+0.0095+0.022}_{-0.013-0.021}$	3.018	$3.025^{+0.0093+0.022}_{-0.012-0.021}$
n_s	0.9703	$0.9718^{+0.0034+0.0077}_{-0.0039-0.0073}$	0.9701	$0.9718^{+0.0038+0.0068}_{-0.0034-0.0070}$
τ_{reio}	0.04767	$0.04968^{+0.0044+0.010}_{-0.0070-0.0097}$	0.04370	$0.04945^{+0.0039+0.010}_{-0.0069-0.0094}$
β	0.01 (fixed)	—	0.07878	unconstrained
α	1.704	unconstrained	4 (fixed)	—
$\bar{\tau}_{\text{reio}}$	6.906	$7.089^{+0.47+0.99}_{-0.70-1.0}$	6.457	$7.064^{+0.43+1.0}_{-0.68-1.0}$
$\Omega_{M,0}$	0.2890	$0.2876^{+0.0043+0.0084}_{-0.0040-0.0084}$	0.2863	$0.2876^{+0.0047+0.0092}_{-0.0042-0.0090}$
$H_0 \left[\frac{\text{km}}{\text{s Mpc}} \right]$	69.40	$69.53^{+0.34+0.73}_{-0.37-0.71}$	69.68	$69.54^{+0.36+0.77}_{-0.40-0.75}$
σ_8	0.8042	$0.8047^{+0.0042+0.0088}_{-0.0048-0.0088}$	0.8008	$0.8046^{+0.0040+0.0088}_{-0.0045-0.0082}$




Figure 5: The 1σ and 2σ constraints on some selected cosmological parameters of multi-fractional model compared to Λ CDM.

4. Conclusions

This work is devoted to explore the multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives by cosmological probes. Multi-fractional theories are considered to improve the renormalization properties of perturbative quantum gravity [22, 40, 52]. In q -derivatives theory the coordinates x^μ are replaced by the multi-fractional profile $q^\mu(x^\mu)$, which results in modified field equations described in section 2. We concentrate on the multi-fractional measure in the time direction $\nu(\tau)$ as defined in equation (8), which is more effective in late time. Considering numerical analysis based on the modified version of the CLASS code, according to the q -derivatives theory, it is found that observational tensions would not be relieved in multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives. Actually, matter power spectra diagrams report larger structure formation compared to standard cosmological model, which exhibits inconsistency with local measurements of structure growth. On the other hand there is a suppression in the value of Hubble constant in q -derivatives theory depicted in figure (4), disclosing more tensions with low redshift estimations of this parameter. Hence, according to primary numerical results, multi-fractional theory with q -derivatives is not effective in addressing observed tensions between low-redshift measurements and CMB data. To be more precise, we also perform an MCMC calculation using CMB, weak lensing, supernovae, BAO, and RSD data, to constrain cosmological parameters. Numerical results indicate that because of the degeneracy between multi-fractional parameters β and α with each other and also with other cosmological parameters, it is not possible to put constraints on them by observational data. Moreover, concerning MCMC analysis, obtained constraints on H_0 and σ_8 report no considerable departure from Λ CDM model.




Figure 6: The 1σ and 2σ constraints on some selected cosmological parameters of multi-fractional model, while β is fixed to 0.01 (left panel) and α is fixed to 4 (right panel).

Declaration of competing interest

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

Data availability

No new data were generated or analysed during the current study.

Acknowledgments

We thank Shiraz University Research Council. We are also grateful to the referee for valuable comments which helped us improve the paper significantly.

References

References

- [1] A. G. Riess, et al., Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant, *The Astronomical Journal* 116 (3) (1998) 1009–1038. [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9805201), doi:10.1086/300499.
- [2] S. Perlmutter, et al., Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae, *The Astrophysical Journal* 517 (2) (1999) 565–586. [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9812133), doi:10.1086/307221.
- [3] C. L. Bennett, A. J. Banday, K. M. Gorski, G. Hinshaw, P. Jackson, P. Keegstra, A. Kogut, G. F. Smoot, D. T. Wilkinson, E. L. Wright, Four-Year COBE DMR Cosmic Microwave Background Observations: Maps and Basic Results, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 464 (1996) L1. [arXiv:astro-ph/9601067](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9601067), doi:10.1086/310075.
- [4] D. J. Fixsen, E. S. Cheng, J. M. Gales, J. C. Mather, R. A. Shafer, E. L. Wright, The Cosmic Microwave Background Spectrum from the Full COBE FIRAS Data Set, *Astrophys. J.* 473 (1996) 576. [arXiv:astro-ph/9605054](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9605054), doi:10.1086/178173.

- [5] G. Hinshaw, et al., Nine-year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 208 (2) (2013) 19. [arXiv:1212.5226](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.5226), doi:10.1088/0067-0049/208/2/19.
- [6] P. A. R. Ade, et al., Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 571 (2014) A16. [arXiv:1303.5076](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.5076), doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201321591.
- [7] P. A. R. Ade, et al., Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 594 (2016) A13. [arXiv:1502.01589](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01589), doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201525830.
- [8] N. Aghanim, et al., Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641 (2020) A6. [arXiv:1807.06209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06209), doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.
- [9] M. Tegmark, et al., Cosmological parameters from SDSS and WMAP, *Phys. Rev. D* 69 (2004) 103501. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.103501. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.69.103501>
- [10] K. Abazajian, et al., The Second Data Release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, *The Astronomical Journal* 128 (1) (2004) 502–512. [arXiv:astro-ph/0403325](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0403325), doi:10.1086/421365.
- [11] K. Abazajian, et al., The Third Data Release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, *The Astronomical Journal* 129 (3) (2005) 1755–1759. [arXiv:astro-ph/0410239](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0410239), doi:10.1086/427544.
- [12] W. J. Percival, et al., Baryon acoustic oscillations in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 galaxy sample, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 401 (4) (2010) 2148–2168. [arXiv:0907.1660](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.1660), doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15812.x.
- [13] H. Lampeitl, et al., First-year Sloan Digital Sky Survey-II supernova results: consistency and constraints with other intermediate-redshift data sets, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 401 (4) (2010) 2331–2342. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15851.x.
- [14] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo, A. A. Starobinsky, Model-independent Evidence for Dark Energy Evolution from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 793 (2) (2014) L40. [arXiv:1406.2209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2209), doi:10.1088/2041-8205/793/2/L40.
- [15] A. G. Riess, et al., A 2.4% DETERMINATION OF THE LOCAL VALUE OF THE HUBBLE CONSTANT, *The Astrophysical Journal* 826 (1) (2016) 56. doi:10.3847/0004-637x/826/1/56. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637x/826/1/56>

- [16] A. G. Riess, et al., New parallaxes of galactic cepheids from spatially scanning the Hubble space telescope: Implications for the Hubble constant, *The Astrophysical Journal* 855 (2) (2018) 136. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aaadb7.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaadb7>
- [17] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, Large magellanic cloud cepheid standards provide a 1% foundation for the determination of the Hubble constant and stronger evidence for physics beyond Λ CDM, *The Astrophysical Journal* 876 (1) (2019) 85. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab1422>
- [18] A. G. Riess, et al., Cosmic distances calibrated to 1% precision with Gaia EDR3 parallaxes and Hubble space telescope photometry of 75 milky way cepheids confirm tension with Λ CDM, *The Astrophysical Journal* 908 (1) (2021) L6. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/abdbaf.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/abdbaf>
- [19] 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, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 934 (1) (2022) L7. arXiv:2112.04510, doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b.
- [20] S. W. Allen, R. W. Schmidt, A. C. Fabian, H. Ebeling, Cosmological constraints from the local X-ray luminosity function of the most X-ray-luminous galaxy clusters, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 342 (1) (2003) 287. doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06550.x.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06550.x>
- [21] G. Calcagni, Multi-scale gravity and cosmology, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2013 (12) (2013) 041. doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/12/041.
- [22] G. Calcagni, Multifractional theories: an unconventional review, *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2017 (3) (2017) 138. doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2017)138.
- [23] G. Calcagni, Towards multifractional calculus, *Frontiers in Physics* 6. doi:10.3389/fphy.2018.00058.
URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphy.2018.00058>
- [24] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Differential geometry and modern cosmology with fractionally differentiated lagrangian function and fractional decaying force term, *Romanian Journal of Physics* 52 (3/4) (2007) 467.
- [25] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Some fractional geometrical aspects of weak field approximation and schwarzschild spacetime, *Romanian Journal of Physics* 52 (2007) 705.
- [26] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Cosmology with a fractional action principle, *Rom. Rep. Phys.* 59 (3) (2007) 763.
- [27] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Increasing effective gravitational constant in fractional ADD brane cosmology, *Electronic J. Theor. Phys.* 5 (2008) 103.
- [28] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Fractional action-like variational approach, perturbed Einstein's gravity and new cosmology, *Fizika B-Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics-Zagreb* 19 (2010) 103.
- [29] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Oscillating flat FRW dark energy dominated cosmology from periodic functional approach, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* 54 (1) (2010) 16.
- [30] V. K. Shchigolev, Cosmological Models with Fractional Derivatives and Fractional Action Functional, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* 56 (2) (2011) 389. doi:10.1088/0253-6102/56/2/34.
- [31] M. Jamil, M. A. Rashid, D. Momeni, O. Razina, K. Esmakhanova, Fractional Action Cosmology with Power Law Weight Function, *Journal of Physics Conference Series* 354 (2012) 012008. doi:10.1088/1742-6596/354/1/012008.
- [32] U. Debnath, M. Jamil, S. Chattopadhyay, Fractional Action Cosmology: Emergent, Logamediate, Intermediate, Power Law Scenarios of the Universe and Generalized Second Law of Thermodynamics, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 51 (3) (2012) 812.
- [33] R. A. El-Nabulsi, Gravitons in fractional action cosmology, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 51 (12) (2012) 3978.
- [34] U. Debnath, S. Chattopadhyay, M. Jamil, Fractional action cosmology: some dark energy models in emergent, logamediate, and intermediate scenarios of the universe, *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Physics* 7 (1) (2013) 1-19.
- [35] V. K. Shchigolev, Cosmic Evolution in Fractional Action Cosmology, *Discontinuity, Nonlinearity and Complexity* 2 (2) (2013) 115. doi:10.5890/DNC.2013.04.002.
- [36] V. K. Shchigolev, Fractional Einstein-Hilbert Action Cosmology, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* 28 (2013) 1350056. doi:10.1142/S0217732313500569.
- [37] V. K. Shchigolev, Testing fractional action cosmology, *European Physical Journal Plus* 131 (8) (2016) 256. doi:10.1140/epjp/i2016-16256-6.
- [38] G. Calcagni, Fractal universe and quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 104 (2010) 251301. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.251301.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.251301>
- [39] G. Calcagni, Geometry of fractional spaces, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 16 (2) (2012) 549. doi:10.4310/ATMP.2012.v16.n2.a5.
- [40] G. Calcagni, Geometry and field theory in multi-fractional spacetime, *Journal of High Energy Physics* 01 (2012) 065. doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2012)065.
- [41] G. Calcagni, G. Nardelli, Symmetries and propagator in multi-fractional scalar field theory, *Phys. Rev. D* 87 (2013) 085008. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.085008.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.085008>
- [42] G. Calcagni, Multi-fractional spacetimes, asymptotic safety and Hořava-Lifshitz gravity, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 28 (2013) 1350092. doi:10.1142/S0217751X13500929.
- [43] G. Calcagni, Relativistic particle in multiscale spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 065005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.065005.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.065005>
- [44] G. Calcagni, G. Nardelli, Quantum field theory with varying couplings, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 29 (2014) 1450012. doi:10.1142/S0217751X14500122.
- [45] G. Calcagni, Multiscale spacetimes from first principles, *Phys. Rev. D* 95 (2017) 064057. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.064057.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.064057>
- [46] G. Calcagni, Multifractional theories: an updated review, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* 36 (14) (2021) 2140006. doi:10.1142/S021773232140006X.
- [47] G. Calcagni, G. U. Variaschi, Gravitational potential and galaxy rotation curves in multi-fractional spacetimes, *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2022 (8) (2022) 24. doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2022)024.
- [48] G. Calcagni, G. Nardelli, Spectral dimension and diffusion in multiscale spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 124025. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.124025.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.124025>
- [49] G. Calcagni, G. Nardelli, D. Rodríguez-Fernández, Particle-physics constraints on multifractal spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* 93 (2016) 025005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.025005.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.025005>
- [50] G. Calcagni, S. Kuroyanagi, S. Tsujikawa, Cosmic microwave background and inflation in multi-fractional spacetimes, *JCAP* 08 (2016) 039. doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2016/08/039.
- [51] G. Calcagni, G. Nardelli, D. Rodríguez-Fernández, Standard model in multiscale theories and observational constraints, *Phys. Rev. D* 94 (2016) 045018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.045018.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.045018>
- [52] G. Calcagni, Lorentz violations in multifractal spacetimes, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 77 (5) (2017) 291. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4841-6.
- [53] G. Calcagni, A. De Felice, Dark energy in multifractional spacetimes, *Phys. Rev. D* 102 (2020) 103529. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103529.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.103529>
- [54] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, T. Tram, The Cosmic Linear Anisotropy Solving System (CLASS). Part II: Approximation schemes, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2011 (07) (2011) 034.
URL <http://stacks.iop.org/1475-7516/2011/i=07/a=034>

- [55] C.-P. Ma, E. Bertschinger, Cosmological perturbation theory in the synchronous and conformal Newtonian gauges, *The Astrophysical Journal* 455 (1995) 7. doi:10.1086/176550. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/176550>
- [56] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, S. Prunet, Conservative Constraints on Early Cosmology: an illustration of the MONTE PYTHON cosmological parameter inference code, *JCAP* 1302 (2013) 001. arXiv:1210.7183, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/02/001.
- [57] T. Brinckmann, J. Lesgourgues, MontePython 3: boosted MCMC sampler and other features, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 24 (2019) 100260. arXiv:1804.07261, doi:10.1016/j.dark.2018.100260.
- [58] P. A. R. Ade, et al., Planck 2013 results. XX. Cosmology from Sunyaev-Zeldovich cluster counts, *Astron. Astrophys.* 571 (2014) A20. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201321521.
- [59] P. A. R. Ade, et al., Planck 2015 results. XXIV. Cosmology from Sunyaev-Zeldovich cluster counts, *Astron. Astrophys.* 594 (2016) A24. arXiv:1502.01597, doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201525833.
- [60] M. Kilbinger, et al., CFHTLenS: Combined probe cosmological model comparison using 2D weak gravitational lensing, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 430 (3) (2013) 2200. doi:10.1093/mnras/stt041. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt041>
- [61] C. Heymans, et al., CFHTLenS tomographic weak lensing cosmological parameter constraints: Mitigating the impact of intrinsic galaxy alignments, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 432 (3) (2013) 2433. doi:10.1093/mnras/stt601. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt601>
- [62] D. M. Scolnic, et al., The complete light-curve sample of spectroscopically confirmed SNe Ia from pan-STARRS1 and cosmological constraints from the combined pantheon sample, *The Astrophysical Journal* 859 (2) (2018) 101. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aab9bb. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aab9bb>
- [63] F. Beutler, et al., The 6DF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 416 (4) (2011) 3017–3032. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19250.x>
- [64] L. Anderson, et al., The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations in the Data Releases 10 and 11 Galaxy Samples, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 441 (1) (2014) 24–62. doi:10.1093/mnras/stu523. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu523>
- [65] S. Alam, et al., The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III baryon oscillation spectroscopic survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 470 (3) (2017) 2617–2652. doi:10.1093/mnras/stx721. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx721>
- [66] M. A. Buen-Abad, M. Schmaltz, J. Lesgourgues, T. Brinckmann, Interacting Dark Sector and Precision Cosmology, *JCAP* 1801 (01) (2018) 008. arXiv:1708.09406, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2018/01/008.
- [67] M. Hashim, A. A. El-Zant, W. El Hanafy, A. Golovnev, Toward a concordance teleparallel cosmology. Part II. Linear perturbation, *JCAP* 07 (2021) 053. arXiv:2104.08311, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/07/053.
- [68] E. Di Valentino, N. A. Nilsson, M.-I. Park, A new test of dynamical dark energy models and cosmic tensions in Hořava gravity, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* 519 (4) (2023) 5043–5058. arXiv:2212.07683, doi:10.1093/mnras/stac3824.
- [69] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, P. Yadav, New cosmological constraints on f(T) gravity in light of full Planck-CMB and type Ia supernovae data, *Phys. Rev. D* 107 (6) (2023) 063529. arXiv:2209.11131, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.063529.
- [70] M. N. Castillo-Santos, A. Hernández-Almada, M. A. García-Aspeitia, J. Magaña, An exponential equation of state of dark energy in the light of 2018 CMB Planck data, *Phys. Dark Univ.* 40 (2023) 101225. arXiv:2212.01974, doi:10.1016/j.dark.2023.101225.
- [71] S. Nesseris, G. Pantazis, L. Perivolaropoulos, Tension and constraints on modified gravity parametrizations of $G_{\text{eff}}(z)$ from growth rate and Planck data, *Phys. Rev. D* 96 (2) (2017) 023542. arXiv:1703.10538, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.023542.
- [72] Z. Davari, S. Rahvar, MOG cosmology without dark matter and the cosmological constant, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* 507 (3) (2021) 3387–3399. arXiv:2108.00266, doi:10.1093/mnras/stab2350.
- [73] C. Kaeonikhom, H. Assadullahi, J. Schewtschenko, D. Wands, Observational constraints on interacting vacuum energy with linear interactions, *JCAP* 01 (2023) 042. arXiv:2210.05363, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2023/01/042.
- [74] C. C. Thomas, C. van de Bruck, Constraints on late time violations of the equivalence principle in the dark sector, *JCAP* 04 (2023) 015. arXiv:2210.09732, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2023/04/015.