

Reconciling Cosmological Tensions with Inelastic Dark Matter and Dark Radiation in a $U(1)_D$ Framework

Wonsub Cho,^{1,*} Ki-Young Choi,^{1,2,†} and Satyabrata Mahapatra^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics and Institute of Basic Science,*

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Korea

²*Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 02455, Korea*

Abstract

We propose a novel and comprehensive particle physics framework that addresses multiple cosmological tensions observed in recent measurements of the Hubble parameter, S_8 , and Lyman- α forest data. Our model, termed ‘**SIDR+ z_t** ’ (Self Interacting Dark Radiation with transition redshift), is based on an inelastic dark matter (IDM) scenario coupled with dark radiation, governed by a $U(1)_D$ gauge symmetry. This framework naturally incorporates cold dark matter (DM), strongly interacting dark radiation (SIDR), and the interactions between these components. The fluid-like behavior of the dark radiation component which originates from the self-quartic coupling of the $U(1)_D$ breaking scalar, effectively mitigates both the Hubble and S_8 tensions by suppressing free-streaming effects. Simultaneously, the interacting DM-DR system attenuates the matter power spectrum at small scales, potentially reconciling discrepancies in Lyman- α (Ly- α) observations. The inelastic nature of DM provides a distinct temperature dependence for the DM-DR interaction rate determined by the mass-splitting between the inelastic dark fermions which is crucial for resolving the Ly- α discrepancies. We present a cosmologically consistent analysis of the model by solving the relevant Boltzmann equations to obtain the energy density and number density evolution of different species of the model. The DR undergoes two “steps” of increased energy density when the heavier dark species freeze out and become non-relativistic, transferring their entropy to the dark radiation and enhancing ΔN_{eff} . The analysis showcases the model’s potential to uphold the Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) prediction of ΔN_{eff} but dominantly producing additional contributions prior to recombination, while simultaneously achieving correct relic density of DM through an hybrid of freeze-in and non-thermal production.

*Electronic address: sub526@skku.edu

†Electronic address: kiyoungchoi@skku.edu

‡Electronic address: satyabrata@g.skku.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard model of cosmology, Λ CDM, has been remarkably successful in explaining a wide range of observational data, from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) to large-scale structure (LSS) formation. However, recent high-precision measurements have revealed tensions that challenge this paradigm. Among these discrepancies, the Hubble tension and the S_8 tension stand out as particularly significant [1–3]. The Hubble tension refers to the discrepancy between the locally measured Hubble constant (H_0) using Supernovae Ia (SNe Ia) calibrated by Cepheids [4], and the value inferred from the CMB observations by the Planck satellite [1]. On the other hand, the S_8 tension involves a mismatch between the amplitude of matter fluctuations inferred from LSS surveys [5–7] and the CMB data [1, 8]. These tensions have reached levels of 5σ and 3σ , respectively. Additionally, there is a significant tension of approximately 4.9σ between the linear matter power spectrum (MPS) inferred from combined Planck CMB, baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), and supernovae data, and that from the eBOSS Ly- α forest observations [9]. These discrepancies indicate potential inadequacies in the standard cosmological model and suggest the need for novel scenarios to tackle these issues.

Many mechanisms have been proposed to ease the H_0 tension, most of which involve the presence of additional energy around the time of matter-radiation equality such that it reduces the sound horizon during the era leading up to recombination [10–13]. Such models are usually referred to as “early-time solutions” (for example see [14–18]). One such proposed solution involves additional relativistic degrees of freedom, often parameterized by the effective number of neutrino species N_{eff} [14, 19–23]. Free-streaming dark radiation has been considered as a potential remedy for the Hubble tension by contributing to the early-time expansion rate. However, such models tend to exacerbate the S_8 tension since they require a larger value of Ω_m to maintain the redshift at matter-radiation equality fixed, which increases the value of σ_8 [24–26]. Such scenarios also worsen the fit to Ly- α forest observations, which probe the matter power spectrum at small scales [27]. Thus, free-streaming dark radiation alone is insufficient to resolve these cosmological tensions simultaneously. Recent studies have highlighted the potential of SIDR in alleviating the H_0 and S_8 tension simultaneously as the correlation between these two quantities is lessened in models with non-free-streaming radiation [28–31]. Self-interactions suppress free-streaming effects and modify the evolution of cosmological perturbations, leading to a more consistent fit with observational data. Additionally, DM-DR interactions have been proposed as a promising avenue for resolving small-scale structure issues and improving consistency with Ly- α data [27, 32, 33].

Models of SIDR that interact with DM, known as ‘SIDR+’ models, have demonstrated the ability to provide a smooth transition in the matter power spectrum and address both the Hubble tension and the S_8 tension [34–36]. Additionally, the Wess Zumino Dark Radiation (WZDR) model with DM-DR interactions known as ‘WZDR+’, or the stepped partially acoustic dark matter (SPartAcous) model, further refines these interactions by introducing a break in the MPS before recombination at a specific redshift z_t [26, 31, 37]. These models have been shown to be consistent with Ly- α constraints, as highlighted in [27, 32, 33] ensuring that the proposed interactions do not conflict with the observed small-scale structure of the universe. This comprehensive approach of integrating SIDR with DM interactions offers a promising pathway to resolve multiple cosmological tensions simultaneously.

In this paper, we introduce a novel and cosmologically consistent particle physics framework designed to resolve these puzzles by IDM and SIDR within a $U(1)_D$ gauge symmetry extension of the Standard Model (SM) which we refer to as ‘**SIDR+ z_t** ’. The self-interactions of the dark radiation component result in fluid-like dynamics, effectively diminishing free-streaming and anisotropic stress, a crucial factor for addressing the S_8 tension. Additionally, we demonstrate that our model can naturally generate a matter power spectrum that aligns with Ly- α observations. The interplay between the SIDR and its interactions with the IDM provides a framework to reconcile Ly- α constraints with the observed characteristics of small-scale structures. Our ‘SIDR+ z_t ’ model facilitates momentum transfer between the DM and DR through the mediation of a heavier dark fermion. This scattering rate displays a unique temperature dependence that is influenced by the mass-splitting of the IDM fermions, setting it apart from the ‘SIDR+’ and ‘WZDR+’ scenarios. Furthermore, the matter power spectrum exhibits a smooth suppression corresponding to a redshift z_t , which is determined by the mass-splitting of IDM fermions. Thus, our scenario presents a more generalized approach compared to the ‘SIDR+’ model, featuring a transition redshift for the suppression of the matter power spectrum. As the dark sector is realized through an abelian $U(1)_D$ gauge symmetry, dark sector particles are produced via the freeze-in mechanism and non-thermal contributions [38]. This approach allows for a significant contribution to N_{eff} from SIDR without violating BBN constraints on N_{eff} , while DM achieves a correct relic abundance simultaneously. In our setup, DR also undergoes two “steps” increase in its energy density, when the heavier dark species (DM and the $U(1)_D$ gauge boson) freeze out and become non-relativistic, thereby transferring their entropy to the DR [19, 26]. Consequently it increases the overall energy density of DR and thus helps in achieving an enhanced ΔN_{eff} .

The rest of the manuscript is built up as follows: we begin by briefly discussing the concept of

this setup and various observational constraints in section II and explain the details of the model in section III along with its cosmological phenomenology that solves the cosmological tensions in section IV. Subsequently in section V we discuss the production of DM as well as the generation of dark radiation by solving the set of coupled Boltzmann equations and present the result of our numerical calculations and finally conclude in section VI.

II. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS AND THE INTERACTING DM-DR

Assuming the Λ CDM model, the Planck CMB data predicts a present Hubble constant value $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.6$ km/s/Mpc at 68% C.L. [1] ($H(t) \equiv a^{-1} da/dt$ and $a_0 a^{-1} = 1 + z$ with scale factor a , and subscript denotes the value at present), which is based on the direct measurement of the angular size of the acoustic scale in the CMB power spectrum. In contrast, direct measurements in the local universe which determine H_0 by constructing a distance-redshift relation known as the cosmic “distance ladder,” show a discrepancy with this result. For example, the latest measurement from the SH0ES collaboration reports $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04$ km/s/Mpc [4]. There are actually two sets of measurements rather than just these two values. All the indirect, model-dependent early estimates, such as those from the CMB and BAO experiments, agree among themselves, while all the direct, late-time Λ CDM-independent measurements, such as those from distance ladders and strong lensing, also agree among themselves [2, 3].

The S_8 parameter, defined as $S_8 = \sigma_8 \left(\frac{\Omega_m}{0.3}\right)^{1/2}$ (where $\Omega_m \equiv \rho_m/\rho_c$ is the matter density today and σ_8 is the root mean square amplitude of linear matter density fluctuations), characterizes the amplitude of matter density fluctuations in the Universe. CMB experiments typically yield higher S_8 values, for example, the primary CMB measurement by Planck [1] reports $S_8 = 0.834 \pm 0.016$. In comparison, weak lensing surveys such as KiDS reports $S_8 = 0.759 \pm 0.024$ [39] and DES reports $S_8 = 0.776 \pm 0.017$ [5], suggesting the universe is less “clumpy” than predicted by the standard Λ CDM model. While this tension is somewhat less pronounced, its consistency across several data sets is noteworthy.

Numerous models have been proposed to address the Hubble tension. These include increasing the effective number of relativistic species N_{eff} [14, 19–23], incorporating neutrinos with significant self-interactions [40–43] or interactions with dark matter [34, 35, 44–47], considering decaying dark matter [14, 17, 48–52], or introducing early dark energy [18, 53, 54]. For recent reviews one may refer to [2, 3, 55–57] and references therein.

Among the various scenarios mentioned, models incorporating self interacting dark radiation

and its interactions with dark matter (‘SIDR+’ model) have shown promise in addressing multiple cosmological puzzles simultaneously, as discussed in the previous section. Here, we review the observational constraints on such models and their effectiveness in resolving these tensions. Additionally, we discuss how these models fare against constraints from Ly α forest data and other LSS observations.

The ‘SIDR+’ model introduces two additional key parameters: ΔN_{eff} , representing the contribution of dark radiation, and $R_\Gamma \equiv \Gamma/H$, which characterizes the interaction rate between DM and DR relative to Hubble expansion. ΔN_{eff} is defined as the difference between the effective number of relativistic species, N_{eff} , and the standard model prediction, $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}}$:

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{eff}} - N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}}, \quad \text{with} \quad N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\rho_r - \rho_\gamma}{\rho_{\nu_L}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_\gamma = \frac{\pi^2}{15} T_\gamma^4$ is the energy density of photons, and $\rho_{\nu_L} = \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{T_\nu}{T_\gamma} \right)^4 \rho_\gamma$ corresponds to the energy density of a single active neutrino species. In the absence of additional radiation, the standard model accurately predicts $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} = 3.046$, which arises from the entropy conservation argument following electron-positron annihilation, where $T_\nu/T_\gamma = (4/11)^{1/3}$. Consequently, ΔN_{eff} can be expressed as:

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\rho_{\text{DR}}}{\rho_{\nu_L}} = \frac{8}{7} \left(\frac{T_\nu}{T_\gamma} \right)^{-4} \frac{\rho_{\text{DR}}}{\rho_\gamma} \simeq \frac{8}{7} \left(\frac{11}{4} \right)^{4/3} \frac{\rho_{\text{DR}}}{\rho_\gamma}, \quad (2)$$

applicable after electron-positron annihilation, *i.e.* for $T_\gamma \lesssim 0.5$ MeV. It is important to note that models that attempt to resolve the H_0 tension by adding extra degrees of freedom must only affect the dynamics during the CMB era and not impact BBN. This is critical due to the precise predictions of light element production during BBN, which place tight constraints on the effective degrees of freedom. Current data shows $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{BBN}} = 2.88 \pm 0.27$ at 68% CL [58, 59], closely matching the SM prediction of $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} \simeq 3.046$ [1]. Any changes in N_{eff} during BBN could significantly alter the Universe’s expansion rate and light element synthesis. Therefore, models must introduce additional degrees of freedom for the CMB without violating BBN constraints, significantly narrowing the range of viable options.

Recent analyses of the CMB data within the ‘SIDR+’ model reveal best-fit values for these parameters: $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.7$ and $R_\Gamma \simeq 0.056$. These values show consistency with the LSS data including Ly- α while significantly reducing the Hubble tension to approximately 2σ [27, 28, 60].

In this context, the WZDR+ model features three parameters: N_{IR} , R_Γ , and z_t , which represent the amount of DR around recombination, the DM-DR interaction rate relative to Hubble expansion, and the transition redshift for momentum transfer, respectively. At the transition redshift, an

increase in ΔN_{eff} occurs, leading to what is known as a stepped SIDR. This increase arises from the growth of DR energy density at redshift z_t , driven by the annihilation of additional heavy DR, thereby enhancing the fit to the CMB. This is due to its distinct contributions to the low- l and high- l multipoles in the TT power spectrum [19]. The model favors parameters of $N_{\text{IR}} \simeq 0.59$, $R_\Gamma \simeq 0.07$, and $\log z_t \simeq 4.25$, based on analyses of weak lensing, CMB lensing, full-shape galaxy clustering, and the e-BOSS Ly α data set (collectively referred to as the $\mathcal{DH}\mathcal{L}$ data set) [27].

In the following section, we introduce a minimal model termed the ‘**SIDR+ z_t** ’ model, which bridges the ‘SIDR+’ and ‘WZDR+’ models. This model extends the SIDR+ framework by incorporating a free parameter z_t , which influences the MPS similarly to the WZDR+ model. The break in the MPS occurs at k_t , suppressing modes for $k > k_t$. Thus, the parameters ΔN_{eff} , R_Γ along with z_t effectively alleviate the H_0 -tension, align with the S_8 values from weak lensing and full-shape LSS data while remaining consistent with the Ly- α observations. Also our model features two “stepped” dark radiation fluid which causes an increase in ΔN_{eff} in the era prior to recombination which might significantly improve the combined fit to CMB, BAO, and SH0ES data [19, 26].

III. MINIMAL MODEL FOR ‘**SIDR+ z_t** ’

In this section, we propose a minimal framework incorporating inelastic dark matter with an additional $U(1)$ gauge interaction to address the prevailing cosmological challenges. We consider an abelian gauge extension of the SM *i.e.* $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{\text{SM}} \otimes U(1)_D$ featuring two vector like Dirac fermion singlets χ and ψ and a singlet scalar Φ . The relevant Lagrangian can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \supset & i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\psi - M_\psi\bar{\psi}\psi + i\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi - M_\chi\bar{\chi}\chi + (D_\mu\Phi)^\dagger(D^\mu\Phi) - y\bar{\chi}\Phi\psi \\ & - \frac{1}{4}F_X^{\mu\nu}F^{X\mu\nu} - \frac{\epsilon}{2}F_X^{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, ψ and χ are singlets under the SM gauge group, with masses M_ψ and M_χ , respectively. Their charges under $U(1)_D$ are Q_ψ , Q_χ , and Q_ϕ , with the condition $Q_\chi = Q_\psi + Q_\phi$ to maintain gauge invariance. We choose $Q_\chi = 1$, $Q_\phi = 1$, and $Q_\psi = 0$. Being vector-like, ψ and χ do not introduce any triangle anomalies, as all SM fermions are trivially charged under $U(1)_D$. The covariant derivative is given by $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig_D Q_D (Z_D)_\mu$, where g_D and Q_D are the gauge coupling and dark gauge charge, respectively. The last term in the Lagrangian Eq. (3), represents kinetic mixing between the $U(1)_D$ and $U(1)_Y$ gauge bosons, parameterized by the kinetic mixing parameter ϵ , a free parameter of the theory.

The scalar Φ being charged under $U(1)_D$ can break the symmetry when it acquires a vev

$\langle \Phi \rangle = v_\phi$ and generate the mass of the corresponding new gauge boson Z_D , *i.e.* $M_{Z_D} = g_D Q_\phi v_\phi$. The scalar potential can be written as

$$V(H, \Phi) = -\mu_H^2 (H^\dagger H) + \lambda_H (H^\dagger H)^2 - \mu_\Phi^2 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi) + \lambda_\Phi (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 + \lambda_{H\Phi} (H^\dagger H) (\Phi^\dagger \Phi). \quad (4)$$

The scalar Φ is parameterized with $\Phi = (\phi + v_\phi + i\eta)/\sqrt{2}$. When Φ acquires a VEV and breaks the $U(1)_D$ symmetry, it also mixes with the SM Higgs $H^T = (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + h))$, with $v = 246\text{GeV}$. The mixing parameter γ is given by :

$$\tan 2\gamma = \frac{\lambda_{H\Phi} v v_\phi}{\lambda_H v^2 - \lambda_\Phi v_\phi^2}. \quad (5)$$

After mass diagonalization, we get the mass eigen states h_1 and h_2 . We recognise h_1 as the SM Higgs and h_2 as the second Higgs. We work in the limit $\lambda_{H\Phi} \rightarrow 0$ (or $\gamma \rightarrow 0$), and thus only kinetic mixing portal is relevant for freeze-in mechanism. In this limit, h_2 is identified as ϕ . It also isolates ϕ from the SM sector. The scalar ϕ will be identified as DR with its mass much smaller than eV achieved by tuning the coupling λ_Φ .

After $U(1)_D$ breaking, the fermions ψ and χ mix because of the Yukawa coupling among them as Φ acquires VEV. In the basis $(\chi, \psi)^T$, the mass matrix for the fermions can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_\chi & yv_\phi/\sqrt{2} \\ yv_\phi/\sqrt{2} & M_\psi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

After the diagonalisation of the above mass matrix we get the physical states

$$\xi_1 = \cos \beta \chi - \sin \beta \psi \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_2 = \sin \beta \chi + \cos \beta \psi, \quad (7)$$

with two mass eigenvalues

$$M_{\xi_{1,2}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(M_\chi + M_\psi \pm \sqrt{(M_\chi - M_\psi)^2 + 2y^2 v_\phi^2} \right), \quad (8)$$

and the mixing parameter

$$\tan 2\beta = \frac{\sqrt{2} y v_\phi}{M_\psi - M_\chi}. \quad (9)$$

From the inverse transformation, we can obtain a relation

$$\delta \equiv M_{\xi_2} - M_{\xi_1} = \frac{\sqrt{2} y v_\phi}{\sin 2\beta}. \quad (10)$$

Thus in the physical basis, the interactions in the dark sector can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \supset & ig_D (Z_D)_\mu \left[c_\beta^2 \bar{\xi}_1 \gamma^\mu \xi_1 + s_\beta^2 \bar{\xi}_2 \gamma^\mu \xi_2 + c_\beta s_\beta (\bar{\xi}_1 \gamma^\mu \xi_2 + \bar{\xi}_2 \gamma^\mu \xi_1) \right] \\ & - y (\cos \gamma h_2 + \sin \gamma h_1) \left[c_{2\beta} (\bar{\xi}_1 \xi_2 + \bar{\xi}_2 \xi_1) + s_{2\beta} (\bar{\xi}_2 \xi_2 - \bar{\xi}_1 \xi_1) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $c_\beta = \cos \beta$, and $s_\beta = \sin \beta$ respectively and we will take $\gamma = 0$ identifying $h_2 = \phi$ afterwards. Since the kinetic mixing exists, the relevant interactions between the visible sector and dark sector can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \epsilon g (Z_D)_\mu \bar{f} \gamma^\mu f + \epsilon g_X \frac{s_{\theta_W}}{c_{\theta_W}} Z_\mu \left[c_\beta^2 \bar{\xi}_1 \gamma^\mu \xi_1 + s_\beta^2 \bar{\xi}_2 \gamma^\mu \xi_2 + c_\beta s_\beta (\bar{\xi}_1 \gamma^\mu \xi_2 + \bar{\xi}_2 \gamma^\mu \xi_1) \right] \quad (12)$$

where g is the electro-weak gauge coupling. We also consider a gauge singlet scalar S to be the source of a non-thermal contribution to the dark matter and dark radiation. The relevant lagrangian for S can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \kappa_1 S \bar{\xi}_1 \xi_1 + \kappa_2 S \bar{\xi}_2 \xi_2, \quad (13)$$

and the corresponding relevant terms in the scalar potential can be written as :

$$V(S) \supset \mu_S^2 S^2 + \lambda_S S^4 + \lambda_{SH} S^2 (H^\dagger H) + \lambda_{S\Phi} S^2 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi), \quad (14)$$

This scalar S is produced from the interaction $HH \rightarrow SS$ and decays to DM at late time after BBN.

IV. COSMOLOGICAL PHENOMENOLOGY

In this section, we explore the phenomenological implications of our model, as introduced in Sec. III, with a focus on addressing the cosmological tensions. Our model exhibits several key properties: 1) the decay of particle S results in the production of DM and DR, yielding the observed values of $\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2$ and required ΔN_{eff} after BBN, 2) the DR is characterized with self-interactions, facilitated by its self quartic coupling λ_ϕ , 3) there are interactions between DM and DR, leading to momentum transfer at a rate defined by $R_\Gamma \equiv \Gamma/H$ where Γ is the interaction rate and H is the Hubble parameter, 4) the suppression of these interactions occurs at a redshift z_t , which is determined by the mass difference δ between the particles ξ_1 and ξ_2 , and 5) a step-like increase of ΔN_{eff} during the annihilation of heavy particles ξ and Z_D . As previously discussed, these properties collectively help reconcile the discrepancies in H_0 and S_8 while remaining consistent with LSS and Ly- α .

A. Production and decay of S

S particle can be produced from Higgs in the visible sector through interactions like $HH \rightarrow SS$, $W^+W^- \rightarrow SS$ and $H \rightarrow SS$ decay. Depending on the coupling strength λ_{SH} , the abundance of S can be determined by freeze-out or freeze-in mechanism.




FIG. 1: Production of ξ_i via freeze-in from visible sector (left) and from S -decay (right).

Regardless of the production mechanism, once produced, the S particle becomes non-relativistic at temperatures $T \lesssim M_S$. Consequently, the energy density $\rho_S = M_S n_S$ increases relative to the background radiation. Given that most of this energy is subsequently transferred into DR via the annihilation processes of $\xi_{1,2}$ and Z_D , we can approximate that ρ_S equals ρ_{DR} . Thus with appropriate choice of λ_{SH} , we can obtain the required ΔN_{eff} at late time after its decay.

The S particle primarily decays into ξ_1 and ξ_2 through Yukawa couplings κ_1 and κ_2 , respectively. The lifetime of S is given by:

$$\tau_S = \left[\sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\kappa_i^2 M_S}{8\pi} \right]^{-1} \simeq 16 \text{ s} \left(\frac{10^{-12}}{\kappa} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 \text{ GeV}}{M_S} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $\kappa^2 \equiv \sum_i \kappa_i^2$. To ensure that S decays after BBN has completed and that its energy density during BBN is negligible, we impose the condition $\tau_S \gtrsim 100 \text{ s}$. This approach is similar to other models, where DR originates from the decay of heavy particles [61–67].

B. Production of DM ξ_1

In our model, the light fermion ξ_1 serves as the DM candidate. It is primarily produced through the decay of S , followed by annihilation into Z_D and ϕ in the hidden sector. Thus the mass of ξ_1 and the associated gauge coupling are determined by the observed DM relic density, as we will demonstrate below. While ξ_1 can also be produced via freeze-in from the visible sector through gauge kinetic mixing, this production mechanism is insufficient to account for the observed DM relic density because of stringent bounds on kinetic mixing parameter from astrophysical and experimental constraints on light gauge bosons with masses of $\mathcal{O}(\text{eV})$ [68]. Fig. 1 illustrates the production mechanisms of $\xi_{1,2}$. The left panel depicts the freeze-in production from the visible sector, while the right panel shows the production through S -decay.

Thus the relic density of ξ_1 depends on the thermal averaged cross section of ξ_1 annihilation




FIG. 2: Production of Z_D from annihilation of $\xi_{1,2}$ and its annihilation into ϕ .

into the gauge bosons Z_D as:

$$\Omega_{\xi_1} h^2 \simeq \frac{2.6 \times 10^{-9} \text{ GeV}^{-2}}{\langle \sigma_{\xi_1} v \rangle}. \quad (16)$$

where the cross-section for the dominant t -channel annihilation process is given by

$$\langle \sigma_{\xi_1} v \rangle = \frac{\pi \alpha_D^2}{M_{\xi_1}^2} \left(1 - \frac{M_{Z_D}^2}{M_{\xi_1}^2} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (17)$$

Here it is worth mentioning that, the other annihilation channel $\xi_1 \xi_1 \rightarrow \phi \phi$, remains suppressed as compared to the annihilation into gauge bosons. Thus to achieve the required DM relic density $\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2 = 0.1200 \pm 0.0012$ [1], α_D and M_{ξ_1} has to be tuned appropriately.

The heavier dark fermion ξ_2 can decay into ξ_1 and ϕ and this decay width is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \phi} &= \left(\frac{\cos^2 2\beta \cos^2 \gamma}{64\pi} \right) \left(\frac{2y^2}{M_{\xi_2}^3} \right) ((M_{\xi_2} + M_{\xi_1})^2 - M_\phi^2) \\ &\times (M_{\xi_2}^4 + M_{\xi_1}^4 + M_\phi^4 - 2M_{\xi_2}^2 M_{\xi_1}^2 - 2M_{\xi_2}^2 M_\phi^2 - 2M_{\xi_1}^2 M_\phi^2)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\simeq \left(\frac{\cos^2 2\beta \cos^2 \gamma}{4\pi} \right) y^2 \delta, \quad (19)$$

where we have assumed $M_\phi = 0$ and $\delta \ll M_{\xi_1}$ in the last equation. Thus the corresponding lifetime of ξ_2 is

$$\tau_{\xi_2} \simeq 8 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s} \left(\frac{10^{-5}}{y} \right)^2 \left(\frac{10 \text{ eV}}{\delta} \right). \quad (20)$$

Even though both ξ_1 and ξ_2 are produced from S decay, ξ_2 subsequently decays into ξ_1 . The resulting ξ_1 annihilates into Z_D which ultimately produces the dark radiation ϕ .

C. Production and annihilation of Z_D

The hidden sector gauge boson Z_D can be produced through two mechanisms: freeze-in from the visible sector and annihilation of $\xi_{1,2}$ particles following S decay. For $M_{Z_D} < m_e$, where m_e is the

electron mass, stringent constraints limit the kinetic mixing parameter to $\epsilon \lesssim 10^{-13}$. This severely suppresses Z_D production via freeze-in. However, Z_D production from dark fermion annihilations, following S decay, is sufficient to thermalize both Z_D and ϕ in the hidden sector.

Z_D annihilation becomes significant when the hidden sector temperature drops below its mass, $T_h \lesssim M_{Z_D}$. This process results in a small increase in ΔN_{eff} [19]. Fig. 2 illustrates the Feynman diagrams for Z_D production through $\xi_{1,2}$ annihilation and its subsequent annihilation into ϕ . Due to its larger annihilation cross-section, the post-freeze-out abundance of Z_D is significantly lower than that of ξ_1 . The remaining Z_D population gradually diminishes as it decays into neutrinos via gauge kinetic mixing. The decay width for this process is given by:

$$\Gamma_{Z_D} = \frac{\epsilon^2 g^2 M_{Z_D}}{96\pi \cos^2 \theta_W}. \quad (21)$$

Thus the lifetime of Z_D is given by:

$$\tau_{Z_D} = 3.65 \times 10^{12} \text{ s} \left(\frac{10^{-13}}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \left(\frac{10 \text{ eV}}{M_{Z_D}} \right). \quad (22)$$

D. Production of DR and ΔN_{eff}

Dark radiation ϕ is produced from the annihilation of Z_D and ξ_i , which themselves originate from the decay of S . Consequently, the final energy density of DR is approximately equal to the energy density of S at the time of its decay. However, there is an additional increase in the DR energy density due to the annihilation of ξ_i and Z_D . When the heavier species freeze out and become non-relativistic, they transfer their entropy to the lighter species, thereby increasing the overall energy density of DR. This increase can be quantified by the conservation of comoving entropy [19]. We can approximately write ΔN_{eff} as:

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\rho_{\text{DR}}}{\rho_{\nu_L}} \simeq \left(\frac{\frac{7}{8} g_{*}^{\xi_1} + g_{*}^{Z_D} + g_{*}^{\phi}}{g_{*}^{\phi}} \right)^{1/3} \frac{\rho_S|_{\text{decay}}}{\rho_{\nu_L}}, \quad (23)$$

with $\rho_S|_{\text{decay}} = M_S Y_S$.

Note that DM annihilation results in a 1.23-fold increase in ΔN_{eff} and subsequently, Z_D annihilation leads to a further 1.58-fold increase. It is important to note that ξ_2 is not included in this calculation due to its relatively weaker coupling to Z_D , which is a consequence of the mixing angle $\sin \beta$. This weaker interaction prevents ξ_2 from achieving thermal equilibrium with the other dark sector particles, thus excluding it from contributing significantly to these entropy transfer processes. This stepwise increase in ΔN_{eff} illustrates the cascading energy transfer from heavier to lighter species in the dark sector, ultimately augmenting the DR component.




FIG. 3: Feynman diagram for quartic coupling of ϕ which leads to SIDR.

To achieve $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.6$ as indicated by Eq. (2), we find that the hidden sector temperature T_h must be approximately 0.77 times the visible sector temperature T_v *i.e.* $T_h = 0.77 T_v$. It is important to note that since the production of DR occurs after BBN, it does not impact the abundances of light elements, even with a significant increase in ΔN_{eff} near the time of recombination.

E. DR self interaction

The self-interactions among dark radiation can occur through four-point contact interactions, as depicted in Fig. 3, as well as through H or S mediated processes and gauge interactions. These self-interactions prevent the dark radiation from free-streaming, causing it to behave as an ideal relativistic fluid. This behavior has the potential to simultaneously address both the H_0 and S_8 tensions. To achieve efficient self-interactions of ϕ , the coupling strength can be estimated by comparing the interaction rate with the Hubble expansion rate. By requiring the interaction rate $\Gamma_{\phi\leftrightarrow\phi} = n_\phi \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\phi\phi}$ to be greater than the Hubble rate, we can estimate the lower limit on the self-interaction coupling:

$$\lambda_\phi \gtrsim 10^{-13}. \quad (24)$$

As discussed in [28, 29], non-free-streaming radiation component allows for a larger amount of total energy density in radiation, leading to improvement of the fit to cosmological data compared to models with only a free-streaming component.

F. DM-DR interaction: $\phi + \xi_1 \rightarrow \phi + \xi_1$

In our model, the dark fermions $\xi_{1,2}$ interact with the DR ϕ via Yukawa interactions. Thus DM-DR interactions are mediated by ϕ as well as ξ_2 as shown in Fig. 4. The momentum transfer




FIG. 4: Feynman diagrams for DM-DR scattering.

rate Γ is defined as the rate of change of DM momentum due to the friction it experiences as it moves through the DR fluid. Microscopically, this arises from the DM-DR scatterings and to compute it we evaluate the rate of change of DM momentum [69]

$$\dot{\vec{p}}_{\text{DM}} = -a\Gamma\vec{p}_{\text{DM}}, \quad (25)$$

where a is the scale factor and the dot denotes the derivative with respect to conformal time. For two-body scattering between DM and DR, $\dot{\vec{p}}_{\text{DM}}$ is given by [34, 47]

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\vec{p}}_{\text{DM}} = \frac{a}{2E_p} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2E_k} f(k; T) \int \frac{d^3k'}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{k'}} \frac{d^3p'_{\text{DM}}}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{p'_{\text{DM}}}} (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_{\text{DM}} + k - p'_{\text{DM}} - k') \\ \times |\mathcal{M}|^2 (\vec{p}'_{\text{DM}} - \vec{p}_{\text{DM}}). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where k is the DR momentum, and *prime* denotes the momentum of the outgoing particles. In the limit $M_{\text{DM}} \gg k$ and p_{DM} , explicitly, after some calculation, the momentum transfer rate Γ can be expressed as:

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{1}{8(2\pi)^3 M_{\text{DM}}^3} \int k^3 f(k; T) dk \int d\cos\theta |\mathcal{M}|^2 (1 - \cos\theta), \quad (27)$$

where θ is the scattering angle¹. In our model, DM-DR interaction is dominated by u -channel process mediated by ξ_2 . The s -channel process is suppressed by $1/M_{\xi_2}^4$, and the third process (Fig. 4) is suppressed due to the small value of λ_ϕ (as $|\mathcal{M}| \propto y\lambda_\phi v_\phi$).

¹ The momentum transfer rate Γ can be approximated as [36],

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{T_{\text{DR}}}{M_{\text{DM}}} n_{\text{DR}} \sigma_{\text{mt}}, \quad (28)$$

where σ_{mt} is momentum transfer scattering cross section between DM and DR in the CM frame,

$$\sigma_{\text{mt}} = \int d\Omega \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} (1 - \cos\theta). \quad (29)$$

Thus the matrix amplitude squared for the DM-DR scattering is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2 &= \frac{y^4(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)^4[(m_\phi^2 + 3M_{\xi_1}^2 + 2M_{\xi_1}M_{\xi_2} - s)^2 + t(s - (2M_{\xi_1} + M_{\xi_2})^2)]}{4(u - M_{\xi_2}^2)^2} \\ &\simeq \frac{y^4(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)^4 M_{\xi_1}^2}{(k + \delta)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where s , t , and u are the Mandelstam variables with $s + t + u = 2M_{\xi_1}^2$ and $s \simeq M_{\xi_1}^2 + 2M_{\xi_1}k$ in the range $M_{\xi_1}^2 \gg \delta$, t , and M_ϕ is ignored.

In this limit, the momentum transfer rate is

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &\simeq \frac{y^4(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)^4 T_h^2}{32\pi^3 M_{\xi_1}} f(x) \\ &\simeq 2.86 \times 10^{-36} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{T_h}{10 \text{ eV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{y(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)}{4.1 \times 10^{-6}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{0.01 \text{ MeV}}{M_{\xi_1}}\right), \quad \text{for } T_h \gg \delta, \\ &\simeq 1.4 \times 10^{-35} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{T_h}{10 \text{ eV}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{y(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)}{4.1 \times 10^{-6}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{0.01 \text{ MeV}}{M_{\xi_1}}\right) \left(\frac{10 \text{ eV}}{\delta}\right)^2, \quad \text{for } T_h \ll \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $x = \delta/T_h$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= x^2(x + 3)e^x\Gamma(0, x) - x^2 - 2x + 1, \\ &= 1 \quad \text{for } x \ll 1, \quad 6x^{-2} \quad \text{for } x \gg 1, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\Gamma(0, x)$ is incomplete Gamma function. Therefore, the ratio of the momentum transfer rate to the Hubble expansion rate is

$$R_\Gamma \equiv \frac{\Gamma}{H} \simeq 0.07 \left(\frac{y(1 - 2\sin^2\beta)}{4.1 \times 10^{-6}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{0.01 \text{ MeV}}{M_{\xi_1}}\right), \quad \text{for } T \gg \delta, \quad (33)$$

where we used $T_h = 0.77T_v$. Clearly, R_Γ decreases for smaller temperature $T_h < \delta$. This implies that the momentum transfer effectively shuts off after crossing the δ threshold, or below the transition redshift z_t , given by $1 + z_t \equiv \delta/T_{h_0}$, with T_{h_0} being the present hidden temperature. The small mode which enters the horizon at temperature $T_h \gg \delta$ is suppressed, however for large modes which enter at $T_h \ll \delta$ remain unsuppressed. Our SIDR+ z_t model extends the SIDR+ framework by introducing a transition redshift z_t , which controls the scale at which matter power spectrum suppression occurs. Unlike the standard SIDR+ model, where suppression primarily happens at matter-radiation equality, or the WZDR+ model, where the momentum exchange diminishes after crossing the threshold of mediator mass, our model provides a transition in the matter power spectrum, governed by the mass splitting of inelastic dark matter fermions, offering a more flexible mechanism for addressing small-scale structure issues while maintaining consistency with large-scale observations [27]. Moreover, our SIDR+ z_t model incorporates an additional feature: a two

“step” increase in ΔN_{eff} resulting from the annihilations of ξ_i and Z_D particles. This characteristic potentially enhances the model’s fit to CMB data. These annihilation events occur at energy scales corresponding to the masses of ξ_i and Z_D , and importantly, their effects are distinct from and independent of the suppression scale in the matter power spectrum. This separation of scales provides our model with greater flexibility in addressing multiple cosmological observations simultaneously.

Based on our analytical estimates and a comprehensive scan of the model parameters, we have identified a set of viable values that potentially reconcile the observed cosmological tensions. One such benchmark point is:

$$M_\xi = 0.01 \text{ MeV}, \quad \delta = 3.2 \text{ eV}, \quad M_{Z_D} = 5 \text{ eV}, \quad \alpha_D = 2.8 \times 10^{-10}, \quad y = 4.1 \times 10^{-6}. \quad (34)$$

This benchmark point yields the following dependent parameters:

$$v_\phi = 8.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}, \quad \lambda_\phi = 1.4 \times 10^{-12}, \quad \sin 2\beta = 0.153. \quad (35)$$

These parameters successfully generate the required DM-DR momentum transfer rate and the correct DM relic density. Notably, with the specified gauge and Yukawa couplings, the hidden sector particles readily achieve thermal equilibrium. This benchmark point demonstrates the model’s capacity to address multiple cosmological issues simultaneously while maintaining consistency with observational constraints.

V. BOLTZMANN EQUATIONS AND NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present a comprehensive analysis of the hidden sector dynamics in our inelastic DM and DR model. We begin by outlining the set of coupled Boltzmann equations that govern the evolution of the abundance and energy density of the hidden sector particles. By solving these equations numerically, we demonstrate how our model successfully achieves the correct dark matter relic abundance while simultaneously generating the required dark radiation component. The subsequent discussion will focus on interpreting these results in the context of addressing the cosmological tensions outlined earlier, highlighting the unique features of our ‘SIDR+ z_t ’ model.

The hidden and visible sectors in our model are connected through gauge kinetic mixing. To adhere to the stringent constraints on the kinetic mixing parameter for light new abelian gauge bosons, which is essential for reconciling cosmological tensions as demonstrated by our analytical

estimates in the previous section, the kinetic mixing parameter must be extremely small. Consequently, the visible and dark sectors never achieve thermal equilibrium with each other. In this scenario, hidden sector particles are produced via both freeze-in which involves feeble interactions with the visible sector, and non-thermal production, primarily through the decay of a heavy scalar. This approach provides more flexibility to achieve correct DM relic density and required ΔN_{eff} , enabling us to address multiple cosmological challenges simultaneously. To accurately track the evolution of comoving number densities and energy densities, we solve a set of coupled Boltzmann equations, detailed in Appendix D.

It is important to note that while such a small kinetic mixing parameter can safely evade existing constraints, it is insufficient to generate the required energy density for DR to alleviate the H_0 tension. Although it can produce the correct DM relic density for certain DM masses, an additional mechanism is needed to address the DR deficit. To overcome this limitation, we invoke a non-thermal contribution through the decay of an additional singlet scalar, S . The late-time decay of S serves a dual purpose: 1) it contributes to achieving the correct DM relic density giving additional freedoms for the other model parameters, and 2) it generates the required contribution of SIDR to ΔN_{eff} . This hybrid production mechanism, combining freeze-in and non-thermal contributions, allows our model to simultaneously address multiple cosmological challenges while remaining consistent with observational constraints.

In our analysis, we consider the distinct thermal environments of the hidden and visible sectors, acknowledging that they typically exist at different temperatures. To accurately model the evolution of particle species in both sectors, we employ a two-temperature framework in our Boltzmann equations. This approach allows us to track the number densities of particles, while also accounting for the correlations that arise from the interactions between the two sectors. The evolution equation for the energy density of species in the hidden sector can be described by the following equation:

$$\frac{d\rho_h}{dT_v} = \frac{3H(1 + \omega_h)\rho_h - j_h d\rho_v}{3H(1 + \omega_v)\rho_v + j_h dT_v}, \quad (36)$$

In Eq. (36), the source for the hidden sector j_h is given by

$$j_h = n_S m_S \Gamma_S + \sum_f j(f\bar{f} \rightarrow \xi_i \bar{\xi}_j)(T_v) + j(f\bar{f} \rightarrow Z_D \gamma)(T_v) + j(f\gamma \rightarrow f Z_D)(T_v). \quad (37)$$

where the j -terms in the above equation are given in Appendix C. In Eq. (37), the energy density injection into the hidden sector has two distinct contributions: the first term represents the non-thermal component arising from the decay of the scalar S , while the subsequent terms account for




FIG. 5: Thermal averaged annihilation cross section between hidden sector particles in terms of a hidden sector temperature T_h (Left), and the ratio of the interaction rate and expansion $n\langle\sigma v\rangle/H$ vs T_v (right) to ensure that hidden sector particles are in kinetic equilibrium. Here we use the benchmark values of the parameters as given in Eq. (34).

the freeze-in production mechanism, where particles from the visible sector gradually populate the hidden sector through feeble interactions.

To conduct our numerical analysis, we have implemented the model in the `LanHEP` package [70], which automates the process of generating Feynman rules from the Lagrangian. Subsequently, we utilized `CalcHEP` [71] to compute the necessary cross-sections and decay widths. These calculated quantities were then incorporated into a custom-built solver using the `Boost C++` libraries [72] to numerically integrate the relevant Boltzmann equations.

Fig. 5 illustrates the temperature dependence of interactions within the hidden sector. The left panel shows the thermally averaged cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle$ for various processes as a function of the hidden sector temperature T_h , while the right panel depicts the ratio $n\langle\sigma v\rangle/H$ for DM annihilations and Z_D annihilations versus the visible sector temperature T_v . The thermal averaged cross-sections for ξ_i annihilation to Z_D and Z_D annihilation to DR exhibit distinct temperature regimes: at high temperatures ($T_h \gg M_{\xi}$), $\langle\sigma v\rangle \propto T_h^2$, and at low temperatures, $\langle\sigma v\rangle$ approaches a constant value. This behavior is characteristic of s-wave annihilation processes involving vector mediators. For $M_{Z_D} \ll M_{\xi_1}$, the cross-section asymptotes to $\langle\sigma v\rangle \approx \pi\alpha_D^2/M_{\xi_1}^2$. As evident from the right panel figure, the condition $n\langle\sigma v\rangle/H \gg 1$ is satisfied across a wide temperature range, ensuring equilibrium among hidden sector particles.

In Fig. 6, we illustrate the abundance (left) and energy density (right) evolution of hidden sector particles, using the same parameters as in Fig. 5, with $M_S = 130$ GeV and a decay width




FIG. 6: Evolution of the abundance of the hidden particles (left) and the energy density (right). The same parameters are used as in Fig. 5 with $M_S = 130$ GeV and $\Gamma_S = 10^{-27}$ GeV.

$\Gamma_S = 10^{-27}$ GeV. In the left panel, the blue line shows the number density of dark matter particle ξ_1 . Initially, it grows due to the decay of S . This growth continues until ξ_1 annihilates into Z_D around $T_v = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV. After freeze-out, the abundance stabilizes at a value corresponding to the correct relic abundance of DM. The black dashed line represents the comoving number density required for the correct relic density for $M_{\text{DM}} = 10$ keV. It is important to note that although both ξ_1 and ξ_2 are produced from the decay of S , ξ_2 rapidly decays into ξ_1 and ϕ , converting its entire number density to ξ_1 . Following the decay of S and DM annihilation, the total energy density in the hidden sector is dominated by Z_D until Z_D itself freezes out at approximately 10 eV. The number density evolution of Z_D is depicted by the red line. Subsequently, ρ_h is primarily dominated by ϕ . Notably, we observe a step-like increase in the abundance of ϕ after each annihilation process *i.e.* DM annihilation into Z_D and Z_D annihilation into ϕ , as shown by the green line. In the right panel, we compare the energy densities of S (orange), ρ_h (green), and ρ_v (black). As mentioned earlier, the hidden sector energy density ρ_h also exhibits distinct step-like increases following the annihilation events of ξ_1 and Z_D . This key feature of cascading energy transfer from heavier to lighter species within the dark sector is similar to that in WZDR model [19].

Due to the substantial gauge and Yukawa couplings, the hidden sector particles achieve thermal equilibrium efficiently. We define the hidden sector temperature, T_h from the hidden sector energy density using the relation:

$$\rho_h = \sum_i g_i \frac{\pi^2}{30} T_h^4. \quad (38)$$

After the decay of S , the particles ξ_i and Z_D annihilate into ϕ , making the hidden sector predom-




FIG. 7: (Left) Evolution of the ratio of hidden sector temperature to the visible sector temperature (T_h/T_v). (Right) The evolution of ΔN_{eff} . The same parameters are used as in Fig. 5 and 6.

inantly composed of dark radiation ϕ . Thus, the hidden sector energy density can be expressed as:

$$\rho_h = \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_\phi T_h^4, \quad (39)$$

In Fig. 7, we depict the evolution of the hidden sector temperature relative to the visible sector temperature, T_h/T_v (left), and the corresponding ΔN_{eff} (right). We can see that, following the decay of S , there is a sharp rise in T_h at $T_v \sim 10^{-5}$ GeV. The hidden sector temperature also increases when relatively massive hidden sector particles annihilate into lighter hidden sector particles which is evident around $T_v \sim 10^{-5}$ GeV and $T_v \sim 10^{-8}$ GeV respectively. Similarly, ΔN_{eff} also increases during these annihilation events. This stepwise increase in the ΔN_{eff} , ultimately helps in enhancing the dark radiation component and its impact on cosmological observables.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a novel particle physics framework, termed ‘**SIDR+ z_t** ’, which offers a comprehensive approach to addressing multiple cosmological tensions observed in recent measurements. Our model, based on an inelastic dark matter scenario coupled with self-interacting dark radiation within a $U(1)_D$ gauge symmetry extension of the SM, provides a unified solution to the Hubble tension, S_8 tension, and discrepancies in Lyman- α observations. The key features of our model include: SIDR that behaves as a fluid, suppressing free-streaming effects and anisotropic stress, which is crucial for addressing the S_8 tension and inelastic DM interacting with DR, providing a mechanism to suppress the matter power spectrum at small scales, potentially reconciling

Lyman- α observations. A distinct temperature dependence for the DM-DR interaction rate, which has a cut-off at the transition redshift z_t determined by the mass-splitting between inelastic dark fermions, sets our model apart from previous SIDR+ and WZDR+ scenarios. The energy scales of the steps for increase in energy density of the two “stepped” DR fluid, being independent of the MPS suppression scale, provides enhanced flexibility in addressing the cosmological tensions. The production mechanism for dark sector particles via freeze-in and non-thermal contributions, allows for significant N_{eff} from SIDR without violating BBN constraints, while simultaneously achieving the correct DM relic abundance. Our comprehensive analysis, including solving the relevant Boltzmann equations, demonstrates the model’s potential to uphold BBN predictions while producing additional contributions to N_{eff} prior to recombination. This framework not only addresses current cosmological tensions but also provides a testable particle physics model that can be probed by future experiments.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge Amin Aboubrahim and Mellisa Joseph for helpful discussions. The authors also acknowledge the financial support from National Research Foundation (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MEST) NRF-2022R1A2C1005050. Hospitality at APCTP during the focus program “The Origin and Evolution of the Universe” is kindly acknowledged.

Appendix A: Neutrino Temperature

In standard cosmology, the energy density around BBN epoch comes mainly from neutrinos, photon, and electron, which can be described as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \rho_\nu + \rho_\gamma + \rho_e \\ &= \frac{7N_\nu}{8} \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_\nu T_\nu^4 + \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_\gamma T_\gamma^4 + \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_{\text{eff},e} T_\gamma^4 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where g_e^{eff} is defined from the relation

$$g_e(T) = \frac{g_e}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dp \frac{p^2 \sqrt{p^2 + m_e^2}}{\exp(\sqrt{p^2 + m_e^2}/T) \pm 1} \equiv g_{\text{eff},e} \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_e T_\gamma^4. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Using $\rho = g_{\text{eff}} \frac{\pi^2}{30} T_\gamma^4$, we find the change of the temperature ratio during e^+e^- annihilation and after that as

$$\left(\frac{T_\nu}{T_\gamma} \right)^4 = \frac{g_{\text{eff}} - g_\gamma - g_{\text{eff},e} g_e}{\frac{7}{8} N_\nu g_\nu}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Appendix B: Thermal averaged cross section and decay rate

The thermal averaged annihilation cross section is defined as

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_{ab \rightarrow cd}(T) = \frac{1}{8m_a^2 m_b^2 T K_2(m_a/T) K_2(m_b/T)} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} ds \sqrt{s} (s - s_0) \sigma(s) K_1(\sqrt{s}/T), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where s_0 is minimum value of the Mandelstam variable s in the annihilation process. The thermal average decay rate is defined as

$$\langle \Gamma \rangle = \Gamma \frac{K_1(m_S/T_v)}{K_2(m_S/T_v)} \simeq \Gamma, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where we used $m_S \gg T_v$ in the last equation.

Appendix C: The source terms from the visible to the hidden sector

Energy source term from the visible sector to the hidden sector is

$$j = \frac{T}{32\pi^4} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \sigma(s) s (s - s_0) K_2(\sqrt{s}/T), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $K_2(T)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind.

Appendix D: Boltzmann equations

The Boltzmann equations for the hidden sector evolution are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dY_{\xi_1}}{dT_v} = & -\frac{s}{H} K_v \left[\langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\bar{f} \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\bar{f} \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1} \rangle(T_v) Y_Z^{eq} + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2} \rangle(T_v) Y_Z^{eq} \\ & + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{S \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1} \rangle(T_v) Y_S + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{\xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \phi} \rangle(T_h) Y_{\xi_2} \\ & + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_1 \xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1} Y_{\xi_2} - \frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{\xi_1}^2 \right) \\ & + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_2}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{\xi_1}^2 \right) \\ & - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\ & \left. - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1} Y_{\xi_2} - \frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \right], \quad (\text{D1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dY_{\xi_2}}{dT_v} = & -\frac{s}{H}K_v \left[\langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\bar{f} \rightarrow \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\bar{f} \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2} \rangle(T_v) Y_Z + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2} \rangle(T_v) Y_Z \\
& + \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{S \rightarrow \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2} \rangle(T_v) Y_S - \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma_{\xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \phi} \rangle(T_h) Y_{\xi_2} \\
& - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\bar{\xi}_1 \xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1} Y_{\xi_2} - \frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{\xi_1}^2 \right) \\
& - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow \xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_2}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{\xi_1}^2 \right) \\
& - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_2}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\
& \left. - \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\bar{\xi}_1 \xi_2 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1} Y_{\xi_2} - \frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \right], \tag{D2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dY_{Z_D}}{dT_v} = & -\frac{s}{H}K_v \left[\langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\bar{f} \rightarrow Z_D \gamma}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 + 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{f\gamma \rightarrow f Z_D}(T_v) \left(Y_f^{eq}(T_v) \right)^2 \right. \\
& + 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_1 \bar{\xi}_1 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\
& + 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_2 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_2}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\
& + 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_1 \bar{\xi}_2 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_1} Y_{\xi_2} - \frac{Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\
& + 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\xi_2 \bar{\xi}_1 \rightarrow Z_D Z_D}(T_h) \left(Y_{\xi_2} Y_{\xi_1} - \frac{Y_{\xi_2}^{eq}(T_h) Y_{\xi_1}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)^2} Y_{Z_D}^2 \right) \\
& \left. - 2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{Z_D Z_D \rightarrow \phi \phi} \left(Y_{Z_D}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\phi}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{\phi}^2 \right) \right], \tag{D3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{dY_{\phi}}{dT_v} = -\frac{s}{H}K_v \left[2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{Z_D Z_D \rightarrow \phi \phi} \left(Y_{Z_D}^2 - \left(\frac{Y_{Z_D}^{eq}(T_h)}{Y_{\phi}^{eq}(T_h)} \right)^2 Y_{\phi}^2 \right) \right], \tag{D4}$$

$$\frac{dY_S}{dT_v} = -\frac{s}{H}K_v \frac{1}{s} \langle \Gamma(S \rightarrow \xi_i \bar{\xi}_i) \rangle Y_S \tag{D5}$$

where K_v is defined by

$$K_v \equiv \frac{d\rho_v/dT_v}{4\zeta\rho_v + 4(\zeta - \zeta_h)\rho_h + j_h/H} \sim \frac{1}{T_v}. \tag{D6}$$

where $\zeta = \frac{p_v + p_h}{\rho_v + \rho_h}$, $\zeta_h = \frac{3}{4}(1 + \frac{p_h}{\rho_h})$ and j_h is the source term for the hidden sector. The last approximation in Eq. (D6) is applied when the source term is subdominant to the energy density in the visible sector.

-
- [1] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6 [1807.06209].
 - [2] E. Abdalla et al., *Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies*, *JHEAp* **34** (2022) 49 [2203.06142].
 - [3] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri et al., *In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) 153001 [2103.01183].
 - [4] A.G. Riess et al., *A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934** (2022) L7 [2112.04510].
 - [5] DES collaboration, *Dark Energy Survey Year 3 results: Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering and weak lensing*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 023520 [2105.13549].
 - [6] O.H.E. Philcox and M.M. Ivanov, *BOSS DR12 full-shape cosmology: Λ CDM constraints from the large-scale galaxy power spectrum and bispectrum monopole*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 043517 [2112.04515].
 - [7] KiDS, EUCLID collaboration, *KiDS and Euclid: Cosmological implications of a pseudo angular power spectrum analysis of KiDS-1000 cosmic shear tomography*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **665** (2022) A56 [2110.06947].
 - [8] ACT collaboration, *The Atacama Cosmology Telescope: DR4 Maps and Cosmological Parameters*, *JCAP* **12** (2020) 047 [2007.07288].
 - [9] K.K. Rogers and V. Poulin, *5 σ tension between Planck cosmic microwave background and eBOSS Lyman-alpha forest and constraints on physics beyond Λ CDM*, **2311.16377**.
 - [10] J.L. Bernal, L. Verde and A.G. Riess, *The trouble with H_0* , *JCAP* **10** (2016) 019 [1607.05617].
 - [11] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Hubble constant hunter’s guide*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 043533 [1908.03663].
 - [12] K. Aylor, M. Joy, L. Knox, M. Millea, S. Raghunathan and W.L.K. Wu, *Sounds Discordant: Classical Distance Ladder & Λ CDM -based Determinations of the Cosmological Sound Horizon*, *Astrophys. J.* **874** (2019) 4 [1811.00537].
 - [13] J. Evslin, A.A. Sen and Ruchika, *Price of shifting the Hubble constant*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 103511 [1711.01051].
 - [14] A. Aboubrahim, M. Klasen and P. Nath, *Analyzing the Hubble tension through hidden sector dynamics in the early universe*, *JCAP* **04** (2022) 042 [2202.04453].

- [15] V. Poulin, T.L. Smith, T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Early Dark Energy Can Resolve The Hubble Tension*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 221301 [[1811.04083](#)].
- [16] T. Bringmann, F. Kahlhoefer, K. Schmidt-Hoberg and P. Walia, *Converting nonrelativistic dark matter to radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 023543 [[1803.03644](#)].
- [17] K.L. Pandey, T. Karwal and S. Das, *Alleviating the H_0 and σ_8 anomalies with a decaying dark matter model*, *JCAP* **07** (2020) 026 [[1902.10636](#)].
- [18] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner and L. Randall, *Rock ‘n’ roll solutions to the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42** (2023) 101347 [[1904.01016](#)].
- [19] D. Aloni, A. Berlin, M. Joseph, M. Schmaltz and N. Weiner, *A Step in understanding the Hubble tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 123516 [[2111.00014](#)].
- [20] C. Brust, Y. Cui and K. Sigurdson, *Cosmological Constraints on Interacting Light Particles*, *JCAP* **08** (2017) 020 [[1703.10732](#)].
- [21] P. Ko and Y. Tang, *Light dark photon and fermionic dark radiation for the Hubble constant and the structure formation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **762** (2016) 462 [[1608.01083](#)].
- [22] M. Escudero and S.J. Witte, *The hubble tension as a hint of leptogenesis and neutrino mass generation*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 515 [[2103.03249](#)].
- [23] P. Ko, N. Nagata and Y. Tang, *Hidden Charged Dark Matter and Chiral Dark Radiation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **773** (2017) 513 [[1706.05605](#)].
- [24] E. Di Valentino et al., *Cosmology Intertwined III: $f\sigma_8$ and S_8* , *Astropart. Phys.* **131** (2021) 102604 [[2008.11285](#)].
- [25] R.C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *Arbitrating the S_8 discrepancy with growth rate measurements from redshift-space distortions*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **505** (2021) 5427 [[2106.01208](#)].
- [26] M. Joseph, D. Aloni, M. Schmaltz, E.N. Sivarajan and N. Weiner, *A Step in understanding the S_8 tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 023520 [[2207.03500](#)].
- [27] H. Bagherian, M. Joseph, M. Schmaltz and E.N. Sivarajan, *Stepping into the Forest: Confronting Interacting Radiation Models for the Hubble Tension with Lyman- α Data*, [2405.17554](#).
- [28] N. Blinov and G. Marques-Tavares, *Interacting radiation after Planck and its implications for the Hubble Tension*, *JCAP* **09** (2020) 029 [[2003.08387](#)].
- [29] T. Brinckmann, J.H. Chang, P. Du and M. LoVerde, *Confronting interacting dark radiation scenarios with cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 123517 [[2212.13264](#)].
- [30] S. Ghosh, S. Kumar and Y. Tsai, *Free-streaming and coupled dark radiation isocurvature perturbations: constraints and application to the Hubble tension*, *JCAP* **05** (2022) 014 [[2107.09076](#)].
- [31] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, T. Simon, A. Bartlett, Y. Patel and T.L. Smith, *Comparative analysis of interacting stepped dark radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 123513 [[2306.12469](#)].
- [32] M. Garny, T. Konstandin, L. Sagunski and S. Tulin, *Lyman- α forest constraints on interacting dark sectors*, *JCAP* **09** (2018) 011 [[1805.12203](#)].
- [33] M. Archidiacono, D.C. Hooper, R. Murgia, S. Bohr, J. Lesgourgues and M. Viel, *Constraining Dark*

- Matter-Dark Radiation interactions with CMB, BAO, and Lyman- α* , *JCAP* **10** (2019) 055 [1907.01496].
- [34] M.A. Buen-Abad, G. Marques-Tavares and M. Schmaltz, *Non-Abelian dark matter and dark radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 023531 [1505.03542].
- [35] J. Lesgourgues, G. Marques-Tavares and M. Schmaltz, *Evidence for dark matter interactions in cosmological precision data?*, *JCAP* **02** (2016) 037 [1507.04351].
- [36] Z. Pan, M. Kaplinghat and L. Knox, *Searching for Signatures of Dark matter-Dark Radiation Interaction in Observations of Large-scale Structure*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 103531 [1801.07348].
- [37] M.A. Buen-Abad, Z. Chacko, C. Kilic, G. Marques-Tavares and T. Youn, *Stepped partially acoustic dark matter: likelihood analysis and cosmological tensions*, *JCAP* **11** (2023) 005 [2306.01844].
- [38] H. Baer, K.-Y. Choi, J.E. Kim and L. Roszkowski, *Dark matter production in the early Universe: beyond the thermal WIMP paradigm*, *Phys. Rept.* **555** (2015) 1 [1407.0017].
- [39] KiDS collaboration, *KiDS-1000 Cosmology: Cosmic shear constraints and comparison between two point statistics*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **645** (2021) A104 [2007.15633].
- [40] G.B. Gelmini, A. Kusenko and V. Takhistov, *Possible Hints of Sterile Neutrinos in Recent Measurements of the Hubble Parameter*, *JCAP* **06** (2021) 002 [1906.10136].
- [41] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Hubble tension in lepton asymmetric cosmology with an extra radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 063019 [2104.04381].
- [42] G.-y. Huang and W. Rodejohann, *Solving the Hubble tension without spoiling Big Bang Nucleosynthesis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 123007 [2102.04280].
- [43] F. Arias-Aragon, E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. Gonzalez-Lopez and L. Merlo, *Neutrino Masses and Hubble Tension via a Majoron in MFV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 28 [2009.01848].
- [44] M. Raveri, W. Hu, T. Hoffman and L.-T. Wang, *Partially Acoustic Dark Matter Cosmology and Cosmological Constraints*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 103501 [1709.04877].
- [45] G. Choi, T.T. Yanagida and N. Yokozaki, *A model of interacting dark matter and dark radiation for H_0 and σ_8 tensions*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 127 [2010.06892].
- [46] Z. Chacko, Y. Cui, S. Hong, T. Okui and Y. Tsai, *Partially Acoustic Dark Matter, Interacting Dark Radiation, and Large Scale Structure*, *JHEP* **12** (2016) 108 [1609.03569].
- [47] F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, K. Sigurdson, J. Zavala, T. Bringmann, M. Vogelsberger and C. Pfrommer, *ETHOS—an effective theory of structure formation: From dark particle physics to the matter distribution of the Universe*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 123527 [1512.05344].
- [48] N. Blinov, C. Keith and D. Hooper, *Warm Decaying Dark Matter and the Hubble Tension*, *JCAP* **06** (2020) 005 [2004.06114].
- [49] G. Choi, M. Suzuki and T.T. Yanagida, *Degenerate Sub-keV Fermion Dark Matter from a Solution to the Hubble Tension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 075031 [2002.00036].
- [50] L. Fuß and M. Garny, *Decaying Dark Matter and Lyman- α forest constraints*, *JCAP* **10** (2023) 020 [2210.06117].

- [51] A. Cheek, Y.-C. Qiu and L. Tan, *Gemini Dark Matter*, [2407.01099](#).
- [52] L. Fuß, M. Garny and A. Ibarra, *Minimal decaying dark matter: from cosmological tensions to neutrino signatures*, [2403.15543](#).
- [53] O. Seto and Y. Toda, *Comparing early dark energy and extra radiation solutions to the Hubble tension with BBN*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 123501 [[2101.03740](#)].
- [54] K. Freese and M.W. Winkler, *Chain early dark energy: A Proposal for solving the Hubble tension and explaining today's dark energy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 083533 [[2102.13655](#)].
- [55] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S.J. Witte, V. Poulin and J. Lesgourgues, *The H0 Olympics: A fair ranking of proposed models*, *Phys. Rept.* **984** (2022) 1 [[2107.10291](#)].
- [56] M. Kamionkowski and A.G. Riess, *The Hubble Tension and Early Dark Energy*, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **73** (2023) 153 [[2211.04492](#)].
- [57] J.-P. Hu and F.-Y. Wang, *Hubble Tension: The Evidence of New Physics*, *Universe* **9** (2023) 94 [[2302.05709](#)].
- [58] R.H. Cyburt, B.D. Fields, K.A. Olive and T.-H. Yeh, *Big Bang Nucleosynthesis: 2015*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88** (2016) 015004 [[1505.01076](#)].
- [59] C. Pitrou, A. Coc, J.-P. Uzan and E. Vangioni, *Precision big bang nucleosynthesis with improved Helium-4 predictions*, *Phys. Rept.* **754** (2018) 1 [[1801.08023](#)].
- [60] I.J. Allali, A. Notari and F. Rompineve, *Dark Radiation with Baryon Acoustic Oscillations from DESI 2024 and the H_0 tension*, [2404.15220](#).
- [61] K. Ichikawa, M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama, M. Senami and F. Takahashi, *Increasing effective number of neutrinos by decaying particles*, *JCAP* **05** (2007) 008 [[hep-ph/0703034](#)].
- [62] W. Fischler and J. Meyers, *Dark Radiation Emerging After Big Bang Nucleosynthesis?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 063520 [[1011.3501](#)].
- [63] D. Hooper, F.S. Queiroz and N.Y. Gnedin, *Non-Thermal Dark Matter Mimicking An Additional Neutrino Species In The Early Universe*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 063513 [[1111.6599](#)].
- [64] O.E. Bjaelde, S. Das and A. Moss, *Origin of Delta N_{eff} as a Result of an Interaction between Dark Radiation and Dark Matter*, *JCAP* **10** (2012) 017 [[1205.0553](#)].
- [65] K. Choi, K.-Y. Choi and C.S. Shin, *Dark radiation and small-scale structure problems with decaying particles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 083529 [[1208.2496](#)].
- [66] J. Hasenkamp and J. Kersten, *Dark radiation from particle decay: cosmological constraints and opportunities*, *JCAP* **08** (2013) 024 [[1212.4160](#)].
- [67] A.C. Sobotka, A.L. Erickcek and T.L. Smith, *Comprehensive constraints on dark radiation injection after BBN*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 063538 [[2312.13235](#)].
- [68] A. Caputo, A.J. Millar, C.A.J. O'Hare and E. Vitagliano, *Dark photon limits: A handbook*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 095029 [[2105.04565](#)].
- [69] C. Dvorkin, K. Blum and M. Kamionkowski, *Constraining Dark Matter-Baryon Scattering with Linear Cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 023519 [[1311.2937](#)].

- [70] A. Semenov, *LanHEP — A package for automatic generation of Feynman rules from the Lagrangian. Version 3.2*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **201** (2016) 167 [[1412.5016](#)].
- [71] A. Belyaev, N.D. Christensen and A. Pukhov, *CalcHEP 3.4 for collider physics within and beyond the Standard Model*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** (2013) 1729 [[1207.6082](#)].
- [72] Boost, “Boost C++ Libraries.” <http://www.boost.org/>, 2015.