

# Interacting dark energy after DESI DR2: a challenge for $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm?

Supriya Pan,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Sivasish Paul,<sup>1,†</sup> Emmanuel N. Saridakis,<sup>3,4,5,‡</sup> and Weiqiang Yang<sup>6,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Presidency University, 86/1 College Street, Kolkata 700073, India*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Systems Science, Durban University of Technology,  
PO Box 1334, Durban 4000, Republic of South Africa*

<sup>3</sup>*National Observatory of Athens, Lofos Nymfon, 11852 Athens, Greece*

<sup>4</sup>*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Católica del Norte,  
Avda. Angamos 0610, Casilla 1280 Antofagasta, Chile*

<sup>5</sup>*CAS Key Laboratory for Researches in Galaxies and Cosmology, Department of Astronomy,  
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R. China*

<sup>6</sup>*Department of Physics, Liaoning Normal University, Dalian, 116029, P. R. China*

We investigate the scenario of interacting dark energy through a detailed confrontation with various observational datasets. We quantify the interaction in a general way, through the deviation from the standard scaling of the dark matter energy density. We use observational Hubble Data from Cosmic Chronometers (CC), data from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) from the recently released DESI DR2, data from Supernova Type Ia (SNIa), both with and without calibration by SH0ES, and finally the CMB data from Planck 2018. For the basic and simplest interacting model, we find that the data favor a non-zero interaction up to  $2\sigma$ . Notably, when we employ SH0ES-calibrated SNIa data the preference of non-zero interaction becomes more significant. However, comparison with  $\Lambda$ CDM scenario through AIC, BIC and Bayesian analysis, reveals a mixed picture.

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

## I. INTRODUCTION

According to different accumulating observations our universe has experienced two phases of accelerating expansion, one at the primordial phase and one at late times. The late-time acceleration can indeed be explained by the simple cosmological constant, however the relevant theoretical problem, the possibility of a dynamical nature, as well as various potential observational tensions [1–5], led to consider scenarios that go beyond  $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm or/and beyond general relativity. A first avenue that one can follow is to construct modified gravitational theories, which have general relativity as a limiting case, but which in general can alter the universe evolution by providing new additional degree(s) of freedom [6, 7]. Another way is to maintain general relativity but introduce new sectors such as the dark energy one or other exotic forms of matter [8, 9], which can give rise to acceleration.

Since the underlying microscopical theory of dark energy is unknown, and since the underlying microscopical theory of dark matter is unknown too, there is no reason that could theoretically forbid their mutual interaction. From the particle physics and field theoretical point of view, the investigation of such interactions could be enlightening for revealing the nature of the dark sectors. Nevertheless, from the cosmological point of view, the possibility of an interacting dark energy has the addi-

tional advantage that it can alleviate the problems of  $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm, such as the coincidence one [10–17], the presence of accelerating scaling solution [18–50], the  $H_0$  tension [51–62], and the  $\sigma_8$  tension [63–66] (for reviews see [67, 68]).

The smoking gun of interacting dark energy is an altered evolution law of the dark matter energy density  $\rho_{\text{dm}}$ , since due to the interaction the latter is no more conserved. In particular, considering dark matter as a cold barotropic fluid, one has

$$\rho_{\text{dm}} = \rho_{\text{dm},0} a^{-3+\delta(a)}, \quad (1)$$

with  $\rho_{\text{dm},0}$  the dark matter energy density at present value,  $a$  the scale factor, and where the deviation from  $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm, namely from the non-interacting case, is quantified by  $\delta(a)$ , which in general can be a varying quantity. If  $\delta(a) < 0$ , then for increasing scale factor  $\rho_{\text{dm}}$  decreases more rapidly than its standard evolution  $a^{-3}$ , which implies an energy flow from dark matter to dark energy. On the other hand, for  $\delta(a) > 0$  we have the opposite situation.

In the present letter, we desire to confront interacting dark energy with observational data, including the recent Data Release 2 (DR2) of Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) [69]. As we show, we find that a non-zero interaction is favored, which reveals a potential challenge for  $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm. The plan of the work is the following. In Section II we present the scenario of interacting dark energy. Then, in Section III we provide the observational datasets that we use in our analysis, and we perform the full observational confrontation, deriving the corresponding contour plots. Finally, in Section IV we discuss our results and we conclude.

\* [supriya.maths@presiuniv.ac.in](mailto:supriya.maths@presiuniv.ac.in)

† [sivasishpaul@gmail.com](mailto:sivasishpaul@gmail.com)

‡ [msaridak@noa.gr](mailto:msaridak@noa.gr)

§ [d11102004@163.com](mailto:d11102004@163.com)

## II. INTERACTING DARK ENERGY

Let us present the scenario of interacting dark energy in the framework of general relativity. We focus on the spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric, described by the line element,  $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2)$ , where  $a$  is the scale factor. The general Friedmann equations can be written as

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} (\rho_{\text{dm}} + \rho_{\text{de}}), \quad (2)$$

$$2\dot{H} + 3H^2 = -8\pi G(p_{\text{dm}} + p_{\text{de}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $H = \dot{a}/a$  is the Hubble function (an overhead dot represents the cosmic time differentiation), and  $\rho_{\text{de}}$  is the energy density of dark energy, while  $p_{\text{dm}}$  and  $p_{\text{de}}$  are the dark matter and dark energy pressures (since dark matter is cold we have  $p_{\text{dm}} = 0$ ).

In the case where an interaction between dark energy (DE) and dark matter (DM) sectors is present, due to the diffeomorphism invariant the total energy-momentum tensor is indeed conserved, however, the separate DE and DM sectors do not. In particular, in such an interacting case one has

$$\dot{\rho}_{\text{dm}} + 3H\rho_{\text{dm}} = -\dot{\rho}_{\text{de}} - 3H(1 + w_{\text{de}})\rho_{\text{de}} = -Q, \quad (4)$$

with  $w_{\text{de}} = p_{\text{de}}/\rho_{\text{de}}$  being the barotropic equation-of-state parameters of the DE sector, and where  $Q$  quantifies the interaction rate (also known as the interaction function) between the dark sectors. Usually there is no guiding principle to determine  $Q$ , and thus in the literature one may find several phenomenological choices [18–45, 47, 48]. However, as we mentioned in the Introduction, in full generality one may quantify the effect of the interaction straightaway in the scaling behavior, which for cold dark matter, will take the form (1).

In this work we focus on the basic interacting scenario in which  $w_{\text{de}} = -1$ , namely DE corresponds to the vacuum energy sector, and  $\delta(a) = \delta_0 = \text{const.}$  Inserting (1) with  $\delta(a) = \delta_0$  into the conservation equation (4) for DM, we extract an interaction function of the form

$$Q = -\delta_0 H \rho_{\text{dm}}. \quad (5)$$

Additionally, for the energy density of DE we have

$$\rho_{\text{de}}(a) = \rho_{\text{de},0} + \rho_{\text{dm},0} \left( \frac{\delta_0}{-3 + \delta_0} \right) \times [1 - a^{-3+\delta_0}]. \quad (6)$$

Note that for  $\delta_0 = 3$  the energy density for DE is undefined, while we have a constant DM energy density, case which is not physically interesting, and thus in the following we exclude  $\delta_0 = 3$  from our parameter space. Now, introducing the density parameters  $\Omega_i = 8\pi G\rho_i/(3H^2)$  (where  $i$  stands for DM and DE), we can write the first Friedmann equation as

$$\left( \frac{H}{H_0} \right)^2 = \Omega_{\text{dm},0} a^{-3+\delta_0} + \Omega_{\text{de},0} + \frac{\delta_0 \Omega_{\text{dm},0}}{-3 + \delta_0} (1 - a^{-3+\delta_0}), \quad (7)$$

$z$	$H(z)$	$\sigma_{H(z)}$	Ref.	$z$	$H(z)$	$\sigma_{H(z)}$	Ref.
0.07	69.0	19.6	[70]	0.48	97.0	62.0	[71]
0.09	69.0	12.0	[72]	0.5929	104.0	13.0	[73]
0.12	68.6	26.2	[70]	0.6797	92.0	8.0	[73]
0.17	83.0	8.0	[74]	0.75	98.8	33.6	[75]
0.1791	75.0	4.0	[73]	0.7812	105.0	12.0	[73]
0.1993	75.0	5.0	[73]	0.80	113.1	25.22	[76]
0.20	72.9	29.6	[70]	0.8754	125.0	17.0	[73]
0.27	77.0	14.0	[74]	0.88	90.0	40.0	[71]
0.28	88.8	36.6	[70]	0.90	117.0	23.0	[74]
0.3519	83.0	14.0	[73]	1.037	154.0	20.0	[73]
0.3802	83.0	13.5	[77]	1.26	135.0	65.0	[78]
0.4	95.0	17.0	[74]	1.3	168.0	17.0	[74]
0.4004	77.0	10.2	[77]	1.363	160.0	33.6	[79]
0.4247	87.1	11.2	[77]	1.43	177.0	18.0	[74]
0.44497	92.8	12.9	[77]	1.53	140.0	14.0	[74]
0.47	89.0	49.6	[80]	1.75	202.0	40.0	[74]
0.4783	80.9	9.0	[77]	1.965	186.5	50.4	[79]

Table I. 34 measurements of the Hubble parameter at different redshifts adopting the CC approach. The  $H(z)$  from [80] is  $89 \pm 23$  (stat)  $\pm 44$  (syst)  $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ , and here we consider the total error  $89 \pm 49.6$  (tot)  $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$  in our analysis. The  $H(z)$  from [76] is  $113.1 \pm 15.1$  (stat)  $^{+29.1}_{-11.3}$  (syst)  $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ , and here we consider the total error  $113.1 \pm 25.22$  (tot)  $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ . For the calculation of the total errors, we have used  $\sigma_{\text{tot}} = \sqrt{((\sigma_{\text{stat}}^+ + \sigma_{\text{stat}}^-)/2)^2 + ((\sigma_{\text{syst}}^+ + \sigma_{\text{syst}}^-)/2)^2}$ .

where  $\Omega_{\text{dm},0} + \Omega_{\text{de},0} = 1$ . Notice that the Hubble expansion law (7) can be interpreted as the solution of two non-interacting cosmic fluids as follows: the conservation equations in (4) can be rewritten as  $\dot{\rho}_{\text{dm}} + 3H(1 + w_{\text{dm}}^{\text{eff}})\rho_{\text{dm}} = 0$ , and  $\dot{\rho}_{\text{de}} + 3H(1 + w_{\text{de}}^{\text{eff}})\rho_{\text{de}} = 0$ , where  $w_{\text{dm}}^{\text{eff}} \equiv Q/(3H\rho_{\text{dm}})$  and  $w_{\text{de}}^{\text{eff}} = -1 - Q/(3H\rho_{\text{de}})$  are respectively the effective equation-of-state parameters of DM and DE. For the present set-up,  $w_{\text{dm}}^{\text{eff}} = -\delta_0/3$  and  $w_{\text{de}}^{\text{eff}} = -1 + \frac{\delta_0}{3} \times \frac{\rho_{\text{dm}}}{\rho_{\text{de}}} = (\delta_0/3) \times a^{-3+\delta_0} [(\Omega_{\text{de},0}/\Omega_{\text{dm},0}) + (\delta_0/(-3 + \delta_0)) \times (1 - a^{-3+\delta_0})]^{-1}$ . This emphasizes that in presence of an interaction, DM may not remain cold effectively.

## III. DATA AND RESULTS

In this section we proceed to the detailed confrontation of the scenario of interacting dark energy with observational data. In particular, we use the following data sets:

- Hubble parameter measurements obtained from Cosmic Chronometers (CC) approach, as listed in Table II.
- Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) distance measurements from (DESI) DR2 [81]<sup>1</sup>.
- Supernovae Type Ia (SNIa) from three well known astronomical surveys: (i) **PantheonPlus** from [82,

<sup>1</sup> [https://github.com/CobayaSampler/desi\\_bao\\_dr2](https://github.com/CobayaSampler/desi_bao_dr2)

Dataset	$H_0$	$\Omega_{\text{dm},0}$	$\delta_0$
DESI	$68.48^{+0.89}_{-0.89}$	$0.321^{+0.026}_{-0.031}$	$0.070^{+0.084}_{-0.084}$
DESI+CC	$68.39^{+0.87}_{-0.87}$	$0.321^{+0.026}_{-0.030}$	$0.071^{+0.084}_{-0.084}$
DESI+Pan+(S)	$74.31^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	$0.1997^{+0.0084}_{-0.0084}$	$-0.251^{+0.057}_{-0.057}$
DESI+CC+Pan+(S)	$74.30^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$0.1996^{+0.0084}_{-0.0084}$	$-0.253^{+0.057}_{-0.057}$
DESI+Pan+	$68.04^{+0.58}_{-0.58}$	$0.333^{+0.018}_{-0.018}$	$0.105^{+0.058}_{-0.058}$
DESI+CC+Pan+	$68.02^{+0.58}_{-0.58}$	$0.333^{+0.018}_{-0.018}$	$0.106^{+0.058}_{-0.058}$
DESI+Union3	$67.90^{+0.68}_{-0.68}$	$0.339^{+0.023}_{-0.023}$	$0.123^{+0.067}_{-0.067}$
DESI+CC+Union3	$67.90^{+0.68}_{-0.68}$	$0.339^{+0.021}_{-0.024}$	$0.122^{+0.067}_{-0.067}$
DESI+DESY5	$70.18^{+0.28}_{-0.28}$	$0.297^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$	$0.068^{+0.057}_{-0.057}$
DESI+CC+DESY5	$70.18^{+0.28}_{-0.28}$	$0.297^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$	$0.067^{+0.057}_{-0.057}$
CMB+DESI	$69.03^{+0.48}_{-0.48}$	$0.2979^{+0.0077}_{-0.0077}$	$0.0013^{+0.0043}_{-0.0043}$
CMB+CC+DESI	$69.00^{+0.47}_{-0.47}$	$0.2984^{+0.0077}_{-0.0077}$	$0.0011^{+0.0042}_{-0.0042}$
CMB+DESI+CC+Pan+(S)	$73.78^{+0.14}_{-0.14}$	$0.2414^{+0.0034}_{-0.0034}$	$0.0257^{+0.0034}_{-0.0034}$
CMB+DESI+CC+Pan+	$68.71^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	$0.3036^{+0.0071}_{-0.0071}$	$-0.0008^{+0.0041}_{-0.0041}$
CMB+DESI+CC+Union3	$68.81^{+0.45}_{-0.45}$	$0.3021^{+0.0074}_{-0.0074}$	$-0.0002^{+0.0041}_{-0.0041}$
CMB+DESI+CC+DESY5	$70.40^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	$0.2836^{+0.0045}_{-0.0045}$	$0.0073^{+0.0035}_{-0.0035}$

Table II. 68% CL constraints on the model parameters of the present interacting scenario considering DESI DR2 and its inclusion with various datasets.

[83] excluding the data points affected by peculiar velocity corrections [84]. We analyze two cases: **Pan+(S)**, using the fiducial SNIa magnitude ( $M$ ) from SHOES (Supernova H0 for the Equation of State of Dark energy) Cepheid host distances [85], and **Pan+**, where SHOES calibration is removed, considering the apparent magnitude to constrain absolute magnitude of SNIa; (ii) **Union3** dataset consisting 2087 SNIa [86]; (iii) five-year dataset of **Dark Energy Survey** (labeled as **DES-Y5**), covering the redshift range  $0.025 < z < 1.3$  [87], along with 194 low-redshift SNeIa in the range  $0.025 < z < 0.1$  [88–91].

- Cosmic microwave background (**CMB**) shift parameter ( $\mathcal{R}$ ), a compressed representation of CMB data [92] inferred from the concordance  $\Lambda$ CDM model, as reported in Table I of [93].<sup>2</sup>

We perform the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analyses using the publicly available python package

**emcee**<sup>3</sup> [95] in order to constrain the parameter space of the underlying interacting scenario. For our parameter inference, we adopt a broad uniform prior,  $H_0 \sim \mathcal{U}(60, 90)$ ,  $\Omega_{\text{dm},0} \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$  and  $\delta_0 \sim \mathcal{U}(-3, 3)$ . For the visualization of the MCMC chains, we use the widely known **getdist**<sup>4</sup> package [96].

The results are summarized in Tables II and III. Additionally, in Fig. 1 we present the corresponding likelihood contours, while in Fig. 2 we display the Whisker plot for the interaction parameter  $\delta_0$ , for the various datasets used in our analysis.

In particular, in Table II we show the constraints on the model parameters considering DESI alone, as well as its combination with other datasets. In the first half of Table II we place the constraints for the non-CMB datasets, while the last half of Table II shows the constraints when CMB data is included. One can see that for DESI alone and DESI+CC, the interaction parameter  $\delta_0$  is consistent with zero within 68% CL, thus no interaction is favored. However, when SNIa datasets are independently added to DESI (and DESI+CC), a non-zero interaction appears.

Considering both DESI+Pan+(S) and DESI+CC+Pan+(S), we notice an evidence of interaction at more than  $3\sigma$ , and since  $\delta_0 < 0$  this suggests that DM decays to DE. However, the interaction strength is also affected by the presence of Cepheid host distances, since due to the presence of the Cepheid calibrators,  $H_0$  assumes a higher value, and due to the existing anti-correlation between  $H_0$  and  $\Omega_{\text{dm},0}$ , higher value of  $H_0$  naturally leads to lower value of  $\Omega_{\text{dm},0}$ , which in turn results to a negative  $\delta_0$ , that is non-null at many standard deviations. On the other hand, for DESI+Pan+, DESI+Union3 and DESI+CC+Union3, we find that  $\delta_0$  is positive and non-zero at slightly more than  $1\sigma$ . This implies a mild evidence of the interaction, and the energy flow from DE to DM is favored at more than  $1\sigma$  in the presence of the Union3 dataset. The results for DESI+DESY5 and DESI+CC+DESY5 are also similar to the earlier case with Pan+ and Union3. Hence, this implies again an evidence of interaction together with an energy transfer from DE to DM at slightly more than  $1\sigma$ . We also notice that CC dataset does not add any constraining power, since the constraints from DESI+SNIa and DESI+CC+SNIa are almost identical for all the SNIa datasets (see the upper graph of Fig. 1).

Finally, we mention here that the inclusion of CMB with DESI and other datasets, significantly affects the resulting picture (note that since in our model we exclude baryons, as we focus on the universe dark sectors, during the analyses with CMB we considered the approximation where  $\Omega_{\text{m},0} \sim \Omega_{\text{dm},0}$ ). We find that the inclusion of CMB reduces the mean value of  $\delta_0$  regardless of

<sup>2</sup> As argued in Ref. [94], CMB shift parameter may serve as a robust alternative of CMB full data, providing consistent and unbiased constraints.

<sup>3</sup> <https://github.com/dfm/emcee>

<sup>4</sup> <https://github.com/cmbant/getdist>




Figure 1. One-dimensional marginalized posterior distributions and two-dimensional joint contours of the model parameters considering various datasets without CMB (upper graph) and with CMB (lower graph). The horizontal and the vertical dotted lines displayed in both graphs correspond to  $\delta_0 = 0$  (no-interaction). Since the constrained values of  $H_0$  and  $\delta_0$  are significantly high for the datasets in presence of Pan+(S), for presentation improvement we have omitted them from the main plot, as their inclusion renders the variations across different datasets negligible.




Figure 2. Whisker plot of  $\delta_0$ , with the 68% CL constraints, for various datasets used in our analysis.

the other datasets, and  $\delta_0$  is shifted towards zero (see the lower graph of Fig. 1), hence only for Pan+(S) and DESYS5 we obtain evidence of interaction. In particular, CMB+DESI+CC+DESYS5 exhibits an evidence of interaction at  $\sim 2\sigma$  with  $\delta_0 > 0$ , hence suggesting an energy flow from DE to DM. On the other hand, in presence of Pan+(S) with CMB the evidence of interaction is triggered, and our earlier explanation regarding the Cepheid calibrators hold in this case too.

We close this section by performing a statistical comparison of the interacting dark energy scenario with the standard non-interacting case, namely the  $\Lambda$ CDM paradigm, applying the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) [97], the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [98],<sup>5</sup> and the Bayesian evidence analysis quantified through  $\ln Z$  [99]. The level of support for the model is assessed using  $\Delta\text{AIC}$ . If  $\Delta\text{AIC} < 2$  (especially  $< 0$ ), the model is strongly favored; between 4 and 7 indicates less support, and when  $\Delta\text{AIC} > 10$  suggests no support for the model over the reference model [100]. Additionally,  $\Delta\text{BIC}$  is used to assess the strength of evidence: values  $< 2$  provide no distinguishable evidence,  $2 < \Delta\text{BIC} < 6$  suggest mild to positive evidence,  $6 < \Delta\text{BIC} < 10$  suggest strong evidence, and values  $> 10$  provide very strong evidence, increasing the likelihood of rejecting the given model in favor of the reference model [101]. Finally, for Bayesian evidence analysis we employ

<sup>5</sup> The AIC is defined as:  $\text{AIC} \equiv -2 \ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} + 2k$ , while the BIC is given by  $\text{BIC} \equiv -2 \ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} + k \ln N$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ ,  $k$  and  $N$  represent the maximum likelihood of the model, the number of free parameters and the total number of data points, respectively.

Dataset	Model	$\chi^2_{\min}$	$\Delta\chi^2_{\min}$	AIC	$\Delta\text{AIC}$	BIC	$\Delta\text{BIC}$	$\ln Z$	$\Delta \ln Z$
DESI+CC+Pan+ (S)	Our-model	1552.10	-20.24	1558.10	-18.24	1574.30	-12.84	-788.929	-6.504
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1572.34	-	1576.34	-	1587.14	-	-795.433	-
DESI+CC+Pan+	Our-model	1428.24	-3.2	1436.24	-1.2	1457.84	4.2	-729.843	1.094
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1431.44	-	1437.44	-	1453.64	-	-728.749	-
DESI+CC+Union3	Our-model	52.12	-3.13	58.12	-1.13	64.82	1.11	-37.176	1.658
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	55.25	-	59.25	-	63.72	-	-35.518	-
DESI+CC+DESY5	Our-model	1697.40	-1.3	1703.40	0.70	1720.01	6.23	-860.866	2.390
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1698.70	-	1702.70	-	1713.78	-	-858.476	-
CMB+DESI+CC+Pan+ (S)	Our-model	1576.81	-56.81	1582.81	-54.51	1599.01	-49.41	-804.261	-21.995
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1633.62	-	1637.62	-	1648.42	-	-826.256	-
CMB+DESI+CC+Pan+	Our-model	1431.50	-0.03	1439.50	1.97	1461.11	7.37	-734.794	5.956
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1431.53	-	1437.53	-	1453.74	-	-728.838	-
CMB+DESI+CC+Union3	Our-model	55.26	0.01	61.26	2.01	68.01	4.27	-41.995	5.947
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	55.25	-	59.25	-	63.74	-	-36.048	-
CMB+DESI+CC+DESY5	Our-model	1698.42	-4.34	1704.42	-2.34	1721.032	3.20	-864.630	3.976
	$\Lambda\text{CDM}$	1702.76	-	1706.76	-	1717.83	-	-860.654	-

Table III. Summary of  $\Delta\chi^2_{\min}$ ,  $\Delta\text{XIC}$  ( $X = \text{A or B}$ ),  $\ln Z$  for several combined datasets. Negative values of  $\Delta\chi^2_{\min}$ ,  $\Delta\text{XIC}$ , and  $\Delta \ln Z$  indicate that the interacting dark energy scenario is preferred over the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  reference model.

the cosmological package `dynesty` [102] and we interpret the results using revised Jeffreys' scale [101]. A difference in log evidence  $|\Delta \ln Z| \lesssim 1$  indicates inconclusive results,  $1 \lesssim |\Delta \ln Z| \lesssim 3$  corresponds to a moderate evidence, and  $3 \lesssim |\Delta \ln Z| \lesssim 5$  indicates strong evidence.

We selected the combined datasets DESI+CC+SN and CMB+DESI+CC+SN, which include all the datasets together, in order to gain the maximal idea regarding support of the model with respect to the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  model. In Table III we show  $\Delta\chi^2_{\min} \equiv \chi^2_{\min}(\text{Model}) - \chi^2_{\min}(\Lambda\text{CDM})$ ;  $\Delta\text{XIC} \equiv \text{XIC}(\text{Model}) - \text{XIC}(\Lambda\text{CDM})$  where  $X$  stands for A and B; and  $\Delta \ln Z \equiv \ln Z(\Lambda\text{CDM}) - \ln Z(\text{Model})$ . Now, following the above convention, the interaction model provides a better fit over the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  if  $\Delta\chi^2_{\min} < 0$ ,  $\Delta\text{XIC} < 0$  and  $\ln Z < 0$ . As we see,  $\Delta\chi^2 < 0$  across all datasets ( $\Delta\chi^2_{\min} \sim 0.01$  for CMB+DESI+CC+Union3 is actually inconclusive according to the  $\chi^2$ -statistic), and hence this criterion is in favor of the interaction model over the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  paradigm. On the other hand, according to AIC, for some of the combined datasets the interaction is favored over  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  scenario, however according to the other two criteria  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  cosmology remains favored over the interacting scenario. It should be noted that the inclusion of SH0ES provides more stringent results in favor of interaction, while disfavoring  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ , a trend evident in current works, as noted in Ref. [103–107]. In summary, the above observational confrontation and model comparison puts a question mark on the overall selection between the interaction model and the  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  paradigm.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this letter we considered a general interacting scenario between DM and DE, quantified through the deviation from the standard scaling of the DM energy density,  $\rho_{\text{dm}} \propto a^{-3+\delta(a)}$  where  $\delta(a) = \text{const.}$  Considering the most basic interacting scenario in which DM is pressureless and DE is the vacuum energy density, we constrained the scenario employing the latest astronomical probes including CC, BAO from DESI DR2, SNIa datasets (Pan+, Union3, DESY5) and CMB distance prior from Planck 2018. According to our results, a mild interaction in the dark sector is suggested at more than  $1\sigma$  when DESI DR2 is added with the SNIa datasets. The inclusion of CC with DESI+SN does not add significant constraining power. However, the presence of CMB in the combined datasets with DESI affects the constraints. As we noticed, in presence of DESY5 an evidence of interaction in the dark sector at  $\sim 2\sigma$  is found, and this evidence increases quite significantly in presence of Pan+(S). However, comparison with  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  scenario through AIC, BIC and Bayesian analysis, reveals a mixed picture, where for some datasets AIC favors the interaction but the other two criteria favor  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$  cosmology, while some other datasets, such as the cases with Pan+(S), always favor interaction over  $\Lambda\text{CDM}$ .

Our results may reveal evidence of interaction in the dark sector. The evidence of interaction may increase once  $\delta(a)$  is considered to be time-varying, which is the most general case, or if a different interaction function is assumed [108, 109], or if DE is considered to be more general than simple vacuum energy. We mention that since the interaction may lead to an effective DM equation-

of-state parameter deviating from zero, which may lead to the possibility of a non-cold DM [110], the fact that DESI DR2 favors dynamical DE [81] perhaps leads to an evidence of interaction together with a non-cold DM. The question whether the dark sectors interact mutually remains open.

### Acknowledgments

SP acknowledges the support from the Department of Science and Technology (DST), Govt. of India under the Scheme “Fund for Improvement of S&T Infras-

structure (FIST)” (File No. SR/FST/MS-I/2019/41). ENS acknowledges the contribution of the LISA CosWG, and of COST Actions CA18108 “Quantum Gravity Phenomenology in the multi-messenger approach” and CA21136 “Addressing observational tensions in cosmology with systematics and fundamental physics (CosmoVerse)”. WY has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 12175096, and Liaoning Revitalization Talents Program under Grant no. XLYC1907098. We acknowledge the computing facility of the ICT Department of Presidency University, Kolkata.

- 
- [1] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 153001 (2021), [arXiv:2103.01183 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [2] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *New Astron. Rev.* **95**, 101659 (2022), [arXiv:2105.05208 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [3] N. Schöneberg, G. Franco Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Rept.* **984**, 1 (2022), [arXiv:2107.10291 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [4] E. Abdalla *et al.*, *JHEAp* **34**, 49 (2022), [arXiv:2203.06142 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [5] M. Kamionkowski and A. G. Riess, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **73**, 153 (2023), [arXiv:2211.04492 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Phys. Rept.* **509**, 167 (2011), [arXiv:1108.6266 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [7] Y. Akrami *et al.* (CANTATA), *Modified Gravity and Cosmology. An Update by the CANTATA Network*, edited by E. N. Saridakis, R. Lazkoz, V. Salzano, P. Vargas Moniz, S. Capozziello, J. Beltrán Jiménez, M. De Laurentis, and G. J. Olmo (Springer, 2021) [arXiv:2105.12582 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [8] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0603057](#).
- [9] Y.-F. Cai, E. N. Saridakis, M. R. Setare, and J.-Q. Xia, *Phys. Rept.* **493**, 1 (2010), [arXiv:0909.2776 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] L. Amendola, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 043501 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9904120](#).
- [11] L. Amendola and D. Tocchini-Valentini, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 043509 (2001), [arXiv:astro-ph/0011243](#).
- [12] A. P. Billyard and A. A. Coley, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 083503 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9908224](#).
- [13] W. Zimdahl and D. Pavon, *Phys. Lett. B* **521**, 133 (2001), [arXiv:astro-ph/0105479](#).
- [14] C. Wetterich, *Astron. Astrophys.* **301**, 321 (1995), [arXiv:hep-th/9408025](#).
- [15] L. Amendola, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 043511 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/9908023](#).
- [16] R.-G. Cai and A. Wang, *JCAP* **03**, 002 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0411025](#).
- [17] S. del Campo, R. Herrera, and D. Pavon, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 021302 (2008), [arXiv:0806.2116 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [18] L. P. Chimento, A. S. Jakubi, D. Pavon, and W. Zimdahl, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 083513 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0303145](#).
- [19] J. D. Barrow and T. Clifton, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 103520 (2006), [arXiv:gr-qc/0604063](#).
- [20] L. Amendola, G. Camargo Campos, and R. Rosenfeld, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 083506 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0610806](#).
- [21] S. del Campo, R. Herrera, and D. Pavon, *JCAP* **01**, 020 (2009), [arXiv:0812.2210 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [22] J.-H. He and B. Wang, *JCAP* **06**, 010 (2008), [arXiv:0801.4233 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [23] X.-m. Chen, Y.-g. Gong, and E. N. Saridakis, *JCAP* **04**, 001 (2009), [arXiv:0812.1117 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [24] S. Basilakos and M. Plionis, *Astron. Astrophys.* **507**, 47 (2009), [arXiv:0807.4590 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [25] M. B. Gavela, D. Hernandez, L. Lopez Honorez, O. Mena, and S. Rigolin, *JCAP* **07**, 034 (2009), [Erratum: *JCAP* 05, E01 (2010)], [arXiv:0901.1611 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [26] M. Jamil, E. N. Saridakis, and M. R. Setare, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 023007 (2010), [arXiv:0910.0822 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] S. Z. W. Lip, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 023528 (2011), [arXiv:1009.4942 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [28] X.-m. Chen, Y. Gong, E. N. Saridakis, and Y. Gong, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **53**, 469 (2014), [arXiv:1111.6743 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [29] W. Yang and L. Xu, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 083517 (2014), [arXiv:1401.1286 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [30] V. Faraoni, J. B. Dent, and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 063510 (2014), [arXiv:1405.7288 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [31] V. Salvatelli, N. Said, M. Bruni, A. Melchiorri, and D. Wands, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 181301 (2014), [arXiv:1406.7297 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [32] W. Yang and L. Xu, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 083532 (2014), [arXiv:1409.5533 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [33] S. Pan, S. Bhattacharya, and S. Chakraborty, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **452**, 3038 (2015), [arXiv:1210.0396 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [34] R. C. Nunes, S. Pan, and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 023508 (2016), [arXiv:1605.01712 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [35] W. Yang, H. Li, Y. Wu, and J. Lu, *JCAP* **10**, 007 (2016), [arXiv:1608.07039 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] A. Mukherjee and N. Banerjee, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **34**, 035016 (2017), [arXiv:1610.04419 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [37] R.-G. Cai, N. Tamanini, and T. Yang, *JCAP* **05**, 031 (2017), [arXiv:1703.07323 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [38] W. Yang, S. Pan, and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 043529 (2018), arXiv:1706.04953 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] L. Santos, W. Zhao, E. G. M. Ferreira, and J. Quintin, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 103529 (2017), arXiv:1707.06827 [astro-ph.CO].
- [40] S. Pan, A. Mukherjee, and N. Banerjee, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **477**, 1189 (2018), arXiv:1710.03725 [astro-ph.CO].
- [41] X. Xu, Y.-Z. Ma, and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 083504 (2018), arXiv:1710.03643 [astro-ph.CO].
- [42] W. Yang, S. Pan, R. Herrera, and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043517 (2018), arXiv:1808.01669 [gr-qc].
- [43] R. von Martens, L. Casarini, D. F. Mota, and W. Zimdahl, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **23**, 100248 (2019), arXiv:1807.11380 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] S. Pan, W. Yang, C. Singha, and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 083539 (2019), arXiv:1903.10969 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] C. Li, X. Ren, M. Khurshudyan, and Y.-F. Cai, *Phys. Lett. B* **801**, 135141 (2020), arXiv:1904.02458 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] S. Pan, W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 103520 (2019), arXiv:1907.07540 [astro-ph.CO].
- [47] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, B. Wang, and A. Wang, *JCAP* **05**, 050 (2020), arXiv:1904.11980 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] W. Yang, S. Vagnozzi, E. Di Valentino, R. C. Nunes, S. Pan, and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **07**, 037 (2019), arXiv:1905.08286 [astro-ph.CO].
- [49] W. Khyllap, J. Dutta, S. Basilakos, and E. N. Saridakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 043511 (2022), arXiv:2111.01268 [gr-qc].
- [50] S. Halder, S. D. Odintsov, S. Pan, T. Saha, and E. N. Saridakis, (2024), arXiv:2411.18300 [gr-qc].
- [51] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 121302 (2015), arXiv:1507.06646 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 103511 (2017), arXiv:1702.02143 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] N. Khosravi, S. Baghram, N. Afshordi, and N. Altamirano, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 103526 (2019), arXiv:1710.09366 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] E. Mörtzell and S. Dhawan, *JCAP* **09**, 025 (2018), arXiv:1801.07260 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] R.-Y. Guo, J.-F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **02**, 054 (2019), arXiv:1809.02340 [astro-ph.CO].
- [56] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, E. N. Saridakis, and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 043543 (2019), arXiv:1810.05141 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] C. D. Kreisch, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, and O. Doré, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 123505 (2020), arXiv:1902.00534 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] M. Martinelli, N. B. Hogg, S. Peirone, M. Bruni, and D. Wands, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **488**, 3423 (2019), arXiv:1902.10694 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] K. L. Pandey, T. Karwal, and S. Das, *JCAP* **07**, 026 (2020), arXiv:1902.10636 [astro-ph.CO].
- [60] K. Vattis, S. M. Koushiappas, and A. Loeb, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 121302 (2019), arXiv:1903.06220 [astro-ph.CO].
- [61] P. Agrawal, F.-Y. Cyr-Racine, D. Pinner, and L. Randall, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **42**, 101347 (2023), arXiv:1904.01016 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] W. Yang, S. Pan, S. Vagnozzi, E. Di Valentino, D. F. Mota, and S. Capozziello, *JCAP* **11**, 044 (2019), arXiv:1907.05344 [astro-ph.CO].
- [63] A. Pourtsidou and T. Tram, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 043518 (2016), arXiv:1604.04222 [astro-ph.CO].
- [64] R. An, C. Feng, and B. Wang, *JCAP* **02**, 038 (2018), arXiv:1711.06799 [astro-ph.CO].
- [65] E. Di Valentino and S. Bridle, *Symmetry* **10**, 585 (2018).
- [66] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, and S. K. Yadav, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 576 (2019), arXiv:1903.04865 [astro-ph.CO].
- [67] Y. L. Bolotin, A. Kostenko, O. A. Lemets, and D. A. Yerokhin, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **24**, 1530007 (2014), arXiv:1310.0085 [astro-ph.CO].
- [68] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavon, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 096901 (2016), arXiv:1603.08299 [astro-ph.CO].
- [69] K. Lodha *et al.*, (2025), arXiv:2503.14743 [astro-ph.CO].
- [70] C. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Yuan, T.-J. Zhang, and Y.-C. Sun, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **14**, 1221 (2014), arXiv:1207.4541 [astro-ph.CO].
- [71] D. Stern, R. Jimenez, L. Verde, M. Kamionkowski, and S. A. Stanford, *JCAP* **02**, 008 (2010), arXiv:0907.3149 [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] R. Jimenez, L. Verde, T. Treu, and D. Stern, *Astrophys. J.* **593**, 622 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0302560.
- [73] M. Moresco, L. Verde, L. Pozzetti, R. Jimenez, and A. Cimatti, *JCAP* **07**, 053 (2012), arXiv:1201.6658 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] J. Simon, L. Verde, and R. Jimenez, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 123001 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412269.
- [75] N. Borghi, M. Moresco, and A. Cimatti, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **928**, L4 (2022), arXiv:2110.04304 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] K. Jiao, N. Borghi, M. Moresco, and T.-J. Zhang, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **265**, 48 (2023), arXiv:2205.05701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] M. Moresco, L. Pozzetti, A. Cimatti, R. Jimenez, C. Maraston, L. Verde, D. Thomas, A. Citro, R. Tojeiro, and D. Wilkinson, *JCAP* **05**, 014 (2016), arXiv:1601.01701 [astro-ph.CO].
- [78] E. Tomasetti, M. Moresco, N. Borghi, K. Jiao, A. Cimatti, L. Pozzetti, A. C. Carnall, R. J. McLure, and L. Pentericci, *Astron. Astrophys.* **679**, A96 (2023), arXiv:2305.16387 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] M. Moresco, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, L16 (2015), arXiv:1503.01116 [astro-ph.CO].
- [80] A. L. Ratsimbazafy, S. I. Loubser, S. M. Crawford, C. M. Cress, B. A. Bassett, R. C. Nichol, and P. Väisänen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **467**, 3239 (2017), arXiv:1702.00418 [astro-ph.CO].
- [81] M. Abdul Karim *et al.* (DESI), “DESI DR2 Results II: Measurements of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Cosmological Constraints,” (2025), arXiv:2503.14738 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] D. Scolnic *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 113 (2022), arXiv:2112.03863 [astro-ph.CO].
- [83] D. Brout *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **938**, 110 (2022), arXiv:2202.04077 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] C.-G. Park, J. de Cruz Pérez, and B. Ratra, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 123533 (2024), arXiv:2405.00502 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] A. G. Riess *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] D. Rubin *et al.*, “Union Through UNITY: Cosmology with 2,000 SNe Using a Unified Bayesian Framework,”

- (2023), [arXiv:2311.12098 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [87] T. M. C. Abbott *et al.* (DES), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **973**, L14 (2024), [arXiv:2401.02929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [88] M. Hicken, P. Challis, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, T. Matheson, M. Modjaz, A. Rest, and W. M. Wood-Vasey, *Astrophys. J.* **700**, 331 (2009), [arXiv:0901.4787 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [89] M. Hicken *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **200**, 12 (2012), [arXiv:1205.4493 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [90] K. Krisciunas *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **154**, 211 (2017), [arXiv:1709.05146 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [91] R. J. Foley *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **475**, 193 (2018), [arXiv:1711.02474 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [92] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [93] L. Chen, Q.-G. Huang, and K. Wang, *JCAP* **02**, 028 (2019), [arXiv:1808.05724 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [94] Z. Zhai, C.-G. Park, Y. Wang, and B. Ratra, *JCAP* **07**, 009 (2020), [arXiv:1912.04921 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [95] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **125**, 306 (2013), [arXiv:1202.3665 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [96] A. Lewis, (2019), [arXiv:1910.13970 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [97] H. Akaike, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19**, 716 (1974).
- [98] G. Schwarz, *The Annals of Statistics* **6**, 461 (1978).
- [99] R. Trotta, *Contemp. Phys.* **49**, 71 (2008), [arXiv:0803.4089 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [100] K. Burnham and D. Anderson, *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach* (Springer New York, 2003).
- [101] R. E. Kass and A. E. Raftery, *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* **90**, 773 (1995).
- [102] J. S. Speagle, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493**, 3132 (2020), [arXiv:1904.02180 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [103] S. Pan, W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, A. Shafieloo, and S. Chakraborty, *JCAP* **06**, 062 (2020), [arXiv:1907.12551 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [104] E. Di Valentino, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, S. Pan, and W. Yang, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **502**, L23 (2021), [arXiv:2011.00283 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [105] W. Yang, S. Pan, E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, and A. Melchiorri, *JCAP* **10**, 008 (2021), [arXiv:2101.03129 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [106] O. Akarsu, A. De Felice, E. Di Valentino, S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, E. Özlüker, J. A. Vazquez, and A. Yadav, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 103527 (2024), [arXiv:2406.07526 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [107] M. A. Sabogal, E. Silva, R. C. Nunes, S. Kumar, and E. Di Valentino, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 043531 (2025), [arXiv:2501.10323 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [108] R. Shah, P. Mukherjee, and S. Pal, “Interacting dark sectors in light of DESI DR2,” (2025), [arXiv:2503.21652 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [109] E. Silva, M. A. Sabogal, M. S. Souza, R. C. Nunes, E. Di Valentino, and S. Kumar, “New Constraints on Interacting Dark Energy from DESI DR2 BAO Observations,” (2025), [arXiv:2503.23225 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [110] S. Pan, W. Yang, E. Di Valentino, D. F. Mota, and J. Silk, *JCAP* **07**, 064 (2023), [arXiv:2211.11047 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).