

A new method to determine H_0 from cosmological energy-density measurements

Alex Krolewski* and Will J. Percival

*Waterloo Centre for Astrophysics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada and
Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St. North, Waterloo, ON NL2 2Y5, Canada*

Alex Woodfinden

*Waterloo Centre for Astrophysics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada and
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada
(Dated: March 29, 2024)*

We introduce a new method for measuring the Hubble parameter from low-redshift large-scale observations that is independent of the comoving sound horizon. The method uses the baryon-to-photon ratio determined by the primordial deuterium abundance, together with Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) calculations and the present-day CMB temperature to determine the physical baryon density $\Omega_b h^2$. The baryon fraction Ω_b/Ω_m is measured using the relative amplitude of the baryonic signature in galaxy clustering measured by the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey, scaling the physical baryon density to the physical matter density. The physical density $\Omega_m h^2$ is then compared with the geometrical density Ω_m from Alcock-Paczynski measurements from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and voids, to give H_0 . Including type Ia supernovae and uncalibrated BAO, we measure $H_0 = 67.1_{-5.3}^{+6.3} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. We find similar results when varying analysis choices, such as measuring the baryon signature from the reconstructed correlation function, or excluding supernovae or voids. This measurement is currently consistent with both the distance-ladder and CMB H_0 determinations, but near-future large-scale structure surveys will obtain $3\text{--}4\times$ tighter constraints.

INTRODUCTION

The standard model in cosmology, flat Λ CDM, has been the benchmark for the last 25 years. Recently, however, tensions have started to appear between the parameters of the model as measured from different data. The strongest of these tensions is that the H_0 measurements from Cepheid variables [1] disagree with those from the CMB [2] or Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO) data [3] analysed together with Big Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) measurements. It is imperative to understand tensions such as these in case they require extensions to the standard flat Λ CDM model.

The Hubble constant is an absolute quantity with units of inverse time and therefore needs to be constrained by an absolute measurement, which for distance ladder measurements typically comes from geometrical measurements of the distance to the LMC (e.g. [4]). For the CMB or BAO measurements, this comes from the CMB temperature. Relative measurements of Cepheid brightness as a function of redshift, or of angular anisotropies in the CMB, then allow us to convert these absolute measurements to a measurement of H_0 . The CMB temperature is extremely well-measured, $T_\gamma = 2.7255 \pm 0.00057$ [5], and the shift required to solve the Hubble tension is too large to be viable (e.g. [6])

The most accurate way of measuring H_0 from CMB and large scale structure is by using the sound horizon as a standard ruler. The comoving sound horizon at the baryon drag epoch, r_d , is extremely well-determined in the standard cosmological model, with the

absolute baseline set by the CMB temperature. But unlike the distance-ladder measurements, this requires an assumption on the cosmological model. Therefore, a promising way to raise H_0 from CMB and LSS is by modifying the cosmological model around recombination, decreasing the sound horizon and increasing H_0 [7–9]. One model that accomplishes this is Early Dark Energy (EDE), which posits the existence of an additional scalar field in the early Universe, leading to an increase in the expansion rate around the baryon drag epoch [10, 11].

We present a new method to measure H_0 comparing low redshift physical and geometrical matter densities without having to model the sound horizon. This combines $\Omega_b h^2$ from the CMB temperature and light element abundances together with the baryon fraction Ω_b/Ω_m from the amplitude of the baryon signal in the power spectrum. As discussed in [12], this is a robust measurement that directly depends on the relative densities of baryons and cold dark matter. Finally, adding a geometrical measurement of the matter density Ω_m from the Alcock-Paczynski (AP) effect, uncalibrated standard rulers, and uncalibrated standard candles is sufficient to form a new measurement of H_0 . To improve the information coming from the AP effect, measurements from cosmological voids can be included [13, 14]. This signal has previously been included in other fits to galaxy clustering data [15, 16], and there have been previous attempts to remove the dependence on the sound horizon, marginalising over r_s [17–21]. However, these H_0 measurements use the matter power spectrum turnover, which occurs at the matter-radiation equality scale; since

EDE alters the shape of the power spectrum, these measurements are potentially unable to rule out EDE despite the sound horizon freedom [22, 23]). We provide a new method that extracts the amplitude of the baryon signal, sacrificing signal-to-noise for simplicity of the underlying physics.

We apply this new method to data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey [24] Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) sample [25]. We include the measurements of the baryon fraction made in our companion paper [12] and AP measurements from voids from [14]. The method is discussed in more detail in the next section, and then we consider our results, ending with a discussion and a look forward to the improved large-scale structure measurements due from the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI [26]) and Euclid satellite [27].

THE HUBBLE CONSTANT FROM GALAXY SURVEYS USING ENERGY DENSITIES

The relative density of baryons in the galaxy clustering signal is usually marginalised in any BAO measurement, as the cosmological constraints it provides are weak compared with those from the CMB. However, the amplitude can be separated from other measurements and depends on the properties of the Universe in an exceptionally clean way. To see this, consider the combined baryon+CDM transfer function

$$T(k) = \frac{\Omega_b}{\Omega_{bc}} T_b(k) + \frac{\Omega_c}{\Omega_{bc}} T_c(k). \quad (1)$$

where Ω_{bc} is the total matter density excluding massive neutrinos. The physics of the relative weighting of the baryon (T_b) and CDM (T_c) transfer functions is simply that the growth of structure responds to both components proportional to the energy-density in each. The baryon transfer function can be approximated

$$T_b(k) = \alpha_b \frac{\sin(kr_d)}{kr_d} \mathcal{D}(\parallel), \quad (2)$$

in the small-scale limit $ks \gg 1$ [28]. $\mathcal{D}(\parallel)$ represents the effects of Silk damping, and α_b is a suppression factor arising from the adiabatic decrease in the sound speed, the growth suppression between matter-radiation equality and the drag epoch before velocities decay due to cosmological expansion (see equations 14 & 15 in [28], also [29]). For cosmological models close to the Planck best-fit, α_b is very close to constant, independent of $\Omega_m h^2$ (we investigate this further in [12]). Thus, T_b has a very different form than T_c , such that the fraction of the clustering signal seen in galaxy surveys resulting from T_b can be measured, and provides a relatively clean measurement of Ω_b/Ω_m , which crucially does not depend on r_d . We present extensive tests on N -body mocks, and noiseless theory vectors in both Λ CDM and EDE cosmologies in [12].

This leads to a new method to measure the Hubble parameter, which can be understood as follows: we start with the CMB temperature, which provides a strong (absolute) constraint on the present-day physical photon density $\epsilon_{\gamma,0} \propto \Omega_{\gamma,0} h^2$. Observations of primordial deuterium abundances together with BBN calculations tell us the photon-to-baryon ratio, while the amplitude of the baryonic signal constrains the baryon-to-matter density. The AP measurements from BAO and voids constrain the matter density relative to the critical density $\Omega_{m,0} \equiv \epsilon_{m,0}/\epsilon_{c,0}$ from geometrical considerations at low redshift.

Together, the four observations constrain the Hubble parameter. The method relies on having a Universe in which the CMB is a blackbody, BBN acts as expected such that the relative abundances can be used to constrain the baryon-to-radiation ratio, and the structure in the matter field depends on the baryon and CDM components in proportion to their relative densities. We also assume that the BAO and voids are isotropic, the BAO (SNe) are standard rulers (standardizable candles), the Universe is flat, and the dark energy is a cosmological constant, to convert the AP measurements to measurements of Ω_m . We consider the amount of curvature and dynamical dark energy required to affect this measurement later. The BAO amplitude constrains the ratio of the baryon and CDM densities (since galaxy clustering responds to the power spectrum of matter perturbations, excluding neutrinos, rather than all matter [30]) whereas the geometric measurements of Ω_m are also sensitive to the small density of non-relativistic massive neutrinos Ω_ν . However, the variation in $\sum m_\nu$ required to affect this measurement is large compared to current uncertainties [2, 3, 21, 31–33].

The method is summarised in Eq. 3

$$\frac{3c^2 H_0^2}{8\pi G} = \epsilon_c = \epsilon_{\gamma,0} \times \frac{\epsilon_{b,0}}{\epsilon_{\gamma,0}} \times \frac{\epsilon_{m,0}}{\epsilon_{b,0}} \times \frac{1}{\Omega_{m,0}}. \quad (3)$$

The first term on the right hand side of this expression comes from the CMB temperature, the second from BBN, the third from the amplitude of the baryon signal and the fourth from the AP effect.

MEASUREMENTS

Between 2009 and 2014, the BOSS survey measured redshifts for 1.4 million galaxies across $\sim 10,000$ deg² and publicly released large-scale structure catalogues, N -body mocks, and clustering measurements at $0.2 < z < 0.75$ [34, 35]. As detailed in [12], we added a parameter quantifying the amplitude of the baryon signature to two kinds of existing models: template-based models of the power spectrum typically used to make BAO measurements [36], fitted to data both before and after BAO reconstruction [37]; and the effective field the-

ory of large scale structure models of [15, 38]. These methods are quite complementary: they use different galaxy statistics (correlation function vs. power spectrum); make different assumptions about the broadband (i.e. non-BAO) power spectrum (fully modelling it within Λ CDM vs. using a fixed-cosmology template with empirical polynomial terms to account for broadband variations); and make different assumptions about the galaxy bias parameters. Nevertheless, we find that they give very consistent constraints on the baryon fraction, $f_b = 0.173 \pm 0.029$ (0.153 ± 0.029) from the post-reconstruction (pre-reconstruction) correlation function fit with the template model, and $f_b = 0.154 \pm 0.023$ from the EFT fits. Based on fits to N -body simulations and noiseless theory vectors in EDE cosmologies, we place a systematic error on f_b of 0.013 [12].

We use the full-shape fits as our baseline results since the model is more flexible and applicable in a wider range of situations. This choice does in principle reduce the expected precision of the BAO amplitude from the post-reconstruction correlation function, in which the BAO amplitude is sharpened. However, in practice, the full-shape constraints on data from the unreconstructed power spectrum are actually tighter (though they are similar to the post-reconstruction constraints on mocks), and the post-reconstruction template fits only provide $\sim 10\%$ tighter precision on the baryon fraction than the pre-reconstruction template fits. When quoting the pre-reconstruction results, we always combine with the best available standard ruler measurements using reconstruction.

We use uncalibrated BAO measurements made by the BOSS team on the combination of the post-reconstruction correlation function and power spectrum [35, 39, 40]. We use their best-fit combined α_{\parallel} and α_{\perp} measurements (see Eqs. 21–23 in [35]), and add the sound horizon r_d as an extra parameter which is marginalised over in our parameter fits, so we only include relative measurements. A wide redshift range significantly increases the constraining power of uncalibrated BAO on Ω_m [41–44], and hence we also use isotropic BAO measurements from the SDSS Main Galaxy Survey (MGS) at $z = 0.15$ [45]; D_M and D_H measurements from eBOSS quasars at $z = 1.48$ [3, 46, 47]; and D_M and D_H at $z = 2.334$ from the eBOSS Ly α forest autocorrelation and cross-correlation with quasars [48].

We use the void isotropy measurements presented in [14] for MGS at $0.07 < z < 0.2$ and BOSS at $0.2 < z < 0.6$. We do not use their highest-redshift measurement, which combines BOSS and eBOSS at $0.6 < z < 1.0$, because we cannot measure the covariance between this measurement at the galaxy power spectrum at $0.5 < z < 0.75$, due to the lack of simulations with suitable geometry.

In our baseline analysis, we add supernova constraints using the Pantheon+ measurement of $\Omega_m = 0.334 \pm 0.018$

as an external prior (or representing the supernova likelihood as a 2D or 3D gridded prior on (Ω_m, Ω_k) or (Ω_m, w_0, w_a) in models with curvature or varying dark energy equation of state) [49]. For the extended models, we use the publicly available Pantheon+ chains. [50] More recent measurements from Union3 ($\Omega_m = 0.36 \pm 0.03$) [51] or DES ($\Omega_m = 0.352 \pm 0.017$) [52] are modestly different from Pantheon+. However, replacing the Pantheon+ prior with a UNION or DES prior does not appreciably change our H_0 constraints.

We use the recent updated BBN recommendations of [53], $\Omega_b h^2 = 0.02218 \pm 0.0055$ (assuming the standard model value of $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$), which rely on measurements as compiled by the Particle Data Group [54] and nuclear rates from the PRyMordial code [55], which adds marginalization over nuclear reaction rate uncertainties. The observational measurements are challenging because the inferred abundances must be primordial, i.e. not contaminated by stellar production or destruction of helium and deuterium. The PDG uses the weighted mean of the 11 most precise deuterium abundances from quasar absorption systems [56–62] and the 6 best helium abundance measurements from extragalactic HII regions [63–68]. There are modest differences when using experimental or theoretical nuclear reaction rates, but the marginalization in PRyMordial comfortably encompasses both experimental and ab-initio results. Additional relativistic species ΔN_{eff} do not appreciably change the central value or uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties on the BBN measurement of $\Omega_b h^2$ are certainly quite formidable, particularly on the astrophysical side (perhaps leading to outlying Y_p measurements like [69]). However, they are completely subdominant to the uncertainties in Ω_m and Ω_b/Ω_m in our H_0 measurement.

The voids and galaxies overlap in redshift and thus have a nonzero covariance, which must be taken into account. We measure the covariance using 1000 Multi-Dark Patchy mocks [70]. For the template-based fits, we measure γ_B using our code for all 1000 pre or post-reconstruction mock correlation functions, and measure the covariance with the BOSS team’s 1000 fits combining post-reconstruction correlation function and power spectrum. We then re-scale the resulting covariance matrices to match the measured error on γ_B on data (which is slightly larger than the spread of the mocks, as described in [12]). We also measure the covariance with the void measurements using the void-finding pipeline of [71] applied to the 1000 Patchy mocks. The template-based fits thus consist of two stages, one in which γ_B , α_{\parallel} and α_{\perp} are measured from the correlation function on both data and the Patchy mocks, and another in which H_0 and Ω_m are inferred from these measurements and the mock-based covariance.

In the full-shape fits, we measure the covariance between the power spectrum multipoles $P_{\ell}(k)$ and the AP parameters from both galaxies and voids. An additional

Data Combination	f_b	Ω_m	H_0
Full Shape $P(k)$	0.153 ± 0.026	0.313 ± 0.012	$67.1^{+6.3}_{-5.3}$
Post-Reconstruction Template $\xi(r)$	0.170 ± 0.030	0.312 ± 0.012	$64.8^{+6.6}_{-5.7}$
Pre-Reconstruction Template $\xi(r)$	0.153 ± 0.032	0.312 ± 0.012	$68.3^{+8.4}_{-6.7}$
Full Shape $P(k)$ + UNION SNe	0.153 ± 0.026	0.310 ± 0.014	$67.6^{+6.1}_{-5.6}$
Full Shape $P(k)$ + DES SNe	0.153 ± 0.026	0.323 ± 0.012	$66.1^{+6.1}_{-5.4}$
Full Shape $P(k)$ + no SNe	0.153 ± 0.026	0.296 ± 0.015	$69.1^{+6.1}_{-5.6}$
Full Shape $P(k)$ + no voids	0.154 ± 0.026	0.279 ± 0.015	$70.9^{+6.6}_{-5.8}$
Full Shape $P(k)$ + BOSS only	0.150 ± 0.026	0.385 ± 0.035	$61.0^{+6.1}_{-5.5}$
Post-Reconstruction Template $\xi(r) + w_0 w_a$	0.175 ± 0.030	$0.260^{+0.039}_{-0.054}$	$71.0^{+11.0}_{-7.7}$
Post-Reconstruction Template $\xi(r) + \Omega_k$	0.175 ± 0.030	$0.273^{+0.021}_{-0.018}$	$68.4^{+7.3}_{-5.8}$

TABLE I. H_0 constraints in $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ from the signature of baryons, uncalibrated BAO positions and supernovae, and BBN. The fiducial H_0 constraint is the top (shaded) row. The errors on f_b and H_0 include the estimated systematic error of 0.013 in f_b or $2.9 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ in H_0 , added in quadrature. The next rows show various changes to the baryon amplitude measurement, the geometrical datasets, or the late-time expansion history, as explained in the text.

complication is that the power spectra are split between the North Galactic Cap and the South Galactic Cap (owing to the slightly different galaxy selection and thus bias parameters in the two regions), but the AP parameters are measured on the combined sample. However, all of these quantities can be measured on mocks and the covariance directly computed, similar to [72].

We use the MCMC samplers `cobaya` [73, 74] for the template fits and `MontePython` [75, 76] for the full-shape fits. Due to the dramatically faster likelihood evaluation times, we run the template fits to Gelman-Rubin $R-1=0.01$ [77] and the full-shape fits to Gelman-Rubin $R-1=0.05$, but we verify in both cases that our results are consistent to stopping at slightly higher values of $R-1=0.05$ or 0.1 . We analyze the resulting chains with `GetDist` [78].

RESULTS

In our baseline results, combining the amplitude of the baryonic signature, BBN, uncalibrated standard rulers, and type Ia supernovae, we find $H_0 = 67.1^{+6.3}_{-5.3}$, including the systematic error budget on f_b . The statistical errors alone give $H_0 = 67.1^{+5.6}_{-4.4} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ with an additional systematic error of $\pm 2.9 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ (Fig. 1 and Table I). The systematic error is derived from the estimated systematic error on f_b , scaling to H_0 since the f_b errors dominate the errors on Ω_m or $\Omega_b h^2$. Our result is robust to changing the method used to measure the baryon fraction: we find a very similar result using the template fit for the pre-reconstruction correlation function, though with a slightly larger error ($68.3^{+8.4}_{-6.7} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$); and a 0.5σ shift towards lower H_0 after reconstruction ($64.8^{+6.6}_{-5.7} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$); in all cases systematic errors are added in quadrature. The difference between the full-shape and post-reconstruction results is consistent with the differences seen in N -body mocks [12].




FIG. 1. Constraints on H_0 (in $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$), Ω_m and $\Omega_b h^2$ from the combination of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis; uncalibrated standard rulers, voids, and Type Ia supernovae; and the amplitude of the baryonic signature in BOSS galaxy clustering. Three variations are shown corresponding to different methods for measuring the baryon fraction: using the EFT of Large Scale Structure on the pre-reconstruction power spectrum (blue); a damped exponential BAO model (with fixed power spectrum template) applied to the pre-reconstruction correlation function (gray); and the same model applied to the post-reconstruction correlation function (red). These contours show statistical errors only, without contribution from systematic errors.

Indeed, H_0 is more sensitive to the geometric dataset used to constrain Ω_m . Both the supernovae and voids prefer high Ω_m , whereas BAO prefers lower Ω_m (in this case, driven by the comparison

of BOSS galaxy and eBOSS Ly α distance measurements). While the supernovae measurements are in $\sim 1\sigma$ tension with each other, our result does not change much when using UNION (DES), changing to $67.6^{+6.1}_{-5.6} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ($66.1^{+6.1}_{-5.4} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$). Removing either supernovae or voids lowers Ω_m and thus raises H_0 to $69.1^{+6.1}_{-5.6} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ (no SNe) or $70.9^{+6.6}_{-5.8} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ (no voids). Finally, when using BOSS data only (including voids), Ω_m increases by nearly 2σ , leading to a very low H_0 value of $61.0^{+6.1}_{-5.5} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. The errors are dominated by the errors on f_b even when the Ω_m error triples when using BOSS data alone.

Finally, this measurement is sensitive to different models for the late-time expansion history. Adding curvature lowers Ω_m and weakens its constraint, but doesn't change H_0 significantly (to $68.4^{+7.3}_{-5.8} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$), a 20% increase in the error. A varying dark energy equation of state has a larger impact on H_0 , significantly weakening the constraint in a $w_0 + w_a$ cosmology to $71.0^{+11.0}_{-7.7} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. This is largely due to the degeneracy between the poorly constrained w_a and H_0 . While we do not explore the impact of varying the neutrino mass in this work, a minimum $\Sigma m_\nu = 0.06 \text{ eV}$ translates to $\Omega_\nu = 0.0013$. Using the 90% upper limit on Σm_ν from direct detection, 0.8 eV [33], Ω_ν is still a considerably smaller fraction of Ω_m (5%) than our f_b fractional error (15%) and thus will not substantially broaden the H_0 constraint.

DISCUSSION

Our H_0 measurement is consistent both with SH0ES ($73.04 \pm 1.04 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) [1] and Planck ($67.26 \pm 0.49 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) [31] (see also [32] and [2]). In Fig. 2, we compare to other sound horizon-free H_0 measurements from large-scale structure. [19], [22] and [79] infer cosmological parameters from the shape of the matter power spectrum, with explicit marginalization over the sound horizon. While they obtain tighter constraints on H_0 , these measurements are model-dependent; nonzero Early Dark Energy leads to a different power spectrum shape than in ΛCDM , shifting the H_0 constraint [22, 23]. In contrast, our measurement has larger errors, but is less model-dependent, as demonstrated in our companion paper [12]. For comparison, we also show results from an alternative local calibration of the distance ladder using the Tip of the Red Giant Branch rather than Cepheids. Refs. [80, 81] achieve H_0 precision of $\sim 2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, although with a fairly large discrepancy between the two results perhaps suggesting larger systematic errors.

While the current constraining power of this measurement is insufficient to resolve the Hubble tension, ongoing large-scale structure surveys will allow for significantly higher precision. DESI [26, 82] and Euclid [83]




FIG. 2. H_0 measurements (in $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) from Cepheids [1] and Planck CMB measurements assuming a flat ΛCDM cosmology [2], shown in the gray bands. The points show various measurements with minimal additional assumptions: those presented in this paper (red, at top, with fiducial measurement starred); other sound horizon free H_0 measurements from large-scale structure; and local H_0 measurements from the Tip of the Red Giant Branch. Our constraints on H_0 are currently weak and compatible with both the local and CMB/ ΛCDM measurements; but with DESI and Euclid, our method will have sufficient constraining power to differentiate Planck and SH0ES at $\sim 5\sigma$.

will both survey roughly ten times the effective volume of BOSS. We show in Fig. 2 the forecasted constraining power of these surveys, scaling our fiducial constraint by the square root of the effective volume (as demonstrated in the companion paper [12]) and centering at $70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. The systematic errors are dominated by prior effects from the large number of poorly constrained EFT parameters, and hence are expected to improve in tandem with the statistical errors.[84] If the systematics remain under control, the combination of DESI and Euclid could reach a precision of $1.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, sufficient to differentiate SH0ES and Planck at $\sim 5\sigma$. Moreover, sound horizon free measurements constraining H_0 from the turnover of the matter power spectrum will continue to improve [20]. The complementarity of these two large-scale structure measurements could yield intriguing hints about potential solutions to the Hubble tension, or put substantial pressure on currently-allowed models that can resolve the tension by shifting the sound horizon.

We thank Ashley Ross for useful conversations and for helping to dig out old data. AK was supported as a CITA National Fellow by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), funding reference #DIS-2022-568580. WP acknowledges support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of

Canada (NSERC), [funding reference number RGPIN-2019-03908] and from the Canadian Space Agency. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. This research was enabled in part by support provided by Compute Ontario (computeontario.ca) and the Digital Research Alliance of Canada (alliancecan.ca).

* alex.krolewski@uwaterloo.ca

- [1] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, G. S. Anand, L. Breuval, and et. al., *ApJ* **934**, L7 (2022), [arXiv:2112.04510 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04510).
- [2] Planck Collaboration, *A&A* **641**, A6 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06209).
- [3] S. Alam, M. Aubert, S. Avila, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, M. A. Bershad, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, A. S. Bolton, J. Bovy, and et. al., *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083533 (2021), [arXiv:2007.08991 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.08991).
- [4] G. Pietrzyński, D. Graczyk, W. Gieren, I. B. Thompson, B. Pilecki, A. Udalski, I. Soszyński, S. Kozłowski, P. Konorski, K. Suchomska, and et. al., *Nature* **495**, 76 (2013), [arXiv:1303.2063 \[astro-ph.GA\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.2063).
- [5] D. J. Fixsen, *ApJ* **707**, 916 (2009), [arXiv:0911.1955 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0911.1955).
- [6] M. M. Ivanov, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, and J. Lesgourgues, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063515 (2020), [arXiv:2005.10656 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.10656).
- [7] L. Knox and M. Millea, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 043533 (2020), [arXiv:1908.03663 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.03663).
- [8] K. Aylor, M. Joy, L. Knox, M. Millea, S. Raghunathan, and W. L. Kimmy Wu, *ApJ* **874**, 4 (2019), [arXiv:1811.00537 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.00537).
- [9] J. L. Bernal, L. Verde, and A. G. Riess, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2016**, 019 (2016), [arXiv:1607.05617 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.05617).
- [10] T. Karwal and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103523 (2016).
- [11] V. Poulin, T. L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 221301 (2019).
- [12] Krolewski, Alex and Percival, Will J., In preparation.
- [13] G. Lavaux and B. D. Wandelt, *ApJ* **754**, 109 (2012), [arXiv:1110.0345 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.0345).
- [14] A. Woodfinden, S. Nadathur, W. J. Percival, S. Radinovic, E. Massara, and H. A. Winther, *MNRAS* **516**, 4307 (2022), [arXiv:2205.06258 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.06258).
- [15] M. M. Ivanov, M. Simonović, and M. Zaldarriaga, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2020**, 042 (2020), [arXiv:1909.05277 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.05277).
- [16] T. Colas, G. d'Amico, L. Senatore, P. Zhang, and F. Beutler, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2020**, 001 (2020), [arXiv:1909.07951 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07951).
- [17] E. J. Baxter and B. D. Sherwin, *MNRAS* **501**, 1823 (2021), [arXiv:2007.04007 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.04007).
- [18] O. H. E. Philcox, B. D. Sherwin, G. S. Farren, and E. J. Baxter, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023538 (2021), [arXiv:2008.08084 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08084).
- [19] O. H. E. Philcox, G. S. Farren, B. D. Sherwin, E. J. Baxter, and D. J. Brout, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063530 (2022), [arXiv:2204.02984 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.02984).
- [20] G. S. Farren, O. H. E. Philcox, and B. D. Sherwin, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 063503 (2022), [arXiv:2112.10749 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.10749).
- [21] M. S. Madhavacheril, F. J. Qu, B. D. Sherwin, N. MacCrann, Y. Li, I. Abril-Cabezas, P. A. R. Ade, S. Aiola, T. Alford, M. Amiri, and et. al., *ApJ* **962**, 113 (2024), [arXiv:2304.05203 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05203).
- [22] T. L. Smith, V. Poulin, and T. Simon, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103525 (2023), [arXiv:2208.12992 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.12992).
- [23] J. A. Kable and V. Miranda, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2403.11916](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.11916) (2024), [arXiv:2403.11916 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.11916).
- [24] D. G. York, J. Adelman, J. Anderson, John E., S. F. Anderson, J. Annis, N. A. Bahcall, J. A. Bakken, R. Barkhouser, S. Bastian, E. Berman, and et. al., *AJ* **120**, 1579 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/0006396 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0006396).
- [25] K. S. Dawson, D. J. Schlegel, C. P. Ahn, S. F. Anderson, É. Aubourg, S. Bailey, R. H. Barkhouser, J. E. Bautista, A. Beifiori, A. A. Berlind, and et. al., *AJ* **145**, 10 (2013), [arXiv:1208.0022 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.0022).
- [26] DESI Collaboration, A. Aghamousa, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, L. E. Allen, C. Allende Prieto, J. Annis, S. Bailey, C. Balland, and et. al., *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:1611.00036](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.00036) (2016), [arXiv:1611.00036 \[astro-ph.IM\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.00036).
- [27] R. Laureijs, J. Amiaux, S. Arduini, J. L. Auguères, J. Brinchmann, R. Cole, M. Cropper, C. Dabin, L. Duvet, A. Ealet, and et. al., *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:1110.3193](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.3193) (2011), [arXiv:1110.3193 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.3193).
- [28] D. J. Eisenstein and W. Hu, *ApJ* **496**, 605 (1998), [arXiv:astro-ph/9709112 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9709112).
- [29] W. Hu and N. Sugiyama, *ApJ* **471**, 542 (1996), [arXiv:astro-ph/9510117 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9510117).
- [30] F. Villaescusa-Navarro, F. Marulli, M. Viel, E. Branchini, E. Castorina, E. Sefusatti, and S. Saito, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2014**, 011 (2014), [arXiv:1311.0866 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.0866).
- [31] E. Rosenberg, S. Gratton, and G. Efstathiou, *MNRAS* **517**, 4620 (2022), [arXiv:2205.10869 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10869).
- [32] M. Tristram, A. J. Banday, M. Douspis, X. Garrido, K. M. Górski, S. Henrot-Versillé, L. T. Hergt, S. Ilić, R. Keskitalo, G. Lagache, C. R. Lawrence, B. Partridge, and D. Scott, *A&A* **682**, A37 (2024), [arXiv:2309.10034 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10034).
- [33] M. Aker *et al.* (KATRIN), *Nature Phys.* **18**, 160 (2022), [arXiv:2105.08533 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.08533).
- [34] B. Reid, S. Ho, N. Padmanabhan, W. J. Percival, J. Tinker, R. Tojeiro, M. White, D. J. Eisenstein, C. Maraston, A. J. Ross, and et. al., *MNRAS* **455**, 1553 (2016), [arXiv:1509.06529 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.06529).
- [35] S. Alam, M. Ata, S. Bailey, F. Beutler, D. Bizyaev, J. A. Blazek, A. S. Bolton, J. R. Brownstein, A. Burden, C.-H. Chuang, and et. al., *MNRAS* **470**, 2617 (2017), [arXiv:1607.03155 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.03155).
- [36] H.-J. Seo, F. Beutler, A. J. Ross, and S. Saito, *MNRAS* **460**, 2453 (2016), [arXiv:1511.00663 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00663).
- [37] D. J. Eisenstein, H.-J. Seo, E. Sirko, and D. N. Spergel, *ApJ* **664**, 675 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0604362 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0604362).

- [38] A. Chudaykin, M. M. Ivanov, O. H. E. Philcox, and M. Simonović, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063533 (2020), [arXiv:2004.10607 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [39] A. J. Ross, F. Beutler, C.-H. Chuang, M. Pellejero-Ibanez, H.-J. Seo, M. Vargas-Magaña, A. J. Cuesta, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, A. G. Sánchez, and et. al., *MNRAS* **464**, 1168 (2017), [arXiv:1607.03145 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [40] F. Beutler, H.-J. Seo, A. J. Ross, P. McDonald, S. Saito, A. S. Bolton, J. R. Brownstein, C.-H. Chuang, A. J. Cuesta, D. J. Eisenstein, and et. al., *MNRAS* **464**, 3409 (2017), [arXiv:1607.03149 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [41] W. Lin, X. Chen, and K. J. Mack, *ApJ* **920**, 159 (2021), [arXiv:2102.05701 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [42] M. Blomqvist, H. du Mas des Bourboux, N. G. Busca, V. de Sainte Agathe, J. Rich, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, K. Dawson, A. Font-Ribera, J. Guy, and et. al., *A&A* **629**, A86 (2019), [arXiv:1904.03430 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [43] A. Cuceu, J. Farr, P. Lemos, and A. Font-Ribera, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2019**, 044 (2019), [arXiv:1906.11628 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [44] S. Brieden, H. Gil-Marín, and L. Verde, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2022**, 024 (2022), [arXiv:2204.11868 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [45] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden, and M. Manera, *MNRAS* **449**, 835 (2015), [arXiv:1409.3242 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [46] J. Hou, A. G. Sánchez, A. J. Ross, A. Smith, R. Neveux, J. Bautista, E. Burtin, C. Zhao, R. Scoccimarro, K. S. Dawson, and et. al., *MNRAS* **500**, 1201 (2021), [arXiv:2007.08998 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] R. Neveux, E. Burtin, A. de Mattia, A. Smith, A. J. Ross, J. Hou, J. Bautista, J. Brinkmann, C.-H. Chuang, K. S. Dawson, and et. al., *MNRAS* **499**, 210 (2020), [arXiv:2007.08999 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [48] H. du Mas des Bourboux, J. Rich, A. Font-Ribera, V. de Sainte Agathe, J. Farr, T. Etourneau, J.-M. Le Goff, A. Cuceu, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, and et. al., *ApJ* **901**, 153 (2020), [arXiv:2007.08995 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, A. Carr, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton, D. Jones, and et. al., *ApJ* **938**, 110 (2022), [arXiv:2202.04077 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [50] In detail, we measure the $\Omega_m - \Omega_k$ or $\Omega_m - w_0 - w_a$ priors from the “Pantheon+_{SH0ES}” chains, marginalizing over H_0 . The “Pantheon+_{only}” chains do not give consistent constraints on the dark energy equation of state parameters.
- [51] D. Rubin, G. Aldering, M. Betoule, A. Fruchter, X. Huang, A. G. Kim, C. Lidman, E. Linder, S. Perlmutter, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, and N. Suzuki, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2311.12098](#) (2023), [arXiv:2311.12098 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] DES Collaboration, T. M. C. Abbott, M. Acevedo, M. Aguena, A. Alarcon, S. Allam, O. Alves, A. Amon, F. Andrade-Oliveira, J. Annis, P. Armstrong, and et. al., *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2401.02929](#) (2024), [arXiv:2401.02929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] N. Schöneberg, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2401.15054](#) (2024), [arXiv:2401.15054 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] P. D. Group, R. L. Workman, V. D. Burkert, V. Crede, E. Klempt, U. Thoma, L. Tiator, K. Agashe, G. Aielli, B. C. Allanach, and et. al., *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* **2022**, 083C01 (2022), <https://academic.oup.com/ptep/article-pdf/2022/8/083C01/49175539/ptac097.pdf>.
- [55] A.-K. Burns, T. M. P. Tait, and M. Valli, *European Physical Journal C* **84**, 86 (2024), [arXiv:2307.07061 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] R. J. Cooke, M. Pettini, R. A. Jorgenson, M. T. Murphy, and C. C. Steidel, *ApJ* **781**, 31 (2014), [arXiv:1308.3240 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] R. J. Cooke, M. Pettini, K. M. Nollett, and R. Jorgenson, *ApJ* **830**, 148 (2016), [arXiv:1607.03900 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [58] S. A. Balashev, E. O. Zavarygin, A. V. Ivanchik, K. N. Telikova, and D. A. Varshalovich, *MNRAS* **458**, 2188 (2016), [arXiv:1511.01797 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [59] S. Riemer-Sørensen, S. Kotuš, J. K. Webb, K. Ali, V. Dumont, M. T. Murphy, and R. F. Carswell, *MNRAS* **468**, 3239 (2017), [arXiv:1703.06656 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [60] R. J. Cooke, M. Pettini, and C. C. Steidel, *ApJ* **855**, 102 (2018), [arXiv:1710.11129 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] E. O. Zavarygin, J. K. Webb, V. Dumont, and S. Riemer-Sørensen, *MNRAS* **477**, 5536 (2018), [arXiv:1706.09512 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [62] S. Riemer-Sørensen, J. K. Webb, N. Crighton, V. Dumont, K. Ali, S. Kotuš, M. Bainbridge, M. T. Murphy, and R. Carswell, *MNRAS* **447**, 2925 (2015), [arXiv:1412.4043 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] E. Aver, D. A. Berg, K. A. Olive, R. W. Pogge, J. J. Salzer, and E. D. Skillman, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2021**, 027 (2021), [arXiv:2010.04180 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] M. Valerdi, A. Peimbert, M. Peimbert, and A. Sixtos, *ApJ* **876**, 98 (2019), [arXiv:1904.01594 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [65] V. Fernández, E. Terlevich, A. I. Díaz, and R. Terlevich, *MNRAS* **487**, 3221 (2019), [arXiv:1905.09215 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [66] M. Valerdi, A. Peimbert, and M. Peimbert, *MNRAS* **505**, 3624 (2021), [arXiv:2105.12260 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [67] T. Hsyu, R. J. Cooke, J. X. Prochaska, and M. Bolte, *ApJ* **896**, 77 (2020), [arXiv:2005.12290 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [68] M. Valerdi, A. Peimbert, and M. Peimbert, *MNRAS* **505**, 3624 (2021), [arXiv:2105.12260 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [69] A. Matsumoto, M. Ouchi, K. Nakajima, M. Kawasaki, K. Murai, K. Motohara, Y. Harikane, Y. Ono, K. Kushibiki, S. Koyama, and et. al., *ApJ* **941**, 167 (2022), [arXiv:2203.09617 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [70] F.-S. Kitaura, S. Rodríguez-Torres, C.-H. Chuang, C. Zhao, F. Prada, H. Gil-Marín, H. Guo, G. Yepes, A. Klypin, C. G. Scóccola, and et. al., *MNRAS* **456**, 4156 (2016), [arXiv:1509.06400 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [71] A. Woodfinden, S. Nadathur, W. J. Percival, S. Radinovic, E. Massara, and H. A. Winther, *MNRAS* **516**, 4307 (2022), [arXiv:2205.06258 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [72] O. H. E. Philcox, M. M. Ivanov, M. Simonović, and M. Zaldarriaga, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2020**, 032 (2020), [arXiv:2002.04035 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [73] J. Torrado and A. Lewis, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2021**, 057 (2021), [arXiv:2005.05290 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
- [74] J. Torrado and A. Lewis, “Cobaya: Bayesian analysis in cosmology,” *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, record ascl:1910.019 (2019).
- [75] T. Brinckmann and J. Lesgourgues, (2018), [arXiv:1804.07261 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [76] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed, and S. Prunet, *JCAP* **1302**, 001 (2013), [arXiv:1210.7183 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin, *Statistical Science* **7**, 457 (1992).
- [78] A. Lewis, (2019), [arXiv:1910.13970 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).

- [79] S. Brieden, H. Gil-Marín, and L. Verde, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2023**, 023 (2023), [arXiv:2212.04522 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [80] W. L. Freedman, B. F. Madore, T. Hoyt, I. S. Jang, R. Beaton, M. G. Lee, A. Monson, J. Neeley, and J. Rich, *ApJ* **891**, 57 (2020), [arXiv:2002.01550 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [81] D. Scolnic, A. G. Riess, J. Wu, S. Li, G. S. Anand, R. Beaton, S. Casertano, R. I. Anderson, S. Dhawan, and X. Ke, *ApJ* **954**, L31 (2023), [arXiv:2304.06693 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [82] DESI Collaboration, A. G. Adame, J. Aguilar, S. Ahlen, S. Alam, G. Aldering, D. M. Alexander, R. Alfarsy, C. Al-
lende Prieto, M. Alvarez, and et. al., *AJ* **167**, 62 (2024), [arXiv:2306.06307 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [83] Euclid Collaboration, A. Blanchard, S. Camera, C. Carbone, V. F. Cardone, S. Casas, S. Clesse, S. Ilić, M. Kilbinger, T. Kitching, and et. al., *A&A* **642**, A191 (2020), [arXiv:1910.09273 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [84] In [12], we find $\sim 0.5\sigma$ biases on H_0 using an EDE cosmology as truth and scaling the covariance by a factor of 10. This is similar to the 0.5σ biases that we find with an unscaled covariance, but with a smaller σ_{H_0} and thus smaller offset in H_0 .