Journal of Advanced Research in Natural and Applied Sciences
dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jarnas
Open Access

ISSN: 2757-5195 12 (3) (2026) 389-397 doi.org/10.28979/jarnas.1998253

Inverse-Power-Law Scalar-Field Cosmology in (n+2) Dimensions: Slow-Roll Evolution and de Sitter-Like Asymptotics

Emine Canan Günay Demirel[1], İhsan Yılmaz[2]

Article Info
Received: 18 Jul 2026
Accepted: 10 Sep 2026
Published: 30 Sep 2026
Research Article

Abstract − This study investigates a homogeneous canonical scalar field with an inverse-power-law potential in an $(n+2)$-dimensional spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker/Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FRW/FLRW) spacetime. The approximately 5% baryonic-matter, 25% dark-matter, and 70% dark-energy fractions are used only as present-day observational motivation and are not imposed as fixed weights in the scalar-field dynamics. Using the metric signature $(+,-,\ldots,-)$, the scalar-field definition and the higher-dimensional Friedmann, acceleration, Klein-Gordon, and conservation equations are formulated consistently with the gravitational coupling G_{n+2}. For $K > 0$, $\alpha > 0, \phi > 0$, and integer $n \geq 2$, the scalar-field-dominated late-time regime is analyzed under the slow-roll approximation. The solution obeys an asymptotic power-law scaling with exponent $2/(\alpha+4)$. Substitution back into the field equations shows that the kinetic-to-potential-energy ratio, the second slow-roll ratio, and the Hubble slow-roll parameter all tend to zero. Consequently, the scalar-field equation-of-state parameter approaches -1 and the dimension-dependent acceleration condition is satisfied asymptotically. The resulting expansion is de Sitter-like in its equation-of-state and slow-roll behavior, although H remains time dependent and the solution is not an exact de Sitter fixed point. The analysis is restricted to homogeneous background evolution; observational parameter fitting, perturbations, stability, and structure formation are left for future work.

Keywords − *FRW/FLRW metric, scalar field, dark energy, inverse-power potential, slow-roll approximation*

1. Introduction

The observational discovery of the expansion of the Universe in the early twentieth century was one of the major turning points in the development of modern cosmology. Hubble's relation between galaxy distances and redshifts demonstrated that the Universe is not static and established the expansion history as a central observational tool for understanding its cosmic content [1]. Subsequent observations of Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) showed that the expansion is not merely continuing but accelerating [2, 3]. This result transformed the established picture of cosmic dynamics and made the nature of dark energy, which is thought to drive the accelerated expansion, one of the principal problems of contemporary cosmology.

The Lambda cold dark matter (ΛCDM) model explains late-time cosmic acceleration through the cosmological constant Λ. In this framework, dark energy is treated as a time-independent vacuum-energy component with an equation-of-state parameter $w = -1$ [4]. The ΛCDM model successfully describes mutually independent

[1]ecanan@comu.edu.tr (Corresponding Author), [2]ihsanyilmaz@maltepe.edu.tr
[1] Department of Electric and Energy, Çanakkale Technical Sciences Vocational School, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Türkiye
[2] Department of Basic Sciences, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Türkiye

observational data sets, including the cosmic microwave background (CMB), baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), and SNe Ia [5-7]. Nevertheless, the physical origin of dark energy remains unknown. The enormous discrepancy between the extremely small observed value of the cosmological constant and the value expected from quantum field theory gives rise to the fine-tuning and cosmic-coincidence problems [8, 9]. The question of whether dark energy is genuinely a constant vacuum component or a dynamical field that evolves with cosmic time therefore remains important from both observational and theoretical perspectives.

The significance of this question becomes even clearer when the observed energy-matter distribution of the Universe is considered. Current cosmological observations indicate that approximately 70% of the present-day budget is dark energy, 25% is dark matter, and about 5% is baryonic matter [5]. In the present study, these percentages are used only as phenomenological motivation. In the standard four-dimensional observational description they may be represented schematically by present-day density parameters $\Omega_{b0} \approx 0.05$, $\Omega_{dm0} \approx 0.25$, and $\Omega_{de0} \approx 0.70$, with their sum approximately unity for a spatially flat background. They are not treated as universal multiplicative coefficients of the scalar-field density, pressure, potential, or solution. The analytical calculation below evolves a single homogeneous scalar field; baryonic matter, dark matter, and radiation may enter the general Friedmann system as independent sectors but are not assigned separate evolution or interaction equations in the slow-roll solution derived here.

Another major problem confronting the standard cosmological framework is the Hubble tension. There is a statistically significant discrepancy between the H_0 value inferred from Planck CMB data for the early Universe and the H_0 value obtained from the late-Universe distance ladder [5, 10]. This discrepancy may indicate that measurement systematics have not yet been fully controlled, but it may also be a sign of new physics requiring an extension of the standard model [11]. Because the time-dependent behavior of dark energy can directly affect the inference of H_0, the expansion history and the Hubble tension should be examined within a common theoretical framework. To this end, recent studies compare the ΛCDM model with a constant-equation-of-state extension (wCDM); a time-dependent equation-of-state extension (w_0w_aCDM); scalar-field models; and interacting dark-energy scenarios [12]. Such a comparison allows the model dependence and possible physical origin of the observed tension to be evaluated more clearly.

Although SNe Ia play a central role in determining dark-energy parameters, these observations are not entirely free of systematic effects. Even after standardization, residual dependencies are observed between supernova luminosities and properties of their host galaxies, including stellar mass, star-formation activity, and stellar-population characteristics [13-15]. Although individually small, these dependencies may produce meaningful biases in the inference of sensitive cosmological quantities such as the equation-of-state parameter. In particular, the evolution of host-galaxy stellar-population age with redshift may generate an artificial trend in supernova luminosities that could be confused with genuine dark-energy evolution [16]. Conversely, recent counter-analyses argue that corrections for host-galaxy mass and environment account for a substantial part of this effect and that modern SNe Ia results remain generally robust against age evolution [17]. This debate shows that new cosmological models must be tested not only for mathematical consistency but also within an integrated framework that accounts for observational systematics.

The theoretical approaches developed to explain the origin of dark energy are highly diverse. Quintessence models based on canonical scalar fields, phantom-energy scenarios, k-essence models, early-dark-energy approaches, modified-gravity theories, and interacting dark-energy frameworks demonstrate that cosmic acceleration need not be reduced solely to a constant vacuum energy defined within ΛCDM [9, 12]. Among these possibilities, scalar-field models provide a particularly useful basis for investigation because their energy density and pressure can be formulated explicitly in terms of the kinetic and potential components of the field.

Moreover, the dark-energy problem is a multilayered research area at the intersection of fundamental physics, observational cosmology, and astrophysical systematics. Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI), BAO, Pantheon+, Planck, and current SNe Ia samples provide increasingly precise tests of ΛCDM and

dynamical-dark-energy alternatives [5, 7, 12]. In the present work these observations are used as motivation rather than as fitted data: no likelihood analysis, parameter estimation, perturbation calculation, or structure-formation analysis is performed. Accordingly, any comparison with ΛCDM in this article concerns the qualitative background behavior of the scalar field and does not constitute a statistical preference for the proposed model.

The specific novelty of the present analysis lies in combining an explicitly $(n+2)$-dimensional Friedmann-Robertson-Walker/Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FRW/FLRW) background in Einstein gravity with a canonical inverse-power-law scalar potential and deriving a closed analytical slow-roll scaling solution together with dimension-dependent consistency and acceleration conditions. This differs, for example, from the higher-dimensional Klein-Gordon-Rastall model of Widianto et al. [18], which employs Rastall gravity, an exponential scalar potential, and dynamical-system critical-point analysis. Here the gravitational sector is standard Einstein gravity, the potential is inverse power law, and the emphasis is on an analytical asymptotic solution whose dependence on n can be traced directly and whose $n = 2$ limit recovers the familiar four-dimensional equations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 formulates the higher-dimensional field equations, derives the slow-roll solution for the inverse-power-law potential, and examines the associated consistency and asymptotic conditions. Section 3 summarizes the principal conclusions and outlines the limitations and directions for future work.

2. Higher-Dimensional Field Equations and Slow-Roll Consistency for an Inverse-Power-Law Potential

This section formulates the model with one consistent set of conventions and then identifies the regime actually described by the analytical solution. We use $D = n + 2$ spacetime dimensions, so that there are $n + 1$ spatial dimensions, and adopt the metric signature $(+,-,\dots,-)$. The Einstein equations are written with the $(n+2)$-dimensional gravitational coupling $G_{\mathrm{n+2}}$. Baryonic matter, dark matter, radiation, and the scalar field are first retained as independent contributions to the general homogeneous background. The analytical slow-roll solution is then obtained in the scalar-field-dominated late-time regime, where the other components are neglected relative to the scalar-field energy density.

For a spatially flat background ($k = 0$), the FRW/FLRW line element can be written as in (2.1) [19-21]. The symbol $d\Omega_{\mathrm{n}}{}^2$ denotes the metric on the unit n-sphere. Because flatness is imposed from the outset, no $k = \pm 1$ branch is used in the subsequent derivation.

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t)[dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_n^2] \tag{2.1}$$

With the above $(+,-,\dots,-)$ signature, a canonical minimally coupled scalar field is defined by the Lagrangian density in (2.2). This sign choice is used consistently in the stress-energy tensor, energy density, pressure, and Klein-Gordon equation.

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu}\, \partial_\mu\phi\ \partial_\nu\phi - V(\phi) \tag{2.2}$$

The field is assumed homogeneous, $\phi = \phi(t)$, so all spatial derivatives vanish. The stress-energy tensor and the resulting homogeneous energy density and pressure are then given in (2.3) - (2.6) [20, 21].

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\phi\ \partial_\nu\phi - g_{\mu\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta}\, \partial_\alpha\phi\ \partial_\beta\phi - V(\phi)\right] \tag{2.3}$$

$$\phi = \phi(t), \qquad \partial_i \phi = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) \tag{2.5}$$

$$P_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) \tag{2.6}$$

The scalar field is not identified with a fixed weighted sum of baryonic matter, dark matter, and dark energy. Instead, the general background may contain independent sectors with total density and pressure as defined in (2.7). The quoted 5%, 25%, and 70% values refer only to approximate present-day four-dimensional observational density fractions; no direct numerical mapping of these values to arbitrary $n > 2$ is assumed. In the standard $n = 2$ observational limit, the usual present-day density parameters Ω_{i0} may be defined relative to the critical density.

$$\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} = \rho_b + \rho_{\mathrm{dm}} + \rho_r + \rho_\phi, \qquad P_{\mathrm{tot}} = P_b + P_{\mathrm{dm}} + P_r + P_\phi \tag{2.7}$$

The scalar-field equation-of-state parameter is defined in (2.8). For a canonical field with a non-negative potential, it lies between -1 and 1. The kinetic-to-potential ratio R and its relation to the equation-of-state parameter are defined in (2.9); these expressions will be used to check the late-time limit rather than assuming it.

$$w_\phi = \frac{P_\phi}{\rho_\phi} = \frac{1/2\,\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi)}{1/2\,\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)} \tag{2.8}$$

$$R \equiv \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2V(\phi)}, \qquad w_\phi = \frac{R-1}{R+1} \tag{2.9}$$

The higher-dimensional Friedmann and acceleration equations for the total homogeneous content are given in (2.10) and (2.11):

$$H^2 = \frac{16\pi G_{n+2}}{n(n+1)}\,\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} \tag{2.10}$$

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{8\pi G_{n+2}}{n(n+1)}[(n-1)\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} + (n+1)P_{\mathrm{tot}}] \tag{2.11}$$

For a barotropic total fluid with equation-of-state parameter w, the acceleration equation implies accelerated expansion when $w < -(n-1)/(n+1)$. Thus, the familiar four-dimensional threshold $w < -1/3$ is recovered only for $n = 2$. For a scalar-field-dominated background, the equivalent condition in terms of the ratio R is $R < 1/n$. The Klein-Gordon and conservation equations are given in (2.12) and (2.13).

$$\ddot{\phi} + (n+1)H\dot{\phi} + \frac{dV}{d\phi} = 0 \tag{2.12}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{\mathrm{tot}} + (n+1)H(\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} + P_{\mathrm{tot}}) = 0, \qquad \dot{\rho}_\phi + (n+1)H\big(\rho_\phi + P_\phi\big) = 0 \tag{2.13}$$

As a consistency check, setting $n = 2$ and $G_{\mathrm{n+2}} = G_4$ reduces the general system to the standard four-dimensional Friedmann, acceleration, Klein-Gordon, and conservation equations shown below.

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G_4}{3}\rho_{\mathrm{tot}}$$

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G_4}{3}(\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} + 3P_{\mathrm{tot}})$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{dV}{d\phi} = 0$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{\mathrm{tot}} + 3H(\rho_{\mathrm{tot}} + P_{\mathrm{tot}}) = 0$$

We now specialize to the inverse-power-law potential in (2.14). The analytical domain is $K > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\phi > 0$, with integer $n \geq 2$. The restriction $\phi > 0$ keeps the potential real and single-valued for non-integer α.

$$V(\phi) = K\phi^{-\alpha}, \qquad K > 0,\ \alpha > 0,\ \phi > 0 \tag{2.14}$$

The remaining analytical derivation refers specifically to the scalar-field-dominated asymptotic regime, in which the total density and pressure are well approximated by the scalar-field contributions. It should therefore not be interpreted as a simultaneous dynamical solution for baryons, dark matter, radiation, and dark energy. Substitution of the inverse-power potential gives (2.15)-(2.17):

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + K\phi^{-\alpha} \tag{2.15}$$

$$P_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - K\phi^{-\alpha} \tag{2.16}$$

$$H^2 = \frac{16\pi G_{n+2}}{n(n+1)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + K\phi^{-\alpha}\right) \tag{2.17}$$

Using the derivative of the inverse-power potential in (2.14), the Klein-Gordon equation becomes (2.18). Combining it with the scalar-field-dominated Friedmann relation gives the nonlinear equation (2.19).

$$\ddot{\phi} + (n+1)H\dot{\phi} - \alpha K\phi^{-\alpha-1} = 0 \tag{2.18}$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + (n+1)\sqrt{\frac{16\pi G_{n+2}}{n(n+1)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + K\phi^{-\alpha}\right)}\,\dot{\phi} - \alpha K\phi^{-\alpha-1} = 0 \tag{2.19}$$

To obtain an analytical late-time solution, we impose the two slow-roll conditions displayed below: the kinetic energy is much smaller than the potential energy, and the field acceleration is negligible relative to Hubble friction. Under these assumptions the Friedmann and Klein-Gordon equations reduce to (2.20) and (2.21).

$$\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 \ll V(\phi), \qquad |\ddot{\phi}| \ll (n+1)H|\dot{\phi}|$$

$$H \simeq \sqrt{\frac{16\pi G_{n+2}}{n(n+1)}}\,\sqrt{K}\,\phi^{-\alpha/2} \tag{2.20}$$

$$(n+1)H\dot{\phi} - \alpha K\phi^{-\alpha-1} \simeq 0 \tag{2.21}$$

$$(n+1)H\dot{\phi} \simeq \alpha K\phi^{-\alpha-1} \tag{2.22}$$

Using the derivative of (2.14) in (2.21), and then combining (2.20) and (2.22), yields the separable equation (2.23). The constant C is positive for the adopted parameter domain and contains the dependence on n, G_{n+2}, K, and α.

$$\dot{\phi} \simeq C\phi^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}, \qquad C = \frac{\alpha\sqrt{K}}{(n+1)\sqrt{16\pi G_{n+2}/[n(n+1)]}} \tag{2.23}$$

Integration gives (2.24). At late times the additive integration constant becomes subleading. Because the overall normalization has not been fixed to unity, the simplified result must be written as the asymptotic scaling relation in (2.25), rather than as an approximate equality with the multiplicative coefficient omitted.

$$\phi(t) \simeq \left[\frac{\alpha+4}{2}(Ct+C_0)\right]^{2/(\alpha+4)} \tag{2.24}$$

$$\phi(t) \propto t^{2/(\alpha+4)} \qquad (t\to\infty) \tag{2.25}$$

The asymptotic equation-of-state limit can now be checked without circularly assuming potential domination. Substituting the derived solution into the kinetic-to-potential ratio gives (2.26), which decays to zero for $\alpha > 0$. Therefore, (2.27) follows, and w_ϕ tends to -1. The second slow-roll ratio and the Hubble slow-roll parameter likewise decay as ϕ^{-2}, as shown in (2.28) and (2.29), so both slow-roll consistency conditions improve asymptotically.

$$R = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2V} = \frac{\alpha^2 n}{32\pi G_{n+2}(n+1)}\,\phi^{-2} \propto t^{-4/(\alpha+4)} \to 0 \tag{2.26}$$

$$w_\phi = \frac{R-1}{R+1} \to -1 \tag{2.27}$$

$$\frac{|\ddot{\phi}|}{(n+1)H|\dot{\phi}|} = \frac{\alpha(\alpha+2)n}{32\pi G_{n+2}(n+1)}\,\phi^{-2} \to 0 \tag{2.28}$$

$$\epsilon_H \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{\alpha^2 n}{32\pi G_{n+2}}\,\phi^{-2} \to 0 \tag{2.29}$$

The same scaling also makes the meaning of 'de Sitter-like' precise. Since the Hubble rate inherits the inverse-power dependence on the evolving field, $H(t)$ remains time dependent and scales as (2.30); integrating the definition of the Hubble rate gives the stretched-exponential form in (2.31), where $B > 0$ is a constant. Thus, the model approaches $w_\phi = -1$ and $\epsilon_H = 0$ asymptotically, but it does not approach an exact de Sitter fixed point with strictly constant positive H. The functional exponent $2/(\alpha+4)$ in $\phi(t)$ is independent of n, whereas n enters the normalization through the Friedmann coefficient and C, the Hubble-friction term, the acceleration threshold, and the slow-roll consistency coefficients.

$$H(t) \propto t^{-\alpha/(\alpha+4)} \tag{2.30}$$

$$a(t) \propto \exp\left[B\,t^{4/(\alpha+4)}\right], \qquad B>0 \tag{2.31}$$

3. Conclusion

In this study, the cosmological evolution of a homogeneous canonical scalar field with an inverse-power-law potential has been re-examined in an $(n+2)$ −dimensional spatially flat FRW/FLRW spacetime using one internally consistent set of field and metric conventions. For the signature $(+,-,\ldots,-)$, the canonical Lagrangian, stress-energy tensor, energy density, pressure, Friedmann equation, acceleration equation, Klein-Gordon equation, and conservation equation have been written consistently with the $(n+2)$ −dimensional gravitational coupling G_{n+2}. The $n = 2$ limit reproduces the familiar four-dimensional forms, while the general acceleration threshold is $w < -(n-1)/(n+1)$.

The approximate present-day 5% baryonic-matter, 25% dark-matter, and 70% dark-energy fractions are used only as phenomenological motivation. They are not fixed weights multiplying the scalar-field density, pressure, potential, or solution. In the general background, baryons, dark matter, radiation, and the scalar field may be treated as independent density sectors; the closed analytical solution derived here applies to the scalar-field-dominated late-time regime and does not constitute a multi-component dynamical model.

For $K > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\phi > 0$, and integer $n \geq 2$, the inverse-power potential admits a slow-roll asymptotic field scaling with exponent $2/(\alpha+4)$. Substitution of this solution back into the approximated equations shows explicitly that the kinetic-to-potential ratio, the acceleration-to-friction ratio, and the Hubble slow-roll parameter all vanish asymptotically. Hence, w_ϕ approaches -1 and accelerated expansion is supported. At the same time, $H(t)$ remains time dependent and the scale factor has a stretched-exponential asymptotic form, so 'de Sitter-like' refers to the asymptotic equation-of-state and slow-roll behavior rather than to an exact de Sitter fixed point. The exponent of the field scaling retains the same functional form as in four dimensions, whereas n controls normalization factors, Hubble friction, and the acceleration criterion.

The present work is limited to homogeneous background-level analytical evolution. It does not include likelihood fitting to $H(z)$, SNe Ia, BAO, or CMB data, nor does it analyze linear perturbations, stability, or structure formation. Consequently, no statistical superiority over ΛCDM is claimed. Constraining K and α with current observations and studying perturbative stability and structure growth constitute natural extensions required to assess the model's full cosmological viability.

Future studies should constrain the model parameters using current observational data, extend the present background treatment to linear cosmological perturbations and stability analyses, and investigate structure formation to enable quantitative model comparison and a fuller assessment of cosmological viability.

Author Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this paper. They have all read and approved the final version of the paper.

Declaration

This paper is derived from the first author’s doctoral dissertation supervised by the second author.

Conflict of Interest

All the authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical Review and Approval

No approval from the Board of Ethics is required.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Statement

AI-assisted tools were used during the revision process for language editing.

References

[1] E. Hubble, *A relation between distance and radial velocity among extra-galactic nebulae*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 15 (3) (1929) 168–173. [link]

[2] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, ..., J. Tonry, *Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant*, The Astronomical Journal 116 (3) (1998) 1009–1038. [link]

[3] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, ..., The Supernova Cosmology Project, *Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae*, The Astrophysical Journal 517 (2) (1999) 565–586. [link]

[4] P. J. E. Peebles, B. Ratra, *The cosmological constant and dark energy*, Reviews of Modern Physics 75 (2) (2003) 559–606. [link]

[5] Planck Collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, Astronomy & Astrophysics 641 (2020) A6. [link]

[6] S. Alam, M. Aubert, S. Avila, C. Balland, J. E. Bautista, M. A. Bershady, D. Bizyaev, M. R. Blanton, A. S. Bolton, …, Z. Zheng, *Completed SDSS-IV extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: Cosmological implications from two decades of spectroscopic surveys*, Physical Review D 103 (8) (2021) 083533. [link]

[7] D. Brout, D. Scolnic, B. Popovic, A. G. Riess, J. Zuntz, R. Kessler, A. Carr, T. M. Davis, S. Hinton, ..., P. Wiseman, *The Pantheon+ analysis: Cosmological constraints*, The Astrophysical Journal 938 (2) (2022) 110. [link]

[8] S. Weinberg, *The cosmological constant problem*, Reviews of Modern Physics 61 (1) (1989) 1–23. [link]

[9] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami, S. Tsujikawa, *Dynamics of dark energy*, International Journal of Modern Physics D 15 (11) (2006) 1753–1936. [link]

[10] A. G. Riess, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, D. Scolnic, D. Brout, S. Casertano, D. O. Jones, Y. Murakami, L. Breuval, ..., W. Zheng, *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*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters 934 (1) (2022) L7. [link]

[11] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, J. Silk, *In the realm of the Hubble tension–a review of solutions*, Classical and Quantum Gravity 38 (15) (2021) 153001. [link]

[12] Z. Zhang, T. Xu, Y. Chen, *Dynamical dark energy and the unresolved Hubble tension: multi-model constraints from DESI 2025 and other probes*, The Astrophysical Journal 999 (2) (2026) 248. [link]

[13] P. L. Kelly, M. Hicken, D. L. Burke, K. S. Mandel, R. P. Kirshner, *Hubble residuals of nearby Type Ia supernovae are correlated with host galaxy masses*, The Astrophysical Journal 715 (2) (2010) 743–756. [link]

[14] M. Sullivan, A. Conley, D. A. Howell, J. D. Neill, P. Astier, C. Balland, S. Basa, R. G. Carlberg, D. Fouchez, ..., E. S. Walker, *The dependence of Type Ia supernovae luminosities on their host galaxies*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 406 (2) (2010) 782–802. [link]

[15] M. Childress, G. Aldering, P. Antilogus, C. Aragon, S. Bailey, C. Baltay, C. Bongard, S. Buton, A. Canto, ..., C. Wu, *Host galaxy properties and Hubble residuals of Type Ia supernovae from the Nearby Supernova Factory*, The Astrophysical Journal 770 (2) (2013) 108. [link]

[16] J. Son, Y.-W. Lee, C. Chung, S. Park, H. Cho, *Strong progenitor age bias in supernova cosmology – II. Alignment with DESI BAO and signs of a non-accelerating universe*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 544 (1) (2025) 975–987. [link]

[17] P. Wiseman, B. Popovic, M. Sullivan, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, R. C. Chen, T. M. Davis, L. Galbany, I. M. Hook, ..., M. Vincenzi, *Still accelerating: Type Ia supernova cosmology is robust to host galaxy age evolution*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 549 (3) (2026) stag797. [link]

[18] T. A. Widianto, A. K. Falah, A. Suroso, H. Alatas, B. E. Gunara, *Some cosmological consequences of higher dimensional Klein-Gordon-Rastall theory*, The European Physical Journal C 83 (11) (2023) 1000. [link]

[19] R.-G. Cai, S. P. Kim, *First law of thermodynamics and Friedmann equations of Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe*, Journal of High Energy Physics 2005 (02) (2005) 050. [link]

[20] E. C. Demirel, *Dark matter and dark energy solution*, Doctoral Dissertation, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale (2009). [link]

[21] E. C. Günay Demirel, I. Yilmaz, *Dark matter and dark energy solutions using by observational evidence,* 33rd International Physics Congress of the Turkish-Physical-Society 1935 (1), Bodrum, 2018, 080001. [link]