Tests of Standard Cosmology in Hořava Gravity and Bayesian Evidence for a Closed Universe without the Hubble Tension
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Abstract

We consider some background tests of standard cosmology in the context of Hořava gravity with different scaling dimensions for space and time, which has been proposed as a renormalizable, higher-derivative, Lorentz-violating quantum gravity model without ghost problems. We obtain the “very strong” and “strong” Bayesian evidences for our two cosmology models A and B, respectively, depending on the choice of parametrization based on Hořava gravity, against the standard, spatially-flat, LCDM cosmology model based on general relativity. An MCMC analysis with the observational data, including BAO, shows (a) preference of a “closed” universe with the curvature density parameter $\Omega_k = -0.005 \pm 0.001, -0.004^{+0.003}_{-0.001}$ and (b) reduction of the Hubble tension with the Hubble constant $H_0 = 71.4^{+1.2}_{-0.9}, 69.5^{+1.6}_{-0.9}$ km$^{-1}$Mpc$^{-1}$ for the models A, B. We comment on some possible further improvements for the “cosmic-tension problem” by considering the more complete early universe physics, based on the Lorentz-violating standard model with anisotropic space-time scaling, consistently with Hořava gravity, as well as the observational data which are properly adopted for the closed universe.
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Standard cosmology, which is usually formulated as the Lambda Cold Dark Matter (LCDM) model, is based on general relativity (GR) with a positive cosmological constant \[1–3\] and has been quite successful in describing the observational data \[4\]. However, with the increased accuracy of data, the significant deviations from LCDM are becoming clearer \[5–7\]. In particular, regarding the recent discrepancies of the Hubble constant from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) data and the direct (local) measurements at the lower redshift, which corresponds to the mismatches between the early and late universes, there have been various proposals (for recent reviews, see \[8–10\]) but it is still a challenging problem to find a resolution at the fundamental level.

On the other hand, if our universe was created from the Big Bang, we need a quantum gravity to describe the early universe or later space-time. But, it has been well known that a renormalizable quantum gravity can not be realized in GR or its (relativistic) higher-derivative generalizations, due to the ghost problem \[11\]. Recently, Hořava has proposed a renormalizable, higher-derivative, Lorentz-violating quantum gravity model without the ghost problem, due to the high-energy (UV) Lorentz-symmetry violations from the different scaling dimensions for space and time à la Lifshitz, DeWitt, and Hořava \[12–14\]. In the last 12 years, there have been many works on its various aspects (see \[15\] for a review and extensive literatures). Theoretically, there are still several fundamental issues, like the full/complete symmetry structure, full dynamical degrees of freedom, renormalizability, and the very meaning of black holes and Hawking radiation, etc (see \[16\] for related discussions and their current status). However, phenomenologically, Hořava gravity is one of the (viable) modified gravity theories and it can be tested from astrophysical or cosmological observations \[17\]. In particular, from the recent detections of gravitational waves from black holes/neutron stars, the importance of quantum gravity and its non-GR behaviors is increasing \[18\]. There are some interesting results on testable Hořava gravity effects, such as the increased maximum mass of neutron stars \[19\], reduced light deflection \[20\] and black hole shadow \[21\], etc. There are also some constraints on its low-energy limit or Einstein-Aether theory from astrophysical data \[22–25\] or cosmological data with the “assumed” spatially-flat universe in standard cosmology \[26, 27\]. But still, for a renormalizable Hořava gravity with the desired higher-derivative terms, there are no systematic and significant constraints from the observational data.

In this paper, we test the spatially non-flat universe in standard cosmology in the context of Hořava gravity. A peculiar property of the cosmology based on Hořava gravity is that the spatially-curved universe may be more “natural” due to contributions from higher spatial derivatives. For the spatially-flat universe, on the other hand, the usual FLRW background cosmology in Hořava gravity \[1, 2\] is the same as in GR and hence there are no observable differences in the data analysis which means the same (background) tensions in LCDM model. In other words, Hořava gravity is a “natural laboratory” for the tests of the spatially non-flat universe in standard cosmology.

Recently, it has been found \[22–31\] that the tensions get worse in LCDM as \(-\Omega_k\) increases, i.e, a rather lower value of Hubble constant for a closed universe (\(\Omega_k < 0\)), which is preferred in the recent Planck CMB data \[32\]. In this paper, we show that the situation in Hořava gravity is the opposite, i.e., tensions get better with an increasing \(-\Omega_k\), due to some non-linear corrections from (spatial) higher-derivative terms. From an MCMC analysis with the observational data, including BAO, we obtain (a) preference of a “closed” universe and (b) reduction of the Hubble
tension for our two Hořava-gravity based cosmological models A and B, depending on the choice of parametrization, with “very strong” and “strong” Bayesian evidences, respectively, against the standard, spatially-flat, LCDM cosmological model.

To this ends, we consider the ADM metric

$$ds^2 = -N^2 c^2 dt^2 + g_{ij} (dx^i + N^i dt)(dx^j + N^j dt)$$

and the Hořava gravity action with \( z = 3 \), à la Lifshitz, DeWitt, and Hořava [12–14], given by

(up to boundary terms)

$$S_g = \int dt d^3 x \sqrt{g} N \left[ \frac{2}{\kappa^2} (K_{ij} K^{ij} - \lambda K^2) - \mathcal{V} \right],$$

$$\mathcal{V} = \sigma + \xi R + \alpha_1 R^2 + \alpha_2 R_{ij} R^{ij} + \alpha_3 \frac{\epsilon^{ijk}}{\sqrt{g}} R_{il} \nabla_j R^{lk} + \alpha_4 \nabla_i R_{jk} \nabla^i R^{jk} + \alpha_5 \nabla_i R_{jk} \nabla^j R^{ik} + \alpha_6 \nabla_i R \nabla^i R,$$

which is viable \(^1\ [35]\) and power-counting renormalizable \([36]\), with the extrinsic curvature

$$K_{ij} = \frac{1}{2N} (\dot{g}_{ij} - \nabla_i N_j - \nabla_j N_i)$$

(the dot (\(\dot{}\)) denotes a time derivative), the Ricci tensor \(R_{ij}\) of the (Euclidean) three-geometry, their corresponding traces \(K = g_{ij} K^{ij}\), \(R = g_{ij} R^{ij}\), coupling constants \(^2\ \kappa, \lambda, \xi, \alpha_i\), and a cosmological constant parameter \(\sigma\).

In order to study standard cosmology for the Hořava gravity action \([2]\), we consider the homogeneous and isotropic Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric ansatz

$$ds^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + a^2(t) \left[ \frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2/R_0^2} + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right]$$

with the (spatial) curvature parameter \(k = +1, 0, -1\) for a closed, flat, open universe, respectively, and the curvature radius \(R_0\) in the current epoch \(a(t_0) \equiv 1\). Assuming the perfect fluid

\(^1\) At the perturbation level, even for the spatially-flat background, Hořava gravity produces notable differences from GR. In order to obtain a (nearly) scale-invariant background CMB power spectrum for the spatially-flat universe in Hořava gravity, where the “inflation without inflation era” is possible \([33, 34]\), we need a proper form of the six-derivative (UV) terms which break the detailed balance condition in UV as in the action \([2, 35]\). It would be interesting to see the curvature-induced effect on the scale-invariant power spectrum. However, in this paper, we consider the action \([2]\) without any UV conditions for the generality of our approach.

\(^2\) One might consider the extension terms which depend on \(a_i = \partial_i N/N\) and \(\nabla_j a_i\) generally \([37]\). However, since these terms affect the IR physics a lot from those of the standard action \([2, 38, 39]\), we do not consider those terms in this paper by assuming that the IR physics is well described by GR. This implies that the gravity probe \(E_G\) approaches the GR prediction in the current epoch, \(i.e.,\ low\ \ z\), though currently it would not be tested due to large statistical errors \([40]\).
form of matter contributions with energy density $\rho$ and pressure $p$, we obtain the Friedmann equations as

\[ H^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{6(3\lambda - 1)} \left[ \rho + \frac{3\kappa^2 \mu^2}{8(3\lambda - 1)} \left( \frac{k^2}{R_0^4 a^4} + \frac{2k(\omega - \Lambda_W)}{R_0^2 a^2} + \Lambda_W^2 \right) \right], \quad (6) \]

\[ \dot{H} + H^2 = \frac{-\kappa^2}{6(3\lambda - 1)} \left[ \frac{1}{2}(\rho + 3p) + \frac{3\kappa^2 \mu^2}{8(3\lambda - 1)} \left( \frac{k^2}{R_0^4 a^4} - \Lambda_W^2 \right) \right], \quad (7) \]

where we have used the conventional parametrization of the coupling constants $\sigma, \xi, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ for the lower-derivative terms $^{14, 41}$

\[ \sigma = \frac{3\kappa^2 \mu^2 \Lambda_W^2}{8(3\lambda - 1)}, \quad \xi = \frac{k^2 \mu^2 (\omega - \Lambda_W)}{8(3\lambda - 1)}, \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{k^2 \mu^2 (4\lambda - 1)}{32(3\lambda - 1)}, \quad \alpha_2 = -\frac{k^2 \mu^2}{8} \quad (8) \]

with $\mu^2 > 0 \ (\leq 0)$ for a positive (negative) cosmological constant ($\sim \Lambda_W$) and the Hubble parameter $H(t) \equiv \dot{a}/a$. However, we take the coupling constants $\alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_6$ for higher-derivative (UV) terms to be arbitrary so that a (nearly) scale-invariant CMB spectrum with respect to the background universe, as well as power-counting renormalizability, can be obtained $^{32, 33}$. However, it is important to note that there are no contributions in the above Friedmann equations from the fifth and sixth-derivative UV terms in the Hořava gravity action $^2$ due to $R_{ij} = 2kg_{ij}/R_0^2 a^2(t)$, $K_{ij} = H(t)g_{ij}$, but only from the fourth-derivative terms, which leads to $k^2/a^4$ terms $^4$ in the Friedmann equations $^6$ and $^7$. On the other hand, for the spatially-flat universe with $k = 0$, all the contributions from the higher-derivative terms disappear and we recover the same background cosmology as in GR, which means a return to the LCDM model with the Hubble constant tension. In this sense, Hořava gravity is a “natural laboratory” for the tests of the spatially-non-flat universe in standard cosmology.

Introducing the dust matters (non-relativistic baryonic matters and (non-baryonic) cold dark matter with $p_m = 0$) and radiation (ultra-relativistic matter with $p_r = \rho_r/3$), which satisfy the continuity equations $\dot{\rho}_i + 3H(\dot{\rho}_i + p_i) = 0 \ (i = m, r)$, we conveniently define the canonical density parameters at the current epoch $a_0 = 1$ as $^5$

\[ \Omega_m \equiv \beta \frac{\rho_m^0}{3H_0^2}, \quad \Omega_r \equiv \beta \frac{\rho_r^0}{3H_0^2}, \quad \Omega_k \equiv -\gamma \frac{k}{H_0^2 R_0^2}, \quad \Omega_\Lambda \equiv \gamma \frac{\Lambda_W}{2H_0^2}, \quad \Omega_\omega \equiv \gamma \frac{\omega}{2H_0^2}, \quad (9) \]

where $\beta \equiv \kappa^2/2(3\lambda - 1), \gamma \equiv k^4 \mu^2 \Lambda_W/8(3\lambda - 1)^2$ are positive constant parameters. Then, we can write the (first) Friedmann equation $^6$ as

\[ \left( \frac{H}{H_0} \right)^2 = \Omega_r a^{-4} + \Omega_m a^{-3} + \Omega_k a^{-2} + \Omega_{DE}(a), \quad (10) \]

$^3$ For the cosmological perturbation around the spatially-flat FLRW background, the scale-invariant spectrum for the tensor modes depend only on the coupling $\alpha_4$, whereas the scalar mode depends on the combination $\bar{\alpha}_4 \equiv \alpha_4 + 2\alpha_5/3 + 8\alpha_6/3$.

$^4$ If we include non-derivative higher-curvature terms, like $R^3, R^2 R_{ij} R^{ij}$, etc., we have $a^{-6}$ terms as well, which correspond to the stiff matters $^{42, 43}$. However, in this paper we do not consider those terms for simplicity.

$^5$ We adopt the common convention $\Omega_i$ for the current values and $\Omega_i(a)$ for the fully time-dependent values.
where we have introduced the (dynamical) dark-energy (DE) component as

$$\Omega_{DE}(a) \equiv \left( \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4\Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-4} - \left( \frac{\Omega_k \Omega_\omega}{\Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-2} + \Omega_\Lambda,$$

(11)

which is defined as all the extra contributions to the first-three GR terms in (10) [41]. Here, we note that this dynamical dark-energy component includes the dark radiation (DR) and dark curvature (DC) components as

$$\Omega_{DR}(a) \equiv \left( \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4\Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-4}, \quad \Omega_{DC}(a) \equiv - \left( \frac{\Omega_k \Omega_\omega}{\Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-2},$$

(12)

respectively, as well as the usual cosmological constant component \(\Omega_\Lambda\), so that \(\Omega_{DE}(a) = \Omega_{DR}(a) + \Omega_{DC}(a) + \Omega_\Lambda\).

So far we have not assumed any specific information about the early universe. The whole physics of early universe in the context of Hořava gravity would be quite different from our known physics and needs to be revisited for a complete analysis. However, as in the standard cosmology, we may introduce the phenomenological parametrization so that all the unknown (early-universe) physics can be taken into account. For example, regarding the Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) at the decoupling epoch \(a_{\text{dec}} = (1 + z_{\text{dec}})^{-1} = (1091)^{-1}\), the early dark radiation can be expressed as the contribution from the hypothetical excess \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\) in the standard model prediction of the effective number of neutrino species \(N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046\) as [44]

$$\Omega_{DR}(a) \equiv \left( \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4\Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-4} \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \Omega_\gamma a^{-4} = 0.13424 \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \Omega_\gamma a^{-4},$$

(13)

where we have used the present radiation density parameter for the standard model particles with negligible masses (photon and three species of neutrinos), \(\Omega_\gamma = [1 + \frac{7}{8}(\frac{4}{11})^{4/3} N_{\text{eff}}] \Omega_\gamma = \frac{7}{8}(\frac{4}{11})^{4/3} \cdot (0.13424)^{-1} \Omega_\gamma\) with the photon density \(\Omega_\gamma = 2.4730 \times 10^{-5} h^{-2}\) for the present CMB temperature \(T_0 = 2.7255K\) [32] and \(h \equiv H_0/100\) kms\(^{-1}\)Mpc\(^{-1}\). If we use the relation (13) for the dark radiation formula [12] in Hořava gravity, we can express the cosmological constant component \(\Omega_\Lambda\) as

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4 \cdot 0.13424 \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \Omega_r}$$

(14)

so that the Friedmann equation (10) can be written by \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\), instead of \(\Omega_\Lambda\) [42, 43]. Here, it is important to note that \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\) needs not to be an integer but can be an arbitrary and positive (negative) real number for a positive (negative) \(\Omega_\Lambda\), i.e., asymptotically de Sitter (Anti de Sitter) universe with a cosmological constant \(\sim \Lambda_W\). Moreover, we note that the relation (14) implies an intriguing correlation between \(\Omega_k, \Omega_r, \Delta N_{\text{eff}},\) and \(\Omega_\Lambda\).

In this paper, we consider two models, A and B, depending on whether we implement (14) or not, to see the effectiveness of the BBN-like parametrization in terms of \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\). Then, for
model A, the Friedmann equation \((10)\) reduces to
\[
\left( \frac{H}{H_0} \right)^2 = (1 + 0.13424 \Delta N_{\text{eff}}) \Omega_r a^{-4} + \Omega_m a^{-3} \\
+ \left[ \Omega_k - 4 \cdot 0.13424 \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \left( \frac{\Omega_\omega \Omega_r}{\Omega_k} \right) \right] a^{-2} + \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4 \cdot 0.13424 \Delta N_{\text{eff}}} \Omega_r,
\]
which is one of our main equations for comparing with cosmological data, with the assumption of non-vanishing \(\Omega_k\) and \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\) for the well-defined equation \((15)\). Here we note that, considering \(\Omega_r\) is a function of \(H_0\) as given above, this model is described by five non-linearly coupled parameters \(H_0, \Omega_m, \Omega_k, \Omega_\omega, \Delta N_{\text{eff}}\), in contrast to the three linear, decoupled parameters \(H_0, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda\) for the standard, spatially-flat (background) cosmology, LCDM.\(^6\)

On the other hand, for model B, the Friedmann equation \((10)\) is simply given by
\[
\left( \frac{H}{H_0} \right)^2 = \left( \Omega_r + \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4 \Omega_\Lambda} \right) a^{-4} + \Omega_m a^{-3} + \left( 1 - \frac{\Omega_\omega}{\Omega_\Lambda} \right) \Omega_k a^{-2} + \Omega_\Lambda
\]
without using the relation \((14)\) from the BBN-inspired formula \((13)\) for the dark radiation in Hořava gravity. This model has two (non-linearly) coupled parameters \(\Omega_k\) and \(\Omega_\omega\), in addition to those of standard flat cosmology, \(H_0, \Omega_\Lambda\), with assuming a non-vanishing \(\Omega_\Lambda\) for the well-defined equation \((16)\). We also consider the spatially flat \((k = 0)\) LCDM as well as non-flat \((k \neq 0)\) kLCDM for a comparison.

We probe our universe by using a Markov-Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method for the 4 models, A, B, LCDM, kLCDM and determine the independent parameters with the statistical inferences for the models. We use the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm \(^7\) for the posterior parameter distributions, the statistical method in \([47]\) for convergence tests of the MCMC chains, and the public code GetDist \([48]\) for the visualization of the results. The cosmological data sets we consider (for the details, see Appendix A) are CMB (Planck 2018 \([49]\)), BAO (SDSS-BOSS \([50]\), SDSS-IV \([51]\), Lyman-\(\alpha\) forest \([52]\), and WiggleZ \([53]\)), SNe Ia (Pantheon \([54]\)), GRBs (Mayflower \([55]\)), Lensed Quasars (H0liCOW \([56]\)), and Cosmic Chronometers (CC) \([57]\).

\(^6\) From the current-epoch constraint, i.e., \(H(t_0) = H_0\) in \((11)\), the number of independent parameters reduces to 4 and 2 for our two models based Hořava gravity and the standard models based on GR, respectively. In this paper, we conveniently take \(H_0, \Omega_k, \Omega_\omega, \Delta N_{\text{eff}}\) (or \(\Omega_\Lambda\)) and \(H_0, \Omega_k, \Omega_\Lambda\) for the models A, B, and (k)LCDM, respectively, by considering \(\Omega_m\), as well as \(\Omega_r\), as the derived (dependent) parameter. However, we need to introduce the baryonic parameter \(\Omega_b\) as an independent parameter when we analyze CMB and BAO data later so that only the (non-baryonic) dark matter sector in \(\Omega_m\) is the derived parameter.

\(^7\) We use the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm at the background level since there is no known analysis of the cosmological perturbations for a non-flat universe, contrary to the flat universe \([35]\), due to computational complications in Hořava gravity. However, the algorithm has the limitation in our case, though not a general feature, that does not show the proper \(\chi^2\) values for the separate data sets, while it shows the convergent results for the whole data sets.
Our main results are shown in Table 1 and their essentials are plotted in Fig. 1 (for the full plots, see Appendix B). Some noticeable results are as follows:

1. For our two main models A and B, constrained with all the data sets, including BAO, shows a sizable tension in the Hubble constant when compared to the standard LCDM and kLCDM. However, the usual Hubble constant tension from the direct local measurements using Cepheids [5] is reduced. (See Fig. 2 for a comparison with other previous measurements [58–62].) In particular, for model A, the tension is reduced to within 1σ even if BAO data is included. On the other hand, for Ω_m and Ω_Λ, there are only some slight differences from the standard LCDM or kLCDM, and the earlier conclusion of Ω_m ≈ 0.3 and Ω_Λ ≈ 0.7 [3] is still robust even in Hořava cosmology.

The constraint of Ω_r, for model A, is not overlapping within 2σ CL of the Planck 2018 data, (9.179 + 0.441 – 0.431) × 10^{-5} (CMB+lensing+BAO) [63]. However, it is not surprising that Ω_r, which is a derived quantity from the formula below Eq. (13) and reduced by a factor H_0^{-2} from the increased constraint on H_0, which is in about 4σ tension with the Planck 2018 data H_0 = 67.27 ± 0.60 kms^{-1}Mpc^{-1} [32], has the similar tension with the Planck data.

2. Ω_k is peculiar in two aspects as follows. First, the result for model A shows the higher precision, i.e., narrower MCMC contour (see Ω_k vs. Ω_m in Fig. 1, for example) and, as a result, a closed universe, i.e., Ω_k < 0, is more strongly preferred than in kLCDM (cf. [8]). (See Fig. 3 for the comparisons with other results based on a minimal extension to LCDM) This is peculiar because the lower precision (i.e., wider distribution) is normally expected with the addition

| Model Parameters | Model A | Model B | kLCDM | LCDM |
|------------------|---------|---------|-------|------|
| Ω_bh^2          | 0.0227 ± 0.0001 | 0.0227 ± 0.0001 | 0.0226 ± 0.0001 | 0.0225 ± 0.0001 |
| Ω_m             | 0.307 ± 0.004  | 0.306±0.005  | 0.302 ± 0.005  | 0.305 ± 0.004  |
| Ω_r · 10^5      | 8.20±0.22  | 8.64±0.23  | 8.93±0.14  | 8.94±0.08  |
| Ω_k             | -0.005 ± 0.001 | -0.004±0.003 | -0.001 ± 0.002 | -0.001 ± 0.002 |
| Ω_Λ             | 0.70 ± 0.01  | 0.695 ± 0.005 | 0.699 ± 0.004 | 0.695 ± 0.004 |
| H_0 [km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}] | 71.38±1.19 | 69.53±1.57 | 68.41±0.52 | 68.36±0.32 |
| Ω_ω             | -0.75±0.24  | 0.34±1.15  | -0.51     | -0.30     |
| ΔN_{eff}        | 0.87±0.28   | -         | -         | -         |
| χ^2_{min}       | 1143.6      | 1150.1    | 1155.0   | 1157.9   |
| Δχ^2_{min}      | -14.3       | -7.8      | -2.9     | 0         |
| ln E            | -573.8      | -576.9    | -578.9   | -580.0   |
| ln B_{ij}       | +6.2        | +3.1      | +1.1     | 0         |

TABLE I: Constraints at 1σ (68%) CL errors on the cosmological parameters for our two cosmology models A, B, based on Hořava gravity, and the standard cosmology models, spatially-flat (k = 0) LCDM and spatially-non-flat (k ≠ 0) kLCDM, based on GR. In the bottom lines, we show χ^2_{min} for the best-fit values of parameters, the (logarithmic) Bayesian evidence ln E, and the Bayes factor ln B_{ij} with respects to LCDM. Δχ^2_{min} represents the difference of χ^2_{min} from those of LCDM. The bold-faced quantities represent the derived quantities.
FIG. 1: 2D joint and 1D marginalized posterior probability distributions for $\Omega_m, \Omega_k, H_0,$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda}$, obtained within our two models A, B and the standard cosmology models, spatially-flat LCDM, spatially-non-flat kLCDM. Contour plots are shown at 1$\sigma$ (68%) and 2$\sigma$ (95%) CL.

of more parameters, as can be seen in $\Omega_b h^2, \Omega_r,$ and $H_0$ for A and B, in contrast to kLCDM. Second, the correlation between $H_0$ and $\Omega_k$ is quite different for A or B and kLCDM: As $-\Omega_k$ increases, i.e., the universe tends more towards a closed universe, $H_0$ increases for A and B, i.e., the two parameters are “anti-correlated”, whereas the situation is the opposite for kLCDM. This property for $H_0$ resolves the problem of Hubble constant tension in kLCDM $[28,30]$. (See

8 It is interesting that a similar effect of curvature has been noted earlier in $[6]$ [see Fig. 4] though it would be hardly justified in the data sets with the CMB, based on GR $[61,62]$.}
FIG. 2: Constraints on the Hubble constant $H_0$ at 1σ CL obtained by different measurements vs. our constraints for the models A, B, LCDM, and kLCDM, using all the data sets in Table 1. In the different measurements, we use all the non-flat universe analysis (their companions with the same left numbers in Fig. 3) except the $H(z)$ data [28] and the bottom three data [32], and the full analysis (without priors) for all the CMB data, in contrast to our analysis with the CMB priors. The grey vertical band corresponds the value $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.60$ kms$^{-1}$Mpc$^{-1}$ as reported by Planck 2018 team [32] within a LCDM scenario. The blue vertical band corresponds to the value $H_0 = 73.52 \pm 1.62$ kms$^{-1}$Mpc$^{-1}$ from the recent direct local measurement using Cepheids [6].

3. In our analysis, we use the CMB distance priors, or shift parameters, instead of the full CMB data (for the details, see Appendix A). It is possible that this choice may lead to the lower statistical weight generally, though it has been widely used and a convenient substitute of the full CMB data. However, the comparison of our analysis for the kLCDM or LCDM case and the full CMB analysis in Fig. 2 when combining other data sets, including BAO, shows that it has just a little effect as can be seen. For example, CMB+BAO+SN [31], CMB+BAO Full [61], CMB+lensing+BAO [32] (with or without $\Omega_k$) that use the full CMB data, show a few
FIG. 3: Constraints on $\Omega_k$ at 1σ CL obtained by different measurements based on a minimal extension to LCDM vs. our constraints for the models A, B, and kLCDM, with all the data sets in Table 1. The corresponding companions in Fig. 2 have the same left numbers.

percent effects ($< 2\%$), in comparison with our LCDM, kLCDM results with the CMB priors.

4. The constraint of $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$, for model A (considering its central value), is consistent with SPT-3G 2018 data (alone), $0.65 \pm 0.70$ (CMB)\(^9\) by $0.31\sigma$, while in a tension with Planck 2018 data, for example, $2.7 - 2.8\sigma$ of $-0.06^{+0.34}_{-0.33}$ (CMB+lensing+BAO)\(^10\). Since, in our MCMC analysis, we have not included SPT-3G 2018 data, which gives better constraints at the higher angular multipoles $l > 1000$, the agreement of our constraint of $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$ might give an independent support of our model A. However, due to a lack of data with both $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$ and $\Omega_k$, which would be quite (anti-)correlated (see Fig. 4), as the “varying” parameters in SPT and Planck, the exact quantification of (in)compatibility is not available yet. But we can generally

\(^9\) There is a more systematic analysis on the test of the CMB priors which supports the use of the CMB priors for the background analysis of dark-energy dynamics\(^6\). It would be an interesting problem to confirm the accuracy of the CMB priors for our Ho\v{r}ava cosmology model also in a more systematic way.

\(^10\) In this case, the constraint of $H_0$ is given by $73.5 \pm 5.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}$.
expect some tensions with Planck 2018 in $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$ as in the case of $H_0$ due to the correlation of $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$ and $H_0$ in Planck 2018 [32, 65], as well as in SPT-3G 2018 [65] and our case (Fig. 4).

It is known that primordial gravitational waves may add to the effective relativistic degrees of freedom [66]. For example, in a recently proposed scenario linking $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$ with the gravitational waves from primordial black holes [67], it is possible to have $\Delta N_{\text{eff}(GW)} \sim 0.1 - 0.2$ which may increase the standard value $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$ and its associated radiation parameter $\Omega_r$, slightly. In some different scenarios, it has been also found that the primordial gravitational waves do not solve but alleviates the $H_0$-tension problem [68]. However, in all those cases, a spatially-flat universe is assumed implicitly and the effect of a non-flat universe seems to still be an open problem. Moreover, due to some inaccuracies of the (our-adopted) CMB priors for the primordial power spectrum in a non-flat universe [64], in this paper, we will not quantify its effect in the $H_0$-tension problem further which needs another full data analysis as well.

5. From the Bayes theorem, the Bayesian evidence $E(D|M)$ for a model $M$ with the total data sets $D$ is given by the integration over the model parameters $\theta$

$$E(D|M) = \int d\theta \mathcal{L}(D|\theta, M) \pi(\theta|M),$$

(17)

where $\mathcal{L}(D|\theta, M)$ is the likelihood $\mathcal{L}(D|\theta, M) \equiv \exp[-\chi^2(D|\theta, M)/2]$ in which the total $\chi^2$ is obtained by summing $\chi^2(D_i|\theta, M)$ over all the data sets $D_i$. $\pi(\theta|M)$ is the prior probability, which we have assumed to be flat, i.e., no prior information on $\theta$, in order to be as agnostic as possible: Our only priors are $0 < \Omega_b < \Omega_m$, $0 < H_0 < 100$ for LCDM, kLCDM; in addition, $\Omega_k \neq 0$, $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \neq 0$ for model $A$ and $\Omega_\Lambda \neq 0$ for model $B$, in order to avoid the singularity of the corresponding Friedmann equations (15) and (16), respectively.

The differences of $\chi^2_{\text{min}}$ for the models $A$ and $B$, with respect to LCDM, $\Delta \chi^2_{\text{min}} = -14.3, -7.8$ indicate the notable improvements of fitting to the given data sets, in contrast to the smaller difference $\Delta \chi^2_{\text{min}} = -2.9$ for kLCDM.

For a more quantitative comparison of the models, we consider the Bayes factor

$$B_{ij} \equiv \frac{E(D|M_i)}{E(D|M_j)},$$

(18)

which quantifies the preference for model $M_i$ against model $M_j$, using the (revised) Jeffrey’s
These correspond to the CPL parameters, \((\bar{\omega}, \omega_a)\) = \((-1.005, -0.010), (-0.998, 0.004)\) for the expansion of \(\omega_{\text{DE}} = \omega_0 + \omega_a(1 - a) + \omega_b(1 - a)^2 + \cdots\) near the current epoch \(a = 1\).

6. The theory parameters can be written in terms of cosmological parameters as

\[
\omega = \frac{2k\Omega_\omega}{R_0^2\Omega_k}, \quad \Lambda_W = -\frac{2k\Omega_{\Lambda}}{R_0^2\Omega_k}, \quad \mu^2 = \left(\frac{\Omega_k}{-k}\right)\frac{H_0R_0M_P}{\Omega_{\Lambda}L_P},
\]

where \(M_P\) and \(L_P\) are the Planck mass and length, respectively, with \(M_P/L_P = c^2/8\pi G = \alpha^{-1}\). Then we obtain their best-fit values\(^{14}\), \((\bar{\omega}, \Lambda_W, \bar{\mu}) = (-275.94, 270.99, 0.0062), (173.51, 390.24, 0.0043)\), where \(\bar{\omega} \equiv \omega R_0, \Lambda_W \equiv \Lambda W R_0, \bar{\mu} \equiv (\mu^2 L_P/H_0 R_0 M_P)^{1/2}\), for the models A and B, respectively\(^{15}\). There are large errors (see Table 2 and Fig. 5) due to the non-linearity of the relation \((19)\) but their best-fit values are distributed near what can be obtained by plugging the obtained best-fit values of observational parameters in Table 1, \((\bar{\omega}, \Lambda_W, \bar{\mu}) = (-299.20, 281.20, 0.00596), (167.50, 347.50, 0.00479)\). These would be the first full (cosmological) determination of the theory parameters (for the earlier determinations\(^{16}\), see \([41]\)).

In conclusion, we have tested the spatially non-flat universe in standard cosmology within Horava gravity. We have obtained the “very strong” and “strong” Bayesian evidences against flat LCDM, for our two models A and B, respectively. Moreover, the MCMC analysis shows (a) the preference of a closed universe and (b) a reduction of the Hubble constant tension for model A, even if BAO data is included.

The reason for the reduced Hubble tension may be related to the “natural” inclusion of the (early) dark radiation within the dynamical dark energy and its associated contribution to \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = 0.87\), which is a bit larger than required in GR context. Another reason may be the peculiar contribution of the curvature \(\Omega_k < 0\), which has been previously considered on phenomenological ground \([5, 73]\). However, the resolution does not seem to be quite complete yet \([74]\); this might be due to the fact that our observational data may not be completely model independent and are based on known physics. For example, as noted earlier, the BBN-like parametrization \([13]\), which has been used for model A, is based on standard particle physics model with the phenomenological parameter \(\Delta N_{\text{eff}}\). Our MCMC analysis implies that the phenomenological approach of model A is a good approximation of the BBN, constraining \(\Omega_k\) more precisely and reducing the Hubble constant tension, i.e., increasing \(H_0\), with the almost doubled Bayesian evidences compared to model B. It would be a challenging problem

\(^{13}\) This is in contrast to the “strong” evidence for kLCDM with \(\ln B_{ij} = +3.3\) for the CMB data alone \([22]\).

\(^{14}\) It is interesting to note that this is the case of \(\omega < 0, \omega < 2\Lambda W\) in which the observer region is located between the inner and outer (black hole) horizons with the cutting-edge (surface-like) singularity of the space-time (or, the end of world) inside the inner horizon \([22]\).

\(^{15}\) These correspond to the CPL parameters, \((\bar{\omega}_0, \omega_a)\) = \((-1.005, -0.010), (-0.998, 0.004)\) for the expansion of \(\omega_{\text{DE}} = \omega_0 + \omega_a(1 - a) + \omega_b(1 - a)^2 + \cdots\) near the current epoch \(a = 1\).

\(^{16}\) There are sign errors for the results of \(\bar{\omega}\) and \(k\) in \([41]\).
to consider thoroughly the effect of anisotropic scaling beyond the standard model BBN and revisit the Hubble tension problem to see whether a complete resolution can be found or not. Finally, the analysis of the cosmological perturbations for the non-flat universe and with the full use of Boltzmann solvers such as CAMB/Class would also be an important arena for studying standard cosmology, like the cosmic-shear or $\sigma_8$ tension [28].
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Appendix A: Cosmological Data Sets and $\chi^2$ Measures

In this Appendix, we present some more details on the cosmological data sets and their $\chi^2$ measures as used for the statistical analysis.

1. Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)

The CMB data is given by the shift parameters which describe the location of the first peak in the temperature angular power spectrum. We use the shift parameters for Planck 2018 data [49], given by the ratio between the model being tested and the LCDM model ($x$ is a vector containing the model parameters) with a canonical cold dark matter as [75]

$$R(x) = 100 \sqrt{\Omega_m h^2} \left( \frac{d_A(z_*, x)}{c} \right),$$

$$\ell_a(x) = \pi \left( \frac{d_A(z_*, x)}{r_s(z_*, x)} \right),$$

as well as $\Omega_b h^2$, with the reduced Hubble constant $h \equiv H_0/100$ kms$^{-1}$Mpc$^{-1}$. Here, $d_A(z_*, x)$ and $r_s(z_*, x)$ are the comoving angular-diameter distance and the sound horizon

$$d_A(z, x) = \frac{c}{H_0} \sqrt{\Omega_k} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega_k}} \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{E(z', x)} \right),$$

$$r_s(z, x) = \int_{z}^{\infty} \frac{c_s(z')dz'}{H(z', x)},$$

respectively, where $E(z, x) \equiv H(z, x)/H_0$ and $c_s$ is the sound speed

$$c_s(z) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{3[1 + h_0(1 + z)^{-1}]}}.$$
\[ R_b = 31500 \, \Omega_b h^2 \left( T_{\text{CMB}}/2.72 \right)^{-4} \]  

(A4)

at the photon-decoupling redshift \( z_* \), given by \([76]\)

\[
z_* = 1048 \left[ 1 + 0.00124 \left( \Omega_b h^2 \right)^{-0.738} \right] \left[ 1 + g_1 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{g_2} \right],
\]

\[
g_1 = 0.0783 \left( \Omega_b h^2 \right)^{-0.238} \left[ 1 + 39.5 \left( \Omega_b h^2 \right)^{-0.763} \right]^{-1},
\]

\[
g_2 = 0.560 \left[ 1 + 21.1 \left( \Omega_b h^2 \right)^{1.811} \right]^{-1}.
\]

(A5)

Then, we obtain the \( \chi^2 \) measure for Planck 2018 as

\[
\chi^2_{\text{Planck}} = (\Delta F_{\text{Planck}})^T C^{-1}_{\text{Planck}} \Delta F_{\text{Planck}},
\]

(A6)

where \( \Delta F_{\text{Planck}} \equiv F_{\text{Planck}(\text{th})} - F_{\text{Planck}(\text{obs})} \) is the difference between the theoretical and observed distance modulus for a vector formed from the three shift parameters \( F_{\text{Planck}} \equiv \{ R, \ell_a, \Omega_b h^2 \} \) and \( C^{-1}_{\text{Planck}} \) is the inverse covariance matrix \([75]\).

2. Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO)

The BAO consists of several data sets:

**SDSS-BOSS:** This includes the data points from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey III - Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (SDSS-BOSS), DR12 release \([50]\), with associated redshifts \( z_B = \{0.38, 0.51, 0.61\} \). The pertinent quantities for the BOSS data are

\[
d_A(z, x) \frac{r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d)}{r_s(z_d, x)},
\]

\[
H(z, x) \frac{r_s(z_d, x)}{r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d)}
\]

(A7)

at the *dragging* redshift\( z_d \) which can be approximated as \([77]\)

\[
z_d = \frac{1291 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{0.251}}{1 + 0.659 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{0.828}} \left[ 1 + b_1 \left( \Omega_b h^2 \right)^{b_2} \right],
\]

\[
b_1 = 0.313 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{-0.419} \left[ 1 + 0.607 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{0.6748} \right],
\]

\[
b_2 = 0.238 \left( \Omega_m h^2 \right)^{0.223}.
\]

(A8)

Here, \( r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d) \) is the same quantity evaluated for a fiducial/reference model and we take \( r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d) = 147.78 \, \text{Mpc} \) \([50]\). We then obtain its \( \chi^2 \) measure as

\[
\chi^2_{\text{BOSS}} = (\Delta F_{\text{BOSS}})^T C^{-1}_{\text{BOSS}} \Delta F_{\text{BOSS}}
\]

(A9)

with \( \Delta F_{\text{BOSS}} \equiv F_{\text{BOSS}(\text{th})} - F_{\text{BOSS}(\text{obs})} \) for a vector \( F_{\text{BOSS}} \equiv \{ d_A(z_B) r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d)/r_s(z_d), H(z_B) r_s(z_d)/r_s^{\text{fid}}(z_d) \} \) and \( C^{-1}_{\text{BOSS}} \) is the inverse covariance matrix found in \([50]\).
SDSS-eBOSS: There is one more data point in the extended Baryon Acoustic Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (eBOSS) at $z = 1.52$, which gives the value

$$D_V(1.52, x) \frac{r_s^{\text{fid}}(zd)}{r_s(zd, x)} = 3843 \pm 147,$$

where $D_V$ is defined as

$$D_V(z, x) = \left[d_A^c(z, x)^2 \frac{cz}{H(z, x)}\right]^{1/3}.$$  

We have then its $\chi^2$ measure as

$$\chi^2_{\text{eBOSS}} = \frac{\Delta F_{\text{eBOSS}}}{\sigma_{\text{eBOSS}}}$$

with $\Delta F_{\text{eBOSS}} \equiv F_{\text{eBOSS}(th)} - F_{\text{eBOSS}(obs)}$ for $F_{\text{eBOSS}} \equiv D_V(z = 1.52) r_s^{\text{fid}}(zd)/r_s(zd)$ and the measurement error $\sigma_{\text{eBOSS}}$.

SDSS-BOSS-Lyman-$\alpha$: The Quasar-Lyman-$\alpha$ forest from SDSS-III BOSS RD11 gives the two data points as

$$d_A^c(z = 2.34, x)/r_s(zd, x) = 36.98^{+1.26}_{-1.18},$$

$$c/H(z = 2.34, x) r_s(z = zd, x) = 9.00 \pm 0.22,$$

and we obtain the corresponding $\chi^2$ measure as

$$\chi^2_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$}} = \frac{\Delta F_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$}}}{\sigma_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$}}}$$

with $\Delta F_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$}} \equiv F_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$(th)}} - F_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$(obs)}}$ and $F_{\text{Lyman-$\alpha$}} \equiv \{d_A^c(z = 2.34)/r_s(zd), c/H(z = 2.34)r_s(zd)\}$.

WiggleZ: This includes the data from the WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey at redshift points $z_W = \{0.44, 0.6, 0.73\}$. Here, the pertinent quantities are the acoustic parameter

$$A(z, x) = 100 \sqrt{\Omega_m h^2} \frac{D_V(z, x)}{cz}$$

and Alcock-Paczynski parameter

$$F(z, x) = \frac{d_A^c(z, x) H(z, x)}{c},$$

where $D_V$ is defined as above (A11). We then obtain its $\chi^2$ measure as

$$\chi^2_{\text{WiggleZ}} = \frac{\Delta F_{\text{WiggleZ}}}{\sigma_{\text{WiggleZ}}}$$

with $\Delta F_{\text{WiggleZ}} \equiv F_{\text{WiggleZ}(th)} - F_{\text{WiggleZ}(obs)}$ and $F_{\text{WiggleZ}} \equiv \{A(z_W), F(z_W)\}$.

3. Type Ia Supernovae (SNe Ia)
We use the recent Pantheon catalogue of Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) which consists of 1048 objects in the redshift range $0.01 < z < 2.26$ [54]. The data is expressed as the distance modulus
\[ \mu(z, \mathbf{x}) = 5 \log d_L(z, \mathbf{x}) + \mu_0, \tag{A18} \]
where $\mu_0$ is a nuisance parameter containing the supernova absolute magnitude and $d_L$ is the luminosity distance
\[ d_L(z, \mathbf{x}) \equiv (1 + z) \cdot d_A^3(z, \mathbf{x}). \tag{A19} \]
Removing the nuisance parameter dependence via marginalizing over $\mu_0$ [78], we obtain its $\chi^2$ measure as
\[ \chi^2_{\text{Pantheon}} = a + \log \frac{e}{2\pi} - \frac{b^2}{e}, \tag{A20} \]
where $a \equiv \Delta \mu^T C^{-1}_{\text{Pantheon}} \Delta \mu$, $b \equiv \Delta \mu^T C^{-1}_{\text{Pantheon}} \cdot 1$, $c \equiv 1^T \cdot C^{-1}_{\text{Pantheon}} \cdot 1$ with $\Delta \mu = \mu_{\text{th}} - \mu_{\text{obs}}$ for each object and the inverse covariance matrix $C^{-1}_{\text{Pantheon}}$ for the whole sample. Here, the theoretical value of the distance module (A18) is given by
\[ \mu_{\text{th}} = 5 \log [(1 + z_{\text{hel}}) \cdot d_A^3(z_{\text{cmb}}, \mathbf{x})] + \mu_0, \tag{A21} \]
where $z_{\text{cmb}}$ is the CMB restframe redshift and $z_{\text{hel}}$ is the heliocentric redshifts which includes the effect of the peculiar velocity [79, 80].

4. Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs)

We use the set of 79 Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs) in the range $1.44 < z < 8.1$, called the Mayflower sample [55], which was calibrated in a model independent manner. The pertinent quantity for GRBs is the distance modulus $\mu$ and therefore its $\chi^2$ measure is in analogue with SNe Ia in the formula (A20). But the important difference is that there is no distinction between $z_{\text{cmb}}$ and $z_{\text{hel}}$ for the theoretical value of the distance module $\mu_{\text{th}}$ in (A21).

5. Lensed Quasars

We use the 6 lensed quasars from the recent release by the H0liCOW collaboration [56, 81]. These quasars have multiple-lensed images from which a time delay due to the different light paths can be obtained. The time delay can be expressed as
\[ t(\theta, \beta) = \frac{1 + z_L}{c} \frac{D_L D_S}{D_{LS}} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \beta)^2 - \psi(\theta) \right], \tag{A22} \]
where $z_L$ is the lens redshift, $\psi$ is the lensing potential, and $\theta, \beta$ are the angular position of the image and the source, respectively. The quantities $D_L, D_S$, and $D_{LS}$ are the angular-diameter distances for lens $\rightarrow$ observer, source $\rightarrow$ observer, and source $\rightarrow$ lens, respectively, defined as
\[ d_A(z, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{d_A^3(z, \mathbf{x})}{1 + z}, \tag{A23} \]
\[ D_L = d_A(z_L, \mathbf{x}), \quad D_S = d_A(z_S, \mathbf{x}), \]
\[ D_{LS} = \frac{1}{1 + z_S} [(1 + z_S)D_S - (1 + z_L)D_L], \tag{A24} \]
where $z_L$ is the source redshift. From the time-delay distance, the combination constrained by H0liCOW, defined as $D_{\Delta t} = (1 + z_L) D_L D_S / D_{LS}$, we obtain its $\chi^2$ measure as

$$
\chi^2_{\text{H0liCOW}} = \sum_{i=1}^{6} \frac{(D_{\Delta t,i}(x) - D_{\Delta t,i}^{\text{obs}})^2}{\sigma_{D_{\Delta t,i}}^2},
$$

(A25)

with the observed values $D_{\Delta t,i}^{\text{obs}}$ and the measurement errors $\sigma_{D_{\Delta t,i}}$.

6. Cosmic Chronometers (CC)

We use the early elliptical and lenticular galaxies at different redshifts whose spectral properties can be traced with cosmic time $t$ so that they can be used as Cosmic Chronometers (CC) by measuring the Hubble parameter $H(z) \equiv dz/dt(1 + z)$, independently on cosmological models [82]. Then, using 25 measurements from the data set in the range $0.07 < z < 1.965$ [57], we obtain its $\chi^2$ measure as

$$
\chi^2_{\text{CC}} = \sum_{i=1}^{25} \frac{[H(z_i, x) - H_{\text{obs}}(z_i)]^2}{\sigma_{\text{CC}}^2(z_i)},
$$

(A26)

where $H_{\text{obs}}(z_i)$ are the measured values of the Hubble parameter and $\sigma_{\text{CC}}(z_i)$ are their measurement errors.

Appendix B: More Details of Constraints on Parameters

| Theory Parameters | Model A       | Model B       |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| $\bar{\omega}$    | $-275.94^{+171.38}_{-133.08}$ | $173.51^{+1357.96}_{-159.84}$ |
| $\bar{\Lambda}W$  | $270.99^{+49.89}_{-31.65}$     | $390.24^{+1224.34}_{-117.17}$ |
| $\bar{\mu}$       | $0.0062^{+0.0008}_{-0.0010}$   | $0.0043^{+0.0018}_{-0.0033}$   |

TABLE II: Constraints at 1$\sigma$ CL on the theory parameters for our two cosmology models A, B.
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