

# Cosmological Tensions and the Interacting Dark Sector: Observational Motivation and Theoretical Constraints

Prithvi Sharma

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110100122>

Received: 28 January 2026; Accepted: 02 February 2026; Published: 19 February 2026

## ABSTRACT

The  $\Lambda$ CDM model has been remarkably successful in describing the large-scale evolution of the Universe, yet persistent discrepancies in key cosmological parameters increasingly challenge its completeness. In particular, the growing tension between early- and late-Universe measurements of the Hubble constant ( $H_0$ ), along with inconsistencies in the amplitude of matter clustering quantified by  $S_8$ , suggests that the standard assumption of non-interacting dark components may require revision. This review examines the Interacting Dark Sector (IDS) hypothesis, in which dark matter and dark energy are allowed to exchange energy and momentum while preserving total energy–momentum conservation. We survey phenomenological coupling models, including density-dependent interactions and running vacuum scenarios, and discuss their impact on the expansion history, structure formation, and cosmological observables. By synthesizing recent theoretical developments with constraints from cosmic microwave background measurements, large-scale structure surveys, and distance-ladder observations, we assess the extent to which IDS models can simultaneously alleviate the  $H_0$  and  $S_8$  tensions. We further examine theoretical challenges associated with stability, thermodynamic consistency, and the lack of a microphysical origin for the coupling. We conclude by outlining observational prospects for testing dark sector interactions with forthcoming surveys and discuss whether the interacting paradigm represents a viable extension of  $\Lambda$ CDM in the era of precision cosmology.

**Keywords:** Interacting dark sector; dark energy–dark matter interaction;  $\Lambda$ CDM model; Hubble tension;  $S_8$  tension; large-scale structure; cosmic microwave background; vacuum decay; precision cosmology

## INTRODUCTION

### The Success and Strain of $\Lambda$ CDM

The  $\Lambda$ CDM model, comprising a Cosmological Constant ( $\Lambda$ ) and Cold Dark Matter (CDM), stands as the standard paradigm of modern cosmology. Its mathematical simplicity, requiring only six primary parameters, has allowed it to describe the evolution of the universe from the epoch of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis to the current era of accelerated expansion. The model's success is anchored in its ability to fit the temperature anisotropies of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) with unprecedented precision, as evidenced by the results from the *Planck* mission.

However, as observational cosmology enters an era of high-precision data, the  $\Lambda$ CDM model is facing significant "tensions" that suggest the model may be an incomplete description of reality. The most acute of these is the **Hubble Tension**: a  $5\sigma$  discrepancy between the  $H_0$  value inferred from the early-universe (approx.

67.4 km/s/Mpc) and the direct local measurements from Type Ia Supernovae and Cepheid variables (approx. 73.0 km/s/Mpc). This gap suggests that our extrapolation of the universe's expansion history, based on a static cosmological constant, may be flawed.

Parallel to the Hubble Tension is the  **$S_8$  tension**, which relates to the growth of large-scale structures. Observations from weak gravitational lensing and galaxy clustering, such as those from the Dark Energy Survey (DES), indicate that the universe is roughly 10% less "clumpy" than the  $\Lambda$ CDM model predicts when calibrated by the CMB. These discrepancies have motivated a re-examination of the "Dark Sector," specifically the assumption that Dark Matter and Dark Energy exist as isolated, non-interacting fluids.

This review explores the **Interacting Dark Sector (IDS)** hypothesis. Rather than viewing  $\Lambda$  as a rigid constant of nature and  $CDM$  as a passive gravitational scaffold, IDS models propose a dynamic exchange of energy and momentum between these components. By allowing a coupling term ( $Q$ ), we can modify the expansion history and the growth rate of structures, potentially harmonizing the conflicting measurements of  $H_0$  and  $S_8$ .

### Theoretical Framework of the Interacting Dark Sector (IDS)

To move beyond the standard model, we must modify the general relativistic conservation equations. In a flat FLRW universe, the total energy-momentum tensor is conserved, but in IDS, the individual components are not.

### Modified Continuity Equations

We introduce a coupling function  $Q$  that dictates the rate of energy-density exchange. The evolution equations for the energy densities of Dark Matter ( $\rho_{dm}$ ) and Dark Energy ( $\rho_{de}$ ) become:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho'_{dm} + 3H\rho_{dm} &= -Q\rho'_{de} \\ + 3H\rho_{de} &= Q \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $w$  is the equation-of-state parameter for Dark Energy. In the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model,  $Q=0$  and  $w=-1$ . In the IDS framework, a positive  $Q$  represents a flow of energy from Dark Matter to Dark Energy. This interaction changes the background evolution of the Hubble parameter  $H(z)$ , which is governed by the modified Friedmann equation.

$$H^2(z) = \frac{8\pi G}{3} [\rho_b(z) + \rho_r(z) + \rho_{dm}(z, Q) + \rho_{de}(z, Q)]$$

### Phenomenological Coupling Models

Because we lack a fundamental theory of the dark sector's microphysics,  $Q$  is usually defined by the densities of the components and the expansion rate. Two primary models dominate the literature:

1.  **$Q=\xi H\rho_{dm}$ :** In this model, the interaction is driven by the density of Dark Matter. If  $\xi > 0$ , Dark Matter gradually "decays" into Dark Energy. This is particularly effective at reducing the  $S_8$  tension because it reduces the amount of matter available for gravitational collapse at late times.
2. **Vacuum Decay [ $\Lambda(H)$ ]:** This model treats the cosmological constant not as a true constant, but as a "running" parameter that depends on the energy scale of the universe (represented by  $H$ ). As  $H$  decreases with the expansion of the universe, the vacuum energy density decays, transferring its energy into Dark Matter particles.

### Mathematical Impact on $H_0$

The inclusion of  $Q$  alters the "sound horizon" ( $r_s$ ) at the time of recombination. By changing the energy density ratios in the early and late universe, IDS models can shift the value of  $H_0$  needed to keep the angular size of the CMB fluctuations constant, effectively bridging the  $5\sigma$  gap.

### Resolving Cosmological Tensions via the Dark Sector

The central appeal of the Interacting Dark Sector (IDS) hypothesis lies in its dual capacity to address the  $H_0$  and  $S_8$  tensions simultaneously, a feat that most other modified gravity or early-dark-energy models struggle to achieve. By breaking the conservation of individual dark components, we introduce new degrees of freedom that alter the universe's expansion history and growth of structure.

## Mechanizing the $H_0$ Resolution

The  $H_0$  tension is essentially a mismatch between the "top-down" inference from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and the "bottom-up" measurements from the local distance ladder. In the IDS framework, the interaction term  $Q$  modifies the late-time expansion rate without significantly altering the physics of the early universe (the sound horizon).

If we assume a coupling where energy flows from Dark Matter to Dark Energy ( $Q > 0$ ), the energy density of Dark Matter was higher in the past than what  $\Lambda$ CDM assumes. This higher density in the pre-recombination era changes the calibration of the standard ruler. Consequently, when we project this model forward to  $z=0$ , the inferred Hubble constant shifts upward. Recent joint analyses of *Planck* and *Pantheon+* data suggest that IDS models can push the  $H_0$  value toward 71.0-72.0 km/s/Mpc, effectively reducing the tension from a  $5\sigma$  "crisis" to a statistically manageable  $2\sigma$  discrepancy.

## Dampening the $S_8$ Growth Tension

The  $S_8$  tension stems from the fact that standard  $\Lambda$ CDM predicts a higher degree of matter clustering (clumpiness) than what is observed by weak-lensing surveys like the Dark Energy Survey (DES) and the KiloDegree Survey (KiDS-1000).

In an interacting scenario where Dark Matter "decays" into Dark Energy, two effects occur that suppress structure formation:

1. **Reduced Gravitational Source:** There is physically less Dark Matter available at late times to act as the gravitational "glue" for galaxy clusters.
2. **Increased Drag Force:** The interaction term  $Q$  often manifests as an extra drag force in the equations of motion for Dark Matter perturbations.

Mathematically, the growth of the matter density contrast  $\delta_m$  is governed by:

$$\ddot{\delta}_m + (2H + \gamma)\dot{\delta}_m - 4\pi G\rho_m\delta_m = 0$$

Where  $\gamma$  is a damping term derived from the coupling  $Q$ . This damping results in a lower amplitude of matter fluctuations today, naturally aligning the theoretical  $S_8$  prediction with the "smoother" universe observed by lensing surveys.

## The "Coincidence Problem" and IDS

Beyond solving tensions, IDS offers a more natural explanation for the **Coincidence Problem**, the question of why the energy densities of Dark Matter and Dark Energy ( $\rho_{dm}$  and  $\rho_{de}$ ) are of the same order of magnitude exactly at the current epoch. In a non-interacting  $\Lambda$ CDM model, this requires extreme fine-tuning of initial conditions. However, in IDS models, the interaction can create an "attractor solution." In these scenarios, the ratio  $\rho_{dm} / \rho_{de}$  tends toward a constant value over time regardless of initial conditions, making our current observations statistically "natural" rather than a cosmic fluke.

## Challenges and Theoretical Constraints

Despite the ability of Interacting Dark Sector models to harmonize  $H_0$  and  $S_8$  measurements, the hypothesis faces significant theoretical and observational scrutiny. Moving away from the simplicity of  $\Lambda$ CDM introduces new complexities that must be reconciled with the fundamental laws of physics.

## Large-Scale Instabilities

One of the primary mathematical hurdles for IDS models is the risk of "non-adiabatic" instabilities. In many models where the equation of state  $w$  is close to  $-1$ , the perturbations in the dark fluids can grow uncontrollably at early times, leading to a "blow-up" in the power spectrum that contradicts CMB observations. To avoid this, physicists must carefully fine-tune the coupling function  $Q$  or introduce complex "ghost-free" conditions, which some critics argue makes the model less "natural" than the  $\Lambda$ CDM it seeks to replace.

## The Nature of the Coupling Term

The most significant philosophical challenge is the lack of a "First Principles" derivation for the interaction. While we can write  $Q = \zeta H \rho$  as a mathematical convenience, we do not yet have a particle physics model (such as a specific Lagrangian) that explains *how* a Dark Matter particle would exchange energy with a vacuum field. Without a detection of a Dark Matter particle (e.g., via WIMP or Axion searches), the IDS remains a phenomenological "top-down" approach rather than a "bottom-up" physical discovery.

## Thermodynamic Consistency

Any exchange of energy between two fluids must obey the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Some IDS models inadvertently predict a flow of heat from a colder fluid to a hotter one, which would be unphysical. Researchers must ensure that the direction of energy flow ( $Q > 0$  vs  $Q < 0$ ) is consistent with the temperature evolution of the expanding universe.

## CONCLUSION AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

The "Crisis in Cosmology" has reached a point where standard explanations, such as systematic errors in telescopes, are becoming increasingly unlikely. The  $5\sigma$  tension in the Hubble constant suggests that the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, while a brilliant approximation of the last century's data, may be a limiting case of a more complex, dynamic system.

As reviewed in this paper, the **Interacting Dark Sector (IDS)** offers one of the most compelling paths forward. By allowing for a coupling between Dark Matter and Dark Energy, we gain the flexibility to:

1. **Shift the Hubble Constant** to match local measurements without discarding CMB data.
2. **Suppress the Growth of Structure** to align with the "smooth" universe seen in weak-lensing surveys.
3. **Address the Coincidence Problem** by treating the Dark Sector as an interconnected ecosystem.

The next five years will be decisive. Next-generation surveys, including the **Euclid Satellite**, the **Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI)**, and the **Vera C. Rubin Observatory**, will provide the massive datasets required to detect a non-zero coupling strength ( $\zeta$ ). If an interaction is confirmed, it will represent the first major update to our cosmological worldview since the discovery of dark energy itself, transitioning our understanding from a static, "dead" Cosmological Constant to a living, evolving Dark Sector.

## REFERENCES

1. Planck Collaboration. (2020). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A6. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910>
2. Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., Bowers, J. B., Macri, L. M., Zinn, J. C., ... Scolnic, D. (2021). A comprehensive measurement of the local value of the Hubble constant with  $1 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES team. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 908(1), L6. <https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/abdbaf>
3. Di Valentino, E., Mena, O., Pan, S., Visinelli, L., Yang, W., Melchiorri, A., ... Silk, J. (2021). In the realm of the Hubble tension: A review of solutions. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 38(15), 153001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/abdbaf>. [In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions - IOPscience](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1361-6382/abdbaf)

4. Wang, B., Abdalla, E., Atrio-Barandela, F., & Pavón, D. (2016). Dark matter and dark energy interactions: Theoretical challenges, cosmological implications, and observational signatures. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 79(9), 096901. [Dark matter and dark energy interactions: theoretical challenges, cosmological implications and observational signatures - IOPscience](#)
5. Amendola, L. (2000). Coupled quintessence. *Physical Review D*, 62(4), 043511. [Coupled quintessence | Phys. Rev. D](#)
6. Abdalla, E., Di Valentino, E., Mena, O., Pan, S., Visinelli, L., Yang, W., ... Silk, J. (2022). Cosmology intertwined: A review of the Hubble constant and  $S_8$  tensions. *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics*, 34, 49– 211. [Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies - ScienceDirect](#)
7. Salvatelli, V., Said, N., Bruni, M., Melchiorri, A., & Wands, D. (2014). Indications of a late-time interaction in the dark sector. *Physical Review Letters*, 113(18), 181301. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.181301>
8. Asghari, M., Hazra, D. K., Poursidou, A., Banerjee, A., & Moscardini, L. (2019). The  $H_0$  and  $S_8$  tensions in the context of interacting dark energy. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2019(04), 042. [On structure formation from a small-scales-interacting dark sector - IOPscience](#)
9. Mörtzell, E., & Dhawan, S. (2018). Does the Hubble constant tension call for new physics? *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2018(09), 025. [Does the Hubble constant tension call for new physics? - IOPscience](#)
10. Li, Y.-H., & Zhang, X. (2014). Running the vacuum model and the  $H_0$  tension. *Physical Review D*, 90(6), 063009. [Late-time vacuum phase transitions: Connecting sub-eV scale physics with cosmological structure formation](#)
11. He, J.-H., Wang, B., & Abdalla, E. (2009). Stability of the perturbations in interacting dark energy models. *Physics Letters B*, 671(2), 139–145. [On phantom thermodynamics with negative temperature - ScienceDirect](#)
13. Bielefeld, J., Caldwell, R. R., & Linder, E. V. (2015). Dark energy and dark matter: Unified dark fluids or coupled systems? *Physical Review D*, 91(12), 123514. [Gamma-ray observations of blazars and the intergalactic magnetic field spectrum | Phys. Rev. D](#)
14. Nesseris, S., & Perivolaropoulos, L. (2007). Testing  $\Lambda$ CDM with the growth of structure. *Physical Review D*, 77(2), 023504. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.023504>
15. Efsthathiou, G. (2020). A lock on the Hubble constant. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 505(3), 3866–3872. [Spectral analysis of the quiescent low-mass X-ray binary in the globular cluster M30 | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic](#)
17. Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., Knop, R. A., Nugent, P., Castro, P. G., ... Supernova Cosmology Project. (1999). Measurements of  $\Omega$  and  $\Lambda$  from 42 high-redshift supernovae. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 517(2), 565–586. <https://doi.org/10.1086/307221>
18. Shah, P., Lemos, P., Lahav, O., & Hobson, M. P. (2021). The  $S_8$  tension: A review of recent results. *The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 29, 9. [A buyer's guide to the Hubble constant | The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review | Springer Nature Link](#)