

# A Comparative Test of the $\Lambda$ CDM and $R_h = ct$ Cosmologies Based on Upcoming Redshift Drift Measurements

F. MELIA

*Department of Physics, The Applied Math Program, and Department of Astronomy,  
The University of Arizona, AZ 85721, USA*

PACS 98.80.-k – Cosmology

PACS 98.80.Jk – Relativistic Astrophysics

**Abstract** – A measurement of the redshift drift constitutes a model-independent probe of fundamental cosmology. Several approaches are being considered to make the necessary observations, using (i) the Extremely Large Telescope (ELT), (ii) the Cosmic Accelerometer, and (iii) the differential redshift drift methodology. Our focus in this *Letter* is to assess how these upcoming measurements may be used to compare the predictions of  $\Lambda$ CDM with those of the alternative Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker cosmology known as the  $R_h = ct$  universe, and several other models, including modified gravity scenarios. The ELT should be able to distinguish between  $R_h = ct$  and the other models at better than  $3\sigma$  for  $z \gtrsim 3.6$  after 20 years of monitoring, while the Cosmic Accelerometer may be able to achieve the same result with sources at  $z \gtrsim 2.6$  after only 10 years.

**Introduction.** – Ongoing comparative studies between the *Planck*  $\Lambda$ CDM (standard) model [1, 2] and the alternative Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker cosmology known as the  $R_h = ct$  universe [3–5], suggest that the latter may be a better fit to the data at both high and low redshifts [6]. For example, several anomalies with the distribution of anisotropies studied in the cosmic microwave background with  $\Lambda$ CDM as the background cosmology [7, 8] appear to be completely mitigated by  $R_h = ct$  [9–11].

In addition, while the baryon acoustic oscillations measured in the Ly- $\alpha$  forest with the final SDSS-IV release [12] appear to disagree with the standard prediction at a confidence level of  $\sim 2.5\sigma$ , they favor  $R_h = ct$  over  $\Lambda$ CDM with a likelihood of  $\sim 80\%$  versus  $\sim 20\%$  [13]. Most recently, we have also witnessed a growing discordance between the expected formation of structure in  $\Lambda$ CDM and the discovery by *JWST* of well-formed galaxies at  $z \gtrsim 16$  [14–16] and an X-ray bright supermassive quasar at  $z \sim 10.1$  [17]. In both cases, the time versus redshift relation in the standard model does not work at all with the premature emergence of such objects so soon after the big bang, but the required timeline is fully consistent with the predictions of  $R_h = ct$  [18, 19]. By now, this contrast follows a well formed pattern that also accounts for the discovery of  $\sim 2$  Glyr-sized structures, which are ten times larger than can

be accommodated in  $\Lambda$ CDM, yet well within the expected evolution in the  $R_h = ct$  cosmology [20].

A short summary of the fundamental basis for  $R_h = ct$ , and its comparative tests with  $\Lambda$ CDM based on many kinds of cosmological data, is provided in the Appendix. All in all, the evidence favoring  $R_h = ct$  over  $\Lambda$ CDM appears to be compelling (see also Table 2 in ref. [21]), but the most definitive test ruling out one or the other of these two competing models is arguably the measurement of redshift drift. Unlike other kinds of cosmological probes, the redshift drift of sources moving passively with the Hubble flow allows us to see the Universe expand in real time [22–24]. Crucially, the standard model predicts a non-zero drift, while  $R_h = ct$  predicts absolutely zero drift at all redshifts. The distinction could not be clearer. For these two models, the test produces an essentially yes/no outcome, regardless of what the actual drift turns out to be if it's not zero.

The first detailed study to gauge the observational feasibility of such a measurement was carried out by [25], and this has become a key science driver for the ELT-HIRES spectrograph [26]. Since then, two other approaches have been proposed. In the first of these, the Cosmic Accelerometer [27] is focused on lowering the cost of the project. The second, known as The Acceleration Programme [28], aims to measure the differential redshift drift

between pairs of non-zero redshifts to maximize the difference.

Each has its pros and cons, some more suited to one specific goal, others perhaps more appropriate for different kinds of test, such as the optimization of parameters within nested models [29]. Our aim in this *Letter* is more straightforward than that. We shall examine which strategy is likely to result in robust model selection by the end of a nominal 20-year baseline.

**Redshift Drift.** – Objects moving with the Hubble flow display a redshift that depends on distance and, if the expansion rate is evolving, on time as well. Thus, measuring the change in redshift as the Universe expands constitutes a direct, non-geometric probe of its dynamics, independent of any assumptions concerning gravity and clustering [22]. An observed ‘redshift drift’ may be readily interpreted as long as the spacetime metric is consistent with the Cosmological principle, which asserts that the Universe is homogeneous and isotropic (at least on large scales).

Our principal concern in this *Letter* is how the time-dependent redshift of a source may be used to infer the Universe’s expansion dynamics [30–32]. The required measurements will be made with various instruments, including the ELT High-Resolution Spectrograph in the approximate redshift range  $2 \lesssim z \lesssim 5$  [25, 26].

The first (and second) time derivatives of the redshift have been derived by many workers (e.g., ref. [25, 32, 33]), so we shall simply quote their key results. Since the cosmological redshift,  $z$ , between the time of emission,  $t_e$ , when the expansion factor was  $a(t_e) \equiv a_e$ , and the observation time,  $t_0$ , when  $a(t_0) \equiv a_0$ , is given as

$$1 + z = \frac{a_0}{a_e}, \quad (1)$$

its derivative in terms of  $t_0$  is simply

$$\frac{dz}{dt_0} = [1 + z(t_0)]H(t_0) - \frac{a_0}{a_e^2} \frac{da_e}{dt_e} \frac{dt_e}{dt_0}, \quad (2)$$

where the Hubble parameter is defined to be

$$H(t) \equiv \frac{1}{a(t)} \frac{da(t)}{dt}. \quad (3)$$

We also have

$$dt_0 = [1 + z(t_0)] dt_e, \quad (4)$$

and so

$$\frac{dz}{dt_0} = [1 + z(t_0)]H_0 - H(z), \quad (5)$$

where  $H_0 \equiv H(t_0)$  is the Hubble constant today.

The redshift-dependent Hubble variable is often written in the form

$$H(z) = H_0 E(z), \quad (6)$$

where the dimensionless function

$$E^2(z) = \Omega_m(1+z)^3 + \Omega_r(1+z)^4 + \Omega_{de}(1+z)^{3(1+w_{de})} + \Omega_k(1+z)^2, \quad (7)$$

explicitly shows the parametrization for any given cosmological model.

In the case of  $\Lambda$ CDM,  $\Omega_m$ ,  $\Omega_r$  and  $\Omega_{de}$  are the ratios of energy density for, respectively, matter ( $\rho_m$ ), radiation ( $\rho_r$ ) and dark energy ( $\rho_{de}$ ) over the critical density  $\rho_c \equiv 3c^2 H_0^2 / 8\pi G$ . In addition,  $w_{de}$  is the equation of state parameter for dark-energy, defined as  $w_{de} \equiv p_{de} / \rho_{de}$ , where  $p$  is the pressure. The ratio  $\Omega_k \equiv -kc^2 / (a_0^2 \rho_c)$ , in terms of the spatial curvature constant  $k$ , is non-zero if the Universe is not spatially flat, i.e., if  $k \neq 0$ .

The situation for  $R_h = ct$  is much simpler because  $a(t) = t/t_0$  [3–5, 34, 35]. In this case we have

$$H(t) \equiv \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = \frac{1}{t} \quad (8)$$

and, since  $(1+z) = t_0/t_e$  from Equation (1), we also find that  $(1+z) = H(t_e)/H(t_0)$ , or

$$H(t_e) = H_0[1+z]. \quad (9)$$

Thus, it is easy to see from Equation (5) that

$$\frac{dz}{dt_0} = 0 \quad (10)$$

at all redshifts for this model.

The surveys do not measure  $\Delta z$  directly, but instead monitor the spectroscopic velocity shift  $\Delta v$  associated with  $\Delta z$  over a time interval  $\Delta t$ , where

$$\Delta v = \frac{c\Delta z}{1+z} = \frac{c\Delta t}{1+z} \frac{dz}{dt_0}. \quad (11)$$

For the model selection we seek in this *Letter*, we shall therefore be comparing the drift rates

$$\frac{\Delta v}{\Delta t}(\Lambda\text{CDM}) = cH_0 \left[ 1 - \frac{E(z)}{1+z} \right] \quad (12)$$

for *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM, with

$$\frac{\Delta v}{\Delta t}(R_h = ct) = 0 \quad (13)$$

for  $R_h = ct$ .

The baseline required to discern the expected difference between  $\Lambda$ CDM and  $R_h = ct$  depends on the measurement uncertainty  $\sigma_v$ . According to [25], the ELT-HIRES is expected to reach an accuracy

$$\sigma_v = 1.35 \frac{2370}{\text{S/N}} \sqrt{\frac{30}{N_{\text{QSO}}}} \left( \frac{5}{1+z_{\text{QSO}}} \right)^\alpha \text{ cm s}^{-1}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\alpha = 1.7$  for  $z \leq 4$ , and  $\alpha = 0.9$  for  $z > 4$ , with a S/N of approximately 1,500 after 5 years of monitoring  $N_{\text{QSO}} = 10$  quasars.

The Cosmic Accelerometer [27] is a low-cost version of the ELT-HIRES experiment, relying on the acquisition of off the shelf-equipment. No detailed feasibility study has




Fig. 1: Spectroscopic velocity shift  $\Delta v/\Delta t$  predicted by *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM (solid black) along with the  $3\sigma$  C.L. (teal, bounded by thin black lines) after 20 years of monitoring with the ELT HIRES (Liske et al. 2008). The dashed black line represents the zero redshift drift expected in the  $R_h = ct$  universe. The red shaded region shows the expected  $1\sigma$  error for this baseline as a function of redshift. For example, after 20 years of monitoring, the ELT measurements should distinguish between *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM and  $R_h = ct$  at better than  $3\sigma$  for  $z \gtrsim 3.6$ .

yet been carried out, though a spectroscopic velocity uncertainty was quoted in the proposal white paper as part of the Astro2020 decadal survey:

$$\sigma_v = \sigma_c \left( \frac{6}{t_{\text{exp}}} \right)^{1/2} \text{ cm s}^{-1}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\sigma_c = 1.5$  and  $t_{\text{exp}}$  is the baseline in years. The expected redshift range is similar to that of ELT, i.e.,  $2 \lesssim z \lesssim 5$ .

The Acceleration Programme [28] will use ELT as described above, also characterized by the uncertainty in Equation (14), though it will attempt to measure the difference in drift between two non-zero redshifts along the same line-of-sight:

$$\frac{\Delta v_{12}}{\Delta t} = c H_0 \left[ \frac{E(z_2)}{1+z_2} - \frac{E(z_1)}{1+z_1} \right], \quad (16)$$

where  $z_2$  and  $z_1$  are, respectively, the redshift of the reference and intervening sources, with  $z_1 < z_2$ . For some choices of redshifts, the drift signal can be larger than the case with  $z_1 = 0$ .

**Results.** — We adopt concordance  $\Lambda$ CDM model parameters [36],  $k = 0$ ,  $\Omega_m = 0.3153 \pm 0.0073$ ,  $\Omega_l = 0.6847 \pm 0.0073$ ,  $H_0 = 67.36 \pm 0.54 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  and  $w_{\text{de}} = -1$ , but also show the redshift drift predicted by this model within  $\pm 3\sigma$  of the optimal value via error propagation from the *Planck* uncertainties.  $\Delta v$  for the standard model after 20 years of monitoring is shown as a function of  $z$  (solid black curve) in figure 1. The teal shaded




Fig. 2: Similar to Figure 1, except now with the red  $1\sigma$  error region corresponding to the Cosmic Accelerometer (Eikenberry et al. 2019), and the spectroscopic velocity shift estimated after 10 years of monitoring. In this case, the Cosmic Accelerometer measurements should distinguish between *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM and  $R_h = ct$  at better than  $3\sigma$  for  $z \gtrsim 2.6$ .

region corresponds to the  $3\sigma$  C.L. This  $3\sigma$  uncertainty is typically  $\sim 2.4\%$  over the range of redshifts sampled here. By comparison, the thick dashed line shows the strictly zero redshift drift expected in  $R_h = ct$ .

The red shaded region in this figure shows the crucial  $1\sigma$  uncertainty in the spectroscopic velocity measurement (Eq. 14) after 20 years of monitoring, with a truncation at  $z = 2$ , below which the Ly- $\alpha$  forest falls in the unmeasurable ultraviolet portion of the spectrum. Clearly, the factor guiding the confidence with which one of these models is selected by the redshift drift data will be the uncertainty in the ELT Hires measurements, rather than the measurement errors in *Planck* which, at this stage, are much smaller. We thus see that, with the ELT-HIRES experiment, one of these two models should be favored over the other at a confidence level of  $3\sigma$  for sources at  $z \gtrsim 3.6$ .

The spectroscopic velocity uncertainty (Eq. 15) is smaller than that of the ELT-HIRES (Eq. 14). In figure 2, we therefore show the cumulative velocity shift for  $\Lambda$ CDM and  $R_h = ct$  as a function of redshift for a baseline of 10 years. The curves have the same meaning as those in figure 1, though the red shaded region is now smaller, allowing the redshift drift measurements to favor one of these models over the other by the same confidence level (i.e.,  $3\sigma$ ), in half the monitoring time. In addition, it might suffice to sample sources even closer to us, i.e., at  $z \gtrsim 2.6$ , rather than  $\gtrsim 3.6$ .

Finally, we show in figure 3 the predicted differential drift as a function of redshift (which is now  $z_2$ ) expected over a 20-year baseline for two intermediate redshifts,  $z_1 = z_2/4$  and  $z_1 = z_2/2$ . The teal shaded region highlights the difference between the redshift drift in the original ELT experiment (as in fig. 1), and the differential value




Fig. 3: Similar to Figure 1, except now showing the prediction of *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM (solid thin black) and the differential redshift drift proposed for the Acceleration Programme (Cooke 2020), with intermediate redshifts  $z_i = z/4$  (solid thick blue) and  $z_i = z/2$  (dotted thin black). The  $1\sigma$  error region is the same as that in Figure 1.

corresponding to  $z_1 = z_2/4$ . As one can see, this approach should produce results favoring one model over the other at a confidence level of  $3\sigma$  with sources as close as  $z \sim 3$  instead of  $\sim 3.6$ , though with the same baseline of 20 years.

**Discussion.** — Though our principal focus in this *Letter* has been a direct head-to-head comparison between  $R_h = ct$  and *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM, several other cosmological models have been proposed in recent years to address the growing tension between the standard model and the ever improving observations.

In figures 4 and 5, we summarize these results analogously to those shown in figures 1 and 2 for three additional representative cosmologies, which may be described as follows. The so-called  $f(R, L_m)$  models constitute various modified gravity theories in which dark energy is understood as an effective geometric quantity, with the added flexibility that the Ricci curvature,  $R$ , may be coupled to the Lagrangian density of matter,  $L_m$  [37, 38]. To study their cosmological implications, a suitable parametrization is adopted, such that

$$H(z) = H_0 [A(1+z)^3 + B + \epsilon \ln(1+z)]^{1/2}, \quad (17)$$

where  $H_0$ ,  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $\epsilon$  are free parameters [39]. Their optimization using cosmic chronometers and the Pantheon SN sample yields the values:  $H_0 = 68.0^{+1.5}_{-1.6}$  km s $^{-1}$  Mpc $^{-1}$ ,  $A = 0.34^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$ ,  $B = 1 - A$ , and  $\epsilon = -0.16^{+0.80}_{-0.79}$ . The redshift drift predicted by this class of models is shown as a short dashed green curve in figures 4 and 5.

An alternative approach to modifying general relativity, known as  $f(Q)$  theory, attempts to eliminate the dark sector by extending Einstein’s equations into the quantum domain. An illustrative choice of equation-of-state for the stress-energy tensor yields the following Hubble parameter




Fig. 4: Spectroscopic velocity shift  $\Delta v/\Delta t$  predicted by *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM (solid black) and four other models, after 20 years of monitoring with the ELT HIRES: (i)  $R_h = ct$  flat dashed black; (ii) a typical  $f(R, L_m)$  model short dashed green; (iii) the Brans-Dicke theory dashed blue; and (iv) a typical  $f(Q)$  model long dashed grey. The red shaded region represents the expected  $1\sigma$  error for this baseline as a function of redshift.

[40],

$$H(z) = H_0 [(1-\gamma)(1+z)^3 + \gamma]^{1/2n}, \quad (18)$$

in which the free parameters  $H_0$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $n$ , may be optimized using various selected data. For example, fitting this function with cosmic chronometer  $H(z)$  measurements, one finds  $H_0 = 65.5^{+4.3}_{-4.6}$  km s $^{-1}$  Mpc $^{-1}$ ,  $\beta = 0.33^{+0.39}_{-0.24}$  and  $n = 1.16^{+0.14}_{-0.15}$ , where  $\gamma \equiv (1+3\beta)^{-1}$ . The redshift drift predicted by this model is shown as a long dashed grey curve in figures 4 and 5.

Finally, we consider a model in which dark energy is handled in the framework of generalized Brans-Dicke theory with a self-interacting potential [41]. The Hubble parameter in this scenario may be parametrized according to

$$H(z) = \delta + \beta(1+z)^\gamma. \quad (19)$$

An optimization of this expression using cosmic chronometer data yields the parameter values:  $H_0 = 64.57 \pm 23.53$  km s $^{-1}$  Mpc $^{-1}$ ,  $\delta = 36.67 \pm 9.58$  km s $^{-1}$  Mpc $^{-1}$ ,  $\beta = 27.90 \pm 7.09$ , and  $\gamma = 1.58 \pm 0.17$ . The redshift drift predicted by this type of model is shown as a dashed blue line in figures 4 and 5.

We draw several conclusions from this comparative study. First, 20 years of monitoring with ELT may not be able to distinguish between *Planck*- $\Lambda$ CDM and the  $f(R, L_m)$ ,  $f(Q)$  and Brans-Dicke based models for sources at  $z \lesssim 5$ . The Cosmic Accelerometer approach may be able to discern  $1 - 2\sigma$  differences between some of these models over the same baseline, but only for similarly distant sources.

The  $R_h$  cosmology stands out in this group because it predicts strictly zero redshift drift at all redshifts, while




Fig. 5: Similar to Figure 4, except now with the  $1\sigma$  error region corresponding to the Cosmic Accelerometer, and the spectroscopic velocity shift estimated after 10 years of monitoring. In this case, the Cosmic Accelerometer measurements should distinguish between  $R_h = ct$  and all the other models at better than  $3\sigma$  for  $z \gtrsim 4$ .

the rest of the models all need to account for various phases of decelerated and accelerated expansion. As such, 10 years of Cosmic Accelerometer monitoring should be able to distinguish it from the rest of the models at a confidence level of  $3\sigma$  for sources at  $z \gtrsim 4$ . It should attain the same level of confidence for sources at  $z \lesssim 3.5$  after 20 years of monitoring.

**Conclusion.** – The comparative study proposed in this *Letter* is motivated by the growing observational evidence favoring the  $R_h = ct$  cosmology over the current standard model. Interest in implementing the innovative idea of actually measuring the cosmic expansion in real time has been growing following feasibility studies suggesting that the next generation of telescopes, such as ELT, may have the capability of assessing the redshift drift after a monitoring campaign lasting one to two decades.

Several other projects are also aiming to measure the redshift drift of selected quasar sources, so the prospects of carrying out the model selection we have discussed in this *Letter* extend beyond the direct comparison we have just described. For example, ESPRESSO is a relatively new high-resolution spectrograph on ESO’s Very Large Telescope (VLT). It was designed for ultra-high radial-velocity precision and extreme spectral fidelity [42]. The challenge is always to achieve the highest possible radial-velocity resolution, and ESPRESSO is expected to achieve a precision of  $\sim 10 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$  with a baseline of a decade or more. As one can see from figures 1-5, ESPRESSO may therefore be able assist in model selection between  $R_h = ct$  and other cosmologies that accelerate, but perhaps only with quasars at somewhat higher redshifts and with an extended monitoring program, certainly at least several decades long.

At radio wavelengths, FAST will observe damped Lyman- $\alpha$  absorbers in HI 21 cm systems [43], covering most of the Northern hemisphere at low redshifts ( $0 - 0.35$ ), thereby complementing the planned ground-based Lyman- $\alpha$  forest projects, such as ELT, that will focus more on the Southern hemisphere and at higher redshifts ( $1.5 - 5$ ). Its goal will be to determine the cosmic expansion rate by measuring the redshift evolution of these HI 21 cm absorption-line systems over a decade or longer time span, on par with the other monitoring programs we have been discussing [44].

A similar approach will be followed by SKA, whose goal is to measure the spectral drift in the neutral hydrogen (HI) emission signals of galaxies to estimate their redshift drift in the redshift range of  $0 - 1$ . Unlike FAST, however, SKA will observe predominantly the Southern hemisphere, thus again complementing the other monitoring campaigns. If SKA performs optimally and detects a billion galaxies, its measurement of redshift drift could achieve a precision of one percent [45].

If the upcoming measurement of redshift drift is strictly zero, this would completely invalidate the various phases of deceleration and acceleration predicted by  $\Lambda$ CDM, along with many other categories of models, and redirect attention to the zero active mass condition (i.e.,  $\rho + 3p$ ) underlying the  $R_h = ct$  cosmology. The consequences would be substantial. For example, it would obviate the need for inflation.

Our analysis has shown that this potentially critical outcome may be reached in only 10 years, using the Cosmic Accelerometer approach, if the survey functions as projected. A simple yes/no answer is all we shall need.

\* \* \*

I am grateful to the anonymous referees for their helpful comments that have led to an improved presentation of the material in this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- [1] OSTRICKER J. P. and STEINHARDT P. J., *Nature*, **377** (1995) 600.
- [2] PLANCK COLLABORATION, ADE P. A. R., AGHANIM N., ARNAUD M., ASHDOWN M., AUMONT J., BACCIGALUPI C., BANDAY A. J., BARREIRO R. B., BARTLETT J. G. and ET AL., *A&A*, **594** (2016) A13.
- [3] MELIA F., *MNRAS*, **382** (2007) 1917.
- [4] MELIA F. and SHEVCHUK A. S. H., *MNRAS*, **419** (2012) 2579.
- [5] MELIA F., *The Cosmic Spacetime* (Taylor and Francis, Oxford) 2020.
- [6] MELIA F., *Pub Astron Soc Pacific*, **134** (2022) 121001.
- [7] BENNETT C. L., LARSON D., WEILAND J. L., JAROSIK N., HINSHAW G., ODEGARD N., SMITH K. M., HILL R. S., GOLD B., HALPERN M. and ET AL., *ApJ Supplements*, **208** (2013) 20.



- [8] PLANCK COLLABORATION, AGHANIM N., ARNAUD M., ASHDOWN M., AUMONT J., BACCIGALUPI C., BANDAY A. J., BARREIRO R. B., BARTLETT J. G., BARTOLO N., BATTANER E. and ET AL., *A&A*, **594** (2016) A11.
- [9] MELIA F. and LÓPEZ-CORREDOIRA M., *A&A*, **610** (2018) A87.
- [10] MELIA F., MA Q., WEI J.-J. and YU B., *A&A*, **655** (2021) A70.
- [11] SANCHIS-LOZANO M. A., MELIA F., LÓPEZ-CORREDOIRA M. and SANCHIS-GUAL N., *A&A*, **660** (2022) A121.
- [12] BLANTON M. R., BERSHADY M. A., ABOLFATHI B., ALBARETI F. D., ALLENDE PRIETO C., ALMEIDA A., ALONSO-GARCÍA J., ANDERS F., ANDERSON S. F., ANDREWS B. and ET AL., *AJ*, **154** (2017) 28.
- [13] MELIA F., *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, **143** (2023) 59004.
- [14] PONTOPPIDAN K. M., BARRIENTES J., BLOME C., BRAUN H., BROWN M., CARRUTHERS M., COE D., DEPASQUALE J., ESPINOZA N., MARIN M. G., GORDON K. D. and ET AL., *ApJ Letters*, **936** (2022) L14.
- [15] FINKELSTEIN S. L., BAGLEY M. B., ARRABAL HARO P., DICKINSON M., FERGUSON H. C., KARTALTEPE J. S., PAPOVICH C., BURGARELLA D., KOCEVSKI D. D., HUERTAS-COMPANY M., IYER K. G. and ET AL., *arXiv e-prints*, (2022) arXiv:2207.12474.
- [16] TREU T., ROBERTS-BORSANI G., BRADAC M., BRAMMER G., FONTANA A., HENRY A., MASON C., MORISHITA T., PENTERICCI L., WANG X., ACEBRON A. and ET AL., *ApJ*, **935** (2022) 110.
- [17] BOGDÁN Á., GOULDING A. D., NATARAJAN P., KOVÁCS O. E., TREMBLAY G. R., CHADAYAMMURI U., VOLONTERI M., KRAFT R. P., FORMAN W. R., JONES C., CHURAZOV E. and ZHURAVLEVA I., *Nature Astronomy*, (2023) .
- [18] MELIA F. and MCCLINTOCK T. M., *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A*, **471** (2015) 20150449.
- [19] MELIA F., *Z. Naturforsch.*, **78** (2023) 525.
- [20] MELIA F., *MNRAS*, **525** (2023) 3248.
- [21] MELIA F., *MNRAS*, **481** (2018) 4855.
- [22] SANDAGE A., *ApJ*, **136** (1962) 319.
- [23] McVITTIE G. C., *ApJ*, **136** (1962) 334.
- [24] LOEB A., *ApJ Letters*, **499** (1998) L111.
- [25] LISKE J., GRAZIAN A., VANZELLA E., DESSAUGES M., VIEL M., PASQUINI L., HAEHNELT M., CRISTIANI S., PEPE F., AVILA G. and ET AL., *MNRAS*, **386** (2008) 1192.
- [26] LISKE J., *Status of the European Extremely Large Telescope* in proc. of *Thirty Meter Telescope Science Forum*, edited by DICKINSON M. and INAMI H., 2014 p. 52.
- [27] EIKENBERRY S., GONZALEZ A., DARLING J., SLEPIAN Z., MUELLER G., CONKLIN J., FULDA P., JERAM S., DONG C., TOWNSEND A. and LIKAMONSAVAD M., *arXiv e-prints*, (2019) arXiv:1904.00217.
- [28] COOKE R., *MNRAS*, **492** (2020) 2044.
- [29] ESTEVES J., MARTINS C. J. A. P., PEREIRA B. G. and ALVES C. S., *MNRAS*, **508** (2021) L53.
- [30] CORASANITI P.-S., HUTERER D. and MELCHIORRI A., *PRD*, **75** (2007) 062001.
- [31] QUERCELLINI C., AMENDOLA L., BALBI A., CABELLA P. and QUARTIN M., *Physics Reports*, **521** (2012) 95.
- [32] MARTINS C. J. A. P., MARTINELLI M., CALABRESE E. and RAMOS M. P. L. P., *PRD*, **94** (2016) 043001.
- [33] WEINBERG S., *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity* (John Wiley and Sons, New York) 1972.
- [34] MELIA F., *Frontiers of Physics*, **11** (2016) 119801.
- [35] MELIA F., *MNRAS*, **463** (2016) L61.
- [36] PLANCK COLLABORATION, AGHANIM N., AKRAMI Y., ASHDOWN M., AUMONT J., BACCIGALUPI C., BALLARDINI M., BANDAY A. J., BARREIRO R. B., BARTOLO N., BASAK S. and ET AL., *A&A*, **641** (2020) A6.
- [37] BERTOLAMI O., BÖHMER C. G., HARKO T. and LOBO F. S. N., *PRD*, **75** (2007) 104016.
- [38] HARKO T. and LOBO F. S. N., *European Physical Journal C*, **70** (2010) 373.
- [39] MYRZAKULOVA S., KOUSSOUR M. and MYRZAKULOV N., *arXiv e-prints*, (2023) arXiv:2312.03948.
- [40] KOUSSOUR M. and DE A., *European Physical Journal C*, **83** (2023) 400.
- [41] TRIPATHY S. K., SENDHA A. P., PRADHAN S. K., NAIK Z. and MISHRA B., *Gravitation and Cosmology*, **29** (2023) 468.
- [42] PEPE F., CRISTIANI S., REBOLO R., SANTOS N. C., DEKKER H., CABRAL A., DI MARCANTONIO P., FIGUEIRA P., LO CURTO G., LOVIS C. and ET AL., *A&A*, **645** (2021) A96.
- [43] LU C.-Z., JIAO K., ZHANG T., ZHANG T.-J. and ZHU M., *Physics of the Dark Universe*, **37** (2022) 101088.
- [44] KANG J., LU C.-Z., ZHANG T.-J. and ZHU M., *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, **24** (2024) 075002.
- [45] KLOECKNER H. R., OBRESCHKOW D., MARTINS C., RACCANELLI A., CHAMPION D., ROY A. L., LOBANOV A., WAGNER J. and KELLER R., *Real time cosmology - A direct measure of the expansion rate of the Universe with the SKA* in proc. of *Advancing Astrophysics with the Square Kilometre Array (AASKA14)* 2015 p. 27.
- [46] MELIA F., *The Edge of Infinity: Supermassive Black Holes in the Universe* (Cambridge University Press) 2003.
- [47] MELIA F., *American Journal of Physics*, **86** (2018) 585.
- [48] HARIKANE Y., OUCHI M., OGURI M., ONO Y., NAKAJIMA K., ISOBE Y., UMEDA H., MAWATARI K. and ZHANG Y., *arXiv e-prints*, (2022) arXiv:2208.01612.
- [49] DONNAN C. T., MCLEOD D. J., DUNLOP J. S., McLURE R. J., CARNALL A. C., BEGLEY R., CULLEN F., HAMADOUCHE M. L., BOWLER R. A. A., MCCracken H. J., MILVANG-JENSEN B. and ET AL., *arXiv e-prints*, (2022) arXiv:2207.12356.
- [50] NAIDU R. P., OESCH P. A., VAN DOKKUM P., NELSON E. J., SUESS K. A., WHITAKER K. E., ALLEN N., BEZANSON R., BOUWENS R., BRAMMER G., CONROY C. and ET AL., *arXiv e-prints*, (2022) arXiv:2207.09434.
- [51] BRADLEY L. D., COE D., BRAMMER G., FURTA L. J., LARSON R. L., ANDRADE-SANTOS F., BHATAWDEKAR R., BRADAC M., BROADHURST T., CARNALL A., CONSELICE C. J. and ET AL., *arXiv e-prints*, (2022) arXiv:2210.01777.
- [52] MELIA F., *MNRAS*, **521** (2023) L85.
- [53] MELIA F., *Modern Physics Letters A*, **37** (2022) 2250016.
- [54] MELIA F., *Physics of the Dark Universe*, **42** (2023) 101329.
- [55] MELIA F., *European Physical Journal C*, **81** (2021) 234.
- [56] MELIA F., *Astronomische Nachrichten*, **341** (2020) 812.
- [57] MELIA F., *A&A*, **553** (2013) A76.
- [58] MELIA F., *European Physical Journal C*, **78** (2018) 739.
- [59] MELIA F., *European Physical Journal C*, **79** (2019) 455.

**Appendix.** — We have been developing the  $R_h = ct$  cosmology for almost two decades [4, 5, 46]. During this time, more than 30 different kinds of cosmological data have been used in studies comparing its predictions with those of  $\Lambda$ CDM, at low and high redshifts, based on a broad array of integrated and differential measures. These tests have consistently shown that  $R_h = ct$  accounts for the observations better than  $\Lambda$ CDM. A complete, more pedagogical description of this model, starting with its foundational underpinnings, and demonstrating its viability with the data, may be found in a recently published monograph [5].

This model was originally motivated by the discovery of a very awkward ‘coincidence’ in the data, showing that the Universes’s gravitational horizon is equal to the light-travel comoving distance since the Big Bang [3, 46, 47]. This equality is possible only once in the history of the Universe, and it is happening right now [4]. The probability for such a coincidence is effectively zero.

The most straightforward ‘solution’ to this perplexing outcome is that the equality  $R_h = ct$  (giving rise to the model’s eponymous name) is true at all times, not merely at  $t_0$ . In that case, the probability of measuring this equality would always be one.

The cosmic expansion rate implied by this equality via the Friedmann equations is constant, however, with an expansion factor  $a(t) = t/t_0$ , which contrasts noticeably with the variable expansion rate predicted in the standard model. Not surprisingly, therefore, early work with this hypothesis largely involved the acquisition of empirical evidence supporting such an unexpected scenario, in the face of significant skepticism derived from  $\Lambda$ CDM’s general degree of success accounting for many broad features in the data. Yet test after test (now numbering over 30) throughout the redshift history of the Universe, have all indicated that the observations quite compellingly favor  $R_h = ct$  over the standard model. The sample of such tests listed in Table 2 of ref. [21] suggests that the ‘score’ is at least 30 to 0 in favor of the former model.

More recent observations by JWST create an even bigger problem for the standard model because they conflict with the timeline it predicts for the formation of large-scale structure [48–51]. But they agree almost exactly with the evolution predicted by  $R_h = ct$  [20, 52].

A deeper probe of its fundamental origin and viability has shown that  $R_h = ct$  is really an updated version of  $\Lambda$ CDM, with one crucial additional constraint: the zero active mass condition from general relativity, i.e.,  $\rho + 3p = 0$ , in terms of the total energy density  $\rho$  and pressure  $p$  in the cosmic fluid. One may see this directly from the Friedmann equations, which reduce to  $a(t) = t/t_0$  when  $p = -\rho/3$ .

More recent theoretical work shows that the zero active mass condition may be necessary for the correct usage of FLRW in a cosmic setting [19, 53]. The choice of lapse function,  $g_{tt} = 1$ , in the FLRW spacetime metric precludes any acceleration, explaining why the zero active

mass equation-of-state is necessary to produce an expansion with  $a(t) = (t/t_0)$  at all redshifts.

This appears to be true even in the early Universe, which provides straightforward solutions to many conflicts and hurdles in the standard model. For example,  $R_h = ct$  completely avoids the monopole problem [54], the cosmic entropy anomaly [55] and the trans-Planckian anomaly [56].

On a broader scale, this model impacts every area in which  $\Lambda$ CDM has a major problem or inconsistency. The  $R_h = ct$  universe completely eliminates the CMB temperature [57] and electroweak [58] horizon problems, without needing inflation. It also provides a natural explanation for the cutoff  $k_{\min}$  observed in the primordial power spectrum [59].

In this *Letter*, we have described one of the few remaining types of test that may be used to clearly distinguish between  $R_h = ct$  and the standard model. Indeed, a determination of whether or not the Universe exhibits redshift drift is arguably more important and compelling than all the other tests we have described in this Appendix.