Prepared for submission to JCAP

Variable time flow as an alternative to dark energy

P. Magain and C. Hauret

STAR-OrCA, Université de Liège, Allée du 6 Août 19c, B-4000 Liège, Belgium

E-mail: pierre.magain@ulg.ac.be, clementine.hauret@ulg.ac.be

Abstract. Time is a parameter playing a central role in our most fundamental modelling of natural laws. Relativity theory shows that the comparison of times measured by different clocks depends on their relative motions and on the strength of the gravitational field in which they are embedded. In standard cosmology, the time parameter is the one measured by fundamental clocks, i.e. clocks at rest with respect to the expanding space. This proper time is assumed to flow at a constant rate throughout the whole history of the Universe. We make the alternative hypothesis that the rate at which cosmological time flows depends on the global geometric curvature the Universe. Using a simple one-parameter model for the relation between proper time and curvature, we build a cosmological model that fits the Type Ia Supernovae data (the best cosmological standard candles) without the need for dark energy.

Contents

1 Introduction

Since its introduction a century ago [1], general relativity (GR) has been brilliantly confirmed by a number of observations, most notably the perihelion precession of Mercury, the gravitational redshift and the deflection of light by massive bodies. GR has also been used in cosmology to describe the evolution of the Universe as a whole through the Robertson-Walker (RW) metric. This metric, associated with the equations of GR, leads to the model that currently gives the best description of the large-scale structure and evolution of our Universe, namely the ΛCDM model (a flat Universe with a cosmological constant). However, in this cosmological context, a number of ingredients had to be added to the original theory in order to provide an accurate description of large-scale and long-term phenomena. Indeed, the motion of stars in the outskirts of spiral galaxies and the velocity dispersions of galaxies in clusters required the addition of dark matter. The acceleration of the expansion of the Universe called for the introduction of a repulsive component called dark energy.

One may note that all the successful tests of GR are dealing with small scales and are quasi-instantaneous in terms of cosmological time. Conversely, additional ingredients (dark matter and dark energy) are necessary to bring the cosmological models in agreement with observations dealing with very large scales and very long term phenomena. We are thus faced with the following alternative: either these dark components are actual constituents of the Universe (in which case they should sooner or later be identified) or there is something wrong with our actual application of GR to the Universe as a whole, via the RW metric.

In this paper, we want to explore the hypothesis that the problems encountered when dealing with large scales are related to our fundamental understanding of time. GR has shown that the time measured by a clock depends on the strength of the gravitational field in which it is embedded and, thus, on the local geometric curvature. We wish to go one step further and postulate that cosmological time – the time measured by a fundamental, comoving clock – depends on the global curvature of the Universe in which it is embedded. We introduce this hypothesis into the general framework (the RW metric and the relation between geometry and observable physical quantities) and we examine the consequences of this modification on the evolution of the Universe.

In Section 2, we discuss the difference between coordinate time and cosmological time. We introduce our modifications and derive their impact on the Friedmann-Lemaître equations. In Section 3, we propose a specific relation between cosmological proper time and curvature in a matter-dominated Universe and derive the equations for the evolution of the scale factor.

We test our simple model on Type Ia Supernovae (SNIa) data in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 discusses some of the consequences of our model, especially regarding the age of the Universe.

2 Cosmological time and coordinate time

When applying GR to the whole Universe in order to derive the ΛCDM model, one assumes that the Universe is homogeneous (and isotropic) on large scales and that the small scale inhomogeneities have no impact on the evolution of the Universe as a whole. One also assumes that the 4-dimensional space-time can be sliced into 3-dimensional space-like hypersurfaces labelled with a time parameter t. This time parameter is usually taken as the time measured by fundamental (comoving) clocks located far from any gravitational field [2]. The time t is thus identified with the proper time τ of fundamental observers. It is generally taken for granted that this proper time flows at the same rate all along the history of the Universe. Indeed, when Einstein derived the theory of GR, the Universe was believed to be essentially static and there was no reason to question that hypothesis.

In other applications of GR, e.g. when computing the gravitational effect of massive bodies, it is generally found that the proper time of an observer depends on the local geometric curvature. The simplest example is given by the Schwarzschild metric, valid for a spherically symmetrical gravitational field.

The metric used in standard cosmological models, i.e. the RW metric, has an interval ds given by:

$$ds^2 = c^2 d\tau^2 - R^2(t)\Big[\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\phi^2)\Big], \tag{2.1}$$

where (r, θ, ϕ) are the comoving spherical coordinates, k is a constant measuring the spatial curvature and R is a dimensionless scale factor.

Here, we propose that the time measured by fundamental clocks (τ in Eq. (2.1)) may flow at a variable rate compared to a coordinate time t, itself flowing at a constant rate:

$$\frac{d\tau}{dt} = \alpha(t), \tag{2.2}$$

allowing us to rewrite the metric:

$$ds^2 = \alpha^2(t) c^2 dt^2 - R^2(t)\Big[\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\phi^2)\Big]. \tag{2.3}$$

With this change of coordinate, we implement the possibility of a variation (expansion or contraction) of time, in addition to the well-known expansion of space. This varying time flow could then be incorrectly interpreted as an acceleration of the expansion of our Universe.

The distinction must thus be made between the two different times introduced: (1) the (conventional) coordinate time parameter t, which is the one that would be measured by clocks at rest in a flat space and is assumed to flow at a constant rate and (2) the cosmological proper time τ, which is the one measured by fundamental clocks at any times, that depends on the geometric curvature of the Universe and controls all physical processes.

All physical laws have to be written as a function of the cosmological proper time τ, which flows at a varying rate as the Universe evolve. This affects the presently observed duration or frequency of phenomena occurring far away, and thus long ago.

Hence, while at first sight, the difference between Eq. (2.1) and Eq. (2.3) looks like a simple coordinate transformation that can have no physical consequence, this is not the case.

Indeed, our coordinate change is unique in the sense that it connects the time measured by fundamental clocks to a constantly flowing time (that equals the fundamental clock time at the Big Bang). Then, the difference with other cosmological solutions of Einstein equations is that, in our model, this is this "variable-flow time" τ that controls the physical phenomena, such as the frequency of emitted photons. This property modifies the relations between observables such as redshift and magnitude.

We obtain, as usual, a cosmological redshift caused by the expansion of the Universe:

$$z_{\cos} = \frac{1}{R} - 1. \tag{2.4}$$

However, the variation of proper time flow introduces an additional wavelength shift, so that the observed redshift amounts to:

$$z_{\rm obs} = z_{\cos} \frac{\alpha(t)}{\alpha_0}, \tag{2.5}$$

α_0 being the present-day value of $\frac{d\tau}{dt}$. This observed redshift is also the one to be used when computing the luminosity distance and thus observed magnitudes.

As usual, we assume that the stress-energy tensor is that of a comoving perfect fluid of density ρ and pressure p. Consequently, the Einstein equations reduce to two independent equations:

$$\left(\frac{dR}{dt}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{8\pi G\rho}{3} R^2 - kc^2\right) \alpha^2 \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\frac{d^2R}{dt^2} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{dR}{dt}\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}\left(\rho + \frac{3p}{c^2}\right) R\, \alpha^2. \tag{2.7}$$

Of course, in the case $\alpha = 1$, these equations reduce to the usual Friedmann-Lemaître equations, with t being then the proper time of fundamental observers.

The basic difference between the standard cosmological model and our alternative solution may be illustrated by the following thought experiment. Let us imagine that we can measure the distance to a remote clock by a method that does not rely on the redshift, in order not to depend on Eq. (2.5). Consider an astronomer equipped with a powerful telescope and a local clock identical to the remote one. When this astronomer observes the remote clock and makes the correction for the cosmological time dilation, will he conclude that the remote clock ticks at the same rate as his local clock? The answer would be 'yes' in the standard model and 'no' (unless the geometrical curvature is zero) in our alternative model.

In the following, we make a specific assumption on the relation between $\alpha(t)$ and the curvature of the Universe. We then examine the consequences of that simple hypothesis and compare its predictions with the fundamental test of a cosmological model, i.e. its ability to reproduce the Hubble diagram of standard candles. We stress that this is just an example and that other relations between cosmological time and the curvature of the Universe might be proposed (or, even better, derived).

3 Evolution of a matter-dominated Universe

As in the classical Friedmann-Lemaître equations, the evolution of the scale factor R is governed by two fundamental parameters, the Hubble parameter

$$H = \frac{1}{R}\frac{dR}{d\tau} \tag{3.1}$$

and the density parameter

$$\Omega = \frac{8\pi G\rho}{3H^2}. \tag{3.2}$$

The present-day value of these quantities are written H_0 and Ω_0. A flat Universe corresponds to $\Omega = 1$, $\Omega < 1$ and $\Omega > 1$ corresponding, respectively, to open and closed Universes.

Equation (3.1) assumes the Hubble parameter to be measured in the τ-scale. An analogous expression gives this parameter in the t-scale. One has to be careful and use the proper units when comparing it with the observations. Such a change of measurement units has no effect on Ω, which is a pure number. Indeed, G and H^2 have the same time dependence, so that a change in time units cancels in Eq. (3.2).

We now seek an expression of $\alpha(t)$ such that $\alpha = 1$ in a flat Universe and departs from unity in curved spatial geometry. A very simple expression is

$$\alpha(t) = \Omega^n \tag{3.3}$$

with n being any real number, which will be an adjustable parameter in our model.

In a matter-dominated Universe with present-day density ρ_0, ρ is given by the usual formula:

$$\rho = \frac{\rho_0 R_0^3}{R^3}. \tag{3.4}$$

In the following, we choose to measure the scale factor in units of its present-day value ($R_0 = 1$). The density parameter can be written:

$$\Omega = \frac{\Omega_0 H_0^2}{H^2 R^3}. \tag{3.5}$$

Combining Eqs. (3.1), (3.3) and (3.5), we can express $\alpha(t)$ as a function of $R(t)$ and its time derivative:

$$\alpha(t) = \left(\frac{dR}{dt}\right)^{\frac{2n}{2n-1}} \left(\frac{R}{\Omega_0 H_0^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2n-1}} \tag{3.6}$$

which is valid for any $n \neq 0.5$. Substituting this in Eq. (2.6), we obtain a differential equation for R, valid for any $n \neq 0$:

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = H_0 \left(\frac{\Omega_0}{R}\right)^n \left(\frac{\Omega_0}{R} + 1 - \Omega_0\right)^{\frac{1-2n}{n}} \tag{3.7}$$

4 Comparison with Supernovae data

The fundamental test of cosmological models is the Hubble diagram, which uses standard candles such as Type Ia Supernovae (SNIa) and compares their luminosity distances to their observed redshifts.

To build our Hubble diagram, we consider the 740 SNIa from the JLA compilation [3]. Our model has two adjustable parameters: the exponent n in Eq. (3.3) and the present-day density parameter Ω_0. Only models with $n < 0$ reproduce the observed behaviour, i.e. first a deceleration of the expansion, followed by an acceleration (which, in the standard ΛCDM model, is interpreted as the effect of dark energy). $n < 0$ is also required to have a slowing down of proper time when the gravitational field increases, which is the usual behaviour in GR.



Figure 1. χ^2 map obtained when comparing our model predictions with SNIa data from the JLA compilation. The best-fit model has $\Omega_0 = 0.16$ and $n = -0.31$ and is shown by the white cross. The white contours delineate the regions of parameter space with confidence levels of 68%, 95% and 99.7%. The color scale reflects the χ^2 value above minimum. Red corresponds to $\Delta\chi^2 \geq 100$. Models with or without dark matter are fully compatible with the SNIa data, and are shown as diamonds for $\Omega_0 = 0.05$ and 0.30.

The χ^2 map in the 2-parameter space (Ω_0, n) is displayed in Fig. 1, which shows that best-fit values follow a valley going roughly from $\Omega_0 = 0.0$ for $n = -0.2$ to $\Omega_0 = 0.4$ for $n = -0.6$. The minimum χ^2 is found for $\Omega_0 = 0.16$ and $n = -0.31$ but all values of $\Omega_0 < 0.4$ are fully compatible with the SNIa data within the 1σ error bar.

Interestingly, the Ω_0 range obtained is compatible with the amount of ordinary baryonic matter deduced from an inventory of the observable Universe ($\Omega_0 \simeq 0.03$ [4] [5]), from predictions of cosmological nucleosynthesis ($\Omega_0 \simeq 0.05$ [6]) and from the analysis of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature fluctuations ($\Omega_0 \simeq 0.05$ [7]). It is also compatible with the total amount of baryonic and dark matter deduced from a fit of a flat ΛCDM model onto the SNIa data ($\Omega_0 \simeq 0.29$ [3]) or from the CMB fluctuations ($\Omega_0 \simeq 0.31$ [7]). Thus, in our model, dark matter is neither needed nor excluded by a comparison with the SNIa data, as also illustrated by the Hubble diagram of Fig. 2.

5 Discussion & Conclusion

The evolution of the scale factor R as a function of time for two representative models of our valley is compared to the standard ΛCDM model in Fig. 3. We chose a model with



Figure 2. Comparison of predicted distance moduli with observations. For clarity, distance moduli of an empty cosmological model have been subtracted. Circles correspond to average values in redshift bins of $\Delta z = 0.1$ for $z < 1$ and $\Delta z = 0.2$ for $z > 1$. Error bars correspond to the standard deviation of the mean. The curves are the predictions of different cosmological models whose Ω_0 and n values have been chosen along the valley of minimal χ^2 in Fig. 1, i.e. the following (Ω_0, n) pairs: $(0.05, -0.22)$, $(0.16, -0.31)$ and $(0.30, -0.47)$. They are labelled with their Ω_0 value. The ΛCDM model deduced by Betoule et al [3] from JLA SNIa data ($\Omega_{m,0} = 0.295$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda,0} = 0.705$) is also displayed as the dash-dotted red curve.

dark matter ($\Omega_0 = 0.30$, $n = -0.47$) and a model with baryonic matter only ($\Omega_0 = 0.05$, $n = -0.22$). In the ΛCDM model, the accelerated expansion in the last ~ 6 billion years is due to the cosmological constant Λ, which is generally interpreted as the effect of dark energy. In our model, it is the acceleration of the cosmological proper time flow that produces this effect: $d\tau/dt$ increases from a value of 1 at early epochs to about 1.8 at the present time. In other words, the apparent acceleration of the expansion is due to the fact that, when interpreting the observables, one incorrectly assumes that the unit of proper time does not vary as the Universe evolves.

Adopting a present-day Hubble parameter of 70 km/s/Mpc, we obtain a physical age of the Universe (measured in τ scale) of 20.1 (25.3) Gyr for our model with (without) dark matter. Measured in the present units of t time, the Big Bang happened 13.9 (15.7) Gyr ago. This is to be compared to the latest ΛCDM age of 13.8 Gyr [8]. In this context, Bond et al. [9] determine an age of 14.5 ± 0.8 Gyr for the very metal-poor subgiant star HD140283. They argue that, within the errors, the age of HD140283 does not conflict with the age of the Universe deduced from the standard ΛCDM model, but that it must have formed soon after the Big Bang. We further note that the surface composition of HD140283 shows the presence of a variety of elements that must have been processed in a previous stellar generation. HD140283 is thus at least a second generation star. In the ΛCDM model, it requires star formation to begin extremely fast after the Big Bang. Such a tension between the age of the star and the age of the Universe is not present in our model, where the Universe is at least 20 Gyr old.

In conclusion, from the simple assumption that the proper time of fundamental ob-



Figure 3. Evolution of the scale factor R with coordinate time t (bottom x-axis on each panel) or cosmological proper time τ (top x-axis on each panel), where 0 corresponds to the present time. Full yellow curve (top panel): evolution of R for our model with $\Omega_0 = 0.05$ and $n = -0.22$; full green curve (bottom panel): evolution of R for our model with $\Omega_0 = 0.30$ and $n = -0.47$; dashed red curve (both panels): $R(t)$ for the ΛCDM model from Betoule et al. [3]. Note that the τ scale has units of varying length and is irrelevant for the ΛCDM model.

servers varies with the geometric curvature, we obtain a cosmological model that fits the SNIa data without recourse to dark energy and leaves more time for structure to form after the matter/radiation decoupling.

As both the standard model and our alternative model predict an essentially flat geometry in the early epochs ($\Omega \simeq 1$), cosmological proper time τ and coordinate time t are basically identical at these times. Thus, the early phases should be similar in both models and, in particular, the results of cosmological nucleosynthesis are not expected to change.

Of course, more tests are needed. In particular, the CMB anisotropies, the rotation

curves of spiral galaxies and the velocity dispersions of galaxies in clusters have to be investigated before our model becomes a viable alternative to the ΛCDM model.

References

[1] A. Einstein, *Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*, *Annal. Phys.* **354** (1916) 769–822.

[2] M. P. Hobson, G. P. Efstathiou and A. N. Lasenby, *General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press, Feb., 2006.

[3] M. Betoule, R. Kessler, J. Guy, J. Mosher, D. Hardin, R. Biswas et al., *Improved cosmological constraints from a joint analysis of the SDSS-II and SNLS supernova samples*, *Astronom. Astrophys.* **568** (Aug., 2014) A22.

[4] M. Fukugita and P. J. E. Peebles, *The Cosmic Energy Inventory*, *Astroph. J.* **616** (Dec., 2004) 643–668.

[5] J. M. Shull, B. D. Smith and C. W. Danforth, *The Baryon Census in a Multiphase Intergalactic Medium: 30% of the Baryons May Still be Missing*, *Astrophys. J.* **759** (Nov., 2012) 23.

[6] D. N. Schramm and M. S. Turner, *Big-bang nucleosynthesis enters the precision era*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70** (Jan., 1998) 303–318.

[7] Planck collaboration, P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi et al., *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, *ArXiv e-prints* (Feb., 2015) , [1502.01589].

[8] Planck collaboration, R. Adam, P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. I. R. Alves, M. Arnaud et al., *Planck 2015 results. I. Overview of products and scientific results*, *ArXiv e-prints* (Feb., 2015) , [1502.01582].

[9] H. E. Bond, E. P. Nelan, D. A. VandenBerg, G. H. Schaefer and D. Harmer, *HD 140283: A Star in the Solar Neighborhood that Formed Shortly after the Big Bang*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **765** (Mar., 2013) L12, [1302.3180].