

Alternative Cosmology: Λ CDM-Like Predictions Today

Stéphane Wojnow 

University of Limoges 7 Avenue Georges Dumas, 87 000 LIMOGES, Independent Researcher, Limoges, France

Email: wojnow.stephane@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The theory of quantum mechanics and the theory of general relativity are both important with respect to the initial conditions of the universe and its evolution. In this paper we consider the question of how these theories might interrelate through a simple and didactic cosmological alternative model based on the Hubble time, Planck mass flow rate, and a variable coefficient α_H . In doing so, we derive the parameters obtained by the Planck 2018 results using the Planck mass flow rate and Hubble time. By introducing a double universe theory (matter and antimatter universes arising from an initial instanton (i.e., half Planck mass) state, we sketch out a general framework for unifying, in the cosmology, general relativity with quantum field theory.

Keywords: Cosmology, double universe theory, dark energy, Hubble constant, Planck, quantum mechanics, general relativity

©2023 The Authors, Published by Hyperscience International Journal. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

The predominant cosmological framework for understanding the large-scale structure and evolution of the universe is the Λ CDM model [1]. This model, rooted in Einstein's theory of general relativity and supported by observational evidence, is commonly referred to as the **Lambda Cold Dark Matter model** (Λ CDM)[2].

It comprises two fundamental elements: a cosmological constant denoted as Λ (Lambda) and Cold Dark Matter (CDM) [3, 4].

On the other hand, no quantum description of the universe is now in wide consensus. We can note that the Planck mass flux is both a relativistic quantity (c^3/G) and a quantum quantity (m_{Pl}/t_{Pl}) [5, 6].

We will use this quantity associated to the Hubble time to propose a quasi-complete alternative theoretical framework, relativistic and quantum, of the universe. Our alternative theoretical framework, which follows from the Λ CDM model, finds values consistent with the results of the Planck 2018 measurements, and may possibly explain what dark energy is. Our model also suggests a possible explanation for

the disappearance of antimatter in the Big Bang model. Finally, it recovers the cosmological diffuse background temperature determined by the WMAP satellite, in conjunction with the Planck 2018 results in a simple and easily understandable way.

SIMPLIFIED COSMOLOGY ALIGNED WITH Λ CDM POST-DECOUPLING

It seems possible to obtain the critical mass of the universe which correlates with the Λ CDM model. This could eventually lead to the development of a simple toy cosmological model previously unknown to the author, which is built around the Hubble constant H_0 , the Hubble time $t_H = 1/H$, the Planck mass flow and a variable coefficient α_H .

Here α_H represents the scalar radius of the observable universe (following calculations in the Λ CDM model for example) and correlates the Hubble radius at time t_H for a flat universe, according to;

$$\alpha_H = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_{a=0}^{a=1} \frac{da}{a^2 \sqrt{\Omega_r a^{-4} + \Omega_m a^{-3} + \Omega_k a^{-2} + \Omega_\Lambda}} / \frac{c}{H_0} \quad (1)$$

where a is the scale factor, c is the speed of light, $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, is the Hubble parameter measured today, the Ω_i are the density parameters of the standard cosmological model, i.e. the Λ CDM model, measured today [7].

$$A_H = \int_{a=0}^{a=1} \frac{da}{a^2 \sqrt{\Omega_r a^{-4} + \Omega_m a^{-3} + \Omega_k a^{-2} + \Omega_\Lambda}} \quad (2)$$

So that δ here is the Planck mass flow rate and introduce with $\delta = c^3/G = m_{Pl}/t_{Pl}$. and $t_{H_0} = 1/H_0$ is the Hubble time and its value is about $4.578 \times 10^{17} \text{ s}$ or approximately equal 14.51 billion years. R_{H_0} is also known as the Hubble radius.

$$R_{H_0} = \frac{c}{H_0} = c t_{H_0} \quad (3)$$

The increase of the "total mass of Hubble volume", (i.e. dark energy + total matter), M_{H_0} in the sense of the Λ CDM model, is determined for a flat quantum universe by the following relation with the critical density $\rho_c = 3/(8\pi G t_{H_0}^2)$ and the Hubble volume $V_{H_0} = 4\pi/3 (c t_{H_0})^3$

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{3}{8\pi G t_{H_0}^2} \frac{4\pi}{3} (c t_{H_0})^3 \quad (4)$$

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{c^3}{G} t_{H_0} \quad (5)$$

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{Pl}}{t_{Pl}} t_{H_0} \quad (6)$$

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \delta t_{H_0} \quad (7)$$

The mass of the observable universe in the sense of the Λ CDM model is:

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \delta t_{H_0} \alpha_{H_0}^3 \quad (8)$$

With

$$\alpha_{H_0} \approx \frac{4.399 \times 10^{26} \text{ m}}{1.372 \times 10^{26} \text{ m}}, \text{ i.e. } \alpha_{H_0} \approx 3.175 \text{ today}$$

If, $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, $\Omega_m = 0.315$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.685$ [7].

$$M_{H_0} \alpha_{H_0}^3 \approx 2.959 \times 10^{54} / \text{kg} \quad (9)$$

in other words, the mass of the observable universe Λ CDM today. (taking into account $E = mc^2$).

(α_H) PRE-DECOUPLING IN COSMOLOGICAL TOY MODEL: CONSEQUENCES

The author hypothesizes that, before and after the decoupling, the radius of the observable universe was equal to the Hubble radius. The ratio α_H was then normalized equal to 1. Thus, the mass of the Hubble sphere at $t_{H_0} = \text{Planck time}$ is determined here by:

$$M_{Ht_{Pl}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m_{Pl}}{t_{Pl}} \right) t_{Pl} \quad (10)$$

$$M_{Ht_{Pl}} = \frac{1}{2} (m_{Pl}) \quad (11)$$

This can be verified with the thermal energy

$$E_{Th} = \frac{1}{2} m_{Pl} c^2 = \frac{1}{2} k_B T_{Pl} \quad (12)$$

where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, with one degree of freedom assumed for the singularity and T_{Pl} the Planck temperature.

Mass of the universe at Hubble radius in this alternative cosmological model

Starting with a "Planck time grain mass" or "instanton" our proposed "Singularity" state at the beginning of the Big Bang model, which we define as the beginning time of our universe, with our galaxy as center. Then by making the assumption that for each unit of Planck time that passes, a corresponding half Planck mass is added to the mass of the universe. It should be noted that the instanton, as we define it, has a Schwarzschild radius of a single Planck length, which is of some importance in our model in comparison to other similar models.

In our toy cosmological model, the critical mass (energy) of the universe at the Hubble radius, before and after the decoupling, at time, t_{H_0} grows simply with the following formulas.

$$M_{H_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{i=t_H/t_{Pl}} \left(\frac{1}{2} m_{Pl} \right)_i \quad (13)$$

i.e.

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{Pl}}{t_{Pl}} t_{H_0} \quad (14)$$

$$M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{c^3}{G} t_{H_0} \quad (15)$$

If t_{H_0} is the Hubble time today, $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$ [8], $t_{H_0} = 4.578 \times 10^{17} \text{ seconds}$ today, so $M_{H_0} = 9.241 \times 10^{52} \text{ kg}$. With $t_H = 1/H$. So, the Hubble radius in our toy universe is continually the same as the Hubble radius in the Λ CDM model.

We assume that it's valid, without recourse to cosmic inflation, from Planck time to the Hubble radius of the

universe at the time of decoupling in the standard model (377 700 years) but also beyond.

This is made possible by writing the "critical mass" (= critical energy) and the Hubble radius with δ and t_{H_0} . This has the consequence of limiting quantum phenomena in the universe to dimensions of the order of Planck units between t_{H_0} and $t_{H_0} + t_{Pl}$.




Figure 1: Hubble sphere

Figure 1 shows that the observation of the Hubble sphere is always done in a given direction whether along the axes t_H or along the axes R_H . When we look in the opposite direction, we observe a universe with the same characteristics, namely a Hubble universe whose mass increases as a function of t_H . This toy model is therefore by construction isotropic, i.e. identical whatever the direction of observation. It is also homogeneous on a large scale by construction, i.e. for any considered time interval t_H , it contains a Planck half-mass.

In other words, there's always an observational bias that means part of the Hubble Universe is not visible to our observation for one observer, but it's there. The observer sees only one of these mini-spheres, depending on the direction of his observation. This observation is made according to an arrow of time that appears to be always positive.

We will simply note that the possibility of a double universe with two opposite time arrows was proposed by Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov in 1967 is taken up here. The ideas that follow from Andrei Sakharov's hypothesis should be re-examined according to the author, especially in order to account for dark matter and dark energy. The hypothesis of Andrei Sakharov has given rise to a few scientific works. Among the scientists who have worked on his hypothesis are Nathan Rosen, Jean Pierre Petit, Gabriel Chardin, Michael Boris Green, John Henry Schwarz, Abdus Salam (Nobel Prize in Physics in 1979), and Sabine Hossenfelder.

In this toy model, the red shift is due to time dilation and have for consequence the expansion of our visible universe

in the 3 space dimensions (distance = ct) of our visible universe. In other words, in this toy model, the Doppler effect of space expansion is connected to the Doppler effect of time. We also note that matter translated into energy gives the negative energy first proposed by Stephen Hawking, but also proposed later by Tatum [9].

PROPOSAL OF DETERMINATION OF THE COSMOLOGICAL CONSTANT IN THIS TOY COSMOLOGICAL MODEL

The Hubble sphere seen as a black hole

We would therefore have a Hubble universe of mass $\rho_c V_{H_0}$ which have a diameter $D_{H_0} = 2ct_{H_0}$ and composed of two mini spheres S_H^+ and S_H^- .

M_{H_0} = Hubble volume \times critical density in kg, with large-scale homogeneous distribution for a flat quantum universe.

We also have, Eq.15: $M_{H_0} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c^3}{G} \right) t_{H_0}$. We can define two spheres H' left and H' right which;

- both have diameter $D_{H_0} = R_{H_0}$ and mass M_{H_0} .
- whose contact point is the center of the sphere with radius R_{H_0} .

The invariant gravitational force that attracts these masses of the two mini-spheres $M_{H_0}^+$ on the left and $M_{H_0}^+$ on the right is $FM_{H_0}^\pm$:

$$FM_{H_0}^\pm = \frac{GM_{H_0}^+ M_{H_0}^-}{R_{H_0}^2} \quad (16)$$

$$FM_{H_0}^\pm = \frac{G \left(\frac{1c^3}{2G} t_{H_0} \right)^2}{(c t_{H_0})^2} \quad (17)$$

$$FM_{H_0}^\pm = \frac{c^4}{4G} \quad (18)$$

$$FM_{H_0}^\pm = \frac{F_{Pl}}{4} \quad (19)$$

where F_{Pl} is Planck's force and where N is the Newton.

$$FM_{H_0}^\pm = 3,02564 \cdot 10^{43} \text{ N} \quad (20)$$

The Planck force characterizes a property of space-time according to Barrow and Gibbons [10]. In general relativity, the limiting value it represents does not correspond to the Planck unit, but to the reduced Planck unit, where G is replaced by $4G$. The resulting reduced Planck force is four times weaker and is equal to Eq.16 to Eq.20.

This is a maximum limit in general relativity, attainable only at the horizon of a black hole. As the radius of a Schwarzschild black hole R_s is also its horizon R_h where it would appear to be permissible to model our universe as a Schwarzschild black hole, where the observer is operationally-defined as always being at the center of our

Hubble sphere. All partial or entire models [11] at the critical Friedmann mass with these characteristics could be valid. This one is only one of them.

$$R_h = \frac{2GM_{H_0}}{c^2} \quad (21)$$

Considering the Hubble sphere as a Schwarzschild black hole expanding will be essential in a following paragraph to theorize the temperature of the cosmic microwave background, i.e. the CMB.

The two mini spheres can also be two complete Hubble spheres. Finally, we note by examining two mini spheres that $M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$ can be seen as a mass of matter and a mass of antimatter.

Proposal of determination of the cosmological constant

Here, we try to deal with dark energy. In classical mechanics, the gravitational interaction between two masses is instantaneous, but in general relativity this interaction cannot be faster than the speed of light. We will use this property of general relativity theory to propose a value for the cosmological constant. The value, which is questionable from a dimensional point of view, is nevertheless consistent with the results of Planck 2018, as we'll point out below. Since the velocity of the gravitational interaction $FM_{H_0}^\pm$ between $M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$ is limited to c we assume that the power of $FM_{H_0}^\pm$ is $PM_{H_0}^\pm$ Watts such that:

$$PM_{H_0}^\pm = FM_{H_0}^\pm c \quad (22)$$

$$PM_{H_0}^\pm = 9.0706 \times 10^{51} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^2 \cdot \text{s}^{-3} \quad (23)$$

We will look for what could balance this power. As we have already used the opposite with $M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$ to find $FM_{H_0}^\pm$, this time we will try to use the inverse of $PM_{H_0}^\pm$ to get the neutrality equal to 1 of the mathematical operation and the dimension of $PM_{H_0}^\pm$

$$\frac{1}{PM_{H_0}^\pm} = 1.1025 \times 10^{-52} \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^3 \quad (24)$$

The watt is also a measure of energy flux. The latter is by definition the measure of the total power of electromagnetic radiation emitted or received by a real or virtual surface. We assume that this is electromagnetic radiation. We will also assume that the units of dimension $[M^{-1} L^{-2} T^3]$ are the units of dimension of the cosmological constant in our toy model. It should be noted here that this dimension for obtaining Λ is erroneous with respect to the Λ CDM model, but the value of retaining the numerical value of Λ from this model seems, to the author, to be more important at present because of its basis with $FM_{H_0}^\pm$. Later in this version, the author will show that this "anomalous" dimension of the cosmologic constant could be natural in quantum cosmology because it follows from the underlying dynamical reality of

the cosmological constant that applies in the framework of this alternative model. Note that:

$$PM_{H_0}^\pm = \frac{4}{P_{Pl}} \quad (25)$$

where P_{Pl} is the Planck power.

Validation of the value of the proposed cosmological constant.

The density parameter of the cosmological constant Ω_Λ in the Λ CDM model is defined by Friedmann equation for a flat relativistic universe as follows:

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \frac{c^2 \Lambda}{3H_0^2} \quad (26)$$

i.e. with Planck 2018 results ($H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ km/s/Mpc)[7], $t_{H_0} = 4.578 \times 10^{17}$ seconds today) and the proposed value of Λ from model standard formula is:

$$\Omega_\Lambda = 0.6923 \quad (27)$$

By simplifying, today, the matter density parameter $\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda$, i.e. $\Omega_m = 0.3077$.

Planck 2018 results[7] give $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$. If $\Omega_m = 0.315 - 0.007$, then $\Omega_m = 0.3080$. Our theoretical value of Λ gives a result extremely close to the lower bound of Ω_m with the Planck 2018 results [7]. This is the main reason why the authors propose that the important open question about the dimensions of Λ could be as presented here. Our alternative cosmological model would then possibly account for the origin of dark energy where the Λ CDM model fails.

About the dimension of the proposed cosmological constant in this model

The dimension of Λ in this toy model is $\text{kg}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^3$. It can also be written: $\text{s}/\text{kg} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$, i.e. time divided by energy. The universe we see is only our universe, with our galaxy as center. Our universe is made up, as Sakharov and we assumed, of two time-dependent dynamic universes: M_{H^+} and M_{H^-} , and 2-time arrows t_{H^+} and t_{H^-} . Therefore, to explain its dimensions, we have a cosmological constant Λ of constant value, whose underlying reality is dynamic from $t_H = 0$ to all $t_H = 1/H$, and which is equal to:

$$\Lambda = \frac{2t_H}{M_H c^2} = 1.1024583 \times 10^{-52} \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^3 \quad (28)$$

Our measurable universe is simply a universe expands critical of Friedman, i.e. the contents of the Hubble sphere, as proposed, for example, by E. Haug in recent work. The Λ CDM model despite its success fails to find, unlike this toy model, the nature and dynamical origin of the cosmological constant as a function of time t_H , i.e. the Hubble parameter $H = 1/t_H$.

Proposal to redress the dimension of Λ in this toy model to Λ CDM model

The power $4/PM_{H_0}^\pm$ (Dim: $1/W$) or inverse energy flux of the cosmological constant and the fact that our observations of the universe are made in W/m^2 . [12]

We do $Wm^{-2} \times 4/P_{Pl}$ to find Lambda's dimension in the standard model. its dimension is then transformed into m^{-2} in the standard cosmological model from this toy model. Moreover, as Lambda's Watts origin comes from a force times a velocity, we can't observe it directly, as it's a non-luminous phenomenon. It is therefore "black" with our current observational methods. Its observation is, at best, indirect.

In all cases, the cosmological constant of this model comes from a force multiplied by a speed. It is not related to the luminosity which we like to use in order to draw models from observations. It should be realized that an event where a force is multiplied by a speed would not necessarily be associated with light emission.

We propose that this may be why cosmologists can only see indirect effects, such as a lack of cosmic acceleration, which they then, understandably refer to as the result of dark energy.

Proposed explanation of the vacuum catastrophe in this alternative cosmological model

Let's consider the force that attracts our two mini spheres in contact and expanding, $M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$ at a distance $R_{H_0}^\pm$. At the point of origin of figure.1, this force crosses, at speed c , a quantum surface of Planck scale $(l_{Pl})^2$, where l_{Pl} is the Planck length. The power $PM_{H_0}^\pm$ or energy flux of the cosmological constant thus crosses orthogonally the virtual surface $(l_{Pl})^2$. Mathematically, this gives us:

$$\varphi = \frac{PM_{H_0}^\pm}{l_{Pl}^2} \approx 3.5 \times 10^{121} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3} \quad (29)$$

The dimension of Eq.30 is that of a surface power density, i.e., that of the energy flux $PM_{H_0}^\pm$ that starts from the origin of the Hubble sphere to interact with its surface. $(l_{Pl})^2$ is the assumed value of quantum energy suggested by quantum field theory [13] with a cutoff at l_{Pl} .

One writing of the vacuum catastrophe is divide the vacuum engrener suggested by quantum field theory by the energy of the cosmological constant Λ with the dimension $[L^{-2}]$ is:

$$\frac{l_{Pl}^2}{\Lambda} \quad (30)$$

Another expression with energy densities, of dimension $[M][L^{-1}][S^{-2}]$, is :

$$\left(\frac{F_{Pl} l_{Pl}^{-2}}{\frac{F_{Pl} \Lambda}{8\pi}} \right) \quad (31)$$

Considering the zero-point energy suggested by the quantum field theory l_{Pl}^{-2} as the inverse of a surface and not as an energy should fit easily into the mirror theories that follow from Andrei Sakharov's hypothesis.

PROPOSAL OF EXPLANATION OF THE DISAPPEARANCE OF ANTIMATTER IN THE BIG BANG MODEL

To make this proposal we must refer to figure 1. To facilitate the understanding of what follows without having to navigate in this file, I make a copy here:




Fig 2

The resolution of this problem comes naturally when the human or instrumental observational bias is identified:

When we observe the Hubble sphere in the "up" or "down" direction, the two masses $M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$, the two Hubble mini-spheres are not included in the field of view. They are there but the observer placed at the origin of the 4 directions of the figure does not see them. This is Schrödinger's cat, which is both dead and alive as long as you look in those "up" or "down" directions. The time can pass as much as one want, as long as the observer does not change direction of observation, the observer does not know if he will see the matter M^+ or the antimatter M^- .

The cat of the matter is thus at the same time dead M^- and alive M^+ . When the observer chooses to make the observation by turning 90° , he will see a dead cat or a living cat. This model of universe starts at $t_{H_0} = 0.5m_{Pl}^+$, the time being signed + or -, the observer will see, either matter M^+/t^+ , or matter M^-/t^- , i.e. $0.5m_{Pl}^+$.

The mass $0.5m_{Pl}^-$ is on the time line $-t_H$ from the origin. It is located on the other side of the observer's time origin. He does not see it. This explains the infinitesimal amount of antimatter in the observed universe in the Bing bang model which begin at t_{Pl} .

PROPOSAL OF A SIMPLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CMB TEMPERATURE AND THE HUBBLE CONSTANT IN OUR ALTERNATIVE COSMOLOGICAL MODEL

At the end of the paragraph in Section C.1), we stressed the importance of potentially modeling our Hubble sphere as an expanding black hole.

Here, we will partially repeat the work of the article "The Basics of Flat Space Cosmology" by E.T. Tatum, U. V. S. Seshavatharam and S. Lakshminarayana [11].

This is because they accurately calculate the Hubble constant H_0 using only the Fixsen CMB temperature of 2.72548 K as their sole input. Their success in this regard appears to be from using their modified cosmological scaling temperature formula inspired by Hawking's temperature formula for black holes. Their formula, demonstrated by Haug and Wojnow recently [14], is as follows:

$$T_{H_0} = \frac{\hbar c^3}{8\pi k_B G \sqrt{m_{Pl} M_{H_0}}} \quad (32)$$

where T_{H_0} is the Hubble sphere CMB temperature today, \hbar is the reduced Planck constant (or Dirac constant) and k_B is the Boltzmann constant. The Planck 2018 results give a value of $H_0 = 67,4 \pm 0,5$ km/s/Mpc. We use, $H_0 = 66.90$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ and $t_{H_0} = 4.6124 \times 10^{17}$ s.

We obtain with Eq.14, $M_{H_0} = 9.310 \times 10^{52} kg$, which is identical to the number Tatum et al. also reported in 2015 [11]. The Hubble CMB temperature, for instance, is derived in the following way:

$$T_{H_0} = 2.7256 K \quad (33)$$

The CMB temperature measured today for $z = 0$, is: TCMB($z = 0$) = 2.72548 \pm 0.0005 K [15]. The upper bound of the uncertainty error in our calculation is 2.72605 K. The above Fixsen CMB temperature is, therefore, in perfect agreement with the calculation made by modeling the Hubble sphere as a black hole and calculating its (modified) Hawking temperature.

In like manor, by plugging the Fixsen CMB temperature into a rearranged Tatum et al. formula, and assuming a c/R_H value for the Hubble constant, a Hubble constant value of 66.89 km/s. Mpc can also be obtained.

The above values can only be derived in a black hole cosmological model, such as the 2015 Tatum model. Thus, there is an extremely high correlation between the CMB temperature and the Hubble constant. This is the subject of a current letter under review authored by E.T. Tatum, E.G. Haug and S. Wojnow [11].

This last paper highlights, with values from four studies of CMB temperature, a much more precise value of H_0 . This would be the lower bound of $H_0 = 67.40 \pm 0.5$ km/s. Mpc, i.e. : $H_0 = 66.90$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ used here.

NUMERICAL AND DIMENSIONAL CONSISTENCY OF ZERO-POINT ENERGY IN THIS ALTERNATIVE MODEL

The dimension and value corresponding to vacuum energy in quantum field theory, i.e. the zero-point energy, is l_{Pl}^{-2} [13]. The dimension of the cosmological constant in this alternative model (Eq.24 and Eq.25) is

$$kg^{-1}.m^{-2}.s^3 \quad (34)$$

We have the value of l_{Pl}^{-2} , which is totally independent of Λ , so much so that it is referred to as the "worst prediction of theoretical physics" with regard to the gap between its cosmological measurement and the prediction in quantum theory.

By setting the value of the zero-point energy equal to the dimension of the cosmological constant in this alternative model, in the same way that the Planck force transforms the dimension [L^{-2}] into an energy density it becomes very simple to reconcile these two values using Planck units at the cut off:

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{vacuum} = \frac{2t_{Pl}^3}{m_{Pl}l_{Pl}^2} = 1.1025 \times 10^{-52} kg^{-1}m^{-2}s^3 \quad (35)$$

where Λ_{vacuum} is the value and dimension of the cosmological constant of quantum vacuum in this alternative model, which unifies general relativity and quantum field theory.

CONCLUSION

In this alternative model, the mass of the Hubble sphere in the sense of the Λ CDM model is equal to the summation

$$M_{H_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{i=t_H/t_{Pl}} \left(\frac{1}{2} m_{Pl} \right)_i \quad (36)$$

and appears as, a quantification i.e., as a "stacking" of Planck half masses on a Hubble timeline $t_H = 1/H$ instead of a density multiplied by a spherical volume in the Λ CDM model. This stacking of masses is compatible with the apparent isotropy and homogeneity of the universe. This model starts at t_{H_0} , $t_H = 0$, contrary to the Big bang model, and goes until today. It gives results consistent with the observations made with the Planck satellite today. We take up the idea of doubles universes, and explore the relationship between the infinitely small in quantum mechanics and the infinitely large in general relativity.

We hesitated for a while about the value proposed here of the cosmological constant because of its special dimension compared to the usual conventions, but we can be much surer of its foundation ($M_{H_0}^+$ and $M_{H_0}^-$ with $FM_{H_0}^{\pm}$). We've established its underlying reality in this model. This model allows us to theorize about the CMB temperature measurement in relation to the Hubble constant measurement

[16] and the interest in revisiting and renewing Andrei Sakharov's hypothesis.

Furthermore, we note that the idea of Bruno Valeixo Bento and Stav Zalel in their article "If time had no beginning"[17] seems correct. By linking it to quantum space universe, we can assume that a multiverse of universes could exist everywhere in a flat, infinite 4D spacetime, with no beginning and no end quantum space-time, as proposed in Figure 1 with singularities inside and outside the Hubble sphere. This is true for each unit of Planck time that elapses from the Big Bang, but also before the Planck time of the Big Bang.

Finally, we provide a solution to the "worst prediction of theoretical physics", also known as the vacuum catastrophe or cosmological constant problem in this model. In doing so, we find an a -dimensional factor of 1 between the measured cosmological energy and the vacuum energy suggested by quantum field theory, with an appropriate dimension.

In conclusion, our model is a potential candidate as a general framework for a cosmological model of relativistic and

quantum cosmology. Among other things, it appears to provide possible validation for the zero-energy universe model of Tatum [9, 18] and more simply of the zero-energy universe hypothesis of Pascual Jordan with MH^+c^2 and MH^-c^2 .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. Espen Haug and E.T. Tatum for stimulating e-mail discussions. He would also like to thank E.T. Tatum for his very important contribution to the English translation of this document.

He would also like to thank and recommend Hyperscience International Journal (HIJ) for its technical support and the addition of missing references. Finally, the author would like to affectionately thank his uncle, Dr. Patrick Vaudon, who guided his thinking with this remark: "Cosmology is a very difficult science, because it can practically only be based on electromagnetic waves from the cosmos."

REFERENCES

- [1] J. S. Bullock, M. J. A. R. o. A. Boylan-Kolchin, and Astrophysics, "Small-scale challenges to the Λ CDM paradigm," vol. 55, pp. 343-387, 2017.
- [2] C. Pittordis, "Model-Independent Probes of Cosmology & Gravitation," Queen Mary University of London, 2019.
- [3] J. Hamann, S. Hannestad, J. Lesgourgues, C. Rampf, Y. Y. J. J. o. C. Wong, and A. Physics, "Cosmological parameters from large scale structure-geometric versus shape information," vol. 2010, no. 07, p. 022, 2010.
- [4] S. Kumar, R. C. Nunes, and S. K. J. M. N. o. t. R. A. S. Yadav, "Testing the warmness of dark matter," vol. 490, no. 1, pp. 1406-1414, 2019.
- [5] G. J. S. i. t. h. o. g. r. Gorelik, "The first steps of quantum gravity and the Planck values," vol. 3, pp. 364-79, 1992.
- [6] D. S. Blanco, L. J. C. Lombriser, and Q. Gravity, "Exploring the self-tuning of the cosmological constant from Planck mass variation," vol. 38, no. 23, p. 235003
- [7] N. Aghanim *et al.*, "Planck 2018 results-VI. Cosmological parameters," vol. 641, p. A6, 2020.
- [8] P. Collaboration *et al.*, "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters," 2020.
- [9] E. T. J. J. o. M. P. Tatum, "How the Dirac Sea Idea May Apply to a Spatially-Flat Universe Model (A Brief Review)," vol. 10, no. 08, p. 974, 2019.
- [10] J. D. Barrow and G. W. J. M. N. o. t. R. A. S. Gibbons, "Maximum tension: with and without a cosmological constant," vol. 446, ed, 2015, pp. 3874-3877.
- [11] E. T. Tatum, U. Seshavatharam, S. J. I. j. o. A. Lakshminarayana, and Astrophysics, "The basics of flat space cosmology," vol. 5, no. 02, p. 116, 2015.
- [12] E. Mamajek *et al.*, "IAU 2015 Resolution B2 on Recommended Zero Points for the Absolute and Apparent Bolometric Magnitude Scales," 2015.
- [13] L. J. P. L. B. Lombriser, "On the cosmological constant problem," vol. 797, p. 134804, 2019.
- [14] E. Haug and S. Wojnow, "How to predict the temperature of the CMB directly using the Hubble parameter and the Planck scale using the Stefan-Boltzman law," 2023.
- [15] D. J. T. A. J. Fixsen, "The temperature of the cosmic microwave background," vol. 707, no. 2, p. 916, 2009.
- [16] E. Tatum, E. G. Haug, and S. Wojnow, "High precision Hubble constant determinations based upon a new theoretical relationship between CMB temperature and H_0 ," 2023.
- [17] B. V. Bento and S. J. a. p. a. Zalel, "If time had no beginning," 2021.
- [18] E. T. Tatum and U. J. J. o. M. P. Seshavatharam, "Flat space cosmology as a model of light speed cosmic expansion—Implications for the vacuum energy density," vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 2008-2020, 2018.