

Hubble constants and luminosity distance in the renormalized cosmological models due to general-relativistic second-order perturbations

Kenji Tomita*

Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

*E-mail: ketomita@yahoo.co.jp

.....
 Renormalized cosmological models based on the general-relativistic second-order perturbation theory were proposed in the previous papers to solve a tension on the observed Hubble constants. The cosmological random adiabatic fluctuations were found to play an important role as the first-order perturbations. The second-order metric perturbations in a previous paper are revised in the present paper. It is shown as a result that two types of Hubble constants (the kinematic constant H_{kin} and the dynamic constant H_{dyn}) are derived, and their values are found to be comparable, and larger than the background value. The optical quantities such as redshift and luminosity distance are derived using the revised metric perturbations.

1. Introduction

In order to discuss the cosmological tension on the difference between the Hubble constant derived from the Planck measurements[1, 2] and that from the direct measurements of the Hubble constant[3–8], we studied cosmological models[9–11] which were derived using the general-relativistic second-order perturbation theory ([12] for non-zero Λ and [13–15] for zero Λ). It was found in these models that the cosmological random adiabatic density fluctuations[16] play an important role as the first-order perturbations for producing the gap of Hubble constants due to the non-linear process.

After the publication of our above papers, we found a necessity of the revision for the derivation of averages of second-order metric perturbations in the first paper[9], which changed the derived value of the Hubble constant slightly.

In the present paper we first derive our correct averages of metric perturbations, and use them to derive the Hubble constants and optical quantities such as redshift and luminosity distance necessary for the observations.

In Sect. 2, we show our background model and the outline of our perturbation theory. In Sect. 3, we show the revised second-order metric perturbations, and in Sect. 4, derive two kinds of the Hubble parameter, which are found to be comparable, and larger than the background value. In Sect. 5, we derive the optical quantities, and the observational relation using the revised metric perturbations. In Sect. 6, concluding remarks are given. In Appendix A, the basic formulation is compactly reviewed. In Appendix B, the deceleration parameter q is derived, and in Appendix C, the luminosity distance d_L is derived, based on the revised metric perturbations. In Appendix D, dependence of renormalized model parameters on background model parameters is shown.

2. Background and the perturbation theory

The space-time of our spatially flat background universe is expressed by the line element

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dy^\nu = a^2(\eta)[-d\eta^2 + \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j], \quad (1)$$

where the Greek and Roman letters denote 0, 1, 2, 3 and 1, 2, 3, respectively. The conformal time $\eta(= x^0)$ is related to the cosmic time t by $dt = a(\eta)d\eta$. The background Hubble parameter $H (\equiv a'/a^2 = \dot{a}/a)$ satisfies

$$H = [(\rho + \Lambda)/3]^{1/2} = H_0 (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

where a prime and a dot denote $d/d\eta$ and d/dt , respectively. We use a background model with model parameters given by

$$H_0 = 67.3 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad (\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.22, 0.78), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\Omega_M = \frac{8\pi G \rho_0}{3H_0^2} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\rho_0}{H_0^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3H_0^2} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\Lambda}{H_0^2}, \quad (4)$$

H_0 and ρ_0 are the present Hubble constant and matter density, and the units $8\pi G = c = 1$ are used. In Appendix D, cases of $(\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.24, 0.76)$ and $(0.28, 0.72)$ are treated for comparison.

For perturbations on large scales with $x \equiv k/k_{eq} \leq x_{max}$, the perturbed metric, velocity and density perturbations are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta g_{\mu\nu} &= h_{\mu\nu} + \ell_{\mu\nu}, \\ \delta u^\mu &= \delta_1 u^\mu + \delta_2 u^\mu, \\ \delta \rho/\rho &= \delta_1 \rho/\rho + \delta_2 \rho/\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the definition of k_{eq} and x_{max} are shown in Appendix A. Here we assume the synchronous and comoving coordinates, that is

$$h_{00} = 0, \quad h_{0i} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_1 u^0 = 0, \quad \delta_1 u^i = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\ell_{00} = 0, \quad \ell_{0i} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_2 u^0 = 0, \quad \delta_2 u^i = 0 \quad (7)$$

in the same way as the previous paper[9], cited as [I]. In the previous paper[12], the expressions of metric in the Poisson coordinates also were shown, but here our treatments are confined only to the synchronous and comoving coordinates.

The first-order perturbations in the growing mode are expressed in Eq.(14) of [I] by use of an arbitrary potential function $F(\mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{x} is the spatial coordinates. The amplitude of $F(\mathbf{x})$ is related to the cosmological adiabatic density fluctuations.[16] The second-order perturbations corresponding to the first-order perturbations are expressed in Eqs. (20) - (23) of [I].

The average values of second-order density perturbations are shown in Appendix A with some small corrections. For those of second-order metric perturbations, the revised version is shown in the next section.

The scale with $x > x_{max}$ represents the scale which is always sub-horizon at the matter-dominant stage after the epoch such as $1 + z = 1500$ (cf [10]). Perturbations on small scales

with $x \geq x_{max}$ were separately treated in the Newtonian approximation and their effect to the large-scale quantities was found to be negligible. So the following analyses are confined to the above perturbations on large scales with $x \leq x_{max}$.

3. Revised second-order metric perturbations

The average of second-order perturbations of the scale-factor ($\delta_2 a$) is expressed using the second-order metric perturbations l_{ij} as

$$\delta_2(a^2)/a^2 = \frac{1}{3}\langle l_m^m \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where the average process is shown in Appendix A and $\langle l_m^m \rangle = \langle l_1^1 + l_2^2 + l_3^3 \rangle$. We have this relation (8), because $a^2 l_j^i$ represents the perturbations corresponding to the background space-time Eq.(1). So, Eq.(40) of [I] is wrong with respect to the factor a^2 , and the following Eqs. (42) - (51) of [I] should be replaced by the correct ones, which are shown in the following:

$$\langle l_{ij} \rangle = P(\eta)\langle L_{ij} \rangle + P^2(\eta)\langle M_{ij} \rangle + Q(\eta)\langle N_{,ij} \rangle + \langle C_{ij} \rangle. \quad (9)$$

Here L_{ij} , M_{ij} and $N_{,ij}$ are metric components being functions of spatial variable \mathbf{x} , and C_{ij} represents the components of gravitational waves, which were used in Eqs. ((20), (21), and (A1) - (A4)) of [I]. Since $L_j^i = L_{ij}$, $M_j^i = M_{ij}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} L_i^i &= -\frac{1}{2} [2F\Delta F + \frac{3}{2}F_{,l}F_{,l}], \\ M_i^i &= \frac{1}{28} [10F_{,jl}F_{,jl} - 3(\Delta F)^2], \\ \Delta N &= \frac{1}{28} [(\Delta F)^2 - F_{,kl}F_{,kl}], \\ \square C_i^i &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_i^i \rangle &= -\frac{1}{4} \langle F\Delta F \rangle, \\ \langle M_i^i \rangle &= \frac{1}{4} \langle (\Delta F)^2 \rangle, \\ \langle \Delta N \rangle &= \langle C_i^i \rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Then we get using Eqs.(A5) and (A7)

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle = \langle l_i^i \rangle = \frac{1}{4}(2\pi)^{-2}P(\eta) \left[\int d\mathbf{k}k^2 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) + P(\eta) \int d\mathbf{k}k^4 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Here \mathcal{P}_F is replaced by \mathcal{P}_R with \mathcal{P}_{R0} in Eq.(A10), and we obtain

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle = 2\pi \ 32.4^4 \ \mathcal{P}_{R0} \ Z(a)[32.4^{-2}A + Z(a)B], \quad (13)$$

where $P(\eta)$ is expressed using $Z(a)$ (defined in Eqs. (A14) and (A15)), and the constants A and B (defined by Eq. (A13)) reflect the amplitude of the BBKS adiabatic fluctuations. [16].

The average metric perturbations $\langle l_{ii} \rangle$ are spatially constant and isotropic, and so we can consider the renormalized scale-factor a_{rem} defined by

$$a_{rem} = a \left(1 + \frac{1}{3} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \right)^{1/2} = a \left(1 + \frac{1}{6} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \right), \quad (14)$$

where we neglect the terms of higher-orders than second-order. The renormalized Hubble parameter (H_{kin}) is defined as

$$H_{kin} \equiv \frac{\dot{a}_{rem}}{a_{rem}} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{1}{6} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot \quad (15)$$

or

$$H_{kin}/H = 1 + \frac{1}{6} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot / H, \quad (16)$$

where H ($\equiv \dot{a}/a$) is the background Hubble parameter. Here H_{kin} denotes the kinematic definition of the Hubble parameter. Differentiating Eq.(13), we obtain

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot = 2\pi \cdot 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} [32.4^{-2} A + 2Z(a)B] \frac{dZ(a)}{da} \dot{a}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\frac{dZ(a)}{da} = (H_0)^2 \frac{P'}{a'} = (H_0/H)^2 Y(a)/a^3 = \frac{Y(a)}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \quad (18)$$

using Eqs. (2) and (A15). Therefore, we get using Eq. (18)

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot / H = 2\pi \cdot 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} \frac{[32.4^{-2} A + 2Z(a)B] Y(a)a}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3}, \quad (19)$$

and then the kinematic second-order Hubble parameter is given by Eq.(15). At present epoch, it is expressed as

$$(H_{kin})_0/H_0 = 1 + \frac{1}{6} [\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot / H]_0 = 1 + \frac{2\pi}{3} \cdot 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} \left[\frac{1}{2} \times 32.4^{-2} A + Z(1)B \right] Y(1). \quad (20)$$

Here, $Y(1)$ and $Z(1)$ are expressed as

$$Y(1) = I(1), \quad Z(1) = \frac{2}{3\Omega_M} [1 - I(1)], \quad \text{and} \quad I(1) = \int_0^1 db [b^3 / (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda b^3)]^{1/2}. \quad (21)$$

For the background model parameters (3), we get


$$I(1) = Y(1) = 0.566, \quad Z(1) = 1.316. \quad (22)$$

So, we obtain using A and B in Eq.(A18)

$$(H_{kin})_0 = 72.6 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

In order to explain the histories of H_{kin} and a_{rem} , the behaviors of H_{kin} (H_0/H) and ξ ($\equiv a_{rem}(t)/a(t) - 1$) are shown as functions of a in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. Corresponding previous figures (Figs. 2 and 4 in [I]) must be replaced by these figures.

Fig. 1: History of H_{kin} . The ordinate denotes $H_{kin}(H_0/H)$ is expressed as a function of a . The scale factor a has 1 at the present epoch.



4. Renormalization of model parameters

For the second-order density perturbations, we have no revision, and so using Eqs.(A12) and (A19) for the density perturbations, we can consider the renormalization of model parameters, similarly to that in [I]. Since $\langle \delta_2 \rho \rangle$ is spatially constant and isotropic, we assume that it is a part of the renormalized matter density ρ_{rem} . So we have

$$\rho_{rem} = \rho + \langle \delta_2 \rho \rangle. \quad (24)$$

Then the renormalized ones corresponding to Ω_M and Ω_Λ are given by


$$[(\Omega_M)_{rem}, (\Omega_\Lambda)_{rem}] = [\Omega_M(1 + \langle \delta_2 \rho / \rho \rangle), \Omega_\Lambda / (1 + \langle \delta_2 \rho / \tilde{\rho} \rangle)], \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\rho} \equiv \rho + \Lambda$.

Next, we define a renormalized Hubble parameter H_{dyn} corresponding to Eq.(24) as

$$H_{dyn} = \left[\frac{1}{3}(\rho_{rem} + \Lambda) \right]^{1/2} = \left[\frac{1}{3}(\tilde{\rho} + \langle \delta_2 \rho \rangle) \right]^{1/2}. \quad (26)$$

Fig. 2: The relative scale-factors ξ ($\equiv a_{rem}/a - 1$) is expressed as a function of a . The scale factor a has 1 at the present epoch.



This Hubble parameter appears when we describe the dynamical evolution of the perturbed model, as used in the previous paper[10], and so we call it the dynamical Hubble parameter. Its present value is expressed as

$$(H_{dyn})_0/H_0 = 1 + \frac{2\pi}{3} 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} \left[-\frac{5}{2} \times 32.4^{-2} A + Z(1)B \right] [1 - Y(1)], \quad (27)$$

where A and B are given in Eqs.(A13) and (A18).

Corresponding to the background model parameter (3), the present value of renormalized model parameters are found to be

$$(\Omega_M)_{rem} = 0.305, \quad (\Omega_\Lambda)_{rem} = 0.695, \quad (28)$$

and

$$(H_{dyn})_0 = 71.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-1}. \quad (29)$$

As for the histories of $\langle \delta_2 \rho \rangle$ and $(\Omega_M)_{rem}$, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 in [I] are useful also in the present paper.

On the other hand, we have the kinematic Hubble parameter H_{kin} , which was derived in the previous section. H_{kin} and H_{dyn} are different with respect to the factor $Y(a)$, and H_{kin} is a little larger than H_{dyn} . So we discriminate these two Hubble parameters. On the other hand, both Hubble parameters are found to be larger than the background Hubble parameter H .

These Hubble parameters depend on the value of B which is sensitively related to the upper limit x_{max} in Eq.(A13). The terms with A are negligibly small. We have used $x_{max} = 5.7$ here and in previous papers. In Table 1, we show the dependence of $(H_{kin})_0$ and $(H_{dyn})_0$ on the value of x_{max} and L_{max} ($= 2\pi/k_{max}$) given in Eq.(53) of [I], which may represent the boundary for whether the general-relativistic non-linearity is effective for the evolution of perturbations, as was discussed in a previous paper[11]. For larger x_{max} (or smaller L_{max}), we have larger Hubble constant.

Table 1: Dependence of $(H_{kin})_0$ and $(H_{dyn})_0$ on x_{max} and L_{max} in the case of background model parameters (3).

x_{max}	L_{max}	$(H_{kin})_0$	$(H_{dyn})_0$
5.7	102/h	72.6	71.4
6.0	97/h	73.3	71.7
6.3	92/h	74.0	72.4

5. Optics and observations

The renormalized line-element can be expressed as

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a_{rem}(t)^2 [(dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 + (dx^3)^2], \quad (30)$$

where the renormalized scale factor $a_{rem}(t)$ is given by Eq. (14), and x^1, x^2 and x^3 are comoving coordinates.

5.1. Redshift

The light path is given by the null condition

$$dt = \pm a_{rem}(t) dr, \quad (31)$$

where $r \equiv [(dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 + (dx^3)^2]^{1/2}$.

If a light ray starts from a distant source with r at epoch t_1 and reaches an observer at epoch t_0 , we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_0} dt/a_{rem} = r. \quad (32)$$

If we receive two subsequent signals with intervals δt_0 and δt_1 from a comoving source, we obtain

$$\frac{\delta t_1}{a_{rem}(t_1)} = \frac{\delta t_0}{a_{rem}(t_0)}. \quad (33)$$

For the frequencies ν_0 and ν_1 (given by $\nu_1/\nu_0 = \delta t_0/\delta t_1$), we have

$$1 + z_{rem} = \nu_1/\nu_0 = a_{rem}(t_0)/a_{rem}(t_1), \quad (34)$$

where z_{rem} is the redshift.

For nearby sources, we can expand $a_{rem}(t)$ as

$$a_{rem}(t) = a_{rem}(t_0)[1 + (t - t_0)(H_{kin})_0 + \dots], \quad (35)$$

where $(H_{kin})_0$ gives the relation

$$(H_{kin})_0 = \dot{a}_{rem}(t_0)/a_{rem}(t_0). \quad (36)$$

Moreover, we have

$$z_{rem} = (H_{kin})_0 \Delta t, \quad (37)$$

where $\Delta t = t_0 - t_1$.

5.2. Luminosity distance

The relation between the apparent luminosity l and the absolute luminosity L is expressed by

$$l = L/(4\pi d_L^2), \quad (38)$$

where d_L is the luminosity distance between a source and an observer. In the expanding universe with the metric (30), the time intervals δt_1 and δt_0 in the source and the observer are not equal and given by Eq.(33). Moreover, the received and emitted energies of a photon are different and given by the redshift factor. As a result, the above relation is expressed as

$$l = L/[4\pi(d_L)_{rem}^2], \quad (39)$$

using the renormalized luminosity distance $(d_L)_{rem}$, which is given by

$$(d_L)_{rem} = a_{rem}(t_0) r(z_{rem}) (1 + z_{rem}). \quad (40)$$

Here $r(z_{rem})$ is the coordinate distance between the observer and the source with z_{rem} , which is derived eliminating t_1 from Eqs. (32) and (34).

For $z_{rem} \ll 1$, we have

$$z_{rem} = (H_{kin})_0(t_0 - t_1) + \frac{1}{2}[(q_{kin})_0 + 2] (H_{kin})_0^2 (t_0 - t_1)^2 + \dots, \quad (41)$$

where the kinematic deceleration parameter (q_{kin}) is defined as

$$q_{kin} \equiv -\left(\frac{d^2 a_{rem}(t)}{dt^2}\right)/[(H_{kin})^2 a_{rem}]. \quad (42)$$

From Eq.(41), we obtain inversely

$$(H_{kin})_0(t_0 - t_1) = z_{rem} - \frac{1}{2}[(q_{kin})_0 + 2] z_{rem}^2 + \dots \quad (43)$$

Therefore, we obtain from Eq.(40)

$$(d_L)_{rem} = (H_{kin})_0^{-1} \left\{ z_{rem} + \frac{1}{2}[1 - (q_{kin})_0] z_{rem}^2 + \dots \right\}, \quad (44)$$

where the value of q_{kin} is derived in Appendix B. Its present value $(q_{kin})_0$ is a little larger than q_0 in the background :

$$q_0 = -0.670 \quad \text{and} \quad (q_{kin})_0 = -0.659 \quad (45)$$

for the background model parameter (3).

The background equation corresponding to Eq.(44) is[17]

$$d_L = (H_0)^{-1} \left\{ z + \frac{1}{2} [1 - q_0] z^2 + \dots \right\}. \quad (46)$$

Here the ratio $[(q_{kin})_0/q_0]^{-1}$ ($= 1.016$) is smaller than the ratio $(H_{kin})_0/H_0$ ($= 1.079$). As for coefficients of the second terms $(\frac{1}{2}[1 - (q_{kin})_0])$ and $\frac{1}{2}[1 - q_0]$ for d_L also, the ratio is $(0.993)^{-1}$ ($= 1.007$), and so smaller than $(H_{kin})_0/H_0$.

Now let us show the z_{rem} -dependence of $(d_L)_{rem}$ from the definition (Eq.(40)) for arbitrary z_{rem} :

$$\begin{aligned} (H_{kin})_0 (d_L)_{rem} &= z_{rem}(1 + z_{rem}) \Phi(z_{rem}) \\ &\times \frac{1}{z} \int_{1/(1+z)}^1 \frac{da}{a^2} (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{6} \zeta [(Z(1))^2 - (Z(a))^2] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\zeta \equiv 2\pi \times 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} B$ ($= 0.319$), $Z(a)$ is given by Eq.(A15), and

$$\Phi(z_{rem}) \equiv \frac{(H_{kin})_0}{H_0} \frac{z}{z_{rem}}. \quad (48)$$

The derivation of Eq.(47) is shown in Appendix C. On the other hand, we have the relation between z_{rem} and z ($= 1/a - 1$):

$$z_{rem} = z + \frac{1}{6} \zeta \{ [Z(1)]^2 - [Z(a)]^2 \}, \quad (49)$$

which is derived from Eq.(C6). So we can get $(H_{kin})_0(d_L)_{rem}$ as a function of given z_{rem} . The expanded form of this $(d_L)_{rem}$ for small z_{rem} is found to be consistent with Eq.(44), in which the approximate forms of W and Φ in Eqs.(C11) and (C12) are used.

On the other hand, the background equation corresponding to Eq.(47) is[17]

$$H_0 d_L = (1 + z) \times \int_{1/(1+z)}^1 \frac{da}{a^2} (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2}. \quad (50)$$


The difference between $(H_{kin})_0(d_L)_{rem}$ and $H_0 d_L$ for equal z_{obs} is found to be $\sim 0.2\%$, for $z_{obs} = 0.5$. But, $(d_L)_{rem}$ and d_L have a larger difference ($\sim 8\%$) due to the ratio $(H_{kin})_0/H_0$. Here z_{obs} is defined to be equal to z_{rem} and z for the renormalized case and the background case, respectively.

The relation between $\log_{10} (d_L)_{rem}$ and the observed redshift z_{obs} is shown in Fig. 3 for the cases of $z_{obs} < 1$, in a comparison with the background counterpart ($\log_{10} d_L$). The absolute magnitude M of an object is defined in terms of an apparent magnitude m and the luminosity distance $((d_L)_{rem})$ as

$$m - M = 5 \log_{10} [(d_L)_{rem}/10\text{pc}], \quad (51)$$

which is applicable to the observational redshift-magnitude relation for SNIa[3].

Fig. 3: Luminosity distances. Solid and dotted curves show $(d_L)_{rem}$ and d_L , respectively, relative to the observed redshift z_{obs} , where z_{obs} is equal to z_{rem} and z , respectively.



5.3. Angular diameter distance

The angular diameter distance d_A is related to d_L as[17, 18]

$$d_A = (1 + z)^{-2} d_L. \quad (52)$$

On the other hand, the angular diameter distance $(d_A)_{rem}$ is related to $(d_L)_{rem}$ in the line-element (30) as

$$(d_A)_{rem} = (1 + z_{rem})^{-2} (d_L)_{rem}, \quad (53)$$

where z_{rem} is related to z by Eq.(49). So, the difference of $(H_{kin})_0(d_A)_{rem}$ and $H_0 d_A$ is very small, for equal z_{obs} , similarly to that of the luminosity distance.

6. Concluding remarks

It was shown that there are two kinds of renormalized Hubble parameters : the dynamical parameter (H_{dyn}) and the kinematic parameter (H_{kin}) . As for their present values, the ratio

is

$$H_0 : (H_{dyn})_0 : (H_{kin})_0 = 1 : 1.061 : 1.079, \quad (54)$$

so that $(H_{dyn})_0$ and $(H_{kin})_0$ are larger than the background constant H_0 by the factors $6 \sim 8\%$, respectively.

The roles of H_{dyn} and H_{kin} are for dynamical motions (including phenomena treated in the second paper[10]) and the optical phenomena (which were treated in the present paper), respectively. In the latter, we found that $H_0 d_L(z_{obs})$ and $(H_{kin})_0 (d_L)_{rem}(z_{obs})$ are almost equal, so that $d_L(z_{obs})$ and $(d_L)_{rem}(z_{obs})$ are different by the factor (H_{kin}/H_0) . This situation is quite same also in that of the angular diameter distances d_A and $(d_A)_{rem}$ in Eqs.(52) and (53).

In the determination of the Hubble constant due to the gravitational-wave measurements[19] also, we have the kinematic constant $(H_{kin})_0$ in the same way as the optical observation.

A. Average second-order perturbations

The arbitrary potential function is given the following expression

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \int d\mathbf{k} \alpha(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}, \quad (A1)$$

where $\alpha(\mathbf{k})$ is a random variable and the average of F expressed as $\langle F \rangle$ vanishes, and the average of their products is given by

$$\langle \alpha(\mathbf{k}) \alpha(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = (2\pi)^{-2} \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'). \quad (A2)$$

Here we have

$$\langle \delta_1 \rho / \rho \rangle = 0 \quad (A3)$$

for the first-order density perturbation. For the second-order perturbations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F_{,i} F_{,i} \rangle &= - \int \int d\mathbf{k} d\mathbf{k}' \langle \alpha(\mathbf{k}) \alpha(\mathbf{k}') \rangle \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}' e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}')\mathbf{x}}, \\ \langle F \Delta F \rangle &= - \int \int d\mathbf{k} d\mathbf{k}' \langle \alpha(\mathbf{k}) \alpha(\mathbf{k}') \rangle k^2 e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}')\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned} \quad (A4)$$

so that we obtain

$$\langle F_{,i} F_{,i} \rangle = - \langle F \Delta F \rangle = (2\pi)^{-2} \int d\mathbf{k} k^2 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}), \quad (A5)$$

where we corrected some careless misprints in [I].

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle F_{,ij} F_{,ij} \rangle &= \int \int d\mathbf{k} d\mathbf{k}' \langle \alpha(\mathbf{k}) \alpha(\mathbf{k}') \rangle (\mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}')^2 e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \\ \langle (\Delta F)^2 \rangle &= \int \int d\mathbf{k} d\mathbf{k}' \langle \alpha(\mathbf{k}) \alpha(\mathbf{k}') \rangle k^2 (k')^2 e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{x}},\end{aligned}\tag{A6}$$

so that we obtain

$$\langle F_{,ij} F_{,ij} \rangle = \langle (\Delta F)^2 \rangle = (2\pi)^{-2} \int d\mathbf{k} k^4 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}).\tag{A7}$$

The second-order density perturbations are expressed by Eq.(23) of [I] using $F(\mathbf{k})$, and so average second-order density perturbations are shown as follows:

$$\langle \delta_2 \rho / \rho \rangle = \frac{1 - \frac{a'}{a} P'}{2\rho a^2} (2\pi)^{-2} \left[-\frac{5}{2} \int d\mathbf{k} k^2 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) + P \int d\mathbf{k} k^4 \mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) \right].\tag{A8}$$

Here F is related to the curvature fluctuation \mathcal{R} by $F = 2 \mathcal{R}$, and so we have the relation

$$\mathcal{P}_F(\mathbf{k}) = 4 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{k}),\tag{A9}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is expressed using the power spectrum[17, 18] as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} = 2\pi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}0} k^{-3} (k/k_{eq})^{n-1} T_s^2(k/k_{eq})\tag{A10}$$

and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}0} = 2.2 \times 10^{-9}$ according to the result of Planck measurements.[1, 2] The transfer function $T_s(x)$ is expressed as a function of $x = k/k_{eq}$, where

$$k_{eq} (\equiv a_{eq} H_{eq}) = 219 (\Omega_M h) H_0 = 32.4 H_0.\tag{A11}$$

Here H_0 ($\equiv 100h$) is the present background Hubble constant, (a_{eq}, H_{eq}) is (a, H) at the epoch of equal energy density, and $(\Omega_M, h) = (0.22, 0.673)$ (given in Eq. (3)).

Moreover, we assume $n = 1$ here and in the following. Then we obtain for arbitrary a

$$\langle \delta_2 \rho / \tilde{\rho} \rangle = \frac{4\pi}{3} 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}0} \frac{[1 - Y(a)]}{(\Omega_M/a + \Omega_\Lambda a^2)} \left[-\frac{5}{2} 32.4^{-2} A + Z(a) B \right],\tag{A12}$$

where $\tilde{\rho} \equiv \rho + \Lambda$, and A and B are expressed as

$$A \equiv \int_{x_{min}}^{x_{max}} dx x T_s^2(x), \quad B \equiv \int_{x_{min}}^{x_{max}} dx x^3 T_s^2(x)\tag{A13}$$

using the transfer function $T_s(x)$ for the interval (x_{max}, x_{min}) . Here we have

$$Y(a) \equiv \frac{a'}{a} P', \quad Z(a) \equiv (H_0)^2 P.\tag{A14}$$

These functions are reduced to

$$Y(a) = a^{-5/2} (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3)^{1/2} I(a), \quad Z(a) = \frac{2}{3\Omega_M} a [1 - Y(a)],\tag{A15}$$

where

$$I(a) \equiv \int_0^a db [b^3 / (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda b^3)]^{1/2}.\tag{A16}$$

For T_s , we assume the simplest transfer function (BBKS) for cold matter, adiabatic

fluctuations, given by[16]

$$T_s(x) = \frac{\ln(1 + 0.171x)}{0.171x} [1 + 0.284x + (1.18x)^2 + (0.399x)^3 + (0.490x)^4]^{-1/4}. \quad (\text{A17})$$

For x_{max} and x_{min} , we take $x_{max} = 5.7$ and $x_{min} = 0.01$, which were used in [1]. This value of x_{max} corresponds to the lower limit of linear scales of super-horizon perturbations at the matter-dominant stage.[11]

Then we obtain

$$A = 2.22, \quad B = 20.95, \quad (\text{A18})$$

$Y(1)$ and $Z(1)$ are shown in Eqs. (21) and (22) for the background parameter (3), and

$$\langle \delta \rho / \tilde{\rho} \rangle = 0.121, \quad (\text{A19})$$

at the present epoch ($a = 1$), where $\tilde{\rho} \equiv \rho + \Lambda$.

B. Derivation of the deceleration parameter q_{kin}

The background deceleration parameter q is defined by

$$q \equiv -\ddot{a}a/(\dot{a})^2. \quad (\text{B1})$$

The corresponding parameter q_{kin} is expressed as

$$q_{kin} \equiv -\ddot{a}_{rem}a_{rem}/(\dot{a}_{rem})^2, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where a_{rem} is given using a and $\langle l_{ii} \rangle$ in Eq.(14). Differentiating a_{rem} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{a}_{rem} &= \dot{a} \left(1 + \frac{1}{6} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{6} a \langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot, \\ \ddot{a}_{rem} &= \ddot{a} \left(1 + \frac{1}{6} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \right) + \dot{a} \frac{1}{3} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot + \frac{1}{6} a \langle l_{ii} \rangle \ddot{\cdot}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Using them, we obtain the Hubble parameter $H_{kin} (\equiv \dot{a}_{rem}/a_{rem})$ in Eq. (15), and

$$q_{kin} = q - \frac{1}{6H^2} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \ddot{\cdot} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{1+q}{H} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Here we have the expression of $\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot$ in Eq.(17) with $dZ(a)/da$.

Now we neglect the small terms with A , i.e.

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle = \zeta [Z(a)]^2, \quad (\text{B5})$$

and

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot = 2\zeta \frac{Z(a)Y(a)\dot{a}}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where

$$\zeta \equiv 2\pi \times 32.4^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} B = 0.01523 \times 20.95 = 0.319. \quad (\text{B7})$$

First, differentiating Eq.(B5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l_{ii} \rangle \ddot{\cdot} &= 2\zeta (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3)^{-1} Z(a)Y(a) \\ &\times \left\{ \ddot{a} + (\dot{a})^2 \left[\frac{dZ(a)/da}{Z(a)} + \frac{dY(a)/da}{Y(a)} - \frac{3\Omega_\Lambda a^2}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

Using Eqs.(18), (A14) and (A15), we can derive

$$-dY(a)/da = \frac{1}{a} \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{3}{2} \Omega_M / (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3) \right] Y - 1 \right\}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

From Eqs.(B8) and (B9), we obtain

$$\langle l_{ii} \rangle \cdot = 2\zeta \frac{aH^2}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \left[- \left(q + \frac{5}{2} + \frac{\frac{3}{2}\Omega_\Lambda a^3}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \right) Z Y + Z + \frac{aY^2}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \right]. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Using Eqs.(B4) and (B10), we obtain

$$q_{kin} = q - \frac{\frac{1}{3}\zeta a}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \left[\left(q - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\frac{3}{2}\Omega_\Lambda a^3}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \right) Z Y + Z + \frac{aY^2}{\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3} \right]. \quad (\text{B11})$$

On the other hand, the background model gives

$$q \equiv \left(\frac{1}{2} \Omega_M - \Omega_\Lambda a^3 \right) / (\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3), \quad (\text{B12})$$

where the present value is $q_0 = -0.67$.

The present value of q_{kin} is

$$(q_{kin})_0 - q_0 = -\frac{1}{3}\zeta [-3\Omega_\Lambda Z(1)Y(1) + Z(1) + Y(1)^2]. \quad (\text{B13})$$

Using the values of $Y(1)$ and $Z(1)$ in Eqs.(21) and (22) for the background model parameters, we obtain

$$(q_{kin})_0 = -0.670 + 0.011 = -0.659. \quad (\text{B14})$$

C. Derivation of $(d_L)_{rem}$

Using the background equations for a light path, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_{rem}(t_0) \quad r &= \int_t^{t_0} dt \, a_{rem}(t_0)/a_{rem}(t) \\ &= \int_a^1 \frac{da}{aH_0} (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2} [1 + z_{rem}(a)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $z_{rem}(a)$ is expressed using Eq.(14) as

$$1 + z_{rem}(a) = (1 + z) \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{6} [\langle l_{ii} \rangle_0 - \langle l_{ii} \rangle] \right\} \quad (\text{C2})$$

and $1 + z = 1/a(t)$. Using $(H_{kin})_0$ and Eq.(40), therefore, $(d_L)_{rem}$ is expressed as

$$(H_{kin})_0 (d_L)_{rem} = \frac{(H_{kin})_0}{H_0} (1 + z_{rem}) \times zW(a), \quad (\text{C3})$$

where

$$W(a) \equiv \frac{1}{z} \int_a^1 \frac{da}{a^2} (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2} \left[1 + \frac{1}{6} (\langle l_{ii} \rangle_0 - \langle l_{ii} \rangle) \right]. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Using Eq.(13), moreover, we can express $W(a)$ as

$$W(a) = \frac{1}{z} \int_a^1 \frac{da}{a^2} (\Omega_M a^{-3} + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{6} \zeta [Z(1)^2 - Z(a)^2] \right\}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

Here we have the relation for z as

$$z (= 1/a - 1) = z_{rem} - \frac{1}{6} \zeta [Z(1)^2 - Z(a)^2]. \quad (\text{C6})$$

For $z \ll 1$, we get

$$z = z_{rem} - \frac{1}{3} \zeta \left[Z(a) \frac{Z(a)}{da} \right]_{a=1} (1 - a) = z_{rem} \left[1 - \frac{1}{3} \zeta Z(1)Y(1) \right] + O(z^2), \quad (\text{C7})$$

where we used the relation $dZ(a)/da = Y(a)/(\Omega_M + \Omega_\Lambda a^3)$.

On the other hand, we have a relation

$$\frac{(H_{kin})_0}{H_0} = 1 + \frac{1}{3}\zeta Z(1)Y(1), \quad (C8)$$

neglecting small terms with A . So we obtain finally

$$(H_{kin})_0 (d_L)_{rem} = z_{rem}(1 + z_{rem}) \Phi(z_{rem}) W(a), \quad (C9)$$

where $W(a)$ is given by Eq.(C5), $a = 1/(1 + z)$, and z is related to z_{rem} by Eq.(C6). The auxiliary function $\Phi(z_{rem})$ is expressed as

$$\Phi(z_{rem}) \left(\equiv \frac{(H_{kin})_0}{H_0} \frac{z}{z_{rem}} \right) = 1 + \frac{1}{3}\zeta Z(1)Y(1) - \frac{1}{6}\zeta[Z(1)^2 - Z(a)^2]/z_{rem}. \quad (C10)$$

For $z_{rem} \ll 1$, W and Φ are expanded as

$$(1 + z_{rem}) W = 1 + \left[1 - \frac{3}{4}\Omega_M - \frac{1}{6}\zeta Z(1)Y(1) \right] z_{rem} + \dots, \quad (C11)$$

and

$$\Phi = 1 + \frac{1}{6}\zeta \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - 3\Omega_\Lambda)Z(1)Y(1) + Y(1)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\Omega_M Z(1)^2 \right] z_{rem} + \dots. \quad (C12)$$

D. Renormalized model parameters for other background model parameters

Let us show the renormalized model parameters for other background model parameters such as

$$H_0 = 67.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_M, \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_M > 0.22. \quad (D1)$$

In these cases, we have

$$k_{eq} (\equiv a_{eq}H_{eq}) = 219 (\Omega_M h) = 147.4 \Omega_M, \quad (D2)$$

From Eqs. (20), (25), (27) and (A12), we obtain

$$(H_{kin})_0/H_0 = 1 + \frac{2\pi}{3} (k_{eq})^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} Y(1)Z(1)B, \quad (D3)$$

$$(H_{dyn})_0/H_0 = 1 + \frac{2\pi}{3} (k_{eq})^4 \mathcal{P}_{R0} [1 - Y(1)]Z(1)B, \quad (D4)$$

$$(\Omega_\Lambda)_{rem} = \Omega_\Lambda [H_0/(H_{dyn})_0]^2, \quad (D5)$$

where we neglected small terms with A . Here $Y(a)$ and $Z(a)$ depend on Ω_M and Ω_Λ , while B does not depend on them, but on x_{max} and x_{min} .

For $(\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.24, 0.76)$, we have

$$k_{eq} = 35.4, \quad Y(1) = 0.557, \quad Z(1) = 1.232, \quad (D6)$$

so that

$$(H_{kin})_0/H_0 = 1 + 0.1043 (B/20.95), \quad (D7)$$

$$(H_{dyn})_0/H_0 = 1 + 0.0827 (B/20.95).$$

Then we obtain

$$(H_{kin})_0 = 74.3, \quad (H_{dyn})_0 = 72.8, \quad (\Omega_\Lambda)_{rem} = 0.65 \quad (D8)$$

for $B = 20.95$ (with $x_{max} = 5.7$). From Eqs.(B12) and (B13), moreover, we have

$$[q_0, (q_{kin})_0] = (-0.640, -0.638). \quad (D9)$$

For $(\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.28, 0.72)$, we have

$$k_{eq} = 41.3, \quad Y(1) = 0.540, \quad Z(1) = 1.095, \quad (\text{D10})$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (H_{kin})_0/H_0 &= 1 + 0.166 (B/20.95), \\ (H_{dyn})_0/H_0 &= 1 + 0.141 (B/20.95). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D11})$$

Then we obtain

$$(H_{kin})_0 = 71.5, \quad (H_{dyn})_0 = 70.8, \quad (\Omega_\Lambda)_{rem} = 0.65 \quad (\text{D12})$$

for $B = 7.8$ (with $x_{max} = 3.77$). Moreover, we have

$$[q_0, (q_{kin})_0] = (-0.580, -0.568). \quad (\text{D13})$$

References

- [1] P. A. R. Ade et al., *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A16 (2014).
- [2] P. A. R. Ade et al., *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A3 (2016).
- [3] A.G. Riess et al., *Astrophys. J.* **730**, 2019 (2011).
- [4] A.G. Riess et al., arXiv:1903.07603 [astro-ph.CO].
- [5] S.H. Suyu et al., *Astrophys. J.* **766**, 70 (2013).
- [6] J.L. Bernal et al., *JCAP* **10**, 019 (2016).
- [7] W.L. Freedman et al., *Astrophys. J.* **758**, 24 (2012).
- [8] W.L. Freedman, *Nature Astron.* **1**, 0169 (2017).
- [9] Kenji Tomita, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2017**, 053E01(2017); arXiv:1702.07821 [astro-ph.CO], cited as [1].
- [10] Kenji Tomita, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2017**, 083E04(2017); arXiv:1706.07655 [gr-qc].
- [11] Kenji Tomita, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2018**, 021E01(2018); arXiv:1711.02775 [astro-ph.CO].
- [12] Kenji Tomita, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 083504 (2005).
- [13] Kenji Tomita, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **37**, 831 (1967).
- [14] H. Russ et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 6881 (1996).
- [15] S. Matarrese et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D58**, 043504 (1998).
- [16] J. M. Bardeen, J. R. Bond, N. Kaiser, and A.S. Szalay, *Astrophys. J.* **304**, 15 (1986).
- [17] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2008).
- [18] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
- [19] B.P. Abbott et al., *Nature* **551**, 85 (2017).