

# Homogeneity and the causal boundary

Enrique Gaztañaga<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Institute of Space Sciences (ICE, CSIC), 08193 Barcelona

2. Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya (IEEC), 08034 Barcelona

A Universe with finite age also has a finite causal scale  $\chi_{\S}$ , so the metric can not be homogeneous for  $\chi > \chi_{\S}$ , as it is usually assumed. To account for this, we propose a new causal boundary condition, that can be fulfilled by fixing the cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  (a free parameter for gravity). The resulting Universe is inhomogeneous, with possible variation of cosmological parameters on scales  $\chi \simeq \chi_{\S}$ . The size of  $\chi_{\S}$  depends on the details of inflation, but regardless of its size, the boundary condition forces  $\Lambda/8\pi G$  to cancel the contribution of a constant vacuum energy  $\rho_{vac}$  to the measured  $\rho_{\Lambda} \equiv \Lambda/8\pi G + \rho_{vac}$ . To reproduce the observed  $\rho_{\Lambda} \simeq 2\rho_m$  today with  $\chi_{\S} \rightarrow \infty$  we then need a universe filled with evolving dark energy (DE) with pressure  $p_{DE} > -\rho_{DE}$  and a fine tuned value of  $\rho_{DE} \simeq 2\rho_m$  today. This seems very odd, but there is another solution to this puzzle. We can have a finite value of  $\chi_{\S} \simeq 3c/H_0$  without the need of DE. This scale corresponds to half the sky at  $z \sim 1$  and 60deg at  $z \sim 1000$ , which is consistent with the anomalous lack of correlations observed in the CMB.

## 1 Introduction

One of the most striking changes to Newton's gravity proposed by Einstein is that energy gravitates. Scientists have since been wondering if vacuum energy  $\rho_{vac}$  (vacuum fluctuations, zero-point fluctuations, quantum vacuum, dark energy or aether) could also gravitate. Measurements of cosmic acceleration (see e.g. Planck Collaboration et al. 2018; Abbott et al. 2019; Tutusaus et al. 2017) point to a model with  $\Lambda$ , that we refer to as  $\Lambda$ CDM. Even while the accuracy and precision of measurements have greatly improved in the last years, the mean values of cosmological parameters have remained similar for well over a decade (see e.g. Gaztañaga et al. 2009, 2006). The Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) flat metric in comoving coordinates  $(t, \chi)$ :

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = dt^2 - a(t)^2 (d\chi^2 + \chi^2 d\Omega^2) \quad (1)$$

is the exact general solution for an homogeneous and isotropic flat Universe. The scale factor,  $a(t)$ , describes the expansion of the Universe as a function of time. We can relate  $a(t)$  to the energy content of the Universe for a perfect fluid by solving Eq.8-9:

$$R_{00} = - \left( \frac{3\ddot{a}}{a} \right) = 4\pi G(\rho + 3p) - \Lambda \quad (2)$$

$$H^2 \equiv \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho + \frac{\Lambda}{3} \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho = \rho_m a^{-3} + \rho_r a^{-4} + \rho_{vac}$  and  $\rho_m$  is the pressureless matter density today ( $a = 1$ ),  $\rho_r$  corresponds to radiation (with pressure  $p_r = \rho_r/3$ ) and  $\rho_{vac}$  represents

vacuum energy ( $p_{vac} = -\rho_{vac}$ ). One can argue that  $\Lambda$  is indistinguishable from  $\rho_{vac}$ , because equations are degenerate to the combination:

$$\rho_\Lambda \equiv \rho_{vac} + \frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G}. \quad (4)$$

Here we take  $\Lambda$  to be a fundamental constant, while  $\rho_{vac}$  depends on the energy content. The measured  $\rho_\Lambda$  is extremely small compared to what we expect for  $\rho_{vac}$ . Moreover,  $\rho_\Lambda \simeq 2.3\rho_m$  today, which is a remarkable coincidence. Possible solutions to this puzzle are: I)  $\Lambda = 0$ , so that  $\rho_\Lambda$  originates only from  $\rho_{vac}$  or dark energy (DE) (Weinberg, 1989; Elizalde & Gaztañaga, 1990; Carroll et al., 1992; Huterer & Turner, 1999; Elizalde, 2006), II)  $\rho_{vac} = 0$  and we need  $\Lambda$  or Modified Gravity (Gaztañaga & Lobo, 2001; Gaztañaga et al., 2002; Lue et al., 2004; Nojiri et al., 2017) or III) there is a cancellation between  $\Lambda$  and  $\rho_{vac}$ , as will be shown here.

Eq.1-3 represent a mathematical extrapolation. A physical explanation requires a mechanism to produce homogeneity. Regardless of the details of inflation or the early Universe, a Universe of finite age will only be causally homogeneous for scales smaller than some cut-off  $\chi < \chi_\S$ . We need some boundary condition at  $\chi = \chi_\S$  to account for the lack of causality (and therefore homogeneity) at larger scales. This boundary results in cosmic acceleration and a cancellation between  $\Lambda$  and  $\rho_{vac}$ . In §2 we view this problem in Classical Physics, while in §3 we present the relativistic version. In §4 we estimate the size of the causal Universe and discuss the implications for inflation and CMB. We end with some Discussion and Conclusions.

## 2 Hooke's law

A key property of Gravity in Classical Mechanics is Gauss law. The acceleration  $\vec{g}$  created by a point mass (or charge) at distance  $\vec{r}$  is such that a spherical shell of arbitrary radial density  $\rho(r)$  produces a field which is identical to a point source of equal mass (or charge)  $m$  in its center. The solution (Wilkins, 1986) is more general than Newton's law:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{g} \equiv -\vec{\nabla}\phi &= -\left(\frac{Gm}{r^3} - \frac{\Lambda}{3}\right)\vec{r} \\ \nabla^2\phi &= 4\pi G\rho_m - \Lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Using Stokes Theorem, the field produces a flux around 2D closed surface  $\partial V$ :

$$\Phi = \oint_{\partial V} d\vec{r} \vec{g} = - \int_V dV (4\pi G \rho_m - \Lambda) \quad (6)$$

so the flux only depends on the total mass inside the boundary  $\partial V$ . Note the second term with  $\Lambda$  in Eq.5-6 which corresponds to Hooke's law, i.e. proportional to distance. These of course are the same equations that come from General Relativity in the Newtonian limit (see below). Thus  $\Lambda$  in Eq.5-6 is allowed by the symmetries of gravity. In fact Newton, and other scientist, had already noticed this (Calder & Lahav, 2008).

Physicist assume that particles should be free at infinity, because of lack of causality. This is why boundary terms are usually neglected at infinity. In the same spirit, we will require here that test particles should be free ( $\vec{g} = 0$ ) or more relevant for

a fluid: that boundary terms should be zero ( $\Phi = 0$ ), when outside causal contact,  $r > r_\S$ . This condition for  $r_\S \Rightarrow \infty$  requires  $\Lambda \Rightarrow 0$ , as otherwise  $\vec{g}$  and  $\Phi$  diverge. Observational evidence that  $\Lambda \neq 0$  may then indicate that  $r_\S$  is finite. This agrees with the finite age of the Universe, which also implies that  $r_\S < \infty$ . From Eq.6 the boundary condition  $\Phi(r > r_\S) = 0$ , implies:

$$\Lambda = 4\pi G\rho_m(r < r_\S) \tag{7}$$

which can provide an explanation for the coincidence  $\rho_\Lambda \sim 2\rho_m$ . Lets next explore this same argument in General Relativity. For this we first need to see what is the relativistic version of Eq.6.

### 3 Relativistic case

The symmetries of Einstein’s field equations allow for a cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  term (Landau & Lifshitz 1971; Weinberg 1972):

$$R^\nu_\mu + \Lambda\delta^\nu_\mu = 8\pi G (T^\nu_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\delta^\nu_\mu T), \tag{8}$$

For a perfect fluid with density  $\bar{\rho}$  and pressure  $\bar{p} \equiv \omega\bar{\rho}$ :

$$T^\nu_\mu = (\bar{p} + \bar{\rho})u_\mu u^\nu - \bar{p}\delta^\nu_\mu \tag{9}$$

where both  $\bar{p}$  and  $\bar{\rho}$  could change with space-time.

#### 3.1 The generalised Gauss’s law

Consider perturbations around Minkowski metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  (i.e. around empty space):

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu} \tag{10}$$

where  $h_{\mu\nu}$  are small corrections. To linear order in  $h_{\mu\nu}$  we have  $R_{00} = 1/2 \square h_{00}$  (Landau & Lifshitz, 1971), so that:

$$R_{00} = R_0^0 = \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \phi \tag{11}$$

where  $\phi \equiv h_{00}/2$  is the gravitational potential. We can now use the right side of Eq.8 to calculate  $R_0^0$  by contracting  $T^\mu_\mu$  in Eq.9. We consider observers moving with the fluid so that the 3D velocity  $u^i = 0$  so that  $u^\mu u_\mu = u^0 u_0 = 1$  :

$$R_0^0 = 4\pi G (\bar{\rho} + 3\bar{p}) - \Lambda, \tag{12}$$

where  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\bar{p}$  are perturbations around empty space. Combined with Eq.11, this results in:

$$\nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \phi = 4\pi G (\bar{\rho} + 3\bar{p}) - \Lambda \tag{13}$$

which is the relativistic generalization of Poisson equation Eq.5. Thus the relativistic version of Gauss law in Eq.6 is then

$$\Phi = - \int_M \sqrt{-g} d^4x [4\pi G (\bar{\rho} + 3\bar{p}) - \Lambda] \tag{14}$$

where  $M$  is the 4D volume inside the 3D surface  $\partial M$ .

### 3.2 Causal Boundary condition

As discussed in the introduction, causality can only be efficient for  $\chi < \chi_\S$ . Larger scales can have no effect on the metric, which mathematically is equivalent to  $T_{\mu\nu}$  equal to zero for  $\chi > \chi_\S$ . In Eq.9, this corresponds to:

$$\bar{\rho} = \rho \mathcal{H}(\chi_\S - \chi) ; \bar{p} = p \mathcal{H}(\chi_\S - \chi) \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the Heaviside step function (or a smoothed version of it) and  $\rho$  and  $p$  are quantities inside  $\chi_\S$ . This requires a non-homogeneous solution for the metric of the Universe (see Gaztañaga 2019). But it does not mean that space is physically empty for  $\chi > \chi_\S$ : it just can't have any effect on the metric of our local observer. An observer situated at the edge of our causal boundary will find a similar solution, but could measure different cosmological parameters, because she sees a different patch of the initial conditions. There should be a smooth background across disconnected regions with an infrared cutoff in the spectrum of inhomogeneities for  $\chi > \chi_\S$ . Solutions in different regions could be matched as in Sanghai & Clifton (2015).

On scales  $\chi < \chi_\S$  we have a homogeneous expanding Universe with  $\bar{\rho} = \rho$ . On larger scales we want particles to be free, i.e. to approach Minkowski metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu}$  as in Eq.10. Thus we require the boundary term  $\Phi(\chi > \chi_\S) = 0$  in Eq.14. This implies:

$$\frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G} = \frac{1}{2M_\S} \int_{M_\S} \sqrt{-g} d^4x (\rho + 3p), \quad (16)$$

where  $M_\S$  is the volume inside the lightcone to the surface  $\partial M_\S$ , where  $\chi = \chi_\S$ . Recall how Eq.14 was obtained in the weak field limit. The exact result for a general (non-homogeneous) spherically symmetric metric is (Gaztañaga, 2019):

$$\frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G} = \frac{\int_{M_\S} \sqrt{-g} d^4x (\rho + 3p)(1 - H^2 r^2)}{2 \int_{M_\S} \sqrt{-g} d^4x (1 - H^2 r^2)}, \quad (17)$$

the additional factor  $(1 - H^2 r^2)$  accounts for deviations from the weak field expansion used in Eq.14. We shall check below how well this weak field approximation works.

### 3.3 Vacuum Energy does not gravitate

Inside  $\chi < \chi_\S$ , we can use Eq.1-3 with  $\rho = \rho_m + \rho_r + \rho_{\text{vac}}$  and  $p = \rho_r/3 - \rho_{\text{vac}}$ , so that we can write Eq.17 as:

$$\frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G} = \frac{\rho_m(\S)}{2} + \rho_r(\S) - \rho_{\text{vac}} \equiv \rho_\S - \rho_{\text{vac}}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\rho_\S$  is the matter and radiation contribution in the integral of Eq.17. The values of  $\rho_m$  and  $\rho_r$  evolve with space-time, so that  $\rho_\S$  is the average contribution inside the volume  $M_\S$ , while the vacuum density contribution is constant (by definition). We can combine Eq.4 with Eq.18:

$$\rho_\Lambda \equiv \frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G} + \rho_{\text{vac}} = \rho_\S - \rho_{\text{vac}} + \rho_{\text{vac}} = \rho_\S, \quad (19)$$

which shows that vacuum energy cancels out and can not change the observed value of  $\rho_\Lambda$ .

### 3.4 Effective Dark Energy (DE)

If vacuum energy suffers a phase transition or changes in some other way, as is believed to have happened during inflation, then this cancellation will not necessarily happen and an evolving  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  (which we usually call Dark Energy) could contribute to the effective value of  $\rho_\Lambda$ . Consider the more general case of DE:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{DE}(a) &= \rho_{\text{vac}} + \rho_{DE} a^{-3(1+\omega)} \\ p_{DE}(a) &= -\rho_{\text{vac}} + \omega \rho_{DE} a^{-3(1+\omega)},\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

where only one component of DE is evolving. We then have from Eq.17 and Eq.4:

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\S + \rho_{DE} \left[ 1 + \frac{1+3\omega}{2} \hat{a}_\S^{-3(1+\omega)} \right]. \quad (21)$$

where  $\hat{a}_\S$  is some mean value of  $a$  in the past light-cone of  $a_\S$  in Eq.17. This reduces to  $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\S$  for  $\omega = -1$ . For  $a_\S \Rightarrow \infty$  we have  $\rho_\S \Rightarrow 0$  because  $\rho_m(a)$  and  $\rho_r(a)$  tend to zero as we increase  $a_\S$ . The same happens with  $\hat{a}_\S^{-3(1+\omega)}$  for  $\omega > -1$ , so that:

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{DE} \quad \text{for } a_\S \Rightarrow \infty \quad \& \quad \omega > -1. \quad (22)$$

So evolving DE could produce the observed cosmic acceleration in an infinitely large Universe. This solution does not explain why  $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{DE} \simeq 2\rho_m$ . The original motivation to introduce DE was to explain how vacuum energy  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  could be as small as the measured  $\rho_\Lambda$  (Weinberg, 1989; Huterer & Turner, 1999). But we have shown in Section 3.3 that the causal boundary condition explains why  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  does not contribute to  $\rho_\Lambda$  and also results in  $\rho_\Lambda \simeq 2\rho_m$ . This removes the motivation to have DE, as it represents an unnecessary complication of the model.

## 4 The size of the Causal Universe

We assume in this section that vacuum energy is constant after inflation ( $\omega = -1$ ). In this case Eq.17-19 give:

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\S = \frac{\int_{M_\S} \sqrt{-g} d^4x (\rho_m + 2\rho_r) (1 - H^2 r^2)}{\int_{M_\S} \sqrt{-g} d^4x (1 - H^2 r^2)}. \quad (23)$$

The horizon after inflation (see Eq.6.20 in Dodelson 2003 and Eq.28 below) is:

$$\chi(a) = \eta(a) - \eta(a_e) \quad (24)$$

where  $a_e$  represents the end of inflation. We then have  $\chi_\S = \chi(a_\S) = \eta(a_i)$  where  $a_\S$  is the time when the causal boundary enters the horizon after inflation and  $a_i$  the beginning of inflation. Fig.1 illustrate this. We calculate  $\rho_\S$  in Eq.23 as the integral to  $\chi_\S$  in the light-cone:

$$\rho_\S = \frac{\int_0^{\chi_\S} d\chi \chi^2 a^3 (\rho_m a^{-3} + 2\rho_r a^{-4}) (1 - a^2 \chi^2 H^2)}{2 \int_0^{\chi_\S} d\chi \chi^2 a^3 (1 - a^2 \chi^2 H^2)}, \quad (25)$$

where  $a = a(\chi)$  in Eq.24. For  $H(a)$  we use Eq.3 with  $\Omega \equiv \rho/\rho_c$   $\rho_c = 3H_0^2/8\pi G$ ,  $\Omega_r = 4.2 \times 10^{-5}$  (Planck Collaboration et al., 2018) and flat Universe  $\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda - \Omega_r$ .

We can use Eq.25 to solve  $\Omega_\Lambda = \Omega_\S$  numerically given  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.69 \pm 0.01$  (Planck Collaboration et al., 2018). We find:

$$\chi_\S = (3.034 \pm 0.004) \frac{c}{H_0} \quad (26)$$

$$a_\S = 0.85 \pm 0.003. \quad (27)$$

to be compared to  $a_0 = 1$  and  $\chi_0 = 3.200 \frac{c}{H_0}$  today. Because  $\chi_\S$  is smaller than  $2\pi$  times our observable horizon, we should be able to see this horizon in our past lightcone at  $\theta_\S = \chi_\S/\chi$ . At  $z \simeq 1$  about half of the sky is causally disconnected. At larger redshifts this boundary tends to a fix value  $\sim 60$  deg. depending on  $\chi_\S$  (and therefore  $\Lambda$ ). This has implications for CMB observations (see section 4.2).

If we set  $\Omega_r = 0$  we find  $a_\S = 0.86$  and  $\chi_\S = 3.081$ , so our results are not very sensitive to the details of the Early Universe. If we neglect the  $(1 - H^2 r^2)$  factor in Eq.17 (which accounts from deviations from the weak field limit) we find instead:  $\chi_\S = 3.138$  and  $a_\S = 0.94$ , which indicates small but significant deviations from the weak field approximation in Eq.16.

#### 4.1 Inflation and the coincidence problem

Particles separated by distances larger than the comoving Hubble radius  $d_H(t) = c/[a(t)H(t)]$  can't communicate at time  $t$ . Distances larger than the horizon

$$\eta(a) = c \int_0^t \frac{dt}{a(t)} = c \int_0^a d \ln(a) d_H(a), \quad (28)$$

have never communicated. We know from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) and large scale structure (LSS) that the Universe was very homogeneous on scales that were not causally connected (without inflation). This either means that the initial conditions were acausally smooth to start with or that there is a mechanism like inflation (Dodelson, 2003; Liddle, 1999; Brandenberger, 2017) which inflates homogeneous and causally connected regions outside the Hubble radius. This allows the full observable Universe to originate from a very small causally connected homogeneous patch, which here we call the Causal Universe,  $\chi_\S$ . During inflation,  $d_H$  decreases which freezes out communication on comoving scales larger than the horizon  $\chi_\S \simeq \eta(a_i) = d_H(t_i)$  when inflation begins, at  $a_i = a(t_i)$ . When inflation ends, radiation from reheating makes  $d_H$  grow again. Eq.23 indicates that when the causal boundary re-enters the Horizon the expansion becomes dominated by  $\rho_\Lambda$ . This is because  $\rho_m(a_\S) < \rho_\S = \rho_\Lambda$ , as density decreases with the expansion. This results in another inflationary epoch at  $a = a_\S$  which keeps the Causal Universe frozen (see Fig.1). Thus, causality can only play a role for comoving scales  $\chi < \chi_\S$ . The Causal Universe  $\chi_\S$  is therefore fixed before inflation in comoving coordinates and is the same for all times, while the horizon  $\eta$  and  $d_H$  change with time.

We can now recast the coincidence problem (why  $\rho_\Lambda \simeq 2.3\rho_m$ ?) into a new question: why we live at a time which is close to  $a_\S$ ? In terms of anthropic reasoning (Weinberg, 1989; Garriga & Vilenkin, 2003), at earlier times the Universe is dominated by radiation and there are no stars or galaxies to host observers. Closer to  $a \simeq a_\S$  the Universe is dominated by matter and there are galaxies and stars with planets and potential observers. At later times  $\Omega_\Lambda \simeq 1$  and galaxies will be torn




Fig. 1: Comoving Hubble radius  $d_H = c/(aH)$  (blue line) as a function of the scale factor  $a$ . The Causal Universe  $\chi_\S$  is identified with the region inside the largest causally connected scale at the beginning of inflation (red dashed line).

apart by the new inflation. Moreover,  $a_\S$  has the largest Hubble radius (see Fig.1) with the highest chances to host observers like us. There is nothing too special about this coincidence. Ultimately, the reason why  $\chi_\S \sim 3c/H_0$  reside in the details of inflation: when inflation begins  $a_i$  and ends  $a_e$  (see Fig.1). This recasts the coincidence problem into an opportunity to better understand inflation and the origin of homogeneity. We propose here to identify  $\chi_\S = \eta(a_i)$  with the comoving horizon before inflation begins at time  $t_i$ ,  $H_i = H(t_i)$  or  $a_i = a(t_i)$ :

$$a_i H_i = c \chi_\S^{-1} \simeq (0.328 \pm 0.004) H_0 \quad (29)$$

The Hubble rate during inflation  $H_I$  is proportional to the energy of inflation. During reheating this energy is converted into radiation:  $H_I^2 \simeq \Omega_r H_0^2 a_e^{-4}$ , with  $a_e \equiv e^N a_i$ . We can combine with Eq.29 to find:

$$a_i \chi_\S = \frac{H_i}{H_I} e^{-2N} \Omega_r^{1/2} (\chi_\S^2 H_0 / c) \simeq 4 \times 10^8 l_{\text{Planck}} \quad (30)$$

where for the second equality we have used the canonical value of  $N \simeq 60$  and  $H_i \simeq H_I$ , which also yields  $a_i \simeq 1.56 \times 10^{-53}$  and  $H_I \sim 10^{10}$  GeV. The condition  $a_i \chi_\S > l_{\text{Planck}}$  requires  $N < 70$ , close to the value found in Dodelson & Hui (2003).

#### 4.2 Implications for CMB

The (look-back) comoving distance to the surface of last scattering  $a_* \simeq 9.2 \times 10^{-4}$  (Planck Collaboration et al., 2018) is  $\chi_{\text{CMB}} = \eta(1) - \eta(a_*) \simeq 3.145 \frac{c}{H_0}$ . This is just slightly larger than our estimate for  $\chi_\S$  in Eq.26. Thus, we would expect to see no correlations in the CMB on angular scales  $\theta > \theta_\S \equiv \frac{\chi_\S}{\chi_{\text{CMB}}} \simeq 56 - 62$  degrees for  $\Omega_\Lambda = \Omega_\S = 0.7 - 0.5$ . The lack of structure seen in the CMB on these large scales is one of the well known anomalies in the CMB data, see Schwarz et al. (2016) and references therein. Fig.2 (from Gaztañaga et al. 2003) shows a comparison of the measured CMB temperature correlations (points with error-bars) with the  $\Lambda$ CDM prediction for an infinite Universe (continuous line). There is a very clear discrepancy. If we suppress the large scale modes (multipoles  $l < 5$ ) in the  $\Lambda$ CDM simulations, the agreement is much better (shaded red area in Fig.2).




Fig. 2: Two-point correlation function of measured CMB temperature fluctuations in WMAP (points with errorbars) as a function of angular separation. The black continuous line shows the  $\Lambda$ CDM prediction for an infinite Universe.

We can also predict  $\Omega_\Lambda$  from the lack of CMB correlations. From Fig.2 we roughly estimate  $\theta_\S \simeq 60 \pm 2$  deg. to find (using Eq.25)  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.6 \pm 0.1$ . But note that this rough estimate does not take into account the foreground (late) ISW and lensing effects (Fosalba et al., 2003; Das & Souradeep, 2014), which will typically reduce  $\theta_\S$  because they add non primordial correlations to the largest scales. This requires further investigation. Also note that this estimate for  $\Omega_\Lambda$  corresponds to the size of disconnected regions at the location of the CMB, which might be slightly different to the value near us, as we see a different patch of the primordial Universe (see below). Note also that there are temperature differences on scales larger  $\theta_\S$ , but they are not correlated, as expected in causality disconnected regions. Nearby regions are connected which creates a smooth transition across disconnected regions.

## 5 Discussion and Conclusions

$\Lambda$ CDM in Eq.1-3 assumes that  $\rho$  is constant everywhere at a fixed comoving time. This requires acausal initial conditions (Brandenberger, 2017) unless there is inflation, where a tiny homogeneous and causally connected patch, the Causal Universe  $\chi_\S$ , was inflated to be very large today. Regions larger than  $\chi_\S$  are out of causal contact. Here we require that test particles become free (or the relativistic flux is zero) as we approach  $\chi_\S$ . This leads to Eq.17, which is the main result in this paper. If we ignore the vacuum, this condition requires:  $\Lambda = 8\pi G\rho_\S$ , where  $\rho_\S$  is the matter



and radiation inside  $\chi_\S$  (Eq.23). For an infinite Universe ( $\chi_\S \rightarrow \infty$ ) we have  $\rho_\S \Rightarrow 0$  which requires  $\Lambda \Rightarrow 0$ . This is also what we find in classical gravity with a  $\Lambda$  term, because Hooke's term diverges at infinity (see Eq.5). So the fact that  $\Lambda \neq 0$  could indicate that  $\chi_\S$  is not infinite. Adding vacuum  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  does not change this argument because  $\rho_\Lambda \equiv \Lambda/8\pi G + \rho_{\text{vac}} = \rho_\S$  turns out to be independent of  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  (see Eq.19). Thus, whether the causal size of the Universe is finite or not,  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  can not gravitate! The cancellation between  $\Lambda$  and  $\rho_{\text{vac}}$  is a direct consequence of the boundary condition and it also implies that deSitter Universe (empty with a cosmological constant) is not causal (as it produces curvature being empty). In classical terms of Eq.5, it will produce a divergent gravitational force.

For constant vacuum ( $\omega \equiv p/\rho = -1$ ), we find  $\chi_\S \simeq 3c/H_0$  for  $\Omega_\S = \Omega_\Lambda \simeq 0.7$ . We can also estimate  $\chi_\S$  as  $c/(a_i H_i)$  when inflation begins, see Eq.29. After inflation  $\chi_\S$  freezes out until it re-enters causality at  $a_\S \simeq 0.85$ , close to now ( $a = 1$ ). This starts a new inflation (as  $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\S > \rho_m$ ) which keeps the causal boundary frozen. Thus a finite  $\chi_\S$  explains why  $\rho_\Lambda \simeq 2\rho_m$ . It also predicts that CMB temperature should not be correlated above  $\theta > \theta_\S \simeq 60$  deg. A prediction that matches observations (see Fig.2). One can reverse this argument to use the lack of CMB correlations above  $\theta_\S \simeq 60$  deg, to estimate  $\chi_\S \simeq \theta_\S \chi_{\text{CMB}}$ . Together with condition  $\rho_\S = \rho_\Lambda$ , this provides a prediction of  $\Omega_\Lambda \simeq 0.6 \pm 0.1$ , which is independent of other measurements for  $\Omega_\Lambda$ . This is slightly lower than other local measurements, but more work is needed to account for the late ISW and lensing and to interpret the CMB measurements with a metric that is not homogeneous (Gaztañaga, 2019).

Note that because the Universe is not strictly homogeneous outside a causal region, the causal boundary for observers far away from us could be slightly different from ours, because they see a different patch of the Universe which could have slightly different energy content. Continuity across nearby disconnected regions forces these differences to be small, but it is impossible to quantify this without a model for the initial conditions and a better understanding of the process that generates the primordial homogeneity. In general such differences could affect structure formation, galaxy evolution and CMB observations. The fact that we can measure a concordance picture from different observations with the  $\Lambda$ CDM model indicates that these differences must be small. But tensions between measurements of cosmological parameters from very different redshifts (eg between CMB and local measurements) could be related to such in-homogeneities, rather than to evolution of the Dark Energy (DE) equation of state or other more exotic explanations.

For  $\chi_\S \gg 3c/H_0$  we can not explain cosmic acceleration with  $\omega = -1$ , because the resulting  $\rho_\Lambda$  in Eq.23 would be very small. We need evolving DE with equation of state  $\omega_{\text{DE}} > -1$  and  $\rho_\Lambda = \rho_{\text{DE}}$  today. But DE gives no clue as to why  $\rho_{\text{DE}} \simeq 2\rho_m$  today and can not explain the anomalous lack of CMB correlations at large scales. We apply Occam's razor to argue that there is no need for DE or Modify Gravity: measurements of cosmic acceleration and CMB can be explained by the finite age of our Universe using the standard Einstein's field equations and standard matter-energy content.

*Acknowledgements.* I want to thank A.Alarcon, J.Barrow, C.Baugh, R.Brandenberger, G.Bernstein, M.Bruni, S.Dodelson, E.Elizalde, J.Frieman, M.Gatti, L.Hui, D.Huterer, A.Liddle, P.J.E. Peebles, R.Scoccimarro and S.Weinberg for their feedback. This work has been supported by MINECO grants AYA2015-71825, LACEGAL Marie Skłodowska-Curie

grant No 734374 with ERDF funds from the EU Horizon 2020 Programme. IEEC is partially funded by the CERCA program of the Generalitat de Catalunya.

## References

- Abbott, T. M. C., et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 17, 171301 (2019)
- Brandenberger, R., *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **26**, 1, 1740002-126 (2017)
- Calder, L., Lahav, O., *Astronomy and Geophysics* **49**, 1, 1.13 (2008)
- Carroll, S. M., Press, W. H., Turner, E. L., *ARA&A* **30**, 499 (1992)
- Das, S., Souradeep, T., *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2014**, 2, 002 (2014)
- Dodelson, S., *Modern cosmology* (2003)
- Dodelson, S., Hui, L., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 13, 131301 (2003)
- Elizalde, E., *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **39**, 21, 6299 (2006)
- Elizalde, E., Gaztañaga, E., *Physics Letters B* **234**, 3, 265 (1990)
- Fosalba, P., Gaztañaga, E., Castander, F. J., *ApJ* **597**, 2, L89 (2003)
- Garriga, J., Vilenkin, A., *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 4, 043503 (2003)
- Gaztañaga, E., *In preparation* (2019)
- Gaztañaga, E., Lobo, J. A., *ApJ* **548**, 1, 47 (2001)
- Gaztañaga, E., Manera, M., Multamäki, T., *MNRAS* **365**, 1, 171 (2006)
- Gaztañaga, E., Miquel, R., Sánchez, E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 9, 091302 (2009)
- Gaztañaga, E., et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 2, 023506 (2002)
- Gaztañaga, E., et al., *MNRAS* **346**, 1, 47 (2003)
- Huterer, D., Turner, M. S., *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 8, 081301 (1999)
- Landau, L. D., Lifshitz, E. M., *The classical theory of fields* (1971)
- Liddle, A. R., *arXiv e-prints* astro-ph/9910110 (1999)
- Lue, A., Scoccimarro, R., Starkman, G., *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 4, 044005 (2004)
- Nojiri, S., Odintsov, S. D., Oikonomou, V. K., *Phys. Rep.* **692**, 1 (2017)
- Planck Collaboration, et al., *arXiv e-prints* arXiv:1807.06209 (2018)
- Sanghai, V. A. A., Clifton, T., *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 10, 103532 (2015)
- Schwarz, D. J., Copi, C. J., Huterer, D., Starkman, G. D., *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **33**, 18, 184001 (2016)
- Tutusaus, I., Lamine, B., Dupays, A., Blanchard, A., *A&A* **602**, A73 (2017)
- Weinberg, S., *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity* (1972)
- Weinberg, S., *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, 1, 1 (1989)
- Wilkins, D., *American Journal of Physics* **54**, 8, 726 (1986)