arXiv:1912.00716v1 [astro-ph.GA] 2 Dec 2019

Dark Matter – Modified Dyanamics: Reaction vs. Prediction

Robert H. Sanders[1]

Kapteyn Astronomical Institute, Groningen, The Netherlands

Abstract

The dark energy-cold dark matter paradigm (ΛCDM) has gained widespread acceptance because it explains the pattern of anisotropies observed in the cosmic microwave background radiation, the observed distribution of large scale inhomogeneities in detectable matter, and the perceived overall expansion history of the Universe. It is further *assumed* that the cosmic dark matter component clusters on the scale of bound astronomical systems and thereby accounts for the observed difference between the directly detectable (baryonic) mass and the total Newtonian dynamical mass. In this respect the paradigm fails; it is falsified by the existence of a simple algorithm, modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND), which explains, not only general scaling relations for astronomical systems, but quite precisely predicts the effective gravitational acceleration in such objects from the observed distribution of detectable baryonic matter – all of this with one additional universal parameter having units of acceleration. On this sub-Hubble scale, the dark matter hypothesis is essentially reactive, while MOND is successfully predictive.

1. Introduction

The world, we are told with great certainty, is composed of 68.3% dark energy, 26.8% dark matter and only 4.9% of the familiar directly observable baryons. This description of the Universe is recited at the beginning of almost all lectures on cosmology – like a catechism – which is appropriate because it is almost an article of faith. And yet, we have no clear idea what these two dominant substances actually are but only the general properties they must have in order to meet the observational requirements (see Sanders 2016 and references therein for a general discussion of the modern cosmological paradigm, also Merritt 2017).

Dark energy is mysterious. The direct empirical evidence for its existence is the observed acceleration in the expansion of the Universe seen in the radial velocity of high redshift (distant) galaxies. Because gravity is normally attractive this can be taken to be a cosmological term in Einstein's field equations which appears as a repulsive force. This works but leaves one feeling somehow unsatisfied as an explanation. The cosmological term (Λ) can be interpreted as an energy density of the vacuum – an additional (negative) source term on the right hand side of the field equations – and as such can be given an equation of state, a fluid with pressure equal to negative energy density ($p = -\rho$) that provides repulsion and guarantees its constancy with the expansion of the Universe; i.e., this fluid does not dilute with volume as the Universe expands. But then the value of the density seems unnaturally small, particularly with respect to the matter-energy density of the Universe near the Planck epoch (10^{-121} give or take a order of magnitude). It could be the energy density of an evolving field allowing a more general equation of state ($p = w\rho$ where $w < -1/3$) and therefore having some dilution with expansion. But then what is this new cosmic field and how does it relate to physics in general? It seems disturbing that the major constituent of the Universe, the only evidence for which is astronomical, is not understood.

The second major component, dark matter, seems more comprehensible. We can all imagine particles like ping-pong balls bouncing around the Universe, diluting with the expanding volume, and contributing through their mass density the necessary attraction (via gravity) to counterbalance (almost at present) the expansion driven by dark energy. Dark matter is required on a cosmological scale in order in order to understand the observed expansion history of the Universe – in particular the transition from deceleration, where matter dominates, to acceleration at a redshift of about one, where dark energy begins to dominate. And then, it is required in order to form the observed structure – galaxies, clusters of galaxies, enormous filaments and voids of galaxies – in the necessary finite time via gravitational collapse in an expanding Universe. And finally there is direct evidence in the pattern of anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background which are consistent with photon-baryon oscillations in the pre-recombination universe in the presence of more rigid dark matter concentrations.

In fact, the original motivation for dark matter is the discrepancy between the directly observed mass in baryons – stars and gas – and the Newtonian dynamical mass of self-gravitating systems – galaxies and clusters of galaxies – estimated by size and internal velocity. That is to say, there is a local motivation for dark matter that is present on scales much smaller than the Universe as a whole, the Hubble scale c/H_0. and that means dark matter must cluster at least on the scales of galaxies. This requires that considered as a fluid it must be cold – cold dark matter or CDM – which is to say when it decouples from the rest of the Universe at early epochs its velocity dispersion is less than the speed of light. So this cosmological substance impinges directly upon dynamics of these local systems. Because it clusters locally, this leads to the expectation that the particles may be detectable locally, even in terrestrial experiments. Thus far, in spite of heroic efforts, dark matter particles have not been seen in any non-astronomical experiment, meaning that the particles must interact very weakly with ordinary baryonic matter and with themselves. These mysterious particles cannot be charged, and they must be stable on cosmic timescales. There is no standard model particle which meets these requirements with the possible exception of neutrinos (and these should be non-standard neutrinos). The primary interaction must be gravitational just as the primary evidence at present is astronomical.

And this brings us to the essential motivation for an alternative paradigm: *When a theory (in this case general relativity), extended into a regime where it has never before been tested (low acceleration systems), requires a medium, an aether (dark matter-dark energy), that cannot be detected by any means independent of the phenomena it is introduced to explain – then it is not unreasonable to question that theory*. There is such an alternative, modified Newtonian dynamics, which here I will view as a simple algorithm that allows the the distribution of force in an astronomical object to be calculated from the observed distribution of baryons with one new universal parameter having units of acceleration. These predictions for spiral galaxies work very well as evidenced by the matching of calculated with observed rotation curves in these objects, in a number of case with no free parameters apart from the universal acceleration. This fact would appear totally at odds with dark matter as it is perceived to be: a dissipationless fluid that interacts with normal matter only via gravity.

2. Modified Newtonian Dynamics:General Predictions (Milgrom 1983)

Milgrom noticed more than 30 years ago that in bound astronomical systems, the discrepancy between directly observable mass and the classical dynamical mass does not appear preferentially in large systems but in low acceleration systems. Thus he introduced a modification of Newtonian dynamics not connected to a length scale but to an acceleration scale. And this algorithm has turned out to provide, in its most primitive form. a very efficient summary of galaxy phenomenology. Moreover it is predictive. New phenomena not seen earlier were accurately predicted before being observed. And it is simple – as simple as $F = ma$:

$$g\mu(a/a_0) = g_n \tag{1}$$

where g is the "true" acceleration, g_n is the traditional Newtonian acceleration calculated for an observed mass distribution via the traditional Poisson equation, a_0 is the single new universal parameter, and $\mu(x)$ is a function of the acceleration in terms of a_0 which interpolates between the high acceleration Newtonian regime and the phenomena at heretofore unexplored low acceleration. This function is not specified but must have definite asymptotic behaviour: $\mu(x) = 1$ when $x >> 1$ and $\mu(x) = x$ when $x << 1$.

[Figure 1 about here.]

The MOND equation forms the basis for the recently emphasised radial acceleration relation (McGaugh et al. 2016) as shown in Fig. 1. This is a plot of the measured centripetal acceleration in spiral galaxies against the Newtonian acceleration of the baryonic mass distribution, stars and gas, in a sample of about 100 galaxies over a range of radii. It is a perfect demonstration of the validity of eq. 1 in the real world and the role of a critical acceleration in differentiating between the Newtonian and non-Newtonian behaviour. The asymptotic regimes are clearly evident and the shape of this curve defines the interpolating function $\mu(a/a_0)$.

At high accelerations the true acceleration is equal to the Newtonian acceleration, but at low accelerations

$$g = \sqrt{a_0 g_n} \tag{2)}$$

In the very low acceleration limit ("deep MOND") the effective force about an isolated point mass M becomes

$$g = \sqrt{GMa_0}/r \tag{3}$$

which is to say, the asymptotic circular velocity (V^2/r) is

$$V = (GMa_0)^{1/4}. \tag{4}$$

The rotation velocity about an isolated mass is asymptotically constant at a value proportional to the one-fourth power of the mass. In other words, asymptotically flat rotation curves and a baryonic mass – rotation velocity (Tully-Fisher) relation are subsumed by this idea.

Now one might argue that these two aspects of galaxy phenomenology are not predictions because they are part of the axiomatic basis or MOND, but in several major aspects they are true predictions. MOND as a modification of physical law means that every isolated galaxy should exhibit an asymptotically flat rotation curve and all such objects should fall on the same mass-rotation velocity relationship – without exception. The velocity entering this relation and minimises its scatter is the asymptotic constant velocity. Moreover, the parameter a_0 that enters the rotation curve is the same constant that normalises the Tully-Fisher relationship. These are predictions and they are verified by more than 100 galaxies such as that in Fig. 2 and by the observed baryonic Tully-Fisher relation shown by Fig. 3 (McGaugh 2011).

[Figure 2 about here.]

[Figure 3 about here.]

The acceleration parameter, empirically determined from rotation curves and the Tully-Fisher relation, has the cosmologically significant value of $a_0 \approx cH_0/6$, which suggests a connection between cosmology and dynamics of local systems. There has been much work over three decades attempting to formulate a deeper theory of MOND beginning with the Bekenstein & Milgrom (1984) non-relativistic Lagrangian-based modification of gravity, but here I will consider MOND as the original simple algorithm in terms of its predictive power (see Famaey & McGaugh 2012, Milgrom 2014).

[Figure 4 about here.]

An extension of the Tully-Fisher relation has been recently pointed out by Milgrom (2013). It is now possible to apply weak gravitational lensing (systematic distortions of background galaxies in the presence of an isolated foreground galaxy) to statistically trace the effective force distribution well beyond the visible image of the foreground galaxy in relatively gas-free systems (Brimioulle et al. 2013). A Newtonian isothermal sphere (with $\rho = \sigma_r^2/(2\pi G r^2)$ fits the resulting mass distributions (presumably the dark halo) reasonably well, and one finds that the implied velocity dispersion (proportional to the asymptotically constant circular rotation velocity) bears the same relationship to the baryonic mass of the central object as that implied by MOND, i.e., eq. 4. This is true for radial distances out to several hundred kpc or accelerations on the order $0.01\,a_0$. Milgrom's result is shown in Fig. 3 which shows the fitted velocity dispersion of the isothermal sphere as a function of the luminosity of the central galaxy – a proxy for the baryonic mass but one dependent upon the mass-to-light ratio and this depends upon colour with redder galaxies having a larger M/L (this result has been confirmed to higher precision by Brouwer et al. 2017). In terms of dark matter this would mean that the dynamics of the extensive dark halo well beyond the visible disk is correlated with the mass of a trace of visible matter in the very central regions which would seem quite extraordinary in the context of dark matter. With MOND this is the expected result.

Milgrom in his original papers made an essentially new prediction that was not anticipated before MOND concerning the existence of a critical surface density or surface brightness. This arises because the MOND acceleration constant a_0 can also be written as a surface density,

$$\Sigma_c = a_0/(\pi G). \tag{5}$$

With the standard value of a_0 the numerical value is $0.19\ g/cm^2$ or $270\ M_\odot/pc^2$. With a typical mass-to-light ratio of one to two in solar units, this would (in the peculiar astronomical units) correspond to a critical surface brightness on the order of $22\ mag/arcsec^2$ Because systems with a surface brightness greater than this limit are in the Newtonian regime (high surface brightness systems such as globular star clusters or luminous ellipticals) this would imply that such objects should exhibit a small mass discrepancy within the visible object (little need for dark matter). In the other limit extreme low surface brightness systems (dwarf spheroidal, low surface brightness spiral galaxies), should exhibit a large discrepancy within the visible object.

This prediction has been consistently verified by subsequent observations. There were very few kinematic observations of dwarf spheroidal galaxies or LSB spirals in 1983 when Milgrom made his prediction, but now there are many – and all have large mass discrepancies (de Blok & McGaugh 1998). There also have now been detailed spectroscopic observations of luminous ellipticals using bright tracers such as planetary nebulae. It came as a surprise to many when these objects were found to require little dark matter within the visible object (Romanowsky et al. 2003, Milgrom & Sanders 2003).

Recently there have been claims that several large LSB galaxies exhibit a small discrepancy between visible and dark matter within the optical image (van Dokum et al. 2018, Mancera Piña et al. 2019). If there are such isolated, virialized objects these would falsify MOND, but these claims remain controversial primarily because of observational uncertainties: ie inclination uncertainties, possibility of non-circular motions, implied long virialization timescales.

3. Near-isothermal pressure-supported systems

These are self-gravitating objects supported not by rotation but by the random motion of their components having a velocity dispersion in a given system that is roughly constant (isothermal). These range from

giant molecular clouds within galaxies to globular star clusters to dwarf spheroidal galaxies, luminous elliptical galaxies and clusters of galaxies. One might expect that they would be described by isothermal solutions to the equation of hydrodynamics which in spherical symmetry (and assuming isotropy of the velocity field) is

$$\frac{\sigma_r^2}{r}\frac{dln\rho}{dlnr} = -g \tag{7}$$

where ρ is the density, σ_r is the (constant) radial component of the velocity dispersion, and g is the radial component of the gravitational force. In the Newtonian limit ($g = g_n$) the isothermal sphere has infinite extent and mass with the density falling as $1/r^2$ and so cannot represent a realistic description of these objects. But with MOND the asymptotic gravitational acceleration in the outer regions is greater, falling as in eq. 3. Thus the equilibrium object is finite with a density (in low accelerations regime) decreasing as $1/r^4$ and a finite mass given by

$$\frac{M}{10^{11}M_\odot} = \left(\frac{\sigma_r}{100\,km/s}\right)^4. \tag{7}$$

In fact there is such observed relationship for bright elliptical galaxies – the Faber-Jackson relation relationship – and this finds a natural explanation in terms of MOND. But MOND goes further as a predictive theory: in the context of MOND every near-isothermal system should lie on roughly the same relationship; i.e., the Faber-Jackson relationship should be universal (Sanders 2010). An object with the velocity dispersion of luminous galaxy (100-200 km/s) will have a mass on the order of $10^{11}\ M_\odot$, a typical galaxy mass; if the velocity dispersion is 1000 km/s, the mass would be $10^{14}\ M_\odot$, the baryonic mass of a cluster of galaxies; if the velocity dispersion is 5 to 10 km/s as for a globular star cluster, the mass is on the order of $10^5/M_\odot$, typical for such an object; and if the velocity dispersion is 2 - 5 km/s as observed in massive molecular clouds, the mass is $10^3 - 10^4\ M_\odot$ as is observed for these objects. The predication of MOND is that the same $M \propto \sigma^4$ relationship apply to this very wide range of astronomical objects ranging from sub-galactic clouds to massive clusters of galaxies in so far as they are near-isothermal systems supported by pressure. Dark matter makes no such prediction.

But there is more. The structure of a high surface density isothermal sphere in MOND is basically that of a Newtonian sphere in the inner regions with density falling as $1/r^2$. But then at the radius where the internal acceleration falls to a_0 the sphere is effectively truncated – it does not extend much beyond (density falling line $1/r^4$). That means that the internal acceleration of near isothermal spheres should be on the order of a_0. And this is true for such objects as we see in Fig. 5. Here we see that for this very wide range of near isothermal objects it is true that the internal acceleration is on the order a_0. Dark matter offers no explanation of this observation, but it is a natural consequence of MOND (Sanders & McGaugh 2002).

[Figure 5 about here.]

4. Rotation curves of spiral galaxies

Asymptotically flat rotation curves are a fundamental prediction of MOND. But with respect to reproducing rotation curves, MOND goes beyond this. Milgrom first pointed out that a general difference is expected between the rotation curves of high surface brightness and low surface galaxies. In LSB (low internal acceleration) galaxies the discrepancy is present within the visible disk, and the rotation curve will rise to the asymptotic value (consistent with the Tully-Fisher relation, eq. 4). But within HSB objects (high internal acceleration) the rotation curve is effectively Newtonian and will fall in the outer galaxy to the asymptotic value. Thus, a simple rule: rising rotation curves in LSB galaxies, falling rotation curves in HSB galaxies.

With the advent (in the 1970s, see e.g. Bosma 1978) of high quality observations of galaxies in the 21 cm line of HI (extending well beyond the visible galaxy) this has been outstandingly confirmed. In figure we see two examples in the neutral hydrogen rotation curves of NGC 1560, an LSB galaxy, NGC 2903 , an HSB galaxy (Begeman et al. 1991). This in fact is a general pattern of galaxy rotation curves. But it is also obvious from this analysis that even the details of these observed rotation curves are well-accounted for by the MOND algorithm, as first emphasised by Begeman et al. (1990) with one single universal new parameter, a_0, by the observed distribution of baryons.

[Figure 6 about here.]

However, in the earlier analyses there is an adjustable parameter which may vary from galaxy to galaxy – that is, the mass-to-light ratio of the visible disk. This quantity, assumed to be constant in a given galaxy, determines the contribution of the stellar disk to the gravity force within the object and is generally adjusted to achieve the best agreement with the observations. There are certain general constraints – the fitted M/L should not be much larger than is reasonable for the stellar population observed in the Milky Way galaxy near the sun (on the order of unity in solar mass units), otherwise we are back to dark matter, and it should certainly not be negative. In these initial studies these general constraints were met (there is no a priori reason that they should be). But in fact, MOND goes beyond these generalities: The implied mass-to-light ratios are completely consistent with independent estimates of M/L on the basis of models of stellar populations.

This is evident in Fig. 6 which is relevant to the rotation curves for a sample of spiral galaxies in the Ursa Major cluster and hence all at about the same distance (Sanders & Verneijen 1998). The points here show the fitted mass-to-light ratios of the galaxies (in terms of MOND) plotted against the B-V colour index: blue is to the left, red is to the right (Sanders & McGaugh 2002). The upper plot is the B (blue) band M/L and the lower plot is the K band (near infrared) M/L. In the near-infrared the M/L values are near constant but in the blue band, the redder galaxies have higher M/L (recently formed stars have a lower M/L and emit a larger fraction of their light in the blue). The curves are not fits but are the theoretical M/L values for a populations of stars having these average colours (Bell and de Jong 2001). This is completely independent of the MOND estimated M/L values – those required to achieve the optimal fits to the rotation curves using the MOND algorithm. The results are impressive considering that MOND has no way of "knowing" that redder galaxies should have a higher M/L. If we had taken, a priori, the M/L from the population synthesis models we could have achieved reasonable representations of the observed rotation curves with no free parameters.

[Figure 7 about here.]

But true MOND predictions for rotation curves can be achieved for a sample of galaxies where M/L is no longer a relevant parameter at all; that is for gas-dominated dwarf galaxies. In these galaxies, the mass of neutral hydrogen is observed directly (in inferred from the total 21 cm line emission). It is found to completely dominate the baryonic mass budget of the galaxies, i.e, the mass of gas overwhelmingly exceeds the mass of of the visible stellar component. Therefore, the mass-to-light ratio of the stellar component essentially vanishes as an adjustable parameter. There are complicating issues with these small galaxies however. The morphologies are generally irregular which means that is difficult to estimate the inclination of the plane in which the gas moves and thereby correct the observed line-of-sight velocity to the true rotational velocity. In most cases there is clearly evidence for warping of the plane in which the gas moves and the additional complication of non-motion due to deviations from perfect axial symmetry. But even given these uncertainties, the predicted MOND rotation curves most often agree with the observed curves to high precision.

[Figure 8 about here.]

This is shown if Fig. 8 where we see six examples of such gas-dominated objects from the observed sample of Oh et al. 2015 considered by Sanders (2019). For each galaxy the top panel is the distribution of the baryonic components (dashed - gas, dotted - stars) plotted as surface density as a function of radius. These have been taken directly as given in the analysis of Oh et al. (2015) and not adjusted in any sense. The bottom panel shows the rotation curve: points are the observations, dashed curve is the Newtonian rotation curve of the baryonic components (mostly gas) and the solid curve is the MOND curve calculated via eq. 3 with the standard value of a_0. The agreement of MOND with the observations is noteworthy for most objects, particularly considering that the MOND rotation curves are pure predictions from the distribution of baryonic components. Details of the observed rotation curves in several cases are clearly related to details in the observed gas distribution in the presence of a large discrepancy. It is difficult to imagine that dark matter, as it is perceived to be, could achieve such a level of successful prediction.

5. DM and MD: Competition or Completion

In ΛCDM the basic gravitational or dynamical framework is provided by general relativity which is a well-established theory with no adjustable parameters and no established contradictions on sub-galactic scales. But to explain cosmological observations general relativity alone is not enough: two unconventional sources must be added – dark energy and dark matter. The nature or microphysics of these two aethers is unknown and as long as this is so, triumphalism over our present understanding of the Universe is premature.

It is well known that there are phenomenological problems with the dark matter with respect to smaller scales where it is assumed to cluster and make up the mass budget in systems such as galaxies: e.g., the "core-cusp problem", the "missing satellites". These problems are generally brushed away because there is a reductionist current in modern science which assigns priority to cosmology – the phenomenology of the entire Universe – over the behaviour of its mere constituents. The observational problems of galaxies are considered minor and will be solved when there is a better understanding of " baryonic physics".

The essential problem of the dark matter hypothesis concerns the regularities revealed by galaxy scaling relations as well the details of galaxy rotation curves. With respect to the scaling relations – the Tully-Fisher, the radial acceleration relation – in the context of dark matter, these are thought to emerge as aspects of galaxy formation; it seems curious that such a precise relations can arise from what is certainly a highly stochastic process with each individual galaxy having its own history of dynamical evolution and merging. With respect to rotation curves, the dark matter approach is to use the observations to constrain the properties of halos. The procedure is to fit halo parameters (usually three) to the observations and to apply semi-analytic repairs to fix details of the baryonic effects. It may work, but the basic concept of dark halos cannot be falsified by measurements of the force distribution even in halo-dominated objects such as gas rich dwarf galaxies where the total force is so obviously connected to the gas distribution. The exercise is essentially one of post facto data fitting.

MOND subsumes scaling relations; they are an aspect of physical law and not the random circumstances of formation – hence their precision. As an algorithm for calculating the rotation curves of spiral galaxies from the observed distribution of baryonic matter, MOND is inherently predictive and thus inherently falsifiable. It is one simple formula that involves one new universal parameter. In so far as predictability in has value in science, this is a clear advantage, and the fact that it works constitutes a severe challenge to the assumption that dark matter dominates the mass budget of galaxies. In addition, there is the ubiquity of a_0 ($\approx cH_0$) in phenomena on sub-Hubble scales. This parameter appears as the acceleration below which the discrepancy is present in galaxies (Fig. 1); as a critical surface density within systems above which the discrepancy is not apparent; as the normalisation of the Tully-Fisher relation in spiral galaxies (Fig. 3); as the normalisation the Faber-Jackson relation in pressure supported systems from globular clusters to clusters

of galaxies; as the typical internal acceleration in nearly-isothermal systems ranging from sub-galactic self-gravitating molecular clouds to the great clusters of galaxy (Fig. 5). The ubiquitous presence of this critical acceleration in different settings has no single explanation in the context of the CDM paradigm.

The strongest observational evidence for cosmic dark matter is the matching of the pattern of anisotropies in angular power spectrum in cosmic microwave background emitted at the epoch when that radiation decouples from matter at a redshift of about 1000. That is not to say that this explanation is unique, but it is consistent with a total mass abundance of dark matter five to six times greater than that of baryons. However, these observations do not extend down to the scale of present self-gravitating systems where it is most often assumed that the cosmic dark matter clusters and provides the explanation for the mass discrepancy in galaxies. Of course, there is an efficiency in this explanation: only one sort of mysterious substance need be invoked for cosmic and local phenomena (less compelling now that a second mysterious substance – dark energy – is also required). But this idea does not work on local scales; it is falsified by the algorithm which predicts rotation curves from the observed distribution of baryons – MOND. Perhaps the answer is more subtle. Perhaps there is dualism involved – that a substance (or a field) is implicated which behaves like dark matter-dark energy on cosmic scale but like modified dynamics on small scale. This is a possibility for further consideration.

I am grateful to Moti Milgrom for useful comments on this manuscript.

References

[1] Begeman, K.G., Broeils A.H., Sanders, R.H. (1991). Extended rotation curves of spiral galaxies : dark haloes and modified dynamics. Mon.Not.R.Astron.Soc., 249, 523-537.

[2] Bekenstein, J.D. & Milgrom, M. (1984). Does the missing mass problem signal the breakdown of Newtonian gravity. Astrophys.J., 266, 7-14.

[3] Bell, E.F., & de Jong, R.S. (2001). Stellar Mass-to-Light Ratios and the Tully-Fisher Relation. Astrophys.J., 550, 212-229.

[4] Bosma, A. (1978). The distribution and kinematics of neutral hydrogen in spiral galaxies of various morphological types. PhD Dissertation, Univ. of Groningen.

[5] Brimioulle, F. et al. (2013). Dark matter halo properties from galaxy-galaxy lensing. Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 432, 1046.

[6] Brouwer, M.M. et al. (2017). First test of Verlindes the- ory of emergent gravity using weak gravitational lensing measurements. Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 466, 2547.

[7] de Blok, W.J.G. & McGaugh, S.S. (1998). Testing Modified Newtonian Dynamics with Low Surface Brightness Galaxies: Rotation Curve FITS. Astrophys.J. 508, 132-140.

[8] Famaey, B. & McGaugh, S. (2012). Modified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND): Observational Phenomenology and Relativistic Extensions. Liv. Rev. Rel. 15, 10.

[9] Mancera Piña, P.E., Faternali, F., Adams, E.A.K, et al. (2019). Off the Baryonic Tully-Fisher Relation: A Population of Baryon-dominated Ultra-diffuse Galaxies. Astrophys.J, 883, L33-L39.

[10] McGaugh, S.S. (2011). Phys.Rev.Lett, 106, 121303.

[11] McGaugh, S.S., Lelli, F., Schombert, J.M. (2016). The Radial Acceleration Relation in Rotationally Supported Galaxies. Phys Rev Lett., 117, 201101.

[12] Merritt, D. (2017). Cosmology and convention. Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics,57, 41-52.

[13] Milgrom, M. (1983). A modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis. Astrophys. J. 270, 365.

[14] Milgrom, M. (2013). Testing the MOND Paradigm of Modified Dynamics with Galaxy-Galaxy Gravitational Lensing. Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 041105.

[15] Milgrom, M. (2014). The MOND paradigm of modified dynamics. Scholarpiedia, 93140 (continually updated)

[16] Milgrom, M. & Sanders (2003) R.H. MOND and the Dearth of Dark Matter in Ordinary Elliptical Galaxies. Astrophys. J., 599, L25-L28.

[17] Romanowsky, A.J., Douglas, N.G., Arnaboldi, M., et al. (2003), A Dearth of Dark Matter in Ordinary Elliptical Galaxies. Science, 301, 1696-1698.

[18] Oh S.-H., et al., (2015). High-resolution Mass Models of Dwarf Galaxies from LITTLE THINGS. Astron.J., 149, 180-276.

[19] Sanders, R.H. & Verheijen M.A.W. (1998). Rotation Curves of Ursa Major Galaxies in the Context of Modified Newtonian Dynamics. Astro.Phys.J, 473, 117-142.

[20] Sanders, R.H. & McGaugh, S.S. (2002). Modified Newtonian Dynamics as an Alternative to Dark Matter. Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophysi. 40, 263-317.

[21] Sanders, R.H. (2010). The universal Faber-Jackson Relation. Mon.Not.R.Astron.Soc., 407, 1128-1134.

[22] Sanders, R.H. (2016). Deconstructing Cosmology. Cambridge University Press.

[23] Sanders, R.H. (2019) The prediction of rotation curves in gas-dominated dwarf galaxies with modified dynamics. Mon.Not.R.Astron.S., 485, 513-521.

[24] van Dokkum, P., Shany, D., Cohen, Y et al. (2018) A galaxy lacking dark matter. Nature, 555, 629-632.

List of Figures

1 The radial acceleration relation (RAR). This is a plot of the measured (true) acceleration (g) against the Newtonian acceleration of the baryonic component over a range of radii in aprroximately 100 spiral galaxies It is essentially g vs g_n in eq. 1. The shape of the curve defines the interpolating function, $\mu(g/a_0)$ (see McGaugh, Lelli & Schombert 2014)) 11

2 Rotation curve (rotation velocity vs. radius) of NGC 2403 as measured in the 21 cm line of neutral hydrogen. The points are the observations, the dashed curve is th Newtonian rotation curve of the stellar component, the faint dashed curve is the Newtonian rotation curve of the gaseous compoent, and the solid curve is the MOND rotation curve (Begeman et al. 1991). . 12

3 Baryonic Tully-Fisher relationship. Asymptotic rotation velocity plotted against baryonic (detectable) mass (McGaugh 2010) 13

4 Extended Baryonic Tully-Fisher relationship (Milgrom 2013). The solid lines show the MOND predictions for the σ-luminosity relation for the indicated mass-to-light ratios. The points are the results of weak gravitational lensing analysis of isolated foreground galaxies (blue and red). 14

5 The velocity dispersion size relation of self-gravitating objects near isothermal objects. The solid round points are molecular clouds in the Milky Way, asterisks are globular clusters, triangles are dwarf spheroidal galaxies, dashes are compact elliptial galaxies, crosses are luminous elliptical galaxies, and the solid squares are the giant clusters of galaxies. The solid line corresponds to $\sigma^2/r = a_0$ demonstrating that most of these objects have an internal acceleration near a_0. Points above the line would have high surface brightness and little expected mass discrepancy. Below the line are found low surface brightness objects with a large expected discrepancy (Sanders & McGaugh 2002). 15

6 Rotation curve a of LSB galaxy ($\Sigma < \Sigma_c$) and b of HSB galaxy (($\Sigma > \Sigma_c$). Points with error bars are the observations, dashed and dotted curves are the Newtonian rotation curves of the baryonic components, gas and stars, and the solid curve is the MOND curve with $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-8}\ cm/s^2$ (Begeman, Broeils & Sanders 1991) 16

7 Points are values of M/L for spiral galaxies following from MOND fits to rotation curves in the UMa cluster (Sanders & McGaugh 2002) plotted against B-V colour index (blue to the left, red to the right) in the blue band (top) and infrared (bottom). The upper plot is M/L in the blue band and in the lower plot, M/L in the near infrared. The solid curves are M/L values predicted by population synthesis models (Bell and de Jong 2001) 17

8 Upper panels are baryonic surface density distribution (gas - dashed, dotted -stars)) and, lower panels, rotation curves of individual gas-dominated dwarf galaxies. Points with error bars are the observations; dashed curves are the Newtonian rotation curves of baryonic components, and solid curves are the MOND rotation curves with the standard value of a_0 (Sanders 2019). 18




Figure 1: The radial acceleration relation (RAR). This is a plot of the measured (true) acceleration (g) against the Newtonian acceleration of the baryonic component over a range of radii in aprroximately 100 spiral galaxies It is essentially g vs g_n in eq. 1. The shape of the curve defines the interpolating function, $\mu(g/a_0)$ (see McGaugh, Lelli & Schombert 2014))




Figure 2: Rotation curve (rotation velocity vs. radius) of NGC 2403 as measured in the 21 cm line of neutral hydrogen. The points are the observations, the dashed curve is th Newtonian rotation curve of the stellar component, the faint dashed curve is the Newtonian rotation curve of the gaseous compoent, and the solid curve is the MOND rotation curve (Begeman et al. 1991).




Figure 3: Baryonic Tully-Fisher relationship. Asymptotic rotation velocity plotted against baryonic (detectable) mass (McGaugh 2010)




Figure 4: Extended Baryonic Tully-Fisher relationship (Milgrom 2013). The solid lines show the MOND predictions for the σ-luminosity relation for the indicated mass-to-light ratios. The points are the results of weak gravitational lensing analysis of isolated foreground galaxies (blue and red).




Figure 5: The velocity dispersion size relation of self-gravitating objects near isothermal objects. The solid round points are molecular clouds in the Milky Way, asterisks are globular clusters, triangles are dwarf spheroidal galaxies, dashes are compact elliptial galaxies, crosses are luminous elliptical galaxies, and the solid squares are the giant clusters of galaxies. The solid line corresponds to $\sigma^2/r = a_0$ demonstrating that most of these objects have an internal acceleration near a_0. Points above the line would have high surface brightness and little expected mass discrepancy. Below the line are found low surface brightness objects with a large expected discrepancy (Sanders & McGaugh 2002).




Figure 6: Rotation curve *a* of LSB galaxy ($\Sigma < \Sigma_c$) and *b* of HSB galaxy (($\Sigma > \Sigma_c$). Points with error bars are the observations, dashed and dotted curves are the Newtonian rotation curves of the baryonic components, gas and stars, and the solid curve is the MOND curve with $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-8}\ cm/s^2$ (Begeman, Broeils & Sanders 1991)




Figure 7: Points are values of M/L for spiral galaxies following from MOND fits to rotation curves in the UMa cluster (Sanders & McGaugh 2002) plotted against B-V colour index (blue to the left, red to the right) in the blue band (top) and infrared (bottom). The upper plot is M/L in the blue band and in the lower plot, M/L in the near infrared. The solid curves are M/L values predicted by population synthesis models (Bell and de Jong 2001)




Figure 8: Upper panels are baryonic surface density distribution (gas - dashed, dotted -stars)) and, lower panels, rotation curves of individual gas-dominated dwarf galaxies. Points with error bars are the observations; dashed curves are the Newtonian rotation curves of baryonic components, and solid curves are the MOND rotation curves with the standard value of a_0 (Sanders 2019).