

The Hubble tension from the standpoint of quantum cosmology

V.E. Kuzmichev, V.V. Kuzmichev

*Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics,
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, 03143 Ukraine*

Abstract

The Hubble tension is analyzed in the framework of quantum cosmological approach. It is found that there arises a new summand in the expression for the total energy density stipulated by the quantum Bohm potential. This additional energy density modifies the expansion history of the early universe and decays faster than radiation in late universe. Similarly to physical models with early dark energy, taking account of this matter source of quantum nature can, in principle, eliminate a discrepancy between the Hubble constant estimates obtained in different approaches. The model been considered allows one to extend the standard cosmology to quantum sector.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Qc, 98.80.Es, 95.35.+d, 95.36.+x

1 Introduction

The Hubble expansion rate (or the Hubble constant) is a cornerstone of the modern cosmology based on the idea of non-stationary expanding universe. Its value H_0 in the modern era can be extracted from astronomical data by means of independent analyses within the framework of different model concepts. There is a discrepancy between the Hubble constant estimates obtained from classical distance ladder approaches using Cepheids and SNe Ia and those derived from CMB data taking into account the standard Λ CDM model, $H_0 = 73.52 \pm 1.62$ km/s/Mpc [1] and $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.60$ km/s/Mpc [2], respectively. The disagreement of $\sim 7\%$ in them cannot be explained by any significant systematic errors in determination of cosmological parameters [3]. An introduction of a new element into the standard cosmological model may be a key allowing to relieve this tension. The possible solution to this Hubble constant problem lies in modification of scale factor evolution before recombination. The detailed review of modern approaches can be found in Ref. [4].

In the present note, we point out the feasible solution to the Hubble tension based on consecutive consideration of the evolution of the early universe in the era, when quantum corrections to the Einstein–Friedmann equation are significant and cannot be neglected. Usually, it is accepted that quantum theory is of relevance only in the microscopic regime. However, this is not always true. Since the universe as a whole is of quantum nature, there may exist situations, where a classical behavior breaks down and its quantum nature becomes apparent (see, e.g., Ref. [5]). We demonstrate that quantum effects generate an additional energy density which, in particular, leads to expansion of the early universe faster than expected.

It is convenient to define the variables making them dimensionless. We use the modified Planck system of units. The $l_p = \sqrt{2G\hbar/(3\pi c^3)}$ is taken as a unit of length, the $\rho_p = 3c^4/(8\pi G l_p^2)$ is a unit of energy density and so on.

2 Equations of the model

We consider the homogeneous and isotropic quantum cosmological system (universe) whose geometry is determined by the Robertson–Walker line element with the cosmic scale factor a . It is assumed that such a universe is originally filled with a uniform scalar field ϕ and a reference perfect fluid. After averaging with respect to appropriate quantum k -states $u_k(\phi)$, the scalar field turns into the effective barotropic fluid [6,7] with the energy density $\rho_m = 2M/a^3$, where M is an amount of non-relativistic matter which may include dark matter in the non-relativistic sector. In the general case, the mass M may depend both on the quantum number k of the wave function of matter $u_k(\phi)$ in the representation, in which the Hamiltonian of the uniform scalar field ϕ is diagonalized, and on the cosmic scale factor a , $M \equiv M_k(a)$. The value $a^3/2$ plays a role of a proper volume made dimensionless.

The reference perfect fluid defines a matter reference frame [8–11] and is taken in the form of relativistic matter (radiation) with the energy density $\rho_\gamma = E/a^4$, where $E = \text{const}$ (in natural physical units, it is proportional to the conversion constant $\hbar c$). The density ρ_γ may include dark matter in the relativistic sector. Dark energy is simulated by the cosmological constant Λ .

Such a model universe is described by the state vector [6,11]

$$\Psi(a, \phi; T) = e^{\frac{i}{2}ET} \sum_k u_k(\phi) \psi_k(a), \quad (1)$$

where T is the time variable (conformal time) connected with the proper time t by the differential equation $dt = adT$, and $dT = Nd\eta$, N is the lapse function whose choice is arbitrary [12], η is the “arc time” which coincides with T for $N = 1$ (cf. Ref. [13,14]). In general case, the function N serves as a Lagrange multiplier in the Hamiltonian constraint formalism and it should be taken into account in an appropriate way.

The wave function $\psi_k(a)$ satisfies the equation:

$$[-\partial_a^2 - a^4 \rho(a)] \psi(a) = 0, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\rho(a) = \frac{2M}{a^3} + \frac{E}{a^4} + \frac{\Lambda}{3} - \frac{\kappa}{a^2} \quad (3)$$

is the total energy density. Here the subscript k is omitted and the curvature term $-\kappa/a^2$ with $\kappa = +1, 0, -1$ is included into the total energy density for convenience.

Formally Eq. (2) coincides with the Wheeler-DeWitt equation [15,16] for the universe under consideration. However, it contains an important difference: the constant E not only enters the energy density (3), but also determines the evolution of the universe in conformal time T according to Eq. (1). The analogy with the quantum mechanics in the Schrödinger–Madelung [17] formulation rather than the Wheeler-DeWitt quantum geometrodynamics comes to mind. The latter in principle does not contain a time variable. The presence of the constant E in Eq. (3) is not

enough. It is required to know what canonical variable should be related to it. In our approach, it is the conformal time T , the same as in general relativity. Let us note that in natural physical units E and T have the dimensions: $[E] = \text{Energy} \times \text{Length}$, $[T] = \text{Radians}$.

3 The Hubble constant with quantum correction

We look for the solution in the form of a wave propagating along the a direction

$$\psi(a) = |\psi|e^{iS(a)}, \quad (4)$$

where $|\psi| = \text{const}/\sqrt{\partial_a S(a)}$ is the amplitude, $S(a)$ is the phase which is assumed to be a real function of the scale factor a . Substituting Eq. (4) into (2), we find that $\partial_a S(a)$ satisfies the non-linear equation (generalized Hamilton–Jacobi equation),

$$(\partial_a S(a))^2 = a^4 (\rho + \rho_B), \quad (5)$$

where the term

$$\rho_B = \frac{Q_B}{a^4} \quad (6)$$

is known in quantum mechanics as the energy density produced by the Bohm potential [18],

$$Q_B = \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\partial_a^2 S}{\partial_a S} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_a^3 S}{\partial_a S}. \quad (7)$$

In order to pass from Eq. (5) to the equation for the Hubble constant, the time variable T should be restored. Following Dirac [19] and considering the wave function $\psi(a)$ as immovable vector of the Heisenberg representation, we obtain the equation of motion [6]

$$\langle \psi | -i\partial_a | \psi \rangle = \langle \psi | -\frac{da}{dT} | \psi \rangle, \quad (8)$$

which connects the quantum-mechanical momentum $-i\partial_a$ with the velocity da/dT of general relativity. The simple substitution of Eq. (4) into (8) gives the expression

$$\partial_a S + \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial_a^2 S}{\partial_a S} = -\frac{da}{dT}. \quad (9)$$

From Eq. (9), it follows that time T should be complex for real a and $S(a)$. This means that for complete description of the dynamics of the universe one has to take into account that the universe can transit from the region near initial singularity with sub-Planck scales, where the interval has the Euclidean signature and time is complex, to the region with the Lorentzian signature metric and real-valued physical variables (for discussion see Refs. [20–22]). Let us notice here that such a picture of change in spacetime geometry during the transition of the universe from the region near initial singularity into the region of real physical scales can be interpreted as the spontaneous nucleation of the expanding universe from the initial singularity point.

Taking into account that time T can be complex, $T = T_R + iT_I$, where T_R is time in real physical region, whereas T_I is imaginary time component on sub-Planck scales, we have

$$\frac{da}{dT} = \frac{\partial a}{\partial T_R} - i \frac{\partial a}{\partial T_I}, \quad (10)$$

where, according to Eq. (9),

$$-\frac{\partial a}{\partial T_R} = \partial_a S, \quad \frac{\partial a}{\partial T_I} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_a^2 S}{\partial_a S}, \quad (11)$$

and Eq. (5) can be rewritten as

$$\left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial T_R} \right)^2 = a^4 \rho + Q_B. \quad (12)$$

This equation can be derived directly from Eq. (5). To do this, one should square the left- and right-hand sides of Eq. (9) and use Eqs. (10) and (11).

Since the Hubble constant H has meaning only in the region of real physical values, then defining it in accordance with general relativity,

$$H = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\partial a}{\partial T_R} = -\frac{\partial_a S}{a^2}, \quad (13)$$

we obtain the equation

$$H^2 = \rho + \rho_B, \quad (14)$$

which contains an additional energy density (6) produced by the quantum potential (7).

4 Quantum potential in semiclassical approximation

In order to find an explicit dependence of Q_B (7) on a , we will use the semiclassical approximation for the derivative of the phase $\partial_a S$. According to general relativity, for the most common matter sources, the dependence of H on proper time t has a simple form: $H = \alpha/t$, where α is a parameter defined by a type of matter (e.g., $\alpha = 1/2$ for radiation, $\alpha = 2/3$ for non-relativistic matter and so on). Then from the differential equation $\frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt} = \frac{\alpha}{t}$, it follows the solution $a = \beta t^\alpha$, where β is an integration constant. From Eqs. (11) and (13), we find that $\partial_a S = -\alpha \beta^{1/\alpha} a^{2-1/\alpha}$. Calculating higher derivatives and substituting them in Eq. (7), we get

$$Q_B = \frac{\gamma_\alpha}{a^2}, \quad (15)$$

where the numerator

$$\gamma_\alpha = \frac{(2\alpha - 1)(4\alpha - 1)}{4\alpha^2} \quad (16)$$

does not depend on a .

For the universe expanding exponentially, $a = a(0)e^{\sqrt{\rho_v}t}$, where ρ_v is some constant (e.g., $\rho_v = \frac{\Lambda}{3}$), the Hubble constant is $H = \sqrt{\rho_v}$ and the momentum equals to $\partial_a S = -\sqrt{\rho_v}a^2$. For such a universe, the quantum potential has a form

$$Q_B = \frac{2}{a^2}. \quad (17)$$

It is worth noting that Eq. (17) follows from (15) in the limit $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$.

Thus the quantum addition to the energy density is equal to

$$\rho_B = \frac{\gamma_\alpha}{a^6}. \quad (18)$$

Considering it as a fluid with the equation of state $p_B = w_B \rho_B$ which decays as $a^{-3(1+w_B)}$, we find that the additional energy density ρ_B corresponds to a stiff fluid with $w_B = 1$. The energy density ρ_B can be negative, when $\frac{1}{4} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, positive for $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha < \frac{1}{4}$, or vanish at $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$. The negative energy density ρ_B corresponds to the negative pressure $p_B < 0$. In this case, it means that expanding universe obtains an additional acceleration within the scope of the potential Q_B . The positive energy density ρ_B increases the total energy density leading to higher H according to Eq. (14), so that it can, in principle, remove a discrepancy between the lower value of the Hubble constant deduced from CMB measurements and galaxy surveys and the higher value obtained from measurements of distances and redshifts in the local universe.

The dependence a^{-6} appears also in the case, when the universe is filled with a cosmological scalar field whose energy density is dominated by its kinetic term. It was found that physical models introducing early dark energy (EDE) that modifies the expansion history of the universe before the recombination period and then decays faster than radiation can resolve the Hubble tension [4, 23–25]. Many of the EDE models that have been explored postulate an oscillating scalar field potential. Concerning the approach based on quantum cosmology, it has the advantage, since a desirable dependence of the energy density on a arises naturally and does not require any model assumptions.

5 Conclusion

In quantum cosmological approach been considered above, there naturally arises an additional energy density (18) that dilutes away faster than radiation. Such a behavior is stipulated by a well-known Bohm potential (7). This energy density component that has a quantum origin may act similarly to EDE modifying the early expansion rate before recombination while leaving the late evolution of the universe unchanged. For this reason, the model based on quantum cosmology can be considered as a candidate for solving the Hubble tension.

There is another implication from the calculations given above, which are supported by the equations of quantum cosmology. Despite the generally accepted point of view that observed quantum effects are absent in late universe, their influence can be revealed by comparing cosmological parameters extracted from the data of astronomical observations by using different model methods.

The generalized Einstein–Friedmann equation (14) allows to supplement the standard Λ CDM model with a new term of quantum nature:

$$H^2(z) = H^2(0) \left[\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\gamma(1+z)^4 + \Omega_{dm}(z)(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_{curv}(1+z)^2 + \Omega_B(1+z)^6 \right], \quad (19)$$

where Ω are the energy densities in units of critical density, z is a redshift, Ω_B is the quantum energy density corresponding to ρ_B (16). The energy density of dark matter Ω_{dm} is a function of z , since it can contain both non-relativistic and relativistic matter of any nature. From Eq. (19), it follows the constraint

$$\Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_\gamma - \Omega_{dm}(0) - \Omega_{curv} - \Omega_B. \quad (20)$$

For $\Omega_{curv} = 0$ and $\Omega_B = 0$, one has the standard model of spatially flat universe.

References

- [1] A.G. Riess et al. *ApJ* **861**, 126 (2018), arXiv:1804.10655.
- [2] Planck collaboration VI. *A&A* **641**, A6 (2020), arXiv:1807.06209.
- [3] K. Aylor et al. *ApJ* **874**, 4 (2019), arXiv:181100537.
- [4] E. Di Valentino et al. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, **38**, 153001 (2021), arXiv:2103.01183.
- [5] C. Kiefer and B. Sandhöfer, arXiv:0804.0672.
- [6] V.E. Kuzmichev and V.V Kuzmichev, *Acta Phys. Pol. B*, **44**, 2051 (2013), arXiv:1307.2383.
- [7] V.E. Kuzmichev and V.V Kuzmichev, *Ukr J. Phys.*, **61**, 449 (2016).
- [8] K.V. Kuchař and C.G. Torre, *Phys. Rev.*, **D43**, 419 (1991).
- [9] J.B. Brown and D. Marolf, *Phys. Rev.*, **D53**, 1835 (1996), arXiv:gr-qc/9509026.
- [10] V.E. Kuzmichev and V.V Kuzmichev, *Eur. J. Phys. C*, **23**, 337 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0111438.
- [11] V.E. Kuzmichev and V.V Kuzmichev, *Acta Phys. Pol. B*, **39**, 979 (2008), arXiv:0712.0464.
- [12] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C.W. Misner, in: *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, ed. L. Witten Wiley, New York 1962, arXiv:gr-qc/0405109.
- [13] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne, and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, San Francisco 1973.
- [14] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields. Course of Theoretical Physics*, Vol. 2, Butterworth–Heinemann Amsterdam 1975.
- [15] J.A. Wheeler, in: *Battelle Rencontres*, eds. C. DeWitt, J.A. Wheeler, Benjamin, New York 1968.
- [16] B.S. DeWitt, in: *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, ed. L. Witten Wiley, New York 1962; *Phys. Rev.*, **160**, 1113 (1967).
- [17] E. Madelung, *Zeit. f. Phys.*, **40**, 322 (1927).
- [18] D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.*, **85**, 166 (1952).
- [19] P.A.M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1958.
- [20] V.E. Kuzmichev and V.V Kuzmichev, *Acta Phys. Pol. B*, **40**, 2877 (2009), arXiv:0905.4142.
- [21] J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.*, **D28**, 2960 (1983).
- [22] S.W. Hawking and R. Penrose, *The Nature of Space and Time*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 2000.
- [23] V. Poulin, T.L. Smith, D. Grin, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev.*, **D98**, 083525 (2018), arXiv:1806.10608.
- [24] V. Poulin, T.L. Smith, T. Karwal, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 221301 (2019), arXiv:1811.04083.
- [25] M. Kamionkowski and A.G. Riess, arXiv:2211.04492.