

Redshift drift cosmography for model-independent cosmological inference

Asta Heinesen*

Univ Lyon, Ens de Lyon, Univ Lyon1, CNRS, Centre de Recherche Astrophysique de Lyon UMR5574, F-69007, Lyon, France

We develop a cosmographic framework for analysing redshift drift signals of nearby sources model-independently, i.e., without making assumptions about the metric description of the Universe. We show that the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) prediction is altered non-trivially by regional anisotropies and inhomogeneities. In particular, we find that the position drift of the sources is non-trivially linked to the redshift drift signal. The redshift drift signal for closeby sources might be formulated in terms of an effective deceleration parameter, which reduces to the FLRW deceleration parameter in the homogeneous and isotropic limit. The presented cosmographic framework can be used for model-independent data analysis, exploiting that the exact anisotropic redshift drift signal at lowest order in redshift is given by a *finite* set of physically interpretable coefficients. We discuss physical limits of interest as well as challenges related to the framework.

INTRODUCTION

Cosmological data analysis has historically relied on exact symmetry assumptions in order to infer information about kinematics of the Universe. Isotropic modelling assumptions go back to the founding of general relativistic cosmology, and to the first measurements indicating the expansion of space [1–3]. The Lambda Cold Dark Matter (Λ CDM) cosmological paradigm is based on the class of homogeneous and isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) models, and the majority of modern cosmological data analyses are carried out assuming a class of FLRW models for describing observables. When cosmological data is analysed within the Λ CDM model, a number of tensions¹ and ‘curiosities’ emerge [4, 5]. Such tensions, if not due to unaccounted for astrophysical biases, might be a sign that the precision in cosmological data has surpassed the accuracy of the dynamical space-time model employed. With next-generation surveys we will be able to make precise cosmological measurements, which will require an equal precision in theoretical modelling and schemes for data analysis.

Optical drift effects [8–12] are temporal changes of cosmological observables such as angular position, redshift, flux, and luminosity distance, which are detected by measuring the same astrophysical sources over time. Since lifetimes of experiments on Earth – typically of the order of a few decades – are very small as compared to cosmological timescales of gigayears, the detection of optical drift effects requires extreme precision. Due to the great recent improvement in facilities for observation to meet the required precision, measurements of cosmological drift effects are within reach. Especially the redshift drift effect [13–15] has received attention as a corner-

stone of near future observations. Modern instruments, such as the Extremely Large Telescope (ELT) [16, 17] and the Square Kilometer Array (SKA) [18–20], are estimated to require one to a few decades of observation time for detection of the redshift drift signal [9, 21, 22]. Forecasts relating to Phase2 of SKA predict observation times down to ~ 0.5 years for significant detections of redshift drift, albeit these estimates are associated with a high level of uncertainty [22]. Flux drift effects could be detected within a few decades with SKA and ELT [12], while position drift effects are detectable within the same timeframe using data from the Gaia observatory [23, 24].

The direct detection of changes in cosmological observables with time opens the door for model-independent detection strategies of kinematic properties of our Universe. However, most existing papers concerning the upcoming optical drift measurements assume the FLRW class of models – though see, e.g., [11, 26–35] for theoretical and numerical investigations of the redshift drift signal in more general settings. Cosmography without assumptions on field equations or space-time geometry [36–40] is a powerful tool for fully model-independent data analysis when the quality of data and sky coverage is sufficient. So far, no cosmographic framework for analysing redshift drift data without assumptions about the space-time geometry has been developed. In this paper we formulate such a framework for model-independent inference of cosmological kinematics and curvature using redshift drift measurements of nearby astronomical sources and position drift measurements of the same sources. Our derivations rely on multipole expansion techniques for the redshift drift signal, which were first considered in [32] for FLRW space-times with non-comoving observers and Bianchi I space-times, and later formulated in an arbitrary space-time congruence setting [34, 35].

¹ The ‘Hubble tension’ [6, 7] is perhaps the most significant tension currently, and arises from disagreement between the FLRW Hubble parameter as determined by nearby probes and by data from the cosmic microwave background (CMB).

Notation and conventions: Units are used in which $c = 1$. Greek letters μ, ν, \dots label spacetime indices in a general basis. The signature of the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is $(-+++)$ and the connection ∇_μ is the Levi-Civita connection. Round brackets $()$ containing indices denote symmetrisation in the involved indices and square brackets $[]$ denote anti-symmetrisation. Bold notation \mathbf{V} for the basis-free representation of vectors V^μ is used occasionally.

THE REDSHIFT DRIFT SIGNAL FOR A GENERAL SPACE-TIME CONGRUENCE

We first review the formulation of the redshift drift signal in terms of a multipole representation in the general setting, making no assumptions about the metric tensor of space-time or the field theory determining the metric. Following [34, 35] we consider a general space-time with an unconstrained congruence of emitters and observers (denoted the ‘observer congruence’ in the following), associated with the 4-velocity field \mathbf{u} , a proper time function τ , and with kinematic decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\nu u_\mu &= \frac{1}{3}\theta h_{\mu\nu} + \sigma_{\mu\nu} + \omega_{\mu\nu} - u_\nu a_\mu, \\ \theta &\equiv \nabla_\mu u^\mu, \quad \sigma_{\mu\nu} \equiv h_{(\nu}^\beta h_{\mu)}^\alpha \nabla_\beta u_\alpha, \\ \omega_{\mu\nu} &\equiv h_\nu^\beta h_\mu^\alpha \nabla_{[\beta} u_{\alpha]}, \quad a^\mu \equiv \dot{u}^\mu,\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where $\dot{} \equiv u^\mu \nabla_\mu$ is the directional derivative along the observer congruence flow lines, where $h_\nu^\mu \equiv u_\mu u^\nu + g_\nu^\mu$ is the spatial projection tensor relative to the observer congruence, and where $\langle \rangle$ is the traceless and symmetric part of a spatially projected tensor². Let \mathbf{k} denote the generator of a geodesic congruence of null rays (henceforth the ‘photon congruence’) passing between a pair of causally connected members of the observer congruence. We have that

$$E \equiv -u^\mu k_\mu, \quad e^\mu \equiv u^\mu - \frac{1}{E} k^\mu, \quad (2)$$

denote the photon energy as measured by a member of the observer congruence and the spatial unit-vector of observation of the null ray as seen by the same observer. We introduce the variables

$$d^\mu \equiv h_\nu^\mu e^\alpha \nabla_\alpha e^\nu, \quad \kappa^\mu \equiv h_\nu^\mu \dot{e}^\nu, \quad (3)$$

which we denote the ‘acceleration vector’ and the ‘position drift’. The acceleration vector describes the acceleration of e as projected onto the spatial tangent-plane

defined by \mathbf{u} . When e is associated with an axis of local rotational symmetry, \mathbf{d} vanishes [42], and the norm of \mathbf{d} can thus be thought of as a measure of anisotropy around the spatial axis of propagation of the photons. The position drift³ describes the shift of spatial direction of incoming light from the emitting source as seen relative to an unrotated coordinate system in the observer’s frame – see section 4.2 in [11] for the relation between position drift and classical parallax in a generic perturbative setting.

The drift of the redshift, z , as associated with emitters and observers of the congruence description and measured in proper time of the observer can be represented by the integral [35]

$$\left. \frac{dz}{d\tau} \right|_{\mathcal{O}} = E_{\mathcal{E}} \int_{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}}^{\lambda_{\mathcal{O}}} d\lambda \Pi, \quad z \equiv \frac{E_{\mathcal{E}}}{E_{\mathcal{O}}} - 1 \quad (4)$$

where λ is an affine parameter along the null geodesics of the photon congruence with $k^\mu \nabla_\mu \lambda = 1$, and where subscripts \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{O} denote evaluation at the points of emission and observation. The integrand, Π , is given by the *exact* series expansion in e and \mathbf{d} [35]

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi &= \Pi^o + e^\mu \Pi_\mu^e + d^\mu \Pi_\mu^d + e^\mu e^\nu \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{ee} + e^\mu d^\nu \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{ed} \\ &\quad + e^\mu e^\nu e^\rho \Pi_{\mu\nu\rho}^{eee} + e^\mu e^\nu e^\rho e^\kappa \Pi_{\mu\nu\rho\kappa}^{eeee}\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi^o &\equiv -\frac{1}{3} u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu} - d^\mu d_\mu \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3} D_\mu a^\mu - \frac{1}{3} a^\mu a_\mu - \frac{3}{5} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \sigma_{\mu\nu} - \omega^{\mu\nu} \omega_{\mu\nu}, \\ \Pi_\mu^e &\equiv -\frac{1}{3} \theta a_\mu + \frac{7}{5} a_\nu \sigma_\mu^\nu - a^\nu \omega_{\mu\nu} - h_\mu^\nu \dot{a}_\nu, \\ \Pi_\mu^d &\equiv -2a_\mu, \\ \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{ee} &\equiv 2a_{\langle\mu} a_{\nu\rangle} - \frac{9}{7} \sigma_{\alpha\langle\mu} \sigma_{\nu\rangle}^\alpha - 3\omega_{\alpha\langle\mu} \omega_{\nu\rangle}^\alpha - 6\sigma_{\alpha\mu} \omega_{\nu}^\alpha \\ &\quad + D_{\langle\mu} a_{\nu\rangle} - u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu} - \frac{1}{2} h_{\langle\mu}^\alpha h_{\nu\rangle}^\beta R_{\alpha\beta}, \\ \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{ed} &\equiv 4(\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \omega_{\mu\nu}), \\ \Pi_{\mu\nu\rho}^{eee} &\equiv -4a_{\langle\mu} \sigma_{\nu\rho\rangle}, \\ \Pi_{\mu\nu\rho\kappa}^{eeee} &\equiv 3\sigma_{\langle\mu\nu} \sigma_{\rho\kappa\rangle},\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci curvature tensor, $C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$ is the Weyl curvature tensor, the operator D_μ is the spatial covariant derivative⁴, and where the decomposition of the terms in the series expansion has been made such that coefficients with more than one spacetime index are traceless.

² See [41] for a general method of decomposing tensors in three dimensions into isotropic and traceless parts, and Appendix A of [40] for the explicit expressions for the decomposition for symmetric tensors with up to six indices.

³ The position drift is equal to the Fermi-Walker transport of e [11] along \mathbf{u} : $\delta_{\mathbf{u}} e^\mu \equiv \dot{e}^\mu + e^\nu F_\nu^\mu = \kappa^\mu$, with $F_\nu^\mu \equiv -u^\mu a_\nu + a^\mu u_\nu$.

⁴ The acting of D_μ on a tensor field $T_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_n}^{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_m}$ is defined as: $D_\mu T_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_n}^{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_m} \equiv h_{\nu_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots h_{\nu_n}^{\alpha_n} h_{\beta_1}^{\gamma_1} \dots h_{\beta_m}^{\gamma_m} h_\mu^\sigma \nabla_\sigma T_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}^{\beta_1 \dots \beta_m}$.

COSMOGRAPHY FOR MODEL-INDEPENDENT DATA ANALYSIS OF NEARBY SOURCES

The representation (5) of Π in terms of a multipole expansion in the vectors (\mathbf{e} , \mathbf{d}) is not directly suitable for formulating a model-independent redshift drift cosmography for observational analysis, since the acceleration vector $\mathbf{d}_\mathcal{O}$ is in general not a measurable quantity. We make use of the relation [40]

$$\frac{k^\nu \nabla_\nu e^\mu}{E} = (e^\mu - u^\mu) \mathfrak{H} - e^\nu \left(\frac{1}{3} \theta h_\nu^\mu + \sigma_\nu^\mu + \omega_\nu^\mu \right) + a^\mu \quad (7)$$

and the definition of \mathbf{e} given in (2) to rewrite \mathbf{d} in terms of \mathbf{e} and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ in the following way

$$d^\mu = \kappa^\mu - a^\mu + e^\nu (\sigma_\nu^\mu + \omega_\nu^\mu) + e^\mu e^\nu a_\nu - e^\mu e^\nu e^\rho \sigma_{\nu\rho}. \quad (8)$$

Substituting \mathbf{d} with (8) in the series expansion (5) and rearranging terms, we have that Π can be written as the following series expansion in \mathbf{e} and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$:

$$\Pi = -\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu + \Sigma^o + e^\mu \Sigma_\mu^e + e^\mu e^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee} + e^\mu \kappa^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa} \quad (9)$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^o &\equiv -\frac{1}{3} u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} D_\mu a^\mu + \frac{1}{3} a^\mu a_\mu, \\ \Sigma_\mu^e &\equiv -\frac{1}{3} \theta a_\mu - a^\nu \sigma_{\mu\nu} + 3a^\nu \omega_{\mu\nu} - h_\mu^\nu \dot{a}_\nu, \\ \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee} &\equiv a_{\langle\mu} a_{\nu\rangle} + D_{\langle\mu} a_{\nu\rangle} - u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu} - \frac{1}{2} h_{\langle\mu}^\alpha h_{\nu\rangle}^\beta R_{\alpha\beta}, \\ \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa} &\equiv 2(\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \omega_{\mu\nu}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The representation (9) of Π in terms of the position drift $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is a simple truncated expression at quadratic order in (\mathbf{e} , $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$). (Compare to the representation (5) with expansion in (\mathbf{e} , \mathbf{d}), which has terms up till fourth order in \mathbf{e} .) This representation is furthermore of observational interest, since position drifts of galaxies are detectable with facilities such as Gaia⁵ [24]. It is interesting to note that a general relation between redshift drift and position drift has also been obtained in⁶ [11].

We now consider the redshift drift signal of nearby sources by expanding the signal in the affine parameter along the incoming null geodesic. Expanding (4) around the point of observation \mathcal{O} , we have that the redshift drift

signal to lowest order in affine distance along the null ray reads

$$\left. \frac{dz}{d\tau} \right|_{\mathcal{O}} = -E_\varepsilon \Pi_{\mathcal{O}} \Delta\lambda + \mathcal{O}(\Delta\lambda^2), \quad (11)$$

where $\Delta\lambda \equiv \lambda_\varepsilon - \lambda_{\mathcal{O}}$. We can rewrite (11) as a first order Taylor series expansion in redshift by noting that

$$\frac{dE}{d\lambda} = -k^\mu \nabla_\mu (k^\nu u_\nu) = -E^2 \mathfrak{H}, \quad (12)$$

with

$$\mathfrak{H} \equiv \frac{1}{3} \theta - e^\mu a_\mu + e^\mu e^\nu \sigma_{\mu\nu}, \quad (13)$$

which, assuming that the function $\lambda \mapsto z(\lambda)$ is invertible, gives [40]

$$\Delta\lambda = -\frac{1}{E_{\mathcal{O}} \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}} z + \mathcal{O}(z^2) \quad (14)$$

along each null ray. Using (14) in (11), we finally have the first order cosmographic expression for redshift drift

$$\left. \frac{dz}{d\tau} \right|_{\mathcal{O}} = -\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{O}} \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}} z + \mathcal{O}(z^2), \quad \mathfrak{d} \equiv -\Pi/\mathfrak{H}^2. \quad (15)$$

Thus, we see that the redshift drift signal of nearby sources is given by $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$, which are *truncated* series expansions in the direction of incoming light from the source $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{O}}$ and its position drift $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{\mathcal{O}}$. We note that this truncation is *exact*, and that no model assumptions have been used in the expressions (9), (10) and (13). We might identify \mathfrak{H} as a natural generalised ‘Hubble parameter’ prescribing the evolution of photon energy along null rays⁷, and identify \mathfrak{d} as an effective observational deceleration parameter for the redshift drift signal as motivated by the well known FLRW limit of (15): $-q_0 H_0 z + \mathcal{O}(z^2)$, where q_0 and H_0 are the present epoch deceleration parameter and Hubble parameter of the FLRW model [43, 44]. We note that an alternative effective observational deceleration parameter, \mathfrak{Q} , has been defined from the expansion of luminosity distance $d_L = z/\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}} + (1 - \mathfrak{Q}_{\mathcal{O}}) z^2 / (2\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}) + \mathcal{O}(z^3)$ valid for general space-time geometries [40, 45]. Thus, the redshift drift data and distance-redshift data motivate two different generalisations of the FLRW deceleration parameter. This is not surprising, since we might expect different observations to be sensitive to inhomogeneities in the underlying space-time solution in different ways.

Equation (15), together with (9), (10) and (13), is the *main result of this paper*. In the $\mathcal{O}(z)$ vicinity of the observer, the general expression for redshift drift is given in terms of a *finite* number of

⁵ The identification of an irrotational coordinate system is needed for isolating the position drift effect from local kinematics of the observer [24]. Such a non-rotating reference frame might be defined relative to a ‘background’ of extragalactic sources [25].

⁶ The formalism presented in [11] does not rely on a congruence description of the observers and emitters of light, but instead introduces vector fields from parallel transport of the observer and emitter 4-velocities along the null ray, with respect to which observables are decomposed. Therefore the results found for redshift drift in [11] are not directly comparable to those of the present paper.

⁷ The identification of \mathfrak{H} as a generalisation of the FLRW Hubble parameter can further be motivated by noting that the first order term in the Taylor series expansion of luminosity distance is given by z/\mathfrak{H} , as detailed in [40].

physically interpretable coefficients, which can be measured given sufficient data and sky coverage: Given data $\mathbf{e}_\mathcal{O}$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathcal{O}$ for each source, the effective observational Hubble parameter $\mathfrak{H}_\mathcal{O}$ represents 9 degrees of freedom⁸: $\{\theta, a_\mu, \sigma_{\mu\nu}\}|_\mathcal{O}$, while $\Pi_\mathcal{O}$ represents 12 independent degrees of freedom⁹: $\{\Sigma^o, \Sigma_\mu^e, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}\}|_\mathcal{O}$. In a fully model-independent analysis, the coefficients $\{\theta, a_\mu, \sigma_{\mu\nu}\}|_\mathcal{O}$ and $\{\Sigma^o, \Sigma_\mu^e, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}\}|_\mathcal{O}$ are to be treated as free parameters giving a total of 21 independent degrees of freedom to be determined from data. However, complementary data¹⁰ or physically motivated assumptions can reduce the number of independent parameters. In the following section we shall consider approximations that reduce the number of degrees of freedom in various situations.

PHYSICALLY MOTIVATED APPROXIMATIONS

We shall now discuss limits of the general cosmographic expression for redshift drift (15). We first discuss the ‘monopole limit’ relevant for when the sources in the cosmological survey are sufficiently uniformly distributed over the observer’s sky. Next we shall discuss the potential of measuring the cosmological position drift effect with upcoming surveys, and perform an order of magnitude analysis of the terms in the expansion (9) involving the position drift. We then discuss the limiting case $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathcal{O} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{a}_\mathcal{O} = \mathbf{0}$, valid for when position drift is subdominant in the expression for redshift drift and the observer congruence is well approximated as being geodesic.

The monopole limit:

We might analyse the monopole limit $\mathfrak{H}_\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \theta_\mathcal{O}/3$ and $\Pi_\mathcal{O} \rightarrow -\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu|_\mathcal{O} + \Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o$, corresponding to the situation where the redshift drift signal is isotropic (independent of $\mathbf{e}_\mathcal{O}$) as seen by the observer $\frac{dz}{d\tau}|_\mathcal{O} \rightarrow 3 \frac{-\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu|_\mathcal{O} + \Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o}{\theta_\mathcal{O}} z + \mathcal{O}(z^2)$. For a uniform distribution of sources over the observer’s sky, we might hypothesise the average redshift drift signal over the observer’s sky to be well probed by this monopole limit – even if higher order multipoles are significant in the case of individual sources – since any traceless component is expected to cancel when averaged uniformly over directions. The monopole limit of the

redshift drift signal leaves the 2 independent degrees of freedom $\theta_\mathcal{O}$ and $\Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o$ to be determined from data¹¹.

The monopole limit of the redshift drift signal contains contributions from space-time structure via the position drift (see the below discussion on position drift), 4-acceleration of the observer congruence, and the Ricci curvature term $R_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu$, as can be seen from the expression for $\Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o$ in (10). The extrapolation of the FLRW result for redshift drift to the general case is thus non-trivial, even in the monopole limit of the expression. In particular we note that the isotropised $\mathcal{O}(z)$ redshift drift signal does not in general probe the deceleration of length scales in the observer frame directly, which is contrary to the exact FLRW limit. The contributions to the monopolar redshift drift signal from position drift are non-positive – as can be seen directly from (9) and (10) – while the 4-acceleration can contribute with terms of either sign, depending on its spatial gradient $D_\mu a^\mu|_\mathcal{O}$. If the 4-acceleration and its spatial gradient are subdominant¹², the only way to obtain a positive monopolar redshift drift signal in the $\mathcal{O}(z)$ vicinity of the observer, is thus to have $R_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu < 0$ which in a general relativistic context is equivalent to the violation of the strong energy condition. This conclusion for low redshift measurements is similar to that found in [35] for redshift drift signals of sources located at distances much greater than an approximate homogeneity scale, where positive values of redshift drift were found to be likely caused only by violation of the strong energy condition or by a special 4-acceleration profile of the observer congruence.

Accounting for position drift:

We note that a full model-independent analysis requires knowledge of $\mathbf{e}_\mathcal{O}$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathcal{O}$ for each astrophysical source. While the position of the source on the sky, $\mathbf{e}_\mathcal{O}$, is immediately known (though note the aberration effect if a change of the inertial frame of reference is performed [12]), its drift, $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathcal{O}$, is a measurement that is at least as delicate to measure as the redshift drift signal itself. The position drift considered in this paper might be viewed as an *intrinsic* parallax effect [28] due to inhomogeneities in the expanding space-time congruence description¹³ and does not include the local motion effects of the Earth

⁸ Spatial vectors represent 3 degrees of freedom, whereas spatial symmetric and trace-free tensors with 2 indices represent 5 degrees of freedom.

⁹ The shear term in $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}|_\mathcal{O}$ is specified by the quadrupole moment $\sigma_{\mu\nu}|_\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathfrak{H}_\mathcal{O}$. This leaves $\omega_{\mu\nu}|_\mathcal{O}$ to be determined independently, which is specified by the 3 degrees of freedom of a three-dimensional antisymmetric tensor with two indices.

¹⁰ If for instance the coefficients $\{\theta, a_\mu, \sigma_{\mu\nu}\}|_\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathfrak{H}_\mathcal{O}$ have already been measured by analysis of distance-redshift data as proposed in [40], this leaves the coefficients $\{\Sigma^o, \Sigma_\mu^e, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}\}|_\mathcal{O}$ to be determined.

¹¹ Under the approximation $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_\mathcal{O} = \mathbf{0}$ for each source (see below), the $\mathcal{O}(z)$ monopole signal reduces to $3\Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o z/\theta_\mathcal{O}$, which renders $\theta_\mathcal{O}$ and $\Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o$ degenerate, leaving one effective parameter $\Sigma_\mathcal{O}^o/\theta_\mathcal{O}$ to be determined from data.

¹² Vanishing 4-acceleration occurs for instance when the energy content of the Universe is well described by a dust source, which is typically assumed to be the case in general relativistic modelling of the late universe.

¹³ An expanding congruence description of the emitters and observers is needed for the redshift function to be a well defined parameter along the individual null rays, and for regularity of the series expansion (14) – see [40] for detailed descriptions of regularity requirements in the the context of luminosity distance cosmography.

relative to the local group of galaxies, which must be accounted for separately (See the discussion in the below section). Even though position drift effects associated with large scale cosmic structure could be determined with upcoming Gaia data [23, 24], it might be non-trivial to combine such detections with detections of redshift drift for a combined analysis of the two effects. In the following we shall estimate the magnitude of the position drift effect relative to the expected redshift drift effect from existing order of magnitude estimates in the literature. Cosmological position drifts of galaxies with $z \sim 1$ have been estimated to be of order $\lesssim 10^{-6}$ arcsec/year $\approx 10^{-12}$ rad/year for off-center observers in LTB void models [23, 24]. Using these estimates we have $\sqrt{\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu}|_{\mathcal{O}} \lesssim 10^{-12}$ year $^{-1}$. For local expansion rates comparable to current estimates of the FLRW Hubble parameter: $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}} \sim H_0 \sim 10^{-10}$ year $^{-1}$, we have that the contribution from the first term of (9) in (15) is of size $\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu / \mathfrak{H}|_{\mathcal{O}} \lesssim 10^{-14}$ year $^{-1}$. Similarly we have that the coupled term $e^\mu \kappa^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}$ of (9) contributes in (15) with a term of size $e^\mu \kappa^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa} / \mathfrak{H}|_{\mathcal{O}} \lesssim 10^{-2} e^\mu \hat{\kappa}^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa}|_{\mathcal{O}}$, with the above order of magnitude estimates of $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ the norm of $\kappa_{\mathcal{O}}$, where $\hat{\kappa}_{\mathcal{O}} \equiv \kappa / \sqrt{\kappa^\mu \kappa_\mu}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the unit vector aligned with $\kappa_{\mathcal{O}}$. If off diagonal components of the expansion are not dominating over the isotropic part of the expansion, i.e., $e^\mu \hat{\kappa}^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa} = e^\mu \hat{\kappa}^\nu 2(\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \omega_{\mu\nu}) \lesssim \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$, then we finally have that $e^\mu \kappa^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{e\kappa} / \mathfrak{H}|_{\mathcal{O}} \lesssim 10^{-12}$ year $^{-1}$. For comparison, redshift drift signals in the Λ CDM model have magnitudes of $\sim 10^{-11}$ year $^{-1}$ for sources with $z \sim 1$ [12]. If these order of magnitude estimates hold in the actual Universe for typical sources, then we might neglect the position drift of the sources in a lowest order analysis of the redshift drift signal.

The geodesic and position drift free approximation:

Let us suppose that the above relative order of estimates concerning position drift apply to the low-redshift regime of interest, such that we can set $\kappa_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbf{0}$ for a lowest order description of redshift drift. Let us further suppose that the cosmological congruence description is well approximated as being geodesic, such that $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbf{0}$. This is a reasonable assumption above scales of virialized structure, where effective hydrodynamic pressure from velocity dispersion tends to be negligible [46]. Under this approximation, we have that (9) as evaluated at the observer reduces to

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{O}} = \Sigma^{\circ}|_{\mathcal{O}} + e^\mu e^\nu \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}|_{\mathcal{O}} \quad (\text{limit: } a_{\mathcal{O}}^\mu = 0, \kappa_{\mathcal{O}}^\mu = 0) \quad (16)$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{\circ}|_{\mathcal{O}} &\equiv -\frac{1}{3} u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu}|_{\mathcal{O}} \quad (\text{limit: } a_{\mathcal{O}}^\mu = 0, \kappa_{\mathcal{O}}^\mu = 0), \\ \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}|_{\mathcal{O}} &\equiv -u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}|_{\mathcal{O}} - \frac{1}{2} h_{(\mu}^\alpha h_{\nu)}^\beta R_{\alpha\beta}|_{\mathcal{O}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

while $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ in the case of zero 4-acceleration reads

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}} \equiv \frac{1}{3} \theta_{\mathcal{O}} + e^\mu e^\nu \sigma_{\mu\nu}|_{\mathcal{O}} \quad (\text{limit: } a_{\mathcal{O}}^\mu = 0). \quad (18)$$

In this case we are left with the coefficients $\{\Sigma^{\circ}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ representing 6 degrees of freedom in addition to the 6 degrees of freedom incorporated in the coefficients $\{\theta, \sigma_{\mu\nu}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ of $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$. This gives a total of 12 parameters, of which one degree of freedom is redundant¹⁴. When the coefficients of $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ can be determined by complementary data, for instance by analysis of standardisable candles [40], the redshift drift signal is given by the 6 degrees of freedom $\{\Sigma^{\circ}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$. Let us consider the significance of the coefficients in (17). The monopole Σ° is given by the source term, $u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$, of the focusing of the observer congruence worldlines. The quadrupole $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}$ is given in terms of the electric part of the Weyl tensor in the observer frame, $u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$, together with the trace-free part of the spatially projected Ricci tensor, $h_{(\mu}^\alpha h_{\nu)}^\beta R_{\alpha\beta}$, which are source terms of the evolution of shear in the observer frame. In a general relativistic hydrodynamical description, the latter term is identified as the anisotropic stress in the observer frame. The electric part of the Weyl tensor, $u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$ is not necessarily small in the ‘weak field’ or ‘small relative velocity’ limit of gravity. See equation (113) of [47] for the expression for the electric part of the Weyl tensor in linearised perturbation theory around a flat FLRW model. In the Newtonian limit, the electric part of the Weyl tensor translates into the tidal tensor [48]. We can further remark that the eigenbasis of $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ and $u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$ coincide in irrotational dust space-times with vanishing divergence of the magnetic Weyl tensor [49]. Under this model assumption, which might be thought of as a stable approximation in the linear regime of density contrasts [49], the number of independent degrees of freedom represented by $\{\Sigma^{\circ}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ reduces from 6 to 3 degrees of freedom. Under the present approximation, and independent determination of $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$, the redshift drift signal at low redshifts directly measures these curvature invariants.

DISCUSSION OF UPCOMING SURVEYS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE FORMALISM

An upcoming probe for the detection of redshift drift is the Lyman- α forest, which is the observed absorption lines in the spectra of quasars comming from the Lyman- α transition of the hydrogen atom [21, 50]. The Lyman- α forest is most efficiently probed in the range $2 \lesssim z \lesssim 5$ [9, 21], and is therefore not suitable for the cosmographic framework developed in this paper. Another promising experiment is to measure redshift drift with the neutral hydrogen 21-cm emission lines of galaxies, as is the aim with SKA experiment [19, 51]. Significant detections of

¹⁴ An overall scaling of the coefficients $\{\Sigma^{\circ}, \Sigma_{\mu\nu}^{ee}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ by a scalar can be absorbed into an overall rescaling of $\{\theta, \sigma_{\mu\nu}\}|_{\mathcal{O}}$ by the inverse of the same scalar, in the case where $\kappa_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbf{0}$.

the redshift drift signal at $z \lesssim 0.3$ are currently predicted be within reach in ~ 40 years of observation time for SKA Phase1, while for SKA Phase2 the observation time needed for a significant detection could drop to ~ 0.5 years [22, 51]. See also [52] for an outline of potential complementary measurements of redshift drift in the low-redshift regime.

In this paper, we use a congruence description for the emitters and observers of light in the space-time, in order to make a cosmographic representation of redshift drift signals possible. The cosmography has the advantage that it can be directly applied to model-independent analysis of redshift drift, as detailed in the above analysis. However, the congruence description is also a limitation of the presented framework, as it necessarily implies the (implicit) coarse-graining over scales where caustics in the matter distribution appear. Furthermore, regularity of the cosmographic expression (15) requires invertibility of the function $\lambda \mapsto z(\lambda)$ which prevents the inclusion of physics below and around the scales of virialized structure – see the discussion in [40] in context of luminosity distance cosmography. Change in the redshift signal due to local motion effects are thus unaccounted for in the presented framework. The special relativistic acceleration of the solar system relative to an idealised ‘background’ of extragalactic sources, has been inferred through the secular aberration drift of radio sources and quasars [53, 54], with an inferred acceleration smaller than, but of the same order as, the Hubble constant, and might thus be expected to contribute significantly to the redshift drift signal. The implications for redshift drift of Newtonian 3-acceleration of the solar system relative to a hypothesised frame of idealised Hubble flow was formulated in [9], and investigated in detail in [55], where a dipolar signature in the redshift drift signal with amplitude comparable to the predicted monopole signal from the rate of change of cosmic expansion in the Λ CDM model was found. This predicted dipolar signal is independent of redshift of the sources [55], and the effect might thus be distinguished from the cosmological signal, which will in general be redshift dependent. In particular, we note that the dipolar and quadrupolar effects in (15) caused by the 4-acceleration of the observers in the expanding cosmological congruence description through the appearance of \mathbf{a} in (13) and (10) are *not* identical to the signatures of local aberration effects. We expect the dipole in the redshift drift signal to be dominated by the local secular aberration drift, while a quadrupole in data might be a signature of cosmological Weyl curvature/shearing effects, cf. (16) and the discussions below this equation. Local aberration effects might be corrected for separately, or alternatively be integrated in the cosmological analysis, by for instance employing formalism for combining the full hierarchy of scales relevant for cosmological observation [11, 31].

CONCLUSION

We have presented a framework for model-independent analysis of redshift drift data from nearby sources. Due to the representation of the redshift drift signal in terms of truncated multipole series in the incoming direction of the null ray and the position drift of the source as seen by the observer, the *exact* anisotropic expression for redshift drift in the $\mathcal{O}(z)$ vicinity of the observer is given by a *finite* number of coefficients. A fully model-independent analysis, making no use of complementary constraints or assumptions about the space-time congruence or the metric tensor of the Universe, implies 21 independent degrees of freedom to be determined. These degrees of freedom describe combinations of kinematic and curvature variables associated with the observer congruence and projections of the Ricci and Weyl curvatures of the space-time. The formalism allows to transparently impose assumptions on the observer congruence description and the curvature of space-time, which might reduce the number of independent degrees of freedom to be determined from data. In the approximation of subdominant position drift and 4-acceleration of the congruence description, the number of independent degrees of freedom reduces to 11 – and further reduces to 6 independent degrees of freedom in the case where the effective Hubble constant $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ can be measured by complementary data. In a general relativistic hydrodynamic setting with subdominant anisotropic stress, these 6 independent degrees of freedom are given by the focusing term $u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$ (1 degree of freedom) and the electric part of the Weyl tensor $u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$ (5 degrees of freedom). The number of degrees of freedom might be even further reduced – see discussion below equation (18). The curvature invariants $u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$ and $u^\rho u^\sigma C_{\rho\mu\sigma\nu}$ can in this case be determined directly from redshift drift data given sufficient constraining power for sources at low redshift. For an approximately isotropic sky-sampling, the monopole term (given by the source term $u^\mu u^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$) of the redshift drift signal dominates, constituting a single scalar degree of freedom to be determined from data. The framework in the present paper has formal similarities with that presented in [40] for the analysis of distance-redshift data. The frameworks can be combined for joint model-independent constraints on the kinematics of the Universe.

I wish to thank Mikołaj Korzyński for valuable comments, which helped improve this paper. I would also like to thank Thomas Buchert for his reading and comments on the manuscript, and Roy Maartens and Carlos Martins for correspondence regarding forecasts of redshift drift detections. This work is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement ERC advanced grant 740021–ARTHUS, PI: Thomas Buchert).

-
- * asta.heinesen@ens-lyon.fr
- [1] G. Lemaître, *Un Univers homogène de masse constante et de rayon croissant rendant compte de la vitesse radiale des nébuleuses extra-galactiques*, Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles **A47** (1927), 49, Republished in: Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **91** (1931), 438
 - [2] V. M. Slipher, *Nebulae*, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society **56** (1917), 403
 - [3] E. P. Hubble, *A relation between distance and radial velocity among extra-galactic nebulae*, PNAS **15** (1929), 168
 - [4] T. Buchert, A. A. Coley, H. Kleinert, B. F. Roukema and D. L. Wiltshire, *Observational Challenges for the Standard FLRW Model*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **25** (2016), 1630007 [arXiv:1512.03313]
 - [5] L. Perivolaropoulos and F. Skara, *Challenges for Λ CDM: An update*, [arXiv:2105.05208]
 - [6] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri and D. Scolnic, *Large Magellanic Cloud Cepheid Standards Provide a 1% Foundation for the Determination of the Hubble Constant and Stronger Evidence for Physics beyond Λ CDM*, Astrophys. J. **876** (2019), 85 [arXiv:1903.07603]
 - [7] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess and J. Silk, *In the Realm of the Hubble tension – a Review of Solutions*, [arXiv:2103.01183]
 - [8] C. Quercellini, M. Quartin and L. Amendola, *Possibility of Detecting Anisotropic Expansion of the Universe by Very Accurate Astrometry Measurements*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009), 151302 [arXiv:0809.3675]
 - [9] J. Liske, A. Grazian, E. Vanzella, M. Dessauges, M. Viel, L. Pasquini, M. Haehnelt, S. Cristiani, F. Pepe and G. Avila, *et al.*, *Cosmic dynamics in the era of Extremely Large Telescopes*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **386** (2008), 1192 [arXiv:0802.1532]
 - [10] C. Quercellini, L. Amendola, A. Balbi, P. Cabella and M. Quartin, *Real-time Cosmology*, Phys. Rept. **521** (2012), 95-134 [arXiv:1011.2646]
 - [11] M. Korzyński and J. Kopiński, *Optical drift effects in general relativity*, JCAP **03** (2018), 012 [arXiv:1711.00584]
 - [12] K. Bolejko, C. Wang and G. F. Lewis, *Direct detection of the cosmic expansion: the redshift drift and the flux drift*, [arXiv:1907.04495]
 - [13] A. Sandage, *The Change of Redshift and Apparent Luminosity of Galaxies due to the Deceleration of Selected Expanding Universes*, Astrophysical Journal **136** (1962), 319
 - [14] G. C. McVittie, *Appendix to The Change of Redshift and Apparent Luminosity of Galaxies due to the Deceleration of Selected Expanding Universes*, Astrophysical Journal **136** (1962), 334
 - [15] A. Loeb, *Direct Measurement of Cosmological Parameters from the Cosmic Deceleration of Extra-galactic Objects*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **499** (1998), L111 [astro-ph/9802122]
 - [16] L. Pasquini et al., *CODEX: Measuring the Expansion of the Universe (and beyond)*, The Messenger **122** (2005), 10
 - [17] C. J. A. P. Martins, *Fundamental Physics and Cosmology in the Extremely Large Telescopes Era*, [arXiv:1902.01783]
 - [18] R. Maartens *et al.* [SKA Cosmology SWG], *Overview of Cosmology with the SKA*, PoS **AASKA14** (2015), 016 [arXiv:1501.04076]
 - [19] H. R. Klöckner, D. Obreschkow, C. Martins, A. Raccanelli, D. Champion, A. L. Roy, A. Lobanov, J. Wagner and R. Keller, *Real time cosmology - A direct measure of the expansion rate of the Universe with the SKA*, PoS **AASKA14** (2015), 027 [arXiv:1501.03822]
 - [20] D. J. Bacon *et al.* [SKA], *Cosmology with Phase 1 of the Square Kilometre Array: Red Book 2018: Technical specifications and performance forecasts*, Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral. **37** (2020), e007 [arXiv:1811.02743]
 - [21] A. Balbi and C. Quercellini, *The time evolution of cosmological redshift as a test of dark energy*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **382** (2007), 1623 [arXiv:0704.2350]
 - [22] C. S. Alves, A. C. O. Leite, C. J. A. P. Martins, J. G. B. Matos and T. A. Silva, *Forecasts of redshift drift constraints on cosmological parameters*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **488** (2019), 3607 [arXiv:1907.05151]
 - [23] M. Quartin and L. Amendola, *Distinguishing Between Void Models and Dark Energy with Cosmic Parallax and Redshift Drift*, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010), 043522 [arXiv:0909.4954]
 - [24] A. Krasinski and K. Bolejko, *Redshift propagation equations in the $\beta' \neq 0$ Szekeres models*, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011), 083503 [arXiv:1007.2083]
 - [25] F. Mignard, S. Klioner, L. Lindgren, J. Hernández, U. Bastian and A. Bombrun, *Gaia Data Release 2. The celestial reference frame (Gaia-CRF2)*, Astron. Astrophys. **616** (2018), 1 [arXiv:1804.09377]
 - [26] J. P. Uzan, C. Clarkson and G. F. R. Ellis, *Time drift of cosmological redshifts as a test of the Copernican principle*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008), 191303 [arXiv:0801.0068]
 - [27] A. Balcerzak and M. P. Dabrowski, *Redshift drift in a pressure gradient cosmology*, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013), 063506 [arXiv:1210.6331]
 - [28] S. Räsänen, *A covariant treatment of cosmic parallax*, JCAP **03** (2014), 035 [arXiv:1312.5738]
 - [29] P. Fleury, C. Pitrou and J. P. Uzan, *Light propagation in a homogeneous and anisotropic universe*, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015), 043511 [arXiv:1410.8473]
 - [30] C. Hellaby and A. Walters, *Calculating observables in inhomogeneous cosmologies. Part I: general framework*, JCAP **02** (2018), 015 [arXiv:1708.01031]
 - [31] M. Korzyński and E. Villa, *Geometric optics in relativistic cosmology: new formulation and a new observable*, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020), 063506 [arXiv:1912.04988]
 - [32] O. H. Marcori, C. Pitrou, J. P. Uzan and T. S. Pereira, *Direction and redshift drifts for general observers and their applications in cosmology*, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018), 023517 [arXiv:1805.12121]
 - [33] S. M. Kocsabang, *Observations in statistically homogeneous, locally inhomogeneous cosmological toy-models without FLRW backgrounds*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **498** (2020), L135 [arXiv:2008.07108]
 - [34] A. Heinesen, *Multipole decomposition of redshift drift: Model-independent mapping of the expansion history of the Universe*, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021), 023537 [arXiv:2011.10048]

- [35] A. Heinesen, Redshift drift as a model-independent probe of dark energy, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), L081302 [arXiv:2102.03774]
- [36] J. Kristian and R. K. Sachs, *Observations in cosmology*, *Astrophysical Journal* **143** (1966), 379
- [37] G.F.R. Ellis, S.D. Nel, R. Maartens, W.R. Stoeger and A.P. Whitman, Ideal observational cosmology, *Physics Reports* **124** (1985), 315
- [38] G. F. R. Ellis and M. A. H. MacCallum, *A class of homogeneous cosmological models. II. Observations*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **19** (1970), 31
- [39] C. Clarkson, G. F. R. Ellis, A. Faltenbacher, R. Maartens, O. Umeh and J. P. Uzan, *(Mis-)Interpreting supernovae observations in a lumpy universe*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **426** (2012), 1121 [arXiv:1109.2484]
- [40] A. Heinesen, Multipole decomposition of the general luminosity distance 'Hubble law' – a new framework for observational cosmology, [arXiv:2010.06534]
- [41] A. J. M. Spencer, *A note on the decomposition of tensors into traceless symmetric tensors*, *International Journal of Engineering Science* **8** (1970), 475
- [42] H. van Elst, Extensions and applications of 1 + 3 decomposition methods in general relativistic cosmological modelling, PhD thesis (1996), University of London
- [43] Neben A and Turner M, Beyond H_0 and q_0 : Cosmology is no longer just two numbers, *Astrophys. J.* **769** (2012), 133 [arXiv:1209.0480]
- [44] F. S. N. Lobo, J. P. Mimoso and M. Visser, Cosmographic analysis of redshift drift, *JCAP* **4** (2020), 043 [arXiv:2001.11964]
- [45] C. Clarkson and O. Umeh, *Is backreaction really small within concordance cosmology?*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011), 164010 [arXiv:1105.1886]
- [46] T. Buchert and A. Dominguez, Adhesive gravitational clustering, *Astron. Astrophys.* **438** (2005), 443 [astro-ph/0502318]
- [47] M. Bruni, P. K. S. Dunsby and G. F. R. Ellis, Cosmological Perturbations and the Physical Meaning of Gauge-invariant Variables, *Astrophys. J.* **395** (1992), 395
- [48] J. Ehlers and T. Buchert, On the Newtonian Limit of the Weyl Tensor, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **41** (2009), 2153 [arXiv:0907.2645]
- [49] R. Maartens, W. M. Lesame and G. F. R. Ellis, Consistency of dust solutions with $\text{div } H = 0$, *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997), 5219 [gr-qc/9703080]
- [50] M. Rauch, The Lyman alpha forest in the spectra of quasistellar objects, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **36** (1998), 267 [arXiv:astro-ph/9806286]
- [51] C. J. A. P. Martins, M. Martinelli, E. Calabrese and M. P. L. P. Ramos, Real-time cosmography with redshift derivatives, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016), 043001 [arXiv:1606.07261]
- [52] A. G. Kim, E. V. Linder, J. Edelman and D. Erskine, Giving Cosmic Redshift Drift a Whirl, *Astropart. Phys.* **62** (2015), 195 [arXiv:1402.6614]
- [53] M. H. Xu, G. L. Wang and M. Zhao, The solar acceleration obtained by VLBI observations, *Astron. Astrophys.* **544** (2012), A135
- [54] Gaia Collaboration, S. Klioner et al., Gaia Early Data Release 3: Acceleration of the Solar System from Gaia astrometry, *Astron. Astrophys.* **649** (2021), A9 [arXiv:2012.02036]
- [55] T. Inoue, E. Komatsu, W. Aoki, T. Chiba, T. Misawa and T. Usuda, The effect of our local motion on the Sandage–Loeb test of the cosmic expansion, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Jap.* **72** (2020), 131 [arXiv:1911.01467]