Time-Varying Scalar Mass in uDRD: Alleviating JWST High-Redshift Galaxy Anomalies

With Substantial Narrowing of the H_0 Tension and Testable S_8 Predictions

E. W. Maina

November 5, 2025
Final Submission Version

Abstract

We extend the unified Dimensional Resonance Dynamics (uDRD) framework by promoting the scalar field mass m_ϕ from a constant to a time-dependent parameter: $m_\phi^2(a) = m_0^2 \cdot a^{-\gamma}$, where γ is a dimensionless exponent controlling the evolution rate. This single modification preserves all established successes of uDRD (Solar System screening, galaxy rotation curves, cluster phenomenology, cosmological EFT compliance) while addressing critical observational tensions in the early universe. When $\gamma = 0$, the model reduces to standard uDRD; for $\gamma > 0$, the ϕ-field's energy density scales as $\rho_\phi \propto a^{-(3+\gamma)}$, providing enhanced gravitational support at high redshift. We derive this scaling rigorously from oscillating scalar field dynamics in curved spacetime.

For a benchmark value $\gamma = 0.05$—selected to balance observational improvements against Big Bang Nucleosynthesis constraints—we predict: (1) approximately 14% more effective dark matter at $z = 12$, enabling 20% more massive halos that partially alleviate (though do not fully resolve) the JWST "too-early" galaxy anomaly; (2) a $\sim$ 4–5% reduction in the sound horizon r_s, increasing the CMB-inferred Hubble constant from 67.4 to approximately 70–71 $\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$, thereby *substantially narrowing* the H_0 tension from $\sim 5.6\sigma$ to ~ 2–3σ; (3) a $\sim 6\%$ increase in σ_8 due to enhanced structure growth, potentially worsening the S_8 tension by $\sim 1\sigma$. The enhanced early-universe energy density has negligible impact on Big Bang Nucleosynthesis ($\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \ll 0.01$), leaving this mechanism unconstrained by primordial abundance measurements. All predictions are immediately falsifiable with current data from JWST, Planck, DESI, and eROSITA. We discuss degeneracies with early dark energy models and provide criteria to distinguish scenarios based on persistent late-time effects in structure formation and void lensing.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation: New tensions in the early universe

The unified Dimensional Resonance Dynamics (uDRD) framework [1] was developed to provide a cross-scale description of gravitational phenomena from quantum scales (fm) to cosmological distances (Gpc), using a two-field geometric extension of General Relativity. The theory successfully addresses multiple observational challenges: it reproduces galaxy rotation curves and the radial acceleration relation (RAR) with a single parameter η, explains colliding cluster phenomenology (Bullet Cluster, MACS J0025, Abell 520) through a shared amplitude $A(a)$ without per-system retuning, maintains Solar System compliance with margins orders of magnitude below Cassini/LLR bounds, and integrates into the Effective Field Theory of Dark Energy (EFT-of-DE) with luminal tensor propagation ($\alpha_T = 0$).

However, two critical observational tensions have intensified in recent years:

JWST high-redshift galaxy anomalies. The James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) has revealed an unexpectedly high abundance of massive, luminous galaxies at redshifts $z \gtrsim 10$ to 15 [2, 3, 4]. Observations from the JADES, CEERS, and GLASS surveys show galaxies with stellar masses $M_* \sim 10^{10}$ to $10^{11}\,M_\odot$ at cosmic ages $t \lesssim 500\,\mathrm{Myr}$, appearing "too massive, too early" relative to ΛCDM predictions. The cumulative number density of these objects exceeds ΛCDM expectations by factors of 3 to 10, depending on mass threshold and redshift bin [4]. While systematic uncertainties in stellar population synthesis and photometric redshifts remain under investigation, the tension appears robust across multiple surveys and selection methods.

The H_0 tension. The Hubble constant measured from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) yields $H_0^{\mathrm{CMB}} = 67.4 \pm 0.5\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$ [5], while local distance ladder measurements give $H_0^{\mathrm{local}} = 73.0 \pm 1.0\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$ [6]. This $\sim 5.6\sigma$ discrepancy persists despite extensive scrutiny of systematic uncertainties in both approaches.

1.2 The uDRD-evolved extension

We extend uDRD by introducing a *single new parameter* γ that controls the time evolution of the ϕ-field's mass:

$$m_\phi^2(a) = m_0^2 \cdot a^{-\gamma}, \tag{1}$$

where m_0 is the present-day ($a = 1$) mass scale and γ is a dimensionless exponent.

Enhanced early-universe density. For $\gamma > 0$, the ϕ-field was denser in the past. At a given redshift z, the energy density ratio relative to standard CDM is

$$R(z) \equiv \frac{\rho_{\phi,\mathrm{evolved}}(z)}{\rho_{\phi,\mathrm{standard}}(z)} = (1+z)^\gamma. \tag{2}$$

At $z = 12$ (a key JWST redshift) with $\gamma = 0.05$, we obtain $R = (13)^{0.05} \approx 1.14$: the ϕ-field provides approximately 14% more gravitational support than in standard uDRD or ΛCDM. We adopt $\gamma = 0.05$ as our benchmark value, chosen to balance JWST improvements against potential constraints from primordial nucleosynthesis (though as shown in Sec. 3.5, the model is actually unconstrained by BBN).

Theoretical justification. The ansatz (1) represents the phenomenological exploration of a well-established theoretical mechanism. In quantum field theory on curved spacetime, scalar field masses generically acquire curvature-dependent corrections through non-minimal coupling to the Ricci scalar:

$$m_{\rm eff}^2 = m_0^2 + \xi\, R, \tag{3}$$

where ξ is a dimensionless coupling constant and R is the Ricci scalar. On a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FRW) background, $R = 6(2H^2 + \dot{H})$. For a matter-dominated universe, $H \propto a^{-3/2}$, giving $R \propto a^{-3}$, which naturally induces power-law running of the effective mass. The parameter γ is therefore the *measured strength* of this fundamental, expected effect.

2 Theory: Derivation from First Principles

2.1 The oscillating regime and matter-like behavior

When the field oscillates ($H < m_\phi(a)$), the time-averaged field amplitude $\langle\bar{\phi}^2\rangle$ dilutes as a^{-3} to ensure the total energy density behaves as pressureless dust. However, the *potential energy density* now includes the time-varying mass:

$$\rho_\phi(a) \approx m_\phi^2(a) \cdot \langle\bar{\phi}^2(a)\rangle \propto a^{-\gamma} \cdot a^{-3} = a^{-(3+\gamma)}. \tag{4}$$

This is the central result: the ϕ-field's energy density scales as $a^{-(3+\gamma)}$, not a^{-3}.

2.2 Modified Friedmann equation

The modified Hubble parameter is:

$$H^2(a) = H_0^2 \left[\Omega_{r,0}\, a^{-4} + \Omega_{b,0}\, a^{-3} + \Omega_{\phi,0}\, a^{-(3+\gamma)} + \Omega_{\rm DE}(a)\right]. \tag{5}$$

The term $\Omega_{\phi,0}\, a^{-(3+\gamma)}$ replaces the standard CDM term and is the source of all phenomenological differences.

3 Quantitative Observable Predictions

3.1 CMB acoustic scale and substantial narrowing of the H_0 tension

Physical mechanism. The sound horizon at the drag epoch ($z_* \approx 1090$) is

$$r_s = \int_0^{a_*} \frac{c_s(a)\, da}{a^2 H(a)}, \tag{6}$$

where $c_s = c/\sqrt{3(1+3\rho_b/(4\rho_\gamma))}$ is the sound speed in the photon-baryon fluid. For $\gamma > 0$, the factor $a^{-(3+\gamma)}$ makes $H(a)$ *larger* at early times compared to standard CDM scaling a^{-3}. A larger H in the integrand yields a *smaller* r_s.

CMB angular scale constraint. The angular acoustic scale measured by Planck is

$$\theta_* = \frac{r_s}{D_A(z_*)}, \tag{7}$$

where $D_A(z_*)$ is the angular diameter distance to recombination. Since θ_* is tightly constrained ($\Delta\theta_*/\theta_* \sim 10^{-4}$), a smaller r_s must be compensated by a smaller D_A, implying a *larger inferred* H_0 when fitting the CMB data.

Quantitative calculation. Numerical integration of (6) using Planck 2018 cosmological parameters yields:

$$r_s^{\rm LCDM} \approx 144.4\,{\rm Mpc}, \tag{8}$$

$$r_s^{\rm evolved} \approx 138.2\,{\rm Mpc} \quad (\gamma = 0.05), \tag{9}$$

representing a 4.3% reduction. To match the fixed CMB angular scale θ_*, this implies an inferred Hubble constant of

$$H_0^{\rm CMB,inferred} = 67.4 \times \frac{144.4}{138.2} \approx \boxed{70.4\,{\rm km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}}. \tag{10}$$

Substantial narrowing of the H_0 tension. The CMB-inferred value (10) represents a significant improvement over the ΛCDM prediction. The tension is reduced from approximately 5.6σ (difference of $5.6\,{\rm km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$) in standard ΛCDM to approximately 2.6σ (difference of $2.6\,{\rm km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$) in uDRD-evolved with $\gamma = 0.05$. This represents a $\sim 50\%$ reduction in the discrepancy—a substantial improvement that brings the early-universe and late-time measurements into much better agreement, though not complete resolution.

Importantly, this improvement arises *naturally* from the theoretically motivated time-varying mass mechanism, without fine-tuning or adding new phenomenological parameters beyond the single exponent γ.

Late-time measurements remain unaffected. Late-time probes (SNe Ia, Cepheids, TRGB) measure H_0 at $z \sim 0$–2, where the correction $(1+z)^\gamma$ is modest. For $\gamma = 0.05$ and $z = 1$, the enhancement is only $2^{0.05} \approx 1.035$, translating to $\sim 1.7\%$ effect on H and negligible shift in H_0 compared to observational uncertainties.

3.2 JWST galaxy abundance at $z \gtrsim 10$: Partial alleviation

Enhanced matter density. In uDRD-evolved, the mean matter density at high z is

$$\bar\rho_\phi(z) = \bar\rho_{\phi,0}\,(1+z)^{3+\gamma}. \tag{11}$$

For $\gamma = 0.05$ and $z = 12$, the density enhancement is $R(12) = 13^{0.05} \approx 1.14$.

Halo mass function scaling. The cumulative number density of halos scales approximately as

$$N(> M_{\rm th}, z) \propto \bar{\rho}_\phi^{3/2}(z) \propto (1+z)^{(9+3\gamma)/2}. \tag{12}$$

At $z = 12$ with $\gamma = 0.05$:

$$\frac{N_{\rm evolved}}{N_{\Lambda\rm CDM}} = (13)^{0.075} \approx 1.21. \tag{13}$$

Partial alleviation of JWST anomalies. For mass threshold $M_{\rm th} = 10^{10}\,M_\odot$, uDRD-evolved with $\gamma = 0.05$ predicts approximately 20% more massive halos at $z = 10$–15 than ΛCDM. This *partially alleviates* the JWST observations, which show factor of 3–10 excesses depending on mass and redshift bin. The model accounts for a modest fraction of the discrepancy, potentially more if systematic uncertainties in stellar mass estimates or photometric redshifts reduce the reported excess. Alternatively, a larger value $\gamma \sim 0.1$–0.15 would more fully address the JWST anomaly but at the cost of increased tension with S_8 measurements (see Sec. 3.5).

3.3 Structure growth rate $f(z)$

The structure growth rate is

$$f(z) \equiv \frac{d\ln D}{d\ln a}, \tag{14}$$

where $D(z)$ is the linear growth factor.

For $\gamma = 0.05$, we predict modest enhancements:

Redshift z	$f_{\Lambda\rm CDM}(z)$	$f_{\rm evolved}(z)$	Ratio
0.5	0.75	0.756	1.008
1.0	0.82	0.830	1.012
2.0	0.88	0.895	1.017

The 1–2% enhancement is potentially measurable with upcoming DESI BAO+RSD measurements.

3.4 Cluster abundance evolution

For $\gamma = 0.05$ and $z = 1.5$, the density enhancement is $R(1.5) = (2.5)^{0.05} \approx 1.047$. The cumulative number density of clusters scales as $\bar{\rho}_m^{3/2}$, giving

$$\frac{N_{\rm evolved}(> M, z = 1.5)}{N_{\Lambda\rm CDM}(> M, z = 1.5)} \approx (1.047)^{3/2} \approx 1.07. \tag{15}$$

This $\sim 7\%$ enhancement at $z = 1.5$ is measurable with upcoming eROSITA and SPT-3G surveys.

3.5 BBN constraints and the S_8 tension

BBN: No significant constraint. A common concern with enhanced early-universe energy density is the impact on Big Bang Nucleosynthesis through the effective number of relativistic species ΔN_{eff}. However, the ϕ-field in uDRD-evolved behaves as *matter* ($w = 0$), not radiation ($w = 1/3$), throughout the BBN epoch.

At the BBN redshift $z_{\text{BBN}} \sim 10^8$–10^{10} (corresponding to temperatures $T \sim 0.01$–$10\,\text{MeV}$), the enhancement factor is $R = (1 + z_{\text{BBN}})^\gamma$. For $\gamma = 0.05$ and $z_{\text{BBN}} \sim 10^9$:

$$R(10^9) = (10^9)^{0.05} \approx 2.5. \tag{16}$$

However, this enhanced *matter* density contributes to the Hubble rate as

$$H^2 \propto \rho_r + \rho_m \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\Delta H}{H} \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Delta\rho_m}{\rho_r + \rho_m}. \tag{17}$$

At BBN, radiation dominates: $\rho_r \gg \rho_m$. The fractional change in H is

$$\frac{\Delta H}{H} \sim \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Omega_m}{\Omega_r}\, a_{\text{BBN}}\,(R-1) \sim \frac{1}{2} \times 6 \times 10^{-10} \times 1.5 \sim 5 \times 10^{-10}, \tag{18}$$

which is utterly negligible. The corresponding ΔN_{eff} (which measures the deviation in radiation content) is

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \sim \left(\frac{\Delta H}{H}\right)^2 \ll 0.01, \tag{19}$$

well below the observational bound $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.3$ from primordial deuterium and helium abundances [5].

Conclusion: The uDRD-evolved extension with $\gamma = 0.05$ is *completely unconstrained* by BBN measurements. This is a significant strength of the model, as it avoids the tight constraints that plague many early-universe modifications.

S_8 tension: A testable trade-off. Enhanced early-universe structure growth increases the amplitude of matter fluctuations σ_8 at late times. The growth factor $D(z)$ satisfies a modified equation with enhanced source term proportional to $\Omega_m(a) \propto a^{-(3+\gamma)}$. Integrating from high redshift to today, the cumulative effect is approximately

$$\frac{\sigma_{8,\text{evolved}}}{\sigma_{8,\text{LCDM}}} \approx \left[\frac{\Omega_{m,\text{evolved}}(z\sim 10)}{\Omega_{m,\text{LCDM}}(z\sim 10)}\right]^{1/2} \approx (1+z)^{\gamma/2}\Big|_{z\sim 10} \approx 1.06. \tag{20}$$

For $\gamma = 0.05$, this represents a $\sim 6\%$ increase in σ_8. Current measurements show a mild S_8 tension: Planck CMB gives $S_8 = \sigma_8\sqrt{\Omega_m/0.3} = 0.834 \pm 0.016$, while weak lensing surveys (DES, KiDS) yield $S_8 \approx 0.77 \pm 0.02$—a $\sim 2.5\sigma$ discrepancy. Boosting σ_8 by 6% would worsen this tension to approximately 3.5σ.

The trade-off assessment. The uDRD-evolved extension presents a clear trade-off:

- **Successes:** Substantially narrows the H_0 tension (from 5.6σ to 2.6σ, a $\sim 50\%$ reduction) and partially alleviates JWST high-redshift galaxy anomalies.
- **Cost:** Potentially worsens the S_8 tension by $\sim 1\sigma$.
- **BBN:** No constraint—the model is safe for all $\gamma \lesssim 0.2$.

This is a *testable prediction*, not a fatal flaw. If future DESI Year-5, Euclid, or LSST measurements show S_8 values higher than current weak lensing estimates (closer to the Planck value), the model is vindicated. If S_8 remains persistently low, $\gamma < 0.03$ is required, reducing (but not eliminating) the model's explanatory power for JWST and H_0.

3.6 Summary of predictions

Observable	ΛCDM	uDRD-evolved ($\gamma = 0.05$)	Ratio	Survey
$H_0^{\rm CMB}$ [km/s/Mpc]	67.4	70.4	1.045	Planck/ACT
H_0 tension	5.6σ	2.6σ	0.46	—
$N(M > 10^{10} M_\odot, z = 12)$	n_0	$1.21\, n_0$	1.21	JWST JADES
$f(z = 1)$	0.82	0.830	1.012	DESI/Euclid
σ_8 (today)	0.811	0.860	1.060	Planck+LSS
$N_{\rm cluster}(z = 1.5)$	$n_{\rm cl}$	$1.07\, n_{\rm cl}$	1.07	eROSITA/SPT

Table 1: Summary of quantitative predictions for uDRD-evolved with $\gamma = 0.05$ compared to ΛCDM. The model substantially narrows the H_0 tension by $\sim 50\%$ and partially alleviates JWST high-redshift galaxy anomalies, at the cost of a modest 6% increase in σ_8 that may worsen the S_8 tension. Crucially, the model is unconstrained by BBN. All predictions are falsifiable with current or near-term data.

4 Discussion

4.1 Degeneracies with early dark energy

uDRD-evolved mimics early dark energy (EDE) in boosting early $H(z)$, but differs fundamentally in its equation of state and persistence. EDE models typically invoke a fluid or scalar field with $w \approx 1/3$–1 that activates before recombination and dilutes rapidly as a^{-4} or faster post-recombination. In contrast, the uDRD ϕ-field is pressureless ($w = 0$) oscillating dark matter with persistent $a^{-(3+\gamma)}$ scaling that affects late-time observables.

Distinguishing signatures:

- **Structure growth:** EDE resolves H_0 without significantly boosting late-time σ_8; uDRD-evolved boosts both, worsening S_8 tension.
- **Cluster abundances:** uDRD-evolved predicts enhanced cluster counts at $z > 1.5$; EDE does not.

- **Void lensing:** At $z > 7$, the persistent ϕ-field in uDRD-evolved enhances void lensing signals; EDE (having diluted away) does not.

These signatures allow MCMC fits to Planck+JWST+DESI+eROSITA data to break the degeneracy and distinguish between scenarios.

4.2 Future tests and falsification criteria

Key falsification criteria:

1. **Growth rate:** If DESI Year-5 or Euclid show $f(z)$ at $z \sim 1$–2 consistent with ΛCDM (no $\sim 1\%$ enhancement), then $\gamma < 0.02$ is required.

2. **Cluster counts:** If eROSITA DR2 (expected ∼2026) shows cluster abundances at $z > 1.5$ in perfect agreement with ΛCDM (no $\sim 7\%$ excess), then $\gamma < 0.02$.

3. S_8 **measurements:** If future weak lensing surveys (LSST, Euclid) confirm $S_8 \ll 0.80$, the $\sim 6\%$ boost from $\gamma = 0.05$ is disfavored.

4. **JWST systematics:** If continued spectroscopic follow-up reduces the high-z galaxy excess from ~ 3–$10\times$ to $\lesssim 1.5\times$, then $\gamma < 0.02$ suffices.

5 Conclusion

We have extended the uDRD framework by promoting the scalar field mass to time-dependent: $m_\phi^2(a) = m_0^2 \cdot a^{-\gamma}$. This single modification:

- **Substantially narrows the H_0 tension:** CMB-inferred H_0 increases from 67.4 to ~ 70–$71\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,Mpc^{-1}}$, reducing the discrepancy with local measurements from 5.6σ to 2.6σ—a $\sim 50\%$ improvement.

- **Partially alleviates JWST anomalies:** Predicts $\sim 20\%$ more massive halos at $z = 12$, accounting for a fraction of the observed excess.

- **Preserves uDRD successes:** All Solar System, galaxy, and cluster phenomenology remains intact.

- **Makes testable predictions:** Enhanced growth ($f(z)$), cluster abundances, σ_8 boost.

- **Unconstrained by BBN:** Matter-like ϕ-field has negligible impact on primordial abundances.

The model presents a trade-off: it substantially improves agreement with JWST and H_0 observations while potentially worsening the S_8 tension by $\sim 1\sigma$. This is a testable prediction with upcoming DESI, Euclid, and LSST data. We argue that the combined explanatory power, theoretical motivation (curvature-dependent mass running), and minimal extension (one parameter γ) make this a compelling avenue for addressing multiple cosmological tensions within the uDRD framework.

Acknowledgments

This research made use of: `NumPy`, `SciPy`, `Matplotlib`. JWST data from MAST archive. We thank the anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback.

References

[1] E. W. Maina, "Unified Dimensional Resonance Dynamics (uDRD): A Cross-Scale Framework from Quantum to Cosmological Regimes," Zenodo (2025). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17527321

[2] I. Labbé et al., "A population of red candidate massive galaxies ∼600 Myr after the Big Bang," *Nature* **616**, 266 (2023), arXiv:2207.12446.

[3] M. Boylan-Kolchin, "Stress testing ΛCDM with high-redshift galaxy candidates," *Nature Astronomy* **7**, 731 (2023), arXiv:2208.01611.

[4] S. L. Finkelstein et al., "A Long Time Ago in a Galaxy Far, Far Away: A Candidate z ∼ 12 Galaxy in Early JWST CEERS Imaging," *ApJ Lett.* **940**, L55 (2023), arXiv:2207.09434.

[5] Planck Collaboration, "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters," *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), arXiv:1807.06209.

[6] A. G. Riess et al., "A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km/s/Mpc Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team," *ApJ Lett.* **934**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2112.04510.