

---

AI translation · View original & related papers at  
[chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202410.00047](https://chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202410.00047)

---

## Quantized Redshift and its Significance for Recent Observations (Postprint)

**Authors:** Arindam Mal, Sarbani Palit, Christopher C. Fulton and Sisir Roy

**Date:** 2024-10-08T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

With the recent observational evidence in extragalactic astronomy, the interpretation of the nature of quasar redshift continues to be a research interest. Very high redshifts are being detected for extragalactic objects that are presumably very distant and young while also exhibiting properties that are characteristic of a more mature galaxy such as ours. According to Halton Arp and Geoffrey Burbidge, redshift disparities consist of an intrinsic component and are related to an evolutionary process. Karlsson observed redshift periodicity at integer multiples of 0.089 in log scale and Burbidge observed redshift periodicity at integer multiples of 0.061 in linear scale. Since Singular Value Decomposition based periodicity estimation is known to be superior for noisy data sets, especially when the data contain multiple harmonics and overtones, mainly irregular in nature, we have chosen it to be our primary tool for analysis of the quasar-galaxy pair redshift data. We have observed a fundamental periodicity of 0.051 with a confidence interval of 95% in linear scale with the site-available Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 (SDSS DR7) quasar-galaxy pair data set. We have independently generated quasar-galaxy pair data sets from both 2dF and SDSS and found fundamental periodicities of 0.077 and 0.089, respectively, in log scale with a confidence interval of 95%.

### Full Text

### Preamble

Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 24:095014 (11pp), 2024 September  
© 2024. National Astronomical Observatories, CAS and IOP Publishing  
Ltd. Printed in China.

<https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/ad6db5>

### Quantized Redshift and its Significance for Recent Observation

Arindam Mal<sup>1</sup>, Sarbani Palit<sup>2</sup>, Christopher C. Fulton<sup>3</sup>, and Sisir Roy<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Indian Space Research Organization, Space Applications Centre, Ahmedabad, India; arindam.mal1982@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

<sup>3</sup>National Institute of Advanced Studies, IISC Campus, Bangalore, India

<sup>4</sup>National Institute of Advanced Studies, IISC Campus, Bangalore, India

Received 2024 May 22; revised 2024 July 30; accepted 2024 August 7; published 2024 September 16

## Abstract

With recent observational evidence in extragalactic astronomy, the interpretation of quasar redshift nature continues to be a research interest. Very high redshifts are being detected for extragalactic objects that are presumably very distant and young, while also exhibiting properties characteristic of more mature galaxies such as ours. According to Halton Arp and Geoffrey Burbidge, redshift disparities consist of an intrinsic component and are related to an evolutionary process. Karlsson observed redshift periodicity at integer multiples of 0.089 in log scale, while Burbidge observed redshift periodicity at integer multiples of 0.061 in linear scale. Since Singular Value Decomposition-based periodicity estimation is known to be superior for noisy data sets, especially when the data contain multiple harmonics and overtones that are mainly irregular in nature, we have chosen it as our primary tool for analyzing quasar-galaxy pair redshift data. We have observed a fundamental periodicity of 0.051 with a 95% confidence interval in linear scale using the publicly available Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 (SDSS DR7) quasar-galaxy pair data set. We have independently generated quasar-galaxy pair data sets from both 2dF and SDSS and found fundamental periodicities of 0.077 and 0.089, respectively, in log scale with a 95% confidence interval.

**Key words:** galaxies: distances and redshifts – (galaxies:) quasars: absorption lines – cosmology: observations

## 1. Introduction

The cosmological hypothesis defines the total observed redshift as  $z = z_c + z_{nc}$ , where  $z$  is the total observed redshift,  $z_c$  is the redshift due to cosmological contribution, and  $z_{nc}$  is the redshift due to non-cosmological contribution (Bell & Fort 1973). According to standard theory, quasar redshifts result from space-time expansion. If one plots quasar redshift against apparent brightness, one obtains a nonlinear relation, which implies that the linear Hubble relation is not valid for high-redshift quasars (Roy et al. 2000, 2007).

Hoyle & Narlikar (1966) observed the physical association of quasars and galaxies by noting numerous instances of a quasar and galaxy in close astrometric proximity but with different redshifts—for instance, a quasar with  $z = 2.114$

very close to the nucleus of galaxy NGC 7319 with  $z = 0.022$ .

Arp observed many such pair cases in which filaments connect the objects, including prominent ones (e.g., NGC 4319 and MRK 205; NGC 3067 and 3C 232). Some quasars exhibit jets of unknown nature (e.g., 3C 345 in the vicinity of NGC 6212), while in some cases moving structures are radio sources accompanied by optical jets. López-Corredoira & Gutiérrez (2004) observed two emission-line objects with redshifts greater than 0.2 in the optical filament apparently connecting the Seyfert galaxy NGC 7603 with  $z = 0.029$  to its companion NGC 7603B with  $z = 0.057$ , a possible example of anomalous redshift. These findings lead to the conclusion that quasars are ejected from galactic nuclei and that quasar redshift is largely an intrinsic parameter.

In the opening paragraphs of their introduction, Fulton & Arp (2012) directly compare and discuss opposing viewpoints about cosmological versus quantized quasar redshifts. Using the first very large quasar and galaxy redshift surveys—2dF quasars (Croom et al. 2001) and galaxies (Sadler et al. 2002)—they support the quantized view with strong statistical evidence that high-redshift quasars are indeed associated with low-redshift galaxies. Standard theory predicts an evolutionary process in which supermassive black holes (SMBHs) begin their lives in the dust-shrouded cores of vigorously star-forming “starburst” galaxies before expelling surrounding gas and dust and emerging as extremely luminous quasars. The recently observed GNz7q (Fujimoto et al. 2022) exhibits exactly both aspects of the dusty starburst galaxy and the quasar. This observation lacks various features usually observed in very luminous quasars. The central black hole of GNz7q is still in a young and less massive phase at high redshift.

GN-z11 (Jiang et al. 2021) was photometrically selected as a luminous star-forming galaxy candidate at redshift  $z > 10$  and is known to be the “oldest galaxy.” The age of GN-z11 is estimated to be only 70 million years and is moderately massive, suggesting this young galaxy was born and grew rapidly. The evidence of carbon and oxygen in GN-z11 indicates this galaxy is not the first metal-free galaxy in the Universe and that it is a second-generation galaxy. The detection of carbon and oxygen suggests special physical conditions not found in present-day galaxies. Its accurate redshift remains unclear.

Advancing a widely held conjecture that an SMBH must be the power source for any extremely massive extragalactic object, a search is on to find ultraluminous quasars to serve as examples. Part of this activity is to explain why the luminosity of each such object exceeds the Eddington limit (Schindler et al. 2021). Accompanying this scenario is the fact that if quasars are actually at cosmological distances, they are by definition engaging in superluminal motion, as opposed to being simply luminous, moving at less than the speed of light, and much less distant. Observations of metallicity in high-redshift quasars raise questions about the evolutionary process. Production of heavy elements by known nuclear processes occurs at later stages of quasar evolution, but Juarez et al. (2009) found high metal abundances in high-redshift, presumably very young, quasars. They also found that the abundance of carbon relative to sili-

con and oxygen does not evolve significantly in quasars.

Arp (1994) and Arp et al. (2001) observed that a group of high-redshift quasars appears to be physically connected with a lower-redshift galaxy. They claimed that quasar redshifts do not indicate distance, that quasar redshifts are quantized, and that they obey a simple formula  $z_{k+1} = 1.227z_k$ , where  $z_k$  is the redshift of a quasar and  $z_{k+1}$  is the next higher redshift. The factor 1.227 was subsequently raised to 1.228 in conjunction with using an anchor redshift of 1.960 (Fulton & Arp 2012 Appendix). Karlsson (1977) observed that the peaks of the redshift histogram form a mathematical series:  $z = 0.061, 0.300, 0.600, 0.960, \dots$  Hawkins et al. (2002) found non-existence of quasar periodicity, but their methodology was challenged by Napier & Burbidge (2003). Tang & Zhang (2005, 2008) claimed non-existence of periodicity with a data set fifteen times larger than previous ones, but their work was directly contradicted by Fulton & Arp (2012), and subsequently by Fulton et al. (2018), demonstrating redshift periodicity with very high statistical significance using ejection velocity computations. Mal et al. (2020, 2022) have already shown the existence of redshift periodicity for quasars as well as galaxies. Here we have analyzed quasar, galaxy, and quasar-galaxy pair data sets in an effort to ultimately understand the physics behind redshift quantization.

## 2.1. Proposed Method

We examine the existence of redshift periodicity in variations of five redshift data sets following the procedure outlined here. After initial selection of data in accordance with any flag values provided, the bin width for histogram formation is optimized as in Shimazaki & Shinomoto (2007, 2009), minimizing the overall cost function for each data set. All data sets are originally sourced from other related work using Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 (SDSS DR7) or from the 2dF.

A Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)-based method (Kanjilal & Palit 1995) has been adapted for estimating the fundamental periodicity present in the histogram of redshift data. Mal et al. (2020) established the superiority of the SVD-based approach for periodicity detection over the periodogram-based approach. The periodogram is not a suitable tool for data of quasi-periodic nature or data sets containing multiple periodic components and a large number of overtones or somewhat irregular periodic parts. Hence, periodicity detection for the data sets examined in this paper has been performed using the SVD-based method.

## 2.2. Description of Data Sets

We have analyzed data sets from different sources. First, the SDSS DR7 database contains information pertaining to quasar-galaxy pairs, where each quasar is projected within 100 kpc of a galaxy and has a redshift larger than the galaxy redshift by an amount equal to the total error in the redshift obtained

from the quasar spectrum. Quasars and galaxies with misidentified Ly $\alpha$  forest lines are omitted. A total of 97,489 quasar-galaxy pairs are reported from a sample of 105,783 spectroscopic quasars and 798,948 spectroscopic galaxies. This data set contains spectroscopically observed quasar-galaxy projections that can be used to study quasar absorption-line systems arising from known galaxies with  $0 < z < 0.6$  and quasars with  $0 < z < 3.5$ . The quasar and galaxy redshift data were collected from SDSS DR7 and sifted to find galaxies with definite Ca II and Na I absorbers by Cherinka & Schulte-Ladbeck (2011).

Second, Fulton & Arp (2012) examined the 2dF quasar-galaxy data set. Statistical data sets were prepared separately for galaxies and quasars as described in Section 2 therein. Examinations were performed in terms of the ejection hypothesis using a procedure that, though wider in scope, is equivalent to examining quasar-galaxy pairs. The results not only confirmed the ejection hypothesis and quasar periodicity but also the existence of many quasar-galaxy pairs with disjoint redshifts at high significance for both conjectures. The data set contains 7,849 quasar-galaxy pairs for which each quasar is within 30 arcseconds of its one and only paired galaxy.

Third, Fulton et al. (2018) examined the SDSS DR7 quasar-galaxy data set in a manner procedurally identical to that just described for the 2dF data set.

Fourth, the same Fulton et al. (2018) SDSS DR7 data set can also be examined as a variation in which the quasar-galaxy pairs are subjected to ejection model periodicity constraints, thus culling the data set to contain only pairs for which the quasar is found to be physically associated with only one galaxy.

Fifth, the SDSS active galactic nucleus (AGN) data set examined by Liu et al. (2019) can be treated as the galaxy portion of a quasar-galaxy data set that is then paired with the SDSS DR7 quasars from Fulton et al. (2018).

### 2.3. Data Extraction

Narlikar & Arp (1993) explain that if quasars are physically connected with a parent galaxy, the redshift of each quasar must be transformed to the reference frame of the putative parent galaxy (Narlikar & Das 1980). The computations used to examine Karlsson redshift periodicity in quasars and to implement the ejection hypothesis are detailed in the appendix of Fulton & Arp (2012), and a complete description of the quasar family detection procedure is given in Section 5 of Fulton et al. (2018). The algorithm that performs the periodicity analyses for both papers is also capable of generating quasar-galaxy pair data sets. Using quasars alone, galaxies alone, or adding pairs to the mix allows examination of individual data sets with three different redshift values:

1.  $z_q$ : This is the measured redshift obtained by a survey for a quasar.
2.  $z_g$ : This is the measured redshift obtained by a survey for a galaxy.
3.  $z_0$ : This is the transformed redshift of a quasar. The measured redshift obtained by a survey for the quasar is transformed to the rest frame of a

paired galaxy using the measured redshift of the galaxy. Only the transformed redshift is under consideration. The measured redshifts of the quasar-galaxy pair are unknown to the analysis and are used only to compute the quasar  $z_0$  when creating the redshift data set.

The data extraction varies somewhat with the data set as indicated in Section 2.2, and there are additional differences in the redshifts being examined:

**Quasars:** Only quasar redshifts are being considered, and as described in the redshift value list above, the redshift can be either  $z_q$  or  $z_0$ . If the redshifts are  $z_0$  values, the data set follows the prescription below for quasar-galaxy pairs.

**Galaxies:** Only galaxy redshifts are being considered, and as described in the redshift value list above, the redshift can be only  $z_g$ .

**Quasar-galaxy Pairs:** Each pair under consideration is one quasar and one galaxy, and as described in the redshift value list above, the redshift can be only  $z_0$ . No quasar-quasar or galaxy-galaxy pairs are being considered. The list of pairs for a given data set is determined by an astrometric association algorithm that for each galaxy determines which quasars lie within 30 arcseconds of that galaxy. Each quasar so positioned is considered a pair with the galaxy independently of each of the other quasars that are also paired with that same galaxy. The algorithm determines whether each quasar is paired with more than one galaxy or is uniquely associated with only one, so that the list of pairs can, respectively, be generated either with all pairs or with unique pairs only.

## 2.4. The Procedure for Analysis

As proposed by Mal et al. (2020), the two main stages of the approach consist of formation of an appropriate histogram after determining the optimal bin width and application of SVD for periodicity determination. For convenience, the procedure is briefly outlined here.

**Determination of optimal bin width and histogram formation:** The optimal bin width is obtained by minimizing the mean integrated square error (MISE, Shimazaki & Shinomoto 2007, 2009) for the entire data set, and that bin width is used for analysis of the redshift data. Bin width has an impact on histogram data analysis, so proper bin width estimation is important. For this paper we have made use of simulation with random numbers and periodic numbers and observed that there is no periodicity in the random number case but in the other case a proper period length is found.

The optimum bin width  $\Delta$  of the histogram is obtained using the following formula where  $C$  is the cost function,  $K$  is the mean of the data, and  $v$  is the variance of the data. The optimal bin size is determined using minimization of the cost function. The input data vary with random sampling for 1000 iterations, and the bin size and resulting sensitivity vary accordingly, which is defined as the confidence interval. The MISE is computed as:

$$\text{MISE} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T E[(\hat{l}(t) - l(t))^2] dt$$

where MISE is defined by how close the estimator  $\hat{l}$  is to observations over the time period  $T$ , and  $E$  is the expectation parameter.

Shimazaki & Shinomoto (2007) adapted the above equation for optimization of the histogram bandwidth by segmenting the total observation period  $T$  into  $N$  intervals of size  $\Delta$ , with the MISE redefined as:

$$\text{MISE}(\Delta) = \frac{1}{\Delta} E \left[ \int_0^{\Delta} (\hat{l}(t) - l(t))^2 dt \right]$$

This equation is solved for  $\Delta$  to obtain the cost function using Equation (4).

The existence of periodicity in a data sequence is examined using SVD and a matrix formulation.

**Matrix formulation and application of SVD:** In order to examine the existence of a periodic component in the data sequence, candidate period lengths are selected and the input matrix for application of SVD is formed as follows. For a candidate period length of say,  $L$ , the corresponding data matrix  $A$  is formed by partitioning the data into contiguous segments of each length  $L$  and placing each segment (aligned in phase) as a row of  $A$  such that  $A$  is of size  $M \times L$ . SVD of  $A$  is computed to yield the singular values  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_p$  arranged in decreasing order of magnitude, where  $p = \min(M, L)$  and is also the rank of  $A$ .

It may be noted that if the data sequence under consideration is perfectly periodic with period length  $L$ , then  $A$  will have rank one and hence only one singular value, i.e.,  $\sigma_1 \neq 0$  while  $\sigma_i = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq p$ . If the data sequence contains a large periodic component of length  $L$  and smaller noise-like signals, the rank of  $A$  would no longer be one as all the  $p$  singular values would be non-zero. The magnitude of  $\sigma_1$  would still be much greater than  $\sigma_2$  and the rest of the singular values. Hence, the distribution of magnitudes of the singular values of  $A$  can be conveniently used to assess the degree of periodicity since, in reality, considering the redshift sequences under analysis, not only may there be a multitude of different components (including possibly a periodic component), there is also noise arising from measurement errors or even on account of the data traveling over immense lengths of space and time.

Similar to Kanjilal & Palit (1995), we follow two approaches using two different indicators or measures for periodicity detection, as outlined below:

**SVR1:** Our first method is based on the following measure of periodicity:

$$\text{SVR1} = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_2}$$

A plot of this ratio versus row length is called the SVR1 plot, which shows the presence of multiple peaks at integer multiples of the value of the period length of the periodic component contained, which for the case under consideration is the fundamental redshift. It may be observed that for a perfectly periodic signal  $\text{SVR1} \rightarrow \infty$ , while for a signal with no periodicity implying that  $A$  is full rank,  $\text{SVR1} = 1$ . Hence  $1 \leq \text{SVR1} < \infty$ .

**SVR2:** Our second method (Kanjilal & Palit 1995) is based on a quantification of the aperiodicity of the data sequence being analyzed. Let:

$$\bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sigma_i$$

Then, SVR2 is defined as:

$$\text{SVR2} = \frac{\sigma_1}{\bar{\sigma}}$$

The construction of SVR2 is such that it has the same range of values as SVR1, i.e.,  $[1, \infty]$ . It may be noted that it reflects the ratio of residual energy to the energy content of the aperiodic signal. The plot of this quantity versus row length is called the SVR2 plot, which also shows repeated peaks at integral multiples of the value of the period length of the periodic component contained, if any.

In each case, the presence of a periodic component is confirmed by the presence of a peak at the relevant period length as well as its integral multiples. In practice, there may be very slight deviations due to the presence of noise, as already explained above. For example, the peak at a particular integral multiple may be negligible or may occur at a shift of one or two positions from the integral multiple. Generic simulations are provided in Appendix A.

### 3. Results of Redshift Periodicity

Table 1 summarizes the results of quasar, galaxy, and quasar-galaxy pair analyses. In each case, the period of the periodic component present is determined as the product of the peak location of the histogram and the optimal bin width. A peak location is selected as the base period if peaks are also observed at integral multiples of that peak location. The 95% confidence level of the base period is determined using resampling of the redshift data set. A Monte Carlo-type simulation is conducted over 1000 iterations to compute the confidence interval.

The redshift periodicity of a pair data set is computed using  $z_0$ . The redshift periodicity of a quasar or galaxy data set is computed using the measured redshift,  $z_q$  or  $z_g$ , respectively, i.e., without transformation to a galaxy rest frame.

The SVR spectrum exhibits the periodic peaks shown in the respective figures. In all figures, the primary series peaks are marked with a blue vertical line and a

secondary strong peak, if present, is marked with a red vertical line. Depending on the data set, a periodic component, or in some cases two components, can be observed for different ranges of redshifts of quasars, galaxies, or quasar-galaxy pairs. Working by example, some salient observations are made about a specific result for each data set.

**Table 1: Results of Redshift Data Sets**

Data Set	Redshift Object Range	Fundamental Method	Confidence Period	Confidence Interval	Confidence Level	Notes
SDSS DR7 Quasar-Galaxy Pairs	0.08 < $z_0$ < 2.20	SVR1	0.0510	[0.0470, 0.0980]	95%	Sourced from Cherinka & Schulte-Ladbeck (2011)
2dF Quasar-Galaxy Pairs	Quasar- $z_0$ values	SVR2	0.0462	[0.0420, 0.0690]	95%	Sourced from Fulton & Arp (2012)
SDSS DR7 Quasar-Galaxy Pairs	Quasar- $z_0$ values	SVR2	0.0884	[0.0180, 0.0900]	95%	Sourced from Fulton et al. (2018)
SDSS DR7 Physically Associated Pairs	Quasar- $z_0$ values	SVR2	0.0877	[0.0230, 0.0910]	95%	Physically associated quasar-galaxy pairs only
SDSS AGN-Quasar Pairs	Galaxy $z_g > 0.03$	SVR1	0.022	[0.0117, 0.0244]	95%	Sourced from Liu et al. (2019)

The first data set is an extraction of Cherinka & Schulte-Ladbeck (2011) SDSS quasar-galaxy pairs. For quasars with  $0.08 < z_0 < 2.20$ , Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper] is an SVR1 spectrum showing a primary strong peak at 0.0510, a secondary strong peak at 0.0640, and additional peaks that occur at multiples of both the primary and secondary peaks.

The second data set is an extraction of 2dF quasar-galaxy pairs from Fulton & Arp (2012) Section 2 and Fulton et al. (2018) Section 5. For quasar-galaxy pair  $z_0$  values, Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper] is an SVR2 spectrum showing a primary strong peak at 0.0462 and smaller peaks at corresponding multiples.

The third data set is an extraction of SDSS quasar-galaxy pairs from Fulton et al. (2018) Sections 2 and 5. For quasar-galaxy pair  $z_0$  values, Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper] is an SVR2 spectrum showing a primary strong peak at 0.0884 and a smaller peak at the corresponding multiple.

The fourth data set is an extraction of SDSS quasar-galaxy pairs from Fulton et al. (2018) Sections 2 and 5. This extraction is the same as in the third data set example except that it has been modified to include only those pairs for which the generating algorithm has determined that the quasar and galaxy of each pair are physically associated. For quasar-galaxy pair  $z_0$  values, Figure 4 [Figure 4: see original paper] is an SVR2 spectrum showing a primary strong peak at 0.0877 and a smaller peak at the corresponding multiple.

The fifth data set is an extraction of SDSS AGNs (Liu et al. 2019) and SDSS quasars from Fulton et al. (2018) Sections 2 and 5 to form quasar-galaxy pairs. The fundamental periodicity repeats with the value 0.022 using the SVR1 method.

It has been observed that if the noise level is increased by 4 dB at an arbitrary point in a periodic quasar/galaxy redshift data set, then at a point later in the data set, the periodicity will disappear, amounting to the null condition.

The redshift periodicity of quasars, galaxies, and quasar-galaxy pairs may indicate that evolution of quasars into galaxies has occurred over time, and this is consistent with statistical tests of the ejection hypothesis (Fulton & Arp 2012; Fulton et al. 2018).

## 4. Discussion

Statistical analysis of redshift data clearly establishes the existence of discrete redshifts using quasar-galaxy pair data sets (Fulton & Arp 2012; Fulton et al. 2018). We are therefore looking for models capable of explaining the periodicity of extragalactic redshifts. One such model proposed by Hoyle–Narlikar (Hoyle & Narlikar 1964, 1966; Narlikar & Das 1980) considers periodicity of redshifts based on the Variable Mass Hypothesis (VMH). According to this model, the inertia of matter arises due to its interaction with other matter, and the inertial matter is created from a zero-mass surface based on a quantum principle. The excess redshift does not arise from high speed of ejection but from

the low mass of the newly created matter. Narlikar & Das (1980) explain that an ejected quasar can be bound to the parent galaxy with typical separations on the order of 100–200 kpc. Burbidge et al. (1999) explain redshift periodicity using VMH. Redshift periodicity is a direct confirmation of the fact that quantization in redshift implies quantization in mass. VMH theory predicts that the age of an object is usually measured from the zero-mass epoch on its world line, so the higher the redshift of a quasar, the younger it is. This is well matched with recent observations of the extragalactic objects HD1 and HD2 (Harikane et al. 2022), GNz7Q, and GNz11, and it should be noted that HD1 and HD2 are not likely to be lensed objects (Zhe Lee et al. 2022).

Another model proposed and elaborated upon by Roy et al. (2000, 2007) based on the Wolf mechanism is known as Dynamic Multiple Scattering (DMS; see Appendix B) theory. Roy et al. (2000) have shown that DMS can explain the redshift for quasar-galaxy association, which depends on the properties of the environments around galaxies as well as quasars. It raises considerable interest within the community about the alternate mechanism of redshift even in the absence of relative motion between the object and the observer. No works have so far been done regarding the existence of periodicity of redshift within this framework. However, we find that the redshift in this framework depends on parameters directly related to the characteristics of the medium—i.e., correlation coefficients and characteristic lengths associated with random refractive index of the environments around galaxies and quasars—which may explain the redshift periodicity. We emphasize that this can be verified in laboratory experiments as well.

Lehto (1990) developed a theoretical model that could predict redshift periodicity in the framework of matter using three-dimensional (3D) quantized time, where the time unit is Planck time. The redshift quantization can be obtained based on the assumption that distances are quantized in Planck units. However, understanding the concept of 3D quantized time from the standard interpretation of modern physics is difficult.

Wolf (1986) explains correlation-induced spectral shift as well as the broadening and shifts of spectral lines. Roy et al. (2000, 2007) statistically analyzed the Véron-Cetty (V-C) quasar catalog (Véron-Cetty & Véron 2006) and the SDSS DR3 data set and concluded that the Hubble law is linear up to small redshifts less than 0.3 but nonlinear for higher redshift, which adds fuel to the cosmological debate. Roy et al. (2000) explain the broadening of spectral lines using DMS. They also found a critical source frequency below which no spectrum can be observed for a particular medium. The broadening due to multiple scattering is more than the shift due to a cosmological effect.

The generally accepted idea is that a galaxy is surrounded by background quasars. However, this idea runs counter to statistical analysis of probability in a small area distributed according to position and average density in any line of sight. The main approach here is to demonstrate that two extragalactic objects with very different redshifts may in reality be physical neighbors.

Physical association of quasars and galaxies can also be explained using SMBHs and AGNs. An SMBH can grow in size up to billions of solar masses from a “seed,” with the growth process being dependent on the feeding mechanism from surrounding gas. Astronomers think that every galaxy has an extremely bright central region, referred to as an AGN, and it is thought that it is powered by an SMBH at its center. The most luminous of all AGNs are quasars. The recent discovery of J0313-1806 leads to questions about its rapid formation, as it is thought to sit inside a galaxy with a very active region, with the host galaxy producing 200 solar masses worth of stars per year. The SMBH that powers this quasar presumably formed just 670 million years after the presumed expansion of spacetime began, begging the question of how a seed grew large enough to form a black hole, with “direct collapse” proposed as a possible origin.

One of the outstanding conundrums in astronomy today is how an SMBH, weighing millions to billions of times the mass of the Sun, got to be so huge so fast and so near the presumed beginning of the Universe. Recent observations of extragalactic objects do not appear to be consistent with the cosmological hypothesis that their redshifts arise from the expansion of spacetime. Observational evidence suggesting that a galaxy in the early Universe is as mature as our galaxy is contradictory—a discrepancy that does not exist if high redshifts have a largely intrinsic component (Fulton & Arp 2012).

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

We have observed the existence of redshift periodicity in quasar-galaxy pair redshift data with transformation to a galaxy rest frame and in quasar and galaxy redshift data without transformation. Our results directly contradict propositions by other analyses that redshift periodicity does not exist—for example, that any such observations are actually due to a selection effect of data binning (Basu 1978), or due to noise in the fundamental periodicity within a particular radiation band. The most significant contribution of the present work is the analysis of the pair redshift data and the associated periodicity detection and estimation using an SVD-based approach rather than the conventional periodogram FFT-based approach. The applicability of the SVD approach, also used in Mal et al. (2020) and Mal et al. (2022), is further vindicated by the present results. SVD is therefore invaluable for astronomical data analysis. It is able to reveal hidden periodicities, leading to correct interpretation of the data.

Fulton & Arp (2012) and Fulton et al. (2018) have statistically demonstrated the existence of Karlsson peaks and quasar redshift periodicity using periodicity constraints to confine the hypothesized quasar ejection velocity while also significantly reducing false positive quasar family detections. This paper adds weight to their argument by independently confirming the existence of redshift quantization in quasar, galaxy, and quasar-galaxy pair data sets. These new results also support the Hoyle–Narlikar model (Hoyle & Narlikar 1964, 1966) and the Narlikar–Das cosmological model (Narlikar & Das 1980; Burbidge et al. 1999) in which quasars are ejected from galactic nuclei and in so doing define

the true process of quasar and galaxy evolution.

Cosmologists are greatly interested in understanding the source of the Ly $\alpha$  forest and any related physical processes occurring in the environments surrounding galaxies. We posit that a key element of the ultimate elucidation of that physics is provided by VMH by virtue of its contention that a lower-redshift quasar implies an older and larger mass, whereas a higher-redshift quasar implies a younger and smaller mass. In contrast to the standard model (SM), the absorption features in the Ly $\alpha$  forest should exhibit peaks at multiples of the base periodic component (Karlsson 1971, 1973, 1990 and Burbidge 1968). This paper confirms redshift periodicity of quasars, galaxies, and quasar-galaxy pairs, but 3D imaging may provide a more detailed understanding of quasars ejected from galactic nuclei. In our future work we will discuss possible direct estimation of redshift periodicity within the DMS framework.

This paper demonstrates that, in contrast to the SM of cosmology, redshift periodicity exists independently in each quasar, galaxy, or pair data set, and that periodicity exists in quasar and galaxy redshifts, each independently. The recent observations just prior to and now pouring in from the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) prompt us to make the following connections to the existence of extragalactic redshift periodicity:

1. **Ever increasing redshifts:** The ever-increasing maximum observed redshift is a huge problem for the SM, with GN-z11 ( $z > 10$ ; Jiang et al. 2021) being just one of the more recent examples showing up prior to JWST and now with Yan (2022) reporting  $z \approx 11 - 20$  in the first batch of JWST candidate objects. The problem does not exist for an alternative model that embraces redshift periodicity because, as per Sections 1 and 9 in Fulton et al. (2018) and elsewhere in the literature, a major portion of all high as well as mid-range redshifts is intrinsic. Very high redshifts even for very distant objects are more than reasonable if the objects are simply examples of a quasar with a very large intrinsic redshift ejected from a very distant galaxy, with the combined effects being the reason for the ever-increasing measured redshifts.
2. **High redshift and high luminosity:** The high-redshift and extremely luminous quasars, such as GNz7q (Fujimoto et al. 2022), are multiply problematic for SM, first for the reason stated in Item 1, but also due to an outlandish luminosity, even to the extent of exceeding the otherwise generally accepted Eddington limit (Schindler et al. 2021). As with the high redshift, the luminosity is problematic only if the object is evolving on its own at a distance corresponding to an SM cosmological redshift, as opposed to being at a much smaller distance and therefore also lower luminosity because it is evolving after ejection from a much closer but unaccounted parent galaxy.
3. **Metallicity and carbon evolution:** The greater distances forced by insisting on cosmological redshifts interfere with the modeling and tracking

of the evolution of high-redshift quasars. Juarez et al. (2009) observed high-redshift quasars with well-evolved metallicity but also an abundance of carbon relative to silicon and oxygen, neither of which are expected for young quasars.

4. **The largest galaxy:** Oei et al. (2022) isolated what they have determined in projection to be the unambiguously largest giant radio galaxy (GRG) yet detected. A GRG is assumed to be hosted by another galaxy acting as its progenitor, and in this particular case both the GRG and the progenitor appear to be otherwise ordinary in terms of a long list of presumably relevant attributes, including an unambiguous and unspectacular host redshift,  $z_{\text{spec}} = 0.24674$ , and notably they reside in a low-density environment. What is pointed out by Oei et al. (2022) and is of note in the current context is that neither very massive galaxies nor SMBHs are required to produce these giant entities, and this sits in conflict with rationalizations being made about presumably very large objects being generated in the very early Universe and of course also at very high redshift.
5. **Milky Way and other filaments:** Yusef-Zadeh et al. (2022) compare the morphology and other attributes of filamentary structures in the center of the Milky Way with those found in radio galaxies in the intercluster medium of galaxy clusters. Due to the similarities between our local example and those far away and therefore much older galaxies, the underlying physical processes of the respective populations must be the same. If that is true, an obvious ramification is that extragalactic objects undergo the same evolutionary processes without regard to a particular location or epoch, as in an isotropic Universe. This in turn is consistent with an object having a redshift with an intrinsic component that decreases as the object evolves as part and parcel of a local phenomenon that is occurring everywhere and in every epoch.
6. **Diversity at high redshift:** Kartaltepe et al. (2023) have found a wide diversity in the structure and morphology of galaxies at  $z = 3 - 9$  in early JWST observations. Their work includes repetitive visual classification, quantitative morphological determination, classification of type by percentage in different redshift ranges, and identification of trends in type and size that appear overall to exist over the full redshift range studied. The diversity and trend findings comport specifically with the contentions expressed in Item 5 and generally with the thrust of all these itemized conclusions.
7. **Redshift does not mean distance:** Redshift is not a distance indicator. In no case has an independent distance measurement been obtained for any object with  $z > 1$ , and this is also true for many extragalactic objects with  $z < 1$ . As stated in Item 1, Fulton et al. (2018) have already determined that statistical samples (Schneider et al. 2010; Shen et al. 2011) of SDSS DR7 quasars do indeed have a large intrinsic redshift component, but at

long last the literature from the wider community is publishing evidence that agrees with our contention that the long-assumed redshift-distance relation has never been established. Based on the application of numerical methods to a joint X-ray and ultraviolet data set, Petrosian et al. (2022) have shown that a correlation between luminosity measurements in different wavelength regimes must be used with greater care to definitively demonstrate such a relationship. They state unequivocally that all of the correlation methods used to date suffer from a circularity argument, and we agree with that assessment.

## Acknowledgments

The authors express their thanks to Prof. J. V. Narlikar of IUCCA for the excellent guidance and suggestions provided during the research. The authors want to express their special thanks to Martín López-Corredoira for providing suggestions during discussions. The authors also acknowledge Prof. Debasis Sengupta from ISI, Kolkata for his help in designing simulations and Ms. Susmita Nandi for her assistance in carrying out some simulations. The first author wants to acknowledge Dr. Rajat Acharya and Group Director Atul P. Shukla for their encouragement.

## Appendix A. Simulation of Different Effects on Data Sets

Here we simulate different effects on periodic data sets with various types of bias, such as clustering or the finite pixel size of a spectral graph. We assume that an ongoing process is repeating with a fixed-length interval as mentioned below. The simulations performed are summarized in Table A1 and described below.

**Null hypothesis:** Generate a set of random numbers uniformly within a range of values, 0.036–3.0. Apply a periodicity detection method as mentioned in Section 2.4, and observe that the optimized bin width is 1.4811 and there is no repeating pattern in the histogram.

**Aperiodic pattern:** Repeat the null hypothesis pattern with period lengths of 7, 22, 35, 60, 75, 80, 98, and 105 in an aperiodic manner. Analysis confirms non-existence of periodicity with a confidence level of <50%.

**Periodic pattern with noise:** Repeat the null hypothesis pattern with a fixed-length interval of 10 and observe periodicity with a 95% confidence level as indicated in Table A1.

**Simple clustering effect:** A simple clustering effect simulated by introducing another random process with no periodicity and with amplitude higher than the periodic pattern with noise data set. SVR1 is unable to detect a proper periodic length and instead observes false periodicity due to the subharmonic amplitude being stronger than the fundamental peak.

**Amplitude modulation clustering:** A clustering effect simulated as a modulation in amplitude of a periodic data set. Both SVR methods detect a fundamental period with a 95% confidence level. SVR2 correctly detects periodicity in the simulated result, whereas SVR1 does not perform as well due to the noisy conditions.

**Table A1: Summary of Results of Simulations of Different Effects on Data Sets**

Simulation	Known Period	Method	Confidence Interval	Confidence Level
Null hypothesis	No Detection	SVR1	[0.00, 2.59]	<50%
Null hypothesis	No Detection	SVR2	[0.00, 2.59]	<50%
Aperiodic pattern	No Detection	SVR1	[4.96, 10.09]	<50%
Aperiodic pattern	No Detection	SVR2	[4.90, 10.09]	<50%
Periodic pattern with noise	10.00	SVR1	[4.96, 10.09]	95%
Periodic pattern with noise	10.00	SVR2	[5.82, 10.52]	95%
Simple clustering effect	10.00	SVR1	[3.09, 6.18]	<50%
Simple clustering effect	10.00	SVR2	[10.00, 15.09]	<50%
Amplitude modulated clustering	10.00	SVR1	[1.66, 10.02]	95%
Amplitude modulated clustering	10.00	SVR2	[2.66, 10.02]	95%

## Appendix B. Dynamic Multiple Scattering

Below are the equations from Roy et al. (2007) to distinguish between redshifts due to DMS or Doppler mechanisms:

$$\Delta\omega_D = \omega_0 \frac{v}{c}$$

$$\Delta\omega_{\text{DMS}} = \omega_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_{\text{eff}}}\right)$$

where  $n_{\text{eff}}$  is the effective refractive index. If  $\delta_0$  is considered as due to Doppler broadening only, then:

$$\delta_0 = \frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{v}{c}$$

Therefore:

$$z_{\text{Doppler}} = \frac{v}{c}$$

$$z_{\text{DMS}} = 1 - \frac{1}{n_{\text{eff}}}$$

## References

- Arp, H. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, 74
- Arp, H. C., Burbidge, E. M., Chu, Y., & Zhu, X. 2001, *ApJL*, 553, L11
- Basu, D. 1978, *Natur*, 273, 130
- Bell, M., & Fort, D. N. 1973, *ApJ*, 186, 1
- Burbidge, G. 1968, *ApJL*, 154, L41
- Burbidge, G., Hoyle, F., & Narlikar, J. V. 1999, *PhT*, 52, 38
- Cherinka, B., & Schulte-Ladbeck, R. E. 2011, *AJ*, 142, 122
- Croom, S. M., Smith, R. J., Boyle, B. J., et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 322, L29
- Fujimoto, S., Brammer, G. B., Watson, D., et al. 2022, *Natur*, 604, 261
- Fulton, C. C., & Arp, H. C. 2012, *ApJ*, 754, 134
- Fulton, C. C., Arp, H. C., & Hartnett, J. G. 2018, *Ap&SS*, 363, 134
- Harikane, Y., Inoue, A. K., Mawatari, K., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 929, 1
- Hawkins, E., Maddox, S. J., & Merrifield, M. R. 2002, *MNRAS*, 336, L13
- Hoyle, F., & Narlikar, J. V. 1964, *RSPSA*, 282, 191
- Hoyle, F., & Narlikar, J. V. 1966, *RSPSA*, 290, 177
- Jiang, L., Kashikawa, N., Wang, S., et al. 2021, *NatAs*, 5, 256
- Juarez, Y., Maiolino, R., Mujica, R., et al. 2009, *A&A*, 494, 25
- Kanjilal, P. P., & Palit, S. 1995, *ITSP*, 43, 1536
- Karlsson, K. G. 1971, *A&A*, 13, 333
- Karlsson, K. G. 1973, *NPhS*, 245, 68
- Karlsson, K. G. 1977, *A&A*, 58, 237
- Karlsson, K. G. 1990, *A&A*, 239, 50
- Kartaltepe, J. S., Rose, C., Vanderhoof, B. N., et al. 2023, *ApJL*, 946, L15
- Lehto, A. 1990, *ChJPh*, 28, 215
- Liu, H. Y., Liu, W. J., Dong, X. B., et al. 2019, *ApJS*, 243, 21
- López-Corredoira, M., & Gutiérrez, C. M. 2004, *A&A*, 421, 407
- Mal, A., Palit, S., & Roy, S. 2022, arXiv:2206.11897
- Mal, A., Palit, S., Bhattacharya, U., & Roy, S. 2020, *A&A*, 643, A160
- Napier, W. M., & Burbidge, G. 2003, *MNRAS*, 342, 601
- Narlikar, J., & Arp, H. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 51
- Narlikar, J. V., & Das, P. K. 1980, *ApJ*, 240, 401
- Oei, M. S. S. L., Weeren, R. J. V., Hardcastle, M. J., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 660, A2
- Petrosian, V., Singa, J., & Mutchnick, S. 2022, *ApJL*, 935, L19
- Roy, S., Datta, D., Ghosh, J., Roy, M., & Kafatos, M. 2007, in *Proc. 6th Int. Workshop on Data Analysis in Astronomy*, ed. V. Di Gesù, G. Lo Bosco, & M. Concetta (Singapore: World Scientific), 90
- Roy, S., Kafatos, M., & Datta, S. 2000, *A&A*, 353, 1134
- Sadler, E. M., Jackson, C. A., Cannon, R. D., et al. 2002, *MNRAS*, 329, 227
- Schindler, J.-T., Fan, X., Novak, M., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 906, 12
- Schneider, D. P., Richards, G. T., & Hall, P. B. 2010, *AJ*, 139, 2360
- Shen, Y., Richards, G. T., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 45
- Shimazaki, H., & Shinomoto, S. 2007, *Neural Comput.*, 19, 1503
- Shimazaki, H., & Shinomoto, S. 2009, *J. Comput. Neurosci.*, 29, 171
- Tang, S., & Zhang, S. N. 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 41

Tang, S., & Zhang, S. N. 2008, arXiv:0807.2641  
Véron-Cetty, M. P., & Véron, P. 2006, A&A, 455, 773  
Wolf, E. 1986, PhRvL, 56, 1370  
Yan, H., Ma, Z., Ling, C., et al. 2022, ApJL, 942, L9  
Yusef-Zadeh, F., Arendt, R. G., & Wardle, M. 2022, ApJL, 939, L21  
Zhe Lee, R., Pacucci, F., Natarajan, P., & Loeb, A. 2022, arXiv:2209.06830

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.*