

$$\implies \Phi_{\hat{z}}^2(\zeta_{(\hat{z})}) \circ \widehat{\text{exp}}_p = \left(\frac{1-v_{\hat{z}}(p)}{1+v_{\hat{z}}(p)} \right) \frac{D_{\hat{z}}^2 \circ \zeta_{(\hat{z})}}{\widehat{D}_{\hat{z}}^2 \circ \widehat{\text{exp}}_p} = \frac{D_{\hat{z}}^2(\zeta_{\hat{z}}, v_{\hat{z}})}{\widehat{D}_{\hat{z}}^2 \circ \widehat{\text{exp}}_p},$$

where we exploited the relation (G.84) defining the (aberration) normalized area distance $D_{\hat{z}}^2(\zeta_{\hat{z}}, v_{\hat{z}})$. \square

Proposition I.1 shows that the conformal factor $\Phi_{\hat{z}}(\zeta_{(\hat{z})})$, evaluated for a given source \hat{q} at FLRW celestial sphere coordinates $y \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}(p)$, can be expressed as the ratio between the (normalized) physical area distance of the source, $D(\zeta_{\hat{z}}(y), v_{\hat{z}})$, and the corresponding reference area distance $\widehat{D}(\widehat{\text{exp}}_p(y))$. It follows that $\Phi_{\hat{z}}(\zeta_{(\hat{z})})$ is an explicit and, at least in principle, measurable quantity, also when the exponential mapping is not smooth.

J The comparison functional at a given FLRW redshift

We can think of the conformal factor $\Phi_{\hat{z}}(\zeta_{(\hat{z})})$ as stretching the elastic surface $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}(p), h_{\hat{z}})$ on the rigid surface $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}(p), \widehat{h}_{\hat{z}})$. In [20, 21], we associated with this stretching an *elastic energy functional*, whose structure was suggested to us by the rich repertoire of functionals used in the problem of comparing shapes of surfaces in computer graphics and visualization problems (see *e.g.* [56] and [50], to quote two relevant papers in a vast literature). In particular, we were inspired by an energy functional introduced, under the name of *elastic energy*, in a remarkable paper by J. Hass and P. Koehl [51], who use it as a powerful means of comparing the shapes of genus-zero surfaces in problems relevant to surface visualization. In the more complex cosmological setting, we introduce the following comparison functional between the celestial spheres $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}(p), h_{\hat{z}})$ and $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}(p), \widehat{h}_{\hat{z}})$

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}[\zeta_{\hat{z}}] := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}} (\Phi_{\hat{z}}(\zeta_{(\hat{z})}) - 1)^2 d\mu_{\widehat{h}_{\hat{z}}} = \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}} \left[\frac{D_{\hat{z}}(\zeta_{\hat{z}}, v_{\hat{z}}) - \widehat{D}_{\hat{z}}}{\widehat{D}_{\hat{z}}} \right]^2 d\mu_{\widehat{h}_{\hat{z}}}, \quad (\text{J.1})$$

where we exploited (I.22). As the notation suggests, $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}[\zeta_{\hat{z}}]$, is a functional of the Möbius map $\zeta_{\hat{z}}$ controlling, on the FLRW celestial sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}$, the conformal distortion between the FLRW metric $\widehat{h}_{\hat{z}}$ and the pulled back physical metric

$$\zeta_{(\hat{z})}^* h_{\hat{z}} = \left(\frac{1+v_{\hat{z}}(p)}{1-v_{\hat{z}}(p)} \right) \Phi_{\hat{z}}^2(\zeta_{(\hat{z})}) \widehat{h}_{\hat{z}} \circ \widehat{\text{exp}}_p, \quad (\text{J.2})$$

defined by (I.20). Note that one can easily rephrase the characterization of the comparison functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}_{\hat{z}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}[\zeta_{\hat{z}}]$ in terms of the map $\psi_{\hat{z}}$ defined by (I.5), acting between the sky sections $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\hat{z}}$ and $\Sigma_{\hat{z}}$.

Lemma J.1. *As an immediate consequence of the preceding remarks, we have*

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_z] = E_{\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma}[\psi(z)]. \quad (\text{J.3})$$

Proof. By exploiting the pull back action associated with $\widehat{\text{exp}}_p$ we can write

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_z] := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}} (\Phi - 1)^2 d\mu_{\widehat{h}(z)} \quad (\text{J.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}} (\Phi(\widehat{\text{exp}}_p(y)) - 1)^2 (\widehat{\text{exp}}_p)^* d\mu_{\widehat{g}(z)} \\ &= \int_{\widehat{\text{exp}}_p(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z})} (\Phi(\widehat{q}) - 1)^2 d\mu_{\widehat{g}(z)}(\widehat{q}) \\ &= \int_{\widehat{\Sigma}_z} (\Phi - 1)^2 d\mu_{\widehat{g}(z)} = E_{\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma}[\psi(z)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{J.5})$$

□

Lemma J.1 shows that $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta(z)]$ can be used to compare sky sections at given redshift, and eventually, as the redshift varies, it compares the physical and the reference FLRW past light cones in the pre-homogeneity region[20, 21].

From a geometric analysis point of view, the (bi)-Lipschitz continuous exponential map exp_p admits a Sobolev (1, 2)-norm, requiring that exp_p and its first differential be square integrable. This property implies that the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta(z)]$ is well-defined in the assumed bi-Lipschitzian setting here adopted, and that it can be minimized over $\zeta(z) \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ providing a redshift-dependent distance functional between the reference FLRW celestial sphere $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \widehat{h}_z)$ and the physical celestial sphere $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z, h_z)$, or, equivalently, between the corresponding sky sections $\widehat{\Sigma}_z$ and Σ_z . We have the following result.

Theorem J.1. *(The distance functional at redshift \widehat{z} [20, 21]).*

For any given FLRW reference redshift \widehat{z} , the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta(\widehat{z})]$ can be minimized over $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, and

$$d_{\widehat{z}}[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z] := \inf_{\zeta(\widehat{z}) \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})} E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta(\widehat{z})] \quad (\text{J.6})$$

defines a redshift-dependent distance functional between the reference FLRW celestial sphere $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \widehat{h}_z)$ and the physical celestial sphere $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z, h_z)$. Since

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_z] = E_{\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma}[\psi(z)]. \quad (\text{J.7})$$

the distance functional $d_{\widehat{z}}[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z]$ extends to a corresponding functional between the sky sections $(\widehat{\Sigma}_z, \widehat{g}_z^{(2)})$ and $(\Sigma_z, g_z^{(2)})$.

Proof. Without loss in generality, we can safely assume that, for the given \widehat{z} ,

$$\int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}} \frac{D_z(\zeta_z, v_z)}{\widehat{D}_z} d\mu_{\widehat{h}_z} > 0. \quad (\text{J.8})$$

Since we can write (see (I.14))

$$\Phi_{\widehat{z}}(\zeta(\widehat{z})) = \frac{D_{\widehat{z}}(\zeta(\widehat{z}), v_{\widehat{z}})}{\widehat{D}_{\widehat{z}}}, \quad (\text{J.9})$$

the condition (J.8) rules out an almost everywhere collapsing behavior of the conformal factor $\Phi_{\widehat{z}}(\zeta(\widehat{z}))$ induced by the $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ map $\zeta_{\widehat{z}} : \widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z$. In particular, let $\widehat{q}_{(j)} = \widehat{\text{exp}}_p(y_{(j)})$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, denote the three selected sources on the reference FLRW celestial sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}$, and let $\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}(\widehat{q}_{(j)}) = q_{(j)}(k) = \text{exp}_p(x_{(j)}(k))$, be the corresponding images in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z$. Then, if the sequences $\{x_{(j)}(k)\}$ converge to three distinct points $\{\bar{x}_{(j)}\}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, and (J.9) holds, the sequence $\{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equicontinuous and converges to the unique $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ map $\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}$ that takes $y_{(j)}$ to $\{\bar{x}_{(j)}\}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. This is the configuration of interest in mapping our celestial spheres.

Under these conditions a minimizing sequence $\{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ for the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_z]$ is equicontinuous, and by selecting a subsequence, we may assume that $\{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a smooth map $\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}$. Thus, given $\delta > 0$, there exists k_0 such that for all $k \geq k_0$, we have

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}] \leq E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}] + \delta, \quad (\text{J.10})$$

for all $k \geq k_0$. Since the choice of $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary, (J.10) implies that the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}]$ is lower semicontinuous, *i.e.*,

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}] \leq \liminf_k E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}]. \quad (\text{J.11})$$

Hence, $\{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}^{(k)}\} \rightarrow \bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}$ minimizes $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}]$ over $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, as stated.

If, according to (J.6) we set

$$d_{\widehat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z \right] := \inf_{\zeta_{(\widehat{z})} \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})} E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\zeta_{(\widehat{z})}] = E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}], \quad (\text{J.12})$$

then, by exploiting the rewriting of the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}[\bar{\zeta}_{(\widehat{z})}]$ in terms of the area distances, is not difficult to prove that $d_{\widehat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z \right]$ provides a redshift-dependent distance functional between the celestial spheres $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z}, \widehat{h}_z)$ and $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_z, h_z)$. Explicitly, we have

- (Non-negativity)

$$d_{\hat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}} \right] \geq 0; \quad (\text{J.13})$$

- (Isometry)

$$d_{\hat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}} \right] = 0, \quad (\text{J.14})$$

iff $(\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \widehat{h}_{\hat{z}})$ and $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}, \zeta_{(\hat{z})}^* h_{\hat{z}})$ are isometric ;

- (Symmetry)

$$d_{\hat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}} \right] = d_{\hat{z}} \left[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}, \widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}} \right]; \quad (\text{J.15})$$

- (Triangular inequality)

$$d_{\hat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \widetilde{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}} \right] \leq d_{\hat{z}} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}} \right] + d_{\hat{z}} \left[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}, \widetilde{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}} \right], \quad (\text{J.16})$$

where \sim refers to a third candidate spacetime (either another FLRW selected for enlarging the possible choices among potential FLRW best-fitting candidates or another physical spacetime among those candidates that the astrophysical observations may suggest).

□

According to (G.60), the area element associated with the metric $\widehat{h}_{\hat{z}}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}(p)$ is given by $d\mu_{\widehat{h}_{\hat{z}}} = (1 + \hat{z})^{-2} f^2(\widehat{r}(\hat{z})) d\mu_{\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^2}$, where $d\mu_{\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^2}$ denotes the solid angle measure on the FLRW observer's celestial sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}$, where the radial density is constant. It follows that if we consider a model FLRW spacetime with flat spatial sections, then $f^2(\widehat{r}(\hat{z})) = \widehat{r}^2(\hat{z})$ and we can profitably rewrite the functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}[\zeta(\hat{z})]$ in terms of the mean square relative fluctuation $\delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}}^{(2)}(\hat{z})$ of the area distance (see (G.92)) according to

$$E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}} = \frac{4\pi \widehat{r}(\hat{z})^2}{(1 + \hat{z})^2} \delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}}}^{(2)}(\hat{z}). \quad (\text{J.17})$$

From this rewriting and (H.63), we easily obtain the following physical characterization of the comparison functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}$.

Theorem J.2. *The functional $E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}[\zeta(\hat{z})]$ minimized on the celestial sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}}}(c)$ associated with the cosmological uncoupling surface $\partial V_{(c)}(p)$ is given by*

$$d_{\hat{z}(c)} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)} \right] = E_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)}}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)}}[\zeta(\hat{z}(c))] = \frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{\widehat{\Omega}_{\widehat{\Lambda}}}{H_0^2} \left(\frac{\widehat{\Lambda} - \Lambda^{(v)}}{\widehat{\Lambda}} \right) \widehat{z}^4(c). \quad (\text{J.18})$$

In particular, if in the pre-homogeneity region $(\frac{\Delta_{\hat{z}(c)}\rho}{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{z}(c)}})^2 \neq 0$, then we have the lower bound

$$d_{\hat{z}(c)} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)} \right] > \pi \left(\frac{\widehat{\Omega}_m}{24H_0} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\Delta_{\hat{z}(c)}\rho}{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{z}(c)}} \right)^2 (1 + \hat{z}(c))^2 \hat{z}^6(c). \quad (\text{J.19})$$

This result implies that as long as there is a non-trivial matter density contrast in the pre-homogeneity region (and for a cluster, this contrast can be very large), the distance functional $d_{\hat{z}(c)} \left[\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}_{\hat{z}(c)} \right]$ is different from zero.

Proof. The relation (J.18) follows from a straightforward substitution of the factorization (H.63) of $\delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}^{(1)}(\hat{z}(c))$ into (J.17), and of the standard low redshift Hubble formula $\hat{z} = H_0 \hat{r}(\hat{z})$. The lower bound is a consequence of the variance inequality (see (G.93) and (H.9))

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}(Y_{\hat{z}(i)}) &:= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}} \left(Y_{\hat{z}(i)} - \delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}^{(1)}(\hat{z}(i)) \right)^2 d\mu_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}^2} \\ &= \delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}^{(2)}(\hat{z}(i)) - \left(\delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}^{(1)}(\hat{z}(i)) \right)^2 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{J.20})$$

The bound (J.19) follows from a direct computation exploiting the factorization

$$\delta_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{S}}^{(1)}(\hat{z}(c)) = \frac{\widehat{\Omega}_m}{48} \left(\frac{\Delta_{\hat{z}(c)}\rho}{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{z}(c)}} \right) (1 + \hat{z}(c))^2 \hat{z}^2(c) \quad (\text{J.21})$$

provided by (H.63). □

References

- [1] T. M. C. Abbot, et al., *Dark Energy Survey Year 3 results: Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering and weak lensing*, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 023520 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.023520>.
- [2] W. Abikoff, *The uniformization theorem*, Amer. Math. Monthly **88**, no. 8, 574–592 (1981).
- [3] J. Adamek, C.Clarkson, L. Coates, R. Durrer, M. Kunz, *Bias and scatter in the Hubble diagram from cosmological large-scale structure*, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 021301 (2019), doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.021301; arXiv:1812.04336v2 [astro-ph.CO].

- [4] J. Adamek, C. Clarkson, R. Durrer, A. Heinesen, M. Kunz, H. J. Macpherson, *Towards Cosmography of the Local Universe*, The Open Journal of Astrophysics 7 (2024),doi.org/10.33232/001c.118782; arXiv:2402.12165v2.
- [5] S. W. Allen, A. E. Evrard, A. B. Mantz, *Cosmological Parameters from Observations of Galaxy Clusters*, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **49** (2011) 409–470.
- [6] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations*, Cambridge University Press (2015), isbn 978–1–107–45398–2.
- [7] , N. A. Bahcall, J. P. Ostriker, S. Perlmutter, and P. J. Steinhardt, *The Cosmic Triangle: Revealing the State of the Universe*, Science, **284** 1481–1488, (1999) DOI: 10.1126/science.284.5419.1481
- [8] J. Beem, P. Ehrlich, K. Easley, *Global Lorentzian Geometry, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics* Vol. 202, 2nd ed., Dekker, New York, (1996).
- [9] M. S. Berger, *On Riemannian structures of prescribed Gaussian curvature for compact 2-manifolds*, J. Diff. Geo. **5** 325–332 (1971).
- [10] C. Berthiere, G. Gibbons, and S. N. Solodukhin, *Comparison theorems for causal diamonds*, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 064036 (2015).
- [11] C. Bonvin, C. Clarkson, D. Durrer, R. Maartens, O. Umeh, *Do we care about the distance to the CMB? Clarifying the impact of second-order lensing*, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics06(2015)050 DOI 10.1088/1475–7516/2015/06/050 [arXiv:1503.07831].
- [12] M.–A. Breton and P. Fleury, *Theoretical and numerical perspectives on cosmic distance averages*, Astron. Astrophys. **655** (2021) A54 [arXiv:2012.07802].
- [13] T. Buchert, *Dark energy from structure: a status report*, GRG Journal **40**: 467 (2008) [arXiv:0707.2153].
- [14] T. Buchert, S. Räsänen, *Backreaction in Late-Time Cosmology*, The Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science **62**, 57–79 (2012).
- [15] T. Buchert, M. Carfora, *Regional averaging and scaling in relativistic cosmology*, Class. Quantum Grav. 19 6109 (2002) DOI 10.1088/0264–9381/19/23/314.
- [16] T. Buchert, M. Carfora, *Cosmological Parameters Are Dressed*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 031101, (2003).
- [17] T. Buchert, M. Carfora, G. F. R. Ellis, E. W. Kolb, M. MacCallum, J. Ostrowski, S. Räsänen, B. Roukema, L. Andersson, A. Coley, D. Wiltshire, *Is there proof that backreaction of inhomogeneities is irrelevant in cosmology?*. Classical and Quantum Gravity **32** (21), (2015).

- [18] T. Buchert, M. J. France, F. Steiner, *Model-independent analyses of non-Gaussianity in Planck CMB maps using Minkowski Functionals*. *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **34** 094002 (2017), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/aa5ce2>. (or arXiv:1701.03347v2 [astro-ph.CO] <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1701.03347>)
- [19] T. Buchert, H. van Elst, A. Heinesen, *The averaging problem on the past null cone in inhomogeneous dust cosmologies*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **55** (2023) 7; doi.org/10.1007/s10714-022-03051-x; arXiv:2202.10798v2.
- [20] M. Carfora, F. Familiari, *A comparison theorem for cosmological lightcones*, *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 111:53 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11005-021-01393-2>
- [21] M. Carfora, F. Familiari, *A Scale-Dependent Distance Functional between Past Light Cones in Cosmology*, *Universe* 2023, 9(1), 25; <https://doi.org/10.3390/universe9010025> – 30 Dec 2022, (this article belongs to the Special Issue *Cosmological Perturbations in Early and Late Cosmology—in Honor of Professor Maurizio Gasperini on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*).
- [22] M. Carfora, A. Marzuoli, *Einstein Constraints and Ricci Flow: A Geometrical Averaging of Initial Data Sets*, *Mathematical Physics Studies (MPST)*, Springer (2023) ISBN: 978-981-19-8539-3.
- [23] S. Cartwright, *Distances at moderate redshifts*, <http://www.hep.shef.ac.uk/cartwright/phy323/DistancesModerateRedshift.pdf>.
- [24] B.-L. Chen and P. LeFloch, *Injectivity Radius of Lorentzian Manifolds*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 278 (2008)
- [25] T. M. Davis et al., *The Effect of Peculiar Velocities on Supernova Cosmology*, *ApJ* 741 67, (2011) DOI 10.1088/0004-637X/741/1/67
- [26] DESI Collaboration, *Extended Dark Energy Analysis Using DESI DR2 BAO Measurements*, *Physical Review D* **112**, 083511 (2025). DOI: 10.1103/w4c6-1r5j(arXiv: 2503.14743 [astro-ph.CO])
- [27] DESI Collaboration, *The Dark Energy Survey Supernova Program: Investigating Beyond- Λ CDM*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **533** (3), 2615–2639 (2024). DOI: 10.1093/mnras/stae1988
- [28] B. L. Dias, F. Avila, A. Bernui, *Probing cosmic homogeneity in the Local Universe*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **526**, (2023) 3219–3229.
- [29] G. De Cecco, G. Palmieri, *Length of curves on Lip manifolds*, *Rend. Mat. Acc. Lincei* **1**, 215–221 (1990).

- [30] J. Eells and B. Fuglede, *Harmonic maps between Riemannian polyhedra*, Cambridge tracts in mathematics 142, Cambridge University Press (2001).
- [31] G. F. R. Ellis, *Relativistic cosmology: its nature, aims and problems*, In General Relativity and Gravitation, ed. B Bertotti et al. (Reidel, 1984), 215.
- [32] G.F.R. Ellis, *Relativistic Cosmology*, in *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi," Course 47: General Relativity and cosmology* pp. 104–182, Ed. R. K. Sachs. Academic Press, New York and London (1971). Reprinted as a Golden Oldie in *Gen. Relativ. and Gravit* (2009) 41: 581–660.
- [33] G.F.R. Ellis, B.A. Bassett and P.K.S. Dunsby, *Lensing and caustic effects on cosmological distances*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** (1998) 2345 [gr-qc/9801092].
- [34] G.F.R. Ellis and D.M. Solomons, *Caustics of compensated spherical lens models*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** (1998) 2381 [gr-qc/9802005].
- [35] G.F.R. Ellis and R. Durrer, *Note on the Kaiser–Peacock paper regarding gravitational lensing effects*, arXiv:1806.09530.
- [36] G.F.R. Ellis and H. van Elst, *Deviation of geodesics in FLRW spacetime geometries*, p. 203–225 in A. Harvey ed., *On Einstein's path—Essays in Honor of Engelbert Schücking*, Springer, New York, (1999).
- [37] G.F.R. Ellis, S.D. Nel, R. Maartens, W.R. Stoeger, and A.P. Whitman, *Ideal observational cosmology*, *Phys. Reports* **124**, 315–417 (1985).
- [38] G. F. R. Ellis and W. R. Stoeger, *The "Fitting Problem" in cosmology*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **4**, 1697 (1987)
- [39] G.F.R. Ellis, R. Maartens and M. A. H. MacCallum, *Relativistic Cosmology*, Cambridge Univ. Press (2012).
- [40] I. M. H. Etherington, *On the definition of distance in general relativity*, *Phil. Mag.* **15**, 761 (Reprinted as a Golden Oldie in *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39**, 1047–1052 (2007)).
- [41] L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press (Boca Raton, Florida) (1992).
- [42] G. Fanizza, M. Gasperini, G. Marozzi, and G. Veneziano, *A new approach to the propagation of light-like signals in perturbed cosmological backgrounds*, *JCAP* 1508 (2015), no. 08 020, [arXiv:1506.02003].
- [43] P. M. Garnavich *et al*, *Supernova Limits on the Cosmic Equation of State*, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **509**, 74 (1998) DOI 10.1086/306495.
- [44] M. Gasperini, G. Marozzi, F. Nugier, G. Veneziano, *Lightcone averaging in cosmology: formalism and applications*, *JCAP* 1107:008,(2011);

doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2011/07/008; arXiv:1104.1167v3.

- [45] G. W. Gibbons and S. N. Solodukhin, *The geometry of small causal diamonds*, Phys. Lett. **B 649** (2007) 317 [hep-th/0703098]
- [46] G. W. Gibbons and S. N. Solodukhin, *The geometry of large causal diamonds and the No-Hair property of asymptotically DeSitter spacetimes*, Phys. Lett. **B 652** (2007) 103 [arXiv: 0706.0603]
- [47] J. R. Gott, III, M. Juric, D. Schlegel, F. Hoyle, M. Vogeley, M. Tegmark, N. Bahcall, J. Brinkmann, *A Map of the Universe*, Astrophys.J.624:463,(2005) (arXiv:astro-ph/0310571).
- [48] S. R. Green, and R. M. Wald, *A new framework for analyzing the effects of small scale inhomogeneities in cosmology*, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 084020,[arXiv:1011.4920].
- [49] S. R. Green, and R. M. Wald,*Examples of backreaction of small scale inhomogeneities in cosmology* Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 124037,[arXiv:1304.2318].
- [50] X. Gu, S.-T. Yau, *Computing conformal structure of surfaces*, Communications in Information and Systems, Vol. 2 (2002) 121-146.
- [51] J. Hass and P. Koehl, *Comparing shapes of genus-zero surfaces*, Journal of Applied and Computational Topology, Vol. 1, (2017) 57-87.
- [52] A. Heinesen, *Multipole decomposition of the general luminosity distance 'Hubble law' - a new framework for observational cosmology*, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 05(2021)008 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2021/05/008>, arXiv:2010.06534v2 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] D. W. Hogg, D. J. Eisenstein, M. R. Blanton, N. A. Bahcall, J. Brinkmann, J. E. Gunn, and D. P. Schneider, *Cosmic Homogeneity Demonstrated with Luminous Red Galaxies*, The Astrophysical Journal, Vol. 624, (2005) 54-58.
- [54] D. Huterer, *Growth of cosmic structure*, Astron. Astrophys. Rev. (2023)31:2 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00159-023-00147-4>
- [55] A. Ishibashi, and R. M. Wald, *Can the Acceleration of Our Universe Be Explained by the Effects of Inhomogeneities?*, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 235-250,[arXiv:gr-qc/0509108].
- [56] M. Jin, Y. Wang, S.-T. Yau, X. Gu, *Optimal global conformal surface parametrization for visualization*, Communications in Information and Systems, (2005) 117-134.
- [57] S. Klainerman and I. Rodnianski, *On the radius of injectivity of null hypersurfaces*, journal of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. **21** (2008) 775-795

- [58] E. W. Kolb, V. Marra, S. Matarrese, *Cosmological background solutions and cosmological backreactions*, Gen.Rel.Grav. **42** (2010) 1399–1412.
- [59] M. Kunzinger, R. Steinbauer, M. Stojkovic, *The exponential map of a $C^{1,1}$ metric*, Differential Geometry and its Applications **34** (2014) 14–24.
- [60] R. Maartens, *Is the Universe homogeneous?* Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, **A 369** (2011), 5115–37.
- [61] V. Marra, E. W. Kolb, S. Matarrese, *Light-cone averages in a swiss-cheese universe*, Phys.Rev.D77:023003,2008, doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.023003; arXiv:0710.5505v2 [astro-ph].
- [62] E. Minguzzi, *Convex neighborhoods for Lipschitz connections and sprays*, Monatsh. Math. **177**, 569–625 (2015), https://doi.org/10.1007/s00605-014-0699-y. See also arXiv:1308.6675v2 [math.DG].
- [63] J. Myrheim, *Statistical Geometry*, Report No. CERN-TH-2538, (1978) (unpublished).
- [64] J. Neyman, *Alternative Stochastic Models of the Spatial Distribution of Galaxies*, Problems of Extra-Galactic Research, Proceedings from IAU Symposium no. 15. Edited by G. C. McVittie. International Astronomical Union Symposium no. 15, Macmillan Press, New York, p.294–314 (1962).
- [65] D. Ntalampekos and M. Romney, *Polyhedral approximation and uniformization for non-length surfaces*, arXiv:2206.01128v1[math. MG] (2022).
- [66] P.J.E. Peebles, *Cosmology's Century*, Princeton University Press (2020)
- [67] V. Perlick, *Gravitational Lensing from a Spacetime Perspective*, Living Reviews in Relativity, Livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-9.
- [68] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space Time Vol I*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge Univ. Press (1984).
- [69] S. Perlmutter *et al*, *Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae*, The Astrophysical Journal, **517**, 565 (1999) DOI 10.1086/307221.
- [70] P. Petersen, *Riemannian Geometry*, Graduate Text in Mathematics **171** Springer (1998).
- [71] F. A. E. Pirani, *Introduction to Gravitational Radiation Theory*, pp. 249–352 in *Lectures in General Relativity* (Brandeis Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics (1964), Vol. I) Eds. S. Deser and K. Ford, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall (1965).

- [72] Planck Collaboration, *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, A&A Vol. **594**, A13 (2016). arXiv:1502.01589v3 [astro-ph.CO]. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525830>
- [73] Planck Collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, A&A Vol. **641**, A6, (2020) (1–67) DOI 10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.
- [74] A. G. Riess et al, *A Comprehensive Measurement of the Local Value of the Hubble Constant with 1 km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ Uncertainty from the Hubble Space Telescope and the SH0ES Team*, ApJL **934** L7 (2022) DOI 10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b
- [75] A. G. Riess et al, *Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant*, The Astronomical Journal, **116**,1009 (1998) DOI 10.1086/300499.
- [76] J. Rosenberg, *Applications of Analysis on Lipschitz Manifolds*, Proc. Centre Math. Appl., 16: 349pp. (1987) 269–283, Miniconference on Harmonic Analysis and Operator Algebras (August 5–8 and December 2–3, 1987, Australian National University, Canberra). Eds. M. Cowling, C. Meaney, W. Moran.
- [77] R. Sachs, *Gravitational waves in general relativity VI. The outgoing radiation condition*, Proc. Royal Soc., **A264**, 309–338 (1961).
- [78] T. Schiavone, E. Di Dio, G. Fanizza, *The skewness of the distance–redshift relation in Λ CDM*, JCAP 02 (2024) 050, doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2024/02/050; arXiv:2307.13455v2 [astro-ph.CO].
- [79] R. Schoen, S–T. Yau, *Lectures on differential geometry*, Vol. I, International Press, Cambridge, MA, (1994).
- [80] D. Scolnic et al, *The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release*, The Astrophysical Journal, **938**, 113 (2022) DOI 10.3847/1538-4357/ac8b7a.
- [81] M. Scrimgeour M et al., *The WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey: the transition to large-scale cosmic homogeneity* Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc. 425 (2012) 116 [arXiv:1205.6812].
- [82] P. Shah, P. Lemos, O. Lahav, *A buyer’s guide to the Hubble constant*, Astron Astrophys Rev 29:9 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00159-021-00137-4>.
- [83] W. R. Stoeger, G. F. R. Ellis and C. Hellaby, *The relationship between continuum homogeneity and statistical homogeneity in cosmology*, Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc. **226** (1987), 373–381.
- [84] D. W. Strook, *Probability Theory*, 3rd Ed. Cambridge Univ. Press (2025).

- [85] O. Umeh, C. Clarkson, and R. Martens, *Nonlinear relativistic corections to cosmological distances, redshift, and gravitational lensing magnification II - derivation*, Class. Quant. Grav. **31** (2014) 205001.
- [86] O. Umeh, *Emergence of smooth distance and apparent magnitude in a lumpy Universe*, Class. Quantum Grav. **39** (2022) 235006 (15pp).
- [87] J.-P. Uzan, *Emergent Structures of Effective Field Theories*, pp. 109–135 in *The Philosophy of Cosmology*, Eds. K. Chamcham, J. Silk, J. D. Barrow, S. Saunders, Cambridge Univ. Press (2017).
- [88] S. Weinberg, *Apparent luminosities in a locally inhomogeneous universe*, Astrophys. J. 208 (1976).
- [89] A.Wiegand, T. Buchert, M. Ostermann, *Direct Minkowski Functional analysis of large redshift surveys: a new high—speed code tested on the luminous red galaxy Sloan Digital Sky Survey–DR7 catalogue*. MNRAS, **443**, 241 (2014) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1118> (arXiv:1311.3661v2 [astro-ph.CO]) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1311.3661>
- [90] D. L., Wiltshire, P. R. Smale, T. Mattsson, and R. Watkins, *Hubble flow variance and the cosmic rest frame*, Physical Review D, 88(8), (2013), doi:10.1103/physrevd.88.083529
- [91] D. L. Wiltshire, *Cosmic clocks, cosmic variance and cosmic averages*, New J. Phys. **9** (2007), 377 DOI 10.1088/1367-2630/9/10/377.
- [92] D.Wiltshire, *Comment on "Hubble flow variations as a test for inhomogeneous cosmology"*, Astronomy and Astrophysics **624** (2019) A12.