Review of: "Why Mature Galaxies Seem to Have Filled the Universe Shortly After the Big Bang — A New Cosmological Model, that Predicted the JWST Observations"

Lior Shamir[1]

1 Michigan Technological University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, I thank the author for taking some of my previous comments into consideration, and making changes to the paper. Many unsupported statements were corrected, and claims for “proofs” that are merely observations were removed. The new version does not imply that the model is proven, which makes it better than the previous versions. In that sense the paper has improved.

A short discussion about the relevance of previous work of holographic universe can still add to the paper and perhaps strengthen it. The R^2 projection can be associated with the previous work on holographic Universe, and can be discussed.

The abstract highlights the Ho tension, but the paper itself does not provide a full quantitative analysis or a full explanation.

Nevertheless, the idea that a new redshift model can explain many of the puzzling observations and tensions is an idea that should be develop and discussed rather than silenced. The main argument of the paper is that the redshift is not absolute, and is observer-dependent. In that sense the paper makes arguments that deserve consideration. Changing a single model can indeed provide answers to several questions that are currently unanswered.

One of the primary weaknesses of the paper is that there is no strong physical explanation to the new model. The projection itself is based on assumptions, and at this point it is difficult to prove it, but that does not mean that an explanation will not be developed in the future. The paper also does not show a direct observation that the redshift can be observer-dependent. But some observations that could be related to observer-dependent redshift were reported in the literature, even if they are not mentioned in the paper.

Another weakness of the paper is that it does not provide full quantitative analysis of how the new model impacts the different tensions discussed in the paper. The discussion is much more qualitative than quantitative.

But despite its weaknesses, the idea itself is a valid direction of research, and should be encouraged rather than discouraged. As an idea that shifts from the standard model it is expected that it will not be received well by the broader scientific community, as the history of cosmology proved times and times again, probably even more than any other discipline. But accumulating observations show that the standard model does not explain recent observations, and it

should be valid to explore other explanations, even though these explanations do not have strong foundations at this time. Although the full model is incomplete at this point, it should be further developed. Even if it is not true, it is a research direction that should be explored.