

Correcting K-correction: dark energy is based on a math error from 1930

LOGAN P. EVANS

ABSTRACT

We rederive the K-correction equation and discover that the version commonly used to calculate magnitudes contains multiple errors. The oldest of these errors traces back to 1930 and two new errors were introduced in 1996. We conclude that properly correcting apparent magnitudes for redshift resolves two of the preeminent mysteries in cosmology: first, dark energy is not supported by observations of Type Ia supernovae and second, the Hubble tension is due to the errors in the K-correction equation.

Keywords: Type Ia supernovae(1728) — Apparent magnitude(59)

1. INTRODUCTION

The estimate of Type Ia supernovae (SnIa) distances is one of the primary sources of data for cosmological models. Performing these distance estimates involves taking a measurement of redshifted light in our observation frame and then calculating the rest frame magnitude as if no redshift had occurred. The equation that converts from an observation frame magnitude to a rest frame magnitude is called K-correction.

Tolman (1930) published the first formal derivation of K-correction, but he did not account for spectral bandwidth stretching, one of the dimming effects of redshift. An alternative K-correction was correctly derived by de Sitter (1934). However, in Hubble & Tolman (1935), the discrepancy was briefly discussed yet dismissed. Oke & Sandage (1968) rederived the K-correction equation where they accounted for spectral bandwidth stretching, but they did not account for time dilation, one of the other dimming effects of redshift. The paper by Kim et al. (1996), which is the basis for modern implementations of K-correction, extended the work of Oke & Sandage (1968) to handle additional cross-filter comparisons and added a term that was intended to address zero-point corrections. This history is explored in more depth in Section 2.

The effect of using an incorrect redshift correction for SnIa is that we think objects are farther away than they really are; this effect compounds for greater distances. Up until Riess et al. (1998), we did not have distant enough observations for this error to matter much for cosmological models, but by the late 1990s, it became clear that our measurements for distance and redshift were not linear. This realization led to a model that utilized a cosmological constant Λ and dark energy in order to explain the non-linear distance-redshift graph. We will show in Section 5 that correcting the flaws of K-correction leads to a linear graph that does not need to rely on a cosmological constant.

Planck-Collaboration et al. (2016) used an alternative technique to compute the Hubble constant H_0 that is based on measurements of the cosmic microwave background (CMB). CMB-based computations of H_0 have made it evident that something is missing with our understanding of cosmology because this technique produces a significantly different value than when the constant is derived using SnIa. As we will discuss in Section 5, fixing the errors with K-correction produces a measurement of the Hubble constant that is compatible with models based on the CMB.

2. A BRIEF HISTORY OF K - CORRECTION

Observational data from SnIa are essential for the calibration of models that use redshift to estimate distance. The approximately linear relationship between redshift and luminosity distance, often called the Hubble-Lemaître law, describes how quickly the universe is expanding. However, Riess et al. (1998) and Perlmutter et al. (1999) presented




Figure 1. The relationship between luminosity distance and redshift for two treatments of magnitude data. The red $k(z) = 1$ treatment, which represents the uncorrected values, is clearly non-linear while the blue $k(z) = 1 + z$ treatment, which fixes the K-correction redshift error, appears to be linear. The displayed points are roughly a third of the values in the full SnIa dataset published in [DES-Collaboration et al. \(2024\)](#), selected with uniform redshift spacing to aid visibility.

evidence that there is not a linear relationship between redshift and distance, but instead, distant objects are farther away than their redshift would predict (see Figure 1). This phenomenon implies that the acceleration of the universe is faster today than it was for old observations. The cause of this phenomenon was unknown and was referred to as dark energy.

SnIa are used to explore the relationship between distance and redshift because these events have a roughly constant absolute magnitude, which allows us to use the apparent magnitude to estimate distance. An analogy is to imagine someone walking in the dark and lighting matches. If we know how brightly a match burns at a known distance, we can estimate the distance to any match by measuring the apparent brightness before applying some geometry.

However, redshifting dims the luminosity of an observation in three ways:

- The energy of a wave is inversely proportional to its wavelength; thus a redshift of z means the amount of energy per photon is reduced by a factor of $1/(1+z)$.
- The bandwidth stretches. If the rest frame observes photons in the bandwidth from 400nm and 401nm, then a redshift of $z = 1$ stretches the wavelengths to the bandwidth from 800nm to 802nm. The number of photons per bandwidth is reduced by a factor of $1/(1+z)$.
- Cosmological time dilation reduces the rate at which photons arrive. The number of photons that arrive per second is reduced by a factor of $1/(1+z)$.

To complicate matters, we use the B band magnitude to calculate luminosity distance. We want to know how bright a supernova appears for wavelengths around 445nm as if no redshift had occurred. However, we typically need to observe the supernova with a filter that is sensitive to longer wavelengths, such as the i band filter which is sensitive to wavelengths from 700nm-850nm (Flaugher et al. 2015). The K-correction formula allows us to take a magnitude measured in an observation filter y and compute the magnitude in the target filter x .

The first mathematical treatment of K-correction was performed by Tolman (1930). However, when Tolman made his derivation, he did not consider the effects of a spectrum that is stretched due to redshift.

A few years later, de Sitter (1934) discussed all three issues that reduce the observed magnitude of a distant observation. The correction for each of these issues is identical: take a measurement for luminosity and multiply it by the factor $1 + z$.

A year later, Hubble & Tolman (1935) published a similar set of calculations where they noted:

It should be specially noted that this expression differs from the correction to m proposed by de Sitter, which contains the term $(1 + z)^3$ instead of $(1 + z)^2$. Expression (28), however, would seem to give the proper correction to use in connection with our equation (21), since it has been derived in such a way as to make appropriate allowance, first, for the double effect of nebular recession in reducing both the individual energy and the rate of arrival of photons, and then for the further circumstance that a change in spectral distribution of the energy that does arrive will lead to changes in its photographic effectiveness.

However, even though they considered all three dimming effects of redshift, they started their derivation by copying the incorrect equation from 1930. The incorrect correction term has been used ever since.

In a paper published by Oke & Sandage (1968), the two factors of $(1 + z)$ were attributed to the change in energy and to the spectral bandwidth elongation, which leaves time dilation as the factor that was omitted.

The modern treatment of K-correction is based on the work of Kim et al. (1996). This work extended the work of Oke & Sandage (1968) to apply to filters beyond the blue B and visible V bands. It also introduced a term that deals with the zero-point for the actual filters. Historically, bolometric devices would measure the energy flux, but modern charge-coupled device (CCD) cameras effectively measure the photon flux, so Kim et al. (1996) derived a form of the K-correction equation that uses photon flux.

Quoting Kim et al. (1996):

Therefore, the correct K correction calculation to be used with measured photometric magnitudes is the integral photon counts:

$$K_{xy} = -2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int \lambda \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) + 2.5\log(1 + z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int \lambda F(\lambda/(1 + z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right). \quad (1)$$

This equation has three errors that we will explore in Section 4.

3. DERIVATION OF K-CORRECTION

The K-correction K_{xy} uses a spectral energy density F template that specifies the expected spectrum for a SnIa observation. It also uses the observed redshift z and the observed photon flux magnitude m_y .

With modern CCD cameras, a telescope observation consists of a single value \mathcal{F}_y erg/s, which represents the energy collected per second in filter y . Photogenerated electrons are collected in potential wells, which means that the energy measured in this filter is proportional to the number of photons (Lesser 2015). However, we need to calculate the expected number of photons collected by using a spectral energy density function F .

To convert the spectral energy density F to the photon density F' , we need to use the Plank relation $E = hc/\lambda$ where E is the energy, h is Planck's constant, and c is the speed of light. This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} F(\lambda) &= F'(\lambda) \times \frac{hc}{\lambda} \\ F'(\lambda) &= \frac{\lambda F(\lambda)}{hc}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

It is important to note that for the blueshifted wavelength $\lambda/(1 + z)$, this equation produces

Calculating K'_{xy} , the ratio of rest frame to observation frame counts for $z = 0.5$




Figure 2. The value K'_{xy} is equal to the number of photons we want to report in the target filter divided by the number of photons we measure in the observation filter. Deriving this value starts with $F(\lambda)$, the spectral energy density, which we then convert to $F'(\lambda)$, the photon density for the rest frame. Starting at the top right corner of the figure we show three steps used to compute $R'(\lambda)$, the photon density in the observation frame. We first stretch the photon density, but this step inflates counts. In the second step, we correct for the inflated counts by multiplying by $1/(1+z)$; at this point, the total count equals the total count of $F'(\lambda)$. Finally, in the third step we finish calculating the observation frame photon density $R'(\lambda)$ by accounting for time dilation, which also reduces photon counts by a factor of $1/(1+z)$. We can compute the expected ratio of photons by totalling the area under the curves in the bottom two panels.

$$F'\left(\frac{\lambda}{1+z}\right) = \frac{\lambda}{(1+z)hc} F\left(\frac{\lambda}{1+z}\right). \quad (3)$$

However, this equation is misleading and error prone. We will want to use it to help calculate the flux in an observation filter at the redshifted wavelength $\lambda \times (1+z)$. In other words, we want to produce the photon density function R' that is the redshifted version of F' . Redshifting the photon density does two things:

- All wavelengths are increased by a factor of $1+z$. When we integrate R' from wavelength λ_a to wavelength λ_b , the values correspond to the wavelengths $\lambda_a/(1+z)$ to $\lambda_b/(1+z)$ in F' . We will integrate over a width of $\lambda_b - \lambda_a$, but $F'(\lambda/(1+z))$ will refer to values in a width of $(\lambda_b - \lambda_a)/(1+z)$.

In order to account for the spectral bandwidth stretching effect, we multiply F' by $1/(1+z)$.

- The stretching of space increases the distance between photons while they are traveling. To an observer, this phenomenon appears like time dilation, although cosmological time dilation is due to a different mechanism than relativistic time dilation. This effect reduces the photon arrival rate by a factor of $1/(1+z)$.

In order to account for cosmological time dilation, we multiply F' by a second factor of $1/(1+z)$.

Combining these two phenomena, we can calculate the redshifted spectral energy density R using

$$\begin{aligned} R'(\lambda) &= F' \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+z} \right) \times \frac{1}{(1+z)^2} \\ R(\lambda) &= \frac{\lambda}{(1+z)hc} \times F \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+z} \right) \times \frac{1}{(1+z)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We deliberately do not combine all of the factors of $1+z$ together because this form is more natural to implement in code.

In order to calculate the flux \mathcal{F}_x measured in filter x , we need to compute the photon density $F'(\lambda)$ and multiply it by the sensitivity $S_x(\lambda)$, which represents the proportion of photons with wavelength λ that filter x will measure. We then sum over all wavelengths, which is expressed with the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_x &= \int F'(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda \\ &= \int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We will also use the flux \mathcal{F} to magnitude m formula:

$$\begin{aligned} m_x &= -2.5 \log(\mathcal{F}_x) + P_x \\ -2.5 \log(\mathcal{F}_x) &= m_x - P_x. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

P_x represents the zero-point for the filter x on some particular telescope. In order to use consistent magnitude values across telescopes that have different light gathering abilities, we take the measured magnitude and multiply it by the ratio of the standard flux rate to the flux rate for this particular telescope and filter. For convenience, we use $P_x = -2.5 \log(P'_x)$ so that we can work with flux instead of with magnitude.

Now that we have the identities in Equations 5 and 6, we will change directions and look at the definition of K-correction K_{xy} . This value allows us to make an observation in filter y and report what the magnitude would have been in filter x if no redshift occurred:

$$\begin{aligned} m_y &= M_x + \mu + K_{xy} \\ &= M_x + m_x - M_x + K_{xy} \\ &= m_x + K_{xy} \\ m_x &= m_y - K_{xy}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The second line of Equation 7 expands the distance modulus μ using $\mu = m - M$ where m is the observed magnitude and M is the absolute magnitude.

Since the K-correction is a magnitude value and we wish to work on flux values, it is convenient to define the following substitution:

$$K_{xy} = 2.5 \log(K'_{xy}). \quad (8)$$

Note that this substitution omits the minus $(-)$ sign that we used on a similar substitution for P_x .

Starting with Equation 6 and then recombining the flux term \mathcal{F}_y with m_y from Equation 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-2.5\log(\mathcal{F}_x) &= m_x - P_x \\
&= m_y - K_{xy} - P_x \\
&= -2.5\log(\mathcal{F}_y) + P_y - K_{xy} - P_x \\
&= -2.5\log(\mathcal{F}_y) - 2.5\log(P'_y) - 2.5\log(K'_{xy}) + 2.5\log(P_x) \\
&= -2.5(\log(\mathcal{F}_y) + \log(K'_{xy}) + \log(P'_y) - \log(P_x)) \\
&= -2.5\log\left(\mathcal{F}_y \times K'_{xy} \times \frac{P'_y}{P'_x}\right) \\
\mathcal{F}_x &= \mathcal{F}_y \times K'_{xy} \times \frac{P'_y}{P'_x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We can isolate K'_{xy} and then use Equation 5 to expand

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_x &= \mathcal{F}_y \times K'_{xy} \times \frac{P'_y}{P'_x} \\
K'_{xy} &= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times \frac{\mathcal{F}_x}{\mathcal{F}_y}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We now use Equations 4 and 5 to calculate the fluxes \mathcal{F}_x and \mathcal{F}_y in terms of the spectral energy density function F . Note that \mathcal{F}_x uses the rest frame spectral energy density F , while \mathcal{F}_y uses the redshifted spectral energy density $R(\lambda)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
K'_{xy} &= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times \frac{\mathcal{F}_x}{\mathcal{F}_y} \\
&= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times \frac{\int F'(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int R'(\lambda) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda} \\
&= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times \frac{\int F'(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int F'(\lambda/(1+z)) \times (1/(1+z)^2) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda} \\
&= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times (1+z)^2 \times \frac{\int (\lambda/hc) F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/((1+z)hc)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda} \\
&= \frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times (1+z)^2 \times \frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Finally, we use Equation 8 to convert K'_{xy} back into the magnitude K_{xy} :

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{xy} &= 2.5\log(K'_{xy}) \\
&= 2.5\log\left(\frac{P'_x}{P'_y} \times (1+z)^2 \times \frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) \\
&= 2.5\left(\log\left(\frac{P'_x}{P'_y}\right) + \log((1+z)^2) + \log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right)\right) \\
&= 2.5\log\left(\frac{P'_x}{P'_y}\right) + 5\log(1+z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) \\
&= 5\log(1+z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) - P_x + P_y.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

4. CONSEQUENCES

In order to fully compare our derivation against Equation 1 (from Kim et al. (1996)) we need to use the identity

$$P = -2.5\log\left(\int \frac{\lambda}{hc} \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S(\lambda) d\lambda\right) \tag{13}$$

where, according to Kim et al. (1996), “ $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)$ is an idealized spectral energy distribution at $z = 0$ for which $U = B = V = R = I = 0$ in the photometric system being used.” Combining this with Equation 12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{xy} &= 5\log(1+z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) - P_x + P_y \\
&= 5\log(1+z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) \\
&\quad + 2.5\log\left(\int (\lambda/hc) \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda\right) - 2.5\log\left(\int (\lambda/hc) \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda\right) \\
&= 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int \lambda \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right) + 5\log(1+z) + 2.5\log\left(\frac{\int \lambda F(\lambda) S_x(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int (\lambda/(1+z)) F(\lambda/(1+z)) S_y(\lambda) d\lambda}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Three differences with Equation 1 stand out:

- The sign is different for the first term. This will have a subtle but frustrating effect for real measurements. The zero-point values for the two filters are usually, but not always, roughly equal. As we observe more distant supernovae, it is useful to switch our observational filter to a filter that is sensitive to longer wavelengths, but each observation filter will have its own small bias.
- This effect by itself can alter estimates of H_0 by several percent. While we present an estimate of the Hubble constant in Figure 4, we are not terribly confident in the numbers because we were unable to correct the zero-point errors, or verify that these errors may not exist.
- The second term is multiplied by 2.5 in Kim et al. (1996), but is multiplied by 5 here. This is the manifestation of the error in Tolman (1930) and leads to the conclusion that the expansion of the universe is accelerating.
- In our derivation, the third term has an extra $1+z$ expression. Based on an inspection of the SN(oo)py software package presented by Burns et al. (2010) and the SNANA software package presented by Kessler et al. (2009), this error is ignored and software package authors implement it as intended, not precisely as written.

5. CONCLUSIONS

As shown in Figure 1, when reported magnitudes are corrected by adding the magnitude $-2.5\log(1+z)$, there is a linear relationship between redshift and luminosity distance. This is in accordance with the Hubble-Lemaître law. As opposed to the uncorrected values, there is no visual acceleration. Since the corrected values are approximately linear, we can use them to estimate the Hubble constant H_0 which is demonstrated in Figure 3. Furthermore, we performed a bootstrap calculation to estimate the distribution of H_0 estimates in Figure 4.

The value estimated here, $H_0 = 65.94 \pm 1.3$ is highly suspicious because of the flipped zero-point corrections, but it is consistent with estimates of H_0 that are based on the CMB. Planck-Collaboration et al. (2020) published the CMB value of $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.6$, and the one sigma error bars overlap. It is interesting to note that restricting the Dark Energy Survey observations of SnIa (Vincenzi et al. 2024) to only those with $z < 0.1$, which presumably is a small enough redshift that most of the observations will have been made with the same filter, gives the estimate $H_0 = 67.8 \pm 1.9$.

Since the K-correction error has corrupted all astronomical measurements that depend on both magnitude and redshift, a lot of data needs to be reanalysed. Cosmological parameters, such as those used by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric or the Λ -CDM model, can only be recalculated once the data is cleaned.

The reasons that the K-correction errors went undiscovered for so long should also be explored. Many hints existed that something was wrong, yet the problems persisted.

REFERENCES

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>178 Burns, C. R., Stritzinger, M., Phillips, M., et al. 2010, The
179 Astronomical Journal, 141, 19</p> <p>180 Camarena, D., & Marra, V. 2020, Physical Review
181 Research, 2, 013028</p> | <p>182 de Sitter, W. 1934, Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes
183 of the Netherlands, Vol. 7, p. 205, 7, 205</p> <p>184 DES-Collaboration, Abbott, T., Acevedo, M., et al. 2024,
185 arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02929</p> |
|---|---|




Figure 3. The relationship between expansion velocity and distance. The slope of this graph demonstrates the Hubble constant. The data for these SnIa observations comes from the Dark Energy Survey (Vincenzi et al. 2024), but the magnitudes are corrected to account for time dilation by adding $-2.5\log(1+z)$.

186 Flaugher, B., Diehl, H., Honscheid, K., et al. 2015, The
 187 Astronomical Journal, 150, 150
 188 Hubble, E., & Tolman, R. C. 1935, Astrophysical Journal,
 189 vol. 82, p. 302, 82, 302
 190 Kessler, R., Bernstein, J. P., Cinabro, D., et al. 2009,
 191 Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific,
 192 121, 1028
 193 Kim, A., Goobar, A., & Perlmutter, S. 1996, Publications
 194 of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 108, 190
 195 Lesser, M. 2015, Publications of the Astronomical Society
 196 of the Pacific, 127, 1097
 197 Oke, J. B., & Sandage, A. 1968, Astrophysical Journal, vol.
 198 154, p. 21, 154, 21

199 Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1999,
 200 The Astrophysical Journal, 517, 565
 201 Planck-Collaboration, Ade, P. A., Aghanim, N., et al. 2016,
 202 Astronomy & Astrophysics, 594, A13
 203 Planck-Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al.
 204 2020, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 641, A6
 205 Riess, A. G., Filippenko, A. V., Challis, P., et al. 1998, The
 206 astronomical journal, 116, 1009
 207 Siegel, A. F. 1982, Biometrika, 69, 242
 208 Tolman, R. C. 1930, Proceedings of the National Academy
 209 of Sciences, 16, 511
 210 Vincenzi, M., Brout, D., Armstrong, P., et al. 2024, The
 211 Astrophysical Journal, 975, 86




Figure 4. A histogram of 10,000 bootstrap trials measuring the Hubble constant H_0 . Each trial samples an absolute magnitude $M \sim \text{Norm}(-19.2334, 0.0404)$ (Camarena & Marra 2020) before it samples, with replacement, a population of supernovae from the dataset published by DES-Collaboration et al. (2024). Finally, it uses the non-parametric linear regression technique described by Siegel (1982). The result of the bootstrap is $H_0 \sim \text{Norm}(65.94, 1.3^2)$.