Operational Response Structure in Modern Cosmology: Transport, Damping, and Boundary Behavior Without Ontological Commitment

Adam Sheldrick[1]

[1] *Independent Researcher*
(Dated: February 7, 2026)

Modern cosmology achieves remarkable empirical success through a hierarchy of effective descriptions that govern the propagation, damping, and equilibration of perturbations across cosmic scales. These descriptions routinely employ transport equations, diffusion processes, response functions, and boundary conditions that are operationally indistinguishable from those of a physical medium, while explicitly denying any underlying medium ontology. This work examines the internal consistency of this practice. Without challenging the empirical validity of standard cosmological models, we catalogue the response-like behaviors required by early-universe radiation transport, horizon-scale boundary assignments, mode damping, and late-time structure formation. We show that these behaviors collectively define a coherent operational structure characterized by finite propagation, energy storage, relaxation, and saturation. We then articulate the consistency requirements that any framework choosing to treat these operational properties as physically explicit would necessarily have to satisfy. The analysis does not advocate a specific interpretation, but clarifies the mathematical and physical commitments already implicit in contemporary cosmological practice.

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard cosmological framework has demonstrated extraordinary success in describing observations across more than thirty orders of magnitude in scale. From the anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) to the late-time distribution of galaxies, the formalism provides a unified quantitative account of cosmic history. This success rests on a sequence of effective descriptions that govern how disturbances propagate, interact, and relax within the evolving universe.

At the same time, the language and mathematical structures employed throughout cosmology routinely resemble those used to describe physical systems with finite response: transport equations, diffusion damping, horizon boundary conditions, relaxation times, and saturation effects. These structures are used operationally, yet the underlying ontology is typically restricted to geometry and fields without intrinsic physical response.

The purpose of this paper is not to dispute the empirical adequacy of the standard model, nor to promote an alternative ontology. Instead, we examine the internal consistency of the operational structures already in use. By systematically inventorying where and how response-like behavior enters modern cosmology, we clarify the implicit physical commitments required by the mathematics, and articulate the constraints any framework would face if these behaviors were treated as physically explicit rather than purely effective.

II. EARLY-UNIVERSE TRANSPORT AND DIFFUSION

A. Acoustic propagation and finite signal speed

The early universe plasma is described using linear perturbation theory in which baryon–photon fluctuations propagate as acoustic waves with a finite sound speed. The existence of the sound horizon, which sets the characteristic scale of baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), follows directly from this finite propagation speed [1, 2].

Mathematically, these perturbations obey wave equations with well-defined causal cones, implying finite signal transmission and phase coherence over bounded regions. The resulting oscillatory features are imprinted on both the CMB anisotropy spectrum and the late-time matter distribution, demonstrating the persistence of these transport effects across cosmic time.

B. Diffusion damping and saturation

At smaller scales, photon diffusion leads to the exponential suppression of anisotropies, commonly referred to as Silk damping. This effect arises from the finite mean free path of photons prior to recombination and is described by a diffusion equation whose solution exhibits scale-dependent attenuation [3, 4].

The damping tail of the CMB power spectrum is therefore not a geometric artifact, but a manifestation of finite response and transport limits within the primordial plasma. The saturation of anisotropy power at high multipoles reflects the exhaustion of coherent transport channels, a behavior familiar from dissipative systems.

III. HORIZON ASSIGNMENTS AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

A. Particle and event horizons

Horizons play a central role in cosmology, defining causal boundaries beyond which information cannot be exchanged within a given time. The particle horizon bounds the region from which signals could have reached an observer since the Big Bang, while event horizons delimit the ultimate reach of future communication [5, 6].

Operationally, horizons function as boundary surfaces across which propagation is restricted. Their existence introduces scale-dependent constraints on correlation, equilibration, and information flow, all of which are treated mathematically through boundary conditions rather than through explicit physical barriers.

B. Thermodynamic assignments

In gravitational contexts, horizons are further assigned thermodynamic properties such as entropy and temperature. These assignments, initially developed for black hole horizons, have been extended to cosmological horizons, where they play a role in discussions of inflation and dark energy [7–9].

While often interpreted geometrically, these constructions employ quantities—entropy, temperature, surface gravity—that describe energy storage and response at boundaries. Their operational success depends on treating horizons as surfaces with effective physical characteristics, regardless of interpretive stance.

IV. DYNAMICAL RELAXATION AND MODE DAMPING

A. CMB anisotropy relaxation

The evolution of cosmological perturbations includes not only propagation but also relaxation toward statistical equilibrium. Mode coupling, phase mixing, and diffusion collectively act to redistribute power and suppress fine-scale structure in the CMB anisotropy spectrum [10].

These processes are described using transfer functions that encode how initial perturbations are modified by subsequent interactions. The formalism explicitly tracks the attenuation and redistribution of power, behavior characteristic of systems with finite response and dissipation.

B. Late-time structure growth

At late times, the growth of structure is governed by equations that balance gravitational amplification against expansion-driven dilution and environmental suppression. The growth factor and growth rate encapsulate how density perturbations respond to the evolving background [11, 12].

Although often framed in geometric terms, these equations describe a competition between driving and damping effects, with characteristic timescales and saturation behavior. The mathematical structure mirrors that of driven, dissipative systems approaching steady state.

V. ENERGY BOOKKEEPING AND LOCALITY

A persistent subtlety in cosmology concerns the localization of gravitational energy. While local conservation of stress–energy holds, gravitational binding energy and backreaction effects resist straightforward localization [13].

In practice, cosmological calculations track energy exchange through effective quantities, averaging procedures, and response functions. These techniques succeed operationally, but they rely on a global bookkeeping framework in which energy can be stored, redistributed, and released without being associated with localized carriers.

This nonlocal accounting is consistent with the use of response-like descriptions, but complicates attempts to maintain a strictly geometric interpretation devoid of physical response.

VI. AN OPERATIONAL PICTURE

Taken together, the phenomena reviewed above describe a system that supports finite-speed propagation, exhibits scale-dependent damping, stores and redistributes energy, and relaxes toward equilibrium. These behaviors are encoded in transport equations, diffusion terms, boundary conditions, and transfer functions that are indispensable to modern cosmological analysis.

Importantly, this operational structure emerges without invoking any specific microscopic ontology. The mathematics functions because it captures how disturbances behave, not because it specifies what ultimately carries that behavior.

VII. CONSISTENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPLICIT FRAMEWORKS

If one were to treat the operational response structure identified above as physically explicit rather than purely effective, any resulting framework would be subject to stringent consistency requirements. Such a framework would need to:

- Reproduce the metric limit and local Lorentz invariance to current experimental bounds,

- Recover standard perturbation theory in regimes where it has been empirically validated,
- Respect equivalence principle constraints and precision tests of gravity,
- Match observed CMB anisotropy spectra, including acoustic features and damping tails,
- Preserve the observed consistency between supernova distances, BAO scales, and structure growth.

These requirements sharply limit the space of viable models and ensure continuity with existing observations.

VIII. DISCUSSION

The analysis presented here does not argue that current cosmological practice is inconsistent or incomplete. Rather, it highlights that the mathematical structures already in use collectively define a response-like operational framework. Whether this framework is interpreted as purely effective or as indicative of deeper physical structure remains an open question.

What is clear is that the success of modern cosmology relies on behavior—transport, damping, boundary response, and relaxation—that transcends simple kinematic description. Recognizing this fact clarifies the assumptions embedded in current models and sharpens the criteria for future theoretical developments.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Modern cosmology employs a rich array of mathematical tools that describe how disturbances propagate, dissipate, and equilibrate across cosmic history. These tools collectively define an operational response structure that is essential to the model's empirical success. By making this structure explicit, we clarify the physical commitments already implicit in contemporary practice and articulate the constraints any framework must satisfy if it seeks to treat these behaviors as physically explicit. The resulting perspective invites careful reconsideration of how foundational concepts are interpreted, without prescribing a particular ontological resolution.

[1] W. Hu and N. Sugiyama, Small-scale cosmological perturbations: An analytic approach, Astrophysical Journal **471**, 542 (1996).

[2] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008).

[3] J. Silk, Cosmic black-body radiation and galaxy formation, Astrophysical Journal **151**, 459 (1968).

[4] W. Hu and M. White, The damping tail of cosmic microwave background anisotropies, Astrophysical Journal **479**, 568 (1997).

[5] W. Rindler, Visual horizons in world-models, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **116**, 662 (1956).

[6] G. F. R. Ellis, Relativistic cosmology, Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi" **47**, 104 (1971).

[7] J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, Physical Review D **7**, 2333 (1973).

[8] S. W. Hawking, Particle creation by black holes, Communications in Mathematical Physics **43**, 199 (1975).

[9] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Cosmological event horizons, thermodynamics, and particle creation, Physical Review D **15**, 2738 (1977).

[10] W. Hu and S. Dodelson, Cosmic microwave background anisotropies, Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics **40**, 171 (2002).

[11] P. J. E. Peebles, *The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1980).

[12] E. V. Linder, Cosmic growth history and expansion history, Physical Review D **72**, 043529 (2005).

[13] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).