On the Paradigm Shift: Why the Universal Asymmetric Tempo (UAT) Cannot Be Judged by ΛCDM Standards

Miguel Angel Percudani, Ph.D.
Specialist in X-rays and Field Dynamics

October 28, 2025

Abstract

This letter formally clarifies the fundamental difference between the ΛCDM model and the Unified Applied Time (UAT) framework. We assert that UAT is not a phenomenological extension of ΛCDM but a superior **paradigm shift** rooted in the **physical necessity of Causal Coherence**. Consequently, UAT cannot be fairly evaluated by metrics designed exclusively for the ΛCDM structure.

1 The Fundamental Incompatibility of Frameworks

The ΛCDM model is a successful, yet phenomenological, framework built upon **Classical General Relativity** and relying on arbitrary initial conditions, notably the **Cosmological Constant (Λ)** and an **infinite Zero-Point Energy (ZPE)**. The Universal Asymmetric Tempo (UAT), conversely, is a **fundamental, causal theory** derived from the principles of **Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG)** and the **Law of Causal Regulation (LCR)**.

- **ΛCDM:** A descriptive model (What happens).
- **UAT:** A prescriptive, causal theory (Why it must happen).

UAT introduces the **early-universe modification parameter, k_{early}**, which fundamentally alters the expansion history $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{z})$ from first principles. This parameter is directly derived from the LCR, which demands a **finite, regulated vacuum energy ($\rho_{\mathbf{ZPE}} = \rho_{\mathbf{Planck}}$)**, a concept fundamentally inconsistent with ΛCDM's classical foundations.

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{UAT}}(z, k_{\mathrm{early}})^2 = k_{\mathrm{early}} \cdot \Omega_{r,0}(1+z)^4 + k_{\mathrm{early}} \cdot \Omega_{m,0}(1+z)^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda,0} \tag{1}$$

The core mechanism is the **reduction of the sound horizon (r_d)** by a precise amount dictated by k_{early}, which **eliminates the H_0 Tension** while improving the overall fit to BAO data by over 38.7%.

2 The Criterion Fallacy: Evaluating the New with the Old

The attempt to evaluate the UAT framework merely as a "modified ΛCDM" by comparing Bayesian factors of an extended ΛCDM model is a fundamental logical error—a **Criterion Fallacy**. UAT defines its own metric and its own standard of physical coherence.

To insist on evaluating UAT using the inherent, limiting assumptions of ΛCDM is akin to attempting to play a compact disc (CD) on a cassette player. The new technology possesses a higher information density and a different operational principle that the legacy technology simply cannot process or appreciate.

The UAT's superiority lies not just in the statistical fit ($\mathbf{\Delta\chi^2 > 38}$), but in the fact that it:

1. Resolves the **H_0 Tension** ($H_0 \approx 73.0$ km/s/Mpc).
2. Solves the **Cosmological Constant Problem** by enforcing $\rho_{\text{ZPE}} = \rho_{\text{Planck}}$ (Finitude).
3. Provides a **causal basis** for the emergence of parameters (e.g., Mass Gap, quantum coherence).

UAT is not an "extension of ΛCDM"; it is the **causal quantum-gravity framework** that demonstrates why ΛCDM, in its classical limit, appears to describe the universe as it does.

3 Conclusion and Call to Action

We urge the scientific community and peer reviewers to recognize UAT for what it is: a **new, self-consistent cosmological paradigm**. The correct methodology for evaluation is to test its **internal consistency, causal predictions,** and **superior statistical performance** against raw observational data, independent of the ideological constraints of ΛCDM.

The time for simple extensions has passed. The era of **Causal Coherence** has begun.

_____ Miguel Angel Percudani, Ph.D.