

What Do We Really Mean by the Big Bang?

QTC-012 · From Quarks to Consciousness

The universe, life, and how we came to know it

Author: Juan Segurola

Version: v1.0 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Current scientific interpretation

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

The Big Bang is not a claim that matter exploded from one point into an empty container. In modern cosmology it names an evidence-led history in which the observable Universe was once much hotter, denser, and expanding. This article separates that durable statement from several layers often bundled with it: relativistic expansion, the cosmic microwave background, primordial nucleosynthesis, Lambda-CDM, inflation, and proposals about a quantum beginning or bounce. It also restores the distributed history of the idea, from Friedmann and Lemaître to Slipher, Hubble, Hoyle, and the measurements that displaced steady-state cosmology. Running the equations backward reaches a boundary where classical general relativity ceases to be trustworthy. That boundary is scientifically important, but it is not a photograph of creation, nor a settled answer to whether time had an absolute beginning.

In 60 Seconds

A homogeneous expanding universe has no unique spatial centre. Cosmologists describe large-scale separations with a changing scale factor, while atoms, planetary systems, and galaxies remain governed by local binding. The evidence for a hot past is convergent: measured redshifts and distance relations, the nearly perfect blackbody spectrum and anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background, primordial light-element abundances, and large-scale structure. These traces probe different epochs and physical processes. Light nuclei formed mainly in the first minutes; the CMB last scattered about 380,000 years later. Within base Lambda-CDM, the fitted expansion history gives an age near 13.8 billion years, but extrapolating classical equations toward zero scale factor produces a boundary, not direct access to creation. Quantum gravity should matter near the Planck regime, and proposed bounces or preceding phases remain unconfirmed. Inflation is a leading framework for primordial perturbations, yet no specific inflaton has been established. The Big Bang is therefore strong science precisely because its reliable claims are narrower than the total origin story often attached to its name.

Why This Question Matters

“Big Bang” is a compact name with too many pictures hidden inside it. If it means a bomb, readers look for a centre; if it means time zero, every uncertainty in quantum cosmology appears to threaten the measured hot past; if it means Lambda-CDM plus inflation, corrections to one layer seem to overturn them all. Separating the layers makes the reasoning auditable. It shows which quantities

were observed, which were inferred through a model, which independent processes cross-check one another, and exactly where current physics stops earning confidence.

1. It Was Not an Explosion

The Question

Where did the Big Bang happen? The question assumes an explosion with a place outside it. Relativistic cosmology changes the geometry of the question itself: the hot dense state filled the modeled region, and large-scale distances changed without choosing one privileged centre.

In modern cosmology, the hot Big Bang means that the observable Universe evolved from a much hotter, denser, expanding state. The phrase does not specify a bomb, an ignition point, or debris moving into pre-existing emptiness. It names a reconstruction of earlier physical conditions from relics that can still be measured. [36,38]

Homogeneous and isotropic relativistic models represent expansion with a scale factor. As that factor changes, proper distances between comoving worldlines change, even though each observer can remain locally at rest in comoving coordinates. This mathematical description is about spacetime relations across the modeled universe, not an expanding cloud inside a fixed arena. [1,2,36,38]

A homogeneous expansion has no unique spatial centre within the model. Every comoving observer sees sufficiently distant comoving systems receding according to the same large-scale relation. The absence of a centre is not a claim that every point is secretly one; it is the symmetry of the geometry, analogous to no preferred position on a uniform surface. [2,10,36]

Cosmic expansion also does not make every object swell. Electromagnetic binding dominates within atoms, gravity and orbital dynamics dominate in planetary systems, and virialized galaxies do not simply scale up with the Hubble flow. The scale factor describes the large-scale cosmological solution, not a universal stretching force imposed identically on every system. [10,36]

Even the phrase “expanding space” is one useful description rather than the sole possible language. Cosmological redshift can be decomposed into accumulated local Doppler shifts along a photon path, provided the geometry is handled correctly. Coordinate language may vary; the invariant observation and relativistic relation do not turn into motion through a static container. [9–11]

Where That Leaves Us

The Big Bang happened neither at one address nor outside the Universe. It is a history of changing scale and physical conditions throughout the modeled region, while bound systems obey local dynamics. Once the explosion picture is removed, the historical question becomes clearer: expansion theory, observational evidence and proposals about a beginning arrived in separate steps.

2. Expansion Before the Name

Alexander Friedmann showed in 1922 that Einstein’s equations admit non-static homogeneous solutions. Relativistic universes could expand or contract; staticity was not forced by the field equations. This was a mathematical opening, not yet an observational demonstration of the particular cosmic history our Universe followed. [1]

Georges Lemaître independently connected a changing cosmic radius with measured nebular velocities in 1927. The English translation published in 1931 omitted material from the original discussion, and archival evidence shows that Lemaître himself prepared the translation and chose the omissions. Recovering the French paper matters because the missing text belonged to his own quantitative argument. [2,39,40]

Edwin Hubble's 1929 distance–velocity relation was crucial observational evidence, but its inputs had a distributed provenance. Hubble supplied distance estimates while radial velocities came largely from Vesto Slipher and other observers; Hubble and Humason later extended the relation. This achievement did not independently invent relativistic expansion or the hot Big Bang. [4,5,41]

Lemaître's 1931 primeval-atom note added a finite-age physical origin picture. That proposal was not identical to his 1927 expanding solution, whose past behaviour differed. The history therefore resists a single discovery date: non-static equations, expansion tied to velocities, and a physical beginning were distinct conceptual moves. [3,8]

Fred Hoyle introduced the phrase “big bang” in a BBC broadcast on 28 March 1949 while defending steady-state cosmology. The steady-state model was a serious scientific rival that made testable claims about an eternally expanding universe with constant large-scale density. Evidence does not justify reducing Hoyle's phrase to a simple sneer that accidentally named the winning theory. [6–8]

Where That Leaves Us

No solitary moment delivered the modern Big Bang. Mathematics opened non-static cosmology; observers assembled distances and velocities; Lemaître linked them and later proposed a primeval atom; Hoyle named the rival picture while defending another theory. The decision between cosmologies ultimately depended not on priority stories but on several physical traces of a hot past.

3. More Than One Trace of a Hot Past

The Question

One observation can be reinterpreted or absorbed by a flexible model. A persuasive cosmic history must instead survive different measurements, instruments, epochs and physical processes. Expansion, thermal radiation, nuclear abundances and structure become powerful when their constraints intersect rather than merely repeat one another.

Redshift is measured directly from spectra, but its translation into recession speed or distance depends on a cosmological model and the regime considered. Peculiar motions and gravitational shifts can add to the expansion-related signal. The evidence lies in a patterned relation across many objects, not in treating each redshift as a simple speedometer reading. [9–11,38]

Type Ia supernovae revealed in the late 1990s that recent expansion is accelerating. That result changed the parameterized cosmic history without abolishing the hot Big Bang. Expansion need not proceed at one constant rate, and an early decelerating universe can coexist with later acceleration under the fitted energy inventory. [12,13,16]

The cosmic microwave background supplies a different relic. Its spectrum is extraordinarily close to a blackbody, while tiny anisotropies encode acoustic and gravitational structure. It is radiation released when the Universe became transparent, not light travelling outward from an explosion centre. QTC-011 owns the detection, mapmaking and foreground details. [14–16,32]

Big Bang nucleosynthesis uses yet another physical process. Nuclear reaction rates in the first minutes predict light-element abundances, long before neutral atoms released the CMB. The network's dependence on temperature, expansion and baryon density turns helium and deuterium into an independent test rather than a restatement of the microwave sky. [17–21]

Large-scale structure and baryon acoustic geometry add later evidence for the same expansion history and primordial perturbations. No single observation bears the whole theory. The strongest case is convergence among distance and redshift data, thermal radiation, light nuclei and structure, each with its own systematics and model connections. [16,25,32,38]

Where That Leaves Us

The hot past is not inferred from one iconic image. It is triangulated across redshift, acceleration, thermal radiation, nuclear chemistry and structure. Those probes do not observe the same moment, which is why their agreement matters. To understand what they constrain, the next step is to connect expansion with changing temperature, density and cosmic time.

4. Heat, Density and the Clock

In the standard freely expanding thermal setting, radiation cools approximately as the inverse scale factor. Its energy density falls as the fourth power: three powers from increasing volume and one from redshifting photon energy. Nonrelativistic matter density falls mainly as the third power because particle rest mass does not redshift in the same way. [35,36,38]

Reverse the expansion and the average temperature and density rise everywhere in the modeled homogeneous region. The early Universe was hot because the radiation and matter inventory occupied a smaller scale with greater energy density, not because fragments near an ignition point were hotter than distant debris. Backward evolution turns geometry into a physical thermal history. [36,38]

The CMB last scattered about 380,000 years after the beginning of the modeled hot expansion, when electrons and nuclei combined efficiently enough for photons to travel freely. This surface is the oldest electromagnetic image available, but it is neither the Big Bang itself nor direct sight of an initial singularity. [14–16]

Light nuclei belong to a much earlier clock. Big Bang nucleosynthesis was largely settled within the first few minutes, whereas photon decoupling occurred hundreds of thousands of years later. Conflating the epochs destroys the independent leverage that makes nuclear abundances and microwave anisotropies such a strong cross-check. [15,21]

Temperature therefore provides a chronology only through tested physical processes: weak reactions freeze out, nuclear networks open and close, plasma later recombines, and photons decouple. Each event has its own rates and assumptions. Their ordered sequence connects the measured relics without pretending that any one of them reaches time zero. [14–16,21]

Where That Leaves Us

Expansion predicts a sequence of thermal and density thresholds, not merely a movie played backward. The CMB marks transparency; nucleosynthesis marks an earlier nuclear window. Keeping the clocks separate makes their agreement informative and leads to the most quantitative early test:

calculate the light elements produced during the first minutes and compare them with ancient material.

5. Nuclear Evidence from the First Minutes

The Question

A theory of the early Universe should not merely say that it was hot. It should calculate what that heat did. Nuclear reaction rates, neutron decay and cosmic expansion together predict a pattern of light elements that later stars can alter but cannot freely invent.

Standard Big Bang nucleosynthesis begins as weak interactions cease to maintain the neutron–proton balance near one second. As expansion cools the plasma, deuterium can survive photodissociation and a short nuclear network rapidly assembles the principal light nuclei. The main yields are largely fixed within the first few minutes. [17–21]

The network predicts that roughly a quarter of primordial baryonic mass ends in helium-4, with the exact value depending on reaction rates, neutron lifetime and baryon density. Observations of low-metallicity environments broadly agree. Stars make additional helium, but they are not the sole source of the cosmic abundance. [21,23]

Deuterium is especially useful because stellar processing destroys it rather than producing a large later reservoir. Absorption systems at high redshift and low metallicity preserve a sensitive baryometer. The inferred baryon density agrees with the independent value extracted from CMB acoustic structure within standard cosmology. [20–22]

Lithium refuses full concordance. Standard calculations predict several times more primordial lithium-7 than old metal-poor stellar atmospheres appear to contain. Stellar depletion or new physics may contribute, but no resolution is established. The discrepancy is genuine without erasing the successful helium and deuterium pattern. [21,24]

The network also explains its limits. Rapid expansion lowers density, while the absence of stable nuclei with mass numbers five and eight blocks efficient construction of most heavier elements. Stars later make most carbon, oxygen and beyond. Agreement between BBN and CMB baryon densities is therefore a cross-epoch test, not a claim that the first minutes made everything. [16,21]

Where That Leaves Us

Nuclear physics turns “hot” into predicted abundances and exposes both concordance and a live lithium discrepancy. Helium, deuterium and the CMB converge on a baryon inventory through different processes, while heavier elements belong mainly to stars. The next limit lies deeper: what happens when the successful classical expansion is extrapolated beyond every directly tested thermal milestone.

6. Running the Equations Backward

Within base Lambda-CDM, precision measurements fit a present cosmic age close to 13.8 billion years. This is a model age derived from expansion parameters and their relations, not a clock placed at creation. Its precision depends on the model and data combination, even though multiple observations constrain it tightly. [16,38]

Classical Friedmann solutions with ordinary components drive density, temperature and curvature quantities toward divergence as the scale factor approaches zero. A divergence marks failure or incompleteness of the classical description at its boundary. It is not an object photographed by a telescope and does not explain why anything exists. [26,35,36]

Singularity theorems sharpen that statement through geodesic incompleteness under specified energy and causal conditions. Incomplete paths mean the spacetime cannot be extended indefinitely within the theorem's assumptions. They do not describe matter exploding from a spatial point, prove creation from nothing, or remove the need to examine where the assumptions fail. [26,27]

Near the conventional Planck regime, around 10^{-43} seconds in simple extrapolations, quantum effects of gravity should no longer be negligible. General relativity and quantum field theory have each been extraordinarily successful in their domains, but no experimentally established quantum-gravity theory yet carries the calculation through that boundary. [28,35]

The Borde–Guth–Vilenkin result shows past incompleteness for geodesics satisfying a positive average expansion condition. It constrains inflationary past extension; it does not prove that every conceivable cosmology has an absolute beginning. Cyclic or quantum proposals must still supply complete dynamics and evidence rather than being declared exempt by a slogan. [27,33,34]

Where That Leaves Us

Backward extrapolation earns confidence through the epochs where tested physics connects relics, then reaches a classical boundary where quantum gravity is required. Age, divergence and geodesic incompleteness are precise claims with different scopes; none is simply “creation observed.” This boundary also reveals that the hot Big Bang, Lambda-CDM and inflation are related layers rather than one indivisible model.

7. The Framework Is Not One Model

The Question

If one proposed inflaton fails, has the Big Bang failed? Only if distinct theoretical layers have been fused. A thermal expanding history, a fitted inventory of cosmic components, and a mechanism proposed for an earlier accelerated phase answer different questions and carry different evidential burdens.

The hot Big Bang is the thermal expanding history supported by relics. Lambda-CDM is a parameterized model combining that history with cold dark matter, a cosmological constant and specified primordial conditions. Inflation is a proposed pre-hot accelerated phase intended to explain features of those initial conditions. Evidence and revision propagate between layers, but the terms are not synonyms. [16,29,31,32]

Inflation remains the leading framework for explaining near-flatness and the origin of nearly scale-invariant primordial perturbations. CMB observations constrain broad classes of inflationary behaviour. Yet no specific inflaton field, potential or embedding has been empirically established, and many models can reproduce current observables. Framework success is not identification of one microscopic mechanism. [29–31]

Dark matter and dark energy likewise belong to the current inventory used to fit structure and expansion. Their gravitational effects are strongly evidenced, but their microscopic natures remain incomplete. Changing the dark-energy model or identifying a dark-matter particle would revise Lambda-CDM's components without redefining the hot Big Bang as an explosion. [12,13,16,37]

Bounce, cyclic and quantum-cosmology proposals attempt to continue the history beyond the classical boundary. They demonstrate that logically and mathematically serious alternatives exist, not that one has won. Present observations have not decisively selected a unique pre-hot history, and proposals must confront both internal consistency and empirical access. [28,33,34]

The layered architecture is a strength because it makes failure localizable. A nuclear reaction rate can alter BBN, a foreground model can alter a CMB inference, and a dark-energy parameter can alter late expansion without every result collapsing together. Scientific confidence belongs to particular links, not to a single all-or-nothing cosmological story. [16,31,37]

Where That Leaves Us

The hot Big Bang, Lambda-CDM, inflation and quantum-origin proposals occupy different epistemic levels. Separating them lets observations correct one layer without manufacturing a false total crisis or false total certainty. The final question is therefore not whether the Big Bang explains everything, but what its converging evidence actually settles and what remains outside its reach.

8. What the Big Bang Does Not Settle

Current evidence does not decide whether the observable expansion emerged from an absolute beginning, a quantum boundary, a bounce, or a preceding phase. Classical incompleteness establishes a limit under assumptions; candidate quantum continuations remain hypotheses. The reliable hot history does not require cosmologists to pretend that the more remote ontological question is closed. [26–28,34]

The framework is revisable because its parts are calculated and tested separately. Nuclear rates determine abundance predictions; recombination physics shapes last scattering; expansion parameters fit distances and ages; primordial perturbations seed later structure. Disagreement can identify a parameter, dataset, model layer or missing mechanism rather than forcing a choice between total belief and total rejection. [16,19,20,31]

The articles in this series preserve those boundaries. QTC-011 owns how the oldest observable light was detected and mapped. QTC-013 reconstructs the pre-atomic plasma and particle epochs. QTC-014 addresses the matter–antimatter imbalance. QTC-012 owns the narrower correction that Big Bang names an evidence-led hot expansion, not witnessed time zero. [15,16,21,32]

That division also prevents uncertainty from travelling in the wrong direction. An open inflaton potential does not erase the CMB spectrum; the lithium problem does not erase deuterium concordance; an unknown pre-hot phase does not make measured expansion disappear. Each claim inherits only the uncertainty of the evidence and assumptions that actually support it. [15,16,21,32]

What remains is both substantial and limited. We can reconstruct a hot dense Universe through independent relics and place quantitative clocks on its later evolution. We cannot yet cross the classical boundary with an established quantum theory or say whether “before” is physically

meaningful. The name Big Bang should carry the earned reconstruction, not an answer smuggled in beyond it. [26–28,34]

Where That Leaves Us

The Big Bang is a tested history, not a witnessed explosion and not a complete metaphysics. Expansion, thermal radiation, light nuclei and structure carry us far backward; classical singularities then mark where the method must change. QTC-013 continues through the pre-atomic states we can still reconstruct, while the absolute origin remains an open problem.

What We Know, and How

- The observable Universe evolved from a hotter, denser expanding state, and a homogeneous expansion has no unique spatial centre.
- Expansion history, the CMB, primordial light elements and large-scale structure provide converging but physically distinct evidence.
- Classical backward extrapolation reaches a boundary where quantum gravity is required; that boundary is not direct observation of creation.

What We Still Don't Know

- No specific inflaton field or potential has been established, although inflation remains the leading perturbation framework.
- The primordial lithium discrepancy remains unresolved within the otherwise broad light-element concordance.
- Whether the hot expansion has an absolute beginning, bounce, quantum boundary or preceding phase is not settled.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A coherent alternative would have to reproduce the measured expansion, CMB, light-element and structure evidence at least as well.
- An empirically confirmed quantum-cosmology signal could replace the present agnosticism about the pre-hot boundary.
- Persistent cross-probe contradictions that survive systematic and model checks would force revision of the current layered synthesis.

If You Remember Only One Thing

The Big Bang is the evidenced hot expanding history of the observable Universe; it is neither a bomb in space nor a settled account of absolute creation.

Related Articles

- QTC-011 — The Oldest Light We Can See
- QTC-013 — Before Atoms
- QTC-014 — Matter, Antimatter and an Unsolved Imbalance

References

- [1] A. Friedman. Über die Krümmung des Raumes. *Zeitschrift für Physik* 10, 377-386 (1922). DOI 10.1007/BF01332580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01332580>
- [2] G. Lemaître. A Homogeneous Universe of Constant Mass and Increasing Radius Accounting for the Radial Velocity of Extra-galactic Nebulae. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 91, 483-490 (1931). DOI 10.1093/mnras/91.5.483. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/91.5.483>
- [3] G. Lemaître. The Beginning of the World from the Point of View of Quantum Theory. *Nature* 127, 706 (1931). DOI 10.1038/127706b0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/127706b0>
- [4] Edwin Hubble. A Relation between Distance and Radial Velocity among Extra-Galactic Nebulae. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 15, 168-173 (1929). DOI 10.1073/pnas.15.3.168. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.15.3.168>
- [5] Edwin Hubble; Milton L. Humason. The Velocity-Distance Relation among Extra-Galactic Nebulae. *The Astrophysical Journal* 74, 43-80 (1931). DOI 10.1086/143323. <https://doi.org/10.1086/143323>
- [6] F. Hoyle. A New Model for the Expanding Universe. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 108, 372-382 (1948). DOI 10.1093/mnras/108.5.372. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/108.5.372>
- [7] H. Bondi; T. Gold. The Steady-State Theory of the Expanding Universe. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 108, 252-270 (1948). DOI 10.1093/mnras/108.3.252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/108.3.252>
- [8] H. Kragh. Big Bang: The Etymology of a Name. *Astronomy & Geophysics* 54(2), 2.28-2.30 (2013). DOI 10.1093/astrogeo/att035. <https://doi.org/10.1093/astrogeo/att035>
- [9] Emory F. Bunn; David W. Hogg. The Kinematic Origin of the Cosmological Redshift. *American Journal of Physics* 77, 688-694 (2009). DOI 10.1119/1.3129103. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.3129103>
- [10] Tamara M. Davis; Charles H. Lineweaver. Expanding Confusion: Common Misconceptions of Cosmological Horizons and the Superluminal Expansion of the Universe. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia* 21, 97-109 (2004). DOI 10.1071/AS03040. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AS03040>
- [11] David W. Hogg. Distance Measures in Cosmology. *arXiv:astro-ph/9905116* (1999). <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9905116>
- [12] Adam G. Riess; Alexei V. Filippenko; Peter Challis; Alejandro Clocchiatti; Alan Diercks; Peter M. Garnavich; Ron L. Gilliland; Craig J. Hogan; Saurabh Jha; Robert P. Kirshner; B. Leibundgut; M. M. Phillips; David Reiss; Brian P. Schmidt; Robert A. Schommer; R. Chris Smith; J. Spyromilio; Christopher Stubbs; Nicholas B. Suntzeff; John Tonry. Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant. *The Astronomical Journal* 116, 1009-1038 (1998). DOI 10.1086/300499. <https://doi.org/10.1086/300499>
- [13] S. Perlmutter; G. Aldering; G. Goldhaber; R. A. Knop; P. Nugent; P. G. Castro; S. Deustua; S. Fabbro; A. Goobar; D. E. Groom; I. M. Hook; A. G. Kim; M. Y. Kim; J. C. Lee; N. J. Nunes; R. Pain; C. R. Pennypacker; R. Quimby; C. Lidman; R. S. Ellis; M. Irwin; R. G. McMahon; P. Ruiz-Lapuente; N. Walton; B. Schaefer; B. J. Boyle; A. V. Filippenko; T. Matheson; A. S. Fruchter; N. Panagia; H. J. M.

Newberg; W. J. Couch; The Supernova Cosmology Project. Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae. *The Astrophysical Journal* 517, 565-586 (1999). DOI 10.1086/307221. <https://doi.org/10.1086/307221>

[14] A. A. Penzias; R. W. Wilson. A Measurement of Excess Antenna Temperature at 4080 Mc/s. *The Astrophysical Journal* 142, 419-421 (1965). DOI 10.1086/148307. <https://doi.org/10.1086/148307>

[15] D. J. Fixsen; E. S. Cheng; J. M. Gales; J. C. Mather; R. A. Shafer; E. L. Wright. The Cosmic Microwave Background Spectrum from the Full COBE FIRAS Data Set. *The Astrophysical Journal* 473, 576-587 (1996). DOI 10.1086/178173. <https://doi.org/10.1086/178173>

[16] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 Results. VI. Cosmological Parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641, A6 (2020). DOI 10.1051/0004-6361/201833910. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910>

[17] R. A. Alpher; H. Bethe; G. Gamow. The Origin of Chemical Elements. *Physical Review* 73, 803-804 (1948). DOI 10.1103/PhysRev.73.803. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.73.803>

[18] Ralph A. Alpher; James W. Follin, Jr.; Robert C. Herman. Physical Conditions in the Initial Stages of the Expanding Universe. *Physical Review* 92, 1347-1361 (1953). DOI 10.1103/PhysRev.92.1347. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.92.1347>

[19] Richard H. Cyburt; Brian D. Fields; Keith A. Olive; Tsung-Han Yeh. Big bang nucleosynthesis: Present status. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 88, 015004 (2016). DOI 10.1103/RevModPhys.88.015004. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.88.015004>

[20] Cyril Pitrou; Alain Coc; Jean-Philippe Uzan; Elisabeth Vangioni. Precision Big Bang Nucleosynthesis with Improved Helium-4 Predictions. *Physics Reports* 754, 1-66 (2018). DOI 10.1016/j.physrep.2018.04.005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2018.04.005>

[21] B. D. Fields; P. Molaro; S. Sarkar / Particle Data Group. Big Bang Nucleosynthesis. Review of Particle Physics, section 24 (2024). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001. <https://pdg.lbl.gov/2024/reviews/rpp2024-rev-bbang-nucleosynthesis.pdf>

[22] Ryan J. Cooke; Max Pettini; Charles C. Steidel. One Percent Determination of the Primordial Deuterium Abundance. *The Astrophysical Journal* 855, article 102 (2018). DOI 10.3847/1538-4357/aaab53. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaab53>

[23] Erik Aver; Keith A. Olive; Evan D. Skillman. The Effects of He I λ 10830 on Helium Abundance Determinations. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* 2015(07), 011 (2015). DOI 10.1088/1475-7516/2015/07/011. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2015/07/011>

[24] Brian D. Fields. The Primordial Lithium Problem. *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* 61, 47-68 (2011). DOI 10.1146/annurev-nucl-102010-130445. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-102010-130445>

[25] Daniel J. Eisenstein; Idit Zehavi; David W. Hogg; Roman Scoccimarro; Michael R. Blanton; Robert C. Nichol; Ryan Scranton; Hee-Jong Seo; Max Tegmark; Zheng Zheng; Scott F. Anderson; Jim Annis; Neta Bahcall; Jon Brinkmann; Scott Burles; Francisco J. Castander; Andrew Connolly; Istvan Csabai; Mamoru Doi; Masataka Fukugita; Joshua A. Frieman; Karl Glazebrook; James E. Gunn; John S. Hendry; Gregory Hennessy; Zeljko Ivezić; Stephen Kent; Gillian R. Knapp; Huan Lin; Yeong-Shang Loh; Robert H. Lupton; Bruce Margon; Timothy A. McKay; Avery Meiksin; Jeffery A. Munn;

- Adrian Pope; Michael W. Richmond; David Schlegel; Donald P. Schneider; Kazuhiro Shimasaku; Christopher Stoughton; Michael A. Strauss; Mark SubbaRao; Alexander S. Szalay; Istvan Szapudi; Douglas L. Tucker; Brian Yanny; Donald G. York. Detection of the Baryon Acoustic Peak in the Large-Scale Correlation Function of SDSS Luminous Red Galaxies. *The Astrophysical Journal* 633, 560-574 (2005). DOI 10.1086/466512. <https://doi.org/10.1086/466512>
- [26] Stephen William Hawking; Roger Penrose. The Singularities of Gravitational Collapse and Cosmology. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 314, 529-548 (1970). DOI 10.1098/rspa.1970.0021. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1970.0021>
- [27] Arvind Borde; Alan H. Guth; Alexander Vilenkin. Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions. *Physical Review Letters* 90, 151301 (2003). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.151301. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.151301>
- [28] Claus Kiefer. *Quantum Gravity*, Third Edition. Oxford University Press; ISBN 9780199585205 (2012). DOI 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199585205.001.0001. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199585205.001.0001>
- [29] Alan H. Guth. Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems. *Physical Review D* 23, 347-356 (1981). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevD.23.347. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.23.347>
- [30] A. D. Linde. A New Inflationary Universe Scenario. *Physics Letters B* 108, 389-393 (1982). DOI 10.1016/0370-2693(82)91219-9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(82\)91219-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(82)91219-9)
- [31] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 Results. X. Constraints on Inflation. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641, A10 (2020). DOI 10.1051/0004-6361/201833887. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833887>
- [32] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 Results. I. Overview and the Cosmological Legacy of Planck. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641, A1 (2020). DOI 10.1051/0004-6361/201833880. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833880>
- [33] Paul J. Steinhardt; Neil Turok. A Cyclic Model of the Universe. *Science* 296, 1436-1439 (2002). DOI 10.1126/science.1070462. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1070462>
- [34] Abhay Ashtekar; Tomasz Pawłowski; Parampreet Singh. Quantum Nature of the Big Bang. *Physical Review Letters* 96, 141301 (2006). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.141301. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.141301>
- [35] Steven Weinberg. *Cosmology*. Oxford University Press; ISBN 9780198526827 (2008). DOI 10.1093/oso/9780198526827.001.0001. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198526827.001.0001>
- [36] P. J. E. Peebles. *Principles of Physical Cosmology*. Princeton University Press; ISBN 9780691087497 (1993). <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691087497/principles-of-physical-cosmology>
- [37] Sean M. Carroll. The Cosmological Constant. *Living Reviews in Relativity* 4, article 1 (2001). DOI 10.12942/lrr-2001-1. <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2001-1>

- [38] K. A. Olive; J. A. Peacock / Particle Data Group. Big-Bang Cosmology. Review of Particle Physics, section 22 (2024). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001. <https://pdg.lbl.gov/2024/reviews/rpp2024-rev-bbang-cosmology.pdf>
- [39] G. Lemaître. Un univers homogène de masse constante et de rayon croissant, rendant compte de la vitesse radiale des nébuleuses extra-galactiques. Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles 47A, 49-59 (1927). <https://articles.adsabs.harvard.edu/pdf/1927ASSB...47...49L>
- [40] Mario Livio. Mystery of the missing text solved. Nature 479, 171-173 (2011). DOI 10.1038/479171a. <https://doi.org/10.1038/479171a>
- [41] V. M. Slipher. Nebulae. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 56, 403-409 (1917). <https://articles.adsabs.harvard.edu/pdf/1917PAPhS..56..403S>