Signatures of sub-solar mass Primordial Black Holes

Po-Yan Tseng (NTHU)

Collaborators: Danny Marfatia (*U. of Hawaii*), Jan Tristram Acuna(NTHU), Pin-Jung Chen(NTHU), Yu-Min Yeh(NTHU),

References: 2305.14399, 2304.10084, 2212.13035, 2209.01552

The 3rd International Joint Workshop on the Standard Model and Beyond and the 11th KIAS Workshop on Particle Physics and Cosmology

DM candidate

Range of DM mass:



Dark Sector Candidates, Anomalies, and Search Techniques

CERN document Server: US:Cosmic Visions: New ideas in dark matter 2017

Jeju workshop 2023

DM candidate

Range of DM mass:



CERN document Server: US:Cosmic Visions: New ideas in dark matter 2017

Jeju workshop 2023

Mass range of PBH (Primordial Black Holes):



B.Carr, K.Kohri, Y.Sendouda, and J.Yokoyama, arXiv:2002.12778

Jeju workshop 2023



FIG. 10. Constraints on f(M) from evaporation (red), lensing (magenta), dynamical effects (green), gravitational waves (black), accretion (light blue), CMB distortions (orange), large-scale structure (dark blue) and background effects (grey). Evaporation

Jeju workshop 2023







FIG. 10. Constraints on f(M) from evaporation (red), lensing (magenta), dynamical effects (green), gravitational waves (black), accretion (light blue), CMB distortions (orange), large-scale structure (dark blue) and background effects (grey). Evaporation

Jeju workshop 2023

PBH constraints: Hawking evaporation

 Hawking temperature characterizes black-body spectrum from PBH evaporation



Contents

- Introduction
- 511keV line
- Type Ia Supernovae
- PBH formation
- Boosted DM
- Summary

511 keV line from Galaxy Center

511 keV line excess

All-Sky map of 511 keV gamma-ray line from INTEGRAL



Date: 16 October 2007 Satellite: INTEGRAL Depicts: Sky map of 511 keV electron-positron annihiliation emission line Copyright: J. Knödlseder et al.

https://sci.esa.int/web/integral/-/41415-all-sky-map-of-511-kev-line-emission

$$e^+ + e^- \to \gamma \gamma$$



Figure 1. The orange curve is combined 511 keV gamma-ray flux from PBH evaporation with $M_{\rm PBH} = 10^{16}$ g, $f_{\rm PBH} = 10^{-4}$ and astrophysical source [52] (blue curve). Comparing to the INTEGRAL data from 508.25 keV to 513.75 keV [27].

P.Y.Tseng, Y.M. Yeh: 2209.01552

• If identified as electron-positron annihilation, it requires the injection rate of 2E43 non-relativistic positrons per second.

Jeju workshop 2023

PBH interpretation: 511 keV

- We consider PBH mass range from 1E15 to 2E17 g and spectra of evaporated particles (photon, electron, and positron). P.Y.Tseng, Y.M.Yeh: 2209.01552
- 95% positrons from PBH evaporation become nonrelativistic via ionization. Among them, 97% form a positronium (e+ e- bound state). 25% of positronium annihilate to a pair of 511 keV photons.

$$\Phi_{\rm PBH}(\Delta\Omega) = \frac{0.55L_{e^+}(M_{\rm PBH})f_{\rm PBH}}{4\pi M_{\rm PBH}} \int_{\Delta\Omega} \int_{\rm l.o.s} \rho(\ell,\Omega)d\ell d\Omega$$

PBH spatial distribution follow NFW profile:

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\rho_0}{(r/R_s)^{\gamma} [1 + (r/R_s)^{\alpha}]^{(\beta - \gamma)/\alpha}}$$

Jeju workshop 2023

PBH interpretation: 511 keV

 We consider PBH mass range from 1E15 to 2E17 g and spectra of evaporated particles (photon, electron, and positron). P.Y.Tseng, Y.M.Yeh: 2209.01552



Figure 1. The orange curve is combined 511 keV gamma-ray flux from PBH evaporation with $M_{\rm PBH} = 10^{16}$ g, $f_{\rm PBH} = 10^{-4}$ and astrophysical source [52] (blue curve). Comparing to the INTEGRAL data from 508.25 keV to 513.75 keV [27].

Jeju workshop 2023

Extra-galactic and Galactic gamma-ray

 There are constraints from extragalactic and galactic continuous gamma-ray spectra. P.Y.Tseng, Y.M.Yeh: 2209.01552



Figure 3. The predicted photon fluxes from the **BP**s listed in table 1 for extragalactic (leftpanel) and inner Galactic (right-panel). The current limits from COMPTEL/EGRET/FermiLAT [28] and projecting sensitivities of AMEGO/e-ASTROGAM [29–31] are shown in gray curves in leftpanel, meanwhile, in the right-panel, the **BP**s fluxes are compared with the INTEGRAL/SPI/ COMPTEL/FermiLAT inner Galactic data ($|l| < 30^{\circ}$, $|b| < 10^{\circ}$) [29].

Jeju workshop 2023

Allowed PBH mass and abundance

Favored regions of PBHs, interpreting 511 keV excess:



P.Y.Tseng, Y.M.Yeh: 2209.01552

Jeju workshop 2023



Allowed PBH mass and abundance

Favored regions of PBHs, interpreting 511 keV excess:



P.Y.Tseng, Y.M.Yeh: 2209.01552

Jeju workshop 2023



PBH trigger Type la Supernovae

Mass range of PBH (Primordial Black Holes):



B.Carr, K.Kohri, Y.Sendouda, and J.Yokoyama, arXiv:2002.12778

Jeju workshop 2023

PBH: Type la Supernovae

- An asteroid-mass PBH passes through a white dwarf(WD), which creates a shock wave (Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton BHL accretion), such that initiates the thermonuclear supernovae (SN Ia).
 H.Steigerwalc, E.Tejeda, arXiv:2104.07066
- The maximum radius inside WD associates with detonation ignition R_m, were determined from successful shock wave and self-sustained ignition detonation in the BHL accretion flow.



Jeju workshop 2023

$$\pi R_m^2 \left(\frac{v_{*\rm esc}(R_m)}{v_{\rm gal}}\right)^2$$



PBH: Type la Supernovae

- SN Ia data is able to constrain the fraction of asteroid PBH abundance. P.J.Chen, P.Y.Tseng, arXiv:2305.14399
- We assume the WD distribution follows the stellar distribution, and normalize it to the WD data within 100 pc near our solar system.



PBH: Type la Supernovae

- The observed SN Ia Milky Way event rate is 0.54+-0.12 per century with 68.3% confidence.
- This prefers the certain abundance for asteroid PBH:



P.Y. Tseng

p.11

Jeju workshop 2023

PBH formation:

FOPT→FB→PBH

Model framework

• The mass of dark fermion χ come from the vacuum expectation value (vev) inducing by scalar ϕ .

 $\mathcal{L} \supset \bar{\chi}(i\partial \!\!\!/ - m)\chi - g_{\chi}\phi \bar{\chi}\chi - V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, T)$

$$m_{\chi} = m + g_{\chi} v_{\phi}, \quad v_{\phi} \equiv \langle \phi \rangle$$

 The finite-temperature quartic effective potential induce the first-order phase transition (FOPT) in the early Universe.

$$V_{\rm eff}(\phi, T) = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\phi^2 - (AT + C)\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4$$

p.12

K.Kawana, K.P.Xie: 2106.00111, D.Marfatia, P.Y. Tseng: 2107.00859

Jeju workshop 2023

First-order phase transition

 More rich phenomenologies, if we consider 1st order phase transition (FOPT).

K.Kawana, K.P.Xie: 2106.00111



- Dark fermion X inside the bubble becomes the DM relic density (bubble filtering X).
- X outside the bubble could form macroscopic DM (Fermi Ball or primordial black hole)

Jeju workshop 2023

Number density of FB

- FBs start to form at T_{*} in the false vacuum, it shrinks and separates into smaller volumes.
- Critical volume $V_{\star} = 4\pi R_{\star}^3/3$, there is no other bubble forming inside during its shrinking $\Gamma(T_{\star})V_{\star}\Delta t \sim 1$, corresponds to one FB.
- The number density of FB $n_{\text{FB}}|_{T_{\star}}$ is determined by $n_{\text{FB}}|_{T_{\star}}V_{\star} = F(t_{\star})$: $n_{\text{FB}}|_{T_{\star}} = \left(\frac{3}{4\pi}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\Gamma(T_{\star})}{v_w}\right)^{3/4} F(t_{\star})$

• Total numbers of χ for a FB: $Q_{\text{FB}} = \eta_{\chi} \left(\frac{s}{n_{\text{FB}}} \right)_{T_{\star}}$

Jeju workshop 2023

FB mass profile

• The mass and radius of FB are obtained by minimizing the FB energy with respect to the radius $dE_{FB}/dR = 0$:

$$E_{\rm FB} = \frac{3\pi}{4} \left(\frac{3}{2\pi}\right)^{2/3} \frac{Q_{\rm FB}^{4/3}}{R} \left[1 + \frac{4\pi}{9} \left(\frac{2\pi}{3}\right)^{1/3} \frac{R^2 T^2}{Q_{\rm FB}^{2/3}}\right] - \frac{3g_{\chi}^2}{8\pi} \frac{Q_{\rm FB}^2 L_{\phi}^2}{R^3} + \frac{4\pi}{3} V_0(T) R^3$$

$$\begin{split} R_{\rm FB} &= \left[\frac{3}{16} \left(\frac{3}{2\pi}\right)^{2/3} \frac{Q_{\rm FB}^{4/3}}{V_0}\right]^{1/4} \left[1 - \frac{\pi}{6\sqrt{3}} \frac{T^2}{V_0^{1/2}}\right]^{1/2} \,,\\ M_{\rm FB} &= Q_{\rm FB} \left(12\pi^2 V_0\right)^{1/4} \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{4\sqrt{3}} \frac{T^2}{V_0^{1/2}}\right) \,, \end{split}$$

FB relic abundance:

$$\Omega_{\rm FB}h^2 = \frac{M_{\rm FB} n_{\rm FB}|_{T_0}}{3M_{\rm Pl}^2 (H_0/h)^2}$$

Jeju workshop 2023

FB collapse to PBH

• The mass and radius of FB are obtained by minimizing the FB energy with respect to the radius $dE_{FB}/dR = 0$:

$$E_{\rm FB} = \frac{3\pi}{4} \left(\frac{3}{2\pi}\right)^{2/3} \frac{Q_{\rm FB}^{4/3}}{R} \left[1 + \frac{4\pi}{9} \left(\frac{2\pi}{3}\right)^{1/3} \frac{R^2 T^2}{Q_{\rm FB}^{2/3}}\right] - \frac{3g_{\chi}^2}{8\pi} \frac{Q_{\rm FB}^2 L_{\phi}^2}{R^3} + \frac{4\pi}{3} V_0(T) R^3$$

$$L_{\phi}(T) \equiv \left(\left. \frac{d^2 V_{\text{eff}}}{d\phi^2} \right|_{\phi=0} \right)^{-1/2} = \left(2D(T^2 - T_0^2) \right)^{-1/2}$$

• Magnitude of Yukawa energy increases as FB temperature decrease. It will dominate when $L_{\phi} \simeq R_{\rm FB}/Q_{\rm FB}^{1/3}$, and FB collapse to PBH.

Boosted Dark matter from PBH evaporation

Boosted DMs from PBH evaporation

 Hawking temperature characterizes black-body spectrum from PBH evaporation:
 BlackHawk v2.1, A.Aarbey, J.Auffinger: 2108.02737

$$T_{\rm PBH} \simeq 5.3 \ {
m MeV} \times \left(\frac{10^{-18} M_{\odot}}{M_{\rm PBH}} \right)$$

$$\frac{dN_{\chi}}{d\mathcal{T}dt} = \frac{2\Gamma_{\chi}(\mathcal{T}, M_{\text{PBH}})}{\pi(e^{(\mathcal{T}+m_{\chi})/T_{\text{PBH}}}+1)}$$

• χ flux on Earth come from extragalactic PBH, it does not rely on DM density near galactic center

$$\frac{d\Phi}{d\mathcal{T}} = \int_{t_{\phi}}^{\min(t_{\text{eva}},t_0)} c \, dt [1+z(t)] \frac{f_{\text{PBH}}\rho_{\text{DM}}}{M_{\text{PBH}}} \frac{d^2 N_{\chi}}{d\mathcal{T}dt} \Big|_{\tilde{E}=\sqrt{(E^2-m_{\chi}^2)(1+z(t))^2+m_{\chi}^2}}$$

R.Calabrese et. al: 2203.17093

Jeju workshop 2023

DM-e scattering

 We are interested in X in energy range from keV to GeV so that XENON1T/XENONnT and SK/HK can detect a signal.

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dE_r} = \frac{\sigma_{\chi e}\Theta(E_r^{\max} - E_r)}{8\mu_{\chi e}^2\tilde{p}^2}(2m_e + E_r)(2m_{\chi}^2 + m_eE_r)$$

The maximum allowed recoil energy

$$E_r^{\max} = \frac{2m_e \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T} + 2m_e)}{((m_e + m_\chi)^2 + 2m_e \mathcal{T})}$$



At XENON1T/XENONnT

• At XENON1T/XENONnT detector, χ can ionize the Xe atom via $\chi + Xe \rightarrow \chi + Xe^* + e^-$, which produces an electron recoil signal. XENON Collaboration: 2207.11330, 2006.09721



 XENONnT reduced tritium background five times lower than in XENON1T.

P.Y. Tseng

25

30

At XENON1T/XENONnT

 At XENON1T/XENONnT detector, the differential event rate is given by

$$\frac{dR}{dE_r} = n_t \eta(E_r) \,\tilde{F}(E_r) \int d\mathcal{T} \frac{d\Phi}{d\mathcal{T}} \sum_{n,l} \frac{d\sigma^{n,l}}{dE_r}$$

including the cross section of scattering of χ on a bound electron, because the binding energy is non-negligible compared to energy of χ .

To find parameter space allowed by data

$$\chi^2 \equiv \sum_{i} \left(\frac{\left. \frac{dR}{dE_r} \right|_i + \left. \frac{dR_{\rm bkgd}}{dE_r} \right|_i - \left. \frac{dR_{\rm obs}}{dE_r} \right|_i}{\sigma_i} \right)^2$$

Jeju workshop 2023



- At SK/HK, χ -e scattering produce Cherenkov radiation.
- 161.9 kiloton-year SK observed 4042 events, which is compatible with background 3992.9. Super-Kamiokande: 1711.05278



P.Y. Tseng





Super-Kamiokande Pho... www-sk.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp The Super-Kamiokande deter researchgate.net

Jeju workshop 2023

p.21

At SK/HK

- At SK/HK, χ -e scattering produce Cherenkov radiation.
- 161.9 kiloton-year SK observed 4042 events , which is compatible with background 3992.9. Super-Kamiokande: 1711.05278

$$N_{\rm PBH}^{\rm SK} = 161.9 \; [\text{kton} - \text{yr}] \times \int_{0.1 \; \text{GeV}}^{1.33 \; \text{GeV}} dE_r \frac{dR}{dE_r}$$

- Define 2σ exclusion by $N_{\text{PBH}}^{\text{SK}} / \sqrt{N_{\text{PBH}}^{\text{SK}} + N_{\text{bkgd}}^{\text{SK}}} \ge 2$.
- HK is expected to collect 3.74 Mton-year exposure.

Hyper-Kamiokande: 1805.04163



Correlated signals

Parameter scan

- This model: dark sector <--> PBH observable
- Specify the quartic effective potential:

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, T) = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\phi^2 - (AT + C)\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4$$

Finding the parameter regime, which realizes the scenario:

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0.05 \leq \lambda \leq 0.2 \,, & 0.1 \leq B^{1/4} / \mathrm{MeV} \leq 10^4 \,, & 0.01 \leq C / \mathrm{MeV} \leq 10^4 \,, \\ 0.1 \leq D \leq 10 \,, & 0.3 \leq T_\star / T_{\mathrm{SM}\star} \leq 1.0 \,, & 0.01 \leq g_\chi \leq \sqrt{4\pi} \,, \\ 10^{-3} \leq m / B^{1/4} \leq 10 \,, & 10^{-40} \leq \sigma_{\chi e} / \mathrm{cm}^2 \leq 10^{-31} \,. \end{array}$$

Jeju workshop 2023



Gravitational Wave

• GW spectra from the benchmark points:

D.Marfatia, P.Y.Tseng: 2112.14588

	BP_1		BP_3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6
	0.101	0.102	0.195	0.199	0.100	0.171
λ	0.161	0.103	0.185	0.189	0.196	0.171
$B^{1/4}/MeV$	1.796	4.237	0.294	10.75	0.499	1.171
C/MeV	0.065	0.113	0.021	1.736	0.079	0.115
D	3.676	6.910	4.189	1.017	0.441	1.538
g_{χ}	1.698	1.011	1.375	1.306	1.808	1.663
η_{χ}	7.62×10^{-13}	3.35×10^{-13}	3.13×10^{-16}	5.92×10^{-16}	3.23×10^{-18}	3.48×10^{-17}
$m/{ m MeV}$	0.021	0.344	0.028	20.54	0.059	0.016
$\sigma_{\chi e}/{ m cm}^2$	8.80×10^{-32}	$5.85 imes10^{-32}$	8.62×10^{-33}	1.40×10^{-32}	$1.99 imes 10^{-33}$	6.44×10^{-32}
$T_{\rm SM\star}/{ m MeV}$	0.909	2.252	0.189	14.86	0.737	0.991
T_{\star}/MeV	0.547	0.833	0.074	4.906	0.411	0.489
T_f/MeV	0.591	1.183	0.103	7.846	0.459	0.643
T_{ϕ}/MeV	0.546	0.823	0.072	4.285	0.391	0.481
T_0/MeV	0.529	0.810	0.069	2.272	0.184	0.401
α	2.21×10^{-2}	2.63×10^{-2}	4.17×10^{-2}	2.73×10^{-2}	2.29×10^{-2}	$5.00 imes 10^{-2}$
β/H_{\star}	3.05×10^4	2.30×10^4	1.48×10^4	1.52×10^3	2.13×10^3	4.84×10^3
v_w	0.873	0.974	0.971	0.985	0.902	0.962
$dM_{\rm FB}/dQ_{\rm FB}/{ m MeV}$	2.410	4.859	0.424	42.52	1.890	2.647
$m_{\chi}(T_{\star})/\mathrm{MeV}$	2.949	5.056	0.528	57.19	2.588	3.775
$Q_{\rm FB}$	2.98×10^{42}	2.27×10^{41}	1.71×10^{42}	7.67×10^{39}	1.28×10^{41}	$3.80 imes 10^{40}$
$R_{\rm FB}$ [cm]	2876	534	1.21×10^4	21.94	1249	461
$\sigma_{\chi\chi}$ [cm ²]	1.06×10^{-21}	3.28×10^{-22}	2.82×10^{-20}	1.19×10^{-23}	1.39×10^{-21}	1.00×10^{-21}
$n_{\chi} [\mathrm{cm}^{-3}]$	2.99×10^{31}	3.56×10^{32}	2.33×10^{29}	1.73×10^{35}	1.57×10^{31}	9.26×10^{31}
$\ell_{\chi} = 1/n_{\chi}\sigma_{\chi\chi} [\text{cm}]$	3.16×10^{-11}	8.58×10^{-12}	1.52×10^{-10}	4.85×10^{-13}	4.58×10^{-11}	1.08×10^{-11}
$M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot}$	6.47×10^{-18}	1.13×10^{-18}	7.64×10^{-19}	$3.91 imes 10^{-19}$	2.18×10^{-19}	9.34×10^{-20}
β'	2.90×10^{-23}	1.22×10^{-23}	8.40×10^{-28}	1.00×10^{-25}	1.78×10^{-29}	1.80×10^{-28}
$\Omega_{\rm PBH}h^2$	5.79×10^{-7}	5.53×10^{-7}	4.80×10^{-11}	7.72×10^{-9}	1.91×10^{-12}	$2.98 imes 10^{-11}$
$f_{\rm PBH} \times \sigma_{\chi e}/{\rm cm}^2$	4.25×10^{-37}	2.70×10^{-37}	3.45×10^{-42}	9.02×10^{-40}	$3.16 imes 10^{-44}$	1.60×10^{-41}
$\Delta N_{\rm eff}$	0.479	0.200	0.386	0.199	0.409	0.472
χ^2 XENON1T	166.82	166.50	167.11	167.78	167.11	167.11
χ^2 XENONnT	20.92	20.31	19.95	19.91	19.95	19.95
χ^2 XENONnT ₂₀ ton-yr	25.76	10.93	0	14.58	0	0
$N_{\rm SK}$	0	14.30	36.14	27.91	115.8	27.56
$N_{\rm HK}$	0	330	835	645	2674	637

Jeju workshop 2023
Gravitational Wave

• GW spectra from the benchmark points:

D.Marfatia, P.Y.Tseng: 2112.14588

		BP-1	BP-2	BP-3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6	
	λ	0.161	0.103	0.185	0.189	0.196	0.171	
	$B^{1/4}/{ m MeV}$	1.796	4.237	0.294	10.75	0.499	1.171	
	$C/{ m MeV}$	0.065	0.113	0.021	1.736	0.079	0.115	
	D	3.676	6.910	4.189	1.017	0.441	1.538	
	g_{χ}	1.698	1.011	1.375	1.306	1.808	1.663	
	η_{χ}	7.62×10^{-13}	3.35×10^{-13}	3.13×10^{-16}	5.92×10^{-16}	3.23×10^{-18}	3.48×10^{-17}	
	$m/{ m MeV}$	0.021	0.344	0.028	20.54	0.059	0.016	
	$\sigma_{\chi e}/{ m cm}^2$	8.80×10^{-32}	5.85×10^{-32}	8.62×10^{-33}	1.40×10^{-32}	$1.99 imes 10^{-33}$	6.44×10^{-32}	
Temperature of FOPT	$T_{SM\star}/MeV$	0.909	2.252	0.189	14.86	0.737	0.991	
•••••	$T_{\star}/{ m MeV}$	0.547	0.833	0.074	4.906	0.411	0.489	
	T_f/MeV	0.591	1.183	0.103	7.846	0.459	0.643	
	$T_{\phi}/{ m MeV}$	0.546	0.823	0.072	4.285	0.391	0.481	
	T_0/MeV	0.529	0.810	0.069	2.272	0.184	0.401	
	α	2.21×10^{-2}	2.63×10^{-2}	4.17×10^{-2}	2.73×10^{-2}	2.29×10^{-2}	$5.00 imes 10^{-2}$	
	eta/H_{\star}	3.05×10^4	2.30×10^4	1.48×10^{4}	1.52×10^3	2.13×10^{3}	4.84×10^3	
	v_w	0.873	0.974	0.971	0.985	0.902	0.962	
	$dM_{ m FB}/dQ_{ m FB}/{ m MeV}$	2.410	4.859	0.424	42.52	1.890	2.647	
DM mass	$m_{\chi}(T_{\star})/\mathrm{MeV}$	2.949	5.056	0.528	57.19	2.588	3.775	1
	$Q_{ m FB}$	2.98×10^{42}	2.27×10^{41}	1.71×10^{42}	7.67×10^{59}	1.28×10^{41}	$3.80 imes 10^{40}$	
	$R_{\rm FB}$ [cm]	2876	534	1.21×10^{4}	21.94	1249	461	
	$\sigma_{\chi\chi} \ [{ m cm}^2]$	1.06×10^{-21}	3.28×10^{-22}	2.82×10^{-20}	1.19×10^{-23}	1.39×10^{-21}	1.00×10^{-21}	
	$n_{\chi} [\mathrm{cm}^{-3}]$	2.99×10^{31}	3.56×10^{32}	2.33×10^{29}	1.73×10^{35}	1.57×10^{31}	9.26×10^{31}	
DBH mass	$\ell_{\chi} = 1/n_{\chi}\sigma_{\chi\chi} \ [\text{cm}]$	3.16×10^{-11}	8.58×10^{-12}	1.52×10^{-10}	4.85×10^{-13}	4.58×10^{-11}	1.08×10^{-11}	
FBH IIIa33	$M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot}$	6.47×10^{-18}	1.13×10^{-18}	7.64×10^{-19}	3.91×10^{-19}	2.18×10^{-19}	9.34×10^{-20}	
	β'	2.90×10^{-23}	1.22×10^{-23}	-8.40×10^{-28}	1.00×10-23	1.78 × 10-29	1.80×10-20	
	$\Omega_{\rm PBH}h^2$	5.79×10^{-7}	5.53×10^{-7}	4.80×10^{-11}	7.72×10^{-9}	1.91×10^{-12}	2.98×10^{-11}	
	$f_{\rm PBH} \times \sigma_{\chi e}/{\rm cm}^2$	4.25×10^{-37}	2.70×10^{-37}	3.45×10^{-42}	9.02×10^{-40}	3.16×10^{-44}	1.60×10^{-41}	
	$\Delta N_{\rm eff}$	0.479	0.200	0.386	0.199	0.409	0.472	
	χ^2 XENON1T	166.82	166.50	167.11	167.78	167.11	167.11	
	χ^2 XENONnT	20.92	20.31	19.95	19.91	19.95	19.95	
	χ^2 XENONnT _{20ton-yr}	25.76	10.93	0	14.58	0	0	
	N _{SK}	0	14.30	36.14	27.91	115.8	27.56	
	N _{HK}	0	330	835	645	2674	637	

Jeju workshop 2023





Figure 1. The regions of parameter space that produce a detectable boosted DM flux at XENON1T/XENONnT/SK+GW (yellow), XENONnT/HK+GW (red), and a gravitational wave signal at THEIA/ μ Ares (green).

Jeju workshop 2023





D.Marfatia, P.Y.Tseng: 2112.14588

Figure 1. The regions of parameter space that produce a detectable boosted DM flux at XENON1T/XENONnT/SK+GW (yellow), XENONnT/HK+GW (red), and a gravitational wave signal at THEIA/ μ Ares (green).

Jeju workshop 2023





Figure 1. The regions of parameter space that produce a detectable boosted DM flux at XENON1T/XENONnT/SK+GW (yellow), XENONnT/HK+GW (red), and a gravitational wave signal at THEIA/ μ Ares (green).

Jeju workshop 2023



Figure 1. The regions of parameter space that produce a detectable boosted DM flux at XENON1T/XENONnT/SK+GW (yellow), XENONnT/HK+GW (red), and a gravitational wave signal at THEIA/ μ Ares (green).

Jeju workshop 2023



Figure 1. The regions of parameter space that produce a detectable boosted DM flux at XENON1T/XENONnT/SK+GW (yellow), XENONnT/HK+GW (red), and a gravitational wave signal at THEIA/ μ Ares (green).

Jeju workshop 2023

Gravitational Wave

• GW spectra from the benchmark points:

D.Marfatia, P.Y.Tseng: 2112.14588



Jeju workshop 2023

p.27

PBHs and Pulsar Timing Array: Tristram Acuna's talk

Summary

Summary

- We discussed several detectable signals of PBHs with different mass.
- 511keV gamma-ray line excess can be interpreted by PBH $1.0 \times 10^{-17} \lesssim M_{\text{PBH}}/M_{\odot} \lesssim 8.0 \times 10^{-17}$ via Hawking radiation
- SN Ia event rate associates with PBHs $7.6 \times 10^{-13} \le M_{PBH}/M_{\odot} \le 6.1 \times 10^{-12}$, transiting through WDs.
- Introduce a dark sector model, which efficiently produces sub-solar-mass PBHs through FOPT and associates to the boosted DM.





Thank you for your attention!

Back up

Discussion: FB stability

• The stable conditions for FBs not decay to χ or fission to lighter FBs

$$\frac{dM_{\rm FB}}{dQ_{\rm FB}} < m + g_{\chi} v_{\phi}, \text{ and } \frac{d^2 M_{\rm FB}}{dQ_{\rm FB}^2} < 0$$

- X-e scattering, the X may be ejected from FB unless its mean free path is short enough that multiple scattering with other X in the FB slows it down.
- The χ χ scattering $\sigma_{\chi\chi}$ via ϕ is larger than $\sigma_{\chi e} < 10^{-31} \text{ cm}^2$. The $\ell_{\chi} \equiv (n_{\chi}\sigma_{\chi\chi})^{-1}$ is much smaller than R_{FB} .

FB

p.33

electron

P.Y. Tseng

CYCU 15th Mar. 2023

Discussion: relic of dark scalar

- During FB formation, ϕ can be copiously produced via $\chi \bar{\chi} \rightarrow \phi \phi$ Since ϕ is non-relativistic and evolve like matter, so that its relic density may overclose the Universe.
- To avoid this, we allow ϕ decay to a pair of relativistic scalars s, which preserves the relativistic degree of freedom in dark sector. We require $\Delta N_{\rm eff} \leq 0.5$.
- The trilinear term $\mu \phi ss$

$$\tau_{\phi \to ss} \simeq 6.6 \times 10^{-20} \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{\mu}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{\phi}}{\text{MeV}}\right) \text{ [sec]}$$



- The millisecond pulsars provide accurate timing signals, and are exploited to measure the gravitational waves (GW).
- The NANOGrav collaboration observed 67 pulsars for 15 yr and reported the correlations of Helling-Downs pattern, pointing to the stochastic GW.



Pulsar Timing Arrays | Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute)



Helling-Downs pattern from NANOGrav 15 yr, arXiv:2306.16213

NTU 4th Oct. 2023

- Pulsar timing as probe of PBHs. J.T.Acuna, P.Y.Tseng, arXiv:2306.16213
- Pulsar signals arriving on Earth can be characterized by its phase

$$\phi(t) = \phi_0 + \nu t + \frac{\dot{\nu}}{2}t^2$$
frequency
Spin-down

Third-order from transiting PBHs: i) in the vicinity of the pulsar induce-->*Doppler phase shift*, ii) close to the Earthpulsar line of sight-->*Shapiro time delay*.

Doppler:
$$\left(\frac{\delta\nu}{\nu}\right)_D = \frac{1}{c}\int dt \ \hat{d} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\Phi,$$

Shapiro: $\left(\frac{\delta\nu}{\nu}\right)_S = -\frac{2}{c^3}\int_{LOS} dz \ \vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\Phi,$ A PBH gr

ravitational potential

NTU 4th Oct. 2023

The corresponding phase shift is

$$\delta\phi(t) = \int^t dt' \; \delta\nu(t')$$

 The residual signal amplitude after subtracting the phase shift from the 1st and the 2nd order

$$h_{I}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta \phi_{I,i}(t) - \delta \phi_{0,I}(t), \quad \delta \phi_{0,I} \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{2} f_{n}(t) \left[\frac{1}{T_{obs}} \int_{0}^{T_{obs}} dt' \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta \phi_{I,i}(t') f_{n}(t') \right]$$

The signal-to-noise ratio is given as

$$\mathrm{SNR}_I^2 = \frac{1}{\nu_I^2 t_{rms}^2 \Delta t} \int_0^{T_{obs}} dt \ h_I^2(t)$$

J.T.Acuna, P.Y.Tseng, arXiv:2306.16213

NTU 4th Oct. 2023

P.Y. Tseng



 The projecting sensitivity of SKA, assuming 20 yr observation of 200 pulsars with 50 ns uncertainty in the pulsar timing data and 2 weeks cadence:



J.T.Acuna, P.Y.Tseng, arXiv:2306.16213

NTU 4th Oct. 2023

PBH formation:

FOPT→FB→PBH

Trapping DM

During FOPT, lighter (heavier) *χ* locate outside (inside) the bubble, and momentum conservation much be satisfied at the bubble wall.



Bubble Wall v_w

```
NTU 4th Oct. 2023
```

P.Y. Tseng

p.28

FB formation

- Suppose χ particle mass difference is large: $\Delta m_{\chi} \simeq g_{\chi} v_{\phi} > T_c$
- *χ* particles, remaining in **outside** the bubble (trapped in the *false vacuum*), will be aggregated by the expanding bubbles and form a macroscopic **Fermi-Ball(FB)**.
- For this to occur, there must be non-zero **asymmetry** $\eta_{\chi} \equiv (n_{\chi} n_{\bar{\chi}})/s$ in the false vacuum so that the an excess remain after pair annihilation.
- **FB** stability:

$$\frac{dM_{\rm FB}}{dQ_{\rm FB}} < m + g_{\chi} v_{\phi}, \text{ and } \frac{d^2 M_{\rm FB}}{dQ_{\rm FB}^2} < 0$$

NTU 4th Oct. 2023

Signals from FB

Gravitational wave from FOPT

The associated gravitational wave signals from FOPT:



Fermi ball

We consider the finite-temperature quartic effective potential: D.Marfatia, P.Y. Tseng: 2107.00859

in 70 hours of observation of M31 by Subaru-HSC.									
	BP-1	BP-2	BP-3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6	BP-7	BP-8	
λ	0.134	0.158	0.193	0.078	0.062	0.072	0.053	0.060	
$B^{1/4}/{ m keV}$	2.42	43.5	34.9	64.2	63.6	73.2	284	1390	
$C/{\rm keV}$	0.059	6.234	4.988	3.080	0.315	0.586	0.342	7.713	
D	5.807	0.451	0.720	0.445	0.257	0.293	0.584	0.706	
η_{χ}	7.34×10^{-6}	1.37×10^{-7}	3.51×10^{-6}	4.55×10^{-8}	6.98×10^{-9}	3.64×10^{-9}	8.54×10^{-9}	2.40×10^{-8}	
$T_{\rm SM\star}/{\rm keV}$	1.41	100.0	64.5	128.1	164.8	169.5	427.8	1601	
T_{\star}/keV	0.57	34.2	21.6	52.3	84.8	86.9	201.0	879.0	
T_f/keV	0.63	41.4	25.9	64.4	92.9	92.5	233.2	1005	
$S_3(T_\star)/T_\star$	189	188	187	186	187	184	177	171	
$M_{\rm FB}/M_{\odot}$	$3.37 imes 10^{-6}$	$1.11 imes 10^{-6}$	9.66×10^{-6}	$1.01 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.08 imes 10^{-8}$	1.08×10^{-9}	9.66×10^{-11}	1.09×10^{-11}	
$R_{ m FB}/R_{\odot}$	0.529	$7.77 imes 10^{-3}$	2.15×10^{-2}	$2.09 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.00 imes 10^{-3}$	3.86×10^{-4}	2.83×10^{-5}	1.64×10^{-6}	
$Q_{\rm FB}$	4.70×10^{56}	8.62×10^{54}	9.38×10^{55}	5.34×10^{53}	5.74×10^{52}	5.00×10^{51}	1.15×10^{50}	2.65×10^{48}	
α	$1.63 imes10^{-2}$	$1.56 imes10^{-2}$	$1.70 imes 10^{-2}$	$2.83 imes10^{-2}$	$2.00 imes 10^{-2}$	1.24×10^{-2}	$1.79 imes10^{-2}$	$2.62 imes 10^{-2}$	
eta/H_{\star}	3.43×10^4	1.57×10^3	3.01×10^3	2.04×10^3	1.86×10^3	2.80×10^3	4.44×10^3	$5.59 imes 10^3$	
v_{ϕ}/T_{\star}	3.554	4.175	3.958	4.889	3.987	3.501	4.724	4.469	
v_w	0.890	0.940	0.937	0.946	0.886	0.854	0.923	0.916	
$\Omega_{\mathrm{FB}}h^2$	$1.79 imes10^{-2}$	$5.81 imes 10^{-3}$	0.12	$2.94 imes10^{-3}$	4.56×10^{-4}	2.70×10^{-4}	2.39×10^{-3}	$3.38 imes 10^{-2}$	
N_{events}	19.5	20.4	29.3	38.9	17.5	19.3	46.1	29.1	
$\Delta N_{\rm eff}$	0.391	0.226	0.248	0.394	0.497	0.425	0.261	0.408	

Table 1. Benchmark points with A = 0.1. N_{events} is the number of microlensing events expected in 70 hours of observation of M31 by Subaru-HSC.

KEK seminar 2022

P.Y. Tseng

PBHs from FOPT

The benchmark points for PBH formation from FOPT

		BP-1	BP-2	BP-3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6
	λ	0.097	0.177	0.084	0.198	0.198	0.077
	$B^{1/4}/{ m MeV}$	37.89	16.55	3.412	1.843	0.286	2.411
	$C/{ m MeV}$	0.551	1.329	0.054	0.260	0.047	0.022
	D	1.257	0.138	0.413	0.750	0.794	0.286
	g_{χ}	0.031	0.020	0.187	0.240	0.118	0.164
Corresponding temperatu	re η_{χ}	$4.97 imes 10^{-9}$	4.67×10^{-11}	$3.81 imes 10^{-13}$	9.40×10^{-16}	$1.47 imes 10^{-18}$	9.26×10^{-17}
or phase transition	$T_{\rm SM\star}/{ m MeV}$	29.81	53.46	7.821	2.939	0.440	4.979
	$T_{\star}/{ m MeV}$	18.72	36.89	3.156	1.126	0.157	2.908
	$T_f/{ m MeV}$	19.73	37.13	3.338	1.343	0.214	3.071
	$T_{\phi}/{ m MeV}$	17.72	21.64	2.737	0.800	0.077	2.361
	$S_3(T_\star)/T_\star$	156	161	165	170	180	170
	$M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot}$	3.18×10^{-16}	1.08×10^{-16}	1.07×10^{-17}	1.07×10^{-18}	3.91×10^{-19}	3.99×10^{-20}
	$Q_{ m FB}$	5.02×10^{42}	1.77×10^{42}	1.14×10^{42}	2.06×10^{41}	4.48×10^{41}	5.00×10^{39}
	β'	3.83×10^{-17}	2.02×10^{-19}	8.01×10^{-23}	3.43×10^{-26}	5.45×10^{-30}	1.01×10^{-27}
	α	1.26×10^{-2}	1.72×10^{-3}	2.78×10^{-3}	9.23×10^{-3}	1.81×10^{-2}	1.14×10^{-2}
	eta/H_{\star}	1.42×10^4	2.55×10^3	4.22×10^3	2.86×10^3	1.90×10^3	2.74×10^3
	v_w	0.840	0.694	0.845	0.935	0.968	0.843
	$\Omega_{ m PBH}h^2$	0.108	9.74×10^{-4}	1.15×10^{-6}	1.57×10^{-9}	4.17×10^{-13}	2.52×10^{-10}
	$\Delta N_{\rm eff}$	0.413	0.406	0.087	0.114	0.165	0.379

D.Marfatia, P.Y. Tseng: 2107.00859

Jeju workshop 2023

Microlensing

These FB mass and radius ranges can induce microlensing effects.



D.Croon, D. McKeen, N. Raj: 2002.08962

 The separating angle of two images of the background star are too small to be resolved, but we can observe the sudden luminosity enhancement of the star.

Microlensing

 Astrophysical Sky surveys are ideal for observing microlensing. Ex. Subaru-HSC (observing M31 for 7 hrs).



Relativistic degree of freedom

• The temperature of FOPT is lower than the BBN, and robust 95% CL upper limit is $\Delta N_{\rm eff} \lesssim 0.5$. ^{2009.09745, 1103.1261}

	in 70 hour	rs of observ	vation of M	31 by Suba	ru-HSC.				
		BP-1	BP-2	BP-3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6	BP-7	BP-8
	λ	0.134	0.158	0.193	0.078	0.062	0.072	0.053	0.060
	$B^{1/4}/{ m keV}$	2.42	43.5	34.9	64.2	63.6	73.2	284	1390
	C/keV	0.059	6.234	4.988	3.080	0.315	0.586	0.342	7.713
	D	5.807	0.451	0.720	0.445	0.257	0.293	0.584	0.706
Tomporaturo	η_{χ}	7.34×10^{-6}	$1.37 imes 10^{-7}$	3.51×10^{-6}	4.55×10^{-8}	6.98×10^{-9}	3.64×10^{-9}	8.54×10^{-9}	2.40×10^{-8}
Temperature	$T_{\rm SM\star}/{\rm keV}$	1.41	100.0	64.5	128.1	164.8	169.5	427.8	1601
of FOPT	T_{\star}/keV	0.57	34.2	21.6	52.3	84.8	86.9	201.0	879.0
	T_f/keV	0.63	41.4	25.9	64.4	92.9	92.5	233.2	1005
	$S_3(T_\star)/T_\star$	189	188	187	186	187	184	177	171
	$M_{\rm FB}/M_{\odot}$	$3.37 imes 10^{-6}$	1.11×10^{-6}	9.66×10^{-6}	1.01×10^{-7}	$1.08 imes 10^{-8}$	1.08×10^{-9}	9.66×10^{-11}	1.09×10^{-11}
	$R_{ m FB}/R_{\odot}$	0.529	7.77×10^{-3}	2.15×10^{-2}	2.09×10^{-3}	1.00×10^{-3}	3.86×10^{-4}	2.83×10^{-5}	1.64×10^{-6}
	Q_{FB}	4.70×10^{56}	8.62×10^{54}	$9.38 imes 10^{55}$	$5.34 imes 10^{53}$	$5.74 imes 10^{52}$	5.00×10^{51}	$1.15 imes 10^{50}$	2.65×10^{48}
	α	$1.63 imes10^{-2}$	$1.56 imes10^{-2}$	$1.70 imes 10^{-2}$	$2.83 imes10^{-2}$	$2.00 imes 10^{-2}$	1.24×10^{-2}	$1.79 imes10^{-2}$	$2.62 imes 10^{-2}$
	eta/H_{\star}	3.43×10^4	1.57×10^3	3.01×10^3	2.04×10^3	1.86×10^3	2.80×10^3	4.44×10^3	$5.59 imes 10^3$
	v_{ϕ}/T_{\star}	3.554	4.175	3.958	4.889	3.987	3.501	4.724	4.469
	v_w	0.890	0.940	0.937	0.946	0.886	0.854	0.923	0.916
	$\Omega_{ m FB}h^2$	$1.79 imes10^{-2}$	$5.81 imes 10^{-3}$	0.12	2.94×10^{-3}	$4.56 imes 10^{-4}$	2.70×10^{-4}	2.39×10^{-3}	$3.38 imes 10^{-2}$
	N_{events}	19.5	20.4	29.3	38.9	17.5	19.3	46.1	29.1
	$\Delta N_{\rm eff}$	0.391	0.226	0.248	0.394	0.497	0.425	0.261	0.408

Table 1. Benchmark points with A = 0.1. N_{events} is the number of microlensing events expected in 70 hours of observation of M31 by Subaru-HSC.

KEK seminar 2022

Gravitational Wave

- A FOPT generates GWs from three processes: I). Bubble collisions, II). Sound wave in the plasma, III)
 Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence.
- The relevant parameters are required to calculate the GW signals:

$$\begin{cases} T_{\star}, \\ \alpha \equiv \frac{\left(1 - T\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\right) \Delta V_{\text{eff}}|_{T_{\star}}}{\rho(T_{\star})}, \quad \rho \equiv \pi^2 g_{\star} T^4 / 30 \\ \frac{\beta}{H_{\star}} \simeq T_{\star} \frac{d(S_3/T)}{dT} \Big|_{T_{\star}} \\ v_w \end{cases}$$

KEK seminar 2022

- A FOPT generates GWs from three processes: I). Bubble collisions, II). Sound wave in the plasma, III)
 Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence.
- The Euclidean action:

$$S_3(T) = 4\pi \int_0^\infty r^2 dr \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\phi}{dr}\right)^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, T)\right]$$

Bubble nucleation rate per unit volume:

$$\Gamma(T) = T^4 \left(\frac{S_3}{2\pi T}\right)^{3/2} e^{-\frac{S_3}{T}}$$

KEK seminar 2022

- A FOPT generates GWs from three processes: I). Bubble collisions, II). Sound wave in the plasma, III)
 Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence.
- The fraction of space in the false vacuum:

$$F(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{4\pi}{3}v_w^3 \int_{t_c}^t dt'(t-t')^3 \Gamma(t')\right]$$

The percolation temperature T_{*} of FOPT is determined by :

$$F(t_{\star}) = 1/e \simeq 0.37$$

A FOPT generates GWs from: I). Bubble collisions

$$h^{2}\Omega_{\rm env}(f) = 1.67 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{H_{*}}{\beta}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\kappa\alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{100}{g_{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{0.11 \, v_{w}^{3}}{0.42 + v_{w}^{2}}\right) \, S_{\rm env}(f)$$

C.Caprini et. al: 1512.06239

$$S_{\rm env}(f) = \frac{3.8 \ (f/f_{\rm env})^{2.8}}{1 + 2.8 \ (f/f_{\rm env})^{3.8}}$$

 The peak frequency is determined by the time scale of FOPT 1/β:

$$\frac{f_*}{\beta} = \left(\frac{0.62}{1.8 - 0.1v_w + v_w^2}\right)$$

KEK seminar 2022

A FOPT generates GWs from: I). Bubble collisions

$$h^{2}\Omega_{\rm env}(f) = 1.67 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{H_{*}}{\beta}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\kappa\alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{100}{g_{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{0.11 \, v_{w}^{3}}{0.42 + v_{w}^{2}}\right) \, S_{\rm env}(f)$$

C.Caprini et. al: 1512.06239

$$S_{\rm env}(f) = \frac{3.8 \ (f/f_{\rm env})^{2.8}}{1 + 2.8 \ (f/f_{\rm env})^{3.8}}$$

 The peak frequency is determined by the time scale of FOPT. Then red-shift to present epoch

$$f_{\rm env} = 16.5 \times 10^{-3} \,\mathrm{mHz} \,\left(\frac{f_*}{\beta}\right) \,\left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right) \left(\frac{T_*}{100 \,\mathrm{GeV}}\right) \left(\frac{g_*}{100}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}$$

KEK seminar 2022

Gravitational Wave

• GW spectra from the benchmark points:



KEK seminar 2022

P.Y. Tseng

p.17
PBH: benchmark points

Benchmark points for PBHs from FOPT.

D.Marfatia, P.Y. Tseng:2112.14588

	BP-1	BP-2	BP-3	BP-4	BP-5	BP-6
λ	0.061	0.110	0.195	0.087	0.150	0.158
$B^{1/4}/{ m MeV}$	75.14	13.81	1.501	1.261	0.121	2.999
$C/{ m MeV}$	0.249	0.462	0.078	0.052	0.011	0.325
D	0.596	1.458	1.119	0.596	1.418	0.519
g_χ	1.088	1.301	1.011	1.289	0.983	1.228
η_{χ}	1.03×10^{-9}	1.28×10^{-10}	1.64×10^{-12}	1.21×10^{-15}	2.59×10^{-18}	6.26×10^{-17}
$m/{ m MeV}$	53.41	0.120	0.259	0.394	0.341	1.704
$T_{\rm SM\star}/{ m MeV}$	94.68	14.63	0.895	2.104	0.164	4.774
$T_{\star}/{ m MeV}$	53.16	6.143	0.421	0.868	0.052	2.287
$T_f/{ m MeV}$	59.63	6.888	0.472	1.023	0.068	2.571
$T_{\phi}/{ m MeV}$	53.09	6.045	0.415	0.857	0.050	1.950
$S_3(T_\star)/T_\star$	155	159	166	171	180	170
$M_{ m PBH}/M_{\odot}$	2.92×10^{-16}	1.15×10^{-16}	1.19×10^{-17}	1.93×10^{-18}	3.91×10^{-19}	4.23×10^{-20}
$Q_{ m FB}$	1.26×10^{42}	4.31×10^{42}	5.96×10^{42}	$5.01 imes 10^{41}$	$7.58 imes10^{41}$	4.18×10^{39}
eta^\prime	2.80×10^{-17}	2.54×10^{-19}	7.78×10^{-23}	4.45×10^{-26}	$5.75 imes 10^{-30}$	8.97×10^{-28}
α	1.48×10^{-2}	7.40×10^{-3}	1.20×10^{-2}	1.12×10^{-2}	1.35×10^{-2}	1.30×10^{-2}
eta/H_{\star}	4.41×10^3	$9.36 imes 10^3$	3.21×10^4	3.25×10^3	4.94×10^3	2.64×10^3
v_w	0.904	0.904	0.904	0.930	0.963	0.905
$v_{\phi}/{ m MeV}$	224	23.1	1.426	3.821	0.247	8.157
$dM_{\rm FB}/dQ_{\rm FB}/{ m MeV}$	258	28.3	1.980	4.264	0.573	10.89
$\Omega_{\rm PBH}h^2$	0.079	1.12×10^{-3}	1.09×10^{-6}	1.52×10^{-9}	2.15×10^{-13}	6.35×10^{-29}
$\Delta N_{ m eff}$	0.218	0.126	0.208	0.146	0.147	0.221

KEK seminar 2022

Gravitational Wave

• GW spectra from the benchmark points:



D.Marfatia, P.Y. Tseng: 2112.14588

KEK seminar 2022



PBH evaporation

 The evaporation of a PBH produces all particles with mass below the PBH temperature: Kazunori Kohri et.al: 2002.12778

$$T_{\rm PBH} \simeq 5.3 \ {
m MeV} \times \left(\frac{10^{-18} M_{\odot}}{M_{\rm PBH}} \right)$$

- For $M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot} \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-19}$, PBHs evaporated before today.
- The Hawking emission rate of primary particles:

$$\frac{dN_i}{dEdt} = \frac{n_i^{\text{d.o.f}}\Gamma_i(E, M_{\text{PBH}})}{2\pi(e^{E/T_{\text{PBH}}} \pm 1)}$$

A.Arbey, J.Auffinger (BlackHawk): 1905.04268



PBH evaporation

 The extragalactic gamma-ray background due to PBH evaporation
 Kazunori Kohri et.al: 2002.12778

$$\frac{d^2\Phi}{dEdt} = \int_{t_{\rm CMB}}^{\min(t_{\rm eva},t_0)} c[1+z(t)] \frac{f_{\rm PBH}\rho_{\rm DM}}{M_{\rm PBH}} \left. \frac{d^2N_{\gamma}}{d\tilde{E}dt} \right|_{\tilde{E}=[1+z(t)]E} dt$$

with average DM density $\rho_{\rm DM} = 1.27 \ {\rm GeV \, m^{-3}}$

 The evolution of the Universe is approximated as matter dominated until the current epoch

$$1 + z(t) = \left(\frac{t_0}{t}\right)^{2/3}$$

Correlated GW and gamma-ray signals

• β' is defined at PBH formation as:

Kazunori Kohri et.al: 2002.12778

$$\beta' \equiv \gamma^{1/2} \left(\frac{g_*(T_{\phi})}{106.75} \right)^{-1/4} \left(\frac{h}{0.67} \right)^{-2} \frac{\rho_{\rm PBH}(T_{\phi})}{\rho(T_{\phi})}$$

• γ is the ratio between BH mass to the horizon mass in radiation dominated era. In our scenario, it gives

$$\gamma^{1/2} \left(\frac{g_*(T_\phi)}{106.75} \right)^{-1/4} = 4.58 \times 10^{-12} \frac{T_\phi}{\text{MeV}} \left(\frac{M_{\text{PBH}}}{10^{-18} M_{\odot}} \right)^{1/2}$$

KEK seminar 2022

Part-1: Bubble wall velocity

 Particles reflected by the bubble wall exert pressure on it, and slow down the bubble wall velocity.





Part-1: Bubble filtering

 If a thermal DM flux is incident on the wall, the number density of DM that enter the bubble is:

$$n_{\chi}^{\rm in} = n_{\bar{\chi}}^{\rm in} \simeq \frac{g_{\rm DM} T_{\star}^3}{\gamma_w v_w} \left(\frac{\gamma_w (1 - v_w) m_{\chi} / T_{\star} + 1}{4\pi^2 \gamma_{\omega}^3 (1 - v_w)^2} \right) e^{-\frac{\gamma_w (1 - v_w) m_{\chi}}{T_{\star}}}$$

D.Chway, T.H.Jung, C.S.Shin: 1912.04238

 DMs are filtered by the non-relativistic and relativistic bubble wall velocity:

$$n_{\chi}^{\rm in} = \begin{cases} \sim e^{-m_{\chi}/T_{\star}} & \text{for } v_w \to 0\\ \sim e^{-m_{\chi}/(2\gamma_w T_{\star})} & \text{for } m_{\chi}/(\gamma_w T_{\star}) \to 0 \end{cases}$$

NTNU HEP seminar 2021

Part-1: Bubble filtering

- If *T*[★] < *T*_{dec}, the DM inside the bubble is decoupled from the thermal bath and become DM relic abundance.
- DM relic abundance today can be calculated by dividing $n_{\chi}^{in} + n_{\bar{\chi}}^{in}$ by entropy $s = (2\pi^2/45)g_{\star S}T^3$:

$$\Omega_{\rm DM} h^2 \simeq 6.29 \times 10^8 \, \frac{m_{\chi} (n_{\chi}^{\rm in} + n_{\bar{\chi}}^{\rm in})}{{\rm GeV}} \frac{1}{g_{\star S} T_{\star}^3}$$

$$\Omega_{\rm DM} h^2 \simeq \begin{cases} 1.27 \times 10^8 \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{\rm GeV}\right) \left(\frac{g_{\rm DM}}{g_{\star S}}\right) \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{2\gamma_w T_{\star}} + 1\right) e^{-\frac{m_{\chi}}{2\gamma_w T_{\star}}}, & \text{for } v_w \to 1\\ 3.19 \times 10^7 \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{\rm GeV}\right) \left(\frac{g_{\rm DM}}{g_{\star S}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{v_w}\right) \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{T_{\star}} + 1\right) e^{-\frac{m_{\chi}}{T_{\star}}}, & \text{for } v_w \to 0. \end{cases}$$

NTNU HEP seminar 2021

Part-1: Bubble wall velocity

 In the ultrarelativistic limit, the pressure on bubble wall can be obtain from the light degree of freedom inside and outside the bubble:

$$P = \frac{d_n g_\star \pi^2}{90} (1 + v_w)^3 \gamma_\omega^2 T_\star^4$$

D.Chway et.al : 1912.04238 J.R.Espinosa et.al: 1004.4187 D.Bodeker et.al : 0903.4099

P.Y. Iseng

$$d_n \equiv \frac{1}{g_{\star}} \left[\sum_{0.2M_i > \gamma_w T_{\star}} \left(g_i^b + \frac{7}{8} g_i^f \right) \right]$$

• The v_w can be obtained by solving the eq. $P = \Delta V_{\text{eff}}$:

$$\alpha = \frac{d_n}{3}(1+v_w)^3\gamma_\omega^2$$

0.16

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{\left(1 - T\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\right) \Delta V_{\text{eff}}|_{T_{\star}}}{\rho(T_{\star})}, \quad \rho \equiv \pi^2 g_{\star} T^4 / 30$$

NTHU HEP seminar

Part-1: Bubble wall velocity

• For bubble wall velocity v_w faster than the sound speed in plasma, but not ultrarelativistic, we use the approximation:

P.J.Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. D. 25, 2074 (1982)

$$v_w = \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \frac{2}{3}\alpha}}{1 + \alpha}$$



Part-2: anti-correlation

The percolation condition using saddle point approximation:

 $F(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{4\pi}{3}v_w^3 \int_{t_c}^t dt'(t-t')^3 \Gamma(t')\right] \qquad F(t_\star) = 1/e \simeq 0.37$ $8\pi v_w^3 \Gamma(T_\star) \beta^{-4} \simeq 1$

• Since β/H_{\star} is almost constant, thus $\beta \propto H_{\star} \propto T_{\star}^2$ and from above condition, we have

 $T_{\star}^{-4} e^{-S_3(T_{\star})/T_{\star}} \simeq B^{-1} e^{-S_3(T_{\star})/T_{\star}} \simeq \text{constant}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad e^{-S_3(T_{\star})/T_{\star}} \propto B$

- Bubble nucleation rate per unit volume grow with vacuum energy density.
- For fixed $\Omega_{\rm FB}h^2$, we obtain $M_{\rm FB} \propto 1/n_{\rm FB}|_{T_0} \propto e^{3/4 \cdot (S_3(T_\star)/T_\star)} \propto B^{-3/4}$

P.Y. Tseng

APCTP, Oct. 18-10, 2021