

# Implications for primordial black holes from cosmological constraints on scalar-induced gravitational wave

JUNSONG CANG,<sup>1,2,3</sup> YIN-ZHE MA,<sup>4,5,6,\*</sup> AND YU GAO<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Key Laboratory of Particle Astrophysics, Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, China

<sup>3</sup>Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy

<sup>4</sup>School of Chemistry and Physics, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Westville Campus, Private Bag X54001, Durban, 4000, South Africa

<sup>5</sup>NAOC–UKZN Computational Astrophysics Centre (NUCAC), University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, 4000, South Africa

<sup>6</sup>National Institute for Theoretical and Computational Sciences (NITheCS), South Africa

## ABSTRACT

Sufficiently large scalar perturbations in the early Universe can create over-dense regions that collapse into primordial black holes (PBH). This process is accompanied by the emission of scalar-induced gravitational waves (SIGW) that behave like an extra radiation component, thus contributing to the relativistic degrees of freedom ( $N_{\text{eff}}$ ). We show that the cosmological constraints on  $N_{\text{eff}}$  can be used to pose stringent limits on PBHs created from this particular scenario as well as the relevant small-scale curvature perturbation ( $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$ ). We show that the combination of cosmic microwave background (CMB), baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) and Big-Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) datasets can exclude supermassive PBHs with peak mass  $M_{\bullet} \in [5 \times 10^5, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$  as the major component of dark matter, while the detailed constraints depend on the shape of the PBHs mass distribution. The future CMB mission like CMB-S4 can broaden this constraint window to a much larger range  $M_{\bullet} \in [8 \times 10^{-5}, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$ , covering sub-stellar masses. These limits on PBH correspond to a tightened constraint on  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  on scales of  $k \in [10, 10^{22}] \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ , much smaller than those probed by direct CMB and large-scale structure power spectra.

*Keywords:* Primordial black hole – Scalar induced gravitational wave – Curvature perturbation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Large density fluctuation in the early Universe can lead to gravitational collapse of over-dense regions and form primordial black holes (PBHs; Hawking 1971; Carr & Hawking 1974; Carr 1975). PBHs have been proposed to explain a range of observed black hole conundrums (Carr et al. 2021a), such as the existence of supermassive black holes (Bean & Magueijo 2002) and black hole merging events seen by LIGO and Virgo (Abbott et al. 2019; Jedamzik 2021; Hütsi et al. 2021). PBHs are also considered as a dark matter (DM) candidate (Carr et al. 2016; Carr & Kuhnel 2020, 2022) and their abundance has been constrained via various cosmological and astrophysical observations (Khlopov 2010; Tashiro & Sugiyama 2013; Belotsky et al. 2014; Carr et al. 2016; Ali-Haïmoud & Kamionkowski 2017; Wang et al. 2018;

Clark et al. 2017, 2018; Belotsky et al. 2019; Laha 2019; Chen et al. 2020; Carr & Kuhnel 2020; Laha et al. 2020; Ashoorioon et al. 2021a,b; Carr et al. 2021b; Domènech et al. 2021a; Hütsi et al. 2021; Vaskonen & Veermäe 2021; Ray et al. 2021; Yang 2021; Domènech et al. 2021b; Carr & Kuhnel 2022; Cang et al. 2022; Mittal et al. 2022; Zhou et al. 2022; Auffinger 2022; Ashoorioon et al. 2022; Karam et al. 2022; Wang et al. 2022, see Carr & Kuhnel 2020 for the review).

There are a plethora of mechanisms through which PBHs can be produced (Carr et al. 2021b), such as the bubble collisions (Hawking et al. 1982; Crawford & Schramm 1982; La & Steinhardt 1989) and the collapse of cosmic strings (Hogan 1984; Hawking 1989; Polnarev & Zembowicz 1991; Hansen et al. 2000). Here we focus on one particular scenario in which PBHs are formed from overdensities produced by an inflation-induced enhancement on primordial curvature perturbation (Carr et al. 2010; Inomata & Nakama 2019; Chen et al. 2021; Kimura et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2022). At large scales

\* Corresponding author: Y.-Z. Ma, ma@ukzn.ac.za

† Corresponding author: Y. Gao, gaoyu@ihep.ac.cn

$k \lesssim 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ , the curvature perturbation power spectrum  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  has been precisely measured by cosmic microwave background (CMB) and large-scale structure (LSS) observations (Hunt & Sarkar 2015; Planck Collaboration et al. 2020), however the small-scale power is still poorly constrained (Inomata & Nakama 2019; Byrnes et al. 2019; Pi & Sasaki 2020; Chen et al. 2021; Yuan & Huang 2021; Kimura et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2022). Thus, the enhanced small scale  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  can potentially produce enough PBHs to explain *all* dark matter without violating the existing observational bounds.

Associated with PBH production, enhanced  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  inevitably generates scalar-induced gravitational wave (SIGW) at second order (Carbone & Matarrese 2005; Nakamura 2007; Vaskonen & Veermäe 2021; Yuan & Huang 2021; Chen et al. 2021; Karam et al. 2022), which can potentially be observed by gravitational wave (GW) detectors like Taiji (Hu & Wu 2017) and LISA (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2017). After horizon-crossing, SIGW can be considered as dark radiation (DR; Chacko et al. 2015; Serpico 2019; Takahashi & Yamada 2019) in that it free-streams with an energy density redshifting as  $(1+z)^4$  (Inomata & Nakama 2019; Chen et al. 2021). From a cosmological point of view, the gravitational behavior of SIGW is indistinguishable from a relativistic species such as the massless neutrino. Therefore, just as other forms of dark radiation (e.g. primordial gravitational wave (Meerburg et al. 2015; Aich et al. 2020), axion (Green et al. 2019) and sterile neutrinos (Takahashi & Yamada 2019; Green et al. 2019)), the energy density of SIGW DR can be parameterised by an additional effective degree of freedom

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \equiv N_{\text{eff}} - N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $N_{\text{eff}}$  describes the total effects of relativistic species containing both neutrino and SIGW, and  $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} = 3.046$  is the prediction from the standard model (SM) of particle physics (Mangano et al. 2002, 2005; de Salas & Pastor 2016).

As a measure of cosmic radiation density, a higher  $N_{\text{eff}}$  can delay radiation-to-matter equality and change the size of the sound horizon (Aich et al. 2020), which can leave distinctive features on CMB anisotropies (Hou et al. 2013; Follin et al. 2015), baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) and Big-Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) (Wallisch 2018). Currently the leading  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  constraint is set by measuring the damping tail and the phase shift in the CMB anisotropy spectrum (Hou et al. 2013; Ade et al. 2016; Follin et al. 2015; Wallisch 2018; Aich et al. 2020), which reads  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.3$  at 95% confidence level (C.L.) from the latest *Planck* CMB data (Planck Collaboration et al. 2020). Future CMB missions are expected to

give significant improvements on  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  (Abazajian et al. 2016; Di Valentino et al. 2018; Hanany et al. 2019). For example, the CMB Stage IV (S4) experiment is aiming to constrain  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.027$  at  $2\sigma$  C.L. (Baumann et al. 2016a; Abazajian et al. 2016; Baumann et al. 2016b; Wallisch 2018).

Here we use the SIGW upper bounds inferred from cosmological constraints on  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  to place limits on both small-scale  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  and the associated PBH abundance. The structure of this paper is as follows: Sec. 2 reviews PBH production induced by enhanced curvature perturbation. Sec. 3 discusses the energy density of SIGW and its connection with  $N_{\text{eff}}$ . Our results are presented in Sec. 4 and we conclude in Sec. 5.

## 2. PBH MODEL

In order for inflation to produce density fluctuation required for efficient PBH formation, the primordial curvature perturbation power spectrum  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  needs to be boosted to  $10^{-2}$  on small scales ( $k \gtrsim 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ) (Josan et al. 2009; Bringmann et al. 2012; Garcia-Bellido & Ruiz Morales 2017; Pi & Sasaki 2020; Green & Kavanagh 2021; Chen et al. 2021; Karam et al. 2022), which can be realised in several inflation theories (Kawasaki et al. 1998; Yokoyama 1998a; Kohri et al. 2013; Garcia-Bellido & Ruiz Morales 2017; Kannike et al. 2017; Cai et al. 2020; Pi & Sasaki 2020). As a good approximation for a wide range of curvature perturbations (Inomata & Nakama 2019; Pi & Sasaki 2020; Chen et al. 2021; Yuan & Huang 2021; Domènech 2021), we adopt a log-normal  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  model peaked at the scale  $k_{\bullet}$ , which was motivated in the Horndeski theory of gravity (Inomata & Nakama 2019; Chen et al. 2021)

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} = A_s \left( \frac{k}{k_*} \right)^{n_s-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{A}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-(\ln \frac{k}{k_{\bullet}})^2 / 2\sigma^2} \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $A_s = 2.1 \times 10^{-9}$  and  $n_s = 0.9665$  are the amplitude and spectral index of primordial fluctuations fixed at the pivot scale  $k_* = 0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  (Planck Collaboration et al. 2020). Model parameters  $A$ ,  $k_{\bullet}$  and  $\sigma$  describe the amplitude, location and width of the enhanced peak. For large scales ( $k \ll k_{\bullet}$ ) or for  $A \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is reduced to a power-law primordial spectrum.

Once the large scalar fluctuations crossed the Hubble radius during radiation dominated era, the overdensity above a certain threshold ( $\delta_c \simeq 0.45$ , see e.g. Musco & Miller 2013; Harada et al. 2013; Carr & Kuhnel 2020<sup>1</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> A simple analytic estimate would give  $\delta_c \sim 0.3$  (Carr 1975), but our value was suggested from recent analytic and numerical analyses (Musco & Miller 2013; Harada et al. 2013; Carr & Kuhnel 2020).

can gravitationally collapse into a PBH with mass (Carr et al. 2010; Nakama et al. 2017; Özsoy et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2021),

$$M = 3.16 \times 10^{12} \left( \frac{\gamma}{0.2} \right) \left( \frac{g_*(T)}{106.75} \right)^{-1/6} \left( \frac{k}{\text{Mpc}^{-1}} \right)^{-2} M_\odot, \quad (3)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the collapse efficiency, for which we adopt a typical value of  $\gamma = 0.2$  (Carr 1975; Carr et al. 2010; Özsoy et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2021).  $g_*(T)$  is the total number of effectively massless degrees of freedom (those species with  $m \ll T$ ) at horizon-crossing ( $k = aH$ ), which we adopted SM particle content ( $\text{SU}(3)_C \otimes \text{SU}(2)_L \otimes \text{U}(1)_Y$  theory (Kolb & Turner 1990; Wallisch 2018)).

We use Press-Schechter model (Press & Schechter 1974) to calculate the fraction of Universe's density collapsing into PBHs with mass  $M$  (Carr 1975; Özsoy et al. 2018; Carr & Kuhnel 2020; Chen et al. 2021)

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(M) &\equiv \rho_\bullet / \rho_{\text{cr}}(z) \\ &= 2 \int_{\delta_c}^{\infty} d\delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\bar{\sigma}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2\bar{\sigma}^2}\right) \\ &\simeq \sqrt{\frac{2\bar{\sigma}^2}{\pi\delta_c^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_c^2}{2\bar{\sigma}^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\rho_\bullet$  and  $\rho_{\text{cr}}(z)$  are the PBH density and the critical density of the Universe at the collapsing time. In deriving the third equality in Eq. (4) we used  $\delta_c > \bar{\sigma}$ , which remains valid for all scenarios we explored.  $\bar{\sigma}^2$  is the variance of density fluctuations at the scale  $k^{-1}$  (Young et al. 2014; Özsoy et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2021)

$$\bar{\sigma}^2(M) = \frac{16}{81} \int d \ln k' \left( \frac{k'}{k} \right)^4 \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k') W^2 \left( \frac{k'}{k} \right), \quad (5)$$

where  $k(M)$  function is defined via Eq. (3).  $W(x)$  is a window function, which we use  $\exp(-x^2/2)$  (Özsoy et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2021).

Since PBHs behave as matter,  $\rho_\bullet / \rho_{\text{cr}}$  grows inversely proportional to temperature until matter-radiation equality, and the current distribution of PBH abundance in different masses can be estimated via (see also Young et al. 2014; Inomata et al. 2017; Özsoy et al. 2018; Chen et al. 2021)

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &\equiv \frac{df_{\text{bh}}}{d \ln M} \\ &= 0.28 \left( \frac{\beta}{10^{-8}} \right) \left( \frac{\gamma}{0.2} \right)^{3/2} \left( \frac{g_*}{106.75} \right)^{-1/4} \left( \frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $f_{\text{bh}} \equiv \rho_\bullet / \rho_c$  is the fraction of cold dark matter in form of PBHs. For convenience, we describe the

distribution calculated from Eq. (6) with a log-normal parameterisation (Dolgov & Silk 1993; Green 2016; Carr et al. 2017; Carr & Kuhnel 2020; Cang et al. 2022)

$$\Phi = f_{\text{bh}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_\bullet} \exp\left[-\frac{\ln(M/M_\bullet)^2}{2\sigma_\bullet^2}\right], \quad (7)$$

which provides an excellent fit to the actual profile. Model parameters  $M_\bullet$  and  $\sigma_\bullet$  describe peak PBH mass and distribution width respectively, and their values are calculated using a least-square fitting method.

### 3. SIGW AS DARK RADIATION

In addition to forming PBHs, scalar perturbations also change the radiation quadrupole moment and generate GW at second order, which carries an energy density  $\rho_{\text{GW}}$  that redshifts as radiation after the horizon-crossing (Inomata & Nakama 2019; Chen et al. 2021),  $\rho_{\text{GW}} \propto (1+z)^4$ . At the present day, the GW energy density parameter  $\Omega_{\text{GW}} \equiv (\rho_{\text{GW}}/\rho_{\text{cr}})_{z=0}$  follows the distribution (Ando et al. 2018; Kohri & Terada 2018; Inomata & Nakama 2019)

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &\equiv \frac{d\Omega_{\text{GW}}}{d \ln k} \\ &= 0.29 \Omega_r \left( \frac{106.75}{g_*} \right)^{1/3} \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\infty dv \int_{|1-v|}^{1+v} du \left[ \frac{4v^2 - (1-u^2+v^2)^2}{4u^2v^2} \right]^2 \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{u^2 + v^2 - 3}{2uv} \right)^4 F(u, v) \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(kv) \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(ku), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F(u, v) &= \left( \ln \left| \frac{3 - (u+v)^2}{3 - (u-v)^2} \right| - \frac{4uv}{u^2 + v^2 - 3} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \pi^2 \Theta(u + v - \sqrt{3}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\Omega_r = 9.1 \times 10^{-5}$  is present fractional radiation density assuming massless neutrinos.

After neutrino decoupling, the cosmic radiation energy density ( $\rho_r$ ) is a sum of CMB photon ( $\gamma$ ), neutrino ( $\nu$ ) and GW densities

$$\rho_r = \rho_\gamma + \rho_\nu + \rho_{\text{GW}}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\gamma &= \frac{\pi^2}{15} T_\gamma^4, \\ \rho_\nu + \rho_{\text{GW}} &= \frac{7\pi^2}{120} N_{\text{eff}} T_\nu^4. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here  $T_\gamma = 2.728(1+z)$  K and  $T_\nu = (4/11)^{1/3} T_\gamma$  are temperatures of CMB and neutrino respectively. Because

the behavior of GW density mimics that of neutrino, Eq. (11) counts the contribution of GW to the effective number of neutrino species as  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  (Eq. (1)). Comparing  $\rho_{\text{GW}} = \Omega_{\text{GW}}\rho_{\text{cr}}(1+z)^4$  with Eq. (11), one can see that

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = 8.3 \times 10^4 \Omega_{\text{GW}}(\vec{\theta}), \quad (12)$$

where  $\vec{\theta}$  indicates the model parameters. Depending on the choice of parameterisation,  $\vec{\theta}$  can be either the  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  parameters ( $A, \sigma, k_{\bullet}$ ) defined in Eq. (2), or the PBH parameters ( $f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\bullet}, M_{\bullet}$ ) defined in Eq. (7). For a given set of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  parameters, the value of  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  is directly determined by integrating Eq. (8). To obtain the relation between  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  and PBH parameters, we constructed a three dimensional grid in  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  parameter space and calculated  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  and ( $f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\bullet}, M_{\bullet}$ ) for each point on the grid, using the large discrete sample of  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\bullet}, M_{\bullet})$  function obtained in the process, we then built an interpolation function to calculate  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  for any ( $f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\bullet}, M_{\bullet}$ ) parameter values in between.

To derive our PBH and  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  constraints, we use the  $N_{\text{eff}}$  limits from Planck Collaboration et al. (2020), which gives  $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.04 \pm 0.22$  at 95% C.L. for *Planck*+BAO+BBN data (hereafter PBB)<sup>2</sup>. Using Gaussian statistics, this can be inverted to an 95% C.L. upper bound of  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.175$ . We also study the prospective constraints from a future CMB Stage IV experiment, which is expected to constrain  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.027$  at 95% confidence level (Baumann et al. 2016a; Abazajian et al. 2016; Baumann et al. 2016b; Wallisch 2018). Combining the current and future constraints, we have

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < \begin{cases} 0.175 & \text{Planck + BAO + BBN (PBB)} \\ 0.027 & \text{CMB Stage IV (S4)}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Through Eq. (12), Eq. (13) is inverted to the upper bounds on SIGW density at 95% C.L.

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}} < \begin{cases} 2.11 \times 10^{-6} & \text{(PBB)} \\ 3.25 \times 10^{-7} & \text{(S4)}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

In the following, we will substitute Eq. (2) into Eq. (8) to calculate  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  or numerically using the  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\bullet}, M_{\bullet})$  interpolation function, and then use the upper bound in Eq. (14) to constrain the model parameters. We also notice that because of the positive

correlation between  $N_{\text{eff}}$  and  $H_0$ , adopting a different value of  $H_0$  may lead to the shift of posterior distribution of  $N_{\text{eff}}$ . In recent years, measurements from the local distance ladder (Riess et al. 2016, 2018; Riess et al. 2022) give a higher value of  $H_0$  than the CMB (Planck Collaboration et al. 2020; Aiola et al. 2020; Balkenhol et al. 2022) and BAO measurements (Schöneberg et al. 2022), which are inconsistent with each other at almost  $5\sigma$  C.L. (Verde et al. 2019). However, we notice that there are still a lot of debates on the potential systematics of Cepheids measurement (Freedman et al. 2020; Efstathiou 2020, 2021), which requires more data in the future to clarify the Cepheids measurement. The uncertainty of  $N_{\text{eff}}$  associated with this on-going debates of anchor galaxy distance certainly exceeds the scope of this paper, but we notice the reader for this potential effect on  $N_{\text{eff}}$  measurement.

#### 4. RESULTS


For given  $\sigma$  and  $k$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is determined by  $k_{\bullet}$  and  $A$  parameters. Once we set  $k_{\bullet} = k \cdot \exp[(1 - n_s)\sigma^2]$ , which gives a  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  spectra that peaks at  $k$  (see Eq. (2)), the upper bound on  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$  can be obtained by fixing  $A$  to its upper limit given by Eq. (14). To avoid overlapping with existed large scales constraints (Hunt & Sarkar 2015), we restrict the solution to the range of  $k > 10 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ , which corresponds to  $M_{\bullet} < 5 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$  from Eq. (3).

As shown in Fig. 1, in the majority of parameter space we explored, our results show that PBB constrains  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  to be  $\sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-1})$ . The constraint becomes more stringent for a wider spectral width  $\sigma$ , which is because the peak amplitude of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is roughly inversely proportional to  $\sigma$ . For a sharp spectra with  $\sigma = 0.1$ , our constraint yields  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , whereas the limit tightens to  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 0.1$  for  $\sigma = 2$ . In most cases, the linear part in Eq. (2) can be safely ignored, so that  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \propto A$  and  $\Omega_{\text{GW}} \propto A^2$ , therefore our  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  upper limit is proportional to the maximally allowed  $\sqrt{\Omega_{\text{GW}}}$ . Therefore, compared to PBB, the CMB-S4 experiment will uniformly improve its  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  constraint by 60 per cent on all scales.


The left panel of Fig. 1 compares our PBB and S4 results with other leading  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  constraints from different astrophysical data (Bringmann et al. 2012; Hunt & Sarkar 2015; Inomata & Nakama 2019). At  $k < 4 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is well measured by CMB anisotropy and LSS to  $\sim 2 \times 10^{-9}$  (Hunt & Sarkar 2015). Between  $k = [4, 3 \times 10^7] \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ , the non-detection of gamma rays from ultracompact minihalos (UCMHs) gives  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 10^{-6}$  (Bringmann et al. 2012). All other limits shown in Fig. 1 are for  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with a log-normal width of  $\sigma = 0.5$ , set by the BBN and GW observations, e.g. EPTA (European Pulsar Timing Array) and aLIGO (advanced

<sup>2</sup> Note that there are several updated  $N_{\text{eff}}$  constraints from more recent CMB datasets, e.g. *Planck* and ACTPol jointly constrains  $N_{\text{eff}} = 2.74 \pm 0.17$  at 68% C.L. (Aiola et al. 2020), which is lower than standard model  $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$  by  $1.8\sigma$  C.L. This might be due to unaccounted systematics in the data. The SPT-3G and *Planck* data gives  $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.00 \pm 0.18$  at 68% C.L. (Balkenhol et al. 2022), which has larger error than the PBB limits.






**Figure 1.** *Left*– Comparison of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  constraints. The shaded regions show the excluded parameter space. We present limits derived in this work for  $\sigma = 0.5$  in blue shaded region and black dashed line, corresponding to the current excluded space from PBB and the forecasted S4 upper bounds respectively. Regions in cyan and yellow colours indicate the constraints from CMB and LSS (Hunt & Sarkar 2015), and the non-detection of  $\gamma$ -rays from Ultracompact minihalos (UCMHs) (Bringmann et al. 2012). Regions in magenta, green, and brown colours show the exclusion of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with width of  $\sigma = 0.5$ , from Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) (Kohri & Terada 2018; Inomata & Nakama 2019), European Pulsar Timing Array (EPTA) and advanced LIGO (aLIGO) (Inomata & Nakama 2019). *Right*– Our  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  upper bounds for different  $k$  and  $\sigma$  parameters, set by the current PBB datasets. Prospective  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  limits from S4 can uniformly improve current PBB constraints by 60%.



**Figure 2.** Bounds on  $f_{\text{bh}}$  as a function of PBH peak mass  $M_{\bullet}$ , the filled regions indicate the excluded parameter space. Our constraints are for PBHs produced by inflation-induced scalar perturbation, with the blue and red regions showing the current PBB exclusion bounds on PBHs with distribution widths of 1 and 2 respectively, whereas the blue ( $\sigma_{\bullet} = 1$ ) and red ( $\sigma_{\bullet} = 2$ ) dashed lines show the prospective limits from S4. All other limits in this figure are collected from Carr & Kuhnel (2020) and they apply to PBHs with monochromatic distribution (i.e.  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 0$ ) irrespective of their formation mechanism, from left to right, they are set by lensing (grey; Tisserand et al. 2007; Niikura et al. 2019), accretion (magenta; Serpico et al. 2020), X-ray binary (XB, light blue; Inoue & Kusenko 2017), dynamical effects (DE, green; Lacey & Ostriker 1985; Carr & Sakellariadou 1999; Brandt 2016; Carr & Kuhnel 2020) and cosmological large-scale structure (LSS, brown; Carr & Silk 2018; Carr & Kuhnel 2020).

LIGO) (Inomata & Nakama 2019). Our PBB results constrain  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 0.28$ , which is the strongest  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  limit for  $k \in [10^8, 10^{22}] \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  up-to-date. Projected limits from S4 further tighten to  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 0.11$ . Future GW detectors such as Taiji (Hu & Wu 2017), TianQin (Luo et al. 2016), LISA (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2017) and SKA (Carilli & Rawlings 2004; Moore et al. 2015; Janssen et al. 2015) can probe  $k$  in between  $10^5$  to  $10^{14} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  (Chen et al. 2021), potentially improving our constraints further.

As with the majority of PBH formation theories (Dolgov & Silk 1993; Yokoyama 1998b; Niemeyer & Jedamzik 1999; Green 2016; Carr et al. 2017; Bellomo et al. 2018; Pi et al. 2018), our PBHs follow an extended distribution and can be well described by the log-normal parameterisation in Eq. (7). Using the  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f_{\text{bh}}, \sigma_{\text{bh}}, M_{\text{bh}})$  interpolation function described in previous section, it can be shown numerically that  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  increases with  $f_{\text{bh}}$ , and here we derive our  $f_{\text{bh}}$  upper bounds by iteratively solving Eq. (14). In Fig. 2 we show the  $f_{\text{bh}}$  limits for PBHs with distribution widths of  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 1$  and  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 2$ , along with the existing bounds on monochromatic PBH (assuming all PBHs having same mass) summarised in Carr & Kuhnel (2020) and Serpico et al. (2020). Note that in addition to the inflation-induced scalar perturbation, there are many other PBH formation scenarios (Carr et al. 2021b), e.g. collapse of cosmic strings (Hogan 1984; Hawking 1989; Polnarev & Zembowicz 1991; Hansen et al. 2000) and the bubble collisions (Hawking et al. 1982; Crawford & Schramm 1982; La & Steinhardt 1989), thus caution should be



**Figure 3.** The 95% C.L. upper bounds on  $f_{\text{bh}}$  for different peak mass  $M_{\bullet}$  and distribution width  $\sigma_{\bullet}$ , applicable to PBHs formed from inflation-induced scalar perturbation. The *left* and *right* panels show the current PBB constraints and the prospective S4 limits respectively. The white contours indicate the parameter space where PBH can explain all dark matter ( $f_{\text{bh}} = 1$ ).

taken while interpreting Fig. 2. Our constraints applies to PBHs formed from enhanced scalar perturbation, whereas the rest of the limits constrain PBHs regardless of their formation mechanism.

For constraint from PBB with  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 1$ , the blue filled region in Fig. 2 shows that it excludes supermassive PBHs with  $M_{\bullet} \in [5 \times 10^5, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$  as the dominant DM component ( $f_{\text{bh}} < 1$ ), spanning over 5 orders of magnitude. The limit covers the range set by X-ray binary (light blue; Inoue & Kusenko 2017) and LSS (brown; Carr & Kuhnel 2020). For  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 2$ , the PBB exclusion window expands to  $[10^2, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$ , which constitutes the widest PBH constraints up-to-date. The red and blue dashed lines show the sensitivity of projected CMB-S4 experiment on PBH abundance, which can exclude PBHs in  $[8 \times 10^{-5}, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$  while setting the most stringent PBH constraints in a large mass range of  $[7 \times 10^{-3}, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$ . Compared to other leading constraints in the supermassive PBH window around  $[3 \times 10^4, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$ , the limit from projected S4 can be stronger by more than 10 orders of magnitude. Fig. 3 shows the complete constraints for a range of  $\sigma_{\bullet}$  values. For fixed  $f_{\text{bh}}$ , we find that  $\Omega_{\text{GW}}$  increases with both  $\sigma_{\bullet}$  and  $M_{\bullet}$ , therefore our  $f_{\text{bh}}$  limit is tightened as we increase either  $\sigma_{\bullet}$  or  $M_{\bullet}$ .

## 5. SUMMARY

Scalar-perturbation-induced PBH formation events emit SIGWs that behave like a relativistic species, so that the measured  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  can yield stringent lim-

its on the scalar power spectra  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  on small scales  $10 < k < 10^{22} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ , much smaller than the direct CMB power spectra measurement. Using a log-normal parameterisation for  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  arised from Horndeski gravity theory (Chen et al. 2021) (also a good approximation for a wide class of perturbation theories), we show that *Planck* CMB data combined with BBN and BAO datasets (PBB) gives the currently most stringent  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  constraints in  $k \in [10^8, 10^{22}] \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ . For PBHs with a log-normal width of  $\sigma_{\bullet} = 1$ , PBB exclude supermassive PBHs with peak mass  $M_{\bullet} \in [5 \times 10^5, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$  as the dominant DM component. Future CMB-S4 can probe  $M_{\bullet} \in [8 \times 10^{-5}, 5 \times 10^{10}] M_{\odot}$  mass window and potentially improve  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$  limits of PBB by 60%.

J.C. and Y.G. acknowledges support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12275278), the China Scholarship Council (CSC, No.202104910395) and partially from the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2020YFC2201601). Y.Z.M. is supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa under grant No. 120385 and No. 120378, NITheCS program “New Insights into Astrophysics and Cosmology with Theoretical Models confronting Observational Data”, and National Natural Science Foundation of China with project 12047503. J.C. thanks for the hospitality at the Cosmology Group of SNS during this project.

## REFERENCES

- Abazajian, K. N., et al. 2016, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1610.02743. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.02743>
- Abbott, B. P., et al. 2019, Phys. Rev. X, 9, 031040, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.9.031040

- Ade, P. A. R., et al. 2016, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 594, A13, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201525830](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525830)
- Aich, M., Ma, Y.-Z., Dai, W.-M., & Xia, J.-Q. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 101, 063536, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063536](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.063536)
- Aiola, S., et al. 2020, *JCAP*, 12, 047, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2020/12/047](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/12/047)
- Ali-Haïmoud, Y., & Kamionkowski, M. 2017, *PhRvD*, 95, 043534, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.95.043534](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.043534)
- Amaro-Seoane, P., et al. 2017, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1702.00786. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00786>
- Ando, K., Inomata, K., & Kawasaki, M. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 97, 103528, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.103528](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.103528)
- Ashoorioon, A., Rezazadeh, K., & Rostami, A. 2022, *Phys. Lett. B*, 835, 137542, doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137542](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137542)
- Ashoorioon, A., Rostami, A., & Firouzjaee, J. T. 2021a, *JHEP*, 07, 087, doi: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2021\)087](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2021)087)
- . 2021b, *Phys. Rev. D*, 103, 123512, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.123512](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.123512)
- Auffinger, J. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2206.02672. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.02672>
- Balkenhol, L., et al. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.05642>
- Baumann, D., Green, D., Meyers, J., & Wallisch, B. 2016a, *JCAP*, 01, 007, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2016/01/007](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2016/01/007)
- Baumann, D., Green, D., & Wallisch, B. 2016b, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 117, 171301, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.171301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.171301)
- Bean, R., & Magueijo, J. 2002, *Phys. Rev. D*, 66, 063505, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.66.063505](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.66.063505)
- Bellomo, N., Bernal, J. L., Raccanelli, A., & Verde, L. 2018, *JCAP*, 01, 004, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/01/004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/01/004)
- Belotsky, K. M., Dmitriev, A. D., Esipova, E. A., et al. 2014, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 29, 1440005, doi: [10.1142/S0217732314400005](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732314400005)
- Belotsky, K. M., Dokuchaev, V. I., Eroshenko, Y. N., et al. 2019, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 79, 246, doi: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6741-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6741-4)
- Brandt, T. D. 2016, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 824, L31, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/824/2/L31](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/824/2/L31)
- Bringmann, T., Scott, P., & Akrami, Y. 2012, *Phys. Rev. D*, 85, 125027, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.85.125027](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.85.125027)
- Byrnes, C. T., Cole, P. S., & Patil, S. P. 2019, *JCAP*, 06, 028, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2019/06/028](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2019/06/028)
- Cai, R.-G., Guo, Z.-K., Liu, J., Liu, L., & Yang, X.-Y. 2020, *JCAP*, 06, 013, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2020/06/013](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/06/013)
- Cang, J., Gao, Y., & Ma, Y.-Z. 2022, *JCAP*, 03, 012, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2022/03/012](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2022/03/012)
- Carbone, C., & Matarrese, S. 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 043508, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.71.043508](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.71.043508)
- Carilli, C. L., & Rawlings, S. 2004, *New Astron. Rev.*, 48, 979, doi: [10.1016/j.newar.2004.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newar.2004.09.001)
- Carr, B., Clesse, S., García-Bellido, J., & Kühnel, F. 2021a, *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 31, 100755, doi: [10.1016/j.dark.2020.100755](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2020.100755)
- Carr, B., Kohri, K., Sendouda, Y., & Yokoyama, J. 2021b, *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 84, 116902, doi: [10.1088/1361-6633/ac1e31](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6633/ac1e31)
- Carr, B., & Kuhnel, F. 2020, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 70, 355, doi: [10.1146/annurev-nucl-050520-125911](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-050520-125911)
- . 2022, *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes*, 48, 1, doi: [10.21468/SciPostPhysLectNotes.48](https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhysLectNotes.48)
- Carr, B., Kuhnel, F., & Sandstad, M. 2016, *Phys. Rev. D*, 94, 083504, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.083504](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.083504)
- Carr, B., Raidal, M., Tenkanen, T., Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 96, 023514, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.96.023514](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.023514)
- Carr, B., & Silk, J. 2018, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 478, 3756, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1204](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1204)
- Carr, B. J. 1975, *Astrophys. J.*, 201, 1, doi: [10.1086/153853](https://doi.org/10.1086/153853)
- Carr, B. J. 1975, *ApJ*, 201, 1, doi: [10.1086/153853](https://doi.org/10.1086/153853)
- Carr, B. J., & Hawking, S. W. 1974, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 168, 399
- Carr, B. J., Kohri, K., Sendouda, Y., & Yokoyama, J. 2010, *Phys. Rev. D*, 81, 104019, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.81.104019](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.81.104019)
- Carr, B. J., & Sakellariadou, M. 1999, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 516, 195, doi: [10.1086/307071](https://doi.org/10.1086/307071)
- Chacko, Z., Cui, Y., Hong, S., & Okui, T. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, 92, 055033, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.92.055033](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.055033)
- Chen, P., Koh, S., & Tumurtushaa, G. 2021, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2107.08638. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08638>
- Chen, Z.-C., Yuan, C., & Huang, Q.-G. 2020, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 124, 251101, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.251101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.251101)
- Clark, S., Dutta, B., Gao, Y., Ma, Y.-Z., & Strigari, L. E. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 043006, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.043006](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.043006)
- Clark, S., Dutta, B., Gao, Y., Strigari, L. E., & Watson, S. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 95, 083006, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.95.083006](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.083006)
- Crawford, M., & Schramm, D. N. 1982, *Nature*, 298, 538, doi: [10.1038/298538a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/298538a0)
- de Salas, P. F., & Pastor, S. 2016, *JCAP*, 07, 051, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2016/07/051](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2016/07/051)
- Di Valentino, E., et al. 2018, *JCAP*, 04, 017, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/04/017](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/04/017)
- Dolgov, A., & Silk, J. 1993, *Phys. Rev. D*, 47, 4244, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.47.4244](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.47.4244)
- Domènech, G. 2021, *Universe*, 7, 398, doi: [10.3390/universe7110398](https://doi.org/10.3390/universe7110398)
- Domènech, G., Lin, C., & Sasaki, M. 2021a, *JCAP*, 04, 062, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2021/11/E01](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2021/11/E01)

- Domènech, G., Takhistov, V., & Sasaki, M. 2021b, *Phys. Lett. B*, 823, 136722, doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136722](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136722)
- Efstathiou, G. 2020, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2007.10716, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2007.10716](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2007.10716)
- . 2021, *MNRAS*, 505, 3866, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab1588](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab1588)
- Follin, B., Knox, L., Millea, M., & Pan, Z. 2015, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115, 091301, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.091301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.091301)
- Freedman, W. L., Madore, B. F., Hoyt, T., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 891, 57, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab7339](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab7339)
- Garcia-Bellido, J., & Ruiz Morales, E. 2017, *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 18, 47, doi: [10.1016/j.dark.2017.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2017.09.007)
- Green, A. M. 2016, *Phys. Rev. D*, 94, 063530, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.063530](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.063530)
- Green, A. M., & Kavanagh, B. J. 2021, *J. Phys. G*, 48, 043001, doi: [10.1088/1361-6471/abc534](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/abc534)
- Green, D., et al. 2019, *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51, 159, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.04763>
- Hanany, S., et al. 2019, in *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society*, Vol. 51, 194, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.07495>
- Hansen, R. N., Christensen, M., & Larsen, A. L. 2000, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 15, 4433, doi: [10.1142/S0217751X00001450](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X00001450)
- Harada, T., Yoo, C.-M., & Kohri, K. 2013, *PhRvD*, 88, 084051, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.88.084051](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.084051)
- Hawking, S. 1971, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 152, 75
- Hawking, S. W. 1989, *Phys. Lett. B*, 231, 237, doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(89\)90206-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(89)90206-2)
- Hawking, S. W., Moss, I. G., & Stewart, J. M. 1982, *Phys. Rev. D*, 26, 2681, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.26.2681](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.26.2681)
- Hogan, C. J. 1984, *Phys. Lett. B*, 143, 87, doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(84\)90810-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(84)90810-4)
- Hou, Z., Keisler, R., Knox, L., Millea, M., & Reichardt, C. 2013, *Phys. Rev. D*, 87, 083008, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.87.083008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.083008)
- Hu, W.-R., & Wu, Y.-L. 2017, *Natl. Sci. Rev.*, 4, 685, doi: [10.1093/nsr/nwx116](https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwx116)
- Hunt, P., & Sarkar, S. 2015, *JCAP*, 12, 052, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2015/12/052](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2015/12/052)
- Hütsi, G., Raidal, M., Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2021, *JCAP*, 03, 068, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2021/03/068](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2021/03/068)
- Inomata, K., Kawasaki, M., Mukaida, K., Tada, Y., & Yanagida, T. T. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 96, 043504, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.96.043504](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.043504)
- Inomata, K., & Nakama, T. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, 99, 043511, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.99.043511](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.043511)
- Inoue, Y., & Kusenko, A. 2017, *JCAP*, 10, 034, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2017/10/034](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2017/10/034)
- Janssen, G., et al. 2015, *PoS, AASKA14*, 037, doi: [10.22323/1.215.0037](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.215.0037)
- Jedamzik, K. 2021, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126, 051302, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.051302](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.051302)
- Josan, A. S., Green, A. M., & Malik, K. A. 2009, *Phys. Rev. D*, 79, 103520, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.79.103520](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.79.103520)
- Kannike, K., Marzola, L., Raidal, M., & Veermäe, H. 2017, *JCAP*, 09, 020, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2017/09/020](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2017/09/020)
- Karam, A., Koivunen, N., Tomberg, E., Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2205.13540, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.13540>
- Kawasaki, M., Sugiyama, N., & Yanagida, T. 1998, *Phys. Rev. D*, 57, 6050, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.57.6050](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.57.6050)
- Khlopov, M. Y. 2010, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.*, 10, 495, doi: [10.1088/1674-4527/10/6/001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/10/6/001)
- Kimura, R., Suyama, T., Yamaguchi, M., & Zhang, Y.-L. 2021, *JCAP*, 04, 031, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2021/04/031](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2021/04/031)
- Kohri, K., Lin, C.-M., & Matsuda, T. 2013, *Phys. Rev. D*, 87, 103527, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.87.103527](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.103527)
- Kohri, K., & Terada, T. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 97, 123532, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.123532](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.123532)
- Kolb, E. W., & Turner, M. S. 1990, *The early universe*, Vol. 69 (CRC press)
- La, D., & Steinhardt, P. J. 1989, *Phys. Lett. B*, 220, 375, doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(89\)90890-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(89)90890-3)
- Lacey, C. G., & Ostriker, J. P. 1985, *ApJ*, 299, 633, doi: [10.1086/163729](https://doi.org/10.1086/163729)
- Laha, R. 2019, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123, 251101, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.251101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.251101)
- Laha, R., Muñoz, J. B., & Slatyer, T. R. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 101, 123514, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.123514](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.123514)
- Luo, J., et al. 2016, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 33, 035010, doi: [10.1088/0264-9381/33/3/035010](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/33/3/035010)
- Mangano, G., Miele, G., Pastor, S., & Peloso, M. 2002, *Phys. Lett. B*, 534, 8, doi: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(02\)01622-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(02)01622-2)
- Mangano, G., Miele, G., Pastor, S., et al. 2005, *Nucl. Phys. B*, 729, 221, doi: [10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.09.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.09.041)
- Meerburg, P. D., Hložek, R., Hadzhiyska, B., & Meyers, J. 2015, *PhRvD*, 91, 103505, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.91.103505](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.103505)
- Mittal, S., Ray, A., Kulkarni, G., & Dasgupta, B. 2022, *JCAP*, 03, 030, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2022/03/030](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2022/03/030)
- Moore, C. J., Cole, R. H., & Berry, C. P. L. 2015, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32, 015014, doi: [10.1088/0264-9381/32/1/015014](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/32/1/015014)
- Musco, I., & Miller, J. C. 2013, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 30, 145009, doi: [10.1088/0264-9381/30/14/145009](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/30/14/145009)
- Nakama, T., Silk, J., & Kamionkowski, M. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 95, 043511, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.95.043511](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.043511)



- Nakamura, K. 2007, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 117, 17, doi: [10.1143/PTP.117.17](https://doi.org/10.1143/PTP.117.17)
- Niemeyer, J. C., & Jedamzik, K. 1999, *Phys. Rev. D*, 59, 124013, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.59.124013](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.59.124013)
- Niikura, H., et al. 2019, *Nature Astron.*, 3, 524, doi: [10.1038/s41550-019-0723-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-019-0723-1)
- Özsoy, O., Parameswaran, S., Tasinato, G., & Zavala, I. 2018, *JCAP*, 07, 005, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/07/005](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/07/005)
- Pi, S., & Sasaki, M. 2020, *JCAP*, 09, 037, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2020/09/037](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/09/037)
- Pi, S., Zhang, Y.-l., Huang, Q.-G., & Sasaki, M. 2018, *JCAP*, 05, 042, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/05/042](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/05/042)
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A6, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833910](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910)
- Polnarev, A., & Zembowicz, R. 1991, *Phys. Rev. D*, 43, 1106, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.43.1106](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.43.1106)
- Press, W. H., & Schechter, P. 1974, *Astrophys. J.*, 187, 425, doi: [10.1086/152650](https://doi.org/10.1086/152650)
- Ray, A., Laha, R., Muñoz, J. B., & Caputo, R. 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, 104, 023516, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.104.023516](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.023516)
- Riess, A. G., et al. 2016, *Astrophys. J.*, 826, 56, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/826/1/56](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/826/1/56)
- . 2018, *Astrophys. J.*, 855, 136, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaadb7](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaadb7)
- Riess, A. G., Yuan, W., Macri, L. M., et al. 2022, *ApJL*, 934, L7, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac5c5b)
- Schöneberg, N., Verde, L., Gil-Marín, H., & Brieden, S. 2022, *JCAP*, 2022, 039, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2022/11/039](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2022/11/039)
- Serpico, P. 2019, *PoS, CORFU2018*, 094, doi: [10.22323/1.347.0094](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.347.0094)
- Serpico, P. D., Poulin, V., Inman, D., & Kohri, K. 2020, *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 2, 023204, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.023204](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.023204)
- Takahashi, F., & Yamada, M. 2019, *JCAP*, 07, 001, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2019/07/001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2019/07/001)
- Tashiro, H., & Sugiyama, N. 2013, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 435, 3001, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt1493](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt1493)
- Tisserand, P., et al. 2007, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 469, 387, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20066017](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20066017)
- Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2021, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126, 051303, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.051303](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.051303)
- Verde, L., Treu, T., & Riess, A. G. 2019, *Nature Astronomy*, 3, 891, doi: [10.1038/s41550-019-0902-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-019-0902-0)
- Wallisch, B. 2018, PhD thesis, Cambridge U., doi: [10.17863/CAM.30368](https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.30368)
- Wang, S., Wang, Y.-F., Huang, Q.-G., & Li, T. G. F. 2018, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 120, 191102, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191102)
- Wang, X., Zhang, Y.-l., Kimura, R., & Yamaguchi, M. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2209.12911. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.12911>
- Yang, Y. 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, 104, 063528, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063528](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063528)
- Yokoyama, J. 1998a, *Phys. Rev. D*, 58, 083510, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.58.083510](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.58.083510)
- . 1998b, *Phys. Rev. D*, 58, 107502, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.58.107502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.58.107502)
- Young, S., Byrnes, C. T., & Sasaki, M. 2014, *JCAP*, 07, 045, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2014/07/045](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2014/07/045)
- Yuan, C., & Huang, Q.-G. 2021, *iScience*, 24, 102860, doi: [10.1016/j.isci.2021.102860](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.102860)
- Zhou, H., Lian, Y., Li, Z., Cao, S., & Huang, Z. 2022, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 513, 3627, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac915](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac915)