







# Deciphering the Soliton-Halo Relation in Fuzzy Dark Matter

Pin-Yu Liao (廖品瑜)<sup>1,2</sup> Guan-Ming Su (蘇冠銘)<sup>2</sup> Hsi-Yu Schive (薛熙于)<sup>1,2,3,4,\*</sup>  
Alexander Kunkel<sup>1,2</sup> Hsinhao Huang (黃新豪)<sup>1,2</sup> and Tzihong Chiueh (闕志鴻)<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Astrophysics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

<sup>3</sup>*Center for Theoretical Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

<sup>4</sup>*Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

(Dated: December 16, 2024)

Soliton cores at the center of fuzzy dark matter (FDM) halos provide a promising way to distinguish FDM from other dark matter models. However, the relation between solitons and their host halos remains contentious. Here, we rigorously examine this soliton-halo relation (SHR) using a rich set of cosmological simulations across various FDM particle masses, halo masses, and redshifts. We explicitly demonstrate thermal equilibrium between solitons and surrounding halo granules, energy equipartition within halos, and an FDM concentration-mass-nonisothermality relation. For each FDM halo, we confirm that its density profile outside the central soliton matches a collisionless N-body simulation from the same initial condition, serving as stringent numerical convergence tests. Our refined SHR agrees well with virialized halos in simulations, with a  $1\sigma$  deviation of less than 30%. These findings not only reaffirm the SHR proposed by Schive et al. (2014) but also offer a more comprehensive understanding that extends its applicability.

*Introduction.*—Fuzzy dark matter (FDM) [1–11], composed of ultra-light bosons with masses around  $m \sim 10^{-22}$ – $10^{-20}$  eV, offers a compelling alternative to cold dark matter (CDM). Its sub-kiloparsec de Broglie wavelength produces distinctive quantum wave effects on galactic scales, including the suppression of low-mass halos [12–14], the formation of dynamic, granular structures throughout halos [15–17], and the presence of stable soliton cores surrounded by a Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW; [18]) profile [15, 19–21]. Solitons are spherically symmetric, stationary, ground-state solutions of the Schrödinger-Poisson equation [22], where quantum pressure counteracts gravity, producing a dense, flat central density profile. Additionally, solitons exhibit density oscillations and random walk due to wave interference [16, 23–27]. These characteristics are markedly different from the predictions of CDM and other alternative dark matter models, thereby providing a promising means of discriminating FDM. It is therefore critical to quantitatively examine how soliton properties depend on their host halos — the soliton-halo relation (SHR).

For a fixed  $m$ , all soliton solutions satisfy a scale transformation [22, 28] characterized by a single parameter, such as the soliton mass  $M_s$ . Therefore, the SHR is typically expressed as  $M_s(M_h, z, m)$ , where  $M_h$  is the host halo mass and  $z$  is redshift. Schive et al. [19] proposed  $M_s \propto m^{-1}(1+z)^{1/2}M_h^{1/3}$ , derived from both cosmological simulations and a spherical top-hat collapse model assuming thermal equilibrium between the soliton and halo. This relation has been confirmed by several follow-up studies, including the cosmological simulations of [13, 16] and theoretical models based on halo mergers [29] and thermodynamic approaches [30], with further refinements incorporating NFW halos [31], FDM concentration-halo relation [32, 33], and self-interaction

[34]. However, several controversies exist. For example, the theoretical models of [19, 32, 33] tend to underestimate  $M_s$  for massive halos. Mocz et al. [20] proposed a different SHR,  $M_s \propto M_h^{5/9}$ , aligning with the simulation results of [35, 36]. Large scatter in  $M_s$  has been reported in [37, 38], which, together with the aforementioned discrepancies, suggests that a universal SHR may not exist [39–41]. These controversies necessitate further investigation to gain a deeper understanding of this relation.

Furthermore, FDM simulations are extremely challenging. Simulations solving the Schrödinger-Poisson equation (e.g., [19, 20]) require much higher resolution than CDM simulations to resolve the de Broglie wavelength associated with high-speed flows. On the other hand, it remains unclear whether simulations based on the fluid-like Madelung equation (e.g., [35]) can accurately capture solitons, as they struggle to handle strong destructive interference with vanishing density that is ubiquitous in FDM halos [42]. Consequently, previous simulations addressing the SHR have been subject to significant uncertainties.

In this Letter, we scrutinize the SHR with a rich set of cosmological simulations, exploring a broad range of  $m$ ,  $M_h$ , and  $z$ . We demonstrate that both the model from [19] and the improved model introduced here agree well with the simulation results (Fig. 1). All simulated halos pass rigorous convergence tests (Fig. 2). Moreover, our improved model provides significantly deeper insights into the SHR by addressing several key aspects that were previously unexplored. These include the velocity distribution of FDM halos and solitons (Fig. 3), the relations between FDM concentration, halo mass, and nonisothermality (Fig. 4), and the validation of virialization, thermal equilibrium, energy equipartition, and soliton fidelity (Fig. 5).

*Simulation setup.*—We conduct FDM cosmological simulations using the GPU-accelerated adaptive mesh refinement code **GAMER** [43]. Notably, the code employs a novel hybrid integration method [44]: on coarser grids, it uses a fluid approach to solve the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations, effectively capturing the large-scale structure without the need to resolve the de Broglie wavelength  $\lambda_{\text{dB}}$ ; on finer grids, it switches to a local pseudospectral scheme based on Fourier continuations with Gram polynomials to solve the Schrödinger equation, thereby resolving small-scale interference fringes and solitons. Initial conditions are generated at  $z = 100$  using **AxionCAMB** [45] and **MUSIC** [46]. To investigate the  $m$ ,  $M_{\text{h}}$ , and  $z$  dependence in the SHR, we perform 31 simulations with three sets of  $m_{22} \equiv m/10^{-22}$  eV and comoving box size  $L^3$ :  $(m_{22}, L/\text{Mpc}) = (0.1, 5), (0.2, 4)$  and  $(0.8, 3)$ . These simulations produce a total of 42 halos at  $z = 0$  without mergers, spanning a halo mass range of  $M_{\text{h}} \sim 7 \times 10^9 - 3 \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$  at  $z = 0-2$ . Although the small  $m_{22}$  explored in our simulations are disfavored by some astrophysical constraints [47–50], the inferred SHR is general and applicable to larger  $m_{22}$ .

To ensure the robustness of our FDM simulations, we increase the simulation resolution until the halo properties converge. This necessitates using at least 6–12 cells per halo granule size, defined as  $d \sim 0.35\lambda_{\text{dB}}$ , where  $\lambda_{\text{dB}} \sim 1.48(v/100 \text{ km s}^{-1})^{-1} m_{22}^{-1}$  kpc and  $v$  is the three-dimensional bulk velocity [51]. The corresponding maximum spatial resolutions are 0.32, 0.13, and 0.09 kpc for  $m_{22} = 0.1, 0.2$  and 0.8, respectively. Furthermore, for each FDM simulation, we conduct a collisionless N-body simulation with the same initial condition using the code **GADGET-2** [52] to verify that the FDM and N-body halo density profiles match well outside the central soliton (see the *Numerical convergence* section for details).

*Soliton-halo relation.*—The improved SHR proposed in this work stems from the thermal and bulk velocity distributions of halos and solitons:

$$M_{\text{s}}(M_{\text{h}}, z, m_{22}) = 3.15 \times 10^8 \left( \frac{\langle w \rangle_{\text{s}}}{100 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \right) m_{22}^{-1} M_{\odot}, \quad (1)$$

$$\langle w \rangle_{\text{s}} = \left( \frac{|E_{\text{p}}(M_{\text{h}}, c)|}{M_{\text{h}}} \right)^{1/2} \alpha \beta(c) \gamma. \quad (2)$$

Here  $E_{\text{p}}(M_{\text{h}}, c)$  is the gravitational potential energy and  $c(M_{\text{h}}, z, m_{22})$  is the concentration parameter assuming an NFW halo (see the *Concentration-mass-nonisothermality relation* section for details). We define  $\alpha \equiv (1 + (\langle v \rangle_{\text{h}}/\langle w \rangle_{\text{h}})^2)^{-1/2}$ ,  $\beta \equiv w_{\text{h, in}}/\langle w \rangle_{\text{h}}$ , and  $\gamma \equiv \langle w \rangle_{\text{s}}/w_{\text{h, in}}$ .  $\mathbf{w} = (\hbar/m)\nabla f/f$  is the thermal velocity and  $\mathbf{v} = (\hbar/m)\nabla S$  is the bulk velocity, with the wave function expressed as  $\psi = f e^{iS}$ . The subscripts s and h refer to the soliton and halo, respectively, and  $w_{\text{h, in}}$  represents the thermal velocity in the inner halo surrounding the soliton. The angle brackets denote the




FIG. 1. Comparison of soliton masses from cosmological simulations  $M_{\text{s, sim}}$  with theoretical predictions  $M_{\text{s, theory}}$  from Schive et al. (2014) [19] and this work, as a function of halo mass  $M_{\text{h}}$ . Different colors represent different FDM particle mass  $m_{22}$ . (a)  $M_{\text{s, sim}}$  (closed symbols) and  $M_{\text{s, theory}}$  (solid and dashed lines) at  $z = 0$ . (b)  $M_{\text{s, sim}}/M_{\text{s, theory}}$  at  $z = 0-2$ . The dashed line shows the median values and the shaded region denotes the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty in this work. Both theoretical models show good agreement with simulations over a wide parameter range:  $m_{22} = 0.1-0.8$ ,  $M_{\text{h}} \sim 7 \times 10^9 - 3 \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ , and  $z = 0-2$ . Our work, however, provides significantly deeper insights into the soliton-halo relation (see Figs. 2–5 and text for details).

mass-weighted root-mean-square velocity, for example,  $\langle w \rangle \equiv (\int |\psi|^2 w^2 d^3x / \int |\psi|^2 d^3x)^{1/2}$ .

Eq. (1) can be derived directly from the soliton scale transformation, where  $M_{\text{s}}$  is the soliton mass within its half-density radius  $r_{\text{s}}$ . Assuming virialization,  $E_{\text{p}} = -2E_{\text{k}} = -M_{\text{h}}(\langle w \rangle_{\text{h}}^2 + \langle v \rangle_{\text{h}}^2)$ , where  $E_{\text{k}}$  is the sum of thermal and kinetic energy.  $\alpha^2$  represents the fraction of  $E_{\text{k}}$  in thermal energy, which is 1/2 assuming energy equipartition.  $\beta$  describes the nonisothermality of temperature distribution within the halo and equals unity for an isothermal distribution.  $\gamma$  characterizes the temperature contrast between the soliton and inner halo, with  $\gamma = 1$  representing thermal equilibrium. In the following sections, we demonstrate that  $\alpha^2 = 1/2$  and  $\gamma = 0.89$  provide reasonable approximations (Figs. 3 and 5), and that both  $E_{\text{p}}(M_{\text{h}}, c)$  and  $\beta(c)$  can be inferred from an FDM concentration-mass-nonisothermality relation (Fig. 4 and Eq. (3)). We also validate halo virialization and soliton fidelity (Fig. 5), which are implicitly assumed in Eqs. (1) and (2).




FIG. 2. Density profiles of a representative FDM halo with  $M_h = 9.8 \times 10^{11} M_\odot$ ,  $M_s = 1.7 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ , and  $m_{22} = 0.2$  at  $z = 0$ . The high-resolution result (solid line), utilizing 10 cells per granule size, closely matches both the N-body simulation (thick dotted line) and the NFW model (dash-dotted line) in the halo profile at  $r \gtrsim 7$  kpc. The central profile fits well with the analytical soliton solution (thin dotted line). By contrast, the low-resolution result (dashed line), using only 5 cells per granule size, produces an overly concentrated halo and a soliton that is 30% more massive, despite that the inner profile still agrees with the analytical soliton solution. This discrepancy arises from an underestimation of quantum pressure, highlighting the importance of validating numerical convergence in FDM simulations.

Before examining in detail the contributions of individual terms in Eqs. (1) and (2), we present our key results in Fig. 1 by comparing  $M_s$  from cosmological simulations with theoretical predictions. It demonstrates that both the model of [19] and our refined model align well with the simulation results, exhibiting a  $1\sigma$  deviation of less than 30% across the parameter space probed:  $m_{22} = 0.1$ – $0.8$ ,  $M_h \sim 7 \times 10^9$ – $3 \times 10^{12} M_\odot$ , and  $z = 0$ – $2$ . Our work thus reaffirms the SHR derived in [19] but incorporates more rigorous numerical convergence tests and provides a more comprehensive understanding of this relation, potentially allowing a more accurate description across a broad range of  $m_{22}$ ,  $M_h$ , and  $z$ . We elaborate on these points as follows.

*Numerical convergence.*—We first validate numerical convergence since it is critical for establishing a robust SHR. To this end, we increase the simulation resolution until each FDM halo satisfies the following criteria: (i) the central density profile matches the analytical soliton solution [19], and (ii) the halo profile outside the central soliton agrees with the N-body simulation [16]. For several representative halos, we additionally verify that (iii) the entire halo profile converges with increasing resolution. Our results show that criterion (iii) is always met when criteria (i) and (ii) are satisfied. While criterion (i) is relatively easy to achieve, criteria (ii) and (iii) prove more challenging. Fig. 2 illustrates this by comparing




FIG. 3. Velocity profiles of the same halo shown in Fig. 2. The solid and dashed lines represent the thermal velocity  $w$  and bulk velocity  $v$ , respectively. In the inner halo surrounding the soliton (blue shaded region), the thermal velocity  $w_{h,in}$  and bulk velocity  $v_{h,in}$  have similar magnitudes and remain roughly constant, indicating energy equipartition and an isothermal distribution. Both velocities closely match the velocity dispersion derived from the isotropic spherical Jeans equation (dash-dotted line). In contrast, the outer halo exhibits a non-isothermal velocity profile (see panel (b) of Fig. 4 for the FDM nonisothermality-concentration relation). Within the soliton (yellow shaded region), the thermal velocity dominates, and its average value  $\langle w \rangle_s$  approximately coincides with  $w_{h,in}$ , suggesting thermal equilibrium between the soliton and inner halo. See panels (b) and (c) of Fig. 5 for an analysis of energy equipartition and thermal equilibrium across all halos.

high- and low-resolution simulations, utilizing 10 and 5 cells per granule size, respectively. The central profiles of both cases match the soliton solution. However, for the halo profiles outside the soliton, only the high-resolution run aligns well with the N-body result, whereas the low-resolution run generates an overly concentrated halo and a soliton that is 30% more massive.

The large discrepancy in the low-resolution run stems from an underestimation of quantum pressure, leading to unphysical halo contraction. This contraction deepens the gravitational potential and increases the halo velocity dispersion, thereby raising the soliton energy and mass. Crucially, increasing resolution only within the soliton does not eliminate this problem, as the soliton properties depend on its thermal equilibrium with the surrounding halo granules (see Fig. 3). Properly resolving both solitons and halos is thus essential for obtaining the correct SHR. This explains, to some extent, the overgrowth of soliton mass in the simulated massive halos at lower redshifts in [19]. It may also partially account for the significant scatter and the different SHR reported in previous studies, particularly for massive halos (or larger  $m_{22}$ ) with smaller granules.

*Velocity distribution.*—After confirming numerical accuracy, we proceed to scrutinize the SHR. Fig. 3 presents the shell-average profiles of the thermal velocity  $w$  and bulk velocity  $v$ . It shows that the average thermal velocity of the soliton  $\langle w \rangle_s$  approximately coincides with the inner-halo thermal velocity  $w_{h,\text{in}}$  within  $6r_s \lesssim r \lesssim 40r_s$ . We calculate  $\langle w \rangle_s$  within  $r \lesssim 3.3r_s$  [25]. This result demonstrates that the soliton and inner halo are in thermal equilibrium (i.e.,  $\gamma \sim 1$  in Eq. (2)), a key assumption in the theoretical SHR.

The soliton exhibits  $w \gg v$  as it is supported by quantum pressure. In contrast,  $w \sim v$  outside the soliton, signifying energy equipartition (i.e.,  $\alpha \sim 2^{-1/2}$  in Eq. (2)). Moreover, both  $w$  and  $v$  remain approximately constant in the inner halo but decrease in the outer halo, suggesting that only the inner halo follows an isothermal distribution. These findings challenge some assumptions in [19]. First, their model neglects energy equipartition, leading to an overestimation of the halo thermal velocity. Second, they assume a spherical top-hat collapse model [53] without accounting for the non-isothermal distribution, thus underestimating the inner-halo velocity. These two errors roughly cancel each other out, which explains why their simplified SHR still fits the simulation data (as shown in Fig. 1). In comparison, our improved model explicitly incorporates both factors, offering the possibility of exploring halos with larger temperature contrasts.

In addition, Fig. 3 shows that the inner-halo velocity is consistent with the velocity dispersion derived from the isotropic spherical Jeans equation. This validation aligns with the findings of [26] and reinforces our results.

*Concentration-mass-nonisothermality relation.*—To further investigate the non-isothermal velocity distribution revealed in Fig. 3, we plot in Fig. 4 the relations between halo concentration  $c$ , halo mass  $M_h$ , and nonisothermality for all halos. We compute  $c$  by fitting the halo density profiles at  $r > 6r_s$  (to exclude the soliton) with the NFW model. Panel (a) shows the  $c$ - $M_h$  relation at  $z = 0$ . For CDM,  $c$  increases monotonically with decreasing  $M_h$ , where we adopt the  $c$ - $M_h$  relation of [55] computed by the tool `Colossus` [56]. In comparison, the FDM halo concentration decreases below a redshift-independent half-mode halo mass,  $M_{1/2} = 3.8 \times 10^{10} m_{22}^{-4/3} M_\odot$  [12], in quantitative agreement with the theoretical predictions of [33, 54]. This decrease is caused by quantum pressure delaying the onset of halo formation below  $M_{1/2}$ , thereby suppressing the halo central density. Note that the  $c$ - $M_h$  relation is  $z$ -dependent while here we only plot the results at  $z = 0$  as an illustration. For a given  $M_h$  and  $c(M_h, z, m_{22})$ , we can infer  $E_p$  in Eq. (2).

We also show the results of N-body simulations using the same FDM initial conditions for comparison. Concentration parameters in genuine FDM simulations are slightly but systematically lower than their N-body counterparts, presumably due to the presence of massive soli-




FIG. 4. (a) FDM concentration-mass relation at  $z = 0$ . Different colors represent different  $m_{22}$ . Compared to CDM (dashed line), FDM halo concentration decreases for  $M_h$  below a half-mode halo mass,  $M_{1/2} \propto m_{22}^{-4/3}$  [12] (vertical arrows). This decrease results from quantum pressure delaying halo formation and agrees quantitatively with the theoretical predictions of [33, 54] (solid lines). For reference, we also include the results of N-body simulations using the same FDM initial conditions. (b) FDM nonisothermality-concentration relation. Nonisothermality is defined as the ratio of the inner-halo thermal velocity,  $w_{h,\text{in}}$ , to the average thermal velocity of the entire halo,  $\langle w \rangle_h$  (i.e.,  $\beta$  in Eq. (2)), which increases with higher concentration parameters. The dash-dotted line represents the regression fit. Notably, this relation is insensitive to redshift.

tons that suppress density near the soliton-halo transition (e.g., see Fig. 2 at  $3 \text{ kpc} \lesssim r \lesssim 6 \text{ kpc}$ ).

Panel (b) of Fig. 4 shows the nonisothermality-concentration relation of FDM halos. We define nonisothermality as the ratio of the inner-halo thermal velocity to the average thermal velocity of the entire halo,  $\beta = w_{h,\text{in}}/\langle w \rangle_h$  (see Eq. (2)). The plot reveals a positive correlation between  $c$  and  $\beta$ . This occurs because FDM halos are approximately isothermal at formation, and subsequent accretion of lower-density mass in the outskirts leads to an increase in  $c$  and a more non-isothermal velocity distribution. The FDM nonisothermality-concentration relation can be fitted by

$$w_{h,\text{in}}/\langle w \rangle_h = 0.270 \log c + 1.05, \quad (3)$$

which is insensitive to redshift.

Note that most halos in our simulations have  $M_h \lesssim M_{1/2}$ , where quantum effects are important, resulting in




FIG. 5. Examination of the individual terms and assumptions in the soliton-halo relation, Eqs. (1) and (2), for all FDM halos in our simulations. (a) Virial ratio  $2E_k/|E_p|$ , where  $E_k$  is the sum of thermal and kinetic energy and  $E_p$  is the potential energy. In this work, we include only virialized halos with  $2E_k/|E_p| < 1.35$  (dotted line). (b) Ratio of the average thermal velocity  $\langle w \rangle_h$  to the average bulk velocity  $\langle v \rangle_h$  for the entire halo, equal to unity under energy equipartition. (c) Ratio of the average thermal velocity of the soliton  $\langle w \rangle_s$  to the thermal velocity in the inner halo surrounding the soliton  $w_{h,in}$  (i.e.,  $\gamma$  in Eq. (2)), which is unity assuming thermal equilibrium. (d) Ratio of the soliton mass measured directly from the simulated density field,  $M_{s,sim}$ , to that inferred from  $\langle w \rangle_s$ ,  $M_{s,\langle w \rangle_s}$ . It equals unity if a simulated central density profile follows exactly the analytical soliton solution. Dashed lines represent the fiducial values adopted in this work:  $2E_k/|E_p| = \langle w \rangle_h/\langle v \rangle_h = M_{s,sim}/M_{s,\langle w \rangle_s} = 1$  and  $\langle w \rangle_s/w_{h,in} = 0.89$ .

systematically lower concentration parameters for FDM halos compared to CDM. Therefore, whether Eq. (3) can be applied to halos with  $M_h \gg M_{1/2}$  remains an open question. This uncertainty cannot be addressed by the simplified SHR of [19] and underscores the importance of isolating  $\beta(c)$  from other terms in Eq. (2).

*Further validation.*—Figs. 2 and 3 show only a single representative halo. Additionally, we have implicitly assumed virial condition and soliton fidelity in Eqs. (1) and (2). To provide more robust evidence, in Fig. 5 we validate these implicit assumptions and examine the contributions of individual terms in Eqs. (1) and (2) for all FDM halos in our simulations with  $2E_k/|E_p| < 1.35$  [57]. The results confirm that halos approach virialization (panel (a)) and energy equipartition (panel (b)) as  $z \rightarrow 0$ . Solitons and inner halos are approximately in thermal equilibrium (panel (c)), with  $\langle w \rangle_s/w_{h,in}$  scattering around an average of 0.89. The ratio being slightly below unity warrants deeper investigation. Panel (d) confirms that the simulated central density profiles closely match the analytical soliton solution, especially when the soliton-halo systems become more stable as  $z \rightarrow 0$ .

Based on these findings, we implicitly assume  $2E_k/|E_p| = M_{s,sim}/M_{s,\langle w \rangle_s} = 1$  in Eq. (2) and further adopt  $\langle w \rangle_h/\langle v \rangle_h = 1$  and  $\langle w \rangle_s/w_{h,in} = 0.89$  in our SHR plotted in Fig. 1. These assumptions hold well at  $z = 0$  but introduce modest uncertainties at higher redshifts, highlighting the importance of separating individual terms in Eq. (2) to facilitate further refinement of SHR. Nevertheless, note that the fiducial values shown in all four panels of Fig. 5 are positively correlated with the inferred soliton mass. As a result, deviations between theory and simulations arising from the systematic trends of  $2E_k/|E_p| > 1$ ,  $\langle w \rangle_h/\langle v \rangle_h < 1$ , and  $M_{s,sim}/M_{s,\langle w \rangle_s} < 1$  at  $z > 0$  tend to counterbalance each other, thereby extending the applicability of our SHR to higher redshifts.

*Conclusions.*—We propose a refined SHR for FDM (Eqs. (1) and (2)) supported by an extensive set of cosmological simulations. Our results demonstrate that all virialized halos exhibit a stable soliton core, followed by an NFW halo that, with sufficient numerical resolution, closely matches the collisionless N-body simulations from identical initial conditions (Fig. 2). Solitons and surrounding halo granules are shown to be in thermal equilibrium (Figs. 3 and 5). The energy distribution of halos satisfies equipartition and exhibits a non-isothermal profile (Figs. 3 and 5). The FDM halo concentration parameter decreases below a characteristic halo mass, distinctly different from CDM and aligning with theoretical predictions (Fig. 4). Furthermore, we find a positive correlation between FDM halo concentration and nonisothermality (Fig. 4 and Eq. (3)). Our work reaffirms the simplified SHR proposed by [19] (Fig. 1), while providing a more comprehensive description that enables exploration of a broad range of FDM particle masses, halo masses, and redshifts, especially for halos with larger temperature contrasts.

*Acknowledgments.*—We thank Chun-Yen Chen for his significant contributions to the development of GAMER. We use yt [58] for data visualization and analysis. This research is partially supported by the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) of Taiwan under Grant No. NSTC 111-2628-M-002-005-MY4 and the NTU Academic Research-Career Development Project under Grant No. NTU-CDP-113L7729.

*Data availability.*—The simulation code GAMER is accessible at <https://github.com/gamer-project/gamer>. A Python script for computing the theoretical SHR is available at <https://github.com/calab-ntu/fdm-soliton-halo-relation>.

\* hyschive@phys.ntu.edu.tw

- [1] W. Hu, R. Barkana, and A. Gruzinov, Fuzzy cold dark matter: The wave properties of ultralight particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1158 (2000).
- [2] P. J. E. Peebles, Fluid dark matter, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*

- 534**, L127 (2000).
- [3] F. S. Guzmán and T. Matos, Scalar fields as dark matter in spiral galaxies, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **17**, L9 (2000).
- [4] J. Goodman, Repulsive dark matter, *New Astronomy* **5**, 103 (2000).
- [5] C. G. Böhm and T. Harko, Can dark matter be a Bose Einstein condensate?, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2007**, 025 (2007).
- [6] P. Sikivie and Q. Yang, Bose-Einstein condensation of dark matter axions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 111301 (2009).
- [7] T.-P. Woo and T. Chiueh, High-resolution simulation on structure formation with extremely light bosonic dark matter, *Astrophys. J.* **697**, 850 (2009).
- [8] D. J. E. Marsh, Axion cosmology, *Phys. Rep.* **643**, 1 (2016).
- [9] L. Hui, J. P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine, and E. Witten, Ultralight scalars as cosmological dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 043541 (2017).
- [10] L. Hui, Wave dark matter, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **59**, 247 (2021).
- [11] F. Chadha-Day, J. Ellis, and D. J. E. Marsh, Axion dark matter: What is it and why now?, *Science Advances* **8**, eabj3618 (2022).
- [12] H.-Y. Schive, T. Chiueh, T. Broadhurst, and K.-W. Huang, Contrasting galaxy formation from quantum wave dark matter,  $\psi$ DM, with  $\Lambda$ CDM, using Planck and Hubble data, *Astrophys. J.* **818**, 89 (2016).
- [13] S. May and V. Springel, Structure formation in large-volume cosmological simulations of fuzzy dark matter: impact of the non-linear dynamics, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **506**, 2603 (2021).
- [14] S. May and V. Springel, The halo mass function and filaments in full cosmological simulations with fuzzy dark matter, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **524**, 4256 (2023).
- [15] H.-Y. Schive, T. Chiueh, and T. Broadhurst, Cosmic structure as the quantum interference of a coherent dark wave, *Nature Physics* **10**, 496 (2014).
- [16] J. Veltmaat, J. C. Niemeyer, and B. Schwabe, Formation and structure of ultralight bosonic dark matter halos, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043509 (2018).
- [17] H.-Y. Yang, B. T. Chiang, G.-M. Su, H.-Y. Schive, T. Chiueh, and J. P. Ostriker, Galactic disc heating by density granulation in fuzzy dark matter simulations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **530**, 129 (2024).
- [18] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, The structure of cold dark matter halos, *Astrophys. J.* **462**, 563 (1996).
- [19] H.-Y. Schive, M.-H. Liao, T.-P. Woo, S.-K. Wong, T. Chiueh, T. Broadhurst, and W. Y. P. Hwang, Understanding the core-halo relation of quantum wave dark matter from 3D simulations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 261302 (2014).
- [20] P. Mocz, M. Vogelsberger, V. H. Robles, J. Zavala, M. Boylan-Kolchin, A. Fialkov, and L. Hernquist, Galaxy formation with BECDM - I. Turbulence and relaxation of idealized haloes, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **471**, 4559 (2017).
- [21] D. J. E. Marsh and A.-R. Pop, Axion dark matter, solitons and the cusp-core problem, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **451**, 2479 (2015).
- [22] R. Ruffini and S. Bonazzola, Systems of self-gravitating particles in general relativity and the concept of an equation of state, *Phys. Rev.* **187**, 1767 (1969).
- [23] H.-Y. Schive, T. Chiueh, and T. Broadhurst, Soliton random walk and the cluster-stripping problem in ultralight dark matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 201301 (2020).
- [24] X. Li, L. Hui, and T. D. Yavetz, Oscillations and random walk of the soliton core in a fuzzy dark matter halo, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 023508 (2021).
- [25] B. T. Chiang, H.-Y. Schive, and T. Chiueh, Soliton oscillations and revised constraints from Eridanus II of fuzzy dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 103019 (2021).
- [26] D. Dutta Chowdhury, F. C. van den Bosch, V. H. Robles, P. van Dokkum, H.-Y. Schive, T. Chiueh, and T. Broadhurst, On the random motion of nuclear objects in a fuzzy dark matter halo, *Astrophys. J.* **916**, 27 (2021).
- [27] J. L. Zagorac, I. Sands, N. Padmanabhan, and R. Easther, Schrödinger-Poisson solitons: Perturbation theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 103506 (2022).
- [28] F. S. Guzmán and L. A. Ureña-López, Gravitational cooling of self-gravitating bose condensates, *Astrophys. J.* **645**, 814 (2006).
- [29] X. Du, C. Behrens, J. C. Niemeyer, and B. Schwabe, Core-halo mass relation of ultralight axion dark matter from merger history, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 043519 (2017).
- [30] P.-H. Chavanis, Derivation of the core mass-halo mass relation of fermionic and bosonic dark matter halos from an effective thermodynamical model, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 123506 (2019).
- [31] N. Bar, D. Blas, K. Blum, and S. Sibiryakov, Galactic rotation curves versus ultralight dark matter: Implications of the soliton-host halo relation, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083027 (2018).
- [32] A. Taruya and S. Saga, Analytical approach to the core-halo structure of fuzzy dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103532 (2022).
- [33] H. Kawai, A. Kamada, K. Kamada, and N. Yoshida, Modeling the core-halo mass relation in fuzzy dark matter halos, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 023519 (2024).
- [34] L. E. Padilla, T. Rindler-Daller, P. R. Shapiro, T. Matos, and J. A. Vázquez, Core-halo mass relation in scalar field dark matter models and its consequences for the formation of supermassive black holes, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 063012 (2021).
- [35] M. Nori and M. Baldi, Scaling relations of fuzzy dark matter haloes - I. Individual systems in their cosmological environment, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **501**, 1539 (2021).
- [36] M. Mina, D. F. Mota, and H. A. Winther, Solitons in the dark: First approach to non-linear structure formation with fuzzy dark matter, *Astron. Astrophys.* **662**, A29 (2022).
- [37] B. Schwabe, J. C. Niemeyer, and J. F. Engels, Simulations of solitonic core mergers in ultralight axion dark matter cosmologies, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 043513 (2016).
- [38] H. Y. J. Chan, E. G. M. Ferreira, S. May, K. Hayashi, and M. Chiba, The diversity of core-halo structure in the fuzzy dark matter model, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **511**, 943 (2022).
- [39] T. D. Yavetz, X. Li, and L. Hui, Construction of wave dark matter halos: Numerical algorithm and analytical constraints, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 023512 (2022).
- [40] J. L. Zagorac, E. Kendall, N. Padmanabhan, and R. Easther, Soliton formation and the core-halo mass relation: An eigenstate perspective, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 083513 (2023).
- [41] A. S. Dmitriev, D. G. Levkov, A. G. Panin, and I. I. Tkachev, Self-similar growth of bose stars, *Phys. Rev.*

- Lett. **132**, 091001 (2024).
- [42] X. Li, L. Hui, and G. L. Bryan, Numerical and perturbative computations of the fuzzy dark matter model, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 063509 (2019).
- [43] H.-Y. Schive, J. A. ZuHone, N. J. Goldbaum, M. J. Turk, M. Gaspari, and C.-Y. Cheng, GAMER-2: a GPU-accelerated adaptive mesh refinement code - accuracy, performance, and scalability, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **481**, 4815 (2018).
- [44] A. Kunkel, H. Y. Jowett Chan, H.-Y. Schive, H. Huang, and P.-Y. Liao, A hybrid scheme for fuzzy dark matter simulations combining the Schrödinger and Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2411.17288 (2024).
- [45] R. Hlozek, D. Grin, D. J. E. Marsh, and P. G. Ferreira, A search for ultralight axions using precision cosmological data, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 103512 (2015).
- [46] O. Hahn and T. Abel, Multi-scale initial conditions for cosmological simulations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **415**, 2101 (2011).
- [47] D. J. E. Marsh and J. C. Niemeyer, Strong constraints on fuzzy dark matter from ultrafaint dwarf galaxy Eridanus II, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 051103 (2019).
- [48] K. K. Rogers and H. V. Peiris, Strong bound on canonical ultralight axion dark matter from the Lyman-alpha forest, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 071302 (2021).
- [49] E. O. Nadler, A. Drlica-Wagner, K. Bechtol, S. Mau, R. H. Wechsler, V. Gluscevic, K. Boddy, A. B. Pace, T. S. Li, M. McNanna, A. H. Riley, J. García-Bellido, Y. Y. Mao, G. Green, D. L. Burke, A. Peter, B. Jain, T. M. C. Abbott, M. Aguena, S. Allam, J. Annis, S. Avila, D. Brooks, M. Carrasco Kind, J. Carretero, M. Costanzi, L. N. da Costa, J. De Vicente, S. Desai, H. T. Diehl, P. Doel, S. Everett, A. E. Evrard, B. Flaugher, J. Frieman, D. W. Gerdes, D. Gruen, R. A. Gruendl, J. Gschwend, G. Gutierrez, S. R. Hinton, K. Honscheid, D. Huterer, D. J. James, E. Krause, K. Kuehn, N. Kuropatkin, O. Lahav, M. A. G. Maia, J. L. Marshall, F. Menanteau, R. Miquel, A. Palmese, F. Paz-Chinchón, A. A. Plazas, A. K. Romer, E. Sanchez, V. Scarpine, S. Serrano, I. Sevilla-Noarbe, M. Smith, M. Soares-Santos, E. Suchyta, M. E. C. Swanson, G. Tarle, D. L. Tucker, A. R. Walker, W. Wester, and DES Collaboration, Constraints on dark matter properties from observations of Milky Way satellite galaxies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 091101 (2021).
- [50] N. Dalal and A. Kravtsov, Excluding fuzzy dark matter with sizes and stellar kinematics of ultrafaint dwarf galaxies, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 063517 (2022).
- [51] B. Bar-Or, J.-B. Fouvry, and S. Tremaine, Relaxation in a fuzzy dark matter halo, *Astrophys. J.* **871**, 28 (2019).
- [52] V. Springel, The cosmological simulation code GADGET-2, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **364**, 1105 (2005).
- [53] An improved model considering the NFW profile is provided by [31].
- [54] A. Laroche, D. Gilman, X. Li, J. Bovy, and X. Du, Quantum fluctuations masquerade as haloes: bounds on ultralight dark matter from quadruply imaged quasars, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **517**, 1867 (2022).
- [55] T. Ishiyama, F. Prada, A. A. Klypin, M. Sinha, R. B. Metcalf, E. Jullo, B. Altieri, S. A. Cora, D. Croton, S. de la Torre, D. E. Millán-Calero, T. Oogi, J. Ruedas, and C. A. Vega-Martínez, The Uchuu simulations: Data Release 1 and dark matter halo concentrations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **506**, 4210 (2021).
- [56] B. Diemer, COLOSSUS: A Python toolkit for cosmology, large-scale structure, and dark matter halos, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **239**, 35 (2018).
- [57] A. F. Neto, L. Gao, P. Bett, S. Cole, J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, S. D. M. White, V. Springel, and A. Jenkins, The statistics of  $\Lambda$  CDM halo concentrations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **381**, 1450 (2007).
- [58] M. J. Turk, B. D. Smith, J. S. Oishi, S. Skory, S. W. Skillman, T. Abel, and M. L. Norman, yt: A multi-code analysis toolkit for astrophysical simulation data, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **192**, 9 (2011).