

Quantum Scales of Galaxies from Self-interacting Ultralight Dark Matter

Jae-Weon Lee*

*Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Jungwon University,
85 Munmu-ro, Goesan-eup, Goesan-gun, Chungcheongbuk-do, 28024, Korea.*

Chueng-Ryong Ji†

Department of Physics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-8202

We derive the characteristic scales for physical quantities of galaxies, such as mass, size, acceleration, and angular momentum, within the self-interacting ultralight dark matter (ULDM) model. Due to the small mass of ULDM, even minor self-interactions can drastically alter these scales in the Thomas-Fermi limit. Even in this limit, the characteristic mass can be determined by quantum pressure rather than by repulsive forces. We suggest that these characteristic scales are connected to certain mysteries of observed galaxies such as the universal acceleration scale or the constant surface density of galaxies. Oscillation of ULDM field can explain the current cosmological density of dark matter. Many cosmological constraints imply the energy scale \tilde{m} of order of 10 eV and a GUT scale phase transition related to ULDM.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ultralight dark matter (ULDM) model has emerged as a compelling alternative to cold dark matter (CDM), in which dark matter particles have an exceptionally small mass m , typically on the order of 10^{-22} eV, and exist in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) state. (for a review, see [1–6]). This model is known by various other names, including fuzzy DM, BEC DM, scalar field DM, ultra-light axion, and wave- ψ DM [7–24]. The long de Broglie wave length $\lambda_{dB} = \hbar/mv \sim kpc$ of ULDM determines the typical size of galaxies, where v is the typical velocity of the halo dark matter. This scale can give the size and mass of galaxies [25, 26] and resolve the small scale issues of CDM including the core-cusp problem, the satellite galaxy plane problem and the missing satellite problem [27–31]. ULDM has also been proposed to address the mysteries of black holes, including the M-sigma relation [32] and the final parsec problem [33]. In Ref. 34, the characteristic scales of physical properties of galaxies, such as angular momentum and acceleration, in the fuzzy DM model (i.e., without self-interaction) were studied and found to be consistent with observations. In this model, quantum pressure arising from the uncertainty principle counteracts the gravitational force. However, the fuzzy DM model with $m \simeq 10^{-22}$ eV encounters some tensions with observations, such as the Lyman-alpha forest [35, 36]. Introducing self-interaction in ULDM is one potential solution to address these issues [9, 37]. In this case pressure from self-interaction counteracts the gravitational force. In [9], it was proposed that incorporating self-interaction in ULDM drastically increases the length scale of the model and allows for a wider range of dark matter masses. This model satisfies numerous cosmological constraints [38, 39].

In this paper, we derive a typical scales for physical quantities of galaxies in self-interacting ULDM model, which are related to mysteries of galaxies. We demonstrate the scale differences between the two models and show that both quantum pressure and interaction pressure are required to accurately explain the observed scales.

In the section II we review the Jeans length of ULDM. In the section III the characteristic scales are derived for fuzzy DM. In the section IV we consider the self-interacting case. In the section V we discuss the results.

II. JEANS LENGTH OF ULTRALIGHT DARK MATTER

The ULDM field can be a scalar field ϕ with an action

$$S = \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x \left[\frac{-R}{16\pi G} - \frac{g^{\mu\nu}}{2} \phi_{;\mu}^* \phi_{;\nu} - U(\phi) \right], \quad (1)$$

*Electronic address: scikid@jwu.ac.kr

†Electronic address: ji@ncsu.edu

where the potential for the field can be

$$U(\phi) = \frac{m^2 c^2}{2\hbar^2} |\phi|^2 + \frac{\lambda |\phi|^4}{4\hbar c} = \frac{m^2 c^2}{2\hbar^2} |\phi|^2 + \frac{2\pi a_s m}{\hbar^2} |\phi|^4. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\lambda = 8\pi a_s m c / \hbar$ and $a_s = \lambda \hbar / (8\pi m c)$ is a scattering length [4]. In the Newtonian limit, odd-power terms can be ignored because they average out to zero over galactic time scales as the field rapidly oscillates with a frequency of $O(m)$. We adopt the quartic term with $\lambda > 0$, which is the highest even power term that remains renormalizable. We do not consider the cosine potential in this paper which gives an effective attractive quartic term. The evolution of field is described by the following equation

$$\square \phi + 2 \frac{dU}{d|\phi|^2} \phi = 0, \quad (3)$$

where \square is the d'Alembertian. Since galaxies are non-relativistic, it is useful to define ψ as

$$\phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}} [e^{-imt} \psi(t, \mathbf{x}) + e^{imt} \psi^*(t, \mathbf{x})]. \quad (4)$$

Then, $|\phi|^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{m^2} |\psi|^2$.

In the Newtonian limit, the macroscopic wave function ψ satisfies the following nonlinear Schrödinger-Poisson equation (SPE);

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \partial_t \psi &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi + mV\psi + \frac{\lambda \hbar^3}{2cm^3} |\psi|^2 \psi, \\ \nabla^2 V &= 4\pi G \rho, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the the DM mass density $\rho = m|\psi|^2$, and V is the gravitational potential.

Cosmological structure formation is described by an equation for the density contrast $\delta \equiv \delta\rho/\bar{\rho} = (\rho - \bar{\rho})/\bar{\rho} = \sum_k \delta_k e^{ik \cdot r}$ with a wave vector k of the perturbation,

$$\frac{d^2 \delta_k}{dt^2} + [(c_q^2 + c_s^2)k^2 - 4\pi G \bar{\rho}] \delta_k = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ is the background density, $c_q = \hbar k / 2m$ is a quantum velocity and $c_s = \sqrt{4\pi a_s \hbar^2 \bar{\rho} / m^3} = \sqrt{\hbar^3 \lambda \bar{\rho} / 2cm^4}$ is the sound velocity from self-interaction. The Jeans length corresponds to the wave vector k_J satisfying $(c_q^2 + c_s^2)k^2 - 4\pi G \bar{\rho} = 0$. The DM system becomes unstable to perturbations with $k < k_J$, resulting in the formation of cosmic structures.

III. QUANTUM SCALES OF FUZZY DARK MATTER

In this section we review the case of the free field model ($\lambda = 0$), i.e. fuzzy DM model [34]. From the condition $c_q^2 k^2 = 4\pi G \bar{\rho}$, one can obtain the quantum Jeans length scale [6, 40] at a redshift z :

$$\lambda_Q(z) = \frac{2\pi}{k} = \left(\frac{\pi^3 \hbar^2}{G m^2 \bar{\rho}(z)} \right)^{1/4} \simeq 55.6 \text{ kpc} \left(\frac{\rho_b}{m_{22}^2 \Omega_m \hbar^2 \bar{\rho}(z)} \right)^{1/4} \propto 55.6 \text{ kpc} (1+z)^{-3/4}, \quad (7)$$

where $m_{22} = m/10^{-22} \text{ eV}$, the Hubble parameter $h = 0.67$, ρ_b is the current matter density, and the matter density parameter $\Omega_m = 0.31$.

A different length scale, characterizing a galactic core, emerges from the equilibrium between the self-gravitational force of a ULDM soliton with a mass M and quantum pressure;

$$R_{99} = \mathbf{x}_c = 9.95 \left(\frac{\hbar}{m} \right)^2 \frac{1}{GM} = 8.49 \text{ kpc} \left(\frac{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}{m} \right)^2 \frac{10^8 M_\odot}{M}, \quad (8)$$

where R_{99} is the radius containing 99% of the ULDM mass [41]. This scale is of order of the de Broglie wavelength of the ULDM particles in the soliton.

The scales of ULDM systems are determined by two mass parameters m and M . From λ_Q the quantum Jeans mass can be derived as

$$M_Q(z) = \frac{4\pi}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_Q}{2}\right)^3 \bar{\rho} = \frac{4}{3} \pi^{\frac{13}{4}} \left(\frac{\hbar}{G^{\frac{1}{2}} m}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\rho}(z)^{\frac{1}{4}} = 1.54 \times 10^8 M_\odot \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right)^{-3/2} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{10^{-7} M_\odot / \text{pc}^3}\right)^{1/4} \propto (1+z)^{3/4}, \quad (9)$$

which is the typical mass scale of dwarf galaxies.

Inserting $M = M_Q$ into Eq. (8) gives

$$R_{99} = \frac{3 \times 9.95 \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}}}{4\pi^{13/4} (G\bar{\rho})^{1/4}} = 5.5 \text{ kpc} \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{10^{-7} M_\odot / \text{pc}^3}\right)^{-1/4}. \quad (10)$$

The time scale relevant is

$$t_c \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{G\bar{\rho}}}, \quad (11)$$

which is just the order of the Hubble time at the formation of soliton with mass M .

From these fundamental typical scales one can easily obtain other physical scales. The typical acceleration scale is given by

$$a_c = x_c/t_c^2 = 3.925 G^3 m^4 M^3 / \hbar^4 = 7.45 \times 10^{-11} \text{ meter/s}^2 \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^3 \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} (G\bar{\rho})^{3/4}, \quad (12)$$

which is similar to the Modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND) scale $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ meter/s}^2$. In Ref. 42, it is suggested that MOND arises as an effective phenomenon of ULDM, with a_c linked to the observed radial acceleration relation. The typical velocity is

$$v_c \equiv \mathbf{x}_c/t_c = 3.925 GMm/\hbar = 87.9 \text{ km/s} \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right) \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} (G\bar{\rho})^{1/4}, \quad (13)$$

which is a typical velocity in a dwarf galaxy and leads to a typical angular momentum of galactic halos

$$L_c = M \mathbf{x}_c v_c = (3.925)^2 \hbar \frac{M}{m} = 1.69 \times 10^{97} \hbar \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \left(\frac{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}{m}\right) \simeq \frac{(\frac{\hbar}{m})^{5/2} \bar{\rho}^{1/4}}{G^{3/4}}. \quad (14)$$

The typical density is

$$\rho_c \equiv M/\mathbf{x}_c^3 = \frac{G^3 m^6 M^4}{3.925^3 \hbar^6} = 2.64 \times 10^{-3} M_\odot / \text{pc}^3 \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right)^6 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^4. \quad (15)$$

The scale for the gravitational potential,

$$V_c = \frac{m^2}{3.925 \hbar^2} (4\pi GM)^2 = 2.24 \times 10^{-7} c^2 \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^2, \quad (16)$$

becomes relativistic when $M \simeq 10^{12} M_\odot$ for $m = 10^{-22} \text{ eV}$. This mass M is similar to the maximum galaxy mass.

IV. SELF-INTERACTING CASE

In this section we consider the self-interacting case with a quartic potential $U(\phi)$ in Eq. (2) with $\lambda > 0$ [9]. In the Thomas-Fermi (TF) limit, the kinetic term can be ignored and the physical quantities often depend on the single parameter $\tilde{m} \equiv m/\lambda^{1/4}$, which represents the typical energy scale of ϕ .

An equation for the density contrast δ is now

$$\frac{d^2 \delta_k}{dt^2} + [(c_s^2)k^2 - 4\pi G\bar{\rho}] \delta_k = 0. \quad (17)$$




FIG. 1: The evolution of the typical length scales of galaxies versus redshift z . The upper two curves represent λ_Q for $m_{22} = m/10^{-22} eV = 1$ and $m_{22} = 5$, respectively, while the lower two curves represent the corresponding R_{99} . The horizontal line represents $R_{TF} = \lambda_J/2$ in TF limit. λ_Q determines the galaxy mass, while R_{TF} and R_{99} are associated with the final sizes of stable dark matter halos.

From the equation one can obtain the Jeans length

$$\lambda_J = 2\pi\hbar\sqrt{\frac{a_s}{Gm^3}} = 2R_{TF} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi\hbar^3\lambda}{2cGm^4}} = 0.978 \text{ kpc} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10eV}\right)^{-2}, \quad (18)$$

which is time-independent, unlike the λ_Q of fuzzy dark matter. Note that the Jeans wavelength does not depend on the density.

In the TF limit, the exact ground state solution is given by [9, 43]

$$|\psi|^2 = \frac{|\psi(0)|^2 R_{TF}}{\pi r} \sin\left(\frac{\pi r}{R_{TF}}\right), \quad (19)$$

where the soliton size is

$$R_{TF} = \pi\hbar\sqrt{\frac{a_s}{Gm^3}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi\hbar^3\lambda}{8cGm^4}}. \quad (20)$$

From λ_J we can obtain the Jeans mass

$$M_J \equiv \frac{4\pi}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_J}{2}\right)^3 \bar{\rho} = \frac{4\pi^4\hbar^3}{3} \left(\frac{a_s}{Gm^3}\right)^{3/2} \bar{\rho} = \frac{\pi^{5/2}}{\sqrt{288}} \left(\frac{\hbar^3\lambda}{cGm^4}\right)^{3/2} \bar{\rho} = 49 M_\odot \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10eV}\right)^{-6} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{10^{-7}M_\odot/pc^3}\right) \propto (1+z)^3 \quad (21)$$

Since the present value of $\bar{\rho}$ is about $10^{-7}M_\odot/pc^3$, $M_J(z=0)$ is too small to explain the observed galaxy. This discrepancy can be resolved once we realize that to calculate the typical mass M we should use λ_Q instead of λ_J when $\lambda_J < \lambda_Q$, because the minimum spatial size of density perturbation starting overcoming any pressure is about λ_Q in this case. (See Fig. (1).) Therefore, we can adopt M_Q from Eq. (9) as the mass scale M , rather than M_J , for the high- z epoch during galaxy formation. Note that even though structure formation starts with λ_Q , the final size of a stable galaxy is about $R_{TF} = \lambda_J/2$. Therefore, M_Q defines the mass scale, while λ_J determines the length scale of galaxies. Even when $R_{TF} < R_{99}$, we select R_{TF} as the characteristic length scale for galaxies, as R_{99} is inversely proportional to the soliton mass, which is not typical in observed galactic cores. It seems that, to understand the mass scales of actual galaxies, we must account for both quantum pressure and the pressure from self-interaction. Now, it is natural to represent physical quantities with $M = M_Q$ and \tilde{m} .

The dynamical time scale $t_c \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{G\rho_0}}$ is [44]

$$t_c = \left(\frac{R_{TF}^3}{GM_J}\right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi G\bar{\rho}}} = \pi^{3/4} \left(\frac{\hbar^3\lambda^3}{512c^3G^5m^{12}}\right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M_J}} \propto (1+z)^{-3/2}. \quad (22)$$

We have the length scale $x_c = R_{TF}$, the time scale t_c , and the mass scale $M = M_Q$ for the self-interacting ULDm, from which we can derive the typical scales for various other physical quantities as follows. Since x_c , t_c and M are functions of λ/m^4 , we expect many derived quantities from them to have a dependency on λ/m^4 .

The typical velocity is

$$v_c \equiv \mathbf{x}_c/t_c = \frac{4\hbar\pi^{3/2}\sqrt{\frac{a_s\bar{\rho}}{m^3}}}{\sqrt{3}} = \frac{2^{7/4}\left(\frac{cG^3m^4}{\hbar^3\lambda}\right)^{1/4}}{\pi^{1/4}}\sqrt{M} = 59.28 \text{ km/s} \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10\text{eV}}\right) \propto (1+z)^{3/2}, \quad (23)$$

which is similar to the typical velocity dispersion in a dwarf galaxy. v_c leads to a typical angular momentum in turn

$$L_c = M\mathbf{x}_c v_c = \frac{32\hbar^5\pi^{13/2}\sqrt{\frac{a_s^5\bar{\rho}^3}{m^{15}}}}{3\sqrt{3}G^2} = \left(\frac{32\pi G\hbar^3\lambda}{cm^4}\right)^{1/4} M^{3/2} = 3.375 \times 10^{96} \hbar \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{10 \text{ eV}}{\tilde{m}}\right) \propto (1+z)^{9/2}, \quad (24)$$

which is not of order of $\hbar(M/m)$ as in the fuzzy dark matter.

The typical acceleration scale is given by

$$a_c = x_c/t_c^2 = \frac{8\sqrt{a_s G\hbar\pi^2\bar{\rho}}}{3m^{3/2}} = \frac{16cG^2m^4M}{\pi\hbar^3\lambda} = 1.163 \times 10^{-10} \text{ meter/s}^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10\text{eV}}\right)^4 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \propto (1+z)^3 \quad (25)$$

which is very similar to the MOND scale $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ meter/s}^2$.

On the other hand, the wave function scales as

$$\psi_c = \frac{8a_s^3\pi^6(\hbar\bar{\rho})^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3}(a_s G)^{3/4}m^{15/4}} = \frac{512^{1/4}\sqrt{M}\left(\frac{cGm^4}{\lambda}\right)^{3/4}}{\hbar^{9/4}\pi^{3/4}} = 4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ pc}^{-3/2} \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22}\text{eV}}\right)^3 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right)^{3/2} \simeq \left(\frac{\hbar}{m}\right)^{-3/4} (G\bar{\rho})^{3/8}, \quad (26)$$

which is not proportional to $\bar{\rho}^{1/2}$ as naively expected. Then, the typical density $\rho_c \equiv M/\mathbf{x}_c^3$ is

$$\rho_c = \frac{2\sqrt{2}M\left(\frac{cGm^4}{\lambda}\right)^{3/2}}{\hbar^{9/2}\pi^{3/2}} = 0.106 M_\odot/\text{pc}^3 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10 \text{ eV}}\right)^6 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \propto (1+z)^3. \quad (27)$$

The scale for the gravitational potential,

$$V_c = GM/x_c = \frac{2a_s\hbar^2\pi^3\bar{\rho}}{3m^3} = \frac{GM\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar^3\lambda}{cGm^4}}} = 4.888 \times 10^{-9} c^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10 \text{ eV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \propto (1+z)^3, \quad (28)$$

becomes relativistic when $M \simeq 10^{16} M_\odot$ for $\tilde{m} = 10 \text{ eV}$.

The typical surface density $\Sigma \equiv M/x_c^2$ is

$$\Sigma = \frac{\hbar\pi^{3/2}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar\lambda}{cGm^4}\rho}}{6\sqrt{2}} = 5.124 M_\odot/\text{pc}^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10\text{eV}}\right)^{-2} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{10^{-2}M_\odot/\text{pc}^3}\right) = 104.4 M_\odot/\text{pc}^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{10\text{eV}}\right)^{-2} \left(\frac{M}{10^8 M_\odot}\right) \propto (1+z)^3 \quad (29)$$

which is very similar to the observed value $\Sigma = 75 M_\odot/\text{pc}^2$, while fuzzy dark matter has trouble explaining it [45]. In this sense, self-interacting ULDM provides a better explanation for observed galaxies. All physical scales above indicates that $\tilde{m} \simeq 10 \text{ eV}$ nicely fits with cosmological observations.

The self-interacting ULDM can be a pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone boson (pNGB) associated with a phase transition [8]. For the fiducial values $m = 10^{-22} \text{ eV}$ and $\tilde{m} \simeq 10 \text{ eV}$, we obtain $\lambda = 10^{-92}$. If we consider a broken phase with a negative quadratic term in $U(\phi)$, these values can lead to a vacuum expectation value $\langle\phi\rangle \simeq \frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \simeq 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$, which is similar to the energy scale of Grand unified theories (GUT). We expect that for $\tilde{m} \simeq 10 \text{ eV}$ the phase transition temperature T_c is [46]

$$T_c \simeq \langle\phi\rangle \simeq 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{ eV}}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{10^{-92}}\right)^{-1/2} \quad (30)$$

at which neutrinos can get their masses by interacting with ULDM. This scenario also provides a hint to resolving the hierarchy problem as well [47].

To derive the dark matter density, we follow the arguments in Ref. 6. For $\lambda = 0$, the field begins to oscillate at $\phi = F$ when the Hubble parameter satisfies $H \sim \frac{T_{\text{osc}}^2}{M_P} = m$, where $M_P = 1/\sqrt{8\pi G}$ is the reduced Planck mass,




FIG. 2: Cosmological constraints on the mass m and the coupling constant λ of ULDM. The gray region represents the parameter space disallowed by the constraint on Ω_ϕ . The red solid line represents the constraint from galaxy observations. The vertical dotted lines represent m , corresponding to the typical galaxy mass scale $M_Q = 10^6 M_\odot$ and $10^8 M_\odot$, respectively.

and $T_{osc} = \sqrt{m M_P}$ represents the temperature at that time. The typical energy density of ULDM at this time is of order of $F^2 m^2$. At the matter-radiation equality with the temperature $T_{eq} \simeq 1\text{eV}$ the following relation holds, $\frac{m^2 F^2}{T_{osc}^4} \frac{T_{osc}}{T_{eq}} \sim 1$. Therefore,

$$F \sim \frac{M_P^{3/4} T_{eq}^{1/2}}{m^{1/4}} \sim 10^{17} \text{GeV} \left(\frac{10^{-22} \text{eV}}{m} \right)^{1/4}, \quad (31)$$

which indicates that the typical value of ϕ is on the order of the GUT scale. This fact again supports the idea that ULDM is related to GUT. From the present Hubble parameter H_0 and the temperature of the universe one can estimate the density parameter today for ULDM [6],

$$\Omega_\phi \sim 0.1 \left(\frac{F}{10^{17} \text{GeV}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22} \text{eV}} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (32)$$

For $\lambda \neq 0$, the above logic used for the $\lambda = 0$ case cannot be directly applied, as the equation of state for ϕ depends on the field value [48]. To treat the oscillation of ϕ as cold dark matter, the quartic term in $U(\phi)$ must be smaller than the quadratic term, at least at the time when the temperature is T_{eq} . In other words, at this time, the field value $\phi = \phi_{eq}$ should be smaller than $m/\sqrt{\lambda}$. Considering oscillation of the field one can obtain the present density parameter

$$\Omega_\phi \simeq \frac{\frac{m^2 \phi_{eq}^2}{2} \left(\frac{T_{now}}{T_{eq}} \right)^3}{3H_0^2 m_P^2} \lesssim \frac{m^4}{6\lambda H_0^2 m_P^2} \left(\frac{T_{now}}{T_{eq}} \right)^3 \quad (33)$$

which leads to

$$\phi_{eq} = \sqrt{\frac{6\Omega_\phi H_0^2 m_P^2}{m^2} \left(\frac{T_{eq}}{T_{now}} \right)^3} \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{13} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{10^{-22} \text{eV}}{m} \right) \quad (34)$$

and [49]

$$\tilde{m} = m/\lambda^{1/4} \gtrsim \left(6\Omega_\phi \left(\frac{T_{eq}}{T_{now}} \right)^3 H_0^2 m_P^2 \right)^{1/4} \simeq 1.1 \text{ eV}, \quad (35)$$

where $T_{now} = 2.3 \times 10^{-4}$ is the current temperature of the universe and $\Omega_\phi \simeq 0.26$.

Fig. 2 illustrates the allowed parameter regions that satisfy these constraints. The two vertical lines indicate the m values corresponding to the mass scales $M_Q = 10^6 M_\odot$ and $M_Q = 10^8 M_\odot$ in Eq. (9), respectively. The actual mass scale of galactic cores is expected to lie within these vertical lines. From the figure, it seems that the cosmological constraints favor the fiducial values ($m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV, $\lambda \sim 10^{-92}$), although theoretical uncertainty still remains in ϕ_{osc} , and consequently in the prediction of Ω_ϕ . It is worth studying scales from ultralight axions with a cosine potential for future research.

V. DISCUSSIONS

Through the analysis of the SPE derived from ϕ^4 scalar field theory, we have explained the characteristic scales of physical quantities observed in galaxies for both the free ($\lambda = 0$) and self-interacting ($\lambda > 0$) ULDM scenarios. By accounting for both quantum pressure and self-interaction pressure, the limitations of each model can be addressed. For parameters consistent with observations, quantum pressure determines the mass of galaxies, while self-interaction regulates their size. The density and typical field values of ULDM suggest that ULDM particles might be pNGBs associated with some GUT-scale physics. To account for the typical mass of galaxies, the mass of self-interacting ULDM should be close to that of fuzzy DM. This implies the existence of ULDM oscillations with a frequency $\sim m \sim$ nHz, which could be detectable through pulsar timing array experiments [50], or atomic clock experiments [51]. Future observations, including data from the James Webb Space Telescope, will provide new insights into galaxy evolution, potentially validating these characteristic scales.

acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy (Grant No. DE-FG02-03ER41260). This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 using NERSC award NP-ERCAP0027381.

-
- [1] J.-W. Lee, *Journal of Korean Physical Society* **54**, 2622 (2009), 0801.1442.
 - [2] A. Suárez, V. H. Robles, and T. Matos, in *Accelerated Cosmic Expansion* (2014), vol. 38 of *Astrophysics and Space Science Proceedings*, p. 107, 1302.0903.
 - [3] T. Rindler-Daller and P. R. Shapiro, *Modern Physics Letters A* **29**, 1430002 (2014), 1312.1734.
 - [4] P.-H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 043531 (2011), 1103.2050.
 - [5] D. J. E. Marsh, *Phys. Rep.* **643**, 1 (2016), 1510.07633.
 - [6] L. Hui, J. P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine, and E. Witten, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 043541 (2017), 1610.08297.
 - [7] M. R. Baldeschi, R. Ruffini, and G. B. Gelmini, *Phys. Lett. B* **122**, 221 (1983).
 - [8] S.-J. Sin, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 3650 (1994), hep-ph/9205208.
 - [9] J.-W. Lee and I.-G. Koh, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 2236 (1996), hep-ph/9507385.
 - [10] L. M. Widrow and N. Kaiser, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **416**, L71 (1993).
 - [11] U. Nucamendi, M. Salgado, and D. Sudarsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3037 (2000), gr-qc/0002001.
 - [12] A. Arbey, J. Lesgourgues, and P. Salati, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123528 (2001), astro-ph/0105564.
 - [13] W. Hu, R. Barkana, and A. Gruzinov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1158 (2000), astro-ph/0003365.
 - [14] P. J. E. Peebles, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **534**, L127 (2000), astro-ph/0002495.
 - [15] E. W. Mielke and J. A. Vélez Pérez, *Physics Letters B* **671**, 174 (2009).
 - [16] V. Sahni and L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 103517 (2000), astro-ph/9910097.
 - [17] M. Alcubierre, F. S. Guzman, T. Matos, D. Nunez, L. A. Urena-Lopez, and P. Wiederhold, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 5017 (2002), gr-qc/0110102.
 - [18] C.-G. Park, J.-c. Hwang, and H. Noh, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 083535 (2012), 1207.3124.
 - [19] P. Sikivie and Q. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 111301 (2009), 0901.1106.
 - [20] B. Fuchs and E. W. Mielke, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **350**, 707 (2004), astro-ph/0401575.
 - [21] T. Matos, F. S. Guzman, L. A. Urena-Lopez, and D. Nunez, in *Mexican Meeting on Exact Solutions and Scalar Fields in Gravity: In Honor of Heinz Dehnen's 65th Birthday and Dietrich Kramer's 60th Birthday* (2001), pp. 165–184, astro-ph/0102419.
 - [22] U. Nucamendi, M. Salgado, and D. Sudarsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 125016 (2001), gr-qc/0011049.
 - [23] C. G. Boehmer and T. Harko, *JCAP* **06**, 025 (2007), 0705.4158.

- [24] J. Eby, C. Kouvaris, N. G. Nielsen, and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, *JHEP* **02**, 028 (2016), 1511.04474.
- [25] J.-W. Lee, *Phys. Lett. B* **681**, 118 (2009), 0805.2877.
- [26] P. G. van Dokkum, M. Kriek, and M. Franx, *Nature (London)* **460**, 717 (2009), 0906.2778.
- [27] S. Park, D. Bak, J.-W. Lee, and I. Park, *JCAP* **2022**, 033 (2022), 2207.07192.
- [28] P. Salucci, F. Walter, and A. Borriello, *Astron. Astrophys.* **409**, 53 (2003), astro-ph/0206304.
- [29] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, *Astrophys. J.* **462**, 563 (1996), astro-ph/9508025.
- [30] W. J. G. de Blok, A. Bosma, and S. McGaugh, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **340**, 657 (2003), astro-ph/0212102.
- [31] A. Tasitsiomi, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **12**, 1157 (2003), astro-ph/0205464.
- [32] J.-W. Lee, J. Lee, and H.-C. Kim, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **35**, 2050155 (2020), 1512.02351.
- [33] H. Koo, D. Bak, I. Park, S. E. Hong, and J.-W. Lee, *Physics Letters B* **856**, 138908 (2024).
- [34] J.-W. Lee, *Quantum scales of galaxies from ultralight dark matter* (2023), 2310.01442.
- [35] V. Iršič, M. Viel, M. G. Haehnelt, J. S. Bolton, and G. D. Becker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 031302 (2017), 1703.04683.
- [36] E. Armengaud, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, C. Yèche, D. J. E. Marsh, and J. Baur, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **471**, 4606 (2017), 1703.09126.
- [37] B. Dave and G. Goswami, *JCAP* **07**, 015 (2023), 2304.04463.
- [38] S. T. H. Hartman, H. A. Winther, and D. F. Mota, *JCAP* **02**, 005 (2022), 2108.07496.
- [39] P. R. Shapiro, T. Dawoodbhoy, and T. Rindler-Daller, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **509**, 145 (2021), 2106.13244.
- [40] M. I. Khlopov, B. A. Malomed, and I. B. Zeldovich, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **215**, 575 (1985).
- [41] R. Ruffini and S. Bonazzola, *Phys. Rev.* **187**, 1767 (1969).
- [42] J.-W. Lee, H.-C. Kim, and J. Lee, *Phys. Lett. B* **795**, 206 (2019), 1901.00305.
- [43] P.-H. Chavanis, *Physical Review D* **84**, 043531 (2011).
- [44] P.-H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 043531 (2011), 1103.2050.
- [45] A. Burkert, *Astrophys. J.* **904**, 161 (2020), 2006.11111.
- [46] T. Matos and A. Suárez, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 045015 (2014), 1103.5731.
- [47] J.-W. Lee (2024), 2410.02842.
- [48] B. Li, T. Rindler-Daller, and P. R. Shapiro, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 083536 (2014), 1310.6061.
- [49] A. Boudon, P. Brax, and P. Valageas, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 043507 (2022), 2204.09401.
- [50] G. Agazie et al. (NANOGrav), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **952**, L37 (2023), 2306.16220.
- [51] C. Kouvaris, E. Papantonopoulos, L. Street, and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063014 (2020), 1910.00567.