

Revision of upper bound on volume-filling intergalactic magnetic fields with LOFAR

A. Neronov^{1,2}, F. Vazza^{3,4}, S. Mtchedlidze^{3,5}, E. Carretti⁴

¹ BAstroparticules et Cosmologie, Université Paris Cité, CNRS, France

² Laboratory of Astrophysics, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

³ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia, Università di Bologna, Via Gobetti 93/2, 40129 Bologna, Italy

⁴ INAF Istituto di Radioastronomia, Via P. Gobetti 101, 40129 Bologna, Italy

⁵ School of Natural Sciences and Medicine, Ilia State University, 3-5 Cholokashvili St., 0194 Tbilisi, Georgia

December 20, 2024

ABSTRACT

Magnetic fields present in the Large Scale Structure (LSS) of the Universe change polarization of radio waves arriving from distant extragalactic sources through the effect of Faraday rotation. This effect has been recently used to detect magnetic field in the LSS filaments based on the Rotation Measure data of the LOFAR Two-Meter Sky Survey (LoTSS). We notice that the same data also constrain the strength of the volume-filling magnetic field in the voids of the LSS. We use the LoTSS data to derive an improved upper bound on the volume-filling field. The new upper bound provides an order of magnitude improvement on the previous Faraday rotation bounds. The new Faraday Rotation bound on the scale-invariant field that may originate from the epoch of inflation is also an order of magnitude lower than the bound on such field derived from the anisotropy analysis of the Cosmic Microwave Background.

1. Introduction

The existence of non-zero magnetic fields in the voids of the large-scale structure has been hinted at by non-observation of extended and delayed secondary γ -ray emission from distant extragalactic sources, such as Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) Neronov & Vovk (2010); Acciari et al. (2023); Aharonian et al. (2023) and Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRB) Vovk et al. (2024). Magnetic fields in voids can be of cosmological (primordial) origin. As proposed by inflationary magnetogenesis theories, primordial magnetic fields (PMFs) correlated on Mpc scales are generated when the conformal invariance of the electromagnetic action is broken via the coupling of the electromagnetic field with the scalar inflaton field during inflation (see Refs. Turner & Widrow (1988); Ratra (1992) for pioneering studies and Ref. Durrer & Neronov (2013) for a review). PMFs could have also been produced during cosmic phase transitions through charge separation processes (see Refs. Hogan (1983); Quashnock et al. (1989); Tajima et al. (1992) and Refs. Subramanian (2016); Vachaspati (2021) for reviews). In this case, their coherence scale λ_B , is initially smaller than the Hubble horizon at the electroweak (EW) or quantum chromodynamical (QCD) phase-transition epochs, although it can reach tens or hundreds of kpc scales (see e.g., Refs. Tevzadze et al. (2012); Brandenburg et al. (2017); Durrer & Neronov (2013)) by the end of recombination when accounting for the magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulent decay (i.e., the inverse cascade process – decrease of the magnetic field strength B , accompanied by an increase of λ_B) of the field after its generation; the strength and coherence scale of the magnetic field at the recombination, and consequently, at the current epoch depend on the decay timescale of the field and B – λ_B evolutionary trend Banerjee & Jedamzik (2004); Brandenburg et al. (2017); Hosking & Schekochihin (2023); Brandenburg et al. (2024). Alternatively, magnetic fields could have been generated and amplified during structure formation processes, and then transported into voids through magnetised outflows

from galaxies Bertone et al. (2006); Donnert et al. (2009) or AGN jets Xu et al. (2011). Even though the most recent modeling of this process indicate that galactic outflows are perhaps not powerful enough for producing magnetised outflows that result in the void volume-filling magnetic fields Marinacci et al. (2018); Vazza et al. (2017); Bondarenko et al. (2022); Blunier & Neronov (2024); Carretti et al. (2024), modeling uncertainties are large.

Various observational probes have been used to place constraints on the void Inter-Galactic Magnetic Field (IGMF) strength. Gamma-ray observations yield a lower bound on the void IGMF strength B that depends on assumptions about the field variability distance scale λ_B Neronov & Vovk (2010); Acciari et al. (2023); Aharonian et al. (2023). For the large scale magnetic field variable on the Hubble distance scale, the most conservative lower bound on the field strength is currently at the level of $\sim 10^{-17}$ G Acciari et al. (2023). Upper limits have been previously derived from non-detection of Faraday Rotation of the polarized radio waves from AGN Blasi et al. (1999); Pshirkov et al. (2016); Aramburo-Garcia et al. (2022). This upper limit also depends on the magnetic field spatial structure and for the large-scale field it is at the level of several nano-Gauss Aramburo-Garcia et al. (2022). A correlation-length dependent upper bound can also be deduced from Ultra-High-Energy Cosmic Ray observations Neronov et al. (2023). If the field is of cosmological origin, it is also constrained by non-detection of magnetic field induced anisotropies on the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) Ade et al. (2016); Zucca et al. (2017); Paoletti & Finelli (2019).

Faraday Rotation measurements, in particular, the Residual Rotation Measure (RRM¹) analysis, have recently been used to study the effects of PMF spectrum Carretti et al. (2023); Car-

¹ The RRM refers to the Rotation Measure (RM) line-of-sight integral $RM \propto \int n_e B_{\parallel} dl$ of the product of the free electron density n_e and the magnetic field component parallel to the line-of-sight, B_{\parallel} that is ob-

retti et al. (2024); Mtchedlidze et al. (2024) and coherence scale Mtchedlidze et al. (2024) on the redshift evolution of the RRM. In what follows, we use the simulated RRM from Refs. Carretti et al. (2024); Mtchedlidze et al. (2024) and the constrained RRM Carretti et al. (2024), derived from observations of the Faraday rotation measure of polarized extragalactic sources up to redshift $z \approx 2.5$ (from the LOFAR Two-metre Sky Survey, LoTSS, O’Sullivan et al. (2023)), to place upper limits on the void IGMF strength. We show that the new LOFAR bound is an order of magnitude tighter than the bound from the CMB anisotropy studies Ade et al. (2016); Zucca et al. (2017), particularly for inflationary PMF with scale-invariant power spectrum, while it is comparable to the CMB anisotropy bound for the cosmological fields that may originate from cosmological phase transitions.

2. Upper limit from LOFAR RRM

The RRM redshift-dependence data, $RRM(z)$, were obtained in Ref. Carretti et al. (2024) by analysing the LoTSS data, after subtraction of the Galactic foreground, RM_{Gal} , to the total RM, RM_{total} ($RRM = RM_{total} - RM_{Gal}$) and removing the RM contribution from intervening massive halos along the lines of sight. The reconstructed $RRM(z)$ trends exhibit significant scatter of unclear origin (including “wiggles” across all redshift bins, likely with a physical origin. In this work, we follow a conservative approach, in which we consider the $RRM(z)$ trend from Ref. Carretti et al. (2024) as an upper bound on the contribution from IGMF, noticing that the RM induced by the IGMF cannot exceed the RRM. For each RRM model simulated using cosmological simulations with the ENZO code, reported in Ref. Carretti et al. (2024), we find the best-fit to the constrained RRM data and define the maximal possible magnetic field strength as the value at which the model becomes inconsistent with the data at 90% confidence level. In this way, we derive the maximum possible normalization, A , of the magnetic field power spectrum, defined in Fourier space $P(k) = A(k/k_0)^\alpha$ for different slopes α . We subsequently re-express the magnetic field power spectrum in real space as $B(\lambda, \alpha)$, representing the magnetic field strength averaged over given distance scale λ . In fact, Ref. Carretti et al. (2024) directly provides normalization of this real-space power spectrum as the magnetic field strength B_{Mpc} averaged over the reference scale 1 Mpc, following the convention used in the analysis of the CMB (see e.g., Ref. Ade et al. (2016)).

Fig. 1 shows the upper bounds on the field strength as a function of distance scale for different assumptions about the slope of the power spectrum α and the overall upper bound marginalized over α . The magnetic field energy density is related to the power spectrum as $E_M = \int 4\pi k^2 P(k) dk$. The minimal possible value of $\alpha = -3$ corresponds to the scale-invariant magnetic field (which only inflationary processes can produce) that has magnetic field energy density per decade of k independent of k . Such magnetic field is represented by horizontal line part of the upper bound shown in Fig. 1. The largest value of α explored in Ref. Carretti et al. (2024) is $\alpha = 2$, corresponding to the PMFs produced during or after reheating. The upper limit on the PMF with such power spectrum is represented by the steepest part of the upper limit curve in Fig. 1. The field with such power spectrum is represented by a straight line $B = B_{Mpc}(\lambda_B/1 \text{ Mpc})^{-(\alpha+3)/2} = B_{Mpc}(\lambda_B/1 \text{ Mpc})^{-5/2}$ in the log-log plot of the figure. The line corresponding to the maxi-

tained after subtraction of the modeled contribution of the contribution of the Milky Way galaxy to the integral.




Fig. 1. Upper bounds on the field as a function of distance scale for PMF models where magnetic field is characterised by the power-law power spectrum with different slopes (colored lines). Black line shows the envelope of all colored lines, which is an upper bound on the field strength marginalized over the slope α .

mal possible field of this type is tangent to the upper limit black curve in the figure.

It should be noted that any PMF model is affected by a small-scale damping on scales smaller than the Silk damping scale for acoustic waves in cosmological perturbations, caused alternating phases of turbulent and viscous regimes (see e.g., Ref. Banerjee & Jedamzik (2004)). This means that, for every particular magnetic field configuration, there is a minimum scale, l_D , below which the field has no structure and our (B, λ) relation cannot be extrapolated for $\lambda \leq l_D$ scales. The physics ruling the exact value of l_D is complex (see e.g., Refs. Trivedi et al. (2018); Jedamzik et al. (2023)), and it depends on the combination of the spectral energy distribution of magnetic fields, as well as on the normalisation of the field. However, for the range of values in which we are concerned here, l_D is usually assumed to be in the $\sim 10 - 100$ kpc range. (see e.g., Paoletti & Finelli (2019)). Dissipation of the small-scale power results in the formation of a broken power-law type power spectra, with a steeper slope above the $k = 2\pi/l_D$ wavenumber.

For power-law magnetic fields with a slope $\alpha > -2$, or for magnetic fields with a more complex power spectrum than a simple power-law (e.g., PMF models explored in Refs. Brandenburg et al. (2017); Mtchedlidze et al. (2024)), it is possible to define the magnetic field correlation length $l_B = \int k^{-1} P(k) d^3k / E_M$. Different estimates of the comoving magnetic field correlation length at recombination have been made in the past, and recently. As mentioned in the Introduction the locus of PMF states in the $B - \lambda_B$ parameter space depends on the magnetic field decay timescale. The green band in Fig. 2 illustrates the uncertainty in the predictions of the magnetic field strength and coherence scale. An order-of-magnitude estimate for B and λ_B can be obtained by assuming that pre-recombination decay of the field is governed by Alfvénic timescale and that it is of the order of Hubble time. That is, $l_B = C_M^{-1} v_A t_H$, where v_A is Alfvén velocity, t_H is the Hubble time and, C_M is a proportionality coefficient. This estimate, assuming $C_M \approx 1$ Banerjee & Jedamzik (2004) is shown with the “Banerjee & Jedamzik ’04” label in the figure. It has been argued in Ref. Hosking & Schekochihin (2023) that reconnection of magnetic field lines plays an important role




Fig. 2. LOFAR RM bounds on IGMF strength and correlation length, compared with other known constraints. Green area shows possible locations of endpoints of the evolution of PMF Hosking & Schekochihin (2023); Brandenburg et al. (2024); Banerjee & Jedamzik (2004) generated during EW or QCD phase transitions [?]. The red semi-transparent arrow shows the level of other recent limits from the Faraday rotation, obtained by comparing Illustris simulations with NVSS radio data Aramburo-Garcia et al. (2022). γ -ray lower bounds are from Refs. Acciari et al. (2023); Aharonian et al. (2023).

in regulating the rate of turbulent decay of small-scale eddies, and C_M can be much larger than unity. These estimates from Ref. Hosking & Schekochihin (2023) are shown at the boundary of the green region labeled “Hosking & Schekochihin ’23” in Fig. 2. The direct numerical modeling of Ref. Brandenburg et al. (2024) indeed reveals the values of $C_M \gg 1$, reaching $C_M \approx 50$, but it does not confirm the hypothesis proposed in Ref. Hosking & Schekochihin (2023) on the strong dependence of C_M on the Prandtl number (the ratio of viscosity and resistivity of the plasma). The estimates from Ref. Brandenburg et al. (2024) are shown within the green region labeled “Brandenburg et al. ’24”.

To explore the dependence of the upper bound from the constrained RRM on the l_B assumptions, we use numerical simulations from Ref. Mtchedlidze et al. (2024). These simulations consider PMF models with correlation lengths ($l_B = \{1 \text{ Mpc}, 1.8 \text{ Mpc}, 3.5 \text{ Mpc}\}$) as initial conditions for the ENZO cosmological MHD simulations for the magnetic fields with broken powerlaw spectra with the slopes $\alpha = 2$ at small k and $\alpha = -11/3$ in the large k limit. While these models may resemble phase-transition-generated PMFs, the aforementioned coherence scales are larger than those currently predicted by theory. For these PMF models (see Table 1 in Ref. Mtchedlidze et al. (2024)), we find the scaling factor of magnetic field power spectrum at which the predicted RM would saturate the LOFAR upper bound. In this way we obtain the upper bounds on B as a function of l_B . We find that these upper bounds follow a power-law shown by the red dotted line in Fig. 2. The bound shown by the red dashed line is a slight improvement of the bound derived in Ref. Mtchedlidze et al. (2024) due to the update of the LOFAR RRM data in Ref. Carretti et al. (2024). It should be stressed that

the bounds represented by the red dotted line and by the red solid curve have somewhat different meaning:

- the dotted red line is the bound on $B - l_B$ for magnetic fields with “causal” power spectra with a $\alpha = 2$ slope for small k ;
- the solid red line is the bound on magnetic fields with different spectral slopes α ($\alpha \neq 2$ corresponds to magnetic fields produced in “acausal” way, i.e. originating from inflation).

3. Discussion

Fig. 2 shows that the new LOFAR upper limit on the volume-filling IGMF is particularly strong for the fields with scale-invariant power spectrum (that would be represented by horizontal lines in the figure). The normalization of such field at the reference smoothing scale $\lambda = 1 \text{ Mpc}$ cannot exceed $B_{\text{Mpc}} = 70 \text{ pG}$. This is more than an order of magnitude below the limit that has been derived from the analysis of CMB anisotropies Ade et al. (2016); Zucca et al. (2017). The influence of magnetic fields on cosmological recombination is not limited to the CMB anisotropy. The coupling of the magnetic field to the primordial plasma creates inhomogeneities in the baryonic fluid, which modify the dynamics of recombination. It has been argued that this effect is observable, and when accounted for, it leads to a modification of the expansion rate of the Universe as inferred from the CMB data Jedamzik & Pogosian (2020). Such modification is relaxing the so-called “Hubble tension” problem of cosmology — an inconsistency between the estimates of the expansion rate of the Universe derived from the measurements in the present-day Universe and from cosmological probes in the earlier epochs.

In the absence of unambiguous detection of the effect, an upper limit on the present-day relic magnetic field in the voids have been derived in Ref. Jedamzik & Saveliev (2019). This limit is shown by the dotted black line in Fig. 2. Remarkably, this bound is close to the new Faraday Rotation bound derived above. This means that if the PMF is indeed relevant for the solution of the Hubble tension problem, and the field is a scale-invariant originating from inflation (see also footnote on p.2), it should be detectable through its effect on the Faraday rotation of polarized radio signals. Major improvements of the Faraday rotation data, expected with the next releases of LOFAR, ASKAP and SKA, may ultimately lead to the detection of the volume-filling inflationary IGMF in this case.

Otherwise, for the causally produced cosmological magnetic fields, or inflationary fields with the steeper spectral slopes $\alpha > -3$, LOFAR constraints are currently weaker than the constraints obtained through CMB anisotropy and are much weaker than the CMB clumping constraints. Prospects for detection of such fields in the Faraday rotation data are therefore not promising. The detection of the signature of such shorter correlation length fields using the Faraday Rotation technique would have several important consequences. First, it may imply that the volume filling fields are non-cosmological (since they would have not impacted CMB observables), but it would also strongly challenge all commonly proposed alternative scenarios for cosmic magnetisation from galactic outflows or jets from active galactic nuclei (see e.g., Refs. Bertone et al. (2006); Marinacci et al. (2018); Vazza et al. (2017); Bondarenko et al. (2022)) since magnetic fields generated in this way must still have $\sim \text{Mpc}$ correlation lengths (see e.g., Ref. Vazza et al. (2017)). Alternatively, this will imply that the complex physics of the interplay between PMFs and baryons in the recombination era Trivedi et al. (2018); Paoletti et al. (2019); Jedamzik et al. (2023) requires further assessment.

In conclusion, we surmise that we might have entered an interesting era, in which the combination of radio and γ -ray observations of the low redshift Universe, combined with the advanced theoretical modeling of the co-evolution of magnetic fields with cosmic structures, can allow us to probe (or limit) PMFs better than what is possible using the existing or forthcoming CMB data, for a significant range of magnetic field configurations.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the COsmic Magnetism with RADio Astronomy 2024 (COMRAD2024) conference for fostering insightful discussions that contributed to the development of some of the ideas presented in this work. F.V. and S. M.'s research has been supported by Fondazione Cariplo and Fondazione CDP, through grant Rif: 2022-2088 CUP J33C22004310003 for "BREAKTHRU" project. F.V. acknowledges the CINECA award "IsB28_RADGALEO" under the ISCRA initiative, for the availability of high-performance computing resources and support used to produce the numerical models used in this work. A.N. has been supported in part by the French National Research Agency (ANR) grant ANR-24-CE31-4686

References

- Acciari, V. A. et al. 2023, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 670, A145
 Ade, P. A. R. et al. 2016, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 594, A19
 Aharonian, F. et al. 2023, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 950, L16
 Aramburo-Garcia, A., Bondarenko, K., Boyarsky, A., et al. 2022, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 515, 5673
 Banerjee, R. & Jedamzik, K. 2004, *Phys. Rev. D*, 70, 123003
 Bertone, S., Vogt, C., & Ensslin, T. 2006, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 370, 319
 Blasi, P., Burles, S., & Olinto, A. V. 1999, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 514, L79
 Blunier, J. & Neronov, A. 2024, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 691, A34
 Bondarenko, K., Boyarsky, A., Korochkin, A., et al. 2022, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 660, A80
 Brandenburg, A., Kahniashvili, T., Mandal, S., et al. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 96, 123528
 Brandenburg, A., Neronov, A., & Vazza, F. 2024, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 687, A186
 Carretti, E., O'Sullivan, S. P., Vacca, V., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 518, 2273
 Carretti, E., Vazza, F., O'Sullivan, S. P., et al. 2024 [arXiv:2411.13499]
 Donnert, J., Dolag, K., Lesch, H., & Müller, E. 2009, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 392, 1008
 Durrer, R. & Neronov, A. 2013, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.*, 21, 62
 Hogan, C. J. 1983, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 51, 1488
 Hosking, D. N. & Schekochihin, A. A. 2023, *Nature Commun.*, 14, 7523
 Jedamzik, K., Abel, T., & Ali-Haimoud, Y. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2312.11448
 Jedamzik, K. & Pogosian, L. 2020, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 125, 181302
 Jedamzik, K. & Saveliev, A. 2019, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123, 021301
 Marinacci, F. et al. 2018, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 480, 5113
 Mtchedlidze, S., Domínguez-Fernández, P., Du, X., et al. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 977, 128
 Neronov, A., Semikoz, D., & Kalashev, O. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 108, 103008
 Neronov, A. & Vovk, I. 2010, *Science*, 328, 73
 O'Sullivan, S. P., Shimwell, T. W., Hardcastle, M. J., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 519, 5723
 Paoletti, D., Chluba, J., Finelli, F., & Rubiño-Martín, J. A. 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, 185
 Paoletti, D. & Finelli, F. 2019, *JCAP*, 2019, 028
 Pshirkov, M. S., Tinyakov, P. G., & Urban, F. R. 2016, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116, 191302
 Quashnock, J. M., Loeb, A., & Spergel, D. N. 1989, *APJ.Lett*, 344, L49
 Ratra, B. 1992, *APJ.Lett*, 391, L1
 Subramanian, K. 2016, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 79, 076901
 Tajima, T., Cable, S., Shibata, K., & Kulsrud, R. M. 1992, *ApJ*, 390, 309
 Tevzadze, A. G., Kisslinger, L., Brandenburg, A., & Kahniashvili, T. 2012, *ApJ*, 759, 54
 Trivedi, P., Reppin, J., Chluba, J., & Banerjee, R. 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 3401
 Turner, M. S. & Widrow, L. M. 1988, *Phys. Rev. D*, 37, 2743
 Vachaspati, T. 2021, *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 84, 074901
 Vazza, F., Brueggen, M., Gheller, C., et al. 2017, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*
 Vovk, I., Korochkin, A., Neronov, A., & Semikoz, D. 2024, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 683, A25
 Xu, H., Li, H., Collins, D. C., Li, S., & Norman, M. L. 2011, *ApJ*, 739, 77
 Zucca, A., Li, Y., & Pogosian, L. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, 95, 063506