

Photon proliferation from N -body dark matter annihilation

Shao-Ping Li^{1,*} and Ke-Pan Xie^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan*

²*School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, P. R. China*

We demonstrate a photon proliferation effect from N -body dark matter (DM) annihilation in the early Universe, which can induce a drastic photon-temperature shift after neutrino decoupling. For pseudoscalar DM mass below the eV scale, we show that the photon proliferation effect becomes significant as the mass approaches the ultralight end, due to the huge enhancement from the background DM number density. This presents the leading constraints on the DM-photon coupling, DM self-interaction, and DM-electron coupling, which are stronger than the existing bounds up to several orders of magnitude. The present research can be extended to other interactions and DM candidates, and highlights the importance of multi-body processes in the early Universe.

Introduction. Dark matter (DM) contributes approximately 84% of the total matter in the Universe [1], yet its particle nature remains mysterious. Numerous particle DM models have emerged in recent decades. These models typically involve interactions between DM and the Standard Model (SM), allowing DM annihilation into SM particles and opening detectable channels. For example, the $2 \rightarrow 2$ processes, in which DM annihilates into e^+e^- , $\gamma\gamma$, or $\nu\bar{\nu}$, have become key multi-messenger probes in modern cosmology and astrophysics, with potential signals arising from the diffuse photon background [2, 3], cosmic rays [4, 5], cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies [6, 7], CMB spectral distortions [8–10], big-bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) [11–13], and extra neutrino abundances [14–16].

While the $3 \rightarrow 2$ and $4 \rightarrow 2$ processes may also play an important role in certain contexts [17–19], N -body DM annihilation $N \rightarrow 2$ with $N \geq 5$ is rarely considered. Such N -body cross sections are supposed to be negligible due to the suppression from phase-space factors and higher-order couplings. However, the physical impact of DM annihilation depends not only on the cross section, but also on the background DM number density n_{dm} . For sufficiently light DM, the observed relic abundance suggests that the number density in the early Universe must be substantial, enhancing the impact of $N \rightarrow 2$ processes by a huge factor of n_{dm}^N . As a result, the dominant contribution may occur at $N \gg 2$.

In this letter, we demonstrate a photon proliferation effect from N -body DM annihilation to diphotons. The annihilation channel is present in a broad class of DM scenarios, typically via the *fence* diagram shown in Fig. 1. The injected photons can lead to important physical consequences at redshifts much higher than the recombination epoch ($z \gtrsim 1100$), including modification to the effective neutrino number [20–23], discrepancy of the baryon asymmetry between the BBN and CMB [24], and the primordial CMB spectral distortions [25, 26]. We will illustrate the photon proliferation effect via a light pseudoscalar DM particle with mass below the eV scale, and focus on the impact on the effective neutrino number $N_{\text{eff}} \equiv (8/7)(11/4)^{4/3} \rho_\nu / \rho_\gamma$ as the photon

proliferation is high-temperature dominated. In this regime, photon-number injection is more significant than energy release [10], which will lead to temperature shifts of the background photons [26] after neutrino decouples at $T = \mathcal{O}(1)$ MeV.

To illustrate how the photon proliferation arises in the modification of N_{eff} , we first present one of the key results in this letter, i.e., the net photon-number injection rate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \delta\eta_\gamma \approx \sum_{N=2}^{\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{M}_N|^2}{(2N!) \pi n_{\text{bg}}} \left(\frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^N \left(\frac{T}{Nm_{\text{dm}}} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\delta\eta_\gamma \equiv (n_\gamma - n_{\text{bg}})/n_{\text{bg}}$ denotes the injected photon number normalized to the equilibrium background density $n_{\text{bg}} \approx 0.24 T^3$, $|\mathcal{M}_N|^2$ is the squared amplitude of the $N \rightarrow 2$ nonrelativistic DM annihilation, and the factor $1/(2N!)$ is from identical DM particles and photons. The resulting modification of N_{eff} yields $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{eff}} - N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} \approx -4N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} \delta\eta_\gamma / 3$ with $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}}$ the SM prediction. We anticipate from Eq. (1) that the enhancement from n_{dm}^N and inverse powers of m_{dm} may dominate over the suppression from higher-order couplings in $|\mathcal{M}_N|^2$ up to certain N , leading to an enhancement of $\delta\eta_\gamma$ with increasing N . When N further increases, however, the $1/N!$ factor becomes important to suppress $\delta\eta_\gamma$. Consequently, we reach an interesting conclusion that the dominant contribution comes from $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation instead of the conventional $2 \rightarrow 2$ channel.

As will be shown below, for ultralight pseudoscalar DM [27–30], the photon proliferation effect significantly strengthens current constraints on DM couplings by several orders of magnitude, thereby excluding a substantial portion of the parameter space targeted by future experiments. Additionally, the concept presented here can be extended




FIG. 1. N -body DM annihilation to diphotons via the a - γ - γ vertex, where a denotes a pseudoscalar DM particle.

* lisp@het.phys.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

† kpxie@buaa.edu.cn

beyond the diphoton channel and applied to other interactions, such as the DM-neutrino interactions, as well as other DM candidates, such as the dark photon [31, 32], highlighting the importance of general multi-body annihilation processes in the early Universe.

Photon proliferation in the early Universe. The DM number density in the early Universe is $n_{\text{dm}} \approx 10^{-11}(1+z)^3(0.97 \text{ eV}/m_{\text{dm}}) \text{ eV}^3$, which is enhanced by the small mass m_{dm} and the high redshift z . The evolution of the photon number density is governed by the Boltzmann equation $\dot{n}_\gamma + 3Hn_\gamma = \sum_{N=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_N$. Here, \mathcal{C}_N is the net collision rate from DM annihilation ($N \rightarrow 2$) and photon coalescence ($2 \rightarrow N$):

$$\mathcal{C}_N = 2 \int d\Phi_{\text{dm}} d\Phi_\gamma (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p) \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2}{2N!} \mathcal{F}, \quad (2)$$

where the phase-space integration is defined via

$$d\Phi_{\text{dm}} \equiv \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i}, \quad d\Phi_\gamma \equiv \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b}, \quad (3)$$

and $\delta^4(p) \equiv \delta^4(p_a + p_b - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i)$. The distribution function \mathcal{F} reads

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv \left(\prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right) (1 + f_a)(1 + f_b) - f_a f_b \prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i), \quad (4)$$

where $f_i \equiv f_{\text{dm}}(\mathbf{p}_i)$, $f_{a,b} \equiv f_\gamma(\mathbf{p}_{a,b})$ denote the DM and photon distribution functions, respectively. We will remain agnostic on the production mechanism for light DM (e.g., vacuum misalignment [27–29]). However, we assume that DM has decoupled from the thermal bath and become nonrelativistic at the temperature under consideration. We apply this fact by using $f_{\text{dm}}(\mathbf{p}) \approx 0$ for $|\mathbf{p}| \gtrsim m_{\text{dm}}$. On the other hand, since the injected photons will quickly thermalize, we will use $f_\gamma(\mathbf{p}) = (e^{|\mathbf{p}|/T} - 1)^{-1}$ in Eq. (4). The squared amplitude $|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2$ depends on the center-of-mass energy \sqrt{s} . If the power of the s -dependence is not higher than 2, and $T \gg Nm_{\text{dm}}$ holds, then it can be proven that Eq. (2) reduces to Eq. (1) with $|\mathcal{M}_N|^2 = |\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2|_{\sqrt{s}=Nm_{\text{dm}}}$ [33].

Integrating Eq. (1) yields the injected photon number

$$\delta\eta_\gamma = \int_{z_1}^{z_2} dz \left(\frac{d}{dt} \delta\eta_\gamma \right) \left| \frac{dt}{dz} \right|. \quad (5)$$

where $z_2 \approx 5.6 \times 10^9$ corresponds to the neutrino decoupling temperature $T \approx 1.32 \text{ MeV}$ [23], and we have cut the lower integration limit at $z_1 \approx 2 \times 10^6$, corresponding to the dawn of the primordial CMB μ -distortion formation [25, 26]. Extending the integration limit to lower redshifts only causes negligible changes, since the photon-number injection rate is high-temperature dominated. The resulting ΔN_{eff} can be analytically written as

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \approx \sum_{N=2}^{\infty} c_N \left(\frac{|\mathcal{M}_N|^2}{m_{\text{dm}}^{4-2N}} \right) \left(\frac{3.6 \times 10^4 \text{ eV}}{m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^{4N-3}, \quad (6)$$

with $c_N \equiv -1.7 \times 10^{17}/[N(3N-4)N!]$. The above modification must be subject to the joint bound from the

BBN and CMB measurements: $|\Delta N_{\text{eff}}| < 0.429$ at 2σ level [24]. For numerical discussions, we will take the instantaneous neutrino decoupling limit with $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} = 3$. While going beyond the instantaneous decoupling leads to a different prediction of $N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}}$ at 4% level [20–23], the constraint presented below would not change noticeably. Additionally, using non-universal decoupling temperatures for three neutrinos would only cause a slight change of the bound. While we have used a neutrino decoupling temperature around 1 MeV, the large photon proliferation effect above 1 MeV also leads to modification of the Hubble expansion and followed neutrino decoupling, where constraints are expected to be somewhat stronger. These refined bounds can be obtained straightforwardly by substituting Eq. (1) into the full neutrino Boltzmann equation, though it will not be pursued here.

DM-photon coupling. Let us first consider the effective DM-photon interaction from

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{4} g_{a\gamma\gamma} a F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (7)$$

where a denotes the pseudoscalar DM candidate with a dimensionful coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$. This interaction can induce the $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation channel shown in Fig. 1. For this process, we find that the squared amplitude for nonrelativistic $a(p_1)a(p_2) \cdots a(p_N) \rightarrow \gamma(k_1)\gamma(k_2)$ annihilation can be written as

$$|\mathcal{M}_N|^2 = \sum_{\text{spins}} \left| \epsilon_{\mu_0}^*(k_1) \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2) \mathcal{M}_N^{\mu_0 \mu'_0} \right|^2, \quad (8)$$

where ϵ_μ is the photon polarization vector. The general amplitude yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_N^{\mu_0 \mu'_0} &= \left(\frac{N! g_{a\gamma\gamma}^N}{m_{\text{dm}}^{2N-2}} \right) \epsilon^{k_1 q_1 \mu_0 \mu_1} \epsilon^{q_{N-1} k_2 \mu_2 \mu_{N-2} \mu'_0} \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{g_{\mu_{2i-1} \mu_{2i}}}{i(i-N)} \prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{q_{j-1} q_j \mu_{2j-2} \mu_{2j-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where q_i is the momentum transfer of the i -th internal photon line, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the Minkowski metric tensor, and we have used the shorthand for contraction between the Levi-Civita tensor and momenta, e.g., $\epsilon^{kq\rho\sigma} \equiv \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} k_\mu q_\nu$. Note that the factor $N!$ at the amplitude level is from boosted Feynman diagrams via permutation of DM momenta.

The amplitudes satisfy the recursion relation [33]

$$\mathcal{M}_{N+1} = \frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N} \right)^{N+2} \mathcal{M}_N, \quad (10)$$

which can be used to determine the large- N amplitudes from small- N ones. Parameterizing

$$|\mathcal{M}_N|^2 \equiv \kappa_N g_{a\gamma\gamma}^{2N} m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad (11)$$

with κ_N being dimensionless, we can infer from Eq. (10) that $\kappa_{N+1} = \kappa_N (1 + 1/N)^{2N+4}/4$, which leads to $\kappa_{N+1} \approx 1.85 \kappa_N$ for large N . Given this, we first evaluate $|\mathcal{M}_6|^2$,




FIG. 2. The upper bound of the DM-photon coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ from the photon proliferation effect, which is induced from N -body DM annihilation via Fig. 1. Current bounds (shaded regions) and detection limits from future experiments (dashed lines) are also shown for comparison.

with $\kappa_6 = 2657.21$ consistently obtained from Eq. (9) and the `FeynArts`/`FeynCalc` packages [34, 35], and then use $\kappa_N \approx 1.85^{N-6} \kappa_6$ to calculate $|\mathcal{M}_N|^2$ at $N > 6$.

We derive the bound on the DM-photon coupling by taking the largest N -body contribution from Eq. (6), yielding

$$\log_{10} \left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{\text{GeV}^{-1}} \right) < \left(1 - \frac{3}{2N} \right) \log_{10} \left(\frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{\text{eV}} \right) - 0.24 + \frac{\log_{10} [N(3N-4)N!]}{2N} - \frac{2.88}{N}. \quad (12)$$

The strongest constraint typically appears at $N \gg 10$ for m_{dm} below 1 eV. As an example, for $m_{\text{dm}} = 10^{-14}$ eV, the best bound is $g_{a\gamma\gamma} < 5.7 \times 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, which is derived at $N = 94$ and stronger than the conventional $2 \rightarrow 2$ contribution by around 8 orders of magnitude.

For each m_{dm} , we derive the strongest $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ constraint by varying N , and show it as the black line in Fig. 2, the region above which is excluded by the ΔN_{eff} constraint due to the photon proliferation effect. Note that in specific ultralight DM production scenarios such as the misalignment mechanism, the relative size of the DM mass and the Hubble parameter H usually determines the epoch when the pseudoscalar field starts to oscillate. After $m_{\text{dm}} > H$, the pseudoscalar energy density is damped like nonrelativistic matter, which is also the behavior we work upon. Nevertheless, the DM mass threshold from the condition $m_{\text{dm}} > H$ depends on several dynamics, including an initial amplitude before oscillation, the Hubble expansion in the production regime and a potentially time-dependent mass [27]. If the oscillation starts after neutrino decoupling, the upper integration limit in Eq. (5) would be adapted to $z_2 [m_{\text{dm}}/H(z_2)]^{1/2}$, where $H(z_2) = 7.7 \times 10^{-16} \text{ eV}$ corresponds to neutrino decoupling at $T = 1.32 \text{ MeV}$. In this case, the constraint becomes weaker than from Eq. (12) when $m_{\text{dm}} < H(z_2)$, as shown by the black dotted line.

For $m_{\text{dm}} \lesssim 10^{-13} \text{ eV}$, the photon proliferation effect

presents stronger constraints on the DM-photon coupling compared with the existing bounds shown in shaded regions, including the observations from the Chandra mission (on NGC 1275 [36], M87 [37], and Hydra A [38]), the SN1987A gamma-ray data [39], the CERN Axion Solar Telescope (CAST) [40], the SuperMAG [41, 42], the Sgr A* [43]. The bound derived here also rules out a large portion of detection windows in several future experiments (dashed lines), including the Dark matter Axion search with riNg Cavity Experiment (DANCE) [44], the Twisted Anyon Cavity [45], the black hole polarimetry [46], the International AXion Observatory (IAXO) [47], and the gravitational wave detectors (aLIGO [48] and space-based interferometers such as LISA, TianQin, Taiji, and BBO [49]). Noticeably, the bound on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ derived here does not assume model-dependent relations between $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ and m_a (or the decay constant f_a in some axion-like particle (ALP) models [50]).

Self-interacting DM. The above discussions assume that N -body DM annihilation to diphotons comes solely from the a - γ - γ vertex. For pseudoscalar DM, the quartic self-coupling is usually also present either at tree-level or from quantum corrections, and the effective Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{4!} \lambda a^4. \quad (13)$$

The basic $3 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation channel induced from Eq. (13) is shown in Fig. 3, and the $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation processes with $N \geq 5$ are generated by attaching more λ -vertices to the DM lines, where the squared amplitude can be parameterized as

$$|\mathcal{M}'_N|^2 \equiv \frac{\kappa'_N \lambda^{N-1} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2}{m_{\text{dm}}^{2N-6}}, \quad (14)$$

with a dimensionless coefficient κ'_N .

Generally, for self-interacting DM the $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation channel is induced by Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and the diagrams generated by attaching λ -vertices to DM lines in Fig. 1. The resulting contribution to $|\Delta N_{\text{eff}}|$ would contain Eq. (11), Eq. (14), and their interference terms. For a specific parameter choice of $(m_{\text{dm}}, g_{a\gamma\gamma}, \lambda)$ and a given N , there might be a delicate cancellation effect from the interference terms, which leads to a very small $|\Delta N_{\text{eff}}|$. However, this is expected to be the tuning case, and for a different N the cancellation




FIG. 3. The $3 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation process of DM to diphotons via the quartic self-coupling λ . The $N \geq 5$ channels can be induced by attaching more λ -vertices to the a -lines.




FIG. 4. The upper bound on the DM-electron coupling g_{aee} , where the photon proliferation effect arises from the g_{aee} -induced quartic DM coupling. Current bounds (shaded regions) and future detection sensitivities (dashed lines) are shown for comparison.

would not appear. Given that the modification to N_{eff} results from the sum of different $N \rightarrow 2$ channels, we neglect the accidental cancellation and derive the bound of λ by considering the $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation process induced by Fig. 3.

Although a general formula for κ'_N is difficult to obtain, we have used `FeynArts/FeynCalc` to obtain $\kappa'_3 = 0.63$, $\kappa'_5 = 0.85$, and $\kappa'_7 = 2.49$, and find that κ'_N slowly increases with N . Then for large N , we consider a conservative estimate of $|\mathcal{M}'_N|^2$ by taking $\kappa'_N = \kappa'_7$ for $N \geq 7$. Using the $|\Delta N_{\text{eff}}|$ constraint from BBN and CMB, we obtain

$$\log_{10} \lambda < \frac{4N-5}{N-1} \log_{10} \left(\frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{\text{eV}} \right) - \frac{18.2N-13.7}{N-1} \quad (15)$$

$$- \frac{2}{N-1} \log_{10} \left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{\text{GeV}^{-1}} \right) + \frac{\log_{10} [N(3N-4)N!]}{N-1}.$$

The bound of λ also depends on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, but the factor of $2/(N-1)$ makes the dependence rather insensitive at large N . Given this, we substitute the bound of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ from Eq. (12) into Eq. (15). It turns out that the bound of λ is not sensitive to the precise value of N , as the right-hand side changes slowly with N . For $10^{-15} \text{ eV} \lesssim m_{\text{dm}} \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{ eV}$, the upper limit of λ varies from $\mathcal{O}(10^{-76})$ to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-40})$, which is much stronger than from CMB anisotropies [51]. It is worth mentioning that the strongest constraint on λ is derived at $N = \mathcal{O}(100)$, and the bound derived at $N = 7$ is weaker by 1 (5) order(s) of magnitude at $m_{\text{dm}} = 10^{-6}$ (10^{-15}) eV.

DM-electron coupling. For pseudoscalar DM, the generic coupling to electrons can be described by shift-symmetric interaction $-m_e e^{2ia/f} \bar{e}_{ReL} + \text{h.c.}$, where m_e is the electron mass and f corresponds to some symmetry breaking scale. Up to $\mathcal{O}(a^2/f^2)$, the low-energy effective Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -im_e \frac{a}{f} \bar{e} \gamma_5 e + m_e \frac{a^2}{f^2} \bar{e} e. \quad (16)$$

Usually, only the first term is considered in constraints of light particles coupling to electrons. However, the second term is necessary to ensure the mass stability of the ultralight DM particle under self-energy corrections [52]. At one-loop level, Eq. (16) induces an effective quartic coupling for DM self-interaction,

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}} = \frac{24}{\pi^2} g_{aee}^4 \ln \left(\frac{m_e^2}{m_a^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

where $g_{aee} \equiv m_e/f$, and the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization scheme is used with the running scale fixed at m_a .

Following Eq. (15), we can obtain an upper bound on g_{aee} via λ_{eff} , as shown in the black line of Fig. 4. For $10^{-15} \text{ eV} \lesssim m_{\text{dm}} \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{ eV}$, the limit of g_{aee} varies from $\mathcal{O}(10^{-20})$ to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-11})$. Existing bounds from solar ALP search on the DM direct detection experiments (PandaX [53, 54], LUX [55], XENONnT [56]) and from the red giant observations [57] are shown in shaded regions. It is seen that the photon proliferation effect presents stronger bounds on g_{aee} than the current limits at $m_{\text{dm}} \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-8}) \text{ eV}$. We also show the projected detection sensitivities on g_{aee} from the electron storage ring [58], the future comagnetometer [59], the Nitrogen-Vacancy centers in diamonds [60], the spin precession experiment via torsion pendulum [61], and the axion wind multilayer [62]. As can be seen from Fig. 4, a large portion of the parameter space targeted by these future experiments is already excluded.

Conclusion. We have shown the photon proliferation effect from N -body DM annihilation to diphotons in the early Universe. This is expected to be a general phenomenon for ultralight DM that has become nonrelativistic at temperatures of $\mathcal{O}(\text{MeV})$. A huge photon number injection rate arises due to the enhancement from the high DM background density, and a drastic increase of the photon temperature will be induced, leading to a significant modification of N_{eff} after neutrino decoupling. We also demonstrated that for DM mass approaching the ultralight end, the photon proliferation effect will present the leading constraints on the DM-photon, DM self-interaction, and DM-electron couplings.

The discussion presented in this letter can be extended to other interactions such as the DM-neutrino interaction, and other DM candidates like the dark photon. Our results highlight the importance of $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation in the early Universe, where the enhanced DM number density may compensate for the suppression from higher-order couplings and multi-body phase-space factors. By boosting the impacts in the early Universe, it may also open avenues to probe hidden particles that were once abundant in the early Universe but disappeared in the present day.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Amin Aboubrahim, Jinhui Guo, Jia Liu, Yong Tang, Jingqiang Ye, and Bingrong Yu for useful discussions on ultralight DM, and Vladyslav Shtabovenko for helpful comments on `FeynArts` and `FeynCalc`. We appreciate the helpful data repositories of ultralight DM constraints managed by Ciaran A. J. O'Hare [63]. K.-P. Xie also thanks the hospitality of Osaka University where part of this work was performed. S.-P. Li is supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Research Fellows No. 24KF0060. K.-P. Xie is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

- [1] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], 1807.06209.
- [2] T. Bringmann and C. Weniger, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **1**, 194 (2012), 1208.5481.
- [3] D. Hooper, C. Kelso, and F. S. Queiroz, *Astropart. Phys.* **46**, 55 (2013), 1209.3015.
- [4] J. Hisano, M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi, and K. Nakayama, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 083522 (2009), 0901.3582.
- [5] D. Grasso et al. (Fermi-LAT), *Astropart. Phys.* **32**, 140 (2009), 0905.0636.
- [6] N. Padmanabhan and D. P. Finkbeiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 023508 (2005), astro-ph/0503486.
- [7] J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **402**, 1195 (2010), 0910.3663.
- [8] J. Chluba and R. A. Sunyaev, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **419**, 1294 (2012), 1109.6552.
- [9] J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **460**, 227 (2016), 1603.02496.
- [10] S.-P. Li, *JCAP* **07**, 019 (2024), 2402.16708.
- [11] K. Jedamzik and M. Pospelov, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 105028 (2009), 0906.2087.
- [12] M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi, and Y. Takaesu, *Phys. Lett. B* **751**, 246 (2015), 1509.03665.
- [13] P. F. Depta, M. Hufnagel, K. Schmidt-Hoberg, and S. Wild, *JCAP* **04**, 029 (2019), 1901.06944.
- [14] C. Boehm, M. J. Dolan, and C. McCabe, *JCAP* **08**, 041 (2013), 1303.6270.
- [15] K. M. Nollett and G. Steigman, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 083505 (2015), 1411.6005.
- [16] C. A. Argüelles, A. Diaz, A. Kheirandish, A. Olivares-Del-Campo, I. Safa, and A. C. Vincent, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 035007 (2021), 1912.09486.
- [17] E. D. Carlson, M. E. Machacek, and L. J. Hall, *Astrophys. J.* **398**, 43 (1992).
- [18] Y. Hochberg, E. Kuflik, T. Volansky, and J. G. Wacker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 171301 (2014), 1402.5143.
- [19] N. Bernal and X. Chu, *JCAP* **01**, 006 (2016), 1510.08527.
- [20] M. Escudero, *JCAP* **02**, 007 (2019), 1812.05605.
- [21] J. J. Bennett, G. Buldgen, M. Drewes, and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *JCAP* **03**, 003 (2020), [Addendum: *JCAP* 03, A01 (2021)], 1911.04504.
- [22] M. Escudero Abenza, *JCAP* **05**, 048 (2020), 2001.04466.
- [23] M. Drewes, Y. Georis, M. Klasen, L. P. Wiggering, and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *JCAP* **06**, 032 (2024), 2402.18481.
- [24] T.-H. Yeh, J. Shelton, K. A. Olive, and B. D. Fields, *JCAP* **10**, 046 (2022), 2207.13133.
- [25] W. Hu and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 485 (1993).
- [26] J. Chluba, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **440**, 2544 (2014), 1312.6030.
- [27] P. Arias, D. Cadamuro, M. Goodsell, J. Jaeckel, J. Redondo, and A. Ringwald, *JCAP* **06**, 013 (2012), 1201.5902.
- [28] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, and L. Visinelli, *Phys. Rept.* **870**, 1 (2020), 2003.01100.
- [29] E. G. M. Ferreira, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29**, 7 (2021), 2005.03254.
- [30] P. W. Graham, I. G. Irastorza, S. K. Lamoreaux, A. Lindner, and K. A. van Bibber, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **65**, 485 (2015), 1602.00039.
- [31] A. Caputo, A. J. Millar, C. A. J. O'Hare, and E. Vitagliano, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 095029 (2021), 2105.04565.
- [32] M. Fabbrichesi, E. Gabrielli, and G. Lanfranchi (2020), 2005.01515.
- [33] See more details in the Supplemental Material.
- [34] T. Hahn, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140**, 418 (2001), hep-ph/0012260.
- [35] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig, and F. Orellana, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **306**, 109357 (2025), 2312.14089.
- [36] C. S. Reynolds, M. C. D. Marsh, H. R. Russell, A. C. Fabian, R. Smith, F. Tombesi, and S. Veilleux, *Astrophys. J.* **890**, 59 (2020), 1907.05475.
- [37] M. C. D. Marsh, H. R. Russell, A. C. Fabian, B. P. McNamara, P. Nulsen, and C. S. Reynolds, *JCAP* **12**, 036 (2017), 1703.07354.
- [38] D. Wouters and P. Brun, *Astrophys. J.* **772**, 44 (2013), 1304.0989.
- [39] S. Hoof and L. Schulz, *JCAP* **03**, 054 (2023), 2212.09764.
- [40] V. Anastassopoulos et al. (CAST), *Nature Phys.* **13**, 584 (2017), 1705.02290.
- [41] A. Arza, M. A. Fedderke, P. W. Graham, D. F. J. Kimball, and S. Kalia, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 095007 (2022), 2112.09620.
- [42] M. Friel, J. W. Gjerloev, S. Kalia, and A. Zamora (2024), 2408.16045.
- [43] G.-W. Yuan, Z.-Q. Xia, C. Tang, Y. Zhao, Y.-F. Cai, Y. Chen, J. Shu, and Q. Yuan, *JCAP* **03**, 018 (2021), 2008.13662.
- [44] Y. Michimura, Y. Oshima, T. Watanabe, T. Kawasaki, H. Takeda, M. Ando, K. Nagano, I. Obata, and T. Fujita, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1468**, 012032 (2020), 1911.05196.
- [45] J. F. Bourhill, E. C. I. Paterson, M. Goryachev, and M. E. Tobar, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 052014 (2023), 2208.01640.
- [46] X. Gan, L.-T. Wang, and H. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 063039 (2024), 2311.02149.
- [47] I. Shilon, A. Dudarev, H. Silva, and H. H. J. ten Kate, *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **23**, 4500604 (2013), 1212.4633.
- [48] K. Nagano, T. Fujita, Y. Michimura, and I. Obata, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 111301 (2019), 1903.02017.
- [49] Y.-H. Yao, T. Jiang, and Y. Tang (2024), 2410.22072.
- [50] A. Ringwald, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **1**, 116 (2012), 1210.5081.
- [51] J. A. R. Cembranos, A. L. Maroto, S. J. Núñez Jareño, and H. Villarrubia-Rojo, *JHEP* **08**, 073 (2018), 1805.08112.
- [52] M. Bauer and G. Rostagni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 101802 (2024), 2307.09516.
- [53] X. Zhou et al. (PandaX-II), *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **38**, 011301 (2021), [Erratum: *Chin. Phys. Lett.* 38, 109902 (2021)], 2008.06485.
- [54] X. Zeng et al. (PandaX) (2024), 2408.07641.
- [55] D. S. Akerib et al. (LUX), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 261301 (2017), 1704.02297.
- [56] E. Aprile et al. (XENON), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 161805 (2022), 2207.11330.
- [57] M. Giannotti, I. G. Irastorza, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald, and K. Saikawa, *JCAP* **10**, 010 (2017), 1708.02111.
- [58] C. Brandenstein, S. Stelzl, E. Gutschiedl, W. Schott, A. Weiler, and P. Fierlinger, *EPJ Web Conf.* **282**, 01017 (2023), 2211.08439.
- [59] I. M. Bloch, Y. Hochberg, E. Kuflik, and T. Volansky, *JHEP* **01**, 167 (2020), 1907.03767.
- [60] S. Chigusa, M. Hazumi, E. D. Herbschleb, N. Mizuochi, and K. Nakayama (2023), 2302.12756.
- [61] P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan, J. Mardon, S. Rajendran, W. A. Terrano, L. Trahms, and T. Wilkason, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 055006 (2018), 1709.07852.
- [62] A. Berlin, A. J. Millar, T. Trickle, and K. Zhou, *JHEP* **05**, 314 (2024), 2312.11601.

- [63] C. O'Hare, [cajohare/axionlimits: Axionlimits](https://cajohare.github.io/AxionLimits/), <https://cajohare.github.io/AxionLimits/> (2020).
- [64] W. Hu, R. Barkana, and A. Gruzinov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1158 (2000), astro-ph/0003365.
- [65] L. Hui, J. P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine, and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 043541 (2017), 1610.08297.
- [66] L. Hui, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **59**, 247 (2021), 2101.11735.
- [67] A. H. Mueller and D. T. Son, Phys. Lett. B **582**, 279 (2004), hep-ph/0212198.
- [68] S. Jeon, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 014907 (2005), hep-ph/0412121.
- [69] M. P. Hertzberg, JCAP **11**, 037 (2016), 1609.01342.

Supplemental Material

Photon proliferation from N -body dark matter annihilation

Shao-Ping Li and Ke-Pan Xie

I. PHOTON NUMBER INJECTION FROM DM ANNIHILATION AND PRODUCTION

In this section, we derive the Boltzmann collision rates from DM $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation and photon $2 \rightarrow N$ coalescence. When the nonrelativistic DM particle becomes ultralight, the number of particles (occupancy) within the volume of the Compton wavelength, $1/m_{\text{dm}}^3$, is typically large in the early Universe, $n_{\text{dm}}/m_{\text{dm}}^3 \gg 1$, such that the set of DM particles is usually described by classical field [64–66]. Here, we will work on the particle collision pattern to describe DM interactions. We expect that both approaches should give the same result after proper matching, as already hinted by the equivalence between the Boltzmann equation and classical field theory [67–69].

The collision term from N -body annihilation in the photon Boltzmann equation is given by Eq. (2) in the main text, which can be written as

$$\mathcal{C}_N = 2 \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4 \left(p_a + p_b - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \right) \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2}{2N!} \times \left\{ (1 + f_a + f_b) \left(\prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right) - f_a f_b \left[\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i) - \prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right] \right\}, \quad (18)$$

where $f_i \equiv f_{\text{dm}}(\mathbf{p}_i)$ and $f_{a,b} \equiv f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{p}_{a,b})$ with f_{dm} and f_{γ} being the dark matter (DM) and photon phase-space distribution functions, respectively. Equation (18) can be treated as the difference between two positive-definite terms, $\mathcal{C}_N \equiv \mathcal{C}_F - \mathcal{C}_L$, according to the expressions in the curly brackets. We further make four assumptions:

1. Photons are in equilibrium with the Bose-Einstein distribution, $f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{p}) = 1/(e^{E/T} - 1)$ with $E = |\mathbf{p}|$.
2. DM particles are out-of-equilibrium and nonrelativistic, namely $f_{\text{DM}}(\mathbf{p}) \approx 0$ when $|\mathbf{p}| \gtrsim m_{\text{dm}}$.
3. The $N \rightarrow 2$ squared amplitude can be parameterized as $|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2 \approx \alpha s^{\beta}$, where \sqrt{s} is the energy in the center-of-mass frame, and (α, β) are determined by the specific annihilation process. For example, if DM only couples to photons via $-g_{a\gamma\gamma} a F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}/4$, then the dimensionful α scales as $\alpha \propto g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$ while the power reads $\beta = 2$. If the $N \rightarrow 2$ squared amplitude is induced by the DM self-interaction $-\lambda a^4/4!$, then $\alpha \propto \lambda^{N-1} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2$ and $\beta = 3 - N$. We will only consider the case of $\beta \leq 2$.
4. The relevant scales under consideration are

$$T \sim 1 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_{\text{dm}} \ll 1 \text{ eV}, \quad Nm_{\text{dm}} \ll T. \quad (19)$$

Based on this setup, we will demonstrate two things: first, \mathcal{C}_F can be expressed as a simple function of the DM number density and mass, and second, $\mathcal{C}_L \ll \mathcal{C}_F$ such that Eq. (18) reduces to \mathcal{C}_F and Eq. (1) in the main text will be reproduced.

We first calculate

$$\mathcal{C}_F \equiv 2 \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4 \left(p_a + p_b - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \right) \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2}{2N!} (1 + f_a + f_b) \left(\prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right). \quad (20)$$

A remarkable feature of this integration is that each \mathbf{p}_i is dressed with a nonrelativistic distribution f_i . Therefore, we can make the replacement $p_i^{\mu} \rightarrow (m_{\text{dm}}, 0, 0, 0)$, and hence $\delta(p_a + p_b - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i) \rightarrow \delta(E_a + E_b - Nm_{\text{dm}}) \delta(\mathbf{p}_a + \mathbf{p}_b)$ becomes irrelevant to p_i . Therefore, the integration on p_i can be performed trivially in the nonrelativistic regime, with

$$\int \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3} f_i \rightarrow n_{\text{dm}}, \quad |\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2 \xrightarrow[s \rightarrow N^2 m_{\text{dm}}^2]{\text{nonrelativistic}} \alpha N^{2\beta} m_{\text{dm}}^{2\beta} \equiv |\mathcal{M}_N|^2, \quad (21)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_F &\approx 2 \left(\frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^N \int \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b} (2\pi)^4 \delta(E_a + E_b - Nm_{\text{dm}}) \delta^3(\mathbf{p}_a + \mathbf{p}_b) |\mathcal{M}_N|^2 (1 + f_a + f_b) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^N |\mathcal{M}_N|^2 (1 + 2f_a) \Big|_{2E_a = Nm_{\text{dm}}} \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^N |\mathcal{M}_N|^2 \left(\frac{T}{Nm_{\text{dm}}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $Nm_{\text{dm}} \ll T$ has been used in the last approximation.

Next we calculate

$$\mathcal{C}_L \equiv 2 \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4 \left(p_a + p_b - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \right) \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2}{2N!} f_a f_b \left[\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i) - \prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right]. \quad (23)$$

As not all p_i are associated with a f_i , we cannot make the replacement from Eq. (21). In particular, some of DM momenta can be in the relativistic regime such that $s \gg N^2 m_{\text{dm}}^2$. Consequently, we have to use $|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}|^2$ instead of $|\mathcal{M}|^2$, and the calculation of \mathcal{C}_L will be rather involved. However, an *upper limit* of \mathcal{C}_L can still be derived, and our goal is to demonstrate that this upper limit is much smaller than \mathcal{C}_F . Let $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{p}_i$ and $E = \sum_{i=1}^N E_i$ (such that $s = E^2 - P^2$). We can first complete the integration on $p_{a,b}$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{C}_L = 2 \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \left[\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i) - \prod_{i=1}^N f_i \right] \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N|^2}{2N!} \mathcal{I}, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} = \int \frac{d^3 p_a}{(2\pi)^3 2E_a} \frac{d^3 p_b}{(2\pi)^3 2E_b} (2\pi)^4 \delta^3(\mathbf{p}_a + \mathbf{p}_b - \mathbf{P}) \delta(E_a + E_b - E) f_a f_b = \frac{1}{8\pi (e^{E/T} - 1)} \left[\frac{2T}{P} \log \left(\frac{e^{\frac{E+P}{2T}} - 1}{e^{\frac{E-P}{2T}} - 1} \right) - 1 \right], \quad (25)$$

is a function of E and $P = |\mathbf{P}|$.

Now we deal with the integration on p_i . The expansion of $\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i)$ yields terms such as $f_1 f_2 f_3$ or $f_1 f_N$. Since all DM particles are identical, the terms containing the same number of f_{dm} 's are effectively identical. For example, $f_1 f_2$ is identical to $f_1 f_N$ after the integration on all p_i 's. As a result, expanding $\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i)$ effectively generates $(N + 1)$ terms, each with a prefactor $C_N^n = N!/[n!(N - n)!]$ for n varying from 0 to N . The prefactor indicates that n particles are relativistic, while $(N - n)$ particles are nonrelativistic due to the f_i multiplier. The case of $n = 0$ will be canceled by the $\prod_{i=1}^N f_i$ term shown in Eq. (24). Therefore, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^N (1 + f_i) - \prod_{i=1}^N f_i \rightarrow C_N^1 \underbrace{f_2 f_3 \cdots f_N}_{N-1} + C_N^2 \underbrace{f_3 \cdots f_N}_{N-2} + \cdots + C_N^{N-2} \underbrace{f_{N-1} f_N}_2 + C_N^{N-1} \underbrace{f_N}_1 + 1, \quad (26)$$

Correspondingly, \mathcal{C}_L can be rewritten as a series summation: $\mathcal{C}_L \equiv \sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{D}_n$, where

$$\mathcal{D}_n \approx C_N^n \left(\frac{n_{\text{DM}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^{N-n} \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{1}{4\pi (e^{E/T} - 1)} \left[\frac{2T}{P} \log \left(\frac{e^{\frac{E+P}{2T}} - 1}{e^{\frac{E-P}{2T}} - 1} \right) - 1 \right] \left[\frac{\alpha (E^2 - P^2)^{2\beta}}{2N!} \right]. \quad (27)$$

In deriving the above \mathcal{D}_n , we have used the fact that the momenta $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n$ are relativistic while $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N$ are nonrelativistic, which results in $E \approx \sum_{i=1}^n E_i + (N - n)m_{\text{dm}}$, $P \approx |\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{p}_i|$, and the integration for the $(N - n)$ nonrelativistic particles:

$$\int \left(\prod_{i=n+1}^N \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} f_i \right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{2m_{\text{dm}}} \right)^{N-n}. \quad (28)$$

If we can prove that all \mathcal{D}_n 's are negligible compared with \mathcal{C}_F , then $\mathcal{C}_L \ll \mathcal{C}_F$. To show this, we define the ratio $R_n \equiv \mathcal{D}_n/\mathcal{C}_F$, where

$$R_n \approx \frac{C_N^n}{4} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}^2}{ST^3 T_*} \right)^n \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{1}{e^{E/T} - 1} \left[\frac{2T}{P} \log \left(\frac{e^{\frac{E+P}{2T}} - 1}{e^{\frac{E-P}{2T}} - 1} \right) - 1 \right] \left(\frac{E^2 - P^2}{N^2 m_{\text{dm}}^2} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{Nm_{\text{dm}}}{T} \right). \quad (29)$$

Here, the α parameter is canceled out, and the following relations have been used

$$Y_{\text{dm}} = \frac{n_{\text{dm}}}{s} \sim \frac{T_*}{m_{\text{dm}}}, \quad s = \frac{2\pi^2}{45} g_* T^3 \equiv ST^3, \quad (30)$$

with $T_* \approx 0.43$ eV, and $S \approx 3.25$ under the parameter setup of Eq. (19). We also notice that $\sqrt{E^2 - P^2} > Nm_{\text{dm}}$, therefore, the base of the power $(\dots)^\beta$ is larger than 1. As a result, $R_n \leq R_n|_{\beta=2}$, and we only need to prove $R_n|_{\beta=2} \ll 1$.

Let us first consider $n = 1$. In this case, we have $E' \sim (N - 1)m_{\text{dm}} + E_1$ and $P' \approx E_1$, and hence

$$R_1|_{\beta=2} \approx \frac{(N-1)^2}{N^2} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}}{ST^4 T_*} \right) \int \frac{d^3 p_1}{(2\pi)^3 2E_1} \frac{E_1^2}{e^{E_1/T} - 1} \left[\frac{2T}{P_1} \log \left(\frac{e^{\frac{E_1}{T}} - 1}{e^{\frac{(N-1)m_{\text{dm}}}{2T}} - 1} \right) - 1 \right]. \quad (31)$$

Using the inequality $\log \xi < \log(e^\xi - 1) < \xi$, we find

$$\log \left(e^{\frac{E_1}{T}} - 1 \right) - \log \left(e^{\frac{(N-1)m_{\text{dm}}}{2T}} - 1 \right) < \frac{E_1}{T} - \log \left(\frac{(N-1)m_{\text{dm}}}{2T} \right). \quad (32)$$

Applying the above result to the definition of R_1 yields

$$R_1|_{\beta=2} < \frac{(N-1)^2}{N^2} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}}{ST_*} \right) \left[\frac{\pi^2}{60} + \frac{\zeta_3}{\pi^2} \log \left(\frac{2T}{(N-1)m_{\text{dm}}} \right) \right] \ll 1, \quad (33)$$

where $\zeta_3 \equiv \zeta(3) \approx 1.2$. Note that the last inequality holds for large N with the parameter setup under Eq. (19). In particular, for $N = \mathcal{O}(100)$, it requires $m_{\text{dm}} < 1$ eV.

Next we consider the case of $n \geq 2$. The crucial difference between $n = 1$ and $n \geq 2$ is that now P can be zero. In fact, by fixing E , the following function

$$F(P) = \left[\frac{2T}{P} \log \left(\frac{e^{\frac{E+P}{2T}} - 1}{e^{\frac{E-P}{2T}} - 1} \right) - 1 \right] (E^2 - P^2)^2, \quad (34)$$

is monotonically decreasing with P , and $F(E) = 0$, $F(0) = E^4 \coth(E/4T)$. Therefore,

$$R_{n \geq 2}|_{\beta=2} < \frac{C_N^n}{4N^3} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}^2}{ST^3 T_*} \right)^n \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \frac{E^4}{e^{E/T} - 1} \coth \left(\frac{E}{4T} \right) \left(\frac{1}{m_{\text{dm}}^3 T} \right), \quad (35)$$

which sets an upper limit for the ratio R_n . As a specific application, we set $n = 2$ and find

$$\begin{aligned} R_2|_{\beta=2} &< \frac{N-1}{8N^2} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}^2}{ST^3 T_*} \right)^2 \int \frac{d^3 p_1}{(2\pi)^3 2E_1} \frac{d^3 p_2}{(2\pi)^3 2E_2} \frac{1}{e^{(E_1+E_2)/T} - 1} \coth \left(\frac{E_1 + E_2}{4T} \right) \left(\frac{(E_1 + E_2)^4}{m_{\text{dm}}^3 T} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{K} \frac{N-1}{8N^2} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}^2}{ST^3 T_*} \right)^2 \left(\frac{T^7}{m_{\text{dm}}^3} \right) \approx \frac{\mathcal{K}}{S^2} \frac{N-1}{2N^2} \left(\frac{m_{\text{dm}} T}{T_*^2} \right) \approx \frac{N-1}{N^2} \left(\frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{10^{-5} \text{ eV}} \right) \ll 1, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $\mathcal{K} \approx 0.589$ is a constant from integration. The last inequality can readily hold under the parameter setup of Eq. (19). In particular, for $N = \mathcal{O}(100)$, it requires $m_{\text{dm}} < 10^{-3}$ eV.

Finally, we consider $n \geq 3$ (note that this implies $N \geq 3$). In this case, we see that the factor $\sim E^4 \coth(E/4T)/(e^{E/T} - 1)$ in Eq. (35) is maximized at $E \sim 3T$ with a value around $T^4/(4\pi)$. Therefore, as a conservative estimate, we have

$$R_{n \geq 3}|_{\beta=2} \lesssim \frac{C_N^n}{4N^3} \left(\frac{2m_{\text{dm}}^2}{ST^3 T_*} \right)^n \left(\int_{E < 3T} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d^3 p_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \right) \left(\frac{T^4}{4\pi m_{\text{dm}}^3 T} \right) \approx \frac{C_N^n}{16\pi N^3 (2n)!} \left(\frac{9m_{\text{dm}}}{8\pi^2 ST_*} \right)^n \left(\frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{T} \right)^{n-3}, \quad (37)$$

which is always $\ll 1$ under the parameter setup of Eq. (19). In summary, we have $R_n \ll 1$ for $n \in [1, N]$ and hence the $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation of DM particles dominates the $2 \rightarrow N$ coalescence of diphotons.

II. SQUARED AMPLITUDES FROM PHOTON-MEDIATED ANNIHILATION

Here we will demonstrate the recursion relation between $|\mathcal{M}_{N+1}|^2$ and $|\mathcal{M}_N|^2$ from the fence diagrams shown in Fig. 1 of the main text. Defining the $N \rightarrow 2$ squared amplitude as

$$|\mathcal{M}_N|^2 \equiv \kappa_N g_{a\gamma}^{2N} m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad (38)$$

we are to find out the relation between the dimensionless coefficients κ_{N+1} and κ_N , and in particular show that $\kappa_{N+1} > \kappa_N$.




FIG. 5. N -body DM annihilation to diphotons via the effective DM-photon coupling, where μ_i, μ'_0 are used to denote the Lorentz indices in the DM-photon-photon vertices.

From Fig. 5, we can write down the general amplitude in the limit of nonrelativistic DM annihilation:

$$\mathcal{M}_N = g_{a\gamma\gamma}^N N! \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\eta_{\mu_{2i-1}\mu_{2i}}}{(i^2 - iN)m_{\text{dm}}^2} \right) \left(\prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{q_{j-1}q_j\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}} \right) \epsilon^{k_1q_1\mu_0\mu_1} \epsilon^{q_{N-1}k_2\mu_{2N-2}\mu'_0} \epsilon_{\mu_0}^*(k_1) \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2), \quad (39)$$

where we have dropped a potential minus sign in the amplitude, and contraction between the Levi-Civita tensor and momenta is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{k_1q_1\mu_0\mu_1} &\equiv \epsilon^{\alpha_0\alpha_1\mu_0\mu_1} k_{1,\alpha_0} q_{1,\alpha_1}, \\ \epsilon^{q_{N-1}k_2\mu_{2N-2}\mu'_0} &\equiv \epsilon^{\alpha_{2N-2}\alpha'_0\mu_{2N-2}\mu'_0} q_{N-1,\alpha_{2N-2}} k_{2,\alpha'_0}, \\ \epsilon^{q_{i-1}q_i\mu_{2i-2}\mu_{2i-1}} &\equiv \epsilon^{\alpha_{2i-2}\alpha_{2i-1}\mu_{2i-2}\mu_{2i-1}} q_{i-1,\alpha_{2i-2}} q_{i,\alpha_{2i-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

with $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$. The kinetics for $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation in the center-of-mass frame gives

$$k_1 = \frac{N}{2} m_{\text{dm}} (1, \vec{e}_k), \quad k_2 = \frac{N}{2} m_{\text{dm}} (1, -\vec{e}_k), \quad q_i = m_{\text{dm}} \left(\frac{N-2i}{2}, \frac{N}{2} \vec{e}_k \right), \quad \text{for } i \leq N-1, \quad (41)$$

where \vec{e}_k denotes the unit vector of the outgoing photon momentum \vec{k}_1 , and we take $\vec{e}_k \equiv (0, 0, 1)$ without loss of generality. Furthermore, we have $k_1^2 = k_2^2 = 0$ and $q_i^2 = (i^2 - iN)m_{\text{dm}}^2$.

For $N+1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation, it is straightforward to obtain the kinetics by replacing N with $N+1$ in Eq. (41). Since we intend to derive the recursion relation, now we express the kinetics (primed) from $N+1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation in terms of those (unprimed) from $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation:

$$k'_1 = r_1 + k_1, \quad k'_2 = r_2 + k_2, \quad q'_i = r_1 + q_i \quad (i \leq N-1), \quad q'_N = -r_2 + q_{N-1}, \quad (42)$$

with

$$r_1 = \frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{2} (1, \vec{e}_k), \quad r_2 = \frac{m_{\text{dm}}}{2} (1, -\vec{e}_k), \quad q_i'^2 = q_i^2 \left(1 - \frac{i}{i^2 - iN} \right), \quad q_N'^2 = -Nm_{\text{dm}}^2. \quad (43)$$

Using the above relations and Eq. (39), we can write down the general amplitude for $N+1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{N+1} &= \left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}(N+1)}{Nm_{\text{dm}}^2} \right) \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{k^2 - kN} \right)^{-1} \\ &\times \eta_{\mu_{2N-1}\mu_{2N}} \epsilon^{(r_1+k_1)(r_1+q_1)\mu_0\mu_1} \times \epsilon^{(q_{N-1}-r_2)(r_2+k_2)\mu_{2N}\mu'_0} \times \epsilon^{(r_1+q_{N-1})(q_{N-1}-r_2)\mu_{2N-2}\mu_{2N-1}} \\ &\times g_{a\gamma\gamma}^N N! \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\eta_{\mu_{2i-1}\mu_{2i}}}{(i^2 - iN)m_{\text{dm}}^2} \right) \left(\prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{(r_1+q_{j-1})(r_1+q_j)\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}} \right) \epsilon_{\mu_0}^*(k_1) \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where the first line is a new term from $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation, while the second and third lines contain both the $N \rightarrow 2$ terms and new contributions from r_1, r_2 . The first line gives an overall factor

$$\left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}(N+1)}{Nm_{\text{dm}}^2} \right) \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{k^2 - kN} \right)^{-1} = g_{a\gamma\gamma} \frac{N+1}{N^2 m_{\text{dm}}^2}. \quad (45)$$

The first contraction in the second line reads

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{(r_1+k_1)(r_1+q_1)\mu_0\mu_1} &= \epsilon^{\alpha_0\alpha_1\mu_0\mu_1} (r_{1,\alpha_0}q_{1,\alpha_1} + k_{1,\alpha_0}r_{1,\alpha_1} + k_{1,\alpha_0}q_{1,\alpha_1}) \\ &= \epsilon^{\alpha_0\alpha_1\mu_0\mu_1} (k_{1,\alpha_0}q_{1,\alpha_1} - r_{1,\alpha_0}p_{1,\alpha_1}) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{N} \right) \epsilon^{k_1q_1\mu_0\mu_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $\epsilon^{\alpha_0\alpha_1\mu_0\mu_1} = -\epsilon^{\alpha_1\alpha_0\mu_0\mu_1}$ and $q_1 = k_1 - p_1$ were used in the second equation, and the last result was derived by using the kinetics given in Eqs. (41)–(43). This result indicates that the first term in the second equation of Eq. (46), which comes from $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation, is at $\mathcal{O}(Nm_{\text{dm}}^2)$, while the second term, which is a new contribution in $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation, is at $\mathcal{O}(m_{\text{dm}}^2)$. The second contraction in the second line of Eq. (44) also exhibits the similar feature, where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{(q_{N-1}-r_2)(r_2+k_2)\mu_{2N}\mu'_0} &= \epsilon^{\alpha_{2N}\alpha'_0\mu_{2N}\mu'_0} (q_{N-1,\alpha_{2N}}k_{2,\alpha'_0} - r_{2,\alpha_{2N}}k_{2,\alpha'_0} + q_{N-1,\alpha_{2N}}r_{2,\alpha'_0}) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{N} \right) \epsilon^{q_{N-1}k_2\mu_{2N}\mu'_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The first term in the first line of Eq. (47) would correspond to $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation up to a different index from μ_{2N} . By using the property of the Levi-Civita tensor, the second and third terms can be verified to be:

$$\epsilon^{\alpha_{2N}\alpha'_0\mu_{2N}\mu'_0} (-r_{2,\alpha_{2N}}k_{2,\alpha'_0} + q_{N-1,\alpha_{2N}}r_{2,\alpha'_0}) = -\frac{m_{\text{dm}}^2}{2} \epsilon^{03\mu_{2N}\mu'_0}, \quad (48)$$

where the first two indices in the Levi-Civita tensor result from the fact that only the time-space and space-time components survive from the 4-momentum product and the index 3 appears since we have taken the spatial momentum in the z -direction. By comparing Eq. (47) with the corresponding term in $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation, we find that in addition to a different index from μ_{2N} , an overall factor arises when going from $N \rightarrow 2$ to $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation.

By similar arguments, we find that the second product in the third line of Eq. (44) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{(r_1+q_{j-1})(r_1+q_j)\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}} &= \prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{\alpha_{2j-2}\alpha_{2j-1}\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}} (q_{j-1,\alpha_{2j-2}}q_{j,\alpha_{2j-1}} - r_{1,\alpha_{2j-2}}p_{j,\alpha_{2j-1}}) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{N} \right)^{N-2} \prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{q_{j-1}q_j\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $q_j - q_{j-1} = -p_j$ was used in the first equation. Therefore, an overall factor arises from this product when going from $N \rightarrow 2$ to $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation.

Finally, the third contraction in the second line of Eq. (44) is a new term from $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation. Using the kinetics, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{(r_1+q_{N-1})(q_{N-1}-r_2)\mu_{2N-2}\mu_{2N-1}} &= \epsilon^{\alpha_{2N-2}\alpha_{2N-1}\mu_{2N-2}\mu_{2N-1}} \left[(r_1 + r_2)_{\alpha_{2N-2}} q_{N-1,\alpha_{2N-1}} - r_{1,\alpha_{2N-2}} r_{2,\alpha_{2N-1}} \right] \\ &= \frac{(N+1)m_{\text{dm}}^2}{2} \epsilon^{03\mu_{2N-2}\mu_{2N-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where the reason for the appearance of the 03 indices is the same as that in Eq. (48).

Assembling these terms, we can rewrite the $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ amplitude as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{N+1} &= \left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{N+1}{N} \right)^{2+N} \eta_{\mu_{2N-1}\mu_{2N}} \epsilon^{03\mu_{2N-2}\mu_{2N-1}} \epsilon^{k_1q_1\mu_0\mu_1} \epsilon^{q_{N-1}k_2\mu_{2N}\mu'_0} \\ &\times g_{a\gamma\gamma}^N N! \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\eta_{\mu_{2i-1}\mu_{2i}}}{(i^2 - iN)m_{\text{dm}}^2} \right) \left(\prod_{j=2}^{N-1} \epsilon^{q_{j-1}q_j\mu_{2j-2}\mu_{2j-1}} \right) \epsilon_{\mu_0}^*(k_1) \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Comparing to Eq. (39), we find that an overall factor arises in the $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation $(1 + 1/N)^{2+N}/2$ in addition to the expected DM-photon coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$. The remaining difference can be parameterized as

$$N \rightarrow 2 : \mathcal{M}_{N,\mu_{2N-2}} \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2) \epsilon^{q_{N-1} k_2 \mu_{2N-2} \mu'_0}, \quad (52)$$

$$N + 1 \rightarrow 2 : \mathcal{M}_{N+1,\mu_{2N-2}} \epsilon_{\mu'_0}^*(k_2) \eta_{\mu_{2N-1} \mu_{2N}} \epsilon^{03 \mu_{2N-2} \mu_{2N-1} \mu_{2N}} \epsilon^{q_{N-1} k_2 \mu_{2N} \mu'_0}. \quad (53)$$

To see the above difference, we recall that only the 03 and 30 components in the first two indices of the Levi-Civita tensors ($\epsilon^{q_{N-1} k_2 \mu_{2N-2} \mu'_0}$ and $\epsilon^{q_{N-1} k_2 \mu_{2N} \mu'_0}$) survive. Then we perform the contraction of index μ'_0 , with the photon polarization vector $\epsilon_{\mu'_0}^* = (0, 0, 1, 0)$, which selects $\mathcal{M}_{N,1}$ for $N \rightarrow 2$ annihilation and $\mathcal{M}_{N+1,2}$ for $N + 1 \rightarrow 2$ annihilation. These two results, when further repeatedly contracting with other indices via the Minkowski metric tensor $\eta_{\mu_i \mu_j}$, will be identical up to a potential difference of a total minus sign. Therefore, we arrive at the final recursion relation

$$\mathcal{M}_{N+1} = \left(\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{N+1}{N} \right)^{2+N} \mathcal{M}_N, \quad (54)$$

and consequently the relation

$$\kappa_{N+1} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{N+1}{N} \right)^{2N+4} \kappa_N. \quad (55)$$

We can easily check this relation by using the results obtained from the FeynArts/FeynCalc packages [34, 35]. The squared amplitude of the $2 \rightarrow 2$ process is $|\mathcal{M}_2|^2 = 2g_{a\gamma\gamma}^4 m_{\text{dm}}^4$, and the ones up to $N = 6$ read

$$|\mathcal{M}_3|^2 = \frac{2187}{512} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^6 m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad |\mathcal{M}_4|^2 = \frac{128}{27} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^8 m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad |\mathcal{M}_5|^2 = \frac{48828125}{14155776} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^{10} m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad |\mathcal{M}_6|^2 = \frac{59049}{32000} g_{a\gamma\gamma}^{12} m_{\text{dm}}^4, \quad (56)$$

where κ_N can be extracted via Eq. (38).

III. N_{eff} DEFICIT FROM PHOTON-NUMBER INJECTION

After neutrino decoupling, photon-number injection leads to modification of background photons. We can write:

$$n_{\gamma,f} = \left(\frac{a_i}{a_f} \right)^3 n_{\text{bg},i} + \delta n_\gamma \equiv n_{\text{bg},f} + \delta n_\gamma, \quad (57)$$

where δn_γ denotes the number of photons injected between the initial (a_i) and final (a_f) moments, and $n_{\text{bg}} = 2\zeta_3 T^3/\pi^2$ is the background number density. The above result can be recast into energy density by using $\rho_{\text{bg}} \propto n_{\text{bg}}^{4/3}$, which, in the limit of $\delta n_\gamma \ll n_\gamma$, gives rise to

$$\rho_{\gamma,f} = \left(\frac{a_i}{a_f} \right)^4 \rho_{\text{bg},i} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta n_\gamma}{n_{\text{bg},f}} \rho_{\text{bg},f}. \quad (58)$$

We see that the photon-number injection mimics the energy release through

$$\delta \xi_\gamma = \frac{4}{3} \delta \eta_\gamma, \quad (59)$$

with $\delta \xi_\gamma$ and $\delta \eta_\gamma$ being the energy release and number injection normalized to the background $\rho_{\text{bg}} = 2\pi^2 T^4/15$ and n_{bg} , respectively.

Let us consider the impact of the photon-number injection right after the SM neutrinos mostly decouple at around $T \sim 1$ MeV. Using the modified photon temperature and energy density from Eq. (58),

$$T_\gamma = T_{\text{bg}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \delta \xi_\gamma \right), \quad \rho_\gamma = \rho_{\text{bg}} (1 + \delta \xi_\gamma), \quad (60)$$

with the unperturbed background temperature T_{bg} and energy density ρ_{bg} , we obtain

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \approx -N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} \delta \xi_\gamma \approx -\frac{4}{3} N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} \delta \eta_\gamma, \quad (61)$$

where Eq. (59) was used.