arXiv:2412.21097v1 [nucl-th] 30 Dec 2024

Effects of asymmetric dark matter on a magnetized neutron star: A two-fluid approach

Pinku Routaray¹, Vishal Parmar², H. C. Das³, Bharat Kumar¹, G. F. Burgio³, and H.-J. Schulze³

¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, NIT Rourkela, 769008, India

² INFN Sezione di Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 3, 56127 Pisa, Italy and

³ INFN Sezione di Catania, Dipartimento di Fisica, Universitá di Catania, Via Santa Sofia 64, 95123 Catania, Italy

(Dated: December 31, 2024)

We study the interaction between dark matter (DM) and highly magnetized neutron stars (NSs), focusing on how DM particle mass, mass fraction, and magnetic field (MF) strength affect NS structure and stability. We consider self-interacting, non-annihilating, asymmetric fermionic DM that couples to NSs only through gravitational interaction. Using the QMC-RMF4 relativistic mean-field model with density-dependent magnetic fields, we investigate the magnetized equation of state and examine the accumulation of DM under various conditions. Our results show that as the DM fraction increases, the maximum gravitational mass of the NS decreases, especially for heavier DM particles, while lighter DM particles can induce a transition from a dark core to a halo structure, increasing the maximum mass. Strong MFs soften the equation of state and reduce the dark mass a NS core can retain before transitioning to a halo. These findings provide key insights into how DM and MF jointly shape the mass-radius relation and the stability of DM-admixed magnetized NSs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The majority of matter within the Universe remains obscured in the form of dark matter (DM) [1]. Although numerous discoveries provide compelling evidence for the existence of DM [2–5], none elucidate the particle identity of DM, which remains an enigma. Comprehending the characteristics of DM will facilitate observational astrophysics to identify its nature. Methods such as direct detection, indirect detection, particle colliders, and astrophysical probes constitute the means for such observations. Neutron stars (NSs) stand out as invaluable probes for deciphering the elusive nature of DM and its scattering cross sections [6, 7]. Given their compact and dense composition, they have become indispensable tools for examining the particle characteristics of DM. The incorporation of DM into the constitution of NSs results in significant modifications of their observables, including changes in massradius profiles, tidal deformability, and luminosity [8, 9]. This phenomenon provides a distinctive indirect avenue for scrutinizing the properties of DM.

Given the substantial mass of these compact objects, their presence is predominantly observed in proximity to the Galactic center rather than its periphery. Moreover, the density distribution of DM is higher in these regions. Consequently, there is a non-negligible probability that DM may be captured within a NS due to its significant gravitational potential. The associated accretion rate is contingent upon various factors including (i) the nature of the DM particle, (ii) prevailing environmental conditions, and (iii) the star's internal structure.

Numerous theories have been proposed over many years on the nature of DM and its impact on the properties of NSs, considering both gravitational and non-gravitational interactions [10–39]. Among these, asymmetric DM (ADM) interacting gravitationally with NSs has received significant attention recently, resulting in several theories on the nature of DM, both fermionic and bosonic. In [21], the authors considered a trace amount of ADM captured inside a NS, which selfinteracts without annihilation. They also investigated how DM affects gravitational-wave (GW) emission and leads to the formation of a DM halo during inspiral, comparing results for both fermionic and bosonic natures of DM. Subsequently, in [24], a permissible range for the mass of fermionic ADM and the mass fraction inside the two massive pulsars PSR J0348+0432 [40] and PSR J0740+6620 [41] was obtained. In [29] a Bayesian analysis was performed to determine the formation criterion for dark cores/halos and also investigate the impact of dark halos on the pulsar pulse profile. Similarly, presuming self-interacting fermionic DM with dark scalar and vector mediators, [25] investigated the impact of DM on NS properties and carried out a Bayesian analysis to constrain the DM parameters for a single NS model. Likewise, other studies assuming self-interacting bosonic ADM have been conducted to investigate their effects on NS properties [26, 27, 31, 35– 37].

Nevertheless, the particular effect of DM on highly magnetized NSs remains a largely unexplored domain. NSs originate as dense remnants resulting from the explosive collapse of massive stars during core-collapse supernova events. Throughout this violent genesis, the magnetic fields are significantly amplified, reaching magnitudes ranging from 10^{11} to 10^{13} G [42, 43]. On rare occasions, magnetars exhibit even more intense fields, escalating to 10^{14-16} G, approximately 1000 times stronger than typical pulsars [44]. These extreme magnetic fields significantly affect the structure and evolution of NSs, influencing their deformations and, consequently, leading to substantial GW emissions.

Anomalous X-ray Pulsars [45] and Soft Gamma Repeaters [46], subsets of NSs characterized by high magnetic fields, provide valuable insights. These pulsars, distinguished by their intermittent emissions of X-rays and gamma rays, contribute to the understanding of the complex interplay between extreme magnetic fields (MFs) and the observable behavior of NSs [47]. As NSs experience dissipative processes over time, younger magnetars may exhibit even stronger MFs. This phenomenon warrants further exploration into the dynamic relationship between intense MFs and the intrinsic properties of NSs [48].

In this study, we explore ADM realized through selfinteracting fermions, which interact with highly-magnetized NSs solely via gravitation. The mass of the DM particle, rang-

2

TABLE I. Saturation properties and NS observables predicted by the QMC-RMF4 EOS model: density ρ_0 , binding energy per nucleon E_0 , compressibility K_0 , symmetry energy S_0 , its derivative L_0 , maximum NS mass M_{max} , radii of $1.4M_{\odot}$ and $2.08M_{\odot}$ NSs, and tidal polarizability $\Lambda_{1.4}$. Observational ranges are listed for comparison.

	$ ho_0 [{ m fm}^{-3}]$	$-E_0$ [MeV]	K_0 [MeV]	S_0 [MeV]	L_0 [MeV]	$M_{\rm max} [M_{\odot}]$	<i>R</i> _{2.08} [km]	$R_{1.4}$ [km]	$\Lambda_{1.4}$
	0.162	16.1	279	30.4	31.3	2.20	11.81	12.24	454
Exp.	$\sim 0.140.17$	$\sim 15-17$	220-260	28.5-34.9	30-87	$> 2.35 \pm 0.17$	12.35 ± 0.75	12.45 ± 0.65	70–580
Ref.	[49]	[49]	[50, 51]	[50, 51]	[52, 53]	[54]	[55]	[55]	[56]

ing from MeV to GeV scales, is treated as a free parameter, while the repulsive interaction strength is constrained by observational data on the DM particle cross section.

For the hadronic equation of state (EOS), we employ the QMC-RMF4 parameter set, developed within the relativistic mean field (RMF) formalism [57], and extend it to include density-dependent meson fields using the methodology described in [58–60]. This EOS is capable of producing a NS with a maximum mass of about $2.2M_{\odot}$. Considering the gravitational interaction between DM and magnetized NSs, we examine the impact of DM on macroscopic properties such as mass, radius, and tidal deformability of magnetized NSs. A crucial parameter for evaluating these effects is the DM mass fraction, defined as the ratio of the included DM mass to the total mass of the NS. We investigate the existence of dark cores and dark halos, accounting for all the free parameters of the DM-admixed magnetized NSs.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we illustrate the properties of the hadronic EOS and its extension to the magnetized case; we also discuss the DM EOS. In Sec. III we discuss the results, and finally in Sec. IV we draw our conclusions.

II. FORMALISM

A. Magnetized hadronic EOS

In this work, we employ a RMF model called "QMC-RMF4" that is derived by fitting parameters to the uniform pure-neutron-matter EOS obtained from chiral effective field theory [57]. The unified treatment of the crustal EOS is described in [61]. This EOS exhibits stiff behavior, with a maximum mass of 2.20 M_{\odot} , and a canonical radius which lies within the limits given by the NICER+XMM data [55]. Also the tidal deformability $\Lambda_{1.4}$ meets the GW170817 constraint [56]. In Table I we summarize the main properties of the EOS at saturation density, along with some NS observables.

In the presence of a uniform external MF aligned along the *z* direction ($\boldsymbol{B} = B\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$), such that $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{B} = 0$ [62], the transverse momenta of charged particles with an electric charge *q* are quantized into discrete Landau levels [59]. The thermodynamic potential Ω [63], which is a function of the chemical potential μ , temperature *T*, and MF *B*, conforms to canonical relations $\Omega = -p_{\parallel} = \varepsilon - \sum_{i} \rho_{i} \mu_{i}$ and $p_{\perp} = p_{\parallel} - MB$. Here, ε represents the energy density, ρ_{i} denotes the density of the *i*th particle, μ_{i} the corresponding chemical potential, $M = -\partial\Omega/\partial B$ repre-

sents the system's magnetization, and p_{\parallel} and p_{\perp} indicate the pressure in the directions parallel and transverse to the MF, respectively [58, 59, 63, 64].

In the present paper, following the seminal work of [58], we compute the magnetized EOS starting from the RMF effective Lagrangian given in [65–69]. A detailed description and derivation of the various quantities required to define the magnetized nuclear matter can be found in [58, 59, 63]. Here, we present the necessary formalism required in the zero-temperature limit.

The energy spectra of neutrons, protons, and charged leptons (electron and muon) are

$$E_n = \sqrt{k^2 + {m_n^*}^2} + W + R/2, \qquad (1)$$

$$E_{p} = \sqrt{k_{z}^{2} + (\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(p)})^{2} + W - R/2}, \qquad (2)$$

$$E_{l} = \sqrt{k_{z}^{2} + \left(\overline{m}_{v,\sigma_{z}}^{(l)}\right)^{2}},$$
(3)

where *W* and *R* are the omega and rho meson mean field, respectively [70, 71], k_z and $\sigma_z = \pm 1$ are the momentum and spin along the direction of the MF, and *v* is the principal quantum number. The masses of the charged particles get modified due to the Landau levels [58, 59],

$$(\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_z}^{(p)})^2 = m_p^{*2} + 2qB\left(\nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z\right), \qquad (4)$$

$$(\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_z}^{(l)})^2 = m_l^2 - 2qB\left(\nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z\right),\tag{5}$$

where m_p^* is the effective mass of the proton.

The partial number and energy densities of the species $i = p, e, \mu$ in presence of the MF are then given by [58]

$$\rho_{i} = \frac{|q|B}{2\pi^{2}} \sum_{\sigma_{z}=\pm 1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{\max}} k_{F,\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)}, \qquad (6)$$

$$\varepsilon_{i} = \frac{|q|B}{4\pi^{2}} \sum_{\sigma_{z}=\pm 1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{\max}} \left[E_{F}^{(i)} k_{F,\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)} + (\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)})^{2} \operatorname{arsinh} \left| \frac{k_{F,\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)}}{\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)}} \right| \right].$$
(7)

In these equations, the Fermi momentum is defined by

$$k_{F,\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)} = \sqrt{E_{F}^{(i)^{2}} - (\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_{z}}^{(i)})^{2}},$$
(8)

where the Fermi energies $E_F^{(i)}$ are fixed by the respective

chemical potentials,

$$E_F^{(l)} = \mu_l \,, \tag{9}$$

$$E_F^{(b=p,n)} = \mu_b - W \pm R/2.$$
 (10)

The largest possible energy label v_{max} for protons or leptons is the integer for which the Fermi momentum remains positive, i.e.,

$$v_{\max} \le \frac{E_F^2 - m^{*2}}{2|q|B} \,. \tag{11}$$

While the contribution of the neutrons to the pressure is straightforward [64, 70], that of the protons can be written in terms of parallel and perpendicular components along the local direction of the magnetic field [59, 72],

$$p_{\parallel} = \frac{|q|B}{4\pi^2} \sum_{\sigma_z = \pm 1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{\text{max}}} \left[E_F^{(i)} k_{F,\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)} - (\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)})^2 \operatorname{arsinh} \left| \frac{k_{F,\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)}}{\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)}} \right| \right],$$
(12)

$$p_{\perp} = \frac{|q|^2 B^2}{2\pi^2} \sum_{\sigma_z = \pm 1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{\text{max}}} \nu \operatorname{arsinh} \left| \frac{k_{F,\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)}}{\overline{m}_{\nu,\sigma_z}^{(i)}} \right|.$$
(13)

Consequently, the energy-momentum tensor in the presence of a magnetic field can be expressed as [73, 74]

$$T_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{matter}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{MF}}, \qquad (14)$$

$$= \operatorname{diag}\left(\varepsilon + \frac{B^2}{2}, p_{\perp} + \frac{B^2}{2}, p_{\perp} + \frac{B^2}{2}, p_{\parallel} - \frac{B^2}{2}\right). \quad (15)$$

In order to be able to employ the standard Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equations that require an isotropic pressure (see the extended discussion in [75]), we average the spatial components of $T_{\mu\nu}$ to obtain an effective local isotropic pressure. Adhering to the "chaotic-magneticfield" framework outlined in [73, 76–78], we express the total average pressure as

$$p = \frac{T_{11} + T_{22} + T_{33}}{3} = \frac{2p_{\perp} + p_{\parallel}}{3} + \frac{B^2}{6}.$$
 (16)

Finally, the total energy density ε and pressure p of the EOS $p(\varepsilon)$ needed in the TOV equations are obtained by summing the nucleon and lepton contributions as detailed above, of asymmetric, beta-stable, and charge-neutral matter. The anomalous magnetic moment is excluded from our calculations as it does not significantly affect the EOS [74].

Regarding the MF strength profile inside the NS, we assume the standard parametrization [79–82] (but see [75] for a critical discussion)

$$B(\rho) = B_{\text{surf}} + B_c \left(1 - e^{-\beta(\rho/\rho_0)^{\gamma}} \right).$$
(17)

Here, ρ_0 is the saturation density, B_{surf} represents the surface MF assumed to be 10^{15} G, consistent with the observed surface MF of various magnetars [83, 84]. B_c pertains to the MF at the core of the star. The parameters $\beta = 0.01$ and $\gamma = 3$ are selected to reproduce the decaying behaviors of the MF [79].

B. DM EOS

In this study, the ADM EOS is realized by self-interacting fermions that do not undergo annihilation. The fermion mass varies from the MeV to GeV scale, as discussed in [8, 21, 29, 38], and the Lagrangian reads

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm DM} = (D_{\mu}\chi)^{*} (D^{\mu}\chi) - m_{\chi}^{2}\chi^{*}\chi + \frac{1}{2}m_{\phi}^{2}\phi_{\mu}\phi^{\mu} - \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu},$$
(18)

where χ and ϕ_{μ} represent the fermionic ADM field and vector boson field with masses m_{χ} and m_{ϕ} , respectively. $D_{\mu} = \partial_{\mu} + ig_{\chi}\phi_{\mu}$ is the covariant derivative, where g_{χ} is the interaction strength of χ with the ϕ_{μ} field. The strength tensor is defined as $\Omega_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}\phi_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}\phi_{\mu}$. The corresponding DM energy density and pressure are [11, 38, 85]

$$\varepsilon_{\chi} = \frac{m_{\chi}^{4}}{8\pi^{2}} \left[x\sqrt{1+x^{2}}(2x^{2}+1) - \operatorname{arsinh}(x) \right] + \delta, \quad (19)$$

$$p_{\chi} = \frac{\partial(\varepsilon_{\chi}/n_{\chi})}{\partial n_{\chi}} n_{\chi}^{2} = \frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\chi}}{\partial n_{\chi}} n_{\chi} - \varepsilon_{\chi}$$

$$= \frac{m_{\chi}^{4}}{8\pi^{2}} \left[x\sqrt{1+x^{2}}(2x^{2}/3-1) + \operatorname{arsinh}(x) \right] + \delta, \quad (20)$$

where

$$x = \frac{k_{\chi}}{m_{\chi}} = \frac{(3\pi^2 n_{\chi})^{1/3}}{m_{\chi}}$$
(21)

is the dimensionless kinetic parameter with the DM Fermi momentum k_{χ} and number density n_{χ} . Introducing the dimensionless interaction parameter $y \equiv g_{\chi}m_{\chi}/(\sqrt{2}m_{\phi})$, the selfinteraction term is written as

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} = \left(\frac{yn_{\chi}}{m_{\chi}}\right)^2. \tag{22}$$

Ref. [11] contains interesting scaling relations regarding the EOS and mass-radius relations of pure fermionic DM stars.

Within this model, m_{χ} and y are not independent free parameters, but constrained by limits imposed on the DM selfinteraction cross section σ_{χ} through observation of the interaction of galaxies in different colliding galaxy clusters [86– 89],

$$\sigma_{\chi}/m_{\chi} \sim 0.1 - 10 \,\mathrm{cm}^2/\mathrm{g}$$
. (23)

In [90–93] it has been shown that the Born approximation

$$\frac{\sigma_{\chi}}{m_{\chi}} = \frac{y^4}{\pi m_{\chi}^3} \tag{24}$$

is very accurate for $m_{\chi} \lesssim 1$ GeV and in any case remains valid in the limit $y \to 0$ for larger masses. We therefore employ here this approximation, choosing for simplicity the fixed constraint

$$\sigma_{\chi}/m_{\chi} = 1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g} = 4560/\text{ GeV}^3$$
, (25)




FIG. 1. Upper panel (a): QMC-RMF4 EOS for magnetized NS matter with different MF strengths B_c . The markers indicate the maximum-mass configurations. Lower panel (b): Different contributions to the pressure for $B_c = 3 \times 10^{18}$ G.

which appears compatible with all current observations. This implies

$$y^4 = \pi m_{\chi}^3 \sigma_{\chi} / m_{\chi} \approx \pi (16.58 m_1)^3 ,$$
 (26)

$$y \approx 10.94 m_1^{3/4}$$
 (27)

with $m_1 \equiv m_{\chi}/1$ GeV. After this, the DM EOS depends only on the one parameter m_{χ} .

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we provide our numerical results for the DNS properties in presence of a MF. As mentioned earlier, the DM has only indirect effects on the properties of the magnetized NS; therefore, we mainly focus on explaining the results of the combined system with different scenarios in the following.

A. EOS of magnetized NSs

In Fig. 1(a) we present the EOS $p(\varepsilon)$ for nucleonic NSs without DM, employing the QMC-RMF4 EOS under varying MF strengths $B_c = 1, 2, 3 \times 10^{18}$ G, comparing with the




FIG. 2. Pure DM EOS with different masses m_{χ} in comparison with the nucleonic QMC-RMF4 EOS. The DM self-interaction parameter *y*, Eq. (27), is also listed. The markers indicate the maximum-mass configurations.

EOS without a MF ($B_c = 0$). Note that due to the assumption of a density-dependent magnetic field, Eq. (17), *B* increases with pressure or energy density along the curves, and this causes a progressive softening of the EOS [77], i.e., lower pressures for a given energy density, resulting in less massive and compact NSs [59, 77]. Thus, the MF's effect on the pressure profile of the NS is considerable, demonstrating that MFs can induce significant structural changes in NSs. The markers on the curves indicate the maximum-mass configurations for each EOS, anticipating that the maximum mass decreases with stronger MFs.

In the lower panel (b) we show individual contributions to the pressure at the highest field considered, $B_c = 3 \times 10^{18}$ G: The bare matter pressures p_{\perp} and p_{\parallel} , Eqs. (12,13), are practically identical and strongly reduced compared to the B = 0pressure. The pure field contributions $\pm B^2/2$ to the components of $T_{\mu\nu}$, Eqs. (15), are of considerable size, such that also the contribution $B^2/6$ to the average pressure p, Eqs. (16), plotted in panel (a), is sizeable. However, the effect is not enough to compensate the reduction of p_{\perp} , p_{\parallel} relative to the B = 0 pressure. Note that the pressures shown in Fig. 1 always contain contributions of neutrons, protons, and leptons. These results corroborate earlier findings, which also showed that deviations from spherical symmetry, even in high-MF scenarios up to 10¹⁸ G, remain minimal (less than 1%) [64, 82, 94], thus, supporting the assumption that the structure of highlymagnetized NSs can still be effectively described assuming spherical symmetry.

B. EOS of ADM

The DM EOS is depicted in Fig. 2 for different DM candidate masses $m_{\chi} = 0.1 - 1$ GeV and the compatible DM self-




FIG. 3. The radial energy-density profiles of magnetized DNSs for the DM EOSs shown in Fig. 2. Several choices of DM fraction f_{χ} and magnetic field strength B_c are compared. The curves correspond to the respective maximum-mass configurations.




FIG. 4. The mass-radius profiles of magnetized DNS for the DM EOSs shown in Fig. 2, and several choices of DM fraction f_{χ} and magnetic field strength B_c . The radius is $R = \max(R_N, R_{\chi})$, note the different scales. The mass constraints for PSR J0952-0607 [54], PSR J0740+6620 [41], and PSR J0348+0432 [40] are represented by shaded bars. The simultaneous M - R constraints from NICER+XMM for PSR J0740+6620 [55] are also shown as horizontal error bars.

interaction parameter *y*, Eq. (27). The hadronic QMC-RMF4 EOS is shown for comparison, exhibiting different domains for core, inner crust, and outer crust. Markers indicate the maximum-mass configurations of pure dark stars or standard NSs. Within the range of interest, lighter DM masses result in a notably stiffer EOS, corresponding to larger DNS maximum masses, as is well know [8, 38].

C. Density profiles

The interaction between DM and a magnetized NS can result in either a DM-core or a DM-halo star, mainly determined by the DM particle mass m_{χ} (and the correlated interaction

strength), and the DM mass fraction $f_{\chi} = M_{\chi}/M$ [35, 38]. We are interested in the effect of a magnetic field on this feature.

In Fig. 3, the radial energy-density profiles of magnetized DNSs are shown for the maximum-mass configuration of each EOS, varying m_{χ} , f_{χ} , and B_c . The figure illustrates that as the DM particle mass or its fraction increase, the energy density rises, corresponding to a more compact star. As will be better seen in the next Fig. 4, for light DM masses, such as $m_{\chi} = 100,200$ MeV, the DM extends beyond the normal matter radius R_N for all chosen values of f_{χ} , forming a DM-halo star, whereas for heavier DM masses like $m_{\chi} = 600,1000$ MeV, the DM extends being f_{χ} , also the dark radius R_{χ} increases, extending further the DM halo for 'small'




FIG. 5. The maximum gravitational mass as a function of DM fraction for different DM particle masses and magnetic fields. The markers indicate the transition from DM core to halo.

 m_{χ} , whereas for 'large' m_{χ} the DM remains trapped within the DNS core, substantially increasing the star's compactness.

An increasing MF also decreases the compactness by a few percent, but the effect is much weaker than varying the DM fraction in the figure.

D. Mass-radius relations

The density profiles of magnetized DNSs show clearly that the model parameters m_{χ} and f_{χ} determine the formation of either a DM-halo ($R = R_{\chi}$) or a DM-core ($R = R_N$) structure, and thus, impact significantly the radius and overall structure of the DNS, whereas the magnetic field appears of minor importance. This is also seen in the mass-radius profiles shown in Fig. 4, for the same conditions as in Fig. 3. As analyzed in more detail in [38], for 'small (large)' masses $m_{\chi} \leq (\geq)1$ GeV DM-halo (core) stars are formed, where both R and M_{max} increase (decrease) with increasing (not too large) f_{χ} . Two typical contrasting cases are shown in the $m_{\chi} = 100$ MeV and $m_{\chi} = 1000$ MeV panels.

The $m_{\chi} = 600$ MeV panel illustrates the transition between both regimes: on the $f_{\chi} = 5\%$ curves one notes a $R_{\chi} = R_N$ configuration (red marker) with $M \approx 1.73 M_{\odot}$ and $R \approx 11.79$ km, where the R_N branch for larger masses deviates onto the R_{χ} branch for lower masses. The same occurs on the $f_{\chi} = 15\%$ curves for $m_{\chi} = 1000$ MeV. Again we refer to [38] for a more extended discussion.

The figure also shows current maximum-mass constraints from PSR J0952-0607, PSR J0740+6620, and PSR J0348+0432, as well as NICER+XMM constraints of the radii $R_{1.4}$ and $R_{2.08}$. The nucleonic RMF EOS is compatible with




FIG. 6. M_{max} contours in the (m_{χ}, f_{χ}) plane for different magnetic fields.

all of them, and some admixture of DM can currently not be excluded for the observed objects.

The effect of the magnetic field (reduction of M_{max}) is not more than a few percent for all configurations and will be analyzed in more detail now.

E. Maximum mass

In Fig. 5 we show the maximum DNS gravitational mass as a function of DM fraction, for different m_{χ} and B_c values. For each EOS the transition from DM core to halo is indicated by a marker. In accordance with Fig. 4, for the 'small' masses $m_{\chi} = 100,200$ MeV the DM-halo character sets in at low $f_{\chi} < 1\%$, increasing M_{max} , while for 'large' $m_{\chi} = 600$ MeV the onset ocurs at $f_{\chi} \approx 15\%$, and for $m_{\chi} = 1000$ MeV, there are only DM-core configurations with lowered M_{max} in the plot range. Again the effect of the magnetic field is very small, in particular there is a small reduction of the halo-core transition fraction.

Finally, Fig. 6 shows some contours of M_{max} in the (m_{χ}, f_{χ}) plane for different magnetic fields. As the previous figure, it indicates that for greater m_{χ} , a smaller f_{χ} is sufficient to destabilize the DNS. Since a magnetic field decreases the maximum mass, it provides some degree of destabilization against DM-induced collapse, but the effect is again small compared to variation of f_{χ} .

F. Tidal deformability

In a binary system, the gravitational interaction with a companion object (either a NS or a BH) induces deformation in a NS. The dimensionless tidal deformability of the system, which quantifies this deformation, is represented by $\Lambda = (2/3)(R/M)^5 k_2$, where k_2 refers to its second Love number [96, 97]. Λ depends on the star's mass and radius, and is




FIG. 7. The tidal deformability vs DNS mass for different values of m_{χ} , f_{χ} , and B_c . The GW170817 constraint [95] is also shown.

modulated by DM and magnetic fields. Within the two-fluid framework, it has been examined both with [64, 71, 98] and without [21, 25, 27, 28, 35, 38] the presence of a MF.

In Fig. 7, Λ is plotted vs the DNS mass for different values of m_{χ} , f_{χ} , and B_c . As $\Lambda \sim R^5$ is extremely sensitive to the gravitational radius, the DM-halo or -core character plays a decisive role: According to Fig. 4, the small- m_{χ} DM-halo stars feature very large radii and consequently enormous val-

ues of Λ , whereas the large- m_{χ} DM-core stars with their reduced radii exhibit also reduced Λ values.

Across all panels it is apparent that the effect of the MF is very small and only visible near the M_{max} configurations. A stronger MF results in a more compact NS, thereby decreasing its deformability.

The pure NS EOS with $\Lambda = 454$ fulfills (by construction) the observational limits imposed by GW170817, but also here, the large error bar currently cannot exclude an admixture of DM.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we examined the combined effects of DM and MF on DNSs properties. We considered self-interacting, asymmetric, non-annihilating fermionic DM, obeying the self-interaction cross-section constraint imposed by the observed interaction of galaxies in various galaxy clusters. This left the DM particle mass as a free parameter. Combined with the nucleonic QMC-RMF4 EOS and density-dependent MFs of magnetar size, we investigated how DM particle mass, DM mass fraction, and MF strength influence key DNS properties such as maximum mass, mass-radius relations, tidal deformability, and the critical DM mass fraction needed for destabilization.

As is well known, the DM-halo or -core character of a DNS is mainly determined by a small (halo) or large (core) DM particle mass (compared to the nucleon mass), associated with possible increase or decrease of the DNS maximum gravitational mass, respectively.

We found that the influence of the MF on these features is generally very small, even for the strongest field values of magnetar size. The magnetized EOS is softer and consequently causes slighty smaller maximum masses and less stability against collapse, for example, for otherwise unchanged parameters. But as the same effects are caused by a small variation of the DM fraction, it will be real challenge to extract this information from observation, if such DNSs with large DM fraction exist.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

B. K. acknowledges partial support from the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, with grant no. CRG/2021/000101. Part of this computation was performed using the CINECA cluster under the NEUMATT project.

- [1] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, Phys. Rep. 405, 279 (2005).
- [2] V. C. Rubin and J. Ford, W. Kent, Astrophys. J. 159, 379 (1970).
- [3] V. C. Rubin, J. Ford, W. K., and N. Thonnard, Astrophys. J. **238**, 471 (1980).
- [4] D. Clowe, M. Bradač, A. H. Gonzalez, M. Markevitch, S. W. Randall, C. Jones, and D. Zaritsky, Astrophys. J. 648, L109 (2006).
- [5] E. Komatsu et al., Astrophys. J. Supplement Series 192, 18

(2011).

- [6] G. Bertone and M. Fairbairn, Phys. Rev. D 77, 043515 (2008).
- [7] N. F. Bell, G. Busoni, T. F. Motta, S. Robles, A. W. Thomas, and M. Virgato, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 111803 (2021).
- [8] B. Kain, Phys. Rev. D 103, 043009 (2021).
- [9] D. Rafiei Karkevandi, S. Shakeri, V. Sagun, and O. Ivanytskyi, Phys. Rev. D 105, 023001 (2022).
- [10] I. Goldman and S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. D 40, 3221 (1989).

- [11] G. Narain, J. Schaffner-Bielich, and I. N. Mishustin, Phys. Rev. D 74, 063003 (2006).
- [12] C. Kouvaris, Phys. Rev. D 77, 023006 (2008).
- [13] C. Kouvaris and P. Tinyakov, Phys. Rev. D 82, 063531 (2010).
- [14] L. J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell, et al., JHEP 2010, 80 (2010).
- [15] C. Kouvaris and P. Tinyakov, Phys. Rev. D 83, 083512 (2011).
- [16] C. Kouvaris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 191301 (2012).
- [17] I. Goldman, R. Mohapatra, S. Nussinov, D. Rosenbaum, and V. Teplitz, Phys. Lett. B 725, 200 (2013).
- [18] T. Han, Z. Liu, and S. Su, JHEP **2014**, 93 (2014).

(2019).

- [19] G. Panotopoulos and I. Lopes, Phys. Rev. D 96, 083004 (2017).
 [20] N. Bernal, M. Heikinheimo, T. Tenkanen, *et al.*, IJMP A 32, 1730023 (2017).
- [21] A. E. Nelson, S. Reddy, and D. Zhou, JCAP 2019, 012 (2019).
- [22] M. I. Gresham and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D 99, 083008
- [23] H. C. Das, A. Kumar, B. Kumar, S. K. Biswal, T. Nakatsukasa, A. Li, and S. K. Patra, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 495, 4893 (2020).
- [24] O. Ivanytskyi, V. Sagun, and I. Lopes, Phys. Rev. D 102, 063028 (2020).
- [25] A. Das, T. Malik, and A. C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. D 105, 123034 (2022).
- [26] D. Rafiei Karkevandi, S. Shakeri, V. Sagun, and O. Ivanytskyi, Phys. Rev. D 105, 023001 (2022).
- [27] K.-L. Leung, M.-C. Chu, and L.-M. Lin, Phys. Rev. D 105, 123010 (2022).
- [28] M. Collier, D. Croon, and R. K. Leane, Phys. Rev. D 106, 123027 (2022).
- [29] Z. Miao, Y. Zhu, A. Li, and F. Huang, Astrophys. J. 936, 69 (2022).
- [30] P. Routaray, H. C. Das, S. Sen, B. Kumar, G. Panotopoulos, and T. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D 107, 103039 (2023).
- [31] N. Rutherford, G. Raaijmakers, C. Prescod-Weinstein, and A. Watts, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 103051 (2023).
- [32] M. Mariani, C. Albertus, M. d. R. Alessandroni, M. G. Orsaria, M. A. Pérez-García, and I. F. Ranea-Sandoval, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 527, 6795 (2023).
- [33] P. Routaray, A. Quddus, K. Chakravarti, and B. Kumar, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **525**, 5492 (2023).
- [34] P. Routaray, S. R. Mohanty, H. Das, S. Ghosh, P. Kalita, V. Parmar, and B. Kumar, JCAP **2023**, 073 (2023).
- [35] H.-M. Liu, J.-B. Wei, Z.-H. Li, G. F. Burgio, and H.-J. Schulze, Physics of the Dark Universe 42, 101338 (2023).
- [36] D. Rafiei Karkevandi, M. Shahrbaf, S. Shakeri, and S. Typel, Particles 7, 201 (2024).
- [37] S. Shakeri and D. R. Karkevandi, Phys. Rev. D 109, 043029 (2024).
- [38] H.-M. Liu, J.-B. Wei, Z.-H. Li, G. F. Burgio, H. C. Das, and H.-J. Schulze, Phys. Rev. D 110, 023024 (2024).
- [39] P. Routaray, H. Das, J. A. Pattnaik, and B. Kumar, International Journal of Modern Physics E 0, 2450052 (0), https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218301324500526.
- [40] J. Antoniadis, P. C. C. Freire, N. Wex, et al., Science 340, 1233232 (2013).
- [41] E. Fonseca, H. T. Cromartie, T. T. Pennucci, *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **915**, L12 (2021).
- [42] V. M. Kaspi, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 107, 7147 (2010).
- [43] V. M. Kaspi and A. M. Beloborodov, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 55, 261 (2017).
- [44] K. Makishima, T. Enoto, J. S. Hiraga, T. Nakano, K. Nakazawa, S. Sakurai, M. Sasano, and H. Murakami, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112,

171102 (2014).

- [45] B. Kern and C. Martin, Nature 417, 527 (2002).
- [46] K. Hurley, Advances in Space Research 47, 1326 (2011).
- [47] J. Lattimer, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sc. 71, 433 (2021).
- [48] Y. Gao, L. Shao, G. Desvignes, D. I. Jones, M. Kramer, and G. Yim, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 519, 1080 (2022).
- [49] J. Margueron, R. Hoffmann Casali, and F. Gulminelli, Phys. Rev. C 97, 025805 (2018).
- [50] B.-A. Li and X. Han, Phys. Lett. B 727, 276 (2013).
- [51] M. Oertel, M. Hempel, T. Klähn, and S. Typel, Rev. Mod. Phys. 89, 015007 (2017).
- [52] S. Shlomo, V. M. Kolomietz, and G. Colò, Eur. Phys. J. A 30, 23 (2006).
- [53] J. Piekarewicz, J. Phys. G 37, 064038 (2010).
- [54] R. W. Romani, D. Kandel, A. V. Filippenko, T. G. Brink, and W. Zheng, Astrophys. J. Lett. 934, L17 (2022).
- [55] M. C. Miller, F. K. Lamb, A. J. Dittmann, et al., APJ 918, L28 (2021).
- [56] B. P. Abbott et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 161101 (2018).
- [57] M. G. Alford, L. Brodie, A. Haber, and I. Tews, Phys. Rev. C 106, 055804 (2022).
- [58] A. Broderick, M. Prakash, and J. M. Lattimer, Astrophys. J. 537, 351 (2000).
- [59] M. Strickland, V. Dexheimer, and D. P. Menezes, Phys. Rev. D 86, 125032 (2012).
- [60] V. Parmar, H. C. Das, M. K. Sharma, and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. D 107, 043022 (2023).
- [61] V. Parmar, H. C. Das, A. Kumar, M. K. Sharma, and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. D 105, 043017 (2022).
- [62] J. Fang, H. Pais, S. Pratapsi, et al., Phys. Rev. C 95, 062801 (2017).
- [63] A. Goyal, V. K. Gupta, K. Goswami, and V. Tuli, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 16, 347 (2001).
- [64] N. K. Patra, T. Malik, D. Sen, et al., Astrophys. J. 900, 49 (2020).
- [65] H. Müller and B. D. Serot, Nucl. Phys. A 606, 508 (1996).
- [66] P. Wang, Phys. Rev. C 61, 054904 (2000).
- [67] S. K. Patra, M. Centelles, X. Viñas, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 65, 044304 (2002).
- [68] A. Kumar, H. C. Das, S. K. Biswal, et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 80 (2020).
- [69] H. C. Das, A. Kumar, B. Kumar, et al., JCAP 2021, 007 (2021).
- [70] B. Kumar, S. K. Patra, and B. K. Agrawal, Phys. Rev. C 97, 045806 (2018).
- [71] V. Parmar, H. C. Das, M. K. Sharma, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 107, 043022 (2023).
- [72] S. Chakrabarty, Phys. Rev. D 54, 1306 (1996).
- [73] M. Mariani, M. G. Orsaria, I. F. Ranea-Sandoval, *et al.*, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **489**, 4261 (2019).
- [74] M. Mariani, L. Tonetto, M. C. Rodríguez, M. O. Celi, I. F. Ranea-Sandoval, M. G. Orsaria, and A. Pérez Martínez, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 512, 517 (2022).
- [75] D. Chatterjee, J. Novak, and M. Oertel, Eur. Phys. J. A 57, 249 (2021).
- [76] I. Bednarek, A. Brzezina, R. Mańka, and M. Zastawny-Kubica, Nucl. Phys. A 716, 245 (2003).
- [77] L. Lopes and D. Menezes, JCAP **2015**, 002 (2015), arXiv:1411.7209 [astro-ph.HE].
- [78] C. V. Flores, L. B. Castro, and G. Lugones, Phys. Rev. C 94, 015807 (2016).
- [79] D. Bandyopadhyay, S. Chakrabarty, and S. Pal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2176 (1997).
- [80] A. Rabhi, H. Pais, P. K. Panda, and C. Providência, J. Phys. G 36, 115204 (2009).

- [81] R. Mallick and S. Schramm, Phys. Rev. C 89, 045805 (2014).
- [82] G. H. Bordbar and M. Karami, Eur. Phys. J. C 82, 74 (2022).
- [83] R. H. Casali, L. B. Castro, and D. P. Menezes, Phys. Rev. C 89, 015805 (2014).
- [84] T. Güver, E. Göğüş, and F. Özel, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 418, 2773 (2011).
- [85] M. F. Barbat, J. Schaffner-Bielich, and L. Tolos, Phys. Rev. D 110, 023013 (2024).
- [86] M. Markevitch, A. H. Gonzalez, D. Clowe, A. Vikhlinin, W. Forman, C. Jones, S. Murray, and W. Tucker, Astrophys. J. 606, 819 (2004).
- [87] M. Kaplinghat, S. Tulin, and H.-B. Yu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 041302 (2016).
- [88] L. Sagunski, S. Gad-Nasr, B. Colquhoun, A. Robertson, and S. Tulin, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 2021, 024 (2021).
- [89] A. Loeb, Astrophys. J. Lett. 929, L24 (2022).

- [90] S. Tulin, H.-B. Yu, and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D 87, 115007 (2013).
- [91] C. Kouvaris and N. G. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. D 92, 063526 (2015).
- [92] A. Maselli, P. Pnigouras, N. G. Nielsen, C. Kouvaris, and K. D. Kokkotas, Phys. Rev. D 96, 023005 (2017).
- [93] K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rep. 537, 91 (2014).
- [94] P.-C. Chu, X. Wang, L.-W. Chen, and M. Huang, Phys. Rev. D 91, 023003 (2015).
- [95] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 161101 (2017).
- [96] T. Hinderer, Astrophys. J. 677, 1216 (2008).
- [97] B. Kumar, S. K. Biswal, and S. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. C 95, 015801 (2017).
- [98] I. A. Rather, U. Rahaman, V. Dexheimer, A. A. Usmani, and S. K. Patra, Astrophys. J. 917, 46 (2021).