

# No Dark Matter Axion During Minimal Higgs Inflation

Claire Rigouzzo<sup>1,\*</sup> and Sebastian Zell<sup>2,3,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Laboratory for Theoretical Particle Physics and Cosmology,  
King's College London, London, United Kingdom*

<sup>2</sup>*Arnold Sommerfeld Center, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Theresienstraße 37, 80333 München, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Boltzmannstr. 8, 85748 Garching b. München, Germany*

We study minimal versions of Higgs inflation in the presence of a massless QCD axion. While the inflationary energy scale of the metric variant is too high to accommodate isocurvature bounds, it was argued that Palatini Higgs inflation could evade these constraints. We show, however, that an energy-dependent decay constant enhances isocurvature perturbations, implying that axions can at most constitute a tiny fraction  $< 10^{-5}$  of dark matter. This conclusion can be avoided in Einstein-Cartan gravity by an additional coupling of the axion to torsion, albeit for a very specific choice of parameters. Analogous constraints as well as the possibility to alleviate them are relevant for all inflationary models with a non-minimal coupling to gravity.

**Inflation & dark matter** — In our Universe, about 85% of matter has only been observed through gravitational effects. Understanding the microscopic nature of this dark matter (DM) remains one of the greatest challenges in cosmology. Another fundamental mystery is the origin of the initial conditions for the hot Big Bang. The leading explanation is cosmic inflation [1–4] – an early phase of accelerated expansion – which successfully accounts for the near-homogeneity and isotropy of the Universe and is strongly supported by precision measurements of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [5, 6]. A wide range of DM models have been developed (see [7]). Similarly, a plethora of inflationary scenarios have been put forward (see [8]). The key difficulty lies in distinguishing viable proposals from the multitude of possibilities, with the ultimate goal of identifying the mechanisms that govern our Universe. In this work, we reveal an incompatibility between two leading candidates: QCD axions [9–11] and Higgs inflation (HI) [12].

Originally, axions were introduced to address the strong CP-problem of QCD, originating from the experimental fact that strong interactions are CP-conserving to a very good accuracy [13]. This observation can be explained by promoting the CP-violating angle of QCD to a dynamical pseudoscalar field – the axion [9–11], which does not only resolve the strong CP-problem but moreover contributes to DM (see e.g. [14]). The QCD axion can arise, among others, from the original proposal of a spontaneously broken PQ-symmetry [9–11], from extra dimensions [15] (see review [16]), or from local gauge invariance [17–20].

HI agrees excellently with CMB observations and is unique among inflationary proposals since it does not require more particles than have already been observed in experiment. HI is highly sensitive to the different formulations of General Relativity (GR) [21–25] (see overview in [26]). While in the most commonly-employed metric version a low perturbative cutoff scale can lead to issues [27, 28], no such problems exist in Palatini HI [21]. This makes it possible to compute the end of inflation

unambiguously [29, 30] and to connect Palatini HI to low-energy collider measurements [31, 32].

The presence of a massless axion during inflation induces isocurvature perturbations [33]. The fact that they have not been observed in the CMB leads to a well-known challenge in combining axions with inflation.<sup>1</sup> In this paper, we shall investigate the compatibility of QCD axions with HI. While metric HI leads to excessive isocurvature perturbations, it was suggested that Palatini HI could tolerate a massless QCD axion during inflation [35]. However, the energy dependence of the decay constant [36, 37] was not taken into account in [35]. Since it is smaller during inflation than in the late Universe, isocurvature perturbations are enhanced (see illustration in fig. 1). We point out that this is a generic feature in all inflationary models with a non-minimal coupling to gravity. Applied to Palatini HI, we show that the presence of a massless axion field that can later act as DM is excluded. So DM axions must not exist in minimal versions of HI.

**Review of isocurvature bound** — CMB observations bound the magnitude of isocurvature perturbations  $\Delta_a$  relative to the adiabatic curvature perturbations  $\Delta_{\mathcal{R}}$  as  $\Delta_a^2/(\Delta_{\mathcal{R}}^2 + \Delta_a^2) \lesssim 0.038$  [5, 14]. Plugging in the measured value  $\Delta_{\mathcal{R}}^2 \approx 2.1 \cdot 10^{-9}$ , we get [5]

$$\Delta_a \lesssim 9.1 \cdot 10^{-6} . \quad (1)$$

Now an axion with initial misalignment angle  $\theta_i$  induces isocurvature perturbations [38, 39]

$$\Delta_a = \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sigma_\theta \sqrt{2(\sigma_\theta^2 + 2\theta_i^2)}}{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2} , \quad (2)$$

<sup>1</sup> No issue with isocurvature bounds arises if the massless axion field does not exist during inflation (or reheating). This can e.g. be realized in PQ-scenarios with a post inflationary symmetry breaking, although in this case many models are excluded due to an overabundance of topological defects [34].




FIG. 1. Representation of varying decay constant. Since the effective decay constant is reduced during inflation, isocurvature perturbations are enhanced. The dashed line corresponds to the result of [35], where the change of the decay constant was not taken into account. The *physical* fluctuation of the axion field is shown with  $\delta a$ . Figure inspired by [36].

where  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$  is the relative contribution of axions to DM and  $\sigma_\theta$  stands for the typical quantum fluctuation of the angular axion field. Moreover,  $\theta_i$  is the initial misalignment angle, which can be expressed through  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$  and the axionic decay constant  $f_a$  (see e.g. [40] and details in appendix A):

$$\theta_i = \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^{a/2} \left( \frac{1.02 \times 10^{12} \text{GeV}}{f_a} \right)^{7/12}. \quad (3)$$

For  $\sigma_\theta \gg \theta_i$ , eq. (2) reduces to  $\Delta_a \approx \sqrt{2} \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$  and so the isocurvature bound can only be satisfied for a tiny  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$ . Having a sizable contribution of axions to DM,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \approx 1$ , is only possible for  $\sigma_\theta \ll \theta_i$ , in which case eq. (2) gives  $\Delta_a \approx \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a 2\sigma_\theta/\theta_i$ . In summary, the isocurvature constraint (2) implies that one of the following two conditions must be satisfied (see details in appendix B):

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \lesssim 6.4 \cdot 10^{-6} \quad \text{OR} \quad \sigma_\theta \lesssim 4.6 \cdot 10^{-6} \frac{\theta_i}{\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a}. \quad (4)$$

Since we are interested to have a sizable fraction of DM in axions, we shall focus on fulfilling the second condition.

**Argument of [35]** — In Palatini HI, the inflationary Hubble scale is (see [21, 31, 32] and derivation below)

$$H_I \sim 2.6 \cdot 10^{-6} \frac{M_P}{\sqrt{\xi}}. \quad (5)$$

Here  $\xi$  sets the strength of non-minimal coupling of the Higgs field to the Ricci scalar. The value of  $\xi$  is not

known exactly, as will be discussed later. We shall use the largest possible  $\xi \sim 10^9$  since this leads to the weakest isocurvature constraint. Then the Hubble scale (5) yields  $H_I \sim 2.2 \cdot 10^8 \text{ GeV}$ , in accordance with [35].

For incorporating the axionic isocurvature bound (4) into Palatini HI, one is tempted to estimate  $\sigma_\theta = H_I/(2\pi f_a)$  as in [35], where  $f_a$  is the axionic decay constant. With the Hubble scale (5), we would then get (for  $\xi \sim 10^9$ ):

$$f_a \theta_i \gtrsim 9.0 \cdot 10^{-2} \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{M_P}{\sqrt{\xi}} \sim \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a 6.9 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ GeV}. \quad (6)$$

If eq. (6) were to hold, plugging in eq. (3) would show that having all DM in axions,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a = 1$ , can be achieved for  $f_a \sim 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$  corresponding to  $\theta_i/(2\pi) \sim 10^{-2}$  [35]. We shall demonstrate, however, that this conclusion is premature because it overlooks the need to canonically normalize the axion field in the early Universe.

**QCD axion coupled to Palatini HI** — For a fundamental derivation, the relevant action of the axion  $a$  and the Higgs field  $h$  (in unitary gauge) coupled to gravity is

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \Omega^2 R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} \right], \quad (7)$$

where  $M_P$  denotes the reduced Planck mass,  $R$  the Ricci scalar,  $\lambda$  the Higgs self-coupling, and we defined

$$\Omega^2 = 1 + \frac{\xi h^2}{M_P^2}, \quad (8)$$

with non-minimal coupling constant  $\xi$ . Moreover,  $G_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$  correspond to the field strength tensor of QCD and its dual, respectively, and, we have the dimensionless parameter  $c_G \sim \alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is the gauge coupling. We view eq. (7) as the low-energy effective field theory of a pseudo-scalar  $a$  coupled to QCD via an operator of mass dimension 5 that is suppressed by a fixed mass scale  $f_a$ . Crucially, the shift symmetry of the axion prevents the appearance of a non-minimal interaction of  $a$  with  $R$ .

As usual, we remove the non-minimal coupling to curvature with the conformal transformation  $g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega^{-2} g_{\mu\nu}$ . In contrast to the situation in metric gravity, the Ricci tensor  $R_{\mu\nu}$  of Palatini GR is independent of the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and therefore curvature simply transforms as  $R \rightarrow \Omega^2 R$ . Thus, action (7) becomes

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \dot{R} - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4\Omega^4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} \right], \quad (9)$$

where it is important to note that the gauge kinetic term is invariant under the conformal transformation so that the gauge field remains canonical (see [41]). Since in the form (9) the coupling of gravity to matter is minimal, the Palatini and metric formulations of GR are equivalent. This has allowed us to replace curvature by its Riemannian counterpart  $\hat{R}$ , which is a function of the metric only.

Still following the standard analysis of Palatini HI, we next perform a field transformation for the Higgs field, introducing a new field  $\chi$  defined by [21, 31]

$$h = \frac{M_P}{\sqrt{\xi}} \sinh\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right), \quad (10)$$

so that the action (9) becomes

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \chi \partial^\alpha \chi - U - \frac{\partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a}{2 \cosh^2\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right)} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} \right], \quad (11)$$

with inflationary potential

$$U = \frac{\lambda M_P^4}{4\xi^2} \tanh^4\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right). \quad (12)$$

Evaluating the first slow-roll parameter, we can express  $\chi$  as a function of the number  $N_\star$  of e-foldings (see [32])

$$\chi(N) \approx \frac{M_P \text{arccosh}(16\xi N_\star)}{2\sqrt{\xi}}, \quad (13)$$

and then match the amplitude of CMB perturbations to obtain the constraint  $\xi = 1.2 \cdot 10^{10} \lambda$ , where we used  $N_\star \approx 51$  as in [31]. Then the potential (12) yields the Hubble scale (5). Due to uncertainties in the measurement of the top Yukawa coupling, the inflationary value of  $\lambda$  is unknown [31, 42]. Although RG analysis indicates a small  $\lambda \sim 10^{-3}$  at high energies [31], we shall follow [35] and use  $\lambda = 0.1$  corresponding to  $\xi \sim 10^9$  since a large  $\xi$  weakens isocurvature perturbations.

Finally, we define an approximately canonical axion field

$$A = \frac{a}{\Omega} = \frac{a}{\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right)}, \quad (14)$$

where we plugged the field (10) into eq. (8). We arrive at

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \chi \partial^\alpha \chi - U - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha A \partial^\alpha A - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\Omega A}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} + \Delta\mathcal{L} \right], \quad (15)$$

where  $\Delta\mathcal{L}$  contains correction terms:

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = -\frac{\sqrt{\xi}A}{M_P} \tanh\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right) \left[ \partial_\alpha \chi \partial^\alpha A + \frac{\sqrt{\xi}A}{2M_P} \tanh\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi}\chi}{M_P}\right) \partial_\alpha \chi \partial^\alpha \chi \right]. \quad (16)$$

Since during inflation  $A \sim H_I \sim \sqrt{\lambda} M_P / \xi$ , the correction terms in  $\Delta\mathcal{L}$  are at least suppressed as  $\sqrt{\xi}A/M_P \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda/\xi}$  and we shall neglect them in the following (see also [36, 37, 43, 44] and appendix C for a consistency check).

**Field-dependent decay constant** — Crucially, eqs. (14) and (15) make evident that the effective decay constant  $f_{a,\text{inf}}$  during inflation differs from its low-energy value  $f_a$ :

$$f_{a,\text{inf}} = \frac{f_a}{\Omega} \approx \frac{f_a}{\sqrt{8\xi N_\star}}, \quad (17)$$

where we used the solution (13) in eq. (8). Therefore, plugging  $\sigma_\theta = H_I/(2\pi f_{a,\text{inf}})$  together with eq. (5) into the second condition of the isocurvature bound (4) implies

$$f_a \theta_i \gtrsim 0.25 \sqrt{N_\star} \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a M_P. \quad (18)$$

This constraint is much stronger than the previously proposed eq. (6). Interestingly, it is not sensitive to the uncertainty in  $\lambda$  (and equivalently  $\xi$ ). Upon inserting  $\theta_i$  as in eq. (3), eq. (18) would bound the abundance of axions as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \lesssim 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8} \left(\frac{f_a}{M_P}\right)^{5/6}. \quad (19)$$

Thus, the first condition of the isocurvature bound (4) is relevant for any subplanckian decay constant:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \lesssim 6.4 \cdot 10^{-6}. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, QCD axions that are present as massless field during Palatini HI can at most contribute a tiny fraction  $\sim 6 \cdot 10^{-6}$  to DM. We show in appendix D that the same conclusion can be obtained in a UV-completion by a PQ-symmetry, where  $a$  arises as phase of a complex PQ-field.

#### **Axion and generic inflationary models**

Clearly, the existence of these bounds does not depend on the particular structure of Palatini HI. Only important is a non-minimal coupling  $\Omega^2 \gg 1$  so that the axion kinetic term is multiplied by  $1/\Omega^2 \ll 1$  as in the action (9). This directly translates to a decay constant that is smaller during inflation than now, according to the first equality in eq. (17). Importantly, the same conclusion also holds in the metric formulation of GR. In this case, the conformal transformation  $g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega^{-2} g_{\mu\nu}$  yields an additional contribution proportional to  $(\partial_\alpha \Omega)^2$  (see [26]), but this only contributes to the kinetic term of the inflaton. Therefore, the enhancement of isocurvature perturbations is

not limited to HI but generic in all inflationary models with a non-minimal coupling to gravity.<sup>2</sup>

**Way out from non-minimal coupling to torsion**

— Since Palatini gravity is part of the Einstein-Cartan formulation (see [26] for terminology), we can add many more terms composed of torsion to the action (c.f. [26, 41, 45]). All of them could potentially modify the value of the decay constant. As an illustrative example, we shall consider a direct coupling of the axion to torsion via a term  $\zeta J_\alpha T^\alpha$ , where  $\zeta$  is a coupling constant,  $J_\alpha = f_a \partial_\alpha a$ , and  $T^\alpha = g_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\alpha\nu}$  is the torsion vector (with  $T^{\mu}_{\alpha\nu}$  defined in terms of the Christoffel symbols  $\Gamma^{\mu}_{\alpha\nu}$  as  $T^{\mu}_{\alpha\nu} \equiv 1/2(\Gamma^{\mu}_{\alpha\nu} - \Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\alpha})$ ). Correspondingly, action (7) is extended as

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \Omega^2 R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} - \zeta J_\alpha T^\alpha \right]. \quad (21)$$

After solving for  $T^\alpha$  and going to the Einstein frame via the conformal transformation  $g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega^{-2} g_{\mu\nu}$ , we derive an extension of eq. (9) (see details in appendix E). From it we can read off the non-trivial axionic kinetic term:

$$-\frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \left( 1 - \frac{3\zeta^2 f_a^2}{2M_P^2 \Omega^2} \right) \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a. \quad (22)$$

Restricting ourselves to the late Universe, where  $\Omega^2 \sim 1$ , we canonically normalize  $a$  to show that the decay constant is modified at low energies:

$$f_a \rightarrow f_{a,\text{IR}}(f_a) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{3\zeta^2 f_a^2}{2M_P^2}} f_a. \quad (23)$$

Now  $f_{a,\text{IR}}$  becomes the scale that suppresses the operator  $a c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$ , which among others is responsible for the non-perturbative generation of the axion mass in the late Universe.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, eq. (18) remains valid, with the only difference that  $\theta_i$  (and hence also  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$ ) now depend on  $f_{a,\text{IR}}$ . Thus, the bound (19) generalizes to (c.f. [44])

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \lesssim 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8} \left( \frac{f_{a,\text{IR}}}{M_P} \right)^{-7/6} \left( \frac{f_a}{M_P} \right)^2. \quad (24)$$

<sup>2</sup> In a UV-completion by a PQ-field, inflationary models driven by the radial mode  $|\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|$  represent an exception [36, 37, 43, 44]. Since in this case  $|\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|$  is displaced from its minimum, the effective inflationary decay constant can be larger than its low-energy counterpart in spite of the presence of a non-minimal coupling to gravity.

<sup>3</sup> In a UV-completion with PQ-symmetry,  $J_\alpha = f_a \partial_\alpha a$  arises from the PQ-current  $J_\alpha \equiv -i (\Phi_{\text{PQ}}^* \partial_\alpha \Phi_{\text{PQ}} - (\partial^\alpha \Phi_{\text{PQ}})^* \Phi_{\text{PQ}})$  after PQ symmetry breaking. Therefore,  $f_a$  still sets the expectation value of the canonical PQ-field at low energies.




FIG. 2. Representation of a possible way out: If the effective decay constant becomes smaller at lower energy, this improves the isocurvature bound and allows for the axion to account for all of DM. The *physical* fluctuation of the axion field at low energy is shown with  $\delta a_{\text{IR}}$ . Figure inspired by [36].

After plugging in the low-energy decay constant (23), we conclude that axions can constitute all of DM if

$$1 - 2 \cdot 10^{-14} \left( \frac{f_a}{M_P} \right)^{10/7} \lesssim \frac{3\zeta^2 f_a^2}{2M_P^2} < 1. \quad (25)$$

This implies  $f_{a,\text{IR}} \lesssim 10^{-7} f_a$  and so comparison with eq. (17) shows that we get the hierarchy  $f_{a,\text{IR}} < f_{a,\text{inf}} < f_a$ . A decay constant that is larger during inflation than in the late Universe alleviates isocurvature bounds, as in [36, 37, 43, 44] – see visual depiction of the mechanism in fig. 2. The value (25) does not change the high-energy decay constant  $f_{a,\text{inf}}$  since eq. (22) shows that during inflation the correction resulting from  $\zeta$  is negligible, which makes our using of eqs. (17) and (18) self-consistent. Evidently, one could include numerous other torsion contributions in the action, and a systematic study of their effect remains to be performed [46].

**Further ways out** — Several other options exist to alleviate isocurvature bounds. First, it is possible to consider non-minimal models of HI such as [24, 25] or to include a direct coupling between the norm of the PQ-field and torsion,  $|\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|^2 T_\alpha T^\alpha$ . Independently of torsion, one can consider an early phase of confinement [47], which can arise from an effective coupling of the Higgs field to the gauge kinetic term  $\text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu}$  and would drive the QCD axion to the CP-conserving value already during inflation, thereby reducing isocurvature perturbations. We do not expect this mechanism to be generic in our approach since there is no simple coupling of torsion to gauge fields and so new new interactions involving  $G^{\mu\nu}$  arise [41]. In a UV-completion by a PQ-field, one can also

directly include a coupling  $|\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|^2 h^2$  to change the inflationary vacuum expectation value of the PQ-field.<sup>4</sup> However, all of these options require additional non-minimal interactions with coupling constants in specific intervals – c.f. the highly tuned parameter choice (25) – and so arguably should be considered as non-minimal. Finally, one may turn to more generic axion-like particles (see [48]) as solution to the strong CP-problem, as e.g. in [49].

**Conclusion** — The microscopic origins of inflation and dark matter remain among the most important open questions in cosmology. Given that many models are still consistent with all observations, additional constraints are needed to distinguish among the plethora of proposals. In this work, we have corrected a previous claim in the literature and demonstrated that a massless QCD axion – if abundant enough to account for dark matter in the late Universe – must not exist during simple Higgs inflation models. This finding resonates with the approach of Higgs inflation, which is motivated by the lack of detected particles beyond the Standard Model.

Our result stems from the energy dependence of the axionic decay constant. An inflationary value that is smaller than its late-time counterpart enhances isocurvature perturbations. As a result, a significant axion abundance is incompatible with observational isocurvature bounds. Our findings have important implications for all inflationary models with non-minimal couplings to gravity. First, the enhancement of isocurvature perturbations is a general feature of such scenarios. Second, coupling the axion to torsion can relax isocurvature constraints; in particular, Einstein-Cartan gravity can rescue proposal otherwise deemed excluded due to excessive isocurvature perturbations.

**Acknowledgments** — We thank Gia Dvali, Mudit Jain, Georgios Karananas, David Marsh, Nicole Righi, and Misha Shaposhnikov for discussions and insightful feedback. C.R. is very grateful to Mudit Jain for long and enlightening discussions on axion abundance and isocurvature perturbations. C.R. acknowledges support from the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC). The work of S.Z. was supported by the European Research Council Gravites Horizon Grant AO number: 850 173-6.

**Disclaimer:** Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

## A. Abundance of the QCD axion

The potential of the axion for small  $\theta$  reads:

$$V(\theta) \simeq \frac{1}{2} m_a^2 f_a^2 \theta^2. \quad (\text{A1})$$

When  $H \gg m/3$ , the axion freezes (the Hubble friction prevents it from rolling) and is approximately given by  $\theta \sim \theta_i = \text{constant}$ . At this stage, the number density is frozen and given by

$$n_i = \frac{\rho}{m_a} = \frac{V(\theta_i)}{m_a} = \frac{1}{2} m_a f_a^2 \theta_i^2, \quad (\text{A2})$$

which holds for non-relativistic particles. When  $H \lesssim m_a/3$ ,  $\theta$  starts oscillating, therefore becoming temperature dependent:  $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta(T)$ . The number density then becomes:

$$n(T) = \frac{1}{2} m(T) \theta^2(T) f_a^2. \quad (\text{A3})$$

We also know that during matter domination epoch

$$n(T) = \frac{n_i a^3(T_i)}{a^3(T)} = \frac{1}{2} m(T_i) \theta_i^2 \left( \frac{g_s(T)}{g_s(T_i)} \right) \frac{T^3}{T_i^3}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Finally, the QCD axion mass depends on temperature, which can be approximated as [50]:

$$m(T) \sim \underbrace{5.7 \times 10^{-10} \text{eV}}_{m_a} \left( \frac{10^{16} \text{GeV}}{f_a} \right) \begin{cases} 1, & T < T_c \\ (T_c/T)^4, & T > T_c \end{cases}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

with  $T_c \sim 150$  MeV. Therefore we can now solve for  $T_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 3H(T_i) &= m(T_i), \\ \Leftrightarrow 3\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)} \frac{T_i^2}{M_P} &= m_a \left( \frac{T_c}{T_i} \right)^4, \\ \Rightarrow T_i^6 &= \frac{m_a M_P}{3\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)}} T_c^4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

We can also express the mass of the QCD axion at freeze out:

$$m(T_i) = m_a \frac{T_c^4}{\left( \frac{m_a M_P}{3\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)}} T_c^4 \right)^{4/6}}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Plugging this into eq. (A4), we obtain

$$n(T) = \frac{1}{2} m_a \frac{T_c^4}{\left( \frac{m_a M_P}{3\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)}} T_c^4 \right)^{4/6}} \theta_i^2 f_a^2 \frac{g_s(T)}{g_s(T_i)} \frac{T^3}{T_i^3}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

<sup>4</sup> We thank Misha Shaposhnikov for pointing out this option.

Finally, the axion energy density nowadays is given by  $\rho_a = m_a n(T)$  because we are at a temperature  $T < T_C$ . So:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a(T) &= \frac{1}{2} m_a^2 f_a^2 \frac{g_s(T)}{g_s(T_i)} T_c^4 T^3 \left( \frac{m_a M_P}{3\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)}} T_c^4 \right)^{-7/6} \theta_i^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} m_a^2 f_a^2 \frac{g_s(T)}{g_s(T_i)} T_c^{-4/6} T^3 \left( \frac{3f_a \sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_p(T_i)}}{5.7 \times 10^{15} M_P} \right)^{7/6} \theta_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

From there, we can get the abundance of axion [40]

$$\Omega_a h^2 \sim 0.12 \left( \frac{\theta_i}{4.7 \times 10^{-3}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{f_a}{10^{16} \text{GeV}} \right)^{7/6}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where we used  $M_P = 2.43 \times 10^{27}$  eV,  $T_c = 150 \times 10^6$  eV,  $T_0 = 2.33 \times 10^{-4}$  eV,  $\rho_c = 8.06 \times 10^{-11} h^2$  eV,  $g_s(T_0) = 4$  [51],  $g_s(T_i) = 41$ , and  $g_p(T_i) = 44$  [40].

If the axion was all of DM nowadays, then the l.h.s. would be 0.12. Now, if the axion is a fraction of the DM, then:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \sim \left( \frac{\theta_i}{4.7 \times 10^{-3}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{f_a}{10^{16} \text{GeV}} \right)^{7/6}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

or equivalently

$$f_a = \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^{a 6/7} f_0 \theta_i^{-12/7}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

where we defined<sup>5</sup>

$$f_0 = 1.02 \times 10^{12} \text{GeV}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Solving eq. (A12) for  $\theta_i$ , we get eq. (3) as shown in the main part.

## B. Axion isocurvature bounds

As shown in eq. (2), the general formula for the isocurvature perturbation is [38, 39]:

$$\Delta_a = \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sigma_\theta \sqrt{2(\sigma_\theta^2 + 2\theta_i^2)}}{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Without any assumptions, we can bound

$$\Delta_a < \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{2\sigma_\theta}{\sqrt{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2}} < \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{2\sigma_\theta}{\theta_i}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Still without restrictions, one can alternatively bound

$$\Delta_a < \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{2\sigma_\theta}{\sqrt{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2}} < 2\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a. \quad (\text{B3})$$

For obtaining lower bounds, we distinguish two cases. If  $\sigma_\theta < \theta_i$ , then

$$\Delta_a > \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma_\theta}{\sqrt{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2}} > \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sigma_\theta}{\theta_i}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

In the other case,  $\sigma_\theta > \theta_i$ , we get

$$\Delta_a > \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma_\theta}{\sqrt{\theta_i^2 + \sigma_\theta^2}} > \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a. \quad (\text{B5})$$

In summary, we conclude:

$$\sigma_\theta < \theta_i : \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sigma_\theta}{\theta_i} < \Delta_a < 2\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a \frac{\sigma_\theta}{\theta_i}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$\sigma_\theta > \theta_i : \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a < \Delta_a < 2\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Thus, the asymptotic scalings  $\Delta_a \approx \mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a 2\sigma_\theta/\theta_i$  (for  $\sigma_\theta \ll \theta_i$ ) and  $\Delta_a \approx \sqrt{2}\mathcal{F}_{\text{DM}}^a$  (for  $\sigma_\theta \gg \theta_i$ ) represent good approximations, with an error of at most 2, even when  $\sigma_\theta$  and  $\theta_i$  are of the same order of magnitude. Therefore, the requirement (4) is applicable in the full parameter space of  $\sigma_\theta$  and  $\theta_i$ .

## C. On Mixing of inflaton and axion

In order to remove the leading mixing term in eq. (16), we can perform another field redefinition

$$\chi \rightarrow \chi - 1/2 \frac{\sqrt{\xi} A^2}{M_P} \tanh\left(\frac{\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}\right). \quad (\text{C1})$$

Apart from terms that are suppressed by at least two powers of  $\sqrt{\xi} A/M_P$ , this generates a potential for the axion. In order to evaluate it, we use the well-known approximation of the potential (12) (see [25])

$$U = \frac{\lambda M_P^4}{4\xi^2} \left( 1 + \exp\left\{-\frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}\right\} \right)^{-2}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

Plugging the field transformation (C1) into this asymptotic form of the potential, we expand to second order in  $A$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U &\approx \frac{\lambda M_P^4}{4\xi^2} \left( 1 + \exp\left\{-\frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}\right\} \right)^{-2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda A^2 M_P^2}{2\xi} e^{-\frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}} \left( 1 + e^{-\frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}} \right)^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

We see that the induced mass of  $A$  scales as

$$m_A^2 \sim \frac{\lambda M_P^2}{\xi \exp\left(\frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \chi}{M_P}\right)}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

<sup>5</sup> In [35] a smaller value  $f_0 = 1.5 \cdot 10^{11}$  GeV was used. Since the bound on the axion abundance (19) scales with a positive power of  $f_0$ , eq. (A13) yields the more conservative result. The small difference could be due to a) a different value for  $T_C$  (in [14]  $T_C = 160$  MeV is used), b) a different value for the degrees of freedom (in [14]  $g_p(T_i) = g_s(T_i) \sim 61.75$  is used), c) the use of a refined formula for the axion mass at high energies  $m_a(T) \simeq \beta m_a \left(\frac{T_C}{T}\right)^4$ , with  $\beta$  a parameter that depends on the quark flavors physics, that [14] and [52] estimates it at  $10^{-2}$ .

Since  $\exp(\sqrt{\xi}\chi/M_P) \sim \sqrt{\xi N_*}$  by eq. (13), we conclude that the mass is hugely suppressed,  $m_A \sim \sqrt{\lambda}M_P/\xi^{3/2}$  and in particular  $m_A \ll H_I$ . In summary, we can remove the leading correction term from eq. (16), which only produces a negligible axion mass. This is a consistency check showing that indeed the suppressed terms in eq. (16) can be safely neglected.

#### D. Consistency with UV-perspective

In the main part, we have employed an effective field theory approach in which we treat the axion  $a$  as a low-energy degree of freedom, independently of its UV-completion (see [15, 16] and [17–20] for alternatives to the original proposal of a PQ-axion [9–11]). As a consistency check, we shall now demonstrate that our analysis is compatible with the PQ-mechanism, where  $a$  arises as phase field of the complex PQ-field  $\Phi_{\text{PQ}}$ . Then in eq. (7) the term  $1/2\partial_\alpha a\partial^\alpha a$  is replaced by  $|\partial_\alpha\Phi_{\text{PQ}}\partial^\alpha\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|$ , which after the conformal transformation becomes  $1/\Omega^2|\partial_\alpha\Phi_{\text{PQ}}\partial^\alpha\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|$ , to be inserted into eq. (9). Thus, PQ-symmetry breaking leading to  $\langle\Phi_{\text{PQ}}\rangle = f_a/\sqrt{2}$  is equivalent to

$$\langle\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{PQ}}\rangle = \frac{f_a}{\sqrt{2}\Omega}, \text{ with } \tilde{\Phi}_{\text{PQ}} \equiv \frac{\Phi_{\text{PQ}}}{\Omega}, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where  $\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{PQ}}$  is defined to be approximately canonical (c.f. eq. (14)). Importantly,  $f_a$  is now defined as the energy scale setting the expectation value of the bare PQ-field (e.g. resulting from a potential of the form  $(|\Phi_{\text{PQ}}|^2 - f_a^2)^2$ ). Reading off the inflationary decay constant as vacuum expectation value of the canonical  $\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{PQ}}$ , we conclude  $f_{a,\text{inf}} = f_a/\Omega$ , in accordance with eq. (17).

As a second point, eq. (D1) makes clear that

$$e^{ia/f_a} \propto \Phi_{\text{PQ}} \propto \tilde{\Phi}_{\text{PQ}} \propto e^{iA/f_{a,\text{inf}}}. \quad (\text{D2})$$

Thus, an evolving vacuum expectation value of the PQ-field conserves the phase  $a/f_a = A/f_{a,\text{inf}}$ . This fact is well-known [36] (see also [37, 43, 44]) and justifies our plugging in of  $\sigma_\theta$  as computed during inflation into the post-inflationary constraint (4).

#### E. Way out from direct coupling of torsion to matter

Starting from eq. (21):

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \Omega^2 R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} - \zeta J_\alpha T^\alpha \right], \quad (\text{E1})$$

one can use that the scalar curvature depends on the metric and torsion via  $R = \hat{R} + 2\hat{\nabla}_\alpha T^\alpha - \frac{2}{3} T_\alpha T^\alpha + \frac{1}{24} \hat{T}_\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha$ , therefore splitting the torsion part and the metric part in our initial action:

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \Omega^2 \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} - \zeta J_\alpha T^\alpha + M_P^2 \Omega^2 \hat{\nabla}_\alpha T^\alpha - \frac{M_P^2 \Omega^2}{3} T_\alpha T^\alpha + \frac{M_P^2 \Omega^2}{48} \hat{T}_\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha \right]. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Then we can solve for  $T^\alpha$  and  $\hat{T}^\alpha$ :

$$T_\alpha = -\frac{3}{2M_P^2\Omega^2} (M_P^2\partial_\alpha(\Omega^2) + \zeta J_\alpha), \quad \hat{T}_\alpha = 0. \quad (\text{E3})$$

Plugging it back in eq. (E2) gives:

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \Omega^2 \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{3\zeta^2}{4M_P^2\Omega^2} J_\alpha J^\alpha + 3M_P^2 \partial_\alpha \Omega \partial^\alpha \Omega + \frac{3\zeta}{2\Omega^2} \partial_\alpha(\Omega^2) J^\alpha \right]. \quad (\text{E4})$$

Finally, we can do a conformal transformation to arrive at

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{M_P^2}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \partial_\alpha h \partial^\alpha h - \frac{\lambda}{4\Omega^4} h^4 - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \partial_\alpha a \partial^\alpha a - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{a}{f_a} c_G \text{Tr} G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{3\zeta^2}{4M_P^2\Omega^4} J_\alpha J^\alpha + \frac{3\zeta}{2\Omega^4} \partial_\alpha(\Omega^2) J^\alpha \right], \quad (\text{E5})$$

where the inhomogeneous part of the conformal transformation cancels out with  $3M_P^2\partial_\alpha\Omega\partial^\alpha\Omega$ . Plugging in  $J_\alpha = f_a\partial_\alpha a$ , we can read off the axionic kinetic term (22) as shown in the main part.

\* [claire.rigouzzo@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:claire.rigouzzo@kcl.ac.uk)

† [sebastian.zell@lmu.de](mailto:sebastian.zell@lmu.de)

- [1] A. A. Starobinsky, A New Type of Isotropic Cosmological Models Without Singularity, *Phys. Lett. B* **91**, 99 (1980).
- [2] A. H. Guth, The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [3] A. D. Linde, A New Inflationary Universe Scenario: A Possible Solution of the Horizon, Flatness, Homogeneity, Isotropy and Primordial Monopole Problems, *Phys. Lett. B* **108**, 389 (1982).

- [4] V. F. Mukhanov and G. V. Chibisov, Quantum Fluctuations and a Nonsingular Universe, *JETP Lett.* **33**, 532 (1981).
- [5] Y. Akrami *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A10 (2020), [arXiv:1807.06211 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [6] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (BICEP, Keck), Improved Constraints on Primordial Gravitational Waves using Planck, WMAP, and BICEP/Keck Observations through the 2018 Observing Season, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 151301 (2021), [arXiv:2110.00483 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [7] G. Bertone and D. Hooper, History of dark matter, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 045002 (2018), [arXiv:1605.04909 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [8] J. Martin, C. Ringeval, and V. Vennin, Encyclopædia Inflationaris: Opiparous Edition, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **5-6**, 75 (2014), [arXiv:1303.3787 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [9] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).
- [10] S. Weinberg, A New Light Boson?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223 (1978).
- [11] F. Wilczek, Problem of Strong  $P$  and  $T$  Invariance in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279 (1978).
- [12] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, The Standard Model Higgs boson as the inflaton, *Phys. Lett. B* **659**, 703 (2008), [arXiv:0710.3755 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] C. Abel *et al.*, Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081803 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11966 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [14] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, and L. Visinelli, The landscape of QCD axion models, *Phys. Rept.* **870**, 1 (2020), [arXiv:2003.01100 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] E. Witten, Some Properties of  $O(32)$  Superstrings, *Phys. Lett. B* **149**, 351 (1984).
- [16] M. Reece, Extra-Dimensional Axion Expectations, (2024), [arXiv:2406.08543 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] G. Dvali, Three-form gauging of axion symmetries and gravity, (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0507215](#).
- [18] G. Dvali, S. Folkerts, and A. Franca, How neutrino protects the axion, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 105025 (2014), [arXiv:1312.7273 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] G. Dvali, Topological Origin of Chiral Symmetry Breaking in QCD and in Gravity, (2017), [arXiv:1705.06317 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] G. Dvali, Strong- $CP$  with and without gravity, (2022), [arXiv:2209.14219 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] F. Bauer and D. A. Demir, Inflation with Non-Minimal Coupling: Metric versus Palatini Formulations, *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 222 (2008), [arXiv:0803.2664 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] S. Rasanen, Higgs inflation in the Palatini formulation with kinetic terms for the metric, *Open J. Astrophys.* **2**, 1 (2019), [arXiv:1811.09514 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [23] S. Raatikainen and S. Rasanen, Higgs inflation and teleparallel gravity, *JCAP* **12**, 021, [arXiv:1910.03488 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [24] M. Långvik, J.-M. Ojanperä, S. Raatikainen, and S. Rasanen, Higgs inflation with the Holst and the Nieh–Yan term, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083514 (2021), [arXiv:2007.12595 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [25] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Higgs inflation in Einstein-Cartan gravity, *JCAP* **02**, 008, [Erratum: *JCAP* 10, E01 (2021)], [arXiv:2007.14978 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] C. Rigouzzo and S. Zell, Coupling metric-affine gravity to a Higgs-like scalar field, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024015 (2022), [arXiv:2204.03003 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] C. P. Burgess, H. M. Lee, and M. Trott, Power-counting and the Validity of the Classical Approximation During Inflation, *JHEP* **09**, 103, [arXiv:0902.4465 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] J. L. F. Barbon and J. R. Espinosa, On the Naturalness of Higgs Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 081302 (2009), [arXiv:0903.0355 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] J. Rubio and E. S. Tomberg, Preheating in Palatini Higgs inflation, *JCAP* **04**, 021, [arXiv:1902.10148 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] F. Dux, A. Florio, J. Klarić, A. Shkerin, and I. Timiryasov, Preheating in Palatini Higgs inflation on the lattice, *JCAP* **09**, 015, [arXiv:2203.13286 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, and S. Zell, Quantum Effects in Palatini Higgs Inflation, *JCAP* **07**, 064, [arXiv:2002.07105 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] A. Poisson, I. Timiryasov, and S. Zell, Critical points in Palatini Higgs inflation with small non-minimal coupling, *JHEP* **03**, 130, [arXiv:2306.03893 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [33] M. S. Turner and F. Wilczek, Inflationary axion cosmology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 5 (1991).
- [34] P. Sikivie, Of Axions, Domain Walls and the Early Universe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1156 (1982).
- [35] T. Tenkanen and L. Visinelli, Axion dark matter from Higgs inflation with an intermediate  $H_*$ , *JCAP* **08**, 033, [arXiv:1906.11837 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] M. Fairbairn, R. Hogan, and D. J. E. Marsh, Unifying inflation and dark matter with the Peccei-Quinn field: observable axions and observable tensors, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 023509 (2015), [arXiv:1410.1752 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald, and C. Tamarit, Standard Model—axion—seesaw—Higgs portal inflation. Five problems of particle physics and cosmology solved in one stroke, *JCAP* **08**, 001, [arXiv:1610.01639 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [38] M. Beltran, J. Garcia-Bellido, and J. Lesgourgues, Isocurvature bounds on axions revisited, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 103507 (2007), [arXiv:hep-ph/0606107](#).
- [39] M. P. Hertzberg, M. Tegmark, and F. Wilczek, Axion Cosmology and the Energy Scale of Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 083507 (2008), [arXiv:0807.1726 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [40] E. Sheridan, F. Carta, N. Gendler, M. Jain, D. J. E. Marsh, L. McAllister, N. Righi, K. K. Rogers, and A. Schachner, Fuzzy Axions and Associated Relics, (2024), [arXiv:2412.12012 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [41] C. Rigouzzo and S. Zell, Coupling metric-affine gravity to the standard model and dark matter fermions, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 124067 (2023), [arXiv:2306.13134 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [42] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Why should we care about the top quark Yukawa coupling?, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **120**, 335 (2015), [arXiv:1411.1923 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] S. M. Boucenna and Q. Shafi, Axion inflation, proton decay, and leptogenesis in  $SU(5) \times U(1)_{PQ}$ , *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 075012 (2018), [arXiv:1712.06526 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] G. Ballesteros, A. Ringwald, C. Tamarit, and Y. Welling, Revisiting isocurvature bounds in models unifying the axion with the inflaton, *JCAP* **09**, 036, [arXiv:2104.13847 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] G. K. Karananas, M. Shaposhnikov, A. Shkerin, and S. Zell, Matter matters in Einstein-Cartan gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 064036 (2021), [arXiv:2106.13811 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [46] G. K. Karananas, C. Rigouzzo, and S. Zell, Coupling Metric-Affine Gravity to Axionic Fields, To appear.

- [47] G. R. Dvali, Removing the cosmological bound on the axion scale, (1995), [arXiv:hep-ph/9505253](#).
- [48] D. J. E. Marsh, Axion Cosmology, *Phys. Rept.* **643**, 1 (2016), [arXiv:1510.07633 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [49] G. K. Karananas, M. Shaposhnikov, and S. Zell, Weyl-invariant Einstein-Cartan gravity: unifying the strong CP and hierarchy puzzles, *JHEP* **11**, 146, [arXiv:2406.11956 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [50] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, Calculation of the axion mass based on high-temperature lattice quantum chromodynamics, *Nature* **539**, 69 (2016), [arXiv:1606.07494 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [51] K. Saikawa and S. Shirai, Primordial gravitational waves, precisely: The role of thermodynamics in the Standard Model, *JCAP* **05**, 035, [arXiv:1803.01038 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski, and L. G. Yaffe, Qcd and instantons at finite temperature, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53**, 43 (1981).