

QCD Axion Dark Matter in String Theory: Haloscopes and Helioscopes as Probes of the Landscape

Naomi Gendler^a and David J. E. Marsh^b

^a*Jefferson Physical Laboratory, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138 USA and*

^b*Theoretical Particle Physics and Cosmology, King's College London,
Strand, London, WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom*

Laboratory experiments have the capacity to detect the QCD axion in the next decade, and precisely measure its mass, if it composes the majority of the dark matter. In type IIB string theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds in the geometric regime, the QCD axion mass, m_a , is strongly correlated with the topological Hodge number $h^{1,1}$. We compute m_a in a scan of 185,965 compactifications of type IIB string theory on toric hypersurface Calabi-Yau threefolds. We compute the range of $h^{1,1}$ probed by different experiments under the condition that the QCD axion can provide the observed dark matter density with minimal fine-tuning. Taking the experiments DMRadio, ADMX, MADMAX, and BREAD as indicative on different mass ranges, the $h^{1,1}$ distributions peak near $h^{1,1} = 24.9, 65.4, 196.8, \text{ and } 310.9$, respectively. We furthermore conclude that, without severe fine tuning, detection of the QCD axion as dark matter *at any mass* disfavors 80% of models with $h^{1,1} = 491$, which is thought to have the most known Calabi-Yau threefolds. Measurement of the solar axion mass with IAXO is the dominant probe of all models with $h^{1,1} \gtrsim 250$. This study demonstrates the immense importance of axion detection in experimentally constraining the string landscape.

Introduction. The quantum chromodynamics (QCD) axion is a hypothetical particle, θ , first proposed in the 1970s [1–3] to solve the problem of CP invariance of the strong nuclear force [4]. In the early 1980s, experimentally viable versions of this model were constructed in quantum field theory [5–8], and it was soon realized [9–11] that these ‘invisible’ axion models can provide an explanation for the observed [12] cosmic dark matter (DM). The QCD axion mass, m_a , is determined by its ‘decay constant’, f_a : $m_a = 5.70(1) \mu\text{eV}(10^{12} \text{ GeV}/f_a)$ [2, 3, 13].

The QCD axion is typically searched for by its coupling to electromagnetism, $g_{a\gamma} = C\alpha/(2\pi f_a)$, where α is the fine structure constant, and $C \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ is model dependent [14–16]. Due to the immense experimental challenge to detect the axion [17–20], QCD axion DM is in the relatively unique position that the original theories from the 1980’s remain largely unconstrained.

The experimental landscape, however, is undergoing a sea change. In 2018 the Axion Dark Matter eXperiment (ADMX) demonstrated for the first time experimental sensitivity to the 1980s target axion DM models [7, 8] of a given \mathcal{C} , at axion mass $m_a \approx 2.7 \mu\text{eV}$ [21]. ADMX uses a resonant microwave cavity to search for axion DM [22], giving the ability to precisely determine the axion mass in the event of a detection. Cavity resonators, due to limitations imposed by volume at low and high frequency, are only a viable technology to detect axions over around a decade in mass [23, 24]. In par-

allel, theoretical and experimental groups around the world have developed a wide variety of complementary technologies that have the capability to detect QCD axion DM across a much wider range, $10^{-11} \text{ eV} \lesssim m_a \lesssim 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$, within the coming decade or so [23, 25, 26]. The question, then, is: what is the axion mass?

There are two possibilities for QCD axion DM production in the early Universe: the ‘pre-inflation’ and the ‘post-inflation’ scenarios (see reviews [25, 27, 28]). In the pre-inflation scenario, cosmic inflation (or any alternative initial conditions scenario) has the effect of hiding from view the high energy physics responsible for the existence of the axion, leaving a uniform field everywhere at early times. There is a free (stochastic) parameter associated to this mechanism, the ‘initial misalignment angle’, θ_i , and therefore the axion mass is able to span a wide range and still provide the correct DM relic density, $\Omega_a h^2 \approx 0.12$ [12], restricted only by the fine tuning allowed on θ_i . In the alternative post-inflation scenario the axion is assumed to be given by the phase of a complex field, $\Phi = \rho e^{i\theta}$, which undergoes spontaneous symmetry breaking and forms cosmic strings [29] that subsequently decay producing axions [30, 31]. Current numerical simulations of this scenario predict $95 \mu\text{eV} \lesssim m_a \lesssim 450 \mu\text{eV}$ if the axion provides the DM relic density [32–34].

What does string theory have to say? String theory provides a natural mechanism for the existence of the QCD axion, and generically predicts a range

of other axion-like particles [35–41]. In this context, the decay constants of the axions are typically fixed by the volumes of some internal regions of the six-dimensional compact manifold [42], and so, in principle, axion detection can probe extra dimensions and the string theory landscape. To make concrete progress in this direction we restrict our search space to type IIB string theory compactified on Calabi-Yau (CY) threefolds [43, 44] in the geometric regime realized as hypersurfaces in toric varieties [45]. The QCD axion arises as the integral of the ten-dimensional C_4 potential over a four-cycle in the geometry that hosts QCD, modeled by a stack of D7 branes. The geometry is chosen such that the gauge coupling of QCD at low energy matches observations.

It has been observed by us and in previous studies [40, 41, 46, 47] that the axion decay constant and mass in such setups is strongly correlated with the topological Hodge number $h^{1,1}$ of the CY. On the other hand, we note that such a setup alone does not uniquely predict the value of C in the axion-photon coupling, since this depends on the charged matter content below the compactification scale. String theory predicts the QCD axion mass in terms of the topology of the CY, and experiments that measure the QCD axion mass thus constrain the topology. Our main result is summarized by Fig. 1: we present a distribution of the fraction of CYs in our ensemble that give rise to a detectable QCD axion in mass ranges covered by representative experiments. We now explain how this result was arrived at.

Pre-inflation Relic Abundance and Fine Tuning. In this scenario, the QCD axion relic abundance is found by solving the homogeneous Klein-Gordon equation, which, at temperatures above the QCD crossover, is: $\ddot{\theta} + 3H(T)\dot{\theta} + \frac{\chi(T)}{f_a^2} \sin \theta = 0$, where $H(T)$ is the Hubble rate given the Standard Model degrees of freedom [48], and $\chi(T)$ is the QCD topological susceptibility [49], giving $m_a(T) = \sqrt{\chi(T)}/f_a$. For small θ_i , the axion field begins to oscillate when $3H(T_{\text{osc}}) \approx m_a(T_{\text{osc}})$, after which time the axion number density is conserved. For large θ_i the time of oscillations receives logarithmic corrections [50], which can be accounted for by a correction factor $\mathcal{F}(\theta_i)$ to the relic density (which we compute following Refs. [27, 51]):

$$\rho_a \approx \frac{1}{2} m_a(T_0) m_a(T_{\text{osc}}) f_a^2 \theta_i^2 \mathcal{F}(\theta_i) \frac{g_S(T_0)}{g_S(T_{\text{osc}})} \left(\frac{T_0}{T_{\text{osc}}} \right)^3, \quad (1)$$

with g_S the number of relativistic degrees of freedom in the entropy, and T_0 the temperature of the




FIG. 1. The fraction of Calabi-Yau threefolds that fall into the range of sensitivity for each QCD axion experiment, as a function of $h^{1,1}$.

Universe today.

In order for the QCD axion to explain the observed DM density, $\Omega_a h^2 = \rho_a / 8.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ eV}^4 \approx 0.12$, we impose a Gaussian likelihood for $\Omega_a h^2$ following Ref. [12]. Fixing $\theta_i \sim 1$, one obtains too large axion relic density at large f_a , and too small axion relic density at small f_a . We compute the range of allowed f_a given a fine tuning measure on θ_i . We do so by finding the range where $\chi_{\text{min}}^2 < 1$ subject to the range $\theta_i \in [\epsilon, \pi - \epsilon]$ for given ϵ . The result is shown in Fig. 2. Allowing θ_i tuned small with $\epsilon \geq 10^{-3}$ allows $f_a \lesssim 10^{17}$ GeV. For small decay constants, however, even at this level of fine tuning the anharmonic corrections are only sufficient to allow the QCD axion to compose the entirety of the DM for $f_a \gtrsim 10^{10}$ GeV. As we will see, the fine tuning penalty in the pre-inflation scenario has a significant effect on conclusions related to the landscape.

String Theory Set Up. Our basic setup is to compactify type IIB string theory on (an orientifold of) a CY threefold X , realized as a hypersurface in a toric variety (we will not construct explicit orientifolds, therefore tacitly assuming that one exists with $h_{-}^{1,1} = 0$). With the inclusion of fluxes in the internal manifold, the resulting four-dimensional scalar F-term potential can be characterized in terms of a Kähler potential \mathcal{K} and superpotential W :

$$\mathcal{K} = -2 \log \mathcal{V}, \quad W = W_0 + \sum_{\ell} A_{\ell} e^{-2\pi q_{\ell}^i T_i}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{V} = \text{vol}(X)$, W_0 is the flux-induced Gukov-Vafa-Witten superpotential [52], the A_{ℓ} are the Pfaffian prefactors, which in general depend on the complex structure moduli, q_{ℓ}^i are instanton charges, and




FIG. 2. The minimum value of $\chi^2(f_a)$ from Eq. (1) and the *Planck* [12] measurement approximated as a Gaussian likelihood. We allow fine tuning of the initial misalignment angle in the range $\theta_i \in [\epsilon, \pi - \epsilon]$. For moderate fine-tuning $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ it is possible to accommodate large values of f_a , but values $f_a \lesssim 10^{10}$ GeV are severely penalized even for very small ϵ . We impose $\chi^2 < 1$ in our string theory ensemble to select models where the QCD axion can be all of the DM in the pre-inflation scenario with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$.

$i = 1, \dots, h^{1,1}$. The fields appearing in the exponential are the complexified Kähler moduli, given by

$$T_j := \tau_j + i\theta_j = \frac{1}{2} \int_{D_j} J \wedge J + i \int_{D_j} C_4, \quad (3)$$

where J is the Kähler form on X , D_j is a four-cycle, and C_4 is the ten-dimensional Ramond-Ramond four-form potential. We will take $W_0 = A_\ell = 1$ in this work and leave the effects of supersymmetry breaking and fermion zero-mode counting to future endeavors. Thus defined, the τ_i are the volumes of a basis of divisors (4-cycles), and θ_i are the axions in the same basis.

We do not fashion explicit realizations of the Standard Model (SM) in this setup: rather, we consider toy models of the SM as stacks of D7-branes on various calibrated four-cycles in the CY. We do not engineer the chiral spectrum of the SM, but we impose on the geometry that the infrared gauge couplings of the SM are in the right range. Namely, the microscopic gauge coupling of an $SU(N)$ gauge theory living on a stack of D7-branes wrapping a four-cycle D is given by

$$\frac{1}{g_{UV}^2} \propto \text{vol}(D). \quad (4)$$

Given a four-cycle volume $\text{vol}(D)$, the IR gauge coupling depends on the β -function of the gauge theory. For QCD on a four-cycle D_{QCD} , assuming no

extra vectorlike pairs, low-scale supersymmetry implies $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) \approx 25$, while high-scale (or no) supersymmetry implies $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) \approx 40$. In this work, we impose $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) = 40$ as a benchmark value.

The parameter space of 2- and 4-cycle sizes for a given CY X is known as the Kähler cone, K_X . Without any sources of supersymmetry breaking, these parameters are massless moduli, which are experimentally excluded. Stabilizing these moduli is an important problem in string theory, and in this work we will make the assumption that the moduli can be stabilized by perturbative corrections to \mathcal{K} at any point in K_X , or more specifically in some region where the gauge couplings take the correct values. The interplay of axion physics and more explicit moduli stabilization schemes has been studied in Refs. [37, 39, 53, 54].

We select points in K_X via the following method: first, choose the point closest to the origin in K_X such that that all 2-cycles have volume at least 1 in string units. Then, choose a four-cycle D_{QCD} on which to host a toy version of QCD. Perform a homogeneous rescaling of the Kähler parameters such that $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) = 40$. It was observed in Ref. [41] that the resulting axion physics is not highly sensitive to angle within the Kähler cone, so we take the point chosen in this way as representative.

Having chosen a point in moduli space, we compute the QCD axion decay constant. The axion potential is estimated by

$$V_{\text{QCD}} \approx \chi(T)U(\theta_{\text{QCD}}) + \sum_{\ell} 8\pi \frac{\vec{q}_\ell \cdot \vec{\tau}}{\mathcal{V}^2} e^{-2\pi \vec{q}_\ell \cdot \vec{\tau}} [1 - \cos(2\pi q_\ell^i \theta_i)], \quad (5)$$

where $U(\theta)$ is the periodic potential generated by low-scale non-perturbative QCD effects, which is a cosine at high T [13, 49, 55, 56]. The kinetic term for the axions is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} = -\frac{M_{\text{pl}}}{2} K_{ij} \partial_\mu \theta^i \partial^\mu \theta^j, \quad (6)$$

where $K_{ij} = 2 \partial_{T_i} \partial_{\bar{T}_j} \mathcal{K}$ and M_{pl} is the reduced Planck mass.

The decay constant of the QCD axion, in the approximation that the instanton scales in (5) are hierarchical, is [46]:

$$f_a = \frac{M_{\text{pl}}}{2\pi} \left[\sum_{\ell} q_{\ell n} (\mathbb{M}^{-1})_{\ell n}^{\ell} \right]^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

where the index n denotes the cycle D_{QCD} and \mathbb{M} is the change-of-basis matrix that takes the original




FIG. 3. Kernel density estimates of the QCD axion mass for each value of $h^{1,1}$ in the dataset.

charges in (5) to the kinetic and approximate mass eigenbasis (see [46] for more detail).

Axion Experiments. Proposed axion experiments will probe 10^{-11} eV $\lesssim m_a \lesssim 10^{-2}$ eV for the QCD axion [26], within the limits imposed by astrophysics [57–62] and $f_a < M_{\text{pl}}$. In this work, we consider four representative ‘haloscope’ axion DM experiments and their target mass ranges: DMRadio [63], ADMX [24]; MADMAX [64] and BREAD [65] (the implications for other experiments and proposals, e.g. Refs. [66–69] can be inferred from the mass range). Importantly, all of these projections assume the QCD axion to be all of the local DM density. We also consider the ‘helioscope’ IAXO, which can detect and measure the mass of QCD axion models with large C in the range 10^{-3} eV $\lesssim m_a \lesssim 10^{-1}$ eV [70, 71]. IAXO detects axions produced in the sun, and thus does not depend on the relic abundance, but for the QCD axion to be detectable requires an increased C [70, 71], which can be achieved via anomalies [14–16] (with the QCD axion interacting only via the D-brane Chern-Simons action, plus IR mixing with the pion, we have $C \approx \pm 1 - 0.87$ [46]).

Results. An important lesson that can be drawn from numerous studies of string axions [40, 41, 46, 47, 72, 73] is that axion decay constants (and thus QCD axion mass) are highly correlated with $h^{1,1}$. The axion experiments given above are sensitive to the QCD axion mass in different ranges. Therefore, a detection by any one of these experiments allows us to make an inference on $h^{1,1}$ in the landscape of string theory compactifications. We now make this correlation between $h^{1,1}$ and experiments concrete.

To this end, we analyzed an ensemble of 185,965

CY threefolds obtained as hypersurfaces in toric varieties. These manifolds are explicitly made via Batyrev’s construction [45] by triangulating polytopes in the Kreuzer-Skarke database [74] using CYTOOLS [75]. Our scan consisted of at most 100 randomly selected polytopes per $h^{1,1}$, sampled in steps of 10 starting at $h^{1,1} = 10$, with the addition of the single polytope with $h^{1,1} = 491$ (the largest in the set). For each polytope, a set of triangulations was obtained using the `random_triangulations_fast` method in CYTOOLS. The number of triangulations sampled per polytope was chosen such that the total number of triangulations per $h^{1,1}$ was 1000. As pointed out in Ref. [76], this sampling method does not necessarily produce a fair sample on the space of triangulations. Sampling triangulations and inequivalent CYs are difficult problems that we are currently investigating, but we do not expect them to qualitatively change the picture presented here.

For each Calabi-Yau threefold in our ensemble, we randomly choose at most five four-cycles to host QCD, as well as a point in moduli space, as described in the previous section. Once these data are specified, we read off the QCD axion decay constant using (7), and bin by experiment.

Our results are shown in Fig 1, giving the fraction of CYs in the ensemble at each $h^{1,1}$ where the QCD axion falls in the range of each experiment. Due to the correlation of f_a with $h^{1,1}$, detection of the QCD axion as DM by any experiment would favour particular values of $h^{1,1}$ in the ensemble.

The most intuitive way to understand these results is to note the correlation of the QCD axion mass with $h^{1,1}$ in this landscape. To this end, in Fig. 3, we show the distribution of masses (using kernel density estimation) for each value of $h^{1,1}$ in our dataset. Fig. 3 includes every instance of the QCD axion, rather than restricting to instances in which the QCD axion can compose all of the dark matter.

To investigate the effect on f_a of taking the QCD divisor with volume 40 found as specified above, we used Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling [77] of the Weil-Petersson prior within the stretched Kähler cone with a Gaussian likelihood for $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) = 40 \pm 1$ on a single CY with $h^{1,1} = 10$ (a more complete study of the landscape using this method is beyond the scope of the present work, but is under investigation). We found that the resulting spread in f_a is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. We also ran our analysis imposing $\text{vol}(D_{\text{QCD}}) = 25$ and found that our results do not change significantly.

Discussion. We have demonstrated the immense power of experiments to cut down the string land-

scape by measuring the QCD axion mass and thus making an inference on $h^{1,1}$. Though the counting measure on the set of toric hypersurface CYs is not known, the polytope with the overwhelming majority of (possibly equivalent) triangulations has $h^{1,1} = 491$ [76]. In our scans and previous work [46] we found that this case has mean decay constant 2.6×10^9 GeV, which cannot give all of the DM without severe fine tuning $\epsilon \ll 10^{-6}$. Nonetheless, around 20% of models with $h^{1,1} = 491$ lie in the untuned BREAD and MADMAX sensitivity regions. On the other hand, if \mathcal{C} is large, IAXO offers sensitivity to around 50% of the $h^{1,1} = 491$ samples (from a string theory perspective, this mass range was proposed in [78]).

We have considered only closed string axions, which are necessarily in the pre-inflation regime [42], with the inflationary scale below the compactification scale (if this is not the case, the early Universe would be highly exotic and almost impossible to study analytically, although see Refs. [79–81]). In string theory, the alternative post-inflation scenario only seems possible if the QCD axion is from the *open string* sector, which, however, may be outside of the geometric regime of control [53]. It is possible, however, that experiments and astrophysics

could determine the axion to be in the post-inflation scenario by detecting the ‘miniclusters’ predicted by cosmic string decay [64, 65, 82–89]. Such a detection would have very profound implications for string theory as it would appear to exclude all models we have considered and a vast region of the landscape. Further study of post-inflation and open string QCD axions in string theory is warranted. Detection of the QCD axion, either as dark matter or through a helioscope, provides strong constraints on our universe’s location in the string theory landscape.

Acknowledgments

We thank Liam McAllister and Jakob Moritz for discussions and helpful comments on a draft. We thank Edward Witten for some reassuring correspondence. DJEM is supported by an Ernest Rutherford Fellowship from the STFC, Grant No. ST/T004037/1 and by a Leverhulme Trust Research Project (RPG-2022-145). The work of NG was supported in part by a grant from the Simons Foundation (602883,CV), the DellaPietra Foundation, and by the NSF grant PHY-2013858. We would like to thank the Harvard Swampland Initiative program, where this work was initiated.

-
- [1] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).
 - [2] S. Weinberg, A New Light Boson?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223 (1978).
 - [3] F. Wilczek, Problem of Strong P and T Invariance in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279 (1978).
 - [4] C. Abel *et al.*, Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081803 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11966 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [5] J. E. Kim, Weak Interaction Singlet and Strong CP Invariance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 103 (1979).
 - [6] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Can Confinement Ensure Natural CP Invariance of Strong Interactions?, *Nucl. Phys. B* **166**, 493 (1980).
 - [7] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, A Simple Solution to the Strong CP Problem with a Harmless Axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **104**, 199 (1981).
 - [8] A. R. Zhitnitsky, On Possible Suppression of the Axion Hadron Interactions. (In Russian), *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **31**, 260 (1980).
 - [9] M. Dine and W. Fischler, The not-so-harmless axion, *Physics Letters B* **120**, 137 (1983).
 - [10] J. Preskill, M. B. Wise, and F. Wilczek, Cosmology of the invisible axion, *Physics Letters B* **120**, 127 (1983).
 - [11] L. F. Abbott and P. Sikivie, A cosmological bound on the invisible axion, *Physics Letters B* **120**, 133 (1983).
 - [12] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [13] G. Grilli di Cortona, E. Hardy, J. Pardo Vega, and G. Villadoro, The QCD axion, precisely, *JHEP* **01**, 034, [arXiv:1511.02867 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [14] L. Di Luzio, F. Mescia, and E. Nardi, Redefining the Axion Window, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 031801 (2017), [arXiv:1610.07593 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [15] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, and L. Visinelli, The landscape of QCD axion models, *Phys. Rept.* **870**, 1 (2020), [arXiv:2003.01100 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [16] V. Plakkot and S. Hoof, Anomaly ratio distributions of hadronic axion models with multiple heavy quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 075017 (2021), [arXiv:2107.12378 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [17] W. Wuensch, S. De Panfilis-Wuensch, Y. K. Sermertzidis, J. T. Rogers, A. C. Melissinos, H. J. Ha-

- lama, B. E. Moskowit, A. G. Prodel, W. B. Fowler, and F. A. Nezrick, Results of a Laboratory Search for Cosmic Axions and Other Weakly Coupled Light Particles, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 3153 (1989).
- [18] C. Hagmann, P. Sikivie, N. S. Sullivan, and D. B. Tanner, Results from a search for cosmic axions, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 1297 (1990).
- [19] S. DePanfilis, A. C. Melissinos, B. E. Moskowit, J. T. Rogers, Y. K. Semertzidis, W. U. Wuensch, H. J. Halama, A. G. Prodel, W. B. Fowler, and F. A. Nezrick, Limits on the abundance and coupling of cosmic axions at $4.5; m_a; 5.0 \mu\text{ev}$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 839 (1987).
- [20] C. Hagmann *et al.*, First results from a second generation galactic axion experiment, *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **51**, 209 (1996), [arXiv:astro-ph/9607022](#).
- [21] N. Du *et al.* (ADMX), A Search for Invisible Axion Dark Matter with the Axion Dark Matter Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 151301 (2018), [arXiv:1804.05750 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [22] P. Sikivie, Experimental Tests of the Invisible Axion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1415 (1983), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **52**, 695 (1984)].
- [23] Y. K. Semertzidis and S. Youn, Axion dark matter: How to see it?, *Sci. Adv.* **8**, abm9928 (2022), [arXiv:2104.14831 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] I. Stern, ADMX Status, *PoS ICHEP2016*, 198 (2016), [arXiv:1612.08296 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [25] F. Chadha-Day, J. Ellis, and D. J. E. Marsh, Axion dark matter: What is it and why now?, *Sci. Adv.* **8**, abj3618 (2022), [arXiv:2105.01406 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] C. B. Adams *et al.*, Axion Dark Matter, in *Snowmass 2021* (2022) [arXiv:2203.14923 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [27] D. J. E. Marsh, Axion Cosmology, *Phys. Rept.* **643**, 1 (2016), [arXiv:1510.07633 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [28] C. A. J. O'Hare, Cosmology of axion dark matter, *PoS COSMICWISPerS*, 040 (2024), [arXiv:2403.17697 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] T. W. B. Kibble, Topology of Cosmic Domains and Strings, *J. Phys. A* **9**, 1387 (1976).
- [30] C. Hagmann and P. Sikivie, Computer simulations of the motion and decay of global strings, *Nucl. Phys. B* **363**, 247 (1991).
- [31] R. A. Battye and E. P. S. Shellard, Axion string constraints, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2954 (1994), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **76**, 2203–2204 (1996)], [arXiv:astro-ph/9403018](#).
- [32] M. Gorghetto, E. Hardy, and G. Villadoro, More axions from strings, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 050 (2021), [arXiv:2007.04990 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [33] M. Buschmann, J. W. Foster, A. Hook, A. Peterson, D. E. Willcox, W. Zhang, and B. R. Safdi, Dark matter from axion strings with adaptive mesh refinement, *Nature Commun.* **13**, 1049 (2022), [arXiv:2108.05368 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [34] K. Saikawa, J. Redondo, A. Vaquero, and M. Kaltschmidt, Spectrum of global string networks and the axion dark matter mass, (2024), [arXiv:2401.17253 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] E. Witten, Some Properties of O(32) Superstrings, *Phys. Lett. B* **149**, 351 (1984).
- [36] P. Svrcek and E. Witten, Axions In String Theory, *JHEP* **06**, 051, [arXiv:hep-th/0605206](#).
- [37] J. P. Conlon, The QCD axion and moduli stabilisation, *JHEP* **05**, 078, [arXiv:hep-th/0602233](#).
- [38] A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos, S. Dubovsky, N. Kaloper, and J. March-Russell, String Axiverse, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 123530 (2010), [arXiv:0905.4720 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [39] M. Cicoli, M. Goodsell, and A. Ringwald, The type IIB string axiverse and its low-energy phenomenology, *JHEP* **10**, 146, [arXiv:1206.0819 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [40] M. Demirtas, C. Long, L. McAllister, and M. Stillman, The Kreuzer-Skarke Axiverse, *JHEP* **04**, 138, [arXiv:1808.01282 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [41] M. Demirtas, N. Gendler, C. Long, L. McAllister, and J. Moritz, PQ axiverse, *JHEP* **06**, 092, [arXiv:2112.04503 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] M. Reece, Extra-Dimensional Axion Expectations, (2024), [arXiv:2406.08543 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger, and E. Witten, Vacuum configurations for superstrings, *Nucl. Phys. B* **258**, 46 (1985).
- [44] B. R. Greene, String theory on Calabi-Yau manifolds, in *Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics (TASI 96): Fields, Strings, and Duality* (1996) pp. 543–726, [arXiv:hep-th/9702155](#).
- [45] V. V. Batyrev, Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for calabi-yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties (1993), [arXiv:alg-geom/9310003 \[alg-geom\]](#).
- [46] N. Gendler, D. J. E. Marsh, L. McAllister, and J. Moritz, Glimmers from the Axiverse, (2023), [arXiv:2309.13145 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [47] V. M. Mehta, M. Demirtas, C. Long, D. J. E. Marsh, L. McAllister, and M. J. Stott, Superradiance in string theory, *JCAP* **07**, 033, [arXiv:2103.06812 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [48] K. Saikawa and S. Shirai, Primordial gravitational waves, precisely: The role of thermodynamics in the Standard Model, *JCAP* **05**, 035, [arXiv:1803.01038 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, Calculation of the axion mass based on high-temperature lattice quantum chromodynamics, *Nature* **539**, 69 (2016), [arXiv:1606.07494 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [50] D. H. Lyth, Axions and inflation: Sitting in the vacuum, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 3394 (1992).
- [51] A. Diez-Tejedor and D. J. E. Marsh, Cosmological production of ultralight dark matter axions, (2017), [arXiv:1702.02116 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] S. Gukov, C. Vafa, and E. Witten, CFT's from Calabi-Yau four folds, *Nucl. Phys. B* **584**, 69 (2000), [Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.B* **608**, 477–478 (2001)], [arXiv:hep-th/9906070](#).
- [53] M. Cicoli, Axion-like Particles from String Compactifications, in *9th Patras Workshop on Axions, WIMPs and WISPs* (2013) pp. 235–242,

- arXiv:1309.6988 [hep-th].
- [54] I. Broeckel, M. Cicoli, A. Maharana, K. Singh, and K. Sinha, Moduli stabilisation and the statistics of axion physics in the landscape, *JHEP* **08**, 059, [Addendum: *JHEP* 01, 191 (2022)], arXiv:2105.02889 [hep-th].
- [55] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski, and L. G. Yaffe, QCD and Instantons at Finite Temperature, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53**, 43 (1981).
- [56] O. Wantz and E. P. S. Shellard, Axion Cosmology Revisited, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 123508 (2010), arXiv:0910.1066 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] A. Arvanitaki, M. Baryakhtar, and X. Huang, Discovering the QCD Axion with Black Holes and Gravitational Waves, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084011 (2015), arXiv:1411.2263 [hep-ph].
- [58] M. J. Stott and D. J. E. Marsh, Black hole spin constraints on the mass spectrum and number of axionlike fields, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 083006 (2018), arXiv:1805.02016 [hep-ph].
- [59] S. Hoof, D. J. E. Marsh, J. Sisk-Reynés, J. H. Matthews, and C. Reynolds, Getting More Out of Black Hole Superradiance: a Statistically Rigorous Approach to Ultralight Boson Constraints, (2024), arXiv:2406.10337 [hep-ph].
- [60] A. Burrows, M. S. Turner, and R. P. Brinkmann, Axions and SN 1987a, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 1020 (1989).
- [61] G. G. Raffelt, Astrophysical axion bounds, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **741**, 51 (2008), arXiv:hep-ph/0611350.
- [62] A. Lella, P. Carena, G. Co', G. Lucente, M. Gianotti, A. Mirizzi, and T. Rauscher, Getting the most on supernova axions, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023001 (2024), arXiv:2306.01048 [hep-ph].
- [63] L. Brouwer *et al.* (DMRadio), Projected sensitivity of DMRadio-m3: A search for the QCD axion below 1 μeV , *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103008 (2022), arXiv:2204.13781 [hep-ex].
- [64] S. Beurthey *et al.*, MADMAX Status Report, (2020), arXiv:2003.10894 [physics.ins-det].
- [65] J. Liu *et al.* (BREAD), Broadband Solenoidal Haloscope for Terahertz Axion Detection, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 131801 (2022), arXiv:2111.12103 [physics.ins-det].
- [66] D. Horns, J. Jaeckel, A. Lindner, A. Lobanov, J. Redondo, and A. Ringwald, Searching for WISPy Cold Dark Matter with a Dish Antenna, *JCAP* **04**, 016, arXiv:1212.2970 [hep-ph].
- [67] D. Budker, P. W. Graham, M. Ledbetter, S. Rajendran, and A. Sushkov, Proposal for a Cosmic Axion Spin Precession Experiment (CASPER), *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 021030 (2014), arXiv:1306.6089 [hep-ph].
- [68] D. J. E. Marsh, K.-C. Fong, E. W. Lentz, L. Smejkal, and M. N. Ali, Proposal to Detect Dark Matter using Axionic Topological Antiferromagnets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 121601 (2019), arXiv:1807.08810 [hep-ph].
- [69] M. Lawson, A. J. Millar, M. Pancaldi, E. Vitagliano, and F. Wilczek, Tunable axion plasma haloscopes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 141802 (2019), arXiv:1904.11872 [hep-ph].
- [70] T. Dafni, C. A. J. O'Hare, B. Lakić, J. Galán, F. J. Iguaz, I. G. Irastorza, K. Jakovčić, G. Luzón, J. Redondo, and E. Ruiz Chóliz, Weighing the solar axion, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 035037 (2019), arXiv:1811.09290 [hep-ph].
- [71] S. Hoof, J. Jaeckel, and L. J. Thormaehlen, Quantifying uncertainties in the solar axion flux and their impact on determining axion model parameters, *JCAP* **09**, 006, arXiv:2101.08789 [hep-ph].
- [72] V. M. Mehta, M. Demirtas, C. Long, D. J. E. Marsh, L. McAllister, and M. J. Stott, Superradiance Exclusions in the Landscape of Type IIB String Theory, (2020), arXiv:2011.08693 [hep-th].
- [73] J. Halverson, C. Long, B. Nelson, and G. Salinas, Towards string theory expectations for photon couplings to axionlike particles, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 106010 (2019), arXiv:1909.05257 [hep-th].
- [74] M. Kreuzer and H. Skarke, Complete classification of reflexive polyhedra in four-dimensions, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **4**, 1209 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0002240.
- [75] M. Demirtas, A. Rios-Tascon, and L. McAllister, CYTools: A Software Package for Analyzing Calabi-Yau Manifolds, (2022), arXiv:2211.03823 [hep-th].
- [76] M. Demirtas, L. McAllister, and A. Rios-Tascon, Bounding the Kreuzer-Skarke Landscape, *Fortsch. Phys.* **68**, 2000086 (2020), arXiv:2008.01730 [hep-th].
- [77] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, emcee: The MCMC Hammer, *Publications of the ASP* **125**, 306 (2013), arXiv:1202.3665 [astro-ph.IM].
- [78] N. Gendler and C. Vafa, Axions in the Dark Dimension, (2024), arXiv:2404.15414 [hep-th].
- [79] B. R. Greene, A. D. Shapere, C. Vafa, and S.-T. Yau, Stringy Cosmic Strings and Noncompact Calabi-Yau Manifolds, *Nucl. Phys. B* **337**, 1 (1990).
- [80] J. March-Russell and H. Tillim, Axiverse Strings, (2021), arXiv:2109.14637 [hep-th].
- [81] J. N. Benabou, Q. Bonnefoy, M. Buschmann, S. Kumar, and B. R. Safdi, The Cosmological Dynamics of String Theory Axion Strings, (2023), arXiv:2312.08425 [hep-ph].
- [82] J. Schütte-Engel, D. J. E. Marsh, A. J. Millar, A. Sekine, F. Chadha-Day, S. Hoof, M. N. Ali, K.-C. Fong, E. Hardy, and L. Smejkal, Axion quasiparticles for axion dark matter detection, *JCAP* **08**, 066, arXiv:2102.05366 [hep-ph].
- [83] M. Fairbairn, D. J. E. Marsh, and J. Quevillon, Searching for the QCD Axion with Gravitational Microlensing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 021101 (2017), arXiv:1701.04787 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] C. A. J. O'Hare and A. M. Green, Axion astronomy with microwave cavity experiments, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 063017 (2017), arXiv:1701.03118 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] T. D. P. Edwards, B. J. Kavanagh, L. Visinelli, and C. Weniger, Transient Radio Signatures from Neutron Star Encounters with QCD Axion Mini-

- clusters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 131103 (2021), [arXiv:2011.05378 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [86] D. Ellis, D. J. E. Marsh, B. Eggemeier, J. Niemeyer, J. Redondo, and K. Dolag, Structure of axion miniclusters, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 103514 (2022), [arXiv:2204.13187 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [87] S. J. Witte, S. Baum, M. Lawson, M. C. D. Marsh, A. J. Millar, and G. Salinas, Transient radio lines from axion miniclusters and axion stars, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063013 (2023), [arXiv:2212.08079 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [88] C. A. J. O’Hare, G. Pierobon, and J. Redondo, Axion minicluster streams in the solar neighbourhood, (2023), [arXiv:2311.17367 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [89] M. Gorghetto, E. Hardy, and G. Villadoro, More Axion Stars from Strings, (2024), [arXiv:2405.19389 \[hep-ph\]](#).