# Can primordial black holes explain the overabundance of bright super-early galaxies?

Antonio Matteri<sup>1</sup> <sup>(i)</sup>, Andrea Pallottini<sup>1,2</sup> <sup>(i)</sup>, and Andrea Ferrara<sup>1</sup> <sup>(i)</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica "Enrico Fermi", Universitá di Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 3, Pisa I-56127, Italy

Received Jan 8, 2025; accepted XX XXX, XXXX

# ABSTRACT

Received Jan 8, 2025; accepted XX XXX, XXXX **ABST**  *JWST* is detecting an excess of high-redshift ( $z \ge 10$ ), bright galax we investigate the impact of Primordial Black Holes (PBHs) on the early galaxies. We explore two key effects: (i) the enhancement of distribution of PBHs, and (ii) the luminosity boost, characterized powered by matter accretion onto PBHs. We build an effective must the evolution of the LF including the additional PBH contribution. (log *f*PBH  $\approx -5.42$ ) of massive (log *M*PBH/M<sub>o</sub>  $\approx 8.37$ ), non-emi abundance enhancement, this solution is excluded by CMB  $\mu$ -dist AGN emitting at super-Eddington luminosity ( $\lambda_E \approx 10$ ), the obser-mass log *M*PBH/M<sub>o</sub>  $\approx 3.69$  constituting a tiny (log *f*PBH  $\approx -8.16$ ) about 75% of the observed galaxies with M<sub>UV</sub> = -21 at z = 11 sl halos,  $M_h = 10^{8-9}$ M<sub>o</sub>. These predictions can be tested with avail analysis considers a lognormal PBH mass function and compare Further work is required to relax such limitations. Key words. Galaxies: evolution – high-redshift – luminosity func **1. Introduction** Since its launch, the *James Webb Space Telescope* (JWST) led to the photometric discovery (Naidu et al. 2022; Castellano et al. 2022; Atek et al. 2023; Robertson et al. 2023; Bunker et al. 2023; Hsiao et al. 2024; Zavala et al. 2024) of galaxies up to about redshift z = 14 (Carniani et al. 2024), when the Universe was  $\approx 300$  Myr old. The abundant new data from *JWST* are shedding light on the primordial Universe, allowing us to study the first galaxies in great detail. The analysis of the observations has shown the existence of an excess of high-redshift ( $z \ge 10$ ), bright galax-ies challenging most theoretical predictions (Labbé et al. 2023; Robertson et al. 2023, 2024; Casey et al. 2024; Harvey et al. 2025; Finkelstein et al. 2024; Casey et al. 2024; Harvey et al. 2025; Finkelstein et al. 2024; Casey et al. 2024; The inferred abundance of these systems is indeed about norder of magnitude biother than any prediction based on JWST is detecting an excess of high-redshift ( $z \ge 10$ ), bright galaxies challenging most theoretical predictions. To address this issue, we investigate the impact of Primordial Black Holes (PBHs) on the halo mass function and UV luminosity function (LF) of superearly galaxies. We explore two key effects: (i) the enhancement of massive halos abundance due to the compact nature and spatial distribution of PBHs, and (ii) the luminosity boost, characterized by the Eddington ratio  $\lambda_E$ , due to Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) powered by matter accretion onto PBHs. We build an effective model, calibrated using data at lower redshifts ( $z \approx 4-9$ ), to derive the evolution of the LF including the additional PBH contribution. Via Bayesian analysis, we find that: (a) Although a small fraction  $(\log f_{\text{PBH}} \approx -5.42)$  of massive  $(\log M_{\text{PBH}}/M_{\odot} \approx 8.37)$ , non-emitting ( $\lambda_E = 0$ ) PBHs can explain the galaxy excess via the halo abundance enhancement, this solution is excluded by CMB µ-distortion constraints on monochromatic PBHs. (b) If PBHs power an AGN emitting at super-Eddington luminosity ( $\lambda_E \approx 10$ ), the observed LF can be reproduced by a PBH population with characteristic mass log  $M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot} \approx 3.69$  constituting a tiny (log  $f_{\rm PBH} \approx -8.16$ ) fraction of the cosmic dark matter content. In the AGN scenario, about 75% of the observed galaxies with  $M_{UV} = -21$  at z = 11 should host a PBH-powered AGN and typically reside in low mass halos,  $M_h = 10^{8-9} M_{\odot}$ . These predictions can be tested with available and forthcoming JWST spectroscopic data. We note that our analysis considers a lognormal PBH mass function and compares its parameters with monochromatic limits on PBH abundance.

Key words. Galaxies: evolution - high-redshift - luminosity function - quasars: supermassive black holes

The inferred abundance of these systems is indeed about an order of magnitude higher than any prediction based on pre-JWST data, such as hydrodynamical simulations (e.g. IllustrisTNG, Vogelsberger et al. 2020; FLARES, Vijayan et al. 2021; BlueTides, Wilkins et al. 2017), abundance matching models (e.g. UniverseMachine, Behroozi et al. 2020), and also extrapolations from lower redshift fits (e.g. Bouwens et al. 2022a) of the UV luminosity function (LF). Such tension constitutes an important challenge to our knowledge of the galaxy formation and evolution process in the early Universe, and several possible solutions have been proposed to solve this problem.

Astrophysical solutions include a stochastic star formation rate (SFR) in early galaxies that could boost the bright end of the LF to the observed level (Mason et al. 2023; Shen et al. 2024). However, (i) the magnitude of the SFR flickering predicted from simulations is debated (Pallottini & Ferrara 2023; Sun et al. 2023), (ii) the r.m.s. amplitude necessary to explain the overabundance problem is shown to be inconsistent with the observed mass-metallicity relation (Pallottini et al. 2024), and (iii) spectral energy density analysis shows that the SFR stochasticity of early galaxies is relatively low (Ciesla et al. 2024).

Alternatively, the tension can be solved by scenarios in which either a negligible dust attenuation produced by radiation-driven outflows brightens the galaxies (attenuationfree, Ferrara et al. 2023, 2024), or the star formation efficiency is high due to inefficient supernova feedback in dense regions (Dekel et al. 2023). These models and their implications are still under scrutiny.

Moreover, modifications of the "concordance" ACDM model have also been explored. Indeed, if the number density of massive halos were higher than predicted by  $\Lambda CDM$ , the tension could be released without postulating significant changes in the underlying astrophysics (e.g. star formation efficiency, dust attenuation, etc.). This can be achieved, for instance, by assuming different cosmological scenarios, such as an early dark energy contribution at  $z \approx 3500$  (Klypin et al. 2021; Shen et al. 2024) that significantly changes the halo abundance at z > 10. In addition, the Halo Mass Function (HMF) can also be enhanced by (i) an effective modification of the transfer function (Padmanabhan & Loeb 2023), (ii) the presence of non-Gaussianities that make overdense regions more frequent (Biagetti et al. 2023), or (iii) the contribution of primordial black holes (PBHs) to the halo formation (Liu & Bromm 2022).

However, these proposals might cause other tensions: (i) an enhanced transfer function is argued to be excluded by lowz HST observations (Sabti et al. 2024), (ii) the amplitude of non-Gaussian fluctuations is tightly constrained by CMB observations (Planck Collaboration et al. 2020b), (iii) a monochromatic  $\approx 10^{10} \,\mathrm{M_{\odot}}$  PBH solution contributing to structure formation is excluded by Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)  $\mu$ distortions (Nakama et al. 2018; Gouttenoire et al. 2024).

In this work, we focus on the effects of PBHs on the observed galaxy LF relaxing the constraints imposed in Liu & Bromm (2022) by considering the possibility that PBHs have an extended mass function, as predicted by some inflationary models (García-Bellido et al. 2021; Carr et al. 2021a), and/or non-negligibly contribute to the UV luminosity of the host galaxy. These two additions make the model more realistic, in principle allowing for less massive PBHs to have an impact on observations without violating current CMB constraints (for the  $\mu$ -distortion limit in particular, see Wang et al. 2025)<sup>1</sup>.

# 2. Methods

We start by fixing the astrophysical model for star formation, emission, and attenuation by matching low ( $z \approx 4 - 9$ ) redshift data before considering the potential effects of PBHs. To this aim, we compute the HMF for a given PBH mass distribution (Sec. 2.1), fit the stellar emission of galaxies to the low-*z* LF (Sec. 2.2), add PBH emission contribution to the total UV luminosity (Sec. 2.3), compute the theoretical LF when PBHs are present (Sec. 2.4), and then determining the main parameters within a Bayesian framework (Sec. 2.5).

#### 2.1. PBH effects on structure formation

Following Inman & Ali-Haïmoud (2019), the power spectrum of  $\Lambda$ CDM can be modified through an additional term to account for the Poissonian shot noise (Carr & Silk 2018) produced by the discrete nature of PBHs

$$P_{\rm CDM} = P_{\rm \Lambda CDM} + P_{\rm PBH} \,, \tag{1a}$$

with

$$P_{\rm PBH} = \frac{f_{\rm PBH}^2}{n_{\rm PBH}} D^2 \Theta(k_{crit} - k), \qquad (1b)$$

where  $n_{\text{PBH}}$  is the comoving number density of PBHs, D = D(z) is the growth factor<sup>2</sup> from Inman & Ali-Haïmoud (2019), and  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  can be written as

$$f_{\rm PBH} = \frac{n_{\rm PBH} m_{\rm PBH}}{\Omega_{dm} \rho_c} \tag{1c}$$

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the paper we assume a flat Universe with Planck Collaboration et al. (2020a) parameters  $\Omega_m = 0.30966$ ,  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.68885$ ,  $\Omega_b = 0.04897$ ,  $\sigma_8 = 0.8102$ , and h = 0.6766, where  $\Omega_m$ ,  $\Omega_{\Lambda}$ ,  $\Omega_b$  are the matter, dark energy and baryon density ratios to the critical density, h is the Hubble constant in units of 100 km/s/Mpc and  $\sigma_8$  is the fluctuations' r.m.s. amplitude parameter.

<sup>2</sup> Since only PBHs have a Poisson noise term, in the initial perturbations isocurvature modes should be accounted for. The growth factor from Inman & Ali-Haïmoud (2019) refers to these fluctuations instead of the usual adiabatic ones.

Article number, page 2

for a monochromatic mass function.  $\Theta$  is the step function that suppresses the PBH contribution on scales smaller than the critical one (Liu & Bromm 2022)

$$k > k_{crit} = (2\pi^2 n_{\text{PBH}} / f_{\text{PBH}})^{1/3}$$
 (1d)

Such scales are strongly affected by nonlinear evolution, due to the seed effect (Carr & Silk 2018), and mode mixing between isocurvature and adiabatic modes (Liu et al. 2022). We normalize the power spectrum in eq. 1 by imposing the value for  $\sigma(R = 8 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}) = \sigma_8$  from Planck Collaboration et al. (2020a).

Following the excursion set theory for the halo collapse and using the approach from Press & Schechter (1974) accounting for the ellipsoidal collapse (Sheth & Tormen 2002), we compute the comoving number density of DM halos (Halo Mass Function, HMF) as a function of z and of the halo mass ( $M_h$ ).

Eqs. 1 hold for PBHs with a monochromatic mass function, as considered by Liu & Bromm (2022). In this work, we allow PBHs to have an extended mass function, adopting a lognormal distribution

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}n(>M)}{\mathrm{d}\log M} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\log M/M_{\mathrm{PBH}}}{\sigma}\right)^2\right],\tag{2}$$

where  $M_{\rm PBH}$  is the characteristic mass of PBHs, and  $\sigma$  is the r.m.s. of the distribution; the constant of proportionality is fixed by normalizing the integral of the distribution to  $f_{\rm PBH}$ . The monochromatic case can be retrieved in the limit  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ .

The lognormal mass function for PBHs is predicted by several inflationary models (e.g. Dolgov & Silk 1993; Green 2016; Kannike et al. 2017) and we choose it for its simple analytical form with only 3 parameters. Other mass functions are produced when considering different models (e.g. García-Bellido et al. 2021), eventually spanning a wider mass range than the lognormal and/or having several peaks. Further investigation should be undertaken to test them within our framework.

In Fig. 1 we show the HMF at z = 11 for several PBH models to highlight the differences to the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM structure formation. The corresponding power spectra are shown in the inset. Although in this case, PBHs constitute only a small fraction  $f_{PBH} = 10^{-5}$  of the dark matter density, they can significantly affect the power spectrum with a boost of  $\approx 10 \times \text{around } k_{crit}$ . The width of the mass function changes the sharpness of the power spectrum contribution, i.e. the higher  $\sigma$  the smoother it is around  $k_{crit}$ . An important feature of the power spectrum is the bump shift toward lower k for higher  $\sigma$  values. This is caused by the extended tail of the lognormal distribution. The general effect on the HMF is an enhancement in the halo abundance on a wide mass range peaked at a mass scale slightly larger than  $M_{PBH}$ . More massive PBHs require a smaller  $f_{PBH}$  to imprint the same relative increase in the halo abundance around  $M_{PBH}$ .

The extended mass function changes the functional form of the power spectrum term in eq. 1b, which must now be replaced with that in eq. A.5. In particular, the  $\Theta$  function becomes smoother and has a width that depends on  $\sigma$ ; the explicit derivation is given in appendix A.

#### 2.2. Stellar emission

We build an effective model for the stellar emission from galaxies that matches pre-*JWST* LF data and sets our baseline for super-early galaxy applications. The LF ( $\Phi_{UV}$ ) as a function of z



Fig. 1: Overview of the modifications to the Halo Mass Function (HMF) due to the Primordial Black Holes (PBH) contribution to the power spectrum. The Sheth & Tormen (2002) HMF (*n*) at z = 11 is plotted as a function of halo mass ( $M_h$ ) for a pure ACDM cosmology and for PBHs with lognormal mass functions, constituting a fraction  $f_{PBH} = 10^{-5}$  of the total dark matter density; each color corresponds to a different PBH mass  $M_{PBH} = 10^9 M_{\odot}$ ,  $10^{11} M_{\odot}$ , whereas continuous (dashed) lines represent monochromatic (lognormal with  $\sigma = 0.5$ ) mass functions. For reference, we show the corresponding power spectra at z = 0 ( $P_{CDM}$ , eq. 1) as a function of the wavenumber (k) as an inset.

is computed from the halo mass function  $n(> M_h, z)$  through the chain rule

$$\Phi_{\rm UV} = \frac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}M_{\rm UV}} (M_{\rm UV}, z) = \frac{\mathrm{d}n(>M_h, z)}{\mathrm{d}M_h} \frac{1}{\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{\rm UV}(M_h, z)}{\mathrm{d}M_h}},$$
(3)

where  $M_h$  is the mass of halos hosting galaxies of magnitude  $M_{UV}$ . With this approach, we only need an emission model  $M_{UV} = M_{UV}(M_h, z)$ , i.e. the expected magnitude of a galaxy based on its halo mass. Note that implicitly this neglects possible stochasticity contributions to the galaxy emission (see e.g. Mason et al. 2023; Pallottini & Ferrara 2023; Gelli et al. 2024; Sun et al. 2024, for more details on the impact).

In this work, we choose a flexible functional form for the emission model

$$\mathbf{M}_{\rm UV} = p_1 + \left[ p_2 \left( \frac{M_h}{10^{11} \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}} \right)^{p_3} + p_4 \right] \log \left( \frac{M_h}{10^{11} \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}} \right) + p_5 z^{p_6} \qquad (4)$$

where  $p_i$  are parameters. The function combines a power-law with a logarithm to properly match the LF at fixed redshift with an additional term for the explicit dependence on *z*. Despite this particular choice lacking a clear physical motivation, we find it gives good results over the whole redshift range we are considering. We fit these parameters to the LF data at z = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 from Bouwens et al. (2021), by assuming a purely  $\Lambda$ CDM model ( $f_{PBH} = 0$  in eq. 1) when computing the LF (eq. 3). Errors on LF data are treated as Gaussian, which is a rough approximation, but allows us to account for uncertain-



Fig. 2: UV luminosity function of galaxies at different redshifts compared to data (Bouwens et al. 2021, 2022a). The LF from our model (solid line, eq. 4) is fitted to the points at the reported redshifts (parameters in eq. 5).

ties of the fit in a simple way. The result is given by

$$p_{\text{fit}} = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ p_3 \\ p_4 \\ p_5 \\ p_6 \end{pmatrix}_{fit} = \begin{pmatrix} -13.58 \\ -8.80 \\ 0.0751 \\ 5.68 \\ -3.44 \\ 0.299 \end{pmatrix} \pm \begin{pmatrix} 5.91 \\ 7.67 \\ 0.0683 \\ 7.67 \\ 5.35 \\ 0.306 \end{pmatrix}$$
(5)

where the error of the fit is relatively large due to the high correlation between the parameters retrieved from the 6 parameters least square error procedure.

In Fig. 2 we report the modeled LF at different z along with the fitting data (Bouwens et al. 2021) and the Schechter function fit<sup>3</sup> from Bouwens et al. (2022a). The fitting function (eq. 4) appears to provide a very good approximation to the data over the whole redshift range of interest. The plot has been produced using the best-fit values from eq. 5 and neglecting their uncertainties. In general, this is a bad practice since it does not provide information about the robustness of the results. However, in this context, we are not interested in the precise values of the parameters, but only in the model agreement with the data points. In other words, it is not a problem if the solution we find does not have tightly constrained parameters. Therefore, we proceed to neglect the uncertainties in eq. 5 and consider only the best-fit values in the following treatment.

We plot the  $M_{UV} - M_h$  relation at z = 9 (Fig. 3) to compare our fiducial model with previous works. The models from Ferrara et al. (2023) are built through a semi-analytical model obtained fitting the LF at z = 7 and considering the dust attenuation (Inami et al. 2022) from the REBELS survey (Bouwens et al. 2022b); in addition, the attenuation-free case is reported labeled by AF. Behroozi et al. (2019) model uses the stellar-halo mass relation, derived via abundance matching, combined with their eq. D5 to link the stellar mass to the UV magnitude, including dust attenuation. We also report the results of the BlueTides (Wilkins et al. 2017; Feng et al. 2015, 2016) hydrodynamical N-body simulation focused on the properties of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> We underline that the fit from Bouwens et al. (2022a) is performed directly on the LF, while we perform a fit on the  $M_{UV} - M_h$  relation.



Fig. 3: UV magnitude  $(M_{UV})$  as a function of  $M_h$  at z = 9 within different models. The relation in this work is obtained via a fit of the luminosity function (see eq. 4 for the functional form and eq. 5 for the parameters). For comparison, we report  $M_{UV}(M_h)$  from the semi-analytical model of Ferrara et al. (2023, in the dust-attenuated, DA, and attenuation-free, AF, cases), from the abundance-matching based procedure of Behroozi et al. (2019) and results from the BlueTides hydrodynamical simulations (Wilkins et al. 2017).

galaxies with stellar masses  $M_* \ge 10^8 \text{ M}_{\odot}$  at  $z \ge 8$ . To compute the observed UV luminosity from simulated data they assume the intrinsic UV luminosity of a galaxy to be  $\propto$  SFR, and its dust attenuation to scale linearly with metallicity.

Except for the attenuation-free case from Ferrara et al. (2023), the  $M_{UV} - M_h$  relation from our model is very close to the ones from literature up to  $M_h \approx 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ . Above this threshold models behave differently, and in our model the luminosity of a galaxy monotonically increases with halo mass. This indicates that we may be missing heavily dust-obscured galaxies (expected in dust-attenuated models, see Ferrara et al. 2023 [DA], and Behroozi et al. 2019) and eventually also Active Galactic Nucleus (AGN) feedback (considered in Wilkins et al. 2017). These effects, however, become important only for  $M_{UV} \leq -22$ , and hence do not dramatically impact our conclusions.

We underline that we are missing detailed information on the galaxy obscuration since it is included implicitly in the fit done with eq. 4 (cfr. with Ferrara et al. 2023). From Fig. 3, we can see that dust extinction affects only galaxies contained in massive ( $\gtrsim 10^{12}\,M_{\odot}$ ), thus rare, halos. We treat the AGN dust extinction in the following section.

### 2.3. PBH emission

Accreting PBHs can emit light as AGN, thus increasing the brightness of their host galaxies. We quantify PBH emission via the Eddington ratio  $\lambda_E$ , defined as the ratio between the AGN bolometric luminosity,  $L_{bol}$ , and its Eddington luminosity:

$$L_E = \frac{4\pi G m_p c}{\sigma_T} m_{\text{PBH}} = 3.28 \times 10^4 \, \frac{m_{\text{PBH}}}{M_{\odot}} \, \text{L}_{\odot} \,, \tag{6}$$

where *G* is Newton's constant,  $m_p$  the proton mass, *c* the speed of light, and  $\sigma_T$  the cross section for Thomson scattering. From the bolometric luminosity ( $L_{bol} = \lambda_E L_E$ ), we retrieve the UV luminosity through the conversion factors from Shen et al. (2020)

Article number, page 4

$$L_{\rm UV, PBH} = \frac{L_{\rm bol}}{c_1 \left(\frac{L_{\rm bol}}{10^{10} \, \rm L_{\odot}}\right)^{k_1} + c_2 \left(\frac{L_{\rm bol}}{10^{10} \, \rm L_{\odot}}\right)^{k_2}}$$
(7a)

where:

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ k_1 \\ c_2 \\ k_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.862 \\ -0.361 \\ 4.870 \\ -0.0063 \end{pmatrix}$$
(7b)

and sum it to the stellar contribution to obtain the total emission from the galaxy:

$$L_{\rm UV, \, tot} = L_{\rm UV}(M_h, z) + L_{\rm UV, \, PBH} \,. \tag{7c}$$

Note that we do not account explicitly for dust attenuation in the AGN term, which reduces the observed luminosity, rather it is considered implicitly in the bolometric correction factors. The total UV magnitude is used to compute the LF including PBH emission. For simplicity, we assume that  $\lambda_E$  is the same for each PBH, although more realistically we do expect this parameter to have a wide distribution (Bhatt et al. 2024). The case in which PBHs do not emit can be retrieved by imposing  $\lambda_E = 0$ .

We warn that we use the same PBH mass function to compute the modified power spectrum and the PBH emission term even though they should correspond to the one at matter-radiation equality and that at the observed z, respectively. Stated differently, we neglect the accretion of PBHs from their formation epoch up to the observed z (Jangra et al. 2024; Nayak & Jamil 2012). This implies that the required  $\lambda_E$  values to fit the observed LF must be seen as upper limits. Assuming a specific model for accretion (e.g. Hasinger 2020) we can compute the PBH mass growth. Supposing that each of them grows by a factor K before z = 11, we retrieve the same results as considering a model in which PBH do not grow and setting  $\lambda'_E = K\lambda_E$ (further discussion in Sec. 4).

We underline that here we are not accounting for the AGN duty cycle. Values < 1 for this quantity would reduce the number of active AGN, thus requiring a higher number of PBHs (i.e.  $f_{PBH}$ ) to retain the same results.

#### 2.4. PBH spatial distribution

To properly estimate the contribution to the LF, we must populate galaxies with PBHs using some educated guesses.

First, we assume that all PBHs reside in galactic halos rather than in the intergalactic medium. This choice maximizes the impact of PBH emission at fixed  $f_{PBH}$  and it is motivated by the notion that PBHs may foster the growth of baryonic structures around them. This point has been made by some works, such as e.g. Inman & Ali-Haïmoud (2019, who conclude that isolated PBH are an artifact preferentially appearing for large  $f_{PBH}$  values), while other ones consider the presence of some intergalactic PBHs (Manzoni et al. 2024; Jangra et al. 2024).

Next, we distribute PBHs in halos with a mass  $M_h > M_{min} = 10^{7.5} M_{\odot}$ . This choice is motivated by the fact that it should be unlikely to find PBHs in small halos and that galaxies hosted by halos with  $M_h < M_{min}$  are fainter than the lowest LF constraints (according to our astrophysical model, Sec. 2.2). With larger  $M_{min}$  values instead the LF at z = 11 cannot be reproduced properly varying the model parameters, since the predicted LF has a different behavior in the faint end than the data. Our recipe is admittedly rough and should be refined based on more stringent physical arguments in the future. This could be done along

the lines initially explored in Inman & Ali-Haïmoud (2019) and Liu et al. (2022).

In practice, we implement the previous assumption by imposing that halos with  $M_h > M_{min}$  contain a number of PBHs drawn from a Poisson distribution with mean *x*, independent of  $M_h$ . Each PBH is assigned a mass by extracting from the mass function. The value of *x* can be determined by matching the total cosmic number density of PBHs,

$$x = \frac{f_{\rm PBH}\Omega_{dm}\rho_c}{n(>M_{min})\langle M_{\rm PBH}\rangle}$$
(8)

where  $\langle M_{\rm PBH} \rangle$  is the mass function-averaged PBH mass, and  $n(> M_{min})$  is the number density of halos with  $M_h > M_{min}$ . Therefore, we split the halos with a certain mass in groups based on the number of PBHs they host, we compute the PBH UV luminosity distribution within each group and add it to the stellar one. In the end we bin the galaxies based on their UV luminosity to retrieve the LF. With this approach, halos of the same mass may host objects with different M<sub>UV</sub> due to the different contributions of PBHs, that may vary in number (following a Poissonian distribution) and in mass (according to their mass function).

#### 2.5. Model parameters and their determination

In summary, the model has 4 parameters (3 for the mass function and  $\lambda_E$ ), which we constrain with the observed LF considering both the effects due to PBHs: the power spectrum enhancement and the additional UV emission. We expect the model to present degeneracies since massive PBHs with low  $\lambda_E$  emit exactly like smaller PBHs with a higher  $\lambda_E$ . To avoid problems connected to the presence of such degeneracies, we work in a Bayesian framework imposing flat priors on the mass function parameters within the intervals:

$$-20 \leq \log f_{\text{PBH}} \leq -2$$
  

$$1 \leq \log M_{\text{PBH}} / M_{\odot} \leq 11$$
  

$$0.01 \leq \sigma \leq 1.5$$
  
(9)

and considering different values for  $\lambda_E$  (0, 0.01, 0.1, 1, and 10). To obtain the posterior distribution, we run Monte Carlo Markov Chains (MCMCs) considering LF data at z = 11 from McLeod et al. (2024) and Donnan et al. (2024) as constraints.

# 3. Results

The posterior distributions resulting from our Bayesian analysis are reported in Fig. 4 in the form of a corner plot and in Tab. 1 using the 16, 50, and 84 percentiles. Values of the parameters corresponding to different cases of  $\lambda_E$  (10, 1, 0.1, 0.01, and 0) are reported separately to easily compare the results. An alternative parametrization of the results, that may be useful when comparing to other works, is reported in appendix B.

In the  $\lambda_E = 0$  case, very massive PBHs are required to match the LF since the power spectrum enhancement affects the HMF on a mass scale  $\approx M_{\rm PBH}$  and we need to boost the abundance of galaxies that have  $M_h \gtrsim 10^{10} \,\mathrm{M_{\odot}}$ . From the corner plot, we also see that broader PBH mass functions (larger  $\sigma$ ) require a smaller  $M_{\rm PBH}$  due to the skewed shape of the lognormal distribution.

For cases with  $\lambda_E \gtrsim 0.01$ , the shapes of the posteriors are very similar to each other, but the location appears shifted in  $M_{\rm PBH}$  and  $f_{\rm PBH}$ . We find that the peak position satisfies the "degeneracy conditions"

$$M_{\rm PBH}\lambda_E \approx 10^{4.5}\,\rm M_\odot \tag{10a}$$

$\lambda_E$	$\log f_{\rm PBH}$	$\log M_{\rm PBH}/{ m M}_{\odot}$	$\sigma$
10	$-8.16^{+0.73}_{-0.39}$	$3.69^{+0.84}_{-1.43}$	$0.70^{+0.23}_{-0.18}$
1	$-7.12^{+0.87}_{-0.42}$	$4.60^{+0.91}_{-1.71}$	$0.71^{+0.27}_{-0.18}$
0.1	$-6.06^{+0.99}_{-0.46}$	$5.49^{+0.99}_{-2.08}$	$0.73^{+0.31}_{-0.20}$
0.01	$-4.90^{+0.55}_{-0.62}$	$5.98^{+\overline{1.44}}_{-3.01}$	$0.83^{+0.57}_{-0.27}$
0	$-5.42^{+0.22}_{-0.16}$	$8.37^{+1.92}_{-2.68}$	$0.93^{+0.39}_{-0.51}$

Table 1: Tabulated MCMC results for corner plot reported in Fig. 4. For each parameter, the fiducial value corresponds to the median, the uncertainties are built using the 16 and 84 percentiles.

and

$$M_{\rm PBH}/f_{\rm PBH} \approx 10^{11.7} \,\rm M_{\odot} \,,$$
 (10b)

up to statistical uncertainties. Compared to the non-emitting case, the required PBH masses are lower, and the posterior on  $\sigma$  are no longer flat but rather peaked around 0.7.

The different behaviors and shapes of the non-emitting and emitting solutions can be understood as follows. When  $\lambda_E = 0$ , by definition, only the power spectrum enhancement can induce changes in the LF. For solutions with  $\lambda_E > 0.01$ , the DM power spectrum is instead virtually the same as the  $\Lambda$ CDM one, because of the small PBH mass; thus, the PBH-powered AGN luminosity contribution dominates the LF enhancement.

The relations in eq. 10 state that the number density of PBHs is fixed (see eq. 1c) and that their luminosity distribution (see Sec. 2.3) is also the same. This holds until the power spectrum contribution breaks this degeneracy.

The  $\lambda_E = 0.01$  case presents a second solution with a very broad mass function ( $\sigma \approx 1.5$ ) and lower typical mass ( $M_{\text{PBH}} \approx 10^3 \text{ M}_{\odot}$ ), absent in other cases. This solution lies on the border of our prior distribution, meaning that we can get only partial information about such wide mass functions within the limitations of this work. For such a case, the combination of the retrieved parameters takes advantage of both the power spectrum enhancement (in the faint end) and of the PBH emission (in the bright end) to recover the detected LF.

To visualize how the LF is affected by PBHs, in Fig. 5 we compare the LF predicted by our standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model without PBHs (Sec. 2.2, with that including PBHs with  $\lambda_E = 0$  and  $\lambda_E = 1$ . A striking difference between the two PBH models is evident at the LF bright end. The non-emitting case ( $\lambda_E = 0$ ) presents a rapidly decreasing LF, which is similar to the exponential tail of a Schechter function. On the other hand, the case in which PBHs are emitting at the Eddington rate ( $\lambda_E = 1$ ) predicts a much flatter slope at bright magnitudes, resembling a double power-law trend. This is particularly interesting as there has been some debate in the literature concerning the appropriate functional form of the bright-end of the LF at  $z \gtrsim 7$  (Bowler et al. 2014; Donnan et al. 2023). In our model, the actual shape of the LF is determined by the accretion efficiency onto PBHs.

The inset in Fig. 5 shows the fraction of galaxies with  $M_{UV} = -21$  that are hosted by halos with mass  $M_h$ . In the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model (and also in the  $\lambda_E = 0$  case, not shown) the contribution comes from a single bin around  $10^{11} M_{\odot}$ . For  $\lambda_E = 1$ , instead, the distribution features a double-peak structure, with a high-mass (low-mass) peak produced by stellar (PBH-powered AGN) emission. As there is no significant difference in the right-most part of the histograms, the bright-end LF enhancement is therefore mainly driven by galaxies in  $10^{8-9} M_{\odot}$  halos.

Article number, page 5



Fig. 4: Corner plot of the posterior for the PBH models (Sec. 2). The parameters describing the mass function of the PBHs (eq. 2) are obtained via the MCMC using constraints at z = 11 and assuming PBHs are distributed independently of halo mass. Each color corresponds to a value for  $\lambda_E$ , as reported in the legend. An interesting feature to note is that, as long as  $\lambda_E > 0.01$ , changing  $\lambda_E$  shifts the posterior distribution, as indicated in eq. 10. Tabulated results are reported in Tab. 1.

# 4. Discussion

PBHs have attracted considerable attention as possible dark matter candidates. These studies are limited in their predictions by the persisting ignorance of their typical mass, initial mass distribution, and abundance (Carr et al. 2021b).

In Fig. 6 we report the currently available limits on monochromatic PBHs in the mass range relevant to the present study. Shaded regions correspond to combinations of parameters in tension with observations and stars represent our results. For

simplicity, constraints assume a monochromatic mass function, while results are reported as the peak of the posterior distribution we find. Lognormal mass functions usually have tighter limits due to the long tail of the distribution (Bellomo et al. 2018).

Between  $10^2 M_{\odot}$  and  $10^{10} M_{\odot}$  the two main constraints come from CMB observations. The first is from the undetected  $\mu$ distortion (Nakama et al. 2018); the second is obtained from the angular power spectrum (Serpico et al. 2020). The  $\mu$ -distortion is a deviation in the CMB temperature distribution that may be caused by local heating due to PBHs when the Universe age was



Fig. 5: Predicted UV luminosity function ( $\Phi_{UV}$ ) at z = 11. Our standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model without PBHs (Sec. 2.2; solid orange curve) is compared with models including PBHs with  $\lambda_E = 0$  (solid black) and  $\lambda_E = 1$  (solid brown); shaded regions denote model uncertainties (16 and 84 percentiles at fixed M<sub>UV</sub>). Data from McLeod et al. (2024) and Donnan et al. (2024) at z = 11, and the fit from Bouwens et al. (2022a) to low-*z* data as a reference for our fiducial model are also shown. The inset shows the percentage of M<sub>UV</sub> = -21 galaxies that are hosted by halos of mass  $M_h$  for the  $\lambda_E = 1$  case (brown line); the orange line instead is computed within the  $\Lambda$ CDM model without changing the normalization. Although LF curves for both values of  $\lambda_E$  agree with data, they differ in the bright end of the LF.

between  $7 \times 10^6$  s and  $3 \times 10^9$  s. In Fig. 6, the standard ACDM limit is reported as  $f_{\rm NL} = 0$  (Gaussian fluctuations), while non-Gaussianity models are presented due to the loosening of constraints with higher  $f_{\rm NL}$  (we plot the cases  $f_{\rm NL} = 10, \infty$ ). According to Planck Collaboration et al. (2020b), values of  $f_{\rm NL} > 10$  are incompatible with observations. The CMB angular power spectrum limit is derived by computing the effect of accreting PBHs on the baryon angular distribution at the last scattering surface. Massive and abundant PBHs would indeed produce detectable patterns in the baryon density field.

The results we obtain in the case  $\lambda_E = 0$  are compatible with the ones from Liu & Bromm (2022), who find that  $f_{\text{PBH}}m_{\text{PBH}} \gtrsim 200 \,\text{M}_{\odot}$ ,  $m_{\text{PBH}} \gtrsim 5 \times 10^8 \,\text{M}_{\odot}$  and  $\sigma = 0$  (they consider only monochromatic PBHs) are required to explain *JWST* observations without assuming a high star formation efficiency. However, our  $\lambda_E = 0$  solution leads to two problems: i) at least a fraction of such massive black holes would probably accrete gas and emit with a detectable  $\lambda_E > 0$  and ii) the required abundance would be higher than the  $\mu$ -distortion limits for their mass even when using an extended mass function for PBHs. Allowing for PBH emission ( $\lambda_E > 0$ ) ameliorates both issues as it automatically addresses the former and reconciles the results with the  $\mu$ -distortion data constraints.

When considering high  $\lambda_E$  values, the mass function resulting from our study shifts toward lower mass scales, evading the  $\mu$ -distortion constraint. However, the angular power spectrum limit becomes dominant when  $M_{\rm PBH} \leq 10^4 \, {\rm M}_{\odot}$  (see Fig. 6) and values  $\lambda_E \gtrsim 10$  provide consistent solutions to the problem.

The second solution found in the  $\lambda_E = 0.01$  case is in tension with the CMB angular power spectrum constraint even though much smaller PBH masses are required than in the other cases.



Fig. 6: PBH parameter exclusion plot in the  $f_{PBH} - m_{PBH}$  plane. We plot the constraint on monochromatic PBHs abundance from the CMB  $\mu$ -distortion absence (Nakama et al. 2018, green lines) within different non-Gaussianity scenarios ( $f_{NL} = 0, 10, \infty$  represented by the solid, dashed, and dotted lines respectively) and the one from the observed CMB angular power spectrum (Serpico et al. 2020, orange line). Shaded regions are excluded and their colors denote the violated limit (same color scheme of the lines). Stars and error bars give the results and uncertainty we find for different values of  $\lambda_E$  (Tab. 1). The red dotted line traces the expected trend varying  $\lambda_E$  in the case only AGN contribution is present.

When comparing this solution with monochromatic limits, we must pay attention to the fact that the mass function is very wide: PBHs with mass  $\approx 10^6 \, M_{\odot}$  are  $2\sigma$  outliers and their sole abundance is incompatible with  $\mu$ -distortion limits, assuming that the constraint is not weakened by abundant low-mass PBHs.

Exploring diverse mass functions and considering even broader ones (e.g. García-Bellido et al. 2021) may provide useful insight on this topic and possibly find solutions compatible with CMB limits. Since results obtained by assuming extended mass functions are not reliably comparable with monochromatic constraints, a model-dependent analysis is required to solidly rule out the corresponding solutions. For example, Wang et al. (2025) report looser constraints from the  $\mu$ -distortion with a wide enough ( $\sigma \geq 0.3$ ) lognormal mass function when specific non-Gaussian primordial fluctuations models are assumed.

These considerations imply that the emission from PBHs acting as AGN is required for them to both explain the LF enhancement and comply with CMB observations. Moreover, our model entails that in 75% of the observed  $M_{UV} = -21$  sources at  $z \approx 11$  the emission should be dominated by an AGN (see inset in Fig. 5), making it testable against spectroscopic observations. So far, spectroscopy on  $z \gtrsim 10$  objects has revealed both AGN (e.g. UHZ1, Natarajan et al. 2024; GHZ2, Castellano et al. 2024) and star-forming galaxies (e.g. JADES-GS-z14-0, Carniani et al. 2024), but more data are required to provide a statistical sample to test our prediction.

We recall that we have ignored the accretion of PBHs from their formation up to redshift  $z \approx 11$ . To properly address this issue, further modeling of the PBH environment (Nayak & Jamil 2012; Jangra et al. 2024) is required. Naively, though, we note that if PBHs increase their mass of a factor 100 before z = 11 (as permitted by an efficient Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton accretion, see Jangra et al. 2024), they would explain *JWST* observation with  $\lambda_E$  being 100 times smaller then the ones found here (see Fig. 4).

We also assumed that all PBH-powered AGN predicted by the model shine continuously and simultaneously, i.e. we have not attempted to model the likely possibility that their duty cycle is < 1. In that case, a higher  $f_{PBH}$  would be required to match the LF since a fraction of the PBHs would be quiescent. Unfortunately, the duty cycle would be degenerate with  $f_{PBH}$ . Detailed numerical simulations could be useful to break such a degeneracy.

# 5. Summary

We have investigated whether the inclusion of PBHs in the standard  $\Lambda$ CDM model can alleviate the problems raised by the observed excess of bright, super-early (z > 10) galaxies. To this aim we have computed the PBH contribution to the halo mass function (Sec. 2.1) and the galaxy LF (Sec. 2.3) for a lognormal initial PBH mass function (with a peak at  $M_{\text{PBH}}$  and amplitude  $\sigma$ , eq. 2), further assuming that they constitute a fraction  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  of the dark matter and power an AGN with an Eddington ratio  $\lambda_E$ . Using a Bayesian analysis (Sec. 2.5), we find that:

- Although a small fraction (log  $f_{\text{PBH}} \approx -5.42$ ) of massive (log  $M_{\text{PBH}}/M_{\odot} \approx 8.37$  with  $\sigma \approx 0.93$ ), non-emitting ( $\lambda_E = 0$ ) PBHs can explain the galaxy excess (Fig. 4), this solution is in contrast with CMB  $\mu$ -distortion constraints on monochromatic PBHs (Fig. 6) and therefore must be discarded.
- If PBHs power an AGN emitting at super-Eddington luminosities ( $\lambda_E \approx 10$ ), the observed LF can be reproduced by a PBH population with characteristic mass log  $M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot} \approx$  3.69 constituting a tiny (log  $f_{\rm PBH} \approx -8.16$ ) fraction of the cosmic dark matter content.
- As  $\lambda_E$  and  $M_{\text{PBH}}$  are degenerate, the LF remains unchanged if the degeneracy condition  $M_{\text{PBH}}\lambda_E = 10^{4.5} \text{ M}_{\odot}$  is satisfied. A similar degeneracy exists between  $\lambda_E$  and  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  (eq. 10).
- Although the LF can be reproduced by any set of  $(M_{\text{PBH}}, \lambda_E)$  values satisfying the degeneracy condition, current CMB limits (Fig. 6) require that PBH-powered AGN emit at significant super-Eddington ( $\lambda_E \gtrsim 10$ ) luminosities. This constraint can be overcome if PBHs grow by  $\gtrsim 10 \times$  their initial mass by the time of observation.
- In the PBH scenario, about 75% of the observed galaxies with  $M_{UV} = -21$  at z = 11 should host a PBH-powered AGN and typically reside in low mass halos,  $M_h = 10^{8-9} M_{\odot}$  (Fig. 5). These predictions can be thoroughly tested with available and forthcoming *JWST* spectroscopic data.

## Acknowledgments

AF acknowledges support from the ERC Advanced Grant IN-TERSTELLAR H2020/740120. Partial support (AF) from the Carl Friedrich von Siemens-Forschungspreis der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Research Award is kindly acknowledged. We gratefully acknowledge the computational resources of the Center for High Performance Computing (CHPC) at SNS. We acknowledge usage of wolfRAM|ALPHA, the PYTHON programming language (Van Rossum & de Boer 1991; Van Rossum & Drake 2009), ASTROPY (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013), CORNER (Foreman-Mackey 2016), EMCEE (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013), HMF (Murray et al. 2013), MATPLOTLIB (Hunter 2007), NUMPY (van der Walt et al. 2011), and SCIPY (Virtanen et al. 2020).

# References

- Arrabal Haro, P., Dickinson, M., Finkelstein, S. L., et al. 2023, ApJL, 951, L22 Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, A&A, 558, A33
- Atek, H., Shuntov, M., Furtak, L. J., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 519, 1201
- Behroozi, P., Conroy, C., Wechsler, R. H., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 499, 5702
- Behroozi, P., Wechsler, R. H., Hearin, A. P., & Conroy, C. 2019, MNRAS, 488, 3143
- Bellomo, N., Bernal, J. L., Raccanelli, A., & Verde, L. 2018, JCAP, 2018, 004
- Bhatt, M., Gallerani, S., Ferrara, A., et al. 2024, A&A, 686, A141
- Biagetti, M., Franciolini, G., & Riotto, A. 2023, ApJ, 944, 113
- Bouwens, R. J., Illingworth, G., Ellis, R. S., Oesch, P., & Stefanon, M. 2022a, ApJ, 940, 55
- Bouwens, R. J., Oesch, P. A., Stefanon, M., et al. 2021, AJ, 162, 47
- Bouwens, R. J., Smit, R., Schouws, S., et al. 2022b, ApJ, 931, 160
- Bowler, R. A. A., Dunlop, J. S., McLure, R. J., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 2810
- Bunker, A. J., Saxena, A., Cameron, A. J., et al. 2023, A&A, 677, A88
- Carniani, S., Hainline, K., D'Eugenio, F., et al. 2024, Nature, 633, 318
- Carr, B., Clesse, S., & García-Bellido, J. 2021a, MNRAS, 501, 1426
- Carr, B., Kohri, K., Sendouda, Y., & Yokoyama, J. 2021b, Reports on Progress in Physics, 84, 116902
- Carr, B. & Silk, J. 2018, MNRAS, 478, 3756
- Casey, C. M., Akins, H. B., Shuntov, M., et al. 2024, ApJ, 965, 98
- Castellano, M., Fontana, A., Treu, T., et al. 2022, ApJL, 938, L15
- Castellano, M., Napolitano, L., Fontana, A., et al. 2024, ApJ, 972, 143
- Ciesla, L., Elbaz, D., Ilbert, O., et al. 2024, A&A, 686, A128
- Curtis-Lake, E., Carniani, S., Cameron, A., et al. 2023, Nature Astronomy, 7, 622
- Dekel, A., Sarkar, K. C., Birnboim, Y., Mandelker, N., & Li, Z. 2023, MNRAS, 523, 3201
- Dolgov, A. & Silk, J. 1993, Phys. Rev. D, 47, 4244
- Donnan, C. T., McLeod, D. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 518, 6011
- Donnan, C. T., McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2024, MNRAS, 533, 3222
- Feng, Y., Di Matteo, T., Croft, R., et al. 2015, ApJL, 808, L17
- Feng, Y., Di-Matteo, T., Croft, R. A., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 455, 2778
- Ferrara, A., Pallottini, A., & Dayal, P. 2023, MNRAS, 522, 3986
- Ferrara, A., Pallottini, A., & Sommovigo, L. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2410.19042
- Finkelstein, S. L., Leung, G. C. K., Bagley, M. B., et al. 2024, ApJL, 969, L2
- Foreman-Mackey, D. 2016, The Journal of Open Source Software, 1, 24
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, Publ. Astr. Soc. Pac., 125, 306
- Fujimoto, S., Wang, B., Weaver, J. R., et al. 2024, ApJ, 977, 250
- García-Bellido, J., Carr, B., & Clesse, S. 2021, Universe, 8, 12
- Gelli, V., Mason, C., & Hayward, C. C. 2024, ApJ, 975, 192
- Gouttenoire, Y., Trifinopoulos, S., Valogiannis, G., & Vanvlasselaer, M. 2024, Phys. Rev. D, 109, 123002
- Green, A. M. 2016, Phys. Rev. D, 94, 063530
- Harvey, T., Conselice, C. J., Adams, N. J., et al. 2025, ApJ, 978, 89
- Hasinger, G. 2020, JCAP, 2020, 022
- Hsiao, T. Y.-Y., Abdurro'uf, Coe, D., et al. 2024, ApJ, 973, 8
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, Computing in Science Engineering, 9, 90
- Inami, H., Algera, H. S. B., Schouws, S., et al. 2022, MNRAS, 515, 3126
- Inman, D. & Ali-Haïmoud, Y. 2019, Phys. Rev. D, 100, 083528
- Jangra, P., Gaggero, D., Kavanagh, B. J., & Diego, J. M. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2412.11921
- Kannike, K., Marzola, L., Raidal, M., & Veermäe, H. 2017, JCAP, 2017, 020
- Klypin, A., Poulin, V., Prada, F., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 504, 769
- Labbé, I., van Dokkum, P., Nelson, E., et al. 2023, Nature, 616, 266
- Liu, B. & Bromm, V. 2022, ApJL, 937, L30
- Liu, B., Zhang, S., & Bromm, V. 2022, MNRAS, 514, 2376
- Manzoni, D., Ziparo, F., Gallerani, S., & Ferrara, A. 2024, MNRAS, 527, 4153
- Mason, C. A., Trenti, M., & Treu, T. 2023, MNRAS, 521, 497
- McLeod, D. J., Donnan, C. T., McLure, R. J., et al. 2024, MNRAS, 527, 5004 Murray, S. G., Power, C., & Robotham, A. S. G. 2013, Astronomy and Comput-
- ing, 3, 23 Neide P. P. Occel B. A. von Deldeum P. et al. 2022, An H. 040, L14
- Naidu, R. P., Oesch, P. A., van Dokkum, P., et al. 2022, ApJL, 940, L14
- Nakama, T., Carr, B., & Silk, J. 2018, Phys. Rev. D, 97, 043525
- Natarajan, P., Pacucci, F., Ricarte, A., et al. 2024, ApJL, 960, L1
- Nayak, B. & Jamil, M. 2012, Physics Letters B, 709, 118
- Padmanabhan, H. & Loeb, A. 2023, ApJL, 953, L4
- Pallottini, A. & Ferrara, A. 2023, A&A, 677, L4
- Pallottini, A., Ferrara, A., Gallerani, S., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2408.00061
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al. 2020a, A&A, 641, A6 Planck Collaboration, Akrami, Y., Arroja, F., et al. 2020b, A&A, 641, A9
- Press, W. H. & Schechter, P. 1974, ApJ, 187, 425
- Robertson, B., Johnson, B. D., Tacchella, S., et al. 2024, ApJ, 970, 31

- Robertson, B. E., Tacchella, S., Johnson, B. D., et al. 2023, Nature Astronomy, 7, 611
- Sabti, N., Muñoz, J. B., & Kamionkowski, M. 2024, Phys. Rev. Lett., 132, 061002
- Serpico, P. D., Poulin, V., Inman, D., & Kohri, K. 2020, Physical Review Research, 2, 023204
- Shen, X., Hopkins, P. F., Faucher-Giguère, C.-A., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 495, 3252
- Shen, X., Vogelsberger, M., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Tacchella, S., & Naidu, R. P. 2024, MNRAS, 533, 3923
- Sheth, R. K. & Tormen, G. 2002, MNRAS, 329, 61
- Sun, G., Faucher-Giguère, C.-A., Hayward, C. C., et al. 2023, ApJL, 955, L35
- Sun, G., Muñoz, J. B., Mirocha, J., & Faucher-Giguère, C.-A. 2024, arXiv eprints, arXiv:2410.21409
- van der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C., & Varoquaux, G. 2011, Computing in Science Engineering, 13, 22
- Van Rossum, G. & de Boer, J. 1991, CWI Quarterly, 4, 283
- Van Rossum, G. & Drake, F. L. 2009, Python 3 Reference Manual (Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace)
- Vijayan, A. P., Lovell, C. C., Wilkins, S. M., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 501, 3289
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, Nature Methods, 17, 261 Vogelsberger, M., Nelson, D., Pillepich, A., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 492, 5167
- Wang, B., Fujimoto, S., Labbé, I., et al. 2023, ApJL, 957, L34
- Wang, Z.-H., Huang, H.-L., & Piao, Y.-S. 2025, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2501.08542
- Wilkins, S. M., Feng, Y., Di Matteo, T., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 469, 2517
- Zavala, J. A., Castellano, M., Akins, H. B., et al. 2024, Nature Astronomy [arXiv:2403.10491]

# Appendix A: PBH contribution to the power spectrum with lognormal IMF

We take a lognormal as the fiducial model for the PBH mass function

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}n(>M)}{\mathrm{d}\log M} = \frac{n_0}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} \exp\left(-\frac{\log^2 M/M_{\mathrm{PBH}}}{2\sigma^2}\right),\tag{A.1}$$

where  $n_0$  is the number density scale;  $n_0$  can be connected to  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  from

$$f_{\rm PBH}\rho_c \Omega_{\rm dm} = \int_0^{+\infty} M \frac{{\rm d}n}{{\rm d}M} {\rm d}M =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\ln 10} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{{\rm d}n}{{\rm d}\log M} {\rm d}M =$$

$$= n_0 M_{\rm PBH} e^{0.5\sigma^2 \ln^2 10},$$
(A.2a)

which implies

$$n_0 = \frac{f_{\rm PBH} \rho_c \Omega_{\rm dm}}{M_{\rm PBH}} e^{-0.5\sigma^2 \ln^2 10}.$$
 (A.2b)

The corresponding fraction of DM mass in PBH of mass M is:

$$f(M) = \frac{M}{\rho_c \Omega_{\rm dm}} \frac{\mathrm{d}n(>M)}{\mathrm{d}M} = \frac{1}{\rho_c \Omega_{\rm dm}} \frac{\mathrm{d}n(>M)}{\mathrm{d}\ln M}.$$
 (A.3)

Inverting the relation for  $k_{crit}$  in eq. 1 combined with eq. 1c, it is possible to define

$$M(k) \equiv 2\pi^2 \Omega_{dm} \frac{\rho_c}{k^3} \tag{A.4}$$

as the mass associated with a given critical wavenumber. The power spectrum contribution can then be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\rm PBH}(k) &= (A.5) \\ \frac{D^2 n_0}{\sqrt{2\pi} \ln 10\sigma \rho_c^2 \Omega_{\rm dm}^2} \int_0^{M(k)} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log M'/M_{\rm PBH})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) M' \, \mathrm{d}M' \stackrel{x = \log M'}{=} \\ \frac{D^2 n_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma \rho_c^2 \Omega_{\rm dm}^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\log M(k)} 100^x \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \log M_{\rm PBH})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \, \mathrm{d}x = \\ \frac{D^2 f_{\rm PBH}}{2\rho_c \Omega_{\rm dm}} M_{\rm PBH} e^{1.5\sigma^2 \ln^2 10} \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{\log M_{\rm PBH}/M(k) + 2\sigma^2 \ln 10}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Although it is not explicit from eq. A.5, in the limit  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  we effectively recover the term in eq. 1. This expression is also convenient to avoid numerical problems with the derivation of the power spectrum around the scale of  $k_{crit}$ .

### Appendix B: Alternative parametrization of results

In the case of a monochromatic mass function for PBHs, the power spectrum enhancement is completely degenerate in  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  and  $m_{\text{PBH}}$ . For this reason, in Fig. B.1 and Tab. B.1 we report the results from Sec. 3 with an alternative parametrization (product and ratio of  $f_{\text{PBH}}$  and  $M_{\text{PBH}}$ ) that may be useful to compare with other works.



Fig. B.1: Alternative corner plot of the posterior for the PBH models (Sec. 2). Parameters resulting from the MCMC procedure (see Fig. 4 and Tab. 1) have been recombined in the form of log  $f_{\rm PBH}M_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot}$  and log  $M_{\rm PBH}/f_{\rm PBH}/M_{\odot}$ . Each color corresponds to a value for  $\lambda_E$ , as reported in the legend. Tabulated results are reported in Tab. B.1.

$\lambda_E$	$\log(f_{\rm PBH}M_{\rm PBH}/{\rm M}_{\odot})$	$\log(M_{\rm PBH}/f_{\rm PBH}/{\rm M}_{\odot})$	$\sigma$
10	$-4.46^{+0.47}_{-0.72}$	$11.86^{+1.23}_{-2.17}$	$0.70^{+0.23}_{-0.18}$
1	$-2.50^{+0.50}_{-0.86}$	$11.72_{-2.60}^{+1.34}$	$0.71^{+0.27}_{-0.18}$
0.1	$-0.56^{+0.53}_{-1.07}$	$11.55_{-3.10}^{+1.45}$	$0.73^{+0.31}_{-0.20}$
0.01	$1.11^{+0.81}_{-2.74}$	$10.83^{+2.10}_{-3.31}$	$0.83^{+0.57}_{-0.27}$
0	$2.94^{+1.78}_{-2.47}$	$13.83^{+2.06}_{-2.92}$	$0.93^{+0.39}_{-0.51}$

Table B.1: Tabulated MCMC results for the alternative parameters whose corner plot is reported in Fig. B.1. For each parameter, the fiducial value corresponds to the median, the uncertainties are built using the 16 and 84 percentiles.