

Gravitational Waves from First-Order Phase Transition in a Simple Axion-Like Particle Model

P. S. Bhupal Dev,^a Francesc Ferrer,^a Yiyang Zhang,^a Yongchao Zhang^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Physics and McDonnell Center for the Space Sciences, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

^bCenter for High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

Abstract. We consider a gauge-singlet complex scalar field Φ with a global $U(1)$ symmetry that is spontaneously broken at some high energy scale f_a . As a result, the angular part of the Φ -field becomes an axion-like particle (ALP). We show that if the Φ -field has a non-zero coupling κ to the Standard Model Higgs boson, there exists a certain region in the (f_a, κ) parameter space where the global $U(1)$ symmetry-breaking induces a strongly first order phase transition, thereby producing stochastic gravitational waves that are potentially observable in current and future gravitational-wave detectors. In particular, we find that future gravitational-wave experiments such as TianQin, BBO and Cosmic Explorer could probe a broad range of the energy scale $10^3 \text{ GeV} \lesssim f_a \lesssim 10^8 \text{ GeV}$, independent of the ALP mass. Since all the ALP couplings to the Standard Model particles are proportional to inverse powers of the energy scale f_a (up to model-dependent $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficients), the gravitational-wave detection prospects are largely complementary to the current laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological probes of the ALP scenarios.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Scalar Potential in the ALP model	3
2.1	Tree-level potential	3
2.2	Effective finite-temperature potential	4
3	First-order phase transition	5
3.1	Bounce solution	5
3.2	Gravitational waves	6
3.3	Critical temperature	8
3.4	Bubble nucleation	8
3.5	Detection prospects	9
4	Comparison with other ALP constraints	11
4.1	Low-energy effective ALP couplings	12
4.2	Coupling to photons	13
4.3	Coupling to electrons	16
4.4	Coupling to nucleons	17
5	Prospects from precision Higgs data at future colliders	18
6	Conclusion	19
A	Power-law Integrated Sensitivity Curves	20

1 Introduction

Axion-like particles (ALPs) are light gauge-singlet pseudoscalar bosons that couple weakly to the Standard Model (SM) and generically appear as the pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone boson (pNGB) in theories with a spontaneously broken global $U(1)$ symmetry. ALPs could solve some of the open questions in the SM, such as the strong CP problem via the Peccei-Quinn mechanism [1] and the hierarchy problem via the relaxion mechanism [2]. They could also play an important cosmological role in inflation [3–5], dark matter (DM) [6–8], dark energy [9–12], and baryogenesis [13, 14]. Furthermore, there are recent proposals involving axions to simultaneously address several open issues of the SM in one stroke [15–20].

A common characteristic among ALPs is that their coupling to SM particles is suppressed by inverse powers of the $U(1)$ symmetry breaking energy scale f_a . This energy scale can be identified as the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of a SM-singlet complex scalar field Φ , i.e. $\langle\Phi\rangle = f_a/\sqrt{2}$, which is assumed to be much larger than the electroweak scale $v_{\text{ew}} \simeq 246.2$ GeV to evade current experimental limits [21, 22]. The ALP field a then arises as the massless excitation of the angular part of the Φ -field:

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [f_a + \phi(x)] e^{ia(x)/f_a} . \quad (1.1)$$

The particle excitation of the modulus ϕ of the Φ -field gets a large mass $m_\phi \sim f_a$, while the angular part a becomes a pNGB that acquires a much smaller mass m_a from explicit low energy $U(1)$ -breaking effects. Thus, for the low-energy phenomenology of ALPs, the modulus part ϕ can be safely integrated out, and the only experimentally relevant parameters are m_a and f_a .

In this paper, we show that the dynamics of the modulus ϕ -field around the f_a scale can provide complementary constraints on the ALP scenario. In particular, if the parent Φ -field has a non-zero coupling to the SM Higgs doublet H , the $U(1)$ symmetry breaking at the f_a -scale could induce a strongly first-order phase transition (FOPT) [23], giving rise to stochastic gravitational waves (GWs) that are potentially observable in current and future GW detectors (see e.g. [24, 25] for a review on GWs from a FOPT). We find that GW signals of strength up to $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim 10^{-12}$ could be generated, where Ω_{GW} is the fraction of the total energy density of the universe in the form of GWs today and $h = 0.674 \pm 0.005$ is the current value of the Hubble parameter in units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [26]. Future GW observatories like TianQin [27], Taiji [28], LISA [29, 30], ALIA [31], MAGIS [32], DECIGO [33], BBO [34], Cosmic Explorer (CE) [35] and Einstein Telescope (ET) [36] can probe a broad range $10^3 \text{ GeV} \lesssim f_a \lesssim 10^8 \text{ GeV}$, *independent* of the ALP mass. It turns out that the aLIGO [37] and aLIGO+ [38] can not probe any of the allowed parameter space for the benchmark configurations considered in this paper (see Fig. 4).

The heavy modulus ϕ decouples at low energies, and we are left with the ALP a , which has only derivative couplings to the SM particles. These are generated via effective higher-dimensional operators [39], and are proportional to inverse powers of f_a , up to model-dependent $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficients. The effective ALP couplings to photons, electrons and nucleons are strongly constrained by a number of laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological observables [22]. However, current and future low-energy constraints depend on the ALP mass m_a , while we find that the GW prospects in the (m_a, f_a) plane are largely complementary. For instance, if a stochastic GW signal was found with the frequency dependence predicted by the FOPT¹, this would point to a limited range of f_a in a given ALP model, which might lead to a *positive* signal in some of the future laboratory and/or astrophysical searches of ALPs. On the other hand, if we fix the ALP mass m_a , then current ALP constraints exclude certain ranges of f_a . If a GW signal is found in the frequency range corresponding to the excluded range of f_a , then the underlying simple ALP model has to be extended to account for the GW signal.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we provide the details of the ALP model, and compute the one-loop effective scalar potential at both zero and finite temperatures. In Section 3 we calculate the GW emission from a strong FOPT at the scale f_a , including bubble collision, sound wave (SW) and magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence contributions. The complementary reach of laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological observations is presented in Section 4. The constraints from future precision Higgs data on the ALP model are discussed in Section 5. We summarize and conclude in Section 6. The method used to obtain the power-law integrated sensitivity curves for future GW experiments is described in Appendix A.

¹The frequency dependence in this scenario is generically different and can be distinguished from other stochastic GW sources, like inflation [40–45] or unresolved binary black hole mergers [46].

2 Scalar Potential in the ALP model

2.1 Tree-level potential

The coupling between the SM Higgs doublet H and the complex field Φ is described by the tree-level potential (see also Refs. [23, 47])

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = -\mu^2|H|^2 + \lambda|H|^4 + \kappa|\Phi|^2|H|^2 + \lambda_a \left(|\Phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}f_a^2 \right)^2. \quad (2.1)$$

The SM Higgs doublet can be parameterized as $H = (G_+, (h + iG_0)/\sqrt{2})$, with h the SM Higgs and G_0, G_+ the Goldstone bosons that become the longitudinal components of the Z and W^+ bosons, respectively. The complex field Φ can be expressed in the form given by Eq. (1.1). At an energy scale around f_a , a phase transition (PT) occurs which breaks the global $U(1)$ symmetry. The field Φ gets a VEV $\langle\Phi\rangle = f_a/\sqrt{2}$, and the associated pNGB a is identified as the physical ALP. Depending on the parameters f_a, κ and λ_a , the PT may be strongly first order, in which case it would generate a spectrum of GWs that could be detected in current or future experiments [48], as detailed in Section 3. We note that at this stage the ALP a is neither involved in the scalar potential given by Eq. (2.1), nor in the GW emission from the high-energy scale PT. The low-energy effective couplings of a to SM particles will be discussed in Section 4.1.

In terms of the real scalar field components, the tree-level potential in Eq. (2.1) can be re-written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_0 = & \frac{\lambda_a}{4} (\phi^2 - f_a^2)^2 + \left[\frac{\kappa}{2}\phi^2 - \mu^2 \right] \left(\frac{1}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}G_0^2 + G_+G_- \right) \\ & + \lambda \left[\frac{1}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}G_0^2 + G_+G_- \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Setting the field values of the Goldstone modes to zero, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_0(\phi, h) = \frac{\lambda_a}{4} (\phi^2 - f_a^2)^2 + \frac{\kappa}{4}\phi^2 h^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}h^4. \quad (2.3)$$

Here f_a, μ, κ and λ_a are taken as free parameters. By examining the tree-level potential in Eq. (2.3) we have found that a FOPT occurs along the ϕ direction, while maintaining the VEV of h equal to zero at the same time, if the parameters satisfy the inequality:

$$\mu^2 \leq \frac{2\lambda\lambda_a}{\kappa} f_a^2. \quad (2.4)$$

While this is not the only possible choice that results in a FOPT along the ϕ direction, for our present purpose, we will set the μ -parameter to the value that saturates the inequality above, i.e.,

$$\mu^2 = \frac{2\lambda\lambda_a}{\kappa} f_a^2. \quad (2.5)$$

We have verified numerically that, with this choice of μ^2 , the VEV of h remains zero up to one-loop level during the phase transition, if there is one. Therefore, in the following analysis, we will ignore the dependence of the effective potential on the h -field, and consider ϕ as the only dynamical field.

It should be noted that with the specific choice in Eq. (2.5), the scalar ϕ will contribute radiatively to the SM Higgs mass, making the latter unacceptably large at the electroweak scale. Nevertheless, this contribution can be cancelled out, e.g. by introducing vector-like fermions at the μ -scale that keep the SM Higgs boson mass at the observed 125 GeV [49]. In the parameter space of interest in this paper, $\lambda_a \simeq 10^{-3}$ and $\kappa \simeq 1$ (see Section 3), we have $\mu \sim 10^{-2} f_a$. Therefore, the effect of these extra vector-like fermions on the renormalization group (RG) running of the SM couplings, as required for the calculation of the critical temperature (see Section 3.3), is expected to be small and will not be considered here. Since we are focusing on a generic ALP scenario below the f_a scale, we will defer a detailed study of ultraviolet-completion involving additional heavy fields to a future work.

2.2 Effective finite-temperature potential

At finite temperature $T \neq 0$, the effective one-loop potential of the scalar fields is [50–53]:

$$\mathcal{V}(\phi, T) = \mathcal{V}_0(\phi) + \mathcal{V}_{\text{CW}}(\phi) + \mathcal{V}_T(\phi, T), \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{\text{CW}}$ is the Coleman-Weinberg (CW) potential [54] that contains all the one-loop corrections at zero temperature with vanishing external momenta, and $\mathcal{V}_T$ describes the finite-temperature corrections. Working in the Landau gauge to avoid ghost-compensating terms, the CW potential reads:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{CW}}(\phi) = \sum_i (-1)^F n_i \frac{m_i^4(\phi)}{64\pi^2} \left[\log \frac{m_i^2(\phi)}{\Lambda^2} - C_i \right]. \quad (2.7)$$

The sum runs over all the particles that couple to the ϕ field (notice that massless particles do not contribute). In Eq. (2.7), $F = 1$ for fermions and 0 for bosons; n_i is the number of degrees of freedom of each particle; $C_i = 3/2$ for scalars and fermions, and $5/6$ for gauge bosons; and Λ is the renormalization scale, which will be set to f_a throughout this paper.

The finite-temperature corrections are given by:

$$\mathcal{V}_T(\phi, T) = \sum_i (-1)^F n_i \frac{T^4}{2\pi^2} J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m_i^2(\phi)}{T^2} \right), \quad (2.8)$$

where the thermal functions are:

$$J_{B/F}(y^2) = \int_0^\infty dx \, x^2 \log \left[1 \mp \exp \left(-\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \right) \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

Here, the minus sign “−” is for bosons and the positive sign “+” for fermions. We also need to include the resummed daisy corrections, that add a temperature-dependent term $\Pi_i(T)$ to the field-dependent mass m_i^2 [53]. To leading order, we have in the ALP model:

$$\Pi_h(T) = \Pi_{G_{0,\pm}}(T) = \left[\frac{3}{16} g_2^2 + \frac{1}{16} g_1^2 + \frac{\kappa}{12} + \frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{y_t^2}{4} \right] T^2, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\Pi_\phi(T) = \left(\frac{\kappa}{6} + \frac{\lambda_a}{3} \right) T^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Effectively, the mass terms m_i^2 in Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8) get replaced by $m_i^2 + \Pi_i(T)$.

The effective potential in Eq. (2.6) could become complex due to m_i^2 being negative. This is related to particle decay and does not affect the computation of the dynamics of PT (see e.g. Refs. [55–57] for more details). In the numerical calculations in Section 3 we will always take the real part of the effective potential.




Figure 1. An example of the effective potential with a potential barrier when $T = T_c$ (see Section 3.3) and $T = T_n$ (see Section 3.4). Here $f_a = 10^6$ GeV, $\kappa = 3.8$ and $\lambda_a = 1.15 \times 10^{-3}$.

3 First-order phase transition

We fix the decay constant f_a at a specific value and scan in (κ, λ_a) to find the region in parameter space where a FOPT can take place. In particular, we evaluate the effective potential for given values of (κ, λ_a) to look for regions where there is a valid critical temperature T_c . Here, T_c is defined as the temperature at which the two local minima of the effective potential are degenerate.² We use the package `CosmoTransitions` [59] for the numerical work and the results are given in the following subsections. We show one example of the effective potential varying temperature T in Fig. 1. In this case, a valid T_c can be found, and tunneling can happen for $T < T_c$ to give rise to a FOPT.

3.1 Bounce solution

The decay rate of the false vacuum is [60–62]:

$$\Gamma(T) \simeq \max \left[T^4 \left(\frac{S_3}{2\pi T} \right)^{3/2} \exp(-S_3/T), \left(\frac{S_4}{2\pi R_0^2} \right)^2 \exp(-S_4) \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where the first term corresponds to thermally induced decays and the second term is the quantum-tunneling rate. In Eq. (3.1) S_3 and S_4 are the three- and four-dimensional Euclidean actions for the $O(3)$ and $O(4)$ -symmetric tunnelling (“bounce”) solutions respectively, and R_0 is the size of the bubble. For quantum tunneling,

$$S_4 = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla\phi)^2 + \mathcal{V}(\phi, T) \right], \quad (3.2)$$

where $\phi(r)$ is the solution of the $O(4)$ -symmetric instanton (with $r = \sqrt{\mathbf{r}^2 + t^2}$):

$$\frac{d^2\phi}{dr^2} + \frac{3}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dr} = \mathcal{V}'(\phi, T). \quad (3.3)$$

²In our analysis, we have not considered the potential gauge-invariance [58] and RG improvement [47] effects on the calculation of T_c and the resultant GW prospects, which are beyond the scope of this paper.

For thermally-induced decay,

$$S_3 = \int d^3x \left[(\nabla\phi)^2 + \mathcal{V}(\phi, T) \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where $\phi(r)$ is the $O(3)$ -symmetric solution of

$$\frac{d^2\phi}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dr} = \mathcal{V}'(\phi, T). \quad (3.5)$$

3.2 Gravitational waves

The GW signal from a FOPT consists of three main components: the scalar field contribution during the collision of bubble walls [63–68], the sound wave in the plasma after bubble collisions [69–72], and the MHD turbulence in the plasma after bubble collisions [73–77]. Assuming the three components can be linearly superposed, the total strength of GWs produced reads

$$h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \simeq h^2\Omega_\phi + h^2\Omega_{\text{SW}} + h^2\Omega_{\text{MHD}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that the global $U(1)$ symmetry breaking could also generate cosmic strings, which then annihilate to produce GWs [78, 79]. However, this effect turns out to be subdominant for the energy scales under consideration here.

The envelope approximation is often used to calculate the GWs from the scalar ϕ contribution, and numerical simulations tracing the envelope of thin-walled bubbles reveal that [65, 80]³

$$h^2\Omega_\phi(f) \simeq 1.67 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{H_*}{\beta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\kappa_\phi \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 \left(\frac{100}{g_*} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{0.11 v_w^3}{0.42 + v_w^2} \right) S_{\text{env}}(f),$$

where f is the frequency; g_* is the number of relativistic degrees of freedom in the plasma at the temperature T_* when the GWs are generated; H_* is the Hubble parameter at T_* ; v_w is the bubble wall velocity in the rest frame of the fluid; $\alpha \equiv \rho_{\text{vac}}/\rho_{\text{rad}}^*$ is the ratio of the vacuum energy density ρ_{vac} released in the PT to that of the radiation bath $\rho_{\text{rad}}^* = g_* \pi^2 T_*^4/30$; β/H_* measures the rate of the PT; κ_ϕ measures the fraction of vacuum energy that is converted to gradient energy of the ϕ field; and $S_{\text{env}}(f)$ parameterizes the spectral shape of the GW radiation,

$$S_{\text{env}}(f) = \frac{3.8 (f/f_{\text{env}})^{2.8}}{1 + 2.8 (f/f_{\text{env}})^{3.8}}. \quad (3.7)$$

The peak frequency f_{env} of the ϕ contribution to the spectrum is determined by β and by the peak frequency $f_* = 0.62\beta/(1.8 - 0.1v_w + v_w^2)$ [65] at the time of GW production,

$$f_{\text{env}} = \left(\frac{f_*}{\beta} \right) \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*} \right) h_*. \quad (3.8)$$

Assuming the Universe is radiation-dominated after the PT and has expanded adiabatically ever since, the inverse Hubble time h_* at GW production, red-shifted to today, is

$$h_* = 16.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{mHz} \left(\frac{T_*}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right) \left(\frac{g_*}{100} \right)^{1/6}. \quad (3.9)$$

³For an analytic derivation of GW production in the thin-wall and envelope approximation, see e.g. Refs. [81, 82].

The SW contribution is given by [72]:

$$h^2 \Omega_{\text{SW}}(f) \simeq 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \left(\frac{H_*}{\beta} \right) \left(\frac{\kappa_v \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 \left(\frac{100}{g_*} \right)^{1/3} v_w S_{\text{SW}}(f)$$

where κ_v is the fraction of vacuum energy that is converted to bulk motion of the fluid, and the spectral shape

$$S_{\text{SW}}(f) = \left(\frac{f}{f_{\text{SW}}} \right)^3 \left(\frac{7}{4 + 3(f/f_{\text{SW}})^2} \right)^{7/2}, \quad (3.10)$$

with the peak frequency

$$f_{\text{SW}} = 1.008 \times \frac{2}{\sqrt{3} v_w} \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*} \right) h_*. \quad (3.11)$$

The MHD turbulence contribution is given by [77, 83]:

$$h^2 \Omega_{\text{MHD}}(f) \simeq 3.35 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{H_*}{\beta} \right) \left(\frac{\kappa_{\text{MHD}} \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{100}{g_*} \right)^{1/3} v_w S_{\text{MHD}}(f),$$

where κ_{MHD} is the fraction of vacuum energy that is transformed into MHD turbulence, and the spectral shape can be found analytically:

$$S_{\text{MHD}}(f) = \frac{(f/f_{\text{MHD}})^3}{[1 + (f/f_{\text{MHD}})]^{11/3} (1 + 8\pi f/h_*)}, \quad (3.12)$$

where the peak frequency measured today is

$$f_{\text{MHD}} = 0.935 \left(\frac{3.5}{2v_w} \right) \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*} \right) h_*. \quad (3.13)$$

In most of the parameter space of interest, the phase transition occurs in the ‘runaway bubbles in the plasma’ regime, where the Ω_ϕ contribution cannot be neglected. In principle, friction from the plasma could stop the bubble wall at some terminal velocity [84], thus rendering the plasma-related GW contributions and their associated uncertainties more important [85, 86]. The friction term, however, turns out to be unimportant in our case, because the ϕ field only couples to the Higgs doublet through a scalar quartic interaction, and does not directly couple to the gauge fields. Therefore, the friction from the plasma does not grow with energy [84], thus preserving the runaway behavior. In this limit, the uncertainties in the SW and MHD contributions to Ω_{GW} due to nonlinearities developing in the plasma do not significantly affect our results.

To calculate the GW signal Ω_{GW} described above, we need to know the following quantities:

- The ratio α of vacuum energy density released in the PT to that of the radiation bath.
- The rate of the PT, β/H_* . The smaller β/H_* , the stronger the PT. From the bubble nucleation rate $\Gamma(t) = A(t)e^{-S_E(t)}$ [87], with $A(t)$ the amplitude and S_E the Euclidean action of a critical bubble, we have:

$$\beta \equiv - \left. \frac{dS_E}{dt} \right|_{t=t_*} = TH_* \left. \frac{dS_E}{dT} \right|_{T=T_*}, \quad (3.14)$$

where we have assumed the nucleation temperature $T_n \simeq T_*$ (or equivalently $t_n \simeq t_*$ with t_n and t_* respectively the time for bubble nucleation and GW production).

- The latent heat fractions κ for each of the three processes. For the case of runaway bubbles in a plasma, we have

$$\kappa_\phi = \frac{\alpha - \alpha_\infty}{\alpha}, \quad \kappa_v = \frac{\alpha_\infty}{\alpha} \kappa_\infty, \quad \kappa_{\text{MHD}} = \epsilon \kappa_v, \quad (3.15)$$

where ϵ is the turbulent fraction of bulk motion, which is found to be at most (5% – 10%) [72]. To be concrete, we choose $\epsilon = 0.1$ in this paper. We also have:

$$\kappa_\infty \equiv \frac{\alpha_\infty}{0.73 + 0.083\sqrt{\alpha_\infty} + \alpha_\infty}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\text{with } \alpha_\infty \simeq \frac{30}{24\pi^2} \frac{\sum_i c_i \Delta m_i^2}{g_* T_*^2}. \quad (3.17)$$

In Eq. (3.17), the sum runs over all particles i that are light in the initial phase and heavy in the final phase; Δm_i^2 is the squared mass difference in the two phases; and $c_i = n_i (n_i/2)$ for bosons (fermions) with n_i the number of degrees of freedom of the particle [88].

- The bubble wall velocity v_w in the rest frame of the fluid away from the bubble. A conservative estimate for v_w is given by [89]:

$$v_w = \frac{1/\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha/3}}{1 + \alpha}. \quad (3.18)$$

- The number of relativistic degrees of freedom g_* at the time of the PT, which is taken to be the SM contribution of 106.75 plus an additional 1 from the ALP.

3.3 Critical temperature

For the calculation of the GW production associated to the PT, we take f_a , κ and λ_a as the only free parameters in the scalar potential (2.1). Below the scale f_a , the scalar sector only contains the SM Higgs and the superlight ALP a . The value of λ_a , as well as the other relevant coupling constants appearing in Eqs. (2.10) and (2.11), at a high energy scale $\Lambda < f_a$ can be obtained by running the SM RG equations up to the scale Λ [90]. We will consider values $f_a \leq 10^8$ GeV, as the SM vacuum becomes unstable for $\Lambda \gtrsim 10^8$ GeV [91] with the current best-fit top quark mass $m_t = 173.0$ GeV [92]. Similarly, we take $f_a \geq 10^3$ GeV, because for f_a comparable to (or smaller than) the Higgs mass, the LHC Higgs data impose stringent constraints on the coupling κ (see Section 5).

Fixing $f_a = 10^6$ GeV, we scan the two parameters κ and λ_a . The critical temperature is shown in the left panel of Fig. 2, in units of f_a . It can be seen that T_c gets larger for larger κ or larger λ_a , and in the parameter region we focus on, we have $T_c \lesssim f_a$.

3.4 Bubble nucleation

For the region in parameter space where there is a valid T_c , bubble nucleation might occur when $T < T_c$, i.e., when the two local minima become non-degenerate. The nucleation temperature T_n is estimated by the condition:

$$\frac{\Gamma(T_n)}{H(T_n)^4} = 1, \quad (3.19)$$




Figure 2. Critical temperature T_c (left) and nucleation temperature T_n (right) in units of f_a in (κ, λ_a) parameter space for $f_a = 10^6$ GeV.

where the Hubble constant is given by [85]:

$$H(T) = \frac{\pi T^2}{3M_{\text{Pl}}} \sqrt{\frac{g_*}{10}}. \quad (3.20)$$

If a valid solution for T_n from Eq. (3.19) can be found, this indicates that the nucleation process will happen, and that the majority of the GW signal is produced at $T_* \simeq T_n$. β/H_* is obtained from Eq. (3.14), and the result for the nucleation temperature T_n is shown in the right panel of Fig. 2, for the specific value $f_a = 10^6$ GeV. It is clear from Fig. 2 that the region with a viable nucleation temperature T_n is a subset of the FOPT region, and that $T_n \lesssim T_c$.

The two important parameters for computing the GW signal, β/H_* and α , are then evaluated at T_n . We show the results of these two parameters in the parameter space (κ, λ_a) for the case of $f_a = 10^6$ GeV in Fig. 3. β/H_* can reach values as small as $\sim 10^2$; while $\alpha \lesssim 0.05$ for most of the parameter space, but it can reach values of order 1. The region with large α and relatively small β/H_* is where a relatively large GW signal is expected. This is the region where $0.001 \lesssim \lambda_a \lesssim 0.1$ and $\kappa \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. Note that larger values of κ would lead to a breakdown of the perturbation theory, as a Landau pole is developed below the f_a scale. Moreover, the one-loop self-energy corrections to the ϕ field due to the Higgs and Goldstone modes will be large in this case. In order to avoid these theoretical issues, we will restrict ourselves to $\kappa < 6$.

3.5 Detection prospects

We have assumed that the majority of the GW signal is produced at $T_* \simeq T_n$. Since the three GW contributions scale as inverse powers of β/H_* ,

$$h^2\Omega_\phi \propto \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right)^{-2}, \quad h^2\Omega_{\text{SW}} \propto \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right)^{-1}, \quad h^2\Omega_{\text{MHD}} \propto \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right)^{-1}, \quad (3.21)$$

we expect that a relatively large GW signal can be generated in the small- β/H_* region.

The three different components of GW signals from bubble wall collision in Eq. (3.7), SW in the plasma in Eq. (3.10), and MHD turbulence in Eq. (3.12) are added to obtain the total GW emission, given in Eq. (3.6), as a function of frequency f . Our numerical




Figure 3. β/H_* (left) and α (right) evaluated at T_* for $f_a = 10^6$ GeV.




Figure 4. The detection prospects for the GW experiments TianQin [27], Taiji [28], LISA [29, 30], ALIA [31], MAGIS [32], DECIGO [33], BBO [34], aLIGO [37], aLIGO+ [38], ET [36] and CE [35], and the curves of GW strength $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ as functions of the three parameters f_a , κ and λ_a in the ALP model. In the upper panel, we have fixed $f_a = 10^6$ GeV and $\kappa = 1.0$ and varied λ_a from 0.001 to 0.2; in the lower left panel $f_a = 10^6$ GeV and $\lambda_a = 0.001$, with κ varying from 1.0 to 6.00; in the lower right panel $\kappa = 1.0$ and $\lambda_a = 0.001$, with f_a between 10^3 GeV and 10^8 GeV.

simulations reveal that the GW signal obtained in this model can be as large as $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \approx 10^{-12}$ for configurations with $\kappa \approx 1$ and $\lambda_a \approx 10^{-3}$. For such configurations that can produce considerable GW signals, contributions from both scalar fields and sound waves are

comparable, and cannot be neglected, as indicated by the shape of the $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}$ curves in Fig. 4. In most cases we have $h^2\Omega_{\text{SW}} \gtrsim h^2\Omega_\phi$ and the MHD contribution is much smaller than the other two contributions.

In Fig. 4, we show the detection prospects for the future GW experiments TianQin [27], Taiji [28], LISA [29, 30], ALIA [31], MAGIS [32], DECIGO [33], BBO [34], aLIGO [37], aLIGO+ [38], ET [36] and CE [35]. To see the dependence of the GW signal on the parameters f_a , κ and λ_a , let us first fix $f_a = 10^6$ GeV and $\kappa = 1.0$ and vary the quartic coupling λ_a from 0.001 to 0.2. The corresponding GW signal $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}}$ is shown in the upper panel of Fig. 4, as a function of the frequency f . It is obvious that within the T_* region the configurations with smaller λ_a tend to produce a larger GW signal with a relatively smaller peak frequency, which is preferred by the space-based experiments. Likewise, when we fix $f_a = 10^6$ GeV and $\lambda_a = 0.001$, the configurations with $\kappa \approx 1$ tend to produce the strongest GW signals at small peak frequencies, as shown in the lower left panel of Fig. 4. When κ and λ_a are fixed, e.g. $\kappa = 1.00$ and $\lambda_a = 0.001$, a larger f_a tends to produce a slightly larger GW signal with a larger peak frequency, as seen in the lower right panel of Fig. 4.

The GW detection prospects in the two-dimensional plane of κ and λ_a are shown in Fig. 5 for the benchmark values $f_a = 10^{3,4,5,6,7,8}$ GeV. For the sake of clarity, we show only the sensitivity regions for three selected GW experiments: TianQin, BBO and CE.

The current and future GW observations are largely complementary to each other. For instance, TianQin, Taiji, LISA and ALIA are more sensitive to the GWs with a comparatively lower frequency and thus a smaller f_a ; aLIGO, aLIGO+, ET and CE could probe higher frequency GWs, and thus larger f_a ; while MAGIS, DECIGO and BBO are able to cover the frequency range in between. This is explicitly illustrated in Fig. 6, for the benchmark values $\kappa = 1.0$ and $\lambda_a = 0.001$. We use the power-law integrated sensitivity curves for future GW experiments, as described in Appendix A. Although the GW emission in the ALP model does not directly involve the ALP particle a , future GW observations could definitely probe a broad range of the decay constant f_a , which largely complements the low-energy, high-energy, astrophysical and cosmological constraints on the f_a parameter, as detailed in Section 4. For related discussions on GW emission from the ALP field itself, see e.g. Refs. [93–95].

4 Comparison with other ALP constraints

As shown in Figs. 4, 5 of Section 3, current and future GW observations could probe a broad region of the parameter space in the ALP model. In particular, the scale f_a in the range $(10^3 - 10^8)$ GeV can be probed by future GW observatories, as summarized in Fig. 6. At low energies, all the ALP couplings to SM particles are inversely proportional to powers of the decay constant f_a (see e.g. Eqs. (4.1) and (4.5)); thus, GW observations are largely complementary to the laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological constraints on the couplings of a to SM particles. For the sake of simplicity, we will focus on the effective CP-conserving ALP couplings to photons ($g_{a\gamma\gamma}$), electrons (g_{aee}) and nucleons (g_{aNN}). In principle, the ALP could also couple to other SM particles like the muon, tau and other gauge bosons (gluons, W and Z boson), and we could even have CP-violating couplings to SM particles [39, 96, 100] (see e.g. Refs. [22, 96] for more details). In addition, the muon $g - 2$ anomaly could be explained by ALP couplings to muons and photons [97–100] or by flavor violating couplings to muons and taus [101].




Figure 5. GW detection prospects for TianQin [27], BBO [34] and CE [35] in (κ, λ_a) parameter space for $f_a = 10^{3,4,5,6,7,8}$ GeV.

4.1 Low-energy effective ALP couplings

Even though the ALP a does not couple directly to the SM Higgs or the real scalar ϕ in the potential (2.1), low-energy couplings to SM particles can be induced at dimension-5 or higher. For instance, the effective couplings of a to the SM photon and fermions f can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_a = -\frac{C_{a\gamma}\alpha_{\text{EM}}}{8\pi f_a} a F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2f_a} \sum_f C_{af} (\bar{f} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 f). \quad (4.1)$$

Here, $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the electromagnetic field strength tensor and $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$ its dual, α_{EM} is the fine-structure constant, and $C_{a\gamma}$, C_{af} are model-dependent coefficients. Generally speaking, these coefficients are of order one for the QCD axion. Setting the model-dependent coefficients C_i




Figure 6. Ranges of f_a values accessible to the GW experiments TianQin [27], Taiji [28], LISA [29, 30], ALIA [31], MAGIS [32], DECIGO [33], BBO [34], ET [36] and CE [35]. We have fixed $\kappa = 1.0$ and $\lambda_a = 0.001$. The GW signal produced by this configuration is not accessible by aLIGO [37] or aLIGO+ [38].

to one for simplicity, we rewrite the couplings in Eq. (4.1) as

$$\mathcal{L}_a = -\frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}}{4}aF_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} - a\sum_f g_{aff}(i\bar{f}\gamma^5 f), \quad (4.2)$$

where the effective couplings are related to the high scale f_a via

$$g_{a\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{EM}}}{2\pi f_a}, \quad g_{aff} = \frac{m_f}{f_a}, \quad (4.3)$$

and m_f is the corresponding fermion mass. We thus see that the GW limits on f_a from Fig. 6 can be used to probe the effective couplings $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, g_{aee} and g_{aNN} .

4.2 Coupling to photons

Following Ref. [22], all the current constraints on the ALP couplings to photons $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ are collected in the left panel of Fig. 7, while future laboratory and astrophysical prospects are shown in the right panel of Fig. 7. In both panels we also show the parameter space for DFSZ [102, 103] and KSVZ [104, 105] axions, indicated respectively by the yellow region and brown line. The various constraints are explained below:

- Given the coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, the ALP can decay into two photons in the early universe, with a rate depending largely on its mass m_a and the magnitude of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$. If ALPs decay before recombination, the photons produced in the decays would potentially distort the cosmic microwave background (CMB) spectrum and, at earlier times, they would also affect big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) [106]. The monochromatic photon lines from axion/ALP decays are also constrained by the flux of extragalactic background light (EBL) and direct searches in X-rays and γ -rays [106]. Furthermore, the photons might also change the evolution of the hydrogen ionisation fraction, x_{ion} [106]. These limits are shown in greenish color in the left panel of Fig. 7.
- Assuming ALPs account for all the DM, the regions labelled as “telescopes” in the left panel of Fig. 7 have been excluded by direct decaying DM searches in galaxies [107, 108]. It is promising that future telescopes could probe couplings down to [109]

$$g_{a\gamma\gamma} \sim (10^{-12} \text{ GeV}^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{m_a}{10^{-6} \text{ eV}}\right) \left(\frac{d}{2 \text{ kpc}}\right)^{1/2} \quad \text{for } 10^{-7} \text{ eV} \lesssim m_a \lesssim 10^{-4} \text{ eV}. \quad (4.4)$$




Figure 7. Complementarity between the GW limits on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ and laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological constraints on the ALP mass m_a and $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$. The GW prospects for $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ are shown in purple (TianQin [27]), red (BBO [34]) and orange (CE [35]), with dashed border lines. Other available constraints are collected in the left panel, including those from LSW experiments [136–142], beam-dump experiments [156–160], helioscopes [117–126], observations of the Sun [113], HB stars [114] and SN1987A (labelled as “SN”) [115], telescope [107, 108] and haloscope [130–133] searches of ALP cold DM, and cosmological constraints from BBN, CMB, EBL, x-rays, γ -rays, x_{ion} [106]. In the right panel, all the current limits are shown in gray, and we emphasize the future reach of telescope observations (green line) [109], helioscope experiments (red line) [127–129], the LSW experiments ALPS II (dashed blue line) [143], ALPS III (solid blue line) [144], STAX (solid purple line) [145] and SHiP (solid orange line) [162]. The regions above the lines can be probed by these experiments. In both the panels we also display the parameter space for DFSZ (yellow region) and KSVZ axions (brown line). The limits and prospects are adapted from [22] (see text for more details).

Taking the distance to the ALP source to be $d \simeq 2 \text{ kpc}$, the future sensitivity could reach $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \sim 10^{-13} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. This is shown as the green line in the right panel of Fig. 7.

- As a result of the coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, ALPs can be produced and emitted copiously from dense stellar cores, thus affecting stellar evolution [110–112]. Large portions of the $(m_a, g_{a\gamma\gamma})$ parameter space have been excluded by measurements of the solar neutrino flux and helioseismology [113], the ratio of horizontal branch (HB) to red giants in globular clusters [114], and SN1987A neutrino data [115]. These limits are labelled respectively as “Sun”, “HB stars” and “SN” in the left panel of Fig. 7.
- In the presence of an electromagnetic field, the ALP can be converted to a photon through the $a\gamma\gamma$ coupling [116]. The axion helioscope experiments Brookhaven [117], SUMICO [118–120] and CAST [121–126] aim to detect X-rays from $a - \gamma$ conversion in the Sun. The absence of a signal can be used to set the limits on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ labelled as “helioscopes” in the left panel of Fig. 7. Future experiments such as TASTE [127] and IAXO [128, 129] could improve current constraints by over one order of magnitude, also shown by the solid red line in the right panel of Fig. 7.
- In a static magnetic field, ALP DM in the $\sim 10^{-6} \text{ eV}$ mass range can be converted

into a microwave photons [116]. Narrow regions around this range have been excluded by the ADMX experiment [130–133]. They are labelled as “haloscopes” in the left panel of Fig. 7. Although we do not display these limits, let us mention that future stages of ADMX could probe a very narrow range around $m_a \sim 10 \mu\text{eV}$ [134], while the ABRACADABRA experiment might be sensitive to light ALPs with mass $10^{-14} \text{eV} \lesssim m_a \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{eV}$ and couplings down to $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \sim 10^{-19} \text{GeV}^{-1}$ [135].

- Light-shining-through-wall (LSW) experiments provide the most stringent laboratory constraints on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ for a broad range of ALP mass m_a . In such experiments, ALPs can be produced from intense photon sources in the presence of magnetic fields and then convert back into photons. The LSW limits from BRFT [136], BMV [137], GammaV [138], LIPPS [139], ALPS [140], OSQAR [141] and CROWS [142] are collectively shown in the left panel of Fig. 7. The LSW limits could be further improved by up to four orders of magnitude by the experiments ALPS II [143], ALPS III [144] and STAX [145], as indicated by the dashed blue, solid blue and solid purple lines in the right panel of Fig. 7. There are also constraints from the polarization experiment PVLAS [136, 146–148] and from fifth force searches [149–155], which are however weaker and thus not shown in Fig. 7.
- In beam-dump experiments, ALPs can be produced off photons. The limits on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ from the experiments CHARM [156], E137 [157], E141 [158] and NuCal [159, 160] are comparatively weaker than those from the astrophysical observations above, excluding a region $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \gtrsim 10^{-7} \text{GeV}^{-1}$ for ALP masses $m_a \sim (\text{MeV} - \text{GeV})$, as shown in Fig. 7. The future experiment SHiP [161, 162] will extend the exclusion regions to higher m_a , but it will not push to smaller couplings $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ [163, 164], as indicated in the right panel of Fig. 7. The projected limit from NA62 is expected to be weaker and thus not shown.

For sufficiently small $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, the ALP might be long-lived and decay outside the detectors in high-energy colliders. There have been searches of single photon plus missing transverse energy $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ at LEP [166–169] and $pp \rightarrow \gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ at LHC [170–173]. Similarly, observations of radiative decays of Upsilon mesons $\Upsilon \rightarrow \gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ at CLEO [174] and BaBar [175] can be used to set limits on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$. If the ALP decays promptly in the detectors, then we have the three photon signature e^+e^- , $p\bar{p}$, $pp \rightarrow \gamma + a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma$ at LEP [176, 177], Tevatron [178] and LHC [179, 180]. These limits could be improved by one to two orders of magnitude at future colliders such as Belle II [181], ILC [182], FCC-ee [183] and at later stages of the LHC [184, 185]. Benefiting from the large proton number in heavy ions, the photon-photon luminosity can be greatly enhanced in heavy-ion collisions compared to proton-proton colliders, and the current LHC bounds on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ can be improved by two orders of magnitude with ultra-peripheral heavy-ion collisions [186]. However, even at future colliders, the prospective limits are still too weak, at the level of $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \gtrsim 10^{-5} \text{GeV}^{-1}$ [184–186], and hence not shown. Additional collider and flavor factory constraints on the coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ can be found e.g. in Refs. [39, 187, 188].

The following effective operators appear at dimension 6 and 7 [39, 96, 100]:

$$\mathcal{L}_a \supset \frac{C_6}{f_a^2} (\partial_\mu a) (\partial^\mu a) (H^\dagger H) + \frac{C_7}{f_a^3} (\partial^\mu a) (H^\dagger i D_\mu H) (H^\dagger H), \quad (4.5)$$

with $C_{6,7}$ the dimensionless Wilson coefficients and D_μ the covariant derivative for the SM Higgs doublet. These operators generate ALP couplings haa to the SM Higgs and haZ to the




Figure 8. Complementarity between the GW limits on g_{ee} and laboratory and astrophysical constraints on the ALP mass m_a and g_{ee} . The region of g_{ee} values that will be probed by GW observatories is shown with dashed border lines for the case of TianQin [27] (purple), BBO [34] (red) and CE [35] (orange). The constraints include those from EDELWEISS (gray) [191], Red Giants (green) [198], and the beam-dump experiment E137 (pink) [157]. The dashed gray line indicates the prospect at MINOS/MINERvA [199]. We also show the parameter space for DFSZ (yellow region) and KSVZ axions (brown line). See text for more details.

Z boson, which induce exotic decays of the SM Higgs, i.e. $h \rightarrow aa$ and $h \rightarrow aZ$ with the ALPs further decaying into two photons $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [96, 100]. In principle, we can set limits on $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ from the searches for exotic decays of the SM Higgs $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 4\gamma$ and $h \rightarrow aZ \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\ell^+\ell^-$ (with $\ell = e, \mu$). However, these limits depend on the coefficients $C_{6,7}$ in Eq. (4.5), and we do not include them in Fig. 7.

Using Eq. (4.3), the GW bounds on f_a from TianQin, BBO and CE can be converted to limits on the effective coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ that do not depend on the ALP mass m_a , and are shown as the purple, red and orange horizontal bands with dashed border lines in Fig. 7 respectively. When combined, these GW observations are sensitive to the range

$$10^{-11} \text{ GeV}^{-1} \lesssim g_{a\gamma\gamma} \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-1}. \quad (4.6)$$

As shown in Fig. 7, some of the regions within this range of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ have been excluded by astrophysical and cosmological observations and laboratory experiments, while some are still unconstrained. Assuming that a GW signal from the PT in the ALP model is found in the near future, then we would expect a positive signal in future ALP searches. This can be seen in the right panel of Fig. 7 by the overlap between the regions covered by GW searches and those covered by telescopes [109], helioscopes [127–129], the LSW experiments ALPS II [143], ALPS III [144] and STAX [145], and beam-dump experiments like SHiP [162].

4.3 Coupling to electrons

Astrophysical and laboratory constraints on the ALP coupling to electrons g_{ee} are collected in Fig. 8. In this figure we also show the parameter space for DFSZ and KSVZ axions. As in the case of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, exotic SM Higgs decays $h \rightarrow aa$ and $h \rightarrow aZ$ can not be used to set robust

limits on the coupling g_{ae} , since they also depend on the coefficients $C_{6,7}$ in Eq. (4.5). The other constraints are described below:

- ALPs can be produced by bremsstrahlung and Compton effects in the Sun. Model-independent constraints on the mass m_a and coupling g_{aee} have been imposed by electron recoil searches in the low-background experiments Derbin [189], XMASS [190] and EDELWEISS [191]. The limit from EDELWEISS is the most stringent one, and is shown as the gray region in Fig. 8. There are also constraints from CoGeNT [192] and CDMS [193] on ALPs DM in local galaxies, which exclude however a much narrower region of g_{aee} . The limits on g_{aee} from CUORE [194], Derbin [195] and Borexino [196] depend on the effective ALP coupling to nucleons g_{aNN}^{eff} , and are not shown in Fig. 8.
- If the ALP couples to electrons, it will lead to extra energy losses in astrophysical objects. Constraints from observations of solar neutrinos [197] and Red Giants [198] have excluded a broad region in parameter space. The Red Giant excluded region is shown in green in Fig. 8, while the solar neutrino limits are comparatively much weaker.
- ALPs can be produced in beam-dump experiments by bremsstrahlung off an incident electron beam and decay back into electron-positron pairs in the detector [199]. The region excluded by E137 [157] is shown in pink in Fig. 8. The experiment MINOS/MINERvA could improve significantly the current limit [199], as indicated by the dashed gray line.

Given the relation in Eq. (4.3), the GW experiments TianQin, BBO and CE could probe the range

$$10^{-11.5} \lesssim g_{aee} \lesssim 10^{-6.5}. \quad (4.7)$$

A sizable fraction of this range for with $m_a \lesssim 10$ keV has already been excluded by EDELWEISS [191] and Red Giants [198]. Should the GW experiments TianQin find a GW signal, then the corresponding ALP mass would be expected to be heavier than roughly 10 keV, which might be tested by the MINOS/MINERvA experiment [199].

4.4 Coupling to nucleons

Limits on the effective coupling g_{aNN} of ALPs to nucleons are collected in Fig. 9, which also displays the parameter space for DFSZ and KSVZ axions.

- ALPs can be produced in compact astrophysical objects like neutron stars and supernova cores via nucleon bremsstrahlung $N + N \rightarrow N + N + a$, where $N = p, n$ represents both protons and neutrons [200, 201]. Neutron star constraints on the coupling g_{aNN} can be found in e.g. [200, 202]. Limits from neutrino bursts from SN1987A are stronger, and exclude couplings $10^{-8} \lesssim g_{aNN} \lesssim 10^{-6}$ for $m_a \lesssim 100$ MeV [199, 203–208], as shown in blue in Fig. 9. Next-generation supernova observations could improve greatly the limits on g_{aNN} , depending on how far the next supernova explosion is [209].
- The Yukawa couplings of ALPs to nucleons could potentially cause violations of the gravitational inverse-square law, and the effective coupling g_{aNN} is thus constrained by Cavendish-type experiments [150, 210], as shown in brown in Fig. 9. Limits from measurements of Casimir forces are comparatively weaker with $g_{aNN} \lesssim 10^{-2.5}$ [211, 212], and are not shown.




Figure 9. Complementarity between GW limits on g_{aNN} and astrophysical constraints on m_a and g_{aNN} . GW experiments are sensitive to values of g_{aNN} in the region shown in purple (TianQin [27]), red (BBO [34]), and orange (CE [35]), with dashed border lines. The constraints include those from SN1987A [199] (blue), Cavendish-type experiments (brown) and magnetometer experiments (pink). We also show the parameter space for DFSZ (yellow region) and KSVZ axions (brown line). See text for more details.

- Searches of new long-range spin-dependent forces between nucleons can be used to set limits on the coupling g_{aNN} . Magnetometer experiments have excluded couplings $g_{aNN} \gtrsim 10^{-4}$ for ALP masses $m_a \lesssim \text{meV}$ [213], as shown in pink in Fig. 9.

The GW experiments TianQin, BBO and CE could probe the range

$$10^{-8} \lesssim g_{aNN} \lesssim 10^{-3}, \quad (4.8)$$

which is largely complementary to supernova and laboratory constraints.

5 Prospects from precision Higgs data at future colliders

If the scalar ϕ in the ALP model resides at the few-TeV scale, it will contribute to the trilinear coupling λ_3 of the SM Higgs through the quartic coupling κ . This is obtained from the temperature-independent effective potential $\mathcal{V}$ in Eq. (2.6), after integrating out the ϕ -field, and reads [214, 215]:

$$\lambda_3 \simeq \lambda_3^{\text{SM}} + \frac{\kappa^3 v_{\text{EW}}^3}{24\pi^2 m_\phi^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

with the SM contribution $\lambda_3^{\text{SM}} = m_h^2/2v_{\text{EW}}$. If the quartic coupling $\lambda_a \simeq \mathcal{O}(0.1) - \mathcal{O}(1)$ as seen in Fig. 5, the mass $m_\phi = \sqrt{4\lambda_a} f_a$ is of the same order as the scale f_a . Then we can set limits on the f_a scale and κ by precision measurements of the trilinear SM Higgs coupling at high-energy colliders. Current Higgs pair production data at the LHC lead to the limit $-9 \lesssim \lambda_3/\lambda_3^{\text{SM}} \lesssim 15$ [216–218], which is too weak to exclude any parameter space of the ALP model. Future hadron colliders like the high-luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) and the FCC-hh [219], and lepton colliders such as the ILC [182], will be able to measure the




Figure 10. Prospects for the trilinear coupling of the SM Higgs at 1σ confidence level at the HL-LHC with center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV and an integrated luminosity of 3 ab^{-1} [220–224], at the FCC-hh with $\sqrt{s} = 100$ TeV and 30 ab^{-1} [225], and at the ILC with $\sqrt{s} = 1$ TeV and 2.5 ab^{-1} [226, 227], as a function of the scale f_a and the coupling κ in the ALP model. The shaded region is excluded by the perturbative limit.

trilinear scalar coupling more precisely and probe the scale f_a and the quartic coupling κ . Indeed, λ_3 can be measured within (30% - 50%) at the 1σ confidence level by the HL-LHC with an integrated luminosity of 3 ab^{-1} [220–224]. With a larger cross section, the precision can be improved to $\sim 5\%$ at the future 100 TeV collider FCC-hh with a luminosity of 30 ab^{-1} [225], and up to 13% at the 1 TeV ILC with a luminosity of 2.5 ab^{-1} [226, 227]. All these sensitivities are shown in Fig. 10, for the benchmark value $\lambda_a = 0.25$. Future high energy colliders are largely complementary to low energy axion experiments and GW observations for TeV scale f_a .

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have studied the production of GWs due to a strong FOPT in a generic axion or ALP model, where we extended the SM scalar sector by adding only a complex singlet field Φ . The angular component of Φ is identified as the axion or ALP field a . The original Lagrangian contains only a few free parameters, namely, the ALP mass m_a , the “axion decay constant” f_a and the quartic couplings κ and λ_a in Eq. (2.1). We have explored the prospects for GW emission for f_a between 10^3 GeV and 10^8 GeV. Our numerical calculations reveal that in the ALP model we are considering, the GW signal strength could be as large as $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW}} \sim 10^{-12}$, which might be detectable at future GW experiments like TianQin, BBO and CE, depending on the GW frequency and on the ALP model parameters (see Figs. 4-6).

At low energies, the ALP couplings to SM particles are universally determined by the decay constant f_a , up to model-dependent coefficients; in other words, all the effective couplings of ALP depend on inverse powers of f_a . Therefore, we can convert the GW limits on f_a to sensitivities on the effective ALP couplings to SM particles, independent of the ALP mass m_a . We have considered the CP-conserving couplings of ALP to photons $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, electrons g_{aee} and nucleons g_{aNN} . These couplings are tightly constrained by a large variety of laboratory experiments, and by astrophysical and cosmological observations, which exclude broad regions depending on the ALP mass m_a . GW experiments would probe sizable

regions of the unconstrained parameter space, namely, $10^{-11} \text{ GeV}^{-1} \lesssim g_{a\gamma\gamma} \lesssim 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, $10^{-11.5} \lesssim g_{aee} \lesssim 10^{-6.5}$ and $10^{-8} \lesssim g_{aNN} \lesssim 10^{-3}$, which are largely complementary to the laboratory, astrophysical and cosmological constraints. Thus, if a GW signal is found in future GW experiments and interpreted in the framework of axion or ALP models, it can be cross-checked in the upcoming laboratory and/or astrophysical ALP searches. In addition, for f_a at the TeV scale, the real component ϕ contributes to the trilinear coupling of the SM Higgs. Thus precision Higgs data at future hadron and lepton colliders can be used to probe the f_a and κ parameters in the ALP model, which is also complementary to low-energy axion/ALP experiments and GW observations.

Acknowledgements

We thank Robert Caldwell, Yanou Cui, Ryusuke Jinno, Arthur Kosowsky, Marek Lewicki, Andrew Long, Alex Pomarol, Michael Ramsey-Musolf and Fabrizio Rompineve for useful discussions and comments on the draft. B.D. also thanks Aniket Joglekar for a discussion on the trilinear Higgs coupling. This work was supported by the US Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-SC0017987. Y.C.Z. is grateful to the Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University where part of the work was done for generous hospitality.

A Power-law Integrated Sensitivity Curves

Let us briefly outline the procedure used to compute the power-law integrated sensitivity curves for current and future GW experiments. For a detailed description of this method, see Ref. [228].

In the literature, the square root $\sqrt{S_n(f)}$ of the strain power spectral density is usually given as a function of frequency, in units of $1/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$. We first convert it to $\Omega_n(f)$:

$$\Omega_n(f) = \frac{2\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f^3 S_n(f). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then, given a set of power-law indices β , e.g. $\beta \in \{-8, -7, \dots, 7, 8\}$, we compute for each β

$$\Omega_{0\beta} = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2T}} \left[\int_{f_{\min}}^{f_{\max}} df \frac{(f/f_{\text{ref}})^{2\beta}}{\Omega_n^2(f)} \right]^{-1/2}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where f_{ref} is some reference frequency. It can be arbitrarily chosen and it will not affect the results. ρ is the integrated signal-to-noise ratio and T is the observation time. Following Ref. [228], for $\rho = 1$ and $T = 1$ year we have:

$$\Omega_\beta(f) = \Omega_{0\beta} \left(\frac{f}{f_{\text{ref}}} \right)^\beta. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The power-law integrated sensitivity curve $\Omega_{\text{PI}}(f)$ is the envelope of all the $\Omega_\beta(f)$ curves,

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) = \max \left[\Omega_{0\beta} \left(\frac{f}{f_{\text{ref}}} \right)^\beta \right]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

As an explicit example, the power-law integrated curve $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f)$ of BBO as well as the series of $\Omega_\beta(f)$ are presented in Fig. 11.




Figure 11. The sensitivity curves for BBO. The red curve is the power-law integrated sensitivity curve defined in Eq. (A.4); the gray curves are sensitivity curves for different power-law indices, defined in Eq. (A.3).

References

- [1] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977).
- [2] P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 22, 221801 (2015) [arXiv:1504.07551 [hep-ph]].
- [3] K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and A. V. Olinto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3233 (1990).
- [4] F. C. Adams, J. R. Bond, K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and A. V. Olinto, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 426 (1993) [hep-ph/9207245].
- [5] R. Daido, F. Takahashi and W. Yin, JCAP **1705**, no. 05, 044 (2017) [arXiv:1702.03284 [hep-ph]].
- [6] J. Preskill, M. B. Wise and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **120**, 127 (1983).
- [7] L. F. Abbott and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. B **120**, 133 (1983).
- [8] M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B **120**, 137 (1983).
- [9] P. Jain, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **20**, 1763 (2005) [hep-ph/0411279].
- [10] J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, JCAP **0905**, 010 (2009) [arXiv:0902.3610 [hep-th]].
- [11] J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. B **730**, 53 (2014) [arXiv:1311.0012 [hep-ph]].
- [12] A. Lloyd-Stubbs and J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no. 2, 023510 (2019) [arXiv:1807.00778 [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. Daido, N. Kitajima and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1507**, no. 07, 046 (2015) [arXiv:1504.07917 [hep-ph]].
- [14] A. De Simone, T. Kobayashi and S. Liberati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 13, 131101 (2017) [arXiv:1612.04824 [hep-ph]].
- [15] A. Salvio, Phys. Lett. B **743**, 428 (2015) [arXiv:1501.03781 [hep-ph]].
- [16] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 7, 071802 (2017) [arXiv:1608.05414 [hep-ph]].

- [17] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, JCAP **1708**, no. 08, 001 (2017) [arXiv:1610.01639 [hep-ph]].
- [18] Y. Ema, K. Hamaguchi, T. Moroi and K. Nakayama, JHEP **1701**, 096 (2017) [arXiv:1612.05492 [hep-ph]].
- [19] A. Salvio, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no. 1, 015037 (2019) [arXiv:1810.00792 [hep-ph]].
- [20] R. S. Gupta, J. Y. Reiness and M. Spannowsky, arXiv:1902.08633 [hep-ph].
- [21] J. Jaeckel and A. Ringwald, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **60**, 405 (2010) [arXiv:1002.0329 [hep-ph]].
- [22] I. G. Irastorza and J. Redondo, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **102**, 89 (2018) [arXiv:1801.08127 [hep-ph]].
- [23] V. Barger, P. Langacker, M. McCaskey, M. Ramsey-Musolf and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 015018 (2009) [arXiv:0811.0393 [hep-ph]].
- [24] D. J. Weir, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **376**, no. 2114, 20170126 (2018) [arXiv:1705.01783 [hep-ph]].
- [25] A. Mazumdar and G. White, arXiv:1811.01948 [hep-ph].
- [26] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] J. Luo *et al.* [TianQin Collaboration], Class. Quant. Grav. **33**, no. 3, 035010 (2016) [arXiv:1512.02076 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [28] Z. K. Guo, R. G. Cai and Y. Z. Zhang, arXiv:1807.09495 [gr-qc].
- [29] H. Audley *et al.* [LISA Collaboration], arXiv:1702.00786 [astro-ph.IM].
- [30] T. Robson, N. Cornish and C. Liu, arXiv:1803.01944 [astro-ph.HE].
- [31] X. Gong *et al.*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **610**, no. 1, 012011 (2015) [arXiv:1410.7296 [gr-qc]].
- [32] J. Coleman [MAGIS-100 Collaboration], arXiv:1812.00482 [physics.ins-det].
- [33] M. Musha [DECIGO Working group], Proc. SPIE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng. **10562**, 105623T (2017).
- [34] V. Corbin and N. J. Cornish, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 2435 (2006) [gr-qc/0512039].
- [35] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific Collaboration], Class. Quant. Grav. **34**, no. 4, 044001 (2017) [arXiv:1607.08697 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [36] M. Punturo *et al.*, Class. Quant. Grav. **27**, 194002 (2010).
- [37] [LIGO Scientific Collaboration], arXiv:1904.03187 [gr-qc].
- [38] The LIGO Scientific Collaboration, LIGO DCC-T1400316 (2014).
- [39] I. Brivio, M. B. Gavela, L. Merlo, K. Mimasu, J. M. No, R. del Rey and V. Sanz, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 8, 572 (2017) [arXiv:1701.05379 [hep-ph]].
- [40] M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **55**, R435 (1997) [astro-ph/9607066].
- [41] R. Easther and E. A. Lim, JCAP **0604**, 010 (2006) [astro-ph/0601617].
- [42] R. Easther, J. T. Giblin, Jr. and E. A. Lim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 221301 (2007) [astro-ph/0612294].
- [43] L. Senatore, E. Silverstein and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **1408**, 016 (2014) [arXiv:1109.0542 [hep-th]].
- [44] M. C. Guzzetti, N. Bartolo, M. Liguori and S. Matarrese, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **39**, no. 9, 399 (2016) [arXiv:1605.01615 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [45] N. Bartolo *et al.*, JCAP **1612**, no. 12, 026 (2016) [arXiv:1610.06481 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [46] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations], Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 13, 131102 (2016) [arXiv:1602.03847 [gr-qc]].
- [47] C. W. Chiang, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf and E. Senaha, Phys. Rev. D **97**, no. 1, 015005 (2018) [arXiv:1707.09960 [hep-ph]].
- [48] P. S. B. Dev and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 10, 104001 (2016) [arXiv:1602.04203 [hep-ph]].
- [49] P. W. Graham, A. Ismail, S. Rajendran and P. Saraswat, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 055016 (2010) [arXiv:0910.3020 [hep-ph]].
- [50] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3320 (1974).
- [51] P. B. Arnold and O. Espinosa, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3546 (1993) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **50**, 6662 (1994)] [hep-ph/9212235].
- [52] M. Quiros, hep-ph/9901312.
- [53] D. Curtin, P. Meade and H. Ramani, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, no. 9, 787 (2018) [arXiv:1612.00466 [hep-ph]].
- [54] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888 (1973).
- [55] J. Iliopoulos, C. Itzykson and A. Martin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 165 (1975).
- [56] E. J. Weinberg and A. q. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 2474 (1987).
- [57] C. Delaunay, C. Grojean and J. D. Wells, JHEP **0804**, 029 (2008) [arXiv:0711.2511 [hep-ph]].
- [58] H. H. Patel and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, JHEP **1107**, 029 (2011) [arXiv:1101.4665 [hep-ph]].
- [59] C. L. Wainwright, Comput. Phys. Commun. **183**, 2006 (2012) [arXiv:1109.4189 [hep-ph]].
- [60] S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2929 (1977) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1248 (1977)].
- [61] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **100B**, 37 (1981).
- [62] A. D. Linde, Nucl. Phys. B **216**, 421 (1983) Erratum: [Nucl. Phys. B **223**, 544 (1983)].
- [63] A. Kosowsky, M. S. Turner and R. Watkins, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4514 (1992).
- [64] A. Kosowsky and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 4372 (1993) [astro-ph/9211004].
- [65] S. J. Huber and T. Konstandin, JCAP **0809**, 022 (2008) [arXiv:0806.1828 [hep-ph]].
- [66] A. Kosowsky, M. S. Turner and R. Watkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2026 (1992).
- [67] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2837 (1994) [astro-ph/9310044].
- [68] C. Caprini, R. Durrer and G. Servant, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 124015 (2008) [arXiv:0711.2593 [astro-ph]].
- [69] M. Hindmarsh, S. J. Huber, K. Rummukainen and D. J. Weir, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 041301 (2014) [arXiv:1304.2433 [hep-ph]].
- [70] J. T. Giblin, Jr. and J. B. Mertens, JHEP **1312**, 042 (2013) [arXiv:1310.2948 [hep-th]].
- [71] J. T. Giblin and J. B. Mertens, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 2, 023532 (2014) [arXiv:1405.4005 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [72] M. Hindmarsh, S. J. Huber, K. Rummukainen and D. J. Weir, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 12, 123009 (2015) [arXiv:1504.03291 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [73] C. Caprini and R. Durrer, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 063521 (2006) [astro-ph/0603476].
- [74] T. Kahniashvili, A. Kosowsky, G. Gogoberidze and Y. Maravin, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 043003 (2008) [arXiv:0806.0293 [astro-ph]].

- [75] T. Kahniashvili, L. Campanelli, G. Gogoberidze, Y. Maravin and B. Ratra, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123006 (2008) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **79**, 109901 (2009)] [arXiv:0809.1899 [astro-ph]].
- [76] T. Kahniashvili, L. Kisslinger and T. Stevens, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 023004 (2010) [arXiv:0905.0643 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [77] C. Caprini, R. Durrer and G. Servant, JCAP **0912**, 024 (2009) [arXiv:0909.0622 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [78] Y. Cui, M. Lewicki, D. E. Morrissey and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. D **97**, no. 12, 123505 (2018) [arXiv:1711.03104 [hep-ph]].
- [79] Y. Cui, M. Lewicki, D. E. Morrissey and J. D. Wells, JHEP **1901**, 081 (2019) [arXiv:1808.08968 [hep-ph]].
- [80] C. Caprini *et al.*, JCAP **1604**, no. 04, 001 (2016) [arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [81] R. Jinno and M. Takimoto, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 2, 024009 (2017) [arXiv:1605.01403 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [82] R. Jinno and M. Takimoto, JCAP **1901**, 060 (2019) [arXiv:1707.03111 [hep-ph]].
- [83] P. Binetruy, A. Bohe, C. Caprini and J. F. Dufaux, JCAP **1206**, 027 (2012) [arXiv:1201.0983 [gr-qc]].
- [84] D. Bodeker and G. D. Moore, JCAP **1705**, no. 05, 025 (2017) [arXiv:1703.08215 [hep-ph]].
- [85] J. Ellis, M. Lewicki and J. M. No, JCAP **1904**, 003 (2019) [arXiv:1809.08242 [hep-ph]].
- [86] J. Ellis, M. Lewicki, J. M. No and V. Vaskonen, arXiv:1903.09642 [hep-ph].
- [87] M. S. Turner, E. J. Weinberg and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2384 (1992).
- [88] J. R. Espinosa, T. Konstandin, J. M. No and G. Servant, JCAP **1006**, 028 (2010) [arXiv:1004.4187 [hep-ph]].
- [89] P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 2074 (1982).
- [90] H. Arason, D. J. Castano, B. Keszthelyi, S. Mikaelian, E. J. Piard, P. Ramond and B. D. Wright, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3945 (1992).
- [91] G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208**, 098 (2012) [arXiv:1205.6497 [hep-ph]].
- [92] M. Tanabashi *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Rev. D **98**, no. 3, 030001 (2018).
- [93] C. S. Machado, W. Ratzinger, P. Schwaller and B. A. Stefanek, JHEP **1901**, 053 (2019) [arXiv:1811.01950 [hep-ph]].
- [94] N. Ramberg and L. Visinelli, arXiv:1904.05707 [astro-ph.CO].
- [95] D. Croon, R. Houtz and V. Sanz, arXiv:1904.10967 [hep-ph].
- [96] M. Bauer, M. Neubert and A. Thamm, JHEP **1712**, 044 (2017) [arXiv:1708.00443 [hep-ph]].
- [97] R. Armillis, C. Coriano, M. Guzzi and S. Morelli, JHEP **0810**, 034 (2008) [arXiv:0808.1882 [hep-ph]].
- [98] P. deNiverville, H. S. Lee and M. S. Seo, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no. 11, 115011 (2018) [arXiv:1806.00757 [hep-ph]].
- [99] C. W. Chiang, M. Takeuchi, P. Y. Tseng and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no. 9, 095020 (2018) [arXiv:1807.00593 [hep-ph]].
- [100] M. Bauer, M. Neubert and A. Thamm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, no. 3, 031802 (2017) [arXiv:1704.08207 [hep-ph]].
- [101] P. S. B. Dev, R. N. Mohapatra and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, no. 22, 221804 (2018) [arXiv:1711.08430 [hep-ph]].

- [102] M. Dine, W. Fischler and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. **104B**, 199 (1981).
- [103] A. R. Zhitnitsky, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 260 (1980) [Yad. Fiz. **31**, 497 (1980)].
- [104] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 103 (1979).
- [105] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **166**, 493 (1980).
- [106] D. Cadamuro, S. Hannestad, G. Raffelt and J. Redondo, JCAP **1102**, 003 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3694 [hep-ph]].
- [107] R. Hlozek, D. Grin, D. J. E. Marsh and P. G. Ferreira, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 10, 103512 (2015) [arXiv:1410.2896 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [108] B. D. Blout, E. J. Daw, M. P. Decowski, P. T. P. Ho, L. J. Rosenberg and D. B. Yu, Astrophys. J. **546**, 825 (2001) [astro-ph/0006310].
- [109] G. Sigl, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 10, 103014 (2017) [arXiv:1708.08908 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [110] A. Friedland, M. Giannotti and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 6, 061101 (2013) [arXiv:1210.1271 [hep-ph]].
- [111] S. Aoyama and T. K. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 6, 063016 (2015) [arXiv:1502.02357 [astro-ph.SR]].
- [112] I. Domínguez, M. Giannotti, A. Mirizzi and O. Straniero, Mem. Soc. Ast. It. **88**, 270 (2017).
- [113] N. Vinyoles, A. Serenelli, F. L. Villante, S. Basu, J. Redondo and J. Isern, JCAP **1510**, no. 10, 015 (2015) [arXiv:1501.01639 [astro-ph.SR]].
- [114] A. Ayala, I. Domínguez, M. Giannotti, A. Mirizzi and O. Straniero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, no. 19, 191302 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6053 [astro-ph.SR]].
- [115] E. Masso and R. Toldra, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 1755 (1995) [hep-ph/9503293].
- [116] P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1415 (1983) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 695 (1984)].
- [117] D. M. Lazarus, G. C. Smith, R. Cameron, A. C. Melissinos, G. Ruoso, Y. K. Semertzidis and F. A. Nezrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2333 (1992).
- [118] S. Moriyama, M. Minowa, T. Namba, Y. Inoue, Y. Takasu and A. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B **434**, 147 (1998) [hep-ex/9805026].
- [119] Y. Inoue, T. Namba, S. Moriyama, M. Minowa, Y. Takasu, T. Horiuchi and A. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B **536**, 18 (2002) [astro-ph/0204388].
- [120] Y. Inoue, Y. Akimoto, R. Ohta, T. Mizumoto, A. Yamamoto and M. Minowa, Phys. Lett. B **668**, 93 (2008) [arXiv:0806.2230 [astro-ph]].
- [121] K. Zioutas *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 121301 (2005) [hep-ex/0411033].
- [122] S. Andriamonje *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], JCAP **0704**, 010 (2007) [hep-ex/0702006].
- [123] E. Arik *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], JCAP **0902**, 008 (2009) [arXiv:0810.4482 [hep-ex]].
- [124] S. Aune *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 261302 (2011) [arXiv:1106.3919 [hep-ex]].
- [125] M. Arik *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, no. 9, 091302 (2014) [arXiv:1307.1985 [hep-ex]].
- [126] V. Anastassopoulos *et al.* [CAST Collaboration], Nature Phys. **13**, 584 (2017) [arXiv:1705.02290 [hep-ex]].
- [127] V. Anastassopoulos *et al.* [TASTE Collaboration], JINST **12**, no. 11, P11019 (2017) [arXiv:1706.09378 [hep-ph]].
- [128] I. G. Irastorza *et al.*, JCAP **1106**, 013 (2011) [arXiv:1103.5334 [hep-ex]].

- [129] E. Armengaud *et al.*, JINST **9**, T05002 (2014) [arXiv:1401.3233 [physics.ins-det]].
- [130] S. De Panfilis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 839 (1987).
- [131] W. Wuensch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 3153 (1989).
- [132] C. Hagmann, P. Sikivie, N. S. Sullivan and D. B. Tanner, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1297 (1990).
- [133] S. J. Asztalos *et al.* [ADMX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 041301 (2010) [arXiv:0910.5914 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [134] G. Rybka [ADMX Collaboration], Phys. Dark Univ. **4**, 14 (2014).
- [135] Y. Kahn, B. R. Safdi and J. Thaler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, no. 14, 141801 (2016) [arXiv:1602.01086 [hep-ph]].
- [136] R. Cameron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3707 (1993).
- [137] C. Robilliard, R. Battesti, M. Fouche, J. Mauchain, A. M. Sautivet, F. Amiranoff and C. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 190403 (2007) [arXiv:0707.1296 [hep-ex]].
- [138] A. S. Chou *et al.* [GammeV (T-969) Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080402 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3783 [hep-ex]].
- [139] A. Afanasev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 120401 (2008) [arXiv:0806.2631 [hep-ex]].
- [140] K. Ehret *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **689**, 149 (2010) [arXiv:1004.1313 [hep-ex]].
- [141] R. Ballou *et al.* [OSQAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 9, 092002 (2015) [arXiv:1506.08082 [hep-ex]].
- [142] M. Betz, F. Caspers, M. Gasior, M. Thumm and S. W. Rieger, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 075014 (2013) [arXiv:1310.8098 [physics.ins-det]].
- [143] R. Bähre *et al.*, JINST **8**, T09001 (2013) [arXiv:1302.5647 [physics.ins-det]].
- [144] A. Lindner, talk given at Physics Beyond Colliders Annual Workshop, CERN, November 2017, <https://indico.cern.ch/event/644287/>.
- [145] L. Capparelli, G. Cavoto, J. Ferretti, F. Giazotto, A. D. Polosa and P. Spagnolo, Phys. Dark Univ. **12**, 37 (2016) [arXiv:1510.06892 [hep-ph]].
- [146] Y. Semertzidis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2988 (1990).
- [147] F. Della Valle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 9, 092003 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6518 [quant-ph]].
- [148] F. Della Valle, A. Ejlli, U. Gastaldi, G. Messineo, E. Milotti, R. Pengo, G. Ruoso and G. Zavattini, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 1, 24 (2016) [arXiv:1510.08052 [physics.optics]].
- [149] J. K. Hoskins, R. D. Newman, R. Spero and J. Schultz, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 3084 (1985).
- [150] D. J. Kapner, T. S. Cook, E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, C. D. Hoyle and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 021101 (2007) [hep-ph/0611184].
- [151] R. S. Decca, D. Lopez, E. Fischbach, G. L. Klimchitskaya, D. E. Krause and V. M. Mostepanenko, Eur. Phys. J. C **51**, 963 (2007) [arXiv:0706.3283 [hep-ph]].
- [152] A. A. Geraci, S. J. Smullin, D. M. Weld, J. Chiaverini and A. Kapitulnik, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 022002 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2350 [hep-ex]].
- [153] A. O. Sushkov, W. J. Kim, D. A. R. Dalvit and S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 171101 (2011) [arXiv:1108.2547 [quant-ph]].
- [154] S. Schlamminger, K.-Y. Choi, T. A. Wagner, J. H. Gundlach and E. G. Adelberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 041101 (2008) [arXiv:0712.0607 [gr-qc]].
- [155] G. L. Smith, C. D. Hoyle, J. H. Gundlach, E. G. Adelberger, B. R. Heckel and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 022001 (2000).

- [156] F. Bergsma *et al.* [CHARM Collaboration], Phys. Lett. **157B**, 458 (1985).
- [157] J. D. Bjorken *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 3375 (1988).
- [158] E. M. Riordan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 755 (1987).
- [159] J. Blumlein *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **51**, 341 (1991).
- [160] J. Blumlein *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **7**, 3835 (1992).
- [161] S. Alekhin *et al.*, Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, no. 12, 124201 (2016) [arXiv:1504.04855 [hep-ph]].
- [162] M. Anelli *et al.* [SHiP Collaboration], arXiv:1504.04956 [physics.ins-det].
- [163] B. Döbrich, J. Jaeckel, F. Kahlhoefer, A. Ringwald and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, JHEP **1602**, 018 (2016) [JHEP **1602**, 018 (2016)] [arXiv:1512.03069 [hep-ph]].
- [164] B. Döbrich, J. Jaeckel and T. Spadaro, arXiv:1904.02091 [hep-ph].
- [165] <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1404985>.
- [166] G. Abbiendi *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **18**, 253 (2000) [hep-ex/0005002].
- [167] A. Heister *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **28**, 1 (2003).
- [168] P. Achard *et al.* [L3 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **587**, 16 (2004) [hep-ex/0402002].
- [169] J. Abdallah *et al.* [DELPHI Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **38**, 395 (2005) [hep-ex/0406019].
- [170] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 261803 (2012) [arXiv:1204.0821 [hep-ex]].
- [171] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 1, 011802 (2013) [arXiv:1209.4625 [hep-ex]].
- [172] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-EXO-12-047.
- [173] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 1, 012008 (2015) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 059903 (2015)] [arXiv:1411.1559 [hep-ex]].
- [174] R. Balest *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **51**, 2053 (1995).
- [175] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 021804 (2011) [arXiv:1007.4646 [hep-ex]].
- [176] M. Acciarri *et al.* [L3 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **345**, 609 (1995).
- [177] E. Anashkin *et al.* [DELPHI Collaboration], CERN-OPEN-99-410, DELPHI-99-137 HEP'99 CONF 324.
- [178] <https://www-cdf.fnal.gov/physics/exotic/r2a/20060908.diphotonPlusX/>
- [179] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 4, 210 (2016) [arXiv:1509.05051 [hep-ex]].
- [180] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **781**, 55 (2018) [arXiv:1712.07291 [hep-ex]].
- [181] E. Kou *et al.* [Belle II Collaboration], arXiv:1808.10567 [hep-ex].
- [182] H. Baer *et al.*, arXiv:1306.6352 [hep-ph].
- [183] M. Bicer *et al.* [TLEP Design Study Working Group], JHEP **1401**, 164 (2014) [arXiv:1308.6176 [hep-ex]].
- [184] K. Mimasu and V. Sanz, JHEP **1506**, 173 (2015) [arXiv:1409.4792 [hep-ph]].
- [185] J. Jaeckel and M. Spannowsky, Phys. Lett. B **753**, 482 (2016) [arXiv:1509.00476 [hep-ph]].
- [186] S. Knapen, T. Lin, H. K. Lou and T. Melia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 17, 171801 (2017) [arXiv:1607.06083 [hep-ph]].

- [187] A. Mariotti, D. Redigolo, F. Sala and K. Tobioka, Phys. Lett. B **783**, 13 (2018) [arXiv:1710.01743 [hep-ph]].
- [188] X. Cid Vidal, A. Mariotti, D. Redigolo, F. Sala and K. Tobioka, JHEP **1901**, 113 (2019) [arXiv:1810.09452 [hep-ph]].
- [189] A. V. Derbin, I. S. Drachnev, A. S. Kayunov and V. N. Muratova, JETP Lett. **95**, 339 (2012) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **95**, 379 (2012)] [arXiv:1206.4142 [hep-ex]].
- [190] K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **724**, 46 (2013) [arXiv:1212.6153 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [191] E. Armengaud *et al.*, JCAP **1311**, 067 (2013) [arXiv:1307.1488 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [192] C. E. Aalseth *et al.* [CoGeNT Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 251301 (2008) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 109903 (2009)] [arXiv:0807.0879 [astro-ph]].
- [193] Z. Ahmed *et al.* [CDMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 141802 (2009) [arXiv:0902.4693 [hep-ex]].
- [194] F. Alessandria *et al.* [CUORE Collaboration], JCAP **1305**, 007 (2013) [arXiv:1209.2800 [hep-ex]].
- [195] A. V. Derbin, A. S. Kayunov, V. N. Muratova, D. A. Semenov and E. V. Unzhakov, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 023505 (2011) [arXiv:1101.2290 [hep-ex]].
- [196] G. Bellini *et al.* [Borexino Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 092003 (2012) [arXiv:1203.6258 [hep-ex]].
- [197] P. Gondolo and G. G. Raffelt, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 107301 (2009) [arXiv:0807.2926 [astro-ph]].
- [198] G. G. Raffelt, Lect. Notes Phys. **741**, 51 (2008) [hep-ph/0611350].
- [199] R. Essig, R. Harnik, J. Kaplan and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 113008 (2010) [arXiv:1008.0636 [hep-ph]].
- [200] N. Iwamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1198 (1984).
- [201] D. B. Kaplan, Nucl. Phys. B **260**, 215 (1985).
- [202] A. Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 6, 065044 (2016) [arXiv:1512.07828 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [203] R. Mayle, J. R. Wilson, J. R. Ellis, K. A. Olive, D. N. Schramm and G. Steigman, Phys. Lett. B **203**, 188 (1988).
- [204] A. Burrows, M. S. Turner and R. P. Brinkmann, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 1020 (1989).
- [205] G. Raffelt and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1793 (1988).
- [206] M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1797 (1988).
- [207] M. Giannotti and F. Nesti, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 063005 (2005) [hep-ph/0505090].
- [208] J. H. Chang, R. Essig and S. D. McDermott, JHEP **1809**, 051 (2018) [arXiv:1803.00993 [hep-ph]].
- [209] T. Fischer, S. Chakraborty, M. Giannotti, A. Mirizzi, A. Payez and A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 8, 085012 (2016) [arXiv:1605.08780 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [210] E. G. Adelberger, B. R. Heckel, S. A. Hoedl, C. D. Hoyle, D. J. Kapner and A. Upadhye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 131104 (2007) [hep-ph/0611223].
- [211] G. L. Klimchitskaya and V. M. Mostepanenko, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 4, 164 (2015) [arXiv:1503.04982 [hep-ph]].
- [212] G. L. Klimchitskaya, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 5, 315 (2017) [arXiv:1704.02920 [hep-ph]].
- [213] G. Vasilakis, J. M. Brown, T. W. Kornack and M. V. Romalis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 261801 (2009) [arXiv:0809.4700 [physics.atom-ph]].

- [214] D. Curtin, P. Meade and C. T. Yu, JHEP **1411**, 127 (2014) [arXiv:1409.0005 [hep-ph]].
- [215] P. Huang, A. Joglekar, B. Li and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 5, 055049 (2016) [arXiv:1512.00068 [hep-ph]].
- [216] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-HIG-17-008.
- [217] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-HIG-17-002.
- [218] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1901**, 030 (2019) [arXiv:1804.06174 [hep-ex]].
- [219] <https://fcc.web.cern.ch/Pages/default.aspx>
- [220] J. Baglio, A. Djouadi, R. Gröber, M. M. Mühlleitner, J. Quevillon and M. Spira, JHEP **1304**, 151 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5581 [hep-ph]].
- [221] ATLAS Collaboration, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2013-001.
- [222] F. Goertz, A. Papaefstathiou, L. L. Yang and J. Zurita, JHEP **1306**, 016 (2013) [arXiv:1301.3492 [hep-ph]].
- [223] W. Yao, arXiv:1308.6302 [hep-ph].
- [224] V. Barger, L. L. Everett, C. B. Jackson and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Lett. B **728**, 433 (2014) [arXiv:1311.2931 [hep-ph]].
- [225] A. J. Barr, M. J. Dolan, C. Englert, D. E. Ferreira de Lima and M. Spannowsky, JHEP **1502**, 016 (2015) [arXiv:1412.7154 [hep-ph]].
- [226] D. M. Asner *et al.*, arXiv:1310.0763 [hep-ph].
- [227] J. Tian *et al.* [ILD Collaboration], PoS EPS **-HEP2013**, 316 (2013) [arXiv:1311.6528 [hep-ph]].
- [228] E. Thrane and J. D. Romano, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 12, 124032 (2013) [arXiv:1310.5300 [astro-ph.IM]].