

SPINS OF PRIMORDIAL BLACK HOLES FORMED IN THE RADIATION-DOMINATED PHASE OF THE UNIVERSE: FIRST-ORDER EFFECT

TOMOHIRO HARADA¹, CHUL-MOON YOO², KAZUNORI KOHRI^{3,4}, YASUTAKA KOGA¹, AND TAKERU MONOBE¹

¹Department of Physics, Rikkyo University, Toshima, Tokyo 171-8501, Japan

²Gravity and Particle Cosmology Group, Division of Particle and Astrophysical Science, Graduate School of Science, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan

³Institute of Particle and Nuclear Studies, KEK, 1-1 Oho, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan

⁴The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), 1-1 Oho, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan

ABSTRACT

The standard deviation of the initial values of the nondimensional Kerr parameter a_* of primordial black holes (PBHs) formed in the radiation-dominated phase of the universe is estimated to the first order of perturbation for the narrow power spectrum. Evaluating the angular momentum at turn around based on linearly extrapolated transfer functions and peak theory, we obtain the expression $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 4.0 \times 10^{-3} (M/M_H)^{-1/3} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} [1 - 0.072 \log_{10}(\beta_0(M_H)/(1.3 \times 10^{-15}))]^{-1}$, where M_H , $\beta_0(M_H)$, and γ are the mass within the Hubble horizon at the horizon entry of the overdense region, the fraction of the universe which collapsed to PBHs at the scale of M_H , and a quantity which characterizes the width of the power spectrum, respectively. This implies that for $M \simeq M_H$, the higher the probability of the PBH formation, the larger the standard deviation of the spins, while PBHs of $M \ll M_H$ formed through near-critical collapse may have larger spins than those of $M \simeq M_H$. In comparison to the previous estimate, the new estimate has the explicit dependence on the ratio M/M_H and no direct dependence on the current dark matter density. On the other hand, it suggests that the first-order effect can be numerically comparable to the second-order one.

Keywords: early universe, black holes, theory, cosmology, inflation

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, primordial black holes (PBHs) have been intensively investigated not only as a realistic candidate for dark matter (Carr et al. 2010, 2016, 2017, 2020) but also as a possible origin of black holes of tens of solar masses that source gravitational waves detected by LIGO and Virgo (Nakamura et al. 1997; Sasaki et al. 2016; Bird et al. 2016; Clesse & García-Bellido 2016; Raidal et al. 2017). Various kinds of mechanisms generating PBHs have been proposed. Among them, we will focus on PBHs formed as a result of collapse of primordial cosmological perturbation. After inflation generates perturbations at super-horizon scales, the scales successively enter the Hubble horizon in the radiation-dominated phase and the perturbations can collapse to form PBHs if the amplitude of the perturbation exceeds some threshold value. The threshold values have been studied in terms of $\bar{\delta}_H$, the density perturbation averaged over the overdense region at horizon entry (Carr 1975; Polnarev & Musco 2007; Musco et al. 2009; Harada et al. 2013; Musco & Miller 2013; Harada et al. 2015), although this is currently discussed in more sophisticated way based on the compaction function (Shibata & Sasaki 1999; Musco 2019; Gernami & Musco 2019; Escrivà 2020; Escrivà et al. 2020) and peak theory (Yoo et al. 2018; Yoo et al. 2020). Roughly speaking, the mass of the PBH is given by the mass M_H contained within the Hubble horizon at the time of the horizon entry t , where $M_H \sim c^3 t / G$, although for the near-critical case $\bar{\delta}_H \simeq \bar{\delta}_{H,th}$, the scaling law $M/M_H \propto (\bar{\delta}_H - \bar{\delta}_{H,th})^\beta$ with $\beta \simeq 0.36$ implies the formation of PBHs of $M \ll M_H$ (Niemeyer & Jedamzik 1999; Musco et al. 2009; Musco & Miller 2013).

Thanks to the uniqueness theorem, isolated stationary black holes in vacuum are perfectly characterized by two parameters, the mass M and the spin angular momentum \vec{S} . Alternatively, we can use the nondimensional spin

angular momentum $\vec{a}_* = \vec{S}c/GM^2$. The statistical distribution of the spins is a key probe into the origin of the black holes. In gravitational wave observation of binary black holes by LIGO and Virgo, the effective spin parameter χ_{eff} can be measured. Up to now, the observed data for the most of the binary black holes have been consistent with $\chi_{\text{eff}} = 0$ (Abbott et al. 2019), although there are some exceptions (Abbott et al. 2020).

PBHs may have changed their spins from their initial values. PBHs have evaporated away through Hawking radiation if their masses are smaller than $\sim 10^{15}$ g. The spin of the black hole enhances Hawking radiation and deforms its spectrum. A spinning black hole decreases its nondimensional Kerr parameter $a_* := \sqrt{\vec{a}_* \cdot \vec{a}_*}$ through the Hawking radiation, while a black hole much more massive than $\sim 10^{15}$ g does not significantly change a_* through the Hawking radiation (Page 1976; Arbey et al. 2020; Dasgupta et al. 2020). PBHs change their spins very little in the radiation-dominated phase (Chiba & Yokoyama 2017), while it is proposed that mass accretion could change the spin of black holes in some cosmological scenarios (e.g. De Luca et al. (2020)).

In this paper, we investigate the initial values of the spins of PBHs. Recently, this issue has been discussed by many authors from different points of view (Chiba & Yokoyama 2017; Harada et al. 2017; De Luca et al. 2019; He & Suyama 2019; Mirbabayi et al. 2020). Among them, De Luca et al. (2019) apply Heavens & Peacock (1988)'s approach to the first-order effect of perturbation and give a clear expression $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \sim \Omega_{\text{dm}} \tilde{\sigma}_H \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2}/\pi$, where Ω_{dm} , $\tilde{\sigma}_H$, and $\gamma := \langle k^2 \rangle / \sqrt{\langle k^4 \rangle}$ are the current ratio of the dark matter component to the critical density, the standard deviation of the density perturbation at horizon entry of the inversed wave number, and a quantity which characterizes the width of the power spectrum. In this paper, we apply the same approach to this issue but reach a different result. This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we define the angular momentum and give its expression to the first order of perturbation in the region which collapses to a PBH. In Section III, we estimate the angular momentum at turn around under the assumption of the narrow spectrum. In Section IV, we estimate the nondimensional Kerr parameter of the PBH. Section V is devoted to summary and discussion in particular in comparison to the previous works. We use the units in which $c = 1$ in this paper.

2. ANGULAR MOMENTUM

2.1. Definition

We follow De Luca et al. (2019) for the definition of angular momentum. If the spacetime admits a Killing vector field ϕ_i^a which is tangent to a spacelike hypersurface and generates a spatial rotation on it, the angular momentum $S_i(\Sigma)$ contained in the region Σ on the spacelike hypersurface can be defined as a conserved charge in terms of the integral on the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ as (Wald 1984)

$$S_i(\Sigma) := \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int_{\partial\Sigma} \epsilon_{abcd} \nabla^c (\phi_i)^d = -\frac{1}{8\pi G} \int_{\Sigma} R^{ab} n_a (\phi_i)_b d\Sigma, \quad (1)$$

where n^a is the unit vector normal to Σ . Using the Einstein equation $G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab}$, Eq. (1) transforms to

$$S_i(\Sigma) = - \int_{\Sigma} T^{ab} n_a (\phi_i)_b d\Sigma.$$

Let us use the 3+1 decomposition of the spacetime

$$ds^2 = -\alpha^2 d\eta^2 + a^2(t) \gamma_{ij} (dx^i + \beta^i d\eta) (dx^j + \beta^j d\eta). \quad (2)$$

We assume that the matter field is given by a single perfect fluid described by

$$T^{ab} = \rho u^a u^b + p(g^{ab} + u^a u^b), \quad (3)$$

where u^a is the four-velocity of the fluid element, and that the background spacetime is given by a flat FLRW spacetime, in which the line element is written in the conformally flat form:

$$ds^2 = a^2(-d\eta^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2).$$

We can naturally define ϕ_i^a the generator of a spatial rotation with respect to the peak of the density perturbation at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{pk}$ as

$$(\phi_i)^a = \epsilon_{ijk} (x - x_{pk})^j \delta^{kl} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^l} \right)^a.$$

To the first order of perturbation from the flat FLRW spacetime, we find

$$S_i(\Sigma) = (1 + w) a^4 \rho_b \epsilon_{ijk} \int_{\Sigma} (x - x_{pk})^j (v - v_{pk})^k d^3x,$$

in the gauge with $\beta^k = 0$, where $v^i := u^i/u^0$ and we have assumed the equation of state $p = w\rho$. The region Σ should be taken as a region which will collapse into a black hole. Although the determination of Σ is a nontrivial task, following [Heavens & Peacock \(1988\)](#); [De Luca et al. \(2019\)](#), we assume

$$\Sigma = \{\mathbf{x} | \delta(\mathbf{x}) > f\delta_{pk}\}. \quad (4)$$

We truncate the Taylor-series expansion of δ around the peak at the second order as

$$\delta \simeq \delta_{pk} + \frac{1}{2}\zeta_{ij}(x - x_{pk})^i(x - x_{pk})^j,$$

where

$$\zeta_{ij} := \left. \frac{\partial^2 \delta}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \right|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{pk}}.$$

This truncation is justified provided that physical quantities do not change so steeply within Σ . Adjusting x , y , and z axes to the principal ones, we obtain

$$\delta \simeq \delta_{pk} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i ((x - x_{pk})^i)^2, \quad (5)$$

where σ_j and λ_i are defined in Appendix A. Equations (4) and (5) imply that Σ is given by an ellipsoid with the three axes given by

$$a_i^2 = 2 \frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_2} \frac{1-f}{\lambda_i} \nu,$$

where we have defined $\nu := \delta_{pk}/\sigma_0$.

Taking the truncated Taylor-series expansion of $v - v_{pk}$ at $x = x_{pk}$

$$v^i - v_{pk}^i \simeq v_{,j}^i (x - x_{pk})^j,$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} S_i(\Sigma) &\simeq (1+w)a^4 \rho_b \epsilon_{ijk} v_l^k \int_{\Sigma} (x - x_{pk})^j (x - x_{pk})^l d^3x \\ &= (1+w)a^4 \rho_b \epsilon_{ijk} v_l^k J^{jl}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_l^k &:= \left. \frac{\partial v^k}{\partial x^l} \right|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{pk}}, \\ J^{jl} &:= \int_{\Sigma} (x - x_{pk})^j (x - x_{pk})^l d^3x = \frac{4\pi}{15} a_1 a_2 a_3 \text{diag}(a_1^2, a_2^2, a_3^2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we concentrate on a growing mode of linear scalar perturbation, which is briefly summarized in Appendix B. According to peak theory ([Bardeen et al. 1986](#); [Heavens & Peacock 1988](#)), which is briefly introduced in Appendix A, the distribution of the nondiagonal components of v_{ij} is independent from that of the trace-free part of J^{jl} . Then, we obtain

$$\sqrt{\langle S_i S^i \rangle} = S_{\text{ref}} \sqrt{\langle s_e^i s_{ei} \rangle}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$S_{\text{ref}}(\eta) = (1+w)a^4 \rho_b g(\eta) (1-f)^{5/2} R_*^5, \quad (8)$$

$$\vec{s}_e = \frac{16\sqrt{2}\pi}{135\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{\nu}{\gamma} \right)^{5/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}} (-\alpha_1 \tilde{v}_{23}, \alpha_2 \tilde{v}_{13}, -\alpha_3 \tilde{v}_{12}), \quad (9)$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\lambda_3} - \frac{1}{\lambda_2}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_3} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1}, \quad \alpha_3 = \frac{1}{\lambda_2} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1}, \quad \Lambda := \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3, \quad (10)$$

and R_* and γ are defined in Appendix A. The quantity γ must satisfy $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ and we can usually assume $0.8 \lesssim \gamma \leq 1$ for PBH formation ([De Luca et al. 2019](#)). The function $g(\eta)$ is defined by

$$\langle (v_l^k(\eta))^2 \rangle = g^2(\eta) \langle (\tilde{v}_l^k)^2 \rangle, \quad (11)$$

for all (k, l) , where \tilde{v}_l^k is time-independent and defined in Eq. (A3).¹

2.2. Long-wavelength solutions and near-spherical approximation

Motivated by inflationary cosmology, we consider cosmological long-wavelength solutions as initial data at $\eta = \eta_{\text{init}}$, in which the density perturbation in the constant mean curvature (CMC) slicing is written in terms of the curvature perturbation ζ in the uniform-density slicing as follows (Harada et al. 2015):

$$\delta_{\text{CMC}} = -\frac{1}{2\pi a^2 \rho_b} e^{5\zeta/2} \Delta e^{-\zeta/2}, \quad (12)$$

where $\Delta := \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j$ and ζ is defined as $\gamma_{ij} = e^{-2\zeta} \delta_{ij}$ in the uniform-density slicing. We assume that the density perturbation is appropriately smoothed at scales smaller than the one under consideration. (See e.g. Yoo et al. (2018); Young (2019); Yoo et al. (2020); Tokeshi et al. (2020) for the possible dependence on the choice of the window functions.)

To make the situation clear, we will apply peak theory to this density perturbation field. For $\nu \gg 1$, peak theory implies that the density perturbation is nearly spherical near the peak with $\lambda_i = (\gamma\nu/3)(1 + \epsilon_i)$ (Bardeen et al. 1986; Heavens & Peacock 1988), where $\epsilon_i = O(1/(\gamma\nu))$, and hence we obtain

$$a_i \simeq r_f = \sqrt{6(1-f)} \frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_1}. \quad (13)$$

That is, the region Σ is nearly spherical and the deviation appears at the order of $1/\nu$.

In the following, we assume $w = 1/3$ and without loss of generality take $\mathbf{x}_{pk} = 0$. Linearizing Eq. (12), we obtain

$$\delta_{\text{CMC}} = \frac{2}{3a^2 H_b^2} \Delta \zeta. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, we find

$$\sigma_j^2 = \frac{4}{9} \eta_{\text{init}}^4 \int \frac{dk}{k} k^{4+2j} P_\zeta(k),$$

where we have assumed that $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(0)$ obeys a homogeneous Gaussian distribution with

$$\langle \zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(0) \zeta_{\mathbf{k}'}^*(0) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') |\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(0)|^2$$

and the power spectrum $P_\zeta(k)$ is defined as $P_\zeta(k) := k^3 |\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(0)|^2 / (2\pi^2)$.

As for the velocity gradient field, from Eq. (B4), we have

$$v_j^i(\eta, \mathbf{x}) := \left(\frac{\partial v^i}{\partial x^j} \right) (\eta, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^i k_j}{k} v_{\mathbf{k}}(\eta) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}. \quad (15)$$

Therefore, we obtain the following expression for $g(\eta)$

$$g^2(\eta) = \frac{4}{9} \int \frac{dk}{k} k^2 T_v^2(k, \eta) P_\zeta(k), \quad (16)$$

where $T_v(k, \eta)$ is a transfer function for $v_{\mathbf{k}}(\eta)$ defined in Appendix B and we have used $\langle \tilde{v}_j^i \tilde{v}_i^j \rangle = 1$ as seen in Eq. (A1).

3. ESTIMATE OF THE ANGULAR MOMENTUM

3.1. Narrow power spectrum

In general, we cannot expect a simple expression for $g(\eta)$ because it is obtained by a convolution of different modes with different time dependence. In Heavens & Peacock (1988), this is possible because the growth rate function is homogeneous at sub-horizon scales in the Einstein-de Sitter universe. In De Luca et al. (2019), they implicitly assume that the perturbation of some single k effectively determines the angular momentum of the region Σ . Here, we assume the same assumption as in De Luca et al. (2019). This is possible if we assume the power spectrum has a narrow peak at $k = k_0$ so that

$$P_\zeta(k) \simeq \sigma_\zeta^2 k_0 \delta(k - k_0).$$

Then, Eq. (14) implies

$$\sigma_j \simeq \frac{2}{3} \eta_{\text{init}}^2 k_0^{2+j} \sigma_\zeta \quad (17)$$

¹ In Heavens & Peacock (1988); De Luca et al. (2019), the condition $v_l^k(\eta) = g(\eta) \tilde{v}_l^k$ is assumed.

and therefore $\gamma \simeq 1$. In this case, from Eq. (16), we can obtain

$$g(\eta) \simeq \frac{2}{3} k_0 |T_v(k_0, \eta)| \sigma_\zeta. \quad (18)$$

In more general case, k_0 is identified with k which dominates the integral on the right hand side of Eq. (16).

According to peak theory, in the case of the narrow power spectrum, the most probable profile is given by a sinc function (Bardeen et al. 1986; Yoo et al. 2018), that is,

$$\delta_{\text{CMC}}(\eta, \mathbf{r}) = \delta_{pk}(\eta) \psi(r), \quad \zeta(\eta, \mathbf{r}) = \zeta_{pk}(\eta) \psi(r), \quad \psi(r) = \frac{\sin(k_0 r)}{k_0 r}.$$

Then, we can replace the harmonic function Y with $\psi(r)$. We identify $\delta_{pk}(\eta)$ with $\delta_{\text{CMC}, k_0}(\eta)$ in Eq. (B5). From Eq. (14), we obtain

$$\delta_{\text{CMC}, k_0}(\eta) \simeq \frac{2}{3} x^2 (-\zeta_{k_0}(0)), \quad D = \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3} (-\zeta_{k_0}(0)), \quad (19)$$

where $x = k_0 \eta$ and D is defined in Appendix B.

3.2. PBH formation threshold

Under the truncated Taylor-series expansion, since the initial density perturbation profile is given by

$$\delta_{\text{CMC}, k_0}(\eta_{\text{init}}, r) \simeq \delta_{\text{CMC}, k_0}(\eta_{\text{init}}) \left[1 - \frac{1}{6} (k_0 r)^2 \right],$$

the compaction function $C_{\text{CMC}}(\eta, r)$ in the CMC slicing is given in the long-wavelength limit by

$$C_{\text{CMC}}(\eta_{\text{init}}, r) := \left(\frac{\delta M}{ar} \right) (\eta_{\text{init}}, r) \simeq \frac{1}{3} (k_0 r)^2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{10} (k_0 r)^2 \right] (-\zeta_{k_0}(0)),$$

where δM is the mass excess. This is independent from η_{init} . It takes a maximum value C_{max} at $r = r_m$, where

$$C_{\text{max}} = \frac{5}{6} (-\zeta_{k_0}(0)), \quad r_m = \sqrt{5} k_0^{-1}.$$

The threshold value of C_{max} for the PBH formation is known to $C_{\text{max}} \simeq 0.38 - 0.42 \simeq 2/5$ from fully nonlinear numerical simulations and this is fairly stable against different profiles of Gaussian-function or sinc-function shape (Shibata & Sasaki 1999; Harada et al. 2015; Musco 2019; Gernami & Musco 2019). Using the threshold value $C_{\text{max}} \simeq 2/5$, we can identify the threshold values for other variables as $\zeta_{k_0}(0) \simeq -12/25$ or $D \simeq 16\sqrt{3}/25$. For this value of $\zeta_{k_0}(0)$, we can calculate the density perturbation $\bar{\delta}_H$ averaged over the overdense region with the radius $r_0 = \sqrt{6} k_0^{-1}$ in the long-wavelength limit at horizon entry $\eta_{\text{init}} = \eta_H$, which we define $(aH)(\eta_H)r_0 = 1$. The result is the following:

$$\bar{\delta}_H = \bar{\delta} (aH r_0)^2 \simeq \frac{2}{5} \cdot \frac{2}{3} (k_0 r_0)^2 (-\zeta_{k_0}(0)) \simeq \frac{96}{125} = 0.768.$$

This is fairly consistent with the numerical value $\simeq 0.63 - 0.84$ in the CMC slicing, which is obtained by converting the threshold value $\simeq 0.42 - 0.56$ in the comoving slicing obtained in fully nonlinear numerical simulations for the Gaussian-function or sinc-function shaped profiles (Polnarev & Musco 2007; Musco & Miller 2013; Harada et al. 2015; Musco 2019; Gernami & Musco 2019). Although the long-wavelength limit is only approximately valid at $\eta = \eta_H$, it is useful and conventional to use $\bar{\delta}_H$ obtained in the extrapolation of the long-wavelength limit to $\eta_{\text{init}} = \eta_H$ to refer to the amplitude of the density perturbation. Alternatively, one can use the curvature perturbation $\zeta_{k_0}(0)$ for which the threshold and standard deviation are given by $\simeq -12/25$ and σ_ζ , respectively. From now on, if we set $\eta_{\text{init}} = \eta_H$ in Eq. (17), we denote σ_0 with σ_H . Then, we find

$$\sigma_H = 4\sigma_\zeta.$$

Using this notation, from Eq. (18), we find

$$g(\eta) \simeq \frac{1}{6} |T_v(k_0, \eta)| k_0 \sigma_H. \quad (20)$$

We should note that since $\bar{\delta}$, the density perturbation averaged over the overdense region, is given by $\bar{\delta} \simeq (2/5)\delta_{pk}$, we find

$$\nu = \frac{\delta_{pk}}{\sigma_0} \simeq \frac{5}{2} \frac{\bar{\delta}_H}{\sigma_H} = \frac{5}{2} \bar{\nu},$$

where we have defined $\bar{\nu}$ as $\bar{\nu} = \bar{\delta}_H / \sigma_H$.

3.3. Decoupling from the cosmological expansion

In De Luca et al. (2019), the angular momentum of the region Σ at the horizon entry of the inversed wave number is identified with the initial spin angular momentum of the black hole by arguing that turn around is immediately after the horizon entry. This might result in misestimating the nondimensional spin parameter because the angular momentum increases and the mass decreases in time during the cosmological expansion. Here, we will estimate the angular momentum of the black hole by that of the region Σ at turn around, after which the evolution of the region decouples from the cosmological expansion and the mass and the angular momentum of the collapsing region should be approximately conserved. However, it is not a trivial task to determine this moment. Strictly speaking, turn around is beyond the regime of linear perturbation. However, since it can be regarded as still in a quasi-linear regime, we should be able to apply an extrapolation of linear perturbation theory. We here identify the condition $\delta_{\text{CMC}} \simeq 1$ in the CMC slicing as the decoupling condition because this implies that the local density perturbation becomes so large that the expansion should be about to turn around.

To go beyond the turn around, the CMC slicing should not be appropriate because the maximum expansion means a vanishing mean curvature, while there exists a far region, where the mean curvature is nonvanishing due to Hubble expansion. To avoid this difficulty, we will shift to the conformal Newtonian gauge. It is expected that the dynamics should fit to an usual Newtonian picture later. For this reason, we evaluate $T_v(\eta_{\text{ta}})$ in Eq. (16) for v_{CN} , the velocity perturbation in the conformal Newtonian gauge at the decoupling from the cosmological expansion.

In Fig. 1, we can see that the turn around occurs $x = x_{\text{ta}} \simeq 2.14$ for $D = 16\sqrt{3}/25$. The value of the transfer function at the turn around $x = x_{\text{ta}}$ is calculated to give

$$T_{v_{\text{CN}}}(k_0, \eta_{\text{ta}}) = \frac{v_{\text{CN}}(x_{\text{ta}})}{\Phi_{k_0}(0)} \simeq 0.622,$$

where we have used $v_{\text{CN}}(x_{\text{ta}}) \simeq -0.199$. Thus, from Eq. (20), the value of $g_{\text{CN}}(\eta_{\text{ta}})$ is given by

$$g_{\text{CN}}(\eta_{\text{ta}}) \simeq 0.104 k_0 \sigma_H.$$

Although there is some ambiguity in the choice of the decoupling condition and the gauge condition, it will not change the estimate in orders of magnitude as seen from Fig. 1 if we choose x_{ta} between $\simeq 1.5$ and $\simeq 3$.




Figure 1. The functions v_{CMC} , δ_{CMC} , and \mathcal{R} in the CMC slicing and δ_{CN} , v_{CN} , and Φ in the conformal Newtonian gauge are plotted for $D = 16\sqrt{3}/25$ as functions of $x = k\eta$. We can see that δ_{CMC} gets larger than unity at $x \simeq 2.14$, at which $v_{\text{CN}} \simeq -0.199$.

4. ESTIMATE OF THE NONDIMENSIONAL KERR PARAMETER

4.1. Estimate of A_{ref}

Let us estimate the reference spin value at turn around

$$A_{\text{ref}}(\eta_{\text{ta}}) = \frac{S_{\text{ref}}(\eta_{\text{ta}})}{GM_{\text{ta}}^2} = \frac{\frac{4}{3} [a^4 \rho_b g_{\text{CN}}](\eta_{\text{ta}}) (1-f)^{5/2} R_*^5}{GM_{\text{ta}}^2}, \quad (21)$$

where the black hole mass M is identified with the mass within the region Σ at turn around

$$M_{\text{ta}} = (\rho_b a^3)(\eta_{\text{ta}}) \cdot \frac{4}{3} \pi r_f^3.$$

This is different from M_H , which we define the mass within the horizon at the horizon entry of the overdense region. The condition for the horizon entry $H^{-1}(\eta_H) = ar_0$ implies $\eta_H = r_0$ or $x = \sqrt{6}$. Since $a(\eta) \propto \eta$, we have

$$\frac{a(\eta_{\text{ta}})}{a(\eta_H)} = \frac{\eta_{\text{ta}}}{r_0} = \frac{x_{\text{ta}}}{\sqrt{6}}.$$

Using $\rho_b a^3 \propto a^{-1}$, we find

$$M_{\text{ta}} \simeq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{x_{\text{ta}}} (1-f)^{3/2} M_H.$$

Using Eq. (20) and $2GM_H = a(\eta_H)r_0$, we obtain a simple expression

$$A_{\text{ref}}(\eta_{\text{ta}}) \simeq \frac{1}{24\sqrt{3}\pi} x_{\text{ta}}^2 (1-f)^{-1/2} |T_{v_{\text{CN}}}(k_0, \eta_{\text{ta}})| \sigma_H. \quad (22)$$

4.2. Estimate of a_*

As for the distribution of s_e , we just quote the result of [Heavens & Peacock \(1988\)](#) with the correction by [De Luca et al. \(2019\)](#). For large ν limit, if we define h by

$$s_e := \sqrt{\vec{s}_e \cdot \vec{s}_e} = \frac{2^{9/2} \pi}{5\gamma^6 \nu} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} h,$$

the probability distribution of h is approximately given by

$$P(h)dh \simeq \exp[-2.37 - 4.12 \ln h - 1.53(\ln h)^2 - 0.13(\ln h)^3] dh.$$

$P(h)$ takes a maximum at $h \simeq 0.178$, while $\sqrt{\langle h^2 \rangle} \simeq 0.419$. Using

$$P(s_e|\nu)ds_e = P(h) \frac{dh}{ds_e} ds_e,$$

we have

$$\sqrt{\langle s_e^2 \rangle} \simeq 5.96 \frac{\sqrt{1 - \gamma^2}}{\gamma^6 \nu}.$$

Putting $a = A_{\text{ref}} s_e = Ch$, we have

$$P_a(a)da = P(C^{-1}a)C^{-1}da.$$

From the above argument and the equation

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} = A_{\text{ref}}(\eta_{\text{ta}}) \sqrt{\langle s_e^2 \rangle},$$

we find the expression for the initial spin of PBHs for $\gamma \simeq 1$:

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq \frac{5.96}{24\sqrt{3}\pi} x_{\text{ta}}^2 (1-f)^{-1/2} T_{v_{\text{CN}}}(k_0, \eta_{\text{ta}}) \sigma_H \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \nu^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

Putting $x_{\text{ta}} = 2.14$, $T_{v_{\text{CN}}}(k_0, \eta_{\text{ta}}) = 0.622$, $\bar{\delta}_H = \bar{\nu} \sigma_H$, $\nu = (5/2)\bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{\delta}_H \simeq 0.768$, we find

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 3.90 \times 10^{-3} (1-f)^{-1/2} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \left(\frac{\nu}{8}\right)^{-2} \quad (24)$$

for the PBH mass

$$M \simeq 1.14 (1-f)^{3/2} M_H. \quad (25)$$

Eliminating f from Eqs. (24) and (25), we obtain the following simple expression

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 4.01 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{M}{M_H}\right)^{-1/3} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \left(\frac{\nu}{8}\right)^{-2}. \quad (26)$$

Although f or M is a free parameter in the present scheme, numerical simulations strongly suggest $M \simeq M_H$ except for the near-critical case in which $M \ll M_H$ ([Musco & Miller 2013](#); [Escrivà 2020](#)). If we put $M = M_H$, $\gamma = 0.85$,

$\nu = 8$, the above expression yields $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 2.14 \times 10^{-3}$. Therefore, we conclude that $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} = O(10^{-3})$ or even smaller for $M \simeq M_H$.

Let us now discuss small PBHs formed in the near-critical case. In this case, only the small fraction of PBHs are produced through the critical collapse, while the rest have $M \sim M_H$. Therefore, we should fix ν at the scale of M_H . Using Eq. (26), for example, we find $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 2.14 \times 10^{-2}$ for $M = 10^{-3} M_H$, $\gamma = 0.85$, and $\bar{\nu} = 8$. It also strongly suggests that the angular momentum will play an important role and may significantly suppress the formation of PBHs of $M \lesssim 10^{-8} M_H$, for which $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \gtrsim 1$.

4.3. Implications

Since our expression is given in terms of ν , the initial spin directly depends on the fraction $\beta_0(M_H)$ of the universe which collapsed into black holes. If we use the Press-Schechter approximation as a rough estimate of $\beta_0(M_H)$ (Carr 1975)

$$\beta_0(M_H) \simeq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\nu_{\text{th}}} e^{-\nu_{\text{th}}^2/2} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{2}{5} \frac{\sigma_H}{\bar{\delta}_{H,\text{th}}} \exp \left[- \left(\frac{5}{2} \right)^2 \frac{\bar{\delta}_{H,\text{th}}^2}{2\sigma_H^2} \right]$$

we find a simple expression

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 4.01 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{M}{M_H} \right)^{-1/3} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \left[1 - 0.072 \log_{10} \left(\frac{\beta_0(M_H)}{1.3 \times 10^{-15}} \right) \right]^{-1},$$

where ν is identified with ν_{th} and weak dependence on ν_{th} in the logarithm is neglected. For simplicity, let us concentrate on PBHs of $M \simeq M_H$. Using the relation between $\beta_0(M)$ and $f_{\text{PBH}}(M)$ (Carr et al. 2010)

$$\Omega_{\text{dm}} f_{\text{PBH}}(M) \simeq 10^{18} \beta_0(M) \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{g}} \right)^{-1/2},$$

we further obtain

$$\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq 4.01 \times 10^{-3} \frac{\sqrt{1 - \gamma^2}}{1 + 0.036 \left[21 - 2 \log_{10} \left(\frac{f_{\text{PBH}}(M)}{10^{-7}} \right) - \log_{10} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{g}} \right) \right]}. \quad (27)$$

We plot Eq. (27) in Fig. 2. In this figure, we can see that the larger $f_{\text{PBH}}(M)$ and M , the larger $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle}$. For example, $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle}$ of PBHs for $M = 50 M_\odot$ and $f_{\text{PBH}} = 1$ is about 3.3 times larger than that for $M = 10^{15} \text{g}$ and $f_{\text{PBH}} = 10^{-7}$.

5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have applied Heavens & Peacock (1988)'s approach to the first-order effect on the spins of PBHs. Although we have presented numerical values with two or three significant digits, at present we admit that there is large uncertainty in modeling PBH formation. Nevertheless, we would like to claim that the standard deviation of the initial spins is given by $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} = O(10^{-3})$ or even smaller for $M \simeq M_H$ based on peak theory. We have obtained the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} &\simeq 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{M}{M_H} \right)^{-1/3} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \left(\frac{\nu_{\text{th}}}{8} \right)^{-2} \\ &\simeq 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{M}{M_H} \right)^{-1/3} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \left[1 - 0.072 \log_{10} \left(\frac{\beta_0(M_H)}{1.3 \times 10^{-15}} \right) \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The above formula also implies that the higher the PBH formation probability $\beta_0(M_H)$, the larger the standard deviation of the spins. On the other hand, for PBHs of $M \ll M_H$ in the near-critical case, we find $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle}$ can be much larger than those for PBHs of $M \simeq M_H$.

In comparison to the expression in De Luca et al. (2019), the new estimate has no overall factor Ω_{dm} , takes critical collapse into consideration, and gives an explicit expression in terms of $\beta_0(M_H)$. The proof of the nonexistence of the overall factor Ω_{dm} is delegated to Appendix C. From a physical point of view, dark matter does not play any role in dynamics well in the radiation-dominated phase. On the other hand, their assumption that the turn around occurs almost simultaneously to the horizon entry is supported if we take the horizon entry of not the inversed wave number but the radius of the overdense region. As for the gauge choice, we have taken the conformal Newtonian gauge to evaluate the angular momentum at the turn around. If we instead continued taking the CMC slicing as in De Luca et al. (2019), the estimate would be further reduced by half approximately as seen in Fig. 1.

Here, we would like to compare the present result with PBHs formed in the matter-dominated phase of the universe. As seen in this paper, in the radiation-dominated phase, since ν_{th} is large suggested by the Jeans argument, peak




Figure 2. The standard deviation of the initial spins of the PBH, $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle}$, as a function of the PBH mass M with fixed f_{PBH} , where we have assumed that the PBH mass is equal to the horizon mass, i.e., $M = M_H$ and $\gamma = 0.85$.

theory implies that the region Σ is nearly spherical and the effect of tidal torque is suppressed. In fact, as we can see in Eq. (9), only the trace-free part \mathcal{J}^{jl} of J^{jl} enters the expression of the angular momentum and we can see that $\sqrt{\langle (\mathcal{J}^{jl} \mathcal{J}_{jl}) / (J^{jl} J_{jl}) \rangle} = O(\nu^{-1})$ for large ν and also $g(\eta) \sim k_0 \sigma_H$. In the matter-dominated phase, since ν_{th} is vanishingly small in spherical symmetry, the region Σ can be far from spherical and the tidal torque can give the large amount of angular momentum on Σ . Therefore, it is predicted that the angular momentum within the region Σ is so large that PBH formation can be strongly suppressed and that the formed PBHs can have near-extremal spins (Harada et al. 2017). This suggests that PBHs formed in the phase transition at which the equation of state is softer than the radiation, their spins can be larger than those formed in the radiation-dominated phase.

It would be interesting to remove the assumption of the narrow power spectrum as the broad mass function of PBHs is intensively discussed from an observational point of view (Carr et al. 2016; Carr & Kühnel 2019), although the deviation of γ from unity might not change the result in orders of magnitude. Note also that although we have investigated the first-order effect on the angular momentum, the obtained result is apparently second order in terms of σ_H as we can see in Eqs. (23) and (24), where ν^{-1} and $\bar{\nu}^{-1}$ are of the order of σ_H because the threshold value of the PBH formation for the perturbation amplitude is of the order of unity. This means that the first-order effect investigated here might be comparable to the second-order effect. In fact, in Mirbabayi et al. (2020), the second-order effect is estimated to $\sqrt{\langle a_*^2 \rangle} \simeq \langle \zeta^2 \rangle$. Finally, it should be noted that our analysis is based on the linear perturbation theory, which is not completely justified for perturbations that can generate PBHs. In particular, the behaviors of the solutions at the final stage of black hole formation are highly nonlinear and cannot be predicted by linear perturbation theory. In this line, the assumption of the conservation of the nondimensional Kerr parameter after the decoupling from the cosmological expansion should be confirmed by numerical simulations. It is clear that further investigations are necessary to answer the problem how large spins PBHs have.

T.H. was very grateful to B. J. Carr for indicating him this problem. T.H. would also like to T. Murata, K. Nakashi, T. Sato, and Y. Watanabe for interesting discussion on peak theory. The authors would like to thank K. Nakao for his helpful comment and continuous encouragement. They would also like to thank the anonymous referee for the important comments and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19H01895

(T.H. and C.Y.), JP19K03876 (T.H.), JP17H01131 (K.K.), and JP19J12007 (Y.K.) and MEXT KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19H05114 (K.K.) and JP20H04750 (K.K.).

APPENDIX

A. PEAK THEORY

We briefly review peak theory based on [Heavens & Peacock \(1988\)](#). We treat the following fields as probability variables.

$$\delta, \quad \zeta_i = \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x^i}, \quad \zeta_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \delta}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, \quad v^i_j = \frac{\partial v^i}{\partial x^j}.$$

The correlations of the above variables are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \delta^2 \rangle &= \sigma_0^2, \quad \langle \delta \zeta_{11} \rangle = -\langle \zeta_1 \zeta_1 \rangle = \cdots = -\frac{\sigma_1^2}{3}, \quad \langle \delta \tilde{v}_{11} \rangle = \cdots = -\frac{\sigma_0}{3}, \\ \langle \zeta_{11}^2 \rangle &= 3\langle \zeta_{11} \zeta_{22} \rangle = 3\langle \zeta_{12}^2 \rangle = \cdots = \frac{\sigma_2^2}{5}, \\ \langle \zeta_{11} \tilde{v}_{11} \rangle &= 3\langle \zeta_{11} \tilde{v}_{22} \rangle = 3\langle \zeta_{12} \tilde{v}_{12} \rangle = \cdots = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{5\sigma_0}, \\ \langle \tilde{v}_{11}^2 \rangle &= 3\langle \tilde{v}_{11} \tilde{v}_{22} \rangle = 3\langle \tilde{v}_{12}^2 \rangle = \cdots = \frac{1}{5}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

and all other correlations vanish, where

$$\sigma_j^2 := \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} k^{2j} |\delta_{\mathbf{k}}|^2, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\tilde{v}^i_j := -\frac{1}{\sigma_0} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^i k_j}{k^2} \delta_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Putting the eigenvalues of $-\zeta_{ij}/\sigma_2$ as λ_1, λ_2 , and λ_3 ($\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$), and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= \delta/\sigma_0, \quad \xi_1 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \quad \xi_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3), \quad \xi_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \\ w_1 &= \tilde{v}_{23}, \quad w_2 = \tilde{v}_{13}, \quad w_3 = \tilde{v}_{12}, \end{aligned}$$

the probability distribution of $\nu, \boldsymbol{\lambda}$, and \mathbf{w} at a peak is given by

$$N_{pk}(\nu, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{w}) d\nu d^3 \xi d^3 \mathbf{w} = \frac{B}{R_*^3} \exp(-Q_4) F(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) d\nu d^3 \boldsymbol{\lambda} d^3 \mathbf{w},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \frac{3^{9/2} 5^4}{2^{11/2} \pi^{9/2} (1 - \gamma^2)^2}, \\ 2Q_4 &= \nu^2 + \frac{(\xi_1 - \gamma\nu)^2}{1 - \gamma^2} + 15\xi_2^2 + 5\xi_3^2 + 15 \frac{w_1^2 + w_2^2 + w_3^2}{1 - \gamma^2}, \\ F(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \frac{27}{2} \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2), \\ R_* &:= \sqrt{3} \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_2}, \quad \gamma := \sigma_1^2 / (\sigma_0 \sigma_2), \end{aligned}$$

We can see that the distribution of \mathbf{w} is independent from other variables.

B. COSMOLOGICAL LINEAR PERTURBATIONS

Here we briefly review the result of cosmological linear perturbation theory that is necessary for the present paper. We basically follow the notation of [Kodama & Sasaki \(1985\)](#). We would like readers to refer to [Kodama & Sasaki \(1985\)](#) or other reference for derivation. The scalar, vector and tensor harmonic functions Y, Y_i, Y_{ij} in the flat space for scalar perturbations are defined as follows:

$$Y = C e^{ik_l x^l}, \quad Y_i = -k^{-1} Y_{|i}, \quad Y_{ij} = k^{-2} \left(Y_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \Delta Y \right) = - \left(\frac{k_i k_j}{k^2} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \right) Y,$$

where the roman indices are raised and lowered by δ^{ij} and δ_{ij} , respectively, and Y satisfies

$$(\Delta + k^2)Y = 0.$$

The Fourier decomposition of the perturbations is given by

$$\delta(\eta, \mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \delta_{\mathbf{k}}(\eta) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \quad \delta_{\mathbf{k}}(\eta) = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \delta(\eta, \mathbf{x}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}},$$

and so on. In the following in this section, we abbreviate $\delta_{\mathbf{k}}(\eta)$ as δ and so on. In Eq. (2), we write the scalar perturbation of the metric tensor as follows:

$$\alpha = a(1 + AY), \quad \beta_i = -a^2 BY_i, \quad \gamma_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + 2H_L Y \delta_{ij} + 2H_T Y_{ij}.$$

The trace of the extrinsic curvature of the constant η hypersurface is written as

$$K = K_b(1 + \mathcal{K}_g Y).$$

The perturbed quantities of the perfect fluid are written as

$$\rho = \rho_b(1 + \delta Y), \quad p = p_b(1 + \pi_L Y), \quad v^i = \frac{u^i}{u^0} = v Y^i. \quad (\text{B4})$$

In the adiabatic process with $p = w\rho$ equation of state, we have $\pi_L = \delta$. For the scalar perturbation, the infinitesimal coordinate transformation is given by

$$\bar{\eta} = \eta + T(\eta)Y, \quad \bar{x}^j = x^j + L(\eta)Y^j,$$

where T and L are arbitrary functions of η . Under this coordinate transformation, the metric perturbation quantities transform as follows:

$$\bar{A} = A - T' - \mathcal{H}T, \quad \bar{B} = B + L' + kT, \quad \bar{H}_L = H_L - \frac{k}{n}L - \mathcal{H}T, \quad \bar{H}_T = H_T + kL.$$

where n is the dimension of the space, $\mathcal{H} := a'/a$, and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to η . On the other hand, matter perturbation quantities transform as follows:

$$\bar{v} = v + L', \quad \bar{\delta} = \delta + n(1 + w)\mathcal{H}T, \quad \bar{\pi}_L = \pi_L + 3\frac{c_s^2}{w}(1 + w)\mathcal{H}T,$$

where $c_s^2 = w$ is the sound speed. From the above, we can construct gauge-invariant perturbation quantities corresponding to δ and V as follows:

$$\Delta = \delta + 3(1 + w)\mathcal{H}k^{-1}(v - B), \quad V = v - k^{-1}H'_T.$$

From the Einstein equation, we can derive the equations for the gauge-invariant variables, Δ and V . We present the solutions for the radiation-dominated phase of the universe below:

$$\Delta(x) = D\sqrt{3} \left(\frac{\sin z}{z} - \cos z \right),$$

$$V(x) = D \left[\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{2}{z^2} - 1 \right) \sin z - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\cos z}{z} \right],$$

where D is an arbitrary constant, $z := x/\sqrt{3}$, $x := k\eta$, and a decaying mode is omitted.

In the CMC ($\mathcal{K}_g = 0$) slicing with $B = 0$, using the above solutions for $\Delta(x)$ and $V(x)$, we can obtain

$$\delta = D \frac{\sqrt{3}z^2}{z^2 + 2} \left(2 \frac{\sin z}{z} - \cos z \right), \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$v = -\frac{3}{4}D \frac{(z^2 - 2) \sin z + 2z \cos z}{z^2 + 2}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$\mathcal{R} = D \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \frac{1}{z^2 + 2} \left(2 \frac{\sin z}{z} - \cos z \right), \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $\mathcal{R} = H_L + \frac{1}{3}H_T$. In this gauge, A and \mathcal{R} are completely fixed, while H_T and H_L are fixed only up to a constant.

In the conformal Newtonian gauge, in which $H_T = B = 0$, we can obtain

$$\delta = \sqrt{3}D \frac{2(z^2 - 1) \sin z + (2 - z^2)z \cos z}{z^3}, \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$v = \frac{3}{4}D \frac{(2 - z^2) \sin z - 2z \cos z}{z^2}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$\Phi = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}D \frac{\sin z - z \cos z}{z^3}, \quad (\text{B10})$$

where $H_L = -\Phi$ and $A = \Phi$. Thus, all perturbation quantities are completely fixed in this gauge.

We can define transfer functions $T_{\delta_{\text{CMC}}}$, $T_{v_{\text{CMC}}}$, $T_{\delta_{\text{CN}}}$, $T_{v_{\text{CN}}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{CMC}}(\eta) &= T_{\delta_{\text{CMC}}}(k, \eta)\Phi(0), \quad v_{\text{CMC}}(\eta) = T_{v_{\text{CMC}}}(k, \eta)\Phi(0), \\ \delta_{\text{CN}}(\eta) &= T_{\delta_{\text{CN}}}(k, \eta)\Phi(0), \quad v_{\text{CN}}(\eta) = T_{v_{\text{CN}}}(k, \eta)\Phi(0), \end{aligned}$$

where we can see $\Phi(0) = -D/(2\sqrt{3}) = -(2/3)\mathcal{R}(0)$ from Eqs. (B7) and (B10). We should note that $\mathcal{R}(0) = -\zeta(0)$, where ζ is the curvature perturbation in the uniform-density slicing.

C. NONEXISTENCE OF THE OVERALL FACTOR Ω_{DM}

Here, we show that the overall factor Ω_{dm} in De Luca et al. (2019)'s expression should be removed. Although their notation is slightly different from ours, we consistently continue to use our notation.

In the following, we follow the process of calculation in De Luca et al. (2019). They estimate the angular momentum at the horizon entry of the inversed wave number saying that the turn around is just after the horizon entry. Their analysis is confined to the CMC slicing, where $g(\tilde{\eta}_H) = g_{\text{CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H)$ was estimated to

$$g_{\text{CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H) \sim \left| \frac{T_{v_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)}{T_{\delta_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)} \right| k_0 \tilde{\sigma}_H, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where k_0 is identified with k_H in De Luca et al. (2019), $\tilde{\eta}_H = k_0^{-1}$, and $\tilde{\sigma}_H$ is σ_0 at $\eta = \tilde{\eta}_H$ without the long-wavelength limit. Although our calculation does not reproduce their numerical value $|T_{v_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)/T_{\delta_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)| \sim 0.5$ but gives a much smaller value $\simeq 0.0714$ at $x = 1$, this is not the origin of the factor Ω_{dm} . Since $\mathcal{H} \propto a^{-1}$ in the radiation-dominated era and $\mathcal{H} \propto a^{-1/2}$ in the matter-dominated era, they probably inferred that

$$\mathcal{H}(\eta_{\text{eq}}) = \frac{\mathcal{H}_0}{(a(\eta_{\text{eq}})/a_0)^{1/2}}, \quad (\text{C12})$$

where we have put $a(\eta_0) = a_0$ and $\mathcal{H}(\eta_0) = \mathcal{H}_0$ and η_0 is the present conformal time. This corresponds to Eq. (5.4) in De Luca et al. (2019). Then, using

$$\frac{a(\tilde{\eta}_H)}{a_0} = \frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\eta}_H)} \right) = \left(\frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_0}{\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\eta}_H)} \right) \quad (\text{C13})$$

and defining \tilde{M}_H as the mass within the Hubble horizon at $\eta = \tilde{\eta}_H$, we find

$$\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\eta}_H) = \frac{a(\tilde{\eta}_H)}{2G\tilde{M}_H} = \left(\frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\mathcal{H}_0}{\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\eta}_H)} \frac{a_0}{2G\tilde{M}_H}, \quad (\text{C14})$$

and

$$k_0 = \left(\frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{H}_0 a_0}{2G\tilde{M}_H}}. \quad (\text{C15})$$

Moreover, using

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_b(\tilde{\eta}_H) \left(\frac{a(\tilde{\eta}_H)}{a_0} \right)^4 &\simeq \rho_{\text{rad}}(\tilde{\eta}_H) \left(\frac{a(\tilde{\eta}_H)}{a_0} \right)^4 \simeq \rho_{\text{rad}}(\eta_0) = \Omega_{\text{dm}} \frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \frac{3\mathcal{H}_0^2}{8\pi G a_0^2}, \\ k_0^{-1} &= \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}_H) = \frac{2G\tilde{M}_H}{a(\tilde{\eta}_H)}, \end{aligned}$$

and identifying the mass of the PBH with \tilde{M}_H , they reached their conclusion

$$A_{\text{ref,CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H) \simeq \frac{\frac{4}{3}a_0^4 \Omega_{\text{dm}} \frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \frac{3\mathcal{H}_0^2}{8\pi G a_0^2} \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0} \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{H}_0 a_0}{2G\tilde{M}_H}} \right]^{-4} \tilde{\sigma}_H}{G\tilde{M}_H^2} \simeq \frac{\Omega_{\text{dm}}}{\pi} \tilde{\sigma}_H, \quad (\text{C16})$$

where $g_{\text{CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H) \sim 0.5k_0\tilde{\sigma}_H$, $R_* \simeq \sqrt{3}k_0^{-1}$, and $1 - f \simeq 1/3$ have been used.

In the following, we would like to redo the above estimate more carefully. Let us keep $g_{\text{CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H)$ as in Eq. (C11) and focus on the factor Ω_{dm} . Using $\tilde{M}_H = (4\pi/3)(\rho_b a^3)(\tilde{\eta}_H)(k_0^{-1})^3$, we can directly get the following simple estimate:

$$A_{\text{ref,CMC}}(\tilde{\eta}_H) = \frac{\frac{4}{3}[a^4 \rho_b g_{\text{CMC}}](\tilde{\eta}_H)(1-f)^{5/2} R_*^5}{G \tilde{M}_H^2} \simeq 2 \left| \frac{T_{v_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)}{T_{\delta_{\text{CMC}}}(k_0, \tilde{\eta}_H)} \right| \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_H}{\pi}, \quad (\text{C17})$$

where we have used the Friedmann equation only at the formation of PBHs well in the radiation-dominated era. We can see that there is no overall factor Ω_{dm} .

Although the above derivation is complete, it might be useful to trace the calculation in De Luca et al. (2019) in a right way. Assuming that the energy of the universe consists of radiation, dark matter, and the cosmological constant, the Friedmann equation implies

$$H^2 = H_0^2 \left[\Omega_{\text{rad}} \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^4 + \Omega_{\text{dm}} \left(\frac{a_0}{a} \right)^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda} \right], \quad (\text{C18})$$

Moreover, we assume that $\Omega_{\text{rad}} \ll \Omega_{\text{dm}}$, $\Omega_{\text{dm}} \simeq 0.3$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda} \simeq 0.7$. Then, we can safely neglect Ω_{Λ} at the matter-radiation equality $\eta = \eta_{\text{eq}}$, when $\rho_{\text{rad}} = \rho_{\text{dm}}$. This immediately implies

$$\frac{\Omega_{\text{rad}}}{\Omega_{\text{dm}}} = \frac{a(\eta_{\text{eq}})}{a_0}.$$

Therefore, Eq. (C18) implies

$$\mathcal{H}(\eta_{\text{eq}}) = \frac{\mathcal{H}_0}{(a(\eta_{\text{eq}})/a_0)^{1/2}} \sqrt{2\Omega_{\text{dm}}}.$$

This corrects Eq. (C12) or Eq. (5.4) in De Luca et al. (2019). This gives a factor $\sqrt{2\Omega_{\text{dm}}}$ on the rightmost side of Eqs. (C13) and (C14) and a factor $(2\Omega_{\text{dm}})^{1/4}$ on the rightmost side of Eq. (C15). Thus, there appears a factor $(2\Omega_{\text{dm}})^{-1}$ on the rightmost side of Eq. (C16) and this Ω_{dm}^{-1} cancels out the factor Ω_{dm} from ρ_b . Then, we reach the same expression as in Eq. (C17).

REFERENCES

- Abbott, B. P., *et al.* [LIGO Scientific & Virgo] 2019, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **882** no.2, L24
- Abbott, R., *et al.* [LIGO Scientific & Virgo] 2020, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no.4, 043015
- Arbey, A., Auffinger, J., & Silk, J. 2020, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **494** no.1, 1257-1262
- Bardeen, J. M., Bond, J. R., Kaiser, N., & Szalay, A. S. 1986, *Astrophys. J.* **304**, 15-61
- Bird, S., Cholis, I., Muñoz, J. B., Ali-Haïmoud, Y., Kamionkowski, M., Kovetz, E. D., Raccanelli, A., & Riess, A. G. 2016, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no. 20, 201301
- Carr, B. J. 1975, *Astrophys. J.* **201**, 1-19
- Carr, B. J., Kohri, K., Sendouda, Y., & Yokoyama, J. 2010, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 104019
- Carr, B. J., Kohri, K., Sendouda, Y., and Yokoyama, J., [arXiv:2002.12778 [astro-ph.CO]].
- Carr, B. J. & Kühnel, F. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no.10, 103535
- Carr, B. J., Kühnel, F., & Sandstad, M. 2016, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no.8, 083504
- Carr, B. J., Raidal, M., Tenkanen, T., Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no.2, 023514
- Chiba, T. & Yokoyama, S. 2017, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2017**, 083E01
- Clesse, S. & García-Bellido, J. 2017, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **15**, 142
- Dasgupta, B., Laha R. & Ray A. 2020, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** no.10, 101101
- De Luca, V., Desjacques, V., Franciolini, G., Malhotra, A., & Riotto, A. 2019, *JCAP* **05**, 018
- De Luca, V., Franciolini, G., Pani, P., & Riotto, A. 2020, *JCAP* **04**, 052
- Escrivà, A. 2020, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **27**, 100466
- Escrivà, A., Germani, C., & Sheth, R. K. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no.4, 044022
- Germani, C. & Musco, I. 2019, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** no.14, 141302
- Harada, T., Yoo, C. M., & Kohri, K. 2013, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** no.8, 084051
- Harada, T., Yoo, C. M., Nakama, T., & Koga, Y. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** no.8, 084057
- Harada, T., Yoo, C. M., Kohri, K., & Nakao, K. I. 2017, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no.8, 083517
- He, M. & Suyama, T. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no.6, 063520
- Heavens, A. & Peacock, J. 1988., *Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc.* **232**, 339
- Kodama, H. & Sasaki, M. 1984, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **78**, 1-166
- Mirbabayi, M., Gruzinov, A., & Noreña, J. 2020, *JCAP* **03**, 017
- Musco, I. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no.12, 123524
- Musco, I. & Miller, J. C. 2013, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 145009
- Musco, I., Miller, J. C., & Polnarev, A. G. 2009, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 235001
- Nakamura, T., Sasaki, M., Tanaka, T., & Thorne, K. S. 1997, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **487**, L139-L142
- Niemeyer, J. C. & Jedamzik, K. 1999, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 124013
- Page, D. N. 1976, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 3260-3273
- Polnarev, A. G. & Musco, I. 2007, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 1405-1432
- Raidal, M., Vaskonen, V., & Veermäe, H. 2017, *JCAP* **1709**, 037
- Sasaki, M., Suyama, T., Tanaka, T., & Yokoyama, S. 2016, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** 061101
- Shibata, M. & Sasaki, M. 1999, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 084002
- Tokeshi, K., Inomata, K. and Yokoyama J. 2020, [arXiv:2005.07153 [astro-ph.CO]].

Young, S. 2019, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **29** no.02, 2030002

Yoo, C. M., Harada, T., Garriga, J., & Kohri, K. 2018, PTEP
2018 no.12, 123E01

Yoo, C. M., Harada, T., Hirano, S., & Kohri, K. 2020, to appear
in PTEP [arXiv:2008.02425 [astro-ph.CO]].

Wald, R. M. 1984, General Relativity, (Chicago, Chicago
University Press) doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226870373.001.0001