

Impedance Matching to Axion Dark Matter

Saptarshi Chaudhuri^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544*

²*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305*

(Dated: April 2, 2024)

We introduce the concept of impedance matching to axion dark matter by posing the question of why axion detection is difficult, even though there is enough power in each square meter of incident dark-matter flux to energize a LED light bulb. We show that a small axion-photon coupling does not in itself prevent an order-unity fraction of the dark matter from being absorbed through an optimal impedance match. We further show that, since the axion mass is unknown, the photon-electron coupling across a frequency-integrated impedance match must be considered to determine constraints on power coupled from axion dark matter. Using conservation of energy statements derived from the equations of axion electrodynamics, we demonstrate stringent limitations on absorbed power in linear, time-invariant, passive receivers. We discuss the results in the context of recent works constraining axion search sensitivity that conduct a broad first-principles optimization of receivers subject to the Standard Quantum Limit on phase-insensitive amplification.

I. INTRODUCTION

The QCD axion and axion-like particles are leading candidates for cold dark matter. QCD axions not only possess natural mechanisms for generating the dark matter abundance[1–3], but can also solve the strong CP problem[4–6]. Recent theoretical investigations and the advent of precision experimental techniques have resulted in the proposal and construction of several new probes for axion dark matter[1, 7]. (We refer to the QCD axion and axion-like particles collectively as “axions.”) Many of these probes search for the axion’s coupling to two photons, quantified by coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$, so that in a background electromagnetic field, the axion converts to a photon[8, 9]. The photon signal may be detected with a sensitive receiver. Over much of the allowed parameter space, axion dark matter possesses a low mass $\lesssim 1$ eV, which when combined with the local dark-matter density ~ 0.45 GeV/cm³[10], results in large number density. In the context of detection, axions are then more appropriately described as wave-like dark matter, rather than particle-like dark matter. The photon signal is best described as a coherent electromagnetic field.

In experimental searches, the background electromagnetic field usually takes the form of a several-Tesla DC magnetic field extending over a ~ 1 m³ volume, and the electromagnetic receiver often consists of a high-Q ($\gtrsim 10^4$) resonator. In the presence of the DC magnetic field, an axion dark-matter field of mass m_a produces an electromagnetic signal oscillating at $\omega_a = m_a c^2 / \hbar$. If the resonance frequency of the receiver is near the rest-mass frequency, the electromagnetic signal is enhanced. One may conduct a sensitive search for axion dark matter over a wide range of mass-coupling parameter space by tuning the resonance frequency. An axion search therefore operates much like an AM radio, searching for a station at particular frequency[11–16]. However, because the axion is feebly coupled to the photon, the expected power from a QCD axion signal in a state-of-the-art resonant receiver is $\lesssim 10^{-22}$ Watts[17–20]. The low signal power necessi-

tates the use of layers of shielding to mitigate electromagnetic interference[21], as well as cryogenic operation to reduce thermal noise. Additionally, the experiments utilize sensitive readout, often in the form of amplifiers operating near the Standard Quantum Limit (SQL) on phase-insensitive amplification[22, 23]. Recently, there has been work on squeezed-state receivers, single-photon counting, backaction evasion, and other metrology protocols which evade the SQL and enhance search sensitivity[24–27].

The power available per unit area in the axion dark-matter field is given by the incident energy flux, roughly equal to the product of the local dark-matter density[10] and the virial velocity $\sim 10^{-3}c$. In each square meter of flux, there is then ~ 10 Watts of power, enough to turn on a LED light bulb and ~ 23 orders of magnitude more power than expected in resonant searches. Our observation begs the question: Why is axion dark matter detection difficult? The axion-photon coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ may be “small”, but that alone does not mean power absorption cannot be efficient or tell us why detection should be difficult. So what precisely are the physical mechanisms that prevent one from absorbing all power in the axion field, or equivalently, why is it impractical to impedance match to axion dark-matter, necessitating the use of precision measurement techniques that are often challenging to implement?

In this paper, we investigate impedance matching to axion dark matter, elucidating the performance of laboratory searches. Since the axion mass is a priori unknown, the metric we use for describing the difficulty of obtaining an impedance match is signal power integrated over a search band of rest-mass frequencies. Our results, which extend the impulse response technique introduced in ref. [28] and put an upper bound on the frequency-integrated signal power, demonstrate the stringent limitations on coupling power from the axion-photon interaction imposed by the photon-electron interaction. When combined with a noise analysis—as performed in the comprehensive signal-to-noise optimization of refs. [29, 30] for single-moded, linear, passive receivers sub-

ject to the SQL on phase-insensitive amplification—they yield constraints on search sensitivity. We thus caution the reader that, while the results here elucidate one aspect of optimization (the signal), they are insufficient for an optimization or to determine whether the optimal search technique is resonant, broadband, or otherwise.

Almost all present axion dark-matter receivers fall into the category of linear, time-invariant, and passive. (Our mathematical definition of passivity is provided in Section III, but for now, it suffices to consider passive receivers as those in which the charges do not supply energy in response to the axion forcing.) This category of receivers will thus be the focus of our work.

We begin in Section II with a thought experiment analyzing two toy receivers, a broadband antenna and a cavity resonator. The thought experiment provides physical intuition as to how the photon-electron interaction limits power absorption and why one cannot efficiently impedance match to axion dark matter with a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver. We calculate the signal power dissipated in the antenna and cavity receivers and show that both receivers are, in practice, a poor impedance match to axions. Motivated by the arguments of Schwinger[31, 32] and Dicke[33], we produce equivalent circuits of the two toy receivers and calculate the scale of the effective source impedance of dark matter. The results from the circuit calculations enable us to generalize the observations from the toy receivers. We show that there is a self-impedance acting on receiver charges, associated with coupling to the axion-induced electromagnetic forcing, and that the scale of this self-impedance is much larger than the effective source impedance of dark matter. This mismatch limits the power absorbed into a receiver unless the self-impedance is nulled, as in a cavity on-resonance. In a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, the nulling can only be achieved over a small bandwidth of possible rest-mass frequencies. Moreover, even with a nulled self-impedance, the loss required to absorb an order-one fraction of available axion-field power is too small to be realized practically. *Limitations on coupling power from the axion-photon interaction are therefore governed in significant part by the photon-electron interaction.*

In Section III, we formalize the limitations observed in our thought experiment by deriving an upper bound on the gain-bandwidth of the impedance match to axion dark matter for linear, time-invariant, passive receivers. This bound constrains the axion-field power delivered to the receiver, integrated over all possible rest-mass frequencies in a search band. We first formulate a definition of impedance as seen by the axion, using conservation of energy statements derived from the governing equations of axion electrodynamics. Our formulation works entirely from classical electrodynamics; we therefore do not consider the effects of quantum state preparation (e.g., Fock states), discussed recently as a method to enhance axion search sensitivity[34]. We then discuss the use of impulse response, first introduced in ref. [28], to con-

strain the gain-bandwidth on the match to dark matter. In Appendix B, we explain why the argument for a gain-bandwidth relation in ref. [28] is incomplete, as it does not apply to systems with electrons. Incorporating the charges is a key element of our work. Combining the impulse response approach with the energy-conservation statements and the intuition gained from Section II, we establish a bound, including charges, and constrain frequency-integrated signal power in a receiver.

In Section IV, we discuss our results in the context of optimizing axion dark-matter receivers. We show how the gain-bandwidth bound derived in Section III relates to the Bode integral theorem[35, 36], which governs gain-bandwidth in equivalent circuits of linear, time-invariant, passive receivers with reactive elements. We then use the Bode integral theorem to systematically generate large classes of receivers—including the single-pole cavity resonator, widely used in axion searches—that can saturate the gain-bandwidth bound. We discuss why the impedance-matching results in this paper are necessary, but not sufficient, for a complete receiver optimization. In particular, a complete optimization must consider not frequency-integrated signal power, but rather, frequency-integrated signal-to-noise-squared, i.e. integrated sensitivity. We thus frame our results as providing useful insight into one component of the analysis of refs. [29, 30], which conducts a broad optimization of single-moded linear, time-invariant, passive receivers subject to the SQL on phase-insensitive amplification. In the context of those works, we show that a single-pole cavity resonator can, in theory, saturate the bound on frequency-integrated signal power, but cannot quite saturate the bound on frequency-integrated sensitivity. Additionally, while high-Q resonant and broadband searches possess roughly the same frequency-integrated signal power, the frequency-integrated sensitivity is orders of magnitude different. The figure of merit of frequency-integrated sensitivity is thus distinct from the concept of frequency-integrated signal power.

We conclude our work in Section V. Our work provides significant insights into the performance of laboratory axion dark-matter searches, elucidating the limitations on coupling power from the axion-photon interaction imposed by the photon-electron interaction and the importance of integrated signal-to-noise-squared, as opposed to integrated signal power, in receiver optimization.

II. THOUGHT EXPERIMENT

A. Setup

Fig. 1 illustrates our thought experiment with a toy antenna and a toy cavity. As can be derived from conservation of energy[27, 29], these receivers represent the two generic categories of coupling to the electromagnetic excitation from the axion: radiative coupling (antenna), through free-space radiation modes of the receiver, and

reactive coupling (cavity), through energy-storing elements of the receiver. We describe the toy setups and their power absorption from the axion driving field. Our analysis builds on a more detailed calculation in [29].

Consider a uniform DC magnetic field of strength B_0 pointing in the $\hat{z}$ direction and filling all space. An approximately static, spatially uniform axion field $a(t)$ of mass m_a oscillating at its rest-mass frequency $\omega_a = m_a c^2/\hbar$,

$$a(t) = \text{Re}(\tilde{a}\exp(+i\omega_a t)), \quad (1)$$

produces an electric field,[37]

$$\vec{E}_a(t) = \text{Re}(\tilde{E}_a \exp(+i\omega_a t))\hat{z}, \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{E}_a = \kappa_a c B_0 \tilde{a}$ and κ_a is related to the axion-photon coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ by $\kappa_a = g_{a\gamma\gamma} \sqrt{\hbar c \epsilon_0}$. The tilde above E_a on the right-hand side of (2) indicates that the quantity is a complex number, with amplitude and phase. This electric field drives the toy receivers, depositing axion-field power.




FIG. 1. (a) Resistive sheet antenna and (b) resonant cavity embedded in a background DC magnetic field, $\vec{B}_{DC} = B_0 \hat{z}$.

In Fig. 1(a), we show a square resistive sheet of area A and ohmic conductivity σ_r . Suppose that its thickness h is much less than the skin depth at frequency ω_a and that each lateral dimension is much larger than the Compton wavelength $\lambda_a = 2\pi c/\omega_a$. The resistive sheet then models a broadband-antenna search for axions[38]. The sheet currents, driven by the tangential field $\vec{E}_a(t)$ in the $\hat{z}$ -direction, both dissipate power and produce electromagnetic radiation, which can be approximated as $\hat{z}$ -polarized plane waves propagating in the $+\hat{y}$ - and $-\hat{y}$ -direction. These waves also represent the antenna receiving modes. One can solve Maxwell's equations for the steady-state power dissipation per unit area:

$$\frac{P_r}{A} = \frac{Z_r}{2} \frac{|\tilde{E}_a|^2}{(Z_r + Z_{fs}/2)^2}, \quad (3)$$

where $Z_r = 1/(\sigma_r h)$ is the sheet impedance and $Z_{fs} = \sqrt{\mu_0/\epsilon_0} \approx 377 \Omega$ is the free-space impedance. One may note the similarity of the power dissipation (3) to that for bolometric absorption of an electromagnetic plane wave[39, 40].

In Fig. 1(b), we show two square sheets of area A separated by length l . The sheet on the left possesses finite-conductivity σ_c , while that on the right is an ideal conductor. As with the antenna in Fig. 1(a), the thickness h of the finite-conductivity sheet is assumed to be much less than the skin depth, and the lateral dimensions are assumed to be much larger than the Compton wavelength. This receiver is a toy model of a cavity. For rest-mass frequencies ω_a near the half-wavelength resonance frequency $\omega_r = \pi c/l$, $\vec{E}_a(t)$ drives resonantly enhanced currents on the left-side sheet, resulting in enhanced energy storage between the sheets and enhanced power dissipation. Solving Maxwell's equations for the power dissipation per unit area gives, for frequencies ω_a near resonance, $|\omega_a - \omega_r| \ll \omega_r$,

$$\frac{P_c}{A} \approx \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{|\tilde{E}_a|^2}{Z_{fs}} \frac{Q}{|1 + 2iQ(\omega_a - \omega_r)/\omega_r|^2} \quad (4)$$

where $Z_c = 1/(\sigma_c h)$ is the impedance of the sheet on the left and $Q = \pi Z_{fs}/2Z_c$ is the quality factor of the half-wavelength mode.

For signals on resonance, taking the limit $Q \rightarrow \infty$ yields $P_c/A \rightarrow \infty$. Of course, extracting infinite power from the finite-power axion field is unphysical. Two assumptions break down. First, the axion dark-matter field has some velocity, imparting a nonzero linewidth to the axion signal. For a virialized signal with velocity $v \sim 10^{-3}c$, the linewidth is $\sim 10^{-6}\omega_a$; for quality factors much larger than 10^6 , our expression for the dissipated power (4) is then not valid, as portions of the signal spectrum are off resonance. Second, and more importantly for analyzing impedance matching, at sufficiently high Q , the cavity backreacts on the axion field, modifying the local axion-field amplitude via photon-to-axion conversion and effectively changing the value of $\tilde{E}_a$. Backreaction can be ignored as long as the dissipated power is much smaller than the available power, i.e. as long as the impedance match to the axion source is poor. The available power per unit area is the axion energy flux, roughly equal to the product of the energy density

$$\rho_a = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \left(\frac{\omega_a}{c} \right)^2 |\tilde{a}|^2 \quad (5)$$

and velocity v :

$$\frac{P_a}{A} \sim \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\omega_a/c)^2 |\tilde{a}|^2 v}{Z_{fs} c}. \quad (6)$$

From (2) and (4), backreaction may then be ignored if

$$Q \ll \left(\frac{\kappa_a c B_0}{\omega_a/c} \right)^{-2} \frac{v}{c}. \quad (7)$$

For virialized DFSZ axions[41] in a $B_0 = 10$ T magnetic field, the quantity in parentheses is $\approx 3 \times 10^{-16}$, so we may ignore backreaction as long as $Q \ll 10^{28}$. This is readily satisfied for practical cavities. Similarly, we may ignore backreaction for the antenna because the dissipated power is a small fraction, $\lesssim 10^{-28}$, of the available power for all sheet impedances.

B. Equivalent Circuits

We conclude that both of our toy receivers are, in practice, a poor impedance match to dark matter. However, our calculations have provided no physical intuition as to why the impedance match is poor. As Schwinger and Dicke point out[31–33], equivalent circuits are powerful tools for understanding the physics of electromagnetic systems. We now produce equivalent circuits of the toy receivers and elucidate the mechanisms limiting the impedance match.

The equivalent circuits may readily be derived as a mapping to complex-power flow integral equations. See also refs. [33, 42, 43].




FIG. 2. Equivalent circuits for the (a) sheet antenna and (b) half-wave cavity mode. Axion source impedance not shown.

In Fig. 2(a), the sheet of impedance Z_r has been replaced by an equivalent resistor Z_r . The sheet antenna may be treated as receiving the electric field $\vec{E}_a(t)$ through the two radiation modes described above eq. (3). The radiation modes are represented by equivalent resistors of value equal to the free-space impedance Z_{fs} . The electric field $\vec{E}_a(t)$ driving the antenna is represented by two equivalent voltages—one for each receiving mode—with complex-valued voltage phasor $\tilde{V}_a^r$. The voltage drive produces a current $\tilde{I}_r$ through the resistor Z_r , which using Kirchhoff's Laws, results in power dissipation

$$P_r^{\text{equiv}} = \frac{Z_r}{2} |\tilde{I}_r|^2 = \frac{Z_r}{2} \frac{|\tilde{V}_a^r|^2}{(Z_r + Z_{fs}/2)^2}. \quad (8)$$

Mapping $\tilde{V}_a^r \rightarrow \tilde{E}_a \sqrt{A}$, we recover eq. (3).

In Fig. 2(b), the half-wave cavity mode has been represented as an equivalent series-RLC circuit, which models the behavior near resonance[33]. The equivalent inductor L_{eq} and capacitor C_{eq} , whose values are shown in the figure, represent electromagnetic energy storage between the two sheets. The sheet of impedance Z_c is represented by an equivalent resistor of the same value. The axion drive is represented as a voltage $\tilde{V}_a^c$ and produces current $\tilde{I}_c$. The power dissipation in the equivalent resistor Z_c is

$$P_c^{\text{equiv}} = \frac{Z_c}{2} |\tilde{I}_c|^2 \approx \frac{Z_c}{2} \frac{|\tilde{V}_a^c|^2}{|Z_c + 2i(\omega_a - \omega_r)L_{eq}|^2} \quad (9)$$

where the approximation holds for frequencies ω_a near resonance $\omega_r = 1/\sqrt{L_{eq}C_{eq}}$. Using $Q = \omega_r L_{eq}/Z_c$ and mapping $\tilde{V}_a^c \rightarrow 2\tilde{E}_a \sqrt{A}$, we recover eq. (4).

As discussed earlier, power conservation dictates that, at sufficiently high Q , the cavity backreacts on the axion field. Backreaction can be represented with a source impedance Z_a^s in series with the voltage drive. The scale of the source impedance is given by the impedance Z_c at which the on-resonance power dissipation is comparable to the power available (6), i.e. the sheet impedance at which an efficient match is obtained:

$$Z_a^s \sim \left(\frac{\kappa_a c B_0}{\omega_a / c} \right)^2 Z_{fs} \frac{c}{v}. \quad (10)$$

A precise calculation of the source impedance, solved directly from the equations of axion electrodynamics, is given in [27]. Note that the source impedance varies with the square of axion-photon coupling. This is expected because one power of κ_a comes from the axions creating photons that couple to the receiver, while another power of κ_a comes from the receiver producing photons, which in turn produce axions.

For virialized DFSZ QCD axions in a 10 Tesla field, the source impedance is $Z_a^s \sim 10^{-28} Z_{fs}$. In particular, the source impedance is much smaller than the free-space impedance. Comparing the size of the source impedance to the impedance scales in the equivalent circuits now reveals the mechanism limiting an efficient match to axion dark matter in linear, time-invariant, passive receivers.

The axion produces electromagnetic fields (e.g., $\vec{E}_a(t)$ in our toy model), and the receiver charges may couple to these fields radiatively (as with the antenna) and/or reactively (as with the cavity)[27, 29]. However, for either manner of coupling, in order for the charges to couple to the fields, the charges must produce fields themselves. These fields produced by the charges exert a self-impedance on the charges that is much larger than the axion source impedance, limiting electromagnetic current flow and axion power coupled to the receiver. *In a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, the impedance match to axion dark matter is limited in large part by the self-impedance of photons acting on electromagnetic charges in the receiver.* For example, in the resistive sheet antenna, the charges couple to the axion-induced electric field via free-space radiation modes. The radiative coupling is accompanied by the emission of electromagnetic radiation from the sheet. The radiation impedance on the charges, characterized by the free-space impedance Z_{fs} , is much larger than the axion source impedance, and the mismatch limits the power coupled into the charges. Quantitatively, the impedance mismatch can be understood from eqs. (3) and (8). If we eliminate the free-space impedance term in the denominator, we may absorb arbitrarily large amounts of power by reducing the sheet impedance (up to backreaction on the axion field, characterized by source impedance Z_a^s). However, with the free-space impedance term in the denominator, representing the radiation self-impedance, the power coupled to the receiver is limited.

For the cavity in Figs. 1(b) and 2(b), the self-impedance takes the form of reactance, rather than radi-

ation resistance. The reactance is both a self-capacitance and self-inductance, representing the field energy produced by the charges and stored in the cavity. On-resonance, the impedance from the inductance and capacitance cancel. One can then absorb an order-one fraction of the available power by increasing the Q so that the resistance Z_c matches the source impedance Z_a^s [27]. However, the Q required for the match is too high to be achieved practically, as shown in eq. (7).

Off resonance, the inductive and capacitive impedances do not cancel. The magnitude of the inductive impedance near resonance is approximately $\pi Z_{fs}/2$ and similarly for the capacitive impedance. Both impedances are much larger than the axion source impedance. Therefore, as the detuning between the axion rest-mass frequency and resonance frequency increases, the net self-reactance becomes large relative to the axion source impedance. The consequent impedance mismatch limits power coupled to the cavity for signals off resonance. Because passive reactive impedances are frequency-dependent (the impedance of an inductor is proportional to frequency and the impedance of a capacitor is inversely proportional to frequency)[44], the frequency range over which the self-impedance may be nulled for an efficient impedance match is limited[45][46].

III. GAIN-BANDWIDTH BOUNDS

We now formalize the observed limitations. We use energy-conservation statements to quantify the concept of impedance. We combine these statements with impulse response to derive a gain-bandwidth bound, constraining power delivered to a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, integrated over possible rest-mass frequencies in a search band.

A. Conservation of Energy

Here, we state assumptions on our derivation of energy-conservation for an axion field interacting with a receiver. The assumptions also underlie the gain-bandwidth bound. We assume that axion-to-photon conversion occurs in a background DC magnetic field of finite spatial extent (unlike the infinite spatial extent of the toy receivers), similar to those used near-universally in laboratory dark-matter searches. However, similar mathematical treatments may be carried out for other types of background fields. In Appendix A, we establish a gain-bandwidth bound for axions in background monochromatic AC magnetic fields, as well as a gain-bandwidth bound for hidden photons, another well-motivated dark-matter candidate[11, 47, 48].

We hold the axion field to be a stiff source (with negligible source impedance), which is justified by our observations in the thought experiment. Our focus in this paper is constraining laboratory axion dark-matter searches

probing axion-to-photon conversion in background electromagnetic fields. Thus, we do not consider the reverse process of photon-to-axion conversion, which is central to solar axion searches, as well as light-shining-through-walls searches[1].

We assume that the electromagnetic currents driven by the axion-induced fields occupy a finite volume. In practice, it may be difficult to guarantee that such an assumption is satisfied if axion-induced photons radiate into free space. The experimentalist searching for axions has little control over the interaction of photons and electrons far from the receiver, and these interactions need not be linear. Nevertheless, for our initial considerations of energy conservation and gain-bandwidth bounds, we assume that the electromagnetic currents driven by the axion-induced fields occupy a finite volume. At the end of this section, we explain how our derivations yield impedance-matching constraints on the types of controlled, shielded setups found in experiments.

We work entirely from the equations of classical electrodynamics. See refs. [7, 34] for discussion of the distinctions between classical and quantum-mechanical descriptions of axion electrodynamics.

Axion electrodynamics is governed by equations[49, 50]

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{E} = (\rho + \rho_a)/\epsilon_0, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{E} = -\partial_t \vec{B} \quad (11)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{B} = 0, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{B} = \mu_0(\vec{J} + \vec{J}_a) + \mu_0\epsilon_0\partial_t \vec{E} \quad (12)$$

where $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are the electric and magnetic fields, respectively. The ρ and $\vec{J}$ are the electromagnetic charge and current density. All field and charge/current quantities are functions of position $\vec{x}$ and time t . The arguments have been omitted for brevity. ρ_a and $\vec{J}_a$ are the effective axion charge and current density, which model the fields produced by axion-to-photon conversion. They can be related to the axion potential $a(\vec{x}, t)$ by

$$\rho_a(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \vec{B}(\vec{x}, t) \cdot \vec{\nabla} a(\vec{x}, t) \quad (13)$$

$$\vec{J}_a(\vec{x}, t) = -\frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \left(\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t) \partial_t a(\vec{x}, t) - \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \times \vec{\nabla} a(\vec{x}, t) \right) \quad (14)$$

Eqs. (11) and (12) contain information about the electromagnetic fields and currents arising from the axion dark-matter field, the DC currents driving the DC magnetic field, noise fields and currents, as well as any other fields and currents in the receiver system. For our discussion of impedance matching, we focus on the fields and currents arising from the axion dark matter. Formally, one can perturbatively expand the fields and currents in orders of the axion-photon coupling κ_a :

$$\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) = \vec{E}_0(\vec{x}, t) + \kappa_a \vec{E}_1(\vec{x}, t) + \kappa_a^2 \vec{E}_2(\vec{x}, t) + \dots \quad (15)$$

and analogously for $\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)$, $\rho(\vec{x}, t)$, and $\vec{J}(\vec{x}, t)$, with each term in the sum on the right-hand side being much

smaller than the preceding term. Terms with subscript '0' represent the fields and currents in the absence of the axion-photon interaction. We assume that the background DC magnetic field $\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})$ is sufficiently large (e.g., much larger than thermal noise fields) such that

$$\vec{B}_0(\vec{x}, t) \approx \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}). \quad (16)$$

for all $\vec{x}$ and t . We assume that $\vec{E}_0(\vec{x}, t)$ is negligible. Since we assume that the axion field is stiff, we ignore terms which are order κ_a^2 and higher, representing the effects of back-reaction. From here on, for brevity of notation, we identify the fields and currents $\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)$, $\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)$, $\rho(\vec{x}, t)$, $\vec{J}(\vec{x}, t)$ with the first-order terms in the expansion. For example, $\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)$ is synonymous with $\kappa_a \vec{B}_1(\vec{x}, t)$ and distinct from the background DC magnetic field $\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})$. In our thought experiment, note that $\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)$, now synonymous with $\kappa_a \vec{E}_1(\vec{x}, t)$, represents the sum of the axion-induced background electric field $\vec{E}_a(t)$ and the fields produced by the receiver in response to this drive.

We assume that the axion field is spatially uniform over the extent of the DC magnetic field. This is a good assumption in an experiment if, for all rest-mass frequencies in the search range, the coherence length of the axion[29] is much larger than the extent of the magnetic field, which is nearly always the case[7]. For a spatially uniform axion field, eq. (14) becomes

$$\vec{J}_a(\vec{x}, t) \approx -\frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}) \partial_t a(t). \quad (17)$$

The effective axion charge density is negligible.

Consider a volume V , with boundary ∂V , surrounding the DC magnetic field and all currents driven by the axion-induced electromagnetic fields. From eqs. (11)-(12), the discussion following eq. (15), and eq. (17),

$$\frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \partial_t a(t) \int_V \vec{E} \cdot \vec{B}_{DC} = P_J(t) + P_{rad}(t) + \partial_t (W_B + W_E) \quad (18)$$

where

$$W_B(t) = \frac{1}{2\mu_0} \int_V |\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)|^2, \quad W_E(t) = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \int_V |\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)|^2 \quad (19)$$

$$P_J(t) = \int_V \vec{J}(\vec{x}, t) \cdot \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \quad (20)$$

$$P_{rad}(t) = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_{\partial V} (\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \times \vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)) \cdot \vec{d}\vec{a}. \quad (21)$$

The absolute value signs in eq. (19) indicate vector magnitude. Eq. (18) is a statement of energy conservation in axion electrodynamics. It states that the rate of energy transfer from the background axion field in volume V is equal to the sum of three quantities: the rate of work

done on electromagnetic charges (represented by $P_J(t)$), the electromagnetic energy flux through the surface ∂V (represented by $P_{rad}(t)$), and the rate of change in field energy (represented by $\partial_t (W_B + W_E)$). Note that in limiting $\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)$ to be the first-order field produced by the axion, we have ignored the possibility of coherent signal addition; if a monochromatic axion field sources an electric field that constructively interferes with a background electric field at the same frequency, the energy transfer from the axion is enhanced (relative to no such background electric field)[34]. However, the phase of the axion dark-matter field, dictating the phase of the produced electric field, is unknown, so we ignore this scenario, which is not relevant to present laboratory searches.

B. Impedance Seen by the Axion Source

In an electromagnetic system, e.g., a resistor governed by Ohm's Law, impedance relates an input current to a produced voltage. We thus define the quantities that play the role of current and voltage in our analysis, after which we introduce the assumptions underlying our concept of impedance and the gain-bandwidth bound. We define

$$I_a(t) \equiv \frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \partial_t a(t), \quad V_a(t) \equiv \int_V \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}). \quad (22)$$

The quantity $I_a(t)$ plays the role of input current, being proportional to the effective current density (17). From eqs. (11)-(12), its effect is governed by

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{E} = \rho/\epsilon_0, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{E} = -\partial_t \vec{B} \quad (23)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{B} = 0, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{B} = \mu_0(\vec{J} - I_a(t)\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})) + \mu_0\epsilon_0\partial_t \vec{E}, \quad (24)$$

To constrain gain-bandwidth on the impedance match to axion dark matter, we consider the effect of a delta function $I_a(t)$. A delta function is not a solution for the equation of motion of the axion field[8]. However, mathematically, the system response to a delta function reveals the behavior of axion-induced electromagnetic fields and currents over a wide range of possible rest-mass frequencies because its Fourier transform carries constant value in the frequency domain.

The quantity $V_a(t)$, characterizing the overlap of the electric field with the DC magnetic field, plays the role of voltage in our analysis. Note that the left-hand side of eq. (18) can be written as $I_a(t)V_a(t)$, similar to other source-power expressions in electromagnetic systems[33, 51]. However, $I_a(t)$ and $V_a(t)$ do not possess the physical units of current and voltage. We use the language of linear-response theory[52] and refer to $I_a(t)$ as the input to the receiver and $V_a(t)$ as the output.

We assume that the relationship between the input $I_a(t)$ and output $V_a(t)$ is linear and time-invariant, as defined in [52]. From eqs. (23)-(24), one can observe that the assumption holds if the constitutive equations

(e.g., susceptibility relations in a dielectric), describing the relationships between electromagnetic currents and fields in the system, are linear and time-invariant. We may then write a response function $Z_a(t)$ given by the convolution[52]

$$V_a(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau Z_a(t - \tau) I_a(\tau). \quad (25)$$

We refer to $Z_a(t)$ as the impedance seen by the axion field. The impedance governs the response of the photons and charges to an axion drive. Although we have defined $V_a(t)$ and $Z_a(t)$ in terms of a volume V , they are independent of the choice of volume as long as it completely surrounds the DC magnetic field. For what follows, we also assume that V surrounds all currents driven by the axion-induced electromagnetic fields.

We assume that, for all inputs $I_a(t)$ and all times τ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt P_J(t) \geq 0. \quad (26)$$

In other words, the charges do not supply energy in response to the axion-induced electromagnetic forcing. Eq. (26) holds for receivers containing only passive elements. Conversely, eq. (26) may not hold for receivers containing active elements, e.g., lumped negative inductors and capacitors and cavities with negative dispersion, from which energy may be extracted[53–60][61].

Because no electromagnetic sources exist beyond the volume V by construction, the energy flow through the surface ∂V must be zero or net outwards:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt P_{\text{rad}}(t) \geq 0 \quad (27)$$

for all inputs $I_a(t)$ and times τ . Combining eqs. (18), (22), (26), and (27) with the fact that $W_E(t)$ and $W_B(t)$ are non-negative, we find that, for linear, time-invariant, passive receivers,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt I_a(t) V_a(t) \geq 0. \quad (28)$$

That is, due to energy conservation and the assumption (26) that charges not supply energy, energy is always extracted from the axions. From ref. [52], $Z_a(t)$ therefore has a well-defined Fourier transform:

$$Z_a(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt Z_a(t) \exp(-i\omega t), \quad (29)$$

and we may write (25) in the frequency domain as

$$V_a(\omega) = Z_a(\omega) I_a(\omega). \quad (30)$$

Denote the real part of the impedance $Z_a(\omega)$ as $R_a(\omega)$. Since the receiver is assumed to be passive, $R_a(\omega)$ is non-negative for all ω [52]. From Ch. 6.9 of ref. [62], we obtain

$$R_a(\omega) = \frac{\int_V \text{Re}(\vec{J}^*(\vec{x}, \omega) \cdot \vec{E}(\vec{x}, \omega))}{|I_a(\omega)|^2} + \frac{\frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_{\partial V} \text{Re}(\vec{E}(\vec{x}, \omega) \times \vec{B}^*(\vec{x}, \omega)) \cdot \vec{d}\vec{a}}{|I_a(\omega)|^2}, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\vec{E}(\vec{x}, \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \exp(-i\omega t) \quad (32)$$

is the Fourier transform of the electric field and similarly for $\vec{J}$ and $\vec{B}$. $R_a(\omega)$ thus represents dissipation in charges and electromagnetic radiation due to the axion forcing.

C. Impulse Response

To constrain the frequency-integrated impedance match, we must therefore constrain $R_a(\omega)$. We show that for linear, time-invariant, passive receivers,

$$\int_0^{\infty} d\omega R_a(\omega) \leq \frac{\pi}{2\epsilon_0} \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (33)$$

We demonstrate (33) by placing an upper bound on the energy supplied to the system by an impulse

$$I_a^\delta(t) = I_a^0 \delta(t), \quad I_a^0 > 0 \quad (34)$$

where $\delta(t)$ is the Dirac delta function. That an upper bound should exist follows from the intuition developed in Section II. The self-impedance of photons acting on charges limits current flow, which in turn, limits the electric field. A limitation on the electric field constrains the response $V_a^\delta(t)$. Since the energy supplied by the pulse is given by the time integral of $I_a^\delta(t) V_a^\delta(t)$, we then expect a limitation on its value. The limitation leads to eq. (33). Ref. [28], which introduces impulse response, claims a gain-bandwidth relation similar to (33), but the argument is incomplete because it does not apply to systems with electromagnetic charges. See Appendix B for details.

It is important to understand the limits of integration $(0, +\infty)$ in eq. (33), which is a product of mathematical extrapolation rather than physical deduction. We are not making assumptions about the photon-electron interaction at arbitrarily high or low frequency, but rather working from the understanding of the interaction at the frequency scales relevant to searches (e.g., $\lesssim 200$ MHz for lumped-element searches, $\gtrsim 600$ MHz for cavity searches[7]). At these scales, the observed relationships between electromagnetic fields and currents in a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver are well-described by linear, time-invariant constitutive equations, e.g., Ohm's Law, descriptions of dielectrics using susceptibility tensors, and current-voltage relationships in the system's equivalent circuit. These equations are compatible with the usage of linear response in eq. (25) and are consistent with eq. (26). Plugging these relationships into the equations of motion (23) and (24) and into the energy-conservation statement (18), we mathematically infer a bound on the energy transfer from the impulse (34), which contains all frequencies. This leads to (33). We then deduce a maximum on axion signal power, integrated over all possible rest-mass frequencies in the

search range, leading to (43) below. In other words, though we mathematically extrapolate the constitutive relations to outside the search range (where they fail physically) in order to establish (33), we can still use eq. (33) to constrain power flow in the search range since the relations are physically valid there. For what follows, we denote all response quantities resulting from the pulse with a superscript δ [63].

Consider a time $\tau > 0$. Integrating eq. (18) yields, for the energy supplied by the pulse over all time,

$$\begin{aligned} W_a^\delta &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt I_a^\delta(t) V_a^\delta(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt I_a^\delta(t) V_a^\delta(t) \quad (35) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt [P_J^\delta(t) + P_{rad}^\delta(t) + \partial_t (W_B^\delta + W_E^\delta)] \\ &\geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \int_V |\vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, \tau)|^2 \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{(\int_V \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, \tau) \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}))^2}{\int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we have used the assumption (26) that the charges do not supply energy, as well as eq. (27). We have also used the fact that W_B is non-negative at time τ and that the electric and magnetic fields vanish in the limit $t \rightarrow -\infty$. We have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the last step.

For the pulse (34), eq. (22) yields

$$W_a^\delta = I_a^0 \int_V \frac{\vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0+) + \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0-)}{2} \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}), \quad (36)$$

where we have defined

$$\vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0+) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow 0+} \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, t) \quad (37)$$

as the electric field immediately after the pulse and similarly $\vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0-)$ as the field immediately before the pulse. The latter vanishes. Combining (35) and (36) gives

$$\begin{aligned} W_a^\delta &= \frac{I_a^0}{2} \int_V \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0+) \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}) \\ &\geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{(\int_V \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, \tau) \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}))^2}{\int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2} \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

for all times $\tau > 0$. We may then take the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0+$ in the second line, which, after rearranging, implies

$$W_a^\delta \leq \frac{(I_a^0)^2}{2\epsilon_0} \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (39)$$

Fourier-transforming the first integrand of (35), with $I_a^\delta(\omega) = I_a^0$ for all ω , gives, using (30),

$$W_a^\delta = \frac{(I_a^0)^2}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega Z_a(\omega) = \frac{(I_a^0)^2}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} d\omega R_a(\omega) \quad (40)$$

In the second equality, we have used that $Z_a(t)$ is real-valued so $Z_a(\omega) = Z_a^*(-\omega)$. Combining (39) and (40) then yields our desired result (33).

To show explicitly how (33) constrains the impedance match to axion dark matter in a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, we consider a situation resembling a laboratory search between possible rest-mass frequencies ω_l and ω_h . We calculate an upper bound on the amount of axion-field power dissipated in the receiver, integrated over this search band. We assume that for all frequencies in the search, the coherence length is much larger than the extent of the DC magnetic field, so that the axion field is spatially uniform and (33) applies. We hold fixed the axion-photon coupling, dark-matter energy density ρ_a , and DC magnetic field, over the search range. To simplify calculations, we assume a monochromatic, rather than virialized, axion at each search frequency, so that the axion field may be expressed as in eq. (1). We stress however that (33) constrains power flow generally, regardless of the particular assumptions about the axion cold-dark-matter velocity distribution.

Consider an axion dark-matter field $a(t)$ of rest-mass frequency $\omega_a = m_a c^2 / \hbar$, with energy density (5). From (18) and (22), the instantaneous power flow from the field is $I_a(t) V_a(t)$ (with units of Watts). Then, from (25), (30), and (31),

$$P(\omega_a) \equiv \frac{(\kappa_a c)^2}{\mu_0} \rho_a R_a(\omega_a) \quad (41)$$

represents the time-averaged power flow from axions, and using eq. (33), the frequency-integrated power flow obeys

$$\int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a P(\omega_a) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (42)$$

Denoting $P_J(\omega_a)$ as the power dissipated in the charges, we have $P_J(\omega_a) \leq P(\omega_a)$ from eq. (31), so

$$\int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a P_J(\omega_a) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (43)$$

The power dissipated in the receiver, integrated over all rest-mass frequencies, is proportional to κ_a^2 , but, as discussed, the power available from dark matter is independent of κ_a . *For practical background magnetic-field strengths, owing to limitations from the photon-electron interaction, an efficient, broadband impedance match to a range of possible rest-mass frequencies in a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver is fundamentally impossible.* If a receiver is designed to be an efficient match at one possible rest-mass frequency, the match at other possible frequencies is necessarily limited.

As discussed at the beginning of this section, our derivation of (42) and (43) relies on the axion-driven currents occupying a finite volume. This condition may be difficult to guarantee in an experiment, especially if axion-induced photons radiate into free space and interact with charges far from the apparatus. These interactions may not be linear (violating the assumptions for our definition of impedance $Z_a(t)$). However, we should note that the experimentalist is usually only interested in measuring the signal power deposited in some sub-volume of

charges, e.g., the power delivered to the input of an amplifier, rather than the power also dissipated in magnet wires and mechanical supports. The sub-volume is often well-shielded to mitigate electromagnetic interference and minimize parasitic coupling to nonlinearities, which can degrade sensitivity. Suppose that the sub-volume of interest is contained within a volume V_s . We show how the bounds (42) and (43) can still apply to this volume.

We modify the definition of the output $V_a(t)$ in (22) to be an integral over V_s . We assume that the relationship between $I_a(t)$ and $V_a(t)$ is linear and time-invariant and that, within the volume V_s , the receiver possesses only passive elements so that (26) is satisfied. Suppose also that eq. (27) is satisfied over the boundary ∂V_s , as justified below. Then, using the impulse-response approach, we find integrated-power bounds similar to (42) and (43), except that the volume integrals are performed over V_s . Since V_s may or may not entirely contain the DC magnetic field, eqs. (42) and (43) are also satisfied.

Eq. (27) is satisfied over the volume of interest in general laboratory situations. For instance, suppose that the receiver is completely shielded by a high-conductivity normal (superconducting) metal, several skin (penetration) depths thick at all frequencies within the search range. By taking the volume boundary ∂V_s to be within the bulk of the shield, the electric field on the boundary approximately vanishes and (27) is satisfied with equality. Note that, in using an impulse-response approach, we extrapolate the boundary conditions, describing the electric field within the shield bulk as vanishingly small, to frequencies beyond the search range. The extrapolation generally fails physically, e.g., at low frequencies for a normal-metal shield, where the skin depth can be arbitrarily large. However, as discussed earlier, we may still make physical deductions applying to the search band.

Another common setup is a resonant cavity that is completely self-shielded with the exception of a readout port, presenting a real impedance Z_0 (typically 50 ohms), to which signal power is delivered[18–21]. Taking the volume boundary to be within the cavity walls yields

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt P_{rad}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt I(t)^2 Z_0 \geq 0, \quad (44)$$

where $I(t)$ is the equivalent-circuit current across the load[52, 62, 64]. We find that eq. (27) holds, so that again (42) and (43) are satisfied. The bounds (42) and (43) thus apply to generic laboratory receivers that are linear, time-invariant, and passive.

IV. OPTIMIZING THE IMPEDANCE MATCH

We determine classes of receivers that can saturate the bound (43) and then discuss axion search optimization.

We begin by demonstrating that a single, high- Q mode of a resonant cavity receiver, widely used in axion dark-matter searches, can saturate the frequency-integrated power bound. Consider a free-space cavity of volume V_c

containing no dielectric or magnetic materials. Suppose the cavity possesses a high- Q resonant mode at center frequency ω_c within the given search band, $\omega_l < \omega_c < \omega_h$. Assume that the search bandwidth is at least several resonator bandwidths on each side of the center frequency. Within the search range, the axion field is assumed to be approximately monochromatic and spatially uniform over the DC magnetic field extent. Assuming that the mode is well-separated from other cavity modes (so that we may ignore mode interactions), then for possible axion rest-mass frequencies ω_a satisfying $|\omega_a - \omega_c| \ll \omega_c$, the power dissipated in the cavity is [9, 29, 65–67]

$$P_{J,c}(\omega_a) \approx (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \mathcal{C} \frac{Q}{\omega_c} \frac{\int_{V_c} |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2}{1 + 4Q^2(\omega_a - \omega_c)^2/\omega_c^2}, \quad (45)$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ describes the mode function overlap with the DC field, with a maximum value of unity (although in practice it is less than unity[18]). Integrating, we find

$$\int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a P_{J,c}(\omega_a) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \mathcal{C} \int_{V_c} |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (46)$$

In the limit that the cavity encloses the entire DC magnetic field and the overlap factor $\mathcal{C}$ approaches unity, we recover the upper bound of (43), as desired.

However, to the extent that (45)-(46) are valid as we change the Q of the cavity mode, the frequency-integrated power dissipation is independent of Q . The factor of Q in signal-power enhancement on resonance is compensated by a bandwidth varying as $1/Q$. Moreover, in the model of Section II, one may observe that the integrated power dissipation of the cavity mode and the antenna, in a range of several bandwidths about the resonance, are comparable. Thus, our impedance-matching analysis does not inform whether a high- Q resonant or broader-band search is a better technique. It suggests that there may be large classes of receivers that can saturate the gain-bandwidth bound (43).

A. Optimizing with the Bode Integral Theorem

A systematic framework for determining receivers that saturate (43) is obtained through the use of equivalent circuits. We investigate single-moded receivers which are inductively coupled to the axion signal, i.e. which, over the given search range bounded by ω_l and ω_h , can be modeled as driven through a single equivalent-circuit inductance. Examples of such receivers include single-pole modes of cavity resonators, as described in more detail below. Using the gain-bandwidth bounds derived in Section III, we show that, at all frequencies in the search band, there is a maximum amplitude for the equivalent-circuit voltage source parametrizing the receiver excitation. We then combine the voltage constraint with the Bode integral theorem, which constrains equivalent-circuit impedance and is independent of the

derivations thus far, to bound power dissipation integrated over the search range. The bound is identical to eq. (43), demonstrating the consistency between the gain-bandwidth bound derived in Section III and gain-bandwidth bounds governing equivalent circuits. Our equivalent-circuit derivations also yield conditions for receivers to saturate the gain-bandwidth bound on power dissipation over a given search range and classes of receivers that can meet these conditions.




FIG. 3. Equivalent circuit of a receiver coupled to the axion excitation $\tilde{V}_L$ through an equivalent inductance L .

See Fig. 3. The equivalent-circuit inductance is attached to a linear, passive load impedance Z_L , which we assume to consist of inductors, capacitors, and/or resistors with frequency-independent values. Resistors typically represent both power dissipation in the receiver charges, as well as radiation loss. So that we may compare the integrated-power bound derived from the equivalent-circuit approach to eq. (43), we assume that the resistors represent solely electronic power dissipation. Additionally, receiver resistances physically tend to have frequency-dependent value, but over a finite search bandwidth or especially within a narrow search bandwidth $\omega_h - \omega_l \ll \omega_l$, can often be approximated as frequency-independent, which we assume here. As before, we consider monochromatic axion fields so the voltage drive may be written as

$$V_L(t) = \text{Re}(\tilde{V}_L(\omega_a)\exp(+i\omega_a t)). \quad (47)$$

In the equivalent circuit, we ignore the axion source impedance, demonstrated to be negligible in Section II.

For example, a typical cavity haloscope search[7] may be described by the circuit in Fig. 3. A single mode of a cavity resonator may be modeled as an equivalent-RLC circuit, e.g, as in Fig. 2(b). The inductance and capacitance are determined by the mode wavenumber and cavity volume, and the resistance is determined by the internal quality factor[33]. The drive voltage, which is a function of axion dark-matter parameters and DC magnetic field, can be modeled as coupling to the cavity inductance, and the square modulus of the voltage phasor increases with overlap factor $\mathcal{C}$. In a typical search, the cavity is coupled to a readout waveguide via an antenna sampling the intracavity field[68]. Then, the impedance Z_L consists of the cavity capacitance and resistance, representing internal loss, as well as the antenna equivalent-circuit elements and the input impedance of the readout

amplifier. The excitation from axions delivers power to both the internal loss and the amplifier input.

As Schwinger states, Maxwell's equations are used to constrain the parameter values in equivalent circuits[31, 32]. Thus, we first note that, for any rest-mass frequency ω_a within the search range, the voltage phasor obeys

$$|\tilde{V}_L(\omega_a)|^2 \leq 2L(\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (48)$$

where V surrounds the background DC magnetic field[69]. To see this, assume that the square modulus of the voltage phasor exceeds the bound at some frequency ω_a^* and that $\tilde{V}_L$ is a continuous function of rest-mass frequency (a reasonable assumption for a physical system). Then, one can construct a high- Q equivalent series-RLC circuit, with series resistor and capacitor in the load Z_L and with resonance frequency ω_a^* , such that the power delivered to the load, integrated over rest-mass frequencies, exceeds the bound (43). (The integral may be evaluated using steps similar to eqs. (45) and (46).) Such is not possible for a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, so we conclude that eq. (48) holds for any frequency.

The power delivered to the load satisfies

$$P_L(\omega_a) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\tilde{V}_L(\omega_a)|^2}{|Z_T(\omega_a)|^2} \text{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a)), \quad (49)$$

where

$$Z_T(\omega_a) = i\omega_a L + Z_L(\omega_a) \quad (50)$$

is the total impedance seen by the axion-induced voltage source at frequency ω_a . Thus, in order to constrain the frequency-integrated power, we must constrain the impedance $Z_T(\omega_a)$. Using the Bode integral theorem, derived from the residue theorem, we demonstrate[35, 36]

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L \text{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a))}{|Z_T(\omega_a)|^2} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (51)$$

We extend $Z_T(\omega)$ to the complex plane:[51]

$$Z_T(\omega) \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_T(p), \quad \tilde{Z}_T(p = i\omega) = Z_T(\omega). \quad (52)$$

By construction, $\tilde{Z}_T(p)$ is a real-rational function. Consider an arbitrary resistance $R_s > 0$ and the reflectance

$$\Gamma(p, R_s) = \frac{\tilde{Z}_T(p) - R_s}{\tilde{Z}_T(p) + R_s}. \quad (53)$$

We also define

$$\zeta(\omega, R_s) \equiv 1 - |\Gamma(p = i\omega, R_s)|^2 = \frac{4R_s \text{Re}(Z_T(\omega))}{|Z_T(\omega) + R_s|^2}. \quad (54)$$

The Bode integral theorem gives

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega_a \ln \left(\frac{1}{|\Gamma(i\omega_a, R_s)|} \right) = \frac{\pi R_s}{L} - \pi \sum_m p_m(R_s) \quad (55)$$

where $\{p_m(R_s)\}$ represent the zeros of $\Gamma(p, R_s)$ in the right-half of the complex plane. Because $\tilde{Z}_T(p)$ is real-rational, the zeros must occur in pairs which are complex conjugates, so the sum in (55) is non-negative. Thus,

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L}{4R_s} \ln \left(\frac{1}{1 - \zeta(\omega_a, R_s)} \right) \leq \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (56)$$

Since $0 \leq \zeta(\omega_a, R_s) \leq 1$, $\zeta \leq \ln((1 - \zeta)^{-1})$. Combining eqs. (54) and (56), we then obtain

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L \operatorname{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a))}{|Z_T(\omega_a) + R_s|^2} = \int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L}{4R_s} \zeta(\omega_a, R_s) \leq \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (57)$$

Since the above relation holds for arbitrary resistances $R_s > 0$, eq. (51) must hold.

From (48) and (49), the power delivered to the load, integrated over the search range $\omega_l \leq \omega_a \leq \omega_h$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a P_L(\omega_a) \\ & \leq (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2 \int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a \frac{L \operatorname{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a))}{|Z_T(\omega_a)|^2} \\ & \leq (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2 \int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L \operatorname{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a))}{|Z_T(\omega_a)|^2} \\ & \leq \frac{\pi}{2} (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \int_V |\vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

which is identical to the bound of eq. (43). Thus, the gain-bandwidth bound (55) governing the equivalent circuit is consistent with the gain-bandwidth bound derived using the underlying equations of axion electrodynamics.

Importantly, our equivalent-circuit treatment reveals how one might construct a receiver which saturates the bound (43). Suppose we have a receiver, which over the search range is well-described by the circuit in Fig. 3, with a load Z_L consisting of inductors, capacitors, and/or resistors with frequency-independent value. From (58), a receiver may saturate the integrated-power bound over the search range if:

1. For all frequencies at which the power delivered to the load $Z_L(\omega_a)$ is non-negligible, the voltage constraint (48) is saturated (first inequality in (58)).
2. Outside of the search range, the frequency-integrated power delivered to the load Z_L is negligible (second inequality).
3. The inequality (51), describing gain-bandwidth in the equivalent circuit and derived from the Bode integral theorem, is saturated (third inequality).

Thus, a single-moded, reactively coupled receiver that saturates the integrated-power bound (43) must saturate the constraint (51) implied by the Bode integral theorem.

Condition 1 cannot be satisfied in the quasi-static limit, in which the spatial extent of the receiver and DC magnetic field is much smaller than the Compton

wavelength at frequencies in the search band[11, 12, 49]. However, as shown in ref. [29], it may be satisfied when the size of the receiver and DC magnetic-field extent is comparable to or larger than the Compton wavelength. For a free-space cavity mode with negligible participation from dielectric or magnetic materials and entirely containing the DC magnetic field, the ratio of $|\tilde{V}_L(\omega_a)|^2$ to its maximum (48) is the cavity mode overlap factor $\mathcal{C}$, which can, in theory, approach unity. Condition 2 can be satisfied by appropriately engineering the bandwidth of the receiver frequency response (e.g., by constructing a receiver that is sufficiently narrowband).

To understand how condition 3 may be satisfied, suppose that the load $Z_L(\omega_a)$ possesses as its first element a frequency-independent series resistance R , so that

$$\tilde{Z}_T(p) = pL + R + \tilde{Z}'_T(p), \quad (59)$$

where $\tilde{Z}'_T(p)$ is another real-rational, passive impedance. The real part of $\tilde{Z}'_T(p) + pL$ must then have non-negative value on the right-half of the complex plane[51]. Then, for $R_s < R$, the reflectance (53) possesses no zeros in that domain and the sum in (55) vanishes, so

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L}{4R_s} \ln \left(\frac{1}{1 - \zeta(\omega_a, R_s)} \right) = \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (60)$$

Since for each frequency ω_a ,

$$\lim_{R_s \rightarrow 0+} \left[\frac{L}{4R_s} \ln \left(\frac{1}{1 - \zeta(\omega_a, R_s)} \right) - \frac{L}{4R_s} \zeta(\omega_a, R_s) \right] = 0, \quad (61)$$

we have, from eqs. (54) and (60),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty d\omega_a \frac{L \operatorname{Re}(Z_T(\omega_a))}{|Z_T(\omega_a)|^2} \\ & = \int_0^\infty d\omega_a \lim_{R_s \rightarrow 0+} \frac{L}{4R_s} \zeta(\omega_a, R_s) = \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Therefore, condition 3 is satisfied if the equivalent-circuit inductive pickup is accompanied by an equivalent-circuit, frequency-independent series resistance. If the series resistance representing loss possesses significant frequency dependence over the search range or if the load impedance possesses active matching elements, then the statements in this paragraph need not apply.

Thus, we find that not only can a single-pole resonant mode of a cavity saturate eq. (43), but so can, e.g., Bessel and Chebyshev filters constructed from waveguide-filter techniques[70].

B. Distinguishing A Signal-to-Noise Optimization

In the final part of this section, we consider our results in the context of optimizing laboratory axion dark-matter searches. In particular, we place our results in the context of the optimization undertaken in refs. [29, 30] for single-moded linear, passive receivers subject to the SQL

on phase-insensitive amplification. While the impedance match to dark matter is a necessary component of the search optimization, it is certainly not sufficient to consider only signal power. As we discussed earlier, it is not clear from an analysis of frequency-integrated signal power whether a search should use a high- Q single-pole resonant receiver, a broadband receiver, or some other type of receiver. There are large classes of receivers that saturate the bound on frequency-integrated signal power, so frequency-integrated signal power is not, by itself, particularly useful for distinguishing performance among receivers. To determine optimal receiver architecture, one must also consider noise in the receiver. *Optimizing the sensitivity of a dark-matter search fundamentally requires a simultaneous consideration of signal and measurement noise, necessitating a far more comprehensive analysis.*

To optimize a search, one must then study how dark-matter power is coupled into the receiver charges and transferred to the readout. As described in Sections II and III of [29], the toy receivers represent the two generic categories of coupling to the axion-induced electromagnetic fields, radiative coupling and reactive coupling. For readout with a phase-insensitive amplifier subject to the SQL, receivers using solely radiative couplings are generally disadvantaged, compared to reactive couplings, because of the mismatch between the effective dark-matter source impedance and the free-space self-impedance. This motivates a focus on single-moded, reactively coupled receivers, which describes the majority of electromagnetic axion dark-matter receivers[7].

A receiver optimization must, at minimum, consider thermal noise and readout noise. For readout with a phase-insensitive amplifier, the frequency response of a receiver to backaction-noise forcing and to axion forcing (e.g., $\hat{V}_L(\omega_a)$ in Fig. 3) are generally not the same. One must then produce a framework for analyzing signal and noise transfer throughout a receiver, considering simultaneously power matching and amplifier-noise matching. Thus, the critical figure of merit is not frequency-integrated signal power, but frequency-integrated signal-to-noise-squared, i.e. integrated sensitivity. To maximize integrated sensitivity, one would ideally achieve an efficient power match to dark matter and an efficient noise match to the amplifier at all frequencies. However, the ability to do so is severely limited for a reactively coupled receiver read out by an amplifier subject to the SQL. In ref. [29], the metric of integrated sensitivity is constrained with the Bode-Fano criterion, an extension of the Bode integral theorem.[35, 36] Note that while the Bode-Fano criterion is typically used to constrain gain-bandwidth on signal transfer, ref. [29] uses it to constrain gain-bandwidth on signal-to-noise. An optimized single-pole cavity resonator can achieve an integrated sensitivity that is approximately 75% of the Bode-Fano limit, while a multi-pole Chebyshev filter can saturate the limit. Thus, while a single-pole resonator can saturate the limit on integrated signal power, it cannot saturate the limit on integrated sensitivity. Additionally, while high- Q res-

onant and broadband search strategies possess comparable integrated signal power, the difference in integrated sensitivity is orders of magnitude. *Saturating the limit on integrated sensitivity is distinct from saturating the limit on integrated signal power.*

In this paper, we considered the impedance match of dark matter to a single receiver with parameters that are constant in time. A single-pole resonator, while possessing near-ideal integrated sensitivity, has poor sensitivity far off-resonance. One needs to tune the resonant frequency to conduct a sensitive probe over a wide search range. An optimization of scan strategy must then account for periodically-varied frequency response. We must also incorporate prior information on the axion signal. These priors may take the form of previous constraints, as well as regions of parameter space that are particularly well-motivated, e.g., the QCD axion band[1]. One can calculate without a detailed consideration of priors that, subject to the SQL, a resonant search is superior to a reactive broadband search at all frequencies at which a resonator may practically be constructed. However, priors are required to calculate the size of the advantage and to conclude that, for most reasonable priors over a wide search range, the advantage is a few orders of magnitude in integration time.

Altogether, a large number of factors—coupling of dark-matter power to the receiver, signal and noise transfer, thermal and readout noise (including backaction), noise matching, periodically-varied frequency-response, and priors—must be considered simultaneously for a comprehensive search optimization, as analyzed in refs. [29, 30] for single-moded linear, passive receivers, subject to the SQL on phase-insensitive amplification.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated impedance matching to axion dark-matter in the context of laboratory searches. We introduced the concept of impedance matching to dark matter, noting that there is enough power in each square meter of dark-matter flux to energize a light bulb and that while the axion-photon coupling constant $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ may be "small," that alone does not explain why extracting power from the dark-matter field should be difficult. One must also consider the photon-electron coupling across a frequency-integrated impedance match.

We conducted a thought experiment analyzing the matching properties of a broadband antenna and a high- Q cavity. By developing equivalent circuits of the two receivers, we calculated the scale of the dark-matter source impedance and showed that it is much smaller in magnitude than the self-impedance governed by the photon-electron interaction. This impedance mismatch is a stringent limitation on absorbing power from the axion-photon interaction in a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver.

Using conservation of energy and impulse response, we

formalized the limitation in the form of a gain-bandwidth bound (33) on the impedance match to axion dark matter in linear, passive, time-invariant receivers. We showed how the bound constrains receiver signal power, eq. (43), integrated over all possible rest-mass frequencies in a search band. We thus linked our analysis directly to experimental searches.

Finally, we discussed our results in the context of axion search optimization. We demonstrated the relationship between the gain-bandwidth bound derived in this paper and the Bode integral theorem, governing gain-bandwidth in equivalent circuits with reactances. We used the relationship to discuss conditions under which single-moded receivers can saturate the gain-bandwidth bound and to systematically determine such receivers.

For a comprehensive search optimization, one must combine the characteristics of the axion signal with a simultaneous consideration of noise, tuning, and priors, as analyzed in refs. [29, 30]. One must consider frequency-integrated sensitivity, as opposed to integrated signal power. Nevertheless, the results in our paper provide insights into one component of optimization and into limitations on axion dark-matter receivers.

The author is grateful to Kent Irwin, Lyman Page, Derek Jackson Kimball, Roman Kolevator, and Arran Phipps for comments on the manuscript. The author thanks Peter Graham, Surjeet Rajendran, Dick Bond, Stephen Kuenstner, Nicholas Rapidis, Betty Young, and the DM Radio Collaboration for enlightening discussions. The author is supported by the R.H. Dicke Postdoctoral Fellowship and the Wilkinson Research Fund at Princeton University. This research is funded in part by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation.

Appendix A: Impedance Matching For Background AC Fields and Hidden-Photon Dark Matter

We establish gain-bandwidth bounds on the impedance match for axions in a background, monochromatic AC field of finite spatial extent as well as for hidden photons. Our treatment is analogous to that given in Section III.

1. Background AC Field

A monochromatic AC magnetic field takes the form

$$\vec{B}_{AC}(\vec{x}, t) = \vec{B}^{(c)}(\vec{x})\cos(\omega_0 t) + \vec{B}^{(s)}(\vec{x})\sin(\omega_0 t). \quad (\text{A1})$$

Such a background field is proposed for use in axion dark-matter searches based on upconversion.[71–73] In these searches, the axion, of rest-mass frequency ω_a , mixes with the AC magnetic field, producing electromagnetic fields and currents at the sideband frequencies $\omega_0 \pm \omega_a$. One then aims to detect the signals at the sidebands.

We first derive the gain-bandwidth bound analogous to (33) and then discuss explicitly how it constrains power

absorbed by a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, integrated over all rest-mass frequencies in a search band.

Analogous to eq. (16), we assume that

$$\vec{B}_0(\vec{x}, t) \approx \vec{B}_{AC}(\vec{x}, t), \quad (\text{A2})$$

so that the effective axion current density is

$$\vec{J}_a(\vec{x}, t) \approx -\frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \vec{B}_{AC}(\vec{x}, t) \partial_t a(t). \quad (\text{A3})$$

In analogy with eq. (22), we define two pairs of quantities that play the role of current and voltage:

$$I_a^{(c)}(t) \equiv \frac{\kappa_a}{Z_{fs}} \cos(\omega_0 t) \partial_t a, \quad V_a^{(c)}(t) \equiv \int_V \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \cdot \vec{B}^{(c)}(\vec{x}) \quad (\text{A4})$$

for the cosine component of the background field and similarly $I_a^{(s)}(t)$ and $V_a^{(s)}(t)$ for the sine component.

Conservation of energy dictates (cf. (18))

$$I_a^{(c)}(t) V_a^{(c)}(t) + I_a^{(s)}(t) V_a^{(s)}(t) = P_J(t) + P_{rad}(t) + \partial_t (W_B(t) + W_E(t)). \quad (\text{A5})$$

We assume that the relationship between $I_a^{(c)}(t)$ and $V_a^{(c)}(t)$ is linear and time-invariant (and identically for $I_a^{(s)}(t)$ and $V_a^{(s)}(t)$). Then, we may define impedance functions $Z^{(c)}(t)$ and $Z^{(s)}(t)$ which satisfy (cf. (25))

$$V_a^{(c,s)}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \, Z_a^{(c,s)}(t - \tau) I_a^{(c,s)}(\tau) \quad (\text{A6})$$

From impulse-response arguments, we find (cf. (33))

$$\int_0^{\infty} d\omega \, R_a^{(c,s)}(\omega) \leq \frac{\pi}{2\epsilon_0} \int_V |\vec{B}^{(c,s)}(\vec{x})|^2. \quad (\text{A7})$$

$R_a^{(c)}(\omega)$ and $R_a^{(s)}(\omega)$ are the real parts of the Fourier transforms of $Z^{(c)}(t)$ and $Z^{(s)}(t)$. The volume V contains the background field and all axion-driven currents.

To demonstrate how eq. (A7) constrains the power delivered to a receiver, we consider a situation resembling a laboratory search. (See Section III.) We calculate an upper bound on the receiver power dissipation, integrated over a search band. An axion field oscillating at rest-mass frequency ω_a , as in eq. (1), gives rise to Fourier components in the currents $I_a^{(c)}(t)$ and $I_a^{(s)}(t)$ at the sideband frequencies $\omega_0 \pm \omega_a$. Analogous to eq. (41),

$$P(\omega_a) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\kappa_a c)^2}{\mu_0} \rho_a (R_a^{(c)}(\omega_0 + \omega_a) + R_a^{(c)}(\omega_0 - \omega_a) + R_a^{(s)}(\omega_0 + \omega_a) + R_a^{(s)}(\omega_0 - \omega_a)) \quad (\text{A8})$$

represents the power flow out of the axion field. The power dissipated in the charges is at most the power flow out of the axion field, so integrating (A8) yields

$$\int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} d\omega_a \, P_J(\omega_a) \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi}{2} (\kappa_a c^2)^2 \rho_a \times \int_V (|\vec{B}_{AC}^{(c)}(\vec{x})|^2 + |\vec{B}_{AC}^{(s)}(\vec{x})|^2). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Here, we have used eq. (A7), as well as the fact that $R_a^{(c)}(\omega)$ and $R_a^{(s)}(\omega)$ are even functions of frequency ω .

2. Hidden-Photon Dark Matter

The hidden photon is a vector particle, characterized by mass $m_{\gamma'}$ and three-vector potential $\vec{A}'(\vec{x}, t)$. Like the axion, the effect of the hidden photon on Maxwell's equations is to add a current density[11, 66]:

$$\vec{J}_{\gamma'}(\vec{x}, t) = -\varepsilon\epsilon_0 \left(\frac{m_{\gamma'} c^2}{\hbar} \right)^2 \vec{A}'(\vec{x}, t), \quad (\text{A10})$$

where ε is the kinetic mixing angle. Unlike the axion, the effective hidden-photon current density fills all space.

While the impedance-matching constraint (33) for axions is set by the volume of the DC magnetic field, the constraint for hidden photons is set by the volume V_s of the high-conductivity shield surrounding the receiver, which is necessary to mitigate electromagnetic interference in a search. For a high-conductivity (superconducting) shield which is many skin (penetration) depths thick at all frequencies within the search range, the receiver couples negligible power from the hidden-photon field outside of the shield.[66] We assume that the hidden photon field is spatially uniform within the shielded volume, which is appropriate when the coherence length is much larger than the length scale of the shield. Suppose the hidden-photon field points in the $\hat{z}$ direction. Then,

$$I_{\gamma'}(t) \equiv -\varepsilon\epsilon_0 \left(\frac{m_{\gamma'} c^2}{\hbar} \right)^2 A'_z(t), \quad V_{\gamma'}(t) \equiv \int_{V_s} E_z(\vec{x}, t). \quad (\text{A11})$$

play the role of current and voltage. The subscript z represents the z -component of the vector.

For a linear, time-invariant, passive receiver, we may define an impedance function given by

$$V_{\gamma'}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau Z_{\gamma'}(t - \tau) I_{\gamma'}(\tau). \quad (\text{A12})$$

Denote $R_{\gamma'}(\omega)$ as the real part of the Fourier transform of $Z_{\gamma'}(t)$. Using impulse response arguments, we find

$$\int_0^{\infty} d\omega R_{\gamma'}(\omega) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} V_s \quad (\text{A13})$$

In establishing (A13), we have extrapolated the boundary conditions describing the shield, similar to the situation at the end of Section III.

Let $\omega_{\gamma'} = m_{\gamma'} c^2 / \hbar$. We hold fixed the hidden-photon mixing angle ε and energy density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ across a search band. Similar to Section III, we find that the receiver power dissipation must satisfy

$$\int_{\omega_l}^{\omega_h} \frac{d\omega_{\gamma'}}{\omega_{\gamma'}^2} P_J(\omega_{\gamma'}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \varepsilon^2 \rho_{\gamma'} V_s. \quad (\text{A14})$$

For axions in background AC fields and hidden photons, we may use the methods of Section IV to determine receivers saturating the gain-bandwidth bounds. One may note that the limitations on impedance matching observed in Section II—stemming from self-impedance—are qualitatively the same for axions in background AC fields and hidden photons.

Appendix B: Comparison to Previous Work

Before discussing the arguments in ref. [28], it is first useful to demonstrate that eq. (33) holds with equality for a system without charges. We determine $R_a(\omega)$ using eq. (31). Given a Fourier component $I_a(\omega)$ for the axion current, the complex-valued vector potential $\vec{A}(\vec{x}, \omega)$ is, in the far-field limit $(\omega/c)|\vec{x}| \gg 1$, [62]

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{A}(\vec{x}, \omega) &\rightarrow \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} I_a(\omega) \frac{\exp(-ik|\vec{x}|)}{|\vec{x}|} \\ &\times \int_V d^3\vec{x}' \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}') \exp(+ik\hat{x} \cdot \vec{x}'), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where the volume V entirely surrounds the DC magnetic field. $\hat{x}$ is a unit vector pointing from the origin to the position $\vec{x}$, and $k = \omega/c$. Consider a sphere S , centered at the origin, with all points on the surface in the far field. Eq. (31) yields (see Ch. 9.1 of ref. [62])

$$\begin{aligned} R_a(\omega) &= \frac{1}{\mu_0 |I_a(\omega)|^2} \int_{\vec{x} \in S} d\vec{x} (\vec{E}(\vec{x}, \omega) \times \vec{B}^*(\vec{x}, \omega)) \cdot \hat{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_{fs} |I_a(\omega)|^2} \int_{\vec{x} \in S} d\vec{x} \omega^2 |\vec{A}(\vec{x}, \omega)|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Plugging in eq. (B1) and simplifying yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_a(\omega) &= \frac{\omega^2 \mu_0}{4\pi c} \\ &\times \int_V d^3\vec{x}' \int_V d^3\vec{x}'' \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}') \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x}'') \text{sinc}(k|\vec{x}' - \vec{x}''|) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

To integrate this expression over all frequencies, note that the three-dimensional Dirac delta function satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\vec{x}' - \vec{x}'') &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\vec{k} \exp(+i\vec{k} \cdot (\vec{x}' - \vec{x}'')) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{\infty} dk k^2 \text{sinc}(k|\vec{x}' - \vec{x}''|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

where the first integral is over all real-valued vectors $\vec{k}$. Combining this identity with the previous equation shows that eq. (33) holds with equality.

Ref. [28] introduces the impulse-response approach to constrain power flow from the axion field and claims a generic gain-bandwidth relationship on the impedance match to axion dark matter which is similar to eq. (33). (See also ref. [74], which uses the impulse-response approach to specifically calculate frequency-averaged signal power in an axion haloscope consisting of stacks of

dielectrics.) However, that work claims that the relationship is an equality, rather than an inequality. Ref. [28] also asserts that the constraint holds for receivers using active-matching elements (e.g. negative inductors). In other words, receivers using active matching cannot possess higher gain-bandwidth than receivers using solely passive matching elements.

The claims of ref. [28] appear to run contrary to previous work. One can show by direct calculation that certain receivers do not saturate eq. (33), which they must if the equality in ref. [28] applies. One example is a high- Q cavity resonator, surrounding the DC magnetic field, which is filled uniformly with an isotropic dielectric of approximately frequency-independent, real-valued, relative permittivity ϵ_r (loss tangent much less than unity). Using cavity-mode expansion or Hamiltonian techniques, one can show that the value of $\int_0^\infty d\omega R_a(\omega)$ relative to the maximum is $1/\epsilon_r$. [9, 29, 33] The value decreases as the dielectric constant increases due to screening of the axion drive by electric dipoles. Ref. [28] asserts that, for a dielectric-filled cavity, equality of (33) actually holds because of dynamics above the energy scale at which the effective cavity Hamiltonian is valid.

Also, it is well-established that the use of active matching elements makes it possible to evade gain-bandwidth constraints on systems using only passive elements, e.g., wideband reactance cancellation to evade the Bode-Fano criterion [35, 36, 56, 58, 75–77]. These observations beg the question of whether the arguments in [28] apply to systems with electrons. As we now explain, the arguments do not apply to systems with electrons.

To demonstrate this, we summarize calculations in Sections IIA and IIB of [28]. We point to equations in that work and adopt its notation where necessary.

Ref. [28] factorizes the background field into temporal and spatial components (discussion following (14) of [28]),

$$B_0(x, t) = B_0(t)b(x). \quad (\text{B5})$$

We focus on DC magnetic fields, for which $B_0(t) = B_0$ is time-independent. Ref. [28] defines

$$E_b(t) \equiv \frac{1}{V_b} \int E \cdot b(x), \quad A_b(t) \equiv \frac{1}{V_b} \int A \cdot b(x) \quad (\text{B6})$$

where $V_b = \int b^2(x)$ and the integrals are performed over all space. $E_b(t)$ is proportional to $V_a(t)$, as defined in eq. (22). $A = A(x, t)$ is the vector potential in Coulomb gauge. Note that $\dot{A}_b(t) = -E_b(t)$. $E_b(t)$ obeys

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_b(t) = \frac{1}{V_b} \left(- \int d^3x \nabla^2 A(x, t) \cdot b(x) \right. \\ \left. - g j(t) - \int d^3x J(x, t) \cdot b(x) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

where g is the axion-photon coupling, $j(t) = \dot{a}(t)B_0V_b$ is proportional to the effective axion current, and $J(x, t)$

represents electromagnetic current. For consistency with ref. [28], we use natural units $\hbar = c = \epsilon_0 = 1$ for the equation of motion, as well as subsequent equations.

Ref. [28] considers the response of the variable $E_b(t)$ to a short $j(t)$ pulse. See the paragraph following eq. (17) of ref. [28]. This pulse effectively takes the form

$$j(t) = J\delta(t). \quad (\text{B8})$$

Assume that $E_b(t)$ is zero before the pulse. Using (B7), the change in $E_b(t)$ due to the pulse is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_b = -\frac{gJ}{V_b} - \frac{1}{V_b} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0+} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} dt \left(\int d^3x \nabla^2 A(x, t) \cdot b(x) \right. \\ \left. + \int d^3x J(x, t) \cdot b(x) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

ΔE_b is the analog of $\int \vec{E}^\delta(\vec{x}, 0+) \cdot \vec{B}_{DC}(\vec{x})$ in our main-text analysis. In assuming that the pulse occurs “much faster than the system’s dynamics,” ref. [28] neglects the last two terms on the right-hand side of eq. (B9), which incorporate the contribution of charges to the electric-field response. The energy from the pulse is then

$$\langle W \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\Delta E_b)^2 V_b = \frac{g^2 J^2}{2V_b}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Using this equation, along with methods similar to eq. (40), ref. [28] arrives at (eq. (20) of [28])

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \omega \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(\omega) = \frac{\pi}{V_b}, \quad (\text{B11})$$

describing the gain-bandwidth of the impedance match to axion dark matter. $\tilde{\chi}(\omega)$ is the linear-response function describing how A_b responds to the axion forcing. This result is similar to (33), except that it is an equality.

Note that by eliminating the last two terms on the right-hand side of eq. (B9), this derivation is entirely independent of any dynamics of receiver electrons. It thus cannot account for the effect of electrons on the impedance match to axions. As we have shown in the main text, once electrons are included and the assumptions for the gain-bandwidth argument are defined (in particular, the assumption of passivity (26)), then one obtains inequality instead of equality [78].

Conversely, if the system possesses no charges at all, then the assumptions of ref. [28] are valid. In this situation, axion-field power is converted solely into electromagnetic radiation. As shown above, one can then directly calculate $R_a(\omega)$ and find that eq. (33) holds with equality, consistent with ref. [28]. We thus conclude that the gain-bandwidth relation of [28] does not apply to systems with electrons, either as an equality (since it does not include electrons) or as a bound (since it can be exceeded with receivers that evade the Bode-Fano criterion). Therefore, it does not apply to present laboratory axion dark-matter searches.

Ref. [28] also uses (B11) to constrain signal to noise, and thus, search sensitivity, in various situations, including readout with a phase-insensitive amplifier. As above, these calculations do not apply to laboratory searches. Ref. [28] develops its own definition of quantum noise and SQL which is inconsistent with accepted definitions[22, 23] and with the physical operation of amplifiers. Amplifiers inherently couple to charges at their input, and the approach of [28] does not account for receivers having charges. Additionally, as discussed in the main text, gain-bandwidth bounds on signal power gener-

ally cannot set gain-bandwidth bounds on signal-to-noise or constrain search sensitivity.

The impulse response approach and the frontier (B11) proposed in ref. [28] are a significant step in understanding first-principles constraints on coupling power from the axion field, integrated over possible rest-mass frequencies. In this paper, we have extended the impulse response approach to incorporate the effect of the photon-electron interaction in coupling power from the axion field. We have shown stringent constraints on the impedance match to axion dark matter for linear, time-invariant, passive receivers.

-
- [1] P. W. Graham, I. G. Irastorza, S. K. Lamoreaux, A. Lindner, and K. A. van Bibber, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **65**, 485 (2015).
 - [2] P. W. Graham and A. Scherlis, *Physical Review D* **98**, 035017 (2018).
 - [3] F. Takahashi, W. Yin, and A. H. Guth, *Physical Review D* **98**, 015042 (2018).
 - [4] R. Peccei and H. Quinn, *Physical Review Letters* **38**, 1440 (1977).
 - [5] F. Wilczek, *Physical Review Letters* **40**, 279 (1978).
 - [6] S. Weinberg, *Physical Review Letters* **40**, 223 (1978).
 - [7] P. Sikivie, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 015004 (2021).
 - [8] P. Sikivie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1415 (1983).
 - [9] P. Sikivie, *Phys. Rev. D* **32**, 2988 (1985).
 - [10] M. Tanabashi, K. Hagiwara, K. Hikasa, K. Nakamura, Y. Sumino, F. Takahashi, J. Tanaka, K. Agashe, G. Aielli, C. Amsler, *et al.*, *Physical Review D* **98**, 030001 (2018).
 - [11] S. Chaudhuri, P. W. Graham, K. Irwin, J. Mardon, S. Rajendran, and Y. Zhao, *Physical Review D* **92**, 075012 (2015).
 - [12] Y. Kahn, B. R. Safdi, and J. Thaler, *Physical review letters* **117**, 141801 (2016).
 - [13] M. Silva-Feaver *et al.*, *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity* **27**, 1 (2017).
 - [14] J. L. Ouellet, C. P. Salemi, J. W. Foster, R. Henning, Z. Bogorad, J. M. Conrad, J. A. Formaggio, Y. Kahn, J. Minervini, A. Radovinsky, *et al.*, *Physical review letters* **122**, 121802 (2019).
 - [15] A. Phipps, S. Kuenstner, S. Chaudhuri, C. Dawson, B. Young, C. FitzGerald, H. Froland, K. Wells, D. Li, H. Cho, *et al.*, in *Microwave Cavities and Detectors for Axion Research* (Springer, 2020) pp. 139–145.
 - [16] C. P. Salemi, J. W. Foster, J. L. Ouellet, A. Gavin, K. M. Pappas, S. Cheng, K. A. Richardson, R. Henning, Y. Kahn, R. Nguyen, *et al.*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.06722* (2021).
 - [17] B. Brubaker, L. Zhong, Y. Gurevich, S. Cahn, S. Lamoreaux, M. Simanovskaia, J. Root, S. Lewis, S. Al Kenany, K. Backes, *et al.*, *Physical review letters* **118**, 061302 (2017).
 - [18] N. Du, N. Force, R. Khatiwada, E. Lentz, R. Ottens, L. Rosenberg, G. Rybka, G. Carosi, N. Woollett, D. Bowring, *et al.*, *Physical review letters* **120**, 151301 (2018).
 - [19] L. Zhong, S. Al Kenany, K. Backes, B. Brubaker, S. Cahn, G. Carosi, Y. Gurevich, W. Kindel, S. Lamoreaux, K. Lehnert, *et al.*, *Physical Review D* **97**, 092001 (2018).
 - [20] T. Braine, R. Cervantes, N. Crisosto, N. Du, S. Kimes, L. Rosenberg, G. Rybka, J. Yang, D. Bowring, A. Chou, *et al.*, *Physical review letters* **124**, 101303 (2020).
 - [21] B. M. Brubaker, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00835* (2018).
 - [22] C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 1817 (1982).
 - [23] A. A. Clerk, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, F. Marquardt, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1155 (2010).
 - [24] H. Zheng, M. Silveri, R. Brierley, S. Girvin, and K. Lehnert, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02529* (2016), *arXiv:1607.02529v2 [hep-ph]*.
 - [25] K. Backes, D. Palken, S. A. Kenany, B. Brubaker, S. Cahn, A. Droster, G. C. Hilton, S. Ghosh, H. Jackson, S. Lamoreaux, *et al.*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01853* (2020).
 - [26] A. V. Dixit, S. Chakram, K. He, A. Agrawal, R. K. Naik, D. I. Schuster, and A. Chou, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12231* (2020).
 - [27] S. Chaudhuri, *The Dark Matter Radio: A Quantum-enhanced Search for QCD Axion Dark Matter*, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University (2019).
 - [28] R. Lasenby, *Physical Review D* **103**, 075007 (2021).
 - [29] S. Chaudhuri, K. Irwin, P. W. Graham, and J. Mardon, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01627* (2018).
 - [30] S. Chaudhuri, K. D. Irwin, P. W. Graham, and J. Mardon, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05806* (2019).
 - [31] J. Schwinger, Stanley H. Klosk lecture at NYU School of Engineering Science, published in *Scientific Research*, 19 (1969).
 - [32] K. A. Milton, *Physics in Perspective* **9**, 70 (2007).
 - [33] C. G. Montgomery, R. H. Dicke, and E. M. Purcell, *Principles of microwave circuits*, 25 (Iet, 1987).
 - [34] A. S. Chou, in *Illuminating Dark Matter* (Springer, 2019) pp. 41–48.
 - [35] H. W. Bode, *Network analysis and feedback amplifier design* (van Nostrand, 1945).
 - [36] R. M. Fano, *Journal of the Franklin Institute* **249**, 57 (1950).
 - [37] A. Caldwell, G. Dvali, B. Majorovits, A. Millar, G. Raffelt, J. Redondo, O. Reimann, F. Simon, F. Steffen, M. W. Group, *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 091801 (2017).
 - [38] D. Horns, J. Jaeckel, A. Lindner, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald, *et al.*, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle*

- Physics **2013**, 016 (2013).
- [39] L. N. Hadley and D. Dennison, JOSA **37**, 451 (1947).
 - [40] R. C. Jones, JOSA **43**, 1 (1953).
 - [41] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, Physics letters B **104**, 199 (1981).
 - [42] L. J. Chu, Journal of applied physics **19**, 1163 (1948).
 - [43] J. Zmuidzinas, Applied Optics **42**, 4989 (2003).
 - [44] R. M. Foster, Bell System technical journal **3**, 259 (1924).
 - [45] It is useful to compare our description of impedance matching for axion waves to descriptions for electromagnetic waves and gravitational waves in the literature. For electromagnetic waves, an efficient impedance match is practical because one can match the impedance of the absorber (containing the electrons) to the impedance of the source, given by the free-space impedance Z_{fs} [39, 40]. For gravitational waves, an efficient impedance match is impractical because the impedance of the absorber (the test mass), characterized by the acoustic impedance, is far below the impedance of the source, given by the impedance of spacetime[79]. For axions, an efficient impedance match is impractical because of the intermediary (the photons) between the source (the axions) and the absorber (the electrons), which results in a mismatch due to self-impedance.
 - [46] The reader may also note that the limitations observed in this thought experiment may be overcome with receivers using active-matching elements that supply energy to the receiver. For instance, active elements may be used to cancel the self-reactance of a pickup over a wide range of frequencies (as opposed to a single frequency in a single-pole resonator), enabling a larger gain-bandwidth for the impedance match to axion dark matter[58, 75, 76].
 - [47] P. Arias, D. Cadamuro, M. Goodsell, J. Jaeckel, J. Redondo, and A. Ringwald, JCAP **2012**, 013 (2012).
 - [48] P. W. Graham, J. Mardon, and S. Rajendran, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 103520 (2016), arXiv:1504.02102 [hep-ph].
 - [49] P. Sikivie, N. Sullivan, and D. B. Tanner, Physical review letters **112**, 131301 (2014).
 - [50] A. J. Millar, G. G. Raffelt, J. Redondo, and F. D. Steffen, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **2017**, 061 (2017).
 - [51] R. B. Adler, L. J. Chu, and R. Fano, *Electromagnetic Energy Transmission and Radiation* (1968).
 - [52] P. Triverio, S. Grivet-Talocia, M. S. Nakhla, F. G. Canavero, and R. Achar, IEEE Transactions on Advanced Packaging **30**, 795 (2007).
 - [53] J. Clarke and A. I. Braginski, *The SQUID handbook: Applications of SQUIDS and SQUID systems* (John Wiley & Sons, 2006).
 - [54] C. M. Caves, K. S. Thorne, R. W. Drever, V. D. Sandberg, and M. Zimmermann, Reviews of Modern Physics **52**, 341 (1980).
 - [55] W.-K. Chen, *The circuits and filters handbook* (CRC Press, 2002).
 - [56] A. Wicht, K. Danzmann, M. Fleischhauer, M. Scully, G. Müller, and R.-H. Rinkleff, Optics Communications **134**, 431 (1997).
 - [57] G. Pati, M. Salit, K. Salit, and M. Shahriar, Physical review letters **99**, 133601 (2007).
 - [58] M. Salit and M. Shahriar, Journal of Optics **12**, 104014 (2010).
 - [59] H. Yum, J. Scheuer, M. Salit, P. Hemmer, and M. Shahriar, Journal of lightwave technology **31**, 3865 (2013).
 - [60] B. Nistad and J. Skaar, Physical Review E **78**, 036603 (2008).
 - [61] At first glance, the assumption (26) seems to exclude laboratory receivers using amplifiers as readout elements. However, the amplifier's effect on the receiver impedance-match to axions is generally well-characterized by its input impedance, described as an equivalent-circuit passive load.[80, 81] We can apply our arguments to receivers with a readout amplifier by substituting this passive load.
 - [62] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd ed. (Wiley, 1998).
 - [63] Our approach is similar to that used in establishing the Bode-Fano criterion[35, 36]. Consider a two-port system that, over a frequency range of interest, can be described by a lumped-element equivalent circuit with a source resistor and a load consisting of a series inductor and resistor. Under certain assumptions, the Bode-Fano criterion constrains the gain-bandwidth of the match between the source and the load. In proving the criterion, one uses the voltage-current relationships governing lumped elements to determine the set of possible impedance functions that can be seen by the load resistor. Based on this set, one mathematically infers the behavior of the impedance function in the limit of infinite frequency (which is essentially dual to inferring behavior on arbitrarily short time scales, as in an impulse-response argument). The result is used to mathematically constrain the pole structure of the circuit's return-loss function in the complex plane. One then deduces the maximum gain-bandwidth of the two-port system in the frequency range over which the circuit is an accurate physical descriptor.
 - [64] R. M. Fano, R. B. Adler, and L. J. Chu, *Electromagnetic fields, energy, and forces* (Taylor & Francis, 1963).
 - [65] L. Krauss, J. Moody, F. Wilczek, and D. E. Morris, Physical review letters **55**, 1797 (1985).
 - [66] P. W. Graham, J. Mardon, S. Rajendran, and Y. Zhao, Physical Review D **90**, 075017 (2014).
 - [67] H. Peng, S. Asztalos, E. Daw, N. Golubev, C. Hagmann, D. Kinion, J. LaVeigne, D. Moltz, F. Nezrick, J. Powell, *et al.*, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment **444**, 569 (2000).
 - [68] R. Khatriwada, D. Bowring, A. Chou, A. Sonnenschein, W. Wester, D. Mitchell, T. Braine, C. Bartram, R. Cervantes, N. Crisosto, *et al.*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00169 (2020).
 - [69] This implies $k(\omega_{DM}^0)^2 \leq 1/2$ in Section III B of ref. [29]. Note that treatments similar to that in Section IV A are possible for capacitively coupled receivers.
 - [70] G. L. Matthaei, L. Young, and E. M. T. Jones, *Micro-wave filters, impedance-matching networks, and coupling structures* (Artech house, 1980).
 - [71] A. C. Melissinos, arXiv preprint arXiv:0807.1092 (2008).
 - [72] P. Sikivie, arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.0762 (2010).
 - [73] A. Berlin, R. T. D'Agnolo, S. A. Ellis, C. Nantista, J. Neilson, P. Schuster, S. Tantawi, N. Toro, and K. Zhou, JHEP **07**, 088 (2020), arXiv:1912.11048 [hep-ph].
 - [74] M. Baryakhtar, J. Huang, and R. Lasenby, Physical Review D **98**, 035006 (2018).
 - [75] A. Shlivinski and Y. Hadad, Physical review letters **121**, 204301 (2018).
 - [76] S. E. Sussman-Fort and R. M. Rudish, IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation **57**, 2230 (2009).

- [77] J. T. Aberle and R. Loepsinger-Romak, *Synthesis Lectures on Antennas* **2**, 1 (2007).
- [78] Additionally, it can be pointed out that ref. [28] has assumed linear response with a well-defined Fourier transform, and in physical systems with electrons, this can often be an inaccurate assumption, especially at short timescales/high frequency scales.[52, 82–90].
- [79] D. G. Blair, *The detection of gravitational waves* (Cambridge university press, 2005).
- [80] M. Castellanos-Beltran, K. Irwin, G. Hilton, L. Vale, and K. Lehnert, *Nature Physics* **4**, 929 (2008).
- [81] C. Hilbert and J. Clarke, *Journal of low temperature physics* **61**, 237 (1985).
- [82] M. T. Hassan, T. T. Luu, A. Moulet, O. Raskazovskaya, P. Zhokhov, M. Garg, N. Karpowicz, A. Zheltikov, V. Pervak, F. Krausz, *et al.*, *Nature* **530**, 66 (2016).
- [83] N. Ashcroft and N. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Saunders College, Philadelphia, 1976).
- [84] J. M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids* (Cambridge university press, 1972).
- [85] G. Agrawal, *Nonlinear Fiber Optics* (Elsevier Science, 2007).
- [86] F. Siebert and P. Hildebrandt, *Vibrational spectroscopy in life science* (John Wiley & Sons, 2008).
- [87] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to superconductivity* (Courier Corporation, 2004).
- [88] J. Zmuidzinas, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **3**, 169 (2012).
- [89] B. Oripov, T. Bieler, G. Ciovati, S. Calatroni, P. Dhakal, T. Junginger, O. B. Malyshev, G. Terenziani, A.-M. Valente-Feliciano, R. Valizadeh, *et al.*, *Physical Review Applied* **11**, 064030 (2019).
- [90] C. P. Steinmetz, *Proceedings of the IEEE* **72**, 197 (1984).