Wave Dark Matter Non-minimally Coupled to Gravity
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We consider a model where a light scalar field (with mass $\lesssim 30 \text{ eV}$), conjectured to be dark matter, has a non-minimal coupling to gravity. In the non-relativistic limit, this new coupling introduces a self-interaction term in the scalar-field equation of motion, and modifies the source term for the gravitational field. Moreover, in the small-coupling limit justified by the observed dark-matter density, the system further reduces to the Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations, which remarkably also arise from a self-gravitating and self-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate system. We derive predictions of our model on linear and non-linear structure formation by exploiting this unexpected connection.

With decades of compelling evidence about its existence, the identity of dark matter remains perhaps as the central question in cosmology [1]. Proposals for dark matter range from an ultra-light axion with mass $\sim 10^{-22} \text{ eV}$ [2,3] to primordial black holes with mass $\sim 10 M_\odot$. A distinction occurs at around mass $\sim 30 \text{ eV}$ [4], below which the mean separation of dark matter particles is smaller than their de Broglie wavelength, rendering their wave-like behavior important.

Motivated by various particle physics considerations, there are many flavors of these wave dark matter models, most of which consist of a scalar field that is minimally coupled to gravity. However, the scalar field could, or some [5] would argue in general has to, be non-minimally coupled to gravity. In the non-relativistic limit, this new coupling introduces a non-minimal coupling term is crucial to the renormalizability of a scalar-field theory in curved space-time [7,9]. This coupling will change the dynamical behavior of dark matter and can potentially have observable effects in structure formation.

Here, we consider a non-minimal coupling of the form $\phi^2 R$, where $\phi$ is the scalar field and $R$ is the Ricci scalar. We first write down the general theory and derive the equations of motion in the non-relativistic limit. We point out the difference between this theory and the minimally coupled theory of wave dark matter. We then discuss the small-coupling limit valid in most practical cases, while making connections to self-gravitating and self-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate [10,11]. Following those connections, we present predictions of this model on linear and non-linear structure formation. We end with several concluding remarks.

We consider the theory $S = S_{EH} + S_\phi$, where

$$S_{EH} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \frac{R}{16\pi G}$$

(1)

is the familiar Einstein-Hilbert action, and

$$S_\phi = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (\nabla^\mu \phi)(\nabla_\mu \phi) - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{2} \xi R \phi^2 \right]$$

(2)

is the scalar-field action with a non-minimal coupling to gravity. Here, $g \equiv \det(g_{\mu\nu})$ is the determinant of the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$; $V(\phi)$ is the potential of the scalar field; and $\xi$ is a dimensionless coupling constant. The equation of motion for the scalar field is determined by

$$\Box \phi - \xi R \phi - V'(\phi) = 0.$$  (3)

Here, $\Box \equiv g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu$ is the d’Alembertian with $\nabla_\mu$ being the covariant derivative, and $V'(\phi) \equiv dV(\phi)/d\phi$. In the rest of this paper, we assume $\phi = 0$ is a local minimum of the potential, and the excursion of $\phi$ is small enough so that we can write $V(\phi) = \frac{m^2}{2} \phi^2/2$. We define the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field as $T^\phi_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{-g}} \delta S/\delta g^{\mu\nu}$ and obtain

$$T^\phi_{\mu\nu} = (\nabla_\mu \phi)(\nabla_\nu \phi) - g_{\mu\nu} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\nabla^\alpha \phi)(\nabla_\alpha \phi) + V(\phi) \right] + \xi \left[ G_{\mu\nu} \phi^2 + g_{\mu\nu} \Box \phi - \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu (\phi^2) \right].$$  (4)

It is worth noting that the variation of the last term in Eq. (2) is subject to the Leibniz rule, and thus more complex than the variation of the Ricci scalar $R$ in Eq. (1). This explains the three terms proportional to $\xi$ in Eq. (4). The Einstein equation $\delta S/\delta g^{\mu\nu} = 0$ can then be written as

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T^\phi_{\mu\nu}. $$  (5)

Here, $G_{\mu\nu} \equiv R_{\mu\nu} - R g_{\mu\nu}/2$ is the Einstein tensor. Note that, due to the non-minimal coupling, the right-hand side of Eq. (5) also contains the geometric quantity $G_{\mu\nu}$.

We consider the weak-gravity limit in the Newtonian gauge with only the scalar metric perturbation $\Psi$, where the line element is

$$ds^2 = -(1 + 2\Psi) dt^2 + (1 - 2\Psi) dx^i dx^i.$$  (6)

Note that we ignore the cosmic expansion for simplicity. The effect of cosmic expansion can be simply restored by considering “Newtonian cosmology” [11], provided that the pressure is negligible in comparison with the energy...
density. We also neglect any anisotropic stress so that the other metric perturbation variable $\Phi$ is equal to $\Psi$, and the gravity sector is described by only one variable $\Psi$. This will be consistent with the non-relativistic limit we are about to take later in this work. From now on, we assume $|\Psi| \ll 1$ and only work to leading order in $\Psi$.

This space-time geometry implies some formulas that will be useful later. For a scalar quantity $f = f(\vec{x}, t)$, the d’Alembertian is

$$\Box f = (1 + 2\Psi) \nabla^2 f - (1 - 2\Psi) \partial_t^2 f + 4(\partial_i \Psi)(\partial_t f);$$  

the $(0, 0)$ component of the Hessian is

$$\nabla^0 \nabla_0 f = \nabla \cdot \nabla f + (\partial_i \Psi)(\partial_t f) - (1 - 2\Psi) \partial_t^2 f;$$  

the Ricci scalar is

$$R = 2\nabla^2 \Psi - 6\partial_t^2 \Psi;$$

and the $(0, 0)$ component of the Einstein tensor $G^\mu_\nu$ is

$$G^0_0 = -2\nabla^2 \Psi.$$  

Note that here $\nabla$ without the subscript is the flat spatial gradient operator, and should not be confused with $\nabla_\mu$.

In the non-relativistic limit we will discuss, only two equations are important. The first equation is the scalar-field equation of motion. By inserting Eq. (7) (with $f = \phi$) and Eq. (9) into Eq. (5), we have

$$(1 + 2\Psi) \nabla^2 \phi - (1 - 2\Psi) \partial_t^2 \phi - m^2 \phi + 4(\partial_i \Psi)(\partial_t \phi) - \xi (2\nabla^2 \Psi - 6\partial_t^2 \Psi) = 0. \tag{11}$$

The second equation is the $(0, 0)$ component of the Einstein equation $G^0_0 = 8\pi G T^0_0$. By inserting Eqs. (7) and (8) (with $f = \phi^2$) plus Eq. (10) into Eq. (5), we have

$$\nabla^2 \Psi = 4\pi G \rho_\phi, \tag{12}$$

where the energy density $\rho_\phi \equiv -T^0_0$ of the scalar field is

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}(1 - 2\Psi)(\partial_t \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + 2\Psi)(\nabla \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2 \phi^2 + \xi [2(\nabla^2 \phi)^2 + (\nabla \Psi)(\nabla \phi)^2 - (1 + 2\Psi)(\nabla^2 \phi^2) - 3(\partial_i \Psi)(\partial_t \phi^2)]. \tag{13}$$

Note that due to the non-minimal coupling, $\rho_\phi$ itself now contains $\nabla^2 \Psi$. This implies that the metric perturbation $\Psi$ is not sourced by $\rho_\phi$, but a slightly more complicated term. Later, in the non-relativistic limit, we will show exactly how the source term is modified.

We now work out the non-relativistic limit of the equation of motion, Eq. (11), and the Einstein equation, Eq. (12), by factoring out the fast-varying oscillation $e^{-imt}$ in $\phi$ as

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}}(\psi e^{-imt} + \phi^* e^{+imt}). \tag{14}$$

The newly defined complex scalar $\psi$ is then slowly varying (i.e. $\partial_t \ll m$ when acting on everything other than $\phi$). The non-relativistic limit also implies that the gradient of $\phi$ and $\psi$ is small (i.e. $\nabla \ll m$ when acting on $\phi$ or $\psi$). Now, we proceed by working in the appropriate orders of $\Psi, \partial_t/m, \text{ and } \nabla/m$. We shall also average out the fast-varying contribution to the energy density $\rho_\phi$.

Since these standard procedures have been detailed for a minimally coupled scalar field in Ref. [13], we only explain in detail how we approximate terms proportional to $\xi$. In Eq. (11), we only keep $\nabla^2 \Psi$ but neglect $\partial_t^2 \Psi$. This is justified by the smallness of the spatial part of the Einstein equation (i.e. $|G^j_j| \ll |G^0_0|$) in the non-relativistic limit. In Eq. (12), we only keep $(\nabla^2 \Psi)\phi^2$. The terms $(\nabla \Psi)(\nabla \phi^2)$ and $(1 + 2\Psi)(\nabla^2 \phi^2)$ are neglected due to the smallness of $\nabla \phi$; the term $((\partial_i \Psi)(\partial_t \phi^2))$ is approximately $(\partial_i \Psi)/(\partial_t |\phi|^2/m)$ after averaging out the fast-varying contribution, and is then neglected due to the smallness of $\partial_t \phi$.

Doing so, Eqs. (11) and (12) then become the coupled differential equations

$$i\partial_t \psi = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \psi + m\Psi \psi + \xi \nabla(\psi)\psi, \tag{15}$$

$$\nabla^2 \Psi = m \nabla(\psi), \tag{16}$$

where we define the effective potential,

$$\nabla(\psi) \equiv \frac{4\pi G m |\psi|^2}{m - 8\pi \xi G |\psi|^2}. \tag{17}$$

It is obvious that without non-minimal coupling ($\xi = 0$), the system further reduces to the Schrödinger-Poisson equations. In the presence of non-minimal coupling, a self-interaction term is added to the Schrödinger equation, and the source term of the Poisson equation is modified. As will become clear later, we are practically always in the small-non-minimal-coupling limit $\xi \ll m/(8\pi G |\psi|^2)$. This implies $\nabla(\psi) \approx 4\pi G |\psi|^2$, and the system reduces to the Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations

$$i\partial_t \psi = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \psi + m\Psi \psi + 4\pi G m |\psi|^2 \psi; \tag{18}$$

$$\nabla^2 \Psi = 4\pi G m |\psi|^2. \tag{19}$$

From this familiar form, we can then interpret $m|\psi|^2$ as the dark-matter density $\rho$ (not to be confused with $\rho_\phi$).

So, retrospectively, the small coupling limit is valid when

$$\xi \ll \frac{m^2}{8\pi G \rho} \approx 8 \times 10^{15} \left(\frac{m}{10^{-22}\text{eV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1\text{GeV/cm}^3}{\rho}\right), \tag{20}$$

which is easily satisfied if $\xi$ is not unnaturally large. We proceed with the small-coupling limit from now on.

Interestingly, the Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations also arise in the description of self-gravitating and self-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate [10][14]. Although
the equations are equivalent, the physical picture is completely different. In the Bose-Einstein condensate scenario, the self-interaction term $\propto |\psi|^2 \psi$ is the direct result of the explicitly introduced contact interaction between the bosons, while in our case it arises from the scalar field’s non-minimal coupling to gravity. This unexpected correspondence allows us to benefit from the results of previous work. For instance, we provide the translation from Ref. [12] to our paper,

$$h \rightarrow 1, \quad N \rightarrow 1, \quad g \rightarrow \frac{4\pi G}{m^2} \xi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

The last one can be substituted by $a \rightarrow Gm\xi$. On the left-hand side, $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant; $N$ is the number of particles in the condensate; and $g$ is the contact-interaction strength, with the s-wave scattering length $a$ being an equivalent representation. We emphasize that the duality established here is only in the appropriate limits of both theories (non-relativistic and small-coupling limit for the theory presented in this work, and non-relativistic limit for the Bose-Einstein condensate). While the duality likely does not exist in the full theory, relativistic studies of the self-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate (for instance, Refs. [15, 16]), once reduced to the relativistic limit, should re-obtain this duality.

The Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations, Eqs. (18) and (19), have a fluid description. We define the fluid variables

$$\rho \equiv m|\psi|^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v} \equiv \frac{1}{m} \nabla \arg \psi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

It can be shown that Eqs. (18) and (19) are equivalent to the following fluid equations

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

$$\partial_t \vec{v} + (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v} = -\nabla \Psi - \frac{\nabla P_{\xi}}{\rho} - \frac{\nabla \cdot P_Q}{\rho},$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

$$\nabla^2 \Psi = 4\pi G \rho.$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

These equations can also be obtained by translating Eqs. (10), (14), and (7) in Ref. [12] using our Eq. (21). Here we define the quantum pressure tensor and the pressure caused by non-minimal coupling as

$$P_{Q,ij} = -\frac{\rho}{4m^2} \partial_i \partial_j \ln \rho, \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\xi} = \frac{2\pi G \xi}{m^2} \rho^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

respectively. While we have a fully classical system here, we still choose to follow the widely accepted name of $P_Q$ as the quantum pressure. Note that the non-minimal coupling amounts to an isotropic pressure term, whereas the quantum pressure is anisotropic. We refer to $P_{\xi}$ as the “$\xi$-pressure” from now on.

The Jeans scale $k_J$ of this theory is crucial to linear structure formation. Intuitively, gravity pulls the dark matter together and makes structure grow, while the quantum pressure and the $\xi$-pressure resist this effect. Quantitatively, we examine the divergence of the right-hand side of Eq. (24) by setting $\rho = \bar{\rho}(1+\delta)$ and working to leading order in $\delta$, which gives (in the original sequence of terms)

$$-4\pi G \bar{\rho} \delta - \frac{4\pi G \bar{\rho}}{m^2} \nabla^2 \delta + \frac{1}{4m^2} \nabla^4 \delta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

Here, in the first term, we use the Poisson equation, Eq. (25), with only the perturbation $\delta \rho$, without the background $\bar{\rho}$, as the source (i.e. the “Jeans swindle” [19]). Substituting $\nabla$ with $i\vec{k}$, we see that a given $k$-mode of density perturbation $\delta$ will grow normally (as cold dark matter) at low $k$ when gravity wins, but this growth is suppressed at high $k$ when the quantum pressure and the $\xi$-pressure win. The transition, namely the Jeans scale $k_J$, follows from solving the resulting quadratic equation in $k^2$. Doing so, we find,

$$k_J = (16\pi G \bar{\rho})^{\frac{1}{2}} m^2 \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{4\pi G \bar{\rho}}{m^2} \xi^2} - \sqrt{4\pi G \bar{\rho}} \xi^2 \right)\frac{1}{2}. \hspace{1cm} (28)$$

Note that this formula can also be obtained by translating Eq. (138) in Ref. [12] using our Eq. (21). The dimensionless quantity

$$\frac{4\pi G \bar{\rho}}{m^2} \xi^2 \approx 8 \times 10^{-25} \left( \frac{\xi}{0.1} \right)^2 \left( \frac{10^{-22} \text{eV}}{m} \right)^2 \times \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}}{1.3 \times 10^{-6} \text{GeV/cm}^3} \right) \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

determines $k_J$’s deviation from the Jeans scale $k_{J0} = (16\pi G \bar{\rho})^{\frac{1}{2}} m^2$ of the minimally coupled theory, and is likely a small number if $\xi$ is not unnaturally large. This can be understood, in a different way, by considering the scales $k_{\xi}$ and $k_Q$ at which the quantum pressure and the $\xi$-pressure, respectively, become comparable to gravity. By comparing the second and the third terms to the first term in Eq. (27), we find

$$k_{\xi} = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\xi}}, \quad \text{and} \quad k_Q = (16\pi G \bar{\rho})^{\frac{1}{2}} m^{\frac{1}{2}} = k_{J0}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

Taking the same anchored values as in Eq. (29), we see that $k_{\xi}^{-1} \sim 0.02 \text{pc}$ is far smaller than $k_Q^{-1} \sim 0.014 \text{Mpc}$, so the new $\xi$-pressure is not important in modifying the Jeans scale $k_{J0} (= k_Q)$ of the minimally coupled theory. But, we need to point out that, in principle, it is still possible for a large enough $\xi$, without violating the small-coupling limit in Eq. (20), to make Eq. (29), hence the deviation of $k_J$ from $k_{J0}$ large.

However, the $\xi$-pressure will almost always be important at small scales, implying noticeable change in nonlinear structure formation. In wave dark matter models, numerical simulations show that the dark-matter halo will host an enormous soliton — as massive as $10^8 M_{\odot}$
for a $10^{10} M_\odot$ halo with $m \sim 10^{-22}$ eV. The profile of a soliton for a given mass can be obtained by solving the hydrostatic version of Eqs. (23), (24), and (25). It is also possible to obtain approximate analytical results by assuming a Gaussian density profile $\rho(r) = M(\pi R^2)^{-3/2} \exp(-(r^2/R^2))$ of the soliton, and minimize the energy functional with respect to the characteristic soliton size $R$ for a given soliton mass. The two approaches are found to yield similar results (i.e. a local maximum of the energy functional). Representative evaluations of this formula are given in Fig. 1. We see that for the dynamically stable branches, a positive $\xi$ increases the radii of large-mass solitons, whereas a negative $\xi$ decreases them. We also see that, for a negative $\xi$, there is a maximum mass and a minimum radius for a stable soliton. In addition to this limit, the soliton cannot become too compact (i.e. $R \sim GM$), at which point our non-relativistic treatment will become insufficient, and the soliton might collapse into a black hole.

Now, the mass-radius relationship, Eq. (31), can be used to interpret observational results. We only present two preliminary examples here, and leave a full-fledged study to future work. First, a recent dynamical analysis of the Galactic center suggests a $10^9 M_\odot$ solitonic core with a size of 0.1 kpc. This would only be compatible, in the minimally coupled theory, with $m \simeq 10^{-22}$ eV. When allowing non-minimal coupling, interpretations with different $m$ emerge when $|\xi|$ becomes large ($\gtrsim 10^4$, but still within the small-coupling limit). The minimally coupled theory predicts the mass-radius scaling $R \sim M^{-1}$, in tension with the observed constant core surface density for various low-mass galaxies (i.e. $M/R^2 \sim \text{const.}$, implying $R \sim M^{1/2}$). Although the non-minimal coupling cannot fully resolve the problem, it will alleviate it by providing a $R \sim M^0$ scaling via the plateau part of Eq. (31) at large soliton mass.

Before closing, we identify some similarities between the theory presented here, in the small-coupling limit, and other models of wave dark matter. A minimally coupled ($\xi = 0$) theory with an explicit self-interaction $\lambda \phi^4 \in V(\phi)$ in Eq. (2) will also yield similar Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations, Eqs. (18) and (19). The leading contribution from time averaging the Poisson equation, Eq. (19). This also means that our theory can be described by the non-relativistic effective field theory for scalar dark matter, detailed recently in Ref. (28).

In this work, we discuss a theory of wave dark matter that has a non-minimal coupling $\phi^2 R$ to gravity. We derive the equations of motion for this theory in the non-relativistic and small-coupling limit and present an equivalent fluid description with the Gross-Pitaevskii-Poisson equations. From that, we also point out a connection between this theory and previous research on self-gravitating and self-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate. We proceed to discuss some phenomenology of linear and non-linear structure formation. Future work may explore the next-to-leading-order effect in $\xi$; the cosmological matter power spectrum incorporating the full expansion history of the Universe; the production process in the early Universe; numerical simulations of halo formation, etc. It should also be interesting to see the consequences of other forms of non-minimal coupling.
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\caption{Mass-radius relationship, Eq. (31), of the soliton for different dark-matter mass $m$ and non-minimal coupling $\xi$. The blue (red) curves show mass $m = 10^{-22}$ eV ($10^{-20}$ eV). Among those curves, $\xi$ takes the values $\{+10^3, +10, +0.1, 0, -0.1, -10, -10^3\}$, with $\xi = 0$ giving the minimal coupling limit. For negative values of $\xi$, the solid lines indicate the choice of plus sign in Eq. (31), while the dashed lines indicate minus sign. We note that the minus-sign branch when $\xi < 0$ is dynamically unstable. The shaded region indicates $R < GM$, where the relativistic effect becomes important, and the soliton might collapse into a black hole.}
\end{figure}
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