

# Axion as a fuzzy-dark-matter candidate: Uniqueness of the comoving gauge

Jai-chan Hwang<sup>1,2</sup>, Hyerim Noh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Astronomy and Atmospheric Sciences,  
Kyungpook National University, Daegu 702-701, Republic of Korea*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Theoretical Physics of the Universe,  
Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, 34051, Republic of Korea*

<sup>3</sup>*Theoretical Astrophysics Group, Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, Daejeon, Republic of Korea*

(Dated: April 6, 2022)

Axion as a coherently oscillating massive scalar field is known to behave as a zero-pressure irrotational fluid with characteristic quantum stress on a small scale. In relativistic perturbation theory, the case was proved in the axion-comoving gauge up to fully nonlinear and exact order. Our basic assumption is that the field is oscillating with Compton frequency and the Compton wavelength is smaller than the horizon scale. Here, we revisit the relativistic proof to the linear order in the other gauge conditions. To our surprise, we show that *the same* equation for density perturbation known in the non-relativistic treatment can be consistently derived *only* in the comoving gauge. In other gauge conditions either we have inconsistencies or the quantum stress term is missing. We clarify that our relativistic analysis is valid for all scales larger than the Compton wavelength. For comparison, we review the non-relativistic quantum hydrodynamics and present the Schrödinger equation to first-order post-Newtonian expansion in the cosmology context.

PACS numbers:

## I. INTRODUCTION

A coherently oscillating massive scalar field without interaction is known to behave as a pressureless fluid. An example is the axion where its pseudo nature does not interfere with its cosmological role. Such a scalar field can have a role just after the inflation, with the field oscillating at the bottom of the potential, providing a brief matter-dominated period before the radiation domination. More importantly, it can serve as a cold dark matter [1]. Calling a coherently oscillating phase of the massive scalar field as axion, disregarding the mass range of the original QCD axion [2], might be an overuse of the term [3]. Still, here we will continue to use it.

The massive scalar field, in fact, has characteristic stress with quantum origin. The quantum origin is apparent in the non-relativistic treatment based on the fluid formulation of the Schrödinger equation known as early as in 1926 [4], the same year both the Schrödinger equation and its relativistic version, the Klein-Gordon equation, appeared; for a historical summary, see Section 1 in [5], and [6]. We review the non-relativistic treatment in Sec. II. The quantum stress term with extreme-light mass has recently attracted much attention as the fuzzy dark matter [7] enabling to resolve the small-scale tensions encountered in the conventional cold dark matter scenario while enjoying all the success of the cold dark matter in the large scale; for reviews, see [8].

The relativistic cosmological perturbation theory is based on Einstein's equation together with the Klein-Gordon equation in the homogeneous and isotropic cosmological background. The relativistic treatment depends on the gauge choice, especially the temporal one often called the hypersurface or slicing condition; the spatial gauge condition is trivial and unique in the homoge-

neous and isotropic background [9]. Previous analyses used the zero-shear gauge [10], the synchronous gauge [11], the uniform-curvature gauge [12], and the comoving gauge [13]. But the density perturbation equation has appeared *only* in the comoving gauge [13]. Here, we present the density perturbation equations in these gauge conditions with an addition for the uniform-expansion gauge. We will show that the proof is possible *only* in the comoving gauge. In the other gauges, either the quantum stress term is missing, or inconsistencies are encountered, see Sec. III.

We consider a massive scalar field, and our proof is based on the oscillating field *ansatz* assuming the Compton wavelength smaller than the horizon scale. In the relativistic analysis, we find the consistency of full equations demands the Compton wavelength smaller than the scale we are interested in; however, this latter condition is *not* required in the non-relativistic analysis. Thus, the final equation in (71) is valid in *all* scales as long as the Compton wavelength is smaller than the horizon.

Our relativistic perturbation theory is confined to the linear order in perturbation and ignores the interaction term, see Sec. III. In contrast, the non-relativistic analysis reviewed in Sec. II and the post-Newtonian (PN) treatment in the Appendix A are presented in an exact form with full nonlinearity and including the interaction term.

Three points are new: (i) proof of the uniqueness of the axion-comoving gauge in deriving the density perturbation equation with quantum stress which coincides with the non-relativistic treatment, (ii) proof that the scale larger than Compton wavelength is demanded for consistency in relativistic treatment, (iii) Schrödinger equation derived to post-Newtonian order.

## II. NON-RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM HYDRODYNAMICS

From the Schrödinger equation combined with the Poisson's equation, we have

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \Delta \psi + \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m} |\psi|^2 \psi + m\Phi \psi, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G m |\psi|^2 - \Lambda c^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\ell_s$  is the s-wave scattering length [14, 15]. Equation (1) with the interaction term is often known as the Gross-Pitaevskii equation [16, 17]. This will be *derived* in the Appendix as the non-relativistic ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ) or zeroth-order PN (0PN), i.e., Newtonian, limit of the Klein-Gordon equation; there, we derive the Schrödinger equation to 1PN order in the context of cosmological background, see Eq. (A7).  $\Phi$  is the Newtonian gravitational potential with

$$g_{00} = -\left(1 + 2\frac{\Phi}{c^2}\right), \quad (3)$$

and  $\Lambda$  is the cosmological constant. The Poisson's equation follows from the Einstein equation in the 0PN ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ) limit, see the Appendix for derivation. Equation (2) can be written as

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G m (|\psi|^2 - |\psi_b|^2), \quad (4)$$

with  $\psi_b$  the homogeneous background wave function.

Using the Madelung transformation [4]

$$\psi \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\varrho}{m}} e^{imu/\hbar}, \quad (5)$$

with  $\varrho$  and  $u$  interpreted as the density and velocity potential, respectively, the imaginary and real parts of the Schrödinger equation give

$$\dot{\varrho} = -(\varrho u^i)_{,i}, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{u} + \frac{1}{2} u^i u_{,i} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \frac{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho}}{\sqrt{\varrho}} - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \varrho - \Phi. \quad (7)$$

These can be arranged as the continuity and Euler equations, respectively. Together with the Poisson equation, we have

$$\dot{\varrho} + \nabla \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \nabla \left( \frac{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho}}{\sqrt{\varrho}} \right) - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \nabla \varrho - \nabla \Phi \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G \varrho - \Lambda c^2, \quad (10)$$

where we introduce  $\mathbf{u} \equiv \nabla u$ , thus the flow vector  $\mathbf{u}$  is irrotational. The first term in the right-hand-side of Eq. (9) is the characteristic quantum stress appearing in the Euler equation. The fuzzy nature as the dark matter is played by this term which we may call the Madelung term. The second term is an interaction pressure, caused

by the nonlinear interaction term. Compared with the Newtonian fluid equation [18]

$$\dot{u}_i + u^j \nabla_j u_i = -\frac{1}{\varrho} \left( \nabla_j \Pi_{ij}^j + \nabla_i p \right) - \nabla_i \Phi, \quad (11)$$

with the pressure (isotropic stress)  $p$  and the anisotropic stress  $\Pi_{ij}$  (with  $\Pi_i^i \equiv 0$ ), we have [19]

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{ij}^Q &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m^2} \varrho \left( \nabla_i \nabla_j - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \Delta \right) \ln \varrho, \\ p^Q &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{12m^2} \varrho \Delta \ln \varrho + \frac{2\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \varrho^2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

thus the Madelung term has both isotropic and anisotropic stresses, justifying calling it the *quantum stress* as correctly pointed out in [19].

Equations (8)-(10) guarantee that  $\varrho$  and  $u$  defined in Eq. (5) can be identified as the density and velocity potential, respectively. It is important to notice, however, that these identifications apply *only* to the non-relativistic limit [5, 20]. The proper identification of the fluid quantities should be made based on decomposition of the energy-momentum tensor using the four-vector; see Eq. (40), and Eq. (41) to the linear order perturbation in cosmology.

The equivalence between the two systems, the Schrödinger equation in (1) compared with its quantum-fluid formulation in Eqs. (8) and (9), in the absence of the interaction term, was challenged in [21]. These two are *not* equivalent. An important difference appears in the presence of quantized circulation (or vortex,  $\nabla \times \mathbf{v}$ ) in the Schrödinger system, as is well known in superfluids and Bose-Einstein condensates [15–17, 19, 21–27]. The difference is reflected in the simulations based on the Schrödinger formulation, with the interference pattern and quantized vortex [8, 28]. These wave-like features are not available in the simulations based on the fluid formulation [29]; see, however, [30].

### A. Cosmological perturbation

In the cosmology context, we introduce spatially homogeneous and isotropic background and perturbation

$$\varrho \rightarrow \varrho + \delta\varrho, \quad \mathbf{u} = H\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{v}, \quad (13)$$

where  $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$  with  $a(t)$  the cosmic scale factor; we set  $\delta\varrho \equiv \varrho\delta$ , and  $\Phi$  have a perturbed part *only*. To the background order, Eqs. (8)-(10) give

$$\dot{\varrho} + 3H\varrho = 0, \quad \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}\varrho + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3}. \quad (14)$$

These are the Friedmann equations in the absence of pressure and background curvature. Moving to the co-moving coordinate  $\mathbf{x}$  where

$$\mathbf{r} \equiv a(t)\mathbf{x}, \quad (15)$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} &= \frac{1}{a} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{r}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{x} \right) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} - H \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}},\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

neglecting the subindex  $\mathbf{x}$ , Eqs. (8)-(10) become

$$\dot{\delta} + \frac{1}{a} \nabla \cdot [(1 + \delta) \mathbf{v}] = 0, \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{v}} + H \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{a} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} &= \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \frac{1}{a^3} \nabla \left( \frac{\Delta \sqrt{1 + \delta}}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \frac{\rho}{a} \nabla \delta - \frac{1}{a} \nabla \Phi,\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G \rho \delta. \quad (19)$$

Combining these we have

$$\begin{aligned}\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G \rho \delta &+ \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \frac{\Delta}{a^4} \left( \frac{\Delta \sqrt{1 + \delta}}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}} \right) - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \rho \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \delta \\ &= \frac{1}{a^2} \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{a^2} [a \nabla \cdot (\delta \mathbf{v})].\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

These are valid to fully nonlinear order in perturbation. Ignoring the quantum stress and the interaction pressure terms, this equation can be derived to the second order perturbation in relativistic perturbation theory in the comoving gauge, see Eq. (342) in [31]. Newtonian hydrodynamic equations are closed to the second order which is not the case in Einstein's gravity. Thus, all higher order perturbations in Einstein's gravity are pure relativistic corrections, see Section 5 in [32] to the third-order perturbation, and Section 5.1 in [33] to the fully nonlinear and exact order perturbation in Einstein's gravity. These relativistic corrections were derived in the comoving gauge.

To the linear order, we have

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G \rho \delta + \frac{\hbar^2}{m^2} \left( \frac{\Delta}{4a^2} - \frac{4\pi\ell_s}{m} \rho \right) \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \delta = 0. \quad (21)$$

In the absence of the interaction term, this is the density perturbation equation for axion in the non-relativistic limit; our relativistic analysis in the next section will show that *the same* equation is valid in the relativistic analysis in the comoving gauge, see Eq. (71). Compared with the relativistic analysis where rapid oscillation of the massive scalar field is used for the axion, the oscillatory nature is used in the relation between the field ( $\phi$ ) and the wave function ( $\psi$ ), see Eqs. (38) and (54).

## B. Cosmology context

In the cosmology context, in the zeroth-order post-Newtonian (OPN) approximation, or equivalently in the

non-relativistic limit ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ), we have the Schrödinger equation and the Poisson equation in expanding medium

$$i\hbar \left( \dot{\psi} + \frac{3}{2} H \psi \right) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \psi + \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m} |\psi|^2 \psi + m \Phi \psi, \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G m |\psi|^2 + 3 \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} - \Lambda c^2. \quad (23)$$

Equation (22) is *derived* in the Appendix where we also present the fully relativistic version and the one valid to 1PN order, see Eq. (A1) and (A7), respectively. These follow from the Klein-Gordon equation using the Klein transformation in Eq. (37). Equation (23) is also *derived* in the Appendix. In the non-expanding background we recover Eqs. (1) by setting  $a \equiv 1$ . Equation (23) can also be written as

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G m (|\psi|^2 - |\psi_b|^2), \quad (24)$$

with  $\psi_b$  the homogeneous background wave function.

Under the Madelung transformation in Eq. (5), from imaginary and real parts, respectively, we have

$$\dot{\varrho} + 3H\varrho + \frac{1}{a^2} (\varrho u^i)_{,i} = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\dot{u} + \frac{1}{2a^2} u^i u_{,i} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho}}{\sqrt{\varrho}} - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \varrho - \Phi. \quad (26)$$

Identifying  $\mathbf{v} \equiv \frac{1}{a} \nabla u$ , we have [35]

$$\dot{\varrho} + 3H\varrho + \frac{1}{a} \nabla \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{v}} + H \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{a} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} &= \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^2} \frac{1}{a^3} \nabla \left( \frac{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho}}{\sqrt{\varrho}} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{4\pi\ell_s \hbar^2}{m^3} \frac{1}{a} \nabla \varrho - \frac{1}{a} \nabla \Phi,\end{aligned}\quad (28)$$

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G \varrho + 3 \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} - \Lambda c^2. \quad (29)$$

Using perturbation expansion in Eq. (13), we recover Eq. (14) to the background order, and Eqs. (17)-(19) to the nonlinear perturbations. Subtracting the background, Eq. (29) becomes

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G (\varrho - \varrho_b), \quad (30)$$

with  $\varrho_b$  the homogeneous background density.

The Madelung transformation can be inverted to give

$$\varrho = m |\psi|^2, \quad \mathbf{v} = \frac{\hbar}{2ima} \left( \frac{\nabla \psi}{\psi} - \frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\psi^*} \right). \quad (31)$$

Using this we can directly show that Eqs. (27) and (28) are valid by Eq. (22).

### III. RELATIVISTIC ANALYSIS

Now, we present the relativistic counterpart of the previous section to the linear order perturbation. Fully relativistic quantum hydrodynamics will be presented in a later occasion [20], and here, we consider only the linear perturbation analysis in cosmology context. Instead of the Schrödinger equation with Newtonian gravity represented by the Poisson's equation, in Eqs. (1) and (2), or Eqs. (22) and (23), now we use the Klein-Gordon equation with Einstein's gravity modified by the cosmological constant

$$\square\phi = V_{,\phi}, \quad (32)$$

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}R + \Lambda g_{ab} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}T_{ab}. \quad (33)$$

Our convention in Lagrangian density is

$$L = \frac{c^4}{16\pi G} (R - 2\Lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\phi^{;c}\phi_{,c} - V(\phi). \quad (34)$$

The energy-momentum tensor is

$$T_b^a = \phi^{;a}\phi_{,b} - \left(\frac{1}{2}\phi^{;c}\phi_{,c} + V\right)\delta_b^a. \quad (35)$$

For a massive scalar field with interaction, we have

$$V = \frac{1}{2}\frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2}\phi^2 + \frac{2\pi\ell_s m}{\hbar^2}\phi^4. \quad (36)$$

In this section we will consider a massive scalar field *without* interaction.

The Schrödinger equation in Eqs. (1) and (22) follows from the Klein-Gordon equation in (32), under the Klein transformation [34]

$$\phi = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}}\psi e^{-imc^2 t/\hbar}, \quad (37)$$

as the non-relativistic limit ( $c \rightarrow \infty$ ). This can be done regarding  $\phi$  as if it is a complex field. As we consider a *real* scalar field  $\phi$  and a complex wave function  $\psi$ , however, a more proper way is to expand as

$$\phi = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}}\left(\psi e^{-imc^2 t/\hbar} + \psi^* e^{+imc^2 t/\hbar}\right). \quad (38)$$

Both methods give the same answer, see below Eq. (A1) and below Eq. (A9).

#### A. Cosmological perturbation

We consider a flat Friedmann cosmology supported by a minimally coupled massive scalar field. As the scalar field does not support the (transverse) vector and (transverse-tracefree) tensor type perturbations to the

linear order, we consider only the scalar-type perturbation. Our metric convention is [9, 33]

$$\begin{aligned} g_{00} &= -a^2(1 + 2\alpha), & g_{0i} &= -a\chi_{,i}, \\ g_{ij} &= a^2(1 + 2\varphi)\delta_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where  $x^0 = \eta$  with  $cdt \equiv ad\eta$ ; we imposed a spatial gauge condition under which all remaining perturbation variables are spatially gauge-invariant [9].

The fluid quantities are identified based on the time-like four-vector  $u_a$  with  $u^a u_a \equiv -1$ . In the energy frame, setting the flux four-vector  $q_a \equiv 0$ , we have [33, 36]

$$T_{ab} = \mu u_a u_b + p(g_{ab} + u_a u_b) + \pi_{ab}, \quad (40)$$

with  $\pi_{ab}u^b = 0 = \pi_a^a$ .

To the linear order, with  $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \delta\phi$  and  $u_i \equiv av_i/c$ , Eq. (35) gives

$$\begin{aligned} T_0^0 &= -\frac{1}{2c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi^2\right) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}\delta\dot{\phi} - \dot{\phi}^2\alpha + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi\delta\phi\right) \\ &\equiv -\mu - \delta\mu, \\ T_i^0 &= -\frac{1}{ac}\dot{\phi}\delta\phi_{,i} \equiv -\frac{1}{c}(\mu + p)v_{,i}, \\ T_j^i &= \left[\frac{1}{2c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi^2\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}\delta\dot{\phi} - \dot{\phi}^2\alpha - \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi\delta\phi\right)\right]\delta_j^i \\ &\equiv (p + \delta p)\delta_j^i + \Pi_j^i, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where we decompose  $v_i \equiv -v_{,i}$  for scalar type perturbation [31]. Thus, we read perturbed fluid quantities as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mu &= \frac{1}{c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}\delta\dot{\phi} - \dot{\phi}^2\alpha + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi\delta\phi\right), \\ \delta p &= \frac{1}{c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}\delta\dot{\phi} - \dot{\phi}^2\alpha - \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi\delta\phi\right), \\ (\mu + p)v &= \frac{1}{a}\dot{\phi}\delta\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

and vanishing anisotropic stress,  $\Pi_j^i$ ; this shows that the scalar field does not support the vector and tensor type perturbations.

To the background order we have the Friedmann equations and the equation of motion

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3c^2}\mu + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3}, \quad \dot{H} = -\frac{4\pi G}{c^2}(\mu + p), \quad (43)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi = 0, \quad (44)$$

with fluid quantities identified in Eq. (41) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{1}{2c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi^2\right), \\ p &= \frac{1}{2c^2}\left(\dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}\phi^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

To linear order in perturbation, the basic equations for the scalar-type perturbation, without imposing the temporal gauge condition, are [9, 31, 33]

$$\kappa \equiv 3H\alpha - 3\dot{\phi} - c\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\chi, \quad (46)$$

$$\frac{4\pi G}{c^2}\delta\mu + H\kappa + c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\varphi = 0, \quad (47)$$

$$\kappa + c\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\chi - \frac{12\pi G}{c^4}(\mu + p)av = 0, \quad (48)$$

$$\dot{\kappa} + 2H\kappa + \left(3\dot{H} + c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\right)\alpha = \frac{4\pi G}{c^2}(\delta\mu + 3\delta p), \quad (49)$$

$$\varphi + \alpha - \frac{1}{c}(\dot{\chi} + H\chi) = 0, \quad (50)$$

$$\delta\dot{\mu} + 3H(\delta\mu + \delta p) = (\mu + p)\left(\kappa - 3H\alpha + \frac{\Delta}{a}v\right), \quad (51)$$

$$\frac{1}{a^4}[a^4(\mu + p)v]^\cdot = \frac{c^2}{a}[\delta p + (\mu + p)\alpha]. \quad (52)$$

The equation of motion gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\ddot{\phi} + 3H\delta\dot{\phi} - c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\delta\phi + \frac{m^2c^4}{\hbar^2}\delta\phi \\ = \dot{\phi}(\kappa + \dot{\alpha}) + (2\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi})\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Using Eqs. (42) and (45), this also follows from Eq. (51), and Eq. (52) is identically satisfied.

The above set of perturbation equations is presented without imposing the temporal gauge (hypersurface or slicing) condition, and all variables used are spatially gauge invariant. We have the following temporal gauge conditions: the comoving gauge (CG,  $v \equiv 0$ ), the zero-shear gauge (ZSG,  $\chi \equiv 0$ ), the uniform-curvature gauge (UCG,  $\varphi \equiv 0$ ), the uniform-expansion gauge (UEG,  $\kappa \equiv 0$ ), the uniform-density gauge (UDG,  $\delta\mu \equiv 0$ ), the uniform-field gauge (UFG,  $\delta\phi \equiv 0$ ), and the synchronous gauge (SG,  $\alpha \equiv 0$ ). These include most of the gauges used in the literature [9, 37]. Except for the SG, all the other gauge conditions completely fix the gauge degree of freedom, and each variable in these gauge conditions has a unique gauge-invariant combination of variables. These statements concerning the gauge issue are valid to fully nonlinear order in perturbations [31, 33]. In a single component fluid supported by the scalar field, the UFG coincides with the CG.

## B. Axion perturbation

We take an *ansatz* [11]

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t) + \delta\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = a^{-3/2}\phi_{+0}[1 + \Phi_+(\mathbf{x}, t)]\sin(mc^2t/\hbar) \\ + a^{-3/2}\phi_{-0}[1 + \Phi_-(\mathbf{x}, t)]\cos(mc^2t/\hbar), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

which is *the same* as the Klein transformation in Eq. (37). We will strictly consider *only* the leading order in

$$\frac{\hbar H}{mc^2} = \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_H} = 2.13 \times 10^{-11} \frac{h_{100}}{m_{22}} \frac{H}{H_0}, \quad (55)$$

with  $\lambda_c \equiv \lambda_c/(2\pi)$  and  $\lambda_c \equiv \hbar/(mc)$  the Compton wavelength and  $\lambda_H \equiv c/H$  the Hubble horizon scale, respectively; we set  $H \equiv 100h_{100}\text{km/secMpc}$ ,  $m_{22} \equiv mc^2/(10^{-22}\text{eV})$  and the index 0 indicates the present epoch. By taking the time-average over the oscillation, to leading order in  $\hbar H/(mc^2)$ , the background fluid quantities in Equation (45) give

$$\mu = \frac{m^2c^2}{2\hbar^2a^3}(\phi_{+0}^2 + \phi_{-0}^2), \quad p = 0. \quad (56)$$

Thus, to the background order the rapidly oscillating massive scalar field behaves as a pressureless fluid.

To the perturbed order, Equation (42) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta\mu}{\mu} &= \frac{2}{\phi_{+0}^2 + \phi_{-0}^2}(\phi_{+0}^2\Phi_+ + \phi_{-0}^2\Phi_-) - \alpha, \\ \frac{\delta p}{\mu} &= -\alpha, \quad v = \frac{\hbar}{am}\frac{\phi_{+0}\phi_{-0}}{\phi_{+0}^2 + \phi_{-0}^2}(\Phi_- - \Phi_+). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Our task in the following is to derive density perturbation equations in various gauge conditions and check the consistency.

Using the axion fluid quantities in Eqs. (56) and (57), Eqs. (46)-(52) become

$$\kappa = 3H\alpha - 3\dot{\phi} - c\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\chi, \quad (58)$$

$$\frac{4\pi G}{c^2}\delta\mu + H\kappa + c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\varphi = 0, \quad (59)$$

$$\kappa + c\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\chi = \frac{12\pi G}{c^4}\mu av, \quad (60)$$

$$\dot{\kappa} + 2H\kappa = \frac{4\pi G}{c^2}\delta\mu - c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\alpha, \quad (61)$$

$$\varphi + \alpha = \frac{1}{c}(\dot{\chi} + H\chi), \quad (62)$$

$$\dot{\delta} = \kappa + \frac{\Delta}{a}v, \quad (63)$$

$$\frac{1}{a}(av)^\cdot = 0. \quad (64)$$

We may set  $\mu \equiv \varrho c^2$ . As we remarked below Eq. (12),  $\varrho$  in this section *differs* from  $\varrho$  in the previous section. Here,  $\varrho$  is the relativistic density defined in the energy-momentum tensor, whereas  $\varrho$  in the previous section is defined in Eq. (5) and identified with the density in the non-relativistic limit, thus it is the rest-mass density.

For  $\kappa \neq 0$ , thus *excluding* the UEG, from Eqs. (61), (63) and (64) we have

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G\varrho\delta = -c^2\frac{\Delta}{a^2}\alpha. \quad (65)$$

The UEG will be treated separately. In the SG, the right-hand-side of Eq. (65) vanishes, thus *missing* the quantum stress term. Now, the remaining task is to express  $\alpha$  in terms of  $\delta$  in other gauge conditions. This is provided by the equation of motion.



The leading  $[mc^2/(\hbar H)]^2$  order terms in Eq. (53) cancel, and to the next leading  $mc^2/(\hbar H)$ -order, the sine and cosine parts, respectively, give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{H} \frac{\phi_{-0}}{\phi_{+0}} \dot{\Phi}_{-} + \frac{\hbar \Delta}{m H a^2} \Phi_{+} &= \frac{\phi_{-0}}{\phi_{+0}} \frac{\kappa}{H} + 2 \frac{mc^2}{\hbar H} \alpha, \\ \frac{2}{H} \frac{\phi_{+0}}{\phi_{-0}} \dot{\Phi}_{+} - \frac{\hbar \Delta}{m H a^2} \Phi_{-} &= \frac{\phi_{+0}}{\phi_{-0}} \frac{\kappa}{H} - 2 \frac{mc^2}{\hbar H} \alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where we kept  $\frac{\hbar \Delta}{m H a^2}$ -order terms. The  $v$  and  $\delta$  relations in Eq. (57), respectively, using Eq. (64), give

$$\dot{\Phi}_{-} = \dot{\Phi}_{+}, \quad 2\dot{\Phi}_{+} = (\delta + \alpha)'. \quad (67)$$

From Eq. (66), removing the  $\kappa$ -term and  $\alpha$ -term, respectively, we have

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\hbar^2 \Delta}{4m^2 c^2 a^2}} \frac{\hbar^2 \Delta}{4m^2 c^2 a^2} \delta, \quad 2\dot{\Phi}_{+} = \kappa + \frac{\Delta}{a} v, \quad (68)$$

where we used  $\delta$  and  $v$  relations in Eq. (57), respectively. We still have not imposed the gauge condition, thus the above equations are valid even for the UEG.

Here, we check the consistency with the rest of the equations which we omitted in our previous work [13]. In order to have the second relation in Eq. (68) consistent with Eq. (63), we need  $\alpha \ll \delta$ , thus

$$\frac{\lambda_c^2}{\lambda^2} = \frac{\hbar^2}{m^2 c^2} \frac{k^2}{a^2} \ll 1, \quad (69)$$

where  $\lambda = 2\pi/k_p \equiv 2\pi a/k$  is the physical scale of the perturbation;  $k$  is the comoving wavenumber with  $\Delta \equiv -k^2$ .

As our analysis is valid for scales larger than the Compton wavelength, we have

$$\alpha = \frac{\hbar^2 \Delta}{4m^2 c^2 a^2} \delta. \quad (70)$$

Therefore, except for the SG where  $\alpha = 0$ , Eq. (65) finally gives

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G \rho \delta = -\frac{\hbar^2 \Delta^2}{4m^2 a^4} \delta. \quad (71)$$

This is valid for the CG, the ZSG, and the UCG, and coincides with the non-relativistic one in Eq. (21).

As we have

$$\frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda} = \frac{\hbar k_p}{mc} = 4.0 \times 10^{-7} \frac{1}{m_{22}} \frac{1 \text{Mpc}}{\lambda_0} \frac{a_0}{a}, \quad (72)$$

the Compton wavelength is indeed negligible compared with the cosmologically interesting scales in the proposed fuzzy dark matter scenarios. This estimation reveals that for  $m \sim 10^{-22} \text{eV}$ , our analysis is *not* reliable for scales smaller than  $\lambda_c \sim 0.4 \text{pc}$ , and  $\lambda_c \sim 12 \text{cm}$  for a QCD axion with  $m \sim 10^{-5} \text{eV}$ ; of course, under the condition of linear perturbation theory. Although our relativistic analysis demands the condition in Eq. (69), Eq. (71) was derived

in exactly the same form the non-relativistic calculation in Eq. (21) without the condition. Thus, Eq. (71) is valid in all scales as long as the Compton wavelength is smaller than the horizon scale.

By setting the gravity term (the third term in the left-hand-side) equal to the quantum stress we have the quantum Jeans scale,  $\lambda_J \equiv 2\pi a/k_J$ , as

$$\lambda_J = \pi \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m \sqrt{\pi G \rho}}} = \frac{55.6 \text{kpc}}{\sqrt{m_{22} \sqrt{\Omega_{m0} h_{100}}}} \left( \frac{\rho_0}{\rho} \right)^{1/4}, \quad (73)$$

where  $\Omega_m \equiv 8\pi G \rho/(3H^2)$  is the density parameter of the matter component.

### C. Uniqueness of the CG

Now we consider the consistency with the rest of the equations; the full set is Eqs. (57)-(64) and (66). We can show the consistency in the CG, with  $v \equiv 0$ , thus  $\Phi_{+} = \Phi_{-}$ .

The UEG sets  $\kappa \equiv 0$ . Equations (63) and (64) give  $(a^2 \dot{\delta})' = 0$  which already looks strange. Equation (61) gives  $4\pi G \rho \delta = (c^2 \Delta/a^2) \alpha$ . This is *inconsistent* with the  $\alpha$ - $\delta$  relation in Eq. (68).

In fact, similar inconsistencies are encountered in the ZSG and the UCG where we already derived the correct result in Eq. (71). For example, in the ZSG, from Eqs. (60) and (64) we have  $(a^3 \kappa)' = 0$  which is inconsistent with Eq. (61). Similarly, in the UCG, from (59) we have  $\kappa = 4\pi G \rho \delta/H$  which is inconsistent with Eq. (61). Thus, although Eq. (71) is successfully derived in the ZSG and the UCG, the equation is not acceptable as we have inconsistencies in other equations in the same gauges.

In Eq. (70), the SG does not necessarily imply  $\delta = 0$  as we have  $\alpha \sim (\lambda_c/\lambda)^2 \delta$ . The SG fails to fix the temporal gauge degree of freedom, and the non-vanishing  $v$  in Eq. (64) is the gauge mode [39]. In order to fix this remnant gauge mode we can further impose the condition  $v = 0$  which is the comoving gauge condition. With this we can show the consistency of the rest of the equations. But, as we set  $\alpha \equiv 0$  for the gauge condition the quantum stress term is missing in the SG.

As we are interested in the equation for  $\delta$ , we do not consider the UDG, setting  $\delta \equiv 0$  for the gauge condition. Still, the analysis of the basic equations leads to null result with all perturbation variables vanishing. As we have a gauge-invariant combination  $\delta\mu_v \equiv \delta\mu + 3H(\mu + p)av/c^2 \equiv 3H(\mu + p)av_v/c^2$ , there was a possibility that we get Eq. (71) for the CG, thus  $\delta = \delta_v$ , expressed in term of  $v_\delta$ . However, the analysis shows it is not the case in the axion. This is an example of inconsistency forbidding the proper gauge transformation between different gauges.

These inconsistencies or null results, especially the case in the UDG, may demand a reason for the inconsistencies. For example, in perturbation theory, from a variable known in one gauge condition, we can derive all the rest of the variables in the same gauge as well as all variables

in all other gauge conditions, unless we have pathology in some particular gauge. The above inconsistencies do not allow such a translation in deriving the density perturbation variable except for the CG. Unfortunately, we do not have an answer for it. Our results show that, although the fundamental set of equations in Sec. III A is consistent, the reduced set of equations in Sec. III B under our *ansatz* in Eq. (54) is consistent *only* for the CG in deriving the density perturbation equation of perturbed axion.

Therefore, we conclude that except for the CG, the analysis in other gauges encounters inconsistencies in handling the coherently oscillating massive scalar field, or misses the quantum stress term as in the SG. Although Eq. (71) is derived in the ZSG and the UCG, the analyses are not reliable as we have inconsistencies in other equations in the same gauges.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

We presented relativistic derivations of cosmological linear density perturbation equations in several gauge conditions for a coherently oscillating massive scalar field, see Sec. III. We used the Klein-Gordon equation combined with the Einstein equation in a flat cosmological background. The results depend on the gauge choice, and we show that *only* in the CG we can consistently derive the same equation known in the non-relativistic treatment reviewed in Sec. II. The SG *fails* to recover the quantum stress term, and the ZSG, the UCG and the UEG lead to *inconsistencies*, see Sec. III C. Although the correct density perturbation equation is derived in the ZSG and the UCG, the cases are not reliable as we find inconsistencies in the remaining set of equations.

While the UEG and the UCG are rarely used in the literature, the SG and the ZSG are quite popular in cosmology [39, 41–44]. In the relativistic perturbation theory, the non-relativistic nature of the axion was proved to the fully nonlinear and exact order in [45, 46]. The proof was made in the CG. The deficiency found in the SG and inconsistencies found in the ZSG and others in handling the axion perturbation even to the linear order are unexpected and surprising. The case in ZSG is note-

worthy, as we have the Newtonian limit available in the ZSG and the UEG [38]. Pathology can appear depending on the gauge choice and the case is not strange in general relativity. In cosmological perturbation theory, some gauge conditions are superior (or advantageous) in handling mathematical manipulation or in physical interpretation compared with other choices. Here, we show an example where the density perturbation equation in non-relativistic limit can be consistently derived only in one gauge condition. In the case of axion, even the gauge transformation cannot cure the pathology in other gauge conditions.

As a second point, we clarify that the relativistic linear analysis is reliable only for scales larger than the Compton wavelength, see Eq. (69). Whereas, no such restriction applies in the non-relativistic case. Combining both the relativistic and non-relativistic treatments implies that Eq. (71) can be applied to *all* (including the super-horizon) scales as long as the Compton wavelength is smaller than the horizon scale.

For comparison, we reviewed the non-relativistic derivation in the context of Schrödinger equation combined with Poisson equation, see Sec. II. Here, the derivation is based on the Madelung transformation of Schrödinger equation which leads to the hydrodynamic equations with a characteristic quantum stress term appearing in Euler equation, see Eq. (9), or Eqs. (11) and (12). In our way to derive the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation combined with Newtonian gravity, we presented the Schrödinger equation valid to 1PN order in the Appendix; this is our third point. Extension to full 1PN equations of the quantum fluid formulation will be derived and studied on a later occasion [20].

#### Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Jiajun Zhang for useful discussion on simulations. H.N. was supported by the National Research Foundation (NRF) of Korea funded by the Korean Government (No. 2018R1A2B6002466 and No. 2021R1F1A1045515). J.H. was supported by NRF of Korea (No. NRF-2019R1A2C1003031) and by IBS under the project code IBSR018-D1.

#### Appendix A: Schrödinger equation to 1PN order

Here we derive the relativistic Schrödinger equation to 1PN order and the Poisson equation to 0PN order. Under the Klein transformation in Eq. (37), with  $\phi^3 \rightarrow |\phi|^2 \phi$ , the Klein-Gordon equation in Eqs. (32) and (36) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \square\phi - \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} \phi - \frac{8\pi\ell_s m}{\hbar^2} |\phi|^2 \phi \\ = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{m}} \psi e^{-imc^2 t/\hbar} \left[ \square\psi - \frac{2im}{\hbar} c g^{0c} \psi_{,c} + \frac{im}{\hbar} c g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^0 \psi - \frac{m^2}{\hbar^2} c^2 (g^{00} + 1) \psi - 8\pi\ell_s |\psi|^2 \psi \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Using a more proper Klein transformation in Eq. (38) for a real field, ignoring the rapidly oscillating terms arising in the  $\phi^3$  term, we simply have an additional equation with the complex conjugation of the above equation for  $\psi$ . This is the relativistic Schrödinger equation written in terms of the wave function  $\psi$ . Together with the fluid quantities properly constructed, this equation can be combined with Einstein's equation. This will be pursued later [20].

The following presentation of the 1PN expression of the Schrödinger equation is, in our knowledge, new; a weak gravity expansion attempted in [5] is not proper. But, here our purpose is only to show the proper derivation of the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation combined with Newtonian gravity in Eqs. (1) and (2), or Eqs. (22) and (23) in the cosmological context. For this pedagogic purpose, we present some details involved in the derivation.

In a spatially flat cosmological background, our metric convention to 1PN order is

$$g_{00} = - \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\Phi}{c^2} \right), \quad g_{0i} = -a \frac{P_i}{c^3}, \quad g_{ij} = a^2 \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\Psi}{c^2} \right) \delta_{ij}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the spatial index of  $P_i$  is raised and lowered using  $\delta_{ij}$  and its inverse; index 0 =  $ct$ . In order to properly consider the 1PN expansion, we have to include  $c^{-4}$ -order in  $g_{00}$ , see Eq. (A6); thus,  $\Phi$  includes  $c^{-2}$  order. The inverse metric and connection, valid to 1PN order, are

$$g^{00} = - \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\Phi}{c^2} + 4 \frac{\Phi^2}{c^4} \right), \quad g^{0i} = - \frac{1}{a} \frac{P^i}{c^3}, \quad g^{ij} = \frac{1}{a^2} \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\Psi}{c^2} \right) \delta^{ij}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{00}^0 &= \frac{\dot{\Phi}}{c^3} - \frac{1}{c^5} \left( 2\Phi\dot{\Phi} + \frac{1}{a} P^i \Phi_{,i} \right), \quad \Gamma_{0i}^0 = \frac{\Phi_{,i}}{c^2} - \frac{1}{c^4} (2\Phi\Phi_{,i} + aH P_i), \\ \Gamma_{ij}^0 &= \frac{1}{c} a^2 H \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{c^3} a^2 \left[ \dot{\Psi} + 2H(\Phi + \Psi) \right] \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{c^3} a P_{(i,j)}, \quad \Gamma_{00}^i = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\Phi_{,i}}{c^2} + \frac{1}{c^4} [2\Psi\Phi_{,i} - (aP^i)_{,i}], \\ \Gamma_{0j}^i &= \frac{1}{c} H \delta_j^i - \frac{\dot{\Psi}}{c^3} \delta_j^i + \frac{1}{c^3} \frac{1}{2a} (P_j{}^{,i} - P^i{}_{,j}), \quad \Gamma_{jk}^i = -\frac{1}{c^2} (\Psi_{,k} \delta_j^i + \Psi_{,j} \delta_k^i - \Psi^{,i} \delta_{jk}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

These are the same as Eqs. (1)-(5) in [18]. Using these, to 1PN order, Eq. (A1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2im}{\hbar} \left( \dot{\psi} + \frac{3}{2} H \psi \right) + \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \psi - \frac{2m^2}{\hbar^2} \Phi \psi - 8\pi\ell_s |\psi|^2 \psi + \frac{1}{c^2} \left[ -\ddot{\psi} - 3H\dot{\psi} + 2\Psi \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \psi + \frac{1}{a^2} (\Phi - \Psi)^{,i} \psi_{,i} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2im}{\hbar} \left( -2\Phi\dot{\psi} + \frac{1}{a} P^i \psi_{,i} \right) + \frac{im}{\hbar} \left( -\dot{\Phi} - 3\dot{\Psi} - 6H\Phi + \frac{1}{a} P^i{}_{,i} \right) \psi + \frac{4m^2}{\hbar^2} \Phi^2 \psi \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

To the 0PN order ( $c \rightarrow \infty$  limit) we recover Eq. (22), and Eq. (1) in a static background. The first  $\Phi$  term appearing in this equation still contains 1PN order. Using Chandrasekhar's 1PN notation in [47]

$$\Phi = -U + \frac{1}{c^2} (U^2 - 2\Upsilon), \quad \Psi = -V, \quad (\text{A6})$$

with  $V = U$  to 0PN order, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2im}{\hbar} \left( \dot{\psi} + \frac{3}{2} H \psi \right) + \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \psi + \frac{2m^2}{\hbar^2} U \psi - 8\pi\ell_s |\psi|^2 \psi + \frac{1}{c^2} \left[ -\ddot{\psi} - 3H\dot{\psi} - 2U \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \psi \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2im}{\hbar} \left( 2U\dot{\psi} + \frac{1}{a} P^i \psi_{,i} \right) + \frac{im}{\hbar} \left( 4\dot{U} + 6HU + \frac{1}{a} P^i{}_{,i} \right) \psi + \frac{2m^2}{\hbar^2} (U^2 + 2\Upsilon) \psi \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

To 1PN order, we still have a freedom to impose the temporal gauge (hypersurface or slicing); for various gauge conditions, see Section 6 of [18]. Together with the fluid quantities properly constructed to 1PN order, this can be combined with Einstein's equation expanded to 1PN order [18].

Now we derive the Poisson equation to 0PN order. To 0PN order, we have

$$g_{00} = - \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\Phi}{c^2} \right), \quad g_{0i} = 0, \quad g_{ij} = a^2 \delta_{ij}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

and no gauge condition is needed. Under the Klein transformation in Eq. (38), the energy-momentum tensor in Eqs. (35) and (36) gives

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ab} &= \frac{\hbar^2}{m} \left\{ \psi_{,(a} \psi_{,b)}^* + \frac{imc}{\hbar} \left( \psi_{,(a} \delta_{b)}^0 \psi^* - \psi_{,(a}^* \delta_{b)}^0 \psi \right) + \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} |\psi|^2 \delta_a^0 \delta_b^0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \psi^{,c} \psi_{,c}^* + \frac{imc}{\hbar} (\psi^{,0} \psi^* - \psi^{*,0} \psi) + \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} |\psi|^2 (g^{00} + 1) + 4\pi\ell_s |\psi|^4 \right] g_{ab} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$



where we used  $ct_{,a} = \delta_a^0$ , and ignored the rapidly oscillating terms. This is exact. The same result can be derived using the original Klein transformation in Eq. (37), this time without need for ignoring the oscillating terms, by an appropriate complex conjugation of the energy-momentum tensor, as

$$T_{ab} = \phi_{,(a} \phi_{,b)}^* - \left( \frac{1}{2} \phi^{;c} \phi_{,c}^* + \frac{1}{2} \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} |\phi|^2 + \frac{2\pi \ell_s m}{\hbar^2} |\phi|^4 \right) g_{ab}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

which is the same as Eqs. (35) and (36) for our real scalar field.

To 0PN (or  $c \rightarrow \infty$ ) limit, we have

$$T_{ab} = mc^2 |\psi|^2 \delta_a^0 \delta_b^0. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Thus,

$$T_{00} = mc^2 |\psi|^2, \quad T_{0i} = 0, \quad T_{ij} = 0. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Equation (A9) shows that *only* in the non-relativistic limit, we can identify  $m|\psi|^2$  as the mass-density. Using

$$R_{00} = \frac{1}{c^2} \left( -3 \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi \right), \quad (\text{A13})$$

the 00-component of Einstein's equation

$$R_b^a = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \left( T_b^a - \frac{1}{2} T \delta_b^a \right) + \Lambda, \quad (\text{A14})$$

gives

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G m |\psi|^2 + 3 \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} - \Lambda c^2. \quad (\text{A15})$$

This is Eq. (23); in a static background, with  $a \equiv 1$ , we recover Eq. (2). To the background order, we have

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3} m |\psi_b|^2 + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

thus, in the static background, we have  $4\pi G m |\psi_b|^2 = \Lambda c^2$ . Subtracting the background order, we have

$$\frac{\Delta}{a^2} \Phi = 4\pi G m (|\psi|^2 - |\psi_b|^2). \quad (\text{A17})$$

This avoids the so-called Jeans swindle, with Poisson's equation applying *only* for inhomogeneous part: i.e., no gravitational potential for the homogeneous background as Jeans has correctly chosen [48].

- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>[1] J. Preskill, M.B. Wise, F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B <b>120</b>, 127 (1983); L.F. Abbott and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. B <b>120</b>, 133 (1983); M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B <b>120</b>, 137 (1983).</p> <p>[2] J.E. Kim, Phys. Rep. <b>150</b>, 1 (1987).</p> <p>[3] D.J.E. Marsh, Phys. Rep. <b>643</b>, 1 (2016).</p> <p>[4] E. Madelung, Z. Phys. <b>40</b>, 332 (1926).</p> <p>[5] P.-H. Chavanis and T. Matos, Eur. Phys. J. Plus, <b>132</b>, 30 (2017).</p> <p>[6] P.A.M. Dirac, Sov. Phys. Usp. <b>22</b>, 648 (1979).</p> <p>[7] W. Hu, R. Barkana, and A. Gruzinov, Phys. Rev. Lett. <b>85</b>, 1158 (2000).</p> <p>[8] D.J.E. Marsh, Phys. Rep. <b>643</b>, 1 (2016); J.C.</p> | <p>Niemeyer, Prog. Particle Nucl. Phys. <b>113</b>, 103787 (2020); E.G.M. Ferreira, arXiv: 2005.03254 (2020); L. Hui, arXiv:2101.11735 (2021).</p> <p>[9] J.M. Bardeen, in L. Fang and A. Zee, eds., <i>Particle Physics and Cosmology</i>, Gordon and Breach, London (1988).</p> <p>[10] Y. Nambu and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D <b>42</b>, 3918 (1990).</p> <p>[11] B. Ratra, Phys. Rev. D <b>44</b>, 35 (1991).</p> <p>[12] J. Hwang, Phys. Lett. B <b>401</b>, 241 (1997).</p> <p>[13] J. Hwang and H. Noh, Phys. Lett. B <b>680</b>, 1 (2009).</p> <p>[14] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L.P. Pitaevskii, S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. <b>71</b>, 463 (1999).</p> <p>[15] L. Pitaevskii, S. Stringari, <i>Bose-Einstein condensation</i></p> |
|---|--|

- and *superfluidity* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003)
- [16] E.P. Gross, *Nuovo Cimento* **20** 454 (1961).
  - [17] L.P. Pitaevskii, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **40**, 646 (1961); *Sov. Phys. JETP* **13** 451 (1961).
  - [18] J. Hwang, H. Noh, and D. Puetzfeld, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **03**, 010 (2008).
  - [19] T. Takabayasi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **8**, 143 (1952).
  - [20] J. Hwang and H. Noh, Relativistic quantum hydrodynamics, in preparation (2021).
  - [21] T.C. Wallstrom, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 1613 (1994).
  - [22] L. Onsager, *Nuovo Cimento, Suppl.* **6**, 279 (1949).
  - [23] R.P. Feynman, in *Progress in Low Temperature Physics*, ed. C.J. Gorter vol. 1, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1955) p. 17.
  - [24] E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics, Part 2 Theory of the Condensed State* (Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd, Oxford, 1980)
  - [25] C.J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2001).
  - [26] M. Tsubota, M. Kobayashi, and H. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rep.* **522**, 191 (2013).
  - [27] C.F. Barenghi, N.G. Parker, *A Primer on Quantum Fluids*, arXiv:1605.09580 (2016)
  - [28] P.F. Hopkins, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **489**, 2367 (2019).
  - [29] J. Zhang, H. Liu, M-C. Chi, *Frontiers in Astron. Space Sci.* **5**, 1 (2019)
  - [30] X. Li, L. Hui, G.L. Bryan, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 063509 (2019).
  - [31] H. Noh and J. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 104011 (2004).
  - [32] J. Hwang and H. Noh, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **367**, 1515 (2006).
  - [33] J. Hwang and H. Noh, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **433**, 3472 (2013).
  - [34] O. Klein, *Z. Phys.* **41**, 407 (1927).
  - [35] P.H. Chavanis, *Astron. Astrophys.* **537**, A127, (2012).
  - [36] G.F.R. Ellis, *General relativity and cosmology, Proceedings of the international summer school of physics Enrico Fermi course 47*, edited by R.K. Sachs (Academic Press, New York, 1971); G.F.R. Ellis,, *Cargese Lectures in Physics*, edited by E. Schatzmann (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1973)
  - [37] J.M. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1882 (1980).
  - [38] J. Hwang and H. Noh, *Astrophys. J.* **833**, 180 (2016).
  - [39] E.M. Lifshitz, *J. Phys. (USSR)* **10**, 116 (1946); English transl. reprinted in *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **49**, 18 (2017).
  - [40] J. Hwang and H. Noh, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **31**, 1131 (1999).
  - [41] P.J.E. Peebles, *The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1980).
  - [42] Ya.B. Zel'dovich and I.D. Novikov, *Relativistic Astrophysics, Vol. 2: The Structure and Evolution of the Universe* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1983).
  - [43] V.F. Mukhanov, H.A. Feldman, and R.H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rep.* **215**, 203 (1992).
  - [44] C. Ma and E. Bertschinger, *Astrophys. J.* **455**, 7 (1995).
  - [45] J. Hwang, H. Noh, and C-G. Park, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **12**, 016 (2015);
  - [46] H. Noh, J. Hwang, and C-G. Park, *Astrophys. J.* **846**, 1 (2017).
  - [47] S. Chandrasekhar, *Astrophys. J.* **142**, 1488 (1965).
  - [48] J.H. Jeans, *Philosophical Transactions of Roy. Soc. A* **199**, 1 (1902).