

Snowmass2021 Cosmic Frontier White Paper: Probing dark matter with small-scale astrophysical observations

Richard Brito¹, Sukanya Chakrabarti², Sébastien Clesse³, Cora Dvorkin⁴, Juan García-Bellido⁵,
Joel Meyers⁶, Ken K. Y. Ng⁷, Andrew L. Miller⁸, Sarah Shandera⁹, and Ling Sun¹⁰

¹CENTRA, Departamento de Física, Instituto Superior Técnico – IST, Universidade de Lisboa – UL, Avenida Rovisco Pais 1, 1049
Lisboa, Portugal

²School of Physics and Astronomy, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY 14623 USA

³Service de Physique Théorique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Boulevard du Triomphe CP225, B-10503 Brussels, Belgium

⁴Department of Physics, Harvard University, 17 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

⁵Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 28049 Madrid, Spain

⁶Department of Physics, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275, USA

⁷LIGO Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

⁸Kavli Institute for Astrophysics and Space Research, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge,
Massachusetts 02139, USA

⁹Université catholique de Louvain, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

¹⁰Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

¹¹Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802, USA

¹²OzGrav-ANU, Centre for Gravitational Astrophysics, College of Science, The Australian National University, Australian Capital
Territory 2601, Australia

Abstract

The current understanding of dark matter comes largely from measurements of the total matter content in the universe, from the distribution of gravitating matter on very large scales, and from rotation curves and velocity dispersions on sub-galactic scales. However, small-scale structure may well hold the key to unlocking the particle physics of the still-mysterious 85% of matter in the universe. Novel small-scale astrophysical probes of new particles and dark matter will become possible with a large data volume of high-precision measurements enabled by next-generation gravitational-wave detectors and advanced astrometry instruments. Cosmic microwave background and large-scale structure surveys will provide complementary constraints on dark matter models with unique small-scale signatures. We lay out the studies of small-scale structures and compact objects as dark matter probes, and summarize the requirements to achieve the goals.

Contents

1	Executive summary	2
2	Background and motivation	5
2.1	Probes of ultra-small-scale structure	5
2.2	Observational enablers	7

3	Dark matter physics probed by ultra-small-scale structure	8
3.1	Dissipative dark matter and dark black holes	8
3.2	Primordial black holes	10
3.3	Ultralight bosons and black hole superradiance	12
3.3.1	Astrophysical sources	13
3.3.2	Gravitational-wave searches	14
3.3.3	Future prospects	15
4	Gravitational-wave interferometers as dark matter detectors	16
4.1	Sources	16
4.2	Signals	17
4.3	Searches	17
4.4	Prospects	19
5	Complementary and integrated probes of total matter content of the universe	20
5.1	Light relics	20
5.2	Neutrino mass constraints	21
6	Conclusions	21

1 Executive summary

The last decade brought the first successful detection of gravitational waves (GWs) [1] and a dramatic improvement in high-precision astrometry [2]. As GW detectors mature and new instruments to measure proper motions and spectroscopy are deployed in the next few years, they will provide the first high data-volume probes of the ultra small-scale structure of the universe. This data will enable searches for novel populations of compact objects that cannot be formed in stellar processes, will harness the extreme gravitational environment around black holes to constrain new ultralight particles, and will provide precise determinations of the dark matter distribution down to earth-mass scales. Coordination of the communities that study compact objects and astrometry with those that study dark matter is required in order to realize the science potential of this data. Here we lay out the case for small-scale structure and compact-object data as dark matter probes, covering a few key questions about the nature of the Universe: (1) Is dark matter made of compact objects such as sub-solar mass black holes and of primordial origin? (2) Is the dark matter composed of interacting or dissipative beyond-Standard-Model particles? (3) What are the GW signatures of dark matter? These perspectives should inform future decisions about the design and science reach of surveys of ultra small-scale structure, including compact objects.

Our current understanding of dark matter comes from measurements of the total matter content in the universe, from the distribution of gravitating matter on very large scales where baryonic feedback is relatively unimportant, and from rotation curves and velocity dispersions on sub-galactic scales. There are hints from some of these measurements that dark matter may not fit traditional models [3], but the complex nature of baryonic

feedback makes definitive statements elusive. However, the properties of structure on smaller scales are predicted to vary even more dramatically between dark matter scenarios. Small-scale structure may well hold the key to unlocking the early universe physics of the still-mysterious 85% of matter in the universe.

The data from the future observing runs of the LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA GW detector network [4–6], from the Rubin Observatory Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) [7], and the Nancy Grace Roman Space Telescope [8], will lead to strong constraints on dark matter from small-scale structure. A careful understanding of the implications of that data will be critical in planning for and developing the next stage of instruments, including the next-generation ground-based GW detectors like Cosmic Explorer [9] and Einstein Telescope [10], space-based detectors including Laser Interferometer Space Antenna (LISA) [11], TianQin [12], and the DECi-hertz Interferometer Gravitational wave Observatory (DECIGO) [13], and a possible successor to Gaia [2] (see more details about future facilities in Refs. [14, 15]). The novel searches on various length scales, together with the observational enablers, are laid out in Figure 1.

Recent work has also shown significant advances in constraining dark objects at the stellar mass scales. Large-scale spectroscopic surveys, such as the Apache Point Observatory Galactic Evolution Experiment (APOGEE), have been analyzed to search for stellar mass black holes [16–18]. Microlensing survey programs, e.g., the Optical Gravitational Lensing Experiment (OGLE) and Microlensing Observations in Astrophysics (MOA), have been analyzed to identify long-duration microlensing events that have been attributed as arising due to black holes [19]. Additionally, Hubble Space Telescope (HST) follow-up of a source identified independently in OGLE and MOA provided a measurement of the small astrometric shift ($\sim$ milliarcseconds), which enables a measurement of the mass of lens that is not degenerate with the transverse velocity [20]. In external galaxies, quasar microlensing provides a route to probe mass distributions at the planet-mass scale [21, 22]. Advances in technology should also enable constraints on dark matter sub-structure by measuring Galactic accelerations directly, using pulsar timing [23], extreme-precision radial velocity observations [24], and by measuring the small shift in the eclipse time induced by the Galactic potential [23]. These kind of time-series precision measurements of accelerations can be carried out across the Galaxy (and possibly beyond) with the Extremely Large Telescopes (ELTs)—the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) and the Giant Magellan Telescope (GMT). These facilities as well as wide-field spectroscopic facilities, including the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument DESI-II, MegaMapper, Maunakea Spectroscopic Explorer (MSE), and SpecTel, will enable constraints on dark matter sub-structure down to $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ using future facilities [25]. Future Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) facilities, such as CMB-S4 [26] and CMB-HD [27], will also be able to measure the matter power spectrum on small scales using gravitational lensing of the microwave background radiation [25].

In addition to advances in the electromagnetic observations of structure, the direct detection of GWs by the LIGO, Virgo, and KAGRA collaborations provides a completely new avenue to understand the matter content of the universe. GW observations provide the first data that can treat dark matter on precisely the same footing as the light-emitting matter of the Standard Model. As a result, they open a new direction in dark matter physics that does not rely on any non-gravitational coupling between dark matter and




Figure 1: The diagram shows phenomena probing dark matter, on length scales ranging from terrestrial detectors to the cosmic microwave background (CMB). The colors indicate the new generation of observational tools that can enable the cosmic probes of these phenomena. The unprecedented measurements on sub-galactic small scales, combined with complementary advances on large scales, will lead to strong constraints and largely improved understanding of dark matter. Future telescope facilities, including TMT, GMT, MegaMapper, MSE, and SpecTel, will be sensitive to the dark matter halo mass function down to $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ [25].

the Standard Model. Populations incompatible with standard stellar evolution, such as subsolar mass black holes, may be detected through the now-familiar observation of binary mergers. Alternatively, the extreme gravitational effects of a black hole on its environment can generate a new gravitational signal of light fields via superradiance. In addition, the GW detectors themselves double as a new kind of direct detection experiment. Also see discussions in Ref. [28].

While the most detailed insights on non-minimal dark sectors may come from studying small-scale structure and compact objects, scenarios that introduce additional particles are also constrained by measurements of the total matter and radiation content of the universe. Next generation surveys of the CMB [26, 27, 29] will provide stringent new limits on the radiation density (N_{eff}) [30]. The combination of data from future galaxy surveys and CMB surveys will precisely measure the clustering of matter, providing excellent sensitivity to the presence of matter that does not cluster in the same way as ordinary cold dark matter, including massive neutrinos, warm dark matter, ultralight axion dark matter, and light but massive relics. We discuss the potential for complementarity between advances in CMB, large-scale structure surveys, and small-scale structure measurements in the coming

decade.

All of these advances will become accessible with the use of multiple facilities in the whole range displayed in Fig. 1, from new GW detectors, described at length in the Snowmass paper [15], to the next generation telescopes, pulsar timing arrays [14] and CMB experiments [29]. All of these facilities will act in synergy as a multiprobe exploration of the physics of dark matter, testing both massive compact objects as dark matter and a variety of scenarios that introduce new particles into the hot big bang universe.

2 Background and motivation

2.1 Probes of ultra-small-scale structure

Kinematic probes that allow the inference of the Galactic and dark matter structure on increasingly small scales take several forms. These include the 3d velocities and positions of stars in the Galaxy and stellar streams [31–36], which provide constraints on fundamental Galactic parameters, the Galactic potential, the orbits of dwarf galaxies, dark matter sub-structure on small scales, as well detection of the smallest gravitationally bound objects [37], and possible collisions of dwarf galaxies [38, 39] that can be used to test for collisional self-interaction of dark matter [40]. However, kinematic probes may not accurately represent the time-dependent Galactic potential. Direct acceleration measurements using time-series extremely precise observations using multiple different techniques have recently become possible. These direct acceleration measurements provide the most direct probes into the mass distributions in galaxies [23, 24, 41]. These techniques include pulsar timing [23], extreme-precision radial velocity observations that are now enabled with current generation high-resolution spectrographs (and others that will come online over the next several years) [24, 42], and eclipse timing [41] to measure the very small accelerations of stars that live within the gravitational potential of the Milky Way (about 10 cm/s/decade) (also see Ref. [14]).

While galactic interiors are regimes governed by the interplay of many complex processes, some probes of structure on the smallest scales may provide remarkably clean data about dark matter. For example, dark matter models can predict novel compact objects, including black holes, with mass and compactness for which there are no formation channels via stellar processes in the standard model. The populations and distributions of any such objects may well be affected by baryonic processes, but their existence would unambiguously be linked to new types of particles in the universe [43]. For example, GW detectors are sensitive to ultracompact objects with masses well below a solar mass, and any observed subsolar mass black holes would either of a primordial origin or formed dynamically in the late universe from particle dark matter [44–51].

While the primary objective of GW detectors is to detect astrophysical signals, they can also act as particle physics laboratories to directly search for ultralight dark matter [52, 53] in the mass range $\mathcal{O}(10^{-14} - 10^{-11})$ eV/ c^2 . In brief, different dark matter particles would interact in various ways with standard model particles in the interferometer components (in particular, the laser light, the mirrors or the beam splitter), which would lead to a differential strain on the detector. The kind of interaction and subsequent differential

strain depend on the type or model of dark matter considered.

In addition to using GW detectors directly as dark matter detectors, cosmic probes via GW observations provide an alternative novel approach to search for ultralight, beyond-Standard-Model particles that could constitute a portion or all of dark matter. Ultralight boson particles have been predicted to solve problems in particle physics, high-energy theory, and cosmology. Such fundamental scalar (spin 0), vector (spin 1), or tensor (spin 2) fields could form macroscopic clouds around rapidly rotating black holes through a phenomenon called “superradiance” [54–59]. Such clouds are expected to emit continuous, quasimonochromatic signals that fall in the sensitive range of GW detectors [60–65, 65–69]. Given that such cosmic probes take advantage of the universal gravitational coupling of these predicted ultralight bosons, the constraints do not rely on model-dependent predictions of the particles’ couplings to the Standard Model, as long as those are small enough [70, 71].

The astrophysical GW signals emitted by boson clouds that are expected to form around black holes through superradiance largely resemble the signals produced by direct dark matter interactions with the detectors; in both cases, we expect persistent, quasimonochromatic signals in the data collected by GW detectors. Hence, similar methods can be used to search for both types of signals resulting from dark matter particles in the same mass range. Analyses have been conducted using data collected by existing Advanced LIGO and Virgo detectors, yielding interesting constraints on the properties of these yet-undiscovered particles. The future ground-based detector network, including Cosmic Explorer and Einstein Telescope, with improved sensitivity, as well as space-based GW detectors, will provide the capability to constrain a large parameter space of the ultralight bosons, or even a direct detection. By searching for such GW and dark matter signals, ground-based detectors (e.g., [4, 5, 72–74]), and space-based detectors (e.g., [12, 75]) could probe bosons with masses in the ranges of $10^{-14} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-11}$ and $10^{-19} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-15}$, respectively, which are largely inaccessible to conventional experiments [63, 66, 67, 76] (but also see methods like [77]). The constraints obtained using GW detectors are of great interest and complementary to related research in particle physics, high-energy theory, and cosmology. If there is a detection, detailed measurements of the signal morphology would provide invaluable information about the properties of the new particle, and would shed light on the fascinating connection between black holes and particle physics.

Axions are pseudo-scalar bosons that are potentially detectable not only via GW observations of the phenomenon of superradiance and directly via their couplings to light in the GW interferometers [78], but also through their effects on small-scale structures. Self-attractive axions may produce numerous dark matter haloes that are denser but smaller than those predicted by the Λ CDM model [79]. The halo scale mass depends on the axion mass: $\sim 5 \times 10^9 M_\odot (10^{-22} \text{ eV}/\mu)^{3/2}$, and may have a soliton structure with a soft core (e.g., [80]) instead of the cuspy Navarro-Frenk-White profile [81]. These soliton-typed dark matter haloes can act as gravitational lenses and perturb the propagation of the background electromagnetic (EM) radiations or GWs. Searching for the gravitational lensing signatures in the EM surveys (magnified multiple images) or the GW observations (diffraction effect) can constrain the axion mass ranging from $\mathcal{O}(10^{-14} - 10^{-7}) \text{ eV}/c^2$ (EM lensing), $\mathcal{O}(10^{-18} - 10^{-16}) \text{ eV}/c^2$ (GW lensing in the ground-based detectors), and

$\mathcal{O}(10^{-21} - 10^{-18}) \text{ eV}/c^2$ (GW lensing in LISA). See Fig. 11 in Ref. [79] for other possible probes and detailed constraints in the parameter space of the axion mass and the halo scale mass density.

Models for the dark sector that predict unique signatures on ultra-small scales often involve new degrees of freedom that can be searched for with integrated measures of the matter and radiation content of the universe. Upcoming CMB surveys will greatly improve the precision with which we measure the light relic density, N_{eff} , making these surveys very sensitive probes of new light degrees of freedom. Candidates for light relics that will be constrained by upcoming CMB surveys include a thermal population of axions, light particles that mediate interactions in the dark sector, sterile neutrinos, and many more [82–135]. Additionally, the influence of light species that became non-relativistic after recombination (similarly to the neutrinos of the Standard Model) leads to a suppression of matter clustering on scales smaller than their free-streaming length [136–138]. This suppression of clustering can be seen through measurements of CMB lensing [139, 140], clustering and weak lensing of galaxies [141, 142], and the number density of galaxy clusters [143–145]. These measurements of the light relic density and of the clustering of matter made possible by CMB and large scale structure surveys serve as complementary probes of the physics responsible for unique signatures expected on ultra-small scales.

2.2 Observational enablers

With the direct observation of GWs, existing ground-based GW detectors, including Advanced Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (Advanced LIGO) [4], Advanced Virgo [5], and KAGRA [72], have opened a new era of GW astrophysics and astronomy. The use of GW detectors to probe the dark sector has already begun, while the next-generation detectors with significantly improved sensitivity, e.g., Einstein Telescope [146, 147] and Cosmic Explorer [9, 148, 149], as well as space-based GW detectors, e.g., LISA [75], TianQin [12], and DECIGO [13], will enable the detailed study of fundamental physics and potentially lead to the breakthroughs in constraining the properties and/or detecting beyond-Standard-Model particles and dark matter. The development and capabilities of the future GW detectors are detailed in Ref. [15].

The expected Galactic acceleration, i.e., the change in the line-of-sight velocity, ΔRV over a decade, experienced by stars at $\sim \text{kpc}$ distances from the Sun is $\sim 10 \text{ cm/s/decade}$ [24]. The current generation of spectrographs like ESPRESSO/NEID have nearly achieved this level of RV precision, but as they are on 8m (or smaller) telescopes, they cannot reach large distances in the Galaxy at the requisite precision. The ELTs are expected to enable acceleration measurements *across* the Galaxy with instruments of comparable precision [14]. Aside from their ability to reach larger distances, the ELTs should also provide a measurement of dark matter sub-structure from acceleration measurements across many different lines of sight.

Pulsar timing observations were recently analyzed by [23] to directly obtain an acceleration using the time-rate of change of the binary period for a set of fourteen pulsars that were timed sufficiently precisely such that the Galactic acceleration could be measured. These accelerations enabled a measurement of the total mid-plane density (also

known as the Oort limit), the local dark matter density, and the shape of the Galactic potential traced by the pulsars. Although these observations provided the first direct measurement of Galactic accelerations, they are limited to about $\sim \text{kpc}$ distances from the Sun. The acceleration of the solar system has also recently been measured from *Gaia* astrometry [150]. Future data releases from pulsar timing facilities, as well as future radio facilities like the Next Generation Very Large Array (ngVLA) and the Deep Synoptic Array (DSA-2000) are expected to increase the dynamic range yield measurements out to the Magellanic Clouds, as well as provide constraints on dark matter sub-structure down to the $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ scale [14].

Upcoming surveys of the CMB [29], including those with Simons Observatory [151], CMB-S4 [26, 152], PICO [153], and CMB-HD [27, 154] will provide exquisite measurements of CMB temperature and polarization anisotropies across a wide range of scales. These experiments will also provide maps of the integrated mass density through measurements of CMB lensing. These measurements, especially when combined with galaxy surveys including those from DESI [155], LSST [156], MegaMapper [157], and PUMA [158] will provide measurements of the energy content and large-scale structure growth at unprecedented precision, allowing for complementary constraints on physical effects that impact ultra-small scale structure.

The strength of this research program relies on its multiprobe nature and the synergies that the different facilities provide, from new GW detectors [15], to next generation telescopes, pulsar timing arrays [14] and CMB experiments [29].

3 Dark matter physics probed by ultra-small-scale structure

In this section we provide more details about specific dark matter scenarios for which ultra-small-scale structure will provide key data: dissipative dark matter, primordial black holes, and ultralight bosons.

3.1 Dissipative dark matter and dark black holes

While all observations are so far largely consistent with the cold dark matter (CDM) scenario of a single particle species weakly interacting with the standard model, there are observational hints from structure within galaxies for a more complex dark sector with interactions between dark matter particles. The lack of a definitive detection of dark matter in laboratory experiments constrains the possible ways dark matter may interact with the standard model. Together with the discovery of the Higgs but no other new particles at the Large Hadron Collider, these observations are spurring a shift in the theoretical landscape of possible physics beyond the standard model. New notions of naturalness, for example, suggest dark sectors that consist of relatively low mass particles decoupled or very weakly coupled to the standard model. This may be the start of a paradigm shift in dark matter studies away from a focus on an interaction between the dark matter and visible matter

as cosmologically most important and toward a focus on possible interactions within the dark sector itself.

The rich astrophysical structures observed electromagnetically form due to interactions that allow energy transfer between particles with very different masses and interactions. For example, the early stages of structure formation depend crucially on the dissipation of kinetic energy in a gas of hydrogen and electrons, for example via collisional excitation of the hydrogen atoms and molecules. The hydrogen then emits photons that can escape the gas entirely, allowing the gas to cool and condense enough for proto-stars to form. Dark matter with a particle spectrum more complex than that of a traditional CDM may similarly have dissipative interactions that become relevant only at some densities and temperatures so that the halo structure observed on large scales is maintained but structure can be clumpier on small scales [159]. A dramatically detectable example occurs if some dark matter gas can cool sufficiently for gravitational collapse to proceed. In the absence of nuclear physics, end state of collapse is a black hole. In a simple model, atomic dark matter [92], estimates have shown that if even 0.01% of dark matter has collapsed into black holes, this population is accessible with current and near-future detectors [160] and is likely to contain sub-solar mass objects. On the other end of the mass spectrum, similar scenarios may enable the formation of super-massive black holes [161–163]. Between these perhaps most detectable extremes, dissipative dark matter would likely impact the entire black hole mass spectrum. In addition, other possible novel compact objects, including neutron stars [135] or white dwarfs [164] made of dark matter. These objects would in general follow mass-radius or mass-compactness curves distinct from standard model objects and so would have distinct GW signatures.

On the sub-solar mass end, observations have the potential to illuminate dark matter microphysics in at least two straightforward ways. First, the smallest mass of any detected black holes provides a lower limit on the mass of fundamental particles in the dark sector via the Chandrasekhar bound. Second, the formation of black holes from dark matter requires that the dark gas can cool to a low enough temperature for gravitational collapse to win over pressure. The detected mass of any dark black holes therefore bounds the cooling function, and the bound state energy levels (atomic or molecular) that enable cooling. These ideas were explored in detail in [166]. Figure 2 shows the constraints on the fraction of dark matter in black holes as a function of the minimum mass of a potential dark black hole population, assuming none of the events detected Sept 12, 2015 - Oct 1, 2019 have a dark matter origin. Also shown are the most likely regions of parameter space if GW190425 alone (purple) or GW190425 and GW190814 (pink) are mergers involving dark black holes.

Figure 3 shows how the large-scale constraints on interacting dark matter can be used together with ultra-small scale constraints from compact objects to constrain dissipation in the dark sector. The mapping between the dark matter microphysics and the black hole spectrum used in [166] will likely be revised now that the molecular processes have been calculated [167] and numerical tools are being developed [168, 169] to study a cooling gas of dissipative dark matter in detail.

Dissipative dark matter provides a motivation to pursue GW data at high frequencies in order to constrain a potential population of sub-solar mass black holes. It is also a motivation to search existing data for binary mergers involving sub-solar mass compact




Figure 2: Constraint on the fraction of dark matter f in dark black holes against the minimum allowed mass of the dark black hole $M_{\min}$ for the dissipative dark matter model of [165] if (i) none of LVC’s binary black holes are dark black holes (*dashed*), (ii) all LVC detections are either from astrophysical or dark black hole binaries with equal probability (agnostic about origin) (*dotted*), (iii) GW190425 is a dark black hole binary detection (*blue*), and (iv) GW190425 and GW190814 are from dark black hole binaries (*pink*). Constraints for (iii) and (iv) are computed under an agnostic assumption about the origins of other LVC events. The Chandrasekhar limit for conventional black holes ($1.4 M_{\odot}$) is plotted for reference. The contours mark 90% confidence regions. Figure from in Ref. [166].

objects. This analysis has been carried out by the LIGO/VIRGO/KAGRA collaborations and by independent groups [44, 47–50, 170, 171]. Although GW wave observations may not distinguish a dark black hole from a primordial black hole (discussed next), other aspects of small-scale structure will differ significantly between dissipative dark matter and primordial black hole dark matter. Clearly, a suite of small-scale observations are required to uncover the nature of dark matter. Finally, further work on a wider variety of dissipative dark matter scenarios, and the spectrum of black holes, neutron stars [135], and white dwarfs [164] that can form from dark matter should inform analysis strategies for future GW observatories. See [172] for an additional discussion of GW signatures of dark sectors, and [173] for a broader discussion of how halo measurements can constrain dark matter.

3.2 Primordial black holes

Primordial black holes have long been considered as perfect Cold Dark Matter (CDM) candidates [174], although their present renaissance has come in hand with the detection of GWs by the LIGO-Virgo interferometers from the merging of massive black holes that




Figure 3: Cooling rate constraints from dark black hole detections combined with large scale structure collisions. Shaded regions correspond to the allowed parameter space in which (blue) small halos at $z = 5, 10$ where dark black holes form, (red) energy loss fraction $f_{\text{lost}} = 0.01, 0.1, 0.3$ (solid to dashed), for galaxy cluster collisions, and (brown) $f_{\text{lost}} = 0.5$ for dwarf galaxy collisions. We also include the cooling function (solid black line) for an example atomic dark matter model consistent with the interpretation that GW190425 is a binary dark black hole ($m_x = 14 \text{ GeV}, m_c = 325 \text{ keV}, \alpha_D = 0.01$). Figure from in Ref. [166].

could be primordial [175–177]. We still do not know whether there are indeed primordial black holes among the LVK events [178], and we may have to wait for a subsolar mass candidate, but even then we still could not tell if they comprise all of the dark matter [179].

What has become clear in the last few years is that the formation of primordial black holes in the early universe is rather generic [180]. We do not need unexpectedly large amplitudes of matter fluctuations but rather large non-Gaussian exponential tails, probably arising from the phenomenon of quantum diffusion during inflation, an effect overlooked until recently [181]. Moreover, even the known thermal history of the universe may play an important role by providing the required lack of pressure to allow gravitational collapse at certain well defined epochs in the evolution of the universe [182]. These are the Electroweak and QCD epochs at the time of e^+e^- annihilation, which generate a multimodal primordial black hole mass function with peaks at $10^{-5}, 1, 10^2, 10^6 M_\odot$. These black holes come with different fractional abundances depending on the underlying inflationary potential and this may be used as a window into the early universe and fundamental physics. For example, if an excess of $10^{-10} M_\odot$ is found in microlensing events, or in the induced Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background (SGWB) at LISA frequencies, we may infer the existence of new fundamental particles at scales above those reached by present particle physics accelerators, which become non-relativistic and momentarily decrease the radiation pressure at a time when the mass within the horizon is precisely that mass scale.

The possibility that primordial black holes may be lurking in the dark universe as building blocks of the Cold Dark Matter fluid is extremely attractive [183]. In fact, the non-

Gaussian exponential tails mentioned above may give rise to enhanced clustering, which leads, after recombination, to a population of primordial black hole clusters, with intermediate masses of order $10^6 M_\odot$, that could be searched for with the microlensing of quasars around clusters or the perturbations they induce on stellar tidal streams around our galaxy and Andromeda [184]. These clusters could explain where most of the mass in the halo of galaxies is, thus evading the microlensing limits coming from stars in LMC and the bulge [185], which had been used in the past to rule out primordial black holes as the main component of CDM [186]. Moreover, such dense objects may help explain many unexpected correlations in the radio and X-ray backgrounds at high redshift [187, 188], as well as the unusually high number of massive galaxies and quasars at high redshift, while the standard Λ CDM scenario could not account for them.

There is nowadays a great opportunity for testing all these ideas with new astrophysical and cosmological observations. For example, if primordial black holes existed before recombination, they should have left their imprint in an excess of injected energy in the plasma in the form of spectral distortions at high frequencies that a CMB experiment dedicated to it could detect [189]. One could further use the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) to look for the first stars and galaxies at redshifts bigger than ten or twenty, confirming the role of black holes in early star formation [190, 191].

Moreover, with the advent of the next generation of GW observatories, like the Cosmic Explorer [192] and the Einstein Telescope [193] on the ground, and LISA in space [194], we should be able to reach black hole fusions at high redshift (above 100), where no plausible stellar evolution could have generated such a population, and therefore convincingly prove their primordial nature. A further hint at their primordial origin which would link their formation with the cosmic history is the discovery of the induced SGWB from second order perturbations of large amplitude fluctuations entering at the same time of the primordial black hole formation [195], when the size of the horizon redshifted today gives LISA frequencies (mHz), or perhaps in the PTA range of nHz. Such a discovery would open a new window into the early universe, where we could explore the non-Gaussian character of the fluctuations giving rise to the primordial black hole mass spectrum, as well as the number of relativistic species present at that time [182], well beyond the present reach with particle accelerators.

For reference, it is worth pointing out the Snowmass paper on Primordial Black Holes, Ref. [196], which specifically focuses on these natural candidates for dark matter, describing the science cases (the origin of primordial black hole dark matter in the early Universe) and the existing observational constraints, expanding on the theoretical work and data analysis required to improve the constraints and/or enable a possible detection in the future.

3.3 Ultralight bosons and black hole superradiance

Ultralight boson particles, including scalar (spin 0), vector (spin 1), and tensor (spin 2) fields, have been predicted under several theoretical frameworks to solve problems in particle physics, high-energy theory and cosmology [57, 104, 197–202]. One well-motivated example is the quantum-chromodynamics (QCD) axion, a pseudo-Goldstone scalar boson

proposed to explain the strong charge-parity (CP) problem [197–199]. Other examples include a variety of axion-like particles with masses in a range spanning between 10^{-33} eV and 10^{-10} eV (e.g., string axiverse [57]) and ultralight vector particles (e.g., hidden photons arising from string theory [200]). These bosons could also be a significant component of dark matter [104, 201, 202].

These proposed new particles are difficult to detect by conventional particle physics experiments, due to their extremely small mass and weak interaction (if any) with Standard Model particles. For example, existing constraints on the existence of the QCD axion and its mass ($\lesssim 10^{-3}$ eV) obtained from conventional experiments are based on particular assumptions of its expected coupling to the Standard Model [203, 204]. However, as predicted by theory, a mass range of $\lesssim 10^{-10}$ eV is favored for the QCD axion [60]. For such conjectured bosons with ultralight mass and vanishing interaction with the Standard Model, gravitational coupling would be the only possible way to study them.

Around a rapidly spinning black hole, if there exists a fundamental ultralight boson field, it is expected to grow when the superradiance condition is satisfied [54–59]: $\omega_\mu/m < \Omega_{\text{BH}}$, where $\omega_\mu = \mu/\hbar$ is the characteristic angular frequency of a boson with rest energy μ , m is the boson azimuthal quantum number with respect to the rotation axis of the black hole, and Ω_{BH} is the angular speed of the black hole’s outer horizon. For a black hole with mass M , when the Compton wavelength of the particle is comparable to the characteristic length of the black hole, i.e., $\hbar c/\mu \sim GM/c^2$, the superradiant instability is maximized, and thus the occupation number of ultralight bosons grows exponentially, forming a macroscopic cloud comprising $\sim 10\%$ of the black hole mass. After forming, the bosons in the cloud can annihilate, which would generate continuous, quasimonochromatic GWs over a long lifetime, which can be observed by GW detectors [60–69].

In this paper, we focus on the GW searches for ultralight boson clouds. More discussions are detailed in Ref. [172] about other studies of superradiance, including the inference of the boson existence from the spin distribution of black holes with next-generation GW detectors, numerical and theoretical opportunities in superradiance, etc.

3.3.1 Astrophysical sources

Primary types of individual sources for ground-based detectors include: (1) remnant black holes from compact binary coalescences (CBCs) [205], (2) known black holes in X-ray binaries [62, 206, 207], and (3) isolated black holes in the Milky Way.

Nearby remnant black holes from detected CBC events are ideal targets [64, 65, 205]. The age of the newly born remnant black hole is perfectly known, and the black hole’s intrinsic parameters (mass and spin) can be inferred through the CBC parameter estimation. This enables accurate theoretical predictions of the GW signal waveform from the boson cloud around the remnant black hole. Moreover, the extrinsic parameters, e.g., the sky position and orientation of the source, can also be well measured for a sufficiently loud CBC event, allowing us to conduct a dedicated, efficient follow-up search for the conjectured cloud in the detector data. Detection prospects for CBC remnants using current-generation detectors are penalized by the typically large luminosity distances. However, future detectors promise to enable stringent boson constraints and/or possibly a detection over significantly increased luminosity distance.

Known black holes in X-ray binaries [206, 207] are much closer and hence potentially within the detectable range of existing detectors. Constraints on the boson mass have already been suggested from spin measurements of black holes in X-ray binaries, roughly disfavoring the mass range of $10^{-12} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-11}$ for axion-like scalars [63, 208, 209] and $10^{-13} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-11}$ for vectors [65, 208]. Direct probe through GW searches would allow for dedicated in-depth study of these systems. There are, however, some challenges associated with these sources that need to be taken into account: The age and history of these systems are largely uncertain; there might be impact from the systematics in the black hole spin measurements [210, 211]; the active astrophysical environments surrounding these black holes needs to be better understood [63, 65, 212]. In addition, the Doppler modulation due to the black hole motion within the binary needs to be accounted for, increasing the complexity of these searches.

Isolated black holes in the Milky Way are also extremely interesting [63, 64, 66, 67], due to their expected abundance and proximity to Earth, and as they could provide a cleaner signal compared to the X-ray black holes. The lack of electromagnetic counterparts, however, requires searching over a larger parameter space (with reduced sensitivity) since in general no prior information of the black hole position and parameters is available.

In addition to the above sources, with the launch of space-based GW detectors (e.g., LISA [75], TianQin [12]) in the next decade, the boson mass range of $10^{-19} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-15}$ will also become accessible to GW detectors through the same superradiance phenomenon, corresponding to boson clouds grown around massive black holes with masses in the range $\sim 10^3\text{--}10^8 M_\odot$ [67].

3.3.2 Gravitational-wave searches

Searches have already been carried out with existing ground-based GW detectors. The search for GW signals from boson clouds around spinning black holes is conceptually similar to the “standard” searches for continuous waves (CWs) from individual, asymmetric spinning neutron stars [213–215]. We can take advantage of the existing methods and framework developed for standard CW searches, and apply them to searching for signals from individual boson clouds.

A semi-coherent, computationally efficient method using a collection of fast Fourier transforms (FFTs) computed over various durations (from hundreds to thousands of seconds), has been designed and implemented for all-sky CW searches [216]. An estimate of the detection reach for vector boson condensates, derived from all-sky CW searches in the first Advanced LIGO observing run (O1) has been presented in [217]. The first constraints on the scalar boson mass (in a range $\sim 10^{-13}$ eV) have been derived in [218], using strain upper limits obtained from all-sky CW searches in the second observing run of Advanced LIGO (O2). The black hole population is considered for characterizing ensemble signals from galactic isolated black holes [219]. Ref. [76] modeled the signal waveforms for individual sources, and demonstrated the suitability of a specific search algorithm based on a hidden Markov model to efficiently search for signals from a known sky position [220–222]. A dedicated search for GWs from ultralight scalars in Cygnus X-1 was conducted using Advanced LIGO O2 data [223], with and without considering the nonlinear self-interaction of the bosons [57, 62, 63, 224, 225]. Direct constraints on the boson mass




Figure 4: (Fig. 12 in Ref. [76]) Maximum detectable luminosity distances (color) for optimal scalar clouds around black holes with initial mass M_i and spin χ_i for (a) Cosmic Explorer and (b) Einstein Telescope (one year of observation by a single detector). White contour lines indicate the values of the corresponding boson rest-energy μ/eV .

and decay constant have been obtained [223]. In the third observing run of Advanced LIGO and Virgo (O3), an all-sky search for tailored for scalar bosons has been carried out, yielding some of the most stringent upper limits on the existence of boson clouds around spinning black holes in the Milky Way [226].

Finally, in addition to individual sources, searches for a stochastic GW background from scalar and vector boson cloud signals have also been proposed and carried out [66, 227, 228].

3.3.3 Future prospects

The next-generation ground-based detector network, including Einstein Telescope [146, 147] and Cosmic Explorer [9, 148, 149], as well as space-based GW detectors will promise the capability of reaching a significantly increased luminosity distance and probing a large parameter space of the ultralight bosons. In particular, follow-up searches for CBC remnant black holes in the latest observing runs that are still limited by the detectable luminosity distance with existing detectors, will reach a detectable luminosity distance up to $\sim 10^4$ Mpc for scalars with mass $10^{-14} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-13}$ with the next-generation detectors (e.g., see Fig. 4) [76, 146, 147, 229–231]. In addition to remnant black holes from CBC events, individual pre-merger black holes in compact binary systems are also proposed to be interesting CW sources for ground-based detectors, when those inspirals become accessible to the LISA detector, allowing for the measurement of the source properties [232]. Finally, given that LISA will be sensitive to GWs with much lower frequencies than ground-based detectors, it will be able to probe the complementary mass range $10^{-19} \lesssim \mu/\text{eV} \lesssim 10^{-15}$ [66, 67].

On the other hand, progress has been made in theoretical studies of signals from vector

and tensor fields. The signal waveforms have been computed numerically from black hole perturbation theory [68], which largely facilitates the implementation of improved methods to look for vector bosons. Moreover, recent work presents the analytically computed GW emission from superradiant instability triggered by massive tensor fields and predicts the parameter space that can be probed through GW observations [69], setting up the theoretical basis for empirical studies of tensor fields around black holes using GW data. Signals from vector and tensor fields are expected to be stronger due to the intrinsically higher radiated power, which in principle could increase the distance to the detectable sources [65, 69, 233]. However, the detectability is penalized by a much shorter signal lifetime, also due to the higher radiated power. Nonetheless, theoretical advances continue to enable new studies of vector and tensor fields, and the detection chances are expected to be improved with next-generation detectors and with LISA.

4 Gravitational-wave interferometers as dark matter detectors

GW detectors could directly detect DM that interacts with various interferometer components. While the signal embedded in the detector noise would not arise from GWs, a detection would still offer new and interesting insights into the nature of ultralight DM, just as conventional direct DM detection experiments do.

4.1 Sources

Different types of DM would cause fundamentally different differential strains in current and future GW detectors. Scalar, dilaton DM would cause time-dependent oscillations of the values of fundamental constants, such as the electron mass [234–236]. Physically, the Bohr radius would change, causing time-varying changes in the size and index of refraction of the beam splitter [237]. Since the light from each cavity would traverse a slightly different path on the surface of the beam splitter, a differential strain would result whose magnitude is independent of the length of the arms, and what matters is the amount of quantum noise reduction; thus, the most sensitive detector is actually GEO600, since it employs squeezed light vacuum light that greatly reduce quantum noise compared to LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA. Additionally, axions could couple to the laser light and alter the phase velocities of left- and right-hand circularly polarized light [78]. In this case, the birefringence in the interferometer, i.e. optical path difference between p- and s-polarized lights, has to be measured using some additional optics [238].

Vector dark matter, such as dark photons arising from e.g. the misalignment mechanism [239] or cosmic string network decays [240], would interact with baryons in the input and end mirrors, causing oscillatory forces on them that can be formulated as arising from a “dark electric field”, analogously to the ordinary photon [241]. Since the dark matter field sees each of the mirrors in a different location with respect to its propagation direction, each one experiences a slightly different force, leading to different travel times for light down each arm and hence a differential strain [241]. Furthermore, an additional

contribution to the differential strain arises due to the finite amount of time light takes to traverse each arm, a “common-mode motion” effect [242]. Tensor dark matter [243], arising as a modification to gravity that could also play the role of DM [244], could also cause a differential strain analogously to GWs by stretching and squeezing the spacetime around the mirrors [245].

Primordial black hole dark matter also leave signatures in GW detectors through their coalescence or scattering. The signal from primordial black hole binaries is rather distinct. It could arise from distant sources ($z > 10$), correspond to black holes in the (upper) Pair Instability Super Novae mass gap, $60 < M < 120 M_{\odot}$, or the (lower) Neutron Star - Black Hole mass gap, $2 < M < 5 M_{\odot}$, but most importantly a black hole with less than one solar mass (Chandrasekhar limit) would signal its non-astrophysical origin. Moreover, primordial black holes are typically born without spin, while stellar black holes are known to have large spins. A prediction of clustered primordial black holes is that the spin distribution of black hole binaries should be peaked around negligible projected spin and misaligned with the orbital angular momentum [246].

4.2 Signals

Though the physical motivations behind DM interactions with GW detectors differ, all types of ultralight DM share some common traits. First, the ultralight mass, coupled with the known local DM energy density, imply a gargantuan number of DM particles in a given volume of space, whose wavefunctions overlap and can therefore be modelled as a superposition of plane waves [247]. Since the DM is cold, the velocities of each individual DM particle likely follow a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution, centered around the velocity at which DM orbits the center of the Milky Way, the so-called “virial velocity”, $\sim 10^{-3}c$ [248]. The DM velocities and ultralight masses imply finite coherence lengths and coherence times of the signal, the former ensuring correlated signals in earth-based detectors since the coherence length greatly exceeds the detector separation; the latter implying perfectly sinusoidal oscillations of the field fixed by the mass if observing for less than a coherence time, but deviations from monochrome since the observation time is much longer than the coherence time [249]. The detectors always exist within the DM field, ensuring interactions that last much longer than the signal coherence time and the need for techniques to handle stochastic changes in the signal frequency over the observation time.

If primordial black holes have a multimodal mass function, as in the thermal history scenario [182], and a significant fraction of them are associated with their production at the QCD scale, corresponding to primordial black hole masses of around a solar mass, then we should also see an important SGWB in present laser interferometers, but very likely in future ground- and space-based GW antennas [250].

4.3 Searches

Multiple searches for DM directly interacting with GW detectors have been performed over the last few years. The methods employed rely semi-coherent approaches, in which the data are broken into small time segments and analyzed with the phase information, and

then combined afterwards without the phase information.

In the search for scalar, dilaton DM with GEO600, an LPSD method was employed that varies the FFT length as a function of logarithmically-spaced frequencies, ensuring optimal sensitivity to each DM mass [251]. Such an optimization comes at the price of an increased computational cost, though this cost lies much below those of standard GW searches. Competitive upper limits were produced on three models for scalar DM that surpassed those from existing experiments, which can be seen in figure 5a.





Figure 5: (Fig. 2 in [251]). Constraints on scalar, dilaton dark matter coupling to GEO600, which alters the electron mass and change the size and index of refraction of the beam splitter.

For dark photon DM, one technique relies on cross-correlation [241], in which at least two data streams are analyzed together to look for a signal whose signal-to-noise ratio is negative. This search is very efficient, and produced the first-ever upper limits on dark photon DM coupling to baryons using data from the first observing run of LIGO [252]. Furthermore, a second method [249] looks for excess power in individual detectors, then further analyzes coincident frequency bins that contain a high-enough SNR. Here, the FFT length is judiciously varied such that the frequency-dependent modulation due to the individual velocities of dark photons is confined to one frequency bin, which allows optimal sensitivity to each possible dark photon mass. While not as sensitive as cross-correlation, both methods have produced extremely stringent upper limits on dark photons using data from the third observing run of LIGO/Virgo [253]. These results improved upon existing constraints on the squared coupling of dark photons to baryons by a few orders of



(a)

Figure 6: (Fig. 3 in [253]). Constraints on the coupling strength of dark photons to baryons in the LIGO mirrors using two methods: cross-correlation and excess power (BSD).

magnitude, and can be seen in figure 6a. Finally, constraints on extremely ultralight DM have been placed with pulsar timing arrays, in which a cross-correlation analysis had to account for both correlated and uncorrelated signals depending upon the coherence length of the dark photon [254].

4.4 Prospects

The future of this field is bright. As current detectors improve their sensitivities and take data for longer periods of time, the limits on the coupling of DM to standard model particles will only become more stringent, allowing for a possible detection of ultralight DM. Most DM models do not predict lower bounds for the coupling strength; therefore, it is necessary to continue to probe the existence of DM in a wide mass range. Furthermore, projections for searches for tensor bosons and axions have been forecast [238, 245], which allow for the possibility of deep constraints with current and future ground-based GW detectors. In the case of axions, minimal hardware adjustments to the detection ports would allow a birefringence measurement and would not affect GW detection [255]. Furthermore, sapphire mirrors could greatly improve the sensitivity of all GW detectors to vector dark matter that couples to baryon-lepton number [255], since this would enhance the number of charges in the mirrors relative to fused silica.

Looking further in to the future, space-based detectors, such as LISA, DECIGO and TianQin, will allow a different ultralight mass regime to be probed, $\sim 10^{-17} - 10^{-15} \text{ eV}/c^2$, which will require the adaption of techniques to handle space detector data, as well as to

work in a regime with potentially uncorrelated signals.

Also see Ref. [256], which is specifically focused on probing early-universe GW and fundamental physics. Here, different forms of particle and macroscopic DM are discussed in the context of what their detections would mean for early-universe physics.

5 Complementary and integrated probes of total matter content of the universe

5.1 Light relics

Models that predict ultra-small-scale structure that differs from what is expected with standard cold dark matter often contain new light degrees of freedom. One example is provided by axions, which may have a cold population acting as the dark matter as well as a hot component that contributes to the radiation density [115]. Another example is provided by dark matter that undergoes self-interactions mediated by some new light species in the dark sector. The density of light relics, as measured with primordial light element abundances, the CMB power spectrum, and large-scale structure, receives contributions from any particles that have the same gravitational influence as relativistic neutrinos, which is true of any (free-streaming) radiation [82]. See also the dedicated Snowmass 2021 White Paper [30] for a further discussion of the physics of light relics.

If these additional light species have any couplings to the Standard Model, they may have been in thermal equilibrium with the plasma filling the early universe. At early times, the density and temperature of the plasma were extremely high, much higher even than in the cores of stars or supernovae. Measurements of the light relic density thereby allow deep insights into the existence of new light species, even those that may have evaded detection in other searches. It is straightforward to predict the thermal relic density of any light species that decoupled from the plasma while relativistic. Under mild assumptions [257], the contribution to the effective number of neutrino species ΔN_{eff} of any light thermal relic is determined by two numbers, the temperature at which the relic decoupled from the Standard Model plasma, T_F , and its effective number of spin degrees of freedom, g_s , specifically $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4}{7} g_s \left(\frac{43/4}{g_*(T_F)} \right)^{4/3}$. The function $g_*(T_F)$ is the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom present in the thermal plasma at the temperature T_F (defined as the effective number of independent states including a factor of $7/8$ for fermions). The quantity $g_*(T_F)$ encodes the dilution of the thermal relic relative to photons due to the annihilation of heavy states after the relic decouples from the plasma. The next generation of CMB observations are expected to reach a precision of $\sigma(N_{\text{eff}}) = 0.03$ [152, 153, 258], which would extend our reach in T_F by several orders of magnitude, thereby allowing detection of or severe constraints on new light species with very weak couplings to the Standard Model.

Measurements of the light relic density provide useful insights into thermal history of the universe, even in models that do not include new light species. Since GWs contribute to the light relic density, models that result in a stochastic background of GWs [259–261] can be usefully constrained by measurements of N_{eff} , which acts as an integral constraint

on the stochastic GW background. Violent phase transitions and other nonlinear dynamics in the primordial universe can lead to a large amplitude of GWs, with a spectrum that may be peaked at frequencies much larger than those accessible to B -mode polarization measurements of the CMB and in some cases at frequencies above the range probed by LIGO and LISA [10, 262–265]. For particularly violent sources, the energy density in GWs can be large enough to make a measurable contribution to N_{eff} [265–267].

Light relic particles do not need to be massless. Light relics with non-zero mass can have observable signatures in the large-scale structure of the universe. A light (but massive) relic (LiMR) [138] that is non-relativistic today will contribute to the dark matter density of the universe, but it will differ from dark matter in its temperature [137]. An example of a LiMR in the Standard Model is provided by neutrinos. Other examples include axions, dark photons, and gravitinos.

The decoupling of these relics while relativistic gives these particles significant streaming motion, which sets a scale below which they cannot cluster, altering the large-scale structure of the universe. In particular, they produce a suppression in the matter power spectrum at scales smaller than their free-streaming scale, with the size of this suppression depending on the present abundance of the LiMR, allowing the relic’s temperature and mass to be measured independently (see [268] for details on a search on existing data).

5.2 Neutrino mass constraints

Over the past decade, we made significant progress in our understanding of the clustering of the matter field in the presence of massive neutrinos, reaching constraints tighter than any laboratory experiment. We expect this limits to improve with forthcoming experiments, reaching a detection of the absolute neutrino mass scale [269].

Cosmological probes of the clustering of matter and its suppression due to the presence of massive neutrinos [136] and other cosmological relics include gravitational lensing of the CMB [139, 140], clustering and weak lensing of galaxies [141, 142], and the number density of galaxy clusters [143–145]. Complementary measurements of cosmological clustering across various scales and redshifts will allow the suppression of clustering due to relics to be disentangled from nonlinear gravitational effects and baryonic feedback that otherwise acts as a source of theoretical uncertainty on the small scale power spectrum. Figure 7 shows how various observational probes of cosmological structure are sensitive to the matter power spectrum on different scales and redshifts. Ongoing and future efforts to measure the cosmological impact of neutrino mass and related effects will enhance the value of small scale structure measurements.

6 Conclusions

The advanced new facilities in the upcoming decade, including the next-generation ground-based and space-based GW detectors and telescopes, will enable high data-volume probes of the ultra small-scale structure of the universe for the first time. In this white paper, we laid out the science cases for probing dark matter across a range of observational length scales, from earth-scale to galaxy clusters, but with an emphasis on the new science




Figure 7: Contributions of the matter power spectrum $P(k, z)$ to various observational probes of clustering. Heights denote the signal-to-noise ratio anticipated for each observable: the CMB lensing power spectrum using the lensing reconstruction expected from CMB-S4 [26, 152, 258], the angular power of galaxy density using observations from the LSST gold sample [156], and number counts of clusters with mass greater than $10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ corresponding roughly to the detection threshold for the thermal Sunyaev-Zel’dovich effect anticipated with CMB-S4 [258]. The CMB lensing weighting is scaled up by a factor of 3 relative to the others in order to make the CMB lensing contributions more visible in the displayed region despite the very broad lensing redshift kernel. The values of wavenumber k and redshift z that contribute to a given angular scale ℓ in the Limber approximation are shown by the black dotted lines. The purple dashed line shows the free-streaming scale $k_{\text{fs}}(z)$ for standard neutrinos with $\sum m_{\nu} = 58 \text{ meV}$, with the region to the right of that line expected to experience suppression due to massive neutrinos. Nonlinear corrections to the matter power spectrum are expected to be non-negligible to the right of the red dash-dot line. Combined analysis of these probes of clustering should make it possible to disentangle effects that impact the growth of structure on small scales. Figure reproduced from [136].

uniquely probed by the smallest scales. In addition, we discussed the complementarity of future constraints set by measurements of the total matter and radiation content of the universe using next-generation surveys of CMB and the large-scale structure of the universe.

Coordination of the broad communities, including particle physicists, astronomers, instrumentalists, computer scientists, etc., is required in order to realize the scientific breakthrough using new facilities and data sets. This paper does not only aim to provide perspectives that may guide future decisions about the planning and design of new facilities and surveys on small-scale observations, but also urges the recognition, from the funding agencies and communities, of these new research areas that emerge as new facilities and

data become available. None of the novel small-scale probes for dark matter discussed here were included as main science goals when the new facilities were proposed and/or funded, but emerged as the theoretical and observational landscape for dark matter changed. Additional support and recognition, and flexibility in traditional funding streams, are needed to facilitate these cross-field emerging studies in order to achieve the prospects laid out in this paper.

The advances in probing beyond-Standard-Model particles and dark matter through small-scale observations discussed in this white paper will become possible with the data from future observing runs of the current-generation GW detector network and telescopes like the Vera Rubin Observatory and the Nancy Grace Roman Space Telescope, and will further rely on the next-generation facilities, including Cosmic Explorer, Einstein Telescope, LISA, the successor to Gaia, etc. The critical technology and research required for building these future facilities are more comprehensively discussed in Ref. [14, 15]. The strength of this research program relies on its multi-probe nature and the synergies that the different facilities provide, from new GW detectors, to next generation telescopes, pulsar timing arrays and CMB experiments.

In addition, advanced data analysis, signal processing, and computing techniques are crucial to extracting information from the large amount of data and combining multi-messenger channels. Theoretical and numerical studies, on the other hand, will facilitate the understanding of astrophysical models and the development of optimal analysis techniques.

Acknowledgments

R.B. acknowledges financial support provided by FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the Scientific Employment Stimulus – Individual Call – 2020.00470.CEECIND. CD is partially supported by US Department of Energy (DOE) grant DE–SC0020223. JGB acknowledges support from the research project PGC2018-094773-B-C32 [MICINN-FEDER], and the Spanish Research Agency (Agencia Estatal de Investigación) through the Grant IFT Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa No CEX2020-001007-S, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. JM is supported by the US Department of Energy under Grant DE–SC0010129. A.L.M. is a beneficiary of a FSR Incoming Post-doctoral Fellowship. L.S. acknowledges the support of the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Gravitational Wave Discovery (OzGrav), Project No. CE170100004. Support for S.S. was provided by the Charles E. Kaufman Foundation of the Pittsburgh Foundation. K. K. Y. N., a member of the LIGO Laboratory, acknowledges the support of the National Science Foundation through the NSF Grant No. PHY–1836814. LIGO was constructed by the California Institute of Technology and Massachusetts Institute of Technology with funding from the National Science Foundation and operates under Cooperative Agreement No. PHY–1764464. S.C. gratefully acknowledges support from NSF AAG grant 2009828.

References

- [1] B. P. Abbott et al. Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(6):061102, 2016.
- [2] T. Prusti et al. The Gaia Mission. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 595(Gaia Data Release 1):A1, 2016.
- [3] James S. Bullock and Michael Boylan-Kolchin. Small-Scale Challenges to the Λ CDM Paradigm. *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 55:343–387, 2017.
- [4] J. Aasi et al. Advanced LIGO. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 32:074001, 2015.
- [5] F. Acernese et al. Advanced Virgo: a second-generation interferometric gravitational wave detector. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 32(2):024001, 2015.
- [6] B. P. Abbott et al. Prospects for observing and localizing gravitational-wave transients with Advanced LIGO, Advanced Virgo and KAGRA. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 21(1):3, 2018.
- [7] Ž. Ivezić, S. M. Kahn, J. A. Tyson, B. Abel, E. Acosta, R. Allsman, D. Alonso, Y. Al-Sayyad, S. F. Anderson, J. Andrew, and et al. LSST: From Science Drivers to Reference Design and Anticipated Data Products. *ApJ*, 873:111, March 2019.
- [8] D. Spergel, N. Gehrels, C. Baltay, D. Bennett, J. Breckinridge, M. Donahue, A. Dressler, B.S. Gaudi, T. Greene, O. Guyon, C. Hirata, J. Kalirai, N.J. Kasdin, B. Macintosh, W. Moos, S. Perlmutter, M. Postman, B. Rauscher, J. Rhodes, Y. Wang, and D. Weinberg. Wide-Field Infrared Survey Telescope-Astrophysics Focused Telescope Assets WFIRST-AFTA 2015 Report. 2015.
- [9] Matthew Evans, Rana X Adhikari, Chaitanya Afle, Stefan W. Ballmer, Sylvia Biscoveanu, Ssohrab Borhanian, Duncan A. Brown, Yanbei Chen, Robert Eisenstein, Alexandra Gruson, Anuradha Gupta, Evan D. Hall, Rachael Huxford, Brittany Kamai, Rahul Kashyap, Jeff S. Kissel, Kevin Kuns, Philippe Landry, Amber Lenon, Geoffrey Lovelace, Lee McCuller, Ken K. Y. Ng, Alexander H. Nitz, Jocelyn Read, B. S. Sathyaprakash, David H. Shoemaker, Bram J. J. Slagmolen, Joshua R. Smith, Varun Srivastava, Ling Sun, Salvatore Vitale, and Rainer Weiss. A horizon study for cosmic explorer: Science, observatories, and community. 2021.
- [10] Michele Maggiore. Gravitational wave experiments and early universe cosmology. *Phys. Rept.*, 331:283–367, 2000.
- [11] eLISA Consortium, P. Amaro Seoane, et al. The Gravitational Universe. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1305.5720, May 2013.
- [12] Jianwei Mei et al. The TianQin project: Current progress on science and technology. *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics*, 2021(5), 08 2020. 05A107.

- [13] S Kawamura et al. The japanese space gravitational wave antenna - DECIGO. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 122:012006, jul 2008.
- [14] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Alex Drlica-Wagner, Ting S. Li, Neelima Sehgal, Joshua D. Simon, Simon Birrer, Duncan A. Brown, Rebecca Bernstein, Alberto D. Bolatto, Philip Chang, Kyle Dawson, Paul Demorest, Daniel Grin, David L. Kaplan, Joseph Lazio, Jennifer Marshall, Eric J. Murphy, Scott Ransom, Brant E. Robertson, Rajeev Singh, Anže Slosar, Tommaso Treu, Yu-Dai Tsai, and Benjamin F. Williams. Snowmass2021 cosmic frontier white paper: Observational facilities to study dark matter. 2022.
- [15] Stefan W. Ballmer, Rana Adhikari, Leonardo Badurina, Duncan A. Brown, Swapan Chattopadhyay, Matthew Evans, Peter Fritschel, Evan Hall, Jason M. Hogan, Karan Jani, Tim Kovachy, Kevin Kuns, Ariel Schwartzman, Daniel Sigg, Bram Slagmolen, Salvatore Vitale, and Christopher Wipf. Snowmass2021 cosmic frontier white paper: Future gravitational-wave detector facilities. 2022.
- [16] Todd A. Thompson, Christopher S. Kochanek, Krzysztof Z. Stanek, Carles Badenes, Richard S. Post, Tharindu Jayasinghe, David W. Latham, Allyson Bieryla, Gilbert A. Esquerdo, Perry Berlind, Michael L. Calkins, Jamie Tayar, Lennart Lindegren, Jennifer A. Johnson, Thomas W. S. Holoiën, Katie Auchettl, and Kevin Covey. A non-interacting low-mass black hole-giant star binary system. *Science*, 366(6465):637–640, November 2019.
- [17] T. Jayasinghe, K. Z. Stanek, Todd A. Thompson, C. S. Kochanek, D. M. Rowan, P. J. Vallely, K. G. Strassmeier, M. Weber, J. T. Hinkle, F. J. Hambsch, D. V. Martin, J. L. Prieto, T. Pessi, D. Huber, K. Auchettl, L. A. Lopez, I. Ilyin, C. Badenes, A. W. Howard, H. Isaacson, and S. J. Murphy. A unicorn in monoceros: the 3 $M_{\odot}$ dark companion to the bright, nearby red giant V723 Mon is a non-interacting, mass-gap black hole candidate. *MNRAS*, 504(2):2577–2602, June 2021.
- [18] T. Jayasinghe, Todd A. Thompson, C. S. Kochanek, K. Z. Stanek, D. M. Rowan, D. V. Martin, P. J. Vallely, J. T. Hinkle, D. Huber, H. Isaacson, J. Tayar, K. Auchettl, I. Ilyin, A. W. Howard, and C. Badenes. The “Giraffe”: Discovery of a 2 – 3 $M_{\odot}$ dark companion to a stripped red giant. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2201.11131, January 2022.
- [19] Łukasz Wyrzykowski and Ilya Mandel. Constraining the masses of microlensing black holes and the mass gap with Gaia DR2. *A&A*, 636:A20, April 2020.
- [20] Kailash C. Sahu et al. An Isolated Stellar-Mass Black Hole Detected Through Astrometric Microlensing. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2201.13296, January 2022.
- [21] Xinyu Dai and Eduardo Guerras. Probing Extragalactic Planets Using Quasar Microlensing. *ApJ*, 853(2):L27, February 2018.
- [22] Saloni Bhatiani, Xinyu Dai, and Eduardo Guerras. Confirmation of Planet-mass Objects in Extragalactic Systems. *ApJ*, 885(1):77, November 2019.

- [23] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Philip Chang, Michael T. Lam, Sarah J. Vigeland, and Alice C. Quillen. A Measurement of the Galactic Plane Mass Density from Binary Pulsar Accelerations. *ApJ*, 907(2):L26, February 2021.
- [24] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Jason Wright, Philip Chang, Alice Quillen, Peter Craig, Joey Territo, Elena D’Onghia, Kathryn V. Johnston, Robert J. De Rosa, Daniel Huber, Katherine L. Rhode, and Eric Nielsen. Toward a Direct Measure of the Galactic Acceleration. *ApJ*, 902(1):L28, October 2020.
- [25] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Alex Drlica-Wagner, Ting S. Li, Neelima Sehgal, Joshua D. Simon, Simon Birrer, Duncan A. Brown, Rebecca Bernstein, Alberto D. Bolatto, Philip Chang, Kyle Dawson, Paul Demorest, Daniel Grin, David L. Kaplan, Joseph Lazio, Jennifer Marshall, Eric J. Murphy, Scott Ransom, Brant E. Robertson, Rajeev Singh, Anže Slosar, Tommaso Treu, Yu-Dai Tsai, and Benjamin F. Williams. Snowmass2021 Cosmic Frontier White Paper: Observational Facilities to Study Dark Matter. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2203.06200, March 2022.
- [26] Kevork Abazajian et al. Snowmass 2021 CMB-S4 White Paper. In *2022 Snowmass Summer Study*, 3 2022.
- [27] Simone Aiola et al. Snowmass2021 CMB-HD White Paper. In *2022 Snowmass Summer Study*, 3 2022.
- [28] Emanuele Berti, Vitor Cardoso, Zoltán Haiman, Daniel E. Holz, Emil Mottola, Sudip Mukherjee, Bangalore Sathyaprakash, Xavier Siemens, and Nicolás Yunes. Snowmass2021 cosmic frontier white paper: Fundamental physics and beyond the standard model. 2022.
- [29] Clarence L. Chang et al. Snowmass2021 Cosmic Frontier: Cosmic Microwave Background Measurements White Paper. In *2022 Snowmass Summer Study*, 3 2022.
- [30] Cora Dvorkin, Joel Meyers, Peter Adshead, Mustafa Amin, Carlos A. Argüelles, Thejs Brinckmann, Emanuele Castorina, Timothy Cohen, Nathaniel Craig, David Curtin, Francis-Yan Cyr-Racine, Peizhi Du, Lloyd Knox, Bohua Li, Marilena Loverde, Kaloian Lozanov, Julian B. Muñoz, Katelin Schutz, Paul Shapiro, Benjamin Wallisch, Zachary J. Weiner, and Weishuang Linda Xu. The physics of light relics. 2022.
- [31] Robyn E. Sanderson, Johanna Hartke, and Amina Helmi. Modeling the Gravitational Potential of a Cosmological Dark Matter Halo with Stellar Streams. *ApJ*, 836(2):234, February 2017.
- [32] Andrew Lipnicky and Sukanya Chakrabarti. Is the vast polar structure of dwarf galaxies a serious problem for Λ cold dark matter? *MNRAS*, 468(2):1671–1682, June 2017.
- [33] Amina Helmi, Carine Babusiaux, Helmer H. Koppelman, Davide Massari, Jovan Veljanoski, and Anthony G. A. Brown. The merger that led to the formation of the Milky Way’s inner stellar halo and thick disk. *Nature*, 563(7729):85–88, October 2018.

- [34] Ana Bonaca, David W. Hogg, Adrian M. Price-Whelan, and Charlie Conroy. The Spur and the Gap in GD-1: Dynamical Evidence for a Dark Substructure in the Milky Way Halo. *ApJ*, 880(1):38, July 2019.
- [35] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Philip Chang, Adrian M. Price-Whelan, Justin Read, Leo Blitz, and Lars Hernquist. Antlia 2’s Role in Driving the Ripples in the Outer Gas Disk of the Galaxy. *ApJ*, 886(1):67, November 2019.
- [36] Axel Widmark, Khyati Malhan, Pablo F. de Salas, and Sofia Sivertsson. Measuring the matter density of the Galactic disc using stellar streams. *MNRAS*, 496(3):3112–3127, August 2020.
- [37] Joshua D. Simon. The Faintest Dwarf Galaxies. *ARA&A*, 57:375–415, August 2019.
- [38] Joseph Silk. Ultra-diffuse galaxies without dark matter. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 488(1):L24–L28, 2019.
- [39] Joohyun Lee, Eun-jin Shin, and Ji-hoon Kim. Dark Matter Deficient Galaxies and Their Member Star Clusters Form Simultaneously during High-velocity Galaxy Collisions in 1.25 pc Resolution Simulations. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 917(2):L15, 2021.
- [40] Abraham Loeb. Self-Interacting Dark Matter from Gravitational Scattering. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2203.11962, March 2022.
- [41] Sukanya Chakrabarti, Daniel J. Stevens, Jason Wright, Roman R. Rafikov, Philip Chang, Thomas Beatty, and Daniel Huber. Eclipse timing the Milky Way’s gravitational potential. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2112.08231, December 2021.
- [42] Hamish Silverwood and Richard Easter. Stellar accelerations and the galactic gravitational field. *PASA*, 36:e038, October 2019.
- [43] Paolo Salucci. The distribution of dark matter in galaxies. *The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 27(1):2, 2019.
- [44] Ryan Magee, Anne-Sylvie Deutsch, Phoebe McClincy, Chad Hanna, Christian Horst, Duncan Meacher, Cody Messick, Sarah Shandera, and Madeline Wade. Methods for the detection of gravitational waves from subsolar mass ultracompact binaries. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(10):103024, 2018.
- [45] B. P. Abbott et al. Search for Subsolar-Mass Ultracompact Binaries in Advanced LIGO’s First Observing Run. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 121(23):231103, 2018.
- [46] B. P. Abbott et al. Search for Subsolar Mass Ultracompact Binaries in Advanced LIGO’s Second Observing Run. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123(16):161102, 2019.
- [47] R. Abbott et al. Search for subsolar-mass binaries in the first half of Advanced LIGO and Virgo’s third observing run. 9 2021.

- [48] Alexander H. Nitz and Yi-Fan Wang. Search for gravitational waves from the coalescence of sub-solar mass binaries in the first half of Advanced LIGO and Virgo's third observing run. 6 2021.
- [49] Alexander H. Nitz and Yi-Fan Wang. Search for gravitational waves from the coalescence of sub-solar mass and eccentric compact binaries. 2 2021.
- [50] Alexander Harvey Nitz and Yi-Fan Wang. Search for Gravitational Waves from High-Mass-Ratio Compact-Binary Mergers of Stellar Mass and Subsolar Mass Black Holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126(2):021103, 2021.
- [51] Alexander H. Nitz and Yi-Fan Wang. Broad search for gravitational waves from subsolar-mass binaries through LIGO and Virgo's third observing run. 2 2022.
- [52] Gianfranco Bertone and M. P. Tait, Tim. A new era in the search for dark matter. *Nature*, 562(7725):51–56, 2018.
- [53] Gianfranco Bertone et al. Gravitational wave probes of dark matter: challenges and opportunities. *SciPost Phys. Core*, 3:007, 2020.
- [54] Roger Penrose. Gravitational Collapse: the Role of General Relativity. *Nuovo Cimento Rivista Serie*, 1, 1969.
- [55] William H. Press and Saul A. Teukolsky. Floating Orbits, Superradiant Scattering and the Black-hole Bomb. *Nature*, 238(5361):211–212, Jul 1972.
- [56] Jacob D. Bekenstein. Extraction of Energy and Charge from a Black Hole. *Phys. Rev. D*, 7(4):949–953, Feb 1973.
- [57] Asimina Arvanitaki, Savas Dimopoulos, Sergei Dubovsky, Nemanja Kaloper, and John March-Russell. String axiverse. *Physical Review D*, 81(12):123530, Jun 2010.
- [58] Richard Brito, Vitor Cardoso, and Paolo Pani. Black holes as particle detectors: evolution of superradiant instabilities. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32(13):134001, 2015.
- [59] Richard Brito, Vitor Cardoso, and Paolo Pani. *Superradiance*, volume 906 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.
- [60] Asimina Arvanitaki and Sergei Dubovsky. Exploring the string axiverse with precision black hole physics. *Physical Review D*, 83(4):044026, Feb 2011.
- [61] Hirotaka Yoshino and Hideo Kodama. Gravitational radiation from an axion cloud around a black hole: Superradiant phase. *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics*, 2014(4):43E02–0, Apr 2014.
- [62] Hirotaka Yoshino and Hideo Kodama. Probing the string axiverse by gravitational waves from Cygnus X-1. *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics*, 2015(6), Jul 2015.

- [63] Asimina Arvanitaki, Masha Baryakhtar, and Xinlu Huang. Discovering the QCD axion with black holes and gravitational waves. *Physical Review D*, 91(8):084011, Apr 2015.
- [64] Asimina Arvanitaki, Masha Baryakhtar, Savas Dimopoulos, Sergei Dubovsky, and Robert Lasenby. Black hole mergers and the QCD axion at Advanced LIGO. *Physical Review D*, 95(4):043001, Feb 2017.
- [65] Masha Baryakhtar, Robert Lasenby, and Mae Teo. Black hole superradiance signatures of ultralight vectors. *Phys. Rev. D*, 96(3):035019, Aug 2017.
- [66] Richard Brito, S. Ghosh, E. Barausse, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, I. Dvorkin, A. Klein, and P. Pani. Stochastic and Resolvable Gravitational Waves from Ultralight Bosons. *Physical Review Letters*, 119(13):131101, Sep 2017.
- [67] Richard Brito, S. Ghosh, E. Barausse, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, I. Dvorkin, A. Klein, and P. Pani. Gravitational wave searches for ultralight bosons with LIGO and LISA. *Physical Review D*, 96(6):064050, Sep 2017.
- [68] Nils Siemonsen and William E. East. Gravitational wave signatures of ultralight vector bosons from black hole superradiance. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101:024019, Jan 2020.
- [69] Richard Brito, Sara Grillo, and Paolo Pani. Black Hole Superradiant Instability from Ultralight Spin-2 Fields. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 124(21):211101, May 2020.
- [70] Hajime Fukuda and Kazunori Nakayama. Aspects of Nonlinear Effect on Black Hole Superradiance. *JHEP*, 01:128, 2020.
- [71] Masha Baryakhtar, Marios Galanis, Robert Lasenby, and Olivier Simon. Black hole superradiance of self-interacting scalar fields. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(9):095019, 2021.
- [72] Yoichi Aso, Yuta Michimura, Kentaro Somiya, Masaki Ando, Osamu Miyakawa, Takanori Sekiguchi, Daisuke Tatsumi, and Hiroaki Yamamoto. Interferometer design of the KAGRA gravitational wave detector. *Phys. Rev. D*, 88:043007, Aug 2013.
- [73] Einstein Telescope Science Team. Einstein gravitational wave Telescope conceptual design study. Technical Report ET-0106C-10, European Gravitational Observatory, 2011.
- [74] B P Abbott et al. Exploring the sensitivity of next generation gravitational wave detectors. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 34(4):044001, Jan 2017.
- [75] P. Amaro-Seoane et al. Laser Interferometer Space Antenna. *arXiv:1702.00786*, 2017.
- [76] Maximiliano Isi, Ling Sun, Richard Brito, and Andrew Melatos. Directed searches for gravitational waves from ultralight bosons. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99:084042, Apr 2019.

- [77] Suvodip Mukherjee, David N. Spergel, Rishi Khatri, and Benjamin D. Wandelt. A new probe of axion-like particles: CMB polarization distortions due to cluster magnetic fields. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2020(02):032–032, Feb 2020.
- [78] Koji Nagano et al. Axion dark matter search with gravitational wave detectors. *PRL*, 123(11):111301, 2019.
- [79] Asimina Arvanitaki, Savas Dimopoulos, Marios Galanis, Luis Lehner, Jedidiah O. Thompson, and Ken Van Tilburg. Large-misalignment mechanism for the formation of compact axion structures: Signatures from the QCD axion to fuzzy dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101(8):083014, 2020.
- [80] Philip Mocz, Mark Vogelsberger, Victor H. Robles, Jesús Zavala, Michael Boylan-Kolchin, Anastasia Fialkov, and Lars Hernquist. Galaxy formation with BECDM – I. Turbulence and relaxation of idealized haloes. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 471(4):4559–4570, 2017.
- [81] Julio F. Navarro, Carlos S. Frenk, and Simon D. M. White. A Universal density profile from hierarchical clustering. *Astrophys. J.*, 490:493–508, 1997.
- [82] Daniel Green et al. Messengers from the Early Universe: Cosmic Neutrinos and Other Light Relics. *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51(7):159, 2019.
- [83] Haim Goldberg and Lawrence J. Hall. A New Candidate for Dark Matter. *Phys. Lett. B*, 174:151, 1986.
- [84] R. Foot. Have mirror stars been observed? *Phys. Lett. B*, 452:83–86, 1999.
- [85] Robert Foot, A. Yu. Ignatiev, and R. R. Volkas. Physics of mirror photons. *Phys. Lett. B*, 503:355–361, 2001.
- [86] Kevork Abazajian, George M. Fuller, and Mitesh Patel. Sterile neutrino hot, warm, and cold dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 64:023501, 2001.
- [87] Alessandro Strumia and Francesco Vissani. Neutrino masses and mixings and... 6 2006.
- [88] Lotty Ackerman, Matthew R. Buckley, Sean M. Carroll, and Marc Kamionkowski. Dark Matter and Dark Radiation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 79:023519, 2009.
- [89] Maxim Yu. Khlopov and Chris Kouvaris. Composite dark matter from a model with composite Higgs boson. *Phys. Rev. D*, 78:065040, 2008.
- [90] Graham D. Kribs, Tuhin S. Roy, John Terning, and Kathryn M. Zurek. Quirky Composite Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 81:095001, 2010.
- [91] Daniele S. M. Alves, Siavosh R. Behbahani, Philip Schuster, and Jay G. Wacker. Composite Inelastic Dark Matter. *Phys. Lett. B*, 692:323–326, 2010.

- [92] David E. Kaplan, Gordan Z. Krnjaic, Keith R. Rehermann, and Christopher M. Wells. Atomic Dark Matter. *JCAP*, 05:021, 2010.
- [93] Alexey Boyarsky, Oleg Ruchayskiy, and Mikhail Shaposhnikov. The Role of sterile neutrinos in cosmology and astrophysics. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 59:191–214, 2009.
- [94] Asimina Arvanitaki, Savas Dimopoulos, Sergei Dubovsky, Nemanja Kaloper, and John March-Russell. String Axiverse. *Phys. Rev. D*, 81:123530, 2010.
- [95] Daniele Spier Moreira Alves, Siavosh R. Behbahani, Philip Schuster, and Jay G. Wacker. The Cosmology of Composite Inelastic Dark Matter. *JHEP*, 06:113, 2010.
- [96] Davide Cadamuro, Steen Hannestad, Georg Raffelt, and Javier Redondo. Cosmological bounds on sub-MeV mass axions. *JCAP*, 02:003, 2011.
- [97] David E. Kaplan, Gordan Z. Krnjaic, Keith R. Rehermann, and Christopher M. Wells. Dark Atoms: Asymmetry and Direct Detection. *JCAP*, 10:011, 2011.
- [98] James M. Cline, Zuowei Liu, and Wei Xue. Millicharged Atomic Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 85:101302, 2012.
- [99] K. N. Abazajian et al. Light Sterile Neutrinos: A White Paper. 4 2012.
- [100] Francis-Yan Cyr-Racine and Kris Sigurdson. Cosmology of atomic dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(10):103515, 2013.
- [101] Christopher Brust, David E. Kaplan, and Matthew T. Walters. New Light Species and the CMB. *JHEP*, 12:058, 2013.
- [102] Steven Weinberg. Goldstone Bosons as Fractional Cosmic Neutrinos. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110(24):241301, 2013.
- [103] Alberto Salvio, Alessandro Strumia, and Wei Xue. Thermal axion production. *JCAP*, 01:011, 2014.
- [104] Rouven Essig et al. Working Group Report: New Light Weakly Coupled Particles. In *Proceedings, 2013 Community Summer Study on the Future of U.S. Particle Physics: Snowmass on the Mississippi (CSS2013): Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 29-August 6, 2013*, 2013.
- [105] James M. Cline, Zuowei Liu, Guy Moore, and Wei Xue. Scattering properties of dark atoms and molecules. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89(4):043514, 2014.
- [106] JiJi Fan, Andrey Katz, Lisa Randall, and Matthew Reece. Double-Disk Dark Matter. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 2:139–156, 2013.
- [107] JiJi Fan, Andrey Katz, Lisa Randall, and Matthew Reece. Dark-Disk Universe. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110(21):211302, 2013.

- [108] JiJi Fan, Andrey Katz, and Jessie Shelton. Direct and indirect detection of dissipative dark matter. *JCAP*, 06:059, 2014.
- [109] Francis-Yan Cyr-Racine, Roland de Putter, Alvise Raccanelli, and Kris Sigurdson. Constraints on Large-Scale Dark Acoustic Oscillations from Cosmology. *Phys. Rev.*, D89(6):063517, 2014.
- [110] James M. Cline, Zuowei Liu, Guy D. Moore, and Wei Xue. Composite strongly interacting dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 90(1):015023, 2014.
- [111] Oleg Antipin, Michele Redi, Alessandro Strumia, and Elena Vigiani. Accidental Composite Dark Matter. *JHEP*, 07:039, 2015.
- [112] Masahiro Kawasaki, Masaki Yamada, and Tsutomu T. Yanagida. Observable dark radiation from a cosmologically safe QCD axion. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(12):125018, 2015.
- [113] Peter W. Graham, David E. Kaplan, and Surjeet Rajendran. Cosmological Relaxation of the Electroweak Scale. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115(22):221801, 2015.
- [114] David J. E. Marsh. Axion Cosmology. *Phys. Rept.*, 643:1–79, 2016.
- [115] Daniel Baumann, Daniel Green, and Benjamin Wallisch. New Target for Cosmic Axion Searches. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 117(17):171301, 2016.
- [116] Jim Alexander et al. Dark Sectors 2016 Workshop: Community Report. 8 2016.
- [117] Nima Arkani-Hamed, Timothy Cohen, Raffaele Tito D’Agnolo, Anson Hook, Hyung Do Kim, and David Pinner. Solving the Hierarchy Problem at Reheating with a Large Number of Degrees of Freedom. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 117(25):251801, 2016.
- [118] Zackaria Chacko, Nathaniel Craig, Patrick J. Fox, and Roni Harnik. Cosmology in Mirror Twin Higgs and Neutrino Masses. *JHEP*, 07:023, 2017.
- [119] Nathaniel Craig, Seth Koren, and Timothy Trott. Cosmological Signals of a Mirror Twin Higgs. *JHEP*, 05:038, 2017.
- [120] Graham D. Kribs and Ethan T. Neil. Review of strongly-coupled composite dark matter models and lattice simulations. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 31(22):1643004, 2016.
- [121] P. Ko, Natsumi Nagata, and Yong Tang. Hidden Charged Dark Matter and Chiral Dark Radiation. *Phys. Lett. B*, 773:513–520, 2017.
- [122] Elliott Rosenberg and JiJi Fan. Cooling in a Dissipative Dark Sector. *Phys. Rev.*, D96(12):123001, 2017.
- [123] Akshay Ghalsasi and Matthew McQuinn. Exploring the astrophysics of dark atoms. *Phys. Rev.*, D97(12):123018, 2018.

- [124] Zackaria Chacko, David Curtin, Michael Geller, and Yuhsin Tsai. Cosmological Signatures of a Mirror Twin Higgs. *JHEP*, 09:163, 2018.
- [125] Masahiro Ibe, Ayuki Kamada, Shin Kobayashi, and Wakutaka Nakano. Composite Asymmetric Dark Matter with a Dark Photon Portal. *JHEP*, 11:203, 2018.
- [126] Moira I. Gresham, Hou Keong Lou, and Kathryn M. Zurek. Astrophysical Signatures of Asymmetric Dark Matter Bound States. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(9):096001, 2018.
- [127] Rouven Essig, Samuel D. McDermott, Hai-Bo Yu, and Yi-Ming Zhong. Constraining Dissipative Dark Matter Self-Interactions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123(12):121102, 2019.
- [128] Gerardo Alvarez and Hai-Bo Yu. Astrophysical probes of inelastic dark matter with a light mediator. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101(4):043002, 2020.
- [129] David Curtin and Jack Setford. How To Discover Mirror Stars. *Phys. Lett. B*, 804:135391, 2020.
- [130] David Curtin and Jack Setford. Signatures of Mirror Stars. *JHEP*, 03:041, 2020.
- [131] Harrison Winch, Jack Setford, Jo Bovy, and David Curtin. Using LSST Microlensing to Constrain Dark Compact Objects in Spherical and Disk Configurations. 12 2020.
- [132] Francis-Yan Cyr-Racine, Fei Ge, and Lloyd Knox. A Symmetry of Cosmological Observables, and a High Hubble Constant as an Indicator of a Mirror World Dark Sector. 7 2021.
- [133] Nikita Blinov, Gordan Krnjaic, and Shirley Weishi Li. Towards a Realistic Model of Dark Atoms to Resolve the Hubble Tension. 8 2021.
- [134] James M. Cline. Dark atoms and composite dark matter. In *Les Houches summer school on Dark Matter*, 8 2021.
- [135] Maurício Hippert, Jack Setford, Hung Tan, David Curtin, Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler, and Nicolas Yunes. Mirror Neutron Stars. 3 2021.
- [136] Daniel Green and Joel Meyers. Cosmological Implications of a Neutrino Mass Detection. 11 2021.
- [137] Julian B. Muñoz and Cora Dvorkin. Efficient Computation of Galaxy Bias with Neutrinos and Other Relics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(4):043503, 2018.
- [138] Nicholas DePorzio, Weishuang Linda Xu, Julian B. Muñoz, and Cora Dvorkin. Finding eV-scale light relics with cosmological observables. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(2):023504, 2021.
- [139] Manoj Kaplinghat, Lloyd Knox, and Yong-Seon Song. Determining neutrino mass from the CMB alone. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91:241301, 2003.

- [140] Antony Lewis and Anthony Challinor. Weak gravitational lensing of the CMB. *Phys. Rept.*, 429:1–65, 2006.
- [141] Wayne Hu, Daniel J. Eisenstein, and Max Tegmark. Weighing neutrinos with galaxy surveys. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80:5255–5258, 1998.
- [142] Asantha R. Cooray. Weighing neutrinos: Weak lensing approach. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 348:31, 1999.
- [143] K. N. Abazajian et al. Cosmological and Astrophysical Neutrino Mass Measurements. *Astropart. Phys.*, 35:177–184, 2011.
- [144] Carmelita Carbone, Cosimo Fedeli, Lauro Moscardini, and Andrea Cimatti. Measuring the neutrino mass from future wide galaxy cluster catalogues. *JCAP*, 03:023, 2012.
- [145] Kiyotomo Ichiki and Masahiro Takada. The impact of massive neutrinos on the abundance of massive clusters. *Phys. Rev. D*, 85:063521, 2012.
- [146] M. Punturo et al. The Einstein Telescope: A third-generation gravitational wave observatory. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 27:194002, 2010.
- [147] S. Hild et al. Sensitivity Studies for Third-Generation Gravitational Wave Observatories. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 28:094013, 2011.
- [148] B P Abbott, R Abbott, T D Abbott, M R Abernathy, K Ackley, C Adams, P Addesso, R X Adhikari, V B Adya, C Affeldt, and et al. Exploring the sensitivity of next generation gravitational wave detectors. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 34(4):044001, Jan 2017.
- [149] David Reitze, Rana X Adhikari, Stefan Ballmer, Barry Barish, Lisa Barsotti, Gari-Lynn Billingsley, Duncan A. Brown, Yanbei Chen, Dennis Coyne, Robert Eisenstein, Matthew Evans, Peter Fritschel, Evan D. Hall, Albert Lazzarini, Geoffrey Lovelace, Jocelyn Read, B. S. Sathyaprakash, David Shoemaker, Joshua Smith, Calum Torrie, Salvatore Vitale, Rainer Weiss, Christopher Wipf, and Michael Zucker. Cosmic explorer: The u.s. contribution to gravitational-wave astronomy beyond ligo. 2019.
- [150] Gaia Collaboration, S. A. Klioner, et al. Gaia Early Data Release 3. Acceleration of the Solar System from Gaia astrometry. *A&A*, 649:A9, May 2021.
- [151] Peter Ade et al. The Simons Observatory: Science goals and forecasts. *JCAP*, 02:056, 2019.
- [152] Kevork Abazajian et al. CMB-S4 Science Case, Reference Design, and Project Plan. 7 2019.
- [153] Shaul Hanany et al. PICO: Probe of Inflation and Cosmic Origins. 3 2019.
- [154] Neelima Sehgal et al. CMB-HD: An Ultra-Deep, High-Resolution Millimeter-Wave Survey Over Half the Sky. 6 2019.

- [155] Amir Aghamousa et al. The DESI Experiment Part I: Science, Targeting, and Survey Design. 10 2016.
- [156] Paul A. Abell et al. LSST Science Book, Version 2.0. 12 2009.
- [157] David J. Schlegel et al. Astro2020 APC White Paper: The MegaMapper: a $z > 2$ Spectroscopic Instrument for the Study of Inflation and Dark Energy. 7 2019.
- [158] Anže Slosar et al. Packed Ultra-wideband Mapping Array (PUMA): A Radio Telescope for Cosmology and Transients. *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51:53, 2019.
- [159] Matthew R. Buckley and Anthony DiFranzo. Collapsed Dark Matter Structures. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 120(5):051102, 2018.
- [160] Sarah Shandera, Adrienne L. Erickcek, Pat Scott, and Jhon Yana Galarza. Number Counts and Non-Gaussianity. *Phys. Rev.*, D88(10):103506, 2013.
- [161] Guido D’Amico, Paolo Panci, Alessandro Lupi, Stefano Bovino, and Joseph Silk. Massive Black Holes from Dissipative Dark Matter. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 473(1):328–335, 2018.
- [162] M A Latif, A Lupi, D R G Schleicher, G D’Amico, P Panci, and S Bovino. Black hole formation in the context of dissipative dark matter. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 485(3):3352–3359, mar 2019.
- [163] Jae Hyeok Chang, Daniel Egana-Ugrinovic, Rouven Essig, and Chris Kouvaris. Structure Formation and Exotic Compact Objects in a Dissipative Dark Sector. *JCAP*, 03:036, 2019.
- [164] Michael Ryan and David Radice. Exotic Compact Objects: The Dark White Dwarf. 1 2022.
- [165] Sarah Shandera, Donghui Jeong, and Henry S. Grasshorn Gebhardt. Gravitational Waves from Binary Mergers of Subsolar Mass Dark Black Holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 120(24):241102, 2018.
- [166] Divya Singh, Michael Ryan, Ryan Magee, Towsifa Akhter, Sarah Shandera, Donghui Jeong, and Chad Hanna. Gravitational-wave limit on the Chandrasekhar mass of dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(4):044015, 2021.
- [167] Michael Ryan, James Gurian, Sarah Shandera, and Donghui Jeong. Molecular Chemistry for Dark Matter. 6 2021.
- [168] James Gurian, Donghui Jeong, Michael Ryan, and Sarah Shandera. Molecular Chemistry for Dark Matter II: Recombination, Molecule Formation, and Halo Mass Function in Atomic Dark Matter. 10 2021.
- [169] Michael Ryan, Sarah Shandera, James Gurian, and Donghui Jeong. Molecular Chemistry for Dark Matter III: DarkKROME. 10 2021.

- [170] B. P. Abbott, the LIGO, and Virgo Collaborations. Search for sub-solar mass ultra-compact binaries in Advanced LIGO’s first observing run. 2018.
- [171] B. P. Abbott et al. Search for sub-solar mass ultracompact binaries in Advanced LIGO’s second observing run. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123(16):161102, 2019.
- [172] Masha Baryakhtar, Regina Caputo, Djuna Croon, Kerstin Perez, Emanuele Berti, Joseph Bramante, Malte Buschmann, Richard Brito, Philippa S. Cole, Adam Coogan, William E. East, Joshua W. Foster, Marios Galanis, Maurizio Giannotti, Bradley J. Kavanagh, Ranjan Laha, Rebecca K. Leane, Benjamin V. Lehmann, Gustavo Marques-Tavares, Jamie McDonald, Ken K. Y. Ng, Nirmal Raj, Laura Sagunski, Jeremy Sakstein, Sarah Shandera, Nils Siemonsen, Olivier Simon, Kuver Sinha, Rajeev Singh, Chen Sun, Ling Sun, Volodymyr Takhistov, Yu-Dai Tsai, Edoardo Vitagliano, Salvatore Vitale, Huan Yang, and Jun Zhang. Dark matter in extreme astrophysical environments. 2022.
- [173] Keith Bechtol et al. Snowmass2021 Cosmic Frontier White Paper: Dark Matter Physics from Halo Measurements. In *2022 Snowmass Summer Study*, 3 2022.
- [174] Bernard J. Carr. The Primordial black hole mass spectrum. *Astrophys. J.*, 201:1–19, 1975.
- [175] Simeon Bird, Ilias Cholis, Julian B. Muñoz, Yacine Ali-Haïmoud, Marc Kamionkowski, Ely D. Kovetz, Alvise Raccanelli, and Adam G. Riess. Did LIGO detect dark matter? *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(20):201301, 2016.
- [176] Sebastien Clesse and Juan García-Bellido. The clustering of massive Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter: measuring their mass distribution with Advanced LIGO. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 15:142–147, 2017.
- [177] Misao Sasaki, Teruaki Suyama, Takahiro Tanaka, and Shuichiro Yokoyama. Primordial black hole scenario for the gravitational-wave event gw150914. *Physical review letters*, 117(6):061101, 2016.
- [178] Sebastien Clesse and Juan García-Bellido. GW190425, GW190521 and GW190814: Three candidate mergers of primordial black holes from the QCD epoch. arXiv:2007.06481, 2020.
- [179] Juan García-Bellido. Massive Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter and their detection with Gravitational Waves. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 840(1):012032, 2017.
- [180] Juan García-Bellido, Andrei D. Linde, and David Wands. Density perturbations and black hole formation in hybrid inflation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 54:6040–6058, 1996.
- [181] Jose María Ezquiaga, Juan García-Bellido, and Vincent Vennin. The exponential tail of inflationary fluctuations: consequences for primordial black holes. *JCAP*, 03:029, 2020.

- [182] Bernard Carr, Sebastien Clesse, Juan García-Bellido, and Florian Kühnel. Cosmic conundra explained by thermal history and primordial black holes. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 31:100755, 2021.
- [183] Sebastien Clesse and Juan García-Bellido. Seven Hints for Primordial Black Hole Dark Matter. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 22:137–146, 2018.
- [184] Francesco Montanari and Juan García-Bellido. Mass classification of dark matter perturbbers of stellar tidal streams. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 35:100978, 2022.
- [185] Josh Calcino, Juan García-Bellido, and Tamara M. Davis. Updating the MACHO fraction of the Milky Way dark halowith improved mass models. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 479(3):2889–2905, 2018.
- [186] Łukasz Wyrzykowski and Ilya Mandel. Constraining the masses of microlensing black holes and the mass gap with Gaia DR2. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 636:A20, 2020.
- [187] A. Kashlinsky. LIGO gravitational wave detection, primordial black holes and the near-IR cosmic infrared background anisotropies. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 823(2):L25, 2016.
- [188] A. Kashlinsky et al. Electromagnetic probes of primordial black holes as dark matter. *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51:51, 2019.
- [189] J. Chluba et al. Spectral Distortions of the CMB as a Probe of Inflation, Recombination, Structure Formation and Particle Physics: Astro2020 Science White Paper. *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, 51(3):184, 2019.
- [190] G. Hasinger. Illuminating the dark ages: Cosmic backgrounds from accretion onto primordial black hole dark matter. *JCAP*, 07:022, 2020.
- [191] Nico Cappelluti, Günther Hasinger, and Priyamvada Natarajan. Exploring the High-redshift PBH- Λ CDM Universe: Early Black Hole Seeding, the First Stars and Cosmic Radiation Backgrounds. *Astrophys. J.*, 926(2):205, 2022.
- [192] Matthew Evans et al. A Horizon Study for Cosmic Explorer: Science, Observatories, and Community. 9 2021.
- [193] Michele Maggiore et al. Science Case for the Einstein Telescope. *JCAP*, 03:050, 2020.
- [194] Enrico Barausse et al. Prospects for Fundamental Physics with LISA. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 52(8):81, 2020.
- [195] Juan García-Bellido, Marco Peloso, and Caner Unal. Gravitational Wave signatures of inflationary models from Primordial Black Hole Dark Matter. 2017.

- [196] Simeon Bird, Andrea Albert, Will Dawson, Yacine Ali-Haïmoud, Adam Coogan, Alex Drlica-Wagner, Qi Feng, Derek Inman, Keisuke Inomata, Ely Kovetz, Alexander Kusenko, Benjamin V. Lehmann, Julian B. Munoz, Rajeev Singh, Volodymyr Takhistov, and Yu-Dai Tsai. Snowmass2021 cosmic frontier white paper: primordial black hole dark matter. 2022.
- [197] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn. CP conservation in the presence of pseudoparticles. *Physical Review Letters*, 38:1440–1443, Jun 1977.
- [198] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn. Constraints imposed by CP conservation in the presence of pseudoparticles. *Physical Review D*, 16:1791–1797, Sep 1977.
- [199] Steven Weinberg. A new light boson? *Physical Review Letters*, 40:223–226, Jan 1978.
- [200] Mark Goodsell, Joerg Jaeckel, Javier Redondo, and Andreas Ringwald. Naturally Light Hidden Photons in LARGE Volume String Compactifications. *JHEP*, 11:027, 2009.
- [201] Joerg Jaeckel and Andreas Ringwald. The Low-Energy Frontier of Particle Physics. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 60:405–437, 2010.
- [202] Lam Hui, Jeremiah P. Ostriker, Scott Tremaine, and Edward Witten. Ultralight scalars as cosmological dark matter. *Phys. Rev.*, D95(4):043541, 2017.
- [203] Jihn E. Kim and Gianpaolo Carosi. Axions and the Strong CP Problem. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 82:557–602, 2010.
- [204] Georg G. Raffelt. Astrophysical Axion Bounds. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 741:51–71, Nov 2006.
- [205] B. P. Abbott et al. GWTC-1: A Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalog of Compact Binary Mergers Observed by LIGO and Virgo during the First and Second Observing Runs. *Phys. Rev. X*, 9:031040, Sep 2019.
- [206] Ronald A. Remillard and Jeffrey E. McClintock. X-ray Properties of Black-Hole Binaries. *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 44:49–92, 2006.
- [207] M. Middleton. Black Hole Spin: Theory and Observation. In C. Bambi, editor, *Astrophysics of Black Holes: From Fundamental Aspects to Latest Developments*, volume 440 of *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, page 99, 2016.
- [208] Vitor Cardoso, Óscar J.C. Dias, Gavin S. Hartnett, Matthew Middleton, Paolo Pani, and Jorge E. Santos. Constraining the mass of dark photons and axion-like particles through black-hole superradiance. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2018(03):043–043, Mar 2018.
- [209] Matthew J. Stott and David J. E. Marsh. Black hole spin constraints on the mass spectrum and number of axionlike fields. *Phys. Rev.*, D98(8):083006, 2018.

- [210] Christopher S. Reynolds. Measuring Black Hole Spin using X-ray Reflection Spectroscopy. *Space Sci. Rev.*, 183(1-4):277–294, 2014.
- [211] Jeffrey E. McClintock, Ramesh Narayan, and James F. Steiner. Black Hole Spin via Continuum Fitting and the Role of Spin in Powering Transient Jets. *Space Sci. Rev.*, 183:295–322, 2014.
- [212] Daniel Baumann, Horng Sheng Chia, and Rafael A. Porto. Probing ultralight bosons with binary black holes. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99:044001, Feb 2019.
- [213] K. Riles. Recent searches for continuous gravitational waves. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 32(39):1730035, Dec 2017.
- [214] Reinhard Prix. *Gravitational Waves from Spinning Neutron Stars*, pages 651–685. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [215] Magdalena Sieniawska and Michał Bejger. Continuous gravitational waves from neutron stars: Current status and prospects. *Universe*, 5(11):217, Oct 2019.
- [216] S. D’Antonio, C. Palomba, P. Astone, S. Frasca, G. Intini, I. La Rosa, P. Leaci, S. Mastrogiovanni, A. Miller, F. Muciaccia, O. J. Piccinni, and A. Singhal. Semicoherent analysis method to search for continuous gravitational waves emitted by ultralight boson clouds around spinning black holes. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98:103017, Nov 2018.
- [217] Vladimir Dergachev and Maria Alessandra Papa. Sensitivity Improvements in the Search for Periodic Gravitational Waves Using O1 LIGO Data. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123:101101, Sep 2019.
- [218] Cristiano Palomba et al. Direct constraints on ultra-light boson mass from searches for continuous gravitational waves. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123:171101, 2019.
- [219] Sylvia J. Zhu, Masha Baryakhtar, Maria Alessandra Papa, Daichi Tsuna, Norita Kawanaka, and Heinz-Bernd Eggenstein. Characterizing the continuous gravitational-wave signal from boson clouds around Galactic isolated black holes. *arXiv:2003.03359*, Mar 2020.
- [220] S. Suvorova, L. Sun, A. Melatos, W. Moran, and Robin J. Evans. Hidden Markov model tracking of continuous gravitational waves from a neutron star with wandering spin. *Physical Review D*, 93(12):123009, Jun 2016.
- [221] B. P. Abbott et al. Search for gravitational waves from Scorpius X-1 in the first Advanced LIGO observing run with a hidden Markov model. *Phys. Rev. D*, 95:122003, Jun 2017.
- [222] L. Sun, A. Melatos, S. Suvorova, W. Moran, and R. J. Evans. Hidden Markov model tracking of continuous gravitational waves from young supernova remnants. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97:043013, Feb 2018.

- [223] Ling Sun, Richard Brito, and Maximiliano Isi. Search for ultralight bosons in Cygnus X-1 with Advanced LIGO. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101:063020, Mar 2020.
- [224] Hirotaka Yoshino and Hideo Kodama. Bosenova Collapse of Axion Cloud around a Rotating Black Hole: . *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 128(1):153–190, Jul 2012.
- [225] Hirotaka Yoshino and Hideo Kodama. The bosenova and axiverse. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32(21):214001, 2015.
- [226] R. Abbott et al. All-sky search for gravitational wave emission from scalar boson clouds around spinning black holes in ligo o3 data. 2021.
- [227] Leo Tsukada, Thomas Callister, Andrew Matas, and Patrick Meyers. First search for a stochastic gravitational-wave background from ultralight bosons. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99:103015, May 2019.
- [228] Leo Tsukada, Richard Brito, William E. East, and Nils Siemonsen. Modeling and searching for a stochastic gravitational-wave background from ultralight vector bosons. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103:083005, Apr 2021.
- [229] Shrobona Ghosh, Emanuele Berti, Richard Brito, and Mauricio Richartz. Follow-up signals from superradiant instabilities of black hole merger remnants. *Phys. Rev.*, D99(10):104030, 2019.
- [230] B. Sathyaprakash et al. Scientific Objectives of Einstein Telescope. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 29:124013, 2012.
- [231] Benjamin P Abbott et al. Exploring the Sensitivity of Next Generation Gravitational Wave Detectors. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 34(4):044001, 2017.
- [232] Ken K. Y. Ng, Maximiliano Isi, Carl-Johan Haster, and Salvatore Vitale. Multiband gravitational-wave searches for ultralight bosons. *arXiv:2007.12793*, 2020.
- [233] Richard Brito and Paolo Pani. *Black-Hole Superradiance: Searching for Ultralight Bosons with Gravitational Waves*; In: Bambi C., Katsanevas S., Kokkotas K.D. (eds) *Handbook of Gravitational Wave Astronomy.*, pages 1–33. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2020.
- [234] Yevgeny Stadnik and Victor Flambaum. Searching for Dark Matter and Variation of Fundamental Constants with Laser and Maser Interferometry. *PRL*, 114:161301, 2015.
- [235] Yevgeny Stadnik and Victor Flambaum. Can Dark Matter Induce Cosmological Evolution of the Fundamental Constants of Nature? *Physical Review Letters*, 115:201301, 2015.
- [236] Yevgeny Stadnik and Victor Flambaum. Enhanced effects of variation of the fundamental constants in laser interferometers and application to dark-matter detection. *Physical Review A*, 93:063630, 2016.

- [237] Hartmut Grote and Yevgeny Stadnik. Novel signatures of dark matter in laser-interferometric gravitational-wave detectors. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):033187, 2019.
- [238] Koji Nagano et al. Axion dark matter search using arm cavity transmitted beams of gravitational wave detectors. *Physical Review D*, 104(6):062008, 2021.
- [239] Ann E Nelson and Jakub Scholtz. Dark light, dark matter, and the misalignment mechanism. *Physical Review D*, 84(10):103501, 2011.
- [240] Andrew J Long and Lian-Tao Wang. Dark photon dark matter from a network of cosmic strings. *Physical Review D*, 99(6):063529, 2019.
- [241] Aaron Pierce, Keith Riles, and Yue Zhao. Searching for Dark Photon Dark Matter with Gravitational Wave Detectors. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 121(6):061102, 2018.
- [242] Soichiro Morisaki et al. Improved sensitivity of interferometric gravitational-wave detectors to ultralight vector dark matter from the finite light-traveling time. *Physical Review D*, 103(5):L051702, 2021.
- [243] Luca Marzola, Martti Raidal, and Federico R. Urban. Oscillating Spin-2 Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(2):024010, 2018.
- [244] Katsuki Aoki and Kei-ichi Maeda. Condensate of Massive Graviton and Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(4):044002, 2018.
- [245] Juan Manuel Armaleo, Diana López Nacir, and Federico R. Urban. Searching for spin-2 ULDM with gravitational waves interferometers. *JCAP*, 04:053, 2021.
- [246] Juan García-Bellido, José Francisco Nuño Siles, and Ester Ruiz Morales. Bayesian analysis of the spin distribution of LIGO/Virgo black holes. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 31:100791, 2021.
- [247] Daniel Carney, Anson Hook, Zhen Liu, Jacob M. Taylor, and Yue Zhao. Ultra-light dark matter detection with mechanical quantum sensors. *New J. Phys.*, 23(2):023041, 2021.
- [248] Martin C Smith et al. The rave survey: constraining the local galactic escape speed. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 379(2):755–772, 2007.
- [249] Andrew L. Miller et al. Probing new light gauge bosons with gravitational-wave interferometers using an adapted semicoherent method. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(10):103002, 2021.
- [250] Matteo Braglia, Juan García-Bellido, and Sachiko Kuroyanagi. Testing Primordial Black Holes with multi-band observations of the stochastic gravitational wave background. *JCAP*, 12(12):012, 2021.
- [251] Sander M Vermeulen et al. Direct limits for scalar field dark matter from a gravitational-wave detector. *Nature*, 600(7889):424–428, 2021.

- [252] Huai-Ke Guo et al. Searching for dark photon dark matter in ligo o1 data. *Communications Physics*, 2(1):1–7, 2019.
- [253] R. Abbott et al. Constraints on dark photon dark matter using data from LIGO’s and Virgo’s third observing run. 5 2021.
- [254] Xiao Xue et al. High-precision search for dark photon dark matter with the Parkes Pulsar Timing Array. 12 2021.
- [255] Yuta Michimura, Tomohiro Fujita, Soichiro Morisaki, Hiromasa Nakatsuka, and Ippei Obata. Ultralight vector dark matter search with auxiliary length channels of gravitational wave detectors. *Physical Review D*, 102(10):102001, 2020.
- [256] Robert Caldwell, Yanou Cui, Huai-Ke Guo, Vuk Mandic, Alberto Mariotti, Jose Miguel No, Michael J. Ramsey-Musolf, Mairi Sakellariadou, Kuver Sinha, Lian-Tao Wang, Graham White, Yue Zhao, Haipeng An, Chiara Caprini, Sebastien Clesse, James Cline, Giulia Cusin, Ryusuke Jinno, Benoit Laurent, Noam Levi, Kunfeng Lyu, Mario Martinez, Andrew Miller, Diego Redigolo, Claudia Scarlata, Alexander Sevrin, Barmak Shams Es Haghi, Jing Shu, Xavier Siemens, Daniele A. Steer, Raman Sundrum, Carlos Tamarit, David J. Weir, Bartosz Fornal, Ke-Pan Xie, Fengwei Yang, and Siyi Zhou. Detection of early-universe gravitational wave signatures and fundamental physics.
- [257] Benjamin Wallisch. *Cosmological Probes of Light Relics*. PhD thesis, Cambridge U., 2018.
- [258] Kevork N. Abazajian et al. CMB-S4 Science Book, First Edition. 10 2016.
- [259] Latham A. Boyle and Alessandra Buonanno. Relating gravitational wave constraints from primordial nucleosynthesis, pulsar timing, laser interferometers, and the CMB: Implications for the early Universe. *Phys. Rev. D*, 78:043531, 2008.
- [260] Andrew Stewart and Robert Brandenberger. Observational Constraints on Theories with a Blue Spectrum of Tensor Modes. *JCAP*, 08:012, 2008.
- [261] P. Daniel Meerburg, Renée Hložek, Boryana Hadzhiyska, and Joel Meyers. Multiwavelength constraints on the inflationary consistency relation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(10):103505, 2015.
- [262] Richard Easther and Eugene A. Lim. Stochastic gravitational wave production after inflation. *JCAP*, 04:010, 2006.
- [263] Jean Francois Dufaux, Amanda Bergman, Gary N. Felder, Lev Kofman, and Jean-Philippe Uzan. Theory and Numerics of Gravitational Waves from Preheating after Inflation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 76:123517, 2007.
- [264] Mustafa A. Amin, Mark P. Hertzberg, David I. Kaiser, and Johanna Karouby. Non-perturbative Dynamics Of Reheating After Inflation: A Review. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D*, 24:1530003, 2014.

- [265] Chiara Caprini and Daniel G. Figueroa. Cosmological Backgrounds of Gravitational Waves. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 35(16):163001, 2018.
- [266] Peter Adshead, John T. Giblin, and Zachary J. Weiner. Gravitational waves from gauge preheating. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(4):043525, 2018.
- [267] Mustafa A. Amin, Jiji Fan, Kaloian D. Lozanov, and Matthew Reece. Cosmological dynamics of Higgs potential fine tuning. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(3):035008, 2019.
- [268] Weishuang Linda Xu, Julian B. Muñoz, and Cora Dvorkin. Cosmological Constraints on Light (but Massive) Relics. 7 2021.
- [269] Cora Dvorkin et al. Neutrino Mass from Cosmology: Probing Physics Beyond the Standard Model. 3 2019.