

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO JCAP

Dark Matter from Evaporating PBH dominated in the Early Universe

Pratik Chattopadhyay,^a Arnab Chaudhuri,^{b,1} and Maxim Yu Khlopov^c

^aSchool of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK

^bDiscipline of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Gandhinagar, Palaj, Gujarat 382355, India.

^cResearch Institute of Physics, Southern Federal University, 344090 Rostov on Don, Russia;

Virtual Institute of Astroparticle Physics, 75018, Paris, France;

Center for Cosmoparticle Physics Cosmion, National Research Nuclear University “MEPHI”, 115409 Moscow, Russia

E-mail: pratikpc@gmail.com and pmzpc@nottingham.ac.uk,
arnabchaudhuri.7@gmail.com and arnab.c@iitgn.ac.in, khlopov@apc.in2p3.fr

Abstract. Primordial Black Holes (PBH) could dominate in the early universe and, evaporating before Big bang Nucleosynthesis, can provide new freeze in mechanism of dark matter (DM) production. The proposed scenario is considered for two possible mechanisms of PBH formation and the corresponding continuous PBH mass spectra so that the effect of non-single PBH mass spectrum is taken into account in the results of PBH evaporation, by which PBH dominance in the early universe ends. We specify the conditions under which the proposed scenario can explain production of dark matter in very early Universe.

¹Corresponding author.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Primordial Black Holes and Mass Spectrum	3
2.1	PBH formation from the collapse of domain wall	4
2.1.1	Closed wall formation	5
2.2	Domain wall collapse and PBH formation	6
2.3	Parameterization of the extended mass spectrum	6
3	Extended Mass Spectrum-I	9
4	Extended Mass Spectrum-II	10
5	Dark Matter Formation	12
6	Conclusion	18

1 Introduction

Primordial black holes (PBH) are black holes which formed in the early universe due to accumulation of over-dense regions as a result of quantum fluctuations or strong nonhomogeneity of very early Universe, reflecting various aspects of physics beyond the Standard model of fundamental interactions (see e.g. [1] for review and references). There are various scenarios for the formation of PBHs and some of them are: collapse from inhomogeneities [2], collapse of cosmic strings [3], bubble collisions [4], from tiny bump in the inflaton potential [5] and collapse of domain walls [6].

Since PBHs are not formed as a result of stellar collapse, their masses can have a wide range, starting from the Planck mass to the mass of the observable universe enclosed by the Hubble horizon today. Some of the heavy PBHs of mass of the order of 10^{23}g can accrete matter and coalesce. This in turn gives constraints coming from X-ray observations and gravitational waves. The lightest PBHs which are in the mass range $M \sim 10^{17} - 10^{23}\text{g}$ are unconstrained and they can be the source of much of the fraction of dark matter (DM). Since these PBHs are very light, they can emit a variety of particles by Hawking radiation [7–10]. However, the detection of such radiation remain to be seen since the signal is very faint. Apart from the production of DM, the evaporation of PBHs can lead to the production of gravitational waves as shown in [11–16]. The smallest PBHs of mass of the order of $M < 10^9\text{g}$ should have contributed to particle DM abundance. Since PBHs generally have a mass of the order of the horizon mass at formation, one could expect that PBHs forming in a particular epoch have a monochromatic mass spectrum. But there can be scenarios in which the form of the primordial fluctuations as a function of scale could led to the formation of PBHs over a prolonged period of time and thus can have an extended mass spectrum.

The origin and properties of DM remains to be one of the important problems in cosmology. In spite of extensive search of DM through various experiments, e.g collider searches, indirect detection experiments and direct detection experiments, we have come short of receiving any good signal. Since the experiments conducted to this day has returned null results, it begs for the understanding of DM production mechanisms. One of the main candidates of DM production mechanisms is the evaporation of PBHs. A black holes loses mass by emitting all the particles that are lighter than its temperature [17–20]. In this course of emission by Hawking radiation, it is prescribed in many works, for example see [21] that the relics that remain after PBH evaporation could possibly explain the abundance of DM particles. It has been assumed in many reports that only a single DM particle species is obtained as a relic after PBH evaporation. However, in principle, it is possible that PBHs emit all kinds of particles and thus, multiple DM particle species with a broad mass spectrum could be obtained as a relic after PBH evaporation. This later condition has been extensively studied in [22]. In the paper [23], the effect of DM mass spectrum on the initial PBH density has been studied by taking four different mass spectra. The first one is a single mass DM, the second being a degenerate series of masses, the third being multiple DMs with masses in arithmetic progression and the last being multiple DMs with masses in geometric progression.

It has been also mentioned in the article [24] that provided DM particles has enough non-gravitational interactions, they may thermalize with the thermal bath or with a pre-existing population of thermal dark matter particles. It has also been mentioned that thermalization was only effective if the PBHs disappear before the freeze-out of dark matter and this will possibly erase the information that PBHs have contributed to the abundance of DM particles which we observe today. If the PBHs have evaporated after the freeze-out of DM particles, then this would contribute directly to the abundance of DM. However, some of the weakly interacting DM particles that come from PBHs and which cannot thermalize, contribute directly to the DM abundance today. If the case is such, then the relevant production mechanisms are outlined in the article [21]. These include a freeze-in or gravitational production of very heavy DM. Such a phenomenon must be reduced to produce the requisite amount of DM which we observe today. The searches for the DM particles would become harder if the freeze-in mechanism has occurred because then the weak interaction between the DM particles and the thermal bath would become far weaker.

In this article, we give some numerical results and estimates of the possible production of DM particles through PBH evaporation. It is assumed that the PBHs are produced by the Zel’dovich–Novikov (ZN) mechanism and the mass spectrum is narrow. Sometimes it is even taken as a delta function but in this work, we would consider the extended mass function where it is in the form of a power law. Such a law would match to a large extent with the log-normal mass distribution. Some of the works on PBH formation with extended mass spectrum is given in the article [25]. The log-normal

mass distribution became very popular in recent years and is introduced for the description of PBH, observed in the present times. Also, it needs to be mentioned that the chirp signals from the LIGO events agrees to a great extent with the log-normal distribution. It is also possible that there can be some other distribution laws which match with experimental results to a high degree of accuracy but we will specifically focus on one of the extended mass spectrum and would analyse the resultant DM particle ratio from it. The novelty of the extended mass spectrum which we use, see below, is that it is confined between some maximum and minimum values of the mass parameter.

We consider a spectrum of small PBH masses such that the black holes evaporated much before the Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN). Despite getting decayed a long time ago, their presence in the present day universe could be observable by the relics they left as a result of emission of various particles by Hawking radiation. In what follows, we will also see that besides DM particle relics, the PBH decays could also release a major amount of entropy which would diminish the baryon asymmetry of the universe. The decay of such PBH on the other hand could result in both the baryon asymmetry and DM relics but we will focus here on the later aspect and neglect the first kind of processes. Indeed, it can be shown that with a chosen range of values of the mass of PBH, a significant amount of DM particles may be released which have signatures in the present day observable universe.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present an extended mass spectrum for PBHs and describe their decay process. In section 3, we emphasize on the DM formation as a result of PBH evaporation, where we give the results for a particular set of mass range of the PBHs. In section 4, we interpret our results in terms of possible relics that the PBHs would have left in the present day universe.

2 Primordial Black Holes and Mass Spectrum

In this work we are interested in those PBHs which are rather short lived. These PBHs evaporated in the very early stage of universe expansion, well before the onset of (BBN). These short lived PBHs can have significant effect in the present universe. First of all, these decays can lead to a significant influx of entropy into the plasma which can dilute the magnitude of any preexisting asymmetry. Secondly, dark matter can be produced as a result of PBH evaporation. In this work we are interested in the production of dark matter. It is shown in this paper that with the proper choice of parameter, relics produced in the process of PBH evaporation would make significant contribution to the density of dark matter.

We consider the universe is initially in the radiation dominated (RD) stage when the cosmological matter is mostly made up of relativistic particles. During this epoch the energy density is given by:

$$\rho_{rel}^{(1)} = \frac{3m_{Pl}^2}{32\pi t^2}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here m_{pl} is the Planck mass. The cosmological scale factor varies with time in the following manner:

$$a_{rel}(t) = a_{in} \left(\frac{t}{t_{in}} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.2)$$

If the number density of the PBHs were sufficiently large and they were massive enough to survive up to the moment when they started to dominate in the universe, the energy density after a certain time t_1 is given by:

$$\rho_{nr} = \frac{m_{Pl}^2}{6\pi(t + t_1)^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here t_1 is established from the condition of equality of (2.1) and (2.3) at the moment of equilibrium t_{eq} . A nice review on the instant change of regime can be found in [26] It can be shown that $t_1 = t_{eq}/3$, while t_{eq} can be found from the equations: $a_{in}/a_{eq} = (t_{in}/t_{eq})^{1/2} = \rho_{BH}^{in}/\rho_{rel}^{in}$. After a certain time t_2 , the PBHs evaporate and producing relativistic matter and the expansion regime returned to the relativistic one when all or a significant part of PBH evaporated:

$$\rho_{rel}^{(2)} = \frac{3m_{Pl}^2}{32\pi(t + t_2)^2}. \quad (2.4)$$

Here t_2 is determined by the condition of the equality of ρ_{nr} (2.3) and $\rho_{rel}^{(2)}$ (2.4) at the moment of PBH decay $t = \tau_{BH}$.

2.1 PBH formation from the collapse of domain wall

It is well known by now that galactic centres contain supermassive black holes. However, what is still unclear is the mechanism with which galactic nuclei formed and their evolution. There are two possible explanations in the literature; one being the model of Stiavelli, where he considered the galaxy formation around a massive black hole and the other being Velleux's idea that formation of stars and galaxies proceeded together. Both of these models have some drawbacks. An alternative model which is given in [27] describes the early formation of galactic nuclei from PBH, which serve as the nucleation centres. However, in this paper, we will not discuss the nucleation process, but explain the formation of PBH as presented in this model. In particular, the PBH formation in this model occurs because of collapse of closed walls arising from the succession of second order phase transitions after the end of inflation.

Consider a potential which has two different vacuum. Therefore, we get two different distributions of these states, where the first one is that the universe contains equal numbers of these states and the alternative possibility being that the two vacuum states are formed with different possibilities. For the later one, the less probable vacuum state is surrounded by the sea of the more probable vacuum state. It is shown in [28] that such a distribution begs for the existence of valleys in the potential during the

inflationary period. It is then conceivable that the background fluctuations allow for the formation of islands, where one state is in the sea of another state and the phase transition occurs after the end of inflation in the FRW universe. The mass spectrum of black holes formed by this mechanism depends on parameters of the scalar field potential determining the direction and size of the potential valley during inflation and the post-inflationary phase transition.

2.1.1 Closed wall formation

Consider a Lagrangian for a complex scalar field

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}|\partial\phi|^2 - V(|\phi|), \quad (2.5)$$

The form of the potential is taken to be

$$\begin{aligned} V(|\phi|) &= \lambda(|\phi|^2 - f^2/2)^2 + \delta V(\alpha), \\ \delta V(\alpha) &= \Lambda^4(1 - \cos \alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where f and λ are the parameters in the above Lagrangian. The potential above has a saddle point at $v = \pi$. We assume here that the mass of the radial component r of the field to be large enough such that the magnitude of the field acquires the value somewhere in the circle valley $|\phi| = f/\sqrt{2}$ before the end of inflation. Note, the minimum of the potential is degenerate and thus the field has the form

$$\phi \sim f/\sqrt{2}e^{i\alpha(x)} \quad (2.7)$$

Let us now substitute the above value of the field in the Lagrangian. This gives us a form of the effective Lagrangian which is given

$$\mathcal{L}_v = \frac{1}{2}(\partial\chi)^2 - \Lambda^4(1 - \cos(\chi/f)) \quad (2.8)$$

where the dynamical variable $\chi = \alpha f$ which serves as a massless field in the above Lagrangian.

Here, we assume that the whole part of the Universe observed within the contemporary horizon was formed N_U e-folds before the end of inflation. The quantum fluctuations in the field during inflation transformed into classical perturbations. The corresponding values of the massless field χ in the neighbouring causally-disconnected space points differ on the average by $\delta\chi = H/2\pi$ after a single e-fold. In the next time step $\Delta t = H^{-1}$ (i.e., during the next e-fold) each causally-connected domain is divided onto e^3 causally-disconnected subdomains; the phase in each of the new domains differs by $\delta\alpha = H/2\pi f$ from that at the preceding step. We can therefore see that more and more domains appear in time where the phase from the initial value differs by a significant amount.

2.2 Domain wall collapse and PBH formation

The evolution of domain walls which were formed with the phase $\theta > \pi$ sharply increased in their volume, after the heating of the universe. These domain walls formed in the background of the Friedmann expansion is described by the relativistic equation of state. At a temperature, $T \sim \Lambda$ an equilibrium state is established with the phase $\theta = 2\pi$ inside the domain and $\theta = 0$ outside the domain. A closed wall is formed at $\theta = \pi$ which acts as a boundary, separating the two phases. The wall has a width of $\sim f/\Lambda^2$ and the surface energy density is f/Λ^2 . Let us mention that the process of establishing the equilibrium phase values lasts longer than expected. In the meantime, when the stage of coherent phase oscillations is sufficiently long, the energy density of these oscillations may become dominating and thus determine the dust period of the expansion. Now we consider the factors which influence the evolution of such a wall and thereafter the wall collapse along with PBH formation.

Let us mention that immediately after the end of inflation, the domain size exceeds the horizon size in the Friedman expansion stage. The contraction of the wall would begin only when the horizon size be equal to the domain size. However, until this moment of time, the domain size increases with the expanding universe. The field gives a small contribution to the total energy density of the universe upon heating in the case where the energy density of the inflaton field turns into the energy density of relativistic particles. After crossing the horizon, the internal stresses become dominant which tends to minimize the surface of the wall. Therefore it implies that the wall tends to acquire the minimal surface area, which is the shape of a sphere and then starts to contract towards the center. Let us consider the case of closed spherical walls. The energy of the plasma surrounding the wall decreases rapidly and the wall energy at a certain time becomes comparable to the surrounding plasma energy. Simultaneously, the radius of the domain R_w may become smaller than the horizon size R_h . The energy of the wall gets proportional to its own area at the moment when it crosses the horizon and this energy gets totally converted to the kinetic energy of the wall. A PBH is then formed when the wall is localized inside the gravitational radius. As the wall moves through the surrounding plasma due to the internal force, the friction may, under certain conditions, become significant and lead to a uniform contraction of the wall. Hence the potential energy of the wall is dissipated in the surrounding medium. Only when the wall would decrease to a certain small size R_f , the internal forces proportional to the surface curvature will dominate and the wall will again contract with acceleration to supply a necessary energy to the center which is sufficient to form a PBH.

2.3 Parameterization of the extended mass spectrum

As mentioned before the mass spectrum of PBHs produced by both ZN mechanism and domain wall collapse can be a very narrow one, almost comparable to the delta function. However in this work, we will consider an extended mass spectrum. The extended mass spectrum generally has the form:

$$\frac{dN_{BH}}{dM} = f(M, t), \quad (2.9)$$

where N_{BH} is the number density of PBH, M is the mass and t is the evolving time. As these PBHs behave like non-relativistic particles, their differential energy density as a function of mass is given by:

$$\frac{d\rho_{BH}}{dM} \equiv \sigma(M, t) = Mf(M, t). \quad (2.10)$$

We assume here that even though the PBHs are created in the conventional manner but they have a wider spectrum as can be found in the early works [29–32].

We consider the scenario where the the number and energy densities of PBHs are confined within M_{min} and M_{max} . The minimal value of the PBH mass M_{min} should be higher than the lower bound for which the assumption $\tau_{BH} \geq t_{eq}$ holds. The value of M_{max} is imposed by the condition that PBH evaporation would not distort the well known results of BBN-theory. We begin with the parameterization of the PBH mass by using a dimensionless parameter x such that

$$M = xM_0, \quad (2.11)$$

where M_0 is the mean value of the distribution. It is the value where $\sigma(M, t)$ and x takes a non-zero value in the limits:

$$x_{min} \equiv M_{min}/M_0 \leq x \leq x_{max} \equiv M_{max}/M_0. \quad (2.12)$$

We define the dimensionless "time" η as $\eta = t/\tau(M_0)$ where $\tau(M_0) \equiv \tau_0$ is the life time of PBH with mass M_0 . Since all the PBHs have different life-times, their masses and moment of creation are different as well. The differential energy evolves with time as:

$$\dot{\sigma}(M, t) = -[3H + \Gamma(M)]\sigma(M, t), \quad (2.13)$$

where $\Gamma(M) = 1/\tau(M)$. $\tau(M)$ is further defined as $\tau(M) = 3 * 10^3 N_{eff}^{-1} M_{BH}^3 m_{pl}^{-4} \equiv C \frac{M_{BH}^3}{m_{pl}^4}$. Here $C \sim 30$ and N_{eff} is the effective number of number of particle species with masses smaller than the black hole temperature. For more details, see [30]. Hence $\Gamma(M)$ takes the form:

$$\Gamma(M) = \frac{m_{Pl}^4}{(CM^3)}. \quad (2.14)$$

In the units of η , (2.13) can be written as:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\eta} \equiv \sigma' = - \left[3H\tau_0 + \left(\frac{M_0}{M} \right)^3 \right] \sigma. \quad (2.15)$$

The initial value of η is the moment of PBH formation, depends on M and has the form:

$$\eta_{form}(M) = \frac{m_{Pl}^2 M}{CM_0^3}. \quad (2.16)$$

Evidently $\sigma(M) = 0$ when $\eta(M) < \eta_{form}$.

The energy evolution of the relativistic matter can be written as:

$$\frac{d\rho_{rel}}{d\eta} \equiv \rho'_{rel} = -4H\tau_0\rho_{rel} + \int dM(M_0/M)^3\sigma(M). \quad (2.17)$$

The red-shift factor as a function of η normalised to the value of the scale factor at the moment of the least massive PBH formation:

$$z(\eta) = a(\eta)/a[\eta_{form}(M_{min})]. \quad (2.18)$$

The temporal evolution of z is governed by the Hubble parameter and can be written as:

$$\frac{dz}{d\eta} = H\tau_0 z \quad (2.19)$$

with the Hubble parameter following:

$$\frac{3H^2 m_{Pl}^2}{8\pi} = \rho_{rel} + \rho_{BH} = \rho_{rel} + \int dM\sigma(M), \quad (2.20)$$

Eqn. (2.15) follows the following solution:

$$\sigma(M, \eta) = \theta(\eta - \eta_f) \sigma(M, \eta_f) \exp \left[(\eta_f - \eta) \left(\frac{M_0}{M} \right)^3 \right] \left(\frac{z(\eta_f)}{z(\eta)} \right)^3, \quad (2.21)$$

where for simplicity we chose $\eta_f \equiv \eta_{form}(M)$. The theta function ensures that the function vanishes outside the bounds.

The initial value of the PBH energy density at the moment of creation depends on the factor $\epsilon(M)$ which is defined as:

$$\epsilon(M) = \frac{\rho_{PBH}^{in}}{\rho_{rel}^{in}}. \quad (2.22)$$

And hence the initial value of the PBH energy density takes the form:

$$\sigma(M, \eta_f(M)) = \epsilon(M) \rho_{rel}(\eta_f(M))/M, \quad (2.23)$$

where $\epsilon(M)$ depends upon the scenario of PBH formation. $\epsilon(M)$ disappears outside the bound of the PBH mass spectrum. We assume that within the interval $\eta_f(M_{min}) < \eta < \eta_f(M_{max})$, the total fraction of PBH mass density is negligibly small in comparison with the energy density of relativistic matter, and so the expansion regime is the non-disturbed relativistic one. The energy density of the relativistic particles when the first (lightest) PBH was created is:

$$\rho_{rel}(t_{in}) = \frac{3}{32\pi} \frac{m_{Pl}^6}{M_{min}^2}. \quad (2.24)$$

Let us consider the case when the energy density of PBH remains small as compared to that of relativistic matter, till the formation of the heaviest PBHs. In such a case, the last term on the r.h.s of (2.17) is neglected. Therefore, given the time interval $\eta(M_{min}) < \eta < \eta(M_{max})$, the energy density ρ_{rel} is equal to

$$\rho_{rel} = \frac{3}{32\pi} \frac{m_{Pl}^6}{M_{min}^2} \frac{1}{z(\eta)^4}. \quad (2.25)$$

And the differential energy density becomes:

$$\sigma(M, \eta) = \frac{3m_{Pl}^6}{32\pi M M_{min}^2} \frac{\epsilon(M)}{z(\eta_f(M))} \frac{\theta(\eta - \eta_f(M))}{z^3(\eta) \exp[(M_0/M)^3(\eta - \eta_f(M))]} \quad (2.26)$$

In this equation η runs in the limits $\eta(M_{min}) < \eta < \eta(M_{max})$ or $\eta_f(M) < \eta < \eta(M_{max})$, depending upon which lower limit is larger.

Since $(M_0/M)^3 \eta_f(M) = m_{Pl}^2/(CM^2) \ll 1$, for any η , we may expand the exponent as

$$\exp[-(M_0/M)^3(\eta - \eta_f(M))] = \exp[-(M_0/M)^3\eta] (1 + m_{Pl}^2/(CM^2)) \quad (2.27)$$

We need to integrate over the variable M . Thus the equations which govern the evolution are integro-differential equations and it is expected that if we perform numerical calculations, it will become too cumbersome to get any desired result. As an alternative, we can consider some simplified forms of the initial mass distribution of the PBH such that the integrals over the variable M can be evaluated analytically. After this is done, we can solve the differential equations rather quickly. Such toy models would render understanding of the essential features of entropy production by PBH with an extended mass spectrum. Unfortunately, we are unable to find a toy model for a realistic log-normal mass distribution, see [33]. However, it is seen that the spectra which allows for analytic integration is very close numerically to the log-normal distribution. Next, we consider a couple of illustrative examples, with the assumption that the function

$$F(x) = \epsilon(M)/z(\eta_f(M)) \quad (2.28)$$

is confined between $x_{min} = (M_{min}/M_0)$ and $x_{max} = (M_{max}/M_0)$. Here according to (2.23) $\epsilon(M)$ is the fraction of the energy density of PBH with mass M at the moment of PBH creation. For simplicity we assume that $F(x)$ is a polynomial function of integer powers of x , though the latter is not necessary.

3 Extended Mass Spectrum-I

Phase transitions at the inflationary stage can lead to spikes in the spectrum of density fluctuations, strongly increasing the probability of PBH formation in some mass interval [35, 36] (see e.g. [1] for review and references). To illustrate this possibility we take by hands an interesting form of the spectrum given by

$$F(x) = \frac{\epsilon_0}{N} a^2 b^2 (1/a - 1/x)^2 (1/x - 1/b)^{-5}. \quad (3.1)$$

where we take

$$a = 1, b = 50, \epsilon_0 = 10^{-12}, N = 32 \times 10^{-12}. \quad (3.2)$$

The maximum value of $F(x)$ is at $x_0 = 0.6$, with $F_{max} = 1$.




Figure 1. The extended mass spectrum as a result of PBH formation from ZN mechanism.

4 Extended Mass Spectrum-II

Let us now consider the second mass spectrum which arises due to PBH formation from the collapse of domain walls. We first give some estimates for the minimal and maximal mass of the PBHs using the parameters of the scalar field model. Let us recall that the width of the domain wall is inversely proportional to the mass of the scalar field ϕ

$$l \sim \frac{f}{\Lambda^2} \sim \frac{1}{m_\phi} \quad (4.1)$$

where m_ϕ is the mass of the scalar particle. The PBH formation occurs when the gravitational radius of the fluctuating field is larger than the width of the domain wall, i.e.,

$$\tau_g > l \quad (4.2)$$

The above estimate can be interpreted in terms of the mass of the PBH in the following way. The gravitational radius r_g is given as follows

$$r_g = \frac{2M}{m_{pl}^2} \quad (4.3)$$

Putting the above value in (4.2), we get the following inequality

$$\frac{2M}{m_{pl}^2} > \frac{f}{\Lambda^2} \quad (4.4)$$

This inequality in turn gives the estimate of the minimal mass of the PBH in terms of the parameters f and Λ . The minimal mass is given by

$$M_{min} = f \left(\frac{m_{pl}}{\Lambda} \right)^2 \quad (4.5)$$

To satisfy the BBN constraint, the minimal mass of the PBHs should be less than $10^9 g$. Thus, we need to choose the parameters judiciously such that

$$M_{min} = f \left(\frac{m_{pl}}{\Lambda} \right)^2 > 10^6 g. \quad (4.6)$$

The above condition gives us the estimate that some of the black holes should evaporate before the BBN. However, if we want to consider the case that all such PBHs evaporate, we should set a condition on the maximal mass of the PBHs. The maximal mass of the PBHs is estimated by the condition that the wall starts to dominate when it enters the horizon. We better avoid this dominance because of the following reason. Initially there are some pieces of the universe in which there are walls and matter/radiation. If walls start to dominate in the sense that the energy density of the walls is greater than that of the matter/radiation, it corresponds to superluminal expansion. The maximal mass obtained from this constraint is given by

$$M_{max} = M_{min} \left(\frac{m_{pl}}{f} \right)^2 \quad (4.7)$$

We consider the common scenario for both of these spectra where the entire spectrum of PBHs completely evaporate prior to BBN. This is given by the condition that

$$M_{max} = M_{min} \left(\frac{m_{pl}}{f} \right)^2 < 10^9 g \quad (4.8)$$

It is not necessary that the maximal mass of the PBHs follow the above condition. Indeed, we can have only a part of the whole spectrum to evaporate that could give rise to DM particles. However, there are many sensitive probes based on the estimation of light elements abundance which compels us to put an upper bound to the maximal mass of PBHs as is given above. To this end, let us give some quick estimates. In order to have a consistent inflationary regime, we take the parameter f and Λ to be

$$f = 10^{14} \text{GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda = 10^{10} \text{GeV}. \quad (4.9)$$

These values simply imply that it does not lead to over production of gravitino and other particles of that sort and confine ourselves only to stable SUSY relics which can be primarily dark matter particles. As can be seen below, the number density of the PBH can be pretty high and it depends on the peak and the character of the spectrum,

decreasing with the increase of PBH mass. In fact the approximate analytical form the spectrum can be expressed as:

$$F(x) = 1.19628 - 0.96x - 0.13x^2 + 0.18x^3 - 0.022x^4 - 0.13x^5 + 0.078x^6 \quad (4.10)$$

The spectrum in consideration here is shown in the following figure 2. Detailed about this spectrum can be found in [37].




Figure 2. The extended mass spectrum as a result of PBH formation from domain wall collapse.

5 Dark Matter Formation

Let us now estimate the density of stable SUSY relics produced in PBH evaporation and show their contribution to the cosmological dark matter is significant in some cases whereas insignificant in others. To this end, we present some simple estimates and correspondingly some numerical values. Note, we work only with the Extended Mass Spectrum-I here. At the end of the calculation, we present two tables, one for each spectrum which gives the ratio of the DM particle densities to that of relativistic particle densities.

Consider the Extended Mass Spectrum-I. We parameterize the mass of PBH using the dimensionless parameter x . Thus we have

$$x = \frac{M}{M_0} \quad (5.1)$$

where M is the PBH mass and M_0 is the peak value of the mass density distribution. At the peak value of $F(x)$, we have $x = 0.6$. Let us take $M_0 = 10^6 \text{g}$ as the first case. The moment of PBH production with mass M is:

$$\begin{aligned} t_{in} &= \frac{M}{m_{pl}^2} = \frac{M_6 \times 10^6}{(2.18 \times 10^{-5})^2} \\ &= 5.3 \times 10^{-33} M_6 \text{sec}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where $M_6 = M(g)/10^6(g)$

We assume that PBHs make a small fraction of the energy density of relativistic matter at the moment of production. Thus, the energy density and number density at $t = t_{in}$ are

$$\rho_{BH}^{(in)} = \frac{3\epsilon}{32\pi} \frac{m_{pl}^6}{M^2}, \quad n_{BH}^{(in)} = \frac{3\epsilon}{32\pi} \frac{m_{pl}^6}{M^3} \quad (5.3)$$

where $\epsilon \ll 1$. The energy density of relativistic matter at $t = t_{in}$ is

$$\rho_{rel}^{(in)} = \frac{3}{32\pi} \frac{m_{pl}^6}{M^2} = \frac{\pi^2 g_*^{(in)}}{30} T_{(in)}^4, \quad (5.4)$$

where $g_*^{(in)} \sim 100$ is the number of relativistic species at $T = T_{in} \sim 1.72 \times 10^{12}$ GeV/ $\sqrt{M_6}$. The ratio of PBH number density to that of relativistic particles at the moment of creation is estimated to be

$$r_{in} = \frac{n_{BH}^{(in)}}{n_{rel}^{(in)}} = \frac{\rho_{BH}^{(in)}}{\rho_{rel}^{(in)}} \frac{T_{in}}{0.3M} = 10^{12}\epsilon \times M_6^{-3/2} = 5.73\epsilon_{12} M_6^{-3/2} \quad (5.5)$$

The average distance between PBHs at the moment of their creation is

$$d_{in}^{BH} = (n_{BH}^{(in)})^{-1/3} = 11.62 \times 10^{-17} M_6 \epsilon_{12}^{-1/3} \text{cm}. \quad (5.6)$$

Here $\epsilon_{12} = 10^{12}\epsilon$. At the moment of equilibrium, the distance of BH separation was

$$d_{eq}^{BH} = d_{in}^{BH} / \epsilon_{12} = 11.62 \times 10^{-5} M_6 \epsilon^{-4/3} \quad (5.7)$$

The temperature of relativistic matter at equilibrium moment was

$$T_{eq} = \epsilon T_{in} S_{eq}^{1/3} = 3.67 \epsilon_{12} M_6^{-1/2} \text{GeV}, \quad (5.8)$$

where S_{eq} is the ratio of the number of particle species at $T = T_{in}$ to that at $T = T_{eq}$, which is ≈ 10 .

The universe expanded in a relativistic regime before equilibrium was attained and the scale factor in such a universe rose as $a(t) \sim t^{1/2}$. The equilibrium is reached at the moment of time

$$t_{eq} = t_{in} / \epsilon^2 = 5.3 \times 10^{-33} M_6 \epsilon^{-2} = 5.3 \times 10^{-9} \epsilon_{12}^{-2} M_6 \text{sec} \quad (5.9)$$

After this time, till the moment of decay,

$$\begin{aligned} t = \tau = 30 M_{BH}^3 / m_{pl}^4 &= 30 M_6^3 \times 10^{18} \times \frac{1}{(2.18)^4 \times 10^{20}} \times \frac{1}{8.53 \times 10^{47}} \text{sec} \\ &= 1.5 \times 10^{-10} M_6^3 \text{sec} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

the universe expanded in matter dominated regime with the scale factor going like $a(t) \sim t^{2/3}$. So during this stage, the scale factor rose as

$$z(\tau) = \left(\frac{\tau}{t_{eq}}\right)^{2/3} = 0.02(\epsilon_{12} \times M_6)^{4/3} \quad (5.11)$$

Correspondingly, the energy density of PBHs just before their moment of decay is larger than the energy density of the relativistic background and the amount is calculated by the redshift factor $z(\tau)$, which is

$$\frac{\rho_{BH}(\tau)}{\rho_{rel}(\tau)} = 0.02(\epsilon_{12} \times M_6)^{4/3}. \quad (5.12)$$

Now, the temperature of the relativistic background just before the black hole decay was

$$T_{cool} \equiv T_{rel}(\tau) = T_{eq}/z(\tau) = 183.5\epsilon_{12}^{-1/3}M_6^{-11/6}\text{MeV}. \quad (5.13)$$

The temperature of the particles produced during the BH decay is equal to

$$T_{BH} = \frac{m_{pl}^2}{8\pi M} = 0.48 \times 10^7 M_6^{-1} \text{GeV}. \quad (5.14)$$

Hence, the lightest SUSY particles of the minimal SUSY model with mass $m_X \sim 10^3$ GeV should be produced abundantly in process of PBH evaporation.

The average distance between PBH just before their decay was

$$d^{BH}(\tau) = d_{eq}^{BH} \cdot z(\tau) \approx 0.23 \times 10^{-5} M_6^{7/3} \text{cm} \quad (5.15)$$

The total number of energetic particles produced by the decay of a single PBH is given by

$$N_{hot} \approx \frac{M_{BH}}{3T_{BH}} = \frac{8\pi}{3} \left(\frac{M}{m_{pl}}\right)^2 = 1.8 \times 10^{22} M_6^2. \quad (5.16)$$

We assume the following model that the result of BH evaporation is a cloud of energetic particles with temperature as T_{BH} and with radius τ_{BH} given by

$$\tau_{BH} = 4.5 M_6^3 \text{cm}. \quad (5.17)$$

The number of PBHs in this common cloud is

$$N_{cloud} = (\tau_{BH}/d_{BH}(\tau))^3 = 7.593 \times 10^{18} M_6^2 \quad (5.18)$$

and their number density just before the decay was

$$n_{BH}(\tau) = d(\tau)^{-3} = 8.21 \times 10^{16} M_6^{-7} \text{cm}^{-3}. \quad (5.19)$$

The density of hot particles with temperature T_{BH} , created by evaporation of this set of black holes is

$$n_{hot} = n_{BH} \cdot N_{hot} = 14.78 \times 10^{38} M_6^{-5} \text{cm}^{-3}. \quad (5.20)$$

The density of cool background particles with temperature T_{cool} is

$$0.1g * T_{cool}^3 = 3.03 \times 10^{37} \epsilon_{12}^{-1} M_8^{-11/2} \text{cm}^{-3} \quad (5.21)$$

where we took $g_* = 10$ at $T < 100 \text{MeV}$.

The cooling proceeds through the Coulomb-like scattering and hence the momentum of hot particles decreases according to the equation

$$\dot{E}_{hot} = -\sigma v n_{cool} \delta E, \quad (5.22)$$

where δE is the momentum transfer from hot particles to the cold ones. For massless particles,

$$q^2 = (p_1 - p_2)^2 = -2(E_1 E_2 - p_1 \cdot p_2). \quad (5.23)$$

Finally we have

$$\dot{E} = 0.1g * T_{cool}^3 \alpha^2 / E_1 \approx 10^{-4} T_{cool}^2. \quad (5.24)$$

The loss of energy of hot particles of the order of their temperature would be achieved during very short time

$$t_{cool} \approx 10^{-10} \text{sec} \quad (5.25)$$

As a result of mixing and thermalization between the hot and cool components, the temperature of the resulting plasma would be

$$T_{fin} = T_{cool} (\rho_{hot} / \rho_{cool})^{1/4} \approx 69.007 M_6^{-3/2} \text{MeV}. \quad (5.26)$$

Then, the total number density of relativistic particles would be equal to

$$n_{rel} = 0.1g * T_{fin}^3 = 328608.99 M_6^{-9/2} (MeV)^3 = 0.04 \times 10^{39} M_6^{-9/2} \text{cm}^{-3} \quad (5.27)$$

According to (5.20), the number density of X -particles immediately after evaporation should be about $10^{39} M_6^{-5} \text{cm}^{-3}$. After fast thermalization, the ratio of number densities of X s to that of all relativistic particles becomes

$$n_X / n_{rel} = 35 \quad (5.28)$$

The evolution of the number density of X -particles is given by the following equation

$$\dot{n}_X + 3H n_X = -\sigma_X^{ann} v n_X^2 \quad (5.29)$$

The Hubble parameter which enters (5.29) is given by the expression

$$H = \left(\frac{8\pi^3 g_*}{90} \right)^{1/2} \frac{T^2}{m_{pl}} \approx \frac{0.4 T_{in}^2}{z^2 m_{pl}} \quad (5.30)$$

where $z = a_{in}/a$ is the ratio of the initial scale factor to the running one and for T_{in} , we take T_{fin} given by (5.26). Introducing $r = n_X z^3$ and the changing the time variable to z , we arrive at

$$\frac{dr}{dz} = - \frac{\sigma_{ann} v m_{pl}}{0.4 T_{in}^2} \frac{r^2}{z^2} \quad (5.31)$$

which can be solved and we get

$$n_X = \frac{n_{in}}{z^3(1 - 1/z)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{Q z^3}, \quad (5.32)$$

where $Q = (\sigma v m_{pl}) / (0.4 T_{in}^2)$.

According to observational data, we have

$$\Omega_{DM} = 0.26 \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{CMB} = 5.5 \times 10^{-5} \quad (5.33)$$

or we can say in terms of energy density that $(\rho_X / \rho_\gamma)_{obs} \approx 5 \times 10^3$. We now have

$$\sigma_{ann} v m_{pl} \sim 3 \times 10^{11} \text{GeV}^{-1} \quad (5.34)$$

and

$$n_X \approx 10^{-12} z^{-3} T_{in}^2 \text{GeV} \quad (5.35)$$

Now, the red-shift factor z depends on both M_6 and the initial energy density (ϵ). Thus, an appropriate choice of both these parameters would yield a significant amount of dark matter relic. Indeed, if we choose $\epsilon = 10^{-14}$, the resultant number density of X (DM particles) is given by

$$n_X \approx 1.1 \times 10^3 \text{GeV} \quad (5.36)$$

In the following tables we have shown the variation of the ratio of the dark matter particles to the relativistic particles for different values of the ratio of the mass of PBH to that of the mean mass of the spectrum. For brevity, the notation is kept same as M_6 . The parameter space for the Extended mass spectrum-II is kept same as that of the first one in order to lay out the comparison more clearly.

Extended mass spectrum-I		
M_6	$n_{BH}(\text{cm}^{-3})$	n_X/n_{rel}
0.1	8.21×10^{23}	0.035
1	8.21×10^{16}	0.1106
10	8.21×10^9	0.35
100	8.21×10^2	1.1068

Extended mass spectrum-II		
M_6	$n_{BH}(\text{cm}^{-3})$	n_X/n_{rel}
0.1	8.21×10^{23}	0.035
1	8.21×10^{16}	0.1106
10	8.21×10^9	0.35
100	8.21×10^2	1.1068

As can be seen from the two tables the ratio of the relic abundance to that of the relativistic particles is exactly the same for both spectra with the condition that their parameter space is the same.




Figure 3. The variation of the ratio of the relic to that of the relativistic particles produced as a result of PBH evaporation is shown. The left panel corresponds to that of Extended Mass Spectrum-I and the right panel to that of Extended Mass Spectrum-II.

As can be seen from the above figure (3) the two panels are identical and hence showing the production of relics due to PBH evaporation is not dependent on the mechanism of the production of PBHs. It is also clear that the the ratio of the mean mass of the black hole to the peak value of the black hole is inversely proportional to the relic abundance. Lesser the ratio, greater is the relic abundance.




Figure 4. The production of dark matter particles as a result of PBH evaporation is shown. The left panel corresponds to that of Extended Mass Spectrum-I and the right panel to that of Extended Mass Spectrum-II.

It is clear from the above figure (4) the relic abundance depends on the energy density of the primordial black holes. The dependence is given by the following relation:

$$n_X \sim \frac{1}{\epsilon_{12}^4} \quad (5.37)$$

Thus, lesser the initial energy density of the primordial black holes, more is the relic abundance. Since the ratio of the DM particles to that of relativistic matter is again proportional to the inverse fourth power of the initial energy density, we can get a significant ratio (> 1) by adjusting the value of the initial energy density appropriately.

6 Conclusion

Production of primordial black holes can lead to a specific form of their mass spectrum, reflecting physical mechanism of their creation. Such mechanisms relate the mass interval and specific features of the PBH spectrum to the BSM physics at very high energy scales.

In the recent work [38], it is shown how the evaporation of a singular PBH, which can be approximated as a delta function mass spectrum, can lead to the instant change of regime and contribute to the dark matter density of the universe. It was shown how the energy density of the PBH affected the density of the dark matter. On the same note, it is established in this work that the initial energy density of the PBHs at the very early stage of the universe expansion plays a significant role in the production of dark matter (relic abundance) as a result of PBH evaporation. This idea has been tested for the cases when PBHs were formed by the ZN mechanism accomplished by strongly increased probability of their formation in some interval of small PBH mass and also for the case when they were formed by the collapse of domain wall. In both the cases, the resulting number density of the dark matter particles is significant. We conclude with the claim that the dark matter production process due of the evaporation of PBHs does not depend of the mechanism of PBH formation for the same peak mass in their mass distribution. However, the PBH mass spectrum may be flat as it is the case for PBH formation at the post-inflationary matter dominant stage of massive scalar field [39]. There is no evident peak mass value in such case and the proper analysis of evolution of PBH dominant stage and DM production in PBH evaporation need special study, which we plan in our future work.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to Kousik Loho and Baradhwaj Coleppa for useful discussions. Further, the authors express their gratitude to A.S. Sakharov, J. Turner and her group and Vincent Vennin for pointing towards some recent and interesting work on the production of relic particles and gravitational waves as a result of PBH evaporation. The work of A.C. is supported by the project RES/SERB/PH/P0202/2021/0039. The research by M.K. is financially supported by Southern Federal University, 2020 Project VnGr/2020-03-IF. The work of P.C. is supported by the EPSRC fellowship.

References

- [1] M.Y. Khlopov, Primordial black holes. *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **10** (2010) , 495–528, doi:10.1088/1674-4527/10/6/001.
- [2] T. Kokubu, K. Kyutoku, K. Kohri and T. Harada, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) no.12, 123024 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.123024 [arXiv:1810.03490 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [3] A. C. Jenkins and M. Sakellariadou, Primordial black holes from cusp collapse on cosmic strings, [arXiv:2006.16249 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [4] T. H. Jung and T. Okui, Primordial black holes from bubble collisions during a first-order phase transition, [arXiv:2110.04271 [hep-ph]].
- [5] S. S. Mishra and V. Sahni, Primordial Black Holes from a tiny bump/dip in the Inflaton potential, *JCAP* **04** (2020), 007 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/04/007 [arXiv:1911.00057 [gr-qc]].
- [6] J. Liu, Z. K. Guo and R. G. Cai, Primordial Black Holes from Cosmic Domain Walls, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.2, 023513 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.023513 [arXiv:1908.02662 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] A. Cheek, L. Heurtier, Y. F. Perez-Gonzalez and J. Turner, Redshift Effects in Particle Production from Kerr Primordial Black Holes, [arXiv:2207.09462 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [8] A. Cheek, L. Heurtier, Y. F. Perez-Gonzalez and J. Turner, Primordial black hole evaporation and dark matter production. I. Solely Hawking radiation, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.1, 015022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.015022 [arXiv:2107.00013 [hep-ph]].
- [9] A. Cheek, L. Heurtier, Y. F. Perez-Gonzalez and J. Turner, Primordial black hole evaporation and dark matter production. II. Interplay with the freeze-in or freeze-out mechanism, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.1, 015023 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.015023 [arXiv:2107.00016 [hep-ph]].
- [10] A. S. Sakharov, Y. N. Eroshenko and S. G. Rubin, Looking at the NANOGrav signal through the anthropic window of axionlike particles, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.4, 043005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.043005 [arXiv:2104.08750 [hep-ph]].
- [11] G. Domènech, C. Lin and M. Sasaki, Gravitational wave constraints on the primordial black hole dominated early universe, *JCAP* **04** (2021), 062 [erratum: *JCAP* **11** (2021), E01] doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/11/E01 [arXiv:2012.08151 [gr-qc]].
- [12] G. Domènech, V. Takhistov and M. Sasaki, Exploring evaporating primordial black holes with gravitational waves, *Phys. Lett. B* **823** (2021), 136722 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136722 [arXiv:2105.06816 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [13] T. Papanikolaou, Gravitational waves induced from primordial black hole fluctuations: The effect of an extended mass function, [arXiv:2207.11041 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [14] T. Papanikolaou, V. Vennin and D. Langlois, Gravitational waves from a universe filled with primordial black holes, *JCAP* **03** (2021), 053 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/03/053 [arXiv:2010.11573 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [15] J. Martin, T. Papanikolaou and V. Vennin, Primordial black holes from the preheating

- instability in single-field inflation, *JCAP* **01** (2020), 024
doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/01/024 [arXiv:1907.04236 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [16] P. Auclair and V. Vennin, Primordial black holes from metric preheating: mass fraction in the excursion-set approach, *JCAP* **02** (2021), 038
doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/02/038 [arXiv:2011.05633 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [17] M. Lemoine, Moduli constraints on primordial black holes. *Phys. Lett. B* **2000**, 481, 333–338, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(00)00469-X.
 - [18] Green, A.M. Supersymmetry and primordial black hole abundance constraints. *Phys. Rev. D* **1998**, 60, 063516, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.063516.
 - [19] M.Y. Khlopov, A. Barrau and J. Grain, Gravitino production by primordial black hole evaporation and constraints on the inhomogeneity of the early Universe. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **2006**, 23, 1875–1882, doi:10.1088/0264-9381/23/6/004.
 - [20] A. Addazi, A. Marciano, S.V. Ketov and M.Yu. Khlopov, Physics of superheavy dark matter in supergravity. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **2018**, 27, 1841011. DOI: 10.1142/S0218271818410110
 - [21] P. Gondolo, P. Sandick and B. Shams Es Haghi, Effects of primordial black holes on dark matter models, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.9, 095018
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.095018 [arXiv:2009.02424 [hep-ph]].
 - [22] M. J. Baker and A. Thamm, Probing the particle spectrum of nature with evaporating black holes, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2022) no.5, 150 doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.12.5.150 [arXiv:2105.10506 [hep-ph]].
 - [23] T. Kitabayashi, Primordial black holes and dark matter mass spectrum,
[arXiv:2204.07898 [hep-ph]].
 - [24] N. Bernal and Ó. Zapata, Self-interacting Dark Matter from Primordial Black Holes, *JCAP* **03** (2021), 007 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2021/03/007 [arXiv:2010.09725 [hep-ph]].
 - [25] B. Carr, F. Kuhnel and M. Sandstad, Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) no.8, 083504 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.083504 [arXiv:1607.06077 [astro-ph.CO]]
 - [26] R. J. Scherrer and M. S. Turner, Decaying particles do not “heat up” the Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* 31, **681**.
 - [27] V. I. Dokuchaev, Y. N. Eroshenko and S. G. Rubin, Early formation of galaxies initiated by clusters of primordial black holes, *Astron. Rep.* **52** (2008), 779-789
doi:10.1134/S1063772908100016 [arXiv:0801.0885 [astro-ph]].
 - [28] S. G. Rubin, M. Y. Khlopov and A. S. Sakharov, Primordial black holes from nonequilibrium second order phase transition, *Grav. Cosmol.* **6** (2000), 51-58
[arXiv:hep-ph/0005271 [hep-ph]].
 - [29] A. Dolgov and J. Silk, Baryon isocurvature fluctuations at small scales and baryonic dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** 4244, (1993).
 - [30] A. Dolgov, M. Kawasaki, N. Kevlishvili, Inhomogeneous baryogenesis, cosmic antimatter, and dark matter, arXiv:0806.2986.

- [31] P. Ivanov, P. Naselsky and I. Novikov, Inflation and primordial black holes as dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** 7173, (1994).
- [32] J. Garcia-Bellido, A. D. Linde, D. Wands, Density Perturbations and Black Hole Formation in Hybrid Inflation, *Phys. Rev.D* **54** 60406058 (1996), arXiv:astro-ph/9605094.
- [33] M. Kawasaki, K. Murai, Formation of supermassive primordial black holes by Affleck-Dine mechanism, *JCAP01(2019)027*, arXiv:1907.02273.
- [34] P. Gondolo, P. Sandick and B. Shams Es Haghi, Effects of primordial black holes on dark matter models, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) no.9, 095018, arXiv:2009.02424
- [35] L.A. Kofman and A.D. Linde, Generation of density perturbations in the inflationary cosmology. *Nucl. Phys. B* **282** (1987) 555–626, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(87)90698-5.
- [36] A.S. Sakharov and M.Yu. Khlopov, Cosmological signatures of family symmetry breaking in multicomponent inflation models. *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **56** (1993) 412–417.
- [37] S. G. Rubin, A.S. Sakharov and M. Yu. Khlopov, The Formation of Primary Galactic Nuclei during Phase Transitions in the Early Universe, *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics*, Vol. **92**, No. 6, 2001, pp. 921–929.
- [38] B. Coleppa, K. Loho and S. Shil, Dark Matter Phenomenology in the Littlest Seesaw Model with an Extended Dark Sector in presence of Primordial Black Hole, [arXiv:2209.06793 [hep-ph]].
- [39] M.Y. Khlopov, B.A. Malomed, Y.B. Zel’dovich, Gravitational instability of scalar fields and formation of primordial black holes. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **215** (1985) 575–589.