

Black Holes as “Time Capsules”: A Cosmological Graviton Background and the Hubble Tension

Tsvi Piran*

Racah Institute for Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Raul Jimenez†

*ICC, University of Barcelona, Martí i Franques 1, 08028 Barcelona, Spain. and
ICREA, Pg. Lluis Companys 23, 0810 Barcelona, Spain.*

(Dated: November 9, 2022)

Minuscule primordial black holes before the end and after inflation can serve as “time capsules” bringing back energy from the past to a later epoch when they evaporate. As these black holes behave like matter, while the rest of the Universe content behaves like radiation, the mass fraction of these black holes, that is tiny at formation, becomes significant later. If sufficiently small, these black holes will evaporate while the Universe is still radiation dominated. We revisit this process and point out that gravitons produced during the evaporation behave as “dark radiation”. If the initial black holes are uniformly distributed so will be the gravitons and in this case they will be free of Silk damping and avoid current limits on “dark radiation” scenarios. Seeds for such black holes can arise during the last phases of inflation. We show here that with suitable parameters, this background graviton field can resolve the Hubble tension. We present current observational constraints on this scenario and suggest upcoming observational tests to prove or refute it. Finally, we also elaborate on the graviton background produced by particle annihilation during the Planck era or shortly after inflation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Hawking’s [1, 2] dramatic discovery of black hole (BH) evaporation was the first link between general relativity and quantum theory, the two pillars of physics. In one of these papers [1] Hawking predicts that primordial BHs of 10^{15}g will appear as cosmic explosions today. However, in spite of the almost 50 years that have passed, BH evaporation has evaded any observational confirmation¹. We explore here potential cosmological consequences of BH evaporation and show that it might have had dramatic effects on the early Universe.

Minuscule BHs that form in the early Universe evaporate eons later. The surrounding radiation energy density decreases like $(1+z)^4$ while the BHs’ energy density decreases like $(1+z)^3$. Thus, a tiny fraction of the early Universe mass captured in such BHs can be significant or even dominant by the time they evaporate. As such, these BHs can be considered as “time capsules” that carry energy² from their formation time and deposit it much later.

The original idea was proposed by Hopper et al., [5] and various aspects of this process have already been

explored in detail (see e.g. [6, 7] and references therein and the review in [8]). Here we propose an extension of this scenario in which we explore the implication of a possible homogeneous cosmological graviton background (CGB) as to provide the means to address the Hubble tension.

This involves the possibility that minuscule BH ($m_{\text{BH}} < 10^{12}\text{g}$ and typically much smaller) that form during inflation provide a source of pure “dark radiation” in the form of gravitons. This dark radiation can change the Friedman equation at recombination and thus, it can solve the Hubble tension (see e.g. [9] and references therein).

It is worth mentioning that the current constraints on ΔN_{eff} from the Planck satellite combined with Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) and large scale structure [10] limit it to be < 0.25 while a value of ≈ 0.4 is needed to fully remove the tension. However, the above constraint comes from the Silk damping and perturbation effects on the CMB high multipoles and does not apply to the Friedman equation as we will show in § IV. Thus any background that has no perturbation and Silk damping will avoid these constraints [11, 12].

We consider first, in § II, the formation and the energy budget of these minuscule BHs. In § III we discuss the composition of particles emitted and their thermalization and the homogeneity of this process. We address a possible solution to the Hubble tension puzzle in § IV. We conclude in § V with a brief summary and a discussion of possible observational signatures. As the formation mechanism (if any) of BHs at the early Universe is highly uncertain, our estimates are given only up to factors of order unity. In an appendix we discuss aspects of graviton formation via annihilation processes during or

* tsvi.piran@mail.huji.ac.il

† raul.jimenez@icc.ub.edu

¹ See, however, claims of observations of Hawking radiation in analogue systems [3, 4]

² If BH evaporation releases the information captured within the BH at formation, in principle, these BHs can served as “time information capsules” as far as information as well. However, capturing the exact phases of all the radiated particles, which is essential for that, might prove very challenging as it will require a cosmic Bell-like experiment.

shortly after the Planck era, and the corresponding CGB production. While Ω_g produce in this way is probably too small to resolve the Hubble tension, this is an interesting route to produce CGB whose nature could be used to explore the quantum nature of gravity.

II. FORMATION

Consider a BH that evaporates at redshift z_{ev} . The evaporation takes place over a time scale $H^{-1}(z_{\text{ev}})$, the inverse of the Hubble parameter at z_{ev} . Equating H^{-1} to the evaporation life-time of the BH, $5120\pi G m_{\text{BH}}^3 / (c^3 m_{\text{pl}}^2)$, we find $m_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})$, the mass of a BH that evaporates at z_{ev} :

$$m_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}}) \approx 0.02 m_{\text{pl}} \left(\frac{E_{\text{pl}}}{T} \right)^{2/3} \approx 5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ g} \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{T} \right)^{2/3}, \quad (1)$$

where m_{pl} and E_{pl} are the Planck mass and Planck energy respectively and T is the temperature of the Universe at z_{ev} .

The horizon mass of a flat Universe is comparable to a BH mass of the same size. This determines the formation epoch z_{BH} of the BHs evaporating at z_{ev} (see Fig. 1). In turn, this determines the temperature ratios and the ratio between the fraction of the BH energy densities at evaporation, $\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})$, and at formation, $\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{BH}})$ (see Fig. 2):

$$\frac{z_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})}{z_{\text{ev}}} = \frac{\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})}{\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{BH}})} \approx 3 \left(\frac{E_{\text{pl}}}{T} \right)^{2/3} \approx 1.5 \cdot 10^{15} \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{T} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (2)$$

The corresponding temperature of the Universe at the time that the BHs form, T_{BH} , is (see Fig. 1):

$$T_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}}) \approx 3 E_{\text{pl}} \left(\frac{T}{E_{\text{pl}}} \right)^{1/3} \approx 3 \times 10^{13} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{T}{\text{MeV}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (3)$$

Typical values are $z_{\text{BH}} = 10^{23}$ and $m_{\text{BH}} = 10^8 \text{ g}$ for evaporation just before nucleosynthesis. The temperature of the Universe, T_{BH} , at the time that these BHs form is $\approx 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$, just a few orders of magnitude below the canonical scale of exit from inflation. This suggests that their formation may be associated with the end of inflation. Specifically, it is possible that exit from inflation isn't smooth and the fluctuations that led to the formation of minuscule BHs arose at this stage, or that BH formation is a generic feature at small scales [13].

After formation, BHs will accrete some of the surrounding matter. With $\dot{M} = \pi G^2 m_{\text{BH}}^2 \rho / c_s^3$, where $\rho, c_s = c/\sqrt{3}$ are the surrounding density and speed of sound, this accretion is significant only right after BH formation when the surrounding density is largest. At this stage the BHs grow by a factor of ~ 2 compared to their initial mass. This order of unity effect can be ignored.




FIG. 1. m_{BH} , Mass of the BHs (in grams - blue line), T_e the temperature of the evaporating BHs (in MeV - orange line) and T_{BH} the background temperature of the Universe (in GeV - green line) when these BHs form as a function of T , the Universe temperature at the time the BHs evaporate.




FIG. 2. The ratio, $d_{\text{BH}}/(c/H)$, of the distance between the evaporation BHs to the horizon (black) and the ratio, T/T_{BH} , of the temperature at BH evaporation, T , to the temperature at formation, T_{BH} (blue), as a function of T . The latter ratio also equals (see Eq. 2) the ratio $\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{BH}})/\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})$, demonstrating that a minute fraction of the energy density of the Universe in BHs at the early Universe can be very significant and even dominant later.

III. EVAPORATION

A. The Composition of the evaporating particles.

The evaporation temperature, T_e :

$$T_e \approx 2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{pl}}}{T} \right)^{1/3} T \approx 10^7 \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{T}{\text{MeV}} \right)^{2/3}, \quad (4)$$

determines the composition of the particles that are produced according to their rest mass and spin [14]. *Photons, neutrinos and gravitons*, that are massless³, are produced at any temperature. Their energy density ratio

³ Neutrinos are effectively massless at the relevant temperatures discussed

depends strongly on the evaporating BH spin. Gravitons dominate for high spin BHs and neutrinos for low spin ones [14]. In the following we assume, lacking information on these primordial BHs, that their spin distribution results in roughly equal amounts of different massless particles.

At higher evaporation temperatures massive particles form. Within most of the relevant regime, evaporation temperatures are above the QED and QCD phase transitions and the composition of the evaporating matter resembles the early Universe composition with one significant difference, production of thermal gravitons. At these temperatures g_* that measures the effective number of degrees of freedom⁴ (see e.g. Fig. 1 in [15]), is ≈ 100 , and at first glance it seems that f_g , the fraction of the BH energy deposited in gravitons, is small ($f_g \sim 1\%$) [14]. However this fraction increases if the BHs are rotating rapidly [16]. f_g can be as high as 10% for $a > 0.95$ and seems to plateau at that value even for $a \sim 0.9999$ [7].

The density in gravitons with respect to the whole radiation one is⁵

$$\frac{\rho_G(T_{\text{eq}})}{\rho_R(T_{\text{eq}})} = f_g \left(\frac{g_s(T_{\text{eq}})}{g_s(T_{\text{ev}})} \right)^{1/3} \quad (5)$$

B. Thermalization

The fate of the produced particles depends on their interaction with the surrounding matter. Within the relevant temperature range that we consider here ($T \gtrsim 1$ MeV) all electromagnetically or strongly and even weakly interacting particles are strongly coupled and they thermalize quickly, depositing their energy to the rest of the energy reservoir at that time. However, Gravitons remain decoupled at all temperatures. As gravitons propagate freely they form a background radiation field whose typical energy today is T_e/z_{ev} (see Fig. 1):

$$h\nu_g \approx \left(\frac{m_{\text{pl}}}{T} \right)^{1/3} T_0 \approx 10 \text{ keV} \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{T} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (6)$$

where T_0 is the current CMB temperature. These energies corresponds to frequencies of $\approx 10^{18}$ Hz. These are comparable to the energies of gravitons produced by gravitational Bremsstrahlung at the Sun [17]. This prediction can, at least in principle, be tested observationally.

Massive relics: Over most of the relevant range of T the evaporation energy, T_e , is much larger than the QCD and QED transition energies. The mean free path of

the vast majority of these particles will be much smaller than the horizon size and they quickly thermalize. An interesting exception is a case in which a particle, denoted X , has the lowest mass with a specific charge. At $T < m_X$ particle X can only annihilate with its anti-particle, \bar{X} . Depending on the details of the evaporation and on $\sigma_{X\bar{X}} \Omega_X$ might be significant. Importantly, Ω_X won't satisfy, in such a case the common relation (the so-called WIMP miracle) between m_X and $\sigma_{X\bar{X}}$ that hold for a regular freeze-out. This leaves room for the formation of a WIMP type of dark matter that doesn't satisfy this condition, a possibility that has been explored further elsewhere [5–7, 18].

C. Black Hole Scale Homogeneity

The evaporating BHs masses are extremely small compared to $M_H(z_{\text{ev}})$, the horizon mass at evaporation:

$$\frac{m_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})}{M_H(z_{\text{ev}})} \approx 0.01 \left(\frac{T}{E_{\text{pl}}} \right)^{4/3} \approx 4 \cdot 10^{-31} \left(\frac{T}{\text{MeV}} \right)^{4/3}. \quad (7)$$

The corresponding ratio between the distance between evaporating BHs, d_{BH} and the horizon c/H , determines the inhomogeneity (or lack off) induced by the evaporation:

$$\frac{d_{\text{BH}}}{c/H(z_{\text{ev}})} \approx 0.1 \left(\frac{T}{E_{\text{pl}}} \right)^{4/9} \approx 10^{-9} \left(\frac{T}{\text{MeV}} \right)^{4/9}. \quad (8)$$

As this ratio is extremely small (see Fig. 2) the inhomogeneity that it introduces is erased on a time scale much shorter than the horizon crossing time and the evaporation does not affect the homogeneity of the Universe.

IV. THE HUBBLE TENSION

The recently realized ‘‘Hubble tension’’ between early and late Universe observations may indicate or point to the need of new physics to describe the Universe (see e.g. the review in [9] and references therein). This tension consists of a mismatch between the model-dependent inferred value of H_0 from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature and polarization data [10] and direct measurements using parallaxes and different standardizable candles in the local Universe ($z < 0.1$), which are cosmology independent. The disagreement is at the 4–5 σ level [9] and translates into the local value of H_0 being about 10% larger than the CMB inferred one. It is worth taking it seriously given the exhaustive tests for systematic uncertainties that both measurements have endured, finding no obvious source for such an effect.

There is already a myriad of theoretical solutions proposed (see [19] for a fairly exhaustive description of possible solutions) to alleviate and resolve this tension. All boil down to the need to change the anchors (either at the early Universe or the late one) as the evolution since the

⁴ Considering only the degrees of freedom of the standard model of particle physics at those energies.

⁵ At high temperatures (corresponding to larger than matter-radiation equality) the entropy degrees of freedom are equal to the particle ones.

high- z Universe ($H(z)$ for $z < 2$ as given by SN, BAO and cosmic chronometers) to the local one is well described by the current Λ CDM paradigm [20, 21]. For the early Universe this translates into changing the length of the standard ruler.

It is straightforward to see that a change in the energy densities will lead to a change in the inferred H_0 value from the CMB. To establish the value of H_0 we use the CMB to infer angles and the sound horizon scale, r_s :

$$r_s = \int_{z_s}^{\infty} \frac{c_s dz}{H(z)}. \quad (9)$$

This equation is fully model dependent as it relies on the assumed value for the sound speed c_s , the recombination redshift z_s and the Hubble parameter $H(z)$. A change in the Hubble parameter up to the recombination redshift will change the value of r_s . In particular, an increase of $H(z)$ by some additional radiation field will decrease r_s , so the true value of H_0 would have to be higher in order to compensate for this change of length. This solution is generally referred to as “dark radiation”.

Usually “dark radiation” is discarded as a solution to the Hubble tension because in these models Silk damping of this dark radiation field puts a strong limit the amount of dark radiation due to CMB constraints [10]. This limit is expressed using N_{eff} , the extra relativistic degrees of freedom affect the thermal budget of the Universe according to the well known equation (see e.g. [22])

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4}{7} g_{Y,*} \left(\frac{43}{4g_*(T_F)} \right)^{4/3} \quad (10)$$

where g_* is the effective number of degrees of freedom of the dark radiation particle Y and $g_*(T_F)$ is the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom in *thermal equilibrium* at the temperature T_F at which Y decouples from the plasma. To resolve the tension we need to increase H_0 to change the sound horizon scale as can be trivially seen in (9). Within “dark radiation” solutions this corresponds to increasing N_{eff} by ≈ 0.4 .

The problem is that the value of ΔN_{eff} needed to fix the tension (≈ 0.4 [9]) is already ruled out by observations. Silk damping limit $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} < 0.25$ (e.g. [19]). A second, weaker limit on ΔN_{eff} arises from BBN constraints, as the combination of deuterium and helium, limits the value of N_{eff} in a nearly cosmology model independent way. Using their Fig. 8 of Ref. [12], the right panel shows that indeed, it is possible to have $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.5$. With this upper limit we obtain values of H_0 as high as $73 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ within the current constraints of BBN at the 95% confidence level. This will remove the tension.

Previous estimates of the possible role of massless particles produced by evaporation primordial BHs [5] focused on Silk damping and concluded that, since such particles can contribute at most $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.2$ they cannot resolve the tension. However, this limit can be avoided if the “dark radiation” does not suffer from Silk damping. This can happen for gravitons produced by evaporating

miniscule BHs if the BHs are distributed uniformly. As the gravitons don’t interact with the rest of the matter they will remain uniform. In this case the only limit on “dark radiation” will be the BBN limit which allows a solution of the Hubble tension.

The question is whether enough gravitons are produced so that their energy density, Ω_{gr} , (corresponding to $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} \sim 0.4$) is 10% of the CMB energy. Using eq. 32 in [23]:

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff,g}} \sim 0.013 \left(\frac{f_g}{0.0047} \right) \left(\frac{106}{g_*} \right)^{0.33} \Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}}), \quad (11)$$

If evaporation is before BBN⁶ then $g \sim 100$. If the BHs are fast rotating then $f_g = 0.1$ and $\Delta N_{\text{eff,G}} \Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}}) \sim 0.3 \Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})$, which is consistent, although an underestimate, with the values found in the detailed numerical analysis by [6, 7]. Thus, to produce sufficient gravitons the BHs must be rapidly rotating and $\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}})$ must be of order unity.

The above considerations puts somewhat opposing limits on the conditions needed to resolve the Hubble tension. On one hand Ω_{BH} must be of order unity. On the other hand, these uniformly distributed BHs produce other particles as well. Hence, they shouldn’t be too abundant as otherwise their products would dominate the Universe resulting in a uniform Universe. These two opposing conditions suggest a small window of $\Omega_{\text{BH}} \sim 0.8 - 0.9$ at the time of evaporation. Within this enough gravitons are produced. The other products of the evaporating BHs dominate, but there is enough room for relic material to produce the needed structure. Because of the dilution factor due to the evaporation product this relic must have higher fluctuations than what is observed today.

Let us summarize the conditions needed for gravitons produced by evaporating BHs to provide a solution to the Hubble tension:

1. BHs must form uniformly⁷. Within the context of inflationary models this could happen if the BHs form during the last epochs of inflation or right after it during the re-heating phase. Recall that only a minute fraction of the Universe is initially in these BHs.
2. BHs must be rotating with spins > 0.9 as to provide a sizable amount of gravitons.
3. Ω_{BH} must be close to unity but somewhat smaller as to avoid all energy content in the universe to be homogeneous. This means that most of the matter in the Universe, but not all, has been “recycled”

⁶ The high energy photons arising from evaporation after BBN may destroy the BBN products.

⁷ With these conditions dark matter cannot be formed from the evaporating BHs as it must be non-uniform.

through black holes. The condition $\Omega_{\text{BH}}(z_{\text{ev}}) \approx 0.8 - 0.9$ can be seen as a fine-tuning requirement in our model.

4. Evaporation must take place before BBN as to not alter the successful agreement of current BBN estimates with observations. This constrains the maximal mass of the BHs to $< 10^9 \text{g}$.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONAL SIGNATURES

Light ($M_{\text{BH}} < 10^{12} \text{g}$) primordial BHs will evaporate during the radiation dominated era and those with $M_{\text{BH}} < 10^9 \text{g}$ before BBN. Most of the evaporating particles, apart from gravitons and possibly some unknown weakly interacting particles that may contribute to the dark matter, thermalize rapidly. A background field of $\sim 10^{18} \text{Hz}$ gravitons is the natural remnant of these BHs. With suitable parameters the resulting graviton radiation field can resolve the so-called Hubble tension. This can happen if the BHs are (i) rapidly rotating, (ii) uniformly distributed and (iii) at the time of evaporation they compose a dominant fraction, $\sim 0.8 - 0.9$, of the energy density of the Universe.

In our scenario seeds for primordial black holes are formed during inflation and inflation homogenizes their distribution. Our main assumption is that these BHs rotate rapidly as in order to produce gravitons. Although even almost non-rotating BHs do produce some gravitons, so in this case their abundance will need to higher by a factor $\sim 10 - 100$. One important point is that the required initial energy density in these BHs is so tiny $< 10^{-10}$ or less, that even if their seeds are produced during the late phases of inflation and hence are diluted by expansion they will have a noticeable effect.

The observational predictions of these scenarios are very clear: First, gravitational wave experiments in the 10^{18}Hz range should see a stochastic background. If this is indeed the solution of the Hubble tension, then the energy density of this background is a significant fraction (a few percent) of the CMB energy density. Exploring this window (see e.g. [24] and references therein) could therefore also unveil the presence in the early Universe of evaporating BHs and indirectly probe the quantum nature of gravity.

While detecting these gravitons is an experimental challenge for the future, the above estimates provide an avenue to test our scenario rather soon. Improvements in theoretical reactions rates relevant to BBN calculations by the LUNA⁸ project, as well as further analysis from large scale structure by the ShapeFit team [25], will provide a much tighter constrain on the allowed value of ΔN_{eff} during BBN. This can either refute our scenario or

support it. Strong upper limits on $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}(\text{BBN})$ would put very tight constraints on primordial BH production with $M_{\text{BH}} \lesssim 10^9 \text{g/cm}^3$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this work was partially provided by (TP) an Advanced ERC grant TReX and by (RJ) project PGC2018-098866-B-I00, FEDER “Una manera de hacer Europa” and “Center of Excellence Maria de Maeztu 2020-2023” award to the ICCUB (CEX2019-000918-M funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033). One of us (RJ) thanks coffee house “fin del mondo” in Piran (Slovenia) where some zoom discussions concerning this work took place.

Appendix A: Cosmological Graviton Production via Annihilation

One of the firm predictions of quantum gravity is that quanta known as gravitons should exist. Gravitons are quantum whereas the detected gravitational waves by LIGO are classical. To verify that gravitons exist we must detect single gravitons, for example by observing gravito-ionization atomic transitions due to absorption of a graviton - or an equivalent type of quantum experiment.

In the main body of this paper we have explored the graviton production via the super-radiance process in Hawking evaporation. There is, however, a much less explored process that can lead to a measurable signature of the quantum nature of gravity. This process is the production of gravitons via annihilation. The annihilation process is quantized producing two gravitons in each event. Even an indirect evidence for the existence of this particular CGB would verify that gravitons do exist as quantum objects and we consider the detection prospects.

In this appendix we explore a different route to produce a uniform cosmological gravitation background. This is by the process

$$X\bar{X} \rightarrow 2g, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where X is an arbitrary particle. The annihilation cross section to gravitons (denoted hereafter g) is extremely small but non-vanishing. Detailed calculations ([26], see [27] for a review), as well as dimensional analysis, suggest that it behaves like,

$$\sigma_{x\bar{x} \leftrightarrow gg} \approx (GE/c^4)^2 = r_g^2(E), \quad (\text{A2})$$

the square of the gravitational radius of a particle with a total energy E . Thus, two particles with energy E can annihilate and produce two gravitons of the same energies. As the cross section is proportional to the square

⁸ <https://luna.lngs.infn.it>

of the gravitational radius of the particles, this process is significant only when the typical energy of the particles is of order of the Planck energy. Similarly the inverse process of annihilation of two gravitons to a particle-antiparticle pair will be significant only at the Planck era. Namely it is only at this energy that gravitons can be in thermal equilibrium with other particles.

Once formed, the graviton's energy decreases like the expansion factor a^{-1} . As the energy of the gravitons decreases their cross section for annihilation decreases rapidly. Thus, apart from a brief phase at the Planck era gravitons can never be in thermal equilibrium with other matter fields [28, 29]. For this reason, Zel'dovich [28] remarked that the graviton background is determined just by the initial conditions of the Universe. This is in contrast with thermal equilibrium at lower temperatures, assumed by [30] and subsequent work, that have led to an overestimated Ω_g . Once gravitons form their chance to annihilate back to other form of matter is negligible. The CGB is an energy sink that hides a fraction of the total energy as dark-radiation. Namely, it has no interaction apart from gravity and will only contribute to the radiation energy density of the Universe.

The graviton energy production rate per volume element in a thermal bath with a temperature T and a density $n \approx (kT/\hbar c)^3$ is:

$$\dot{e}_{\text{gr}} \approx cn^2 r_g^2(E) E = \frac{G^2}{c^7} n^2 E^3, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $E = kT$. In a Hubble time, $H^{-1} \sim (Ge/c^2)^{-1/2}$, an energy $\dot{e}_{\text{gr}} H^{-1}$ is converted per comoving volume to gravitons. Its ratio to the total energy density is:

$$\Omega_g = \frac{\dot{e}_{\text{gr}} H^{-1}}{e} \approx \left(\frac{E}{E_{\text{pl}}} \right)^3 = \left(\frac{T}{T_{\text{pl}}} \right)^3, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where E_{pl} is the Planck energy. This last relation can be cast into the form

$$\Omega_g \approx \left(\frac{E_{\text{gr}}}{E_{\text{pl}}} \right)^3 \Omega_{\text{CMB}}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where E_{gr} is the energy scale when most gravitons formed and $\Omega_{\text{CGB};\text{CMB}}$ are the cosmological energy fractions. This ratio is of order unity for the Planck era but it decreases rapidly as the temperature decreases.

We have to consider two different scenarii distinguished by the question of whether inflation took place or not.

a. Annihilation CGB with Inflation

Inflation that took place sometime after the Planck era, diluted and erased the CGB that formed during the Planck era. As inflation ends a thermal phase is restored at a temperature T_{inf} . A minuscule fraction of the particle will annihilate to gravitons, forming a new CGB, whose fraction of the total energy is $\approx (T_{\text{inf}}/T_{\text{pl}})^3$. The initial energy of these gravitons will be T_{inf} , but of course they won't be in thermal equilibrium with the rest of the universe and their density will be much lower than the thermal density of massless particles at this temperature.

Today the energy of these gravitons will be comparable, but slightly smaller than the energy of a CMB photon⁹ Namely, it will be of order $\sim 10^{-4}$ eV with a corresponding frequency of ~ 10 GHz.

If inflation wasn't too far from the Planck era we might be able to detect the CGB by measuring its $\Delta N_{\text{eff},g}$, its contribution to the light particles cosmic background. Otherwise, the argument can be reversed to set a new model-independent limit on the epoch of inflation. An upper limit on $\Delta N_{\text{eff},g}$ (where here we consider just the contribution of these specific gravitons that are formed via annihilation and are today at $\sim 10\text{GHz}$ implies a lower limit on the energy scale in which inflation took place.

b. Annihilation CGB with no inflation

The situation is much more interesting if inflation didn't take place. In this case the relic gravitons will have a non negligible Ω_g . The above estimate, that ignores gravitons annihilating back to regular particles, suggests that when this is also taken into account the gravitons are in thermal equilibrium with the rest of the universe. In such case we expect

$$\Omega_g \lesssim \frac{\Omega_{\text{CMB}}}{g_{\text{pl}}}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where g_{pl} is the unknown number of degrees of freedom (particle species multiplied by the spin factor) at the Planck time. g_{pl} is most likely large and hence Ω_g is too small to resolve the Hubble tension.

⁹ The photons that have been until then in thermal equilibrium in the early universe will have their energy boosted by subsequent annihilation of other species.

-
- [1] S. W. Hawking, Nature (London) **248**, 30 (1974).
 - [2] S. W. Hawking, Communications in Mathematical Physics **43**, 199 (1975).
 - [3] S. Weinfurtner, E. W. Tedford, M. C. J. Penrice, W. G. Unruh, and G. A. Lawrence, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**,

- 021302 (2011), arXiv:1008.1911 [gr-qc].
- [4] J. Drori, Y. Rosenberg, D. Bermudez, Y. Silberberg, and U. Leonhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 010404 (2019).
 - [5] D. Hooper, G. Krnjaic, and S. D. McDermott, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 1 (2019), arXiv:1905.01301 [hep-ph].
 - [6] I. Masina, *European Physical Journal Plus* **135**, 552 (2020), arXiv:2004.04740 [hep-ph].
 - [7] A. Arbey, J. Auffinger, P. Sandick, B. Shams Es Haghi, and K. Sinha, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 123549 (2021), arXiv:2104.04051 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [8] J. Auffinger, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2206.02672 (2022), arXiv:2206.02672 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [9] L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astronomy* **3**, 891 (2019), arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [10] N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, and et al., *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641**, A6 (2020).
 - [11] N. Schöneberg, J. Lesgourgues, and D. C. Hooper, *JCAP* **2019** (10), 029, arXiv:1907.11594 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [12] N. Schöneberg, L. Verde, H. Gil-Marín, and S. Brieden, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2209.14330 (2022), arXiv:2209.14330 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [13] C. Gomez and R. Jimenez, *Physics of the Dark Universe* **36**, 101035 (2022), arXiv:2111.05380 [hep-th].
 - [14] D. N. Page, *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 198 (1976).
 - [15] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, K. H. Kampert, S. D. Katz, T. Kawanai, T. G. Kovacs, S. W. Mages, A. Pasztor, F. Pittler, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald, and K. K. Szabo, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:1606.07494 (2016), arXiv:1606.07494 [hep-lat].
 - [16] D. N. Page, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 3260 (1976).
 - [17] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, B516 (1965).
 - [18] L. Morrison, S. Profumo, and Y. Yu, *JCAP* **2019** (5), 005, arXiv:1812.10606 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [19] N. Schöneberg, G. F. Abellán, A. Pérez Sánchez, S. J. Witte, V. Poulin, and J. Lesgourgues, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2107.10291 (2021), arXiv:2107.10291 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [20] A. Heavens, R. Jimenez, and L. Verde, *PRL* **113**, 241302 (2014), arXiv:1409.6217 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [21] L. Verde, J. L. Bernal, A. F. Heavens, and R. Jimenez, *MNRAS* **467**, 731 (2017), arXiv:1607.05297 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [22] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *The early universe*, Vol. 69 (Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, 1990).
 - [23] D. Hooper, G. Krnjaic, J. March-Russell, S. D. McDermott, and R. Petrossian-Byrne, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2004.00618 (2020), arXiv:2004.00618 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [24] A. Berlin, D. Blas, R. T. D’Agnolo, S. A. R. Ellis, R. Harnik, Y. Kahn, and J. Schütte-Engel, *PRD* **105**, 116011 (2022), arXiv:2112.11465 [hep-ph].
 - [25] S. Brieden, H. Gil-Marín, and L. Verde, *JCAP* **08** (08), 024, arXiv:2204.11868 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [26] Y. S. Vladimirov, *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* **16**, 65 (1963).
 - [27] G. Papini and S. R. Valluri, *Physics Reports* **33C**, 51 (1977).
 - [28] Y. B. Zel’dovich, *Soviet Physics Uspekhi* **9**, 602 (1967).
 - [29] L. Smolin, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **3**, 17 (1985).
 - [30] R. A. Matzner, *Astrophys. J.* **154**, 1123 (1968).