

# Dark Matter from freeze-in and its inhomogeneities

Alessandro Strumia

*Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Pisa, Italia*

## Abstract

We consider generic freeze-in processes for generation of Dark Matter, together with the consequent re-thermalization of the Standard Model fluid. We find that Dark Matter inherits the Standard Model adiabatic inhomogeneities on the cosmological scales probed by current observations, that were super-horizon during freeze-in. Thereby, freeze-in satisfies the bounds on iso-curvature perturbations.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Intuitive argument based on ‘separate universes’</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Iso-curvature perturbations during freeze-in?</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Intrinsic non-adiabatic energy transfer . . . . .	4
3.2	Intrinsic non-adiabatic pressure . . . . .	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>6</b>

## 1 Introduction

Freeze-in is a possible mechanism that could have generated the Dark Matter (DM) cosmological abundance [1]. It assumes that the Standard Model (SM) cosmological thermal plasma was not initially accompanied by any DM abundance. Since all SM components self-interact thermalising to a common temperature, cosmological inhomogeneities were initially adiabatic.

Next, ‘freeze-in’ particle physics processes produce DM particles with mass  $M$  out of the SM plasma. For example, one can have decays  $\text{SM} \rightarrow \text{DM DM}$  or scatterings  $\text{SM SM}$

$\rightarrow$  DM DM, dominated either at large temperatures  $T \gg M$  (‘UV-dominated freeze-in’) or at low temperatures  $T \sim M$  (‘IR-dominated freeze-in’). In order to match the observed cosmological DM density [2], the rate of freeze-in processes must be much smaller than the Hubble rate  $H$ . Freeze-in automatically generates DM inhomogeneities out of SM inhomogeneities.

Observations are consistent with dominant adiabatic inhomogeneities (namely, the SM/DM fluid is the same everywhere), while iso-curvature inhomogeneities (namely, DM inhomogeneities different from SM inhomogeneities) are constrained, on cosmological scales, to be below a few % level [2].

We consider if freeze-in leads to acceptable DM inhomogeneities.

Weinberg answered positively this issue for thermal freeze-out: since freeze-out dominantly happens in the non-relativistic regime, computing inhomogeneities in the DM number density was enough [3]. On the other hand, freeze-in can be relativistic, and the iso-curvature issue started being considered recently: [4] claims that a specific freeze-in model is excluded because it generates too large scale-independent iso-curvature perturbations. The authors of [4] argue that all freeze-in models are similarly problematic. In the model considered in [4] DM has a small electric charge and is thereby produced by IR-dominated scatterings of two SM particles, such as  $e^-e^+ \rightarrow$  DM DM. This generates, at any given time, a contribution to the DM density  $\rho_{\text{DM}}$  proportional to the square of the SM density  $\rho_{\text{SM}}$ , and DM inhomogeneities might be not proportional to SM inhomogeneities. However, one must consider the cumulative cosmological process taking into account that all regions of the Universe undergo a similarly diluting  $\rho_{\text{SM}}$ . As we will see, this leads to negligible iso-curvature effects. A simple argument is presented in section 2, and the general formalism is used in section 3. Section 4 presents our conclusions.

## 2 Intuitive argument based on ‘separate universes’

We start presenting an intuitive argument. Working in the Newtonian gauge,

$$ds^2 = -[1 + 2\Phi(t, \vec{x})]dt^2 + a^2(t)[1 - 2\Psi(t, \vec{x})]d\vec{x}^2 \quad (1)$$

the primordial adiabatic perturbations  $\delta\rho_\alpha(t, \vec{x})$  in the density  $\rho_\alpha(t)$  of a fluid  $\alpha$  can be characterised in a simple geometric way as [3, 5–7]

$$\delta\rho_\alpha = \frac{d\rho_\alpha}{dt} \delta t \quad (2)$$

working at first-order in the small  $\delta\rho_\alpha \ll \rho_\alpha$ . In eq. (2)  $\delta t(t, \vec{x})$  is some universal function common to all fluids that can be intuitively thought as a delay in the time evolution of the different regions.

Observation constrain iso-curvature perturbations only on scales comparable to the horizon today, while the freeze-in DM density was generated before matter/radiation

equality (much before in most freeze-in models). This means that we only need to worry if freeze-in generated iso-curvature perturbations on scales much larger than the small horizon at freeze-in.

We can thus apply the ‘separate universes’ picture (see e.g. [5]): the very early Universe at freeze-in can be thought as many homogeneous regions without causal contact, given that inhomogeneities on different scale evolve independently in first-order approximation. Freeze-in dynamics produces DM with adiabatic perturbations because all regions undergo the same dynamics, up to the delay  $\delta t$ . So eq. (2) holds for the DM density, no matter how complicated the freeze-in dynamics is. Explicitly, the Boltzmann equation for the homogeneous small DM number density  $n_{\text{DM}}$  is  $d(n_{\text{DM}}/s)/d\ln T \simeq \gamma/Hs$ , where  $s$  is the entropy density,  $H$  is the Hubble rate, and  $\gamma(T)$  is the space-time density rate of freeze-in processes that produce one DM particle out of the SM plasma at temperature  $T$ . Integrating this equation leads to

$$\frac{n_{\text{DM}}}{s} = \int \frac{dT}{T} \frac{\gamma(T)}{Hs}. \quad (3)$$

Interpreting eq. (3) in the ‘separate universes’ picture implies that, in regions where the SM plasma was denser, freeze-in initially produced more DM by some amount that depends on the freeze-in model, but in these region the DM average density changed more rapidly leading to adiabatic DM inhomogeneities. The above discussion explicitly verifies how, in the special freeze-in case, the ‘separate universes’ regions undergo the same evolution, up to the time delay.

The next section substantiates the above intuitive reasoning by explicit computations.

### 3 Iso-curvature perturbations during freeze-in?

A general formalism to compute the cosmological evolution of inhomogeneities in interacting fluids was developed in [8, 9]. We adopt its presentation as summarized in [10], that makes more explicit the sources of iso-curvature inhomogeneities.

Simple first-order evolution equations for the various densities are obtained by combining the Einstein gravity equations into the conservation of the energy-momentum tensor  $T^{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\alpha} T_{(\alpha)}^{\mu\nu}$ . The energy-momentum tensor  $T_{(\alpha)}^{\mu\nu}$  of fluid  $\alpha$  only is not conserved because interactions transfer energy-momentum  $Q_{(\alpha)}^{\nu}$  to other fluids. So one has

$$\nabla_{\mu} T_{(\alpha)}^{\mu\nu} = Q_{(\alpha)}^{\nu} \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{\alpha} Q_{(\alpha)}^{\nu} = 0 \quad (4)$$

because of total energy conservation. In the homogeneous limit, this implies that the average densities evolve as  $\dot{\rho}_{\alpha} + 3H(\rho_{\alpha} + \wp_{\alpha}) = Q_{(\alpha)}^0 \equiv Q_{\alpha}$ , where  $\wp_{\alpha}$  is the pressure of fluid  $\alpha$ . The energy component of  $Q_{(\alpha)}$  is expanded in small inhomogeneities as  $Q_{(\alpha)0} = -Q_{\alpha}(1 + \Phi) - \delta Q_{\alpha}$  [10] so that  $\sum_{\alpha} \delta Q_{\alpha} = 0$  by total energy conservation. The total density is  $\rho = \sum_{\alpha} \rho_{\alpha}$ .

It is useful to write equations in terms of the curvature perturbation  $\zeta = -H[\Psi/H + \delta\rho/\dot{\rho}]$ , which is the relative displacement between uniform-density and uniform-curvature surfaces. This curvature perturbation can be defined for each fluid

$$\zeta_\alpha = -\Psi - H \frac{\delta\rho_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} \quad (5)$$

and it evolves as [10]

$$\dot{\zeta}_\alpha = -\frac{H}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} \delta Q_{\text{intr},\alpha} + 3 \frac{H^2}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} \delta \wp_{\text{intr},\alpha} - \dot{H} \frac{Q_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} \left( \frac{\delta\rho_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} - \frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} \right) + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad (6)$$

where  $\delta Q_{\text{intr},\alpha}$  and  $\delta \wp_{\text{intr},\alpha}$  will be defined later. As usual, small perturbations are conveniently expanded in comoving Fourier modes  $k$ , and the ‘separate universe’ argument amounts to consider the limit  $k \rightarrow 0$  of the full equations. We focus on large super-horizon scales, thereby omitting the label  $k$  and neglecting Laplacians and other terms suppressed by  $k^2/a^2 H^2$ . Such terms are indeed negligible whenever freeze-in occurs way before matter/radiation equality, for relevant cosmological scales  $k$ .

The equations (6) can be written in a slightly more convenient form by avoiding using the total density  $\rho$  and defining instead the iso-curvature relative perturbations  $S_{\alpha\beta}$  between two fluids  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$

$$S_{\alpha\beta} \equiv 3(\zeta_\alpha - \zeta_\beta) = -3H \left( \frac{\delta\rho_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} - \frac{\delta\rho_\beta}{\dot{\rho}_\beta} \right) \quad (7)$$

that evolve as

$$\dot{S}_{\alpha\beta} = -3H \left( \frac{\delta Q_{\text{intr},\alpha} - 3H \delta \wp_{\text{intr},\alpha}}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} - \frac{\delta Q_{\text{intr},\beta} - 3H \delta \wp_{\text{intr},\beta}}{\dot{\rho}_\beta} \right) + \dot{S}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mul}} + \mathcal{O}(k^2). \quad (8)$$

We again ignore the terms suppressed by  $k^2$ . We can also ignore the ‘multiplicative’ terms (namely, those proportional to combinations of  $S_{\alpha'\beta'}$  terms) [10]

$$\dot{S}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mul}} = \frac{\dot{H}}{2H} \left[ \left( \frac{Q_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} + \frac{Q_\beta}{\dot{\rho}_\beta} \right) S_{\alpha\beta} + \left( \frac{Q_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} - \frac{Q_\beta}{\dot{\rho}_\beta} \right) \sum_\gamma \frac{\dot{\rho}_\gamma}{\dot{\rho}} (S_{\alpha\gamma} + S_{\beta\gamma}) \right] \quad (9)$$

because we are only concerned in understanding if non-zero iso-curvature perturbations are generated by the ‘source’ terms explicitly shown in eq. (8). The formalism summarized in [10] makes clear that, in the long-wavelength limit  $k \rightarrow 0$ , iso-curvature perturbations are only sourced by the non-adiabatic energy transfer  $\delta Q_{\text{intr},\alpha}$  and by the non-adiabatic pressure  $\delta \wp_{\text{intr},\alpha}$  intrinsic in each fluid  $\alpha$ . These terms will be now be defined and evaluated.

### 3.1 Intrinsic non-adiabatic energy transfer

One source of iso-curvature perturbations is the intrinsic non-adiabatic energy transfer, the part of energy transfer  $\delta Q_\alpha$  from fluid  $\alpha$  ‘biased’ with respect to its energy density

$\rho_\alpha$  [10]:

$$\delta Q_{\text{intr},\alpha} \equiv \delta Q_\alpha - \frac{\dot{Q}_\alpha}{\dot{\rho}_\alpha} \delta \rho_\alpha. \quad (10)$$

We next consider its value during freeze-in, where the relevant fluids are  $\alpha = \{\text{SM}, \text{DM}\}$ .

The rate of freeze-in particle collisions can be computed, in any given particle-physics model, as a function of the local temperature of the SM fluid, that also controls its density. Thereby the energy transfer from the SM fluid only depends on its local density,  $Q_{\text{SM}}(\rho_{\text{SM}})$ . Consequently  $\delta Q_{\text{intr},\text{SM}} = \delta Q_{\text{SM}} - \delta \rho_{\text{SM}} dQ_{\text{SM}}/d\rho_{\text{SM}} = 0$  vanishes in a generic freeze-in model.

Next, energy conservation demands  $\delta Q_{\text{SM}} + \delta Q_{\text{DM}} = 0$ , so that the intrinsic non-adiabatic energy transfer to the DM fluid can be written as

$$\delta Q_{\text{intr},\text{DM}} \equiv \delta Q_{\text{DM}} - \frac{\dot{Q}_{\text{DM}}}{\dot{\rho}_{\text{DM}}} \delta \rho_{\text{DM}} = \dot{Q}_{\text{DM}} \left( \frac{\delta \rho_{\text{SM}}}{\dot{\rho}_{\text{SM}}} - \frac{\delta \rho_{\text{DM}}}{\dot{\rho}_{\text{DM}}} \right). \quad (11)$$

This potential ‘source’ terms thereby becomes a ‘multiplicative’ term, proportional to the relative entropy  $S_{\text{SM},\text{DM}}$ . Since this is assumed to be initially vanishing,  $\delta Q_{\text{intr},\text{DM}}$  generates no isocurvature perturbation.

### 3.2 Intrinsic non-adiabatic pressure

The second kind of source term, the non-adiabatic part of the pressure perturbation intrinsic of each fluid  $\alpha$ , is given by [10]

$$\delta \wp_{\text{intr},\alpha} = \delta \wp_\alpha - c_\alpha^2 \delta \rho_\alpha \quad \text{where} \quad c_\alpha^2 = \dot{\wp}_\alpha / \dot{\rho}_\alpha \quad (12)$$

is its adiabatic speed of sound. This term vanishes when the pressure and energy inhomogeneities respect the equation of state of the fluid,  $\wp_\alpha(\rho_\alpha)$ .

Freeze-in particle-physics processes contribute as  $\delta \wp_{\text{intr},\text{SM}} \neq 0$  because they convert SM particles into DM particles, thereby inducing an energy and momentum loss of the SM fluid, as dictated by the specific freeze-in interaction, that generically does not follow the equation of state of the SM fluid.

As a simple example of this unbalance, freeze-in via the decay into DM particles of some SM particle (or, in SM extensions, of some speculative new-physics particle tightly coupled to the SM) transfers more energy than pressure ( $\dot{\rho}_{\text{SM}}/\dot{\wp}_{\text{SM}} > \rho_{\text{SM}}/\wp_{\text{SM}}$ ) because the decaying particles must be massive and thereby they decay slower when they have higher relativistic energy. An unbalance also generically occurs in freeze-in scatterings, described by a cross-section  $\sigma(\text{SM SM} \rightarrow \text{DM DM})$  that only depends on the invariant energy  $\sqrt{s}$  at leading order in the couplings (the motion with respect to the plasma enters at higher orders). The sign of  $\delta \wp_{\text{intr},\text{SM}}$  is not fixed, as the energy dependence of  $\sigma$  can either result in a larger energy transfer when the colliding SM particles have higher energy  $E \gtrsim T$  (this can happen in UV-dominated freeze-in, via non-renormalizable interactions,

for example gravitational [11]) or when the colliding SM particles have lower energy  $E \lesssim T$  (this can happen in IR-dominated freeze-in, via renormalizable interactions). As a possibly relevant special case,  $\delta\wp_{\text{intr,SM}}$  is nearly-vanishing in freeze-in models that only lead to the disappearance of ultra-relativistic SM particles, as they (on angular average) satisfy the same equation of state  $\wp = \rho/3$  as the radiation-dominated SM fluid.

However, the fact that freeze-in processes (decays and scatterings) can contribute as  $\delta\wp_{\text{intr,SM}} \neq 0$  is inconsequential, as we must also take into account the self-interactions of the SM fluid. A multitude of SM particle processes allow the SM fluid to locally re-thermalize to its equation of state with rates  $\Gamma$  much faster than the Hubble rate and than the freeze-in rate. Typically  $\Gamma \sim g^2 T$  where  $g \sim 1$  is a typical SM coupling, such as a gauge coupling. The re-thermalization processes conserve the SM energy  $\rho_{\text{SM}}$ :  $\delta Q_{\text{SM}}$  remains given by freeze-in processes only, so that  $\delta Q_{\text{intr,SM}} = 0$  remains as in section 3.1. On the other hand, the SM pressure  $\wp_{\text{SM}}$  changes such that the combination of the two processes (freeze-in and re-thermalization) leads to  $\delta\wp_{\text{intr,SM}} = 0$ .

This leaves  $\delta\wp_{\text{intr,DM}}$  as a possible source of iso-curvatures. A self-thermalization argument parallel to what just discussed for the SM plasma implies  $\delta\wp_{\text{intr,DM}} = 0$  if DM has significant self-interactions just after being produced during freeze-in. This happens, for example, if DM is a multiplet under a dark gauge group [12] that confines at a scale  $\Lambda$  and if freeze-in happens at  $T \gg \Lambda$ . If instead DM self-interactions are negligible, a formalism extended to higher moments may be needed, but the physics is simple: DM particles free stream on sub-horizon scales, but not on large scales  $k \rightarrow 0$ . The non-thermal DM distribution  $f(\vec{x}, t, q) = f_0(q) + \delta f(\vec{x}, t, q)$  produced by freeze-in redshifts with scale factor  $a$  as [13]

$$\rho_{\text{DM}} = \frac{1}{a^4} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} E f, \quad \wp_{\text{DM}} = \frac{1}{a^4} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{q^2}{3E} f \quad (13)$$

where  $q$  and  $E = \sqrt{q^2 + a^2 M^2}$  are the comoving momentum and energy of the DM particle with mass  $M$ . Two limits are of special interest. If freeze-in is IR-dominated, DM is only mildly relativistic, so that DM motion is soon red-shifted down to negligible pressure,  $\wp_{\text{DM}} \ll \rho_{\text{DM}}$ . UV-dominated freeze-in can produce ultra-relativistic DM with  $\wp_{\text{DM}}/\rho_{\text{DM}} \simeq \dot{\wp}_{\text{DM}}/\dot{\rho}_{\text{DM}} \simeq 1/3$ , that becomes non-relativistic only later when the SM cools down to temperatures comparable to the DM mass  $M$ , while the horizon reaches larger scales.

## 4 Conclusions

We considered generic models of freeze-in (from decays, from scatterings, IR-dominated, UV-dominated...) finding that the generated Dark Matter inherits the Standard Model adiabatic inhomogeneities on the cosmological scales probed by current observations, that were super-horizon during freeze-in. In section 2 we presented an intuitive argument

based on the well-known ‘separate universe’ picture. This was substantiated in section 3 by checking the explicit sources of iso-curvature perturbations on super-horizon scales.

Iso-curvature perturbations can only be generated on small scales that were sub-horizon during freeze-in: this effect can perhaps be relevant in models where freeze-in happens at the lowest possible temperature  $T \sim M \sim \text{keV}$ , possibly in the presence of dark long-range forces.

In conclusion, freeze-in appears a viable mechanism for generation of the cosmological DM abundance. Similar arguments hold for other particle-physics mechanisms such as ‘cannibalism’ [14] or ‘freeze-out and decay’. Furthermore, baryogenesis mechanisms that involve elements similar to freeze-in (such as leptogenesis from right-handed neutrinos with initially negligible abundance) are similarly compatible with iso-curvature bounds.

**Acknowledgements** We thank Guido d’Amico, Alessio Notari, Paolo Panci, Michele Redi, Andrea Tesi for discussions. This work was supported by the MIUR grant PRIN 2017FMJFMW.

## References

- [1] The term ‘freeze-in’ was introduced in L.J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell, S.M. West, “[Freeze-In Production of FIMP Dark Matter](#)”, JHEP 03 (2010) 080 [[arXiv:0911.1120](#)]. The idea is much older: it was for example assumed for sterile neutrinos, and next for singlet scalars, see e.g. J. McDonald, “[Thermally generated gauge singlet scalars as self-interacting dark matter](#)”, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88 (2002) 091304 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0106249](#)]. For a review and references see N. Bernal, M. Heikinheimo, T. Tenkanen, K. Tuominen, V. Vaskonen, “[The Dawn of FIMP Dark Matter: A Review of Models and Constraints](#)”, Int.J.Mod.Phys.A 32 (2017) 1730023 [[arXiv:1706.07442](#)].
- [2] PLANCK Collaboration, “[Planck 2018 results. I. Overview and the cosmological legacy of Planck](#)”, Astron.Astrophys. 641 (2020) A1 [[arXiv:1807.06205](#)]. PLANCK Collaboration, “[Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters](#)”, Astron.Astrophys. 641 (2020) A6 [[arXiv:1807.06209](#)].
- [3] S. Weinberg, “[Must cosmological perturbations remain non-adiabatic after multi-field inflation?](#)”, Phys.Rev.D 70 (2004) 083522 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0405397](#)].
- [4] N. Bellomo, K.V. Berghaus, K.K. Boddy, “[Dark matter freeze-in produces large post-inflationary isocurvature](#)” [[arXiv:2210.15691](#)].
- [5] D. Wands, K.A. Malik, D.H. Lyth, A.R. Liddle, “[A New approach to the evolution of cosmological perturbations](#)”, Phys.Rev.D 62 (2000) 043527 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0003278](#)].
- [6] D.H. Lyth, D. Wands, “[Conserved cosmological perturbations](#)”, Phys.Rev.D 68 (2003) 103515 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0306498](#)].
- [7] S. Weinberg, “[Can non-adiabatic perturbations arise after single-field inflation?](#)”, Phys.Rev.D 70 (2004) 043541 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0401313](#)].
- [8] J.M. Bardeen, “[Gauge Invariant Cosmological Perturbations](#)”, Phys.Rev.D 22 (1980) 1882.
- [9] H. Kodama, M. Sasaki, “[Cosmological Perturbation Theory](#)”, Prog.Theor.Phys.Suppl. 78 (1984) 1.

- [10] K.A. Malik, D. Wands, “Adiabatic and entropy perturbations with interacting fluids and fields”, JCAP 02 (2005) 007 [[arXiv:astro-ph/0411703](#)].
- [11] M. Garny, M.C. Sandora, M.S. Sloth, “Planckian Interacting Massive Particles as Dark Matter”, Phys.Rev.Lett. 116 (2016) 101302 [[arXiv:1511.03278](#)].
- [12] C. Gross, S. Karamitsos, G. Landini, A. Strumia, “Gravitational Vector Dark Matter”, JHEP 03 (2021) 174 [[arXiv:2012.12087](#)].
- [13] C.-P. Ma, E. Bertschinger, “Cosmological perturbation theory in the synchronous and conformal Newtonian”, Astrophys.J. 455 (1995) 7 [[arXiv:astro-ph/9506072](#)].
- [14] E.D. Carlson, M.E. Machacek, L.J. Hall, “Self-interacting dark matter”, Astrophys.J. 398 (1992) 43. E. Kuflik, M. Perelstein, N.R.-L. Lorier, Y.-D. Tsai, “Elastically Decoupling Dark Matter”, Phys.Rev.Lett. 116 (2016) 221302 [[arXiv:1512.04545](#)]. D. Pappadopulo, J.T. Ruderman, G. Trevisan, “Dark matter freeze-out in a nonrelativistic sector”, Phys.Rev.D 94 (2016) 035005 [[arXiv:1602.04219](#)].