

Primordial black hole mass functions as a probe of cosmic origin

Yi-Fu Cai,^{1,2,*} Chengfeng Tang,^{1,2} Geyu Mo,^{1,2} Shengfeng Yan,^{3,4} Chao Chen,⁵ Xiaohan Ma,^{1,2} Bo Wang,^{1,2,†} Wentao Luo,^{1,2,‡} Damien Easson,^{6,§} and Antonino Marciano^{7,8,9,¶}

¹*Deep Space Exploration Laboratory/School of Physical Sciences,*

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

²*CAS Key Laboratory for Researches in Galaxies and Cosmology/Department of Astronomy, School of Astronomy and Space Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

³*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Sezione di Milano, Via Celoria 16, 20146, Milano, Italy*

⁴*DiSAT, Università degli Studi dell'Insubria, Via Valleggio 11, 22100, Como, Italy*

⁵*Jockey Club Institute for Advanced Study, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China*

⁶*Department of Physics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-1504, USA*

⁷*Department of Physics & Center for Field Theory and Particle Physics, Fudan University, 200433 Shanghai, China*

⁸*Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati INFN Via Enrico Fermi 54, Frascati (Roma), Italy*

⁹*INFN sezione Roma Tor Vergata, I-00133 Rome, Italy*

We discuss a novel window to probe the origin of our universe via the mass functions of primordial black holes (PBHs). The mass functions of PBHs are simply estimated using the conventional Press-Schechter formalism for different paradigms of cosmic origin, including inflationary Λ CDM and bounce cosmology. The standard inflationary Λ CDM model cannot generate an appreciable number of massive PBHs; however, non-trivial inflation models with blue-tilted power spectra at small scales and matter bounce cosmology provide formation mechanisms for heavy PBHs, which in turn, may seed the observed supermassive black holes (SMBHs). Fitting the observed mass functions of SMBHs in the local universe, we derive for the first time constraints on the PBH current density fraction f_{PBH} and the characteristic mass M_* for different paradigms of cosmic origin, with the prior assumption that all local SMBHs stem from PBHs. We demonstrate that this newly proposed procedure, relying on astronomical measurements that utilize deep-field scans of SMBHs at high redshift, can in principle be used to constrain models of cosmic origin.

Introduction – How to probe cosmic origin is one of the most fundamental questions in modern physics, and sets the cornerstone supporting modern techniques for experimental development and for observational cosmology. Over decades, we have precisely measured a nearly scale-invariant power spectrum of primordial density fluctuations through the windows provided by the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [1] and large-scale structure (LSS) [2, 3]. The measurements yield significant constraints on the inflationary Λ CDM model, first proposed to understand initial conditions for hot big bang cosmology [4–7]. However, research interests in alternative scenarios remain extensive, both to attain developments of cosmological perturbation theory [8] and to face challenges from several astronomical experiments [9–12]. Cosmologists are motivated to search for primordial paradigms beyond inflation, including bounce cosmology [13–17], Ekpyrotic cosmology [18, 19], string gas cosmology [20–22] and emergent universe [23–26], among others. Naturally, the question follows whether or not these theoretical paradigms can be distinguished by observational physics.

While many efforts were made on the precise characterization of power spectra of primordial perturbations on large scales [27, 28], it becomes crucial to look for new and independent probes at small scales. A natural prediction of primordial perturbations at small scales is the formation of primordial black holes (PBHs) [29–32]. Due

to their broad mass distribution, PBHs can possibly seed supermassive black holes (SMBHs), which were found in abundance in astronomical surveys [33–35]. In particular, many SMBHs were discovered at high redshift while the underlying formation mechanism remains unclear [36–38]. The current astrophysical approaches of SMBH formation suffer puzzles such as supercritical accretion time, exceptionally high star formation rate, etc [33, 39–41]. Accordingly, besides their astrophysical origin, it is necessary to consider the cosmological origin of SMBHs formed in the primordial epoch. It is well known that a nearly scale-invariant power spectrum derived from inflationary Λ CDM cosmology can hardly generate enough PBHs responsible for the observed SMBHs [42]. Thus, several paradigms of cosmic origin that may generate sufficient PBHs were extensively pursued, such as non-trivial inflation models with a blue-tilted power spectrum at small scales [43, 44] and bounce cosmology [45–48].

In this Letter, we introduce a novel probe of cosmic origin using the mass function of PBHs predicted by different cosmological scenarios and comparing it with the observed SMBHs. Specifically, we consider the inflationary scenario that allows a blue-tilted power spectrum at small scales, dubbed as small-scale enhanced inflation (SSE-inflation), and the cosmology of a matter bounce in which the regular thermal expansion is preceded by a period of matter-dominated contraction. This approach may be applied to other cosmic origin models as well.

For both scenarios, we consider power-law-parameterized primordial power spectra. We then adopt the conventional Press-Schechter (PS) formalism [49] to estimate their PBH mass functions under the assumption of Gaussian probability distributions of density perturbations. For simplicity, we ignore the effects on PBH mass function from some dynamical processes including accretion and merger during cosmic evolution. We further assume that all local SMBHs arise from PBHs. Utilizing 28 observational data points of SMBHs in the local universe provided in [50, 51], we perform Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations to pin down the parameter spaces of the fraction of PBHs against total dark matter f_{PBH} and the characteristic mass M_* for different cosmological scenarios. We then compare the mass functions of massive PBHs produced within different scenarios with the observed SMBHs. Consequently, by investigating the feature of supermassive PBHs mass function incorporated with the primordial scalar power spectra, this scheme provides a novel probe to falsify cosmic origin paradigms by observing SMBHs.

Power spectra and PBH formation – Several cosmological surveys, including CMB, LSS, galaxy clustering, Lyman- α forest, etc., have tightly constrained the matter power spectrum at scales $k \lesssim 3 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [52, 53]. These observations are consistent with the predictions of the standard inflationary Λ CDM model, according to which the primordial power spectrum $P(k) = A_s(k/k_*)^{n_s-1}$ is nearly scale-invariant, with spectral index n_s and amplitude A_s measured precisely at pivot scale k_* by Planck [54]. This red-tilted power spectrum prevents PBHs from constituting a considerable fraction of dark matter [44], seeding SMBHs [42], and from addressing several such issues. Theoretically, however, there are many realizations of SSE-inflation that generate a blue-tilted spectrum at small scales, allowing for an increase in the abundance of massive PBHs, such as non-attractor inflation [55–57] and non-perturbative resonance effects [58–61]. Furthermore, it was found in [45, 46] that a matter bounce can produce substantial PBH formation.

To investigate the formation of PBHs, we adopt the general forms of power spectra for SSE-inflation and matter bounce [62, 63], which are parameterized in the power-law form by,

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}^I(k) = \begin{cases} A_s(k/k_*)^{n_s-1}, & k < k_t \\ A_b(k/k_*)^{n_b-1}, & k \geq k_t \end{cases}; \quad (1)$$

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}^B(k, a) \simeq A_B k^{n_B-1} a^{-3},$$

where “I” and “B” denote the SSE-inflation and matter bounce scenarios, respectively. For SSE-inflation, a characteristic scale k_t is introduced to account for the transition from the red-tilted spectrum with amplitude A_s and spectral index $n_s \sim 1$ to the blue-tilted spectrum with A_b and $n_b > 1$, the latter inducing an efficient formation of heavy PBHs. For matter bounce, the power spectrum

is parameterized by the corresponding amplitude A_B and spectral index n_B , and inversely proportional to the cubic power of the scale factor a . During the contracting phase, the scalar perturbations grow as the universe contracts [63, 64].

In addition to the distinct shapes of the primordial power spectra, the formation mechanisms of PBHs are also different in the scenarios of SSE-inflation and matter bounce. For SSE-inflation, PBHs can form when the amplified perturbations re-enter the Hubble radius during radiation domination [31]; while for matter bounce, when the Jeans length is smaller than the Hubble radius during the contracting phase, quantum fluctuations at the Jeans-length crossing can evolve into classical perturbations at super-Jeans, but sub-Hubble scales. Thus, the growth of perturbations in the super-Jeans/sub-Hubble regime can allow for the formation of PBHs [45, 46, 48]. Consequently, the PBH mass functions derived in these two scenarios are expected to exhibit different behaviors.

PBH mass functions – As a preliminary demonstration of probing cosmic origin using PBH mass functions, we ignore the uncertain late-time evolution of the PBHs, including accretion and merger. The PBH mass function is derived by the PS formalism [62, 65],

$$\frac{dn}{dM}(M) = \frac{2A_n f_{\text{PBH}} \rho_{\text{DM}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}M} \left| \frac{d\nu}{dM} \right| e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu(M)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where f_{PBH} is the current PBH fraction, ρ_{DM} is the current dark matter density, $A_n \sim 1$ is a normalized factor [62] and $\nu(M) \equiv \delta_c/\sigma(M)$ is the peak height with critical density contrast δ_c and fluctuation variance $\sigma(M)$. It is manifest from Eq. (2) that the shape of the PBH mass function relies on $\nu(M)$, and hence indicates an exponential suppression of the PBH mass function, controlled by the characteristic mass M_* defined as $\nu(M_*) = 1$. Using the power spectra presented in Eq. (1), it is straightforward to calculate the PBH mass functions for SSE-inflation and matter bounce via the formula (2) through the following peak heights [45, 62]:

$$\nu_I(M) = \left(\frac{S_1 M_*^2 + S_2 M_*^{-\beta}}{S_1 M^2 + S_2 M^{-\beta}} \right)^{1/2}; \quad (3)$$

$$\nu_B(M) = \left(\frac{M}{M_*} \right)^{\frac{n_B+5}{6}},$$

where $\beta = (n_b - 1)/2$, $S_1 = (n_b - n_s)/M_t^{2+\beta}$ and $S_2 = n_s + 3$, with a particular mass $M_t \sim 4\pi^2 H_0^2 \Omega_{r,0}/k_t^2$, H_0 denoting the present Hubble constant and $\Omega_{r,0}$ the radiation density parameter. Distinct forms of $\nu(M)$ within different scenarios allow one to distinguish the related mass functions. This is triggered by calculations of the fluctuation variance $\sigma(M)$ through the PS formalism, which depends both on the power spectrum of density fluctuation and the window function. Eq. (1) leads to

different density fluctuation power spectra. In addition, the scales at which PBH formation occurs differ in the expanding and contracting phases and hence affect the smoothing scale of the window function.

In order to satisfy homogeneity at large scales in the PS formalism, an increasing $\nu(M)$ is required. The lower limit of the spectral index should be then $n_b > 1$ and $n_B > -5$, according to Eq. (3). Differently from the monotonic increase of $\nu_B(M)$, $\nu_I(M)$ reaches its maximum at $M \sim \mathcal{O}(M_t)$. This induces a cut-off for the PBH mass function $dn/dM = 0$ at $M \sim \mathcal{O}(M_t)$ in SSE-inflation. A relatively large M_t is then required to be consistent with the mass of produced PBHs, as seeds of observed SMBHs. The lower bound of k_t is on the other side arising from the observed nearly scale-invariant spectrum at large scales. Numerical results show that $k_t \sim \mathcal{O}(10) \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and that the PBH mass function is insensitive to k_t . Moreover, the slopes of the PBH mass functions ($M < M_\star$) can be estimated from Eq. (3), encoding the behaviours $dn/dM \propto M^{\frac{n_b-9}{4}}$ and $\propto M^{\frac{n_B-7}{6}}$ for SSE-inflation and matter bounce, respectively.




FIG. 1. PBH mass functions derived from the best-fit parameters at 68% C.L. in SSE-inflation (red shaded area) and matter bounce (blue shaded area), by using observational SMBH mass functions in the local universe. Observational estimates of SMBH mass functions are from Marconi *et al.* [50] (blue circles), Vika *et al.* [51] (orange diamonds), Li *et al.* [66] (purple dashed curve), Sicilia *et al.* [67] (black dashed curve) and Shankar *et al.* [68] (gray shaded area). The gray shaded area depicts the observational uncertainty when determining the SMBH mass functions from the local stellar mass/velocity dispersion functions [68].

Numerical results – We choose 5 data sets of SMBH mass functions in the local universe and exhibit our results in Figs. 1 and 2. Sets are derived from the Center for Astrophysics redshift survey [50], Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [50, 68], Millennium Galaxy Catalogue survey [51], ROSAT All-Sky Survey [68], UKIDSS Ultra Deep Survey [66]. We adopt the simulated SMBH mass func-

tion in [66, 67] displayed as dashed curves in Fig. 1. All observations imply a decreasing mass function of SMBHs, in particular, their mass functions drop rapidly when the mass is roughly above $10^9 M_\odot$. We perform the MCMC simulations (emcee [69]), exploiting 28 data points provided in [50, 51], and derive the best-fit model parameters M_\star , f_{PBH} and n_b . The PBH mass functions for SSE-inflation and matter bounce, derived from the best-fit values (at 68% CL), are shown by the red and the blue shaded areas in Fig. 1, respectively. We set the transition scale to be $k_t = 10 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, which corresponds to the mass $M_t = 9 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$ to ensure that the mass of produced PBHs is consistent with the mass range of SMBHs. Without loss of generality, in SSE-inflation, we choose the spectral index of the blue-tilted power spectrum n_b to be a free parameter while keeping the power spectrum in the matter bounce to be almost scale-invariant, i.e., $n_B \sim 1$ in order to be consistent with cosmological observations [45, 64].

From Fig. 1, we observe that the mass function in SSE-inflation fits the data from [50, 51, 66] well and that the mass function predicted by the matter bounce scenario is almost located within the allowed region provided in [68]. Note that there are two significant behaviors. First, within the lower-mass region ($M < M_\star$), the slopes of mass functions for both the scenarios, derived through the numerical calculations, are completely consistent with the analytical estimates made in the previous subsection. Second, for the larger-mass region ($M \gtrsim M_\star$), the matter bounce yields a mass function that decreases faster than that of SSE-inflation. The underlying reason is that the monotonic growth of $\nu_B(M)$ leads to a drastic exponential suppression of the mass function in the matter bounce scenario. Therefore, these crucial dynamics can be exploited in order to distinguish different cosmic origin paradigms by leveraging high-precision SMBH surveys in the near future.

Fig. 2 presents the parameter spaces for M_\star and f_{PBH} in 1σ - and 2σ -confidence regions for the SSE-inflation and matter bounce scenarios, respectively. The best-fit parameter space for SSE-inflation at 68% C.L. reads

$$\text{Log}_{10}\left(\frac{M_\star}{M_\odot}\right) = 8.606_{-0.066}^{+0.080}, \quad \text{Log}_{10}f_{\text{PBH}} = -4.588_{-0.052}^{+0.044}, \\ n_b = 2.75 \pm 0.12,$$

which for matter bounce at 68% C.L. reads

$$\text{Log}_{10}\left(\frac{M_\star}{M_\odot}\right) = 9.340_{-0.026}^{+0.020}, \quad \text{Log}_{10}f_{\text{PBH}} = -4.43 \pm 0.1.$$

The best-fit values of f_{PBH} in both the scenarios are close to the upper limit for f_{PBH} at M_\star , although not yet ruled out [44]. Moreover, according to the numerical results, the spectral index n_b needs to be very blue-tilted, so that the PBH formation due to the enhanced power at small scales can account for SMBHs. This is not the case for




FIG. 2. The best-fit values of the parameters M_* , f_{PBH} and n_b from MCMC simulations of SSE-inflation (red) and matter bounce (blue) scenarios, associated with the system error parameter σ_{sys} . In each scenario, the 68% C.L. (deep color) and 95% C.L. (light color) regions of each parameter are provided.

the matter bounce, for which the power spectrum remains nearly scale-invariant at all scales, but the abundance of PBHs can be realized by increasing the growth history of the contracting phase. Consequently, these two scenarios can be distinguished using the measurements of the scalar power spectrum at $10 \text{ Mpc}^{-1} \lesssim k \lesssim 10^9 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, by exploiting data from future surveys, e.g., Primordial Inflation Explorer, Square Kilometre Array [70, 71].

To properly assess the relevance of our results, we comment on the assumption we made to neglect the effects of astrophysical dynamical processes, including accretion and merger, upon the PBH mass functions, to consider all local SMBHs to occur from PBHs, and to estimate the PBH formation only through the PS formalism. Once a more realistic evolution of PBHs is taken into account, e.g., including accretion and merging processes, our approach is still reliable except for reasonable variations on the parameter spaces that deserve further concrete investigation. Furthermore, if local SMBHs were formed both from conventional astrophysical processes and PBHs, our approach would provide an upper limit on the parameter space of the cosmic origin scenario, enabling falsification of several models of the very early universe. Additionally, PBHs at formation would be lighter, extending consequently the range of k_t to smaller scales, and the M_* parameter for each scenario would be smaller, although associated to larger f_{PBH} , and hence could be constrained by lensing observations [44].

Concluding remarks – We proposed a promising scheme that offers the possibility to probe the origin of the universe by combining PBH mass functions with the observed SMBHs. Every cosmic origin paradigm predicts a unique scalar power spectrum at small length scales and thus leads to distinct PBH mass functions. Specifically, we considered two representative scenarios, SSE-inflation and the matter bounce. For the sake of generality, we parameterized the primordial curvature spectra in the power-law form and adopted the conventional PS formalism in order to estimate the resulting PBH mass functions. By performing the MCMC numerical computation, we found the best-fit values of the parameters M_* , f_{PBH} , and n_b , showing that the behavior of the mass functions for different cosmological scenarios in the mass range of SMBHs are distinguishable.

Inspired by the new probe developed in this Letter, there are several follow-up issues that deserve further investigation, namely the generalization of the PS formalism to alternative paradigms, including Ekpyrotic cosmology and emergent universe, massive PBH formation in hybrid cosmic origin scenarios, the evolution of resulting mass function throughout the cosmic history, and so forth. Additionally, some non-Gaussian effects can significantly affect the PBH formation [72–76], and hence may also lead to distinguishable features for this probe. These topics bridge the theoretical study of cosmic origin and observations of SMBHs, enriching our approach towards the investigation of the early universe.

We conclude with the statement that this novel probe, along with the accumulated data of SMBHs, are expected to shed light on cosmic origin. Remarkably, a population of SMBHs at high redshift has been found by several observations, such as SDSS, Chandra X-ray Observatory, and DESI Legacy Imaging Surveys, etc [77–79]. The current James Webb Space Telescope also revealed the discovery of extremely high luminosity objects which could be SMBH candidates at high redshift [80]. Those observations indicate possible challenges to the theory of primordial structure formation within the standard Λ CDM cosmology. According to our results, for the alternative scenarios, the structure formations are allowed at much earlier epochs. It becomes then experimentally possible to falsify several cosmic origin scenarios through forthcoming astronomical observations derived by means of deep-field scans of SMBHs at high redshift.

Acknowledgments – We are grateful to Ugo Moschella, Jerome Quintin, Misao Sasaki, Dong-Gang Wang, Yi Wang, and Zihan Zhou for their valuable communications. This work is supported in part by National Key R&D Program of China (2021YFC2203100), by NSFC (11875113, 11961131007, 12261131497, 12003029, 11833005, 12192224), by Fundamental Research Funds for Central Universities, by CSC Innovation Talent Funds, by USTC Fellowship for International Cooperation, by USTC Research Funds of the Double First-Class Initiative, by

CAS project for young scientists in basic research (YSBR-006), by the Shanghai Municipality Science and Technology Commission (KBH1512299). SFY is supported by the Disposizione del Presidente INFN n. 24433 in INFN Sezione di Milano. DE is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award No. DE-SC0019470, and the Foundational Questions Institute under Grant No. FQXi-MGB-1927. We acknowledge the use of the computing cluster *LINDA* & *JUDY* in the particle cosmology group at USTC.

* yifucui@ustc.edu.cn

† ymwangbo@ustc.edu.cn

‡ wtluo@ustc.edu.cn

§ easson@asu.edu

¶ marciano@fudan.edu.cn

- [1] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A5 (2020), arXiv:1907.12875 [astro-ph.CO].
- [2] S. Alam *et al.* (eBOSS), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 083533 (2021), arXiv:2007.08991 [astro-ph.CO].
- [3] S. Pandey *et al.* (DES), *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 043520 (2022), arXiv:2105.13545 [astro-ph.CO].
- [4] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [5] A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **91**, 99 (1980).
- [6] A. D. Linde, *Phys. Lett. B* **108**, 389 (1982).
- [7] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1220 (1982).
- [8] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman, and R. H. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rept.* **215**, 203 (1992).
- [9] P. Bull *et al.*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **12**, 56 (2016), arXiv:1512.05356 [astro-ph.CO].
- [10] J. S. Bullock and M. Boylan-Kolchin, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **55**, 343 (2017), arXiv:1707.04256 [astro-ph.CO].
- [11] L. Verde, T. Treu, and A. G. Riess, *Nature Astron.* **3**, 891 (2019), arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph.CO].
- [12] E. Di Valentino, O. Mena, S. Pan, L. Visinelli, W. Yang, A. Melchiorri, D. F. Mota, A. G. Riess, and J. Silk, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38**, 153001 (2021), arXiv:2103.01183 [astro-ph.CO].
- [13] R. H. Brandenberger, V. F. Mukhanov, and A. Sornborger, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 1629 (1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9303001.
- [14] P. Peter and N. Pinto-Neto, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 063506 (2008), arXiv:0809.2022 [gr-qc].
- [15] Y.-F. Cai, D. A. Easson, and R. Brandenberger, *JCAP* **08**, 020 (2012), arXiv:1206.2382 [hep-th].
- [16] Y.-F. Cai, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **57**, 1414 (2014), arXiv:1405.1369 [hep-th].
- [17] R. Brandenberger and P. Peter, *Found. Phys.* **47**, 797 (2017), arXiv:1603.05834 [hep-th].
- [18] J. Khoury, B. A. Ovrut, P. J. Steinhardt, and N. Turok, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123522 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0103239.
- [19] P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 126003 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0111098.
- [20] R. H. Brandenberger and C. Vafa, *Nucl. Phys. B* **316**, 391 (1989).
- [21] A. Nayeri, R. H. Brandenberger, and C. Vafa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 021302 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0511140.
- [22] T. Battefeld and S. Watson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 435 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0510022.
- [23] G. F. R. Ellis and R. Maartens, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 223 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0211082.
- [24] G. F. R. Ellis, J. Murugan, and C. G. Tsagas, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 233 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0307112.
- [25] P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis, and E. Trincherini, *JCAP* **11**, 021 (2010), arXiv:1007.0027 [hep-th].
- [26] A. Ilyas, M. Zhu, Y. Zheng, and Y.-F. Cai, *JHEP* **01**, 141 (2021), arXiv:2009.10351 [gr-qc].
- [27] R. H. Brandenberger, S. Kanno, J. Soda, D. A. Easson, J. Khoury, P. Martineau, A. Nayeri, and S. P. Patil, *JCAP* **11**, 009 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0608186.
- [28] Y.-F. Cai, A. Marciano, D.-G. Wang, and E. Wilson-Ewing, *Universe* **3**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1610.00938 [astro-ph.CO].
- [29] Y. B. Zel'dovich and I. D. Novikov, *Sov. Astron.* **10**, 602 (1967).
- [30] S. Hawking, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **152**, 75 (1971).
- [31] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **168**, 399 (1974).
- [32] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35**, 063001 (2018), arXiv:1801.05235 [astro-ph.CO].
- [33] M. Volonteri, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **18**, 279 (2010), arXiv:1003.4404 [astro-ph.CO].
- [34] A. Dressler, in *Active Galactic Nuclei*, Vol. 134, edited by D. E. Osterbrock and J. S. Miller (1989) p. 217.
- [35] B. Devecchi and M. Volonteri, *Astrophys. J.* **694**, 302 (2009), arXiv:0810.1057 [astro-ph].
- [36] J. Magorrian *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **115**, 2285 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9708072.
- [37] K. Gültekin *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **698**, 198 (2009), arXiv:0903.4897 [astro-ph.GA].
- [38] N. J. McConnell, C.-P. Ma, K. Gebhardt, S. A. Wright, J. D. Murphy, T. R. Lauer, J. R. Graham, and D. O. Richstone, *Nature* **480**, 215 (2011), arXiv:1112.1078 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] Z. Haiman, *Astrophys. J.* **613**, 36 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0404196 [astro-ph].
- [40] S. L. Shapiro, *Astrophys. J.* **620**, 59 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0411156.
- [41] K. Inayoshi, E. Visbal, and Z. Haiman, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **58**, 27 (2020), arXiv:1911.05791 [astro-ph.GA].
- [42] R. Bean and J. Magueijo, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 063505 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0204486.
- [43] C. T. Byrnes, P. S. Cole, and S. P. Patil, *JCAP* **06**, 028 (2019), arXiv:1811.11158 [astro-ph.CO].
- [44] B. Carr and F. Kuhnel, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **70**, 355 (2020), arXiv:2006.02838 [astro-ph.CO].
- [45] J. Quintin and R. H. Brandenberger, *JCAP* **11**, 029 (2016), arXiv:1609.02556 [astro-ph.CO].
- [46] J.-W. Chen, J. Liu, H.-L. Xu, and Y.-F. Cai, *Phys. Lett. B* **769**, 561 (2017), arXiv:1609.02571 [gr-qc].
- [47] J.-W. Chen, M. Zhu, S.-F. Yan, Q.-Q. Wang, and Y.-F. Cai, *JCAP* **01**, 015 (2023), arXiv:2207.14532 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] B. J. Carr and A. A. Coley, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **20**, 2733 (2011), arXiv:1104.3796 [astro-ph.CO].
- [49] W. H. Press and P. Schechter, *Astrophys. J.* **187**, 425 (1974).
- [50] A. Marconi, G. Risaliti, R. Gilli, L. K. Hunt, R. Maiolino, and M. Salvati, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **351**, 169 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0311619.

- [51] M. Vika, S. P. Driver, A. W. Graham, and J. Liske, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **400**, 1451 (2009), arXiv:0908.2102 [astro-ph.CO].
- [52] B. A. Reid *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **404**, 60 (2010), arXiv:0907.1659 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] S. Chabanier, M. Millea, and N. Palanque-Delabrouille, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **489**, 2247 (2019), arXiv:1905.08103 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), *Astron. Astrophys.* **652**, C4 (2022), arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [55] W. H. Kinney, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 023515 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0503017.
- [56] J. Martin, H. Motohashi, and T. Suyama, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 023514 (2013), arXiv:1211.0083 [astro-ph.CO].
- [57] J. Garcia-Bellido and E. Ruiz Morales, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **18**, 47 (2017), arXiv:1702.03901 [astro-ph.CO].
- [58] Y.-F. Cai, X. Tong, D.-G. Wang, and S.-F. Yan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 081306 (2018), arXiv:1805.03639 [astro-ph.CO].
- [59] Y.-F. Cai, C. Chen, X. Tong, D.-G. Wang, and S.-F. Yan, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 043518 (2019), arXiv:1902.08187 [astro-ph.CO].
- [60] Z. Zhou, J. Jiang, Y.-F. Cai, M. Sasaki, and S. Pi, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 103527 (2020), arXiv:2010.03537 [astro-ph.CO].
- [61] Y.-F. Cai, J. Jiang, M. Sasaki, V. Vardanyan, and Z. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 251301 (2021), arXiv:2105.12554 [astro-ph.CO].
- [62] J. Sureda, J. Magana, I. J. Araya, and N. D. Padilla, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **507**, 4804 (2021), arXiv:2008.09683 [astro-ph.CO].
- [63] Y.-F. Cai, R. Brandenberger, and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **2011**, 003 (2011), arXiv:1101.0822 [hep-th].
- [64] P. Peter, E. J. C. Pinho, and N. Pinto-Neto, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 023516 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0610205.
- [65] B. Carr, F. Kuhnel, and M. Sandstad, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 083504 (2016), arXiv:1607.06077 [astro-ph.CO].
- [66] Y.-R. Li, L. C. Ho, and J.-M. Wang, *Astrophys. J.* **742**, 33 (2011), arXiv:1109.0089 [astro-ph.CO].
- [67] A. Sicilia *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **934**, 66 (2022), arXiv:2206.07357 [astro-ph.GA].
- [68] F. Shankar *et al.*, *Nature Astronomy* **4**, 282 (2020), arXiv:1910.10175 [astro-ph.GA].
- [69] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **125**, 306 (2013), arXiv:1202.3665 [astro-ph.IM].
- [70] A. Kogut *et al.*, *JCAP* **07**, 025 (2011), arXiv:1105.2044 [astro-ph.CO].
- [71] C. J. Moore, R. H. Cole, and C. P. L. Berry, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 015014 (2015), arXiv:1408.0740 [gr-qc].
- [72] Y.-F. Cai, X.-H. Ma, M. Sasaki, D.-G. Wang, and Z. Zhou, *Phys. Lett. B* **834**, 137461 (2022), arXiv:2112.13836 [astro-ph.CO].
- [73] Y.-F. Cai, X.-H. Ma, M. Sasaki, D.-G. Wang, and Z. Zhou, *JCAP* **12**, 034 (2022), arXiv:2207.11910 [astro-ph.CO].
- [74] G. Panagopoulos and E. Silverstein, (2019), arXiv:1906.02827 [hep-th].
- [75] J. M. Ezquiaga, J. García-Bellido, and V. Vennin, *JCAP* **03**, 029 (2020), arXiv:1912.05399 [astro-ph.CO].
- [76] D. G. Figueroa, S. Raatikainen, S. Rasanen, and E. Tomberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 101302 (2021), arXiv:2012.06551 [astro-ph.CO].
- [77] X. Fan *et al.* (SDSS), *Astron. J.* **122**, 2833 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0108063.
- [78] F. Wang *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **908**, 53 (2021), arXiv:2011.12458 [astro-ph.GA].
- [79] J. Yang *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **897**, L14 (2020), arXiv:2006.13452 [astro-ph.GA].
- [80] D. Wylezalek *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **940**, L7 (2022), arXiv:2210.10074 [astro-ph.GA].