## W hat is the low est possible reheating tem perature?

Steen Hannestad Department of Physics, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark and

> NORDITA, Blegdam svej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark (Dated: 11 March 2004)

W e study models in which the universe exits reheating at temperatures in the MeV regime. By combining light element abundance measurements with cosm ic microwave background and large scale structure data we nd a fairly robust lower limit on the reheating temperature of  $T_{\rm R\,H}$  > 4 MeV at 95% C L. However, if the heavy particle whose decay reheats the universe has a direct decay mode to neutrinos, there are some small islands left in parameter space where a reheating temperature as low as 1 MeV is allowed. The derived lower bound on the reheating temperature also leads to very stringent bounds on models with n large extra dimensions. For n = 2 the bound on the compactic cation scale is M > 2000 TeV, and for n = 3 it is 100 TeV. These are currently the strongest available bounds on such models.

PACS num bers: 98.80.Cq, 98.80 Ft, 98.70.Vc

I. IN TRODUCTION

The standard big bang model has been tested thoroughly up to tem peratures around 1 M eV where big bang nucleosynthesis occurred. At much higher tem peratures the universe is assumed to have undergone in ation, during which the prim ordial density perturbations are produced.

Towards the end of in ation the in aton potential steepens so that slow roll is violated, and the universe enters the reheating phase. During this phase all particles which are kinem atically allowed are produced, either by direct decay or from the therm al bath produced by the in aton decay.

Finally the universe enters the radiation dominated phase at a temperature  $T_{R\,H}$ , which is a function of the in aton decay rate. The only certain bound on this reheating temperature comes from big bang nucleosynthesis, and has in several previous studies been found to be around 1 M eV [1, 2].

It should be noted that even if the reheating tem perature after in ation is much higher there can still be subsequent "reheating" phases, in the sense that reheating is de ned to be a period where the energy density is dom inated by an unstable non-relativistic particle species. In standard reheating this is the in aton, but in supersym m etric m odels it could for instance be the gravitino.

In the present paper we update previous calculations of this reheating phenom enon, using data from cosm ic m icrow ave background and large scale structure observations. Furtherm ore we extend the analysis to include the possibility of having a direct decay mode of the heavy particle into light neutrinos. If the heavy particle is a scalar this decay is norm ally suppressed by a factor  $(m = m)^2$  because of the necessary helicity ip. However, the heavy particle could either be a non-scalar particle, or it could be a pseudo-scalar like the majoron which couples only to neutrinos. Even though such models are slightly contrived it is of interest to study whether the tem perature bound on reheating is signily cantly a ected by the possibility of direct decay into neutrinos.

In section II we discuss the set of Boltzm ann equations necessary to follow the evolution of all particle species. In section III present results of the numerical solution of these equation, and in section IV we compare model predictions with observational data. Finally, section V is a review of other astrophysical constraints on heavy, decaying particles, and section V I contains a discussion.

### II. BOLTZMANN EQUATIONS

W e follow the evolution of all particles by solving the Boltzm ann equation for each species

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \quad H p \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} = C_{coll}; \qquad (1)$$

where C  $_{\rm coll}$  is the collision operator describing elastic and inelastic collisions.

### A. Neutrinos

N eutrinos interact with the electrom agnetic plasm a via weak interactions. A comprehensive treatment of this can for instance be found in Ref. [3]. The collision integrals can be written as [3]

$$C_{\text{coll;i}}(f_1) = \frac{1}{2E_1}^{Z} \frac{d^3p_2}{2E_2(2)^3} \frac{d^3p_3}{2E_3(2)^3} \frac{d^3p_4}{2E_4(2)^3}$$

E lectronic address: hannestad@ fysik.sdu.dk

$$(2 \stackrel{4}{)}^{4} (p_1 + p_2 \quad p_3 + p_4) (f_1; f_2; f_3; f_4) S M \quad j_{2! \quad 34; i};$$
(2)

where  $S M j_{2!} j_{34;i}$  is the spin-sum m ed and averaged m atrix element including the symmetry factor S = 1=2 if there are identical particles in initial or nal states. The phase-space factor is  $(f_1; f_2; f_3; f_4) = f_3 f_4 (1 f_1) (1 f_2) f_1 f_2 (1 f_3) (1 f_4).$ 

This collision integral can be reduced to 2 dimensions using the method developed in Ref. [3]. However, if Pauli blocking and interactions involving only neutrinos are neglected the integrals can in fact be reduced to 1 dimension, as described in Ref. [1]. In the following we use this method. The quantitative error resulting from this is quite sm all.

In addition to standard weak interactions we allow for a direct decay of to neutrinos, ! . If is non-relativistic then each neutrino is born with momentum m = 2 and in this case the collision integral is

$$C_{!i} = b_{i} \frac{2^{2}}{(m = 2)^{2}} n (p = m = 2);$$
 (3)

where  $b_i$  is the branching ratio into neutrino species i, and is the decay rate of the heavy particle. For sim – plicity we assume equal branching ratios into all neutrino species. Even is this is not the case the neutrino distribution functions will be alm ost equilibrated by oscillations [4]. This means that  $b_e'$  b ' b ' b =3.

Note that if one assumes that neutrinos are in kinetic equilibrium so that they can be described by a single tem perature T it is in fact possible to solve the Boltzm ann equation sem i-analytically [5]. However, this is a very poor approximation for the case when there is a direct decay mode  $\ !$  .

в.

W e assume the heavy particle to be completely nonrelativistic. If that is the case then the Boltzm ann equation can be integrated to give the following equation for the evolution of the energy density

\_ = 3H ; (4)

i.e. there are no inverse decays. This is a good approximation for all the cases covered in the present work.

W e only work with masses which are low enough that there are no hadronic decay channels open. This of course severely restricts the possible models. However, if there is a hadronic branching ratio then the minimum allowed reheating tem perature increases dram atically [1], and we are investigating what the lowest possible reheating tem – perature is.

C. Electrom agnetic plasm a

The evolution of the photon tem perature can then be found from the equation of energy conservation

$$\frac{d_{T}}{dt} = 3H (_{T} + P_{T}); \qquad (5)$$

where  $_{\rm T}$  and  $P_{\rm T}$  are the total energy density and the total pressure respectively. This equation can be rewritten as an evolution equation for T

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \frac{(1 \ b) + 4H + 3H (_e + P_e) + 4H + d = dt}{0 = 0 T + 0 e^{-0}T}$$
(6)

## E. Initial conditions

Follow ing convention we de ne the reheating tem perature of the universe to be when

$$= 3H (T_{RH})$$
 (8)

To a reasonable approximation the universe is radiation dominated at this point so that

$$H = \frac{g^{2}}{90} \frac{T_{RH}^{2}}{M_{Pl}}; \qquad (9)$$

where M  $_{\rm P\,l}=$  2.4  $10^{18}~{\rm G\,eV}$  is the reduced P lanck m ass and g is the num ber of degrees of freedom .

This means that there is a one to one correspondence

Finally we solve the Friedmann equation to nd the scale factor as a function of time

D. Scale factor

$$H = \frac{a}{a} = \frac{8 G_T}{3}$$
(7)

A ltogether we solve Eq. (7) together with Eq. (1) for each neutrino species, Eq. (4) for , and Eq. (6) for the photon temperature, to obtain a (t), T (t), (t), and f  $_{i}$  (t).

between and  $T_{RH}$ ,

$$T_{RH;MeV} \prime 0:7 \frac{1=2}{2};$$
 (10)

where g = 10.75 has been used. Note that the constant of proportionality is som ewhat arbitrary (although it should always be of order 1), and just gives a rough idea about the therm altem perature when the universe enters the standard radiation dom inated phase.

As long as the initial time is set so that  $t_i = t(T_{\text{R}\,\text{H}})$  and  $T_{\text{m}\,ax} > T_D$ ; , where  $T_{\text{m}\,ax}$  is the maximum temperature reached by the plasm a after time  $t_i$  and  $T_D$ ; is the neutrino decoupling temperature then the nal outcome is independent of initial conditions. The universe starts out being strongly matter dominated and the nal neutrino energy density, as well as the light element abundances depend only on  $\$ , m $\$ , and b $\$ . The initial time is found from the Friedmann equation by assuming complete domination of  $\$  so that  $t_i = \frac{2}{3}$  [B G $_{ji}$ =3]  $^{1=2}$ .

### F. Nucleosynthesis

O ne of the main observables from the epoch around neutrino decoupling is the abundance of light elements, mainly helium and deuterium. In order to calculate these abundances we have modi ed the K aw ano nucleosynthesis code [6]. First is has been modi ed to incorporate the modi ed tem perature evolution, and second the subroutines used to calculate weak interaction rates for n p have been modi ed to incorporate the full num erical electron neutrino distribution com ing from the solution of the coupled B oltzm ann equations.

T his allow s us to calculate the abundance of  ${}^{4}\text{H}\,\text{e}$  and D for the various models.

## III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We have solved the set of coupled Boltzm ann equations for all species for the free parameters, m , , and b .

The main output from this is the relativistic energy density in neutrinos, param eterized in units of the energy density of a standard model neutrino,

$$N = \frac{e^{+} + +}{0}$$
 (11)

If b = 0 then the equations become independent of m and this case has already been covered in Ref. [1]. We present this as our rst case in order to compare results with those of [1]. Fig. 1 shows the elective number of neutrino species, N , after complete decay of . This qure is identical to Fig. 4 in Ref. [1].

We also test whether our results are independent of initial conditions. In Fig. 2 we show T (t) and (t)



Γ [s<sup>-1</sup>]

FIG.1: The e ective number of neutrino species as a function of when there is no direct decay into neutrinos, b = 0.

for = 6:4 s<sup>1</sup> for two dierent initial times,  $t_i =$  $10^3$  s and t<sub>i</sub> = 8:8  $10^3$  s. In both cases we 1:8 assume an initial photon temperature of 2.3 MeV (we could equally well have chosen an initial tem perature of 0). W hile the maximum temperature reached is clearly dependent on t<sub>i</sub>, T and quickly become indistinguishable, and as long as the tem perature where this happens is greater than the neutrino decoupling tem perature all nal results are independent of ti. Furtherm ore, as expected [1], the photon tem perature scales as T  $\,$  / t  $^{1=4}$ during the matter dominated period and shifts to the usual T / t<sup>1=2</sup> once the universe becomes radiation dom inated (except for a sm all deviation due to heating by  $e^+e$  annihilation).

# B. b € 0

Next we cover the case when b  $\frac{6}{6}$  0. This is much more complicated to solve num erically because of the presence of the delta function (p m =2) and the fact that the solution now depends on both b and m . In Fig. 3 we show N for di erent values of and b.

From this gure is clear that when b is small the effective number of neutrino species becomes independent of m and increasing with , with N ! 3 for ! 1.

For the opposite case when  $b\ =\ 1$  (only decay to neutrinos) the situation is the opposite. When  $\ !\ 1$  the limiting value is again N  $\ =\ 3$ . This corresponds to the case when decays into neutrinos, but the elective neutrino temperature after complete decay is higher than  $T_D$ .

W hen ! 0 the e ective number of neutrino species goes to in nity. This corresponds to the case when decays so slow ly that the produced neutrinos never equili-



FIG. 2: T and as functions of time for  $= 6.4 \text{ s}^1$ , b = 0 and two di erent initial times. The full line is for  $t_i = 8.8 \quad 10^3$  s, whereas the dashed is for  $t_i = 1.8 \quad 10^3$  s.

brate with the electrom agnetic plasm a, leaving only neutrinos.

However, there is a large interm ediate region where N < 3, even for b = 1. The reason for this unexpected feature can be explained as follows: W hen high energy T) are produced by direct decay they neutrinos (E have a very high annihilation cross section to e<sup>+</sup> e , because the cross section goes as  $E^2$ . However, the produced electrons and positrons are im m ediately converted into a sea of low energy e<sup>+</sup> , e , and because of electrom agnetic interactions. This means that the production rate of neutrinos is much lower. In the case where the reheating tem perature is very high this does not matter because the universe still has time to therm alize com pletely after decay. However, if  $T_{RH}$  $T_D$  , this is not possible and the result is that N < 3 because of the very e cient conversion of neutrinos into e + e . Notice also that this e ect becom es less pronounced when m decreases because neutrinos are born with energies closer to 3T, and the m ism atch between forward and backward rates becom es sm aller.

In Figs. 4 and 5 this e ect can be seen directly on the

distribution functions. In Fig. 4, which shows b = 1, = 6.4 s<sup>1</sup>, and m = 120 MeV, it can be seen that the distribution function is higher than therm all at high energies because of decay. How ever, there are few er low energy neutrinos because of the ine cient production via e<sup>+</sup> e annihilation.

C onversely, in Fig.5, which show sb = 1,  $= 50 s^{1}$ , and m = 120 M eV, it can be seen that the decay rate is high enough that neutrinos equilibrate with the electrom agnetic plasm a, except for a sm all deviation around p = m = 2. This subsequently leads to N ' 3 after com plete decay.

## IV. COMPARISON W ITH DATA

In order to constrain the parameters b, , and m we compare the predicted values of N ,  $^4{\rm H}\,e,$  and D with the observationally determined values. In addition to the parameters directly related to the nucleosynthesis outcome depends crucially on the baryon density, =  $n_{\rm B}$  =n .

Taken at face value the recent CMB data from the WMAP satellite constrain tightly. However, it has been shown that there is a signi cant correlation between and N in the CMB data. This means that it is not possible to take CMB constraint on directly and apply it to the nucleosynthesis calculations. Rather a full CMB likelihood analysis for N and must be carried out. This can then be combined with the nucleosynthesis likelihood analysis for b , , m , and .

F inst the following subsection covers the current observational status, then the next covers the constraints on decay parameters which can be obtained.

## A. Observational data

### 1. Light elem ent abundances

The prim ordial helium abundance has been derived by two independent groups. Fields and O live [7] nd the value

$$Y_{\rm P} = 0.238 \quad 0.002 \quad 0.005;$$
 (12)

whereas Izotov and Thuan [8] nd

$$Y_{\rm P} = 0.244 \quad 0.002 \quad 0.005 \quad (13)$$

Because of this inconsistency we blow up the error bars on  $Y_{\rm P}$  and use the value

$$Y_{\rm P} = 0.238 \quad 0.015;$$
 (14)

which encom passes the allowed regions of both observational determ inations.

The most recent determ ination of the primordial deuterium abundance has yielded the value [9]

$$D = H = (2.78 \quad 0.29) \quad 10^{5}$$
 (15)



FIG.3: Contour plot of N for di erent m and . The top left plot is for b = 0.1, the top right for b = 0.5, the bottom left for b = 0.9, and the bottom right for b = 1.0.

A determ ination of the prim ordial lithium abundance has also been perform ed by several groups. How ever, this m easurem ent is prone to large system atics and we refrain from using it here.

#### 2. Cosm ic m icrowave background

The CMB temperature uctuations are conveniently described in term softhe spherical harm onics power spectrum

where

$$\frac{T}{T}(;) = \frac{X}{a_{lm}} Y_{lm}(;):$$
(17)

Since Thom son scattering polarizes light there are additional power spectra coming from the polarization an isotropies. The polarization can be divided into a curlfree (E) and a curl (B) component, yielding four independent power spectra:  $C_{T,1}; C_{E,1}; C_{B,1}$  and the temperature E -polarization cross-correlation  $C_{TE,1}$ .

The W MAP experiment have reported data on  $C_{T;1}$ and  $C_{TE;1}$ , as described in Ref. [10, 11, 12]

We have performed the likelihood analysis using the prescription given by the W MAP collaboration which includes the correlation between di erent  $C_1$ 's [10, 11, 12]. Foreground contam ination has already been subtracted from their published data.

#### 3. Large scale structure

The 2dF G alaxy Redshift Survey (2dFGRS) [13] has measured the redshifts of more than 230 000 galaxies with a median redshift of  $z_m$  0:11. An initial estimate of the convolved, redshift-space power spectrum of the 2dFGRS has been determined [14] for a sample of 160



FIG. 4: The distribution function for  $_{\rm e}$  for di erent values of T when  $= 6.4~{\rm s}^{-1}$ , b = 1, and m  $= 120~{\rm M\,eV}$ . The dotted line is for T  $= 2.18~{\rm M\,eV}$ , the dashed for T  $= 0.42~{\rm M\,eV}$ , the long-dashed for T  $= 0.19~{\rm M\,eV}$ , and the full line for T  $= 0.01~{\rm M\,eV}$ . The full grey (red) line is an equilibrium distribution with T = T.



FIG.5: The distribution function for  $_{\rm e}$  for di erent values of T when = 50 s<sup>1</sup>, b = 1, and m = 120 MeV. The dotted line is for T = 7:7 MeV, the dashed for T = 0:93 MeV, the long-dashed for T = 0:23 MeV, and the full line for T = 0:01 MeV. The full grey (red) line is an equilibrium distribution with T = T.

000 redshifts. On scales  $0.02 < k < 0.15h \text{ Mpc}^{1}$  the data are robust and the shape of the power spectrum is not a ected by redshift-space or nonlinear e ects, though the am plitude is increased by redshift-space distortions. A potential com plication is the fact that the galaxy power

spectrum m ay be biased with respect to the m atterpower spectrum, i.e. light does not trace m ass exactly at all scales. This is often param etrised by introducing a bias factor

$$b^{2}(k) = \frac{P_{g}(k)}{P_{m}(k)};$$
 (18)

where  $P_g(k)$  is the power spectrum of the galaxies, and  $P_m(k)$  is the matter power spectrum . However, we restrict our analysis of the 2dFGRS power spectrum to scales  $k < 0.15 \ h M \ pc^{-1}$  where the power spectrum is well described by linear theory. On these scales, two di erent analyses have demonstrated that the 2dF-GRS power spectrum is consistent with linear, scale-independent bias [15, 16]. Thus, the shape of the galaxy power spectrum can be used straightforwardly to constrain the shape of the matter power spectrum .

The only parameters which a ect CMB and structure form ation are the baryon density, , and the relativistic energy density at late times, parameterized by N [17, 18] (see also [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]). It is therefore relatively straightforward to perform the CMB+LSS like-lihood analysis.

## B. Likelihood analysis

Nucleosynthesis is a ected both by the expansion rate around T  $\,$  0:1  $\,$  1M eV, and by the electron neutrino distribution function. The reason is that electron neutrino enter directly in the weak reactions which interconvert protons and neutrons.

The speci c neutrino distributions are therefore found as functions of tem perature and used in a modi ed version of the Kawano BBN code [6]. This is then used to calculate prim ordial abundances of deuterium and helium.

For calculating the theoretical CM B and m atter power spectra we use the publicly available CM BFA ST package [27]. As the set of cosm ological parameters we choose m, the matter density, b, the baryon density, H<sub>0</sub>, the Hubble parameter, the optical depth to reionization, Q, the normalization of the CM B power spectrum, b, the bias parameter, and the elective number of neutrino species N, found from the solution of the Boltzm ann equations. We assume neutrinos to be almost m assless. We restrict the analysis to geometrically at models m + m = 1.

For each individual model we calculate <sup>2</sup> in the following way: G iven a theoretical CMB spectrum the <sup>2</sup> of the W MAP data is calculated using the method described in Ref. [12]. W ith regards to the 2dF data we use the data points and window functions from Ref. [28] (http://www.hep.upenn.edu/ max/2df.htm l). 68% and 95% con dence levels from the data are calculated from <sup>2</sup> = 2:31 and 6.17 respectively.



FIG.6:68% and 95% con dence exclusion plot of the param – eters  $_{10}$   $10^{10}$  and for the case when b = 0.

# 1. b = 0

In Fig. 6 we show 68% and 95% exclusion limits for and from BBN, CMB, and LSS. The top panel for BBN only is very similar to Fig. 8 in KKS, except that we use slightly di erent bounds on light element abundances. From BBN alone the 95% bound on  $T_{\rm RH}$  is roughly 0.6 M eV. How ever this bound is achieved for relatively low , whereas CMB+LSS strongly prefer a high value of . Therefore com bining the BBN and CMB+LSS constraints rem oves the low  $T_{\rm RH}$  region and increases the lower bound to 3.9 M eV.

# 2. b € 0

Apart from the fact that N depends on b there is a second e ect which is just a important. W hen b  $\bigcirc$  0 there are more high energy neutrinos. A round weak

7

freeze-out there are m any m ore protons than neutrons. W hen E m  $_{\rm n}$  m  $_{\rm p}$  the weak absorption cross section is equal on protons and neutrons. This m eans that additional neutrinos at high energies will have the net e ect of converting protons into neutrons, so that in the end m ore helium is produced. Note that this is the opposite e ect of just increasing the weak interaction rates, in which case less helium would be produced. The phenom enon is quite similar to what happens if has a hadronic decay channel. In that case pions and kaons will be produced, which subsequently convert protons to neutrons and lead to overproduction of helium .

In Fig. 7 we show 68%, 95%, and 99.99% con dence exclusion plots for and m , marginalized over .

Both when b~ is small and when b~ = 1 the bound on  $T_{\rm R\,H}~becom~es~independent~ofm~$  . In both cases the 95% bound is  $T_{\rm R\,H}~^>~$  4 M eV .

However, there is an interm ediate regime for b which allows for much lower values of  $T_{\rm R\,H}$ . The reason for this can be seen directly from Fig. 3, i.e. there is an interm ediate range where N can be kept close to 3, even for low . However, for large masses (which is of course by far the most likely) there is no allowed region. The reason is the one given in the previous section: More high energy neutrinos will produce more helium, and this in turn will con ict with observations.

The naloutcome is that for almost all values of m and b there is a robust lower bound on  $T_{\rm R\,H}$  which is around 4 M eV. However there is a small region where b 0.9, m  $^{<}$  40 M eV where a reheating tem perature as low as roughly 1 M eV is allowed.

# V. OTHER CONSTRAINTS

If is a scalar then the decay rate to neutrinos is norm ally suppressed by a factor m<sup>2</sup> because of the necessary helicity ip. Therefore the simplest assumption is that has no branching into neutrinos. If for instance the heavy particle is a pseudo-scalar like the axion, then there is an upper bound on the coupling to photons ([30, 31]), g 0.6  $10^{10}$  GeV <sup>1</sup> form < 30 keV.For higher m asses the bound is signi cantly weaker. However, even if this bound is used together with the decay width  $_{1/2} = g^2 m^3 = 64$  then we nd that

$$_{!2} < 50 \text{ m}^{3}_{;10 \text{ M eV}} \text{ s}^{1};$$
 (19)

which is easily satis as for the parameter space we are considering.

0 n the other hand, if is a particle like the majoron which couples only to neutrinos then the decay width is [32]

$$_{!} = \frac{g^2 m}{16} \quad 3 \quad 1\dot{\vartheta}^9 g^2 m _{M eV} s^1$$
 (20)

The bound on the dimensionless coupling constant comes from BBN as well as supernova considerations and is of



FIG. 7: 68%, 95%, and 99.99% condence exclusion plot of the parameters and m using all available data (CMB+LSS+BBN). The top left plot is for b = 0.1, the top right for b = 0.5, the bottom left for b = 0.9, and the bottom right for b = 1.0.

order 10  $^{6}$  10  $^{5}$  form a jorons in the M eV m ass range [31, 33]. Form one massive majorons the bound weakens. Again it is clear that the decay parameters which we consider here are not excluded by any other astrophysical or experimental data.

The nalconclusion is that heavy, decaying particles such as the ones considered here cannot be directly excluded by any current data. Furtherm ore a branching ratio into neutrinos can be anywhere from 0 to 1.

# VI. CONCLUSION

We have carefully calculated constraints on models with extremely low reheating temperature, where a massive particle decays around T 1 MeV. By combining constraints on light element abundances with constraints on and N from CMB and large scale structure we

derived a fairly robust lim it of

$$T_{RH} > 4 M eV$$
: (21)

This bound is a signi cant improvement over the previous bound of  $T_{\rm R\,H}$   $^>$  0.7 MeV, calculated from BBN alone. It is interesting that the lower bound is signi – cantly higher than the n $\ddagger$  p conversion freeze-out tem – perature, T  $_{\rm 0.8}$  MeV, end even higher than the neutrino decoupling tem perature  $T_{\rm D}$   $_2$  MeV. This shows that even sm all residual e ects can be measured with present observational data.

M odels with reheating tem perature in the M eV regin e are in general di cult to reconcile with such features as baryogenesis. However, in models with large extra dimensions a low reheating temperature is essential in order to avoid overproduction of massive K aluza-K lein graviton states. This means that we can use our present bound to derive limits on the compactication scale in such models. For the case of two extra dimensions the bound is M > 2000 TeV and for n = 3 it is M > 100 TeV. This bound is somewhat stronger than the bound coming from considerations of neutron star cooling and gamma ray emission.

### A cknow ledgm ents

W e acknowledge use of the publicly available CMB-FAST package written by Uros Seljak and Matias Zal-

- [L] M.Kawasaki, K.Kohri and N.Sugiyama, Phys. Rev.D 62, 023506 (2000).
- [2] G.F.Giudice, E.W. Kolb and A.Riotto, Phys. Rev. D 64, 023508 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005123].
- [3] S. Hannestad and J. Madsen, Phys. Rev. D 52, 1764 (1995).
- [4] A. D. Dolgov, S. H. Hansen, S. Pastor, S. T. Petcov, G.G. Ra elt and D. V. Sem ikoz, Nucl. Phys. B 632, 363 (2002).
- [5] P.A dhya, D.R. Chaudhuriand S.H annestad, Phys. Rev. D 68, 083519 (2003).
- [6] L.Kawano, FERM ILAB-PUB-92-04-A
- [7] B. D. Fields and K. A. O live, Astrophys. J. 506, 699 (1998)
- [8] Y. I. Izotov and T. X. Thuan, A strophys. J. 500, 188 (1998).
- [9] S.Burles and D.Tytler, A strophys. J. 499, 699 (1998);
  J.M. O'M eara et al., A strophys. J. 552, 718 (2001);
  D.K irkm an et al., astro-ph/0302006.
- [10] C. L. Bennett et al., \First Year W ilkinson M icrowave Anisotropy Probe (W MAP) Observations: Prelim inary M aps and Basic Results," A strophys. J. Suppl. 148, 1 (2003) [astro-ph/0302207].
- [11] D. N. Spergel et al., \First Year W ilkinson M icrowave Anisotropy Probe (W MAP) Observations: Determination of Cosm ological Param eters," A strophys. J. Suppl. 148, 175 (2003) [astro-ph/0302209].
- [12] L. Verde et al., \First Year W ilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (W MAP) Observations: Parameter Estimation Methodology," Astrophys.J. Suppl. 148, 195 (2003) [astro-ph/0302218].
- [13] M. Colless et al. (the 2dFGRS team ), M on.Not.R.Astron.Soc.328, 1039 (2001).
- [14] W .J.Percival et al. (the 2dFGRS team ), M on.Not.R. A stron.Soc.327,1297 (2001).

[15] O.Lahav et al. (the 2dFGRS team), Mon.Not.R.Soc. 333,961 (2002).

darriaga [27], as well as the nucleosynthesis code written

by Law rence K aw ano [6]. I wish to thank P. Serpico for

- [16] L.Verde et al. (the 2dFGRS team ), M on. Not. R. Soc. 335, 432 (2002).
- [17] S.Hannestad, JCAP 5,004 (2003) [astro-ph/0303076].
- [18] V.Barger, D.Marfatia and A.Tregre, hep-ph/0312065.
- [19] S.Hannestad, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 4203 (2000).
- [20] S. Esposito, G. Mangano, A. Melchiorri, G. Miele and O. Pisanti, Phys. Rev. D 63, 043004 (2001).
- [21] J. P. Kneller, R. J. Scherrer, G. Steigman and T.P.W alker, Phys. Rev. D 64, 123506 (2001).
- [22] S.Hannestad, Phys.Rev.D 64, 083002 (2001).
- [23] S.H.Hansen, G.Mangano, A.Melchiorri, G.Miele and O.Pisanti, Phys. Rev. D 65, 023511 (2002).
- [24] R. Bowen, S. H. Hansen, A. Melchiorri, J. Silk and R. Trotta, Mon. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 334, 760 (2002).
- [25] P. Crotty, J. Lesgourgues and S. Pastor, Phys. Rev. D 67, 123005 (2003) [arX ivastro-ph/0302337].
- [26] E. Pienpaoli, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 342, L63 (2003) [arXiv astro-ph/0302465].
- [27] U. Seljak and M. Zaldarriaga, Astrophys. J. 469, 437 (1996).
- [28] M. Tegm ark, A. J. Ham ilton and Y. Xu, Mon. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 335, 887 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0111575].
- [29] See for instance N.Kabper et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 928 (2000).
- [30] K. Hagiwara et al, Phys. Rev. D 66, 010001 (2002)
- [31] G.G.Ra elt,

com m ents.

- [32] V.Berezinsky and J.W.F.Valle, Phys.Lett.B 318, 360 (1993) [arXiv:hep-ph/9309214].
- [33] R.Tom as, H.Paes and J.W.F.Valle, Phys. Rev. D 64, 095005 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0103017]; M.Kachelniess, R.Tom as and J.W.F.Valle, Phys. Rev. D 62, 023004 (2000) [arX iv hep-ph/0001039].