Primordial black holes dark matter from inflection point models of inflation and the effects of reheating
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Abstract. We study the generation of primordial black holes (PBH) in a single field inflection point model of inflation wherein the effective potential is expanded up to the sextic order and the inversion symmetry is imposed such that only even powers are retained in the potential. By working with a quasi-inflection point, we find that PBHs can be produced in our scenario in a very relevant mass range with a nearly monochromatic mass fraction which can account for a sizeable fraction of the cold dark matter in the universe. With changing various parameters in our model, we can also generate PBHs in a higher mass range but the primordial spectrum of curvature perturbations becomes strongly tilted at the CMB scales. We briefly discuss already existing difficulties and uncertainties associated with the computation of the PBH mass fraction for a given inflationary model. Moreover, we study the effects of a reheating epoch after the end of inflation on the PBH mass fraction and find that an epoch of a matter dominated reheating can shift the mass fraction to a larger mass range as well as increase their fractional contribution to the total dark matter even for the case of a monochromatic mass fraction.
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1 Introduction

The recent detection of astrophysical gravitational waves (GW) emitted from a system of binary black holes (BH) has reinitiated an immense interest in exploring the possibility that such BHs could also constitute a significant fraction of the cold dark matter (CDM) in our universe. A few such events have been reported in a short span of time by the LIGO scientific collaboration [1–4]. A generic and interesting conclusion that emerges out from the analysis of the LIGO events data is that these BHs are very massive, with masses \( \gtrsim O(10\ M_\odot) \) where \( M_\odot \sim 2 \times 10^{33} \text{g} \) [5, 6]. Since the detected BHs were found to be very massive, it was soon pointed out that these BHs could be of a primordial nature i.e. they could have been produced in the very early universe [7–11]. When cosmological fluctuations with large overdensities exit the horizon during inflation and re-enter during the radiation dominated epoch, they would collapse rather quickly and form these primordial black holes (PBH). Since the PBHs are produced before the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN), they are considered non-baryonic, non-relativistic and effectively collisionless and thus could be an unconventional yet a very promising candidate for the CDM (or at least a fraction of it !) in the universe [12–15]. PBHs are therefore widely considered a very unique non-baryonic candidate for the CDM which remain free from the BBN constraints on the total baryonic density in the universe.
The mass of such PBHs that are produced post-inflation is typically given by the horizon mass at the time of re-entry of a given mode characterised by the wavenumber $k$ [16],

$$M(k) \equiv \gamma M_H = \frac{4\pi \gamma \rho}{3 H^3} \bigg|_{k=aH},$$

$$\simeq 10^{18} \left(\frac{\gamma}{0.2}\right) \left(\frac{g_*}{106.75}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{k}{7\times 10^{13} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}}\right)^{-2} \text{g}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\gamma$ is a proportionality constant ($\gamma \sim 0.2$) that characterises the efficiency of the formation process and $g_*$ is the effective number of the relativistic degrees of freedom at the formation epoch. This relation indicates that PBHs in wider mass ranges can be produced when very small scales re-enter the horizon during the radiation dominated epoch. It is well known that PBHs do evaporate due to Hawking radiation\(^1\) and as a result, very light PBHs ($M \lesssim 10^{-18} M_\odot$) would have been completely evaporated by today [19]. This leads to an interesting constraint on the wavenumber, $k \lesssim k_* = 5 \times 10^{14} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ i.e. the lower bound on the physical length scales relevant for PBHs production such that they survive until today. The physical scales corresponding to $k \lesssim k_*$ are much smaller than the cosmological scales probed by the cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies and large scale structure (LSS) surveys. While the amplitude of the primordial spectrum at the CMB scales is $P_\zeta \sim 10^{-9}$, it turns out that the spectrum must quickly rise to $P_\zeta \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$ at the relevant scales ($k \lesssim k_*$) in order to produce the sufficient abundance of PBHs such that their corresponding masses always satisfy the condition $M \gtrsim 10^{-18} M_\odot$ so as to survive until today [20–24].

Although PBHs are a very exotic class of candidates for the CDM in the universe, their mass spectrum is nevertheless strongly constrained by several different types of observations such as CMB anisotropies, capture of PBHs by neutron stars and gravitational femtolensing. Assuming a monochromatic mass spectrum which is appropriate for very narrow mass distribution, these observations constrain different mass ranges for PBHs which we have listed and briefly explained below:

1. $M \lesssim 10^{-18} M_\odot$: This constraint (on the smallest mass range) simply comes from the non-detection of the evaporation signatures of PBHs in the extragalactic photon background. Due to the thermal evaporation by means of Hawking radiation, PBHs evaporate on a time scale given by

$$t_{\text{ev}}(M) \sim \frac{G^2 M^3}{\hbar c^4} \sim 10^{63} \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot}\right)^3 \text{yr}. \quad (1.2)$$

As mentioned earlier, this means that PBHs with mass $M \lesssim 10^{-18} M_\odot$ ($M \lesssim 10^{15} \text{ g}$) would be completely evaporated by today and therefore, can not contribute significantly to the CDM at the present epoch [19].

2. $M \sim 10^{-18} - 10^{-16} M_\odot$: PBHs in the mass range $10^{-18} - 10^{-16} M_\odot$ would be evaporating at the present epoch and thus can induce an observable gamma-ray background. In principle, this background could contribute to the extragalactic (cosmological) gamma-ray background, the galactic gamma-ray background and the antiprotons or positrons

\(^1\)In higher dimensional theories, the presence of extra spatial dimensions affects how gravity acts on small scales and could slow down the Hawking evaporation substantially [17]. Recently, it has been discussed that PBHs production and their evaporation is also affected in a dimensionally reduced universe [18].
in cosmic rays \[19, 25\]. It turns out that PBHs can not account for the total CDM if 
\[ M \lesssim 7 \times 10^{15} \text{g} \]. However, this limit strongly relies on the fact that PBHs are uniformly
distributed throughout the universe which is certainly not the realistic situation.

3. \( M \sim 10^{-16} - 10^{-13} M_\odot \): Compact objects such as PBHs can induce gravitational
femtolensing of gamma-ray bursts. The non-detection of any femtolensing signature in
the Fermi Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor experiment leads to the evidence that PBHs in
the mass range \( 10^{17} - 10^{20} \text{g} \) can not account for a sizeable fraction of CDM \[26\].

4. \( M \sim 10^{-14} - 10^{-9} M_\odot \): Dark matter consisting of PBHs can cause the white dwarf
to explode as a supernova. The shape of the observed distribution of white dwarfs
rules out PBHs within mass range \( 10^{19} - 10^{24} \text{g} \) \[27\]. However, these bounds have been
obtained for a specific maximum mass and radius of white dwarfs and are therefore
subject to astrophysical uncertainties. These bounds can be further made stronger
through the measurements of white dwarf binaries in gravitational wave observatories.

5. \( M \sim 10^{-15} - 10^{-9} M_\odot \): If a PBH is captured by a neutron star, the star is accreted onto
the PBH and gets destroyed in a relatively short time. Using this fact, one can find
that PBHs can not entirely account for the CDM in the mass range \( 10^{18} - 10^{24} \text{g} \) \[28\].
This bound strongly relies on the CDM density inside globular clusters and neutron
star properties such as mass, radius, lifetime and the velocity distribution.

6. \( M \sim 10^{-11} - 10^{-6} M_\odot \): If the PBHs are the dominant component of the galactic dark
matter halo, one expects gravitational microloensing signatures of stars in the magellanic
cloud. However, such stellar microlensing events are not detected in the halo regions
of the Milky Way (MW) and Andromeda galaxy (M31) by the Subaru Hyper Suprime-
Cam. Simultaneous monitoring of tens of millions of stars in M31 combined with long
enough observations eliminate any possibility of PBHs abundance in the mass range
given by \( 10^{22} - 10^{27} \text{g} \) although point mass source approximation leads to stronger
bounds than finite source approximation in this case \[29\].

7. \( M \sim 0.6 \times 10^{-7} - 15 M_\odot \): A few years monitoring of stars in the Magellanic clouds
for microlensing events by EROS, EROS-2 and MACHO surveys leads to a constraint
on the mass range of PBHs as \( 10^{36} - 10^{34} \text{g} \) at 2\( \sigma \) and are also subject to various
astrophysical uncertainties \[30, 31\].

8. \( M > 10 M_\odot \): Emission due to gas accretion onto PBHs leads to a considerable modifi-
cation in the recombination history of the universe, thereby modifying the CMB
temperature anisotropies and spectral distortion signatures. This results to the fact
that PBHs with \( M > 2 \times 10^{34} \text{g} \) can at most contribute to a few percent of the total
CDM in the universe \[32–34\]. However, these bounds assume that the mass of PBHs
remain unchanged with time which is certainly not the case as the mass keeps changing
primarily due to gas accretion. Moreover, robust upper limit in this mass range comes
from the dynamics of ultra faint dwarf galaxies (UFD) observations \[35, 36\].

9. \( M \sim 10^{2} - 10^{3} M_\odot \): The constraints in this regime arise from a comprehensive analysis
of high resolution and high redshift Lyman-\( \alpha \) forest data. The fluctuations in the
number density of PBHs induce an enhancement at small scales which departs from
the standard CDM prediction. Using hydrodynamic simulations with different values
of astrophysical parameters, one arrives at the mass range \( 10^{35} - 10^{37} \text{g} \) at 2\( \sigma \) for a
monochromatic PBH mass distribution. These constrains further become stronger for a non-monochromatic PBH mass distribution [37].

As mentioned earlier, all these constraints have been obtained by assuming a monochromatic mass spectrum for PBHs and in some cases, these constraints become tighter for the non-monochromatic mass spectrum [38]. However, note that all these bounds involve various degrees of uncertainties and are very sensitive to assumptions about different astrophysical parameters. The current constraints for a monochromatic mass spectrum of PBHs are shown in Figure 5 and they should certainly be improved by future experiments and observations. It is evident from this figure that PBHs can not contribute entirely to the CDM in any mass range but can atmost contribute to $\sim 25 - 30\%$ of the total CDM in the universe in some specific mass window. Note that the constraints shown in Figure 5 are not directly applicable for the case of an extended PBH mass distribution.

PBHs can be produced by several mechanisms in the early universe. These include first-order phase transitions [39], grand unified theories [40], resonant reheating [41], tachyonic preheating [42, 43], curvaton scenarios [44–46], and inflationary scenarios [9, 47–58]. Recently, it has also been discussed if PBHs can be produced by a long range attractive fifth force stronger than the gravitational force in the early universe, mediated by a light scalar [59]. Among these various mechanisms, inflation, in particular, provides an ideal setting to produce PBHs in the very early universe. When small scale perturbations with large overdensities re-enter the expanding horizon during the radiation dominated epoch, they can collapse very quickly and form the PBHs. Since a large range of modes are scanned during inflation, in principle, PBHs across different mass ranges can be produced during inflation. In general, a sharp peak ($P_\zeta \sim 10^{-2}$) in the primordial power spectrum of curvature perturbations at sufficiently small scales is required to produce PBHs while leaving the large scales unaffected which are already strongly constrained by the CMB observations. However, not all the inflationary models can produce the relevant abundance of PBHs as it critically depends on the shape and various parameters of the potential. Recently, it has been pointed out that inflationary models with potentials having an inflection point are very useful in producing PBHs and thus polynomial potentials have often been used for this purpose [60, 61].

In this paper, we study the abundance of PBHs generated in a single field inflationary scenario whose potential allows the existence of a plateau region caused by an inflection point. The inflaton potential is motivated from the effective field theory of inflation wherein it is expanded in the powers of the field $\phi$ with a given cutoff scale $\Lambda$. In order to arrive at the desired inflationary dynamics, we restrict the potential to the sextic order, impose the inversion symmetry, $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ and flatten it appropriately. This leads to a potential which is sufficiently flat at large values of $\phi$, contains at least one inflection point and has a global minima at $\phi = 0$. Although we expand the potential upto the sextic order but due to the flattening term in the denominator, the effective potential actually behaves as a quadratic potential\textsuperscript{2} at both large and small values of $\phi$ (away from the plateau) which

\textsuperscript{2}In the context of inflation, a quadratic potential i.e. $V(\phi) \sim \phi^2$ is a sufficiently flat potential which leads to the required number of e-folds, a nearly scale invariant power spectrum of curvature perturbations and an observably large tensor-to-scalar ratio.
makes it renormalizable as well as consistent with the upper bound on the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r$ from Planck + BICEP2 [62, 63]. We study the background scalar field dynamics with this potential and find that it generically allows a dynamical phase wherein the fractional variation per e-fold of the first slow roll parameter becomes large and thus leads to a violation of the slow roll approximation. We implement a numerical scheme to evolve the background dynamics and linear perturbations and evaluate the spectrum at the end of inflation. We find that the slow roll spectrum computed at the horizon exit is very different from the spectrum evaluated numerically at the end of inflation. We then incorporate the Press-Schechter formalism in our code to compute the PBH mass fraction and find that PBHs can be produced for very different mass ranges for different choice of parameters of our model while being consistent with the CMB constraints on large scales. We further study the effects of a reheating phase after the end of inflation on the PBH mass fraction and find that the resulting imprints due to a matter dominated reheating could be very significant. We also point out a possible degeneracy between the PBH mass fractions obtained by changing the parameters of the effective potential and by changing the reheating history. We notice that this degeneracy can not be broken by comparing the tensor power spectra for the two cases, however, it can possibly be broken by the scalar index calculated at the pivot scale for the two cases.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: In the following section, we shall describe in detail the dynamics of the inflationary model with an inflection point that we explore and obtain the power spectra of curvature perturbations both using the slow roll formalism and an exact numerical computation. In Section 3, we briefly discuss the two commonly used methods, Peaks Theory and Press-Schechter formalism to compute the abundance of PBHs and also point out the key differences in the predictions of the two methods. In Section 4, we present our main results, highlighting the fact that PBHs can be produced in our scenario for very different mass ranges by varying different parameters. In order to achieve this, we also discuss a strategy to effectively scan the parameter space to arrive at the desired mass fraction. We also study the effects of reheating on the mass fraction of PBHs and point out that the resulting effects could be very significant. Finally, we conclude and discuss the implications of our results in Section 5.

Before we proceed further, a few words on the conventions and notations that we adopt in this paper are in order. We shall work in the natural units, $\hbar = c = 1$, with reduced Planck mass $M_{Pl}^2 = (8\pi G)^{-1}$. Our metric signature is mostly plus with $(-, +, +, +)$. The background metric is described by the homogeneous, isotropic and spatially flat FLRW universe with a line element $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)dx^2 = a^2(\tau)(-d\tau^2 + dx^2)$. The overdots and primes on time dependent quantities denote the derivatives with respect to the coordinate time $t$ and the conformal time $\tau$, respectively and the conformal time $\tau$ is defined as $d\tau = dt/a(t)$. The physical Hubble parameter is defined as $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ while the conformal Hubble parameter is given by $H \equiv a'/a$.

2 An inflationary model with a polynomial potential

In order to achieve the sufficient abundance of PBHs, an amplification of the power spectrum of the order $P_\zeta \sim 10^{-2}$ at the appropriate scales is required. Since $P_\zeta \sim H^2/\epsilon$, this feature can roughly be achieved in any single field inflationary model wherein the first slow roll parameter $\epsilon$ becomes very small at those scales. Although $\epsilon$ remains smaller than unity, it turns out that its fractional variation of per e-fold becomes large and thus leads to a
violation of the slow roll approximation. Hence, it turns out that a necessary condition for the formation of PBHs is $O(1)$ violation of the slow roll conditions. Since this violation is large enough, one cannot just use the slow roll approximation to compute the power spectrum \cite{64–66}. Therefore, in all such models, the power spectrum should be computed exactly by adopting a numerical scheme.

2.1 An effective scenario with an inflection point

Besides a class of monomial potentials, polynomial potentials have also been used to drive inflation as well as to explain possible anomalies in the CMB such as the power suppression at low multipoles \cite{67, 68}. Such a potential typically allows the existence of an inflection point (a plateau region) which leads to a phase to slow roll violation (due to ultra slow roll evolution) around that region. So far, polynomial potentials have been used in various contexts such as explaining large scale suppression in the CMB, producing sufficient abundance of PBHs and inducing an observably large tensor-to-scalar ratio \cite{69–71}. A polynomial potential can be motivated from the framework of an effective field theory (EFT) with a cutoff scale $\Lambda$ wherein the effective potential is generally given by \cite{72–74}

$$\tilde{V}_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \sum_{n} \frac{b_n}{n!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^n \tilde{V}_0 \left[ 1 + c_1 \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} + \frac{c_2}{2!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^2 + \frac{c_3}{3!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^3 + \ldots \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $V_0$ is an overall factor, often referred to as the energy scale of the inflaton potential and $c_i$ are constants. In principle, the effective potential consists of all the higher order terms but in practice, one truncates the potential at some order to achieve the desired inflationary dynamics. Moreover, one can also impose certain symmetries such that the potential remains unchanged under $\phi \to -\phi$ symmetry while the constant term can be absorbed in the redefinition of the potential. By truncating the effective potential to the sextic order and ignoring the constant term, we can write the potential as \cite{73, 74}

$$\tilde{V}_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \tilde{V}_0 \left[ \frac{c_2}{2!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^2 + \frac{c_4}{4!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^4 + \frac{c_6}{6!} \left( \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^6 \right]. \quad (2.2)$$

This potential generically allows the existence of inflection points for different choices of the constants $c_i$ but it turns out to be non-renormalizable. If inflation has to take place at large values of $\phi$, one can show that inflationary observables will be in strong disagreement with the CMB as the potential is extremely steep at large values of $\phi$. Therefore, one must flatten the potential enough to get the desired inflationary dynamics. This flattening can be achieved by introducing an appropriate factor such that the potential can now be written as

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\tilde{V}_{\text{eff}}(\phi)}{(1 + \xi \phi^2)^2}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\xi$ is also a constant. This potential can be recast in the form\footnote{Note that this potential that provides us the desired dynamics in our scenario can be considered as a combination of the motivation from the EFT and the requirement for the needed flatness at the CMB scales which also makes the potential renormalizable at large field values.}

$$V(x) = V_0 \frac{ax^2 + bx^4 + cx^6}{(1 + dx^2)^2}, \quad (2.4)$$
The scalar potential of our inflationary model is plotted for different choices of parameters corresponding to different values of quasi-inflection points. Depending on the choices of these parameters, an inflection point may or may not exist in the potential. In general, in such potentials, the large field region corresponds to the observed CMB scales, the plateau region leads to PBHs formation while the true minima corresponds to the reheating phase after the end of inflation. Note that, our potential effectively behaves as $\sim \phi^2$ at large values of $\phi$ corresponding to the CMB scales and is symmetric under $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$, unlike other examples discussed in the literature.

where $x = \phi/v$, $V_0 = \tilde{V}_0(v/\Lambda)^2$, $a = c_2/2!$, $b = c_4/4!(v/\Lambda)^2$, $c = c_6/6!(v/\Lambda)^4$ and $d = \xi v^2$. The parameter $v$ is just a constant scaling factor. This is the potential of our scenario we shall work with in this paper. Note that, this potential behaves as a quadratic potential i.e. $V(\phi) \sim \phi^2$ for both the large and small field values (far away from the plateau region). The flattening of the potential helps in two ways: first, it makes the potential renormalizable at large field values and second, it flattens the potential sufficiently for large sales. Such a behaviour of the potential leads to a nearly scale invariant power spectrum of curvature perturbations which is consistent with the CMB observations on large scales. As we shall discuss later, this potential also dynamically leads to a phase of slow roll violation (or ultra slow roll) close to the plateau region and finally reheats the universe when the scalar field rolls down to the true minima of the potential. The asymptotic behaviour of our potential is very different from the flattened quartic polynomial potential which has recently been discussed in the literature [56, 60, 61]. While our potential being roughly quadratic at large scales leads to an observably large tensor-to-scalar ratio $r$, their potential being nearly flat on large scale induces a very small $r$. Moreover, the quartic polynomial potential does not possess an inversion symmetry i.e. the potential is not symmetric under $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ and thus, one has to necessarily start the dynamics from positive values of the field $\phi$. This restriction is relaxed in our scenario as our potential has an inversion symmetry and therefore, one can start from both the positive or negative values of $\phi$. The inflaton potential of our scenario is shown in Figure 1 for different choices of parameters corresponding to different values of quasi-inflection points which are appropriate to obtain the desired inflationary dynamics.
Before we proceed further and discuss the details of the presence of inflection points in our potential, let us briefly comment on the quartic polynomial potential that has recently been used in the literature to produce PBHs from single field inflation. The quartic polynomial potential recently proposed is given by [60]

\[ U(x) = U_0 \frac{ax^2 + bx^3 + cx^4}{(1 + dx^2)^2}, \] (2.5)

wherein the denominator again provides appropriate flatness of the potential and could possibly be motivated from a non minimal coupling term in the Lagrangian. However, this potential behaves as a constant potential at large values of \( x \) (or \( \phi \)) while behaves as a quadratic potential at small values of \( x \). For the case of our potential given in (2.4), we find that in the limit of \( x \gg 1 \), the potential reduces to

\[ V(x) \approx V_0c d^2 x^2, \] (2.6)

while in the small \( x \) limit \( i.e. \) \( x \ll 1 \)

\[ V(x) \approx V_0a x^2. \] (2.7)

Therefore, in both the limits, our potential reduces to a quadratic potential which is renormalizable and it is very different from the earlier potential. This is one of the key differences between the two cases. Since the CMB scales correspond to the large field part of the potential, as we shall discuss in Section 4, our scenario will lead to a rather large tensor-to-scalar ratio \( r \) on such scales as compared to the earlier scenario. Future observations of the tensor-to-scalar ratio can strongly constrain our scenario.

We would now like to understand the details of various inflection points that originate in our potential. A necessary condition for the existence of an inflection point is that the lowest order (above the second) non-zero derivative to be of odd order. We start with the first and second derivatives of the potential given in (2.4) and set them to zero, leaving the third derivative non-zero. This leads to the following two equations given by

\[ a + (2b - ad)x^2 + 3cx^4 + cdx^6 = 0, \] (2.8)
\[ a + 2(3b - 4ad)x^2 + 3(ad^2 - 2bd + 5c)x^4 + 4cdx^6 + cd^2 x^8 = 0. \] (2.9)

In this case, we get two equality conditions and one inequality condition, but have five unknowns \( a, b, c, d \) and \( x \) to find. We shall try to arrive at conditions using these two equations for the existence of inflection point(s) and refer to them as the ‘inflection point conditions’ which are given in rather simpler form as

\[ a = \frac{bx^2 (2dx^2 + 3)}{(d^2x^4 - 3)}, \] (2.10)
\[ c = \frac{b}{x^2(d^2x^4 - 3)}. \] (2.11)

First, by looking at the potential in (2.4), we can impose \( d > 0 \) to avoid any singularities in the potential. Also, if the potential should be monotonously increasing for both large and small field values, we find, from (2.6) and (2.7), that

\[ a > 0, \quad c > 0. \] (2.12)
If we limit ourselves in the positive field regime of the potential i.e. \( x > 0 \), we notice that in order to satisfy (2.10) and (2.11) together with (2.12), we arrive at the following two conditions on \( b \).

- \( x > (3/d^2)^{1/4} \) leads to positive denominators and thus \( b > 0 \).
- \( x < (3/d^2)^{1/4} \) leads to negative denominators and thus \( b < 0 \).

Therefore, in this model, we get two different kinds of inflection points for two choices of \( b \), \( b > 0 \) and \( b < 0 \) and they are separated by \( x \sim (3/d^2)^{1/4} \). Since it is not possible to explore the details of inflection points for this model analytically, we shall resort to a numerical scan of the parameter space to obtain real inflection points. In fact, we have noticed that if we first fix the value of the inflection point \( x_0 \) and the values of \( b \) and \( d \), one can then determine \( a \) and \( c \) using (2.10) and (2.11). Although the potential has four independent parameters, one only needs to fix two of them and the rest will be determined by the inflection point conditions. We shall elaborate on the details of our numerical strategy about how to scan the parameter space in Section 4.

2.2 Background evolution: slow roll, ultra slow roll and all that

After specifying the potential, we can now study the background inflationary dynamics that arises from it. Using the number of e-folds, \( N(t) = \ln (a(t)/a_i) \), as the independent time variable, the system is governed by the following Friedmann equations

\[
H^2 = \frac{V(\phi)}{M^2_{Pl}(3-\epsilon)},
\]

\[
\frac{dH}{dN} = -\frac{H}{2M^2_{Pl}} \left( \frac{d\phi}{dN} \right)^2,
\]

with the Klein-Gordon equation for \( \phi \) as

\[
\frac{d^2 \phi}{dN^2} + (3-\epsilon) \frac{d\phi}{dN} + \frac{1}{H^2} V'(\phi) = 0,
\]

where \( \epsilon \) is the first Hubble slow roll parameter, given by

\[
\epsilon = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} = \frac{1}{2M^2_{Pl}} \left( \frac{d\phi}{dN} \right)^2.
\]

We also define the second slow roll parameter \( \eta \) as

\[
\eta = -\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{H\dot{\phi}} = \epsilon - \left( \frac{d^2 \phi/dN^2}{d\phi/dN} \right).
\]

Of course, only two out of the above three equations are independent. To solve these equations completely, we need three initial conditions: \( \phi_i, d\phi_i/dN \) and \( H_i \). Since the evolution of the field \( \phi \) starts in the slow roll regime at large field part of the potential, after choosing an appropriate value of \( \phi_i \), the values of \( d\phi_i/dN \) and \( H_i \) can be chosen from the slow roll conditions and the Friedmann equations. In slow roll approximation wherein \( \frac{d^2 \phi}{dN^2} \ll \frac{d\phi}{dN} \) and \( \epsilon \ll 1 \), eq. (2.15) reads

\[
\frac{d\phi}{dN} + \frac{1}{3H^2} V'(\phi) \simeq 0,
\]
whose solution is given by
\[ \phi(N) \simeq \phi_i - \sqrt{2\epsilon_v} M_{\text{Pl}} (N - N_i), \] (2.19)
where \( \epsilon_v \) is the first potential slow roll parameter defined as \( \epsilon_v \equiv \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \left( \frac{V'}{V} \right)^2 \). It is clear form this slow roll solution that \( \phi \) is a monotonically decreasing function of \( N \). However, the same does not remain valid in the regime of ultra slow roll wherein the slow roll conditions do not hold. Since the potential is very flat and \( \epsilon \) becomes very small, one can now ignore the last term in (2.15) and thus it reduces to
\[ \frac{d^2\phi}{dN^2} + 3 \frac{d\phi}{dN} \simeq 0, \] (2.20)
which leads to
\[ \frac{d\phi}{dN} \sim \exp[-3(N - N_i)], \] or \( \phi(N) \sim \exp[-3(N - N_i)], \] (2.21)
and therefore, the inflaton velocity gets exponentially suppressed. This also implies that \( \epsilon \sim \exp[-6(N - N_i)] \) and \( \eta \simeq \epsilon + (3 - \epsilon) \sim 3 \) during the ultra slow roll phase which is also evident in Figure 2. As we shall discuss later, this behaviour leads to an exponential enhancement of the curvature perturbations which induces a tremendous growth of the power spectrum around the scales corresponding to the ultra slow roll regime.

Let us now quickly comment on the initial conditions \( \phi_i, \phi_i/dN \) and \( H_i \) we need for the background evolution. The initial value of the inflaton field \( \phi_i \) is important for two reasons: first, a minimum value of \( \phi_i \) ensures that the field acquires enough momentum to classically\(^4\) cross over the inflection point within a finite number of e-folds \( N \) and second, the slowing down of the inflation near the inflection point depends, exclusively on the choice of other parameters in the potential and the nature of the inflection point, but it also largely depends on \( \phi_i \). Once the value of \( \phi_i \) is appropriately chosen, the initial values of \( \phi_i/dN \) and Hubble parameter \( H_i \) can be obtained from the slow roll conditions and the Friedmann equations, respectively.

At this point when we have all the information required for the background evolution of the inflaton field, we realize that for a particular set of parameters which satisfy the inflection point conditions, the duration of inflation in terms of number of e-folds \( N \) can be a subject of fine tuning in terms of \( \phi_i \) or the ratios of parameters in the potential. Since any change in the value of \( \phi_i \) affects the mass range of PBHs in our model, we often need a different set of parameters to obtain the right mass PBHs with inflection point conditions unharmed. Since it is very impractical to change all the parameters simultaneously, we find that if we rescale the field as \( x = \phi/v \), we can overcome this issue saliently. It is important to note that, any non-zero constant value of \( v \) would satisfy the inflection point conditions. Now from eqs. (2.10) and (2.11), if we fix the four coefficients \( a, b, c, d \) of our potential, different values of \( v \) will lead to different number of total e-folds while the location of the scalar power spectra bump required for PBHs formation, will solely depend on the choice of \( \phi_i \) and the location of the inflection point \( x_0 \). This freedom allows us to work with fixed values of \( x_0 \) and \( \phi_i \) and explore the parameter space in terms of \( a, b, c, d \) by changing \( v \) only. With this,

\(^4\)Since the inflaton field in the ultra slow roll regime undergoes a phase of strong deceleration, the quantum diffusion of the inflation becomes very relevant around the inflection point. We shall discuss its implications for our model elsewhere [75].
we also find that the duration of the ultra slow roll phase and the total number of e-folds depends strongly on \( v \) and one can get a desired number of e-folds by changing \( v \) only and not any other parameters. From a numerical perspective, we can get a precise value of \( v \) corresponding to a fixed number of e-folds. While computing the scalar and tensor power spectra, we always ensure that the universe always undergoes the minimal required number of e-folds.

2.3 A necessary criterion for the enhancement of curvature perturbations

As briefly mentioned earlier in this section, a necessary condition for the production of PBHs from inflation leads to the fact that the spectrum of primordial curvature perturbations has to increase by a factor of \( \sim 10^7 \) or so in its amplitude at scales much smaller than the observable CMB scales. Such an enhancement can induce large matter density fluctuations at the horizon re-entry of these scales which can collapse to form PBHs. Let us briefly review the condition under which such an enhancement can happen [76–79]. We start with the Fourier mode equation for the comoving curvature perturbation \( \mathcal{R}_k \) in single field inflation which follows from the well known Mukhanov-Sasaki equation

\[
\mathcal{R}_k'' + 2 \left( \frac{z'}{z} \right) \mathcal{R}_k' + k^2 \mathcal{R}_k = 0.
\]

The comoving curvature perturbation \( \mathcal{R}_k \) matches with the curvature perturbation on the constant density hypersurface \( \zeta_k \) in the super-horizon limit. In the rest of this paper, we shall
use these two variables interchangeably to describe the scalar power spectrum. The ‘pump field’ $z$ is defined as $z = a\dot{\phi}/H$ and the friction term $z'/z$ is given by

$$\frac{z'}{z} = aH(1 + \epsilon - \eta).$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.23)

During inflation, while $\epsilon < 1$, $\eta$ can in principle take any value. However, during slow roll inflation, $\epsilon, |\eta| \ll 1$ should be satisfied. At the first order in slow roll, one can consider $\epsilon$ and $\eta$ to be constants and the naive solution to (2.23) is given by

$$z(a) \sim \exp\left[\int \frac{da}{a}(1 + \epsilon - \eta)\right],$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.24)

which in the slow roll limit simplifies to $z \sim a$. Let us now look for a solution to (2.22) in the super-horizon limit, $k \ll aH$. A very general solution to this equation can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{R}_k(\tau) \simeq \alpha u_k(\tau) + \beta v_k(\tau),$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.25)

with the condition $\alpha + \beta = 1$ without loss of generality [77]. Here, $u_k(\tau)$ and $v_k(\tau)$ are the growing and decaying modes, respectively and $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are their fractional contributions at any given time. This general solution can be rewritten in a more transparent form as

$$\mathcal{R}_k(\tau) \simeq C_1 + C_2 \int \frac{d\tau}{z^2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.26)

In slow roll inflation, it is evident to note that the second term decays rapidly as $a^{-3}$ outside the horizon and therefore, the curvature perturbation $\mathcal{R}_k$ is conserved in time at super-horizon scales for each wavenumber $k$ and its amplitude is determined by the constant $C_1$. Since the decaying mode dies completely in this limit, one can safely compute the power spectrum of curvature perturbations at the horizon exit in slow roll by fixing the initial conditions for each Fourier mode using the Bunch-Davies vacuum at sub-horizon scales.

However, a complete different situation arises if the friction term $z'/z$ transiently changes sign and becomes a ‘driving term’ during an epoch for different modes right after they cross the horizon. This is equivalent to the following condition

$$(1 + \epsilon - \eta) < 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.27)

Since $\epsilon > 0$ by definition, this condition can only be achieved if $\eta > 1$ during some epoch. This can be satisfied if the universe goes through a transition to fast-roll regime, during which the slow-roll approximation breaks down. In particular, the ultra slow-roll regime that we mentioned in the introduction, corresponds to a dynamical phase during which $\eta \geq 3$. During this regime, the exponent in (2.24) becomes negative and hence $z$ now decreases with time instead of increasing. This implies that otherwise decaying mode appearing in (2.26) now becomes a growing mode in this regime and its contribution to the curvature perturbation $\mathcal{R}_k$ can no longer be neglected. This transient growth of the decaying mode can be used to enhance the primordial spectrum of curvature perturbations for a short range of scales and thus, to produce PBHs on these scales. However, one has to fine tune a given inflationary scenario to obtain this transient departure from slow roll such that PBHs are produced on appropriate scales so as to contribute a larger fraction to the CDM.

In general, in any potential with a plateau region as in our scenario, this transient phase with a departure from slow roll is very likely to be present. In our model wherein we
have solved the background equation with e-folds $N$ as the independent time variable, we find that this ultra slow roll regime is present for a few e-folds corresponding to the scales appropriate for PBHs formation, as shown in Figure 2 and the system returns back to the usual slow-roll phase. It is the dynamics of this transient regime which is responsible for the required exponential growth of $\mathcal{R}_k$ resulting in a suitable bump in the $P_\zeta(k)$ as high as $10^{-2}$ needed for the PBHs formation.

3 Primordial black holes mass fraction and the collapse criteria

In this section, we shall quickly discuss the basic formalism to calculate the abundance of PBHs from a primordial power spectrum obtained at the end of inflation and also point out the uncertainties in the estimation of the final mass fraction which are associated with the underlying collapse criteria, the choice of the window function and the value of the critical density contrast. As we shall discuss later, it turns out that the mass fraction is exponentially sensitive to the value of the critical density contrast and can significantly change the predictions of a model for the same primordial power spectrum.

3.1 PBH mass fraction and associated uncertainties

The mass fraction $\beta(M)$ which specifies the fraction of the energy density of the universe populated by PBHs formed with a mass $M$ is an important quantity to calculate in a given scenario and is defined by

$$\beta(M) \equiv \frac{\rho_{\text{PBH}}(M)}{\rho_{\text{tot}}}. \quad (3.1)$$

The mass fraction is a very important quantity in this context which is typically calculated at the time of the PBH formation $t_f$ but is generally translated to the epoch of radiation-matter equality $t_{eq}$ to compare it with the CDM fraction in the universe at that epoch. Since PBHs behave as matter, $\rho_{\text{PBH}} \sim \rho_m \sim a^{-3}$ and since they are formed during radiation domination, $\rho_{\text{tot}} \sim \rho_{\text{rad}} \sim a^{-4}$, this implies that $\beta(M) \sim a \; i.e. \; \beta(M)$ grows with the scale factor until the radiation-matter equality. This relation can be used to arrive at the following expression relating the mass fraction at the epochs of formation and the radiation-matter equality as

$$\beta_{eq}(M) \simeq \beta_f(M) \left( \frac{a_{eq}}{a_f} \right) \quad (3.2)$$

Here, $a_f$ is the scale factor at $t = t_f$ i.e at the time of formation of PBHs. Since one assumes that PBHs are formed immediately by the collapse of a given scale at its horizon re-entry, $a_f$ can actually be calculated using the relation $k = aH$.

It turns out to be very useful to compute the present total abundance of PBHs which is given by [80]

$$\Omega_{\text{PBH}} = \int \frac{dM}{M} \Omega_{\text{PBH}}(M), \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$f_{\text{PBH}}(M) \equiv \frac{\Omega_{\text{PBH}}(M)}{\Omega_{\text{DM}}} \quad (3.4)$$

$$= \frac{\beta(M)}{8 \times 10^{-16} \left( \frac{0.2}{\gamma} \right)^{3/2} \left( \frac{g_*}{106.75} \right)^{-1/4} \left( \frac{M}{10^{18} \text{ g}} \right)^{-1/2}}, \quad (3.5)$$
and the total CDM fraction is constrained at equality to be $\Omega_{DM} \simeq 0.42$ [81]. In a given inflationary model, the aim is to obtain the largest possible value of $f_{PBH}$ in a given mass range. This not only suffers from the fine-tuning of various parameters of the model but also turns out to be extremely sensitive to the peak in the primordial spectrum $P_R$ or the choice of $\delta_c$. In this paper we shall essentially limit ourselves to the mass fraction in a very narrow mass range (a monochromatic mass fraction) and shall not consider the cases wherein PBHs are produced in a continuous broad mass range or discretely at different mass ranges. In such cases, the mass fraction $\beta(M)$ is conventionally described by a mass function $\psi(M)$. It is well known that the calculation of $\beta(M)$, for a primordial power spectrum $P_R(k)$ suffers from many approximations and uncertainties and each of these uncertainties changes the final result drastically. As we shall highlight in the following section, the PBH mass fraction needs to be in a very narrow mass range to lead to a significant contribution to the total CDM and therefore, in order to produce such a monochromatic mass spectrum, the choice of the collapse formalism or the value of the critical density contrast becomes very crucial. In what follows, we shall briefly discuss some of these difficulties and emphasize upon our physical and sometimes numerical motivation to choose a preferred way over the other, or specific value of certain parameters used in our analysis.

3.1.1 Peaks theory vs. Press-Schechter formalism

Primordial overdensities on smaller scales collapsing to form PBHs instantaneously right after the horizon entry of these scales in the radiation dominated universe can be described by two class of formalisms: Peaks theory and Press-Schechter. Both these formalisms use a critical value above which the fluctuations should collapse and form a PBH. In the peaks theory, the critical value is stated in terms of the peak value of a fluctuation while in the Press-Schechter approach, it is calculated as the average value of a fluctuation. In principle, the relationship between the peak value and the average value of a fluctuation depends on its shape but in practice, they are expected to differ only by a factor of order unity, with the peak value being higher. In general, results from these two established methods do not show convergence with all the other criterias and parameters fixed [82–84]. For our model which produces a nearly monochromatic PBH mass fraction, we find that the calculated mass fraction from peaks theory is somewhat higher than the Press-Schechter formalism as shown in the left panel of Figure 3. However, it turns out that in both cases, the PBH mass range converges with good accuracy.

3.1.2 Critical value of the density contrast

A critical threshold value of the density contrast $\delta_c$ plays an extremely crucial role in understanding the collapse and formation of PBHs. It has been discussed at length that an appropriate parameter that should be used to calculate the PBH abundance is the density contrast $\delta$ [85]. However, often the critical value of a metric perturbation such as the curvature perturbation $\zeta_c$ has also been used extensively to determine the PBHs mass fraction [24]. Such a choice simplifies the calculations of the mass fraction but, as pointed out in [82], $\zeta_c$ is strongly dependent on the local environment unlike $\delta_c$ which was also numerically verified in [86]. Thus, the density contrast should be considered a more natural (and physical) parameter to describe to collapse criteria. Since the environmental effects are likely to change the collapse threshold in terms of $\zeta_c$ which will then affect the resulting mass function, we shall use $\delta_c$ in all our calculations to avoid this.
Until now, we lack the knowledge of a very specific value of $\delta_c$ above which the PBHs should form [20, 24]. Using the Jeans collapse condition as the criteria for the PBH formation, the first order of magnitude estimate of the density contrast was provided as follows [8]

$$w \simeq \delta_c < \delta < \delta_{\text{max}} \sim 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

Here, $w$ is the equation of state parameter described by $w = p/\rho$. Since $w = 1/3$ during the radiation dominated phase, $\delta_c \simeq 1/3 = 0.33$. The upper limit on $\delta_c$ was initially set by Hawking and Carr from separate universe scenario [8, 16] but it was realized much later by Kopp, Hofmann and Weller that this limit is in fact a geometrical consequence and not necessarily a result of the separate universe approach [87]. Subsequent works to find out the lower limit on $\delta_c$ were based on approaches using numerical relativity [22, 24, 88]. In Ref. [24], the critical value of $\zeta$ was obtained as $\zeta_c = 1.4 - 1.8$ which corresponds to $\delta_c = 0.3 - 0.5$. Later, Polnarev and Musco did this analysis for $\delta_c$ and converged upon $\delta_c = 0.45 - 0.66$ [89]. This numerical result was also supported by an analytical formula obtained a few years later which suggested $\delta_c = 0.414$ for the radiation dominated era [20]. Further, this analytical estimate of $\delta_c$ is in rough agreement with the range specified from the numerical analysis in [24]. For the scenario that we consider in this paper, it is evident that the numerically allowed range of $\delta_c$ leaves a huge space for uncertainty in the calculation of mass fraction which is
also evident in the right panel of Figure 3. Therefore, to avoid ambiguity, we shall use the analytical value suggested for critical density contrast \( \delta_c = 0.414 \) throughout our analysis. Note that, the value of \( \delta_c \) also depends on the shape of the inflationary power spectrum but we shall neglect that effect for simplicity [90].

### 3.1.3 Choice of the window function

In order to estimate the PBH abundance in a given inflationary model, one must relate the primordial power spectrum in Fourier space to the probability distribution function in the real space by coarse-graining the curvature perturbations with the help of a window (smoothing) function. It has been noted that different choices of a window function leads to a different relation between the PBH abundance and the required power spectrum and therefore, one typically does not have a one-to-one correspondence between the two as has been extensively discussed in [83, 85, 91]. In practice, the widely used window functions are (i) the real space top-hat window function, (ii) Fourier space Gaussian window function, and (iii) Fourier space top-hat window function. The choice of a window function thus turns out to be an important factor that can change the predictions of the collapse criteria drastically. For our calculations in this paper, we shall use the most commonly used Fourier space Gaussian window function which is given by

\[
W(k, R) = \exp \left( -\frac{k^2 R^2}{2} \right),
\]

where \( R \) is the scale associated with the smoothing of primordial overdensities.

### 3.2 Press-Schechter formalism: A brief overview

As we have discussed, the PBH mass fraction depends crucially on the choice of the collapse formalism. In this paper, we shall adopt the Press-Schechter formalism to compute this fraction. Once we converge upon the formalism and choose the value of \( \delta_c \) and fix the window function, the primordial power spectrum is the only function, the PBH mass fraction depends on. We start with the simple relation between the curvature perturbation \( \zeta(k) \) and the density contrast \( \delta(t, k) \) which is given by [92, 93]

\[
\delta(t, k) = 2 \left( \frac{w+1}{w+5} \right) \left( \frac{k}{aH} \right)^2 \zeta(k).
\]

At horizon re-entry of a given mode in the radiation epoch with \( w = 1/3 \), one finds \( \delta = (4/9)\zeta \). Using this, we can obtain the following relation between the power spectra of \( \delta \) and \( \zeta \)

\[
P_\delta(k, t) = \frac{4(w + 1)^2}{(3w + 5)^2} \left( \frac{k}{aH} \right)^4 P_\zeta(k).
\]

Now, the variance of the density contrast \( \sigma_\delta^2 \) at a comoving scale \( R \), course grained using a Gaussian window function described in (3.7) can be expressed as

\[
\sigma_\delta^2(t, R) = \int \frac{dk}{k} P_\delta(k, t) W^2(k, R).
\]

For PBHs which are formed due to the collapse of a comoving wavenumber \( k \) just after the horizon re-entry during the radiation epoch, we can absorb the time dependence in the comoving smoothing scale, \( R = (aH)^{-1} \). This leads to

\[
\sigma_\delta^2(R) = \frac{16}{81} \int \frac{dk}{k} (kR)^4 P_\zeta(k) W^2(k, R).
\]
In the context of the Press-Schechter formalism of the gravitational collapse [94], the mass fraction $\beta(M)$ in PBHs of mass $M$, is given by the probability that the overdensity $\delta$ is above a certain threshold value $\delta_c$ for collapse. Assuming that $\delta$ is a Gaussian random variable with mass (or scale) dependent variance, the mass fraction $\beta(M)$ at the time of formation is therefore given by\footnote{Note that, one can include here the famous “fudge factor” of 2 of the Press-Schechter formalism as it is done conventionally.}

$$\beta_f(M) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_\delta^2(M(R))} \int_{\delta_c}^{\infty} \delta d\delta \exp\left( -\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma_\delta^2(M(R))} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}\left( \frac{\delta_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_\delta(M(R))} \right),$$

(3.12)

where erfc(x) is the complementary error function. Often, one can use the fact that it is the fluctuations in the upper tail of the distribution that form the PBHs and therefore, the complementary error function in the above expression can be approximated by an exponential function so that the mass fraction is given by [56]

$$\beta_f(M) \simeq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} \frac{\sigma_\delta(M(R))}{\delta_c} \exp\left( -\frac{\delta_c^2}{2\sigma_\delta^2(M(R))} \right).$$

(3.13)

In order to proceed further, we first need to relate the comoving smoothing scale $R$ to the PBH mass at formation. Since every smoothing scale $R$ corresponds to a formed PBH of comoving radius $R$, the formation mass is simply given by

$$M(R) = \frac{4\pi}{3} \gamma \rho (aR)^3,$$

(3.14)

where $\gamma \sim 0.2$ is the efficiency factor as mentioned in the introduction and $R = (aH)^{-1}$ at the horizon re-entry of that scale. Since we assume that all the PBHs in our scenario are formed when the respective scales re-enter the horizon during radiation domination, we have $a(t) \sim t^{1/2}$ so $aH \sim 1/a$ and thus $R \sim a$. Upon using this, we can find the following useful relation

$$\frac{R_f}{R_{eq}} = \frac{a_f}{a_{eq}},$$

(3.15)

where $R_{eq}^{-1} \sim k_{eq} = 0.07 \Omega_m h^2 \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ and $a_{eq}^{-1} = 24000 \Omega_m h^2$. This relation turns out to be very relevant for relating the scale factor and the radius of the PBH at the formation epoch. Using this relation together with (3.14) and $H_f = (a_f R_f)^{-1}$ at the time of formation, we can now find the PBH mass at formation as

$$M(R_f) = 4\pi \gamma M_{Pl}^2 \left( \frac{R_{eq}}{a_{eq}} \right) \left( \frac{a_{eq}}{a_f} \right) R_f^2.$$

(3.16)

This equation can now be used to calculate the mass fraction $\beta_f(M)$ from (3.12) or (3.13). Once $\beta_f(M)$ is calculated, we can readily use (3.2) to calculate the mass fraction at equality which is given by [95]

$$\beta_{eq}(M) = \beta_f(M) \left( \frac{a_{eq}}{a_f} \right) = \beta_f(M) \left( \frac{R_{eq}}{R_f} \right).$$

(3.17)
Assuming a monochromatic mass spectrum, the PBHs fraction in the form of dark matter can be expressed as [95]

\[ f_{\text{PBH}}(M) = \frac{\Omega_{\text{PBH}}(M)}{\Omega_{\text{DM}}} \approx \frac{\Omega_{\text{PBH}}^\text{eq}(M)}{0.42}, \]

where \( \Omega_{\text{PBH}}^\text{eq}(M) \sim \beta_{\text{eq}}(M_{\text{max}}) \) and \( M_{\text{max}} \) is the PBH mass which contributes the maximum mass fraction at the the radiation-matter equality.

4 Results and discussions

4.1 Limitations of the slow roll approximation and the exact power spectra

As we have mentioned earlier, the existence of an inflection point around the plateau region of the potential exponentially slows down the motion of the inflaton field much after the large scales left the horizon. Since the CMB scales leave the horizon during the initial slow roll regime, the power spectrum corresponding to those scales is nearly scale invariant and can be computed using the standard slow roll formalism. However, as evident from Figure 2, near the inflection point, there is a tremendous decrease in the value of \( \epsilon \), leading to a growth in the value of \( \eta \) for a few e-folds. This transient phase thus leads to a violation of the slow roll conditions but inflation is never interrupted in this scenario. As the scales of interest for the PBHs formation exit the horizon during or after this transient phase, there is no way we can expect reasonably correct results for the power spectra using slow roll approximation. However, slow roll can still be useful to determine the length scales leaving the horizon around the inflection point which will show exponential growth in the scalar power spectrum.

For exact numerical analysis, we also need the initial value of the scale factor and it must be chosen appropriately so as to lead to the correct length scale \( k_{eq} \) of the radiation-matter equality. It is important to note that \( k_{eq} \) is completely fixed by the energy densities of radiation and matter today. The choice of initial value of the scale factor depends on the number of e-folds during inflation and initial conditions of the radiation dominated phase which eventually depends on the inflationary dynamics. The ratio \( a_i/a_0 \) can be written as

\[ \frac{a_i}{a_0} = \frac{a_i}{a_e} \frac{a_e}{a_0}, \]

\[ \frac{a_i}{a_e} = e^{-N}, \]

where \( a_i, a_e \) and \( a_0 \) are the scale factors at the beginning, end of inflation and at the present time, respectively and \( N \) is the total number of e-folds during inflation. In the case of an instantaneous reheating phase wherein the universe becomes radiation dominated right after the end of inflation, one can write

\[ \frac{a_e}{a_0} = \frac{a_r}{a_0}. \]

However, if the reheating is not instantaneous, the above equation will be modified and we shall discuss the effects of such an epoch in the following section. Now that aim is to determine the ratio \( a_r/a_0 \). From the equation of entropy conservation for relativistic particles, we can write

\[ S = \frac{U + PV}{T} = \frac{\rho_r V + \frac{4}{3} \rho_r V}{T} = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\rho_r V}{T} = \text{constant}, \]
where $V \propto a(t)^3$ and $\rho_r$ is the radiation energy density at any epoch and is given by

$$\rho_r = \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_\ast(T) T^4,$$

(4.5)

which leads to $T \propto g_\ast^{-1/3}/a$. Here, $g_\ast(T)$ is the total number of effective degrees of freedom taking into account all the relativistic particles, $T$ is the photon temperature and both of them evolve with time. Now, using the entropy conservation at the beginning of radiation dominated phase and at the present epoch, we find

$$\frac{a_r}{a_0} = \left(\frac{g_{\ast,0}}{g_{\ast,r}}\right)^{1/3} \frac{T_{\gamma}}{T_r},$$

(4.6)

where $g_{\ast,0} = 3.36$, $g_{\ast,r} = g_{\ast,e} = 106.75$ and $T_{\gamma} = 2.725$ K. Upon using (4.2) and (4.6), we can now write

$$\frac{a_i}{a_0} = \left(\frac{g_{\ast,0}}{g_{\ast,r}}\right)^{1/3} \frac{T_{\gamma}}{T_r} e^{-N},$$

(4.7)

which will provide the value of $a_i$ for our numerical calculations. At the end of inflation, the energy density can be obtained using Friedmann equations as

$$\rho_e = 3H_e^2 M_{Pl}^2.$$ 

(4.8)

Using this and $\rho_e = \frac{\pi^2}{30} g_{\ast,e} T^4_e$, one can now find the temperature at the end of inflation as

$$T_e = \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{\ast,e}}\right)^{1/4} \left(H_e M_{Pl}\right)^{1/2},$$

(4.9)

which should also serve as the reheating temperature for the case of instantaneous reheating.

In our numerical approach, each time a different initial value of the scale factor is chosen, it leads to different physical length scales and different conditions for the normalisation of the scalar spectrum at pivot scale, and also different initial conditions for the radiation dominated phase in terms of $H_e$ and $T_e$. So while satisfying all these equations for consistency, only an adaptive numerical search of the parameter space can suggest an appropriate value of the initial scale factor which must be consistent with CMB normalisation at the pivot scale $k_p = 0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ of Planck.

### 4.2 Primordial power spectra and the PBH mass fraction

As we have discussed earlier, a plateau region corresponding to an inflection point in the potential will generally lead to an ultra slow roll evolution which is required for the growth of the scalar power spectra at scales relevant for the PBHs formation. An exact inflection point that demands, exact zero values for the first and second derivatives of potential, does not always offer a very appropriate PBH mass fraction. Moreover, a near inflection point with a very small positive value (very close to zero) of the first derivative of the potential leads to a slightly lower bump in the power spectrum than the exact inflection point case whereas a near inflection point with a small negative value of the first derivative leads to a higher bump in the power spectra. The aim of our numerical approach is to choose a deviation from an exact inflection point in such a way that the contribution to the PBH mass fraction is maximum possible in the relevant mass range.
In general, the primordial power spectrum of curvature and tensor perturbations are defined as

\[ P_R(k) = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} |R_k|^2, \quad P_h(k) = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} |h_k|^2 \]

and the Bunch-Davies vacuum initial conditions on \( R_k \) and \( h_k \) are imposed in the sub-horizon regime \( k \gg aH \) which are given by

\[ R_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} \frac{e^{-ikr}}{z}, \quad h_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} \frac{e^{-ikr}}{a}. \]

The governing equation for \( R_k \) is given in (2.22) while the equation for \( h_k \) is

\[ h_k'' + 2 \left( \frac{a'}{a} \right) h_k' + k^2 h_k = 0, \]

and the spectra are generally calculated in the super-horizon limit wherein \( k \ll aH \) while ensuring that the universe always inflates for the minimal required number of e-folds. As we have discussed earlier, in order to produce a large enough abundance of PBHs, the power spectrum must grow exponentially from an amplitude of \( \sim 10^{-9} \) at CMB scales to \( \sim 10^{-2} \) at the PBH scales and this is controlled by the smallness and the rate of change of \( \epsilon \). As has been discussed in earlier works, this kind of inflationary dynamics around a local minima (or an inflection point) can not be correctly captured by the slow roll approximation \([55, 61]\). Since the PBH mass fraction also depends exponentially on the density contrast \( \delta \), an exact numerical integration of the mode equation for curvature perturbations is required to calculate the power spectrum which also justifies our approach of calculating all the relevant quantities exactly by adapting a suitable numerical scheme without relying on any approximations.

In our scenario the parameters which are essentially free to take any value are \( \phi_i, x_0(\equiv \phi_0/v) \), and any two of the four parameters \( a, b, c, d \) while the other two are fixed by the conditions (2.10) and (2.11). Among these parameters, only first two i.e. \( \phi_i \) and \( x_0 \) control the location of the peak in the power spectra and, correspondingly, the mass and abundance of formed PBHs. A significant fractional contribution of PBHs to CDM directly corresponds to a larger height of the bump in the power spectra and also the critical value of the density contrast \( \delta_c \) that we choose. After we fix the value of \( \delta_c \) for all our calculations, the only way to obtain the desired mass fraction is by slightly departing from the conditions for an exact inflection point in the potential. In order to explore the feasibility of PBHs production from such a feature in the potential, we resort to a full numerical scan of the parameter space. One should also keep in mind that although the inflaton velocity is exponentially suppressed around the inflection point which is actually required to generate a large peak in the power spectrum, it should still have enough inertia to cross over that region and not get trapped there forever.

We have computed the scalar power spectra numerically for our model with different choices of the model parameters leading to different values of the inflection points as shown in Figure 4. In particular, we notice that as we continuously increase the value of \( \phi_0 \) (the location of the inflection point), the bump in the scalar spectra shift to the left. Although the spectra at CMB scales appear nearly flat, we find that there exists a strong correlation between \( n_s \) computed at the pivot scale \( k_p \) and the position and height of the peak in the power spectrum, and correspondingly, in the mass range and abundance of PBHs. While the value of \( n_s \) is perfectly consistent with the best fit value from Planck for the spectra on the very right in Figure 4, the tension grows as one goes to the left. Since the spectrum on very
Figure (4) The scalar power spectra $P_R$ (solid lines) are shown for our model corresponding to different values of the inflection point as displayed in the inset. All the spectra show a similar exponential rise around the scales associated with the ultra slow roll regime. The spectrum on the extreme right corresponding to the best fit value of $n_s = 0.963$ which is perfectly consistent with the Planck constraint. We also compute the tensor power spectra (dashed lines) for all the different cases. While the scalar power spectra show a tremendous rise for all the different cases, the tensor spectra result in a suppression on the smaller scales. Also, note that as the bump in the scalar spectra shifts to the left, the tension of the scalar spectral index $n_s$ with the best fit value from Planck increases.

left leads to mass fraction in the larger mass range, it may however be very inconsistent on the ground of the value of $n_s$. All the spectra show a similar exponential growth corresponding to the scales which leave the horizon around the ultra slow roll phase. We have also computed the exact tensor power spectra for our model. While the scalar spectra show a tremendous rise around the scales of PBHs formation for all the different cases, the tensor spectra, on the other hand, show a suppression on the smaller scales but is consistent with a nearly flat spectrum on large scales corresponding to CMB observations. We also find a similar trend if we rather change the value of $\phi_i$ i.e. the scalar spectra shift to the left as we decrease the value of $\phi_i$. In principle, it is possible to obtain more than one set of parameters leading to the same value of $x_0$, but we find that it does not change the nature of the potential much and hence the resulting inflationary dynamics remains unaffected.

In Figure 5, we have calculated the resulting mass fraction for different cases of power spectra in Figure 4. It is immediately evident from this figure that the power spectrum with a bump on much smaller scales leads to a mass fraction in the smaller mass range and vice versa. In particular, from this figure, we find that there exists two mass windows, one around $10^{-16} M_\odot$ and the other around $10^{-8} M_\odot$ which could contribute to a significant fraction of CDM ($\sim 25 - 30\%$). And, the value of $n_s$ for these two possibilities is also within 1$\sigma$ range of the best fit value from Planck. We also show in this figure the various bounds arising from
Figure (5) Fractional abundance of PBHs calculated for different primordial spectra of Figure 4 and latest observational bounds for a monochromatic mass spectrum are displayed. These constraints are from the measurements of extragalactic γ-ray background (due to Hawking evaporation) [19], gravitational femtolensing of gamma-ray bursts [26], white dwarf explosions [27], neutron star capture [28], microlensing from Subaru (HSC) [29] and EROS/MACHO [30, 31], ultra faint dwarf galaxies (UFD) observations [35, 36] and the CMB anisotropies [32–34]. We find that in our model, the contribution of PBHs to the CDM is quite significant (∼ 25 – 30%) in some specific mass ranges. Also note that, the mass fractions obtained for different model parameters are nearly monochromatic.

observations constrains which clearly indicate that PBHs can at most be a large fraction of the CDM but can not be all of it. Following our numerical results, we should further point out that, the same mass fraction can be obtained with different initial conditions either by changing $\phi_i$ ) or by changing $x_0$. But, the change in $\phi_i$ causes significant variation in the value of $n_s$ at the CMB scales as compared to the case when $x_0$ is changed. In other words, we can use the running of $n_s$ to disentangle the PBH mass fraction arising from these two possibilities.

Before we conclude this section, let us briefly comment on the understanding of the exponential rise in the scalar power spectra arising from the ultra slow roll regime. It has been discussed recently in [96] that one can arrive at relevant analytic bounds on the shape of the primordial power spectrum arising in the ultra slow roll regime in the context of single field inflation. In particular, they show that the steepest possible growth has a spectral index of $n_s - 1 = 4$. Moreover, they also perform a more careful calculation by sandwiching an ultra slow roll phase between two slow roll regimes, match the mode solutions for the curvature perturbations at each boundary and finally calculate the spectrum after the final slow roll phase ends. This leads to a spectrum which behaves as $P_R \sim k^3 (\log k)^2$. Interestingly, we find that the growing behaviour of all the spectra that we have plotted in Figure 4 are
perfectly consistent with this logarithmic growth, and not so with the steepest power law
growth of the spectrum at the appropriate scales. Note that, this logarithmic correction to
the power spectrum comes from the otherwise decaying mode of $R_k$ which in this particular
situation, becomes a growing mode. Therefore, the weaker logarithmic growth of the power
spectrum turns out to be more realistic matching with exact numerical spectra than the
steepest growth index for single field inflation. Although various causality and analyticity
arguments have been used in different contexts to arrive at particular bounds on the growth
index of cosmological perturbations [97], it seems that these arguments cannot be directly
applied to the growth of the scalar spectrum associated with the PBH formation as the
transient growth only happens for a very short range of modes.

4.3 PBH abundance and the effects of reheating

We shall now turn out attention to understand the effects of an epoch of non-instantaneous
reheating on the PBH mass function. An epoch of reheating can affect the PBH mass fraction
in two different ways: first, an epoch of slow reheating or an intermediate matter dominated
phase with $w = 0$ can subsequently enhance the PBH mass fraction [98] and second, the
presence of a non-instantaneous reheating stage changes the mapping of different length
scales from exit to re-entry thereby affecting the mass fraction [95]. In our model inflation
lasts upto the horizon exit of reasonably small length scales which minimizes the first effect
so we shall mainly focus on the second effect. In order to determine this effect, eq. (4.2)
needs to be modified to include a reheating epoch as

\[
\frac{a_i}{a_0} = \frac{a_i}{a_e} \frac{a_e}{a_{reh}} \frac{a_{reh}}{a_0},
\]

\[a_e = e^{-N_{reh}},\]

where $N_{reh}$ denotes the number of e-folds during the reheating phase. Now, the temperature
$T_r$ at the beginning of the radiation domination depends both on inflation and reheating.
Assuming that the reheating epoch is characterised by an equation of state $w_{reh} = p_{reh}/\rho_{reh}$, we find

\[
\rho_{reh} = \rho_e e^{-3N_{reh}(1+w_{reh})}.
\]

Upon using $\rho_{reh} = \rho_r$ along with (4.5), (4.8) and (4.15), we find the temperature $T_r$ at the
onset of the radiation epoch as [95]

\[
T_r = \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*, r}}\right)^{1/4} \left(H_e^2 M_{\text{Pl}}^2 e^{-3N_{reh}(1+w_{reh})}\right)^{1/4}.
\]

After getting $T_r$, we can now use eq. (4.7) to obtain the value of $a_i$ to match the observational
constraints at the pivot scale for a given reheating history and then use the same formalism
described in the previous section to obtain the power spectra for different reheating histories.
It is worth mentioning that the PBH mass fraction exclusively depends on the inflationary
power spectrum, if we exclude the first effect of PBH formation during a slow reheating phase,
the reheating history plays no role in the determination of the PBH mass fraction from the
power spectrum. In our approach, the primordial spectrum contains all the information of
the reheating history and the scale $k_{eq}$ remains fixed from observations.

As a proof of concept, we shall discuss four cases of different reheating histories to show
how it affects the scalar power spectra and the PBH mass fraction. In Figure 6 we have
Figure (6) On the left, the scalar power spectra $P_R$ (solid lines) are shown for our model corresponding to different reheating histories as displayed in the inset. The scalar spectra show a shift to the left for the four different reheating scenarios that we have considered. The tensor spectra $P_h$ for these four cases are also shown with dotted lines. On the right, the PBH mass fraction calculated for these four cases are shown with an increase in the height of the bump as well as a shift to a larger mass range as the reheating details are changed. Thus a larger mass fraction can be obtained in our model only by changing the reheating details without changing other parameters of the model.

displayed the power spectra and the PBH mass fraction for these four cases wherein the first one with $N_{reh} = 0$ and $w_{reh} = 1/3$ corresponds to an instantaneous reheating. We find that as the power spectra shift to the left for these different cases, the corresponding PBH mass fraction shift to the right with an increase in the height of the bump thereby leading to a larger contribution of PBHs to the CDM. Since the reheating stage can not be very long in duration, we have restricted to the parameter range $0 \leq N_{reh} \leq 10$ and $0 \leq w_{reh} \leq 1/3$. A substantial increase in the mass fraction happens when $N_{reh} = 10$ and $w_{reh} = 0$ i.e. a matter dominated reheating epoch maximises this effect. In order to gain further insights into the gain in the mass fraction for different reheating histories, in Figure 7, we have plotted the PBH abundance $\Omega_{PBH}/\Omega_{DM}$ at equality for different values of $N_{reh}$ and $w_{reh}$ using a contour plot for a fixed value of $\delta_c = 0.414$. In particular, we notice that the abundance gets increased for larger value of $N_{reh}$ and fixed $w_{reh}$ while it gets suppressed for larger $w_{reh}$ and fixed $w_{reh}$. These results are in broad agreement with [95] which are derived using the slow roll spectra for a different model. However, it was discussed in [95] that reheating only affects an extended mass fraction of PBHs while a monochromatic mass fraction remains unchanged. Since our model predicts a nearly monochromatic mass fraction for different parameter values, we find that reheating also affects our mass fraction and thus our conclusion is that, an epoch of reheating in general affects the PBH abundance although the effects may not be very significant in some cases.

Often, another parameter $R_{reh}$ has also been used to characterise the reheating stage which is given by [99]

$$\log R_{reh} = \frac{-1 + 3w_{reh}}{4} N_{reh}. \quad (4.17)$$

Clearly, $R_{reh} = 1$ for instantaneous reheating, corresponding to either $N_{reh} = 0$ or $w_{reh} =$
The contour plot of PBH abundance $\Omega_{\text{PBH}}/\Omega_{\text{DM}}$ at equality for different values of $N_{\text{reh}}$ and $w_{\text{reh}}$ for a fixed value of $\delta_c = 0.414$. The different contours are labelled in yellow with their respective fraction $f$. We find that the abundance increases for larger value of $N_{\text{reh}}$ and fixed $w_{\text{reh}}$ while it gets suppressed for larger $w_{\text{reh}}$ and fixed $N_{\text{reh}}$. Our results broadly agree with [95] which are derived using the slow roll spectra for a different model.

1/3. Most often, this parameter is quite useful as it contains the effects of both $N_{\text{reh}}$ and $w_{\text{reh}}$ but we find that in our case, it is more convenient to use $N_{\text{reh}}$ and $w_{\text{reh}}$ and a contour plot as in Figure 7 gives a much clear picture about the change in the mass fraction with varying these two parameters. We should also emphasize that $R_{\text{reh}} \neq 1$ (with $0 \leq w_{\text{reh}} < 1/3$) always leads to a larger mass fraction than $R_{\text{reh}} = 1$ case.

Before concluding this section, a few remarks about a possible degeneracy that we noticed in our scenario are in order. As shown in Figure 4, the scalar power spectra shifts to the left as one increases the value of $\phi_0$ (or the PBH mass fraction shifts to the right as in Figure 5). Also, note that, exactly the same shift to the right in the PBH mass fraction happens when the reheating history is changed by varying both $w_{\text{reh}}$ and $N_{\text{reh}}$ as is evident from Figure 6. This indicates that there exists a degeneracy between these two cases as the power spectra and as a result, the mass fraction turns out to be the same for the two different choices of parameters. To surmount this difficulty, we have evaluated the scalar spectral index $n_s$ at the pivot scale $k_p = 0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ which has been plotted for the two cases in Figure 8. We find that $n_s$ can indeed break this degeneracy if measured very precisely as the calculated values of $n_s$ for these two cases are very close to each other. Note that, we have also calculated the tensor power spectra for the two cases but we find that it can not break this degeneracy.

Figure (7)
As discussed in the text, there exists a degeneracy implying that one can get the same mass function for two different possibilities: (i) \( \phi_0 \) is varied while \( \phi_i \) is fixed and (ii) for different reheating parameters \( w_{reh} \) and \( N_{reh} \) while keeping both \( \phi_0 \) and \( \phi_i \) fixed. Although the difference in the value of \( n_s \) for these two cases is very small, we find that \( n_s \) is the parameter which can actually break this degeneracy if measured very accurately.

5 Conclusions and outlook

PBHs belong to a class of very fascinating objects whose idea was conceived a long time ago. Recently, they have gained a lot of attention primarily due to observations of BHs merger events by LIGO and Virgo collaborations. In addition, they can also be an unconventional candidate of the CDM in the universe as well as can provide seeds for the supermassive BHs observed at the centre of galaxies. There do not exist many satisfactory explanations for the existence of the supermassive BHs in our universe. However, all these possibilities are already somewhat constrained from the existing data. As we have discussed, PBHs can only be a significant fraction of the total dark matter in the universe but can not be all of it in any mass range. Since PBHs are supposed to be produced in the very early universe, they provide a completely new window to probe the early universe by means of their generation mechanisms and distinct observable imprints.

Inflation provides the right underlying platform to produce the PBHs in the very early universe. While cosmological scales are strongly constrained by the CMB and LSS observations, the small scales existing the horizon during inflation (and re-entering during later epochs) however remain unconstrained. PBHs formation and spectral distortions in the CMB provide two novel avenues to constrain the small scale dynamics during inflation. A diverse class of inflationary models including both single field and multi-fields have been studied for producing PBHs. Among the single field models, it turns out that inflection point models of inflation provide the necessary dynamics to produce the required abundance of PBHs. Inflationary potentials allowing the existence of an inflection point are typically of polynomial in nature. In such potentials, the general understanding is that inflation starts in the slow roll
regime at the flat enough part (corresponding to large field values) of the potential while the plateau region provides the necessary ultra slow roll phase. The field finally rolls down to the true minima of the potential thereby reheating the universe. PBHs are populousely generated during the ultra slow roll phase when the second slow roll parameter becomes large thereby violating the slow roll approximation which in fact turns out to be a necessary condition for PBHs production.

In this paper, we have studied a single field model of inflation allowing a plateau region for generating PBHs whose potential is broadly motivated from an effective field theory with a suitable flattening at large field values. We should mention here that it is indeed a challenge to find a single field inflationary model with a suitable potential which leads to the desired background dynamics required for producing sufficient abundance of PBHs. While the primordial spectrum on cosmological scales should be consistent with the CMB, the small scale power spectrum should be sufficiently enhanced at the appropriate scales. By solving the background and perturbation equations exactly using an adequate numerical scheme, we find that our model can produce a large enough abundance of PBHs in different mass ranges. Moreover, our model predicts a large fraction of the CDM $\sim 25-30\%$ and the mass fraction turns out to be nearly monochromatic. Note that, in principle, one can obtain a larger mass fraction by choosing a smaller value of $\delta_c$, without changing any other parameters of a given model. However, we also noticed that as we change the values of various parameters in our model, we do generate the PBHs mass fraction in the higher mass range but at the cost of the primordial spectrum being strongly tilted at the CMB scales.

We have further studied the effects of a reheating phase after the end of inflation onto the mass fraction of PBHs. The epoch of reheating is characterised by two parameters $w_{\text{reh}}$ and $N_{\text{reh}}$ which turn out to be very useful as for instance, $w_{\text{reh}} = 1/3$ and $N_{\text{reh}} = 0$ correspond to a phase of an instantaneous reheating wherein the universe immediately enters into a radiation dominated phase after the end of inflation. We have computed the primordial scalar spectra and the mass fractions for different choices of these two parameters and found that a prolonged matter dominated reheating epoch can lead to very interesting effects on the mass fraction. In particular, we observed that it can shift the mass fraction to larger mass ranges as well as increase the fractional contribution of PBHs to the total CDM. We have computed the effects on the mass fraction for different reheating histories and presented the final results with the help of a contour plot to clearly display the values of $w_{\text{reh}}$ and $N_{\text{reh}}$ which do lead to the same amount of CDM fraction. We have also calculated the tensor power spectra in our model for different reheating histories and found that it is not strongly affected due to an epoch of non-instantaneous reheating.

One should keep in mind that the underlying mechanism to produce PBHs during inflation is very model specific and therefore, model independent conclusions can not in general be obtained. However, one can still try to broadly predict the results from two different models if they allow the same background dynamics. Finally, we discuss below some future interesting directions one could look at within this context.

1. PBHs can generate a stochastic background of GWs at the smaller scales. Although there exists an upper bound on the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r$ from Planck on the CMB scales, no such bound exists on the scales of the PBHs formation. Since the required amplitude of the power spectrum $P_\zeta \sim 10^{-2}$ implying $\zeta \sim 0.1$ for abundant generation of PBHs, this implies that the linear treatment of primordial perturbations at those scales is not entirely correct and one should perform a complete non-linear perturbation theory to understand the evolution of these perturbations at such scales. Moreover, the
anisotropic stresses induced by the second order perturbations will act as a source term for linear perturbations thereby generating a secondary contribution to the stochastic background of gravitational waves from the epoch of PBHs formation. Of course, such a background will depend on the specific model of PBHs formation. But one can expect that a narrow/broad peak in the scalar spectrum would roughly generate a narrow/broad peak in the GWs spectrum which could then be compared with the sensitivities plots of future GW observatories such as LISA [100]. This has recently been discussed for specific models in [101–104]. Induced GWs from PBHs in the mass range around $10^{-12} M_\odot$ correspond to frequency peaked in the mHz range, precisely around the maximum sensitivity of the LISA mission [105]. In addition, there might also exist a GW background from the merger of PBHs in a binary system which could have been created by close encounters of PBHs. This possibility and its observational prospects have also been discussed in [106]. It will be interesting to study the constraints arising from these two GWs contributions on our scenario of PBHs formation [107].

2. In models of PBHs generation, the mass fraction is typically calculated assuming the fact that the initial distribution of primordial curvature perturbations is Gaussian. However, the CMB data from Planck indicates that there exists small amounts of primordial non-Gaussianities [108]. It has already been discussed how such primordial non-Gaussianities would affect the mass fraction of PBHs and in some cases, the resulting effects could be very significant [109–111]. Further, there could also arise additional non-Gaussianities due to the generation of a bump in the power spectrum which could affect the PBHs formation at those scales. Therefore, in all these models, one can use the abundance of PBHs as a tool to constrain non-Gaussianities on very small scales which can not otherwise be constrained [112]. In addition, the non-linear relation between the curvature and density perturbations introduces significant non-Gaussianities in the over-density statistics even when the curvature perturbation has an exactly Gaussian distribution. It has been recently discussed that the abundance of PBHs is very sensitive to such non-linear effects [113, 114]. Since these imprints could be very model dependent, it will be worth exploring them in our model arising both from the bispectra and trispectra as well as from the intrinsic non-linearities.

3. The calculation of the PBHs mass fraction in a given model is generally done in a classical set-up. However, it has been greatly discussed that quantum diffusion during the ultra slow roll phase around the inflection point would be very relevant since the inflaton field in this region undergoes a phase of strong deceleration. In single field slow roll inflation, the classical evolution of the field fluctuations is $\delta \phi_{\text{Cl}} \sim \dot{\phi}/H$ while the quantum evolution is given by $\langle \delta \phi_{\text{Q}} \rangle \sim H/2\pi$. The classical evolution leads to correct predictions for the power spectrum when $\delta \phi_{\text{Cl}} > \langle \delta \phi_{\text{Q}} \rangle$. However, there could be a situation when this condition does not hold true. In particular, this happens when $\dot{\phi}$ becomes extremely small i.e. during the ultra slow roll phase which is very crucial for PBHs generation. It has been pointed out that the classical calculation of PBHs mass fraction during this phase does not necessary give the correct results and one should take into account the contributions arising from the quantum diffusion [115, 116]. The resulting effects on the PBHs mass fraction due to quantum diffusion will depend on the underlying background dynamics of an inflationary model and it will be very important to calculate this in our model. We leave the computation of quantum diffusion in our model and its implications for future work [75].
4. Super massive black holes (SMBH) are observed at the centre of galaxies and in quasars at high redshifts, \(z \sim 6 - 7\) [117, 118]. On the contrary, it is very challenging to form such SMBHs at high redshifts in the standard ΛCDM cosmology. It has been pointed out that the tail of the PBHs distribution can serve as the seeds for the origin of such SMBHs. PBHs produced with masses larger than \(10^4 M_\odot\) at around \(z \sim 15\) can provide seeds which can then accrete matter over time and probably merge by today to form these SMBHs [53]. It has also been noted that only the Eddington accretion would be enough for explaining SMBHs today and super-Eddington accretion is perhaps not necessary required [119]. Note that it is extremely difficult to form very massive BHs from stellar evolution in a rather short timescale and therefore, this possibility makes higher mass PBHs very interesting seed candidates for SMBHs. Furthermore, intermediate PBHs can also be produced in the same model which can explain the presence of ultraluminous x-ray sources [120, 121]. Since our scenario predicts PBHs in all mass ranges, it will be interesting to analyze whether the tail distribution of PBHs in our model can give rise to seeds for the SMBHs.
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