



Escaping the Pair-Instability Mass Gap with the Help of Dark Matter

Raghav Narasimha P ¹, Della Vincent ¹, Arun Kenath ¹ and C. Sivaram ²

¹ Department of Physics and Electronics, Christ (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, 560029, Karnataka, India; raghav.p@phy.christuniversity.in, della.vincent@phy.christuniversity.in, kenath.arun@christuniversity.in

² Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Bengaluru, 560034, Karnataka, India; sivaram@iiap.res.in

† Presented at the 2nd Electronic Conference on Universe, 16 February–2 March 2023; Available online: <https://ecu2023.sciforum.net/>.

Abstract: Black Holes are not expected to form in the mass range of $60 M_{\odot}$ to $130 M_{\odot}$ because of the Pair-Instability Supernova (PISN). But the recent observational evidence of GW190521 does not comply with the existing theory. Here we have looked upon the effects of Dark Matter (DM) in the progenitors of PISN in terms of luminosity, lifetime and temperature and have shown that in the presence of DM particles, the progenitors can overcome the PISN stage, to collapse into a black hole (BH) as remnant.

Keywords: Dark matter; Black hole mass gap; Pair-Instability Supernova; Gravitational waves

1. Introduction

On 21st May 2019, Laser Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory (LIGO) and Virgo interferometer observed the largest binary black hole merger to date. The merger involved two black holes with masses of $85 M_{\odot}$ and $66 M_{\odot}$. The mass of the remnant black hole is about $142 M_{\odot}$ [1]. One of the primary black holes ($85 M_{\odot}$) in the merger lies within the PISN mass gap. Non-rotating models with ZAMS ranging from $140 M_{\odot}$ to $260 M_{\odot}$ end their lives by exploding as PISN [2, 3]. PISN occurs when Carbon-Oxygen (C-O) core reaches a mass ranging between $60 M_{\odot}$ to $130 M_{\odot}$, [4, 5, 6, 7] at sufficient temperature ($T \sim 3 \times 10^9 \text{K}$) and density ($\rho < 5 \times 10^5 \text{gcm}^{-3}$), the photon energy rises such that electron-positron pair starts to form. The pair production phenomenon occurs at $1.2 \times 10^{10} \text{K}$, but even at 10^9K appreciable pair creation happens because of high energy photons [8, 9, 10]. The formation of electron-positron pair lowers the radiation pressure thereby causing the star to become unstable. Once explosive oxygen burning takes place, the dynamical instability leads the C-O core to explode with no compact remnant left behind. Hence, no black holes between $60 M_{\odot}$ and $130 M_{\odot}$ mass range are expected to form but the GW190521 remains a contradiction.

There are a few alternative explanations for GW190521. One is merger of black holes [11] or stellar progenitors [12] or primordial black holes [13]. Another alternative even extends the Standard Model [14]. Gas accretion driven mechanism that can build up black hole masses which can reach up to any intermediate mass black holes [15]. Another alternative says that the event may have been occurred due to instantaneous collision in a dense and crowded galactic environment [16]. Another alternative says that if an extra energy source is added other than nuclear fusion, then the star might avoid the PISN stage and leave a BH remnant behind. The extra energy source is coming from DM annihilation [17]. But we suggest that even the presence of DM particles in the progenitors can affect their evolution and leave a BH as remnant.

Citation: Raghav Narasimha P, Della Vincent, Arun Kenath, C. Sivaram. Escaping the Pair-Instability Mass Gap with the Help of Dark Matter. *Phys. Sci. Forum* **2023**, *3*, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Published: 17 February 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

The evidence from the anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background [18], galaxy cluster velocity dispersions [19], large-scale structure distributions [20], gravitational lensing studies [21], and X-ray measurements from galaxy clusters [22] show that the universe is not dominated by the ordinary baryonic matter, but by a form of non-luminous matter, called dark matter. DM is non-baryonic matter which is about five times more abundant than ordinary baryonic matter. DM interacts normally only via gravity and is dynamically cold. Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (WIMPs) are hypothesized to be DM particles which are the thermal relics of the early universe [23, 24]. Recent studies have shown that the stellar structure and evolution could be affected by the admixture of DM particles and baryonic matter, especially in the formation of stars in the early universe [25]; white dwarfs [26]; neutron stars [27], and in the evolution of low mass red giants [28]. In this work, we extend this idea and study how DM admixture can affect the progenitor of PISN and show that the presence of DM can help the progenitor to escape the PISN phase and form a black hole.

2. Method

From the hydrostatic equilibrium relation [29],

$$T_c \propto \frac{M}{R} \quad (1)$$

It is clear that the core temperature (T_c) increases as the mass (M) increases. If more DM fraction is present in the star, then the star's core temperature will increase, thereby the star will burn faster and brighter to maintain the equilibrium. Using the relations between the mass and parameters like temperature, lifetime, and luminosity we can analyze how DM particles of different mass and different fractions can affect the progenitor of PISN.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Effect of Dark Matter on the Temperature of the PISN progenitors

Whether a C-O core becomes degenerate or not, depends upon its mass. For simplicity, we neglect radiation pressure, as well as the creation of electron-positron pairs, which can also lead to partial degeneracy of electrons at very high temperatures and low densities. Thus, from the equation of state we arrived at the relation between maximum core temperature and the core mass as [29]:

$$T \propto M^{1.3} \quad (2)$$

To analyze how DM admixture alters the progenitor, we take the ratio of mass in presence of DM particles to the mass in absence of DM particles which is given as:

$$\frac{M_{DM}}{M_0} = \frac{f m_{DM} + (100-f)m_B}{100m_B} \quad (3)$$

Where f is the fraction of dark matter particles, m_B is the mass of baryonic matter (mass of proton, $m_p \approx 1$ GeV) and m_{DM} is the mass of DM particle. From (2) and (3) the ratio of temperature in the presence of DM particles (T_{DM}) to the temperature in the absence of DM particles (T_0) can be given as:

$$\frac{T_{DM}}{T_0} = \left(\frac{M_{DM}}{M_0} \right)^{1.3} \quad (4)$$

The plot for increasing fractions of DM particles, with the ratio of the temperature in the presence of DM particles (T_{DM}) to the temperature in the absence of DM particles (T_0) can be seen in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Variation of temperature with increasing dark matter fraction.

Thus, for a DM particle having a mass of 10 GeV, even a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ (10% of DM admixture) will lead to a temperature increase by a factor of 2. Similarly, for DM particle having a mass of 60 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ will lead to a temperature increase by a factor of 13 and for $1m_{DM} = 100$ GeV, the temperature will increase by a factor of 24 for $f \sim 0.1$.

3.2. Effect of Dark Matter on the Lifetime of the PISN progenitors

When the star burns more quickly to maintain the equilibrium, the rate of fusion in the core increases which leads to a lower lifetime of the star. During the nuclear fusion phase in the star, the timescale is given by [30]:

$$\tau \approx \frac{M\epsilon c^2}{L} \tag{5}$$

Where ϵ is the mass defect of the nuclear reaction, and L is the luminosity output. The ratio of the lifetime of the progenitor in the presence of DM particles (τ_{DM}) to the lifetime of the progenitor in the absence of DM particles (τ_0) is given as:

$$\frac{\tau_{DM}}{\tau_0} = \left(\frac{M_{DM}}{M_0}\right)^{-0.45} \tag{6}$$

The plot for increasing fraction of DM particles, with the ratio of the lifetime in the presence of DM particles (τ_{DM}) to the lifetime in the absence of DM particles (τ_0) can be seen in Figure 2.

Thus, for a DM particle having the mass of 10 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ will reduce the lifetime to 0.7 times of the original lifetime (without the presence of DM). Similarly, for a DM particle having a mass of 60 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ reduces the lifetime the lifetime to 0.4 times of the original lifetime and for $1m_{DM} = 100$ GeV, a 10% of DM admixture will result in lifetime reduced to 0.3 times.




Figure 2. Variation of lifetime with increasing dark matter fraction

3.3. Effect of Dark Matter on the Luminosity of the PISN progenitors

Because of DM admixture, the star burns more brightly in order to maintain the equilibrium. Greater the rate of fusion in the core, higher is the luminosity of the star. Thus, the DM admixture contributes to a considerable increase in the luminosity of star. The M/L relation for rotating massive stars at solar composition for ZAMS between $120 M_{\odot}$ to $500 M_{\odot}$ is given as [31]:

$$L \propto M^{1.45} \quad (7)$$

From (7), the ratio of luminosity in the presence of DM particles (L_{DM}) to the luminosity in the absence of DM particles (L_0) is given as:

$$\frac{L_{DM}}{L_0} = \left(\frac{M_{DM}}{M_0} \right)^{1.45} \quad (8)$$

The plot for increasing fraction of DM particles with the ratio of the luminosity in the presence of DM particles (L_{DM}) to the luminosity in the absence of DM particles (L_0) is seen in Figure 3.




Figure 3. Variation of luminosity with increasing dark matter fraction

For a DM particle having a mass of 10 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ will lead to an increase in the luminosity by a factor of 2.5. As the mass of the DM particle is increased to 60 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ will lead to an increase in luminosity by a factor of 16. For $1m_{DM} = 100$ GeV, the luminosity of the progenitor will increase by a factor of 31 for $f \sim 0.1$.

3.4. Overcoming the PISN stage

In massive stars, carbon burning occurs at temperatures around $T = 0.6 - 1.0 \times 10^9$ K. Oxygen burning occurs around $T = 1.5 - 2.7 \times 10^9$ K and $T = 3 - 4 \times 10^9$ K in explosive environments [32]. A temperature rises by a factor of 10 (from 0.5×10^9 K to 5×10^9 K) will lead the progenitor to vanquish the explosive oxygen burning stage by burning faster and brighter. The lifetime of carbon burning is about $10^2 - 10^3$ yr [30]. For a DM particle having the mass of 10 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.1$ will reduce the lifetime to 0.7 times the original lifetime (without the presence of DM). So, the lifetime of carbon burning phase reduces from 1000 yr to 700 yr.




Figure 4: DM fraction versus DM mass for a change in temperature by a factor of 10

From Figure 4, we can infer that for the temperature to increase by a factor of 10, we need a fraction of $f \sim 0.5$ for a DM particle having a mass of 10 GeV and a fraction of $f \sim 0.06$ for a DM particle having the mass of 80 GeV. For a DM particle with a mass of 60 GeV, a fraction of $f \sim 0.08$ is enough to raise the temperature by a factor of 10 reaching $T \sim 5 \times 10^9$ K thereby avoiding the explosive oxygen burning phase, and collapsing into a black hole in the PISN mass gap region. Similarly, for a DM particle with a mass of 100 GeV, a fraction of $f < 0.05$ is enough for the progenitor to collapse into a black hole.

4. Conclusion

We have used DM particles of different masses to explain the discrepancy of the black hole's existence in the PISN mass gap. From the results, we can conclude that when the core mass rise in the presence of DM, the brightness and temperature also rises. The increased brightness and temperature cause the lifetime of the PISN progenitor to drop around half, even in the presence of relatively small fractions of DM. The admixture model is extensively used to show that the PISN progenitors could collapse into a black hole in the PISN mass gap by burning faster and brighter.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the preparation of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Abbott, R. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration). A Binary black hole merger with a total mass of $150 M_{\odot}$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2020, 125, 101102.
2. Heger, A.; Fryer, C.L.; Woosley, S.E.; Langer, N.; Hartmann, D.H. How Massive Single Stars End Their Life. *Astrophys J.* 2003, 591, 288–300.
3. Heger, A.; Woosley, S.E. The nucleosynthetic signature of population III. *Astrophys J.* 2002, 567, 532–543.
4. Chatzopoulos, E.; Wheeler, J.C.; Couch, S.M. Multi-dimensional Simulations of Rotating Pair Instability Supernovae. *Astrophys. J.* 2013, 776, 129
5. Chen, K.J.; Woosley, S.E.; Heger, A.; Almgren, A.S.; Whalen, D.J. Two Dimensional Simulations of Pulsational Pair Instability Supernovae. *Astrophys. J.* 2014, 792, 28.
6. Mapelli, M.; Spera, M.; Montanari, E.; Limongi, M.; Chieffi, A.; Giacobbo, N.; Bressan, A.; Bouffanais, Y. Impact of the rotation and compactness of progenitors on the mass of black holes. *Astrophys. J.* 2020, 888, 76.
7. Woosley, S. E.; Blinnikov, S.; Heger, A. Pulsational pair instability as an explanation for the most luminous supernovae. *Nature* 2007, 450, 390-392
8. Barkat, Z.; Rakavy, G.; Sack, N. Dynamics of Supernova Explosion Resulting from Pair Formation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1967, 18, 379–381.
9. Fraley, G.S. Supernovae Explosions Induced by Pair-Production Instability. *Ap&SS* 1968, 2,96–114.
10. Rakavy, G.; Shaviv, G. Instabilities in Highly Evolved Stellar Models. *Astrophys. J.* 1967, 148, 803.

11. Fragione, G.; Loeb, A.; Rasio, F.A. On the origin of GW190521-like events from repeated black hole mergers in star clusters. *Astrophys. J.* 2020, 902, 26.
12. Di Carlo, U.N.; Mapelli, M.; Bouffanais, Y.; Giacobbo, N.; Santoliquido, F.; Bressan, A.; Spera, M.; Haardt, F. Binary black holes in the pair instability mass gap. *MNRAS* 2020, 497, 1043–1049
13. De Luca, V.; Desjacques, V.; Franciolini, G.; Pani, P.; & Riotto, A. GW190521 Mass Gap Event and the Primordial Black Hole Scenario. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2021, 126, 051101.
14. Sakstein, J.; Croon, D.; McDermott, S.D.; Straight, M.C.; Baxter, E. J. Beyond the Standard Model Explanations of GW190521. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2020, 125, 261105.
15. Natarajan, P. A new channel to form IMBHs throughout cosmic time. *MNRAS* 2020, 501, 1413–1425.
16. Gamba, R.; Breschi, M.; Carullo, G.; Albanesi, S.; Rettegno, P.; Bernuzzi, S.; Nagar, A. GW190521 as a dynamical capture of two nonspinning black holes. *Nature Astronomy* 2022.
17. Ziegler, J.; Freese, K. Filling the black hole mass gap: Avoiding pair instability in massive stars through addition of nonnuclear energy. *Phys. Rev. D* 2021, 104, 043015.
18. Ade, P.A.R. et al. Planck 2015 results. xiii. cosmological parameters. *A&A* 2016, 594, A13.
19. Zwicky, F. On the Masses of Nebulae and of Clusters of Nebulae. *Astrophys. J.* 1937, 86, 217–246.
20. Fu, L.; Kilbinger, M. et al. CFHTLenS: cosmological constraints from a combination of cosmic shear two-point and three-point correlations. *MNRAS* 2014, 441, 2725–2743.
21. Massey, R.J.; Kitching, T.D.; Richard, J. The dark matter of gravitational lensing. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 2010, 73, 086901.
22. Clowe, D.; Bradac, M.; Gonzalez, A.H.; Markevitch, M.; Scott, W.; Jones, C.; Zaritsky, D. A direct empirical proof of the existence of dark matter. *Astrophys. J.* 2006, 648, 109–113.
23. Arun, K.; Gudennavar, S.B.; Sivaram, C. Dark matter, dark energy, and alternate models: A review. *ASR* 2017, 60, 166–186.
24. Steigman, G.; Turner, M.S. Cosmological constraints on the properties of weakly Interacting massive particles. *Nucl. Phys. B* 1985, 253, 375–386.
25. Arun, K., Gudennavar, S.B.; Prasad, A.; Sivaram, C. Effects of dark matter in star formation. *Ap&SS* 2019, 364.
26. Arun, K.; Gudennavar, S.B.; Prasad, A.; Sivaram, C. Alternate models to dark energy. *ASR* 2018, 61, 567–570.
27. Kumar, S.S.; Arun, K.; Sivaram, C. Discrepancy in the upper Bound mass of neutron stars. *arXiv e-prints* 2019.
28. Sunny, C.; Arun, K.; Sivaram, C.; Gudennavar, S.B. Effects of dark matter in red giants. *Phys.Dark Univ.* 2020, 30, 100727.
29. Kippenhahn, R.; Weigert, A.; Weiss, A. *Stellar Structure and Evolution*. 2nd Ed.; Springer-VBH 2012; pp. 450–454.
30. Lamers, H. J.G.L.M.; Levesque, E.M. *Understanding Stellar Evolution*. 1st Ed.; IOP Publishing: Bristol, UK, 2017; pp. 26–1.
31. Yusof, N.; et al. Evolution and fate of very massive stars. *MNRAS* 2013, 433, 1114–1132.
32. Jose, J. *Stellar Explosions: Hydrodynamics and Nucleosynthesis*. 1st ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, USA, 2015; pp. 108–110.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.