December 4, 1989

LBL-27982
UCB-PTI-89/30

Cosmological Production Of Black Holes.

L.J. Hall

and

S. Hsu

Department of Physics
University of California

and

Theoretical Physics Group

Physics Division

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

1 Cyclotron Road

Berkeley, California 94720

Abstract

It is argued that, at a first order phase transition, false vacuum bubbles may occasionally collapse to become black holes. If the critical temperature T_c is less than a TeV, these black holes, which have a mass proportional to M_{Planck}^2/T_c , could survive until today to be the dark matter. Alternatively, evaporation of black holes could give rise to relic particle abundances.

*This work was supported in part by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00088 and in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant PHY85-15857.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor The Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or The Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or The Regents of the University of California and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory is an equal opportunity employer.

The framework of the standard Friedmann-Robertson-Walker big bang, together with a theory of particle physics, allows us to calculate, at least in principle, the present contents of the universe. However, there are several snags: we do not know the particle physics of baryon number violation, nor the particle physics corresponding to dark matter. Furthermore, while accurate calculations of relic particle abundances can be made, it is much harder to compute abundances of extended relics produced at phase transitions.

It is critical to consider any mechanism which at high temperatures transforms energy from radiation to a form which red-shifts more slowly. For example, suppose that at temperature T_c , during the radiation dominated era, a fraction f_M of the radiation energy is converted to a form which red-shifts like matter. Today this matter will contribute to $\Omega = \rho/\rho_c$ an amount

$$\Omega_M \approx 10^8 \left(\frac{T_c}{\text{GeV}} \right) f_M \quad (1)$$

where ρ is energy density, and ρ_c the value which makes the universe critical. At high T_c only a very weak conversion mechanism is required to produce significant Ω_M . Alternatively, if the conversion mechanism at high T_c is too strong, the universe will be overclosed. Examples include the cosmological monopole problem, which constrains certain phase transitions, and a limit of about 1000 TeV on the mass of point particle candidates for dark matter. In this letter we give a new mechanism for primordial black hole (PBH) production at a first order phase transition. It produces PBHs only rarely, but this may suffice to give the dark matter.

It is an unproven, but widely believed, result in general relativity that if a mass M is located inside a region of radius $R_0 \leq 2GM$, it forms a black hole. Such a black hole emits radiation⁽¹⁾ with a spectrum similar to a thermal one of temperature $T = 1/8\pi GM$.⁽²⁾ The black hole lifetime is therefore $\tau \approx 0(G^2 M^3) \approx 10^{10}$ year $(M/10^{30} \text{ GeV})^3$. PBHs produced with masses less than 10^{30} GeV will reach a temperature of the Planck mass before today. The final state of such an exploding PBH is unclear, we will not consider the case of PBH remnants as dark matter.⁽³⁾

Could the dark matter be dominantly in PBHs of mass $O(10^{30} \text{ GeV})$? No, they have a temperature today of about 10 MeV, and the diffuse background

radiation in this region implies $\Omega < 10^{-9}$ for such masses.⁽⁴⁾ Furthermore, if the temperature of the PBHs today is larger than m_e , they will emit significant numbers of e^- and e^+ . If our galactic halo were made of these PBHs, the positrons would slow down in the interstellar medium and annihilate to produce 512 keV line radiation. We find that this implies that the halo should be dominated by PBHs of mass greater than 10^{41} GeV. If $\Omega = 1$ in PBHs of mass $O(10^{41} \text{ GeV})$, they will lead to a diffuse background radiation peaking at energies of .25 MeV with a flux of $.1 \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. This is just below the observed background, and apparently is just unable to explain the observed feature in the MeV region.

Many dark matter candidates, monopoles and stable point particles for example, are more dangerous in overclosing the universe the earlier they are produced. This is not the case for PBHs. At temperatures larger than 10^9 GeV the horizon mass is less than the 10^{41} GeV. Hence prior PBH production is unimportant for dark matter, unless they can be made to collide and "canibalise" before evaporating. We argue later that significant cannibalism does not occur. Consequently, we find that if PBHs are the dark matter today, the scale of the particle physics responsible for the phase transition is less (for our mechanism, much less) than 10^9 GeV.

Cosmological production mechanisms of PBHs are not new. Carr showed that the Harrison-Zeldovich scale-invariant density perturbation spectrum, which is commonly taken for the origin of large scale structure, leads to PBH formation as the perturbations enter the horizon.⁽⁵⁾ The resulting spectrum of PBHs is a steeply falling power law, implying an Ω in PBHs today which is much too small to be of interest for the dark matter. Gross, Perry and Yaffe calculated PBH production rates via quantum tunneling.⁽⁶⁾ The tunneling rate becomes exponentially suppressed at temperatures beneath the Planck mass, and hence this mechanism does not lead to PBHs heavy enough to survive until today. More interesting from the viewpoint of dark matter is the mechanism of Hawking, Moss and Stewart.⁽⁷⁾ They produce horizon size PBHs at a first order phase transition by the unlikely event that many neighboring bubbles grow to horizon size before percolating. Providing the phase transition occurs at $T_c < 10^9$ GeV the PBH masses will be large enough to survive until today. Critically closing the universe with these PBHs requires a choice for the bubble nucleation rate. In

this letter we provide an alternative production mechanism, in which the PBH masses are much less than the horizon mass at formation, and where the density of PBHs is largely independent of the bubble nucleation rate.

We illustrate our mechanism in a simple field theory with a real scalar field ϕ coupled to a Dirac fermion ψ :

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi + i \bar{\psi} (\not{\partial} - m') \psi - \mu^2 \phi^2 + \gamma \phi^3 - \lambda \phi^4 + \alpha \bar{\psi} \psi \phi$$

where all the parameters are chosen to be real and positive. At high T the vacuum is at $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$, while at lower temperatures this becomes a false vacuum with a true vacuum appearing for positive $\langle \phi \rangle = v(T)$, as shown in Figure 1. At the critical temperature T_c , the two phases coexist and are separated by a transition region in which ϕ interpolates between the two vacua. The energy per unit area of the boundary region is the surface tension $\sigma \equiv \Delta^3$. The scale Δ is a function of the parameters of the scalar potential, and is typically, but not always, of order T_c .

At T_c , there will be a non-zero difference in vacuum energy: $B(T_c) = V(\phi = 0) - V(\phi = v(T_c)) \neq 0$. This is because the vacuum, or bag, pressure tending to collapse the regions with $\phi = 0$ is countered by the pressure due to the fermions being transmitted and reflected from the boundary. For convenience we take $m' < T_c$ and ignore m' from now on. The fermions have a mass difference $m = \alpha v(T_c)$ across the phase boundary and the fermion pressure arises from the change in momentum of fermions which are reflected or transmitted at the boundary.

Suppose that bubble nucleation is appreciable at some temperature T_N which is not very much less than T_c . As the bubbles grow and convert false to true vacuum, we assume that the released energy reheats the bulk of the universe and does not accumulate as domain wall kinetic energy. Throughout this letter we assume a "thermalon" mechanism which always maintains the universe at a single homogeneous temperature. Finally, we assume that the temperature reaches T_c while the fraction of the universe in the true vacuum, f_T , is much less than $1/2$. This will prevent further bubble nucleation, establishing an era of quasi-static equilibrium⁽⁹⁾ (QSE). Such a phase transition is of great interest: the transition proceeds very slowly at a rate governed by the rate of expansion

of the universe:

$$\dot{f}_T = \frac{3}{B(T_c)} H(p + \rho) \quad (2)$$

where H is the Hubble parameter during this era, p the pressure and ρ the energy density. The rate at which vacuum energy is released is equal to the rate of doing work of expansion together with the rate at which energy density must be created to fill the increased physical volume. For $p \simeq \rho \simeq T_c^4$, $H = \dot{f}_T^{-1}$ the era of quasi-static equilibrium lasts for a time

$$\frac{\tau_{QSE}}{t_H} \simeq \frac{B(T_c)}{T_c^4}. \quad (3)$$

We consider the case that $\tau_{QSE}/t_H \ll O(1)$ since in this case no significant inflation takes place, and for many simple estimates the expansion of the universe can be ignored. In the case that the mass acquired by the fermion crossing the boundary, $m = \alpha v(T_c)$, is less than T_c , we find $B(T_c)/T_c^4 \simeq m^2/T_c^2$, so that this condition is straightforward to satisfy. The controlled nature of the slow-burn phase transition allows us to make simple calculations.

When f_T approaches $1/2$, bubble collisions become frequent. We assume that at T_N the nucleation rate was fast enough so that when the bubbles collide they are sufficiently small that a period of bubble coalescence takes place. The original scale of the bubbles is erased and the final scale of the bubbles depends on the dominant dynamics of bubble coalescing. During coalescence of two bubbles of size r , bubble walls must move a distance r in time $\simeq \tau_{QSE}$. Bubble wall speeds are limited by frictional drag: the transmitted fermions impart a momentum of order $(m/T_c)^2 T_c$ to the wall. This turns out to be a severe limitation, so that bubbles coalesce by settling up bulk fluid flows rather than having walls moving rapidly with respect to the fluid. Bulk motion of fluids is set up because fermions crossing the phase boundary have their momentum changed. We find that in time τ_{QSE} bubbles coalesce by fluid flow up to an average scale $r_c \equiv \bar{r}_H$ where

$$\bar{r}_c \simeq \left(\frac{\Delta}{T_c} \right) \left(\frac{m}{T_c} \right)^2 \left(\frac{T_c}{M_{Pl}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (4)$$

After the era of coalescence, further expansion of the bubbles causes f_T to become greater than $1/2$. The true vacuum percolates to produce a connected

region of true vacuum containing shrinking bubbles of false vacuum. We will argue that eventually a few of these shrinking bubbles will form black holes.

Consider first the idealized situation of a density $n_B = r_c^{-3}$ of identical spherical, collapsing bubbles of radius $r(t)$. Since $1 - f_T = n_B r^3$

$$\dot{f}_T \simeq \frac{r^2 \dot{r}}{2r_B^3}. \quad (5)$$

As the bubbles get smaller, $\dot{r}$ must increase in order to satisfy the condition of quasi-static equilibrium, equation 2. When the bubble walls reach the speed of light, quasi-static equilibrium will be lost and the bubble radius will be

$$\dot{r} \simeq c^{3/2} \left(\frac{T_c}{m} \right) t_H. \quad (6)$$

Next we consider the case of a distribution of initial bubble radii about the average $\bar{r} = \bar{t} t_H$. If the temperature in the true vacuum during QSE is uniform throughout the universe, the rate of collapse of bubbles will be approximately independent of their size. This of course neglects surface tension which causes smaller bubbles to contract slightly faster than larger bubbles. Therefore, at the end of QSE, while $\bar{r}$ has decreased to $\bar{r}^{1/2} (T_c/m) \bar{r}$ (and smaller bubbles have already disappeared), a bubble with initial radius $r_1 > \bar{r}$ has only decreased to $r_1 - \bar{r}$. Thus, as QSE ends, we are left with the bubbles on the large end of the size distribution, most of which have barely decreased in radius.

After QSE is lost, work is done on the bubbles as they undergo relativistic collapse

$$W = P_{\text{ext}} \Delta V = (B(T) - P_{\text{inter}}) \Delta V. \quad (7)$$

There are two separate effects which contribute to P_{ext} . One is the increase in $B(T)$ as the temperature falls beneath T_c : $B(T) \simeq B(T_c) + B'(T_c)(T - T_c)$. The time δt necessary for relativistic collapse of a bubble is at least $\delta r \geq \bar{t} t_H$. The corresponding temperature drop will be: $\delta T \sim (M\pi)^{1/2} (\bar{t} t_H)^{3/2} \delta t \sim T_c (\frac{\delta}{t_H}) \sim \epsilon T_c$ so $\delta B(T) \sim |B'(T_c)| \epsilon T_c$ which we will approximate as $\sim (\Delta^2 T_c)^2$. The second contribution comes from the fact that the bubble walls become increasingly porous to fermions as they become highly relativistic. Consider the scattering potential. Since the thickness of the bubble wall $\sim \Delta^{-1}$, and the de Broglie

wavelength of fermions is $\sim T^{-1}$, this is a relatively good approximation for nonrelativistic scattering with $\Delta > T_c$. In this case we have the follow results from elementary quantum mechanics:

$$E_\gamma < m \rightarrow \text{reflection, } \Delta p \simeq 2E_\gamma$$

$$E_\gamma > m \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{probability } (\frac{E_\gamma}{m})^4 \text{ of reflection} \\ \text{probability } (1 - (\frac{E_\gamma}{m})^4) \text{ of transmission, (with } \Delta p \simeq \frac{m^2}{2E_\gamma}) \end{cases}$$

Note that these results already indicate that very energetic particles ($E_\gamma > m$) barely interact with the interface between true and false vacuum. For the extremely relativistic case, in which the domain wall has a velocity $\beta_{DW} \sim 1$, we can still apply the results above if we calculate the scattering process in the frame of the domain wall and then Lorentz transform back to the cosmological frame. In the case where $\gamma_{DW} \gg 1$, we find that virtually all fermions penetrate the wall, and that the momentum change is: $\Delta p \simeq \frac{m^2}{2E_\gamma(1+\beta_{DW})}$. The above considerations imply that P_{inter} in Eq. (7) decreases as the collapse becomes relativistic. This means that we can approximate P_{ext} in Eq. (7) by:

$$P_{\text{ext}} \simeq (\Delta^2 T_c)^2 + T_c^4 (m/T_c)^2. \quad (8)$$

The dominant term for small ϵ is the latter, which yields the following mass formula:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{PBH} &\simeq P_{\text{ext}} \Delta V \simeq T_c^4 (\bar{t} t_H)^3 (m/T_c)^2 \\ &\simeq \left(\frac{\Delta}{T_c} \right)^3 \left(\frac{m}{T_c} \right)^3 \frac{M_{\text{pl}}^2}{T_c}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

This of course applies only for bubbles with $\epsilon > \bar{\epsilon}$. Bubbles smaller than or only slightly larger than $\bar{r} = \bar{t} t_H$ will collapse without forming black holes. Bubbles with $\epsilon \gg \bar{\epsilon}$ produce heavier PBH. In general, the mass distribution of black holes formed can be given in terms of the initial distribution of bubble sizes after percolation. Let $N(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}) d\epsilon$ be the number of bubbles in the $\epsilon, \epsilon + d\epsilon$ range. Presumably $N(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})$ is peaked about $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$, with some power law or exponential fall off. Then the number of black holes formed with mass in the $m, m + dm$ range is $\propto (\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^3 N(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}) d\epsilon$ which applies for $\epsilon > \epsilon_{\text{min}} > \bar{\epsilon}$. (ϵ_{min} represents the smallest bubble which can collapse to form a black hole.)

Given the mass estimate Eq. (9), we can now estimate how far a bubble must collapse before falling into its Schwarzschild radius r_s . Using equations (4) and (9):

$$\frac{r_s}{r_i} = \frac{r_s}{\sigma r_H} \simeq \left(\frac{\Delta}{T_c}\right)^2 \left(\frac{T_c}{M_P}\right)^{2/3} \quad (10)$$

where we drop factors of m/T_c from now on. We see that for high T_c (ie GUT scales or higher), this factor is not extremely small. However, to produce PBHs which are interesting as dark matter, Eq. (9) requires a much lower T_c . This leads to $r_s/r_i < 1$, which can only be achieved for bubbles which are extremely spherical at collapse.

Bubbles which have fractional asphericities greater than (r_s/r_i) at the point of collapse will probably self collide, rather than form PBHs. In considering coalescence, we calculated the maximum size of bubbles that could become roughly spherical in a Hubble time. To understand exactly how spherical such a bubble can become, it is necessary to include the effects of damping on the motion of bubble walls. During the QSE era, we can treat an individual bubble as a stationary, nearly spherical membrane with surface tension $\sigma \sim \Delta^3$ and radius $r = \sigma r_H$. We can now study the damping of an arbitrary perturbation on our membrane by examining the excited normal modes. We can characterize a given mode by its amplitude δr and wavelength λ . A bubble minimizes its surface energy by becoming spherical. For fixed δr , it is clearly the longest wavelength modes ($\lambda \sim r$) that are hardest to eliminate. The equation of motion for such a mode is:

$$(\sigma + T_c^4 \delta r) \ddot{\delta r} + \gamma \dot{\delta r} + \frac{\sigma}{r} \left(\frac{\delta r}{r}\right) = 0 \quad (11)$$

where γ is the damping factor and $(\sigma + T_c^4 \delta r)$ is the effective mass per unit area (surface tension plus mass per unit area of bulk fluid) to be moved.

The damping factor represents the rate of energy dissipation into the bulk fluid. Each bounce of the membrane produces a sound wave in the fluid which carries off an energy per unit area of $\sim T_c^4 \delta r \beta^2$, leaving the membrane with kinetic energy $\sim \sigma \beta^2$. Here β is the velocity of the membrane when $\delta r = 0$. Since initially, $T_c^4 \delta r \gg \sigma$, we expect each succeeding bounce to have a drastically smaller amplitude than the previous one. This approximation holds

until $\sigma \sim T_c^4 \delta r$, ie until:

$$\frac{\delta r}{r} \simeq \frac{\left(\frac{\Delta}{T_c}\right)^3 T_c^{-1}}{\sigma r_H} \simeq \left(\frac{\Delta}{T_c}\right)^2 \left(\frac{T_c}{M_P}\right)^{2/3} \quad (12)$$

which is $O(r_s/r_i)$.

In general, ignoring dissipation, the timescale for a particular mode to bounce is $\tau_{\text{bounce}}/\tau_{\text{QSE}} \sim (\delta r/r)^{1/2}$. Therefore a bubble which is initially fairly spherical ($\delta r \ll r$) should be able to achieve (12). Thus, in the approximation where we treat the background particles as a bulk fluid, bubbles can become very spherical. While this approach is extremely naive, we are encouraged by the fact that only about one in $10^8 (\frac{T_c}{M_P})$ bubbles need be this spherical in order to account for ρ_{critical} today.

It is perhaps not clear that Eq. (9) gives the final result for the mass of PBHs. One might wonder whether it is possible for many PBHs to collide and combine to form larger black holes.⁽⁹⁾ In this case the eventual mass distribution of PBHs might bear no resemblance to the mass distribution at formation. We will show that cannibalism will be a negligible effect for the case of PBH dark matter. There are other scenarios in which cannibalism can be an important effect and we will discuss those also. Statistical fluctuations in the number density of PBHs can lead to density perturbations which eventually grow to nonlinearity. While PBH "galaxies" so formed can be composed of very many individual PBHs, it is very difficult for these PBHs to find each other and cannibalize. In particular, the PBHs are slow to dissipate their energies and hence only a few collisions due to intersections of orbits can occur for a long time.

Due to the stochastic nature of PBH formation, we expect fluctuations $\sim \sqrt{N}$ in regions containing N PBHs. However, a fluctuation in PBH number does not correspond to a density perturbation. The energy density ρ is the same in regions of different PBH number density. This is because failed PBHs (bubbles which had self-collisions before reaching their Schwarzschild radius) contribute to the thermal density by radiating their energy away. The total energy density $\rho = \rho_{\text{PBH}} + \rho_{\text{thermal}}$ is constant. It is only when two regions with differing ρ_{thermal} come into causal contact that thermal energy equilibrates to give an actual density perturbation in PBHs $\frac{\delta \rho}{\rho}$. Therefore density perturbations

are always inside the horizon.

It is well-known⁽¹⁰⁾ that density perturbations inside the horizon do not grow while the universe is radiation dominated. Once the universe is matter dominated, however, $\delta\rho$ grows like $t^{2/3}$. When $\delta\rho \sim 1$ the perturbation goes nonlinear; a bound structure is formed which does not take part in the expansion of the universe. In our case, such structures will take the form of PBH "galaxies" in which many PBHs move in virialized orbits. In order to cannibalize, it is necessary for these PBHs to dissipate their kinetic energies. For a non-relativistic PBH, collisions with thermal particles cause the loss of momentum:

$$\frac{d\vec{p}}{dt} \simeq R^2 T^3 \vec{\delta} \simeq \left(\frac{T_D}{M_{pl}}\right)^4 m_{PBH} \vec{p} \quad (13)$$

where T_D is the temperature of the universe at PBH "galaxy" formation. This gives the following timescale for dissipation:

$$t_D \simeq \left(\frac{M_{pl}}{T_D}\right)^4 m_{PBH}^{-1} \quad (14)$$

Requiring that $t_D < \tau_{PBH} \sim m_{PBH}^3/M_{pl}^4$ yields:

$$m_{PBH} > M_{pl} \left(\frac{M_{pl}}{T_D}\right). \quad (15)$$

Note that for a perturbation made up of many PBHs ($N \gg 1$) to go nonlinear, it is clear that $T_D < T_{MD}$, where T_{MD} is the temperature at which the universe becomes matter-dominated. For $f_{PBH} \sim f_{crit} \sim 10^{-3} (\frac{GeV}{T_D})$, matter domination occurs at $T \sim eV$, so $T_D < eV$. Unless the critical temperature of the phase transition, T_c , is extremely low, it is clear that (15) cannot be satisfied. Although PBH structure can form, the individual PBHs typically evaporate before any significant cannibalization can occur. Or, in the case of $T_c \lesssim GeV$, the timescale for dissipation is much longer than the age of the universe.

On the other hand, one can consider scenarios in which $f_{PBH} \sim 1$. In this case the universe is matter dominated almost immediately by PBHs, and a potentially large amount of cannibalization can occur. However, $f_{PBH} \sim 1$ is clearly unsatisfactory for dark matter. Let N_c be the size of a fluctuation that can go nonlinear and cannibalize before τ_{PBH} . If $N_c m_{PBH} \gtrsim 10^{29}$ GeV then the

lifetime of such a large PBH is longer than the age of the universe. Only a small fraction of the total number of PBHs can end up in such fluctuations, or else f_{PBH} (today) $\gg \rho_{critical}$. Therefore, for a given volume containing N_c PBHs, a fluctuation capable of cannibalization must be very rare, and correspond to a fluctuation in PBH number many times $\sqrt{N_c m}$. This means that there will be exponentially more cannibalized PBHs with mass less than $N_c m$. Since experimental measurements of γ -ray backgrounds limit Ω in PBH of mass $\sim 10^{29}$ GeV to be less than 10^{-9} it is not possible for cannibalism to lead to $\Omega = 1$ in PBHs with $m_{PBH} > 10^{29}$ GeV.

Interesting consequences may result from PBH production even if they evaporate while the universe is still hot. Consider a phase transition at T_c in which f is the probability that a false vacuum bubble collapses to a PBH of mass M_2/T_c . For $f > (T_c/M_2)^{1/2}$, the PBHs dominate the energy density of the universe at temperature $f T_c$ and subsequently evaporate, reheating the universe to a temperature $T_R \simeq T_c (T_c/M_2)^{1/2}$. A particle X , with mass $m_X < T_c$, will be produced in the evaporation with a relative abundance

$$f_X = \frac{n_X}{T_R} = \frac{1}{g} \left(\frac{T_c}{M_2}\right)^{1/2} \quad (16)$$

where g is the number of degrees of freedom lighter than T_c .⁽¹¹⁾ This abundance can be large enough to have important consequences. For example, X particles might decay out of thermal equilibrium to generate the cosmological baryon asymmetry at low temperatures. It is easy to arrange for $T_R < m_X$, avoiding wash-out of the asymmetry. This can be used for a baryogenesis scheme where the X particles are TeV top squarks,⁽¹²⁾

If the X particles are stable, the above abundance may be larger than the Lee-Weinberg freezeout value, and may give $\Omega_X \approx 1$. For example, for $T_c = 10^5$ GeV, and $f > 10^{-7}$ the PBH evaporation could lead to $\Omega_X \approx 1$, with X being 50 GeV neutrinos. The reheat temperature of 10 MeV would be sufficient to give a fresh start to nucleosynthesis.

In this letter we have considered the collapse of false vacuum bubbles in a model of a first order phase transition which undergoes an era of quasi-static equilibrium. We find that, during the initial era of non-relativistic collapse, a

few bubbles may spherulize to a sufficiently high degree that the work done on them during the later relativistic collapse can result in them becoming black holes. The required collapse factor and the resulting PBH mass are given in equations (10) and (9). For T_c above a TeV, the PBH are likely to be produced, but are unlikely to survive until today. Their evaporation leads to a production of relic particles. For T_c beneath a TeV, the PBH can be heavy enough to survive until today and, with even a very small probability of a bubble becoming a PBH, can give $\Omega_{PBH} \approx 1$. It is possible that this might arise in QCD, although we have not studied that case here. For QCD, if holes survive until today to be the dark matter, it is likely that they would have a mass close to the observational bound of 10^{11} GeV. To detect such holes from the particles they evaporate would require their mass to be very close to the limit. Holes in the range of $10^9 - 10^{10}$ GeV, which would occur for lower T_c , could be detected by lensing of background stars.⁽¹³⁾

We thank Eric Carlson for several conversations. We acknowledge support from the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098, and in part by the national Science Foundation under research grant No. PHY-85-15837. L.I.L. acknowledges support from a Sloan Foundation Fellowship and from a Presidential Young Investigator award. S.H. acknowledges support from a U.S. DOE fellowship.

References

1. S.W. Hawking, *Nature* **248**, 30 (1974).
2. D.N. Page, *Phys. Rev.* **D13**, 198 (1976), *Phys. Rev.* **D16**, 2402 (1977).
3. J.I.L. MacGibbon, *Nature* **329**, 308 (1987).
4. B.J. Carr, *Ap. J.* **206**, 3 (1976); D.N. Page and S.W. Hawking, *Ap. J.* **206**, 1 (1976).
5. B.J. Carr, *Ap. J.* **201**, 1 (1975).
6. D. Gross, M. J. Perry and L.G. Yaffe, *Phys. Rev.* **D25**, 330 (1982).
7. S.W. Hawking, I.G. Moss and J. M. Stewart, *Phys. Rev.* **D26**, 2681 (1982).

8. E. Witten, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 272 (1984).
9. S. Glasow and U. Sarid, private communication.
10. See, e.g. P.J. Peebles, *Large Scale Structure of the Universe*, (Princeton Univ. Press: Princeton), 1980.
11. Equation (16) follows from simple energetics. We have assumed that local "hot spots" forming around the evaporating black holes do not change the X abundance.
12. S. Dimopoulos and L.J. Hall, *Phys. Lett.* **207B**, 210 (1987).
13. B. Paczynski, *Ap. J.* **304**, 1 (1986).

Figure Caption: The effective potential for the scalar field ϕ as a function of temperature. Equilibrium between true and false vacuum holds for $T = T_c$.

fig 1