

# Gravitational to Coulomb force ratio and the origin of the Cosmic magnetic field

N. D. Padilla<sup>1</sup>, J. Racker<sup>1,2</sup>, I. J. Araya<sup>3,4,5</sup>, and F. Stasyszyn<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Instituto de Astronomía Teórica y Experimental, IATE, CONICET-UNC, Laprida 854, X5000BGR, Córdoba, Argentina  
e-mail: nelson.padilla@unc.edu.ar

<sup>2</sup> Observatorio Astronómico de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Laprida 854, X5000BGR, Córdoba, Argentina

<sup>3</sup> Instituto de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad Arturo Prat, Playa Brava 3256, 1111346, Iquique, Chile

<sup>4</sup> Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Arturo Prat, Avenida Arturo Prat Chacón 2120, 1110939, Iquique, Chile

<sup>5</sup> School of Mathematics and Hamilton Mathematics Institute, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland

Received ; accepted

## ABSTRACT

**Aims.** The origin of the seeds of galactic magnetic fields is a subject that remains under debate; here we will explore a new possible mechanism that could provide such seed from charge asymmetries in slowly rotating protogalaxies.

**Methods.** We use current knowledge of galaxy formation and evolution to estimate that a charge imbalance of 1 every  $\sim 10^{38\pm 5}$  charge carriers in slowly rotating protogalaxies can provide an alternative mechanism to produce such seeds.

**Results.** The gravitationally induced charge imbalance within plasmas in hydrostatic equilibrium lies in the upper range of this estimation, and is higher than possible surviving primordial charge asymmetries. We conclude that this known, but unappreciated thermodynamic property of plasmas in gravitational fields, may have important cosmological consequences.

**Key words.** Cosmic Magnetic Fields – Galaxy Formation – Hydrostatic equilibrium

## 1. Introduction

Magnetic fields are ubiquitous in the Universe (Widrow et al. 2012; Pandey et al. 2015), with present-day amplitudes that can be explained by astrophysical dynamos driven by the baryonic plasma that take place after galaxy formation begins (Subramanian 2016; Barrow et al. 2007; Brandenburg & Ntormousi 2023).

However, these fields require a seed since amplification processes require a non-zero initial field. These seeds have been proposed to be produced by several mechanisms and are generally divided into primordial and late-time seeds. The former correspond to mechanisms that take place before fluctuations become non-linear, i.e. early after the Big Bang (Grasso & Rubinstein 2001; Widrow 2002; Medvedev & Loeb 2017), or during phase transitions (Quashnock et al. 1989), due to early non-linearities in the pre-decoupling primordial density perturbations (Matarrese et al. 2005; Gopal & Sethi 2005; Takahashi et al. 2005; Saga et al. 2015), or even primordial black holes (Araya et al. 2021). There are also proposals for charge asymmetries involving non-Standard Model particles (Dolgov & Silk 1993) or arising from massive photons and black hole evaporation (Dolgov & Pelliccia 2007) that could produce the seed magnetic fields. Late-time seeds include plasma (Zhou et al. 2022) and Biermann battery processes (Biermann 1950) occurring, for instance, due to shocks during gravitational collapse (Attia et al. 2021; Subramanian et al. 1994) and due to star formation including population III stars (Xu et al. 2008; Durrive & Langer 2015). Further details and references can be

found in reviews such as Widrow et al. (2012); Subramanian (2016); Widrow (2002).

One possible way to tell apart different seeding scenarios is to compare their amplitude and scale of influence with those required to explain the present-day magnetic field configurations. There have been several attempts at estimating the level of enhancement of magnetic fields due to the dynamo process in order to estimate the required seed fields. Davis et al. (1999) made an estimate allowing for the first time for the effect of a cosmological constant, which effectively increases the age of the Universe and, consequently, allowed to consider very small seed values. They found that the level of required seed is of  $B_{\text{seed}} \sim 10^{-30\pm 5}$  Gauss (Davis et al. 1999), where the uncertainty is mostly due to the difficulty in assessing the e-folding timescale of the astrophysical dynamo enhancement of the field. Prior estimates were quite larger than this value. The seed proposals listed above lie within and above this minimum seed estimate.

In this letter we will study the possibility that a seed field arises from charge asymmetries in protogalaxies which rotate due to the effect of tidal fields from neighbouring overdensities prior to its collapse. We will first estimate the required level of charge asymmetry in rotating protogalaxies in order to produce the required level of magnetic field seed. Then we will compare the possible amplitude of leftover primordial and hydrostatic equilibrium asymmetries. We will show that the asymmetry which arises naturally from hydrostatic equilibrium (Pannekoek 1922; Rosseland 1924), is expected to impart a local net charge within a gravitationally collapsed galaxy that is significantly

larger than primordial charge asymmetries that are able to survive until the epoch of galaxy formation.

In some sense the hydrostatic seed mechanism acts as a type of battery process since, as shown below, it arises as a result of the different properties of charge carriers of different sign. This seeding mechanism is of the late-time group and will be present throughout the evolution of cosmological structure formation as galaxies collapse gravitationally and relax to quasi-equilibrium. Our simple analytical approach is complementary to numerical results for recently collapsed objects (eg. Attia et al. 2021), where it is not straight forward to separate effects coming from different physical processes such as dynamo during collapse, and battery processes in shocks.

## 2. Required charge asymmetry to produce the magnetic field seed in protogalaxies

To estimate the amplitude of a seed field from a charge asymmetry arising due to hydrostatic equilibrium we first begin by looking at the magnitude of  $B_{\text{seed}}$  within a typical primeval galaxy, the rotation of which is due to tidal torques from its surrounding structures at the time of collapse. To do this we make a calculation of the field resulting from the rotation of a plasma bound to the proto-galaxy that collapsed along with the dark matter that is thought to dominate gravitationally bound objects in the Universe (Rubin et al. 1978; Aghanim et al. 2020). The following assumes that gas has not yet cooled to form stars, i.e. that all baryons are in a hot gas state. We adopt the following assumptions, which reflect the current model of galaxy formation and of the structure of dark matter dominated objects in the Universe.

We assume that the hot barionic plasma follows a core profile (Lacey et al. 2016) forming a singular isothermal sphere (Springel et al. 2001). If the magnetic moment of the plasma is sourced by a charge asymmetry

$$\epsilon_q = n_i/n_j - 1, \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  represents a number density and  $i$  and  $j$  correspond to either electrons or protons, depending on the charge sign of the asymmetry, the resulting magnetic moment reads

$$m(r) = \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_V \mathbf{r} \times (\rho_q \mathbf{v}) dV \right|, \quad (2)$$

where the charge density is,

$$\rho_q = \epsilon_q e \rho_b / (\mu m_p). \quad (3)$$

Here  $e$  is the proton charge,  $m_p$  is the proton mass,  $\mu \simeq 1.4$  the mean molecular weight of the plasma, and  $\rho_b$  the baryon mass density.

We assume that the hot plasma has the same specific angular momentum than the dark matter (Macciò et al. 2007), which has a dimensionless spin parameter well approximated by  $\lambda' = J_{\text{vir}} / (\sqrt{2} M_{\text{vir}} V_{\text{vir}} r_{\text{vir}})$ , where  $M_{\text{vir}}$ ,  $J_{\text{vir}}$ ,  $V_{\text{vir}}$  and  $r_{\text{vir}}$  are the mass, angular momentum, virial velocity and virial radius of the dark matter halo host, respectively. These approximations are commonly used in models of galaxy formation and evolution which are able to reproduce the sizes and spins of galaxies (Baugh 2006). Notice that the rotation of galaxies is quite faster than that of this primeval hot gas atmosphere which has not yet contracted due to cooling.

This results in the following amplitude of a dipolar magnetic field for the plasma at the virial radius of the galaxy, representative of the extent of the primeval hot gas halo,

$$B(r_{\text{vir}}) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \frac{m(r_{\text{vir}})}{r_{\text{vir}}^3} = \frac{\Omega_b \mu_0}{\Omega_m} \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\epsilon_q e}{2 \mu m_p} \lambda' \sqrt{2} \frac{M_{\text{vir}} V_{\text{vir}}}{r_{\text{vir}}^2}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu_0$  is the magnetic permeability of the vacuum, and the baryon fraction represented by the ratio of the baryon to matter density parameters,  $\Omega_b/\Omega_m$ , multiplying the virial mass,  $M_{\text{vir}}$ , is used as an estimate of the mass of the plasma in the proto-galaxy, ignoring cooling and other processes that become important with the onset of star formation. The virial radius can be obtained using the virial mass and the typical halo overdensity (see for instance Bryan & Norman 1998), and the virial velocity follows from the virial relations.

Next we assume a dimensionless galaxy spin parameter  $\log_{10} \lambda' = -1.5$  following Macciò et al. (2007), and adopt the history of mass accretion from Fakhouri et al. (2010) for a Milky Way like halo to estimate the Galaxy mass at an approximate redshift for its initial collapse of  $z \sim 20$ , which results in  $M_{\text{vir}} \sim 3 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ . Plugging this into Eq. 4 and solving for  $\epsilon_q$  we obtain,

$$\epsilon_q \sim 10^{-38 \pm 5}. \quad (5)$$

Notice that the ratio of gravitational to Coulomb forces between the elementary plasma constituents lies in this range, e.g. that between two protons is

$$F_G/F_C = \frac{G m_p^2}{k_C e^2} \sim 10^{-36}, \quad (6)$$

where  $G$  and  $k_C$  are the gravitational and Coulomb constants, respectively. This number represents a remarkable coincidence with the required charge imbalance for the magnetic seed.

## 3. Source of charge asymmetries

We now turn to the possible origins of charge asymmetries  $\epsilon_q$  in protogalaxies showing, firstly, upper limits on the amplitude of primordial spatial charge fluctuations by the epoch of galaxy formation (these limits do not apply to global charge asymmetries) and, secondly, the amplitude of charge fluctuations arising from hydrostatic equilibrium in protogalaxies.

### 3.1. Upper limits to primordial charge asymmetries

There are proposals of mechanisms for primordial non-local charge fluctuations that could provide this charge imbalance within protogalaxies (Siegel & Fry 2006). For instance, the case of a charged inflaton would be able to produce non-local charge differences (Lozanov & Amin 2016). A charged curvaton (D'Onofrio et al. 2012) would also produce superhorizon charge fluctuations with stable inflaton potentials (see also Soriano & Maroto (2019)).

However, it is not clear whether these fluctuations would be able to survive until the epoch of galaxy formation. Instead of exploring the possible amplitudes for these primordial spatial charge fluctuations, we directly estimate the maximum charge imbalance within an expanding background leftover after decoupling, that would eventually reach turnaround, using the Newtonian approximation for the estimate of the critical density of the Universe, adapted to Coulomb forces for the unbalanced charges and assuming that electrons, the lighter charge carriers, would follow the positive charge carriers. If turnaround is attained we assume the charge imbalance would be neutralised.

Since most of the matter is in a neutral state since decoupling down to the epoch of reionization, we assume that the unbalanced charges are fully decoupled from the cosmic background radiation and that they respond only to their mutual Coulomb

forces and to the total gravitational potential, ignoring for simplicity other possible interactions (e.g. Dolgov & Pelliccia 2007). At the redshifts of interest here, these considerations result in

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} &= \frac{8\pi}{3} \left( G\rho + \frac{k_C \mu m_p \rho_q^2}{m_e \rho_b \epsilon_q} \right) \\ &= H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(z) + \frac{8\pi}{3} \frac{k_C \mu m_p \rho_q^2}{m_e \rho_b \epsilon_q}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho$  is the total energy density,  $\rho_b$  and  $\rho_q$  are the matter density of baryons and charge density of the unbalanced charges in the Universe, respectively, and  $a$  represents the scale factor of the region that circumscribes the unbalanced charges. In the second equality we replaced the first term with the  $\Lambda$ CDM Hubble factor. Equating the two terms in the right hand side of this equation, we obtain the maximum imbalance that would be able to expand along with the global  $\Lambda$ CDM expansion, regardless of the sign of the imbalance, i.e.,

$$\epsilon_q^{\text{coll}} = \frac{3\mu m_p m_e H_{\Lambda\text{CDM}}(z)^2}{8\pi k_C \rho_{b,0} (1+z)^3 e^2} = \frac{G\mu m_p m_e \rho_m}{k_C e^2 \rho_b}, \quad (8)$$

where in the second equality we have assumed the total energy density to be comparable to that of the mass  $\rho \simeq \rho_m$ , and it shows that this excess is comparable to the gravitational to Coulomb forces between electrons and protons, i.e. it is about three orders of magnitude smaller than the ratio of Eq. 6 discussed above.

A larger imbalance than that of Eq. 8 would decouple from the expansion and it would collapse and become electrically neutral. The maximum imbalance that is able to survive after decoupling is  $\epsilon_q^{\text{coll}} \sim 5 \times 10^{-39}$ , with a very mild dependence on redshift, dropping to  $\sim 4 \times 10^{-39}$  at  $z = 20$  due to the decreasing rate of expansion (see Lyttleton & Bondi 1959 for the case of fully coupled excess charges).

This imbalance lies within the required range to produce a seed according to Davis et al. (1999), but it turns out it is quite smaller than what is expected in plasmas in hydrostatic equilibrium, as we show next.

### 3.2. Charge asymmetries in protogalaxies in hydrostatic equilibrium

It has been shown long ago (Pannekoek 1922; Rosseland 1924) that due to the mass difference between electrons and the positive charged ions, a plasma in thermodynamic equilibrium in a gravitational field has a tiny positive charge which is basically determined by the relative strength between gravitational and Coulomb forces.

For a protogalaxy in hydrostatic equilibrium, the gravitationally induced charge can be estimated taking a Boltzmann distribution for the number densities of the main plasma components, i.e. electrons and protons, with a common and approximately constant temperature  $T$ , namely

$$n_e = n_e^0 e^{(-m_e \phi + e\psi)/k_B T}, \quad (9)$$

$$n_p = n_p^0 e^{(-m_p \phi - e\psi)/k_B T}, \quad (10)$$

where  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant,  $\phi = \phi(r)$  is the gravitational field at a distance  $r$  from the center,  $\psi = \psi(r)$  is the (induced) electric potential, and  $n_{e,p}^0$  are the number densities of electrons and protons, respectively, for zero gravitational and electric potentials (see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz 1980). The quasi-neutrality

condition,  $n_e(r) \simeq n_p(r)$ , therefore implies that  $-m_e \phi + e\psi = -m_p \phi - e\psi$ , which leads to

$$\psi = -\frac{(m_p - m_e)}{2e} \phi \simeq -\frac{m_p}{2e} \phi. \quad (11)$$

Using the Poisson equations for the electric potential,  $\nabla^2 \psi = -4\pi k_C \rho_q$  and the gravitational potential,  $\nabla^2 \phi = 4\pi G \rho_m$ , the net charge density in the plasma can be related to the source of the gravitational field,

$$\rho_q = \frac{G m_p}{2 k_C e} \rho_m. \quad (12)$$

Note that this gives a charge imbalance with the same (positive) sign along the whole protogalaxy, i.e. equilibrium implies an apparently tiny effect but which is coherent over galactic scales. Using Eq. 3, the resulting imbalance is

$$\epsilon_q = \frac{G \mu m_p^2 \rho_m}{2 k_C e^2 \rho_b}, \quad (13)$$

which is remarkably similar to the gravitational to Coulomb force ratio of Eq. 6, and significantly larger than the one in Eq. 8, indicating that this imbalance is likely larger than leftover primordial ones.

Considering that  $\rho_m \simeq \frac{\Omega_m}{\Omega_b} \rho_b$  and replacing this relation in Eq. (4), we obtain  $B_{\text{seed}} = 3 \times 10^{-26} G$ , in the upper range of the minimum required seeds (Davis et al. 1999). This possible seed arises then from the different masses of electrons and ions, combined with non-linear evolution of fluctuations that induce rotation (as in Matarrese et al. 2005; Gopal & Sethi 2005; Takahashi et al. 2005; Saga et al. 2015, except at late times).

## 4. Discussion

Although it was known for a long time that a positive charge imbalance must be present in gravitationally bound plasmas (Pannekoek 1922; Rosseland 1924; Bally & Harrison 1978), its potential cosmological importance has not been realized before. This is probably due to the evolving knowledge of galaxy formation and astrophysical dynamo processes, which only since recent times has reached a point where we can connect the imbalance with a possible seed for magnetic fields. For instance, crude estimates of the magnetic fields generated by the charge imbalance in the Sun and our Galaxy were given in Bally & Harrison (1978) and considered of no astrophysical interest. In particular, the galactic magnetic field mentioned in Bally & Harrison (1978) was not interpreted as a possible magnetic field seed. Moreover, although their estimate (given without details on the computation),  $B \sim 10^{-25}$  Gauss, is very close to our derivation based on modern and detailed assumptions, the coincidence presumably comes from a cancellation of quite large factors. Our estimate is at the time that galaxy formation begins, when a seed is of interest, which requires the use of current understanding of dark matter dominated galaxies and their mass accretion history. Presumably the estimate in Bally & Harrison (1978) is for the magnetic field of the present-day Galaxy, which using Eq. 4 actually yields  $B \sim 10^{-27}$  Gauss at the virial radius. It is quite difficult to reconcile this estimate with the value quoted in Bally & Harrison (1978), for which we would need, for instance, a factor of 10 higher Galaxy spin which can be obtained estimating the magnetic field within the disc, and a mass in baryons of  $10^{12} M_\odot$ .

The induced charge imbalance estimated above was based on the assumption of thermodynamic equilibrium, that requires constancy of the chemical potentials of electrons and protons along the plasma (which is equivalent to the condition of hydrostatic equilibrium, see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz 1980). The basic reason for the origin of the gravitationally induced charge is that electrons, being much lighter than protons, have on average larger velocities with respect to the median, than protons. Then, as long as this takes place after reionization, we expect a charge imbalance of roughly the same order of magnitude to arise as soon as the protogalaxy decouples from the Hubble expansion. This observation might be relevant since the process of gravitational collapse induces an important magnetic field growth (Sur et al. 2012), which could place an even higher initial magnetic field in galaxies in time for astrophysical dynamos to take over the enhancement of the field. For example, the very existence of small mergers leads to equipartition values for the magnetic field in less than 1 Gy (Kotarba et al. 2011).

Notice that the seed mechanism proposed here would in principle apply within galaxies being there in place by the time star formation begins which is also the time when astrophysical winds start to take effect. The latter, among other out of equilibrium effects, could then provide a way to expel magnetic fields and seed the intergalactic space (Bertone et al. 2006).

We end by noting that there are other mechanisms that provide charge asymmetry via the interplay of gravitational and electric forces. For instance Padilla et al. (2023), propose that black holes of primordial or stellar origin can remove negative charge in the form of electrons from the hot galactic plasma and redistribute it with a different density profile, giving rise to a non-zero electric charge profile within galaxies. In their case, the charge asymmetry has a radial dependence, but its origin lies in the ability of the gravitational field of the black hole to hold a stable electric charge within it, right below the level where the chemical potential at the outer horizon produces charges of apposite sign to stop the increase of charge of black holes. In this case the rotation of the galaxy combined with this non-zero charge, could give rise to a seed field of slightly lower amplitude, early in the history of the galaxy.

## 5. Conclusions

Summarizing, we have analyzed the possibility that a tiny charge asymmetry in slowly rotating protogalaxies be a possible source of magnetic field seeds. In particular, we have shown that the charge imbalance induced gravitationally in plasmas in hydrostatic equilibrium combined with rotation generated by tidal torques in the early stages of structure formation can source late-time magnetic field seeds of order  $10^{-26}$  Gauss on protogalactic scales. This result is based on simple physics and on the current model of galaxy formation and evolution. Given that gravity acts directly as the source for both, the charge imbalance and the tidal induced rotation, the process can be referred to as a gravitationally induced battery.

We notice that numerical simulations for the epoch of reionization are able to provide stronger seed fields; our results demonstrate that in a quasi-equilibrium estate (which is more straightforward to analyze), the induced charge imbalance is already able to provide interesting seed amplitudes. Larger seeds of up to  $B \sim 10^{-20}$  Gauss can indeed be obtained via numerical simulations of Biermann battery processes by the end of reionization at  $z = 6$  including out of equilibrium processes such as supernovae winds (Attia et al. 2021; Durrive & Langer 2015). However, these simulations do not allow to follow charge separa-

tion, at least in an explicit way. It is also of note that our results of  $B \sim 10^{-26}$  Gauss are consistent with the simulation results from Attia et al. (2021) at similar redshifts  $z \sim 20$ , which in their case arise from Biermann battery processes.

The equilibrium processes we present here are an interesting option looking forward to the state of the art of observations such as those of Geach et al. (2023), where high ordered magnetic fields have been observed at  $z \sim 2.6$ . Such high fields could be reconciled with our proposed seed by strong dynamos in early mergers. Further studies need to be done to understand if these fields can also seed inter galactic or intra-cluster media.

*Acknowledgements.* NDP was supported by a RAICES, a RAICES-Federal, and PICT-2021-I-A-00700 grants from the Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación, Argentina. JR thanks the support from the Secretaría de Ciencia y Técnica de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (SeCyT). The work of IJA is funded by ANID FONDECYT grants No. 11230419 and 1231133, and by ANID Becas Chile grant No. 74220042. FAS thanks support by grants PIP 11220130100365CO, PICT-2016-4174, PICT-2021-GRF-00719 and Consolider-2018-2020, from CONICET, FONCYT (Argentina) and SECYT-UNC. IJA is grateful to Andrei Parnachev and the School of Mathematics at Trinity College Dublin for their hospitality.

## References

- Aghanim, N. et al. 2020, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 641, A6, [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)]
- Araya, I. J., Rubio, M. E., San Martín, M., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 503, 4387
- Attia, O., Teyssier, R., Katz, H., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 504, 2346
- Bally, J. & Harrison, E. R. 1978, *ApJ*, 220, 743
- Barrow, J. D., Maartens, R., & Tsagas, C. G. 2007, *Physics Reports*, 449, 131
- Battaner, E., Florido, E., & Jimenez-Vicente, J. 1997, *AAP*, 326, 13
- Baugh, C. M. 2006, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 69, 3101
- Bertone, S., Vogt, C., & Enßlin, T. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 319
- Biermann, L. 1950, *Zeitschrift Naturforschung Teil A*, 5, 65
- Brandenburg, A. & Niormousi, E. 2023, *ARA&A*, 61, 561
- Bryan, G. L. & Norman, M. L. 1998, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 495, 80
- Davis, A.-C., Lilley, M., & Törnkvist, O. 1999, *Phys. Rev. D*, 60, 021301
- Dolgov, A. & Pelliccia, D. N. 2007, *Physics Letters B*, 650, 97
- Dolgov, A. & Silk, J. 1993, *Phys. Rev. D*, 47, 3144
- D’Onofrio, M., Lerner, R. N., & Rajantie, A. 2012, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2012, 004
- Durrive, J.-B. & Langer, M. 2015, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 453, 345
- Fakhouri, O., Ma, C.-P., & Boylan-Kolchin, M. 2010, *MNRAS*, 406, 2267
- Geach, J. E., Lopez-Rodriguez, E., Doherty, M. J., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 621, 483
- Gopal, R. & Sethi, S. K. 2005, *MNRAS*, 363, 521
- Grasso, D. & Rubinstein, H. R. 2001, *Physics Reports*, 348, 163
- Kotarba, H., Lesch, H., Dolag, K., et al. 2011, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 415, 3189
- Lacey, C. G., Baugh, C. M., Frenk, C. S., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 3854
- Landau, L. D. & Lifshitz, E. M. 1980, *Course of Theoretical Physics*, Vol. 5, *Statistical Physics, Part 1* (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann)
- Lozanov, K. D. & Amin, M. A. 2016, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2016, 032
- Lyttleton, R. A. & Bondi, H. 1959, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A*, 252, 313
- Macciò, A. V., Dutton, A. A., van den Bosch, F. C., et al. 2007, *MNRAS*, 378, 55
- Matarrese, S., Mollerach, S., Notari, A., & Riotto, A. 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 043502
- Medvedev, M. V. & Loeb, A. 2017, *JCAP*, 2017, 058
- Padilla, N. D., Araya, I. J., & Stasyszyn, F. 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2309.14929
- Pandey, K. L., Choudhury, T. R., Sethi, S. K., & Ferrara, A. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 1692
- Pannekoek, A. 1922, *Bull. Astron. Inst. Netherlands*, 1, 107
- Quashnock, J. M., Loeb, A., & Spergel, D. N. 1989, *ApJL*, 344, L49
- Rosseland, S. 1924, *MNRAS*, 84, 720
- Rubin, V. C., Ford, W. K., J., Strom, K. M., Strom, S. E., & Romanishin, W. 1978, *ApJ*, 224, 782
- Saga, S., Ichiki, K., Takahashi, K., & Sugiyama, N. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, 91, 123510
- Siegel, E. R. & Fry, J. N. 2006, *ApJ*, 651, 627
- Soriano, J. F. & Maroto, A. L. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, 100, 083532

- Springel, V., White, S. D. M., Tormen, G., & Kauffmann, G. 2001, *MNRAS*, 328, 726
- Subramanian, K. 2016, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 79, 076901
- Subramanian, K., Narasimha, D., & Chitre, S. M. 1994, *MNRAS*, 271, L15
- Sur, S., Federrath, C., Schleicher, D. R. G., Banerjee, R., & Klessen, R. S. 2012, *MNRAS*, 423, 3148
- Takahashi, K., Ichiki, K., Ohno, H., & Hanayama, H. 2005, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95, 121301
- Widrow, L. M. 2002, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 74, 775
- Widrow, L. M., Ryu, D., Schleicher, D. R., et al. 2012, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 166, 37
- Xu, H., O'Shea, B. W., Collins, D. C., et al. 2008, *ApJL*, 688, L57
- Zhou, M., Zhdankin, V., Kunz, M. W., Loureiro, N. F., & Uzdensky, D. A. 2022, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 119, e2119831119