IN SEARCH OF DARK MATTER:

THEORETICAL MODELS AND THEIR EXPERIMENTAL SIGNATURES

> KATHRYN M. ZUREK UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE FOR DARK MATTER



Tuesday, October 2, 12

EVIDENCE FOR DM OVERWHELMING

All evidence points toward







NEW PHYSICS

Dynamical Selection?



New Dynamics in Particles, Definitely BSM

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE DARK MATTER?



WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE DARK MATTER?



WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE DARK MATTER?



HOW DARK IS DARK MATTER?



HOW DARK IS DARK MATTER?

• Which probe is the most constraining?



NEUTRINOS AND THE WEAK INTERACTIONS

 $M_{pl} \sim 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$

Energy

 $M_p \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$

Standard Model

Inaccessibility

Weak Interactions $M_{wk} \sim 100 \text{ GeV}$

Gravitational Interactions

Neutrinos

SUPER-WEAKLY INTERACTING

Gravitational Coherence



Cosmological Scales!

- Helps us learn about aggregate properties of dark matter
- Particle properties much harder

PARTICLE PHYSICS PROVIDES SOME IDEAS

Sub-weak Interactions

 $M_p \sim 1 \,\,{\rm GeV}$

Standard Model

Weak Interactions

 Fundamental premise: DM has interactions other than gravitational

Dark Matter

PARTICLE PHYSICS PROVIDES SOME IDEAS



SUB-WEAKLY INTERACTING MASSIVE PARTICLES



SUB-WEAKLY INTERACTING MASSIVE PARTICLES



SUB-WEAKLY INTERACTING MASSIVE PARTICLES



PROGRESS IN DARK MATTER

 "Generic" WIMP also doesn't give correct relic density



THEORIES OF DARK MATTER

• Axions

- Solve Strong CP
- Correct density of high scale axions via selection

• WIMPs

- Naturally obtain correct density via freeze-out
- Connected to weak scale
- Chemical Potential Dark Matter
 - Naturally obtain correct density via chemical potential
 - Connected to weak scale

CHEMICAL POTENTIAL DARK MATTER

Matter Anti-matter

Matter Anti-Matter



Visible

Dark

BARYON AND DM NUMBER RELATED?

- Standard picture: freeze-out of annihilation; baryon and DM number unrelated
- Accidental, or dynamically related?



Experimentally, $\Omega_{DM} \approx 5\Omega_b$ Mechanism $n_{DM} \approx n_b$ $m_{DM} \approx 5m_p$

Hall, Gelmini, Barr, Chivukula, Farhi, D.B. Kaplan

Nussinov,

DM MASS SCALES

• DM can be heavier if DM number violating operators decouple late

$$n_X - n_{\bar{X}} \sim (n_b - n_{\bar{b}}) e^{-m_{DM}/T_d}$$

• Extra Boltzmann suppression

TECHNIBARYON AND QUIRKY DARK MATTER

Use sphalerons to transfer asymmetry



SU(2) carrying dark fields!

X

- First used in the context of technicolor, by Barr, Chivukula, Farhi; D. B. Kaplan
- Sphalerons mix SM fields carrying B,L with technifermions

TECHNICOLOR AND TECHNIBARYONS



Technifermions transform under SM

Technibaryon is gauge singlet (scalar or fermion)

TB number is accidental global symmetry, completely analogous to baryon number.

- LEP, precision EW and Technicolor
- Self-interacting Dark Matter constraints
- Struggle to obtain correct relic density

Barr, Chivukula, Farhi Sannino et al D.B. Kaplan

A SIMPLE PRESCRIPTION: ASYMMETRIC DM

Luty, Kaplan, KZ '09

- Avoids the pitfalls of models which have their asymmetry related to the baryon asymmetry via standard model quantum numbers
- Essential idea is to use higher dimension operators to transfer the asymmetry between sectors

ASYMMETRIC DM



Energy



ASYMMETRIC DARK MATTER



Matter Anti-Matter



Visible

Dark

ANNIHILATING THERMAL ABUNDANCE

 $n_{DM} \sim T^3 \to 10^{-10} T^3$

Buckley





Robust alternative: annihilate to light states!



$$\Delta W = \lambda_X S X \bar{X} + \lambda_H S H_u H_d + \frac{\kappa}{3} S^3.$$
$$\Delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = m_X \bar{X} X e^{ia/s} + \text{h.c.},$$

DARK FORCES AND DM SELF-INTERACTIONS



- Dark Forces Natural for ADM
- Structure problems and dark forces
- Very big scattering cross-sections! $\sigma/m_X \sim 0.1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g} \simeq 0.2 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2/\text{ GeV}$ $\sigma_T \approx 5 \times 10^{-23} \text{ cm}^2 \left(\frac{\alpha_X}{0.01}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_X}{10 \text{ GeV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{10 \text{ MeV}}{m_{\phi}}\right)^4$

IS CDM AND HALO STRUCTURE A PROBLEM?

- Halo substructure: satellite galaxies and sub-halos -- more satellites found
- Halo cores and central densities
- Feedback? Governato et al '10
- In dwarves hard to understand how so little stellar feedback could blow out so much material: $M_* \sim 10^6 M_{\odot}$ blows out $5 \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$

"Too Big to Fail"

Bolyan-Kolchin et al '11

SCATTERING NOT GENERICALLY CONSTANT



RESONANT DARK FORCES AND STRUCTURE

Tulin, Yu, KZ, in progress

 Verify classical result numerically and presence of Sommerfeld-like effect for scattering



107

RESONANT DARK FORCES AND STRUCTURE

Tulin, Yu, KZ, in progress

 Verify classical result numerically and presence of Sommerfeld-like effect for scattering



ASTROPHYSICAL Implications

McDermott, Yu, KZ '11

- DM does not annihilate
- It can accumulate in the center of stars
- Notable case: neutron stars
- Elastically scatter, come to rest in core
- High density!

ADM, BLACK HOLE AND NEUTRON STARS

McDermott, Yu, KZ '11

- Scalar case can lead to BH formation
- DM continues to accumulate until there are enough that they self-gravitate
- OR, they first form Bose-Einstein condensate and then self-gravitate
- Once they self-gravitate, they can collapse to form a BH!

ADM, BLACK HOLE AND NEUTRON STARS



NEW AVENUES FOR BARYOGENESIS





Need Baryon violation and CP violation beyond what is currently observed in experiments

GENERATING AN Asymmetry

- Original ADM scenario assumed an asymmetry was generated and then transferred
- Higher dimension operators make a natural playing field for Affleck-Dine Cogenesis = simultaneous generation of asymmetries Cheung, KZ '11

COGENESIS -- NATURAL FOR ADM!

 $\mathcal{O}_{R-L}\mathcal{O}_X$

 $\mathcal{O}_{B-L} = LH_u, LLE^c, QLD^c, U^cD^cD^c,$

 $\mathcal{O}_X = X, \ X^2$

Cheung, KZ '11

- Affleck-Dine works by utilizing flat directions with non-zero <B-L>
- Note there is a symmetry $U(1)_{B-L+X}$ which generates $-n_{B-L} = n_X \neq 0$.
- At low temperature, symmetry breaks when O_{B-L}O_X decouples, separately freezing in the asymmetries

 $U(1)_{B-L+X} \to U(1)_{B-L} \times U(1)_X$

COGENESIS IN THE EARLY UNIVERSE

To see how it works, map to simple mechanical analog: pseudo-particle in 2-dimensions

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} r_{\phi} e^{i\theta_{\phi}}$$

$$n_{\phi} = j^{0} = i(\phi \dot{\phi}^{\dagger} - \phi^{\dagger} \dot{\phi}) = r_{\phi}^{2} \dot{\theta}_{\phi}$$



B-L and X asymmetry: torque on mechanical analog

COGENESIS IN THE EARLY UNIVERSE

- Two ingredients for successful Affleck-Dine Cogenesis
 - Stabilization: non-zero B-L and X vevs



 Torque: non-zero angular momentum

2. TORQUE

- The torque is exerted when fm = gH $V_{\text{soft}} \supset (fm + gH) \frac{\mathcal{O}_{B-L}\mathcal{O}_X}{M^{d-4}}$
- Claim is that $-n_{B-L} = n_X \neq 0$.
- Easily seen from Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (r_{B-L}^2 \dot{\theta}_{B-L}^2 + r_X^2 \dot{\theta}_X^2) - V(\theta_{B-L} - \theta_X)$$

Note θ_+ conserved!

$$\theta_{\pm} = \theta_{B-L} \pm \theta_X$$

2. TORQUE

 Calculable asymmetry, using impulse approximation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\theta}_{-}} = \frac{d}{dt}\left(n_{B-L} - n_{X}\right) = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta_{-}}$$

Impulse approximation; evaluate at:

$$V_{\text{soft}} \supset (fm + gH) \frac{\mathcal{O}_{B-L}\mathcal{O}_X}{M^{d-4}}$$

$$H \sim fm/g$$
.

$$-n_{B-L} = n_X \sim \frac{\arg(f/g) \, g \left|\mathcal{O}_{B-L}\right| \left|\mathcal{O}_X\right|}{M^{d-4}}$$

OSCILLATING ADM

- Asymmetry may be erased
- Any violation of DM number can lead to darkanti-dark oscillations
- Like ν oscillations
- Become important when³ mass exceeds Hubble expansion



Cohen, KZ '09 Falkowski, Rudermann, Volansky '10 Buckley, Profumo '11 Cirelli, Panci, Servant, Zaharijas '11 Tulin, Yu, KZ, '12

NUMERICAL RESULTS



NUMERICAL RESULTS

- Scalar interactions
- Oscillations turn on

Flavor-sensitive $\kappa = 0$



V + V -

 10^{8}

1000

 Γ_{\pm}

Tuesday, October 2, 12

Rate (eV)

V + V -

Flavor-sensitive $v - 10^{-4}$

Comoving density $Y \times 10^{10}$

Comoving density $Y \times 10^{10}$

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO THINK ABOUT NEW MODELS?

Lamp post problem: Experimental results have forced us to look outside the lamp post



1. DIRECT DETECTION



DAMA CoGeNT CRESST

CRESST 2011

ALL COMPLICATED BY UNCERTAINTIES ...

- ... of the experimental kind
- How do you calibrate energy?







DM IN A DATA RICH DISCOVERY ERA

- Meaning of experimental results still unclear -- as not uncommonly the case in a discovery era!
- Neutralino from MSSM not viable Kuflik, Pierce, KZ '10



- Consider range of theoretically motivated theories
- Is 7-10 GeV mass window suggestive of something else?

2. SEARCH VIA ANNIHILATIONS

How do we get photons from DM annihilation?



1. Direct



2. Final State Radiation



3. Inverse Compton

2. SEARCH VIA ANNIHILATIONS



A LINE WAS SUPPOSED TO BE A SMOKING GUN ...

- Slightly off galactic center
- A broken power law?
- Detector systematic?



A LINE WAS SUPPOSED TO BE A SMOKING GUN ...



WHAT DO YOU REQUIRE FROM A MODEL?



- Some way to:
 - suppress continuum photons
 - obtain the observed abundance of DM

THREE EXCEPTIONS

Tulin, Yu, KZ '12

- Can suppress continuum today with pwave cross-section $\langle \sigma v \rangle \sim v^2$
- Annihilation still too large for relic; need additional mechanism $v \sim 0.3$



If we believe Hooper's results, then even if winos are only about 1/10 of all the dark matter there is some tension with the galactic center, and the corresponding photon lines would be at the 10^{-28} cm³/s level, too small to explain the observation. The suggestion of Acharya et al. [?] is then **ruled out**, in an especially decisive way if Hooper's bound is correct.

Direct detection: Any dark matter that a millilater to root of an inprinted showing PTIONS in direct-detection experiments through either a loop process (exchanging two photons or a photon and a Z with the nucleus) or the 2 \rightarrow 3 process $\chi N \rightarrow \chi N \gamma$. However, these will typically be small enough that there is no limit (in fact, they may be small enough that the neutrino background swamps any possible detection, possibly with the exception of directional direct detection). Estimates for a particular model appear in [?], and are several orders of magnitude below the current limits.

Tulin, Yu, KZ '12

l expect that any model consistent with Hooper's precieve Sontinuum gamma-ray tonum today with pstraints will also be safe, or at worst borderline, from direct detection through Higgs exchange. Can we make this statement more precise? This is interesting even indep $\sim v^2$ pendent of the gamma-ray line, since it suggests that Fermi-DAT is doing roughly as well as Xenon at constraining models.

Neutrinos: Annihilation to Z bosons in the sun lead to a flux of neutrinos that may be detectable on Earth. What are the humbers? Edite Uthink it's hopeless—but stillarge for relic; should maybe write down some numbers.

Ladditional mechanism $v \sim 0.3$ DM

Figure 3: Illustrating the role of charge particles in arguments about the γ -ray line.

3. Asymmetric Dark Matter (4.) Degenerate States



Buckley, Hooper Bai, Shelton Fan, Reece

WHAT DO YOU REQUIRE FROM A MODEL?

Tulin, Yu, KZ '12



2. Forbidden Channels

THE ROAD AHEAD

- Direct Detection experiments will continue to probe Higgs mediated scattering
- Higgs pole largely covered within 5 -10 years

$$\sigma_n \sim 10^{-45-46} \ \mathrm{cm}^2$$





THE ROAD AHEAD

- LHC will continue looking for physics Beyond the Standard Model at the weak scale
- Evidence for Higgs; further accumulate this year
- Be patient! Current energy 8 TeV; Ramp-up to 14 TeV after 1-2 year shutdown



THE ROAD ÅHEAD

- PAMELA / Fermi and cosmic ray positrons
- Fermi photons
- Data rich! Many experiments collecting data





SUMMARY

• Dark Matter has not shown itself yet, but we continue to probe from all sides!



Astro Objects AMS **CDMS** COUPP CoGeNT Cresst DM ICE Fermi Icecube **KIMS** LHC LUX PAMELA Panda-X **XENON**

....