# Constraining Light Dark Matter with CDMS II and SuperCDMS

Scott Hertel MIT, SuperCDMS Collaboration DPF '11 (August 10, 2011)

#### The SuperCDMS Collaboration



**Caltech** Z. Ahmed, J. Filippini, S. Golwala, D. Moore, R. Nelson, R.W. Ogburn

#### Fermilab

D.A. Bauer, J. Hall, F. DeJongh, D. Holmgren, L. Hsu, E. Ramberg, R.L. Schmitt, R. B. Thakur, J. Yoo

#### MIT

A. Anderson, E. Figueroa-Feliciano, S. Hertel, K. McCarthy, S.W. Leman, P. Wikus

#### NIST

K. Irwin

Queens University P. Di Stefano, N. Fatemighomi, J. Fox, S. Liu, C. Martinez, P. Nadeau, W. Rau, Y. Ricci

Santa Clara University B.A. Young

#### SLAC/KIPAC

M. Asai, A. Borgland, D. Brandt, P.L. Brink, W. Craddock, E. do Couto e Silva, G.G. Godfrey, J. Hasi, M. Kelsey, C. J. Kenney, P. C. Kim, R. Partridge, R. Resch, D. Wright

Southern Methodist University J. Cooley, B. Karabuga, S. Scorza, H. Qiu

#### **Stanford University**

B. Cabrera, M. Cherry , R. Moffatt, L. Novak, M. Pyle, M. Razeti, B. Shank, A. Tomada, S. Yellin, J. Yen

Syracuse University R.W. Schnee, M. Kos and M. Kiveni

**University of California, Berkeley** M. Daal, T. Doughty, N. Mirabolfathi, A. Phipps, B. Sadoulet, D. Seitz, B. Serfass, D. Speller, K.M. Sundqvist

**University of California, Santa Barbara** R. Bunker, D.O. Caldwell, H. Nelson

University of Colorado at Denver M. E. Huber, B. Hines

**University of Florida** D. Balakishiyeva, T. Saab, B. Welliver

#### **University of Minnesota**

P. Cushman, L. Duong, M. Fritts, V. Mandic, X. Qiu, A. Reisetter, O. Kamaev, J. Zhang

#### **University of Texas A&M**

A. Jastram, K. Koch, R. Mahapatra, M. Platt , K. Prasad, J. Sander



#### Motivation: DAMA & CoGeNT



Scott Hertel MIT, CDMS Collaboration

## **CDMS II Detectors**



## **CDMS II at Low Energies**



## **CDMS II at Low Energies**







50

**40** 

30

20

Example 2 keV Pulse

# CDMS timing rejection fails below ~10 keV...

# ... which is precisely the 7 GeV WIMP signal region.



#### 2 keVne Threshold → Significant Background Rates

Used only 8 Ge detectors with the lowest trigger thresholds (1.5-2.5 keV) (Yellin method "optimal gaps" happened to all be in a single detector)

2006-2008 data randomly subdivided: 1/4 used to define cuts in yield 3/4 used to calculate limits (241 kg-days raw exposure)



#### **Recoil Energy = Measured - Luke** (Luke from charge measurement)



#### Recoil Energy = Measured - Luke (Luke from charge measurement)

Alternatively, we can eliminate charge noise by assuming a particular yield...

#### **Nuclear Recoil Energy = Measured x Scaling Factor**

#### Nuclear Recoil Energy = Measured x Scaling Factor

#### Step 1:

# Calibrate the absolute scale using Ge activation lines.

The 1.298 keV line calibration was pushed in the conservative *over*estimating direction to the 90% confidence level for each detector.



#### Nuclear Recoil Energy = Measured x Scaling Factor

#### Step 2: Define a nuclear recoil scaling factor.

Again conservatively, the slightly low yield seen by CDMS was used. If we are off, we are *over*estimating phonon energy.



#### Nuclear Recoil Yield Band Definition



#### **Event Selection**

The events within the band are the WIMP candidates.



#### Spectra



## Limits

Conservatively assume all candidates may be WIMPs. (ie, no background subtraction)

Limit defined using optimum interval method S. Yellin, PRD, 66, 032005 (2002) arXiv:0709.2701v1 (2007)

Spin-independent elastic scattering WIMP interpretation ruled out for joint DAMA/CoGeNT region.

A portion of the CoGeNT region remains, where only a small fraction of the excess is WIMP recoils.



DAMA/LIBRA, light blue CoGeNT region, and combined region: Hooper et al., PRD 82 123509 (2010)

## Varying the Nuclear Recoil Energy Scale



Scott Hertel MIT, CDMS Collaboration

## SuperCDMS



# Fiducial volume definition is much more stringent, and can be phonon-only.

#### Luke Phonon Gain



#### Background rejection destroyed, but threshold greatly lowered (~50eV so far).



Luke et al., Nucl. Inst. Meth. Phys. Res. A, 289, 406 (1990)

#### A low-threshold, non-zero-background analysis of the CDMS II exposure is inconsistent with the light wimp interpretation of DAMA/CoGeNT.

Future detectors will probe the light mass region significantly more effectively.

#### **Extra Slides**

#### No CoGeNT Background Subtraction



## Extrapolating CDMS Backgrounds



# How far do we need to push the energy scale for agreement?



#### Experimental Outlook



Scott Hertel MIT, CDMS Collaboration