Theories of Dark Matter

EPS-HEP, Vienna

July 2015

Tomer Volansky
Tel-Aviv University

Outline

- The Thermal WIMP
    - The mechanism
    - Experimental status and recent news
- Beyond WIMP
    - Classifying theories of dark matter
    - Self-interacting dark matter
- Direct Detection of Sub-GeV Dark Matter

(Gravitational) Evidence for Dark Matter



(Gravitational) Evidence for Dark Matter



Will We Find Dark Matter?

All experimental signatures of dark matter are *gravitational*.

Q: Why should we see dark matter anywhere else?

A: Because it was produced in the early universe!

How do we explain the 85% DM abundance?

Thermal WIMP
(Weakly Interacting Massive Particle).

The Thermal WIMP

- Single parameter: $\langle \sigma v \rangle$
- A simple analysis shows,

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \sim 2 \times 10^{-26}\,\mathrm{cm}^3/\mathrm{sec}$$



- For standard annihilation cross-section:

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \simeq \frac{g^4}{m_{\mathrm{DM}}^2} \Longrightarrow m_{\mathrm{DM}} \simeq 100\,\mathrm{GeV} - 1\,\mathrm{TeV}$$

The Thermal WIMP

- Single parameter: $\langle \sigma v \rangle$

- A simple analysis shows,



$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \sim 2 \times 10^{-26}\,\mathrm{cm}^3/\mathrm{sec}$$

- For standard annihilation cross-section:

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \simeq \frac{g^4}{m_{\rm DM}^2} \Longrightarrow m_{\rm DM} \simeq 100\,\mathrm{GeV} - 1\,\mathrm{TeV}$$

Same mass-scale we are now probing at the LHC

The Thermal WIMP

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \simeq \frac{g^4}{m_{\rm DM}^2} \Longrightarrow m_{\rm DM} \simeq 100\,{\rm GeV} - 1\,{\rm TeV}$$

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha \sqrt{T_{\rm eq} M_{\rm Pl}}$$



This is the WIMP Miracle

WIMPs

So where do we stand?

Several ways to search for DM



Direct Detection

Direct Detection: Basics





Direct Detection: Status



[From Schumann, 2015]

Direct Detection: Status

Two anomalies remain unexplained..



[From Schumann, 2015]

Direct Detection: Implications



$\sigma_{\chi N} \sim 10^{-39}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$



$\sigma_{\chi N} \sim 10^{-44-47}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$



$\sigma_{\chi N} \lesssim 10^{-46}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$

XENON100
LUX
CDMS
...

Direct Detection: Implications



$\sigma_{\chi N} \sim 10^{-39}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$ $\sigma_{\chi N} \sim 10^{-44-47}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$ $\sigma_{\chi N} \lesssim 10^{-46}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$



Current technologies will only be able to reach $\sim 10^{-48}\ \mathrm{cm}^2$ due to irreducible backgrounds

Indirect Detection

Indirect Detection: Basics



Indirect Detection: Basics



Search for photons and anti-particles

Indirect Detection: Status

In the past few years we've had:

Numerous measurements which place strong constraints on theory.

Few anomalies. Most notable:

- Galactic-center excess
- 3.5 keV line

Indirect Detection: Status

In the past few years we've had:

Numerous measurements which place strong constraints on theory.

Few anomalies. Most notable:

- Galactic-center excess
- 3.5 keV line

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



- Discovered with Fermi data.
- First found in Galactic Center, later at higher altitudes.

[Goodenough,Hooper, 2009,2010; Hooper, Linden 2011; Abazajian,Kaplinghat, 2012; Macias, Gordon, 2013; Hooper, Slatyer, 2013; Huang,Urbano,Xue, 2013; Abazajian et al. 2014; Daylan, et al., 2014; Zhou, et al. 2014; Calore, et al. 2014]

- Confirmed by Fermi collaboration.



[Daylan, et al., 2014]



[Calore, et al. 2015]

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



What can it be?



[Calore, et al. 2015]

- Excess is highly statistically significant and robust under systematic uncertainties.
- However, modeling of the Galactic diffuse emission is very uncertain in center.
- Several possibilities have been suggested, e.g.:

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



What can it be?



[Calore, et al. 2015]

- Excess is highly statistically significant and robust under systematic uncertainties.
- However, modeling of the Galactic diffuse emission is very uncertain in center.
- Several possibilities have been suggested, e.g.:
    - Unresolved millisecond pulsars (less likely).

[Wang, Jiang, Cheng, 2005; Abazajian 2010; Abazajian,Kaplinghat, 2012; Macias, Gordon, 2013; Yuan and Zhang, 2014]

[Hooper et al. 2013; Calore et al. 2014; Cholis et al. 2014]

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



What can it be?



[Calore, et al. 2015]

- Excess is highly statistically significant and robust under systematic uncertainties.
- However, modeling of the Galactic diffuse emission is very uncertain in center.
- Several possibilities have been suggested, e.g.:
  - Unresolved millisecond pulsars (less likely).
    [Wang, Jiang, Cheng, 2005; Abazajian 2010; Abazajian,Kaplinghat, 2012; Macias, Gordon, 2013; Yuan and Zhang, 2014]
    [Hooper et al. 2013; Calore et al. 2014; Cholis et al. 2014]
  - Cosmic-ray interaction with gas from galactic center or burst-like events from supernova remnant or AGN.
    [Yusef-Zadeh et al. 2012; Linden et al. 2012; Carlson, Profumo 2014; Petrovic et al. 2014]

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



What can it be?



[Calore, et al. 2015]

- Excess is highly statistically significant and robust under systematic uncertainties.
- However, modeling of the Galactic diffuse emission is very uncertain in center.
- Several possibilities have been suggested, e.g.:
  - Unresolved millisecond pulsars (less likely).
    [Wang, Jiang, Cheng, 2005; Abazajian 2010; Abazajian,Kaplinghat, 2012; Macias, Gordon, 2013; Yuan and Zhang, 2014]
    [Hooper et al. 2013; Calore et al. 2014; Cholis et al. 2014]
  - Cosmic-ray interaction with gas from galactic center or burst-like events from supernova remnant or AGN.
    [Yusef-Zadeh et al. 2012; Linden et al. 2012; Carlson, Profumo 2014; Petrovic et al. 2014]
  - Annihilating dark matter.
    [Hooper, Goodenough, 2011; Abazajian,Kaplinghat, 2012; Abazajian et al. 2014; Daylan et al. 2014; Berlin et al. 2014; Agrawal et al. 2014; Alves et al. 2014; Martin et al. 2014; Majumdar et al. 2014; Han et al. 2014; Huang et al. 2014; Ko et al. 2014; Cahill-Rowley et al. 2014; Okada et al. 2014; …PLUS MANY MORE…]

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



Dark Matter Interpretation

- Fits the WIMP thermal cross-section: $\langle \sigma_{\rm ann} v \rangle \sim 2 \times 10^{-26}\ {\rm cm}^3/{\rm sec}$
- The extended morphology is a highly non-trivial test for the dark matter interpretation.
- Uncertainties allow for several annihilation channels and variety of DM masses.



Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess

Is it Dark Matter?

Too early to tell!

- Looks intriguing but too many systematic uncertainties (morphology, background modeling, point sources, etc.).
- Many models exist, but are constrained by non-observations in indirect- and direct-detection. Will become more so (unless discovered) with more data.
- Other explanations are certainly still viable.

Cosmological Probes: Planck

- Injection of ionizing particles from DM annihilations changes reionization history, broadening the last scattering surface and modifying the CMB spectrum. [Adams et al. 1998; Chen et al. 2003; Padmanabhan et al. 2005; Finkbeiner et al. 2011]



- Places strong constraints on annihilating light dark matter.

- Can be evaded in several ways. [e.g.: Essig et al. 2013; D'Agnolo, Ruderman, 2015]

Going Beyond WIMPs?

Obsessed with the WIMP...

For the last ~30 years we have been (mostly) focusing on the WIMP scenario

Problem made up by theorists..

Obsessed with the WIMP...

For the last ~30 years we have been (mostly) focusing on the WIMP scenario

Our experimental effort is strongly focused on the WIMP!



Obsessed with the WIMP...

For the last ~30 years we have been (mostly) focusing on the WIMP scenario

Our experimental effort is strongly focused on the WIMP!



Lots more to do!

(repeat everything we did for the WIMP...)

Beyond WIMP:
Theories of Dark Matter

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- Gauge symmetries
- …

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- Gauge symmetries
- …

Production Mech.

- Freeze-out
- Freeze-in
- Freeze-out and decay
- Non-thermal
- Asymmetric
- Misalignment
- …

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- Gauge symmetries
- …

Production Mech.

- Freeze-out
- Freeze-in
- Freeze-out and decay
- Non-thermal
- Asymmetric
- Misalignment
- …

Mediation Scheme

- Gravity
- Weak-scale Mediator
- Light Hidden photon
- Axion portal
- Higgs portal
- …

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector	Production Mech.	Mediation Scheme	Couplings
• Spin	• Freeze-out	• Gravity	• Quarks
• Mass	• Freeze-in	• Weak-scale Mediator	• Gluons
• Self-Interactions	• Freeze-out and decay	• Light Hidden photon	• Charged Leptons
• Light States	• Non-thermal	• Axion portal	• Neutrinos
• Gauge symmetries	• Asymmetric	• Higgs portal	• Photons
• …	• Misalignment	• …	• …
	• …		

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- Gauge symmetries
- …

Production Mech.

- Freeze-out
- Freeze-in
- Freeze-out and decay
- Non-thermal
- Asymmetric
- Misalignment
- …

Mediation Scheme

- Gravity
- Weak-scale Mediator
- Light Hidden photon
- Axion portal
- Higgs portal
- …

Couplings

- Quarks
- Gluons
- Charged Leptons
- Neutrinos
- Photons
- …

Direct (Quarks, Gluons)
Colliders (Quarks, Gluons, Charged Leptons)
Indirect (Charged Leptons, Neutrinos, Photons)

Only a small fraction is probed for the WIMP

New production mechanisms and mediation schemes often imply a hidden dark sector. Possibly with complex dynamics.



Such hidden sectors often include low scale particles, below the GeV scale.

Very different from the WIMP paradigm!!

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- Gauge symmetries
- …

Production Mech.

- Freeze-out
- Freeze-in
- Freeze-out and decay
- Non-thermal
- Asymmetric
- Misalignment
- …

Mediation Scheme

- Gravity
- Weak-scale Mediator
- Light Hidden photon
- Axion portal
- Higgs portal
- …

Couplings

- Quarks
- Gluons
- Charged Leptons
- Neutrinos
- Photons
- …

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

- Several discrepancies between N-body simulations and astrophysical observations:

  I. Core vs. Cusp

  [Moore 1994; Flores,Primack 1994]

  - N-body simulations typically predict: $\rho(r) \xrightarrow{r \to 0} \frac{1}{r^\alpha}$
  - Measurements suggest a core: $\rho(r) \xrightarrow{r \to 0} \text{const}$
  - Problem exists in:
    (field and satellite) dwarfs,
    LSBs, Clusters

[Walker, Penarrubia, 2011; de Blok, Bosma, 2002; Kuzio de Naray et al., 2007; Kuzio de Naray, Spekkens, 2011; Newman et al. 2012; Oh et al. 2015;…]



[Oh et al., 2010]

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

- Several discrepancies between N-body simulations and astrophysical observations:

  1. Core vs. Cusp [Moore 1994; Flores,Primack 1994]

  2. "Too-big-to-fail" problem [Boylan-Kolchin,Bullock,Kaplinghat 2011,2012]

     - N-body simulations typically predict: MW should have O(10) satellite galaxies that are more massive than the observed most massive dwarf.

     - Problem recently shown to exist also in dSph in Andromeda and around the local group.



[Boylan-Kolchin et al. '11]

[Boylan-Kolchin,Bullock,Tollerud 2014; Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014; Kirby et al. 2014; Papastergis et al. 2014;…]

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

- Several discrepancies between N-body simulations and astrophysical observations:

  1. Core vs. Cusp [Moore 1994; Flores,Primack 1994]

  2. "Too-big-to-fail" problem [Boylan-Kolchin,Bullock,Kaplinghat 2011,2012]

  3. Missing satellite problem [Kauffmann et al. 1993; Klypin et al. 1999; Moore et al. 1999]

     - N-body simulations typically predict: More MW dSPhs than observed.

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

Discrepancies above strongly rely on N-body simulations, typically without baryons.

- Statistically significant once M31 and field dwarfs are included.

[Purcell, Zentner 2012; Rodríguez-Puebla et al., 2013]

- It is still possible that the missing dwarf galaxies will be discovered.

Can one explain these with CDM?

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

Discrepancies above strongly rely on N-body simulations, typically without baryons.

Can one explain these with CDM?

Definitely maybe!

But highly non-trivial…

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

Discrepancies above strongly rely on N-body simulations, typically without baryons.

Can one explain these with CDM?

Definitely maybe!

But highly non-trivial…

Baryonic effects such as supernova feedback may explain (some) these discrepancies (significant ongoing study). Harder to explain (some) discrepancies in field dwarfs.

To answer, must understand baryonic feedback much better!

One more problem to note…

Features in Rotation Curves





[Oh et al. 2015]

Features in rotation curves are intriguing. Mergers may provide a clue?

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

- DM self-interactions may solve many of the above problems.

[Spergel, Steinhardt, 2000]

- Idea:
  - DM interacts with itself allowing for the transfer of heat from outer to inner regions, thereby producing a core.



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

- DM self-interactions may solve many of the above problems.

[Spergel, Steinhardt, 2000]

- Idea:
  - DM interacts with itself allowing for the transfer of heat from outer to inner regions, thereby producing a core.
  - Collisions strip sub-halos and reduce number of satellites.



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

Dark Matter Interpretation

- Numerous models of self-interactions.
- Several implications:
  - Typical self-interacting cross-section (for small-scale structure such as dwarfs):

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm self}}{m_{\rm DM}} \simeq 0.1 - 10\,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$$

  - Requires light states or strong dynamics.
  - Numerous additional constraints (on large-scale structure) imply

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm self}}{m_{\rm DM}} \lesssim 0.5\,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$$

A Non-trivial dark sector!

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled



Strong Dynamics

$\alpha_{\rm eff} \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled



Strong Dynamics

$\alpha_{\rm eff} \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$

QCD (low!) scale emerges for a strongly-interacting sector.

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(T_{\rm eq}^2 M_{\rm Pl}\right)^{1/3} \sim 100 \text{ MeV}$$

Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

E.g.: The SIMP

[Carlson, Hall, Machacek, 1992; Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014; Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

2 sectors weakly coupled



Strong Dynamics

$\alpha_{\text{eff}} \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$

Large self-interactions



QCD (low!) scale emerges for a strongly-interacting sector.

$$m_{\text{DM}} \simeq \alpha_{\text{eff}} \left(T_{\text{eq}}^2 M_{\text{Pl}}\right)^{1/3} \sim 100 \text{ MeV}$$

Many theoretical and experimental considerations hint towards DM beyond the WIMP,
with low mass scales.

How do we search for it?

Significant experimental efforts in recent years to search for a dark matter or dark sector

Focus briefly on direct detection



Significant experimental efforts in recent years to search for a dark matter or dark sector

Focus briefly on direct detection



Significant experimental efforts in recent years to search for a dark matter or dark sector

Focus briefly on direct detection



Direct Detection of Light and Exotic DM

- Two basic efforts:
  - Lower threshold of existing techniques (DM-nucleon elastic scattering)

Threshold ≳ 50 eV

SuperCDMS



From talk by Matt Pyle, 2015

DAMIC



From talk by Javier Tiffenberg, 2015

Direct Detection of Light and Exotic DM

- Two basic efforts:
  - Lower threshold of existing techniques (DM-nucleon elastic scattering)
  - Search for inelastic processes (DM-electron and DM-nucleon scattering)

[Essig, Mardon, TV, 2011]

Threshold ≳ 0.1 eV

XENON



[Essig, Manalaysay, Mardon, Sorensen, TV, 2012;
Essig, Mardon, TV, XENON100 (upcoming)]

SuperCDMS and DAMIC



[Essig, Fernandez-Serra, Mardon, Soto, TV, Yu, 2015 (upcoming)]

Direct Detection of Light and Exotic DM



[An et al., 2014]



[Essig, Fernandez-Serra, Mardon, Soto, TV, Yu, 2015 (upcoming)]

Upcoming and existing direct detection constraints from DM-electron recoil are sensitive to many interesting theories

Direct Detection of Light and Exotic DM

- Several new technologies have been suggested in recent years.

[Essig, Mardon, TV, 2011; Anderson, Figueroa-Feliciano, Formaggio, 2011; Drukier, Nussinov, 2013; Agnes et al. 2014; Hochberg, Zhao, Zurek, 2015; Essig, Mardon, Slone, TV, 2015 (upcoming)]

- One effort:

Concept



Ultra-low threshold (1eV - 10's of eV)

2-3 orders of magnitude below existing technologies

In crystals: search for color-center defects produced due to interaction with dark matter.

Direct Detection of Light and Exotic DM

- Several new technologies have been suggested in recent years.

[Essig, Mardon, TV, 2011; Anderson, Figueroa-Feliciano, Formaggio, 2011; Drukier, Nussinov, 2013; Agnes et al. 2014; Hochberg, Zhao, Zurek, 2015; Essig, Mardon, Slone, TV, 2015 (upcoming)]

- One effort:



New theory-experimental collaboration. New lab opened.

Abir, Bloch, Essig, Mardon, Slone, TV, Budnik, Chechnovsky, Kreisel, Soffer, Sagiv, Landsman, Ashkenazi, Priel

Conclusions

The WIMP paradigm is reaching its climax!
Either will be found soon or become less motivated.

Trends are changing!
Significant recent activity in understanding and searching for DM theories beyond the WIMP.

There are organising principles to help classify DM theories.

Many efforts in developing new technologies to expand the search for dark matter

Testing DM may not necessarily involve non-gravitational interactions!
Improved understanding of structure formation may play crucial role in upcoming years.

Backup Slides

Problems with Cold Dark Matter?

Observations above strongly rely on N-body simulations, typically without baryons.

Can one explain these with CDM?

- Baryonic effects (such as Supernova feedback) are important, and can explain core vs. cusp (may require late time star formation). [Governato et al. 2012; Onorbe et al. 2015]
- Supernovae cannot explain too-big-to-fail but baryons from MW can.
- However harder to explain discrepancies in field dwarfs.

[Papastergis et al. 2014]



Two more problems to note…



ΛCDM can explain, but requires baryonic feedback.

Non-trivial to explain jointly: slope, scatter, luminosity function..

Direct Detection: Status (Spin-Independent)



Anomaly II: The 3.5 keV Line

- Initially discovered with XMM-Newton data in Perseus cluster, Andromeda galaxy, and several other clusters.

[Bulbul, et al. 2014; Boyarsky et al. 2014]



Anomaly II: The 3.5 keV Line

- But not everyone agrees…
- There are several nearby atomic lines:
    - K-XVIII (3.47+3.51 keV)
    - Ar-XVII (3.68 keV)
- Need to know plasma model and atomic abundances.
- Jeltema and Profumo reanalyze and find no need for an excess.

[Jetelma, Profumo, 2014]

- They also find the same line in the Tycho supernova remnant which hosts no dark matter.
- Additional study argues the morphology is inconsistent with dark matter and line correlates strongly with nearby atomic transition lines.

[Carlson, Jetelma, Profumo. 2014]

- Original groups disagree with criticism: Required abundance of K or Ar to explain data must be O(10-20) above expectation.

Anomaly II: The 3.5 keV Line

- But not everyone agrees…
- The
- Ne
- Jelte ... a, Profumo, 2014]
- The ... osts
  no
- Add ... ter
  and

[Carlson, Jetelma, Profumo. 2014]

- Original groups disagree with criticism: Required abundance of K or Ar to explain data must be O(10-20) above expectation.

Anomaly II: The 3.5 keV Line

- But not everyone agrees…
- The
- Ne
- Jelte

ıa, Profumo, 2014]

- The … ıosts no
- Add … :ter and

[Carlson, Jetelma, Profumo. 2014]

- Original groups disagree with criticism: Required abundance of K or Ar to explain data must be O(10-20) above expectation.

Anomaly II: The 3.5 keV Line

Dark Matter Interpretation



- Morphology requires decaying dark matter.
- Most attractive candidate: 7 keV sterile neutrinos.
- Sterile neutrinos ruled out (at ~12σ) by several null observations (in dwarfs, clusters, GC, Andromeda).

[Anderson, et al. 2014; Sekia et al. 2014; Riemer-Sorensen 2014; Malyshev et al. 2014]



- Other DM models that can ameliorate the tension between positive and null results exist.

[e.g.: Cicoli et al. 2014; Conlon et al. 2014; Alvarez et al. 2014]

Dark Matter Interpretation

- Alternative exotic DM interpretations which are less constrained exist. E.g.:

DM decaying to axion-like particle





- Rate depends on magnetic fields.
- Can ameliorate tension between positive and null results.

[Cicoli et al. 2014; Conlon et al. 2014; Alvarez et al. 2014]

Too-big-to-fail Outside the MW

Field Dwarfs in the Local Group



[Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2014]

dSph around Andromeda



[Boylan-Kolchin, Bullock, Tollerud 2014]

Self-Interactions: Constraints

90% of ordinary matter is in gas, not in galaxies



Self-Interactions: Constraints

90% of ordinary matter is in gas, not in galaxies



Self-Interactions: Constraints

90% of ordinary matter is in gas, not in galaxies



Self-Interactions: Constraints

Determine location of mass with weak-lensing



Self-Interactions: Constraints

Composite image: ordinary + dark matter

Self-Interactions: Constraints

Composite image: ordinary + dark matter

clear separation of gas/mass peaks



Self-Interactions: Constraints



[Harvey et al. 2015]

- Bottom line: at cluster scale,

Cluster scale: $\dfrac{\sigma_{\rm self}}{m_{\rm DM}} \lesssim 0.5\,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$

Classifying Theories of DM

Dark Sector

- Spin
- Mass
- Self-Interactions
- Light States
- . . .

Production Mech.

- Freeze-out
- Freeze-in
- Freeze-out and decay
- Non-thermal
- Asymmetric
- Misalignment
- . . .

Mediation Scheme

- Gravity
- Weak-scale Mediator
- Light Hidden photon
- Axion portal
- Higgs portal
- . . .

Couplings

- Quarks
- Gluons
- Charged Leptons
- Neutrinos
- Photons
- . . .

Strongly Interacting Massive Particles

A New Perspective on Freeze Out

[Kuflik, Hochberg, TV, Wacker, 2014]

[Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, 2014]

[Kuflik, Hochberg, Murayama, TV, Wacker, in progress]

Skip

No 2-2 Annihilations..

- The WIMP paradigm assumes significant 2-2 annihilations (typically to SM) that suppresses the number density.



No 2-2 Annihilations..

- The WIMP paradigm assumes significant 2-2 annihilations (typically to SM) that suppresses the number density.



- But what if DM is the lightest state in a hidden (sequestered) sector?



No 2-2 Annihilations..

- The WIMP paradigm assumes significant 2-2 annihilations (typically to SM) that suppresses the number density.



- But what if DM is the lightest state in a hidden (sequestered) sector?



- Then 2-2 annihilations may be highly suppressed

No 2-2 Annihilations..



- More generally, the hidden sector will have additional interactions (especially in a strongly coupled case).





3-2 Freeze Out

WIMP DM

Weak scale emerges for a weak-strength interactions

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(T_{\rm eq} M_{\rm Pl}\right)^{1/2} \sim {\rm TeV}$$

SIMP DM

QCD scale emerges for a strongly-interacting sector.

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(T_{\rm eq}^2 M_{\rm Pl}\right)^{1/3} \sim 100~{\rm MeV}$$

3-2 Freeze Out

WIMP DM

Weak scale emerges for a weak-strength interactions

$$m_{\mathrm{DM}} \simeq \alpha_{\mathrm{eff}} \left(T_{\mathrm{eq}} M_{\mathrm{Pl}}\right)^{1/2} \sim \mathrm{TeV}$$

SIMP DM

QCD scale emerges for a strongly-interacting sector.

$$m_{\mathrm{DM}} \simeq \alpha_{\mathrm{eff}} \left(T_{\mathrm{eq}}^2 M_{\mathrm{Pl}}\right)^{1/3} \sim 100\ \mathrm{MeV}$$



2-2 Good or Bad?

Weak scale emerges for a weak-strength interactions



$$a \equiv \frac{\alpha_{2-2}}{\alpha_{\rm eff}} =$$



Excluded by
Bullet-cluster and
halo-shape constraints

Constraints
push to strong
regime
→ **SIMP**

3-2 Freeze Out

WIMP DM

Weak scale emerges for a weak-strength interactions

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(T_{\rm eq} M_{\rm Pl}\right)^{1/2} \sim {\rm TeV}$$

SIMP DM

QCD scale emerges for a strongly-interacting sector.

$$m_{\rm DM} \simeq \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(T_{\rm eq}^2 M_{\rm Pl}\right)^{1/3} \sim 100\ {\rm MeV}$$

Excluded by Bullet-cluster and halo-shape constraints

$$a \equiv \frac{\alpha_{2-2}}{\alpha_{\rm eff}}$$



Constraints push to strong regime

⇓

SIMP

3-2 Freeze Out

- Problem: We implicitly assumed that **T_{dark} = T_{SM}.** Otherwise DM is hot and excluded.

- To evade limits on hot DM, the dark sector needs to be in thermal equilibrium with SM.



$$\frac{m_f}{\Lambda^2}\chi^\dagger\chi\bar{f}f \qquad \frac{\alpha_{\rm EM}}{4\pi\Lambda^2}\chi^\dagger\chi F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$$

- Consequently, t re diagrams:



2-2 Annihilations



Thermal Equilibrium

3-2 Freeze Out

- Problem: We implicitly assumed that $\mathbf{T_{dark} = T_{SM}}$. Otherwise DM is hot and excluded.

- To evade limits on hot DM, the dark sector needs to be in thermal equilibrium with SM.



$$\frac{m_f}{\Lambda^2}\chi^\dagger\chi\bar{f}f \qquad \frac{\alpha_{\rm EM}}{4\pi\Lambda^2}\chi^\dagger\chi F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$$

- Consequently, t re diagrams.



2-2 Annihilations

Thermal Equilibrium

3-2 Freeze Out





3-2 Freeze Out

Taking:

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\rm kin} \sim \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\rm ann} \equiv \frac{\epsilon^2}{m_{\rm DM}^2}$$

$$\Longrightarrow \qquad \frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{\Gamma_{\rm kin}} \sim \frac{n_{\rm DM}}{n_{\rm SM}} \sim e^{-m_{\rm DM}/T} \sim 2 \times 10^{-7}$$



$$\left.\frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{\Gamma_{3\to2}}\right|_{T=T_F} \lesssim 1 \Longrightarrow \epsilon \lesssim \epsilon_{\rm max} \equiv 0.1\ \alpha_{\rm eff} \left(\frac{T_{\rm eq}}{M_{\rm Pl}}\right)^{1/6} \simeq 3 \times 10^{-6}$$



$$\left.\frac{\Gamma_{\rm kin}}{\Gamma_{3\to2}}\right|_{T=T_F} \gtrsim 1 \Longrightarrow \epsilon \gtrsim \epsilon_{\rm min} \equiv 2\ \alpha_{\rm eff}^{1/2} \left(\frac{T_{\rm eq}}{M_{\rm Pl}}\right)^{1/3} \simeq 1 \times 10^{-9}$$

3-2 Freeze Out

Thus, much like the WIMP, the SIMP scenario predicts couplings to SM.





SIMP DM: Experimental Status



CDMS: SNOLAB Projected Reach



From talk by Cooley, 2015

Indirect Detection: Constraints

Fermi Dwarf Galaxies



[Geringer-Sameth, Koushiappas, Walker, 2014]

Indirect Detection: Constraints

Fermi Dwarf Galaxies



[Geringer-Sameth, Koushiappas, Walker, 2014]

Two more problems to note…

Features in Rotation Curves



[Famaey, McGaugh 2012]

ΛCDM can explain, but requires baryonic feedback.

Non-trivial to explain jointly: slope, scatter, luminosity function..

Anomaly I: GeV Gamma-ray Excess



Dark Matter Interpretation

- Fits the WIMP thermal cross-section: $\langle \sigma_{\rm ann} v \rangle \sim 2 \times 10^{-26}\ {\rm cm}^3/{\rm sec}$
- The extended morphology is a highly non-trivial test for the dark matter interpretation.
- Model building is more involved due to lack of observations in other direct and indirect measurements. Nonetheless, simple MSSM may (marginally) work.

Agrawal et al. 2014



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

Dark Matter Interpretation

- Numerous models of self-interactions.
- Several implications:
  - Typical self-interacting cross-section: $$\frac{\sigma_{\text{self}}}{m_{\text{DM}}} \simeq 0.1 - 10\,\text{cm}^2/\text{g}$$
  - Requires light states or strong dynamics.
  - Numerous additional constraints such as the bullet-cluster imply

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{self}}}{m_{\text{DM}}} \lesssim 0.5\,\text{cm}^2/\text{g}$$



Self-Interacting Dark Matter?

Dark Matter Interpretation

- Numerous models of self-interactions.
- Several implications:
    - Typical self-interacting cross-section: $$\frac{\sigma_{\rm self}}{m_{\rm DM}} \simeq 0.1 - 10\,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$$
    - Requires light states or strong dynamics.
    - Numerous additional constraints such as the bullet-cluster imply

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm self}}{m_{\rm DM}} \lesssim 0.5\,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$$