Theory Overview of Dark Matter Searches

Matthew R Buckley Rutgers University

> DM@LHC 2017 Irvine, CA

Theory Overview of Dark Matter Searches

- Theory:
 - Dark matter exists.
- Overview:
 - We should search for it.

How do we look for Dark Matter?

- What do we think dark matter is?
- What tools do we have available?

A thermal relic of the Early Universe (Important: this is a *guess*)

Detectors capable of measuring weak-scale interactions with SM

Thermal Dark Matter

- Assume dark matter was in equilibrium with the thermal bath of Standard Model particles
 - Then need annihilation avoid overclosure
 - Sets a minimum $\langle \sigma v \rangle$
 - Approximately the Weak Scale
 - We can look for this!



Thermal Dark Matter



 The Thermal Dark Matter *ansatz* gives us a reason to expect interactions at the detectors we have available at the rates we can detect.

How's that Working out for Us?

- So far, only negative results.
- Definitely probing the parameter space of interest.



Is Thermal Dark Matter Dead?



Supersymmetry

• Natural dark matter candidate:

$$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 = N_{11}\tilde{B} + N_{12}\tilde{W}^3 + N_{13}\tilde{h}_u^0 + N_{14}\tilde{h}_d^0$$

- For LHC-accessible dark matter $\mathcal{O}(100 \text{ GeV})$:
 - \tilde{B} has too little annihilation, $\tilde{W}^3/\tilde{h}_u^0/\tilde{h}_d^0$ have too much
- Good news!
 - Successful SUSY dark matter often requires some new particles around
 - stau coannihilation, A-funnel, etc.
- Non-discovery of MSSM at LHC suggests theory needs modification



Arbey, Battaglia, and Mahmoudi 1504.05091

Supersymmetry

- Pure Winos or Higgsinos are too heavy to be seen at the LHC
 - Need to look via direct and indirect detection



Supersymmetry

 For mixed neutralinos, tend to need other "light" particles around to annihilate with/through.



³³⁹ consistent with the background expectations.



- Hard to find a second data with small splittings
 - Generalizes to $SU(2)_L$ -multiplet WIMPs



Effective Operators

- Supersymmetry is great for naturalness (and dark matter), but we don't care about naturalness here.
 - So free to build new models which aren't natural.

- Effective theory is only valid if $Q_{\rm transfer} < M = \sqrt{g_{\chi}g_q}\Lambda < 4\pi\Lambda$
- At the LHC $Q_{\mathrm{transfer}} \propto p_{T,\mathrm{jet}}$



Effective Operators Simplified Models

- Supersymmetry is great for naturalness (and dark matter), but we don't care about naturalness here.
 - So free to build new models which aren't natural.



Monojets/Mono-X

Probes a combination of visible-invisible couplings







 A single model can result in multiple correlated final states (remember to include all of them)



Visible vs. Invisible

 Mediators connected to Standard Model can decay back into Standard Model



- Fraction of $\sigma \nu$ 9.0 Higgs w/ scater coupling • Naturalness 0.2 0.2 our motivatin 10 10^{4} 10 10 10⁴ $\Omega_{v}h^{2} = 0.12$ Dirac m_{ϕ} (GeV) m_{ϕ} (GeV) Majorana X
- Nevertheless, ะพังธี is interesting.

1 0

0.8

- Can the Higgs be our mediator?
 - Maybe, but it's difficult.



Spin-0 Portals

- Generalize the Higgs sector: new scalars and pseudoscalars
 - Expect minimal flavor violating-couplings



Spin-0 Portals

- Generalize the Higgs sector: new scalars and pseudoscalars
 - Expect minimal flavor violating-couplings



Leptophilic Dark Matter



- An example I've been thinking about
 - Spin-0 mediators between dark matter and leptons seem "maximally bad."
 - Impossible to rule out?

Not so Simple Simplified Models

- But a generic leptophilic spin-0 mediator isn't leptophilic after EWSB.
 - Can start applying other experimental constraints



Thermal

Vector Portals

- Massive vector mediators must have their own symmetry breaking.
- New Higgses, new mixings. New constraints



What's Left?

- Need to continue asking:
 - What can we be missing in simplified models?
 - Are the new particles:
 - Too Heavy? quark-phobic? Hidden in background?
 - Are we making unwarranted assumptions about particle widths/couplings?
 - Are the models too simple?
 - Overlooking some essential phenomenology?

Beyond Thermal Dark Matter

- We don't know dark matter has $\langle \sigma v \rangle \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{-26} \ {\rm cm}^3 {\rm /s}$
- Coming up with new mechanisms for dark matter production is an industry for theorists.
- What does this mean for experiments?
 - New models may not *need* to have a significant interaction with Standard Model.
 - Removes much of the "predictivity"
- Bottom Line:
 - Experimentalists should take notice of new signatures proposed by theorists. Don't worry if a model is invisible to your experiments.

Look to the Skies

• Our only source for positive statements about dark matter comes from gravity.





 Dark Matter parameters measured by the "classic" experimental triad are often orthogonal to what we learn from cosmology/astrophysics.

Is Dark Matter Boring?

- Early Universe consistent with ΛCDM .
- But there are some wrinkles around the edges.
- "Crisis in small scale structure"



Via Lactea 100's of dwarf galaxies



dozens seen

Is Dark Matter Boring?

- Evidence of interactions internal to the dark sector?
 - If so, these are not likely to be seen at LHC etc.



Vogelsberger et al 1512.05349

Astrophysical Probes

- What do we think dark matter is?
- What tools do we have available?



A Simple Parameterization



How much dark matter interacts with us

Conclusions

- Thermal dark matter is a well-motivated idea.
 - Rumors of its demise are greatly exaggerated.
 - We can catch non-thermal DM in this dragnet
 - Need to continually fine-tune the balance between



 If you're an experimentalist, look for new theories that predict new signatures. If you're a theorist, work to make those new signatures understandable.

Conclusions

- Remember: we don't know what dark matter is
- Many good ideas out there. How can we prove or disprove them?
- Don't forget the experiments that the Universe has kindly run for us over the last 13.7 gigayears.

