A Comparison Between Direct and Indirect Dark Matter Search

Carlos Muñoz

if

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid & Instituto de Física Teórica

TeV Particle Astrophysics 2007, Venice, August 27-31

A good dark matter candidate must fulfil $\Omega h^2 \approx 0.1$

Recalling that
$$\ \Omega \propto rac{1}{\sigma_{
m annihilation}}$$

It is easy to check that a particle with weak scale interactions has the appropriate value of the annihilation cross section to obtain $\Omega h^2 \approx 0.1$

THUS AN INTERESTING CANDIDATE FOR DARK MATTER IS:
 a Weakly Interacting Massive Particle with a mass ~ 10²⁻³ GeV

AND, AN INTERESTING CANDIDATE FOR **WIMP** IS:

a Neutralino

- It has weak interactions and a mass $\sim 10^{2\text{--}3}~\text{GeV}$
- It is stable, since it is the LSP
- It is a neutral particle

 We will analyze The Neutralino in the context of Supergravity (SUGRA), and Superstrings

Which kind of experiments, direct or indirect detection, will be able to test larger regions of the parameter space of supersymmetric models ?

Carlos Muñoz



Working in the framework of SUGRA, the masses, M_a , m_{α} , are generated at high energy once SUSY is broken through gravitational interactions.

 \checkmark The simplest possibility is to assume universality : $M_a = M$, $m_\alpha = m$

The RGEs are used to derive the low-energy soft parameters

With $M_{GUT} \approx 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV, in the **MSSM** m_{Hu}^2 evolves towards large and negative values



 $\mu^{2} \approx -m_{Hu}^{2} - (1/2)M_{Z}^{2} \text{ is large}$ $m_{H}^{2} \approx m_{A} \approx m_{Hd}^{2} - m_{Hu}^{2} - M_{Z}^{2} \text{ is large}$ Small cross section





More sensitive detectors producing further data are needed e.g. 1 tonne detectors where $\sigma_{\chi_1^{0-n}} \sim 10^{-10} \text{ pb}$

Experimental constraints:

-- masses of the Higgs and superpartners

-- low energy observables (BR(b \rightarrow s γ), BR(B_s \rightarrow $\mu^+ \mu^-$), g-2)

Astrophysical constraints:

--Relic density $0.1 < \Omega_{DM} h^2 < 0.3$, WMAP range: $0.094 < \Omega_{DM} h^2 < 0.129$

In addition, the parameter space may be limited by Charge and Colour Breaking constraints

Departures from universality can lead to an increase of the predictions for $\sigma \chi_1^{0}$ -**n**

• Working with non-universal scalar masses, m_{α}

Berezinsky, Bottino, Ellis, Fornengo, Mignola, Scopel, 95 Arnowitt, Nath, 97

Working with non-universal gaugino masses, M_a

Corsetti, Nath, 00 Cerdeño, Kahlil, C.M.,01

Another approach is to use generic masses at the ew scale without using RGEs (effMSSM)

see e.g. Bottino, Donato, Fornengo, Scopel

Carlos Muñoz



Baek, Cerdeño, Y.G. Kim, Ko, C.M., 05

Can non-universal masses arise from a more fundamental theory?

After compactification of the Heterotic Superstring on a 6-dimensional orbifold, the resulting 4D SUGRA is described by:

$$m_{\alpha}^{2} = m_{3/2}^{2} \left\{ 1 + n_{\alpha} \cos^{2} \theta + \frac{q_{\alpha}^{A}}{q_{C}^{A}} \left[(6 - n_{C}) \cos^{2} \theta - 5 \right] \right\}$$

These soft terms are generically **non-universal**

Few free parameters: $m_{3/2}$, θ



Cerdeño, Kobayashi, C.M., 07

$\mu H_1 H_2 \longrightarrow \lambda S H_1 H_2 \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mu_{eff} = \lambda \langle S \rangle$

NMSSM

NMSSM has a richer and more complex phenomenology:



2 extra Higgses 1 additional neutralino

A light Higgs is experimentally viable: Implications for $\sigma_{\chi-n}$

Cerdeño, Gabrielli, Lopez-Fogliani, C.M., Teixeira, 07

Large values of $\sigma \chi_1^{O}$ -**n**, within the reach of detectors, can be obtained: • Very light, singlet-like Higgses $m_h \ge 15$ GeV

INDIRECT DETECTION in the MSSM

Annihilation of neutralinos in the galactic center will produce gamma rays, and these can be measured, e.g., in space –based detectors



Starting this year, the GLAST satellite will be able to detect a flux of gamma rays, as small as 10^{-11} cm⁻² s⁻¹



Carlos Muñoz



<u>Astrophysics</u>: e.g. a **NFW profile** for our galaxy, has for small distances from the galactic center $\rho(\mathbf{r}) \sim \rho_0/\mathbf{r}$

The combination of both effects implies that GLAST will be able to test some regions

Mambrini, C.M., 04

 10^{-7} $flux > 1 \text{ GeV} (\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s})$ EGRET 10^{-9} **GLAST** 10^{-11} $\delta_u = 1$ $\delta_d = 0$ γ–Ray 10^{-13} tan I 800 600 1000 200mχ (GeV)

DIRECT versus INDIRECT detection

Which kind of experiments, direct or indirect detection, will be able to test larger regions of the parameter space of supersymmetric models ? Mambrini, C.M., 04





X The previous situation occurs for simulations of halos without baryons. When <u>baryons</u> are taken into account a larger $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is obtain, producing a larger ϕ

Blumenthal, Faber, Flores, Primack, 86; Prada, Klypin, Flix, Martinez, Simonneau, 04; Bertone, Merrit, 05; Athanassoula, Ling, Nezri, 05

a NFW profile including baryons has $\rho(\mathbf{r}) \sim \rho_0/\mathbf{r}^{1.45}$ producing $\phi \ge 100$

Equivalent to Moore et al. profile without baryons

Mambrini, C.M., Nezri, Prada, 05







m_y (GeV)

Carrying out a more sophisticated analysis, e.g. considering the HESS data as the gamma ray background, as suggested by Zaharijas, Hooper, 06, the previous optimistic results are ameliorated



GLAST versus PAMELA

To simplify the analysis we consider,

PAMELA: we use a constant boost factor to parameterise possible clumps in the halo (see Lavalle, Pochon, Salati, Taillet, 06 for a more sophisticated analysis of the clumps)

GLAST: we neglect the efect of clumpliness

(see Bergstrom, Edsjo, Gondolo, Ullio, 98 where an enhacement due to clumps is obtained) our predictions for GLAST are therefore conservative.



Mambrini, C.M., Nezri, 06

PAMELA will be competitive with GLAST, for typical NFW profiles,

if the boost factor is about 10

CONCLUSIONS

• $\sigma_{\chi_1^0-nucleon}$ in supergravity, with universal soft terms, is too small • Larger $\sigma_{\chi_1^0-nucleon}$ can be obtained with non-universal masses Regions accesible for experiments are present D Ì Neutralinos with masses \approx (10-500) GeV can be obtained within the reach of dark matter detectors in the MSSM Similarly in the NMSSM (50-100) GeV and orbifolds (200-400) GeV CDMS Soudan, $\sigma_{\chi_1} \sim n \approx 10^{-7,-8}$ pb, will cover a small part of the parameter space • ϕ_{γ} ($\chi_1^{0}\chi_1^{0}$) in Supergravity with universality is in general small • Larger ϕ can be obtained with non-universality. Actually, using a NFW profile, more regions will be accesible than in direct detection

Including baryons, GLAST will cover important regions of the parameter space PAMELA will be competitive with GLAST, for typical NFW profiles if the boost factor is about 10

Backup Slides

Carlos Muñoz

Baryons

The previous situation occurs for simulations of halos without baryons. When baryons are taken into account a larger $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is obtain, producing a larger ϕ Blumenthal, Faber, Flores, Primack, 86 Prada, Klypin, Flix, Martinez, Simonneau, 04 Bertone, Merrit, 05 Athanassoula, Ling, Nezri, 05 a NFW profile including baryons has $\rho(\mathbf{r}) \sim \rho_0/r^{1/2}$, producing $\phi \times 100$ Equivalent to Moore et al. profile without baryons Mambrini, C.M., Nezri, Prada, 05 The combination of both effects, non-universality + baryons, may even allow to reproduce the observations of EGRET



SUGRA from SUPERSTRINGS

Since the low-energy limit of superstring theory is 4-dimensional SUGRA, the neutralino is also a candidate for dark matter in superstring constructions

Taking into account that the soft terms can in principle be computed in these constructions, once can study the associated χ_1^{Ω} -nucleon cross section

Of course, the results in superstrings will be a subset of the ones studied in SUGRA e.g. in the dilaton limit $M = \sqrt{3}$ m, A = -M

SUGRA

 M_{a} , m_{α} , $A_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$

The previous general analysis of soft terms in SUGRA, and the strategy to obtain a large cross section, is very useful for the study of these more specific cases

Strinas

Carlos Muñoz

Orbifold Scenarios

After compactification of the Heterotic Superstring on a 6-dimensional orbifold, the resulting 4D SUGRA is described by:

$$m_{\alpha}^{2} = m_{3/2}^{2} \left\{ 1 + n_{\alpha} \cos^{2} \theta + \frac{q_{\alpha}^{A}}{q_{C}^{A}} \left[(6 - n_{C}) \cos^{2} \theta - 5 \right] \right\}$$

These soft terms are generically **non-universal**

Few free parameters: $m_{3/2}$, θ



δ

Cerdeño, Kobayashi, C.M., 07

$$\delta_{H_u} = 10 - 17\cos^2\theta, \quad \delta_{H_d} = -\frac{5}{2} + \cos^2\theta,$$

NMSSM

- Going beyond the MSSM: adding singlet superfield S the NMSSM Elegant solution to the *µ*-problem of the MSSM $\mu H_1 H_2 \longrightarrow \lambda S H_1 H_2 \longrightarrow \mu_{eff} = \lambda \langle S \rangle$ **NMSSM** has a richer and more complex phenomenology: 2 extra Higgses 1 additional neutralino A light Higgs is experimentally viable: Implications for $\sigma_{\gamma-n}$
- Parameter space of the NMSSM:

$$\lambda, \kappa, \mu(=\lambda s), \tan \beta, (A_{\lambda}, A_{\kappa}, M_1, M_2)$$

Carlos Muñoz



Figure 11: Scatter plot of the neutralino-nucleon cross section as a function of the neutralino mass (left) and as a function of the lightest CP-even Higgs mass (right) for an example with $\tan \beta = 5$, and the remaining parameters in the ranges $0.01 \le \lambda, \kappa \le 0.7$, 110 GeV $\lesssim M_2 \lesssim 430$ GeV, -300 GeV $\lesssim A_{\kappa} \lesssim 300$ GeV, -800 GeV $\lesssim A_{\lambda} \lesssim 800$ GeV, and 110 GeV $< \mu < 300$ GeV. All the points represented are in agreement with LEP/Tevatron, $a_{\mu}^{\rm SUSY}$, and BR($b \rightarrow s \gamma$) constraints, and have a relic density in agreement with the astrophysical bound (grey dots) or the WMAP constraint (black dots).

Cerdeño, Gabrielli, Lopez-Fogliani, C.M., Teixeira, 07

Large values of $\sigma \chi_1^{0-n}$, within the reach of detectors, can be obtained:

- Very light, singlet-like Higgses $m_h \ge 15 \text{ GeV}$
- Lightest neutralino is a mixed Higgsino-singlino state
- In those regions the neutralino mass is in the range 50-100 GeV

Carlos Muñoz

In addition, the parameter space is very limited by experimental, astrophysical, and CCB constraints

Experimental constraints:

- Supersymmetric spectrum: $m_{\chi_1^{\pm}} > 103 \text{ GeV}, \ldots$
- Higgs Mass: $m_h > 114.1 \; {
 m GeV}$ (dependent on $\sin^2(lpha eta)$)
- $7.1 \times 10^{-10} < a_{\mu}^{\rm SUSY} < 47.1 \times 10^{-10}$
- $2 \times 10^{-4} < \mathrm{BR}(b \rightarrow s\gamma) < 4.1 \times 10^{-4}$

Astrophysical constraints:

• Relic density: $0.1 \lesssim \Omega_{ ilde{\chi}_1^0} h^2 \lesssim 0.3$ **WMAP:** $0.094 \lesssim \Omega_{ ilde{\chi}_1^0} h^2 \lesssim 0.129$









Carlos Muñoz

$$B_s \rightarrow \mu + \mu -$$

The decay $B_s \longrightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ is very sensitive to large values of tan β and small values of Higgs masses , in particular $\propto \tan^6\beta / m_H^4$



Thus the current upper limit B (B_s to $\mu^+ \mu^-$) < 2.9 × 10⁻⁷ may exclude regions of the parameter space with large $\sigma_{\chi_1^{0-n}}$

Baek, Y.G. Kim, Ko, 04

