

Hidden dynamics of a sub-component dark matter

Seodong Shin



Ayuki Kamada, Hee Jung Kim, Jong-Chul Park, SS, arXiv: 2111.06808

What particle is dark matter?

- Mass?
- (Non-gravitational) Interactions?
 DM SM
 DM DM

What particle is dark matter?

- Mass?
- (Non-gravitational) Interactions?



What particle is dark matter?

- Mass?
- (Non-gravitational) Interactions?

DM - SM i) Observation ii) Amount of DM DM - DM

Preferred candidate so far was

Weakly Interacting Massive Particle (WIMP)



- Weak scale mass: $O(1 \sim 10^5) \times proton mass$
- Weak interaction with the SM particles: about < 10⁻¹² (in cross section) smaller than EM

Byproduct of many BSM theories for resolving the hierarchy problem

What particle is dark matter? • Mass?



What particle is dark matter? • Mass?



Dark world beyond WIMP



- WIMP: a single species of particles with thermal relic via freeze-out
- Mass in between 1 GeV $\leq m_{\chi} \leq 100$ TeV roughly

Dark world beyond WIMP



- WIMP: a single species of particles with thermal relic via freeze-out
- Mass in between 1 GeV $\leq m_{\chi} \leq 100$ TeV roughly

Dark world beyond WIMP



- Dark sector: multiple species of particles? Symmetries?
- Non-trivial structures give unique signals: e.g., iDM



Smith, Weiner, PRD 2001

Sub-dominant component is hidden?

- Particularly useful in the scenarios where the dominant relic communicates with the SM sector through the sub-dominant relic.
- Question is how the amount of the sub-dominant relic is determined.



Sub-dominant component is hidden?

- Particularly useful in the scenarios where the dominant relic communicates with the SM sector through the sub-dominant relic.
- Question is how the amount of the sub-dominant relic is determined.



Sub-dominant component is hidden?

- Particularly useful in the scenarios where the dominant relic communicates with the SM sector through the sub-dominant relic.
- Question is how the amount of the sub-dominant relic is determined.





Agashe, Cui, Necib, Thaler, JCAP 2014 Kim, Park , **SS**, PRL 2017 Giudice, Kim, Park , **SS**, PLB 2018







- *x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)
 - $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic
 - \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic



*x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)

 $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic

Observe χ_1 scattering off target with $E_1 > E_{th}$ (indirect detection of χ_0)



*x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)

 $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic

Observe χ_1 scattering off target with $E_1 > E_{th}$ (indirect detection of χ_0)

Flux of
$$\chi_1 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-8} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{s}^{-1} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{0 \to 1}}{5 \times 10^{-26} \,\mathrm{cm}^3 \mathrm{s}^{-1}}\right) \times \left(\frac{100 \,\mathrm{GeV}}{m_0}\right)^2$$

Assume: NFW

Fixed ~ 1 if **s-wave** annihilation dominates (throughout this work for simplicity) Agashe et al., 10,000 times smaller than the flux of atmospheric v if m₀ ~ 100 GeV Kim, Park , **SS**, PRL 2017



*x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)

 $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic

Observe χ_1 scattering off target with $E_1 > E_{th}$ (indirect detection of χ_0)

Flux of
$$\chi_1 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-8} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{s}^{-1} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{0 \to 1}}{5 \times 10^{-26} \,\mathrm{cm}^3 \mathrm{s}^{-1}}\right) \times \left(\frac{100 \,\mathrm{GeV}}{m_0}\right)^2$$

Assume: NFW



Fixed ~ 1 if **s-wave** annihilation dominates (throughout this work for simplicity) 10,000 times smaller than the flux of atmospheric v if $m_0 \sim 100$ GeV Kim, Park , **SS**, PRL 2017



*x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)

 $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic

Observe χ_1 scattering off target with $E_1 > E_{th}$ (indirect detection of χ_0)

Flux of
$$\chi_1 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-8} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{s}^{-1} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{0 \to 1}}{5 \times 10^{-26} \,\mathrm{cm}^3 \mathrm{s}^{-1}}\right) \times \left(\frac{100 \,\mathrm{GeV}}{m_0}\right)^2$$

Assume: NFW



Assume: NFW Fixed ~ 1 if **s-wave** annihilation dominates (throughout this work for simplicity) 10,000 times smaller than the flux of atmospheric v if $m_0 \sim 100$ GeV Comparable Giudice, Kim, Park, SS, PLB 2018 Agashe et al., JCAP 2014 Kim, Park, SS, PLB 2018



*x*₀: accumulated
 (GC, Sun, dSphs)

 $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (current universe) relativistic \approx relic χ_1 is non-relativistic

Observe χ_1 scattering off target with $E_1 > E_{th}$ (indirect detection of χ_0)

Flux of
$$\chi_1 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-8} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{s}^{-1} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{0 \to 1}}{5 \times 10^{-26} \,\mathrm{cm}^3 \mathrm{s}^{-1}}\right) \times \left(\frac{100 \,\mathrm{GeV}}{m_0}\right)^2$$

Assume: NFW
Fixed ~ 1 if **s-wave** annihilation dominates (throughout this work for s



Assume: NFW Fixed ~ 1 if **s-wave** annihilation dominates (throughout this work for simplicity) Agashe et al., 10,000 times smaller than the flux of atmospheric v if $m_0 \sim 100$ GeV Talk by comparable Mohlabena Giudice, Kim, Park, SS, PLB 2018 Mohlabena

 χ_0 : heavy (dominant), χ_1 : light (subdominant)





 χ_0 : heavy (dominant), χ_1 : light (subdominant)









After the heavy component χ_0 freezes-out

- If $Y_{ast.}$ is negligible, χ_1 freezes out at T ~ m₁/20 as usual.
- If the fraction of χ_1 is very small, i.e., $r_1 \ll 1$, however, <u>departure from</u> <u>thermal equilibrium is delayed</u> and $Y_{ast.}$ is non-negligible compared to $Y_{\chi_1}^{eq}$





- For a fixed $r_1 \ll 1$, $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ should be even larger to deplete the contribution by the residual annihilation $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (Yast.).
- We find $\langle \sigma_1 v \rangle \propto 1/r_1^2$, $1/r_1^3$ for s-wave and p-wave, respectively.



- For a fixed $r_1 \ll 1$, $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ should be even larger to deplete the contribution by the residual annihilation $\chi_0 \chi_0 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1$ (Yast.).
- We find $\langle \sigma_1 v \rangle \propto 1/r_1^2$, $1/r_1^3$ for s-wave and p-wave, respectively.

observables $\propto n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v \rangle \rightarrow \text{No } r_1 \text{ suppression!}$

Sub-component DM can be not hidden and affect

- Big Bang Nucleosynthesis: photo-dissociation of light elements primordial elements if freeze-out T $\leq T_{\nu,dec}$
- Cosmic microwave background: $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ after the last scattering, N_{eff} constraints if freeze-out T $\leq T_{\nu,dec}$
- Diffuse X-rays and γ -rays in the Milky Way
- Direct detection if the crossing symmetry is effective (severer)

observable \backsim $n_{\chi_1}\sigma$

Unprecedented role of a sub-dominant DM component

• For s-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints directly apply because $n_{\chi_1}^2 (\sigma_1 v_{rel})_s \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^2} = \text{no } r_1 : \text{s-wave not preferred!}$

(preconception: $n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{rel} \rangle_{standard} \sim r_1$ is not true in the assisted regime.)

• For p-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints can be weaken by velocity suppression but its effect can be small since

$$n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^3} \cdot v^2 = \frac{v^2}{r_1}$$

Unprecedented role of a sub-dominant DM component

• For s-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints directly apply because $n_{\chi_1}^2 (\sigma_1 v_{rel})_s \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^2} = \text{no } r_1$: s-wave not preferred!

(preconception: $n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{rel} \rangle_{standard} \sim r_1$ is not true in the assisted regime.)

• For p-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints can be weaken by velocity suppression but its effect can be small since

$$n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^3} \cdot v^2 = \underbrace{v^2}_{r_1}$$

Sensitive to the evolution of the temperature of χ_1
in the early Universe

Unprecedented role of a sub-dominant DM component

For s-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints directly ulletapply because $n_{\chi_1}^2(\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_{\rm s} \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^2} = \text{no } r_1$: **s-wave not preferred!**

(preconception: $n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle_{\rm standard} \sim r_1$ is not true in the assisted regime.)

For p-wave dominant $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM SM$, the nominal constraints can be ulletweaken by velocity suppression but its effect can be small since

$$n_{\chi_1}^2 \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle \sim r_1^2 \cdot \frac{1}{r_1^3} \cdot v^2 = \frac{v^2}{r_1}$$

 $\frac{1}{x^{1} - \chi_{1}}$ Sensitive to the evolution of the temperature of χ_{1} $\frac{\chi_{1} - \chi_{1}}{\text{self-interaction}}$ in the early Universe

• Self-interacting DM models have been proposed actively recently.

• Self-interactions always exist. The question is how efficient they can transfer energy long after the freeze-out (not effective for WIMP).

• Self-interaction of a subdominant DM χ_1 can be large for the O(1) dark sector coupling.

• Self-interacting DM models have been proposed actively recently.

• Self-interactions always exist. The question is how efficient they can transfer energy long after the freeze-out (not effective for WIMP).

• Self-interaction of a subdominant DM χ_1 can be large for the O(1) dark sector coupling.



• Self-interacting DM models have been proposed actively recently.

• Self-interactions always exist. The question is how efficient they can transfer energy long after the freeze-out (not effective for WIMP).

• Self-interaction of a subdominant DM χ_1 can be large for the O(1) dark sector coupling.



• Self-interacting DM models have been proposed actively recently.

• Self-interactions always exist. The question is how efficient they can transfer energy long after the freeze-out (not effective for WIMP).

• Self-interaction of a subdominant DM χ_1 can be large for the O(1) dark sector coupling.



Chu, Garcia-Cely, JCAP 2018

Sekiguchi, PRL 2018

Vogelsberger, Zavala, Schutz, Slatyer, MNRAS 2018



• If self-heating is efficient even after the kinetic decoupling, the temperature evolution of χ_1 makes it behave like a radiation.

- The self-heating lasts as r_1 (hence n_1) & the self-interaction are sizable.
- The temperature increases rapidly as $1/r_1$ (large χ_1 SM cross section).



• The photo-dissociation bounds become severer.



- The photo-dissociation bounds become severer.
- For $r_1 \ge 0.07$, the self-heating epoch can persist even until the matter-radiation equality.



The photo-dissociation bounds become severer.

• For $r_1 \ge 0.07$, the self-heating epoch can persist even until the matterradiation equality.

X1 can be sub-Gev Warm Dark Matter!!

Lyman-α # of satellites

New bounds due to self-heating



- WDM constraint enters when $r_1 \ge 0.07$ even for $m_{\chi^1} \sim 40$ MeV.
- Direct detection bounds get weaken since n_{χ^1} inside our MW decreases due to the kinetic energy of χ_1
- \star : reference values of r₁ in the temperature evolution (previous slide)

Complementary searches

Light DM can be produced in accelerators with high intensities!

Green: N_{eff},

Pink: WDM

for $r_1 \gtrsim 0.07$.



Complementary searches

Light DM can be produced in accelerators with high intensities!



Reference model:
 singlet scalar DM +
 dark photon (p-wave)

- Green: N_{eff},
 Pink: WDM
 for r₁ ≈ 0.07.
- For $r_1 \leq 0.07$, not preferred by the accelerator results.

Complementary searches

Light DM can be produced in accelerators with high intensities!



Reference model:
 singlet scalar DM +
 dark photon (p-wave)

Green: N_{eff},
 Pink: WDM
 for r₁ ≥ 0.07.

• For $r_1 \leq 0.07$, not preferred by the accelerator results.

• Future discovery can tell the dark sector details.



- A sub-component DM (χ_1) can severely affect the cosmo/astro observables (χ_1 SM: p-wave preferred!).
- Self-heating naturally arises in a wide range of parameter space and changes the evolution of the temperature of χ_1 after the freeze-out.
- The temperature evolution affects the structure formation of *χ*₁:

 a sub-GeV mass Warm Dark Matter (heavy WDM) for r₁ ≥ 0.07!
 → This is true even when *χ*₁ is a dominant component DM.
- Complementary searches in accelerators can give hints on the dark sector details (disfavor r₁ ≤ 0.07 for a reference model).

When $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ is dominated by s-wave



• CMB kills almost everywhere.

When $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ is dominated by s-wave



• CMB kills almost everywhere.

Kamada, Kim, Park, **SS**, arXiv: 2111.06808





• In the assisted regime, the kinetic decoupling can occur after the freeze-out of $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow e^+e^-$: photo-dissociation if 100 eV $\leq T_{kd} \leq 10$ keV after BBN.





• In the assisted regime, the kinetic decoupling can occur after the freeze-out of $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow e^+e^-$: photo-dissociation if 100 eV $\leq T_{kd} \leq 10$ keV after BBN.



Assisted regime

Kamada, Kim, Park, SS, arXiv: 2111.06808

- For $r_1 \ll 1$, Y_{χ_1} is lifted-up by $Y_{ast.}$ (follows it when T $\leq m_1/30$).
- The annihilation cross section $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ is enhanced by $1/r_1^2$.

$$(\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_s \simeq 4.7 \times 10^{-24} {\rm cm}^3 / {\rm s} \left(\frac{0.1}{r_1}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{\chi_1}/m_{\chi_0}}{0.6}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{g_*}}{g_{*S}}\right)_{x_{\rm fo,0}} \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle \simeq (\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_2 + (\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_p v_{\rm rel}^2$$



- For $r_1 \ll 1$, Y_{χ_1} is lifted-up by $Y_{ast.}$ (follows it when T $\leq m_1/30$).
- The annihilation cross section $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ is enhanced by $1/r_1^2$.

$$(\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_s \simeq 4.7 \times 10^{-24} {\rm cm}^3 / {\rm s} \left(\frac{0.1}{r_1}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{\chi_1}/m_{\chi_0}}{0.6}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{g_*}}{g_{*S}}\right)_{x_{\rm fo,0}} \langle \sigma_1 v_{\rm rel} \rangle \simeq (\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_2 + (\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_p v_{\rm rel}^2$$



- For $r_1 \ll 1$, Y_{χ_1} is lifted-up even more by $Y_{ast.}$ (until T ~ m₁/80).
- The annihilation cross section $\chi_1 \chi_1 \rightarrow SM$ increases as $1/r_1^3$ so the process can be also sensitive to various observables.

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_1 v_{\rm rel})_p \simeq 4.2 \times 10^{-24} \,{\rm cm}^3/{\rm s} \, \left(\frac{c'}{0.35}\right)^4 \left(\frac{m_{\chi_1}/m_{\chi_0}}{0.6}\right)^4 \left(\frac{0.1}{r_1}\right)^3 \left(\frac{g_{*S}}{\sqrt{g_*}}\right)_{x'_{\rm fo}}^4 \, \left(\frac{\sqrt{g_*}}{g_{*S}}\right)_{x_{\rm fo,0}}^2 \\ (Y_{\rm ast.} - Y_{\chi_1})/Y_{\rm ast.} = c' \end{aligned}$$