

Decaying Dark Matter

Alejandro Ibarra

Technical University of Munich



Many thanks to Chiara Arina, Wilfried Buchmüller, Gianfranco Bertone, Laura Covi, Michael Grefe, Thomas Hambye, Koichi Hamaguchi, Tetsuo Shindou, Fumihiro Takayama, David Tran, Andreas Ringwald, Christoph Weniger and Tsutomu Yanagida.



PPC 2010

Torino

12th July 2010


Introduction

Dark matter exist



Introduction

Dark matter exist



**What is
the dark matter?**



Observations indicate that the dark matter is a particle which the following properties:

- Non baryonic,
- Slow moving ("cold" or perhaps "warm"),
- Interactions with ordinary matter not stronger than the weak interaction,
- Long lived (not necessarily stable!)


All these evidences for dark matter are of gravitational origin

Impossible to determine the nature and properties of the dark matter particle from these observations

Independent (non-gravitational) evidences for dark matter are necessary

Direct detection

$\text{DM nucleus} \rightarrow \text{DM nucleus}$



Indirect detection

$\text{DM DM} \rightarrow \gamma X, e^+e^- \dots$ (annihilation)

$\text{DM} \rightarrow \gamma X, e^+X, \dots$ (decay)

Collider searches

$pp \rightarrow \text{DM } X$

Direct detection

DM nucleus \rightarrow DM nucleus

Indirect detection

DM DM $\rightarrow \gamma X, e^+e^- \dots$ (annihilation)

DM $\rightarrow \gamma X, e^+X, \dots$ (decay)

Collider searches

pp \rightarrow DM X




An anomalous positron abundance in cosmic rays with energies 1.5–100 GeV

O. Adriani^{1,2}, G. C. Barbarino^{3,4}, G. A. Bazilevskaya⁵, R. Bellotti^{6,7}, M. Boezio⁸, E. A. Bogomolov⁹, L. Bonechi^{1,2}, M. Bongi², V. Bonvicini⁸, S. Bottai², A. Bruno^{6,7}, F. Cafagna⁷, D. Campana⁴, P. Carlson¹⁰, M. Casolino¹¹, G. Castellini¹², M. P. De Pascale^{11,13}, G. De Rosa⁴, N. De Simone^{11,13}, V. Di Felice^{11,13}, A. M. Galper¹⁴, L. Grishantseva¹⁴, P. Hofverberg¹⁰, S. V. Koldashov¹⁴, S. Y. Krutkov⁹, A. N. Kvashnin⁵, A. Leonov¹⁴, V. Malvezzi¹¹, L. Marcelli¹¹, W. Menn¹⁵, V. V. Mikhailov¹⁴, E. Mocchiutti⁸, S. Orsi^{10,11}, G. Osteria⁴, P. Papini², M. Pearce¹⁶, P. Picozza^{11,13}, M. Ricci¹⁷, S. B. Ricciarini², M. Simon¹⁵, R. Sparvoli^{11,13}, P. Spillantini^{1,2}, Y. I. Stozhkov⁵, A. Vacchi⁸, E. Vannuccini², G. Vasilyev⁹, S. A. Voronov¹⁴, Y. T. Yurkin¹⁴, G. Zampa⁸, N. Zampa⁸ & V. G. Zverev¹⁴

Antiparticles account for a small fraction of cosmic rays and are known to be produced in interactions between cosmic-ray nuclei and atoms in the interstellar medium¹, which is referred to as a ‘secondary source’. Positrons might also originate in objects such as pulsars² and microquasars³ or through dark matter annihilation⁴, which would be ‘primary sources’. Previous statistically limited measurements^{5–7} of the ratio of positron and electron fluxes have

calorimeter data. The proton-to-positron flux ratio increases from approximately 10^3 at 1 GV to approximately 10^4 at 100 GV. Robust positron identification is therefore required, and the residual proton background must be estimated accurately. The imaging calorimeter is 16.3 radiation lengths (0.6 nuclear interaction lengths) deep, so electrons and positrons develop well contained electromagnetic showers in the energy range of interest. In contrast, the majority of






Measurement of the Cosmic Ray $e^+ + e^-$ Spectrum from 20 GeV to 1 TeV with the Fermi Large Area Telescope

A. A. Abdo,^{1,2} M. Ackermann,³ M. Ajello,³ W. B. Atwood,⁴ M. Axelsson,^{5,6} L. Baldini,⁷ J. Ballet,⁸ G. Barbiellini,^{9,10}
 D. Bastieri,^{11,12} M. Battelino,^{5,13} B. M. Baughman,¹⁴ K. Bechtol,³ R. Bellazzini,⁷ B. Berenji,³ R. D. Blandford,³
 E. D. Bloom,³ G. Bogaert,¹⁵ E. Bonamente,^{16,17} A. W. Borgland,³ J. Bregeon,⁷ A. Brez,⁷ M. Brigida,^{18,19} P. Bruel,¹⁵
 T. H. Burnett,²⁰ G. A. Caliandro,^{18,19} R. A. Cameron,³ P. A. Caraveo,²¹ P. Carlson,^{5,13} J. M. Casandjian,⁸ C. Cecchi,^{16,17}
 E. Charles,³ A. Chekhtman,^{22,2} C. C. Cheung,²³ J. Chiang,³ S. Ciprini,^{16,17} R. Claus,³ J. Cohen-Tanugi,²⁴
 L. R. Cominsky,²⁵ J. Conrad,^{5,13,26,27} S. Cutini,²⁸ C. D. Dermer,² A. de Angelis,²⁹ F. de Palma,^{18,19} S. W. Digel,³
 G. Di Bernardo,⁷ E. do Couto e Silva,³ P. S. Drell,³ R. Dubois,³ D. Dumora,^{30,31} Y. Edmonds,³ C. Farnier,²⁴ C. Favuzzi,^{18,19}
 W. B. Focke,³ M. Frailis,²⁹ Y. Fukazawa,³² S. Funk,³ P. Fusco,^{18,19} D. Gaggero,⁷ F. Gargano,¹⁹ D. Gasparri,²⁸
 N. Gehrels,^{23,33} S. Germani,^{16,17} B. Giebels,¹⁵ N. Giglietto,^{18,19} F. Giordano,^{18,19} T. Glanzman,³ G. Godfrey,³ D. Grasso,⁷
 I. A. Grenier,⁸ M.-H. Grondin,^{30,31} J. E. Grove,² L. Guillemot,^{30,31} S. Guiriec,³⁴ Y. Hanabata,³² A. K. Harding,²³
 R. C. Hartman,²³ M. Hayashida,³ E. Hays,²³ R. E. Hughes,¹⁴ G. Jóhannesson,³ A. S. Johnson,³ R. P. Johnson,⁴
 W. N. Johnson,² T. Kamae,³ H. Katagiri,³² J. Kataoka,³⁵ N. Kawai,^{36,37} M. Kerr,²⁰ J. Knödlseher,³⁸ D. Kocevski,³
 F. Kuehn,¹⁴ M. Kuss,⁷ J. Lande,³ L. Latronico,^{7,*} M. Lemoine-Goumard,^{30,31} F. Longo,^{9,10} F. Loparco,^{18,19} B. Lott,^{30,31}
 M. N. Lovellette,² P. Lubrano,^{16,17} G. M. Madejski,³ A. Makeev,^{22,2} M. M. Massai,⁷ M. N. Mazziotta,¹⁹
 W. McConville,^{23,33} J. E. McEnery,²³ C. Meurer,^{5,26} P. F. Michelson,³ W. Mitthumsiri,³ T. Mizuno,³² A. A. Moiseev,^{39,33,†}
 C. Monte,^{18,19} M. E. Monzani,³ E. Moretti,^{9,10} A. Morselli,⁴⁰ I. V. Moskalenko,³ S. Murgia,³ P. L. Nolan,³ J. P. Norris,⁴¹
 E. Nuss,²⁴ T. Ohsugi,³² N. Omodei,⁷ E. Orlando,⁴² J. F. Ormes,⁴¹ M. Ozaki,⁴³ D. Paneque,³ J. H. Panetta,³ D. Parent,^{30,31}
 V. Pelassa,²⁴ M. Pepe,^{16,17} M. Pesce-Rollins,⁷ F. Piron,²⁴ M. Pohl,⁴⁴ T. A. Porter,⁴ S. Profumo,⁴ S. Rainò,^{18,19}
 R. Rando,^{11,12} M. Razzano,⁷ A. Reimer,³ O. Reimer,³ T. Reposeur,^{30,31} S. Ritz,^{23,33} L. S. Rochester,³ A. Y. Rodriguez,⁴⁵
 R. W. Romani,³ M. Roth,²⁰ F. Ryde,^{5,13} H. F.-W. Sadrozinski,⁴ D. Sanchez,¹⁵ A. Sander,¹⁴ P. M. Saz Parkinson,⁴
 J. D. Scargle,⁴⁶ T. L. Schalk,⁴ A. Sellerholm,^{5,26} C. Sgrò,⁷ D. A. Smith,^{30,31} P. D. Smith,¹⁴ G. Spandre,⁷ P. Spinelli,^{18,19}
 J.-L. Starck,⁸ T. E. Stephens,²³ M. S. Strickman,² A. W. Strong,⁴² D. J. Suson,⁴⁷ H. Tajima,³ H. Takahashi,³² T. Takahashi,⁴³
 T. Tanaka,³ J. B. Thayer,³ J. G. Thayer,³ D. J. Thompson,²³ L. Tibaldo,^{11,12} O. Tibolla,⁴⁸ D. F. Torres,^{49,45} G. Tosti,^{16,17}
 A. Tramacere,^{50,3} Y. Uchiyama,³ T. L. Usher,³ A. Van Etten,³ V. Vasileiou,^{23,51} N. Vilchez,³⁸ V. Vitale,^{40,52} A. P. Waite,³
 E. Wallace,²⁰ P. Wang,³ B. L. Winer,¹⁴ K. S. Wood,² T. Ylinen,^{53,5,13} and M. Ziegler⁴


(Fermi LAT Collaboration)

¹National Research Council Research Associate





Probing the ATIC peak in the cosmic-ray electron spectrum with H.E.S.S.

F. Aharonian^{1,13}, A.G. Akhperjanian², G. Anton¹⁶, U. Barres de Almeida⁸, A.R. Bazer-Bachi³, Y. Becherini¹², B. Behera¹⁴, K. Bernlöhr^{1,5}, A. Bochow¹, C. Boisson⁶, J. Bolmont¹⁹, V. Borrel³, J. Brucker¹⁶, F. Brun¹⁹, P. Brun⁷, R. Bühler¹, T. Bulik²⁴, I. Büsching⁹, T. Boutelier¹⁷, P.M. Chadwick⁸, A. Charbonnier¹⁹, R.C.G. Chaves¹, A. Cheesebrough⁸, L.-M. Chouet¹⁰, A.C. Clapson¹, G. Coignet¹¹, M. Dalton⁵, M.K. Daniel⁸, I.D. Davids^{22,9}, B. Degrange¹⁰, C. Deil¹, H.J. Dickinson⁸, A. Djannati-Atai¹², W. Domainko¹, L.O'C. Drury¹³, F. Dubois¹¹, G. Dubus¹⁷, J. Dyks²⁴, M. Dyrda²⁸, K. Egberts¹, D. Emmanoulopoulos¹⁴, P. Espigat¹², C. Farnier¹⁵, F. Feinstein¹⁵, A. Fiasson¹¹, A. Förster¹, G. Fontaine¹⁰, M. Füßling⁵, S. Gabici¹³, Y.A. Gallant¹⁵, L. Gérard¹², D. Gerbig²¹, B. Giebels¹⁰, J.F. Glicenstein⁷, B. Glück¹⁶, P. Goret⁷, D. Göring¹⁶, D. Hauser¹⁴, M. Hauser¹⁴, S. Heinz¹⁶, G. Heinzlmann⁴, G. Henri¹⁷, G. Hermann¹, J.A. Hinton²⁵, A. Hoffmann¹⁸, W. Hofmann¹, M. Holleran⁹, S. Hoppe¹, D. Horns⁴, A. Jacholkowska¹⁹, O.C. de Jager⁹, C. Jahn¹⁶, I. Jung¹⁶, K. Katarzyński²⁷, U. Katz¹⁶, S. Kaufmann¹⁴, E. Kendziorra¹⁸, M. Kerschhaggl⁵, D. Khangulyan¹, B. Khélifi¹⁰, D. Keogh⁸, W. Kluźniak²⁴, T. Kneiske⁴, Nu. Komin¹⁵, K. Kosack¹, R. Kossakowski¹¹, G. Lamanna¹¹, J.-P. Lenain⁶, T. Lohse⁵, V. Marandon¹², J.M. Martin⁶, O. Martineau-Huynh¹⁹, A. Marcowith¹⁵, J. Masbou¹¹, D. Maurin¹⁹, T.J.L. McComb⁸, M.C. Medina⁶, R. Moderski²⁴, E. Moulin⁷, M. Naumann-Godo¹⁰,



Present situation:



Evidence for a primary component of positrons
(possibly accompanied by electrons)

astrophysical sources? Pulsars, SN remnants...


new Particle Physics? DM annihilation, DM decay.

Dark matter decay


- No fundamental objection to this possibility, provided $\tau_{\text{DM}} > 10^{17}$ s.
- Not as thoroughly studied as the case of the dark matter annihilation.

Possible reason: the most popular dark matter candidates are weakly interacting (can be detected in direct searches and can be produced in colliders). If the dark matter is a WIMP, absolute stability has to be normally imposed.


Sketch of a WIMP dark matter model:



Sketch of a WIMP dark matter model:



Sketch of a WIMP dark matter model:




Supersymmetry

Requires a suppression of the coupling of at least 22 orders of magnitude!

SM

Sketch of a WIMP dark matter model:




Supersymmetry

Simplest solution: forbid the dangerous couplings altogether by imposing exact R-parity conservation. The lightest neutralino is absolutely stable


SM

**WIMP dark matter is not the only possibility:
superweakly interacting**




Roszkowski

Sketch of a superWIMP dark matter model:




SuperWIMP DM particles are naturally very long lived. Their lifetimes can be larger than the age of the Universe, or perhaps a few orders of magnitude smaller.



Beyond the SM

It is enough a moderate suppression of the coupling to make the superWIMP a viable dark matter candidate.

SuperWIMP DM particles are naturally very long lived. Their lifetimes can be larger than the age of the Universe, or perhaps a few orders of magnitude smaller.



Beyond the SM

It is enough a moderate suppression of the coupling to make the superWIMP a viable dark matter candidate.

Eventually the dark matter decays!

Candidates of decaying dark matter

- Gravitinos in general SUSY models
(without imposing R-parity conservation).
Decay rate doubly suppressed by the SUSY breaking scale and by the small R-parity violation. Takayama, Yamaguchi; Buchmüller, et al.; AI, Tran; Ishiwata et al.; Choi et al.
- Hidden sector gauge bosons/gauginos.
Decay rate suppressed by the small kinetic mixing between $U(1)_y$ and $U(1)_{hid}$. Chen, Takahashi, Yanagida; AI, Ringwald, Weniger;
- Right-handed neutrinos/sneutrinos.
Decay rate suppressed by a tiny coupling between left and right sectors. Babu, Eichler, Mohapatra Pospelov, Trott
- Hidden sector particles.
Decay rate suppressed by the GUT scale. Eichler; Arvanitaki et al.; Hamaguchi, Shirai, Yanagida; Arina, Hambye, AI, Weniger
- Bound states of strongly interacting particles.
Decay rate suppressed by the GUT scale. Hamaguchi et al.; Nardi et al

Positron fraction from decaying dark matter: model independent analysis

Possible decay channels

AI, Tran

AI, Tran, Weniger

fermionic DM

$$\Psi \rightarrow Z^0 \nu$$

$$\Psi \rightarrow W^\pm \ell^\mp$$

$$\Psi \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \nu$$

scalar DM


$$\Phi \rightarrow Z^0 Z^0$$

$$\Phi \rightarrow W^+ W^-$$



$$\Phi \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$$

The injection spectrum of positrons depends just on two parameters: the dark matter mass and lifetime.


The positrons travel under the influence of the tangled magnetic field of the Galaxy and lose energy → complicated propagation equation



$$\Psi \rightarrow Z^0 \nu$$




For "low" DM mass: conflict with PAMELA (spectrum too flat)
 For "high" DM mass: agreement with PAMELA, but conflict with H.E.S.S.



$$\Psi \rightarrow e^+ e^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 2000 \text{ GeV}$$


$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$



$$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 3500 \text{ GeV}$$


$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$



$$\Psi \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 5000 \text{ GeV}$$


$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$



$$\Psi \rightarrow e^+ e^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 2000 \text{ GeV}$$


$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$



$$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 3500 \text{ GeV}$$


$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$






$$\Psi \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^- \gamma$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 5000 \text{ GeV}$$



$$\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$$




$m_{\text{DM}} = 2000 \text{ GeV}$
 $\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$



$m_{\text{DM}} = 3500 \text{ GeV}$
 $\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$



$m_{\text{DM}} = 5000 \text{ GeV}$
 $\tau_{\text{DM}} \sim 10^{26} \text{ s}$




Democratic decay

$$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \nu$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 2500 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\tau_{\text{DM}} = 1.5 \times 10^{26} \text{ s}$$





Democratic decay

$$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \nu$$

$$m_{\text{DM}} = 2500 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\tau_{\text{DM}} = 1.5 \times 10^{26} \text{ s}$$



Some decay channels can explain
simultaneously the PAMELA,
 Fermi LAT and H.E.S.S. observations

Decay Channel	M_{DM} [GeV]	τ_{DM} [10^{26} s]
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \nu$	3500	1.1
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \nu$	2500	1.5
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow W^\pm \mu^\mp$	3000	2.1
$\phi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$	2500	1.8
$\phi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$	5000	0.9

10^{26} seconds??

Eichler; Arvanitaki et al.;
Nardi, Sannino, Strumia;
Chen, Takahashi, Yanagida;
Bae, Kyae.

The lifetime of a TeV dark matter particle which decays via a dimension six operator suppressed by M^2 is



$$\tau \sim 2 \times 10^{26} \text{ s} \left(\frac{\text{TeV}}{m_{\text{DM}}} \right)^5 \left(\frac{M}{10^{16} \text{ GeV}} \right)^4$$

M is remarkably close to the Grand Unification Scale ($M_{\text{GUT}} = 2 \times 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$).

Indirect dark matter searches are starting to probe the Grand Unification Scale!

Conclusion so far:

the electron/positron excesses can be naturally explained by the decay of dark matter particles.



Is this the first non-gravitational evidence of dark matter?

“Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence”
Carl Sagan

More tests needed!



Decay Channel	M_{DM} [GeV]	τ_{DM} [10^{26} s]
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \nu$	3500	1.1
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \nu$	2500	1.5
$\psi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow W^\pm \mu^\mp$	3000	2.1
$\phi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$	2500	1.8
$\phi_{\text{DM}} \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$	5000	0.9

No free parameters from Particle Physics

Prediction for the fluxes of:

- Antiprotons
- Gamma rays
- Neutrinos
- Antideuterons

Antiproton flux





Good agreement of the theory with the experiments:
no need for a sizable contribution to the primary antiproton flux. Purely leptonic decays (e.g. $\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \nu$) are favoured over decays into weak gauge bosons.

Antiproton flux from dark matter decay

Propagation mechanism more complicated than for the positrons.

The predicted flux suffers from huge uncertainties due to degeneracies in the determination of the propagation parameters

$$\Psi \rightarrow W^\pm \mu^\mp$$





Antiproton flux from dark matter decay

Propagation mechanism more complicated than for the positrons.

The predicted flux suffers from huge uncertainties due to degeneracies in the determination of the propagation parameters

$$\Psi \rightarrow W^\pm \mu^\mp$$



Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay


The gamma ray flux from dark matter decay has two components:

- Inverse Compton Scattering radiation of electrons/positrons produced in the decay.
- Always smooth spectrum.

- Prompt radiation of gamma rays produced in the decay (final state radiation, pion decay...)
- May contain spectral lines.

e.g. gravitino in SUSY models without R-parity conservation

Buchmüller et al.



Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay


The gamma ray flux from dark matter decay has two components:

- Inverse Compton Scattering radiation of electrons/positrons produced in the decay.
- Always smooth spectrum.

- Prompt radiation of gamma rays produced in the decay (final state radiation, pion decay...)
- May contain spectral lines.

e.g. Hidden vector dark matter

Arina et al.



Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay


The gamma ray flux from dark matter decay has two components:

- Inverse Compton Scattering radiation of electrons/positrons produced in the decay.
- Always smooth spectrum.

- Prompt radiation of gamma rays produced in the decay (final state radiation, pion decay...)
- May contain spectral lines.

e.g. Hidden vector dark matter

Arina et al.



Prompt radiation


$$\frac{dJ}{dE_\gamma}(\Omega) = \frac{dJ_{\text{halo}}}{dE_\gamma}(\Omega) + \frac{dJ_{\text{eg}}}{dE_\gamma}$$

Halo component

- Depends on the dark matter profile. Strong dependence in the direction of the galactic center and mild at high latitudes ($|b| > 10^\circ$)
- Even if the profile is spherically symmetric, the flux at Earth is anisotropic (more later)

Extragalactic component


- Assumed to be isotropic
- It is attenuated at high energies due to scattering with the intergalactic background light.



Stecker et al.



Prompt radiation

$$\frac{dJ}{dE_\gamma}(\Omega) = \frac{dJ_{\text{halo}}}{dE_\gamma}(\Omega) + \frac{dJ_{\text{eg}}}{dE_\gamma}$$



Inverse Compton Scattering radiation


The inverse Compton scattering of electrons/positrons from dark matter decay with the interstellar and extragalactic radiation fields produces gamma rays.




Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514

(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)



$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$




$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \gamma$


Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514

(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)



$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$





$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \gamma$

Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514


(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)




Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514

(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)



$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$




$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \gamma$

- **Crucial test:** the contribution from DM decay to the total flux should not exceed the measured one.


Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514

(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)



$\Psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$




$\Psi \rightarrow l^+ l^- \gamma$

- **Crucial test:** the contribution from DM decay to the **total** flux should not exceed the measured one.
- In some channels, there starts to be a deviation from the power law in the diffuse EG flux at higher energies.


Diffuse gamma ray flux from DM decay

AI, Tran, Weniger
arXiv: 0909.3514

(Data taken from M. Ackermann, talk given at TeV Particle Astrophysics 2009)




$\phi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$




$\phi \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$

More indications for or against the decaying dark matter scenario arise from the **angular distribution** of gamma-rays.

Gamma rays do not diffuse and point directly to the source!




A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.



(but no North-South anisotropy)


A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.

Strategy: 1) For a certain energy, take the map of the **total** diffuse gamma ray flux




A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.

Strategy: 2) Remove the galactic disk



A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.

Strategy: 3) Take the total fluxes coming from the direction of the galactic center (J_{GC}) and the galactic anticenter (J_{AC}).



A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.


Strategy: 4) Calculate the anisotropy, defined as:

$$A(E) = \frac{J_{GC} - J_{GA}}{J_{GC} + J_{GA}}$$

A crucial test: since the Earth is not in the center of the Milky Way halo, the contribution from dark matter decay to the diffuse gamma ray flux is **anisotropic**.

Strategy: 4) Calculate the anisotropy, defined as:





$$A(E) = \frac{J_{GC} - J_{GA}}{J_{GC} + J_{GA}}$$




DM decay prediction:
15-20% at high energies!

"conventional"
diffusive model


The same conclusion holds for all decaying DM scenarios that explain the electron/positron excesses.




Galactic center



Galactic anticenter




Fermi coll.



Neutrino flux


- Difficult to see due to large atmospheric backgrounds.



Covi et al.

Neutrino flux



- Difficult to see due to large atmospheric backgrounds.



Covi et al.

Neutrino flux

- Difficult to see due to large atmospheric backgrounds.
- **But not impossible: it may be observed by IceCube (+ DeepCore)**



Covi et al.

Conclusions


- Some well motivated candidates for dark matter are predicted to decay with very long lifetimes. Their decay products could be detected in indirect search experiments.
- Recent experiments have confirmed the existence of an excess of positrons at energies larger than $\sim 7\text{GeV}$.

Evidence for a primary component:

astrophysics?


particle physics?

- **Decaying dark matter** could explain the electron/positron excesses observed by PAMELA and Fermi. Furthermore, these scenarios make predictions for future gamma-ray and neutrino observations, providing tests for this interpretation of the e^+/e^- excesses




Adriani et al., 1001.3522

PAMELA ELECTRON (e^-) SPECTRUM




From Roberta Sparvoli
Les Rencontres de Physique
de la Vallée d'Aoste 2010

PAMELA ELECTRON (e^-) SPECTRUM




From Roberta Sparvoli
Les Rencontres de Physique
de la Vallée d'Aoste 2010


North hemisphere




South hemisphere



Fermi coll.



Diffuse gamma ray flux



Fermi coll.


For the dominant high-latitude components, bremsstrahlung and π^0 -decay emission from HI and HII in the local Galaxy ($7.5 \text{ kpc} < R < 9.5 \text{ kpc}$) and IC emission, the intensities are fit to the LAT data via scale factors. We use the GALPROP sky maps as templates with the component normalizations per energy bin as fit parameters. The subdo-

TABLE I. Fit results and uncertainties for the EGB and other components for $|b| \geq 10^\circ$.

Energy in GeV	Intensity integrated over energy band ($\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{sr}^{-1}$)								
	0.2–0.4	0.4–0.8	0.8–1.6	1.6–3.2	3.2–6.4	6.4–12.8	12.8–25.6	25.6–51.2	51.2–102.4
Intensity scale factor	$\times 10^{-6}$	$\times 10^{-7}$	$\times 10^{-7}$	$\times 10^{-8}$	$\times 10^{-8}$	$\times 10^{-9}$	$\times 10^{-9}$	$\times 10^{-9}$	$\times 10^{-10}$
EGB	2.4 ± 0.6	9.3 ± 1.8	3.5 ± 0.6	12.7 ± 2.1	5.0 ± 1.0	14.3 ± 4.0	6.3 ± 1.5	2.6 ± 0.7	11.1 ± 2.9
Galactic diffuse (fit)	4.9 ± 0.4	25.9 ± 1.8	12.6 ± 1.3	50.7 ± 7.2	17.0 ± 3.0	50.0 ± 10	17.1 ± 3.6	6.1 ± 1.4	19.1 ± 5.2
Galactic diffuse (model)	5.0	26.0	11.5	43.3	14.7	47.9	15.7	5.2	17.0
IC (fit)	1.5 ± 0.1	6.8 ± 0.5	3.5 ± 0.4	16.1 ± 2.3	6.6 ± 1.2	23.3 ± 4.9	9.3 ± 2.1	3.9 ± 1.0	10.6 ± 3.7
IC (model)	1.2	5.3	2.3	9.7	4.0	16.2	6.3	2.4	8.7
local HI (fit)	2.7 ± 0.2	15.4 ± 1.1	7.4 ± 0.8	28.3 ± 4.0	8.3 ± 1.5	20.6 ± 4.2	5.9 ± 1.2	1.6 ± 0.4	7.0 ± 2.2
local HI (model)	3.1	17.0	7.6	27.6	8.7	26.0	7.7	2.3	6.8
Sources	0.8 ± 0.1	3.8 ± 0.2	1.7 ± 0.1	7.2 ± 0.8	2.7 ± 0.4	9.0 ± 1.3	3.4 ± 0.5	1.5 ± 0.2	6.3 ± 1.0
CR background	1.4 ± 0.6	4.2 ± 1.7	1.0 ± 0.4	2.8 ± 1.2	0.8 ± 0.4	6.3 ± 3.0	1.4 ± 0.8	0.6 ± 0.4	0.9 ± 0.9
Solar	0.1 ± 0.01	0.4 ± 0.04	0.2 ± 0.02	1.0 ± 0.2	0.4 ± 0.2	1.7 ± 0.4	0.7 ± 1.6	0.1 ± 0.04	0.8 ± 0.5
LAT	9.6 ± 0.8	44.0 ± 3.0	18.8 ± 2.0	72.9 ± 10	25.3 ± 4.5	81.3 ± 16	28.3 ± 5.7	10.6 ± 2.1	37.9 ± 7.7
	Foreground modeling related uncertainty in $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{sr}^{-1}$								
HI column density	+0.1/−0.3	+0.1/−1.7	+0.1/−0.9	+0.1/−3.6	+0.1/−1.1	+0.1/−2.4	+0.1/−0.9	+0.1/−0.2	+0.1/−1.1
IC + halo size	+0.1/−0.2	+0.1/−0.8	+0.1/−0.5	+0.1/−1.8	+0.1/−0.5	+0.1/−0.7	+0.3/−0.3	+0.4/−0.1	+2.9/−0.5
CR propagation model	+0.1/−0.3	+0.1/−1.1	+0.1/−0.6	+0.1/−0.8	+0.1/−0.3	+0.1/−1.2	+1.4/−0.1	+0.4/−0.1	+3.0/−0.1
Subregions of $ b > 10^\circ$ sky	+0.2/−0.3	+0.8/−1.5	+0.4/−0.9	+1.9/−2.1	+0.7/−0.5	+2.5/−1.9	+1.0/−1.5	+0.5/−0.3	+2.7/−0.9

Acceleration in nearby sources Blasi, 0903.2794

$\Gamma = 2.4$



Ahlers, Mertsch, Sarkar




FIG. 1: The titanium-to-iron ratio in cosmic rays along with model predictions — the ‘leaky box’ model with production of secondaries during propagation only (dashed line), and including production and acceleration of secondaries in a nearby source (solid line - dotted beyond the validity of our calculation). The data points are from ATIC-2 (triangles) [27] and HEAO-3-C3 (circles) [34].




FIG. 2: The boron-to-carbon ratio in cosmic rays along with model predictions — the ‘leaky box’ model with production of secondaries during propagation only (dashed line), and including production and acceleration of secondaries in a nearby source (solid line). The data points are from HEAO-3-C2 (circles) [31], ATIC-2 (triangles) [35] and CREAM (squares) [36].

Mertsch, Sarkar