10 March 2016 La Thuile 2016, "Les rencontres de physique de la Vallée d'Aoste"

# Indirect Detection of Minimal Dark Matter

### Paolo Panci

based on: E. Del Nobile, M. Nardecchia, P. Panci, Submitted to JCAP [arXiv: 1512.05353]

and on: M. Cirelli, T. Hambye, P. Panci, F. Sala, M. Taoso Published in JCAP 1510 (2015) 10, **026** [arXiv: 1507.05519]







### Plan of the Talk

#### Critical review of t

MDM: Well motivated model

 $\gamma$ 

 $e^{\pm}$ 



We compute  $b(E, \vec{x})$  by The profile of the magnetic field in the Galaxy is very uncertain and we adopt the conventional one

Figure 3: Comparison between spectra with (continuous lines) and without EW corr. $H(F_B^{-2}) = B_0 \exp[-(r - r_{\infty})/r_B - |z|/z_B]$  ((abach)). We show the following final states:  $e^+$  (green)  $e_0 (bw_{22})$  (with  $h_0^{-1} b_0^{-1} b_0^{-2} b_0^{-2} 4.78 \ \mu$ G,  $r_B = 10 \ \text{kpc}$  and  $z_B = 2 \ \text{kpc}$ . With these choice (label)

the dominant energy losses are due to ICS everywhere, except in the region of the Galactic Center and for high  $e^{\pm}$  energies, in which case synchrotron losses dominate. All in all, the  $b(E, \vec{x})$  function that we obtain is sampled in fig. 5 and given in numerical form on the weissite [20]. In the figure, one sees the  $E^2$  behaviour at low energies changing into a softer dependence as the energy increases (the transition happens earlier at the GC, where starlight is more abundant, and later at the periphery of the Galaxy, where CMB is the dominant background). At the GC, it eventually re-settles onto a  $E^2$  slope at very high energies, where synchrotron losses dominate.

The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, since the distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes throughout the galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. they would have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the galactic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-

20



We compute  $b(E, \vec{x})$  by The profile of the magnetic field in the Galaxy is very uncertained and we adopt the conventional one

2. Comparison between spectra with (continuous lines) and without EW correll(Im<sup>2</sup>) = B<sub>0</sub> exp[-(r - r<sub>0</sub>)/r<sub>B</sub> - |z|/z<sub>B</sub>]
(a) We show the following final states:
(b) We show the following final states:
(a) We show the following final states:
(a) We show the following final states:
(b) We show the following final states:
(b) We show the following final states:
(c) We show the following final states:<

Center and for high  $e^{\pm}$  energies, in which case synchrotron losses dominate. All in all, the  $b(E, \vec{x})$  function that we obtain is sampled in fig. and given in numerical form on the website [29]. In the figure, one sees the  $E^2$  behaviour at low energies changing into a softer dependence as the energy increases (the transition happens earlier at the GC, where starlight is more abundant, and later at the periphery of the Galaxy, where CMB is the dominant background). At the GC, it eventually re-settles onto a  $E^2$  slope at very high energies, where synchrotron losses dominate.

The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, since he distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes throughout he galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. they would have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the galactic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-



We compute  $b(E, \vec{x})$  by The profile of the magnetic field in the Galaxy is very uncertain and we adopt the conventional one

### Dark Side: Overview

Precise measurements on CMB, BBN, LSS, etc...





Planck reveals an almost perfect Universe

$$\begin{split} \Omega_{tot} &= \Omega_{\Lambda} + \Omega_{M} + \Omega_{Rad} \simeq 1 & \Omega_{M} = \Omega_{b} + \Omega_{DM} \\ \Omega_{Rad} &\sim 10^{-5} & \Omega_{\Lambda} \simeq 0.68 \\ \Omega_{b} &\simeq 0.05 & \Omega_{DM} \simeq 0.27 \end{split}$$

Dark Sector:  $\Omega_{\rm DM} + \Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.95$ 

### DM Open Questions

There are compelling and strong evidences of *non-baryonic matter* in the Universe; from galactic to cosmological scale



### **BUT** !!



Stability may be explained in terms of symmetries

#### Stability may be explained in terms of symmetries



#### Stability may be explained in terms of symmetries

Stability via accidental symmetries (Elegant & Robust)

**Accidental symmetries:** gift of the specific matter content of the model

Gal edge z = 15 kp

stipp of the state of the stat

galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. the ild have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the actic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-

10<sup>2</sup>

e<sup>±</sup> energy E [GeV]

 $e^{\pm}$  energy E [GeV]

**This mechanism already exist in nature**: **B** & L conservation in the SM

e<sup>±</sup> energy E [GeV]

e<sup>±</sup> energy E [GeV]

Every ilass conflicient

of the Earth along the coordinate z

 $e^{\pm}$ 

 $e^{\pm}\gamma$ 

ii)

#### Stability may be explained in terms of symmetries



Stability may be explained in terms of symmetries



### MDM Candidates

#### DM Stability via accidental symmetries: "Minimal Dark Matter", Nucl.Phys.B753 (2006), 178-194

#### Minimal Dark Matter Candidates with Y=0



### MDM Candidates

#### DM Stability via accidental symmetries: "Minimal Dark Matter", Nucl. Phys. B753 (2006), 178-194

#### Minimal Dark Matter Candidates with Y=0



The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, si as distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes through

**MDM candidates with Y = \varepsilon:** 

"Millicharge or decay: A critical take on Minimal Dark Matter", arXiv: 1512.05353

*New class of MDM candidates with Y=ε* 

#### **Results:**

The Requirement Y=0 is not mandatory

multiplets must be odd under SU(2) To avoid tree-level coupling with Z

**MDM candidates with Y = \varepsilon:** 

"Millicharge or decay: A critical take on Minimal Dark Matter", arXiv: 1512.05353

#### New class of MDM candidates with $Y = \varepsilon$

#### **Results:**

#### The Requirement Y=0 is not mandatory

multiplets must be odd under SU(2) To avoid tree-level coupling with Z

### But!!

they can have a small millicharge (Y=ε)

#### Bounds on the millicharge



**MDM candidates with Y=ε:** 

"Millicharge or decay: A critical take on Minimal Dark Matter", arXiv: 1512.05353

#### *New class of MDM candidates with Y=ε*

#### **Results:**



Left panel: at several locations along the galactic radial coordinate r, right panel: above (or below)

**MDM candidates with Y=ε:** 

"Millicharge or decay: A critical take on Minimal Dark Matter", arXiv: 1512.05353

#### New class of MDM candidates with $Y = \varepsilon$

#### **Results:**



### MDM Candidates

#### Minimal Dark Matter Candidates: Summary



### Relic Density (Y=0)





#### **Bottom Line:** One can have very heavy thermally produced WIMPs

DM mass in TeV

10

5

0.00

Dirac

15

20

"Millicharge

25



### MDM 5plet at Colliders

#### production at colliders



#### MO HOPE to read

 $e^{\pm}$ 

The series of th

becautory, espectationary and a second second state of the second secon

We compute  $b(E, \vec{x})$  by The profile of the magnetic field in the Galaxy is very uncertain and we adopt the conventional one

Figure 3: Comparison between spectra with (continuous lines) and without EW corrections  $z = B_0 \exp[-(r - r_{\odot})/r_B - |z|/z_B]$ (defed) We show the following final states  $z = (r_{\odot})/r_B - |z|/z_B$ 

(black).

as given im [164]. (with  $\hat{B}_{0}^{(\nu)}$ ] 4.78  $\mu$ G,  $r_{B} = 10$  kpc and  $z_{B} = 2$  kpc. With these choices, the dominant energy losses are due to ICS everywhere, except in the region of the Galactic Center and for high  $e^{\pm}$  energies, in which case synchrotron losses dominate. All in all, the  $b(E, \vec{x})$  function that we obtain is sampled in fig. and given in numerical form on the website [29]. In the figure, one sees the  $E^{2}$  behaviour at low energies changing into a softer dependence as the energy increases (the transition happens earlier at the GC, where starlight is more abundant, and later at the periphery of the Galaxy, where CMB is the dominant background). At the GC, it eventually re-settles onto a  $E^{2}$  slope at very high energies, where synchrotron losses dominate.

The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, since the distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes throughout the galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. they would have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the galactic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-

ass of 9.4 TeV with a 100 TeV collider)

See e.g.: arXiv: 1407.7058

- EW multiplets at colliders

### **Direct Detection**



### Indirect Detection



- Constraints from the observations of the Gal. center by H.E.S.S.
- Only available constraint from the observation of Segue 1 by MAGIC

based on: M. Cirelli, T. Hambye, P. Panci, F. Sala, M. Taoso, JCAP 1510 (2015) 10, **026** similar work: C. Garcia-Cely, A. Ibarra, A.S. Lamperstorfer, M.H.G. Tytgat, [arXiv:1507.05536]

### XS Predictions



We compute  $b(E, \vec{x})$  by The profile of the magnetic field in the Galaxy is very uncertain and we adopt the conventional one

gure 3: Comparison between spectra with (continuous lines) and without EW correlations  $z = B_0 \exp[-(r - r_{\odot})/r_B - |z|/z_B]$ ashed). We show the following final states:  $e^+$  (green),  $p_i(bloc) = 0$  ( $r_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} r_{ij} \frac{1}{2} \frac$ 

as given in [108], with  $B_0 = 4.78 \ \mu$ G,  $r_B = 10$  kpc and  $z_B = 2$  kpc. With these choices, the dominant energy losses are due to ICS everywhere, except in the region of the Galactic Center and for high  $e^\pm$  energies, in which case synchrotron losses dominate. All in all, the  $b(E, \vec{x})$  function that we obtain is sampled in fig. 5 and given in numerical form on the weighter [20]. In the figure, one sees the  $E^2$  behaviour at low energies changing into a softer dependence as the energy increases (the transition happens earlier at the GC, where starlight is more abundant, and later at the periphery of the Galaxy, where CMB is the dominant background). At the GC, it eventually re-settles onto a  $E^2$  slope at very high

The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, since the distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes throughout the galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. they would have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the galactic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-

20

### XS Predictions



### XS Predictions



### y Continuum: Fermi

#### Constraints from the measurement of the Gal. diffuse emission



### y Continuum: Fermi

#### Constraints from the measurement of the Gal. diffuse emission



### y Continuum: Fermi

#### Constraints from the measurement of the Gal. diffuse emission



### y Continuum: dSphs

#### dSph galaxies are probably the cleanest laboratory for looking at DM signals

- high Dark Matter content

this is why they are good target !!

- low stellar foreground emission

## y Continuum: dSphs

dSph galaxies are probably the cleanest laboratory for looking at DM signals

- high Dark Matter content
- low stellar foreground emission



this is why they are good target !!



Fermi: staking analysis of 15 dSphs HESS: a subset of 4 dSphs + Sagittarius MAGIC: only Segue 1

## y Continuum: dSphs

dSph galaxies are probably the cleanest laboratory for looking at DM signals

- high Dark Matter content
- low stellar foreground emission



this is why they are good target !!



Fermi: staking analysis of 15 dSphs HESS: a subset of 4 dSphs + Sagittarius MAGIC: only Segue 1



#### Bonnivard et al 1504.02048

The *J*-factors & statistical errors in Bonnivard et al. are quite different with respect to those used by the exp. collaborations

### y lines: GC & dSphs

The MDM 5plet has large cross sections into  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $\gamma$ Z

### y lines: GC & dSphs

The MDM 5plet has large cross sections into  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $\gamma$ Z



**HESS:** 112h observations of the GC **Fermi:** threshold below  $M_{\chi}$ -> No bound

HESS Bound: from a RoI with an aperture of 0.1° -> Large uncertainties

### y lines: GC & dSphs

The MDM 5plet has large cross sections into  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $\gamma$ Z



HESS Bound: from a Rol with an aperture of 0.1° -> Large uncertainties MAGIC bound: only available bound, but from Segue 1 -> wrong *J*-factor

- quantify the statistical & systematical errors in the determination of J
- point the currently operating & upcoming IACTs towards the best dSph

### 100h CTA sensitivity: dSphs

EW Multiplets have large cross sections into  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $\gamma Z$ 



<u>Bottom Line</u>: with 100h of observations by CTA towards Reticulum II the parameter space of well motivated EW multiplets can be probed based on: V. Lefranc, E. Moulin, P. Panci, F. Sala, J. Silk, in preparation

### Critical review of

The scalar eptaplet is no longer a good

 $\gamma$ 

 $e^{\pm}$ 



ork

it decays very quickly due to 5 dim. operator



the  $b(E, \vec{x})$  function that we obtain is sampled in fig. 5 and given in numerical form o the website [29]. In the figure, one sees the  $E^2$  behaviour at low energies changing into softer dependence as the energy increases (the transition happens earlier at the GC, when starlight is more abundant, and later at the periphery of the Galaxy, where CMB is th dominant background). At the GC, it eventually re-settles onto a  $E^2$  slope at very hig energies, where synchrotron losses dominate.

The diffusion coefficient function  $\mathcal{K}$  is also in principle dependent on the position, since the distribution of the diffusive inhomogeneities of the magnetic field changes throughout the galactic halo. However, a detailed mapping of such variations is prohibitive: e.g. they would have different features inside/outside the galactic arms as well as inside/outside the galactic disk, so that they would depend very much on poorly known local galactic geogra-



