Coalescence afterburner for antinuclei production in hadronic collisions with input from PYTHIA8



F. Bellini^{1,2}, M. Di Mauro³, S. Tripathy² ¹University of Bologna; ²INFN, Bologna; ³INFN, Torino



1. Cosmic antinuclei as smoking guns for dark matter



Indirect searches for dark matter with space-based experiments^[1] look for Standard Model particles (e.g. e^+ , \overline{p}) coming from the annihilation of dark matter WIMPs in the Galactic halo.

The detection of cosmic antideuterons (\overline{d}) and antihelium nuclei (${}^{3}\overline{He}$, ${}^{4}\overline{He}$) is a promising smoking gun signature^[2] because of the low background coming from secondary cosmic rays (CR), i.e. from hadronic interactions of primary CR with the interstellar matter (pp, p-He...) in the Galaxy.

One key ingredient for the prediction of signal and background rates is the modelling of the formation mechanism^[3] of antimatter clusters.

Antinuclei formation via coalescence of antinucleons, constrained by measurements at the LHC.

 \rightarrow Implementation of an afterburner to to produce antideuterons using PYTHIA8.3 event generator input



2. From antinucleons to antinuclei

2.1 Antinucleons from PYTHIA8.3 tuned to LHC data

GALACTIC PROPAGATION

PYTHIA8.3^[4] is tuned to reproduce the p_T distributions of p and \overline{p} measured by ALICE in inelastic pp collisions at LHC energies^[5,6].

This choice is driven by the



ALICE, p+ \overline{p} , pp $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV

- Pythia8: p+p

- Pythia8: p

– Pythia8: 🗖

3. Results from the afterburner

3.1 Antideuterons from prompt nucleons

The antideuteron spectra are obtained for various \sqrt{s} and compared to data:

p_T shape described

(*//c*)_

sensitivity to different \overline{d} wave functions (bands: single-Gaussian, double-Gaussian fitted to realistic Hulthén wave-function^[9])

> pp $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, |y| < 0.5Pythia8: Wigner (WF: Single Gaussian)



availability of precise and copious antideuteron data from ALICE, not available at the energies mostly relevant for cosmic rays, √s ~ 10-25 GeV.

In PYTHIA, $p(\overline{p})$ and $n(\overline{n})$ are produced in the same amount and with the same p_T -distributions.



The formation of a \overline{d} by coalescence is the result of final state interactions^[7,8] between a \overline{p} and a \overline{n} .

The coalescence probability is given by the overlap of the nucleus and the nucleon wave functions and depends on the momentum



p₋ (GeV/*c*)

р_т (GeV/*c*)



3.2 Comparison to "simple coalescence"

The Wigner approach results in a more accurate description of the $p_{\rm T}$ spectrum shape than obtained with the simplest coalescence condition

 $|\overrightarrow{p_n} - \overrightarrow{p_p}| < p_0$ with p_0 extracted from ALICE data^[5].





4. Conclusions and next steps

- the size of the nucleon source
- the nucleus wavefunction

We compute this probability, w, event by event and for each possible $(\overline{p}, \overline{n})$ pair following the approach in [9]

E.g. For a \overline{d} single-Gaussian wf.

 $q = |\overrightarrow{p_n} - \overrightarrow{p_p}|/2,$ d = RMS charge radius of \overline{d} = 3.2 fm σ = source size (fixed) = 0.84 fm (Realistic? Unmeasured!)

w = 3

Acknowledaments

F.B. has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement No. 950692. M.D.M. has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 754496.





Cosmic**AntiNuclei**

The current implementation, for prompt antinucleons, is **promising** and the **development** will continue to address

Coalescence from non-prompt (resonances) antinucleons Source size from generator and/or constrained on data • Predictions of \overline{d} yield at low collision energy

References

erc

[1] P. von Doentichem et al., JCAP08(2020)035 [2] M. Korsmeier et al., PRD 97 (2018) 103011 [3] K. Blum et al., PRD 96,103021 (2017) [4] J. Christiansen et. al., JHEP 08 (2015) 003 [5] ALICE Coll., PRC 97 (2018) 024615

[6] ALICE Coll., EPJC 80 (2020) 889 [7] K. Blum et al., PRC 99, 044913 (2019) [8] K. Blum et al., PRC 103, 014907 (2021) [9] M. Kachelriess et al., EPJA 56:4 (2020)



