DAMA results at
Gran Sasso underground lab

P. Belli

INFN-Roma Tor Vergata

Relic DM particles from primordial Universe

SUSY
(as neutralino or sneutrino
in various scenarios)

axion-like (light pseudoscalar
and scalar candidate)

the sneutrino in the Smith
and Weiner scenario

self-interacting dark matter

sterile ν

mirror dark matter

Kaluza-Klein particles (LKK)

electron interacting dark matter

a heavy ν of the 4-th family

heavy exotic canditates, as
"4th family atoms", ...

even a suitable particle not
yet foreseen by theories

Elementary Black holes,
Planckian objects, Daemons

invisible axions, ν's

etc...

What accelerators can do:
to demostrate the existence of
some of the possible DM candidates

What accelerators cannot do:
to credit that a certain particle is the
Dark Matter solution or the "single"
Dark Matter particle solution...

+ DM candidates and scenarios exist (even for neutralino
candidate) on which accelerators cannot give any information

DM direct detection method using a model
independent approach and a low-background
widely-sensitive target material

Some direct detection processes:

- Scatterings on nuclei
  - → detection of nuclear recoil energy

  DMp'
  Ionization: Ge, Si
  Bolometer: TeO_2, Ge, $CaWO_4$, ...
  DMp
  N
  Scintillation: NaI(Tl), LXe, CaF_2(Eu), ...

- Inelastic Dark Matter: **W + N → W* + N**
  - → W has 2 mass states χ^+, χ^- with δ mass splitting
 - → Kinematical constraint for the inelastic scattering of χ^- on a nucleus

  $$\frac{1}{2}\mu v^2 \geq \delta \Leftrightarrow v \geq v_{thr} = \sqrt{\frac{2\delta}{\mu}}$$

- Excitation of bound electrons in scatterings on nuclei
 - → detection of recoil nuclei + e.m. radiation

- Conversion of particle into e.m. radiation
  - → detection of γ, X-rays, e^-

  a
  X-ray
  γ
  e^-

- Interaction only on atomic electrons
  - → detection of e.m. radiation

  DMp
  e^-
 ... even WIMPs

- Interaction of light DMp (LDM) on e^- or nucleus with production of a lighter particle
  - → detection of electron/nucleus recoil energy

  e.g. sterile ν

  k_μ ν_H k'_μ
  ν_L
  p_μ T T p'_μ

e.g. signals from these candidates are **completely lost** in experiments based on "rejection procedures" of the e.m. component of their rate

... also other ideas ...

- **... and more**

The annual modulation: a model independent signature for the investigation of DM particles component in the galactic halo

With the present technology, the annual modulation is the main model independent signature for the DM signal. Although the modulation effect is expected to be relatively small a suitable large-mass, low-radioactive set-up with an efficient control of the running conditions can point out its presence.

Requirements of the annual modulation

1) Modulated rate according cosine

2) In a definite low energy range

3) With a proper period (1 year)

4) With proper phase (about 2 June)

5) Just for single hit events in a multi-detector set-up

6) With modulation amplitude in the region of maximal sensitivity must be <7% for usually adopted halo distributions, but it can be larger in case of some possible scenarios

Drukier, Freese, Spergel PRD86; Freese et al. PRD88

30 km/s   December

SUN

~232 km/s

30 km/s

60°

June   30 km/s

- $v_{sun} \sim 232$ km/s (Sun vel in the halo)

- $v_{orb} = 30$ km/s (Earth vel around the Sun)

- $\gamma = \pi/3$, $\omega = 2\pi/T$, $T = 1$ year

- $t_0 = 2^{nd}$ June (when $v_\oplus$ is maximum)

$$v_\oplus(t) = v_{sun} + v_{orb} \cos\gamma\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$$

$$S_k[\eta(t)] = \int_{\Delta E_k} \frac{dR}{dE_R} dE_R \cong S_{0,k} + S_{m,k} \cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$$

the DM annual modulation signature has a different origin and peculiarities (e.g. the phase) than those effects correlated with the seasons

To mimic this signature, spurious effects and side reactions must not only - obviously - be able to account for the whole observed modulation amplitude, but also to satisfy contemporaneously all the requirements

Roma2,Roma1,LNGS,IHEP/Beijing

+ by-products and small scale expts.: INR-Kiev
+ in some studies on ββ decays (DST-MAE project): IIT – Ropar, India

DAMA: an observatory for rare processes @LNGS

DAMA/CRYS

DAMA/R&D

DAMA/LXe

DAMA/Ge

DAMA/NaI

DAMA/LIBRA

http://people.roma2.infn.it/dama

# The pioneer DAMA/NaI: ≈100 kg highly radiopure NaI(Tl)

Results on rare processes:

- **Possible Pauli exclusion principle violation**   **PLB408(1997)439**
- **CNC processes**   **PRC60(1999)065501**
- **Electron stability and non-paulian transitions in Iodine atoms (by L-shell)**   **PLB460(1999)235**
- **Search for solar axions**   **PLB515(2001)6**
- **Exotic Matter search**   **EPJdirect C14(2002)1**
- **Search for superdense nuclear matter**   **EPJA23(2005)7**
- **Search for heavy clusters decays**   **EPJA24(2005)51**

data taking completed on July 2002, last data release 2003. Still producing results

Results on DM particles:

- PSD   **PLB389(1996)757**
- Investigation on diurnal effect   **N.Cim.A112(1999)1541**
- Exotic Dark Matter search   **PRL83(1999)4918**
- Annual Modulation Signature

PLB424(1998)195, PLB450(1999)448, PRD61(1999)023512, PLB480(2000)23, EPJC18(2000)283, PLB509(2001)197, EPJC23(2002)61, PRD66(2002)043503, Riv.N.Cim.26 n.1 (2003)1, IJMPD13(2004)2127, IJMPA21(2006)1445, EPJC47(2006)263, IJMPA22(2007)3155, EPJC53(2008)205, PRD77(2008)023506, MPLA23(2008)2125.

**model independent evidence of a particle DM component in the galactic halo at 6.3σ C.L.**

total exposure (7 annual cycles)   0.29 ton×yr

The DAMA/LIBRA set-up ~250 kg NaI(Tl) (Large sodium **I**odide **B**ulk for **RA**re processes)

As a result of a 2nd generation R&D for more radiopure NaI(Tl) by exploiting new chemical/physical radiopurification techniques (all operations involving - including photos - in HP Nitrogen atmosphere)

Residual contaminations in the new DAMA/LIBRA NaI(Tl) detectors: ^{232}Th, ^{238}U and ^{40}K at level of 10^{-12} g/g

➢ Radiopurity, performances, procedures, etc.: NIMA592(2008)297, JINST 7 (2012) 03009
➢ Results on DM particles, Annual Modulation Signature: EPJC56(2008)333, EPJC67(2010)39, EPJC73(2013)2648. Related results: PRD84(2011)055014, EPJC72(2012)2064, IJMPA28(2013)1330022
➢ Results on rare processes: PEP violation: EPJC62(2009)327; CNC in I: EPJC72(2012)1920; IPP in ^{241}Am decay: EPJA49(2013)64

DAMA/LIBRA calibrations

Low energy: various external gamma sources (^{241}Am, ^{133}Ba) and internal X-rays or gamma's (^{40}K, ^{125}I, ^{129}I), routine calibrations with ^{241}Am


$$\frac{\sigma_{LE}}{E} = \frac{(0.448 \pm 0.035)}{\sqrt{E(keV)}} + (9.1 \pm 5.1) \cdot 10^{-3}$$

High energy: external sources of gamma rays (e.g. ^{137}Cs, ^{60}Co and ^{133}Ba) and gamma rays of 1461 keV due to ^{40}K decays in an adjacent detector, tagged by the 3.2 keV X-rays


The signals (unlike low energy events) for high energy events are taken only from one PMT

$$\frac{\sigma_{HE}}{E} = \frac{(1.12 \pm 0.06)}{\sqrt{E(keV)}} + (17 \pm 23) \cdot 10^{-4}$$

The curves superimposed to the experimental data have been obtained by simulations

Thus, here and hereafter keV means keV electron equivalent

Complete DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

	Period	Mass (kg)	Exposure (kg×day)	$(\alpha - \beta^2)$
DAMA/LIBRA-1	Sept. 9, 2003 - July 21, 2004	232.8	51405	0.562
DAMA/LIBRA-2	July 21, 2004 - Oct. 28, 2005	232.8	52597	0.467
DAMA/LIBRA-3	Oct. 28, 2005 - July 18, 2006	232.8	39445	0.591
DAMA/LIBRA-4	July 19, 2006 - July 17, 2007	232.8	49377	0.541
DAMA/LIBRA-5	July 17, 2007 - Aug. 29, 2008	232.8	66105	0.468
DAMA/LIBRA-6	Nov. 12, 2008 - Sept. 1, 2009	242.5	58768	0.519
DAMA/LIBRA-7	Sep. 1, 2009 - Sept. 8, 2010	242.5	62098	0.515
DAMA/LIBRA–phase1	Sept. 9, 2003 - Sept. 8, 2010		$379795 \simeq 1.04$ ton×yr	0.518
DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA–phase1:			1.33 ton×yr	

a ton × yr experiment? done

- EPJC56(2008)333
- EPJC67(2010)39
- EPJC73(2013)2648

- calibrations: ≈96 M events from sources
- acceptance window eff: 95 M events (≈3.5 M events/keV)

- **First upgrade on Sept 2008:**
  - replacement of some PMTs in HP N_2 atmosphere
  - restore 1 detector to operation
  - new Digitizers installed (U1063A Acqiris 1GS/s 8-bit High-Speed cPCI)
  - new DAQ system with optical read-out installed

START of DAMA/LIBRA – phase 2
- **Second upgrade on Oct./Nov. 2010**
- ✧ Replacement of all the PMTs with higher Q.E. ones from dedicated developments
- ✧ Goal: lowering the software energy threshold

Fall 2012: new preamplifiers installed + special trigger modules. Other new components in the electronic chain in development

... continuously running

Model Independent DM Annual Modulation Result

experimental residuals of the single-hit scintillation events rate vs time and energy

DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1   Total exposure: 487526 kg×day = 1.33 ton×yr

$A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$;
continuous lines: t_0 = 152.5 d, T = 1.00 y

2-4 keV
A=(0.0179±0.0020) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 87.1/86   **9.0 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=169/87 ⇒ P(A=0) = 3.7×10^{-7}

2-5 keV
A=(0.0135±0.0015) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 68.2/86   **9.0 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=152/87 ⇒ P(A=0) = 2.2×10^{-5}

2-6 keV
A=(0.0110±0.0012) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 70.4/86   **9.2 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=154/87 ⇒ P(A=0) = 1.3×10^{-5}

The data favor the presence of a modulated behavior with proper features at 9.2σ C.L.

Model Independent DM Annual Modulation Result

experimental residuals of the single-hit scintillation events rate vs time and energy

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

Fit on DAMA/LIBRA-phase1(1.04 ton × yr)

2-4 keV

2-5 keV

2-6 keV

$A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$;
continuous lines: $t_0 = 152.5$ d, T = 1.00 y

2-4 keV
A=(0.0167±0.0022) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 52.3/49   **7.6 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=111.2/50 $\Rightarrow$ P(A=0) =1.5×10^{-6}

2-5 keV
A=(0.0122±0.0016) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 41.4/49   **7.6 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=98.5/50 $\Rightarrow$ P(A=0) = 5.2×10^{-5}

2-6 keV
A=(0.0096±0.0013) cpd/kg/keV
χ^2/dof = 29.3/49   **7.4 σ C.L.**
Absence of modulation? No
χ^2/dof=83.1/50 $\Rightarrow$ P(A=0) = 2.2×10^{-3}

The data of DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 favor the presence of a modulated behavior with proper features at 9.2σ C.L.

DAMA/NaI & DAMA/LIBRA experiments main upgrades and improvements

PHASE2

Minimal upgrade in Fall

July 2000 new DAQ and new electronic chain installed (MULTIPLEXER removed, now one TD channel for each detector):
(i)   TD VXI Tektronix;
(ii)   Digital Unix DAQ system;
(iii)   GPIB-CAMAC.

July 2002 DAMA/NaI data taking completed

On 2003 DAMA/LIBRA has begun first operations

Sept.-Oct. 2008 – DAMA/LIBRA upgrade:
① one detector recovered by replacing a broken PMT
② a new optimization of some PMTs and HVs performed
③ all the TD replaced with new ones (U1063A Acqiris 8-bit 1GS/s DC270 High-Speed cPCI Digitizers)
④ a new DAQ with optical read-out installed.

The second DAMA/LIBRA upgrade in Fall 2010:
Replacement of all the PMTs with higher Q.E. ones from dedicated developments
(+new preamp in Fall 2012 and other developments in progress)
DAMA/LIBRA-phase2 *in data taking*

# Modulation amplitudes (A), period (T) and phase (t_0) measured in DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

DAMA/NaI (0.29 ton x yr) + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 (1.04 ton x yr)

total exposure: 487526 kg×day = 1.33 ton×yr

$$A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$$

	A(cpd/kg/keV)	T=$2\pi/\omega$ (yr)	t_0 (day)	C.L.
DAMA/NaI+DAMA/LIBRA-phase1				
(2-4) keV	0.0190 ±0.0020	0.996 ±0.0002	134 ± 6	9.5σ
(2-5) keV	0.0140 ±0.0015	0.996 ±0.0002	140 ± 6	9.3σ
(2-6) keV	0.0112 ±0.0012	0.998 ±0.0002	144 ± 7	9.3σ

χ^2 **test** (χ^2 = 9.5, 13.8 and 10.8 over 13 *d.o.f.* for the three energy intervals, respectively; upper tail probability 73%, 39%, 63%) and *run test* (lower tail probabilities of 41%, 29% and 23% for the three energy intervals, respectively) accept at 90% C.L. the hypothesis that the modulation amplitudes are normally fluctuating around their best fit values.

Compatibility among the annual cycles

Power spectrum of single-hit residuals

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 (7 years)
total exposure: 1.33 ton×yr

Principal mode in the 2-6 keV region:
2.737×10^{-3} d^{-1} ≈ 1 yr^{-1}

Not present in the 6-14 keV region (only aliasing peaks)

The Lomb-Scargle periodogram, as reported in DAMA papers, always according to Ap.J. 263 (1982) 835, Ap.J. 338 (1989) 277 with the treatment of the experimental errors and of the time binning:

Given a set of data values r_i, $i = 1, \ldots N$ at respective observation times t_i, the Lomb-Scargle periodogram is:

$$P_N(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\{ \frac{\left[\sum_i (r_i - \bar{r}) \cos\omega(t_i - \tau) \right]^2}{\sum_i \cos^2 \omega(t_i - \tau)} + \frac{\left[\sum_i (r_i - \bar{r}) \sin\omega(t_i - \tau) \right]^2}{\sum_i \sin^2 \omega(t_i - \tau)} \right\}$$

where: $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_1^N r_i \qquad \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_1^N (r_i - \bar{r})^2$

and, for each angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f > 0$ of interest, the time-offset τ is:

$$\tan(2\omega\tau) = \frac{\sum_i \sin(2\omega t_i)}{\sum_i \cos(2\omega t_i)}$$

In order to take into account the different time binning and the residuals' errors we have to rewrite the previous formulae replacing:

$$\sum_i \quad \rightarrow \quad \sum_i \frac{\frac{N}{\Delta r_i^2}}{\sum_j \frac{1}{\Delta r_j^2}} = \frac{N}{\sum_j \frac{1}{\Delta r_j^2}} \cdot \sum_i \frac{1}{\Delta r_i^2}$$

$$\sin\omega t_i \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2\Delta t_i} \int_{t_i - \Delta t_i}^{t_i + \Delta t_i} \sin\omega t \, dt$$

$$\cos\omega t_i \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2\Delta t_i} \int_{t_i - \Delta t_i}^{t_i + \Delta t_i} \cos\omega t \, dt$$

The Nyquist frequency is ≈3 y^{-1} (≈0.008 d^{-1}); meaningless higher frequencies, washed off by the integration over the time binning.

Clear annual modulation is evident in (2-6) keV, while it is absent just above 6 keV

Rate behaviour above 6 keV

- **No Modulation above 6 keV**

6-14 keV

A=(0.3±0.8) 10⁻³ cpd/kg/keV

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

Residuals (cpd/kg/keV) vs Time (day)

Mod. Ampl. (6-10 keV): cpd/kg/keV
(0.0016 ± 0.0031) DAMA/LIBRA-1
$-(0.0010 \pm 0.0034)$ DAMA/LIBRA-2
$-(0.0001 \pm 0.0031)$ DAMA/LIBRA-3
$-(0.0006 \pm 0.0029)$ DAMA/LIBRA-4
$-(0.0021 \pm 0.0026)$ DAMA/LIBRA-5
(0.0029 ± 0.0025) DAMA/LIBRA-6
$-(0.0023 \pm 0.0024)$ DAMA/LIBRA-7
→ statistically consistent with zero

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

frequency vs $(R_{90} - \langle R_{90}\rangle)/\langle R_{90}\rangle$

σ ≈ 1%, fully accounted by statistical considerations

- **No modulation in the whole energy spectrum:**
  studying integral rate at higher energy, R_{90}

- R_{90} percentage variations with respect to their mean values for single crystal in the DAMA/LIBRA running periods

- Fitting the behaviour with time, adding a term modulated with period and phase as expected for DM particles:

  consistent with zero

Period	Mod. Ampl.
DAMA/LIBRA-1	-(0.05±0.19) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-2	-(0.12±0.19) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-3	-(0.13±0.18) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-4	(0.15±0.17) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-5	(0.20±0.18) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-6	-(0.20±0.16) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-7	-(0.28±0.18) cpd/kg

+ if a modulation present in the whole energy spectrum at the level found in the lowest energy region → R_{90} ~ tens cpd/kg → ~ 100 σ far away

**No modulation above 6 keV
This accounts for all sources of bckg and is consistent
with the studies on the various components**

Multiple-hits events in the region of the signal

- Each detector has its own TDs read-out → pulse profiles of *multiple-hits* events (multiplicity > 1) acquired (exposure: 1.04 ton×yr).

- The same hardware and software procedures as those followed for *single-hit* events

signals by Dark Matter particles do not belong to *multiple-hits* events, that is:

multiple-hits events = Dark Matter particles events "switched off"

Evidence of annual modulation with proper features as required by the DM annual modulation signature:
- present in the **single-hit** residuals
- absent in the **multiple-hits** residual

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

A = -(0.0012 ± 0.0006) cpd/kg/keV (2-4 keV)

A = -(0.0008 ± 0.0005) cpd/kg/keV (2-5 keV)

A = -(0.0005 ± 0.0004) cpd/kg/keV (2-6 keV)

This result offers an additional strong support for the presence of Dark Matter particles in the galactic halo, further excluding any side effect either from hardware or from software procedures or from background

Energy distribution of the modulation amplitudes

$$R(t) = S_0 + S_m \cos\left[\omega(t - t_0)\right]$$

here $T = 2\pi/\omega = 1$ yr and $t_0 = 152.5$ day

DAMA/NaI **+ DAMA/LIBRA-phase1**

total exposure: 487526 kg×day ≈ **1.33 ton×yr**

ΔE = 0.5 keV bins

A clear modulation is present in the (2-6) keV energy interval, while S_m values compatible with zero are present just above

The S_m values in the (6–20) keV energy interval have random fluctuations around zero with χ^2 equal to 35.8 for 28 degrees of freedom (upper tail probability 15%)

# *Statistical distributions of the modulation amplitudes (S_m)*

a) S_m for each detector, each annual cycle and each considered energy bin (here 0.25 keV)
b) $\langle S_m \rangle$ = mean values over the detectors and the annual cycles for each energy bin; σ = error on S_m

**DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 (7 years)**
total exposure: 1.04 ton×yr

Each panel refers to each detector separately; 112 entries = 16 energy bins in 2-6 keV energy interval × 7 DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 annual cycles (for crys 16, 2 annual cycle, 32 entries)

2-6 keV

Standard deviations of
$(S_m-\langle S_m \rangle)/\sigma$
for each detectors
r.m.s. ≈ 1

0.85 < r.m.s. < 1.12

$x=(S_m-\langle S_m \rangle)/\sigma,$

$\chi^2=\Sigma\, x^2$

Individual S_m values follow a normal distribution since **$(S_m-\langle S_m \rangle)/\sigma$** is distributed as a Gaussian with a unitary standard deviation (r.m.s.)

⟹ **S_m statistically well distributed in all the detectors, energy bin and annual cycles**

Statistical analyses about modulation amplitudes (S_m)

$x = (S_m - \langle S_m \rangle)/\sigma,$

$\chi^2 = \Sigma \, x^2$

$\chi^2/d.o.f.$ values of S_m distributions for each DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 detector in the (2–6) keV energy interval for the seven annual cycles.

The line corresponds to an upper tail probability of 5%.

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 (7 years)

total exposure: 1.04 ton × yr

The $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ values range from 0.72 to 1.22 for all 25 detectors ⟹ at 95% C.L. the observed annual modulation effect is well distributed in all the detectors.

- The mean value of the twenty-five points is 1.030, slightly larger than 1. Although this can be still ascribed to statistical fluctuations, let us ascribe it to a possible systematics.

- In this case, one would have an additional error of $\leq 3 \times 10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV, if quadratically combined, or $\leq 2 \times 10^{-5}$ cpd/kg/keV, if linearly combined, to the modulation amplitude measured in the (2 − 6) keV energy interval.

- This possible additional error ($\leq$ **3 %** or $\leq$ **0.2%**, respectively, of the DAMA/LIBRA modulation amplitude) can be considered as an upper limit of possible systematic effects

Is there a sinusoidal contribution in the signal? Phase ≠ 152.5 day?

**DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1 (7 years)**

total exposure: 487526 kg×day **= 1.33 ton × yr**

$$R(t) = S_0 + S_m \cos[\omega(t - t_0)] + Z_m \sin[\omega(t - t_0)] = S_0 + Y_m \cos[\omega(t - t^*)]$$

For Dark Matter signals:

- $|Z_m| \ll |S_m| \approx |Y_m|$
- $t^* \approx t_0 = 152.5d$
- $\omega = 2\pi/T$
- $T = 1$ year

Slight differences from 2nd June are expected in case of contributions from non thermalized DM components (as e.g. the SagDEG stream)

| E (keV)	S_m (cpd/kg/keV)	Z_m (cpd/kg/keV)	Y_m (cpd/kg/keV)	t* (day)
2-6	0.0106 ± 0.0012	-0.0006 ± 0.0012	0.0107 ± 0.0012	149.5 ± 7.0
6-14	0.0001 ± 0.0007	0.0000 ± 0.0005	0.0001 ± 0.0008	--

Model independent result on possible diurnal effect in DAMA/LIBRA–phase1

Eur. Phys. J. C 74 (2014) 2827

- Experimental *single-hit* residuals rate vs either sidereal and solar time and vs energy.

- These residual rates are calculated from the measured rate of the *single-hit* events after subtracting the constant part

Energy region where the annual modulation is observed.

Energy region just above.

no diurnal variation with a significance of 95% C.L.

Energy	Solar Time	Sidereal Time
2–4 keV	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 35.2/24 \to P = 7\%$	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 28.7/24 \to P = 23\%$
2–5 keV	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 35.5/24 \to P = 6\%$	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 24.0/24 \to P = 46\%$
2–6 keV	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 25.8/24 \to P = 36\%$	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 21.2/24 \to P = 63\%$
6–14 keV	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 25.5/24 \to P = 38\%$	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 35.9/24 \to P = 6\%$

+ run test to verify the hypothesis that the positive and negative data points are randomly distributed. The lower tail probabilities (in the four energy regions) are: 43, 18, 7, 26% for the solar case and 54, 84, 78, 16% for the sidereal case.

Thus, the presence of any significant diurnal variation and of time structures can be excluded at the reached level of sensitivity.

The time dependence of the counting rate

Expected signal counting rate in a given k–th energy bin:

$$S_k\left[v_{lab}(t)\right] \simeq S_k\left[v_s\right] + \left[\frac{\partial S_k}{\partial v_{lab}}\right]_{v_s}\left[V_{Earth}A_m\cos\omega(t-t_0) + V_r A_d\cos\omega_{rot}(t-t_d)\right]$$

- Annual modulation amplitude: $S_m = \left[\dfrac{\partial S_k}{\partial v_{lab}}\right]_{v_s} V_{Earth}B_m$

The ratio R_{dy} of the diurnal over annual modulation amplitudes is a model independent constant

- Diurnal modulation amplitude: $S_d = \left[\dfrac{\partial S_k}{\partial v_{lab}}\right]_{v_s} V_r B_d$

$$R_{dy} = \frac{S_d}{S_m} = \frac{V_r B_d}{V_{Earth}B_m} \simeq 0.016 \qquad \text{at LNGS latitude}$$

- Observed annual modulation amplitude in DAMA/LIBRA–phase1 in the (2–6) keV energy interval:
  (0.0097 ± 0.0013) cpd/kg/keV
- Thus, the expected value of the diurnal modulation amplitude is ≈1.5 × 10^{-4} cpd/kg/keV.
- When fitting the *single-hit* residuals with a cosine function with amplitude A_d as free parameter, period fixed at 24 h and phase at 14 h: all the diurnal modulation amplitudes are compatible with zero.

DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

Energy	A_d^{exp} (cpd/kg/keV)	χ^2/d.o.f.	P
2–4 keV	$(2.0 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{-3}$	27.8/23	22%
2–5 keV	$-(1.4 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-3}$	23.2/23	45%
2–6 keV	$-(1.0 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3}$	20.6/23	61%
6–14 keV	$(5.0 \pm 7.5) \times 10^{-4}$	35.4/23	5%

$A_d < 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$ cpd/kg/keV (90%CL)

The A_d values are compatible with zero, having random fluctuations around zero with χ^2 equal to 19.5 for 18 dof

Present experimental sensitivity more modest than the expected diurnal modulation amplitude derived from the DAMA/LIBRA–phase1 observed effect.

larger exposure DAMA/LIBRA–phase2 (+lower energy threshold) offers increased sensitivity to such an effect

The analysis at energies above 6 keV, the analysis of the multiple-hits events and the statistical considerations about S_m already exclude any sizable presence of systematical effects

Additional investigations on the stability parameters

Modulation amplitudes obtained by fitting the time behaviours of main running parameters, acquired with the production data, when including a DM-like modulation

Running conditions stable at a level better than 1% also in the two new running periods

	DAMA/LIBRA-1	DAMA/LIBRA-2	DAMA/LIBRA-3	DAMA/LIBRA-4	DAMA/LIBRA-5	DAMA/LIBRA-6	DAMA/LIBRA-7
Temperature (°C)	-(0.0001 ± 0.0061)	(0.0026 ± 0.0086)	(0.001 ± 0.015)	(0.0004 ± 0.0047)	(0.0001 ± 0.0036)	(0.0007 ± 0.0059)	(0.0000 ± 0.0054)
Flux N_2 (l/h)	(0.13 ± 0.22)	(0.10 ± 0.25)	-(0.07 ± 0.18)	-(0.05 ± 0.24)	-(0.01 ± 0.21)	-(0.01 ± 0.15)	-(0.00 ± 0.14)
Pressure (mbar)	(0.015 ± 0.030)	-(0.013 ± 0.025)	(0.022 ± 0.027)	(0.0018 ± 0.0074)	-(0.08 ± 0.12) ×10^{-2}	(0.07 ± 0.13) ×10^{-2}	-(0.26 ± 0.55) ×10^{-2}
Radon (Bq/m^3)	-(0.029 ± 0.029)	-(0.030 ± 0.027)	(0.015 ± 0.029)	-(0.052 ± 0.039)	(0.021 ± 0.037)	-(0.028 ± 0.036)	(0.012 ± 0.047)
Hardware rate above single ph.e. (Hz)	-(0.20 ± 0.18) × 10^{-2}	(0.09 ± 0.17) × 10^{-2}	-(0.03 ± 0.20) × 10^{-2}	(0.15 ± 0.15) × 10^{-2}	(0.03 ± 0.14) × 10^{-2}	(0.08 ± 0.11) × 10^{-2}	(0.06 ± 0.10) × 10^{-2}

All the measured amplitudes well compatible with zero
+ none can account for the observed effect
(to mimic such signature, spurious effects and side reactions must not only be able to account for the whole observed modulation amplitude, but also simultaneously satisfy all the 6 requirements)

No role for μ in DAMA annual modulation result

✓ **Direct μ interaction in DAMA/LIBRA set-up:**

DAMA/LIBRA surface ≈0.13 m^2
μ flux @ DAMA/LIBRA ≈2.5 μ/day

MonteCarlo simulation:
- muon intensity distribution
- Gran Sasso rock overburden map
- Single hit events

It cannot mimic the signature: already excluded by R$_{90}$, by *multi-hits* analysis + different phase, etc.

Detector's matrix

✓ **Rate, R$_n$, of fast neutrons produced by μ:**

R$_n$ = (fast n by μ)/(time unit) = Φ$_μ$ Y M$_{eff}$

- Φ$_μ$ @ LNGS ≈ 20 μ m^{-2}d^{-1} (±1.5% modulated)
- Measured neutron Yield @ LNGS:

  Y=1÷7 10^{-4} n/μ/(g/cm^2)

Annual modulation amplitude at low energy due to μ **modulation**:

S$_m^{(m)}$ = R$_n$ g ε f$_{DE}$ f$_{single}$ 2% /(M$_{setup}$ ΔE)

g = geometrical factor;
ε = detection eff. by elastic scattering
f$_{DE}$ = energy window (E>2keV) effic.;
f$_{single}$ = single hit effic.

Hyp.: M$_{eff}$ = 15 tons; g≈ε≈f$_{ΔE}$≈f$_{single}$≈0.5 (cautiously)
Knowing that: M$_{setup}$ ≈ 250 kg and ΔE=4keV

S$_m^{(m)}$ < (0.3-2.4) × 10^{-5} cpd/kg/keV

Moreover, this modulation also induces a variation in other parts of the energy spectrum and in the *multi-hits* events

It cannot mimic the signature: already excluded by R$_{90}$, by *multi-hits* analysis + different phase, etc.

Inconsistency of the phase between DAMA signal and μ modulation

For many others arguments EPJC72(2012)2064

μ flux @ LNGS (MACRO, LVD, BOREXINO) ≈3·10⁻⁴ m⁻²s⁻¹; modulation amplitude 1.5%; phase: July 7 ± 6 d, June 29 ± 6 d (Borexino)

but

- the muon phase differs from year to year (error no purely statistical); LVD/BOREXINO value is a "mean" of the muon phase of each year

- The DAMA: modulation amplitude 10⁻² cpd/kg/keV, in 2-6 keV energy range for single hit events; phase:

    May 26 ± 7 days (stable over 13 years)

    considering the seasonal weather al LNGS, quite impossible that the max. temperature of the outer atmosphere (on which μ flux variation is dependent) is observed e.g. in June 15 which is 3 σ from DAMA

The DAMA phase is 5.7σ far from the LVD/BOREXINO phases of muons (7.1 σ far from MACRO measured phase)

Similar for the whole DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

Can (whatever) hypothetical cosmogenic products be considered as side effects, assuming that they might produce:

- only events at low energy,
- only *single-hit* events,
- no sizable effect in the *multiple-hit* counting rate
- pulses with time structure as scintillation light

But, its phase should be (much) larger than μ phase, t_μ :

- if $\tau \ll T/2\pi$: $t_{side} = t_\mu + \tau$
- if $\tau \gg T/2\pi$: $t_{side} = t_\mu + \dfrac{T}{4}$

It cannot mimic the signature: different phase

Summary of the results obtained in the additional investigations of possible systematics or side reactions – DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

Source	Main comment	Cautious upper limit (90%C.L.)
RADON	Sealed Cu box in HP Nitrogen atmosphere, 3-level of sealing, etc.	$<2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ cpd/kg/keV
TEMPERATURE	Installation is air conditioned+ detectors in Cu housings directly in contact with multi-ton shield$\rightarrow$ huge heat capacity + T continuously recorded	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
NOISE	Effective full noise rejection near threshold	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
ENERGY SCALE	Routine + instrinsic calibrations	$<1\text{-}2 \times 10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
EFFICIENCIES	Regularly measured by dedicated calibrations	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
BACKGROUND	No modulation above 6 keV; no modulation in the (2-6) keV *multiple-hits* events; this limit includes all possible sources of background	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
SIDE REACTIONS	Muon flux variation measured at LNGS	$<3 \times 10^{-5}$ cpd/kg/keV

+ they cannot satisfy all the requirements of annual modulation signature

Thus, they cannot mimic the observed annual modulation effect

Final model independent result
DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

- Presence of modulation for 14 annual cycles at 9.3σ C.L. with the proper distinctive features of the DM signature; all the features satisfied by the data over 14 independent experiments of 1 year each one

- The total exposure by former DAMA/NaI and present DAMA/LIBRA is 1.33 ton × yr (14 annual cycles)

- In fact, as required by the DM annual modulation signature:

1. The *single-hit* events show a clear cosine-like modulation, <u>as expected for the DM signal</u>

2. Measured period is equal to (0.998±0.002) yr, well compatible with the 1 yr period, <u>as expected for the DM signal</u>

3. Measured phase (144±7) days is well compatible with 152.5 days, <u>as expected for the DM signal</u>

4. The modulation is present only in the low energy (2-6) keV interval and not in other higher energy regions, <u>consistently with expectation for the DM signal</u>

5. The modulation is present only in the *single-hit* events, while it is absent in the *multiple-hits,* <u>as expected for the DM signal</u>

6. The measured modulation amplitude in NaI(Tl) of the *single-hit* events in (2-6) keV is: (0.0112 ± 0.0012) cpd/kg/keV (9.3σ C.L.).

No systematic or side process able to simultaneously satisfy all the many peculiarities of the signature and to account for the whole measured modulation amplitude is available

Model-independent evidence by DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA

well compatible with several candidates (in many possible astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics scenarios)

Neutralino as LSP in various SUSY theories

Various kinds of WIMP candidates with several different kind of interactions Pure SI, pure SD, mixed + Migdal effect +channeling,… (from low to high mass)

a heavy ν of the 4-th family

Pseudoscalar, scalar or mixed light bosons with axion-like interactions

WIMP with preferred inelastic scattering

Mirror Dark Matter

Light Dark Matter

Dark Matter (including some scenarios for WIMP) electron-interacting

Sterile neutrino

Self interacting Dark Matter

heavy exotic canditates, as "4th family atoms", …

Elementary Black holes such as the Daemons

Kaluza Klein particles

… and more

Possible model dependent positive hints from indirect searches (but interpretation, evidence itself, derived mass and cross sections depend e.g. on bckg modeling, on DM spatial velocity distribution in the galactic halo, etc.) not in conflict with DAMA results;

Available results from direct searches using different target materials and approaches do not give any robust conflict & compatibility with positive excesses

Just few examples of interpretation of the annual modulation in terms of candidate particles in some scenarios

- Not best fit
- About the same C.L.

$\theta = 2.435$

Compatibility with several candidates; other ones are open

About interpretation

…and experimental aspects…

- Exposures
- Energy threshold
- Detector response (phe/keV)
- Energy scale and energy resolution
- Calibrations
- Stability of all the operating conditions.
- Selections of detectors and of data.
- Subtraction/rejection procedures and stability in time of all the selected windows and related quantities
- Efficiencies
- Definition of fiducial volume and non-uniformity
- Quenching factors, channeling, …
- …

…models…

- Which particle?
- Which interaction coupling?
- Which Form Factors for each target-material?
- Which Spin Factor?
- Which nuclear model framework?
- Which scaling law?
- Which halo model, profile and related parameters?
- Streams?
- …

Uncertainty in experimental parameters, as well as necessary assumptions on various related astrophysical, nuclear and particle-physics aspects, affect all the results at various extent, both in terms of exclusion plots and in terms of allowed regions/volumes. Thus comparisons with a fixed set of assumptions and parameters' values are intrinsically strongly uncertain.

No experiment can be directly compared in model independent way with DAMA

Examples of uncertainties in models and scenarios

Nature of the candidate and couplings

- WIMP class particles (neutrino, sneutrino, etc.): SI, SD, mixed SI&SD, preferred inelastic + e.m. contribution in the detection
- Light bosonic particles
- Kaluza-Klein particles
- Mirror dark matter
- Heavy Exotic candidate
- …etc. etc.

Halo models & Astrophysical scenario

- Isothermal sphere ⇒ very simple but unphysical halo model
- Many consistent halo models with different density and velocity distribution profiles can be considered with their own specific parameters (see e.g. PRD61(2000)023512)
- Caustic halo model

- Presence of non-thermalized DM particle components
- Streams due e.g. to satellite galaxies of the Milky Way (such as the Sagittarius Dwarf)
- Multi-component DM halo
- Clumpiness at small or large scale
- Solar Wakes
- …etc. …

Instrumental quantities

- Energy resolution
- Efficiencies
- Quenching factors
- Channeling effects
- Their dependence on energy
- …

Scaling laws
of cross sections for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Different scaling laws for different DM particle:

  $\sigma_A \propto \mu^2 A^2 (1+\varepsilon_A)$

  $\varepsilon_A = 0$ generally assumed

  $\varepsilon_A \approx \pm 1$ in some nuclei? even for neutralino candidate in MSSM (see Prezeau, Kamionkowski, Vogel et al., PRL91(2003)231301)

Form Factors
for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Many different profiles available in literature for each isotope
- Parameters to fix for the considered profiles
- Dependence on particle-nucleus interaction
- In SD form factors: no decoupling between nuclear and Dark Matter particles degrees of freedom + dependence on nuclear potential

Spin Factors
for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Calculations in different models give very different values also for the same isotope
- Depend on the nuclear potential models
- Large differences in the measured counting rate can be expected using:

  either SD not-sensitive isotopes

  or SD sensitive isotopes depending on the unpaired nucleon (compare e.g. odd spin isotopes of Xe, Te, Ge, Si, W with the ^{23}Na and ^{127}I cases).

Quenching Factor

- differences are present in different experimental determinations of q for the same nuclei in the same kind of detector depending on its specific features (e.g. q depends on dopant and on the impurities; in liquid noble gas e.g. on trace impurities, on presence of degassing/releasing materials, on thermodynamical conditions, on possibly applied electric field, etc); assumed 1 in bolometers
- channeling effects possible increase at low energy in scintillators (dL/dx)
- possible larger values of q (AstropPhys33 (2010) 40)
- → energy dependence

… and more …

# DAMA vs possible positive hints 2010 - 2013

CoGeNT:
low-energy rise in the spectrum
("irreducible" by the applied
background reduction procedures) +
annual modulation

CDMS-Ge:
after many data selections and cuts, 2 Ge recoil-like
candidates survive in an exposure of 194.1 kg x day
(0.8 estimated as expected from residual background)

CRESST: after many data selections and cuts, 67 recoil-like candidates
in the O/Ca bands survive in an exposure of 730 kg x day (expected
residual background: 40-45 events, depending on minimization)

CDMS-Si:
after many data selections and cuts, 3 Si recoil-like candidates
survive in an exposure of 140.2 kg x day. Estimated residual
background 0.41

All those recoil-like excesses with respect to an estimated bckg surviving cuts as well as the CoGeNT result
are compatible with the DAMA 9.3 σ C.L. annual modulation result in various scenarios

Case of DM particles inducing elastic scatterings on target-nuclei, SI case

DMp'

DMp

N

Regions in the nucleon cross section vs DM particle mass plane

- Some velocity distributions and uncertainties considered.
- The DAMA regions represent the domain where the likelihood-function values differ more than 7.5σ from the null hypothesis (absence of modulation).
- For CoGeNT a fixed value for the Ge quenching factor and a Helm form factor with fixed parameters are assumed.
- The CoGeNT region includes configurations whose likelihood-function values differ more than 1.64σ from the null hypothesis (absence of modulation). This corresponds roughly to 90% C.L. far from zero signal.

Including the Migdal effect
→Towards lower mass/higher σ

DAMA allowed regions for a particular set of astrophysical, nuclear and particle Physics assumptions without (green), with (blue) channeling, with energy-dependent Quenching Factors (red);

7.5 σ C.L.

CoGeNT; qf at fixed assumed value

1.64 σ C.L.

Compatibility also with CRESST and CDMS, if the two CDMS-Ge, the three CDMS-Si and the CRESST recoil-like events are interpreted as relic DM interactions

PRD84(2011)055014, IJMPA28(2013)1330022

Co-rotating halo,
Non thermalized component
→ Enlarge allowed region towards larger mass

Combining channeling and energy dependence of q.f. (AstrPhys33 (2010) 40)
→Towards lower σ

$\xi\sigma^{(nucleon)}_{scalar}$ (cm^2)

10^{-39}

10^{-40}

10^{-41}

10^{-42}

10^{-43}

1 10 10^2

m_χ (GeV)

Case of DM particles inducing elastic scatterings on target-nuclei, SI case

DMp'

DMp

N

Regions in the nucleon cross section vs DM particle mass plane

… a recent conjecture …

arXiv:1401.3295

- Non-Maxwellian halo model is considered.
- The DAMA regions are for both Maxwellian and non-Maxwellian halo models.
- **Na quenching factor taken at the fixed value 0.3**
- **A fractional modulation amplitude corresponding to that found for CoGeNT data is assumed for DAMA.**
- For CoGeNT a fixed value for the Ge quenching factor and a Helm form factor with fixed parameters are assumed.
- The CoGeNT region includes configurations whose likelihood-function values differ more than 1.64σ from the null hypothesis (absence of modulation). This corresponds roughly to 90% C.L. far from zero signal.

nium data [69] would be insensitive to up to a 100% modulation amplitude in a possible CDMS-Ge signal [63]. Liquid xenon (LUX, XENON-100) sensitivity to $m_\chi < 12$ GeV/c^2 is presently under test, using an ^{88}Y/Be neutron source [61].

Another example of compatibility

DM particle with preferred inelastic interaction

In the Inelastic DM (iDM) scenario, WIMPs scatter into an excited state, split from the ground state by an energy comparable to the available kinetic energy of a Galactic WIMP.

DAMA/NaI+DAMA/LIBRA Fund. Phys. 40(2010)900
Slices from the 3-dimensional allowed volume

$$\chi^- + N \rightarrow \chi^+ + N$$

- iDM has two mass states χ^+ , χ^- with δ mass splitting

- Kinematical constraint for iDM

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu v^2 \geq \delta \Leftrightarrow v \geq v_{thr} = \sqrt{\frac{2\delta}{\mu}}$$

iDM interaction on Iodine nuclei

iDM interaction on Tl nuclei of the NaI(Tl) dopant?

arXiv:1007.2688

- For large splittings, the dominant scattering in NaI(Tl) can occur off of Thallium nuclei, with A~205, which are present as a dopant at the 10^{-3} level in NaI(Tl) crystals.

- Inelastic scattering WIMPs with large splittings do not give rise to sizeable contribution on Na, I, Ge, Xe, Ca, O, … nuclei.

… and more considering experimental and theoretical uncertainties

Quantum Efficiency features

Second upgrade on end of 2010:

Q.E.

JINST 7(2012)03009

Q. E. %

Serial number

- Q.E. @ peak (%) ◆ Q.E @ 420 nm (%)

Residual Contamination

The limits are at 90% C.L.

Energy (keV)

PMT	Time (s)	Mass (kg)	^{226}Ra (Bq/kg)	^{234m}Pa (Bq/kg)	^{235}U (mBq/kg)	^{228}Ra (Bq/kg)	^{228}Th (mBq/kg)	^{40}K (Bq/kg)	^{137}Cs (mBq/kg)	^{60}Co (mBq/kg)
Average			0.43	-	47	0.12	83	0.54	-	-
Standard deviation			0.06	-	10	0,02	17	0.16	-	-

Energy resolution

σ/E (%)

Mean value:
7.5%(0.6% RMS)
6.7%(0.5% RMS)

Detector number

σ/E @ 59.5 keV for each detector with new PMTs with higher quantum efficiency (blu points) and with previous PMT EMI-Electron Tube (red points).

The light responses
Previous PMTs: 5.5-7.5 ph.e./keV
New PMTs: up to 10 ph.e./keV

• To study the nature of the particles and features of related astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics aspects, and to investigate second order effects

• Special data taking for *other rare processes*

Features of the DM signal

The importance of studying second order effects and the annual modulation phase

High exposure and lower energy threshold can allow further investigation on:

- the nature of the DM candidates

- possible diurnal effects on the sidereal time

- astrophysical models

The annual modulation phase depends on :
- Presence of streams (as SagDEG and Canis Major) in the Galaxy
- Presence of caustics
- Effects of gravitational focusing of the Sun

PRL112(2014)011301

The effect of the streams on the phase depends on the galactic halo model

Expected phase in the absence of streams $t_0 = 152.5$ d (2nd June)

Evans'log axisymmetric non-rotating, $v_0=220$km/s, $R_c= 5$kpc, ρ_0 max + 4% Sgr

NFW spherical isotropic non-rotating, $v_0=220$km/s, ρ_0 max + 4% Sgr

Example, NaI: 10 tons×yr

DAMA:
(2-6) keV - $t_0 = (146\pm7)$ d

A step towards such investigations:
➔ **DAMA/LIBRA-phase2**
with lower energy threshold and larger exposure
+ further possible improvements (DAMA/LIBRA-phase3) and DAMA/1ton

Conclusions

- Positive evidence for the presence of DM particles in the galactic halo supported at 9.3σ C.L. (14 annual cycles DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA-phase1: 1.33 ton × yr)

- The modulation parameters determined with better precision

- Full sensitivity to many kinds of DM candidates and interactions both inducing recoils and/or e.m. radiation.

- Possible positive hints in direct searches are compatible with DAMA in many scenarios; null searches not in robust conflict. Consider also the experimental and theoretical uncertainties. Indirect model dependent searches not in conflict

- New PMTs with higher Q.E.

- **DAMA/LIBRA – phase2 in *continuous data taking*** at lower software energy threshold (below 2 keV).

- Suitable exposure planned in the new configuration to deeper study the nature of the particles and features of related astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics aspects.

- Investigation on dark matter peculiarities and second order effect

- Special data taking for other rare processes.

Moreover, works and efforts for:
- further improvement (phase3);
- DAMA/1ton set up;
- ADAMO project, anisotropic scintillators for directionality