Recent results from DAMA/ LIBRA-phase1 and perspectives

R. Cerulli
INFN-LNGS

RICAP 2014
Noto (SR), Italy
Sept 30th – Oct 3rd, 2014

DAMA set-ups

an observatory for rare processes @ LNGS



- DAMA/LIBRA (DAMA/NaI)
- DAMA/LXe
- DAMA/R&D
- DAMA/Crys
- DAMA/Ge

Collaboration:

Roma Tor Vergata, Roma La Sapienza, LNGS, IHEP/Beijing

+ by-products and small scale expts.: INR-Kiev

+ in some studies on ββ decays (DST-MAE and Inter-Universities projects): IIT Kharagpur and Ropar, India

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

Some direct detection processes:

- Scatterings on nuclei

  → detection of nuclear recoil energy



- 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^-



- Interaction only on atomic electrons

  → detection of e.m. radiation



... 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



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 ...

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.

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

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



- v_{sun} ~ 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 simultaneously all the requirements

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



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

Performances:

N.Cim.A112(1999)545-575, EPJC18(2000)283, Riv.N.Cim.26 n. 1(2003)1-73, IJMPD13(2004)2127

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

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 Iodide Bulk for RAre 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, Annual Modulation Signature: **EPJC56(2008)333, EPJC67(2010)39, EPJC73(2013)2648**
  related results: **PRD84(2011)055014, EPJC72(2012)2064, IJMPA28 (2013)1330022, EPJC74(2014)2827, arXiv:1409.3516**
- Rare processes: PEP viol.: **EPJC62(2009)327**, CNC in I: **EPJC72(2012)1920**, IPP in Am: **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





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

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 ≃ 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 Annual Modulation Result

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

Single-hit residuals rate *vs* time in 2-6 keV

EPJC 56(2008)333, EPJC 67(2010)39, EPJC 73(2013)2648



continuous line: t_0 = 152.5 d, T =1.0 y

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}

Fit with all the parameters free:
A = (0.0112 ± 0.0012) cpd/kg/keV
t_0 = (144±7) d - T = (0.998±0.002) y

Power spectrum



Comparison between **single hit residual rate (red points)** and **multiple hit residual rate (green points)**; Clear modulation in the single hit events; No modulation in the residual rate of the multiple hit events
A=-(0.0005±0.0004) cpd/kg/keV



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

No systematics or side reaction able to account for the measured modulation amplitude and to satisfy all the peculiarities of the signature

The data favor the presence of a modulated behaviour with all the proper features for DM particles in the galactic halo at about 9.2σ C.L.

Energy distribution of the modulation amplitudes

Maximum-likelihood analysis

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

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

DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA-phase1

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



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%)

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

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + **DAMA/LIBRA** (6 years)
total exposure: 425428 kg×day = **1.17 ton×yr**

Maximum-likelihood analysis

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

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	--

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

(NIMA592(2008)297, EPJC56(2008)333, J. Phys. Conf. ser. 203(2010)012040, arXiv:0912.0660, S.I.F.Atti Conf.103(211), Can. J. Phys. 89 (2011) 11, Phys.Proc.37(2012)1095, EPJC72(2012)2064, arxiv:1210.6199 & 1211.6346, IJMPA28(2013)1330022)

Source	Main comment	Cautious upper limit (90%C.L.)
RADON	Sealed Cu box in HP Nitrogen atmosphere, 3-level of sealing, etc.	**<2.5×10^{-6} cpd/kg/keV**
TEMPERATURE	Installation is air conditioned+ detectors in Cu housings directly in contact with multi-ton shield→ 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 + intrinsic calibrations	**<1-2 ×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	**<3×10^{-5} cpd/kg/keV**

+ they cannot satisfy all the requirements of annual modulation signature

Thus, they cannot mimic the observed annual modulation effect

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

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

EPJC72(2012)2064



MonteCarlo simulation

✓ **Rate, R_n, of fast neutrons produced by μ:**

- Φ_μ @ LNGS ≈ 20 μ $m^{-2}d^{-1}$ (±1.5% modulated)
- Annual modulation amplitude at low energy due to μ **modulation**:

$$S_m^{(m)} = R_n\, g\, \varepsilon\, f_{\Delta E}\, f_{single}\, 2\% /(M_{setup}\, \Delta E)$$

$$S_m^{(\mu)} < (0.3\text{-}2.4) \times 10^{-5}\ \text{cpd/kg/keV}$$

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**

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

The DAMA phase: May 26 ± 7 days (stable over 13 years)

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

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



For many others arguments EPJC72(2012)2064

- Contributions to the total neutron flux at LNGS;
- Counting rate in DAMA/LIBRA for *single-hit* events, in the $(2-6)$ keV energy region induced by:
  - neutrons,
  - muons,
  - solar neutrinos.

$$\Phi_k = \Phi_{0,k}\left(1 + \eta_k \cos\omega\left(t - t_k\right)\right)$$
$$R_k = R_{0,k}\left(1 + \eta_k \cos\omega\left(t - t_k\right)\right)$$

(See e.g. also EPJC 56 (2008) 333, EPJC 72 (2012) 2064,IJMPA 28 (2013) 1330022)

arXiv:1409.3516

Modulation amplitudes

Source		$\Phi^{(n)}_{0,k}$ (neutrons cm^{-2} s^{-1})	η_k	t_k	$R_{0,k}$ (cpd/kg/keV)		$A_k = R_{0,k}\eta_k$ (cpd/kg/keV)	A_k/S_m^{exp}
SLOW neutrons	thermal n ($10^{-2} - 10^{-1}$ eV)	1.08×10^{-6} [15]	$\simeq 0$ however $\ll 0.1$ [2, 7, 8]	–	$< 8 \times 10^{-6}$	[2, 7, 8]	$\ll 8 \times 10^{-7}$	$\ll 7 \times 10^{-5}$
	epithermal n (eV-keV)	2×10^{-6} [15]	$\simeq 0$ however $\ll 0.1$ [2, 7, 8]	–	$< 3 \times 10^{-3}$	[2, 7, 8]	$\ll 3 \times 10^{-4}$	$\ll 0.03$
FAST neutrons	fission, $(\alpha, n) \to$ n (1-10 MeV)	$\simeq 0.9 \times 10^{-7}$ [17]	$\simeq 0$ however $\ll 0.1$ [2, 7, 8]	–	$< 6 \times 10^{-4}$	[2, 7, 8]	$\ll 6 \times 10^{-5}$	$\ll 5 \times 10^{-3}$
	$\mu \to$ n from rock (> 10 MeV)	$\simeq 3 \times 10^{-9}$ (see text and ref. [12])	0.0129 [23]	end of June [23, 7, 8]	$\ll 7 \times 10^{-4}$	(see text and [2, 7, 8])	$\ll 9 \times 10^{-6}$	$\ll 8 \times 10^{-4}$
	$\mu \to$ n from Pb shield (> 10 MeV)	$\simeq 6 \times 10^{-9}$ (see footnote 3)	0.0129 [23]	end of June [23, 7, 8]	$\ll 1.4 \times 10^{-3}$	(see text and footnote 3)	$\ll 2 \times 10^{-5}$	$\ll 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$
	$\nu \to$ n (few MeV)	$\simeq 3 \times 10^{-10}$ (see text)	0.03342 *	Jan. 4th *	$\ll 7 \times 10^{-5}$	(see text)	$\ll 2 \times 10^{-6}$	$\ll 2 \times 10^{-4}$
	direct μ	$\Phi_0^{(\mu)} \simeq 20\ \mu$ m^{-2}d^{-1} [20]	0.0129 [23]	end of June [23, 7, 8]	$\simeq 10^{-7}$	[2, 7, 8]	$\simeq 10^{-9}$	$\simeq 10^{-7}$
	direct ν	$\Phi_0^{(\nu)} \simeq 6 \times 10^{10}\ \nu$ cm^{-2}s^{-1} [26]	0.03342 *	Jan. 4th *	$\simeq 10^{-5}$	[31]	3×10^{-7}	3×10^{-5}

* The annual modulation of solar neutrino is due to the different Sun-Earth distance along the year; so the relative modulation amplitude is twice the eccentricity of the Earth orbit and the phase is given by the perihelion.

All are negligible w.r.t. the annual modulation amplitude observed by DAMA/LIBRA and they cannot contribute to the observed modulation amplitude.

+ In no case neutrons (of whatever origin) can mimic the DM annual modulation signature since some of the **peculiar requirements of the signature** would fail, such as the neutrons would induce e.g. variations in all the energy spectrum, variation in the multiple hit events,... which were not observed.

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

well compatible with several candidates (in several of the many possible astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics scenarios); other ones are open

Neutralino as LSP in various SUSY theories

a heavy n of the 4-th family

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

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

Sterile neutrino

WIMP with preferred inelastic scattering

Light Dark Matter

Self interacting Dark Matter

Mirror Dark Matter

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

heavy exotic canditates, as “4th family atoms”, ...

Kaluza Klein particles

Elementary Black holes such as the Daemons

… 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; null results not in conflict as well

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

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.

θ = 2.435

EPJC56(2008)333
IJMPA28(2013)1330022

Compatibility with several candidates; other ones are open



About interpretation

See e.g.: Riv.N.Cim.26 n.1(2003)1, IJMPD13(2004)2127, EPJC47(2006)263, IJMPA21(2006)1445, EPJC56(2008)333, PRD84(2011)055014, JMPA28(2013)1330022

…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?
- …

…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
- …

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

... an example in literature...

Case of DM particles inducing elastic scatterings on target-nuclei

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)



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

CoGeNT

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

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

... many other interpretations available in literature

DAMA/LIBRA phase 2 - running

Second upgrade on end of 2010:
all PMTs replaced with new ones of higher Q.E.



Residual Contamination

The limits are at 90% C.L.

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 @ 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*

The second orders effects to be investigated by DAMA/LIBRA-phase2

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
  - ✓ to disentangle among the different astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics models (nature of the candidate, couplings, inelastic interaction, form factors, spin-factors ...)
  - ✓ scaling laws and cross sections
  - ✓ multi-component DM particles halo?
- possible diurnal effects on the sidereal time
  - ✓ expected in case of high cross section DM candidates (shadow of the Earth)
  - ✓ due to the Earth rotation velocity contribution (it holds for a wide range of DM candidates)
  - ✓ due to the channeling in case of DM candidates inducing nuclear recoils.
- astrophysical models
  - ✓ velocity and position distribution of DM particles in the galactic halo, possibly due to:
    - satellite galaxies (as Sagittarius and Canis Major Dwarves) tidal "streams";
    - caustics in the halo;
    - gravitational focusing effect of the Sun enhancing the DM flow ("spike" and "skirt");
    - possible structures as clumpiness with small scale size
    - Effects of gravitational focusing of the Sun



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

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





A step towards such investigations:
➔**DAMA/LIBRA-phase2**
with lower energy threshold and larger exposure

Conclusions

New PMTs with higher Q.E.

- Positive evidence for the presence of DM particles in the galactic halo at 9.3σ C.L. (14 annual cycles DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA-phase1: 1.33 ton $\times$ yr)
- The modulation parameters determined with better precision
- Full sensitivity to many kinds of DM candidates and interactions types (both inducing recoils and/or e.m. radiation), full sensitivity to low and high mass candidates



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

- software energy threshold (below 2 keV) to investigate further features of DM signals and second order effects
- Continuing investigations of rare processes other than DM as well as further developments

Moreover, works and efforts for:

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