N-PACT meeting, Kristiansand, 4-6 Aug 2020

# Thermal decoupling of Dark Matter in hidden sectors

Based on: TB, Depta, Hufnagel & Schmidt-Hoberg, 2007.03696







### The standard treatment<sup>TM</sup> (

 ${\ensuremath{\, \ensuremath{\, \ensuremath{\,$ 



WIMP DM is seriously pressured, but not (yet) 'dead' !

Arcadi+, EPJC '18 Athron+, EPJC '19 (+ many more)

UiO: University of Oslo (Torsten Bringmann)

### Ingredients for numerical evaluation

#### Thermal average:

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \equiv \frac{g_{\chi}^2}{n_{\chi,\mathrm{eq}}^2} \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3 \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \sigma v_{\bar{\chi}\chi \to \bar{f}f} f_{\chi,\mathrm{eq}}(\mathbf{p}) f_{\chi,\mathrm{eq}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})$$

$$2m \sqrt{\tilde{s}-1} (2\tilde{s}-1) K_1 \left(\frac{2\sqrt{\tilde{s}}m_{\chi}}{2\sqrt{\tilde{s}}m_{\chi}}\right)$$

$$= \int_{1}^{\infty} d\tilde{s} \, \sigma_{\bar{\chi}\chi \to \bar{f}f} v_{\text{lab}} \frac{2m_{\chi}\sqrt{\tilde{s}} - 1(2\tilde{s} - 1)K_1\left(\frac{2\sqrt{s}m_{\chi}}{T}\right)}{TK_2^2(m_{\chi}/T)}$$

Number density in EQ:

 $n_{\chi,\text{eq}} = g_{\chi} m_{\chi}^2 T K_2 (m_{\chi}/T) / (2\pi^2)$ 

Radiation domination:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho \equiv \frac{8\pi^3 G}{90} g_{\text{eff}} T^4$$



[See also Steigman+, PRD '12]

### (Often forgotten) assumptions

#### Soltzmann equation at phase-space level:

 $\left[\int d^3p \text{ gives Eq for number density } n_{\chi}\right]$ 



DM becomes non-relativistic while still in (full) EQ:

$$f_{\chi}^{\rm eq} = e^{-E/T} \ll 1$$

DM remains in kinetic EQ during freeze-out

$$f_{\chi} = e^{-(E-\mu_{\chi})/T} = e^{\mu_{\chi}/T} f_{\chi}^{\text{eq}}$$

$$\mu_{\chi}/m_{\chi} \ll 1$$

(energy conservation:  $E_{\rm SM} = E_{\chi}$ )

SM particles never build up significant chemical potentials

 $f_{\rm SM} = e^{-E_{\rm SM}/T}$ 

UiO: University of Oslo (Torsten Bringmann)

Hidden sector freeze-out – 4

### Generic dark sector models

#### $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$

Standard

Model

e.g.  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{Higgs}} \supset \kappa |\phi|^2 |\Theta|^2$ 

SM particles



$$\xi(T) \equiv \frac{T_{\chi}(T)}{T} = \frac{\left[g_*^{\rm SM}(T)/g_*^{\rm SM}(T_{\rm dec})\right]^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\left[g_*^{\rm DS}(T)/g_*^{\rm DS}(T_{\rm dec})\right]^{\frac{1}{3}}}$$

Let's study a simple set-up for concreteness:

 ${}^{\odot}$  only fermionic DM (  $\chi$  ) and a scalar ( S ) in dark sector (with  $m_S < m_\chi$  )

 $\odot$  decoupling at high temperatures:  $T_{
m dec} \gg m_t, m_\chi$ 

 $(directly) afterwards EQ in DS through \overline{\chi}\chi \leftrightarrow SS$ UiO: University of Oslo (Torsten Bringmann)

### Case I: massless DS 'heat bath'

#### $\ensuremath{\,^{\odot}}$ Vanishing chemical potential for S

 ${}^{\mbox{\tiny \ensuremath{ \hbox{\tiny $\oplus$}}}}$  e.g. because of  $\ {} \bar{\chi}\chi 
ightarrow {} \bar{\chi}\chi S$ 

UiO: University of Oslo (Torsten Bringmann)

 $\Rightarrow$  identical assumptions to standard case possible, after replacing  $T \rightarrow T_{\chi}$ 

 $\Rightarrow$  Can use same Boltzmann equation for  $n_{\chi}$ , after changing



### p-wave annihilation

[In case you ever wondered how the 'Steigman plot' looks like for non-constant cross sections...]



### Case II: massive annihilation products

- $\ensuremath{\,^{\odot}}$  In general, nothing prevents S to build up chemical potentials
  - @ unless adding new physics, e.g. massless states N with  $\Gamma_{\bar{N}N\leftrightarrow SS}\gg\Gamma_{\bar{\chi}\chi\leftrightarrow SS}$
- Underlying assumptions for standard Boltzmann equation **not** satisfied anymore, even when assuming kinetic EQ:



$$f_{\chi}^{\rm eq} \neq e^{-E/T_{\chi}} \ll 1$$



- In kinetic EQ, particles will still follow BE / FD distributions
  Need to independently solve for  $T_{\chi}$ ,  $\mu_{\chi}$  and  $\mu_{S}$ , with full spin-statistics!
  - $\square$  number conservation  $\dot{n}_i + 3Hn_i = \mathfrak{C}/N_{\chi}, \quad \dot{n}_S + 3Hn_S = -\mathfrak{C}$
  - $\odot$  energy conservation  $\nabla_{\mu}T_{\rm DS}^{0\mu}=0$

### Case II: results





### Conclusions

- Increasing interest in dark sector models
   to explain dark matter
- Thermal freeze-out works equally well in this case...
  ... but must be treated correctly for consistent
  interpretation of experimental searches and pheno studies!
- Difference to 'vanilla' approach can be orders of magnitude [c.f. percent accuracy in total observed DM abundance ]
- Even DarkSUSY can't do everything [yet] ;)

## Thanks for your attention!

### DarkSUSY





TB, Edsjö, Gondolo, Ullio & Bergström, JCAP '18

<u>http://</u> <u>darksusy.hepforge.org</u>

#### Since version 6: no longer restricted to supersymmetric DM !

- Numerical package to calculate
   'all' DM related quantities:
  - $\ \ \, \odot \ \ \, relic \ \ \, density$  + kinetic decoupling (also for  $T_{\rm dark} \neq T_{\rm photon}$  )
  - generic SUSY models + laboratory constraints implemented
  - cosmic ray propagation
  - particle yields for generic DM annihilation or decay
  - indirect detection rates: gammas, positrons, antiprotons, neutrinos
  - direct detection rates



since 6.1: DM self-interactions since 6.2: 'reverse' direct detection (see later)

💋 UiO **: University of Oslo** (Torsten Bringmann)