

Light Dark Matter Accumulating in Terrestrial Planets: Nuclear Scattering

Jason Kumar, University of Hawaii 2210.01812

with Joe Bramante, Gopi Mohlabeng, Nirmal Raj and Ningqiang Song

dark matter accumulation in the Earth

- why do we care?
- leads to several search strategies
 - DM annihilation constrained by anomalous Earth heating ...
 - … and neutrino flux
 - low-threshold direct detection may probe captured DM (RKL, JS 2209.09834; AD, NK, RKL 2210.09313)
- most studies focus on optically thin regime
- we focus on optically thick regime





optically thick regime

- dark matter can scatter many times as it passes through Earth
- opportunities for studying otherwise unconstrained parameter space
 - deep-underground direct detection experiments shielded, so need another way to close parameter space at large $\sigma_{\chi N}$
 - evaporation calculation more tricky, affecting constraints at low mass
- new aspects to the analysis
 - low-mass dark matter can bounce off the Earth ("ping-pong effect")
 - must deal with three-body gravitational effects
- some studies use analytic treatments
- we use a numerical simulation using modified DaMaSCUS code
 - can address some more complicated features



pathway to DM accumulation

- dark matter scatters, loses energy, and is gravitationally captured by Earth
- continues scattering and thermalizes with SM matter
- thermal dark matter distribution can annihilate or evaporate
- total number accumulated (N) determined by equilibrium of capture (C), annihilation (A) and evaporation (E) rates

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = \frac{C}{L} - \left(\frac{E}{N}\right)N - AN^2$$



outline

- dark matter capture in the optically-thick regime
- density profile
- evaporation
- annihilation
- application to bounds on dark matter annihilation via anomalous Earth heating



DM capture – our basic approach

- assume a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution (boosted) for DM far from Sun
- particles incident on Earth after including acceleration due to Earth and Sun gravitational potential
- propagate with DaMaSCUS until particles drop below Earth escape speed
 - captured
 - 3D Earth model includes atmosphere, crust, mantle, core
- if particle leaves Earth with $v > v_e$ (Earth escape speed) \rightarrow gone
- determine the fraction of incident particles which are captured, and will eventually thermalize
- numerical simulation is computationally intensive, but worth it



fraction of DM captured



approaches to optically-thick regime

- several works use analytic approximations, but can miss some features which matter in optically-thick regime
- one approach is to only consider capture after a single scatter, but account for attenuation of flux (G,P-R 1702.02768; B, M-A, P-R 1208.0824 for Sun)
 - interpolates between optically-thin and geometric capture rates
 - $C = C_{thin} [1 exp(-C_{geom}/C_{thin})]$
 - only accounts for capture after multiple scatters through "reprocessing"
- another approach → analytic approximation to multiple scattering (RKL, JS 2209.09834)
 - actual evolution of kinetic energy
 - may not fully account for varying composition of Earth, detailed DM trajectory (except in limiting cases) (but see Chris' talk for recent progress)



comparison to single scatter treatment



left → include effect of solar potential
right → compare with or without solar
potential

M1 → target nucleus at rest (G,P-R 1702.02768) M2 → thermal motion for target (BVFS 1611.09665)



comparison to single scatter treatment

- including multiple scatters washes out the effect of kinematic resonances
- impact from solar potential on extrapolation from single scatter
 - need $\Delta E_{max}/E \sim m_A m_{\chi} / (m_A + m_{\chi})^2 > (v^2 + v_s^2) / (v^2 + v_e^2 + v_s^2)$
 - if you ignore solar potential ($v_s=0$), then for any m_{χ} , some particles ($v \sim 0$) can be captured with a single scatter
 - if you assume reprocessing, reach geometric cross section for large $\sigma_{\chi N}$
 - but if you include solar potential, then for heavy or light χ , can never capture with a single scatter, so not captured at all
- but solar potential has little impact on MC result, even though $v_s > v_e$
 - related to slope of the low mass regime



ping-pong effect

- for $m_{\chi} \ll m_{A}$, scattering is nearly isotropic
 - DM random walks through Earth until dropping below escape vel.
 - if it leaves Earth, it is gone
 - $N_{scat} \sim 2~(m_{\text{A}}/m_{\text{X}})$ ln (v_{\text{i}}/v_{\text{f}})
 - fraction captured $\sim N_{scat}^{-1/2}$ (NFM, 1805.08794)
 - so f_c scales as $m_X^{1/2}$, but only logarithmically with v_s
- but for low mass, $f_c \ll 1$
- what about details?





"greenhouse" resonance

- MC shows a peak in capture fraction near $\sigma_{\chi N} \sim 10^{-26} \ \text{cm}^2$
 - for larger $\sigma_{\chi N}$ capture/reflection in atmosphere
 - for smaller $\sigma_{\chi N}$, atm. transparent, capture/reflection off crust
- in between, some DM reflected off Earth reflects back off atmosphere



Comparison to multi-scatter treatment

- multi-scatter analytic (M3) result (RKL, JS 2209.09834)
 - N_{scat}^{-1/2} scaling at small m_{χ}
 - straight line trajectory at large m_{χ}
 - assume one element
- match geometric at large $\sigma_{\chi N}$, m_{χ}
- M3 overestimates capture at low mass, but not so relevant
 - will evaporate away anyway
- M3 underestimates capture at large m_{χ}





density distribution

- DM in local thermodynamic equilibrium (LTE)(see Aaron's talk)
 - like ideal gas in thermal equi.
 with SM (Earth)
 - grav. potential as μ_{ext}
- given N, determines n_χ(r)
 - heavier DM sinks
- density distribution affects
 - evaporation
 - rate depends on T(r), $n_{\chi}(r)$
 - annihilation rate within Earth
 - annihilation in atmosphere not constrained by Earth heating



$$\frac{\eta_{\chi}\left(r\right)}{\eta_{\chi}\left(0\right)} \!=\! \left(\!\frac{T_{_{\oplus}}\left(r\right)}{T_{_{\oplus}}\left(0\right)}\!\right)^{\!\!3/2} exp\!\left(\!-\!\int_{_{0}}^{_{r}}\!\!\left[\alpha\frac{dT_{_{\oplus}}}{dr'}\!+\!m_{\chi}\frac{d\varphi}{dr'}\!\right]T_{_{\oplus}}^{^{-1}}\,dr'\!\right)$$

 $\alpha(r)$ = thermal diffusivity parameter

Nauenberg PRD**36** (1987) 1080 Gould, Raffelt, ApJ**352** (1990) 654



evaporation

- evaporation rate given by likelihood that DM at r is scattered above escape vel, and doesn't scatter back down
 - if it scatters down on way out, rethermalizes
 - effect of atm. is important, since it is cooler and can block evap.
 - use G,P-R 1702.02768
- evaporation rate per particle (E/N) depends only on m_{χ} , $\sigma_{\chi N}$
- saturates for $m_{\chi} \lesssim 100 \text{ MeV}$
- for larger $\sigma_{\chi N}$, evaporation saturates at smaller m_{χ}





annihilation

- solve for N(t) at age of earth
 - assume s-wave thermal
 - A depends on m_{χ}
 - annih. negligible for $m_{\chi} \lesssim 1 \text{ GeV}$
- assume DM annihilates entirely to visible states (heat)
 - Earth heating < 44 TW (WV-HAS, Geo. J Int. 38 (09, 1974) 587-608)

$$\begin{split} & \Gamma \!=\! \frac{1}{2} A N^2 \\ & A \!=\! \frac{\left\langle \sigma v \right\rangle}{N^2} \! \int \! dV \; \eta_{\chi}^2 \! \left(r \right) \end{split}$$





Earth heating bounds



conclusion

- dark matter accumulation in the Earth in the optically-thick regime can lead to important constraints on the parameter space
- requires more detailed study of capture, density distribution, and evaporation
- we do so with Monte Carlo study

- new Earth heating bounds → some constraints strengthened, others weakened
- can apply these results to other search strategies and targets

Mahalo!



Backup Slides



subdominant dark matter (5%)







matching in the optically-thin regime

at small $\sigma_{\chi N}$, where single scatter should be a good approximation, MC matches the single scatter approach

also gets kinematic resonances





evaporation rate (G,P-R 1702.02768)

$$E_{\oplus} = \sum_{j} \int_{0}^{R_{\oplus}} 4\pi r^{2} n_{\chi}(r) s(r) dr \times \int_{0}^{v_{e}(r)} 4\pi u_{\chi}^{2} f_{\oplus} du_{\chi} \int_{v_{e}(r)}^{\infty} R_{j}^{+}(u_{\chi} \to v) dv \,.$$

$$s(r) = \eta_{\rm ang} \eta_{\rm mult} e^{-\tau(r)}$$

→ likelihood of getting out without scattering back below escape velocity

would be interesting to update with a Monte Carlo analysis for low mass regime could affect s(r)