



THE SEARCH FOR DARK MATTER ANNIHILATION IN THE MILKY WAY GALACTIC CENTER

TIM LINDEN

WITH: TANSU DAYLAN, DOUG FINKBEINER, DAN HOOPER, STEPHEN PORTILLO, NICK RODD, TRACY SLATYER, ILIAS CHOLIS, MANOJ KAPLINGHAT, HAIBO YU, PHILIPP MERTSCH AND OTHERS

RECONTRES DE BLOIS

JUNE 2, 2015



INDIRECT DETECTION OF WIMPS

Astrophysics

Particle Physics

Instrumental Response

INDIRECT DETECTION OF WIMPS PARTICLE PHYSICS

<u>Why Do We Search in</u> <u>Gamma-Rays?</u>

For a dark matter particle with a mass of ~100 GeV, the standard model annihilation products tend to have energy in the 10 GeV range



INDIRECT DETECTION OF WIMPS WE HAVE AN INSTRUMENT!

Launched in June 2008 and has been taking science data for > 6 yr

Detects γ -rays between ~30 MeV - 1 TeV





Effective Area ~ 0.8 m²

Field of View ~ 2.4 sr

Energy Resolution ~ 10%

Angular Resolution is highly Energy Dependent



A simple analytic formula has been found that provides a reasonable fit to the observed density distribution of dark matter over halos of widely varying masses.

In the standard NFW scenario, $\gamma = 1$

Navarro, Frenk, White (1996) Springel et al. (2008, 0809.0898)

INDIRECT DETECTION OF WIMPS MARK MATTER DENSITY PROFILES

A Coincidence! THE GALACTIC CENTER The Fermi-LAT telescope observes a flux in the inner 1° between 1-3 GeV of approximately 1 x 10⁻¹⁰ erg cm⁻² s⁻¹

A Generic Dark Matter Scenario predicts a flux of 2 x 10⁻¹¹ erg cm⁻² s⁻¹

Unfortunately, the backgrounds are not negligible.

Chandra image of Galactic Center



WHY WE'RE DOING WHAT WE'RE DOING

1.) Dark Matter is one of the guaranteed extensions to the standard model

2.) WIMPs are among the most well-motivated dark matter models

3.) The observation of dark matter annihilation products offers the capability to observe/understand the WIMP particle

4.) The Milky Way Galactic Center is a promising target for indirect detection studies.

5.) The Fermi-LAT has provided us with an unparalleled ability to detect WIMPs annihilating at the thermal cross-section

PREVIOUS WORK

Many Analyses of the Galactic Center over the past 5 years:

Goodenough & Hooper (2009) Hooper & Goodenough (2011, PLB 697 412) Hooper & TL (2011, PRD 84 12) Abazajian & Kaplinghat (2012, PRD 86 8) **Hooper & Slatyer (2013, PDU 2 18) Gordon & Macias (2013, PRD 8 8)** Macias & Gordon (2013, PRD 89 6) Abazajian et al. (2014, PRD 90 2) Daylan et al. (2014) **Calore et al. (2014)**

0910.2998 1010.2752 1110.0006 1207.6047 1302.6589 1306.5725 1312.6671 1402.4090 1402.6703 1409.0042

Different studies have used various techniques and regions of interest, but have obtained consistent results!

TWO REGIONS OF INTERESTINNER GALAXYGALACTIC CENTER

- Mask galactic plane (e.g. lbl > 1°), and consider 40° x 40° box
 - Bright point sources masked at 2°
- Use likelihood analysis, allowing the diffuse templates to float in each energy bin

DAYLAN ET AL. CALORE ET AL.

•



- Box around the GC (10° x 10°)
- Include and model all point sources
- Use likelihood analysis to calculate the spectrum and intensity of each source

DAYLAN ET AL.

EXCESS SPECTRUM Calore et al. (2014, 1409.0042)



Spectral Model highly resilient to changing systematic background models ~300 models considered here.

Low energy spectrum hard to constrain due to systematics High energy spectrum difficult due to statistics

MORPHOLOGY



Inner galaxy prefers density profile $\gamma = 1.18$ Galactic Center prefers $\gamma = 1.17$

INNER GALAXY

COMBINATION



Calore et al (2014) also find evidence for excess emission in morphological bins that extend far from the GC.

Consistent spectrum!



CENTERED-NESS?

GALACTIC CENTER



The center of the emission profile is located to within 0.05° of Sgr A*.

This disfavors Sgr A East as the source of the γ -ray excess (though only at 2σ).

ELLIPTICITY

GALACTIC CENTER





The ellipticity serves as a powerful discriminator of baryonic mechanisms, which tend to be much more luminous along the plane.

CURRENT STATE OF MEASUREMENTS

<u>All</u> published studies agree:

- The spectrum of the excess is peaked at an energy of ~2 GeV, and falls off at low energies with a spectrum that is harder than expected for astrophysical pion emission
- The excess extends to at least 10° away from the galactic center, following a 3D profile which falls in intensity as r ^{-2.2 to -2.8}

IMPORTANT CAVEAT

I have discussed "dark matter fits" to the γ -ray data.

But this does <u>NOT</u> mean that the mechanism producing the excess has a dark matter origin

The data analysis tells us that the model of γ -ray data improves when we add a template with:

- A spherically symmetric, radially falling emission profile with r^{-2.0 to -2.8}
- A spectrum which peaks at an energy of ~2 GeV and has a hard low-energy spectrum compared to known astrophysical emission mechanisms

INTERPRETATIONS

Three Classes of Interpretations Have Been Proposed So Far:

1.) A Population of GC Millisecond Pulsars

2.) An Outburst of Hadronic or Leptonic Emission from the Galactic Center

3.) Dark Matter Annihilation







INTERPRETATIONS MILLISECOND PULSARS

 To first order, the peak of the MSP energy spectrum matches the peak of the observed excess

 MSPs are thought to be overabundant in dense starforming regions (like globular clusters, and potentially the galactic center)

ABAZAJIAN (2011, 1011.4275) ABAZAJIAN & KAPLINGHAT (2012, 1207.6047) PETROVIC ET AL. (2014, 1411.2980)



INTERPRETATIONS MILLISECOND PULSARS

- There would need to be 226 (+91/-67) MSPs with luminosity > 10^{34} erg s⁻¹ in the GC region, and 62(+60/-33.7) with luminosity > 10^{35} erg s⁻¹.
- These should be detectable by the Fermi-LAT as bright point sources
- We <u>only see 7</u> MSPs or potential MSPs



CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5583) CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5625)

INTERPRETATIONS **OUTBURSTS**

Gamma-ray emissions

X-ray emissions

Echoes of multiple, outpursts of SaBittanius A*

N. Current . R. Terrier . A. Coldworm . M. R. Morris C. Druss . . .

And President Communication International Communication

Milky Way

CARLSON & PROFUMO (2014, 1405.7685)

INTERPRETATIONS





Best Fitting Linear Combination of Hadronic Outburst Models: Best Fitting NFW Template TS=51 (14 d.o.f) TS=315 (5 d.o.f)

INTERPRETATIONS LEPTONIC OUTBURSTS



Electron Cooling is a significant issue — the models which correctly fit the morphology of the GC excess are poor fits to the spectrum of the GC excess, and vice versa.

PETROVIC, SERPICO, ZAHARIJAS (2014)

INTERPRETATIONS

ASTROPHYSICAL MECHANISMS: BAYESIAN VIEW

- Current astrophysical models form a relatively poor fit to the excess.
- However, the Bayesian prior on the existence of these emission mechanisms is quite high.
- Preview More nuanced astrophysical models should be coming soon, and may provide reasonable fits to the data. Stay tuned!

INTERPRETATIONS



20

0.3

Sphericity

0.5

1.0

Axis Ratio

0.7

2.0

3.0





FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER DWARF GALAXIES



For typical parameters from an NFW profile:

 $J \sim 10^{21} \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$

Name	GLON (deg)	GLAT (deg)	Distance (kpc)	$\overline{\log_{10}(J^{NFW})^{a}}$ $(\log_{10}[GeV^{2} cm^{-5} sr])$
Bootes II	353.7	68.9	42	-
Bootes III	35.4	75.4	47	-
Canes Venatici I	74.3	79.8	218	17.7 ± 0.26
Canes Venatici II	113.6	82.7	160	17.9 ± 0.25
Canis Major	240.0	-8.0	7	-
Carina	260.1	-22.2	105	18.1 ± 0.23
Coma Berenices	241.9	83.6	44	19.0 ± 0.25
Draco	86.4	34.7	76	18.8 ± 0.16
Fornax	237.1	-65.7	147	18.2 ± 0.21
Hercules	28.7	36.9	132	18.1 ± 0.25
Leo I	226.0	49.1	254	17.7 ± 0.18
Leo II	220.2	67.2	233	17.6 ± 0.18
Leo IV	265.4	56.5	154	17.9 ± 0.28
Leo V	261.9	58.5	178	-
Pisces II	79.2	-47.1	182	-
Sagittarius	5.6	-14.2	26	-
Sculptor	287.5	-83.2	86	18.6 ± 0.18
Segue 1	220.5	50.4	23	19.5 ± 0.29
Segue 2	149.4	-38.1	35	-
Sextans	243.5	42.3	86	18.4 ± 0.27
Ursa Major I	159.4	54.4	97	18.3 ± 0.24
Ursa Major II	152.5	37.4	32	19.3 ± 0.28
Ursa Minor	105.0	44.8	76	18.8 ± 0.19
Willman 1	158.6	56.8	38	19.1 ± 0.31

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER DWARF GALAXIES

Dwarf Galaxies can also produce a significant γ -ray signal from dark matter annihilation.

Results from the 4-year, P7 Analysis of the Fermi-LAT data showed a TS=8.7 excess!





FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

DWARF GALAXIES

However, a new analysis of the Fermi-LAT data was recently presented at the Fermi Symposium (not yet published)

The observed excess has disappeared, and the new limit is now in mild tension with some models of the GC excess

BRANDON ANDERSON, 2014 FERMI-LAT SYMPOSIUM



FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER





Analyses of the DES, and Pan-Starrs Data have recently observed 12 (and counting) new dwarf candidates in the Southern Hemisphere.



Reticulum 2 also has an excess!

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

RETICULUM 2

Evidence for Gamma-ray Emission from the Newly Discovered Dwarf Galaxy Reticulum 2

Alex Geringer-Sameth^{*} and Matthew G. Walker[†] McWilliams Center for Cosmology, Department of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

Savvas M. Koushiappas[‡] Department of Physics, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA

Sergey E. Koposov, Vasily Belokurov, Gabriel Torrealba, and N. Wyn Evans Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0HA, UK (Dated: March 10, 2015)

We present a search for γ -ray emission from the direction of the newly discovered dwarf galaxy Reticulum 2. Using Fermi-LAT data, we detect a signal that exceeds expected backgrounds between $\sim 2 - 10$ GeV and is consistent with annihilation of dark matter for particle masses less than a few $\times 10^2$ GeV. Modeling the background as a Poisson process based on Fermi-LAT diffuse models, and taking into account trials factors, we detect emission with *p*-value less than 9.8×10^{-5} (> 3.7σ). An alternative, model-independent treatment of background reduces the significance, raising the *p*-value to 9.7×10^{-3} (2.3σ). Even in this case, however, Reticulum 2 has the most significant γ -ray signal of any known dwarf galaxy. If Reticulum 2 has a dark matter halo that is similar to those inferred for other nearby dwarfs, the signal is consistent with the *s*-wave relic abundance cross section for annihilation.



Reticulum 2 also has an excess!

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER RETICULUM 2



Reticulum 2 also has an excess!

A CONSISTENT PICTURE? HANGING BY A THREAD?

1.) The observed (modeled) J-factors of Galactic Center, the LMC/ SMC, and Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies imply that any dark matter signal should be observed in that order

2.) A high significance excess exists in the Galactic Center, a lowsignificance excess in the LMC (not discussed here), and very lowsignificance excesses exist in several dwarfs.

3.) Most importantly, this model can be disproved:

- Lack of future dwarf detections will challenge the Dark Matter interpretation of the Galactic Center Excess
- Improved Astrophysical Models may provide convincing explanations for the GC data.

CONCLUSIONS

1.) A bright, spherically symmetric, hard spectrum excess has been observed coincident with the dynamical center of the Milky Way.

2.) This excess is difficult to explain with known astrophysical source mechanisms, such as MSPs and galactic outbursts.

3.) Dark matter provides a natural fit to the characteristics of the GC excess

4.) However, any dark matter claim must be backed up by redundant observations. Significant work must still be done to test out or confirm our models of the GC excess.

EXTRA SLIDES

INTERPRETATIONS

DARK MATTER

BERLIN, HOOPER, MCDERMOTT (2014)

NumberDirectInteractionsScatteringDirect1Dirac FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}f$ $\sigma_{SI} \sim (q/2m_{\chi})^2$ (scalar)No1Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}f$ $\sigma_{SI} \sim (q/2m_{\chi})^2$ (scalar)No2Dirac FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never2Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never3Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu}b$ $\sigma_{SI} \sim loop$ (vector)Yes4Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ or NeverNever	Near Future Reach?	
1Dirac FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim (q/2m_{\chi})^2$ (scalar)No1Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim (q/2m_{\chi})^2$ (scalar)No2Dirac FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never2Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never3Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_\mu b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim \text{loop (vector)}$ Yes4Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ or ($q/2m_n)^2$ Never	LHC	
1Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim (q/2m_{\chi})^2$ (scalar)No2Dirac FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never2Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never3Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu}b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim \text{loop (vector)}$ Yes4Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ or NeverNever	Maybe	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c } \hline 2 & \text{Dirac Fermion} & \text{Spin-0} & \bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f & \sigma_{\text{SD}} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2 & \text{Never} \\ \hline 2 & \text{Majorana Fermion} & \text{Spin-0} & \bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f & \sigma_{\text{SD}} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2 & \text{Never} \\ \hline 3 & \text{Dirac Fermion} & \text{Spin-1} & \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_\mu b & \sigma_{\text{SI}} \sim \text{loop (vector)} & \text{Yes} \\ \hline 4 & \text{Dirac Fermion} & \text{Spin-1} & \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5f & \sigma_{\text{SD}} \sim (q/2m_n)^2 \text{ or} & \text{Never} \\ \hline \end{array} $	Maybe	
2Majorana FermionSpin-0 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \bar{f}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q^2/4m_nm_{\chi})^2$ Never3Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu}b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim \log (\operatorname{vector})$ Yes4Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^5f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ or NeverNever	Maybe	
3Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu}b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim \text{loop (vector)}$ Yes4Dirac FermionSpin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^{5}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_{n})^{2}$ or Never	Maybe	
4 Dirac Fermion Spin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^{5}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_{n})^{2}$ or Never	Maybe	
$\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_\chi)^2$	Maybe	
5 Dirac Fermion Spin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^{5}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^{5}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim 1$ Yes	Maybe	
5 Majorana Fermion Spin-1 $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^{5}\chi, \bar{f}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma^{5}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim 1$ Yes	Maybe	
6 Complex Scalar Spin-0 $\phi^{\dagger}\phi, \bar{f}\gamma^{5}f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ No	Maybe	
6 Real Scalar Spin-0 ϕ^2 , $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ No	Maybe	
6 Complex Vector Spin-0 $B^{\dagger}_{\mu}B^{\mu}, \bar{f}\gamma^5 f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ No	Maybe	
6 Real Vector Spin-0 $B_{\mu}B^{\mu}, \bar{f}\gamma^5 f$ $\sigma_{\rm SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ No	Maybe	
7 Dirac Fermion Spin-0 (t-ch.) $\bar{\chi}(1 \pm \gamma^5)b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI} \sim \text{loop (vector)}$ Yes	Yes	
7 Dirac Fermion Spin-1 (t-ch.) $\bar{\chi}\gamma^{\mu}(1\pm\gamma^5)b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI}\sim$ loop (vector) Yes	Yes	
8 Complex Vector Spin-1/2 (t-ch.) $X^{\dagger}_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu}(1\pm\gamma^5)b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI}\sim$ loop (vector) Yes	Yes	
8 Real Vector Spin-1/2 (t-ch.) $X_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu}(1\pm\gamma^5)b$ $\sigma_{\rm SI}\sim$ loop (vector) Yes	Yes	

About half of the tree-level diagrams producing the GC signal are currently compatible with direct detection and collider constraints.

More than 100 papers considering specific models have been submitted.
DARK MATTER





FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER RETICULUM 2

STELLAR KINEMATICS AND METALLICITIES IN THE ULTRA-FAINT DWARF GALAXY RETICULUM II

J. D. SIMON,¹ A. DRLICA-WAGNER,² T. S. LI,³ B. NORD,² M. GEHA,⁴ K. BECHTOL,⁵ E. BALBINOT,^{6,7} E. BUCKLEY-GEER,² H. LIN,² J. MARSHALL,³ B. SANTIAGO,^{8,7} L. STRIGARI,³ M. WANG,³ R. H. WECHSLER,^{9,10,11} B. YANNY,² T. ABBOTT,¹² A. H. BAUER,¹³ G. M. BERNSTEIN,¹⁴ E. BERTIN,^{15,16} D. BROOKS,¹⁷ D. L. BURKE,^{10,11} D. CAPOZZI,¹⁸
A. CARNERO ROSELL,^{7,19} M. CARRASCO KIND,^{20,21} C. B. D'ANDREA,¹⁸ L. N. DA COSTA,^{7,19} D. L. DEPOY,³ S. DESAI,²² H. T. DIEHL,² S. DODELSON,^{2,5} C. E CUNHA,¹⁰ J. ESTRADA,² A. E. EVRARD,²³ A. FAUSTI NETO,⁷ E. FERNANDEZ,²⁴ D. A. FINLEY,² B. FLAUGHER,² J. FRIEMAN,^{2,5} E. GAZTANAGA,¹³ D. GERDES,²³ D. GRUEN,^{25,26} R. A. GRUENDL,^{20,21} K. HONSCHEID,^{27,28} D. JAMES,¹² K. KUEHN,²⁹ N. KUROPATKIN,² O. LAHAV,¹⁷ M. A. G. MAIA,^{7,19} M. MARCH,¹⁴
P. MARTINI,^{27,30} C. J. MILLER,^{31,23} R. MIQUEL,²⁴ R. OGANDO,^{7,19} A. K. ROMER,³² A. ROODMAN,^{10,11} E. S. RYKOFF,^{10,11} M. SAKO,¹⁴ E. SANCHEZ,³³ M. SCHUBNELL,²³ I. SEVILLA,^{33,20} R. C. SMITH,¹² M. SOARES-SANTOS,² F. SOBREIRA,^{2,7} E. SUCHYTA,^{27,28} M. E. C. SWANSON,²¹ G. TARLE,²³ J. THALER,³⁴ D. TUCKER,² V. VIKRAM,³⁵ A. R. WALKER,¹² AND W. WESTER² (THE DES COLLABORATION)

galaxy known. Although Ret II is the third-closest dwarf galaxy to the Milky Way, the line-of-sight integral of the dark matter density squared is $\log_{10}(J) = 18.8 \pm 0.6 \,\text{GeV}^2 \,\text{cm}^{-5}$ within 0.2°, indicating that the predicted gamma-ray flux from dark matter annihilation in Ret II is lower than that of several other dwarf galaxies.

Yeoman's work by several optical spectroscopers has given us two estimations of the J-factors for Reticulum 2

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER RETICULUM 2

DARK MATTER ANNIHILATION AND DECAY PROFILES FOR THE RETICULUM II DWARF SPHEROIDAL GALAXY

VINCENT BONNIVARD¹, CÉLINE COMBET¹, DAVID MAURIN¹, ALEX GERINGER-SAMETH², SAVVAS M. KOUSHIAPPAS³, MATTHEW G. WALKER², MARIO MATEO⁴, EDWARD W. OLSZEWSKI⁵, AND JOHN I. BAILEY III⁴

Draft version April 14, 2015

$lpha_{ m int}$	$\log_{10}(J(lpha_{ m int}))$
[deg]	$[J/{ m GeV^2cm^{-5}}]^{ m a}$
0.01	$16.9^{+0.5(+1.1)}_{-0.4(-0.8)}$
0.05	$18.2^{+0.5(+1.0)}_{-0.4(-0.7)}$
0.1	$18.6^{+0.6(+1.1)}_{-0.4(-0.8)}$
0.5	$19.5^{+1.0(+1.6)}_{-0.6(-1.3)}$
1	$19.7^{+1.2(+2.0)}_{-0.9(-1.5)}$

against several of its ingredients. We find that Ret II presents one of the largest annihilation *J*-factors among the Milky Way's dSphs, possibly making it one of the best targets to constrain the DM particle properties. However, it is important to obtain follow-up photometric and spectroscopic data in order to test the assumptions of dynamical equilibrium as well as a negligible fraction of binary stars in the kinematic sample. Nevertheless, the proximity of Ret II and its potential large dark matter content make it the most interesting object from the newly discovered dwarf galaxies.

Yeoman's work by several optical spectroscopers has given us two estimations of the J-factors for Reticulum 2

MORPHOLOGY

INNER GALAXY



Can additionally fix the spectrum and allow the normalization to float independently in different radial bins. In this case we find $\gamma = 1.4$, which provides some evidence that the profile is steepening with distance.

DARK MATTER

WEAKLY INTERACTING MASSIVE PARTICLES

density increasing number $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ Ø comovin N_{EQ} 10 10^{2} 10^{1} 0^{3} time m

Ignoring several possible complications, a particle with a weak interaction crosssection and a mass on the weak scale is expected to naturally obtain the correct relic abundance through thermal freezeout in the early universe

$$\left(\frac{\Omega_{\chi}}{0.2}\right) \simeq \frac{x_{\text{f.o.}}}{20} \left(\frac{10^{-8} \text{ GeV}^{-2}}{\sigma}\right)$$

 $\langle \sigma v \rangle \sim 10^{-8} \ {\rm GeV^{-2}} \left(3 \times 10^{-28} \ {\rm GeV^2} \ {\rm cm^2} \right) \ 10^{10} \ {{\rm cm} \over {\rm s}} = 3 \times 10^{-26} \ {{\rm cm^3} \over {\rm s}}$

INTERPRETATIONS



- Analyze the average spectrum and luminosity of the Fermi MSP and globular cluster populations:
 - 5.5 years of data
 - P7 Reprocessed Photons
 - 15 energy bins, no spectral model assumed

CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5583) CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5625)

INTERPRETATIONS

MILLISECOND PULSARS: M31

DEGENERACY WITH MILLI-SECOND PULSARS IN SPATIAL PROFILE Voss and Gilfanov 2007 8 CXB K-band 5 N/arcmin² **R**−1.2 steepening with respect to **Bulge stellar** distribution 0.1 100 10 R [arcsec]

We make the reasonable assumption that Low-Mass X-ray Binaries have the same spatial distribution as MSPs

400" towards M31 center = 1.5 kpc distance from center = 10 degrees towards MW center

Orange line is same as best-fit excess template (R^{-1.2} in projection implies r^{-2.2} de-projected)! Slide from Manoj Kaplinghat

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

RETICULUM 2



Several of these dwarfs (Reticulum 2 and possibly Triangulum 2) are close enough to be important targets for dwarf galaxy searches





CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5583) CHOLIS, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1407.5625)

FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER DWARF GALAXIES: MODEL BUILDING

If the tension between the GC and dwarf observations persists, this could be addressed via secondary emission models:

x x -> φ φ -> e⁺e⁻

The spectrum and morphology of the signal can then be reproduced through the secondary up-scattering of the ISRF.

This is a natural solution in models of self-interacting dark matter.

KAPLINGHAT, TL, YU (2014, 1311.6524) KAPLINGHAT, TL, YU (2015, 1501.03507)



FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER DIRECT DETECTION SEARCHES

However, these limits are model dependent.

Annihilations through a pseudo-scaler mediator will be unobservable with direct detection



BERLIN, HOOPER, MCDERMOTT (2014)

INTERPRETATIONS

Difficult to explain the low-energy spectrum without introducing highly peaked proton injection spectra



CARLSON & PROFUMO (2014, 1405.7685)



Fortunately, these terms are separable for standard CDM

EMISSION MAPS



INTERPRETATIONS MILLISECOND PULSARS

- Petrovic et al. argue that this may still be consistent with the data, if a break in the MSP luminosity function is added in order to decrease the number of bright systems.
- It is not clear how this new cutoff is affected by non-isotropic emission "beaming", which is expected to exist in most pulsars.



PETROVIC, SERPICO, ZAHARIJAS (2014, 1411.2980)

COMPARISON TO OTHER RESIDUALS



FRACTIONAL INTENSITY



IG EXCESS WITH GC EVENTS REMOVED



INSIDE/OUTSIDE BUBBLES SPECT RUM



SPECTRAL VARIATION INSIDE BUBBLES



PROFILE CORES

GALACTIC CENTER



The emission intensity continues to rise to within 10 pc of the GC.

CORRELATION WITH GAS



SPECTRAL VARIATIONS IN DIFFUSE MODEL



ELLIPTICITY IN GENERAL DIRECTION







Employ analytic model for the integrated gas density near the galactic center (Kalberla & Kerp 2009)

Fit the emission in regions far from the galactic center ($|U| > 5^{\circ}$), and extrapolate into center

Remove emission correlating with gas, and examine intensity and spectrum of remaining emission

ABAZAJIAN & KAPLINGHAT (2011)

Produce full model of γ -ray emission in the GC, including all point sources and diffuse emission models

Fit data with, and without, a dark matter component, use loglikelihood to determine best fit

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i} k_{i} \ln \mu_{i} - \mu_{i} - \ln \left(k_{i} ! \right)$$

k_i=data counts

 μ_i = model counts



GORDON & MACIAS (2013), MACIAS & GORDON (2013)

Use Log-Likelihood Formulation, but add additional components corresponding to known high-energy emission sources (20 cm lines, H.E.S.S. ridge)



ABAZAJIAN ET AL. (2014)

Examined the variation in the low-energy spectrum of the GC Excess for different choices in the diffuse background modeling.





1402.6703

DAYLAN ET AL. (2014)

The Characterization of the Gamma-Ray Signal from the Central Milky Way: A Compelling Case for Annihilating Dark Matter

> Tansu Daylan,¹ Douglas P. Finkbeiner,^{1,2} Dan Hooper,^{3,4} Tim Linden,⁵ Stephen K. N. Portillo,² Nicholas L. Rodd,⁶ and Tracy R. Slatyer^{6,7}

¹Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA ²Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA ³Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Theoretical Astrophysics Group, Batavia, IL ⁴University of Chicago, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Chicago, IL ⁵University of Chicago, Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, Chicago, IL ⁶Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, MA ⁷School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ

Past studies have identified a spatially extended excess of ~1-3 GeV gamma rays from the region surrounding the Galactic Center, consistent with the emission expected from annihilating dark matter. We revisit and scrutinize this signal with the intention of further constraining its characteristics and origin. By applying cuts to the *Fermi* event parameter CTBCORE, we suppress the tails of the point spread function and generate high resolution gamma-ray maps, enabling us to more easily separate the various gamma-ray components. Within these maps, we find the GeV excess to be robust and highly statistically significant, with a spectrum, angular distribution, and overall normalization that is in good agreement with that predicted by simple annihilating dark matter models. For example, the signal is very well fit by a 31-40 GeV dark matter particle annihilating to $b\bar{b}$ with an annihilation cross section of $\sigma v = (1.4 - 2.0) \times 10^{-26}$ cm³/s (normalized to a local dark matter density of 0.3 GeV/cm³). Furthermore, we confirm that the angular distribution of the excess is approximately spherically symmetric and centered around the dynamical center of the Milky Way (within ~0.05° of Sgr A^{*}), showing no sign of elongation along or perpendicular to the Galactic Plane. The signal is observed to extend to at least $\simeq 10^{\circ}$ from the Galactic Center, disfavoring the possibility that this emission originates from millisecond pulsars.

PACS numbers: 95.85.Pw, 98.70.Rz, 95.35.+d; FERMILAB-PUB-14-032-A, MIT-CTP 4533

I. INTRODUCTION

tons), other explanations have also been proposed. In particular, it has been argued that if our galaxy's central stellar cluster contains several thousand unresolved mil-

Weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) are a

DAYLAN ET AL. (2014) TWO ANALYSIS METHODS

INNER GALAXY

- Mask galactic plane (e.g. lbl > 1°)
- Bright point sources masked at 2°
- Allow diffuse templates (galactic diffuse, isotropic, Fermi bubbles, dark matter) to float independently in each of 30 energy bins

GALACTIC CENTER

- Box around the GC (10° x 10°)
- Include and model all point sources
- Use likelihood analysis to calculate the spectrum and intensity of each source component
- Calculate log-likelihood to determine significance

DAYLAN ET AL. (2014) see Portillo & Finkbeiner (1406.0507) CTBCORE Point Spread Function

Use additional information to classify each photon event based on the accuracy of its directional reconstruction





HOOPER & SLATYER (2013)

Instead analyzed the Fermi bubbles. They found an excess low-energy emission which fell of with increasing distance from the GC.







FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

► THE GALACTIC CENTER

Better constraints on the spherical symmetry, spatial extension, and low-energy spectrum of the GC excess can support a DM interpretation.

One interesting analysis has found evidence of a secondary inverse-Compton component with an intensity matching that expected by dark matter annihilation to leptonic final states.







FERMI-LAT COLLABORATION

Though no Fermi-LAT publication on the GC has yet been published, the preliminary results were shown at 2014 Fermi Symposium.

They also find improved fits when an NFW template is added, the spectral details of the additional component depend on the modeling of the astrophysical diffuse emission.



FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER OTHER GAMMA-RAY TARGETS

May find other bright indirect detection targets.

One possibility is the population of High Velocity Clouds orbiting the Milky Way

Some may be confined by dark matter halos

However, no γ -ray excess is observed in these systems

NICHOLS & BLAND-HAWTHORN (2009, 0911.0684) NICHOLS ET AL. (2014, 1404.3209) DRLICA-WAGNER ET AL. (2014, 1405.1030)




FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

COSMIC-RAY SEARCHES

Observations of the cosmic-ray positron spectrum by the AMS-02 instrument can place strong constraints on the annihilation to leptonic final states.

In some cases (i.e. direct annihilation to e⁺e⁻) these can fall below the thermal cross-section by two orders of magnitude.





FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER COSMIC-RAY SEARCHES HOOPER, TL, MERTSCH (2014, 1410.1527)

Observations of Cosmic-Ray Antiproton Fluxes show some evidence for an excess compared to astrophysical models, which can be fit by a dark matter candidate.





FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER

DIRECT DETECTION SEARCHES



The 20 - 60 GeV Mass Range is optimal for direct detection searches.





Can add in the SFD dust map, integrated over the line of sight, and globally bias each ring in order to test the fit to local peaks in the gas density

CALORE ET AL. (2014) (1409.0042)

Tour de force paper which investigates the resiliency of the γ -ray excess to changes in the astrophysical diffuse model.

Tests over 300 diffuse models and finds the GC excess to be a resilient feature

Finds some evidence for extra high energy emission compared to Daylan et al. (2014)





FERMI-LAT COLLABORATION





Counts in 0.1°x0.1° pixels 0.3° radius gaussian smoothing









FUTURE TESTS OF DARK MATTER DWARF GALAXIES

How can this test statistic be translated into a significance?

Can cross-correlate hotspots in the Fermi-LAT data with the positions of known high-energy blazars and radio galaxies.

This allows for a determination of the significance, which was nearly 2.7σ



CARLSON, TL, HOOPER (2014, 1409.1572)



What Are These Backgrounds?

* Point Sources (SNR, pulsars, etc.)

* Hadronic Interactions (pp -> π^0 -> $\gamma\gamma$)

* Bremsstrahlung

* Inverse Compton Scattering



PREVIOUS WORK

NSISTENCY

Despite different background models, ROIs, and degrees of freedom, the results of each analysis are statistically consistent



10^{-25}	
10	Inner slope: 1σ CI, this work $\gamma = 1.3$ 2σ CI, this work Hooper & Linden (2011)
<u> </u>	$50\% b\bar{b}$ 50% lentons
$<\sigma v> [{ m cm}^{3/\epsilon}$	(b) 10% bb, 90% leptons 100% bb
	Gordon & Macias (2013)
10-27	
10-27	$5 \hspace{0.1in} 10 \hspace{0.1in} 15 \hspace{0.1in} 20 \hspace{0.1in} 25 \hspace{0.1in} 30 \hspace{0.1in} 35 \hspace{0.1in} 40 \hspace{0.1in} 45 \hspace{0.1in} M_{ m DM} \hspace{0.1in} [{ m GeV}]$

channel, m_{χ}	TS_{\approx}	$-\ln \mathcal{L}$	$\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}$
$b\bar{b}, 10 \text{ GeV}$	2385.7	139913.6	156.5
$b\bar{b}, 30 \text{ GeV}$	3460.3	139658.3	411.8
$b\bar{b}$, 100 GeV	1303.1	139881.1	189.0
$b\overline{b}$, 300 GeV	229.4	140056.6	13.5
$b\overline{b}$, 1 TeV	25.5	140108.2	-38.0
$b\bar{b}$, 2.5 TeV	7.6	140114.2	-44.0
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 10 GeV	1628.7	139787.7	282.5
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 30 GeV	232.7	140055.9	14.2
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 100 GeV	4.10	140113.4	-43.3

Abazajian & Kaplinghat (2012)