



INDIRECT DETECTION W/X-RAYS& Y-RAYS





NICK RODD

GGI, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019

OVERVIEW



• 1. Landscape of X-ray & γ-ray indirection detection



OVERVIEW



- 1. Landscape of X-ray & γ-ray indirection detection
- 2. Status of two anomalies: 3.5 keV line & GeV excess



Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays

Images Courtesy of NASA/CXC/SAO/E.Bulbul et al., Overlay: APS/Alan Stonebraker and NASA Goddard/A. Mellinger (Central Michigan Univ.) and T. Linden (Univ. of Chicago)

3

OVERVIEW



4

- 1. Landscape of X-ray & γ-ray indirection detection
- 2. Status of two anomalies: 3.5 keV line & GeV excess one



Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays

Images Courtesy of NASA/CXC/SAO/E.Bulbul et al., Overlay: APS/Alan Stonebraker and NASA Goddard/A. Mellinger (Central Michigan Univ.) and T. Linden (Univ. of Chicago)



1. LANDSCAPE











What are the dark matter interactions?



Where are they occurring?







 $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ $m_{\chi} = 100 \text{ GeV}$ $dN_{\gamma}/dE = 2\delta(E - m_{\chi}) \quad (\chi \chi \to \gamma \gamma)$ $\Rightarrow \text{PP} \approx 10^{-31} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}/\text{GeV}^2$



















Cape Canaveral June 11, 2008



18

16

14

12

10

8_2

 $\overline{\text{H.E.}}$ γ -rays

 $\log_{10} \left[\mathcal{E} / \mathrm{cm}^2 \times T / \mathrm{s} \right]$



 $\log_{10} [E/\text{GeV}]$ V.H.E. γ U.H.E. γ







































Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays





Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ -rays





Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays





Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays





Nick Rodd - Indirect Detection with X-rays and γ-rays



2. ANOMALIES







2. ANOMALIES





STATUS OF THE 3.5 KEV LINE





STATUS OF THE 3.5 KEV LINE





[Dessert, NLR, Safdi 1812.06976]

• Expected DM flux

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dE} = \frac{1}{4\pi \, m_s \, \tau} \delta(E - m_s/2) \times \frac{\int_{\text{LoS}} ds \, \int_{\text{FoV}} d\Omega \, \rho_{\text{DM}}(s, \Omega)}{\int_{\text{FoV}} d\Omega}$$

Nick Rodd - Evidence the 3.5 keV line is not from Dark Matter Decay

• Expected DM flux

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dE} = \frac{1}{4\pi \, m_s \, \tau} \delta(E - m_s/2) \times \frac{\int_{\rm LoS} ds \, \int_{\rm FoV} d\Omega \, \rho_{\rm DM}(s, \Omega)}{\int_{\rm FoV} d\Omega}$$

• Perseus flux

$$D_{\rm Pers} \approx \frac{1}{\Omega_{\rm XMM}} \frac{M_{\rm Pers}}{d_{\rm Pers}^2} \approx \frac{1}{(10^{-4} \text{ sr})} \frac{(10^{15} M_{\odot})}{(100 \text{ Mpc})^2} \sim 10^{29} \text{ keV/cm}^2$$

• Perseus halo > XMM Field of View, reduces flux by factor of ~3

• Expected DM flux

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dE} = \frac{1}{4\pi \, m_s \, \tau} \delta(E - m_s/2) \times \frac{\int_{\text{LoS}} ds \, \int_{\text{FoV}} d\Omega \, \rho_{\text{DM}}(s, \Omega)}{\int_{\text{FoV}} d\Omega}$$

• Perseus flux

$$D_{\rm Pers} \approx \frac{1}{\Omega_{\rm XMM}} \frac{M_{\rm Pers}}{d_{\rm Pers}^2} \approx \frac{1}{(10^{-4} \text{ sr})} \frac{(10^{15} M_{\odot})}{(100 \text{ Mpc})^2} \sim 10^{29} \text{ keV/cm}^2$$

- Perseus halo > XMM Field of View, reduces flux by factor of ~3
- What about for the Milky Way?

 $D_{\rm MW} \approx \int ds \,\rho_{\rm DM}(s,\Omega) \approx (0.4 \,\,{\rm GeV/cm}^3) \times (20 \,\,{\rm kpc}) \approx 2 \times 10^{28} \,\,{\rm keV/cm}^2$

• Number comparable! Yet more MW we can see than Perseus clusters

Nick Rodd - Evidence the 3.5 keV line is not from Dark Matter Decay

STATUS OF THE 3.5 KEV LINE

- Key observation: Milky Way halo is bright even away from GC
- Average emission over the XMM-Newton FoV

 $D_{\rm Pers} \sim 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ keV/cm}^2$ $D_{\rm MW}(\psi = 148^\circ) \sim 1 \times 10^{28} \text{ keV/cm}^2$ $D_{\rm MW}(\psi = 45^\circ) \sim 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ keV/cm}^2$



- The line is present in every observation XMM has ever made
- If the line was real, we would have detected it at over 100o!



[Dessert, NLR, Safdi 1812.06976]

CONCLUSION



- Exciting new experiments coming online in 10-15 years
- Some of the best datasets are already on disk, need to extract all the information we can from them
- DM interpretation of 3.5 keV excess strongly disfavoured
- GeV excess not yet as clear cut!





BACKUP SLIDES





(ASIDE) FERMI LIMITS

[Super-Kamiokande 1605.03235]



ESTIMATED SENSITIVITY



• What reach should we expect? In the large count limit

$$\Gamma S = 2[\ln \mathcal{L}_S - \ln \mathcal{L}_B] \sim \sigma^2 \sim S^2 / B = \Phi_S^2 / \Phi_B \times t$$

- Bulbul+ detected line with TS ~ 16 and $t_{Pers} \sim 320$ ks
- Blank sky observations (BSO) much lower background than Perseus, by selection:

 $\Phi_B^{\rm BSO}/\Phi_B^{\rm Pers}\sim 0.02$

• As the signal is at least as bright starting at 45°, we could reach the same significance using only

$$t_{\rm BSO} \approx t_{\rm Pers} \times (\Phi_B^{\rm BSO} / \Phi_B^{\rm Pers}) \approx 6 \text{ ks}$$

• With the full ~30 Ms dataset expect

 $TS_{BSO}\approx 16\times(30~Ms/6~ks)\approx 75,000$

• This analysis could detect particle dark matter at over 100σ

ORIGINAL CLAIM



DETECTION OF AN UNIDENTIFIED EMISSION LINE IN THE STACKED X-RAY SPECTRUM OF GALAXY CLUSTERS

ESRA BULBUL^{1,2}, MAXIM MARKEVITCH³, ADAM FOSTER¹, RANDALL K. SMITH¹ MICHAEL LOEWENSTEIN^{2,4}, AND SCOTT W. RANDALL¹ ¹ Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA, USA ² CRESST and X-ray Astrophysics Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA ³ NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA ⁴ Department of Astronomy, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

- Is the line consistent with dark matter?
 - ~scale with cluster mass (see [Lovell+ 1810.05168])
 - No known significant lines nearby, but cluster emission is complex model 31 known emission lines
- A real line we missed?
 - K XVIII lines at 3.48 and 3.52 keV [Jeltema+Profumo 1408.1699]
 - S XVI charge exchange at 3.5 keV [Gu+1511.06557]



Nick Rodd - Evidence the 3.5 keV line is not from Dark Matter Decay

- Strategy motivates using all ~12,000 observations
 - Developed automating tools: github.com/nickrodd/XMM-DM
 - Processed all 6,350 obs with $\psi < 90^{\circ}$
- Apply cuts to restrict this to the best datasets
 - $5^{\circ} < \psi < 45^{\circ}$
 - $I_{2-10} < 5 \times I_{2-10}^{\text{CXRB}}$
 - Lowest 68% of instrumental background
 - Remove $t_{\rm obs} < 1 \ \rm ks$
- 1,397 exposures, 752 observations, 30.6 Ms



Exposure:











PROFILE LIKELIHOOD ANALYSIS



- Analyse each exposure using **profile likelihood**
 - Likelihoods are then joined, we do not stack the datasets
 - Use narrow energy window: $m_s/2 \pm 0.25 \text{ keV} (\Delta E_{\text{XMM}} \approx 0.1 \text{ keV})$
 - Model: astrophysical power-law, instrumental power-law, DM



• In detail use Poisson likelihood for counts + Gaussian likelihood for QPB estimates. Instrument response folded into the model prediction

PROFILE LIKELIHOOD ANALYSIS



- Nuisance parameters removed using the profile likelihood
- The background is refit for every value of the signal









RESULTS



• Calculate the TS for the DM line from the joint profiled likelihood



- No evidence for a DM decay line
- Left inset shows the distribution of individual exposures versus a χ^2 distribution under the null, provides a good fit to the data

TOWARDS A DEFINITIVE STATEMENT



2. Deep observation of dark matter bright object

Deep XMM Observations of Draco rule out at the 99% Confidence Level a Dark Matter Decay Origin for the 3.5 keV Line

[1512.01239]

Tesla Jeltema^{1*} and Stefano Profumo¹

¹Department of Physics and Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA



Nick Rodd - Evidence the 3.5 keV line is not from Dark Matter Decay

TOWARDS A DEFINITIVE STATEMENT



2. Deep observation of dark matter bright object



Nick Rodd - Evidence the 3.5 keV line is not from Dark Matter Decay

TOWARDS A DEFINITIVE STATEMENT



2. Deep observation of dark matter bright object

Searching for decaying dark matter in deep XMM-Newton observation of the Draco dwarf spheroidal [1512.07217]

Oleg Ruchayskiy,^{1,2*} Alexey Boyarsky,³ Dmytro Iakubovskyi,^{2,4} Esra Bulbul,⁵ Dominique Eckert,⁶ Jeroen Franse,^{3,7} Denys Malyshev,⁶ Maxim Markevitch,⁸ Andrii Neronov⁶

X-ray bright objects, such as galaxies and galaxy clusters. We do not detect a statistically significant emission line from Draco; this constrains the lifetime of a decaying dark matter particle to $\tau > (7-9) \times 10^{27}$ s at 95% CL (combining all three XMM-Newton cameras; the interval corresponds to the uncertainty of the dark matter column density in the direction of Draco). The PN camera, which has the highest sensitivity of the three, does show a positive spectral residual (above the carefully modeled continuum) at $E = 3.54 \pm 0.06$ keV with a 2.3σ significance. The two MOS cameras show less-significant or no positive deviations, consistently within 1σ with PN. Our Draco limit on τ is consistent with previous detections in the stacked galaxy clusters, M31 and the Galactic Center within their $1-2\sigma$ uncertainties, but is inconsistent with the high signal from the core of the Perseus cluster (which has itself been inconsistent with the rest of the detections). We conclude that this Draco observation does not exclude the dark matter interpretation of the 3.5 keV line in those objects.

SYSTEMATIC CROSS CHECKS



- The result is controversial, so we have cross checked extensively
- If there was a real signal in the data, would we have excluded it?
- Check by injecting a real signal into the data



SYSTEMATIC CROSS CHECKS



• How dependent are these results on the assumed halo profile?



SYSTEMATIC CROSS CHECKS



• Is the result strongly dependent upon our cuts?

