# Dark Matter Freeze-out during $SU(2)_T$ Confinement

#### JHEP, DOI: 10.1007/JHEP02(2022)047 | arXiv: 2112.09152

### **Jessica N. Howard**

#### NSF Graduate Research Fellow jnhoward@uci.edu

<u>Jessica N. Howard<sup>1</sup></u>, Seyda Ipek<sup>2</sup>, Tim M.P. Tait<sup>1</sup>, Jessica Turner<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, UC Irvine <sup>2</sup> Department of Physics, Carleton University <sup>3</sup> Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, Durham University

GitHub: jnhoward/SU2LDM\_public, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5965537



**Brookhaven National Laboratory Virtual HET Seminar** June 02, 2022



This work was supported in part by the following grants:

DGE-1839285





# Particle physics and cosmological history



- Particles dominated in the early universe
- Particle interactions had profound downstream effects







**Temperature (T)** 



Studying particle interactions will help us understand the evolution of our universe



# Studying particle interactions

- Studied particle interactions at E ~ 100 GeV
  - Indirectly probes the early universe t  $\sim 0.01$  ns
- Leading to the **Standard Model** of Particle Physics
- Assuming that the early universe particles follow the Standard Model gives us the Standard Cosmological History
- However, this is only an assumption, the real cosmological history may differ
  - Direct probes are needed to say definitively









## **Alternate cosmological histories**



 Direct measurements only confirm a Standard Cosmology back to **Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN)** 

Alternate cosmological histories may help provide explanations





# Why consider alternate cosmological histories?

- Immediate practical benefits
  - Might lead to profitable results alleviating current constraints

- Scientifically important
  - Experimentally we can, so scientifically we should

- Long-term benefits
  - Exploring possibilities will help probe what actually happened





04 / 25





## How to modify cosmological history?

### • **Common example:** Add new particle species

Standard WIMP Dark Matter

#### • Weirder example: Modify strengths of forces

- Features of the early universe caused the strengths of the forces to evolve, eventually settling to what we see today





• This talk: Modify the Electroweak (EW) force to alleviate WIMP DM constraints

![](_page_5_Picture_14.jpeg)

### **Overview**

- WIMPs are an attractive model for dark matter (DM) • Simple extension of the Standard Model (SM) yields a WIMP miracle
- Experiments have endangered the scenario leading to the WIMP miracle
- However, this assumes a "standard" cosmological history

![](_page_6_Figure_6.jpeg)

We find that a period of electroweak confinement contemporary with WIMP freeze-out helps restore the WIMP miracle

## WIMP dark matter (DM) freeze-out

![](_page_7_Picture_1.jpeg)

• A classic WIMP model considers DM as a Weakly charged particle

![](_page_7_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_6.jpeg)

**Dark Matter Relic Abundance** 

![](_page_7_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_10.jpeg)

**Standard freeze-out** knobs

![](_page_7_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_13.jpeg)

## WIMP dark matter (DM) freeze-out

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

- A classic WIMP model considers DM as a Weakly charged particle
  - Force coupling is uniquely fixed
  - Getting the correct relic abundance uniquely fixes the DM mass ullet
- This was assuming a standard cosmological history

![](_page_8_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_9.jpeg)

**Dark Matter Relic Abundance** 

#### **Standard freeze-out** knobs

# Strongly constrained by experiments

![](_page_8_Figure_18.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_20.jpeg)

# WIMP dark matter (DM) freeze-out

#### Alternate cosmology

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

- A classic WIMP model considers DM as a Weakly charged particle
  - Force coupling is uniquely fixed
  - Getting the correct relic abundance uniquely fixes the DM mass ullet
- This was assuming a standard cosmological history
- If instead there was an alternate cosmological history where the Weak force coupling was different during freeze-out, freedom in DM mass would be restored

![](_page_9_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_11.jpeg)

**Dark Matter Relic Abundance** 

**Standard freeze-out** knobs

# Strongly constrained by experiments

![](_page_9_Figure_20.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_22.jpeg)

### Schematic outline of calculation

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

$$\supset -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} \text{Tr}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad M > \text{Ter}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad \frac{1}{g^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g^2} - \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{M}\right) \qquad \frac{1$$

**Electroweak (EW) Force is at normal strength** 

![](_page_10_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_9.jpeg)

## **Prior work on EW confinement**

• Historical work: L.F. Abbott, E. Farhi: <u>1981a</u>, <u>1981b</u>.

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} \text{Tr}(W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu}) \qquad \qquad \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} - \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2}\right)$$

Agnostic to phase transition specifics

[1] Joshua Berger, Andrew J. Long, Jessica Turner. A phase of confined electroweak force in the early Universe. arXiv: 1906.05157.

Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_11_Figure_9.jpeg)

M. Claudson, E. Farhi, R L. Jaffe: <u>1986</u>. Gerard 't Hooft: <u>1998</u>.

 One work<sup>[1]</sup> explored cosmological implications of an early EW confinement phase • Coupling strength is linked to the vev of a scalar field,  $\phi$ , undergoing a phase transition in the early universe

![](_page_11_Figure_12.jpeg)

Energy scale parameter: M > TeV

# Main takeaways from [1]

- Strong EW force causes quark and lepton doublets to confine into pion-like objects
- Confinement causes spontaneous flavor symmetry breaking:  $SU(2N_f) \rightarrow Sp(2N_f)$ 
  - Massless GSBs\*:  $(4N_f^2 1) (2N_f^2 + N_f) = 2N_f^2 N_f 1 = 65$
  - One massive pseudo-GSB ( $\eta'$  analog)
- Loop induced corrections from gauge interactions + Yukawas give 58/65 "pions" masses
- Confinement breaks SM gauge symmetry:  $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow SU(2)_C \times U(1)_O$ 
  - 4 massless gauge bosons + 5 massive gauge bosons

### Our work throws a WIMP-like DM particle into the mix

[1] Joshua Berger, Andrew J. Long, Jessica Turner. A phase of confined electroweak force in the early Universe. arXiv: 1906.05157.

![](_page_12_Figure_11.jpeg)

( for SM  $N_f = 6$  ) \*Neglecting gauge interactions

![](_page_12_Figure_19.jpeg)

and Yukawas

![](_page_12_Picture_20.jpeg)

## WIMP dark matter in this scenario

- Our DM candidate is a pair of vector-like  $SU(2)_{I}$  -charged Weyl fermions • SM quantum numbers  $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_V = \{1, 2, \pm 1/2\}$  with mass  $m_{DM}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\chi} = i \chi_1^{\dagger} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu} D_{\mu} \chi_1 + i \chi_2^{\dagger} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu} D_{\mu} \chi_2 + m_{DM} \chi_1 \chi_2 + h.c.$$

- During EW confinement,  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  confine with SM quarks and leptons into bound states
  - These are analogous to mesons and baryons of C
  - The lightest of these states are mesons:  $\Pi$  and  $\eta'$
- In analogy with chiral perturbation theory, we collect these into a complex antisymmetric scalar field  $\Sigma_{ij}$  where  $i, j = 1, ..., 2N_f$  Number of flavors of SU(2)<sub>L</sub> doublets

![](_page_13_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_16.jpeg)

### **Confinement details**

- Confinement spontaneously breaks flavor symmetry  $SU(2N_f) \rightarrow Sp(2N_f)$ 
  - Follows intuition from chiral symmetry breaking in QCD and confirmed with lattice simulations
  - Encoded by  $\Sigma_{ii}$  obtaining a vev  $(\Sigma_0)_{ii}$  satisfying  $\Sigma_0^{\dagger}\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_0\Sigma_0^{\dagger} = 1$
- Goldstone bosons (GSBs) and 1 massive pseudo-GSB, analogous to the  $\eta'$  of QCD.

```
1 generation
\{l, q^{r}, q^{g}, q^{b}, \chi_{1}, \chi_{2}\}
        2N_f = 6
\begin{array}{c} SU(6) \rightarrow Sp(6) \\ \Downarrow \end{array}
       15 mesons
```

Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_14_Figure_9.jpeg)

• Neglecting other SM gauge interactions and Yukawa couplings we get  $2N_f^2 - N_f - 1$  massless

#### **3** generations

 $\{l_1, q_1^r, q_1^g, q_1^b, l_2, q_2^r, q_2^g, q_2^b, l_3, q_3^r, q_3^g, q_3^b, \chi_1, \chi_2\}$  $2N_f = 14$  $2N_f$  $SU(14) \rightarrow Sp(14)$  $SU(2N_f) \rightarrow Sp(2N_f)$ V  $2N_f^2 - N_f - 1 \quad \Pi$ 's and  $1 \quad \eta'$ 91 mesons

![](_page_14_Figure_17.jpeg)

### **Confinement details**

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{IR}} \supset \frac{f^2}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ D_{\mu} \Sigma^{\dagger} D^{\mu} \Sigma \right] + \Lambda_W^3 \operatorname{Tr} \left[ M \Sigma + \Sigma^{\dagger} M^T \right] + \kappa \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \operatorname{Re} \left[ \det \Sigma \right] + \Delta \mathcal{L}$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{L} = C_G \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \sum_{a=1,2,3} \operatorname{Tr}[L^a \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{aT} \Sigma] + C_A \Lambda_W^2 f^2 + C_W \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{g_s^2/2}{16\pi^2} \sum_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{i=1,2} \operatorname{Tr}[L^{i\pm} \Sigma^{\dagger} L^{i\pm} \Sigma] + C_Z \Lambda_W^2 f^2 \frac{e_G^2}{4\pi^2} \int_{\pm} \sum_{i=1,2} \sum$$

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

$$\Sigma = \exp\left[i\frac{\eta'}{\sqrt{N_f f}}\right] \exp\left[\sum_a 2i\frac{\Pi^a X^a}{f}\right]$$

 $\frac{{}^{2}_{W}f^{2}\frac{{}^{e}_{Q}}{16\pi^{2}}\text{Tr}[Q\Sigma^{\dagger}Q\Sigma]}{\frac{{}^{e}_{Q}}{16\pi^{2}}} X^{a} \text{ generators of the broken symmetry} \\ \frac{{}^{e}_{Q}^{2}/{}^{s}_{Q}^{2}c_{Q}^{2}}{16\pi^{2}} \text{Tr}[J\Sigma^{\dagger}J\Sigma] X^{a} \text{ SU}(2N_{f}), a:1, \ldots, 2N_{f}^{2} - N_{f} - 1$ 

•  $\Delta \mathcal{L}$  gauge corrections from SU(3)<sub>C</sub> and U(1)<sub>Y</sub> explicitly break SU(2N<sub>f</sub>) giving some GSBs masses

• Confinement breaks  $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow SU(2)_C \times U(1)_Q$  eating some of the massless GSBs

![](_page_15_Figure_14.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_16.jpeg)

### **Unbroken** *X* **charge**

•  $\mathcal{L}_{IR}$  is invariant under an unbroken  $U(1)_{\gamma}$ , convenient to organize the pions by their charges

$$\Sigma \xrightarrow{\mathrm{U}(1)_{\chi}} \Sigma' \approx \Sigma + i\theta_{\chi} \left( Q_{\chi} \Sigma + \Sigma Q_{\chi} \right) + \dots \qquad Q_{\chi} = \mathrm{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, -1)$$

Expanding  $\Sigma$  to first order implies lacksquare

$$\Pi_b \rightarrow \Pi_b + i\theta_\chi \delta \Pi_b$$

• We can then construct linear combinations of the pion fields with definite  $U(1)_{\gamma}$  charge

$$\Pi_{1}^{\pm} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\Pi_{5}^{\text{mass}} \mp i \Pi_{8}^{\text{mass}}) \qquad \Pi_{2}^{\pm} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\Pi_{6}^{\text{mass}} \mp i \Pi_{7}^{\text{mass}}) \qquad \Pi_{3}^{\pm} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\Pi_{9}^{\text{mass}} \mp i \Pi_{12}^{\text{mass}}) \qquad \Pi_{4}^{\pm} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\Pi_{10}^{\text{mass}} \mp i \Pi_{11}^{\text{mass}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\Pi_{11}^{\text{mass}} \mp i \Pi_{$$

$$\delta \Pi_b = 2\Pi_a \operatorname{Tr}[[Q_{\chi}, X_a], X_b]$$

![](_page_16_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_14.jpeg)

### Pion masses and remaining gauge symmetries

#### **Gauge charges**

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### Masses

![](_page_17_Picture_9.jpeg)

# **Deriving pion interactions**

• We are interested in reactions which deplete the DM density i.e.  $\Pi_{DM}\Pi_{DM} \rightarrow \Pi_{SM} \Pi_{SM}$  $\int_{W} \text{Tr}[M\Sigma + \Sigma^{\dagger}M^{T}] + \kappa \Lambda_{W}^{2} f^{2} \text{Re}[\det \Sigma] + \Delta \mathcal{L}$  $\mathbf{i}$  $\Pi_a \Pi_b \partial^{\mu} [\Pi_c] \partial_{\mu} [\Pi_d] + \frac{2m_{\rm DM} \Lambda_W^3}{3f^4} \operatorname{Tr}_2(a, b, c, d) \Pi_a \Pi_b \Pi_c \Pi_d$ 

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{IR}} \supset \frac{f^2}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ D_{\mu} \Sigma^{\dagger} D^{\mu} \Sigma \right] + \Lambda_{\mathsf{W}}^3$$

$$\Pi_a \Pi_b \to \Pi_c \Pi_d \qquad \qquad \mathcal{L}_{2 \to 2} = \frac{4}{f^2} \operatorname{Tr}_1(a, b, c, d)$$

- Transforming into definite DM charge basis implies we want  $\Pi^+ \Pi^- \to \Pi^0 \Pi^0$
- For the benchmarks chosen we can safely neglect annihilation to gauge bosons
- We calculate the velocity averaged effective cross-section, taking into account coannihilation
  - We assume non-relativistic, s-wave scattering

#### Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_18_Figure_10.jpeg)

• We then use this in solving the Boltzmann equation for the final co-moving number density of  $\Pi_{DM}$ 

![](_page_18_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_15.jpeg)

### WIMP freeze-out in this scenario

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

- Freeze-out happens while  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  are confined in pion form
  - Lightest pion containing  $\chi$  survives freeze-out:  $\Pi_{\text{DM},1}$  (mass =  $m_1$ )
- After freeze-out, EW confined phase ends and pions deconfine
  - freeze-out of the  $\chi$ 's

19/25

![](_page_19_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_13.jpeg)

### Parameter scan

• Under some minimal assumptions:  $m_{\rm DM} < \Lambda$ 

• Performed a parameter scan in  $\log_{10} \left( \frac{m_{\rm DM}}{{\rm GeV}} \right)$ 

Using the log-likelihood as the objective funct

[1] Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. arXiv: 1807.06209

Jessica N. Howard

$$\Lambda_W$$
 and  $f = \frac{1}{4\pi} \Lambda_W$ 

$$\left. \right), \log_{10} \left( \frac{f}{\text{GeV}} \right) \right]$$

tion 
$$\ln L = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\Omega_{\chi} h^2 (m_{\text{DM}}, f) - \Omega_{\text{PDG}} h^2}{\Delta \Omega h^2} \right]$$

 $\Omega_{\rm PDG} h^2 \pm \Delta \Omega h^2 = 0.1200 \ \pm \ 0.0012 \ \text{[1]}$ 

![](_page_20_Picture_14.jpeg)

### Results

#### $\langle \sigma_{\rm eff} v \rangle \approx (1.5 \text{ to } 2) \times 10^{-12}$

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_21_Picture_4.jpeg)

$${}^{1} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \left(\frac{m_{\text{DM}}}{5 \text{ TeV}}\right) \left(\frac{65 \text{ TeV}}{f}\right)^{3}$$

## **Experimental constraints: Direct detection**

**Reminder:**  $\chi_{1,2}$  are SU(2)<sub>L</sub>-doublets with hypercharge with full strength Z-boson couplings  $\Rightarrow$  trouble, but...

- Avoided if there is a small Majorana mass  $m_M \ll m_{\rm DM}$  today<sup>[1]</sup>
- Can be induced by a dimension 5 interaction with the Higgs

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Delta M} = \frac{1}{M_1} (H^{\dagger} \chi_1) (H^{\dagger} \chi_1) + \frac{1}{M_2} (H \chi_2) (H \chi_2) + h$$

• No effect on freeze-out for sufficiently large mass scales

#### [1] David Smith, Neal Weiner. Inelastic Dark Matter. arXiv: hep-ph/0101138

#### Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_22_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_13.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_14.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_19.jpeg)

### Other experimental constraints

### LHC bounds

- Analogous signature to charginos
- No constraints for  $m_{\rm DM} > 420 \ {\rm GeV}^{(1)}$
- Likely out of reach for future colliders

### **Indirect detection**

• Might be in reach of future gamma ray observatories

[1] ATLAS: <u>arXiv:1908.08215</u> and CMS: <u>arXiv: 1807.07799</u>

![](_page_23_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_14.jpeg)

### Main takeaway

#### What did this alternate cosmological history get us?

- Maintains the correct DM relic abundance  $\bullet$
- Increases the possible mass range of DM •
- Restores some freedom to WIMP models

![](_page_24_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_12.jpeg)

### Conclusion

- Considering alternate cosmological histories is important and can be advantageous
- Modification to cosmological history can help restore the WIMP miracle
- Not ruled out by current experiments

# Questions?

![](_page_25_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_13.jpeg)

Jessica N. Howard

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

## **Code outline**

- Because of the many possible combinations of  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  we perform the calculation of  $\Pi_{a}\Pi_{b} \rightarrow \Pi_{c} \Pi_{d}$  numerically via Python
- The code calculates  $\Omega_{\chi} h^2$  for each parameter space point  $(f, m_{\rm DM})$  and compares it to PDG value
- Parameter scan done with ULYSSES with a PyMultiNest back-end

GitHub: jnhoward/SU2LDM\_public DOI: <u>10.5281/zenodo.5965537</u>

![](_page_27_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_12.jpeg)