Bounding Dark Baryons: From Fermions to Bosons







Michael I. Buchoff INT, U of Washington, Seattle

Primary contributors: Sergey Syritsyn Ethan Neil Graham Kribs

arXiv: 1312.???? (hep-ph) arXiv: 1312.???? (hep-lat)

PRD 88 014502 (2013)





James Osborn



Rich Brower Michael Cheng Claudio Rebbi Oliver Witzel Evan Weinberg





Chris Schroeder Pavlos Vranas Enrico Rinaldi

Joe Kiskis

David Schaich



Tom Appelquist George Fleming **Gennady Voronov**

Mike Buchoff



Ethan Neil



Ethan Neil Sergey Syritsyn



Meifeng Lin











How do we know DM is there?



Rotation Curves of Galaxies

Gravitational Lensing



Cosmological Backgrounds

THREE PRIMARY PROPERTIES OF DARK MATTER

1. Candidate should be Stable

- Explains why dark matter has survived to today

Implies a new symmetry and/or charge

2. Candidate should be EW Charge Neutral

- Explains why there is no visible evidence

Implies lightest stable particle is chargeless

3. Candidate should explain observed relic density

$$\rho_D \sim 0.2 \ \rho_c$$

How can this come about?

THERMAL RELIC



One approach to DM theories:

Choose DM Mass Choose DM Interactions



 $\rho_D \sim 0.2 \ \rho_c$

"WIMP Miracle"

Assume Interactions at/near EW Scale







S.Nussinov (1985) S.M. Barr, R.S.Chivukula, E. Farhi (1990)

R.S.Chivukula, T.P.Walker (1990)

D.B.Kaplan (1992)

Observe a different relation:

 $\rho_D \sim 5\rho_B$ $M_D n_D \sim 5M_B n_B$



S.Nussinov (1985) S.M. Barr, R.S.Chivukula, E. Farhi (1990)

R.S.Chivukula, T.P.Walker (1990)

D.B.Kaplan (1992)

Observe a different relation:





THERMAL VS. ASYMMETRIC

However:

Asymmetric relic density suggests negligible thermal abundance



Tricky to achieve for perturbative, elementary DM Strongly-coupled composite theories most interesting... ...this is where the lattice can play significant role!

ASYMMETRIC MODELS

We Want:

★ Lightest stable composite chargeless (EM + weak) **★** Constituents that communicate with electroweak **Direct:** Subset of constituents that are non-singlet under $SU(2)_L$ Indirect: Bai, Neutral, but couples to heavy, Schwaller charged particles yet to be observed 2013

WORTH NOTING

The composite theories discussed here are NOT designed to be solutions to EW symmetry breaking!

Theories studied here are not technicolor
 * No Goldstone modes becoming longitudinal vector components
 * Minimal contribution to vector masses and Higgs vev

 (ala QCD)

Interactions considered here for stable, confinement-scale baryons:

* Odd Nc: Only EM interactions

* Even Nc: EW interactions with SM Higgs

BARYON FLAVOR SYMMETRY Invariant under $SU(N_f)$ transformations

★ Flavor Non-symmetric Example: (3-color neutron ala QCD)



 $Q_u = Q_d$ or $Q_u \neq Q_d$

★ Flavor Symmetric Example: (4-color neutron)



 $Q_u = -Q_d$ only

HOW WE MIGHT SEE IT?

Dim-5 $\overline{\psi}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\psi F_{\mu\nu}$

 $(\overline{\psi}\psi)v_{\mu}\partial_{\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$

Dim-6

Magnetic Moment

Odd Nc No baryon flavor sym.

Odd Nc Baryon flavor sym.

Even Nc No Baryon flavor sym.

Even Nc Baryon flavor sym.



Charge Radius

V

Dim-7

 $(\overline{\psi}\psi)F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$

Polarizability









FOCUS OF PREVIOUS WORK

Direct detection exclusions for odd number of colors

Explore:

3-colors
Multiple degenerate masses
2 and 6 light flavors

Explores a range of confining theories for odd Nc theory

FOCUS OF PREVIOUS WORK

Direct detection exclusions for odd number of colors



Explores a range of confining theories for odd Nc theory

CROSS-SECTION CALC.

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dE_R} = \frac{\overline{|\mathcal{M}_{\rm SI}|^2} + \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{\rm SD}|^2}}{16\pi(\underline{M_{\chi}} + M_T)^2 E_R^{\rm max}}$$

$$E_R^{\max} = \frac{2M_\chi^2 M_T v^2}{(M_\chi + M_T)^2}$$

$$\overline{|\mathcal{M}_{\rm SI}|^2} = e^4 \left[ZF_c(Q) \right]^2 \left(\frac{M_T}{M_{\chi}} \right)^2 \left[\frac{4}{9} M_{\chi}^4 \langle r_{E\chi}^2 \rangle^2 + \kappa_{\chi}^2 \left(1 + \frac{M_{\chi}}{M_T} \right)^2 \left(\frac{E_R^{\rm max}}{E_R} - 1 \right) \right]$$
$$\overline{|\mathcal{M}_{\rm SD}|^2} = e^4 \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{J+1}{J} \right) \left[\left(A \frac{\mu_T}{\mu_n} \right) F_s(Q) \right]^2 \kappa_{\chi}^2$$

$$R = \frac{M_{\text{detector}}}{M_T} \frac{\rho_{\text{DM}}}{M_{\chi}} \int_{E_{\text{min}}}^{E_{\text{max}}} dE_R \,\mathcal{A}cc(E_R) \left\langle v' \,\frac{d\sigma}{dE_R} \right\rangle_f$$

*Non-perturbative lattice input

 $E_{max}^{Xe} = 30.5 \text{ keV}$

Xenon100:

$$E_{min}^{Xe} = 6.6 \text{ keV}$$

THREE-POINT CALCULATION

 $t = 0 \qquad t = \tau \qquad t = \tau_0$

Disconected diagrams omitted in current calculation

2 Propagators

One measurements One time insertion

Transverse charge density:

(courtesy of J. Wasem)



SCALE SETTING

How do we define lattice spacing in physical units?

Lattice QCD: Hadron Masses, HQ potentials, etc. (Example) $aM_{\Omega} = \#$ \longrightarrow $a \approx \frac{\#}{1670 \text{ MeV}}$ Technicolor: "Higgs" vev $af_{\pi} \xrightarrow{m_f \to 0} \# \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad a \approx \frac{\#}{246 \text{ GeV}}$ Dark Matter: Dark Matter Mass $aM_B = \#$ \longrightarrow $a \approx \frac{\#}{M_B}$



SCALE SETTING

How do we define lattice spacing in physical units?

Lattice QCD: Hadron Masses, HQ potentials, etc. (Example) $aM_{\Omega} = \#$ \longrightarrow $a \approx \frac{\#}{1670 \text{ MeV}}$ Technicolor: "Higgs" vev $af_{\pi} \xrightarrow{m_f \to 0} \# \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad a \approx \frac{\#}{246 \text{ GeV}}$ Dark Matter: Dark Matter Mass $aM_B = \#$ \longrightarrow $a \approx \frac{\#}{M_B}$ Vary this value 0 40 50 100 WIMP Mass [GeV/c²]

300 400

CALCULATION DETAILS

10 DWF Ensembles:

- $32^3 \times 64 \times 16$ lattices

 $am_{\rho} \sim \frac{1}{5}$

- 2 flavor: $m_f = 0.010 0.030$
- 6 flavor: $m_f = 0.010 0.030$

Table 1: 2 Flavor			Table 1: 6 Flavor		
m_q	# Configs	# Meas	m_q	# Configs	# Meas
0.010	564	1128	0.010	221	442
0.015	148	296	0.015	112	224
0.020	131	262	0.020	81	162
0.025	67	268	0.025	89	267
0.030	39	154	0.030	72	259

BARYON MASS

Red - 2 Flavor Blue - 6 Flavor



MAGNETIC MOMENT

0.0 -0.5 -1.0 Red - 2 Flavor ^xuent – 1.5 Blue - 6 Flavor -2.0 -2.5 -3.0 1.2 2.0 2.2 1.0 1.6 1.8 1.4 M_B/M_{B_0}

 $u = \frac{\kappa}{2M_B}$

 $\kappa_{\rm neut} = \frac{1}{6}\kappa_s - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_v$

CHARGE RADIUS



EXCLUSION PLOTS



Dashed horizontal line - Xenon100 PRD 88 014502 (2013)

FOCUS OF CURRENT WORK

Direct detection exclusions for even number of colors

Allows for cross-section bounds from Higgs exchange

MODEL BASICS



Field	$SU(4)_D$	$(SU(2)_L, SU(2)_R)$
F_1	4	(2,1)
F_2	$\overline{4}$	$({f \bar 2}, {f 1})$
F_3	4	(1,2)
F_4	$\overline{4}$	$(1,\mathbf{ar{2}})$

Kinetic:

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} = iF_1^{\dagger}\bar{\sigma}^{\mu}\nabla_{\mu,L}F_1 + iF_2^{\dagger}\bar{\sigma}^{\mu}\nabla_{\mu,L}F_2 + iF_3^{\dagger}\bar{\sigma}^{\mu}\nabla_{\mu,R}F_3 + iF_4^{\dagger}\bar{\sigma}^{\mu}\nabla_{\mu,R}F_4$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^{\mu}_{L} &= \partial^{\mu} + igA^{a,\mu}(\tau^{a}_{L}/2) \\ (\nabla^{\mu}_{L})^{*} &= \partial^{\mu} - igA^{a,\mu}(\tau^{a}_{L}/2) \\ \nabla^{\mu}_{R} &= \partial^{\mu} + ig'B^{\mu}(\tau^{3}_{R}/2) \\ (\nabla^{\mu}_{R})^{*} &= \partial^{\mu} - ig'B^{\mu}(\tau^{3}_{R}/2) \end{aligned}$$

MODEL BASICS



Field	$SU(4)_D$	$(SU(2)_L, SU(2)_R)$
F_1	4	(2,1)
F_2	$\overline{4}$	$({f ar 2}, {f 1})$
F_3	4	(1,2)
F_4	$\overline{4}$	$(1,\mathbf{ar{2}})$

Mass:

 $\mathcal{L}_{M} = m_{12}F_{1}F_{2} + m_{34}F_{3}F_{4} + y_{14}F_{1}HF_{4} + y_{23}F_{2}H^{\dagger}F_{3} + \text{h.c.}$ Vector-like Chiral $\langle H \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} v & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix}$ $\mathcal{L}_{M} \rightarrow (F_{1} \ F_{3}) \begin{pmatrix} m_{12} & y_{14}v \\ y_{23}v & m_{34} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_{2} \\ F_{4} \end{pmatrix}$

WHY VECTOR-LIKE MASSES?

% Primary Motivation:

Pure chiral masses 2-color (Quirky) theories in heavy fermion limit excluded by Higgs exchange

G.D. Kribs, T.S. Roy, J. Terning, K.M. Zurek (2009)

Other composite theories of this kind likely to follow suit...

Wector-like masses have unique properties
Lots of recent focus in context of Higgs to two photons
N. Arkani-Hamed, K. Blum, R.T. D'Agnolo, J. Fan (2012)
M. Voloshin (2012)

Can vector-like masses suppress Higgs exchange?

HIGGS EXCHANGE

#Higgs-nucleon cross-section:

$$\sigma = \frac{\mu(m_B, m_n)^2}{4\pi A^2 m_h^4} (Zf_p + (A - Z)f_n)^2 \times g_h^2 \checkmark$$

$$g_h = f_B = \frac{\sigma_h}{M_B} = \left[\frac{yh}{M_B}\frac{\partial\sigma_f}{\partial(yh)}\right]_{h=v}$$

$$\sigma_f = m_f \langle B | \overline{q}q | B \rangle = m_f \frac{\partial M_B}{\partial m_f}$$

Extract

This

$$f_B = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{yh}{m_f} \frac{\partial m_f}{\partial (yh)} \end{bmatrix}_{h=v} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{m_f}{M_B} \frac{\partial M_B}{\partial m_f} \end{bmatrix}$$
Pert. Non-pert.

VEC. MASS SUPPRESSION?

Simplified Mass Matrix:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{M} + \Delta M/2 & yv \\ yv & \bar{M} - \Delta M/2 \end{pmatrix} \qquad m_1 = \bar{M} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta M^2 + 4(yv)^2} \\ m_2 = \bar{M} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta M^2 + 4(yv)^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\frac{yh}{m_f}\frac{\partial m_f}{\partial(yh)} = \frac{1}{2\widetilde{M} + \sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta M}^2 + 1}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta M}^2 + 1}} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \widetilde{M} = \overline{M}/2yv\\ \widetilde{\Delta M} = \Delta M/2yv \end{array}$$

$$\frac{yh}{m_f}\frac{\partial m_f}{\partial(yh)} \to \begin{cases} 1 & 2yv \gg \bar{M}, \Delta M \\ \frac{yv}{\bar{M}} & \bar{M} \gg 2yv \gg \Delta M \\ \frac{2(yv)^2}{\bar{M}\Delta M} & \bar{M} \gg \Delta M \gg 2yv \end{cases}$$

4-COLOR BARYONS

Bosonic baryons One Flavor: USpin-2: $\mathcal{O}_{B,S2}^{N_F=1} = (U^T C \gamma^i U) (U^T C \gamma^j U)$ $i \neq j$ Two Flavors: U D $\mathcal{O}_{B,S2}^{N_F=2} = (U^T C \gamma^i U) (U^T C \gamma^j U)$ Spin-2: $i \neq j$ $\mathcal{O}_{B,S1}^{N_F=2} = (U^T C \gamma^i U) (U^T C \gamma^5 D)$ Spin-1: $\mathcal{O}_{B,S1}^{N_F=2} = (U^T C \gamma^5 D) (U^T C \gamma^5 D)$ Spin-0:

CALCULATION DETAILS

- 28 quenched Ensembles:
 - Two # colors
 - Four lattice volumes
 - Three lattice spacings
 - 3-6 fermion masses

N_c	β	κ	$N_s^3 \times N_t$	# Meas.
4	11.028	0.1554	$16^3 \times 32$	4878
			$32^3 \times 64$	1126
		0.15625	$16^3 \times 32$	4765
			$32^3 \times 64$	1146
			$48^3 \times 96$	1091
		0.1572	$32^3 \times 64$	1075
	11.5	0.1515	$16^3 \times 32$	2975
			$32^3 \times 64$	1057
		0.1520	$16^3 \times 32$	2872
			$32^3 \times 64$	1052
1		0.1523	$16^3 \times 32$	2976
			$32^3 \times 64$	914
			$48^3 \times 96$	637
			$64^3 \times 128$	489
		0.1524	$16^3 \times 32$	2970
1.1.1.1			$32^3 \times 64$	863
		0.1527	$32^3 \times 64$	1011
and the second	12.0	0.1475	$32^3 \times 64$	1125
		0.1480	$32^3 \times 64$	1189
		0.1486	$32^3 \times 64$	1055
1000		0.1491	$16^3 \times 32$	411
		0.1491	$32^3 \times 64$	1050
		0.1491	$48^3 \times 96$	1150
		0.1491	$64^3 \times 128$	928
		0.1495	$32^3 \times 64$	1043
		0.1496	$32^3 \times 64$	1009
3	6.0175	0.1537	$32^3 \times 64$	1000
		0.1547	$32^3 \times 64$	1000

Table 1: Ensembles and number of measurements.

LARGE N COMPARISONS



Solid - 4 colors Dashed - 3 colors

> Black - Spin 2 Blue - Spin 1 Brown - Spin 0 Green - Spin 3/2 Purple - Spin 1/2 Orange - Vector Red- Pseudoscalar

VOLUME EFFECTS



$$\beta = 11.028$$



 $\beta = 11.5$

VOLUME EFFECTS



 $\beta = 12.0$

LATTICE SPACING EFFECTS









SIGMA TERM & HIGGS BOUND



FINAL WORD

** Significant bounds exist for composite DM Fermions - Magnetic Moment $\longrightarrow M_{DM} \gtrsim 10$ TeV Boson - Pure Chiral masses Higgs Exchange $M_{DM} \gtrsim 1$ TeV

* Additional vector-like masses can reduce constraint from Higgs exchange LUX Bound

 $\frac{yv}{\bar{M}} \lesssim 0.70 \quad \text{when} \quad \bar{M} \gg 2yv \gg \Delta M$ $\frac{2(yv)^2}{\bar{M}\Delta M} \lesssim 0.70 \quad \text{when} \quad \bar{M} \gg \Delta M \gg 2yv$

FINAL WORD

Big Question:

Does a minimum SM cross-section on composite DM

For charged constituents: Polarizabilities

Future work in this direction:

1) Lattice measurements of 4-color polarizabilities

- Background field method
- Large volumes, two lattice spacings
- High Statistics
- 2) DM-nucleon scattering via polarizabilities
 - Improve on current methods accounting for nuclear physics
 - Additional sensitivity to nuclear resonances?

The LLNL Multiprogrammatic and Institutional Computing program through the Tier 1 Grand Challenge award provided us the large amounts of necessary computing power.