LUX Sensitivity to Effective Field Theory Interactions

Nicole A. Larsen

CIPANP 2018 31 May 2018

Direct Detection Basics

- **WIMP-nucleon recoil spectrum is approximately a decaying exponential**
- **f(v) depends on halo model:**
	- **"Spherical cow" model: Maxwellian distribution truncated at galactic vescape = 544 km/s**
	- **Accounts for Earth's motion through galaxy (220 km/s + annual modulation)**
- Local dark matter density also depends on halo model ($\rho_0 \sim 0.3$ GeV/cm³)
- $\frac{d\sigma}{dE_R} = \frac{m_A}{2\pi v^2} |\mathcal{M}|^2$ **FERMI'S GOLDEN RULE** • **Differential cross section:**

Scattering amplitude |M|2 contains all the particle physics

An EFT Framework for Direct Detection

Standard SI+SD-only WIMP scattering analyses assume a point-nucleus limit with non-relativistic momenta but…

- **Tension between experiments and the lack of a definitive positive detection suggest it is prudent to look for new interactions!**
	- **Parton momenta inside the nucleus are not necessarily small (q ~ 1/r)**
	- **New operators could add corrections to SI or SD interactions that are momentumor velocity-dependent…**
	- **… or produce entirely new nuclear responses that interfere with SI, SD interactions**
- **Would like to address possible WIMP-nucleon interactions in a complete and model-independent way**

Fitzpatrick et al. arXiv:1203.3542 Fitzpatrick et al. arxiv:1211.2818

Anand et al. arXiv: 1308.6288 Anand et al. arXiv: 1405.6690

A Complete Set of EFT Interactions

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = c \; \Psi_{\chi}^* \mathcal{O}_{\chi} \Psi_{\chi} \Psi_{N}^* \; \mathcal{O}_{N} \Psi_{N} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \left(c_i^{(n)} \mathcal{O}_i^{(n)} + c_i^{(p)} \mathcal{O}_i^{(p)} \right)
$$

- **Oi restricted to be Galilean-invariant and Hermitian**
- Allowed building blocks are WIMP spin S_z, nucleon spin S_N, incident velocity *v***2, momentum transfer** *q***2.**

Solution
\n**Solution**
\n**Function**
\n**Function**
\n
$$
\begin{bmatrix}\nO_1 = 1 & O_9 = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot (\vec{S}_N \times \vec{q}) \\
O_2 = (v^{\perp})^2 & O_{10} = i\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{q} \\
O_3 = i\vec{S}_N \cdot (\vec{q} \times \vec{v}^{\perp}) & O_{11} = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q} \\
O_4 = \vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{S}_N & O_{12} = \vec{S}_\chi \cdot (\vec{S}_N \times \vec{v}^{\perp}) \\
O_5 = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot (\vec{q} \times \vec{v}^{\perp}) & O_{13} = i(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{v}^{\perp})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{q}) \\
O_6 = (\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{q}) & O_{14} = i(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^{\perp}) \\
O_7 = \vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^{\perp} & O_{16} = -(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^{\perp}) \cdot \vec{q}^{\perp} & O_{12} \text{ and } O_{15}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$

\n**Function**
\n**Function**
\n $\begin{aligned}\nO_6 &= (\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{q}) & O_{14} &= i(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^{\perp}) \\
O_{15} &= -(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{q})((\vec{S}_N \times \vec{v}^{\perp}) \cdot \vec{q}) & \text{Linear comb. of} \\
O_{12} \text{ and } O_{15}\n\end{aligned}$

Nuclear Responses

- **All interactions are linear combos. of 6 independent nuclear responses**
- **These are the leading-order multipoles that show up in terms of the nuclear scattering matrix – depend only on the nuclear physics of the target**

Solution
$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I
$$

Direct Detection of Interactions

The scattering amplitude can then be written as

$$
|\mathcal{M}|^2 \equiv \frac{m_A^2}{m_N^2} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{N,N'=n,p} c_i^N c_j^{N'} F_{i,j}^{(N,N')}
$$

where:

- $\mathbf{c}_{\mathsf{i}}, \, \mathbf{c}_{\mathsf{j}}$ are the WIMP-nucleon coupling constants for operators O_i and O_j
- **Fi,j is a form factor that contains all the particle and nuclear physics**
- Each F_{i,j} is a linear combination of nuclear responses F_{k =} M, Σ", Σ', Δ, Φ", Φ':

$$
F_{i,j}^{(N,N')} = \sum_{k=M,\Sigma'',\Sigma',\Delta,\Phi'',\widetilde{\Phi}'} a_{ijk} F_k^{(N,N')}
$$

• Calculate the F_k numerically using your favorite method, e.g. nuclear shell **model**

WIMP-Nucleon Sensitivity by Target

M (SI): Response goes as A2; favors heavy targets (e.g. Xe, I).

Σ", Σ' (SD): The two components can appear independently; each favors targets with unpaired neutrons (e.g. ⁷³Ge,¹²⁹Xe, ¹³¹Xe) or protons (¹⁹F, ¹²⁷I).

Δ (LD): Arises from operators dependent on nucleon velocities. Favors targets with high A.

Φ'', Φ' (LSD, tLSD): Favor elements with unfilled orbitals above the *s-***shell; only targets with spin > 1 are sensitive (e.g. 131Xe).**

Plot adapted from Fitzpatrick et al. arXiv:1203.3542

Xenon is sensitive to all but WIMPproton Σ", Σ'

This can be overcome by:

- **The large size and scalability of xenon-based detectors**
- **Complementarity of targets**

Selected WIMP-Nucleon Recoil Spectra in Xenon

- **SI and SD spectra are approximately decaying exponentials.**
- **For other operators, the momentum dependence affects the spectral shape.**
- Spectra for large m_y stay flat or rise out to O(100-1000) keV!

An EFT Analysis of the First LUX Science Run

- **LUX is a dual-phase 370-kg xenon-based TPC whose 2013, 2014-2016 runs set world-leading** constraints on SI WIMP-nucleon scatters (see M. Szydagis talk)**
- **2013 LUX WIMP search run: 118 kg fiducial volume * 94.98 livedays**

- **For EFT interactions:**
	- **Large upper energy threshold desirable but limited by available calibration data and 83mKr events in the WIMP search dataset**
	- Choose E_{upper} = 30 keV_{ee} (Kr mean 5σ) = 168.7 keV_{nr}. Limits are robust to +/- 1σ **variations in the NR model**
	- **Remove events >3σ below the NR band mean**
	- **4 events observed; 4.78 background events expected**
	- **Computationally expensive => Feldman-Cousins cut-and-count approach**

**** XENON1T now in the lead**

Comparing LUX to Other Experiments

Limits on Selected Operators

Limits on Selected Operators

Isospin-Independent Limits

- **Limits on previous slides not model-independent (restrict either WIMPneutron or WIMP-proton coupling strength to be zero)**
- **For a fixed WIMP mass, can set limits on WIMP-p and WIMP-n interactions in** arbitrary combinations, i.e. define an allowed region in c_p vs. c_n space
- **For a multi-isotope target with isotopes Ai :**

$$
\sum_{A_i} \left(\frac{c_p}{c_p^{lim(A_i)}} \pm \frac{c_n}{c_n^{lim(A_i)}} \right) < 1 \qquad \text{(Reduces to $\left(\frac{c_p}{c_p^{lim}} \pm \frac{c_n}{c_n^{lim}} \right) < 1$} \qquad \text{(Reduces to $ \left(\frac{c_p}{c_p^{lim}} \pm \frac{c_n}{c_n^{lim}} \right) < 1$}.
$$

- (c_p^{lim} is the limit on c_p assuming $c_n = 0$ and vice versa; $c_p^{\text{lim(Ai)}}$, $c_n^{\text{lim(Ai)}}$ **additionally assume only isotope Ai contributes to event rate)**
- **Standard SD limits often presented in this way.**

Limits on Selected Operators

Limits on Selected Operators

Operator Interference

- **Operators interfere pairwise**
	- Neutron-proton interference for a single O_i (e.g. "xenophobic" dark matter)
	- **Two operators Oi and Oj can interfere**
- **Such scenarios may relieve tension between experiments**
- **Or drive the selection of targets to probe previously inaccessible regions in WIMP parameter space** Projections of 4D $\mathcal{O}_8/\mathcal{O}_9$ Interference Eigenvectors

 $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \circ 0$

• **In general, maximal interference found by solving a 4x4 eigenvector problem:**

16

Solid: Constructive

Dashed: Destructive

Interference Between Selected Operators

• **Limits on**

$$
||C||^2 = C_8^{(n)2} + C_8^{(p)2} + (C_9^{(n)} \times m_p)^2 + (C_9^{(p)} \times m_p)^2
$$

are evaluated at the maximally destructive eigenvector for a xenon target for a benchmark WIMP mass of 50 GeV and recoil energy $E_r = 30 \text{ keV}_{\text{nr}}$:

```
C_8^{(n)} : C_8^{(p)} : (C_9^{(n)} \times m_p) : (C_9^{(p)} \times m_p)= 0.1803 : -2.603 : 0.1491 : 0.9367
```
 $\mathcal{O}_8/\mathcal{O}_9$ maximally destructive interference

- **Xenon-based experiments are competitive at all masses**
- **PICO-type experiments (unpaired proton) are complementary**
- **A dark matter explanation for event excesses from DAMA/LIBRA and CDMS-ii Si is ruled out – if XENON/LUX doesn't see it, then PICO will!**
- **Other interference sectors yield similar results (not shown)**

Summary and Conclusion

- **LUX has previously set world-leading limits on SI WIMP-nucleon interactions.**
- **We set limits on each momentum- and velocity-dependent operator in the effective field theory framework developed by Anand + Fitzpatrick + Haxton, et al. using data from the initial 95-day first LUX dark matter search.**
	- **Individually for each nucleon…**
	- **… in an isospin-independent way….**
	- **… and for destructive interference scenarios**

Summary and Conclusion

- **LUX has previously set world-leading limits on SI WIMP-nucleon interactions.**
- **We set limits on each momentum- and velocity-dependent operator in the effective field theory framework developed by Anand + Fitzpatrick + Haxton, et al. using data from the initial 95-day first LUX dark matter search.**

For all operators (except WIMP-proton Σ" and Σ') and WIMP masses above ~12 GeV, LUX is able to set stringent limits. Even in maximally destructive interference scenarios, LUX is competitive.

Ge targets are sensitive to EFT interactions for low-mass WIMPs. At high masses, Xe targets win in all but the most fine-tuned scenarios.

For coverage of WIMP-proton Σ" and Σ' interactions PICO-type experiments (F targets) are complementary to LUX/LZ/XENON1T.

In all cases, an EFT dark matter explanation for DAMA is ruled out!

Summary and Conclusion

- **LUX has previously set world-leading limits on SI WIMP-nucleon interactions.**
- **We set limits on each momentum- and velocity-dependent operator in the effective field theory framework developed by Anand + Fitzpatrick + Haxton, et al. using data from the initial 95-day first LUX dark matter search.**

Look forward to results from the full LUX exposure incorporating:

- **The full set of calibrations**
- **Improved background models**
- **S1 pulse shape discrimination**
- **And a larger energy window to probe high-mass WIMP parameter space**

THANK YOU!

G

 N

K

P

S

 Γ

K

Berkeley Lab / UC Berkeley

PI, Professor

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

PI, Assistant Professor

Ex-Postdoc

Postdoc

University of Edinburgh

Lawrence Livermore

National Laboratory

S Stanislaus State

Wing To

Imperial College London

Alastai

Nellie¹

Da

Ch

TJ

X LIP Coimbra דד

h, **PennState**

Carmen Carmona **Emily Grace**

Douglas Tiedt

Postdoc

PI, Assistant Professor

SDSTA / Sanford Lab

David Taylor Senior Engineer Markus Hom **Research Scientist**

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY State University of New York

TEXAS A&M ĀlÑ

> PI, Professor **Graduate Student**

> > PI, Professor

Postdoc

Project Scientist

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

PI, Professor

Project Scientist

Graduate Student

Senior Machinist

PI, Assistant Professor

Graduate Student

Postdoc

Ex-Graduate Student Ex-Graduate Student

Berkelev

Robert Webb

Paul Terman

Daniel Mckinsey Ethan Bernard Elizabeth Boulton Junsong Lin **Brian Tennyson** Lucie Tvrznikova Vetri Velan

DAVIS UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mani Tripathi Aaron Manalaysay James Morad **Sergey Uvarov** Jacob Cutter Dave Hemer

WISCONSIN

Kimberly Palladino Shaun Alsum Rachel Mannino

UC SANTA BARBARA

University College London 4° ucl

Chamkaur Ghag Jim Dobson Umit Utku

Carter Hall Jon Balajthy

> **Scott Hertel Christopher Nedlik**

Frank Wolfs Wojtek Skulski Eryk Druszkiewicz Dev Aashish Khaitan Mongkol Moongweluwan

University of Sheffield

Dongming Mei

Pl. Professor

Graduate Student MARYLAND

PI, Professor **Graduate Student**

PI, Professor

Postdoc

PI. Assistant Professor

Graduate Student

PI, Professor

Senior Scientist

Electrical Engineer

Graduate Student

Graduate Student

Reader, Particle Physics

Research Associate

Research Associate

Graduate Student