

PAMELA and dark matter

V. Barger¹, W.-Y. Keung², D. Marfatia³, G. Shaughnessy¹

¹*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706*

²*Department of Physics, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL 60607 and*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045*

Assuming that the positron excess in PAMELA data is a consequence of annihilations of cold dark matter lighter than the top quark, we consider from a model-independent perspective if the data show a preference for the spin of dark matter.

Introduction. One of the unsolved problems in cosmology and particle physics is the nature of dark matter (DM) which accounts for about 20% of the energy density of the universe. Particle physics models typically relate discrete symmetries with the existence of a stable cold DM candidate. A variety of such models have been suggested that provide viable explanations of the DM. Weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) can be either of integer or noninteger spin. The classic case of supersymmetry (SUSY) has a spin-1/2 neutralino as dark matter whereas extra dimensional models and collective symmetry breaking models have spin-1 dark matter. Specific realizations are the minimal Universal Extra Dimensions (mUED) [1] and Little Higgs with T-parity (LHT) [2] models. Spin-0 dark matter is possible in models with an additional singlet in the scalar sector of the Standard Model [3].

Recent evidence for a positron excess in the PAMELA satellite data [4] spurs attention to WIMPs whose annihilations in the galactic halo can explain an excess over backgrounds [5, 6]. PAMELA data presented thus far show a turn-up in the energy spectrum at about 10 GeV and a steady rise up to 50 GeV with no fall-off in that dataset. The shape of the spectrum bears directly on the annihilation mechanism. Spin-1 DM annihilations directly into e^+e^- produce a line spectrum, whereas spin-1/2 Majorana DM will give a continuum spectrum from secondary decays of weak bosons, quarks and leptons.

Our goal is to study if the PAMELA excess provides hints about the spin of the DM particle in a model-independent approach. We do not subscribe to any specific particle physics model, but comment on models where appropriate. We also do not require that the measured relic abundance be reproduced since this is highly model-dependent. Moreover, the total energy density in dark matter may be comprised of several components, so only an upper bound need be imposed on the energy density of a particular DM particle. The nature of our analysis precludes us from making projections for signatures at IceCube, the Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope, direct detection experiments and the Large Hadron Collider, all of which are interesting in their own right.

Modelling the positron signal and background. The positron background expected primarily from supernovae and from collisions of cosmic ray protons and nuclei on the interstellar medium is simulated in Ref. [7]. The results of the simulation have the convenient parameteri-

zation [8], $\Phi_{e^+}^{bkg} = 4.5E^{0.7}/(1+650E^{2.3}+1500E^{4.2})$, with the energy of the positron E in GeV. Since we present our results as a positron fraction $\Phi_{e^+}/(\Phi_{e^+}+\Phi_{e^-})$ which allows for cancellations of systematic uncertainties and the effects of solar activity, we also need the electron background which is analogously parameterized by [9] $\Phi_{e^-}^{bkg} = 0.16E^{-1.1}/(1+11E^{0.9}+3.2E^{2.15})+0.7E^{0.7}/(1+110E^{1.5}+580E^{4.2})$. Solar modulations arise from the phase of the solar cycle and from the opposite charges of electrons and positrons. Without charge sign bias, the positron ratio is independent of solar activity. However, since PAMELA data show evidence of charge sign dependence for positron energies below 5 GeV, we only analyze data above 5 GeV.

Positrons produced in DM annihilations propagate through the interstellar medium to the earth and as a consequence suffer absorption effects that broaden the positron spectrum to lower energies. We estimate the primary positron flux from dark matter annihilations according to the prescription of Refs. [9, 10, 11]. Here we briefly describe the procedure and refer the reader to Refs. [9, 11] for details.

The positron number density per unit energy is governed by the diffusion-loss equation with diffusion coefficient $K(E) = K_0(E/\text{GeV})^\delta$ which describes propagation through turbulent magnetic fields, and is taken to be independent of position. The equation also accounts for energy losses through synchrotron radiation and inverse Compton scattering on the cosmic microwave background and infrared galactic starlight. The diffusion zone in which the diffusion-loss equation is applicable is modelled as a cylinder of height $2L$ and radius 20 kpc that straddles the galactic plane in which most cosmic ray interactions take place. The positron number density is assumed to vanish on the surface of the cylinder, since outside the diffusion zone the positrons propagate freely and escape into the intergalactic medium. The source of the positrons due to DM annihilations depend on the DM density profile and on the annihilation cross section. For the former, we adopt the Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) halo profile that has a cusp at the center of the galaxy [12].

The normalization K_0 and the spectral index δ of the diffusion coefficient, and L can all be selected to be consistent with the measured boron to carbon ratio in cosmic rays [13]. We consider three sets of these parameters, “min”, “med” and “max”, of Ref. [11] and reproduce

Model	δ	K_0 (kpc ² /Myr)	L (kpc)
min	0.55	0.00595	1
med	0.70	0.0112	4
max	0.46	0.0765	15

TABLE I: Three sets of parameters describing cosmic ray propagation [11]. The med set is the best-fit to the measured boron to carbon ratio. The min and max sets minimize and maximize the positron fluxes, respectively.

them in Table I. The med set has values of K_0 , δ and L which best fit the measured boron to carbon ratio. The min and max sets minimize and maximize the positron fluxes above about 10 GeV. Needless to say, the min and max sets are only representative, since the positron flux depends on the mass of the DM particle M_{DM} and on the annihilation channel once the halo profile is selected.

Assuming steady-state conditions, a semi-analytic expression for the primary positron flux has been obtained [10, 11]. The result depends on a so-called “halo function” which encodes the physics of cosmic ray propagation. We employ numerical fit functions [9] for the halo functions pertinent to the NFW profile with the min, med and max propagation parameter sets. We allow for the possibility of high density substructures in the dark matter halo that enhance the positron flux by an energy-independent “boost factor” B . Note that N -body simulations suggest that B can not be larger than about 10 and may be energy-dependent [14].

Dark matter annihilations. We assume M_{DM} is smaller than the top quark mass. This choice is dictated by our interest in model-independence. If the $t\bar{t}$ channel were open, the relative contributions of different channels to the positron spectrum would depend on the details of the Higgs sector.

Since the PAMELA data show a sharp rise, we only consider positrons from a e^+ line spectrum or from the two-body decays of pair-produced weak bosons at the source. For DM lighter than the top quark, we do not expect the three-body decays of b quarks and τ leptons to reproduce the PAMELA spectrum without unreasonable astrophysical assumptions. Specifically, we study the spectra from direct production, $DMDM \rightarrow e^+e^-$ (which produces a positron line close to M_{DM}), and from secondary production from the process $DMDM \rightarrow W^+W^-$.¹ Concrete examples of direct annihilation into e^+e^- are found in mUED and LHT in which spin-1 DM annihilate by exchange of an odd-parity fermion [15, 16]. Direct annihilation also occurs for hidden/mirror Dirac fermions and sterile neutrinos. The latter constitute warm DM which is not relevant to our study of non-

spin	s -channel	t, u -channel	t, u -channel
	Higgs	fermion	boson
0	LL, TT	X	LL
$\frac{1}{2}$	0	TT	X
1	LL, TT	X	LL, TT

TABLE II: Polarizations of W pairs produced by static annihilations $DMDM \rightarrow W^+W^-$ depend on the spin of the DM particle. “LL” and “TT” indicate that the W bosons are longitudinally and transversely polarized, respectively. “X” indicates that there is no contribution at the tree-level, and “0” indicates that the amplitude vanishes in the static limit. Note that a Dirac fermion also has contributions from s -channel Z -exchange.

relativistic DM. If DM is a Majorana fermion, helicity suppression prevents the direct production of e^+e^- . For scalar DM the amplitude for static annihilation into light fermions vanishes [17]. Since the production of W pairs is spin-dependent, we further classify the positron spectra according to whether the W bosons are longitudinally polarized or transversely polarized

The normalized distributions for the e^+ energy are

$$f_{TT}(x) = 3 \frac{\beta_W^2 + (1-x)^2}{8\beta_W^3} \quad (1)$$

$$f_{LL}(x) = 3 \frac{\beta_W^2 - (1-x)^2}{4\beta_W^3}, \quad (2)$$

for the transverse (TT) modes and longitudinal (LL) mode, respectively, where $\beta_W^2 = 1 - m_W^2/M_{DM}^2$ and $x = 2E_{e^+}/M_{DM} \leq 1 \pm \beta_W$. In general, if the W^+W^- channel has both TT and LL contributions of relative weights a and b , then the resultant distribution which combines two TT modes and one LL mode is $(af_{LL}(x) + bf_{TT}(x))/(a+b)$.

In Table II, we categorize the polarization modes of the W pair according to the spin of the DM particle. While fermionic DM can not annihilate into W pairs via s -channel Higgs exchange in the static limit, spin-0 and spin-1 DM annihilations (with relative weights $a = (1 + \beta_W^2)^2$ and $b = 2(1 - \beta_W^2)^2$) give the distribution,

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{dx} = \frac{3[1 + \beta_W^4 - 2(1-x)^2]}{2\beta_W(3 - 2\beta_W^2 + 3\beta_W^4)}. \quad (3)$$

Note that as $\beta_W \rightarrow 1$, the longitudinal mode dominates. The DM particle in both mUED and LHT can annihilate via s -channel Higgs exchange. Whether these models produce line or continuum spectra or both depends on specific realizations.

Fermionic DM annihilations via t - or u - exchange of a fermion give only TT modes. The positron spectrum is then simply $f_{TT}(x)$ [18]. SUSY provides the common example of neutralinos that annihilate dominantly by t - or u -channel chargino exchange.

Analysis. We use exact matrix elements to evaluate the positron signal. In Fig. 1, we show spectral distributions of positrons produced in annihilations of a DM

¹ Although each Z in a Z pair produces a positron, since $\sigma(DMDM \rightarrow W^+W^-)/\sigma(DMDM \rightarrow ZZ) \approx 2$ in the high-energy limit, and since the leptonic branching fraction for W s is three times as much as for Z s, W pairs produce three times as many positrons as Z pairs with almost identical distributions.




FIG. 1: Annihilations of DM directly into e^+e^- give the e^+ line at about $M_{DM} = 150$ GeV. The secondary positron spectrum from decays of longitudinal (transverse) W bosons is labeled $W_L W_L$ ($W_T W_T$). The data points are preliminary results from the PAMELA experiment. Only data points above 5 GeV (denoted by filled symbols) are included in our analysis. The solid curve is the expected background. The med set of propagation parameters is used with the NFW profile for the DM halo.

Mode	Model	M_{DM} (GeV)	$B \cdot \langle \sigma v \rangle \cdot 10^{29}$ ($\text{cm}^{-3} \text{s}^{-1}$)	χ^2/dof
$W_L W_L$	med	150	6.6	1.2
	med	85	2.3	2.8
$W_T W_T$	med	150	7.3	1.7
	med	85	2.1	2.1
e^+e^-	min	150	17.0	5.0
	med	150	5.9	0.9
	max	150	3.7	1.1
	min	85	4.1	5.0
	med	85	2.0	1.0
	max	85	1.3	1.7
	min	75	3.0	4.9
	med	75	1.5	1.0
	max	75	1.0	1.9

TABLE III: The χ^2/dof for positron spectra from annihilations into $W_L W_L$, $W_T W_T$ and from direct production for three models of cosmic ray propagation. The overall normalization of the signal is determined by the product of the boost factor B and the cross section $\langle \sigma v \rangle$. For e^+e^- production, it is assumed that annihilation into W pairs is absent even if $M_{DM} > m_W$. The number of degrees of freedom (dof) in each case is 6.

particle of mass 150 GeV that fit the PAMELA excess. We assume that when direct production occurs, annihilations into W^+W^- are negligibly small. As can be seen from Table III, secondary positrons from W bosons of either polarization provide a satisfactory spectrum, although the e^+ line provides the best agreement. Note the similarity of the spectra from $W_L W_L$ and $W_T W_T$ close to threshold. Near threshold W pairs are moving slowly,




FIG. 2: Same as Fig. 1, but for $M_{DM} = 85$ GeV. Only direct production by DM annihilations provide a satisfactory fit to the PAMELA data; see Table III.




FIG. 3: The effect of propagation on the e^+ line spectrum is depicted by considering the min, med and max sets for DM that is assumed not to annihilate into W pairs. The min set does not yield a spectrum consistent with the data.

so in either case the emitted positrons have roughly the same energy. Consequently, the polarizations do not provide discriminatory power near threshold.

If the DM particle is lighter, we see from Fig. 2 and Table III that only direct production represents the data well. The min and max models make the agreement for all modes worse. Since the e^+ line seems to be marginally favored by the data, in Fig. 3 we show how the spectrum changes as the cosmic propagation model is changed. Again, we find that the med set of parameters works best for $M_{DM} = 150$ GeV.

So far we have made the ad hoc assumption that when direct production is possible, annihilations into W^+W^- are forbidden. To avoid making this assumption, we confirm that the e^+ line provides a good fit for $M_{DM} < m_W$. For $M_{DM} = 75$ GeV we find from Fig. 4 and Table III




FIG. 4: Same as Fig. 3, but for $M_{DM} = 75$ GeV, for which annihilations to real W pairs are forbidden. The min set does not yield a spectrum consistent with the data.

complete consistency with the PAMELA excess.

The antiproton spectrum measured by PAMELA up to 60 GeV shows no deviation from the expected background (which has larger uncertainties than the positron background associated in part with the greater propagation distance of antiprotons). Since our approach is model-independent we can not make definite statements about consistency with the cosmic antiproton data. By choosing an appropriate boost factor (which can be different from that for positrons) and appropriately modelling the propagation of antiprotons, it is easy to remain in agreement with the data. Within our approach it is also possible to have consistency by suppressing the DM annihilation branching fraction to antiquarks.

Conclusions. Our analysis shows that the PAMELA positron excess does not favor a DM particle of a particu-

lar spin. The data do not discriminate between positron spectra from direct production and from secondary decays of polarized W bosons. However, PAMELA is expected to collect positrons up to about 270 GeV. With those data it should be possible to draw stronger conclusions. If the data show a line, popular SUSY models will be in danger of being excluded and models with extra dimensions and collective symmetry breaking will gain support since they have spin-1 DM. Models with Dirac fermions as DM will also be viable. On the other hand if the data roll-over smoothly near the endpoint, and are fit well by positrons from transversely polarized W bosons, SUSY will be indicated. If positrons from longitudinally polarized W bosons are preferred by the data, neutralino DM will be in jeopardy, and the DM candidates of mUED and LHT will be preferred. The philosophy of this paper which emphasizes spectral shapes generic to the spin of the DM, and extensions of its methodology for larger DM masses may prove fruitful in conjunction with larger datasets from PAMELA and AMS.

It is important to bear in mind that although astrophysical processes are expected to produce a positron background that falls with energy, it may still be that astrophysical sources could mimic the putative DM signal. Confidence in the DM interpretation will be strengthened by signals in other experiments, involving both direct and indirect detection methods.

In a subsequent paper we will discuss heavier DM that can annihilate to top quark pairs and also compare with predictions of specific models that could reproduce the PAMELA positron excess.

Acknowledgments. This research was supported by DOE Grant Nos. DE-FG02-04ER41308, DE-FG02-95ER40896 and DE-FG02-84ER40173, by NSF Grant No. PHY-0544278, and by the WARF.

-
- [1] T. Appelquist, H. C. Cheng and B. A. Dobrescu, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 035002 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0012100].
 - [2] H. C. Cheng and I. Low, JHEP **0309**, 051 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0308199].
 - [3] V. Barger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 035005 (2008) [arXiv:0706.4311 [hep-ph]].
 - [4] M. Boezio, talk at ICHEP08, 34th International Conference on High Energy Physics, July-Aug 2008.
 - [5] L. Bergstrom, T. Bringmann and J. Edsjo, arXiv:0808.3725 [astro-ph].
 - [6] M. Cirelli and A. Strumia, arXiv:0808.3867 [astro-ph].
 - [7] I. V. Moskalenko and A. W. Strong, Astrophys. J. **493**, 694 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9710124].
 - [8] E. A. Baltz and J. Edsjo, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 023511 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9808243].
 - [9] M. Cirelli, R. Franceschini and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **800**, 204 (2008) [arXiv:0802.3378 [hep-ph]].
 - [10] J. Hisano, S. Matsumoto, O. Saito and M. Senami, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 055004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0511118].
 - [11] T. Delahaye, R. Lineros, F. Donato, N. Fornengo and P. Salati, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 063527 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2312 [astro-ph]].
 - [12] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk and S. D. M. White, Astrophys. J. **490**, 493 (1997) [arXiv:astro-ph/9611107].
 - [13] D. Maurin, F. Donato, R. Taillet and P. Salati, Astrophys. J. **555**, 585 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0101231].
 - [14] J. Lavalle, Q. Yuan, D. Maurin and X. J. Bi, arXiv:0709.3634 [astro-ph].
 - [15] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, Nucl. Phys. B **650**, 391 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206071].
 - [16] A. Birkedal, A. Noble, M. Perelstein and A. Spray, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 035002 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603077].
 - [17] V. Barger, W. Y. Keung and G. Shaughnessy, arXiv:0806.1962 [hep-ph].
 - [18] V. Barger, W. Y. Keung, G. Shaughnessy and A. Tregre, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 095008 (2007) [arXiv:0708.1325 [hep-ph]].