

Axino Dark Matter in Anomalous $U(1)'$ Models

Francesco Fucito^{1‡}, Andrea Lionetto^{2‡}, Andrea Mammarella^{3‡}, Antonio Racioppi^{4‡,‡}

‡ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Roma , “Tor Vergata” and
 I.N.F.N. - Sezione di Roma “Tor Vergata”
 Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1 - 00133 Roma, ITALY

‡ DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences
 Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, UK

Abstract

We study a possible dark matter candidate in the framework of a minimal anomalous $U(1)'$ extension of the MSSM. It turns out that in a suitable decoupling limit the axino, which is present in the Stückelberg multiplet, is the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP). We compute the relic density of this particle including coannihilations with the next to lightest supersymmetric particle (NLSP) which is assumed almost degenerate in mass with the LSP. This assumption is needed in order to satisfy the stringent limits that the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) put on the relic density. We find that in the parameter space region where the model remains perturbative the axino fulfills the WMAP constraints.

¹Francesco.Fucito@roma2.infn.it

²Andrea.Lionetto@roma2.infn.it

³a.mammarella@hotmail.it

⁴Antonio.Racioppi@roma2.infn.it

1 Introduction

A great deal of work has been done recently to embed the standard model of particle physics (SM) into a brane construction [1, 2, 3, 4]. This research is part of the effort, initiated in [5], to build a fully realistic four dimensional vacuum out of string theory. While the original models were formulated in the framework of the heterotic string, the most recent efforts were formulated for type II strings in order to take advantage of the recent work on moduli stabilization using fluxes. Such brane constructions naturally lead to extra anomalous $U(1)$'s in the four dimensional low energy theory and, in turn, to the presence of possible heavy Z' particles in the spectrum. These particles should be among the early findings of LHC and besides for the above cited models they are also a prediction of many other theoretical models of the unification of forces (see [6] for a recent review). It is then of some interest to know if these Z' particles contribute to the cancellation of the gauge anomaly in the way predicted from string theory or not. In [7] some of the present authors have studied a supersymmetric (SUSY) extension of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) in which the anomaly is cancelled *à la* Green-Schwarz. The model is only string-inspired and is not the low-energy sector of some brane construction. The reason of this choice rests in our curiosity to explore the phenomenology of these models keeping a high degree of flexibility, while avoiding the intricacies and uncertainties connected with a string theory construction. For previous work along these lines we refer to [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. In this work we perform a consistency check of our model [7] by evaluating the relic density of the model to compare it against the WMAP data. If the axino is the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP), its relic density is too small with respect to the experimental data. This is why we favor a next to lightest supersymmetric particle (NLSP) with a mass close to the LSP. If this is the case, the model is consistent with the experimental data. This is the plan of the paper: in Section 2 we describe our model. In Section 3 and 4 we find the LSP and study the axino interactions. Finally in Section 5 we compute the relic density. Section 6 is a summary of our results.

2 Model Setup

In this section we briefly discuss our theoretical framework. We assume an extension of the MSSM with an additional abelian vector multiplet $V^{(0)}$ with arbitrary charges. The anomalies are cancelled with the Green-Schwarz (GS) mechanism and with the Generalized Chern-Simons (GCS) terms. All the details can be found in [7]. All the MSSM fields are charged under the additional vector multiplet $V^{(0)}$, with charges that are given in

Table 1, where Q_i, L_i are the left handed quarks and leptons respectively while U_i^c, D_i^c, E_i^c are the right handed up and down quarks and the electrically charged leptons. The superscript c stands for charge conjugation. The index $i = 1, 2, 3$ denotes the three different families. $H_{u,d}$ are the two Higgs scalars.

	$SU(3)_c$	$SU(2)_L$	$U(1)_Y$	$U(1)'$
Q_i	3	2	1/6	Q_Q
U_i^c	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}$	1	-2/3	Q_{U^c}
D_i^c	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}$	1	1/3	Q_{D^c}
L_i	1	2	-1/2	Q_L
E_i^c	1	1	1	Q_{E^c}
H_u	1	2	1/2	Q_{H_u}
H_d	1	2	-1/2	Q_{H_d}

Table 1: Charge assignment.

The gauge invariance of the superpotential, that contains the Yukawa couplings and a μ -term, put constraints on the above charges

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{U^c} &= -Q_Q - Q_{H_u} \\
Q_{D^c} &= -Q_Q + Q_{H_u} \\
Q_{E^c} &= -Q_L + Q_{H_u} \\
Q_{H_d} &= -Q_{H_u}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Thus, we choose Q_Q, Q_L and Q_{H_u} as free parameters of the model. The key feature of this model is the mechanism of anomaly cancellation. As it is well known, the MSSM is anomaly free. In our MSSM extension all the anomalies that involve only the $SU(3)$, $SU(2)$ and $U(1)_Y$ factors vanish identically. However, triangles with $U(1)'$ in the external legs in general are potentially anomalous. These anomalies are⁵

$$U(1)' - U(1)' - U(1)' \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}^{(0)} = \sum_f Q_f^3 \tag{2}$$

$$U(1)' - U(1)_Y - U(1)_Y \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \sum_f Q_f Y_f^2 \tag{3}$$

$$U(1)' - SU(2) - SU(2) \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}^{(2)} = \sum_f Q_f \text{Tr}[T_{k_2}^{(2)} T_{k_2}^{(2)}] \tag{4}$$

⁵We are working in an effective field theory framework and we ignore throughout the paper all the gravitational effects. In particular, we do not consider the gravitational anomalies which, however, could be canceled by the Green-Schwarz mechanism.

$$U(1)' - SU(3) - SU(3) \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}^{(3)} = \sum_f Q_f \text{Tr}[T_{k_3}^{(3)} T_{k_3}^{(3)}] \quad (5)$$

$$U(1)' - U(1)' - U(1)_Y \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}^{(4)} = \sum_f Q_f^2 Y_f \quad (6)$$

where f runs over the fermions in Table 1, Q_f is the corresponding $U(1)'$ charge, Y_f is the hypercharge and $T_{k_a}^{(a)}$, $a = 2, 3$; $k_a = 1, \dots, \dim G^{(a)}$ are the generators of the $G^{(2)} = SU(2)$ and $G^{(3)} = SU(3)$ algebras respectively. In our notation $\text{Tr}[T_j^{(a)} T_k^{(a)}] = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{jk}$. All the remaining anomalies that involve $U(1)$'s vanish identically due to group theoretical arguments (see Chapter 22 of [13]). Using the charge constraints (1) we get

$$\mathcal{A}^{(0)} = 3 \left\{ Q_{H_u}^3 + 3Q_{H_u} Q_L^2 + Q_L^3 - 3Q_{H_u}^2 (Q_L + 6Q_Q) \right\} \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = -\frac{3}{2} (3Q_Q + Q_L) \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{(2)} = \frac{3}{2} (3Q_Q + Q_L) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{(3)} = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{(4)} = -6Q_{H_u} (3Q_Q + Q_L) \quad (11)$$

The mixed anomaly between the anomalous $U(1)$ and the $SU(3)$ nonabelian factors $\mathcal{A}^{(3)}$ vanishes identically. Consistency of the model is achieved by the contribution of a Stückelberg field S and its appropriate couplings to the anomalous $U(1)'$. The Stückelberg lagrangian written in terms of superfields is [14]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_S = & \frac{1}{4} (S + S^\dagger + 4b_3 V^{(0)})^2 \Big|_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2} \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[\sum_{a=0}^2 b_2^{(a)} S \text{Tr} (W^{(a)} W^{(a)}) + b_2^{(4)} S W^{(1)} W^{(0)} \right]_{\theta^2} + h.c. \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the index $a = 0, \dots, 3$ runs over the $U(1)'$, $U(1)_Y$, $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ gauge groups respectively. The Stückelberg multiplet is a chiral superfield

$$S = s + i\sqrt{2}\theta\psi_S + \theta^2 F_S - i\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta}\partial_\mu s + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\theta^2\bar{\theta}\bar{\sigma}^\mu\partial_\mu\psi_S - \frac{1}{4}\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2\Box s \quad (13)$$

and transforms under the $U(1)'$ as

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(0)} & \rightarrow V^{(0)} + i(\Lambda - \Lambda^\dagger) \\ S & \rightarrow S - 4i b_3 \Lambda \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where b_3 is a constant. The lowest component of S is a complex scalar field $s = \alpha + i\phi$. We give the expansion of \mathcal{L}_S in component fields only for the part that is needed in the following sections (for a complete discussion see [7]). Using the Wess-Zumino gauge we

get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{axino} = & \frac{i}{4} \psi_S \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \bar{\psi}_S - \sqrt{2} b_3 \psi_S \lambda^{(0)} - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{a=0}^2 b_2^{(a)} \text{Tr} (\lambda^{(a)} \sigma^\mu \bar{\sigma}^\nu F_{\mu\nu}^{(a)}) \psi_S \\
& - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} b_2^{(4)} \left[\frac{1}{2} \lambda^{(1)} \sigma^\mu \bar{\sigma}^\nu F_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \psi_S + (0 \leftrightarrow 1) \right] + h.c.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

As it was pointed out in [8], the Stückelberg mechanism is not enough to cancel all the anomalies. Mixed anomalies between anomalous and non-anomalous factors require an additional mechanism to ensure consistency of the model: non gauge invariant GCS terms must be added. In our case, the GCS terms have the form [15]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{GCS} = & -d_4 [(V^{(1)} D^\alpha V^{(0)} - V^{(0)} D^\alpha V^{(1)}) W_\alpha^{(0)} + h.c.]_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2} + \\
& + d_5 [(V^{(1)} D^\alpha V^{(0)} - V^{(0)} D^\alpha V^{(1)}) W_\alpha^{(1)} + h.c.]_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2} + \\
& + d_6 \text{Tr} \left[(V^{(2)} D^\alpha V^{(0)} - V^{(0)} D^\alpha V^{(2)}) W_\alpha^{(2)} + \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{6} V^{(2)} D^\alpha V^{(0)} \bar{D}^2 ([D_\alpha V^{(2)}, V^{(2)}]) + h.c. \right]_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The constants d_4 , d_5 and d_6 are fixed by the cancellation of the mixed anomalies. The GCS terms (16), expressed in component fields are given in [7].

For a symmetric distribution of the anomaly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
b_2^{(0)} b_3 = -\frac{\mathcal{A}^{(0)}}{384\pi^2} & \quad b_2^{(1)} b_3 = -\frac{\mathcal{A}^{(1)}}{128\pi^2} & \quad b_2^{(2)} b_3 = -\frac{\mathcal{A}^{(2)}}{64\pi^2} & \quad b_2^{(4)} b_3 = -\frac{\mathcal{A}^{(4)}}{128\pi^2} \\
d_4 = -\frac{\mathcal{A}^{(4)}}{384\pi^2} & \quad d_5 = \frac{\mathcal{A}^{(1)}}{192\pi^2} & \quad d_6 = \frac{\mathcal{A}^{(2)}}{96\pi^2} &
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

It is worth noting that the GCS coefficients $d_{4,5,6}$ are fully determined in terms of the \mathcal{A} 's by the gauge invariance, while the $b_2^{(a)}$'s depend only on the free parameter b_3 , which is related to the mass of the anomalous $U(1)$.

The soft breaking sector of the model is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft} = \mathcal{L}_{soft}^{MSSM} + \mathcal{L}_{soft}^{new} \tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{soft}^{MSSM} = & -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^3 (M_a \lambda^{(a)} \lambda^{(a)} + h.c.) - \left(m_{\tilde{Q}_{ij}}^2 \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_j^\dagger + m_{\tilde{U}_{ij}}^2 \tilde{U}_i^c \tilde{U}_j^{c\dagger} + m_{\tilde{D}_{ij}}^2 \tilde{D}_i^c \tilde{D}_j^{c\dagger} \right. \\
& \left. + m_{\tilde{L}_{ij}}^2 \tilde{L}_i \tilde{L}_j^\dagger + m_{\tilde{E}_{ij}}^2 \tilde{E}_i^c \tilde{E}_j^{c\dagger} + m_{h_u}^2 |h_u|^2 + m_{h_d}^2 |h_d|^2 \right) \\
& - \left(a_u^{ij} \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{U}_j^c h_u - a_d^{ij} \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{D}_j^c h_d - a_e^{ij} \tilde{L}_i \tilde{E}_j^c h_d + b h_u h_d + h.c. \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

is the usual soft susy breaking lagrangian while

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft}^{new} = -\frac{1}{2} (M_0 \lambda^{(0)} \lambda^{(0)} + h.c.) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{M_S}{2} \psi_S \psi_S + h.c. \right) \quad (20)$$

is the new additional term, where $\lambda^{(0)}$ is the gaugino of the added $U(1)'$ and ψ_S is the axino. We allow a soft mass term for the axino since it couples only through GS interactions and not through Yukawa interactions [16]. Notice also that a mass term for the axion ϕ is not allowed since it transforms non trivially under the anomalous $U(1)'$ gauge transformation (14).

3 Neutralino Sector

Assuming the conservation of R-parity the LSP is a good weak interacting massive particle (WIMP) dark matter candidate. As in the MSSM the LSP is given by a linear combination of fields in the neutralino sector. The general form of the neutralino mass matrix is given in [7]. Written in the interaction eigenstate basis $(\psi^0)^T = (\psi_S, \lambda_C, \lambda_B, \lambda_3^{(2)}, \tilde{h}_d^0, \tilde{h}_u^0)$ this is a six-by-six matrix. From the point of view of the strength of the interactions the two extra states are not on the same footing with respect to the standard ones. The axino and the primeino are in fact extremely weak interacting massive particle (XWIMP). Thus we are interested in situations in which the extremely weak sector is decoupled from the standard one and the LSP belongs to this sector. This can be achieved at tree level with the choice

$$Q_{H_u} = 0 \quad (21)$$

The neutralino mass matrix $\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{N}}$ becomes

$$\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{M_S}{2} & \frac{M_{V^{(0)}}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & M_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & M_1 & 0 & -\frac{g_1 v_d}{2} & \frac{g_1 v_u}{2} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & M_2 & \frac{g_2 v_d}{2} & -\frac{g_2 v_u}{2} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & -\mu \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

where M_S , M_0 , M_1 , M_2 are the soft masses coming from the soft breaking terms (19) while $M_{V^{(0)}}$ is given in eq. (24). It is worth noting that the D terms and kinetic mixing terms can be neglected in the tree-level computations of the eigenvalues and eigenstates.

Moreover we make the assumption that $M_0 \gg M_S$ and $g_{1,2} v_{u,d} \ll M_{1,2}$, so the eigenstates are nearly pure axino, gauginos and higgsinos. Finally we suppose that the axino ψ_S is the LSP while the bino λ_1 is the NLSP.

The decoupling in the neutralino sector implies also a decoupling in the gauge bosons sector. In our model there are two mechanisms that give mass to the gauge bosons: (i) the Stückelberg mechanism and (ii) the Higgs mechanism. In this extension of the MSSM, the mass terms for the gauge fields for $Q_{H_u} = 0$ are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_M = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} V_\mu^{(0)} & V_\mu^{(1)} & V_{3\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} M^2 \begin{pmatrix} V^{(0)\mu} \\ V^{(1)\mu} \\ V_3^{(2)\mu} \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

with M^2 being the gauge boson mass matrix

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{V^{(0)}} & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & g_1^2 \frac{v^2}{4} & -g_1 g_2 \frac{v^2}{4} \\ \dots & \dots & g_2^2 \frac{v^2}{4} \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where $M_{V^{(0)}} = 4b_3 g_0$ is the mass parameter for the anomalous $U(1)$ and it is assumed to be in the TeV range. The lower dots denote the obvious terms under symmetrization. After diagonalization, we obtain the eigenstates

$$A_\mu = \frac{g_2 V_\mu^{(1)} + g_1 V_{3\mu}^{(2)}}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} \quad (25)$$

$$Z_{0\mu} = \frac{g_2 V_{3\mu}^{(2)} - g_1 V_\mu^{(1)}}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} \quad (26)$$

$$Z'_\mu = V_\mu^{(0)} \quad (27)$$

and the corresponding masses

$$M_\gamma^2 = 0 \quad (28)$$

$$M_{Z_0}^2 = \frac{1}{4} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) v^2 \quad (29)$$

$$M_{Z'}^2 = M_{V^{(0)}}^2 \quad (30)$$

Finally the rotation matrix from the hypercharge to the photon basis is

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} Z'_\mu \\ Z_{0\mu} \\ A_\mu \end{pmatrix} &= O_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} V_\mu^{(0)} \\ V_\mu^{(1)} \\ V_{3\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{g_1}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} & \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} \\ 0 & \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} & \frac{g_1}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_\mu^{(0)} \\ V_\mu^{(1)} \\ V_{3\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $i, j = 0, 1, 2$.




Figure 1: Annihilation of two axinos into two gauge vectors via the exchange of a gaugino.

4 Axino Interactions

The axino interactions can be read off from the interaction lagrangian (15). The relevant term, written in terms of four components Majorana spinors⁶, is given by

$$i\mathcal{L} = \frac{b_2^{(1)}}{\sqrt{2}} g_1^2 \Lambda^{(1)T} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu] (\partial_\mu V_\nu^{(1)}) \Psi_S + \frac{b_2^{(2)}}{\sqrt{2}} g_2^2 \Lambda_3^{(2)T} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu] (\partial_\mu V_{3\nu}^{(2)}) \Psi_S \quad (32)$$

where the $b_2^{(a)}$ coefficients are given in (17). The related interaction vertex is

$$C[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu] i k_\mu \quad (33)$$

where C is a factor which contains the coupling constants

$$C = \sqrt{2} g_{(a)}^2 b_2^{(a)} R(\theta_W) f \quad a = 1, 2 \quad (34)$$

where $R(\theta_W) = \cos \theta_W$, $\sin \theta_W$ (θ_W is the Weinberg angle) while f is the gaugino coefficient in the mass eigenstate basis. The factor (34) contains the parameters $b_2^{(a)}$ which are related to the anomalous $U(1)$ (see eq. (17)). Therefore $C \ll g_{(a)}$ and the axino interactions will be extremely weak, being suppressed by an order of magnitude factor with respect to the weak interactions. At tree level there is only one type of annihilation diagram, represented in fig. 1. We denoted with p_1 and p_2 the incoming momenta of the axinos while k_1 and k_2 are the two outgoing momenta of the gauge bosons in the final state. We will concentrate on the case with two photons in the final state. In this case the result for the differential cross section is given by

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{4M_S^2 \omega_1}{16\pi^2 (\omega_1 + \omega_2)^2 (\sqrt{M_S^2 - E_2^2})} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \mathcal{M}_i \mathcal{M}_j^* \quad (35)$$

where ω_1 and ω_2 are the energies of the two outgoing photons. Each amplitude \mathcal{M}_i is proportional to the related coefficient C whose generic form is given in (34). The cross

⁶The gamma matrices γ^μ are in the Weyl representation.




Figure 2: Coannihilation of an axino and a bino into a $f\bar{f}$ pair via the exchange of a photon or a Z_0 .

section (35), being extremely weak, cannot give a relic density in the WMAP preferred range. Thus we are forced to consider a scenario in which coannihilations between the axino and the NSLP became sizable. We will assume a NLSP, coming from the “usual” MSSM, with a mass comparable to the axino mass. Without loss of generality the NSLP can be identified with the bino. The allowed coannihilation processes are those which involve an exchange of a photon or a Z_0 in the intermediate state and with a SM fermion-antifermion pair, Higgses and W ’s in the final state. The differential cross section in the center of mass frame has the following general form

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \propto \frac{1}{s} \frac{p_f}{p_i} |\mathcal{M}|^2 \quad (36)$$

where s is the usual Mandelstam variable and $p_{f,i}$ is the spatial momentum of the outgoing (incoming) particles. On dimensional ground $|\mathcal{M}|^2$ has at least a linear dependence on p_f and this implies that the dominant contribution comes from the diagram with the SM fermion-antifermion pair f and \bar{f} in the final state:

$$\Psi_S \lambda^{(a)} \rightarrow f \bar{f} \quad (37)$$

The two possible diagrams associated to this process are sketched in fig. 2. The resulting differential cross section, computed in the center of mass frame, is

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \sum_f c_f \frac{\sqrt{(E_3 - m_f)^2}}{64\pi^2 (E_1 + E_2)^2 \sqrt{(E_1^2 - M_S^2)}} (\mathcal{M}_\gamma^2 + \mathcal{M}_{Z_0}^2 + \mathcal{M}_\gamma^* \mathcal{M}_{Z_0} + \mathcal{M}_\gamma \mathcal{M}_{Z_0}^*) \quad (38)$$

where the sum is extended to all the SM fermions (with mass m_f) while c_f is a color factor. In Appendix A we give the Feynman amplitude for the decay into two neutrinos.

5 Axino Relic Density

In this section we compute the relic density of the axino. As we said in the previous section we assumed a LSP which coannihilates with a NLSP degenerate in mass. Without loss of

generality the NLSP is assumed to be a bino. The relic density can be evaluated solving the Boltzmann equation for two particle species:

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = -3Hn - \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \langle \sigma_{ij} v_{ij} \rangle (n_i n_j - n_i^{eq} n_j^{eq}) \quad (39)$$

where n_i denotes the number density per unit of comoving volume of the species i ($i = 1$ refers to the LSP while $i = 2$ refers to the NSLP), $n = \sum_i n_i$, H is the Hubble constant, σ_{ij} is the annihilation cross section between a species i and a species j , v_{ij} is the modulus of the relative velocity while n_i^{eq} is the equilibrium number density of the species i . Having computed the number density, the relic density is simply given by

$$\Omega_1 h^2 = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_c} = \frac{M_S n_1}{\rho_c} \quad (40)$$

where ρ_c is the critical mass density of the Universe.

We rewrite (39) by defining the thermal average of the effective cross section

$$\langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle \equiv \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \langle \sigma_{ij} v_{ij} \rangle \frac{n_i^{eq} n_j^{eq}}{n^{eq} n^{eq}} \quad (41)$$

obtaining

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = -3Hn - \langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (n^2 - (n^{eq})^2) \quad (42)$$

We parametrize the effective cross section as in [18]:

$$\langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle = \frac{A}{n_{eq}^2} \quad (43)$$

by introducing the following quantity

$$A = \frac{g_1^2 T}{4\pi^4} \int dp_{eff} p_{eff}^2 W_{eff} K_1 \left(\frac{\sqrt{s}}{T} \right) \quad (44)$$

where

$$p_{eff} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{s - 4M_S^2} \quad (45)$$

and K_1 is the modified Bessel function of the first type while

$$W_{eff} = \frac{2(s(s - 2M_1^2)\sigma_{22} + 2(s - (M_S + M_1)^2)(s - (M_S - M_1)^2)\sigma_{12})}{\sqrt{s(s - 2M_S^2)}} \quad (46)$$

Notice that in the above expression we have neglected the term σ_{11} due to the suppression factor with respect to the other cross sections. The leading term in (46) is given by the term proportional to the NLSP (a bino in our case) annihilation cross section σ_{22} . This implies that σ_{22} must be of the right order of magnitude to satisfy the upper bound coming

from the WMAP data [19]. This constraints can always be satisfied with a suitable choice of the soft breaking parameters.

The equilibrium number density is given by

$$n_{eq} = \sum_i \frac{g_i m_i^2 T}{2\pi^2} K_2 \left(\frac{m_i}{T} \right) \quad (47)$$

where K_2 is the the modified Bessel function of the second type. In our notation we have $m_1 = M_S$ and $m_2 = M_1$. Substituting (44) and (47) into (43) we get:

$$\langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (T) = \frac{\int dp_{eff} p_{eff}^2 W_{eff} K_1 \left(\frac{\sqrt{s}}{T} \right)}{M_S^4 T [\sum_i \frac{g_i}{g_1} \frac{m_i^2}{M_S^2} K_2 \left(\frac{m_i}{T} \right)]^2} \quad (48)$$

In order to solve the Boltzmann equation (42) it is convenient to introduce a new variable $Y = n/S$ where S is the entropy density. The Boltzmann equation written in terms of this quantity reads

$$\frac{dY}{dT} = \frac{1}{3H} \frac{dS}{dT} \langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (Y^2 - Y_{eq}^2) \quad (49)$$

By introducing the adimensional quantity $x = T/M_S$ we can further simplify the Boltzmann equation

$$\frac{dY}{dx} = M_S \sqrt{\frac{\pi g_*}{45G}} \langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (Y^2 - Y_{eq}^2) \quad (50)$$

where we have introduced the number of effective degrees of freedom g_* . It can be shown that $g_*^{1/2} \simeq 9$.

The final result for the relic density is

$$\Omega_1 h^2 = \frac{1.07 \times 10^9 \text{GeV}^{-1}}{M_{Pl} \sqrt{g_*}} \frac{1}{J(x_f)} \quad (51)$$

where M_{Pl} is the four-dimensional Planck mass while

$$J(x_f) = \int_0^{x_f} dx \langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (x) \quad (52)$$

The quantity x_f is related to the freeze-out temperature. It turns out that its value weakly depend on $\langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle$. Numerical computation gives $x_f \simeq 1/20$ [17]. In the general case the integral in (52) can not be solved analytically. Therefore we solved it numerically by sampling the function $\langle \sigma_{eff} v \rangle (x)$ at different value of x .

Our aim is to find regions of the parameter space, determined by Q_Q , Q_L and the coupling constant g_0 of the extra $U(1)$, that fulfills the WMAP constraints. This task can be performed by imposing suitable conditions on the C^2 . In the limit in which we can neglect the electroweak symmetry breaking effects since the soft mass are much heavier

than the EW scale and the NLSP is essentially a bino, which implies $f = 1$ in (34), we have

$$C_\gamma^2 = 2(b_2^{(1)})^2 g_1^4 \cos^2 \theta_W \quad (53)$$

for the contribution \mathcal{M}_γ^2 in (38). From the formula (8) of the mixed $U(1)' - U(1)_Y - U(1)_Y$ anomaly and from the eq. (17) we have the following relation

$$b_2^{(1)} = \frac{3(3Q_Q + Q_L)}{128\pi^2 b_3} \quad (54)$$

Using the estimate $b_3 \simeq 1/4g_0$ TeV given in [7] we finally get

$$\frac{C_\gamma^2}{e^2} = 0.94 \times 10^{-8} (3g_0 Q_Q + g_0 Q_L)^2 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (55)$$

where e is the electric charge. We get similar expressions for the other three terms in (38). Collecting all these terms we obtain an upper bound on $(3g_0 Q_Q + g_0 Q_L)^2$ for which the cross section gives a relic density in the 3σ WMAP range [19]:

$$0.0913 < \Omega_1 h^2 < 0.1285 \quad (56)$$

The lower bound is $(3g_0 Q_Q + g_0 Q_L)^2 = 0$ and in this case we have no coannihilations. In (46) the only terms that survives is that proportional to σ_{22} and therefore we recover the standard result. The upper bound is

$$(3g_0 Q_Q + g_0 Q_L)^2 < 16 \quad (57)$$

which is valid for M_S ranging from 100 GeV up to 2 TeV and for a mass gap $\Delta m/m = (M_S - M_1)/M_S$ ranging from 1% up to 5%. The bound (57) corresponds to the perturbative constraints $g_0 Q_Q < 1$ and $g_0 Q_L < 1$. Our result is in agreement with the XWIMP relic density estimate given in [20] which is obtained without an actual computation of the coannihilation cross section.

6 Conclusions

We studied a possible dark matter candidate in the framework of our minimal anomalous $U(1)'$ extension of the MSSM [7]. In the decoupling limit (21) and under the assumptions $M_0 \gg M_S$ and $g_{1,2} v_{u,d} \ll M_{1,2}$ the axino turns out to be the LSP. Being an XWIMP the axino annihilation cross section is suppressed with respect to the typical weak interaction cross sections. This implies that in order to satisfy the WMAP constraints on the relic density we must have a NLSP almost degenerate in mass with the axino. We computed the LSP-NLSP coannihilation cross section and we found that in the parameter space where our model is perturbative the WMAP constraints are always satisfied. This result holds for M_S ranging from 100 GeV up to 2 TeV and for a mass gap $\Delta m/m$ of few percents.

A Amplitude for $\lambda_1 + \psi_S \rightarrow \nu\nu$

In this Appendix we give the amplitude for the process $\lambda_1 + \psi_S \rightarrow \nu\nu$, which is the simplest case over all the possible decays $\lambda_1 + \psi_S \rightarrow f\bar{f}$, since the neutrinos are massless and are coupled only to the Z_0

$$\mathcal{M} = -\frac{i}{2}C_{Z_0}g_{Z_0}\frac{k_\mu}{k^2 - M_{Z_0}^2}\bar{u}_S[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]u_{\lambda_1}\bar{u}_{\nu_1}\gamma_\nu(v_\nu - a_\nu\gamma_5)v_{\nu_2} \quad (58)$$

The corresponding square modulus is

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{M}|^2 &= \sum_{\text{spin } \lambda_1} \sum_{\text{spin } \psi_S} \sum_{\text{spin } \nu_1} \sum_{\text{spin } \nu_2} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^* \\ &= 64C_{Z_0}^2g_{Z_0}^2\frac{a_\nu^2 + v_\nu^2}{(k^2 - M_{Z_0}^2)^2}(p_{\nu_1} \cdot p_{\nu_2}) \times \\ &\quad \times \left[(p_{\lambda_1} \cdot p_{\nu_1})(p_{\nu_1} \cdot p_S) + (p_{\lambda_1} \cdot p_{\nu_2})(p_{\nu_2} \cdot p_S) - (p_{\nu_1} \cdot p_{\nu_2})M_1M_S \right] \quad (59) \end{aligned}$$

where p_{λ_1} , p_S , p_{ν_1} and p_{ν_2} are the bino, axino and neutrinos 4-momenta respectively and $k^2 = s$ is the momentum of the intermediate Z_0 . The result (59) is valid only for one family. If we consider all the families the above amplitude must be multiplied by 3.

Acknowledgments

A. R. would like to thank Prof. Michael Green and DAMTP for hospitality and the Marie Curie Research Training Network ‘‘Superstring Theory’’ and contract MRTN-CT-2004-512194 for financial support.

References

- [1] F. Marchesano, Fortsch. Phys. **55** (2007) 491 [arXiv:hep-th/0702094].
- [2] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetič, P. Langacker and G. Shiu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55** (2005) 71 [arXiv:hep-th/0502005].
- [3] D. Lust, Class. Quant. Grav. **21** (2004) S1399 [arXiv:hep-th/0401156].
- [4] E. Kiritsis, Fortsch. Phys. **52** (2004) 200 [Phys. Rept. **421** (2005 ERRAT,429,121-122.2006) 105] [arXiv:hep-th/0310001].

- [5] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **258** (1985) 46.
- [6] P. Langacker, arXiv:0801.1345 [hep-ph].
- [7] P. Anastasopoulos, F. Fucito, A. Lionetto, G. Pradisi, A. Racioppi and Y. S. Stanev, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 085014 [arXiv:0804.1156 [hep-th]].
- [8] P. Anastasopoulos, M. Bianchi, E. Dudas and E. Kiritsis, JHEP **0611**, 057 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0605225].
- [9] C. Coriano', N. Irges and E. Kiritsis, Nucl. Phys. B **746** (2006) 77 [arXiv:hep-ph/0510332].
- [10] C. Coriano and N. Irges, Phys. Lett. B **651** (2007) 298 [arXiv:hep-ph/0612140].
- [11] C. Coriano, N. Irges and S. Morelli, JHEP **0707** (2007) 008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0701010].
- [12] C. Coriano, N. Irges and S. Morelli, Nucl. Phys. B **789** (2008) 133 [arXiv:hep-ph/0703127].
- [13] S. Weinberg, "The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 2: Modern applications," *Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1996) 489 p.*
- [14] M. Klein, Nucl. Phys. B **569** (2000) 362 [arXiv:hep-th/9910143].
- [15] L. Andrianopoli, S. Ferrara and M. A. Lledo, JHEP **0404** (2004) 005 [arXiv:hep-th/0402142].
- [16] L. Girardello and M. T. Grisaru, Nucl. Phys. B **194** (1982) 65.
- [17] J. Edsjo and P. Gondolo, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 1879 [arXiv:hep-ph/9704361].
- [18] J. Edsjo, M. Schelke, P. Ullio and P. Gondolo, JCAP **0304** (2003) 001 [arXiv:hep-ph/0301106].
- [19] J. Dunkley *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], arXiv:0803.0586 [astro-ph]. ; E. Komatsu *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], arXiv:0803.0547 [astro-ph].
- [20] D. Feldman, B. Kors and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 023503 [arXiv:hep-ph/0610133].