A Solar System Test of Self-Interacting Dark Matter

Cristian Gaidau and Jessie Shelton

Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1110 W Green St., Urbana, IL 61801, USA

E-mail: gaidau2@illinois.edu, sheltonj@illinois.edu

Abstract. Dark matter (DM) self-interactions affect the gravitational capture of DM in the Sun and Earth differently as a simple consequence of the differing kinematics of collisions within the two potential wells: the dominant effect of self-interactions in the Sun is to provide an additional channel for capture, while the dominant effect in the Earth is to eject previously captured DM. We point out that this simple observation can be used to deduce the existence of DM self-interactions by comparing the annihilation rates of DM gravitationally bound within the Sun and Earth. We compute the Sun and Earth annihilation fluxes for DM with spin-independent nuclear cross-sections and thermal annihilation cross-sections and demonstrate that, for cross-sections allowed by direct detection, self-interactions is potentially significant even for self-interaction cross-sections orders of magnitude. This suppression is potentially significant even for self-interaction cross-sections and leading test of dark matter self-interactions. Additionally, we consider thermalization of the captured DM population with the nuclei of the capturing body in some detail, accounting for both nuclear and self-interactions, and point out some consequential and broadly applicable considerations.

Contents .

. .

т

T	I Introduction			
2	Gravitational capture of DM in the solar system	3		
	2.1 DM capture and annihilation in the Sun	3		
	2.2 DM capture and annihilation in the Sun with self-interactions	6		
	2.3 DM capture and annihilation in the Earth	8		
	2.4 DM capture and annihilation in the Earth with self-interactions	9		
3	Self-interactions and DM annihilations in the Sun	9		
4	Self-interactions and DM annihilation in the Earth	13		
5	Diagnosing DM self-interactions	16		
6	Conclusions			
\mathbf{A}	Sun and Earth models	20		
	A.1 The Sun	20		
	A.2 The Earth	22		
в	Thermalization of captured DM	22		
	B.1 Thermalization with nuclei	24		
	B.2 Thermalization in the presence of DM self-interactions	27		

1 Introduction

The nature of dark matter (DM) is one of the biggest outstanding mysteries in particle physics. The possibility that DM may have sizeable self-interactions is especially intriguing. Sufficiently strong dark matter self-interactions can affect galaxy formation and structure [1], and may thereby explain several outstanding discrepancies between the properties of dwarf galaxies in observations versus (DM-only) simulations [2, 3]. More broadly, strong self-interactions are a generic property that DM may have, and establishing the existence of such self-interactions would be a major step towards understanding the particle nature of DM.

In this article we point out that the kinematics of our solar system enable a simple test of dark matter self-interactions through a comparison of the DM populations gravitationally bound within the Sun and the Earth. Dark matter that scatters within a massive body can lose enough kinetic energy in the scattering to become gravitationally bound [4–8]. Thus massive bodies can build up a population of bound DM particles, which can be detected either through their impact on the properties of the massive body, or by observing the products of their annihilation within the massive body.

The number N of gravitationally captured dark matter particles in the massive body is given in general by

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = C_{\rm c} + (C_{\rm sc} - C_{\rm se} - C_{\rm e})N - (C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap})N^2.$$
(1.1)

Here the C_i are rates for scattering processes that change the number of gravitationally bound DM particles. Most familiarly, C_c is the rate of capture of DM particles by elastic scattering on nuclei, C_e is the rate at which captured DM particles evaporate by scattering against nuclear targets, and C_{ann} is the rate at which captured particles annihilate. In the presence of DM self-interactions, three additional scattering processes can become relevant: C_{sc} and C_{se} , the rate for DM self-capture and self-ejection, respectively [9], and C_{sevap} [10], the rate for DM self-evaporation. For the Sun, self-capture dominates over self-ejection, but the shallowness of the Earth's potential well ensures that self-ejection dominates.

At fixed DM mass and annihilation cross-section, the annihilation flux of non-selfinteracting DM is entirely determined by the nuclear cross-section. In the presence of DM self-interactions, the annihilation flux also depends on the self-scattering cross-section, and therefore measurements of the annihilation flux from two different massive bodies are needed to determine both cross-sections. As self-interactions have opposite effects on the populations in the Earth and the Sun, the imprint of self-interactions can be dramatic and unambiguous in parameter space of physical interest.

In this paper we will establish the power and utility of this general observation. Toward this end we will keep our discussion as model-independent as possible. In particular, although for definiteness we will assume that DM is a thermal relic with an *s*-wave annihilation crosssection, we will remain agnostic about the final states to which it annihilates. Of course, directly measuring the DM annihilation rate in the Sun (Earth) is possible only if some of the annihilation products are sufficiently weakly interacting to escape the Sun (Earth). Wellestablished search strategies rely on the neutrinos produced by annihilations into Standard Model (SM) final states [11–18], while in multi-state dark sectors long-lived dark states could also furnish this role [19–29]. Such multi-state dark sectors are often proposed in order to realize strong DM self-interactions, and are especially well-motivated in this context.

Additionally, we will assume for simplicity that DM interacts sufficiently strongly with nuclei in the massive body to reach thermal equilibrium in the core. This assumption allows the number of captured particles to be factorized according to $N(t,r) \equiv N(t)n_{\rm c}(r)$, where the DM radial profile $n_{\rm c}(r)$ is time-independent and unit-normalized:

$$n_{\rm c}(r) = A \exp\left(-\frac{M_{\rm DM}\Phi(r)}{T_{\rm core}}\right),\tag{1.2}$$

where $M_{\rm DM}$ is the DM mass, $\Phi(r)$ is the gravitational potential, $T_{\rm core}$ is the core temperature, and A is a constant normalization factor. When thermalization of captured DM is a good approximation, all the C_i in Eq. 1.1 become constant, vastly simplifying the determination of N(t). As DM-nuclear cross-sections $\sigma_{\rm p}$ have become more and more constrained by direct detection experiments, the available parameter space that allows captured DM to thermalize in the Sun is becoming notably restricted. We consider thermalization through spin-independent nuclear scatterings in detail, both with and without self-interactions, and establish some general criteria for the self-consistency of the thermal description. For nuclear scatterings, we find more restrictive thermalization criteria than some previous estimates. We also find that in the presence of DM self-interactions, energy exchange between bound and halo DM populations can be sizeable but, for constant self-interaction cross-sections, poses a subleading obstacle to achieving thermalization.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Sec. 2 we discuss the gravitational capture of DM in the solar system, establishing our conventions. We quantify the impact of DM self-interactions on the annihilation flux from the Sun and the Earth in Secs. 3 and 4

respectively, specializing for illustration to an isotropic self-interaction cross-section. Our main results are presented in Sec. 5, where we show how comparing annihilation fluxes from the Sun and the Earth can reveal the presence of DM self-interactions. In Sec. 6 we conclude. Two appendices contain technical aspects of the calculations: App. A documents our models of the Earth and the Sun, while App. B contains a detailed examination of DM thermalization within a capturing body, both with and without self-interactions.

2 Gravitational capture of DM in the solar system

We begin by reviewing the capture and annihilation of non-self-interacting DM in the Sun and then discuss how adding self-interactions alters the evolution of the captured DM population. We then discuss capture and annihilation of self-interacting DM in the Earth, highlighting the different impacts of self-interactions on the populations in the Earth and the Sun.

2.1 DM capture and annihilation in the Sun

Here we review the calculation of the nuclear capture, annihilation, and evaporation rates of DM in the Sun, following the pioneering treatment of Gould [6-8].

We begin with nuclear capture. We take the local density of DM to be $\rho_{\odot} = 0.4 \,\text{GeV/cm}^3$, and assume that far from the Sun the DM halo has a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution f(u)of speeds u,

$$f(u)d^{3}u = 4\pi \left(\frac{3}{2\pi\bar{v}^{2}}\right)^{3/2} \exp\left(-\frac{3u^{2}}{2\bar{v}^{2}}\right)u^{2}du = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}x^{2}e^{-x^{2}}dx,$$
(2.1)

where \bar{v}^2 is the DM rms speed, and we have introduced the dimensionless speed $x^2 = 3/(2\bar{v}^2) u^2$. We assume that the DM halo is virialized so that $\bar{v}^2 = 3/2 v_{\rm LSR}^2$, where $v_{\rm LSR}$ is the Local Standard of Rest at the position of the Sun. Recent estimates place $v_{\rm LSR} = 235 \text{ km/s} [30-32]$, so that $\bar{v} = 288 \text{ km/s}$. Meanwhile, given the Sun's peculiar velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\rm pec} = (11, 12, 7) \text{ km/s} [33]$, it moves at $\tilde{v} = 247 \text{ km/s}$ with respect to the DM halo. These velocities are collected for easy reference in Table 1 in the Appendix. We define $\vec{\eta} = \sqrt{3/(2\bar{v}^2)} \vec{v}$ for the dimensionless velocity of the Sun, and perform a Galilean transformation $\vec{x} \to \vec{x} + \vec{\eta}$ to express the DM velocity distribution in the Sun's rest frame,

$$f_{\eta}(x)d^{3}x = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}x^{2}e^{-x^{2}}e^{-\eta^{2}}\frac{\sinh(2x\eta)}{2x\eta}dx,$$
(2.2)

where averaging over the solid angle has been performed.¹

As the DM particle falls into the Sun's potential well, its speed increases. Letting r denote the distance between the DM particle and the center of the Sun, the instantaneous speed w of the DM particle is given in terms of the local escape velocity $v_{\rm esc}(r)$ by $w^2(r) = u^2 + v_{\rm esc}^2(r)$. Once the particle reaches the surface of the Sun, it can scatter off of nuclei in the Sun. In this work we will assume for simplicity a constant spin-independent DM-nucleon cross-section σ_p . Spin-independent cross-sections follow from generic scenarios such as e.g. Higgs portal or kinetic mixing portal interactions between DM and the SM, and are important for obtaining sizeable nuclear capture rates in the Earth, as we will discuss in Sec. 2.3 below.

 $^{^{1}}$ We neglect the galactic escape velocity, as capture rates are insensitive to the high-velocity tail of the DM distribution.

For a spherical shell of radius r within the Sun, the nuclear capture rate due to species i per unit shell volume can then be written as [7]

$$\frac{dC_{c,i}}{dV} = n_{\rm DM} \int_0^\infty du \, f_\eta(u) \frac{w}{u} \Omega_i(w), \qquad (2.3)$$

where $n_{\rm DM} = \rho_{\odot}/M_{\rm DM}$ is the local number density of DM, and $\Omega_i(w)$ is the capture rate for a DM particle with velocity w(r),

$$\Omega_i(w) = n_i(r)\sigma_{\rm cap}w(r). \tag{2.4}$$

Here $n_i(r)$ is the local density of target nuclei of species *i*, and σ_{cap} is the cross-section for DM to undergo a nuclear scattering that results in capture. This cross-section can be found straightforwardly by integrating the DM-nucleus cross-section over the portion of phase space where the DM particle loses enough energy in a nuclear collision to be gravitationally bound. To ensure that a nuclear scattering leads to gravitational capture, we must have the final velocity of the DM particle be less than the local escape velocity, or, in other words, the DM particle's fractional energy loss $\Delta E/E$ must satisfy

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} \ge \frac{u^2}{w^2(r)}.\tag{2.5}$$

Meanwhile the maximum possible energy loss is fixed by kinematics,

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} \leqslant \frac{\mu_i}{\mu_{i,+}^2},\tag{2.6}$$

where, following Gould, we have defined

$$\mu_i \equiv \frac{M_{\rm DM}}{m_i}, \qquad \mu_{i,\pm} \equiv \frac{\mu_i \pm 1}{2}, \qquad (2.7)$$

where m_i is the mass of element *i*. To describe nuclear scattering, we employ an exponential (Helm) form factor following Ref. [34],

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d(\Delta E)}\right)_i = \sigma_{0,i} \frac{\mu_{i,+}^2}{\mu_i} \frac{2}{M_{\rm DM} w^2} F_i^2(\Delta E), \qquad (2.8)$$

where ΔE is again the energy transfer in the collision and the form factor is

$$F_i^2(\Delta E) = \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta E}{E_{0,i}}\right).$$
(2.9)

Here $E_{0,i}$ is given by

$$E_{0,i} \equiv \frac{3}{2m_i R_{0,i}^2},\tag{2.10}$$

where the nuclear radius is modeled as [34]

$$R_{0,i} = 10^{-13} \,\mathrm{cm} \times \left(0.3 + 0.91 \left(\frac{m_i}{\mathrm{GeV}}\right)^{1/3}\right).$$
(2.11)

Finally, we specify σ_0 as follows:

$$\sigma_{0,i} = \int_0^{4m_r^2 w^2} \left(\frac{d\sigma(q=0)}{d|\vec{q}|^2} \right) d|\vec{q}|^2 = \frac{4m_r^2}{\pi} [Z_i f_p + (A_i - Z_i) f_n]^2,$$
(2.12)

where $m_{\rm r} = m_i M_{\rm DM}/(m_i + M_{\rm DM})$ is the reduced mass. We restrict ourselves to the isospinconserving case of $f_{\rm n} = f_{\rm p}$ for simplicity, and write $\sigma_{0,i}$ in terms of the effective per-nucleon cross section $\sigma_{\rm p}$,

$$\sigma_{0,i} = \sigma_{\rm p} A_i^2 \frac{m_{\rm r,i}^2}{m_{\rm r,p}^2} = \sigma_{\rm p} A_i^2 \frac{M_{\rm DM}^2 m_i^2}{(M_{\rm DM} + m_i)^2} \frac{(m_{\rm p} + M_{\rm DM})^2}{m_{\rm p}^2 M_{\rm DM}^2},$$
(2.13)

where $m_{\rm p}$ is the proton mass.

For an isotropic scattering cross-section $\sigma_{\rm p}$, ΔE is uniformly distributed between 0 and the kinematic maximum, meaning that, collision by collision, elements closest in mass to DM will most efficiently contribute to the capture rate. (The slight departure from isotropy in *nuclear* scatterings resulting from the form factor suppression of the most energetic scatterings does not alter this conclusion.) The sheer abundance of helium in the Sun ensures that it dominates the capture rate for light ($M_{\rm DM} < 36.6$ GeV) DM, while oxygen dominates for heavier DM. For further detail, see Fig. 11 in Appendix A.1. The full capture rate is obtained by integrating the capture rate for each radial shell over the volume of the Sun and summing over all relevant nuclear species,

$$C_{\rm c} = \sum_{i} \left(\int_0^{R_{\odot}} d^3 r \frac{dC_{{\rm c},i}}{dV} \right).$$
(2.14)

The nuclear capture coefficient C_c is directly proportional to the DM-nucleon cross-section σ_p and to the local DM number density $n_{\rm DM}$. For heavy DM ($M_{\rm DM} \gtrsim 100$ GeV), C_c falls off as $1/M_{\rm DM}^2$, which can be simply understood: one factor of $1/M_{\rm DM}$ comes from the kinematic suppression in the capture probability $\Omega_i(w)$, while the other factor comes from the decreasing number density of DM with increasing mass, $n_{\rm DM} = \rho_{\odot}/M_{\rm DM}$.

The evaporation coefficient $C_{\rm e}$ is also directly proportional to the DM-nucleon crosssection, and additionally depends on the spatial distribution of DM within the Sun. Assuming this distribution is (near-)thermal, $C_{\rm e}$ becomes important for DM masses below $M_{\rm DM} \leq 4$ GeV [6, 35], and falls off exponentially with increasing mass.

Meanwhile, the annihilation rate Γ_{ann} is directly proportional to the thermally-averaged DM annihilation cross-section $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{ann}}$. We define

$$\Gamma_{\rm ann}(t) = C_{\rm ann} N^2(t), \qquad (2.15)$$

and, in the case of constant s-wave annihilations,

$$C_{\rm ann} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\rm ann} \int_0^{R_{\odot}} d^3 r A^2 \exp\left(\frac{-M_{\rm DM}\Phi(r)}{T_{\rm core}}\right).$$
(2.16)

Unless otherwise specified, we will adopt a fixed reference value of $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\rm ann} = 3 \times 10^{-26} \,{\rm cm}^3/{\rm s}$, corresponding to the assumption that DM is a thermal relic constituting the main component of DM in the universe. In this case, $C_{\rm ann} \propto M_{\rm DM}^{3/2}$ for large $M_{\rm DM}$, with all the mass dependence coming from the spatial distribution of DM within the Sun.

For a traditional WIMP, elastic self-scattering is negligible, and for masses $M_{\rm DM} \gtrsim 4$ GeV evaporation can also be neglected. The DM number abundance in the Sun is then simply given by the balance of capture and annihilation,

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = C_{\rm c} - C_{\rm ann} N^2. \tag{2.17}$$

The solution to this equation is

$$N_0(t) = \sqrt{\frac{C_{\rm c}}{C_{\rm ann}}} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\tau_{\odot}}\right), \qquad (2.18)$$

where $\tau_{\odot}^{-1} \equiv \sqrt{C_c C_{ann}}$ is the timescale for the system to reach equilibrium. When the solar population has achieved steady-state, the present-day annihilation rate is directly proportional to the nuclear cross-section,

$$\Gamma_{\rm ann}(t_0) = C_{\rm c} \tanh^2 \left(\frac{t_0}{\tau_{\odot}}\right) = C_{\rm c}.$$
(2.19)

However, in much of the parameter space allowed by direct detection constraints, the equilibration timescale is longer than the age of the Sun, and the present-day annihilation rate therefore depends on the annihilation cross-section as well as the nuclear cross-section. For reference, Fig. 14 in the Appendix shows the minimum value of $\sigma_{\rm p}$ yielding equilibration as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$.

2.2 DM capture and annihilation in the Sun with self-interactions

Next we discuss the processes that depend on DM's elastic self-scattering. For illustration, we consider an isotropic and velocity-independent self-scattering cross section σ_{xx} . The construction of the self-capture and self-ejection rates C_{sc} , C_{se} is very similar to the calculation of the nuclear capture rate C_c [9], with two important differences. The first is that the target nuclei of the Sun, $n_i(r)$, are replaced with the numerically much smaller population of captured DM $n_c(r)$ (again assumed to be thermalized within the Sun). Collision by collision, momentum transfer is much more efficient for self-capture than for nuclear capture, and therefore the relative importance of self-capture depends on the DM mass. The other important difference is that in evaluating the probability of self-capture we must require not only that the incoming DM particle become gravitationally bound, but also that the target particle remain bound to the Sun after the collision:

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} \ge \frac{u^2}{w^2(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Delta E}{E} \le \frac{v_{\text{esc}}^2(r)}{w^2(r)}.$$
(2.20)

Conversely, for self-ejection, we require that the incoming particle remain unbound to the Sun, while the target becomes unbound after the collision:

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} \leq \frac{u^2}{w^2(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Delta E}{E} \geq \frac{v_{\text{esc}}^2(r)}{w^2(r)}.$$
(2.21)

Both rates are directly proportional to the self-interaction cross-section σ_{xx} . The Sun's potential well is deep—the escape velocity at the Sun's surface, $v_{\rm esc}(R_{\odot}) = 618$ km/s, is far larger than the typical DM speed in the halo, $\bar{v} = 288$ km/s—and consequently self-ejection



Figure 1: Left: Self-capture (black) and self-ejection (purple) rates in the Sun as a function of DM mass, for constant self-interaction cross-section $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-24} \text{cm}^2$. Right: Self-capture and self-ejection coefficients in the Earth as a function of DM mass again with $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-24} \text{cm}^2$. Self-capture is shown in black for direct capture (dashed) and free space (solid). Self-ejection is shown in dashed red for direct capture and solid purple for free space.

is everywhere negligible compared to self-capture [9]. This result can be seen from Fig. 1 for constant self-interactions, and also holds for long-range self-interactions $\sigma_{xx} \propto v^{-4}$ [36].

For DM masses above 10 GeV, both $C_{\rm sc}$ and $C_{\rm se}$ follow very closely a 1/M power law. This dependence is simply due to the local DM number density, $n_{\rm DM} = \rho_{\odot}/M_{\rm DM}$. The complicated velocity and volume integrals have a very weak mass dependence.

This calculation assumes that the Sun is not optically thick to DM. As self-interaction cross-sections of astrophysical interest can be very large, it is instructive to check the validity of this assumption. To do so, we require that the self-capture cross-section multiplied by the number of targets, i.e., the number of captured DM particles, be smaller than the cross-sectional area of the captured DM ball. Defining r_X as the radius containing 95% of the captured DM, we thus require

$$\langle \sigma_{\rm sc} \rangle N(\tau_{\odot}) < \pi r_X^2,$$
 (2.22)

where the average self-capture cross-section $\langle \sigma_{sc} \rangle$ is defined by integrating over the incident DM velocity distribution,

$$\langle \sigma_{\rm sc} \rangle \equiv \frac{\int_0^{r_X} dV \int d^3 u f_\eta(u) \frac{w}{u} \sigma_{\rm sc}}{\int_0^{r_X} dV \int d^3 u f_\eta(u) \frac{w}{u}}.$$
(2.23)

Here $\sigma_{\rm sc}$ is defined to incorporate the kinematic restrictions on the recoil energy that lead to self-capture. Through $N(\tau_{\odot})$, Eq. 2.22 depends on the nuclear cross-section $\sigma_{\rm p}$ and the DM annihilation cross-section as well as the DM self-interaction cross-section. We find for DM with a thermal annihilation cross-section that we are always in the optically thin regime for nuclear cross-sections allowed by direct detection and self-interaction cross-sections allowed by the Bullet Cluster. A similar calculation for self-ejection in the Earth shows that the Earth is always optically thin to DM when the Sun is.

Meanwhile, the self-evaporation of DM through isotropic, velocity-independent scattering can become important for $M_{\rm DM} \leq 4$ GeV [10]; see the left panel of Fig. 2. Our main regime of interest will be in the range $M_{\rm DM} > 10$ GeV, where self-evaporation can be neglected in comparison to annihilation.



Figure 2: Self-evaporation and annihilation rates in the Sun (left) and Earth (right). The self-evaporation coefficient C_{sevap} is shown in black and the annihilation coefficient C_{ann} in red for fixed $\sigma_{\text{xx}} = 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$ and $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{ann}} = 3 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/s$.

2.3 DM capture and annihilation in the Earth

Computing dark matter capture rates in the Earth differs from the corresponding calculations in the Sun in two important ways. First, the Earth is situated deep within the Sun's potential well, complicating the determination of the DM velocity distribution at the location of the Earth. Second, the Earth's potential well is much shallower than the potential well of the Sun, which means that in the presence of strong self-interactions the dominant process is self-ejection, rather than self-capture [9, 36].

When DM from the Galactic halo arrives at the Earth, it has already been accelerated by the Sun. This solar acceleration combines with the Earth's orbital velocity to determine a finite minimum velocity u for DM falling into Earth's potential well. Since the fractional energy loss of a DM particle is limited by kinematics, a minimum incident velocity in turn determines a maximum (minimum) possible DM mass above (below) which gravitational capture is not possible [8, 37]. However this 'direct' capture of DM from the halo population is supplemented by 'indirect' capture from the population of DM already gravitationally bound to the solar system [8, 38]. Understanding the phase space distribution of DM bound to the solar system is a complicated dynamical question. In Ref. [38], Gould argued that a detailed balance should hold between capture and ejection processes in gravitational DM interactions with Jupiter, Earth, and Venus, bringing the total distribution of DM seen at Earth's orbit to an effective free-space distribution for the Earth as considered in isolation. Subsequent numerical work by Peter [39] in a simplified model of the solar system showed that this 'detailed balance' description holds to good approximation at low DM velocities $(v \leq 30 \text{ km/s})$, but overestimates the DM distribution at higher velocities. In our calculations we show results for both direct capture and capture from the detailed balance free-space distribution, which bracket expectations for Earth capture of DM. As low DM velocities are most important for self-capture and high DM velocities more relevant for self-ejection, we expect that the free space distribution gives a reasonable description of self-capture but may underestimate the self-ejection rate. Thus our choice here is conservative.

Details of our Earth model are given in Appendix A.2, where we also show in Fig. 12 the resulting nuclear capture rates in the Earth, for both direct capture and free space velocity distributions, assuming constant spin-independent nuclear interactions. Away from nuclear resonances, the dominant nuclear capture rate is due to oxygen at low masses, while at higher DM masses iron dominates. The choice of DM velocity distribution has a major impact on

the nuclear capture rate at both high $(M \gtrsim 100 \text{ GeV})$ and low $(M \lesssim 10)$ GeV DM masses, with less sensitivity for DM masses in the intermediate regime where nuclear resonances dominate. Finally, we caution that our simplifying approximation that the captured DM population thermalizes at a uniform temperature corresponding to the temperature of the Earth's core is less warranted than for the Sun, as the captured DM occupies a larger fraction of the Earth's volume; this could be straightforwardly refined in a more detailed treatment.

For DM masses below $M_{\text{evap}} \lesssim 10 \text{ GeV}$, evaporation of the Earth's captured population through nuclear scattering becomes important [7]. The evaporation mass is larger in the Earth than in the Sun, thanks to the Earth's more massive constituent nuclei and its shallower potential well. We show our calculation of the evaporation rate in the Earth in Fig. 13.

2.4 DM capture and annihilation in the Earth with self-interactions

The rate of self-ejection and self-capture in the Earth can be computed analogously to the discussion for the Sun above. The resulting self-ejection and self-capture coefficients are shown in Fig. 1 for specific choices of self-interaction strength. Self-ejection is everywhere dominant over self-capture by many orders of magnitude. While we consider constant self-interaction cross-sections here, the dominance of self-ejection over self-capture in the Earth also holds for long-range Rutherford cross-sections, despite the relatively larger self-capture rates in that case [36]. Thus the essential result of this paper—i.e., that the differering kinematics of gravitational capture within the Sun and Earth's potential wells imply differing and potentially sizeable impacts of self-scattering on the bound DM populations—apply to long-range self-interaction cross-sections as well.² Self-capture can only occur in the low-velocity tail of the DM distribution, and thus the self-capture coefficient is highly sensitive to the choice of DM velocity distribution.

Finally, we consider self-evaporation in the Earth. The shallowness of the Earth's potential well $(v_{\rm esc} \oplus (R_{\oplus}) = 11 \,\mathrm{km/s})$ makes self-evaporation more important in the Earth than in the Sun. We find that self-evaporation dominates over annihilation for $M_{\rm DM} \leq 8 \,\mathrm{GeV}$ for constant self-interactions; see the right panel of Fig. 2.

3 Self-interactions and DM annihilations in the Sun

In the presence of self-interactions, the equation governing the evolution of the captured DM population in the Sun is

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = C_{\rm c} + (C_{\rm sc} - C_{\rm e})N - (C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap})N^2.$$
(3.1)

Here we have neglected the highly subdominant contribution of self-ejection. Although our main interest will be in DM masses $M_{\rm DM} > 10$ GeV, we have retained the contributions of evaporation and self-evaporation, in order to get a more complete picture of the impact of self-interactions in the Sun. With the initial condition N(0) = 0, the general solution to Eq. 3.1 is [9]

$$N(t) = \frac{C_{\rm c} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi}\right)}{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{(C_{\rm sc} - C_{\rm e})}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi}\right)},\tag{3.2}$$

 $^{^{2}}$ It is worth observing in this context that substantially enhanced and/or environmentally dependent annihilation cross-sections can also affect the bound Sun and Earth DM populations differently [40].

where

$$\xi^{-1} = \sqrt{C_{\rm c}(C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap}) + \frac{(C_{\rm sc} - C_{\rm e})^2}{4}}$$
(3.3)

is the inverse of the equilibration time for the captured population.

In the absence of self-interactions, the equilibration time is given by

$$\xi_0^{-1} = \sqrt{C_{\rm c}C_{\rm ann} + \frac{C_{\rm e}^2}{4}} \tag{3.4}$$

and the DM population is

$$N_0(t) = \frac{C_{\rm c} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_0}\right)}{\frac{1}{\xi_0} + \frac{C_{\rm e}}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_0}\right)}.$$
(3.5)

We can quantify the impact of self-interactions on the solar population by defining an "enhancement" factor β , given by the ratio of the present-day DM annihilation rate in the presence of self-interactions to the annihilation rate without self-interactions for fixed $M_{\rm DM}$ and $\sigma_{\rm p}$:

$$\beta \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{\Gamma_{\rm ann,0}} = \frac{C_{\rm ann} N(\tau_{\odot})^2}{C_{\rm ann,0} N_0(\tau_{\odot})^2}.$$
(3.6)

Here $N_0(t)$ is given by Eq. 3.5, i.e., is the solar population in the absence of self-interactions, but including the effect of evaporation. When the annihilation cross-section is taken to be independent of the elastic self-scattering cross-section, as here, $C_{\rm ann} = C_{\rm ann,0}$, and the definition of β then reduces to a comparison of the total captured population in the cases with and without self-interactions [9],

$$\beta \equiv \left(\frac{N(\tau_{\odot})}{N_0(\tau_{\odot})}\right)^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Since self-capture dominates over self-ejection in the Sun, the main effect of self-scattering (at fixed annihilation cross-section) is to increase the total solar population and thus enhance DM annihilations in the Sun [9, 41].

As a prelude to our numerical results, we first establish some scales. To remain as model-independent as possible, we will show results for the *annihilation flux*, defined as the annihilation rate divided by the geometric dilution factor:

$$\Phi_{\odot} = \frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{4\pi D^2},\tag{3.8}$$

where D = 1 A.U. for the solar annihilation flux. Contours of constant annihilation flux in the Sun are shown in the (M, σ_p) plane in Fig. 3, without (left) and with (right) constant self-interactions.

Whether or not a given DM annihilation flux is observable depends strongly on the specific annihilation mode(s) in a given model. For DM that annihilates promptly to SM species, current neutrino telescopes can observe annihilation fluxes in the range $10^9 - 10^{13} \text{ km}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$, depending on the DM mass and annihilation channel (*bb*, $\tau\tau$, or *WW*) [16–18]. Greater sensitivities can be achieved in models where DM annihilates to long-lived dark particles that



Figure 3: Solar annihilation flux in km⁻² yr⁻¹. Colored lines represent contours of constant flux. In the left plot we show the annihilation fluxes in the absence of self-interactions. In the right plot we show how a given annihilation flux contour is modified by the introduction of increasing constant self-interaction cross-section. The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. The parameter space to the left of the dashed purple lines is in tension with the Bullet Cluster. In the yellow regions σ_p is too small for the captured DM population to be thermalized in the Sun: (left) less than 90% of the captured DM population is thermalized for the indicated value of σ_{xx} , while below the dashed contours energy injection from halo DM prevents the captured DM population from thermalizing at the Sun's temperature.

escape the Sun; solar γ rays can probe annihilation fluxes on the order of $10^7 - 10^8 \text{ km}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ [29], while for a striking enough signal annihilation fluxes as low as $\sim 10^2 \text{ km}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ can be tested [26]. Depending on the DM mass and detection channel, cosmic rays scattering within the solar atmosphere may provide important backgrounds [42–45].

We fix the annihilation cross-section to the reference (near-)thermal value, $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\rm ann} = 3 \times 10^{-26} \,{\rm cm}^3/{\rm s}$, and plot contours of β in the $(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm xx})$ plane for fixed values of $\sigma_{\rm p}$ in Fig. 4. Here the red shaded region indicates self-interaction cross-sections in excess of the Bullet Cluster bound, $\sigma_{\rm xx}/M < 1 \,{\rm cm}^2/{\rm g}$ [46]. The blue shaded regions are excluded by the results of LUX [47], PandaX-II [48] and XENON1T [49, 50].

Note that large enhancements, $\beta \sim 10^2 - 10^3$, are possible in the parameter space allowed by all current constraints. As $\sigma_{\rm p}$ decreases, a smaller value of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ is needed for $C_{\rm sc}$ to compete with $C_{\rm c}$, $C_{\rm e}$ to obtain the same fixed enhancement β , as is evident by comparing the left and right panels of Fig. 3. The decrease in β with increasing mass at fixed $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ arises from the parametric dependence of the capture and annihilation coefficients on DM mass $M_{\rm DM}$. Recall from Sec. 2 that at large $M_{\rm DM}$, $C_{\rm c} \sim 1/M_{\rm DM}^2$, while for constant self-interactions $C_{\rm ann} \sim M_{\rm DM}^{3/2}$ and $C_{\rm sc} \sim 1/M_{\rm DM}$. Hence in the fundamental timescale of the system, ξ , the $C_{\rm sc}^2$ term decreases faster than $C_{\rm c}C_{\rm ann}$ with increasing DM mass. Thus at a given β , even for large values of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, nuclear capture will always come to dominate at sufficiently large DM masses.

From the right panel of Fig. 4, we also note that for DM with $M_{\rm DM} \gtrsim 10$ GeV and



Figure 4: Solar annihilation flux ratio β in the Sun for constant self-interaction cross-section. Colored lines represent contours of constant β . We show results for fixed nuclear cross-sections $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-45} {\rm cm}^2$ (left) and $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-47} {\rm cm}^2$ (right). The red shaded region is excluded by the Bullet Cluster constraint and the blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. In the yellow region, more than 10% of the captured DM population is not thermalized today.

fixed β , the requisite value of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ scales approximately linearly with $M_{\rm DM}$. This feature appears for sufficiently small $\sigma_{\rm p}$ (we show results for a fixed value $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-47} \,{\rm cm}^2$) and is explained as follows. In this regime evaporation and self-evaporation are negligible and self-interactions dominate over nuclear capture. In the absence of self-interactions, the small $\sigma_{\rm p}$ means that the equilibration time is larger than the age of the Sun. Hence, we can approximate $\tanh(\tau_{\odot}/\xi_0) \approx \tau_{\odot}/\xi_0$. Meanwhile, for large β , the equilibration time $1/\xi$ is dominated by self-capture, $C_{\rm sc}^2 \gg C_{\rm c}C_{\rm ann}$. Hence, we can approximate

$$\frac{1}{\xi} = \sqrt{C_{\rm c}C_{\rm ann} + \frac{C_{\rm sc}^2}{4}} \approx \frac{C_{\rm sc}}{2} + \frac{C_{\rm c}C_{\rm ann}}{C_{\rm sc}}.$$
(3.9)

With these approximations, β takes on the simpler form

$$\beta^{1/2} \approx \frac{1}{\tau_{\odot} C_{\rm sc}} \frac{2 \tanh \frac{\tau_{\odot}}{\xi}}{(1 - \tanh \frac{\tau_{\odot}}{\xi} + 2\frac{C_{\rm c} C_{\rm ann}}{C_{\rm sc}^2})} \qquad (\beta \gg 1).$$
(3.10)

The $1/C_{\rm sc}$ factor gives the dominant mass scaling of β via the mass dependence of $C_{\rm sc} \sim 1/M_{\rm DM}$, giving $\beta^{1/2} \sim M_{\rm DM}$. Conversely, for a constant β , we must scale $\sigma_{\rm xx} \sim M_{\rm DM}$, so that $C_{\rm sc}$ has no strong net mass dependence. On the other hand, for weak enhancements, the equilibration time is larger than the age of the Sun both in the presence and absence of self-interactions. Therefore, taking $\tanh(\tau_{\odot}/\xi_0) \approx \tau_{\odot}/\xi_0$ and $\tanh(\tau_{\odot}/\xi) \approx \tau_{\odot}/\xi$ is justified. With these approximations, the enhancement becomes

$$\beta^{1/2} \approx \frac{\frac{\tau_{\odot}}{\xi}}{\frac{\tau_{\odot}}{\xi_{0}}} \frac{\frac{1}{\xi_{0}}}{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{C_{\rm sc}}{2} \frac{\tau_{\odot}}{\xi}} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2}C_{\rm sc}\tau_{\odot}} \qquad (\beta \sim \mathcal{O}(1)). \tag{3.11}$$

Thus once again the contours appear nearly linear in the $(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm xx})$ plane. As we move to lower masses, both evaporation and self-evaporation start to become important, and the



Figure 5: Solar annihilation flux ratio β in the Sun for constant self-interaction cross-section. Colored solid lines represent contours of constant β . We show results for $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-23} \text{ cm}^2$ (left) and $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$ (right). The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX , LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. In the yellow region σ_p is too small for the captured DM population to be thermalized in the Sun. The parameter space to the left of the dashed red line is in tension with the Bullet cluster constraint.

parametric behavior of the contours changes sharply as both processes turn on exponentially quickly.

Next we consider contours of fixed β in the $(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm p})$ plane in Fig. 5, for fixed values of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$. Here we see again that larger enhancements are obtained for smaller $\sigma_{\rm p}$, and observe the sharp turnover in the contours at low DM masses as evaporation becomes important. From the figure we can further note the important point that β is largely insensitive to $\sigma_{\rm p}$, for $\sigma_{\rm p} \lesssim 10^{-46} \,\mathrm{cm}^2$ and sufficiently large DM masses. In this regime the $C_{\rm c}$ term becomes completely negligible once $\sigma_{\rm p} \lesssim 10^{-46} \,\mathrm{cm}^2$ and the population dynamics is controlled entirely by self-capture. Hence, further decreases in $\sigma_{\rm p}$ will not affect the enhancement.

4 Self-interactions and DM annihilation in the Earth

Next we turn to quantifying the effect of DM self-interactions on the annihilation signal from the Earth. Here self-ejections dominate over self-capture, giving

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = C_{\rm c} - (C_{\rm se} + C_{\rm e})N - (C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap})N^2, \tag{4.1}$$

which has the general solution

$$N(t) = \frac{C_{\rm c} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_{\rm E}}\right)}{\frac{1}{\xi_{\rm E}} + \frac{C_{\rm se} + C_{\rm e}}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_{\rm E}}\right)},\tag{4.2}$$



Figure 6: Annihilation flux in the Earth for constant self-interaction cross-section, in km⁻²yr⁻¹. Colored lines represent contours of constant flux. Solid and dashed contours correspond to Free Space and Direct Capture, respectively. In the left plot we show the annihilation fluxes in the absence of self-interactions. In the right plot we show how a given annihilation flux contour is modified by the introduction of increasing (constant) self-interaction cross-section. The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. The parameter space to the left of the dashed purple lines are in tension with the Bullet Cluster. In the yellow regions σ_p is too small for the captured DM population to be thermalized in the Earth: (left) less that 90 % of the captured DM population is thermalized for the given choice of σ_{xx} , while below the dashed contours the captured DM population does not thermalize at the Earth's temperature.

where $\xi_{\rm E}^{-1} = \sqrt{C_{\rm c}(C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap}) + (C_{\rm se} + C_{\rm e})^2/4}$. The general solution in the absence of self-interactions is

$$N_0(t) = \frac{C_{\rm c} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_0}\right)}{\frac{1}{\xi_0} + \frac{C_{\rm e}}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{t}{\xi_0}\right)},\tag{4.3}$$

where $\xi_0^{-1} = \sqrt{C_c C_{ann} + C_e^2/4}$. Analogously to our discussion of the Sun above, we quantify the importance of self-interactions by introducing the "depletion" factor, the ratio of the annihilation flux in the presence of self-interactions to the annihilation flux expected for non-interacting DM:

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{\Gamma_{\rm ann,0}} = \frac{C_{\rm ann} N(\tau_{\oplus})^2}{C_{\rm ann,0} N_0(\tau_{\oplus})^2},\tag{4.4}$$

where $\tau_{\oplus} = 4.5 \times 10^9$ years is the age of the Earth and $N_0(t)$ is given by Eq. 4.3, i.e., the expected Earth population in the absence of self-interactions, but including the effect of evaporation. Again, for fixed C_{ann} , γ reduces to a comparison of the total captured population in the cases with and without self-interactions.

Since self-ejections will dominate over self-capture in the Earth, the dominant effect of self-scattering is to deplete the Earth population and thus (at fixed C_{ann}) suppress the



Figure 7: Earth annihilation flux ratio γ for constant self-interaction cross-section. Colored lines represent contours of constant γ : solid and dashed lines correspond to Free Space and Direct Capture velocity distributions, respectively. The solid and dashed lines are nearly coincident on the plot. We show results for fixed nuclear cross-sections $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-45} {\rm cm}^2$ (left) and $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-47} {\rm cm}^2$ (right). The red shaded region is excluded by the Bullet Cluster constraint and the blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX, and XENON1T direct detection experiments.

annihilation flux. The annihilation flux from the Earth,

$$\Phi_{\oplus} = \frac{\Gamma_{\rm ann}}{4\pi D^2},\tag{4.5}$$

where $D = R_{\oplus}$, is plotted in the (M_{DM}, σ_p) plane in Fig. 6, without (left) and with (right) constant self-interactions. Comparing Figs. 3 and 6, it is clear that the Earth annihilation flux is numerically subdominant to the flux from the Sun.

Neutrino telescopes are sensitive to annihilation fluxes from the Earth on the order of $10^9 - 10^{13} \,\mathrm{km}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, typically a factor of a few worse sensitivity than for the Sun [51, 52], while sensitivity can be much greater for models where DM annihilates to dark states, e.g. $10^3 \,\mathrm{km}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ in a model that annihilates to dark photons [24].

We again fix the annihilation cross-section to the reference value $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{ann}} = 3 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$, and show contours of the Earth flux ratio γ in the $(M_{\text{DM}}, \sigma_{\text{xx}})$ and $(M_{\text{DM}}, \sigma_{\text{p}})$ planes in Figs. 7 and 8 respectively.

We begin by noting that depletions in the Earth are more modest in magnitude than the enhancements in the Sun. The strongest depletions consistent with Bullet Cluster bounds are $\sim 1/10$. Otherwise, many features of the contours in Fig. 7, such as the linearity at high DM mass, are the same as observed for the Sun in Fig. 4, and can be similarly understood.

One new feature that we can observe from Figs. 7 and 8 is that the depletion factor γ does not appreciably depend on the choice of the DM velocity distribution at the Earth's orbit. As discussed in Sec. 2.3, the greatest impact of the choice of velocity distribution is on the nuclear capture coefficient C_c outside the region of resonant capture (i.e. $M_{\rm DM} < 10 \,{\rm GeV}$ and $M_{\rm DM} > 100 \,{\rm GeV}$). But in the low mass region $M_{\rm DM} < 10 \,{\rm GeV}$, evaporation

dominates, $\frac{1}{4}C_{\rm e}^2 \gg C_{\rm c}(C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap})$, while in the high-mass region $M_{\rm DM} > 100 \,{\rm GeV}$, selfejection dominates, $\frac{1}{4}C_{\rm se}^2 \gg C_{\rm c}(C_{\rm ann} + C_{\rm sevap})$. Therefore away from the regions dominated by resonant nuclear capture, even weak depletions are governed by relatively distributioninsensitive processes.



Figure 8: Earth annihilation flux ratio γ for constant self-interaction cross-section. Colored lines represent contours of constant γ : solid and dashed lines correspond to Free Space and Direct Capture, respectively. We show results for fixed self-interaction cross-sections $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-22} \text{ cm}^2$ (left) and $\sigma_{xx} = 10^{-23} \text{ cm}^2$ (right). The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. In the yellow region σ_p is too small for the captured DM population to be thermalized in the Earth. The parameter space to the left of the dashed red line is in tension with the Bullet cluster constraint.

5 Diagnosing DM self-interactions

We are now ready to demonstrate how comparing Earth and Sun annihilation fluxes can reveal the presence of dark matter self-interactions. In most scenarios, the numerically larger Sun annihilation flux is likely to be observed before the Earth annihilation flux. Suppose the Sun flux is measured to be $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m}$. If we neglect self-interactions, then we can solve

$$\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} = \Phi_{\odot}(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm p}, \sigma_{\rm xx} = 0) \tag{5.1}$$

to obtain the value of the nuclear cross-section $\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)} = \sigma_{\rm p}(M_{\rm DM}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m})$ needed to explain the solar measurement in the absence of self-interactions, as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$. The deduced $\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}$ in turn predicts a specific Earth annihilation flux as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$. We call this the "null" prediction,

$$\Phi_{\oplus}^{(0)} = \Phi_{\oplus} \left(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}(M_{\rm DM}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m}) \right).$$
(5.2)

This prediction is shown by the black lines in Fig. 9.

Self-interactions, if present, enhance the Sun population while suppressing the Earth population, leading to a smaller Earth flux than the null prediction, sometimes by many



Figure 9: Predicted annihilation flux in the Earth for constant self-interaction cross-section and *s*-wave annihilations, in km⁻²yr⁻¹, as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$. Colored lines show different values of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, as indicated by opacity. In the left plot we fix $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} = 10^8 \text{ km}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ and in the right plot $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} = 10^6 \text{ km}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$. Solid and dashed contours correspond to Free Space and Direct Capture for the Earth, respectively. The regions to the left of the vertical dotted lines are excluded by the Bullet Cluster observations for the self-interactions of the corresponding color.

orders of magnitude. In the presence of self-interactions, the predicted Earth flux can be obtained from a measured Sun flux as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$ and $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, again by finding the value of the nuclear cross-section that yields the desired flux from the Sun,

$$\sigma_{\rm p}^{\rm (p)} = \sigma_{\rm p} \left(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm xx}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} \right).$$
(5.3)

The corresponding Earth flux is then simply

$$\Phi_{\oplus}^{(p)} = \Phi_{\oplus} \left(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm p}^{(p)} \left(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm xx}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} \right), \sigma_{\rm xx} \right).$$
(5.4)

As shown in Fig. 9, self-interactions of astrophysical interest can suppress the predicted Earth flux by many orders of magnitude, far more than can be accommodated by uncertainties in the Earth's composition. This suppression is sizeable for cross-sections orders of magnitude below the Bullet Cluster bounds, making this solar system comparison a leading test of dark matter self-interactions.

Fig. 9 shows results for both Free Space and Direct Capture regimes in the Earth, and demonstrates that for heavy DM, $M_{\rm DM} \gtrsim 100 \,{\rm GeV}$, the choice of DM velocity distribution at the Earth's orbit is numerically more consequential than the suppression from self-interactions. Thus to make strong statements about self-interactions in this regime, some additional information about the DM velocity distribution seen by the Earth would be required, perhaps from detailed numerical simulations. In the resonant capture regime, however, the impact of different velocity distributions can easily be a much smaller effect than the overall numerical suppression from self-interactions.

Comparing the left and right panels of Fig. 9 shows that the relative suppression of the Earth flux is not strongly dependent on the value of the Sun flux. We can understand this straightforwardly, and derive an explicit analytical approximation for the suppression as follows. We begin by defining the ratio between predicted Earth fluxes with and without self interactions,

$$R = \frac{\Phi_{\oplus}^{(\mathrm{p})}(M_{\mathrm{DM}}, \sigma_{\mathrm{xx}}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\mathrm{m}})}{\Phi_{\oplus}^{(0)}(M_{\mathrm{DM}}; \Phi_{\odot}^{\mathrm{m}})},\tag{5.5}$$



Figure 10: Plots of the ratio R of self-interacting to non-self-interacting Earth annihilation fluxes as a function of DM mass, with fixed *s*-wave annihilation rate. Curves of different colors correspond to different choices of σ_{xx} . In the left plot we fix $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} = 10^8 \rm km^2 yr^{-1}$, while in the right plot we fix $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m} = 10^6 \rm km^2 yr^{-1}$. Points to the left of the vertical dashed lines are in tension with Bullet Cluster constraints for the self-interactions of the corresponding color. The thick yellow lines indicate parameter space with nuclear cross-sections below the values that guarantee Sun or Earth thermalization. All parameter space shown is consistent with current direct detection results.

which quantifies the suppression of the expected Earth flux; this ratio is shown in Fig. 10. At fixed $C_{\rm ann}$, we must always have $R \leq 1$, simply as a consequence of solar system kinematics. To find an analytical approximation to R, we begin with the simpler regime where neither Earth nor Sun populations have attained steady state. This is generic in the Earth, and for the Sun it holds for self-interaction cross-sections $\sigma_{\rm xx} \leq 10^{-24} \,\mathrm{cm}^2$. The DM population in the Earth can thus be approximated as

$$N_{\oplus}^{(0)} = C_{\oplus c}(\sigma_{\mathrm{p}}^{(0)})\tau_{\oplus} \tag{5.6}$$

in the absence of self-interactions, and

$$N_{\oplus}^{(p)} = C_{\oplus c}(\sigma_{p}^{(p)})\tau_{\oplus}\frac{1}{1 + \frac{C_{\oplus se}}{2}\tau_{\oplus}}$$
(5.7)

with self-interactions included. Since $C_{\rm c} \propto \sigma_{\rm p}$, we then have

$$R = \left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm p}^{(p)}}{\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{C_{\oplus_{\rm se}}}{2} \tau_{\oplus}}\right)^2.$$
(5.8)

Meanwhile, for a Sun-captured DM population that is far away from equilibrium, $\sigma_{\rm p}^{(p)}$ and $\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}$ are determined by solving

$$\Phi^{\rm m}_{\odot} = \frac{1}{4\pi D^2} C_{\odot \rm ann} \left(C_{\odot \rm c}(\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}) \tau_{\odot} \right)^2 \tag{5.9}$$

$$\Phi^{\rm m}_{\odot} = \frac{1}{4\pi D^2} C_{\odot \rm ann} \left(C_{\odot \rm c}(\sigma_{\rm p}^{(p)}) \tau_{\odot} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{C_{\odot \rm sc}}{2} \tau_{\odot}} \right)^2, \tag{5.10}$$

yielding

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm p}^{(p)}}{\sigma_{\rm p}^{(0)}}\right)^2 = \left(1 - \frac{C_{\odot\rm sc}}{2}\tau_{\odot}\right)^2,\tag{5.11}$$

so that the expected suppression from self-interactions is

$$R \approx \left(\frac{1 - \frac{C_{\odotsc}}{2}\tau_{\odot}}{1 + \frac{C_{\oplusse}}{2}\tau_{\oplus}}\right)^2.$$
(5.12)

At larger values of σ_{xx} , self-interactions become sufficiently strong that the Sun-captured population reaches steady-state. This will re-introduce a dependence on $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m}$ in R. However, since most of the Sun DM population self-captures in this case, very small $\sigma_{\rm p}$ values can be accommodated, pushing much of this region below the thermalization floor at a given $\Phi_{\odot}^{\rm m}$.

Finally, it is worth remarking that this technique to extract both the self-interaction cross-section and the nuclear cross-section from two solar system flux measurements works only for $M_{\rm DM}$ above the mass where evaporations become important in both the Sun and, more restrictively, the Earth. For DM masses below this evaporation mass, the annihilation flux of non-self-interacting DM no longer depends on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ [35]. Thus for DM lighter than the evaporation mass, the degeneracy in predictions as well as the much reduced annihilation fluxes make it very challenging to extract useful information about DM self-interactions through this comparison of annihilation fluxes from the Earth and Sun. Additionally, as Fig. 10 demonstrates, for any given value of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, there is a minimum DM mass for which the assumption of thermalization is valid, and the procedure here is thus self-consistent.

6 Conclusions

We have demonstrated that the annihilation of DM captured by the Sun and the Earth can provide a leading test of DM self-interactions. DM's self-scattering cross-section enhances the DM capture rate in the Sun while suppressing it in the Earth, thanks simply to the differing kinematics of scattering in the two potential wells. Thus comparing the DM populations captured by both bodies provides a powerful diagnostic of the presence of DM self-interactions. We examined DM capture and annihilation in detail in the case of a constant spin-independent nuclear cross-section and an isotropic self-interaction crosssection, and showed that self-interactions can suppress the Earth flux by many orders of magnitude, far more than could be accounted for by uncertainties in the Earth's interior composition. While the absolute size of the annihilation flux from the Earth depends on the velocity distribution of DM at the Earth's orbit, the fractional suppression of the flux from self-interactions is largely insensitive to the details of this distribution. In particular, selfinteraction cross-sections that are large enough to affect the properties of dwarf galaxies have a sizeable quantitative impact on the predicted Earth annihilation flux. Moreover, depending on the DM mass, significant suppressions are possible for DM self-scattering cross-sections orders of magnitude below current astrophysical bounds. We further derived a semi-analytical approximation to the fractional suppression of the Earth flux that holds over most of the parameter space still testable by direct detection experiments for spin-independent nuclear cross-sections.

Our calculations assume that captured DM thermalizes with the nuclei in the massive body, and thus can be described by a time-independent spatial distribution. As direct detection experiments place ever more stringent constraints on DM-nuclear scattering, the surviving parameter space where this assumption is valid is rapidly shrinking. As we discuss in detail in the Appendix, concerns about thermalization are especially acute for dark matter with strong self-interactions. For the constant self-interaction cross-sections investigated here, we find that energy transfer from halo DM to bound DM is a subdominant barrier to thermalization, but that self-interactions can increase the thermalization timescale in the Sun simply through enhancing the total DM population. Without thermalization, one would need a full numerical treatment of the trajectories of captured DM particles to obtain a prediction for the annihilation flux. However, the essential result of this paper—that the differing kinematics of DM capture within the Sun and the Earth lead to differing and potentially observable impacts of DM self-interactions on the respective bound populations remains true even in this case. Similarly, while we have assumed for simplicity a constant spin-independent DM-nuclear scattering cross-section, our essential conclusion holds for any DM-nuclear interaction that allows significant capture rates in the Earth as well as the Sun.

The DM annihilation fluxes from the Sun and the Earth depend on the kinematics assumed for scattering as well as on the matrix elements governing DM interactions, and thus may also be affected by departures from the standard halo distribution, e.g. a (thick) dark disk [53, 54].³ In particular the low relative velocity of a disk component of DM would tend to enhance, rather than suppress, the Earth signal relative to the Sun signal, while suppressing direct detection event rates [36, 54]. High velocity DM streams, on the other hand, would dramatically suppress Earth annihilation fluxes while enhancing direct detection rates. Critically, for nuclear cross-sections that allow for thermalization, direct detection experiments would typically be able to provide a direct and independent probe of the velocity distribution of DM at Earth's orbit. Thus one may anticipate that, combining information from DM direct detection experiments, studies of DM diffusion through the solar system, and observed annihilation fluxes from Sun and Earth, DM particle physics could readily be disentangled from astrophysics. Sizeable changes to DM annihilation cross-sections, relative to the reference thermal value used here, can also impact the relative size of the Earth and Sun annihilation fluxes [40]. Significantly enhanced and environment-dependent annihilation rates are often realized in models of self-interacting dark matter, the consequences of which we will return to in future work.

Acknowledgements. We gratefully acknowledge useful conversations with A. Peter and P. Tanedo. The work of CG and JS was supported in part by DOE grants DE-SC0015655 and Early Career DE-SC0017840.

A Sun and Earth models

In this Appendix we describe the density profile and elemental composition of our adopted Sun and Earth models. Additionally, we collect the values of relevant DM halo parameters and Solar System velocities in Table 1.

A.1 The Sun

For the Sun's density profile we use the BS05(AGS, OP) model of Ref. [57]. We divide the profile region into two regions: region 1 for $0 \leq r \leq 0.85 \times R_{\odot}$ and region 2 for $0.85 \times R_{\odot} \leq r \leq R_{\odot}$ and fit a quadratic polynomial in r to the density profile in region 2 and the exponent of a quadratic polynomial in region 1. The density is defined as a piecewise function in the two regions. For the elemental abundance we use the elements included in the BS05(AGS, OP) model, complemented with the abundance of heavy elements from [58]. Note that we use the same isotope abundance for N_i in the Sun and the Earth [59]. The detailed heavy

³Thin dark disks are already highly constrained by Gaia data [55, 56].

ρ_{\odot}	DM density in the halo	$0.4 \ { m GeV/cm^3}$
$\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{LSR}}$	Local Standard of Rest at Sun's position	(0,235,0) km/s
$\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{pec}}$	Sun's peculiar velocity	(11,12,7)km/s
\bar{v}	DM rms velocity in the halo	288 km/s
$v_{\rm c}$	Sun's escape velocity at Earth's position	42 km/s
$\tilde{v}_{\rm E}$	Average of Earth's speed around the Sun	30 km/s
τ_{\odot}	Age of the Sun	5×10^9 years
τ_{\oplus}	Age of the Earth	4.5×10^9 years

Table 1: DM halo and solar system parameters relevant for DM capture in the Sun and Earth.

element content used in the Solar model is shown in Table 2. We take the age of the Sun to be $\tau_{\odot} = 5.0 \times 10^9$ yrs.



Figure 11: Nuclear capture rate C_c in the Sun as a function of DM mass. The green line corresponds to capture due to He₄. The blue line corresponds to combined capture due to oxygen, carbon and nitrogen. The red, purple and orange lines correspond to contributions due to iron, hydrogen and neon, respectively. Finally, the black line shows the total capture rate from all elements. We show values for a reference $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-45} {\rm cm}^2$.

Element Isotope Abundance		$\log(\epsilon)$
	[by mass $\%$]	
²⁰ Ne	100	7.93
56 Fe	100	7.50
⁵⁸ Ni	68	6.99
⁶⁰ Ni	26	0.22

Table 2: List of heavy elements used in the Solar model, where $\log(\epsilon_i) = \log\left(\frac{n_i}{n_{\rm H}}\right) + 12$ is the log-10 number density of the i^{th} element as a fraction of the hydrogen number density $n_{\rm H}$.

A.2 The Earth

We use the Preliminary Reference Earth Model (PREM) [60] for the Earth's density profile $\rho(r)$, where r is the distance from the center of the Earth. The density profile in PREM consists of 10 regions. We retain the two inner regions: region 1 (inner core) from $0 \leq r \leq 1221.5$ km and region 2 (outer core) from 1221.5 km $\leq r \leq 3480$ km, but, for simplicity, collect the remaining ones into two larger domains: region 3 (mantle) from 3480 km $\leq r \leq 5701$ km and region 4 (crust) from 5701 km $\leq r \leq R_{\oplus}$. The density profiles in regions 1 and 2 are fit to quadratic polynomials, while the profiles in regions 3 and 4 are fit to linear polynomials. The fit functions are then used in constructing a piecewise density function $\rho(r)$. For the elemental composition we include the core and mantle weight concentrations of the most abundant elements reported in Ref. [61], together with the isotope abundance of Ref. [62]. The elemental content used in the Earth model is presented in Table 3 below. It is worth observing that nuclei with non-zero spin are relatively rare in the Earth, and thus the nuclear capture rate of DM in the Earth for spin-dependent cross-sections is highly suppressed. We take the age of the Earth to be $\tau_{\oplus} = 4.5 \times 10^9$ yrs.



Figure 12: Nuclear capture rate C_c in the Earth as a function of DM mass for a reference $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-45} {\rm cm}^2$. Left: Contributions of oxygen (blue), magnesium (orange), silicon (purple), and iron (red) to the total capture rate (black), for direct capture from the unbound DM population. **Right:** Comparison of the total capture rate from direct capture (red) and from the free space distribution (black).

B Thermalization of captured DM

The simplicity of the analysis in this work relies critically on the assumption that captured DM quickly thermalizes with the nuclei of the capturing body. As direct detection experiments push allowed values of the spin-independent DM-nucleon cross section $\sigma_{\rm p}$ ever closer to the regime where thermalization in solar system objects is no longer assured, a careful treatment of the thermalization of captured DM becomes ever more important for understanding the validity of this approach to gravitational capture. Here we provide an updated estimate of the thermalization of DM with solar nuclei through spin-independent interactions, and examine how this estimate is affected by the presence of DM self-interactions. Our treatment here is not exact; rather, we point out several generic effects that should be taken into account in any discussion of thermalization and estimate their effects. In particular, here we observe that: (1) DM-nuclei scatterings allow the DM to shed ever smaller fractions of its momentum as it loses energy; (2) requiring the thermalization timescale $\tau_{\rm th}$ to be shorter

Element	Isotope Abundance	Core	Mantle abundance
	[by mass %]	abundance [by	[by mass %]
		mass %]	
¹⁶ Ox	100	0	44
²³ Na	100	0	0.27
^{24}Mg	79		
^{25}Mg	1	0	22.8
^{26}Mg	11		
²⁷ Al	100	0	2.35
²⁸ Si	100	6	21
^{32}S	100	1.9	0
⁴⁰ Ca	100	0	2.53
^{52}Cr	83.8	0.0	0.9695
⁵³ Cr	9.5	0.9	0.2025
^{55}Mn	100	0.3	0
56 Fe	100	85	6.26
⁵⁹ Co	100	0.25	0
⁵⁸ Ni	68	5.0	0.106
⁶⁰ Ni	26	0.2	0.190

Table 3: Elemental abundances used in the Earth model. All abundances are given in percentages with respect to the total mass. For the elements with multiple isotopes the listed core and mantle abundances refer to the total abundance of the element and not its individual isotopes. Isotope abundances are assumed spatially constant within the two indicated regions.



Figure 13: Evaporation coefficient in the Earth, as a function of DM mass $M_{\rm DM}$. The black curves show the total evaporation coefficient. The blue, orange, and red curves correspond to evaporation due to oxygen, silicon, and iron, respectively. We show results for a reference $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-45} {\rm cm}^2$.

than the age of the solar system is a *necessary but not sufficient* condition for the captured DM population to be well described by a thermal distribution; and (3) in the presence of DM self-interactions, energy exchange with the halo DM population is potentially important, although, for constant self-interaction cross-sections, not the dominant process limiting thermalization. Our results are summarized in Figs. 14–16 below.

B.1 Thermalization with nuclei

The average fractional energy loss of a DM particle in a collision with a nucleus is determined by the kinematics of the scattering, $\overline{\Delta E}/E = \mu_i/(2\mu_{i,+}^2)$. Thus, barring resonances where $M_{\rm DM} \approx m_i$, DM does not efficiently shed momentum in a typical scattering process, and numerous scatterings are required in order to cool captured DM down to the temperature of the massive body. A necessary condition for thermalization is $\tau_a \ge \tau_{\rm th}$, where τ_a is the age of the capturing body and $\tau_{\rm th}$ is the amount of time needed for a typical captured DM particle to down-scatter to the thermal energy in the core of the capturing body. The interaction rate for elastic DM-nucleon collisions is

$$\Gamma_i = v_i \sum_j n_j \sigma_j = v_i \sum_j \frac{1}{\lambda_j},\tag{B.1}$$

where v_i is the DM particle velocity between collisions i and i + 1, σ_j is the DM cross-section with nucleus j, and the summation is performed over all nuclear species⁴. We have also introduced the mean free path λ_j for collisions with species j. Let t_i denote the average time the DM particle spends between the two collisions. Then our thermalization statement reads

$$\tau_{\rm a} \ge \tau_{\rm th} = \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\rm th}-1} t_i = \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\rm th}-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma_i},$$
(B.2)

where $N_{\rm th}$ is the number of collisions required for the DM particle to reach the thermal energy of nuclei in the core. We write the nuclear cross-section as (neglecting form factors)

$$\sigma_j = \sigma_{\rm p} A_j^2 \frac{M_{\rm DM}^2 m_j^2}{(M_{\rm DM} + m_j)^2} \frac{(m_{\rm p} + M_{\rm DM})^2}{m_{\rm p}^2 M_{\rm DM}^2} \equiv \sigma_{\rm p} K_j.$$
(B.3)

We can then obtain the average mean free path,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\rangle = \sum_{j} \left\langle \frac{1}{\lambda_{j}} \right\rangle = \sigma_{\rm p} \sum_{j} \langle n_{j} K_{j} \rangle,$$
 (B.4)

where the brackets denote averaging over the volume of the capturing body, so that $\langle n_j K_j \rangle = \frac{1}{V_a} \int d^3 r n_j K_j$. It is useful to define a reduced $\bar{\lambda}$ that depends only on the properties of the capturing body by pulling out a factor of σ_p :

$$\frac{1}{\langle \bar{\lambda} \rangle} \equiv \frac{1}{\sigma_{\rm p}} \langle \frac{1}{\lambda} \rangle \tag{B.5}$$

Using Eq. B.4, we can then rewrite Eq. B.2 as

$$\sigma_{\rm p} \ge \frac{\langle \bar{\lambda} \rangle}{\tau_{\rm a}} \sqrt{\frac{M_{\rm DM}}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\rm th}-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{E_i}},\tag{B.6}$$

⁴Here we have assumed that the time that captured DM particles spend outside the volume of the capturing body is negligible in comparison to $\tau_{\rm th}$ and $\tau_{\rm a}$. On the other hand, we will also use the volume-averaged density of nuclei in our estimate, which underestimates the scattering rate as DM settles into the dense core. A full treatment of these issues would require orbital simulations and is beyond the scope of this paper; see also [63].

where $E_i = \frac{1}{2} M_{\rm DM} v_i^2$ is the DM kinetic energy. To obtain a lower bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ we now compute the average energy lost by the DM in the *i*th collision. In a collision with nucleus j, the mean (i.e., angle-averaged) energy loss is

$$Q_{i,j} = \frac{\mu_j}{2\mu_{+,j}^2} E_{i-1} \tag{B.7}$$

(we neglect the thermal motion of the nucleus). Since we have multiple nuclear species in the bulk, we obtain the representative energy loss by a weighted average of $Q_{i,j}$ over the number fraction of the nuclear species and the elastic cross section:

$$\langle Q_i \rangle = \frac{\sum_j \langle f_j \sigma_j Q_{i,j} \rangle}{\sum_j \langle f_j \sigma_j \rangle}.$$
 (B.8)

This quantity $\langle Q_i \rangle$ represents the energy lost in a typical collision. Using Eq. B.7,

$$\langle Q_i \rangle = \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle E_{i-1} \tag{B.9}$$

where we define

$$\left\langle \bar{\mu} \right\rangle = \frac{\sum_{j} \left\langle f_{j} K_{j} \frac{\mu_{j}}{2\mu_{+,j}^{2}} \right\rangle}{\sum_{j} \left\langle f_{j} K_{j} \right\rangle}.$$
(B.10)

Given a model for the composition of an astrophysical body, $\langle \bar{\mu} \rangle$ is completely specified as a function of DM mass. This allows us to express the average DM energy after the *i*th collision as a fraction of the DM energy immediately after capture, E_0 ,

$$E_i = E_{i-1} - \langle Q_i \rangle = (1 - \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle)^i E_0. \tag{B.11}$$

After $N_{\rm th}$ collisions, the DM particle's energy is equal to the core's thermal energy. Hence

$$\frac{3}{2}T_{\rm core} = E_{N_{\rm th}} = (1 - \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle)^{N_{\rm th}} E_0.$$
(B.12)

Using Eqs. B.11 and B.12 in Eq. B.6 lets us sum the series, yielding

$$\sigma_{\rm p} \ge \sqrt{\frac{M_{\rm DM}}{2}} \frac{\langle \bar{\lambda} \rangle}{\tau_{\rm a}} E_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\rm th}-1} \left((1 - \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right)^i = \sqrt{\frac{M_{\rm DM}}{2E_0}} \frac{\langle \bar{\lambda} \rangle}{\tau_{\rm a}} \frac{\sqrt{\frac{E_0}{E_{\rm th}}} - 1}{(1 - \langle \bar{\mu} \rangle)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 1}.$$
 (B.13)

Finally, we need to estimate the initial energy after capture, E_0 . In an individual capture event, the DM particle will have an energy after capture $E_0 = \frac{1}{2}M(u^2 + v_{\rm esc}^2(r)) - \Delta E$, where ΔE is the energy lost in scattering against a nucleus. We can find the average E_0 by dividing the energy injection rate by the capture rate C_c ,

$$E_0 = \frac{\dot{E}_c}{C_c},\tag{B.14}$$

where $E_{\rm c}$ is constructed by the same logic as the capture coefficient. Specifically,

$$\dot{E}_{\rm c} = \int_0^R 4\pi r^2 dr \sum_j \frac{d\dot{E}_{{\rm c},j}}{dV},$$
 (B.15)



Figure 14: Estimated thermalization bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ as a function of DM mass $M_{\rm DM}$ in the Sun (left) and Earth (right). Above the solid brown lines the corresponding percentage of the captured population is thermalized. Below the black lines $\tau_{\rm th} > \tau_{\odot}$ or τ_{\oplus} . The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments. In the left plot we also show in red regions that attain a steady-state population in the Sun, $\xi < \tau_{\odot}$; the corresponding regions for the Earth are off the plot.

where the summation is performed over all relevant nuclear species and the differential energy injection rate is

$$\frac{d\dot{E}_{c,j}}{dV} = n_j(r)n_{\rm DM} \int_0^\infty \frac{d^3 u f_\eta(u)}{u} w(r)\Omega_{u,j}^c(r),$$
(B.16)

with

$$\Omega_{u,j}^{c}(r) = w(r)\Theta\left(\frac{\mu_{j}}{\mu_{j,+}^{2}} - \frac{u^{2}}{w^{2}(r)}\right) \int_{\Delta E_{\min}}^{\Delta E_{\max}} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Delta E}\right)_{j} \left(\frac{1}{2}M_{\rm DM}w^{2}(r) - \Delta E\right) d(\Delta E).$$
(B.17)

Here ΔE_{max} and ΔE_{min} are determined by the kinematics of the scattering and the requirement of gravitational capture (Eqns 2.5 and 2.6), and an explicit expression for $d\sigma/d\Delta E$ can be found in Eq. 2.8.

The resulting lower bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ is shown in black in Fig. 14 for both the Sun and the Earth. Overall, thermalization in the Sun is more restrictive than in the Earth, despite its higher overall core temperature, thanks to the Sun's more energetic population of captured DM particles and its composition of lighter nuclei. Note that our neglect of nuclear form factors in this estimate is reasonable for the Sun, where energy loss on heavy species like iron is subdominant, but can lead to underestimates in the lower bound for the Earth, where iron is a central contributor to DM down-scattering. As the requirement of thermalization in the Sun is more stringent at the higher DM masses for which energy loss on iron is important, this underestimate will not be important for our purposes.

However, the lower bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ constructed above is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the captured DM population to be well-described by a thermal distribution. If the thermalization time is not much smaller than the age of the solar system, then only the earliest captured DM particles will be thermalized. These particles will only be a small fraction of the total population today, rendering a thermal description of the population inaccurate. Therefore, we introduce the following condition for the thermal distribution to be a reasonably self-consistent approximation:

$$N_{\rm th} \ge f_{\rm th} N(\tau_{\odot}),$$
 (B.18)

which demands that at least a fraction $f_{\rm th} \gtrsim 90\%$ of the Sun-captured DM population today is thermalized. We impose an analogous condition for the Earth-captured DM population today $N(\tau_{\oplus})$. In order for the population $N_{\rm th}$ to be thermalized, each of these particles must spend a time $\tau_{\rm th}$ inside the Sun (or Earth) after capture. Hence,

$$N_{\rm th} = N(\tau_{\odot} - \tau_{\rm th}),\tag{B.19}$$

where $\tau_{\rm th}$ is the thermalization time computed above. Imposing this condition on the captured DM population results in a stronger constraint on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ as a function of $M_{\rm DM}$. We show these lower bounds for the Sun and Earth in blue in Figure 14. For reasonable choices of $f_{\rm th}$ this results in a lower bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ that is larger by about an order of magnitude compared to the bound obtained simply by requiring $\tau_{\rm th} > \tau_{\odot}$.

B.2 Thermalization in the presence of DM self-interactions

Adding dark matter self-interactions changes the above discussion in two ways. First and most importantly, self-interactions provide additional mechanisms for energy transfer into, among, and out of the captured DM population [64]. As our aim here is to establish the region where our ansatz describing the captured DM population as thermalized at the core temperature of the capturing body is self-consistent, the most important of these processes for our purposes is the net rate of energy injected into the captured dark matter population from scattering off of DM particles in the halo. For captured DM to remain at the nuclear temperature, the rate of this energy injection should not exceed the rate at which bound DM can transfer energy to the nuclei. Secondarily, the presence of self-interactions changes the evolution of the total captured DM population with time, and hence can alter how long it takes for a given fraction $f_{\rm th}$ of the total DM population to thermalize even in the absence of changes to the thermalization timescale $\tau_{\rm th}$.

Given a typical energy injection $\langle E_{\text{Halo, el}} \rangle$ from elastic scattering with halo DM, we can estimate the rate at which this energy is transferred to the nuclei:

$$\dot{E}_{\rm el, \ ave} = \frac{\langle E_{\rm Halo, \ el} \rangle - E_{\rm th}}{\tau_{\rm th}},\tag{B.20}$$

where, as in the previous discussion, $\tau_{\rm th}$ is the timescale for a DM particle to downscatter from its initial energy to $E_{\rm th}$. Once we determine the characteristic initial energy $\langle E_{\rm Halo, \ el} \rangle$ from elastic scatterings between bound and halo DM, the technology of the previous subsection lets us directly evaluate this rate.

We begin by estimating the per-particle rate of energy transfer from halo DM particles to captured DM particles, $\dot{E}_{\text{Halo, el}}$. Per unit volume, this rate can be expressed as

$$\frac{d\dot{E}_{\text{Halo, el}}}{dV} = n_{\text{DM}} \int_0^\infty \frac{d^3 u f_\eta(u)}{u} w(r) \Omega^{\text{el}}(w), \qquad (B.21)$$

where $\Omega^{\rm el}(w)$ is the energy transfer rate per halo DM particle in a single scattering, given in terms of the local (thermal) density of captured DM particles $n_{\rm c}(r)$ as

$$\Omega^{\rm el}(w) = n_{\rm c}(r)w \int d\cos\theta \,\Delta E(\cos\theta) \frac{d\sigma_{\rm xx}}{d\cos\theta} \times \Theta(f(\cos\theta)). \tag{B.22}$$

Here the theta-function $\Theta(f(\cos \theta))$ enforces the conditions on the scattering angle required for the collision to result in one bound and one unbound DM particle. Two regions of phase space contribute:

$$\cos\theta \le \operatorname{Min}\left(\frac{v_{\operatorname{esc}}^2(r) - u^2}{w^2(r)}, \frac{u^2 - v_{\operatorname{esc}}^2(r)u^2}{w^2(r)}\right),$$
(B.23)

where the two particles switch places, and

$$\cos\theta \ge \operatorname{Max}\left(\frac{v_{\operatorname{esc}}^2(r) - u^2}{w^2(r)}, \frac{u^2 - v_{\operatorname{esc}}^2(r)u^2}{w^2(r)}\right),$$
(B.24)

where the initially bound particle remains bound. The energy transferred to the captured DM population is $\Delta E = M_{\rm DM} w^2 (1 \pm \cos \theta)/4$, with the + sign pertaining to the first case and the - sign to the second.

It is useful to split $\Omega^{el}(w)$ into two pieces:

$$\Omega^{\rm el}(w) = w(r) \left(\Theta(u - v_{\rm esc}(r))\Omega_1 + \Theta(v_{\rm esc}(r) - u)\Omega_2\right).$$
(B.25)

When $u > v_{\text{esc}}$, the maximum scattering angle allowed by Eq. B.23 is $\cos \theta_{\text{max}} = (v^2 - u^2)/w^2$, and the minimum allowed scattering angle of Eq. B.24 is $\cos \theta_{\text{min}} = -\cos \theta_{\text{max}}$. This yields for Ω_1

$$\Omega_{1} = \frac{1}{4}mw^{2} \left[\int_{-1}^{\cos\theta_{\max}} d\cos\theta \frac{d\sigma_{xx}}{d\cos\theta} (1 - \cos\theta) + \int_{-\cos\theta_{\max}}^{1} d\cos\theta \frac{d\sigma_{xx}}{d\cos\theta} (1 + \cos\theta) \right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}mw^{2} \int_{-1}^{\cos\theta_{\max}} d\cos\theta \frac{d\sigma_{xx}}{d\cos\theta} (1 - \cos\theta), \tag{B.26}$$

where the second equality holds for any cross-section that is even in $\cos \theta$, and similarly for Ω_2 . Specializing to a constant cross-section, the rate of energy exchange with the halo is

$$\dot{E}_{\text{Halo,el}} = \frac{1}{8}\rho_{\odot}\sigma_{\text{xx}} \int_{0}^{R} 4\pi dr r^{2} n_{\text{c}}(r) \left[\int_{0}^{v_{\text{esc}}(r)} \frac{d^{3}u f_{\eta}(u)}{u} f_{+}(r,u) + \int_{v_{\text{esc}}(r)}^{\infty} \frac{d^{3}u f_{\eta}(u)}{u} f_{-}(r,u) \right],$$
(B.27)

where

$$f_{\pm}(r,u) = w^4(r) \pm 2w^2(r)(u^2 - v_{\rm esc}^2(r)) + (u^2 - v_{\rm esc}^2(r))^2.$$
(B.28)

Similarly, the rate for these elastic scattering events to occur is given by

$$\Gamma_{\text{Halo, el}} = 2n_{\text{DM}}\sigma_{\text{xx}} \int_{0}^{R} 4\pi r^{2} dr \, n_{\text{c}}(r) \left[\int_{0}^{v_{\text{esc}}(r)} \frac{d^{3}u f_{\eta}(u)}{u} u^{2} + \int_{v_{\text{esc}}(r)}^{\infty} \frac{d^{3}u f_{\eta}(u)}{u} v_{\text{esc}}^{2}(r) \right].$$
(B.29)

This allows us to construct the average energy deposited in the captured population following an elastic scattering with DM in the halo:

$$\langle E_{\text{Halo, el}} \rangle = \frac{E_{\text{Halo, el}}}{\Gamma_{\text{Halo, el}}}.$$
 (B.30)

We can now compare the rate of energy deposition from the halo $E_{\text{Halo,el}}$ to the rate at which this energy is transferred to the nuclei, Eq. B.20. Our self-consistency criterion is

$$\dot{E}_{\rm el, ave} = \dot{E}_{\rm Halo, el}.$$
 (B.31)

The elastic nuclear rate depends on $M_{\rm DM}$ and $\sigma_{\rm p}$, while the elastic halo rate depends on



Figure 15: Thermalization bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ as a function of DM mass $M_{\rm DM}$ in the Sun, for constant self-interaction cross-section. Above the solid (dashed) purple line $\dot{E}_{\rm el, ave}^{1/2} > \dot{E}_{\rm Halo,el}$, for $\sigma_{\rm xx} = 10^{-24}$ cm² (maximum $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ allowed by the Bullet Cluster bound). The corresponding bounds for the Earth are everywhere below $\sigma_{\rm p} = 10^{-51}$ cm², and thus the Earth plot is not shown. The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments.

 $M_{\rm DM}$ and $\sigma_{\rm xx}$. At fixed $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ the condition of Eq. B.31 becomes a contour in the $(M_{\rm DM}, \sigma_{\rm p})$ plane. Above the contour the thermal assumption is self-consistent: captured particles, while continuously being heated via $\dot{E}_{\rm Halo,el}$, shed their energy sufficiently quickly. These contours are shown in Fig. 15.

We must additionally consider how the size of the thermal population is impacted by the introduction of self-interactions. We recall the thermalization criterion introduced in the previous subsection, Eq. B.18, which demands that at least a fraction $f_{\rm th} \gtrsim 90\%$ of the total captured DM population today $N(\tau_{\odot})$ had enough time to thermalize. In the presence of self-interactions the evolution of N(t) will change because of self-capture or self-ejection. This effect by itself will change the timescale for thermalization through nuclear interactions. These effects are shown in Fig. 16.

Here we discuss the qualitative features shown in Fig. 16. We begin with the Sun. For small and moderate σ_{xx} the equilibration time is still small compared to the age of the Sun. Because of self-interactions, the number of captured particles in the Sun is always larger



Figure 16: Thermalization bound on $\sigma_{\rm p}$ as a function of DM mass $M_{\rm DM}$ in the Sun (left) and Earth (right), for constant self-interaction cross-sections. The colors of the contours correspond to different choices of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ as indicated. The brown contours are constructed assuming no self-interactions. For each choice of $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ we show three curves of differing opacities which correspond to different thermalization percentages: above the most opaque contour 95% of the population is thermalized, above the least opaque contour 50 % of the population is thermalized. The blue shaded region is excluded by the PandaX, LUX and XENON1T direct detection experiments.

than in the absence of self-interactions. Hence $N(\tau - \tau_{\rm th})$ is larger in the presence of selfinteractions than in their absence. The thermalization constraint we impose is essentially that $N(\tau - \tau_{\rm th})$ be sufficiently close to $N(\tau)$. Now, in the time interval $[\tau - \tau_{\rm th}, \tau]$ more particles would be captured in the presence of self-interactions, driving $N(\tau - \tau_{\rm th})$ to lower values compared to $N(\tau)$. So, in order to satisfy this constraint $\sigma_{\rm p}$ must increase. This is shown by the red and orange curves of the left plot of Fig. 16. At large $M_{\rm DM}$ the self-capture coefficient is negligible so that the two sets of contours merge into the contours which assume no self-interactions.

One would then naively expect $\sigma_{\rm p}$ to be larger for larger $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ in order for the thermalization criterion to be satisfied. However, at sufficiently large $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ the equilibration time becomes small enough (because $C_{\rm sc}$ increases with $\sigma_{\rm xx}$) so that the population today is at equilibrium, while the population at $\tau - \tau_{\rm th}$ is very near equilibrium. In this case $\sigma_{\rm p}$ can be smaller because the captured population at the two times $\tau - \tau_{\rm th}$ and τ are forced to be proximal by the equilibration mechanism. This behavior is shown by the purple line. For intermediate $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, the population equilibrates at small $M_{\rm DM}$ and the behavior is the same as previously described (purple line). At large $M_{\rm DM}$, the population is not equilibrated, but the self-capture coefficient remains important. In this region we have the same behavior as for moderate $\sigma_{\rm xx}$ at moderate masses.

For the thermalization of the Earth-captured population self-interactions act in the opposite direction: the number of captured particles in the Earth is always smaller that in the absence of self-interactions. So, in the time interval $[\tau - \tau_{\rm th}, \tau]$ particles would be ejected in the presence of self-interactions, driving $N(\tau)$ closer to $N(\tau - \tau_{\rm th})$. In turn, $\sigma_{\rm p}$ can be smaller for the thermalization criterion to be satisfied. Hence, for larger $\sigma_{\rm xx}$, the bound on

 $\sigma_{\rm p}$ is lower (red and orange curves of right plot of Figure 16). For sufficiently large selfinteractions, the equilibration time is so small that the population is at equilibrium today and near equilibrium at $\tau - \tau_{\rm th}$. This is similar to the Sun-captured population, where the thermalization criterion is satisfied because the captured populations at the two times $\tau - \tau_{\rm th}$ and τ are forced to be proximal by the equilibration mechanism. We have checked that for the Earth the bounds do not depend on the choice of incident velocity distribution.

Finally, we comment that another consequence of introducing self-interactions is that captured DM acquires an additional energy loss mechanism via scattering against other captured DM particles. Thus in general we would expect the introduction of self-interactions to reduce the thermalization timescale. We have conservatively neglected this reduction of the thermalization timescale. Additionally, DM particles which become gravitationally bound via self-capture have a different characteristic initial energy because of the differing kinematic constraints, but this effect is a small correction.

References

- D. N. Spergel and P. J. Steinhardt, Observational evidence for selfinteracting cold dark matter, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 (2000) 3760-3763, [astro-ph/9909386].
- S. Tulin and H.-B. Yu, Dark Matter Self-interactions and Small Scale Structure, Phys. Rept. 730 (2018) 1–57, [1705.02358].
- [3] J. S. Bullock and M. Boylan-Kolchin, Small-Scale Challenges to the ΛCDM Paradigm, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 55 (2017) 343–387, [1707.04256].
- [4] D. N. Spergel and W. H. Press, Effect of hypothetical, weakly interacting, massive particles on energy transport in the solar interior, Astrophys. J. 294 (1985) 663–673.
- [5] K. Griest and D. Seckel, Cosmic asymmetry, neutrinos and the sun, Nuclear Physics B 283 (1987) 681–705.
- [6] A. Gould, WIMP Distribution in and Evaporation From the Sun, Astrophys. J. 321 (1987) 560.
- [7] A. Gould, Resonant Enhancements in WIMP Capture by the Earth, Astrophys.J. **321** (1987) 571.
- [8] A. Gould, Direct and indirect capture of weakly interacting massive particles by the earth, The Astrophysical Journal **328** (1988) 919–939.
- [9] A. R. Zentner, High-Energy Neutrinos From Dark Matter Particle Self-Capture Within the Sun, Phys. Rev. D80 (2009) 063501, [0907.3448].
- [10] C.-S. Chen, F.-F. Lee, G.-L. Lin and Y.-H. Lin, Probing dark matter self-interaction in the sun with icecube-pingu, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 2014 (2014) 049.
- [11] J. Silk, K. A. Olive and M. Srednicki, The Photino, the Sun and High-Energy Neutrinos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55 (1985) 257–259.
- [12] T. K. Gaisser, G. Steigman and S. Tilav, Limits on Cold Dark Matter Candidates from Deep Underground Detectors, Phys. Rev. D34 (1986) 2206.
- [13] N. F. Bell and K. Petraki, Enhanced neutrino signals from dark matter annihilation in the Sun via metastable mediators, JCAP 1104 (2011) 003, [1102.2958].
- [14] C. Rott, J. Siegal-Gaskins and J. F. Beacom, New Sensitivity to Solar WIMP Annihilation using Low-Energy Neutrinos, Phys. Rev. D88 (2013) 055005, [1208.0827].
- [15] N. Bernal, J. Martn-Albo and S. Palomares-Ruiz, A novel way of constraining WIMPs annihilations in the Sun: MeV neutrinos, JCAP 1308 (2013) 011, [1208.0834].

- [16] SUPER-KAMIOKANDE collaboration, K. Choi et al., Search for neutrinos from annihilation of captured low-mass dark matter particles in the Sun by Super-Kamiokande, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015) 141301, [1503.04858].
- [17] ICECUBE collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., Search for annihilating dark matter in the Sun with 3 years of IceCube data, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (2017) 146, [1612.05949].
- [18] ANTARES collaboration, S. Adrian-Martinez et al., Limits on Dark Matter Annihilation in the Sun using the ANTARES Neutrino Telescope, Phys. Lett. B759 (2016) 69–74, [1603.02228].
- [19] B. Batell, M. Pospelov, A. Ritz and Y. Shang, Solar Gamma Rays Powered by Secluded Dark Matter, Phys. Rev. D81 (2010) 075004, [0910.1567].
- [20] P. Schuster, N. Toro and I. Yavin, Terrestrial and Solar Limits on Long-Lived Particles in a Dark Sector, Phys. Rev. D81 (2010) 016002, [0910.1602].
- [21] P. Meade, S. Nussinov, M. Papucci and T. Volansky, Searches for Long Lived Neutral Particles, JHEP 06 (2010) 029, [0910.4160].
- [22] THE FERMI LAT collaboration, M. Ajello et al., Constraints on dark matter models from a Fermi LAT search for high-energy cosmic-ray electrons from the Sun, Phys. Rev. D84 (2011) 032007, [1107.4272].
- [23] J. Berger, Y. Cui and Y. Zhao, Detecting Boosted Dark Matter from the Sun with Large Volume Neutrino Detectors, JCAP 1502 (2015) 005, [1410.2246].
- [24] J. L. Feng, J. Smolinsky and P. Tanedo, Dark Photons from the Center of the Earth: Smoking-Gun Signals of Dark Matter, Phys. Rev. D93 (2016) 015014, [1509.07525].
- [25] J. L. Feng, J. Smolinsky and P. Tanedo, Detecting dark matter through dark photons from the Sun: Charged particle signatures, Phys. Rev. D93 (2016) 115036, [1602.01465].
- [26] ANTARES collaboration, S. Adrin-Martnez et al., A search for Secluded Dark Matter in the Sun with the ANTARES neutrino telescope, JCAP 1605 (2016) 016, [1602.07000].
- [27] J. Smolinsky and P. Tanedo, Dark Photons from Captured Inelastic Dark Matter Annihilation: Charged Particle Signatures, Phys. Rev. D95 (2017) 075015, [1701.03168].
- [28] C. Arina, M. Backovi, J. Heisig and M. Lucente, Solar γ rays as a complementary probe of dark matter, Phys. Rev. D96 (2017) 063010, [1703.08087].
- [29] R. K. Leane, K. C. Y. Ng and J. F. Beacom, Powerful Solar Signatures of Long-Lived Dark Mediators, Phys. Rev. D95 (2017) 123016, [1703.04629].
- [30] J. Bovy, D. W. Hogg and H.-W. Rix, Galactic masers and the milky way circular velocity, The Astrophysical Journal 704 (2009) 1704.
- [31] M. Reid, K. Menten, X. Zheng, A. Brunthaler, L. Moscadelli, Y. Xu et al., Trigonometric parallaxes of massive star-forming regions. vi. galactic structure, fundamental parameters, and noncircular motions, The Astrophysical Journal 700 (2009) 137.
- [32] P. J. McMillan and J. J. Binney, The uncertainty in galactic parameters, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 402 (2010) 934–940.
- [33] R. Schönrich, J. Binney and W. Dehnen, Local kinematics and the local standard of rest, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 403 (2010) 1829–1833.
- [34] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, Supersymmetric dark matter, Phys. Rept. 267 (1996) 195–373, [hep-ph/9506380].
- [35] G. Busoni, A. De Simone and W.-C. Huang, On the Minimum Dark Matter Mass Testable by Neutrinos from the Sun, JCAP 1307 (2013) 010, [1305.1817].

- [36] J. Fan, A. Katz and J. Shelton, Direct and indirect detection of dissipative dark matter, JCAP 1406 (2014) 059, [1312.1336].
- [37] J. Lundberg and J. Edsjo, WIMP diffusion in the solar system including solar depletion and its effect on earth capture rates, *Phys.Rev.* D69 (2004) 123505, [astro-ph/0401113].
- [38] A. Gould, Gravitational diffusion of solar system wimps, The Astrophysical Journal **368** (1991) 610–615.
- [39] A. H. G. Peter, Dark matter in the solar system I: The distribution function of WIMPs at the Earth from solar capture, Phys. Rev. D79 (2009) 103531, [0902.1344].
- [40] C. Delaunay, P. J. Fox and G. Perez, Probing Dark Matter Dynamics via Earthborn Neutrinos at IceCube, JHEP 05 (2009) 099, [0812.3331].
- [41] I. F. M. Albuquerque, C. Prez de Los Heros and D. S. Robertson, Constraints on self interacting dark matter from IceCube results, JCAP 1402 (2014) 047, [1312.0797].
- [42] B. Zhou, K. C. Y. Ng, J. F. Beacom and A. H. G. Peter, *TeV Solar Gamma Rays From Cosmic-Ray Interactions*, *Phys. Rev.* D96 (2017) 023015, [1612.02420].
- [43] C. A. Argelles, G. de Wasseige, A. Fedynitch and B. J. P. Jones, Solar Atmospheric Neutrinos and the Sensitivity Floor for Solar Dark Matter Annihilation Searches, JCAP 1707 (2017) 024, [1703.07798].
- [44] K. C. Y. Ng, J. F. Beacom, A. H. G. Peter and C. Rott, Solar Atmospheric Neutrinos: A New Neutrino Floor for Dark Matter Searches, Phys. Rev. D96 (2017) 103006, [1703.10280].
- [45] J. Edsjo, J. Elevant, R. Enberg and C. Niblaeus, Neutrinos from cosmic ray interactions in the Sun, JCAP 1706 (2017) 033, [1704.02892].
- [46] S. W. Randall, M. Markevitch, D. Clowe, A. H. Gonzalez and M. Bradac, Constraints on the Self-Interaction Cross-Section of Dark Matter from Numerical Simulations of the Merging Galaxy Cluster 1E 0657-56, Astrophys.J. 679 (2008) 1173–1180, [0704.0261].
- [47] D. Akerib, S. Alsum, H. Araújo, X. Bai, A. Bailey, J. Balajthy et al., Results from a search for dark matter in lux with 332 live days of exposure, arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.07648 (2016).
- [48] A. Tan, M. Xiao, X. Cui, X. Chen, Y. Chen, D. Fang et al., Dark matter results from first 98.7 days of data from the pandax-ii experiment, Physical Review Letters 117 (2016) 121303.
- [49] XENON collaboration, E. Aprile et al., First Dark Matter Search Results from the XENON1T Experiment, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119 (2017) 181301, [1705.06655].
- [50] XENON collaboration, E. Aprile et al., Dark Matter Search Results from a One Ton-Year Exposure of XENON1T, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121 (2018) 111302, [1805.12562].
- [51] ICECUBE collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., First search for dark matter annihilations in the Earth with the IceCube Detector, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (2017) 82, [1609.01492].
- [52] ANTARES collaboration, A. Albert et al., Search for Dark Matter Annihilation in the Earth using the ANTARES Neutrino Telescope, Phys. Dark Univ. 16 (2017) 41–48, [1612.06792].
- [53] J. I. Read, G. Lake, O. Agertz and V. P. Debattista, Thin, thick and dark discs in LCDM, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 389 (2008) 1041–1057, [0803.2714].
- [54] T. Bruch, A. H. G. Peter, J. Read, L. Baudis and G. Lake, Dark Matter Disc Enhanced Neutrino Fluxes from the Sun and Earth, Phys. Lett. B674 (2009) 250-256, [0902.4001].
- [55] K. Schutz, T. Lin, B. R. Safdi and C.-L. Wu, Constraining a Thin Dark Matter Disk with Gaia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121 (2018) 081101, [1711.03103].
- [56] J. Buch, J. S. C. Leung and J. Fan, Using Gaia DR2 to Constrain Local Dark Matter Density and Thin Dark Disk, 1808.05603.

- [57] J. N. Bahcall, A. M. Serenelli and S. Basu, New solar opacities, abundances, helioseismology, and neutrino fluxes, Astrophys.J. 621 (2005) L85-L88, [astro-ph/0412440].
- [58] M. Asplund, N. Grevesse, A. J. Sauval and P. Scott, The chemical composition of the sun, arXiv preprint arXiv:0909.0948 (2009).
- [59] J. Brault and H. Holweger, Isotopes of nickel in the sun, The Astrophysical Journal 249 (1981) L43–L46.
- [60] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, Preliminary reference earth model, Physics of the earth and planetary interiors 25 (1981) 297–356, http://metis.geologie.uni-freiburg.de/~hergarte/06W/646819/prem.html.
- [61] W. F. McDonough and S.-S. Sun, The composition of the earth, Chemical geology 120 (1995) 223–253, http://quake.mit.edu/hilstgroup/CoreMantle/EarthCompo.pdf.
- [62] K. Rosman and P. Taylor, Isotopic compositions of the elements 1997 (technical report), Pure and Applied Chemistry 70 (1998) 217–235.
- [63] A. Widmark, Thermalization time scales for WIMP capture by the Sun in effective theories, JCAP 1705 (2017) 046, [1703.06878].
- [64] C.-S. Chen, G.-L. Lin and Y.-H. Lin, Thermal transport of the solar captured dark matter and its impact on the indirect dark matter search, Phys. Dark Univ. 14 (2016) 35–39, [1508.05263].