

Uncertainties in tellurium-based dark matter searches stemming from nuclear structure uncertainties

Daniel J. Heimsath ^{1,*}, Rebecca Kowalski ², Danielle H. Speller ²,
Calvin W. Johnson ^{3,†}, A. Baha Balantekin ^{1,‡} and Susan N. Coppersmith ⁴

¹*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21211, USA*

³*Department of Physics, San Diego State University, San Diego, California 92182-1233, USA*

⁴*School of Physics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia*

(Dated: December 30, 2024)

Using tellurium dioxide as a target, we calculate uncertainties on 90% upper confidence limits of Galilean effective field theory (Galilean EFT) couplings to a WIMP dark matter particle due to uncertainties in nuclear shell models. We find that these uncertainties in naturally-occurring tellurium isotopes are comparable across the different Galilean EFT couplings to uncertainties in xenon, with some reaching over 100%. We also consider the effect these nuclear uncertainties have on estimates of the annual modulation of dark matter from these searches, finding that the uncertainties in the modulation amplitude are proportional to the non-modulating upper confidence limit uncertainties. We also show that the determination of the modulation phase is insensitive to changes in the nuclear model for a given isotope.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the nature and form of dark matter (DM) has been one of the most pursued tasks in physics since the first concrete evidence of DM in galaxy cluster kinematics and galactic rotation curves [1–3]. Many experiments have looked for microscopic evidence of particle DM interacting with Standard Model (SM) particles both directly and indirectly, with no unambiguous positive signal thus far [4–15]. Many major hurdles exist, such as the apparently very small cross sections of DM-SM interactions, our lack of theoretical understanding of the form of the interaction, and the unknown characteristics of the DM particle.

A promising candidate for the DM particle is the Weakly Interacting Massive Particle (WIMP), which, as the name implies, has a nonzero mass and participates in forces no stronger than the weak interaction. In the past, interest in the WIMP was emboldened by the so-called “WIMP miracle” of supersymmetry, which predicted a stable, weakly-interacting particle with a mass of 100 – 1000 GeV (though this range can be expanded by assuming different interaction coupling constants, see Ref. [16] for a review of WIMPs). Even in searches for candidates from so-called “light dark matter” models probing the range below 10 GeV [17–20], recent experiments have failed to find evidence for WIMPs. Such light dark matter has gained interest in direct detection searches in recent years as theoretical constraints relaxed [8, 21–24]. Until recently, analyses have mostly assumed either a simple spin-independent or spin-dependent DM-target interaction. Instead of making this

assumption, a more general approach called Galilean effective field theory (Galilean EFT) considers all possible nonrelativistic, Galilean-invariant elastic interactions between DM and a target [25] (for inelastic collisions, there is Chiral EFT; see Ref. [26]). Galilean EFT was developed at the level of nucleon fields; other effective theories start at quark and gluon fields and reduce to a bound, nonrelativistic state [26–33], though both approaches describe the most general interaction in the energy regime of interest for WIMP-nucleus scattering.

The experiments that could search for DM interactions directly (both those designed explicitly for DM direct detection and those with very low backgrounds, such as neutrinoless double beta decay experiments) generally choose large targets to maximize DM cross sections. For example, XENON1T and its successor XENONnT not surprisingly use xenon ($Z = 54, N \approx 75 - 80$), while CUORE uses the tellurium ($Z = 52, N \approx 70 - 78$) in TeO_2 crystals [8, 26, 34]. Because these nuclei contain many nucleons, they are themselves complicated quantum systems that must be approximated with models. For large nuclei, a popular approach is the configuration-interaction in a nuclear shell model basis, where “valence” nucleons fill valence energy and angular momentum states above a static core of nucleons, in analogy to atomic orbitals [35]. Calculating observable quantities in this basis, while reduced greatly from a full, infinite-dimensional configuration space, still consists of finding eigenvalues and eigenstates of a system with dimensions around and upward of tens of millions. These models have tunable parameters that can be fit to experimental data, allowing more freedom in building a particular model. The model approximation, parameter space truncation, and parameter tuning culminate in somewhat substantial theoretical uncertainties in predicted observables, cross sections being but one example.

Quantifying these nuclear modeling uncertainties is

* dheimsath@wisc.edu

† cjohnson@sdsu.edu

‡ baha@physics.wisc.edu

thus necessary to understand how they affect uncertainties of downstream calculations. Some of the current authors showed in Ref. [36] how these nuclear modeling uncertainties lead to sizeable uncertainties in the determination of upper confidence limits of Galilean EFT coupling coefficients of WIMP-nucleus interactions for isotopes of xenon in the XENON1T detector. We continue that work in this paper by calculating these same uncertainties in Galilean EFT couplings for tellurium and oxygen as in the CUORE detector. Before providing the results of that analysis in Sec. III, we present an overview the theoretical framework of Galilean EFT and the DM-target interaction in Sec. II. In Sec. IV, we consider the impact nuclear uncertainties have on determining parameters of a DM annual modulation signature. We end with a general discussion of the impact of this analysis in Sec. V and conclusions and an outlook on future work in Sec. VI.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

A. Nonrelativistic Effective Field Theory

Historically, dark matter experiments have considered the simplest interactions between the DM particle and their target in their data analysis: a spin-independent density operator ($1_\chi 1_N$) and a spin-dependent operator ($\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{S}_N$), where χ denotes the DM particle and N denotes the target nucleus. However, these are only two of the many possible Hermitian interactions that obey Galilean invariance (or Lorentz invariance for relativistic theories). There has been a heightened interest recently in modeling DM-target interactions through effective field theories (EFT), which take a model-agnostic approach by considering all couplings allowed by imposed symmetries.

One such EFT is the Galilean EFT described in Ref. [25], which provides CP-conserving coupling operators built from four Hermitian quantities:

$$i\vec{q}, \quad \vec{v}^\perp, \quad \vec{S}_\chi, \quad \vec{S}_N,$$

where \vec{S}_χ (\vec{S}_N) is the spin of the DM (target) particle, \vec{q} is the exchanged momentum, and $\vec{v}^\perp \equiv \vec{v} + \vec{q}/2\mu_N$, \vec{v} being the relative incoming velocity of the DM particle. Additionally, we use $\mu_N = m_\chi m_N / (m_\chi + m_N)$ to denote the reduced mass of the interaction, with m_N the nucleon

mass. The fifteen allowed operators \mathcal{O}_i are

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = 1_\chi 1_N, \quad (1a)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_2 = (v^\perp)^2, \quad (1b)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_3 = i\vec{S}_N \cdot \left(\frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \times \vec{v}^\perp \right), \quad (1c)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_4 = \vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{S}_N, \quad (1d)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_5 = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \left(\frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \times \vec{v}^\perp \right), \quad (1e)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \left(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right) \left(\vec{S}_N \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right), \quad (1f)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_7 = \vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^\perp, \quad (1g)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_8 = \vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{v}^\perp, \quad (1h)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_9 = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \left(\vec{S}_N \times \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right), \quad (1i)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{10} = i\vec{S}_N \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N}, \quad (1j)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{11} = i\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N}, \quad (1k)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{12} = \vec{S}_\chi \cdot \left(\vec{S}_N \times \vec{v}^\perp \right), \quad (1l)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{13} = i \left(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \vec{v}^\perp \right) \left(\vec{S}_N \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right), \quad (1m)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{14} = i \left(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right) \left(\vec{S}_N \cdot \vec{v}^\perp \right), \quad (1n)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{15} = - \left(\vec{S}_\chi \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right) \left[\left(\vec{S}_N \times \vec{v}^\perp \right) \cdot \frac{\vec{q}}{m_N} \right], \quad (1o)$$

up to factors of q^2 (which, as a scale-invariant quantity, allows $q^{2n}\mathcal{O}_i$ to be an operator as well). Then, the total Hamiltonian will be

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{x=n,p} \sum_{i=1}^{15} c_i^x \mathcal{O}_i^x, \quad (2)$$

where we now consider both protons and neutrons as targets and the thirty coupling coefficients c_i^x are free parameters of the interaction theory.

The EFT does not assume any characteristics about the DM particle, other than requiring its interaction with the target be nonrelativistic and mediated by a massive spin-0 or spin-1 particle, e.g., a $U(1)$ gauge boson A'_μ . For this paper, we will consider a spin-1/2 weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) as our dark matter, and we will assume its mass is within the range $10 - 10^3$ GeV. In this mass region the DM in our neighborhood of the galactic halo will be nonrelativistic, and any nuclear recoils from the DM will be $\mathcal{O}(100 \text{ keV})$ [37].

While the operators Eqs. (1) are constructed assuming Galilean-invariance in the nonrelativistic regime, one can in principle start with a Lorentz-invariant relativistic effective theory and carry out a nonrelativistic reduction. This was done in Ref. [38] in the EFT framework; see Sec. VI of Ref. [36] for a discussion of the reduction of

relativistic couplings to the Galilean EFT operators or Appendix A. in Ref. [32] for a comparison of Galilean EFT and an effective theory derived from quark-WIMP interactions.

B. Dark Matter Interaction

Deriving the differential event rate of DM-target interactions from the nuclear model, DM model, and effective theory is nontrivial. A thorough explanation of the process is given in Sec. II B-C in Ref. [36]; here we give a brief overview for readability of our analysis.

The DM-nucleus interaction cross section can be factorized into nuclear response functions $W_k^{x,x'}$ and WIMP response functions $R_k^{x,x'}$, where $x, x' \in \{p, n\}$ and $k = 1, \dots, 8$ runs over the eight allowed combinations of electroweak operators:

$$W_X^{x,x'} = \sum_{J_T} \langle \Psi_f || X_{J_T}^x || \Psi_i \rangle \langle \Psi_i || X_{J_T}^{x'} || \Psi_f \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Here Ψ_i (Ψ_f) is the initial (final) target wave function, J_T is the angular momentum rank of the operator, and $\langle || \cdot || \rangle$ is the usual reduced matrix element. Since we assume the DM to be heavy and nonrelativistic, very little energy will be transferred to the nucleus (as mentioned in the previous subsection). Thus, we can assume the final wave function of the nucleus will be the same as the initial wave function, i.e., the ground state, and we will make this assumption in the rest of this paper. The WIMP response functions, given in Eq. 38 of Ref. [25], group the EFT operators for the corresponding nuclear response functions and depend on the coupling coefficients c_i^x in Eq. (2).

The matrix elements in Eq. (3) are calculated by summing over single particle orbitals in the nuclear model:

$$\langle \Psi_f || X_{J_T}^x || \Psi_i \rangle = \sum_{a,b} \langle a || X_{J_T}^x || b \rangle \rho_{J_T}^{fi}(a, b). \quad (4)$$

Here, the nuclear one-body density matrices are

$$\rho_{J_T}^{fi}(a, b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2J_T + 1}} \langle \Psi_f || [\hat{c}_a^\dagger \otimes \tilde{c}_b]_{J_T} || \Psi_i \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where \hat{c}_a^\dagger and \tilde{c}_b are the fermion creation and time-reversed annihilation operators, respectively [39]. The differential cross section is then [40]

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dE_{\text{rec}}}(v^2, E_{\text{rec}}) = \frac{2m_T}{(2j_T + 1)v^2} \sum_{x,x'=p,n} \sum_{i=1}^8 R_k^{x,x'} W_k^{x,x'} \quad (6)$$

where j_T is the spin of the target nucleus (not to be confused with J_T , mentioned earlier) and v is the velocity of the DM particle.

The differential event rate depends on the differential cross section, DM velocity distribution $f(\vec{v})$, and detector

characteristics (c.f. [41]):

$$\frac{dR}{dE_{\text{rec}}}(E_{\text{rec}}) = \varepsilon(E_{\text{rec}}) N_T n_\chi \int \frac{d\sigma}{dE_{\text{rec}}} \tilde{f}(\vec{v}) |\vec{v}| d^3\vec{v}. \quad (7)$$

Here, $\varepsilon(E_{\text{rec}})$ is the detector efficiency, N_T is the number of target nuclei in the detector, n_χ is the local DM number density, and $\tilde{f}(\vec{v})$ is the DM velocity distribution boosted into the rest frame of the detector. For the CUORE detector, we take a constant total efficiency $\varepsilon = 0.883$ which is the product of the detector trigger efficiency (99%), data selection efficiency (90%), and anti-coincidence selection efficiency (99.2%) as were the case in Ref. [42].

III. UNCERTAINTY IN EFT COUPLING UPPER LIMITS IN CUORE

Until a positive detection of dark matter occurs, experiments can at best place upper limits on potential coupling strengths between WIMP particles and ordinary matter. Uncertainties on these upper limits come from the same sources as would any observation, including theoretical uncertainties from the models used in analyses of the data. Nuclear modeling uncertainties are known to be significant, especially in large nuclei that are frequently used in low-background, high-sensitivity detectors, yet until recently this source was neglected or otherwise crudely estimated. We show in this section how the uncertainties in the nuclear shell models affect uncertainties in the determination of the sensitivity of the CUORE detector to different EFT interaction channels. We focus mainly on tellurium, which dominates the nuclear mass of the TeO₂ crystal in CUORE, although we also briefly discuss the WIMP interaction with oxygen.

The Cryogenic Underground Observatory for Rare Events (CUORE), located at Gran Sasso National Laboratory, is a tonne scale bolometric experiment composed of an array of 988 tellurium dioxide crystals. Each crystal is 0.75 kg and 5 cubic centimeters. The crystal array is cooled to ~ 15 mK, and has currently collected over 2 tonne-years of TeO₂ exposure. CUORE's main focus is searching for the neutrinoless double beta decay of ¹³⁰Te which would have an observable Q-value at 2527 keV. CUORE uses Neutron Transmutation Doped (NTD) Ge thermistors to detect thermal phonons generated from energy depositions, including those from radioactive processes, and is calibrated with a ²³²Th – ⁶⁰Co source, achieving a detector resolution of ~ 7 keV in the region of interest. While CUORE is intended to search for neutrinoless double beta decay, its high sensitivity, low noise, and large exposure make it a suitable detector to search for WIMP like dark matter through nuclear recoil scattering off the detector nuclei.

Before considering each element separately, we review the calculation of the EFT coupling confidence limit and its nuclear model-derived uncertainty. A more thorough explanation can be found in Sec. V of Ref. [36]. The

differential event rate of a proposed DM-target interaction depends on the EFT coupling coefficients introduced in Eq. (2) through the WIMP response functions $R_k^{x,x'}$. More specifically, these response functions are quadratic in the c_i^x ; in the case that only one such coupling is nonzero and the coupling is independent of exchanged momentum q , the differential event rate is proportional to $(c_i^x)^2$ (by Eqs. (6-7)). We assume here the interaction conserves isospin, so that $R_k^{x,x'} = 0$ for $x \neq x'$, i.e., only $p \rightarrow p$ and $n \rightarrow n$ interactions in the target occur, as is the case for a ground state-to-ground state transition.

Assuming a Poissonian distribution for the number of WIMP-target interaction events, an experiment needs a total event rate of at least $dR_{\min}/dt = 2.3$ events/ton yr for a positive detection of a DM interaction event at a 90% confidence level [43]. (We neglect the background rate of the detector in our analysis; a nonzero background would increase dR_{\min}/dt and consequently increase the EFT coefficient upper limit, as shown below.) Because of the quadratic dependence of the differential event rate on the EFT coefficients, the 90% upper limit of a given EFT coefficient, written $c_{i,\min}^x$, can be calculated from a single calculation of the total event rate dR_0/dt in the `dmscatter` code of Ref. [40] using a test value $c_{i,0}^x$ for the EFT coupling:

$$c_{i,\min}^x = \sqrt{\frac{dR_{\min}/dt}{dR_0/dt}} c_{i,0}^x. \quad (8)$$

We calculate the uncertainties on $c_{i,\min}^x$ for tellurium only, as it dominates the coupling upper limits and their uncertainties over oxygen. We also determine the uncertainties from oxygen qualitatively, as will be explained in the following subsections.

A. Tellurium

The largest target component by mass in CUORE is tellurium. As natural tellurium is composed of approximately 8% odd-mass isotopes with nonzero ground state spin (namely, ^{123}Te and ^{125}Te , each spin-1/2), there is sensitivity to all spin-dependent EFT interactions. This is in contrast to oxygen, which is nearly entirely (99.8%) ^{16}O , an even-even isotope with ground state spin zero. Thus, tellurium is a relevant target for probing spin-dependent WIMP interactions in CUORE. (Naturally occurring xenon is nearly half odd-mass isotopes by abundance; the contrast between xenon- and tellurium based experiments could thus shed vital light on the nature of WIMP-nucleus interactions.)

To determine uncertainties on the EFT coupling upper confidence limits for WIMP-nucleus interactions with tellurium isotopes, we take the same approach as was performed in Ref. [36] for xenon. Nuclear shell-model configuration-interaction calculations of density matrices are costly; to avoid performing many such calculations we started with two different shell model Hamiltonians,

GCN [44, 45] and JJ55 [46] for tellurium, which are both based on a CD-Bonn potential G-matrix [47, 48] but fit to different experimental data sets. The original papers [44–46] found good agreement with tellurium levels and transition probabilities, and in our more recent work [36] we also found good agreement in xenon isotopes. The difference in observable values is derived from uncertainties in fitting these Hamiltonians to experiment (and, more generally, derived from the difficulty of modeling nuclei).

We constructed a Gaussian ensemble of one-body density matrices by taking the one-body density matrices from each shell model, GCN and JJ55. We then created a Gaussian probability distribution function (PDF) using the two values for each matrix element to fix the average and the width. Finally, we performed a Gaussian ensemble Monte Carlo (MC) simulation on the one-body nuclear density matrices (Eq. (5)); in each single Monte Carlo run a value for each matrix element is randomly selected from its associated PDF, and the resulting randomized one-body density matrix is used in the `dmscatter` code to calculate a differential WIMP-nucleus event rate (Eq. (7)). A total event rate is calculated by integrating the differential event rate over recoil energy E_{rec} , which we take to be in the range [1, 100] keV. We ran $N = 2500$ Monte Carlo iterations for WIMP masses in the range $m_\chi \in [10, 1000]$ GeV and nine different tellurium isotopes (the naturally-occurring Te-120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130 and the unstable Te-129). The best-fit 90% upper confidence limit on the c_i^x are taken as the median value of the $c_{i,\min}^x$ calculated by Eq. (8) over all MC runs. The uncertainty on the upper limit is calculated using the Feldman-Cousins method [49] to bound 68.23% (1σ) of all run values; see Sec. V and App. B in Ref. [36] for further discussion of this method. Notably, this method produces separate upper and lower uncertainties, which allows the determination of a “ 1σ ” interval of a non-Gaussian distribution.

Fig. 1 shows the 90% upper confidence limits of the WIMP-proton EFT coefficients c_i^p and their associated uncertainties for ^{123}Te , ^{125}Te , and ^{130}Te , assuming a WIMP mass $m_\chi = 69.5193$ GeV. At the low end of our WIMP mass region (~ 10 GeV), there is a possibility that the DM particle could excite the nucleus as the DM would have a higher momentum (assuming fixed DM energy density as we do here). This is especially pertinent for ^{125}Te , which has a low-lying first excited state around 35 keV. Since Galilean EFT assumes elastic interactions, we save this scenario for future work. Uncertainties are negligible for couplings that are independent of nucleon spin \vec{S}_N , namely, \mathcal{O}_1 , \mathcal{O}_2 , \mathcal{O}_5 , \mathcal{O}_8 , and \mathcal{O}_{11} . Operators 3, 12, and 15 all have small ($< 5\%$) uncertainties and contain $\vec{S}_N \times \vec{v}^\perp$. The remaining operators, being nucleon spin-dependent, do not couple to the even-even isotopes but have substantial uncertainties in the even-odd isotopes, in some cases surpassing 100%. These EFT channels also have some of the smallest event rates (and thus the highest EFT upper confidence limits).

Fig. 2 provides the analogous 90% upper confi-




FIG. 1. 90% upper confidence limits and uncertainties of Galilean EFT proton couplings for different isotopes of tellurium and WIMP mass $m_\chi = 69.5193$ GeV.

dence limits for the WIMP-neutron couplings at $m_\chi = 69.5193$ GeV, with the addition of ^{129}Te . The trends in the upper limit uncertainties over the proton-coupled EFT operators are also exhibited by the neutron couplings. Nucleon spin-independent couplings have no significant uncertainty while those depending on \vec{S}_N do have an appreciable uncertainty, reaching up to 25% for ^{123}Te across operators. We include ^{129}Te in the neutron couplings, despite it being radioactive and only found naturally in trace amounts, to highlight the very large uncertainty of the upper limit of c_{13}^n in this isotope.

B. Oxygen

As the CUORE target is tellurium dioxide, we also computed the WIMP scattering rates off ^{16}O . We used three different wave functions to generate our reference one-body density matrices. The first and simplest is a single Slater determinant with filled $0s$ and $0p$ shells. We also computed no-core shell-model (NCSM) [50] wave functions with two nucleon-nucleon interactions (fitted to low-energy scattering and few-body systems), the Dae-

jeon16 interaction [51], as well as the Entem-Machleidt interaction derived from chiral effective field theory at next-to-next-to-next-to-leading-order (N3LO) [52], and evolved by the similarity renormalization group [53] to a resolution $\lambda = 2.0 \text{ fm}^{-1}$; for these calculations we used an $N_{\text{max}} = 6$ many-body truncation.

All three wave functions are constructed from harmonic oscillator single-particle states. The only parameter for such harmonic oscillator states is the oscillator length parameter $b = \sqrt{\hbar/M\Omega}$ where M is the nucleon mass and Ω is the oscillator frequency. For Daejeon16 and the Entem-Machleidt N3LO interactions, we varied b (or, alternately, $\hbar\Omega$) to minimize the ground state energy, at $\hbar\Omega = 17.5$ MeV ($b = 1.540$ fm) for Daejeon16 and $\hbar\Omega = 24$ MeV ($b = 1.315$ fm) for Entem-Machleidt N3LO. (These calculations were not fully converged, especially as we left out the three-body forces needed for accurate ground state energies using Entem-Machleidt, but we believe they nonetheless provide a good estimate of the oxygen response relative to tellurium.)

The oscillator parameter b sets the length scale of the calculations, and it is thus natural to compare the calculated root-mean-square radius against the experimen-




FIG. 2. 90% upper confidence limits and uncertainties of Galilean EFT neutron couplings for different isotopes of tellurium and WIMP mass $m_\chi = 69.5193$ GeV. We include ^{129}Te despite it not being a stable, naturally-produced isotope to highlight both its very large uncertainty in operator 13 and the general trend of decreasing uncertainty with increased nucleon number.

tal value of $2.59(7)$ fm [54]. It is known, however, that NCSM calculations struggle to reproduce experimental radii [55, 56]. In order to investigate the sensitivity to the length scale, we used different values of b in our calculations. For example, the phenomenological Blomqvist-Molinari formula [57] for b in shell-model calculations would give $b = 1.726$ fm. To match the experimental radius, however, the simple closed-shell $0s0p$ model required $b = 1.764$ fm, while the Daejeon16 and Entem-Machleidt calculations required $b = 1.709$ fm and 1.663 fm, respectively, to agree with experiment.

Fig. 3 shows the 90% upper confidence limits in ^{16}O for each of our three models: the closed-shell $0s0p$ cases, and NCSM wave functions generated using Daejeon16 and Entem-Machleidt N3LO, for four selected EFT couplings. The results shown are typical of the remainder not shown.

The calculated DM response was not very sensitive to these variations in b , even for different operators; a much bigger variation was found between the three models. Because of this lack of sensitivity, we did not tune the value of b for our tellurium results (nor for our previous xenon calculations [36]).

As oxygen has nearly an order of magnitude fewer nucleons than tellurium, it is not surprising to find the WIMP upper confidence limits on oxygen is much smaller. Comparing against the associated limits from tellurium in Fig. 1, we see the oxygen limits are all at least an order of magnitude higher which implies the event rate dR_0/dt (as in Eq. (8)) is almost two orders of magnitude higher for tellurium. Because of the smaller ^{16}O response, we did not attempt the responses for $^{17,18}\text{O}$, which have natural abundances of $\leq 0.2\%$.

IV. DM ANNUAL MODULATION

Assuming a simple, non-rotating galactic dark matter halo, the motion of the solar system around the galactic center produces a “dark matter wind” on Earth. The apparent speed of this wind (and thus the relative kinetic energy that it carries) depends on both the velocity of the solar system as a whole and the velocity of Earth relative to the Sun. When the Earth is moving in the same direction as the Sun in the galactic frame (which




FIG. 3. Comparison of 90% upper confidence limits of Galilean EFT couplings for three nuclear models of ^{16}O as a function of WIMP mass m_χ . For two of the models, denoted Daejeon and N3LO, limits were calculated using two different values for the harmonic oscillator length parameter $b = \sqrt{\hbar/M\Omega}$ where M is the nucleon mass and Ω is the oscillator frequency, which (among other things) sets the expected radius of the nucleus. The resulting coupling limits are relatively insensitive to the choice of b .

occurs around June) the average available energy in a potential DM-target interaction is maximized. This higher energy leads to more interactions occurring above detector thresholds, increasing the measured interaction rate. Conversely, when the Earth is moving retrograde to the Sun's velocity, the interaction rate is minimized [41, 58]. Since the Earth takes one year to make a full orbit, the period of any changes in the DM interaction rate should be around one year.

We can model this annual modulation in the differential event rate as a Fourier series [58]:

$$\frac{dR}{dE_{\text{rec}}}(v_{\text{min}}, t, t') = M_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \cos(n\omega(t-t')) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \sin(n\omega(t-t')) \quad , \quad (9)$$

where $\omega = 2\pi/(1 \text{ year})$ and the A_n and B_n are functions of v_{min} , the minimum WIMP velocity that can produce a recoil energy E_{rec} . Setting $t' = 0$, the dominant terms of the sums are those with period one year, i.e., $n = 1$. Rewriting $A_1 \equiv M_1$ and $B_1 \equiv M_2$, Eq. (9) becomes

$$\frac{dR}{dE_{\text{rec}}}(E_{\text{rec}}, t) = M_0 + M_1 \cos(\omega t) + M_2 \sin(\omega t) \quad , \quad (10)$$

where we now consider dR/dE_{rec} , M_1 , and M_2 as functions of the recoil energy E_{rec} . The total modulation amplitude M_{tot} and phase t_0 are then calculated from M_1 and M_2 :

$$M_{\text{tot}} = \sqrt{M_1^2 + M_2^2} \quad (11)$$

$$t_0 = \arctan\left(\frac{M_2}{M_1}\right) \quad . \quad (12)$$

With the measured annual modulation signature in DAMA/LIBRA persisting over 2.86 ton \times year of exposure [59], there has been considerable effort to reproduce the result both in the same detector medium (namely, NaI(Tl) crystal) [4] and in different materials [6]. Due to CUORE's underground location at LNGS, shielding, and cryostat, the detector has very low backgrounds, allowing the experiment to look for potential direct dark matter interactions down to recoil energies of around 3 keV. In principle, CUORE can search for a dark matter annual modulation in their TeO₂ crystal as a test of the DAMA/LIBRA result.

To test the response of the differential event rate of DM-nucleus scattering and its nuclear model-induced uncertainty in CUORE to the changing v_{earth} throughout the year, we performed the Gaussian ensemble uncertainty quantification calculation described in Sec. II for $v_{\text{earth}} = \{216, 220, 224, 228, 232, 236, 240, 244\}$ km/s in ¹²⁵Te. This isotope has an even-odd nucleus with a nonzero ground state spin, allowing it to couple to all fifteen EFT operators (see Fig. 1). We simulated $n = 1000$ Monte Carlo nuclear density matrix inputs and calculated the differential event rate at each v_{earth} for $E_{\text{rec}} \in [1, 100]$ keV and a selection of WIMP masses $m_\chi \in [10, 1000]$ GeV. Then, for each Monte Carlo run, we fit the annual modulation model Eq. (10) with fixed $\omega = 2\pi/\text{year}$ and free parameters $\{M_0, M_1, M_2\}$.

We find that changes in nuclear shell model inputs do not affect the parameter ratios $\tilde{M}_1 \equiv M_1/M_0$ and $\tilde{M}_2 \equiv M_2/M_0$. Thus, the phase t_0 is insensitive to nuclear uncertainties, as $t_0 = \arctan(M_2/M_1) = \arctan(\tilde{M}_2/\tilde{M}_1)$. We can similarly rewrite M_{tot} as

$$M_{\text{tot}} = M_0 \sqrt{\tilde{M}_1^2 + \tilde{M}_2^2} \quad ,$$

so the uncertainty in M_{tot} due to nuclear modeling is proportional to the uncertainty in M_0 , the non-modulating portion of the differential event rate. We find $\log M_0$ decreases linearly with increasing E_{rec} for all WIMP masses and EFT channels.

Fig. 4 shows the median value and uncertainty due to nuclear model uncertainties of the DM annual modulation amplitude M_{tot} in ¹²⁵Te as a function of E_{rec} for the proton coupling coefficient of EFT operator \mathcal{O}_4 , commonly called the spin-dependent coupling. For all m_χ in our range of interest, there is a E_{rec} wherein M_{tot} dips down near zero before rebounding, as can be best seen for the yellow and green curves in Fig. 4. We show an example of this phenomenon for \mathcal{O}_4 and $m_\chi = 69.5193$ GeV in Fig. 5. At this critical value of E_{rec} , both M_1 and M_2 flip signs, causing the oscillatory signature to vanish. Thus, in this E_{rec} regime, the phase is poorly defined and becomes discontinuous in the data before settling back down near the expected value (approx. 150-200 days, corresponding to a maximum event rate in the summer). This phenomenon has been studied before, e.g., in Sec. III of Ref. [60] where this crossover recoil energy (denoted Q_C) is considered as a probe for WIMP mass.

V. DISCUSSION

The overall character of the upper limits of EFT couplings and their uncertainties from tellurium in CUORE closely resembles that of xenon in XENON1T, explored in Ref. [36]. A quick comparison of Fig. 1 above and Fig. 4 in Ref. [36] shows strong similarities, from the relative values of the different operator's coupling limits to the significant uncertainties on the spin-dependent couplings that do not interact with even-even isotopes. A few differences stand out, however, such as the much higher relative uncertainties on these spin-dependent couplings in tellurium, with some exceeding 100% upper uncertainty. Further, the coupling limits from tellurium are across all operators approximately ten times higher than the limits set by xenon. This result suggests that further experimental and theoretical characterization of the nuclear structure of tellurium would be beneficial for improving the accuracy of bounds obtained using tellurium in DM experiments.

In Fig. 2, we include EFT coupling limits to ¹²⁹Te, a radioactive isotope with half-life of approximately 70 minutes, despite no appreciable amount of the isotope existing in natural abundances. The relative uncertainty of \mathcal{O}_{13} for WIMP-neutron coupling in ¹²⁹Te is much higher than other isotopes across WIMP masses, while its total event rate (which is inversely proportional to the coupling limit, c.f. Eq. (8)) is also greater. Interestingly, we see this same behavior in the neutron-coupled \mathcal{O}_{13} of ¹³¹Xe, which has the same amount of neutrons ($N = 77$) as ¹²⁹Te. This is most likely due to their ground state spin being 3/2 instead of 0 or 1/2 for the other even-even and even-odd isotopes in this mass regime, respectively. We do not know, however, why this behavior is only seen in \mathcal{O}_{13} , especially because this operator is a product of two others, $\mathcal{O}_{13} = \mathcal{O}_8 \mathcal{O}_{10}$, that do not have significantly larger uncertainties in ¹²⁹Te. Further, other operators that contain both nucleon spin \vec{S}_N and WIMP spin \vec{S}_χ , such as \mathcal{O}_{14} , behave normally. Regardless of the cause of this result, ¹²⁹Te is not found in the CUORE detector, so any conclusions about theoretical uncertainties in CUORE dark matter search results will not be affected by this anomaly.

We find in Sec. IV that the determination of the amplitude, but not the phase, of a DM annual modulation curve is sensitive to nuclear modeling uncertainties. Further, as Fig. 5 shows, outside of regions of (E_{rec}, m_χ) parameter space where the modulation amplitude is small (e.g., near $E_{\text{rec}} = 12 - 15$ keV for EFT coupling c_4^p in Fig. 5), the expected value of t_0 is relatively constant. The location of these regions depends on the isotope, although the strength of the reduction in M_{tot} does not depend on the nuclear model used (c.f. Fig. 4), especially for couplings that do not have an appreciable uncertainty due to nuclear modeling uncertainties (i.e., those with negligible uncertainty in Figs. 1 or 2).

It is clear from Fig. 5 that M_{tot} is proportionally larger than the background rate M_0 at values of E_{rec} further




FIG. 4. Medians and uncertainties on the dark matter annual modulation amplitude M_{tot} as a function for E_{rec} for the spin-dependent proton coupling c_4^p to Te-125. Multiple m_χ values are plotted with varying colors.




FIG. 5. Median annual modulation curve best fit parameters (c.f. Eqs. (10)–(12)) as a function of E_{rec} over $N = 1000$ Monte Carlo runs. Note that around $E_{\text{rec}} = 13.5$ keV, M_{tot} goes to zero and t_0 fluctuates wildly as both M_1 and M_2 go to zero. Outside of this recoil energy region, the phase is in line with its expected value around 150–200 days, corresponding to a maximum DM interaction rate in the summer months.

away from the low-modulation region. This presents an interesting scenario if the WIMP mass is such that the low-modulation region is within the range of interest for an experiment. The DM modulation signature would be suppressed in some E_{rec} channels, and determining the

position of the dip could set bounds on the value of m_χ . Thus, it is of interest to look for DM modulation over a wide range of E_{rec} when detector sensitivity permits.

The ratio M_{tot}/M_0 was the same for all Monte Carlo runs in the Gaussian ensemble uncertainty quantification

for a particular WIMP mass and E_{rec} in all EFT channels. This implies that nuclear model-derived uncertainties on the modulation amplitude M_{tot} are the same as those on the background rate M_0 . Thus, both experiments that search for modulation signatures and experiments that search for the time-averaged DM interaction rate are sensitive to changes in the nuclear model used in their analyses.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown the effect that uncertainties of nuclear modeling can have on dark matter direct detection experiments, in particular on the CUORE detector which uses an array of TeO_2 crystals to search for nuclear recoils from WIMP-like dark matter interactions. Using the Gaussian ensemble method, we have quantified the uncertainties in determining upper limits on nonrelativistic effective field theory (EFT) coefficients for different isotopes of tellurium in CUORE due to differences in nuclear shell models. We find that the size of the uncertainty varies considerably across the EFT operators, with the largest uncertainties belonging to those operators that depend on nucleon spin \vec{S}_N . We have also considered how these nuclear uncertainties affect WIMP-oxygen interaction rates, finding that different models set

different upper limits for EFT couplings across WIMP masses.

We have studied how changes in nuclear modeling affects dark matter annual modulation analyses, finding the modulation amplitude M_{tot} can have over 100% uncertainties for nucleon spin-dependent EFT channels. Moreover, the expected size of M_{tot} is dependent on the WIMP mass and nuclear recoil energy, with prominent dips in the amplitude at particular points in the parameter space. We also have found that the ratio M_{tot}/M_0 , where M_0 is the background differential event rate, and the modulation phase t_0 are independent of changes in the nuclear model. In particular, this shows that uncertainties from nuclear modeling in M_{tot} and M_0 are identical and thus impact both DM annual modulation searches and background rate experiments equally.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Anna Suliga and Brandon Lem for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award No. DE-SC0019465, and in part by NSF award PHY-2411495. DHS would like to gratefully acknowledge the support of the Packard Foundation and Johns Hopkins University.

-
- [1] F. Zwicky, “Die Rotverschiebung von extragalaktischen Nebeln,” *Helvetica Physica Acta* **6**, 110–127 (1933).
 - [2] Vera C. Rubin and Jr. Ford, W. Kent, “Rotation of the Andromeda Nebula from a Spectroscopic Survey of Emission Regions,” *Astrophys. J.* **159**, 379 (1970).
 - [3] K. C. Freeman, “On the Disks of Spiral and S0 Galaxies,” *Astrophys. J.* **160**, 811 (1970).
 - [4] N. Carlin *et al.* (COSINE-100 Collaboration), “Cosine-100 full dataset challenges the annual modulation signal of dama/libra,” (2024), [arXiv:2409.13226 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.13226).
 - [5] G. Adhikari *et al.* (COSINE-100 Collaboration), “Three-year annual modulation search with cosine-100,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 052005 (2022).
 - [6] P. Agnes *et al.* (DarkSide-50 Collaboration), “Search for dark matter annual modulation with darkside-50,” (2023), [arXiv:2307.07249 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07249).
 - [7] J. Aalbers *et al.* (LZ Collaboration), “Probing the scalar wimp-pion coupling with the first lux-zeplin data,” *Communications Physics* **7** (2024), 10.1038/s42005-024-01774-8.
 - [8] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENONnT Collaboration), “First search for light dark matter in the neutrino fog with xenonnt,” (2024), [arXiv:2409.17868 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.17868).
 - [9] PandaX-4T Collaboration, “Dark matter search results from the pandax-4t commissioning run,” *Physical Review Letters* **127**, 261802 (2021).
 - [10] G. Angloher *et al.*, “Results on light dark matter particles with a low-threshold cress-ti detector,” *The European Physical Journal C* **76**, 25 (2016).
 - [11] R. Agnese *et al.* (SuperCDMS Collaboration), “Search for low-mass dark matter with cdmslite using a profile likelihood fit,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 062001 (2019).
 - [12] C. Amole *et al.* (PICO Collaboration), “Dark matter search results from the complete exposure of the pico-60 c_3f_8 bubble chamber,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 022001 (2019).
 - [13] Jan Conrad and Olaf Reimer, “Indirect dark matter searches in gamma and cosmic rays,” *Nature Physics* **13**, 224–231 (2017).
 - [14] Carlos Perez de los Heros, “Status, challenges and directions in indirect dark matter searches,” *Symmetry* **12** (2020).
 - [15] Albert De Roeck, “Dark matter searches at accelerators,” *Nuclear Physics B*, 116480 (2024).
 - [16] Leszek Roszkowski, Enrico Maria Sessolo, and Sebastian Trojanowski, “WIMP dark matter candidates and searches—current status and future prospects,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 066201 (2018), [arXiv:1707.06277 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06277).
 - [17] Graciela B. Gelmini, “Light weakly interacting massive particles,” *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80** (2017).
 - [18] G.L Kane and Iraj Kani, “Cross sections for dark matter particles and implications for allowed masses, interactions, and detection,” *Nuclear Physics B*, 525–546 (1986).
 - [19] Shigeki Matsumoto, Yue-Lin Sming Tsai, and Po-Yan Tseng, “Light fermionic wimp dark matter with light scalar mediator,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **50** (2019).
 - [20] J.R. Angevaere, G. Bertone, A.P. Colijn, M.P. Decowski, and B.J. Kavanagh, “Complementarity of direct detec-

- tion experiments in search of light dark matter,” *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* (2022).
- [21] Rouven Essig, Jeremy Mardon, and Tomer Volansky, “Direct detection of sub-gev dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 076007 (2012).
- [22] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENONnT Collaboration), “Search for light dark matter in low-energy ionization signals from xenonnt,” (2024), [arXiv:2411.15289 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.15289).
- [23] M. M. Arora *et al.* (NEWS-G Collaboration), “Search for light dark matter with news-g at the lsm using a methane target,” (2024), [arXiv:2407.12769 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.12769).
- [24] J. J. Choi *et al.* (NEON Collaboration), “First direct search for light dark matter using the neon experiment at a nuclear reactor,” (2024), [arXiv:2407.16194 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.16194).
- [25] A. Liam Fitzpatrick, Wick Haxton, Emanuel Katz, Nicholas Lubbers, and Yiming Xu, “The effective field theory of dark matter direct detection,” *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2013**, 004 (2013).
- [26] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON Collaboration), “Effective field theory and inelastic dark matter results from xenon1t,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 112017 (2024).
- [27] Martin Hoferichter, Philipp Klos, and Achim Schwenk, “Chiral power counting of one-and two-body currents in direct detection of dark matter,” *Physics Letters B* **746**, 410–416 (2015).
- [28] Martin Hoferichter, Philipp Klos, Javier Menéndez, and Achim Schwenk, “Dark-matter-nucleus scattering in chiral effective field theory,” (2019), [arXiv:1903.11075 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11075).
- [29] Fady Bishara, Joachim Brod, Benjamin Grinstein, and Jure Zupan, “Chiral effective theory of dark matter direct detection,” *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2017**, 009 (2017).
- [30] Vincenzo Cirigliano, Michael L. Graesser, and Grigory Ovanessian, “WIMP-nucleus scattering in chiral effective theory,” *JHEP* **10**, 025 (2012), [arXiv:1205.2695 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.2695).
- [31] Tanner Trickle, Zhengkang Zhang, and Kathryn M. Zurek, “Effective field theory of dark matter direct detection with collective excitations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 015001 (2022), [arXiv:2009.13534 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.13534).
- [32] Martin Hoferichter, Philipp Klos, Javier Menéndez, and Achim Schwenk, “Nuclear structure factors for general spin-independent wimp-nucleus scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 055031 (2019).
- [33] Thomas R. Richardson, Xincheng Lin, and Son T. Nguyen, “Large- N_c constraints for elastic dark-matter-light-nucleus scattering in pionless effective field theory,” *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 044003 (2022).
- [34] C. Alduino *et al.* (CUORE Collaboration), “Cuore-0 detector: design, construction and operation,” *Journal of Instrumentation* **11**, P07009 (2016).
- [35] Jouni Suhonen, *From Nucleons to Nucleus: Concepts of Microscopic Nuclear Theory* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2007).
- [36] Daniel J. Heimsoth, Brandon Lem, Anna M. Suliga, Calvin W. Johnson, A. Baha Balantekin, and Susan N. Coppersmith, “Uncertainties on the eft coupling limits for direct dark matter detection experiments stemming from uncertainties of target properties,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103031 (2023).
- [37] Kim Griest Gerard Jungman, Marc Kamionkowski, “Supersymmetric dark matter,” *Physics Reports* (1996).
- [38] Jingkai Xia, Abdusalam Abdurkerim, Wei Chen, Xun Chen, Yunhua Chen, Xiangyi Cui, Deqing Fang, Changbo Fu, Karl Giboni, Franco Giuliani, *et al.*, “Pandax-ii constraints on spin-dependent wimp-nucleon effective interactions,” *Physics Letters B* **792**, 193–198 (2019).
- [39] A.R. Edmonds, *Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics*, Investigations in physics (Princeton University Press, 1957).
- [40] Oliver C. Gorton, Calvin W. Johnson, Changfeng Jiao, and Jonathan Nikoleydzik, “dmscatter: A fast program for wimp-nucleus scattering,” *Computer Physics Communications* **284**, 108597 (2023).
- [41] J.D. Lewin and P.F. Smith, “Review of mathematics, numerical factors, and corrections for dark matter experiments based on elastic nuclear recoil,” *Astroparticle Physics* **6**, 87–112 (1996).
- [42] C. Alduino *et al.* (CUORE Collaboration), “Low energy analysis techniques for cuore,” *The European Physical Journal C* **77**, 857 (2017).
- [43] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), “Review of particle physics,” *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* **2020**, 083C01 (2020), <https://academic.oup.com/ptep/article-pdf/2020/8/083C01/34673722/ptaa104.pdf>.
- [44] E. Caurier, J. Menendez, F. Nowacki, and A. Poves, “The Influence of pairing on the nuclear matrix elements of the neutrinoless beta beta decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 052503 (2008), [arXiv:0709.2137 \[nucl-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0709.2137).
- [45] E. Caurier, F. Nowacki, A. Poves, and K. Sieja, “Collectivity in the light Xenon isotopes: A shell model study,” *Phys. Rev. C* **82**, 064304 (2010), [arXiv:1009.3813 \[nucl-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1009.3813).
- [46] B. Alex Brown, N. J. Stone, J. R. Stone, I. S. Towner, and M. Hjorth-Jensen, “Magnetic moments of the 2+(1) states around Sn-132,” *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 044317 (2005), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.C* 72, 029901 (2005)], [arXiv:nucl-th/0411099](https://arxiv.org/abs/nucl-th/0411099).
- [47] Morten Hjorth-Jensen, Thomas T.S. Kuo, and Eivind Osnes, “Realistic effective interactions for nuclear systems,” *Physics Reports* **261**, 125–270 (1995).
- [48] R. Machleidt, “The High precision, charge dependent Bonn nucleon-nucleon potential (CD-Bonn),” *Phys. Rev. C* **63**, 024001 (2001), [arXiv:nucl-th/0006014](https://arxiv.org/abs/nucl-th/0006014).
- [49] Gary J. Feldman and Robert D. Cousins, “A Unified approach to the classical statistical analysis of small signals,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 3873–3889 (1998), [arXiv:physics/9711021](https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/9711021).
- [50] Bruce R Barrett, Petr Navrátil, and James P Vary, “Ab initio no core shell model,” *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **69**, 131–181 (2013).
- [51] AM Shirokov, IJ Shin, Y Kim, M Sosonkina, P Maris, and JP Vary, “N3lo nn interaction adjusted to light nuclei in ab exitu approach,” *Physics Letters B* **761**, 87–91 (2016).
- [52] D. R. Entem and R. Machleidt, “Accurate charge-dependent nucleon-nucleon potential at fourth order of chiral perturbation theory,” *Phys. Rev. C* **68**, 041001 (2003).
- [53] S. K. Bogner, R. J. Furnstahl, and R. J. Perry, “Similarity renormalization group for nucleon-nucleon interactions,” *Phys. Rev. C* **75**, 061001 (2007).
- [54] V. Lapoux, V. Somà, C. Barbieri, H. Hergert, J. D. Holt, and S. R. Stroberg, “Radii and binding energies in oxygen isotopes: A challenge for nuclear forces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 052501 (2016).

- [55] SK Bogner, RJ Furnstahl, P Maris, RJ Perry, A Schwenk, and JP Vary, “Convergence in the no-core shell model with low-momentum two-nucleon interactions,” *Nuclear Physics A* **801**, 21–42 (2008).
- [56] Mark A. Caprio, Patrick J. Fasano, and Pieter Maris, “Robust ab initio prediction of nuclear electric quadrupole observables by scaling to the charge radius,” *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, L061302 (2022).
- [57] J Blomqvist and A Molinari, “Collective 0- vibrations in even spherical nuclei with tensor forces,” *Nuclear Physics A* **106**, 545–569 (1968).
- [58] Katherine Freese, Mariangela Lisanti, and Christopher Savage, “Colloquium: Annual modulation of dark matter,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 1561–1581 (2013).
- [59] R. Bernabei, P. Belli, F. Cappella, V. Caracciolo, R. Cerulli, C. J. Dai, A. d’Angelo, A. Incicchitti, A. Leoncini, X. H. Ma, V. Merlo, F. Montecchia, X. D. Sheng, and Z. P. Ye, “Dark matter: Dama/libra and its perspectives,” (2022), [arXiv:2209.00882 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.00882).
- [60] Matthew J. Lewis and Katherine Freese, “Phase of the annual modulation as a tool for determining the mass of the weakly interacting massive particle,” *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043501 (2004).