

Neutralino dark matter in gauge mediation

Michihisa Takeuchi^(a), Norimi Yokozaki^{(b)*}, and Junhao Zhu^{(b)†}

(a) School of Physics and Astronomy, Sun Yat-sen University, 519082 Zhuhai, China

(b) Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics and Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310027, China

Abstract

We explore the potential of neutralino dark matter within the framework of gauge-mediated supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking. In our models, the lightest neutralino, as the lightest SUSY particle (LSP), is a viable dark matter candidate, assuming a gravitino mass of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV. The models are formulated in five-dimensional space-time, where the SUSY breaking field and the matter fields are placed on separate branes to avoid issues related to flavor and CP violation. Four distinct neutralino dark matter scenarios are studied: binowino coannihilation, higgsino dark matter, wino dark matter, and entropy-diluted bino dark matter. For each case, we determine the allowed parameter spaces and evaluate their consistency with existing experimental limits. Additionally, we examine the potential for testing these models through future investigations at the High-Luminosity Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC) and through dark matter direct detection experiments.

arXiv:2502.07539v1 [hep-ph] 11 Feb 2025

*n.yokozaki@gmail.com

†junhaozhu@zju.edu.cn

1 Introduction

The Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) is one of the most compelling extensions of the Standard Model, as it stabilizes the large hierarchy between the weak scale and high-energy scales, provides a natural framework for force unification, and offers viable dark matter candidates. In particular, the stabilization of hierarchies is a crucial feature, given the presence of multiple high-energy scales such as the inflation scale, the right-handed neutrino mass scale, and the Peccei-Quinn symmetry breaking scale. Most alternative solutions for stabilizing the weak scale require treating each hierarchy among these scales separately.

The SUSY particles acquire sufficiently large masses through soft SUSY-breaking mass parameters. Since the operators associated with these mass parameters are not necessarily flavor-blind or CP-invariant, they are constrained by observations such as electric dipole moments, $K-\bar{K}$ mixing, and $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. In particular, $K-\bar{K}$ mixing imposes a stringent constraint on SUSY particles: the mass scale of the SUSY particles must exceed ~ 1000 TeV [1] if the CP and flavor violation are $\mathcal{O}(1)$. While this still significantly alleviates the hierarchy problem compared to non-SUSY frameworks, it becomes evident that lighter SUSY scenarios, which evade the SUSY flavor and CP problems, are more favorable.

Gauge mediation [2–8] provides a solution to the SUSY flavor problem, as the soft SUSY breaking masses are generated through gauge interactions. It can also offer a robust solution to the SUSY CP problem: if the phases of the B -terms of the messenger fields and the Higgs B -term are aligned, the common CP phase of the soft SUSY breaking mass parameters can be eliminated by a field redefinition, thereby resolving the SUSY CP problem [9–13].

In gauge mediation, the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is typically the gravitino, whose mass is significantly smaller than the masses of the MSSM particles. In the minimal gauge mediation model, the gravitino mass is estimated as

$$m_{3/2} \sim 16\pi^2 m_{\tilde{g}} \frac{M_{\text{mess}}}{M_P} \approx 6.6 \text{ keV} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{g}}}{10 \text{ TeV}} \right) \left(\frac{M_{\text{mess}}}{10^7 \text{ GeV}} \right),$$

where M_{mess} is the messenger scale, M_P is the reduced Planck mass, and $m_{\tilde{g}}$ is the gluino mass. The gravitino mass is typically less than ~ 1 GeV. Unless R -parity is violated, the gravitino is stable and serves as a candidate for dark matter.

However, gravitinos tend to be overproduced, and to avoid this overproduction, there is a stringent upper bound on the reheating temperature T_R [14, 15]

$$T_R \lesssim 5 \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{10 \text{ keV}} \right) \left(\frac{10 \text{ TeV}}{m_{\tilde{g}}} \right)^2.$$

Here, we consider the model-independent production of gravitinos through scattering processes involving particles in the thermal bath.

Motivated by the need to avoid the gravitino overproduction problem, we consider models of gauge mediation with a gravitino mass greater than 100 TeV, ensuring it is not the LSP and decays quickly into MSSM particles. This model is realized within an extra-dimensional framework. Similar to gravity mediation, the neutralino becomes the LSP and serves as a viable dark matter candidate. While there is a resemblance to our previous model [16], the models proposed in this paper are more simplified and primarily focus on neutralino dark matter.

We examine four scenarios: (i) bino-like dark matter with a nearly degenerate mass with the wino, (ii) higgsino-like dark matter, (iii) wino-like dark matter, and (iv) bino-like dark matter with an entropy production mechanism.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces a gauge mediation model within a five-dimensional framework and identifies a consistent parameter space that supports the bino-wino coannihilation scenario. Section 3 explores the prospects of higgsino dark matter and wino dark matter within the context of this model. Section 4 discusses a scenario involving bino dark

matter, where entropy production dilutes the relic abundance of the bino. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to conclusions and further discussions.

2 Model for bino-wino coannihilation

We consider a five-dimensional (5D) $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric model compactified on an S^1/\mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold, described by the action:

$$S = \int d^4x \int_0^L dy \sqrt{g} [\mathcal{L}_0 \delta(y) + \mathcal{L}_L \delta(y - L) + \mathcal{L}_B], \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_0 contains the supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking field Z , \mathcal{L}_L includes the messenger fields and the MSSM matter fields, and \mathcal{L}_B comprises gauge singlet fields that mediate SUSY breaking to the messenger sector. In this setup, we focus on scenarios with a heavy gravitino mass of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV. To suppress flavor violations, the MSSM fields and the SUSY breaking fields are localized on separate branes.

SUSY breaking For SUSY breaking, we consider gravitational SUSY breaking, where SUSY is broken by imposing the condition that the cosmological constant vanishes [17]. We consider the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \ni \int d^4\theta \Phi^\dagger \Phi [-3M_P^2 + M_*^2 g(\rho)] + \int d^2\theta \Phi^3 \mathcal{C} + h.c., \quad (2)$$

where $\rho = Z + Z^\dagger$ and $\Phi = \phi(1 + F_\Phi \theta^2)$ is a conformal compensator. The four-dimensional Planck mass, $M_P \approx 2.4 \times 10^{18}$ GeV, is related to the five-dimensional Planck mass, M_5 , as $M_P^2 = M_5^3 L$. The mass parameter M_* is a cutoff, which is somewhat smaller than M_P . A slightly lower cutoff enhances the moduli mass and the F -term component of Z compared to the gravitino mass [16, 18]. The cutoff M_* may be close to M_5 . The superpotential in Eq. (2) contains only a constant term, as we impose the shift symmetry, $Z \rightarrow Z + i\mathcal{R}$ (\mathcal{R} is a real constant). With the shift symmetry, the Lagrangian relevant to SUSY breaking contains only real parameters after taking \mathcal{C} to be real through a $U(1)_R$ rotation.

The F -terms are given by (see appendix of [18])

$$\begin{aligned} F_Z &= -\frac{3f' m_{3/2} M_P^2}{|\phi|^2 ((f')^2 - f f'')}, \\ F_\Phi &= \frac{3f'' m_{3/2} M_P^2}{|\phi|^2 ((f')^2 - f f'')}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $f(\rho) \equiv -3M_P^2 + M_*^2 g(\rho)$. By taking $|\phi|^2 = \langle 1 - M_*^2 g / (3M_P^2) \rangle^{-1} \approx 1$, we go to the Einstein frame. Requiring the vanishing cosmological constant,

$$V = -3\phi^3 F_\Phi \mathcal{C} = 0, \quad (4)$$

we obtain $f''(\rho) = g''(\rho) = 0$ at the minimum. The stable minimum is obtained for $g^{(3)}(\rho) = 0$ and $g^{(4)}(\rho) < 0$. The fine-tuning of the function $g(\rho)$ can be regarded as the fine-tuning of the cosmological constant. By using the conditions for $g(\rho)$ at the minimum, the SUSY breaking F -term is given by ¹

$$\langle F_Z \rangle \simeq -\frac{M_P^2}{M_*^2} \frac{3m_{3/2}}{\langle g'(\rho) \rangle}, \quad (5)$$

¹For canonically normalized Z , $F_Z \simeq -\sqrt{3} m_{3/2} M_P$.

which is larger than the gravitino mass scale, due to the enhancement of M_P^2/M_*^2 . Because of $F_\Phi = 0$, SUSY breaking from anomaly mediation is absent. The scalar component of ρ has a mass of the order of $m_{3/2}M_P^3/M_*^3$ after canonical normalization.

Gravitational loops and loops involving bulk fields generate scalar masses through contributions of the form [19]:

$$m_{\text{scalar}}^2 \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{\Lambda_{\text{eff}}^2}{M_P^2} |F_Z|^2 \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{L^{-2}}{M_P^2} M_{\text{mess}}^2, \quad (6)$$

where Λ_{eff} is the effective cut-off of the loop momentum. Requiring that the above contributions are smaller than $\mathcal{O}(1000 \text{ GeV}^2)$, the compactification scale, L^{-1} , needs to be smaller than

$$(2-3) \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{10^6 \text{ GeV}}{M_{\text{mess}}} \right). \quad (7)$$

Finally, we discuss the effect of gravitino decay on Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN). The gravitino decays into MSSM particles with a decay rate given by (see, e.g., Ref. [20]):

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{193}{384\pi} \frac{m_{3/2}^3}{M_P^2}. \quad (8)$$

This decay rate corresponds to a gravitino lifetime of:

$$\tau_{3/2} \approx 2.4 \times 10^{-2} \text{ s} \left(\frac{100 \text{ TeV}}{m_{3/2}} \right)^3. \quad (9)$$

Since this lifetime is shorter than the onset of BBN, the impact of gravitino decay on BBN is negligible [21].

Messenger sector

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_L &\ni \int d^4\theta \Phi^\dagger \Phi e^{-K/3M_P^2} + \int d^2\theta \Phi^3 W_{\text{mess}} + h.c. \\ &\simeq \int d^4\theta e^{-K/3M_P^2} + \int d^2\theta W_{\text{mess}} + h.c., \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where K is a Kahler potential for the MSSM fields and the messenger field. The superpotential for the messenger sector is given by

$$W_{\text{mess}} = \lambda_5 X_5 \Psi_5 \bar{\Psi}_5 + \lambda_1 X_1 \Psi_1 \bar{\Psi}_1 + \lambda_3 X_3 \Psi_3 \bar{\Psi}_3 + \sum_{i=1,3,5} \frac{\kappa_i}{3} X_i^3, \quad (11)$$

where Ψ_5 is a **5** representation of $SU(5)$, Ψ_1 has a charge 1 of $U(1)_Y$ (in the $SU(5)$ normalization), and Ψ_3 is a fundamental representation of $SU(3)_c$. The coupling constants, κ_i , are taken as real positive without a loss of generality. The Lagrangian in Eq. (11) is not consistent with the $SU(5)$ grand unified theory but is compatible with the product group unification [22, 23], based on $SU(5)_g \times SU(3)_h \times U(1)_h$. In the product group unification framework, $U(1)_Y$ and $SU(3)_c$ are realized as diagonal subgroups of $U(1)_g \times U(1)_h$ and $SU(3)_g \times SU(3)_h$, respectively; Ψ_1 and Ψ_3 are originally charged under $U(1)_h$ and $SU(3)_h$.

In five-dimensional theory, a Weyl spinor cannot be introduced, but a Dirac spinor can. Accordingly, we place X_i in the bulk as hypermultiplets. Each hypermultiplet consists of two chiral superfields, X_i and X_i^c . We assign Z_2 parity to X_i as even, making the parity of X_i^c odd. As a result, X_i has a zero mode, whereas X_i^c does not. The Lagrangian includes the term

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 &\ni \int d^4\theta \Phi^\dagger \Phi \sum_{i=1,3,5} h_i(\rho) |X_i|^2 \\ &\simeq \int d^4\theta \sum_{i=1,3,5} h_i(\rho) |X_i|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here, we omit direct couplings between ρ and X_i^c since X_i^c does not have a zero mode. After taking canonical normalization of X_i ,² the soft breaking mass terms for X_i is obtained as

$$V_{\text{soft}} \ni \sum_{i=1,3,5} \left[m_i^2 |X_i|^2 + \left(A_i \frac{\partial W}{\partial X_i} + h.c. \right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where

$$A_i \simeq \frac{h'_i}{1+h_i} F_Z, \quad m_i^2 \simeq A_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{h''_i}{1+h_i} |F_Z|^2. \quad (14)$$

The messenger mass $\hat{M}_i = M_i + B_i M_i \theta^2$, is given by

$$M_i = \lambda_i \langle X_i \rangle, \quad B_i = -\kappa_i \langle X_i \rangle - A_i. \quad (15)$$

Here, $M_i \sim B_i \sim \sqrt{|F_Z|}$.

After integrating out the messenger fields, superpartners obtain masses. The gaugino masses are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\tilde{b}} &\simeq \frac{g_1^2}{16\pi^2} (B_5 + B_1), \\ M_{\tilde{w}} &\simeq \frac{g_2^2}{16\pi^2} B_5, \\ M_{\tilde{g}} &\simeq \frac{g_3^2}{16\pi^2} (B_5 + B_3), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and the slepton masses are

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\tilde{L}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{3}{2} g_2^4 B_5^2 + \frac{3}{10} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\ m_{\tilde{E}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{6}{5} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The other soft masses are listed in Appendix A. In this model, it is possible to take $M_{\tilde{b}} \sim M_{\tilde{w}}$ at the SUSY particle mass scale (the stop mass scale), which is necessary for coannihilation to work.

It should be noted that to avoid a stau LSP or tachyonic stau in the parameter regions of interest, $|B_1| \gg |B_5|$ is required. This is because large $|B_1|$ is needed to increase the stau masses. Therefore, $B_1/B_5 < 0$ is necessary to explain $M_{\tilde{b}} \sim M_{\tilde{w}}$ ($g_1^2 |B_1 + B_5| \sim g_2^2 |B_5|$).

The Higgs μ -term and B -term can be generated by including the following interaction terms,

$$\int d^4\theta \left(r_{ud} \tilde{h}(\rho) H_u H_d + h.c. + \tilde{h}_u(\rho) |H_u|^2 + \tilde{h}_d(\rho) |H_d|^2 \right) \quad (18)$$

in \mathcal{L}_0 . Here, we consider that H_u and H_d have profiles that are tilted toward $y = L$ due to the bulk mass terms. The effects are expressed by using r_{ud} . For simplicity we take $\tilde{h}_u = \tilde{h}_d = 0$.

The μ -term and the Higgs B-term are given by

$$\mu = r_{ud} \tilde{h}' F_Z, \quad B_\mu = \frac{1}{2} r_{ud} \tilde{h}'' |F_Z|^2 \quad (19)$$

Neglecting \tilde{h}_u and \tilde{h}_d , we need a fine-tuning for \tilde{h}'' . However, it is possible to avoid the significant fine-tuning with large $m_{H_d}^2$ [24, 25].³




Figure 1: The $m_{\chi_1^0}$ - $\tan\beta$ plane for $B_3 = 1200$ TeV. The black and red lines are contours of $m_{\tilde{\nu}_e}$ ($\simeq m_{\tilde{e}_L} \simeq m_{\tilde{\mu}_L}$) and m_A in units of GeV. The gray region is not consistent for our purpose since the stau is the LSP or tachyonic.

Bino-wino coannihilation In the case where the bino-like LSP with wino-like NLSP and the mass splitting is around 20-30 GeV, it is possible to explain the observed dark matter abundance [26]. The bino, which tends to be overproduced, is efficiently annihilated through the annihilation of the wino-like NLSP.

For numerical calculation, we define the messenger scale as $M_{\text{mess}} = \lambda_1 \langle X_1 \rangle = \lambda_3 \langle X_3 \rangle = \lambda_5 \langle X_5 \rangle$. In fig. 1, we present the consistent parameter region for bino dark matter coannihilating with the wino. The gray-shaded region is excluded, as the stau becomes either the LSP or tachyonic. Additionally, we show the mass contours for the sneutrino (left-handed slepton) and the heavy Higgs bosons (H , A , H^\pm). The region for $\tan\beta > 70$ and $m_A < 2$ TeV, is very likely to be excluded [27, 28]. In the plot, we set $M_{\text{mess}} = 3 \cdot 10^6$ GeV, $M_1 = -1.05M_2$ ($M_2 > 0$) at the messenger scale, and $B_3 = 1.3 \cdot 10^6$ GeV. Due to the coannihilation requirement, the mass splitting between the lightest neutralino (χ_1^0) and the chargino (χ_1^\pm) is small, with $m_{\chi_1^\pm} - m_{\chi_1^0} \approx 20 - 30$ GeV.

For SUSY searches in our model, the production modes of (a) $\chi_2^0 \chi_1^\pm$, (b) $\chi_1^+ \chi_1^-$, and (c) slepton pairs are particularly relevant. These processes lead to the following characteristic final states: (a) off-shell W and Z bosons, (b) off-shell W^\pm bosons, (c) dilepton plus missing transverse energy. Based on current SUSY search results [29, 30], all these scenarios remain consistent with experimental constraints at present. However, these processes may become testable in future high-luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) runs.

The spin-independent (SI) cross section between the bino and proton is $(2-4) \times 10^{-12}$ pb. The cross section is estimated using micrOMEGAs 6.1.15 [31, 32]. On the other hand, the current

²The canonically normalized field, X'_i , is obtained as $X'_i = \sqrt{1 + h_i}(1 + \frac{h'_i}{1+h_i} F_Z \theta^2) X_i$

³The fine-tuning to obtain the correct electroweak symmetry breaking scale can not be avoided.

Table 1: The mass spectra and $\sigma_{\text{SI}}(\text{pb})$. The neutralino/chargino masses, μ -parameter and the messenger scale are shown in units of GeV, while the others are shown in units of TeV.

	P1	P2
M_{mess}	10^7	3×10^6
B_5	2335	1050
B_1	8335	2000
B_3	0	2000
$\tan \beta$	8	7
\tilde{g}	14.4	18.2
\tilde{t}	20.0	19.0
$\tilde{\tau}_1$	11.2	4.06
(χ_1^0, χ_1^\pm)	(1080, 1081)	(2827, 2827)
μ	1046	8273
$\sigma_{\text{SI}}(\text{pb})$	$2.7 \cdot 10^{-11}$	10^{-11}

upper-bound on the SI cross section from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) experiment is [33]

$$\sigma_{\text{SI}} \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-11} \text{ pb} \left(\frac{m_{\chi_1^0}}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right). \quad (20)$$

Therefore, this model avoids the constraint, but the SI cross section is above the neutrino fog [34].

3 Higgsino-like or wino-like dark matter

In some regions of B_1 , B_3 , and B_5 , the higgsino-like state or wino-like state becomes the LSP and a viable candidate for dark matter. Higgsino dark matter with a mass of approximately 1.1 TeV and wino dark matter with a mass of approximately 2.8 TeV can account for the observed dark matter density purely through thermal production [35–39].

Although these types of dark matter do not have significant mixing between gauginos and higgsinos, Higgs-mediated diagrams remain important for direct detection. Table 1 presents the SUSY mass spectra for the higgsino-like LSP (P1) and the wino-like LSP (P2), along with the spin-independent cross section σ_{SI} . In both cases, there are regions of parameter space where the LZ constraint in (20) is satisfied. However, the cross section is generally larger compared to the earlier bino LSP scenario, meaning these regions are likely to be probed by future direct detection experiments with relative ease.

For wino-like dark matter, there might be tensions with indirect detection, depending on the dark matter density profile and the cosmic propagation model [40].

4 Bino-like dark matter with entropy production

As an alternative to the coannihilation scenario, in this section, we consider a mechanism where the over-abundant bino-like neutralino is diluted by additional entropy production, thereby explaining the observed dark matter abundance. For this purpose, we utilize the mechanism introduced in Refs. [41, 42].

Instead of the superpotential presented in Eq. (11), we consider:

$$W = \lambda_5 X_5 \Psi_5 \bar{\Psi}_5 + \frac{\kappa_5}{3} X_5^3 + W_{\text{mix}}, \quad (21)$$

where W_{mix} represents the mixing between the messenger field and matter fields.

Neglecting W_{mix} , the lightest state of the messenger field, typically the scalar component of the weak doublet, becomes stable and dominates the energy density of the universe as it cools. However, by including a small mixing term in W_{mix} , the messenger field decays into MSSM particles at a late time. Because of this late decay, the messenger temporarily dominates the energy density of the universe, producing entropy during its decay and diluting the bino abundance.

The small mixing term is given by [42]:

$$W_{\text{mix}} = \tilde{m}\Psi_5\bar{\mathbf{5}} \ni \tilde{m}\Psi_{\text{weak}}L_3. \quad (22)$$

The smallness of \tilde{m} can be explained by certain symmetries and their breaking (spurions), such as messenger parity. With the mixing term, the lightest scalar messenger predominantly decays into a tau and a higgsino. The decay rate is given by

$$\Gamma_{\text{mess}} \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi} y_\tau^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{M_{\text{mess}}} \right)^2 M_{\text{mess}}, \quad (23)$$

where $M_{\text{mess}} \equiv \lambda_5 \langle X_5 \rangle$.

The thermal abundance of the messenger (defined as n_{mess}/s) after freeze-out is given by [43, 44]:

$$Y_{\text{mess}} \approx 3.7 \times 10^{-8} \left(\frac{M_{\text{mess}}}{10^8 \text{ GeV}} \right). \quad (24)$$

If the scalar messenger's decay is sufficiently late, it can dominate the energy density of the universe before decaying. In this case, it produces an entropy, thereby diluting the dark matter energy density. The resulting dilution factor is

$$\Delta = \frac{s_{\text{after}}}{s_{\text{before}}} = \frac{4}{3} \frac{M_{\text{mess}} Y_{\text{mess}}}{T_d}, \quad (25)$$

where $T_d \sim \sqrt{\Gamma_{\text{mess}} M_P}$ is the decay temperature. To ensure compatibility with BBN and dark matter freeze-out, we require $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ MeV}) < T_d < T_{\text{fo}}$, where $T_{\text{fo}} \sim m_{\chi_1^0}/20$ represents the freeze-out temperature.

With this dilution mechanism, the observed dark matter abundance is expressed as

$$\Omega_{\text{obs}} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \Omega_{\chi_1^0}. \quad (26)$$

Typically, a dilution factor of $\Delta = \mathcal{O}(100)$ is required. To satisfy this condition, the decay temperature must lie in the range $10 \text{ MeV} < T_d < 100 \text{ GeV}$, which implies that the messenger scale M_{mess} should be within $\mathcal{O}(10^7) \text{ GeV}$ and $\mathcal{O}(10^{10}) \text{ GeV}$.

As for the superfields containing the Higgs doublets, we assume that H_u and H_d are localized on the brane at $y = L$. In this setup, there exists a μ -term in the superpotential given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_L \ni \int d^2\theta \mu H_u H_d + h.c. \quad (27)$$

At tree level, there is no B -term, but it is radiatively generated. Consequently, $\tan\beta$ is not a free parameter but rather a prediction of the model.

In fig. 2, we plot the contours of the required dilution factors, while fig. 3 illustrates the predicted $\tan\beta$ and the masses of the heavy Higgs bosons (H , A , H^\pm). As discussed in [28], there is an opportunity to test the heavy Higgs bosons through searches for heavy Higgs decays into the final state $\tau^+\tau^-$. The SI cross section between the bino and proton is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-12}) \text{ pb}$.

Finally, the scalar component of ρ has a mass of the order of $(M_*^3/M_P^3)m_{3/2}$ and decays into a pair of gravitinos. If the initial abundance of ρ is too large, the LSP abundance generated




Figure 2: The required dilution factor Δ (black solid) and $m_{\chi_1^0}$ in units of GeV (red dashed). In the gray region, the stau is the LSP or tachyonic.




Figure 3: The predicted $\tan \beta$ (black dashed) and m_A in units of GeV (red solid).

from gravitino decay may exceed acceptable limits unless the reheating temperature is kept very low. To address this issue, the inflaton field can be placed on the $y = 0$ brane, suppressing the initial amplitude of ρ through the enhanced coupling between Z and the inflaton [45–47].⁴ This setup allows for a reheating temperature higher than M_{mess} . For the scalar component of the imaginary part of Z , its mass and behavior depend on the breaking of the shift symmetry. We leave a detailed discussion of this point for future work.

5 Conclusion

We investigate the potential of neutralino dark matter within the framework of gauge-mediated SUSY breaking models with a heavy gravitino of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV. The soft SUSY breaking mass parameters in the MSSM are (almost) exclusively generated by messenger loops, while other possible sources, including anomaly mediation, are suppressed via gravitational SUSY breaking and brane separation. In our setup, both the CP and flavor problems are addressed.

We explore four distinct scenarios for neutralino dark matter:

(a) Bino-wino coannihilation: In this consistent region, the sleptons can be as light as $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV, making them a target for HL-LHC experiments. The spin-independent cross section is $(2-4) \times 10^{-12}$ pb, which is approximately an order of magnitude smaller than the current experimental bounds but still larger than the neutrino fog. This scenario might be probed by upcoming experiments.

(b) Higgsino dark matter: In certain regions, the higgsino-like neutralino is the LSP, and the correct abundance is achieved with a mass of ≈ 1.1 TeV. This scenario marginally avoids current direct detection constraints but is expected to be probed in the near future.

(c) Wino dark matter: The wino-like state, with a mass of ≈ 2.8 TeV, can explain the correct dark matter abundance. As in case (b), the spin-independent cross section tends to be large and is expected to be tested by upcoming experiments. Additionally, this scenario may face tensions with indirect detection experiments, depending on the dark matter density profile and the cosmic propagation model.

(d) Entropy-diluted bino dark matter: The overproduction of bino-like dark matter can be addressed by an entropy production mechanism involving late-decaying messenger fields. This mechanism dilutes the relic abundance, aligning it with observations while satisfying cosmological constraints such as BBN. The SI cross section is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-12})$ pb.

Future experiments, including HL-LHC searches and direct detection experiments, will be crucial in testing these scenarios and advancing our understanding of neutralino dark matter.

Acknowledgments

N.Y. is supported by a start-up grant from Zhejiang University. M.T. is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, the One Hundred Talent Program of Sun Yat-sen University, China. J.Z. is supported by Zhejiang University.

A Soft SUSY breaking mass

We derive the formulas for the soft SUSY-breaking mass parameters of the MSSM particles with the following superpotential:

$$W_{\text{mess}} = \lambda_5 X_5 \Psi_5 \bar{\Psi}_5 + \lambda_1 X_1 \Psi_1 \bar{\Psi}_1 + \lambda_3 X_3 \Psi_3 \bar{\Psi}_3. \quad (28)$$

⁴The Kähler potential includes a term of the form $\sim \frac{M_P^2}{M_*^2} \frac{|Z|^2 |I|^2}{M_*^2}$ after the canonical normalization of Z , where I denotes the inflaton field.

Messenger loops induce the gaugino masses, sfermion masses and Higgs masses. They can be extracted by wave function renormalization constants using the analytic continuation method [48, 49]. The generated gaugino masses are

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\tilde{b}} &\simeq \frac{g_1^2}{16\pi^2}(B_5 + B_1), \\
M_{\tilde{w}} &\simeq \frac{g_2^2}{16\pi^2}(B_5), \\
M_{\tilde{g}} &\simeq \frac{g_3^2}{16\pi^2}(B_5 + B_3).
\end{aligned}
\tag{29}$$

When $x_i \equiv |B_i/M_{\text{mess}}|$ is close one, B_i should be replaced to $B_i g(x_i)$, where [50]

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{x^2} [(1+x) \ln(1+x)] + (x \rightarrow -x). \tag{30}$$

The sfermion masses are

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\tilde{Q}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{8}{3} g_3^4 (B_5^2 + B_3^2) + \frac{3}{2} g_2^4 B_5^2 + \frac{1}{30} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\
m_{\tilde{U}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{8}{3} g_3^4 (B_5^2 + B_3^2) + \frac{8}{15} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\
m_{\tilde{D}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{8}{3} g_3^4 (B_5^2 + B_3^2) + \frac{2}{15} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\
m_{\tilde{L}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{3}{2} g_2^4 B_5^2 + \frac{3}{10} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\
m_{\tilde{E}}^2 &\simeq \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \left[\frac{6}{5} g_1^4 (B_5^2 + B_1^2) \right], \\
m_{H_u}^2 &= m_{H_d}^2 = m_{\tilde{L}}^2.
\end{aligned}
\tag{31}$$

For x_i close to one, B_i^2 should be replaced to $B_i^2 f(x_i)$, where

$$f(x) = \frac{1+x}{x^2} \left[\ln(1+x) - 2\text{Li}_2(x/(1+x)) + \frac{1}{2}\text{Li}_2(2x/(1+x)) \right] + (x \rightarrow -x). \tag{32}$$

References

- [1] M. Ciuchini *et al.*, “Delta M(K) and epsilon(K) in SUSY at the next-to-leading order,” *JHEP* **10** (1998) 008, [arXiv:hep-ph/9808328](#).
- [2] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, “Supersymmetric Technicolor,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **189** (1981) 575–593.
- [3] S. Dimopoulos and S. Raby, “Supercolor,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **192** (1981) 353–368.
- [4] M. Dine and W. Fischler, “A Phenomenological Model of Particle Physics Based on Supersymmetry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **110** (1982) 227–231.
- [5] C. R. Nappi and B. A. Ovrut, “Supersymmetric Extension of the SU(3) x SU(2) x U(1) Model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **113** (1982) 175–179.
- [6] M. Dine and A. E. Nelson, “Dynamical supersymmetry breaking at low-energies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 1277–1287, [arXiv:hep-ph/9303230](#).
- [7] M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, and Y. Shirman, “Low-energy dynamical supersymmetry breaking simplified,” *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 1362–1370, [arXiv:hep-ph/9408384](#).

- [8] M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir, and Y. Shirman, “New tools for low-energy dynamical supersymmetry breaking,” *Phys. Rev. D* **53** (1996) 2658–2669, [arXiv:hep-ph/9507378](#).
- [9] R. Rattazzi and U. Sarid, “Large tan Beta in gauge mediated SUSY breaking models,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **501** (1997) 297–331, [arXiv:hep-ph/9612464](#).
- [10] E. Gabrielli and U. Sarid, “Low-energy signals for a minimal gauge mediated model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 4752–4755, [arXiv:hep-ph/9707546](#).
- [11] J. L. Evans, M. Sudano, and T. T. Yanagida, “A CP-safe solution of the $\mu/B\mu$ problem of gauge mediation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **696** (2011) 348–351, [arXiv:1008.3165 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] T. Moroi and N. Yokozaki, “SUSY CP Problem in Gauge Mediation Model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **701** (2011) 568–575, [arXiv:1105.3294 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [13] J. L. Evans, T. T. Yanagida, and N. Yokozaki, “Flavor- and CP-safe explanation of $g_\mu - 2$ anomaly,” *JHEP* **03** (2023) 024, [arXiv:2205.14906 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [14] T. Moroi, H. Murayama, and M. Yamaguchi, “Cosmological constraints on the light stable gravitino,” *Phys. Lett. B* **303** (1993) 289–294.
- [15] M. Bolz, A. Brandenburg, and W. Buchmuller, “Thermal production of gravitinos,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **606** (2001) 518–544, [arXiv:hep-ph/0012052](#). [Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.B* 790, 336–337 (2008)].
- [16] M. Asano, Y. Nakai, and N. Yokozaki, “Low-Scale Gauge Mediation with a 100 TeV Gravitino,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** no. 5, (2016) 055023, [arXiv:1512.02201 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] K. I. Izawa, T. Kugo, and T. T. Yanagida, “Gravitational Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **125** (2011) 261–264, [arXiv:1008.4641 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [18] K. Harigaya, T. T. Yanagida, and N. Yokozaki, “Axion induced SUSY breaking and focus point gaugino mediation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **833** (2022) 137386, [arXiv:1710.02204 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] T. Gherghetta and A. Riotto, “Gravity mediated supersymmetry breaking in the brane world,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **623** (2002) 97–125, [arXiv:hep-th/0110022](#).
- [20] T. Moroi, “Effects of the gravitino on the inflationary universe,” other thesis, 3, 1995.
- [21] M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi, and A. Yotsuyanagi, “Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis and Gravitino,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 065011, [arXiv:0804.3745 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] T. Yanagida, “Naturally light Higgs doublets in the supersymmetric grand unified theories with dynamical symmetry breaking,” *Phys. Lett. B* **344** (1995) 211–216, [arXiv:hep-ph/9409329](#).
- [23] T. Hotta, K. I. Izawa, and T. Yanagida, “Dynamical models for light Higgs doublets in supersymmetric grand unified theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **53** (1996) 3913–3919, [arXiv:hep-ph/9509201](#).
- [24] M. Asano and N. Yokozaki, “Light Higgsino as the tail of the $\mu-B_\mu$ solution,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** no. 9, (2016) 095002, [arXiv:1601.00652 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] R. Nagai and N. Yokozaki, “Light Higgsino and Gluino in R -invariant Direct Gauge Mediation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **778** (2018) 309–315, [arXiv:1711.04431 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [26] K. Harigaya, K. Kaneta, and S. Matsumoto, “Gaugino coannihilations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** no. 11, (2014) 115021, [arXiv:1403.0715 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Search for heavy Higgs bosons decaying into two tau leptons with the ATLAS detector using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** no. 5, (2020) 051801, [arXiv:2002.12223 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [28] G. Choi, T. T. Yanagida, and N. Yokozaki, “The Upper Bound of the Second Higgs Boson Mass in Minimal Gauge Mediation with the Gravitino Warm Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 024, [arXiv:2012.03266 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “The quest to discover supersymmetry at the ATLAS experiment,” [arXiv:2403.02455 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [30] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Search for displaced leptons in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and 13.6 TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector,” [arXiv:2410.16835 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [31] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, “MicrOMEGAs: A Program for calculating the relic density in the MSSM,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **149** (2002) 103–120, [arXiv:hep-ph/0112278](#).
- [32] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, “micrOMEGAs: Version 1.3” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **174** (2006) 577–604, [arXiv:hep-ph/0405253](#).
- [33] **LZ** Collaboration, J. Aalbers *et al.*, “Dark Matter Search Results from 4.2 Tonne-Years of Exposure of the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment,” [arXiv:2410.17036 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [34] C. A. J. O’Hare, “New Definition of the Neutrino Floor for Direct Dark Matter Searches,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** no. 25, (2021) 251802, [arXiv:2109.03116 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] J. Hisano, S. Matsumoto, M. Nagai, O. Saito, and M. Senami, “Non-perturbative effect on thermal relic abundance of dark matter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **646** (2007) 34–38, [arXiv:hep-ph/0610249](#).
- [36] A. Hryczuk, R. Iengo, and P. Ullio, “Relic densities including Sommerfeld enhancements in the MSSM,” *JHEP* **03** (2011) 069, [arXiv:1010.2172 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] A. Hryczuk and R. Iengo, “The one-loop and Sommerfeld electroweak corrections to the Wino dark matter annihilation,” *JHEP* **01** (2012) 163, [arXiv:1111.2916 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *JHEP* 06, 137 (2012)].
- [38] S. Bottaro, D. Buttazzo, M. Costa, R. Franceschini, P. Panci, D. Redigolo, and L. Vittorio, “Closing the window on WIMP Dark Matter,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 1, (2022) 31, [arXiv:2107.09688 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [39] S. Bottaro, D. Buttazzo, M. Costa, R. Franceschini, P. Panci, D. Redigolo, and L. Vittorio, “The last complex WIMPs standing,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 11, (2022) 992, [arXiv:2205.04486 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [40] A. Boveia *et al.*, “Snowmass 2021 Dark Matter Complementarity Report,” [arXiv:2211.07027 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [41] M. Fujii and T. Yanagida, “Natural gravitino dark matter and thermal leptogenesis in gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **549** (2002) 273–283, [arXiv:hep-ph/0208191](#).

- [42] K. Hamaguchi, M. Ibe, T. T. Yanagida, and N. Yokozaki, “Testing the Minimal Direct Gauge Mediation at the LHC,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90** no. 1, (2014) 015027, [arXiv:1403.1398 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] S. Dimopoulos, G. F. Giudice, and A. Pomarol, “Dark matter in theories of gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking,” *Phys. Lett. B* **389** (1996) 37–42, [arXiv:hep-ph/9607225](#).
- [44] T. Han and R. Hempfling, “Messenger sneutrinos as cold dark matter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **415** (1997) 161–169, [arXiv:hep-ph/9708264](#).
- [45] A. D. Linde, “Relaxing the cosmological moduli problem,” *Phys. Rev. D* **53** (1996) R4129–R4132, [arXiv:hep-th/9601083](#).
- [46] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi, and T. T. Yanagida, “Cosmological Moduli Problem in Low Cutoff Theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 043507, [arXiv:1112.0418 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi, and T. T. Yanagida, “Gravity mediation without a Polonyi problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **714** (2012) 256–261, [arXiv:1203.2085 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, “Extracting supersymmetry breaking effects from wave function renormalization,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **511** (1998) 25–44, [arXiv:hep-ph/9706540](#).
- [49] N. Arkani-Hamed, G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, and R. Rattazzi, “Supersymmetry breaking loops from analytic continuation into superspace,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 115005, [arXiv:hep-ph/9803290](#).
- [50] S. P. Martin, “Generalized messengers of supersymmetry breaking and the sparticle mass spectrum,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 3177–3187, [arXiv:hep-ph/9608224](#).