

















WIMP Dark Matter Search using a 3.1 tonne \times year Exposure of the XENONnT Experiment

E. Aprile ¹ J. Aalbers ² K. Abe ³ S. Ahmed Maouloud ⁴ L. Althueser ⁵ B. Andrieu ⁴ E. Angelino ^{6,7}
D. Antón Martín ⁸ S. R. Armbruster ⁹ F. Arneodo ¹⁰ L. Baudis ¹¹ M. Bazyk ¹² L. Bellagamba ¹³
R. Biondi ^{9,14} A. Bismark ¹¹ K. Boese ⁹ A. Brown ¹⁵ G. Bruno ¹² R. Budnik ¹⁴ C. Cai ¹⁶ C. Capelli ¹¹
J. M. R. Cardoso ¹⁷ A. P. Cimental Chávez ¹¹ A. P. Colijn ¹⁸ J. Conrad ¹⁹ J. J. Cuenca-García ¹¹
V. D’Andrea ^{7,*} L. C. Daniel Garcia ⁴ M. P. Decowski ¹⁸ A. Deisting ²⁰ C. Di Donato ^{21,7}
P. Di Gangi ¹³ S. Diglio ¹² K. Eitel ²² S. el Morabit ¹⁸ A. Elykov ²² A. D. Ferella ^{21,7} C. Ferrari ⁷
H. Fischer ¹⁵ T. Flehmke ¹⁹ M. Flierman ¹⁸ D. Fuchs ¹⁹ W. Fulgione ^{6,7} C. Fuselli ¹⁸ P. Gaemers ¹⁸
R. Gaior ⁴ F. Gao ¹⁶ S. Ghosh ²³ R. Giacomobono ²⁴ F. Girard ⁴ R. Glade-Beucke ¹⁵ L. Grandi ⁸
J. Grigat ¹⁵ H. Guan ²³ M. Guida ⁹ P. Gyorgy ²⁰ R. Hammann ^{9,†} A. Higuera ²⁵ C. Hils ²⁰
L. Hoetzsch ^{9,‡} N. F. Hood ²⁶ M. Iacovacci ²⁴ Y. Itow ²⁷ J. Jakob ⁵ F. Joerg ¹¹ Y. Kaminaga ³
M. Kara ²² P. Kavargin ¹⁴ S. Kazama ²⁷ P. Kharbanda ¹⁸ M. Kobayashi ²⁷ D. Koke ⁵ K. Kooshkjalali ²⁰
A. Kopec ^{26,§} H. Landsman ¹⁴ R. F. Lang ²³ L. Levinson ¹⁴ I. Li ²⁵ S. Li ²⁸ S. Liang ²⁵ Z. Liang ²⁸
Y.-T. Lin ⁹ S. Lindemann ¹⁵ M. Lindner ⁹ K. Liu ¹⁶ M. Liu ^{1,16} J. Loizeau ¹² F. Lombardi ²⁰
J. Long ⁸ J. A. M. Lopes ^{17,¶} G. M. Lucchetti ¹³ T. Luce ¹⁵ Y. Ma ²⁶ C. Macolino ^{21,7} J. Mahlstedt ¹⁹
A. Mancuso ¹³ L. Manenti ¹⁰ F. Marignetti ²⁴ T. Marrodán Undagoitia ⁹ K. Martens ³ J. Masbou ¹²
S. Mastroianni ²⁴ A. Melchiorre ^{21,7} J. Merz ²⁰ M. Messina ⁷ A. Michael ⁵ K. Miuchi ²⁹ A. Molinaro ⁶
S. Moriyama ³ K. Morã ¹ Y. Mosbacher ¹⁴ M. Murra ¹ J. Müller ¹⁵ K. Ni ²⁶ U. Oberlack ²⁰
B. Paetsch ¹⁴ Y. Pan ⁴ Q. Pellegrini ⁴ R. Peres ¹¹ C. Peters ²⁵ J. Pienaar ^{8,14} M. Pierre ¹⁸ G. Plante ¹
T. R. Pollmann ¹⁸ L. Principe ¹² J. Qi ²⁶ J. Qin ²⁵ D. Ramírez García ¹¹ M. Rajado ¹¹
A. Ravindran ¹² A. Razeto ⁷ R. Singh ²³ L. Sanchez ²⁵ J. M. F. dos Santos ¹⁷ I. Sarnoff ¹⁰
G. Sartorelli ¹³ J. Schreiner ⁹ P. Schulte ⁵ H. Schulze Eißing ⁵ M. Schumann ¹⁵ L. Scotto Lavina ⁴
M. Selvi ¹³ F. Semeria ¹³ P. Shagin ²⁰ S. Shi ¹ J. Shi ¹⁶ M. Silva ¹⁷ H. Simgen ⁹ A. Stevens ¹⁵
C. Szyszka ²⁰ A. Takeda ³ Y. Takeuchi ²⁹ P.-L. Tan ^{19,1} D. Thers ¹² G. Trincherò ⁶ C. D. Tunnell ²⁵
F. Tönnies ¹⁵ K. Valerius ²² S. Vecchi ³⁰ S. Vetter ²² F. I. Villazon Solar ²⁰ G. Volta ⁹ C. Weinheimer ⁵
M. Weiss ¹⁴ D. Wenz ⁵ C. Wittweg ^{11,**} V. H. S. Wu ²² Y. Xing ¹² D. Xu ¹ Z. Xu ^{1,††}
M. Yamashita ³ J. Yang ²⁸ L. Yang ²⁶ J. Ye ³¹ L. Yuan ⁸ G. Zavattini ³⁰ Y. Zhao ¹⁶ and M. Zhong ²⁶

(XENON Collaboration)^{††}

¹Physics Department, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

²Nikhef and the University of Groningen, Van Swinderen Institute, 9747AG Groningen, Netherlands

³Kamioka Observatory, Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, and Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (WPI), University of Tokyo, Higashi-Mozumi, Kamioka, Hida, Gifu 506-1205, Japan

⁴LPNHE, Sorbonne Université, CNRS/IN2P3, 75005 Paris, France

⁵Institut für Kernphysik, University of Münster, 48149 Münster, Germany

⁶INAF-Astrophysical Observatory of Torino, Department of Physics, University of Torino and INFN-Torino, 10125 Torino, Italy

⁷INFN-Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso and Gran Sasso Science Institute, 67100 L’Aquila, Italy

⁸Department of Physics, Enrico Fermi Institute & Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

⁹Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

¹⁰New York University Abu Dhabi - Center for Astro, Particle and Planetary Physics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

¹¹Physik-Institut, University of Zürich, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland

¹²SUBATECH, IMT Atlantique, CNRS/IN2P3, Nantes Université, Nantes 44307, France

¹³Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Bologna and INFN-Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy

¹⁴Department of Particle Physics and Astrophysics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel

¹⁵Physikalisches Institut, Universität Freiburg, 79104 Freiburg, Germany

¹⁶Department of Physics & Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P.R. China

¹⁷LIBPhys, Department of Physics, University of Coimbra, 3004-516 Coimbra, Portugal

¹⁸Nikhef and the University of Amsterdam, Science Park, 1098XG Amsterdam, Netherlands

¹⁹Oskar Klein Centre, Department of Physics, Stockholm University, AlbaNova, Stockholm SE-10691, Sweden

²⁰Institut für Physik & Exzellenzcluster PRISMA⁺, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany

²¹Department of Physics and Chemistry, University of L’Aquila, 67100 L’Aquila, Italy

²²Institute for Astroparticle Physics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

²³Department of Physics and Astronomy, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

²⁴*Department of Physics “Ettore Pancini”, University of Napoli and INFN-Napoli, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

²⁵*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rice University, Houston, TX 77005, USA*

²⁶*Department of Physics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA*

²⁷*Kobayashi-Maskawa Institute for the Origin of Particles and the Universe, and Institute for Space-Earth Environmental Research, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi 464-8602, Japan*

²⁸*Department of Physics, School of Science, Westlake University, Hangzhou 310030, P.R. China*

²⁹*Department of Physics, Kobe University, Kobe, Hyogo 657-8501, Japan*

³⁰*INFN-Ferrara and Dip. di Fisica e Scienze della Terra, Università di Ferrara, 44122 Ferrara, Italy*

³¹*School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518172, P.R. China*

(Dated: February 26, 2025)

We report on a search for weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) dark matter (DM) via elastic DM-xenon-nucleus interactions in the XENONnT experiment. We combine datasets from the first and second science campaigns resulting in a total exposure of 3.1 tonne \times year. In a blind analysis of nuclear recoil events with energies above 3.8 keV_{NR}, we find no significant excess above background. We set new upper limits on the spin-independent WIMP-nucleon scattering cross-section for WIMP masses above 10 GeV/ c^2 with a minimum of 1.7×10^{-47} cm² at 90% confidence level for a WIMP mass of 30 GeV/ c^2 . We achieve a best median sensitivity of 1.4×10^{-47} cm² for a 41 GeV/ c^2 WIMP. Compared to the result from the first XENONnT science dataset, we improve our sensitivity by a factor of up to 1.8.

Introduction — Observational evidence from galactic to cosmic scales indicates the existence of massive, non-baryonic dark matter (DM) in the Universe [1]. Among numerous models of DM, weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) in the mass range between GeV/ c^2 and a few TeV/ c^2 are one of the most promising and physics-motivated DM candidates, which are naturally predicted by several extensions of the Standard Model [2]. Dual-phase liquid xenon (LXe) time projection chambers (TPCs) are currently the most sensitive experiments directly searching for these particles. They have placed stringent upper limits on cross-sections for elastic spin-independent (SI) WIMP-nucleon interactions [3–5].

The XENONnT [6] experiment is operated underground at the INFN Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso (LNGS). The experiment consists of three nested detectors: the central liquid xenon (LXe) TPC housed in a cryostat is enclosed by a neutron veto (NV) detector [7] which is situated within, but optically separated from, a muon veto (MV) detector [8]. Both veto detectors are inside a 700-tonne water tank and function as water Cherenkov detectors. All data used in this work were acquired with demineralized water, relying on neutron capture on hydrogen as in [3].

The cylindrical TPC is immersed in 8.5 t of LXe, with gaseous xenon (GXe) on top. Particle interactions in the LXe lead to prompt scintillation light as well as ionization electrons. The light is detected by arrays of photomultiplier tubes (PMTs) at both ends of the cylinder. Electrons are moved towards the liquid surface by an electric drift field, where a stronger extraction field accelerates the electrons into the GXe, leading to a drift-delayed proportional scintillation signal. The measured prompt and delayed light signals are denoted S1 and S2, respectively. The S1–S2 combination allows for energy and 3D-position reconstruction. Compared to electronic recoils

(ERs), mainly expected from backgrounds, nuclear recoils (NRs) from WIMP scattering feature smaller S2/S1 ratios, allowing for ER/NR discrimination [9].

The sensitive volume of the detector has a diameter of 1.33 m, a maximum electron drift length of 1.49 m, and contains 5.9 t of LXe. All detector construction materials were selected for low radioactivity [10]. The walls are made of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and cover the inside of the electric field cage [11]. A drift field of 23 V/cm is established between a cathode electrode at the bottom of the active volume and a gate electrode just below the LXe surface. The extraction field is set between the gate and the anode electrode in the gas phase (2.9 kV/cm in the liquid). All electrodes are composed of parallel wires. Two (four) transverse wires support the gate (anode) wires against sagging. Additional parallel-wire screening electrodes protect the PMT arrays, which contain 494 Hamamatsu R11410-21 3” PMTs [12]. PMT pulses above predefined digitization thresholds are recorded with a triggerless data acquisition (DAQ) system [13], stored, and further processed using the software `strax(en)` [14, 15]. Electronegative impurities that affect electron drift, and radon emanating from surfaces are continuously removed from xenon via gas+liquid purification and online distillation, respectively [6, 16–18]. ⁸⁵Kr was removed via cryogenic distillation as well at the start of the experiment.

Dataset — In this Letter, 95.1 days of data from the first science run (SR0) of XENONnT, already published in [3], were combined with new data from the second science run (SR1) that lasted from May 19th, 2022 to August 8th, 2023. The WIMP signal region of the SR1 data was blinded as in [3] until the full analysis procedure had been fixed, while the SR0 data of the previous blind analysis was kept untouched.

During the preparation for SR1 a small amount of

xenon with commercial-grade purity was accidentally injected into the system without prior distillation, resulting in increased ER background levels from ^{85}Kr and ^{37}Ar . Rare gas mass spectrometry [19] of xenon samples indicated a molar concentration of a few ppt $^{\text{nat}}\text{Kr}/\text{Xe}$, which is about a factor 60 higher than the usual level. This initial period of SR1 with an elevated ER background rate is called SR1a and includes one month of cryogenic distillation that reduced the ER background level. The subsequent low-background period is referred to as SR1b. The total live time for SR1 is 186.5 days (66.6 + 119.9 days for SR1a + SR1b). Temperature, pressure and liquid level remained stable at (177.2 ± 0.4) K, (1.92 ± 0.02) bar and (4.8 ± 0.2) mm. The liquid level in SR1 was lowered compared to SR0 by 0.2 mm, which mitigated the occurrence of localized bursts of single electron (SE) emission from the top electrodes at high rates, referred to as hotspot. With a 50 V anode voltage increase, the resulting SE gain of (29.4 ± 0.6) PE/e $^{-}$ (PE denotes photoelectron) was slightly lower than the one in SR0 of 31.2 PE/e $^{-}$. No changes were made to the drift field. The average “electron lifetime” (defined as the mean time for a drifting electron before being attached to an impurity) in SR1 was $21.8_{-9.7}^{+6.7}$ ms. The PMT performance was monitored with regular LED calibrations, and three additional PMTs (20 in total) were excluded from the SR1 data analysis. In contrast to SR0, the radon distillation system was operated at its full capability in a high-flow LXe+GXe combined mode, which led to an average ^{222}Rn activity concentration of $(0.99 \pm 0.01_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.07_{\text{sys}})$ $\mu\text{Bq}/\text{kg}$ in SR1a and $(1.10 \pm 0.01_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.09_{\text{sys}})$ $\mu\text{Bq}/\text{kg}$ in SR1b (with a minimum of $(0.90 \pm 0.01_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.07_{\text{sys}})$ $\mu\text{Bq}/\text{kg}$ reported in [20]), reducing the associated background from ^{214}Pb ground state β -decays by a factor of 1.9 (1.7) in SR1a (SR1b) compared to SR0.

An “event” from a particle interaction is defined by an S1–S2 signal pair. The depth (Z) is reconstructed as the product of electron drift velocity and S1–S2 time difference. The horizontal (X, Y) position is reconstructed from the S2 light distribution on the top PMTs using neural network models [21]. The reconstructed (X, Y, Z) position of the main signal pair is used for signal corrections. The signal reconstruction and corrections in SR1 generally followed the procedures established for SR0 [21]. Since SR0 data is unchanged, we focus on the analysis changes in SR1.

The event position reconstruction in SR1 was improved with a Z-dependent electron drift velocity from electric field simulations [11]. Additionally, a small charge-insensitive volume located at the outer bottom of the TPC, where electric field lines terminate on the sides of the detector, was included in the correction of the reconstructed (X, Y, Z) positions.

In SR1, we observed a higher rate of small S2 signals following large signals, attributed to photoionization on impurities in LXe [22]. The delayed electron signals ap-




FIG. 1. Efficiencies as functions of NR energy for SR1a (dashed) and SR1b (solid). The peak reconstruction efficiency (green) is determined by the S1 three-fold tight coincidence requirement. Adding event building, data-selection (blue) and ROI selection (black) lowers the total efficiency. The energy range where it exceeds 10% is $[0.6, 13.5]$ keV $_{\text{ER}}$ and $[3.8, 64.1]$ keV $_{\text{NR}}$. Recoil energy spectra for three WIMP masses without efficiencies applied are shown in orange. The upper axis shows the conversion of NR energies to the median ER energies.

peared mainly within one full TPC drift time, exhibited a correlation with the preceding signal size, and are time-dependent. The light absorption on impurities induced a percent-level time dependence in the absolute S1 signal size, as well as in the S2 signal fraction observed by the PMTs in the bottom array. The time dependence of both observables with respect to their averages over the whole dataset was corrected. We believe this phenomenology is caused by non-electronegative impurities introduced by the change of mode of the radon distillation system, since no correlated change in electron lifetime was observed. In addition, the stability of the detector response was constantly monitored by α -decays from ^{222}Rn , and the residual time variation was accounted for in the systematic uncertainties of the S1 and S2 light collection efficiencies (LCE).

With the corrected S1 and S2 sizes, denoted as cS1 and cS2, the ER energy in keV $_{\text{ER}}$ is reconstructed as $E = W(cS1/g_1 + cS2/g_2)$, with the mean energy needed to produce one observable quantum (photon or electron) of $W = 13.7$ eV [23]. The photon (electron) gains g_1 (g_2), defined as the average number of detected photoelectrons per produced photon (electron), were $g_1 = (0.1367 \pm 0.0010)$ PE/ph and $g_2 = (16.9 \pm 0.5)$ PE/e $^{-}$.

Data selection criteria were not changed for SR0 and optimized for SR1. A gradient-boosted decision tree (GBDT) was used to reject accidental coincidence (AC) background from incorrectly paired S1 and S2 sig-

nals [24]. This selection was only applied in the “far-wire” region (≥ 4.45 cm from the transverse wires, its complement is termed “near-wire” region), in which the S2 pulse shape is reliably modeled due to lower distortion of the electric field [21]. An S2 threshold of 320 PE was chosen to reduce the risk of AC background mismodeling, higher than the 200 PE in SR0 due to increased AC rates caused by photoionization in SR1. The fiducial volume (FV) retains the same shape as in SR0 but with a tighter radius cut at 58.8 cm, enclosing (4.00 ± 0.15) tonnes of LXe. With respect to the SR0 FV, this tighter radius further excludes 93% of surface background events originating on the detector walls, while retaining 93% of the WIMP signal and leaving the sensitivity nearly unchanged.

The total efficiency consists of signal peak reconstruction, event building, event selection, and region of interest (ROI) selection efficiencies, as shown in Figure 1. The drop in the peak reconstruction efficiency at low energies arises primarily from the three-fold tight coincidence requirement for S1 signals. It is determined via a data-driven approach and validated with Monte-Carlo (MC) simulations using `WFSim` and `fuse` [25, 26]. The event-building efficiency reflects whether an event will be successfully reconstructed or obscured by, e.g., ambient SE peaks following large S2s, and depends on S1 and S2 signal sizes. It is determined by injecting simulated events, preselected to pass peak reconstruction, at random times into the data and processing them through the analysis pipeline using `saltax` [27] and `axidence` [28]. The chance for an event passing the event-building process is anticorrelated with its rejection by selection criteria targeting AC events. Therefore, the efficiency of both processes is evaluated jointly. The event-building efficiency is lower in SR1a than in SR1b due to a higher rate of the hotspot, and is evaluated separately for the near-wire and far-wire regions. Lastly, the ROIs of both SR0 and SR1 are defined as $cS1 \in [0, 100]$ PE and $cS2 \in [10^{2.1}, 10^{4.1}]$ PE. The ROI efficiency uncertainty is primarily determined by the uncertainties in the fitted NR light yield (LY) and charge yield (CY). The total efficiency plateaus at $\sim 71\%$ (77%) for SR1a (SR1b).

Signal and background models — This analysis accounts for backgrounds from ER, NR, AC, and surface events. An internal ^{220}Rn source (external $^{241}\text{AmBe}$ neutron source) is used to constrain the LY and CY of ER (NR). The ER and NR response models are parametrized and fit to the calibration datasets using a Bayesian approach [24] with the software `appletree` [29], which implements an affine invariant Markov-chain Monte Carlo algorithm [30]. For the ER calibration, approximately 4700 events from the β -decay of the Rn daughter ^{212}Pb remained in the ROI after all data selections. In SR0, ^{37}Ar ER calibration was available, enabling a better determination of g_1 and g_2 in the low-energy region, whereas in SR1 it was not. Consequently, a combined

ER fit could fail to account for the crucial uncertainty in the ER distribution in $cS1$ – $cS2$ space, as toy-MC studies have shown that a 1% shift in the ER event distribution along $cS2$ can lead to a 10% change in sensitivity. To properly capture this uncertainty, we fit ER data separately for SR0 and SR1. For the NR calibration, a clean neutron event sample in the TPC was selected by using the NV to detect the 4.44 MeV γ -ray emitted from the AmBe source in coincidence with the neutron emission with a $\sim 50\%$ probability [31]. This resulted in approximately 5700 neutron events within the ROI. We performed a combined NR fit to both SR0 and SR1 AmBe neutron calibration datasets with shared LY and CY parameters. This allows for a better constraint on the underlying single-scatter NR response from multi-site neutron events, due to the highly spatially localized AmBe events and different source positions in SR0 and SR1. We performed 2D Poisson χ^2 goodness-of-fit (GOF) tests using an equiprobable binning scheme in $cS1$ – $cS2$ space on each ER and NR best-fit model, which showed no indication of a mismatch between models and data, with the exception of the SR1 NR model with a p-value slightly below the predefined threshold. The impact on the sensitivity of a potential mismodeling in the NR response was found to be small.

The NR response model uncertainties are parametrized as a relative WIMP signal rate uncertainty in the statistical inference. For ER, the number of response model parameters is reduced while retaining realistic model uncertainties to make the WIMP search likelihood computationally tractable. We use two parameters to represent the ER distribution uncertainty in $cS1$ – $cS2$ space: one from the principal component decomposition [24], and another from a linear combination of g_1 and g_2 with a correlation coefficient. These two shape parameters are propagated to the statistical inference of the results.

For the SI WIMP model, the energy spectrum is based on the Helm form factor [32] and the standard halo model parameters as suggested in [33].

The dominant background in this analysis is from ER interactions. The contribution from β -decays of ^{214}Pb , which constituted the primary ER background in SR0, together with β -decays from ^{85}Kr , γ -ray background from detector materials, and solar neutrino-electron scattering, exhibits an approximately flat energy spectrum within the ROI. The double β -decays of ^{136}Xe , which have a low expectation in the ROI, are also included in the flat ER component for this study. The rate of these ER background components is constrained by a fit to the reconstructed ER energy spectrum in $[20, 140]$ keV_{ER} outside of the ROI. For SR1a, the dominant ER background component originates from the elevated level of ^{85}Kr , and a subdominant contribution from the K-shell electron capture of ^{37}Ar (~ 2.8 keV). Its rate in SR1a is constrained by extrapolating the ^{37}Ar decay rate from a reference dataset taken before SR1a. While backgrounds

from ^{85}Kr and ^{37}Ar were reduced to a subdominant level in SR1b, an additional ER background component, with an energy spectrum resembling β -decays of ^3H , was present in both SR1a and SR1b. Since this background component only appears in the ROI, its rate was left unconstrained and determined solely from the science data in the ROI, using the ^3H spectral shape.

The LM+LN (~ 6 keV) and LL (~ 10 keV) shell peaks from the double-electron capture ($2\nu\text{ECEC}$) of ^{124}Xe lie within the WIMP search ROI [34]. In [35], the ER background from $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ was fit with a free CY parameter to account for a lower CY due to higher ionization density of electron captures. In our analysis, however, a likelihood-ratio hypothesis test on SR1 data performed after unblinding did not reject the nominal β -yield hypothesis for the LM+LN and LL shell $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ events. Accordingly, we used the nominal model in which $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ is a part of the flat ER component. This strategy was defined before unblinding. Details on the hypothesis test, as well as the results obtained with the alternative model with free $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ CY parameters, are provided in the supplemental material.

The NR background mainly originates from radiogenic neutrons produced by spontaneous fission and (α, n) reactions in detector materials near the LXe target. A fit to the high-energy γ -spectrum suggests that the radioactivity of the inner cryostat flange is significantly higher than expected from material screening results [10]. The neutron expectation from the MC simulations with updated radioactivity is compatible with the data-driven estimate reported in [3]. While the spatial distribution of the neutron background was derived from the updated MC simulations, the rate was estimated from the neutron sideband, defined by multiple-scatter (MS) and single-scatter (SS) events tagged by the NV as in [7, 24]. The NV tagging efficiency was measured with the same procedure as in [7], resulting in $(55 \pm 2)\%$. With the validated MC framework, the data-driven constraint, and the updated tagging efficiency, the sideband unblinding yields a neutron background expectation in the WIMP ROI of 0.48 ± 0.19 (0.7 ± 0.3) for SR1a (SR1b), and an updated expectation of 0.7 ± 0.3 events for SR0. Another contribution to the NR background is due to coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering ($\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$) of ^8B solar, atmospheric (atm.), and diffuse supernova neutrino background (DSNB). Since neutrinos interact weakly with nuclei, they were modeled as SS events, similar to WIMPs. For all NR background components in SR0, the NR response was updated to the best-fit model from the combined SR0+SR1 calibration fit.

The AC background was modeled in a data-driven approach as in [3, 36], using **axidence** [28]. The model was validated by the events that satisfy all selection criteria, but fail the GBDT or S2 width requirements [21]. The 154 observed events in the sideband were in agreement with the expectation of 137 events. The uncertainty on




FIG. 2. Distribution of events in cS1-cS2 for SR1a (top) and SR1b (bottom). All data points are represented as pie charts indicating the fraction of the likelihood from the best-fit model including a $200 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ WIMP signal, evaluated at the data point. The scatter size is scaled according to the WIMP likelihood fraction for visualization only. In addition, the one (dark shaded/solid line) and two (light shaded/dotted line) sigma contours of the ER, AC, surface background, and $200 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ WIMP signal are shown. The NR background follows a distribution similar to that of WIMPs and is therefore not shown separately.

the AC background rate in SR1 was calculated as the Poisson uncertainty of the sideband expectation, yielding a relative value of 8.5%.

The surface background in the WIMP ROI originates from β -decay events in the ^{210}Pb decay chain on the surface of the TPC wall. These events can lose a significant fraction of ionization electrons, resulting in comparatively smaller S2 signals. The surface background model was constructed in a data-driven way as in [24]. The radial modeling was improved by using ^{210}Pb events with $\text{cS1} \in [100, 300]$ PE, which better represent the background than the previously used ^{210}Po α -events. This update was also applied to SR0. Events outside the FV were used as a sideband to validate the radial distribution of the surface background model, which demonstrated a good match with the data.

TABLE I. Expectation values of the nominal (pre-fit) and best-fit models for SR0 (1.09 tonne \times year), SR1a (0.73 tonne \times year), and SR1b (1.31 tonne \times year), including an unconstrained WIMP signal with a mass of 200 GeV/ c^2 . Connected background colors (c.f. Figure 2) indicate which components share a scaling parameter, coupling their rates across different science runs.

	SR0		SR1a		SR1b	
	Nominal	Best fit	Nominal	Best fit	Nominal	Best fit
ER (flat)	134	136 \pm 12	430 \pm 30	450 \pm 20	151 \pm 11	154 \pm 10
ER (^3H -like)	–	–	62	40 \pm 30	101	80 $^{+18}_{-17}$
ER (^{37}Ar)	–	–	58 \pm 6	55 \pm 5	–	–
Neutron	0.7 \pm 0.3	0.6 \pm 0.3	0.47 \pm 0.19	0.45 \pm 0.19	0.7 \pm 0.3	0.7 \pm 0.3
CE ν NS (solar)	0.16 \pm 0.05	0.16 \pm 0.05	0.010 \pm 0.003	0.010 \pm 0.003	0.019 \pm 0.006	0.019 \pm 0.006
CE ν NS (atm.+DSNB)	0.04 \pm 0.02	0.04 \pm 0.02	0.024 \pm 0.012	0.024 \pm 0.012	0.05 \pm 0.02	0.05 \pm 0.02
AC	4.3 \pm 0.9	4.4 $^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	2.12 \pm 0.18	2.10 \pm 0.18	3.8 \pm 0.3	3.8 \pm 0.3
Surface	13 \pm 3	11 \pm 2	0.43 \pm 0.05	0.42 \pm 0.05	0.77 \pm 0.09	0.76 \pm 0.09
Total background	152	152 \pm 12	553	550 \pm 20	257	239 \pm 15
WIMP (200 GeV/ c^2)	–	1.8	–	1.1	–	2.1
Observed	152		560		245	

Statistical inference — For the statistical analysis of the dataset, we used a log-likelihood-based test statistic with the distributions obtained via toy-MC simulations, as recommended in [33] and detailed in [24]. The computations were performed with the `alea` framework [37]. The likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ depends on the WIMP-nucleon cross-section $\sigma \geq 0$, which is the parameter of interest, and a set of nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, written as the product of three terms, $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{sci}}(\sigma, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{cal}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{anc}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The term \mathcal{L}_{sci} is a product of six terms separating SR0, SR1a, and SR1b, as well as the near-wire and far-wire regions. All six terms are extended unbinned likelihood functions, which model the data in (cS1, cS2, R) for the far-wire region and in (cS1, cS2) for the near-wire region. \mathcal{L}_{cal} is a product over two unbinned likelihood functions in (cS1, cS2) modeling the ER calibration datasets in SR0 and SR1, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anc}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a product of Gaussian constraint terms for nuisance parameters from ancillary measurements. The background and signal components are listed in Table I. Apart from the background expectation values, the set of nuisance parameters comprises the WIMP-mass-dependent relative signal efficiency and four ER shape parameters (two for each SR) that modify the shape in (cS1, cS2) of the different ER components. These parameters are tightly constrained via the term \mathcal{L}_{cal} . The relative signal rate uncertainty is 15% (6%, 4%) in SR0 (SR1a, SR1b) for WIMP masses above ~ 100 GeV/ c^2 , and becomes larger for smaller masses. The rate uncertainty in SR1 is smaller than in SR0 due to a smaller selection efficiency uncertainty.

We employed power-constrained limits (PCL) [33, 38] to prevent excluding regions of parameter space where our sensitivity is low, which could otherwise occur due

to statistical fluctuations or systematic effects. In [3], a conservative power threshold of 0.5 was chosen after identifying an error in the definition of power in [33], effectively truncating the upper limits at the median of the sensitivity band. We have investigated the PCL behavior with toy data, specifically in scenarios involving a shift in the ER event distribution, increased background rates, or increased background uncertainties. These studies revealed no issues that would disqualify a lower power threshold of 0.16. The corresponding truncation of the limits at the $-\sigma$ quantile of the sensitivity band allows for a direct comparison with other experiments [4, 5].

The SR1 signal region unblinding was performed in two steps. First, events in a small region above the median of the NR event distribution with energies above 5 keV $_{\text{ER}}$ were unblinded, containing about 7.5% of expected events from a 1 TeV/ c^2 WIMP signal. This initial step allowed us to investigate potential excessive downward leakage of ER events, as previously observed in [3]. The results of the first unblinding step showed no discrepancy with the nominal model. In the second step, all data in the ROI were unblinded. The regions in cS1-cS2 are indicated in Figure S1 in the supplemental material.

Results — After unblinding, we observed 560 events in SR1a and 245 in SR1b within the ROI, of which 14 and 13, respectively, lie in the previously blinded region (with two additional events in SR1b, which were already unblinded in [36]). The distribution of all events in (cS1, cS2) is shown in Figure 2, the corresponding plot for SR0 is Figure 3 in [3]. Table I shows the best-fit expectation values for all SRs. We performed independent GOF tests on SR1a and SR1b data. The tests were defined before unblinding with p-value thresholds of 2.5% to reject the best-fit model. An unbinned Anderson-Darling (AD) test

[39] was performed in the cS2 dimension, after subtracting the cS1-dependent median of the best-fit model. The data and best-fit models in this space are visualized in Figure 3. Additionally, we performed binned Poisson χ^2 tests using an equiprobable binning scheme in cS1–cS2. We found no indication of mismodeling in any of the tests, with p-values of 0.34 (SR1a) and 0.85 (SR1b) for the AD test, and 0.33 (same for SR1a and SR1b) for the Poisson χ^2 test. We also performed an XY-plane spatial uniformity test of the unblinded events in SR1. It is quantified by the fraction of events in the densest quarter and densest half of the XY plane. We found no indication of a spatial asymmetry for SR1.

The local WIMP discovery significance was evaluated for WIMP masses between $10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $1 \text{ TeV}/c^2$. We found no significant excess above backgrounds with the lowest p-value of 0.13 for a WIMP mass of $1 \text{ TeV}/c^2$. We thus report the WIMP-mass-dependent upper limits of the SI WIMP-nucleon cross-section at 90% confidence level (C.L.), shown in Figure 4 together with the sensitivity band. As we observed no limit below the -1σ sensitivity band, no adjustment is needed to satisfy the power constraint requirement. The most stringent limit on the cross-section is $1.7 \times 10^{-47} \text{ cm}^2$ for a WIMP mass of $30 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. For WIMP masses above $\sim 200 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ the limit scales like $M_{\text{WIMP}}/(1 \text{ TeV}/c^2) \times 3.7 \times 10^{-46} \text{ cm}^2$. The supplemental material includes the limit expressed in terms of the number of WIMP events and the SR1-only result, as well as the limits for spin-dependent (SD) WIMP-nucleon coupling.

Summary and outlook — In summary, we have performed a blind analysis of a combined SR0+SR1 dataset from XENONnT with a total of 186.5 (95.1) days of livetime in SR1 (SR0), resulting in a total exposure of $3.1 \text{ tonne} \times \text{year}$. We found no significant excess above background and placed new limits on the SI WIMP-nucleon interaction cross-section, with an improvement of approximately a factor of 1.5 for WIMP masses above $30 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ compared to the SR0-only results. Running the radon distillation system at its full capacity, we have significantly reduced our ^{222}Rn concentration by a factor 1.9 (1.7) in SR1a (SR1b), resulting in a record-low ER background from ^{214}Pb β -decays.

The experiment continues to take data, with an increased NV tagging efficiency due to 0.05% by-weight gadolinium loading, giving an expected factor ~ 2 reduction of the neutron background. The recent installation of a charcoal purifier shows promise in removing photoionizing impurities, which is expected to result in a lower AC background rate.

We gratefully acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation, Swiss National Science Foundation, German Ministry for Education and Research, Max Planck Gesellschaft, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Helmholtz Association, Dutch Research Council (NWO), Fundacao para a Ciencia e Tecnologia, Weizmann Insti-




FIG. 3. Distribution in cS2 of the observed data and the best-fit model including an unconstrained $200 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ SI WIMP component in SR1a (top) and SR1b (bottom). The cS2 is normalized by subtracting the median μ_{ER} and dividing by the standard deviation σ_{ER} of the ER distribution along cS1. The gray histogram represents the total background expectation. Black dots represent observed event counts, while triangles mark bins with zero events, both with Poisson confidence intervals.




FIG. 4. Upper limits on the SI WIMP-nucleon cross-section (90% C.L.) as a function of the WIMP mass (black line). The sensitivity band is indicated by the region containing 68% (green shaded) and 95% (yellow shaded) of expected upper limits under the background-only hypothesis as well as their median (dashed line). In addition, we show published results from XENONnT using only SR0 data [3], LZ [4], and PandaX-4T [5]. For all, PCL with a power threshold of 0.16 is used (XENONnT SR0 limit recast accordingly).

tute of Science, Binational Science Foundation, Région des Pays de la Loire, Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, Kavli Foundation, JSPS Kakenhi, JST FOREST Program, and ERAN in Japan, Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program, DIM-ACAV+ Région Ile-de-France, and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare. This project has received funding/support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 860881-HIDDeN.

We gratefully acknowledge support for providing computing and data-processing resources of the Open Science Pool and the European Grid Initiative, at the following computing centers: the CNRS/IN2P3 (Lyon - France), the Dutch national e-infrastructure with the support of SURF Cooperative, the Nikhef Data-Processing Facility (Amsterdam - Netherlands), the INFN-CNAF (Bologna - Italy), the San Diego Supercomputer Center (San Diego - USA) and the Enrico Fermi Institute (Chicago - USA). We acknowledge the support of the Research Computing Center (RCC) at The University of Chicago for providing computing resources for data analysis.

We thank the INFN Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso for hosting and supporting the XENON project.

* Also at INFN-Roma Tre, 00146 Roma, Italy

† robert.hammann@mpi-hd.mpg.de

‡ Luisa.Hoetzsch@mpi-hd.mpg.de

§ Now at Department of Physics & Astronomy, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, USA

¶ Also at Coimbra Polytechnic - ISEC, 3030-199 Coimbra, Portugal

** christian.wittweg@physik.uzh.ch

†† zihao.xu@columbia.edu

‡‡ xenon@lngs.infn.it

- [1] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints, *Phys. Rept.* **405**, 279 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0404175.
- [2] L. Roszkowski, E. M. Sessolo, and S. Trojanowski, WIMP dark matter candidates and searches – current status and future prospects, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 066201 (2018), arXiv:1707.06277 [hep-ph].
- [3] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), First Dark Matter Search with Nuclear Recoils from the XENONnT Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 041003 (2023), arXiv:2303.14729 [hep-ex].
- [4] J. Aalbers *et al.* (LZ), First Dark Matter Search Results from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 041002 (2023), arXiv:2207.03764 [hep-ex].
- [5] Z. Bo *et al.* (PandaX), Dark matter search results from 1.54 Tonne · Year exposure of PandaX-4T, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **134**, 011805 (2025).
- [6] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), The XENONnT dark matter experiment, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 784 (2024), arXiv:2402.10446 [physics.ins-det].
- [7] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), The neutron veto of the XENONnT experiment: Results with demineralized water, to be published (2024), arXiv:2412.05264 [physics.ins-det].
- [8] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), Conceptual design and simulation of a water Cherenkov muon veto for the XENON1T experiment, *JINST* **9** (11), P11006 (2014), arXiv:1406.2374 [astro-ph.IM].
- [9] E. Aprile, C. E. Dahl, L. DeViveiros, R. Gaitskell, K. L. Giboni, J. Kwong, P. Majewski, K. Ni, T. Shutt, and M. Yamashita, Simultaneous measurement of ionization and scintillation from nuclear recoils in liquid xenon as target for a dark matter experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 081302 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0601552.
- [10] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), Material radiopurity control in the XENONnT experiment, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10345-6 (2021), arXiv:2112.05629 [physics.ins-det].
- [11] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENONnT), Design and performance of the field cage for the XENONnT experiment, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 138 (2024), arXiv:2309.11996 [hep-ex].
- [12] A. Antochi *et al.*, Improved quality tests of R11410-21 photomultiplier tubes for the XENONnT experiment, *JINST* **16** (08), P08033 (2021), arXiv:2104.15051 [physics.ins-det].
- [13] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), The Triggerless Data Acquisition System of the XENONnT Experiment, accepted by *JINST* (2022), arXiv:2212.11032 [physics.ins-det].
- [14] J. Aalbers *et al.*, AxFoundation/strax: Streaming analysis for xenon experiments (2023).
- [15] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/straxen: Streaming analysis for XENON(nT) (2022).
- [16] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), The liquid-phase xenon purification system of the XENONnT dark matter experiment, In preparation (2024).
- [17] G. Plante, E. Aprile, J. Howlett, and Y. Zhang, Liquid-phase purification for multi-tonne xenon detectors, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 860 (2022), arXiv:2205.07336 [physics.ins-det].
- [18] M. Murra, D. Schulte, C. Huhmann, and C. Weinheimer, Design, construction and commissioning of a high-flow radon removal system for XENONnT, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-11001-9 (2022), arXiv:2205.11492 [physics.ins-det].
- [19] S. Lindemann and H. Simgen, Krypton assay in xenon at the ppq level using a gas chromatographic system and mass spectrometer, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2746 (2014), arXiv:1308.4806 [physics.ins-det].
- [20] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), Radon removal in XENONnT down to the solar neutrino level, to be published (2025), arXiv:2502.04209 [physics.ins-det].
- [21] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), XENONnT Analysis: Signal Reconstruction, Calibration and Event Selection, (2024), arXiv:2409.08778 [hep-ex].
- [22] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), Emission of single and few electrons in XENON1T and limits on light dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 022001 (2022), arXiv:2112.12116 [hep-ex].
- [23] C. E. Dahl, *The physics of background discrimination in liquid xenon, and first results from Xenon10 in the hunt for WIMP dark matter*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton U. (2009).
- [24] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), XENONnT WIMP Search: Signal & Background Modeling and Statistical Inference, (2024), arXiv:2406.13638 [physics.data-an].
- [25] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/wfsim: v1.0.2

- (2022).
- [26] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/fuse: 1.4.2 (2024).
 - [27] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/saltax: v0.1.6 (2024).
 - [28] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/axidence: v0.3.2 (2024).
 - [29] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/appletree: v0.5.1 (2024).
 - [30] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, emcee: The mcmc hammer, *PASP* **125**, 306 (2013), 1202.3665.
 - [31] D. Wenz, *Commissioning of the world's first water Cherenkov neutron veto and first WIMP dark matter search results of the XENONnT experiment*, Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (2023).
 - [32] R. H. Helm, Inelastic and elastic scattering of 187-meV electrons from selected even-even nuclei, *Physical Review* **104**, 1466 (1956).
 - [33] D. Baxter *et al.*, Recommended conventions for reporting results from direct dark matter searches, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 907 (2021), arXiv:2105.00599 [hep-ex].
 - [34] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), Double-Weak Decays of ^{124}Xe and ^{136}Xe in the XENON1T and XENONnT Experiments, *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 024328 (2022), arXiv:2205.04158 [hep-ex].
 - [35] J. Aalbers *et al.* (LZ Collaboration), Dark Matter Search Results from 4.2 Tonne-Years of Exposure of the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment, (2024), arXiv:2410.17036 [hep-ex].
 - [36] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), First Indication of Solar B8 Neutrinos via Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering with XENONnT, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 191002 (2024), arXiv:2408.02877 [nucl-ex].
 - [37] XENON Collaboration, XENONnT/alea: v0.3.0 (2024).
 - [38] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, Power-Constrained Limits, (2011), arXiv:1105.3166 [physics.data-an].
 - [39] T. W. Anderson and D. A. Darling, Asymptotic theory of certain "goodness of fit" criteria based on stochastic processes, *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 193 (1952).
 - [40] D. J. Temples, J. McLaughlin, J. Bargemann, D. Baxter, A. Cottle, C. E. Dahl, W. H. Lippincott, A. Monte, and J. Phelan, Measurement of charge and light yields for ^{127}Xe *l*-shell electron captures in liquid xenon, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 112001 (2021).
 - [41] P. Klos, J. Menéndez, D. Gazit, and A. Schwenk, Large-scale nuclear structure calculations for spin-dependent WIMP scattering with chiral effective field theory currents, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 083516 (2013), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 89, 029901 (2014)], arXiv:1304.7684 [nucl-th].
 - [42] M. Hoferichter, J. Menéndez, and A. Schwenk, Coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering: EFT analysis and nuclear responses, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 074018 (2020), arXiv:2007.08529 [hep-ph].
 - [43] C. Amole *et al.* (PICO), Dark Matter Search Results from the Complete Exposure of the PICO-60 C_3F_8 Bubble Chamber, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 022001 (2019), arXiv:1902.04031 [astro-ph.CO].

Supplemental Material

Charge yield of ^{124}Xe double-electron capture events

The $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ of ^{124}Xe contributes to the ER background in the WIMP ROI with an expected number of (4.5 ± 0.7) events in SR0 and (9.1 ± 1.4) events in SR1 from the LM + LN ($\sim 6\text{keV}$) and LL ($\sim 10\text{keV}$) peaks. The event rate was constrained via the KK and KL-shell capture peaks outside the ROI, using the branching fractions 72.4% (KK), 20.0% (KL), 1.4% (LL), and 0.7% (LM + LN) [34]. The de-excitation cascade following the capture can lead to an increased ionization density, which may result in a higher recombination probability and thus lower CY compared to β -decay events. A charge suppression factor of ~ 0.9 was measured for L-shell electron capture in ^{127}Xe ($\sim 5.2\text{keV}$) at drift fields above 250V/cm [40], but no such measurement exists for $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ at the 23V/cm field used in this search.

Introducing reduced charge yields as nuisance parameters could bias upper limits by absorbing leakage from other ER backgrounds, artificially lowering them. Thus, we first tested the hypothesis of a reduced CY for the $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ peaks at 23V/cm using SR1 science data. For this, an alternative likelihood function was defined, modeling the $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ peaks as separate components with $r_{\text{LL}} = \text{CY}_{\text{LL}}/\text{CY}_{\beta}$ and $r_{\text{LM}} = \text{CY}_{\text{LM}}/\text{CY}_{\beta}$ as free-floating parameters, without ancillary constraints.

A likelihood-ratio test compared the nominal CY hypothesis ($r_{\text{LL}} = r_{\text{LM}} = 1$) against an unconstrained alternative. A test size of $\alpha = 5\%$ was chosen to limit the rate of false WIMP discovery for several scenarios with reduced $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ charge yields when not modeled appropriately ($> 3\sigma$ false WIMP discovery rate below 0.5%). After unblinding the data, a p-value of 0.09 was observed, so the nominal CY hypothesis was not rejected. As a result, the nominal model without charge yield suppression, as described in the main text, was used for the WIMP search. The best-fit model using only SR1 science data is illustrated in Figure S1, yielding $r_{\text{LL}} \approx 0.9$ and $r_{\text{LM}} \approx 0.8$. The best-fit results using the combined SR0+SR1 dataset are $r_{\text{LL}} = 0.80^{+0.08}_{-0.04}$ and $r_{\text{LM}} = 0.72^{+0.11}_{-0.04}$.

For comparison, we also report the upper limits using an alternative statistical model with yields as nuisance parameters. The LM+LN peak yield was loosely constrained to $r_{\text{LM}} = 0.9 \pm 0.1$, based on a conservative extrapolation [40]. The resulting upper limits are shown in Figure S2 (left), plotted relative to the sensitivity of the nominal model. At high WIMP masses, the upper limit is a factor of 1.3 more stringent compared to the nominal model. The sensitivity was computed with a nominal value of $r_{\text{LL}} = 0.8$. The competing effects of increased background leakage and the added degrees of freedom largely cancel, leaving the sensitivity mostly unchanged.




FIG. S1. The $cS1$ - $cS2$ distribution for SR1, from Figure 2. The model was modified to include the LM+LN and LL $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ peaks with unconstrained CY while excluding the WIMP component. The regions corresponding to the first (solid gray) and second (hatched gray) steps of unblinding are also indicated.

SR1-only and WIMP event count limits

Alongside the upper limits derived from the combined SR0+SR1 dataset, we also present the results obtained using only the SR1 dataset. These are shown in Figure S2 (right) relative to the combined result. For all masses, the upper limit is above the median, indicating a slight overfluctuation.

Additionally, we present the sensitivity and limits expressed in terms of the corresponding number of WIMP events in Figure S3.

Results on spin-dependent WIMP-nucleon interactions

Using the combined dataset in this analysis, we also computed the upper limit on cross-sections for spin-dependent (SD) WIMP-nucleon interactions. Since the interaction vanishes for zero nuclear spin, only two xenon isotopes, ^{129}Xe and ^{131}Xe , contribute. The nuclear




FIG. S2. Sensitivity and upper limits for the model incorporating reduced $2\nu\text{ECEC}$ CY parameters (left) and SR1-only (right), shown relative to the sensitivity of the nominal model for the full SR0+SR1 dataset. The dark (light) shaded region contains 68% (95%) of expected upper limits under the background-only hypothesis and the dashed colored lines indicate respective medians. The solid colored lines represent the observed upper limits for each model. The black lines correspond to the observed upper limit of the nominal model shown in Figure 4.




FIG. S3. Sensitivity band (yellow-green), median upper limit (dashed line), and observed upper limit (solid line) for the SI SR0+SR1 WIMP search, all expressed in terms of the number of WIMP events.

structure factors used in this analysis are the medians from [41]. A more recent study [42] provides improved results for the SD structure factors. As these still exhibit considerable uncertainties, we report limits with respect to the reference model recommended in [33]. The resulting limits are shown in Figure S4.




FIG. S4. Upper limits on the spin-dependent WIMP-nucleon cross-section, for the “neutron-only” (top) and “proton-only” (bottom) cases. As in Figure 4, we show published results from XENONnT using only SR0 data [3] (limit recast with a power threshold of 0.16), LZ [4], and PandaX-4T [5]. Results from PICO-60 [43] are shown in the bottom plot only.