

Search for Light Dark Matter with accelerator and direct detection experiments: comparison and complementarity of recent results

S. N. Gninenko¹ *, D. V. Kirpichnikov¹ †, N. V. Krasnikov^{1,2} ‡

¹ Institute for Nuclear Research RAS, Moscow 117312, Russia

² JINR, Dubna, Russia

August 2, 2023

Abstract

We discuss the most sensitive constraints on Light Dark Matter (LDM) from accelerator experiments NA64 and BaBar and compare it with recent results from direct searches at XENON1T, DAMIC-M, SuperCDMS, and DarkSide-50. We show that for the dark photon (A') model with scalar LDM, NA64 gives more stringent bounds for A' masses $m_{A'} \leq 0.15 \text{ GeV}$ than direct searches. Moreover, for the case of Majorana LDM the damping DM velocity v factor, $v^2 \sim O(10^{-6})$, for the elastic LDM electron(nucleon) cross section makes direct observation of Majorana LDM extremely challenging, while the absence of this suppression in the NA64 case gives an advantage to the experiment. The similar situation takes place for pseudo-Dirac LDM. The BaBar provides the most stringent bounds for A' masses $m_{A'} \geq 0.35 \text{ GeV}$. For scalar LDM the direct detection experiments give more stringent bounds at $m_{A'} \geq 0.35 \text{ GeV}$ while for Majorana and pseudo-Dirac LDM case, the BaBar bounds are more stringent. The complementarity of the two approaches in searching for LDM is underlined.

*Sergei.Gninenko@cern.ch

†kirpich@ms2.inr.ac.ru

‡Nikolai.Krasnikov@cern.ch

1 Introduction

At present the most striking evidence in favour of new physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) is the existence of Dark Matter (DM) in the Universe. The nature of DM is one of the most important questions in modern science. Among numerous candidates for the role of particle DM [1, 2], light DM (LDM) with the mass of DM particles χ below the electroweak scale are of great interest. In the most popular model, a massive vector boson, called dark photon A' , [3–5] interacting with LDM particles in a similar way as the ordinary photon interacts with charged particles in the SM. The mixing of the A' with the photon leads to a new feeble interaction of SM leptons and quarks with LDM particles, allowing LDM and visible matter to be initially in thermal equilibrium during the early universe via annihilation into each other at equal rates. With this assumption it is possible to predict the decoupling cross section of LDM from ordinary matter and the observed relic density of DM in our universe. This in turn, results in relations among four essential parameters - mixing strength ϵ , dark photon mass $m_{A'}$, LDM mass m_χ and the interaction coupling constant e_D ($\alpha_D \equiv \frac{e_D^2}{4\pi}$) of the dark photon with LDM. Note, that the A' interacts with charged particles similar to the ordinary photon with coupling constant $e' = \epsilon e$. Surprisingly, in this framework LDM could be as light as $m_\chi \leq O(1) \text{ GeV}$, and the above mentioned parameters lie in the region which can be probed with accelerator-based and direct detection experiments [6–23].

The benchmark parameter

$$\alpha_D \simeq 0.02 f \left(\frac{10^{-3}}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{A'}}{100 \text{ MeV}} \right)^4 \left(\frac{10 \text{ MeV}}{m_\chi} \right)^2$$

is typically used for comparing the experimental sensitivities to the parameter space of the relic DM density [2, 8, 20–22, 24, 25]. Here, $f \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$ is the coefficient that depends on the specific type of DM. It should be noted that dark photon model is a renormalizable model, with the scalar, Majorana, and pseudo-Dirac LDM cases often discussed.

There are at least two approaches for the search for the LDM particles. In the first one, accelerator experiments are used for the indirect searches for LDM. The typical examples are the fixed-target NA64 experiment at CERN, and BaBar experiment at e^+e^- collider at SLAC [8, 20, 21]. In the second approach, direct searches for signals from collisions of DM particles with nuclei or electrons of a target at direct detection experiments such as XENON1T [26], DAMIC-M [27], SuperCDMS [28], and DarkSide-50 [29] is used. Therefore it would be of great interest to compare the results of the search for LDM particles for accelerator and direct detection experiments. It is clear that the result of the comparison depends on concrete LDM model, thus making the constraints from these two type of searches highly complementary to each other. In this note, we report the results of such a comparison for the A' model. Interestingly, we found that in some cases the accelerator bounds are stronger than the corresponding bounds from direct searches.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we discuss the bounds on LDM from accelerator-based experiments. In Sec. 3 we compare corresponding limits with the constraints from the direct detection experiments. We conclude in Sec. 4.

2 Accelerator bounds

At present the most stringent accelerator bounds were obtained from the NA64 and BaBar experiments that searched for the LDM production in invisible decay mode of the A' medi-




Figure 1: The bounds in the $(m_{A'}, \epsilon)$ plane from NA64 [35] and BaBar [36]. Constraints from direct search experiments XENON1T [26], DAMIC-M [27], SuperCDMS [28], and DarkSide50 [29] derived for scalar/Dirac dark matter and benchmark point $\alpha_D = 0.1$, $\frac{m_{A'}}{m_\chi} = 3$ are also shown.

ator, $A' \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi}$, assuming $2m_\chi < m_{A'}$.

For the A' production, the NA64 experiment at CERN [30, 31] uses the bremsstrahlung reaction of the high-energy electron scattering off nuclei [32]

$$eZ \rightarrow eZA' \quad (1)$$

and the resonant annihilation of high-energy positrons with atomic electrons [33, 34]

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow A' \quad (2)$$

followed by the prompt invisible decay of the A' . New NA64 constraints on the $\gamma - A'$ mixing strength ϵ were obtained recently with the accumulated record $\approx 10^{12}$ electrons on target (EOT) [35]. The NA64 90% C.L. exclusion region in the $(m_{A'}, \epsilon)$ plane [35] is shown in Fig. 1. Constraints obtained by BaBar [36] using the reaction $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A'$, $A' \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi}$ as a source of LDM, and from direct search experiments are also shown. As one can see, the NA64 constraints are the most sensitive for $m_\chi \leq 0.3$ GeV. Note, that NA64 and BaBar limits do not depend on the type of LDM.

3 Direct LDM detection experiments

Direct detection experiments like XENON1T [26] and DAMIC-M [27] searched for LDM in the elastic χ - electron scattering, $\chi e \rightarrow \chi e$, and also in the χ *nucleon* $\rightarrow \chi$ *nucleon*




Figure 2: Bounds for the A' model in the $(\sigma_{e\chi}, m_\chi)$ plane obtained from the results of NA64 [35] and BaBar [36] experiments. Constraints from the direct detection experiments XENON1T [26] and DAMIC-M [27] searching for LDM in the $\chi - e$ scattering derived for the scalar and Dirac DM case and benchmark points $\alpha_D = 0.1$, $\frac{m_{A'}}{m_\chi} = 3(2.2)$ are also shown for comparison. One can see, the NA64 bounds for masses $m_\chi \leq 0.04 \text{ GeV}$ are most stringent.

scattering. In the non-relativistic approximation for the A' model, the spin independent cross section $\sigma(\chi e \rightarrow \chi e)$ for the LDM is determined by [8]

$$\sigma(\chi e \rightarrow \chi e) = \frac{16\pi\alpha\epsilon^2\alpha_D\mu_{\chi e}^2}{m_{A'}^4}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mu_{\chi e} = \frac{m_\chi m_e}{m_\chi + m_e}$ and $\alpha \equiv \frac{e^2}{4\pi} = \frac{1}{137}$.¹ It is worth noticing that in the non-relativistic regime the typical cross section is given by Eq. (3) for both Dirac and scalar LDM. For Majorana LDM particle χ_M the elastic cross section given by

$$\sigma(\chi_M e \rightarrow \chi_M e) = \frac{16\pi\alpha\epsilon^2\alpha_D\mu_{\chi e}^2}{m_{A'}^4} k_M, \quad (4)$$

is suppressed by the factor $k_M = \frac{2\mu_{\chi e}^2}{m_\chi^2} v_\chi^2$ [8]. Here $v_\chi \approx 10^{-3}$ is the velocity of LDM particle in natural units². For LDM proton elastic scattering, the corresponding formulae coincide with (3,4) up to the proton formfactor $F(q^2)$, which with good accuracy is $\simeq 1$ for the LDM particles due to a small transferred momentum $q \simeq m_\chi v_\chi \leq O(1) \text{ MeV}$. The results of the comparison of NA64 [35] and BaBar [36] constraints with those from XENON1T [26], DAMIC-M [27], SuperCDMS [28], and DarkSide-50 [29], for scalar and Dirac LDM particles

¹The interaction of dark photon A' with Dirac dark matter χ has the form $L_{A'\chi} = e_D A'_\mu \bar{\chi} \gamma^\mu \chi$

²In natural units the speed of light $c \equiv 1$.




Figure 3: Comparison of bounds for the A' model in the $(\sigma_{p\chi}, m_\chi)$ plane for the NA64 [35], BaBar [36], SuperCDMS [28], and DarkSide50 [29] experiments. The SuperCDMS and DarkSide50 limits are derived from the searching for LDM in the $\chi - p$ scattering, for the scalar and Dirac DM case and reference points $\alpha_D = 0.1$, $\frac{m_{A'}}{m_\chi} = 3(2.2)$. Here, p is a proton. One can see the NA64 experiment gives the strongest bound at $m_\chi \leq 0.05 \text{ GeV}$

are presented in Figs.1-3. For $m_{A'} > 2m_\chi$ the accelerator bounds are stronger than direct ones for masses $m_\chi \leq 200 \text{ MeV}$. Note, that for the case LDM to be Majorana particles, a damping factor $k_M = \frac{2m_e^2}{m_\chi^2} \cdot O(10^{-6})$ arises, and as a result, the bounds from direct searches are very weak and can't compete with accelerator ones.

Analogous constraints are valid for LDM models with the pseudoscalar (P) or scalar (S) mediator of a new interaction between the dark and visible sectors. The NA64 experiment in this case severely limits the existence of this type of new interactions with an electron [37]. Namely, for the interaction Lagrangians

$$L_S = g_S \bar{\psi} \psi S, \quad (5)$$

$$L_P = i g_P \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi S \quad (6)$$

the NA64 bounds for the coupling constant $\epsilon_S = \frac{g_S}{e}$ and $\epsilon_P = \frac{g_P}{e}$ with electron are weaker by the factor $\sqrt{2}$ than the corresponding bound on ϵ for the A' case for masses $m_S, m_P \gg m_e$ (see, e. g. Ref. [38,39] and references therein). Therefore, the NA64 bounds for the S or P mediators are also more restrictive than the bounds for the mediator masses $\lesssim O(100) \text{ MeV}$.

4 Conclusion

In this paper we have demonstrated that there is a strong complementarity of searches for LDM with accelerator-based and direct detection experiments. Using the latest NA64 results we compare the discovery perspectives of LDM with these two approaches. As one can see from Fig.1, for A' masses $m_{A'} \leq 300 \text{ MeV}$ the projections for NA64 look more optimistic in comparison with direct dark matter detection experiments. Moreover, for the model with the vector mediator and Majorana type DM, the cross section $\sigma(\chi e(p) \rightarrow \chi e(p))$ is suppressed by the factor $k_M = \frac{2\mu_{\chi e}^2}{m_\chi^2} v_\chi^2 = O(10^{-6})$ that makes the observation of LDM scattering in direct experiments extremely challenging or even hopeless, and the accelerator searches, like NA64, more attractive due to absence of such suppression factor. Also for the model with pseudo-Dirac LDM the pseudoelastic reaction $\chi_1 e(p) \rightarrow \chi_2 e(p)$ is impossible for $\Delta = |m_{\chi_2} - m_{\chi_1}| \geq O(10^{-12})$ due to kinematics considerations, while NA64 and other accelerator experiments like BaBar or BELLE don't have such suppression factors.

5 Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Russian Science Foundation RSF grant 21-12-00379. We are indebted to our colleagues from NA64 and INR RAS theoretical department for discussion and comments.

References

- [1] V. A. Rubakov and D. S. Gorbunov, World Scientific, 2017, ISBN 978-981-320-987-9, 978-981-320-988-6, 978-981-322-005-8
- [2] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *Front. Phys.* **69** (1990), 1-547
- [3] L. B. Okun, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **56** (1982), 502 ITEP-48-1982.
- [4] B. Holdom, *Phys. Lett. B* **166** (1986), 196-198
- [5] M. Pospelov, A. Ritz and M. B. Voloshin, *Phys. Lett. B* **662** (2008), 53-61 [arXiv:0711.4866 [hep-ph]].
- [6] C. Boehm and P. Fayet, *Nucl. Phys. B* **683** (2004), 219-263 [arXiv:hep-ph/0305261 [hep-ph]].
- [7] R. Essig, J. A. Jaros, W. Wester, P. Hansson Adrian, S. Andreas, T. Averett, O. Baker, B. Batell, M. Battaglieri and J. Beacham, *et al.* [arXiv:1311.0029 [hep-ph]].
- [8] J. Alexander, M. Battaglieri, B. Echenard, R. Essig, M. Graham, E. Izaguirre, J. Jaros, G. Krnjaic, J. Mardon and D. Morrissey, *et al.* [arXiv:1608.08632 [hep-ph]].
- [9] M. Battaglieri, A. Belloni, A. Chou, P. Cushman, B. Echenard, R. Essig, J. Estrada, J. L. Feng, B. Flaughner and P. J. Fox, *et al.* [arXiv:1707.04591 [hep-ph]].

- [10] J. Beacham, C. Burrage, D. Curtin, A. De Roeck, J. Evans, J. L. Feng, C. Gatto, S. Gninenko, A. Hartin and I. Irastorza, *et al.* J. Phys. G **47** (2020) no.1, 010501 [arXiv:1901.09966 [hep-ex]].
- [11] R. Alemany, C. Burrage, H. Bartosik, J. Bernhard, J. Boyd, M. Brugger, M. Calviani, C. Carli, N. Charitonidis and D. Curtin, *et al.* [arXiv:1902.00260 [hep-ex]].
- [12] P. Agrawal, M. Bauer, J. Beacham, A. Berlin, A. Boyarsky, S. Cebrian, X. Cid-Vidal, D. d'Enterria, A. De Roeck and M. Drewes, *et al.* Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.11, 1015 [arXiv:2102.12143 [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. Essig, Y. Kahn, S. Knapen, A. Ringwald and N. Toro, [arXiv:2203.10089 [hep-ph]].
- [14] B. Batell, N. Blinov, C. Hearty and R. McGehee, [arXiv:2207.06905 [hep-ph]].
- [15] S. Gori, M. Williams, P. Ilten, N. Tran, G. Krnjaic, N. Toro, B. Batell, N. Blinov, C. Hearty and R. McGehee, *et al.* [arXiv:2209.04671 [hep-ph]].
- [16] G. Lanfranchi, M. Pospelov and P. Schuster, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **71** (2021), 279-313 [arXiv:2011.02157 [hep-ph]].
- [17] M. Fabbrichesi, E. Gabrielli and G. Lanfranchi, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-62519-1 [arXiv:2005.01515 [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. Berlin, N. Blinov, G. Krnjaic, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.7, 075001 [arXiv:1807.01730 [hep-ph]].
- [19] A. Boveia, T. Y. Chen, C. Doglioni, A. Drlica-Wagner, S. Gori, W. H. Lippincott, M. E. Monzani, C. Prescod-Weinstein, B. Shakya and T. R. Slatyer, *et al.* [arXiv:2210.01770 [hep-ph]].
- [20] S. N. Gninenko, N. V. Krasnikov and V. A. Matveev, Phys. Part. Nucl. **51** (2020) no.5, 829-858 [arXiv:2003.07257 [hep-ph]].
- [21] S. N. Gninenko, N. V. Krasnikov and V. A. Matveev, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **191** (2021) no.12, 1361-1386
- [22] C. Antel, M. Battaglieri, J. Beacham, C. Boehm, O. Buchmüller, F. Calore, P. Carena, B. Chauhan, P. Cladè and P. Coloma, *et al.* [arXiv:2305.01715 [hep-ph]].
- [23] B. Dutta, W. C. Huang and J. L. Newstead, [arXiv:2302.10250 [hep-ph]].
- [24] P. deNiverville, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011), 075020 [arXiv:1107.4580 [hep-ph]].
- [25] E. Izaguirre, G. Krnjaic, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.9, 094026 [arXiv:1411.1404 [hep-ph]].
- [26] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON], Phys. Rev. Lett. **123** (2019) no.25, 251801 [arXiv:1907.11485 [hep-ex]].
- [27] I. Arnquist *et al.* [DAMIC-M], Phys. Rev. Lett. **130** (2023) no.17, 171003 [arXiv:2302.02372 [hep-ex]].

- [28] M. F. Albakry *et al.* [SuperCDMS], Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) no.11, 2023 [arXiv:2302.09115 [hep-ex]].
- [29] P. Agnes *et al.* [DarkSide-50], Eur. Phys. J. C **83** (2023), 322 [arXiv:2302.01830 [hep-ex]].
- [30] D. Banerjee *et al.* [NA64], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118** (2017) no.1, 011802 [arXiv:1610.02988 [hep-ex]].
- [31] D. Banerjee *et al.* [NA64], Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.7, 072002 [arXiv:1710.00971 [hep-ex]].
- [32] J. D. Bjorken, R. Essig, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009), 075018 [arXiv:0906.0580 [hep-ph]].
- [33] L. Marsicano, M. Battaglieri, M. Bondí, C. D. R. Carvajal, A. Celentano, M. De Napoli, R. De Vita, E. Nardi, M. Raggi and P. Valente, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121** (2018) no.4, 041802 [arXiv:1807.05884 [hep-ex]].
- [34] Y. M. Andreev, D. Banerjee, J. Bernhard, M. Bondi, V. E. Burtsev, A. Celentano, N. Charitonidis, A. G. Chumakov, D. Cooke and P. Crivelli, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.9, L091701 [arXiv:2108.04195 [hep-ex]].
- [35] Y. M. Andreev *et al.* [NA64], [arXiv:2307.02404 [hep-ex]].
- [36] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. Lett. **119** (2017) no.13, 131804 [arXiv:1702.03327 [hep-ex]].
- [37] Y. M. Andreev *et al.* [NA64], Phys. Rev. Lett. **126** (2021) no.21, 211802 [arXiv:2102.01885 [hep-ex]].
- [38] Y. S. Liu and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.1, 016004 [arXiv:1705.01633 [hep-ph]].
- [39] Y. S. Liu, D. McKeen and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.3, 036010 [arXiv:1609.06781 [hep-ph]].