#### Koushik Dutta

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkaka

#### Constraining non-thermal Dark Matter Physics Depa by CMB

(arXiv:1808.02659) with Rouzbeh Allahverdi and Anshuman Maharana Physics Department Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

1st April 2019

# Key Points (arXiv:1808.02659)

- \* Early matter domination (EMD) is observationally allowed
- \* Dark matter (DM) can be produced non-thermally
- Correct DM abundance puts a lower bound on the duration of EMD
- Inflationary scalar spectral index puts an upper bound on the duration of EMD
- A large class of inflation models (r < 0.01) are not compatible\*\*</li>
   with EMD

DM abundance 
$$\Delta N_{EMD} \leftarrow CMB$$

## Plan

- \* Key points of Inflation, and DM production
- \* EMD history of the Universe
- DM production during EMD
- Relating to inflationary observables
- Constraints on models

# From data ONLY

- \* At the time of BBN, the Universe was radiation dominated
- The existence of primordial spectrum

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{R}}^2(k) = A_s (k/k_*)^{n_s - 1}$$

- \* Coherent super-Hubble perturbations (.. due to inflation)
- Dark matter .. gravitational collapse

#### Inflation Observables



$$V^{1/4} \sim \left(\frac{r}{0.01}\right)^{1/4} \ 10^{16} \ GeV$$

#### Inflation Observables



$$n_s = 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta$$

# Thermal History



# Thermal History



$$N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4} ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh}$$

Liddle, Leach (2003)

$$\Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})} \log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right)$$

# Making Predictions

\* Compute observables in terms of  $N_{k_*}$  and see whether it fits for  $N_{k_*} = 50$  and 60 ('theoretical prior')









Thermal Freeze-In: DM particles never in thermal equilibrium



Produced from annihilation of SM particles

#### Thermal Freeze-In: DM particles never in thermal equilibrium



Produced from annihilation of SM particles

**Decays:** DM is produced from decay of parent particle, and remains non-thermal

$$\left(\frac{n_{\chi}}{s}\right)_{dec} = \frac{3T_R}{4m_{\phi}}Br_{\phi \to \chi}$$

#### Indirect Observations

#### CMB + FERMI + AMS



'Freeze-out' in RD universe leads to overproduction of DM

# Moduli Dynamics & EMD

\* Moduli arise naturally in SUSY/String models - massive and long lived  $\Gamma_{\varphi} = \frac{c}{2\pi} \frac{m_{\varphi}^3}{M_{Pl}^2} \quad \text{typically with } c \sim 0.1 - 1$ 

# Moduli Dynamics & EMD

Moduli arise naturally in SUSY/String models - massive and long \* lived  $\Gamma_{\varphi} = \frac{c}{2\pi} \frac{m_{\varphi}^3}{M_{Pl}^2} \qquad \text{typically with } c \sim 0.1 - 1$ 

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 - \frac{1}{2}H^2(\varphi - \hat{\varphi})^2 - V_{inf}(\chi)$$

$$m_{\varphi} << H_{inf}$$

Displaced during inflation:  $Y = \varphi_0 / M_{Pl} \sim 1$ Dine, Randall, Thomas Dvali Antusch, K.D, Halter

Cicoli, K.D, Maharana, Quevedo

- Start oscillating when  $H \sim m_{\omega}$ \*

Decay and reheats the Universe  $T_R \sim \left(\frac{m_{\varphi}}{50 \text{ TeV}}\right)^{3/2} 3 \text{ MeV}$ 

BBN requires  $T_R > 3 \text{ MeV} \longrightarrow m_{\varphi} > 50 \text{ TeV}$  BBN bound

# Non-standard Thermal History



- Moduli oscillations change the thermal history of the Universe
- All preexisting DM or baryon asymmetry are washed away!



Kane, Sinha, Watson (2015)

# Dynamics of EMD

- \* The field starts to oscillate when  $H \sim m_{\varphi} \simeq H_{osc}$
- \* Fractional energy density at the onset of oscillations

$$\alpha_0 \simeq (\phi_0/M_{Pl})^2 = Y^2$$

As oscillations behaves like matter

$$\alpha(t) \propto a(t) \propto H^{-1/2}$$

\* EMD starts when  $\alpha(t) \simeq 1$   $H_{dom} \simeq \alpha_0^2 m_{\varphi}$ 



- \* Decay of oscillations happens when  $H \simeq \Gamma_{\varphi} = H_R$
- \* After thermalisation RD universe

$$T_R \simeq \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*,R}}\right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\Gamma_{\varphi} M_{Pl}}$$

# Decay during EMD

- \* Decay of oscillations happens when  $H \simeq \Gamma_{\varphi} = H_R$
- \* After thermalisation RD universe

$$T_R \simeq \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*,R}}\right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\Gamma_{\varphi} M_{Pl}}$$

Decay is a continuous process where subdominant radiation component grow continuously

Instantaneous temperature of decay products

Giudice, Kolb, Riotto; Erickcek

$$T = \left(\frac{6\sqrt{g_{*,R}}}{5g_*}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{30}{\pi^2}\right)^{1/8} \left(HT_R^2 M_{Pl}\right)^{1/4}$$

\* During EMD for  $H >> \Gamma_{\varphi}$ , we have  $T >> T_R$ 

DM production from thermal processes (freeze-out/in) possible during EMD  $m_{\chi}/25 \lesssim T_f \lesssim m_{\chi}/5$ 

# Freeze-out during EMD

Giudice, Kolb, Riotto; Erickcek

$$\Omega_{\chi} h^2 \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-4} \frac{\sqrt{g_{*,\mathrm{R}}}}{g_{*,\mathrm{f}}} \left(\frac{m_{\chi}/T_{\mathrm{f}}}{15}\right)^4 \left(\frac{150}{m_{\chi}/T_{\mathrm{R}}}\right)^3 \times \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-26} \mathrm{\ cm^3 \ s^{-1}}}{\langle \sigma_{\mathrm{ann}} v \rangle_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)$$

# Freeze-out during EMD

Giudice, Kolb, Riotto; Erickcek

$$\Omega_{\chi}h^{2} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-4} \frac{\sqrt{g_{*,\mathrm{R}}}}{g_{*,\mathrm{f}}} \left(\frac{m_{\chi}/T_{\mathrm{f}}}{15}\right)^{4} \left(\frac{150}{m_{\chi}/T_{\mathrm{R}}}\right)^{3} \times \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-26} \mathrm{~cm^{3}~s^{-1}}}{\langle \sigma_{\mathrm{ann}}v \rangle_{\mathrm{f}}}\right)^{4}$$

\* Observational constraint (PLANCK):  $\Omega_{\chi}h^2 < 0.120$ 

$$\frac{H_{\rm f}}{H_{\rm R}} \gtrsim 4 \times 10^{-2} \left(g_{*,\rm R} \ g_{*,\rm f}\right)^{-1/3} \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{T_{\rm f}}\right)^{4/3} \times \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-26} \ \rm cm^3 \ s^{-1}}{\langle \sigma_{\rm ann} v \rangle_{\rm f}}\right)^{4/3}$$

\* Using  $H_{\rm dom} > H_{\rm f}$  and  $m_{\chi} \gtrsim 5T_{\rm f}$ 

$$\frac{H_{\rm dom}}{H_{\rm R}} \gtrsim 4 \times 10^{-2} \left(g_{*,\rm R} \ g_{*,\rm f}\right)^{-1/3} \times \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-26} \ \rm cm^3 \ s^{-1}}{\langle \sigma_{\rm ann} v \rangle_{\rm f}}\right)^{4/3}$$

# Freeze-in during EMD

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Giudice, Kolb, Riotto;} \quad \text{Erickcek} \\ & \Omega_{\chi} h^2 \simeq 0.062 \frac{g_{*,\text{R}}^{3/2}}{g_*^3(m_{\chi}/4)} \left(\frac{150}{m_{\chi}/T_{\text{R}}}\right)^5 \left(\frac{T_{\text{R}}}{5 \text{ GeV}}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle_{\text{f}}}{10^{-36} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}}\right) \\ & \overline{H_{\text{dom}}} \\ & \overline{H_{\text{R}}} \gtrsim 4 \times 10^3 \left(g_{*,\text{R}} \ g_*^5(m_{\chi}/4)\right)^{-1/7} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle_{\text{f}}}{10^{-36} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}}\right)^{4/7} \end{aligned}$$

# Freeze-in during EMD

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Giudice, Kolb, Riotto;} \quad \text{Erickcek} \\ & \Omega_{\chi} h^2 \simeq 0.062 \frac{g_{*,\text{R}}^{3/2}}{g_*^3(m_{\chi}/4)} \left(\frac{150}{m_{\chi}/T_{\text{R}}}\right)^5 \left(\frac{T_{\text{R}}}{5 \text{ GeV}}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle_{\text{f}}}{10^{-36} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}}\right) \\ & \overline{H_{\text{dom}}} \\ & \overline{H_{\text{R}}} \gtrsim 4 \times 10^3 \left(g_{*,\text{R}} \ g_*^5(m_{\chi}/4)\right)^{-1/7} \times \left(\frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle_{\text{f}}}{10^{-36} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}}\right)^{4/7} \end{aligned}$$

Sinha

# Decay at the end of EMD

24

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_{\chi} \\ s \end{pmatrix}_{dec} = \begin{pmatrix} n_{\chi} \\ s \end{pmatrix}_{obs} \longrightarrow \frac{3T_{\rm R}}{4m_{\phi}} \operatorname{Br}_{\phi \to \chi} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{1 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\chi}}\right)$$
 Allahverdi, Dutta, Sinha  

$$H_{dom} \simeq \alpha_0^2 m_{\varphi}$$

$$T_R < T_f < \frac{m_{\chi}}{5}$$
 
$$\frac{H_{\rm dom}}{H_{\rm R}} \gtrsim 10^{10} \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*,\rm R}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M_{\rm P}}{1 \text{ GeV}}\right) \alpha_0^2 \operatorname{Br}_{\phi \to \chi}$$
Independent from annihilation cross-section

## Comments

- For smaller annihilation cross-section, we need enough dilution:
   Lower bound on the duration of EMD
- \* This bound can be more robust if we know more about  $T_R, m_{\chi}, \langle \sigma_{ann} v \rangle$
- Freeze-out/in bound depends mostly on DM parameters, whereas decay depends on the EMD driving scalar field
- (Decay+Freeze-out) or (Decay+ Freeze-in) must be satisfied simultaneously.
- Strongest constraint comes from decay process abundance

$$\left(\frac{H_{\rm dom}}{H_{\rm R}} \gtrsim 10^{10} \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*,\rm R}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M_{\rm P}}{1 \text{ GeV}}\right) \alpha_0^2 \text{ Br}_{\phi \to \chi}\right)$$

## **EMD** and Inflation

$$N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4} ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh} - \Delta N_{EMD}$$

Liddle, Leach

K.D, Maharana

$$\Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})} \log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right)$$

$$\Delta N_{EMD} \equiv \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{H_{dom}}{H_R} \right)$$

Implications for inflation models:

$$\left( N_{inf} = \left( 55 - \frac{1}{3} ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{16\pi} M_{pl} Y^2}{m_{\varphi}} \right) \right) \pm 5$$

Das, K.D, Maharana Cicoli, K.D, Maharana, Quevedo

## **EMD** and Inflation

$$N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4} ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh} - \Delta N_{EMD}$$

Liddle, Leach

 $N_{inf} =$ 

K.D, Maharana

 $\frac{\sqrt{16\pi}M_{pl}Y^2}{m_{\varphi}}$ 

$$\Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})} \log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right)$$

$$\Delta N_{EMD} \equiv \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{H_{dom}}{H_R} \right)$$

Implications for inflation models:

0.5

1.0

1.5

2.0

 $\left(55-\frac{1}{3}ln\right)$ 

log(a H)

14

13

12

11

10

Das, K.D, Maharana Cicoli, K.D, Maharana, Quevedo

Green: thermal history Red: non-thermal wrong history Blue: non-thermal correct history

 $\pm 5$ 

log(a)

2.5

$$N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4}ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh} - \Delta N_{EMD} \qquad \Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})}log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right)$$
$$\Delta N_{reh} > 0 \qquad 0 \le w_{re} \le 1/3$$
$$\Delta N_{EMD} \lesssim 57.3 - N_{k_*} + \frac{1}{4}ln \ r$$

 $N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4} ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh} - \Delta N_{EMD} \qquad \Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})} log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right)$ 

 $\Delta N_{reh} > 0 \qquad \qquad 0 \le w_{re} \le 1/3$ 

$$\Delta N_{EMD} \lesssim 57.3 - N_{k_*} + \frac{1}{4} \ln r$$

Inflationary observables

Class I models a = c and  $b \sim \mathcal{O}(10)$ Starobinsky, Higgs inflation with  $a = 2, b \sim 12$  $r \leq \mathcal{O}(0.01)$ 

$$n_{s} \simeq 1 - \frac{a}{N_{k_{*}}} , \quad r \simeq \frac{b}{N_{k_{*}}^{c}}$$

$$Class II models$$

$$b = 8(a - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad c = 1$$

$$V(\varphi) \propto \varphi^{2(a - 1)}$$

 $r \sim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ 

# Connecting to CMB

Observations:  $n_s^{min} \le n_s \le n_s^{max}$ 

$$N_{k_*}^{\min} = \frac{a}{1 - n_s^{\min}} , \quad N_{k_*}^{\max} = \frac{a}{1 - n_s^{\max}}$$
$$\Delta N_{\rm EMD} \lesssim 57.3 - N_{k_*}^{\min} + \frac{1}{4} \ln r(N_{k_*}^{\min})$$

# Connecting to CMB

Observations:  $n_s^{min} \le n_s \le n_s^{max}$ 

$$N_{k_*}^{\min} = \frac{a}{1 - n_s^{\min}} , \quad N_{k_*}^{\max} = \frac{a}{1 - n_s^{\max}}$$
$$\Delta N_{\rm EMD} \lesssim 57.3 - N_{k_*}^{\min} + \frac{1}{4} \ln r(N_{k_*}^{\min})$$

	PLANCK18			PLANCK18 + BK14 + BAO		
Inflation Models	$N_{k_*}^{min}$	$r(N_{k_*}^{min})$	$\Delta N_{EMD}^{up}$	$N_{k_*}^{min}$	$r(N_{k_*}^{min})$	$\Delta N_{EMD}^{up}$
$V(\phi) \sim \phi^{4/3}$	39.4	0.13	17.4	41.2	0.13	15.5
$V(\phi) \sim \phi$	35.5	0.11	21.3	37.1	0.11	19.6
Starobinsky/Higgs Inflation	47.3	0.0054	8.7	49.5	0.0049	6.5
Kähler Moduli Inflation	47.3	$9.46 \times$	4.8	49.5	$8.24 \times$	2.57
		$10^{-10}$			$10^{-10}$	
Goncharov-Linde Model ( $\alpha = 1/9$ )	47.1	0.00059	8.1	49.3	0.00054	5.8

# Bound



DM abundance

CMB

# Bound

$$\left(10^{10} \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_{*,R}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{1GeV}\right) \alpha_0^2 Br_{\varphi \to \chi} < \left(\frac{H_{dom}}{H_R}\right) < 6(57.3 - N_{k_*}^{\min} + \frac{1}{4} \ln r(N_{k_*}^{\min}))\right)$$

#### DM abundance



#### CMB

- The bound is
   conservative and model
   independent
- More inputs of reheating, particle physics models will make the bound stronger

# Implications



- Models with  $r \leq \mathcal{O}(0.01)$  strong constraints
- \* When EMD field is a moduli  $\varphi_0 \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$

$$\mathcal{O}(10^{-3}) \lesssim \operatorname{Br}_{\phi \to \chi} \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$$

EMD epoch from moduli oscillations is ruled out!

- \* When EMD field is visible sector field: allowed  $\alpha_0 \ll 1$  and/or  $Br_{\phi \to \chi} \ll 10^{-3}$
- \* For future experiments, freeze-out/in contributions might be important  $\alpha_0^2 \operatorname{Br}_{\varphi \to \chi} \lesssim 10^{-25}_{34}$

#### Comments

$$\begin{split} N_{k_*} \sim 57.3 + \frac{1}{4} ln(r) - \Delta N_{reh} - \Delta N_{EMD} & \Delta N_{reh} \equiv \frac{1 - 3w_{reh}}{6(1 + w_{reh})} log\left(\frac{H_{inf}}{H_{reh}}\right) \\ \Delta N_{reh} > 0 & 0 \le w_{re} \le 1/3 \\ \hline \Delta N_{EMD} \lesssim 57.3 - N_{k_*} + \frac{1}{4} ln \ r \end{split}$$

- \* More inputs from reheating will strengthen the bound
- Future CMB experiments are expected to shrink the error bar on the spectral index by a factor of ~ 2!
- \* In extension of  $\Lambda CDM + r$  model the constraints are going to be weaker!

# Why Important?

- \* BBN corresponds to 1 pc scales extremely non-linear scale today
- Primordial gravity wave signals gets further suppressed due to \* 10<sup>-12</sup> EMD 10<sup>-14</sup> 10<sup>-16</sup> r=0.1 2<sub>gw</sub>(f) 10<sup>-18</sup> Nakayama, Saito, Suwa, Yokoyama r=0.001 10<sup>-20</sup>  $T_R = 10^5 \text{GeV}$ 10<sup>-22</sup>  $T_R = 10^9 \text{GeV}$ 10<sup>-24</sup> 10<sup>-10</sup> 10<sup>-5</sup>  $10^{-15}$ 10<sup>0</sup>  $10^{5}$  $10^{-20}$ f [Hz]
- Other than particle physics inputs, (probably) correlating with CMB observables is the only way!

# Conclusion

- Viability of non-thermal DM from a period of EMD in light of CMB data
- \* We focussed on  $\langle \sigma_{\rm ann} v \rangle_{\rm f} < 3 \times 10^{-26} {\rm cm}^3 s^{-1}$
- Lower bound on the duration of EMD from DM abundance, and upper bound from CMB observables
- \* Models with  $r \leq O(0.01)$  disfavours non-thermal SUSY DM from a modulus-driven EMD.

Thank you!