The Characterization of the Gamma-Ray Signal from the Central Milky Way:
A Compelling Case for Annihilating Dark Matter



Tim Linden

Einstein/KICP Fellow

University of Chicago

along with:

Tansu Daylan, Doug Finkbeiner, Dan Hooper, Stephen Portillo, Nick Rodd and Tracy Slatyer

arXiv: 1402.6703

Latest Results in Dark Matter Searches - Stockholm, Sweden - May 13, 2014

Dark Matter Indirect Detection

Particle Physics



Astrophysics



Instrumental Response



Slide Concept Courtesy of Gabrijela Zaharijas

The Astrophysical J-Factor

$$\Phi_\gamma \propto J = \frac{1}{\Delta\Omega}\int d\Omega \int_{l.o.s} \rho^2 dl(\phi)$$

Name	GLON (deg)	GLAT (deg)	Distance (kpc)	$\overline{\log_{10}(J^{NFW})}^a$ ($\log_{10}$[$GeV^2\,cm^{-5}\,sr$])
Bootes I	358.1	69.6	66	18.8 ± 0.22
Bootes II	353.7	68.9	42	–
Bootes III	35.4	75.4	47	–
Canes Venatici I	74.3	79.8	218	17.7 ± 0.26
Canes Venatici II	113.6	82.7	160	17.9 ± 0.25
Canis Major	240.0	-8.0	7	–
Carina	260.1	-22.2	105	18.1 ± 0.23
Coma Berenices	241.9	83.6	44	19.0 ± 0.25
Draco	86.4	34.7	76	18.8 ± 0.16
Fornax	237.1	-65.7	147	18.2 ± 0.21
Hercules	28.7	36.9	132	18.1 ± 0.25
Leo I	226.0	49.1	254	17.7 ± 0.18
Leo II	220.2	67.2	233	17.6 ± 0.18
Leo IV	265.4	56.5	154	17.9 ± 0.28
Leo V	261.9	58.5	178	–
Pisces II	79.2	-47.1	182	–
Sagittarius	5.6	-14.2	26	–
Sculptor	287.5	-83.2	86	18.6 ± 0.18
Segue 1	220.5	50.4	23	19.5 ± 0.29
Segue 2	149.4	-38.1	35	–
Sextans	243.5	42.3	86	18.4 ± 0.27
Ursa Major I	159.4	54.4	97	18.3 ± 0.24
Ursa Major II	152.5	37.4	32	19.3 ± 0.28
Ursa Minor	105.0	44.8	76	18.8 ± 0.19
Willman 1	158.6	56.8	38	19.1 ± 0.31

The Fermi-LAT Collaboration (2013)

The J-Factor of the Galactic center is:

$\log_{10}(J) = 21.02$

for a region within 100 pc of the Galactic center and an NFW profile

The Galactic Center "Zoo"



The Galactic Center as an Indirect Detection Target

Positive: Any indirect signal from dark matter annihilation is likely to first be detected at the center of the Milky Way Galaxy

Corollary: Any signal observed elsewhere in the Galaxy should be consistent (or also seen in) the GC

Negative: Astrophysics may make it difficult to conclusively determine that an excess in the galactic center is due to dark matter

A Note about the NFW Profile

$$\rho_{NFW} = \rho_0 \left(\frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_s}\right)^{-3+\gamma}$$

For the rest of the talk, we will model the dark matter profile as a "Generalized NFW profile", with the following functional form.

For studies of the galactic center, the most important parameter is γ, which controls the inner slope, for a canonical NFW profile $\gamma = 1$

The Galactic Center in Gamma-Rays

Back of the Envelope Calculation

- **Total Gamma-Ray Flux from 1-3 GeV within 1° of the GC is ~1 x 10^{-10} erg cm^{-2} s^{-1}**

- **The flux expected from a vanilla dark matter model (100 GeV -> bb with an NFW profile) is ~2 x 10^{-11} erg cm^{-2} s^{-1}**

- **There's no reason this needs to be true -- the total gamma-ray emission from the Galactic center happens to fall within an order of magnitude of the most naive prediction from dark matter simulations**

Previous Efforts

Hooper & Linden (2011)





Abazajian & Kaplinghat (2012)



Results from many groups have used increasingly sophisticated techniques…



Previous Efforts

Hooper & Goodenough (2011)





Hooper & Linden (2011)

…and have remained entirely consistent

Abazajian & Kaplinghat (2012)

channel, m_χ	$TS_\approx$	$-\ln\mathcal{L}$	$\Delta\ln\mathcal{L}$
$b\bar{b}$, 10 GeV	2385.7	139913.6	156.5
$b\bar{b}$, 30 GeV	3460.3	139658.3	411.8
$b\bar{b}$, 100 GeV	1303.1	139881.1	189.0
$b\bar{b}$, 300 GeV	229.4	140056.6	13.5
$b\bar{b}$, 1 TeV	25.5	140108.2	−38.0
$b\bar{b}$, 2.5 TeV	7.6	140114.2	−44.0
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 10 GeV	1628.7	139787.7	282.5
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 30 GeV	232.7	140055.9	14.2
$\tau^+\tau^-$, 100 GeV	4.10	140113.4	−43.3



Gordon & Macias (2013)

Two Interpretations of the Old Data

Dark Matter



Gordon & Macias (2013)

Millisecond Pulsars



Abazajian (2011)

Dark Matter



Gordon & Macias (2013)

Need a WIMP of mass ~25-40 GeV (if annihilating to bb)

Need a slightly adiabatically contracted NFW profile γ ~ 1.1-1.3

Need a dark matter annihilation cross-section ~ 1.5 - 2.5 x 10^{-26}
(for a local density 0.3 GeV cm^{-3})

Millisecond Pulsars

Abazajian (2011)



Need a population of approximately 2000 - 4000 MSPs within the inner degree around the GC

MSPs must follow the square of the spherically symmetric stellar density (dynamical interactions)

Average pulsar spectra must be slightly harder at low energies, and a significant number of pulsars must have escaped detection by radio surveys

Two Interpretations of the Old Data

Dark Matter



Gordon & Macias (2013)

Millisecond Pulsars



Abazajian (2011)

While it is easy to debate the relative strength of these models - it is fair to say data up until this point did not strongly favor either.

Instead, arguments normally were reduced to the relative Bayesian priors you would put on each type of model

Another Region of Interest ?!

In the meantime, Hooper & Slatyer (2013) produced a completely different analysis:

1.) They masked the region |b| < 1º, 2º, and 5º.

2.) Instead of modeling the point sources, they masked the region around bright point sources

3.) They then use template fitting models to allow the normalization of the diffuse emission, isotropic emission, Fermi bubbles template, and dark matter template to float



without a DM template

Another Region of Interest ?!

In the meantime, Hooper & Slatyer (2013) produced a completely different analysis:

1.) They masked the region |b| < 1°, 2°, and 5°.

2.) Instead of modeling the point sources, they masked the region around bright point sources

3.) They then use template fitting models to allow the normalization of the diffuse emission, isotropic emission, Fermi bubbles template, and dark matter template to float





The Inner Galaxy Analysis

This disfavored pulsar interpretations for two reasons

Pulsars are not expected to be distantly located off the plane

The brightest pulsars from this population should be observed as point sources by the Fermi-LAT







Hooper et al. (2013)

The Current Paper - Three Objectives

1.) Produce a significantly enhanced version of the Fermi dataset, using only photons with the best directional reconstruction

2.) Test the compatibility of the excess in the Galactic Center and Inner Galaxy

3.) Produce multiple tests of the dark matter interpretation of the data - concentrating on tests which can differentiate a dark matter or pulsar signal

CTBCORE QUALITY CUTS



1.) Each photon observed by the Fermi-LAT has a different uncertainty in the directional reconstruction

2.) The Pass 7 analysis includes a parameter, CTBCORE, which indicates how well each individual photon was measured

3.) We select only the 50% of photons with the best CTBCORE values, this not only improves the overall PSF, but greatly diminishes the non-Gaussian tails

Portillo & Finkbeiner (2014, TBS)

Data Selection

The new CTBCORE cut is applied to two different selections of the Fermi-LAT data

Inner Galaxy - $|b| > 1^{o}$

Galactic Center - $|l| < 5^{o}$ $|b| < 5^{o}$

The inner galaxy excess is also done at $|b| > 5^{o}$ to remove any dependence between the different analyses

The Inner Galaxy Excess



1.) Mask |b| < 1°, and a 2° radius around all 1FGL sources

2.) Employ models for the diffuse emission, isotropic emission, Fermi bubbles, and a dark matter component

3.) Allow the normalization of each component to float in 25 different energy bins, from 300 MeV - 100 GeV

Galactic Center Modeling

1.) Instead model the inner | l | < 5°, |b| < 5°

2.) Must include all point sources in the model - along with models for the diffuse emission, isotropic emission, 20cm map

3.) In order to obtain the best fitting model, we allow the normalizations and spectra of multiple sources to vary, using the Fermi tool *gtlike* (and the MINUIT algorithm) to determine the best model for each component (same as previous works)

Skymaps of the Residuals



Skymaps of the Residuals



Spectrum of the Residuals





Inner Galaxy - The DM template naturally picks up the following spectral shape - the normalization of the NFW template is allowed to float independently in every energy bin

Galactic Center - An iterative process is used to determine the dark matter spectrum in a method independent of the initial seed spectrum

Spectrum of the Residuals



The residual spectra are almost identical, except for some variation below 1 GeV.



Measurement - The poor PSF of the Fermi-LAT at low energies makes it difficult to distinguish between diffuse emission and point sources

Theory - Any dark matter annihilation will also produce e^+e^- pairs and bremsstrahlung



Spectrum of the Residuals



Still, these changes are very minor. The best fit dark matter model for the Galactic Center and Inner Galaxy Excesses are nearly identical

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess





Inner Galaxy - The best fit is given by a generalized NFW profile with γ=1.26. The Southern sky has a consistent fit to the spectrum of the full sky.

Galactic Center - The best fit is given by γ=1.17.

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess





The fit of γ=1.26 is not strongly rejected by the Galactic center data.

Secondly, the value of γ depends sensitively on the interaction between the dark matter profile and the baryonic potential. It is completely reasonable that the value of γ may shift as a function of galactocentric radius

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess



We can instead fix the spectrum of the Inner Galaxy excess, and allow the normalization to float in 1º angular bins. We find the residual to be statistically significant out to 12o from the Galactic Center. Following a slightly steeper profile (at high latitudes) of $\gamma = 1.4$.

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess



This may again be due to the interaction of the dark matter density profile with baryons, or may be due to measurement effects — since large scale features far from the Galactic Center may be partially absorbed into the data-driven galactic diffuse model

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess



Galactic Center Model: The data prefer that the NFW profile persists throughout the simulation region.

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess



Galactic Center Model: We find the data prefer a NFW profile centered on the position of Sgr A* to within 0.05°

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess



Galactic Center Model: By testing dark matter profiles with various core sizes, we can reject any core larger than 10 pc at more than 2σ

The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess





Ellipticity: We can also ask if the data prefer a spherically symmetric profile.

Axis ratios of greater than 20% either along or perpendicular to the galactic plane.

The Current Paper - Three Objectives

1.) Produce a significantly enhanced version of the Fermi dataset, using only photons with the best directional reconstruction

2.) Test the compatibility of the excess in the Galactic Center and Inner Galaxy

3.) Produce multiple tests of the dark matter interpretation of the data - concentrating on tests which can differentiate a dark matter or pulsar signal

Interpretations of the Excess

1.) Do the data prefer millisecond pulsars or dark matter annihilation?

2.) How do the data compare to theoretically predicted dark matter models?

Interpretations of the Excess

The spectrum of the residual signal in the Inner Galaxy does not look like millisecond pulsars

The spherical symmetry of the fit is hard to reconcile with models of MSP emission







Interpretations of the Excess

The clear extension of the source out to 11º from the galactic center, with a consistent morphology, makes it difficult to produce the intensity of the emission with pulsars







Dark Matter Fits to the Data



The gamma-ray excess is very well fit by simple, theoretically motivated dark matter models.

We tune only:

1.) The dark matter mass and annihilation pathway
2.) The dark matter profile slope
3.) The dark matter annihilation cross-section

Dark Matter Fits to the Data



The gamma-ray excess is very well fit by simple, theoretically motivated dark matter models.

We tune only:

1.) The dark matter mass and annihilation pathway
2.) The dark matter profile slope
3.) The dark matter annihilation cross-section

Dark Matter Fits to the Data

This is in stark contrast to nearly every other excess which has claimed to fit a dark matter signal:

1.) PAMELA/AMS — Need leptophilic dark matter, with a Sommerfeld enhanced cross-section (100 - 1000x thermal). Need a cored profile to avoid Fermi-LAT constraints

2.) DAMA/LIBRA - Require a fine-tuned inelastic dark matter model, with finely tuned splitting between final states to avoid other direct detection experiments

3.) 130 GeV Line - Need to highly enhance (~ x100) the direct annihilation to $\gamma\ \gamma$ compared to expectations from a loop level process.

Dark Matter Fits to the Data

Berlin, Hooper, McDermott (2014)

Half of all models explaining the galactic center are consistent with current constraints

In general, s-channel annihilations are much more likely to be compatible with other constraints





(1)



(8)

Model Number	DM	Mediator	Interactions	Elastic Scattering	Near Future Reach? Direct	LHC
1	Dirac Fermion	Spin-0	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}f$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim (q/2m_\chi)^2$ (scalar)	No	Maybe
1	Majorana Fermion	Spin-0	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}f$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim (q/2m_\chi)^2$ (scalar)	No	Maybe
2	Dirac Fermion	Spin-0	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q^2/4m_n m_\chi)^2$	Never	Maybe
2	Majorana Fermion	Spin-0	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q^2/4m_n m_\chi)^2$	Never	Maybe
3	Dirac Fermion	Spin-1	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi$, $\bar{b}\gamma_\mu b$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim$ loop (vector)	Yes	Maybe
4	Dirac Fermion	Spin-1	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\chi$, $\bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$ or $\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_\chi)^2$	Never	Maybe
5	Dirac Fermion	Spin-1	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim 1$	Yes	Maybe
5	Majorana Fermion	Spin-1	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\chi$, $\bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim 1$	Yes	Maybe
6	Complex Scalar	Spin-0	$\phi^\dagger\phi$, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$	No	Maybe
6	Real Scalar	Spin-0	ϕ^2, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$	No	Maybe
6	Complex Vector	Spin-0	$B_\mu^\dagger B^\mu$, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$	No	Maybe
6	Real Vector	Spin-0	$B_\mu B^\mu$, $\bar{f}\gamma^5 f$	$\sigma_{SD} \sim (q/2m_n)^2$	No	Maybe
7	Dirac Fermion	Spin-0 (t-ch.)	$\bar{\chi}(1 \pm \gamma^5)b$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim$ loop (vector)	Yes	Yes
7	Dirac Fermion	Spin-1 (t-ch.)	$\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu(1 \pm \gamma^5)b$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim$ loop (vector)	Yes	Yes
8	Complex Vector	Spin-1/2 (t-ch.)	$X_\mu^\dagger\gamma^\mu(1 \pm \gamma^5)b$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim$ loop (vector)	Yes	Yes
8	Real Vector	Spin-1/2 (t-ch.)	$X_\mu\gamma^\mu(1 \pm \gamma^5)b$	$\sigma_{SI} \sim$ loop (vector)	Yes	Yes

The Current State of the Excess

1.) The excess is hugely statistically robust (*40σ for the Inner Galaxy, 17σ for the Galactic Center*)***. This gives us ~30,000 photons in the dark matter signal, which we can use to scan the morphology and spectrum of the excess.

2.) The excess is extremely well fit by very standard dark matter models. No strange theoretical tricks are necessary.

3.) There is no other reasonable model which has been put forward to explain the excess.

****** Caveats abound — the uncertainty is systematically dominated — please do not quote this as a significance of the excess!***

Future Tests



How would we test this excess? - Dwarf galaxies are another natural target for dark matter indirect detection. Interestingly, the Fermi-LAT finds an excess with a local significance of 2.7σ at the mass most favored by our dark matter model.

High-Velocity Clouds



Additional Search targets may be necessary:

1.) One possibility is High Velocity Clouds

2.) These may set very strong limits on DM annihilation

3.) However the dark matter content of HVCs is unknown



Drlica-Wagner et al. (2014)

Isn't this How the Indirect Detection of Dark Matter is Supposed to Play Out?

$$\Phi_\gamma \propto J = \frac{1}{\Delta\Omega}\int d\Omega \int_{l.o.s} \rho^2 dl(\phi)$$

The J-Factor of the Galactic center is:

$$\log_{10}(J) = 21.02$$

for a region within 100 pc of the Galactic center and an NFW profile

Name	GLON (deg)	GLAT (deg)	Distance (kpc)	$\overline{\log_{10}(J^{NFW})}^a$ ($\log_{10}[\mathrm{GeV}^2\,\mathrm{cm}^{-5}\,\mathrm{sr}]$)
Bootes I	358.1	69.6	66	18.8 ± 0.22
Bootes II	353.7	68.9	42	–
Bootes III	35.4	75.4	47	–
Canes Venatici I	74.3	79.8	218	17.7 ± 0.26
Canes Venatici II	113.6	82.7	160	17.9 ± 0.25
Canis Major	240.0	-8.0	7	–
Carina	260.1	-22.2	105	18.1 ± 0.23
Coma Berenices	241.9	83.6	44	19.0 ± 0.25
Draco	86.4	34.7	76	18.8 ± 0.16
Fornax	237.1	-65.7	147	18.2 ± 0.21
Hercules	28.7	36.9	132	18.1 ± 0.25
Leo I	226.0	49.1	254	17.7 ± 0.18
Leo II	220.2	67.2	233	17.6 ± 0.18
Leo IV	265.4	56.5	154	17.9 ± 0.28
Leo V	261.9	58.5	178	–
Pisces II	79.2	-47.1	182	–
Sagittarius	5.6	-14.2	26	–
Sculptor	287.5	-83.2	86	18.6 ± 0.18
Segue 1	220.5	50.4	23	19.5 ± 0.29
Segue 2	149.4	-38.1	35	–
Sextans	243.5	42.3	86	18.4 ± 0.27
Ursa Major I	159.4	54.4	97	18.3 ± 0.24
Ursa Major II	152.5	37.4	32	19.3 ± 0.28
Ursa Minor	105.0	44.8	76	18.8 ± 0.19
Willman 1	158.6	56.8	38	19.1 ± 0.31

The Fermi-LAT Collaboration (2013)

Conclusion



Extra Slides

How Big Is This Excess?



Do Other Residuals Have the Same Spectrum?



Wait, Some of the Same Photons are in Each Sample?



Maybe it's just part of the Bubbles?



The Morphology of the Gamma-Ray Excess





Hooper & Slatyer (2013)

Third, it's worth noting how much the usage of CTBCORE improves our models of the data. Previous to our CTBCORE fits, the value of γ was highly sensitive to our choice of ROI

Maybe the Bubbles Have A Spectral Variation?



Does it Correlate with Gas?



With the best fit modulated SFD map, the dark matter fit is still highly preferred

Maybe the Models of the Diffuse Emission in the GC are Wrong



Does it Correlate with Gas?



Does it Correlate with Gas?



Even more generically, you can add an f(r) α r^(-gamma) profile for the SFD template, this is highly preferred in the model with no dark matter (left), but the dark matter template is still highly preferred even when gamma can float freely (right)

Is there an Ellipticity in any direction?



Previous Efforts







Abazajian et al. (2014) found the spectrum of the residual to be resilient to more than 4º away from the galactic center

They did find the low energy spectrum to be highly model dependent

Is it Just Millisecond Pulsars?





Fermi 2nd Pulsar Catalog