Non Thermal Neutralino Production in Deflected Anomaly Mediation

A. M. Lionetto*

Department of Physics and INFN Roma Tor Vergata

arXiv:0705.4665v1 [hep-ph] 31 May 2007

Abstract

We study the effects of a non thermal neutralino production, due to the late decay in the early universe of a single modulus field, in the context of the deflected anomaly mediated scenario. In the regime in which the average number of neutralino produced in each modulus decaying process is $\bar{N}_{\rm LSP} \ll 1$ also models with a thermal relic density below WMAP data became acceptable models. We find out that these models belong to three different classes with the common feature that the low thermal relic density is entirely due to coannihilation effects. The neutralino annihilation cross section for these classes of models is not particularly high compared with the highest cross sections attainable in the generic framework of the MSSM. Hence the detection prospects either by direct or indirect WIMP search experiments are not encouraging.

*Electronic address: lionetto@roma2.infn.it

I. INTRODUCTION

The latest WMAP data [1] determine in a very precise way the matter content of the Universe. For the cold dark matter (CDM) component the WMAP result is

$$\Omega_{CDM} h^2 = 0.110 \pm 0.007 \tag{1}$$

where $\Omega_{CDM} = \rho_{CDM}/\rho_c$ is the ratio between the CDM density ρ_{CDM} and the critical density of the Universe $\rho_c = 1.8791 h^2 \cdot 10^{-29} \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$ with h the Hubble constant in units of $100\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}\,pc^{-1}}$. Eq. (1) is able to put a strong constraint on the parameter space of a generic supersymmetric model. In fact the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP), usually the neutralino, is one of the best motivated cold dark matter candidate (as long as the R-parity is conserved) and one can compute the relic density of the lightest neutralino solving the following Boltzmann equation

$$\frac{dn_\chi}{dt} + 3Hn_\chi = -\langle \sigma v \rangle (n_\chi^2 - n_{eq}^2) \tag{2}$$

where n_χ is the numerical neutralino density, H is the Hubble constant, $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ is the averaged thermal cross section times the neutralino pair relative velocity while n_{eq} is the Boltzmann equilibrium number density. The physical picture described by this equation is simple and the numerical solution is even straightforward until one takes into account coannihilations with particles degenerate in mass with the lightest neutralino. In a first approximation one can show [2] that the following relation holds

$$\Omega^{\mathrm{thermal}} h^2 \equiv \frac{m_\chi n_\chi}{\rho_c} \simeq \langle \sigma v \rangle^{-1} \tag{3}$$

where m_χ is the neutralino mass. With $\Omega^{\mathrm{thermal}} h^2$ we denote the solution of the standard Boltzmann equation (2). Typically when one compute eq. (2) in the mSUGRA framework, in which the LSP is a very pure bino in almost all the parameter space, one finds that the relic density easily exceeds the WMAP result [3]. The same situation happens in other supersymmetry breaking scenarios. Moreover the relation (3) roughly implies the existence of some upper bound on the annihilation cross section. Hence if we want to study models with cross section higher than that allowed by the thermal relic density constraint we have to consider scenarios in which the condition (3) can be relaxed.

The relic density computation can be heavily affected in a non standard cosmological scenario which introduces a non thermal source of cold dark matter production. Among

the different scenarios the neutralino production from late decays of scalar or moduli fields is an elegant and "natural" possibility [4, 5]. In particular in supergravity and superstring theories, where in general the scalar potential has many flat directions, the presence of moduli fields that acquire masses from supersymmetry breaking is a common feature (for a review in the string theory context see [6]). Moduli fields have important cosmological consequences although their couplings are suppressed by inverse powers of the Planck mass. They dominate the energy density in the early Universe and if the modulus mass is sufficiently low (for example of the order of the electroweak scale) it can destroy the standard big-bang nucleosynthesis scenario. This problem is usually termed as cosmological moduli problem (see for example [7] and references therein). One interesting possibility to avoid this problem was given in [4]. In that scenario the modulus mass is setted by the gravitino mass which is quite high in anomaly mediated models. In this paper we will study the same solution applied in the context of the deflected anomaly mediation [8, 9, 10] in which the tachyon problem of the minimal anomaly mediation is elegantly solved. In particular we concentrate on [10] where we performed a detailed analysis of the neutralino sector of this scenario.

The outline of the paper is as follows: in sec. II we describe how the presence of a modulus field changes the standard relic density computation in the framework of a generic supersymmetry breaking scenario. In sec. III we apply the results of the previous section to the deflected anomaly case. In sec. IV we study the detection prospects for this scenario. The last section is devoted to the conclusions.

II. RELIC DENSITY AND MODULI FIELDS

We closely follow the analysis of Moroi and Randall [4] with a single modulus field ϕ. We consider a system of coupled Boltzmann equations describing the time evolution of the wimp number density n_χ, the modulus number density n_ϕ and the radiation density ρ_{rad}:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dn_\chi}{dt} + 3Hn_\chi &= \bar{N}_{\rm LSP}\Gamma_\phi n_\phi - \langle\sigma v\rangle\left(n_\chi^2 - n_{eq}^2\right) \\
\frac{dn_\phi}{dt} + 3Hn_\phi &= -\Gamma_\phi n_\phi \\
\frac{\rho_{rad}}{dt} + 4H\rho_{rad} &= (m_\phi - \bar{N}_{\rm LSP}m_\chi)\Gamma_\phi n_\phi + 2m_\chi\langle\sigma v\rangle\left(n_\chi^2 - n_{eq}^2\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where Γ_ϕ is the decay rate of the modulus field and $\bar{N}_{\rm LSP}$ is the average number of wimp produced in each modulus decaying process. These are the two crucial parameters in this description. The modulus field decay rate Γ_ϕ can be formally written as a sum

$$\Gamma_\phi = \sum_i \Gamma_\phi^{(i)} \tag{5}$$

where each single decay rate $\Gamma_\phi^{(i)}$ is associated to one of the possible interactions terms of the lagrangian in which ϕ is coupled to one of the fields in the neutralino sector, namely the two gauginos $\tilde{B}$, $\tilde{W}$ and the two higgsinos $\tilde{H}_1$ and $\tilde{H}_2$. The index i runs over all possible contributions. In the positive deflected anomaly scenario all the terms described in appendix A of [4] are present and so we decide to use the same useful parametrization

$$\Gamma_\phi = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{m_\phi^3}{M_{\rm P}^2} \tag{6}$$

where m_ϕ^3 is the modulus field mass and $M_{\rm P} \simeq 2.4 \cdot 10^{18}$ GeV is the reduced 4-dimensional Planck mass. The naive expectation for m_ϕ is

$$m_\phi \simeq m_{3/2} = F_\varphi \tag{7}$$

where $m_{3/2}$ is the gravitino mass and F_φ is the auxiliary supergravity field vev that breaks supersymmetry in the anomaly sector. The last equality holds both in the minimal and in the deflected anomaly scenario. This relation guarantees that the modulus mass is in general quite high. The presence of the modulus field changes the thermal history of the early universe [11]. In particular in order to preserve a successful description of the big-bang nucleosynthesis we must require that the reheating temperature associated to the modulus field decay

$$T_{RH} \simeq 10\,{\rm MeV}\,\left(\frac{m_\phi}{100\,{\rm TeV}}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{eff}}{M_{\rm P}}\right)^{-1}\cdot\left(\frac{g_*}{10.75}\right) \tag{8}$$

be of order $T_{RH} \simeq 10$ MeV. In the previous relation Λ_{eff} is the effective interaction scale of the modulus and g_* counts the total number of effectively massless degrees of freedom. If we impose this condition then $m_\phi \simeq 100$ TeV, assuming that $\Lambda_{eff} \simeq M_{\rm P}$ and $g_* = 10.75$. Taking into account (7) this implies the following condition on the auxiliary supergravity field vev

$$F_\varphi \geq 100\,{\rm TeV} \tag{9}$$

The other condition that has to be satisfied to have a source of non thermal neutralino production is

$$T_{RH} < T_{dec} \simeq \frac{m_\chi}{30} \tag{10}$$

where with T_{dec} we have denoted the neutralino decoupling temperature. By definition this is the temperature at which the annihilation rate becomes smaller then the Hubble expansion rate. The condition (10) is necessary because in order to have a neutralino production by the decay of ϕ this must happens far away from the thermal and chemical equilibrium. To compute the relic density one must numerically solve the system of equations (4). However it is possible to give a simple estimate [4] of the solution in two different regimes

$$\Omega_\chi h^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{3 m_\chi \Gamma_\phi}{2(2\pi^2/45) g_* T_{RH}^3 \langle\sigma v\rangle} \frac{h^2}{\rho_c/s} & \bar{N}_{\rm LSP} \simeq 1 \\ \\ \frac{3 \bar{N}_{\rm LSP}\, m_\chi \Gamma_\phi^2 M_{\rm P}^2}{(2\pi^2/45) g_* T_{RH}^3 m_\phi} \frac{h^2}{\rho_c/s} & \bar{N}_{\rm LSP} \ll 1 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $\rho_c/s \simeq 3.6 \cdot 10^{-9} \cdot h^2$ GeV is the critical density to entropy ratio. A key observation about eq. (11) is that in the case of very low number of LSP produced in each decay the relic density is completely unrelated to the thermal averaged cross section $\langle\sigma v\rangle$.

III. NON THERMAL RELIC DENSITY AND DEFLECTED ANOMALY

We now apply the results of the previous section to the deflected anomaly mediation case and in particular to the scenario proposed in [10]. This scenario differs from minimal anomaly mediation for the presence of an additional gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking sector that avoids tachyonic masses for the sleptons (which do not transform under the $SU(3)$ gauge group). In this sector there is a gauge singlet chiral superfield $X = (A_X, \Psi_X, F_X)$ which is directly coupled to N_f copies of messenger chiral superfields Φ_i and $\bar{\Phi}_i$, transforming under the fundamentals and anti-fundamentals of the standard MSSM gauge groups (for a comprehensive review see [12]). The soft breaking sector of the model is specified, as we saw in the previous section, in terms of the auxiliary supergravity field vev F_φ that breaks supersymmetry in the anomaly sector inducing as well a breaking in the additional gauge sector and in terms of the ratio f/m, where $f \equiv \langle F_X \rangle$ is the auxiliary gauge singlet field vev and m is the messenger mass scale.

In [10] we computed the standard thermal relic density without any non thermal contribution using DarkSUSY [13] taking into account all the coannihilations. In that case the

auxiliary supergravity field can be as low as $F_\varphi \simeq 10^2$ GeV. The WMAP allowed models are those in which the neutralino is a very pure bino or a very pure higgsino depending on the number of messenger fields N_f (for $N_f \geq 2$ a higgsino branch open up and this branch becomes greater for $N_f \gtrsim 5$). We declare that a neutralino is gaugino-like (in particular in our case bino-like) if $Z_g > 0.9$ while is higgsino-like when $Z_g < 0.1$, where Z_g is the usually defined gaugino fraction. In all the intermediate cases we denote the neutralino as mixed-like.

In the new scenario with a non thermal contribution in order to satisfy the constraint on the reheating temperature (see eq. (8)) we must impose

$$F_\varphi \geq 10^5 \,\mathrm{GeV} \tag{12}$$

that cuts out all the lower part of the parameter space explored in [10]. The condition (10) on the decoupling temperature turns out to be always satisfied. Moreover we want to add another constraint to select models with the highest possible annihilation cross sections. This condition, having in mind the relation (3), can be translated as an upper bound on the thermal relic density

$$\Omega_\chi^{\mathrm{thermal}} h^2 < 0.09 \tag{13}$$

where 0.09 is the 3σ lower bound of the WMAP result (1). This allows us to use the results of the detailed scan performed in [10].

Applying both constraints (12) and (13) it is possible to rule out the scenario with a high messenger mass scale $m \gtrsim 10^8$ GeV. In fact in this case there is no higgsino branch and the neutralino is a very pure bino with a very low annihilation cross section. For a lower messenger mass scale $m \simeq 10^5$ GeV there are essentially three class of models surviving denoted by A, B and C. For $m < 10^5$ GeV almost all the parameter space is excluded either due to the presence of tachyons or because there is no electroweak symmetry breaking or because the neutralino is not the LSP. The result for $m \simeq 10^5$ GeV is conveniently summarized in fig. 1 where we show in the plane ($\Omega_\chi^{\mathrm{thermal}} h^2$, m_χ) the three class of allowed models. The plot was achieved applying the two bounds (12) and (13) on the entire parameter space. In the first class of models (class A) the neutralino is a very pure bino with 200 GeV $\lesssim m_\chi \lesssim$ 400 GeV. These models are present for $N_f \leq 5$. In the second class of models (class B) the neutralino is a very pure higgsino with 400 GeV $\lesssim m_\chi \lesssim$ 900 GeV. These models are always present as long as the higgsino branch is open, i.e. $N_f > 2$. Class B is the one that resembles more the




Figure 1: Allowed models with $\Omega_\chi^{\rm thermal} h^2 < 0.09$ as a function of the neutralino mass m_χ

scenario considered in [4] where the neutralino is essentially a wino. The wino annihilates in a very efficient way into W^+W^- and Z^0Z^0 (when this channels are kinematically opened) so the thermal relic density is usually very low. In an analogous way the higgsino has a quite efficient annihilation into W^+W^- and Z^0Z^0 although the higgsino cross section is lower than the wino one of about a factor 10^{-2}. For class B models the non thermal modulus contribution could be extremely important to enhance the relic density. In the last class of models (class C) the neutralino has a gaugino fraction $Z_g > 0.1$ so it can be either mixed or bino like. In both cases it has a very high mass of order $m_\chi > 1.5$ TeV. In table I we show the mass spectrum for three sample models (one of each kind A, B or C). The first five rows define the model. The next three rows contain the masses of the lightest neutralino $m_{\tilde\chi}$ of the next to lightest neutralino $m_{\tilde\chi_2}$ and of the lightest chargino $m_{\tilde W_1}$. The next six rows show the mass spectrum of the squark and slepton sector: the gluino mass $m_{\tilde g}$, the stop mass $m_{\tilde t}$, an average mass of all the other squarks $m_{\tilde q}$ (they are near degenerate), the masses of the left and right selectrons, $m_{\tilde e_L}$ and $m_{\tilde e_R}$ respectively, and finally the mass of the lightest stau $m_{\tilde\tau_1}$. The last two rows show the mass spectrum of the Higgs sector: the mass of the lightest Higgs m_{h^0} and that of the CP-odd Higgs m_{A^0} (quite degenerate with the remaining mass eigenstates).

	class A	class B	class C
F_φ (GeV)	10^5	$1.2 \cdot 10^5$	$2 \cdot 10^5$
F_X/m (GeV)	$1.9 \cdot 10^5$	$4.9 \cdot 10^5$	$9.3 \cdot 10^5$
N_f	5	10	4
$\tan\beta$	50	10	50
$sign(\mu)$	+1	+1	+1
$m_{\tilde{\chi}}$	290 GeV	705 GeV	2.1 TeV
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2}$	912 GeV	707 GeV	2.2 TeV
$m_{\tilde{W}_1}$	912 GeV	706 GeV	2.2 TeV
$m_{\tilde{g}}$	4.9 TeV	23 TeV	20 TeV
$m_{\tilde{q}}$	4.2 TeV	15 TeV	17 TeV
$m_{\tilde{t}}$	4 TeV	14 TeV	16 TeV
$m_{\tilde{e}_L}$	1.2 TeV	5.4 TeV	6 TeV
$m_{\tilde{e}_R}$	430 GeV	2.5 TeV	2.9 TeV
$m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$	294 GeV	2.5 TeV	2.5 TeV
m_{h^0}	122 GeV	123 GeV	124 GeV
m_{A^0}	1.4 TeV	5.2 TeV	4.4 TeV

Table I: Mass spectrum for three benchmark models. See the text for the notation.

As can be seen the scalar sector tends to be heavy with the exception of sleptons for class A models. In this case it is worth noting the degeneracy between the lightest neutralino and the the lightest stau $\tilde{\tau}$. For models B and C the key feature is the near degeneracy between the lightest neutralino and the lightest chargino $\tilde{W}_1$ and the next to lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_2$. The thermal relic density of all these models is shown in fig. 1. As can be seen there is a lower bound $\Omega_\chi^{\rm thermal} h^2 > 0.02$. Hence there are no models with an extremely low annihilation cross section and this implies (see eq. (11)) that a relic density in the WMAP range could only be obtained in the regime $\bar{N}_{\rm LSP} \ll 1$. In fact, as we will see in more detail in the next section, for all models a thermal relic density below WMAP data is entirely due to coannihilation effects. In fig. 2 we show the allowed values of $\bar{N}_{\rm LSP}$ for each value of the LSP mass m_χ. As quoted in [4] the exact value of $\bar{N}_{\rm LSP}$ is extremely model dependent. It relies on the precise structure of the operators through which the modulus field can decay. In general the range




Figure 2: Contour plot of $\Omega_\chi h^2$ in the plane $(m_\chi, \bar{N}_{\rm LSP})$. The red (dark shaded) region corresponds to the 3σ WMAP result $0.09 \leq \Omega_\chi h^2 \leq 0.13$ while the green (light shaded) region corresponds to the 5σ WMAP result $0.07 \leq \Omega_\chi h^2 \leq 0.14$.

of the allowed values is

$$10^{-3} \lesssim \bar{N}_{\rm LSP} \lesssim 10^{-4} \tag{14}$$

Such range guarantees that all models fulfill the WMAP constraints at least at a 5σ level.

IV. DETECTION PROSPECTS

In this section we study the detection prospects for the proposed scenario by means of direct and indirect WIMP dark matter experiments.

As can be seen from table I the mass spectrum in this scenario is quite peculiar. For class A models the LSP is a very pure bino with a mass in the range 200 GeV $\lesssim m_\chi \lesssim$ 400 GeV. The squark and gluino sectors are around 4 TeV and hence they are essentially decoupled from the neutralino sector. Also the sfermions are heavy, in particular the charginos and the other neutralinos that are above 1 TeV. The exception is the lightest stau $\tilde{\tau}$ that is quite

degenerate in mass with the lightest neutralino. This implies that the dominant annihilation channel is $\chi\chi \to \tau^+\tau^-$ through a $\tilde{\tau}$ exchange and the existence of a very efficient neutralino-stau coannihilation channel. This latter property make it possible that the thermal relic density is well below the WMAP lower bound. From the detection point of view what is important is the neutralino-neutralino total annihilation cross section. In the case in hand the dominant annihilation cross section (times velocity v) in $\tau^+\tau^-$ is only of order $10^{-29}\,\mathrm{cm}^3\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. Due to the peculiar shape of the energy spectrum of γs produced in the $\tau^+\tau^-$ channel, the class A models can be studied by carefully analyzing the γ ray continuum flux produced by π^0 mesons decay coming for example from the galactic center [16]. On the other hand the cross sections of the two one-loop processes $\chi\chi \to \gamma\gamma$ and $\chi\chi \to Z^0\gamma$ are suppressed by a factor 10^{-2} respect to the $\tau^+\tau^-$ cross section and so are very hard to detect [16]. The direct detection prospects are as well not very encouraging. For class A models the typical neutralino-proton spin independent cross section is

$$\sigma_{\chi p} \simeq 10^{-13}\,\mathrm{pb} \tag{15}$$

well below the current limit of the CDMS experiment [14] and even below the projected sensitivity of the upcoming CDMSII [15]. The indirect detection through cosmic rays is not favorite as well. To give an estimate we consider the interstellar positron and antiproton fluxes at fixed energies, $E = 10$ GeV for positrons and $E = 1$ GeV for antiprotons in order to avoid uncertainties from solar modulation. Taking into account that all the fluxes scale as m_χ^{-2} and assuming for the galactic neutralino distribution a NFW profile and the same propagation model used in [17] and [18], respectively for the positrons and the antiprotons, we obtain that the expected interstellar positron flux at $E = 10$ GeV is around $10^{-11}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$ and the expected interstellar antiproton flux at $E = 1$ GeV is around $10^{-7}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$ which are well below the experimental limits determined, for a given background, in [17, 18]. Even with the recently launched PAMELA satellite [19], that gives an enhanced resolution and a better spectrum determination compared with the balloon experiments, the detection possibilities cannot likely be improved.

In models belonging to the class B the neutralino is a very pure higgsino with 400 GeV $\lesssim m_\chi \lesssim$ 900 GeV. From table I we see that while all the squarks and sleptons are extremely heavy and essentially decoupled from the lightest neutralino sector the lightest chargino and the next to lightest neutralino are quite degenerate in mass with the lightest neutralino.

The dominant annihilation channels in this case are W^+W^- and Z^0Z^0 with a cross section (times velocity v) of about $10^{-26}\,\mathrm{cm}^3\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. As in the previous case the annihilation cross section is that required to obtain a thermal relic density in the WMAP range. The fact that $\Omega_\chi^{\mathrm{thermal}} h^2 < 0.09$ is entirely due to the coannihilations with the second lightest neutralino and with the lightest chargino. For this class of models the one-loop processes $\chi\chi \to \gamma\gamma$ and $\chi\chi \to Z^0\gamma$ gives an extremely high cross section, with a value of about $2 \cdot 10^{-28}\,\mathrm{cm}^3\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ for a neutralino mass $m_\chi \simeq 400$ GeV. This could be within the reach of the GLAST sensitivity [20].

From the other side the direct detection is completely out of reach given the neutralino-proton spin independent cross section

$$\sigma_{\chi p} \simeq 10^{-11}\,\mathrm{pb} \tag{16}$$

The cosmic ray signals are expected to be higher respect to the previous class of models, but still below the sensitivity of PAMELA (see for a general analysis [21, 22]). In fact for class B models the average interstellar positron flux at $E = 10$ GeV is around $10^{-9}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$ while the average interstellar antiproton flux at $E = 1$ GeV is around $5 \cdot 10^{-6}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$.

Finally class C models have 1.7 GeV $\lesssim m_\chi \lesssim$ 2.5 TeV. The neutralino can be bino-like or mixed. The dominant annihilation channel is $b\bar{b}$ for any value of the gaugino fraction Z_g. The direct detection rate is favorite in the case of a mixed-like neutralino, *i.e.* $Z_g = 0.5$. The neutralino-proton spin independent cross section is

$$\sigma_{\chi p} \simeq 10^{-8}\,\mathrm{pb} \tag{17}$$

so it could be in the reach of CDMSII [15] although it could be very difficult to detect such a high mass neutralino. Neutralinos with $Z_g = 0.5$ or $Z_g \simeq 0.1$ are favorite also in the case of cosmic ray detection. The interstellar positron flux at $E = 10$ GeV can be as high as $4 \cdot 10^{-9}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$ while the antiproton flux at $E = 1$ GeV can be as high as $10^{-4}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}\,\mathrm{s}^{-1}\,\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$ (for a mass $m_\chi \simeq 2.1$ TeV). A comparison with the results of [17] and [18] shows that the maximum attainable positron and antiproton fluxes are respectively a factor 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} below the highest generic MSSM fluxes.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We studied the effects of the presence of a single modulus field on the relic density computation in the the specific framework of the deflected anomaly mediation. The non thermal contribution to the relic density allows to resurrect models with $\Omega_\chi^{\rm thermal}h^2$ less than the WMAP lower bound. These models belong to three different classes with a definite neutralino mass range and composition and with a peculiar mass spectrum. The main drawback of this scenario is given by the fact that there are no models with a very high neutralino pair annihilation cross section. The low value of the thermal relic density is entirely due to very efficient coannihilations with particles degenerate in mass with the lightest neutralino. As a consequence the detection prospect of this scenario are not quite promising.

The main result of this analysis is that even invoking a non thermal production mechanism does not assure in general the existence of models with high detection rate. The consequences of a non thermal production has to be carefully analyzed in each specific setup.

---

[1] D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], arXiv:astro-ph/0603449.

[2] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, Phys. Rept. **267** (1996) 195 [arXiv:hep-ph/9506380].

[3] H. Baer, C. Balazs and A. Belyaev, JHEP **0203** (2002) 042 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202076].

[4] T. Moroi and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B **570** (2000) 455 [arXiv:hep-ph/9906527].

[5] D. J. H. Chung, E. W. Kolb and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 063504 [arXiv:hep-ph/9809453].

G. F. Giudice, E. W. Kolb and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 023508 [arXiv:hep-ph/0005123].

R. Jeannerot, X. Zhang and R. H. Brandenberger, JHEP **9912** (1999) 003 [arXiv:hep-ph/9901357].

W. B. Lin, D. H. Huang, X. Zhang and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 954 [arXiv:astro-ph/0009003].

T. Moroi, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **342** (1995) 105

[arXiv:hep-ph/9409367].

M. Kawasaki, T. Moroi and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **370** (1996) 52 [arXiv:hep-ph/9509399].

S. Khalil, C. Munoz and E. Torrente-Lujan, New J. Phys. **4** (2002) 27 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202139].

N. Fornengo, A. Riotto and S. Scopel, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 023514 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208072].

M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi and F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 211301 [arXiv:hep-ph/0602061].

S. Nakamura and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. B **638** (2006) 389 [arXiv:hep-ph/0602081].

[6] E. Silverstein, arXiv:hep-th/0405068.

[7] T. Banks, M. Berkooz and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 705 [arXiv:hep-th/9501053].

[8] A. Pomarol and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9905** (1999) 013

[9] N. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 115009

[10] A. Cesarini, F. Fucito and A. Lionetto, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 025026 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611098].

[11] E. W. . Kolb and M. S. . Turner, "THE EARLY UNIVERSE. REPRINTS," *REDWOOD CITY, USA: ADDISON-WESLEY (1988) 719 P. (FRONTIERS IN PHYSICS, 70)*

[12] G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rept. **322** (1999) 419

[13] P. Gondolo, J. Edsjo, P. Ullio, L. Bergstrom, M. Schelke and E. A. Baltz, JCAP **0407** (2004) 008 [arXiv:astro-ph/0406204].

[14] D. S. Akerib *et al.* [CDMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 011302 [arXiv:astro-ph/0509259].

[15] D. S. Akerib *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **559** (2006) 411.

[16] L. Bergstrom, P. Ullio and J. H. Buckley, Astropart. Phys. **9** (1998) 137 [arXiv:astro-ph/9712318].

[17] E. A. Baltz and J. Edsjo, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 023511 [arXiv:astro-ph/9808243].

[18] L. Bergstrom, J. Edsjo and P. Ullio, Astrophys. J. **526** (1999) 215 [arXiv:astro-ph/9902012].

[19] P. Picozza *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **27** (2007) 296 [arXiv:astro-ph/0608697].

[20] `http://www-glast.slac.stanford.edu/software/IS/glast_lat_performance.htm`

[21] S. Profumo and P. Ullio, JCAP **0407** (2004) 006 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406018].

[22] A. M. Lionetto, A. Morselli and V. Zdravkovic, JCAP **0509** (2005) 010 [arXiv:astro-ph/0502406].