# Capture of Inelastic Dark M atter in the Sun

Shm uelN ussinov<sup>(a,b)</sup>, Lian-Tao W ang<sup>(c)</sup> and Itay Yavin<sup>(c)</sup>

(a) School of Physics and Astronom y, TelAviv University, TelAviv, Israel

(b) Schm id College of Science, Department of Physics, Chapman University, Orange, CA, 92855

(c) Departm ent of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

A bst ract :W e consider the capture of dark m atter in the Sun by inelastic scattering against nuclei as in the inelastic dark m atter scenario. We show that, assuming a W MP-nucleon cross-section of  $_{n} = 10^{40}$  cm<sup>2</sup> the resulting capture rate and density are su ciently high so that current bounds on the muon neutrino ux from the Sun rule out any appreciable annihilation branching ratio of W MPs into W<sup>+</sup>W<sup>-</sup>, Z<sup>0</sup>Z<sup>0</sup>, <sup>+</sup>, tt and neutrinos. Slightly weaker bounds are also available for annihilations into bb and cc. A nnihilations into lighter particles that m ay produce neutrinos, such as <sup>+</sup>, pions and kaons are unconstrained since those stop in the Sun before decaying. Interestingly enough, this is consistent with some recent proposals motivated by the PAM ELA results for the annihilation of W MPs into light bosons which subsequently decay predom inantly into light leptons and pions.

#### 1. Introduction

In the past twenty or so years, much e ort has been devoted to probing galactic dark m atter, (DM) beyond its gravitational e ects, in an attempt to uncover what consitutes DM and how it interacts. M aybe the most promising candidate is a weakly interacting massive particle (W MP). Direct-detection searches look for W MP-nucleus scattering in underground detectors and carry with them the hope of having laboratory control over DM. So far, most experiments have reported null results and placed very strong bounds on the elastic cross-section for W MP scattering against nuclear matter. Notwithstanding these results, the DAMA collaboration announced an 8.3 discovery in the annual modulations of nuclear recoil rate [1]. Unfortunately, if attributed to W MP elastic scattering, such event rates are excluded by more than two orders of magnitude by the other experiments. An intriguing resolution of this controversy is the proposal of \inelastic dark matter" (DM) laid forth in R ef. [2]. If DM scattering o of nuclear matter is inelastic, with a transition to an excited state of DM roughly 100 keV above the ground state, then the incosistency between the di erent experimental results can be settled [3].

A longside the direct detection e orts, there are also indirect searches looking for energetic neutrinos from W IM P annihilations in the Sun or the Earth or other energetic uxes (photons, positrons, and antiprotons) from annihilations in the intragalactic m edium. Very early on, in a sem inal paper, P ress and Spergel [4] considered the possibility of W IM P s' capture by the Sun and their com putation was later re ned and corrected by G ould [5]. In their work, and all subsequent work on the subject, capture was assumed to proceed through elastic collisions of W IM P s with m atter. In this paper we consider the iD M scenario where capture proceeds via inelastic scattering. W e com pute the associated capture rate and discuss detection prospects in neutrino telescopes.

It is important to realize that the computation of the neutrino ux, starting from W IM Ps' capture and ending with their annihilations, involves several steps which are model dependent. The problem nicely divides into a question of capture and a question of annihilation. These are logically disjoint and call for a modular approach which we carefully review in section 3. Throughout, we strive to maintain a model independent approach and clearly state where and which assumptions are made.

In section 2 we make a short detour and consider the relation of the results presented in this paper to some of the recent developments associated with DM observations and model building. Section 3 is devoted to the formulation of the problem and the modular approach we adopt in resolving it. In section 4 we present and discuss the results and section 5 contains our conclusions.

Finally, we note that in their original work on iDM, Sm ith and W einer already considered the possibility of capture of W MPs in the Sun. Our quantitative conclusions di er from theirs on three accounts. First, we include form -factor e ects which are extremely in portant for iron. In the elastic case, these e ects are so signi cant as to dethrone iron from its place as the prime capturer of W MPs. Second, we take into account the case where elastic scattering is altogether absent and show that the resulting density is nevertheless su ciently high to saturate the annihilation rate in the Sun. This ensures maximal signal and closes a loophole whereby iDM models with little or no elastic component can escape the bounds presented below. Third, the oscillations of the di erent neutrino avors into each other are now well established. This closes another loophole whereby sneutrino type W IMPs annihilate into electron-neutrino only. Previously, the possibility existed for these neutrinos to keep their avor and therefore result in no upward going muons in Earth-bound detectors.

## 2. R ecent D evelopm ents

W hile this work deals speci cally with the problem of inelastic capture of W IM P s by the Sun, we momentarily diverge of this route to discuss its relation to some of the recent developments related to DM. This discussion is useful on its own right because it serves to illustrate the different ingredients that enter the computation and expounded upon in later sections.

M otivated by the positron excess seen by PAMELA [6], a new class of DM m odels was suggested in Ref. [7], employing a light m ediator that both explains the large cross-section and the absence of any excess in the anti-proton ux [B]. A very reasonable candidate for this m ediator is the gauge-boson of an additional (non) abelian gauge group under which DM is charged. These m odels have the added bene t that the small splitting ( 100 keV) and inelastic coupling associated with iDM are naturally generated<sup>1</sup>. These m odels form an organic whole, capable of explaining m any of the astrophysical anomalies reported in the recent years, and contain several distinct phenom enological signatures in portant for this work,

- 1. Som m erfeld enhancem ent of the annihilations of slow W  $\square$  P svia a relatively light boson helps to reconcile the large rate needed to explain the PAMELA positron excess with the cross-section deduced from the therm al relic abundance of DM.
- 2. W IM P s annihilate predom inantly into a pair of these bosons which in turn are weakly mixed with the SM . Their decays into <sup>+</sup> or e<sup>+</sup> e are responsible for the excesses seen in PAMELA, and possibly ATIC, whereas decays into anti-protons are kinematically suppressed [12].
- 3. The features seen in PAMELA (and possibly ATIC) require a fairly heavy W IMP, anywhere between 100 GeV TeV.
- 4. DM excited states are naturally present in the spectrum with  $= m \circ m$  O (100 keV M eV) which can realize the iDM scenario.

N evertheless each of the above elements can independently arise in speci c constructions. Hence, from a phenom enological point of view we should consider how each of these elements

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The idea was rst suggested in Ref. [7] for the non-abelian models and expanded upon in Ref. [9]. The existence of this splitting in abelian models was demonstrated in Refs. [10, 11].

seperately in pacts the prospects of indirect detection of W IM Ps capture and annihilation in the Sun in neutrino telescopes experiments.

Indeed, such a signalm ay bem ore robust than any of the other indirect probes. A nom alies in electrom agnetic signals (PAM ELA, AT IC) m ay be due to special astronom icalm echanism s rather than W IM P annihilations. On the other hand a putative signal of energetic m uonneutrinos coming from the Sun during the (southern) winter or straight up from Earth's center m ay have no other reasonable explanation other than W IM P annihilations in the Sun or Earth<sup>2</sup>.

The rst ingredient involving the Sommerfeld enhanced annihilation cross-section is in fact a boon since it helps to gaurantee equilibrium as discussed in section 4. In particular it can greatly enhance the rate of neutrinos from the Earth as discussed in Ref. [14].

The second ingredient concerning the annihilation channels has the most dram atic e ect as far as neutrino telescopes are concerned. If the W IM Ps dom inantly annihilate into light bosons which consequently decay into muons and electrons, then no energetic neutrinos will be observed. Electrons do not yield neutrinos, and the neutrinos from the muons' decay will be too soft since the muons rst stop in the Sun and only then decay, yielding a M ichel spectrum 30 M eV neutrinos [15, 16]. So this class of models, in their purest form, lead to no observable consequences for neutrino telescopes<sup>3</sup>. In what follows, we will instead rem ain agnostic about the annihilation channels open for W IM Ps and quote results based on branching fractions.

The third ingredient pertaining to the mass of the W MP is relevant for the capture rate (and only mildly to the equilibrium condition). The capture rate is reduced by roughly m<sup>2</sup>. One power of the mass is coming from the obvious inverse dependence of the W MPs number density on their mass, once the local energy density is xed, = 0.3 GeV cm<sup>3</sup>. A second power of the W MPs mass is present because it becomes increasingly di cult to transfer enough m om entum and gravitationally capture heavier W MPs. The heaviest target in the Sun is iron so the capture rate for W MPs with m 52 GeV is strongly suppressed. The resonant enhancement in the Earth discussed by G ould [5] is altogether absent.

This reduction in capture rate is, how ever, o set by the increased neutrino energy. First, the conversion probability of neutrinos into m uons in the rock or ice below the detector grows as ( + N ! + X) E. Second, the range of m uons grows with their energy as well E. This o set does not occur for annihilations of W IM Ps in the Earth. The density of accumulated W IM Ps in the Earth does not build to be \optically thick" to neutrinos and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>To put the issue of particle versus astrophysical explanation in perspective, recall the hotly debated "Solar N eutrino A nom aly". Some of its experim ental evidences were suspected and astrophysical explanations suggested. The late John B ahcall correctly argued that while some experiments suggesting neutrino oscilations for certain neutrino energies may have astrophysical explanations the sum total of all evidences cannot [13]. The present "Uni ed DM m odels" motivated by several anom alies in the electrom agnetic spectrum from m icrow aves to multi-G eV G ammas may survive in some form or another. Note that also the solar case involved a more robust neutrino signal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>This is also true for m odels where W IM Ps dom inantly annihilate into photons, gluons, and kaons, all of which result in little if any energetic neutrinos.

hence the signal is proportional to the the square of the capture rate and massive W IM PS yield a weaker signal. These considerations on it two other factors: i) The Sun becomes optically thick for a neutrino of energy E > 1=2 TeV produced at the solar core, reducing the solar signal; ii) M ore energetic muons point more precisely in the direction of the parent neutrinos. The 10<sup>-3</sup> radian precision required to resolve the solar core is unavilable. However better pointing in proves the Earth signal since the annihilations occur at the center and this can be well tested by the long vertical strings of photom ultiplyers in IceC ube.

The fourth ingredient we comment on is the most relevant for the analysis in this paper, namely the inelastic transition. A sclearly explained in [2], an inelastic transition of 100 keV results in a preference towards heavier targets and is essentially how the absence of nuclear recoils in CDMS (germanium) can be reconciled with the DAMA (iodine) results. Since iron is lighter than germanium the rate for capture in the Earth is tiny at best (nickel is actually a little heavier than iron, but its abundance is two orders ofm agnitude smaller). The situation would have been just as bad in the Sun if it was not for the kinetic energy gained by the W IM P as it falls in the Sun's gravitational well. The escape velocity in the Sun ranges in v<sub>esc</sub> 600 1300 km =s and provides su cient energy to overcom e the excitation barrier of 100 keV. This entire paper rests on this simple observation, one that was made already in

the original work of Sm ith and W einer [2].

Finally, we close this section with a brief survey of existing iDM models and their relevancy to this paper. Rather than concentrating on the DM identity, a more useful categorization is obtained by focusing on the mediator of the inelastic transition. One possible mediator is the SM Z<sup>0</sup> as happens for example in the case of sneutrino DM [2] (see [17, 18] for many other interesting possibilities). If kinematically allowed, DM can then annihilate to a pair of Z<sup>0</sup>'s, which as we show below is strongly constrained. Similar comments would apply for a heavier Z<sup>0</sup>, how ever, in this case the annihilation may be kinematically suppressed. Mediation through a scalar (higgs or other) is somewhat less constrained since DM annihilation into this scalar may produce only bottom quarks as nal products. As already mentioned above, the possibility of a new light mediator can avoid the bounds entirely. DM annihilation in the Sun into any light entity (. GeV) would result in no observable neutrinos. O ther variants are certainly possible, and we hope that the modular approach of this paper will allow for direct comparison with any other future models of iDM.

#### 3. M ethodology

#### 3.1 Approach to Equilibrium

The time evolution of the W IM P population in the Sun is controled by (we follow the notation of Ref. [19]),

$$N = C \quad C_A N^2 \tag{3.1}$$

where C is the capture rate of W IM Ps in the Sun and  $C_A$  is related to the annihilation rate as  $_A = \frac{1}{2}C_A N^2$ . The evaluation of the capture rate, C, will be presented below. In this

subsection we concentrate on the estim ation of  $C_A$  and the modi cation necessary for inelastic scattering. Its signi cance manifests itself by solving Eq. (3.1) for the annihilation rate at a given time,

$$A = \frac{1}{2}C \tanh^2 (t = e_q)$$
(3.2)

where  $_{eq} = 1 = \frac{p}{CC_A}$  is the time scale required to reach equilibrium between capture and annihilation. When  $_{eq}$  becomes comparable or larger than the age of the solar system t '1.5  $10^{17}$  s, the system has not yet reached equilibrium and the annihilation rate is strongly suppressed,

$$_{\rm A} = \frac{1}{2} C (t = _{\rm eq})^2$$
 (3.3)

On the other hand, when t  $_{eq}$ , the annihilation rate is saturated at  $_{A} = \frac{1}{2}C$ .

In the usual W IM P scenario with elastic scattering against nuclear matter,  $C_A$  is essentially determined by the temperature of the Sun and the annihilation cross-section. This is based on the assumption that after being gravitationally captured, W IM P s will continue to lose energy with every subsequent collision and reach thermal equilibrium in the Sun's core. Even with elastic cross-sections as low as  $_n = 10^{43}$  cm<sup>2</sup> the number of collisions they undergo over the solar lifetime is  $th_n vin = 3 = 10^7$ , which is su cient to thermalize. In that case, their number density is given by [20],

$$n(r) = n_0 e^{m} (r) = n_0 e^{r^2 = r_{th}^2}$$
 (3.4)

where  $n_0$  is their number density in the center of the Sun, (r) is the gravitational potential with respect to the core, and T is their temperature. The second equality holds if we assume a constant core density and de ne the therm alradius,

$$r_{th} = \frac{3T}{2 m G} = 0.01 R \frac{T}{1.2 \text{ keV}} \frac{1-2}{m} (3.5)$$

where R is the Sun's radius and T = 1.2 keV is the Sun's core tem perature. The annihilation rate per W IM P squared is given by,

$$C_{A} = \frac{\frac{R}{d^{3}r n (r)^{2} h_{A} vi}{\frac{R}{d^{3}r n (r)^{2}}} = \frac{h_{A} vi}{(2)^{3=2} r_{th}^{3}}$$
(3.6)

where  $_{A}$  is the annihilation cross-section, and the last equality follows from Eq. (3.4). The ratio of solar age to equilibrium time is then given by,

$$\frac{t}{r_{eq}} = 10^3 \frac{C}{10^{25} \sec^{-1}} \frac{h_A vi}{3 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^{-3} \sec^{-1}} \frac{1}{r_{th}} \frac{0.01 \text{ R}}{r_{th}}$$
(3.7)

which implies that equilibrium has been reached long ago and we can expect the full signal from the Sun.

The situation is more subtle in the iDM scenario. First, let us consider the case where a sm all elastic component exists in the scattering of W MPs against nuclear targets. In this case, while capture proceeds through an inelastic transition (with a large cross-section), the subsequent them alization of the W IM P against the nucleons in the Sun can be due to its suppressed ( $_{\rm n} < 10^{43}$  cm<sup>2</sup>) elastic scattering. In speci cm odels of iD M, the elastic coupling is suppressed with respect to the inelastic one by  $10^{64}$ . That would result in an elastic cross-section (per nucleon) of  $_{\rm n}$  '  $10^{52}$  cm<sup>2</sup> which is too sm all to bring the W IM Ps into them al equilibrium with the rest of the matter in the Sun. However, if we take the elastic cross-section to be  $.10^{43}$  cm<sup>2</sup> (current bound from direct-detection), but  $_{\rm n} > 10^{47}$  cm<sup>2</sup> the W IM P can undergo enough collisions to them alize. In that case, the above estimates for the annihilation rate C<sub>A</sub> still apply.

As was recently clari ed and emphasized in Ref. [21], even in the absence of any elastic coupling, the second term in the Born series yields an elastic transition. When the force mediator is very light . 50 MeV, the resulting elastic cross-section per nucleon is su ciently large ( $10^{42}$  cm<sup>2</sup>) to allow for thermalization. However, the cross-section drops rapidly as the mass of the mediator increases and becomes ine cient for a mass of GeV.

In order to close any possible loophole in the argument we computed the nal W IM Ps' density in the pure inelastic case where no elastic scattering is allowed. In order to facilitate the computation, we approximated the Sun's gravitational potential with an analytic form which allows for an exact solution of the oribts<sup>5</sup>, as explicated in a beautiful paper by Henon [22, 23]. We describe the details of the computation in appendix B. In Fig. 1 we depict the resulting density for a particular choice of parameters. The W IM Ps undergo only few collisions before their kinetic enery anywhere in the orbit drops below the inelastic threshold. Therefore, it is dicult for them to shed o all their angular momentum which is the reason why the density vanishes as we approach the Sun's center. On the other hand, since most of the Sun's mass is concentrated in its core, most collisions actually happen in the inner radius (< 0.2R ) and the resulting orbits are to a large extent contained inside the Sun as shown in Fig. 7. As the WIMP gets heavier, it become harder for it to shed o kinetic energy in every collision, but since its initial kinetic energy is larger, it also undergoes more collisions. Due to the di erent approximations used in arriving at these results, they are probably only good to 20% accuracy. However, considering that  $tanh(t = _{e^{\alpha}})$ 1 for  $t = e_{e_{\alpha}}$ 1, these uncertainties do not propagate into the annihilation rate and muon yield discussed below. We conclude that even in the worst case scenario where no elastic scattering is allowed, the annihilation rate still reaches equiliberium and is saturated by half the capture rate<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>T his is usually achieved by starting with a D irac ferm ion (or a complex scalar) of m ass m and adding a small M a prana m ass m. That splits the ferm ion into its M a prana components and generates a m ass splitting of m  $\circ$  m = = m<sup>2</sup>=m 100 keV. A ny vector current coupled to the ferm ion will result in a dom inantly inelastic coupling between and  $\circ$ . A small elastic coupling of size =m 10<sup>6</sup> 10<sup>7</sup> is also generated.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>W e would like to extend our warm gratitude to D.Lynden-Bell for bringing this solution to our attention. <sup>6</sup>W e have assumed here that after its rst excitation collision, the W IM P quickly deexcite to the ground state so any subsequent collision is also endotherm ic. If this is not the case, and the deexcitation time is very long (as recently discussed in Ref. [24, 21]), the situation is even more favorable since the W IM P can now scatter against all the nuclei in the Sun, including hydorgen and helium.



Figure 1: On the left pane we show the W IM P's density (normalized to unity) against the distance from the Sun's center for m = 100 GeV and = 100 keV (solid-black), = 150 keV (dashed-blue), and = 200 keV (dotdashed-red). On the right pane we depict the ratio  $t = _{eq}$  as a function of the W IM P's mass for = 100 keV (black-solid) and = 150 keV for  $h_A vi = 3 \quad 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  and  $C = 10^{25} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  as in Eq. (3.7).

#### 3.2 Capture Rate

If equilibrium is reached then W IM Ps' annihilation rate is saturated at half the capture rate  $_{A} = \frac{1}{2}C$ . The formulae and procedure related to the computation of the inelastic capture rate, C, are presented in appendix A. In here we discuss some of the qualitative points that arise and clarify the modi cations involved. For concretness, we x the inelastic energy threshold to be = 100 keV whenever num erical values are used.

As the W  $\mathbb{I}M P s$  fall into the Sun, they get accelerated in the gravitational well until they m eet a nucleus against which they collide. Their velocity at that point is given by,

$$w(r)^2 = u^2 + v(r)^2$$
 (3.8)

where u is their velocity at ini nity, determ ined by the velocity distribution in the halo and the Sun'sm otion through the galaxy, and v(r) is the escape velocity from the Sun at radius r. For a W  $\mathbb{M}$  P to undergo an inelastic transition against another nucleus of mass m<sub>N</sub>, the total kinetic energy in the center of mass fram e must be greater than the inelasticity,

$$\frac{1}{2} w(r)^{2} > = \frac{m_{N} + m}{m_{N} m}$$
(3.9)

This condition is more easily satis ed for heavier nuclei as we show in Fig. 2 with a plot of K  $\pm$ : for the relevant elements in the Sun as a function of the mass enclosed in a given shell (plotting against the radius is more intuitive, however, it can be misleading since the mass density is not uniform). We took the velocity at in nity to be the most probable speed in a M axwell-Boltzm ann distribution of velocities with a Sun rotation velocity of 220 km =s<sup>7</sup>. We

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>This xed choice of velocity was made only with regard to Fig. 2. In the rest of the paper we used the full Maxwell-Boltzm ann distribution for the velocity at in nity as explained in the appendix.

see that iron is an elective scatterer throughout the Sun, but oxygen is only useful in the inner 50% of the Sun's mass and helium is altogether useless as the kinetic energy is never su cient to overcome the inelastic barrier. Indeed, as we shall see in section 4, scattering o of iron yields the largest capture rate. This is in contradistinction with the elastic case, where iron places only third behind oxygen and helium because of the form -factor suppression discussed below [5]. To obtain the results presented in section 4 we included all the di erent elements persent in the Sun with their proper densities [25]. The heavier elements were taken from [26] and their radial pro le was assumed to follow the mass pro le of the sun. With the exception of hydrogen and helium, all the di erent elements included allow for scattering som ewhere in the Sun and contribute to the capture rate.



Figure 2: The kinetic energy in the W IM P-nucleus center of mass frame as a function of the mass m (in units of M) enclosed in a given shell. The velocity at in nity was taken to be u = 220 km =s as explained in the text. The curves correspond to scattering against iron, oxygen, and carbon from top to bottom. The W IM P mass was xed at 100 G eV (500 G eV) on the left (right) pane. Carbon is the lightest element present in the Sun against which the W IM P can scatter inelastically.

The inelastic barrier in fact enhances the capture rate in those cases where a scattering is kinem atically accessible. In order to be gravitationally captured the W IM P must lose a certain am ount of kinetic energy. In the elastic case, the entire energy must be transferred to the nucleus against which the W IM P scatters. In the case of iD M, how ever, a signi cant fraction of this energy is lost to the excitation. W hen the excited state relaxes back to the ground state, it can only do so through the emission of very light states with no signi cant recoil. The net result is that the inelastic transition allows the W IM P to lose energy e ciently and hence to further enhance the capture rate.

The transfer of a large fraction of the kinetic energy to an excited state instead of to the nucleus further contributes to the rate by softening the momentum transfer and tam ing the reduction usually associated with the nuclear form -factor. This is particularly important in the case of iron where the form -factor suppression in the elastic case is very signi cant and can result in an order of magnitude reduction in rate form 100 G eV. More speci cally consider a form -factor exp ( $Q = Q_0$ ) with  $Q_0 = 82$  keV for iron (see appendix A for details) and where Q is the energy transfer. If Q is now smaller by about 100 keV this results in

a rate increase by a factor of  $exp(=Q_0) = 3:4$ .

The above considerations lead us to an important conclusion. While one might have naively expected that inelasticity will result in a substantial reduction in the capture rate this is in fact not the case! Iron (which in the elastic case would have dominated capture if not for the form -factor suppression) is kinem atically accessible everywhere in the Sun and in fact enjoys an enhancement in its associated capture rate because of the reduced energy transfer and the related softening of form -factor suppression! This enhancement is by and large su cient to compensate for the loss of helium (and partly oxygen) as a scatterer.

## 4.Results

In this section we present the numerical results for the capture rate of W MPs in the Sun. Throughout we will assume a W MP-nucleon cross-section of  $_n = 10^{40}$  cm<sup>2</sup>, and note that the resulting capture rate scales linearly with the cross-section<sup>8</sup>. Using the DarkSUSY software package version 5.0 [27] we also give the associated muon yield on the Earth from di erent annihilation channels of W MPs in the Sun. M any annihilation channels are in fact already constrained by present bounds on the neutrino ux from the Sun as we discuss below. Finally, we discuss the reach of future neutrino telescope experiments.

In Fig. 3 we plot the capture rate in the Sun as a function of the W  $\mathbb{M}$  P's mass for two di erent choices of the most probable W  $\mathbb{M}$  P velocity in the halo. In the same gure we also depict the capture rate's dependence on the excitation energy, . As increases, the exponential suppression due to the nuclear form factor is curbed since less momentum is transfered. This results in a rapid rise of the capture rate as illustrated in Eq. A -14 in appendix A. However, when becomes too large the capture rate diminishes rapidly because fewer shells in the Sun can participate in the capture.

There are existing limits on the ux of muon-neutrinos from W IM P annihilation in the Sun from both underground detectors (BAKSAN [28], Super-K am iokande [29], and MACRO [30]) as well as dedicated neutrino telescopes (AMANDA [31], BAIKAL [32]). The strongest bounds acually come from the Super-K results which we show in Fig. 4 alongside the muon yield for several annihilation channels plotted against the W IM P's mass. These channels are excluded by several orders of magnitude. On the right of Fig. 4, we plot the corresponding limits on the branching ratios of the di erent annihilation channels. The bounds on direct annihilation into neutrinos deteriorate at higher W IM P mass because the more energetic neutrinos are further attenuated by matter in the Sun.

Future neutrino telescopes (Antares [33] and IceC ube [34]) are expected to have larger exposures and m ay provide even stronger constraints on W  $\mathbb{I}M P s$  annihilation in the Sun. In Fig. 6 we show the expected reach for both hard and soft spectra together with the expected yield from the least constrained annihilation channels (cc and bb, both resulting in a soft

 $<sup>^{8}</sup>$  <sub>n</sub> = 10  $^{40}$  cm<sup>2</sup> is the typical W IM P-nucleon cross-section used in iD M models for thing the DAMA results, see for example Ref. [3]. It is in fact somewhat of a lower bound since the needed cross-sections are almost always higher except when m 100 GeV and . 50 keV [17].



Figure 3: On the left pane we plot the capture rate against the W M P mass. The solid curve correspond to an inelastic model with = 125 keV and v = 220 km =s whereas the dotted curve to v = 254 km =s. In both cases we take  $_{n} = 10^{40}$  cm<sup>2</sup>. On the right pane we depict the grow th of the capture rate as a function of the inelasticity for v = 220 km =s (solid) and v = 254 km =s (dashed). The upper two curves correspond to m = 200 G eV (blue) and the lower two curves to m = 400 G eV



Figure 4: On the left is a plot of the muon yield in the inelastic case ( = 125 keV,  $_n = 10^{-40} \text{ cm}^2$ ) for di erent annihilation channels from top to bottom on the left: ,  $^+$  ,  $Z^0Z^0$ ,  $W^+W$ , tt, bb, and cc. The area above the thick (violet) curve is excluded by Super-K. On the right pane we plot the corresponding bound on the annihilation branching ratio for the respective channels against the W IM P's mass.

spectrum). We assumed a muon threshold of 5 GeV which is appropriate for Antares, but probably too low for LoeC ube.

Recently, motivated by the positron excess seen in PAMELA, it was suggested that DM may annihilate into two light bosons which are weakly mixed with the SM and so subsequently decay into light particles such as electrons, muons and pions [7]. As mentioned above, such channels cannot be probed by neutrino telescopes since those nalstates will stop in the Sun



Figure 5: Same as Fig. 4, but with v = 254 km =s.

before decaying to neutrinos. However, gauge invariance requires these light bosons to also mix with the Z<sup>0</sup> and so have a small coupling to neutrinos as well. In the case of kinetic mixing the coupling to neutrinos compared to the coupling to charge is suppressed by m<sup>2</sup>=M<sub>Z</sub><sup>2</sup>, where m is the mass of the dark vector-boson. Considering the enormous yield from direct neutrino production this might be observable when m > 3 GeV. However, in that case, the unsuppressed decay into charm quarks is likely to give a better bound.



Figure 6: The bottom (top) solid curve shows the muon yield from W IM P annihilation in the Sun into  $\infty$  (bb) which result in a soft muon spectrum for v = 220 km =s (v = 254 km =s) on the left (right) pane. Antares' reach is shown for hard (soft) spectrum in the violet solide (dotted) curve. IceC ube's reach is shown with the blue solid (dotted) curve for hard (soft) spectrum.

## 5.Conclusions

The iDM scenario o ers the exciting possibility of extra structure in the DM sector which

explains the discrepancy between the DAMA results and limits coming from other direct detection experiments. It may also be responsible for some unexplained background events in those detectors employing heavier targets (XENON [35] and CRESST [36]). In this paper we showed that such a mechanism will result in a very large capture rate of W IMPs in the Sun. Current bounds on the neutrino ux from Super-Kam ionkande strongly constrain the annihilation channels of such W IMPs into SM particles. Assuming a W IMP-nucleon cross-section of  $_n = 10^{40}$  cm<sup>2</sup>, it requires the branching ratio of annihilations into W + W , Z<sup>0</sup>Z<sup>0</sup>, + , tt and neutrinos to be < 1%. Annihilations into bb and cc, which result in a softer spectrum, are less constrained. Future limits from Antares or IceC ube may reduce these branching ratios by an additional order of magnitude.

It is in portant to realize that these results are likely only robust to within 50% due to the uncertainties in some of the input parameters (such as W M P velocity distribution, iron distribution in the Sun, precise form -factors and etc.). Therefore, while the harder annihilation channels are strongly constrained, the softer ones are less so. Finally, it was recently shown in Ref. [37] that a dark disc (as compared to the spherical halo assumed in this work) would enhance the capture rate by up to an order of magnitude. If this e ect is taken into account, even the softer annihilation channels are strongly constrained.

Interestingly enough, the recent fram ework suggested in Ref. [7] unabashedly escapes these bounds. Motivated by the recent results from PAMELA, the DM in this picture annihilates predom inantly into light leptons or pions through interm ediate light bosons. Such light charged particles stop in the Sun before they decay and do not result in any observable neutrinos. Nevertheless, the bounds discussed in this paper restrict the coupling of DM to the SM . A side from restricting the possible annihilation channels, it also has a direct in pact on the possible mechanisms for the mediation of supersymmetry breaking to the extended DM sector.

N ote A dded: W e would like to thank the authors of Ref. [38] for the useful com m unication regarding their results which are in qualitative agreement with ours. W hile they also consider the inelastic capture of W IM Ps in the Sun, some of their input parameters are different and serve to emphasize the inherent uncertainties in the computation when compared with our results.

A cknow ledgm ents: W e would like to thank N. A rkaniH am ed, D. Lynden-Bell, A. Pierce, and N. W einer for very useful discussions. I. Y. would like to thank the CCPP for their hospitality while this work was completed. L.-T.W. and I.Y. are supported by the NSF grant PHY-0756966 and the DOE grant DE-FG 02-90ER 40542.

## A.Capture Rate Computation

In this appendix we sum marize the steps, approximations, and gures used to compute the capture rate of inelastic DM in the Sun. We also provide an analytic approximation which help elucidate some of the features present in the numerical results.

We consider a W IM P with velocity u at in nity which is scattered in a region with escape velocity v. Hence, its total velocity in that shell is  $w^2 = u^2 + v^2$ . In order to be captured, it must scatter down below v. The capture rate per unit shell in the Sun is given by [5],

$$\frac{dC}{dV} = \frac{Z}{du} \frac{f(u)}{u} w \quad (w)$$
 (A-1)

where f(u) is the W IM P's velocity distribution at in nity. (w) is the rate per unit time at which a W IM P of velocity w scatter to a velocity less than v. It is given by,

$$(w) = (n \ w) \frac{Q_{max} \quad Q_{cap}}{Q_{max} \quad Q_{m in}}$$
(A-2)

where the st factor, n w is just the rate of scattering, and the second factor embodies the probability of capture. W e now address each component separately.

The inelastic non-relatvisitic cross-section is given by,

$$= \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{w^2 = 2}} - \frac{\frac{2}{p_{p_{e}}^2}}{\frac{2}{p_{e}}} - \frac{\frac{f_p^2 Z^2 + f_n (A - Z)^2}{f_p^2}}{f_p^2} = \frac{1}{n}$$
 (A-3)

with  $_{ne}$  being the W IM P-nucleon reduced mass, and  $_{n}$  is the W IM P-nucleon elastic crosssection.  $f_{p(n)}$  determines the relative contribution of protons (neutrons) and we normalize our results to  $f_{p} = f_{n} = 1$ . We choose a ducial value of  $_{n} = 10^{-40}$  cm<sup>2</sup>. The nalrate is easily scalable with these quantities.

The second component in Eq. (A-2) contains  $Q_{max}$  ( $Q_{min}$ ) which is the maximum (minimum) energy transfer possible in the scattering process.  $Q_{cap}$  is the minimal energy transfer needed for capture,

$$Q_{max} = \frac{1}{2}m w^{2} @ 1 \frac{2}{m_{N}^{2}} 1 \frac{m_{N}}{m} \frac{1}{w^{2}=2} A \qquad (A-4)$$

$$Q_{m in} = \frac{1}{2}m w^2 \theta 1 \frac{2}{m_N^2} 1 + \frac{m_N}{m} 1 \frac{2}{w^2 = 2} A$$
 (A-5)

$$Q_{cap} = \frac{1}{2}m \quad w^2 \quad v^2 \tag{A-6}$$

where is the W IM P-nucleus reduced mass, and is the inelastic energy gap. Including nuclear form factors, the formula for the capture rate per unit time gets modied to,

$$(w) = \frac{n w}{Q_{max} Q_{min}} \sum_{Q_{max}}^{Z_{Q_{max}}} e^{Q = Q_0}$$
(A-7)

where,

$$Q_0 = \frac{3}{2m_N R^2}$$
  $R = 10^{-13}$   $0.91 \frac{m_N}{GeV} + 0.3$   $cm$  (A-8)

We assume that the WIMP's velocity distribution in the halo is given by a Maxwell-Boltzm ann distribution as seen by an observer moving with velocity v

$$f(x)dx = \frac{4}{m}p - x^2 e^{-x^2} e^{-2} \frac{\sinh(2x)}{2x} dx$$
 (A-9)

where = 0.3 GeV cm<sup>-3</sup> is the local mass density and the dimensionless quantities x and are given by,

$$x^2 = \frac{u^2}{v_0^2}$$
 (A-10)

$$\frac{v^2}{v_0^2}$$
 (A-11)

with  $v_0 = 220$ km =s.

It is possible to obtain approxim at analytic results for the capture rate as follows. Because of the phase-space suppression in Eq. (A-3) the scattering has larger support when  $< w^2=2$ . Hence we can Taylor expand the radical in the expression for the momentum transfer and get,

$$Q_{m ax} = \frac{1}{2}m v_0^2 + A^2 + x^2 - \frac{m + m_N}{m m_N} - \frac{m + v_0^2}{m v_0^2}$$
 (A-12)

with  $4m m_N = (m m_N)^2$ ,  $A^2 v^2 = v_0^2$  (our notation here follows that of G ould [5]). In this case, ignoring form-factor for the moment, the integral over the velocity distribution can be done exactly and the results are identical to those found in Ref. [5] with the identication,

$$A^{2}! A^{2} \frac{m + m_{N}}{m - m_{N}} \frac{m + v_{0}^{2}}{m - v_{0}^{2} = 2}$$
 (A-13)

This tends to reduce the capture since it dim in ishes the maximum energy transfer and hence the probability for capture. Notice that the additive term involving in the energy transfer drops out since in the absence of form -factors the capture rate involves only di erences in energies.

This term becomes signi cant when including the form -factor as it serves to increase the capture rate. Using Eq. (A-13) it is possible to obtain an approximate analytical expression in this case as well. Regardless, the most important feature is that the capture rate grows exponentially with ,

$$\frac{dC}{dV} = \frac{2}{p} \frac{n}{m} \frac{v_0}{m} e^{-Q_0} (:::)$$
 (A-14)

where the ellipsis denote the usual expression involving the form -factor corrected by . This behavior re ects the fact that as the inelastic threshold increases, less energy is transferred to the nucleus and the form -factor suppression is correspondingly sm aller! Therefore, in the case of inelastic transitions, the reduction due to form factor is not as severe. In particular it

allows iron to assume the role of the prime contributer to capture, a role it would have played in the elastic case as well if not for the form -factor suppression.

All together, inelasticity enters in two signi cant ways. First, it tends to reduce the capture rate because of the dim inishing phase-space. Second, since less energy is transferred to the nucleus, the reaction is more coherent, form -factor e ects are dim inished, and the capture rate enjoys an increase as com pared with the elastic case. For iron in particular, the second e ect is much more important as discussed in the text above.

#### B.Density Computation

In order to compute the density of the W IM Ps accumulated in the Sun we approximated the Sun's potential with an analytic formula which allows for an exact solution for the orbits [22, 23]. It interpolates between an harm onic potential close to the core and an inverse fall-o at long distances,

U (r) = 
$$\frac{GM}{2bR}$$
 1  $\frac{2b}{b+b^2+r^2}$  (B-1)

(in here the potential energy is computed with respect to the origin where it is zero rather than at in nity). A t to the Sun's actual potential [25], gives b = 0.0884R and yields an approximation which is roughly 10% 20% accurate. The orbits are found by rst expressing the potential U in term s of r, which by an adequate choice of units can be written simply as,

$$r^2 = \frac{U}{(1 - U)^2}$$
 (B-2)

The dependence of the azim with and the time variable on the potential (and hence on r) can be found by usage of the constants of motion and a straightforward integration. The interested reader can nd the details of the solution in Ref. [23].



Figure 7: A typical event in which a W IM P approaches the Sun, collides with an Iron nuclei and gets captured in a bounded rosette-like orbit. The solid-blue line is the approach path from in nity to the point of collision. The dashed-green line is the orbit after collision which is norm ally contained within the Sun that is delineated by the circle.

To nd the naldensity, we incorporated the exact solution for the orbits into a M onte-Carlo simulation. We let the W IM P's start at in nity with an impact parameter which is uniform ly distributed and a shifted M axwelBoltzm ann velocity distribution with the rotational speed of the local standard of rest  $v_0 = 220$  km =s and  $v = v_0$ . The W IM P is then allowed to scatter at any radius in the Sun, assum ing its orbit reaches that point and its kinetic energy is su ciently large to overcom e the inelasticity. W e take the probability of scattering as a function of radius to be proportional to the local density divided by the W IM P's velocity at that radius. The scattering is assumed to be isotropic in the center of m ass frame, and the kinetic energy of the outgoing W IM P is restricted to be below the capture rate. A fler the collision, the kinetic energy of the outgoing W IM P and its angle with respect to its original direction of motion are used to determ ine its new orbit. Fig. 7 depicts a typical approach and capture of a W IM P by the Sun. If any further collisions are energetically possible then they are executed following similar steps as described above. Once no further collisions are possible the orbit is recorded and stored.

The density is computed by simulating 10,000 capture events and then random ly sampling the radii of the resulting orbits. It is in portant to sample uniform ly in time rather than radius because the particle actually spends most of its time close to the apogee.

#### References

- [1] DAM A Collaboration, R.Bernabei et al., First results from DAMA/LIBRA and the combined results with DAMA/NaI, Eur. Phys. J.C 56 (2008) 333{355, [0804.2741].
- [2] D. Tucker-Sm ith and N. W einer, Inelastic dark matter, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 043502, [hep-ph/0101138].
- [3] S.Chang, G.D.K ribs, D.Tucker-Sm ith, and N.W einer, Inelastic Dark Matter in Light of DAMA/LIBRA, 0807.2250.
- [4] W. H. Press and D. N. Spergel, Capture by the sun of a galactic population of weakly interacting, massive particles, A strophys. J. 296 (1985) 679(684.
- [5] A.Gould, Resonant Enhancements in W IM P Capture by the Earth, Astrophys. J. 321 (1987) 571.
- [6] O.Adrianietal, Observation of an anomabus positron abundance in the cosm ic radiation, 0810.4995.
- [7] N.ArkaniHamed, D.P.Finkbeiner, T.Slatyer, and N.Weiner, A Theory of Dark Matter, Phys. Rev. D 79 (2009) 015014, [0810.0713].
- [8] O.Adrianiet al., A new measurement of the antiproton-to-proton ux ratio up to 100 GeV in the cosm ic radiation, 0810.4994.
- [9] M. Baum gart, C. Cheung, J. T. Ruderm an, L.-T. W ang, and I. Yavin, Non-Abelian Dark Sectors and Their Collider Signatures, 0901.0283.
- [10] A.Katz and R.Sundrum, Breaking the Dark Force, 0902.3271.
- [11] C.Cheung, J.T.Ruderman, L.-T.W ang, and I.Yavin, K inetic M ixing as the O rigin of Light D ark Scales, 0902.3246.

- [12] I. Cholis, L. Goodenough, and N. W einer, H igh Energy Positrons and the W MAP H are from Exciting D ark M atter, 0802.2922.
- [13] S.B ludman, N. Hata, and P. Langacker, A strophysical solutions are incompatible with the solar neutrino data, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 3622 [3625, [hep-ph/9306212].
- [14] C.Delaunay, P.J.Fox, and G.Perez, Probing Dark Matter Dynamics via Earthborn Neutrinos at IceCube, 0812.3331.
- [15] S.Ritz and D. Seckel, DETAILED NEUTRINO SPECTRA FROM COLD DARK MATTER ANNIHILATIONS IN THE SUN, Nucl. Phys. B 304 (1988) 877.
- [16] P.Crotty, High-energy neutrino uxes from supermassive dark matter, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 063504, [hep-ph/0205116].
- [17] Y. Cui, D. E. Morrissey, D. Poland, and L. Randall, Candidates for Inelastic Dark Matter, 0901.0557.
- [18] D.S.M.Alves, S.R.Behbahani, P.Schuster, and J.G.Wacker, Composite Inelastic Dark Matter, 0903.3945.
- [19] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest, Supersymmetric dark matter, Phys. Rept. 267 (1996) 195{373, [hep-ph/9506380].
- [20] K.Griest and D.Seckel, Cosm ic A symmetry, Neutrinos and the Sun, Nucl. Phys. B 283 (1987) 681.
- [21] B.Batell, M.Pospelov, and A.Ritz, Direct Detection of Multi-component Secluded W IM Ps, 0903.3396.
- [22] M. Henon, L'Am as Isochrone, Annales d'Astrophysique 22 (1959) 126.
- [23] M. Henon, L'Am as Isochrone Calcul des Orbites, Annales d'Astrophysique 22 (1959) 491.
- [24] D.P.Finkbeiner, T.R.Slatyer, N.W einer, and I.Yavin, PAMELA, DAMA, INTEGRAL and Signatures of M etastable Excited W IMPs, 0903.1037.
- [25] J.N.Bahcall, M.H.Pinsonneault, and S.Basu, Solar models: Current epoch and time dependences, neutrinos, and helioseism obgical properties, A strophys. J. 555 (2001) 990{1012, [astro-ph/0010346].
- [26] N.G revesse and A.J.Sauval, Standard Solar Composition, Space Sci. Rev. 85 (1998) 161{174.
- [27] P.G ondolo et al, D arkSU SY: C om puting supersym m etric dark m atter properties num erically, JCAP 0407 (2004) 008, [astro-ph/0406204].
- [28] O.V. Suvorova, Status and perspectives of indirect search for dark matter, hep-ph/9911415.
- [29] Super-K am iokande Collaboration, S.Desaiet al, Search for dark matter W IM Ps using upward through-going m uons in Super-K am iokande, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 083523, [hep-ex/0404025].
- [30] M A C R O C ollaboration, M . Am brosio et al., Lim its on dark m atter W IM Ps using upward-going m uons in the M A C R O detector, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999) 082002, [hep-ex/9812020].

- [31] A M A N D A Collaboration, M. Ackerm ann et al., Lim its to the muon ux from neutralino annihilations in the Sun with the AMANDA detector, A stropart. Phys. 24 (2006) 459{466, [astro-ph/0508518].
- [32] BaikalCollaboration, V. Aynutdinov et al., The Baikal neutrino experiment: From NT200 to NT200+, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 567 (2006) 433{437, [astro-ph/0507709].
- [33] A N TA R E S C ollaboration, E. A slanides et al., A deep sea telescope for high energy neutrinos, astro-ph/9907432.
- [34] IceC ube Collaboration, A. A chterberg et al., First year perform ance of the IceC ube neutrino telescope, A stropart. Phys. 26 (2006) 155{173, [astro-ph/0604450].
- [35] X E N O N Collaboration, J. Angle et al., First Results from the X ENON 10 D ark M atter Experim ent at the G ran Sasso N ational Laboratory, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 021303, [0706.0039].
- [36] G.Angloher et al, Commissioning Run of the CRESST-IID ark Matter Search, 0809.1829.
- [37] T.Bruch, A.H.G.Peter, J.Read, L.Baudis, and G.Lake, Dark Matter Disc Enhanced Neutrino Fluxes from the Sun and Earth, 0902.4001.
- [38] A.Menon, R.Morris, A.Pierce, and N.Weiner, Capture and Indirect Detection of Inelastic Dark Matter, 0905.1847.

