Sub-GeV Dark Matter Detection with Electron Recoils in Carbon Nanotubes

G. Cavoto, F. Luchetta, and A.D. Polosa*

Sapienza University of Rome, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Rome, Italy

Directional detection of Dark Matter particles (DM) in the MeV mass range could be accomplished by studying electron recoils in large arrays of parallel carbon nanotubes. In a scattering process with a lattice electron, a DM particle might transfer sufficient energy to eject it from the nanotube surface. An external electric field is added to drive the electron towards the open ends of the array, where it is eventually detected. The anisotropic response of this detection scheme, as a function of the orientation of the target with respect to the DM wind, is calculated, and it is concluded that no direct measurement of the electron ejection angle is needed to explore significant regions of the light DM exclusion plot. A standard compact photomultiplier, in which the photocathode element is substituted with a dense array of parallel carbon nanotubes, could serve as the basic detection unit.

arXiv:1706.02487v2 [hep-ph] 8 Sep 2017

Introduction. Two-dimensional targets for directional dark matter searches have been recently studied in [1] and [2]. Array of carbon nanotubes considered in [1] could work as highly transmitting channels for carbon ions recoiled by DM Particles with masses $M_{\gamma} > 1$ GeV. If nanotube axes are aligned in the direction of the Cygnus constellation, along which the largest fraction of the DM velocity vectors are oriented, a significantly higher number of carbon ions is expected to be channeled with respect to the case in which the array is turned in the transverse direction. Interstices among carbon nanotubes (CNT) are also found to cooperate to enlarge the effective channeling angle of the array: the maximal recoil angle a carbon ion can have to be channeled by the array and eventually be detected is computed in [3].

If instead electron recoils are considered, graphene sheets are potentially very good directional targets for DM in the MeV mass range [2]. Most of the ideas on sub-GeV dark matter and on the possibilities for exploring and revealing it are summarized in the report [4]; more specifically see Refs. [5]–[11].

The energy price to pay to extract valence band, π orbital electrons from graphene is in the order of few eVs (the work function being $\phi_{wf} \approx 4.3 \text{ eV}$ as opposed to a minimum of 20 eV to eject a carbon atom¹). Due to the nature of the scattering with electrons in the graphene structure, electron recoils tend to follow the same direction of the incident DM. Graphene layers, oriented perpendicularly to the DM wind, tend to emit electrons in the same direction, which should be immediately collected/detected. A measurement of the recoil angle would provide clear directional information enhancing the capabilities of background rejection.

In this note we follow the suggestion by Hochberg

et al. [2] of using electron recoils from both π and sp^2 -orbitals in graphene, but again we resort to the wrapped configuration provided by carbon nanotubes (single-wall carbon nanotubes are essentially graphene sheets wrapped on a cylinder surface). This allows to reach a higher density of target material, *i.e.* smaller detectors, which in turn could be more easily handled and oriented in the DM wind direction. With carbon nanotubes we find the same directional behavior of electron recoils it is found in [2] for graphene layers.

The target scheme. When electron recoils are considered, the nanotube walls cannot work as reflecting surfaces, as they were considered in [1, 3], capable of channeling ions having transverse energies lower than the reflecting potential barriers at the boundaries (in the order of few hundreds of eVs). On the contrary, electrons injected in the body of nanotubes (or in the interstices) by DM-electron scatterings, might go through the walls, with definite transmission coefficients, and undergo multi-scattering events, crossing several nanotubes, before exiting from the array. As a benchmark for our analysis, we have used the results of some experimental studies on the determination of transmission coefficients of electrons through graphene planes [12–16]. More information from experiments of this kind would be extremely useful for determining directly also reflection and absorption coefficients.

The addition of an electric field E, coaxial with nanotube parallel axes, turns out to be crucial. Its orientation is such to drive recoiled electrons in the direction opposite to the substrate, where the nanotubes have been deposited on — see Fig. 1. Following [1, 3], we might have considered to align the nanotube axes in the DM wind direction in order to get most of the recoils in that direction. However we eventually find that it is preferable to have the nanotube axes oriented perpendicularly to the DM wind. The alignment can be kept fixed by a continuous mechanical tracking system.

As reminded above, electron recoils are mainly forward, keeping track of the dark matter direction.

We need to identify, in presence of the external E,

¹ In addition to this, more energy is needed to eject an ionized carbon nucleus, necessary condition to be channeled in the nanotube array.



FIG. 1: Scheme of the basic unit of the carbon nanotube array. The grey sectors represent the sections of two close-by nanotubes. In the presence of an electric field directed to the substrate (on the left), 'top-to-bottom' trajectories are possible in which the electron ejected by the DM particle gets bended and redirected as a 'top' electron. The detection apparatus is located on the side of the open ends of the array (on the right of the scheme). Electrons can also be transmitted through the nanotubes walls or reflected/absorbed.

which are the orientations of the nanotube array having maximal probability for the electrons to recoil in the direction opposite to the substrate, where the detection apparatus is located.

We call $N_{+} = N(\theta_w)$ the number of electrons reaching the detection region as a function of the angle θ_w between the average direction of the DM wind and the carbon nanotube (parallel) axes, oriented along the direction from the closed bottom to the open ends. We also define $N_{-} = N(180^{\circ})$ and we will seek for θ_w angles giving the largest asymmetry

$$A(\theta_w) = \frac{N_+ - N_-}{N_+ + N_-} \tag{1}$$

On the basis of the results obtained in [2], we expect A to be maximal in correspondence of $\theta_w \sim 90^\circ$, see the discussion in the 'Results' section below. This is indeed what we find, even though the geometry of the target is different from the flat graphene planes. The interesting point is that, according to our simulations, an asymmetry as large as $A \approx 1/3$ can be reached. Such a value of A could be measured with 5σ experimental significance by counting a total number of about 200 events, in absence of background.

To observe the anisotropy A, there is no need to measure the ejection angle of recoiling electrons. Only an efficient electron counting and mechanical tracking system is needed. This might allow to consider a detection apparatus in which - for instance - the carbon nanotubes array target is replacing the photocathode of a compact photomultiplier.

We will illustrate in what follows how we reach these conclusions.

Trajectories and the absorption coefficient. The basic unit of a carbon nanotube array is sketched

in Fig. 1. A collision with a DM particle might generate

a 'top' electron, which aims in the direction towards the open ends of the nanotubes, where the detection apparatus is located, or a 'bottom' electron, which is instead directed towards the substrate, where it is always absorbed. Top electrons might be reflected, transmitted or just stopped/absorbed by the nanotube walls.

In the conditions described, electrons are in the the 1-10 eV energy range, *i.e.*, they have negligible resolution power for atoms and nuclei. These long wavelength electrons (between 4 and 12 Å) interact with portions of the graphene (or nanotube surfaces) producing a diffraction pattern in transmission, as discussed in [17] and [18]. The largest intensity is expected in the forward direction, as can be seen from Fig. 9 in [18] and Fig. 4 in [17]. Secondary maxima are found at angles θ between the incident electron wave-vector \mathbf{k} and the final one \mathbf{k}' given by $\sin(\theta/2) = (\lambda/3l) \sqrt{m_1^2 + m_2^2 + m_1m_2}$ in the elastic approximation $|\mathbf{k}| \sim |\mathbf{k}'|$ — here l is the bound length $l \simeq 0.14$ nm and $m_{1,2}$ are integers.

Almost everywhere in the range 1 < E < 10 eV, the previous equation has only the solution $m_1, m_2 = 0$ and $\theta = 0$, corresponding to forward transmission. In the upper part of the energy range $E \gtrsim 8$ eV, other solutions are possible but one has to choose those not involving a change of the z component since $\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{q}$ with \mathbf{q} in the graphene plane. To the best of our knowledge, there are no experiments giving precise information about the relative weight of transmissions versus reflections from graphene monolayers. Specular reflections of low energy electrons are expected to occur at low energies.

Inelastic scatterings through the graphene monolayer are also possible in principle. Significant changes in the size of momentum correspond to 'absorptions'. Consider the case in which $|\mathbf{k}'|$ is significantly smaller than $|\mathbf{k}|$. The diffraction condition would require $|(k^2 - q^2)/2k^2| \leq 1$ which does not hold in our low energy range (\mathbf{q} is the momentum exchanged with the lattice).

Indeed in the experiments reported in [12-16] it is found that the largest part of the electron beam is transmitted or reflected by a monolayer graphene sheet (deposited on a surface with holes). When determining the asymmetry in Eq. (1), we include the case in which a certain amount of deflection is taken into account at every carbon nanotube crossing. This does not reflect the ordered diffraction pattern, but gives an idea of how the asymmetry A changes when such a randomization of scattering angles is introduced.

The presence of an electric field \boldsymbol{E} makes 'bottom-totop' trajectories possible, as shown in figure: an electron initially moving with a direction which would not allow its final detection gets bended by \boldsymbol{E} following a trajectory whose curvature depends on the electron recoil energy E_R . In the limit in which the absorption coefficients at the nanotube walls were exactly zero, almost all 'bottom-to-top' electrons would finally become 'top' ones – no distinction between the two categories would be possible. However, as it is known from a number of experiments on graphene sheets [12–16], absorption coefficients C are not zero. This is the key feature we are using here. Using fixed values of C compatible with experimental observations, we find how the ratio

$$S(V) = \frac{N_{\rm top}}{\sqrt{N_{\rm top} + N_{\rm bottom-to-top}}}$$
(2)

varies with the voltage V applied across the nanotube array. In the calculation of S(V) we simply consider an isotropic emission of electrons from the nanotube surfaces, neglecting for the moment the anisotropic emission reminded above. This is done with the purpose of studying the effect of a finite C only.

In the $C \rightarrow 0$ limit we get the minimum possible values of S due to a large number of 'bottom-to-top' events. In the opposite limit of large C we also have rather small Svalues: electrons need to have the right orientation from the start to be eventually detected. In this case very few 'bottom-to-top' events are registered. Plausible Cvalues for nanotubes show instead a reasonable pattern of electron recoils — see Fig. 2.

In the calculation giving the results in Fig. 2, the voltage across the nanotube array and the initial electron kinetic energies are fixed. The probability of transmission T, reflection R and absorption C are introduced (T + R + C = 1). In the following, as suggested in [12– 16] we will keep T + R to be the dominant fraction thus varying only the small C = 1 - (T + R) value. The chosen values of C are suggested in the quoted references; in particular in [16], C is measured to be $C \sim 10^{-4}$ for electrons with $E \leq 3$ eV.

Soft electrons, with energies $E_R \simeq 1$ eV, are most easily dragged by the electric field. For slightly harder ones (left panel) we can see how an increase of the voltage corresponds first to a an increase in S, then to a decrease for higher V values (where more bottom-to-top events are collected) — curves will all eventually raise, as the one for the 1 eV electrons, for V > 40 Volts. The pattern showing maxima, for C = 0.003, disappears when increasing C by an order of magnitude (right panel). In that case bottom-to top electrons tend to get stacked in the nanotube array and S is overall lower.

The simulation of trajectories follows a standard procedure. A random nanotube in the array and a random point P on it are chosen. An electron is ejected from P with some random direction. Electrons facing the substrate/open-ends are labelled as the 'bottom'/'top' ones. Electrons in both categories experience a force due to the potential difference V. Positions and velocities can be computed at every step of the simulation (using an Euler algorithm). This allows to reconstruct the whole trajectory. At every intersection of the trajectory with any nanotube in the array, a transmission/reflection/absorption is decided with probabilistic weights T, R, C. Some few trajectories terminate neither on the side where the open ends of the nanotube array are, nor on the substrate: there is a limited number of 'side' electrons, similarly to what was found for 'side'ions in the simulations discussed in [3]. The calculation are repeated for an arbitrary number of initial electrons.

Results. Differently from the calculations done to study the S(V) ratio defined in Eq. (2), following [2], we consider now the collision of DM particles with graphene electrons in both π and sp^2 -orbitals, with cross section given by Eq. (7), in the Appendix. This depends on the $|\psi(\boldsymbol{q}-\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{\ell})|^2$ factor, which measures the probability for the recoiled electron to have 3-momentum k' when the value of the exchanged 3-momentum with the graphene lattice is q and ℓ is the lattice momentum in the Brillouin zones. In our description, single-wall carbon nanotubes correspond to wrapped graphene planes. Thus, first of all, we have reproduced, with perfect agreement, the results illustrated in [2] and then considered periodic boundary conditions on graphene planes to get the appropriate ψ functions.

The diameter of a nanotube is of the order of 2R = 100 Å and we consider electrons having recoil kinetic energies in the range² ~ 1 - 10 eV, corresponding to de Broglie's wavelengths $4 < \lambda < 12$ Å. At λ , the nanotube curved surface is almost identical to the tangent plane, being $R \gg \lambda$. It is therefore reasonable to assume that electrons do not resolve the curvature of the nanotubes, as if they were locally interacting with graphene planes.

The differential rates obtained with Eq. (20) are displayed in Fig. 3 for an indicative value of the DM mass of $M_{\chi} = 5$ MeV and V = 0, 1, 5, 10 V. To compute the rates we have assumed a Maxwell-Boltzmann velocity distribution $f(\boldsymbol{v})$ for the DM particle velocities in the laboratory frame (see Eq. (22)).

The three curves reported in each panel of Fig. 3, are relative to three different orientations θ_w of the DM wind average direction $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ with respect to the carbon nanotube parallel axes (both sp^2 and π -electrons are considered). The rates systematically increase with the applied voltages and, most importantly, we find that the $\theta_w \sim 90^\circ$ orientation is the favored one, as expected.

Consider a graphene plane oriented orthogonally to the DM wind. Consequent electron recoils will be oriented in the same direction. In the case of carbon nanotubes, given the curvature of the surface the DM will collide on, the effect is slightly modified with respect to what found with graphene sheets. Despite this, we still find that $\theta_w \sim 90^\circ$ represents the preferred direction, the one

² There are not many papers on the experimental determination of transmission coefficients of graphene at these energies. Hassink [12] measure a transmittance of 0.5 - 0.6 in energy range 10 - 30 eV. There is no direct experimental information on absorption coefficient and in our simulations we adopt several plausible values.



FIG. 2: The ratio S(V) defined in (2) for different absorption coefficients, keeping the transmission coefficient at T = 0.55. The initial kinetic energy is fixed whereas initial electron directions are randomly generated with a flat distribution. The voltage reported is to be considered at the ends of the carbon nanotubes. Thus, for nanotubes with an average length of 200 μ m, 20 V corresponds to an effective electric field of 1 kV/cm. Electrons recoiling with softer momenta, $E_R = 1$ eV, are more easily dragged by the external electric field than harder ones. However, when the voltage is sufficiently high, V > 40 Volt, S(V) starts raising as for the $E_R = 1$ eV case. The regions with decreasing values of S(V), in the left panel, result from the finite value of the absorption coefficient C. Considering progressively larger C values, average S(V) values decrease accordingly.

allowing largest electron recoil rates.

All these steps represent a validation of the simulations done, so that we are now ready to establish the anisotropic response of the proposed detection scheme.

The asymmetry defined in Eq. (1) is plotted in Fig. 4 for three θ_w values and in absence of background. The largest asymmetry, $A \approx 1/3$, is attained with $\theta_w \sim 90^\circ$ and, as expected, it diminishes with increasing external voltage: setting the voltage $V \to \infty$ the asymmetry has to be zero for in that case $N(\theta_w) \approx N(\theta_w = 180^\circ)$. Indeed, if the voltage is extremely high, the number of electrons collected in the detection stage will be independent of the θ_w angle.

To obtain a 5σ evidence of a non-zero asymmetry, we compute the exposure, in units of the target mass times the data aquisition time, as a function of the applied voltage, for a fixed value of the absorption coefficient, see Fig. 5. This quantity expresses the amount of target mass needed or the number of years of exposure to appreciate a statistically significant asymmetry.

We have to underscore here that in order to measure a certain degree of asymmetry A, we do not need to precisely measure the electron recoil direction. We only need to count the electrons reaching the detection region. We do not either need to measure the electron recoil energy, therefore a compact photomultiplier unit could be used, as in the configuration described below.

The asymmetry A can also be computed assuming that the low energy electrons being transmitted by the nanotube walls along their paths, get some random deflection angle within a cone of semi-aperture $\Delta \psi$ (see the discussion above). We can see from Fig. 6 how the expected asymmetry A drops down to some minimum value when $\Delta \psi$ is increased from 1 to 10 degrees. For values of A around 0.1, a much larger number of events ($N \sim 1500$) is required to obtain a 5σ evidence of a non-zero asymmetry with respect to $A \sim 0.3$ ($N \sim 200$).

A compact apparatus. In the simulations described above, we have considered electric field intensities of a few kV/cm — the typical field intensity that is used, in a photomultiplier dynode amplification stage. Therefore carbon nanotube targets could be integrated in a photomultiplier substituting the photocathode element. The PMT glass is replaced with a non-scintillating dark material with low radioactivity.

The light DM signal is expected to be a *single electron count.* PMTs are devised to discriminate between single and multi-electron signals. On the other hand, we expect photons from radioactivity to convert into the CNT target array. This would generally produce electrons with keV or higher energies which then loose energy in the CNT array. These events are expected to extract several electrons from the CNT cathode. Therefore the signal-tobackground discrimination, at this level, is that between single-electron and multi-electron counts.

The detection element can be replicated to reach the required mass. Eventually, two arrays of elements can be installed on a system that is tracking the Cygnus apparent position. The two arrays have to be positioned in two different orientations relative to the average DM wind.



FIG. 3: Differential rates of ejected electrons per year per Kg, distributed in the recoil energy E_R for $M_{\chi} = 5$ MeV and V = 0, 1, 5, 10 V. We include both sp^2 and π -orbital electrons. The three curves reported in each panel are relative to three different orientations of the DM wind main direction with respect to the carbon nanotube parallel axes. Note that the rates systematically increase proportionally to the external voltages and, most importantly, that $\theta_w \sim 90^\circ$ orientation is the favored one. Due to the finite absorption coefficient C, at low voltages, electrons tend to be stopped by the carbon nanotube array. The plots reported here are found by Eq. (20) but with the addition of the absorption probability at every hit with the CNT.

The simulations described above suggest how $\theta_w \sim 90^{\circ}$ and $\theta_w \sim 180^{\circ}$ are the preferred orientations. A different counting rate is then expected on the two arrays, providing evidence of the anisotropy in the electron recoils from collisions with DM particles. In this scheme no E_R energy measurement can be made of the recoiling electron. More sophisticated schemes might require the use of magnetic and electric fields, such as the one sketched in [2].

We conclude that the anisotropic response studied in this note allows to use existing technology (compact phototubes) with the substitution of the photocathode element only, and making them blind to light. This makes our proposal easy to test experimentally and scalable to a large target mass. For the sake of illustration, assume a number of 10^{14} , 10 nm diameter CNTs on a 10×10 cm² substrate. Since the surface density of a graphene sheet is $1/1315 \text{ gr/m}^2$, a single-wall CNT weights about 50×10^{-16} grams. This is equivalent to ~ 1 g on a single substrate. In the case of PMT, O(1000) 4-inch PMT units per 1 Kg CNT are needed. In principle, the system is scalable at will, since the target mass does not need to be concentrated in a small region.

Single electrons counts can be triggered by environment neutrons as well. This is a well known source of background afflicting all direct DM search experiments and the screening techniques are the standard ones. Thermal neutrons have scattering lengths of few fermis with electrons in graphene, but they have not enough energy to extract them efficiently from the material. A neutron moderation screen, as those currently used in these kind of experiments, has to be included



FIG. 4: The asymmetry in Eq. (1) with $M_{\chi} = 5$ MeV, C = 0.003 and three values of θ_w . The largest asymmetry $\max_{\theta_w}(N(\theta_w) - N(\theta_w = 180^\circ))$, is attained at $\theta_w = 90^\circ$, in absence of background. The asymmetry decreases with increasing voltage but the total rate increases with it. At zero voltage the most favorable case geometrically, $\theta_w = 0^\circ$, provides almost the same asymmetry of the most favorable case dynamically, $\theta_w = 90^\circ$. Changing C by a an order of magnitude, A(V) changes by a factor of ≈ 0.2 . Calculations are done including both electrons from π -orbitals and from sp^2 -hybridized orbitals.



FIG. 5: Exposure $M \cdot t$ to obtain a 5σ evidence of a nonnull asymmetry as a function of the applied voltage for the preferred value of the absorption coefficient C, assuming a cross section as in (6) and $m_{\chi} = 5$ MeV. Varying C by an order of magnitude, the $M \cdot t$ varies by a approximately a factor of 2. Calculations are done including both electrons from π -orbitals and from sp^2 -hybridized orbitals.

when devising the apparatus. We assume that working with compact units as PMTs, this kind of screening might be achieved more easily than with other configurations.

Another source of single electron counts, which belongs to similar configurations too, is the electron thermoemission. This can strongly be attenuated by cooling



FIG. 6: The asymmetry A in Eq. (1) with $M_{\chi} = 5$ MeV, C = 0.003 and assuming a random deflection of electron trajectories when transmitted through nanotube walls. The deflection angles are randomly selected within cones of semiapertures $\Delta \psi = 1^{\circ}, 5^{\circ}, 10^{\circ}$. At $\Delta \psi = 0^{\circ}$ we recover the curve at $\theta_w = 90^{\circ}$ in Fig. 4.

the device down to cryogenic temperatures. However, as noted in [20], the *thermionic* electron current from an effective surface of 1 m² of graphene should definitely be negligible at room temperatures being proportional to³ $T^3 \exp(-\phi_{\rm wf}/kT)$. This is essentially due to the fact that the work-function $\phi_{\rm wf}$ in graphene is almost three times as large than the typical work-function of photocathodes.

As for the field emission, this has also been studied in [18] where it is found that its starts being significant for electric fields above 1V/nm, way larger than the ones we consider.

Conclusions. We have shown that single wall carbon nanotube arrays might serve as directional detectors also for sub-GeV DM particles, if an appropriate external electric field is applied and electron recoils are studied. An appreciable anisotropic response is reached with a particular orientation orientation of the target with respect to the DM wind. Since the proposed detection scheme does not require any precise determination of the electron ejection angle and recoil energy, the carbon nanotube array target could be integrated and tested in a compact photomultiplier system, blind to light – a technology already available. High target masses can be arranged within limited volumes with respect to configurations proposing to use graphene planes.

³ with a coefficient $\beta = 115.8 \ A/m^2 \ K^{-3}$.

The results presented are obtained starting from the conclusions reached by Hochberg *et al.* [2] on DM scattering on graphene planes and adapted to the wrapped configuration of single wall carbon nanotubes. The fact that carbon nanotubes, and interstices among them in the array, almost behave as empty channels is still an essential feature to obtain the results of the calculations described here. We also observe that, in the detection scheme proposed, differently from [1], small irregularities in the geometry of nanotubes are inessential.

For comparison with previous work, we present the exclusion plot, see Fig. 7, which can be obtained with the detection configuration here proposed. We perform a full calculation including π and sp^2 – electrons. The latter



FIG. 7: We compare our results (disks) with those obtained by Hochberg *et al.* [2]. Calculations are done including both electrons from π -orbitals and from sp^2 -hybridized orbitals and for two different values of the external voltage. The exposure of 1Kg×year is used.

figure summarizes the potentialities of the scheme proposed. They result to be very much comparable to what found in [2], although with rather different apparatus and ways of practical realization.

Acknowledgements. We are very grateful to Yonit Hochberg for several comments and suggestions on the manuscript. We also thank Carlo Mariani and Maria Grazia Betti for useful discussions. G.C. acknowledges partial support from ERC Ideas Consolidator Grant CRYSBEAM G.A. n.615089.

Appendix: DM-electron scattering. In this Appendix we report the essential formulae we have used to obtain the results in the text. We have adapted the expressions in [2] to the configuration with CNTs.

The M_{χ} DM mass needed to eject electrons from graphene is about 3 MeV at the galactic escape velocity. In the χe^- scattering process, part of the momentum is exchanged with the crystal lattice — this is especially true for exchanged momenta smaller than the inverse of the average spacing between atoms a = 0.14 nm = 0.721 keV^{-1} .

The energy released by the DM particle in the scatter-

ing process is

$$\Delta E = E_i(\boldsymbol{\ell}) + \phi_{\rm wf} + k^2/2m_e \tag{3}$$

where $-E_i(\ell)$ is the energy of the electron in the valence band (depending on the lattice momentum ℓ), $-\phi_{\rm wf}$ is the work function of graphene and k' is the momentum of the ejected electron. Let q be the DM four-momentum difference before and after the scattering. One finds that

$$\Delta E = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{q} - \frac{q^2}{2M_{\chi}} \tag{4}$$

Therefore the cross section of the χe^- scattering is

$$d\sigma_{\ell} = \frac{1}{F} |M_{e\chi}(q)|^2 \frac{d^3 p'}{(2\pi)^3 2\varepsilon'} \frac{d^3 k'}{(2\pi)^3 2E'} |\widetilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})|^2$$

$$\times (2\pi)\delta \left(E_i(\boldsymbol{\ell}) + \phi_{wf} + \frac{k'^2}{2m_e} - \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{q} + \frac{q^2}{2M_{\chi}} \right) (5)$$

where F is the flux $F = 4\varepsilon E|v| = 4M_{\chi}m_e|v|$ and $M_{e\chi}(q)$ is the amplitude of the transition process. Electrons in π - orbitals have rather soft kinetic energies which allow $E \simeq m_e$. Here p' and ε' are related to the DM after the collision with the electron. The factor $|\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})|^2$ measures the probability for the recoiled electron to have 3-momentum \boldsymbol{k}' for $\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{\ell}$ fixed [2] (and has dimensions of eV^{-3}). We also consider electrons from sp^2 -hybridized orbitals. The explicit forms of $E_i(\boldsymbol{\ell})$ and $\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})$ are different for the two cases [2]; see also [19]. The calculations are done separately for the four orbitals (three in the sp^2 -hybridized configuration). Electrons in π -orbitals are more weakly bound and more sensible to light dark matter particles. At higher recoil energies σ -electrons dominate.

The definition is used

$$\frac{|M_{e\chi}(\alpha^2 m_e^2)|^2}{16\pi m_e^2 M_\chi^2} \equiv \frac{\sigma_{e\chi}}{\mu_{e\chi}^2} \tag{6}$$

where $\sigma_{e\chi}$ is the cross section of the non-relativistic χe^- elastic scattering and $\mu_{e\chi}$ is the reduced mass of the electron-DM system. In most calculations we use $\sigma_{e\chi} \simeq 10^{-37} \text{ cm}^2$ as a benchmark value for the cross section. It is found

$$\sigma_{\ell} = \frac{\sigma_{e\chi}}{\mu_{e\chi}^2} \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^4 |v|} \int d^3 p' \, d^3 q \, |\widetilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})|^2 \\ \times \, \delta\left(E_i(\boldsymbol{\ell}) + \phi_{\rm wf} + \frac{k'^2}{2m_e} - \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{q} + \frac{q^2}{2M_\chi}\right) \quad (7)$$

The Dirac delta function defines a minimum speed for χ to eject the electron

$$v_{\min} = \frac{\Delta E}{|\boldsymbol{q}|} - \frac{|\boldsymbol{q}|}{2M_{\chi}} \tag{8}$$

If the minimum speed were higher than the Milky Way escape velocity ($v_{\min} > v_{esc} + v_0 = 550 + 220$ Km/sec)

the process would simply be forbidden. If we assume that $|\mathbf{q}| \ll M_{\chi}$, then

$$\frac{\Delta E}{|\mathbf{q}|} \simeq v_{\min} < v_{\rm esc} + v_0 \tag{9}$$

which in turn means

$$|\boldsymbol{q}| \gtrsim \frac{4.3 \text{ eV}}{v_{\text{esc}} + v_0} \simeq 1.7 \text{ keV}$$
 (10)

Observe also that $|\mathbf{q}| < a^{-1} = 8.7$ keV so that

$$1.7 \text{ keV} \lesssim |\boldsymbol{q}| \lesssim 8.7 \text{ keV}$$
(11)

The total rate, per unit of time and detector mass is

$$R = N_C \frac{\rho_{\chi}}{M_{\chi}} A_{cu} \int_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in B_1} \frac{d^2 \ell}{(2\pi)^2} d^3 v f(\boldsymbol{v}) v \sigma_{\ell} \qquad (12)$$

with $A_{cu} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}a^2$ unit cell area of the graphene and B_1 the first Brillouin zone of the reciprocal lattice⁴. N_C is the number of carbon atoms per Kg, $N_C = 5 \times 10^{25} \text{ Kg}^{-1}$. ρ_{χ}/M_{χ} is the dark matter number density, with $\rho_{\chi} \simeq 0.4 \text{ GeV/cm}^3$ being the local density. Finally $f(\boldsymbol{v})$ is the velocity distribution to be defined below.

In the specific case of single wall carbon nanotubes, which is of interest in this paper, periodic boundary conditions are imposed on the argument $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ of $|\widetilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q}-\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{\ell})|^2$. If x is the coordinate on the boundary of the nanotube, and r is its radius, at fixed altitude z, the condition

$$\exp(i(x+2\pi r)\ell_x) = \exp(ix\ell_x) \tag{13}$$

leaves ℓ_y continuous in the integral (12) whereas a discrete sum on ℓ_x has to be taken

$$\int d^2\ell \to \sum_n \int d\ell_y \tag{14}$$

where $\ell_x = n/r$, in the first Brillouin zone. In the following this substitution is understood.

Replacing the cross section formula for σ_{ℓ} in (12) it is found

$$R = N \int d^2 \ell \int d^3 k' \, d^3 q \, |\widetilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})|^2 \\ \times \int_{v_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k', q)}^{v_{\max}} d^3 v \, f(\boldsymbol{v}) \, \delta(v_{\min}|\boldsymbol{q}| - \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{q}) \quad (15)$$

where

$$N = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^6} \frac{N_C \rho_\chi A_{cu}}{M_\chi} \frac{\sigma_{e\chi}}{\mu_{e\chi}^2}$$
(16)

and

$$v_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k', q) = \frac{E_i(\boldsymbol{\ell}) + \phi_{\mathrm{wf}} + \frac{k'^2}{2m_e}}{|\boldsymbol{q}|} - \frac{|\boldsymbol{q}|}{2M_{\chi}} \qquad (17)$$

In Eq. (15) v_{max} is computed solving the inequality

$$v(v - 2v_0 \cos \theta) \le (v_{\rm esc}^2 - v_0^2)$$
 (18)

and

$$d^3v = v^2 \, dv \, d\cos\theta \, d\phi \tag{19}$$

We can turn to the differential rate in the recoil energy. Differentiating the recoil energy of the electron $E_r = \frac{k'^2}{2M_{\chi}}$ one has $\frac{dR}{d\ln E_r} = E_r \frac{dR}{dE_r} = \frac{k'}{2} \frac{dR}{dk'}$ which allows to write the differential cross section distribution

$$\frac{dR}{d\ln E_r} = N \int k'^3 d\Omega_{k'} \int d^2\ell \int_{q_{\min}}^{q_{\max}} d\phi_q \, dq |\mathbf{q}| \, |\widetilde{\psi}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell})|^2 \\ \times \int_{v_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\ell}, \boldsymbol{k}', q)}^{v_{\max}} d\Omega_v \, dv \, v \, f(\boldsymbol{v}) \int d\cos\theta_q \, \delta\left(\cos\theta_q - \frac{v_{\min}}{v}\right) \quad (20)$$

where θ_q is the angle between \boldsymbol{q} and \boldsymbol{v} (and ϕ_q the azimuthal angle around \boldsymbol{v})

$$\delta(v_{\min}|\boldsymbol{q}| - \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{q}) = \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{q}|v} \delta\left(\cos\theta_{q} - \frac{v_{\min}}{v}\right)$$
(21)

The Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution of velocities $f(\boldsymbol{v})$ in the Galaxy is

$$f(\boldsymbol{v}) = \alpha \, e^{-\frac{(\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}_0)^2}{v_0^2}} \theta(v_{\rm esc} - |\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}_0|) \tag{22}$$

where $v_0 \simeq 220$ Km/s with v_0 directed towards the Cygnus constellation. The carbon nanotubes axes may have different orientations with respect to the DM wind v_0 vector. Once v_0 is fixed, a weighetd sum with f(v) of the directions (and lengths) of v around v_0 is taken. For each term in the sum, the direction of q is fixed, as in (20). Changing the orientation of the carbon nanotube axes with respect to the Cygnus (v_0 w.r.t. the parallel axes), the distribution $dR/d \ln E_r$ changes as shown in Fig. 3.

On the basis of (9) and using as a minimum value for ΔE the work function $|\phi_{wf}| \sim 4$ eV and as typical $|\boldsymbol{q}|$ values $2 < |\boldsymbol{q}| < 8$ keV, we see that $v_{\min} \approx v_0 \sim 10^{-3}$.

If the DM is orthogonal to the graphene plane, then the largest component of q will be in same direction. For the sake of illustration, set $\ell = 0$, and make reference to Fig. 8. Then we see that the electron is most likely recoiled with k'_z values not too different from q_z and with small $k'_{x,y}$ values — the z direction is the one orthogonal to the graphene plane. This in turn means that the ejected electrons tend to follow the same direction of the incoming DM particle.

⁴ Observe that $\int_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in B_1} \frac{d^2l}{(2\pi)^2} = \frac{1}{A_{cu}}$.

^{*} Electronic address: antonio.polosa@roma1.infn.it



FIG. 8: The case of a π -orbital. $|\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}', \boldsymbol{\ell} = 0)|^2$ (center of Brillouin zone). Figure is plotted as a function of $\boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{k}'$ in keV. k'_x is in the lattice plane whereas k'_z is orthogonal to the lattice. As can be seen from the figure, it is unlikely to have a $q - k'_z \approx 0$, $|\tilde{\psi}|^2$ measuring the probability for the ejected electron to have \boldsymbol{k}' momentum, once \boldsymbol{q} and $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ are fixed.

- [1] L. М. Capparelli, G. Cavoto. D. Mazzilli and A. D. Polosa, Phys. Dark Univ. 9-10. 24(2015) Erratum: [Phys. Dark Univ. 11. 79(2016)] doi:10.1016/j.dark.2015.12.004, 10.1016/j.dark.2015.08.002 [arXiv:1412.8213 [physics.ins-det]].
- [2] Y. Hochberg, Y. Kahn, M. Lisanti, C. G. Tully and K. M. Zurek, arXiv:1606.08849 [hep-ph].
- [3] G. Cavoto, E. N. M. Cirillo, F. Cocina, J. Ferretti and A. D. Polosa, Eur. Phys. J. C 76, no. 6, 349 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4193-7 [arXiv:1602.03216 [physics.ins-det]].
- [4] J. Alexander *et al.*, arXiv:1608.08632 [hep-ph]. See also R. Essig, J. Mardon and T. Volansky, Phys. Rev. D 85, 076007 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.076007 [arXiv:1108.5383 [hep-ph]].
- [5] R. Essig, J. Mardon and T. Volansky, Phys. Rev.

D **85**, 076007 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.076007 [arXiv:1108.5383 [hep-ph]].

- [6] R. Essig, A. Manalaysay, J. Mardon, P. Sorensen and T. Volansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 021301 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.021301 [arXiv:1206.2644 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [7] R. Essig, M. Fernandez-Serra, J. Mardon, A. Soto, T. Volansky and T. T. Yu, JHEP **1605** (2016) 046 doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2016)046 [arXiv:1509.01598 [hepph]].
- [8] P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan, S. Rajendran and M. T. Walters, Phys. Dark Univ. 1, 32 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.dark.2012.09.001 [arXiv:1203.2531 [hepph]].
- [9] S. K. Lee, M. Lisanti, S. Mishra-Sharma and B. R. Safdi, Phys. Rev. D 92, no. 8, 083517 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.083517 [arXiv:1508.07361 [hep-ph]].
- [10] Y. Hochberg, Y. Zhao and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 1, 011301 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.011301 [arXiv:1504.07237 [hep-ph]].
- [11] Y. Hochberg, M. Pyle, Y. Zhao and K. M. Zurek, JHEP **1608**, 057 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)057 [arXiv:1512.04533 [hep-ph]].
- [12] G. Hassink, R. Wanke, I. Rastegar, J. H. Smeth and J. Mannhart, APL Materials 3, 076106 (2015) doi:10.1063/1.4927406
- J-N Longchamp *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **101** 113117 (2012) doi:10.1063/1.4752717
- [14] J-A Yan et al., Phys. Rev. B 84, 224117 (2011)
- [15] J.Y. Mutus et al., New J. Phys. 13, 063011 (2011)
- [16] S. Srisonphan et al., Nat. Scientific Reports 4, Article number: 3764 (2014) doi:10.1038/srep03764
- [17] M. Müller *et al*, Nature Communications 5:5292 (2014), DOI: 10.1038/ncomms6292
- [18] B. Shevitski, http://www.pa.ucla.edu/sites/default/ files/files/REU/Papers%202010/shevitski_brian. pdf
- [19] R. Saito et al., Physical Properties of Carbon Nanotubes, Imperial College Press (1998).
- [20] S.J. Liang and L.K. Ang., Phys. Rev. Applied, 3, 014002 (2015)