

# Direct detection of freeze-in inelastic dark matter

Haipeng An<sup>1,2</sup> and Daneng Yang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

We show that the current sensitivities of direct detection experiments have already reached the interesting parameter space of freeze-in dark matter models if the dark sector is in the inelastic dark matter framework and the excited dark matter state is cosmologically stable. Using results recently presented by the XENON1T experiment, we present constraints on these models. We also show that these models can explain the reported excess in the electron recoil signals if the mass gap between the ground state and the excited state is at keV scale.

**Introduction** The particle nature of dark matter (DM) is one of the most prominent mysteries. Till now, all the evidence of the existence of DM is from gravitational effects. The relic energy density of DM in today's universe is measured to be about one-quarter of the total energy density. A successful DM model must be able to provide a mechanism to understand this number. The freeze-in scenario of DM production provides such a mechanism [1]. In this scenario, the DM particles live in the dark sector, very weakly connecting to the standard model (SM) sector through a portal. The portal is usually assumed to be a new vector kinetically mixed with the photon field or a new scalar very weakly coupled to the SM Higgs field. It is assumed that after inflation, only the SM sector is reheated, and through the portal, the energy in the SM sector leaked into the dark sector. In this scenario the observed relic density of DM can be nicely produced. However, the direct detection channel in freeze-in models is also proportional to the portal and, therefore, strongly suppressed. Inelastic DM models were first introduced to explain the excess observed in the DAMA/LIBRA experiment [2, 3], since an enhanced annual modulation can be generated due to the extra cost of the kinetic energy in the up-scattering process. The down-scattering process in inelastic DM models is usually ignored since the population of the excited state is usually exponentially suppressed. In this work, we consider freeze-in inelastic DM models. We show that due to the possibility of the large down scattering rate, the sensitivity of the XENON1T experiment [4] has already achieved the interesting parameter space of inelastic freeze-in models. In Ref. [4], an excess around 1~5 keV in electron recoil events is also reported, which cannot be accounted for by known backgrounds. Since the report of this excess, there have been active investigations trying to under it with new physics models [5–40]. In this work we show that this excess can be explained in the framework of inelastic freeze-in models.

**Vector portal freeze-in models** In this paper, we consider two typical models: one with a complex scalar DM and the other with a Dirac spinor DM. In both models, the dark portal is assumed to be a vector field  $V$ , which we call it dark photon in the following discussion.

In both cases we assume the U(1) symmetry is broken softly by an explicit mass splitting. In the scalar case the masses of the real and imaginary parts are split, and in the Dirac spinor case the spinor is split into two Majorana spinors. The DM part of Lagrangian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{sc} &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\chi_1\partial^\mu\chi_1 + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\chi_2\partial^\mu\chi_2 - \frac{1}{2}m_1^2\chi_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_2^2\chi_2^2 \\ &\quad - e_D V^\mu(\chi_1\partial_\mu\chi_2 - \chi_2\partial_\mu\chi_1) + \frac{1}{2}e_D^2 V_\mu V^\mu(\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2) \\ \mathcal{L}^{sp} &= \chi_1^\dagger i\sigma^\mu\partial_\mu\chi_1 + \chi_2^\dagger i\sigma^\mu\partial_\mu\chi_2 - \frac{1}{2}(m_1\chi_1\chi_1 + m_2\chi_2\chi_2 \\ &\quad + h.c.) + e_D V^\mu(\chi_1^\dagger\sigma_\mu\chi_2 - \chi_2^\dagger\sigma_\mu\chi_1).\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

In  $\mathcal{L}^{sc}$ ,  $\chi$  is a complex scalar,  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  real scalars, whereas in  $\mathcal{L}^{sp}$ ,  $\chi$  is a Dirac spinor and  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  two-component Weyl spinors. Then the Lagrangian for the dark photon part is

$$\mathcal{L}^V = -\frac{1}{4}V_{\mu\nu}V^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}m_V^2 V_\mu V^\mu - \frac{\kappa}{2}V_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}.\quad (2)$$

In the freeze-in process  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  must be produced in pair. As long as  $\Delta \equiv m_2 - m_1$  is smaller than  $m_V$  and  $2m_e$ , the dominant channels for the excited state  $\chi_2$  to decay to  $\chi_1$  are the three-photon channel and the neutrino channel. The former is suppressed by a factor of  $\kappa^2(\Delta/m_e)^8$  and the latter is suppressed by  $\kappa^2(m_V/m_Z)^4$ . Therefore, the lifetime of  $\chi_2$  can be much longer than the age of the universe. For the purpose of direct detection we assume  $\Delta \ll m_1 \approx m_2$ .

**Freezing-in the DM** To calculate the relic density of DM we need to solve the Boltzmann equation

$$\frac{dn_D}{dt} + 3Hn_D = \Gamma_{fi},\quad (3)$$

where  $n_D$  is the DM number density,  $H$  is the Hubble parameter, and  $\Gamma_{fi}$  is the production rate of DM per volume. When the temperature  $T_{\text{SM}} > 1$  MeV, the universe is filled with relativistic plasma, therefore a  $\Gamma_{fi}$  can be estimated as  $\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}} T_{\text{SM}}^4$ . The time interval at certain  $T_{\text{SM}}$  can be estimated as  $H^{-1} \sim m_{\text{pl}}/T_{\text{SM}}^2$ , where  $m_{\text{pl}} \approx 1.22 \times 10^{19}$  GeV, is the Planck mass. Then the

produced number density per entropy can be written as  $y_D \equiv n_D/s \sim \kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}} \times (m_{\text{pl}}/T_{\text{SM}})$ . Therefore in this scenario, DM is mainly produced at low temperate. The relation between  $y_D$  and  $T_{\text{SM}}$  stops when  $T_{\text{SM}}$  hits either  $m_V$ ,  $m_D$  or  $m_e$ . For  $m_e < m_V < 2m_D$ , which will be motivated later, the freeze-in process stops at  $T_{\text{SM}} \sim m_D$ . Consequently the dependence of today's relic density  $\Omega_D \propto y_D m_D$  on  $m_D$  is canceled. As an order of magnitude estimation, we can roughly get

$$\Omega_D \sim \kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}} \times \frac{m_{\text{pl}}}{m_p \eta_\gamma}, \quad (4)$$

where  $m_p$  is the proton mass. As a result, to get the observed relic abundance, the product of the dark coupling  $e_D$  and kinetic mixing  $\kappa$  is fixed to  $\kappa e_D \sim 10^{-13} \sim 10^{-12}$ . The numerical results of  $\kappa e_D$  required to produce the observed relic abundance for different choices of  $m_V$  and  $m_D$  are shown in Fig. 1. The direct detection rate is also proportional to the factor  $\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}}$ , making it difficult to search for the freeze-in model. It is also proportional to the number density of the DM, and therefore in favor of low mass DM as long as the energy deposit can surpass the thresholds of the experiments. Therefore in this work, we focus on the region where both  $m_D$  and  $m_V$  are around MeV scale.

In this regime there are two main contributions to  $\Gamma_{fi}$ , one is through  $e^+e^-$  annihilation, the other is through plasmon decay. The details of these two processes can be found in Ref. [41] (see also [42]). In our case since we require that  $m_V < 2m_D$  the freeze-in cannot go through on-shell  $V$  the contribution from plasmon decay is always subdominant (The similar phenomenon is also found in the freeze-in process of on-shell dark photon [43]).

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{fi}^{sc} &\approx \frac{\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}}}{24\pi^3} \int dq \int dq^0 f\left(\frac{q^0}{T}, \frac{q}{T}, s\right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{q^2 (s + 2m_e^2) s (1 - 4m_D^2/s)^{3/2}}{(s - m_V^2)^2}, \\ \Gamma_{fi}^{sp} &\approx \frac{\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}}}{6\pi^3} \int dq \int dq^0 f\left(\frac{q^0}{T}, \frac{q}{T}, s\right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{q^2 (s + 2m_e^2) (s + 2m_D^2) (1 - 4m_D^2/s)^{1/2}}{(s - m_V^2)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where

$$f(x, y, s) = \frac{1}{2\pi y} \frac{4 \tanh^{-1} \left[ \left( \frac{a-1}{a+1} \right) \tanh \left( \frac{b}{2} \right) \right]}{(a-1)(a+1)}, \quad (6)$$

with  $a = e^{x/2}$  and  $b = \frac{y}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{4m_e^2}{s} \right)^{1/2}$ . The difference between  $\Gamma_{fi}^{sc}$  and  $\Gamma_{fi}^{sp}$  is due to the difference of the spin structure and the factor of  $(1 - 4m_D^2/s)^{3/2}$  is due to the p-wave nature of the decay of virtual  $V$  into scalars. Here and the following we use  $m_D \approx m_1 \approx m_2$  in the calculation when  $\Delta$  can be neglected.

**Theoretical rates and recoil spectrum** When  $\chi_2$  particles fly into the XENON detector, the ionization process through the down-scattering of  $\chi_2$  can happen. To calculate the ionization rate, we assume the scattering electron is approximated by a plane wave; the xenon atom is isolated and described by the Roothaan-Hartree-Fock ground state wave functions [44]. It follows that the velocity averaged differential ionization cross section times velocity for electrons in the  $(n.l)$  shell can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle \sigma_{\text{ion}}^{nl} v \rangle}{d \ln E_r} &= \frac{\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}}}{2m_V^4} \int q dq \left\langle \frac{1}{v} \theta(v - v_{\text{min}}) \right\rangle \\ &\quad \times \frac{k^3}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\Omega_k \left| \int d^3x e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x} - i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \psi_{nlm} \right|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $E_r$  and  $k$  are the kinetic energy and momentum of the outgoing electron,  $q$  is the momentum-transfer, and  $v$  is the velocity of the incoming  $\chi_2$ . According to the principles of quantum mechanics, scattering states and bound states from the same Hamiltonian must be orthogonal. Therefore, in the domain that  $|\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}| \lesssim 1$  the plane wave approximation overestimates the cross section. To avoid this spurious contribution, we subtract the bound state component from the outgoing wave function:

$$e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \rightarrow e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} - \int d^3y e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{y}} \psi_{nlm}^*(y) \psi_{nlm}(x). \quad (8)$$

The form factors calculated in this way agree reasonably well with the ones used in [45]. In the case of down-scattering,

$$v_{\text{min}} = \left| \frac{E_k}{q} + \frac{q}{2m_D} + \frac{E_B - \Delta}{q} \right|, \quad (9)$$

where  $E_B$  is the absolute value of the binding energy. If  $E_B \ll \Delta$ , the electrons indeed can be treated as free particles, and one can estimate  $\sigma v$  as follows without going through the complicated form factors evaluations:

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{ion}}^{\text{tot}} \approx \sum_{|E_B| < \Delta} 4\sqrt{2} \frac{\kappa^2 e_D^2 \alpha_{\text{em}} \mu^2}{m_V^4} \left( \frac{\Delta}{\mu} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mu = m_e m_D / (m_e + m_D)$  and the summation is over all the orbits with binding energy smaller than  $\Delta$ .

The differential cross section contributed from each energy level  $d\langle \sigma^{nl} v \rangle / d \ln E_r$  as a function of  $E_r$  is shown in Fig. 2, where one can see that for each individual contribution the spectrum is bump-like and centered at the region  $m_D \Delta / (m_e + m_D)$ . The width of each spectrum can be estimated as  $E_r m_e / m_D$ . This can be understood from the form factor in Eq. (7).

The differential ionization rate in the detector can be written as

$$\frac{dR_{\text{ion}}}{d \ln E_r} = f_2 N_T \frac{\rho_D}{m_D} \frac{d\langle \sigma_{\text{ion}}^{\text{tot}} v \rangle}{d \ln E_r}, \quad (11)$$




FIG. 1: Size of  $\kappa e_D$  in scalar (left) and spinor (right) DM models required to produce the relic DM abundance.




FIG. 2: Total recoil energy spectrum (Black) and its composition. Each colored curve corresponds to a contribution from an energy level. The total expected observation, taking into account effects of detector resolution and efficiency, is shown as a dashed gray curve.

where  $N_T$  is total number of the target atoms,  $f_2 \equiv n_2/n_D$  is the fraction of the excited state. The value of  $f_2$  strongly depends on the detailed model of the dark sector and we decide to discuss the physics in a latter section. Here we choose different values of  $f_2$  and calculate the constraint on  $\Delta$ ,  $m_V$  and  $m_D$ . The electron recoil spectra on top of the known background of the XENON1T experiment are shown in Fig. 3. For the red curve we choose  $m_D = 0.8$  MeV,  $m_V = 1.2$  MeV,  $\kappa e_D = 1.29 \times 10^{-11}$ ,  $\Delta = 5$  keV and extract  $f_2 = 0.063$  from a fit. For the blue curve, we choose  $m_D = 1.7$  MeV,  $m_V = 2.8$  MeV,  $\kappa e_D = 1.35 \times 10^{-11}$ ,  $\Delta = 24$  keV and  $f_2 = 0.5$ . The red curve is the best fit for the excess and the blue is excluded by the result. The parameters for both the two curves can produce the observed relic abundance. We can see that with the XENON1T data we can already put constraints on the parameter space




FIG. 3: A demonstration of down-scattering detection signal from freeze-in inelastic DM model. The red curve is obtained from a fit to data using the background template in Ref.[[4]] and a signal spectrum with  $m_D = 0.8$  MeV,  $\Delta = 5$  keV and a floating  $f_2$ . The blue curve shows a signal with  $m_D = 1.7$  MeV,  $\Delta = 24$  keV that corresponds to 95% CL limit shown in Fig.(4).

of the model.

We perform statistical analysis assuming the same test statistic as in Ref.[4] but without systematic uncertainties, which are neglectable comparing to the statistical ones. For the high energy sideband, we use the XENON1T data to constrain some parameter space. To ease numerical analysis, we assume that the data is consistent with a floating background component and the likelihood function is maximized by signal plus background events being equal to the data events. This assumption enables us to evaluate the test statistic without doing a fit and preserves its positivity provided there is no large signal-like excess. Using the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic in the large sample limit, we use the experiment spectrum in a range




FIG. 4: Observed 95% CL limits in the parameter space of the inelastic freeze-in model with scalar DM and different  $\Delta$ ,  $f_2$ . The excluded regions lie in the lower-left.

$E_R = \frac{m_D \Delta}{m_D + m_e} \pm 2\Delta E_R$  to set observed 95% CL limit on the signal strength, where the  $\Delta E_R$  is the detector resolution extracted from Ref.[46]. We fix  $\kappa e_D$  to reproduce the relic DM abundance in the scalar case as shown in Fig.(1). As shown in Fig.(4), the excluded region on the lower-left is dependent on the size of  $\Delta$  and  $f_2$ . The constraints are stronger in regions of larger  $\Delta$  and  $f_2$ . With different choices of  $\Delta$  and  $f_2$  the parameter regions excluded by the XENON1T data are shown in Fig. 4.

For the benchmark point in Fig.(3), the best fit signal with  $f_2 = 0.063$  is found to be  $3.7\sigma$  favored over the background-only hypothesis, which decreases to  $2.7\sigma$  if the shape of tritium contribution is included as an unconstraint component. To find the parameter region consistent with this excess, we consider spectra whose  $E_R \approx 2.7$  keV, fix  $\kappa e_D$  as in the scalar case of Fig.(1), and adjust  $f_2$  such that the yield equals to that of the best fit benchmark. Results of the parameter scan are shown in Fig.(5) as contours of  $m_V$ . We found that the model in this work can provide viable solutions to the XENON1T excess for dark photon masses between one and two MeV. The contour plot with different choice of  $m_V$  from  $2m_e$  to about 2 MeV to fit the excess is also shown in Fig. 5, one can see that to get enough number events  $f_2$  must be larger than about 0.02.

**De-excitation in the early universe** Although  $\chi_2$  is cosmologically stable, the  $\chi_2\chi_2 \rightarrow \chi_1\chi_1$  in the early universe can de-excite  $\chi_2$  into  $\chi_1$ . During freeze-in the temperature or “average kinetic energy”  $T_D$  is comparable to  $T_{SM}$  and is roughly equal to  $m_D$ . As  $\Delta \ll m_D$ , the occupation of  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  are almost equal to each other. During expansion of the universe,  $T_D$  evolves non-




FIG. 5: Parameter space of the inelastic freeze-in model with scalar DM that is consistent with the XENON1T excess.

relativistically. As a result we can parameterize  $T_D$  as  $T_D = \eta T^2/m_D$ , where  $\eta \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$  can be determined by solving the Boltzmann equation. The Boltzmann equation for  $n_1$  at  $T_D \sim \Delta \ll m_D \sim m_V$  can be written as

$$\frac{dn_2}{dt} + 3Hn_2 = -\mathcal{C}(T_D) \left( n_2^2 e^{\Delta/T_D} - n_1^2 e^{-\Delta/T_D} \right), \quad (12)$$

where the collision coefficient  $\mathcal{C}$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{C}^{(0)} = \frac{e_D^4 m_D^2}{\pi m_V^4} \left( \frac{T_D}{\pi m_D} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta}{T_D} \right) K_1 \left( \frac{\Delta}{T_D} \right) \quad (13)$$

for both the scalar and spinor models introduced in Eq. (1). Here  $K_1$  is the modified Bessel function with index 1. The decoupling of the de-excitation happens during  $T_D \sim \Delta \ll T_{SM}$ , so the universe is still at the radiation dominated era, and therefore the Hubble expansion rate is determined by the energy density of the SM sector. Defining  $f_2 = n_2/n_D$ , and  $x = \Delta/T_D$  we have

$$\frac{df_2}{dx} = -\mathcal{A}x^{-1} K_1(x) [f_2^2(x)e^x - (1-f_2)^2 e^{-x}], \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \left( \frac{9\sqrt{5} m_{pl}^3 H_0^2 \Omega_D}{16\pi^4 g_*^{1/2} T_{CMB}^3} \right) \left( \frac{e_D^4 m_D \Delta}{m_V^4 \eta^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\approx \frac{0.37}{\eta^{1/2}} \left( \frac{e_D}{10^{-3}} \right)^4 \left( \frac{m_V}{1.5\text{MeV}} \right)^{-4} \frac{m_D}{0.9\text{MeV}} \frac{\Delta}{4\text{keV}} \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

and  $H_0$  is today’s Hubble parameter. The dependence of today’s  $f_2$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is shown in Fig. 6, where one can see that  $f_2^{\text{today}} \approx 0.5$  for  $\mathcal{A} \ll 1$ , and  $f_2 \approx (2\mathcal{A})^{-1}$  for  $\mathcal{A} \gg 1$ .




FIG. 6: Today's fraction of  $\chi_2$  as a function of  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in Eq. (15).

MeV scale dark photon can be copiously produced during the supernova explosion, and therefore reduce the amount of the released neutrinos, which will conflict with the observations. For MeV scale dark photon, the constraint on the kinetic mixing can be written as [45]

$$\kappa < 2.5 \times 10^{-9} (1 \text{ MeV}/m_V)^2. \quad (16)$$

For fixed  $m_V$  and  $m_D$  and by requiring all the DM particles observed today are produced from this mechanism, it can be translated to a lower bound on  $e_D$ . Take the scalar model as an example. Eq. (16) means roughly  $e_D > 10^{-3}$ . Then from Eqs. (14) and (15) one can get that in this case

$$f_2 \lesssim 2.8 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{m_V}{1.1 \text{ MeV}} \right)^4 \left( \frac{m_D}{0.6 \text{ MeV}} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta}{0.5 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

which is about one order of magnitude smaller than needed to fit the excess (see Fig. 5). Similarly, for the spinor DM case, in the minimal model (1),  $f_2$  is also about one order of magnitude needed. However, one can easily solve this problem by introducing more interactions in the dark sector. In the scalar DM scenario, a four-point interaction, which we omit in the Lagrangian (1),  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda = -\lambda(|\chi|^2)^2/2$  cannot be forbidden by any symmetries. For the sake of vacuum stability, without inducing other interactions in the potential,  $\lambda$  must be positive. Then the combined square of the absolute value of the matrix element for the down scattering in the NR limit becomes

$$|\mathcal{M}|_{\chi_2 \chi_2 \rightarrow \chi_1 \chi_1}^2 = \left| \frac{8e_D^2 m_D^2}{m_V^2} - \lambda \right|^2. \quad (18)$$

One can see that these two contributions always have different signs. To reach the  $f_2$  value required to fit the excess, only about 60% cancellation is needed. In the spinor DM case, one can introduce a scalar-carried force in the dark sector with the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_h = -yh\bar{\chi}\chi$ , which equals to  $-\frac{1}{2}yh(\chi_1\chi_1 - \chi_2\chi_2) + \text{h.c.}$ . The down scattering process conducted by  $h$  is  $s$ -channel; its sign depends on the mass of  $h$ . Therefore, it is always possible

for this new contribution to cancel part of the contribution from the exchange of  $V$ . In both the scalar and spinor DM scenarios, the newly introduced interactions in the dark sector contribute neither to the freeze-in process nor the direct detection.

**Summary** Freeze-in models with small couplings to the SM field is known to be challenging to search and constrain. However, in models that the DM is composed of a two-state system and with the excited state still populated in the universe, the direct detection signal can be enhanced in both the recoil energy and the rate. We show that the XENON1T experiment's sensitivity has already reached the exciting parameter space of these models. We also present a parameter region where the model predictions can explain the excess in the XENON1T ionization result.

This work is supported by NSFC under Grant No. 11975134, the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant No.2017YFA0402204 and Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program.

- 
- [1] L. J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell and S. M. West, *JHEP* **1003**, 080 (2010) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2010)080 [arXiv:0911.1120 [hep-ph]].
  - [2] D. Tucker-Smith and N. Weiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 043502 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.043502 [arXiv:hep-ph/0101138 [hep-ph]].
  - [3] S. Chang, G. D. Kribs, D. Tucker-Smith and N. Weiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 043513 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.043513 [arXiv:0807.2250 [hep-ph]].
  - [4] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON], [arXiv:2006.09721 [hep-ex]].
  - [5] I. M. Bloch, A. Caputo, R. Essig, D. Redigolo, M. Sholapurkar and T. Volansky, [arXiv:2006.14521 [hep-ph]].
  - [6] M. Chala and A. Titov, [arXiv:2006.14596 [hep-ph]].
  - [7] M. Lindner, Y. Mambrini, T. B. de Melo and F. S. Queiroz, [arXiv:2006.14590 [hep-ph]].
  - [8] R. Budnik, H. Kim, O. Matsedonskyi, G. Perez and Y. Soreq, [arXiv:2006.14568 [hep-ph]].
  - [9] C. Gao, J. Liu, L. T. Wang, X. P. Wang, W. Xue and Y. M. Zhong, [arXiv:2006.14598 [hep-ph]].
  - [10] L. Zu, G. W. Yuan, L. Feng and Y. Z. Fan, [arXiv:2006.14577 [hep-ph]].
  - [11] H. An, M. Pospelov, J. Pradler and A. Ritz, [arXiv:2006.13929 [hep-ph]].
  - [12] M. Baryakhtar, A. Berlin, H. Liu and N. Weiner, [arXiv:2006.13918 [hep-ph]].
  - [13] J. Bramante and N. Song, [arXiv:2006.14089 [hep-ph]].
  - [14] Y. Jho, J. C. Park, S. C. Park and P. Y. Tseng, [arXiv:2006.13910 [hep-ph]].
  - [15] G. B. Gelmini, V. Takhistov and E. Vitagliano, [arXiv:2006.13909 [hep-ph]].
  - [16] K. Nakayama and Y. Tang, [arXiv:2006.13159 [hep-ph]].
  - [17] R. Primulando, J. Julio and P. Uttayarat, [arXiv:2006.13161 [hep-ph]].

- [18] A. N. Khan, [arXiv:2006.12887 [hep-ph]].
- [19] Q. H. Cao, R. Ding and Q. F. Xiang, [arXiv:2006.12767 [hep-ph]].
- [20] A. E. Robinson, [arXiv:2006.13278 [hep-ex]].
- [21] H. M. Lee, [arXiv:2006.13183 [hep-ph]].
- [22] G. Paz, A. A. Petrov, M. Tammaro and J. Zupan, [arXiv:2006.12462 [hep-ph]].
- [23] G. Choi, M. Suzuki and T. T. Yanagida, [arXiv:2006.12348 [hep-ph]].
- [24] D. Aristizabal Sierra, V. De Romeri, L. Flores and D. Papoulias, [arXiv:2006.12457 [hep-ph]].
- [25] J. Buch, M. A. Buen-Abad, J. Fan and J. S. C. Leung, [arXiv:2006.12488 [hep-ph]].
- [26] N. F. Bell, J. B. Dent, B. Dutta, S. Ghosh, J. Kumar and J. L. Newstead, [arXiv:2006.12461 [hep-ph]].
- [27] U. K. Dey, T. N. Maity and T. S. Ray, [arXiv:2006.12529 [hep-ph]].
- [28] Y. Chen, J. Shu, X. Xue, G. Yuan and Q. Yuan, [arXiv:2006.12447 [hep-ph]].
- [29] L. Di Luzio, M. Fedele, M. Giannotti, F. Mescia and E. Nardi, [arXiv:2006.12487 [hep-ph]].
- [30] M. Du, J. Liang, Z. Liu, V. Tran and Y. Xue, [arXiv:2006.11949 [hep-ph]].
- [31] L. Su, W. Wang, L. Wu, J. M. Yang and B. Zhu, [arXiv:2006.11837 [hep-ph]].
- [32] K. Harigaya, Y. Nakai and M. Suzuki, [arXiv:2006.11938 [hep-ph]].
- [33] A. Bally, S. Jana and A. Trautner, [arXiv:2006.11919 [hep-ph]].
- [34] C. Boehm, D. G. Cerdeno, M. Fairbairn, P. A. Machado and A. C. Vincent, [arXiv:2006.11250 [hep-ph]].
- [35] B. Fornal, P. Sandick, J. Shu, M. Su and Y. Zhao, [arXiv:2006.11264 [hep-ph]].
- [36] D. W. P. Amaral, do., D. G. Cerdeno, P. Foldenauer and E. Reid, [arXiv:2006.11225 [hep-ph]].
- [37] G. Alonso-Ivarez, F. Ertas, J. Jaeckel, F. Kahlhoefer and L. Thormaehlen, [arXiv:2006.11243 [hep-ph]].
- [38] K. Kannike, M. Raidal, H. Veerme, A. Strumia and D. Teresi, [arXiv:2006.10735 [hep-ph]].
- [39] C. A. O'Hare, A. Caputo, A. J. Millar and E. Vitagliano, [arXiv:2006.10415 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [40] F. Takahashi, M. Yamada and W. Yin, [arXiv:2006.10035 [hep-ph]].
- [41] H. An, R. Huo and W. Liu, [arXiv:1812.05699 [hep-ph]].
- [42] C. Dvorkin, T. Lin and K. Schutz, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.11, 115009 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.115009 [arXiv:1902.08623 [hep-ph]].
- [43] A. Fradette, M. Pospelov, J. Pradler and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no.3, 035022 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.035022 [arXiv:1407.0993 [hep-ph]].
- [44] C. Bunge, J. Barrientos and A. Bunge, Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl. **53**, 113-162 (1993) doi:10.1006/adnd.1993.1003
- [45] R. Essig, T. Volansky and T. T. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.4, 043017 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.043017 [arXiv:1703.00910 [hep-ph]].
- [46] Aprile, E. and others, Nature volume 568, pages532535(2019) doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1124-4 [arXiv:1904.11002 [nucl-ex]].