# STUDY OF POTENTIAL SELF-ANNIHILATION SIGNAL FROM DARK MATTER PARTICLES IN SOME PROSPECTIVE ASTROPHYSICAL DARK MATTER SOURCES

Thesis Submitted For The Degree Of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (SCIENCE)

 $\mathbf{in}$ 

Physics (Theoretical)

by

### Pooja Bhattacharjee

### DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA 2020

### DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my loving parents Bina Bhattacharjee & Sudipta Bhattacharjee for their endless love, support and encouragement

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Throughout the journey of my PhD and even in the writing of this thesis, I have fortunately received a great deal of support and assistance by so many people, directly or indirectly, that it is a very difficult task for me to acknowledge them all. So, before proceeding further, I must say that the following is not at all a comprehensive endeavour.

First of all, I want to thank my PhD supervisor Dr. Parthasarathi Joarder for providing me with the opportunity to work in the field of astrophysics. Without his support, attention and guidance, none of this would have been possible. His insightful feedback, motivation, continuous support and above all constant questioning pushed me to sharpen my thinking and brought my work to a higher level. In this process, I have gradually learnt the subject with more accuracy by recognising the pre-possessed contradictions or misconceptions in me.

I also acknowledge the fruitful interactions with my joint supervisor Prof. Dhruba Gupta. Several discussions with him have enriched my comprehension of the subject.

I would also like to pay my special regards to Prof. Pratik Majumdar, without whom my PhD career would not have been taken-off. His perceptive feedback, consistent patience, guidance and all insightful questioning shape my PhD work. Specifically, I deeply appreciate his approach of rigorously participating in thoughtful argumentative dialogue in order to elicit the ideas and underlying presuppositions within me. This intense disciplined questioning, yet insoluciant approach deeply help me in examining any thoughts logically and determining the validity of those ideas. Without his persistent help, the goal of this thesis would not have been realised. I am also grateful to Prof. Mousumi Das for her valuable insights into my research. I gratefully acknowledge the fruitful interactions with her.

I would like to acknowledge my senior colleague, Dr. Sayan Biswas, for his insightful academic discussion in various stages of my PhD.

I would also like to thank my other collaborators, Prof. Dilip Kumar Ghosh, Prof. Debajyoti Choudhury, Prof. Subinoy Das, Dr. Tulun Ergin, Dr. Kasinath Das, Dr. Lab Saha, for their valuable inputs in my research career.

I will forever be indebted towards my two colleagues and friends Sananda Raychaudhuri and Kaushik Naskar. Without them, this journey would not have been completed. I will sincerely miss the friendly, supportive and relaxed environment we maintained over these years. Without their constant support and intense academic or non-academic discussions would not have made this bumpy road to a smooth one.

I am grateful to my friends in Bose Institute: Pracheta Singha, Sumana Bhattacharjee, Deeptak Biswas, Souradeep Sasmal, Debarshi Das and Som Kanjilal.

In addition, I want to thank the Bose Institute for the infrastructure provided to pursue my PhD. I am also grateful to DST-INSPIRE for financial support. Without their support and funding, this thesis could not have reached its goal.

I gratefully acknowledge my teachers from school and college- Dr. Arup Roy, Dr. Satadal Bhattacharyya, Dr. Upendranath Nandi, Mr. Rabindranath Sasmal, Mr. Swapan Samanta, Ms. Jasmine Sinha for their guidance and inspiration.

I take this opportunity to mention the support and enormous encouragement I have received from my loving husband, Dr. Chowdhury Aminul Islam. He was always there to pamper my idiotic questions, sort out my philosophical confusions and clarify any difficulties I faced. Due to his continuous supports and suggestions, I never had a deficiency of interesting and stimulating problems to work on. I would like to whole-heartedly acknowledge that he was always able to put things in perspective and provide inspiration when the rigours of research and thesis writing seemed too much to handle.

I would like to mention the love and care I have received from my family members- my Dida, Dadu, Jethu, Barama, Mama, Mami. At this moment I remember my Jethu, Late Mr. Sanjay Bhattacharjee, who was very supportive of my academic and personal life. My mama, Shyamal Ghosh, was my first teacher. They are the ones who have constantly encouraged me to opt for a research career. My brother, Argha, was always there to provide me with support and affection. I do not have words to express my gratitude to my Maa (Ms. Bina Bhattacharjee) and Baba (Mr. Sudipta Bhattacharjee). Without their constant inspiration, motivation and moral support, I could not continue my PhD work. Thank you both for giving me strength to reach for the stars and chase my dreams.

At this moment I cannot name them all who were always there to provide me with support and affection. You know who you are, and I thank you all wholeheartedly for being there.

### ABSTRACT

With the growing interest in indirect detection for dark matter signature, the thesis aims to investigate the signal originating from the self-annihilation of dark matter candidates. The methods for targeting the dark matter signal is two-fold, on one hand, we explore the gamma rays resulting from dark matter particles. On the other hand, we focus on complementary radio properties.

To begin with, for the basic understanding of dark matter, it is first important to characterise their nature and all possible scenarios to identify them. While such characterisation has been briefly discussed in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 provides the methodology and its related mathematical formalism to study the dark matter signal in the multiwavelength spectrum.

Next, in Chapters 3 and 4, by considering the appropriate scenario, the working principle of the Fermi Large Area Telescope and its detailed analysis mechanism have been discussed.

Finally, from Chapters 5 to 8, various aspects of dark matter properties obtained from our detailed analysis have been discussed. In Chapter 5, we investigate the gamma-ray signal from the location of dark matter rich dwarf galaxy, Triangulum II and try to examine whether it can provide strong limits on theoretical dark matter models and the thermal relic annihilation rate. In Chapter 6, we report the faint emission from the location of Tucana-II and in that sense try to investigate whether dark matter is related to such an excess.

Next in Chapters 7 and 8, the electromagnetic radiation over a wide range, from gamma-ray down to radio frequencies appearing from the Low surface brightness galaxies and ultra faint dwarf spheroidal galaxies have been discussed. Moreover, we explore the projected sensitivity of the upcoming Square Kilometer Array and Cherenkov Telescope Array in probing the synchrotron and gamma-ray emission from them.

### LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

#### Publications relevant to the Thesis:

- Constraints on dark matter models from the observation of Triangulum-II with the Fermi Large Area Telescope, Sayan Biswas, Pooja Bhattacharjee, Pratik Majumdar, Mousumi Das, Subinoy Das, and Partha Sarathi Joarder, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 11, 003 (2017); arXiv:1705.00426 [astro-ph.HE] (2017).
- Analysis of Fermi-LAT data from Tucana-II: possible constraints on the Dark Matter models with an intriguing hint of a signal, Pooja Bhattacharjee, Sayan Biswas, Pratik Majumdar, and Partha Sarathi Joarder, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 08, 028 (2019); arXiv:1804.07542 [astro-ph.HE] (2018).
- Multiwavelength analysis of low surface brightness galaxies to study possible dark matter signature, Pooja Bhattacharjee, Pratik Majumdar, Mousumi Das, Subinoy Das, Partha Sarathi Joarder, and Sayan Biswas, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 501, 4238 (2021); arXiv:1911.00369 [astro-ph.HE] (2019).
- 4. Gamma-ray and Synchrotron Radiation from Dark Matter annihilations in Ultra-faint Dwarf Galaxies, **Pooja Bhattacharjee**, Debajyoti

Choudhury, Kasinath Das, Dilip Kumar Ghosh, and Pratik Majumdar, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **06**, 041 (2021); arXiv:2011.08917 [hep-ph] (2020).

# Additional publications during the Ph.D. thesis but not forming part of it:

- Investigating the region of 3C 397 in High Energy Gamma rays, Pooja Bhattacharjee, Pratik Majumdar, Tulun Ergin, Lab Saha, Partha Sarathi Joarder, Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union 12, 316 (2017); arXiv:1801.05961 [astro-ph.HE] (2018).
- Probing the star formation origin of gamma rays from 3FHL J1907.0+0713, Tulun Ergin, Lab Saha, Pooja Bhattacharjee, Hidetoshi Sano, Shuta Tanaka, Pratik Majumdar, Ryo Yamazaki, Yasuo Fukui, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 501, 4226 (2021); arXiv:2012.07357 [astro-ph.HE] (2020).

# CONTENTS

D	edica	ation	iii
A	cknov	wledgement	iv
A	bstra	ıct	vii
$\mathbf{Li}$	st of	Publications	ix
1	Intr	roduction	1
	1.1	Introduction to Dark Matter	2
	1.2	Brief Overview of Thesis	4
	1.3	Observational Evidence of Dark Matter	6
	1.4	Dark Matter Candidates	10
		1.4.1 Possible DM Candidates:	11
		1.4.1.1 The Standard Model and the Neutrino and	
		Supersymmetry:	11
		1.4.2 Weakly Interacting Massive Particles	13
	1.5	Dark Matter Annihilation	14
	1.6	Dark Matter Detection	18
		1.6.1 Direct Detection	19
		1.6.2 Indirect Detection	20
		1.6.3 Collider Searches	22

<b>2</b>	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}$	ltiwavelength searches for dark matter	23
	2.1	Dark Matter Rich Targets	24
	2.2	Dark Matter Density Distributions	27
	2.3	The Gamma-ray Signal Resulting from WIMP Annihilation .	29
		2.3.1 Particle-Physics Factor	30
		2.3.2 Astrophysical Factor (J-factor)	30
		2.3.3 Expected Gamma-Ray Flux from WIMP Annihilation	31
		2.3.4 The Astrophysical Backgrounds	32
	2.4	The X-ray and Radio Signal Resulting from WIMP Annihilation	34
3	Fer	mi Large Area Telescope (Fermi-LAT) Gamma-Bay Ob-	
0	serv	vatory	41
	3.1	Instrumental Requirements	42
	3.2	The Large Area Telescope	42
	0.2	3.2.1 Observational Constraint	44
		3.2.2 Detection Methodology	45
		3.2.3 The LAT Instrument	45
		3.2.3.1 Anti-coincidence Detector (ACD)	46
		3232 The Tracker (TKB)	47
		3233 The Calorimeter (CAL)	48
		3.2.4 The LAT's Data Acquisition System (DAO)	48
		3.2.5 LAT Instrument Performance	49
4	T ile	alibaad Applyzig of LAT Data	50
4	$\frac{\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}}{4}$	Overview of Likelihood	52
	4.1	The LAT Likelihood Eurotion	50
	4.2	The Drafile Likelihood	55
	4.0	The Joint Likelihood	56
	4.4	Ine Joint Likelinood Image: Image	50
	4.0	Derivation of Eleve Upper limita	- 50 E 9
	4.0	Derivation of Flux Opper limits	50
	4.7	r-value	90
<b>5</b>	Cor	nstraints on dark matter models from the Fermi-LAT ob-	
	serv	vation of Triangulum-II	60
	5.1	Triangulum-II	61
	5.2	The <i>Fermi</i> -LAT Data Analysis of Tri-II	62
		5.2.1 Results from the Power-law Modelling	64
	5.3	J-factor for Tri-II	67
	5.4	Constraints on Annihilation Cross-section	68
	5.5	Conclusions & Discussions	73

6	Ana	lysis d	of Fermi-LAT data from Tucana-II: an intriguing
	hint	of a s	ignal 74
	6.1	Tucan	a-II
	6.2	The $F$	ermi-LAT Data Analysis of Tuc-II
		6.2.1	Results of the Power-law Modelling
	6.3	Estima	ation of Astrophysical Factor (J-factor) for Tuc-II 81
	6.4	DM A	nnihilation Constraints from Tuc-II
		6.4.1	Searching for $\gamma - ray$ Emission due to DM Annihilation
			from Tuc-II
		6.4.2	Distribution of the Excess Obtained from $\gamma$ -ray Spectra
			of DM Annihilation
		6.4.3	Possible DM Annihilation Constraint on Theoretical
			DM Models with 9 Years of Tuc-II Fermi-LAT Data . 91
		6.4.4	Comparison of the Constraints on the DM Annihilation
			Cross-section ( $b\bar{b}$ Channel) Obtained from Tuc-II, Ret-
			II and UMi
		6.4.5	Comparative Study between the Limits Obtained from
			Tuc-II and the Limits Obtained from Several Collabo-
			ration Works on dSphs/UFDs
	6.5	Conclu	$1$ sions & Discussions $\cdot$
7	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}$	ltiwave	elength analysis of low surface brightness galaxies 101
	7.1	Low S	urface Brightness Galaxy
	7.2	Sampl	e Selection: $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $103$
	7.3	Fermi	-LAT Observation and Data Analysis of LSBs $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $105$
		7.3.1	Results from the Power-law Modelling 105
	7.4	A the	pretical Framework to Estimate $\gamma$ -ray Flux from Pair-
		annihi	lation of WIMPs In Case of LSB Galaxies 107
		7.4.1	Modelling with NFW Density Profile
		7.4.2	J-factor Derived from the Toy Model 109
		7.4.3	Constraints on the Annihilation Cross-section 110
		7.4.4	Stacking Analysis
		7.4.5	Possible Radio Constraint Obtained from LSB Galaxies 117
		7.4.6	Comparison between the NFW, Burkert and Pseudo
			Isothermal Density Profiles
	7.5	The Fu	ture of LSB Galaxies for Dark Matter Searches and the
		Impac	t of the CTA $\ldots \ldots 128$
	7.6	Conclu	usions & Discussions $\ldots \ldots 129$

8	Syn	hrotron and gamma-ray radiation from few ultra faint
	dwa	f galaxies 13
	8.1	Source Details
		8.1.1 Dependence of $J$ on the Density Profiles $\ldots \ldots \ldots 133$
	8.2	Analysis of $\gamma$ -ray Fluxes from UFDs
		8.2.1 Constraints on DM Annihilation with Eleven Years of
		Fermi-LAT Data
	8.3	Synchrotron Radiation from UFDs
		8.3.1 Results Pertaining to the UFDs
		8.3.2 Future Projections
	8.4	Astrophysical Uncertainties and the Constraints
		8.4.1 Uncertainties in the $\gamma$ -ray Bounds
		8.4.2 Uncertainties in the Synchrotron Fluxes
	8.5	Conclusions & Discussions
9	Disc	ussion and Concluding Remarks 150
	9.1	Discussion and Concluding Remarks
10	App	endix 162

# LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	The multiple components that compose our universe. Dark energy comprises 71.4% of the mass energy density of the universe, DM	
	comprises 24%, and atomic matter makes up 4.6%.	3
1.2	(a) The artistic view of the observed and expected Rotational curve from M33 galaxy. (b) The rotational curve of the spiral	
	galaxy NGC6503.	8
1.3	Gravitational lensing of Abell 370 observed by Hubble Space	
	Telescope (HST). $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$	9
1.4	X-ray image (pink) of Bullet cluster superimposed over a vis- ible light image (blue)	10
1.5	Comoving number density evolution as a function of the ratio	10
	$m_{\chi}/T$ in the context of the thermal freeze-out	15
1.6	WIMP annihilation chain and the end products	17
1.7	Schematic diagram of DM detection through direct, indirect	10
	and its production at Colliders	18
2.1	DM rich regions.	24
2.2	NFW, Einasto, Isothermal and Burkert galactic DM density	
	profile. The profiles are normalized for the Milky-Way such	
	that $\rho_{\odot}=0.3$ GeV $cm^{-3}$ and $r_{\odot}=8.33$ Kpc. The diagram is	
	taken from Ref. Pierre, 2019	28
2.3	Gamma-ray annihilation spectra from WIMPs with masses of	
	100 GeV (solid lines) and 200 GeV (dashed lines), annihilating	
	through four different annihilation channels (the $bb$ channel in	

2.4 2.5 2.6	blue, $\mu^+\mu^-$ channel in red, $\tau^+\tau^-$ channel in green, and $W^+W^-$ channel in magenta). Values are obtained from the DMFit package implemented in the Fermi Science Tools Sources from the third Fermi-LAT catalog (3FGL) plotted in Aitoff projection	29 34 35 36
3.1	A schematic diagram of the Large Area Telescope (LAT)	43
3.2	A schematic diagram of the LAT instrument. The dimensions of the LAT are $1.8m \times 1.8m \times 0.72m$ . A cutaway image of the LAT module shows its tracker and calorimeter components, while the anticoincidence detector covers the tracker and the upper third of the calorimeter. The image is adapted from	
3.3	Atwood <i>et al.</i> , 2009	46
3.4	al., 2012	49
	tion of incident photon energy is shown here. (a) the effective area and (b) the points spread function. The figure is adapted from Bruel et al., 2018.	51
5.1	(a) The spectral fit to the observed data counts and (b) the residual plot for the location of Tri-II. We have modelled the Tri-II with the power-law spectrum for $\Gamma = 2$ . In figure 5.1(a), the solid red curve displays the best-fit total spectrum, along with the corresponding LAT-observed data points (in green); the upper-most solid blue and green curves display the galactic	

	diffuse background and the isotropic background component, respectively.	65
5.2	The $\gamma$ -ray lux upper limits of Tri-II for five WIMP annihilation final states.	69
5.3	Predictions from (a) the mSUGRA and (b) the MSSM models are shown in the parameter plane of $(m_{DM}, < \sigma v >)$ . The red points denote the thermal relic abundance which is related to the DM density, while the blue points denote the lower thermal relic DM density. The red and blues points have been taken from the Abdo <i>et al.</i> , 2010. In both figures, the $< \sigma v >$ upper limits for two velocity dispersion ( $\sigma$ ) values of Tri-II have been estimated for 95% C.L. The $< \sigma v >$ upper limits for UMi have been similarly estimated. The $< \sigma v >$ upper limits of Tri-II for the higher value of J-factor (Genina <i>et al.</i> , 2016) is denoted by the yellow curves. For UMi, we have used the parameter set mentioned in Abdo <i>et al.</i> 2010	70
5.4	Predictions from the AMSB and the Kaluza-Klein UED mod- els are shown in the parameter plane of $(m_{DM}, < \sigma v >)$ . The $< \sigma v >$ upper limits for two velocity dispersion $(\sigma)$ values of Tri-II have been estimated for 95% C.L. The $< \sigma v >$ upper limits for UMi have been similarly estimated. The $< \sigma v >$ upper limits of Tri-II for the higher value of J-factor (Genina <i>et al.</i> , 2016) is denoted by the yellow curves. For UMi, we have used the parameter set mentioned in Abdo <i>et al.</i> , 2010.	70
5.5	Comparison between the $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ upper limits for the bb annihilation channel obtained from our analysis and obtained by the <i>Fermi</i> collaboration for UMi (Ackermann <i>et al.</i> , 2015).	72
6.1	(a) The spectral fit to the observed data counts per energy bin and (b) the residual plot for the location of Tuc-II has been shown here. We have modelled the Tuc-II with the power-law spectrum for $\Gamma = 2$ . In figure 6.1(a), the solid dark reddish- brown curve displays the best-fit total spectrum, along with the corresponding LAT-observed data points (in purple); the dot-dashed sky-blue and orange curves display the galactic dif- fuse background and the isotropic background component, re- spectively; the dot-dashed black curve along with green points denotes the spectral fit of Tuc-II. The rest of the curves corre- spond to various point sources other than Tuc-II, lying within	
6.2	the ROI that are not distinctly labeled in figure 6.1(a) (a) The variation of the TS values of Tuc-II with $m_{DM}$ for two	79

WIMP annihilation channels; i) 100%  $b\bar{b}$  (blue) and ii) 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (red). We have also shown the results for three different periods of LAT data. (b) The peak TS value observed from the location of Tuc-II for three periods of LAT data, while the red and the blue markers refer to the peak value of TS for  $b\bar{b}$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  WIMP annihilation final states, respectively. . . .

- 6.3 (a) The spectral fit to the observed counts and (b) the residual plot for  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  of ROI centred on the location of Tuc-II. From Fig. 6.3(a), the sum of the best-fit spectrum along with the Fermi-LAT detected counts (in brown) is shown with the solid purple curve, while the diffuse galactic and isotropic components are displayed by the 'dot-dashed' sky-blue and orange curves. For Fig. 6.3(b), with the magenta solid cure, we have represented the best-fit DM annihilation spectra for  $100\% \tau^{+}\tau^{-}$  channel at DM Mass, $m_{DM} = 4$  GeV. The corresponding residual points (in red) within 100 MeV to 300 GeV energy ranges are overplotted with error bars. . . . . . . . .
- 6.4 The residual TS maps (between 100 MeV to 300 GeV) for  $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$  ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from the 10° ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 *pixel*<sup>-1</sup>. In the left Fig., the three CRATES sources and Tuc-II are not added to our source model; For middle Fig., Tuc-II is not added to the source model but we have included three CRATES sources in our source model; in right Fig., the three CRATES sources and Tuc-II are included to our source model. We have mentioned the name of Tuc-II and three CRATES sources that lie within 1° with the white cross.
- 6.5 The residual TS maps (between 100 MeV to 300 GeV) for  $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$  ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from the 10° ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 *pixel*<sup>-1</sup>. In the extreme left Fig., the three CRATES sources, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and Tuc-II are not added to our source model; For Second left Fig., Tuc-II and 4FGL 2247.7-5857 are not added to the source model but we have included three CRATES sources in our source model; for Third Fig., Tuc-II in not added to the source model but we have included 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources in our source model; for Third Fig., Tuc-II in not added to the source model but we have included 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources in our source model; in extreme right Fig., the three CRATES sources, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and Tuc-II are included to our source model. We have mentioned the name of Tuc-II, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources that lie within 1° with the white cross.

82

84

89

90

6.6The variations of (a)  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits and (b) the respective WIMP pair annihilation  $< \sigma v >$  in 95% C.L. with DM mass,  $m_{DM}$  estimated for five annihilation channels, "f". The results are produced by considering the median value of 92The variation of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits of Tuc-II with m<sub>DM</sub> for 6.7bb annihilation channels is shown in the parameter plane of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  for the median value of J-factor with its associated uncertainties. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from Tuc-II are compared with the limits predicted by (a) the mSUGRA and (b) the MSSM DM models. In both (a) and (b), the red points are related to the thermal relic DM density, while the blue points correspond to the higher  $<\sigma v >$  and low thermal relic DM density. The thermalrelic cross section rate  $(2.2 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$  estimated by the Steigman *et al.*, 2012 is displayed by a green dashed line. . . . 93 The comparison of the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from 6.8 the Tuc-II with the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits predicted by the AMSB and the Kaluza-Klein UED DM models is displayed in this figure. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The thermal-relic cross section rate  $(2.2 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$  estimated by the Steigman *et al.*, 94 The variations of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  with m<sub>DM</sub> for the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation 6.9 channel of Tuc-II, UMi and Ret-II is shown in the parameter plane of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$ . The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles of UFDs, while the dashed line represents the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits in 95 % C.L. for their median value of J-factor. 95 6.10 The comparison of the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation final state obtained from Tuc-II with the limits obtained from several collaboration work has been shown here. For comparison, we have considered the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from the single or the combined studies on dSphs by VERITAS, HESS, MAGIC, HAWC, Fermi-LAT+MAGIC and Fermi-LAT, respectively. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The relic cross section rate obtained by the Steigman et al., 2012 is represented by the 'dashed' sky-blue coloured line. . . . . . . 97 6.11 The residual TS maps (between 500 MeV to 300 GeV) for

xix

	$1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$ ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 <i>pixel</i> <sup>-1</sup> . In left Fig., Tuc-II is not included in the source model but 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources are added to our source model; in right Fig., 4FGL 2247.7-5857, Tuc-II and the three CRATES sources are added to our source model
7.1	We have shown the residual plots of four LSB galaxies for $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$ ROI. We have modelled them with the power law
7.2 7.3	spectrum for $\Gamma = 2, \ldots, 100$ The diagram of the toy model for calculating J-factor 109 The $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits of all four LSB galaxies for three pair annihilation channels, such as: (a) the 100% $b\bar{b}$ , (b) the 100% $\tau^+\tau^-$ , (c) the 100% $\mu^+\mu^-$ . (d) It shows the variation of $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits for UGC 12632 with DM mass, $m_{DM}$ for four annihilation channels. We have considered the median
7.4	J-factor value from Table 7.4
7.5	J-factor value from Table 7.4
7.6	uncertainty of the DM profiles for our LSB galaxies
7.7	by Ackermann <i>et al.</i> , 2015 are overplotted here

	derived by Steigman <i>et al.</i> , 2012 and the combined $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ upper limits obtained from the Fermi-LAT analysis of 15 dSphs
	by Ackermann $et al.$ , 2015. The shaded region refers to the
7.8	uncertainty associated with the stacking limits
	and the $\mu^+\mu^-$ (dotted). We have considered $m_{DM}=100$ GeV $B_0 = 1\mu G$ and $D_0=3 \times 10^{28} \ (cm^2 s^{-1})$
7.9	The variation of the multiwavelength SED of UGC 12632 for
	(a) four values of $B_0$ , (b) three values of $D_0$ and (c) four values
	of $\gamma_D$ . We have considered $m_{DM}$ =100 GeV, $B_0 = 1\mu$ G, $D_0=3\times$
	$10^{28} (cm^2 s^{-1})$ and have fixed the thermal averaged $\langle \sigma v \rangle$
7 10	to $3 \times 10^{20} \ cm^3 s^{-1}$
7.10	(a) The limits on $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ by using radio flux density ob- tained from the NVSS images and for three application chan
	nels are shown here. The (a) solid dashed and dot-dashed
	linestyle denote the $b\bar{b}$ , the $\tau^+\tau^-$ and the $\mu^+\mu^-$ channels, re-
	spectively. Comparison of the radio $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits obtained
	from NVSS data with $\gamma$ -ray $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits obtained from the
	individual and the stacked analysis for (b) the $b\bar{b}$ , (c) the $\tau^+\tau^-$
	and (d) the $\mu^+\mu^-$ annihilation channels. we have chosen the
	NFW profile. We have considered $m_{DM}=100$ GeV, $B_0 = 1\mu$ G,
	$D_0=3 \times 10^{-5} (cm^2 s^{-1})$ and have fixed the thermal averaged
	$< 00 > 10 3 \times 10^{\circ}$ cm s . Like (a), the same intestyles have been used for (b) (c) and (d) 122
7.11	The uncertainties associated with the $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits obtained
	from NVSS images for (a) the $b\bar{b}$ , (b) the $\tau^+\tau^-$ and (c) the
	$\mu^+\mu^-$ final states are shown here. The radio limits for each
	annihilation channels are compared with the uncertainty band $-$
	associated with $\gamma$ -ray stacking limits for bb. The shaded region
	between dashed lines displays the uncertainty band for radio
	limits, while the shaded region between solid lines shows the
7 1 2	The flux density predicted for our LSB galaxies that applied
1.12	lates into the $b\bar{b}$ , the $\mu^+\mu^-$ and the $\tau^+\tau^-$ channels, we have
	chosen the NFW profile. We have considered $m_{DM}=100$ GeV,
	$B_0 = 1\mu \text{G}, D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \ (cm^2 s^{-1})$ and have fixed the thermal
	averaged $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ to $3 \times 10^{26} \ cm^3 s^{-1}$ . We have overplotted the
	SKA sensitivity curve for its 10, 100 and 1000 hours of obser-
	vation time with the dashed, the dotted and the dot-dashed
	black curves, respectively

<ul><li>7.13</li><li>7.14</li></ul>	(a) The upper limit on the $\gamma$ -ray flux for three different density profiles. (b) The comparison between the upper limits on the $< \sigma v >$ for three density profiles estimated for the median value of J-factor along with the uncertainty. The shaded region refers to the uncertainty in the DM density for LSB galaxies. In both figures, we have chosen UGC 12632 that annihilates into the $b\bar{b}$ channel	. 127
8.1	The maximum TS values (or peak value) detected from loca- tion of our selected UFDs for $b\bar{b}$ and $\tau^+\tau^-$ final states with eleven years of LAT data (left). The TS peak value observed from the location of Tucana II for three, six, nine and eleven	
8.2	years of LAT data (right)	. 135
8.3	95% C.L. $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ upper limit of our selected UFDs for $b\bar{b}$ , $\tau^+\tau^-$ and $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair-annihilation channels. We have not included	. 130
8.4	the limits from Triangulum II, Hydra II and Tucana III as they only have the upper limits of <i>J</i> -factor The $e^{\pm}$ distribution spectrum of Tucana II at equilibrium for radial distance $r = 0.1$ kpc and three pair-annihilation channels, such as: $b\bar{b}$ (red), $\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$ (blue) and $\tau^{+}\tau^{-}$ (green). We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26}$ cm <sup>3</sup> /s, $B = 1 \mu$ G, $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$ cm <sup>2</sup> /s, $\gamma_{\tau} = 0.3$ The spectrum for DM masses 200 GeV and 2 TeV	. 139
8.5	$\gamma_D = 0.3$ . The spectrum for DM masses 200 GeV and 2 TeV have been shown in left and right panels, respectively (a) The power-spectrum at five different frequency values for $B = 1 \mu$ G. (b) The synchrotron flux densities for $b\bar{b}$ (red), $\mu^+\mu^-$ (blue) and $\tau^+\tau^-$ (green) annihilation channels. The fluxes for DM masses 200 GeV and 2 TeV have been denoted with solid and dashed lines, respectively. We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \mathrm{cm}^3/\mathrm{s}$	. 142
8.6	$B = 1 \mu\text{G}, D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{cm}^2/\text{s}, \gamma_D = 0.3. \dots \dots \dots$ 95 % C.L. $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limit of UFDs using upper limits on flux den- sities observed by GMRT and VLA for $b\bar{b}, \tau^+\tau^-$ and $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair-annihilation channels. We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{cm}^3/\text{s}, B = 1 \mu\text{G},$ $D_2 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{cm}^2/\text{s}, \alpha_D = 0.3$	. 143
	$D_0 = 0 \times 10^{-10}$ cm / s, /D = 0.0	. 140

8.7	The synchrotron flux densities of our considered UFDs and classical dSphs, Draco has been determined for three annihi- lation channels, such as: $b\bar{b}$ (left), $\tau^+\tau^-$ (center) and $\mu^+\mu^-$ (right) and for two particular DM masses, such as: 200 GeV (top) and 2 TeV (bottom). For each figure, we have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26}$ cm <sup>3</sup> /s , $B = 1 \mu$ G, $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$ cm <sup>2</sup> /s, $\gamma_D = 0.3$ . The values of $\rho_s, r_s, d$ and $r_h$ have been taken from Table 8.4. For Hydra II, Triangulum II and Tucana III, we only have the upper limits on $\rho_s$ (Table 8.4), thus they can only provide the upper limits on symphrotron flux densities	146
8.8	Comparison between the upper limits on $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ obtained from the Fermi-LAT data for three density profiles for $b\bar{b}$ final state	140
8.9	95% C.L. upper limits of $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ as a function of DM mass, $m_D M$ for the 'central value' of J-factor derived by Pace <i>et al.</i> , 2019 and its relative uncertainties (Table 8.2). The $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits for Horologium I and Tucana II have been shown in the left and	
8.10	the right panels, respectively	148
8.11	parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ , $B = 1 \mu\text{G}$ , $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ , $\gamma_D = 0.3.$	149
	NFW, Burkert and ISO density profiles. We have considered 200 GeV $m_{DM}$ and $b\bar{b}$ final state. Besides, we have fixed the parameters at $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ , $B = 1 \mu\text{G}$ , $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$	
8.12	cm <sup>2</sup> /s, $\gamma_D = 0.3.$	150
8.13	$cm^2/s$ , $\gamma_D = 0.3$	152
	$10^{-20} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ , $B = 1 \mu\text{G}$ , $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ , $\gamma_D = 0.3$	154

# LIST OF TABLES

3.1	Properties of Fermi-LAT	44
5.1	Properties of Triangulum-II.	62
5.2	Best fit value of the normalisation parameter of Tri-II and the	
	TS values for five $\Gamma$ s	66
5.3	Estimated $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L	66
5.4	Parameters to calculate the J-factors	67
6.1	Properties of Tucana-II.	76
6.2	The parameter set that we used for our <i>Fermi</i> -LAT analysis	77
6.3	The best-fit normalization parameters $(N_0)$ of Tuc-II and the	
	TS values for five spectral indices $(\Gamma)$	80
6.4	The $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L. obtained from Tuc-II	
	for five spectral indices $(\Gamma)$	80
6.5	The overview of the TS and the $\Delta$ TS values for two spectrum	
	models that we have considered for this work: 1) the power-	
	law (PL) for the spectral index, $\Gamma = 2.4$ and 2) the best-fit	
	DM model corresponds to the highest TS values (for our case,	
	it is 100% $\tau^+\tau^-$ final state at $m_{DM}=4$ GeV). The p-value is	
	estimated by assuming the $\chi^2$ distribution for the 1 degree of	
	freedom	83
6.6	The list of CRATES and BZCAT sources within the $1^{\circ}$ ROI	
	of the Tuc-II. The J225455-592606 is listed in both catalogs.	
	Thus for this source, we have used its CRATES coordinates	86

6.7 The TS values for Tuc-II, 4FGL 2247.7-5857, and three sources from the BZCAT and the CRATES catalog that lie within 1° of Tuc-II are mentioned. For Tuc-II, we have shown its TS peak value for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel at  $m_{DM}=4$ GeV. The three nearby CRATES sources are modelled with the power-law spectra for  $\Gamma = 2.2$ . In case of 4FGL 2247.7-5857, we have modelled it with power-law spectra and have used the parameter values the 4FGL catalog of Fermi-LAT. . .

87

Properties of LSB galaxies. Column I: Name of LSB galaxies: 7.1Column II: Galactic longitude and latitude of LSB galaxies; Column III: The adopted distance of the galaxies, based on a Hubble constant  $(H_{\circ}) = 75 \ km \ s^{-1} \ Mpc^{-1}$ . We have obtained the value of distance for each LSB galaxies and their corresponding uncertainties from NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database; Column IV: Observed rotational velocity at last measured point of rotational curve from van den Bosch et al., 2000; Column V: Scale length of stellar disk from van den Bosch et al., 2000; Column VI: B band Luminosity of LSBs from OBrien et al., 2011; Column VII: Location of the last observed data points of LSB galaxies from Swaters et al., 2009; Column VIII: Observed HI gas masses of LSB galaxies from 7.2The Best-Fit value for the normalization parameter of LSB, 7.3The  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L. of LSB galaxies. . . . 107 7.4The necessary parameter values for calculating the J-factor 7.5J-factor obtained from the integration method and the Toy The parameter set used as the input of RX-DMFIT tool. . . . 120 7.67.7The radio flux density limit obtained from the NVSS at fre-7.8J-factors derived for three DM density profiles at  $h_0 = 0.75$ . 126 8.1 8.2The astrophysical factors (J-factor) of our selected UFDs deriving from the Eq. 2.7 for NFW, Burket and ISO DM density profiles at  $\theta_{max} = 0.5^{\circ}$ . Also mentioned J-factors of NFW profile estimated by the scaling relation from Pace et al., 2019. 134 8.3 Parameters used for the analysis of *Fermi*-LAT data. . . . . . 136

8.4	The astrophysical parameters for our selected UFDs along
	with the classical dSphs Draco. The values for $r_h$ , $\rho_s$ and $r_s$
	has been derived from the 'central values' of the astrophysical
	parameters listed in Table 8.1
8.5	$2\sigma$ upper limits on radio flux densities detected by the sky-
	survey performed by GMRT and VLA. The location of Carina
	II, Reticulum II, Horologium II and Tucana II&III are not
	covered by both the surveys

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

#### **1.1** Introduction to Dark Matter

Dark matter seems to be What isn't there to be seen In between What we see.

They dub it dark since you cannot detect it Nor can they inspect it With telescopy.

Yet, while it can't be described It cannot be denied For equations that irk To work.

(Harley White)

In our Universe, all the visible things i.e. Planets, stars, asteroids, galaxies constitute less than 5% of the total universe. So what are the remaining parts? What does constitute the rest of our Universe? This is the mystery and beauty of our Universe. Several astrophysical and experimental research suggest that a large part of the universe is composed of a strange substance known as 'dark matter'.

In human history, one of the most extraordinary intellectual achievements is to build the standard model (SM) of Particle Physics. Most of the particles were being discovered during the second half of the 20th century. Experimentally and theoretically, we found that the SM is an answer to a question as old as civilization itself.

Now, the question is what are the fundamental elements of matter? The SM gives us a very explicit representation of the fundamental elements of all the matters that are detected in our terrestrial laboratories. We also have an exact theoretical argument in a detailed mathematical form which explains how the fundamental particles will act. In terms of the understanding of our Universe, one of the most revealing discoveries is the baryonic matter, mostly in form of protons and neutrons. But unfortunately, they are not the dominant form of material in our Universe. Rather, a new mysterious form of "invisible matter" or we can say "dark matter (DM)" fills our Universe and



Figure 1.1: The multiple components that compose our universe. Dark energy comprises 71.4% of the mass energy density of the universe, DM comprises 24%, and atomic matter makes up 4.6%.

from observational evidence, it has been found that they are roughly five times more abundant than ordinary matter.

Unfortunately, the particle content of the SM - the quarks, the leptons, the mediators of the interactions and the Higgs particle can not fill in the role of DM. This is evident from the cosmological observations.

Accumulated observational data over the past century has established that visible matter (baryonic matter) constitutes only 4.6% of the total substance in the Universe, while DM is theorized to account for 24%, dark energy accounting for the remaining 71.4%. In Fig. 1.1, we have shown the content of baryonic matter, DM and dark energy. The invisible matter is termed as DM because it neither emits nor absorbs any detectable electromagnetic radiation and hence it is very difficult to study or identify it. It is not possible to directly detect the DM by any traditional telescopes, but there are enough pieces of evidence for the existence of DM [1]. Interestingly, the existence of missing mass is robustly supported by macroscopic evidences, but the microscopic nature and composition of DM are still in much debate. There are many ongoing experiments which are dedicated to directly detect and study the nature of DM candidates, but none have yet succeeded. To have a complete understanding of DM, we need to study several branches of physics and astronomy.

#### **1.2** Brief Overview of Thesis

The thesis is organized as follows:

To start with, in the following section 1.3 of this chapter, I present a brief introduction to the indirect evidence of DM. Next, in section 1.4, I discuss the possible DM candidates. Then in section 1.5, a brief review on DM annihilation process has been discussed. For my thesis, I study the DM signal resulting from the pair-annihilation. In this section, I would introduce the reader to the theoretically favoured annihilation final states and how we can obtain the emission (for example  $\gamma$ -ray and radio emission) as an end product of annihilation channels. In section 1.6, I briefly give a summary of the DM detection methodology. Direct detection, indirect detection and collider searches are three popular methods to search for the signature of the DM candidates. For my thesis, I solely focused on the indirect detection method.

Next in chapter 2, a brief introduction to the methods of multiwavelength searches for DM is given. The mathematical formalism, the notations and the other necessary concepts that I will explain in this chapter would be used later on my thesis. First, in section 2.1, I discuss the possible DM dense regions. Later in sections 2.3 and 2.4, I explain how we can study the electromagnetic radiation over a wide range, from gamma-ray down to radio frequencies appearing from DM annihilation.

For my thesis, I concentrate on the DM signature from some particular DM sources through indirect detection. For this purpose, we need dedicated and sensitive instruments. In Chapter 3, I describe the working principle of the Fermi Large Area Telescope (Fermi-LAT) in detail. Fermi-LAT is a gamma-ray space telescope that covers the entire celestial sphere. In view of indirect detection of DM signal, Fermi-LAT is one of the most sensitive gamma-ray telescopes. For most of my works, I have analysed the gamma-ray data observed by the Fermi-LAT. The detector and its working principle are described in Chapter 3 along with a review of its performance.

Next, in Chapter 4, I give an overview of the Likelihood function for Fermi-LAT data. The details of the mathematical formulation for Likelihood function and its methodology are explained in this chapter. Here, I will also explain how to estimate the upper limits if we could not detect any signal from the source. I use this formulation for my work to estimate the possible signature of DM annihilation. In Chapter 5, we study Triangulum-II, a newly discovered ultra-faint dwarf galaxy, which is assumed to be rich in DM. We examine the gamma-ray signal from the location of Triangulum-II and from that data try to check whether this galaxy can provide strong annihilation rate than other well studied sources. We show that Triangulum-II would provide very stringent limits on the theoretical DM models and thermal annihilation rate, even better than some well studied dwarf spheroidal galaxies (dSphs).

In Chapter 6, we study the Tucana-II. Like Triangulum-II, Tucana-II is a DM-dominated satellite galaxy of our Milky Way. We examine the gammaray data from its location and unlike most of the dwarf galaxies, we observe a faint emission. Then we first study the maximum significance of this emission and check how this excess would vary with the DM mass, annihilation channels and periods of exposure. Furthermore, we investigate the origin of such emission and our study shows that such excess is mostly coming from the Tucana-II location and most likely related to DM annihilation.

Next, in Chapter 7, we study four Low surface brightness galaxies (LSB). Unlike the earlier two chapters., for this work, we use the multiwavelength approach to investigate the DM signature. LSB galaxies have very diffuse and low surface density stellar disks and their extended HI (neutral hydrogen) rotation curves indicate the presence of very massive DM halos. We analyze the Fermi-LAT data for high energy gamma rays and radio flux upper limits from Very Large Array (VLA) at a frequency of 1.4 GHz to obtain upper limits on annihilation cross-section  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  at 95% confidence level (CL) in a model-independent way. From this study, we show that for LSB galaxies radio cross-section rate would be competitive with the limits predicted from Fermi-LAT. We further discuss the projected sensitivity of the upcoming ground-based telescope, the Cherenkov Telescope Array (CTA) and radio telescope, the Square Kilometer Array (SKA) and investigate whether they can probe the radiation from LSB galaxies.

In Chapter 8, we consider 14 recently discovered ultra faint dwarf galaxies and study the electromagnetic radiation over a wide range, from gamma-ray down to radio frequencies appearing from them. We also, check the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  at 95% CL for the gamma-ray and radio flux upper limits observed by Fermi-LAT, Giant Metrewave Radio (GMRT) and VLA. We study the uncertainty in the synchrotron and gamma-ray fluxes arising from various astrophysical parameters. Furthermore, we discuss the projected sensitivity of the SKA radio telescope in probing the synchrotron radiation from the aforementioned dSphs.

#### **1.3** Observational Evidence of Dark Matter

Dark matter exerts gravitational pull. It glues stars together, makes galaxies full. Unlike normal matter it plays hide and seek And so much of it's interactively weak...

(Harley White)

The very first observational hint of the DM, or "missing mass" began in early 1930. In 1932, Jan Oort observed a bizarre motion of the stars of our Milky Way and that hinted the presence of some form of non-luminous matter which is far more massive than anyone had ever predicted [2]. By studying the Doppler shifts of each moving star in galactic place, Oort calculated the velocities of these stars. The calculation showed that stars were moving so quickly to escape from the gravitational pull of Milky Way. That made Oort to suspect the pressence of massive pull in the galactic plane which can hold the stars to their orbits [2].

Just one year after the Oort's finding, in 1933, Swiss astronomer F. Zwicky, examined a much larger system, Coma Cluster. From Doppler effect, he measured the velocity dispersion for member galaxies of the Coma galaxy cluster and noticed that the member galaxies were moving much faster than we could expect from their luminous components [3,4]. Zwicky measured the velocity dispersions of each member galaxy (i.e. kinetic energy) and then by employing the virial theorem, he estimated the total mass of the Coma cluster. With Virial theorem, he established the relation between the total mass of the galaxy cluster and the averaged square of the velocities of each galaxy. He then observed that in order to maintain the equilibrium in Coma cluster, a large amount of "Dunkle Materie" or DM must be present to theoretically explain the large velocity dispersion of the system.

The virial theorem denotes the following relation between gravitational energy and kinetic energy. The expression is:

$$< T > = -\frac{1}{2} < U >$$
 (1.1)

The virial theorem (equation 1.1) states that for a spherically symmetric system, the total kinetic energy (T) is equal to minus  $\frac{1}{2}$  times the total gravitational potential energy (U) [5]. Hence, if we know the kinetic energy of the system, we can calculate the gravitational potential energy, and then the total mass of the system can be easily estimated. If the obtained mass of the system is greater than the mass of the total luminous matter, then there must be some invisible i.e non-luminous matter present in the system. The invisible matter can only interact gravitationally. Hence, from virial theorem, Zwicky observed that the total mass of the cluster was about 400 times greater than the luminous mass. This result led him to propose that there must be some source of invisible matter that created such a difference with the observational estimation. Study of the Virgo cluster soon produced very similar results [6].

Next, roughly around 40 years later the discoveries of Oort and Zwicky, beginning in the 1970s, Vera Rubin, Alberto Bosma, and others studied the orbital velocities of stars in spiral galaxies ([7–15]). Rubin and her collaborators separately performed an extended study of rotational curves for around 60 individual galaxies [16]. They performed detailed measurements of the Doppler shift for their targets and determined their orbital velocities. Their studies also showed an extreme deviation from the theoretical prediction based on Newtonian gravity and other baryonic matter interactions [16]. They found that the spiral galaxies have flat rotation curves extending out to radii of tens of kpc and their orbital velocities did not decrease as expected. From the flat rotational curve, Rubin estimated that the galaxies have contained almost 10 times more matter than the visible one. This remarkable finding just confirmed the earlier claims by Zwicky. Rubin also predicted that there might be an unobserved huge spherical halo of DM which surrounds the inner luminous galaxy.

According to Newton's Law of Gravitation (Newton 1687), the orbital velocity should fall by increasing the distance from the center of the galaxy as,

$$v(r) = \sqrt{G\frac{m(r)}{r}},\tag{1.2}$$

where v(r) is the rotation velocity as a function of radius, and m(r) is the mass confined within radius, r.

From Eq. 1.2, we should expect to observe the fall of orbital velocity as:  $v(r) \propto 1/\sqrt{r}$ . But interestingly, the galactic rotation curves, as obtained

by Rubin and her collaborators, did not follow the expected nature. In their publication, Rubin, Kent Ford and Norbert Thonnard [15] reported their observational results for 21 spiral galaxies. Their study showed that with increasing the distance from the center of the galaxies the rotational velocity remained constant (or merely increased for some galaxies). The rotational velocity of any galaxy can only remain constant if the total mass of the system is increasing with radius from the center. The artistic view of their study is shown in Fig. 1.2 (a). From this figure, it is evident that the radial velocity of the galactic system is much larger than what would be expected if the gravitational potential of the galaxy came from only the luminous matter i.e. from the stars and gas.



Figure 1.2: (a) The artistic view of the observed and expected Rotational curve from M33 galaxy. (b) The rotational curve of the spiral galaxy NGC6503.

After that, many scientists did similar kinds of studies and all of them confirmed the same nature of the galactic rotational curve. The work by Begeman, Broeils and Sanders, 1991 [17] also reported the same. For their studies, they have chosen the spiral galaxy NGC6503 (Fig. 1.2 (b)). They showed the contributions to the rotational velocity from luminous disk, gas and dark halo. Their analysis also reported the extension of the DM halo beyond the stellar bulge of the galaxy.

#### CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION



Figure 1.3: Gravitational lensing of Abell 370 observed by Hubble Space Telescope (HST).

In the 1970s, scientists tried a new way to understand the distribution of DM, 'Gravitational lensing'. Einstein's theory of relativity postulates that the strong gravitational field can bend the path of light rays, i.e., a massive object can bend spacetime and also affect the motion of nearby objects. This produces a lensing effect where the surrounding objects follow the geodesics of the curved space. This effect is called the gravitational lensing [18]. For observing the effect of gravitational lensing, it requires a very massive object (say the cluster of galaxies) and a distant bright light source behind it. If the distant object is located directly behind the massive body, the massive object would act as a gravitational lens and would create numerous images of the distant object. This effect would create an Einstein ring structure (see, the blue ring structure from Fig. 1.3)  $^{1}$  where the massive object would be at the center and the images of the distant object would create the ring (Fig. 1.3). In 1979, D. Walsh et al. [19] was the first to observe this form of gravitational lensing. The detailed study of the Einstein ring structure allows astronomers to estimate the total mass of any massive body, such as: galaxy, cluster of galaxies, etc. Their observational studies show that only 10% of the total mass of the clusters are in the form of individual galaxies, the rest is DM [19].

Another very strong evidence for DM is the Bullet cluster (1E 0657-56). This cluster consists of two colliding cluster of galaxies. While the galaxies crossed their paths, the stars within the galaxies and other visible light passed by each other without being affected much by the collision. But, the hot gas clouds which represent most of the baryonic matter merging from two colliding galaxies interact electromagnetically and due to friction of the gas molecules,

 $<sup>{}^{1}{\</sup>rm NASA \ images \ from \ Large \ Synoptic \ Survey \ Telescope \ (LSST); \ http://www.lsst.org/lsst/public}$ 



Figure 1.4: X-ray image (pink) of Bullet cluster superimposed over a visible light image (blue).

the gases of both clusters slowed down much faster than the stars. When the gas clouds were slowed down, the visible part of the galaxies came into much clearer view and that gave the scientists a scope to examine the total mass of the Bullet cluster. With the data obtained from the X-ray telescopes and gravitational lensing observations, the scientists found that the mass and the gas element do not follow the same distribution [20]. Then by measuring the gravitational lensing effect of the Bullet cluster, the scientists determined that the cluster bent the path of light more than they could expect from the luminous mass. This proved that there must be the presence of more mass in the cluster than the visible matter. The composite image of bullet cluster (or galaxy cluster 1E 0657-56) is shown in Fig. 1.4. The background part of this image is showing the visible spectrum of the light stems obtained from Hubble Space and Magellan Telescope, while the pink part of this image denotes the X-ray emission of the colliding clusters recorded by the Chandra Telescope and lastly the blue part shows the mass distribution of the Bullet clusters estimated from the gravitational lensing effects<sup>2</sup>.

#### 1.4 Dark Matter Candidates

In this section, we will discuss the nature of DM and its possible candidates. To reveal the nature of the DM particles, the physicists first focused on the known astrophysical bodies which are made of ordinary, baryonic matters. Later, they have extended the standard model theory to explain the nonluminous nature of the DM.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Nasa: A matter of fact, August, 2006; http://www.nasa.gov/vision/universe/starsgalaxies/dark\_matter\_proven.html, X-ray: NASA/CXC/CfA/M.Markevitch el al., Optical: NASA/STScl, Magellan/U.Arizona/D.Clowe et al.; Lensing Map: NASA/STScl; EDO WFI; Magellan/U.Arizona/D.Clowe et al.
From several observational pieces of evidence, we can summarize the following general properties of DM candidates.

- They do not emit or absorb light, indicating absence of electromagnetic interaction. Hence, they do not carry electric charge.
- Majority of them neither participate in strong interaction nor carry colour charge. (A very small fraction of the DM is assumed to be baryonic and only they can take part in strong interaction.)
- They do only interact via gravity. The gravitational effect of the DM is very important to form a large structure of the universe.

### 1.4.1 Possible DM Candidates:

The observational evidence indeed gave us enough hints of the existence of the DM, but the true nature of the DM remains unknown. Below we will discuss the possible candidates for DM.

### 1.4.1.1 The Standard Model and the Neutrino and Supersymmetry:

The standard model (SM) consists of the following particles - six leptons (electron, muon, tau and their corresponding neutrinos), six quarks (bup, down, strange, charm, bottom and top) and five force carriers (photon, gluon, Z,  $W^{\pm}$  and the Higgs scalar). Each of the above-mentioned leptons and quarks has their respective antiparticles which are generally denoted with a bar or opposite charge sign (for example, the up antiquark's symbol is  $\bar{u}$ ). The Higgs Boson with a mass of ~ 125 GeV was discovered in 2012 by the ATLAS [21] and the CMS experiments performed at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) of European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) [22].

In spite of the success of the SM in explaining behaviour of the elementary particles, it does not contain any particle which can act as the DM candidate. One of the most stable, neutral and weakly interacting particles from SM is the neutrino. But, the recent literature by Spergel et al. [23] completely ruled out the possibility of neutrinos being the entire solution to missing mass of the Universe. From WMAP, they showed the neutrino mass to be  $m_v < 0.23 \ eV$ , which in turn makes the cosmological density  $\Omega_v h^2 < 0.0072$  [24]. Hence, neutrinos do only account for a very small fraction of DM, and cannot be the prime source of DM.

Hence, several possible extensions of the SM have been proposed, Supersymmetry (SUSY) being one of them [25]. SUSY assumes an additional symmetry between the fermions and the bosons, i.e., each particle in the SM has its superpartner - fermions have bosons as their superpartners and vice-versa. The most encouraging finding of the SUSY is that it can propose valid DM candidates. Several particles in the SUSY theory are possible DM candidates, like neutralino, sneutrino [26, 27], and gravitino [28, 29]. All of these three candidates show a WIMP (Weakly interacting massive particle)-like nature i.e., weakly interacting and electrically neutral, but sneutrinos [26, 27] might annihilate very rapidly in the early universe and hence its relic densities are very low to explain any cosmological phenomenon, whereas, gravitino [28, 29] would act as a hot DM. In most SUSY models, the lightest neutralino is considered the most promising candidate for DM.

Several exotic particles are also considered as DM candidates - massive compact halo objects (MACHOs), black holes, WIMPs, axions, etc. Some theories also suggest that the DM can be both baryonic and non-baryonic and in that case, MACHOs are considered as the baryonic type. The dominant part of the DM is mainly composed of non-baryonic candidates, e.g. neutrinos, WIMPs, axions, etc. Based on the physical properties, there are different types of DM. We will describe them below.

Kinematically, the DM can be divided into three categories based on their velocity at the time of its decoupling of universe [30]. This is important because it has a direct influence on our galaxy formation and large and small structures of the universe.

- Hot Dark Matter (HDM): The HDM is made of abundant light particles. The best candidate for HDM is the normal light neutrino. The mass of an HDM is of the order of eV or less,  $m_{HDM} < 1$  eV.
- Cold Dark Matter (CDM): The CDM is at the opposite end of HDM in the mass-velocity spectrum. It is non-relativistic at the time of decoupling. Its mass can be in the GeV order or larger. There are many proposed candidates for CDM, including weakly interacting massive particles like neutralinos, WIMPZILLAS, solitons, etc.
- Warm Dark Matter (WDM): The WMD is something in between

the HDM and CDM, consisting of particles of  $m_{WDM} > 1$  KeV which may interact even weaker than a neutrino. It is relativistic at the time of decoupling, but non-relativistic at the radiation-to-matter dominance transition. There are a few possible candidates for WDM, including sterile neutrino, light gravitinos and photino, etc.

The DM can also be classified according to its production mechanism.

- **Thermal relics**: The thermal relics particles are assumed to be in thermal equilibrium in the early universe and mass of that thermal relic is bound from the above by 340 TeV. Most of the favoured DM candidates are from this category.
- Non-Thermal relics: These particles are produced via non-thermal mechanism and is believed that they were never in equilibrium with the thermal bath of the universe. There are several favoured DM candidates which are assumed to be non-thermal relics, such as axions emitted by cosmic strings, superheavy WIMPZILLAs (masses lie between 10<sup>12</sup> to 10<sup>16</sup> GeV), etc.

#### 1.4.2 Weakly Interacting Massive Particles

One of the leading candidates for DM is weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) [31, 32]. The most favoured DM candidates, like the neutralino from supersymmetry, the lightest Kaluza-Klein particle from the superstring theory and theories of extra dimensions and some other candidates from beyond the standard model theory are assumed to be very massive and only interact via gravitational pull, i.e., weakly interacting. These are collectively referred to as WIMPs. They are non-baryonic and well-motivated by independent considerations of particle physics [31]. Systematic theoretical investigations to understand their properties and experimental searches have to be carried out.

At the early universe, say after the Big Bang, the particles were in chemical and thermal equilibrium. By chemical equilibrium, we mean that every reaction among the particles was reversal (e.g. the creation of WIMPs pairproduction from SM particles and the WIMP annihilation were in equilibrium). Hence, the whole system of universe did not change by any reaction. This equilibrium was maintained until the temperature of the universe became lower than the particle mass, and as a result, the pair-production of WIMPs stopped. When this equilibrium was broken, the abundance of DM candidates decayed due to annihilation and this process continued until the annihilation rate fell below the expansion rate of the universe. This epoch is referred to as the "freeze-out".

Another class of particles is the Superweakly interacting massive particles (superWIMPs), which include sterile (right-handed) neutrinos, gravitino. etc. These have annihilation cross- sections much smaller than that of the weak interaction.

### 1.5 Dark Matter Annihilation

In this section, we discuss ways to detect DM candidates of the WIMP type. Generally, experiments look for the end products of their annihilation or decay channels. One very popular way to detect the DM candidates is to search for the end products of WIMP annihilation/decay channels.

We denote the DM and its anti-particles as  $\chi$  and  $\bar{\chi}$ , respectively. If DM is a Majorana particle,  $\chi$  and its anti-particle  $\bar{\chi}$  would be the same. Several observational evidences as well as theoretical models propose that the mass of WIMPs lies in the range of GeV to TeV. If  $\chi$  is assumed to be thermally relic DM candidates, then  $\chi$  and  $\bar{\chi}$  should participate in the evolution of the universe as other SM particles.

In the early universe, through annihilation and pair-production processes,  $\chi$  and  $\bar{\chi}$  were in equilibrium with ordinary SM particles (i.e equilibrium with fermions (f), quarks (Q), gauge bosons ( $W^{\pm}$ , Z) etc). The form of the annihilation reaction could be described as: [33]

 $\chi + \chi \rightarrow Q + \bar{Q} \rightarrow f + \bar{f}, W^+ + W^-, Z + Z, \dots$ , where Q and  $\bar{Q}$  denote quark and its antiparticle, respectively.

After the big bang, all of these particles were in equilibrium and were at the same temperature. The number density of  $\chi$  in equilibrium at a given temperature can be described as:

$$\int n_{\chi}^{eq} = \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3} \int f(p) d^3p$$
 (1.3)

where, g is the number of internal degree of freedom of  $\chi$  and f(p) is a func-



Figure 1.5: Comoving number density evolution as a function of the ratio  $m_{\chi}/T$  in the context of the thermal freeze-out.

tion of the three-momentum p of  $\chi$ . Depending on the spin of the WIMP, f(p) would either follow Dirac-Fermi or Bose-Einstein distribution. At very high temperatures i.e for  $T >> m_{\chi}$ ,  $n_{\chi}^{eq} \propto T$ , while at lower temperature i.e. for  $T \ll m_{\chi}$ ,  $n_{\chi}^{eq} \propto exp(-m_{\chi}/T)$ . At  $T \ll m_{\chi}$ , the production of  $\chi$  $\bar{\chi}$  pair from SM particle pair will be suppressed and at the same time the annihilation rate will remain the same, hence the number density of  $\chi$  will be exponentially reduced. When the universe expands, the temperature of the universe drops to sufficiently low and that would lead to the system out of the equilibrium.

Due to a significant drop in the number density of  $\chi$ , it would be very hard for  $\chi$  and  $\bar{\chi}$  to find each other to annihilate, or to be scattered around by ordinary SM particles. Eventually, they would no longer be in thermal equilibrium and  $\chi$  is decoupled from the rest of the universe. Then, except for a very rare occasion,  $\chi$  would not annihilate or scatter with ordinary particles. But  $\chi$  continues to expand freely with the Hubble flow. The number density of  $\chi$  is fixed to the  $T^3$ . In Fig. 1.5, we have shown how does the comoving number density of the  $\chi$  varies with  $m_{\chi}/T$  at the epoch of thermal freeze-out.

The overall geometry of the universe [34] is determined by the density parameter  $(\Omega)$  of our universe. The expression of the density parameter is:  $\Omega = \rho/\rho_c$ . Where  $\rho$  is observed density and  $\rho_c$  is the critical density of our universe. The critical density is the average of the matter-density that is needed for our universe to halt its expansion and it can be expressed as:

$$\rho_c = \frac{3H_0}{8\pi G} \approx 1.88 \times 10^{-26} \, h^2 \, kg \, m^{-3} \tag{1.4}$$

where  $H_0$  is the Hubble constant and h is the dimensionless form of  $H_0$  in units of 100 km/s/Mpc [34]. From the density parameter of the universe, we can guess the contributions of baryonic matter, DM and dark energy, that is,  $\Omega = \Omega_B + \Omega_{DM} + \Omega_{\Lambda}$ . Here  $\Omega_B$ ,  $\Omega_{DM}$  and  $\Omega_{\Lambda}$  are the relative density parameter for normal baryonic matter, DM and dark energy, respectively. The recent observations of the Planck collaboration obtained  $\Omega_B = 0.05$ ,  $\Omega_{DM} = 0.265$  and  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.685$  [35]. The DM density ( $\Omega_{DM}$ ) depends on the annihilation cross-section ( $\sigma$ ) weighted by the average velocity (v) of the particle i.e. on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ . In order to match the abundance measured by the Planck collaboration, the DM relic density would be equal to  $\Omega_{DM}h^2 =$  $0.1197 \pm 0.0022$  [35]. The expression of the  $\Omega_{DM}h^2$  is:

$$\Omega_{DM}h^2 = 0.11 \frac{3 \times 10^{-26} cm^3 s^{-1}}{\langle \sigma v \rangle_0} \tag{1.5}$$

From eq.(1.5), it is evident that DM might have an annihilation cross-section,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle_0 \approx 3 \times 10^{-26} cm^3 s^{-1}$  at thermal freeze-out [36].

Like we already discussed above, WIMPs are thought to be first self-annihilate into a quark-antiquark pair and later that pair decays to several possible SM particles, as shown in Fig. 1.6. From this image, we can observe that as an end product of WIMP annihilation, it can generate  $\gamma$ -ray, lepton pairs such as muon-antimuon pairs ( $\mu^-\mu^+$ ) or electron-positron ( $e^-e^+$ ) pairs, and also boson pairs like ZZ or  $W^+W^-$ . Thus, even though the WIMPs are invisible to us, we can try to probe these SM particles originated from WIMP annihilation. We can start our search for DM signature by looking for the areas in the universe that are thought to be rich in DM. One of the most popular ways is to scan the universe for the end products which might come from the DM annihilation/decay.

For my thesis, we have focused on five theoretically motivated DM annihilation channels (in the later sections we would discuss this in detail). Those channels are:  $\chi\chi \to \tau^+\tau^-$ ;  $\chi\chi \to \mu^+\mu^-$ ;  $\chi\chi \to W^+W^-$ ;  $\chi\chi \to b\bar{b}$  and  $\chi\chi \to 80\% \ b\bar{b} + 20\% \ \tau^+\tau^-$ .

The lifetime of tau lepton  $(\tau^{-})$  is around  $2.9 \times 10^{-13}$ s and its mass is  $1776.82 MeV/c^2$ .  $\tau^{-}$  can decay into the combination of neutral pions, tau neutrinos and charged pions  $(\pi^{\pm})$ . There are multiple possible decay channels for  $\tau^{-}$  and amongst



Figure 1.6: WIMP annihilation chain and the end products.

them 90% of the decay possibilities are accounting for five channels and the remaining around 10% of decay possibilities can be related to twenty five different decay modes [37]. The five dominant  $\tau^-$  decay channels are:  $\tau^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_{\tau}, \tau^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_{\mu} + \nu_{\tau}, \tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- + \pi^0 + \nu_{\tau}, \tau^- \rightarrow \pi^+ + 2\pi^- + \nu_{\tau},$ and  $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- + 2\pi^0 + \nu_{\tau}$  [37]. The dominant decay modes of neutral pions are  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  (98.82%) and  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma + e^- + e^+$  (1.17%). Thus decays of taus generate radiation.

The lifetime of muon  $(\mu^-)$  is around  $2.2 \times 10^{-6}$  s and its mass is  $105 \ MeV/c^2$  and decays via weak interaction:  $\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu_e} + \nu_{\mu}$  as an end of final state radiation.

The mediator of charged weak interaction W boson, has a mass of 80.4  $MeV/c^2$ , and decays into a fermion-antifermion pair.

The two heaviest quarks, top (173210  $MeV/c^2$ ) and bottom (4180  $MeV/c^2$ ) quarks decay via weak interaction and produce gamma rays as final state.

Four annihilation channels have been chosen for the following reasons. Because of the phase space, we can expect that the DM particles would dominantly annihilate into the heaviest possibles channels [36]. Hence, we consider the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channels. Several ongoing experiments such as Fermi-LAT, MAGIC, etc. have studied  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel for searching the indirect DM signal. Thus, we have chosen the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel to check the direct comparison of results. We have chosen the bosonic  $W^+W^$ channel because in several experiments this bosonic annihilation channel is



Figure 1.7: Schematic diagram of DM detection through direct, indirect and its production at Colliders.

widely considered. Finally, we have included the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  channel for our analysis because this leptonic channel may explain the observed excesses of local positrons [36].

### **1.6** Dark Matter Detection

Physicists hunt for DM, to move it With particle accelerators, to prove it Exists as suspected, from data collected With outcome expected, eureka! projected...

(Harley White)

If DM is dominated by WIMPs, then we should have cosmological abundance of WIMPs. Two different approaches may be used for the detection of DM particles - direct as well as indirect. A schematic diagram of production and decay of DM is shown in figure 1.7.

It is possible to directly detect DM particles, both from cosmic sources as well as from colliding beam experiments like the LHC. It is assumed that WIMPs have weak-scale scattering cross-section with SM particles and thus it might be possible to directly detect the nuclear recoil energy from WIMPnucleon interactions in low-background experiments [38–40]. We can also try to generate WIMPs in accelerators through the collision of SM particles. The distinctive signatures (e.g., the missing transverse energy) of these events are expected to be recorded by the collider experiments [41-43].

Moreover, WIMPs are considered to be a thermal relic and it is expected that they might possess a weak-scale self-annihilation cross-section [25, 44–47]. Thus there might be a fair scope to indirectly detect the WIMP signature through the SM particles (e.g., photons, neutrinos, positrons, etc.) originating from annihilation. Different experiments are designed to probe different characteristics of the WIMP and all of them have their benefits, difficulties, and uncertainties. But, in order to have total knowledge of WIMPs, for example, their eventual detection, identification, and characterization, we need to gather the information from all three experimental techniques.

### **1.6.1** Direct Detection

The basic assumption for direct detection of DM candidates is that our Universe is filled with an abundance of WIMPs and many of those WIMPs are continuously passing through our terrestrial surface. Thus our terrestrial laboratories should notice the interaction of WIMPS with the matter by observing the recoil energy of nuclei through either ionization, scintillation, or vibrations (phonon). This method needs a very clean detector material so that it can detect a possible real signal from the background. It is also very important to minimize particle backgrounds as much as possible. For the direct experiment, one of the most general setup is to find an underground-site that would effectively reduce the cosmic-ray background. The rate of WIMP detection depends on various prime factors, such as the mass of WIMPs, the local halo density of DM, the velocity distribution in the Milky Way and the cross-section on the target nuclei. The detectors generally consist of a very pure crystal as in e.g. CDMS<sup>3</sup>, DAMA<sup>4</sup>, CRESST<sup>5</sup> or a liquid noble gas such as Xenon (Xenon $100^6$ ). From the theoretical prescription, the cross-section of WIMP interactions are predicted to be very small, hence very large detectors are needed (e.g. the Xenon100 contains 100 kg liquid Xenon) to detect the interactions.

There are several ongoing experiments such as DAMA/LIBRA which are designed to detect the DM by using the solid scintillators. For detecting the particle interactions, the particle detectors of DAMA/LIBRA use the

<sup>3</sup> http://cdms.berkeley.edu/

 $<sup>{\</sup>rm 4}_{\rm http://people.roma2.infn.it/~dama/web/home.html}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>http://www.cresst.de/

 $<sup>6</sup>_{\rm http://xenon.astro.columbia.edu/xenon100.html}$ 

thallium-activated sodium iodide crystals which are covered in a low radioactivity container with several Photomultiplier Tubes (PMTs) [48]. These detectors report the annual modulation of the signal of confidence level  $\approx$  $8.9\sigma$  [49].

### 1.6.2 Indirect Detection

The indirect detection method is one of the popular ways to identify the invisible DM signals. As we already discussed in the earlier section, WIMP can self-annihilate (or decay) into SM particles. With this detection method, we probe the SM particles originated from WIMP annihilation and then measure the particle spectra generating from them. The spectra would provide us with valuable information about the nature of DM particles. There are several dedicated (ongoing and planned) indirect detection experiments that are designed for solving the mystery of the DM. The detection experiments are classified according to the particles they detect.

#### • Photons:

Gamma-rays, including both direct line photons and diffusion photons are one of the most popular methods for indirect DM detection. WIMP annihilates to a quark and anti-quark products and they later produce a jet of particles that will generate the gamma-ray spectrum. At high energy, the neutral pions decay to a pair of monoenergetic photons that can create the prompt line of gamma-rays. When WIMP directly annihilates to the gamma-rays i.e.,  $\chi \chi \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ , the energy of the photons is proportional to the mass of WIMPs. Since the mass of WIMP is of the order of GeV, it would create a very high energy gamma-rays and detection of any of such the gamma-ray line would give an obvious indication of the DM annihilation and in the indirect detection, it would be referred to as the smoking gun for the DM search [50, 51]. Another source of the gamma-rays are the internal bremsstrahlung of charged particles produced in the annihilation process. The simulation and the observational study suggest that Galactic centre, dwarf spheroidal galaxies (dSphs), Low surface brightness galaxies (LSBs), cluster of galaxies etc. would be the ideal platform for indirect search. The advantage of tracking  $\gamma$ -ray is that they are electrically neutral and do not interact with magnetic fields. Hence, it is possible to track their origin and energy. In the latter chapter, we will discuss this method in detail.

For indirect DM detection, there are many dedicated space-based and ground-based gamma-ray observatories. The examples of the spacebased observatories are: Fermi-LAT (Fermi Large Area Telescope), AGILE (Astro-rivelatore Gamma a Immagini Leggero [52]), planned Gamma-400 [53], etc. The examples of ground-based Air Cherenkov Telescopes (ACTs) are: MAGIC (Mayor Atmospheric Gamma-ray Imaging Cherenkov [54]) telescope in La Palma, H.E.S.S. (High Energy Stereoscopic System [55]) in Namibia, next-generation telescope, CTA (Cherenkov Telescope Array [56]), etc. The space-based telescopes can directly observe the gamma rays resulting from WIMP pair production within their detector, while the ACTs use the atmosphere as part of the detectors and detect the Cherenkov light from the air showers which are produced during the interaction of gamma rays with the atmosphere. For our thesis work, we have considered the space-based gamma-ray telescope but the ACTs have their advantages and disadvantages. ACTs can generally observe much higher energy photons than the space-based telescopes and they have a comparatively large collecting area. But, the advantage of space-based telescopes is that they can cover the whole sky and are more sensitive than ACTs, while ACTs need to consider the atmospheric distortions and can not observe the whole sky at once.

#### • Charged particles, positrons, and antiproton:

The possible charged particles originating from the WIMP self-annihilation are positrons  $(e^+)$ , electrons  $(e^-)$ , antiprotons  $(\bar{p})$ , and anti-deuterons  $(\bar{d})$ , etc. (see Fig. 1.6). The flux of each charged particles and their anti-particles are being estimated from the WIMP mass and the annihilation channels. There are a few experiments which have prominently reported the excess of positrons such as PAMELA (Payload for Antimatter Matter Exploration and Light-nuclei Astrophysics), AMS-02 (The Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer), etc.

PAMELA [57, 58] reported an excess in the positron fraction and this can be connected to the hint of DM (see e.g. [59]). But there are other existing theories behind such positron excess, some study shows that such excess can also be explained by a population of pulsars [60]. AMS-02 has also observed an excess in the positron fraction and has re-confirmed the findings from PAMELA [61]. Fermi-LAT, a dedicated gamma-ray telescope, can also detect charged particles. Even the results obtained from the Fermi-LAT collaboration [62] show an excess in the electron-positron spectra between 100 to 1000 GeV energy range and again confirm the positron excess reported by PAMELA [63]. But the problem with Fermi-LAT is that this satellite does not have an on-board magnet and so it is not possible for Fermi-LAT to distinguish the signal of positrons from electrons.

• Neutrino:

Neutrinos  $(\nu)$  and anti-neutrinos  $(\bar{\nu})$  produced in the annihilation of DM particles serve as a good signal for their parent particles. The advantage of searching neutrino is that their weak interactions lead to the long mean free path. For heavy DM particles, one expects to see high energy neutrinos coming from the region where the concentration of DM is generally high. Unlike photons, neutrinos can be detected in a controlled environment of underground laboratories, underwater, or in ice. Presently, the active neutrino detectors include Super-Kamiokande (Super-K), ICECUBE [64], and ANTARES [65]. The IceCube collaboration has looked for muon-neutrino signals from annihilating DM in nearby galaxies, galaxy clusters, Galactic centre, Sun, and Galactic halo [66–69]. To date, there are no signals observed in the neutrino channel yet from Super-K, ICECUBE, and ANTARES.

#### 1.6.3 Collider Searches

It is believed that under ideal environment, the DM particles can be produced in the colliders. The idea behind the collider searches is to generate DM candidates from SM particles i.e., from  $SM+SM \rightarrow DM+DM$ . Search for DM in colliding beam experiments suffers from several disadvantages. Production rate of the SM particles is very large compared to the possible DM particles. Also, the DM candidates may not be directly observed, but the SM particles produced in their decays. Since it may not be possible to detect all the SM particles produced in the decay of the DM particles, measurement of their masses in a colliding beam experiment is difficult at the best.

The LHC provided data of proton-proton collisions at centre-of-mass energies 7, 8 and 13 TeV. ATLAS [42] and CMS [43], the two major experiments at the LHC have done a number of analyses and have not seen any signal of DM [70]. It is hoped that the next run of the LHC will reveal evidence of Physics beyond the SM, including the DM candidates.

# CHAPTER 2

# MULTIWAVELENGTH SEARCHES FOR DARK MATTER



Figure 2.1: DM rich regions.

### 2.1 Dark Matter Rich Targets

In order to search for the DM signal, we first need to look for the DM dominated regions. The observational evidences and the optical studies indicate many potential targets. But all of these regions have their advantages and challenges. We need to explore that in detail.

The Galactic centre (GC) is assumed to be one of the most dense DM regions. But this region consists of a large number of unknown gamma-ray sources and a very complicated diffuse gamma-ray emission resulting from cosmic-ray interacting with interstellar radiation fields and gas. Hence, it is very tough to reduce all background emission by modelling and that would simultaneously increase the uncertainties in analysis. Looking for DM signal from the GC needs extra caution to avoid background from other astrophysical sources like pulsars. The spectral line from DM annihilation/decay should be distinct from the expected background. But the issue is with the low statistics and inadequate instrumental facilities. Few studies have observed a hint of a line signal from the GC (e.g. [51]), but the significance of that emission was very low and unfortunately, such significance has decreased over time [71]. Hence, the true origin of such excess from the GC is still under debate [72,73].

Galactic halo is also believed to be rich in DM. Although we do not have much knowledge of the mass and shape of the Galactic halo, the background

in this region is less complicated. The resulting upper limits on the annihilation cross-section obtained from the Galactic halo is comparable to the results from dwarf spheroidal galaxies (dSphs) but they have much larger uncertainties compared to dSphs [74].

The high latitude isotropic diffuse emission, i.e., the combination of unresolved DM halo and possible Galactic subhalos, can constrain the extragalactic isotropic DM signal. The resulting upper limits on the annihilation cross-section obtained from the extragalactic diffusion emission are comparable to the limits from dSphs for mass above  $\approx 10^3$  GeV [75] and for some cases the isotropic diffuse emission can also provide more stringent limits than dSphs. But, their DM profile have large uncertainties and that makes it difficult to know the true nature of the unresolved sources and DM halos. Hence, it is hard to distinguish between the positive DM signal with the diffuse gamma-ray emission resulting from the unresolved sources [76].

The galaxy clusters are also considered as the DM dominated systems. Most of the galaxy clusters are situated at high Galactic latitude and that significantly reduces the contamination from the galactic diffuse emission. But several studies report that in some clusters, the emission might come from their cosmic-ray scenarios and DM substructure could have a significant contribution to that. Hence, it also leads to large uncertainty in the astrophysical factors [74, 77, 78].

In our local universe, low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies would also, be considered as DM dominated galaxies. LSB galaxies are metal-poor, hardly show any signs of star formation [79] and their stellar disks are generally embedded in a rich extended neutral HI gas disk [80-83]. The discrepancy between the HI mass estimated from the rotation curves and the visible baryonic mass (i.e. derived from gas and stars) indicates that LSB galaxies are very rich in DM content [84]. These galaxies generally do not show any significant emission resulting from their astrophysical activities i.e., from star-forming regions and hence, important for indirect search of DM candidates [85]. Besides, their extended HI rotation curve and gas kinematics are used to investigate the distribution of DM at central halo and that might help to resolve the much debated 'cusp-core' problem in the CDM theory for galaxy formation [86]. But the problem with the LSB galaxies is that they lie at very large distances (e.g. at the order of Mpc) and that would weaken their astrophysical factors (at least 3 orders magnitude lower than dSphs). With such a low value of astrophysical factors, it is hard to provide any strong limit on the DM models. We will discuss this in Chapter 7.

The predictions from the cosmological N-body simulation indicate that the structure of the CDM halos assumed to be formed by the WIMPs are not even. Recent simulation result indicate that halos contain a large number of bound substructures or we can say sub-halos [87–90]. The simulation also hints the existence of a huge number of DM sub-halos around the MW's (MW) [91,92] halo and among all these predicted sub-halos, few hundreds are assumed to be massive enough to become the dwarf spheroidal galaxies (dSphs) or the ultra faint dwarf spheroidal galaxies (UFDs) [91].

#### 1. Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies (dSphs):

The dSphs are considered as the largest galactic substructures around the MW. Their mass-to-light ratio lies between 100–1000  $M_{\circ}/L_{\circ}$ , in which  $M_{\circ}$  and  $L_{\circ}$  are the solar mass and the solar luminosity, respectively. Hence, the dSphs could be the most DM dominated structures of the galactic halo. Their large DM content, minimal Galactic foreground emission, and lack of astrophysical radiation [93,94] make dSphs promising targets for the indirect detection of DM. Since the DM content of each dSphs can be determined from stellar kinematic data, it is possible to predict the relative strength and spatial distribution of the annihilation signal expected from each galaxy. These characteristics provide a mechanism for distinguishing a DM annihilation signal in dSphs from conventional astrophysical backgrounds.

#### 2. Ultra-faint Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies (UFDs):

Since the last few decades, the Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System (Pan-STARRS) [95–97], the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [98,99], the Dark Energy Survey (DES) [100–103] experiment and the Dark Energy Camera at Cerro Tololo [104,105] have detected a set of UFD galaxies. They have very low stellar contents and that hints that they could be very rich in DM [95,98,99,106–108]. The UFDs are generally characterised by very old ( $\geq 12$  Gyr) stellar populations with large velocity dispersions and inferred mass-to-light ratios reaching up to  $\approx 3000 \ M_{\circ}/L_{\circ}$ . The high value of velocity dispersion and massto-light ratios support the existence of significant DM in UFDs [109]. Hence, by analysing such UFDs we can aquire a substantial knowledge of the nature of the ancient galaxies [110, 111] that were accreted to form the MW halo [112,113] and the origin of the chemical abundances of the stellar population of Milky Way (MW) halo [114]. Therefore,

the UFDs are considered as the best tracers of early DM sub-halos in the universe [91, 92, 113, 115].

### 2.2 Dark Matter Density Distributions

The exact nature of the DM distribution is still in debate but several theoretically favoured density profiles can considerably fit the N-body simulations data. Amongst all proposed density profiles, the popular profiles are the Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) density profile [116], the Burkert (BURK) profile [117], the Pseudo Isothermal profile (ISO) [118], the Einasto profile [119], etc.

The NFW profile is defined as

$$\rho_{NFW}(r) = \frac{\rho_s r_s^3}{r(r_s + r)^2}$$
(2.1)

where,

 $\rho_s = \text{characteristic density of NFW profile and}$  $r_s = \text{scale radius of NFW profile.}$ 

The BURK profile is defined as

$$\rho_{BURK}(r) = \frac{\rho_B r_B^3}{(r_B + r)(r_B^2 + r^2)}$$
(2.2)

where,

 $\rho_B = \text{central density of BURK profile and}$   $r_B = \text{core radius of BURK profile.}$ 

The ISO profile is defined as

$$\rho_{ISO}(r) = \frac{\rho_c}{(1 + \frac{r^2}{r_c^2})}$$
(2.3)

where,

 $\rho_c = \text{central density of ISO profile and}$   $r_c = \text{core radius of ISO profile.}$ 

and the Einasto (EINO) profile is defined as

$$\rho_{EINO}(r) = \rho_e \exp\left[\frac{-2((r/r_e)^{\alpha} - 1)}{\alpha}\right]$$
(2.4)

CHAPTER 2. MULTIWAVELENGTH SEARCHES FOR DARK MATTER



Figure 2.2: NFW, Einasto, Isothermal and Burkert galactic DM density profile. The profiles are normalized for the Milky-Way such that  $\rho_{\odot}=0.3$  GeV  $cm^{-3}$  and  $r_{\odot}=8.33$  Kpc. The diagram is taken from Ref. Pierre, 2019.

where,

 $\rho_e$  = characteristic density of EINO profile and

 $r_e =$ scale radius of EINO profile.

For Einasto profile  $\alpha$  defines the shape of the distribution. In Fig. 2.2, we have shown the comparison among NFW, BURK, ISO and EINO. The NFW profile defines the cuspy distribution of DM whereas the BURK and ISO are the cored profile with constant DM core. The rotation curves of LSB and late-type and gas-rich dwarf seem to indicate an approximately constant DM density in the inner parts of galaxies, while the N-body cosmological simulations indicate a steep power-law type behaviour. This controversy is generally known as the "core-cusp problem" and till today it remains as one of the unresolved problems in DM distribution, especially for the small-scale structure [120].



Figure 2.3: Gamma-ray annihilation spectra from WIMPs with masses of 100 GeV (solid lines) and 200 GeV (dashed lines), annihilating through four different annihilation channels (the  $b\bar{b}$  channel in blue,  $\mu^+\mu^-$  channel in red,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  channel in green, and  $W^+W^-$  channel in magenta). Values are obtained from the DMFit package implemented in the Fermi Science Tools.

## 2.3 The Gamma-ray Signal Resulting from WIMP Annihilation

In chapter 1, we have shown how WIMP can annihilate into the SM particles and then produce the secondary charged particles and gamma rays as the end products of the annihilation chain (see, Fig. 1.6). The gamma-ray resulting from the WIMP annihilation is expected to produce a distinct line spectrum and such a line feature would be completely distinguished from any known astrophysical phenomena. Thus, it is referred to as the "smoking gun" signature for the indirect search for DM. The nature of the continuum gamma-ray spectra for four different annihilation channels are shown in Fig. 2.3. They are derived from the DMFit package [121] which is implemented in the Fermi Science Tools. This DMFit code was first derived using the Dark-SUSY [122] package, but later it has been updated by Pythia 8.165 [123] and now this code can consider more annihilation channels and cover a wide range of DM masses <sup>1</sup>.

The  $\gamma$ -ray flux originating from the DM annihilation depends on both the distribution of DM and the particle physics involving pair annihilation. At

 $<sup>1</sup>_{http://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/software/}$ 

a specific energy E, the differential  $\gamma$ -ray flux  $\phi_{\text{WIMP}}(E, \Delta \Omega)$  (in units of photons  $cm^{-2}s^{-1}GeV^{-1}$ ) arising from the WIMP annihilations of mass  $m_{DM}$  in a region within a solid angle  $\Delta \Omega$  can be expressed as [87]:

$$\phi_{\text{WIMP}}(E, \Delta\Omega) = \Phi^{pp}(E) \times J(\Delta\Omega), \qquad (2.5)$$

where,  $\Phi^{pp}(E)$  is the particle physics factor and  $J(\Delta\Omega)$  is the astrophysical factor.

#### 2.3.1 Particle-Physics Factor

The  $\Phi^{pp}$  depends on the characteristics of particles generating through WIMP annihilation. The expression of the particle physics factor can be written as [87]:

$$\Phi^{pp}(E) = \frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle}{8\pi \ m_{\rm DM}^2} \sum_f \frac{dN_f}{dE} B_f.$$
(2.6)

where,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  is the thermally-averaged annihilation cross-section and  $m_{DM}$  is mass of WIMP.  $\frac{dN_f}{dE}$  denotes the differential photon spectrum for each possible pair-annihilation final state and  $B_f$  is the branching ratio corresponding to the final state, 'f'. The selection of SM final candidates, through which annihilation would occur, is theoretically motivated. Several numerical packages like Pythia [123], DarkSUSY [122], DMFit [121], etc. are designed to estimate differential photons yields from each annihilation channel.

### 2.3.2 Astrophysical Factor (J-factor)

The Astrophysical factor (or J-factor) characterizes the astrophysical properties of the DM dominated sources. The J-factor depends on the spatial distribution of the DM and directly proportional to the line-of-sight integral of the squared of DM particle density, i.e.  $\propto \rho^2$ . The expression of the J-factor is [87]:

$$J(\Delta \Omega) = \int \int \rho^2(r(\lambda)) d\lambda \, d\Omega$$
  
=  $2\pi \int_{\theta_{\min}}^{\theta_{\max}} \sin \theta \int_{\lambda_{\min}}^{\lambda_{\max}} \rho^2(r(\lambda)) d\lambda \, d\theta.$  (2.7)

In Eq. 2.7,  $\lambda$  and  $r(\lambda)$  are the line-of-sight (l.o.s) and galactocentric distance, respectively.  $\theta$  is the angle between the l.o.s and the center of the target. The value of  $\theta_{max}$  is the angle over which we would average the integration

of the J-factor. We generally use the resolution of the detector as the  $\theta_{max}$ , for example, if we use the data observed by Fermi-LAT, we would consider  $0.5^{\circ}$  as  $\theta_{max}$  for J-factor calculation. For  $\theta_{min}$ , we generally use  $0^{\circ}$ .

The expression for  $r(\lambda)$  is,

$$r(\lambda) = \sqrt{\lambda^2 + d^2 - 2\lambda \ d \cos\theta} \tag{2.8}$$

where, d is defined as the heliocentric distances of the target.

The maximum and minimum limits of  $\lambda$  can be represented as [124]

$$\lambda_{\max} = d\cos\theta + \sqrt{R_t^2 - d^2 \sin^2\theta} \tag{2.9}$$

(2.10)

and

$$\lambda_{\min} = d\cos\theta - \sqrt{R_{t}^{2} - d^{2}\sin^{2}\theta} \qquad (2.11)$$

respectively. Here,  $R_t$  is the tidal radius for DM rich galaxies. For dSphs, we generally consider  $R_t$  for evaluating the maximum and minimum range of l.o.s distances. The tidal radius of the dSphs halo in the gravitational potential of the MW is estimated from the Jacobi limit [125]. But, for comparatively large system, say for Low surface brightness galaxies, we use virial radius  $(R_{vir})$  in place of  $R_t$ .

### 2.3.3 Expected Gamma-Ray Flux from WIMP Annihilation

Several numerical packages such as DarkSUSY [122], Pythia [123], DM-Fit [121], etc. are generally used for producing the spectra of the events resulting from the WIMP annihilation and can also be used to model the probable interactions between the incoming and the outgoing particles. All of these packages are developed for simulating the possible interactions between the self-annihilating DM particles and then to estimate the probable number of end products (such as gamma rays, neutrino or secondary charged particles) resulting from the DM annihilation. For our work, especially for the  $\gamma$ -ray analysis, we have used DMFit tool that is designed to estimate the possible gamma-ray spectrum resulting from the DM annihilation for

any DM mass in GeV ranges and possible annihilation channels. The DM-Fit tool is developed from several set of MC simulations codes used for the hadronization and decay of the DM annihilation final products. The same set of MC simulations codes are also used by the DarkSUSY package [122] which uses the Pythia 6.154 [123] as the event-generator. Once such codes estimate the differential flux (i.e.  $\frac{dN_f}{dE}$ ) originating from pair-annihilation, we can determine the total  $\gamma$ -ray flux corresponding to the DM signal for any target.

WIMP can self-annihilate to several possible channels, but for our analysis, we mostly preferred five combinations, such as:  $\chi\chi \to \tau^+\tau^-$ ,  $\chi\chi \to \mu^+\mu^-$ ,  $\chi\chi \to W^+W^-$ ,  $\chi\chi \to b\bar{b}$  and  $\chi\chi \to 80\% \ b\bar{b} + 20\% \ \tau^+\tau^-$ . The reasons for choosing these annihilation channels are already discussed in section 1.5.

### 2.3.4 The Astrophysical Backgrounds

For gamma-ray data analysis, the backgrounds play a very significant role. Especially for very faint sources, it is very important to investigate the background region in detail. Otherwise, in due course of analysis, the emission coming from the surroundings can be classified as the gamma-ray counts from the source location while they are just the background coming from the nearby point sources or the Galactic and the Extragalactic foreground.

Data collected by the Fermi-LAT has been used for the gamma-ray analysis part of this thesis, as described in Chapters 3 and 4. The space-based telescopes lie above the earth's atmosphere and that help to reduce the possible background contamination at the time of data recording. That enables the detectors to produce much clear images than the ground-based telescope. During the analysis, we can again screen our data with event classification process and can model out the remaining contribution of backgrounds (i.e. gamma-ray emission from diffuse galactic and extra-galactic components and nearby gamma-ray sources).

When Fermi-LAT detects the background particles originating from cosmic rays (or from cosmic-ray's interactions with the Earth's atmosphere), initially those particles are counted as the events [126]. Fermi-LAT has the segmented anti-coincidence detector which vetoes most of the passing cosmic rays (briefly described in Chapter 3.1) and the remaining cosmic rays are correctly deferred in the event selection process. The residual cosmicray background contamination is included as the gamma-ray backgrounds to the source model. The Fermi-LAT collaboration provides the necessary background models and source catalogs. The background models consist of a Galactic diffuse emission template, an extragalactic isotropic diffuse emission

template and the contribution from all the nearby sources that lie within the radius of interest.

The Galactic diffuse emission template contains both the spatial and spectral part of the cosmic emission. The template is derived by fitting the inverse Compton radiation maps as predicted by GALPROP [127] and gamma-ray emissivities obtained from gas density maps with known point sources and a model for isotropic diffuse emission  $[128]^2$ .

The isotropic template contains the extra-galactic residual cosmic-ray contamination and the emission from the unresolved point sources. This isotropic diffuse model is generated by fitting the extra-galactic residual emission to the high-latitude sky with the emission from the Galactic template and from other known gamma-ray sources. These two Galactic diffuse emission template and extragalactic isotropic diffuse emission template play an important role to eliminate the possible background emission.

There is a high possibility that the events detected by the Fermi-LAT are contaminated by the photons coming from the Earth's albedo effect. The Fermi-LAT team has recommended to use the zenith angle cut as 90 degree to reduce the background photons resulting from the Earth's albedo. Fermi-LAT team has provided the Earth-limb template (below 100 MeV) for all available Fermi Gamma-ray LAT (FGL) source catalogs, i.e for 2FGL [128], 3FGL [129] and 4FGL [130].

With time, Fermi-LAT team have released several version of source catalogs. The first published catalog was 1FGL [131] which was prepared on 11 months of data. 1FGL catalog contains 1451 sources where the sources are modelled with the power-law spectrum. They have implied several improvements for their second source catalog, i.e. for 2FGL, [128] which have 24 months of data. In that catalog, the Fermi-LAT team have used the updated diffuse models. They have also considered extended and non-power-law sources and an improved source association process. The 2FGL catalog contains 1873 sources.

The third released source catalog by Fermi-LAT team is the 3FGL [129]. This catalog is derived by the first four years of Fermi-LAT data and for energy range between 100 MeV to 300 GeV. This catalog contains 3033 sources (Fig. 2.4). This catalog has included many new sources which already have known counterparts in other surveys. The new identified or associated sources are from the blazar class (or from active galaxies), supernova, pulsar and X-ray binaries [129].

The most recent version of the Fermi-LAT catalog for point sources i.e. the 4FGL catalog [130] consists of 5064 sources (Fig. 2.5). This catalog is gener-

 $<sup>^2~{\</sup>rm http://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/access/lat/BackgroundModels.html}$ 



Figure 2.4: Sources from the third Fermi-LAT catalog (3FGL) plotted in Aitoff projection.

ated from the first eight years of Fermi-LAT data and is working between the energy range from 50 MeV to 1 TeV. Amongst all the Fermi-LAT published source catalogs, 4FGL is the deepest one if we consider the energy range. Relative to the 3FGL catalog, the 4FGL one has incorporated the improved analysis method and updated models for the Galactic and isotropic diffuse  $\gamma$ -ray emission. The 4FGL catalog consists of 1336 unassociated sources, whereas 239 are the pulsars and more than 3130 of the identified or associated sources are the active galaxies from the blazar class.

### 2.4 The X-ray and Radio Signal Resulting from WIMP Annihilation

For DM detection it is important to use multi-wavelength studies complementing the  $\gamma$ -ray excess with increasing the time period of  $\gamma$ -ray analysis. In case of dSphs, it has already been pointed out that the observational limits obtained from the radio and X-ray data are competitive with  $\gamma$ -ray [132,133]. In WIMP annihilation chain, the secondary charged particles are generated



Figure 2.5: Sources from the fourth Fermi-LAT catalog (4FGL) plotted in Aitoff projection.



Figure 2.6: The  $e^-e^+$  injection spectra resulting from WIMPs annihilation with 100 GeV DM mass for four different annihilation channels (the  $b\bar{b}$  channel in red,  $\mu^+\mu^-$  channel in green,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  channel in blue, and  $W^+W^-$  channel in black). The spectrum is obtained from DarkSUSY.

via various reactions, such as:  $\pi^{\pm} \to \mu^{\pm} + \nu_{\mu}(\overline{\nu_{\mu}})$ , with  $\mu^{\pm} \to e^{\pm} + \overline{\nu_{\mu}}(\nu_{\mu})$ . When the charged particles are propagating through the interstellar medium, they would lose their energy through a variety of electromagnetic processes such as inverse Compton radiation (IC), synchrotron radiation, Coulomb losses and bremsstrahlung, etc. Charged particles passing through the magnetic field of astrophysical objects produce electromagnetic emission in the radio frequency range [134, 135]. For the IC emission, the starlight photons and the photons resulting from the 2.7K cosmic microwave background (CMB) interact with the relativistic charged particles and produce photons in the X-ray range [134, 135]. Thus, by various radiation mechanism [134–137], especially the synchrotron emission and the IC emission at high energies, the charged particles originating from WIMP annihilation produce the energy spectrum at radio and X-ray frequency range.

In order to examine the radio and X-ray emission, we should consider the diffusion coefficient of the region and the relative energy loss from the charged particles for several possible annihilation channels. In Fig. 2.6, we have shown the  $e^{\pm}$  injection spectra resulting from the WIMPs of 100 GeV mass that annihilates to  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$ ,  $\tau^{+}\tau^{-}$  and  $W^{+}W^{-}$  final states. Formalism for solving the transport equation for the number density  $(n_{e}(r, E))$  of  $e^{\pm}$  of a given energy E at the position  $\mathbf{r}$  with respect to the center of the source has been developed in Refs. [136–138]. The transport equation looks as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{dn_e}{dE} = \nabla \cdot \left(D(E, \mathbf{r})\nabla \frac{dn_e}{dE}\right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial E}\left(b(E, \mathbf{r})\frac{dn_e}{dE}\right) + Q_e(E, \mathbf{r}).$$
(2.12)

Here,  $D(E, \mathbf{r})$  is the space-dependent diffusion coefficient and  $b(E, \mathbf{r})$  denotes the energy loss term. The Source term  $(Q_e)$  can be defined as

$$Q_e(E, \mathbf{r}) = \frac{\rho_{\chi}^2(\mathbf{r}) \langle \sigma v \rangle}{2m_{\chi}^2} \frac{dN_e}{dE}, \qquad (2.13)$$

where,  $\frac{dN_e}{dE}$  is the number of  $e^+/e^-$  produced at a given energy E per DM annihilation. The solution of the Eq. 2.11 i.e.,  $\frac{dn_e}{dE}(r, E)$  would give us the number density of  $e^+/e^-$  per unit energy at a distance r from the center of the source.

The energy loss term is given by

$$b(E, \mathbf{r}) = b_{IC}(E) + b_{Syn}(E, \mathbf{r}) + b_{Coul}(E) + b_{brem}(E)$$
  
=  $b_{IC}^{0}E^{2} + b_{syn}^{0}B^{2}E^{2}$   
+  $b_{Coul}^{0}n(1 + \log(\gamma/n)/75) + b_{brem}^{0}n(\log(\gamma/n) + 0.36).$  (2.14)

where, the magnetic field, B is in unit of  $\mu G$ , n denotes the number density of the thermal electrons in unit of cm<sup>-3</sup>,  $\gamma$  is  $E/m_e$  and the energy loss coefficients for all radiative mechanisms are  $b_{IC}^0 = 0.25 \times 10^{-16}$  GeV s<sup>-1</sup>,  $b_{syn}^0 = 0.0254 \times 10^{-16}$  GeV s<sup>-1</sup>,  $b_{brem}^0 = 1.51 \times 10^{-16}$  GeV s<sup>-1</sup> and  $b_{Coul}^0 = 6.13 \times 10^{-16}$  GeV s<sup>-1</sup>.

As we still don't have much detailed knowledge on the structure of DM distribution, we have assumed the diffusion coefficient  $D(E, \mathbf{r})$  to be independent of position. So, we can safely consider the Kolmogorov form for diffusion coefficient:

$$D(E) = D_0 \left(E\right)^{\gamma_D} \tag{2.15}$$

where  $D_0$  is defined as the diffusion constant.

If we assume a uniform magnetic field and stationary state of the number density of thermal electrons (i.e.  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{dn_e}{dE} = 0$ ), the spherically symmetric solution of the diffusion equation is given by

$$\frac{dn_e}{dE}(r,E) = \frac{1}{b(E)} \int_E^{M_{\chi}} dE' G\Big(r, v(E) - v(E')\Big) Q_e(E,r),$$
(2.16)

where, the Green's function is given by

$$\begin{split} G(r,\Delta v) = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\Delta v}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^n \int_0^{r_h} dr' \frac{r'}{r_n} \Big(\frac{\rho_{\chi}(r')}{\rho_{\chi}(r)}\Big)^2 \\ & \times \Big[ exp\Big(-\frac{(r'-r_n)^2}{4\Delta v}\Big) - exp\Big(-\frac{(r'+r_n)^2}{4\Delta v}\Big) \Big], \end{split}$$

with  $r_n = (-1)^n r + 2nr_h$  and  $v(E) = \int_E^{M_{\chi}} d\tilde{E} \frac{D(\tilde{E})}{b(\tilde{E})}$ . Here,  $r_h$  defines the diffusion zone of the galaxy. Typically, the value of  $r_h$  is taken to be twice the radius of the last stellar component of the galaxy (i.e. twice the distance of the outermost star from center). The solution is obtained with the free escape boundary condition  $\frac{dn_e}{dE}(r_h, E) = 0$ . For evaluating Green's function, we are considering the average magnetic field strength. So, we express the energy loss term only as a function of E, i.e.,  $b(E, \mathbf{r}) \approx b(E)$ .

As we already discussed, in the presence of the comparatively strong magnetic field, the synchrotron radiation would play the most dominant role. The synchrotron power spectrum  $(P_{\text{synch}}(\nu, E, B))$  in the presence of B is defined as [135, 139]:

$$P_{\text{synch}}(\nu, E, B) = \pi \sqrt{3} r_0 m_e c \nu_0 \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^2 \theta F\left(\frac{x}{\sin \theta}\right), \qquad (2.17)$$

where,  $\theta$  is the pitch angle,  $r_0 = e^2/(m_e c^2)$  is the classical electron radius and  $\nu_0 = eB/(2\pi m_e c)$  is the non-relativistic gyro-frequency. While,

$$F(y) = y \int_{y}^{\infty} d\zeta \, K_{5/3}(\zeta) \simeq 1.25 \, y^{1/3} \, e^{-y} \, (648 + y^2)^{1/12} \, . \tag{2.18}$$

The quantity x is given by

$$x = \frac{2\nu m_e^2 \left(1+z\right)}{3\nu_0 E^2} \tag{2.19}$$

with z being the redshift of the source. We can also estimate the local emissivity for the synchrotron radiation i.e., the energy radiated at a given  $\mathbf{r}$ , per unit volume per unit time at a given frequency  $\nu$  in terms of  $P_{\rm synch}$  and  $dn_e/dE$ ,

$$j_{\rm synch}(\nu, r) = \int_{m_e}^{M_{\chi}} dE \left(\frac{dn_{e^+}}{dE} + \frac{dn_{e^-}}{dE}\right) P_{\rm synch}(\nu, E, B) = 2 \int_{m_e}^{M_{\chi}} dE \frac{dn_{e^-}}{dE} P_{\rm synch}(\nu, E, B)$$
(2.20)

Then the expression for integrated synchrotron flux density would be

$$S_{\text{synch}}(\nu) = \frac{1}{4\pi d^2} \int d^3 r \ j_{\text{synch}}(\nu, r),$$
 (2.21)

where, d is the distance to the target galaxy.

For regions with low magnetic fields, the IC radiation process would play the dominant role. Depending on the mass of DM candidates, the emission from the IC mechanism would produce a spectral peak between the soft to hard X-ray bands [140]. The expression for the IC power  $(P_{\rm IC}(E_{\gamma}, E))$  is:

$$P_{\rm IC}(E_{\gamma}, E) = cE_{\gamma} \int d\epsilon \, n(\epsilon) \, \sigma(E_{\gamma}, \epsilon, E), \qquad (2.22)$$

where,  $n(\epsilon)$  is photon number density,  $\sigma(E_{\gamma}, \epsilon, E)$  is the IC scattering crosssection and  $\epsilon$  is the energy of the target CMB photons. E is the energy of the relativistic  $e^{\pm}$  pair and  $E_{\gamma}$  is the energy of the upscattered photons. From Klein-Nishina formula, we can define the  $\sigma(E_{\gamma}, \epsilon, E)$  as:

$$\sigma(E_{\gamma}, \epsilon, E) = \frac{3\sigma_T}{4\epsilon\gamma^2} G(q, \Gamma)$$
(2.23)

where,  $\sigma_T$  is the Thomson cross-section and the expression of  $G(q, \Gamma)$  is:

$$G(q,\Gamma) = \left[2q\ln q + (1+2q)(1-q) + \frac{(2q)^2(1-q)}{2(1+\Gamma q)}\right]$$
(2.24)

where,  $\Gamma = \frac{4\epsilon\gamma}{m_ec^2} = \frac{4\gamma^2\epsilon}{E}$  and  $q = \frac{E_{\gamma}}{\Gamma(E-E_{\gamma})}$ . The range of q lie between  $1/(4\gamma^2) \ge q \ge 1$ .

Similar to the synchrotron emission, we can also find the local emissivity for IC emission by folding the power with the electron number density at equilibrium,

$$j_{IC}(\nu, r) = \int_{m_e}^{M_{\chi}} dE \left( \frac{dn_{e^+}}{dE} + \frac{dn_{e^-}}{dE} \right) P_{IC}(E, E_{\gamma}) = 2 \int_{m_e}^{M_{\chi}} dE \frac{dn_{e^-}}{dE} P_{IC}(E, E_{\gamma}),$$
(2.25)

The integrated IC flux density spectrum is given by

$$S_{IC}(\nu) = \frac{1}{4\pi d^2} \int d^3r \ j_{IC}(E_{\gamma}, r), \qquad (2.26)$$

where, d is the distance to the target galaxy.

Here, we would like to mention that, unlike the gamma-ray emission, the X-ray and the synchrotron flux is not directly related to the astrophysical factor (J-factor). They are primarily dependent on the diffusion mechanism and the energy loss processes of the system. In addition, the magnetic field (B) and the diffusion coefficient (characterised by  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$ ) inside the source would also play a crucial role.

# CHAPTER 3

# Fermi Large Area Telescope (Fermi-LAT) Gamma-Ray Observatory

### 3.1 Instrumental Requirements

The possible mass of the DM candidates varies from tens of GeV to a few hundred TeV depending on the theoretical models [141]. Hence, the gammaray detector should have a number of capabilities. The gamma-ray detector for DM searches should have a good energy resolution and sensitivity over a wide energy range. The instrument should have good angular and energy resolution. With good angular resolution, it would be possible to detect a faint gamma-ray emission originating from WIMP annihilation. With good energy resolution, we can distinguish an annihilation spectrum from astrophysical backgrounds. Moreover, the instrument should have a large field-of-view (FOV) because that would help it to observe a vast region of sky at once. Lastly, the instrument should have a good timing resolution and a high observing cadence, so that it can identify variable sources such as pulsars (high frequency) or active galactic nuclei (low frequency).

In section 1.6.2, we have briefly discussed the detection methods of various space-based telescopes which are especially dedicated to search the indirect signature of WIMP annihilation/decay. The telescopes are designed to meet most of the necessary features that we have discussed. In my thesis, for investigating the DM signature in gamma rays, we have used the data observed by the Fermi Large Area Telescope (LAT). In the following sections, we will discuss its working principle in detail.

### 3.2 The Large Area Telescope

Fermi-LAT is expected to perform as a brilliant gamma-ray space detector over the entire celestial sphere, with comparatively better sensitivity than other earlier gamma-ray missions. Fermi-LAT team has made significant improvements in angular resolution, effective area, FOV, energy resolution and time resolution of the detector. Such advanced features in Fermi-LAT can address several unresolved issues in high-energy gamma-ray astrophysics. The LAT scans the whole sky for every  $\approx 192$  minute from the low-Earth orbit of 565 km altitude at a 25.6-degree inclination with an eccentricity <0.01 [142]. It is launched on June 11, 2008, by the Delta II Heavy launch vehicle from Cape Canaveral.

The principal objective of the Fermi-LAT is to conduct a long term high sensitivity observation of the celestial sources for a wide range of energy band i.e. from  $\approx 20$  MeV to > 500 GeV. It has a large effective area combined with good energy, angular and time resolution. Its low deadtime is sufficient enough to study transient phenomena. Some key properties of Fermi-LAT

# CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY



Figure 3.1: A schematic diagram of the Large Area Telescope (LAT).

### CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY

Parameter	Value or Range
Energy Range	$\approx 20 \text{ MeV to} > 500 \text{ GeV}$
Energy Resolution	< 15 % at energies $> 100  MeV$
Effective Area	$> 8,000 \ cm^2$ maximum effective area at normal incidence
Single Photon Angu-	$<~0.15^{\circ},$ on-axis, 68% space angle containment radius for E $>$
lar Resolution	$10 \text{ GeV}; < 3.5^{\circ}, \text{ on-axis}, 68\%$ space angle containment radius
	${ m for}~{ m E}=100~{ m MeV}$
Field of View	2.4 sr
Source Location De-	< 0.5 arcmin for high-latitude source
termination	
Point Source Sensitiv-	$< 6 \times 10^{-9} \ ph \ cm^{-2} \ s^{-1}$ for E > 100 MeV, 5 $\sigma$ detection after
ity	1 year sky survey
Time Accuracy	< 10 microseconds, relative to spacecraft time
Background Rejection	< 10% residual contamination of a high latitude diffuse sam-
(after analysis)	ple for $E = 100$ MeV - 500 GeV.
Dead Time	< < 100 microseconds per event

Table 3.1: Properties of Fermi-LAT.

are described in Table 3.1  $^1$ .

These features have allowed the LAT to explore the new physics associated with  $\gamma$ -ray emission.

### 3.2.1 Observational Constraint

The LAT has very large FOVs and it can change its direction of observation with very ease. But its detectors have their observational constraints that need to be handled carefully. Fermi-LAT should avoid pointing at or near the Earth because that can increase the chances of detecting a large number of astrophysical photons. But, at low energy Fermi-LAT may sometimes observe the Earth's limb at the time of detecting the albedo gamma rays for instrument calibration. Applying a special Zenith angle cut can eliminate the photons resulting from the Earth's limb. There is another strict precaution for Fermi-LAT observation. Fermi-LAT should not record any events when it would transit the South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA). This region has a high

Introduc-

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{1}{\rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Cicerone/Cicerone_tion/LAT_overview.html}$ 

concentration of charged particles which are trapped by the Earth's magnetic field.

### 3.2.2 Detection Methodology

The Fermi-LAT is a pair conversion detector. During the observation, the incident gamma rays penetrate the detector and then interact with a high Z converter material. For Fermi-LAT, the tungsten foil is used to convert the gamma rays into electron-positron pair. They then pass through the silicon strip detectors that track the position of electron-positron pair. As the energy of gamma-ray is much larger than the rest mass of the electron and positron, the daughter products (i.e the charged pair) also predominantly follow the direction of the incoming gamma-ray. In this process, the new reconstructed direction of the gamma rays is restricted by multiple scatterings of the electron-positron pair in the tracker and also by the spatial resolution of the tracker material. At the bottom of the LAT, the charged particles are deposited into a calorimeter made of CsI. The calorimeter is thick enough to measure the energy of the pairs in the LAT energy band.

The charged particles deposit their energy in different parts of the tracker and the calorimeter and then the instrument produces the pulse-height signal as the output. In order to reconstruct the trajectory of the charged particles and their amount of energy losses, one needs to combine the pulse heights with the x-y coordinates from each silicon strip detector where the charged particles hit. Both on-board and ground analysis reconstruct the tracks of the charged particles from their output pulsed data. The Data Acquisition System (DAQ) characterizes the interaction that produced the charged particles and also tries to distinguish the photons from the background events. Meanwhile, this process also determines the direction of the incident photon and its estimated energy.

### 3.2.3 The LAT Instrument

The Fermi-LAT consists of three primary instruments: i) a segmented anticoincidence detector (ACD), ii) 16 precision tracker/converter, and iii) 16 imaging calorimeter (Figure 3.2). The tracker and the calorimeter form the central structure of Fermi-LAT, while the ACD surrounds the tracker and the calorimeter. The ACD is again covered by a micrometeorite shield and thermal blanket. Trackers and calorimeters act all together to calculate the direction of incident particles and their respective energy. The main principle of the ACD is to identify the incoming charged particles and to distinguish them from gamma-rays. The LAT consists of  $4 \times 4$  arrays of 16 tracker/calorimeter

#### CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY



Figure 3.2: A schematic diagram of the LAT instrument. The dimensions of the LAT are  $1.8m \times 1.8m \times 0.72m$ . A cutaway image of the LAT module shows its tracker and calorimeter components, while the anticoincidence detector covers the tracker and the upper third of the calorimeter. The image is adapted from Atwood *et al.*, 2009.

modules. The instrument has nearly  $10^6$  electronic channels operated on a power budget of  $\approx 650$  W [142]. The working principle pf LAT instrument is depicted in Figure 3.3.

#### 3.2.3.1 Anti-coincidence Detector (ACD)

The cosmic charged particles passing through the LAT can generally outnumber the gamma rays by factors of  $10^2$ - $10^5$ . Those charged particles can be recorded by LAT and as a result, the background counts would be increased. In order to eliminate such background events resulting from charged particles, the LAT instrument is surrounded by an ACD. The ACD consists of 89 plastic scintillator tiles which are used to identify background events and to issue a veto signal. ACD detects the veto signal through wave-length shifting fibers by two photomultiplier tubes (PMT). In order to detect the charged particles, for maximum ACD efficiency, the tiles are overlapped in one direction and gaps in the other direction are filled by scintillating fiber ribbons.

ACD covers the entire internal system of the LAT instrument, thus one of the responsibilities of the ACD is to identify the charged particles with an
#### CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY

efficiency of 0.9997 [143], while ACD also simultaneously needs to avoid the "self-vetoes" resulting from the backsplash effect. To examine the actual energy of the source, it is very advisable to consider the effect of backsplash seriously. It is sometimes possible that the secondary charged particles generating by an incident high energy photon in the calorimeter (potentially a valid event) can again travel back up through the tracker and cross the ACD. These particles can Compton scatter and thereby create signals from the recoiled electrons. This effect is called the backsplash effect and for this effect, the valid gamma rays would be vetoed by ACD. Hence, for reducing the effect of backsplash, the LAT team has designed the segmented structure of ACD. With the segmented structure, ACD would now only veto those events which would trigger an ACD tile in the projected path of the incident photon. The segmentation helps to achieve a uniform threshold and also significantly increases the sensitivity of Fermi-LAT, especially for high-energy gamma rays.

There are two types of the output signals generated by the ACD photomultiplier: (1) the fast veto pulses that are accessed by on-board LAT trigger electronics and (2) the slower pulse-shaped signals that are used for charged particle rejection method on the ground. For protecting the ACD from the space environment, it is covered by a micrometeorite shield and a thermal blanket.

#### 3.2.3.2 The Tracker (TKR)

The principal role of the LAT tracker/converter (TKR) is to convert the incident  $\gamma$  rays into electron-positron pairs and then accurately track the resulting particles [144]. The TKR consists of 18 XY detector planes. Each tracker consists of two orthogonal x-y layers that have an array of silicon strip detectors (SSDs) for tracking the charged particles. TKR maintains a perfect balance between the thin converter for preserving the angular resolution at low energy and the thick converter for maximizing  $\gamma$ -ray conversion efficiency at high energy. For this purpose, the TKR is segmented into 'FRONT' and 'BACK' section. The FRONT section consists of 12 planes covering the thin tungsten foil converter of 0.035 radiation lengths, while the BACK section consists of 4 planes covering the thick tungsten foil converter of 0.18 radiation lengths. For preserving the triggering efficiency for  $\gamma$  rays that converts in the final thick converter, the last 2 final planes that place immediately in front of the calorimeter does not have any converter. In order to localize the track of charged particles, each plane of SSDs has two planes of silicon strips, one is along the x-direction and the other along the y-direction. In one of the TKR's converting tungsten plates, the incoming gamma rays are converting

#### CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY

into a pair of electron and positron.

After the conversion point, SSD planes record the directions of the incoming electron and positron pair. But the multiple scattering of the charged particles in the conversion plane would affect the angular resolution of the system, especially for low energy range. Apart from the electron-positron pair, the cosmic rays also interact inside the TKR modules. Thus TKR needs to accurately identify the nature of each passing particle and their reconstructed energy. The advantage of using the thick converters is that it can also partially shield the FRONT portion of the TKR from the effect of low-energy calorimeter backsplash. The on-axis depth for the TKR module is around 1.5 radiation lengths and that increases the probability of the  $\gamma$ -ray conversion by  $\approx 63\%$  [144].

#### 3.2.3.3 The Calorimeter (CAL)

The basic function of the Fermi-LAT calorimeter (CAL) is to estimate the energy deposited by the electron-positron pair [142]. Each CAL module contains 96 CsI crystals which are arranged in eight alternating orthogonal layers where the total number of crystals is 1536. The output of the crystals is recorded on each end by both large and small photodiodes. This structure and the segmentation of CAL provide a large dynamic energy range for each crystal (2 MeV to 70 GeV) and a precise derivation of the three-dimensional position of particle shower. The on-axis depth of the CAL is about 8.6 radiation lengths and for the significant amount of gamma rays with energy  $\geq 100$  GeV, most of the shower fall outside the active region of CAL. But it is very interesting to note that the imaging efficiency of the CsI crystals provides a precise estimation of the shape of the electromagnetic shower and their energy [145].

#### 3.2.4 The LAT's Data Acquisition System (DAQ)

The Data Acquisition System (DAQ) has a very crucial role in interpreting the signal detected by LAT. In order to control the counts of background events from transmitting into the ground, DAQ conducts the onboard filtering on the observed data. This system converts the detected events into a data stream with a speed of around 1.2 Mbps. Apart from that, the DAQ also executes the controlling of the system and instrument monitoring such as housekeeping and power switching. Sometimes, for improving the performance of the processing, the working onboard system is modified by uploading new software.

#### CHAPTER 3. FERMI LARGE AREA TELESCOPE (FERMI-LAT) GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATORY



Figure 3.3: Event display of a simulated 27 GeV  $\gamma$ -ray interacting with the LAT instrument. Clusters of hit TKR strips are represented by black crosses, while the location and magnitude of energy depositions in the CAL crystals are represented by variable-size blue squares. Hit ACD tiles are represented by coloured boxes, with a colour corresponding to the amount of energy deposited. The dotted line represents the true  $\gamma$ -ray direction, the dashed lines represent reconstructed TKR tracks, and the solid line represents the CAL axis. Figure from Ackermann et al., 2012.

Amongst all the penetrated particles through the LAT trackers, the astrophysical photons only share a very tiny portion. The LAT on-board analysis system decreases the raw LAT trigger rate (i.e. from 10 kHz to  $\approx 400$  Hz) and then sends the signal to the ground for further analysis. From those  $\approx 400$ Hz counts, only a very small portion (i.e. between  $\approx 2-5$  Hz) are astrophysical photons. When the reprocessed data for an event is passing through the on-board analysis, all the conservative cuts, the time stamp and information of the signals obtained from various LAT components are saved in a packet. As the number of the signal obtained from an event varies, each data packets have different length. The data packets are the primary version of the data product. LAT further transfers these data packets to the Solid State Recorder (SSR) of spacecraft <sup>2</sup>.

#### 3.2.5 LAT Instrument Performance

The instrument response functions (IRF) of any detector is the mapping between the incoming photon flux and the detected events where the detected events depend on the LAT hardware and the analysis process. The analysis process determines whether the event parameters are from the observables

 $<sup>^{2} \</sup>rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/p7rep/analysis/documentation/Cicerone/Cicerone_Introduction/LAT_overview.html and the state of the sta$ 

and then assigns the probability of the event being a photon. In Fermi-LAT, the IRF is represented by a set of parameters such as instrument coordinates, observed event energy (E'), and incident direction  $(\hat{v}')$  as a function of true event energy (E), and incident direction  $(\hat{v})$ .

The LAT response function is derived by a dedicated GEANT4-based Monte Carlo simulation of  $\gamma$  rays interacting with the LAT detector and Fermi spacecraft [142]. In order to cover all possible photon inclination angles and energies of photons with good statistics, a large number of gamma-ray events are being simulated. The Fermi-LAT team designed a separate set of IRFs for each event class and event type selection and we need to select the correct IRF at the time of performing analysis.

In LAT, the performance of the IRF is factorized into three terms: 1) efficiency in terms of the detector's effective area (A(E,  $\hat{v}$ )), 2) resolution as given by the point-spread function (PSF, P( $\hat{v}'|E, \hat{v}$ )), and 3) energy dispersion (D( $E'|E, \hat{v}$ )).

- A(E,  $\hat{v}$ ) is the product of the geometric collection area,  $\gamma$ -ray conversion probability, and the efficiency of a given event selection.
- $P(\hat{v}'|E,\hat{v})$  is the probability density to reconstruct an event direction  $\hat{v}'$ , for a given true energy (E) and direction  $\hat{v}$ .
- $D(E'|E, \hat{v})$  is the probability density to reconstruct an event energy E', for a given true energy (E) and direction  $\hat{v}$ .

The Fermi Sciencetools has provided us with multiple IRFs and has allowed the user to choose them according to the preferences of the analysis types. The most recent version of IRFs released by the LAT team is the "PASS 8"<sup>3</sup>. In comparison to the earlier version, the "Pass 8" improves the LAT analysis by using a completely new set of event-level reconstruction algorithms and that would effectively decrease the pile-up effects. The performance of the "Pass 8" is shown in Figure 3.4.

 $<sup>{}^{3}\</sup>rm https://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat\_Performance.htm$ 



Figure 3.4: The performance of the Pass 8 at normal incidence as a function of incident photon energy is shown here. (a) the effective area and (b) the points spread function. The figure is adapted from Bruel et al., 2018.

# CHAPTER 4

# LIKELIHOOD ANALYSIS OF LAT DATA

#### 4.1 Overview of Likelihood

For analyzing the Fermi-LAT data, it is very important to construct the likelihood function. This function would be needed to obtain the best fit model parameters during analysis. These best-fitted parameters would describe the source's spectrum, its position and its real significance.

The likelihood function  $(\mathcal{L})$  is the probability of obtaining the data for the assigned input model if the LAT data is true. The input model would include the description of the nature of gamma-ray sources (i.e. whether they are point, extended or transient), and also derive the intensity of the source and its possible spectra. For this purpose, we would first assume that we have a handsome knowledge on the mapping of the input model of the gamma-ray sky to the data.

### 4.2 The LAT Likelihood Function

During analysis, it is advisable to distribute the LAT data into a large number of bins. The binning is important because the LAT counts are dependent on many variables, thus despite having a large number of counts, each bin will have a small number of counts. The observed number of counts in each bin will follow the Poisson distribution.

The expression of the Likelihood function is:

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathcal{D}) \equiv \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}|\alpha) \tag{4.1}$$

Here,  $\mathcal{L}$  is the probability of obtaining the data ( $\mathcal{D}$ ) for a given input model with parameters ( $\alpha$ ).

For binned LAT likelihood analysis, the function,  $\mathcal{L}$ , is defined as the a product of Poisson likelihoods i.e. the product of the probabilities of observing the detected counts in each bin.

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathcal{D}) = \prod_{k} \frac{\lambda_k^{n_k} e^{-\lambda_k}}{n_k!}$$
(4.2)

 $\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathcal{D})$  can also be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathcal{D}) = \prod_{k} e^{-\lambda_{k}} \prod_{k} \frac{\lambda_{k}^{n_{k}}}{n_{k}!}$$
(4.3)

$$= e^{-N_{pred}} \prod_{k} \frac{\lambda_k^{n_k}}{n_k!}, \qquad (4.4)$$

where,  $N_{pred}$  denotes the total number predicted counts from the source model.

Instead of  $\mathcal{L}$ , the logarithm of  $\mathcal{L}$  is comparatively easier to handle as this factor is maximized during the fitting. The log-likelihood can be expressed in the following form:

$$\log \mathcal{L} = \sum_{k} n_k \log \lambda_k - N_{pred} \tag{4.5}$$

Here, the observed counts in bin, k are  $n_k = n_k(\mathcal{D})$  and the counts predicted by the model is  $\lambda_k = \lambda_k(\alpha)$ . If the bin size is infinitely small, then we can assume  $n_k = 0$  or 1 (i.e. for unbinned likelihood). In that case, the functional form of  $\mathcal{L}$  would be:

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathcal{D}) = \prod_{k} \lambda_k^{n_k} e^{-\lambda_k} \tag{4.6}$$

where k is now representing individual photons.

From Eqs. (4.1 - 4.6), we have observed that the likelihood function explicitly depends on the predicted counts by the model but it also depends on the differential  $\gamma$ -ray flux of a source. In Eq. 4.7, we express the distribution of  $\gamma$ -ray source as  $S(E, \hat{p}|\alpha)$  where  $\hat{p}$  denotes the direction of a  $\gamma$ -ray in celestial coordinates. With the help of the spacecraft orientation, direction in celestial coordinates can be converted to instrument coordinates, i.e. to  $\hat{v}(t|\hat{p})$ . The source model can be expressed as:

$$S(E,\hat{p}|\alpha) = \sum_{k} s_k(E)\delta(\hat{p} - \hat{p}_k) + S_G(E,\hat{p}|\alpha) + S_{eg}(E,\hat{p}|\alpha) + \sum_{l} S_l(E,\hat{p}|\alpha)$$

$$(4.7)$$

Here,  $s_k(E)$ ,  $S_G(E, \hat{p}|\alpha)$ ,  $S_{eg}(E, \hat{p}|\alpha)$  and  $S_l(E, \hat{p}|\alpha)$  define the source model for point source, galactic emission, extragalactic isotropic emission and other sources, respectively. In case of faint  $\gamma$ -ray sources, it is very important to consider the correct model of the diffuse  $\gamma$ -ray background. In Fermi-LAT, the diffuse background is divided into Galactic and Extragalactic components:

- Galactic Component: A spatially-structured Galactic component corresponding to the  $\gamma$ -ray emission from the interaction of cosmic rays with interstellar gas, dust, and photon fields.
- Isotropic Extragalactic Component: An isotropic component corresponding to the combination of extragalactic  $\gamma$ -ray emission and instrumental charged particle background.

At the time of searching for a new  $\gamma$ -ray source, it is advisable to free the normalization parameters of the two diffuse components while we can fix the spectral shapes. Now, if we want to calculate the predicted counts by a model for a given bin, k, we can then estimate the differential flux of each  $\gamma$ -ray source for their IRFs as.

$$\lambda_k(\alpha) = \sum \int \int \int S(E, \hat{p} | \alpha) A(E, \hat{v}) P(\hat{v}' | E, \hat{v}) D(E' | E, \hat{v}) d\Omega dE dt \quad (4.8)$$

In Eq. 4.8, we have summed over all  $\gamma$ -ray sources and then integrated over the total observing time, the energy range, and the solid angle with respect to the LAT frame.

Several simplifying assumptions can be considered for lowering the total computational cost of likelihood calculation. The region of interest (ROI) defines centred region around the location of our source of interest and during the likelihood process the  $\gamma$ -ray emission model is generated for only those sources which are situated within a few PSF-widths of this region. The duration of observation and exposure are precomputed and that helps to discard the IRF's dependence on the azimuthal angle. When the bin size of the analysis is comparatively larger (i.e. for binned analysis) than the scale of the energy dispersion, we can ignore the effects of energy dispersion.

### 4.3 The Profile Likelihood

For estimating the best-fit parameters for a given model, we need to maximize the likelihood with respect to the parameters of interest, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\alpha} = \arg_{\alpha} \max \mathcal{L}(\alpha | \mathcal{D}) \tag{4.9}$$

where  $\hat{\alpha}$  represents the estimator of maximum likelihood (MLE) for the parameters,  $\alpha$ . Practically, performing a non-linear maximum likelihood for a large set of parameters is not computationally possible. Hence, a conventional solution is to partition the set of parameters i.e.,  $\alpha$ , into a set of parameters of interest i.e.,  $\mu$ , and a set of nuisance parameters i.e.,  $\theta$ , such that  $\alpha = \{\mu, \theta\}$ . For instance, when we are trying to determine the possible spectra for gamma-ray source, the spectral index or flux of a specific  $\gamma$ -ray source can be the parameters of interest while the background  $\gamma$ -ray sources or constraints on source characteristics derived from independent analysis could be the the nuisance parameters. The expression of the Profile likelihood is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{p}(\mu|\mathcal{D}) = sup_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\mu,\theta|\mathcal{D})$$
(4.10)

The advantage of the profile likelihood is that by maximizing the likelihood function concerning the nuisance parameters, it decreases the dimensionality of likelihood. The profile likelihood function does not disclose the full distribution of the nuisance parameters of the system but it still maintains the statistical properties of the likelihood function [146].

#### 4.4 The Joint Likelihood

The sources which belong to the same class generally share a common set of physical characteristics i.e., they have the same range of luminosity or can be described by the same spectral models, etc. For such cases, the sensitivity to the characteristic of the sources can be increased by combining them. This formulation would follow the likelihood-based analysis and would lead to the concept of joint likelihood. The joint likelihood is the function of the product of the individual likelihoods where the function combines the parameters of all individual sources. For each source, i, the expression of the joint likelihood is:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mu, \{\alpha_i\} | \mathcal{D}) = \prod_{i=1} \mathcal{L}_i(\mu, \alpha_i | \mathcal{D})$$
(4.11)

Here, the parameters are divided into a set of parameters shared by all sources i.e.,  $\mu$ , and a set of parameters depending on each individual source i.e.,  $\alpha_i$ . For example, when we are considering a set of dSphs for DM study, the intrinsic luminosity or spectral model can be treated as the set of shared parameters, while the distance to each source, point-like background sources within each ROI, or the normalization of a diffuse background near each source will be considered as the independent parameters. The joint likelihood would then act as the likelihood of a single source, including the construction of a profile joint likelihood. In order to obtain the combined limits for DM annihilation signal, the individual likelihood function is weighted with their respective J-factor.

### 4.5 Hypothesis Testing

The likelihood formalism allows a robust statistical framework for hypothesis testing. In hypothesis testing we check how much the parameters of interest  $(\mu)$  deviate from their nominal expected value  $(\mu_0)$ . From the ratio of the

maximum likelihood test assuming for two hypothesis [147], we can derive the "test statistic" (TS). The expression of the TS is:

$$TS = 2 \ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mu}|\mathcal{D})}{\mathcal{L}(\mu_0|\mathcal{D})}\right) = 2 \left(\ln\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mu}|\mathcal{D}) - \ln\mathcal{L}(\mu_0|\mathcal{D})\right)$$
(4.12)

where,  $\mathcal{L}(\mu_0|\mathcal{D})$  is the maximum likelihood value for a model without an additional source (i.e., the 'null hypothesis') and  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mu}|\mathcal{D})$  is the maximum likelihood value for a model with the source at a specified location.

Wilks theorem [148] and Chernoff [149] theorem state that the asymptotic distribution of TS values under the null hypothesis (i.e.,  $\mu = \mu_0$ ) should follow a  $\chi_n^2$ -distribution, where n represents the dimensionality of  $\mu$ . Hence, it signifies that the TS value can be drawn from this  $\chi_n^2$ -distribution if the null hypothesis holds. The large TS indicates that the source is present in the location i.e., the null hypothesis is incorrect.

The most general application of the likelihood ratio test is to check the significance of a  $\gamma$ -ray source. The detection significance ( $\sigma$ ) of any source is approximately equal to the square root of the TS value, i.e.,  $\sigma \approx \sqrt{TS}$ . In order to check the significance of the source, the parameter of interest is the flux of the gamma-ray source whereas the null hypothesis assumes that the gamma-ray flux from the source location is zero. From Eq. 4.12, the TS value can be defined by maximizing the likelihood function for both the putative source flux that is free to vary and the putative source flux that is fixed to zero. As a thumb rule, the threshold for detection of the real signal is set at TS  $\geq 25$  i.e., corresponds to  $5\sigma$ . However, for some cases, the spectral index of the source is left free during the model fitting, and that can decrease the detection significance of the source from  $5\sigma$  to  $\approx 4.2\sigma$  [131].

Apart from finding the best-fitted parameter values for a source-model, the likelihood algorithm can also estimate the uncertainty of those parameters of interest [150]. From the shape of the likelihood function, we can determine the uncertainty in the best-fit parameters of interest. For high significant sources where the null hypothesis is not valid, we choose the two-sided confidence interval for the estimation of maximum likelihood, while for the faint sources when we could not strongly eliminate the null hypothesis, we set the one-sided confidence interval on the maximum likelihood estimate. But unfortunately, the calculation is not straight forward for the system with low-counts where we could not directly use the asymptotic formula to estimate the significance of the sources. Many literatures have already provided the solutions for this issue [151–154] and for our analysis, we have particularly used the delta-log-likelihood method provided by the Rolke et al. [154].

### 4.6 Derivation of Flux Upper limits

From section 4.5, we find that for deriving the significance of any source, we need to check the likelihood ratio test. In Wilks's theorem, the null hypothesis means no source exists, while the alternative hypothesis assumes that the source exists. For the analysis of the faint sources (or we can consider the case for DM searches), we observe a little to no gamma-ray emission from the direction of the target. Hence, for that scenario, null hypothesis is a good approximation and it is advisable to estimate upper bound on the gamma-ray flux.

In order to estimate the flux upper limit, we generally prefer to use the profile likelihood method [154,155]. If we assume that the delta-log-likelihood behaves asymptotically i.e., as  $\chi^2$ , then the 90% confidence region would be relative to the change in log-likelihood by 2.71/2. Here, we need to mention that such changes in log-likelihood function corresponds to the two-sided confidence interval. If we would like to derive the upper-limit corresponds to a one-sided 95% C.L., during likelihood, all the normalization parameters along with the two diffuse components would be fitted with the entire dataset until the logarithmic difference between two likelihood functions reach at 1.35 [87].

#### 4.7 P-value

In statistics, the p-value or the calculated probability is the probability of obtaining results at least as extreme, when the null hypothesis  $(H_0)$  is assumed to be true [156]. However, in statistics, the term 'extreme' depends on how we are dealing with the hypothesis test. The null hypothesis  $(H_0)$  is usually an hypothesis of "no difference" whereas the alternative hypothesis  $(H_1)$  is the opposite of the null hypothesis. A smaller p-value means that there is stronger evidence in favor of the alternative hypothesis.

P-values are usually found using p-value tables or spreadsheets/statistical software. These calculations are based on the assumed or known probability distribution of the specific statistic being tested. P-values are calculated from the deviation between the observed value and a chosen reference value, given the probability distribution of the statistic, with a greater difference between the two values corresponding to a lower p-value.

In the contest of null-hypothesis testing, if we consider that the observed test-statistic (t) is drawn from the probability distribution (T), then the p-

value would be of observing a test-statistic value at least as "extreme" as t when the null hypothesis  $(H_0)$  is true. In a formal significance test, the null hypothesis  $(H_0)$  is rejected if the p-value is less than a threshold alpha level  $(\alpha)$  or significance level. The term significance level  $(\alpha)$  is used to refer to a pre-chosen probability whereas we use the p-value to indicate a probability after a given study. The value of  $\alpha$  is instead set by the researcher before examining the data. By convention,  $\alpha$  is commonly set to 0.05, though lower alpha levels are sometimes used.

# CHAPTER 5

# CONSTRAINTS ON DARK MATTER MODELS FROM THE FERMI-LAT OBSERVATION OF TRIANGULUM-II

### 5.1 Triangulum-II

Since last two decades, the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) [98] discovered a new member of Milky Way satellites. They are ultra-faint and have a very high mass to light ratio. Thus we can assume that they might be very rich in DM contents [157–162]. Over the past few years, the Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System (Pan-STARRS) [95] and the Dark Energy Survey (DES) [100] have observed a new population of dSphs [97,101,103,163] around our Milky Way. Triangulum-II (hereafter, we would refer to as Tri-II) is one of the newly discovered dSphs [164], which has been detected by the Pan-STARRS Survey [97]. This survey has concluded that Tri-II is either an ultra-faint and DM dominated dwarf galaxy or a globular cluster. There are several pieces of studies [164–166] which have claimed that Tri-II may come as a very potential target for indirect DM detection. In this chapter, we would describe our findings for Tri-II [164].

For our study, we have considered Tri-II as a metal-poor galaxy with large mass to light ratio [164]. But so far very few numbers of member stars of Tri-II have been detected and its exact number is still uncertain [167, 168]. Ref. [167, 169] had observed nearly 6 member stars in Tri-II, while their most recent study [168] have discovered the existence of 13 stars along with very velocity dispersion  $\approx \sigma_{\rm v} < 4.2$  km s<sup>-1</sup> and < 3.4 km s<sup>-1</sup> for 95% and 90% C.L., respectively. In Table 5.1, we have described some important properties of Tri-II.

In Table 5.1,  $M_{\odot}$  and  $L_{\odot}$  denote the mass and the luminosity of the Sun, respectively. The values of  $M_{1/2}$ ,  $(M/L_v)_{1/2}$  and  $\rho_{1/2}$  have been taken from [167, 168]. For our study, we have assumed Tri-II as spherically symmetric (because of its low ellipticity) and in a state of dynamical equilibrium [164]. From the observational study, ref. [168] had obtained that Tri-II has large velocity dispersion concerning the galactic standard of rest (GSR). All the observational studies (from [167, 168]) suggested that Tri-II might be affected by the total tidal effect from the Milky Way [167]. Several studies have also suspected the association of Tri-II with the Triangulum-Andromeda halo sub-structures [97, 170] and with the PAndAS stream [171], that might cause the effect of tidal disruption of Tri-II. Indeed, the above-mentioned observations did not provide any concrete proof that Tri-II is in dynamical equilibrium [164]. But, any tidally disrupting galaxy would show a high ellipticity, whereas Tri-II has low ellipticity [164]. Moreover, the tidal radius of Tri-II is

Property	Value	Reference
Galactic longitude	141.4°	[97]
Galactic latitude	-23.4°	[97]
Galactocentric dis-	$36^{+2}_{-2} \text{ kpc}$	[165, 167]
tance		
2D half light radius	$34^{+9}_{-8} \text{ pc}$	[167, 168]
$(r_h)$		
Velocity relative to	$-261.7 \text{ km s}^{-1}$	[168]
galactic standard of		
rest (GSR) $(v_{GSR})$		
Mean heliocentric ve-	$-381.7 \pm 2.9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$	[168]
$locity < v_{helio} >$		
Stellar Velocity Dis-	$  < 3.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} (90\% \text{ C.L.})$	[168]
persion $(\sigma_{\rm v})$		
	$< 4.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} (95\% \text{ C.L.})$	[168]
Mass within 3D half-	$  < 3.7 \times 10^5 (90\% \text{ C.L.})$	[168]
light radius $\left(\frac{M_{1/2}}{M_{\odot}}\right)$		
	$< 5.6 \times 10^5 (95\% \text{ C.L.})$	[168]
Mass-to-light ratio	$< 1640 \ M_{\odot} \ L_{\odot}^{-1} \ (90\% \ C.L.)$	[168]
within 3D half-light		
radius $\left( (M/L_v)_{1/2} \right)$		
	$< 2510 \ M_{\odot} \ L_{\odot}^{-1} \ (95\% \ C.L.)$	[168]
Density within 3D	$< 2.2 \ M_{\odot} \ pc^{-3} $ (90% C.L.)	[168]
half-light radius $\rho_{1/2}$		
	$  < 3.3 M_{\odot} \text{ pc}^{-3} (95\% \text{ C.L.})$	[168]
Metallicity ([Fe/H])	$-2.24 \pm 0.05$	[168]

Table 5.1: Properties of Triangulum-II.

nearly three times of the 3D half-light radius of Tri-II and from that observational data, we can also predict that the shape of Tri-II is insulated from Galactic tides. Thus, high mass to light ratio and large velocity dispersion value indicate a high concentration of DM [164].

### 5.2 The *Fermi*-LAT Data Analysis of Tri-II

For examining the possible signal from the Tri-II, we have analysed the gamma-ray observed by the Fermi-LAT [164]. For our analysis, we have

used the Fermi ScienceTools version v10r0p5 (released on June 24, 2015)<sup>1</sup>. Here, we have used the fully reprocessed Pass8 dataset<sup>2</sup>. Such Pass8 processed data provides an improved event reconstruction, a wider energy range, a better energy resolution and a significantly increased effective area, especially for energy below < 100 MeV. We have chosen  $10^{\circ}$  as ROI<sup>3</sup> [164]. With 'gtselect', we have applied  $0.1 \le E \le 50$  GeV energy cut on the photon events [164]. We have chosen this energy range to avoid the possible calibration uncertainties for energy below 100 MeV and background contamination at high energy. To avoid the albedo contamination, we have used the zenith angle cut at  $\theta = 90^{\circ}$  [164]. Next, we have performed the 'binned likelihood', which is implemented in the ScienceTools [172, 173], on our reconstructed dataset<sup>4</sup> [164]. For our analysis, we have used the *event class 128* and *event* type 3 [164]. Event class 128 provids a good sensitivity to the point sources and the moderately extended sources. The event type 3 is preferred for the  $e^+$ ,  $e^-$  pair conversion that is supposed to occur both at the FRONT and the BACK tracker layers of the Fermi-LAT. Along with the above-mentioned selections, we have adopted P8R SOURCE V6 as IRF<sup>5</sup>, <sup>6</sup> [164].

Along with all the sources within  $10^{\circ}$  ROI, we have added the model for Tri-II in our source model [164]. As there was no pre-existing study of Tri-II by the Fermi-LAT collaboration team, we have modelled Tri-II with a power-law spectrum. The spectral and spatial models of all the remaining sources in the ROI have been taken from the 3FGL catalog. Moreover, to eliminate the possible galactic and extragalactic diffuse emission, we have also included the galactic diffuse model and its possible isotropic component to the source model (gll\_iem\_v05.fits & iso\_source\_v05.txt)<sup>7</sup>. During maximum likelihood fitting procedure, the normalisation parameter of those diffuse components are kept free. In that process, the spectral parameters for all the sources within 5° from the location of Tri-II are left free but the parameters of other remaining sources in the ROI are kept fixed to their preferred values from 3FGL catalog. We have also fixed the localisation of Tri-II [164].

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{1}{2} https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/software/$ 

<sup>2</sup> https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Pass8\_usage.html

 $<sup>{}^{3}</sup>_{\rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/scitools/data \_preparation.html$ 

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{4}{2} \rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/scitools/binned_likelihood_tutorial.html$ 

b https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Cicerone/Cicerone\_ LAT\_IRFs/IRF\_overview.html

 $<sup>\</sup>overline{6}$  https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Cicerone/

 $<sup>7\ {\</sup>rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/access/lat/BackgroundModels.html}$ 

#### 5.2.1 Results from the Power-law Modelling

We have modelled Tri-II with power-law spectrum and the differential photon flux obtained from the Tri-II would be [87, 164]:

$$\frac{\mathrm{dN}}{\mathrm{dAdEdt}} = \mathrm{N}_0 \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{E}_0}\right)^{-\Gamma},\tag{5.1}$$

Here dN is the number of photons and their reconstructed energies vary between E to E + dE. The photons are incident on an elemental area dA of the detector with an elemental time interval of dt. In Eq. (5.1),  $\Gamma$  is the spectral index and  $N_0$  is a normalisation parameter. We have fixed the energy scale  $E_0$  at 100 MeV [164]. During the model fitting of Tri-II, we have considered five different values of the  $\Gamma$  i.e., 1, 1.8, 2, 2.2 and 2.4 and have repeated the binned likelihood analysis for each  $\Gamma$  value [164]. We have used  $\Gamma = 1$ because of its connection with DM annihilation model ([164,174]), while the other four  $\Gamma$  is considered to check constraints on the general astrophysical source spectra.

In our power-law modelling, we have determined the best-fit values of  $N_0$ along with the normalisation parameter of isotropic and the galactic diffuse model for each  $\Gamma$  [164]. In fig. 5.1(a), we have displayed the spectral fits to the data from all the sources within ROI, along with two diffuse background models for  $\Gamma = 2$  [164]. In this figure, the sum of the best fit spectrum along with the LAT counts within ROI 10° is denoted by the top red curve, while the best fit spectrum for the galactic and isotropic components are defined by the top blue and the top green curves, respectively. On the other hand, in Fig. 5.1(b), we have shown the residual plot of Tri-II for  $\Gamma = 2$  [164].

In Table 5.2, we have mentioned our obtained best-fit values of  $N_0$ , their statistical errors and the TS values for all spectral indices [164].

From Table 5.2, we can find that for each of spectral indices, the normalisation constant,  $N_0$  of Tri-II is less than the statistical errors obtained from fitting procedure [164]. The corresponding TS value is less than unity. Hence, from Table 5.2, we could conclude that the LAT could not detect any  $\gamma$ -ray signal from Tri-II [164].

As no significant emission has been detected by Fermi-LAT from the direction Tri-II, we have then derived the upper limit of the possible  $\gamma$ -ray flux from the location of Tri-II [164]. With profile likelihood method [154,155] we have determined the  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits for a full dataset where, we have



Figure 5.1: (a) The spectral fit to the observed data counts and (b) the residual plot for the location of Tri-II. We have modelled the Tri-II with the power-law spectrum for  $\Gamma = 2$ . In figure 5.1(a), the solid red curve displays the best-fit total spectrum, along with the corresponding LAT-observed data points (in green); the upper-most solid blue and green curves display the galactic diffuse background and the isotropic background component, respectively.

considered the full range of reconstructed energy of photons for our analysis. The upper limits of  $N_0$  are evaluated with 95% confidence level (C.L.) and during this procedure,  $N_0$  and the normalisation parameters of the galactic and isotropic model are fitted with the LAT-obtained spectrum at each step. This analysis would continue until the difference of the logarithm of the like-lihood function reaches the value 1.35 [87] corresponding to a one-sided 95% C.L. Next we have applied the Bayesian method to our dataset ([151]). This method is already implemented in the Fermi ScienceTools [87] and is used for obtaining a more appropriate value of the upper limit of the  $\gamma$ -ray flux in 95% C.L. [164]. In Table 5.3, we have displayed the upper limits of the  $\gamma$ -ray flux for all five spectral indices [164]. From Table 5.3, we can observe that the gamma-ray flux upper limits for  $\Gamma = 1$  is about 16 times lower than the one for  $\Gamma = 2.4$  [164]. This result is in agreement with the results derived by Ref. [87].

Table 5.2: Best fit value of the normalisation parameter of Tri-II and the TS values for five  $\Gamma$ s.

Spectral	In-	$N_0 \times 10^{-5}$	Test Statistic (TS) value
dex $(\Gamma)$			
1		$(1.41 \pm 2.75) \times 10^{-9}$	0.41
1.8		$(6.66 \pm 11.49) \times 10^{-8}$	0.44
2		$(1.06 \pm 2.41) \times 10^{-7}$	0.23
2.2		$(1.88 \pm 5.53) \times 10^{-7}$	0.02
2.4		$(1.41 \pm 2.75) \times 10^{-11}$	$-7.45 \times 10^{-8}$

Table 5.3: Estimated  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L..

Spectral	In-	Flux upper limits at 95% C.L. $(\text{cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1})$
dex $(\Gamma)$		
1		$8.29 \times 10^{-11}$
1.8		$4.55 \times 10^{-10}$
2		$7.14 \times 10^{-10}$
2.2		$1.04 \times 10^{-9}$
2.4		$1.37 \times 10^{-9}$

#### 5.3 J-factor for Tri-II

For this work, we have modelled the DM distribution of Tri-II with NFW density profile [116]. For estimating the J-factor value of Tri-II, we have used the following simple analytical relation derived by ref. [124]. The J-factor estimated by this analytical formula is in good agreement with the numerically estimated values of J-factor [164].

$$J \approx \frac{25}{8G^2} \frac{\sigma_{\rm v}^4 \theta}{dr_h^2}.$$
 (5.2)

here, G is the gravitational constant,  $\sigma_{\rm v}$  is the velocity dispersion and  $r_h$  is the 2D projected half-light radius. For Tri-II, we have considered  $\theta = 0.15^{\circ}$  [165].

In Table 5.4, we have shown two different values of J-factor [164] for two different  $\sigma_{\rm v}$  values of Tri-II [168].

d (kpc)	$\sigma_{\rm v}$ (km s <sup>-1</sup> )	$r_h$	$\theta$ (deg)	J-factor from Eq. $(5.2)$
[97]	[168]	(pc) [168]	[165]	$(\text{GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5})$
$30 \pm 2$	4.2 (95% C.L.)	34	$0.15^{\circ}$	$0.17 \times 10^{20}$
$30 \pm 2$	3.4 (90% C.L.)	34	$0.15^{\circ}$	$0.75 \times 10^{19}$

Table 5.4: Parameters to calculate the J-factors.

For our J-factor calculation, we did not consider the contribution from the substructures in Tri-II [164] which can increase the value of J-factor by few factors [87, 175].

We would also like to point out that, in our present calculation, we did not take into account the effect of Sommerfeld enhancement [87, 176, 177]. Such enhancement can increase the  $\gamma$ -ray flux due to the dependence of annihilation cross-section (i.e.,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ) on the relative velocity of particles. This enhancement effects the relative velocity of thermal relics cross section at freeze-out. Thus the value for  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  would differ by few factors if we consider the Sommerfeld and can almost maximize the cross section by a factor of 7 to 90 for WIMP masses between 100 GeV to 3 TeV [177]. To make a conservative approach, we have not included any such effect for our calculation.

#### 5.4 Constraints on Annihilation Cross-section

In this section, we would try to examine the possible  $\gamma$ -ray emission resulting from the DM annihilation in Tri-II. For this purpose, we have determined the 95% C.L. upper limits on  $\gamma$ -ray flux as a function of the WIMP mass for some specific annihilation channels [164].

To estimate the flux upper limits in 95% C.L. and the corresponding upper limits to the thermally averaged pair-annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  of the WIMPs with the variation of the plausible WIMP masses (m<sub>DM</sub>), we have used the Bayesian approach ([151]) as this is more sensitive [154,155] than the profile likelihood method for low statistics [164].

For estimating the plausible flux upper limits and limits to the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  of WIMP pair-annihilation, we have fitted the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum arising from the DM-dominated dSphs [164] with an MC-simulated DM self-annihilation spectrum, DMFitFunction [121].

The functional form of DMFitFunction (a modified form of Eq. 2.5) can be written as  $^{8}$ :

$$\frac{dN}{dE}(E,\Delta\Omega) = \langle \sigma v \rangle J(\Delta\Omega)(B \ F(M_{DM},C_0) + (1-B \ F(M_{DM},C_1)) \ (5.3)$$

From Eq. 5.3, B,  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  define the branching ration, primary decay channel and secondary decay channel, respectively. The DMFitFunction is implemented in Fermi ScienceTools as a DMFit package [121] and the values of  $F(M_{DM},C)$  are provided by the Fermi-LAT team. For J-factor, we have taken the values from Table 5.4 [164].

For this work, we have considered five supersymmetry-motivated pair annihilation final states, such as 100% bb, 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , 80% bb + 20%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and 100% W<sup>+</sup>W<sup>-</sup>, respectively [25]. These annihilation channels are particularly favored when we consider the neutralino as the WIMP candidate [164]. Though the supersymmetry theory prefers neutralino as a valid cold DM candidate, our obtained result would be generic to all theoretical WIMP models [164].

In Fig. 5.2, we have shown the variation of flux upper limits in 95% C.L. with DM mass for all five annihilation channels. From Fig. 5.2, we can observe

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/scitools/source models.html



Figure 5.2: The  $\gamma$ -ray lux upper limits of Tri-II for five WIMP annihilation final states.

that for all five final annihilation states, with increasing mass, the spectrum from WIMP annihilation always shifts to higher energies [178] and so, we can expect that the variation of flux upper limits would be comparatively less for high  $m_{\rm DM}$  [164]. Among all five final annihilation states producing hard  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum, 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states produce the abundant photon fluxes especially at high energies where, the diffuse background is comparatively clear [164]. From Fig. 5.2, we can also find that at  $m_{\rm DM} \sim 1$  TeV, the flux upper limit for all five channels varies within a factor of 3 but for low mass WIMP, this variation is more than an order of magnitude [164].

The results that we have shown in Fig. 5.2 are only dependent on the annihilation final state and DM mass [164]. Thus, the flux upper limits from Fig. 5.2 are generic to all DM theoretical models and do not depend on any particular theory. Next, we have considered a few specific models to study the annihilation cross-section of WIMPs [164].

In Figs. 5.3(a,b) and Fig. 5.4, we have compared the resulting LAT sensitivity for Tri-II for three J values with a classical dSph, Ursa Minor (UMi) [164]. In Figs. 5.3(a,b), we have considered two theoretically preferred DM models namely, minimal supergravity (mSUGRA) [179] and Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [180], respectively. In the mSUGRA model, the supersymmetry breaking parameters are defined at a high energy scale; generally of the order of grand unification scale  $\sim 2 \times 10^{16}$  GeV. In the MSSM model, all the supersymmetry breaking parameters are specified at low energy



Figure 5.3: Predictions from (a) the mSUGRA and (b) the MSSM models are shown in the parameter plane of  $(m_{DM}, < \sigma v >)$ . The red points denote the thermal relic abundance which is related to the DM density, while the blue points denote the lower thermal relic DM density. The red and blues points have been taken from the Abdo *et al.*, 2010. In both figures, the  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits for two velocity dispersion ( $\sigma$ ) values of Tri-II have been estimated for 95% C.L. The  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits for UMi have been similarly estimated. The  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits of Tri-II for the higher value of J-factor (Genina *et al.*, 2016) is denoted by the yellow curves. For UMi, we have used the parameter set mentioned in Abdo *et al.*, 2010.



Figure 5.4: Predictions from the AMSB and the Kaluza-Klein UED models are shown in the parameter plane of  $(m_{DM}, < \sigma v >)$ . The  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits for two velocity dispersion  $(\sigma)$  values of Tri-II have been estimated for 95% C.L. The  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits for UMi have been similarly estimated. The  $< \sigma v >$  upper limits of Tri-II for the higher value of J-factor (Genina *et al.*, 2016) is denoted by the yellow curves. For UMi, we have used the parameter set mentioned in Abdo *et al.*, 2010.

scale i.e., in the electro-weak energy range. In Fig. 5.4, we have considered two other DM models, namely, anomaly mediated supersymmetry breaking (AMSB) model [181] and Kaluza-Klein particle of universal extra dimensions (UED) [182–184]. In the AMSB model, the supersymmetry breaking scenario might lead to the production of the wino-like neutralinos or the winos. Winos are the mass eigenstate of neutralino that corresponds to the supersymmetric fermionic partners of the SU(2) gauge bosons. At about 2 TeV mass of wino, the universal DM density agrees with the thermal relic DM density generated by the winos. Several non-thermal production scenarios can interpret the connection of wino with the lighter DM candidates for masses less than 1 TeV [87]. In the Kaluza-Klein model, with very minimum setup, the first order excitation of the U(1) hypercharge gauge boson is also known as  $B^{(1)}$ , might have a connection with the DM candidate. For Kaluza-Klein model, there exists a nearly exact relationship between  $m_{DM}$  and the pair annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ . Moreover, from this model, we can obtain the thermal relic rate corresponding to the DM density for DM masses above 700 GeV [183].

In Figs. 5.3(a,b) and Fig. 5.4, we have compared the LAT sensitivity obtained for Tri-II in the ( $m_{DM}$ ,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ) plane with the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits predicted from the above mentioned four DM models namely mSUGRA, MSSM, Kaluza-Klein DM in UED and wino-like DM in AMSB [164]. In figs. 5.3(a,b), the red points are associated with the thermal relic production while the blue points are related to the lower thermal relic density [183]. All these assumptions have been taken from the Ref. [183].

In figs. 5.3(a,b) and 5.4, we have showed the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  obtained for Tri-II for its two different values of velocity dispersion [168] and the predictions obtained from mSUGRA, MSSM, AMSB and Kaluza-Klein UED models respectively [164]. The study by ref. [168] has derived one optimistic value of  $\sigma_{\rm v} < 4.2 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$  in 95% C.L. and another conservative value of  $\sigma_{\rm v}$  $< 3.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  in 90% C.L. [164]. In addition, we have also compared limits obtained for Tri-II with UMi [164]. From Figs. 5.3(a,b), we can observe that even for the velocity dispersion value of 3.4 km s<sup>-1</sup>, at  $m_{DM} = 100$  GeV, the constraints obtained from mSUGRA and MSSM models for low thermal densities are nearly a factor 2.5 lower than the limits obtained from UMi [164]. For velocity dispersion value of 4.2 km s<sup>-1</sup>, the constraints has further improved by a factor of  $\sim 6$  [164]. Moreover, the Fig 5.4 has also indicated that for  $\sigma_{\rm v} = 4.2 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}, < \sigma v > {\rm upper \ limits \ obtained \ from \ Tri-II \ has \ disfavored}$ the Kaluza-Klein in UED and AMSB models for masses  $\lesssim$  230 GeV and  $\lesssim 375$  GeV respectively [164]. For  $\sigma_{\rm v} = 3.4$  km s<sup>-1</sup>, the limits obtained from Tri-II could not provide any effective constraints on Kaluza-Klein in UED models, whereas it disfavors the AMSB models for masses  $\leq 300$  GeV [164].



Figure 5.5: Comparison between the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for the bb annihilation channel obtained from our analysis and obtained by the *Fermi* collaboration for UMi (Ackermann *et al.*, 2015).

Here we also want to mention that for  $\gamma$ -ray observation, 100% bb channel provides the more stringent limits. Thus, in Figs. 5.3(a,b) and 5.4, we have only shown the results for 100% bb channel [164].

From Figs. 5.3(a,b) and 5.4, we want to note the fact that for even higher value of J-factor, say for  $0.59 \times 10^{21} \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$  (obtained from ref. [165]), Tri-II would put more stringent limits on the theoretical DM models than we have obtained by from the J values associated with the velocity dispersion of Tri-II. At  $m_{\rm DM} = 100 \text{ GeV}$ , the predicted value of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  corresponding to the J =  $0.59 \times 10^{21} \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$  is nearly  $\sim 30$  factor lower than the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained for J =  $0.17 \times 10^{20} \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$  [164]. In addition, this high J value disfavors the Kaluza-Klein in UED and AMSB model for mass  $\langle 700 \text{ GeV} \langle 1000 \text{ GeV}, \text{ respectively [164]}.$ 

We would also like to point out that to check the reliability of our analysis method, we have compared our analysis result for UMi with the result obtained by *Fermi* collaboration [185]. For this comparison, we have followed the same data selection and analysis procedure as *Fermi* collaboration by ref. [185]. In Fig. 5.5, we have shown the comparison. From Fig. 5.5, we can conclude that [164] our result is in good agreement with the result obtained by ref. [185]. This study supports the reliability of the analysis procedure that we followed in this work [164].

### 5.5 Conclusions & Discussions

In this work, we have analysed nearly seven years of  $\gamma$ -ray data from the direction of Tri-II by Fermi ScienceTools but could not observe any  $\gamma$ -ray excess from the location of Tri-II. Thus, we have derived the upper limit of  $\gamma$ -ray flux for two possible scenarios.

Using the DM annihilation spectra, we have estimated the upper limits of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  where, we consider that DM candidates are in form of neutralinos. From our analysis, we have shown that for  $\sigma_{\rm v} = 4.2$  km s<sup>-1</sup> with 100% bb channel,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from Tri-II constrain the mSUGRA and the MSSM models with low thermal relic densities, whereas the limits constraint the Kaluza-Klein DM in UED and the AMSB models for masses  $\lesssim 230$  GeV and  $\lesssim 375$  GeV, respectively.

Even for the velocity dispersion with 90 % C.L. i.e., for  $\sigma_v = 3.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , Tri-II can constrain the MSSM model with low thermal relic densities and the AMSB model for masses  $\leq 300 \text{ GeV}$ . Besides, from our work, we have found that  $\gamma$ -ray data from Tri-II can even put stronger limits on the theoretical DM models than UMi. We would also like to point out that our results are entirely based on the standard NFW profile and we do not consider any effects of boost factor related to substructures in Tri-II or the Sommerfeld effect in accord to the annihilation cross-section. Finally, from our work, we can state that with more precise observations of Tri-II, in future we can establish Tri-II as a very strong DM candidate for indirect DM searching.

# CHAPTER 6

# ANALYSIS OF FERMI-LAT DATA FROM TUCANA-II: AN INTRIGUING HINT OF A SIGNAL

### 6.1 Tucana-II

Inspired by the ongoing research interest in the indirect search for DM signal from the UFDs or dSphs, in this work, we have studied a recently discovered UFD, namely Tucana-II (Tuc-II) [186]. It is also referred to as DES J2251.2-5836. [101, 102, 163]. The observation by ref. [187] has confirmed its status. Their study suggested that Tuc-II is a UFD and not a member of any globular cluster. Its high mass to luminosity ratio, large half light radius, large velocity dispersion value and luminosity-metallicity relation, all of these qualities have well-established Tuc-II as a confirmed candidate of UFD galaxies [94,111,187–191] and make Tuc-II a very promising source for the indirect search of DM signal [187,192–195]. The shape of the Tuc-II is a bit distorted and its outer region appears to be little elongated but the observational noise could be the reason for the distortion in Tuc-II [101, 196, 197].

By using the Michigan Magellan Fibre System (M2FS) [198], the spectroscopic study done by Walker *et al.*, 2016 [187] has identified some of the member stars in the direction of Tuc II. The study by ref. [187] and other previous photometric observation of Tuc-II [102, 163], have identified eight probable member stars of Tuc-II. Those member stars are well-resolved enough to estimate the internal velocity dispersion of Tuc-II but they also lead to a large asymmetrical uncertainties in velocity dispersion (i.e.,  $\sigma_{\rm v} = 8.6^{+4.4}_{-2.7} \,\rm km \, s^{-1}$ ) about a mean velocity of  $-129.1^{+3.5}_{-3.5} \,\rm km \, s^{-1}$ . Some important properties of Tuc-II obtained by several studies [102, 187, 199] have been mentioned in Table 6.1 [186].

### 6.2 The *Fermi*-LAT Data Analysis of Tuc-II

Like Tri-II, for Tuc-II we have analysed the gamma-ray data observed by the Fermi-LAT and have mostly followed the same analysis method that we have applied for Tri-II [186].

We have used the Fermi ScienceTools version v10r0p5 and the dataset was pre-processed with an improved IRF, P8R2\_SOURCE\_V6 of the Fermi-LAT [186].

For analysing the possible signal coming from the direction of Tuc-II, we have extracted about nine years of Fermi-LAT data in between 100 MeV to 300 GeV energy range and have selected a  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI centred on the location of Tuc-II [186].

Property	Value	Reference
Galactic longitude	328.0863°	[102]
Galactic latitude	$-52.3248^{\circ}$	[102]
Heliocentric distance	$57^{+5}_{-5} \text{ kpc}$	[102]
([d])		
Metallicity ([Fe/H])	< 0.4	[187]
Projected half light	$165^{+27.8}_{-18.5} \text{ pc}$	[102]
radius $(R_h)$		
Maximum galactocen-	0.30°	[199]
tric angular distance		
in the sample of the		
observed member		
stars in Tuc-II, as		
measured from the		
observer's position		
$([ heta_{\max}])$		
Square-root of the	$8.6^{+4.4}_{-2.7} \text{ km s}^{-1}$	[187]
luminosity-weighted		
square of the line-of-		
sight stellar velocity		
dispersion $(\sigma_{\rm v})$		
Mass within the pro-	$2.7^{+3.1}_{-1.3} \times 10^6$	[187]
jected half-light radius		
$\left( \frac{M_{1/2}}{M_{\odot}} \right)$		
Dynamical mass-	$1913^{+2234}_{-950} \ \mathrm{M_{\odot}} \ \mathrm{L_{\odot}^{-1}}$	[187]
to-light ratio		
$\left( (M/L_v)_{1/2} \right)$		

Table 6.1: Properties of Tucana-II.

Table 6.2: The parameter set that we used for our *Fermi*-LAT analysis.

Parameter for data extraction	
Parameter	Value
Source	Tucana-II
Right Ascension (RA)	342.9796
Declination (DEC)	-58.5689
Radius of interest (ROI)	10°
TSTART (MET)	239557418 (2008-08-04 15:43:37.000 UTC)
TSTOP (MET)	530362359 (2017-10-22 10:52:34.000 UTC)
Energy Range	100 MeV - 300 GeV
gtselect for event selection	
Event class	Source type (128)
Event type	Front+Back $(3)$
Maximum zenith angle cut	90°
gtmktime for time selection	
Filter applied	$(DATA\_QUAL>0)$ &&(LAT CONFIG==1)
ROI-based zenith angle cut	No
gtltcube for livetime cube	
Maximum zenith angle cut $(z_{cut})$	90°
Step size in $cos(\theta)$	0.025
Pixel size (degrees)	1
gtbin for 3-D (binned) counts map	
Size of the X & Y axis (pixels)	140
Image scale (degrees/pixel)	0.1
Coordinate system	Celestial (CEL)
Projection method	AIT
Number of logarithmically uniform en-	24
ergy bins	
gtexpcube2 for exposure map	
Instrument Response Function (IRF)	P8R2_SOURCE_V6
Size of the X & Y axis (pixels)	400
Image scale (degrees/pixel)	0.1
Coordinate system	Celestial (CEL)
Projection method	AIT
Number of logarithmically uniform en-	24
ergy bins	
gtlike for likelihood analysis	
Galactic diffuse emission model	gll_iem_v06.fits
Extragalactic isotropic diffuse emission model 77	iso_P8R2_SOURCE_V6_v06.txt
Source catalog	3FGL
Extra radius of interest	5°
Response functions	P8R2 SOURCE V6
Optimizer	NEWMINUIT
Spectral model of Tucana-II	Power law (in Section-6.2.1) & DMFit Func-
	tion (in Section-6.4)

In the source model, we have included our source of interest, Tuc-II along with all the sources from 3FGL catalog [129] within 15° ROI from the location of Tuc-II [186]. Then with 'gtlike' tool, we have run the binned likelihood on our dataset [172, 173]. During the likelihood process, the spectral parameters of all the sources within  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI and the normalization parameters of two diffuse backgrounds models (i.e., gll\_iem\_v06.fits and iso\_P8R2\_SOURCE\_V6\_v06.txt) have been left free [186]. The remaining all the background sources within the  $15^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}$  ROI have been kept fixed to their 3FGL catalog [129] mentioned values. All the necessary information for performing the *Fermi*-LAT analysis is mentioned in TABLE 6.2 [186]. In TABLE 6.2, TSTART and TSTOP define the start and the end of observation in unit Mission Elapsed Time (MET), respectively.

In the following section, to check any possible emission from Tuc-II location, we would first model our source with a power-law spectrum for different spectral indices.

#### 6.2.1 Results of the Power-law Modelling

Like our previous chapter, we have modelled the Tuc-II with power-law spectrum (Eq. 5.1) and have performed the fitting for five spectral indices ( $\Gamma$ ). In Fig. 6.1, we have shown the fitting results of Tuc-II for the spectral index  $\Gamma = 2$ .

In Fig. 6.1(a), we have shown the spectral fit of all the sources that lie within the ROI [186]. In this figure, the sum of the best fit spectrum along with the LAT counts (in purple) is denoted by the solid dark reddish-brown curve, while the best fit spectrum for the galactic and isotropic components are defined by the 'dot-dashed' sky-blue and orange curves, respectively. The black 'dot-dashed' curve along with the green points refer to the best-fit spectra of Tuc-II and the remaining curves are related to other sources within ROI. In Fig. 6.1(b) we have displayed the residual plot of Tuc-II for the spectral index,  $\Gamma=2$  [186].

The best-fitted value of the normalisation parameter,  $N_0$  and the TS value obtained from Tuc-II for all five spectral indices ( $\Gamma$ ) is shown in TABLE 6.3 [186]. Among all five spectral indices,  $\Gamma = 1$  is assumed to have the connection with DM annihilation (Ref. [174]) and we have chosen other our  $\Gamma$ 's values to examine the astrophysical spectrum of Tuc-II [186]. From TA-BLE 6.3 we can observe that for  $\Gamma = 1$ , the value of statistical error on  $N_0$  is



Figure 6.1: (a) The spectral fit to the observed data counts per energy bin and (b) the residual plot for the location of Tuc-II has been shown here. We have modelled the Tuc-II with the power-law spectrum for  $\Gamma = 2$ . In figure 6.1(a), the solid dark reddish- brown curve displays the best-fit total spectrum, along with the corresponding LAT-observed data points (in purple); the dot-dashed sky-blue and orange curves display the galactic diffuse background and the isotropic background component, respectively; the dot-dashed black curve along with green points denotes the spectral fit of Tuc-II. The rest of the curves correspond to various point sources other than Tuc-II, lying within the ROI that are not distinctly labeled in figure 6.1(a).

Table 6.3: The best-fit normalization parameters  $(N_0)$  of Tuc-II and the TS values for five spectral indices  $(\Gamma)$ .

Spectral	In-	$N_0 \times 10^{-5} \ (cm^{-2} \ s^{-1} \ MeV^{-1})$	) Test	Statistic
dex $(\Gamma)$			(TS) v	alue
1		$(2.457 \pm 11.17) \times 10^{-10}$	0.056	
1.8		$(1.173 \pm 1.126) \times 10^{-7}$	1.215	
2		$(3.146 \pm 2.565) \times 10^{-7}$	2.077	
2.2		$(7.458 \pm 4.923) \times 10^{-7}$	2.973	
2.4		$(1.433 \pm 0.839) \times 10^{-6}$	3.592	

Table 6.4: The  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L. obtained from Tuc-II for five spectral indices ( $\Gamma$ ).

Spectral	In-	Flux upper limits in 95% C.L. $(\text{cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1})$
dex $(\Gamma)$		
1		$3.248 \times 10^{-11}$
1.8		$4.484 \times 10^{-10}$
2		$8.362 \times 10^{-10}$
2.2		$1.401 \times 10^{-9}$
2.4		$2.113 \times 10^{-9}$

slightly higher than the value of  $N_0$  itself and the TS values of Tuc-II for all  $\Gamma$ s are much less than the threshold limit for detection (i.e., TS $\geq 25$ ) [186]. As we have not detected any excess emission from Tuc-II location, we have determined the flux upper limit in 95% C.L. by the profile likelihood method [154, 155].

We have next derived the flux upper limits in 95% C.L. by using the semi-Bayesian method with flat prior [186]. This semi-Bayesian method is developed from Helene's approach [151] and is already implemented in the ScienceTools.

In Table 6.4, we have shown the flux upper limits in 95% C.L. derived from the semi-Bayesian method [186]. From this table 6.4, we can note that, the  $\gamma$ -flux upper limit for  $\Gamma = 1$  is almost 2 orders lower than the flux upper limits corresponding to  $\Gamma = 2.4$  [186]. This result is consistent with our finding

for Tri-II [164, 186]. Here, we would like to point out that flux upper limits developed from the semi-Bayesian method and the profile likelihood method are hardly differed by 1.2 to 1.3 factor [186].

In the next section, we have attempted to study the possible DM signature coming from the location of Tuc-II [186]. Thus, now we would model Tuc-II with the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum from DM annihilation (i.e., with DMFit function) that is implemented in *Fermi* ScienceTools. For comparison, along with Tuc-II, we would also introduce two newly discovered dSphs, namely, Reticulum-II (Ret-II) and Ursa Minor (UMi) [186].

### 6.3 Estimation of Astrophysical Factor (J-factor) for Tuc-II

The main difficulties in studying the newly discovered UFDs is their insufficient kinematics data. That also questions the reliability of J-factors of the dSphs and UFDs [186]. For our work, we have taken the J-factors of Tuc-II and other two dSphs (Ret-II and UMi) from Evans *et al.*, 2016 [124]. Their study suggests that the analytical formula for J-factor can estimate more or less accurate results if we compare it to the spherical Jeans formula for J-factor calculation driven by Markov Chain Monte Carlo techniques. Evans *et al.* [124] argued that their derived formula for J-factors can even reproduce the computational results.

### 6.4 DM Annihilation Constraints from Tuc-II

#### 6.4.1 Searching for $\gamma - ray$ Emission due to DM Annihilation from Tuc-II

Here first we have fitted the possible  $\gamma$ -ray flux arising from the Tuc-II location with the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum for DM pair-annihilation [186]. For this calculation, we have employed the MC simulation package DMFit [121, 122] which is implemented in the Fermi-ScienceTools. We have defined the Tuc-II as a point source and its significance is derived by the  $\Delta TS$  method that we have followed in section 6.2.1.

In this section, we would try to examine after modelling the Tuc-II with  $\gamma$ -ray annihilation spectrum, whether we can obtain any excess from the location of



Figure 6.2: (a) The variation of the TS values of Tuc-II with  $m_{DM}$  for two WIMP annihilation channels; i) 100%  $b\bar{b}$  (blue) and ii) 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (red). We have also shown the results for three different periods of LAT data. (b) The peak TS value observed from the location of Tuc-II for three periods of LAT data, while the red and the blue markers refer to the peak value of TS for  $b\bar{b}$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  WIMP annihilation final states, respectively.

Tuc-II. Interestingly, we have detected a very faint emission from Tuc-II [186].

From Fig. 6.2(a), we can observe the variation of the detection significance of  $\gamma$ -ray excess (i.e the TS values) from the location of Tuc-II as a function of WIMP mass  $(m_{DM})$  and for two pair annihilation final states, i.e., 100%  $b\bar{b}$ and 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  [186]. In Fig. 6.2(b), we have also shown the variation of TS values for three, six and nine years of LAT data [186]. For this comparison, we have performed the same analysis method in all three years of the dataset. From Fig. 6.2(b), we can observe that the peak value of TS is increased with increasing the dataset and both annihilation channels have followed the same nature. The observed emission from Tuc-II location is indeed too faint (i.e., less than TS=25) to claim anything precisely, but the most interesting finding of this analysis is that the peak value of TS is gradually increasing with time period [186]. From this signature, we can expect that in future we can possibly detect a real signal from Tuc-II either due to its connection with any astrophysical source or resulting from DM annihilation [186]. In Fig. 6.2(a), with nine years of *Fermi*-LAT data, the TS value peaks at  $m_{DM} = 14$  GeV for 100%  $b\bar{b}$  channel, while for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  it peaks at  $m_{DM} = 4$  GeV [186].

There were many earlier studies that already analyzed Tuc-II with six or seven years of *Fermi*-LAT data [192–195]. But in our analysis, we have studied Tuc-II with nine years of *Fermi*-LAT data and thus the increase in TS
Table 6.5: The overview of the TS and the  $\Delta$  TS values for two spectrum models that we have considered for this work: 1) the power-law (PL) for the spectral index,  $\Gamma = 2.4$  and 2) the best-fit DM model corresponds to the highest TS values (for our case, it is 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final state at  $m_{DM} = 4$  GeV). The p-value is estimated by assuming the  $\chi^2$  distribution for the 1 degree of freedom.

Our	TS	for	$\sigma$ (=	p-value	TS for	$\sigma$ (=	p-	$\Delta$ TS
source	PL		$\sqrt{TS}$	for PL	DM	$\sqrt{TS}$	value	(DM-PL)
			for PL			for DM	for	
							DM	
Tucana-	3.59		1.89	0.05	8.61	2.93	0.003	5.02
II								

peak values possibly originate from the larger dataset [186]. Hence, such an increase in  $\gamma$ -ray excess with increasing the time period of analysis seems to encourage the indirect detection of DM annihilation signal [186].

If we compare between the power-law and the DM annihilation spectra, we would find that the peak value of TS value is significantly improved for DM annihilation hypothesis [186]. Besides, the p-value (p-value is defined as the probability of getting the signal-like data obtaining from background excess) related to local significance is reduced for DM annihilation spectra. We have derived the p-value by assuming a  $\chi^2$  distribution for a degree of freedom = 1 [186]. All the necessary details are displayed in TABLE 6.5 [186]. From this table, we can find that excess obtained from the Tuc-II location might favour the DM annihilation scenario over its connection with the astrophysical phenomenon [186]. But here we also want to mention that for both DM annihilation hypothesis and power-law, we have obtained the comparable value of -log(Likelihood). Thus, we could not firmly rule out the possibility of having an astrophysical connection with the faint excess from Tuc-II [186]. Hence, from our analysis, at present, we can conclude that our results at best show a hint of a DM signal from the location of Tuc-II [186]. For DM annihilation spectra, we have obtained  $\sigma = 2.93$  and next, we will examine the effect of surrounding unresolved sources that have not been detected by the Fermi-LAT and will review whether their effects could decrease the local significance  $(\sigma)$  for DM annihilation model.

Till now, we have executed the likelihood analysis over  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI but it is quite impossible to distinguish any special features of Tuc-II from that



Figure 6.3: (a) The spectral fit to the observed counts and (b) the residual plot for  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  of ROI centred on the location of Tuc-II. From Fig. 6.3(a), the sum of the best-fit spectrum along with the Fermi-LAT detected counts (in brown) is shown with the solid purple curve, while the diffuse galactic and isotropic components are displayed by the 'dot-dashed' sky-blue and orange curves. For Fig. 6.3(b), with the magenta solid cure, we have represented the best-fit DM annihilation spectra for  $100\% \tau^+\tau^-$  channel at DM Mass, $m_{DM} = 4$  GeV. The corresponding residual points (in red) within 100 MeV to 300 GeV energy ranges are overplotted with error bars.

large region of the sky. Hence, in Fig. 6.3(a,b), we have displayed the best-fitted spectra and corresponding residual plot of Tuc-II for  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  ROI region [186]. For obtaining the best-fitting spectra for  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  ROI region, we have fixed all the background sources to the best-fitted values obtained from the  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI fitting [186]. Now, for investigating any interesting signature originating from the location of Tuc-II, in Fig. 6.3(a) we have not included Tuc-II in the source model.

From Fig. 6.3(a), we can check the spectral fit per energy bin of all the sources within  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  ROI along with the isotropic and the galactic diffuse background model except for Tuc-II. In Fig. 6.3(b), we have over-plotted the best-fitted spectra of Tuc-II with a magenta solid line and the corresponding residual plot between 100 MeV to 300 GeV energy range are shown with the red points.

In Fig. 6.3(b), we have considered the best-fitted DM spectra for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^$ annihilation channel at DM mass 4 GeV as this channel produces the highest TS peak value of Tuc-II (check Fig. 6.2(a,b)) [186]. Now, to check the goodness of fitting between the DM annihilation spectra for  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel and the data derived from the residual energy spectrum (Fig. 6.3(b)), we have applied the T-TEST method [200, 201]. This method is generally favoured for the system which is dealing with the small number of events. T-TEST is the test for the statistical hypothesis that examines whether there exists any considerable deviation between the means of two samples. Under the null hypothesis, T-TEST expects that both the samples are drawn from the same populations (Appendix A and B from Chapter 9). For our case, with the T-TEST method, we have tried to check whether our selected DM model spectrum can provide an acceptable fit to the data obtained from the residual energy spectrum (Fig. 6.3(b)) [186]. In Fig. 6.3(b), we have combined the residuals from all pixels into the energy bins. From this figure (Fig. 6.3(b)), we can observe that even for the full energy range (i.e., including both the positive bump for energy above 500 MeV and the negative bump for energy below 500 MeV) the spectrum for DM annihilation model with  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final state can produce an acceptable fit to the residual energy spectrum with a p-value of  $\approx 0.112$  (p-value is related to the goodness of fitting of the T-Test) [186]. P-value of > 0.05 implies that we are not in a position to reject the assumption for the null hypothesis. Thus, we could not reject the idea that the DM annihilation spectrum for its  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final state (for both the positive and the negative bumps) is consistent with the residual spectrum. Besides, if we only focus on the positive residual energy bump above 500 MeV, we would find that the DM annihilation model for

Table 6.6: The list of CRATES and BZCAT sources within the 1° ROI of the Tuc-II. The J225455-592606 is listed in both catalogs. Thus for this source, we have used its CRATES coordinates.

Our source	Nearby sources from BZCAT and	Distance to the Tuc-II (°)
	CRATES catalog	
Tucana-II	J 225134-580103	0.55
	J 225008-591029	0.66
	J 225455-592606	0.95

 $\tau^+\tau^-$  final state provides a fit to the residual energy spectrum with a p-value of  $\approx 0.782$  [186]. This positive bump from the residual energy spectrum indicates an intriguing hint of the DM annihilation signal from Tuc-II [186]. Here, we would like to mention that from Fig 6.3(b) the negative bump for energy below 500 MeV is nearly the same significant as the positive bump for energy above 500 MeV and this negative bump at lower energies might be connected to the poor modelling of the diffuse background templates. The TS peak values that we have obtained from the Tuc-II location is much lower than the detection threshold limit for the *Fermi*-LAT. Hence, we could not completely rule out the possibility that such excess might come from the statistical fluctuations or it might have a connection with some nearby unassociated sources. In our next section, we would investigate this in detail.

### 6.4.2 Distribution of the Excess Obtained from $\gamma$ -ray Spectra of DM Annihilation

In subsections 6.2.1 and 6.4.1, we have determined the TS value for Tuc-II but we have not examined whether there is any nearby background fluctuation. Such surrounding fluctuation can influence the significance that we have earlier obtained for Tuc-II. Apart from this, we have obtained a very faint emission from the location of Tuc-II (i.e., TS value of 8.61) [186]. Thus, before claiming its connection with the spectrum resulting from DM annihilation, next, we would try to carefully examine the origin and the reliability of such faint excess [186].

There is a fair chance that the excess that we obtained from Tuc-II location could be the result of either any surrounding unresolved sources or the deficiency of background models [186]. Carlson *et al.*, 2015 [202] have suggested that such faint  $\gamma$ -ray emission from dSphs can plausibly come from several nearby unresolved faint  $\gamma$ -ray sources such as radio galaxies [203],

Table 6.7: The TS values for Tuc-II, 4FGL 2247.7-5857, and three sources from the BZCAT and the CRATES catalog that lie within 1° of Tuc-II are mentioned. For Tuc-II, we have shown its TS peak value for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^$ annihilation channel at  $m_{DM}=4$  GeV. The three nearby CRATES sources are modelled with the power-law spectra for  $\Gamma = 2.2$ . In case of 4FGL 2247.7-5857, we have modelled it with power-law spectra and have used the parameter values the 4FGL catalog of Fermi-LAT.

Year	Tuc-II	TS	TS	TS	TS	TS value of Tuc-	Rescaled
	from	value	value	value	value	II after including	TS value of
	by	of	of	of	of	three CRATES	Tuc-II due to
	$\Delta TS$	J225134	-J225008	- J225455	-4FGL	sources and	all possible
	method	580103	591029	592606	2247.7-	4FGL 2247.7-	background
					5857	5857 to source	fluctuation.
						model	
3	3.0868	0.05	0.027	0.49	5.61	3.04	$\approx 1.7167$
6	6.8802	0.66	1.22	0.98	10.45	5.24	$\approx 3.8265$
9	8.61	2.043	3.82	2.01	21.67	7.05	$\approx 4.7885$

blazars [204], star-forming galaxies [205, 206] and millisecond pulsars [207]. Among these, blazars are the most responsible candidates for such background fluctuations [202]. At high-latitude, blazars are the most numerous point sources and thus they are assumed to be the prime source of anisotropy in extragalactic gamma-ray sky [208–213]. A non-negligible amount of  $\gamma$ -ray emission can also arise from the star-forming and the radio galaxies.

Motivated by the work of Carlson *et al.*, 2015 [202], in this section, we have performed a detailed analysis to examine the possible reason for obtaining a faint excess from the location of Tuc-II. For our purpose, we have used two multiwavelength catalogs for blazar such as CRATES [214] and BZCAT [215]. BZCAT catalog consists of nearly 3149 blazars and among them, 2274 are located at high galactic latitude i.e.,  $|b| > 30^{\circ}$ . CRATES catalog contains nearly 11,000 bright flat-spectrum radio sources. Within 1° ROI of Tuc-II, we have observed one blazar from the BZCAT catalog and three radio sources from the CRATES catalog [186]. The source that is included in the BZCAT catalog has also been detected by the CRATES catalog. For our examination, we have considered three CRATES sources such as J225134-580103, J225008-591029, and J225455-592606. All three sources are located within a 1° ROI of Tuc-II [186]. We have not considered any other radio sources beyond 1° because any source beyond 1° might would not produce

any significant changes to the local emission of dSphs [202]. In Table 6.6, we have mentioned the list of CRATES sources within 1° ROI of Tuc-II [186].

Inspired by ref. Carlson et al. [202], we have modelled all three radio sources with the power-law spectrum of the index ( $\Gamma$ )=2.2 and then have derived the TS values of these three radio sources for different time periods of Fermi-LAT dataset [186]. In Table 6.7, we have mentioned our result. After the inclusion of these three sources, we have observed that the significance of Tuc-II is only reduced by ~ 10% [186]. Here we would like to mention that Carlson *et al.*, 2015 [202], has also observed the same reductions. They have again concluded that the blazars are responsible for only 10% of local TS value of the source and the large part of the excess from dSphs is not related to the nearby radio sources.

To investigate the distribution of local excess obtained from the location of Tuc-II, we have generated the 2° x 2° residual TS map around Tuc-II with 'gttsmap' for energy range between 100 MeV to 300 GeV [186]. During this process, the spectral parameters of all the sources within  $10^{\circ}$  ROI were kept fixed to their values obtained from their fittings performed on nine years of Fermi-LAT data [186]. But the normalization values for the galactic and the isotropic models were left free. We have generated the TS map for three cases [186]: 1) Fig. 6.4 (extreme left) Tuc-II and three sources from BZCAT and CRATES catalog that lies within a 1° x 1° ROI of Tuc-II were not included to the source model, 2) Fig. 6.4 (middle); The three radio sources from BZCAT and CRATES catalog that lie within a 1° x 1° ROI of Tuc-II were included to source model but Tuc-II were not included, 3) Fig. 6.4 (extreme right); Tuc-II and three sources from BZCAT and CRATES catalog that lies within a 1° x 1° ROI of Tuc-II were included to the source model. For generating the residual TS map (for right image of Fig. 6.4), we have taken the best-fitted parameters of Tuc-II obtained from its DM annihilation spectra for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel at  $m_{DM} = 4$  GeV.

From Fig. 6.4 (extreme left, middle), we can observe a hint of a localizedemission of TS value  $\approx 6.5$  and that region is very close to the location of Tuc-II [186]. This is true that the region of faint emission is not directly localized to the position of Tuc-II, but that is mere 0.18° away from the position of Tuc-II [186]. Interestingly, from Fig. 6.4(right), we can find that just after including three radio sources from CRATES catalog and Tuc-II to the source model, the significance of the nearby localized-excess is considerably reduced [186]. Thus, from Fig. 6.4, we can conclude that there is a fair possibility that Tuc-II is associated with the nearby localized emission [186].



Figure 6.4: The residual TS maps (between 100 MeV to 300 GeV) for  $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$  ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from the  $10^{\circ}$  ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 *pixel*<sup>-1</sup>. In the left Fig., the three CRATES sources and Tuc-II are not added to our source model; For middle Fig., Tuc-II is not added to the source model but we have included three CRATES sources in our source model; in right Fig., the three CRATES sources and Tuc-II are included to our source model. We have mentioned the name of Tuc-II and three CRATES sources that lie within 1° with the white cross.

Apart from that nearby localized-excess region of Tuc-II, from Fig. 6.4, we can notice a very bright emission of TS value  $\approx 5\sigma$  at the bottom of the right corner and after investigating the above three TS maps, we can safely state that such bright excess is not associated with Tuc-II [186]. Thus, we have checked 4FGL catalog of Fermi-LAT ([130]) and have noticed that source, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 is exactly overlapping with that bright region [186]. Next, we have produced the residual TS map of  $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$  for four cases (see Fig. 6.5) [186]; First and second residual TS maps of Fig. 6.5 are same as first two TS maps of Fig. 6.4. For the third TS map of Fig. 6.5, the three radio sources from BZCAT and CRATES catalog that lie within a 1° x 1° ROI of Tuc-II and 4FGL 2247.7-5857 were included to source model but Tuc-II were not included. For the last TS map (extreme right of Fig. 6.5); 4FGL 2247.7-5857, Tuc-II and three sources from BZCAT and CRATES catalog that lies within a 1° x 1° ROI of Tuc-II were included to the source model. Now if we check the extreme right image of Fig. 6.5, we can observe that after inclusion of 4FGL 2247.7-5857 to source model, the emission from that bright region at the bottom of the right corner is greatly decreased. Hence, this result shows that the bright excess from residual TS map has an astrophysical connection and primarily originates from the source 4FGL 2247.7-5857 [186].



Figure 6.5: The residual TS maps (between 100 MeV to 300 GeV) for  $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$  ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from the 10° ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 *pixel*<sup>-1</sup>. In the extreme left Fig., the three CRATES sources, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and Tuc-II are not added to our source model; For Second left Fig., Tuc-II and 4FGL 2247.7-5857 are not added to the source model but we have included three CRATES sources in our source model; for Third Fig., Tuc-II in not added to the source model but we have included to the source model but we have included to the sources in our source model; in extreme right Fig., the three CRATES sources, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and Tuc-II are included to our source model. We have mentioned the name of Tuc-II, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources that lie within 1° with the white cross.

From our analysis, we would like to mention that, even after including 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three radio sources from CRATES catalog, from Fig. 6.4 and Fig. 6.5 we can still detect plenty of delocalized excesses [186]. The deficiency in background models for Fermi-LAT can be the reason for leakage [186]. There is also a possibility that these delocalized excess regions are associated with some unresolved astrophysical sources as well as the DM subhalos can also be linked with such emissions. There are some studies which argue that even if we try to accurately model all the astrophysical sources to an extent, the DM subhalos will still be accountable for an irreducible background, say  $\approx 5\% - 10\%$ , for the gamma-ray sky [202,208,216,217]. But with detailed multiwavelength study, we can positively reduce the contamination from most of the unresolved sources in our blank sky.

In this work, for calculating the TS value, we have considered the background models provided by Fermi-LAT and not the blank sky. Hence, there is a high chance that we have overestimated the significance of the source even after including all possible nearby sources to our source model [186]. There are several works by Fermi collaboration [194,218] which have reported that from a vast region of the blank sky, we might observe an excess of TS > 8.7. Such emission would decrease the source significance from  $2.95\sigma$  to  $2.2\sigma$  [194,218]. Following this prescription [194, 218], we have also re-calibrated the TS value estimation and this effect reduces the TS value of Tuc-II from 8.61 to 4.79 i.e., p-value from 0.003 to 0.029 [186]. All our obtained results are mentioned in Table 6.7 [186]. In column 2, we have shown the TS value from  $\Delta TS$  method; in columns 3, 4, 5 and 6, we have given the TS value of all three radio sources from CRATES catalog and 4FGL 2247.7-5857; in column 7, we have provided the revised TS value of Tuc-II after including 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three radio sources from CRATES catalog to the source model; and in column 8, we have shown the re-scalled TS value of Tuc-II by considering all probable background fluctuations.

## 6.4.3 Possible DM Annihilation Constraint on Theoretical DM Models with 9 Years of Tuc-II *Fermi*-LAT Data

In our earlier section, we have already discussed that peak value of TS for  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel is lower than the detection threshold limit of Fermi-LAT (i.e., TS < 25). Thus, in this section, we would estimate  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limit in 95 % C.L. for Tuc-II by employing the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum from DM annihilation. For this purpose, we have used the semi-Bayesian



Figure 6.6: The variations of (a)  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits and (b) the respective WIMP pair annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  in 95% C.L. with DM mass, m<sub>DM</sub> estimated for five annihilation channels, "f". The results are produced by considering the median value of J(0.5°)-factor value for Tuc-II.

method [151], as described in section 6.2.1. With DMFIt Function, we have also determined the upper limits to the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass (m<sub>DM</sub>), for five pair-annihilation final states [25]. Like Tri-II, in this analysis, we have again considered these five supersymmetry-favoured pair annihilation final states [25], such as 100%  $b\bar{b}$ , 80%  $b\bar{b}$ +20%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and 100%  $W^+W^-$ , respectively. In Fig. 6.6(a,b), we have shown the variation of  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits of Tuc-II in 95 % C.L. and the relative upper limits to  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of m<sub>DM</sub> and annihilation final states [186].

In this work, we have also tried to check whether Tuc-II can impose any strong constraint on theoretically favored DM models [186] and for that purpose, we have again considered the mSugra [179] model, the MSSM [180], the Kaluza-Klein in UED [182–184] and the AMSB model [181], respectively. In Figs.6.7 (a,b) and 6.8, we have shown  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits of Tuc-II for 100% bb annihilation channel, as a function of m<sub>DM</sub>, for its median J value and uncertainties in J-factor [124]. Here, we have only considered the 100% bb annihilation channel because for  $\gamma$ -ray analysis, this channel provides the most stringent limits on theoretical model [186]. In Figs. 6.7(a,b) and 6.8, we have denoted the relic thermal cross section rate derived by Steigman et. al. [219] with a horizontal dashed green line. These results are then compared with the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  values obtained from the mSugra (in Fig. 6.7(a)) [179] model, the MSSM (in Fig. 6.7(b)) [180], the Kaluza-Klein in UED (Fig. 6.8) [182–184]



Figure 6.7: The variation of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits of Tuc-II with m<sub>DM</sub> for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channels is shown in the parameter plane of (m<sub>DM</sub>,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ) for the median value of J-factor with its associated uncertainties. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from Tuc-II are compared with the limits predicted by (a) the mSUGRA and (b) the MSSM DM models. In both (a) and (b), the red points are related to the thermal relic DM density, while the blue points correspond to the higher  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  and low thermal relic DM density. The thermal-relic cross section rate (2.2 × 10<sup>-26</sup> cm<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) estimated by the Steigman *et al.*, 2012 is displayed by a green dashed line.



Figure 6.8: The comparison of the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from the Tuc-II with the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits predicted by the AMSB and the Kaluza-Klein UED DM models is displayed in this figure. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The thermal-relic cross section rate  $(2.2 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$  estimated by the Steigman *et al.*, 2012 is displayed by a green dashed line.

and the AMSB model (Fig. 6.8) [181], respectively.

From Figs. 6.7 (a,b) and 6.8, we can immediately observe that for its lowest limit of the shaded band, Tuc-II could provide a very strong limit on the parameter space of all four theoretical DM models [186]. From Figs. 6.7(a,b), it is very encouraging to mention that, even for the median of  $J(0.5^{\circ})$ -factor of Tuc-II (i.e.,  $\log_{10} J(0.5^{\circ})=19.05 \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$ ), the upper limits of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  can significantly constrain the blue points in both the MSSM and the mSUGRA model, while the uncertainty band of J-factor of Tuc-II have already started to limit the red points for both the models [186]. From Fig. 6.8, it is interesting to note that the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limit from Tuc-II for the median value of  $J(0.5^{\circ})$ -factor (i.e.,  $\log_{10} J(0.5^{\circ})=19.05 \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ cm}^{-5}$ ), disfavors the Kaluza-Klein in UED model and the AMSB model for masses  $\approx < 220 \text{ GeV}$ and  $\approx < 400 \text{ GeV}$ , respectively [186].

For Tuc-II, the insufficient kinematics data is the main reason behind its large uncertainties in J-factor. But, in future, with more detailed observation of the structure of Tuc-II, we should positively reduce such large uncertainty band to a single upper limit curve for  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  and that would definitely improve the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limit on beyond SM [186].



Figure 6.9: The variations of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  with  $m_{DM}$  for the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel of Tuc-II, UMi and Ret-II is shown in the parameter plane of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$ . The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles of UFDs, while the dashed line represents the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits in 95 % C.L. for their median value of J-factor.

# 6.4.4 Comparison of the Constraints on the DM Annihilation Cross-section ( $b\bar{b}$ Channel) Obtained from Tuc-II, Ret-II and UMi

In this section, we have introduced two newly discovered dSphs, Ret-II and UMi. In Fig. 6.9, we have shown the comparison between the Tuc-II, Ret-II and UMi in space of  $(\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM})$  and for this comparison, we have again chosen the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel [186]. For obtaining the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limit in 95% C.L. of Ret-II and UMi, we have analysed the nine years of Fermi-LAT and followed the same method that we have used for Tuc-II (check Table 6.2).

In Fig. 6.9, the median value of J-factor is denoted by the dashed lines, while the shaded band represents the range of uncertainties in J-factor for all three UFDs [186]. In case of newly discovered UFDs, a very few numbers of member stars have been observed that leads to the main difficulties in understanding the DM distribution in UFDs. The large uncertainty bands of UFDs actually represent our insufficient knowledge of their internal structures.

From Fig. 6.9, we can notice that compared to UMi and Ret-II, Tuc-II shows larger uncertainty in DM density profile [186]. We can also observe an over-

lapping region between the uncertainties band of the Ret-II, Tuc-II and UMi in parameter space of ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM}$ ). So, from this scenario, we could not favour Tuc-II over other two UFDs [186]. But from Fig. 6.9, it is also important to note that above  $m_{DM} \sim 100 \text{ GeV}$ , Tuc-II has provided a better constraint on ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM}$ ) space than Ret-II for its median value of J(0.5°)-factor [186].

## 6.4.5 Comparative Study between the Limits Obtained from Tuc-II and the Limits Obtained from Several Collaboration Works on dSphs/UFDs

Here, we have performed a comparative study between the upper limits of  $<\sigma v>$  obtained from Tuc-II and the  $<\sigma v>$  limits obtained from several collaboration works on dSphs/UFDs and the related plot is shown in Fig. 6.10 [186]. For comparison, we have included the results from the combined analysis [185] of 15 dSphs with six years of *Fermi*-LAT data, the results obtained by the High Energy Stereoscopic System (H.E.S.S.) telescope from a combined analysis of 5 dSphs [220], the results obtained by the High Altitude Water Cherenkov (HAWC) gamma-ray observatory from the combined analysis of 15 dSphs [221], the results obtained by the Very Energetic Radiation Imaging Telescope Array System (VERITAS) from 4 dSphs [222], the results obtained by the Major Atmospheric Gamma-ray Imaging Cherenkov Telescopes (MAGIC) [223] for Segue-I, as well as the results obtained for Segue-I by the combined analysis from the Fermi+the MAGIC [223] collaboration. From Fig. 6.10, it is evident that among all observational results, the combined *Fermi* & MAGIC analysis for Segue-I imposes the best limit on the WIMP pair-annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  for a very wide range of DM masses. The combined limits obtained from 15 dSph performed by the *Fermi*-LAT collaboration also provides a strong constraint up to around DM mass 1 TeV, and beyond that DM mass, because of the low statistics, Fermi-LAT could not perform well. It is also interesting to mention that the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upperlimits obtained from both HAWC and *Fermi*+MAGIC collaboration tend to converge for the mass range  $\approx 100$  TeV and that signature indicates that they are competitive in place of searching the DM signal from dSphs/UFDs. Thus, from Fig. 6.10, we can conclude that the combined data are taken from several ground and space-based  $\gamma$ -ray telescopes can improve the present limits of WIMP annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ .



Figure 6.10: The comparison of the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation final state obtained from Tuc-II with the limits obtained from several collaboration work has been shown here. For comparison, we have considered the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from the single or the combined studies on dSphs by VERITAS, HESS, MAGIC, HAWC, *Fermi*-LAT+MAGIC and *Fermi*-LAT, respectively. The shaded region denotes the uncertainty associated with the DM profiles for Tuc-II. The relic cross section rate obtained by the Steigman *et al.*, 2012 is represented by the 'dashed' sky-blue coloured line.

## 6.5 Conclusions & Discussions

In this work, we have studied nearly nine years of *Fermi*-LAT data from the location of Tuc-II to investigate the signatures of DM annihilation. We have detected a very faint  $\gamma$ -ray excess from the location of Tuc-II for both the power-law spectra and the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum from DM annihilation. We would also like to report that for  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum from DM annihilation, we have shown the variation of the TS values for Tuc-II with DM mass. We have also observed that for nine years of *Fermi*-LAT data, TS value of Tuc-II peaks at  $m_{DM} \sim 14$  GeV for 100%  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel, while for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  TS value peaks at  $m_{DM} \sim 4$  GeV. In case of our Galactic Center,  $m_{DM}$  range between 8 GeV to 15 GeV for  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel and the  $m_{DM}$  range between 25 GeV to 70 GeV for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel play a crucial role to understand the  $\gamma$ -ray emission possibly arising from DM annihilation [224–228]. The mass range for our obtained TS peaks from the analysis for Tuc-II are slightly lower than the mass range required to describe the DM interpretation for Galactic Center.

From our analysis, we have also confirmed that excess from Tuc-II location is increased with increasing the time periods of data and such increase in TS peak value is approximately proportional to  $\sim \sqrt{t}$  [229]; here t is the time periods of Fermi-LAT dataset. The most encouraging result of this analysis is that such successive increase in TS peak values of Tuc-II with larger time periods of the dataset can hint at the existence of any real signal either associated with any astrophysical scenario or resulting from DM annihilation. In the field of indirect DM detection, such hints of  $\gamma$ -ray emission from Tuc-II may open a new path in DM physics.

When we assume the  $\gamma$ -ray spectra for DM annihilating to 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$  channel, we have obtained a p-value of  $\approx 0.003$  from Tuc-II location corresponding to the background models provided by Fermi-LAT. It can be the result of rare statistical fluctuation in background. The one most tantalizing explanations of such excess are the presence of any surrounding unresolved bright sources. Among different types of unresolved sources, blazars are believed to be the main source of background fluctuation that emits  $\gamma$ -ray emission just below the threshold limit for Fermi-LAT. We have searched the BZCAT and the CRATES catalog, have found that three nearby radio sources lie within 1° ROI of Tuc-II and among all of them, the most nearby source i.e., J225455-592606 lies at just 0.55° away from the location of Tuc-II. We have also checked the 4FGL catalog of Fermi-LAT ([130]) and have noticed that a

source, 4FGL 2247.7-5857 lies 0.66 degree away from Tuc-II location. Hence, it is very unlikely that the emission detected from Tuc-II location would be extremely contaminated by these nearby sources.

We have generated the residual TS maps of Tuc-II for energy > 100 MeV(Figs. 6.4 and 6.5). From these residual TS maps, we have noticed an excess of TS value  $\approx 6.5$  that is 0.18° from the location of Tuc-II. We have also shown that whenever we have included Tuc-II to our source model, the excess from that location is greatly reduced. Thus, there is a very high chance that such emission is associated with Tuc-II. We have generated our all residual TS maps for energy > 100 MeV. But the PSF of Fermi-LAT is comparatively large at lower energies, while at higher energies (say for around energy > 500 MeV), the 68% of the photons would be confined within 1 degree of the location of the source <sup>1</sup> Thus, to again check the origin of the excess near Tuc-II location, we have produced a residual TS map for energy > 500 MeV. Interestingly, from this new TS map (Fig 6.11), we could find that after including the Tuc-II to our source model, the nearby excess region has almost disappeared [186]. This signature would probably hint that in Figs. 6.4 and 6.5 after including Tuc-II to source model, the remaining excess emission is associated with weak background modellings. Thus, from our result, we can at best conclude that the nearby excess is associated with Tuc-II location and it might indicate a DM annihilation signal from our Tuc-II [186].

Several Fermi collaboration papers observe that in a large region of the blank sky, the excess of TS > 8.7 is very common. If we only consider the blazars within 1° from the location of source, they would roughly account for 10% of such excesses. The DM subhalos may also be responsible for a  $\approx 5\%$ -10% irreducible background. Therefore, we have re-calibrated our obtained significance and it decreases the TS peak value of Tuc-II from 8.61 to 4.79, i.e., from p value 0.003 to 0.029. At present, with nine years of data, the obtained emission from Tuc-II is much weaker than Fermi-LAT's threshold detection. But from our work, we have also found that the significance of Tuc-II is increased with an increase in time periods of data and from TS map we have also observed a localized excess just beside the Tuc-II. So, in future, with even more time periods of data and with better background modelling, we can expect to explain the origin of the  $\gamma$ -ray excess from the location of Tuc-II.

As we have already reported, the excess observed from Tuc-II location is below the detection threshold for Fermi-LAT. Thus we have derived the possible

 $<sup>1</sup>_{http://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat\_Performance.htm}$ 



Figure 6.11: The residual TS maps (between 500 MeV to 300 GeV) for  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$  ROI centred at Tuc-II extracted from  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI. The image scale for TS map is 0.025 *pixel*<sup>-1</sup>. In left Fig., Tuc-II is not included in the source model but 4FGL 2247.7-5857 and three CRATES sources are added to our source model; in right Fig., 4FGL 2247.7-5857, Tuc-II and the three CRATES sources are added to our source model.

upper-limit of pair-annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  of the DM in Tuc-II as a function of DM mass and five annihilation channels. For our purpose, we have adopted the values J-factor and their uncertainties from Evans *et al.*, 2016 [124].

For this, we have analysed the larger periods of compared to other previous works performed on Tuc-II and thus from our analysis, we can expect to provide more stringent limits on the theoretical models. We have observed that for median J-factor value, Tuc-II has imposed a strong constraint on the blue points in both the mSUGRA and the MSSM model, while the uncertainty band of Tuc-II have begun to constrain the red points. Because of the large uncertainty band, we may not obtain any impressive limits from Tuc-II in parameter space of  $(\sigma v, m_{DM})$  but our obtained results stress that with a more detailed understanding of the internal structure, there is a high possibility that in future Tuc-II would provide very strong bounds on theoretically favoured DM models. From results show that for >100 GeV DM mass, Tuc-II imposes a stronger bound than the limits obtained from Ret-II. Thus, we can expect if we would have larger periods of dataset and more detailed information of the internal structure, we should be able to reduce the uncertainty band of Tuc-II to a possible narrow band in parameter space of  $(\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM})$ . Then Tuc-II might be considered as one of the most DM dominated UFDs.

# CHAPTER 7

# MULTIWAVELENGTH ANALYSIS OF LOW SURFACE BRIGHTNESS GALAXIES

## 7.1 Low Surface Brightness Galaxy

In this chapter, we have chosen a set of low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies which are thought to be an excellent target for indirect DM detection [230]. LSB galaxies are the diffuse galaxy whose surface brightness is nearly one order of magnitude lower than our night sky. Most of the baryonic component in LSB galaxies are in form of neutral hydrogen (HI) gas [82, 231, 232] and that hydrogen disk is extended up to 2 to 3 times beyond the stellar disks of LSBs [233, 234]. LSB galaxies are metal poor and are generally made of dust free stellar disks [79] with a very considerably small amount of molecular hydrogen gas [235]. Hence, LSB would have a negligible or very little star formation rates (SFRs). The  $\gamma$ -ray emission resulting due to the Star formation would not then interfere much with emission from WIMP annihilation. The supermassive black holes or active galactic nuclei (AGN) can also be a source of  $\gamma$ -rays emission but AGNs are rarely found in LSB galaxies. Thus, from astrophysical perspective, we can consider LSB as the clean sources [230].

The measurements from their HI rotation curves [236] indicate their very high value of mass-to-light ratio [82, 85] i.e., the contribution coming from the stars and the luminous gas is very little compare to the total mass in LSB. The studies obtained from the observation of rotation curve in LSB galaxies also hint the existence of massive DM halos [237]. Even the centres of LSB galaxies do not have any large overdensities in stellar components. Therefore, LSB galaxies are believed to be DM-dominated even in their centres and that makes them an excellent source for the indirect search of the DM signal [230]. For indirect detection of DM candidate, LSB galaxies hold two primary criteria i.e., (i) very rich in DM content and (ii) do not consist of any strong sources of  $\gamma$  radiation, for example, AGN and star-forming regions.

The HI rotation curves and gas kinematics of LSB galaxies are also used to resolve the 'cusp-core' problem in the CDM theory of galaxy formation [86,238]. The N-body simulation generally favours the cuspy profile for DM distribution, while for some LSB galaxies the cored profile can provide a better fit to their central DM distribution.

Even though the LSB galaxies are very suitable targets for indirect DM detection, because of their large distances (of the order of Mpc) they are not widely studied. There are very few dedicated literatures which have studied the possible  $\gamma$ -ray emission from LSB galaxies [230, 239–241]. For our study, we have chosen four LSB galaxies that are relatively close and have applied

the multiwavelength approach for investigating the possible DM signal from LSB galaxies at gamma and radio wavelengths [230].

## 7.2 Sample Selection:

In this section, we would give a brief introduction to our selected LSB galaxies [230]. They have low B-band luminosity and a large quantity of DM contents [86]. They all are situated within the 15 Mpc heliocentric distances. From the optical images, any intense sign of AGN activity and new star formation have not been observed. In Table 7.1, we have mentioned some observational results for LSB galaxies [230].

1) UGC 3371: UGC 3371, also known as DDO 039, is characterised as the irregular dwarf galaxy. Several studies show an impressive agreement between the rotational velocities obtained from the H $\alpha$  and the HI, respectively. But at the initial, rotation curve from HI disk started to arise more steeply than the rotational curve for H $\alpha$ . The overcorrection done in the beam smearing for HI rotational curve is assumed to the reason for such discrepancies [242] and thus for UGC 3371, we could not predict the exact shape of the rotational curve. Its shape could be either linear or steep. The study by ref. [243] showed that the rotational curve of UGC 3371 had provided an impressive fit to the DM halo profile with the steep cusp at the centre. Thus, for UGC 3371, the DM halo profile is consistent with the CDM prediction [86].

2) UGC 11707: UGC 11707 is characterised as the spiral galaxy which has the loosely bound broken arms originating from some individual stellar clusters. The observational data points out the very faint bulge (Sd) at the centre of UGC 11707. But there are not many studies on it and thus because of the insufficient data, there are not many sample data to define its rotational curve. But the study indicates that between H $\alpha$  and HI rotational curves, the inner rise for H $\alpha$  curve is comparatively steeper [243]. The rotational curves for UGC 11707, also indicate a discrepancy between the approaching and receding values of rotational velocity for radius  $\leq 7$  kpc [243]. The DM halo profile for UGC 11707 is consistent with the CDM prediction [86].

3) UGC 12632: UGC 12632, also known as DD0217, is characterised as the weakly barred spiral galaxy (i.e., SABm). Its HI rotational curve follows the uniform distribution but a distinguished high-velocity bump has been observed from the blue portion of the H $\alpha$  curve. From the velocity map of

CHAPTER 7. MULTIWAVELENGTH ANALYSIS OF LOW SURFACE BRIGHTNESS GALAXIES

Table 7.1: Properties of LSB galaxies. Column I: Name of LSB galaxies; Column II: Galactic longitude and latitude of LSB galaxies; Column III: The adopted distance of the galaxies, based on a Hubble constant  $(H_{\circ})=75$  $km \ s^{-1} \ Mpc^{-1}$ . We have obtained the value of distance for each LSB galaxies and their corresponding uncertainties from  $NASA/IPAC \ Extragalactic$ Database; Column IV: Observed rotational velocity at last measured point of rotational curve from van den Bosch *et al.*, 2000; Column V: Scale length of stellar disk from van den Bosch *et al.*, 2000; Column VI: B band Luminosity of LSBs from OBrien *et al.*, 2011; Column VII: Location of the last observed data points of LSB galaxies from Swaters *et al.*, 2002.

Name	(l,b)	D	$V_{last}$	$R_d$	$L_B$	R <sub>last</sub>	$M_{HI}$
	[deg], [deg]	(Mpc)	$(km \ s^{-1})$	(Kpc)	$(10^9 L_{\odot}^B)$	(Kpc)	$(10^8 M_{\odot})$
UGC	138.43,22.81	$12.73_{-0.90}^{+0.90}$	86	3.09	1.54	10.2	12.2
3371							
UGC	74.31,-15.04	$14.95^{+1.05}_{-1.05}$	100	4.30	1.13	15.0	37.2
11707							
UGC	106.77,-19.31	$8.36^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	76	2.57	0.86	8.53	8.7
12632							
UGC	103.74,-33.98	$12.38^{+0.87}_{-0.87}$	98	2.21	0.71	15.4	36.6
12732							

UGC 12632, a steep rise in rotational velocity has been observed near its centre and that pattern is gradually extended to the outer region. Thus, the observational findings, directly indicate that the DM halo profile for UGC 12632 is consistent with the CDM prediction [86].

4) UGC 12732: Like UGC 12632, UGC 12732 is also characterised as the weakly barred spiral galaxy (i.e., SABm). The observational data indicates that the rotational curve for both the HI and the H $\alpha$  are consistent with each other and it is observed that the DM halo profile for UGC 12732 is consistent with the CDM prediction [86, 244].

## 7.3 *Fermi*-LAT Observation and Data Analysis of LSBs

Here we have analysed nearly 9 years of Fermi-LAT data i.e., from 2008-08-04 to 2017-10-22 for our each source of targets [230]. For this purpose, we have used the Fermi ScienceTools version,  $v1.2.1^{1}$  [230]. Like our other works, for this study we have used the source class IRF, P8R3\_SOURCE\_V2<sup>2</sup>, <sup>3</sup> [230]. The PSF of LAT is yielding to 4° and 2.5° for energy around 500 MeV and 1 GeV, respectively<sup>4</sup>. Thus in order to reduce the possible uncertainties at low energies and background contamination at high energies, we have used the energy limits or range between 500 MeV to 300 GeV [230]. Here, we have extracted the LAT data for a 10° ROI for each source of interest and for generating the source model for likelihood analysis, we have used here *Fermi* 4FGL source catalog [130] and the most recent version of galactic (gll\_iem\_v07.fits) and extragalactic (iso\_P8R3\_SOURCE\_V2\_v1.txt) diffuse models [230].

In sections 6.2 and 5.2, we have already described the analysis methodology for Fermi-LAT data.

#### 7.3.1 Results from the Power-law Modelling

In order to check the possible astrophysical constraint from LSB galaxies, first we have modelled them with power-law spectra for spectral index ( $\Gamma$ ) = 2 [230].

Fig. 7.1(a,b,c,d) shows the residual fit for the four LSB galaxies [230]. In Table 7.2, we have shown the spectral results obtained from our each LSB galaxies [230]. From this table, we can find the best-fitted values for the galactic and isotropic components and normalization parameter,  $N_0$  for each galaxy. The best-fitted values for two diffuse models are close to 1 and it strengths the reliability of our analysis method [230]. From table 7.2, we can also check that  $N_0$  is always lower than its statistical error by at least an order of 2. This signifies that Fermi-LAT has not observed any emission from the location of four LSB sources [230].

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1} \rm https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/software/$ 

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{2}{https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Cicerone_LAT_IRFs/IRF\_overview.html}{3}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/documentation/Pass8\_usage.html

 $<sup>{}^{4} \</sup>rm https://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat\_Performance.html$ 



Figure 7.1: We have shown the residual plots of four LSB galaxies for  $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$  ROI. We have modelled them with the power law spectrum for  $\Gamma = 2$ .

Next, we have estimated the upper limits of  $\gamma$ -ray flux by profile likelihood method [154, 155, 230]. In Table 7.3, we have shown the flux upper limits in 95% C.L.for energy ranges between 500 MeV to 300 GeV.

Table 7.2: The Best-Fit value for the normalization parameter of LSB, diffuse galactic and isotropic components.

LSB	Galactic	Isotropic	$N_0 \times 10^{-5}$
Galaxies	Component	Component	
	$cm^{-2}s^{-1}MeV^{-1}$	$cm^{-2}s^{-1}MeV^{-1}$	$cm^{-2}s^{-1}MeV^{-1}$
UGC 3371	$0.95 \pm 0.011$	$0.95 \pm 0.035$	$(6.29 \pm 21.55) \times 10^{-8}$
UGC	$0.92 \pm 0.001$	$1.06 \pm 0.001$	$(0.1099 \pm 6.06) \times 10^{-7}$
11707			
UGC	$0.93 \pm 0.011$	$1.09 \pm 0.05$	$(0.334 \pm 5.82) \times 10^{-6}$
12632			
UGC	$0.97 \pm 0.001$	$1.004 \pm 0.017$	$(0.12 \pm 2.30) \times 10^{-8}$
12732			

LSB galaxies	E > 500  MeV
	$(cm^{-2}s^{-1})$
UGC 3371	$2.43 \times 10^{-10}$
UGC 11707	$3.22 \times 10^{-10}$
UGC 12732	$3.54 \times 10^{-10}$
UGC 12632	$3.06 \times 10^{-10}$

Table 7.3: The  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L. of LSB galaxies.

## 7.4 A theoretical Framework to Estimate $\gamma$ -ray Flux from Pair-annihilation of WIMPs In Case of LSB Galaxies

#### 7.4.1 Modelling with NFW Density Profile

We have used the NFW density profile [116] for modelling the DM distribution in LSB galaxies. The rotational curves for our selected LSB galaxies are consistent with the  $\lambda$ CDM prediction [86, 242, 245] and their observational data obtained from the ref. [86, 242, 245] shows that the cuspy profile can provide a good fit to the central region of LSBs. For our J-factor calculation, we have taken the necessary parameters from ref. [86]. The expression of the NFW density profile is [87, 116]

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\rho_s r_s^3}{r(r_s + r)^2}$$
(7.1)

where,  $\rho_s$  and  $r_s$  are the characteristic density and scale radius, respectively and r is the distance from the center of the LSB galaxy. In order to obtain the value of  $\rho_s$  and  $r_s$ , we have used the following relations [230]:

The expression of the  $\rho_s$  is [246, 247]:

$$\rho_s = \rho_c^0 \delta_{\text{char}} \tag{7.2}$$

where,  $\delta_{char}$  is the fitting parameter and  $\rho_c^0$  is the critical density of Universe. For our calculation, we have adopted the Hubble constant of  $H_0=75 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ = 100*h* km s<sup>-1</sup>Mpc<sup>-1</sup> from Ref. [86] and thus  $\rho_c^0$  can be expressed as  $\rho_c^0$  =  $2.78h^{-1} \times 10^{11} \frac{M_{\odot}}{(h^{-1}Mpc)^3}.$ 

The expression of the  $\delta_{char}$  is:

$$\delta_{\rm char} = \frac{vc^3 g(c)}{3} \tag{7.3}$$

where,

$$g(c) = \frac{1}{\ln(1+c) - c/(1+c)}$$
(7.4)

In Eqs. 7.3 & 7.4, c is the concentration parameter that defines the shape of the density profile and the value of the virial overdensity, v is assumed to be  $\approx 178$  [86].

 $R_{\rm vir}$  (or we can say  $r_{200}$ ) is the virial radius at which mean density is 200 times of present critical density  $(\rho_c^0)$  of our Universe. The circular velocity at  $R_{\rm vir}$  is defined as [86, 246]

$$V_{200} = \frac{R_{vir}}{h^{-1}} \tag{7.5}$$

The expression of scale radius is [86]:

$$r_s = \frac{R_{\rm vir}}{c} \tag{7.6}$$

Thus, using the Eqs. 7.2 to 7.6, we can derive  $\rho_s$  and  $r_s$ .

For our case, we have taken  $\theta_{\min} = 0^{\circ}$  and  $\theta_{max} = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_{vir}}{\mathbf{d}}\right)$  [230]. The J-factor allows us to estimate the annihilation rate from LSB galaxies for theoretical favored DM models.

In Table 7.4, we have mentioned some necessary parameters for estimating the J-factors from Eq. 2.7 [230]. We have adopted the value of c,  $V_{200}$  from ref. [86].

In Table 7.4, we have shown the uncertainty associated with the J-factors. For deriving the uncertainties in J-factor, we have taken the distribution of distance (d) and concentration parameter (c) mentioned in Table 7.4 and have developed an algorithm to find the limiting values of the J-factor in a  $2\sigma$  limit by a Monte Carlo method [230]. As the concentration parameter

Table 7.4: The necessary parameter values for calculating the J-factor from Eq. 2.7 ( $h_0 = 0.75$ ).

Galaxy	Distance	с	$V_{200}$	$\theta_{max}$	J factor
name	Mpc		$km \ s^{-1}$	0	$\times 10^{16} \frac{GeV^2}{cm^5}$
UGC	$12.73^{+0.90}_{-0.90}$	$14.5^{+14.6}_{-10.2}$	69.8	0.42	$0.739^{+2.87}_{-0.63}$
3371					
UGC	$14.95^{+1.05}_{-1.05}$	$14.7^{+14.6}_{-10.3}$	66.9	0.34	$0.485^{+1.85}_{-0.42}$
11707					
UGC	$8.36^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	$15.6^{+15.5}_{-10.9}$	51.4	0.47	$0.795^{+3.25}_{-0.716}$
12632					
UGC	$12.38^{+0.87}_{-0.87}$	$14.3^{+14.4}_{-10}$	73.3	0.45	$0.880^{+3.40}_{-0.75}$
12732					



Figure 7.2: The diagram of the toy model for calculating J-factor.

for LSB galaxies lies within asymmetrical limits, we have considered asymmetric normal distribution about the mean with two different values of the standard deviation on each side of the mean [230]. We have first generated random numbers for the user-defined distribution and then by performing the Smirnov Transform on a set of uniformly distributed random numbers, we have generated the uncertainty limits of J-factor for  $2\sigma$  or 95% C.L. [230].

#### 7.4.2 J-factor Derived from the Toy Model

In this section, we have predicted the J-factor for LSB galaxies by using the toy model proposed by Charbonnier et al, 2011 [248]. The sole purpose of using the toy model is to check the reliability of our derived value for J-factor from Eq. 2.7. In Fig. 7.2, we have shown the sketch of the toy model for J-factor calculation [248]. The vertical hatched region denotes the contribution from integration, while the cross-hatched region refers to the toy model.

In Fig. 7.2, d is the distance to LSB galaxy from the observer and  $\alpha_{int}$  defines the angle for integration where,  $r_{\alpha_{int}} = d \sin \alpha_{int}$ . The toy model assumes

Table 7.5: J-factor obtained from the integration method and the Toy model for  $h_0=0.75$ .

Galaxy	Integration	Toy model
	method	
name	$({\rm GeV^2/cm^5})$	$({ m GeV^2/cm^5})$
UGC 3371	$0.739^{+2.87}_{-0.63} \times 10^{16}$	$0.918^{+3.47}_{-0.82} \times 10^{16}$
UGC 11707	$0.485^{+1.85}_{-0.42} \times 10^{16}$	$0.603^{+2.20}_{-0.54} \times 10^{16}$
UGC 12632	$0.795^{+3.08}_{-0.68} \times 10^{16}$	$0.987^{+3.84}_{-0.88} \times 10^{16}$
UGC 12732	$0.880^{+3.40}_{-0.75} \times 10^{16}$	$1.09^{+4.37}_{-0.97} \times 10^{16}$

that roughly 90% of the clump luminosity might contain in scale radius,  $r_s$  and they do not have any direct dependence on the DM density profile. We can rewrite the Eq.7.1 as:

$$\rho_{approx} = \rho_s r_s / r \text{ for } r_{\text{sat}} < r \le r_s$$
(7.7)

where,  $r_{sat}$  is the saturation distance. The corresponding approximate form of J-factor is:

$$J_{approx} = \frac{4\pi}{d^2} \int_0^{\min[\mathbf{r}_{\alpha_{\text{int}}},\mathbf{r}_{\text{s}}]} \rho_{approx}^2 r^2 dr$$
$$= \frac{4\pi}{d^2} \rho_s^2 r_s^2 (\min[\mathbf{r}_{\alpha_{\text{int}}},\mathbf{r}_{\text{s}}]).$$
(7.8)

If  $r_{\alpha_{int}} \gtrsim r_s$ , the density profile falls faster than 1/r for  $r \sim r_s$ . The the toy model advised us stop the integration at  $r_x$  where,  $\rho_{true} = \frac{\rho_{approx}}{x}$ , x = 2 and  $r_x = r_s[\sqrt{2} - 1]$  [248].

$$J_{approx} = \frac{4\pi}{d^2} \rho_s^2 r_s^2(\min[\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{r}_{\alpha_{\text{int}}}]).$$
(7.9)

The comparison between the J-values obtained from the toy model and integration method has been shown in Table 7.5 [230]. Charbonnier et al, 2011 [248], proposed that the difference in the J values obtaining from these above-mentioned methods should lie within the factor of 2 and from Table 7.5, it is clear that our results are consistent [230] with the study done by Ref. [248]

#### 7.4.3 Constraints on the Annihilation Cross-section

In this section, we have studied the possible  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits in 95% C.L. resulting from WIMP annihilation and its relative thermally averaged



Figure 7.3: The  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits of all four LSB galaxies for three pair annihilation channels, such as: (a) the 100%  $b\bar{b}$ , (b) the 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , (c) the 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . (d) It shows the variation of  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits for UGC 12632 with DM mass,  $m_{DM}$  for four annihilation channels. We have considered the median J-factor value from Table 7.4.



Figure 7.4: The  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limit of all four LSB galaxies for three annihilation channels, such: (a) the 100%  $b\bar{b}$ , (b) the 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , (c) the 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . (d) It shows the variation of the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ for UGC 12632 with DM mas, $m_{DM}$  for four annihilation channels. We have considered the median J-factor value from Table 7.4.



Figure 7.5: The variation of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits in 95% C.L. with  $m_{DM}$  for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channels of four LSB galaxies is shown in the plane of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  for the median value of J-factor along with the uncertainties. The shaded region refers to the uncertainty of the DM profiles for our LSB galaxies.

pair-annihilation cross-section  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass (m<sub>DM</sub>) and WIMP annihilation final states (f) [230] for each LSB galaxy using the DM-Fit tool [121, 122] and for that purpose, we have chosen four WIMP pair annihilation final states (f), such as, 100%  $b\bar{b}$ , 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , 100%  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and 100%  $W^+W^-$ , respectively [25].

In Figs. 7.3 (a,b,c) and 7.4 (a,b,c), we have displayed the  $\gamma$ -ray flux and the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits as a function of DM mass,  $m_{DM}$  for three pair annihilation channels, respectively, while in Figs. 7.3 (d) and 7.4 (d), we have presented the variation for UGC 12632 [230]. From Fig. 7.3(d), we find that at high energies where, the diffuse background is comparatively less,  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  channels provide the best  $\gamma$ -ray flux limits [230]. From fig. 7.3(d), we can also notice that at around 1 TeV DM mass, the gamma-ray flux upper limits for four annihilation channels varies within a factor of 2, whereas for low DM mass, this variation is increased to a factor of 4 [230]. All our sources show the same nature, thus in figs. 7.3(d) and 7.4(d), we have only shown the result for UGC 12632. For obtaining the Figs 7.3 and 7.4, we have used the median J values (see Table 7.4) [230].

From Fig. 7.5, we have shown the variation of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  in 95% C.L. with  $m_{DM}$  for median value of J-factor and its  $2\sigma$  C.L. uncertainties [230]. We have only considered the 100%  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel because for gamma-ray analysis, they put the most stringent limits on the parameter space of



Figure 7.6: The variation of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits in 95% C.L. with  $m_{DM}$  for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channels of four LSB galaxies is shown in the plane of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  for the median value of J-factor. The relic abundance cross-section rate i.e., 2.2 × 10<sup>-26</sup> cm<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> derived by Steigman *et al.*, 2012 and the combined  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from the Fermi-LAT analysis of 15 dSphs by Ackermann *et al.*, 2015 are overplotted here.

the ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ,  $m_{DM}$ ). From Fig. 7.5, it is evident that LSB galaxies impose large uncertainty on the parameter space of the ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ,  $m_{DM}$ ) and the uncertainty bands for all LSB galaxies are overlapping with each other [230]. Thus, from this plot, we won't be able to favour one LSB galaxies between all four [230]. The very low rate of star formation and poor nuclear activity are considered as the primary reasons for the large uncertainties associated with the DM distribution in LSB galaxies.

Next, we have performed a comparative study between the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from the LSB galaxies with the limits derived by the Ackermann et al. [185] and the same is shown in Fig. 7.6 [230]. The limits obtained from Ackermann et al. [185] performed the analysis on 15 dSphs with six years of LAT data. In Fig. 7.6, we have also compared the limits from LSB galaxies with the thermal relic cross-section rate estimated by Steigman et al. [219].

In Fig. 7.6, the thermal cross-section rate obtained by the study of Steigman et al. [219] is denoted by the blue "dot-dashed "line while the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits derived by Ackermann et al. [185] is represented by the red "dotted" line. From Fig. 7.6, it is clear that the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from our four LSB galaxies are roughly 3 orders of magnitude weaker than the limits achieved by the Ackermann et al. [185] and the Steigman et al. [219]. In our next

section, we would estimate the stacking limits for LSB galaxies [230].

#### 7.4.4 Stacking Analysis

In Section 7.4.3, we have estimated the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for individual LSB galaxies and from Fig. 7.6, we have checked that the individual  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits are around 3 orders of magnitude weaker [230] than the limits estimated by the combined analysis of Ackermann et al. [185] and the annihilation rate for relic abundances derived by Steigman et al. [219]. In this section, in order to increase the sensitivity of the limits, we have preferred to derive the stacking limits on the individual  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from each LSB galaxies [230]. In Chapter 4, we have already discussed the formalism for stacking likelihood function. For this work, to estimate the stacking limits, we have used the Eq. 4.11.

The J-factor provides a rough estimation on WIMP signal coming from the DM rich sources, thus the stacking analysis would be able to generate a more stringent result than the limits obtained from any individual LSB galaxy [230]. Even for the combined analysis, we have not observed any gamma-ray emission from the location of LSB. Thus we have computed the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits in 95% C.L. by the delta-likelihood method [230]. In Fig. 7.7(a), we have shown the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits as a function of  $m_{DM}$  obtained from the stacking analysis and have compared it with the individual limits of LSB galaxies for 100%  $b\bar{b}$  final state. From Fig. 7.7(b), we can find the comparison between the stacking  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for LSBs and the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits taken from Ackermann et al. [185] with the thermal annihilation rate from Steigman et al. [219]. For Fig. 7.7(b), the  $2\sigma$  uncertainty band associated with stacking limits of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  has been displayed [230].

From Fig. 7.7, it is evident that the stacking limit of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  has been improved by a factor of  $\approx 4$  from the individual limit obtained from LSB galaxies, but it is still nearly two orders of magnitude weaker [230] than the limits obtained from Ackermann et al. [185] and Steigman et al. [219].

We may then conclude that at present due to low J-values (roughly 2-3 orders weaker than the standard values for dSphs/UFDs), the  $\gamma$ -ray  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained for the LSB galaxies, are unable to produce any stringent limits on the theoretical WIMP models. But in the future, the next generation optical surveys such as Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) are designed to discover many new LSB galaxies. Thus, the constraint limits on theoretical DM models obtained from LSB galaxies might improve significantly.



Figure 7.7: (a) The comparison between the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  obtained from LSB for the stacking analysis and the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from individual LSB for the 100%  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel. b) The comparison between the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  obtained from LSB for the stacking analysis and the relic abundance cross-section rate i.e.,  $2.2 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ derived by Steigman *et al.*, 2012 and the combined  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits obtained from the Fermi-LAT analysis of 15 dSphs by Ackermann *et al.*, 2015. The shaded region refers to the uncertainty associated with the stacking limits.



Figure 7.8: The multiwavelength SED of four LSB galaxies for three DM annihilation final states, such as the  $b\bar{b}$  (solid), the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (dashed) and the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  (dotted). We have considered  $m_{DM}=100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $B_0 = 1\mu\text{G}$  and  $D_0=3 \times 10^{28} \ (cm^2s^{-1})$ .

### 7.4.5 Possible Radio Constraint Obtained from LSB Galaxies

In the earlier section, we find that with  $\gamma$ -ray data, LSB galaxies could not impose strong limits on DM models. Thus, in this section, we have tried to investigate the radio emission that might come from the WIMP annihilation [230].

In order to estimate the radio and the X-ray emission resulting from the DM annihilation, we have solved the diffusion equation for the secondary electron spectrum (Eq. 2.11). In chapter 2, we have already defined the formulation for the radio and the X-ray emission through DM annihilation [136, 137].

Here, we have used a publicly accessible code, RX-DMFIT [138]. This code is an extension of the DMFit tool [121,122] that we have earlier used to inves-



Figure 7.9: The variation of the multiwavelength SED of UGC 12632 for (a) four values of  $B_0$ , (b) three values of  $D_0$  and (c) four values of  $\gamma_D$ . We have considered  $m_{DM}$ =100 GeV,  $B_0 = 1\mu$ G,  $D_0=3 \times 10^{28} \ (cm^2s^{-1})$  and have fixed the thermal averaged  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ ) to  $3 \times 10^{26} \ cm^3s^{-1}$ .
tigate the DM signal from  $\gamma$ -ray data. With the RX-DMFIT code, it might be possible to predict the flux limits from the radio and the X-ray emission resulting from the secondary charged particles which are assumed to be generated from the DM annihilation. For radio analysis, we have modelled the DM density distribution of LSB galaxies with the NFW profile [230]. In order to calculate the source term for DM signal i.e.,  $Q_e$  (check Eq. 2.11), RX-DMFIT tools uses the set of Fortran packages from the DarkSUSY v5.1.2 which is designed to estimate the  $e^+/e^-$  injection spectrum per DM annihilation event (i.e.,  $\sum_f \frac{dN_f^e}{dE}B_f$ ) for any approved range of DM masses and DM annihilation final states [230].

RX-DMFIT gives us access to customize the wide range of parameter sets for the astrophysical and the particle components [138]. With this code, we can check how does the diffusion mechanism, magnetic field, DM distribution etc. can possibly affect the radio and the X-ray emission from LSB galaxies.

As we already mentioned in sections 7.1 and 7.2, there are not many observational studies on the LSB galaxies and thus it is difficult to preciously have any information on their magnetic fields and diffusion mechanism. But fortunately, the systematics of the dSphs are not very different from the LSB galaxies, so for our calculation, we have used the values of diffusion constant  $(D_0)$  and magnetic field (B) that are generally favoured for the dSphs [230]. We have defined the diffusion coefficients of the LSB galaxies by the Kolmogorov form (i.e.,  $D(E) = D_0 E^{\gamma}$ ) where, the diffusion zone i.e.,  $r_h$  is assumed to be equal to the 2 ×  $R_{last}$  (see Table 7.1). We have also fixed the values of  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  at 3 × 10<sup>-28</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> and 0.3, respectively [230]. For LSB galaxies, there is no such detailed study on the distribution of the magnetic field and thus we do not have any knowledge on the spatial extension of their magnetic fields [230]. Thus we have used the exponential form to define the magnetic field of the LSBs. The expression for magnetic field is,  $B(r) = B_0 e^{\frac{-r}{r_c}}$ , where, we have fixed the  $B_0$  at  $1\mu G$  [249] and  $r_c$  defines the core radius of the LSB which is equal to the  $r_d$  (see Table 7.1) [230]. Here, we have also fixed the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  at the  $3 \times 10^{-26} cm^3 s^{-1}$ . In Table 7.6, we have shown all the parameter values that we have used for our radio analysis [230].

Using the parameter set mentioned in Table 7.6, we have tried to predict the spectral energy distribution i.e., SED in multiwavelength range for all four LSB galaxies at 100 GeV of DM mass [230]. From Fig. 7.8, we can find the SED plots for three DM annihilation channels, where, the synchrotron emission is defined by 'Sync' and the IC emission due to starlight and CMB

Galaxy	d	$r_h$	$D_0$	$\gamma_D$	$B_0$	$r_c$	$\rho_s$	$r_s$
	Mpc	Kpc	$cm^{2}s^{-1}$		$\mu G$	Kpc	$\frac{GeV}{cm^3}$	kpc
UGC	13.1	20.4	$3 \times 10^{28}$	0.3	1	3.09	0.5725	6.5151
3371								
UGC	15.4	30.0	$3 \times 10^{28}$	0.3	1	4.30	0.5875	6.2529
11707								
UGC	8.59	17.06	$3 \times 10^{28}$	0.3	1	2.57	0.6825	4.5223
12632								
UGC	12.72	30.8	$3 \times 10^{28}$	0.3	1	2.21	0.5676	6.5556
12732								

Table 7.6: The parameter set used as the input of RX-DMFIT tool.

photons are defined by 'IC SL' and 'IC CMB', respectively [230]. The SED plots that we have shown in Fig.7.8 are dependent on our choice of parameter sets. So, next, we would try to find how the SED plot would be affected by changing the astrophysical parameters [230]. In Fig. 7.9, we have shown the variation of SED plots with  $B_0$ ,  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  and for our purpose, we have only chosen UGC 12632 and  $b\bar{b}$  final state [230]. From Fig. 7.9(a), it is evident that the magnetic field has the direct impact on the synchrotron emission and high B field would increase the emission, while the IC emission is not much affected by the variation of B field [230]. Next, from Fig. 7.9(b), we can find that both synchrotron and IC emission are strongly dependent on the  $D_0$  [230]. Last, from Fig. 7.9(c), we can check how SED would vary with changing the  $\gamma_D$ . Here we would like to mention that  $\gamma_D$  is associated with the Kolmogorov form of diffusion coefficient [230].

With RX-DMFIT tool, from observed X-ray or radio flux density, it would be possible to estimate the corresponding  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of  $m_{DM}$  and WIMP annihilation channels [230]. The star formation rate in LSB galaxies are extremely low and that makes them an ideal room for examining the radio emission which might dominantly come from the DM annihilation/decay [230]. For our purpose, we have taken the observed value of radio flux density for all LSB galaxies from the NVSS survey [250]. NVSS is the 'NRAO VLA Sky Survey' which has performed a sky survey at the frequency( $\nu$ )= 1.4 GHz. The Very Large Array (VLA) is located in southwestern New Mexico. It has the 27 elements of the interferometric array which generates the radio images of the sky for a very broad range of resolutions and frequencies. The spatial size of the NVSS images<sup>5</sup> around UGC

 $<sup>5</sup>_{https://www.cv.nrao.edu/nvss/}$ 

Table 7.7: The radio flux density limit obtained from the NVSS at frequency 1.4 GHz.

Galaxy	Observed Flux density in
	mJy
UGC 3371	< 0.45  mJy
UGC 11707	1.17 mJy
UGC 12632	< 0.45  mJy
UGC 12732	< 0.45  mJy

3371, UGC 11707, UGC 12632 and UGC 12732 are 185.40", 300.70", 66.00" and 307.70", respectively. But except UGC 11707, other three LSB galaxies only provide the upper limits of the radio flux density. The flux limits from the NVSS survey are shown in Table 7.7 [230].

Before proceeding to our next analysis, we would like to report that the signal observed from the location of UGC 11707 is roughly less than  $3\sigma$  and for data analysis, such faint emission is assumed to be mostly originated from the fluctuation in some unknown astrophysical sources. Thus a more sensitive survey at  $\nu=1.4$  GHz is needed to examine the real nature of signal coming from the location of UGC 11707. Thus, for our analysis, even though UGC 11707 produces the physical flux limits, we have performed the same method for all our targets.

By using the VLA data (mentioned in Table 7.7) we have estimated the  $<\sigma v>$  limits as the function of  $m_{DM}$  for three annihilation channels and the relevant plot is shown in Fig. 7.10 [230]. From Fig. 7.10(a), we can find that for radio data  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states provide the more stringent limits than  $b\bar{b}$  [230]. But from  $\gamma$ -ray data (see Fig. 7.4(d)),  $b\bar{b}$  final state put the most stringent limits. Theoretically most of the  $b\overline{b}$  final state first annihilates to the  $\pi^{\circ}$  and they decays to  $\gamma$ -ray photons, while  $\tau^{+}\tau^{-}$  and  $\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$  final states (i.e., leptonic channel) mostly decay to the  $e^+/e^-$  [230]. Hence, for gamma-ray analysis, bb annihilation channel is expected to produce stronger limits than leptonic channels but for radio analysis, we would get the reverse result [230]. For Figs. 7.10 (b,c,d), The comparison between the radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits with the limits obtained from the  $\gamma$ -ray analysis (from sections 7.4.2) and 7.4.3) for three annihilation final states has been shown in Figs. 7.10(b,c,d) [230]. For Fig. 7.10, we have used the other necessary parameter values from Table 7.6. For Fig. 7.10, we have not considered the uncertainty associated with radio and gamma-ray limits and for now, we can observe



Figure 7.10: (a) The limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  by using radio flux density obtained from the NVSS images and for three annihilation channels are shown here. The (a) solid, dashed and dot-dashed linestyle denote the  $b\bar{b}$ , the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and the $\mu^+\mu^-$  channels, respectively. Comparison of the radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from NVSS data with  $\gamma$ -ray  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from the individual and the stacked analysis for (b) the  $b\bar{b}$ , (c) the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and (d) the  $\mu^+\mu^$ annihilation channels. we have chosen the NFW profile. We have considered  $m_{DM}=100$  GeV,  $B_0 = 1\mu$ G,  $D_0=3\times 10^{28}$  ( $cm^2s^{-1}$ ) and have fixed the thermal averaged  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  to  $3\times 10^{26}$   $cm^3s^{-1}$ . Like (a), the same linestyles have been used for (b), (c) and (d).



Figure 7.11: The uncertainties associated with the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from NVSS images for (a) the  $b\bar{b}$ , (b) the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and (c) the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states are shown here. The radio limits for each annihilation channels are compared with the uncertainty band associated with  $\gamma$ -ray stacking limits for  $b\bar{b}$ . The shaded region between dashed lines displays the uncertainty band for radio limits, while the shaded region between solid lines shows the uncertainty band for  $\gamma$ -ray stacking limits.



Figure 7.12: The flux density predicted for our LSB galaxies that annihilates into the  $b\bar{b}$ , the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  channels. we have chosen the NFW profile.We have considered  $m_{DM}$ =100 GeV,  $B_0 = 1\mu$ G,  $D_0=3 \times 10^{28} \ (cm^2s^{-1})$ and have fixed the thermal averaged  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  to  $3 \times 10^{26} \ cm^3s^{-1}$ . We have overplotted the SKA sensitivity curve for its 10, 100 and 1000 hours of observation time with the dashed, the dotted and the dot-dashed black curves, respectively.

that for 100 GeV DM mass, the radio data might provide the stronger limits than gamma-ray [230]. For the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  channel, the radio limits even provide nearly 2 orders of the more stringent limits than the stacking  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for Fermi-LAT data [230].

Next we would try to check the uncertainty associated with the radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits for LSB galaxies [230]. As we already mentioned that there is not much detailed study for our selected LSB galaxies and thus with the inadequate kinematics data of LSB galaxies, they can produce the large uncertainty bands [230]. For radio data, we have estimated the uncertainty band in  $2\sigma$ C.L. and then compared the radio limits with the stacked limits obtained from the gamma-ray data for bb (Fig. 7.11) [230]. For gamma-ray data, we have chosen the bb final states as this channel produces the strongest limits, while for radio data we have shown the uncertainty band associated with UGC 12632 for bb (Fig. 7.11 (a)),  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (Fig. 7.11 (b)) and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  (Fig. 7.11 (c)) final states [230]. Now, from Fig. 7.11, we can observe that for LSB galaxies the magnitude of the uncertainty band associated to radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ is at the order of 2 and for each annihilation channels uncertainty band corresponding to both radio and gamma-ray data is overlapping with each other [230]. Unlike the Fig. 7.10, whenever we would consider the uncertainty band, it would not be possible for us to strongly favour the radio analysis over gamma-ray. Our result at best shows that radio and gamma-ray limits are competitive with each other [230].

We next have tried to explore whether, with Square Kilometre Array (i.e., SKA), it would be possible to detect any radio emission from LSB galaxies [230]. SKA is the next generation radio telescope and because of its wide F.O.V and resolution [251], we expect that from next decade SKA would be able to explore many resolved problems in cosmology. Searching for the DM signal would be one of the most intriguing parts of it [252].

We have predicted the possible flux density  $S(\nu)$  for each LSB galaxies in a form of synchrotron emission with RX-DMFIT tool [230]. In Fig. 7.12, we have shown the variation of  $S(\nu)$  with frequency ( $\nu$ ) for three WIMP annihilation channels and have compared it with the sensitivity curve of SKA for its 10, 100 and 1000 hours of observations [230]. From Fig. 7.12 (a,b,c,d), we find that it might be possible for SKA to detect the radio emission from the LSB galaxies, especially with its 1000 hours of sensitivity curve [230]. In Fig. 7.9, we have presented how does the 'Sync' SED depend on the astrophysical parameters, especially on the B and the D [230]. Hence, accurate knowledge on B, D and DM density distribution is very necessary.

Calarry	Dangity Drafila	$I_{\text{forton}} (C_{0} V^{2} / cm^{5})$
Galaxy	Density Prome	J-factor (Gev <sup>-</sup> /cm <sup>o</sup> )
name		
UGC	NFW	$0.739^{+2.87}_{-0.63} \times 10^{16}$
3371	ISO	$0.188_{-0.169}^{+0.775} \times 10^{16}$
	BURKERT	$0.385^{+1.594}_{-0.346} \times 10^{16}$
UGC	NFW	$0.485^{+1.85}_{-0.42} \times 10^{16}$
11707	ISO	$0.123^{+0.501}_{-0.110} \times 10^{16}$
	BURKERT	$0.253^{+1.03}_{-0.227} \times 10^{16}$
UGC	NFW	$0.795^{+3.08}_{-0.68} \times 10^{16}$
12632	IS0	$0.202^{+0.835}_{-0.182} \times 10^{16}$
	BURKERT	$0.414^{+1.717}_{-0.373} \times 10^{16}$
UGC	NFW	$0.880^{+3.40}_{-0.75} \times 10^{16}$
12732	ISO	$0.223^{+0.919}_{-0.1997} \times 10^{16}$
	BURKERT	$0.459^{+1.888}_{-0.411} \times 10^{16}$

Table 7.8: J-factors derived for three DM density profiles at  $h_0 = 0.75$ .

Otherwise, we could not strongly state whether SKA would be able to detect any positive signal from LSB. Thus our study, at best, hints that SKA would definitely play a very major part to investigate the radio emission (most possibly from DM annihilation) [230].

### 7.4.6 Comparison between the NFW, Burkert and Pseudo Isothermal Density Profiles

In this section, we have done a comparative study between three popular density profiles, i.e., between NFW [116], Pseudo Isothermal (ISO) [118] and Burkert (BURK) profile [117, 253]. For examining the distribution of the DM, two types of profiles are widely used in the literatures. Those are cuspy (e.g. NFW) and cored-like (e.g. BURK, ISO) profiles. N-body simulation results strongly support the cuspy-like distribution of DM distribution, while the observational study i.e., the rotational curves for several irregulars and dwarf galaxy favour the cored profile [230]. This problem is known as the "cuspy-core" problem. Before presenting the comparison between three density profiles, we would like to mention that for our sources we have preferred to use the NFW profile [230]. Because the available rotational curves for our LSB galaxies showed that the NFW profile produced an acceptable fit to the rotational curves [86, 242, 245] and their study was not able to differentiate between the 1/r cusps and constant cores.



Figure 7.13: (a) The upper limit on the  $\gamma$ -ray flux for three different density profiles. (b) The comparison between the upper limits on the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  for three density profiles estimated for the median value of J-factor along with the uncertainty. The shaded region refers to the uncertainty in the DM density for LSB galaxies. In both figures, we have chosen UGC 12632 that annihilates into the  $b\bar{b}$  channel.

The mathematical form of these three DM density profiles are described in Chapter 2. Using the Eqs. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.7, we have calculated the J-factors of UGC 12632 for all three profiles. The values are mentioned in Table 7.8. We can notice that, among three density profiles, NFW produces the largest J-factor [230].

Next, we have estimated the  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits and the corresponding  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for three density profiles. The J-factors of UGC 12632 has been taken from Table 7.8 and for our purpose, in Fig. 7.13 we have shown the result for  $b\bar{b}$  final state [230]. In Fig 7.13 (a), we have shown the gamma-ray flux upper limits for three density profiles. The flux upper limits have no direct dependence on the J-factor, so from for all three profiles, we have obtained the same order of flux limits [230]. In Fig. 7.13 (b), we have displayed the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits along with its  $2\sigma$  uncertainty band for three DM density profiles [230]. From this figure, we could notice that the uncertainty band for each profile are overlapping and thus without reducing the uncertainty band, from this Fig. 7.13 (b) we could not comment which density profile can produce the most stringent limit in the space of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  [230].

### 7.5 The Future of LSB Galaxies for Dark Matter Searches and the Impact of the CTA

It is much expected that from next decade, the Cherenkov Telescope Array (in short CTA) would come as the most advanced and sensitive  $\gamma$ -ray telescope for high-energies. CTA would study the  $\gamma$  rays between 20 GeV to 300 TeV energy range and because of its large angular resolution (say around 2 arc minutes) and improved energy resolution (much below than ~10%), it might be possible for CTA to detect the  $\gamma$  rays even from a very weak and distant target. CTA has very wide F.O.V (for small and medium sized telescopes it is around ~ 8 degree) and the encouraging part of this instrument is that its effective area would increase with energies. Thus all of those quantities make CTA the foremost sensitive comparing to all or any currently working space-based and ground-based telescopes and that also gives us a hope that in future it might be possible for CTA to identify the DM signals.

For our work, we would like to check whether in the future CTA can detect any emission from the LSB galaxies and for that purpose we have compared the differential flux of LSB galaxies obtained from the Fermi-LAT with the sensitivity curve of CTA [230]. Our adopted CTA sensitivity curve ([254]) is derived from the point-like sources where, they are modelled with the powerlaw function and have the  $5\sigma$  significance for 50 hours of CTA observation. For Fermi-LAT we have used the sensitivity curve for 10 years of LAT observation for the high-Galactic-latitude sources <sup>6</sup>. The sensitivity curve for the Fermi-LAT is also estimated for the point-like sources that are modelled with the power law and have the  $5\sigma$  detection significance<sup>7</sup>.

The comparison between the differential flux for all LSBs with the sensitivity curves for CTA and Fermi-LAT instruments are shown in Fig. 7.14 [230]. In order to estimate the differential fluxes for LSB galaxies, they were modelled with the power-law spectrum for  $\Gamma=2$  (see section 7.3.1) [230]. From Fig. 7.14, it is quite evident that between the energy range of 100 GeV to 1 TeV, CTA might be able to observe the emission from LSB galaxies. This is the really very intriguing part of this study but we should also keep in mind that from Fig. 7.14 we can only hint that above 100 GeV with the 50 hours of observation there are chances that CTA would detect the emission from LSB galaxies [230]. But that emission can either come from any astrophysical sources or from the DM annihilation. A detailed simulation study is needed

 $<sup>{}^{6}</sup>_{\rm http://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat\_Performance.html}$ 

 $<sup>7</sup>_{http://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat\_Performance.html}$ 



Figure 7.14: The comparison of the differential  $\gamma$ -ray flux obtained from our LSB galaxies with the detection-sensitivity curves for the Fermi-LAT and CTA.

to check whether such emission is resulting from the DM annihilation but that part is currently beyond the scope of the analysis [230]. Hence, from our study, we can only at best comment that in the next decade CTA would be very important tools for the gamma-ray analysis and would be especially ideal for the indirect DM searching [230].

### 7.6 Conclusions & Discussions

For this work, we have studied for nearly nine years of LAT data but have not detected any emission from the location of LSB. With DMFit tools, we estimated the  $\gamma$ -ray and  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for four annihilation states. But because of their low J-factors, individual limits obtained from the LSB galaxies have not put any stringent limits on the DM theoretical models. With the hope of increasing the LAT sensitivity, we have then performed the joined likelihood on the set of four LSB galaxies. As expected, the stacking method has improved the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  by the factor of 4 than the individual limits obtained from LSB galaxies. But, the combined  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  were still around two orders of magnitude weaker than the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from refs. Ackermann et al. [185] and Steigman et al. [219].

The observation data for our chosen LSB galaxies could not particularly favour cored profile over the cuspy profile. The rotational curves for LSBs

are in an agreement with the prediction from  $\lambda$ CDM and some study also indicated that the cuspy profile could also provide a reasonable fit to the DM distribution at the internal core. Thus, motivated by all the observation indications, we have modelled the DM distribution of LSB galaxies with the NFW profile. We have also performed a comparative study between NFW, ISO and BURK DM density profiles (check Fig. 7.13) and find that the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for each density profiles are overlapping with other. Thus, from our study, we could not favour one profile between all three but for the median value of J-factor, the most stringent limits would come from the NFW profile.

For this study, we have used the multiwavelength approach which is considered as the complementary of the  $\gamma$ -ray detection method and is very popular in nowadays for the indirect searching of the DM signal. For our analysis, we have preferred to focus on the radio signal and for that purpose, we have followed the code RX-DMFIT. RX-DMFIT is the extension of DMFIt package and is specially designed to investigate the possible radio and X-ray emission from DM annihilation. LSB galaxies have very low nuclear activity and poor star formation rates and that makes them suitable targets for examining the diffuse radio emission most possibly coming from the DM annihilation/decay. We have estimated the multiwavelength SED plots for LSB galaxies and have also checked how the nature of SED varies with varying the parameter sets (check Figs. 7.8 & 7.9). We have searched for the radio flux limits for all LSB galaxies from the NVSS sky survey data but only the location of UGC 11707 gives detected flux density values and other thee LSBs only provide the upper limits to the flux density. With the VLA flux density, we have tried to predict the radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits in parameter space of ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM}$ ) (check Fig. 7.10). If we consider the  $2\sigma$  uncertainty band associated with the radio limits, we have noticed that the radio limits are overlapping with the limits obtained from stacking analysis for LAT data (check Fig. 7.11) and all three annihilation channels have shown the same nature. Hence, from our analysis, we could, at best, comment that the radio data is competitive with the gamma-ray data. With more detailed observational data and precise analysis, in future, it might be possible for LSB galaxies to impose strong limits on DM models.

We have checked whether with the next generation radio (SKA) and gammaray (CTA) telescopes it would be possible to detect any emission from the location of LSB galaxies. We have noticed (check 7.12) that SKA might be able to detect the emission from the location of LSB galaxies and its 1000 hours of observation would have the highest possibility to detect the emission

from LSBs. But we would also like mention that in order to claim that SKA would detect the emission from DM annihilation, we first need to perform a simulation study. Besides, the estimated radio emission is also dependent on the various astrophysical scenario. We need to have a well-defined knowledge on the distribution of diffusion zone, magnetic fields, DM density profile, etc.. Hence, from our analysis, we could, at best, hint the possibility of observing the radio signal from LSB galaxies by SKA. We have also found (Fig. 7.14) that for energy ranges between 100 GeV to 1 TeV, it might be possible for CTA to observe the  $\gamma$ -ray emission with the 50 hours of sensitivity curve. But like SKA, the same conclusion also holds for CTA. A simulation study is needed to examine whether it would be possible for CTA to detect the emission resulting from the DM annihilation/decay.

Hence, from our work, we can conclude that the  $\gamma$ -ray data obtained from the Fermi-LAT could not impose the strong  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits on the WIMP models. We find that the radio signal possibly originated from WIMP annihilation is quite competitive with the  $\gamma$ -ray emission observed by the Fermi-LAT. Our analysis, at best, indicates that to study  $\gamma$ -ray and radio signal from the LSB galaxies, SKA and CTA would play a very significant role in future.

# CHAPTER 8

# SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

### 8.1 Source Details

In this chapter, we have investigated the gamma-ray and radio emission possibly resulting from DM annihilation [255]. For this purpose, we have chosen several UFDs based on their very high mass to light ratio, large velocity dispersion of their stars, etc. and thus they are very likely to be rich in DM [256]. The observed spectroscopic and photometric properties of our selected UFDs are described in Table 8.1 [255], where, M/L,  $\sigma$ , d,  $r_{1/2}$  and  $\theta_{max}^o$  refers to mass-to-light ratio, velocity dispersion, heliocentric distance, half light radius and maximum galactocentric distance of each UFDs, respectively [257].

Galaxy	M/L	d (Kpc)	$r_{1/2} (pc)$	$\sigma \; (km \; s^{-1})$	$\theta_{max}^{o}$
	$(M_{\odot}/L_{\odot})$				
Aquarius II	$1330^{+3242}_{-227}$	$107.9^{+3.3}_{-3.3}$	$123^{+22}_{-21}$	$6.2^{+2.6}_{-1.7}$	0.11134
Carina II	$369^{+309}_{-161}$	$37.4^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	$77^{+8}_{-8}$	$3.4^{+1.2}_{-0.8}$	0.23
Draco II	$501^{+1083}_{-421}$	$20.0^{+3.0}_{-3.0}$	$12^{+5}_{-5}$	$3.4^{+2.5}_{-1.9}$	0.1
Eridanus II	$420^{+210}_{-140}$	$366.0^{+17.0}_{-17.0}$	$176^{+14}_{-14}$	$7.1^{+1.2}_{-0.9}$	0.062
Grus I	< 2645	$120.2^{+11.1}_{-11.0}$	$52^{+26}_{-26}$	$4.5^{+5.0}_{-2.8}$	0.093
Horologium I	$570^{+1154}_{-112}$	$79.0^{+7.0}_{-7.0}$	$32^{+5}_{-5}$	$5.9^{+3.3}_{-1.8}$	0.0619
Hydra II	< 315	$151.0^{+8.0}_{-8.0}$	$71^{+11}_{-11}$	< 6.82	0.08509
Leo V	$264^{+326}_{-264}$	$173.0^{+5.0}_{-5.0}$	$30^{+17}_{-17}$	$4.9^{+3.0}_{-1.9}$	0.077
Pegasus III	$1470^{+5660}_{-1240}$	$215.0^{+12}_{-12}$	$37^{+14}_{-14}$	$7.9^{+4.4}_{-3.1}$	0.03049
Pisces II	$370^{+310}_{-240}$	$183.0^{+15}_{-15}$	$48^{+10}_{-10}$	$4.8^{+3.3}_{-2.0}$	0.06861
Reticulum II	$467^{+286}_{-168}$	$30^{+2}_{-2}$	$32^{+3}_{-3}$	$3.4^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$	0.24
Tucana II	$1913_{-950}^{+2234}$	$57.5^{+5.3}_{-5.3}$	$115^{+32}_{-32}$	$7.3^{+2.6}_{-1.7}$	0.225
Tucana III	< 240	$25.0^{+2}_{-2}$	$43^{+6}_{-6}$	< 2.18	0.2
Triangulum II	< 2510	$30^{+2}_{-2}$	$28^{+8}_{-8}$	< 6.36	0.15

Table 8.1: Properties of the UFDs.

### 8.1.1 Dependence of J on the Density Profiles

As we have already discussed, NFW density profile is the benchmark choice for the DM distribution which is mainly favoured by the N-body simulations [258, 259], while some observational studies [260] prefer the cored profile. Thus for this work, we have performed a comparative study between the NFW [116], Burkert (BURK) [117, 253] and Pseudo-Isothermal (ISO) [118] profiles [255]. We have estimated the J-factor of each UFDs for three density

Galaxy	$\log_{10}(J(0.5^{\circ})/\text{GeV}^2\text{cm}^{-5})$			
	Pace $et \ al \ [257]$	Dir	ect Integrat	ion
	(NFW)	NFW	Burkert	ISO
Aquarius II	$18.27^{+0.65}_{-0.59}$	$18.11_{-0.63}^{+0.68}$	$18.53_{-0.66}^{+0.72}$	$18.01_{-0.66}^{+0.73}$
Carina II	$18.24_{-0.53}^{+0.53}$	$18.16_{-0.53}^{+0.55}$	$18.45_{-0.56}^{+0.60}$	$18.05_{-0.54}^{+0.58}$
Draco II	$18.97^{+1.29}_{-1.69}$	$19.07^{+1.33}_{-1.69}$	$19.54_{-1.70}^{+1.35}$	$18.90^{+1.34}_{-1.70}$
Eridanus II	$17.29^{+0.35}_{-0.26}$	$17.14_{-0.30}^{+0.35}$	$17.68^{+0.35}_{-0.31}$	$17.06^{+0.35}_{-0.31}$
Grus-I	$16.87^{+1.52}_{-1.68}$	$16.94^{+1.57}_{-1.74}$	$17.48^{+1.60}_{-1.75}$	$16.76^{+1.54}_{-1.67}$
Horologium I	$19.25_{-0.70}^{+0.79}$	$19.01_{-0.73}^{+0.83}$	$19.37_{-0.75}^{+0.85}$	$18.73_{-0.75}^{+0.85}$
Hydra II	< 17.71	< 17.92	< 18.46	< 17.84
Leo V	$17.69^{+0.93}_{-0.99}$	$17.91^{+1.03}_{-1.06}$	$18.51^{+1.02}_{-1.08}$	$17.84^{+1.01}_{-1.07}$
Pegasus III	$18.41^{+0.89}_{-1.07}$	$18.46_{-1.05}^{+0.94}$	$19.06^{+1.02}_{-1.07}$	$18.39^{+1.03}_{-1.05}$
Pisces II	$17.31_{-0.107}^{+0.97}$	$17.53^{+1.02}_{-1.09}$	$18.10^{+1.04}_{-1.09}$	$17.45^{+1.03}_{-1.09}$
Reticulum II	$18.95_{-0.52}^{+0.57}$	$18.76_{-0.48}^{+0.53}$	$19.21_{-0.54}^{+0.53}$	$18.66^{+0.53}_{-0.53}$
Triangulum II	< 19.72	< 19.74	< 20.18	< 19.64
Tucana II	$19.02\substack{+0.57\\-0.52}$	$18.93_{-0.58}^{+0.62}$	$19.22_{-0.61}^{+0.64}$	$18.83^{+0.66}_{-0.62}$
Tucana III	< 17.68	< 17.87	< 18.20	< 17.76
Draco	$18.83_{-0.10}^{+0.10}$	$18.85_{-0.12}^{+0.12}$	$19.08_{-0.13}^{+0.13}$	$18.75_{-0.13}^{+0.13}$

CHAPTER 8. SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

Table 8.2: The astrophysical factors (J-factor) of our selected UFDs deriving from the Eq. 2.7 for NFW, Burket and ISO DM density profiles at  $\theta_{max} = 0.5^{\circ}$ . Also mentioned J-factors of NFW profile estimated by the scaling relation from Pace *et al.*, 2019.

profiles [255]. From Table 8.2, we could find that Burkert provides stronger limits than NFW, while ISO imposes the weakest limits [255]. In Table 8.2, we have also compared our estimated J values for NFW profile with the J values derived by the Pace *et al* [257].

### 8.2 Analysis of $\gamma$ -ray Fluxes from UFDs

Since the last decade, several dSphs/UFDs have been studied in order to investigate the DM signal but no strong emission has been detected from their location. But even the null detection can provide an intriguing knowledge on the DM signature [185, 194, 218, 261, 262]. With all these keeping in mind, we have chosen a recently discovered 14 UFDs and have analyzed nearly eleven years (2008-09-01 to 2019-02-04) of Fermi-LAT data [255]. For our analysis,

we have used the Fermi ScienceTools version, v1.2.1 and have accessed the source class IRF, P8R3\_SOURCE\_V2 processed data [255]. We have considered the energy range E, viz.  $E \in [0.1, 300]$  GeV and have extracted data within the 15° ROI around the location of each UFDs [255]. We have then generated the source model file where, we have included our 'source of interest' along with all the sources within 20° ROI from the 4FGL catalog [130]. In addition, we have also added the galactic (gll\_iem\_v07.fits) and isotropic (iso\_P8R3\_SOURCE\_V2\_v1.txt) diffuse models to our source model [255]. Next, we have performed the binned likelihood analysis [172, 173] on our extracted dataset and during the process, the spectral parameters of all the sources within 15° × 15° ROI and the normalization parameters for two diffuse backgrounds models have been left free. The necessary information for Fermi-LAT analysis is mentioned in TABLE 8.3 [255].

### 8.2.1 Constraints on DM Annihilation with Eleven Years of Fermi-LAT Data

In order to investigate the  $\gamma$ -ray signal from the location of our 'source of interest', we have modelled our targets with the power-law spectrum (i.e.,  $dN/dE \propto E^{-\Gamma}$ ) for spectral index  $\Gamma = 2$  [185, 186, 194, 218]. Unfortunately, we have not observed any strong emission from the location of UFDs.



Figure 8.1: The maximum TS values (or peak value) detected from location of our selected UFDs for  $b\bar{b}$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final states with eleven years of LAT data (left). The TS peak value observed from the location of Tucana II for three, six, nine and eleven years of LAT data (right).

Parameter for data extraction		
Parameter	Value	
Radius of interest (ROI)	15°	
TSTART (MET)	241976960 (2008-09-01 15:49:19.000 UTC)	
TSTOP (MET)	570987500 (2019-02-04 15:38:15.000 UTC)	
Energy Range	100 MeV - 300 GeV	
<i>Fermitools</i> version	1.2.1	
gtselect for event selection		
Event class	Source type (128)	
Event type	Front+Back $(3)$	
Maximum zenith angle cut	90°	
gtmktime for time selection		
Filter applied	$(DATA\_QUAL>0)$ &&(LAT\_CONFIG==1)	
ROI-based zenith angle cut	No	
gtltcube for livetime cube		
Maximum zenith angle cut $(z_{cut})$	90°	
Step size in $cos(\theta)$	0.025	
Pixel size (degrees)	1	
gtbin for 3-D counts map		
Size of the X & Y axis (pixels)	140	
Image scale (degrees/pixel)	0.1	
Coordinate system	Celestial (CEL)	
Projection method	AIT	
Number of logarithmically uniform en-	24	
ergy bins		
gtexpcube2 for exposure map		
Instrument Response Function (IRF)	P8R3_SOURCE_V2	
Size of the X and Y axis (pixels)	400	
Image scale (degrees/pixel)	0.1	
Coordinate system	Celestial (CEL)	
Projection method	AIT	
Number of logarithmically uniform en-	24	
ergy bins		
diffuse models and Source model XML		
Galactic diffuse emission model	gll_tem_v07.fits	
Extragalactic isotropic diffuse emission model	ISO_P8R3_SOURCE_V2_v1.txt	
Source catalog 136	4FGL	
Extra radius of interest	5°	
Spectral model	DMFit Function [121]	

Table 8.3: Parameters used for the analysis of *Fermi*-LAT data.

We would like to mention out that except for Tucana II, we have not observed any faint emission from the location of other UFDs (i.e., for them TS  $\leq$  5). In Fig. 8.1(a), we have listed the TS peak value of UFDs for  $b\bar{b}$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channels. An intriguing hint of a faint emission had been reported from the direction of Tucana-II in a recent publication (ref. [186]). The significance of this faint emission was shown to increase with time. In Fig. 8.1(b), we have shown the peak TS value as a function of time for Tucana-II. As was seen in ref. Bhattacharjee et al. [186], the significance seems to grow even with a 11 years of LAT data. But the observed significance with eleven years of Fermi-LAT data is still faint (i.e., TS < 25) enough to state any strong claim of the existence of a signal.

As we have not detected any strong emission from the direction of UFDs, we have then derived the 95% C.L. gamma-ray flux upper limits from the region of these objects [255]. For this purpose, we have used the Bayesian approach ([151]), which is sensitive [154, 155] for the low statistics analysis. The approach was developed by Helene [151] and is implemented in the Fermi-ScienceTools.

The aforesaid  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits obtained from the location of our targets can be translated to the WIMP pair-annihilation cross-section,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass and WIMP annihilation channels [255]. We have adopted three pair annihilation final states; such as  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . For estimating the 95% C.L. limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ , we have modelled the  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits with the DMFitFunction [121]<sup>1</sup>

The consequent upper limits on  $\gamma$ -ray flux and  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for all three annihilation channels are shown in Fig. 8.2 and 8.3 [255]. From Fig 8.2, we can observe that for most of DM mass range, Draco provides the strongest limits for all three channels. In Fig. 8.3, we have shown the LAT sensitivity in  $m_{DM} - \langle \sigma v \rangle$  plane for all 15 UFDs [255]. The obtained limits in Fig. 8.3 depend on the *J*-factor and the DM density profiles. Among all our considered UFDs, Horologium I, due to its largest *J*-factor, has imposed the most stringent limit on  $m_{DM} - \langle \sigma v \rangle$  plane for all three annihilation final states [255]. But, we also should not ignore the large uncertainties associated with the J-factor of Horologium I. Thus, the limit obtained from Horologium I might not be as robust as we can expect from Draco. In Fig. 8.3, we have not showed the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for Triangulum II, Hydra II and Tucana III, because they can only produce the limiting values for  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  due to their upper limits

 $<sup>1</sup>_{https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/scitools/source\_models.html}$ 





Figure 8.2: 95% C.L.  $\gamma$ -ray flux upper limits of our selected UFDs for  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  pair-annihilation channels.

of J-factor [255].





Figure 8.3: 95% C.L.  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limit of our selected UFDs for  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^$ and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  pair-annihilation channels. We have not included the limits from Triangulum II, Hydra II and Tucana III as they only have the upper limits of *J*-factor.

### 8.3 Synchrotron Radiation from UFDs

As we have seen above, the limits obtained from the  $\gamma$ -ray data are directly dependent on the J-factor but this is not the case for synchrotron emission. The radio emission generating from synchrotron emission strongly depends on the diffusion coefficient  $(D_0)$ , magnetic field (B) and energy loss mechanism, etc. The magnetic field of dSphs are not well-studied but several studies suggest to consider the  $B \approx 1 \ \mu\text{G}$  for dSphs [137, 138, 263]. For our analysis, we have also assumed the same [121, 137]. For diffusion coefficient, we have considered the simplified form of it, i.e.,  $D(E) = D_0 \left(\frac{E}{1\text{GeV}}\right)^{\gamma_D}$ , where,  $D_0$  is the diffusion constant. For galaxy clusters,  $D_0$  lies between the range of  $10^{28}$ – $10^{30} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  [133, 264], while for Milky Way it stands between  $10^{27}$ – $10^{29} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  [265–267]. Similarly,  $\gamma_D$  is expected to lie between  $0 \leq \gamma_D \leq 1$  [133]. For our analysis, we have fixed  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  at  $3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ and 0.3 [138], respectively.

For a specific DM mass, the synchrotron emission would also depend on the WIMP pair-annihilation channels and their relative cascades. Just like our  $\gamma$ -ray analysis, here we have again considered three annihilation final states; such as  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . Next, in order to predict the possible synchrotron emission resulting from the DM annihilation, we have used a publicly accessible code, RX-DMFIT [138] which is an extension of the DM-Fit tool [121, 122]. As a default we have used the NFW density profile and have fixed the pair annihilation cross-section,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  at  $10^{-26}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> [255]. In addition, we have used the thermal electron density  $n_e \approx 10^{-6}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> [137, 138] for all our selected UFDs.

Using the parameters, d,  $r_{1/2}$ , and  $\sigma$  listed in Table 8.1, we have calculated characteristic density  $(\rho_s)$ , scale radius  $(r_s)$  and diffusion zone  $(r_h)$ . The parameter values mentioned in Table 8.4 are derived from the 'central values' of d,  $r_{1/2}$ , and  $\sigma$  [255].

In Fig. 8.4, we have shown the  $e^{\pm}$  distribution spectrum of Tucana II at a radial distance 0.1 kpc and for DM masses, 2 TeV and 200 GeV [255]. The cascade channels resulting from the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation could produce a large amount of  $e^{\pm}$  that we can expect from the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  or the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  annihilation channel. Thus, the integrated spectrum obtained from the  $b\bar{b}$  channel would be larger than the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  [255]. From Fig. 8.4, we can also explain the relative softness between three annihilation channels.

In Fig. 8.5(a), we have shown the power-spectrum  $(P_{\text{synch}}(\nu, E, B))$  of Tucana II at  $B = 1 \ \mu\text{G}$  for frequency range between 5 MHz to 50 GHz. We

dSphs	d(Kpc)	$r_h(Kpc)$	$ ho_s (GeV/cm^3)$	$r_s(Kpc)$
Aquarius II	107.9	0.42	2.27	0.615
Carina II	37.4	0.3	1.78	0.38
Draco II	20	0.07	71.73	0.06
Eridanus II	366	0.792	1.454	0.88
Grus I	120.2	0.39	6.7	0.26
Horologium I	79	0.188	30.55	0.16
Hydra II	151	0.448	< 8.24	0.335
Leo $V$	173	0.465	23.83	0.15
Pegasus III	215	0.228	40.73	0.185
Pisces II	183	0.438	8.93	0.24
Reticulum II	30	0.251	10.08	0.16
Tucana II	57.5	0.452	3.6	0.575
Tucana III	25	0.174	< 2.29	0.215
Triangulum II	30	0.157	< 46.1	0.14
Draco	76	2.5	1.4	1.0

CHAPTER 8. SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

Table 8.4: The astrophysical parameters for our selected UFDs along with the classical dSphs Draco. The values for  $r_h$ ,  $\rho_s$  and  $r_s$  has been derived from the 'central values' of the astrophysical parameters listed in Table 8.1.

find that  $P_{\text{synch}}$  for higher frequency values peaks at comparatively higher energies [255]. For a specific frequency value, the annihilation channel which produces a large number of  $e^{\pm}$  with increasing energies would generate a larger amount of synchrotron flux. Thus, for a higher value of frequencies, the leptonic annihilation channel would dominate over the hadronic final states. We can observe this feature from Fig. 8.5(b) [255]. In that figure, for = 200 GeV mass and high frequency value,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  annihilation channel dominates over  $b\bar{b}$  final state, while for the low frequency value,  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel dominates over  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final state. The  $e^{\pm}$  resulting as the end product of WIMP annihilation final states could possess the maximum energy, ~  $M_{DM}$  and thus for higher DM mass values, we would obtain the harder the  $e^{\pm}$  spectrum (have already shown in Fig. 8.4). Therefore, from Fig. 8.5(b), we can observe the crossover between  $b\bar{b}$  dominance and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  dominance with changing the frequencies [255].



Figure 8.4: The  $e^{\pm}$  distribution spectrum of Tucana II at equilibrium for radial distance r = 0.1 kpc and three pair-annihilation channels, such as:  $b\bar{b}$  (red),  $\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$  (blue) and  $\tau^{+}\tau^{-}$  (green). We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26}$  cm<sup>3</sup>/s,  $B = 1 \,\mu$ G,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$ cm<sup>2</sup>/s,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ . The spectrum for DM masses 200 GeV and 2 TeV have been shown in left and right panels, respectively.

#### 8.3.1 Results Pertaining to the UFDs

In this section, we have considered the radio data observed by two popular radio telescopes; such as:

- 1) The sky-survey data observed by the Giant Metrewave Radio Telescope (GMRT) [268]. It covers the sky between  $-53^{\circ}$  to  $+90^{\circ}$  declination at  $\nu = 0.1475$  GHz
- 2) The NVSS survey data the Very Large Array (VLA) telescope [269]. It covers the sky between  $-40^{\circ}$  to  $+90^{\circ}$  declination at  $\nu = 1.4$  GHz.

Unfortunately, no excess emission has been detected from the location of UFDs by both the telescopes [255]. Thus the noise obtained from the direction of UFDs is translated to upper limits on flux density for 95% C.L. same as listed in the Table 8.5 [255]. Here we would like to mention that the radio images are generally prepared in per unit beam-size, where, the beam-size is convolved with the PSF of the respective telescope. Thus, for the final processed radio images, the unit for flux density is in Jy. As both of our



Figure 8.5: (a) The power-spectrum at five different frequency values for  $B = 1 \,\mu$ G. (b) The synchrotron flux densities for  $b\bar{b}$  (red),  $\mu^+\mu^-$  (blue) and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (green) annihilation channels. The fluxes for DM masses 200 GeV and 2 TeV have been denoted with solid and dashed lines, respectively. We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ ,  $B = 1 \,\mu$ G,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .

considered telescopes do not cover the full sky, we do not have the information for some UFDs, e.g. Tucana II [255]. The observed upper limits on flux density are then translated to the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for three annihilation final states. In Fig. 8.6, we have shown our results [255].

Compared to GMRT, the VLA telescope has a wider effective area and operates in one order of magnitude higher frequency range which reduces the contribution from the galactic background. From Fig. 8.6, we find that for large DM mass, the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from the NVSS images are stronger than the limits obtained from the GMRT data, while for low DM mass, GMRT data imposes the strongest limits [255]. This result is the outcome of the comparative efficiencies between two telescopes and the dependence of the  $e^{\pm}$  spectrum on DM mass.

#### 8.3.2 Future Projections

SKA is expected to operate for a wide range of radio frequency i.e., between 50 MHz - 50 GHz. This enables SKA to observe the synchrotron emission

Galaxy	$GMRT (\nu = 147.5)$	VLA ( $\nu = 1.4 \text{ GHz}$ )
	MHz)	
Aquarius II	6.8	0.86
Draco II	9	1.1
Eridanus II	7.8	No Data
Grus I	4.1	No Data
Hydra II	8.8	1.1
Leo V	6	0.98
Pegasus III	10	0.96
Pisces II	3.5	0.88
Triangulum II	6	1
Draco	7.2	9.2

CHAPTER 8. SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

Table 8.5:  $2\sigma$  upper limits on radio flux densities detected by the sky-survey performed by GMRT and VLA. The location of Carina II, Reticulum II, Horologium II and Tucana II&III are not covered by both the surveys.

from DM annihilation in dSphs/UFDs [270, 271]. We have calculated the synchrotron flux from our considered UFDs and have examined the possibility of observing these signals by SKA [255]. Fig. 8.7, shows the estimated synchrotron fluxes, for the UFDs listed in Table 8.4, for  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  annihilation channels [255]. In Fig. 8.7, we have also shown the sensitivity of SKA [272, 273] for its 10, 100 and 1000 hours of observation time. Here we would like to mention that SKA would process a very wide effective area and thus we can expect it to cover all our selected UFDs [255].

For high DM mass, the  $e^{\pm}$  produces the hard spectrum and the resulting synchrotron flux can go beyond the detection range of SKA. Thus, that would also consequently reduce the detection feasibility at SKA. From Fig. 8.7, we can observe the same [255]. In Fig. 8.7, we find that for 200 GeV DM mass, the radio emission of 12 UFDs originating from three annihilation channels can be detected by the 100 hours of SKA sensitivity, while for 2 TeV DM mass, the synchrotron emission only for the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel can be observed by the 1000 hours of sensitivity curve [255]. Interestingly, from Fig. 8.7, we can also notice that for both 200 GeV and 2 TeV DM masses, only Draco can be detected by the SKA (too with the ~ 10 hours of sensitivity curve) for all three annihilation channels [255].





Figure 8.6: 95 % C.L.  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limit of UFDs using upper limits on flux densities observed by GMRT and VLA for  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  pair-annihilation channels. We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ ,  $B = 1 \,\mu\text{G}$ ,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .



CHAPTER 8. SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

Figure 8.7: The synchrotron flux densities of our considered UFDs and classical dSphs, Draco has been determined for three annihilation channels, such as:  $b\bar{b}$  (left),  $\tau^+\tau^-$  (center) and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  (right) and for two particular DM masses, such as: 200 GeV (top) and 2 TeV (bottom). For each figure, we have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ ,  $B = 1 \,\mu\text{G}$ ,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ . The values of  $\rho_s$ ,  $r_s$ , d and  $r_h$  have been taken from Table 8.4. For Hydra II, Triangulum II and Tucana III, we only have the upper limits on  $\rho_s$  (Table 8.4), thus they can only provide the upper limits on synchrotron flux densities.

### 8.4 Astrophysical Uncertainties and the Constraints

The limits that we have derived in the earlier sections are based on the central values of the parameters listed in Tables 8.1 and 8.2. But there is not much detailed spectroscopic study for the newly discovered UFDs and due to the inadequate observation, the astrophysical parameters associated with them might process very large uncertainty. Thus, in order to draw any

strong conclusion from the analysis of UFDs, we need to address the possible uncertainty related to the constraints that we obtained from gamma-ray and radio data.

### 8.4.1 Uncertainties in the $\gamma$ -ray Bounds

For gamma-ray analysis, our insufficient knowledge of the shape of DM distribution is the main source for large uncertainties. Especially for the newly discovered UFDs, a few member stars have been detected and that creates the prime obstacle to assume the DM distribution in them [274]. As we have already mentioned, the N-body simulation results favour the cuspy-NFW profile but the observation data from some particular galaxies favour the cored profile for DM distribution (e.g. Pseudo isothermal and Burkert [260]). Hence, we would like to investigate the role of the DM profiles for UFDs and for that purpose we have chosen Horologium I as it provides the strongest  $\gamma$ -ray limits for  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel [255].

We have used the median value of J-factor from Table 8.2 and have derived the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for three DM density profiles (Fig. 8.8). From Fig. 8.8, we observe that Burkert profile imposes the strongest limits, while Pseudo isothermal profile provides the weakest constraints [255]. Though we have only shown the result for Horologium I, all our selected UFDs would show the same nature.



Figure 8.8: Comparison between the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  obtained from the Fermi-LAT data for three density profiles for  $b\bar{b}$  final state.

Next, we have checked how the uncertainties associated with the J-factor for NFW profile can influence our results. We have considered the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty band associated with NFW profile (Table 8.2), and in Fig. 8.9 we have shown their corresponding limits. Here, we again consider only the  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel as for  $\gamma$ -ray data this channel provides the most stringent limits [255]. From Fig. 8.9, we could find that UFDs have possessed a large uncertainty band in the parameter space of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  [255]. If we check the Eq. 2.5, we find that  $\gamma$ -ray flux resulting from the WIMP annihilation is proportional to J-factor and thus the large uncertainty in J-factor would always translate to the large uncertainties in the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits. In the future, with more detailed spectroscopic studies, it might be possible to reduce the uncertainty band for newly discovered UFDs.



Figure 8.9: 95% C.L. upper limits of  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass,  $m_D M$  for the 'central value' of J-factor derived by Pace *et al.*, 2019 and its relative uncertainties (Table 8.2). The  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits for Horologium I and Tucana II have been shown in the left and the right panels, respectively.

#### 8.4.2 Uncertainties in the Synchrotron Fluxes

Like the gamma-ray fluxes, the uncertainties in the astrophysical parameters (e.g. d,  $r_{1/2}$  and  $\sigma$ ) can also affect the synchrotron fluxes. Thus, in this subsection, we would again check the possible uncertainties associated with radio limits and for that purpose, we have used the  $1\sigma$  uncertainties of the parameters listed in Table 8.1. From Fig. 8.10, we have shown the uncer-

tainties related to the synchrotron flux in Tucana II for DM mass 200 GeV and  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel. Here we have particularly chosen Tucana II as it shows the highest synchrotron emission [255].



Figure 8.10: The variation of synchrotron flux densities in Tucana II, for 200 GeV  $m_{DM}$  and  $b\bar{b}$  final state, with  $1\sigma$  uncertainties in (a) d, (b)  $r_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , (c)  $\sigma$ . We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ ,  $B = 1 \,\mu\text{G}$ ,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .

The range of uncertainties that we have shown in Fig. 8.10 is the combina-

tion of the errors associated with d,  $r_{1/2}$  and  $\sigma$  [255]. From Table 8.1, we can notice that compared to  $r_{1/2}$  and  $\sigma$ , the error in d is relatively small and, thus d would not impose large uncertainty in synchrotron flux. But both  $r_{1/2}$  and  $\sigma$  contribute a significant amount to the uncertainties in flux [255]. Hence, in order to reduce the uncertainties level, the accuracy in the measurements of these two parameters would play a very crucial role. From Fig. 8.10, we can check the same [255].

A further source of uncertainty is due to the density distribution for the DM. Until now, we have only used the NFW density profile in order to predict the synchrotron flux, while in Fig. 8.11, we have shown the synchrotron flux from Tucana II predicted for NFW, ISO and Burkert DM profiles. Here, we would like to mention that unlike the  $\gamma$ -ray limits, for synchrotron flux NFW profile provides the highest flux, while Burkert imposes the lowest [255].



Figure 8.11: The synchrotron flux densities in Tucana II predicted from NFW, Burkert and ISO density profiles. We have considered 200 GeV  $m_{DM}$  and  $b\bar{b}$  final state. Besides, we have fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26}$  cm<sup>3</sup>/s,  $B = 1 \,\mu$ G,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .

Besides, the synchrotron fluxes also strongly depend on magnetic field (B), diffusion constant  $D_0$  and its exponent  $(\gamma_D)$ . Unfortunately, for UFDs, we do not have any precise knowledge of them. In section 8.3, we discussed the possible values for B,  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  but to predict the possible synchrotron flux

limits, we had only used the central values of them. Hence, To check the effect of these parameters on the prediction of the amount of synchrotron flux, in Fig. 8.12 we show the synchrotron flux for different values of B,  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  within their plausible ranges [255]. We have taken the values of B in the range of 0.5-10  $\mu$ G,  $D_0$  in the range of  $3 \times 10^{26}$ - $10^{30} cm^2/s$ and  $\gamma_D$  in the range of 0.1-1 [255]. Since the magnetic field is the cause of synchrotron radiation, the flux increases as we go higher in the magnetic field (Fig. 8.12 (a)), while the diffusion constant shows the reverse effect (Fig. 8.12 (b)). For a large value of  $D_0$ , the synchrotron would decrease as most of the relativistic charged particles then leave the diffusion region without radiating their complete energy. For  $\gamma_D$ , its large value would suppress or enhance the D(E), depending on the energy value. Since for synchrotron emission, the high energy  $e^{\pm}$  accelerates in the presence of the magnetic field (check Fig. 8.5 (a)), the large value of  $\gamma_D$  would strongly suppress flux at high frequency, while for frequency below  $\sim 1$  MHz, the synchrotron flux would be enhanced [255]. Between 1 MHz to 5 MHz, the flux would rise to its peak value at  $E(e^{\pm}) = 1$  GeV (Fig. 8.5 (a)). But the effect of  $\gamma_D$  relatively less crucial than B and  $D_0$  (Fig. 8.12 (c)) [255].

### 8.5 Conclusions & Discussions

The UFDs, dominated by the DM content, can also possess the moderately large value of the magnetic field and that makes them an ideal target for the indirect detection of DM signals through the multiwavelength approach. In recent times, several literatures have tried to derive the strong limits on annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  from gamma-ray and radio data [132, 194, 275–278]. For our work, we have considered the newly discovered UFDs detected by the observations performed by Pan-STARRS, DES and some other spectral survey [255]. Using both the gamma-ray (detected by Fermi-LAT) and the radio data (detected by VLA and GMRT), we have searched for the WIMP annihilation signal in 15 UFDs. We have also predicted the possible spectra associated with the radio emission and have checked whether it would be possible for SKA to detect any emission from them [255].

With eleven years of Fermi-LAT data, we have not detected any significant emission from the location of UFDs. Thus, we have then derived the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass for our chosen DM annihilation channels. We have estimated the limits for 12 UFDs. Because, for Triangulum II, Hydra II and Tucana III, we only have the upper limits on J-factor, so they could not provide any robust limits on the parameter space of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  [255]. For gamma-ray data, Holorologium I provided the most strin-



Figure 8.12: Variation of synchrotron flux densities in Tucana II with (a) B, (b)  $D_0$  and (c)  $\gamma_D$ . We have considered 200 GeV  $m_{DM}$ ,  $b\bar{b}$  final state and NFW density profile. Besides, we have fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ ,  $B = 1 \,\mu\text{G}$ ,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .

gent constraints but our obtained limits strongly depend on the distribution of DM. Using the NFW profile, we have derived most of the results. Besides, we have also performed a comparative study between NFW, Burkert and ISO profiles. In view of gamma-ray analysis, the Burkert profile imposed the

strongest limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ , while the ISO imposed the weakest limits [255]. In view of synchrotron emission, we have considered the radio-flux limits observed by GMRT and VLA and have predicted the respective  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states. We have compared our obtained radio limits with the limits obtained from gamma-ray data and found that the VLA telescope has the potential to impose more stringent limits than Fermi-LAT.

We have derived the possible the synchrotron fluxes in UFDs for a wide range of frequencies, i.e., between 10 MHz to 100 GHz and compared these with the sensitivity curves of SKA. We find that for 200 GeV DM mass and bb final state, it might be possible for SKA to detect the radio emission from our considered UFDs, even with its 10 hours of sensitivity curve. For  $\tau^+\tau^$ and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states, the emission could be detected with the 100 hours of exposure curve of SKA. On the other side, for comparatively heavy DM masses, (say  $\sim 2$  TeV), the synchrotron spectrum would become harder, and thus a longer observation time would be necessary to detect the radio signal. We also need to remember that the synchrotron fluxes have strong dependences on several astrophysical components, such as magnetic field, diffusion coefficient, distance, etc. But, due to insufficient observation, the values are not very precise. Thus, in order to predict the synchrotron fluxes in UFDs, we must have the most accurate information of the astrophysical parameters, especially the magnetic field and the diffusion coefficient. We have checked how the synchrotron flux in Tucana II varies with B,  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$ for DM mass 200 GeV and  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel. We have noticed that synchrotron emission strongly depends on these. Besides, the emission is also controlled by the choice of DM density distribution in UFDs. We have found that for Tucana II, NFW density profile could produce the maximum amount of radio flux between all three density profiles. Our considered UFDs process a large uncertainties in  $r_{1/2}$ , d and  $\sigma$ . The uncertainties in these astrophysical parameters can also affect the synchrotron emission arising from UFDs. We have performed the respective checks and have found that the largest contribution is coming from the uncertainties in  $\sigma$ .

Despite the dependence on these uncertainties, we can safely conclude that a very intriguing aspect of indirect searching for DM signal from UFDs has been discussed in our study. In Fig. 8.13, we have compared the most stringent obtained from the VLA sky-survey with the best limits obtained from the Fermi-LAT data for three final states. From Fig. 8.13, we could notice that for  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final states, VLA imposes the better limits that Fermi-LAT, while for  $b\bar{b}$  final state Fermi-LAT provides the stronger limits that VLA [255].

In view of indirect DM search, we expect that the next-generation  $\gamma$ -ray



Figure 8.13: Comparison between the 95 % C.L.  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits obtained from the VLA and the Fermi-LAT data for three annihilation channels, such as:  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . For comparison, we have considered the strongest radio and gamma-ray limits from obtained from Draco and Horologium I, respectively. We have considered NFW profile and fixed the parameters at  $\langle \sigma v \rangle = 10^{-26}$ cm<sup>3</sup>/s ,  $B = 1 \,\mu$ G,  $D_0 = 3 \times 10^{28}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s,  $\gamma_D = 0.3$ .

telescope, CTA would play a very crucial role. CTA would have the deepest sensitivity for a very wide range of energies [279] and would be able to investigate the thermal  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  rate from several of DM rich targets. Along with the CTA, in radio sky, SKA is expected to become the most sensitive radio telescopes in the future. Besides, Low-Frequency Array (LOFAR) such as MeerKAT and ASKAP would also be complementary to the CTA and SKA.
## CHAPTER 8. SYNCHROTRON AND GAMMA-RAY RADIATION FROM FEW ULTRA FAINT DWARF GALAXIES

We can, at best, expect that all of these next-generation telescopes would be able to solve several crucial aspects of dark matter physics.

# CHAPTER 9

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

#### 9.1 Discussion and Concluding Remarks

Finally, in this concluding section, we want to wrap up the thesis. We have performed a detailed study on the indirect detection for DM signature that the aims to investigate the signal originating from the self-annihilation of DM candidates. The methods for targeting the DM signal is two-fold, on one hand, we explore the gamma rays resulting from DM particles. On the other hand, we focus on complementary radio properties. In the earlier chapters, we already summarized the outcomes of each work at the end of the chapter. In this following section, we briefly cover that again for the sake of completeness. Let us take a quick look back at what has been accomplished so far and what may be possible going forward.

In our work for Triangulum-II (Tri-II), we analysed nearly seven years of Fermi-LAT data but could not observe any  $\gamma$ -ray excess from its location. We then derived the upper limit of  $\gamma$ -ray flux for two possible scenarios, such as for  $\sigma_v = 4.2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $\sigma_v = 3.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . For  $\sigma_v = 4.2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , Tri-II constrain the mSUGRA and the MSSM models with low thermal relic densities, whereas the limits constrain the Kaluza-Klein DM in UED and the AMSB models for masses  $\leq 230$  GeV and  $\leq 375$  GeV, respectively. Even for  $\sigma_{\rm v} = 3.4 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$ , Tri-II can constrain the MSSM model with low thermal relic densities and the AMSB model for masses  $\lesssim$  300 GeV. Besides, from our work, we found that  $\gamma$ -ray data from Tri-II can even put stronger limits on the theoretical DM models than UMi. We would also like to point out that our results are entirely based on the standard NFW profile and we do not consider any effects of boost factor related to substructures in Tri-II or the Sommerfeld effect in accord to the annihilation cross-section. Finally, from our work, we can state that with more precise observations of Tri-II. in future we can establish Tri-II as a very strong DM candidate for indirect DM searching.

In case of Tucana-II (Tuc-II), we studied for a longer period of (nearly nine years) *Fermi*-LAT data to investigate the signatures of DM annihilation. Unlike the Tri-II, we detected a very faint  $\gamma$ -ray excess from the location of Tuc-II for both the power-law spectra and the  $\gamma$ -ray spectrum from DM annihilation. We checked the variation of the gamma-ray excess with DM mass and observed that for nine years of data, TS value of Tuc-II peaks at  $m_{DM} \sim 14$  GeV for 100%  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel, while for 100%  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , it peaks at  $m_{DM} \sim 4$  GeV. Apart from that, our study also confirmed the successive increase in TS peak values with increasing the time periods of data. This hints its association with any real signal either astrophysical or resulting from DM annihilation. We also produced a residual TS map for energy > 500 MeV (Fig 6.11). From the residual map, we can at best conclude that the nearby excess is associated with Tuc-II location and it indicates its connection with DM annihilation signal from our Tuc-II [186]. In the field of indirect DM detection, such hints of  $\gamma$ -ray emission from Tuc-II may open a new path in DM physics.

For Low Surface Brightness (LSB) galaxies, we studied for nearly nine years of LAT data but did not detect any emission from the location of LSB. With DMF tools, we estimated the  $\gamma$ -ray and  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for four annihilation channels. But because of their low J-factors, individual limits obtained from the LSB galaxies could not provide any stringent limits on the DM theoretical models. With the hope of increasing the LAT sensitivity, we then performed the joined likelihood on the set of four LSB galaxies. As expected, the stacking method improved the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  bounds by the factor of 4 than the individual limits obtained from LSB galaxies. But, the combined  $<\sigma v>$  were still around two orders of magnitude weaker than the  $<\sigma v>$ limits obtained from refs. Ackermann et al. [185] and Steigman et al. [219]. With the gamma-ray data for our chosen LSB galaxies, we could not particularly favour cored profile over the cuspy profile. The rotational curves for LSBs were in an agreement with the prediction from  $\lambda$ CDM and some study also indicated that the cuspy profile could also provide a reasonable fit to the DM distribution at the internal core. Thus, motivated by all the observational evidences, we modelled the DM distribution of LSB galaxies with the NFW profile. We also performed a comparative study between NFW, ISO and BURK DM density profiles (check Fig. 7.13) and find that the  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ limits for each density profiles were overlapping with other. Thus, from our study, we could not favour one profile between all three but for the median value of J-factor, the most stringent limits would come from the NFW profile.

For this study, we also studied the complementary radio flux upper limits for the indirect search of the DM signal. For radio analysis, we used the RX-DMFIT tool which is an extension of DMFIt package. We estimated the multiwavelength SED plots for LSB galaxies and observed how their SED varies with the parameter sets (check Figs. 7.8 & 7.9). We surveyed the NVSS all-sky data and searched for the radio flux density for all LSB galaxies. But only the location of UGC 11707 appeared as an excess and other thee LSBs provide the upper limits to the flux density. With the VLA flux density, we have tried to predict the radio  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits in parameter space of ( $\langle \sigma v \rangle, m_{DM}$ ) (check Fig. 7.10). When we considered the  $2\sigma$  uncertainty band associated with the radio limits, we noticed that the radio limits were overlapping with the limits obtained from stacking analysis for LAT data (check Fig. 7.11). Hence, from our analysis, we could, at best, comment that the radio data is competitive with the gamma-ray data. With more detailed observational data and precise analysis, in future, it might be possible for LSB galaxies to impose strong limits on DM models. We also checked whether with the next generation radio (SKA) and gamma-ray (CTA) telescopes, it would be possible to detect any emission from the location of LSB galaxies. We noticed (check 7.12) that SKA might be able to detect the emission from the location of LSB galaxies and its 1000 hours of observation would have the highest possibility to detect the emission from LSBs. But we would also like mention that in order to claim that SKA would detect the emission from DM annihilation, we first need to perform a simulation study. Besides, the estimated radio emission is also dependent on the various astrophysical scenario. We need to have a well-defined knowledge on the distribution of diffusion zone, magnetic fields, DM density profile, etc.. Hence, from our analysis, we could, at best, hint the possibility of observing the radio signal from LSB galaxies by SKA. We also found (Fig. 7.14) that for energy ranges between 100 GeV to 1 TeV, it might be possible for CTA to observe the  $\gamma$ -ray emission with the 50 hours of sensitivity curve. But like SKA, the same conclusion also holds for CTA. A simulation study is needed to examine whether it would be possible for CTA to detect the emission resulting from the DM annihilation/decay. From our work, we can ultimately conclude that the  $\gamma$ -ray data obtained from the Fermi-LAT could not impose the strong  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  limits on the WIMP models. We found that the radio signal possibly originated from WIMP annihilation is quite competitive with the  $\gamma$ -ray emission observed by the Fermi-LAT. Our analysis, at best, indicates that to study  $\gamma$ -ray and radio signal from the LSB galaxies, SKA and CTA would play a very significant role in future.

In our last chapter, we considered the newly discovered UFDs detected by the observations performed by Pan-STARRS, DES and some other spectral survey [255]. In recent times, several literatures tried to derive the strong limits on annihilation  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  from gamma-ray and radio data [132, 194, 275–278]. Using both the gamma-ray (detected by Fermi-LAT) and the radio data (detected by VLA and GMRT), we searched for the WIMP annihilation signal in 15 UFDs. We also predicted the possible spectra associated with the radio emission and checked whether it would be possible for SKA to detect any emission from them [255]. With eleven years of Fermi-LAT data, we did not detect any significant emission from the location of UFDs. Thus, we then derived the upper limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  as a function of DM mass for our chosen DM annihilation channels. We estimated the limits for 12 UFDs. Because, for Triangulum-II, Hydra-II and Tucana-III, we only have the upper limits on J-factor, so they could not provide any robust limits on the parameter space of  $(m_{DM}, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$  [255]. For gamma-ray data, Holorologium I provided the most stringent constraints but our obtained limits strongly depend on the distribution of DM. Using the NFW profile, we derived most of the results. Besides, we also performed a comparative study between NFW, Burkert and ISO profiles. In view of gamma-ray analysis, the Burkert profile imposed the strongest limits on  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ , while the ISO imposed the weakest limits [255].

In view of synchrotron emission, we considered the radio-flux limits observed by GMRT and VLA and predicted the respective  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  upper limits for bb,  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states. We compared our obtained radio limits with the limits obtained from gamma-ray data and found that the VLA telescope has the potential to impose more stringent limits than Fermi-LAT. We have derived the possible the synchrotron fluxes in UFDs for a wide range of frequencies, i.e., between 10 MHz to 100 GHz and compared these with the sensitivity curves of SKA. We found that for 200 GeV DM mass and  $b\bar{b}$  final state, it might be possible for SKA to detect the radio emission from our considered UFDs, even with its 10 hours of sensitivity curve. For  $\tau^+\tau^$ and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states, the emission could be detected with the 100 hours of exposure curve of SKA. On the other side, for comparatively heavy DM masses, (say  $\sim 2$  TeV), the synchrotron spectrum would become harder, and thus a longer observation time would be necessary to detect the radio signal. We also need to remember that the synchrotron fluxes have strong dependences on several astrophysical components, such as magnetic field, diffusion coefficient, distance, etc. But, due to insufficient observation, the values are not very precise. Thus, in order to predict the synchrotron fluxes in UFDs, we must have the most accurate information of the astrophysical parameters, especially the magnetic field and the diffusion coefficient. We checked how the synchrotron flux in Tucana-II varies with B,  $D_0$  and  $\gamma_D$  for DM mass 200 GeV and  $b\bar{b}$  annihilation channel. We noticed that synchrotron emission strongly depends on these. Besides, the emission is also controlled by the choice of DM density distribution in UFDs. We found that for Tucana II, NFW density profile could produce the maximum amount of radio flux between all three density profiles. Our considered UFDs process a large uncertainties in  $r_{1/2}$ , d and  $\sigma$ . The uncertainties in these astrophysical parameters can also affect the synchrotron emission arising from UFDs. We performed the respective checks and found that the largest contribution was coming from the uncertainties in  $\sigma$ .

Despite the dependence on these uncertainties, we can safely conclude that a

very intriguing aspect of indirect searching for DM signal from UFDs has been discussed in our study. In Fig. 8.13, we compared the most stringent obtained from the VLA sky-survey with the best limits obtained from the Fermi-LAT data for three final states. From Fig. 8.13, we could notice that for  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  final states, VLA imposed the better limits that Fermi-LAT, while for  $b\bar{b}$  final state Fermi-LAT provided the stronger limits that VLA [255]. In view of indirect DM search, we expect that the next-generation  $\gamma$ -ray telescope, CTA would play a very crucial role. CTA would have the deepest sensitivity for a very wide range of energies [279] and would be able to investigate the thermal  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  rate from several of DM rich targets. Along with the CTA, in radio sky, SKA is expected to become the most sensitive radio telescopes in the future. Besides, Low-Frequency Array (LOFAR) such as MeerKAT and ASKAP would also be complementary to the CTA and SKA. We can, at best, expect that all of these next-generation telescopes would be able to solve several crucial aspects of dark matter physics.

# CHAPTER 10

## APPENDIX

### A: T-TEST for Unequal Variance

T-TEST is the statistical hypothesis test that is generally applied to check whether any significant deviation lies between two populations [280–282]. When we specially deal with the small set of data, e.g.  $n_1$  or/and  $n_2 <$ 30, T-test is favoured [280–282]. The shape of the T-TEST distribution is very similar to the Gaussian distribution and for implying the T-TEST, the variables of each sample must be drawn from the Gaussian distribution. To obtain the output of T-TEST statistics, such as t-value and degree of

To obtain the output of T-TEST statistics, such as t-value and degree of freedom (d.o.f), we need to provide the values of mean, standard deviation and number of counts of each sample as inputs. This t-value is also defined as the test statistics value which is derived from the two-sample dataset at the time of performing the hypothesis test for T-TEST.

Depending on the standard deviation values from two samples, there are generally three types of T-TEST hypothesis check. For our analysis [186], (ref. Chapter 6), we have performed the T-TEST on two independent samples and they have the unequal variance. Thus, we have considered the T-TEST for the unequal variance which is also known as the Welch's T-TEST [200, 201]. The Welch's T-TEST is generally favoured when two samples have different values of variance and their sample size could be same or not. In that case, the formula for evaluating t-value and d.o.f are:

$$t - value = \frac{mean_1 - mean_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(var_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(var_2)^2}{n_2}}}$$
(10.1)

d.o.f. = 
$$\frac{\left(\frac{(\operatorname{var}_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(\operatorname{var}_2)^2}{n_2}\right)^2}{\frac{(\frac{\operatorname{var}_1^2}{n_1})^2}{n_1 - 1} + \frac{(\frac{\operatorname{var}_2^2}{n_2})^2}{n_2 - 1}},$$
(10.2)

where,

mean<sub>1</sub> and mean<sub>2</sub> are the mean values of sample<sub>1</sub> and sample<sub>2</sub>, respectively.  $var_1$  and  $var_2$  are the variance of sample<sub>1</sub> and sample<sub>2</sub>, respectively.  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are the number of counts in sample<sub>1</sub> and sample<sub>2</sub>, respectively.

Once we obtain the t-value, we can then derive the probability i.e., the p-value by following the two-tailed t-distribution curve. We also have to assign the significance level i.e.,  $\alpha$  and for our purpose, we have used the  $\alpha = 5\%$ . Now, from the p-value, we can determine whether our two samples agree

with the null-hypothesis. The p-value lies between 0 and 1. The small p-value i.e.,  $p \le 0.05$  indicates that we might reject the null-hypothesis, while the large p-value i.e., p > 0.05 hints that it might not be possible to reject the null-hypothesis.

For Fig. 6.3(b), we find that for both the full energy residual spectrum and the positive bump for energy above 500 MeV, we obtain the p-values > 0.05. This indicates that for both cases, we are not able to reject the null-hypothesis [186]. Thus, from our analysis, we can, at best, conclude that the DM annihilation spectra can provide an acceptable fit to the residual energy-spectrum of Tuc-II [186].

### **B:** Normality Test of Dataset

As we already have mentioned in the above section, we can only perform the T-TEST hypothesis test, if both the sample set follow the Gaussian distribution [280–282]. Thus, we have tried to check whether our sample data from Fig 6.3(b) follow the normal distribution [186]. To check the normality of the sample dataset, there are various statistical tests such as Kolmogorov–Smirnov test [283, 284], Shapiro–Wilk [285], normal quantile plot [286, 287],etc. For our analysis, we have generated the quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot. The Q-Q plot is the graphical representation that helps to check whether the dataset from two samples originate from the same population which follow a common distribution [286, 287].

In order to check the normality of the sample, this Q-Q plot shows the quantiles of our dataset versus the quantiles values of an ideal Gaussian distribution [286, 287]. The quantile values obtained the theoretical Gaussian distribution are plotted on the horizontal axis, while the quantile values obtained from our samples are plotted on the y-axis. If our sample dataset follows the Gaussian distribution, from Q-Q plot we should obtain a straight line which indicates the correlation between our sample data and the theoretical data from Gaussian distribution [286, 287]. In order to find the exact correlation between the paired dataset used for Q-Q plot, they are fitted with the regression equation (y=ax) and that fitting would return to the value of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ). Once we obtain the value of  $R^2$ , we can then calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient (r), i.e.,  $r=(R^2)^{1/2}=\mathbb{R}$  [288, 289]. Ideally, the value of r should lie between 0.9 to 1 which indicates the high correlation between our sample set and the Gaussian distribution [288, 289]. The r-value close to the 1 indicates that the sample set has very less deviation from the normality, while r-value close to the 0 denotes the large deviation from normality [288, 289].

It is true that no experimental dataset would have the r-value = 1 but for statistical hypothesis check, the dataset should roughly follow the Gaussian distributed i.e., r-value should be > 0.9. For our study (Chapter 6), we have produced the Q-Q plot and have evaluated the respective r-value for the dataset that we have considered for the T-TEST [186]. We find that the residual energy spectrum for both i) full energy range and ii) energy range > 500 MeV, produce a straight line in the Q-Q plots and their corresponding r-value lies > 0.94 [186]. Thus, from this test, we can find that our sample has some deviation from the normality but the r-value > 0.94 indicates that we can safely use our sample set for checking the T-TEST goodness of fitting [186].

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. Tegmark et al. The 3-D power spectrum of galaxies from the SDSS. Astrophys. J., 606:702-740, 2004.
- [2] J. H. Oort. The force exerted by the stellar system in the direction perpendicular to the galactic plane and some related problems.
- [3] F. Zwicky. Die Rotverschiebung von extragalaktischen Nebeln. Helv. Phys. Acta, 6:110–127, 1933.
- [4] F. Zwicky. On the Masses of Nebulae and of Clusters of Nebulae. Astrophys. J., 86:217–246, 1937.
- [5] C. José F, F. Fernando, and F. R. Manuel. A geometric approach to a generalized virial theorem,.
- [6] S. Smith. The Mass of the Virgo Cluster. Astrophys. J., 83:23–30, 1936.
- [7] V. C. Rubin and Jr. Ford, W. K. Rotation of the Andromeda Nebula from a Spectroscopic Survey of Emission Regions. Astrophys. J., 159:379–403, 1970.
- [8] K. C. Freeman. On the disks of spiral and SO Galaxies. Astrophys. J., 160:811, 1970.
- [9] J. Einasto, A. Kaasik, and E. Saar. Dynamic evidence on massive coronas of galaxies. *Nature*, 250:309–310, 1974.

- [10] J. P. Ostriker, P. J. E. Peebles, and A. Yahil. The size and mass of galaxies, and the mass of the universe. Astrophys. J. Lett., 193:L1–L4, 1974.
- [11] M. S. Roberts and R. N. Whitehurst. The rotation curve and geometry of M31 at large galactocentric distances. Astrophys. J., 201:327–346, 1975.
- [12] M. S. Roberts. The Rotation Curves of Galaxies. Symposium-International Astronomical Union, 69:331–340, 1975.
- [13] A. Bosma. The distribution and kinematics of neutral hydrogen in spiral galaxies of various morphological types. PhD thesis, Groningen University, 1978.
- [14] V. C. Rubin, Jr. Ford, W. K., and N. Thonnard. Extended rotation curves of high-luminosity spiral galaxies. IV. Systematic dynamical properties, Sa through Sc. Astrophys. J. Lett., 225:L107–L111, 1978.
- [15] V. C. Rubin, N. Thonnard, and Jr. Ford, W. K. Rotational properties of 21 SC galaxies with a large range of luminosities and radii, from NGC 4605 /R = 4kpc/ to UGC 2885 /R = 122 kpc/. Astrophys. J., 238:471, 1980.
- [16] V. C. Rubin. Dark Matter in Spiral Galaxies. Scientific American, 248:96–106, 1983.
- [17] K. G. Begeman, A. H. Broeils, and R. H. Sanders. Extended rotation curves of spiral galaxies: Dark haloes and modified dynamics. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 249:523, 1991.
- [18] R. Lynds and V. Petrosian. Luminous Arcs in Clusters of Galaxies. Astrophys. J., 336:1, 1989.
- [19] D. Walsh, R. F. Carswell, and R. J. Weymann. 0957 + 561 A, B Twin quasistellar objects or gravitational lens. *Nature*, 279:381–384, 1979.
- [20] D. Clowe, M. Bradac, A. H. Gonzalez, M. Markevitch, S. W. Randall, C. Jones, and D. Zaritsky. A direct empirical proof of the existence of dark matter. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 648:L109–L113, 2006.
- [21] G. Aad et al. Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716:1–29, 2012.

- [22] S. Chatrchyan et al. Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716:30–61, 2012.
- [23] D. N. Spergel et al. First year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) observations: Determination of cosmological parameters. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 148:175–194, 2003.
- [24] N. Jarosik et al. Seven-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Sky Maps, Systematic Errors, and Basic Results. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 192:14, 2011.
- [25] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest. Supersymmetric dark matter. *Phys. Rept.*, 267:195–373, 1996.
- [26] T. Falk, K. A. Olive, and M. Srednicki. Heavy sneutrinos as dark matter. *Phys. Lett. B*, 339:248–251, 1994.
- [27] L. J. Hall, T. Moroi, and H. Murayama. Sneutrino cold dark matter with lepton number violation. *Phys. Lett. B*, 424:305–312, 1998.
- [28] E. J. Chun, H. B. Kim, and J. E. Kim. Dark matters in axino gravitino cosmology. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 72:1956–1959, 1994.
- [29] S. Borgani, A. Masiero, and M. Yamaguchi. Light gravitinos as mixed dark matter. *Phys. Lett. B*, 386:189–197, 1996.
- [30] J. Silk. The Big Bang: Third Edition. Henry Holt and Company, 2000.
- [31] G. Steigman and M. S. Turner. Cosmological Constraints on the Properties of Weakly Interacting Massive Particles. Nucl. Phys. B, 253:375– 386, 1985.
- [32] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk. Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints. *Phys. Rept.*, 405:279–390, 2005.
- [33] P. Salati. Dark Matter Annihilation in the Universe. Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser., 30:1460256, 2014.
- [34] R. J. Gaitskell. Direct detection of dark matter. Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci., 54:315–359, 2004.
- [35] P. A. R. Ade et al. Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters. Astron. Astrophys., 594:A13, 2016.

- [36] A. U. Abeysekara et al. Sensitivity of HAWC to high-mass dark matter annihilations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 90(12):122002, 2014.
- [37] K. Nakamura et al. Review of particle physics. J. Phys. G, 37:075021, 2010.
- [38] M. W. Goodman and E. Witten. Detectability of Certain Dark Matter Candidates. *Phys. Rev. D*, 31:3059, 1985.
- [39] Z. Ahmed et al. Search for inelastic dark matter with the CDMS II experiment. *Phys. Rev. D*, 83:112002, 2011.
- [40] E. Aprile et al. Dark Matter Results from 225 Live Days of XENON100 Data. Phys. Rev. Lett., 109:181301, 2012.
- [41] E. A. Baltz, M. Battaglia, M. E. Peskin, and T. Wizansky. Determination of dark matter properties at high-energy colliders. *Phys. Rev.* D, 74:103521, 2006.
- [42] G. Aad et al. The ATLAS Experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider. JINST, 3:S08003, 2008.
- [43] S. Chatrchyan et al. The CMS Experiment at the CERN LHC. JINST, 3:S08004, 2008.
- [44] J. E. Gunn, B. W. Lee, I. Lerche, D. N. Schramm, and G. Steigman. Some Astrophysical Consequences of the Existence of a Heavy Stable Neutral Lepton. Astrophys. J., 223:1015–1031, 1978.
- [45] F. W. Stecker. The Cosmic Gamma-Ray Background from the Annihilation of Primordial Stable Neutral Heavy Leptons. Astrophys. J., 223:1032–1036, 1978.
- [46] L. Bergstrom and H. Snellman. Observable Monochromatic Photons From Cosmic Photino Annihilation. Phys. Rev. D, 37:3737–3741, 1988.
- [47] L. Bergstrom, P. Ullio, and J. H. Buckley. Observability of gammarays from dark matter neutralino annihilations in the Milky Way halo. *Astropart. Phys.*, 9:137–162, 1998.
- [48] G. Aad et al. Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716:1–29, 2012.

- [49] R. Bernabei et al. New results from DAMA/LIBRA. Eur. Phys. J. C, 67:39–49, 2010.
- [50] L. Bergstrom. Dark Matter Evidence, Particle Physics Candidates and Detection Methods. Annalen Phys., 524:479–496, 2012.
- [51] C. Weniger. A Tentative Gamma-Ray Line from Dark Matter Annihilation at the Fermi Large Area Telescope. JCAP, 08:007, 2012.
- [52] Carlotta P. et al. The Gamma-Ray Imaging Detector AGILE: Scientific Goals and Instrument Performance. *Chinese Journal of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 3(S1):517–522, dec 2003.
- [53] A. M. Galper et al. Status of the GAMMA-400 Project. Adv. Space Res., 51:297–300, 2013.
- [54] J. Aleksic et al. Performance of the MAGIC stereo system obtained with Crab Nebula data. Astropart. Phys., 35:435–448, 2012.
- [55] F. Aharonian et al. Observations of the Crab Nebula with H.E.S.S. Astron. Astrophys., 457:899–915, 2006.
- [56] M. Actis et al. Design concepts for the Cherenkov Telescope Array CTA: An advanced facility for ground-based high-energy gamma-ray astronomy. *Exper. Astron.*, 32:193–316, 2011.
- [57] O. Adriani et al. A new measurement of the antiproton-to-proton flux ratio up to 100 GeV in the cosmic radiation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:051101, 2009.
- [58] O. Adriani et al. An anomalous positron abundance in cosmic rays with energies 1.5-100 GeV. *Nature*, 458:607–609, 2009.
- [59] L. Bergstrom, J. Edsjo, and G. Zaharijas. Dark matter interpretation of recent electron and positron data. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 103:031103, 2009.
- [60] D. Malyshev, I. Cholis, and J. Gelfand. Pulsars versus Dark Matter Interpretation of ATIC/PAMELA. Phys. Rev. D, 80:063005, 2009.
- [61] L. Accardo et al. High Statistics Measurement of the Positron Fraction in Primary Cosmic Rays of 0.5–500 GeV with the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer on the International Space Station. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 113:121101, 2014.

- [62] A. A. Abdo et al. Measurement of the Cosmic Ray e+ plus e- spectrum from 20 GeV to 1 TeV with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:181101, 2009.
- [63] M. Ackermann et al. Measurement of separate cosmic-ray electron and positron spectra with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:011103, 2012.
- [64] A. Achterberg et al. First Year Performance of The IceCube Neutrino Telescope. Astropart. Phys., 26:155–173, 2006.
- [65] M. Ageron et al. ANTARES: the first undersea neutrino telescope. Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A, 656:11–38, 2011.
- [66] M. G. Aartsen et al. Search for dark matter annihilations in the Sun with the 79-string IceCube detector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110(13):131302, 2013.
- [67] M. G. Aartsen et al. IceCube Search for Dark Matter Annihilation in nearby Galaxies and Galaxy Clusters. *Phys. Rev. D*, 88:122001, 2013.
- [68] M. G. Aartsen et al. Multipole analysis of IceCube data to search for dark matter accumulated in the Galactic halo. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 75(99):20, 2015.
- [69] R. Abbasi et al. Search for Neutrinos from Annihilating Dark Matter in the Direction of the Galactic Center with the 40-String IceCube Neutrino Observatory. 10 2012.
- [70] D. Abercrombie et al. Dark Matter Benchmark Models for Early LHC Run-2 Searches: Report of the ATLAS/CMS Dark Matter Forum. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 27:100371, 2020.
- [71] C. Weniger. Gamma-ray lines in the Fermi-LAT data? In 4th International Fermi Symposium, 3 2013.
- [72] M. Ackermann et al. Fermi LAT Search for Dark Matter in Gamma-ray Lines and the Inclusive Photon Spectrum. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:022002, 2012.
- [73] M. Ackermann et al. Search for Gamma-ray Spectral Lines with the Fermi Large Area Telescope and Dark Matter Implications. *Phys. Rev.* D, 88:082002, 2013.

- [74] M. Ackermann et al. Constraints on the Galactic Halo Dark Matter from Fermi-LAT Diffuse Measurements. Astrophys. J., 761:91, 2012.
- [75] M. Ackermann et al. Limits on Dark Matter Annihilation Signals from the Fermi LAT 4-year Measurement of the Isotropic Gamma-Ray Background. JCAP, 09:008, 2015.
- [76] J. Conrad, J. Cohen-Tanugi, and L. E. Strigari. WIMP searches with gamma rays in the Fermi era: challenges, methods and results. J. Exp. Theor. Phys., 121(6):1104–1135, 2015.
- [77] M. Ackermann et al. Search for cosmic-ray induced gamma-ray emission in Galaxy Clusters. Astrophys. J., 787:18, 2014.
- [78] A. Pinzke, C. Pfrommer, and L. Bergstrom. Prospects of detecting gamma-ray emission from galaxy clusters: cosmic rays and dark matter annihilations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 84:123509, 2011.
- [79] C. Impey and G. Bothun. Low surface brightness galaxies. Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys., 35:267–307, 1997.
- [80] W. J. G. de Blok, S. S. McGaugh, and J. M. van der Hulst. Hi observations of low surface brightness galaxies: probing low density galaxies. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 283:18–54, 1996.
- [81] V. Burkholder, C. Impey, and D. Sprayberry. High and Low Surface Brightness Galaxies in the Local Universe. V. Optical and H I Properties. Astron. J., 122:2318–2340, 2001.
- [82] K. O'Neil, G. Bothun, W. van Driel, and D. Monnier Ragaigne. A New HI catalog of low surface brightness galaxies out to z = 0.1: Tripling the number of massive LSB galaxies known. Astron. Astrophys., 428:823– 835, 2004.
- [83] W. Du, H. Wu, M. I. Lam, Y. Zhu, F. Lei, and Z. Zhou. Low Surface Brightness Galaxies Selected from the 40% Sky Area of the ALFALFA H I Survey. I. Sample and Statistical Properties. Astron. J., 149:199, 2015.
- [84] W. J. G. de Blok and S. S. McGaugh. The Dark and visible matter content of low surface brightness disk galaxies. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 290:533–552, 1997.

- [85] M. Honey, W. van Driel, M. Das, and J. M. Martin. A study of the H I and optical properties of Low Surface Brightness galaxies: spirals, dwarfs, and irregulars. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 476:4488–4500, 2018.
- [86] F. C. van den Bosch and R. A. Swaters. Dwarf galaxy rotation curves and the core problem of dark matter halos. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 325:1017, 2001.
- [87] A. A. Abdo et al. Observations of Milky Way Dwarf Spheroidal galaxies with the Fermi-LAT detector and constraints on Dark Matter models. *Astrophys. J.*, 712:147–158, 2010.
- [88] J. Diemand, B. Moore, and J. Stadel. Earth-mass dark-matter haloes as the first structures in the early Universe. *Nature*, 433:389–391, 2005.
- [89] M. Kuhlen, J. Diemand, P. Madau, and M. Zemp. The Via Lactea INCITE Simulation: Galactic Dark Matter Substructure at High Resolution. J. Phys. Conf. Ser., 125:012008, 2008.
- [90] V. Springel et al. Simulating the joint evolution of quasars, galaxies and their large-scale distribution. *Nature*, 435:629–636, 2005.
- [91] M. Kuhlen. The Dark Matter Annihilation Signal from Dwarf Galaxies and Subhalos. Adv. Astron., 2010:162083, 2010.
- [92] A. Drlica-Wagner. Searching for dwarf spheroidal galaxies and other galactic dark matter substructures with the Fermi large area telescope. Phd thesis, SLAC National Accelerator Lab., United States, 2013.
- [93] M. Mateo. Dwarf galaxies of the Local Group. Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys., 36:435–506, 1998.
- [94] J. Grcevich and M. E Putman. HI in Local Group Dwarf Galaxies and Stripping by the Galactic Halo. Astrophys. J., 696:385–395, 2009. [Erratum: Astrophys.J. 721, 922 (2010)].
- [95] N. Kaiser et al. Pan-STARRS: A Large Synoptic Survey Telescope Array. Proc. SPIE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng., 4836:154–164, 2002.
- [96] B. P.M. Laevens et al. Sagittarius II, Draco II and Laevens 3: Three new Milky way Satellites Discovered in the Pan-starrs 1  $3\pi$  Survey. *Astrophys. J.*, 813(1):44, 2015.

- [97] B. P. M. Laevens et al. A New Faint Milky Way Satellite Discovered in the Pan-STARRS1 3 pi Survey. Astrophys. J. Lett., 802:L18, 2015.
- [98] D. G. York et al. The Sloan Digital Sky Survey: Technical Summary. Astron. J., 120:1579–1587, 2000.
- [99] V. Belokurov et al. Big fish, small fish: Two New Ultra-Faint Satellites of the Milky Way. Astrophys. J. Lett., 712:L103, 2010.
- [100] T. Abbott et al. The dark energy survey. arXiv e-prints, pages astroph/0510346, 2005.
- [101] K. Bechtol et al. Eight New Milky Way Companions Discovered in First-Year Dark Energy Survey Data. Astrophys. J., 807(1):50, 2015.
- [102] S. E. Koposov, V. Belokurov, G. Torrealba, and N. W. Evans. Beasts of the Southern Wild: Discovery of nine Ultra Faint satellites in the vicinity of the Magellanic Clouds. *Astrophys. J.*, 805(2):130, 2015.
- [103] D. Kim and H. Jerjen. Horologium II: a Second Ultra-faint Milky Way Satellite in the Horologium Constellation. Astrophys. J. Lett., 808:L39, 2015.
- [104] D. Kim, H. Jerjen, D. Mackey, G. S. Da Costa, and A. P. Milone. A Hero's Dark Horse: Discovery of an Ultra-faint Milky way Satellite in Pegasus. Astrophys. J. Lett., 804(2):L44, 2015.
- [105] N. F. Martin et al. Hydra II: a faint and compact Milky Way dwarf galaxy found in the Survey of the Magellanic Stellar History. Astrophys. J. Lett., 804(1):L5, 2015.
- [106] E. K. Grebel, J. S. Gallagher, and D. Harbeck. The progenitors of dwarf spheroidal galaxies. Astron. J., 125:1926, 2003.
- [107] N. W. Evans, F. Ferrer, and S. Sarkar. A 'Baedecker' for the dark matter annihilation signal. *Phys. Rev. D*, 69:123501, 2004.
- [108] V. Bonnivard et al. Dark matter annihilation and decay in dwarf spheroidal galaxies: The classical and ultrafaint dSphs. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 453(1):849–867, 2015.
- [109] A. Koch, S. Lepine, and S. Caliskan. The puzzling assembly of the Milky Way halo - contributions from dwarf Spheroidals and globular clusters. *EPJ Web Conf.*, 19:3002, 2012.

- [110] J. D. Simon and M. Geha. The Kinematics of the Ultra-Faint Milky Way Satellites: Solving the Missing Satellite Problem. Astrophys. J., 670:313–331, 2007.
- [111] E. N. Kirby, J. G. Cohen, P. Guhathakurta, L. Cheng, J. S. Bullock, and A. Gallazzi. The Universal Stellar Mass-Stellar Metallicity Relation for Dwarf Galaxies. *Astrophys. J.*, 779:102, 2013.
- [112] J. E. Norris, G. Gilmore, R. F. G. Wyse, D. Yong, and A. Frebel. An Extremely Carbon-rich, Extremely Metal-poor Star in the Segue 1 System. Astrophys. J. Lett., 722:L104, 2010.
- [113] V. Belokurov. Galactic Archaeology. The dwarfs that survived and perished. New Astron. Rev., 57:100–121, 2013.
- [114] T. K. Starkenburg and A. Helmi. Dark influences: imprints of dark satellites on dwarf galaxies. Astron. Astrophys., 575:A59, 2015.
- [115] D. Kim. Search for Ultra-faint Milky Way Satellites. PhD thesis, Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics, The Australian National University, 2017.
- [116] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White. A Universal density profile from hierarchical clustering. Astrophys. J., 490:493–508, 1997.
- [117] A. Burkert. The Structure of dark matter halos in dwarf galaxies. IAU Symp., 171:175, 1996.
- [118] J. E. Gunn and III Gott, J. R. On the Infall of Matter into Clusters of Galaxies and Some Effects on Their Evolution. Astrophys. J., 176:1–19, 1972.
- [119] J. Einasto. On the Construction of a Composite Model for the Galaxy and on the Determination of the System of Galactic Parameters. *Trudy Astrofizicheskogo Instituta Alma-Ata*, 5:87–100, 1965.
- [120] W. J. G. de Blok. The Core-Cusp Problem. Adv. Astron., 2010:789293, 2010.
- [121] T. E. Jeltema and S. Profumo. Fitting the Gamma-Ray Spectrum from Dark Matter with DMFIT: GLAST and the Galactic Center Region. *JCAP*, 11:003, 2008.

- [122] P. Gondolo, J. Edsjo, P. Ullio, L. Bergstrom, M. Schelke, and E. A. Baltz. DarkSUSY: Computing supersymmetric dark matter properties numerically. *JCAP*, 07:008, 2004.
- [123] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands. A Brief Introduction to PYTHIA 8.1. Comput. Phys. Commun., 178:852–867, 2008.
- [124] N. W. Evans, J. L. Sanders, and A. Geringer-Sameth. Simple J-Factors and D-Factors for Indirect Dark Matter Detection. *Phys. Rev. D*, 93(10):103512, 2016.
- [125] J. Binney and S. Tremaine. *Galactic dynamics*. Princeton University Press, 1987.
- [126] M. Ackermann et al. The Fermi Large Area Telescope On Orbit: Event Classification, Instrument Response Functions, and Calibration. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 203:4, 2012.
- [127] A. W. Strong, I. V. Moskalenko, and V. S. Ptuskin. Cosmic-ray propagation and interactions in the Galaxy. Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci., 57:285–327, 2007.
- [128] P. L. Nolan et al. Fermi Large Area Telescope Second Source Catalog. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 199(2):31, 2012.
- [129] F. Acero et al. Fermi Large Area Telescope Third Source Catalog. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 218(2):23, 2015.
- [130] S. Abdollahi et al. *Fermi* Large Area Telescope Fourth Source Catalog. *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 247(1):33, 2020.
- [131] A. A. Abdo et al. Fermi Large Area Telescope First Source Catalog. Astrophys. J. Suppl., 188:405–436, 2010.
- [132] M. Regis, L. Richter, and S. Colafrancesco. Dark matter in the Reticulum II dSph: a radio search. JCAP, 07:025, 2017.
- [133] T. E. Jeltema and S. Profumo. Searching for Dark Matter with X-ray Observations of Local Dwarf Galaxies. Astrophys. J., 686:1045, 2008.
- [134] V. L. Ginzburg. The origin of cosmic rays. In Summer School of Theoretical Physics: High energy astrophysics, pages 289–330, 1967.
- [135] M. S. Longair. Introduction to high energy astrophysics. Frascati Phys. Ser., 24:3–48, 2002.

- [136] S. Colafrancesco, S. Profumo, and P. Ullio. Multi-frequency analysis of neutralino dark matter annihilations in the Coma cluster. Astron. Astrophys., 455:21, 2006.
- [137] S. Colafrancesco, S. Profumo, and P. Ullio. Detecting dark matter WIMPs in the Draco dwarf: A multi-wavelength perspective. *Phys. Rev. D*, 75:023513, 2007.
- [138] A. McDaniel, T. Jeltema, S. Profumo, and E. Storm. Multiwavelength Analysis of Dark Matter Annihilation and RX-DMFIT. JCAP, 09:027, 2017.
- [139] E. Storm, T. E. Jeltema, M. Splettstoesser, and S. Profumo. Synchrotron Emission from Dark Matter Annihilation: Predictions for Constraints from Non-detections of Galaxy Clusters with New Radio Surveys. Astrophys. J., 839(1):33, 2017.
- [140] T. E. Jeltema and S. Profumo. Dark Matter Detection with Hard X-ray Telescopes. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 421:1215, 2012.
- [141] J. Silk et al. Particle Dark Matter: Observations, Models and Searches. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [142] W. B. Atwood et al. The Large Area Telescope on the Fermi Gammaray Space Telescope Mission. Astrophys. J., 697:1071–1102, 2009.
- [143] A. A. Moiseev, R. C. Hartman, J. F. Ormes, D. J. Thompson, M. J. Amato, T. E. Johnson, K. N. Segal, and D. A. Sheppard. The Anti-Coincidence Detector for the GLAST Large Area Telescope. Astropart. Phys., 27:339–358, 2007.
- [144] W. B. Atwood et al. Design and Initial Tests of the Tracker-Converter of the Gamma-ray Large Area Space Telescope. Astropart. Phys., 28:422– 434, 2007.
- [145] P. Bruel. Gamma rays, electrons and positrons up to 3 TeV with the Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope. J. Phys. Conf. Ser., 404:012033, 2012.
- [146] M. S. Bartlett. Approximate Confidence Intervals.II. More than one Unknown Parameter. *Biometrika*, 40:306–317, 1953.
- [147] J. Neyman and E. S. Pearson. On the Problem of the Most Efficient Tests of Statistical Hypotheses. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond.* A, 231(694-706):289–337, 1933.

- [148] S. S. Wilks. The Large-Sample Distribution of the Likelihood Ratio for Testing Composite Hypotheses. Annals Math. Statist., 9(1):60–62, 1938.
- [149] H. Chernoff. On the Distribution of the Likelihood Ratio. Ann. Math. Stat., 25:573–578, 1954.
- [150] J. Neyman. Outline of a Theory of Statistical Estimation Based on the Classical Theory of Probability. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 236(767):333–380, 1937.
- [151] O. Helene. Determination of the upper limit of a peak area. Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A, 300:132–136, 1991.
- [152] G. J. Feldman and R. D. Cousins. A Unified approach to the classical statistical analysis of small signals. *Phys. Rev. D*, 57:3873–3889, 1998.
- [153] B. P. Roe and M. B. Woodroofe. Improved probability method for estimating signal in the presence of background. *Phys. Rev. D*, 60:053009, 1999.
- [154] W. A. Rolke, A. M. Lopez, and J. Conrad. Limits and confidence intervals in the presence of nuisance parameters. *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* A, 551:493–503, 2005.
- [155] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, and C. A. Savoy. Gauge Models with Spontaneously Broken Local Supersymmetry. *Phys. Lett. B*, 119:343, 1982.
- [156] R. L. Wasserstein and N. A. Lazar. The asa statement on p-values: Context, process, and purpose. Am. Stat., 70(2):29–133, 2016.
- [157] B. Willman, M. R. Blanton, A. A. West, J. J. Dalcanton, D. W. Hogg, D. P. Schneider, N. Wherry, B. Yanny, and J. Brinkmann. A New Milky Way companion: Unusual globular cluster or extreme dwarf satellite? *Astron. J.*, 129:2692–2700, 2005.
- [158] D. B. Zucker et al. A Curious New Milky Way Satellite in Ursa Major. Astrophys. J. Lett., 650:L41–L44, 2006.
- [159] V. Belokurov et al. Cats and Dogs, Hair and A Hero: A Quintet of New Milky Way Companions. Astrophys. J., 654:897–906, 2007.
- [160] M. J. Irwin et al. Discovery of an Unusual Dwarf Galaxy in the Outskirts of the Milky Way. Astrophys. J. Lett., 656:L13–L16, 2007.

- [161] S. M. Walsh, H. Jerjen, and B. Willman. A Pair of Bootes: A New Milky Way Satellite. Astrophys. J. Lett., 662:L83–L86, 2007.
- [162] L. E. Strigari, S. M. Koushiappas, J. S. Bullock, M. Kaplinghat, J. D. Simon, M. Geha, and B. Willman. The Most Dark Matter Dominated Galaxies: Predicted Gamma-ray Signals from the Faintest Milky Way Dwarfs. Astrophys. J., 678:614, 2008.
- [163] A. Drlica-Wagner et al. Eight Ultra-faint Galaxy Candidates Discovered in Year Two of the Dark Energy Survey. Astrophys. J., 813(2):109, 2015.
- [164] S. Biswas, P. Bhattacharjee, P. Majumdar, S. Das, M. Das, and P. S. Joarder. Constraints on dark matter models from the observation of Triangulum-II with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. JCAP, 11:003, 2017.
- [165] A. Genina and M. Fairbairn. The Potential of the Dwarf Galaxy Triangulum II for Dark Matter Indirect Detection. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 463(4):3630–3636, 2016.
- [166] K. Hayashi, K. Ichikawa, S. Matsumoto, M. Ibe, M. N. Ishigaki, and H. Sugai. Dark matter annihilation and decay from non-spherical dark halos in galactic dwarf satellites. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 461(3):2914–2928, 2016.
- [167] E. N. Kirby, J. G. Cohen, J. D. Simon, and P. Guhathakurta. Triangulum II: Possibly a Very Dense Ultra-faint Dwarf Galaxy. Astrophys. J. Lett., 814(1):L7, 2015.
- [168] E. N. Kirby, J. G. Cohen, J. D. Simon, P. Guhathakurta, A. O. Thygesen, and G. E. Duggan. Triangulum II. Not Especially Dense After All. *Astrophys. J.*, 838(2):83, 2017.
- [169] N. F.and others Martin. Triangulum II: A Very Metal-poor and Dynamically Hot Stellar System. Astrophys. J., 818(1):40, 2016.
- [170] S. R. Majewski, J. C. Ostheimer, H. J. Rocha-Pinto, R. J. Patterson, P. Guhathakurta, and D. Reitzel. Detection of the main sequence turnoff of a newly discovered Milky Way halo structure in the Triangulum-Andromeda region. Astrophys. J., 615:738–743, 2004.
- [171] N. F. Martin et al. The PAndAS Field of Streams: stellar structures in the Milky Way halo toward Andromeda and Triangulum. Astrophys. J., 787:19, 2014.

- [172] W. Cash. Parameter estimation in astronomy through application of the likelihood ratio. Astrophys. J., 228:939–947, 1979.
- [173] J. R. Mattox et al. The Likelihood Analysis of EGRET Data. Astrophys. J., 461:396, 1996.
- [174] R. Essig, N. Sehgal, and L. E. Strigari. Bounds on Cross-sections and Lifetimes for Dark Matter Annihilation and Decay into Charged Leptons from Gamma-ray Observations of Dwarf Galaxies. *Phys. Rev.* D, 80:023506, 2009.
- [175] G. D. Martinez, J. S. Bullock, M. Kaplinghat, L. E. Strigari, and R. Trotta. Indirect Dark Matter Detection from Dwarf Satellites: Joint Expectations from Astrophysics and Supersymmetry. *JCAP*, 06:014, 2009.
- [176] N. Arkani-Hamed, D. P. Finkbeiner, T. R. Slatyer, and N. Weiner. A Theory of Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 79:015014, 2009.
- [177] J. L. Feng, M. Kaplinghat, and H. Yu. Sommerfeld Enhancements for Thermal Relic Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 82:083525, 2010.
- [178] P. D. Serpico and D. Hooper. Gamma-rays from Dark Matter Annihilation in the Central Region of the Galaxy. New J. Phys., 11:105010, 2009.
- [179] A. H. Chamseddine, R. L. Arnowitt, and P. Nath. Locally Supersymmetric Grand Unification. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 49:970, 1982.
- [180] D. J. H. Chung, L. L. Everett, G. L. Kane, S. F. King, J. D. Lykken, and L. Wang. The Soft supersymmetry breaking Lagrangian: Theory and applications. *Phys. Rept.*, 407:1–203, 2005.
- [181] G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama, and R. Rattazzi. Gaugino mass without singlets. *JHEP*, 12:027, 1998.
- [182] H. Cheng, J. L. Feng, and K. T. Matchev. Kaluza-Klein dark matter. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 89:211301, 2002.
- [183] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait. Is the lightest Kaluza-Klein particle a viable dark matter candidate? *Nucl. Phys. B*, 650:391–419, 2003.
- [184] D. Hooper and S. Profumo. Dark Matter and Collider Phenomenology of Universal Extra Dimensions. *Phys. Rept.*, 453:29–115, 2007.

- [185] M. Ackermann et al. Searching for Dark Matter Annihilation from Milky Way Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies with Six Years of Fermi Large Area Telescope Data. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115(23):231301, 2015.
- [186] P. Bhattacharjee, P. Majumdar, S. Biswas, and P. S. Joarder. Analysis of Fermi-LAT data from Tucana-II: Possible constraints on the Dark Matter models with an intriguing hint of a signal. *JCAP*, 08:028, 2019.
- [187] M. G. Walker et al. Magellan/M2FS spectroscopy of Tucana 2 and Grus 1. Astrophys. J., 819(1):53, 2016.
- [188] G Gilmore, M Wilkinson, J Kleyna, A Koch, N. W. Evans, R. F. G. Wyse, and E. K. Grebel. Observed Properties of Dark Matter: Dynamical studies of dSph galaxies. *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.*, 173:15–18, 2007.
- [189] V. Straizys. Reddening-free energy distribution curves and the classification of stars. Astron. Astrophys., 36:435–440, 1974.
- [190] J. S. Gallagher, G. J. Madsen, R. J. Reynolds, E. K. Grebel, and T. A. Smecker-Hane. A search for ionized gas in the Draco and Ursa Minor dwarf spheroidal galaxies. *Astrophys. J.*, 588:326–330, 2003.
- [191] A. P. Ji, A. Frebel, R. Ezzeddine, and A. R. Casey. Chemical Diversity in the Ultra-faint Dwarf Galaxy Tucana II. Astrophys. J. Lett., 832(1):L3, 2016.
- [192] A. Drlica-Wagner et al. Search for Gamma-Ray Emission from DES Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxy Candidates with Fermi-LAT Data. Astrophys. J. Lett., 809(1):L4, 2015.
- [193] D. Hooper and T. Linden. On The Gamma-Ray Emission From Reticulum II and Other Dwarf Galaxies. JCAP, 09:016, 2015.
- [194] A. Albert et al. Searching for Dark Matter Annihilation in Recently Discovered Milky Way Satellites with Fermi-LAT. Astrophys. J., 834(2):110, 2017.
- [195] F. Calore, P. D. Serpico, and B. Zaldivar. Dark matter constraints from dwarf galaxies: a data-driven analysis. JCAP, 10:029, 2018.
- [196] N. F. Martin, J. T. A. de Jong, and H. Rix. A comprehensive Maximum Likelihood analysis of the structural properties of faint Milky Way satellites. Astrophys. J., 684:1075–1092, 2008.

- [197] R. R. Munoz, M. Geha, and B. Willman. Turning the Tides on the Ultra-Faint Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies: Coma Berenices and Ursa Major II. Astron. J., 140:138, 2010.
- [198] M. Mateo et al. M2FS: the Michigan/Magellan Fiber System. In Ian S. McLean, Suzanne K. Ramsay, and Hideki Takami, editors, Groundbased and Airborne Instrumentation for Astronomy IV, volume 8446 of Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, page 84464Y, 2012.
- [199] A. Chiti, A. Frebel, A. P. Ji, H. Jerjen, D. Kim, and J. E. Norris. Chemical Abundances of New Member Stars in the Tucana II Dwarf Galaxy. *Astrophys. J.*, 857(1):74, 2018.
- [200] B. L. Welch. The Generalization of 'STUDENT'S' problem when several different population variances are involved. *Biometrika*, 34(1– 2):28–35, 1947.
- [201] G. D. Ruxton. The unequal variance t-test is an underused alternative to Student's t-test and the Mann–Whitney U test. Behav. Ecol., 17(4):688–690, 2006.
- [202] E. Carlson, D. Hooper, and T. Linden. Improving the Sensitivity of Gamma-Ray Telescopes to Dark Matter Annihilation in Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(6):061302, 2015.
- [203] Y. Inoue. Contribution of the Gamma-ray Loud Radio Galaxies Core Emissions to the Cosmic MeV and GeV Gamma-Ray Background Radiation. Astrophys. J., 733:66, 2011.
- [204] The Fermi-LAT high-latitude Survey: Source Count Distributions and the Origin of the Extragalactic Diffuse Background. Astrophys. J., 720:435–453, 2010.
- [205] M. Ackermann et al. GeV Observations of Star-forming Galaxies with Fermi LAT. Astrophys. J., 755:164, 2012.
- [206] T. Linden. Star-Forming Galaxies Significantly Contribute to the Isotropic Gamma-Ray Background. Phys. Rev. D, 96(8):083001, 2017.
- [207] D. Hooper, I. Cholis, T. Linden, J. Siegal-Gaskins, and T. Slatyer. Pulsars Cannot Account for the Inner Galaxy's GeV Excess. *Phys. Rev. D*, 88:083009, 2013.

- [208] M. Ackermann et al. Anisotropies in the diffuse gamma-ray background measured by the Fermi LAT. Phys. Rev. D, 85:083007, 2012.
- [209] K. N. Abazajian, S. Blanchet, and J. P. Harding. The Contribution of Blazars to the Extragalactic Diffuse Gamma-ray Background and Their Future Spatial Resolution. *Phys. Rev. D*, 84:103007, 2011.
- [210] T. M. Venters. Contribution to the Extragalactic Gamma-ray Background from the Cascades of Very-high Energy Gamma Rays from Blazars. Astrophys. J., 710:1530–1540, 2010.
- [211] T. M. Venters and V. Pavlidou. The Effect of Blazar Spectral Breaks on the Blazar Contribution to the Extragalactic Gamma-ray Background. *Astrophys. J.*, 737:80, 2011.
- [212] A. Cuoco, E. Komatsu, and J. M. Siegal-Gaskins. Joint anisotropy and source count constraints on the contribution of blazars to the diffuse gamma-ray background. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:063004, 2012.
- [213] J. P. Harding and K. N. Abazajian. Models of the Contribution of Blazars to the Anisotropy of the Extragalactic Diffuse Gamma-ray Background. JCAP, 11:026, 2012.
- [214] S. E. Healey, R. W. Romani, G. B. Taylor, E. M. Sadler, R. Ricci, T. Murphy, J. S. Ulvestad, and J. N. Winn. CRATES: An All-Sky Survey of Flat-Spectrum Radio Sources. *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 171:61– 71, 2007.
- [215] E. Massaro, P. Giommi, C. Leto, P. Marchegiani, A. Maselli, M. Perri, S. Piranomonte, and S. Sclavi. Roma-BZCAT: A multifrequency catalogue of Blazars. Astron. Astrophys., 495:691, 2009.
- [216] S. K. Lee, S. Ando, and M. Kamionkowski. The Gamma-Ray-Flux Probability Distribution Function from Galactic Halo Substructure. *JCAP*, 07:007, 2009.
- [217] J. M. Siegal-Gaskins and V. Pavlidou. Robust identification of isotropic diffuse gamma rays from Galactic dark matter. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:241301, 2009.
- [218] M. Ackermann et al. Dark Matter Constraints from Observations of 25 Milky Way Satellite Galaxies with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89:042001, 2014.

- [219] G. Steigman, B. Dasgupta, and J. F. Beacom. Precise Relic WIMP Abundance and its Impact on Searches for Dark Matter Annihilation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:023506, 2012.
- [220] A. Abramowski et al. Search for dark matter annihilation signatures in H.E.S.S. observations of Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies. *Phys. Rev. D*, 90:112012, 2014.
- [221] M. L. Proper, J. P. Harding, and B. Dingus. First Limits on the Dark Matter Cross Section with the HAWC Observatory. *PoS*, ICRC2015:1213, 2016.
- [222] S. Archambault et al. Dark Matter Constraints from a Joint Analysis of Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxy Observations with VERITAS. *Phys. Rev.* D, 95(8):082001, 2017.
- [223] M. L. Ahnen et al. Limits to Dark Matter Annihilation Cross-Section from a Combined Analysis of MAGIC and Fermi-LAT Observations of Dwarf Satellite Galaxies. JCAP, 02:039, 2016.
- [224] C. Gordon and O. Macias. Dark Matter and Pulsar Model Constraints from Galactic Center Fermi-LAT Gamma Ray Observations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 88(8):083521, 2013. [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 89, 049901 (2014)].
- [225] D. Hooper and T. R. Slatyer. Two Emission Mechanisms in the Fermi Bubbles: A Possible Signal of Annihilating Dark Matter. *Phys. Dark* Univ., 2:118–138, 2013.
- [226] T. Daylan, D. P. Finkbeiner, D. Hooper, T. Linden, S. K. N. Portillo, N. L. Rodd, and T. R. Slatyer. The characterization of the gammaray signal from the central Milky Way: A case for annihilating dark matter. *Phys. Dark Univ.*, 12:1–23, 2016.
- [227] B. Zhou, Y. Liang, X. Huang, X. Li, Y. Fan, L. Feng, and J. Chang. GeV excess in the Milky Way: The role of diffuse galactic gamma-ray emission templates. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(12):123010, 2015.
- [228] F. Calore, I. Cholis, and C. Weniger. Background Model Systematics for the Fermi GeV Excess. JCAP, 03:038, 2015.
- [229] E. Charles et al. Sensitivity Projections for Dark Matter Searches with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rept.*, 636:1–46, 2016.

- [230] P. Bhattacharjee, P. Majumdar, M. Das, S. Das, P. S. Joarder, and S. Biswas. Multiwavelength analysis of low surface brightness galaxies to study possible dark matter signature. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 501(3):4238–4254, 2021.
- [231] V. Burkholder, C. Impey, and D. Sprayberry. High and Low Surface Brightness Galaxies in the Local Universe. V. Optical and H I Properties. Astron. J, 122(5):2318–2340, 2001.
- [232] W. Du, H. Wu, M. I. Lam, Y. Zhu, F. Lei, and Z. Zhou. Low Surface Brightness Galaxies Selected from the 40% Sky Area of the ALFALFA H I Survey. I. Sample and Statistical Properties. Astron. J., 149:199, 2015.
- [233] W. J. G. de Blok, S. S. McGaugh, and J. M. van der Hulst. HI observations of low surface brightness galaxies: probing low-density galaxies. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 283:18–54, 1996.
- [234] A. Mishra, N. G. Kantharia, M. Das, A. Omar, and D. C. Srivastava. GMRT H I study of giant low surface brightness galaxies. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 464:2741–2751, 2017.
- [235] M. Das, K. O'Neil, S. N. Vogel, and S. McGaugh. CO Detection and Millimeter Continuum Emission from Low Surface Brightness Galaxies. *Astrophys. J.*, 651:853–860, 2006.
- [236] M. Das, C. Sengupta, and M. Honey. The Extended H I Disk and Star Formation in the Dwarf Spiral Galaxy NGC 4701. Astrophys. J., 871:197, 2019.
- [237] W. J. G. de Blok and S. S. McGaugh. The dark and visible matter content of low surface brightness disc galaxies. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 290:533–552, 1997.
- [238] R. Kuzio de Naray, S. S. McGaugh, and J. C. Mihos. Constraining the NFW Potential with Observations and Modeling of LSB Galaxy Velocity Fields. Astrophys. J., 692:1321–1332, 2009.
- [239] V. Gammaldi, E. Karukes, and P. Salucci. Theoretical predictions for dark matter detection in dwarf irregular galaxies with gamma rays. *Phys. Rev. D*, 98(8):083008, 2018.
- [240] S. H. Cadena, R. Alfaro, A. Sandoval, E. Belmont, H. León, V. Gammaldi, E. Karukes, and P. Salucci. Searching for TeV DM

evidence from Dwarf Irregular Galaxies with the HAWC Observatory. *PoS*, ICRC2017:897, 2018.

- [241] D. Hashimoto, O. Macias, A. J. Nishizawa, K. Hayashi, M. Takada, M. Shirasaki, and S. Ando. Constraining dark matter annihilation with HSC Low Surface Brightness Galaxies. *JCAP*, 01:059, 2020.
- [242] R. A. Swaters, B. F. Madore, F. C. van den Bosch, and M. Balcells. The Central mass distribution in dwarf and low-surface brightness galaxies. *Astrophys. J.*, 583:732–751, 2003.
- [243] R. A. Swaters. *Dark matter in late-type dwarf galaxies*. PhD thesis, University of Groningen, 1999.
- [244] R. A. Swaters, R. Sancisi, T. S. van Albada, and J. M. van der Hulst. The rotation curves shapes of late-type dwarf galaxies. Astron. Astrophys., 493:871, 2009.
- [245] F. C. van den Bosch, A. Burkert, and R. A. Swaters. The angular momentum content of dwarf galaxies: new challenges for the theory of galaxy formation. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 326:1205, 2001.
- [246] E. L. Lokas and G. A. Mamon. Properties of spherical galaxies and clusters with an nfw density profile. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 321:155, 2001.
- [247] A. R. Liddle. An introduction to modern cosmology. 1998.
- [248] A. Charbonnier et al. Dark matter profiles and annihilation in dwarf spheroidal galaxies: prospectives for present and future gamma-ray observatories - I. The classical dSphs. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 418:1526–1556, 2011.
- [249] A. J. Fitt and P. Alexander. Magnetic fields in late-type galaxies. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 261:445–452, 1993.
- [250] J. J. Condon, W. D. Cotton, E. W. Greisen, Q. F. Yin, R. A. Perley, G. B. Taylor, and J. J. Broderick. The NRAO VLA Sky survey. Astron. J., 115:1693–1716, 1998.
- [251] T. L. Bourke et al., editors. Proceedings, Advancing Astrophysics with the Square Kilometre Array (AASKA14): Giardini Naxos, Italy, June 9-13, 2014, volume AASKA14. SISSA, 2015.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [252] R. Braun, T. Bourke, J. A. Green, E. Keane, and J. Wagg. Advancing Astrophysics with the Square Kilometre Array. In Advancing Astrophysics with the Square Kilometre Array (AASKA14), page 174.
- [253] P. Salucci, M. I. Wilkinson, M. G. Walker, G. F. Gilmore, E. K. Grebel, A. Koch, C. F. Martins, and R. F. G. Wyse. Dwarf spheroidal galaxy kinematics and spiral galaxy scaling laws. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 420:2034, 2012.
- [254] G. Maier, L. Arrabito, K. Bernlöhr, J. Bregeon, P. Cumani, T. Hassan, and A. Moralejo. Performance of the Cherenkov Telescope Array. *PoS*, ICRC2017:846, 2018.
- [255] P. Bhattacharjee, D. Choudhury, K. Das, D. K. Ghosh, and P. Majumdar. Gamma-ray and Synchrotron Radiation from Dark Matter annihilations in Ultra-faint Dwarf Galaxies. JCAP, 2021(06):041, 2021.
- [256] H. Baumgardt and S. Mieske. High mass-to-light ratios of UCDs -Evidence for dark matter ? Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 391:942, 2008.
- [257] A. B. Pace and L. E. Strigari. Scaling Relations for Dark Matter Annihilation and Decay Profiles in Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 482(3):3480–3496, 2019.
- [258] J. F. Navarro, A. Ludlow, V. Springel, J. Wang, M. Vogelsberger, S. D. M. White, A. Jenkins, C. S. Frenk, and A. Helmi. The Diversity and Similarity of Cold Dark Matter Halos. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 402:21, 2010.
- [259] J. Wagner. Cosmic structures from a mathematical perspective 1. Dark matter halo mass density profiles. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 52(6):61, 2020.
- [260] W. J. G. de Blok, S. S. McGaugh, and V. C. Rubin. High-Resolution Rotation Curves of Low Surface Brightness Galaxies. II. Mass Models. *Astron. J.*, 122(5):2396–2427, nov 2001.
- [261] M. Ackermann et al. Constraining Dark Matter Models from a Combined Analysis of Milky Way Satellites with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107:241302, 2011.
- [262] A. Geringer-Sameth and S. M. Koushiappas. Exclusion of canonical WIMPs by the joint analysis of Milky Way dwarfs with Fermi. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107:241303, 2011.

- [263] K. Spekkens, B. S. Mason, J. E. Aguirre, and B. Nhan. A Deep Search for Extended Radio Continuum Emission From Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies: Implications for Particle Dark Matter. Astrophys. J., 773:61, 2013.
- [264] A. Natarajan, J. E. Aguirre, K. Spekkens, and B. S. Mason. Green Bank Telescope Constraints on Dark Matter Annihilation in Segue I. 2015.
- [265] W. R. Webber, M. A. Lee, and M. Gupta. Propagation of Cosmic-Ray Nuclei in a Diffusing Galaxy with Convective Halo and Thin Matter Disk. Astrophys. J., 390:96, 1992.
- [266] E. A. Baltz and J. Edsjo. Positron propagation and fluxes from neutralino annihilation in the halo. *Phys. Rev. D*, 59:023511, 1998.
- [267] D. Maurin, F. Donato, R. Taillet, and P. Salati. Cosmic rays below z=30 in a diffusion model: new constraints on propagation parameters. *Astrophys. J.*, 555:585–596, 2001.
- [268] H. T. Intema, P. Jagannathan, K. P. Mooley, and D. A. Frail. The GMRT 150 MHz All-sky Radio Survey: First Alternative Data Release TGSS ADR1. Astron. Astrophys., 598:A78, 2017.
- [269] J. J. Condon, W. D. Cotton, E. W. Greisen, Q. F. Yin, R. A. Perley, G. B. Taylor, and J. J. Broderick. The NRAO VLA Sky Survey. Astron. J, 115(5):1693–1716, May 1998.
- [270] A. Weltman et al. Fundamental physics with the Square Kilometre Array. *Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral.*, 37:e002, 2020.
- [271] S. Colafrancesco, M. Regis, P. Marchegiani, G. Beck, R. Beck, H. Zechlin, A. Lobanov, and D. Horns. Probing the nature of Dark Matter with the SKA. *PoS*, AASKA14:100, 2015.
- [272] R. Braun, A. Bonaldi, T. Bourke, E. Keane, and J. Wagg. Anticipated SKA1 Science Performance. 2017. "SKA-TEL-SKO-0000818".
- [273] R. Braun, A. Bonaldi, T. Bourke, E. Keane, and J. Wagg. Anticipated Performance of the Square Kilometre Array – Phase 1 (SKA1). 2019.
- [274] S. Funk. Indirect Detection of Dark Matter with gamma rays. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 112:2264, 2015.

- [275] S. Hoof, A. Geringer-Sameth, and R. Trotta. A Global Analysis of Dark Matter Signals from 27 Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies using 11 Years of Fermi-LAT Observations. JCAP, 02:012, 2020.
- [276] M. Di Mauro, X. Hou, C. Eckner, G. Zaharijas, and E. Charles. Search for γ-ray emission from dark matter particle interactions from Andromeda and Triangulum Galaxies with the Fermi Large Area Telescope. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(12):123027, 2019.
- [277] G. Beck. Radio-Frequency Searches for Dark Matter in Dwarf Galaxies. Galaxies, 7(1):16, 2019.
- [278] M. Regis, S. Colafrancesco, S. Profumo, W. J. G. de Blok, M. Massardi, and L. Richter. Local Group dSph radio survey with ATCA (III): Constraints on Particle Dark Matter. JCAP, 10:016, 2014.
- [279] B. S. Acharya et al. Science with the Cherenkov Telescope Array. 11 2018.
- [280] Student. The Probable Error of a Mean. *Biometrika*, 6(1):1–25, 1908.
- [281] Miodrag L., editor. International Encyclopedia of Statistical Science. Springer, 2011.
- [282] Kim T. K. T test as a parametric statistic. Korean J. Anesthesiol, 68(6):540-546, 2015.
- [283] A. N. Kolmogorov. Sulla determinazione empiricadi una legge di distribuzione. Giornaledell'Istituto Italiano degli Attuari, 4:83–91, 1933.
- [284] N. Smirnov. Table for Estimating the Goodness of Fit of Empirical Distributions. Ann. Math. Statist., 19(2):279–281, 1948.
- [285] S. S. Shapiro and M. B. Wilk. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples)<sup>†</sup>. *Biometrika*, 52(3–4):591–611, 1965.
- [286] A. Loy, L. Follett, and H. Hofmann. Variations of Q-Q Plots The Power of our Eyes! arXiv e-prints, 2015.
- [287] M. B. Wilk and R. Gnanadesikan. Probability plotting methods for the analysis for the analysis of data. *Biometrika*, 55(1):1–17, 1968.
- [288] A. G. Asuero, A. Sayago, and A. G. González. The Correlation Coefficient: An Overview. Crit. Rev. Analyt. Chem., 36(1):41–59, 2006.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

[289] P. Schober, C. Boer, and L. A. Schwarte. Correlation Coefficients: Appropriate Use and Interpretation, Anesthesia and Analgesia. Anesth. Analg., 126(5):1763–1768, 2018.