GeV antiproton/gamma-ray excesses and the W-boson mass anomaly: three faces of ~ 60 – 70 GeV dark matter particle?
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For the newly discovered W-boson mass anomaly \cite{1}, one of the simplest dark matter (DM) models that can account for the anomaly without violating other astrophysical/experimental constraints is the inert two Higgs doublet model, in which the DM mass (m) is found to be within ~ 54 – 74 GeV \cite{2}. In this model, the annihilation of DM via $SS \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $SS \rightarrow WW^*$ would produce antiprotons and gamma rays, and may account for the excesses identified previously in both particles. Motivated by this, we re-analyze the AMS-02 antiproton and Fermi-LAT Galactic center gamma-ray data. For the antiproton analysis, the novel treatment is the inclusion of the charge-sign-dependent three-dimensional solar modulation model as constrained by the time-dependent proton data. We find that the excess of antiprotons is more distinct than previous results based on the force-field solar modulation model. The interpretation of this excess as the annihilation of $SS \rightarrow WW^*$ ($SS \rightarrow b\bar{b}$) requires a DM mass of ~ 40 – 80 (40 – 60) GeV and a velocity-averaged cross section of $O(10^{-26})$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$. As for the gamma-ray data analysis, rather than adopting the widely-used spatial template fitting, we employ an orthogonal approach with a data-driven spectral template analysis. The fitting to the GeV gamma-ray excess yields DM model parameters overlapped with those to fit the antiproton excess via the $WW^*$ channel. The consistency of the DM particle properties required to account for the W-boson mass anomaly, the GeV antiproton excess, and the GeV gamma-ray excess suggest a common origin of them.

I. INTRODUCTION

The dark matter (DM) problem remains one of the biggest mysteries of the cosmos. Among many kinds of candidates, the weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) is the most naturally motivated by the thermal production in the early Universe and its proper relic density today \cite{3}. Quite a lot of efforts have been spent in looking for WIMP DM in various kinds of experiments. No convincing signal has been identified in the direct detection experiments and very stringent constraints on the WIMP-nucleon interaction strength have been set (e.g., \cite{4, 8}). As for the indirect detection aiming to identify the products of the annihilation or decay of the DM particles \cite{3, 6}, some anomalies have been claimed in the past decade, such as the positron and electron excesses \cite{7, 9}, the antiproton excess \cite{12, 13}, and the Galactic center gamma-ray excess (GCE; \cite{14, 15}). While the positron and electron excesses might be naturally explained by astrophysical pulsars \cite{18, 19} and the DM interpretation is severely constrained by the gamma-ray and cosmic microwave background observations \cite{20}, the antiproton excess and the GCE which point to a consistent DM interpretation survive other constraints \cite{21, 22}. In spite that uncertainties of various astrophysical and particle physics ingredients exist \cite{24, 32}, common implications on the DM scenario from multi-messengers are very interesting. In any case, additional tests of this scenario from independent probes are very important in finally detecting DM particles.

Very recently, the measured W-boson mass by the CDF collaboration shows ~ 7σ deviation from the prediction of the standard model (SM), which strongly suggests the existence of new physics beyond the SM \cite{1}. One of the most economic solutions is to introduce an additional scalar doublet, in which the non-SM scalars can enhance the W-boson mass via the loop corrections. With a proper discrete symmetry $Z_2$, the lightest new scalar in the doublet can be stable and play the role of DM. One realization of this mechanism is the inert two Higgs doublet model (i2HDM), which is shown to be able to accommodate the new W-boson mass and various astrophysical/experimental constraints simultaneously \cite{2}. Considering available constraints from the collider searches for new physics, the electroweak precision tests, the direct detection of DM, and the relic density of DM, the mass of DM is limited within the range of 54 GeV < $m_S$ < 74 GeV, and the annihilation is dominated by the process of $SS \rightarrow WW^*$ for $m_S \geq 60$ GeV and by $SS \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ otherwise.

It is thus essential to examine whether the astrophysical data are in support of such an attractive possibility or not. For such a purpose, we re-analyze the AMS-02 antiproton and Fermi-LAT Galactic center gamma-ray data. Compared with previous works, we improve the technical treatments in several aspects to reduce potential uncertainties of the analyses. For the antiproton modeling, our novel treatment is to include the charge-sign-dependent three-dimensional (3D) solar modulation model \cite{33, 34} as constrained by the time-dependent AMS-02 proton data \cite{35}. To investigate the GCE, taking a data-driven method, we identify the background components for the gamma-ray sky solely with their spectral and morphological properties as in Ref. \cite{36}. To minimize the possible contamination from the astrophysical contribution in the galactic bulge \cite{31, 31}, a large portion of the galactic disk is masked.
We find consistent DM particle properties to account for the W-boson mass anomaly, the GCE, and the antiproton excess, which are in favor of a common origin.

II. ANTIPROTONS

In previous studies, the solar modulation of the antiprotons is usually assumed to be the same as that of protons and the force-field approximation \[47\] was often adopted. However, it is known that the particles with opposite charge have very different trajectories in the heliosphere (e.g., \[39\]). Such an effect should be taken into account to properly reproduce the local interstellar spectra (LIS) of protons and antiprotons. For such a purpose, here we employ the charge-sign-dependent 3D solar modulation model developed in \[40, 41\]. The transport of charged particles inside the heliosphere is described by the Parker’s equation \[42\]

\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = - (V_{sw} + \langle \nu_d \rangle) \cdot \nabla f + \nabla \cdot \left( K^{(s)} \cdot \nabla f \right)
\]

\[\frac{1}{3} (\nabla \cdot V_{sw}) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln p},\]

where \(f(r, p, t)\) is the phase space distribution function of cosmic rays, \(V_{sw}\) is the solar wind speed, \(\langle \nu_d \rangle\) is the pitch-angle-averaged drift velocity, \(K^{(s)}\) is the symmetric diffusion tensor, and \(p\) is the momentum of the particle. See the Appendix Sec. A for more details. We solve the Parker’s equation numerically employing the stochastic differential equations \[48, 49\].

The LIS of protons is derived through fitting to the Voyager-1 \[43\], AMS-02 \[8\], and DAMPE \[44\] data. To do this fitting, we employ the GALPROP code to calculate the propagation of cosmic rays in the Milky Way \[45\]. The detailed fitting procedure is described in the Appendix Sec. B. The antiproton LIS, calculated based on the proton LIS, is shown by the black solid line in Fig. 1. Here we use the new parameterization of the antiproton production cross section from Ref. \[46\] and an energy-dependent nuclear enhancement factor to take into account the contribution from heavy nuclei in both cosmic rays and the interstellar medium \[47\].

We fit the time-dependent proton fluxes measured by AMS-02 \[55\] to obtain the solar modulation parameters. The AMS-02 monthly proton fluxes are grouped into 9 time bins, each contains 6 Bartels rotations, from May 19, 2011 to May 26, 2015, corresponding to the antiproton measurement time \[48\]. The fitting results of the main modulation parameters are given in the Appendix Sec. C. Using the best-fit parameters, we calculate the modulated antiproton spectrum, as shown by the blue dashed line in Fig. 1. We find that, the modulated background spectrum from the cosmic ray interactions is lower than the data between 1 and 30 GeV, consistent with previous studies \[12, 13, 21\]. Intriguingly, the difference between the antiproton data and the predicted astrophysical background is more distinct than that found previously with the force-free solar modulation. This is perhaps due to that particles with negative charge were modulated more severely than positive charged particles after the reversal of the heliospheric magnetic field \[49\].

Then we consider the DM contribution to the antiprotons. The DM density distribution is assumed to be a generalized Navarro-Frenk-White profile \[50\], with a local density of 0.4 GeV cm\(^{-3}\) and an inner slope of 1.28. The annihilation into \(bb\) or \(W^+W^-\) is considered. For DM mass \(m_s < m_{W}\), we also consider the off-shell annihilation into \(W^*\), as in the case of \(i2HDM\). The DM annihilation into \(W^*\) is simulated with MadGraph5_aMC@NLO \[51\], including all three-body final states of one on-shell and one off-shell W bosons. We further utilize PYTHIA 8 \[52\] to carry out the simulation of final state radiation, hadronization, and particle decays, and obtain the corresponding energy spectra of antiprotons and \(\gamma\) rays.

We perform a likelihood fitting to the antiproton data, with a marginalization of the constant re-scaling factor of the background, and obtain the constraints on the \((m_s, \langle \sigma v \rangle)\) parameters. The results are shown in Fig. 2. The favored mass of DM particles is from 40 to 60 GeV for the \(bb\) channel, and from 40 to 80 GeV for the \(W^+W^-\) channel, respectively, and the annihilation cross section is around the level of the thermal production of DM, i.e., \(O(10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1})\). We can see that the contours of \(W^*\) overlap well with the \(i2HDM\) model parameters to fit the \(m_W\) anomaly \[2\]. Two possible regions of the \(i2HDM\) parameter space with DM mass of about 70 – 73 GeV (for four-point interactions) and about 62 – 63 GeV (for the Higgs resonance and scalar-pseudoscalar co-annihilation region) can commonly account for the antiproton excess and the \(m_W\) anomaly. In the even lower-mass window \((m_s < 60 \text{ GeV})\), the \(i2HDM\) model to fit the \(m_W\) anomaly typically requires DM to annihilate dominantly into \(bb\) but with a much
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smaller cross section and seems not able to produce enough antiprotons.

an indication of a spatial correlation between the GCE and astrophysical component was shown if the spatial distribution of the GCE is free [36].

Besides the annihilation channel of $SS \rightarrow bb$ [36], here we apply this method to investigate whether the annihilation of DM via $SS \rightarrow WW^*$ could be consistent with the Galactic center $\gamma$-ray data. The $\gamma$-ray dataset, the point sources, and the spectra from the “cloud-like” component and the “bubble-like” component are the same as in Ref. [36]. Here the DM density distribution is the same as that for the antiproton analysis in Sec. III. The region of interest (ROI) used in this analysis is a square region selected by Galactic latitudes $|b|<20^\circ$ and Galactic longitudes $|l|<20^\circ$, with a mask of the Galactic plane with $|b|<8^\circ$, to eliminate the influence from rich sources, the boxy bulge, the nuclear bulge and the X-shaped bulge [31, 33].

We scan the DM parameters $(m_S, \langle \sigma v \rangle)$ to calculate the likelihood map of different parameters. See the Sec. E of the Appendix for the selected ROI and likelihood map of the GCE fitting. The best fit DM parameters we got are $(m_S, \langle \sigma v \rangle) = (69.7 \text{ GeV}, 2.4 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$, for $SS \rightarrow WW^*$ channel. For the channel $SS \rightarrow bb$, the best fit parameters are $(m_S, \langle \sigma v \rangle) = (80.4 \text{ GeV}, 1.9 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$. The $1\sigma$ and $2\sigma$ contours of the fittings are given in Fig. 2 by blue lines. At $2\sigma$ level, the favored region of the $WW^*$ channel from the the GCE, the antiproton excess, and the $m_W$ anomaly overlap with each other. Given that there should be additional uncertainties from various aspects of the theoretical modeling (e.g., the density profile of DM in the inner Galaxy and the simulation of the spectra of the annihilation final state particles), we regard these three anomalies are accounted for simultaneously with the same DM model component.

\section{III. GALACTIC CENTER GAMMA RAYS}

The Galactic center is expected to gather high densities of DM, which makes it appealing for the indirect detection of DM. A spatially extended excess of $\gamma$ rays in the 1–10 GeV energy range, with respect to the expected emission of cataloged point sources and astrophysical diffuse components, was found in the Fermi-LAT observations (e.g., [14–17]), named as the GCE. Usually, the analysis is done with spatial template regression techniques, where fittings with multiple components of physically or observationally motivated spatial templates for the diffuse Galactic $\gamma$-ray emission (DGE) are adopted to investigate the astrophysical background. Further the spectrum of the GCE is estimated by including the spatial template for DM distribution in the spatial template regression analysis. Unsurprisingly, the DGE model suffers from some uncertainties, associated with the cosmic ray distribution and the gas distribution in the Milky Way. An orthogonal approach was developed to investigate this problem, assuming energy spectra instead of spatial morphologies of various components [53].

The $\gamma$-ray sky is decomposed into point sources and diffuse emission component by $D^3PO$ and spectra from the “cloud-like” component and the “bubble-like” component, for diffuse emission from hadronic and leptonic processes, were derived from two distinctive regions [53]. The astrophysical background is investigated by including point sources and data-driven spectral templates. Further, the spectral information of DM annihilation is used as a new component. The existence of the GCE was confirmed and consistent DM parameters were derived in this alternative way if the spatial distribution of the GCE is fixed as in Ref. [17], although

\section{IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION}

In this work we re-analyze the antiproton excess and GCE for their possible DM origin, motivated by the most recent experimental results of the $W$-boson mass anomaly. While our results are generally in agreement with previous results, we incorporate several new technical treatments in the analysis such as the charge-sign-dependent 3D solar modulation of antiprotons and a spectral template fitting scheme of $\gamma$ rays, as well as the off-shell annihilation channel of $SS \rightarrow WW^*$. It is very intriguing to find that the three very different anomalies can be simultaneously accounted for in a minimal DM model with DM particle mass of ~ 60–70 GeV. The velocity-weighted annihilation cross section is about $\langle \sigma v \rangle \sim 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and is just consistent with the expectation of the thermal production of DM. Although there are various kinds of uncertainties of the antiproton background calculation like the propagation model of cosmic rays, the hadronic interaction models, and/or the solar modulation which is partially addressed in this work [26, 27], as well as debates of the astrophysical or DM origin of the GCE [28, 52], the DM interpretation of the three independent signals seems to be a straightforward, economic, and attractive possibility. The ongoing direct detection experiments such as the PandaX-4T, Xenon-nT and LUX has a good
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FIG. 2. The favored DM parameter space via fitting to the antiproton and GCE data ($1\sigma$ and $2\sigma$ from inside to outside), as well as the $i2HDM$ model parameters to fit the $W$-boson mass anomaly (the 95% region, adopted from Ref. [36]).
prospect to detect it in the near future, as shown in [2].
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APPENDIX

A. Setup of the 3D modulation model

We describe in more detail the ingredients of the 3D modulation model. The diffusion tensor, $K^{\parallel}$, given in the heliospheric magnetic field (HMF) aligned coordinates, is

$$K^{\parallel} = \begin{pmatrix} k_{\parallel} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_{\perp,\parallel} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_{\perp,\parallel} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $k_{\parallel}$ is the parallel diffusion coefficient, $k_{\perp,\parallel}$ and $k_{\perp,\parallel}$ are the two perpendicular diffusion coefficients in the radial and latitudinal directions. In our work, we parameterize the parallel diffusion coefficient as

$$k_{\parallel} = k_{0}^{\parallel} \frac{B_0}{p_0} \left( \frac{p}{p_0} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{p}{p_0} \right)^{\beta} \right]^{-\mu - \eta},$$

where $\beta$ is the particle speed in unit of the speed of light, $B$ is the magnitude of the HMF with $B_0 = 1$ nT, $p$ is the particle momentum, $p_0 = 1$ GV, and $s$ is the smoothness transition parameter which is fixed to be 2.2. The perpendicular diffusion coefficients are assumed to be $k_{\perp,\parallel} = 0.02 k_{\parallel}$. The free parameters of the diffusion coefficient are $k_{0}^{\parallel}, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$, and $p_s$.

We adopt the standard Parker HMF model as

$$B(r, \theta) = \frac{A_0 B_0}{r^2} \left( e_r - \frac{r \Omega \sin \theta}{V_{sw}} e_\theta \right) \left[ 1 - 2H(\theta - \theta_{cs}) \right],$$

where $B_0$ is the reference value at the Earth’s location, $A_0 = A \sqrt{1 + \Omega^2 / V_{sw}^2}$ with $A = \pm 1$ describing the polarity of the HMF, $\Omega$ is the angular velocity of the Sun, $H(\theta - \theta_{cs})$ is the Heaviside function and $\theta_{cs}$ determines the polar extent of the Heliospheric Current Sheet (HCS). Following Ref. [56], we have

$$\cot(\theta_{cs}) = -\tan(\alpha) \sin(\phi^*),$$

where $\alpha$ is the HCS tilt angle, $\phi^* = \phi + r \Omega / V_{sw}$ is the foot point at the Sun for the corresponding spiral magnetic field line with $\phi$ being the longitude angle of the current sheet surface.

The drift velocity ($v_d$) can be described as

$$v_d = \frac{p v}{3q B} \nabla \times \frac{B}{B},$$

where $q$ is the particle’s charge and $v$ is the velocity. To avoid the singularity of the drift close to the HCS where the direction of the magnetic field changes abruptly, the drift velocity within $(-2R_g, 2R_g)$ to the HCS is approximated as $v/6$ in magnitude and the direction is along the HCS [54, 58]. Here $R_g$ is the gyro radius of the particle. As discussed in Ref. [59], the drift velocity may be suppressed, especially for when the solar activity is strong. Here we multiply a factor $K_d \in [0, 1]$ on the drift velocity and fit $K_d$ with the data.

B. The proton LIS

The Voyager-1 measurements of proton fluxes outside the heliosphere [43] and the AMS-02 measurements at high energies (e.g., $\geq 50$ GeV) [8] can robustly constrain the low- and high-energy parts of the proton LIS. However, for the intermediate energy range, the LIS entangles with the solar modulation, and thus a model-dependence is unavoidable. The antiproton LIS depends further on the distribution and interactions of protons in the Milky Way as well as the interstellar propagation of particles. The GALPROP code is used to calculate the propagation of cosmic rays. The propagation parameters were derived through fitting the secondary and primary nuclei of cosmic rays [60]. The reacceleration model is adopted as the benchmark of this work since it fits the secondary nuclei data much better than the model without reacceleration. We use a cubic spline method [61] to describe the source spectrum of protons, and employ the force-field modulation model to approximate the average solar modulation of protons during the data-taking period of AMS-02 [8]. The solid line in Fig. A1 shows the calculated LIS of protons using the best-fit source parameters. Also shown are AMS-02 proton data from [62] with the data-taking period is covered by the monthly AMS-02 proton data, and the 3D modulation (dashed-dotted) with parameters derived in this work (see below). The differences between the 3D modulated spectrum and data is very small.

C. Fit to the time-dependent proton fluxes

The monthly proton fluxes reported in [35] are used to derive the time-dependent solar modulation parameters. To reduce the computation load, the monthly data are rebinned into nine time bins with Bartels rotations: 2426 – 2431, 2432 – 2437, 2438 – 2443, 2444 – 2449, 2450 – 2455, 2456 – 2461, 2462 – 2467, 2468 – 2475, and 2476 – 2479, which cover the time interval of the antiproton measurements [48]. Note that there is no data during Bartels rotations 2472 – 2473. Since there is about one year time lag between the cosmic ray flux modulation and solar activities [61], following Ref. [34], we utilize the previous 13 month averaged interplanetary parameters for every month, including the HCS tilt angle from
D. Impact of uncertainties of the solar modulation fitting

To quantify the uncertainties of the solar modulation fitting, we adopt the modulation parameters which match the upper and lower boundaries of the proton data and repeat the likelihood fitting of the DM contribution to antiprotons. The resulting 1σ and 2σ constraints on the \((m_S, \langle \sigma v \rangle)\) parameters are shown in Fig. A5. This results in uncertainties of \(\sim 20\%\), mainly on the annihilation cross section.

E. The ROI and likelihood map of the GCE fitting

The left panel of Fig. A6 shows the ROI of our analysis. The right panel shows the likelihood map, characterized by \(\Delta \chi^2 = \chi^2 - \chi^2_{\text{min}}\) on the \((m_S, \langle \sigma v \rangle)\) parameter plane for the \(S S \rightarrow WW^*\) channel.


[3] See the definition of \(\chi^2\) in Ref. [36]
FIG. A4. The fitting solar modulation parameters and 1σ uncertainties. The period with uncertain HMF polarity is marked in gray.

FIG. A5. The favored DM parameter regions (1σ and 2σ) by antiprotons for solar modulation parameters which enveloping the measurement uncertainties of protons.

FIG. A6. Left: The ROI (brown) used in our analysis. Right: The Δχ² map on the mass and cross section parameter plane. The yellow star represents the best-fit DM parameters (⟨σv⟩, ⟨S⟩) = (69.7 GeV, 2.4 × 10⁻²⁶ cm³ s⁻¹).
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