Search for Dark Matter Annihilation in Draco with STACEE

D.D. Driscoll* and C.E. Covault
Dept. of Physics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106

J. Ball,† J.E. Carson,‡ A. Jarvis, R.A. Ong, and J. Zweerink
Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095

D.S. Hanna, J. Kildea,§ T. Lindner,¶ C. Mueller,** and K. Ragan
Dept. of Physics, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 2T8

P. Fortin and R. Mukherjee
Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

D.A. Williams
Santa Cruz Inst. for Particle Physics, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064

D.M. Gingrich
Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2G7 and
TRIUMF, Vancouver, BC V6T 2A3 Canada
(Dated: June 19, 2008)

For some time, the Draco dwarf spheroidal galaxy has garnered interest as a possible source for the indirect detection of dark matter. Its large mass-to-light ratio and relative proximity to the Earth provide favorable conditions for the production of detectable gamma rays from dark matter self-annihilation in its core.

The Solar Tower Atmospheric Cherenkov Effect Experiment (STACEE) is an atmospheric Cherenkov telescope located in Albuquerque, NM capable of detecting gamma rays at energies above 100 GeV. We present the results of the STACEE observations of Draco during the 2005-2006 observing season totaling 10.2 hours of livetime after cuts. We do not detect a significant gamma-ray signal from Draco, and place an upper limit on a power law spectrum of $\frac{dN}{dE}\big|_{\rm Draco} < 4\times10^{-8}\left(\frac{E}{\rm GeV}\right)^{-2.2}\gamma\,{\rm s}^{-1}{\rm cm}^{-2}{\rm GeV}^{-1}$ Assuming a smooth NFW profile for the dark matter halo, we also derive upper limits for the cross-section ($<\sigma v>$) of WIMP self-annihilation.

PACS numbers: Valid PACS appear here

I. INTRODUCTION

In the flat universe described by the ΛCDM cosmological model, dark matter is believed to comprise 23% of the total energy density of the universe [1]. Very little about dark matter is known other than by its gravitational influence. Both observational constraints and particle physics models independently suggest that dark matter may take the form of Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (WIMPs), a general class of particles with low cross-sections ($\sigma \ll 10^{-40}$ cm^2) and high masses (10-1000 GeV) [2]. Since there is no Standard Model particle with these properties, a likely candidate is the lightest particle of supersymmetric extensions to the Standard Model.

Given the inherent difficulties with both the accelerator production and the direct detection of such a particle, an indirect search method can complement other search methods. If the WIMPs can self-annihilate, then a signal in gamma rays or cosmic-ray positrons could be detected in a region where the WIMPs have a particularly high density. Massive WIMPs would tend to accumulate at the bottom of gravitational potential wells such as galaxies, where they could undergo self-annihilation processes. Depending on the distance to the source, the dark matter distribution, the WIMP mass, and the branching ratios of the reaction products, a measurable flux of high energy gamma rays could result [3].

The Draco dwarf spheroidal galaxy has long garnered interest as a potential source of concentrated dark matter [4]. Its high concentration of dark matter and cuspy central profile [5] and relative proximity to the Earth ($\mathcal{D} \sim 75$ kpc)[6] make it a likely source of gamma rays from WIMP self-annihilation. Recent studies rank it as one of the most promising candidates for the indirect detection of dark matter via gamma rays [7].

II. STACEE OBSERVATIONS OF DRACO

The Solar Tower Atmospheric Cherenkov Effect Experiment (STACEE) is a gamma-ray telescope operating at

*Current Address: Kent State University, Ashtabula Campus, Ashtabula, OH 44004 ; Electronic address: `ddd3@po.cwru.edu`
†Current Address: Gemini Observatory, Hilo, HI 96720
‡Current Address: Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Menlo Park, CA 94025
§Current Address: F.L. Whipple Obs., Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Amado, AZ 85645
¶Current Address: Dept. of Physics and Astr., Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC
**Current Address: Sander Geophysical Limited, Ottawa, ON K1V 1C1

	ON events	OFF events	Excess	Significance
After Time Cuts	177498	177273	225	$+0.39\sigma$
+ grid ratio Cut	3094	3120	-26	-0.33σ

TABLE I: Data summary of STACEE observations of Draco during the 2005-2006 observing season, representing 3.67×10^4 s of livetime including the grid-ratio cut as described in the text.



FIG. 1: Effective area curves for STACEE observations of Draco. The blue (solid) line represents the STACEE effective area without cuts, the red (dashed) line represents the STACEE effective area after cuts, including a grid-ratio cut.

the National Solar Thermal Test Facility (NSTTF) in Albuquerque, NM. STACEE is a wavefront-sampling atmospheric Cherenkov telescope which uses 64 of the mirrors in the NSTTF heliostat array for a total of $\sim 2400\ \mathrm{m}^2$ of collecting surface. Cherenkov light from gamma ray-induced air showers is reflected off the heliostats onto secondary mirrors on a tower on the south side of the field. These secondaries focus the light from each heliostat onto a single photomultiplier tube (PMTs). Pulses from the PMTs are split, with one copy discriminated and used in the formation of a trigger and the other digitized using a 1 GS/s digitizer. The trigger selects showers that deposit light evenly over the heliostat field. Such a trigger favors those showers initiated by gamma rays over those resulting from charged cosmic rays, the most important background for STACEE. For a more complete description of the STACEE experiment, see [8].

The basic unit of observation for STACEE is the “ON-OFF” pair; 28 minutes on-source and 28 minutes off-source. Both observations view the same path across the sky in local coordinates (altitude and azimuth), but separated by 30 minutes in celestial coordinates (right ascension). The off-source observation allows for a measurement of the local background conditions. We measure the significance of a measurement as in [9].

STACEE observations of Draco total 35 “ON-OFF” pairs, of which 10.2 hours of livetime remain after excluding periods with bad weather and known technical difficulties. Our data set is summarized in Table I.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

A. Data Selection Criteria

Our raw background trigger rate from cosmic rays is approximately 5 Hz. In order to reduce this, we perform a grid-ratio cut which preferentially removes hadron-induced showers. This technique has been successfully used elsewhere [10] and our implementation is described in more detail in [11]. A basic description of the technique is that the “smoothness” of a shower is measured by the height-to-width ratio (H/W) of the sum of pulses from all 64 channels in the detector. This quantity depends on the relative timing of each FADC trace, which depends on the assumed impact point of the shower core (i.e., the extrapolated shower axis). The grid-ratio cut is based on how sharply peaked the H/W distribution is as a function of assumed core position. Gamma-ray showers, which are smoother and more symmetric, are expected to produce narrower H/W distributions than hadronic showers, which result in broader, clumpier deposits of Cherenkov light. Applied to data taken on the Crab Nebula, the grid-ratio cut improves the detection significance from 4.8 standard deviations (σ) to 8.1 standard deviations [12].

As seen in Table I, we do not detect an excess gamma-ray signal from Draco in our data set. We derive an upper limit for the flux from Draco given a measure of our detector response to a candidate source spectrum. We discuss two possible source spectra, a power law (suggested by the gamma-ray flux from the galactic center[13]) and a candidate dark matter spectrum, which will necessarily have a sharp cutoff at the energy corresponding to the candidate WIMP mass.

B. Detector Sensitivity

The intensity distribution of Cherenkov light as it strikes the ground is strongly dependent on the energy of the incoming gamma ray. Our sensitivity is also dependent on the location of the center of the shower relative to the heliostat field. We use simulated showers in order to derive a measure of the detector response called the effective area, given by the product of the probability that a shower triggers our detector with the area over which the simulated showers were generated. Our simulations were created with the CORSIKA air shower simulation package[14] together with our own optical ray-tracing model for the heliostats, secondaries, and PMTs, and a simulation of the electronics [12, 15]. Figure 1 shows effective area curves for STACEE observations of Draco. Since STACEE has an energy-dependent response, our sensitivity to a given source depends on its energy spectrum. STACEE's energy threshold is defined as the peak of the response curve, as is customary in gamma-ray astronomy.

C. Determining the Gamma-Ray Flux Limit

A flux limit can be found for a given source by integrating the detector response over all energies and comparing it with the upper limit of our observed counts, where $N_{\rm UL}$ is given by the 95% upper limit of the excess $N_{\rm ON} - N_{\rm OFF}$:

$$N_{\rm UL} = T \int_0^\infty A_{eff}(E)\Phi(E)dE \tag{1}$$

where T is the livetime and $A_{eff}(E)$ is the effective area. The differential flux, $dN/dE = C\phi(E)$, is composed of a unitless spectral shape function which is then scaled by a normalization constant with units of $[\gamma\ \rm cm^{-2}\ s^{-1}\ GeV^{-1}]$ to match the data.

For the data given in Table I including the grid-ratio cut, $N_{\rm UL} = 138$, and the resulting upper limit for an $E^{-2.2}$ power law is:

$$\left.\frac{dN}{dE}\right|_{\rm Draco} < 4\times10^{-8}\left(\frac{E}{\rm GeV}\right)^{-2.2} \tag{2}$$
$$[\gamma\ \rm s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}\ GeV^{-1}]$$

at an energy threshold of 220 GeV. Figure 2 shows a comparison of this limit with the published upper limit of the Whipple collaboration[16].

We also include a measured spectrum of the Crab Nebula using the same observation techniques as above:

$$\left.\frac{dN}{dE}\right|_{\rm Crab} = (1\pm3)\times10^{-7}\left(\frac{E}{\rm GeV}\right)^{-(2.2\pm0.3)} \tag{3}$$
$$[\gamma\ \rm s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}\ GeV^{-1}]$$

where the errors listed represent the systematic uncertainty in a power-law fit to the data. The Crab is a standard-candle source for gamma-ray astronomy and this differential energy spectrum, also shown in Figure 2, agrees with other published spectra[17][18].

D. Estimating the WIMP Self-Annihilation Rate

In order to determine the gamma-ray flux from a dark matter halo, we follow [7]:

$$\left.\frac{dN}{dE}\right|_i = \phi_i(E)\frac{<\sigma v>_i}{M_\chi^2}\mathcal{L}(\rho_s, r_s, \mathcal{D}) \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is a structure component in terms of a scale density (ρ_s), a scale radius (r_s), and the distance to the cluster ($\mathcal{D}$). The subscript i represents the intermediate state in the decay channel from self-annihilation to gamma rays. The spectrum has the form:



FIG. 2: STACEE Flux limits for a $\frac{dN}{dE} \propto E^{-2.2}$ energy spectrum as applied to Draco (blue). For comparison, also shown is the energy spectrum of the Crab Nebula (green) as measured by STACEE which is well fit by Eq. 4

$$\phi_i(E) = \alpha_1\frac{E}{M_\chi}\left(\frac{E}{M_\chi}\right)^{-3/2}\exp\left[-\alpha_2\frac{E}{M_\chi}\right] \tag{5}$$

where the constants α_1 and α_2 depend on the decay channel of the self-annihilation. Our upper limit will be dominated by the channel with the hardest spectrum, in this case $u\bar{u}$ ($\alpha_1 = 0.95$ and $\alpha_2 = 6.5$), since our energy threshold is similar to the WIMP mass.

Starting with a general matter-density profile:

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\rho_s}{\tilde{r}^\gamma(1+\tilde{r})^{\delta-\gamma}} \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{r} \equiv r/r_s$ has been normalized to the scale radius and $\gamma = 1$ and $\delta = 3$ for the commonly-used NFW profile. The self-annihilation rate goes as ρ^2, so we integrate this over volume and divide by $4\pi\mathcal{D}^2$ to get the flux at the Earth, which gives us:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\rho_s^2 r_s^3}{3\mathcal{D}^2} \tag{7}$$

The claim in [7] is that the term $\rho_s^2 r_s^3$ is tightly constrained by velocity dispersion measurements and is also relatively insensitive to the inner slope (γ) of the profile. We conservatively use the lower bound of $\rho_s^2 r_s^3 \sim 10^{14.8}\ M_\odot^2\ \rm kpc^{-3}$ given there for Draco.

Finally, we substitute Eq. 4 into Eq. 1 and solve for $<\sigma v>$ as a function of M_χ to determine an upper limit, as shown in Figure 3.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

STACEE is a low-threshold, ground-based Atmospheric Cherenkov- Telescope that carried out observations of Draco



FIG. 3: Upper limits on the WIMP self-annihilation rate (cross-section multiplied by halo WIMP velocity) for the dark-matter spectrum in Eq. 5 as a function of m_χ as applied to the STACEE Draco observations. The dashed, colored lines represent the contributions of several decay channels. We exclude the area below the solid black line, which is the sum of the individual decay channels. The limit is dominated by the hardest part of the spectrum, the $u\bar{u}$ channel (see Eq. 5).

during the 2005-06 observing season. Draco's location and its inferred dark matter halo make it a possible source of detectable gamma rays due to WIMP self-annihilation at its core. STACEE does not detect a significant gamma-ray signal from Draco, and so we set an upper limit of about 23% of the Crab flux assuming a differential spectral index of $\alpha = -2.2$. Assuming a density profile for the halo and an annihilation spectrum, we also set upper limits on cross-sections for WIMPs whose rest-mass energy is greater than about 150 GeV. The limits we derive do not include any "boost" factor due to substructure (clumping) in the dark matter halo which may increase the flux by as much as a factor of 100 [7].

Acknowledgments

Many thanks go to the staff of the National Solar Tower Test Facility, who have made this work possible. This work was funded in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Fonds Quebecois de la Recherche sur la Nature et les Technologies, the Research Corporation, and the University of California at Los Angeles.

[1] G. Hinshaw et al. (WMAP) (2008), astro-ph/08030732.
[2] D. Akerib, E. Aprile, et al. (DUSEL Working Group) (2007), astro-ph/0605719.
[3] L. Roszkowski, R. R. de Austri, J. Silk, and R. Trotta (2007), astro-ph/07070622.
[4] C. Tyler, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 023509 (2002).
[5] E. Lokas, G. Mamon, and F. Prada, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **363**, 918 (2005).
[6] A. Bonanos et al., Astron. J. **127**, 861 (2004).
[7] L. E. Strigari, S. M. Koushiappas, J. S. Bullock, and M. Kaplinghat, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 083526 (2007).
[8] D. Gingrich et al. (STACEE), IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **52**, 2977 (2005).
[9] T. P. Li and Y. Q. Ma, Astrophys. J. **272**, 317 (1983).
[10] E. Brion (CELESTE), 35th COSPAR Scientific Assembly (Paris) (2004), unpublished, astro-ph/0501438.
[11] J. Kildea et al. (STACEE), 29th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Pune) **5**, 135 (2005), unpublished.
[12] T. Lindner, Ph.D. thesis, McGill Univ. (2006), unpublished.
[13] J. Ripken et al. (HESS), 30th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Merida) (2007), unpublished, astro-ph/07104057.
[14] D. Heck et al. (1998), http://www-ik.fzk.de/corsika/physics description/corsika phys.html.
[15] P. Fortin, Ph.D. thesis, McGill Univ. (2005), unpublished.
[16] J. Hall et al. (VERITAS), 29th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Pune) **4**, 69 (2005), unpublished.
[17] J. Grube et al. (VERITAS), 30th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf. (Merida) (2007), unpublished, astro-ph/07094300.
[18] F. Aharonian et al. (H.E.S.S.), Astron. Astrophys. **457**, 899 (2006).